

## THE SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONAL POWER OF IBN MUJAHID IN THE FORMATION OF THE QIRĀ'ĀT

*Fuad Nawawi & Mokhamad Sukron*

**Abstract:** *The Canonization of the Seven Qirā'āt by Ibn Mujāhid (d. 324 AH) represents a pivotal effort in disciplining the diverse recitations of the Qur'an during the classical Islamic period. Prior to Ibn Mujāhid, there existed a wide array of qirā'āt, but he proposed a restriction to seven recitations deemed authentic. This article analyzes Ibn Mujāhid's attempt at standardizing the qirā'āt through the lens of Serge Moscovici's social psychology, particularly his theories of social representation, minority influence, and ideological conflict. Through the theoretical framework of social representation, this study demonstrates that the Seven Qirā'āt are not merely the result of scholarly codification, but a form of social construction shaped by the authority of religious scholars and supported by broader socio-political dynamics. Drawing on the concept of minority influence, the article explores how Ibn Mujāhid, as an intellectual figure, played a crucial role in shifting the majority's perception and establishing a widely accepted standard of qirā'āt. Furthermore, the article argues that the standardization of qirā'āt is part of a broader ideological conflict in Islamic history, involving tensions between preserving diversity and the necessity of uniformity in Qur'anic recitation. In conclusion, Ibn Mujāhid's endeavor to formalize the Seven Qirā'āt should be understood as a product of social construction shaped by intellectual, social, political, and religious dynamics, rather than merely a philological phenomenon.*

**Keywords:** *Ibn Mujāhid; Seven Qirā'āt; Social Psychology; Minority Influence; Ideological Conflict.*

**Abstrak:** Penetapan Qira'at Tujuh oleh Ibn Mujahid (w. 324 H) merupakan salah satu upaya penting dalam mendisiplinkan variasi bacaan Al-Qur'an di era klasik Islam. Sebelum Ibn Mujahid, terdapat keragaman qira'at yang cukup luas, tetapi ia mengusulkan pembatasan menjadi tujuh qira'at yang dianggap sah. Artikel ini menganalisis usaha Ibn Mujahid dalam standarisasi qira'at dengan menggunakan pendekatan Psikologi Sosial Serge Moscovici, khususnya representasi sosial, pengaruh minoritas dan konflik ideologi. Melalui teori representasi sosial, kajian ini menunjukkan bahwa Qira'at Tujuh bukan sekadar hasil dari kodifikasi ilmiah, tetapi juga konstruksi sosial yang dibentuk oleh otoritas ulama dan didukung oleh dinamika sosial-politik. Dengan konsep pengaruh minoritas, artikel ini mengeksplorasi bagaimana Ibn Mujahid sebagai seorang cendekiawan memainkan peran penting dalam menggeser pemahaman mayoritas dan membentuk standar qira'at yang diterima luas. Lebih lanjut, artikel ini menganalisis bahwa proses standarisasi qira'at merupakan bagian dari konflik ideologi dalam sejarah Islam, di mana terjadi perdebatan antara pelestarian keberagaman versus kebutuhan akan keseragaman dalam bacaan Al-Qur'an. Kesimpulannya, usaha Ibn Mujahid dalam menetapkan Qira'at Tujuh dapat dipahami sebagai hasil dari konstruksi sosial yang berkembang dalam dinamika intelektual, sosial, politik, dan agama, bukan hanya sebagai fenomena filologis semata.

**Kata Kunci:** Ibn Mujahid; Qira'at Tujuh; Psikologi Sosial; Pengaruh minoritas; Konflik Ideologi.

## Introduction

The Qur'an, as the holy scripture of Islam, was revealed in multiple dialects and recitation variants (*qirā'āt*) that developed across various early Muslim regions. The oral tradition in transmitting the Qur'an gave rise to differences in pronunciation, diction, and phonetic aspects of recitation. While these differences remained within legally acceptable boundaries (*shar'ī*), over time, the wide variety of recitations began to cause divergent understandings and even posed a threat of division within Muslim religious practices. Ibn Mujahid<sup>1</sup> emerged as a central figure in the codification of *qirā'āt* by establishing the seven canonical Qur'anic readings (*al-qirā'āt al-sab'ah*) in his work *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'at*.<sup>2</sup> He selected seven *qirā'āt* from the most renowned reciters of his time: Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān Nāfi' ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Nu'aym al-Laythī, better known as Imam Nāfi' (d. 169 AH),<sup>3</sup> 'Abd Allāh ibn Kathīr (d. 120 AH); Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alā' (d. 154 AH); 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Āmir (d. 118 AH); Abū Bakr 'Āsim ibn Abī al-Najād (d. 127 AH); Ḥamzah ibn Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt (d. 156 AH); and 'Alī ibn Ḥamzah al-Kisā'ī (d. 189 AH).

Ibn Mujaḥid's decision was not universally accepted but rather sparked significant debate among scholars. Some supported his efforts, viewing them as a means of unifying the Muslim community around a standardized recitation. Among their reasons were the prevention of discord stemming

from uncontrolled proliferation of *qirā'āt*, the facilitation of learning and memorization by limiting the number of accepted variants, and the alignment of *qirā'āt* with Arabic grammatical norms. This approach also garnered support from the Abbasid political authority,<sup>4</sup> which saw standardization as a tool for Islamic unity and for minimizing internal disagreements.

In the course of this research, the author identified several relevant scholarly works in the form of journal articles and books addressing Ibn Mujāhid's standardization of Qur'anic *qirā'āt*. This study selects and analyzes several key sources focused on Ibn Mujāhid's efforts. The first article by Christopher Melchert, *Variant Qur'anic Readings Before and After Ibn Mujahid* (2025).<sup>5</sup> centers on the variations in Qur'anic recitation before and after Ibn Mujāhid, particularly regarding his selection of seven principal readers. The article begins by exploring the situation prior to Ibn Mujāhid, when numerous scholars and philologists such as al-Farrā', al-Akhfash, and Abū 'Ubayd accepted variant readings as Qur'anic *qirā'āt* provided they were consistent with the rasm 'Uthmānī (original consonantal script) and Arabic grammar. Melchert then elaborates on how Ibn Mujāhid chose seven authoritative reciters, emphasizing the importance of adherence to the transmitted tradition (*sanad*) and the avoidance of innovation. Consensus among readers and scholars, rather than the rasm alone, played a crucial role in legitimizing a reading.

A particularly notable point in Melchert's article is his citation of Mustafa Shah's view that Ibn Mujāhid may not have intended his selection to be exclusive, yet the seven readings were ultimately treated as the official canon by the end of the century.<sup>6</sup> This suggests that historical circumstances necessitated the stabilization of Qur'anic *qirā'āt*. However, this raises critical questions: Were these circumstances 'given' or socially constructed? If the latter, how do we explain Ibn Mujāhid's decision to compose *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fi al-Qirā'āt*? Why did he reinforce the three conditions (reliable transmission, conformity with the 'Uthmānī script, and adherence to Arabic grammatical rules) for a reading to be accepted as Qur'anic *qirā'ah*?<sup>7</sup> Why did Ibn Muqlah, an Abbasid vizier, with Ibn Mujāhid's backing, prosecute Ibn Shanabudh and Ibn Miqsam for espousing divergent readings? These scattered historical episodes are what this article seeks to address. Using Serge Moscovici's theory of social psychology, this study aims to show that Ibn Mujāhid constructed a new social representation, namely the concept of "*seven authentic qirā'āt*," and through epistemic authority and political power, successfully promoted this construct. Though initially a minority view, his scientific consistency and scholarly legitimacy enabled it to

reshape the dominant discourse. His efforts reflect an ideological conflict between preserving boundless diversity and the need for limited variation to maintain communal cohesion. This article argues that the codification of *qirā'āt* involves not only philological or textual concerns but also social, political, and religious authority in Islam.

