

RESEARCH ARTICLE

WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Semantic Engineering in Mutawātir Quranic Readings: Towards Building a Taxonomic Model for Layers of Semantic and Legislative Impact

Dr. Ilyas Chohra

Department of Arabic Language, Faculty of Arts and Islamic Civilization
, Emir Abdelkader University of Islamic Sciences, Constantine, Algeria
Email: ilyaschohra1@gmail.com | ORCID: 0000-0001-8103-3741

Received: 12/02/2025 Accepted: 02/05/2025 Published: 03/01/2026

Abstract

This inquiry interrogates the structural relationship between the multiplicity of Mass-transmitted (Mutawātir) Quranic readings and the generation of meaning, aiming to construct a taxonomic model that classifies the layers of their semantic and legislative impact. Transcending the traditional "apologetic" methodology which merely seeks to reconcile apparent variances, this study adopts a foundational approach to map the divergence of readings into three distinct strata: (1) **Descriptive Enrichment**, where readings expand the semantic field of a single concept; (2) **Scenic Integration**, where variants narrate complementary stages of a single event (Part-to-Whole relationship); and (3) **Legislative Divergence**, where morphological shifts establish distinct legal rulings for varying conditions. By employing an inductive-analytical methodology on select paradigms, the research concludes that the variation in Canonical Readings constitutes a precise "semantic architecture" that enriches the text's import without contradiction, offering a novel analytical tool for Quranic hermeneutics.

Keywords: Semantic Engineering; Quranic Readings; Semantic Impact; Legislative Impact; Descriptive Enrichment; Scenic Integration.

INTRODUCTION

Praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds, and peace and blessings be upon the most noble of Messengers. To commence: The Book of God is a pelagic expanse whose shores remain unreachable, and its miraculous nature comprises signs that renew themselves across epochs. Among its exquisite secrets and elevated facets of inimitability is the semantic richness and rhetorical complementarity deposited within the variation of its Mass-transmitted (Mutawātir) readings. This variance transcends contradiction or antithesis, ascending to the rank of "diversity of variation" (Ikhtilāf Tanawwu'); a principle established by the consensus of verifiers, who posit that one reading stands in relation to another as one verse stands to another—each elucidating a distinct facet of the Quranic reality.

While the exegetical and linguistic heritage is replete with monumental efforts in directing and justifying these readings, a scrutinizing observer notes that the prevailing methodology is often atomistic—halting at the individual witness—or apologetic, seeking merely to repel the illusion of

conflict. Hence, the research gap this paper seeks to bridge becomes manifest: it aims to transcend the mere affirmation of impact—which is axiomatic—to an attempt at typologizing this impact. The objective is to construct a taxonomic model that organizes scattered examples into graduated semantic layers, revealing the precise cognitive system governing the relationship between the multiplicity of readings and the integrity of meaning. This responds to the cardinal question: How can the phenomenon of reading variance be transformed from scattered linguistic evidences into a defined semantic and legislative system?

This methodological intent necessitates dividing the inquiry into three sections, preceded by a theoretical preamble and followed by a conclusion synthesizing the findings. Each section addresses a specific pattern of semantic relationship: The **First Section** explicates "Descriptive Enrichment and Semantic Expansion," where two readings operate to enrich a single semantic reality. The **Second Section** ascends to "Narrative Integration and Scenic Completeness," where each reading presents a fragment or stage of a single event whose image is incomplete without their conjunction. The **Third Section** reaches the apex of practical impact in "Legislative Divergence and Applicative Plurality," where readings establish divergent meanings resulting in distinct rulings for different states. We ask God for openings of His grace and guidance to the straight path; He suffices us, and He is the best Disposer of affairs.

Theoretical Preamble: On the Nexus of Reading and Meaning

An investigation into the semantic impact of reading variance cannot proceed without first liberating the root of the matter and defining the essence of this discipline. A "Reading" (Qirā'ah) is not an opinion to be opined, nor a linguistic selection to be chosen; rather, it is a followed Sunnah, taken by the latter from the former, revolving around oral reception and audition, with a chain of transmission (Isnād) connected to the Master of Readers, the Messenger of God (peace be upon him).

1. Definition of Canonical Readings and Criteria for Acceptance

It is established among the scholars of this art that the definition of a Reading is: "Knowledge of the manner of performing the words of the Quran and their differences, attributed to the transmitter" (Ibn al-Jazari, 1999, p. 9). The locus of the matter is authentic narration and trustworthy transmission, not grammatical analogy or linguistic preference. Since this science revolves around transmission, verifiers have established pillars for it; no reading is accepted unless these are collectively realized, as versified by Imam Ibn al-Jazari:

Every reading that aligns with a grammatical face,
And holds probability for the [Uthmanic] script,
And is authentically transmitted, is the Quran.
These are the Three Pillars.
Wherever a pillar fails, affirm its irregularity (Shudhūdh),
Even if it were among the Seven.

(Ibn al-Jazari, 1994, p. 32). Thus, a reading does not become a Quran to be recited ritually or argued with in exegesis and legislation unless it fulfills these three conditions: agreement with Arabic grammar even if by one face, agreement with the orthography of one of the Uthmanic Codices even if by probability, and authenticity of the chain of transmission. Whatever fulfills these is definitively Quran; whatever lacks a pillar is irregular (Shādh) and is not recited, even if it possesses validity in Arabic or exegesis.

2. The Nature of Variance between Readings

If it is decided that Readings are divinely arrested (Tawqīf) and not elective, and that their orbit is transmission not intellection, it follows that the difference occurring between them cannot be one of contradiction or antithesis. It is impossible for Revelation to descend with a thing and its negation simultaneously, a flaw God negated from His Book: **﴿أَفَلَا يَتَذَكَّرُونَ الْفَرْعَانِ وَلَوْ كَانَ مِنْ عِنْدِ غَيْرِ اللَّهِ لَوَجَدُوا فِيهِ اخْتِلَافًا كَثِيرًا﴾** [An-Nisa: 82].

Consequently, verifiers have established that this divergence is "a difference of variety and variegation, not contradiction and antithesis, for this is impossible in the Speech of God" (Ibn al-Jazari, n.d., Vol. 1, p. 49). Upon this principle, scholars built their approach to directing readings; they positioned one reading vis-à-vis another as one verse to another (Al-Zarkashi, n.d., Vol. 1, p. 327). Just as one verse may summarize a ruling and another detail it, or one release a meaning absolute and another restrict it, so too is the case of Canonical Readings in a single locus. The second reading does not abrogate or nullify the first; rather, it unveils another face of meaning or establishes a ruling for a state different from that indicated by its sister.

