The Early Arabic Grammarians' Contributions to the Collection and Authentication of Qur'anic Readings: The Prelude to Ibn Mujāhid's *Kitāb al-Sabᶜa*

Mustafa Shah

SOAS, University of London

A circumspect review of the history of the formative years of the Arabic linguistic tradition brings to light many impressive features regarding the form, function and design of the linguistic sciences, including the rapid and yet refined nature of their development. However, one fascinating aspect of these features is the fact that pioneering generations of grammarians were in essence individuals famed not only for their role as distinguished luminaries of linguistic abstraction, but also as Qur'anic readers primarily engaged in developing sophisticated models for the physical preservation of Islam's sacred corpus of scripture, the Qur'an.[1] Given the importance of the liturgical value of scripture, which enshrined theological, legal and paraenetic motifs, this was a task which demanded immense linguistic scrutiny and precision.[2] Indeed, the critical attention to detail applied to the verification of the textual integrity of scripture as enshrined in Qur'anic readings dynamically served as a catalyst for Arabic linguistic thought, engendering the expansion of this discipline as readers sought to relate the linguistic phenomena inherent in the corpus of *variae lectiones* to a robust and coherent theory of language. Individuals among these readers who were responsible for promulgating and advancing the earliest abstract models of language analysis together with their pupils emerged as a distinct class of linguistic specialists, and their introspective efforts therein gradually paved the way for the materialisation of two conventional schools of language: the Baṣran and Kūfan traditions. However, both these developed traditions were now advocates of a seemingly insular approach to the study of the phenomenon of language; and the technical development of the form and content of their discipline reflected this shift in focus and application. Grammarians and readers had been effectively separated as two classes of scholars, and the conceptual compass of their respective interests and pursuits reflected this separation.

While the language of the Qur'an was of primary significance as a sacrosanct and inviolable source to both grammarians and readers, the issue of approaching the authentication of linguistic configurations of readings of the text, despite the infini-

tesimal countenance of their variance, was to prove far more controversial. The reader tradition adhered to a precept that Qur'anic readings together with their linguistic configurations must be based upon transmitted precedents; grammarians, while accepting the broad thrust of this principle, were keen to integrate theoretical and traditional considerations in the approach to the authentication of readings, refining grammatical models to collate, evaluate and justify linguistic configurations inherent in the corpus of Qur'anic readings, as well as elucidating the linguistic inimitability of the Qur'anic diction. One of the unavoidable consequences of this theoretical approach is that confined aspects of the hypothetical and speculative projection of readings were ventured. Despite being carried out in the spirit of linguistic justification, this was to leave an indelible print on the efforts to collect and appraise Qur'anic readings over ensuing centuries.

A number of these early grammarians were to disassociate themselves from their former cohorts, diminishing not only the role of early readers in the inception of Arabic linguistic thought, but also their continued contribution to linguistic thought. The rationale behind this conspicuous dissociation from readers was profound: one way in which grammarians could sanction their audacious activities was to call into question the ability and linguistic aptitude of readers, disputing their prestige as authorities of the readings of scripture.[3] It also provided them with scope to pursue their own Procrustean arguments: linguistic idiosyncrasies of readings which infringed upon their theories of language and grammar could thereby be criticised and dismissed. Grammarians were eagerly seeking to extend their influence from the sphere of the linguistic sciences to the reading tradition, but such manoeuvres were passionately resisted. This resulted in a prolonged struggle. It was this state of affairs that served as the prelude to Ibn Mujāhid's (245–324/859–936) authorship of a work defining seven acknowledged Qur'anic readings associated with seven readers. It is reasonable to argue that any attempt to gauge accurately the broad significance of his work, the *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, together with its design and content, has to be anchored to the factors which spontaneously brought about the genesis of the Arabic linguistic tradition and the emergence of the separate classes of grammarians and readers.[4] It symbolised the extension of an encounter which has its roots in the formative years of the Arabic linguistic tradition and continued into the classical Islamic period.

The Ninth/Tenth Centuries of the Islamic Tradition: A Milieu of Polarisation and Consolidation

Contemporary writers exploring the history of the intellectual maturity of the classical Islamic tradition have conventionally identified the ninth and tenth centuries of this tradition as a period in which an inclination towards consolidation and homogeneity distinguished classical scholarship's approach to the Islamic sciences. It is during this

phase in its history that Sunnism imperiously assumed greater definitive form and function.[5] This impression is seemingly created by perceptions of the general tenor of literature and thought of this period with the basic assumption that, across areas of learning such as Qur'anic readings, ḥadīth literature, jurisprudence, theology, exegesis and grammar a shift towards the standardisation of concepts and doctrines was manifest. Montgomery Watt's survey of this seminal period of Islamic thought refers to the salient features of consolidation and canonisation to illustrate the maturing of Sunnī orthodoxy as expressed through a blend of rational and traditional methods. Watt refers specifically to the fact that a general consensus was attained regarding the corpus of traditions enshrining the model of the Prophetic Sunna; he argues that the expansion and resolution of legal doctrines were broached through this corpus of traditions, adding that the establishment of legal rites and schools was equally prominent during this period. Indeed, Watt estimated that the formulation of the science of the principles of law (uṣūl al-fiqh) was to increase 'mutual recognition' among disciplines. It is while discussing the Qur'anic sciences, which he admits enjoyed a measure of historical stability, that Watt offers a preview of the discipline of Qur'anic readings, qirāʾa, explaining the chronological background to the lectiones of scripture and approaches to the sacred text.[6] It is this aspect of Watt's survey that is relevant to our study as it concerns the enterprise of the eminent reader Ibn Mujāhid. Building on the theme of consolidation, Watt propounded the view that during the tenth century the 'desire to secure uniformity in the readings of the Qur'an' was given realistic expression through the efforts of Ibn Mujāhid, who set out to circumscribe the Qur'anic readings sanctioned by orthodoxy.[7] The efforts to promote 'seven sets of standard readings' coupled with the fact that Ibn Mujāhid was instrumental in opposing two individuals, Ibn Miqsam (265–354/878–965) and Ibn Shannabūdh (d. 328/939), who both insisted on adhering to an idiosyncratic formulation of readings which contravened traditional conventions, seemingly sustained the impression that the periods in question were redolent of the general shift to standardisation and homogeneity. However, this view misconstrues the nature of the activity of these two readers; it also takes for granted that their endeavours were somehow sanctioned within the confines of the reading tradition prior to these periods. In fact, Ibn Mujāhid was merely reiterating the axioms of the reading tradition which were based on the conviction that the linguistic phenomena inherent in Qur'anic readings were the manifestation of defined precedents. The issue here was not one of restriction. Moreover, as we shall attempt to establish, the apposite context and background to Ibn Mujāhid's endeavour are resolved by an entirely different set of circumstances and developments: namely, the inner dynamics of the Arabic linguistic tradition and its relationship with the discipline of readings.

The implications of certain events in the life of Ibn Mujāhid also featured indirectly in George Makdisi's review of the origins of uṣūl al-fiqh.[8] Makdisi was primarily

concerned with designating the treatise of Shāfiʿī on the sources of law, *al-Risāla*, as an 'antidote' to the philosophical theology of the rationalist Muʿtazilites, highlighting the transition inherent in successive attempts to synthesise the sources of Islamic law.[9] Makdisi sought to explain why later Sunnī expressions of *uṣūl al-fiqh* combined a conspicuous mix of theological epistemologies and legal precepts. He identified three landmark events which symbolised the triumph of traditionalism over rationalism: a) the inquisition (*miḥna*) in which Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (164–241/780–855) took a stand against the Muʿtazilī doctrine of the temporal status of the Qur'an; b) the defection of Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (260–324/873–935) to the camp of the traditionalists from the Muʿtazilites; and finally, c) the promulgation of a traditionalist creed by the ʿAbbāsid caliph al-Qādir (r. 381–422/991–1031), which was pronounced in 409/1018 and was seen as an attempt to stem the rise of a resurgent and transformed Ashʿarism.[10] It is during his discussion of Ashʿarī's defection from the Muʿtazilites that Makdisi refers to the trial of the aforementioned reader Ibn Shannabūdh, whose idiosyncratic system of selecting Qur'anic readings was vigorously opposed by Ibn Mujāhid. He states that Ibn Shannabūdh would not have been compelled to retract his readings had the Muʿtazilites been successful in securing the doctrine of a created Qur'an a century earlier, and posits this as a reflection of the failure of the *miḥna*.[11] However, although the incident in question does reflect an irrefutable confrontation between traditionalism and rationalism, Ibn Shannabūdh's endeavours have their origin in an entirely different set of circumstances: they were shaped by developments in the Arabic linguistic tradition, and a theological nexus of the type implied by Makdisi had no real bearing on this whole episode.

The events which surround the enterprise of Ibn Mujāhid continue to serve, perhaps misleadingly, as an indicator of trends of presumed consolidation and harmonisation in theology, grammar and, indeed, jurisprudence. Intriguingly, Jonathan Owens' study of classical Arabic grammatical theory proposed that the crystallisation of formal schools of grammar had occurred only during the late ninth century and alludes to the 'coincidence' of Ibn Mujāhid's providing 'the first explicit catalogue of seven variant reading traditions' during this period when 'grammatical descriptions were consolidated'.[12] According to this viewpoint, the perceived moves towards formalisation in grammar felicitously coincided with trends towards standardisation in terms of Qur'anic readings. However, the paradigmatic parallels suggested of Ibn Mujāhid's endeavours in all of the aforementioned examples appear to be far too expedient; presupposition à propos the significance of this scholar's efforts, together with reference to him as an analogue for the intricate processes of consolidation and homogeneity, is not positively demonstrated by the historical facts.

The reassessment of the political and religious role of the Muʿtazilites during the episode of inquisition and the controversy regarding the temporal status of the Qur'an

by scholars such as Wilferd Madelung and Joseph van Ess has meant that the theological antithesis between Sunnī orthodoxy and Muʿtazilism has become an undeniably complex and convoluted phenomenon.[13] The prominence of leading Ḥanafī jurists during this entire affair, together with the question of their theological inclinations, has fuelled much speculation as to the very nature of the intellectual forces which inexorably shaped Sunnī orthodoxy. This in turn has led to debate concerning the nature of political and religious authority within the matrix of the early ʿAbbāsid caliphate.[14] Formulating his views on this re-evaluation of the relative inclinations and characteristics of the schools of theology of the ninth century, Christopher Melchert has methodically argued for a 'new identification of all the main opposing theological parties'.[15] His argument is acutely structured around the relationship between Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and his presumed adversaries. Melchert concludes that there were three main parties during this ninth century period: traditionalists (this included figures such as Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal), rationalists (this includes the Muʿtazilites and many Ḥanafī jurists), and semi-rationalists (self-proclaimed traditionalists of chiefly Shāfiʿī and Mālikī persuasion who indulged in apologetic theology). *Ex hypothesi*, the traditionalists are viewed as abhorring any form of dialectics, accepting only the Qur'an and *ḥadīth* as the sole basis for interpreting and defending all aspects of religious orthodoxy; in contrast, the semi-rationalists indulged in *kalām* and their application of jurisprudence was based on a rational synthesis of traditional sources. In this hypothesis the semi-rationalists included prominent individuals such as Ḥusayn al-Karābisī (d. 248/862), Abū Thawr (d. 240/854), Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/857), Dāwūd ibn Khalaf al-Ẓāhir (d. 270/884), Muzanī (d. 264/878), Ṭabarī (d. 310/923), even Shāfiʿī (d. 204/820) is placed in this category. Critical for our study is the fact that Ibn Mujāhid serves as a prospective juncture for Melchert's proposition regarding the semi-rationalists' 'classical organization of Qur'anic recitation'.[16]

However, the developments which brought about the organisation of readers and readings are not fully explained by Melchert's interpretation of the events of the ninth and tenth centuries; nor is it apparent that friction between so-called rationalists and semi-rationalists is a decisive factor in their elaboration. Moreover, much of Melchert's classification is based on confined reports from later biographical compilations, texts whose canonising function is manifest. Indeed, Melchert accepts that there is nothing in the primary source material to suggest that these so-called semi-rationalists conceived of themselves as a distinct group. Furthermore, he compartmentalises scholars and their scholarly interests in the order of mutually exclusive categories in a way which certainly serves his own classification of this scholarship, but cannot be definitively substantiated on the basis of primary source material from the periods in question.

