

Exploring the Genesis of Early Arabic Linguistic Thought: Qur'anic Readers and Grammarians of the Kūfan Tradition (Part I)

Mustafa Shah

SOAS, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

The decisive extent of contributions made by Qur'anic readers to the development of the early Arabic linguistic tradition was never fittingly acknowledged in the biographical accounts which chronicled the inception and evolution of the linguistic sciences. The authors of these writings, and those who contributed to them, were principally grammarians and philologists of the two primary schools of linguistics: the Baṣrans and the Kūfans. They were mindfully keen to accentuate the independence of their discipline and its unique status. The Baṣran linguists assertively cast themselves as absolute innovators of Arabic linguistic thought, diminishing the supposedly nominal endeavours of their Kūfan peers.¹ Furthermore, even less attention was granted to those Qur'anic readers who were instrumental in pioneering the incipient models of language analysis; instead, many among them were ignored or viewed as adopting antiquated methods in the study of scripture and language. Nevertheless, a circumspect review of the formative years of this tradition reveals that the linguistic sciences were pre-eminently developed for the service of scripture. This was inevitably achieved by readers who adopted a functional approach to the language sciences: they composed literature on aspects of orthography and diacritics; tracts which enumerated the number of verses in codices and divided the Qur'an into meticulously calibrated parts and sections; writings which catalogued differences between indigenous codices and collated variant readings; treatises which explored phonological characteristics of the Arabic language and their relevance to the articulation of scripture, together with compilations outlining conventions for pauses and points of inception in the recitation of scripture. Yet these readers were awarded an indeterminate role in initiating confined aspects of linguistic thought. And in many instances they were expediently incorporated into the standard histories of the linguistic tradition.

The activities of these readers presupposed not only the immutable status of scripture but equally enshrined its genuine devotional value. These readers saw themselves as guardians of the Qur'anic diction and their approach to scripture was regulated by a resolute principle: the ascendancy of the declaration that *'al-qirā'a sunna'*: namely that Qur'anic readings which were enshrined in subtle linguistic configurations of the

holy text were based on established precedents, a precept which was to be assiduously applied when authenticating the integrity of the *lectiones* of scripture. However, there does emerge from the ranks of these readers a number of figures who pursued a seemingly more theoretical exposition of linguistic features of the readings of scripture; thus, where previously many readers devoted themselves to the operational aspects of preserving the diction of scripture as embodied in the corpus of *qirā'āt*, there were others who sought to contemplate their linguistic justification and indulge in speculative grammatical projection. Within this framework, the sacrosanct status of scripture was never questioned; indeed, the literary conventions of the Qur'an were imperiously deemed the ultimate criterion of linguistic eloquence.²

However, the instruments of linguistic thought developed to scrutinise and justify the linguistic characteristics and idiosyncrasies inherent in the corpus of Qur'anic readings were simultaneously referenced to sources of a more profane nature: this included poetry and material derived from Bedouin informants. Aspiring reader-grammarians developed models of language analysis based on this material. These models become a principal standard for grammar. More controversially, one of the implications of this 'transition' was that Qur'anic readings which contravened prescriptive linguistic conventions were the subject of criticism and in telling cases emendation was proposed. Significantly, there was no sinister motive behind such linguistic deliberation, merely a resolved fascination with the phenomenon of language; it paradoxically served to propel Arabic linguistic thought. Indeed, the corollary of this perceptibly more abstract approach to the language of scripture heralded the gradual emergence of the linguistic traditions of Kūfa and Baṣra. These developed schools were to place Arabic linguistic abstraction on an entirely different plane, symbolising the separation between the old functional tradition of the readers and a more dynamic approach championed by linguists, an approach which sought to cultivate a more general theory of language, but one which claimed to be pertinent to the service of scripture. The forms of writing typically associated with luminaries of the reading tradition were not summarily discarded. On the contrary, they were retained and developed by scholars of the linguistic traditions of Kūfa and Baṣra. Indeed, in addition to producing literature which symbolised the efforts to develop a systematic and coherent theory of language, these scholars composed works on *naqt*, *i'jām*, *hijā'*, *al-waqf wa'l-ibtidā'*, *idghām*, *hamz*, *ikhtilāf al-maṣāḥif*, *wujūh al-qirā'āt*, *gharīb al-Qur'ān*, *lughat al-Qur'ān*; they were effectively supplanting the readers as the ultimate authorities in these areas of scholarship. And this was to continue over the ensuing centuries.

Contemporary Perspectives on the Issue of the Origins of Arabic Linguistic Thought

Recent research into the issue of the development of the Arabic linguistic tradition has

presented a variegated selection of explanations regarding its genesis. One figure who has significantly advanced discussions in this area is Kees Versteegh. He focused his attention on the examination of primary source material from the discipline of exegesis, finding that distinct grammatical terminology occurring in these texts had a provenance which predated its circulation in the grammatical treatises of the Baṣran and Kūfan scholars: hence there must have existed a primitive tradition of linguistic thought which served as a reservoir for subsequent models of linguistic analysis, a tradition which was referred to as the 'ancient Iraqi school'.³ Versteegh argued that patterns for grammatical analysis together with a technical vocabulary would have been acquired by linguists from the exegetical tradition: the prominence of this tradition's influence was unquestionable. This seemingly portentous finding certainly led Versteegh to reassess his previous hypothesis regarding the ostensible influence of Greek linguistic concepts on Arabic linguistic thought, particularly in respect of the origin of the technical vocabulary of the Arabic grammarians.⁴

Basing his conclusions on a comparative survey of the grammatical terminology employed in the *Kitāb* of Sībawayhi (d. 177/793), a work which symbolises the earliest concrete attempt to formulate a comprehensive theory of the Arabic language, Versteegh maintained that refined developments in terms of the use of grammatical terminology together with the general framework of linguistic analysis indicated that Baṣran linguists formulated a revolutionary approach to language study.⁵ He advocated the view that the Baṣrans, beginning with Sībawayhi, had broken with existing conventions relating to the study of language, abandoning the methods and scope of the primitive tradition. Indeed, the sharp contrasts in the grammatical terminology used by Sībawayhi from that employed by the Kūfans highlighted advances made by this figure as he forged an abstract and structural approach to the study of language. According to Versteegh, the Kūfans were not as radical in their approach to the study of language; they remained exponents of the so-called primitive tradition, a tradition in which the *qurrā'* or Qur'anic readers were accepted as linguistic authorities.⁶ The assumption here is that the Kūfans focused their efforts on the grammatical exposition of the Qur'an, accentuating the semantic significance of the text; while the Baṣrans ultimately embraced a whole new corpus of material for linguistic analysis; moreover, the literature of scripture was no longer their specific concern.⁷ Nevertheless, for Versteegh, the Kūfan school was the bulwark of orthodoxy, the conservative tradition which had been equated with the outdated methods of the *qurrā'*, but equally its forms of language analysis had an earlier provenance than the models developed by the Baṣrans.⁸

The Kūfans, according to Versteegh, frequently cited the linguistic features of Qur'anic readings together with readers as authorities in their grammatical analyses, which were presented in the form of *ma'ānī* texts; correspondingly, the Baṣrans were less-inclined to adopt such an approach. However the tendency to refer to frequency

of citation offers no genuine indication of respective attitudes to analysing grammatically the language of scripture. Furthermore, Kūfan grammarians did criticise readers and readings which contravened their own derived principles of grammar. The Baṣrans were also the authors of *ma'ānī* texts and assisted in the development of this genre of writing. Therefore it is essential to appreciate the purpose of *ma'ānī* texts: namely, the grammatical justification of Qur'anic scripture; these texts were explicit expressions of an adherence to a rationally sophisticated approach to the authentication of Qur'anic readings. The Kūfans, particularly Kisā'ī (120–89/738–804) and Farrā' (144–207/761–822), were active participants in these activities and they were prepared to countenance the grammatical justification and rejection of Qur'anic readings they deemed to be grammatically anomalous. Additionally, the Kūfans did compose specific grammatical and philological treatises which intimated a greater compass in their approach to language. The profusion of specific linguistic texts recalled in bibliographical anecdotes along with grammatical opinions cited in secondary source material such as *khilāf* texts, which catalogued grammatical differences among linguists, dispels the myth that the Kūfan tradition based its study of language solely around *ma'ānī* texts of the Qur'an. It is the subsequent hegemony of the Baṣrans within the sphere of Arabic linguistic thought that has tended to obscure the material nature of the Kūfans' contribution to this tradition.

Further research on the development of the Arabic linguistic tradition was ventured by Rafael Talmon. He applied many of Versteegh's findings to support his own supposition that the Kūfan tradition was the earlier of the two conventional schools, presenting the view that it had derived the framework for its teachings from an ancient tradition of language studies prevalent in Iraq.⁹ However, this seemingly provincial tradition had been influenced and inspired by centuries of classical grammatical scholarship. Talmon argued that the existence of putative Greek treatises on logic were referred to by pioneering Arabic grammarians when formulating their own models of grammar. These were available through the medium of Syriac and Pahlavi translations.¹⁰ It was this material which allegedly served as a source for early Arabic linguistic thought. Talmon's examination of one of the earliest sources of Kūfan grammar, Farrā's *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*, was used to illustrate his hypothesis regarding the all-pervading influence of the traditions of antiquity within the sphere of a developing Arabic grammar. He argued that it was possible to discern Aristotelian logical traits which were evidently employed by Farrā' in his grammatical analysis of scripture. However, in the examples referred to by Talmon the alleged links are tenuous, if not amenable to a wide range of interpretation; moreover, they are far from conducive to the 'massive influence of logical studies on a prominent scholar from the early period of Arabic grammar'.¹¹

Talmon's argument was not restricted to the classical background of the 'Iraqi school': he was convinced that similar extrinsic influences could be traced to

indigenous grammatical traditions in places such as Mecca and Medina. The *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān* of Farrāʾ does refer to a collectivity of *naḥwiyyūn* in Ḥijāz, alluding to their opinions on grammatical topics.¹² Indeed, references to the activities of ‘*naḥwiyyūn*’ in this region had earlier caught the attention of scholars such as Edmund Beck and Saʿīd al-Afghānī.¹³ Talmon used these references along with anecdotes found in biographical sources to speculate that there was evidence to support the existence of centres of grammatical studies in Ḥijāz. And, furthermore, such centres of learning had shared a common heritage and engaged in the exchange of linguistic information, even with their Iraqi counterparts. Talmon added that linguistic traditions external to Iraq were suppressed as a result of the Baṣrans’ claiming they had been the actual innovators of Arabic linguistic thought and thus the achievements of linguists outside of Baṣra were mindfully rationalised by Baṣran historians eager to project the historical prominence of their tradition.¹⁴ Talmon supposed that the advanced background of Arabic linguistic studies might explain the seemingly conspicuous emergence of Sībawayhi’s *Kitāb* and its highly-evolved theoretical framework: the concepts in this text were not the Promethean endeavours of one single figure, but rather the culmination of years of linguistic activity which must have been cultivated by external intellectual forces. Talmon showed that there were occasions in Sībawayhi’s *Kitāb* when a group of anonymous *naḥwiyyūn* is openly criticised, deducing that this was an allusion to ‘an old Iraqi school of grammar’.¹⁵ And this last point brings us back to the central theme markedly binding Talmon’s arguments: namely, attributing the development of the Arabic linguistic tradition to an extrinsic origin. Interestingly, his more recent research suggests that the lexicographical text *Kitāb al-ʿayn* ascribed to Khalīl ibn Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī (d. 175/791), displayed features of grammatical teachings which bore similarities to early linguistic sources other than Sībawayhi’s *Kitāb*: this was further proof for the existence of an early linguistic tradition.¹⁶ These findings certainly reinforced the notion of theoretical differences distinguishing the early traditions, whether these were as vigorously pronounced as suggested in later sources is questionable; however, Talmon added that analytical disagreements are attested between the two conventional schools at very early junctures in their development.