One reading may arrive to add a descriptive dimension that expands the circle of meaning or increases its emphasis. Another pair of readings may arrive such that each depicts a stage of a single event whose image is incomplete without their conjunction. Yet another may establish a ruling for a case not encompassed by the other reading. This will become manifest, and its proof evident, in the applied sections of this research.

Section One: Descriptive Enrichment and Semantic Expansion (The Relation of Descriptive Enrichment)

Having established the principle that reading variance implies diversity and complementarity, we proceed to explicate the layers of this integration. The first and most manifest layer is that wherein the difference does not establish two independently disparate meanings; rather, both readings operate within a single semantic circle. One affirms what the other indicates, expands its scope, or adds a descriptive constraint that increases clarity and completeness.

The focus here is on the impact that does not originate a new reality but enriches an existing one. The relationship is that of a root to its attribute, or a summary to its detail. This type often occurs with variations in the morphological structure (Mabna) of the word, such as alternating between a triliteral root and an augmented form; for it is a maxim in Arabic philology that "an increase in structure usually entails an increase in meaning" (Ibn Jinni, 1983, Vol. 3, p. 268). The augmented

form adds nuances of hyperbole, frequency, or reciprocity not explicitly conveyed by the bare root. Similarly, the alternation between a Verbal Noun (Masdar) and an Active Participle (Ism Fa'il) or Assimilated Adjective (Sifah Mushabbahah) plays a pivotal role; the Verbal Noun often conveys a comprehensiveness and hyperbole that the adjective, restricted to its subject, does not—akin to describing a person as "Justice" itself rather than merely "Just."

Readings in this category act as two just witnesses to a single reality; they do not differ in the essence of the testimony, but one adds to the description of the attested object what clarifies its form and completes its image in the listener's mind. One reading establishes the root meaning, and its sister builds upon this root a description that increases the precision of depiction, depth of signification, or comprehensiveness of the ruling. This will be elucidated in the following applied paradigms.

1. The Paradigm of (مَلِك / مَلِك) in (مَلِك يَوْمَ الدِّينِ) [Al-Fatiha: 4]

The first instance confronting us is this sublime locus in the Opening of the Book, where readings multiplied in a manner that stirred the attention of verifiers and revealed an exquisite layer of meaning. 'Asim, Al-Kisa'i, Ya'qub, and Khalaf read (مَلِك) (Mālik) with an Alif, as an Active Participle. The others read (مَلِك) (Malik) without Alif, as an Assimilated Adjective (Ibn al-Jazari, n.d., Vol. 1, p. 271; Al-Banna, 2006, p. 163). Each reading unveils a facet of God's dominion on that Day.

Analysis of the Reading Mālik: The reading of (Mālik) as an Active Participle is derived from Milk (possession) with a Kasra on the Mim, denoting the exclusive appropriation of a thing and the absolute power of disposal over it. The Owner (Mālik) is he who has a specialty in a thing authorizing him to dispose of it in a manner no one shares (Al-Razi, 1420, Vol. 1, p. 205). This description is most apt for disposal over owned objects (property), which Abu Hatim Al-Sijistani noted when he said that "Mālik" is broader and more comprehensive, for one says "owner of the house" and "owner of the bird," but one does not use the title "King" (Malik) for such things (Al-Sam'ani, 1997, Vol. 1, p. 36; Al-Nahhas, 1988, Vol. 1, p. 61). Thus, the reading of (Mālik) establishes that God Almighty is the exclusive Possessor of the affairs of that Day, disposing of its recompense, reward, and punishment with the disposal of an Owner in His property.

Analysis of the Reading Malik: As for the reading of (Malik) as an Assimilated Adjective, it is derived from Mulk (sovereignty) with a Damma on the Mim, denoting authority, command, and the enforcement of order. The King (Malik) is he who disposes of public affairs via command, prohibition, and administration, not merely over specific objects. This signification is broader and more comprehensive in terms of authority, for every King is an Owner (in status), but not every Owner is a King (Al-Tabari, 2001, Vol. 1, p. 151; Al-Farisi, 1999, Vol. 1, p. 12), and the command of the King is enforceable upon the Owner regarding his property. Thus, the reading of (Malik) establishes that God Almighty is the unique Sovereign with absolute authority on that Day; no command exists for anyone else, nor any judgment for other than Him.

Statement of Impact (Semantic Expansion): The intent here is not to prefer one reading as more eloquent than the other—a matter exhausted by the ancients—but to demonstrate how the conjunction of both readings expands and completes the meaning. The reading of (Mālik) affirms the

perfection of disposal over "Recompense" as God's exclusive property, while the reading of (Malik) affirms the enforceability of command and perfection of authority over the "Recompensed" (creatures). Thus, the meeting of the two readings gathers for God Almighty on that Day the perfection of Ownership and the perfection of Sovereignty; He is the One who owns the affairs and recompense of that Day, and He is the King whose command and judgment cannot be disputed. Through this integration, the attribute of His Lordship expands to encompass disposal over things (as property) and sovereignty over persons (as dominion), representing the apex of conciseness and inimitability.

2. The Paradigm of (يُخَادِعُونَ / يَخْدَعُونَ) in (يُخَادِعُونَ اللَّهَ ... وَمَا يَخْدَعُونَ إِلَّا أَنْفُسَهُمْ) [Al-Baqarah: 9]

At the commencement of Surah Al-Baqarah, after God elucidated the state of the God-fearing and then the Disbelievers, He proceeded to unveil the state of a third faction: the Hypocrites, who manifest faith and conceal disbelief. In describing this act of theirs, which constitutes the essence of their hypocrisy, the reading arrived in two modes, each unveiling a dimension of their reality and contributing to the complete depiction of their plotting and deception. Nafi', Ibn Kathir, and Abu 'Amr read (يُخَادِعُونَ) (Yukhādi'ūn) with an Alif after the Kha. The others read (يَخْدَعُونَ) (Yakhda'ūn) without Alif (Ibn al-Jazari, n.d., Vol. 2, p. 207). The difference revolves between the bare triliteral verb (Khada'a) and the augmented form (Khāda'a), and each has a semantic manifestation in its context revealing the nature of the Hypocrites' act.

