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

The activities of these readers presupposed not only the immutable status of scripture but equally enshrined its genuine devotional value. These readers saw themselves as guardians of the Qur’anic diction and their approach to scripture was regulated by a resolute principle: the ascendancy of the declaration that ‘al-qirā’a sunna’: namely that Qur’anic readings which were enshrined in subtle linguistic configurations of the
holy text were based on established precedents, a precept which was to be assiduously
applied when authenticating the integrity of the lectiones of scripture. However,
there does emerge from the ranks of these readers a number of figures who pursued
a seemingly more theoretical exposition of linguistic features of the readings of scruti-
puture; thus, where previously many readers devoted themselves to the operational
aspects of preserving the dictum of scripture as embodied in the corpus of qirāʿāt,
there were others who sought to contemplate their linguistic justification and indulge
in speculative grammatical projection. Within this framework, the sacrosanct status of
scripture was never questioned; indeed, the literary conventions of the Qurʾan were
imperiously deemed the ultimate criterion of linguistic eloquence.2

However, the instruments of linguistic thought developed to scrutinise and justify
the linguistic characteristics and idiosyncrasies inherent in the corpus of Qurʾanic
readings were simultaneously referenced to sources of a more profane nature: this
included poetry and material derived from Bedouin informants. Aspiring reader-
grammarians developed models of language analysis based on this material. These
models become a principal standard for grammar. More controversially, one of the
implications of this ‘transition’ was that Qurʾanic readings which contravened pre-
scriptive linguistic conventions were the subject of criticism and in telling cases emen-
dation was proposed. Significantly, there was no sinister motive behind such linguistic
deliberation, merely a resolved fascination with the phenomenon of language; it para-
doxically served to propel Arabic linguistic thought. Indeed, the corollary of this per-
ceptibly more abstract approach to the language of scripture heralded the gradual
emergence of the linguistic traditions of Kūfa and Baṣra. These developed schools
were to place Arabic linguistic abstraction on an entirely different plane, symbolising
the separation between the old functional tradition of the readers and a more dynamic
approach championed by linguists, an approach which sought to cultivate a more
general theory of language, but one which claimed to be pertinent to the service of
scripture. The forms of writing typically associated with luminaries of the reading tra-
dition were not summarily discarded. On the contrary, they were retained and devel-
oped by scholars of the linguistic traditions of Kūfa and Baṣra. Indeed, in addition to
producing literature which symbolised the efforts to develop a systematic and coher-
ent theory of language, these scholars composed works on naqf, iʿjām, hijāʾ, al-waqf
waʿl-ibtidāʾ, idghām, hamz, ikhtilāf al-maṣāḥif, wujūh al-qirāʿāt, gharīb al-Qurʾān,
lughat al-Qurʾān; they were effectively supplanting the readers as the ultimate author-
ities in these areas of scholarship. And this was to continue over the ensuing centuries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is the case that Talmon’s engaging synthesis of the methods used by Baṣrān historians to enhance the ancestral status and historical depth of their tradition by incorporating the linguistic contributions of figures outside of Baṣra does explain certain contradictions in these accounts, particularly when mention is made of the first figure to invent ‘grammar’ and in other instances when non-Baṣrān figures from the qurrāʾ are spoken of as Baṣrāns; he believed that the Baṣrān biographical reports had to diminish the importance of learning centres outside of Iraq. However, the purpose of accentuating the Baṣrān tradition was, according to Talmon, to emphasise the Arabs’
saliency in the ‘sophisticated branch of studies in their own language’. TALMON presupposes that it would be sheer opprobrium to admit to foreign influences in this discipline. It is not clear whether Talmon was referring to the suppression of the role of non-Arabs such as the mawâli in developing the linguistic tradition or the ‘extrinsic’ traditions of antiquity. This is because Talmon refers to the fact that five of the earliest Arabic grammarians, who are of mawâli origin and all implicated in the earliest biographical reports as prominent in the development of the linguistic tradition, were subsequently credited with a significantly reduced contribution to the discipline. However, the role of the mawâli was certainly not denied by any of the biographical accounts; thus this point is minor. The other notion floated by Talmon suggested that the linguistic sciences were secular disciplines and therefore accuracy in relating the history of this discipline was never critical; however, such a statement is rather presumptuous given the design, function and development of Arabic linguistic thought.

According to Michael Carter, the tradition of Arabic grammar had developed independently of foreign influences. He presented the theory that Sibawayhi had extended his skills as a lawyer, transposing the methodology and concepts of Islamic law into the field of grammar. He felt that the terminology of the Kitâb and its structure were entwined in the tradition of fiqh. Moreover, where fiqh formulated rules for human behaviour; nahw formulated rules for linguistic behaviour, albeit in a descriptive context. Carter employed a sophisticated argument which cited ethical paradigms. He argued that while ethics commended acts of human behaviour on the basis of what was proper and fitting, nahw commended that which was appropriate within a linguistic context, namely, how one should speak. Ex hypothesi, the grammarians had taken the ethical notions of hasan, ghabîh, mustaquant and muhâlî and defined them within the contexts of grammar. The assumption here is that there is a salient ethical dimension inherent in Islamic jurisprudence. Carter dismissed the value of the biographical accounts in determining the development of this tradition, arguing that they did not forward sufficient information to enable one to reconstruct the theoretical endeavours of the first linguists. The figures mentioned in the biographical reports as having been instructors to Sibawayhi and his peers were regarded by Carter as unimportant in terms of the linguistic theories elaborated in the Kitâb. However, these biographical reports comprise much which elucidates intricate aspects of early Arabic linguistic thought. The same stock of biographical reports allude to the positive influence of the discipline of fiqh on grammar. Carter did accept that the earliest nahwiyûn were familiar with ‘the basic descriptive terminology of grammar, possibly through Greek or Syriac influences’. However, he claimed that such an influence was not discernible in Sibawayhi’s Kitâb. Carter does state that the Techmê of Dionysus Thrax had been translated into Syriac, and further logical material was readily available. He therefore accepted a locus for the transmission of Hellenistic
erudition. Nevertheless, the essence of Carter’s premise centres upon the Kitāb representing a break with the conventions adhered to by Sibawayhi’s peers, who may have acquainted themselves informally with Greek techniques.