It is the case that Talmon’s engaging synthesis of the methods used by Baṣran historians to enhance the ancestral status and historical depth of their tradition by incorporating the linguistic contributions of figures outside of Baṣra does explain certain contradictions in these accounts, particularly when mention is made of the first figure to invent ‘grammar’ and in other instances when non-Baṣran figures from the *qurrāʾ* are spoken of as Baṣrans; he believed that the Baṣran biographical reports had to diminish the importance of learning centres outside of Iraq. However, the purpose of accentuating the Baṣran tradition was, according to Talmon, to emphasise the Arabs’

saliency in the 'sophisticated branch of studies in their own language'.¹⁷ Talmon presupposes that it would be sheer opprobrium to admit to foreign influences in this discipline. It is not clear whether Talmon was referring to the suppression of the role of non-Arabs such as the *mawālī* in developing the linguistic tradition or the 'extrinsic' traditions of antiquity. This is because Talmon refers to the fact that five of the earliest Arabic grammarians, who are of *mawālī* origin and all implicated in the earliest biographical reports as prominent in the development of the linguistic tradition, were subsequently credited with a significantly reduced contribution to the discipline. However, the role of the *mawālī* was certainly not denied by any of the biographical accounts; thus this point is minor. The other notion floated by Talmon suggested that the linguistic sciences were secular disciplines and therefore accuracy in relating the history of this discipline was never critical; however, such a statement is rather presumptuous given the design, function and development of Arabic linguistic thought.¹⁸

According to Michael Carter, the tradition of Arabic grammar had developed independently of foreign influences.¹⁹ He presented the theory that Sībawayhi had extended his skills as a lawyer, transposing the methodology and concepts of Islamic law into the field of grammar. He felt that the terminology of the *Kitāb* and its structure were entwined in the tradition of *fiqh*. Moreover, where *fiqh* formulated rules for human behaviour; *naḥw* formulated rules for linguistic behaviour, albeit in a descriptive context. Carter employed a sophisticated argument which cited ethical paradigms. He argued that while ethics commended acts of human behaviour on the basis of what was proper and fitting, *naḥw* commended that which was appropriate within a linguistic context, namely, how one should speak.²⁰ *Ex hypothesi*, the grammarians had taken the ethical notions of *ḥasan*, *qabīḥ*, *mustaqīm* and *muḥāl* and defined them within the contexts of grammar. The assumption here is that there is a salient ethical dimension inherent in Islamic jurisprudence. Carter dismissed the value of the biographical accounts in determining the development of this tradition, arguing that they did not forward sufficient information to enable one to reconstruct the theoretical endeavours of the first linguists. The figures mentioned in the biographical reports as having been instructors to Sībawayhi and his peers were regarded by Carter as unimportant in terms of the linguistic theories elaborated in the *Kitāb*.²¹ However, these biographical reports comprise much which elucidates intricate aspects of early Arabic linguistic thought. The same stock of biographical reports allude to the positive influence of the discipline of *fiqh* on grammar. Carter did accept that the earliest *naḥwiyyūn* were familiar with 'the basic descriptive terminology of grammar, possibly through Greek or Syriac influences'.²² However, he claimed that such an influence was not discernible in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*.²³ Carter does state that the *Technē* of Dionysius Thrax had been translated into Syriac, and further logical material was readily available. He therefore accepted a locus for the transmission of Hellenistic

erudition.²⁴ Nevertheless, the essence of Carter's premise centres upon the *Kitāb* representing a break with the conventions adhered to by Sībawayhi's peers, who may have acquainted themselves informally with Greek techniques.

Andrew Rippin meanwhile has questioned Versteegh's synthesis of the origins of Arabic linguistic thought and the presumed influence of the exegetical tradition.²⁵ Citing John Wansbrough's chronological-stylistic framework for the classification of early Arabic literature, Rippin argued that the history of Arabic grammar could not be accurately reconstructed using the exegetical treatises examined by Versteegh, adding that the nature of the exegesis practised in these texts was decidedly posterior to the periods from which they were alleged to have emanated.²⁶ Furthermore, Rippin contended that such activity presupposes the existence of a canonical religious text; however, the whole purpose of the earliest forms of Arabic literature was to establish the canonical status of the Qur'an.²⁷ Accordingly, Rippin's argument is as follows: it was not possible to determine grammar's historical provenance through a labyrinth of material which had been subjected to editorial reformulation and interpolation, particularly when its historical development hinged on the technical value of a single phrase or term.²⁸ It naturally follows that Rippin dismisses Versteegh's view that differences in the respective terminology of the Kūfan and Baṣran schools corroborate the notion of two separate schools of linguistics. It appears that the relative sophistication of this tradition from an early period, as shown by Versteegh, has obvious ramifications for the theories of Wansbrough: it sanctions greater historical depth to the canonical status of the Qur'an. However, if Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* were to be seen as the proper starting point for the scientific investigation of language, then the findings of Versteegh are less significant. Rippin does point to the relevance of the views of Carter regarding the fictive nature of these two schools and the fact that one is possibly dealing with a difference between two thinkers as opposed to discrete schools of thought on grammar; Rippin adds that Carter was 'following a strong tradition in the study of grammar' and that this begins with Gotthold Weil.²⁹ Nevertheless, in endorsing this latter approach, Rippin has missed a critical point: Carter's thesis endeavours to prove that Sībawayhi was the real architect of Arabic linguistic abstraction, and to achieve this he had to explain away the significance of the term *naḥw*, dismissing that it might connote *grammar* prior to its appropriation by Sībawayhi. However, Talmon has demonstrated that Sībawayhi himself refers to the activities of *naḥwiyyūn* in his *Kitāb*, which creates something of a quandary for the gist of Carter's thesis, a fact to which he readily concedes.³⁰ Moreover, Carter's thesis apropos the originality of Arabic linguistic thought is hardly conducive to a Wansbroughian theory of early Arabic literature. Indeed, the classical material used by Weil and upon which his synthesis was based was far more subjective than the erstwhile texts which formed the core of Versteegh's research.³¹

Weil structured his study of the Baṣran and Kūfan traditions on an analysis of the material adduced in the work of the Baṣran grammarian Ibn al-Anbārī (513–77/1118–81), *al-Inṣāf fī masā'il al-khilāf bayna'l-naḥwīyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn wa'l-Kūfiyyīn*.³² This was a work purporting to present a dispassionate survey of the classical grammatical opinions of Baṣran and Kūfan grammarians. The *Inṣāf* would introduce a topic on which there are conflicting grammatical interpretations, offering a general appraisal of the Baṣran and Kūfan perspectives. Ibn al-Anbārī would then summarily draw conclusions as to the accuracy of the expressed opinions. The work comprises 121 topics chosen to represent a cross-section of analysis derived from the corpuses of the Baṣran and Kūfan traditions. The Baṣrans' perspective was emphatically endorsed in no less than 114 topics; however, the Kūfans' views were deemed correct on only seven occasions. The work confirmed the hegemony achieved by Baṣrans in Arabic linguistic thought. Weil argued in his lengthy introduction to the *Inṣāf* that representatives of supposedly distinct and opposing linguistic traditions such as Sībawayhi and Farrā'; or indeed, Tha'lab (d. 291/904) and Mubarrad (d. 285/898), never had the occasion to meet. He claimed that the *masā'il* or *Streitfragen* were formulated by linguists of a decidedly later period. Weil suggested that in reality there was only one tradition of language studies: the Kūfans were invented as worthy opponents.³³ Indeed, it has been suggested that the systematisation of Arabic grammar created a superfluity in anomalous and irregular material and this was consciously ascribed to a fictional and hypothetical body labelled the Kūfans.³⁴ Weil dismissed the reliability of the biographical accounts of the linguists, claiming that they were exposed to fabrication and invention.³⁵

Monique Bernards has recently assessed the whole concept of *madhāhib* within the early Arabic linguistic tradition, and she concludes that the Baṣran grammarian Mubarrad was the figure who projected the concept of a distinct school of Baṣran grammar, designating Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* the kernel of grammatical studies.³⁶ Bernards claimed that grammatical disagreements between figures of allegedly opposing traditions were often less divergent than those between members of the same school.³⁷ Bernards does differentiate between two definitions of what constitutes a school: the first definition points to the adaptation of similar methodologies and principles; while the second is based on social criteria such as living in the same region, having the same academic lineage and sharing an extensive network of contacts.³⁸ She concluded that the second definition should be applied to the Arabic linguistic tradition and its so-called schools, adding that the biographical accounts had not deliberately accentuated the notion of two separate traditions, but uniformly expedited the principle of categorisation: scholars were classified according to geographical and genealogical factors. Bernards added that the dichotomous nature of the traditions of Kūfa and Baṣra was engendered by these innocuous processes. However, in suggesting that there was no methodological distinction between the Kūfan and

Başran traditions before the late third/ninth century, Bernards has not taken into account Versteegh's analysis of several early Qur'anic commentaries. Moreover, to maintain that the division of schools was based on geographical considerations defies the scholarly differences articulated on the subjects of grammar and philology, the discrete approaches to analysis of language, and trends in relation to literary output, which all combine to distinguish the two conventional schools of the Arabic linguistic tradition; furthermore, the linguists also composed *khilāf*-type texts in which they catalogued grammatical differences among grammarians.³⁹ The amenability of the sources to such a multiplicity of interpretations predicates that it is perhaps prudent to follow the divisions adhered to by the classical biographers.

The Kūfan Grammarians

The two prominent personalities of early Kūfan grammar are ʿAlī ibn Ḥamza al-Kisāʾī and Yaḥyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrāʾ.⁴⁰ The derived grammatical thought of these two figures forms an integral core of the grammatical teachings of what was recognised as the 'Kūfan' linguistic tradition. Later generations of Kūfans specifically linked with Kisāʾī and Farrāʾ went on to compose grammatical treatises and tracts which complemented and consolidated many aspects of these figures' scholarship. Farrāʾ's composition, *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, is one of the earliest remnants of this Kūfan linguistic legacy. And one is able to discern through the *Maʿānī* the highly technical nature of his grammatical discourse. Dévényi's painstaking survey of references to grammarians and Qur'anic readers in this text demonstrates that Kisāʾī is the 'pre-eminent grammarian' for Farrāʾ: his linguistic opinions are subject to review, resolution, and, on occasions, critical analysis.⁴¹ Farrāʾ's *Maʿānī* leaves its reader with the distinct impression that there existed in Kūfa, Baṣra and Ḥijāz a rich and diverse tradition of language erudition. Dévényi did argue that because the Qur'an was the focal point of Farrāʾ's work, references to readers abounded, and with the exception of Kisāʾī, there is a 'meagre presence of grammarians' in this book;⁴² as noted previously, Versteegh took the view that Kūfans focused on *maʿānī* type expositions of the Qur'an;⁴³ but neither of these views takes into account the deliberate design and purpose of the *maʿānī* works and the import attached to linguistic thought in the approach to authenticating scripture; likewise, from an examination of the network of mentor-student relationships, it is evident that the origin of this type of radical thought betrays a Baṣran nexus: the tendency to employ a radical model of *ʿarabiyya* in the authentication of scripture buttressed with references to poetic *shawāhid* has its provenance in the study-circles of luminaries of the early Baṣran linguistic tradition, as we shall see. Moreover, grammarians were distinguished by virtue of their willingness to apply this radical model when analysing the linguistic configurations of scripture; readers favoured a reliance upon authenticated narration. The fine distinction in approaches resulted in intractable tension between readers and grammarians.