Analysis of the Reading Yakhda'ūn: The reading without Alif (يَخْدَعُونَ) is from the bare triliteral verb (Khada'a), which is the root of the category. The root of deception (Khad') in the tongue of the Arabs is concealing the opposite of what one displays, and intending harm to another from where he does not know (Ibn Manzur, 1414, Vol. 8, p. 63; Al-Zubaidi, 2001, Vol. 20, p. 482). The phrasing in this reading arrives to decide the reality of the act and its outcome, not the form of the attempt or reciprocity. The discourse here is not about their claim that they share deception with God or contest Him; rather, it is a report on the reality of what occurs: that the evil consequence of this deception does not transcend them to others, but is restricted to them and encircles them (Al-Baghawi, 2000, Vol. 1, p. 87). Thus, the import of the reading is that the essence of this act, in its naked reality, is nothing but self-deception. The style of restriction using (Ma) and (Illa) confirms that this act, which they thought extended to God and the believers, is in truth an intransitive act whose effect does not go beyond its doer; as if they deceived none but themselves and plotted against none but themselves. This reading is concerned with stating the inevitable effect of the act, stripping the verb of verbal augmentation (like the Alif in Yukhādi'ūn) to strip the meaning of all illusion, halting it at its final truth: that they are the deceiver and the deceived simultaneously.

Analysis of the Reading Yukhādi'ūn: As for the reading of (Yukhādi'ūn), it is on the form (Yufā'ilūn) derived from the augmented verb (Khāda'a). The first thing that comes to mind from the form (Fā'ala) is the category of reciprocity between two parties, a meaning that does not align perfectly here; for how can one conceive of a servant sharing the act of deception with the Lord of Glory? (Al-Zamakhshari, 1407, Vol. 1, p. 56). Therefore, it is necessary to divert attention from this original meaning to other significations carried by the form, which is a vast chapter in Arabic. Among the meanings of (Fā'ala) is that it indicates the issuance of the act from one party, as in "I punished the thief" ('Āqabtu) or "I soled the sandal" (Tāraqtu), not implying reciprocity (Al-Farisi, 1999, Vol.

1, p. 316). Accordingly, the reading (يُخَادِعُونَ) arrives to depict the nature of their act and their attempt, not the reality of its outcome. It reveals aspects of their state not shown by the first reading: (1) **Frequency and Repetition:** The form (Fā'ala) implies hyperbole in the act and its repetition. This reading reveals that their deception was not a fleeting slip, but their constant habit and entrenched nature. They follow one deception with another, attempt after attempt, as noted in philological texts regarding this form indicating frequency (Udaymah, 1999, p. 136). (2) **Manifestation and Affectation:** The structure of (Fā'ala) carries the meaning of laboring and affectation in manifesting the act. The reading (يُخَادِعُونَ) depicts their exaggeration in displaying faith and concealing disbelief, and their labored attempt to project this deceptive image before the believers (Al-Tabari, 2001, Vol. 1, p. 284). (3) **Their Perception of the Act:** The form may carry the meaning that they, in their self-estimation and corrupt conjecture, are engaging in an act they deem to be deception of God and the believers, while God is deceiving them (Abu Hayyan, 2010, Vol. 1, p. 92). Thus, this reading is not concerned with stating the result of the act, but with dissecting the reality of the attempt itself, portraying it as a continuous, labored endeavor founded upon a corrupt illusion. This expands the semantics of the verse and reveals the depth of the disease in the hearts of those hypocrites.

Statement of Impact (Integration and Expansion): By the conjunction of the two readings, the Quranic scene expands to reveal the truth of the Hypocrites' act and the depth of their hypocrisy. The reading with the bare verb (Yakhda'ūn) affirms the occurrence of the "root of deception" from them, while the reading of reciprocity (Yukhādi'ūn) describes the "manner of this deception" and its entrenched nature within them. It is not a transient deception, but a continuous habit, a diligent attempt, and a succession of the act revealing their persistence and rootedness in hypocrisy. One reading affirms the "Act," and the other clarifies the "Description." Through this semantic expansion, the Quranic text, via its two readings, presents a complete image of the hypocrite, who does not suffice with mere lying but makes deception and evasion his nature and character—a nuance added by the form of "Reciprocity" denoting "Frequency" and "Succession."

3. The Paradigm of (حَسَنًا / حَسْنَا) in (وَقُولُوا لِلنَّاسِ حُسْنًا) [Al-Baqarah: 83]

In the context of the Covenant taken from the Children of Israel, after commanding them with the fundamentals of worship and benevolence to kin, the Divine Command arrived to regulate their interaction with people in general. In the form of this command, the variation in reading appeared to elucidate two complementary ranks of good speech and kind treatment. Hamzah, Al-Kisa'i, Ya'qub, and Khalaf read (حَسَنًا) (Hasanan) with a Fatha on the Ha and Sin. The others read (حُسْنًا) (Husnan) with a Damma on the Ha and Sukun on the Sin (Ibn al-Jazari, n.d., Vol. 2, p. 218).

Analysis of the Reading Hasanan: This reading follows the pattern (Fa'alan), which is an Assimilated Adjective. Its function in this syntax is as an adjective for a deleted Verbal Noun indicated by the preceding verb, the estimation being: "And speak to people good speech" (Al-Qisi, 1997, Vol. 1, p. 250; Saber, 2016, p. 1140). The signification in this reading is specific and direct, directing the command to the quality and manner of speech. What is required of them is that their speech to people be characterized by goodness—gentleness of side, pleasantness of words, enjoining good, and forbidding evil (Al-Sam'ani, 1997, Vol. 1, p. 103). This reading establishes a great principle in the etiquette of discourse and makes good logic a religious duty.

