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Abstract

The lower text of Ṣanʿāʾ 1 is at present the most important document for the history of the Qurʾān. As the only known extant copy from a textual tradition beside the standard ʿUthmānic one, it has the greatest potential of any known manuscript to shed light on the early history of the scripture. Comparing it with parallel textual traditions provides a unique window onto the initial state of the text from which the different traditions emerged. The comparison settles a perennial controversy about the date at which existing passages were joined together to form the sūras (chapters). Some ancient reports and modern scholars assign this event to the reign of the third caliph and link it with his standardizing the text of the Qurʾān around AD 650. However, the analysis shows that the sūras were formed earlier. Furthermore, the manuscript sheds light on the manner in which the text was transmitted. The inception of at least some Qurʾānic textual traditions must have involved semi-oral transmission, most likely via hearers who wrote down a text that was recited by the Prophet. This essay argues for these
conclusions by considering the broad features of the text. The essay also presents the edited text of the folios in the Dār al-Makhṭūṭāt, Ṣan‘ā’, Yemen, in addition to four folios that were auctioned abroad. A systematic analysis of all the variants is postponed to future publications.

Introduction

The Manuscript and the Field of Qur’ānic Studies

Scholarly approaches to the early history of the standard text of the Qurʾān can be enumerated in a broad and rough manner as follows:

There is the traditional account that is associated with most pre-modern scholars. They held that the Prophet Muḥammad (d. AD 632) disseminated the Qurʾān gradually. Some of his Companions compiled copies of the scripture. These codices had differences. Motivated by the differences and seeking uniformity among Muslims, the Caliph ʿUthmān (d. AD 656), himself a Companion, established a standard version. He – or, more precisely, a committee of Companions appointed by him – did so by sending master copies of the Qurʾān to different cities – codices that themselves differed slightly in a small number of spots – and people in turn made copies of them. In subsequent decades and centuries, this standard text was read differently by different readers. For example, they often vowelled and pointed the consonants differently, but many of these readings – including those of the famous “Seven Readers” – adhered to the undotted consonantal skeletal form of the original master codices. Here, “skeletal form” requires explanation: one does not know the spelling of every word in the original codices of ʿUthmān. For example, in most cases it is not known whether the ʾā sound in the middle of a word was represented by the letter alif. However, at the very least we know the text at the “skeletal-morphemic” level.  

2) The Islamic scholarly tradition does not purport to have preserved the spelling of every word in the codices sent out by ʿUthmān. Rather, Muslim tradition preserves the original ʿUthmānic codices at least at the skeletal-morphemic level, that is, with respect to features of the skeletal (unpointed) text that would necessarily change a word or part of word (morpheme) into something else if they were different. Some skeletal variations, such as different spellings of a word, are not skeletal-morphemic because they do not necessarily change a word. Moreover, differences in the way consonants are pointed may change a word, but they are not skeletal-morphemic either since they do not change the skeleton. Normally, a reading is said to differ from the standard ʿUthmānic rasm
It is convenient to call the adherents of this account “traditionalists.” The narrative continues to be fairly popular among the specialists in the Muslim world, in part because most of them have not come to entertain radical doubt about the broad outlines of early Islamic history. By contrast, scholars located in Europe and North America generally do not accept this account (which is not to say that they reject it). This is due to a prevailing distrust in the literary sources on which it is founded. These sources were compiled long after the events they describe, and the extent to which they preserve truly early reports has been the subject of an evolving academic debate. This Euro-American majority falls into two main groups.

The first group, a minority, consists of the “revisionists,” that is, those who consider the traditional narrative as wrong. They reject the idea that 'Uthmān attempted to fix the text, or they hold that there continued to be major changes in the standard text after 'Uthmān, or, in the case of Wansbrough, they think it may be anachronistic to speak of the Qur'ān at the time of 'Uthmān in the first place, since the text coalesced long after. Notable revisionists include John Wansbrough, Patricia Crone, Alfred-Louis de Prémare, and David Powers. The degree of textual stability that according to the traditional account had been reached by ca. AD 650 was according to John Wansbrough attained no earlier than the ninth century AD. Most revisionists are more conservative in their dating, focusing on the reign of the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik, that is, AH 65–86/AD 685–705 as the date of textual finality and/or canonization. Revisionists tend to support their views by citing documentary evidence, Christian sources, and Muslim traditions. Their use of the Muslim reports constitutes what they regard as judicious reading between the lines, but what their opponents view as marshaling cherry-picked, decontextualized, and misinterpreted reports.

The second group of scholars, the “skeptics,” is by far larger. Its members likewise do not accept the traditional account, considering it unreliable along with nearly every report in the Muslim literary sources only if it changes both the skeleton and the word, that is, if the change is skeletal and morphemic. All of this has been well-understood for many centuries and is simply taken for granted in the way most Muslim Qur'ān specialists have written about the different readings (qirā'āt). (We are setting aside a caveat concerning cases in which nonetheless the original ‘Uthmānic spelling or pointing is knowable.)

3) For their contributions, see the Bibliography. P. Crone’s approach in her 1994 essay is different from the others we list (or from her 1977 work) in that she provisionally suggests the late canonization of a largely stable text rather than a late date for the attainment of textual stability.
bearing on Islamic origins. But they do not subscribe to the theories of the revisionists either, which they consider to be unsupported by the evidence. The scholars in this group are agnostics, so to speak. They may not assert that the standard text came into being or changed significantly after 'Uthmān, but they do not deny that it could have. They may be adamant that they are not revisionists, but they are de facto revisionists in respect of their attitude towards the literary sources. They may be called “skeptics” inasmuch as they are equally unconvinced by traditional and revisionist narratives. They tend to not publish much on Islamic origins, since as skeptics they have few firm beliefs to write about. This belies the fact that they form the larger group. An indication of their size is given by what has not been published: in recent decades, European and North-American academics have written relatively few accounts of the initial decades of Islamic religion based on the literary sources. Many academics have simply moved to later periods (focusing on how the initial decades were remembered), other topics, or languages other than Arabic.

There is also a minority among scholars in North America and Europe who support key features of the traditional narrative as recounted above. They do not take all the reports in the later sources at face value, but they believe that critical and detailed analysis of the literary evidence confirms elements of the traditional account. These scholars have their counterparts in the Muslim world. Notable members of this group include Michael Cook, Muḥammad Muḥaysin, and Harald Motzki, the first one being a defector from the revisionist camp. One may call scholars who support the traditional account based on a critical evaluation of the literary sources “neo-traditionalists.” They are traditionalists who argue for the traditional account rather than take it for granted as a self-evident part of our scholarly heritage.

We do not believe that this climate of disagreement reflects sheer underdetermination of theory by evidence. This is not a case of takāfu’.


5) The labels traditionalist, revisionist, skeptic, and neo-traditionalist are merely convenient names for the four groups. We do not use these terms in their literal senses or imply other associations. For example, we do not imply that the traditionalists are attached to tradition or that the skeptics are philosophical skeptics.
al-adilla: the arguments for the different sides are not equal in strength.
We also do not believe that the relative size of each group of scholars
mirrors the quality of the evidence in its favor, or that the disagreements
will dissolve completely if very strong new evidence were to surface in
favor of a particular position, or that if a consensus were to emerge, that
would necessarily signify a lack of ambiguity in the evidence. Patterns of
human adherence to paradigms depend on sociological, psychological,
and other irrational factors as well as on the quality of the evidence. Nonetheless, it also goes without saying that any evidence that can poten-
tially shed further light on early Islam will be of great interest to
historians and may sway at least some of us.

The Qurʾān under study is one such piece of evidence. Ṣanʿāʾ 1 is a
palimpsest, that is, a manuscript of which the text, “lower writing,” was
erased by scraping or washing and then written over. Recycling parch-
ment in this manner was not uncommon. It was done, for example, for an
estimated 4.5% of manuscripts from the Latin West produced from AD
400 to AD 800, though one should not rashly generalize this figure since
the frequency of palimpsesting varied greatly depending on time and
place. Beside Ṣanʿāʾ 1, we know of several other Arabic palimpsests.

6) The irrational factors have been famously emphasized in Thomas Kuhn,
*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
1970). In the field of Islamic studies, the irrational factors that affect whether
one accepts an author’s work include, for example, the eminence of the author;
the author’s religious background, whether scholars whom one admires agree
with the author, whether one’s mentors and peers agree with the author; whether
the author’s work agrees with the consensus, the author’s rhetorical strategies,
and whether the author’s positions match those of a particular academic, reli-
gious, philosophical, or ideological movement.

7) Georges Declercq, “Introduction: Codices Rescripti in the Early Me-
dieval West in Early Medieval Palimpsests,” in *Early medieval palimpsests*, ed.


9) There are two Arabic palimpsests in the Monastery of St. Catherine in the
Sinai Peninsula. They are discussed in Aziz S. Atiya, *Arabic Manuscripts of
Mount Sinai: A Hand-list of the Arabic Manuscripts and Scrolls Microfilmed at
the Library of the Monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai* (Baltimore John Hop-
kins Press, 1955), 19, 24; and Aziz S. Atiya, “The Monastery of St. Catherine and
the Mount Sinai Expedition,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*
96.5 (1952): 578–86. One palimpsest, no. 514, has five layers of text in three lan-
guages: two Arabic, two Syriac, and one Greek. Its top writing, consisting of a
Christian hagiography and the Book of Job, is “in the middle Kufic of the eighth
to early ninth century,” while its second layer, another Christian text, is “in ar-
In Ṣanʿā’ 1, as with some other palimpsests, over time the residue of
the ink of the erased writing underwent chemical reactions, causing a
color change and hence the reemergence of the lower writing in a pale
brown or pale gray color. Color change is normal for metal-based ink.
Thus, a black ink may turn brown over time, and the traces of ink buried
deep in the parchment can bring an erased text back to life. Transition
metals like iron, copper, and zinc are implicated in corrosion and color
change. All three metals are present in the inks of both layers of Ṣanʿā’ 1,
chaic Kufic of the first century of the Hijra, that is, seventh to eighth century
AD.” (Atiya, Arabic Manuscripts of Mount Sinai, 19). The image of a folio
(Atiya, “Monastery of St. Catherine,” 584) shows that in the top writing the
verses are separated by a number of dots, a feature found in early Qur’āns. The
second Arabic palimpsest, no. 588, has three layers of Christian writing. The
top layer is in Arabic and dates from about the 10th century. Underneath, there is
a Syriac text. Underneath, “a third layer of Arabic could be traced in some
places” (Atiya, Arabic Manuscripts of Mount Sinai, 24).