The biographical literature of linguists identifies two figures as linguistic mentors of Kisā'ī and Farrā', and they are referred to in his *Ma'ānī*: Abū Ja'far al-Ru'āsī and Mu'ādh al-Harrā' (d. 188/804).⁴⁴ This literature reports that Ru'āsī is the author of a text entitled *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*, a text on diminution; two texts on pauses and points of inception in Qur'anic recitation: *al-Waḡf al-kabīr* and *al-Waḡf al-ṣaḡhīr*; and a treatise on plurals and singulars.⁴⁵ It is claimed that he composed a tract on grammar which the renowned al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad was supposed to have examined, a fact emphatically dismissed by the eminent Baṣran Ibn Darastawayhi (258–346/871–958).⁴⁶ However, biographical reports of Baṣran provenance do mention Ru'āsī's association with leading Baṣrans, although in a negative light. Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī (d. 255/869), a prominent Baṣran philologist, describes him as 'denuded of all knowledge, a nobody'.⁴⁷ Reference is also made to the so-called *masā'il* of Ru'āsī: it was supposed to be a work comprising grammatical definitions. The reader literature confirms that Ru'āsī is linked to the leading Baṣran reader and philologist Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alā' (d. 154/771) and that he transmitted his particular reading (*ḥurūf*). He is described as having his own *ikhtiyār* in readings and *wuḡūf*.⁴⁸ The term *ikhtiyār* indicates a selection of Qur'anic readings drawn from what was a common stock of variants, and we shall return to gauge the technical significance of this term below. Dévényi reported that Ru'āsī is mentioned in the *Ma'ānī* on seven occasions. On one such occasion, Ru'āsī asks Abū 'Amr to comment on the declension of the term *saba'* in Q. 27:22, but Abū 'Amr replies that 'he has no knowledge therein'.⁴⁹ Ru'āsī is characterised by Farrā' as a pious man among the *naḥwiyyūn*.⁵⁰ In a further instance Farrā' recounts the opinions of a figure named al-'Alā' ibn Sayāba whom he describes as 'The person who taught Mu'ādh and his companions'.⁵¹ Although Mu'ādh al-Harrā' is identified by biographical accounts as an early Kūfan grammarian, he is rarely recalled in the source material to enable a satisfactory assessment of his importance, although it is noteworthy that he is identified by Farrā'. He is also viewed as the originator of 'morphology' (*taṣrīf*).⁵² The *Inṣāf* of Ibn al-Anbārī does associate him with a peculiar reading of Q. 19:45, which is the subject of much deliberation.⁵³ Most intriguing of all is the fact that all the early source materials such as the biographical accounts of linguists, the reader literature, and primary source material such as Farrā's *Ma'ānī*, always reveal a Baṣran link which proves to be decisive in the way that features of the Baṣran tradition's approach to the linguistic justification and analysis of Qur'anic readings are replicated by Kūfan luminaries.

Kisā'ī's mentors are both Kūfan and Baṣran. He influentially promulgates grammar and Qur'anic readings in Baghdad, providing the Kūfans with an important platform for establishing a tradition of linguistic thought in the capital. Marzubānī (296–384/908–95) reports that he was invited there by the caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd

(ruled 170–93/786–809) in the year 182/798.⁵⁴ His impressive reputation as a Qur'anic reader seems to have preceded him. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (392–463/1002–71) recalls that he was summoned to the capital by Maḥdī (ruled 775–85) to act as an instructor to his children; quoting Farrā', he states that Kisā'ī began the study of grammar at a very advanced age.⁵⁵ And having drawn from the seemingly confined knowledge of his Kūfan mentor Mu'ādh al-Harrā', he was advised to seek the studentship of Khalīl at Baṣra. He remained with Khalīl before departing to spend several years dwelling among the Arab Bedouins of Najd and Tihāma, scrupulously recording philological information regarding their usage of language. Upon returning to Basra, he found that Khalīl had died; he engaged Khalīl's successor Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb (d. 182/798) in grammatical discussion and due to his excelling therein he was prompted to lead the study-circle.⁵⁶ He then returned to Kūfa, before he was eventually invited to the capital.

Kisā'ī has the following works attributed to him: *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*, *al-Mukhtaṣar fī 'l-naḥw*, *Kitāb al-Qirā'āt*, *Kitāb al-ʿAdad*, *Kitāb Ikhtilāf al-ʿadad*, *Kitāb Maqtūʿ al-Qur'ān wa mawṣūlihi*, *Kitāb al-Nawādir al-ṣaghīr wa 'l-kabīr*, *Kitāb al-Hijā'*, *Kitāb al-Maṣādir*, *Kitāb Mā talḥan fīhi al-ʿamma* and *Mutashābih al-Qur'ān*.⁵⁷ The stock of themes expounded upon in these works intimates a close bond with the functional discipline of readers in which Kisā'ī was originally trained. Moreover, an examination of his own grammatical analysis in texts such as Farrā's *Ma'ānī* betrays a focused regard for the phenomenon of language, incisively distinguishing his own approach from that of his reader peers. It is the inclination of a linguist and not a reader which resonates in his analysis of the Qur'anic text. Farrā' obviously had recourse to Kisā'ī's works and, as noted by Dévényi, he even refers to one particular work in his *Ma'ānī*.⁵⁸ An examination of the instances in which Kisā'ī brings to bear linguistic considerations when evaluating readings underlines the extent to which the Kūfan grammatical tradition had shifted from its reader foundations. Kisā'ī not only intrepidly referred to analogies with the speech patterns of the Arabs when examining a reading, but he applied the evaluation skills of a linguist to reject a reading.⁵⁹ The inflection of verses Q. 16:40 and Q. 36:82: *'kun fa-yakūn(u)* is an example of this. Farrā' deliberates upon the syntactic complexities of *naṣb* and *raf'* readings, before commending a *naṣb* ending, *fa-yakūn(a)*, in both verses of the Qur'an. He tempers his acceptance of this reading by stating that the majority of the *qurrā'* favour *raf'*.⁶⁰ Moreover, he recalls that Kisā'ī rejected *raf'* in both of these cases, despite its grammatical feasibility. Kisā'ī countenances a willingness to discard the former reading on what one can only presume were considerations of *'arabiyya*.

The issue here is not Kisā'ī's endorsement of the *naṣb* reading, but his *rejection* of the alternative; this is the precise dividing line separating grammarians from readers.

It is said that Kisāʿī deliberately selected *hurūf* from Ḥamza's reading, choosing to exclude others: and yet his *ikhtiyār* was, according to Ibn Mujāhid (245–324/859–935), well within the strictures of authenticated transmitted readings.⁶¹ Indeed, Khalaf ibn Hishām (150–229/767–844) stated that he used to be present when Kisāʿī would recite the Qur'an and students would gather around adding diacritics to their codices.⁶² Dhahabī (d. 748/1347) recounted that on one such occasion Kisāʿī read Q. 18:34, inflecting the comparative form for *naṣb*; however, the authenticated reading was *rafʿ*. He was asked to explain the reasoning behind the *naṣb* reading and accepted that it was an inadvertent error, whereupon his students erased the pointing from their codices.⁶³ The Kūfan *qurrāʾ* were effectively selecting from a corpus of predetermined readings: these were readings which could be traced to the early Kūfan tradition but were further augmented with readings from cities such as Baṣra, Medina and Mecca acquired through a network of itinerant mentors and students.

There are contemporaries of Kisāʿī who played a decisive role in disseminating Kūfan linguistic thought. ʿAlī ibn al-Mubārak al-Aḥmar (d. 194/810) was, according to Ibn al-Anbārī (260–328/874–939), the first to codify the works of Kisāʿī.⁶⁴ Thaʿlab remarks that Aḥmar memorised 40,000 pieces of poetic citation relating to grammatical argumentation, adding that he was considered more senior than Farrāʾ.⁶⁵ Indeed, it was suggested that Aḥmar replace Kisāʿī as head of the Kūfans' study-circle upon the latter's demise. However, Aḥmar's premature death allowed Farrāʾ to succeed Kisāʿī. Another of Kisāʿī's associates, Hishām ibn Muʿāwiya (d. 209/824), was the author of several treatises on grammar, including: *al-Ḥudūd fi'l-ʿarabiyya*, *Mukhtaṣar fi'l-naḥw* and *Kitāb al-Qiyās*.⁶⁶

The biographical literature places Farrāʾ as the second senior figure among the Kūfans and it is by virtue of his extant text *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān* that we are able to gauge the strength of Kūfan linguistic thought. He associated with leading Baṣrans, including Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb (d. 182/798), although once again later Baṣran linguists dismissed such links.⁶⁷ The works attributed to Farrāʾ include *Kitāb al-Ḥudūd*, a selection of grammatical definitions which was held in great esteem by Kūfans.⁶⁸ The work was composed at the behest of Maʾmūn and its outline is preserved in Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist*.⁶⁹ The following works are ascribed to him: *Ikhtilāf ahl al-Kūfa wa'l-Baṣra wa'l-Shām fi'l-maṣāḥif*, *Kitāb al-Jamʿ wa'l-tathniyya fi'l-Qurʾān*, *Mā talḥan fīhi al-ʿamma*, *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*, *Kitāb Lughat al-Qurʾān*, *al-Waqf wa'l-ibtidāʾ*, *Ikhtilāf al-maṣāḥif*, *al-Maṣādir fi'l-Qurʾān*, *al-Mudhakkar wa'l-muʿannath* and *al-Maqṣūr wa'l-mamdūd*.⁷⁰ Farrāʾ, like his mentor Kisāʿī, takes an active interest in the forms of authorship associated with the old reader tradition. However, when one contemplates the nature of linguistic thought found in the *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, a distinctly different approach to the justification of scripture is discerned. This type of abstrac-

tion was never subscribed to by early Kūfan readers. It is evident that there was a rich legacy of Kūfan grammatical thought, developed initially by scholars associated with the reading tradition and then placed on an altogether insular plane by luminaries such as Ruʿāṣī, Kisāʿī and Farrāʾ: these figures identify a role for linguistic considerations in the procedures governing the linguistic justification of readings and in other areas of reader scholarship such as *al-waḡf waʿl-ibtidāʾ*. Kisāʿī and Farrāʾ were both the authors of treatises which focused on general principles of grammar; and Ruʿāṣī was the putative author of the so-called *Masāʿil*. The scholarly interests of these grammarians extended well beyond the confines of scripture as shown by the comprehensive range of treatises attributed to them.

Abuʿl-ʿAbbās Thaʿlab fills the vacuum in the Kūfan school left by the death of Farrāʾ. Interestingly, Thaʿlab had met neither Farrāʾ nor Kisāʿī; however, he excelled in memorising the literary legacy of his Kūfan predecessors, deriving material from figures such as Muḥammad ibn Qādim, who was an authority on the grammatical opinions of Ruʿāṣī, Kisāʿī, Farrāʾ and Hishām.⁷¹ The Egyptian biographer Qifī asserts that Thaʿlab examined Farrāʾ's *Ḥudūd* at the age of eighteen: by the age of 25 he had not only memorised the sum of Farrāʾ's literary legacy, but he was able to relate the individual dicta to their places in the original texts.⁷² Zubaydī claimed that he could recount the opinions of his predecessors, although he was never able to expound upon their rationale, or *ḥujja*.⁷³ Thaʿlab often met with his Baṣran counterpart Mubarrad to debate grammatical topics. It is suggested that in his encounters with Mubarrad, the latter figure always emerged victorious.⁷⁴

Rivalry between these two figures led Weil to conclude that the concept of two distinct linguistic traditions was forged in this atmosphere of competition and projected backwards, and yet one finds that biographical literature of Baṣran provenance records his association with leading Baṣran linguists in a positive light: he had contact with Ibn Sallām al-Jumāḥī (d. 232/847), Riyāshī (d. 257/870) and Athram (d. 232/847), transmitting many of their philological treatises.⁷⁵ Thaʿlab wrote profusely composing over forty titles from exegetical treatises to monographs on poetry and philology, including his *Kitāb al-Majālis*, *Kitāb al-Faṣīḥ* and his treatise on grammar entitled *al-Maṣūn fiʿl-naḥw*.⁷⁶ It is not insignificant that Thaʿlab's contemporary, Mubarrad, was one of the first figures to produce a history of Baṣran grammarians, outlining the scholarly pedigree of his Baṣran predecessors; the text is not extant, although a Baṣran grammarian by the name of Sīrāfī (d. 368/979) composed a history of the school in which he quoted extensively from Mubarrad's work.⁷⁷ Indeed, subsequent histories penned by Baṣran linguists tended to dismiss the endeavours of Kūfan linguists, attenuating earlier scholarly links between Kūfans and Baṣrans. The Kūfans were placed among the ranks of readers and equated with a dated approach to linguistic thought. The reality is not that rivalry between Thaʿlab

and Mubarrad leads to the projection of a mythical past for each of these traditions, as opponents vied to enhance the historical pedigree of their respective traditions, but rather that the imposing ascendancy of the Baṣran tradition overshadows the true extent of Kūfan participation in linguistic thought. Nevertheless, this was symbolic because it resembled the way in which early readers, particularly the Kūfans, were deliberately overlooked in the historical framework of the Arabic linguistic sciences. Even the Kūfan grammarians began to disassociate themselves from these readers, mirroring the Baṣran rejection of scholarly links with their Kūfan counterparts.

