Grammatical Argumentation Based on Qurʾānic Readings between the Basran and Kufan Schools

الاحتجاج النحوي بالقراءات القرآنية بين البصريين والكوفيين

Rachid Bedida *(1)
[1] Faculty of Arts and Languages, Department of Arabic Language and Literature, University of El Oued (Algeria), bedida-rachid@univ-eloued.dz

submission date: 18/01/2026 acceptance date: 10/09/2026 published date 15/09/2026

****

Abstract:

Following the advent of Islam and the revelation of the Holy Qur'an, the Arab intellectual environment witnessed a major scientific movement, most notably in linguistic studies, which led to the emergence of distinct grammatical schools defending their methodological convictions in the centers of Basra, Kufa, and Baghdad. Linguistic history records extensive disagreements among these schools, chief among which is the issue of citing Qur'anic readings as authoritative evidence. This study aims to clarify the true stance of both the Basran and Kufan schools toward Qur'anic readings and to explore the scientific rigor of each; the Basran position was characterized by extreme caution, whereas the Kufan stance exhibited greater flexibility. To achieve this, the study adopted a descriptive method based on a comprehensive survey of the sources of linguistic evidence, tracing how grammarians interacted with them, and subsequently analyzing the linguistic methodology of each group. The results revealed that the defining characteristic governing the Basran approach was strict analogy (qiyās), whereas textual transmission (samāʿ) governed the Kufan method. Ultimately, the study concludes that the respective positions of both schools toward Qur'anic readings were an objective outcome of the dominant methodological framework guiding their grammatical thought.

Keywords: Qur'anic readings; grammatical evidence; Basran school; Kufan school; analogy (qiyās); textual transmission (samāʿ).

ملخص باللغة العربية:

شهدت البيئة اللغوية العربية في بداية نهضتها العلمية كثيراً من الخلافات، كان من أبرزها قضية الاحتجاج النحوي بالقراءات القرآنية، وهذه الدراسة جاءت لبيان حقيقة موقف المذهبين البصري والكوفي نحوها، واستكشاف القوة العلمية التي يمتلكها كل اتجاه؛ إذ طبع التشددُ المذهبَ الأول بينما كان التوسعُ هو الحاكمَ للثاني. ولتحقيق ذلك، اعتمدت الدراسة المنهج الوصفي الذي قام بمهمة المسح الشامل لمصادر الاحتجاج وتتبع تعامل النحاة معها، ثم تحليل المنهج اللغوي لكل فريق. أظهر البحث أن القياس هو السمة البارزة لمنهج البصريين، بينما كان السماعُ هو الحاكمَ لمنهج الكوفيين، لتخلص الدراسة في النهاية إلى أن موقف كلا المذهبين من القراءات القرآنية كان نتاجاً موضوعياً للسمة المنهجية الغالبة التي وجهت الفكر النحوي لكل منهما.

الكلمات المفتاحية: القراءات القرآنية؛ الاحتجاج النحوي؛ المذهب البصري؛ المذهب الكوفي؛ القياس؛ السماع.

Introduction

Linguistic studies among Arabs and Muslims emerged within the context of the intellectual transformation brought about by Islam and its supreme constitution, the Noble Qur'an. These studies initially took a simple form, but soon developed and became more clearly defined, whether in terms of specialization, terminology, or methodology. Subsequently—and this represents one aspect of that development—each student of knowledge came to adopt a particular orientation, or rather, to be persuaded by a specific approach and method of inquiry. The fundamental principle in every field of knowledge is to follow the truth rather than its proponents; hence, one finds scholars identified as Basran, Kufan, or Baghdadian, in accordance with the linguistic schools that arose in those intellectual centers.

Linguistic history records numerous disagreements between these schools, among which is the issue of employing Qur'anic readings (qirāʾāt) as authoritative evidence. The Basran attitude toward the Qur'anic readings was marked by considerable caution, whereas the Kufan stance was more equitable. Which of the two, then, was supported by stronger evidence and more closely aligned with sound scientific methodology?

1. The Concept of Argumentation (Iḥtijāj):

Argumentation is the act of adducing a proof (ḥujjah). Al-Jurjānī defines it as "that by which the validity of a claim is demonstrated."[1] It is also described as "evidence and proof"; it is said to be that by which an opponent is repelled. Al-Azharī states: "A ḥujjah is the aspect by which victory is achieved in disputation. It is called a ḥujjah because it is sought out and aimed at, since it is intentionally directed toward and pursued."[2] As for grammatical or linguistic argumentation, it refers to "establishing the validity of a rule, or the correctness of the use of a word or structure, by means of transmitted evidence whose chain of transmission is sound and which is attributed to an eloquent Arab of unimpaired linguistic instinct."[3]

2. Sources of Argumentation:

The sources of argumentation are identical to the sources of linguistic transmission (samāʿ). Al-Suyūṭī states in *al-Iqtirāḥ*, defining the latter: "By it I mean that which is established in the speech of *those* whose eloquence is trusted. This includes the speech of God Almighty, namely the Qurʾān; the speech of His Prophet, peace be upon him; and the speech of the Arabs—before his mission, during his time, and after it—until tongues were corrupted by the proliferation of the muwalladūn, in both poetry and prose, whether Muslim or non-Muslim. These are three categories, each of which requires reliable establishment."[4]

2.1. The Noble Qurʾān and the Qurʾānic Readings (Qirāʾāt):

We have mentioned the term *qirāʾāt* alongside the Noble Qurʾān because some scholars distinguish between them and do not regard them as a single entity. Al-Zarkashī states in his *al-Burhān*, drawing a distinction: "Know that the Qurʾān and the readings are two distinct realities: the Qurʾān is the revelation sent down to Muḥammad, peace and blessings be upon him, for exposition and inimitability; whereas the readings are the variations in the wording of that revelation as recorded in the written letters or in their modes of articulation, such as lightening, strengthening, and other features."[5]

This view of al-Zarkashī is opposed by others, who hold that "the Qurʾān and the readings are two realities sharing a single meaning, for the sound readings that the community has received with acceptance are nothing other than a part of the Noble Qurʾān itself; thus, the relationship between them is a close one, that of part to whole."[6]

2-1-1. Categories of Qurʾānic Readings and Their Governing Criteria

In *al-Nashr fī al-Qirāʾāt al-ʿAshr* by Ibn al-Jazarī, his formulation of the criteria for an authentic Qurʾānic reading[7] states:

"Every reading that conforms to Arabic, even in one aspect; conforms to one of the ʿUthmānic codices, even by way of probability; and whose chain of transmission is sound—such a reading is the authentic reading that may neither be rejected nor denied. Rather, it is among the seven modes in which the Qurʾān was revealed, and it is incumbent upon people to accept it, whether it is transmitted from the seven imams, the ten, or others among the accepted imams."[8]

Thus, these are the three criteria by which an authentic reading is defined. [9] Implicitly, any reading that falls outside these criteria is designated as weak, anomalous (shādhdh), or invalid, whether it is attributed to one of the seven or to someone of even greater standing than them. This is the correct position according to the verifying authorities among both the early and later scholars.[10]

It is important to draw attention to the fact that the criterion of anomaly in Qurʾānic readings differs from the criterion of anomaly in grammar. In the former, anomaly consists in deviation from the three aforementioned conditions, whereas in the latter it consists in deviation from analogy or from regularly established grammatical rules.

In what follows, we will attempt to explicate these stipulated criteria in some detail. Before doing so, however, one may ask: is the ordering of these criteria, as presented by Ibn al-Jazarī, intentional or not? For there are those who consider the soundness of transmission to be the primary criterion, with the remaining two being necessary concomitants of it. Ibn al-Jazarī himself from Shaykh Abū Muḥammad Ibrāhīm ibn ʿUmar al-Jaʿbarī his statement:

"The condition is one, namely the soundness of transmission, and the other two necessarily follow from it."[11]

Accordingly, we shall begin with this criterion, being persuaded by the latter view.

2-1-1-1 The Soundness of the Sanad (Chain of Transmission) or Isnad

Let us begin with the lexical meaning of *sanad*. In *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ*, it is stated: "*al-sanad* (with a movable vowel): that which faces you of a mountain and rises above the slope … in the mountain: to ascend … plural: *masānid* and *masānīd*."[12] This meaning is also found in *Asās al-Balāgha*: "We descended at the *sanad* of the mountain and the valley; it is an elevated part of the land facing it."[13] Likewise, in *al-Muḥkam* and *al-Muḥīṭ al-Aʿẓam*, it is stated: "*al-sanad* is that which rises at the front of a mountain or a valley, and its plural is *asnād*."[14] All of these lexicons agree that *sanad* conveys the meaning of elevation and height. From this general meaning, subsidiary meanings branch out. One says: "He leaned (*tasānada*) against the wall," and "the patient was supported (*sūnida*)."[15] It is also said:

"The two wolves approached him leaning upon one another (*mutasānidayn*), that is, mutually supporting one another,"[16] and "He is my *sanad* and my support (*mustanadī*),"[17] and "*al-sanad* is that upon which a person relies." [18] These subsidiary meanings thus convey notions of reliance, mutual support, protection, and strength.

