

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

Mustafa Shah

SOAS, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

While the early Kūfan tradition of readings displayed overwhelmingly conservative characteristics in its engaged approach to the language of scripture, the Baṣran reading tradition included among its ranks individuals who were far more radical in espousing contentious theories which were scrupulously applied in the attempts to evaluate, explore and authenticate the linguistic features of scripture's diction. Consequently, the principal innovators of linguistic thought emerged from among these Baṣran readers, auspiciously formulating approaches to the development of Arabic linguistic thought. Intriguingly, a number of these early Baṣran readers were linked with pioneering readers of the Ḥijāz who were already experimenting with revolutionary models for the evaluation of scripture; and yet it was the Baṣrans who invigorated these models, effecting a shift from a functional approach to the phenomenon of language and the service of scripture to one in which abstract considerations had become a primary objective. The radical inclination of the Baṣrans does not imply an acute indifference to the sacrosanct status of scripture, but rather a sheer fascination with the phenomenon of language as a detached endeavour. The readers and indeed the grammarians of Baṣra, like their Kūfan counterparts, persistently alluded to the ascendancy of authenticated precedents in Qur'anic readings when pondering grammatical hypotheses; they also expressed immense reverence for the sacrosanct status of codices. However, the creative nature of their linguistic abstraction inadvertently resulted in their frequently encroaching upon the very principles which they declared sacred. Furthermore, the radical aspects of linguistic analysis which were actively pursued by scholars such as Kisā'ī (120–89/738–804), Farrā' (144–207/761–822) and an isolated number of earlier Kūfans seem to have been ventured much earlier and with exceptional vigour by early generations of Baṣran readers.

Given the magnitude of the contributions made by individuals such as Khalīl ibn Aḥmad (d. 175/791) and Sībawayhi (d. 177/193) to the synthesis and development of Arabic linguistic thought, it is not surprising that the inception of grammatical thought was always anchored to these figures' endeavours. Indeed, contemporary

scholarship tended to commence its history of this tradition with these individuals and the distinction of their linguistic enterprise. The setting which allowed much of this thought to be refined was prepared much earlier by scholars associated with the reader tradition. The text of the Qur'an and the functional endeavours which it inspired sedately served as the catalyst for this scholarship, furnishing decisive resources for the formulation and elaboration of a theory of language. Biographical literature recounts that luminaries such as Abū'l-Aswad al-Du'alī (d. 69/689), Naṣr ibn 'Āṣim (d. 89/708), Yaḥyā ibn Ya'far (d. 129/746), 'Abd Allāh ibn Hurmuz (d. 117/735), Maymūn al-Aqrān (d. 125/743) and 'Anbasa al-Fil (d. 120/738) were engaged in the physical preservation of the Qur'anic text which was bequeathed by an oral tradition.¹ However, prerequisite to this enterprise was a profound awareness of the integrated relationship between the Qur'an and the corpus of readings or *lectiones*.

Michael Carter has maintained that many of these early readers were inappropriately paired with innovation, commenting that the linguistic influence of these so-called pioneers was never readily palpable in the currency of grammatical thought embodied in the earliest texts such as Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*. Indeed, primary source material made no mention of the putative works that these figures had supposedly authored.² Carter suggested that there was no definitive means of reconstructing the presumed theoretical composition of their endeavours.³ Kees Versteegh has conceded that improvements in the area of diacritics and vowel markings seemingly characterise the initial linguistic contributions of early Baṣran readers, although his own synthesis of the development of Arabic linguistic thought indicated that mechanisms constructed for the exigencies of grappling with the meanings of scripture were readily imported into an embryonic linguistic tradition and instinctively used for the cultivation of linguistic thought.⁴ Nevertheless, as far as the earliest indications of linguistic activity were concerned it is the Arabic script which becomes the primary focal point of the early linguists' attention. This included improving upon the use of diacritical and vowel markings, collating the orthographical idiosyncrasies of Qur'anic codices and the enumeration of verses therein. The endeavours of readers were soon extended to include the syntactic, phonetic and phonological resolution of the language of Qur'anic scripture. Although the authority and ascendancy of the oral tradition of Qur'anic readings were never diminished, greater significance was judiciously attached to the written means of securing scripture's physical preservation. The Arabic script served as a vehicle for the preservation and promulgation of the Qur'anic diction, and a brief review of recent research on the script's origins and development would help place the linguistic enterprise of early readers within its proper context.

Origins of the Arabic Script: Refining the Use of Diacritics and Vowel Markings

The question of whether the Arabic script was evolved from either a Nabataean or Syriac archetype remains a rather moot point among scholars of orthography. Werner Diem speaks of the Arabic script as being a derivative of the 'Aramaic cursive used by the Nabataeans'. He also mentions Jean Starcky's view, refuted by Adolf Grohmann, that the Syriac estrangelo script served as the principal model for this script.⁵ While John Healey affirms the Nabataean origin of the Arabic script, he distinguishes between western and eastern variants: the former had a closer affinity with Nabataean and was prevalent in Ḥijāz, Syria and Jordan; while the eastern script associated with Iraq may have been subjected to the active influence of Syriac models.⁶ Writing much earlier, Nabia Abbott traced the Ḥijāzi script to the so-called *jazm* prototype, which she described as a modified variant of the Nabataean script.⁷ But she also acknowledged Syriac influences. Indeed, positioning her views around Syriac and Arabic etymologies of the term *jazm*, Abbott referred to the subtle resemblance between the straight, vertical, horizontal and inclined strokes which were typical of Syriac scripts and the early Arabic scripts developed in Iraq; moreover, she was to suggest tentatively that the term *jazm* was illustrative of the intrinsic link between the two scripts.⁸ The aforementioned views are summarised by Beatrice Gruendler, who relates that 'The general proportions of this pre-Islamic Arabic script suggest Syriac calligraphic influences. Yet the individual Arabic graphemes descend through Nabataean from the west Semitic Arabic'.⁹

The traditional Islamic accounts of the development of writing highlight the role played by the Iraqi cities of Anbār and Ḥīra in the evolution of the Arabic script.¹⁰ Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 385/995) historically distinguished an order of four initial Arabic scripts: Meccan, Medinan, Baṣran and Kūfan, briefly referring to physical features of the *alifs* employed in the first two scripts.¹¹ Abbott did accept the general 'chronological significance implied in this order'. However, she maintained that the Baṣran and Kūfan scripts, despite inevitably possessing their own specific features, were effectively heirs to the writing tradition and style of the ancient Iraqi cities of Anbār and Ḥīra.¹² She also asserted that the Ḥīran script was the leading script of the sixth century and that it influenced even the Meccan and Medinan styles from which the *mā'il* (angular or slanted) and *mashq* (extended strokes) forms emerged.¹³ Nonetheless, accentuating the significance of manuscript evidence *per se*, François Déroche has suggested that the focus of previous scholarship centred upon an interpretation of the sources which deal with a history of the Arabic script. He believes that the actual manuscripts have been largely overlooked in such approaches, as have the substantive issues of typology and chronology.¹⁴ One might add to this observation that only a sample of manuscripts is available for this earlier period; and

this renders early accounts of the development of the script and its features as provided by biographical sources as being equally valuable. Déroche assertively claimed that generic terms such as *mashq* were misinterpreted as references to scripts instead of being identified as an individual technique applied to a given script. He reports that the subtle distinctions made by Ibn al-Nadīm regarding early scripts were never fully appreciated by erstwhile scholarship.¹⁵ He went on to stress that palaeographic evidence confirmed that there existed a wide range of styles used in these early scripts.¹⁶ The central thrust of Abbott's argument maintains that while the Meccan and Medinan scripts were initially the main vehicles of Qur'anic transcription, the Iraqi script, complemented by orthographical improvements in terms of 'vocalisation, punctuation, and perhaps, ornamentation', which had been ingeniously championed by Baṣran and Kūfan readers, became the principal script of Qur'anic orthography.¹⁷ Abbott confirmed that the all-pervading predominance of the Iraqi script led to the ill-defined designation of all early specimens of Qur'anic manuscripts as Kūfic; yet this in no way diminishes the significance of the Ḥijāzī script, which, according to Déroche, was in use in the first/seventh and second/eighth centuries. Indeed, he argued that this script uniquely enjoyed venerated status due to its poignant connection with the birthplace of the Islamic tradition.¹⁸

The Qur'anic codices distributed by ʿUthmān were transcribed on parchment in the so-called *scriptio defectiva*. According to Werner Diem, this script followed 'a Ḥijāzī orthography already established when the Qur'an was written down', although not fully reflecting the Ḥijāzī dialect.¹⁹ Abbott refers to an idiosyncratic use of diacritical markings to distinguish consonants in early Ḥijāzī scripts.²⁰ This is confirmed by Gruendler who speaks of a 'selectivity' and 'fluidity' in the use of diacritical markings in these early texts. However, their peculiar use in early manuscripts tells us something about the genuine utility of Baṣran linguists' attempts to improve their form and function.²¹ Indeed, Grohmann furnishes some telling examples of their somewhat irregular usage of diacritics, referring to their incidence in papyrus documents (22/643), inscriptions (58/678) and coins (85–8/704–7), although he believed that within these earlier contexts 'the real aim of adding diacritical dots is not fully appreciated'.²² Grohmann also mentioned that these diacritics occurred in the form of 'dashes' in respect of the older Qur'anic manuscripts. He suggested that the subsequent incidence of shorter dashes may well augur a transitory phase to the introduction of dots.²³ Alphonse Mingana recognised that while 'a different stroke of the pen' served to distinguish a number of consonants, this was eventually replaced by the use of a diacritical dot; however, it was his view that specific consonants may have previously enjoyed this distinction.²⁴

Developments in the sphere of orthography coincide with the emergence of the first reader-grammarians.²⁵ Early Muslim sources have always underlined the deliberate

omission of diacritical markings from the ʿUthmānic codices. It was viewed as a means of textually accommodating authenticated vocalic variants.²⁶ Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī (371–444/981–1053), the redoubtable specialist in Qurʾanic readings, stressed the significance of this fact.²⁷ Nevertheless, from the preceding discussion it should be emphasised that the linguists' contributions to this area of scholarship relate to the systematisation and physical improvement of an existing system of diacritics and vowel markings: figures such as Ibn Yaʿmar and Naṣr were singled out as refining this seemingly primitive system of *iʿjām* (diacritical markings) and *naqṭ* (vowel markings). Classical biographies reported that the introduction of a revised system of *naqṭ* served as a prelude to the evolution of linguistic thought; the improvements to diacritical markings were broached consequent to this.²⁸ Versteegh mentioned that 'The system of vowel signs and that of the diacritical dots were borrowed by the Arabs from the Syrians'.²⁹ Versteegh's original thesis predicated that borrowing was not confined to a system of diacritics and vowel markings, but rather it could be propitiously extended to grammatical terminology and concepts derived from Greek sources; while this contention was eventually discounted as a result of his own research into the development of early Qurʾanic exegesis, the view that Arabic linguists based their system of diacritical and vowel markings on a Syriac model retains support.³⁰ Referring to a number of earlier studies, Versteegh draws attention to the intriguing correspondence between the Arabic terms *fatha*, *kasra* and *ḍamma* and the Syriac terms of *pēlāhā*, *hēbāṣā* and *ēṣāṣā*. A similar observation was made by Mingana in respect of the first two Syriac terms, but he confined the possibility of external influences to the sphere of diacritics, retorting that the philology and grammar of these early linguists were placed on excitingly 'fresh bases'.³¹ It is with this remark that we turn our attention to the linguistic activities of the early Baṣran readers.

Biographical reports conventionally hail Abū'l-Aswad al-Duʿalī as the architect and founder of the Arabic linguistic tradition. The reports in question speak of his being the 'first to originate the principles of ʿarabiyya, setting out its course and establishing its analogies'; he is also renowned for having devised a revised system of vowel markings.³² However, Abū'l-Aswad seems to have been active in the area of adding vowel markings to Qurʾanic codices. The Baṣran grammarian Mubarrad (d. 285/898), the first official Baṣran historian, confidently asserted that Abū'l-Aswad was the first figure to supply vowel markings to the *muṣḥaf*, besides initiating the model of ʿarabiyya.³³ Kūfan sources acknowledge the significance of Abū'l-Aswad: the Kūfan reader Ibn ʿAyyāsh (95–193/713–809) recounts on the authority of ʿĀṣim ibn Abī'l-Najūd (d. 127/744) that Abū'l-Aswad was the first to establish the science of ʿarabiyya. Dānī states that having completed the pointing of the *muṣḥaf* from cover to cover, a task for which he was provided with several scribes whom he versed in the

fundamentals of the use of diacritics, Abū'l-Aswad composed a concise tract covering their application.³⁴ Reader interest in the field of *naqt* reflected an extension of their functional activities. This was to develop *sui generis* into a focal point of authorship to which readers devoted numerous treatises. The system of vowel markings recounted in the *Muḥkam* relates to the peculiar placement of a dot above, parallel to and below a given phoneme to denote *fatha*, *ḍamma*, and *kasra* respectively.³⁵ Dānī records that scribes were instructed to employ red ink to indicate vowel markings, while black ink was used to transcribe the main text of the Qur'anic codex; he also mentions the use of two parallel dots to signify *ghunna* (nunation or *tanwīn*).³⁶ The available samples of early Hījāzī manuscripts surveyed by Déroche betray a lack of uniformity in the use of diacritical dots, vocalisation, clusters to indicate the end of a verse, ornamental markers and decorative bands.³⁷ Nonetheless, it is evident that Baṣran linguists were attempting to refine previous conventions regarding the use of diacritics and vowel markings, and even the orthography of the codices; however, subsequent ʿAbbāsīd manuscripts indicate the somewhat gradual manner in which this was accomplished.

The biographical accounts of the linguists had awarded the contrivance of the system of diacritics to a succession of early figures. Dānī astutely rationalised the contradiction of plurality in a deed, often referred to as unique, by stressing the topical or geographical dimension of these reports. This perceptive approach allowed him to introduce several figures who were historically connected with developing some aspect of what was seen as the science of grammar.³⁸ Thus in Dānī's estimation, and indeed a number of prefaces to the biographical accounts, the developments in diacritics relative to the text of the *muṣḥaf* constitute the principal contributions of the first reader-grammarians to the science of ʿarabiyya. Dānī refers to further improvements to the use of diacritics which were undertaken by Khalīl ibn Aḥmad. These included the graphical representation of *al-hamza* (glottal stop), *al-rawm* ('slurring' of the final vowel to the extent that only someone close would detect its incidence) and *al-ishmām* (providing 'a scent' or 'flavour' of the u-sound when pausing).³⁹ Dānī describes how Khalīl introduced the symbols denoting *shadda* (gemination) and its opposite *khafif*, deriving them from the actual words *shadīd* and *khafif*. As Versteegh notes this system of diacritics was developed by Khalīl for the transcription of poetry.⁴⁰ Dānī alludes to this very fact, although he adds that their use in the principal codices (*al-maṣāḥif al-jāmiʿa min al-ummahāt*) was not desirable.⁴¹ He related that Khalīl also dispensed with the use of strategically placed dots to denote vocalic values by replacing them with a small *wāw* for *ḍamma*, a *yāʾ* for *kasra*, and an *alif* for *fatha*, all being derived from their graphic forms. The surveys of both Abbott and Déroche indicate that the adoption of this new system was not instantaneously achieved.

Naṣr ibn ʿĀṣim was a renowned student of Abū'l-Aswad. He is recalled as an eminent authority on readings, gaining a reputation for his enterprise in the area of diacritics and codices. A number of biographical reports state that Naṣr added diacritics to the *muṣḥaf* and that he devised a system for the division of verses into batches of five and ten using 'unadorned' markers. It is even mentioned that Naṣr was responsible for establishing 'arabiyya.⁴² Dānī analyses an interesting observation that Naṣr was the first individual to insert two *alifs* into the text of the Baṣran indigenous codices in respect of Q. 23:87, 89, and this highlights the nature of these individuals' activities.⁴³ Dānī is swift to dismiss the notion that any particle or letter in the Qur'anic *muṣḥaf* was the subject of whimsical interpolation. Dānī points out that the Baṣran codex read 'Allāh', in both verses; the other indigenous codices read 'li'llāh', having prepositional *lāms* prefixed to the *lafẓ al-jalāla*. Dānī refers to the statement of the Kūfan reader Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim (157–224/774–839), who claims he saw the latter rendering in the *imām* codex. Furthermore, Dānī alludes to a report transmitted by Hārūn ibn Mūsā al-Aʿwar (d. ca 170/786) on the authority of ʿĀṣim al-Jahḍarī (d. 130/747), both prominent Baṣran reader-grammarians, confirming that the *imām* codex read *li'llāh* in both instances, but that Naṣr ibn ʿĀṣim was responsible for appending two *alifs* to each of the verses (presumably in the Baṣran codices) such that 'li'llāh' was rendered 'Allāh'.⁴⁴ A second report has Abū ʿAmr (d. 154/771) claiming on the authority of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728) that the Umayyad governor, ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Ziyād (d. 85/686), had been responsible for these additions. This is confirmed by the grammarian-reader Yaʿqūb al-Ḥaḍramī (117–205/735–820). Dānī categorically denies any such possibility, claiming that it would be unthinkable for such figures to have the audacity to attempt an act of this nature. Dānī adds that 'the *umma* would trenchantly renounce, reject and censure' such a deed.⁴⁵ The point at issue is not the variances between codices, which were plausible, but rather the attempts to explain these variances. In Dānī's view the potential form of these codices would have been determined by ʿUthmān and his editorial committee.