Andrew Rippin meanwhile has questioned Versteegh’s synthesis of the origins of Arabic linguistic thought and the presumed influence of the exegetical tradition. Citing John Wansbrough’s chronological–stylistic framework for the classification of early Arabic literature, Rippin argued that the history of Arabic grammar could not be accurately reconstructed using the exegetical treatises examined by Versteegh, adding that the nature of the exegesis practised in these texts was decidedly posterior to the periods from which they were alleged to have emanated. Furthermore, Rippin contended that such activity presupposes the existence of a canonical religious text; however, the whole purpose of the earliest forms of Arabic literature was to establish the canonical status of the Qur’an. Accordingly, Rippin’s argument is as follows: it was not possible to determine grammar’s historical provenance through a labyrinth of material which had been subjected to editorial reformulation and interpolation, particularly when its historical development hinged on the technical value of a single phrase or term. It naturally follows that Rippin dismisses Versteegh’s view that differences in the respective terminology of the Kufan and Basran schools corroborate the notion of two separate schools of linguistics. It appears that the relative sophistication of this tradition from an early period, as shown by Versteegh, has obvious ramifications for the theories of Wansbrough: it sanctions greater historical depth to the canonical status of the Qur’an. However, if Sibawayhi’s Kitāb were to be seen as the proper starting point for the scientific investigation of language, then the findings of Versteegh are less significant. Rippin does point to the relevance of the views of Carter regarding the fictive nature of these two schools and the fact that one is possibly dealing with a difference between two thinkers as opposed to discrete schools of thought on grammar; Rippin adds that Carter was ‘following a strong tradition in the study of grammar’ and that this begins with Gotthold Weil. Nevertheless, in endorsing this latter approach, Rippin has missed a critical point: Carter’s thesis endeavours to prove that Sibawayhi was the real architect of Arabic linguistic abstraction, and to achieve this he had to explain away the significance of the term nahw, dismissing that it might connote grammatical prior to its appropriation by Sibawayhi. However, Talmon has demonstrated that Sibawayhi himself refers to the activities of nahwiyyūn in his Kitāb, which creates something of a quandary for the gist of Carter’s thesis, a fact to which he readily concedes. Moreover, Carter’s thesis apropos the originality of Arabic linguistic thought is hardly conducive to a Wansbroughian theory of early Arabic literature. Indeed, the classical material used by Weil and upon which his synthesis was based was far more subjective than the erstwhile texts which formed the core of Versteegh’s research.
Weil structured his study of the Başran and Küfan traditions on an analysis of the material adduced in the work of the Başran grammarian Ibn al-Anbārī (513–77/1118–81), *al-Insāf fi masā’il al-khilāf bayna’l-nahwīyīn al-Basriyyīn wa’l-Kūfīyīn*. This was a work purporting to present a dispassionate survey of the classical grammatical opinions of Başran and Küfan grammarians. The *Insāf* would introduce a topic on which there are conflicting grammatical interpretations, offering a general appraisal of the Başran and Küfan perspectives. Ibn al-Anbārī would then summarily draw conclusions as to the accuracy of the expressed opinions. The work comprises 121 topics chosen to represent a cross-section of analysis derived from the corpuses of the Başran and Küfan traditions. The Başrans’ perspective was emphatically endorsed in no less than 114 topics; however, the Küfans’ views were deemed correct on only seven occasions. The work confirmed the hegemony achieved by Başrans in Arabic linguistic thought. Weil argued in his lengthy introduction to the *Insāf* that representatives of supposedly distinct and opposing linguistic traditions such as Sibawayhi and Farrā’; or indeed, Tha’lab (d. 291/904) and Mubarrad (d. 285/898), never had the occasion to meet. He claimed that the *masā’il* or Streitfragen were formulated by linguists of a decidedly later period. Weil suggested that in reality there was only one tradition of language studies: the Küfans were invented as worthy opponents. Indeed, it has been suggested that the systematisation of Arabic grammar created a superfluity in anomalous and irregular material and this was consciously ascribed to a fictional and hypothetical body labelled the Küfans. Weil dismissed the reliability of the biographical accounts of the linguists, claiming that they were exposed to fabrication and invention.

Monique Bernards has recently assessed the whole concept of *madhāhib* within the early Arabic linguistic tradition, and she concludes that the Başran grammarian Mubarrad was the figure who projected the concept of a distinct school of Başran grammar, designating Sibawayhi’s *Kitāb* the kernel of grammatical studies. Bernards claimed that grammatical disagreements between figures of allegedly opposing traditions were often less divergent than those between members of the same school. Bernards does differentiate between two definitions of what constitutes a school: the first definition points to the adaptation of similar methodologies and principles; while the second is based on social criteria such as living in the same region, having the same academic lineage and sharing an extensive network of contacts. She concluded that the second definition should be applied to the Arabic linguistic tradition and its so-called schools, adding that the biographical accounts had not deliberately accentuated the notion of two separate traditions, but uniformly expedited the principle of categorisation: scholars were classified according to geographical and genealogical factors. Bernards added that the dichotomous nature of the traditions of Küfa and Başra was engendered by these innocuous processes. However, in suggesting that there was no methodological distinction between the Küfan and
Başran traditions before the late third/ninth century, Bernards has not taken into account Versteegh’s analysis of several early Qur’anic commentaries. Moreover, to maintain that the division of schools was based on geographical considerations defies the scholarly differences articulated on the subjects of grammar and philology, the discrete approaches to analysis of language, and trends in relation to literary output, which all combine to distinguish the two conventional schools of the Arabic linguistic tradition; furthermore, the linguists also composed khilâf-type texts in which they catalogued grammatical differences among grammarians. The amenability of the sources to such a multiplicity of interpretations predicates that it is perhaps prudent to follow the divisions adhered to by the classical biographers.