Melchert extends the broad thrust of his traditionalist *contra* semi-rationalist classification of attitudes in scholarship in a separate but connected study which expressly

attempts to gauge the significance of Ibn Mujāhid's efforts to 'standardise' seven Qur'anic readings. Steered by this hypothesis of identification, Melchert broaches the classical approach to the tradition of Qur'anic readings and their promulgation, using the transmission of *ḥadīth* and the literature of traditions as his analogue. He compares and contrasts approaches to the scrutiny of relevant texts with reference to the written and oral means of preserving and transmitting such material. However, while the distinctions in the modes of transmission between both disciplines during this period appear fascinating, it is difficult to countenance their conclusive relevance given that the contextual and conceptual significance of the history of the reading tradition is not fully discussed in his study; the enterprise of Ibn Mujāhid is given context by Melchert within the matrices of the modes of *ḥadīth* transmission.[17] For example, Melchert cites Ibn Mujāhid's statement that 'it was a blameworthy innovation to read any variant that agrees with the unpointed text, regardless of whether a previous authority has so read'; however, in this instance the issue for Melchert is whether some variant readings were the result of their being passed on via written transmission. Melchert suggests that, if transmission had been oral in nature, 'there never would have arisen the vexed question of whether any reading consistent with the unpointed text was permissible'. He reasonably concludes that this is proof that some readers clearly relied upon written texts.[18] However, the whole purpose of Ibn Mujāhid's statement was to arrest the speculative activities of the grammarians; it was articulated with this pressing consideration in mind. Thus, to an extent Melchert's forthright classification of attitudes to scholarship predicates both his conclusions and his approach to interpreting the endeavours of Ibn Mujāhid.

Interestingly, early scholars preoccupied with the text of the Qur'an and its readings are not clearly identified by Melchert as constituting a separate grouping of scholarship, namely readers (*qurrāʾ*); nor is the possibility that they represented so-called traditionalists considered. For Melchert 'the study and transmission of the Qur'anic readings before Ibn Mujāhid had been carried out mainly by grammarians and littérateurs, not traditionists (*muḥaddithūn*)',[19] and he contends that the study of variant Qur'anic readings was developed 'above all in Baghadi belletrist circles';[20] according to Melchert, Ibn Mujāhid is closer to the semi-rationalist perspective; meanwhile, the attempt to promote seven readings is seen by Melchert as a means to put a stop to 'the multiplication of readings, hence limiting the burden of Qur'anic scholarship'.[21] Melchert makes the point that the establishment of seven readings did 'restrain growing complexity' in the area of readings and 'their recognition, however halting and incomplete, did mark a widely observable turn in the tenth century towards limited agreement and manageability'.[22] Melchert also sees the trials of Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Shannabūdh as being neither triumphs of the traditionalist party nor endorsements of Ibn Mujāhid's choice of seven readings.[23] This notwithstanding, it should be stressed

that it was never Ibn Mujāhid's intention that a reader could not go beyond his selection of seven readings; the axioms of the reading tradition were the ultimate determinants in this respect. Ibn Mujāhid had effectively selected seven sets of readings associated with seven renowned readers which were acquired by him from their distinguished narrators. There did exist authoritative *ikhtiyārāt* (syntheses of Qur'anic readings) outside of Ibn Mujāhid's selection of seven.[24] Ibn Mujāhid was seeking to invigorate a simple precept, namely, that *qirā'a* was a *sunna*; he was thereby reproaching the conduct of certain grammarians who had encouraged a pretentious culture of presupposition in their approaches to the authentication and analysis of the corpus of Qur'anic readings. Moreover, he was continuing a mode of authorship developed and refined by his many reader predecessors.

The Historical Encounter: Background and Context

The activities of Ibn Mujāhid are typically contextualised within the historical framework of the two separate trials of the readers Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Shannabūdh. Classical Arabic biographical sources have preserved absorbing accounts of these events. The affairs of these two figures seem to lend themselves to the view that they were victims of tangible shifts towards consolidation and standardisation in the ninth and tenth centuries of the Islamic tradition. Yet, in order to gauge the significance of the events leading up to the trials of these two readers it is worth taking into account the crux of what was at stake. These two readers had independently devised an approach to the synthesis and selection of Qur'anic readings which clearly contravened the conventions predominant within this tradition. Their readings comprised specific variations on the given vocalic and consonantal values of specific lexemes in selected verses of the Qur'an together with instances of the transposition, interpolation, and substitution of lexical items. However, given the incontrovertible importance of the Qur'an as a liturgical text, these variations could not be considered Qur'anic in the strict sense of the word: there were weighty implications regarding the validity of such readings in acts of devotional worship such as congregational or individual prayers. It is this simple reality that governed orthodoxy's assertive opposition to these individuals' antics. Historical precedents indicate that grammarians had always pursued an abstract approach to probing the manifestation of linguistic phenomena in readings. The affair of Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Shannabūdh betrays a distinctly linguistic nexus: they had adopted an approach obliquely inspired by the intuitive attitudes of the grammarians. The so-called periods of standardisation and consolidation therefore play only a peripheral role in influencing the course of events, coincidently providing a backdrop for the activities of these two readers. Unusually, the paradoxes presented by the intricacies of this affair rest solely with the fact that readers as opposed to grammarians were caught up in this controversy, although, significantly, Ibn Miqsam also enjoyed a sound reputation as a grammarian. However, these two

individuals had irredeemably rekindled the contentious issue of approaches to the methods of authenticating the *variae lectiones* of scripture. The accentuation of such radical perspectives towards the authentication of readings would have been resisted throughout the history of the reading tradition irrespective of the relative setting: the earliest extant literature of the grammarians provides testimony to this very fact.

Ibn Miqsam Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Yaᶜqūb Abū Bakr al-ᶜAṭṭār is described as an authority on Kūfan grammar by his contemporary Ibn al-Anbārī (260–328/874–939). Indeed, he was also known by the soubriquet *ghulām Thaᶜlab* due to his close association with this leading Kūfan linguist.[25] Notwithstanding his idiosyncratic approach to readings, the treatises ascribed to Ibn Miqsam disclose an exceptionally orthodox demeanour. He was the author of the following writings: *Kitāb al-Anwār fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān, Kitāb al-Madkhal ilā ᶜilm al-shiᶜr, Kitāb al-Iḥtijāj fī'l-qirāʾāt, Kitāb al-Maqṣūr wa'l-mamdūd, Kitāb al-Mudhakkar wa'l-muʾannath, Kitāb al-Waqf wa'l-ibtidāʾ, Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif, Kitāb ᶜAdad al-tamām, Kitāb Mujālasāt Thaᶜlab, Kitāb al-Intiṣār li-qurrāʾ al-amṣār, Kitāb al-Laṭāʾif fī jamᶜ hijāʾ al-maṣāḥif*, and, most interestingly, *al-Radd ᶜalā al-Muᶜtazila*.[26] These forms of authorship are typically synonymous with the functional works of early readers. He is linked to an impressive array of readers, most significantly Idrīs ibn ᶜAbd al-Karīm (199–292/814–905), who was also a mentor of both Ibn Mujāhid and Ibn Shannabūdh.[27] In promulgating a synthesis of Qur'anic readings, Ibn Miqsam accepted that a reading had to be in concordance with the consonantal outline of at least one of the ᶜUthmānic codices; he also accepted that a reading should be harmonious with an aspect of ᶜarabiyya; however, he rejected the importance of a reading being supported by a precedent or *isnād*. He deemed that his readings were Qur'anic and valid in acts of devotional worship, namely congregational and other ritual prayers. A selection of his readings indicates that they involved, in a number of instances, the transposition of individual lexical items, and the exchange of consonants within a given verse which innovatively circumvented the strictures of homographs.[28]

The account of Ibn Miqsam's trial is preserved in a text entitled *al-Bayān wa'l-faṣl* composed by a companion of Ibn Mujāhid, Abū Ṭāhir ᶜAbd al-Wāḥid ibn ᶜUmar (d. 349/960); quotations from this text are found in the *Taʾrīkh Baghdād* of Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071) and in the *Muᶜjam al-udabāʾ* of Yāqūt (d. 629/1229).[29] Abū Ṭāhir is quoted as saying, 'During our own lifetime a character has stood out claiming that if a feature of ᶜarabiyya correlating with the *ḥurūf al-Qurʾān* were to be appropriately reconciled with the consonantal outline of the *muṣḥaf*, then in his estimation its recitation was valid in terms of prayers or for other related purposes.'[30] One of the many infamous examples of Ibn Miqsam's readings employs a mechanism of substitution applied to Q. 12:80. The conventional reading is *lamma'stayʾasū minhu khalaṣū najiyyan* (referring to the brothers of Joseph who, having despaired of

persuading the king to release their brother, withdraw to consult murmuring with one another). Ibn Miqsam replaced the *yā'* in the term *najiyyan* with a *bā'* and radically altered the vocalic values, furnishing the reading *nujabā'*. This gave the verse a rather different semantic gloss which Arthur Jeffery translated as 'So when they despaired of him, they withdrew as noble men'.[31] Yāqūt mentions that, given the contextual constraints, such a gloss seems to be implausible.[32] Ibn Mujāhid was one of a number of distinguished individuals who were called upon to question Ibn Miqsam regarding his approach to readings.