Reports of this nature intimate the perceived radical nature of these figures' linguistic approaches to the text of the Qur'an. Farrā's analysis of the orthographical differences relating to this particular example confirms that they were original features of the indigenous codices.⁴⁶ The work of Abū Aḥmad al-ʿAskarī (293–382/906–92), *Sharḥ mā yaqaʿ fihi al-taṣḥīf wa'l-taḥrīf*, reports that the governor of Baṣra, Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf (d. 109/722) requested that a system for distinguishing homographs be devised due to the proliferation of the misreading and misspelling of Qur'anic texts. Naṣr ibn ʿĀṣim carried out that task, using dots (*naqt*), in singulars and pairs, which were critically placed above and below consonants.⁴⁷ ʿAskarī adds that this system was adhered to for sometime until *iʿjām* was introduced as a further means of elucidation. It seems likely that the phrase *iʿjām* was employed

at a posterior juncture to distinguish earlier stages of improvements to this system devised by Naṣr. Dānī recalls that there was little distinction between *i^ʿjām* and *naqṭ*, stating that the two denoted similar processes. Presenting an analysis of the etymology of these terms, he records that *a^ʿjamta^ʿl-shay^ʿ idhā bayyantahu* connotes 'making something clear'.⁴⁸ The improvements to the existing system of diacritics and vowel markings which these individuals developed resulted in their being hailed as innovators. Moreover, scholars such as Naṣr served as vital lynchpins between early readers, who were involved in the functional linguistic analysis of the Qur'an, and the next generation of Baṣran readers, who developed radical linguistic approaches to this text. The biographical reports state that Naṣr taught readings to Abū Ishāq al-Ḥaḍramī and Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ (d. 154/771), both important figures in the developing Baṣran linguistic tradition.⁴⁹ It is also related that Naṣr's *ḥurūf*, the specific features of his Qur'anic readings, were narrated by Mālik ibn Dīnār (d. 130/748), an individual noted for his accomplished skills as a scribe.⁵⁰

The Baṣran linguist Zubaydī (308–79/921–89) reports that Yaḥyā ibn Yaʿmar was the first person to supply diacritics to the *muṣḥaf*. He recounts the fact that Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn (d. 110/728) had in his possession a codex pointed by Yaḥyā.⁵¹ Referring to a report transmitted in Bukhārī's *Kitāb al-Taʾrīkh*, Ibn al-Jazarī (751–833/1348–1429) adds that Yaḥyā acquired his knowledge in readings from prominent companions such as Ibn ʿUmar and ʿUthmān.⁵² A scholar who served as the principal informant of Qur'anic readings for Sībawayhi, Hārūn ibn Mūsā, also reports that Yaḥyā was the first figure to point codices. He is linked with later generations of Baṣrans such as Abū ʿAmr and Abū Ishāq al-Ḥaḍramī, who both 'reviewed' (*ʿaraḍa*) readings with him; grammatical opinions ascribed to these two figures reveal a distinct measure of theoretical depth.

One figure who falls outside the geographical confines of the Baṣran tradition is the reader ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Hurmuz. Zubaydī refers to him as the first to establish *ʿarabiyya* and states that he was the most learned in *naḥw* and that he was an expert on the genealogy of Quraysh.⁵³ Zubaydī reported that for these reasons he decided to include him among the ranks of Baṣrans. Reader literature confirms that he reviewed readings with Abū Hurayra, Ibn ʿAbbās and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAyyāsh (who is noted for enumerating the verses of Medinan codices).⁵⁴ The Medinan reader, Nāfiʿ ibn Abī Nuʿaym, reviewed his readings with him. The other two renowned students of Abū'l-Aswad are Maymūn al-Aqran and ʿAnbasā al-Fīl: they are often viewed as veritable equals in terms of their reputation as scholars of grammar. However, it is mentioned that Maymūn was supposed to have augmented the *ḥudūd* or grammatical definitions of topics outlined by Abū'l-Aswad, who, according to Zubaydī, presented definitions of *al-fāʿil*, *al-mafʿūl bihi* and *al-muḍāf*, together with the *ḥurūf* of *naṣb*, *rafʿ*, *jarr* and *jazm*.⁵⁵

Rafael Talmon has argued that the contradiction created by awarding primacy to several early scholars of the linguistic tradition has to be attributed to the stages of conscious projection: each figure was invoked as an eponym at different junctures in these cycles of projection; hence the contradictory statements which credit each one of them with primacy in the formulation of aspects of Arabic linguistic thought; likewise, with the introduction of Abū'l-Aswad's primacy, these previous leaders of pseudo-traditions were reclassified as students of Abū'l-Aswad and passively incorporated into the Baṣran school.⁵⁶ It is suggested that the aim of these processes was to conceal the true origin of Arabic linguistic thought. Talmon also dealt with contradictions within the contrived Baṣran account of the inception of the linguistic tradition. Talmon concluded that anti-*shu'ūbiyya* motives were at work.⁵⁷ He argued that in these biographical accounts the Arabs were elaborately placed in a position of superiority, as they were recorded as helping the newly converted *mawālī* master the Arabic idiom. It should be noted that these accounts speak of the pioneering grammarians deciding to establish a system of language analysis to assist the *mawālī*, thereby addressing the proliferation of the phenomenon of solecisms, *lahn*. However, despite the detailed arguments, Talmon's hypothesis fails to elaborate why these tendentious accounts neglected to expunge the significance of non-Baṣrans within the linguistic tradition. Many of the reports on this topic have a Kūfan provenance; why would Kūfans, who were supposed to have been provoked by rivalry with their Baṣran counterparts, have wanted to accentuate and corroborate reports pronouncing Baṣran pre-eminence in the field of Arabic linguistic thought? Indeed, Ibn al-Anbārī (260–328/874–939), who is recognised for his ardent defence of Kūfan linguistic concepts, is mentioned by Dānī as citing a report on the authority of the Baṣran Abū 'Ubayda (d. 210/825) in which primacy in establishing 'arabiyya is linked to Abū'l-Aswad, Maymūn al-Aqran, 'Anbasa al-Fīl and 'Abd Allāh al-Haḍramī consecutively.⁵⁸ Ibn al-Anbārī must have been aware of the relative historical accuracy regarding the prominence of these scholars in the early years. Dānī emphasised that these luminaries excelled in the area of *naqṭ* and that their contributions in this respect were perceptibly cultivated by successive generations of scholars.⁵⁹ Moreover, in Talmon's endeavour to substantiate the processes of rationalisation occurring within the biographical accounts, he refers to the fact that Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889), a Baṣran, was reluctant to endorse the candidacy of Abū'l-Aswad as the architect of the early Baṣran tradition. The evidence cited by Talmon in this respect is far from convincing. He alleges that Ibn Qutayba draws his readers' attention to the less appealing characteristics of Abū'l-Aswad: his parsimonious nature and the fact that he limped; this was supposed to be proof of Ibn Qutayba's reluctance to deal with a highly suspect tradition. It is difficult to countenance how this last fact can be used to substantiate Talmon's thesis.⁶⁰

Religious Opposition to the Use of Diacritics and Vowel Markings

The employment of diacritical markings within the text of the *muṣḥaf* was perceived by a number of senior companions as a controversial development: their presence in codices was initially viewed as an intrusive element seemingly deflecting attention from the Qur'anic text. However, opposition to the use of diacritics may have stemmed from the attempts to implement, expand and refine the format regarding their usage, as manuscript evidence along with primary source material suggests they were indeed used in the early periods. Dānī offers an interesting survey touching upon some of these issues. He recounts the fact that ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿUmar disliked the addition of diacritical markings to codices and further related his remarks concerning the need to 'denude the Qur'an and mix it not with anything'.⁶¹ A similar statement is attributed to Ibn Masʿūd; and the disapproval of the use of diacritics in codices is maintained by Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Muḥammad ibn Sirīn, although as we noted above this latter figure seemingly had in his possession a codex pointed by Yaḥyā ibn Yaʿmar.⁶² Dānī mentions the tentative disapproval of this practice in the principal Qur'anic codices; this is followed by an explicit approval of their use in Qur'anic codices employed for pedagogical purposes and typically transcribed from prototypes. He asserts that scholars who were previously apprehensive about the use of diacritical markings finally assented to their inclusion in codices. Hence, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī is reported as having said, 'There is no harm therein, as long as certain bounds are not exceeded'.⁶³ Dānī cites the examples of the Kūfans Ibn Abī Laylā (d. 148/765) and Kisāʾī as both approving of the inclusion of diacritics in codices. One can only conclude that the debate was a protracted concern which might have been specific to types of Qur'anic codices and the extensive nature of the proposed improvements.⁶⁴ Dānī emphasises that strict rules had been applicable when administering diacritics to the holy text: he disapproved of the use of black ink for pointing, fearing this might create confusion between scripture and diacritics. He adds that this was a precedent stoically established by the pious ancestors.⁶⁵ He asserts that a codex should not combine more than one given reading: red ink should be used to denote *ḥarakāt*, *tanwīn*, *tashdīd*, *takhfīf*, *sukūn*, *waṣl* and *madd*, while yellow ink should be used to denote the *hamza*. Dānī felt that pointing should be confined to case inflection, thereby obviating possible confusion concerning syntactic function (*iʿrāb*). It was not appropriate to every individual consonant.⁶⁶ Abbott mistakenly viewed opposition to improvements to the script, particularly regarding the use of diacritical markings, as being played out across an Iraqi-Ḥijāzī axis: the Ḥijāzīs resisted such developments, while the Iraqis championed their refinement.⁶⁷ However, it is evident that even within the Baṣran and Kūfan traditions there was initial disagreement regarding the use of diacritical and vowel markings in Qur'anic codices, although this opposition was gradually surmounted. Indeed, the Ḥijāzīs previously had their own system of

diacritical markings, but it is conceivable that they resisted attempts to reform this script.

The opposition in some quarters to the use of diacritical and vowel markings in Qur'anic codices is paralleled by the disapproval of the effective marking off of verses into batches of five and ten. Ibn Mas'ūd is reported as having expunged the traces of *ta'ashīr* (dividing verses into batches of ten) in Qur'anic codices. Mālik objected to the use of red and other coloured ink for the purposes of *ta'ashīr*, although he permitted the use of black ink.⁶⁸ The system of divisions ascribed to Naṣr ibn 'Āṣim would have been construed as a unique development. It was probably the reason why he was accorded primacy in developing 'arabiyya. Déroche suggests that early Hījāzī manuscripts employ a somewhat peculiar method of *ta'ashīr*.⁶⁹ However, as in the case of *i'jām*, the use of *ta'ashīr* was justified on the basis that arguments could be adduced to confirm its practical utility in facilitating the preservation and articulation of scripture. The fact that *ta'ashīr* acquires an ornamental function intimates the growing maturity of the orthographical tradition and this was to match sophisticated developments made in Arabic linguistic thought.

While diacritical and vowel markings served as features supplementary to the orthography of the Qur'anic text, the established orthographical conventions of the 'Uthmānic codices were held in great reverence. The statement of Mālik ibn Anas (112–79/731–95) concerning the transcription of codices demonstrates this very point. Mālik was asked whether one should adopt the refined methods of orthography in the duplication of Qur'anic codices or indeed adhere to the precedents set by the amanuenses of the first generations of Muslims.⁷⁰ Mālik's response was that one should adhere to the conventions established by the first generation of amanuenses. A similar position is taken by Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (164–241/780–855). He articulated the view that contravention of the orthography of the *muṣḥaf* of 'Uthmān was prohibited however minute the nature of encroachment. This seems to have been a position devoutly inherited from the pious ancestors, who viewed the orthographical conventions established by 'Uthmān as sacrosanct.

Even among later Baṣran and Kūfan protagonists the issue was debated: Ibn al-Anbārī (260–328/874–939), famed for his apologia for the codex of 'Uthmān, censures as presumptuous the orthographical improvements intrepidly proposed by Ibn Qutayba and other Baṣrans to the transcription of codices.⁷¹ The Kūfan philologist Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1005) takes up the cudgels of this argument with a dogmatic defence of the inviolable nature of the orthography of the early codices. He presented a thesis proposing that the orthography of the Arabs along with its conventions was established via *tawqīf* (i.e. divinely inspired), extending the orthodox thesis concerning the origin of language (*tawqīf al-luġha*). It, like grammar and prosody,

was revelationist in source and had been essentially rediscovered by the likes of Abū'l-Aswad and Khalīl ibn Aḥmad. The principal purpose of Ibn Fāris' exposition of the origin of the linguistic sciences was to emphasise the sacrosanct nature of the orthographical conventions adhered to in the °Uthmānic recension of the Qur'an.⁷² It was also a statement about the rectitude of Kūfan approaches to the holy text and a reassertion of religious orthodoxy within this school. The historical tension between readers and grammarians, which had been strained as a result of differences in approaches to the language of scripture, had remarkably resurfaced in the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries to take on a Kūfan–Baṣran axis.

Spheres of Specialisation: A Mark of Maturity

In the same way that grammarians and philologists emerged from among the ranks of readers pursuing areas of learning which defined their own linguistic interests, the advent of specialists in the field of diacritics is likewise a corollary of conceptual advances made within this tradition. Dānī's preface to his seminal work *al-Muḥkam fi naqṭ al-maṣāḥif* presents an outline of succeeding generations of scholars who were renowned as authorities on orthography and diacritics; moreover, the orthographical conventions they established were adhered to in later scholarship. Dānī mentions that the Baṣrans Bashshār al-Nāqīṭ and Mu°allā ibn °Īsā were second/eighth century specialists in orthography and diacritics. °Īsā ibn Minā Qālūn (140–220/756–835) was Medina's leading authority on diacritics, while for the Kūfans, Ṣāliḥ ibn °Āṣim al-Naḥwī, an associate of Kisā°ī, was the expert on orthography. Ibn al-Jazarī does mention Bashshār when recounting the biography of the Mu°tazilite °Amr ibn °Ubayd (d. 141/759). Bashshār is said to have narrated °Amr's *ḥurūf* which were derived from Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.⁷³ Dānī recalls that Bashshār was a mentor of Ya°qūb al-Ḥaḍramī, the Baṣran reader.⁷⁴ Mu°allā narrated the reading of °Āṣim al-Jaḥdarī and he was responsible for transmitting his enumeration and division of Qur'anic verses, which fell under the purview of early readers.⁷⁵ He is given the epithet of *al-Warrāq*; moreover, he shows not only a determined interest in *ikhtilāf al-maṣāḥif*, but he is cited as an authority on peculiar features of their orthography.⁷⁶ Even the Andalusians had their orthography specialists: Dānī confirms that Ḥakīm ibn °Imrān was his city's authority on *naqṭ* and that he was a companion of Ghāzī ibn Qays (d. 199/814), who was the first figure to introduce the Andalusians to the reading of Nāfi°. ⁷⁷ Ghāzī is also noted for circulating Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'*.⁷⁸ The emergence of a class of specialists from among these readers, whether they were grammarians, philologists or indeed experts in orthography, inexorably points to the growing maturity of Arabic linguistic thought.

Intriguingly, biographical accounts preserve references to the fact that the new system of diacritics had displaced the system previously in the employ of earlier generations

of Hijāzī readers. It was reported by Dānī that the Medinan reader Qālūn observed that the codices of the Medinans included two *hamzas* juxtaposed in the reading of Q. 12:53. He remarks that, from a perspective of recitation, this was not something approved of by Hijāzī readers as they favoured *tashīl*, the facilitation of the glottal stop, in such instances. Qālūn adds that Abū Jaʿfar Yazīd ibn al-Qaʿqāʿ (d. 127/745) was one of those readers who omitted the *hamza* in his reading of this verse and at other analogous junctures in the Qurʾan.⁷⁹ However, despite the fact that Medinan readers omitted the *hamza* in their recitation, they had implemented the Baṣran system of diacritics and graphically represented the *hamza* using yellow ink in their codices, while red ink was used to indicate vowel markings. He added that this was certainly not the convention (*madhhab*) of their predecessors, nor indeed a feature of their vernacular in readings, but it was evidence of the established status of the Baṣran system of orthography and diacritics. Qālūn asserts that even those who inherited the Medinan style of readings, the Andalusians, adhere to this system of diacritics. Dānī reports that he had examined the codices of the Medinans written at the time of Ghāzī ibn Qays and noticed that all of these codices adhered to the Baṣran format. He also confirms that the Meccans adopted the Baṣran model of diacritics and vowel markings, despite the fact that their predecessors had adhered to different conventions. Indeed, the inference here is that there was an existing Hijāzī system of applying diacritics and vowel markings to codices, but it was superseded by the unique Baṣran model. Dānī does quote Ibn Ashta al-Iṣfahānī (d. 316/970), the author of a work cataloguing differences among codices, who reports that the *muṣḥaf* of the Meccan Ismāʿīl al-Qusṭī (100–70/718–86), whose exploits in grammar we shall detail shortly, employed a system of vowel markings which contravened the consensus generally accepted in this respect. His placement of dots to indicate *ḍamma* and *fatha* were not in concord with the Baṣran system: a dot placed above a consonant was used to designate a *ḍamma*, while *fatha* was distinguished by virtue of a dot placed alongside a consonant.⁸⁰

The ‘ancient’ system of diacritics to which Qālūn referred is spoken of in Farrāʾ’s *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*. Farrāʾ adduces a report on the authority of Sufyān ibn ʿUyayna (107–98/725–814), which mentions that a transcribed verse, Q. 2:259, was presented to Zayd ibn Thābit who proceeded to apply dots to various consonants, thereby furnishing the reading *nunshizuhā* (Ibn Kathīr, Nāfiʿ and Abū ʿAmr read the verse *nunshiruhā*); he also altered the orthography of the verb *yatasanna* by suffixing a *hāʾ* to it.⁸¹ In a further instance Farrāʾ explains that he noticed the codex of Ibn Masʿūd differed with the consensus regarding the reading of Q. 49:6: the consensus reading was *fa-tabayyanū*, while ʿAbd Allāh’s codex was pointed to read *fa-tathabbatū*, in this particular verse and in two further occurrences in Q. 4:94. The Kūfans Kisāʾī, Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt (d. 156/772) and Khalaf ibn Hishām al-Bazzār

(150–229/767–844) all emulate Ibn Mas'ūd in his reading of these verses.⁸² The use of diacritics to distinguish consonants and readings must have been widespread in these relatively early periods. Activity in this area was soon followed by a more comprehensive approach to the language of scripture and one which explored syntax, phonology and philology.