The Kûfan Grammarians

The two prominent personalities of early Kûfan grammar are ‘Alî ibn Ḥamza al-Kisâ’î and Yahyâ ibn Ziyâd al-Farrâ’. The derived grammatical thought of these two figures forms an integral core of the grammatical teachings of what was recognised as the ‘Kûfan’ linguistic tradition. Later generations of Kûfans specifically linked with Kisâ’î and Farrâ’ went on to compose grammatical treatises and tracts which complemented and consolidated many aspects of these figures’ scholarship. Farrâ’’s composition, Ma’ânî al-Qur’ân, is one of the earliest remnants of this Kûfan linguistic legacy. And one is able to discern through the Ma’ânî the highly technical nature of his grammatical discourse. Dévényi’s painstaking survey of references to grammarians and Qur’anic readers in this text demonstrates that Kisâ’î is the ‘preeminent grammmarian’ for Farrâ’: his linguistic opinions are subject to review, resolution, and, on occasions, critical analysis. Farrâ’’s Ma’ânî leaves its reader with the distinct impression that there existed in Kûfa, Baṣra and Hijâz a rich and diverse tradition of language erudition. Dévényi did argue that because the Qur’an was the focal point of Farrâ’’s work, references to readers abounded, and with the exception of Kisâ’î, there is a ‘meagre presence of grammarians’ in this book; as noted previously, Versteegh took the view that Kûfans focused on ma’ânî type expositions of the Qur’an, but neither of these views takes into account the deliberate design and purpose of the ma’ânî works and the import attached to linguistic thought in the approach to authenticating scripture; likewise, from an examination of the network of mentor–student relationships, it is evident that the origin of this type of radical thought betrays a Başran nexus: the tendency to employ a radical model of ‘arabiyya in the authentication of scripture buttressed with references to poetic shawâhid has its provenance in the study-circles of luminaries of the early Başran linguistic tradition, as we shall see. Moreover, grammarians were distinguished by virtue of their willingness to apply this radical model when analysing the linguistic configurations of scripture; readers favoured a reliance upon authenticated narration. The fine distinction in approaches resulted in intractable tension between readers and grammarians.
The biographical literature of linguists identifies two figures as linguistic mentors of Kisāʿī and Farrāʾ, and they are referred to in his Maʿānī. Abū Jaʿfar al-Ruṣāsī and Muʿādh al-Harrānī (d. 188/804). This literature reports that Ruṣāsī is the author of a text entitled Maʿānī al-Qurʾān, a text on diminution; two texts on pauses and points of inception in Qurʾānic recitation: al-Waqq al-kabīr and al-Waqq al-saghir; and a treatise on plurals and singulars. It is claimed that he composed a tract on grammar which the renowned al-Khalil ibn Ahmad was supposed to have examined, a fact emphatically dismissed by the eminent Baṣrī ibn Darastawayhi (258–346/871–958). However, biographical reports of Baṣrī provenance do mention Ruṣāsī’s association with leading Baṣrīs, although in a negative light. Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī (d. 255/869), a prominent Baṣrī philologist, describes him as ‘denuded of all knowledge, a nobody’. Reference is also made to the so-called masāʾil of Ruṣāsī: it was supposed to be a work comprising grammatical definitions. The reader literature confirms that Ruṣāsī is linked to the leading Baṣrī reader and philologist Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ (d. 154/771) and that he transmitted his particular reading (ḥurūf). He is described as having his own ikhtiyār in readings and ṭuqīf. The term ikhtiyār indicates a selection of Qurʾānic readings drawn from what was a common stock of variants, and we shall return to gauge the technical significance of this term below. Dēvēni reported that Ruṣāsī is mentioned in the Maʿānī on seven occasions. On one such occasion, Ruṣāsī asks Abū ʿAmr to comment on the declension of the term sabaʾ in Q. 27:22, but Abū ʿAmr replies that ‘he has no knowledge therein’. Ruṣāsī is characterised by Farrāʾ as a pious man among the nahwiyūn. In a further instance Farrāʾ recounts the opinions of a figure named al-ʿAlāʾ ibn Sayāba whom he describes as ‘The person who taught Muʿādh and his companions’. Although Muʿādh al-Harrānī is identified by biographical accounts as an early Kūfī grammarian, he is rarely recalled in the source material to enable a satisfactory assessment of his importance, although it is noteworthy that he is identified by Farrāʾ. He is also viewed as the originator of ‘morphology’ (taṣrīf). The Insāf of Ibn al-Anbārī does associate him with a peculiar reading of Q. 19:45, which is the subject of much deliberation. Most intriguing of all is the fact that all the early source materials such as the biographical accounts of linguists, the reader literature, and primary source material such as Farrāʾ’s Maʿānī, always reveal a Baṣrī link which proves to be decisive in the way that features of the Baṣrī tradition’s approach to the linguistic justification and analysis of Qurʾānic readings are replicated by Kūfī luminaries.

Kisāʿī’s mentors are both Kūfī and Baṣrī. He influentially promulgates grammar and Qurʾānic readings in Baghdad, providing the Kūfīs with an important platform for establishing a tradition of linguistic thought in the capital. Marzubānī (296–384/908–95) reports that he was invited there by the caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd
Exploring the Genesis of Early Arabic Linguistic Thought

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

Kisāʾī has the following works attributed to him: Maʿānī al-Qurʾān, al-Mukhtāsar fiʿl-nahw, Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt, Kitāb al-ʿAdad, Kitāb Ikhtilāf al-ʿadad, Kitāb Maqtaʾ al-Qurʾān wa maṣūlihi, Kitāb al-Nawādir al-ṣaghir waʿl-kabīr, Kitāb al-Hijāʾ, Kitāb al-Maṣādīr, Kitāb Mā talḥān fīhi al-ʿāmma and Mutashābīh al-Qurʾān. The stock of themes expounded upon in these works intimates a close bond with the functional discipline of readers in which Kisāʾī was originally trained. Moreover, an examination of his own grammatical analyses in texts such as Farrāʾ's Maʿānī betrays a focused regard for the phenomenon of language, incisively distinguishing his own approach from that of his reader peers. It is the inclination of a linguist and not a reader which resonates in his analysis of the Qur'anic text. Farrāʾ obviously had recourse to Kisāʾī's works and, as noted by Dēvényi, he even refers to one particular work in his Maʿānī. An examination of the instances in which Kisāʾī brings to bear linguistic considerations when evaluating readings underlines the extent to which the Kūfan grammatical tradition had shifted from its reader foundations. Kisāʾī not only intrepidly referred to analogies with the speech patterns of the Arabs when examining a reading, but he applied the evaluation skills of a linguist to reject a reading. The inflection of verses Q. 16:40 and Q. 36:82: 'kun fa-yakūn(u) is an example of this. Farrāʾ deliberates upon the syntactic complexities of naṣb and raʿf readings, before commending a naṣb ending, fa-yakūn(a), in both verses of the Qurʾan. He tempers his acceptance of this reading by stating that the majority of the qurrāʾ favour raʿf. Moreover, he recalls that Kisāʾī rejected raʿf in both of these cases, despite its grammatical feasibility. Kisāʾī countenances a willingness to discard the former reading on what one can only presume were considerations of ʿarabiyya.