One must bear in mind that the earliest ʿUthmānic codices were reported to have been deliberately denuded of diacritics and vowel markings, allowing the various authenticated indigenous readings to be superimposed onto the text of the official codices.[33] There were slight orthographical differences among these codices; indeed, the genre of *ikhtilāf al-maṣāḥif* was developed to scrutinise the orthographical distinctions of these early codices. Early readers also pursued the enumeration of verses in codices with such considerations in mind.[34] Yet, the essentially oral nature of the reading tradition profoundly governed all these physical processes. The author of the *Bayān*, Abū Ṭāhir, expresses the view that Ibn Miqsam's conduct constituted a grave innovation, for he was 'selecting readings on the basis of speculative thought and presumption without adhering tenaciously to prescribed precedents'.[35]

The historical reports relate that eminent jurists and readers brought the matter to the attention of the sultan. A tribunal was set up in 322/934 to deal with this matter. Ibn Mujāhid was instrumental in cross-examining Ibn Miqsam, requesting that he provide religious sanction for his arguments.[36] Unable to do so, he was compelled to sign a retraction. He promised to refrain from his erroneous ways; however, it is reported that he continued to recite in his own idiosyncratic manner until his very death. Indeed, he is cited as referring to the fact that luminaries of the reading tradition were all noted for having their own *ikhtiyār*; he was, therefore, merely emulating them. He defiantly asserted that 'Khalaf ibn Hishām, Abū ʿUbayd and Ibn Saʿdān were all able to select; it was permitted for them and not censured, it is likewise permissible for me'.[37] The author of the *Bayān wa'l-faṣl*, Abū Ṭāhir, countered this defence by distinguishing between the selection procedure of the aforementioned figures and the tangential method contrived by Ibn Miqsam. The eleventh century biographical dictionary compiled by the Baṣran grammarian Ibn al-Anbārī (513–77/1118–81), *Nuzhat al-alibbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-udabā'*, perceptively qualified this fact by adding that the Kūfan reader Khalaf ibn Hishām (150–229/767–844) had relinquished some of the *ḥurūf* of Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt (80–156/700–72), choosing in their place the reading (*ḥurūf*) of Nāfiʿ (d. 169/785).[38] He also recalls that Abū ʿUbayd and Ibn Saʿdān did not proceed beyond the readings of the *qurrā'* of the *amṣār* (garrison towns): they searched for precedents.[39]

Although Ibn Miqsam was adamant in asserting that he had merely emulated the endeavours of his predecessors, he had ventured beyond the scope allowed in the approaches to the selection, authentication and justification of Qur'anic readings. One approach emphasised the importance of *isnād*; the second resorted to an admixture of *isnād* and speculative analysis. However, in the case of the latter approach, the processes of *ikhtiyār* had assiduously reconciled *isnād* with *ʿarabiyya*. The grammarians selected from a host of precedented readings, using parity with the model of *ʿarabiyya* as the principal criterion when expressing a preference for a reading. Technically, the criteria of narration were infrequently transgressed within the sphere of such collections. The hypothetical configuration of linguistic features of the sacred text does feature in the *maʿānī* genre of works (grammatical commentaries on the Qur'an); yet it was carried out in the spirit of linguistic justification and always tempered with the admission that readings were based on defined and authenticated precedents. Conversely, in Ibn Miqsam's stance, *ʿarabiyya* had superseded *isnād*. Even Jeffery, who compiled a detailed inventory of Ibn Miqsam's many readings, inferred that the trials of these two readers were, 'in a sense test cases as to the continued legitimacy of *ikhtiyār*', which he suggests had previously developed in a rather arbitrary manner. Thus, in Jeffery's view, this affair was essentially about the limitation of *ikhtiyār*, signifying the 'development of the process of canonisation of the text of the Qur'ān'.[40] However, a close reading of the earliest sources of the reader tradition shows this is plainly not the case. Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Shannabūdh had infringed upon conventions consistently considered sacrosanct by their fellow readers.

Given his credentials as a trained Kūfan grammarian, the dynamics of Ibn Miqsam's approach to readings can clearly be placed within the vector of a linguistically inspired philosophy. He adopted an intensely radical approach to *variae lectiones* which had no accepted antecedents as far as the reading and grammarian traditions were concerned. Ironically, contemporary grammarians of both Baṣran and Kūfan persuasions composed spirited refutations of Ibn Miqsam's synthesis of readings: Ibn al-Anbārī was the author of *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā man khālafa muṣḥaf ʿUthmān*, while Ibn Darastawayhi (258–346/871–958) composed *Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā Ibn Miqsam fī ikhtiyārihi*.[41] Ibn Miqsam was the putative author of a text entitled *Kitāb al-Iḥtijāj li'l-Qur'ān* in which he presented and defended his peculiar readings.[42] Ibn Miqsam's antics were imposingly furnished with symbolic import. Yāqūt relates a report in which Ibn Miqsam is seen in a dream, praying in a congregational prayer with his back turned towards the *qibla*; scholars of oneiromancy observed that this was an unequivocal condemnation of his contravention of the orthodox consensus among readers.[43]

Ibn Mujāhid was also involved in a second trial. This took place in 323/935, and implicated a second reader, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Shannabūdh, a respected individual

who had travelled extensively in his quest for knowledge of readings, visiting promi-
nent centres of learning in the classical Islamic world.[44] He is associated with the
famous traditionist and linguist Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarbī (198–285/813–99), a scholar
renowned for his stern religiosity.[45] Furthermore, his mentor in the reading tradition was
Isḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm (d. 286/899), who was eminent as 'the scribe of Khalaf ibn Hishām
al-Bazzār'. Isḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm's brother was meanwhile responsible for transmitting
Khalaf's *ikhtiyār*.[46] It is significant to note that Ibn Shannabūdh was the author of five
works: *Kitāb mā khālafa fīhi Ibn Kathīr Abā ʿAmr*, *Kitāb Qirāʾāt ʿAlī*, *Kitāb Ikhtilāf al-
qurrāʾ*, *Kitāb Shawādhdh al-qirāʾāt*, and a monograph of his own readings. Once again,
these were functional works typically associated with the early reader tradition.[47]

While Ibn Miqsam spoke of readings being permissible if an aspect of their *ʿarabiyya*
was in concordance with the consonantal sketch of the official *muṣḥaf*, Ibn
Shannabūdh took the view that concordance with the ʿUthmānic codices was not a
prerequisite to the acceptance of a reading. He is known to have recited readings
belonging to a class of *qirāʾāt* classified as anomalous, *shawādhdh*. Technically
speaking, the term *shādhdh* was employed to designate a variegated stock of readings
which were irregular for one or more reasons: they lacked the high levels of trans-
mission required to validate their liturgical status; they contravened the ʿUthmānic
codices; or they could not be reconciled with an aspect of the conventions of an
accepted *ʿarabiyya*.[48] It is the second category of *shawādhdh* readings for which Ibn
Shannabūdh was notably indicted for reciting: the existence of a precedent, together
with the fact that a reading was compatible with the conventions of *ʿarabiyya*, was
sufficient in his view for a reading to be considered Qur'anic. It is reported that, on
occasions, while leading congregational prayers, he recited specific readings (*ḥurūf*)
which contravened the sacrosanct ʿUthmānic codices. These particular readings were
the so-called exegetical interpolations and glosses attributed to ʿAbd Allāh ibn
Masʿūd, Ubayy ibn Kaʿb and Ibn ʿAbbās, and also other pre-ʿUthmānic *lectiones*
suppressed as far as their liturgical value was concerned.[49] Among the examples of
his readings are Q. 62:9, *idhā nūdiya li'l-ṣalāti min yawmi'l-jumuʿati fa'mḍū ilā
dhikri'llāh* instead of *fa's ʿaw ilā dhikri'llāh*; while, for Q. 18:79, *wa-kāna
warāʾahum malikun yaʾkhudhu kulla safīnatin ghaṣban*, he read *wa-kāna amāmahum
malikun yaʾkhudhu kulla safīnatin ṣāliḥatin ghaṣban*.[50] Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 393/1003),
and Yāqūt both provide examples of Ibn Shannabūdh's contravention of the
ʿUthmānic codices.[51] The Kūfan philologist Ibn al-Anbārī compiled a refutation of
his readings entitled *Kitāb Naqḍ masāʾil Ibn Shannabūdh*.[52]

It seems that Ibn Shannabūdh refused to relinquish this methodology, nor would he
cease from circulating proscribed readings, maintaining that such readings had a
distinctly devotional value. He was arraigned before a tribunal of judges, jurists and
readers, convened in the presence of the *wazīr* Muḥammad Ibn Muqla

(272–328/886–940). Yāqūt combines a number of important historical narratives covering this issue. Quoting from a text entitled *Afwāj al-qurrā'*, he confirms that Ibn Mujāhid took a very prominent role in prosecuting Ibn Shannabūdh.[53] Indeed, he was able to secure a signed retraction, preserved in Yāqūt's *Mu'jam*, which was obtained after Ibn Shannabūdh received ten strokes of the whip.[54] He was duly released; still, like his contemporary Ibn Miqsam, he continued to advocate privately his views on readings. In the succinct account of the trial of Ibn Shannabūdh recounted by the Ḥanbalite polymath Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200), mention is made of his renouncing the most 'outrageous' of these *ḥurūf*; however, he truculently argued that the other readings which he had recited were based on precedents.[55]

Despite the fine distinctions between the approaches of these two readers, compatibility with *'arabiyya* appears as a common feature in the arguments adduced by both Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Shannabūdh, although, prima facie, in the case of this latter figure it is less prominent. However, that Ibn Shannabūdh renounced the most 'outrageous' of these *ḥurūf* seems to suggest that the stock of his *shawādhdh* readings was not restricted to contraventions of the ʿUthmānic codices such as those ascribed to prominent companions, but probably extended to other questionable alternatives which he had formulated. This is seemingly consistent with a grammarian-inspired approach, although such approaches exceed the bounds breached by even the most innovative of grammarians. The earliest recorded example of a reader radically accentuating linguistic considerations in the authentication and justification of scripture is the pioneering reader-grammarian of Mecca, Ibn Muḥayṣin (d. 123/740). Ibn Mujāhid crucially asserts in the preface to his *Kitāb al-Sabʿa* that Ibn Muḥayṣin 'constructed and organised (readings) according to the principles of *'arabiyya'*, and that he had formulated an *ikhtiyār* in which he differed from his fellow Meccans, noting, again, that it was based on *'madhāhib 'arabiyya'*.[56] Ibn Mujāhid added this caused the early Meccans to spurn his readings as they contravened the consensus among readers; they favoured the readings of Ibn Kathīr (45–120/665–737). Ibn Muḥayṣin was a mentor of several of the earliest linguists of Baṣra and Kūfa.[57] Most fascinating is the fact that Ibn Shannabūdh was one of those scholars who actively promulgated Ibn Muḥayṣin's reading; and it was this linguistically-inspired approach to readings which created the environment for the development of Arabic linguistic thought.[58]

Writing in the fourteenth century, the scholar of readings Ibn al-Jazarī (751–833/1348–1429) authoritatively spoke of three conditions which governed the authenticity of a Qur'anic reading in terms of its liturgical value. These conditions stipulated the existence of a sound precedent, *isnād*; concordance with one of the ʿUthmānic codices; and compatibility with an aspect of the diction of *'arabiyya*.[59] These standards broadly formed the basis of the attitude to Qur'anic readings of luminaries such as Makkī

ibn Abī Ṭālib (355–437/965–1047) and Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī (371–444/981–1053), but the true spirit of these conditions reveals a much earlier provenance, particularly the condition of concordance with the ʿUthmānic codices.[60] The criticisms made by the Kūfan grammarian Farrāʾ (144–207/761–822) of certain readings of Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ (d. 154/771) were ventured with compatibility with the codices in mind.[61] Ibn al-Jazarī does move on to state that a reading which complied with all three conditions could not be rejected. He claimed that it was a manifestation of the seven *aḥruf* in which the Qur'an was revealed. This doctrine of seven *aḥruf* provided latitude in terms of its sanctioning a confined measure of diversity inherent in the stock of Qur'anic readings.[62] A number of scholars argued that all aspects of the seven *aḥruf* were encompassed in the ʿUthmānic codices; others stated that confined aspects of the seven *aḥruf* were exemplified in the ʿUthmānic codices.[63] Ibn al-Jazarī censured those who are ignorant of the distinction between the seven *aḥruf* and the seven readings selected by Ibn Mujāhid. He revealed that accurately transmitted readings are attributed to readers outside of these seven, commenting that scholars had voiced criticisms concerning Ibn Mujāhid's structuring his book around the readings of seven readers. They suggested that Ibn Mujāhid should have based his selection on any number other than seven, as this would have obviated ambiguities between the tradition which speaks of the Qur'an being revealed in seven *aḥruf* and his collection of seven readings.[64] It is clear from Ibn al-Jazarī's remarks that, although grammarians would always stress linguistic considerations such as issues of frequency of usage or analogies of language, the reader instinct was to rely principally on the trusted methods of narration.