Theoretical Bases for the Resolution of Linguistic Thought: Grammarians *contra* Readers

The application of diacritics and vowel markings to readings provides a crucial conjunction between an operational approach to collating readings and one in which abstract considerations in terms of grammar are palpable. The collating of seemingly infinitesimal orthographical variances among codices was a well-established genre (*ikhtilāf al-maṣāḥif*); it was logically complemented by an appreciation of the specific features of linguistic variations distinguishing the readings or *lectiones*. The nature of the abstract relationship between the Qur'an and its readings is a subtle one. The readings or *qirā'āt* constituted the variants which were the recorded *differences* concerning a confined 'letter' (*ḥarf*) or 'letters' (*ḥurūf*) within a verse and this implicitly predicates agreement regarding the remaining linguistic configuration of that verse. These differences predominantly operated on the morpho-syntactic and morpho-phonological levels. Thus, within a given verse of the Qur'an, the vocalic value of one particular morpheme may vary according to the typical way in which it was transmitted and received, but it hardly represents a complete restructuring of the linguistic constitution of that verse. The readings were further regulated through reference to *isnād* and *ʿarabiyya*. One should bear in mind that variant readings are predominantly univocal. Proceeding technically, each authenticated instance of a variant was confirmed as an intrinsic constituent of Qur'anic canon and it was valid in acts of worship (its recitation in a typical ritual prayer).⁸³

The fact that the ʿUthmānic codices were theoretically free from diacritical and vowel markings allowed substantiated readings, which consisted of vocalic and consonantal variants, to be mentally superimposed upon the text; hence the argument that these codices served as mnemonic devices. The imposition of these codices dictated that readings featuring exegetical glosses and textual interpolation, which infringed upon the confines of the consonantal outline of these texts, were not tolerated. Therefore, if one were to consider the aforementioned verse (Q. 2:259), which is a rather lengthy verse concerning which Zayd supplied diacritical markings to furnish the *nunshizuhā* and *yatasannah* readings, the differences therein were confined to these two instances and to the term *aʿlam*, which can be read in the jussive as given or as the imperfect indicative, *aʿlamu*. In other examples of substantiated differences the nature of variation is much less acute. The infinitesimal nature of variances in respect of

pre-^ʿUthmānic and post-^ʿUthmānic codices led John Wansbrough to question their real purpose. He inferred that they were remnants of a conscious attempt to sustain the perception of fixed canon: preoccupation with unity in terms of scripture (and indeed community) was part and parcel of the processes of projection. However, this view overlooks the symbolic devotional value of scripture, and the collective purpose of all these readers' efforts was the physical preservation of scripture and the accentuation of its liturgical import. Wansbrough does concede, however, that the paraenetic phraseology of the Qur'an was primitive in terms of its origin and form.⁸⁴

Ensuing generations of reader-grammarians focused more attention on an explanation of the grammatical reasoning behind the linguistic phenomena inherent in Qur'anic readings. One figure who epitomises the shift from the functional to the abstract approach to scripture is the Baṣran ^ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī Ishāq al-Ḥaḍramī (d. 127/735 or 137/745). He is directly linked with the students of Abū'l-Aswad: Maymūn al-Aqran, Yaḥyā ibn Ya^ʿmar and Naṣr ibn ^ʿĀṣim, whom tradition identifies as his teachers in the science of Qur'anic readings.⁸⁵ His own readings were transmitted by his students: ^ʿĪsā Ibn ^ʿUmar al-Thaqafī (d. 149/766), Abū ^ʿAmr ibn al-^ʿAlā^ʿ and Hārūn ibn Mūsā al-A^ʿwar, all important figures in the early Baṣran tradition. He was noted for promoting analogical models for the examination of linguistic material, often criticising poets for contravening established syntactic conventions. An example of this is found in Farrā's *Ma^ʿānī al-Qur^ʾān*. Quoting from both Ru^ʾāsī and Abū ^ʿAmr, Farrā^ʿ recounts Ḥaḍramī's criticisms of the grammatical inflection in the poetry of Farazdaq (d. 110/728), claiming that it contravened the standards of ^ʿarabiyya.⁸⁶

The work of the third century linguist and historian Muḥammad ibn Sallām (d. 232/847), *Ṭabaqāt fuḥūl al-shu^ʿarā^ʿ*, presents an intriguing report which allows one to gauge the grammatical significance of arguments forwarded to justify linguistic features of readings.⁸⁷ The grammarians were concerned with identifying the ^ʿilla (cause) governing grammatical case endings: how does one reconcile the linguistic phenomena in these readings within a conceptual framework of grammar? The report in question contends that ^ʿĪsā Ibn ^ʿUmar and Ḥaḍramī both read Q. 6:27 with the verb *nukadhdhib(a)*, inflected for *naṣb* (accusative). Abū ^ʿAmr, Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb (d. 182/798) and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī favoured the *raf^ʿ* (nominative) reading of the verse, *nukadhdhib(u)*. Ibn Sallām accordingly asked Sībawayhi which reading is the finer (*al-wajh*) and Sībawayhi expresses his preference for the latter one. Ibn Sallām then queried the origin of the *naṣb* rendering: Sībawayhi promptly informs him that 'they heard the reading of Ḥaḍramī and followed it'.⁸⁸ Ibn Sallām continues on the subject of the reader-grammarians' selection of readings by referring to a number of other verses. He mentioned the fact that Ḥaḍramī's student ^ʿĪsā Ibn ^ʿUmar cited parallels in the poetry of the Arabs to justify his reading of Q. 24:2 and Q. 5:38, *al-zāniyat(a)*

and *al-sāriqat(a)*, with both participles, which are seemingly inchoative, taking an accusative ending. Zubaydī's biographical treatise relates that this was also the reading of Ḥaḍramī, 'Īsā's teacher. Zubaydī referred to this reading as '*khilāf*' (contrary to) that articulated by the *qurrā'*'.⁸⁹ Curiously, Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* presents a detailed grammatical rationalisation of the *raf'* reading, adducing *taqdīr* (textual restoration) to demonstrate that the *raf'* reading could be reconciled with the grammarians' thesis of 'arabiyya. He clearly resorts to the use of parallels in respect of language usage and poetry to validate this reading.⁹⁰ However, it is quite obvious that he favours the *naṣb* reading, not because of its having a finer *isnād*, but because he argues that imperative clauses of this nature are best governed by *naṣb*. Sībawayhi asserts that 'some have read (the two verses) with *naṣb*, which in terms of 'arabiyya is veritably cogent'. However, he is compelled to relent that the 'amma amongst the *qurrā'* will consider only the *raf'* reading. Indeed, one finds that even Farrā' suggested that the *naṣb* reading was acceptable. Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb described Ḥaḍramī as 'enjoying equality with *naḥw*', while Ibn Sallām referred to him as the first to 'split *qiyās* and extend analogies'.⁹¹

Grammarians such as Ḥaḍramī sought parity with a synthetic model of 'arabiyya in their linguistic justification of Qur'anic readings. Conversely, the *qurrā'* adhered to the processes of narration and the relevance of *isnād*. The *naṣb* reading is attested in the reading literature. This, however, in no way disguises the speculative processes vigorously pursued by grammarians in selecting a given reading. Moreover, the inclination to speculate grammatically was to dominate the linguists' approach to authenticating scripture, distinguishing them from their reader peers. Sībawayhi skilfully negotiated the issue of variation between the aforementioned readings. As a linguist he explicitly endorsed the *naṣb* rendering because of its greater compatibility with his thesis of 'arabiyya; yet he accepted that the consensus among the readers was to favour the nominative reading. It is this refined resolution of Qur'anic readings which sustains later Arabic linguistic thought. Grammarians are tangibly realigning the objectives of such endeavours. The service of scripture is somewhat eclipsed in these approaches. The early proliferation of the genre of *ma'ānī* and *ihtijāj* compositions serves as a lucid and cogent reminder of a qualitative shift within the developing Arabic linguistic tradition.

A further reference to Ḥaḍramī's eccentric approach to readings occurs in his analysis of Q. 54:49 which reads *innā kulla shay'(in) khalaqnāhu bi-qadar*: the issue here is the fact that the particle *kulla* is in the accusative (inflected for *naṣb*) and an explanation for this is required. Sībawayhi confirmed that this is a perfectly acceptable form of 'arabiyya: it is frequently found in the diction of the Arabs. Indeed, he equates such constructs with the maxim *Zayd(an) qarabtuhu*. He then adduced a second verse (Q. 41:17) *wa ammā Thamūd(a) fa-hadaynāhum* to illustrate

its incidence; however, he guardedly qualifies his acceptance of this second reading by stating that 'conventions adhered to in readings should not be contravened because *al-qirā'a* is determined by precedents'. The consensus reading among the *qurrā'* was *Thamūd(u)*, taking a nominative case ending. The literature which surveyed the corpus of *shawādh* or anomalous readings attributed the *naṣb* reading to two of Sībawayhi's predecessors: Ḥaḍramī and ʿĪsā ibn ʿUmar, who were both aspiring grammarians.⁹²

Versteegh has argued that there is not only evidence of a linguistic awareness among Sībawayhi's predecessors, but also that such figures were preoccupied with grammatical issues.⁹³ He was dealing with the rather sceptical approach taken by Carter towards those reports which refer to the introspective grammatical endeavours of these pre-Sībawayhian figures. Versteegh does concede, along with Carter, that biographical literature tended to exaggerate the nature of contacts between Sībawayhi and his so-called predecessors; and likewise the nature of their grammatical discourse is viewed as contrived and deliberately shaped by posterity.⁹⁴ Talmon's attempt to resolve the issue of who was the first grammarian of Arabic led him to conclude that Ḥaḍramī was the most probable candidate for this honour.⁹⁵ Ḥaḍramī was the putative author of a text entitled *Kitāb al-Hamz*.⁹⁶ Abū ʿAmr was impressed by the work's explanation of causes in respect of grammar. Ḥaḍramī's text on *hamz* is not extant, but later linguists composed works on this subject.

The figure of ʿĪsā ibn ʿUmar is influential in terms of his use of grammatical projection in the justification of readings and their authentication. Along with being a student of Ḥaḍramī, he was also linked with the Baṣran readers ʿĀṣim al-Jaḥḍarī and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.⁹⁷ Ibn al-Jazarī reports that he narrated the *ḥurūf* of the Meccans Ibn Kathīr and Ibn Muḥayṣin. We are informed that his own reading was circulated by Hārūn ibn Mūsā and Khalīl ibn Aḥmad. The Kūfan philologist and reader Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām notably stated that ʿĪsā had his own *ikhtiyār* in readings.⁹⁸ He adds that this was based upon *madhāhib ʿarabiyya* (linguistic considerations); moreover, this seemingly departed from the *qirā'a* of the principal readers. Abū ʿUbayd is then quoted as saying: 'It was disapproved of by most people for he seemed predominantly influenced by a propensity to *naṣb*, if he was able to find a way to that'.⁹⁹ This propensity to *naṣb* is identified in one of the aforementioned readings in addition to two further instances: one of which was Q. 11:78 which reads *hunna aṭhar(a) lakum*. This is confirmed in Ibn Khālawayhi's survey of anomalous readings, *Mukhtaṣar al-badī'*.¹⁰⁰ Zubaydī reports that it was contrary to what the grammarians agreed upon and it conflicted with consensus readings.¹⁰¹ The same is said of his reading of Q. 111:4 (*ḥammalat(a) al-ḥaṭab*), in which the participle is inflected for *naṣb*. Zubaydī also adduces a further verse Q. 34:10, to which *naṣb* is similarly applied *wa'l-ṭayr(a)*. The whole

point of the grammarians' interest in such verses was to ponder the grammatical *'illa* which accounts for inflection: how does one justify *naṣb* in the aforementioned instances? 'Īsā ibn 'Umar took the view that an elided vocative agent explained the *naṣb* reading. Versteegh perceives the significance of the attempts to explain the 'surface structure of the verse' in this instance as evidence of the grammarians employing ellipsis (*ḥadhf*) as 'an explanatory device'.¹⁰² He observed that Abū 'Amr's grammatical justification of the reading sought a link with the ellipsis of a verb.

The biographical literature reports that 'Īsā was the author of two texts on grammar. These were supposedly praised in some poetry by Khalīl ibn Aḥmad.¹⁰³ Mubarrad claims to have seen one of these works, commenting that it focused on *uṣūl*. He is alleged to have engaged Kisā'ī in grammatical disputation.¹⁰⁴ Carter had argued that 'Īsā ibn 'Umar's legacy to the study of grammar was never a substantial one for the simple fact that the material nature of his contribution to the *Kitāb* is negligible; indeed, the putative works which he is supposed to have authored are not mentioned therein.¹⁰⁵ Versteegh emphasises once again the fact that biographers tended to inflate material which related to contacts and scholarly influences. Versteegh accepted that Ḥaḍramī and 'Īsā ibn 'Umar had 'introduced the concept of *qiyās* (a form of analogical reasoning) in an attempt to regulate the language of the Arabs, and they probably laid the foundation for a terminological apparatus in morphology and syntax'. Versteegh strangely ventures the view that the linguistic approach of these two figures 'led to the correction of the text of the Qur'ān', something Sībawayhi would never countenance.¹⁰⁶ However, the presumed activities of these earlier reader-grammarians led to the formulation of a synthetically devised model of language which precariously allows hypothetical projection and justification on the basis of linguistic considerations to thrive; it can hardly be described as 'correction of the text of the Qur'ān'. The textual integrity of the Qur'an was as sacrosanct to Ḥaḍramī and 'Īsā ibn 'Umar as it was to Sībawayhi, who also indulges in the same forms of grammatical speculation. Linguistic inquisitiveness prevails among them all. Thus if Versteegh accepts that Sībawayhi's innovation was the fact that he was no longer focusing exclusively on an 'explanation of the Holy Book, but the analysis and explanation of the linguistic facts' which relate to this book, then by implication the spirit of such an approach was pioneered by these earlier figures. Indeed, a cursory glimpse of the efforts of early readers confirms the thesis that what is being witnessed here is a simple but subtle shift in focus from the service of scripture to the abstract exploration of its grammatical features. Sībawayhi, far from disassociating himself from the efforts of his predecessors, actually attempted to sanction their endeavours: the readings we examined above demonstrate that his sympathies were with reader-grammarians such as Ḥaḍramī and 'Īsā. Moreover, Ru'āsī and other earlier Kūfans

had scholarly contacts with these early Baṣrans and it is not improbable that they had instructively shared interests in methodologies, perspectives and objectives.

The Significance of the Ḥijāzī Connection

In Talmon's survey of the conceivable existence of a school of grammar in the Ḥijāz, which was referenced to Farrā's allusions to a collectivity of *naḥwiyyūn* in his *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, the assumption was that Baṣran biographers deliberately played down the importance of the grammatical activities of this region's linguists. Scholars not distinctly connected with Baṣra were provided, where appropriate, with Baṣran credentials, or they were simply relegated to the periphery of Arabic linguistic thought and their intellectual endeavours trivialised.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, it is evident that these tendentious accounts failed to erase the trace of non-Baṣrans and therefore one wonders if the notion of a clearly defined conspiracy to shape retrospectively a Baṣran predominance, thereby distorting the whole history of the linguistic tradition, misconstrues what was effectively a cursory venting of prejudices. The biographical account which was manifestly critical of non-Baṣrans, although on occasion this work even criticises Baṣrans, is Abū Ṭayyib al-Lughawī's *Marātib al-naḥwiyyīn*. His work recounted the lives of around sixty linguists and readers. The sources for his criticisms of readers and Kūfans can be traced to prominent figures in the Baṣran camp. One Baṣran, Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī (d. 255/869), quoted throughout the *Marātib*, is especially derisive of a number of non-Baṣrans. The *Marātib* ridicules the idea that there existed corresponding centres of linguistic learning outside of Iraq, rejecting the grammatical activities of the so-called Ḥijāzī grammarians.¹⁰⁸ However, the nexus between early Baṣran and Meccan luminaries, whose knowledge in grammar is renowned, remains salient.