The second source is Shady Hekmat Nasser's book, *The Second Canonization of The Qur'an* (2021).<sup>8</sup> which examines Ibn Mujāhid's pivotal role in the second canonization of the Qur'an through the selection of seven eponymous readings that laid the foundation for the canonical *sab'ah* recitations (pp. 6–7). During his time, over fifty recitational variants circulated widely, and Ibn Mujāhid firmly limited them to seven principal readings. This restriction was not the end of diversity but rather the beginning of a unification process aimed at stabilizing the Qur'anic oral tradition. His efforts were further refined by later scholars such as Abū 'Amr al-Dānī and al-Shāṭibī. Qur'anic recitation evolved gradually, shaped by communities of *qurrā'* (reciters) and grammarians monitoring linguistic and phonetic conformity. Readings deemed deviant (*shawādh*) were excluded. Ibn Mujāhid's restriction sought to preserve uniformity and textual integrity. However, this book focuses more on historical and linguistic aspects and does not delve into the social, psychological, or political contexts of the standardization process, particularly as viewed through Moscovici's framework. Still, it affirms Ibn Mujāhid's significant role in canonizing the seven *qirā'āt*, a subject this article addresses through a social psychological approach.

The third article, by Afrida Arinal Muna and Munirul Ikhwan, titled *Ibn Mujahid's Canonical Legacy: Examining Sanad Authentication and Political Factors in the Standardization of Qirā'āt sab'ah* (2023).<sup>9</sup> investigates Ibn Mujāhid's standardization and canonization process by integrating historical inquiry, *sanad* analysis, and political dynamics. The authors adopt Michel Foucault's archaeology of knowledge to explore epistemic power and Shahab Ahmad's framework for understanding the historical transmission of *qirā'āt*. The article outlines Ibn Mujāhid's criteria for selecting the seven reciters, conformity with Quraysh Arabic, the standard 'Uthmānī codex, a sound *sanad* connected to the Prophet, and scholarly expertise. The article also discusses the political motivations behind the standardization, suggesting that unifying Qur'anic recitation was essential for religious and social cohesion. Ibn Mujāhid received formal endorsement from the Abbasid regime to carry out this project. The authors assess the *sanad* and scholarly credibility of each chosen *qārī'*, applying *jarḥ wa ta'dīl* (hadith criticism) and examining regional representation (e.g., Medina,

Mecca, Kūfah, Baṣrah, and Syria). While the article offers a comprehensive, multidisciplinary perspective, it largely centers on elite scholarly actors, with limited attention to popular reception and lacks detailed political analysis.

In contrast to these studies, the present article contributes by analyzing Ibn Mujāhid's standardization of the seven *qirā'āt* through the theoretical lens of Serge Moscovici's social psychology. It argues that Ibn Mujāhid created a new social representation, "the seven authentic *qirā'āt*," which gained widespread legitimacy through codified knowledge, scholarly endorsement, and political reinforcement. Initially a minority stance, Ibn Mujāhid's intellectual consistency and epistemic authority succeeded in altering the dominant religious discourse. This reflects an ideological tension between unrestricted diversity and the pragmatic need for standardized variation to ensure communal stability. The article demonstrates that the codification of *qirā'āt* transcends technical or philological boundaries and intersects with broader socio-political and religious dynamics. It thereby offers a significant contribution to Qur'anic *qirā'āt* studies.

Frames Ibn Mujāhid as the scholar who officially established the seven *qirā'āt*. Before his intervention, recitational diversity was vast, with no definitive standard. Ibn Mujāhid was also involved in suppressing deviant readings, notably in the cases of Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Shannabudh. Melchert classifies Ibn Mujāhid as closer to the semi-rationalist *mutakallimūn* than to strict *muḥaddithūn* traditionalists. The article emphasizes that Ibn Mujāhid's codification was not purely scholarly but also entwined with the political and intellectual dynamics of Baghdad. His criteria for acceptable *qirā'āt* included conformity with the 'Uthmānī codex, Quraysh Arabic, and authenticated *sanad*. Many of the chosen *qirā'āt* originated not from *muḥaddithūn* but from grammarians and literary scholars. Melchert compares *qirā'āt* with hadith sciences, noting that while both emphasized transmission, *qirā'āt* allowed more oral flexibility. He also explores educational practices such as *qirā'ah 'alā* and oral transmission, underscoring the importance of direct recitation to teachers.

Melchert highlights Ibn Mujāhid's motivations as an effort to resolve confusion and rivalry among reciters by limiting official readings to seven, not to achieve absolute uniformity, but to aid memorization and ensure authenticity. He also discusses debates on the link between the seven *qirā'āt* and the seven *aḥruf* mentioned in hadith, with most scholars and modern academics rejecting an equivalence. Ibn Mujāhid never clearly explained his choice of the number seven. Importantly, Melchert's work excels in its historical depth and critical engagement with primary sources, employing

an interdisciplinary approach that combines *qirā'āt* studies, hadith, theology, and history. Yet, its weakness lies in insufficient exploration of socio-political dimensions and the absence of modern social theory frameworks. In contrast, the present article contributes by applying Serge Moscovici's theory of social psychology, particularly the concepts of social representation, minority influence, and ideological conflict, to illuminate the complex interplay of knowledge, power, and religious authority in Ibn Mujāhid's project.

To explain these things, this article will employ a library research method, which involves collecting and analyzing both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources include works on Qur'anic *qirā'āt*, notably Ibn Mujāhid's *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt*.<sup>10</sup> and foundational texts in social psychology by Serge Moscovici, namely *Social Representation*,<sup>11</sup> *The Invention of Society*,<sup>12</sup> and *Perspectives on Minority Influences*.<sup>13</sup> Secondary sources consist of scholarly articles and books that address Ibn Mujāhid and the Qur'anic *qirā'āt*, such as two articles by Christopher Melchert, *Ibn Mujahid and Establishment of Seven Qur'anic Readings*,<sup>14</sup> *Variant Qur'anic Readings Before and After Ibn Mujahid* (2025),<sup>15</sup> an artikel by Afrida Arinal Muna and Munirul Ikhwān, titled *Ibn Mujahid's Canonical Legacy: Examining Sanad Authentication and Political Factors in the Standardization of Qirā'āt sab'ah* (2023),<sup>16</sup> as well as two books by Shady Hekmat Nasser, *The Second Canonization of The Qur'an* (2021),<sup>17</sup> *The Transmission of The Varian Readings of The Qur'an, The Problem Tawatur and The Emergence of Shawādh* (2013).<sup>18</sup>

This article adopts a theory-based qualitative approach. The research begins with an existing theory and applies it to a specific object or phenomenon. In this case, the researcher chooses Serge Moscovici's theory of social psychology,<sup>19</sup> and applies it to understand and explain the standardization of the Seven *Qirā'āt* by Ibn Mujāhid. Before elaborating on how this theory serves as an analytical lens for Ibn Mujāhid's disciplining of the Qur'anic *qirā'āt*, the article first outlines the three core elements of Moscovici's social psychology: social representation, minority influence, and ideological conflict.