The issue here is not Kisāʾī's endorsement of the naṣb reading, but his rejection of the alternative; this is the precise dividing line separating grammarians from readers.
It is said that Kisâ'i deliberately selected ḥurâf from .Hourma's reading, choosing to exclude others: and yet his ikhtiyâr was, according to Ibn Mujâhid (245–324/859–935), well within the strictures of authenticated transmitted readings.61 Indeed, Khalaf ibn Hishâm (150–229/767–844) stated that he used to be present when Kisâ'i would recite the Qur'an and students would gather around adding dialectics to their codices.62 Dhahabi (d. 748/1347) recounted that on one such occasion Kisâ'i read Q. 18:34, inflecting the comparative form for naṣb; however, the authenticated reading was ṭaf. He was asked to explain the reasoning behind the naṣb reading and accepted that it was an inadvertent error, whereupon his students erased the pointing from their codices.63 The Kūfan qurrâ’ were effectively selecting from a corpus of predetermined readings: these were readings which could be traced to the early Kūfan tradition but were further augmented with readings from cities such as Baṣra, Medina and Mecca acquired through a network of itinerant mentors and students.

There are contemporaries of Kisâ'i who played a decisive role in disseminating Kūfan linguistic thought. ʿAlî ibn al-Mubârak al-Aḥmar (d. 194/810) was, according to Ibn al-Anbârî (260–328/874–939), the first to codify the works of Kisâ'î.64 Tha'lab remarks that Aḥmar memorised 40,000 pieces of poetic citation relating to grammatical argumentation, adding that he was considered more senior than Farrâ'.65 Indeed, it was suggested that Aḥmar replace Kisâ'î as head of the Kūfans' study-circle upon the latter's demise. However, Aḥmar's premature death allowed Farrâ' to succeed Kisâ'î. Another of Kisâ'î's associates, Hishâm ibn Mu'âwiya (d. 209/824), was the author of several treatises on grammar, including: al-Hudûd fi’l-ʿarabiyya, Mukhtaṣar fi’l-naḥw and Kitâb al-Qiyâs.66

The biographical literature places Farrâ' as the second senior figure among the Kūfans and it is by virtue of his extant text Ma‘ānî al-Qur‘ân that we are able to gauge the strength of Kūfan linguistic thought. He associated with leading Baṣrans, including Yûnis ibn Ḥabîb (d. 182/798), although once again later Baṣran linguists dismissed such links.67 The works attributed to Farrâ' include Kitâb al-Hudûd, a selection of grammatical definitions which was held in great esteem by Kūfans.68 The work was composed at the behest of Ma‘mûn and its outline is preserved in Ibn al-Nadîm’s Fihrist.69 The following works are ascribed to him: Ikhtilâf ahl al-Kūfa wa’l-Baṣra wa’l-Shām fi’l-maṣâḥif, Kitâb al-Jam’ wa’l-taḥṭiyya fi’l-Qur‘ân, Mā taḥfân fihi al-ʿammâ, Gharib al-hadîth, Kitâb Lughat al-Qur‘ân, al-Waqf wa’l-ibtidâ’, Ikhtilâf al-maṣâḥif, al-Maṣâdir fi’l-Qur‘ân, al-Mudhakkar wa’l-mu‘annath and al-Maqsûr wa’l-mamdu’d.70 Farrâ', like his mentor Kisâ'î, takes an active interest in the forms of authorship associated with the old reader tradition. However, when one contemplates the nature of linguistic thought found in the Ma‘ānî al-Qur‘ân, a distinctly different approach to the justification of scripture is discerned. This type of abstrac-
tion was never subscribed to by early Kufan readers. It is evident that there was a rich legacy of Kufan grammatical thought, developed initially by scholars associated with the reading tradition and then placed on an altogether insular plane by luminaries such as Ru\'asî, Kisâ\'i and Farrâ\': these figures identify a role for linguistic considerations in the procedures governing the linguistic justification of readings and in other areas of reader scholarship such as al-wa\'af wa'l-ibtidâ'. Kisâ\'i and Farrâ\' were both the authors of treatises which focused on general principles of grammar; and Ru\'asî was the putative author of the so-called Masâ'il. The scholarly interests of these grammarians extended well beyond the confines of scripture as shown by the comprehensive range of treatises attributed to them.

Abu\'l-\'Abbâs Tha\'lab fills the vacuum in the Kufan school left by the death of Farrâ\'. Interestingly, Tha\'lab had met neither Farrâ\' nor Kisâ\'; however, he excelled in memorising the literary legacy of his Kufan predecessors, deriving material from figures such as Muhammad ibn Qâdîm, who was an authority on the grammatical opinions of Ru\'asî, Kisâ\', Farrâ\' and Hishân.\textsuperscript{71} The Egyptian biographer Qif\'f asserts that Tha\'lab examined Farrâ\'s Hudûd at the age of eighteen: by the age of 25 he had not only memorised the sum of Farrâ\'s literary legacy, but he was able to relate the individual dicta to their places in the original texts.\textsuperscript{72} Zubaydî claimed that he could recount the opinions of his predecessors, although he was never able to expound upon their rationale, or hujja.\textsuperscript{73} Tha\'lab often met with his Basran counterpart Mubarrad to debate grammatical topics. It is suggested that in his encounters with Mubarrad, the latter figure always emerged victorious.\textsuperscript{74}

Rivalry between these two figures led Weil to conclude that the concept of two distinct linguistic traditions was forged in this atmosphere of competition and projected backwards, and yet one finds that biographical literature of Basran provenance records his association with leading Basran linguists in a positive light: he had contact with Ibn Sallâm al-Juma\'i (d. 232/847), Riyâshî (d. 257/870) and Athram (d. 232/847), transmitting many of their philological treatises.\textsuperscript{75} Tha\'lab wrote profusely composing over forty titles from exegetical treatises to monographs on poetry and philology, including his Kitâb al-Majâlis, Kitâb al-Fa\'sih and his treatise on grammar entitled al-Ma\'sûn fi’l-\'nahw.\textsuperscript{76} It is not insignificant that Tha\'lab’s contemporary, Mubarrad, was one of the first figures to produce a history of Basran grammarians, outlining the scholarly pedigree of his Basran predecessors; the text is not extant, although a Basran grammarian by the name of Sîrfâî (d. 368/979) composed a history of the school in which he quoted extensively from Mubarrad’s work.\textsuperscript{77} Indeed, subsequent histories penned by Basran linguists tended to dismiss the endeavours of Kufan linguists, attenuating earlier scholarly links between Kufans and Basrans. The Kufans were placed among the ranks of readers and equated with a dated approach to linguistic thought. The reality is not that rivalry between Tha\'lab
and Mubarrad leads to the projection of a mythical past for each of these traditions, as opponents vied to enhance the historical pedigree of their respective traditions, but rather that the imposing ascendancy of the Başran tradition overshadows the true extent of Küfan participation in linguistic thought. Nevertheless, this was symbolic because it resembled the way in which early readers, particularly the Küfans, were deliberately overlooked in the historical framework of the Arabic linguistic sciences. Even the Küfan grammarians began to disassociate themselves from these readers, mirroring the Başran rejection of scholariy links with their Küfan counterparts.