Kūfan Readers in the Biographical Literature

The biographical accounts of the Kūfan reader tradition positively demonstrate that it traced its reading pedigree to principal luminaries among the companions of the Prophet. It was through an elaborate network of readers and their students that the stock of Qur'anic readings was preserved and promulgated. The presupposition that all such readings were based on authenticated precedents was axiomatic. The procedural mechanisms of *ḥarf*, *ḥurūf*, *athar*, *ikhtiyār* were inexorably anchored to the *muṣḥaf*, ensuring that the integrity of scripture was never compromised; and the corpus of Qur'anic readings was projected through these intricate devices. Moreover, the sum and substance of reader linguistic activity was governed by the desire to preserve and enshrine the holy text. Rippin has argued that biographical notices are an attempt to convey the religious piety of the subjects in these accounts and therefore they have a presumed canonising function as opposed to being a genre of literature reflecting social realities: the accounts would have been shaped by the conscious *expectations* of a religious community. However, there is a systematic correlation between material contained in these accounts and the varied trends of scholarship associated with a developing tradition of grammar; and this is far too complex to be the insidious product of deliberate projection.⁷⁸

The figure of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd (d. 32/677) is the revered eponym of the Kūfan reading tradition. Early Kūfan authorities such as Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh (d. 82/706), Aswad ibn Yazīd al-Nakhaʿī (d. 75/713), ʿAlqama ibn Qays (d. 62/681) and Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī (d. ca 73–4/692–3) were recalled as having acquired their readings from this figure.⁷⁹ He serves not only as a prominent source of Qur'anic readings but also as an authority of Kūfan jurisprudence; nevertheless, other companion influences are also referred to in early source material. Thus one finds that Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh acquired his Qur'anic readings by way of review (*ʿaraḍa*) not only with Ibn Masʿūd, but also with ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān and ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib.⁸⁰ The term *ʿaraḍa* implies a scrutinised review by a mentor of a student's readings. This is derived from the occasion of the Prophet's final review with the archangel Gabriel. Other methods of instruction included *qirāʾa*, *samāʿ* and *riwāya*.⁸¹ Biographical literature recalls that Aswad was instrumental in conveying

Ibn Masʿūd's rendition of the *muṣḥaf* to succeeding generations of Kūfans, for the latter figure had 'reviewed' Aswad's readings.⁸² ʿAlqama ibn Qays, who was an uncle of Aswad ibn al-Yazīd, also reviewed his readings with Ibn Masʿūd and heard 'samiʿa' the readings of ʿAlī, ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Abū Dardāʾ and ʿĀʾisha.⁸³ Having established the sources of the Kūfan reading tradition, the biographical literature then relates how subsequent generations of readers preserved this vast corpus of Qurʾanic readings for posterity, placing specific emphasis upon its unique liturgical value.⁸⁴

The individual Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī is a pivotal connective between leading companions and the emerging generations of Kūfan readers around whom a functional linguistic approach to readings crystallises. He acquired readings 'by way of a review' with ʿUthmān, ʿAlī, Ibn Masʿūd, Zayd ibn Thābit and Ubayy ibn Kaʿb, while included among his many students were ʿĀṣim ibn Abī al-Najūd (d. 127/744), Yaḥyā ibn Waththāb (d. 103/721), ʿAṭāʾ ibn al-Sāʾib (d. 136/753), Ibn Abī Laylā (d. 148/765) and ʿĀmir al-Shaʿbī (d. 110/728).⁸⁵ According to Ibn Mujāhid, Sulamī was the first figure to promulgate in Kūfa readings authorised by ʿUthmān, teaching in Kūfa's main mosque for over forty years.⁸⁶ Dévényi records that Sulamī is referred to on 53 occasions in Farrā's *Maʿānī*.⁸⁷ His successor was ʿĀṣim ibn Abī al-Najūd, a *mawlā* also trained by Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh. ʿĀṣim's pupils among the Kūfans were many: Sulaymān ibn Mahrān al-Aʿmash (60–148/680–765), Mufaḍḍal al-Ḍabbī (d. 168/784), ʿĪsā ibn ʿUmar al-Hamdānī (d. 156/773), Abū Bakr ibn ʿAyyāsh (95–193/713–809) and Ḥaḥṣ ibn Sulaymān (d. 180/796).⁸⁸ The last two personalities play a key role in circulating his readings. Indeed, Ibn ʿAyyāsh reports that when Sulamī died, ʿĀṣim replaced him as the chief reader in Kūfa. He claims that ʿĀṣim and Aʿmash (60–148/680–765) were the finest representatives of the readings of Ibn Masʿūd and Zayd ibn Thābit.⁸⁹ It is recalled that ʿĀṣim visited Baṣra; and interestingly, both Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ and al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad transmitted aspects of his readings. Dhahabī refers to several reports recounting his interest in ʿarabiyya and *naḥw*; and Ibn ʿAyyāsh claims he was an eloquent grammarian, adding that ʿĀṣim once remarked, 'He who is able to perfect one *wajh* of ʿarabiyya has perfected nothing'.⁹⁰ ʿĀṣim and his peers within the Kūfan tradition of readings devoted themselves to the circulation and preservation of Qurʾanic scripture, judiciously refining the means to carry out that function.

The fact that ʿĀṣim was associated with the term *naḥwī* seems to have perturbed the Baṣran Abū Ṭayyib (d. 351/962): he asserts that this figure may have been acquainted with some slight aspect of this science, but notes that his opinions are neither mentioned nor memorised.⁹¹ Here we have an excellent example in which the biographical literature of the linguists contradicts reader biographical accounts. Dévényi reports that he is mentioned in Farrā's *Maʿānī* on no less than 141 occasions.⁹² Ibn

Mujāhid included °Āṣim's reading in his collection of seven authenticated readings, along with the readings of Ḥamza and Kisā'i, reporting that it gained partial prominence because one of its transmitters, Ibn °Ayyāsh, did not make himself available to those wishing to acquire it.⁹³ Furthermore, it is confirmed that there were some 520 individual 'hurūf' of °Āṣim's reading concerning which Ibn °Ayyāsh and Ḥafṣ ibn Sulaymān differed.⁹⁴ Ḥafṣ settled in Baghdad, narrating °Āṣim's reading there, but he also travelled to Mecca and Medina. The biographical material states that the reading he derived from °Āṣim had °Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib as its ultimate authority.⁹⁵ However, once again the predominant theme which emerges from these standard accounts is the dominion of authenticated precedents: whenever it is reported that a reader selected only certain *hurūf* from a given mentor, it is implied that these were augmented with *hurūf* acquired from alternative authorities in readings: this conception is referred to as an *ikhtiyār*. That early readers might have codified the specific *hurūf* of their mentors is probable. Yaḥyā ibn Ādam does refer to his having recourse to a 'kurrāsa' or textbook which for 40 years had comprised the *hurūf* of °Āṣim. Yaḥyā adds that Ibn °Ayyāsh read them all to him 'ḥarf by ḥarf', and 'so I vocalised them and confined them, recording their *ma'ānī* alongside them, adhering to that which he related to me'. Ibn °Ayyāsh asserted that 'I have related these to you as they were taught to me by °Āṣim ḥarf by ḥarf'.⁹⁶

Aspects of Early Reader Scholarship: Enumerating Codices

The enumeration of the number of verses in indigenous codices reflected one aspect of the functional approach to scripture developed by readers. Indeed, °Āṣim is credited with a text on this subject.⁹⁷ This form of authorship seems to have been initiated by Medinan readers: a work entitled *Kitāb °Adad al-Madīnī al-awwal*, and a further work entitled *al-°Adad al-thānī*, are linked with Nāfi° ibn Abī Nu°aym (d. 169/785). Prior to this, °Abd Allāh ibn °Ayyāsh (d. 69/689), who was a respected authority on readings in Medina, is credited with the authorship of *°Adad al-Madīnī al-awwal*.⁹⁸ This work is followed by *al-°Adad al-akhīr* of Isma°īl ibn Abī Kathīr (d. 180/796). Similarly titled works are credited to Meccan, Kūfan, Baṣran and Syrian scholars. There were also works dividing the Qur'an into *ajzā'*.⁹⁹ Indeed, the division of the reader Ḥumayd ibn Qays (d. 130/747) is referred to in Tha°lab's *Kitāb al-majālis*: it demonstrates his meticulous division of the verses of the Qur'an into measured parts, a process which facilitates memorisation.¹⁰⁰ Suyūṭī's *Itqān* has a section devoted to the enumeration of verses in codices. It provides further information on the nature of the *°adad* works. One such quotation refers to the differences concerning the number of verses in the indigenous codices of Medina, Mecca, Syria, Baṣra and Kūfa.¹⁰¹ The work corroborates the two counts, referred to above, of the Medinan codices. The first being carried out by the reader Abū Ja°far Yazīd al-Qa°qā° (d. ca 127–8/744–5) and Shayba ibn Abī Niṣāḥ (d. 130/747); the second was carried out by Isma°īl ibn Ja°far.

There are further citations which refer to counts made by prominent readers and linked to companions. Thus the Damascene reader Ibn ʿĀmir (d. 118/736) reports that the Syrian count was transmitted on the authority of Abū Dardāʾ (d. 32 or 34/652 or 654). Suyūṭī asserts that the verses in the Baṣrans' codex were enumerated by ʿĀṣim al-Jaḥḍarī and that the Kūfans' codex was enumerated by three figures: Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb, Kisāʾī and Khalaf ibn Hishām. A second report by Ḥamza states that he was informed of the count of the Kūfan codex by Ibn Abī Laylā on the authority of ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī who referred to the authority of ʿAlī ibn Abī Tālib. Intriguingly, Ibn al-Jazarī (751–833/1348–1429) reports, on the authority of Yaḥyā ibn Ādam (d. 203/820), ʿĀṣim's exclusion of the enigmatic *ḥurūf al-muqaṭṭaʿa* in his enumeration of Qurʾanic verses, arguing that, for the purposes of a count, they did not constitute separate Qurʾanic verses but rather they were composite parts of other verses. This contravened the position taken by other Kūfan readers who included these letters as separate verses in their counts.¹⁰² The whole purpose of such endeavours was to ensure the meticulous regulation of the physical confines of Qurʾanic scripture derived from an essentially oral tradition. Furthermore, it was categorically interfaced with ʿUthmān's dispatching of codices to the principal garrison towns.