First, social representation refers to a system of values, ideas, and practices that fulfills two primary functions: first, to establish an order that allows individuals to orient themselves in the material and social world and to gain mastery over it; second, to facilitate communication among members of a community by providing a code for social exchange and a framework to name and clearly classify various aspects of their world, as well as the histories of individuals and groups.<sup>20</sup> There are two principal mechanisms

in the process of social representation: anchoring and objectifying.

Anchoring refers to the process of connecting unfamiliar ideas to pre-existing categories that are already understood by a society, thereby simplifying and making them intelligible. It involves placing new concepts into familiar modes of thinking.<sup>21</sup> Anchoring is essentially the act of classifying and naming. By classifying the unclassified and naming the unnameable, we become capable of imagining and representing it.<sup>22</sup> Objectifying, on the other hand, is the process of transforming abstract ideas or concepts into concrete forms, images, symbols, or socially usable systems. What initially exists only in a distant intellectual realm eventually appears before our eyes as something tangible and socially accessible.<sup>23</sup>

Second, minority influence refers to a mechanism of social change in which a small group or an individual, holding views that differ from the dominant majority, can exert influence and ultimately reshape prevailing social attitudes. It is a significant concept in social psychology that challenges the traditional assumption that change only emanates from majorities or dominant power structures. In his theoretical exposition, Serge Moscovici outlines four distinct phases through which minority ideas can become socially accepted norms that replace the dominant consensus. In the first phase, an active and consistent minority emerges, displaying commitment to an alternative idea. Moscovici terms this the revelation phase, wherein the minority discloses a novel standpoint and maintains coherence and persistence in its advocacy.<sup>24</sup> The second phase involves the repetition and dissemination of the new message to a wider audience.

In the third phase, members of the majority begin to shift their perspectives, gradually adopting the minority viewpoint, often without openly conceding to it. This is known as cognitive conversion.<sup>25</sup> Finally, in the fourth phase, which Moscovici calls internalization, the once-deviant minority view is widely adopted and becomes integrated into the social norm. What was initially a marginal perspective evolves into a mainstream position.<sup>26</sup>

Third, ideological conflict refers to the divergence of fundamental beliefs and values between competing groups within a society. Such conflicts often arise when one group or ideology seeks to replace a long-standing dominant worldview. In this context, Serge Moscovici does not limit his discussion to the tension between majority and minority ideologies, but also emphasizes how divergent perspectives can generate broader societal tensions.<sup>27</sup> Ideological conflict occurs when groups holding different social representations attempt to shape, transform, or preserve their particular interpretations of social or religious realities. Dominant ideologies



are typically maintained through processes of institutionalization and normalization, whereas minority ideologies seek to challenge and redefine established social or religious norms.<sup>28</sup>

### **The Transformation of *Qirā'āt* into Norms: A Socio-Psychological Analysis**

This article offers a novel approach by applying Serge Moscovici's framework of Social Psychology to analyse Ibn Mujāhid's efforts in codifying the Qur'anic *qirā'āt*. The originality of this study lies in its argument that the concept of the "seven authentic *qirā'āt*" is not merely a philological construct but the product of a social representation process, shaped through strategies of epistemic and political power. By documenting the *qirā'āt* through authorship and securing institutional authority, Ibn Mujāhid, initially a minority voice, was able to shift the dominant perception. This study also addresses an often-overlooked dimension: the codification of *qirā'āt* reflects an ideological conflict between boundless diversity and the necessity of standardization for communal stability. As such, this article expands the understanding that the codification of *qirā'āt* is rooted not only in linguistic concerns but also deeply embedded in social, political, and religious dynamics in Islamic history.

### **Standardization of *Qirā'āt* as a Social Representation**

This section elaborates on how Ibn Mujāhid gradually developed a new social representation by creating standards and conditions for a recitation to be accepted as authentic Qur'anic *qirā'ah*, thereby limiting the previously unbounded diversity of Qur'anic recitations to just seven. To fully assess how Ibn Mujāhid's social representation functioned and influenced society, this article outlines the traditions of collecting *qirā'āt* prior to and during Ibn Mujāhid's time. Before Abū Bakr Ibn Mujāhid (d. 324 AH), many scholars had compiled collections of Qur'anic *qirā'āt* based on individual preference. For instance, Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām (d. 224 AH) compiled and selected 25 *qirā'āt*,<sup>29</sup> while Aḥmad ibn Jubayr al-Anṭākī (d. 258 AH) compiled five *qirā'āt* representing five major centers of Qur'anic learning.<sup>30</sup> Ismā'īl ibn Iṣḥāq (d. 282 AH), a student of Abū 'Ubayd, followed his teacher's tradition by composing a work containing 20 selected *qirā'āt*,<sup>31</sup> some of which would later be canonized by Ibn Mujāhid.

A few years later, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310 AH), a student of Imam Khalaf (a student of Ḥamzah), compiled *al-Jāmi'*, in which he selected 20 *qirā'āt* through the narration of Sulaimān al-Ṭalḥī.<sup>32</sup> Around the same



period, Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Dājūnī (d. 324 AH),<sup>33</sup> a contemporary of Ibn Mujaḥid, compiled 11 qirā'āt, including that of Abū Ja'far.<sup>34</sup> These early efforts demonstrate that from the formative periods of Islam, attempts were made, albeit individually and without institutional consensus, to collect and document various qirā'āt. However, these attempts lacked agreement on a standardized number and were fluid, guided by personal initiative.

Although Ibn Mujaḥid was not the first to collect diverse qirā'āt, his project marked a fundamental shift from the mere continuation of his predecessors' habitus to a systematic effort to construct a new social representation of what constitutes an "authentic" qirā'ah. He did not merely collect but classified and delineated boundaries of legitimacy by standardizing seven accepted qirā'āt. This move was motivated by concern over the growing fragmentation of recitation practices, where individuals recited based on personal understanding without clear standards of transmission or narrators' competence. Ibn Mujaḥid regarded this condition as dangerous, as the level of comprehension among Muslims regarding qirā'āt varied significantly, ranging from grammarians and qirā'āt experts to those who relied solely on memorization without critical understanding.<sup>35</sup> By establishing stringent criteria for who could transmit and which recitations could be deemed authoritative, Ibn Mujaḥid created a new representational structure of Qur'anic recitation authority, a social framework that replaced unrestricted variation with a scientifically and socially framed diversity. This was a critical transformation from fluid multiplicity to regulated plurality, encouraging communal consensus in understanding divine revelation.