There is a palimpsest in the University Library of Cambridge that has a
Qur’ānic lower text in the Ḥijāzī script. It is discussed in the following publica-
tions: Alphonse Mingana and Agnes S. Lewis, Leaves from Three Ancient
Qurāns, Possibly Pre-‘Othmānic (Cambridge: University Press, 1914); Muḥam-
mad Muṣṭafā al-‘Aẓāmī, The History of the Qur’ānic Text, 2nd ed. (Riyadh: Azami
Publishing House, 2008), 342–6; Alba Fedeli, “Early Evidences of Variant
Readings in Qur’ānic Manuscripts,” in Die dunklen Anfänge: Neue Forschungen
(Berlin: Verlag Hans Schiler, 2007), 293–7; Alba Fedeli, “Mingana and the
Manuscript of Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis, One Century Later,” Manuscripta Orientalia
11.3 (2005): 3–7. Fedeli and al-‘Aẓāmī both find Mingana’s transcription
completely unreliable. Fedeli could verify only thirteen of thirty-seven readings
given by Mingana (Fedeli, “Mingana,” 7). In addition, Mingana’s characteriza-
tion of the text as “possibly pre-‘Othmānic” is unwarranted. (We came to know
of the following useful contribution too late to incorporate its contents about
the Cambridge and other palimpsests: Alba Fedeli, “The Digitization Project
of the Qur’ānic Palimpsest, MS Cambridge University Library Or: 1287, and the
Verification of the Mingana-Lewis Edition: Where is Salām!,” Journal of Islamic
Manuscripts 2.1 (2011): 100–117.)

There are several other palimpsests in the Dār al-Makhṭūṭāt in Ṣanʿā’, all rela-
tively late, and all represented by no more than a few pages apiece (Ursula Dreih-
holz, interview, July 30, 3011). The picture of a page from one of them appears as
image 043020C.BMP in a CD published by the UNESCO. Both layers of text are
Qur’ānic and seem later than the palimpsest under study in this essay, though the
lower writing looks like it could be as early as the late first century AH.

Christoph Krekel, “The Chemistry of Historical Iron Gall Inks,” Inter-
though the lower ink has somewhat more copper and a much greater quantity of zinc than the upper one.\footnote{The scientific analysis of the inks on the Stanford 2007 folio was conducted by Uwe Bergmann. The details may be published separately. Cf. Behnam Sadeghi and Uwe Bergmann, “The Codex of a Companion of the Prophet and the Qur'ān of the Prophet,” Arabica 57.4 (2010): 348, 357.}

Both layers of writing are Qur'āns, and each layer appears to have once constituted a complete codex.\footnote{In addition to the writings corresponding to the putative full codices, there are occasional interpolations by different hands. For example, an “upper modifier” filled gaps in the upper writing where the text had faded. There is also a hand (or possibly more than one hand) on a few folios that we call the “lower modifier(s),” responsible for jottings that occasionally either modified the lower writing or filled its gaps where the text had faded or been erased irremediably. The lower modifier is black and was written with a narrower pen than all the other scripts. It appears on folios 2, Stanford 2007, David 86/2003, 22 (possibly different hand), and possibly 23. It dates from a period after the complete erasure of the lower writing, the addition of the upper writing, and the resurfacing of the lower writing. Four considerations establish this dating: First, the fact that the writing is black proves that it does not belong to a reemerged text, since lower writings in palimpsests come to light as pale brown or pale gray if they reappear at all. This argument alone is conclusive. Second, Uwe Bergmann’s examination of the Stanford 2007 folio has established that the lower modifier’s ink has no iron, copper, or zinc, the transition metals responsible for corrosion and color change over time (see above, footnotes 10 and 11), confirming that the script has not resurfaced and thus was never erased to begin with. The ink appears to be based on carbon and is thus relatively inert, invulnerable to corrosion-related color change and more easily erased or worn out than metal-based ink. This consideration, too, is conclusive by itself. Third, in terms of calligraphic style, width of the pen stroke, and the chemical composition of the ink, the upper writing is much closer to the lower writing than to the lower modifier, which again supports its predating the lower modifier. Fourth, the lower modifier’s calligraphic style suggests that it does not belong to the first two centuries AH. On folio 22, however, the calligraphic style looks early: either this is a different hand, or it is the same “lower modifier” hand as found on the other folios but is influenced here by the Hijāzī script it modified. Cf. Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 357-8, especially footnote 12.} The upper text is from the standard textual tradition and was probably written sometime during the seventh or the first half of the eighth century AD. With future advances in paleography and the application of other methods, it may become possible to obtain a more precise date than this. Its verse division pattern displays a
marked affinity for the schemes reported for the Hijāz, but not precisely enough to distinguish between Mecca and Medina.\textsuperscript{13}

The lower Qur'ān is of enormous interest because it is so far the only manuscript that is known to be non-‘Uthmānic, that is, from a textual tradition other than the standard one. One of us previously did a detailed study of this codex based on four folios.\textsuperscript{14} We now extend the analysis to all the folios except one (of which the image we do not have). In this essay, we focus on the broad features of the text, postponing to future publications a systematic textual analysis of all the variants. We shall argue below that regardless of the date of the lower codex, the textual tradition to which it belonged and the ‘Uthmānic tradition must have diverged sometime before the spread of the ‘Uthmānic tradition in the mid-seventh century AD. Therefore, comparing these two traditions opens a window onto the earliest phase of the Qur’ān’s history. We shall also argue, based on just such a comparison, that, contrary to a common view, the existing pieces of revelation were joined to form the \textit{sūras} prior to ‘Uthmān’s famous and fairly effective attempt to standardize the text.

The date of origin of the textual tradition to which the lower text belongs, of course, is a different matter than the date of the lower writing itself. The lower writing, on paleographic and art-historical grounds, is almost certainly from the seventh century AD, and probably not from the latter part of that century. More precision may be obtained by radiocarbon dating, which assigns the parchment, and hence the lower codex, to the period before AD 671 with a probability of 99\% (before 661 with the probability of 95.5\%, and before 646 with a probability of 75\%).\textsuperscript{15} This makes it significantly earlier than the few other Qur’āns that have been radiocarbon-dated.\textsuperscript{16} The manuscript was not written long before the

\textsuperscript{13} See Appendix 2. This conclusion was reached previously based on an analysis of a more limited set of thirteen folios in \textsc{Sadeghi} and \textsc{Bergmann}, “The Codex,” 377–83.

\textsuperscript{14} \textsc{Sadeghi} and \textsc{Bergmann}, “The Codex.”

\textsuperscript{15} Radiocarbon dating was performed on a sample from the “Stanford 2007” folio. For the details, see \textsc{Sadeghi} and \textsc{Bergmann}, “The Codex,” 352–4. On the assumption that the codex was not made a long time after the parchment was prepared, see “The Codex,” 354.

Prophet Muhammad’s death in AD 632, since it contains the ninth sūra, which includes some of the last passages he disseminated.\textsuperscript{17} The manuscript may be, from a textual-critical standpoint, the most important one among those discovered in 1972 between the ceiling and the roof of the Great Mosque of Ṣan‘ā’.\textsuperscript{18} It seems that the other ones in the collection, including the many others from the first century in the Hijāzī and Kūfī scripts, may all belong to the standard tradition.\textsuperscript{19} The collection includes some 12,000 Qur’ānic parchment fragments. As of 1997, all but 1500–2000 leaves or fragments were assigned to 926 distinct Qur’ānic manuscripts, none complete, and many containing only a few folios. There are about 150 non-Qur’ānic parchment fragments, and a large number of fragments written on paper. Among the Qur’ān manuscripts, twenty-two are in the Hijāzī script, and therefore are probably from the


\textsuperscript{19} In a response to a query from a historian, of which we were given a copy, Gerd-Rüdiger Puin wrote that the palimpsest is the only manuscript in the Dār al-Makhtūtāt with significant textual variants. We are unable to verify this because, like everyone else, we are denied access to the microfilms prepared by H. Bothmer, and because we have not been able to travel to Ṣan‘ā’. The claim, however, is consistent with a few images published of other folios in the Hijāzī script.
first century AH (7th century and early 8th century AD). All but eight of these twenty-two Hijāzī manuscripts are in the “vertical format,” that is, are longer in height than width. There are also many manuscripts in the Kūfī script, some of which are probably from the first century AH.

In 1980, a project was initiated to restore and preserve the parchment manuscripts. It was launched under the auspices of the Yemeni Department for Antiquities. The Cultural Section of the German Foreign Ministry funded the work, providing 2.2 million German marks (about 1.1 million Euros). Albrecht Noth (University of Hamburg) was the director of the project. Work on the ground began in 1981 and continued through the end of 1989, when the project terminated with the end of funding. Gerd-Rüdiger Puin (University of Saarland) was the local director beginning with 1981. His involvement came to an end in 1985, when Hans-Caspar Graf von Bothmer (University of Saarland) took over as the local director. Bothmer left Ṣanʿāʾ in the following year, but continued to run the project from Germany, traveling to the site almost every year. Beginning in 1982, Ursula Dreibholz served as the conservator for this project, and worked full time in Ṣanʿāʾ until the end of 1989. She completed the restoration of the manuscripts. She also designed the permanent storage, collated many parchment fragments to identify distinct Qurʾānic manuscripts, and directed the Yemeni staff in the same task. The manuscripts are located in the “House of Manuscripts,” the Dār al-Makhṭūṭāt (DAM), in Ṣanʿāʾ, Yemen. After 1989, Bothmer would visit the collection periodically. In the winter of 1996–7, he microfilmed all of the parchment fragments that have been assigned to distinct Qurʾānic manuscripts. Of the remaining 1500–2000 fragments, he microfilmed a group of 280. The microfilms are available in Ṣanʿāʾ in the House of Manuscripts.

Not all of the manuscript under study is in Yemen. The largest portion is there, in the House of Manuscripts, bearing the catalog number 01-27.1. However, before the piles of manuscripts discovered in the Grand Mosque were secured, some folios must have been pilfered, as they eventually found their way to auction houses abroad. Between 1992 and

---

29) Puin wrote that there are about 90 Hijāzī manuscripts (Gerd-Rüdiger Puin, “Observations on Early Qurʾān Manuscripts in Ṣanʿāʾ,” in The Qurʾān as Text, ed. Stefan Wild (Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 108). This estimate is wrong by a factor of four. Bothmer cites Puin’s error and corrects it, mentioning that the correct number is twenty-two (Bothmer, “Die Anfänge der Koranschreibung,” 46, footnote 28).
2008, four folios from the palimpsest were auctioned in London. It is convenient to refer to them as Christies 2008, Stanford 2007, David 86/2003, and Bonhams 2000. Because the label DAM 01-27.1 applies only to the leaves located in the House of Manuscripts, it is necessary to have a label for the entire manuscript that covers also the other four folios and any others that may surface in future. We call the whole manuscript Ṣan‘ā’ 1.