Analysis of the Reading Husnan: As for the reading with Damma on the Ha and Sukun on the Sin (Husnan), it is a reading using the explicit Verbal Noun of the verb (Hasuna). It is established among rhetoricians that employing the Verbal Noun in the place of a description is more eloquent than employing the adjective itself, for it renders the described object as if it were the embodiment of the event itself, not merely possessing it. This is by way of hyperbole, as in saying "A man of Justice" ('Adl), which is more profound than "A Just man" ('Adil); it is as if the self has transformed into the meaning itself (Saber, 2016, p. 1142). Accordingly, the meaning of **﴿وَقُولُوا لِلنَّاسِ حُسْنًا﴾** transcends the mere description of speech as good, making Goodness (Husn) itself the material and substance of speech. Beyond this rhetorical signification, the use of the Verbal Noun grants the meaning a breadth and comprehensiveness not achieved by the adjective restricted to its subject. While the reading (Hasanan) stipulated speech, the reading (Husnan) arrives to encompass speech and other things (Saber, 2016, p. 1141), becoming a command for everything that is Good in interaction, whether word or deed. The Verbal Noun here describes not only an event but applies to "events and objects" (Al-Zubaidi, 2001, Vol. 34, p. 420). Thus, the command is that they speak to people what is Good, do with them what is Good, and that their association with them be founded upon Goodness itself.

Statement of Semantic Impact (Integration and Expansion): The two readings here do not contradict; rather, they integrate to build a graduated and profound ethical system. The reading (Hasanan - with Fatha) establishes the specific and direct ruling: the obligation of selecting good words and pleasant speech with people. It draws the minimum requirement in the etiquette of address. Then, the reading (Husnan - with Damma) arrives to elevate this ruling from the specific to the general, and from description to essence. It does not suffice with requesting good speech but requests Goodness itself to be the core of interaction. Thus, the semantics of the command expand from mere etiquette of the tongue to a complete methodology in behavior and interaction. By the conjunction of the readings, it is understood that the Covenant taken from them requires two inseparable matters: the first, which is the starting point, is that their speech be good. The second, which is the ultimate goal, is that their entire dealing be based on Goodness, in word and deed. Thus, the reading of the Verbal Noun (Husnan) expanded the meaning and generalized it to include both speech and action, while conveying hyperbole in description. This is of the exquisite Quranic conciseness, where a single word in its two readings indicated a specific ruling and a general one, a root and its objective.

Section Two: Narrative Integration and Scenic Completeness (The Relation of Part to Whole)

We ascend in this section to a deeper layer of semantic impact, where the relationship between readings is no longer merely one of expanding or confirming a single meaning, but transcends that to present—through each reading—an independent face or distinct stage of a single composite event. The relationship here is akin to that of parts to a whole; the complete holistic image of the event or its sequential dimensions is not clarified except by combining the significations of both readings together.

If the readings in the previous section were like two witnesses describing a single reality with complementary descriptions, here they are like two narrators: one narrates the beginning of the story

and the other its news, or one describes the cause of the action and the other its result. Each reading stands on its own, but their conjunction creates a complete narrative or a multi-dimensional scenic description. This type of impact appears manifestly when the two readings differ in the radical linguistic root, such as one being from the root (Z-L-L) and the other from (Z-W-L), or one from (N-Sh-Z) and the other from (N-Sh-R). Each root establishes an independent meaning, but the context of the Quranic text links these two meanings causally or integrally, such that one reading becomes an explanation of the manner of occurrence indicated by the other, or a result consequent to it. This mode of variance is among the highest modes of rhetorical inimitability, where a complex reality with stages and dimensions is expressed by a single word in its locus, as will appear in the following paradigms.

1. The Paradigm of (فَازَ لَهُمَا / فَازَ لَهُمَا) in (فَازَ لَهُمَا الشَّيْطَانُ) [Al-Baqarah: 36]

In the context of the story of Adam (peace be upon him) and his spouse in Paradise, after the Divine Prohibition against approaching the Tree, this passage arrives to depict the moment of the Fall which entailed the exit from Paradise. The verb describing Satan's plot came in two Mass-transmitted readings, differing in linguistic root, revealing through each reading a facet of this momentous event. Hamzah read (فَازَ لَهُمَا) (Fa-azālahumā) with an Alif after the Zai and a light Lam. The others read (فَازَ لَهُمَا) (Fa-azallahumā) deleting the Alif and doubling the Lam (Ibn al-Jazari, n.d., Vol. 2, p. 211).

Analysis of the Reading Fa-azallahumā: This reading, that of the majority, is derived from the root (Z-L-L). The origin of Zalal is error, a slip, and falling into sin without ingrained intent; from it comes "his foot slipped" (Al-Samin Al-Halabi, 1986, Vol. 1, p. 288). The verb on the form (Afala) "Azalla" implies causation. Thus, the meaning of "Azallahumā" is: He induced them to slip and caused them to fall into it. The axis of signification in this reading is the act of seduction and adornment practiced by Satan, which led Adam and his spouse to fall into sin. It depicts the Cause that led to the exit from Paradise, which is the "Slip" resulting from Satan's whispering and temptation (Al-Burusawi, 2018, Vol. 1, p. 111). The verb here describes the nature of the Satanic plot: causing the human to fall into disobedience.

Analysis of the Reading Fa-azālahumā: As for Hamzah's reading, it is derived from the root (Z-W-L). The origin of Zawāl is removal and distancing from a place. The verb "Azāla" implies transfer and displacement. Thus, the meaning of "Azālahumā" is: He removed them and distanced them from Paradise (Abu Hayyan, 2010, Vol. 1, p. 258; Al-Sam'ani, 1997, Vol. 1, p. 69). The axis of signification in this reading is the result of the act and its effect, which is "Removal" and expulsion from the Abode of Bliss. It does not describe the manner of seduction, but describes the effect consequent to it: exit and distancing. Abu Ali Al-Farisi pointed to a rhetorical subtlety in this reading, noting it stands in juxtaposition to God's saying (أَسْكَنْتَ أَنْتَ وَزَوْجَكَ الْجَنَّةَ) [Al-Baqarah: 35], which implies stability and settlement; thus, He countered "Stability" with "Removal," which is its antithesis (Al-Farisi, 1999, Vol. 2, p. 15).