In selecting the seven canonical reciters, Ibn Mujaḥid prioritized each imam's fame and the level of communal recognition of their recitations. For instance, he chose Nāfi' (d. 169 AH/785) as the reciter for Madinah instead of the more senior Abū Ja'far Yazīd ibn al-Qā' qā' (d. 130 AH/747), because more people practiced Nāfi's recitation at the time.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, in Mecca, he selected Ibn Kathīr (d. 120 AH/738) over Ibn Muḥayṣin (d. 123 AH/740), arguing that Ibn Muḥayṣin's reading lacked broad acceptance.<sup>37</sup> The same standard applied in Basra, where Abū 'Amr was preferred over al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.<sup>38</sup> In the Levant (Shām), he selected Ibn 'Āmir, whose reading was the most widely adopted in the region.<sup>39</sup>

Unlike other regions where a single reciter was chosen, in Kūfah, Ibn Mujaḥid selected three reciters due to prevailing socio-political dynamics.<sup>40</sup> Initially, the dominant qirā'ah in Kūfah was that of 'Abd Allāh ibn Mas'ūd. Ibn Mujaḥid's first choice, 'Āṣim ibn Abī al-Najūd (d.

127 AH/745), was known for his eloquence, strong memory, and expertise in Arabic grammar.<sup>41</sup> However, according to al-A'mash (d. 148 AH/765), only a few recited according to the 'Uthmānī codex.<sup>42</sup> Due to 'Āṣim's lack of popularity, Ibn Mujāhid added a second reciter, Ḥamzah ibn Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt (d. 156 AH).<sup>43</sup> Despite his scholarly stature, Ḥamzah's recitation was criticized by some—'Abd Allāh ibn Idrīs considered his prolongations (mad) and use of hamzah letters excessive,<sup>44</sup> and both Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241 AH/855) and Abū Bakr Shu'bah (d. 193 AH/809) viewed some of his readings as innovations.<sup>45</sup> To reinforce his selection, Ibn Mujāhid included a third Kūfan reciter, 'Alī ibn Ḥamzah al-Kisā'ī (d. 189 AH), a student of Ḥamzah and a renowned grammarian whose recitation was widely adopted.<sup>46</sup>

The canonization of the Qur'anic *qirā'āt* by Ibn Mujāhid in the 4th century AH cannot be reduced to a philological project alone. Rather, it was a representational endeavor that can be analyzed through Serge Moscovici's concepts of anchoring and objectification. In response to growing concern over divergent recitations and the unrest they could provoke among believers, Ibn Mujāhid introduced a representational strategy to stabilize diversity. He selected seven imams from major centers of learning, Mecca, Medina, Kūfah, Basra, and Shām, as a form of anchoring: placing unbounded diversity within a known and authoritative social structure based on sanad and normative criteria. This process mirrors Moscovici's anchoring mechanism, wherein unfamiliar ideas are brought closer by associating them with familiar categories.

Beyond that, Ibn Mujāhid objectified this new configuration by documenting it in *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fi al-Qirā'āt*, complete with transmission chains, students, and reading methods. This act rendered the system no longer abstract, but tangible, structured, and socially transmissible. In Moscovici's terms, objectification is the process of transforming abstract ideas into concrete, perceptible forms. Thus, Ibn Mujāhid's codification of the *qirā'āt* constituted a socialization of religious truth through social representation, guiding the Muslim community to accept particular readings as legitimate embodiments of divine revelation.

### **Ibn Mujāhid's Authority Strategies and the Dynamics of Minority Influence**

Within the framework of Serge Moscovici's theory of minority influence, the role of Ibn Mujāhid can be analysed as that of an active minority who successfully challenged and reshaped the dominant normative structure within the Qur'anic recitation (*qirā'āt*) tradition. Moscovici argues that

minorities influence majorities not through compromise, but through consistency in their position, coherence in argumentation, and steadfastness in maintaining their distinction. The strategy employed by Ibn Mujāhid fulfills the core criteria of minority influence identified by Moscovici: historical consistency through reliance on chains of transmission (*isnād*), coherence in selecting the seven principal *qurrā'*, and the organization of an epistemic system that enabled long-term social acceptance among Muslims.

In this context, Ibn Mujāhid's effort to discipline the *qirā'āt* was not merely a scholarly endeavor but an ideological project of hegemony, achieved through symbolic circulation that successfully redefined previously flexible normative boundaries. He consistently promoted the notion that only seven Qur'anic *qirā'āt* were to be accepted, based on three key criteria: conformity with the 'Uthmānī rasm, a traceable *sanad* (chain of narration) reaching the Prophet Muhammad, and linguistic compatibility with classical Arabic grammar. In *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt*, Ibn Mujāhid systematically formulated this argument by selecting *qurrā'* from major Islamic centers, Medina, Mecca, Kūfah, Baṣrah, and Shām, thus ensuring both geographical representation and the popularity of the selected reciters within each region, except in Kūfah (as previously discussed).

The consistency of Ibn Mujāhid's position was further supported by scholarly authority, evidenced by the composition of his canonical text, and by the endorsement of the broader network of *qirā'āt* scholars. In popularizing these seven *qirā'āt*, Ibn Mujāhid not only authored a seminal work and established the criteria for validity but also mobilized pre-existing pedagogical networks of teachers and students. He had received instruction in the readings of all seven *qurrā'* through verified transmission chains:

1. For Nāfi's *qirā'ah*, he studied with sixteen teachers, including Aḥmad ibn Mūsá who transmitted Warsh's narration through Ḥasan ibn 'Alī Ziyād, from Dāwūd ibn Hārūn, a direct student of Nāfi'. Another teacher, Ismā'il al-Qāḍī ibn Ishāq, was a student of Qālūn.
2. For Ibn Kathīr's *qirā'ah*, he studied through two primary chains: one from Mudhir ibn Muḥammad al-Asadī via Aḥmad ibn Abī Bazah al-Bazzī and 'Ikrimah ibn Sulaymān; another from Khalaf ibn Hishām via 'Ubayd ibn 'Aqīl.
3. For Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alā', he learned through 'Abd Allāh ibn Kathīr al-Baṣrī via Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī, and through Shu'ayb al-Sūsī from 'Alī ibn Mūsá.
4. For Ibn 'Āmir, he studied through Aḥmad ibn Yūsuf from Ibn Dhakwān,

tracing back to Ayyūb ibn Tamīm and Yaḥyā al-Dhimārī.

5. For ‘Āṣim’s reading (Syu‘bah’s narration), he learned through Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad al-Wāqī‘ī from al-Wāqī‘ī’s father and Yaḥyā ibn Ādam.
6. For ‘Āṣim’s Haḥṣ narration, he received it via al-Kisā‘ī al-Ṣaghīr, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Ḥazzāz, Abū Muḥammad from al-Anmāṭī, and ‘Amr ibn Shabbah.
7. For Ḥamzah’s reading, he studied under Mūsā ibn Ishāq, Abū Hishām, and Sulaimān ibn ‘Īsā, as well as through Yaḥyā ibn Aḥmad Hārūn from Khalaf ibn Khālīd.
8. For al-Kisā‘ī’s reading, he studied under Ḥasan ibn Abī Mihrān, who transmitted from Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā al-Aṣbahānī and Nāṣir ibn Yūsuf.<sup>47</sup>

Prior to Ibn Mujāhid, Muslim communities were accustomed to a wide array of Qur’anic recitations, some of which included *shādhdh* (irregular) readings. However, following the publication and circulation of *Kitāb al-Sab‘ah*, a gradual shift occurred in both scholarly and public perception, leading to the widespread belief that only seven *qirā’āt* were legitimate. This gave rise to a process of objectification, in which society began to associate the number seven with the seven *ahruf* (seven modes) mentioned in prophetic traditions.<sup>48</sup> This process generated a new social representation: that only seven *qirā’āt* were valid, and all others were deemed deviant or unorthodox.