Scholars have not yet been granted access to the microfilms that have been in the possession of Puin and Bothmer, nor has any author traveled to Ṣan‘ā’ and published a study using the microfilms or manuscripts there. As a result, the first public discussions of the lower text were based on the images of the four folios that were auctioned in London, and which therefore were readily available. Short entries in the auction house catalogs briefly addressed paleographic and art historical aspects. Subsequently, Sergio Noja Noseda (who made an independent set of photos of the DAM 01-27.1 manuscript), Yasin Dutton, and Alba Fedeli announced the non-ʿUthmānic status of the folios they examined. Alba Fedeli published the first article discussing the lower text. She focused on two folios (Bonhams 2000 and David 86/2003), noted some important variants, and pointed out three variants that are also reported as having been in certain Companion codices. She also has

---

21) On the history of these folios, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 354–5. Even though the upper writing in the Stanford 2007 and David 86/2003 folios is in a different script, it is almost certain that these four folios and the DAM 01–27.1 folios are from the same manuscript. The Stanford 2007 and David 86/2003 folios share a number of features with the other folios: the size of the folios is the same, the same intricate and colored ten-verse markers appear in the upper codex, and the lower modifier is found in Stanford 2007 and David 86/2003 as well. The same script seems to be used in the lower codex, but this provisional impression requires careful verification. It is apparent that scribes took turns to write the upper codex, a common practice, about which see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 357, and the references listed there.

22) See the references in Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 354 (footnotes 7 and 8), 360 (footnote 22).

an article in Italian that mentions the 01-27.1 folios. An extended study by Behnam Sadeghi focused on history, the role of orality, and textual criticism.

In 2007, S. Noja Noseda and Christian Robin took an independent set of pictures of DAM 01-27.1. It is conceivable that this stirred the Puins, who had not published anything on the palimpsest since G. Puin had become acquainted with it about twenty-six years earlier. Beginning in 2008, nineteen years after all the parchment manuscripts in Ṣanʿāʾ had been restored, in three successive articles published at the rate of one per year, Elisabeth Puin (the wife of Gerd-Rüdiger Puin) transcribed the lower text of three and a half folios (folios 2, 5, 6A, and 20). Her first essay (2008) mentioned the pictures taken “recently” by S. Noja Noseda and added that they might be published soon. The transcriptions are positive contributions, though the articles are not free from errors.

24) Fedeli, “Early Evidences.”
25) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex.”
27) E. Puin, Koranpalimpsest [Teil I], 462, footnote 2.
28) Among the errors in E. Puin’s work, three are particularly significant. (1) The first one concerns the hand called “the lower modifier.” Preoccupied with the theme of textual suppression, E. Puin misses the signs that the lower modifier came after the upper text had been written and the lower writing had resurfaced (see above, footnote 12). She asserts that the lower modifier’s jottings were introduced before the lower text was fully erased and the upper text was written (E. Puin, Koranpalimpsest [Teil I], 474; “Teil II,” 524; “Teil III,” 234–6, 253). The lower modifier occupies a prominent place in her discussion, signifying a “progressive canonization” of the text (“Teil III,” 235–6). (2) The second significant error concerns what she takes to be the standard text of the Qurʾān. When a
her first two essays and presented without justification) that mirror the conclusions of Sadeghi and Bergmann’s “Codex” essay. She thereby moves away from the prevailing revisionist outlook of the authors in the Inârah series in which her previous two articles appeared.29

word in a manuscript is spelled differently than it is in her Saudi Qur’ān, she calls that a “deviation from the standard text.” Needless to say, many spelling variations in manuscripts do not match her Saudi Qur’ān, and so her essays are filled with statements like these: “even in the … upper writing there are numerous deviations from the standard text with respect to spelling” (“Koranpalimpsest [Teil I],” 462), and “the spelling variant of the defective alif occurs frequently in Hijāzī manuscripts” (“Teil II,” 539). All of this points to a misunderstanding: she thinks that Muslim tradition has a “standard text” that purports to give the spelling of words in the original codices sent out by ʿUthmān. She makes this explicit by referring to “the Standard text … which according to Muslim tradition reproduces the Qur’ān in wording and spelling exactly as it had been specified by the redaction of the caliph ʿUthmān” (“Teil II,” 524). On why this is wrong, see above, footnote 2. (3) The third notable error is her view that David 86/2003 and Stanford 2007 are possibly not from the same manuscript as the other folios (“Teil III,” 248; 251, footnote 30; 258, footnote 38). On this matter, see footnote 21, above.

29) In her third article, “Teil III,” Elisabeth Puin does not cite Sadeghi and Bergmann’s “Codex” and does not include it in her bibliography. However, she may have read it, at least in draft form, as she seems aware of its contents. She mentions Stanford five times and correctly identifies the folio studied at Stanford as the one formerly auctioned at Sotheby’s in 1993. The study of that folio at Stanford University was first mentioned in Sadeghi and Bergmann’s “Codex.” Indeed, she calls it the Stanford folio, a name that was given to it in “The Codex.” E. Puin mistakenly thinks that the folio is located permanently at Stanford University (“Teil III,” 248), which may have led her to think of its presence at Stanford as public knowledge, known independently of “The Codex” essay. In fact, the folio was brought to Stanford only briefly for X-Ray Fluorescence imaging. In any case, Sadeghi promptly sent G. Puin a copy of “The Codex.”

We welcome the new elements in Elisabeth Puin’s third essay (“Teil III”) that parallel Sadeghi and Bergmann’s “Codex”: (1) In her first two essays, E. Puin did not use the label “non-ʿUthmānic,” nor discuss Companion codices, the existence of which is questioned by skeptical and revisionist scholars. In “The Codex,” Sadeghi explained why the lower writing corroborates the reality of the Companion codices, and called the lower writing “non-ʿUthmānic,” preferring it to the oft-used “pre-ʿUthmānic.” In her third essay, E. Puin says that the lower writing confirms the reality of the Companion codices, and likewise calls it “non-ʿUthmānic” (“Teil III,” 233–7). (2) Sadeghi wrote that the lower writing represents a codex other than those of Ibn Masʿūd and Ubayy b.
Elisabeth Puin worked with inferior, "small and 6 × 6 photographs in black and white, taken by Dr. Gerd-R. Puin and Dr. Hans-Caspar Graf von Bothmer." This may explain why her transcriptions have, by our count, forty-one errors. (Based on better photographs and ultraviolet images, our edition includes new transcriptions of the three and a half folios discussed by E. Puin.) It is surprising that in the seventeen years during which G. Puin had the opportunity to take (or have his colleagues take) adequate pictures of the palimpsest for his own use, he did not do so. Although media interviews with G. Puin over a decade ago

Ka'b. E. Puin says the same thing in her third article ("Teil III," 235), but not in her earlier essays. (3) Sadeghi argued at length that "orality played a role" ("The Codex," 344) in generating the differences between the lower writing and the 'Uthmānic Qur'ān. In her third essay, E. Puin says, without providing any justification, that "oral tradition indeed played a role" ("Teil III," 237). She had not mentioned orality in the first two essays. (4) Sadeghi provided a detailed classification of variants ("The Codex," 417–36). E. Puin does so in her third essay."Teil III," 262–76, but not in the first two. (5) E. Puin mentions that the upper and lower writing "seem to have been written ... perhaps in the same kind of ink" ("Teil III," 241) without explaining how she could determine the kind of ink. It is chemical analysis, as described in "The Codex," 367–8, that reveals the inks as alike in being metal-based, and as different from the non-metallic inks of the lower modifier and upper modifier hands. (6) Sadeghi compared the sūra sequences in the folios with those reported for the codices of Ibn Mas'ūd and Ubayy b. Ka'b. E. Puin does this in her third essay ("Teil III," 257) but not in the earlier ones.


31) In a written response to a query sent to him by a historian, of which we were given a copy, G. Puin attributed the poor quality of the microfilm pictures to obstacles erected by the Yemeni authorities, who, he stated, were not interested in the success of the documentation project. The problems caused by the Yemenis are a common motif in media interviews given by G. Puin for stories that suggest that the Yemenis sought to suppress evidence (see Andrew Higgins, "The Lost Archive," The Wall Street Journal, January 12, 2008; Toby Lester, "What is the Koran?" The Atlantic Monthly (January 1999), 44; see also the next footnote). It should be noted, however, that scholars who had much more limited access to the manuscripts than G. Puin was granted, and much less time, took much better photographs of the palimpsest. An ordinary camera should suffice for taking adequate pictures. A more plausible explanation than Yemeni obstructionism is that G. Puin did not seriously plan to study the lower writing of the palimpsest in the 1980s and the 1990s and therefore did not try to take, or have his colleagues take, adequate photographs. When eventually his wife decided to transcribe the text in the late 00s, shortly after Noseda had photographed the palimpsest, she had to rely on the pictures prepared by
described him as “thrilled” about studying the Ṣanʿāʾ texts and erroneously blamed the lack of published studies on the Yemeni authorities, it seems that serious study of the lower writing of the palimpsest was not on his agenda at that time.32

Textual-Critical and Historical Implications

Before the advent of the printing press, book manuscripts formed lineages. Like animals and plants, they were subject to heredity and mutation. Typically, a book manuscript was a copy of an earlier one, which was in turn a copy of an even earlier one, and so forth. As a book was copied, textual variants could arise that would be passed to its offspring.