Ibn Qutayba (213–76/829–89) referred to an important distinction regarding the applicability of the seven *aḥruf* in his seminal work which examines grammatical subtleties of the Qur'anic diction, *Taʾwīl mushkil al-Qurʾān*. Having provided examples of the manifestation of these *aḥruf*, which included citations from pre-ʿUthmānic codices, he contemplates the question of whether it was possible for these readings to be recited in the present. He declared that any of these readings which were in concordance with the codex (of ʿUthmān) were permitted, but not those which went beyond the consonantal sketch of this codex.[65] With this proviso in mind, he added the important qualification that the license granted to the companions, successors and a number of eminent early readers, in terms of their choice, synthesis and range of readings, as furnished by the seven *aḥruf* doctrine, remained exclusive to them: the configuration of the *qirāʾāt* they scrupulously supplied constituted the sum and substance of the corpus of the reading tradition. It was not appropriate to go beyond these readings.[66] This statement reinforced the sense that later scholarship was merely selecting from this eclectic stock of *lectiones*.

Ibn al-Jazarī reflectively refers to Ibn Shannabūdh and Ibn Miqsam in his survey of the principles covering the acceptance of readings, suggesting that the hostility

between Ibn Mujāhid and Ibn Shannabūdh was typical of that found among eminent contemporaries.[67] It is noticeable that less criticism is reserved for Ibn Shannabūdh on the basis that there existed differences among jurists regarding the permissibility of reciting in prayers this particular type of *shādhdh* reading, namely those pre-ᶜUthmānic readings attributed to certain companions. However, a majority of jurists took the view that these readings had no relative *mutawātir* basis and lacked the required consensus needed to substantiate their Qur'anic status.[68] They delivered a categorical indictment of anyone promoting their recitation on the basis that they were Qur'anic.[69] The justification for Ibn Shannabūdh's stance towards these readings rests with their having been recited at some stage in their history by a confined number of prominent companions and successors who derived these readings from the Prophet.[70] Scholars such as Ibn al-Jazarī would retort that the imposition of the ᶜUthmānic codices together with the companions' consensus regarding their peremptory status meant these kinds of *shawādhdh* readings were to all intents and purposes unacceptable as far as their liturgical value was concerned.[71] Nevertheless, it is evident that out of the two readers Ibn al-Jazarī does reserve harsher criticism for Ibn Miqsam's method of synthesising readings, denouncing it as a grave transgression: it was based on arbitrary analogues of *ᶜarabiyya*.[72]

Defining the Text: Ibn Mujāhid's *Kitāb al-Sabᶜa*

Ibn Mujāhid Aḥmad ibn Mūsā was recognised by his contemporaries as the most distinguished reader of his generation. He had studied with the leading figures of the reading tradition, including ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ᶜAbdūs (d. 280/894), Qunbul (195–291/810–904) and numerous other luminaries.[73] He associated with prominent Kūfan and Baṣran linguists such as Muḥammad ibn Jahm al-Simmarī (d. 280/893), Thaᶜlab (d. 291/904) and Mubarrad (d. 285/898). Indeed, the esteem in which his scholarship was held is reflected in the fact that his work, the *Kitāb al-Sabᶜa*, became the subject of copious grammatical apologies and commentaries by leading Baṣran and Kūfan linguists. The text itself was composed prior to the trials of Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Shannabūdh. This is evident from the fact that a prominent grammarian pupil of Ibn Mujāhid, Abū Bakr ibn al-Sarrāj (d. 316/928), was so impressed by the text that he decided to compose a grammatical explication and justification of the readings selected in the *Kitāb al-Sabᶜa*. He completed only the first chapter of the Qur'an and some verses from *Sūrat al-Baqara*.[74] Ibn al-Sarrāj's student Abū ᶜAlī al-Fārisī (d. 377/987) composed a treatise entitled *al-Ḥujja fī ᶜilal al-qirāʾāt al-sabᶜ*. Fārisī reminisced over the contribution made by Ibn al-Sarrāj to this genre, adding that he would incorporate his mentor's analysis within his own text. Intriguingly, Fārisī refers to Ibn Mujāhid's text as *Maᶜrifat qirāʾāt ahl al-amṣār wa'l-Ḥijāz wa'l-ᶜIrāq wa'l-Shām*. Thus, the text enjoyed quite a reputation well before the trials of these two readers. However, it is also the case that the material comprised in this text had already been

assiduously authenticated. Indeed, Ibn Mujāhid states that he himself had read, then revised the reading of Ibn Kathīr with Qunbul in the year 278/891; this provides some indication of the chronological provenance of the collated material featured in the *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*.[75]

The *Kitāb al-Sabʿa* represents a meticulously focused endeavour, premised primarily on the importance of the Qur'an as a liturgical text. The work is structured around the authenticated Qur'anic readings sourced to seven eminent readers, adhering to the traditional order arrangement of chapters and verses in the Qur'an. Ibn Mujāhid selected those readers whose Qur'anic readings had previously gained noticeable prominence and distinction within the reader tradition; they were celebrated luminaries from the regions of Ḥijāz, Iraq and Shām.[76] The text's primary purpose is to collate, record, appraise, and thereby contrast the principal features of these readings in respect of their acknowledged vocalic values, which in turn betray the rather subtle and minute nature of variances existent among these readings; the fact that these variances are restricted to a selected lexeme or lexemes within a given verse demonstrates the rather precise nature of this endeavour. Moreover, the comparative resolution of the vocalic values of the readings in question is interspersed with an authoritative synopsis of phonological and phonetic contingencies, all of which obviously served as pertinent factors in the articulation of scripture.[77]

Ibn Mujāhid includes a compelling preface to his work in which he outlines not only its purpose and design, but also provides the traditionalist context prefiguring the accepted approach to the authentication of readings and the ascendancy of established precedents; variations in the readings were based on Prophetic precedent and transmitted faithfully by the individual readers in question. Furthermore, the controversy regarding approaches to authentication resonates in the themes touched upon in Ibn Mujāhid's preface. He warns of the perils of pursuing readings purely on the basis of hypothetical and speculative explication, a rather subtle indictment of those who chose to emulate the pedantry of a number of grammarians. Ibn Mujāhid even alludes to the example of an individual well versed in the intricacies of *iʿrāb* being driven by his discernment therein to recite a *harf* which was permissible in *ʿarabiyya*, but had not been articulated by scholars from the past. He described such a person as an 'innovator' in the pejorative sense. In a further example, Ibn Mujāhid referred to a quotation made by the Baṣran philologist and reader Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ when asked by his pupil, Aṣmaʿī (d. 213/828) to explain how a reader was supposed to distinguish readings which had an identical consonantal outline, but were dissimilar in terms of their vocalic values. Abū ʿAmr replies, 'That can only be determined by what was heard on the authority of our first sheikhs,' the inference being that they were based on a precise selection of this pre-determined material.[78] Ibn Mujāhid concluded his preface with a series of references to the adage regularly articulated by the

readers: '*al-qirāʾa sunna*'. Moreover, he adds that the majority of scholarship among the *qurrāʾ* had agreed upon the authoritative status of these particular readers: the content, format and disposition of his *Kitāb al-Sabʿa* confirm that its author was particularly loyal to the reading tradition and the simple axioms espoused by readers. The mastery of the grammarians is also tacitly acknowledged, but this had to be tempered with the realisation that readings were selected on the basis of defined precedents. Having presented the framework for his work, Ibn Mujāhid introduces the seven readers whose *variae lectiones* are presented in this treatise together with their genealogies, mentors, students and narrators. Coupled with the preface, this detailed presentation of the numerous scholars and luminaries together with their localities has the desired effect of underpinning the axiom that these Qur'anic readings were meticulously preserved and transmitted. Ibn al-Nadīm credits Ibn Mujāhid with the authorship of a number of functional type tomes, including two treatises: *Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt al-ṣaghīr* and *Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt al-kabīr*. The editor of the *Kitāb al-Sabʿa* argued that the former text was his book on seven readings, while the *Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt al-kabīr* comprised those readings which lacked the same levels of successive transmission and recognition enjoyed by his choice of seven readings. According to Ibn Jinnī, Ibn Mujāhid designated these latter readings as being *shawādhdh*.[79]

Ibn Mujāhid also includes a preliminary section which surveys the so-called *asānīd al-qirāʾa*: the chains of authority which each of the seven readings he selected was based upon. These are initially sourced not only to his own mentors in the reading tradition with whom he had assiduously read (*qaraʾa*) and acquired the readings in question, but more frequently and extensively to a vast array of informants upon whom he had relied in precisely collating all the documented aspects of a reading.[80] The process of listing the distinctive sources of the reading, whether this is referenced to *qirāʾa*, personal informants, or textual sources, symbolises the collective corroboration of a reader's *lectio*. Within this preliminary section, the lists of sources cited for the readings of Nāfiʿ, Ibn Kathīr, ʿĀṣim (d. 127/744) and Abū ʿAmr are particularly detailed and lengthy, while for Ḥamza, Kisāʾī and Ibn ʿĀmir (d. 118/736) the pool of his sources were comparatively less, but just as authoritative.[81] Moreover, whenever there were differences and nuances regarding a particular reader's rendering of an aspect of a given *ḥarf*, Ibn Mujāhid illustrated such variances within the main body of the text, citing the narrators in question.[82]

The phonological and phonetic themes explored by Ibn Mujāhid are particularly salient in the early part of this text. Thus, while the recorded differences relating to the opening chapter of the Qur'an are restricted to the vocalic values of the term sovereign (*mālik, malik, malk* and *milk*), path (*ṣirāṭ, sirāṭ,* and *zirāṭ*), the prepositional phrase (*ʿalayhim* and *ʿalayhum*), and the exceptive particle (*ghayri, ghayra*), the interfaced nature of Ibn Mujāhid's approach, by drawing attention to analogous

examples throughout the Qur'an, extends the scope and magnitude of his survey; this is also apparent in his review of subsequent Qur'anic chapters. His summary of differences among the readings in the opening chapter is also lengthened by his commentary on the so-called ʿilal (grammatical rationale) governing the individual readings. This is something he duly promises to desist from, stating that for the remainder of the text he will recount only the specific vocalic values of the readings, 'akhbartu bi'l-qirāʾa mujarrada'.[83] Prior to his focusing upon Sūrat al-Baqara, he furnishes a separate study of idghām (phonological assimilation) and the approach of the seven readers to this phenomenon; the phonological significance of topics such as kināya (the articulation of pronouns), hamz (the omission and commission of the glottal stop, particularly in reference to al-madd wa'l-qaṣr), fatḥ and imāla (the 'conventional' opening of the a vowel and its fronting or deflection), and yāʾāt al-iḍāfa (the pronunciation of possessive suffixes formed in the first person singular) are introduced in terms of the seven readers' application of these traits, and this constitutes an integral part of Ibn Mujāhid's review of the second chapter of the Qur'an.[84] Given that the principal phonological concerns are addressed in the early part of the text, the discourse in the subsequent chapters focuses almost entirely on the vowelling of phonemes within certain verses, although exceptional phonological topics intersperse his survey of differences among the readings. Ibn Mujāhid consistently references consonantal variances to the indigenous codices.[85] Moreover, the whole book is premised on the conception that each instance of a variance is technically based on a transmitted convention.