In the centuries that followed, what began as a minority position advocated by Ibn Mujāhid evolved into a widely institutionalized norm. Madrasahs, mosques, and religious institutions began teaching only the seven *qirā’āt*, while *shādhdh* readings were gradually excluded from mainstream religious education. This represents a remarkable success in minority influence, effectively shaping a new consensus within the religious social structure. This transformation exemplifies what Serge Moscovici describes as collective cognitive conversion: a fundamental change in societal perception, from accepting unlimited recitational diversity to embracing the standardization of *qirā’āt* as the normative and authentic expression of divine revelation. In this light, what was once a marginal idea has been fully integrated into dominant Islamic orthodoxy.

### **Ideological Conflict and the Standardization of Qur’anic Recitation: The Case of the Seven *Qirā’āt***

Moscovici asserts that the history of society is fundamentally a history of knowledge production, one that is constantly marked by struggles over meaning and symbolic power.<sup>49</sup> From this perspective, Ibn Mujāhid’s project can be interpreted as an ideological conflict in the quest for

authority over the divine text. His canonization of the seven *qirā'āt* constituted an intervention into the social and epistemic landscape of early Islamic scholarly life. He claimed a particular representation of revelation as normative, while marginalizing other living traditions, which he designated as *shādhah* readings, variants not included within the emerging canon.

The ideological contestation is particularly evident in Ibn Mujāhid's unique treatment of Kūfah, where he appointed three canonical reciters, 'Āṣim, Ḥamzah, and al-Kisā'ī, in contrast to other cities, which were represented by only one. This was a strategic response to the socio-political and religious plurality of Kūfah, where the dominant recitation was that of 'Abd Allāh ibn Mas'ūd.<sup>50</sup> Ibn Mujāhid's decision to privilege 'Āṣim, known for his eloquence and grammatical expertise, was not based on popularity, as al-A'mash reports that only a few recited according to the 'Uthmānī rasm via his chain. To mitigate resistance and bridge the gap between competing factions, Ibn Mujāhid added Ḥamzah ibn Ḥabīb as a second reciter, despite his controversial reputation. Ḥamzah had been criticized by major scholars like Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and Abū Bakr Shu'bah for introducing innovative and excessive elements in his recitation.

Here, Moscovici's mechanisms of anchoring and objectification become observable: Ibn Mujāhid responded to ideological conflict by accommodating plurality and reframing it into a new social consensus. The inclusion of a third reciter, al-Kisā'ī, an authoritative and widely accepted figure in Kūfah, enabled Ibn Mujāhid to stabilize competing interpretations and transform diversity into structured legitimacy. The canonization of the Kūfan *qirā'āt* was not a mere compromise, but a dynamic construction of new social representation. Despite his effort, Ibn Mujāhid faced opposition from scholars who rejected the restriction of *qirā'āt* to only seven. They argued that such limitations contradicted the inherited diversity of recitations traced back to the Prophet, noting that many other variants had valid isnāds but were excluded. Two prominent opponents were Ibn Shanabūdh (d. 328 AH) and Ibn Miqsam (d. 332 AH), who publicly challenged Ibn Mujāhid's codification. They contended that *qirā'āt* should remain open-ended and not be confined to a fixed number.

Ibn Mujāhid held firm in his stance. He argued that Ibn Miqsam recited according to the 'Uthmānī rasm but without an authentic sanad, while Ibn Shanabūdh possessed a sound sanad (transmitting the reading of Ibn Mas'ūd) but recited a version not in line with the 'Uthmānī rasm. With Ibn Mujāhid's influence, Ibn Muqlah (d. 328 AH), vizier to the

Abbasid Caliph al-Muqtadir (d. 320 AH),<sup>51</sup> ordered both to issue formal declarations of compliance. Ibn Shanabūdh was even subjected to seven lashes before he submitted his declaration.<sup>52</sup>

Legend has it that in response, Ibn Shanabūdh cursed Ibn Muqlah, praying that his hand be severed, a curse later believed to have been fulfilled during the reign of al-Rāḍī Billah, when Ibn Muqlah's right hand was amputated by his successor, the vizier Ibn Rā'iq.<sup>53</sup> According to al-Dhahabī, a personal rivalry existed between Ibn Mujāhid and Ibn Shanabūdh; the latter mocked Ibn Mujāhid's lack of scholarly travel, claiming that "his feet never gathered the dust of knowledge," alluding to his remaining in Baghdad.<sup>54</sup>

Although the codification of the Seven *Qirā'āt* eventually received institutional endorsement and evolved into a canonical tradition, the process was far from uncontested. Ideological disputes accompanied the reception of this canon. Many scholars questioned the rationale behind selecting exactly seven *qirā'āt*, rejecting the association with the ḥadīth of *sab'atu aḥruf* (seven modes). Some, such as al-Mahdawī and al-Jazā'irī, criticized the legitimacy and consistency of Ibn Mujāhid's selection method. Abū 'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Ammār al-Mahdawī (d. 430 AH) argued that this selection led the public to erroneously equate the seven *qirā'āt* with the seven *aḥruf*.<sup>55</sup> Al-Jazā'irī questioned this association, pointing out the absurdity of attributing the selection to the Prophet while Ibn Mujāhid himself could arbitrarily replace a reciter such as Ya'qūb al-Ḥaḍramī with al-Kisā'ī.<sup>56</sup>

Other scholars, such as Ibn al-Qarrāb and Abū Muḥammad al-Makkī, emphasized that many valid recitations existed outside of the seven canonized by Ibn Mujāhid. Ibn al-Qarrāb contended that the limitation to seven *qāri's* was not based on Prophetic traditions but was a personal decision later immortalized in *Kitāb al-Sab'ah*, leading to the mistaken belief that other *qirā'āt* were impermissible.<sup>57</sup> Al-Makkī further stressed that more than seventy scholars possessed qualifications superior to the seven chosen by Ibn Mujāhid, implying that legitimate recitations should not be restricted to this narrow list.<sup>58</sup>

This controversy created two major currents among scholars: those who accepted, defended, and built upon the canon of seven *qirā'āt*; and those who rejected its exclusivity and advocated for expansion. Each camp developed their arguments through scholarly works and epistemic authority, demonstrating that the hegemony of Ibn Mujāhid's social representation was never absolute but always subject to renegotiation.

Prominent scholars in the first group include Abū Muḥammad Makki

ibn Abī Tālib al-Qaysī (d. 437 AH), who authored key works such as *al-Ibanah ‘an Ma‘āni al-Qirā’at*,<sup>59</sup> *al-Kasyf ‘an Wujuh al-Qirā’at al-Sab’ wa ‘Tlaluha wa Hujajuha dan al-Tabshirah fi al-Qirā’at al-Sab’*,<sup>60</sup> Aḥmad ibn ‘Ammār al-Mahdawī with his commentary *Syarh al- Hidayah fi al-Qirā’at al-Sab’*,<sup>61</sup> Ibn al-Faḥḥām with *al-Mufradat fi al-Qirā’at al-Sab’*, Ibn al-Khalawayh (d. 370 AH) with *al-Hujjah fi al-Qirā’at al-Sab’ah*<sup>62</sup> and ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-Qurṭubī al-Dānī (d. 444 AH), with *Jamī’ al-Bayan fi al-Qirā’at al- Sab’*<sup>63</sup> and *al-Taysir fi al-Qirā’at al-Sab’*.<sup>64</sup> the latter of which simplified each *qāri’* to two transmitters to aid in pedagogy.