The chronological pedigree of the Meccan tradition of readings places Mujāhid ibn Jabr (d. 104/722) as a key link between the early authorities of this tradition and subsequent luminaries who went on to excel in grammar, readings and exegesis. Mujāhid's contribution to exegesis is renowned. His association with Ibn ʿAbbās (d. 68/688) proved to be a critical channel for the transmission of a profusion of exegetical reports which inexorably shaped the literature of *tafsīr*.¹⁰⁹ Biographical reports keenly emphasise his importance in this respect, noting that on three occasions during his review of readings with Ibn ʿAbbās, which are said to have numbered thirty, Mujāhid enquired of 'every verse and its significance'.¹¹⁰ His mentor, Ibn ʿAbbās, was viewed as an authority on the readings of Ubayy ibn Kaʿb (d. 20/641 or 22/643), Zayd ibn Thābit (d. 45/665) and ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib (d. 40/661): the same matrix of authorities who, along with Ibn Masʿūd, were primary sources for Kūfan readings.¹¹¹ Mujāhid was the mentor of the following figures: ʿAbd Allāh ibn Kathīr (45–120/665–737), Ḥumayd ibn Qays (d. 130/747), Ibn Muḥayṣin (d.

123/740), A^cmash (60–148/680–765) and Abū ^cAmr ibn al-^cAlā^c. To place this into perspective, Ibn Kathīr and Ḥumayd are associated with the functional forms of scholarship (the collating of readings and the enumeration and division of verses); Ibn Muḥayṣin is a figure to whom we shall turn shortly; A^cmash and Abū ^cAmr were proponents of a more radical blend of linguistic thought. Abū ^cAmr described Ibn Kathīr as more learned in ^carabiyya than Mujāhid; while one of Sibawayhi's early mentors, the traditionist Ḥammād ibn Salama (d. 167/784), was one of his students.¹¹² Other students included Ismā^cil ibn ^cAbd Allāh ibn Qusṭanṭīn, also known as Qusṭ, whose peculiar system of vowel markings we mentioned above, and authorities in readings such as Ismā^cil ibn Muslim (d. 160/777), Jarīr ibn Ḥāzim (85–170/704–87), Shibil ibn ^cAbbād (70–148/690–765) and Ma^crūf ibn Mushkān (d. 165/782).¹¹³ The reading of Ibn Kathīr was for many centuries distinguished among the Meccans; it was included in Ibn Mujāhid's *Kitāb al-Sab^ca* as the prominent reading of Mecca. The Baṣrans' ultimate hegemony in the field of linguistic thought tended to obscure the true measure of the early Hījāzī readers' linguistic enterprise. Indeed, the radical element in the approach to authenticating the language of scripture, which becomes an indelible feature of the methods adopted by Baṣran and Kūfan authorities, seems to have been nurtured much earlier by the Meccan reader Ibn Muḥayṣin and it is to this figure that we now turn our attention.

Muḥammad ibn ^cAbd al-Raḥmān al-Jahmī, Ibn Muḥayṣin, is one of the most significant reader-grammarian pioneers of linguistic thought. His approach to the authentication and justification of the language of scripture presaged a revolutionary stage in the evolution of Arabic linguistic thought and one in which linguistic considerations were given greater authority and currency. This innovative approach ostensibly formed a crucial foundation for the models of language developed by luminaries of the Baṣran tradition. Biographical accounts state that Ibn Muḥayṣin was of *mawlā* extraction, reviewing his readings with Mujāhid ibn Jabr, Dirbās and Sa^cid ibn Jubayr (d. 95/714). ^cĪsā ibn ^cUmar and Abū ^cAmr are linked with this figure; the latter, along with Shibil ibn ^cAbbād, reviewed readings with him. Ibn al-Jazarī asserts that ^cĪsā ibn ^cUmar and Ismā^cil ibn Muslim only heard (*sami^ca*) his *ḥurūf*. Scholars of the reading tradition emphasise an important distinction between *sami^ca* and *qara^ca*; the second method of instruction is perceived as yielding greater accuracy in the acquisition and promulgation of readings.¹¹⁴ Referring to Sālim's monograph on ^cĪsā ibn ^cUmar, Versteegh has suggested that ^cĪsā's contacts with Ibn Muḥayṣin were brief: he presumably encountered him during the annual pilgrimage. Indeed, the reference to ^cĪsā's having 'heard' his *ḥurūf* suggests that this is probably the case. The true strength of Ibn Muḥayṣin's influence seems compelling given that the forms of analysis one associates with Ibn ^cUmar were first espoused by this Meccan reader.¹¹⁵

In the preface to his *Kitāb al-Sabʿa* Ibn Mujāhid explains that Ibn Muḥayṣin formulated an *ikhtiyār* in which he differed with his fellow Meccans, adding that it was based on ‘*madhāhib ʿarabiyya*’. He claims that this led the Meccans to shun his readings due to their contravening the consensus among readers. This resulted in the Meccans favouring the readings of Ibn Kathīr.¹¹⁶ This peculiar fact is confirmed by Ibn Mujāhid who reports that Ibn Muḥayṣin ‘constructed and organised (readings) according to the principles of *ʿarabiyya*’.¹¹⁷ Quoting Ibn Mujāhid, Ibn al-Jazarī recalls that Ibn Muḥayṣin applied himself wholly (*tajarrada*) to *qirāʾa*; moreover, he regretted that his readings conflicted with the ʿUthmānic codex. This ultimately prevented him from including these readings amongst the *qirāʾāt al-mashhūra*.¹¹⁸ While differences among readings and codices are of an infinitesimal nature, they are always technically linked to the concept of precedents: unsubstantiated readings impinged upon the liturgical value of scripture. Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām states that Ibn Kathīr, Humayd ibn Qays and Muḥammad ibn al-Muḥayṣin were the principal readers of Mecca, although Ibn Muḥayṣin was the most learned and most capable in *ʿarabiyya*. Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī reports that Ibn Muḥayṣin was of Qurayshite lineage: he was a grammarian who read the Qurʾan with (Ibn) Mujāhid. One of Ibn Muḥayṣin’s protégés, Shibil ibn ʿAbbād, was a mentor of Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Qusṭanṭīn, who composed a treatise of grammar which was derided by Abū Ḥātim in the *Marātib*. It is alleged that this figure travelled to Baṣra and experienced at first hand the linguistic endeavours of the Baṣrans. He is reported to have swiftly discarded his own work upon realising the sophistication of the Baṣrans’ models of linguistic thought, although this did not deter him from compiling a second treatise.¹¹⁹ We noted above that Qusṭ’s personal codex employed a system of diacritics which adhered to the ancient conventions of the Ḥijāzīs. Biographical reports state that despite the fact that Abū Ḥātim was a student of Akhfash, he harboured a deep dislike of his mentor. Indeed, he apparently accused Akhfash of plagiarising Abū ʿUbayda’s *Majāz al-Qurʾān*.¹²⁰ Zubaydī seems to have had recourse to Abū Ḥātim’s collection of readings, *Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt*, which he refers to during his quotation. In citing from this text, Zubaydī mentions the endeavours of a figure by the name of ʿAlī al-Jamal, a Medinan grammarian, who produced ‘a worthless treatise on the subject of grammar’. Zubaydī adds that it was Abū Ḥātim’s surmise that Akhfash had relied upon this work when composing his own grammatical tract.¹²¹

Talmon referred to these figures’ linguistic activities as proof of the existence of grammatical traditions of learning outside of Iraq.¹²² Ibn Muḥayṣin’s linguistically inspired approach to readings seems to have left its mark on his many students within the early Baṣran tradition. However, the official accounts of the history of the linguistic tradition attenuated the role played by individuals like Ibn Muḥayṣin,

dismissing their role as mentors of Baṣran luminaries. Abū Ṭayyib describes Ibn Muḥayṣin as slightly able in some aspects of grammar, and states that the 'Kūfans greatly admired him and acquired much of their knowledge and readings from this figure'.¹²³ In reality, the converse was true: he was a principal mentor of several important Baṣrans. Moreover, his students went on to invigorate the debate on the importance of *ʿarabiyya* in the authentication of readings. It became the focus of *maʿānī* texts, also featuring in the works which aimed at formulating a theory of language. The reading of Ibn Muḥayṣin did eventually take its place among the reputable Qur'anic readings, but this was achieved only once posterity had applied to it the rigours of traditional authentication, justification and narration. It was designated the eleventh of the so-called fourteen readings.

Later Baṣrans: From Functional Relevance to Abstract Theorising

Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ was ʿĪsā ibn ʿUmar's peer among the Baṣrans. He was born in Mecca and died in Kūfa. He was trained in readings and philology, gaining an accomplished reputation in both disciplines. Likewise, he took an avid interest in poetry. Abū ʿUbayda reports that Abū ʿAmr's home was filled to the brim with profane literature; however, in the later years of his life he became very ascetic and consequently burnt all that he had amassed in terms of this literature.¹²⁴ Abū ʿUbayda reminisced over the fact that he was the most learned person in *qirāʾāt*, *ʿarabiyya*, the battles of the Arabs and poetry.¹²⁵ The biographical accounts stress his association with the Bedouin Arabs. On one occasion, Abū ʿAmr was asked concerning his system of *ʿarabiyya*, 'does it encompass the entire speech of the Arabs?' Abū ʿAmr admitted that it does not, and emphasised the importance of the phenomenon of frequency within his system of *ʿarabiyya*, such that divergent material is classified as dialectal.¹²⁶ He is quoted as an authority on philology some fifty-seven times in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*.¹²⁷ The functional works attributed to Abū ʿAmr include a text on *waqf wa'l-ibtidāʾ* and a further text entitled *Kitāb Marsūm al-muṣḥaf*; Dānī refers to him frequently as an authority on codices in his *Kitāb al-Muqniʿ*. However, linguists from Abū ʿAmr's generation were now focusing on the composition of literature of a more profane nature and perspective; and this augurs an important shift in emphasis as far as the corpus of Arabic linguistic thought was concerned. Abu ʿAmr was said to have composed commentaries on poetry, a book on proverbs (*amthāl*) and most portentously a work entitled *Kitāb al-Nawādir*.¹²⁸ The *nawādir* genre was popular among generations of linguists of both the Kūfan and Baṣran traditions. Qāsim ibn Maʿn (d. 175/791), Abū ʿAmr al-Shaybānī (d. 213/828), Kisāʾī and Ibn al-Aʿrābī (150–231/767–846) were Kūfans who composed *nawādir* texts, and even Abū ʿUbayd devoted two chapters of his encyclopaedic *Gharīb al-muṣannaf* to the *nawādir* phenomenon. The Baṣrans Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb, Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī (d. 215/830) and Yaḥyā ibn al-Mubārak (126–202/744–817) were all authors of

authoritative works on this subject. Abū Zayd is recalled as Sibawayhi's informant for philological material in the *Kitāb*.¹²⁹

The *nawādir* works catalogued and often contrasted exotic as well as peculiar philological data attested in the language of selected Bedouin tribes, focusing on applied aspects of etymology, dialectology and morphology. The material in question was to assume a critical role in the substantiation, elucidation and evolution of grammatical theories which were then applied in the justification of the linguistic features of Qur'anic diction and its readings. The resort to a broader corpus of data for philological and grammatical purposes reveals a greater conceptual intricacy in these scholars' attempts to evolve Arabic linguistic thought. A similar trajectory can be plotted for the genre of works on *gharīb* and *luḡāt*: they begin with the Qur'an as their specific focus of study but gradually shift to material of a more profane nature, which incidentally serves to illustrate the linguistic tenor of Qur'anic canon. Once the material is synthesised and resolved it re-enters the sphere of exegetical literature, serving in a utilitarian capacity. These sophisticated cycles of development would confirm that these genres of literature have considerable historical depth.

Abū ʿAmr is portrayed as a paragon of religious orthodoxy. His discourse with the Muʿtazilite ʿAmr ibn ʿUbayd in which Abū ʿAmr refuted the Muʿtazilite conception of *waʿd* and *waʿīd* is engagingly recounted in Qifṭī's *Inbāh*.¹³⁰ His students, who included Khalīl ibn Aḥmad, Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb, Aṣmaʿī, Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī, Yaḥyā ibn al-Mubārak and Abū ʿUbayda, were key players in the Baṣran tradition, critically developing much of the literature and thought of this school. Ibn Mujaḥid remarks that among the designated readers no one had more mentors than Abū ʿAmr: he studied in Mecca, Medina, Kūfa, Baṣra and, driven by an interest in philology, he spent extended periods traversing Bedouin regions. Taking into account an assumed hyperbole employed in biographical notices of this kind, the influence of Abū ʿAmr and the extent of his repute are hardly figments insidiously created by biographers. His influence is seemingly discerned in the general trajectory taken by Baṣran linguistic thought in its radical approach to the linguistic justification of scripture. However, it is remarkable to consider that this approach, which was to be employed by later Baṣran and Kūfan linguists, was seemingly nurtured by earlier figures such as Ibn Muḥayṣin.¹³¹

While a number of Abū ʿAmr's linguist peers pursued linguistic considerations in the justification and selection of readings, it is Abū ʿAmr whose criticisms of the linguistic features of peculiar readings of scripture resonate in primary source material of both Kūfan and Baṣran provenance. Among the commonly adduced examples which illustrate the rather dynamic and yet prescriptive nature of Abū ʿAmr's approach to the linguistic evaluation of readings deemed grammatically

anomalous is Q. 20:63, *inn(a) hādhāni la-sāḥirāni*. Abū ʿAmr took the view that the predicate of *inn(a)* was governed by an accusative marker: this would render the dual demonstrative to read as *hādhayni*. While principal readers differed over whether the *inn(a)* particle was geminated or quiescent, they all agreed that the *hādhāni* rendering was an authenticated one. Abū ʿUbayda's *Majāz al-Qurʾān*, a text which operates within the same boundaries as the *maʿānī* type works, reports that Abū ʿAmr, ʿĪsā Ibn ʿUmar and Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb referred to the need to distinguish between orthographical idiosyncrasies and their relative articulation (*lafẓ*) which predicated that the verse ought to be recited with an *accusative* rendering, but its transcription as (*hādhāni*) was plausible, a distinction to which one of the earlier Baṣran authorities had referred.¹³²

Abū ʿUbayda recalls that it was also possible to adduce parallels in the speech characteristics of the tribe of Banū Kināna which substantiated the nominative reading. This tribe employed the dual demonstrative marker (*alif*) to denote accusative and genitive instances of inflection. Nonetheless, the later literature of *tafsīr* along with grammatical commentaries was to emphasise Abū ʿAmr's rejection of the nominative reading. This was compounded by the seemingly conspicuous circulation of reports attributing the origin of what was perceived as grammatical irregularities to the errors of scribes and the remarks of the caliph ʿUthmān that the *muṣḥaf* comprised irregularities and that the Arabs would 'put them right'.¹³³ These remarks were supposedly expressed when he was presented with the codex prepared by Zayd ibn Thābit. The possible motive for such reports was the desire to undermine readers' declarations that they were merely adhering to authenticated precedents when defending specific Qur'anic readings. It is evident that reports of this nature served the grammarians well as they allowed them to indulge in linguistic pedantry.