Statement of Semantic Impact (Scenic Integration): The two readings here do not present different meanings so much as they present two sequential and complementary scenes of a single event. They are not merely an expansion of a description, but a precise narrative construction revealing the relationship of Cause to Effect. The reading "Fa-azallahumā" (with doubling) depicts

the internal and psychological act: Satan's plot targeting the will of Adam and his spouse, inducing them to slip and disobey. It answers the question: How did the exit occur? The answer: By causing a fall into sin. The reading "Fa-azālahumā" (with Alif) depicts the external and spatial effect: the punishment consequent to that slip, which is removal and distancing from Paradise. It answers the question: What resulted from that? The answer: Displacement and expulsion. By the conjunction of the readings, the Quranic scene is completed in the utmost conciseness and inimitability. It is as if the verse says through its readings: Satan caused their slip, and the result of that slip was that God removed them from Paradise. One reading described "Satan's Act" (Inducing Slip), and the other described "Its Effect and Consequence" (Removal). This integration between Cause and Caused, Action and Result, reveals the depth and precision of Quranic narrative, where a single word in its readings could narrate a complete story with its internal and external dimensions.

2. The Paradigm of (نُنشِرُهَا / نُنشِرُهَا) in (وَأَنْظُرْ إِلَى الْعِظَامِ كَيْفَ نُنشِرُهَا ثُمَّ نَكْسُوهَا لَحْمًا) [Al-Baqarah: 259]

This is a majestic locus in the Book of God, where sight halts before a dazzling sign of Divine Power: the manner of reviving the dead. The word constituting the axis of the miracle in this scene arrived in two Mass-transmitted readings, differing in root and structure, to elucidate through each face a rank of the ranks of creation and revival, the image of inimitability remaining incomplete without their conjunction. Ibn 'Amir and the Kufans read: (نُنشِرُهَا) (Nunshizuha) with a dotted Zai. The others read: (نُنشِرُهَا) (Nunshiruha) with an undotted Ra (Ibn al-Jazari, n.d., Vol. 2, p. 231).

Analysis of the Reading Nunshizuha (with Zai): The origin of Nashz in the speech of the Arabs is elevation and height; from it comes the Nashz of the earth, which is what rises from it (Al-Fayyumi, 2021, p. 625). This reading with Zai arrives to depict the material manner and the first formative stage of revival. The meaning of "Nunshizuha" is: We raise them and compose one upon the other (Al-Tha'labi, 2015, Vol. 7, p. 172). It is a precise sensory depiction of the process of gathering scattered remains, lifting bones from their places, and assembling them into their original form with tight composition. It is the stage of "Construction" and erecting the skeletal frame, an act requiring arrangement and formation. It is as if the observer sees with his eye the scene of bones rising, meeting, and interlocking to stand as a complete skeleton. This reading answers the question "How" in its material, sensory aspect.

Analysis of the Reading Nunshiruha (with Ra): As for this reading, it is derived from "Nashr," which is revival and resurrection after death (Al-Fayyumi, 2021, p. 625), the meaning established in religious terminology, as in His saying (وَالْيَهُ النَّشُورُ) [Al-Mulk: 15] and (ثُمَّ إِذَا شَاءَ) (أَنْشُرَهُ) [Abasa: 22] (Al-Baghawi, 2000, Vol. 1, p. 355). This reading with Ra does not describe the material manner of formation, but announces the ultimate goal and the supernatural Divine Act: the infusion of life into those bones after they have become a skeleton. It is the stage of "Revival" and breathing the spirit, an act no one is capable of but God. While the reading of Zai indicated the material manner of the miracle, the reading of Ra indicated its true purpose: Resurrection.

Statement of Semantic Impact (Scenic Integration): There is not the slightest contradiction between the two readings according to verifiers; rather, they are two faces of a single truth, each elucidating a rank of Divine Power, the image of inimitability incomplete without their union. They

draw the scene of revival completely in its logical and miraculous sequence. The reading "Nunshizuha" (with Zai) is the stage of Formation and Assembly, the act preparing the body to be receptive to life. It describes building the frame and raising it. The reading "Nunshiruha" (with Ra) is the stage of Creation and Revival, the act breathing the spirit into that completed frame. Thus, in the reading of Zai was a clarification of the manner of the material act, and in the reading of Ra was an announcement of the essence of the Divine goal. The readings arrived intertwined, as if they were two verses in one, depicting for the observer the scene of Resurrection in its two great stages: the stage of gathering parts and assembling them (Inshāz), then the stage of infusing life into them (Inshār) (Ibn Ashur, 1984, Vol. 3, p. 37). This is of the exquisite Quranic conciseness, where a complex truth composed of act and goal, formation and revival, was folded into a single word via its readings, in a manner incapacitating the eloquence of the Arabs.

Section Three: Legislative Divergence and Applicative Plurality (The Relation of Legislative Variation)

We reach in this section the apex of investigation into the impact of readings, where the difference is no longer merely an enrichment of description or completion of a scene, but ascends to become a rich source of deduction and legislation. In this layer of impact, the two readings establish two divergent meanings that do not combine in a single entity at a single time; rather, they result in two different jurisprudential rulings, or two distinct applications for two different states.

The relationship here is not one of descriptive complementarity, but of legislative branching and judgmental variation. It is as if the Quranic text, through its readings, stipulates two rulings, each assigned to a specific condition or related to a specific aspect. This mode of variance is among the most manifest proofs of legislative inimitability in the Holy Quran; it reveals the comprehensiveness of its statement, the flexibility of its discourse, and its ability to address multiple conditions with a concise, single utterance.

Jurists and legal theorists of old realized this truth, making the difference of Mass-transmitted readings a proof in deduction and a principle of preference. Imam Al-Zarkashi even recorded that if two readings differ in meaning, they are akin to two verses; if each reading indicates a ruling, it is obligatory to implement both as much as possible, by carrying each reading upon a specific condition that does not contradict the other (Al-Zarkashi, n.d., Vol. 1, pp. 326-327). This will become evident in proof and manifest in statement in the following paradigms, which were vast fields for the scrutiny and diligence of jurists.

1. The Paradigm of (يَطْهَرْنَ / يَطْهَرْنَ) in (وَلَا تَقْرُبُوهُنَّ حَتَّى يَطْهَرْنَ) [Al-Baqarah: 222]

In the context of regulating the relationship between spouses and clarifying the rulings of menstruation, God Almighty forbade approaching women in that state, then set a limit (terminus) for this prohibition. In defining this limit precisely, the variation in reading arrived to establish a significant jurisprudential difference among scholars, making it a shining example of the legislative impact of readings. Hamzah, Al-Kisa'i, Khalaf, and Shu'bah from 'Asim read: (يَطْهَرْنَ) (Yattahharna) with doubling of the Ta and Ha, both open. The others read: (يَطْهَرْنَ) (Yathurna) with simplification, Sukun on the Ta and Damma on the Ha (Ibn al-Jazari, n.d., Vol. 2, p. 227; Al-Banna, 2006, p. 203).