Conversely, scholars of the second group include Abū al-Ḥasan Ibn Ghalbūn (d. 399 AH), who adopted eight *qirā’āt* in his *al-Tadzkirah fi al-Qirā’at al-Tsaman*.<sup>65</sup> adding the recitation of Ya‘qūb al-Ḥaḍramī. Similarly, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Ḥusayn ibn Mihrān (d. 381 AH) authored *al-Ghayah fi al-Qirā’at al-‘Asyr*,<sup>66</sup> and Ibn al-Jazarī compiled the influential *al-Nasyr fi al-Qirā’at al-‘Asyr*.<sup>67</sup> These scholars expanded the canon by including three additional *qāri’*’s: Abū Ja‘far al-Madanī, Khalaf ibn Hishām, and Ya‘qūb al-Ḥaḍramī.

From Moscovici’s perspective, the canonization of the Seven *Qirā’āt* reflects how the production of religious knowledge is shaped by symbolic contestation. Although the seven readings gained hegemonic status as a dominant social representation, continued debates, expansions, and alternative compilations reveal that ideological tensions persist within the Muslim scholarly tradition. Standardization did not resolve interpretive plurality but reframed it within new boundaries, prompting ongoing negotiations of religious authority. Thus, rather than ending diversity, the formalization of *qirā’āt* ignited a dynamic process in which rival claims over authenticity and legitimacy continued to evolve. The history of Qur’anic recitation, therefore, is not static but remains a site of contested meanings and shifting scholarly power.

## Conclusion

Applying Serge Moscovici’s Social Psychology framework, this study offers a novel contribution to the analysis of Ibn Mujāhid’s project in stabilizing the Qur’anic *qirā’āt*. It contends that this project was not solely driven by linguistic concerns or the popularity of particular reciters, but rather deeply embedded in social, political, and epistemic power relations. Moscovici’s theory illuminates how Ibn Mujāhid’s decision, such as appointing three *qāri’*’s for Kūfah while assigning only one for other cities, functioned as a deliberate social strategy to counter the lingering dominance of the *qirā’ah* of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd.



This stabilization process was supported by two primary mechanisms: (1) the politics of knowledge, through the formal authorship of *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt*, which documented, classified, and legitimated the seven selected readings; and (2) the politics of power, notably the alignment between Ibn Mujāhid and Abbasid authorities, including Vizier Ibn Muqlah. This alliance provided not only scholarly but also coercive reinforcement, as seen in punitive actions taken against dissenting figures such as Ibn Shanabūdh and Ibn Miqsam, thereby delimiting the boundaries of legitimate recitation within the Muslim ummah.

Viewed through Moscovici's theory, Ibn Mujāhid's approach represents a model case of how new social representations are constructed. Minority influence, rooted in consistency, intellectual coherence, and strategic alignment with authoritative institutions, gradually shifts public consensus. Ibn Mujāhid, initially representing a minority position amidst a broad range of valid and circulating *qirā'āt*, successfully framed his standard as the most authoritative. This reframing occurred within an ideological conflict: on one side stood those who upheld the open-ended pluralism of Qur'anic recitation; on the other, those advocating for standardization to ensure religious stability and orthodoxy. Ibn Mujāhid's model prevailed, and the Seven *Qirā'āt* became the normative canon.

This study also highlights the value of Moscovici's theory for broader applications in Islamic religious studies, especially within ḥadīth scholarship. While social psychology has rarely been used in religious epistemology, Moscovici's concepts offer a compelling lens to analyse ideological shifts and institutional dominance. According to Samer Dajani's *Sufis and Sharī'a: The Forgotten School of Mercy*, a tension emerged between the proponents of the Sunnah and those aligned strictly with the Ḥadīth tradition.<sup>68</sup> This tension can be conceptualized as a struggle between two competing social representations.

The Mālikī and Shaybānī perspectives emphasized the lived practices and consensus (*'amal ahl al-Madīnah*) of the Prophet's Companions, favoring the real-life embodiment of the Sunnah over its mere textual transmission. In contrast, the Shāfi'ī school constructed a representation of Sunnah grounded in the rigor of *sanad*, positing it as the gold standard for religious authenticity. The *sanad*-based approach initially represented a minority epistemology but gradually rose to dominance due to its alignment with institutional authority, growing academic consensus, and its integration into the formal Islamic educational system.

Moscovici's concept of objectification is key to understanding this shift. The idea of *sanad*, once abstract and confined to elite scholarly

circles became concretized in the form of curricula, scholarly manuals, and judicial procedures. Over time, this epistemology was normalized, widely adopted, and eventually institutionalized. Meanwhile, the practice-based epistemology was increasingly marginalized. This trajectory mirrors the earlier success of Ibn Mujāhid's efforts: the construction and consolidation of an epistemic framework through which a minority view becomes mainstream.

Thus, both cases illustrate what Moscovici terms collective cognitive conversion, the moment at which society internalizes a once-minority position as a normative truth. In Ibn Mujāhid's case, this meant redefining the communal understanding of what constitutes a legitimate Qur'anic recitation. In the case of hadith studies, it entailed a paradigm shift in the epistemology of religious truth itself. In both, the struggle was not just theological or legal, but representational and ideological: a contest over who may define religious authority and how that authority becomes socially accepted.

This study affirms that standardization in Islamic intellectual history is rarely neutral or purely scholarly. It is deeply interwoven with political authority, symbolic representation, and institutional force. Ibn Mujāhid's codification of the Seven Qirā'āt, viewed through the lens of Moscovici's social psychology, stands as a prime example of how religious knowledge is contested, negotiated, and normalized over time. It further opens a methodological horizon for integrating psychological theory into the study of Islamic orthodoxy formation, inviting a more interdisciplinary engagement with the dynamics of religious authority.

## Endnotes

1. The full name of Ibn Mujāhid is Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Mūsā ibn al-'Abbās ibn Mujāhid. He lived during the Abbasid Caliphate, specifically under the rule of Caliph al-Rāḍi Billāh. For further details, see Jalāluddīn 'Abdurrahmān Abū Bakr al-Suyūṭī, *Tārikh al-Khulafā* (Qatar: Wizārah al-Awqāf wa al-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyyah, 2013), 603.
2. Aḥmad ibn Mūsā Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt* (Mesir: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1972).
3. One of the canonical readers selected by Ibn Mujāhid is Nāfi'. His full name is Abū Ruwaym Nāfi' ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Nu'aym al-Laythī. He was born in 70 AH in Isfahan and is said to have learned the Qur'anic qirā'āt from seventy of the ṭābi'ūn (successors of the Prophet's companions). Nāfi' passed away in 167 AH. Among his direct students were two well-known transmitters: Qālūn and Warsh. Qālūn's full name is Abū Mūsā 'Isā ibn Minā ibn Wārdān. He was known by the nickname "Qālūn" because of his beautiful voice and passed away in 220 AH. Warsh's full name is 'Uthmān ibn Sa'id ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Miṣrī. He was called "Warsh" due to his light complexion and died in 197 AH. For more detailed information, see 'Abdul Fattāḥ al-Qāḍī, *al-Budūr al-Zāhirah fī al-Qirā'āt al-'Ashr al-Mutawātirah* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Arabī, 2000), 8.
4. Jauhar Azizi Muhammad Sairi, "Al-Qur'an Antara Wahyu Oral Dan Kodifikasi Uthmani,"