The *ikhṭilāf al-maṣāḥif* genre meticulously catalogued diminutive variances among ʿUthmānic codices. Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī (371–444/981–1053), whose work *al-Muqniʿ fī maʿrifat marsūm maṣāḥif ahl al-amṣār* is essentially redolent of this form of writing, reports that ʿUthmān produced four principal codices: a codex which was sent to Kūfa, a codex to Baṣra, a codex to Syria, and a codex which was retained at Medina.¹⁰³ A second report cited by Dānī claims that seven codices were forwarded by the caliph, but Dānī asserts that the former report is sounder. The sections in his work review orthographical variances relating to *ithbāt*, *ḥadhf*, *ziyāda* and *naqṣ*: confirmation, elision, superfluity and preclusion. Dānī attributes these differences to ʿUthmān's preference for Qurayshite conventions of orthography. This meant that it was not possible to accommodate distinctive *ḥurūf* (authenticated readings which were orthographically dissimilar) within a single *textus receptus ne varietur* without resorting to repetition which would result in ambiguity and confusion.¹⁰⁴ However, these *maṣāḥif* and any subsequent codices transcribed on the basis of these prototypes enshrined the totality of scripture. Although it is reported that these principal codices were devoid of all diacritics to facilitate authenticated vocalic preferences, it is clear that a number of codices subsequently transcribed from these prototypes were pointed. In recounting the variances between the Syrian and Iraqi codices, Dānī refers to Q. 10:22: the Syrian codices were pointed to read *yanshurukum*: while the Iraqi codices were pointed to read *yusayyirukum*.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, both readings are accommodated within an unpointed text.¹⁰⁶ The Syrian reading was linked to Ibn ʿĀmir the Damascene, while the latter reading was preferred by most other readers. Moreover,

it was also the case that a reader might elect to adhere to a reading on the basis of its being substantiated by any one of the metropolitan or *amṣār* codices. Dānī states that Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ was asked concerning a feature of his reading of Q. 43:68 which was not substantiated by the Baṣran codices; Abū ʿAmr's reply was that he was able to reference it to the transcribed codices of the Medinans.¹⁰⁷

Dānī's work abounds with reports which emanate from grammarians and readers, including figures such as Kisāʾī, Farrāʾ, Thaʿlab, Ḥamza, Khalaf ibn Hishām, Yaḥyā ibn Ādam, and other authorities who took an active interest in relating these differences. Ibn al-Nadīm furnishes a list of figures with works on differences among codices. The Damascene Ibn ʿAmir is credited with a work on the differences among the codices of Syria, Ḥijāz and Iraq: we noted above that both Kisāʾī and Farrāʾ were the authors of works on this subject. And Khalaf ibn Hishām has a work entitled *Ikhtilāf al-maṣāḥif*.¹⁰⁸ Indeed, Farrāʾ's scholarship in the field of codices is reflected in his *Maʿānī*. In one instance, Q. 6:63, he asserts that the Kūfans' reading of the verse was without the pronominal suffix *tāʾ*, and was accordingly represented in their codices: *anjāna*.¹⁰⁹ Farrāʾ adds that the consensus reading among the *qurrāʾ*, referred to as '*qirāʾat al-nās*', was *anjaytanā*. In a further instance, in Farrāʾ's analysis of Q. 3:153, he alludes to the usage of the Arabs and hypothesises as to their idiomatic rendition of one of the constructs in this verse: the form was incongruous with the aforementioned verse. Moreover, having mentioned this form, Farrāʾ asserts that its insertion into the text of the Qur'an was not permissible, due to its requiring a letter superfluous to the '*kitāb* of the *maṣāḥif*'.¹¹⁰ A report refers to Kisāʾī adjusting his reading of Q. 3:21, having realised it contravened the consensus of the indigenous codices.¹¹¹

Wansbrough made a number of observations concerning both variant readings and codices. He argued that they were 'not genuinely independent of the ʿUthmanic recension', adding that 'infinitesimal differences are not such as would seem to have necessitated a suppression of the non-ʿUthmanic versions, the more so since a minimal standard deviation from the canon was accommodated by the interpretation of the *aḥruf* doctrine'.¹¹² This view presupposes that the *aḥruf* doctrine was purely arbitrary; and yet it was likewise governed by the strictures of precedent and this much is evident from the activity of early readers particularly in the formulation of *ḥurūf* and *ikhtiyār*. Consequently, these so-called 'infinitesimal differences' certainly had profound implications for the status of scripture and its relation to acts of worship. In addition Wansbrough refers to the *amṣār* codices as not displaying the 'differences either among themselves or from the ʿUthmanic recension which are alleged to have provoked the editorial measures attributed to the third caliph'. Moreover, he declares that the tradition of separate *amṣār*-variants 'appears not to be more ancient than Farrāʾ or possibly than his teacher Kisāʾī'.¹¹³ Given the exactitude demanded in confirming the confines of scripture, the attention to infinitesimal detail was critical. The

grammarians' interest in such literature would a fortiori have been preceded by reader treatment of the topic, corroborating the historical depth of such authorship: early readers had to be aware of the diminutive nature of differences among codices as they sought to regulate the devices of *ḥarf* and *ihktiyār*. The scrupulous endeavours of early readers in respect of the enumeration of verses in codices and collating variances therein formed a core around which the Arabic linguistic tradition developed. Moreover, by the era of Kisāʿī, Farrāʾ and Sībawayhi this tradition had systematically attained an exceptional level of sophistication. It also follows that the tension between readers and grammarians, despite the distinctly non-dogmatic nature of its origin, is proof of the early existence of a canonical codex. It is around this fixed text that the linguists attempted to advance their grammatical suppositions.

Readers and grammarians contributed to the authorship of texts on the subject of *al-waqf wa'l-ibtidāʾ*. Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb (80–156/646–722) was the author of a text on the subject of *waqf* which defined pauses in respect of Qurʾanic recitation.¹¹⁴ And Ibn al-Nadīm attributes a text on *waqf* to a Kūfan reader and contemporary of Ḥamza whose reading was narrated by Kisāʿī and Yahyā ibn Ādam: Dirār ibn Šurād (d. 129/746).¹¹⁵ According to Ibn al-Jazarī, the Baṣran Shayba ibn Abī Niṣāḥ (d. 130/747) wrote a text on *waqf*.¹¹⁶ We noted above that Ruʾāṣī composed two treatises on this topic: there are also works attributed to Kisāʿī, Farrāʾ, Khalaf ibn Hishām, Abū ʿUmar al-Dūrī and Thaʿlab.¹¹⁷ And leading Baṣrans also composed texts on this topic. The extant text of the Kūfan philologist Abū Bakr Ibn al-Anbārī (260–328/874–939), *Īdāḥ al-waqf wa'l-ibtidāʾ* was acknowledged as the definitive compilation on this subject.¹¹⁸ Even within the confines of an area of scholarship such as *waqf*, grammarians were able to promote themselves as absolute authorities. Moreover, just as they had developed models of grammar to evaluate and justify the linguistic configuration of scripture, expressing their views as to which readings were linguistically fitting and eloquent, they developed a terminology which they introduced to classify, from a linguistic perspective, instances of *al-waqf wa'l-ibtidāʾ*.

However, the voices of orthodoxy appeared to be rather apprehensive about the introduction of terminology to classify a practice which was essentially spontaneous and determined by transmitted convention. Indeed, Suyūṭī's preface to his discussion of *waqf* suggests, through the excerpts of the work of the Baṣran trained linguist Naḥḥās (d. 338/949), that the practice of *waqf* was essentially contingent to the acquisition of scripture: readers had to be aware of the points of pauses and inception in their recitation of Qurʾanic verses.¹¹⁹ Naḥḥās, as quoted by Suyūṭī, refers to the fact that one of the companions of the Prophet, Ibn ʿUmar, implied that familiarity with the subtleties of *waqf* was something scrupulously imparted to prospective students of the Qurʾan; although Ibn ʿUmar rues the fact that many of his contemporaries were not familiar with these subtleties.¹²⁰ Ibn al-Anbārī's *Īdāḥ* deliberates upon a tripartite division

applicable to *waqf*, and this is adhered to throughout his work.¹²¹ This, in Anbārī's words, was commonly agreed upon by scholars. The division proposes that manifestations of *waqf wa'l-ibtidā'* be classified as *tāmm*, *ḥasan* and *qabīḥ*.¹²² A revealing statement in Suyūṭī's *Itqān* on the authority of Ibn Barhān cites the Ḥanafite judge Abū Yūsuf (d. 182/798) as having deliberated upon several similar terms applied to instances of *waqf*: *tāmm*, *nāqis*, *ḥasan* and *qabīḥ*; he retorted that this classification was innovative, '*bid'at*', in a pejorative sense. Abū Yūsuf argued that the Qur'an was an incomparable composite literary miracle which, a priori, is *tāmm* (consummate) in part and whole: what is true of the whole is also true of the part and hence the terminology used for classification purposes was unbecoming.¹²³

Having alluded to Abū Yūsuf's position, Suyūṭī produces a number of citations which display the earlier readers' approach to factors which determine *al-waqf wa'l-ibtidā'*. He asserts that Nāfi' ibn Abī Nu'aym, the Medinan reader, held that *waqf* and *ibtidā'* were governed by the parameters of meaning.¹²⁴ The Meccan Ibn Kathīr and the Kūfan Ḥamza maintained that *waqf* and *ibtidā'* were ultimately determined by breathlessness, although Ibn Kathīr used deliberate *waqf* in the case of three Qur'anic verses: Q. 7:3; Q. 6:109; and Q. 16:103.¹²⁵ 'Āṣim and Kisā'i had, according to Suyūṭī, employed the notion of the completeness of speech (*kalām*) as the principal criterion in relation to *waqf wa'l-ibtidā'*. The Baṣran Abū 'Amr adhered to the practice of stopping at the end of each verse, as opposed to in the middle of a verse.¹²⁶ The earliest readers based their pauses and points of inception on transmitted conventions; this practice was acquired naturally as an inherent part of the processes of recitation. Ibn al-Jazarī, who like many of his predecessors in the reading tradition articulated with vigour the dominion of narration over linguistic criteria in the authentication of readings, remarked, while discussing one of the sub-categories of *waqf*, that it was unquestionably governed by *samā'* and *naql*.¹²⁷ Nevertheless, the grammarians' prominence in the authorship of these treatises suggests that their respective interpretations were produced as a result of invoking a linguistic model: *'aql* with an admixture of *naql*. More significantly, readers were concerned solely with pursuing areas of scholarship which aid the preservation of scripture in all its aspects and *waqf* is contingent to the recitation and comprehension of scripture.

The Generation of Reader-Grammarians: Maintaining the Pre-eminence of Precedents

The co-ordinated accentuation of an adherence to precedents continues as a prominent theme in the next generation of Kūfan readers. Yaḥyā ibn Waththāb was a mentor of A'ṣam, Ṭalḥa ibn Muṣarrif (d. 112/730) and Ḥumrān ibn al-A'yān (d. ca 130/747).¹²⁸ Yaḥyā features as a source of readings in Farrā's *Ma'ānī*, quoted on 75 occasions. In spite of this, it is not startling to note that Farrā levelled criticisms at Yaḥyā and his generation of readers.¹²⁹ Indeed, it would seem that the motive for this

relates to the fact that certain readings, circulated on the authority of prominent readers, contravened derived rules of grammar. One way of undermining such readings was to criticise their narrator. However, Yaḥyā's status and integrity as a reader himself are never questioned within the reader tradition. Yaḥyā and A^cmash were both of *mawālī* origin. It is reported that Yaḥyā was humiliated by Ḥajjāj's edict prohibiting the *mawālī* from leading the congregational prayers in Kūfa; his fellow worshippers insisted he forfeit his position, and he duly obliged. Ḥajjāj, hearing of Yaḥyā's predicament, assured him that the ruling was never intended to apply to figures of his standing and insisted he return to the mosque to lead prayers. However, he symbolically led the prayer for a further day before voluntarily relinquishing his position.¹³⁰ Yaḥyā associated with Masrūq ibn al-Ajda^c (d. 63/682), one of Ibn Mas^cūd's pupils with whom he also reviewed his readings.¹³¹ He narrated Masrūq's remark that Ibn Mas^cūd used to erase markers indicating a batch of ten verses, *ta^cshīr*, in codices.¹³²

A^cmash studied not only with leading Kūfans such as Zirr, Nakha^cī and ʿĀṣim, but he reviewed his readings with an important Medinan exegete and reader Abu'l-ʿĀliyya al-Riyāḥī (d. 93/712).¹³³ Riyāḥī was the putative author of a substantial exegetical text, to which figures such as the eminent exegete Qatāda (d. 111/735) had recourse.¹³⁴ A^cmash also has links with Mujāhid, the Meccan reader and exegete. It is significant that many of A^cmash's pupils were important figures within the embryonic stages of the Kūfan tradition of linguistics: many were the authors of treatises on both exegetical and grammatical subjects.¹³⁵ Versteegh's initial attempts to explain similarities between the linguistic terminology used in the *tafsīr* of Muqātil ibn Sulaymān (d. 150/767) and that employed by later Kūfan grammarians such as Kisāʿī led him to conclude that the Kūfans must have acquired this terminology through the version of Ibn ʿAbbās's *tafsīr* transmitted by Muqātil.¹³⁶ This was assumed because there were no links between Muqātil and the Kūfan grammatical tradition, although Versteegh does identify a link between Muqātil and A^cmash. However, the assumption is that A^cmash is a reader and not a grammarian. The tendency to demarcate early areas of scholarship such as *qirāʾa*, *naḥw* and *tafsīr* circumscribing the activities of figures such as A^cmash is misleading. It is conceivable that A^cmash himself may have been the very conduit through which Muqātil was introduced to such terminology.