Analysis of the Reading Yathurna (Simplified): This reading is from the intransitive triliteral verb (Tahura, Yathuru). Its meaning is the occurrence of natural purity, which is the cessation of menstrual blood and its disappearance. This is a matter in which the woman has no acquisition or action (Ibn Khalawayh, 1401, p. 96; Al-Jassas, 1994, Vol. 1, p. 422). Accordingly, the particle of limit "Hatta" (Until) implies by its apparent meaning that the ruling after the limit is contrary to before it; thus, the apparent meaning of this reading alone is the permissibility of intercourse merely upon the cessation of blood (Al-Jassas, 1994, Vol. 1, p. 422).

Analysis of the Reading Yattaharna (Intensified): As for this reading, its origin is "Yatatahharna" on the form "Yatafa'alna." This form carries two possibilities according to linguists and verifiers: First: That it means the acquired act, which is washing with water (Ghusl). This is the immediate meaning, supported by His saying afterwards (فَإِذَا تَطَهَّرْنَ) (Al-Baghawi, 2000, Vol. 1, p. 289). Second: That it means the intransitive verb (Tahura), i.e., cessation of blood, just as one says "The rope was cut" (Taqatta'a) meaning "It broke" (Inqata'a), implying no action from the subject (Al-Jassas, 1994, Vol. 1, p. 422).

Statement of Semantic Impact (Legislative Divergence): This difference in signification and probability is what generated the valid jurisprudential disagreement. Jurists followed two main paths in combining the indications of the verse via its readings: **The First Path: The Path of Preference and Clarification (Majority View: Malik, Shafi'i, Ahmad):** They held that intercourse is not lawful except by the realization of both matters together: cessation of blood, then washing with water. Their method of deduction is based on the fact that God Almighty conditioned the permissibility of intercourse on two sequential conditions: Condition 1: Cessation of blood, derived from the first limit (حَتَّى يَطْهَرْنَ). Condition 2: Washing with water, derived from the explicit condition with Fa' (فَإِذَا تَطَهَّرْنَ فَأَتُوهُنَّ). They view His saying (فَإِذَا تَطَهَّرْنَ) as decisive in indicating the requirement of washing, admitting no other interpretation. Just as a thrice-divorced woman does not become lawful to her first husband merely by marrying a second (Until she marries), but the second condition must be met (Then if he divorces her), so too here: intercourse is not lawful merely by blood cessation; the condition of washing must be met (Al-Qurtubi, 2006, Vol. 3, p. 486). They interpret the intensified reading and the phrase (فَإِذَا تَطَهَّرْنَ) as having one meaning: Washing, making it a complementary condition without which the matter is not lawful.

The Second Path: The Path of Combination and Detail (Hanafi View): They followed a precise path to implement the signification of each reading on its reality without carrying one upon the other. They viewed that "two readings are like two verses," and that it is obligatory to use them in two different states so as not to nullify the requirement of one of the limits. They differentiated between two cases: Case 1 (Cessation of blood at the maximum duration of menses): If her blood ceases at the completion of ten days (the maximum menses for them), intercourse becomes lawful merely by cessation and before washing. Their argument is the implementation of the simplified reading (حَتَّى يَطْهَرْنَ) on its reality, for by cessation at the maximum duration, recurrence is secure, purity is realized with certainty, and the cause of prohibition vanishes. Case 2 (Cessation before the maximum duration): If her blood ceases before ten days, intercourse is not lawful except after washing, or the passing of a full prayer time upon her (making prayer obligatory, thus establishing her purity). Their argument is the implementation of the intensified reading (حَتَّى يَطْهَرْنَ) and the

phrase (فَإِذَا تَطَهَّرْتَ) on their reality meaning washing; this is a precaution against the possibility of blood recurrence as long as the duration is not complete. By this methodological detailing, the Hanafis were able to implement each reading in a state befitting it; they used the simplified reading on its reality in one case, and the intensified reading on its reality in another, without being forced to drop the signification of one reading (Al-Jassas, 1994, Vol. 1, p. 422). Thus, it becomes manifest how the difference in readings was not merely a verbal variation, but a rich source for deduction, yielding two precise jurisprudential paths in understanding the ruling and its application, which is of the core of Quranic legislative inimitability.

2. The Paradigm of (وَأَرْجُلُكُمْ) in Accusative and Genitive in يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا ... فَاعْسِلُوا وُجُوهَكُمْ (Al-Ma'idah: 6)

This locus is among the most famous Quranic instances where reading variance had a direct and profound impact on establishing jurisprudential rulings and defining the obligations of Ablution (Wudu). Scholars disputed the ruling of the feet in minor purification based on this difference, making it a model example of the legislative variation relationship between readings. Nafi', Ibn 'Amir, Al-Kisa'i, Hafs from 'Asim, and Ya'qub read: (وَأَرْجُلُكُمْ) (Wa Arjulakum) with the Lam in the Accusative (Nasb). The others read: (وَأَرْجُلِكُمْ) (Wa Arjulikum) with the Lam in the Genitive (Jarr) (Ibn al-Jazari, n.d., Vol. 2, p. 254).

Analysis of the Reading Wa Arjulakum (Accusative): The reading of Nasb is the most apparent face syntactically and the clearest in signification according to the majority of grammarians and jurists. The Accusative here necessitates conjoining "Arjulakum" to the preceding Accusatives, which are (وُجُوهَكُمْ وَأَيْدِيَكُمْ) (Al-Farisi, 1999, Vol. 3, p. 216; Al-Qurtubi, 2006, Vol. 7, p. 343). Since these members are explicitly commanded to be washed by His saying (فَاعْسِلُوا), the conjoined noun takes the ruling of the antecedent, so the ruling of the feet is Washing obligatorily. If it is said: Why was a separation made between the conjoined (Feet) and the antecedent (Hands) by the sentence (وَأَمْسَحُوا بِرُءُوسِكُمْ)? Verifiers answered that this separation was not in vain, but for a rhetorical and legislative purpose: to indicate the obligation of Sequence (Tartīb) in the members of Wudu, and that wiping the head comes after washing the hands and before washing the feet (Al-Qurtubi, 2006, Vol. 7, pp. 344-345). Thus, the reading of Nasb is a text for the obligation of Washing, while implying Sequence.