Gauging the Kūfan grammarians' reaction to these dramatic developments, one finds that Farrāʾ locates parallels in the diction of the Arabs to support the consensus readings. He expressed the view that it was imperative to respect the sacrosanct status of codices when evaluating readings. Farrāʾ subtly alludes to differences among the *qurrāʾ* concerning Q. 20:63, stating that 'certain readers claimed that this was *laḥn*, but we should continue reading thus to avoid contravening the *Kitāb*'.¹³⁴ Farrāʾ then recalls the reading of Abū ʿAmr and this figure's insistence that: 'It has reached me on the authority of one of Muḥammad's companions, peace be upon him, who said, "The *muṣḥaf* has *laḥn*, but the Arabs will put it right."' This report would seemingly justify Abū ʿAmr's stance. However, Farrāʾ says of this, 'I wish not to contravene the *Kitāb*', referring to the consonantal outline of the *muṣḥaf* which supported the nominative (*hādhāni*) reading. At another juncture in his *Maʿānī*, Farrāʾ seemingly embraces the orthodoxy of the readers in stating: 'Adherence to the codex, if it can be related to an aspect of the speech of the Arabs and the readings of the *qurrāʾ*', is

preferable to contradiction therein'.¹³⁵ He then recalls Abū 'Amr's reading of Q. 20:63 and a second verse also subjected to Abū 'Amr's criticisms, Q. 63:10, concerning which alleged alterations to the codex are proposed, and says, 'I would not have the audacity to commit such an act'. Farrā's criticisms of Abū 'Amr are misleading as he himself tends to get embroiled in the criticism of readings which contradicted his own prescriptive linguistic conventions.¹³⁶

The second reading which was also subjected to the emendation of Abū 'Amr was Q. 63:10. The consensus reading was *fa-aṣṣaddaqa wa akun min al-ṣāliḥīn*. Abū 'Amr read *wa akūn*, adding the *wāw* while suggesting it was coordinate with the preceding verb *aṣṣaddaqa*. Farrā declared that Abū 'Amr inserted a *wāw* into the *Kitāb* (Qur'an), adding, 'I do not approve of that'.¹³⁷ One must bear in mind that Farrā's reference to this verse is set out while discussing an entirely different sura and hence the interfaced nature of his grammatical exposition. However, in his analysis of the verse in question in its actual sura, Farrā is able to justify grammatically the jussive reading (*akun*) by referring to the discrete nature of the conjunctions introducing the verbs in question: the former is preceded by a *fā'* and the latter by a *wāw*. But he pronounces that the reading with a *wāw* (*akūn*) was permissible and that it could be sourced to the *qirā'a* of Ibn Mas'ūd.¹³⁸ The Meccan readers Mujāhid and Ibn Muḥayṣin are among a number of readers who also favour the *akūn* reading. Besides, even Farrā substantiates this reading on the basis that the orthographical conventions of the Arabs predicated that they would often elide the *wāw* and *alif* in scripts. To all intents and purposes some later generations of Baṣrans did not accept the reading associated with Abū 'Amr nor the attempts to justify it on the basis of orthographical irregularities. Concerning this very verse Q. 63:10, the Baṣran trained linguist Naḥḥās (d. 338/949) reports that Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Ibn Muḥayṣin and Abū 'Amr all read *akūn*, citing Ubayy and Ibn Mas'ūd as their authorities. He then recalls the arguments advanced by the reading's supporters concerning the anomalies of the Arabic script: it was supposed that *wāws* and *alifs* were invariably omitted from the text of the *muṣḥaf*. Naḥḥās argues, adducing the opinion of Mubarrad, that if this were the case, why was this convention not adhered to at other analogous junctures in the *muṣḥaf*?¹³⁹ The fundamental point in the labyrinth of these arguments is the fact that Abū 'Amr is not only adhering to a given reading on the basis of his own linguistic preferences, but rather he is *rejecting* an alternative. The transition from functional relevance to abstract theorising was almost complete.

The Baṣran Readers

Presenting a synopsis of the biographical pedigree of the Qur'anic reading tradition, the seventh/thirteenth century work of the historian and traditionist Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī refers to seven principal companion readers whom this tradition

sententiously distinguished as sources of Qur'anic readings: °Uthmān ibn °Affān, °Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Ubayy ibn Ka°b, °Abd Allāh ibn Mas°ūd, Zayd ibn Thābit, Abū Mūsā al-Ash°arī and Abū Dardā°; their readings would have been theoretically sourced to the Prophet. Although other eminent companions are referred to, these figures were the main authorities from whom subsequent generations of readers acquired their Qur'anic readings; indeed, even companion figures such as Ibn °Abbās and Abū Hurayra are recognised as having reviewed readings with authorities among these seven eponyms. Ensuing generations of readers were placed in a sequence of chronological classes (*tabaqāt*). This was a hierarchy upon which the whole reading tradition was predicated in terms of its primary sources. Readers were guided by the unyielding principle that *qirā'āt* were governed by precedents: they were conveyed orally through the delicate mechanisms of *ḥarf*, *ikhtiyār* and *muṣḥaf*.¹⁴⁰ The *tabaqāt* and *akhbār* compilations, whether they were biographical dictionaries or prosopographic in format, have an important role to play in deciphering the history of both the linguistic sciences and the reading tradition. The argument that material from biographical sources is unreliable, because of the fact that its contents are consciously shaped by dogmatic expedencies and not historical reality, can be addressed by corroborating such material with contributions found in primary source material.¹⁴¹ In terms of Qur'anic readings it is always the case that there is no single companion figure serving as the exclusive source of readings for a particular city, but rather a panoply of individuals. Variances among readings are mostly confined to specific consonantal and vocalic values. Therefore grammarians and readers are effectively engaged in a discourse, not surrounding the body text of scripture, but focusing upon these infinitesimal distinctions of readings. Two significant conclusions can be drawn from this understanding of the reading tradition: firstly, the liturgical import attached to these readings; and secondly, by implication, the saliency of the oral nature of this tradition and the physical attempts to preserve it.

The reading tradition of Baṣra, just like its Kūfan counterpart, traced its pedigree to scholars among the aforementioned seven eponyms of Qur'anic readings. Indeed, the figure implicated as the inventor of grammar, Abū'l-Aswad al-Du°alī, was said to have reviewed his readings with °Uthmān ibn °Affān and °Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Relying upon earlier sources, Dhahabī states that Abū'l-Aswad read with these two figures and that he *narrated* (*riwāya*) the readings of °Umar, Ubayy and Ibn Mas°ūd.¹⁴² The companion Abū Mūsā al-Ash°arī's association with Baṣra is notable. He reviewed the readings of two Baṣran protégés: Ḥiṭān ibn °Abd Allāh al-Raqqāshī (d. ca 70/690) and Abū Rajā al-Uṭāridī (d. 105/724).¹⁴³ Similarly, Ibn °Abbās occupies a revered place within the Baṣran reading tradition: he is said to have reviewed the reading of Sulaymān ibn Qatta on three occasions.¹⁴⁴ He is connected with figures such as Uṭāridī and Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.¹⁴⁵ These scholars were pre-eminently responsible for

transmitting the stock of readings (*ḥurūf*) to later generations of Baṣran readers and among these we find individuals such as Yūnus ibn ʿUbayd (d. 139/757), Shihāb ibn Shurnufa (d. 160/777), ʿIṣma ibn ʿUrwa and Sallām ibn Sulaymān al-Ṭawīl (d. 171/788). Additionally, individuals like ʿIṣma and Sallām are also linked with prominent Kūfan authorities and this *inter alia* would have seemingly served to influence the idiosyncratic features of *ḥurūf* and *ikhtiyārāt* adopted by scholars of the Baṣran tradition. The first figures identified as pioneers in the inception of Arabic linguistic thought were notably the same figures spoken of as early Baṣran readers: Abū'l-Aswad, Yaḥyā ibn Yaʿmar, Naṣr ibn ʿĀṣim, ʿIsā ibn ʿUmar, Ibn Abī Iṣḥāq al-Ḥaḍramī and Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ.

Surveying the Kūfan reading tradition, we noted that its readers tended to be very conservative in their general approaches to the language of scripture; this fact is observed in areas of learning such as determining pauses and points of inception in the recitation of scripture or indeed the authentication of Qurʾanic readings. It is among later generations of emerging grammarians such as Ruʾāṣī, Kīsāʾī, and Farrāʾ that a more radical inclination took hold. However, there does exist previous references in the biographical literature to Kūfan individuals whose prescience in the grammatical analysis of scripture substantiates early Kūfan participation in the genesis of Arabic linguistic thought.¹⁴⁶ Nevertheless, among early Baṣran readers this inspired creativity is more pronounced, becoming a sustained feature of both its grammatical and reading constitution, as we shall witness below.¹⁴⁷

ʿĀṣim al-Jahḍarī (d. 130/747) reviewed his readings with Sulaymān ibn Qatta and he read (*qaraʾa*) with Naṣr ibn ʿĀṣim, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Yaḥyā ibn Yaʿmar.¹⁴⁸ ʿIsā ibn ʿUmar reviewed his readings with him. He is clearly linked with impressive reader-grammarian protégés, and their influence is apparent in Jahḍarī's somewhat irregular approach to balancing orthographical anomalies between the physical representation of readings in codices and their recitation. According to Ibn Qutayba, it was said that Jahḍarī's method for dealing with perceived grammatical irregularities in readings, such as the ones contested by Abū ʿAmr and those displaying similar 'peculiarities', Q. 4:162, Q. 5:69, and Q. 2:177, was to adhere to the consonantal outline of the ʿUthmānic codices when transcribing his personal codex, but to 'emend' the reading in his actual recitation, paradoxically undermining the purpose of the codices and the authority of the oral tradition.¹⁴⁹ Jahḍarī's method provided a means of circumventing grammatically 'irregular' readings. He thereby fused both the traditional and the innovative in respect of his approach to these readings. Jahḍarī adduced the statement of ʿUthmān, relating to the alleged existence of *lahn* in the codices which the Arabs would correct, as sanctioning his actions therein; but it is certainly indicative of the revolutionary approach taken by Baṣran readers and grammarians to the language of scripture. It had little to do with emendation and was motivated by prescriptive pedantry.

Having previously recalled the grammatical exploits of Abū ʿAmr it is worth noting that this did not diminish his reputation as a reader. He was viewed as a principal authority in readings along with his peer Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. The readings of Abū ʿAmr and Sallām ibn Sulaymān predominated in Baṣra. Ibn Mujāhid reports that Abū ʿAmr's selection of readings was invariably in agreement with the *ikhtiyār* of his predecessors. Ibn Mujāhid emphasises his ingeniousness in ʿarabiyya, but tempers this with the proviso that he adhered rigidly to precedents in readings.¹⁵⁰ In a report related by Aṣmaʿī, Abū ʿAmr utters the comment, 'If I were not aware that readings were regulated by precedents, I would have read a given *ḥarf* in such and such a manner'. Indeed, Abu ʿAmr is asked by Aṣmaʿī to explain how one is supposed to distinguish readings which had an identical consonantal outline, but were vocally dissimilar? Abū ʿAmr replies, 'That can only be determined by what was heard on the authority of our first shaikhs'.¹⁵¹ Thus the reader literature focuses upon Abū ʿAmr's stringent adherence to precedents in respect of *qirāʾa*. He had an impressive array of teachers who were linked with Kūfan and Baṣran luminaries. He boasted of his training with the Ḥijāzī readers, claiming that he emulated them in their reading conventions. Shuʿba ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/777) once said that his reading was destined to become *isnād*. Indeed, due to its popularity in Baṣra, Ibn Mujāhid was obliged to select it as the city's standard reading.

One also finds among a number of later Baṣran and indeed Kūfan readers a tendency to collect and collate readings while seeking to place them within a grammatical framework. This was at a juncture in the history of the linguistic tradition when grammarians tended to view themselves as members of a scholarly élite. These works, like the *maʿānī* type compositions, were to serve as a prelude to the *ḥujja* and *iḥtijāj* genre of works, but they also precipitated reader-based collections in which emphasis was placed upon *riwāya* (narration). Yaʿqūb al-Ḥaḍramī, whose grandfather was one of the prominent pioneering grammarians, helped shape the form and content of this type of literature, taking a specific interest in the grammatical justification of Qur'anic readings. He is described by Yāqūt as an authority on readings, grammar, philology and jurisprudence.¹⁵² He reviewed his readings with principal luminaries of the Baṣran tradition.¹⁵³ Moreover, included among his students was the Baṣran philologist and reader Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī. Abū Ḥātim recalls that Yaʿqūb was the most knowledgeable regarding the subject of *ḥurūf* and differences in respect of Qur'anic readings together with their grammatical explanation.¹⁵⁴ Dānī reports that the majority of Baṣrans after Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ adhered to his *ikhtiyār*. Indeed, the itinerant geographer Muqaddasī (334–90/945–1000) mentions that the reading of Yaʿqūb was predominant in Baṣra.¹⁵⁵ Ibn Ashta recounts that the imams in Baṣra continue to adhere to his readings.¹⁵⁶ The biographical literature records that a contemporary of Yaʿqūb, Ayyūb al-Mutawakkil (d. 200/819), disagreed with his

fellow Baṣran on the subject of readings. Ayyūb was recognised for his strict adherence to precedents in relation to readings.¹⁵⁷ Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī describes him as a very able scholar, and relates that Ayyūb once said he was only able to 'overcome Ya'qūb al-Ḥaḍramī by virtue of *āthār*', which would seem to relate to the selection of readings.¹⁵⁸ Given Ya'qūb's interests in pursuing the perspectives of grammarians when collating readings, it seems plausible that linguistic considerations pervaded his approach therein.

Drawing from earlier sources, Yāqūt mentions that Ya'qūb was the author of a work entitled *Kitāb al-Jāmi'* which comprised differences regarding aspects of readings, and that each *ḥarf* (vocalic or consonantal value) was traced to its reader. This work may well have been inspired by one of his predecessors among the Baṣran readers, Hārūn ibn Mūsā al-A'war. Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī reports that Hārūn was among the first Baṣrans to collate variant Qur'anic readings, pursuing *asānīd* for the so-called anomalous (*shādhah*) readings. He is described as both a grammarian and reader. It is reported that he narrated the readings of 'Āṣim al-Jaḥdarī, 'Āṣim ibn Abī al-Najūd, Ibn Kathīr, Ibn Muḥayṣin and Ḥumayd ibn Qays, making him an important source of Qur'anic readings for Sībawayhi and his peers; and indeed, he also features as an authority on codices in Dānī's works. We mentioned above that Hārūn and Ya'qūb were cited in a number of reports suggesting that Naṣr ibn 'Āṣim appended *alifs* to certain verses in the Baṣran codex. In line with the types of works that one would associate with readers, Ya'qūb was the author of a text entitled *al-Waḥf al-tamām*.¹⁵⁹ He was also a mentor of the grammarians Abū 'Amr al-Jarmī (d. 225/839), and Abū 'Uthmān al-Māzinī (d. 249/863), whose influence within the Baṣran grammatical tradition was enormous, particularly in the dissemination of the *Kitāb*. The eminent status enjoyed by a figure like Ya'qūb within the late Baṣran reading tradition gives some idea of the innovatory texture of linguistic thought which held sway within this tradition.

Towards the Zenith of Arabic Linguistic Thought

The refined status of Arabic linguistic thought prior to the advent of luminaries such as Khalīl ibn Aḥmad and Sībawayhi seems indisputable. Later generations of the grammarians of Baṣra had taken the rudimentary instruments of linguistic analysis developed by readers and furnished them with greater theoretical depth and purpose, and this is reflected in the ensuing literature which linguists composed. Khalīl is traditionally celebrated as the principal mover behind Arabic linguistic abstraction: his links with Ḥijāzī readers, who were already indulging in the suppositional linguistic analysis with which his peers and pupils were to become synonymous, were striking. He is quoted some 600 times in the text of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*.¹⁶⁰ A number of biographical accounts suggested that the *Kitāb* comprised a digest of 'Īsā ibn

‘Umar’s putative text on grammar supplemented by the theoretical thought of Khalīl, which was then given synthesis by Sībawayhi.¹⁶¹ In terms of authorship Khalīl has several works attributed to him on the subject of prosody, confirming his fame as the first figure to introduce metres to classify the poetry of the Arabs. He also composed treatises on music, and the celebrated *Kitāb al-‘Ayn*.¹⁶² He was the author of a text entitled *Kitāb al-Naqt wa’l-shakl*.¹⁶³ Although works on the subject of diacritics were ascribed to early Baṣran readers such as Naṣr ibn ‘Āṣim, Dānī states that Khalīl ibn Aḥmad was the first figure to ‘organise and outline it (*naqt*) in a work which recalled its ‘*ilal* or explanations’.¹⁶⁴ Scholarly enterprise in the field of diacritics and orthography had the Qur’anic codices as their principal point of focus.¹⁶⁵

Carter does acknowledge that Khalīl, together with Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb, was a mentor of Sībawayhi.¹⁶⁶ However, according to Carter the earlier grammarians were engaged in ‘a rigidly analogical type of reasoning which not only led occasionally to absurd conclusions, but which also could claim no systematic authority’.¹⁶⁷ However, Carter had earlier conceded that, in addition to grammatical terms introduced by Sībawayhi, the *Kitāb* drew from a reservoir of primitive nomenclature in circulation among his predecessors.¹⁶⁸ Moreover, much of this previous terminology was adduced in statements attributed to several of Sībawayhi’s mentors. The primitive nomenclature recalled by Carter included the following terms: *ism*, *fī‘l*, *ḥarf*, *raf‘*, *naṣb*, *jarr*, *jazm*, *ḍamma*, *fatha*, *kasra*, *waqf*, *i‘rāb*, *i‘jām*, *binā’*, *ma‘rifa*, *nakira*, *tanwīn*, *ḥaraka*, *sukūn*, *idāfa*, *isnād*, *‘aṭf*, *i‘timād*, *sabab*, *ta‘alluq* and *imāla*.¹⁶⁹ He argued that these terms might be linked to the science of prosody, but many of these terms were consistently in the employ of early readers.