The disciplines concerned with the verification of religious and linguistic texts borrowed these meanings and employed them to describe the transmitters, reciters, and narrators of the Noble Qur'an, its readings, the Prophetic ḥadīth, and even the speech of the Arabs, whether for the purpose of establishing proof, reporting a useful point, or relating an anecdote or witticism.

What appears in the works of Qur'anic sciences, the science of readings, and Prophetic ḥadīth derives its meaning from the aforementioned lexical senses. In some of these works it is stated: "The original meaning of *sanad* in the language is that upon which one leans, such as a wall and the like; and the *sanad* of a ḥadīth or a reading derives from this."[19] It is also said that *sanad* is "a generation of people,"[20] and that "*al-sanad* is reporting by way of the text (*matn*),"[21] or—according to the scholars of ḥadīth—that it is "the path leading to the *matn*, which consists of the wording of the ḥadīth."[22] The *sanad* of a ḥadīth is "the chain of men who transmitted the ḥadīth from the Messenger of God, peace and blessings be upon him and his family,"[23] and "the *asānīd* are the pillars of the ḥadīth."[24] *Isnād* is defined as "attributing the ḥadīth to its original source,"[25] and the continuity of the *sanad* in ḥadīth means "the absence of any missing transmitter within it,"[26] in which case it is described as a ḥadīth with a strong *sanad*.[27] A ḥadīth or narration is described as possessing elevation (*ʿulūw*) or elevated chains (*ʿawālī*) when a consecutive number of trustworthy transmitters are mentioned in its chain.[28]

It is evident that the unifying meaning of all these definitions is that the *sanad* is the chain of transmitters who convey the *matn*, whether it be Qur'anic, prophetic, or otherwise, whereas *isnād* refers to the act itself—that is, the process of linking and attributing the *matn* to its source, whether as a transmitter or as its authoritative origin.

For the Qur'anic text to be sound, it must be carefully traced along with its transmitters and conveyors, and everything related to their integrity, precision, and reliability must be known. In all of this, there is no room for personal reasoning, interpretation, or estimation. This can only be achieved through direct oral transmission and by adhering to an uninterrupted chain of transmission connected to the Messenger of God, peace be upon him. Recitation is a transmitted practice (*sunna*), taken exactly as it was conveyed from the Prophet, peace be upon him, and in accordance with

what he permitted and approved. Al-Dānī states: "The imams of Qur'anic recitation do not operate in any aspect of the letters of the Qur'an according to what is most widespread in language or most analogically consistent in Arabic; rather, they rely upon what is most firmly established in transmitted reports and most sound in transmission and narration. Once it is authentically established from them, it is not rejected on the basis of Arabic analogy or linguistic prevalence, because recitation is a followed tradition that must be accepted and adhered to."[29]

Al-Dānī further narrates in his book *Jāmiʿ al-Bayān fī al-Qirāʾāt al-Sabʿ al-Mashhūra*, in the chapter entitled "Mention of the reports transmitted urging adherence to the imams of the early generations in recitation and holding fast to what the imams of recitation conveyed from them," a number of traditions from the Messenger of God, peace be upon him, and from his Companions. All of these explicitly emphasize and encourage learning and receiving the Qur'an through adherence and following transmitted authority, and avoiding innovation. Among these traditions and reports are the following:[30]

- A report transmitted by ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd from ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib (may God ennoble his countenance), who said: "Indeed, the Messenger of God—peace and blessings be upon him—commands you that each one of you should recite as he has been taught to recite, for those before you were destroyed only by disagreement."[31]
- A report from ʿĪsā ibn Abī ʿĪsā al-Khayyāṭ, in which he says: "I heard ʿĀmir al-Shaʿbī say: Recitation is an established Sunnah, so recite as your predecessors recited."[32]
- A report from ʿUmar ibn Muhājir, in which he heard ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz say: "The recitation of the Qurʾān is a Sunnah that the later generations take from the earlier ones."[33]
- A report from ʿĪsā ibn ʿUmar in which it is stated: "I heard Ṭalḥa ibn Muṣarrif reciting *qad aflaḥū al-muʾminūn* (al-Muʾminūn 1). I said to him: 'Are you making a grammatical error?' He replied: 'Yes, I err as my companions err.'"[34]
- A report from Shibl ibn ʿAbbād in which he says: "Ibn Muḥayṣin and Ibn Kathīr used to recite *(wa-an uḥkum)* (al-Māʾidah 49), *(wa-an uʿbudū)* (al-Māʾidah 117), *(wa-an ushkurū)* (Luqmān 12), *(wa-qālat ukhruj)* (Yūsuf 31), *(qāla rabbī uḥkum)* (al-Anbiyāʾ 112), *(rabbī unṣurnī)* (al-Muʾminūn 26), and similar forms. Shibl ibn ʿAbbād said: I said to them, 'The Arabs do not do this, nor do the grammarians.' They replied, 'Grammar has no bearing on this. Thus we heard our imams and those of the early generations before us.'"[35]

- Someone questioned Mālik ibn Anas, saying: "Why did you recite in *Ṣād (wa-lī naʿjah wāḥidah)* (Ṣād 23) with a quiescent yāʾ, and recite in *(qul yā ayyuhā al-kāfirūn)* (al-Kāfirūn 1) *(wa-lī)* (al-Kāfirūn 6) with the yāʾ in the accusative?" Mālik replied: "O people of Kūfa, nothing remains for you of knowledge except 'how' and 'why.' Recitation is an established Sunnah, taken from the mouths of men. So follow, and do not innovate."[36]
- Another person also questioned Mālik ibn Anas, saying: "How is it that you recited in the Sūrah of Sulaymān *(mā lī lā arā al-hudhud)* (al-Naml 20) with a lengthened yāʾ, and recited in Sūrat Yā Sīn *(mālī lā aʿbud)* (Yā Sīn 22) with the yāʾ in the accusative?" He said: Mālik mentioned some remarks, then said: "Do not introduce 'how' and 'why' into the words of our Lord. Rather, it is a matter of audition and transmission, taught by the younger from the elder, and peace."[37]

In order to preserve the soundness of the Qurʾānic reading and the integrity of its text, scholars established conditions and methodological controls governing the transmitter of the text. Among these is the statement of Ibn al-Jazarī: "By our saying 'and its chain of transmission is sound,' we mean that this reading is transmitted by a just and precise narrator from one like him, in this manner until the chain terminates, and that, in addition, it is well known among the authoritative masters of this discipline who have mastered it, and is not regarded by them as an error nor as something in which some individuals have singularly deviated."[38]

A similar approach is found among the scholars of ḥadīth. In *al-Khulāṣah fī ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth* by al-Ṭībī, several criteria are mentioned concerning the transmitter or narrator. Although what he presents pertains specifically to the transmitter of Prophetic ḥadīth, it is nonetheless useful for elucidating the concept of a sound chain of transmission. He states: "The sound (ḥadīth) is that whose chain of transmission is uninterrupted, transmitted by a just and precise narrator from one like him, and free from irregularity and defect. His statement 'whose chain of transmission is uninterrupted' excludes the disconnected (report), which is that whose chain is not connected in any manner. His statement 'by the transmission of a just narrator' excludes one whose uprightness is unknown or who is subject to some form of disparagement.[39] By 'precise' we mean one who is retentive and vigilant, neither negligent, inattentive, nor doubtful in the states of reception and delivery. If the transmitter falls short of the degree of mastery, his report falls within the category of ḥasan; and if his level descends below that, his report is deemed weak. His statement 'free from irregularity' excludes the anomalous (shādhdh), which is that reported by a

trustworthy narrator but in contradiction to what the majority have transmitted. And his statement 'and defect' means free from subtle, hidden, and discrediting causes. If it is said that this qualification is redundant, since such flaws would not escape a resolute and precise narrator, it may be replied that even the sharp may falter, and the prudent may err."[40]

Al-Ṭībī further reports in his *Khulāṣah* the consensus of the vast majority of the leading authorities in ḥadīth, jurisprudence, and legal theory that, for a report to be used as evidence, its transmitter must possess both uprightness and precision. Uprightness entails that the narrator be a Muslim, legally responsible, sane, and free from the causes of moral corruption and breaches of propriety. Precision entails that he be vigilant and retentive: if he transmits from memory, he must be reliable in his retention; and if he transmits from a written source, he must have firm control over his book, and be aware of what may affect the meaning if he transmits accordingly.[41]

He adds regarding uprightness: "Uprightness is established either by the explicit attestation of two upright individuals or by widespread recognition. Thus, one whose uprightness is well known among the people of transmission or other scholars, and whose commendation for it has become widespread, is deemed sufficient—such as Mālik, the two Sufyāns, al-Awzāʿī, al-Shāfiʿī, Aḥmad, and those similar to them. Precision is recognized by comparing his transmissions with those of trustworthy narrators known for precision and mastery; if he agrees with them in most cases and his divergences are rare, we know him to be precise and reliable."[42]