The analogy with nature extends to questions of method. Biologists usually learn about the past in two ways. One way is to find a specimen that can be dated on external grounds, for example, by using radiocarbon dating or other paleontological methods to establish the date of a fossil (and, in rare cases, recoverable DNA within it). The equivalent in our field is to find an old dated or datable manuscript or inscription. In the last several decades, some scholars in the field of Islamic studies have come to consider only such documentary sources as valid evidence for early

32) Relying on interviews with G. Puin, Toby Lester wrote: “detailed examination ... is something the Yemeni authorities have seemed reluctant to allow.” Lester added that Puin and Bothmer “have been reluctant to publish partly because ... they felt that the Yemeni authorities, if they realized the possible implications of the discovery, might refuse them further access.” Lester adds that the microfilming of the manuscripts was completed in 1997. “This means that soon Von Bothmer, Puin, and other scholars will finally have a chance to scrutinize the texts and to publish their findings freely, a prospect that thrills Puin.” Lester thus implies that, as of 1999, G. Puin had not had the opportunity to “scrutinize the texts.” In fact, Puin had this opportunity since 1981 when he began working with the manuscripts, or since 1989 when the restoration of the parchment fragments was complete, or since early 1997 after the microfilms were made. See Lester, “What is the Koran?,” 44. For G. Puin’s publications, see below, footnotes 33 and 78. For the theme of Yemeni obstructionism, see the previous footnote and the section below entitled, “The Media and Manuscripts.”
Accordingly, their impression that there are not many early copies of the Qur‘an or other documentary evidence is one of the contributing factors to the common pessimism in early Islamic studies about our ability to learn much about the first century or two of Islam. Setting aside the revisionists’ and skeptics’ undervaluation of the potential of the late literary sources, it is noteworthy that they do not always recognize that the earliest manuscripts can be used to work one’s way back in time. Our knowledge can extend to the period before the manuscripts.

This brings us to another method biologists use to learn about the past. They begin with known organisms, modern ones and fossils, and group similar ones together, forming hierarchies of clusters and sub-clusters that correspond to trees of descent. By comparing sub-branches, they are able to learn about the branches from which they must have diverged. In this manner, they recursively work their ways back to earlier stages, identifying ancient species and their characteristics or the archaic attributes of extant species. With a number of important caveats, a similar method works in the study of manuscripts and is commonly used in textual criticism. One may use textual variants to group manuscripts into clusters corresponding to the branches of a family tree. One can also compare the offspring to learn about the progenitors. In the case of Ṣan‘ā’ 1, this method is a more fruitful method of discovery than radiocarbon dating, impressive as the results of radiocarbon dating may be.

As with other widely transmitted books, codices of the Qur‘an fall into clusters, called text types, when compared for textual similarity.

---

33) Not everybody who has written on the Ṣan‘ā’ manuscripts thinks in terms of text types. For an approach that disregards the notion, see Gerd-Rüdiger Puin, “Observations on Early Qur‘an Manuscripts in Ṣan‘ā’,” in The Qur‘an as Text, ed. Stefan Wild (Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 107–11. In this article, G. Puin reaches a striking conclusion based on the discovery of two variants. He writes, “In 19:62 [the] original تَسْمِع لا tasma‘ was later corrected to لا tasma‘ūna (instead of the usual لا yasma‘ūna). Instead of قول جاء الحق qīla jā‘a l-ḥaqqu in 34:49 we find قول جاء الحق qīla jā‘a l-ḥaqqu. The systems of the seven, ten or 14 Qirā‘āt are, consequently, younger than the variants observed in San‘ā’. Puin does not say whether these readings appear in just one manuscript apiece. If they do, as seems likely, the only way in which his theory that these readings give the original text could be sustained is for all the other manuscripts to represent a later state of the text, an improbable scenario, and an impossible one if these other manuscripts have variants of their own, which would make them the original texts by Puin’s method. To avoid such contradictions, scholars normally take a singular reading to be a relatively late development or a scribal error, unless it occurs in a branch of the textual tradition that is different from all the others,
By far the best-known cluster is the standard one, called the 'Uthmānic
text type. We give it this name as a label of convenience because early
Muslims believed that its ancestors were the manuscripts that the caliph
‘Uthmān (d. AD 656) had sent to the main cities of the state sometime
around AD 650 as part of his attempt to establish a standard text. We
accept this early dating for the spread of the text type, and in this essay
we take it as a given. We do not provide an argument for it here, since one
of us has already done so in a previous essay on the basis of the work
done by Michael Cook, Yasin Dutton, Hossein Modarressi, and
other scholars. Regardless of the date one assigns to its origin, it
cannot be denied that the 'Uthmānic text type represents a distinct branch
of the textual tradition. That is so because it forms a genuine cluster:
the differences between the texts within the text type are small com-
pared to the texts outside it. The lower writing of Ṣan‘ā‘ 1 clearly falls
outside the standard text type. It belongs to a different text type, which
we call C-1.

The relatively small number and scope of the variations within
the standard ('Uthmānic) text type entails a critical conclusion with

also unlikely in this case. (For the treatment of singular readings in New Testa-
ment scholarship, see the references cited in Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The
Codex,” 387–8, footnote 84. In some circumstances, pre-modern ḥadīth specialists
also viewed singular features in ḥadīth variants in a similar light.) Textual critics
usually begin by grouping texts into text types before evaluating what is early
and what is late. By contrast, Puin begins with the assumption that the stan-
dard reading is a corruption in every case in which there is some other reading in
any manuscript. He holds to this premise so firmly that even what is on the face
of it a scribal error is for him the original text: the second variant mentioned
above is a scribal error on the face of it since it does not fit the context. (On
scribal errors, see, e.g., Alba Fedeli, “A Perg. 2: A Non Palimpsest and the Cor-
Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 372, footnote 53.) Furthermore, Puin
does not even allow for the possibility that a standard reading and a variant
reading could have at some point existed simultaneously: the standard one is for
him automatically a later corruption, hence his conclusion that the readings in
the qirā‘āt literature are “younger [i.e., later] than the variants” he has men-
tioned.

Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 364–70. Another indication, be-
side those given in the preceding reference, for the early date of the spread of the
‘Uthmānic textual tradition is the significant number of first-century 'Uth-
mānic manuscripts.
important ramifications: the splitting off of the ‘Uthmānic and other textual traditions occurred no later than the spread of the ‘Uthmānic text type. The innumerable ‘Uthmānic manuscripts and the different ‘Uthmānic readings preserved in the literary sources provide a very clear picture of the degree and types of change that could arise during the period in which the ‘Uthmānic tradition flourished. These changes are small enough in scope and few enough in number to be compatible with written transmission or with dictation in which the result is checked against the original. The standard tradition thus appears to have achieved a high level of transmission fidelity already around the mid-seventh century AD. This ‘Uthmānic cluster and the textual traditions that fall significantly outside it, such as the C-I tradition to which the lower writing belongs, must have parted ways prior to the proliferation of the ‘Uthmānic tradition. This conclusion depends on the premise that once people began transmitting the scripture with a high level of accuracy, as in written transmission, a drastic reversion did not occur to a previous, less precise form of transmission, one that could have generated the differences of the sort seen between C-I and the ‘Uthmānic text type. This premise, although not certain, is highly probable. It is, for example, natural to assume that once written transmission began, it continued. Incidentally, one can see a similar trend in New Testament manuscripts and hadith variants.

The conclusion that C-I’s origin must have predated ca. AD 650 is largely independent of the date of Ṣanʿā’-1. For example, it would not be invalidated if it were found that the lower Ṣanʿā’-1 codex was produced, say, in the eighth century AD. This codex would still be only a representative of a C-I text type, and the late date of the manuscript would still beg the question of when this textual tradition originated. The codex would have shared a common ancestor with its contemporaneous ‘Uthmānic cousins, a progenitor which would have dated from before the spread of the ‘Uthmānic tradition. Moreover, since the differences between the C-I text type and the ‘Uthmānic text type outstrip in magnitude and number the range of differences expected to arise in the period after ca. AD 650, most of these differences must have originated before then.

Until recently, no Qurʾān manuscript was known outside the ‘Uthmānic tradition. Non-‘Uthmānic Qurʾāns were known only through descriptions

of them in the literary sources. According to these accounts, some Companions of the Prophet had compiled complete Qur’ān codices of their own. Three Companions are frequently named: ‘Abdallāh b. Mas‘ūd, Ubuyy b. Ka‘b, and Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī. The variants of the codices of the first two are reported, while almost nothing seems to be remembered about the third. However, because the sources quoting these variants were written a long time after the Prophet Muḥammad, scholars such as John Wansbrough and John Burton took the position that the Companion codices never actually existed – they were concepts that allowed Muslims to assign their interpretations to fictive versions of the scripture. These scholars saw the reported textual differences not as genuine variants of the sort that normally arise in the course of transmission, but as instances of exegesis (or desired doctrines, for Burton) transformed into scriptural text. This view is implausible for a number of reasons. A small fraction of the variants do make a difference in meaning. But most variants do not affect the meaning significantly enough to warrant such a theory, and many variants do not change the meaning at all. Furthermore, most textual differences are candidates for being the products of assimilation of parallels, harmonization to context, or simple omission – phenomena that characterize genuine transmission. The one reason that is most relevant for our purposes, however, is that Ṣan‘ā’ 1 constitutes direct documentary evidence for the reality of the non-‘Uthmānic text types that are usually referred to as “Companion codices.”

Table 1 gives a few examples, in English translation, in which C-1 differs from the standard text. The C-1 type shares a number of variants


38) For a few other variants translated into English, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 355.
with those reported for the codices of Abdallāh b. Masʿūd and Ubayy b. Kaʿb, and these are listed in Appendix 1. These constitute a minority among its variants, as C-1 does not share the vast majority of its variants with these codices. Nor are most of their variants found in C-1. Thus, C-1 represents a text type of its own, a distinct “Companion codex.”

C-1 confirms the reliability of much of what has been reported about the other Companion codices not only because it shares some variants with them, but also because its variants are of the same kinds as those reported for those codices. There are additions, omissions, transpositions, and substitutions of entire words and sub-word elements (morphemes). A large number of these variants involve “minor” elements of language such as suffixes, prefixes, prepositions, and pronouns. Many variants involve changes of person, tense, mood, or voice (passive or active), or the use of different words having the same root. Furthermore, the variants in C-1 and other Companion codices richly display the phenomena of assimilation of parallels — whereby a scribe’s writing of a verse is affected by his or her memory of a similar verse elsewhere in the Qurʾān — and assimilation of nearby terms, whereby a scribe’s writing is influenced by nearby expressions. The fact that all these features are found both in the codex of Ibn Masʿūd, as described by al-Aʿmash, and in C-1 establishes that the literary sources preserve information about codices that actually existed. The question remains whether these real codices originated at the time of the Companions, which is what early Muslims recalled. A positive answer to this question is supported by textual criticism, as described above, which assigns the beginning of the C-1 text type to the period before the spread of the standard text type, that is, before ca. AD 650. In sum, the “Companion” codices indeed existed at the time of the Companions, as the literary sources maintain.

40) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 345, 390–4. There is, however, a conspicuous difference between C-1 and the codex of Ibn Masʿūd: C-1 has a lot more variants — by a rough estimate perhaps twenty-five times as many.
41) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 390–4, 389 (Table 6), 393 (Table 7).
**Table 1. Examples of Major Variants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant description</th>
<th>The text of the standard tradition</th>
<th>The text of the C-1 tradition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Q 2.196, C-1 does not have the word ruʿūsakum.</td>
<td>Do not shave your heads until the offering reaches its destination.</td>
<td>Do not shave until the offering reaches its destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Q 2.196, C-1 has fa-in kāna aḥadun instead of the standard fa-man kāna.</td>
<td>If any of you be sick</td>
<td>Should one of you be sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Q 2.196, C-1 has aw nusukin instead of the standard aw ṣadaqatin aw nusukin.</td>
<td>Fasting, or alms, or an offering</td>
<td>Fasting or an offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Q 2.201, C-1 has wa-l-ākhirati instead of the standard ḥasanatan wa-fī l-ākhirati ḥasanatan.</td>
<td>There are people who say, “Our Lord, give us in this world,” and they have no portion in the world to come. Then, there are those who say, “Our Lord, give us good in this world and good in the next.”</td>
<td>There are people who say, “Our Lord, give us in this world,” and they have no portion in the world to come. Then, there are those who say, “Our Lord, give us in this world and the next.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Q 63.7, C-1 has min ḥawliki after yanfaḍḍū.</td>
<td>They are the ones who say, “Do not spend (alms) on those who are with the Messenger of God in order that they may disperse.”</td>
<td>They are the ones who say, “Do not spend (alms) on those who are with the Messenger of God in order that they may disperse from around him.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-1, when combined with the other textual traditions, can shed light on the state of the text from which they all descended, that is, the prototype disseminated by the Prophet Muhammad. The literary sources provide fairly systematic information about the codex of Ibn Masʿūd, allowing one to compare it with C-1 and the Uthmānic text types. It emerges that where the texts of Ibn Masʿūd, C-1, and Uthmān disagree, usually the Uthmānic version is in the majority: that is, the Uthmānic text agrees with one of the others against the third. This is compatible with two scenarios. First, the Uthmānic text may be a hybrid formed on the basis of a number of Companion codices (and, conceivably, partial codi-
ces and free-standing copies of sūras) in which preference was usually
given to the majority reading. This hybridity thesis happens to fit some
early Muslim reports about the formation of the text. Second, the ‘Uth-
mānic Qur’ān could have been a self-contained, existing codex like those
of Ibn Mas‘ūd and C-I, the three text types being distinct descendants of
a common source, the Prophetic prototype. In this scenario, the fact that
the ‘Uthmānic text is usually in the majority suggests that it is overall a
better reproduction of the common source. These broad, initial conclu-
sions may be refined or even significantly modified once we have fin-
ished the detailed study of all the variants and performed a statistical
comparison of C-I and the ‘Uthmānic text. As another refinement,
it may become necessary to come to terms with the fact that different
sūras in a codex could have had different transmission histories before
they came to be incorporated in a Companion codex. As explained in a
previous essay, this likelihood arises since a Companion’s codex may have
taken different sūras from different scribes. This possibility now seems
particularly relevant, since, as compared to the other sūras in C-I found
in the fragment, sūra 20 in C-I shows a greater affinity to the codex of
Ubayy b. Ka‘b. Finally, one should investigate the extent to which the
variants may be due to the Prophet reciting different versions.

Analysis resolves a fundamental question about the early history of
the Qur’ān: who joined the existing verses to form the sūras (chapters)
and when? Many scholars and some early reports hold that this was
accomplished after the death of the Prophet by the committee that

42) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 343–436. We owe the hybridity
hypothesis to Michael Cook.

43) The work is in progress, and it involves comparing C-I’s text with the
‘Uthmānic Qur’ān. The key question relating to the problem of textual priority
is whether one text type has significantly more “irreducible pluses” than the
other. A “plus” of a text type is a word or a phrase found in it that is missing from
the other text type (without some other word or phrase taking its place). It is
“irreducible” if it cannot be explained as an addition resulting from assimilation
of parallels or nearby terms. Having more irreducible pluses is a sign of textual
priority. Such an analysis was conducted previously on the variants in the four
folios of Ṣan‘ā’1 auctioned abroad (Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,”
385–90, 399–405), but, obviously, the results might be different once all the folios
have been analyzed.


45) See Appendix 1.

'Uthmān charged with the task of standardizing the Qurʾān. Some other early reports however indicate that this was done already by the Prophet himself. This last view is now found to be better supported. It follows from the fact that the ‘Uthmānic Qurʾān, C-1, and the Companion codices generally have the same passages within the sūras, that the sūras were fixed before these various textual traditions branched off, in particular before the spread of the ‘Uthmānic version. With only a few exceptions, the differences among the codices are at the level of morphemes, words, and phrases—not at the level of sentences or verses. The exceptions in C-1 include the very short consecutive verses 31 and 32 in sūra 20, which are three words long apiece, and which appear in C-1 in reverse order. Literary sources record that these verses were also transposed in the Codex of Ubayy b. Ka‘b.\textsuperscript{47} Another exception concerns verse 85 of sūra 9, which is missing. At sixteen words, this omission is found to be an outlier when compared to the sizes of other missing elements in C-1, which are much shorter. The anomaly may be explained by the common phenomenon of parablepsis, a form of scribal error in which the eye skips from one text to a similar text, in this case, from the instance of āna followed by a verse separator and the morpheme wa at the end of verse 84 to the instance of āna followed by a verse separator and the morpheme wa at the end of verse 85. The conclusion that the sūras were constituted prior to the ‘Uthmānic text helps one assess the accuracy of some early Muslim accounts. It disproves the reports that imply that it was under ‘Uthmān that the sūras were assembled from the preserved pieces of the revelation.\textsuperscript{48}

There are some traditions about ‘Uthmān’s team finding the last two verses of sūra 9 with a man named Khuzayma, or Abū Khuzayma, or Ibn Khuzayma.\textsuperscript{49} C-1 has these verses in the expected place. Since they are also found in the ‘Uthmānic Qurʾān, and since it is not reported that any Companion codex was without them, these verses must have belonged to the prototype from which the C-1 and ‘Uthmānic text types emerged. Therefore, one should not read too much into the report.

\textsuperscript{47} Abd al-Laṭīf al-Khāṭīb, Mu’jam al-qirā’āt (Damascus: Dār Sa‘d al-Dīn), 5:430.

\textsuperscript{48} For a summary of traditions suggesting that the sūras were fixed only after the Prophet’s death, see Hossein Modarressi, “Early Debates on the Integrity of the Qurʾān: A Brief Survey,” Studia Islamica 77 (1993): 8–13. Modarressi questions their accuracy and calls them “extremely problematic”(p. 14).

The order in which the sūras were put together is a different matter. Different Companion codices had different sūra sequences, indicating that the order was not completely fixed at the time of the Prophet. This is supported by C-1, which adopts a non-standard sūra order. In a previous article, one of us mentioned three sūra transitions found in the lower writing, and subsequently another author mentioned two more. In Table 2 we present a complete table of the eleven sūra transitions in the extant folios of Ṣanʿāʾ 1. (For convenience, in the table and elsewhere in this article, the sūra numbers give the ‘Uthmānic rank.) Al-ʿAḍamī has made the astute point that a non-standard sūra transition does not entail a non-standard Qurʾān if it occurs in a pamphlet with a selection of sūras. However, the point does not apply to the lower writing: it covers too much of the Qurʾān, including some of the largest sūras; its wording establishes its non-‘Uthmānic status; and its sūra ordering is too similar to those reported for other Companion codices.

One may make three observations about C-1’s sūra ordering. First, some transitions are found only in Ubayy b. Kaʾb’s codex, others only in Ibn Masʿūd’s codex, and yet others in no reported sūra ordering. Second, the ordering is closer to those of Ibn Masʿūd and Ubayy b. Kaʾb than to that of ‘Uthmān. This pattern is so strong that one would expect it to hold in the lost remainder of the codex as well. Third, the ordering is closer to the one reported for Ubayy b. Kaʾb than to that of Ibn Masʿūd; but the pattern is not strong enough and the sample size is not large enough to provide an inkling of whether that was also the case in the rest of the codex.

51) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 393 (Table 8); E. Puin, “Teil II,” 526–7.
Table 2. The sūra orders in C-1, Ibn Mas’ūd, and Ubayy b. Ka’b. The numbers are the ‘Uthmānic ranks. The sequences in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm and the Itqān of al-Suyūṭī differ due to errors in the transmission of the reports about sūra orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-1</th>
<th>Ibn Mas’ūd</th>
<th>Ubayy b. Ka’b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11, 8, 9, 19</td>
<td>Fihrist: 53 9, 16, 11, nine intervening sūras, 8, 19</td>
<td>Fihrist: 55 8, 9, 11, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 18</td>
<td>Fihrist: sūra 18 is omitted; 12 is followed by 17</td>
<td>Fihrist: 12, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 25</td>
<td>Fihrist: sūra 15 is omitted</td>
<td>Fihrist: 15, ten intervening sūras, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td>Fihrist: sūra 20 is omitted</td>
<td>Fihrist: 20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 13</td>
<td>Fihrist: 13, 34</td>
<td>Fihrist: 13, four intervening sūras, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 40</td>
<td>Fihrist: 39, 40</td>
<td>Fihrist: 39, five intervening sūras, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63, 62, 89, 90</td>
<td>Fihrist: 63, 62, twenty-nine intervening sūras, 89, 85, 84, 96, 90</td>
<td>Fihrist: 63, 62, 65, 89 (sūra 90 is omitted, unless lā uqsimu refers to it rather than to sūra 75, in which case it comes at eleven removes after sūra 89.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One report ascribes to ‘Uthmān’s team the decision to place sūra 9 after sūra 8, and to do so without inserting between them the basmala;”

---

the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful," a formula found at the beginning of all the other sūras.57 The evidence of Ṣan‘ā‘I adds a nuance to this claim. The transition point between sūras 8 and 9 happens to be part of the surviving fragments of the lower codex, and it lacks the basmala like the 'Uthmānic text. In putting sūra 9 right after sūra 8, the manuscript agrees with the codices of 'Uthmān and Ubayy b. Ka‘b, but not that of Ibn Mas‘ūd, which places sūra 8 at many removes after sūra 9. It is unlikely, then, that the decision of 'Uthmān’s team was an innovation.