Analysis of the Reading Wa Arjulikum (Genitive): As for the reading of Jarr, it was a subject of precise scrutiny among scholars, for its apparent meaning necessitates conjoining "Arjulikum" to the nearest Genitive, which is (بِرُءُوسِكُمْ) (Al-Farisi, 1999, Vol. 3, p. 214). This apparent meaning implies that the ruling of the feet is Wiping, sharing with the heads the ruling of the Genitive agent (the Ba'). Scholars paused before this apparent meaning with investigation and deliberation. The majority prevented the assertion of Wiping for bare feet due to strong divertive evidences diverting this apparent meaning, including: - Mass-transmitted Prophetic Sunnah: Verbal and practical Hadiths from the Prophet ﷺ are mass-transmitted regarding washing the feet in Wudu. Among the most explicit is his saying: "Woe to the heels from the Fire" (Al-Bukhari, 2012, Vol. 1, p. 312), a threat that exists only for abandoning an obligation, indicating that the obligation is Washing that encompasses the heel, which is not achieved by wiping. - Limitation by a Terminus: His saying (إِلَى الْكَعْبَيْنِ) is a limitation by a terminus, parallel to His saying (إِلَى الْمَرَافِقِ) regarding the washed hands. It is established that limitation by a terminus occurs in Washing, not Wiping; wiping the head was not

limited by a terminus (Al-Qurtubi, 2006, Vol. 7, pp. 342-343). Due to these divertive evidences, the majority went to interpreting the reading of Jarr in ways not contradicting the obligation of Washing established by definitive proofs: - Jarr by Proximity (Jiwār): A doctrine of some Arabs where a word is given the inflection of its neighbor even if its true syntactic right is different. Thus, "Arjulikum" is genitive due to its proximity to "Ru'usikum," while its right is Nasb conjoined to "Wujuhakum." While valid in Arabic, it is a rare style resorted to only when confusion is secure (Al-Samin Al-Halabi, 1994, Vol. 4, p. 210). - Intent of Wiping over Leather Socks (Khuffs): This is the most plausible and strongest interpretation. Verifiers held that the Quran, through its two readings, clarified the two rulings of the feet in two different states: The reading of Nasb indicated the ruling of Washing for the uncovered foot, and the reading of Jarr indicated the ruling of Wiping for the foot covered by the Khuff (Al-Samin Al-Halabi, 1994, Vol. 4, p. 215; Al-Qurtubi, 2006, Vol. 7, pp. 345-346).

Statement of Semantic Impact (Legislative Divergence): This paradigm is among the most creative examples of legislative inimitability in reading variance. The two readings did not lead to contradiction; rather, they established two divergent rulings for two divergent states, containing the perfection of statement and completeness of legislation in the utmost brevity. The reading "Wa Arjulakum" (Nasb) established the ruling of the Origin (Azīma): the obligation of washing the feet if they are uncovered. The reading "Wa Arjulikum" (Jarr) established the ruling of the Concession (Rukhsa): the permissibility of wiping the feet if they are covered by Khuffs. Thus, in a single verse, by a single word in its two Mass-transmitted readings, the statement of the ruling of Resolve and the ruling of Concession were gathered. Had each ruling come in an independent verse, it would have been a statement; but when gathered in one verse, it became the apex of rhetorical and legislative inimitability. This clarifies how reading variance is not merely verbal diversity, but is of the core of Quranic legislative structure, revealing its precision and comprehensiveness.

Conclusion

After this tour in the expanse of verses from the Wise Remembrance, and looking into the faces of its Mass-transmitted readings and what they contained of minute meanings and subtle statements, we reach the conclusion of this research, which sought to transcend the mere reviewing of witnesses to an attempt at building a methodological model classifying the layers of semantic impact of reading variance. This analytical view has yielded a set of results, summarized as follows:

First: Summary of Results

1. The research empirically validated the principle from which it started: that the difference in Mass-transmitted readings is "a difference of variety and variegation, not contradiction and antithesis." In all analyzed paradigms, the second reading did not lead to invalidating the meaning of the first; rather, it arrived confirming it, expanding its circle, completing its dimensions, or establishing a ruling for a state different from its own, which entrenches faith in the unity of this Book's source and the precision of its verses.

2. The research revealed the possibility of classifying the semantic impact of reading variance into distinct methodological layers, based on the nature of the relationship between the meanings yielded by the readings. The research concluded with the identification of three main layers: - **Layer of Descriptive Enrichment:** Wherein two readings operate in a single semantic circle; one arrives to add a descriptive dimension (like hyperbole in "Husnan" or frequency in "Yukhādi'ūn"), or to gather two complementary descriptions for a single entity (like "Mālik" and "Malik"), the relationship being one of expansion and confirmation of the original meaning. - **Layer of Scenic Integration:** Wherein each reading presents a part or stage of a single composite event, such that its image is incomplete without their conjunction, like the relationship of Cause to Result in (Fa-azallahumā / Fa-azālahumā), or the relationship of Formation to Goal in (Nunshizuha / Nunshiruha). - **Layer of Legislative Divergence:** Wherein each reading establishes a jurisprudential ruling or practical application varying from what its sister establishes. The two readings together become a statement of two divergent rulings for two different states, as manifested in the ruling of purity from menses in (Yathurna / Yattaharna), and the ruling of foot purification in Wudu in (Arjulakum) with Nasb and Jarr.

Second: Added Value of the Research

The added value of this research manifests in its presentation of a systematic taxonomic model that can be taken as an analytical tool to understand how reading variance operates in producing meaning. This model moves the study of readings from the level of random collection of witnesses to the level of organized analysis revealing the existence of an exquisite semantic system governing this difference. The research also confirms the reality of rhetorical and legislative inimitability in the Holy Quran, where a single word, through the multiplicity of its reading faces, was able to fold within its concise structure layers of meanings, stages of narrative, or multiple rulings, in a manner incapacitating human eloquence.