Earlier Collections of Qur'anic Readings: The Contribution of Readers and Grammarians

The predisposition to collect and collate readings is traced to earlier periods in the history of the Arabic linguistic tradition and its reader complement. Readers and grammarians were to contribute to this genre in their own inimitable ways: the works of the readers were based extensively on the notion of isnād and riwāya; the grammarians' compilations naturally accentuated linguistic considerations and perspectives, but they too were effectively moored to the principle of isnād. The grammarians' propensity towards hypothetical pedantry, emendation and evaluation did unquestionably continue, but it was vociferously countered by the readers' characteristic references to the authority of precedents. This meant that the focus of the grammarians' collections of readings was confined to venting rational explication through the veneer of linguistic justification and evaluation. Despite that, the grammarian contribution to this genre of collections is rather formidable.

Ibn al-Nadīm includes a separate list of works which collated Qur'anic readings, however he makes no distinction between the nature of the methodology employed in

the approaches of their authors.[86] A contemporary of Sībawayhi (d. 177/793) by the name of Hārūn ibn Mūsā is said to have been the author of one of the first treatises to circumscribe Qur'anic readings. The Baṣran philologist Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī (d. 255/869), who himself was the author of a collection of readings, reports that Hārūn was the first individual to pay attention to aspects of variances among readings, *wujūh al-qirā'āt*, composing a text in which he traced *asānīd* for *shādhdh* readings.[87] This trend in authorship was pursued by the Baṣran Yaᶜqūb al-Ḥaḍramī (117–205/735–820). He was the author of a treatise entitled *Kitāb al-Jāmiᶜ* in which he detailed the different aspects of readings and traced each *ḥarf* to its original read-er.[88] It was also the case that some linguists elected to focus on a specific reading. Thus one finds that the Baṣran philologist Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī (d. 215/830) dedicated a monograph to the grammatical defence of the reading of Abū ᶜAmr ibn al-ᶜAlā'.[89] The Andalusian author of *Ṭabaqāt al-nuḥāt*, Abū Bakr al-Zubaydī (308–79/921–89), refers to Abū Ḥātim's text on Qur'anic readings. Zubaydī mentions the title of this work, noting that the work provided details of both *al-qurrā'* and *al-ᶜulamā'*.[90] Zubaydī clearly relied upon this work when citing readings referred to by grammarians. Ibn Jinnī reported that Abū Ḥātim's book was one of the texts he relied upon when compiling his famous *Kitāb al-Muḥtasab fī tabyīn shawādhdh al-qirā'āt wa'l-īḍāḥ ᶜanhā*.[91] Furthermore, Ibn Mujāhid himself refers to the fact that he was able to corroborate aspects of the reading of Nāfiᶜ from a book narrated by Muḥammad ibn Saᶜd (d. 230/845), the author of the celebrated *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, on the authority of his mentor Muḥammad ibn ᶜUmar al-Wāqidī (d. 208/823). Wāqidī was the author of a text entitled *Kitāb al-Qirā'āt*.[92]

The three scholars referred to by Ibn Miqsam in his forlorn defence of his approach to readings were all authors of texts which collated readings: Khalaf ibn Hishām al-Bazzār, Muḥammad ibn Saᶜdān and Abū ᶜUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām.[93] Yet, they were equally famed for their erudition in the linguistic sciences, which explains the disposition of their respective works. Khalaf was a Kūfan-trained reader. He had developed his own synthesis of readings (*ikhtiyār*) which was essentially based upon the readings of Ḥamza ibn Ḥabīb. Ibn Ashta al-Iṣfahānī (d. 316/928), an authority on early codices, asserts that Khalaf adhered to Ḥamza's *madhhab* regarding readings despite contravening him in 120 instances (*ḥarf*); however, he replaced them with the readings of Nāfiᶜ acquired from their transmitter Isḥāq al-Musayyibī (d. 206/821).[94] His own students in readings, the Kūfans Salama ibn ᶜĀṣim (d. 270/884) and Muḥammad ibn Jahm, were both noted for transmitting the literary legacy of Farrā'. Khalaf was originally situated in Baghdad, but journeyed to Kūfa in order to study readings with Abū Bakr ibn ᶜAyyāsh (95–193/713–809). Biographical material which mentions Khalaf confirms that he was stringently drawing from a variegated pool of authenticated precedents in formulating his reading. Due to his distinguished

standing within the reading tradition, classical scholarship designated his *lectio* as one of the ten canonical readings.[95]

Muḥammad ibn Saʿdān's collection of readings is referred to by Ibn al-Jazarī as *al-Jāmiʿ wa'l-mujarrad*.[96] These readings apparently did not contravene the *mashhūr* or well-known readings, and accordingly his *ikhtiyār* would seemingly have been within the limits of authentically acquired readings. He had both Baṣran and Kūfan mentors. Yāqūt presents material concerning Ibn Saʿdān which discloses contrasting details: he reports that Ibn Saʿdān had adhered to Ḥamza's reading before venturing his own selection (*ikhtiyār*), wherein 'he corrupted the *aṣl* and the *farʿ*, despite being a grammarian'.[97] Yāqūt adds that Ibn Saʿdān reflected upon *ikhtilāf* and was a scholar in *ʿarabiyya*. That individuals such as Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Saʿdān were prepared to place emphasis upon linguistic considerations was a corollary of the dominance and the authority impressed upon the reading tradition by linguists. It is probably why Ibn Miqsam also referred to this figure when trying to defend his own stance and method in identifying and promoting peculiar aspects of readings, although it would seem that Ibn Miqsam misconstrued the nature of Khalaf's *ikhtiyār*. Moreover, Jeffery's view that an *ikhtiyār* was an 'independent judgement on how the skeleton consonantal should be pointed and vowelled for correct recitation' appears to overlook the fact that it was limited to selection from a pre-determined pool of *variae lectiones*.[98]

The figure of Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām (157–224/774–839) looms large in the classical reading tradition. He, like Khalaf, was the author of a *Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt*; however, references to, together with citations from, his text are far more profuse, allowing one to gauge the approach adopted by its author. Abū ʿUbayd is linked with an impressive array of early Kūfan luminaries, including Sulaym (130–88/748–803), Kisāʾī (120–89/738–804), Yaḥyā ibn Ādam (d. 203/819), and Ibn ʿAyyāsh.[99] He was of *mawlā* extraction and he developed an *ikhtiyār* of readings which, according to Ibn al-Jazarī, was in harmony with *ʿarabiyya* and *athar*.[100] Not every grammarian was able to achieve this delicate balance. It was said that his work collated 25 readings. Dhahabī (d. 748/1347) declares that no Kūfan was able to produce a work of this calibre.[101] Ibn Mujāhid had recourse to this work as he mentions Abū ʿUbayd's text in the *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*.[102]

The Baṣran trained grammarian Abū Jaʿfar al-Naḥḥās (d. 338/949) describes the *Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt* as the definitive work in the field of readings and regularly adduces quotations from it in his own influential *maʿānī* text, *Iʿrāb al-Qurʾān*.[103] The citations from this work given in the *Iʿrāb* reveal that Abū ʿUbayd accentuated the value of *ʿarabiyya* as a major determinant in his selection of readings. However, that Abū ʿUbayd was able to effect a relative harmony between readings and *ʿarabiyya*, as sug-

gested by Ibn al-Jazarī, seemingly alleviated the gravity of the situation. Nonetheless, in one instance Naḥḥās derided Abū ᶜUbayd's use of analogical reasoning in selecting a reading: Abu ᶜUbayd had expressed a preference for Abū ᶜAmr's reading of Q. 57:23 because it reflected a phonological symmetry with the previous verse; however, the point of issue was not the reading, which was authenticated, but the mode and context of selection. Naḥḥās advises that 'this method of *iḥtijāj* is discarded by scholars and *ahl al-naẓar*'; he moves on to state that the Qur'an 'cannot be subjected to *maqāyīs*: it is established by collective transmission'.[104] It should be noted that although Naḥḥās himself often indulges in a similar method in his appraisal of readings, Abū ᶜUbayd's choice of Abū ᶜAmr's reading was based on a form of rhythmic congruity between two disparate verses.

Naḥḥās also highlights Abū ᶜUbayd's selection of Ibn Masᶜūd's reading of Q. 3:39, which reads *fa-nādahu'l-malāʾika*, and displays a lack of concord in gender between the verb and its subject, as opposed to *fa-nādathu'l-malāʾika*. Quoting from the text of Abu ᶜUbayd, Naḥḥās reports that he justified his *ikhtiyār* by stating that Ibn Masᶜūd treated the term *malāʾika* as a masculine throughout the text of the Qur'an; and that Abū ᶜUbayd selects this reading because he wishes to differ with the polytheists who asserted that the angels were the daughters of God. Naḥḥās interprets this gesture as having no bearing upon the selection of a reading. Furthermore, he dismisses the reasoning behind his selection, claiming that the Qur'an delivers its own riposte to those deliberating upon the gender of angels; this does not, however, prevent Naḥḥās from subsequently endorsing both readings.[105]

In a further example Naḥḥās includes a quotation in which the Baṣran Abū ᶜAmr ibn al-ᶜAlāʾ is censured by Abū ᶜUbayd for promoting a reading which contravened the metropolitan codices. The reading in question was Q. 19:19 and the term *li-ahaba*, which was rendered *layahaba*: the *yāʾ* was preferred to the *hamza*. Abū ᶜUbayd reports that this was a clear contravention of all the indigenous codices. Moreover, he asserts, 'If it were possible to change a *ḥarf* of the *muṣḥaf* on the basis of an opinion, it would expose the *muṣḥaf* to alteration such that one would not be able to distinguish between divine revelation and superfluous material.'[106] These sentiments symbolised the spirit of the ancient reading tradition and its intractable adherence to precedents; Abū ᶜUbayd's work clearly embodied this spirit. Given the form and design of the selection procedures encompassed in Abū ᶜUbayd's *ikhtiyār*, it seems curious that Ibn Miqsam should refer to him to justify his own method of synthesising readings.