Among the many examples in Sībawayhi’s *Kitāb* typifying the way in which models of grammar were systematically applied to the justification of the linguistic features of scripture is Khalīl’s explanation of the jussive *akun* in Q. 63:10; this was the reading questioned by Abū ‘Amr.¹⁷⁰ Khalīl supports this reading by referring to a verse of poetry attributed to Zuhayr ibn Abī Sulmā:

Badā liya annī lastu mudrika mā maḍā

Wa lā sābiq(in) shay’an idhā kāna jā’iyyān

The phenomenon of suppletion (*tawahhum*) is identified in this verse: namely the inferred ellipsis which explains perceived grammatical idiosyncrasies in the inflection of certain terms; in this instance *sābiq(in)*, which in theory is conjoined to *mudrika*, but whose ending is reconciled with a grammatically restored *bi-mudriki*. Baalbaki drew attention to the phenomenon of *tawahhum* in his examination of this grammatical device, propounding the view that later grammarians (fourth/tenth century onwards) were never fully aware of the technical value of grammatical terms coined by earlier authorities.¹⁷¹ Nevertheless, using this grammatical technique,

Khalīl was able to substantiate the reason for the jussive in the verse (*akun*) and confirm that it was a genuine form of *‘arabiyya*: hence the reading was grammatically justified and accepted. This mode of rational analysis formed the nucleus of *ma‘ānī* type works. In the *Ma‘ānī al-Qur‘ān* Farrā’ refers to the exploits of the Medinan grammarians and their justification of a peculiar reading of Q. 6:137.¹⁷² This *lectio* featured a physical separation between the *muḍāf* and the *muḍāf ilayhi*. Despite the fact that the *maṣāḥif al-Shām* upheld such a reading, Farrā’ dismissed the attempts of the Ḥijāzī grammarians to justify this separation through the citation of poetry exhibiting similar linguistic features. Farrā’ argued that the poetry adduced to support this grammatical idiosyncrasy is misconstrued. These examples indicate that the procedures for justification and evaluation were predominant during these early periods. These early readers were clearly invoking a rational grammatical model for the purposes of justification. The linguists of Kūfa and Baṣra were to take these intricate strands of scholarship and furnish them with greater definition and resolution.

Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb is revered as one of Khalīl’s loyal disciples: he was a gifted expert in poetry, appraising the compositions of contemporaries such as Farazdaq (d. 110/728), Jarīr (d. 113/731) and Akḥṭal (d. 113/731).¹⁷³ He was also an authority on Khalīl’s linguistic thought; he is described as having his own analogies in respect of grammar and unique *madhāhib* therein.¹⁷⁴ That one of the most distinguished authorities on Arabic philology, the Baṣran Abū ‘Ubayda, recounts that for forty years he had visited the study-circles of Yūnus recording philological material, is sufficient testimony to his standing.¹⁷⁵ Indeed, Kūfan linguists were also connected with this figure. The works which are attributed to Yūnus broadly confirm the extent to which grammarians had systematically widened the scope of their enquiries, marking a perceptible shift in emphasis towards collating profane sources used to service grammatical theories as opposed to the applied exposition of the holy text. Thus not only is Yūnus mentioned as the author of the following works: *Kitāb Ma‘ānī al-Qur‘ān al-kabīr*, *Kitāb Ma‘ānī al-Qur‘ān al-ṣaghīr*, but he also composed *Kitāb al-Lughāt*, *Kitāb al-Nawādir al-kabīr*, *Kitāb al-Nawādir al-ṣaghīr* and *Kitāb al-Amthāl*.¹⁷⁶

The classical biographical compilations recognise the creative brilliance of Sībawayhi together with the exceptional nature of his *Kitāb*. These accounts relate that it was apparently saved from obscurity by the efforts of two Baṣran grammarians: Abū ‘Amr al-Jarmī and Abū ‘Uthmān al-Māzinī, who as students of the only figure memorising its contents, Akhfash al-Awsaṭ, had played a significant role in preserving and transmitting the work.¹⁷⁷ Akhfash was Sībawayhi’s principal student and he was also the author of an extant *Ma‘ānī al-Qur‘ān* text which was supposed to have been the blueprint which Kūfans such as Kisā’ī and Farrā’ had emulated when producing their

own texts.¹⁷⁸ The work was composed at the behest of Kisā'ī. Akhfash was of course a mentor of both Kisā'ī and Farrā'.¹⁷⁹ Versteegh has pointed to the research of Bernards and Humbert in which it is argued that grammarians such as Akhfash and Jarmī were more creative and independent in their elaboration of grammatical thought. It is suggested that the reformulation of the history of the Baṣran tradition by Mubarrad meant they were cast in a new light as propagators of the *Kitāb* and its teachings.¹⁸⁰ While naturally accepting that the *Kitāb* was 'the founding text of Arabic grammatical science', Carter also refers to the findings of both Bernards and Humbert concerning the role of Mubarrad in imperiously positioning the *Kitāb* at the fulcrum of Arabic linguistic abstraction among Baṣrans.¹⁸¹ Intriguingly, much is made of the fact that Mubarrad was the author of a text entitled *al-Radd 'alā Sībawayhi*; and indeed other Baṣrans such as the renowned philologist Aṣma'ī was supposedly critical of Sībawayhi's interpretation of poetic *loci probantes* (*shawāhid*).¹⁸² He appears to have conspired to embarrass Sībawayhi during a study session held at the main mosque in Baṣra. Mubarrad subsequently claimed that his early refutation was written during a period of intellectual adolescence; his work was the subject of an intrepid riposte by the Egyptian linguist Ibn Wallād in his book entitled *Kitāb al-Intiṣār*. The tenor of such material suggested that it was well after Sībawayhi's death that the *Kitāb* was expediently acknowledged as the *magnum opus* of the Baṣran tradition and furnished with numerous commentaries.¹⁸³ The significance of recognising the distinction of the delayed acceptance of the *Kitāb* and its reception among Baṣran linguists is critical, for it betrays the concomitant existence of a tradition of Arabic linguistic thought which paved the way for the *Kitāb*. It therefore embodies years of linguistic thought, a living scholarly tradition to which numerous figures among Sībawayhi's predecessors had contributed.

Notwithstanding the composition of numerous philological treatises, which in themselves represent expressions of allegiance to a specific tradition of learning, grammarians of Kūfa and Baṣra continued to produce a profusion of treatises and monographs on grammatical concepts, theories and thought. The many commentaries on Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* confirm the true measure of its contribution to the Arabic linguistic tradition; however, it was never the case that a single text and the teachings therein exclusively dominated the tradition. The authorship of grammatical tracts and treatises by Baṣran and Kūfan scholars remained a broad and variegated enterprise. This is reflected in the literary output of Mubarrad. He was the author of *al-Muqtaḍab*, the contents of which were critically shaped around the text of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, along with a number of commentaries exploring aspects of the *Kitāb*. This included an introductory treatise and a commentary on the text and its poetic *shawāhid*. In addition to these previous texts, he was also the author of a work entitled *al-Ziyāda al-muntaza'a min Kitāb Sībawayhi* and a *Ma'nā Kitāb Sībawayhi*.

Mubarrad was also the author of several *maʿānī*-type texts, confirming Baṣran interest in this genre of writing: *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, *Kitāb al-Ḥurūf fī maʿānī al-Qurʾān ilā Sūrat Ṭhāhā*.¹⁸⁴ There is also a definitive selection of separate monographs and grammatical treatises which he composed: *al-Madkhal ilā l-naḥw*, *Kitāb al-Iʿrāb*, *Kitāb al-Taṣrīf* (morphology), *Kitāb al-Ḥurūf* and *Kitāb al-Ishtiqāq* (etymology); and he is the author of several works on prosody and poetry: *Kitāb al-ʿArūd*, *Kitāb al-Qawāfī*, *Qawāʿid al-shiʿr* and a *Kitāb Darurat al-shiʿr*. In addition to the aforementioned works he composed a number of orthographical treatises, including *Kitāb al-Khaṭṭ waʿl-hijāʿ*. It is also significant that he compiled a work entitled *Kitāb Iḥtijāj al-qurrāʾ wa iʿrāb al-Qurʾān*, a text which would have systematically presented a grammatical apologia of readings.¹⁸⁵

These broad and eclectic trends in authorship, and indeed approaches to linguistic analysis, were continued by successive generations of Baṣran and Kūfan luminaries. Abū Bakr ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 316/927) authored the celebrated *Uṣūl fī l-naḥw*, which is said to have epitomised Baṣran attempts to evolve a canonical model of grammar. Yāqūt reports that the *Uṣūl* combined the finer detail of Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* with the *Masāʾil* of Akhfash and those of the Kūfans. He also mentioned that the *Uṣūl* contravened the grammatical consensus of the Baṣrans on several topics, declaring that 'grammar remained recalcitrant until it was restrained by Ibn al-Sarrāj with his *Uṣūl*'.¹⁸⁶ Ibn al-Sarrāj also composed the following array of works: a treatise on *ishtiqāq*; an apologia for Qurʾanic readings: *Iḥtijāj al-qurrāʾ*; a commentary on Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*; several orthographical treatises; texts supplementing the grammatical issues of the *Uṣūl*; and a work on poets and poetry. The comprehensive approach to the authorship of grammatical texts remained salient. The 4th/10th century grammarian Rummānī composed commentaries on the following works: Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, the *Masāʾil* of Akhfash, Jarmī's *Muhktaṣar fī l-naḥw*, Māzinī's *al-Alif waʿl-lām*, Mubarrad's *Muqtaḍab*, the two texts of Ibn al-Sarrāj: *al-Uṣūl fī l-naḥw* and *al-Mūjaz fī l-naḥw*, Zajjāj's *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān* and an exposition of Zajjāj's *Kitāb al-Jumal*.¹⁸⁷ The Arabic linguistic tradition embodied a hybrid core of linguistic thought and concepts distilled through centuries of classical scholarship.

The reader biographical literature offers very terse accounts of Khalīl and Sībawayhi. The latter's notice merits a few lines only: he is described as being *imām al-nuḥāt* and it is stated that he narrated the readings of Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ.¹⁸⁸ No reference is made to his having been the author of any of the functional type of compositions that one associates with early readers (the enumerating of verses in codices; the division of verses; differences among Qurʾanic codices). Later generations of Baṣran and indeed Kūfan grammarians do continue this functional enterprise. Akhfash al-Awsaṭ was the author of a tract on *ishtiqāq* (etymology), two works on prosody, including an extant tract entitled *Kitāb al-Qawāfī*, a work entitled *al-Waqf al-tamām* and two

works on grammatical definitions: *al-Masā'il al-kabīr* and *al-Masā'il al-ṣaghīr*. This is in addition to his extant text on the subject of *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*.¹⁸⁹ Many others among his Baṣran and Kūfan peers composed a similar repertoire of works. Indeed, the Baṣran Ibn Kaysān (d. 299/912) enjoyed scholarly associations with both Tha'lab and Mubarrad. He was the author of the following works: *al-Masā'il 'alā madhhab al-naḥwiyyīn mim mā ikhtalaf fihī al-Baṣriyyūn wa'l-Kūfiyyūn*; *Kitāb al-Kāfi fī'l-naḥw*; *Kitāb al-Qirā'āt*; *Kitāb al-Waqf wa'l-ibtidā'*; *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*, consisting of 400 pages; *Kitāb al-Mudhakkar wa'l-mu'annath*; *Kitāb al-Hijā'*; and numerous other treatises.¹⁹⁰ The authorship of both abstract and functional type tomes is testimony not only to the early reader origins of Arabic linguistic thought, but the fact that the full gamut of Arabic linguistic abstraction was now to be used in the defence and elucidation of the more traditional reader sub-disciplines. Having attained an exceptional level of sophistication following its early struggle for dominance with the reader tradition, the tradition had assertively achieved its independence and had nothing more to prove. It could now return to the service of scripture; its abiding legacy was that it had succeeded in furnishing the reading and exegetical traditions with an array of highly developed theoretical instruments for the resolution, authentication and appraisal of scripture. However, equally, the tenacity of the readers, in their resolute adherence to the hegemony of precedents, had ensured that the functional disciplines that they had cultivated were now consummately defended by rational means. Religious orthodoxy emerged triumphant.

The Question of the Existence of Schools: Fiction or Reality?

It is perhaps worth reflecting briefly upon the question of the existence of discrete traditions of language studies as exemplified in the presumed antithesis between Baṣran and Kūfan approaches to grammatical analysis. To a certain extent this discussion is linked to our earlier review of the origins of Arabic linguistic thought (Part 1 of this article). Carter would argue that if one accepts that grammar only comes into being with Sībawayhi's *Kitāb*, then there can be no nominal notion of schools of grammatical thought before the inception of this text. Versteegh's hypothesis would by implication furnish two traditions: the older Iraqi school favoured by the *qurrā'* and perpetuated by the Kūfans; alongside the innovative tradition championed by the Baṣrans and Sībawayhi in particular. This would also be a view favoured by Talmon, although the essence of his theory locates an exterior channel for the initial diffusion of linguistic thought and concepts. The presence of well-defined distinctions in terms of terminology and methods of approaches would be cited by these two figures as proof of the existence of discrete linguistic traditions. Thus for Carter, the text of the *Kitāb* does not presuppose the existence of opposing traditions: one is dealing with differences between personalities as opposed to separate linguistic schools or exceptional theoretical approaches. Baalbaki has spoken

of an antithesis in approaches to the phenomenon of language which can be explicitly referenced to Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* and Farrā's *Ma'ānī*.¹⁹¹ Jonathan Owens' painstaking analysis of the corpus of grammatical literature spanning the formative years of this tradition argues that it is during the period of the Baṣran Zajjāj (241–311/854–923) that grammatical opinions were polarised around traditions and this was a grammar which had been distinctively based on the analyses of language elaborated by Sībawayhi and Farrā'.¹⁹² This view predicates a much later provenance for the inception of schools than that supposed by Weil. However, Owens shows that the intricate methods and features of Farrā's grammatical synthesis differed considerably with that of Sībawayhi and later Baṣrans; this synthesis purposefully served as a resource and reference point around which the posterior Kūfan tradition could position itself.¹⁹³

Versteegh's earlier survey of Arabic linguistic thought alluded to interesting parallels between the Baṣran and Kūfan linguistic traditions and those of the ancient Greek schools of grammar: the Alexandrians and the Stoics.¹⁹⁴ The Baṣrans were likened to the Alexandrians, who were purportedly noted for their propensity towards order and Aristotelian logical definitions in their analyses of grammar. Conversely, the Kūfans, like the Stoics of Pergamon, represented the anomalists; they were receptive to a broad but discursive corpus of linguistic material in the formulation of grammatical principles. Versteegh stressed that such a comparison was mistaken, indeed flawed; however, it provides a constructive parallel of the distinctions which are conventionally cited when separating the characteristics of language analysis of Baṣran and Kūfan linguists. The Kūfans are viewed as the exponents of *samā'*, which connotes the authority of generally received and accepted linguistic conventions. This allowed ample latitude in the formulation of grammatical precepts through the integration of a greater corpus of linguistic material, even when such material infringed upon formulated grammatical principles. For that reason, the designation of the Kūfans as anomalists appeared fitting. Baalbaki does argue that this propensity to *samā'* is attested in Farrā's approach to the formulation of grammatical principles.¹⁹⁵ One writer, whose examination of the history of the Kūfan linguistic tradition remains valuable, Maḥdī Makhzūmī, argued that the primacy granted to *samā'* by Kūfan grammarians was one of the legacies of the city's affinity with the tradition of Qur'anic readings.¹⁹⁶ Later Kūfan grammarians had merely replicated the methodology of early Kūfan readers, who respected the integrity of the vast corpus of readings on the basis of substantiated precedents. However, as we have noticed from previous examples, this is not necessarily reconciled with some of the critical positions taken by Kisā'i and Farrā' towards readings which contravened their derived rules of grammar. Makhzūmī went on to describe the Baṣrans as the exponents of a profoundly synthetic analysis of language, using the tools of *taqdīr*

(suppletion), *ta'wīl* (rationalisation) and *qiyās* (analogical reasoning) to reconcile anomalies not accommodated in their theories. They were not inclined to alter or rectify their general grammatical precepts. According to Makhzūmī, Baṣran grammar therefore betrayed an efficiently organised constitution; he intimates that a regimented fascination with the abstract, philosophical and logical dimensions of linguistic thought tellingly prevailed.