Such, then, was the case with the Qurʾānic readings: they "are not preserved except through direct reception and audition from teachers and face-to-face transmission, as they received them from those before them, in this manner back to the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him."[43]

The majority of Qurʾānic reciters stipulated **tawātur** (mass transmission) as a condition for the soundness of the chain of transmission, maintaining that this requirement admits of no relaxation. In their view, it is tawātur that confers Qurʾānic status upon a report; accordingly, any reading that contravenes what has been mentioned above is deemed anomalous (shādhdh). On this basis, solitary reports (āḥād) were classified as anomalous.[44]

Those who dissented from this view include Ibn al-Jazarī, who states:

"Some of the later scholars stipulated tawātur in this criterion and were not satisfied with the mere soundness of the chain of transmission. They claimed that the Qurʾān can only be established through tawātur, and that what is transmitted in the manner of solitary reports cannot thereby be

established as Qurʾān. The problematic nature of this view is not hidden, for if tawātur is established, there is no need for the latter two criteria—conformity to the script and otherwise—since whatever of the variant modes is established as mutawātir from the Prophet (peace be upon him) must be accepted and decisively judged to be Qurʾān, whether it conforms to the script or contradicts it. Moreover, if we were to require tawātur for every individual element of the variant modes, a great number of the variant elements firmly transmitted from these seven imams and others would be negated. I myself formerly inclined toward this view, but then its invalidity became clear, along with the correctness of the position held by the leading authorities among the early and later scholars."[45]

It is therefore correct to say that the disagreement between the two positions is one whose outcome is ultimately the same. The first group requires tawātur for the establishment of a reading and regards the other two conditions as merely ancillary and as a form of stating what is already entailed by the tawātur of the transmission. The second group, which deemed soundness of the chain of transmission sufficient and accepted readings transmitted via solitary reports, nonetheless stipulated widespread recognition, dissemination, and the acceptance of the community, together with conformity to Arabic usage and the ʿUthmānic script. These latter conditions confer upon an authentic, well-known transmission a strength equivalent to that of tawātur.[46]

2-1-1-2 Verified (Actual) or Estimated (Probable) Conformity with One of the ʿUthmānic Codices

Anyone concerned with Qurʾanic readings in general, and with the issue of the ʿUthmānic script in particular, will likely notice—when discussing the conditions of a sound reading—that some scholars phrase the condition as "conformity with the ʿUthmānic script," others as "the ʿUthmānic codex," while still others speak of "the ʿUthmānic codices." The first expression is general and, due to the absence of a numerical specification, may be ambiguous and give the impression that the script was uniform. The second expression more definitively suggests that the script was indeed singular and unified. The most precise expression, however, is the third, as it clearly indicates that the script was not uniform. In fact, the copies that the Caliph ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān ordered to be sent to the various regions differed from one another.[47] The reason for this is that the committee entrusted with copying the Qurʾān endeavored to make the script accommodate all the mutawātir readings that were presented in the final recension (*al-ʿarḍa al-ākhira*) of the Noble Qurʾān. What facilitated this was the absence of diacritical dots and vowel markings. On this basis, for example, the written form (ب) could be read as *bāʾ*, *tāʾ*, or *thāʾ*, and it could

also be pronounced with fatḥa, ḍamma, kasra, or sukūn. All such transmitted readings—meaning those that are graphically compatible while differing in dotting or vocalization—could be accommodated within a single codex. This type of conformity is termed *taḥqīqiyya* (verified or explicit).

There is, however, a corresponding type of conformity, namely the probabilistic or estimated (*taqdīriyya*) conformity, such as in the reading *(malika yawmi al-dīn)*, which is written without an alif in all the codices. The reading without the alif is directly accommodated, as in *maliki al-nās*, while the reading with the alif is accommodated by estimation, as in *māliki al-mulk*, such that the alif is considered to have been omitted for the sake of brevity. Similarly, *(al-nashāʾa)* is written with an alif, thereby explicitly conforming to the reading with lengthening (*madd*), while it conforms by estimation to the reading with shortening (*qaṣr*), since it is possible that the alif represents the written form of the hamza in a non-standard manner, as in the writing of *mawʾilan*.[48]

If, however, the committee encountered a difference among the readings that could not be accommodated within a single script, it would then record each reading in a separate codex.[49] There was neither room nor justification for omitting some readings while recording others, since all of them were readings transmitted from the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him, and affirming their Qurʾanic status was obligatory. Among the instances of variation found in the ʿUthmānic codices is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir: *(qālū ittakhadha Allāhu waladan)* in Sūrat al-Baqara, written without the wāw. In the Madinah Electronic Muṣḥaf according to the narration of Ḥafṣ, however, the wāw is written. Likewise, *(bi-al-zuburi wa-bi-al-kitābi al-munīr)* in Sūrat Āl ʿImrān appears with the addition of the preposition *bāʾ* in both nouns, whereas in the Madinah Electronic Muṣḥaf it appears without the *bāʾ*. This form, however, is established in the Syrian codex. Similarly, in the reading of Ibn Kathīr: *(jannātin tajrī taḥtahā al-anhār)* in the final occurrence in Sūrat Barāʾa (or al-Tawba), the preposition *(min)* is added, whereas in the Madinah Electronic Muṣḥaf it appears without it. This form is established in the Meccan codex. Likewise, *(fa-inna Allāha huwa al-ghaniyyu al-ḥamīd)* in Sūrat al-Ḥadīd appears without *(huwa)*, whereas in the Madinah Electronic Muṣḥaf *(huwa)* is included. Similarly, *(sāriʿū)* appears without the wāw in Sūrat Āl ʿImrān, whereas in the Madinah Electronic Muṣḥaf the wāw is written. Likewise, *(minhumā munqalaban)* appears in the dual form in Sūrat al-Kahf, whereas in the Madinah Electronic Muṣḥaf it appears in the singular form. There are many other such instances in which the codices differed. The reading of each region conformed to its own codex. Had this not been the case in any

of the ʿUthmānic codices, such a reading would have been deemed anomalous (*shādhdha*) due to its (contradiction of the script upon which consensus was reached).[50]

2-1-1-3 – Conformity with Arabic, even in one respect

What is meant by conformity with Arabic, even in one respect, is that the recitation accords with grammatical rules, whether it is *afṣaḥ*—that is, possessing the highest degree of grammatical eloquence and clarity, free from any defects that compromise rhetorical effectiveness and expressive precision—or merely *faṣīḥ*. Included within this criterion may be the miraculous Qurʾānic language, as well as the language of those Arabs renowned for eloquence, such as eminent poets and orators. As for what is intended by *faṣīḥ*, it appears to refer to speech that is authentically transmitted Arabic usage, consistently attested and non-anomalous, and subject to the temporal and spatial conditions by which scholars have defined the boundaries of the canonical corpus of eloquent Arabic.

Ibn al-Jazarī states: "By our statement in the criterion 'even in one respect,' we mean one of the aspects of grammar, whether it is the most eloquent or simply eloquent, unanimously agreed upon or disputed in a manner whose disagreement causes no harm, so long as the recitation is among those that have become widespread and well known, and have been received by the imams through a sound chain of transmission."[51] Thus, the chain of transmission is "the greatest foundation and the strongest pillar, and this is the position chosen by the critical scholars regarding the criterion of conformity with Arabic."[52]

We have already elaborated on the issue of the soundness of the chain and transmission in this matter. A sound chain, accompanied by the widespread circulation of the recitation, its broad acceptance, and its reception by the imams of recitation and jurisprudence, together with conformity to Arabic usage in principle and to the ʿUthmānic script in orthography, grants the authentic, well-known transmission the strength of *tawātur*. Although grammarians have objected to certain recitations, their objections were not given consideration.[53]

Al-Dānī mentions in his book *Jāmiʿ al-Bayān*, after discussing the quiescence of *(bāriʾikum)* and *(yaʾmurukum)* in the recitation of Abū ʿAmr and relating Sībawayh's objection to it, that "the quiescence is more authentic in transmission, more prevalent in performance, and it is what I choose and adopt." He then explicitly states: "The imams of recitation do not operate, in anything concerning the letters of the Qurʾān, according to what is most widespread in the language or most analogically consistent in Arabic; rather, they operate according to what is most firmly established in transmitted reports and most sound in transmission and narration. When it

is authentically established from them, it is not rejected on the basis of grammatical analogy or the prevalence of a linguistic usage, because recitation is an established Sunnah whose acceptance and adherence are obligatory."

This means that recitation is a Sunnah taken—as mentioned previously—through uninterrupted chains of transmission, exactly as it is, through direct oral transmission back to the Messenger of God, peace and blessings be upon him. Under no circumstances can recitation be subordinate to the regularized speech patterns upon which grammarians later constructed their analogical rules. Rather, the speech of God is not subject to technical rules formulated after it; on the contrary, the correct position is the reverse.