Küfan Readers in the Biographical Literature

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

The figure of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd (d. 32/677) is the revered eponym of the Küfan reading tradition. Early Küfan authorities such as Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh (d. 82/706), Aswad ibn Yazīd al-Nakhaʾi (d. 75/713), ʿAlqama ibn Qays (d. 62/681) and Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulami (d. ca 73–4/692–3) were recalled as having acquired their readings from this figure.79 He serves not only as a prominent source of Qur’anic readings but also as an authority of Küfan jurisprudence; nevertheless, other companion influences are also referred to in early source material. Thus one finds that Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh acquired his Qur’anic readings by way of review (ʿaraḍa) not only with Ibn Masʿūd, but also with ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān and ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib.80 The term ʿaraḍa implies a scrutinised review by a mentor of a student’s readings. This is derived from the occasion of the Prophet’s final review with the archangel Gabriel. Other methods of instruction included qirāʿa, samāʾ and riwāya.81 Biographical literature recalls that Aswad was instrumental in conveying
Ibn Mas'ūd’s rendition of the muṣḥaf to succeeding generations of Kūfans, for the latter figure had ‘reviewed’ Aswad’s readings.\(^{82}\) Alqama ibn Qays, who was an uncle of Aswad ibn al-Yazīd, also reviewed his readings with Ibn Mas'ūd and heard 'sami’ā' the readings of 'Ali, 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Abū Dardā' and 'Ā'isha.\(^{83}\) Having established the sources of the Kūfan reading tradition, the biographical literature then relates how subsequent generations of readers preserved this vast corpus of Qur’anic readings for posterity, placing specific emphasis upon its unique liturgical value.\(^{84}\)

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

The fact that ʿĀṣim was associated with the term nahwī seems to have perturbed the Baṣran Abū Ṭayyib (d. 351/962): he asserts that this figure may have been acquainted with some slight aspect of this science, but notes that his opinions are neither mentioned nor memorised.\(^{91}\) Here we have an excellent example in which the biographical literature of the linguists contradicts reader biographical accounts. Dévényi reports that he is mentioned in Farrāʾs Maʿānī on no less than 141 occasions.\(^{92}\) Ibn
Mujahid included ʿĀsim’s reading in his collection of seven authenticated readings, along with the readings of Ḥamza and Kiswa, reporting that it gained partial prominence because one of its transmitters, Ibn ʿAyyāsh, did not make himself available to those wishing to acquire it. Furthermore, it is confirmed that there were some 520 individual ‘hurūf’ of ʿĀsim’s reading concerning which Ibn ʿAyyāsh and Ḥafṣ ibn Sulaymān differed. Ḥafṣ settled in Baghdad, narrating ʿĀsim’s reading there, but he also travelled to Mecca and Medina. The biographical material states that the reading he derived from ʿĀsim had ʿAlī ibn Abī Tālib as its ultimate authority. However, once again the predominant theme which emerges from these standard accounts is the dominion of authenticated precedents: whenever it is reported that a reader selected only certain hurūf from a given mentor, it is implied that these were augmented with hurūf acquired from alternative authorities in readings: this conception is referred to as an ikhtiyār. That early readers might have codified the specific hurūf of their mentors is probable. Yahyā ibn ʿAdam does refer to his having recourse to a ‘kurrāsa’ or textbook which for 40 years had comprised the hurūf of ʿĀsim. Yahyā adds that Ibn ʿAyyāsh read them all to him ‘harf by harf’, and ‘so I vocalised them and confined them, recording their maʾānī alongside them, adhering to that which he related to me’. Ibn ʿAyyāsh asserted that ‘I have related these to you as they were taught to me by ʿĀsim harf by harf’.

Aspects of Early Reader Scholarship: Enumerating Codices

The enumeration of the number of verses in indigenous codices reflected one aspect of the functional approach to scripture developed by readers. Indeed, ʿĀsim is credited with a text on this subject. This form of authorship seems to have been initiated by Medinan readers: a work entitled Kitāb ʿAdad al-Madīnī al-awwal, and a further work entitled al-ʿAdad al-thānī, are linked with Nāfiʿ ibn Abī Nuʿaym (d. 169/785). Prior to this, Abī Allāh ibn ʿAyyāsh (d. 69/689), who was a respected authority on readings in Medina, is credited with the authorship of ʿAdad al-Madīnī al-awwal. This work is followed by al-ʿAdad al-akhīr of Ismaʿīl ibn Abī Kathīr (d. 180/796). Similarly titled works are credited to Meccan, Kūfī, Baṣrī and Syrian scholars. There were also works dividing the Qurʾān into ajzāʾ. Indeed, the division of the reader Humayd ibn Qays (d. 130/747) is referred to in Thālab’s Kitāb al-majālis: it demonstrates his meticulous division of the verses of the Qurʾān into measured parts, a process which facilitates memorisation. Suyūṭī’s Itqān has a section devoted to the enumeration of verses in codices. It provides further information on the nature of the ʿadad works. One such quotation refers to the differences concerning the number of verses in the indigenous codices of Medina, Mecca, Syria, Baṣra and Kūfah. The work corroborates the two counts, referred to above, of the Medinan codices. The first being carried out by the reader Abū Jaʿfar Yazīd al-Qaʾqāṣ (d. ca 127–8/744–5) and Shayba ibn Abī Niṣāḥ (d. 130/747); the second was carried out by Ismaʿīl ibn Jaʿfar.
There are further citations which refer to counts made by prominent readers and linked to companions. Thus the Damascene reader Ibn Āmir (d. 118/736) reports that the Syrian count was transmitted on the authority of Abī Dardā (d. 32 or 34/652 or 654). Suyūṭī asserts that the verses in the Baṣrāns’ codex were enumerated by Āṣim al-Jahdāri and that the Kūfāns’ codex was enumerated by three figures: Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb, Kisā’ī and Khalaf ibn Hishām. A second report by Ḥamza states that he was informed of the count of the Kūfān codex by Ibn Abī Laylā on the authority of Abī al-Rahmān al-Sulāmī, who was referred to as Alī ibn Abī Taḥlib. Intriguingly, Ibn al-Jazarī (751–833/1348–1429), on the authority of Yaḥyā ibn Ādam (d. 203/820), Āṣim’s conclusions the enigmatic ḥurūf al-muqattāʿa in his enumeration of Qur’anic verses, arguing that, for the purposes of a count, they did not constitute separate Qur’anic verses but rather they were composite parts of other verses. This contravened the position taken by other Kūfān readers who included these letters as separate verses in their counts.102 The whole purpose of such endeavours was to ensure the meticulous regulation of the physical confines of Qur’anic scripture derived from an essentially oral tradition. Furthermore, it was categorically interfaced with Uthmān’s dispatching of codices to the principal garrison towns.