However, granting the merit of these assumed methodological distinctions, Carter makes a significant point that Sībawayhi consistently balances his acceptance of *qiyās* against *samā'*; accordingly, 'he can hardly be claimed as a representative of either school'.¹⁹⁷ Furthermore, for Carter 'substantive differences between the Baṣran and Kūfans are impossible to state precisely'.¹⁹⁸ Indeed, it can be argued that the amenability of the source material sustains both perspectives in terms of an assumed opposition in approaches. Carter has recently returned to this issue of the antithesis between Baṣran and Kūfan approaches to grammatical analysis, employing a legal parallel to explain the Baṣrans' supposed propensity to *qiyās*. He argues that Baṣrans sought to eliminate *istiqrā'* (deduction), whose imposition meant that the corpus of linguistic data was effectively fluid. Circumvention of *istiqrā'* allowed the Baṣrans to restrict this corpus, countering the greater compass and latitude furnished by the Kūfans' approach.¹⁹⁹ Carter decided that the origins of the Kūfan–Baṣran dichotomy can be traced to differences regarding *istiqrā'*.²⁰⁰ He therefore concludes that the historical reality of this opposition can only be dated as far as the mid-tenth century.²⁰¹ However, texts whose provenance precedes this period: Tha'lab's *Kitāb al-Majālis* and the celebrated *Iṣlāḥ al-Manṭiq* of Ibn al-Sikkīt (d. 244/858), feature examples which clearly betray an antithesis in terms of opinions articulated by grammarians and the methodology used to formulate them. These early grammarians are arguing about substantive linguistic issues as opposed to *argumentum ad hominem*. Classical literature merely preserved the generic distinctions enshrined in the earliest source material. It is feasible to contend that attitudes towards religious orthodoxy play a pivotal role in shaping distinctions in approaches to the phenomenon of language; these evolved distinctions manifest themselves in Kūfan and Baṣran approaches to the design, utility and function of the Arabic linguistic tradition. However, this will be attempted at another juncture.²⁰²

Conclusions

The trajectory of the genesis of Arabic linguistic thought should be traced to the attempts to broach the physical preservation of the holy text as a corpus of scripture enshrined for its liturgical and religious value. The linguists and readers were attempting to develop the means to safeguard the oral tradition of Qur'anic readings. The primary focus of their attention had been issues of orthography, diacritics and

vowel markings, together with collating the physical features of Qur'anic codices. These readers were also concerned with the authentication of the stock of Qur'anic readings and their phonological definition. The early Arabic linguistic tradition combined all of these strands of functional scholarship; yet it was essentially predisposed to the service of scripture. The Baṣran readers, who had refined many of the existing linguistic approaches to the text developed by earlier authorities, were genuine pioneers in terms of their ability to place these strands of linguistic thought within a coherently devised theoretical framework. That individual grammarians in the Hijāz were already indulging in sophisticated forms of grammatical analysis is testimony to their contribution to linguistic thought. Indeed, a number of Meccan readers served as mentors of early Baṣran and Kūfan scholars. The pronounced focus on the abstract and conceptual aspects of the language of scripture together with the attempts to formulate a theory of language is engineered by Baṣran luminaries. The endeavours of these luminaries allowed Arabic linguistic thought to assume a more insular countenance. However, although the Kūfan readers pursued a distinctly functional bent in their approaches to preserving the diction of scripture, they were clearly familiar with the earliest forms of analysis developed for these purposes. Moreover, later generations of Kūfans readers were able to join their Baṣran counterparts as distinguished grammarians, pursuing the type of linguistic enterprise nurtured by Baṣrans. Indeed, they were able to participate actively in the evolution of a stream of grammatical and philological theories. The distinction between grammarians and readers was defined well before the advent of Sībawayhi and his many peers. Indeed, the early preoccupation with the composition and collation of so-called profane literature such as the *gharīb*, *nawādir* and *luḡāt* genres is commensurate with the increasing sophistication of Arabic linguistic thought. The tradition was suitably poised to be placed on a meticulously abstract plane by post-Sībawayhian grammarians.

NOTES

1 Biographical entries can be consulted for details on all of these figures in the following compilations: 'Abd al-Wāhid ibn 'Alī Abū Ṭayyib, *Marātib al-naḥwīyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Maktabat Nahḍat Miṣr, 1955), henceforth *Marātib*; Kamāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Barakāt ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuḡḥat al-alibbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-udabā'*, ed. Ibrāhīm al-Samarā'ī (al-Zarqā': Maktabat al-Manār, 1985), henceforth *Nuḡḥat*; Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt 'alā anbāh al-nuḡḥāt*, 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, *Buḡḡyat al-wu'āt fī ṭabaqāt al-luḡhawīyyīn wa'l-nuḡḥāt*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (2 vols. Beirut: Maktabat al-'Aṣriyya, 1964), henceforth *Buḡḡyat*; Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwīyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1973), henceforth *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwīyyīn*.

2 *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997). See art. 'Sībawayhi', vol. 9, pp. 524–31, esp. p. 525. See also 'When Did the Arabic Word *Naḥw* First Come to Denote

Grammar', *Language and Communication* 5:4 (1985), pp. 265–72, p. 265; 'Arabic Grammar' in *Religion, Learning and Science in the Abbasid Period*, Cambridge History of Arabic Literature, pp. 118f. Also Carter's 'Writing the History of Arabic Grammar', *Historiographia Linguistica* 21 (1994), pp. 385–414 (review article).

3 Carter, *Language and Communication* 5:4 (1985), p. 265.

4 Kees Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qur'anic Exegesis in Early Islam* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993). And see his work entitled *The Arabic Language* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001), pp. 55–6. Versteegh's views prior to his thesis regarding the influence of the exegetical tradition are presented in 'Arabic Grammar and Corruption of Speech', *al-Abḥāth* 31 (1983), pp. 139–60. idem, 'Zayd ibn 'Alī's Commentary on the Qur'an' in Y. Suleiman (ed.), *Arabic Grammar and Linguistics* (Richmond: Curzon, 1999), pp. 9–29. For a survey of the major fields of early Islamic scholarship, see George Makdisi's *The Rise of Humanism in Classical Islam and the Christian West* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990), esp. pp. 121–46.

5 Werner Diem, 'Some Glimpses at the Rise and Early Development of the Arabic Orthography', *Orientalia* 45 (1976), pp. 251–61, p. 252.

6 John Healey, *The Early Alphabet*, pp. 197–257. Reproduced in *Reading the Past: Ancient Writing from Cuneiform to the Alphabet*, introduced by T.J. Hooker (London: Guild Publishing, 1990), p. 248.

7 Nabia Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script and its Kur'anic Development* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 8.

8 Op. cit. pp. 8–10.

9 See *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, ed. J.D. McAuliffe (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001), and her entry 'Arabic Script', pp. 135–44, esp. p. 138. Note also her work, *The Development of the Arabic Scripts. From the Nabatean Era to the First Islamic Century According to Dated Texts* (Atlanta, 1993).

10 A summary of these accounts is presented by Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script*, p. 5. See also Johannes Pedersen (trans. Geoffrey French, ed. R. Hillenbrand), *The Arabic Book* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 72–7, with reference to Balādhurī; cf. Estelle Whelan, 'Writing the Word of God: Some Early Qur'an Manuscripts and their Milieux, Part 1', *Ars Orientalis* 10 (1989).

11 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, ed. R. Tajaddud, 3rd edn (Beirut: Dār al-Masīra, 1988), p. 9.

12 Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script*, p. 17. Cf. Ibn al-Durayd, who quoted Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī as saying it was called *jazm* because it was 'severed' from the so-called *al-khaṭṭ al-musnad* (cuneiform script), a possibility dismissed by Abbott. See Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Durayd, *Jamharat al-lughā*, ed. Ramzi Baalbaki (3 vols. Beirut: Dār al-ʿIlm li'l-Malayīn, 1987), vol. 1, p. 484.

13 Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script*, p. 17.

14 François Déroche, *The Abbasid Tradition: Qur'ans of the 8th to 10th Centuries* (London: Nour Foundation in association with Azimuth Editions & Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 12.

15 Loc. cit.

16 See art. 'Calligraphy' in *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, p. 280. Solange Ory argues that the use of terms such as *māʿil* never fully takes into account the diversity of the early Hijāzī scripts.

17 Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script*, p. 22. Cf. Adolf Grohmann, 'The Problem of Dating the Early Qur'āns', *Der Islam* 33 (1958), pp. 213–31, esp. pp. 216–18.

18 Déroche, *Abbasid*, p. 27. Methodological developments highlighted by Ory refer to the classification of handwritten copies of the Qur'an into two main groups: Hijāzī and 'classical Kufic'; while Déroche prefers the label 'Abbasid' for all the so-called Kufic scripts. See art. 'Calligraphy', p. 280; Déroche, *Abbasid*, p. 16. Introductions to penmanship also became the detailed subject of Kūfan and Baṣran treatises: *Adab al-kuttāb* by Abū Bakr al-Ṣūlī and Ibn Qutayba's *Adab al-kātib* are prime examples, while Farrā's *al-Maqṣūr wa'l-mamdūd* focuses specifically on the relevant orthography relating to certain endings.

19 Diem, *Orientalia* 45 (1976), pp. 251–61, p. 255.

20 Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script*, pp. 38–40 & 54–5.

21 B. Gruendler, art. 'Arabic Script', *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, pp. 139–40.

22 Adolf Grohmann, *From the World of Arabic Papyri* (Cairo: al-Ma'ārif Press, 1952), pp. 82–5. Cf. B. Moritz, *Arabic Palaeography* (Cairo: Bibliothèque Khédivale, 1905).

23 Op. cit. pp. 82–3 (see endnote 292 in his text).

24 Alphonse Mingana & Agnes Smith Lewis, *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurāns Possibly Pre-ʿOthmānic With a List of their Variants* (Cambridge: CUP, 1914), pp. xxxiif. Abbott also refers to a phased influence on the development of diacritics which can be traced to pre-Islamic and Islamic periods, see p. 39.

25 The term 'reader-grammarian' encapsulates the entwined nature of their scholarship. And serves as a prelude to later distinctions in the use of the terms grammarian and reader. Edmund Beck had devoted many articles to readers and readings in the early Islamic tradition; cf. E. Beck, 'Arabiyya, Sunna und ʿĀmma in der Koranlesung des zweiten Jahrhunderts', *Orientalia* 15 (1946), pp. 180–224, and 'Studien zur Geschichte der Kūfischen Koranlesung in den beiden ersten Jahrhunderten', *Orientalia* 17 (1948), pp. 326–55.

26 Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Damashqī ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr*, ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Dabbāʿ (2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, n.d.), henceforth *al-Nashr*, pp. 11–12.

27 See *al-Muqniʿ fī maʿrifat marsūm maṣāḥif ahl al-amṣār*, ed. M. Dahmān (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1983), p. 115; also see Part 1 of this article, *Journal of Qurʾanic Studies* 5:1 (2003), p. 63.

28 For distinctions between *naqʿ* and *iʿjām* see Khalīl Semaan, *Linguistics in the Middle Ages, Phonetic Studies in Early Islam* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), pp. 14–15. See also M.A.S. Abdel Haleem, 'Qurʾanic Orthography: The Written Representation of the Recited Text of the Qurʾan', *Islamic Quarterly* (1983), pp. 171–92. And E.J. Revell, 'The Diacritical Dots and the Development of the Arabic Alphabet', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975), pp. 178–90.

29 Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar*, p. 31.

30 Art. 'Arabic Script', pp. 139–41; Healey, *The Early Alphabet*, pp. 197–257, see esp. pp. 249–50. See also Versteegh, *The Arabic Language*, pp. 55–7.

31 Mingana & Smith Lewis, *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurāns*, p. xxx. Administrative contingencies also provide momentum for the refinement of orthography.

32 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 6. An extensive bibliography and biography of the principal Baṣran luminaries is presented in F. Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1984), vol. 9 ('Grammatik'), pp. 31–72.

33 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 6.

34 Abū ʿAmr ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd al-Dānī, *al-Muḥkam fī naqʿ al-maṣāḥif*, ed. ʿIzzat Ḥasan, 2nd edn (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1986), pp. 4–5.

35 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 7. Cf. Yasin Dutton, 'Red Dots, Green Dots, Yellow Dots and Blue: Some

Reflections on the Vocalisation of Early Qur'anic Manuscripts (Parts I and II)', *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 1:1 (1999), pp. 115–40, and 2:1 (2000), pp. 1–24.

36 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 4 and pp. 6–9.

37 Déroche, *Abbasid*, p. 32, see Pedersen, *The Arabic Book*, pp. 75–80.

38 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 6.

39 This is Pierre Cachia's translation of these terms: *The Monitor, a Dictionary of Arabic Grammatical Terms* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973), see p. 40 for slurring (*rawm*) and p. 50 for *ishmām*, 'giving one vowel a scent or flavour of the other; a sound between those of *kasra* and *ḍamma*; scent or flavour of the u-sound', which tallies with *tajwīd* type definitions. The lengthy definitions highlight the difficulty of finding a single term to convey these meanings: in recitation manuals on such topics *rawm* applies only to instances of (u) and (i) i.e. *fi'l-marfū' wa'l-maḍmūm wa'l-majrūr wa'l-maksūr*; whereas *ishmām* is defined as *itbāq al-shafatayn ba'd al-iskān wa tada' baynahuma infirājan li-yakhruj al-nafas bi-ghayr sawt wa dhālika ishāratun li'l-ḥaraka'l-latī khatamta bihā al-kalima*. And yet *ishmām* applies only to instances of endings with 'u'.

40 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 7. See also Versteegh, *The Arabic Language*, pp. 56–7.

41 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 22.

42 Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Damashqī ibn al-Jazarī, *Ghāyat al-nihāya fī ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, ed. Gotthelf Bergsträsser & Otto Pretzl (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda, 1935), henceforth *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 1, p. 345, vol. 2, p. 336. Cf. *al-Muqni'*, p. 115.

43 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, pp. 104–5.

44 Loc. cit.

45 Loc. cit.

46 Abū Zakariyyā' Yaḥyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrā', *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*, ed. M. Najjār & A. Najātī (3 vols. Cairo: n.p., 1980), vol. 2, p. 240.

47 Abū Aḥmad al-Ḥasan ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Sa'id al-'Askarī, *Sharḥ mā yaqa' fīhi al-taṣḥīf wa'l-tahrīf*, ed. 'Abd al-'Azīz Aḥmad (Cairo: Maṭba'at Muṣṭafā al-Bābī, 1963), pp. 13–14.

48 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, pp. 22–3. The argument here is that the fourth form of the verb inverts the original meaning and in this instance we have an antithesis between 'unclear' and 'clear'. This is not mentioned by Carter in his 'Arabic Grammar': see p. 119 in which he defines it as 'making foreign'.

49 Abū 'Abd Allāh Ya'qūb ibn 'Abd Allāh Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Mu'jam al-udabā'* (5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1991), vol. 5, p. 553.

50 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 2, p. 336.

51 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 29.

52 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 2, p. 381.

53 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 26.

54 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 1, p. 381. See Part 1 of this article, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1 (2003), pp. 62f.

55 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 21.

56 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* (1985:48), pp. 224–36. See his discussion on pp. 224–5, p. 231; 'Schacht's Theory in the Light of Recent Discoveries Concerning the Origins of Arabic Grammar', *Studia Islamica* (1987–8), pp. 31–50, see p. 43.

57 Talmon, *Studia Islamica* (1987–8), p. 45.

58 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 6.

59 Loc. cit.

60 R. Talmon in a number of articles: 'Who was the First Grammarian? A New Approach to an Old Problem' in Hartmut Bobzin & 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 see his survey entitled 'Grammar and the Qur'an' in *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'an*, vol. 2.

61 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 6.

62 Loc. cit.

63 Op. cit. pp. 12f.

64 Op. cit. p. 13.

65 Op. cit. p. 19.

66 Op. cit. pp. 125–6. Cf. *Muḥkam*, p. 20.

67 Abbott, *Rise of the North*, p. 41 and p. 59.

68 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, pp. 14–5.

69 Déroche, *Abbasid*, p. 22; cf. his description of four eighth century folios in which physical distinctions relating to the use of markers and verse endings vary considerably, pp. 30–3.

70 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 11. Cf. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*, ed. Muḥammad Salīm Hāshim (2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, n.d.).

71 Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh ibn Muslim ibn Qutayba, *Ta'wīl mushkil al-Qur'ān*, ed. Aḥmad Ṣaqr, 2nd edn (Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, 1973), p. 70, see editor's notes; this is also outlined in Anbārī's *Risālat al-mushkil*, which included a refutation of Ibn Qutayba. See Lecomte's *Le traité des divergences du ḥadīth* (Institute Français de Damas, 1962). Rivalry between the two is palpable in his *Kitāb al-aḍḍād*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Beirut, Sidon: al-Maktabat al-'Aṣriyya, 1987), pp. 93, 95, 186f, 226f, 241, 308.

72 Abū'l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad ibn Fāris ibn Zakariyyā, *al-Šāhibī fī fiqh al-luḡa al-'arabiyya wa sunan al-'Arab fī kalāmihā*, ed. Aḥmad Ṣaqr (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyya, n.d.), pp. 10–15.

73 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 1, p. 602.

74 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 9.

75 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 2, p. 340.

76 Dānī, *Muqni'*, p. 72 and p. 79; also note his observations regarding the orthography of Ibrāhīm as found in the codices, p. 92 and p. 34.

77 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, pp. 8–9.

78 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 2, p. 2.

79 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, pp. 8–9.

80 Loc. cit.

81 Farrā', *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*, vol. 1, pp. 172–3. And vol. 3, p. 71. Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sab'a fī'l-qirā'āt*, ed. Shawqī Ḍayf, 2nd edn (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1400 A.H.), pp. 188–9.

82 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sab'a fī'l-qirā'āt*, p. 236.

83 See Part 1 of this article, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1 (2003), pp. 64–5. The liturgical significance of scripture can be gauged in William Graham, *Beyond the Written Word: Oral*

Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987). See also William Graham, 'Qur'ān as Spoken Word: an Islamic Contribution to the Understanding of Scripture' in R. Martin (ed.), *Approaches to Islam in Religious Studies* (University of Arizona Press, 1985), pp. 23–40.

84 John Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

85 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 410.

86 Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, vol. 1, pp. 182–3. Cf. Sīrāfī, *Akhbār al-naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad al-Bannā (Cairo: Dār al-ʿItisām, 1985), p. 44.

87 Muḥammad al-Jumāhī ibn Sallām, *Ṭabaqāt fuḥūl al-shuʿarāʾ*, ed. Ṭahā Aḥmad Ibrāhīm (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1988), p. 32.

88 Sībawayhi uses the term 'they' (*al-nās*), which probably suggests he is referring to Baṣran readers.

89 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 33.

90 Abū Bishr ʿAmr ibn ʿUthmān Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Hārūn (5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Jil, 1991), vol. 1, p. 148.

91 Ibn Sallām, *Ṭabaqāt*, p. 30.

92 Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn Khālawayhi, *Mukhtaṣar fī shawādh al-Qurʾān* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Mutanabbī, n.d.), p. 134. Cf. Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, vol. 1, p. 148.