A^cmash's students include Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb, Ṭalḥa ibn Muṣarrif and Abān ibn Taghlib (d. 141/768).¹³⁷ The example of Abān is striking: he was the author of a *Gharīb al-Qurʾān* text and Yaḥyā speaks of him as a scholar of *fiqh*, *qirāʾa* and *luḡhat*.¹³⁸ He also describes his work as replete with poetic *loci probantes*.¹³⁹ Yaḥyā mentions that Abān's tract was collated with two other related works and circulated as a single treatise: one of these works being attributed to the exegete Muḥammad ibn al-Sāʾib al-Kalbī (d. 146/763), and the second to Ibn Rawq (n.d.). Abān completed his study of the *muṣḥaf* under A^cmash's supervision. He also studied readings with

ʿĀṣim, Abū ʿAmr al-Shaybānī and Ibn Muṣarrif. The specialist in readings Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī refers to Abān as a *naḥwī*.¹⁴⁰ Moreover, Ibn al-Nadīm reports that he composed the following works: *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān* and *Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt*.¹⁴¹ Kisāʾī refers proudly to having associated with the likes of Abān, Ibn Abī Laylā, ʿĪsā ibn ʿUmar al-Hamdānī and Ḥamza.¹⁴² Another early figure also recalled in the *Maʿānī* who seems to pursue a somewhat radical blending of the traditional and the abstract is a figure by the name of Zuhayr al-Furqūbī (d. 156/773). According to Dévényi, he is mentioned twice by Farrāʾ in respect of his readings.¹⁴³ Dévényi adds that the *qurrāʾ* literature refers to him using the epithet *al-naḥwī*. Indeed, this literature also confirms that he was a contemporary of ʿĀṣim and that he had his own *ikhtiyār* in readings.¹⁴⁴ This is significant because, according to Qifṭī (d. 646/1248), while in Mecca Zuhayr was asked by the Kūfan reader Ibn ʿAyyāsh from where did he acquire *naḥw*; and he replied, 'from the companions of Abu'l-Aswad (d. 69/689)'.¹⁴⁵ It is curious to note that Zuhayr would adduce poetic *shawāhid* when asked about ʿarabiyya and *qirāʾāt*. Indeed, he apparently cited material derived from one of Abu'l-Aswad's students, Maymūn al-Aqran, renowned as a reader and poetry specialist.¹⁴⁶ The biographical dictionary of Marzubānī also confirms his status as a scholar among the Kūfans and that Abu'l-Aswad's students were his mentors.¹⁴⁷ The endeavours of figures such as Abān and Zuhayr were never properly recognised in the mainstream biographical literature because such scholars were essentially associated with the old tradition in which the role of such scholars was as transmitters, conveying the Qur'anic readings of early authorities but occasionally noted for their own *ikhtiyār*.

During the 2nd/8th century, the reading of Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt was popular among the Kūfans. Indeed, upon the demise of ʿĀṣim, Ḥamza was distinguished as the city's authority on readings.¹⁴⁸ He had reviewed his readings with Ḥumrān ibn Aʿyan, Ibn Abī Laylā and Aʿmash, although Ibn Mujāhid uses the term *samiʿa* to qualify the student relationship between these figures.¹⁴⁹ Ibn al-Jazarī reports that Aʿmash adhered to the *ḥarf* of Ibn Masʿūd; Ibn Abī Laylā adhered to the *ḥarf* of ʿAlī; Ishāq al-Sabīʿī blended the *ḥurūf*; while Ḥumrān adhered to the reading of Ibn Masʿūd.¹⁵⁰ The report refers to the fact that Ḥumrān would not contravene the codex of ʿUthmān despite 'showing mental awareness of (*yaʿtabiru*) the *ḥurūf al-maʿānī* of Ibn Masʿūd'.¹⁵¹ This was a reference to Ibn Masʿūd's exegetical interpolations embodied within the text of his codex. Moreover, this was also the *ikhtiyār* of Ḥamza.

The interesting aspect of this report relates not only to both figures' tenacious adherence to the ʿUthmānic codex, but to the use of the phrase *yaʿtabiru*. The same wording occurs in Ibn Mujāhid's *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, in which it is reported that 'Ḥamza used to *yaʿtabiru qirāʾat* ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd when it was not in concordance with the consonantal outline of the codex of ʿUthmān'.¹⁵² Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1005) shows in his *Mujmal al-lughā* that form II of this verb, as in *ʿabbartu al-kitāb*, denotes, 'to con-

template words (*al-kitāb*) within oneself without raising one's voice with them'.¹⁵³ Firuzabādī (d. 817/1414) also affirms the notion of reading (*qirā'a*) without raising one's voice; adding that the term *ʿabra* refers to both 'a single teardrop shed prior to intense weeping' and 'the materialisation of a sense of crying or grief within one's self (the breast) without physically shedding tears'.¹⁵⁴ Within the confines of such meanings, it is evident that the device of *iʿtibār* (implicit recognition) allowed readers to negotiate the issue of consonantal variants; *iʿtibār* is indispensable to an orally based tradition: one can therefore conclude that the exegetical interpolations of Ibn Masʿūd were never physically articulated as an intrinsic part of scripture relevant to an act of liturgical worship. But it also shows the immense importance attached to the ʿUthmānic codices during these earlier periods. Moreover, this accounts for the apparent contradiction of adhering to the disparate codices of ʿUthmān and Ibn Masʿūd, as both reports reiterate these figures' resolute adherence to the codex of ʿUthmān.

Referring to Beck's allusions to *iʿtibār*, Versteegh does argue that the codices of Ibn Masʿūd and Ibn ʿAbbās were popular in Kūfa and therefore grammarians such as Kisāʾī and Farrāʾ would use *iʿtibār* to 'explain and support alternative vocalic readings of the canonical text'.¹⁵⁵ There are numerous statements in the *Maʿānī* in which Kisāʾī and Farrāʾ express their reverence for the authority of the ʿUthmānic codex; however, *iʿtibār* allows the circumvention of consonantal inconsistencies as manifested in the codices of Ibn Masʿūd, Ibn ʿAbbās and Ubayy. The popularity of such codices does not enter the equation: the profusion and diversity in the stock of alternative vocalic readings are furnished by the devices of *ikhtiyār* and *ḥarf* which are in turn determined by defined precedents and anchored to the *muṣḥaf*. The resort to *iʿtibār* confirms that the boundaries of scripture were far from fluid.

Ḥamza claimed that he had not read a single *ḥarf* without relating it to an authenticated precedent: *athar*.¹⁵⁶ He was once asked if he had read with Aʿmash. Ḥamza said, 'No. But I enquired of him concerning the *ḥurūf*, *ḥarf* by *ḥarf*'.¹⁵⁷ The biographical reports state that Ḥamza used to take his personal codex during the month of Ramaḍān and listen to the reading of Aʿmash, thereby acquiring his *ḥurūf*.¹⁵⁸ Ḥamza was renowned for his idiosyncratic application of *madd* (elongated vowels), *hamza* (the commission of the glottal stop) and *idghām* (assimilation) in his readings: these phonological features were regarded with derision by certain Baṣrans and even censured by scholars such as Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (164–241/780–855).¹⁵⁹ Even Farrāʾ describes Ḥamza as ill informed regarding the characteristics of the Arabs' speech.¹⁶⁰ Ibn al-Jazarī claims that an incompetent student, rather than Ḥamza, was responsible for exaggerating these features and transmitting them on his authority.¹⁶¹ One report in Ibn Mujāhid's work suggests that the Baṣrans were responsible for stigmatising the reading of Ḥamza.¹⁶² He adds that Ḥamza adhered stringently to precedents in his

readings. And yet Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/777), who was one of his students, stated that 'whenever Ḥamza read a *ḥarf* of the Qur'an it was based on a precedent (*athar*)'.¹⁶³ Reader biographical material is replete with praise for the scholarly standing of Ḥamza as a reader and his religiosity; reference is also made to his proficiency in the science of *ʿarabiyya* and the traditions.

However, the biographical reports of the Baṣran historians offer an entirely contradictory perspective, relentlessly criticising Ḥamza. Abū Ṭayyib, who had already reprimanded ʿĀṣim, describes Ḥamza as a grossly exaggerated figure who, according to Baṣran scholars, had no merits.¹⁶⁴ Abū Ṭayyib then cites a Baṣran philologist and reader who was very critical of certain Kūfan readers, Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī (d. 255/869), who asserts that he asked a number of eminent Baṣran scholars such as Abū Zayd al-Anṣarī (d. 215/830), Aṣmaʿī (d. 213/828) and Yaʿqūb al-Ḥaḍramī (117–205/735–820) concerning Ḥamza and, 'they all agreed that he was nothing, and knew not of the speech of the Arabs, nor *naḥw*; moreover, his recitation of the Qur'an was replete with solecisms'. Abū Ḥātim then refers to an example of one of his readings which he ridiculed as having no parallel in the speech of the Arabs. Abū Ḥātim goes on to deride those Kūfans who incessantly boast of his eminence.¹⁶⁵ He claims Ḥamza was unable to distinguish the subtleties of the art of recitation; only the Baṣrans were able to achieve that distinction 'for they are the scholars of *ʿarabiyya* and the leading readers'. Similar criticisms were earlier expressed by the Baṣran Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889) who alludes to Ḥamza as a man 'disguised by Allah in the eyes of the common man as a fine person'.¹⁶⁶ He describes his readings as confused and in disarray, and argues that he complicated the processes of recitation. Ḥamza was a mentor of numerous Kūfans, particularly prominent among these were Sulaym ibn ʿĪsā (130–88/748–806), Kisāʾī and Ḥusayn al-Juʿfī (d. 203/813). While Kisāʾī gained eminence in the area of grammar, it was Sulaym who was acknowledged as the more senior authority on Ḥamza's readings.¹⁶⁷ It seems unlikely that the criticism of Ḥamza was prompted by the peculiar phonological features of his readings, but rather it would seem to emanate from Ḥamza's determined adherence to precedents in his approach to the reading tradition.

It is possible to trace linguistic activity to figures who preceded the subsequent paragons of the two conventional traditions. An examination of biographical literature shows that many of these later linguists received their training from readers who displayed a thorough proficiency in the field of *naḥw*. The readers remained loyal to the principle that the linguistic sciences should function as an instrument of the religious sciences. It is our contention that these figures were overlooked in linguist biographical material as a result of their reluctance to accentuate linguistic considerations in the approach to the language of scripture. However, it is evident that the Kūfans themselves subscribed to what was effectively an insular approach to linguistic thought, just like their Baṣran

counterparts. And therefore Versteegh's belief that the Kūfans restricted their analysis to the text of the Qur'an requires review. They were exploring models of language developed from sources other than scripture; and this distinguished them from their reader counterparts in Kūfa. Among the early generations of Kūfan readers, including those who gained reputations as linguists, there was a noticeable tendency to articulate frequently their reverence for the conventions of the reading tradition. One seldom comes across any of the early readers from Kūfa, or with Kūfan connections, who were embroiled in controversy on the issue of selecting readings, or expressing overtly controversial explanations regarding their linguistic justification; accordingly, the biographical material of the linguists had nothing dramatic to record of their linguistic endeavours. There were later Kūfans who developed types of *ikhtiyār*, selecting *ḥurūf* on the basis of a grammatical synthesis, and it is in the field of collating and selecting Qur'anic readings that one detects a semblance of controversy and conflict as it was possible for figures to express preferences for given readings, citing levels of eloquence and rudimentary linguistic considerations.¹⁶⁸ The overriding regulating principle implemented by Kūfan readers was a strict adherence to precedents and the absolute hegemony of codices. Conversely, those grammarians who composed texts which were in the *ma'ānī*, *ḥujja* and *ihtijāj* genre, emblematic of the grammatical justification of scripture, were able to exploit the full potential of their grammatical theories within the confines of their works just as they were able to apply these theories to instances of *waqf* and indeed to all other aspects of reader scholarship in which linguistic considerations might be applied. While the Kūfans had a number of figures prepared to engage these abstract models, it was with the Baṣrans that their application was ever more vigorously ventured; yet there was also a reader connection as we shall see.