Third: Recommendations and Research Horizons

This research, though reaching its end, opens doors to new research horizons. We recommend scholars and verifiers to consider: - **Expanding the Model's Application:** We recommend applying this taxonomic model to other loci of reading variance in the Holy Quran to test its comprehensiveness and the possibility of adding other layers or branching the mentioned ones. - **Rhetorical and Phonetic Studies:** This research was limited to semantic and legislative impact. Researchers are recommended to conduct similar studies investigating the rhetorical and phonetic impact of reading variance within each of these layers, to reveal the relationship of the word's sound to the shadows of meaning. - **Linking to Modern Linguistic Studies:** We recommend opening up to the methodologies of modern linguistic studies and attempting to employ their tools (such as Cognitive Semantics and Pragmatic Analysis) in studying the impact of readings, to present this great linguistic heritage in a new scientific garb addressing the contemporary age.

In conclusion, this effort remains a human attempt to understand the ocean of God's Speech whose wonders do not cease. I ask God that it has reached a measure of correctness, and that He forgive what is in it of slip or shortcoming; He suffices us, and He is the best Disposer of affairs.

References

- Abu Hayyan al-Andalusi, M. (2010). *Al-Bahr al-Muhit fi al-Tafsir* [The Encompassing Ocean in Exegesis] (S. M. Jamil et al., Eds.). Dar al-Fikr.
- Al-Baghawi, H. (2000). *Ma'alim al-Tanzil* [Landmarks of Revelation] (A. Al-Mahdi, Ed., 1st ed.). Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi.
- Al-Banna, A. (2006). *Ithaf Fudala' al-Bashar fi al-Qira'at al-Arba'ah 'Ashar* [Gift to the Virtuous on the Fourteen Readings] (A. Mahra, Ed., 3rd ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Bukhari, M. (2012). *Al-Jami' al-Musnad al-Sahih* [The Authentic Collection] (1st ed., Vol. 1). Dar al-Ta'sil.
- Al-Burusawi, I. (2018). *Ruh al-Bayan* [The Spirit of Elucidation] (A. H. Abdul Rahman, Ed., 4th ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Farisi, A. (1999). *Al-Hujjah lil-Qurra' al-Sab'ah* [The Argument for the Seven Readers] (B. Qahwaji & B. Huwayjati, Eds., 1st ed.). Dar al-Ma'mun lil-Turath. (Original work published 1984).
- Al-Fayyumi, A. (2021). *Al-Misbah al-Munir* [The Illuminating Lamp] (A. A. Al-Shawwa, Ed., 2nd ed.). Dar al-Fayha.
- Al-Jassas, A. (1994). *Ahkam al-Qur'an* [Rulings of the Quran] (A. M. Shahin, Ed., 1st ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Nahhas, A. (1988). *Ma'ani al-Qur'an al-Karim* [Meanings of the Holy Quran] (M. A. Al-Sabouni, Ed., 1st ed.). Umm Al-Qura University.
- Al-Qisi, M. (1997). *Al-Kashf 'an Wujuh al-Qira'at* [Unveiling the Faces of Readings] (M. Ramadan, Ed., 5th ed.). Mu'assasat al-Risalah.
- Al-Qurtubi, M. (2006). *Al-Jami' li-Ahkam al-Qur'an* [The Compendium of Quranic Rulings] (A. A. Al-Turki, Ed., 1st ed.). Mu'assasat al-Risalah.
- Al-Razi, F. (1420). *Al-Tafsir al-Kabir* [The Great Exegesis] (3rd ed.). Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi.
- Al-Sam'ani, M. (1997). *Tafsir al-Qur'an* (Y. Ibrahim & G. Abbas, Eds., 1st ed.). Dar al-Watan.
- Al-Samin Al-Halabi, A. (1994). *Al-Durr al-Masun* [The Preserved Pearl] (A. M. Al-Kharrat, Ed., 1st ed.). Dar al-Qalam. (Original work published 1986).
- Al-Tabari, M. (2001). *Jami' al-Bayan 'an Ta'wil Ay al-Qur'an* [The Comprehensive Exposition of the Interpretation of the Quran] (A. A. Al-Turki, Ed., 1st ed.). Dar Hajar.
- Al-Tha'labi, A. (2015). *Al-Kashf wa al-Bayan* [Unveiling and Clarification] (K. Al-Anazi et al., Eds., 1st ed.). Dar al-Tafsir.
- Al-Zarkashi, M. (n.d.). *Al-Burhan fi 'Ulum al-Qur'an* [The Proof in the Sciences of the Quran] (M. A. Ibrahim, Ed., 1st ed.). Dar al-Ma'rifah.
- Al-Zamakhshari, M. (1407). *Al-Kashshaf* [The Revealer] (3rd ed.). Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi.
- Al-Zubaidi, M. (2001). *Taj al-Arus* [The Bride's Crown] (A. A. Faraj et al., Eds.). Ministry of Information (Kuwait). (Original work published 1965).
- Ibn al-Jazari, M. (n.d.). *Al-Nashr fi al-Qira'at al-'Ashr* [The Publication on the Ten Readings] (A. M. Al-Dabba', Ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn al-Jazari, M. (1994). *Tayyibat al-Nashr* (M. T. Al-Zu'bi, Ed., 1st ed.). Dar al-Huda.
- Ibn al-Jazari, M. (1999). *Munjid al-Muqri'in* [Aid to the Reciters] (Z. 'Umayrat, Ed., 1st ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.

Ibn Ashur, M. T. (1984). *Tafsir al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir* [Liberation and Enlightenment]. Al-Dar al-Tunisiyyah.

Ibn Jinni, U. (1983). *Al-Khasa'is* [The Characteristics] (M. A. Al-Najjar, Ed., 3rd ed.). Alam al-Kutub.

Ibn Khalawayh, H. (1401). *Al-Hujjah fi al-Qira'at al-Sab'* [The Argument for the Seven Readings] (A. S. Makram, Ed., 4th ed.). Dar al-Shuruq.

Ibn Manzur, M. (1414). *Lisan al-Arab* [The Tongue of the Arabs] (3rd ed.). Dar Sader.

Saber, K. M. (2016). The Impact of Quranic Reading Variance on Semantic Enrichment: An Applied Study on Surah Al-Fatiha and Al-Baqarah Using Componential Analysis Theory. *Journal of Arabic and Human Sciences*, 9(4), 1121–1152.

Udaymah, M. A. (1999). *Al-Mughni fi Tasrif al-Afal* [The Sufficient in Verb Morphology] (2nd ed.). Dar al-Hadith.