There are a number of other individuals recognised as readers to whom texts which collated readings are ascribed: the Kūfans Yaḥyā ibn Ādam, Ḥafṣ ibn ᶜUmar al-Dūrī (150–246/767–860) and Aḥmad ibn Jubayr (d. 258/872) are mentioned as having composed treatises collating Qur'anic readings of Kūfan, Baṣran and Ḥijāzī

provenance. Yahyā is an important source for the early tradition of Kūfan readings; through his studentship with Abū Bakr ibn ʿAyyāsh he relates how he codified the readings of ʿĀsim ibn Abī al-Najūd.[107] Hafs ibn ʿUmar al-Dūrī is described by Ibn al-Jazarī as the first reader to bring together *qirāʾāt*.[108] He is often referred to by the epithet *nahwī*. The author of an important collection of eleven readings *Kitāb al-Iqnāʿ*, Abū ʿAlī al-Ahwāzī (362–446/973–1054), mentions that al-Dūrī journeyed extensively in quest of Qur'anic readings and these included *hurūf* which had gained relative prominence together with readings described as *shawādhdh*: it was with this latter category of readings that he was thoroughly acquainted.[109] Ahmad ibn Jubayr was one of Kisāʾī's students, but his mentors also included other prominent Kūfans.[110] He travelled to Hijāz, Egypt and Syria before settling in Anatolia. He composed a text which brought together the readings of five scholars: one from each major city.[111] Biographical reports show him to be a stern upholder of traditional conventions in respect of Qur'anic readings; indeed, it is recounted that he took exception to the use of green coloured dots in codices, which were often employed to indicate peculiar features of variant readings, for fear that they might lead someone to recite a *harf* not articulated by the pious ancestors.[112]

Ibn al-Jazarī relates that the Basran judge Ismāʿīl ibn Ishāq (199–282/814–895) composed a text which included the readings of twenty imams.[113] Ibn Mujāhid actually transmitted readings on this figure's authority.[114] According to Ibn al-Jazarī, the readings he collected included the seven selected by Ibn Mujāhid for his text.[115] Yāqūt expressed the view that Ismāʿīl's works were held in great esteem by Ibn Mujāhid and by other eminent authorities on readings.[116] Activity in the area of collecting and collating readings was clearly vigorous. Muhammad ibn Jarīr al-Tabarī (224–310/839–922) composed two texts on *qirāʾāt*. The first of these works was entitled *al-Fasl bayna'l-qirāʾa*. It is supposed to have scrutinised differences among the readers regarding the *hurūf* of the Qur'an. It provided not only the names of prominent readers from Medina, Mecca, Kūfa, Basra, Shām and other regions, but additionally the variances among the readings he cited were grammatically evaluated.[117] Sadly the text like so many in this genre has not survived, but the substance of its contents would have permeated Tabarī's extant commentary on the Qur'an. Having referred to scholarship's reception of his work, Yāqūt includes a quotation in which Ibn Mujāhid praises Tabarī's work and refers to its comprising an error regarding a *harf* of Hamza with which Tabarī was authoritatively familiar. Ibn Mujāhid concludes that the mistake was due to the fact that Tabarī based his book on Abū ʿUbayd ibn al-Qāsim's earlier work on readings which contained this original error.[118] Ahwāzī also describes a text composed by Tabarī collating *qirāʾāt*, claiming that it consisted of eighteen volumes written in a large script.[119] Ibn al-Jazarī includes a report in his biographical entry for Tabarī asserting that his work on readings was called *al-Jāmiʿ*.[120]

Further works on Qur'anic readings and readers were written throughout the third century. The Meccan specialist in readings Isḥāq ibn Aḥmad al-Khuzāʿī (d. 308/921) composed several treatises which codified disagreements and agreements among Meccan readings.[121] Ibn Shannabūdh studied readings with this figure. He was an important source for Ibn Mujāhid and his *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*.[122] Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq Abū Rabīʿa (d. 294/907) was an authority on Meccan readings.[123] He produced a detailed monograph of the readings of two eminent Meccans, Qunbul and Bazzī (170–250/786–864); Dhahabī remarked that he produced a text encapsulating the readings of Ibn Kathīr.[124] Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Naqqāsh (266–324/879–935) was one of Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq's students. He was the author of a text entitled *Kitāb al-Muʿjam al-kabīr fī asmāʾ al-qurrāʾ wa-qirāʾātihim*.[125] Ibn al-Nadīm states that he recorded monographs of the readings of Ḥamza and Kisāʾī, and he wrote *Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt al-thamān*, adding Khalaf's reading to the 'seven' readings.[126] Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Dājūnī (273–324/886–936), an eminent colleague of Ibn Mujāhid, is named as the author of a compilation of readings.[127] The synthesis of readings preserved in all of these texts formed a substantial part of the corpus of the reading tradition. But equally, there were clearly other *variae lectiones* which could be corroborated in line with the axiomatic principles of authentication spoken of by luminaries of the reading tradition. This very fact explains why specific collections of readings continued throughout the fourth century even after the text of Ibn Mujāhid had been composed: Ibrāhīm ibn ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Anṭāqī (d. 338/950), Aḥmad ibn Naṣr al-Shadhāʾī (d. 373/984), Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Mihrān (d. 381/991), ʿAbd al-Munʿim ibn Ghalbūn (389/999) and his son Ṭāhir ibn Aḥmad (d. 399/1009) had all composed texts which collated specific numbers of readings.[128]

While many of the aforementioned works seemingly accentuated the substantive codification of readings, supplementing this in some instances with grammatical analysis and resolution, there are also a number of works which were composed under the rubric *al-Iḥtijāj li'l-qurrāʾ* (also referred to as *ḥujja* works), pursuing the grammatical justification of readings as an explicit and purposeful objective. Grammarians of both Kūfan and Baṣran persuasions were the authors of focused texts on this topic: Mubarrad, Thaʿlab, Ibn Qutayba, Ibn Kaysān, Ibn al-Sarrāj, Naṣr ibn ʿAlī, Ibn Darastawayhi to name only a few. Biographical accounts of the Baṣran and Kūfan traditions consistently ascribe texts on the topic of *qirāʾāt* to individual luminaries.[129] The *iḥtijāj* works assume the hegemony of the model of *ʿarabiyya* as an instrument for the authentication of scripture. It should not be surprising that eminent later grammarians should choose this format to pitch their sophisticated arguments; the *iḥtijāj* literature was a vehicle for the expression of their influence. Moreover, this had initially been practised in the *maʿānī* type exegetical treatises which one associates with grammarians.

Conclusions

The extensive efforts to collate and preserve the vast corpus of Qur'anic readings by early readers and grammarians provide the historical setting for Ibn Mujāhid's rigorous endeavour. These earlier collections furnished Ibn Mujāhid with a prospective framework which formed the outline of his own treatise. His work clearly belongs to the *jam^c*-type treatises: those texts composed by readers emphasising the straightforward collation of readings with a minimum of grammatical explication. His predecessors within the reading tradition had distinctively defined the strictures of identifying the various *ḥurūf* and their precise features. The standardisation of readings was not the purpose of the text. Indeed, the so-called periods of consolidation and homogeneity did not impinge upon the approach and methodology adopted by readers towards *variae lectiones*. Ibn Mujāhid's work was propelled into the limelight not only due to his prominence during the trials of Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Shannabūdh, but also because he was so influential as a teacher of readings among leading Baṣran and Kūfan linguists. It was this fact that granted his work such saliency, due to these luminaries' composing illustrious explications and apologies of his *Kitāb al-Sab^ca*. His work was not an attempt to arrest the proliferation of readings, but rather to reiterate the traditional axioms of readers, convincing his grammarian cohorts to dissipate their intellectual energy and expertise in the consummate defence of material which had enjoyed high levels of recognition and successive transmission, rather than indulging in hypothetical grammatical projection and pedantry; this they loyally executed. Ibn al-Sarrāj and Abū ^cAlī al-Fārisī both worked on grammatical explications of the *Kitāb al-Sab^ca*; a further grammatical commentary on the *Kitāb al-Sab^ca* entitled *Kitāb al-Ḥujja* was composed by another of Ibn Mujāhid's pupils, the Kūfan grammarian Ibn Khālawayhi (d. 370/980).[130] Abū Manṣūr al-Azharī (d. 370/980), the eminent philologist, also produced a *Kitāb Mā^cānī al-qirā'āt* in which the *Kitāb al-Sab^ca* served as one of its principal sources for his grammatical survey and evaluation of *variae lectiones*.[131] Moreover, some grammarians even turned their attention to producing commentaries of Ibn Mujāhid's other treatise which collated readings ascribed to luminaries outside of his choice of seven.[132] The tenacity of the readers and their adherence to traditional conventions had proved to be indispensable. Despite the apparently derivative status of his endeavours, Ibn Mujāhid's legacy was to be a lasting one.

NOTES

1 See my previous publications 'Exploring the Genesis of Early Arabic Linguistic Thought: Qur'anic Readers and Grammarians of the Kūfan Tradition (Part 1)', *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1 (2003), pp. 47–78 and 'Exploring the Genesis of Early Arabic Linguistic Thought: Qur'anic Readers and Grammarians of the Baṣran Tradition (Part 2)', *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:2 (2003), pp. 1–47; Andrew Rippin (ed.), *The Qur'ān: Style and Contents* (Aldershot:

Variorum, 2001) (especially the articles by W. Graham & A. Neuwirth), and also my Review Article of Andrew Rippin (ed.), *The Qur'an: Formative Interpretation*, also in *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:2 (2003), pp. 134–152.

2 See Angelika Neuwirth's overview of the role of the liturgical function of the Qur'an, as presented in terms of form and structure of the text, in her article 'Form and Structure of the Qur'ān' in the *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002), vol. 2 (E–I), pp. 245–66, and 'Referentiality and Textuality in Sūrat al-Ḥijr. Some Observations on the Qur'anic Canonical Process and the Emergence of a Community' in Issa J. Boullata (ed.), *Literary Structures of Religious Meaning in the Qur'an* (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 2000), pp. 143–72.

3 See ʿAbd al-Salām Makram & Aḥmad Mukhtār ʿUmar, *Muʿjam al-qirāʾāt al-Qurʾāniyya maʿa muqaddima fi'l-qirāʾāt wa-ashhar al-qurrāʾ* (8 vols. Kuwait: Dhāt al-Salāsīl, 1982–85), for a general view of the scope of readings and their readers.

4 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa fi'l-qirāʾāt*, ed. Shawqī Ḍayf, 2nd edn (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1400 AH/1980).

5 See William Montgomery Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 1998 (reprint of the 1973 edition)), pp. 253–78, in which he argues that the polarity with Shīʿism spontaneously ensued as Sunnism became the established religion. See also his *Islamic Philosophy and Theology* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1987), pp. 56–63; his *Introduction to the Qurʾān, Bell's work revised by Watt, W.M.,* Islamic surveys (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997) and pp. 48–50. Finally, see also George Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges. Institutions of Learning in Islam and the West* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1982).

6 Montgomery Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, pp. 261–2. To an extent, this line of argument is pursued by Michael Cook in *The Koran, A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 73f. He is described as bringing 'order into the field' by picking out seven leading traditions. This view barely takes into account activity prior to Ibn Mujāhid.

7 Montgomery Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, p. 262.

8 George Makdisi, 'The Juridical Theology of Shāfiʿī: Origins and Significance of *Uṣūl al-fiqh*', *Studia Islamica* 59 (1984), pp. 5–47; cf. Wael Hallaq, 'Was al-Shāfiʿī the Master Architect of Islamic Jurisprudence', *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 25 (1993), pp. 587–605.

9 George Makdisi, *Studia Islamica* 59, p. 12; cf. George Makdisi, 'Ashʿarī and the Ashʿarites in Islamic Religious History', *Studia Islamica* 17 (1962), pp. 37–80, and *Studia Islamica* 18 (1963), pp. 19–39. A different perspective is provided by Richard Franks in 'Elements in the Development of the Teaching of al-Ashʿarī', *Le Museon: Revue D'Études Orientales* 104 (1991), pp. 141–90.

10 Makdisi, *Studia Islamica* 59, pp. 18–22; cf. Watt, *Islamic Philosophy and Theology*, p. 100.

11 Makdisi, *Studia Islamica* 59, p. 19.

12 Jonathan Owens, *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory: Heterogeneity and Standardization*, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science (Amsterdam: John Benjamin BV, 1990), pp. 5–6 & p. 219, especially n. 15. Owens speaks of the period 890–930 as one in which 'Arabic grammatical descriptions were consolidated in a form which in many respects has remained essentially unchanged up to the present' (p. 219).