93 Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar*, p. 162.

94 Loc. cit.

95 R. Talmon, 'Who was the First Grammarian?', p. 143.

96 Sīrāfī, *Akhbār al-naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn*, pp. 43f.

97 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 613.

98 Loc. cit.

99 Loc. cit.

100 Ibn Khālawayhi, *Mukhtaṣar*, p. 65.

101 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 41.

102 Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar*, p. 148.

103 ʿAbd al-Wāḥid ibn ʿAlī Abū Ṭayyib, *Marātib al-naḥwiyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Maktabat Nahḍat Miṣr, 1955), p. 23; and Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 42.

104 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 519.

105 *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), pp. 524–5. See also his unpublished PhD thesis for a discussion of the alleged contributors to Sībawayhi's thought: 'A Study of Sībawayhi's Principles of Grammatical Analysis' (1968), Chapter 1. Also see Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar*. See Chapter 5, pp. 160–90, esp. pp. 162–3.

106 Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar*, p. 205.

107 See Part 1 of this article, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1 (2003), p. 51.

108 Op. cit. pp. 50f.

109 H. Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam: The Authenticity of Muslim Literature from the Formative Period* (London: Curzon Press, 2000), pp. 73–8 and pp. 114–18.

110 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, pp. 41–2. Mujāhid had an *ikhtiyār* in readings.

111 Op. cit. vol. 1, pp. 425–6.

112 Op. cit. vol. 1, pp. 443–4.

113 Op. cit. vol. 1, p. 443–4; *Maʿrifā*, vol. 1, p. 71. Ibn Mujāhid reports that the Baṣran Ḥammād ibn Salama, a mentor of Sībawayhi, had narrated aspects of Ibn Kathīr's *ḥurūf*. He was viewed as Abū ʿAmr's equal in terms of his knowledge of grammar, although once again an initial Meccan link is significant.

114 Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qaṣṭalānī, *Laṭāʾif al-ishārāt li-funūn al-qirāʾāt*, vol. 1, p. 181. See endnote 142 below and note the different distinctions in the types of instruction: *ʿarḍ*, *qirāʾa*, *samāʿ*, *talqīn*, *riwāya*: see Part 1 of this article, *Journal of Qurʾanic Studies* 5:1 (2003), pp. 60–1. Cf. Paul Kahle, 'The Arabic Readers of the Qurʾan', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 8 (April, 1949), pp. 65–71.

115 S. Sālim, *ʿĪsā Ibn ʿUmar al-Thaqafī: naḥwuhu min khilāl qirāʾatihi* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-ʿAlamī; Baghdad: Dār al-Tarbiyya, 1975).

116 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 65.

117 Loc. cit.

118 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, p. 167.

119 Abū Ṭayyib, *Marātib al-naḥwiyyīn*, pp. 100–1. And Dānī, *Muḥkam*, pp. 8–9.

120 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, pp. 73f.

121 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, pp. 73f. Cf. Talmon 'An Eighth-Century Grammatical School in Medinah', pp. 232–34.

122 Talmon, 'An Eighth-Century Grammatical School in Medinah', pp. 224–36.

123 Abū Ṭayyib, *Marātib al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 25.

124 Kamāl al-Dīn Abū ʿl-Barakāt ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat al-alibbāʾ fī ṭabaqāt al-udabāʾ*, p. 30. And Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 3, p. 348.

125 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 288–92.

126 Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 39.

127 For a full survey of quotations and teachers see G. Troupeau, *Lexique-index du Kitāb Sībawayhi* (Paris: 1976) pp. 227–31. Cf. Carter, 'Sībawayhi', p. 524; and Kees Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qurʾanic Exegesis in Early Islam* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), p. 17.

128 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, ed. R. Tajaddud, 3rd edn (Beirut: Dār al-Masīra, 1988), p. 46; and Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt ʿalā anbāh al-nuḥāt*, vol. 4, pp. 125f. A survey of his works is provided in ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad al-Aṣṭā, *Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlā: al-lughawī wa ʿl-naḥwī* (Tripoli: Dār al-Jamāhīriyya, 1986), pp. 81–9.

129 Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat*, pp. 101–4 and Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt*, vol. 2, pp. 30–6. Cf. Ibn Durayd's work *Jamharat al-lughā*, vol. 3, pp. 1274–337. And the section on *abwāb al-nawādir*. The contributions of early authorities can be viewed in Suyūṭī's synoptic references to *nawādir* in *al-Muzhir fī ʿulūm al-lughā wa anwāʿihā*, ed. M.A. Jād al-Mawlā, A.M. al-Bijāwī & M.A. Ibrāhīm (2 vols. Cairo: Dār Ihyaʾ al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya, 1970), vol. 2, pp. 275–7.

130 Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt*, vol. 4, p. 125, and Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 39.

131 Versteegh, 'Arabic Grammar and Corruption of Speech', pp. 143f.

132 Maʿmar ibn al-Muthannā Abū ʿUbayda, *Majāz al-Qurʾān*, ed. Fuʾād Sezgin, 2nd edn (2 vols. Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1981), vol. 2, p. 21.

133 Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, vol. 2, pp. 293–4.

134 Op. cit. p. 183.

- 135 Op. cit. vol. 2, pp. 293–4.
- 136 Loc. cit.
- 137 Loc. cit.
- 138 Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, vol. 3, pp. 159–60.
- 139 Abū Jaʿfar al-Naḥḥās, *Iʿrāb al-Qurʾān*, vol. 4, p. 437.
- 140 See Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Naṣhr fī l-qirʾāt al-ʿaṣhr*, vol. 1, pp. 8–9 in which a similar hierarchical structure is presented in the prolegomenon to his book of ten readings.
- 141 For a discussion of the role and function played by such works see Chase Robinson, *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), although he is concerned principally with history. See also Michael Cooper, *Classical Arabic Biography: The Heirs of the Prophet in the Age of al-Maʾmūn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). George Makdisi, 'Ṭabaqāt-Biography: Law and Orthodoxy in Classical Islam', *Islamic Studies* (Islamabad) (1993:32), pp. 371–96.
- 142 Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, *Maʿrifat al-qurrāʾ al-kibār*, ed. M. Jād al-Ḥaqq, 1st edn (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Ḥadītha, 1968) henceforth *Maʿrifa*, vol. 1, p. 49 (although *riwāya* does not necessarily signify direct contact), in which Ibn ʿAyyāsh is confused with Abū l-Aswad.
- 143 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 442–3 and vol. 1, pp. 253–4 and p. 425.
- 144 Op. cit. vol. 1, p. 314.
- 145 Op. cit. vol. 1, p. 235.
- 146 Abū l-Bilād al-Naḥwī is quoted once in Farrāʾ's *Maʿānī*; adducing poetry to support the phenomenon of *addād* (antonyms). Ibn al-Jazarī stated that Yahyā ibn Abī Sulaym Abū l-Bilād al-Naḥwī was renowned for having an *ikhtiyār* in readings. Citing Dānī, he relates that this *ikhtiyār* was predominantly based on *qiyās ʿarabiyya*, which is remarkable given his early period; he was a contemporary of Ḥaḍramī. It is with these Kūfāns that we have the earliest documented proof of a radical bent; however, this seemingly substantiates distinctions separating grammarians from readers.
- 147 This can be contrasted with late Kūfan figures such as Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb and Ḥumrān ibn Aʿyan whose adherence to precedents is resolute. See Part 1 of this article, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1 (2003), pp. 68–9. Dhahabī, *Maʿrifa*, vol. 1, p. 52.
- 148 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 349.
- 149 Ibn Qutayba, *Taʾwīl mushkil al-Qurʾān*, p. 51. Note John Burton's examination of this reader's conventions in his article 'Linguistic errors in the Qurʾān', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 33 (1988), pp. 181–96. A refutation of aspects of this article is offered by M.A.S. Haleem in 'Grammatical Shift for Rhetorical Purposes: *Itifāt* and Related Features in the Qurʾān', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 55:3 (1992), pp. 407–32.
- 150 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, pp. 46–8.
- 151 Op. cit. p. 48.
- 152 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 644. He is referred to as the 'ninth' reader.
- 153 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, pp. 386–9.
- 154 *Maʿrifa*, vol. 1, p. 130.
- 155 Shams al-Dīn Abī ʿAbd Allāh al-Muqaddasī, *Kitāb Aḥsan al-taqāsīm fī maʿrifat al-aqālīm* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, n.d.), p. 128. See also Shams al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Muqaddasī, *The Best Divisions for Knowledge of the Regions (Aḥsan al-taqāsīm fī maʿrifat al-aqālīm)*, trans. Basil Collins, Great Books of Islamic Civilization (Reading: Garnet Publishing, 2001), p. 107.

- 156 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fi'l-qirā'āt al-ʿashr*, vol. 1, p. 43.
- 157 He reviewed his readings with Sallām ibn Sulaymān, Kisāʾī and Ḥusayn al-Juʿfī. See Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 172–3.
- 158 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifā*, vol. 1, p. 123.
- 159 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 644.
- 160 G. Troupeau, *Lexique-index du kitāb Sībawayhi* (Paris, 1976), pp. 227–31.
- 161 Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat*, p. 45 and Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 47. Also see *Early Medieval Arabic: Studies on al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad*, ed. Karin Ryding (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1998). Also note Wolfgang Reuschel's *al-Ḥalīl Ibn Aḥmad, der Lehrer Sībawaihs, als Grammatiker* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959); Stefan Wild, *Das Kitāb al-ʿAyn und die arabische Lexikographie* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965).
- 162 See Ramzi Baalbaki, 'Kitāb al-ʿAyn and Jamharat al-lughā' in *Early Medieval Arabic*, pp. 44–62. Cf. Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn* (and *Muzhir*, vol. 2, pp. 77–92, for Suyūṭī's defence). The ascription of this work to Khalīl was disputed by many of his linguist contemporaries, although the theoretical framework for the treatise is consistently seen as his proposition.
- 163 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 48.
- 164 Dānī, *Muḥkam*, pp. 8–9.
- 165 For their use in non-Qurʾanic manuscripts see Geoffrey Khan, *Bills, Letters and Deeds: Arabic Papyri of the 7th to 11th Centuries* (London: Nour Foundation in association with Azimuth Editions & Oxford University Press, 1993).
- 166 Carter, 'Sībawayhi', p. 525; cf. M.G. Carter, art. 'Arabic Grammar' in *Cambridge History of Arabic Literature. Religion, Learning and Science in the Abbasid Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 121f.
- 167 Carter, *Language and Communication* 5:4 (1985), pp. 265–72, p. 266.
- 168 M.G. Carter, 'Les Origines de la Grammaire Arabe', *Arabica* 40 (1972), pp. 69–97, pp. 84–5. And see 'An Arab Grammarian of the Eighth Century A.D.', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93 (1973), pp. 146–57, p. 147.
- 169 Op. cit. p. 86. Cf. Carter, 'A Study of Sībawayhi's Principles of Grammatical Analysis', Chapter 3, *passim*.
- 170 Sībawayhi, *al-Kitāb*, vol. 3, pp. 100–1.
- 171 Ramzi Baalbaki, 'Tawahhum: An Ambiguous Concept in Early Arabic Grammar', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 45:2 (1982), pp. 233–44. See esp. his examination of this line of poetry on p. 236. Cf. Yishai Peled, 'Aspects of the Use of Grammatical Terminology in the Medieval Arabic Grammatical Tradition' in Y. Suleiman (ed.), *Arabic Grammar and Linguistics* (Richmond: Curzon, 1999), pp. 50–85.
- 172 Farrāʾ, *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, vol. 2, p. 98.
- 173 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*.
- 174 Sīrāfī, *Akhbār al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 51.
- 175 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 652.
- 176 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 652, and Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 48.
- 177 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 2, p. 353; cf. Sīrāfī, *Akhbār al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 66. Note that Carter has a number of reservations about this. An obvious parallel exists in respect of Salama ibn ʿĀṣim's role in transmitting Farrāʾ's *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān* and his *Hudūd*, having dictated the texts during various sittings. See Qifṭī, *Inbāḥ al-ruwāt*, vol. 2, pp. 56–7.

Muḥammad ibn Jahm al-Simmārī is also significant as a *rāwī* of Farrāʾ's *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*: Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 620.

178 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 3, p. 385. Abū'l-Ḥasan Saʿīd ibn Masʿada Akhfash al-Awsaṭ, *Maʿānī al-Qurʾān*, ed. Fāʾiz Fāris, 3rd edn (2 vols. Kuwait: Dār al-Bashīr, 1981). Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt*, vol. 2, pp. 36–43.

179 Sīrāfi, *Akhbār al-naḥwiyyīn*, p. 66.

180 Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar*, p. 14.

181 Carter, 'Sibawayhi', see esp. p. 524 and p. 529. Cf. Jonathan Owens, *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory: Heterogeneity and Standardization*, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science (Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V., 1990), pp. 214–17 and pp. 227–8. This text provides a perceptive analysis of the grammatical features and distinctions employed in classical source material and therefore facilitates an understanding of methodology, terminology and theory. Also see G. Humbert, *Les voies de la transmission du Kitāb de Sibawayhi* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995).

182 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 4, p. 505.

183 Op. cit. vol. 5, p. 486. See AGQE, p. 14 for a review of Monique Bernard's view: her text M. Bernards, *Changing Traditions: al-Mubarrad's Refutation of Sibawayh and the Subsequent Reception of the Kitāb* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997). She also includes the text of Ibn Wallad's *Kitāb al-Intiṣār*. Cf. Ahmad Mukhtār Omar, 'Grammatical Studies in Early Egypt' 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. 239–51.

184 This final text will be spoken about in the forthcoming article mentioned below.

185 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 56; it should be noted that this work is also listed under the alternative title of *Ihtijāj al-qirāʾāt*.

186 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 341. Yāqūt is quoting from Marzubānī (296–384/908–95) whose text survives only in an abbreviated form. Yāqūt may have had recourse to the original. See the introduction to R. Sellheim, *Die Gelehrtenbiographien des Abū ʿUbaydallāh al-Marzubānī in der Rezension des Ḥāfiẓ al-Yaghmurī*, Bibliotheca Islamica (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1964).

187 Cf. extended list of works reported in Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt*, vol. 2, pp. 295–6.

188 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, p. 602.

189 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 3, p. 385. Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt*, vol. 2, pp. 36–43.

190 Op. cit. vol. 5, p. 93.

191 Baalbaki's unpublished PhD thesis, 'A Study of the Analytical Methods of the Arab Grammarians of the 2nd and 3rd Centuries' (1979), see Chapters 3 and 4.

192 Owens, *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory*, pp. 214f. This includes even the text attributed to Khalaf al-Aḥmar (d. 180/796) which has been the subject of much debate (see Versteegh, AGQE, p. 15. See also Baalbaki, 'The Book in the Grammatical Tradition: Development in Contents and Methods' in G. Atiyeh (ed.), *The Book in the Islamic World* (New York: State University of New York, 1995), p. 127).

193 Loc. cit.

194 Versteegh, *Greek Elements*, pp. 55–6; pp. 99–101; pp. 111–12.

195 Baalbaki, 'A Study of the Analytical Methods', see Chapters 3 and 4; also Baalbaki's 'The Treatment of *qirāʾāt* by the Second and Third Century Grammarians', *Zeitschrift für arabische*

Linguistik 15 (Wiesbaden, 1985), pp. 11–32, reproduced in A. Rippin (ed.), *The Qur'an: Formative Interpretation* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1999). Cf. Yasir Suleiman, *The Arabic Grammatical Tradition: A Study in Ta'wil* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999) for a study of terms such as *samā'* and *qiyās*, esp. pp. 13–58. The situation is summed up by Yazīdī through a number of verses of poetry cited by Sīrāfī. He describes the Baṣrans as basing their analogies of language on the diction of eloquent Bedouins; while the Kūfans would adduce the 'aberrations of the vulgar'. Sīrāfī, '*Akhbār*', pp. 60–1. See also Baalbaki, 'The Book in the Grammatical Tradition', pp. 123–39.

196 M. Makhzūmī, *Madrasat al-Kūfa wa manhajuhā fī dirāsāt al-lughā wa'l-naḥw*, 2nd edn (Cairo: Maṭba'at Muṣṭafā al-Bābī, 1958). See pp. 161–6; pp. 260–76; pp. 303–16.

197 Carter, 'Sībawayhi', pp. 528f.

198 Carter, 'Arabic Grammar', p. 126.

199 Michael Carter, 'The Struggle for Authority: A Re-examination of the Baṣran Kūfan Debate' in Lutz Edzard & Mohammed Nekroumi (eds), *Tradition and Innovation: Norm and Deviation in Arabic and Semitic Linguistics* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999), pp. 55–70.

200 Carter, 'The Struggle for Authority', pp. 57f. The accentuation of parity between *naḥw* and *qiyās* is stressed by later Baṣran grammarians: see Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Ighrāb fī jadal al-i'c-rāb wa Luma' al-adilla fī uṣūl al-naḥw* (two treatises), ed. Sa'īd al-Afghānī (Damascus: Maṭba'at al-Jāmi'a al-Sūriyya, 1957).

201 Loc. cit. See also p. 68.

202 See my forthcoming article 'Religious Orthodoxy and the Kūfan Linguistic Tradition: Theological Dimensions of the Linguists' Approach to Language'.

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.