2.1.2. Forms of Variation among the Qurʾānic Readings:

Ibn al-Jazarī reports from Ibn Qutaybah that the modes of variation among the Qurʾānic readings are seven, as follows:[54]

- **Variation in inflection (iʿrāb)** that neither alters the written form nor changes the meaning, such as *hāʾulāʾi banātī hunna aṭharu lakum* and *(aṭhara)*; *(wa-hal nujāzī illā al-kafūra)* and *nujāzī illā al-kufūra*; and *(al-bukhli wa-al-bakhal)*, *(maysaratin wa-maysuratin)*.
- **Variation in the inflection of the word and the vocalization of its morphological pattern** in a manner that changes the meaning without altering the written form, such as *rabbanā bāʿid* and *(rabbunā bāʿada)*; *idh talaqqawnahu* and *(tulqūnahu)*; and *baʿda ummatin* and *(baʿda amahin)*.
- **Variation in the letters of the word without change in inflection**, in a way that alters the meaning without affecting the written form, such as *(wa-unẓur ilā al-ʿiẓāmi kayfa nanshuruhā)* and *nunshizuhā*; and *wa-idhā fuzziʿa ʿan qulūbihim* and *(fazzaʿa)*.
- **Variation in the word itself** that changes both its written form and its meaning, such as *ṭalʿun naḍīd* in one context and *ṭalḥin manḍūd* in another.
- **Variation in the word that changes its written form but not its meaning**, such as *(illā dhaqyatan wāḥidatan)* and *ṣayḥatan wāḥidatan*; and *ka-al-ʿihni al-manfūsh* and *(ka-al-ṣūf)*.
- **Variation by advancement and delay (word order)**, such as *(wa-jāʾat sakratu al-ḥaqqi bi-al-mawt)* as opposed to *sakratu al-mawti bi-al-ḥaqq*.
- **Variation by addition and omission**, such as *(wa-mā ʿamilat aydīhim)* and *ʿamilat-hu*; *(inna Allāha huwa al-ghaniyyu al-ḥamīd)*; and *(hādhā akhī lahu tisʿun wa-tisʿūna naʿjatan unthā)*.

Ibn Qutaybah states that "all of these forms are the speech of God Almighty, revealed by the Trustworthy Spirit to the Messenger of God, peace and blessings be upon him."[55]

2.2. The Noble Prophetic Ḥadīth:

By this is meant that which has been transmitted from the noble Prophet Muḥammad (peace and blessings be upon him), whether spoken statements or written texts in the form of letters addressed to the rulers of his time, or in the form of covenants and treaties concluded between him and his Arab adversaries.[56] The ḥadīth collections also include statements attributed to some of the Companions and the Successors; these take the ruling of statements ascribed to the Messenger of God (peace be upon him) when transmitted through the books of ḥadīth, insofar as their use as evidence for establishing a grammatical rule is concerned.[57] This, of course, applies according to the view of those who permit grammatical argumentation on the basis of Prophetic ḥadīth.

Scholarly opinions have differed on this issue: among them are those who prohibit such argumentation, those who permit it—as previously mentioned—and those who permit it under certain conditions.[58] Perhaps the primary cause of this disagreement lies in the scholars' allowance of transmitting ḥadīth by meaning rather than by exact wording, whereas the latter constituted the foundation upon which grammatical and linguistic rules were generally established.[59]

2-3. The Speech of the Arabs

It may be said that the grammarians placed the use of the speech of the Arabs as a source of linguistic evidence in the second rank after the Noble Qurʾān. This is due to their turning away from the Prophetic ḥadīth for the reason previously mentioned; for those who permitted adducing the ḥadīth as evidence—whether conditionally or unconditionally—it occupies the third rank.

By "the speech of the Arabs" is meant their transmitted prose and poetic legacy. The grammarians stipulated both temporal and geographical conditions for the admissibility of such material as evidence. The purpose of these conditions was to delimit a pure Arabic language whose structures would be close to the linguistic patterns in which the Qurʾān was revealed.

As for the first condition, it was delimited to a period extending one and a half centuries before the Prophetic Hijra, and likewise after it with respect to urban populations, whereas the use of Bedouin language as evidence continued until the fourth century AH. The second condition, in brief, concerned Arab tribes that were distant from non-Arab peoples; thus, those who were contiguous with the Persians and the Romans at that time were excluded.

Language is capable of undergoing both internal and external development, whether it comes into contact with other nations or remains in complete isolation. Speakers may introduce numerous changes into their language in response to various requirements—esthetic, geographical, social, political, economic, and others—the elucidation of which is undertaken by modern semantics and, indeed, by many of the classical disciplines as well. Thus, Sībawayh and Ibn Jinnī spoke of the phonetic heaviness (istithqāl) that may be felt by a speaker, leading him to resort to facilitation through assimilation, substitution, or deletion of a given linguistic unit.

However, the aforementioned temporal and spatial conditions are not the entirety of the matter. There are also conditions and criteria specific to the human sources whose language is adduced as evidence, both the transmitter of the language and the one from whom it is transmitted. With regard to the latter, they sought assurance of the speaker's Arab identity, the soundness of his language and linguistic instinct, and his reliability; with regard to the transmitter, they required truthfulness and precision. As for an attestation whose author is unknown, it admits of no consideration as evidence.[60]

3.The Linguistic Methodology of the Basran and Kufan Schools:

3.1.The Linguistic Methodology of the Basran School:

The defining characteristic that may be said to distinguish the Basran school is its strong attachment to analogy (*qiyās*) and the consistency of rules—or, if the expression may be permitted, its fascination with them. Some scholars view this as one of the essential requirements or necessary conditions of scientific inquiry. Shawqī Ḍayf, for instance, notes that "it is well known that for a discipline to be formulated with precision, its rules must be consistent, founded upon careful induction, supported by sound justification, and each rule must become a well-defined principle against which particular cases are measured with exact analogy."[61]

ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī Isḥāq al-Ḥaḍramī and his Basran students were among those who undertook this task.[62] Linguistic sources report that "he was the first to open up the field of grammar, extend the use of analogy, and explicate causal reasoning."[63]

On the basis of the foregoing, the Basrans adopted a stringent stance regarding consistency, to the extent that they discarded anomalous forms and did not rely upon them, whether few or many. Whenever they encountered such forms, they either deemed them erroneous or subjected them to interpretive explanation.[64]

With regard to the linguistic sources relied upon in the construction of grammatical rules, they stipulated the soundness and reliability of the linguistic material from which those rules were derived.[65]

3.2. The Linguistic Methodology of the Kufan School:

Linguistic sources and references report that the grammarians of the Kufan school were trained within the general grammatical framework whose foundations had been firmly established by Basra.[66] Nevertheless, they were able to carve out for themselves a distinct grammatical doctrine, characterized by its own features, foundations, and principles. Among the defining characteristics that marked the Kufan school are the following:[67]

- **Breadth in transmission**, whereby all avenues and paths were opened to poetic material and anomalous linguistic forms. It seems that they regarded both regular (*muṭṭarid*) and anomalous (*shādhdh*) forms as constituting Arabic speech that had actually been uttered, and therefore not to be disregarded. The issue of anomalous usage, in fact, raises a significant problem: even if we grant the Basrans their reliance on regular forms and their marginalization of anomalous ones, we cannot concede that the totality of Arabic speech was ever fully collected, especially when one takes into account the vast spatial and temporal expanse of the eloquent Arabic environment. What if what is considered anomalous is in fact supported by other instances of speech that did not reach the hands of the linguists who compiled the linguistic corpus?
- **Breadth in analogical reasoning**, such that analogy was extended even to anomalous and rare forms, without restriction due to their rarity or irregularity. This, in turn, follows from their expansive approach to transmission.
- **Divergence in certain grammatical terminologies and the related governing factors**, which may be attributed to two causes: an objective scholarly cause, namely the insufficiency of Basran terminology, and an affective cause, whose aim was opposition for its own sake, driven by the desire to establish an independent, countervailing current.
- **Meticulous linguistic investigation**, coupled with their exclusion of logical methods and their avoidance of interpretive explanations that run counter to the apparent sense of the language.