As mentioned above, most of the differences between C-1 and the other text types must have arisen at the branching off of the textual traditions. This happened probably as the Prophet recited the text and a Companion wrote it down. Purely written transmission can be discounted due to the significance of the variants in number and nature. Purely oral transmission can be ruled out, too, for several reasons. The variations that arose in the ḥadīth literature during the first century AH provide a good idea of what to expect from purely oral transmission: entire paragraphs would be worded differently, with additions, omissions, and transpositions at the sentence and paragraph levels. The differences seen in C-1, rather, compare to ḥadīth variants arising in the late second century AH, when the use of writing was common. (Against this, one might object that the transmission of the Qur’ān would have required a high standard of memorization, and, therefore, perhaps memorization could convey the text with precision. The objection is moot to a degree, however, given that the C-1 variants show that the text was in fact not transmitted precisely. Besides, the thousand or so pointing and vocalization variants of the written 'Uthmānic text highlight the fallibility of oral transmission, and certain 'Uthmānic variant readings presuppose a written skeletal text that was on occasion read seemingly without a memory of the spoken form: take ‘inda versus ‘ibād in Q 43.19, yaqṣṣu versus yaqḍi in Q 6.57, and yusayyirukum versus yanshurukum in Q 10.22.) Another indication of the use of writing is that the textual variants in C-1, while numerous, remain the exception rather than the norm. This holds even for “minor” elements of language, including particles, prepositions, suffixes, etc.58 Moreover, even a careful memorizer who reproduces the words exactly is prone to getting the order of the verses wrong; yet C-1 has the same verses and the same order of verses as the standard Qur’ān.

57) Rāmyār, Tārīkh-i Qur’ān, 429.
The frequency and nature of the variants indicate that the branching off of the C-1 and the ‘Uthmānic text types must have involved semi-oral transmission, that is, some combination of written and oral transmission. Ascertaining the precise manner in which orality and writing were combined requires a considerable amount of research. For now, two different hypotheses may be advanced. One theory would be that transmission involved the reciting of the text and the simultaneous writing down of the recitation by a Companion, but not precise, word-for-word dictation. The variants indicate a recitation that was performed faster than a hearer could take down with complete fidelity. The second theory would be that a Companion with a good memory wrote down a sura not simultaneously with hearing it, but after the recitation had been complete, for example, after he went home. He could have taken notes during the recitation that would serve as a mnemonic. The use of such notes, the scribe’s good memory, and his prior familiarity with the Qur’ān may explain why most of the text remained unchanged, even when it came to the relatively small linguistic elements, while the time gap between the hearing and writing would explain the differences that arose.

There are several possible explanations for why the leaves of the original manuscript were reused to prepare a new one. The original codex may have been worn out due to extensive use over a number of decades. Just how quickly the pages were worn out would depend on how often the manuscript was used, something that we are not in a position to know. In addition, the orthographic and paleographic differences between the two layers are consistent with their being separated by a period long enough for the codex to have been worn out: though both scripts are Ḥijāzī, the upper writing is more compact, uses more alif, and uses more dots for distinguishing the consonants.59 Alternatively, part of the lower codex may have been damaged in an accident. As a third possibility, the fact that the lower writing belongs to a non-‘Uthmānic textual tradition may have been the motive, since C-1 would have become obsolete as the parallel ‘Uthmānic tradition came to be regarded as the standard. These explanations, of course, are not mutually exclusive.60

Some scholars will consider only a narrative of suppression. Indeed, it is possible that the original owner(s) recycled the codex due to a preference for the ‘Uthmānic version. However, this would not necessarily mean that the scribe considered the lower writing wrong or illegitimate.

60) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 370.
Early traditions preserve a wide spectrum of attitudes towards the codices of Ibn Mas'ūd and other Companions, some depreciatory, some adulatory, and some neutral. Many reports imply the legitimacy of Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex or other Companion codices. Even some of the reports that express preference for the standard text do so. However, we are aware of only one report that denies the basic legitimacy and divine origin of Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex. Kūfans who held Ibn Mas'ūd (d. AH 33) in high esteem quoted the statement from al-Ḥajjāj (d. 95). The latter was notorious for his opposition to Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex, and he was not remembered fondly for that in Kūfa, where the local school of law saw Ibn Mas'ūd as its founder, where Sulaymān al-A'mash (d. 147) continued to recite Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex alongside the 'Uthmānic text and transmit its variants, and where important Qur'ān reciters such as Ibrāhīm al-Nakha’i (d. 96), Ibn Waththāb (d. 112), al-A'mash (d. 147), and Ḥamza (d. 156) were influenced to varying degrees by Ibn Mas'ūd’s text type even when they were reciting 'Uthmān’s text. On closer examination, the quotation from al-Ḥajjāj appears as a possible exaggeration by Kūfan Qur'ān reciters, fashioned to make al-Ḥajjāj appear all the more outrageous.

61) For an example of Ibn Mas'ūd’s influence on 'Uthmānic readings in Kūfa, see Sadeghi, “Criteria for Emending the Text of the Qur'ān.”

62) The report was transmitted through the Kūfan Qur’ān reciter Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāsh (d. AH 193) from the well-known Kūfan Qur’ān specialists Ḥātim b. Ṣāliḥ (d. 128) and Sulaymān al-A’mash (d. 147). Here are two representative versions. (Version 1) Ibn Mas'ūd “says (or thinks) that his Qur’ān is from God. By God, it is nothing but Bedouin rajaz poetry (mā hiya illā rajaz min rajaz al-a'rāb); God almighty did not send it to his Prophet.” (Version 2) Ibn Mas'ūd ‘recites the Qur’ān, versifying it as the Bedouin recite rajaz poetry, and calls this [reciting] the Qur’ān (yaqra'u al-Qur'ān rajzan ka-rajz al-a'rāb wa-yaqūlu hādhā al-Qur'ān).’ See Ibn Asākir, Ta’rikh madīnat Dimashq, ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Shirāzi (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1415/1995), 12:159–62; Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, Sunan, ed. Sa‘īd Muḥammad al-Lahjām (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1410/1990), 2:400. The first version quoted above is surprising as it depicts Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex as different in kind from the ‘Uthmānic Qur’ān. That goes against everything else that has been related about that codex, including the detailed account provided by al-A'mash, whose authority this tradition invokes. (On al-A'mash’s description of Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 391–3.) It is possible that this anomalous version adapts and embellishes the second version, which says something quite different and less unexpected. In the second version quoted above, the issue is not the contents of Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex, but rather the manner in which he (and presumably his followers) recited the Qur’ān. He is accused of having recited it in the way a Bedouin would recite poetry, presuma-
One idea that seems to have been in fairly wide circulation already in the first century of Islam was that the Qur’ān was revealed in Seven Modes (ṣab‘at aḥruf). Translated from the language of metaphysics into that of history, this notion entails that the Companion codices were all legitimate despite their differences, as they ultimately represented what the Prophet’s scribes wrote down, and as they all enjoyed the Prophet’s endorsement. Such codical pluralism being an early notion, those who sought to elevate the ‘Uthmānic version above the others could not simply declare the other codices non-Qur’ānic. Some early scholars found a solution by making use of an existing tradition that said that the Prophet’s scribes wrote down the Qur’ān as if it were Bedouin poetry (yaqra’u l-Qur’ān ka-annahu rajaz al-a‘rāb; Abū l-Ḥasan al-Mas‘ūdī, Murūj al-dhahab, ed. Yusuf As‘ad Dāghir, 2nd ed. (Qum: Dār al-Hijra, 1409), 3:143). The possibility that reciting the Qur’ān like poetry was controversial is confirmed by another Kūfan tradition on the authority of Ibn Mas‘ūd that discourages reciting the Qur’ān like poetry (wa-lā tahdhdhū l-Qur’ān ka-hadhdh al-shi‘r, wa-lā tanthurū nathē al-duqūl, quoted in Ibn Abī Shayba, Muṣannaf, ed. Sa‘īd al-Lahham (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1409/1989), 7:186). A related point of controversy was the chanting or singing of the Qur’ān. See Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī, 4th ed. (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, HS 1365), 2:614; al-Suyūṭī, Itqān, 1:243; M. Talbi, “La qirā’a bi-l-alḥān, ” Arabica 5 (1958): 183–90. (We owe the last reference to Michael Cook.) In sum, one version of the report perhaps rearranges the words of a more primitive version and in doing so exaggerates the virulence of al-Ḥajjāj’s words, an unsurprising transformation given that the tradition circulated in a milieu that was hostile to al-Ḥajjāj. If, however, one considers the more audacious version as representing the original wording, then it should be considered as hyperbole, since it goes against the available evidence.

Sixty Seven Modes (ṣab‘at aḥruf) traditions include Prophetic and non-Prophetic reports. For an overview of the matn and isnād of the Prophetic ḥadīths, see ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ‘Abd al-Fattāh al-Qārī, Ḥadīth al-ahurf al-sab‘a: dirāsa li-isnādihi wa-matnihi wa-khtilāf al-‘ulamā’ fī ma’nāhu wa-ṣilatihi bi-l-qirā‘at al-Qur’āniyya (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1423/2002), 9–41. ‘Abd al-Fattāh’s work has the merit of including related traditions that do not use the words sab‘at aḥruf, and the demerit of excluding non-Prophetic ṣab‘at aḥuruf. For the English translation and brief discussion of a Seven Modes report that quotes Ibn Mas‘ūd instead of the Prophet, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 412–3. A detailed analysis of the Seven Modes traditions needs to be conducted. In the meantime, our impression is that the idea dates from the first century AH.
Prophet used to present the Qurʾān to the angel Gabriel every year. They linked these successive presentations with the different Companion codices, and they said that the ʿUthmānic text was the last presentation, implying that it superseded the others. The admirers of Ibn Masʿūd responded by pointing out that his reading would surely have been updated if a text had been abrogated, or they reacted by simply making Ibn Masʿūd’s Qurʾān the final presentation. Both sets of traditions accepted that the Prophet introduced multiple versions of the Qurʾān as the text was updated annually, and both took it for granted that Companion codices represented legitimate recordings of the revelations; they disagreed only over which codex was the last version.