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

amsār codices. Dānī states that Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ was asked concerning a feature of his reading of Q. 43:68 which was not substantiated by the Başran codices; Abū ʿAmr’s reply was that he was able to reference it to the transcribed codices of the Medinans.\(^{107}\)

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

Wansbrough made a number of observations concerning both variant readings and codices. He argued that they were ‘not genuinely independent of the ‘Uthmanic recension’, adding that ‘infinitesimal differences are not such as would seem to have necessitated a suppression of the non-‘Uthmanic versions, the more so since a minimal standard deviation from the canon was accommodated by the interpretation of the ahruf doctrine’.\(^{112}\) This view presupposes that the ahruf doctrine was purely arbitrary; and yet it was likewise governed by the strictures of precedent and this much is evident from the activity of early readers particularly in the formulation of hurūf and ikhtiyār. Consequently, these so-called ‘infinitesimal differences’ certainly had profound implications for the status of scripture and its relation to acts of worship. In addition Wansbrough refers to the amsār codices as not displaying the ‘differences either among themselves or from the ‘Uthmanic recension which are alleged to have provoked the editorial measures attributed to the third caliph’. Moreover, he declares that the tradition of separate amsār-variants ‘appears not to be more ancient than Farrāʾ or possibly than his teacher Kisāʾi’.\(^{113}\) Given the exactitude demanded in confirming the confines of scripture, the attention to infinitesimal detail was critical. The
grammarians’ interest in such literature would a fortiori have been preceded by reader treatment of the topic, corroborating the historical depth of such authorship: early readers had to be aware of the diminutive nature of differences among codices as they sought to regulate the devices of *harf* and *ihktiyār*. The scrupulous endeavours of early readers in respect of the enumeration of verses in codices and collating vari- ances therein formed a core around which the Arabic linguistic tradition developed. Moreover, by the era of Kisāʾī, Farrāʾ and Sībawayhi this tradition had systematically attained an exceptional level of sophistication. It also follows that the tension between readers and grammarians, despite the distinctly non-dogmatic nature of its origin, is proof of the early existence of a canonical codex. It is around this fixed text that the linguists attempted to advance their grammatical suppositions.

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

However, the voices of orthodoxy appeared to be rather apprehensive about the introduction of terminology to classify a practice which was essentially spontaneous and determined by transmitted convention. Indeed, Suyūṭī’s preface to his discussion of *waʿqf* suggests, through the excerpts of the work of the Baṣrān trained linguist Naḥḥās (d. 338/949), that the practice of *waʿqf* was essentially contingent to the acquisition of scripture: readers had to be aware of the points of pauses and inception in their recitation of Qur’anic verses.119 Naḥḥās, as quoted by Suyūṭī, refers to the fact that one of the companions of the Prophet, Ibn ʿUmar, implied that familiarity with the subtleties of *waʿqf* was something scrupulously imparted to prospective students of the Qurʾan; although Ibn ʿUmar rues the fact that many of his contemporaries were not familiar with these subtleties.120 Ibn al-Anbārī’s *Īdāḥ* deliberates upon a tripartite division
applicable to waqf, and this is adhered to throughout his work.\textsuperscript{121} This, in Anbārī’s words, was commonly agreed upon by scholars. The division proposes that manifestations of waqf wa’l-ibtidāʾ be classified as tāmīm, ḥasan and qabiḥ.\textsuperscript{122} A revealing statement in Suyūṭī’s Itqān on the authority of Ibn Burhān cites the Ḥanafite judge Abū Yūsuf (d. 182/798) as having deliberated upon several similar terms applied to instances of waqf: tāmīm, nāqis, ḥasan and qabiḥ; he retorted that this classification was innovative, ‘bidʿa’, in a pejorative sense. Abū Yūsuf argued that the Qurʾān was an incomparable composite literary miracle which, a priori, is tāmīm (consummate) in part and whole: what is true of the whole is also true of the part and hence the terminology used for classification purposes was unbecoming.\textsuperscript{123}

Having alluded to Abū Yūsuf’s position, Suyūṭī produces a number of citations which display the earlier readers’ approach to factors which determine al-waqf wa’l-ibtidāʾ. He asserts that Nāfiʿ ibn Abī Nuʿaym, the Medinan reader, held that waqf and ibtidāʾ were governed by the parameters of meaning.\textsuperscript{124} The Meccan Ibn Kathīr and the Kūfī Hamza maintained that waqf and ibtidāʾ were ultimately determined by breathlessness, although Ibn Kathīr used deliberate waqf in the case of three Qurʾānic verses: Q. 7:3; Q. 6:109; and Q. 16:103.\textsuperscript{125} ʿĀṣim and Kīsāʾī had, according to Suyūṭī, employed the notion of the completeness of speech (kalām) as the principal criterion in relation to waqf wa’l-ibtidāʾ. The Bāṣrī Abū ʿAmr adhered to the practice of stopping at the end of each verse, as opposed to in the middle of a verse.\textsuperscript{126} The earliest readers based their pauses and points of inception on transmitted conventions; this practice was acquired naturally as an inherent part of the processes of recitation. Ibn al-Jazari, who like many of his predecessors in the reading tradition articulated with vigour the dominion of narration over linguistic criteria in the authentication of readings, remarked, while discussing one of the sub-categories of waqf, that it was unquestionably governed by samāʾ and naql.\textsuperscript{127} Nevertheless, the grammarians’ prominence in the authorship of these treatises suggests that their respective interpretations were produced as a result of invoking a linguistic model: ʿaql with an admixture of naql. More significantly, readers were concerned solely with pursuing areas of scholarship which aid the preservation of scripture in all its aspects and waqf is contingent to the recitation and comprehension of scripture.