NOTES

1 See the standard accounts found in the introductory statements of the following works: 'Abd al-Wāhid ibn 'Alī Abū Ṭayyib, *Marātib al-naḥwiyyin*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Maktabat Nahḍat Miṣr, 1955), henceforth *Marātib*. Kamāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Barakāt ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat al-alibbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-udabā'*, ed. Ibrāhīm al-Samarā'ī (al-Zarqā': Maktabat al-Manār, 1985), henceforth *Nuzhat*. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt 'alā anbāh al-nuḥāt*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (4 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 1956), henceforth *Inbāh*. Jalāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-wu'āt fī ṭabaqāt al-lughawiyyin wa'l-nuḥāt*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (2 vols. Beirut: Maktabat al-'Aṣriyya, 1964), henceforth *Bughyat*. Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyin*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1973), henceforth *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyin*. Abū Bakr Taqī al-Dīn ibn Qāḍī Shuhba, *Ṭabaqāt al-nuḥāt wa'l-lughawiyyin* (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, n.d.). Notwithstanding the references to figures identified as readers in these works, their own literature affirms the relevance of their contributions: cf. Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, *Ma'rifat al-qurrā' al-kibār*, ed. M. Jād al-Ḥaqq, 1st edn (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Ḥadītha, 1968) henceforth *Ma'rifa*. Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Damashqī ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Naṣhṣ fī'l-qirā'āt al-'aṣhr*, ed. 'Alī Muḥammad al-Dabbā' (2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, n.d.), henceforth *al-Naṣhṣ*; idem, *Ghāyat al-nihāya fī abaqāt*

al-qurrā', ed. Gotthelf Bergsträsser und Otto Pretzl (Cairo: Maḥaṭat al-Sa'āda, 1935), henceforth *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*). An excellent analysis of the standard accounts of the inception of the Arabic linguistic tradition is ventured by R. Talmon in a number of articles: 'Who was the First Grammarian? A New Approach to an Old Problem' in Hartmut Bobzin and Kees Versteegh (eds), *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar. Proceedings of the First Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar. Nijmegen 16–19th April 1984* (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1985), pp. 124–45. Also 'Schacht's Theory in the Light of Recent Discoveries Concerning the Origins of Arabic Grammar', *Studia Islamica* 1987–8, pp. 31–50.

2 A cursory look at Abu 'Ubayda's introduction to his *Majāz al-Qur'ān* highlights this fact: Ma'amar ibn al-Muthannā Abū 'Ubayda, *Majāz al-Qur'ān*, ed. Fu'ad Sezgin, 2nd edn (2 vols. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1981).

3 Kees Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qur'anic Exegesis in Early Islam* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), henceforth *AGQE*; idem, 'Grammar and Exegesis: The Origins of Kūfan Grammar and the *Tafsīr Muqātil*', *Der Islam* 67:2 (1990), pp. 206–42; idem, *The Explanation of Linguistic Causes, al-Zajjāji's Theory of Grammar* (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1995); idem, 'Zayd ibn 'Alī's Commentary on the Qur'an' in Y. Suleiman (ed.), *Arabic Grammar and Linguistics* (Richmond: Curzon, 1999), pp. 9–29.

4 See Kees Versteegh, *Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977). *AGQE*, pp. 11–12. Cf. Versteegh's observations articulated in his analysis of Makhzūmī's terminology [cf. M. Makhzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa wa-manhajuhā fī dirāsāt al-lughā wa'l-naḥw*, 2nd edn (Cairo: Maḥaṭat Muṣṭafā al-Bābī, 1958)] in *AGQE*.

5 Versteegh, *AGQE*, p. 198. This synthesis can be compared with: Claude Gilliot's survey of 'The Beginnings of Qur'anic Exegesis' in A. Rippin (ed.), *The Qur'ān: Formative Interpretation* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1999).

6 Ibid, pp. 178f.

7 Ibid, pp. 178f.

8 Versteegh, *AGQE*, see p. 177; pp. 182–4; p. 192.

9 R. Talmon, *Arabic Grammar in its Formative Age*, *Kitāb al-°Ayn and its Attribution to Khalīl Ibn Aḥmad* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), pp. 278–9; idem, 'A Problematic Passage in Sībawayhi's *al-Kitāb* and the Authenticity of Akhbār about the Early History of Arabic Grammatical Thinking', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 1984, pp. 691–701.

10 R. Talmon, 'The Philosophising Farrā': An Interpretation of an Obscure Saying Attributed to the Grammarian Tha'lab' in Hartmut Bobzin and Kees Versteegh (eds), *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II. Proceedings of the Second Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar* (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1990), pp. 265–79. Cf. Dimitri Gutas, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco–Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early 'Abbasid Society (2nd–4th/8th–10th Centuries)* (London & New York: Routledge, 1998).

11 Ibid, p. 276.

12 R. Talmon 'An Eighth-Century Grammatical School in Medinah: The Collection and Evaluation of the Available Material', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48 (1985), pp. 224–36. See discussion on pp. 224–5.

13 Ibid, pp. 224f. Talmon also refers to the observations of Brockelmann, Fück, Belguedj and Carter, who expressed views on this topic.

14 Talmon, 'Who was the First Grammarian?', esp. pp. 135–6. Cf. idem, *Studia Islamica* 1987–8, esp. p. 43.

15 R. Talmon, 'Nahwiyyūn in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*' in *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik*, Wiesbaden: 8 (1982), pp. 12–38.

- 16 Talmon, *Arabic Grammar in its Formative Age*, pp. 31–47.
- 17 Ibid, pp. 131–5. Cf. Talmon, *Studia Islamica* 1987–8, pp. 45–7.
- 18 Talmon, *BSOAS* 48 (1985), p. 231, p. 235. Cf. idem, 'Who was the First Grammarian? A New Approach to an Old Problem', pp. 138f.
- 19 M.G. Carter, 'Les Origines de la Grammaire Arabe', *Arabica* 40 (1972), pp. 69–97. And Chapter 3 of his unpublished PhD thesis: 'A Study of Sibawayhi's Principles of Grammatical Analysis' (1968). Also 'An Arab Grammarian of the Eighth Century A.D.', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93 (1973), pp. 146–57. See also 'Arabic Grammar' in *Cambridge History of Arabic Literature. Religion, Learning, and Science in the 'Abbasid Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 124f.
- 20 Carter, *JAOS* 93 (1973), pp. 146–7. Cf. Carter, *Arabica* 40 (1972), p. 86. Versteegh argues that in Carter's hypothesis law must by implication precede grammar and there is no way of substantiating this premise.
- 21 M.G. Carter, 'When did the Arabic Word *Naḥw* First Come to Denote Grammar', *Language and Communication* 5:4 (1985), pp. 265–72.
- 22 Carter, *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik*, Wiesbaden:8 (1982), p. 29. Cf. ibid, p. 17. Cf. *Arabica* 40 (1972), pp. 72–6.
- 23 Carter, 'Arabic Grammar', p. 119.
- 24 Carter, loc. cit.
- 25 A. Rippin, 'Miscellen: Studying Early *Tafsīr* Texts', *Der Islam* (1995), pp. 310–23.
- 26 J. Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 119–21; cf. F. Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins: Beginnings of Islamic Historical Writing* (New Jersey: Princeton, 1998).
- 27 Rippin, *Der Islam* (1995), pp. 310–11.
- 28 See Rippin's articles on 'Ibn 'Abbās's *al-Lughāt fi'l-Qur'ān*' and 'Ibn 'Abbās's *Gharīb al-Qur'ān*' in Rippin (ed.), *The Qur'ān: Formative Interpretation* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1999).
- 29 Rippin, *Der Islam* (1995), p. 313, although he refers incorrectly to Gustav instead of Gotthold.
- 30 Carter, *Language and Communication* 5:4 (1985), pp. 265f. Cf. Chapter four of his thesis.
- 31 For a survey of his views see Gerald Hawting, 'John Wansbrough, Islam, and Monotheism', *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 9:1 (1997), pp. 22–38.
- 32 G. Weil, *Die Grammatischen Streitfragen der Baṣrer und Kūfer* (Leiden, 1913).
- 33 Ibid, p. 53; and p. 65, p. 73, p. 77. Cf. Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Inṣāf fī masā'il al-khilāf bayna'l-naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn wa'l-Kūfiyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥamīd (Cairo: Dār al-Fikr, n.d.), Vol. 2, p. 71.
- 34 Bohas, Guillaume, Kouloughli, *The Arabic Linguistic Tradition* (London: Longman, 1990), pp. 7f.
- 35 Ibid, p. 57, p. 65, p. 80, p. 81. For a discussion of the inaccuracies in the ascription of material see Kinga Dévényi, 'Farrā's linguistic methods in his work *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*' in Hartmut Bobzin & Kees Versteegh (eds), *Studies in the History of Arabic Grammar II. Proceedings of the Second Symposium on the History of Arabic Grammar* (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1990), pp. 101–9. And Naphtali 'Clause and sentence in *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*: A Study of the Term *Kalām*' in *Proceedings of the Colloquium of Arabic Grammar* 1991, pp. 239–46. Ḥulwānī, *al-Khilāf al-naḥwī bayna'l-Baṣriyyīn wa'l-Kūfiyyīn fī Kitāb al-Inṣāf* (Aleppo: Dār al-Qalam al-'Arabī, 1974), pp. 204–5. See pp. 186–87. Cf. Baalbaki's unpublished PhD thesis,

'A Study of the Analytical Methods of the Arab Grammarians of the 2nd and 3rd Centuries' (1979), p. 336; and Makhzūmī's *al-Dars al-naḥwī fī Baghdād* (Beirut, 1974), p. 220. We shall return to this point below. See pp. 278–80 of Bernard's work referred to below for a re-evaluation of the position regarding schools.

36 M. Bernards, *Changing Traditions: Al-Mubarrad's Refutation of Sībawayh and the Subsequent Reception of the Kitāb* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997). See pp. 89–98. Cf. Baalbaki, 'A Study of the Analytical Methods'. An early distinction between the Kūfan and Baṣran traditions is reported in Talmon's *Arabic Grammar in its Formative Age*, pp. 278–87. Bernards reports that Talmon does not wholly support the notion of distinct traditions nor deny them (p. 94). In Talmon's conception, Farrāʾ belongs to an old tradition of language studies along with several *naḥwiyyūn* identified in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*.

37 Bernards, *Changing Traditions*, pp. 95–7.

38 Ibid, pp. 90–95.

39 Versteegh, *AGQE*, pp. 13f.

40 See the standard biographies in *Inbāh*, *Nuzhat*, *Muʿjam* and *Bughyat*.

41 Kinga Dévényi, 'al-Farrāʾ and al-Kisāʾī: References to Grammarians and Qurʾān Readers in the *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān* of al-Farrāʾ' in Kinga Dévényi & Tamas Ivanyi (eds), *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Grammar* (Budapest, 1991), pp. 159–76.

42 Ibid, pp. 160–1 and 163.

43 See above.

44 Abū Zakariyyāʾ Yaḥyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, ed. M. Najjār & A. Najātī (3 vols. Cairo: n.p., 1980). Cf. N. Kinberg, *A Lexicon of al-Farrāʾ's Terminology in his Qurʾān Commentaries, with Full Definitions, English Summaries, and Extensive Citations* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996). Ruʾāsī is said to have outlived the sons of his sons.

45 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 125.

46 Suyūṭī, *Bughyat*, Vol. 2, pp. 82–3.

47 Abū Ṭayyib, *Marātib*.

48 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 2, p. 116. The term *wuqūf* refers to pauses in reading which may have been formulated by Ruʾāsī on the basis of linguistic considerations.

49 Ibid, pp. 162–3.

50 Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, Vol. 2, p. 289.