The codex of Ibn Masʿūd eventually lost popularity, but codical pluralism did not vanish altogether. Although many different interpretations of the “Seven Modes” arose over time, many scholars continued to regard them as encompassing the Companion codices. Ibn al-Jazarī (d. AH 833) wrote that the majority of scholars held that the Seven Modes are not limited to the master codices ʿUthmān sent to the cities—that is to say, they can include non-ʿUthmānic variants—and that they held the ʿUthmānic codices to constitute precisely the Prophet’s “final presentation.” He thus found some Companion textual variants “acceptable” (yuqbal) even though he disapproved of reciting them in prayers. He

---


66) Ibn al-Jazarī writes, “Most scholars from earlier and more recent times and the imams of the Muslims have held that these ʿUthmānic codices contain only that portion of the Seven Modes that fits their rasm” (wa-dhahaba jamāhīr al-ʿulamāʿ min al-salaf wa-l-khalaf wa-aʿīmat al-muslimin ilā anna ḥadhīki l-maṣṭık fī-l-ʿuthmānīyya mushtamila ḍāl mā yaḥtamiḥu rasmuhā min al-abruf al-sabʿa faqat), and adds that the ʿUthmānic codices constitute precisely the Prophet’s final presentation of the text to Gabriel. See Ibn al-Jazarī, al-Nashr fī l-qirāʿāt al-ʿasr, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Ḍabbāʿ (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, n.d.), 31. I was led to this reference by a forthcoming essay of Yasin Dutton, entitled “Orality, Literacy and the Seven Abruṭ Hādīth.”
mentions however that some other scholars did endorse the use of Companion codices in worship. Many pre-modern scholars, if they were with us today, might have looked reverentially at the lower writing’s variants as instantiations of the Seven Modes while perhaps denying the text the status of the ‘Uthmānic Qur’ān in prayers. In sum, neither in early Islam nor later did the preference for the standard text always entail a dismissal of the Companion codices.

The Media and Manuscripts

As much as we would like to disregard the media, it is difficult to do so. Academic publications increasingly rely on them, and professors assign newspaper articles for their classes. Moreover, it is instructive to take note of the rumors that circulate among modern academics and the journalistic articles that mirror and feed them. Stories, after all, spread better if they capture the worldviews, hopes, and fears of their host populations.

In the late 1990s, a narrative swept a number of Western universities, and it can be epitomized by one word: suppression. One version was that Yemen was prone to concealing the precious newly-discovered manuscripts in its possession, leading the Europeans who were restoring the parchments to keep their secrets under wraps for the time being. One journalist, Toby Lester, asserted as much based on interviews with G. Puin. He added that “detailed examination ... is something the

67) For Ibn al-Jazari’s views on the Seven Modes and legitimate recitations, see Ibn al-Jazari, al-Nashr, 7–9, 14–15, 26–8, 31–3, 44. He holds that any reading is authoritative and belongs to the Seven if (i) it is in good Arabic, (ii) it does not differ skeletally-morphemically from one of the ‘Uthmānic regional codices, and (iii) it is transmitted soundly from individuals. If the reading does not fit the ‘Uthmānic text (khatt al-mushaf) but the other two conditions are satisfied, then it is “accepted, but not recited” in rituals (p. 14). He writes that, unlike him, some scholars permit the recitation of such Companion variants in ritual prayers, while others take the middle ground by allowing their use in worship except in the case of the Fātiha (pp. 13–4). This opens the door to the acceptability of some non-‘Uthmānic variants even in his relatively restrictive approach, and he gives as examples two acceptable Companion variants that differ significantly from the ‘Uthmānic text at the phrase level. Cf. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Qāri’, Ḥadīth al-abruf al-sab’a, 45–8.

68) Toby Lester, “What is the Koran?,” 44.
Yemeni authorities have seemed reluctant to allow.69 A more forward version of the motif had Yemen prevent the publication of manuscripts outright. In any case, the narrative implied that European academics had met the resistance and intolerance of people who are beholden to religious dogma and unaccustomed to rational inquiry.

The media weaved the suppression motif within martyrologies and harrowing tales of victimization,70 Reports touching the Ṣanʿa manuscripts mentioned the Rushdie affair and the persecution of Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd.71 The New York Times presented as fact hearsay about a Palestinian scholar of early Islam, Suliman Bashear, being injured when his students threw him out of a second-story window.72 (Several people who were close to the late Bashear told us that the event never happened. For example, Bashear’s wife, Dr. Lily Feidy, in an e-mail message dated August 14, 2011, wrote, “Please note that Suliman was never attacked or injured by his students; nor was he physically attacked by anybody else. I have been asked this question a million times”). The New York Times made much of a book of Christoph Luxenberg being turned down by a publisher.73 The Wall Street Journal related an account narrated by G. Puin about Yemen seizing the images of the Ṣanʿa manuscripts that Bothmer had prepared.74 (In a tele-

69) Toby Lester, “What is the Koran?,” 44. See above, footnotes 31 and 32, for assertions about Yemeni obstructionism.


72) Stille, “Scholars are Quietly Offering New Theories of the Koran.”

73) Stille, “Scholars are Quietly Offering New Theories of the Koran.” Stille assumes that publishers normally accept a book if there is some good scholar somewhere who likes the book. Thus, the fact that there may be some scholars who like Luxenberg’s book is for Stille proof of discrimination. Incidentally, one of the scholars who, according to Stille, praised Luxenberg’s book is Patricia Crone. Yet, in reference to the works by Günter Luling and Christoph Luxenberg, Crone writes, “both books are open to so many scholarly objections (notably amateurism in Luxenberg’s case) that they cannot be said to have done the field much good” (Patricia Crone, “What do we Actually Know about Mohammed?,” http://www.opendemocracy.net/faith-europe_islam/mohammed_3866.jsp).

74) Higgins, “The Lost Archive.”
phone interview on August 26, 2011, Bothmer called the account “ridiculous” and blamed the journalist. And the New York Times reported that Euro-American academia is experiencing a chill due to Muslim threats of violence.\footnote{Stille writes that Muslim threats of violence have sent “a chill through universities around the world” that has “affected non-Muslim scholars in Western countries” (Stille, “Scholars are Quietly Offering New Theories of the Koran”). However, he does not mention any instance of a European or North American university professor receiving a threat or being harmed. According to an anonymous “researcher” in the U.S. whom he quotes, the situation is so bad that “it’s not possible to say anything other than sugary nonsense about Islam.” Yet, most academic publications are non-sugary, and some are even sensible. Stille’s examples include the striking rumor about Bashear, beside Luxenberg’s initial difficulty in finding a publisher. His picture of Euro-American scholarship may not be real, but it probably accurately reflects the siege mentality of some of his informants, Stille’s, Lester’s, Higgins’, and Kristof’s portrayals of the state of scholarship in the Muslim world suffer from similar shortcomings.}

The narrative of oppression resonates with the self-image of academics as upholders of reason and with archetypical notions about the conflict between rationality and traditional religion, a clash that is most commonly symbolized in modern culture by Galileo’s struggle with the Church.\footnote{The historian of skepticism, Richard Popkin, has highlighted how European skeptics selectively appropriated and imagined Galileo’s experience to make it a symbol for an essential conflict between reason and religion. See Richard Popkin, “Skepticism, Theology and the Scientific Revolution in the Seventeenth Century,” in Problems in the Philosophy of Science: Proceedings of the International Colloquium in the Philosophy of Science, London, 1965, volume 3, ed. Imre Lakatos et al. (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1968), 1–28. It should be noted that while a general attitude of unease with religion best explains the wide acceptance of the media’s claims among academics, some of the interlocutors target Islam in particular rather than religion in general. G. Puin, for example, frames his work as a reaction against Muslim criticisms of Christianity that focus on the textual issues of the Gospels – an approach that was made popular in the mid-1980s among English-speaking Muslim non-specialists by a meagerly-trained charismatic speaker named Ahmed Deedat. Puin goes on the counterattack with a tu quoque argument about textual corruption in the Qur’an: “Muslims... like to quote the textual work that shows that the Bible has a history and did not fall straight out of the sky, but until now the Koran has been out of this discussion. The only way to break through this wall is to prove that the Koran has a history too. The Sana’a fragments will help us do this” (Puin, quoted in Lester, “What Is the Koran?,” 44).} The suppression motif also seemed to resolve a conspicuous
paradox: on the one hand, it was indicated that the Ṣanʿāʾ manuscripts refuted core religious doctrines; on the other hand, it was not explained how they did so, as nothing was revealed about the manuscripts beyond the finding that there are variants, a banal observation from the standpoint of traditional Muslim scholarship. The mysterious information gap was explained by putting the responsibility at the door of Yemen and its presumed propensity for withholding purportedly embarrassing evidence.

The suppression narrative is inaccurate. It is true that G. Puin did not share his photographs with scholars who asked for them, nor publish a great deal on them himself, but this was his personal choice (to which

77) The journalists and some of their academic informants suggest that Muslim scholars are unaware of textual variants. They disregard the dozens of volumes written on variants and the textual-critical discussions about them in the tafsīr genre and other sources. They also imply that it is only Western scholars who are now applying proper “analytical tools” to the Qurʾān (Kristof, “Islam, Virgins, and Grapes”). The journalists disregard evidence that complicates their narrative that modern scholarship has upended core Muslim beliefs. Those who discuss both Wansbrough’s theories and early manuscripts do not draw the elementary inference that the latter refutes the former: they are interested in the manuscripts only because they believe they refute traditional views. They also do not note that the palimpsest undermines the modern theory that the Companion codices were fictitious. Evidence is deemed interesting only when there is at least a vague sense that it supports revisionist theories.


In the first article, Puin writes, “My observations do not claim to be either new or unexpected, except for the last paragraph which discusses the different arrangements of the Sūrahs” (p. 108). This refers to his idea that sūra transitions in the manuscripts that do not match the standard sūra ordering point to non-standard textual traditions. However, the author does not reveal any information that can be used to evaluate the evidence (Are the manuscripts in question early or late? Do their texts support a non-‘Uthmānic classification? Is there any indication that the manuscripts constituted complete codices or simply selections of sūras?). For more on this article, see above, footnote 33.