Among the criticisms that the Basrans directed at the Kufans is that the latter did not restrict themselves to taking the language solely from eloquent Bedouin Arabs; rather, they even took it from Arabs who had settled in the urban centers of Iraq. Many of these were individuals from whom the Basrans would neither take nor accept the speech of their tribes,

even when those tribes remained in their original homelands—such as Taghlib and Bakr—due to their contact with the Persians, and such as ʿAbd al-Qays, who had settled in Bahrain, due to their contact with the Persians and the Indians.[68]

This Basran strictness regarding Arabic eloquence led some Basrans to boast over the Kufans by saying: "We take the language from lizards' burrows and eaters of jerboas," meaning the pure Bedouins, "whereas you take it from eaters of *shawārīz* and sellers of *kawāmīkh*," meaning urban Arabs.[69]

According to al-Makhzūmī, the sources relied upon by the Kufans in their studies were more representative of the Arabic language than those used in Basran studies. The Basrans excluded many of the sources upon which the Kufans relied and from which they benefited. These sources were seen as having a negative impact on language and grammar, producing a distorted image thereof, and on this basis the Kufans were accused of corrupting grammar—or of corrupting Basran grammar that had been transmitted to them—by adopting error and solecism from dubious or impugned sources. The Kufans, however, did not give weight to these objections and continued to pursue their methodological approach.[70]

4. Qurʾānic Readings between the Basran and Kufan Schools: Citing the mutawātir Qurʾānic readings that conform to analogical reasoning (qiyās) was, as Shawqī maintains, a methodological approach followed by the Basran grammarians[71] just as it was followed by the Kufans. However, adducing anomalous (shādhdh) readings as evidence, analogizing on their basis, and treating them as foundational principles of linguistic argumentation was not part of the Basran method. This is because the Basrans only regarded a reading as authoritative if it conformed to their established rules, analogies, and foundational principles; if it contravened them, they rejected it.[72]

The Kufans, by contrast, adopted a more expansive approach. They accepted the seven canonical readings as well as others, and used them as evidence in cases that had parallels in Arabic usage. They permitted what occurred in these readings even when it differed from common Arabic usage, and then proceeded to analogize on that basis. Indeed, they treated such readings as foundational principles upon which they constructed grammatical rules and judgments.[73]

Among the readings over which the Basrans differed with the Kufans is the reading of Ibn ʿĀmir:[74] *"wa-kadhālika zuyyina li-kathīrin mina al-mushrikīna qatlu awlādihim shurakāʾihim"* (al-Anʿām: 137), with *awlādihim* in the accusative case and *shurakāʾihim* in the genitive. The Basrans regarded this reading as erroneous, on the grounds that it separates

the construct noun (muḍāf) from the genitive complement (muḍāf ilayhi) by an object.[75] They stated: "This reading cannot be legitimately cited as evidence, because there is consensus on the impermissibility of separating the construct noun from the genitive complement except in cases of poetic necessity, and the Qurʾān admits of no such necessity. If this reading were sound, it would constitute the most eloquent form of speech; and the existence of consensus to the contrary is evidence of the weakness of the reading."[76] The Kufans, however, permitted such separation.

Although the Basrans are widely known for rejecting numerous recitations, Professor Aḥmad Mukhtār ʿUmar pointed out in his discussion of the grammarians' reliance on Qurʾānic readings that:

"The position of grammarians toward recitations was a unified one, wherein a Kufan did not differ from a Basran, nor did scholars such as Ibn Khālawayh or Ibn Jinnī deviate from this consensus. They all evaluated recitations and measured them against their grammatical principles, showing no hesitation in declaring a reading erroneous—whether it belonged to the Seven, the Ten, the anomalous, or otherwise. They only fully accepted a reading if they found a precedent for it in Arab speech, and they felt no constraint in pronouncing a reading incorrect or ungrammatical whenever they failed to comprehend or account for it. In this regard, there was no distinction between those who studied Qurʾānic readings alongside grammar and those who specialized exclusively in grammatical studies."[77]

An example of a reading rejected by the Kufans is the recitation of some reciters in Sūrat al-Nisāʾ: *"wa-ittaqū Allāha alladhī tasāʾalūna bihī wa-l-arḥāmi"* (al-Nisāʾ: 1) , with the noun *al-arḥām* in the genitive case. Al-Farrāʾ criticized this reading, describing it as possessing a degree of linguistic unsightliness (*qubḥ*).[78]

Perhaps we may concur with Professor Aḥmad Mukhtār ʿUmar when he states: "Yes, the Kufans were less inclined to deem readings erroneous and more inclined to accept them than the Basrans; however, this does not, in our view, stem from their reverence for the readings or from a favorable disposition toward accepting them. Rather, it derives from their well-known expansiveness in the foundations of the language, their use of analogy based on limited evidence, and their reliance on a single example.[79] Through this, they were able to justify and account for many readings in accordance with their own principles. Hence, I described their stance as one of deeming readings erroneous."[80] Accordingly, they did not cite Qurʾānic readings as evidence unless they could provide for them a grammatical justification and an Arabic linguistic basis upon which to interpret them; if they were unable to offer such justification, they proceeded to declare the reading erroneous.[81]

5. Responding to Those Who Deny the Use of Certain Readings as Linguistic Evidence

The fundamental principle is that Qurʾānic reading does not follow grammar; rather, grammar follows the reading. The former is the foundation, and the latter is derivative. Judgment, therefore, always rests with the reciters whenever disagreement arises between them and the grammarians—just as the grammarians themselves deferred to the judgment of pure, eloquent Arabs when those Arabs differed among themselves on a given issue. Ibn al-Ḥājib states, in substance:

"When grammarians and reciters disagree, it is more appropriate to defer to the reciters, for they transmit from one whose immunity from error is established, and because the readings are established through tawātur, whereas what the grammarians transmit is solitary. Even if it were conceded that this is not mutawātir, the reciters are more upright and more numerous, and thus returning to them is preferable… Accordingly, no consensus of the grammarians can be established without them, for they share with them in transmitting the language, and many of them are themselves grammarians."

He further relates that Imām Fakhr al-Dīn said, in substance:

"I am greatly astonished by the grammarians: when one of them encounters a line of poetry—even if its author is unknown—he takes it as proof for the correctness of a reading and rejoices in it; yet if the occurrence of a Qurʾānic reading were taken as evidence for its correctness, that would be even more deserving."[82]

Accordingly, Qurʾānic readings constitute authoritative evidence once their Qurʾānic status is established. It is stated:

"As for the Qurʾān, everything that is reported to have been recited may be used as evidence in Arabic, whether it is mutawātir, solitary, or anomalous. People have unanimously agreed on adducing anomalous readings as evidence in Arabic when they do not contravene a known analogy; indeed, even when they do contravene it, they are cited as evidence with respect to that very form itself, though analogy may not be drawn from it. This is analogous to adducing as evidence a form whose occurrence is agreed upon despite its contravention of analogy, such that it is accepted in that specific instance but not generalized—such as *istahwadha* and *yaʾbā*. As for what I have mentioned regarding adducing anomalous readings as evidence, I am not aware of any disagreement among the grammarians concerning it, even though they differ regarding their use as evidence in jurisprudence."[83]

Moreover, "many of the readings that were labeled as anomalous are attributed to Ubayy ibn Kaʿb and ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd, both of whom were among the scribes of revelation; some of them were even described as representing the Prophet's own recitation, peace and blessings be upon him".[84]Anomalous readings, therefore, constitute Arabic texts composed in an eloquent language,[85]. and "at the very least, they are regarded as authenticated linguistic texts and as instances of eloquent Arabic speech"[86]

Among the scholars who did justice to the readings is Ibn Jinnī—who was keen to place the anomalous reading on an equal footing with the canonical seven readings.[87] He states regarding its textual basis that it "is contending for reliability through its reciters, surrounded by transmitted reports before it and after it, and perhaps—or much of it—is equal in eloquence to that upon which consensus has been reached. Indeed, there may even be within it that whose craftsmanship is more refined, whose eloquence is more forceful, whose causes are more powerfully driven, and whose grammatical grounding is more firmly established. For this reason, many read according to it among those who disputed Ibn Mujāhid over its status, challenged him concerning it, concealed it, or sought to revive it—such as Abū al-Ḥasan Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Shanabūdh, Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Miqṣam, and others who transmitted it based on a narration they deemed strong and inclined toward a grammatical construction they approved of and regarded as superior. We do not say this in order to open the door to opposing the readings upon which the people of the regions have agreed, nor to justify abandoning what the trustworthy authorities have established from them. Rather, our aim is to demonstrate the strength of what is now termed anomalous, and that it is firmly grounded in the soundness of transmission… God forbid! How could this be otherwise, when the transmission traces it back to the Messenger of God—peace and blessings be upon him—and God, exalted is He, says: *{Whatever the Messenger gives you, take it}*? This ruling is general with respect to meanings and wordings alike, and to take from him is to accept it from him. How, then, could it be permissible to reject it or shun it? And if any part of it falls short of reaching the Messenger of God—peace and blessings be upon him—it does not fall short of possessing a grammatical basis that calls for latitude and elaboration. Thus, even though we do not recite according to it in liturgical recitation for fear of its widespread dissemination, and we follow those who adhere in recitation to what is permissible by both transmission and knowledge, we nevertheless believe in the strength of what is termed anomalous, and that it is among what God,

exalted is He, has commanded to be accepted and has willed that we act in accordance with, and that it is beloved to Him and approved in His sight."[88]

Al-Suyūṭī regarded the position of the grammarians as weak in their criticism of certain Qurʾānic readings despite their being mutawātir and supported by elevated chains of transmission. He held that their rejection of such readings is not to be taken into account, stating: "A group of early grammarians used to fault ʿĀṣim, Ḥamzah, and Ibn ʿĀmir for readings that they deemed remote from Arabic usage, and they attributed error to them. They were mistaken in this, for their readings are established by sound, mutawātir chains of transmission against which no objection may be raised. The establishment of this is itself evidence of their permissibility in Arabic. Later scholars, among them Ibn Mālik, responded most eloquently to those who criticized them, and he chose to affirm the permissibility in Arabic of what their readings conveyed, even though the majority disallowed it."[89]

Thus,Were the Basrans justified in rejecting certain readings on the basis of their analogical principles? One might seek to excuse the Basrans in this regard, as noted earlier in the course of the study, since they approached the Qurʾān with a sense of sanctity and thus considered it to contain only the strongest and most solid linguistic structures. Accordingly, they accepted what conformed to analogy, which itself is based only on regular usage. Such regular usage remained current and widespread precisely because it had been refined and purged of all defects, for speakers continually strive to eliminate anything that renders language more difficult or communication more burdensome. Yet, even while seeking such an excuse, we encounter another consideration: Qurʾānic recitation is an established reality and an authoritative Sunnah, for which there is no room for rejection once its chain of transmission is sound—how much more so when it is mutawātir.