13 Wilferd Madelung, 'The Origins of the Controversy Concerning the Creation of the Qurʾān' in Félix M. Pareja Casañas (ed.), *Orientalia Hispanica: sive studia FM, Pareja octo-*

genaria dicata (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974). This has been reprinted in Wilferd Madelung, *Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1985). Joseph van Ess, art. 'Muʿtazila' in *Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: 1987), vol. 10, pp. 22–9. See also Michael Cooperson, *Classical Arabic Biography: The Heirs of the Prophet in the Age of al-Maʾmūn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

14 See the entry *'Miḥna'* by Martin Hinds in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*; cf. Muḥammad Qasim Zaman, *Religion and Politics under the Early ʿAbbāsids* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997).

15 Christopher Melchert, 'The Adversaries of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal', *Arabica* 46 (1997), pp. 234–53, p. 234.

16 Melchert, *Arabica* 46, pp. 251f.

17 Christopher Melchert, 'Ibn Mujāhid and the Establishment of Seven Qur'anic Readings', *Studia Islamica* 91 (2000), pp. 5–22, p. 5.

18 Melchert, *Studia Islamica* 91, p. 15.

19 Melchert, *Studia Islamica* 91, p. 5.

20 Melchert, *Studia Islamica* 91, p. 10.

21 Melchert, *Studia Islamica* 91, p. 18. Cf. A. Welch's entry 'Kur'ān' in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 5, pp. 408–9. Melchert disagrees with Welch's view regarding the purpose of Ibn Mujāhid's endeavours and the link with the so-called seven *aḥruf* doctrine.

22 Melchert, *Studia Islamica* 91, p. 22.

23 Melchert, *Studia Islamica* 91, p. 21.

24 This is suggested in the opening sentence of Melchert's article.

25 Kamāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Barakāt ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat al-alibbāʾ fī ṭabaqāt al-udabāʾ*, ed. Ibrāhīm al-Samarāʾī (al-Zarqāʾ: Maktabat al-Manār, 1985), henceforth *Nuzhat*, p. 215.

26 Abū ʿAbd Allāh Yaʿqūb ibn ʿAbd Allāh Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ* (5 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1991), vol. 5, p. 312. This list should be compared with the works mentioned in Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, ed. R. Tajaddud, 3rd edn (Beirut: Dār al-Masīra, 1988), p. 36. His son was the author of the celebrated text, *ʿUqalāʾ al-majanīn*.

27 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.), vol. 2, p. 123 (listed in *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ* under the name of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan Yaʿqūb).

28 The extensive collation of his reading was carried out by Arthur Jeffery, 'The Qurʾān Readings of Ibn Miqsam' in S. Lowinger & J. de Somogyi (eds), *Ignaz Goldziher Memorial Volume* (2 vols. Budapest: Globus, 1958), pp. 1–38.

29 Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh Baghdād* (14 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, n.d.), vol. 1, pp. 206–8; cf. *Ghāyat al-nihāya fī ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, ed. Gotthelf Bergsträsser & Otto Pretzl (2 vols. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Saʿāda, 1935), henceforth *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 475–7. This text relied upon earlier biographical compilations such as Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī's work.

30 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh Baghdād*, vol. 1, pp. 206–8.

31 Jeffery, 'The Qurʾān Readings of Ibn Miqsam', p. 6.

32 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, pp. 311–12.

33 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr*, vol. 1, p. 33 & pp. 7f. See the discussion in my article in *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1, p. 63.

34 Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī, *al-Muqniʿ fī maʿrifat marsūm maṣāḥif ahl al-amṣār*, ed. M. Dahmān (Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1983), p. 115.

35 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 311.

36 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, pp. 311–12.

37 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 311.

38 Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat al-alibbāʾ*, p. 215, and Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt ʿalā anbāh al-nuḥāt*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (4 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 1956), vol. 3, pp. 101–3.

39 Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat al-alibbāʾ*, p. 215.

40 Jeffery, 'The Qurʾān Readings of Ibn Miqsam', p. 2.

41 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist,* pp. 82 & 69; cf. al-Qifṭī, *Inbāh*, vol. 2, p. 66; Jalāl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-wuʿāt fī ṭabaqāt al-lughawiyyīn wa'l-nuḥāt*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (2 vols. Beirut: Maktabat al-ʿAṣriyya, 1964), vol. 2, pp. 82–3.

42 Examples of his readings are found in the *Fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm, pp. 73–4. Yāqūt also provides details of his readings: Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 311.

43 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 312; cf. Leah Kinberg, 'The Standardisation of Qurʾān Readings: The Testimonial Value of Dreams' in Kinga Dévényi & Tamas Ivanyi (eds), *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Grammar* (Budapest: 1991) pp. 223–38; cf. Arthur Jeffery, 'The Qurʾān Readings of Ibn Miqsam', p. 8.

44 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, pp. 52–4. His name is also vocalised as Ibn Shanabūdh and Shanbūdh. This is recounted by Yāqūt from a text entitled *Kitāb al-Taʾrīkh*, quoting Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAlī al-Khaṭībī (Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 114).

45 Ibn al-Anbārī, *Nuzhat*, p. 161.

46 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, pp. 114–5; cf. al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh Baghdād*, vol. 1, pp. 280–1, and Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 34 & p. 155.

47 For examples of functional type works see Shah, *Journal of Qurʾanic Studies* 5:1, pp. 47–8.

48 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr*, vol. 1, pp. 9–16. John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 204, for his appreciation of *shādhdh*.

49 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, pp. 114–15.

50 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 115. There is a semantic equivalence in such readings in terms of *warāʾ* and *amām*, due to the former being one of the *aḍdād*; cf. *Kitāb al-Aḍdād*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Beirut: al-Maktabat al-ʿAṣriyya, 1987). Cf. Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies*, pp. 202–3.

51 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist,* pp. 34–5.

52 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, pp. 115f. See also Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 83.

53 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, pp. 116–17.

54 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 116. An interesting twist to this tale is included in the narrative of Ibn Shannabūdh's trial. It is told that, having been punished at the behest of the *wazīr* Ibn Muqla for his brazen defence of his readings, he called upon God to avenge his treatment. He asked that Ibn Muqla's authority be destroyed and his hands severed. History shows that the *wazīr* was the victim of a purge which claimed his life. See Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, p. 54.

55 Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam fī tāʾrīkh al-umam wa'l-mulūk*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir Aṭāʾ & Muṣṭafā ʿAbd al-Qādir Aṭāʾ (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1992), vol. 13, p. 348; cf. Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, p. 54.

56 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, pp. 65f.

57 See Shah, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1 & 5:2.

58 Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qasṭalānī, *Laṭāʾif al-ishārāt li-funūn al-qirāʾāt,* ed. ʿAbd al-Ṣabūr Shāhīn & ʿĀmir al-Sayyid ʿUthmān (Cairo: Lajnat Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-Islāmī, 1972), vol. 1, p. 105. The author of the *Laṭāʾif* states that his past antics are not considered a blemish against his character nor do they impinge upon his standing as a narrator.

59 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr,* vol. 1, pp. 9f.

60 See the introduction to al-Imām Abū Zurʿa, *Ḥujjat al-qirāʾāt,* ed. Saʿīd al-Afghānī (Beirut: Muʾassassat al-Risāla, 1979), p. 13. The argument is that the *isnād* had to be *mutawātir;* the suggestion being that Makkī and Ibn al-Jazarī should have stressed that fact. The issue here is one of definitions.

61 See Shah, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1 & 5:2.

62 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr,* vol. 1, p. 31–4.

63 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr,* vol. 1, p. 33. Also see pp. 7f; cf. first section of Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī, *al-Muqniʿ* and the extensive discussion of the seven *ḥurūf* in Bāqillānī's *al-Intiṣār li'l-Qurʾān,* ed. M. al-Quḍāh (2 vols. Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2001), vol. 1, pp. 367–92 and vol. 2, p. 437. Also see vol. 1, p. 69, for the issue of whether the modes of reading are comprehensively enshrined in ʿUthmān's codex.

64 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr,* vol. 1, p. 14–18; idem, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ,* vol. 2, p. 123. Also see Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī, *Maʿrifat al-qurrāʾ al-kibār,* ed. M. Jādd al-Ḥaqq, 1st edn (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Ḥadītha, 1968), henceforth *Maʿrifat.*

65 Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muslim ibn Qutayba, *Taʾwīl mushkil al-Qurʾān,* ed. Aḥmad Ṣaqr, 2nd edn (Cairo: Dār al-Turāth, 1973), p. 42.

66 Ibn Qutayba, *Taʾwīl mushkil al-Qurʾān,* p. 42.

67 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ,* vol. 2, p. 54.

68 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr,* vol. 1, p. 14–15. Ibn al-Jazarī adds that one cannot determine whether such readings were integrally Qur'anic nor can one rule regarding their soundness: therefore if a reading's status cannot be established, it cannot plausibly be defined as Qur'anic. The person denying its Qur'anic status is not a disbeliever; yet to do so is deemed outrageous (p. 14). Ibn al-Jazarī adds that it is wrong to classify readings outside of the seven selected by Ibn Mujāhid as being *shādhdha,* stating the use of the terminology in this way represented a posterior development within the reading tradition; as we have noted from Ibn Jinnī's quotation above, Ibn Mujāhid was referring to levels of transmission in this respect.

69 Qasṭalānī, *Laṭāʾif al-ishārāt li-funūn al-qirāʾāt,* vol. 1, pp. 72–6. See my forthcoming article 'The Juridical Implications of the *qirāʾāt al-shādhdha'.* Ibn al-Jazarī points out the misconceptions regarding this term and the fact that it pejoratively served as an umbrella for readings outside the seven; see Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr,* vol. 1, p. 14–15.

70 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr,* vol. 1, pp. 14–15; cf. Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ,* vol. 2, pp. 53f. He notes that this is one of the opinions ascribed to a number of Shāfiʿī and Ḥanafī scholars; it was also one of two opinions on the subject narrated on the authority of Mālik and Aḥmad. Ibn al-Jawzī adds that most scholars said their recitation (in prayers) was not permissible. The claim that such readings had a relative level of transmission was rebutted by the fact that they would have superseded by virtue of the *al-ʿarḍa al-akhīra* (the Prophet's final review with Gabriel) together with the consensus of the companions. Qualification of the legal niceties of this matter is provided on p. 15. Melchert's remark that 'Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal could be cited in favour of putting together one's own reading of the Qur'an on the basis of known variants', as sourced to Dhahabī's *Taʾrīkh,* is a valid point; however, it has no analogue in terms of Ibn Shannabūdh's activities for the plain reason that the latter's readings could not

be sourced to authenticated precedents accepted by the classical reading tradition. See Melchert, *Studia Islamica* 91, p. 21.

71 The arguments on this topic are covered in Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirā'āt al-ʿashr*, vol. 1, pp. 14–17.

72 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī'l-qirā'āt al-ʿashr*, vol. 1, pp. 14–5.

73 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 139–42. The verb *qaraʾa* is used to qualify his relationship with these two figures, and the term *samāʿan* for the numerous other figures.

74 al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī, *al-Ḥujja fī ʿilal al-qirāʾāt al-sabʿ*, ed. Shalabī, Nāṣif, Najjār & Najjār (2 vols. Cairo: al-Hayʾat al-Miṣriyya, 1983), vol. 1, p. 4. Ibn al-Sarrāj was the author of the famous *Uṣūl fī'l-naḥw* and the *Mūjaz fī'l-naḥw*.