- Jurnal Ilmu Ushuluddin* 5. No.2 (2018): 87.
5. Christopher Melchert, "Variant Qur'anic Readings Before and After Ibn Mujahid," *Journal of the International Qur'anic Studies Association*, 2025, 1–36.
  6. Melchert, 3.
  7. Christopher Melchert, "Ibn Mujahid and the Establishment of Seven Qur'anic Readings," *Studia Islamica*, no. 91 (2000): 16, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1596266>.
  8. Shady Hekmat Nasser, *The Second Canonization of The Qur'an (324/936), Ibn Mujahid and The Founding of The Seven Readings* (Leiden: Brill, 2021).
  9. Afrida Arinal Muna Munirul Ikhwan, "Ibn Mujahid's Canonical Legacy: Examining Sanad Authentication and Political Factors in The Standarization of Qira'at Sab'ah," *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu al-Qur'an Dan Hadits* 24. No. 2 (2023): 359–82.
  10. Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt*.
  11. Serge Moscovici, *Sosial Representation, Ekplorasi in Social Psychology* (New York: New York University Press, 2001).
  12. Serge Moscovici, *The Invention of Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005).
  13. Serge Moscovici, *Perspectives On Minority Influences* (Amerika: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
  14. Melchert, "Ibn Mujahid and the Establishment of Seven Qur'anic Readings."
  15. Melchert, "Variant Qur'anic Readings Before and After Ibn Mujahid."
  16. Munirul Ikhwan, "Ibn Mujahid's Canonical Legacy: Examining Sanad Authentication and Political Factors in The Standarization of Qira'at Sab'ah."
  17. Nasser, *The Second Canonization of The Qur'an (324/936), Ibn Mujahid and The Founding of The Seven Readings*.
  18. Shady Hekmat Nasser, *The Transmission of The Variant Readings of The Qur'an, The Problem of Tawatur and The Emergence of Shawwadh* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
  19. Serge Moscovici was born in Brăila, Romania in 1925 and faced discrimination early in life due to his Jewish identity, being expelled from school at the age of thirteen. Following World War II and rising antisemitism, he clandestinely left Romania in 1947 and settled in Paris a year later. There, he developed social psychology not merely as an academic discipline but as a transformative force in rebuilding society after the war. See Ivan Markova, *The Making of Dialogical Theory, Social Representation and Communication* (Amerika: Cambridge University Press, 2023), 16.
  20. Moscovici, *Sosial Representation, Ekplorasi in Social Psychology*.
  21. Moscovici, 42.
  22. Moscovici, 23.
  23. Moscovici, 49.
  24. Moscovici, *Perspectives On Minority Influences*, 5.
  25. Moscovici, 6.
  26. Moscovici, 7.
  27. Moscovici, *The Invention of Society*, 152.
  28. Moscovici, 160.
  29. Shamsuddīn Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Jazari, *al-Nashr fī al-Qirā'āt al-'Ashr*, I (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 2012).
  30. Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad bin Abi Bakar Qaṣṭallānī, *Laṭā'if al-Ishārāt fī Funūn al-Qirā'āt*, I (Saudi: Markaz al-Dirasat al-Qur'aniyyah, 2006).
  31. Shamsuddīn Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ibn Jazari, *Ghāyah al-Nihāyah fī Ṭabāqāt al-Qurrā'*, I (Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah, 2006).
  32. Ghānim Qaddūrī al-Ḥammād, *al-Qirā'āt al-Qur'āniyyah, Manābij wa A'lām* (Irak: Jam'iyyah al-Muḥāfaẓah 'ala al-Qur'ān al-Karīm, 2018).
  33. Shamsuddīn Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ibn Jazari, *Ghāyah al-Nihāyah fī Ṭabāqāt al-Qurrā'*, II (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2006), 70.

34. Ibn Jazari, *Ghāyah al-Nihāyah fī Ṭabāqāt al-Qurrā'*, II.
35. Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt*, 18.
36. Ibn Mujāhid, 63.
37. Ibn Mujāhid, 66.
38. Ibn Mujāhid, 80.
39. Ibn Mujāhid, 87.
40. Hekmat Nasser, *The Transmission of The Variant Readings of The Qur'an, The Problem of Tawatur and The Emergence of Shawwadh*, 55.
41. Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt*, 70.
42. Ibn Mujāhid, 67.
43. Hekmat Nasser, *The Transmission of The Variant Readings of The Qur'an*, 57.
44. Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt*, 77.
45. Melchert, "Ibn Mujahid and the Establishment of Seven Qur'anic Readings," 21.
46. Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt*, 78–79.
47. Muhammad al-Mukhtar, *Tārikh al-Qirā'āt Bayna al-Mashriq wa al-Maghrib* (Maroko: Manshūrāt al-Munazzamah al-Islāmiyyah, 2001), 122–25.
48. Hekmat Nasser, *The Transmission of The Variant Readings of The Qur'an*, 64.
49. Moscovici, *Sosial Representation, Ekplorasi in Sosial Psychology*, 9.
50. Hekmat Nasser, *The Transmission of The Variant Readings of The Qur'an*, 55.
51. Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Umrānī, *al-Inbā fī Tārikh al-Khulafā'* (Mesir: (Mesir: Dār al-Afāq, 1999), 166.
52. Abdul Hayy ibn Ahmad ibn Muhammad Ibn al-Imad, *Shadharah al-Dhahab fī Akhbār Man Dhahab*, IV (Beirut: Dar Ibn Katsir, 1986), 120.
53. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihriṣāt* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah, 1990), 47.
54. Muhammad Husayn al-Dhahabī, *Ma'rifah al-Qurrā' al-Kibār 'alā al-Ṭabāqāt wa al-Aṣār*, I (Beirut: Muassasah al-Risalah, 1997), 277.
55. Hekmat Nasser, *The Transmission of The Variant Readings of The Qur'an*, 64.
56. Ṭāhir al-Jazā'irī, *al-Tibyān li Ba'd al-Mabāhiṭh al-Muta'alliqah bi al-Qur'ān 'alā Ṭarīq al-Itqān* (Mesir: Maṭba'ah al-Manār, 2004), 114.
57. al-Jazā'irī, 113.
58. Abū Muḥammad Makkī ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Qaysī, *al-Ibānah 'an Ma'āni al-Qirā'āt* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'mūn li al-Turāth, 1979), 36–37.
59. Al-Qaysī, *al-Ibānah 'an Ma'āni al-Qirā'āt*.
60. Makki Ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Qaysī, *Kitāb Al-Tabṣirah Fī al-Qirā'āt al-Sab'* (India: Dar al-Salafiyyah, 1982).
61. Abu Abbas Ahmad Ibn 'Ammar al-Mahdawi, *Ṣarḥ Al-Hidāyah* (Riyadh: Maktbaha al-Rusyd, 1995).
62. Abū 'Abdullah Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Khalawayh, *al-Hujjah fī al-Qirā'āt al-Sab'* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1998).
63. Abū 'Amr 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd al-Dānī, *Jāmi' al-Bayān Fī al-Qirā'āt al-Sab' al-Mashhūrah* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2005).
64. Abū 'Amr Uthmān ibn Sa'īd al-Dānī, *al-Taysīr fī al-Qirā'āt al-Sab'* (Saudi: Dār al-Andalus, 2010).
65. Abū Ḥasan Ṭāhir ibn 'Abdul Mun'im ibn Ghalbūn, *al-Tadhkirah fī al-Qirā'āt al-Thamān*, I (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2013).
66. Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Ḥusayn Ibn Mahrān, *al-Ghāyah fī al-Qirā'āt al-'Ashr* (Riyadh: Dar al-Syawaf, 1990).
67. al-Jazari, *al-Nashr fī al-Qirā'āt al-'Ashr*, I.
68. Samer Dajani, *Sufis and Shari'a, The Forgotten School of Mercy* (Inggris: Edinburgh University Press, 2023), 15–19.