Were the Kufans correct, then, in accepting the readings? One may say yes—but why? Because the Kufan methodology was more realistic. If we wish to draw an analogy, we may liken it to the descriptive approach adopted by linguistics, wherein the task of the linguist is solely to describe, while evaluation and preference do not fall within his remit. This applies with respect to readings whose chains of transmission are sound, whether mutawātir or solitary.

Perhaps the most balanced statement made by Professor Aḥmad Mukhtār ʿUmar—without endorsing everything he said—is the following: "We do not fault the grammarians for not citing the readings absolutely, nor for refusing to base the shared literary language upon them except insofar as they conform to general principles and follow the eloquent Arabic pattern; this, as we have previously shown, is entirely correct. Rather, we

fault them for describing some readings as ugly, weak, illusory, or erroneous. They could instead have described them as belonging to a local dialect or as being of lesser eloquence, and thus not suitable for establishing a grammatical rule, without casting aspersions on the reader or casting doubt on the soundness of the reading. We do not claim—nor does anyone else—that all readings are of equal eloquence; in most cases they merely represent dialects, and dialects vary among themselves in degrees of eloquence. Al-Ṭabarī was more judicious in his comments on certain readings when he would say, 'The reading that I find more appealing is such-and-such,' and likewise al-Farrāʾ in remarks such as, 'This is the form I prefer,' or, 'I do not favor that.'"[90]

Thus, a grammarian may reject whatever he wishes if it does not accord with his standards and scholarly principles, but he should do so with a measure of gentleness and restraint. For how can he know that what he has described as weak, ugly, or illusory is not, in fact, Qurʾān revealed from God Almighty—especially when the chain of transmission is established and the narration is sound?

Conclusion: The study arrived at the following findings:

1. While it may superficially appear that the Kufans were more receptive to Qurʾānic recitations, more descriptive and objective, and thus closer to the scientific method, the truth that must be demonstrated is that the grammarians maintained a unified stance toward recitations. Their ultimate criterion for accepting a reading lay in their grammatical principles; otherwise, they deemed a reading erroneous or ungrammatical whenever they failed to comprehend or syntactically account for it.
2. The study emphasizes the necessity of distinguishing between the methodology of the Qurʾānic reciters (*qurrāʾ*) and that of the linguists and grammarians regarding the acceptance of recitations. While the former set three conditions for acceptance (as detailed in the main text), the validity of a reading should properly depend solely on the authenticity of its transmission from an upright narrator (*ʿadl*), even if transmitted through a single chain (*āḥād*), and regardless of whether the reading is *mutawātir*, *āḥād*, belongs to the Seven, the Ten, or is anomalous (*shādhdhah*), as articulated by Professor Aḥmad Mukhtār ʿUmar in his book *Al-Baḥth al-Lughawī ʿinda al-ʿArab*.
3. Although the Basrans aimed to reject certain recitations out of a conviction regarding the linguistic elevatedness of the Qurʾānic text—accepting only that which was linguistically regular

(*muṭṭarid*)—this collides with another fundamental reality: that Qurʾānic recitation is an established reality and a binding tradition (*sunnah muttabaʿah*) that cannot be rejected if its chain of transmission (*sanad*) is authentic, let alone if it is *mutawātir*.

4. The practice of grammarians subjecting the Qurʾānic text to grammatical rules requires critical reconsideration. Fundamentally, grammatical rules must conform to the Qurʾānic recitations, not vice versa; the text is the primary foundation (*aṣl*), whereas grammatical rules are secondary derived structures (*farʿ*).
5. While a grammarian may reject whatever does not align with his theoretical criteria and principles, this should be done with caution and reverence. A grammarian cannot know with certainty whether a recitation he labels as inferior (*radīʾ*), unsightly (*qabīḥ*), or erroneous (*wahm*) is, in fact, divine revelation from God Almighty, especially when its chain of transmission is established and its narration is authentic.

Recommendations: The study suggests the following:

1. Re-evaluating the corpus of classical eloquent Arabic (*al-mudawwanah al-lughawiyyah al-faṣīḥah*) regarding its attribution to fluent linguistic environments, as well as its regularity (*iṭṭirād*) and anomaly (*shudhūdh*), which could allow for its valid utilization according to grammatical criteria.
2. Re-examining the concept of anomalous speech (*al-kalām al-shādhdh*) as unfit for grammatical derivation. Its actual occurrence in linguistic usage grants it legitimacy for grammatical authority. Furthermore, a comprehensive auditing and surveying of the classical Arabic corpus might ultimately negate its classification as anomalous altogether; what is termed "anomalous"—as discussed in the body of the study—may well possess numerous unrecorded instances that early lexicographers failed to capture due to the vastness of the classical linguistic territory.

Bibliography List:

1- Al-Jurjani, Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ali: Al-Tarifat (Definitions), edited by Ibrahim al-Abyari, first edition, Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, Beirut, 1405 AH, p. 112.

2- Al-Zabidi, Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn Abd al-Razzaq al-Husayni: Taj al-Arus min Jawahir al-Qamus, edited by a group of researchers, Dar al-Hidayah, volume 5, p. 464.
3- Said Al Afghani: Fi Usul al Nahw (On the Principles of Grammar), Al Maktab Al Islami, Beirut, 1987, p. 6.
4- Jalal al Din al Suyuti: Al Iqtirah fi Usul al Nahw, edited by Abd al Hakim Atiyya, second edition, Dar al Bayruti, 2006, p. 39.
5- Badr al Din al Zarkashi: Al Burhan fi Ulum al Quran, edited by Muhammad Abu al Fadl Ibrahim, first edition, Dar Ihya al Kutub al Arabiyya, Beirut, 1957, volume 1, p. 318.
6- Abd al Qadir Muhammad Mansur: Mawsuat Ulum al Quran, first edition, Dar al Qalam al Arabi, Aleppo, 2002, p. 196.
7- The first to address the regulatory criteria for correct recitation was Ibn Mujāhid (d. 324 AH), followed by Ibn Khālawayh (d. 370 AH), Makki ibn Abī Ṭālib (d. 437 AH), Abū Shāmah (d. 665 AH), al-Kawāshī (d. 680 AH), and finally Ibn al-Jazarī (d. 833 AH). After him, the matter settled upon the criteria he established, which have remained in force to this day — the discipline of Qurʾānic readings (ʿIlm al-Qirāʾāt). See, Nabil bin Muhammad Ibrahim Al Ismail: Nashatuhu Atwaruhu wa Atharuhu fi al Ulum al Shariyya (Its Emergence Its Stages and Its Impact on Islamic Sciences), first edition, Maktabat al Tawba, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, 2000, p. 36.
8- Muhammad Shams al Din Abu al Khayr Ibn al Jazari: Al Nashr fi al Qiraat al Ashr, edited by Ali Muhammad al Dabba, Al Matbaa al Tijariyya al Kubra, volume 1, p. 9.
9- Based on these criteria, scholars proceeded to enumerate and classify the Qurʾānic readings: some limited them to seven, others expanded them to ten, and others added four to the latter, thereby making them fourteen sound readings unanimously agreed upon as mutawātir.
10- Muhammad Shams al Din Abu al Khayr Ibn al Jazari, op. cit., p. 9.
11- Ibid., p. 13.
12- Majd al Din Abu Tahir Muhammad ibn Yaqub al Firozabadi: Al Qamus al Muhit, edited by the Heritage Investigation Office under the supervision of Muhammad Naim al Araqsusi, third edition, Muassasat al Risala for Printing Publishing and Distribution, Beirut Lebanon, 2005, p. 290.
13- Al Zamakhshari Mahmud ibn Umar: Asas al Balagha, edited by Muhammad Basil Uyun al Sud, first edition, Dar al Kutub al Ilmiyya, Beirut Lebanon, 1998, volume 1, p. 477.
14- Abu al Hasan Ali ibn Ismail ibn Sidah al Mursi: Al Muhkam wa al Muhit al Azam, edited by Abd al Hamid Hindawi, first edition, Dar al Kutub al Ilmiyya, Beirut, 2000, volume 8, p. 453.
15- Muhammad Basil Uyun al Sud, op. cit., p. 477.
16- Ibid.
17- Ibid.
18- Majd al Din Abu Tahir Muhammad ibn Yaqub al Firozabadi, op. cit., p. 290.