75 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 92. Welch states that the book came at just the right time, presuming that the viziers of the state adopted it. See his art. 'Kurʾān', p. 409.

76 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 87.

77 There are references to confined syntactic concerns but these are sporadic: see p. 112, in which he discusses the grammatical *ʿilla* of *ghayr(a)'l-maghḍūbi ʿalayhim* in Chapter One.

78 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 48. One must emphasise the fact that the distinction between grammarians and readers seems to be one of methodology; grammarians show a greater propensity to speculate.

79 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 34. See Ḍayf's introduction to the *Kitāb al-Sabʿa* (p. 20). It is also the case that the readings which fell outside the famous ten readings were referred to as being *shādhdha*; this appears to be a posterior development. Ibn Jinnī does censure Ibn Shannabūdh and Ibn Miqsam. However, his authorship of the famous *Kitāb al-Muḥtasab* was essentially about providing grammatical justification for the *shādhdh* readings as defined by Ibn Mujāhid. Gotthelf Bergsträsser, *Nichtkanonische Koranlesarten im Muḥtasab des ibn Ginnī*, Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (München, 1933). This book includes Ibn Jinnī's preface to his text. See p. 15. The *Kitāb al-Qirāʾāt al-kabīr* thus referred to the *shawādhdh* readings: those not enjoying high levels of transmission and recognition in the garrison cities. The technical compass of the term *shādhdh* varies according to the historical context and setting.

80 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, pp. 88–101.

81 There were numerous other chains of authority which existed for the readings.

82 See Ahmad Ali al-Imam, *Variant Readings of the Qurʾān: A Critical Study of their Historical and Linguistic Origins* (Herndon, Virginia: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 1998), pp. 135–7, for a study of the major transmitters.

83 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 112. It was later grammarians such as Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī and Ibn Jinnī who took up the reins of *ʿilal* in their own commentaries on Ibn Mujāhid's *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*.

84 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, pp. 113–39. The editor of the text introduces the titles of these sub-sections but they are based on the author's discourse. This is defined in terms of elongating and confining the *hamza*; articulating the concomitant and consecutive occurrence of *hamza*. See Pierre Cachia's definition of these terms in *The Monitor, A Dictionary of Arabic Grammatical Terms* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973).

85 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 48. See the following references to codices: pp. 108, 235, 245, 284, 318, 390, 428, 473, 479, 494, 542, 625 and 689.

86 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 38. Further works are often cited by Ibn al-Nadīm when covering the separate biographical details of individuals.

87 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, p. 348. I have spoken about Hārūn and Yaʿqūb at length in *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:2.

88 Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 644.

89 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 60.

90 Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Zubaydī, *Ṭabaqāt al-naḥwiyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad Abū'l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1973), p. 73. Makkī ibn Abī Ṭālib's *Ibāba ʿan maʿānī al-qirāʾāt*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Shalabī (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1960), indicates that Ḥamza, Kisāʾī and Ibn ʿĀmir were omitted from Abū Ḥātim's text on readings. The reasons for his dislike of Ḥamza can be viewed in Shah, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1, p. 70.

91 Gotthelf Bergsträsser, *Nichtkanonische Koranlesarten*, p. 18. He also refers to Quṭrub, Farrāʾ, Zajjāj and Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī as authors of studies of readings which he utilised.

92 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 90. Cf. Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 38. Ibn Saʿd narrated many of Wāqidī's texts: cf. *Fihrist*, pp. 111–12.

93 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 38.

94 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 272–3.

95 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr*, vol. 1, pp. 188–91; he is referred to as one of the ten readers; we shall note below how Naqqāsh includes Khalaf in his compilation of eight readings. Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 272–3 and Qasṭalānī, *Laṭāʾif al-ishārāt*, vol. 1, p. 98.

96 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, p. 143.

97 Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 344.

98 Jeffery, 'The Qurʾān Readings of Ibn Miqsam', p. 4. Note the context in which he is mentioned in the *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, pp. 314, 416, 463, 455 and 552.

99 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, pp. 17–18.

100 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, p. 18; cf. Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr*, vol. 1, p. 34.

101 Dhahabī, *Maʿrifat al-qurrāʾ al-kibār*, vol. 1, p. 72.

102 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 396.

103 Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Naḥḥās, *Iʿrāb al-Qurʾān*, ed. Zuhayr Ghāzī Zāhid, 3rd edn (5 vols. Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1988), vol. 3, p. 205 and see p. 166.

104 Naḥḥās, *Iʿrāb al-Qurʾān*, vol. 4, p. 365.

105 Naḥḥās, *Iʿrāb al-Qurʾān*, vol. 1, p. 373.

106 Naḥḥās, *Iʿrāb al-Qurʾān*, vol. 3, p. 10. Cf. Ismāʿīl ibn Khalaf's *Kitāb al-ʿUnwān fi'l-qirāʾāt al-sabʿ*, ed. Z. Zāhid & K. al-ʿAṭiyya (Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1985), p. 126, in which Warsh narrated the same reading on the authority of Nāfiʿ; cf. Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, p. 408.

107 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 2, p. 363–4.

108 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 255; cf. Dhahabī, *Maʿrifat*, vol. 1, p. 157.

109 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 255. Aḥwāzī is quoted by Yāqūt, *Muʿjam al-udabāʾ*, vol. 5, p. 245. His entry is included in Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 220.

110 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 42–3. Cf. Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr*, vol. 1, p. 34.

111 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrāʾ*, vol. 1, pp. 42–3. Ibn Mujāhid cites him as a source: Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sabʿa*, pp. 268 and 327.

112 He also speaks of mistakes and misapprehensions they might cause. See Abū ʿAmr ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd al-Dānī, *al-Muḥkam fi naqṭ al-maṣāḥif*, ed. ʿIzzat Ḥasan, 2nd edn

(Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1986), p. 20. See Yasin Dutton, 'Red Dots, Green Dots, Yellow Dots and Blue: Some Reflections on the Vocalisation of Early Qur'anic manuscripts (Part I)', *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 1 (1999), pp. 115–40, and idem, 'Red Dots, Green Dots, Yellow Dots and Blue: Some Reflections on the Vocalisation of Early Qur'anic manuscripts (Part II), *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 2:1 (2000), pp. 1–24. Note pp. 116f of Part I and pp. 12f of Part II. He provides numerous examples, highlighting western misconceptions regarding their function. He argues that they were used for *hamzat al-qaṭ^c* (pronounced glottal stops) and *variae lectiones*.

113 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 1, p. 162.

114 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 1, p. 162, see also p. 140 in which it is mentioned that Ibn Mujāhid narrated *ḥurūf* on his authority (*samā^{c}an*). This judge was supposed to have been asked why *tabdīl* (alteration of scripture) was permitted for *ahl al-Tawrāt*, but not for *ahl al-Qur'ān*; he replied that this was because the *ahl al-kitāb* were entrusted to devise the means to preserve their scripture, whereas in the case of *ahl al-Qur'ān*, God carries out that function (see p. 162).

115 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr*, vol. 1, p. 34.

116 Yāqūt, *Mu^{c}jam al-udabā'*, vol. 2, p. 195.

117 Yāqūt, *Mu^{c}jam al-udabā'*, vol. 5, pp. 258–9; cf. Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr*, vol. 1, p. 34.

118 Yāqūt, *Mu^{c}jam al-udabā'*, vol. 5, pp. 258–9.

119 Yāqūt, *Mu^{c}jam al-udabā'*, vol. 5, p. 245.

120 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 2, p. 106. He is quoting from Dānī.

121 Dhahabī, *Ma^{c}rifat*, vol. 1, p. 184; Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā*, vol. 1, p. 156.

122 Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sab^{c}a*, pp. 65f.

123 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 2, p. 99.

124 Dhahabī, *Ma^{c}rifat*, vol. 1, p. 185. Qunbul is described as the unofficial head of readings in Ḥijāz.

125 Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 36.

126 Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 2, p. 120; cf. Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 42. This is rendered as '*al-thamāniyya*' in this printed edition; an alternative title is *Kitāb al-Qurrā' al-thamāniyya*.

127 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr*, vol. 1, p. 34; *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, vol. 2, p. 77. Ibn Mujāhid refers to him as one of his sources: *Kitāb al-Sab^{c}a*, pp. 215 & 268.

128 Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr*, vol. 1, pp. 34–6, for the list of authors of collections see pp. 58–97. For Anṭāqī, see Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā*, vol. 1, pp. 16f; for Shadhā'ī, see vol. 1, pp. 144–5; for Ibn Mihrān, the author of *Kitāb al-Mabsūṭ fī'l-qirā'āt al-^{c}ashr* and *Ṭabaqāt al-qurrā'*, see vol. 1, pp. 49f; for Ibn Ghalbūn, the author of the *Kitāb al-Irshād fī'l-sab^c*, see vol. 1, pp. 470–1; his son Ṭāhir was the author of *Kitāb al-Tadhkira fī'l-qirā'āt al-thamān*, see vol. 1, p. 339 and *al-Nashr*, vol. 1, pp. 73f. Cf. the editors' introduction to *Kitāb al-^{c}Unwān* pp. 15–22.

129 See my articles in *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:1 & 5:2. Baalbaki questioned whether figures such as Mubarrad would have composed works on this topic, but this view overlooks the methodology refined by grammarians. See Ramzi Baalbaki, 'The Treatment of *qirā'āt* by the Second and Third Century Grammarians', *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 15 (1985), pp. 11–32.

130 Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn Khālawayhi, *al-Ḥujja fī'l-qirā'āt al-sab^c*, ed. ^{c}Abd al-Āl Sālim Makram (Beirut: Dār al-Shurūq, 1971).

131 Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Azharī, *Kitāb Maʿānī al-qirāʾāt*, ed. E. Mubārak & E. Qawzī (4 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1991). Later readers such as Makkī ibn Abī Ṭālib (d. 437/1045) and Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī also composed treatises which were structured around the concept of seven readings, although Makkī's text does venture beyond the seven. However, in his famous *Kitāb al-Kashf* he mentions Ibn Mujāhid on only four occasions. Makkī ibn Abī Ṭālib, *Kitāb al-Kashf ʿan wujūh al-qirāʾāt al-sabʿ*, ed. M. Ramāḍān (2 vols. Beirut: Muʾassassat al-Risāla, 1987), vol. 1, pp. 97, 116, 204; vol. 2, p. 79. Thus the concept of 'seven' readings per se becomes the focus. Dānī composed a concise synthesis of the seven readings and their readers, listing two narrators for each of the readings: *Kitāb al-Taysīr fī'l-qirāʾāt al-sabʿ*, ed. Otto Pretzl (Istanbul: Staatsdruckerei, 1930). Again, the focus and definition of these later texts is principally provided by the readings. It is reported that Dānī relied upon the text of Naqqāsh, mentioned above. See also Makkī's *Kitāb al-Tabṣira fī'l-qirāʾāt*, ed. M. Ramaḍān (Kuwait: Manshūrāt Maʿhad al-Makhṭūṭāt al-ʿArabiyya, 1985).

132 Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn Khālawayhi, *Mukhtaṣar fī shawādhdh al-Qurʾān* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Mutanabbī, n.d.). See Shah, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 5:2, pp. 23–45; cf. A.J. Arberry, 'The *Kitāb al-Badīʿ* of Ibn Khalawaih' in Lowinger & Somogyi, *Ignaz Goldziher Memorial Volume*, pp. 183–90. Ibn Jinnī's *Muḥtasab* was inspired by his mentor Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī and his efforts in this area. Ibn Mujāhid enthused this latter individual.