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

The co-ordinated accentuation of an adherence to precedents continues as a prominent theme in the next generation of Kūfī readers. Yaḥyā ibn Waththāb was a mentor of Aḥmad, Ṭalḥa ibn Miṣarrīf (d. 112/730) and Ḥumrān ibn al-Aʾyan (d. ca 130/747).\textsuperscript{128} Yaḥyā features as a source of readings in Farrāʾ’s Maʾānī, quoted on 75 occasions. In spite of this, it is not startling to note that Farrāʾ levelled criticisms at Yaḥyā and his generation of readers.\textsuperscript{129} Indeed, it would seem that the motive for this
relates to the fact that certain readings, circulated on the authority of prominent readers, contravened derived rules of grammar. One way of undermining such readings was to criticise their narrator. However, Yahyā’s status and integrity as a reader himself are never questioned within the reader tradition. Yahyā and Aʿmash were both of mawālī origin. It is reported that Yahyā was humiliated by Ḥajjāj’s edict prohibiting the mawālī from leading the congregational prayers in Kūfa; his fellow worshippers insisted he forfeit his position, and he duly obliged. Ḥajjāj, hearing of Yahyā’s predicament, assured him that the ruling was never intended to apply to figures of his standing and insisted he return to the mosque to lead prayers. However, he symbolically led the prayer for a further day before voluntarily relinquishing his position. Yahyā associated with Mascūq ibn al-Ajdaʿ (d. 63/682), one of Ibn Masʿūd’s pupils with whom he also reviewed his readings. He narrated Mascūq’s remark that Ibn Masʿūd used to erase markers indicating a batch of ten verses, taʿshīr, in codices.

Aʿmash studied not only with leading Kūfān such as Zirr, Nakhaʿī and ʿĀşim, but he reviewed his readings with an important Medinan exegete and reader Abuʾl-ʿĀliyya al-Riyāḥi (d. 93/712). Riyāḥi was the putative author of a substantial exegetical text, to which figures such as the eminent exegete Qatāda (d. 1117/735) had recourse. Aʿmash also has links with Mujāhid, the Meccan reader and exegete. It is significant that many of Aʿmash’s pupils were important figures within the embryonic stages of the Kūfān tradition of linguistics: many were the authors of treatises on both exegetical and grammatical subjects. Versteegh’s initial attempts to explain similarities between the linguistic terminology used in the tafsīr of Muqāṭil ibn Sulaymān (d. 150/767) and that employed by later Kūfān grammarians such as Kisāʿī led him to conclude that the Kūfān must have acquired this terminology through the version of Ibn ʿAbbās’s tafsīr transmitted by Muqāṭil. This was assumed because there were no links between Muqāṭil and the Kūfān grammatical tradition, although Versteegh does identify a link between Muqāṭil and Aʿmash. However, the assumption is that Aʿmash is a reader and not a grammarian. The tendency to demarcate early areas of scholarship such as qirāʿa, naḥw and tafsīr circumscribing the activities of figures such as Aʿmash is misleading. It is conceivable that Aʿmash himself may have been the very conduit through which Muqāṭil was introduced to such terminology.

Aʿmash’s students include Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb, Ṭalḥa ibn Muṣarrif and Abān ibn Taghlib (d. 141/768). The example of Abān is striking: he was the author of a Gharib al-Qurʾān text and Yaqūt speaks of him as a scholar of fiqh, qirāʿa and lughat. He also describes his work as replete with poetic loci probantes. Yaqūt mentions that Abān’s tract was collated with two other related works and circulated as a single treatise: one of these works being attributed to the exegete Muḥammad ibn al-Sāʿib al-Kalbī (d. 146/763), and the second to Ibn Rawq (n.d.). Abān completed his study of the muṣḥaf under Aʿmash’s supervision. He also studied readings with
"Āṣim, Abū ʿAmr al-Shaybānī and Ibn Muṣarrīf. The specialist in readings Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī refers to Abān as a nahwī. Moreover, Ibn al-Nadîm reports that he composed the following works: Maʿānī al-Qurʾān and Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt. Kīsāʾī refers proudly to having associated with the likes of Abān, Ibn Abī Laylā, ʿIsā ibn ʿUmar al-Hamdānī and Ḥazma. Another early figure also recalled in the Maʿānī who seems to pursue a somewhat radical blending of the traditional and the abstract is a figure by the name of Zuhayr al-Furqābī (d. 156/773). According to Dēvēnyi, he is mentioned twice by Farrāʾ in respect of his readings. Dēvēnyi adds that the qurrāʾ literature refers to him using the epithet al-nahwī. Indeed, this literature also confirms that he was a contemporary of ʿĀṣim and that he had his own ikhtiyār in readings. This is significant because, according to Qifṭī (d. 646/1248), while in Mecca Zuhayr was asked by the Kūfī reader Ibn ʿAyyāsh from where did he acquire nahw; and he replied, ‘from the companions of Abuʾl-Aswad (d. 69/689)’. It is curious to note that Zuhayr would adduce poetic shawāḥid when asked about ʿarabiyya and qirāʾāt. Indeed, he apparently cited material derived from one of Abuʾl-Aswad’s students, Maymūn al-Aqrān, renowned as a reader and poetry specialist. The biographical dictionary of Marzubānī also confirms his status as a scholar among the Kūfīs and that Abuʾl-Aswad’s students were his mentors. The endeavours of figures such as Abān and Zuhayr were never properly recognised in the mainstream biographical literature because such scholars were essentially associated with the old tradition in which the role of such scholars was as transmitters, conveying the Qurʾānic readings of early authorities but occasionally noted for their own ikhtiyār.

During the 2nd/8th century, the reading of Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt was popular among the Kūfīs. Indeed, upon the demise of ʿĀṣim, Ḥamza was distinguished as the city’s authority on readings. He had reviewed his readings with Ḥumrān ibn Aṭīya, Ibn Abī Laylā and Aṭīm, although Ibn Mūjāhid uses the term sāmiʿ to qualify the student relationship between these figures. Ibn al-Jazari reports that Aṭīm adhered to the harf of Ibn Masʿūd; Ibn Abī Laylā adhered to the harf of ʿAlī; Ishāq al-Sabīṭī blended the ḥurūf; while Ḥumrān adhered to the reading of Ibn Masʿūd. The report refers to the fact that Ḥumrān would not contravene the codex of ʿUthmān despite its showing mental awareness of (yaʿtabiru) the ḥurūf al-maʿānī of Ibn Masʿūd. This was a reference to Ibn Masʿūd’s exegetical interpolations embodied within the text of his codex. Moreover, this was also the ikhtiyār of Ḥamza.