19- Abu al Qasim Ali ibn Uthman ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn al Hasan known as Ibn al Qasih al Udhri al Baghdadi: Siraj al Qari al Mubtadi wa Tadhkar al Muqri al Muntahi (a commentary on the poem Hirz al Amani wa Wajh al Tahani by al Shatibi), edited by Ali al Dabba, third edition, Matbaat Mustafa al Babi al Halabi, Egypt, 1954, p. 10.
20- Muhammad ibn Abd Allah Ibn Malik al Tai al Jayani Abu Abd Allah Jamal al Din: Ikmal al Alam bi Tathlith al Kalam, edited by Saad ibn Hamdan al Ghamidi, first edition, Umm al Qura University, Mecca, 1984, volume 2, p. 316.
21- Jalal al Din al Suyuti: Mujam Maqalid al Ulum fi al Hudud wa al Rusum, edited by Muhammad Ibrahim Abada, first edition, Maktabat al Adab, Cairo Egypt, 2000, p. 44.
22- Muhammad Amim al Ihsan al Mujaddidi al Barkati: Al Tarifat al Fiqhiyya, first edition, Dar al Kutub al Ilmiyya, 2003, p. 117.
23- Muhammad Rawwas Qalaji and Hamid Sadiq Qunaybi: Mujam Lughah al Fuqaha, second edition, Dar al Nafais for Printing Publishing and Distribution, 1988, p. 251.
24- Muhammad Basil Uyun al Sud, op. cit., p. 477
25- Al Husayn ibn Muhammad ibn Abd Allah Sharaf al Din al Taybi: Al Khulasa fi Marifat Ulum al Hadith, edited by Abu Asim al Shawami al Athari, first edition, Al Maktaba al Islamiyya for Publishing and Distribution and Al Ruwad for Media and Publishing, 2009, p. 30.
26- Muhammad Rawwas Qalaji and Hamid Sadiq Qunaybi, op. cit., p. 41.
27- Muhammad Basil Uyun al Sud, op. cit.
28- Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy: Takmilat al Maajim al Arabiyya, translated and edited by Muhammad Salim al Nuaimi, first edition, Publications of the Iraqi Ministry of Culture and Information, 1979 to 2000, volume 7, p. 298.
29- Muhammad Shams al Din Abu al Khayr Ibn al Jazari, op. cit., p. 10–11.
30- Abu Amr Uthman ibn Said al Dani: Jami al Bayan fi al Qiraat al Sab al Mashhura, edited by Muhammad Saduq al Jazairi, first edition, Dar al Kutub al Ilmiyya, Beirut, 2005, p. 37–42.
31- Abu Abd Allah Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Hanbal ibn Hilal ibn Asad al Shaybani: Musnad al Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal, edited by Shuayb al Arnaut and Adil Murshid and others, first edition, Muassasat al Risala, 2001, hadith number 3981, volume 7 p. 88.
32- Abu Amr Uthman ibn Said al Dani, op. cit., p. 40.
33- Ibid.
34- Ibid., p. 41.
35- Ibid.
36- Ibid., p. 42.
37 Ibid., p. 42.
38- Muhammad Shams al Din Abu al Khayr Ibn al Jazari, op. cit., p. 13.
39- Al Husayn ibn Muhammad ibn Abd Allah Sharaf al Din al Taybi, op. cit., p. 41.
40- Ibid., p. 35.

41- Ibid., p. 100.
42- Ibid., p. 100–101.
43- Ibrahim ibn Said al Dawsari: Al Minhaj fi al Hukm ala al Qiraat, first edition, Dar al Hadara for Publishing and Distribution, Riyadh, 2003, p. 26.
44 - Muhammad Ahmad Muflih al Qudah and Ahmad Khalid Shukri and Muhammad Khalid Mansur: Muqaddimat fi Ilm al Qiraat, first edition, Dar Ammar, Amman Jordan, 2001, p. 72.
45- Muhammad Shams al Din Abu al Khayr Ibn al Jazari, op. cit., p. 13.
46 - Muhammad Ahmad Muflih al Qudah and Ahmad Khalid Shukri and Muhammad Khalid Mansur, op. cit., p. 70.
47- (Five authenticated codices were copied and distributed to the five principal cities, namely Mecca, Medina, Damascus, Basra, and Kufa. It is also possible that the codices were seven, distributed to the five major regions as well as Yemen and Bahrain, as mentioned in some reports). See, Muhammad Habash: Al Qiraat al Mutawatira wa Atharuha fi al Rasm al Qurani wa al Ahkam al Shariyya, first edition, Dar al Fikr, Damascus, 1999, p. 88.
48- Muhammad Shams al Din Abu al Khayr Ibn al Jazari, op. cit., p. 11.
49- Al Qiraat al Mutawatira wa Atharuha fi al Rasm al Qurani wa al Ahkam al Shariyya, p. 92
50- Muhammad Shams al Din Abu al Khayr Ibn al Jazari, op. cit., p. 11.
51- Ibid., p. 10.
52- Ibid.
53- Ibid.
54- Ibid., p. 26–27.
55- Ibid., p. 28.
56- Muhammad Khan: Madkhal ila Usul al Nahw, Dar al Huda, Ain Mlila Algeria, 2003, p. 17.
57- Muhammad al Khidr Husayn: Dirasat fi al Arabiyya wa Tarikhiha, second edition, Al Maktab al Islami and Maktabat Dar al Fath, Damascus, 1960, p. 166–167.
58- Khadija al Hadithi: Al Shahid wa Usul al Nahw fi Kitab Sibawayh, Kuwait University Publications number 37, Maqahwi Press, Kuwait, 1984, p. 62. (We did not elaborate on this issue, as it is not directly connected to the research problem).
59- Jalal al Din al Suyuti, op. cit., p. 43; and Khadija al Hadithi, op. cit., p. 61.
60- Said Al Afghani: Min Tarikh al Nahw al Arabi, Maktabat al Falah, p. 65–66.
61- Shawqi Daif: Al Madaris al Nahwiyya, Dar al Maarif, p. 18.
62- Ibid., p. 18.
63- Muhammad ibn Salam al Jumahi: Tabaqat Fuhul al Shuara, edited by Mahmud Muhammad Shakir, Dar al Madani, Jeddah, volume 1, p. 14.
64- Shawqi Daif, op. cit., p. 18.
65- Ibid., p. 18.
66- Ibid., p. 158; Mahdi al Makhzumi: Madrasa al Kufa wa Manhajuha fi Dirasat al Lughah wa al Nahw, second edition, Sharikat Maktabat wa Matbaat Mustafa al Babi al Halabi wa Awladuhu, Egypt, 1958, p. 69.

67- Shawqi Daif, op. cit., p. 158; and Mahdi al Makhzumi, op. cit., p. 396.
68- Shawqi Daif, op. cit., p. 160; and Jalal al Din Abd al Rahman ibn Abi Bakr al Suyuti: Al Muzhir fi Ulum al Lughah wa Anwaeiha, edited by Fuad Ali Mansur, first edition, Dar al Kutub al Ilmiyya, Beirut, 1998, volume 1, p. 167.
69- Shawqi Daif, op. cit., p. 160.
70- Mahdi al Makhzumi, op. cit., p. 395.
71- Shawqī Ḍayf maintains that the Noble Qurʾān and its readings constituted an inexhaustible source for their analogical grammatical rules, and that the objections raised against them—namely, the hesitation of some grammarians regarding certain readings—were few, scarcely exceeding the fingers of one hand. This occurred when they found that such readings did not consistently conform to their rules, noting that they preferred other readings which they found to be consistent with those rules. Ḍayf further holds that some contemporary scholars exaggerated the matter, portraying the rejection of certain readings as though it were a general phenomenon among the Basran grammarians, despite the fact that
the Kitāb of Sībawayh contains no explicit texts supporting this serious accusation. It should also be noted that it was the Basrans of the third century who criticized some readings, and these were limited examples that do not constitute a phenomenon; they used to describe them as anomalous (shādhdh) and to interpret them whenever a path to interpretation was available. See, ibid., p. 19.
Moreover, there is not a single instance in Sībawayh's Kitāb in which he declares any of the Qurʾānic readings to be erroneous, despite his frequent citation of them; rather, he explicitly affirmed the acceptance of all of them, regardless of how anomalous they might appear according to his own criteria. See, ibid., p. 156.
72- Khadija al Hadithi, op. cit., p. 47.
73- Ibid., p. 47.
74- Abu al Barakat Ibn al Anbari: Al Insaf fi Masail al Khilaf bayna al Nahwiyyin al Basriyyin wa al Kufiyyin, edited by Muhammad Muhyi al Din Abd al Hamid, first edition, Dar al Fikr, volume 2, p. 427; and Jalal al Din al Suyuti, op. cit., p. 40.
75- Khadija al Hadithi, op. cit., p. 47–48.
76- Ibid., p. 48.
77- Aḥmad Mukhtār ʿUmar, Al-Baḥth al-Lughawī ʿinda al-ʿArab (Linguistic Research Among the Arabs), 8th ed., ʿĀlam al-Kutub, n.p., 2003. p. 30–31
78- Ibid., p. 33.and See al-Farrāʾ, Maʿānī al-Qurʾān, ed. Aḥmad Yūsuf al-Najātī et al., 1st ed. (Egypt: Al-Dār al-Maṣriyyah lil-Taʾlīf wa-l-Tarjamah, n.d.), vol. 1, p. 252.
79- Ibrahim Anis: Min Asrar al Lughah, third edition, Maktabat al Anglo al Misriyya, Cairo, 1966, p. 12–13.
80- Aḥmad Mukhtār ʿUmar, op. cit., p. 32.
81- Ibid., p. 33.
82- Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Salim Abu al Hasan al Nuri al Safaqsi al Maliki: Ghayth al Naf fi al Qiraat al Sab, edited by Ahmad Mahmud Abd al Sami al Shafii al Hufyan, first edition, Dar al Kutub al Ilmiyya, Beirut, 2004, p. 104.
83- Jalal al Din al Suyuti, op. cit., p. 39.