## Bibliography

- Dajani, Samer. *Sufis and Shari'a, The Forgotten School of Mercy*. Ingggris: Edinburgh University Press, 2023.
- Dānī, Abū 'Amr Uthmān ibn Sa'īd al-. *al-Tāysīr fī al-Qirā'āt al-Sab'*. Saudi: Dār al-Andālus, 2010.
- Dānī, Abū 'Amr 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd al-. *Jāmi' al-Bayān Fī al-Qirā'āt al-Sab' al-Mashhūrah*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2005.
- Dhababī, Muhammad Husayn al-. *Ma'rifah al-Qurrā' al-Kibār 'alā al-Ṭabāqāt wa al-Aṣār*. I. Beirut: Muassasah al-Risalah, 1997.
- Ghalbūn, Abū Ḥasan Tāhir ibn 'Abdul Mun'im ibn. *al-Tadhkirah fī al-Qirā'āt al-Thamān*. I. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2013.
- Ḥammād, Ghānim Qaddūrī al-. *al-Qirā'āt al-Qur'āniyyah, Manāhij wa A'lām*. Irak: Jam'iyyah al-Muḥāfaẓah 'ala al-Qur'ān al-Karīm, 2018.
- Hekmat Nasser, Shady. *The Transmission of The Variant Readings of The Qur'an, The Problem of Tawatur and The Emergence of Shawwadhdh*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Qaysī, Makki. *Kitāb Al-Tabṣirah Fī al-Qirā'āt al-Sab'*. India: Dar al-Salafiyyah, 1982.
- Ibn al-Imad, Abdul Hayy ibn Ahmad ibn Muhammad. *Shadharah al-Dhabab fī Akhbār Man Dhahab*. IV. Beirut: Dar Ibn Katsir, 1986.
- Ibn al-Nadīm. *Fihriṣāt*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah, 1990.
- Ibn 'Ammar al-Mahdawi, Abu Abbas Ahmad. *Ṣarḥ Al-Hidāyah*. Riyadh: Maktbaha al-Rusyd, 1995.
- Ibn Jazari, Shamsuddīn Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad. *Ghāyah al-Nihāyah fī Ṭabāqāt al-Qurrā'*. I. Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-'Ilmiyyah, 2006.
- . *Ghāyah al-Nihāyah fī Ṭabāqāt al-Qurrā'*. II. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2006.
- Ibn Mahrān, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Ḥusayn. *al-Ghāyah fī al-Qirā'āt al-'Ashr*. Riyadh: Dar al-Syawaf, 1990.
- Ibn Mujāhid, Aḥmad ibn Mūsā. *Kitāb al-Sab'ah fī al-Qirā'āt*. Mesir: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1972.
- Ibn 'Umrānī, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad. *al-Inbā fī Tārikh al-Khulafā*. Mesir: (Mesir: Dār al-Afāq, 1999.
- irī, Tāhir al-Jazā'. *al-Tibyān li Ba'd al-Mabāhith al-Muta'alliqah bi al-Qur'ān 'alā Ṭarīq al-Itqān*. Mesir: Maṭba'ah al-Manār, 2004.
- Jazari, Shamsuddīn Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-. *al-Nashr fī al-Qirā'āt al-'Ashr*. I. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 2012.
- Khalawayh, Abū 'Abdullah Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn al-. *al-Ḥujjah fī al-Qirā'āt al-Sab'*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1998.
- Markova, Ivan. *The Making of Dialogical Theory, Social Representation and Communication*. Amerika: Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- Melchert, Christopher. "Ibn Mujahid and the Establishment of Seven Qur'anic Readings." *Studia Islamica*, no. 91 (2000): 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1596266>.
- . "Variant Qur'anic Readings Before and After Ibn Mujahid." *Journal of the International Qur'anic Studies Association*, 2025, 1–36.
- Moscovici, Serge. *Perspectives On Minority Influences*. Amerika: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

- . *Sosial Representation, Ekploration in Social Psychology*. New York: New York University Press, 2001.
- . *The Invention of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005.
- Muhammad Sairi, Jauhar Azizi. “Al-Qur’an Antara Wahyu Oral Dan Kodifikasi Uthmani.” *Ilmu Ushuluddin* 5. No.2 (2018): 75–90.
- Mukhtar, Muhammad al-. *Tārikh al-Qirā’āt Bayna al-Mashriq wa al-Maghrib*. Maroko: Manshūrāt al-Munazzamah al-Islāmiyyah, 2001.
- Munirul Ikhwan, Afrida Arinal Muna. “Ibn Mujahid’s Canonical Legacy: Examining Sanad Authentication and Political Factors in The Standarization of Qira’at Sab’ah.” *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu al-Qur’an Dan Hadits* 24. No. 2 (2023): 359–82.
- Nasser, Shady Hekmat. *The Second Canonization of The Qur’an (324/936), Ibn Mujahid and The Founding of The Seven Readings*. Leiden: Brill, 2021.
- Qāḍī, ‘Abdul Fattāḥ al-. *al-Budūr al-Zāhirah fī al-Qirā’āt al-‘Ashr al-Mutawātirah*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Arabī, 2000.
- Qaṣṭallānī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad bin Abi Bakar. *Laṭā’if al-Ishārāt fī Funūn al-Qirā’āt*. I. Saudi: Markaz al-Dirasat al-Qur’aniyyah, 2006.
- Qaysī, Abū Muḥammad Makkī ibn Abī Ṭālib al-. *al-Ibānah ‘an Ma’āni al-Qirā’āt*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma’mūn li al-Turāth, 1979.
- Suyūṭī, Jalāluddīn ‘Abdurrahmān Abū Bakr al-. *Tārikh al-Khulāfā*. Qatar: Wizārah al-Awqāf wa al-Shu’ūn al-Islāmiyyah, 2013.

**Fuad Nawawi**, UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon | [fuadnawawi@syekhnurjati.ac.id](mailto:fuadnawawi@syekhnurjati.ac.id)  
**Mokhamad Sukron**, UIN Profesor Kiai Haji Saifudin Zuhri Purwokerto | [mokhamadsukron@uinsaizu.ac.id](mailto:mokhamadsukron@uinsaizu.ac.id)