The interesting aspect of this report relates not only to both figures’ tenacious adherence to the ʿUthmānic codex, but to the use of the phrase yaʿtabiru. The same wording occurs in Ibn Mūjāhid’s Kitāb al-Sabīʿa, in which it is reported that ʿḤamza used to yaʿtabiru qirāʾāt ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd when it was not in concordance with the consonantional outline of the codex of ʿUthmān. Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1005) shows in his Mujmal al-lughāt that form II of this verb, as in ʿabbartu al-kitāb, denotes, ‘to con-
template words (al-kitāb) within oneself without raising one’s voice with them.\(^{153}\) Firuzabādī (d. 817/1414) also affirms the notion of reading (qirā‘a) without raising one’s voice; adding that the term ‘abra refers to both ‘a single teardrop shed prior to intense weeping’ and ‘the materialisation of a sense of crying or grief within one’s self (the breast) without physically shedding tears’.\(^{154}\) Within the confines of such meanings, it is evident that the device of i’tibār (implicit recognition) allowed readers to negotiate the issue of consonantal variants; i’tibār is indispensable to an orally based tradition: one can therefore conclude that the exegetical interpolations of Ibn Mas‘ūd were never physically articulated as an intrinsic part of scripture relevant to an act of liturgical worship. But it also shows the immense importance attached to the ‘Uthmānic codices during these earlier periods. Moreover, this accounts for the apparent contradiction of adhering to the disparate codices of ‘Uthmān and Ibn Mas‘ūd, as both reports reiterate these figures’ resolute adherence to the codex of ‘Uthmān.

Referring to Beck’s allusions to i’tibār, Versteegh does argue that the codices of Ibn Mas‘ūd and Ibn ʿAbbās were popular in Kūfa and therefore grammarians such as Kisā‘ī and Farrā‘ would use i’tibār to ‘explain and support alternative vocalic readings of the canonical text’.\(^{155}\) There are numerous statements in the Ma‘ānī in which Kisā‘ī and Farrā‘ express their reverence for the authority of the ‘Uthmānic codex; however, i’tibār allows the circumvention of consonantal inconsistencies as manifested in the codices of Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ibn ʿAbbās and Ubayy. The popularity of such codices does not enter the equation: the profusion and diversity in the stock of alternative vocalic readings are furnished by the devices of ikhtiyār and harf which are in turn determined by defined precedents and anchored to the mushaf. The resort to i’tibār confirms that the boundaries of scripture were far from fluid.

Hamza claimed that he had not read a single harf without relating it to an authenticated precedent: athar.\(^{156}\) He was once asked if he had read with A‘mash. Hamza said, ‘No. But I enquired of him concerning the hurāf, harf by harf’.\(^{157}\) The biographical reports state that Hamza used to take his personal codex during the month of Ramaḍān and listen to the reading of A‘mash, thereby acquiring his hurāf.\(^{158}\) Hamza was renowned for his idiosyncratic application of madd (elongated vowels), hamza (the commission of the glottal stop) and idghām (assimilation) in his readings: these phonological features were regarded with derision by certain Baṣrans and even censured by scholars such as Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal (164–241/780–855).\(^{159}\) Even Farrā‘ describes Hamza as ill informed regarding the characteristics of the Arabs’ speech.\(^{160}\) Ibn al-Jazari claims that an incompetent student, rather than Hamza, was responsible for exaggerating these features and transmitting them on his authority.\(^{161}\) One report in Ibn Mujāhid’s work suggests that the Baṣrans were responsible for stigmatising the reading of Hamza.\(^{162}\) He adds that Hamza adhered stringently to precedents in his
readings. And yet Sufyân al-Thawrî (d. 161/777), who was one of his students, stated that ‘whenever Ḥamza read a ḥarf of the Qur’an it was based on a precedent (athar)’. Reader biographical material is replete with praise for the scholarly standing of Ḥamza as a reader and his religiosity; reference is also made to his proficiency in the science of ‘arabiyya and the traditions.

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

It is possible to trace linguistic activity to figures who preceded the subsequent paragons of the two conventional traditions. An examination of biographical literature shows that many of these later linguists received their training from readers who displayed a thorough proficiency in the field of nahw. The readers remained loyal to the principle that the linguistic sciences should function as an instrument of the religious sciences. It is our contention that these figures were overlooked in linguist biographical material as a result of their reluctance to accentuate linguistic considerations in the approach to the language of scripture. However, it is evident that the Küfans themselves subscribed to what was effectively an insular approach to linguistic thought, just like their Başran
counterparts. And therefore Versteegh's belief that the Kūfāns restricted their analysis to the text of the Qur'an requires review. They were exploring models of language developed from sources other than scripture; and this distinguished them from their reader counterparts in Kūfa. Among the early generations of Kūfān readers, including those who gained reputations as linguists, there was a noticeable tendency to articulate frequently their reverence for the conventions of the reading tradition. One seldom comes across any of the early readers from Kūfa, or with Kūfān connections, who were embroiled in controversy on the issue of selecting readings, or expressing overly controversial explanations regarding their linguistic justification; accordingly, the biographical material of the linguists had nothing dramatic to record of their linguistic endeavours. There were later Kūfāns who developed types of ikhtiyār, selecting hurūf on the basis of a grammatical synthesis, and it is in the field of collating and selecting Qur’anic readings that one detects a semblance of controversy and conflict as it was possible for figures to express preferences for given readings, citing levels of eloquence and rudimentary linguistic considerations. The overriding regulating principle implemented by Kūfān readers was a strict adherence to precedents and the absolute hegemony of codices. Conversely, those grammarians who composed texts which were in the ma'anī, hujja and iḥtiyāj genre, emblematic of the grammatical justification of scripture, were able to exploit the full potential of their grammatical theories within the confines of their works just as they were able to apply these theories to instances of waṣaf and indeed to all other aspects of reader scholarship in which linguistic considerations might be applied. While the Kūfāns had a number of figures prepared to engage these abstract models, it was with the Baṣārans that their application was ever more vigorously ventured; yet there was also a reader connection as we shall see.
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