84 -Aḥmad Mukhtār ʿUmar, Linguistic Studies in the Holy Qurʾan and Its Readings, ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1st ed., Cairo, 2001, pp. 141–142.
85- Ibid.
86- Ibid.p. 142.
87- Aḥmad Mukhtār ʿUmar, op. cit., p. .21
88-Abu al Fath Uthman ibn Jinni: Al Muhtasib fi Tabyin Wujuh Shawadh al Qiraat wa al Idah Anha, Ministry of Awqaf and the Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs, 1999, volume 1, p. 32–33.
89- Jalal al Din al Suyuti, op. cit., p. 40.
90- Ahmad Mukhtar Umar, op. cit., p. 33–34.

Bibliography

A – Books

- Al-Jurjani, Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ali, *Al-Taʿrīfāt (Definitions)*, edited by Ibrahim al-Abyari, first edition, Beirut; 1405 AH.
- Al-Zabidi, Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn Abd al-Razzaq al-Husayni, *Tāj al-ʿArūs min Jawāhir al-Qāmūs*, edited by a group of researchers, Dar al-Hidayah, volume 5; n.d.
- Said Al Afghani, *Fī Uṣūl al-Naḥw (On the Principles of Grammar)*, Beirut; 1987.
- Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti, *Al-Iqtirāḥ fī Uṣūl al-Naḥw*, edited by Abd al-Hakim Atiyya, second edition, Beirut; 2006.
- Badr al-Din al-Zarkashi, *Al-Burhān fī ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān*, edited by Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, first edition, Beirut; 1957.
- Abd al-Qadir Muhammad Mansur, *Mawsūʿat ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān*, first edition, Aleppo; 2002.
- Nabil bin Muhammad Ibrahim Al Ismail, ʿIlm al-Qirāʾāt: *Nashʾatuhu* wa Aṭwāruhu wa Atharuhu fī al-ʿUlūm al-Sharʿiyya (The Science of Qurʾānic Readings: Its Emergence, Stages, and Impact on Islamic Sciences), first edition, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; 2000.
- Muhammad Shams al-Din Abu al-Khayr Ibn al-Jazari, Al-Nashr fī al-*Qirāʾāt al-ʿAshr*, edited by Ali Muhammad al-Dabba, Cairo; n.d.
- Majd al-Din Abu Tahir Muhammad ibn Yaqub al-Firozabadi, *Al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ*, edited by the Heritage Investigation Office under the supervision of Muhammad Naim al-Araqsusi, third edition, Beirut, Lebanon; 2005.
- Al-Zamakhshari, Mahmud ibn Umar, *Asās al-Balāgha*, edited by Muhammad Basil Uyun al-Sud, first edition, Beirut, Lebanon; 1998.
- Abu al-Hasan Ali ibn Ismail ibn Sidah al-Mursi, *Al-Muḥkam wa al-Muḥīṭ al-Aʿẓam*, edited by Abd al-Hamid Hindawi, first edition, Beirut; 2000.
- Muhammad ibn Abd Allah Ibn Malik al-Tai al-Jayani Abu Abd Allah Jamal al-Din, *Ikmāl al-Aʿlām bi Tathlīth al-Kalām*, edited by Saad ibn Hamdan al-Ghamidi, first edition, Mecca; 1984.

- Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti, *Muʿjam Maqālīd al-ʿUlūm fī al-Ḥudūd wa al-Rusūm*, edited by Muhammad Ibrahim Abada, first edition, Cairo, Egypt; 2000.
- Muhammad Amim al-Ihsan al-Mujaddidi al-Barkati, *Al-Taʿrīfāt al-Fiqhiyya*, first edition; 2003.
- Muhammad Rawwas Qalaji and Hamid Sadiq Qunaybi, *Muʿjam Lughat al-Fuqahāʾ*, second edition; 1988.
- Al-Husayn ibn Muhammad ibn Abd Allah Sharaf al-Din al-Taybi, *Al-Khulāṣa fī Maʿrifat ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth*, edited by Abu Asim al-Shawami al-Athari, first edition; 2009.
- Reinhart Pieter Anne Dozy, *Takmilat al-Maʿājim al-ʿArabiyya*, translated and edited by Muhammad Salim al-Nuaimi; 1979–2000.
- Abu Amr Uthman ibn Said al-Dani, *Jāmiʿ al-Bayān fī al-Qirāʾāt al-Sabʿ al-Mashhūra*, edited by Muhammad Saduq al-Jazairi, first edition, Beirut; 2005.
- Abu Abd Allah Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Hanbal ibn Hilal ibn Asad al-Shaybani, *Musnad al-Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal*, edited by Shuayb al-Arnaut, Adil Murshid, and others, first edition; 2001.
- Ibrahim ibn Said al-Dawsari, *Al-Manhaj fī al-Ḥukm ʿalā al-Qirāʾāt*, first edition, Riyadh; 2003.
- Muhammad Ahmad Muflih al-Qudah, Ahmad Khalid Shukri, and Muhammad Khalid Mansur, *Muqaddimāt fī ʿIlm al-Qirāʾāt*, first edition, Amman, Jordan; 2001.
- Muhammad Habash, *Al-Qirāʾāt al-Mutawātira wa Atharuhā fī al-Rasm al-Qurʾānī wa al-Aḥkām al-Sharʿiyya*, first edition, Damascus; 1999.
- Muhammad Khan, *Madkhal ilā Uṣūl al-Naḥw*, Ain Mlila, Algeria; 2003.
- Muhammad al-Khidr Husayn, *Dirāsāt fī al-ʿArabiyya wa Tārīkhihā*, second edition, Damascus; 1960.
- Khadija al-Hadithi, *Al-Shāhid wa Uṣūl al-Naḥw fī Kitāb Sībawayh*, Kuwait; 1984.
- Shawqi Daif, *Al-Madāris al-Naḥwiyya*, Cairo; n.d.
- Muhammad ibn Salam al-Jumahi, *Ṭabaqāt Fuḥūl al-Shuʿarāʾ*, edited by Mahmud Muhammad Shakir, Jeddah; n.d.
- Mahdi al-Makhzumi, *Madrasat al-Kūfa wa Manhajuhā fī Dirāsāt al-Lugha wa al-Naḥw*, second edition, Egypt; 1958.
- Abu al-Barakat Ibn al-Anbari, *Al-Inṣāf fī Masāʾil al-Khilāf bayna al-Naḥwiyyīn al-Baṣriyyīn wa al-Kūfiyyīn*, edited by Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abd al-Hamid, first edition; n.d.
- Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Salim Abu al-Hasan al-Nuri al-Safaqsi al-Maliki, *Ghayth al-Nafʿ fī al-Qirāʾāt al-Sabʿ*, edited by Ahmad Mahmud Abd al-Sami al-Shafii al-Hufyan, first edition, Beirut; 2004.

- Ahmad Mukhtar Umar: *Al-Baḥth al-Lughawī ʿinda al-ʿArab*, eighth edition; 2003. Linguistic Studies in the Holy Qurʾan and Its Readings, ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1st ed., Cairo, 2001.
- Abu al-Fath Uthman ibn Jinni, *Al-Muḥtasib fī Tabyīn Wujūh Shawādhdh al-Qirāʾāt wa al-Īḍāḥ ʿAnhā*, Cairo; 1999.
- Ibrahim Anis, *Min Asrār al-Lugha*, third edition, Cairo; 1966.
- al-Farrāʾ, Maʿānī al-Qurʾān, ed. Aḥmad Yūsuf al-Najātī et al., 1st ed. (Egypt: Al-Dār al-Maṣriyyah lil-Taʾlīf wa-l-Tarjamah, n.d.).