51 Ibid, Vol. 2, p. 79. Dévényi, 'al-Farrāʾ and al-Kisāʾī', p. 162.

52 Versteegh, *AGQE*, p. 202. Suyūṭī, *Bughyat*, Vol. 1, pp. 82–3. Grammatical opinions of these scholars surface in texts such as Abū Ḥayyān's *Tadhkirat al-nuḥāt*, Suyūṭī's *al-Ashbāh wa'l-naẓāʾir* and *amālī* type works.

53 Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Insāf*, Vol. 2, p. 71.

54 R. Sellheim, *Die Gelehrtenbiographien des Abū ʿUbaydallāh al-Marzubānī in der Rezension des Ḥāfiẓ al-Yaghmurī*, Bibliotheca Islamica (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1964), p. 284.

55 Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh Baghdād* (14 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, n.d.). Cf. Abū ʿAbd Allāh Yaʿqūb ibn ʿAbd Allāh Yaḥyā al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ* (5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1991), Vol. 4, pp. 87–105.

56 Yaḥyā al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, Vol. 2, pp. 88–90.

57 Ibid, p. 105. The last work was examined by Wansbrough in *Qur'anic Studies*, pp. 212–5;

and has been recently republished by Āl-Yāsīn in *Abḥāth fi ta'rīkh al-ʿarabiyya wa maṣādirihā* (Beirut: Ālim al-Kutub, 1996), pp. 123–42.

58 Dévényi, 'al-Farrā' and al-Kisā'i', p. 159.

59 Farrā', *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*. See Vol. 2, p. 423.

60 Ibid, Vol. 2, p. 100. Cf. Kisā'i's discussion of the vocalisation of 'tashmut' in Vol. 1, p. 394.

61 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa fi'l-qirāʾāt*, ed. Shawqī Dayf, 2nd edn (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, A.H. 1400), p. 78.

62 Abū ʿAmr ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd al-Dānī, *al-Muḥkam fi naqṭ al-maṣāḥif*, ed. ʿIzzat Ḥasan, 2nd edn (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1986), p. 10.

63 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, pp. 96f.

64 Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat*, p. 80. Note, there is a second namesake who is a Kūfan philologist of distinction: Lahyānī, who studied with Kisā'i.

65 Yaqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, Vol. 4, pp. 5–6; cf. Suyūṭī, *Bughyat*, Vol. 2, pp. 158–9.

66 Yaqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, Vol. 5, p. 598.

67 See his biography in Yaqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, Vol. 5, pp. 619–21. And Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat* pp. 81–3.

68 M. Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, ed. R. Tajaddud, 3rd edn (Beirut: Dār al-Masīra, 1988), pp. 73–4. Cf. Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 147.

69 Ibn al-Nadīm, loc. cit.

70 Yaqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, Vol. 5, p. 621. The last two works have been published: see the survey provided by Aḥmad Makkī Anṣārī, *Abū Zakariyyā' al-Farrā' wa madhhabubu fi'l-naḥw wa'l-lugha* (Cairo, 1962). And Makhzūmī's survey of early works in pp. 199–253 of the work cited above (fn. no. 3).

71 Yaqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, Vol. 5, pp. 346–9. Cf. Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 138; Suyūṭī, *Bughyat*, vol. 1, pp. 140–1.

72 Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat*, pp. 173–4.

73 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 138f and p. 141. This is generally perceived as a blemish against his scholarly reputation, rather than symbolic of his attachment to the old school of linguistics. See Jamāl al-Dīn, *Inbāh*, Vol. 1, p. 138.

74 Zubaydī, loc. cit.

75 See Jamāl al-Dīn, *Inbāh*, pp. 138f.

76 Jamāl al-Dīn, loc. cit.

77 Sīrāfī, *Akhbār al-naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad al-Bannā (Cairo: Dār al-Iʿtiṣām, 1985).

78 Rippin, *Der Islam* (1995), p. 317.

79 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, pp. 43–49.

80 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 294. Cf. Abū Jaʿfar al-Naḥḥās, *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, Vol. 1, p. 390; Vol. 4, p. 268.

81 Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān fi ʿulūm al-Qurʾān*, ed. Muḥammad Salīm Ḥāshim, (2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, n.d.). This is discussed in the section on 'tahammuluhu', Vol. 2, pp. 203f. Cf. Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Zarkashī, *al-Burhān fi ʿulūm al-Qurʾān*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (4 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, n.d.). Vol. 1, p. 232.

82 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, p. 43.

- 83 Ibid, Vol. 1, pp. 43–4; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 516.
- 84 F. Denny, 'Exegesis and Recitation: Their Development as Classical Forms of Qur'anic Piety' in F. Reynolds & T. Ludwig, *Transitions and Transformations in the History of Religion: Essays in Honour of Joseph M. Kitagawa* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980). Cf. his article on 'The Adab of Quran Recitation: Text and Context' in A. Johns (ed.), *International Congress for the Study of the Qur'an* (Canberra: Australian National University, 1982), pp. 143–60.
- 85 Denny, 'Exegesis and recitation', pp. 44–5; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 413.
- 86 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 67.
- 87 Dévényi, 'al-Farrāʾ and al-Kisāʾī', p. 161.
- 88 Ibid, pp. 73f. Cf. Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 348. ʿĪsā is referred to as *ṣāhib al-ḥurūf*.
- 89 Loc. cit.
- 90 Dévényi, 'al-Farrāʾ and al-Kisāʾī', p. 75.
- 91 Abū Ṭayyib, *Marātib*, p. 24.
- 92 Dévényi, 'al-Farrāʾ and al-Kisāʾī', p. 160.
- 93 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 71.
- 94 Loc. cit. for Ibn Mujāhid's discussion of his *ruwā*. Also Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 348.
- 95 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 254.
- 96 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifat*, Vol. 1, pp. 137–8.
- 97 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 348. Cf. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 40.
- 98 Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 40.
- 99 Loc. cit.
- 100 Abu'l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā Thaʿlab, *Majālis*, ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Ḥārūn (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, n.d.) pp. 50–6.
- 101 Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, Vol. 1, p. 89.
- 102 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 348. Cf. Zarkashī, *Burhān*, for a discussion of what constitutes a verse: Vol. 1, pp. 266–8. There are instances when these letters are deemed to be separate verses.
- 103 Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī, *al-Muqniʿ fī maʿrifat marsūm maṣāḥif ahl al-umṣār*, ed. M. Dahmān (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1983).
- 104 Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, p. 115. For recent research on the collection of the Qur'an see H. Motzki, 'The Collection of the Qur'an: A Reconsideration of Western Views in Light of Recent Methodological Developments', *Der Islam* (2001), pp. 2–34.
- 105 Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, p. 104.
- 106 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 325.
- 107 He read *ʿibādī* (with the *yāʾ* as the pronominal suffix): the codex of the Baṣrans was transcribed *ʿibādī* without the *yāʾ* (Dānī, *Muqniʿ*, p. 113). Ibn al-Mujāhid notes that Nāfiʿ, Ibn ʿĀmir, and ʿĀṣim in one narration on the authority of Ibn ʿAyyāsh all adhered to the same reading: a quiescent rendering of the *yāʾ*, p. 588. Cf. ʿAbd al-Latif al-Khaṭīb, *Muʿjam al-qirāʾāt* (10 vols. Damascus: Dār Saʿd al-Dīn, 2002).
- 108 Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 60.
- 109 Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī*, Vol. 1, p. 338.

- 110 Ibid, p. 239.
- 111 Ibid, p. 202.
- 112 Wansbrough, *Quranic studies*, pp. 44–5.
- 113 Ibid, p. 45.
- 114 Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 72. Cf. p. 38.
- 115 Loc. cit.
- 116 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 330.
- 117 Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 38.
- 118 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 2, p. 231.
- 119 Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, Vol. 1, pp. 166–79.
- 120 Ibid, p. 166.
- 121 Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim, *Kitāb Ḍdāḥ al-waqf wa'l-ibtidāʾ*, ed. Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ramaḍān (2 vols. Damascus: Majmaʿ al-lughā al-ʿarabiyya, 1971). Dānī also has a work on *waqf*: *al-Muktafī fi'l-waqf wa'l-ibtidāʾ*.
- 122 Qāsim, *Ḍdāḥ*, Vol. 1, pp. 149–50. The *ḥasan* is defined as not being *tāmm*; while the *qabīḥ* is neither *ḥasan* nor *tāmm*.
- 123 Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, Vol. 1, p. 174. Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 2, pp. 300–1. He is referred to as Ibn Burhām.
- 124 Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, Vol. 1, pp. 174f.
- 125 Ibid, p. 174.
- 126 Ibid, p. 174.
- 127 Ibid, p. 175.
- 128 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, p. 52.
- 129 Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī*, Vol. 3, p. 75. 'Tawahhum: An Ambiguous Concept in Early Arabic Grammar', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (1982), pp. 233–44. Farrāʾ describes Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb as ill informed regarding the characteristics of the Arabs' speech; Ḥamza was a mentor of Kisāʾī and a number of other leading Kūfan linguists; the fact that he was a Kūfan did not deter Farrāʾ from criticising him. See Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī*, Vol. 3, p. 266. Cf. Baalbaki, 'The Treatment of *Qirāʾāt* by the Second and Third Century Grammarians' in A. Rippin (ed.), *The Qurʾān: Formative Interpretation* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1999).
- 130 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, p. 52.
- 131 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 2, p. 294.
- 132 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 14.
- 133 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, p. 49; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, pp. 284–5.
- 134 Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Dāwudī, *Ṭabaqāt al-mufasssīrīn*, ed. A.M. ʿUmar (2 vols. Cairo: Maktabat Wahba, 1977), Vol. 1, pp. 172–3.
- 135 Versteegh's *AGQE* examined the texts of figures linked with Aʿmash such as Sufyān al-Thawrī.
- 136 Kees Versteegh, 'Grammar and Exegesis: The origins of Kūfan Grammar and the *Tafsīr Muqātil*', *Der Islam* 67:2 (1990), pp. 206–42, esp. p. 236.
- 137 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, p. 49; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, pp. 284–5.
- 138 Dāwudī, *Ṭabaqāt al-mufasssīrīn*, Vol. 1, p. 1.
- 139 Yaqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, Vol. 1, pp. 67–8.

- 140 Suyūṭī, *Bughyat*, Vol. 1, p. 404. Cf. Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, p. 80. And Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 276.
- 141 Loc. cit.
- 142 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, p. 121.
- 143 Dévényi, 'al-Farrā' and al-Kisāʾī', p. 163.
- 144 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 295.
- 145 Qifī, *Inbāh*, Vol. 2, p. 18.
- 146 Loc. cit.
- 147 Sellheim, *Gelehrtenbiographien*, p. 267.
- 148 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 262.
- 149 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 73.
- 150 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 262.
- 151 Loc. cit.
- 152 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 73.
- 153 Ibn Fāris, *Mujmal al-lughā*, ed. Zuhayr Sultān (2 vols. Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1986), p. 643. The exegetical interpolations were not accepted by orthodoxy as sacrosanct scripture: they were not valid in acts of worship.
- 154 *al-Qamūs al-muḥīṭ* (4 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.), Vol. 2, p. 83.
- 155 Versteegh, *AGQE*, p. 39. And E. Beck, 'Studien zur Geschichte der Kūfischen Koranlesung in den Beiden Ersten Jahrhunderten', *Orientalia* 17 (1948), pp. 326–55.
- 156 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, pp. 94–5.
- 157 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 73.
- 158 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 263. And Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, pp. 94–5.
- 159 Ibid, p. 263.
- 160 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 3, p. 266.
- 161 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 263.
- 162 Ibid, pp. 76–7.
- 163 Ibid, p. 263.
- 164 Abū Ṭayyib, *Marātib*, p. 27.
- 165 Loc. cit.
- 166 Muhammad ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muslim ibn Qutayba, *Taʾwīl mushkil al-Qurʾān*, ed. Aḥmad Ṣaqar, 2nd edn (Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, 1973), p. 59.
- 167 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, Vol. 1, p. 115; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, Vol. 1, p. 318.
- 168 See my forthcoming article 'The Early Arabic Grammarians' Contributions to the Collection and Authentication of Qur'anic Readings: The Prelude to Ibn Mujāhid's *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*'.

Copyright of Journal of Qur'anic Studies is the property of Edinburgh University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.