G. Puin’s second article focuses on the already well-known fact that in ancient orthography a tooth could signify the ā sound. He says that the tooth
he was entitled), not the doing of Yemen. Furthermore, there was nothing to prevent other scholars from going to Yemen to study the folios and write about them. The manuscripts and microfilms remained available to visitors. In 2007, Sergio Noja Noseda and his erstwhile student Mounir Arbach freely prepared images of the DAM 01–27.1 folios as part of a project founded by Christian Robin. When we asked Robin whether Yemen tried to hinder such work, he answered in the negative and told us

corresponding to the second ḷ in Ibrāhīm and the ay in Shayṭān were originally pronounced as ʿa, yielding Abrāhām and Sāṭān, but that these pronunciations were forgotten later. In fact, several reciters, including one of the Seven, the Syrian Ibn 'Āmir (d. 118), read the name as Ibrāhām, as noted, for example, in al-Khaṭīb, Mu’jam, 1:187, 2:600, which in any case does not prove that this was the name in early seventh-century Mecca. In addition, Puin notes that the ambiguity of the tooth means that the word ʾilāh (אלה), “God,” could, in principle, be spelled in the same way as the word ʾilayh (אלה), “towards Him.” This leads him to propose, “hypothetically,” an emendation that replaces ʾilayh with ʾilāḥ in lā ilāha illā huwa ilayhi l-maṣīr (Q 40.3), which means, “There is no god but Him; to Him is the journey.” The substitution yields lā ilāḥa illā huwa ilāhu l-maṣīr, which means, “There is no god but Him, the god of destiny.” Puin exclaims, “What a beautiful Qur’ānic sense! What a beautiful Biblical sense as compared to the traditional interpretation!” But then he immediately rejects his hypothetical proposal, stating, “the link between the word ‘destiny’ and the preposition ʾilā is so well-established in many parallel passages of the Qur’ān that one should consider the interpretation ‘God of destiny’ as a hasty conclusion.” Indeed, Puin is right that the proposal is wrong (see Q 3.28, 24.42, 35.18, 5.18, 31.14, 42.15, 64.3, 22.48, 31.14, 50.43, 2.285, 60.4).

Puin thus imagines an emendation to a verse that is fairly clear and straightforward, expresses excitement about the proposed reading, and then says that his proposal cannot be right. What might bring about such an approach? The verse in question may be among those that Puin considers as “incomprehensible” and hence in need of emendation. He avers that a large part of the Qur’ān “simply doesn’t make sense” (Puin, quoted in Lester, “What is the Koran?,” 54), and he holds that Muslims, too, think of much of the Qur’ān as meaningless. These premises have led to further conclusions: “This is what has caused the traditional anxiety about translation. If the Koran is not comprehensible – if it can’t even be understood in Arabic – then it’s not translatable. People fear that” (ibid.). This theory features a key idea in Puin’s conceptual repertoire, namely that of the suppression of embarrassing data: it attributes the Muslims’ misgivings about translations to the fear that the scripture will be exposed for the largely meaningless text they recognize it to be.

G. Puin’s third article, by way of new information, mentions some spelling variations in the manuscripts.
that they were granted greater access than would have been possible in some European libraries. **Robin** and his colleagues have the blessing of the Yemeni authorities to publish the images. We also asked Ursula **Dreibholz**, the conservator for the restoration project, whether the Yemeni authorities hampered research. She said no, and described the Yemeni authorities as supportive.79

Moreover, other participants in the project in Yemen do not confirm G. **Puin**’s statement that Yemeni authorities “want to keep this thing low-profile” or that “they don’t want it made public that there is work being done at all.”80 Ursula **Dreibholz** continued working on the project in Yemen for four more years after the end of **Puin**’s involvement. She spent more time on the project than anybody else, and for the last three years she was the only foreigner to work fulltime in the Dār al-Makhṭūṭāt. She told us that Yemeni authorities “were very grateful” for the work done by the foreigners. They were “proud” of their treasures, and “they brought school children, university students, foreign delegations, religious dignitaries, and heads of state, like Franois Mitterrand, Gerhard Schröder, and Prince Klaus of the Netherlands, to see the collection.”81 Although the Yemeni authorities’ openness proved a boon to scholarship, they were to be punished for it. The American media amplified the erroneous words of G. **Puin**, purveying a narrative that belittled Yemen and misrepresented the work done there. The Arab press in turn exaggerated the American story. The outcome was a media discourse in Yemen borne of three stages of misrepresentation. This embarrassed the Yemeni authorities responsible for the House of Manuscripts, and the Head of the Antiquities Department had to defend before Parliament the decision to bring in the foreigners.82

79) The only credible instance of obstruction of which we know was related to us by **Dreibholz**: a librarian claimed to have lost the key (to the study room, if we recall correctly) (**Dreibholz**, telephone interview, August 8, 2011). **Bothmer** volunteered that the key remained “lost” for a week (**Bothmer**, telephone interview, August 26, 2011). We have not interviewed the librarian, and, in any case, this incident was an aberration.

80) **Puin**, quoted in **Lester**,”What Is the Koran?,” 44.

81) **Dreibholz**, telephone interview, July 30, 2011.

82) We rely on **Dreibholz** for the controversy inside Yemen (telephone interview, July 30, 2011, and e-mail dated August 8, 2011).
A Note on the Edition

In late 2009, when we asked Robin for the photographs and the ultraviolent images of DAM 01-27.1, he agreed immediately and went through some expense and trouble to make them available. The present essay would not have been possible without Christian Robin’s initiative and his exemplary openness and generosity. This edition of the lower writing of Ṣan’ā’ 1 is based on all the folios except one, namely folio 21 of DAM 01-27.1, a picture of which we do not have. The folios are listed in the following table.

Table 3. The Folios of Ṣan’ā’ 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Lower Text</th>
<th>Upper Text</th>
<th>Surviving Fraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2.87 – 2.96</td>
<td>6.149 – 6.159</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2.96 – 2.105</td>
<td>6.159 – 7.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford 2007 recto</td>
<td>2.191 – 2.196</td>
<td>2.265 – 2.271</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford 2007 verso</td>
<td>2.197 – 2.205</td>
<td>2.271 – 2.277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David 86/2003 recto</td>
<td>2.206 – 2.217</td>
<td>2.277 – 2.282</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David 86/2003 verso</td>
<td>2.217 – 2.223</td>
<td>2.282 – 2.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonhams 2000 recto</td>
<td>5.41 – 5.48</td>
<td>4.33 – 4.43</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonhams 2000 verso</td>
<td>5.48 – 5.54</td>
<td>4.43 – 4.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>11.105 – 11.112</td>
<td>14.32 – 14.41</td>
<td>less than ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>11.120 – 8.3</td>
<td>14.52 – 15.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>8.73 – 9.7</td>
<td>16.73 – 16.89</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>9.7 – 9.16</td>
<td>16.89 – 16.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>9.17 – 9.26</td>
<td>16.102 – 16.118</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>9.26 – 9.34</td>
<td>16.118 – 17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20A</td>
<td>9.70 – 9.81</td>
<td>30.26 – 30.40</td>
<td>more than ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20B</td>
<td>9.81 – 9.90</td>
<td>30.40 – 30.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A</td>
<td>9.106 – 9.113</td>
<td>31.24 – 32.4</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21B</td>
<td>9.114 – 9.120</td>
<td>32.4 – 32.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22A</td>
<td>9.121 – 19.5</td>
<td>32.20 – 33.6</td>
<td>more than ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22B</td>
<td>19.6 – 19.29</td>
<td>33.6 – 33.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A</td>
<td>19.29 – 19.53</td>
<td>33.18 – 33.29</td>
<td>more than ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23B</td>
<td>19.54 – 19.74</td>
<td>33.30 – 33.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>22.15 – 22.26</td>
<td>17.40 – 17.58</td>
<td>about ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>22.27 – 22.39</td>
<td>17.59 – 17.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Range 1</td>
<td>Range 2</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31A</td>
<td>12.17 – 12.20</td>
<td>43.63 – 43.69</td>
<td>less than ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31B</td>
<td>12.27 – 12.31</td>
<td>43.89 – 44.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32A</td>
<td>12.111 – 18.5</td>
<td>47.15 – 47.20</td>
<td>less than ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32B</td>
<td>18.15 – 18.18</td>
<td>47.32 – 48.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33A</td>
<td>16.26 – 16.37</td>
<td>21.42 – 21.72</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34A</td>
<td>16.68 – 16.69</td>
<td>21.111 – 21.12</td>
<td>less than 1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34B</td>
<td>16.78 – 16.79</td>
<td>22.15 – 22.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35A</td>
<td>33.51 – 33.57</td>
<td>19.38 – 19.64</td>
<td>about ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B</td>
<td>33.57 – 33.72</td>
<td>19.64 – 19.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36A</td>
<td>39.25 – 39.36</td>
<td>37.38 – 37.59</td>
<td>less than ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36B</td>
<td>39.42 – 39.47</td>
<td>37.73 – 37.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37A</td>
<td>39.51 – 39.70</td>
<td>37.102 – 37.134</td>
<td>less than ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37B</td>
<td>39.70 – 40.8</td>
<td>37.134 – 37.172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38A</td>
<td>20.23 – 20.61</td>
<td>25.10 – 25.34</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38B</td>
<td>20.61 – 20.80</td>
<td>25.34 – 25.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39A</td>
<td>20.122 – 20.133</td>
<td>42.38 – 42.48</td>
<td>about ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39B</td>
<td>21.5 – 21.19</td>
<td>42.21 – 42.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40A</td>
<td>24.13 – 24.23</td>
<td>20.1 – 20.43</td>
<td>more than ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40B</td>
<td>24.13 – 24.23</td>
<td>20.44 – 20.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41A</td>
<td>24.23 – 24.32</td>
<td>20.74 – 20.98</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41B</td>
<td>24.32 – 24.40</td>
<td>20.98 – 20.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42A</td>
<td>34.13 – 34.23</td>
<td>55.16 – 56.4</td>
<td>about ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42B</td>
<td>34.23 – 34.33</td>
<td>56.5 – 56.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43A</td>
<td>34.40 – 34.47</td>
<td>57.1 – 57.10</td>
<td>about ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43B</td>
<td>13.1 – 13.5</td>
<td>57.16 – 57.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44A</td>
<td>13.6 – 13.14</td>
<td>57.27 – 58.6</td>
<td>about ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44B</td>
<td>13.16 – 13.21</td>
<td>58.11 – 58.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45A</td>
<td>13.25 – 13.31</td>
<td>59.1 – 59.10</td>
<td>about ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45B</td>
<td>13.33 – 13.40</td>
<td>59.14 – 60.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47A</td>
<td>37.15 – 37.33</td>
<td>41.17 – 41.27</td>
<td>about 1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47B</td>
<td>37.43 – 37.68</td>
<td>41.33 – 41.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A</td>
<td>37.82 – 37.103</td>
<td>41.47 – 42.5</td>
<td>about 1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48B</td>
<td>37.118 – 37.144</td>
<td>42.10 – 42.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49A</td>
<td>15.4 – 15.33</td>
<td>28.58 – 28.74</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The order in which we transcribe the folios in our edition is given in the above table, and it broadly follows the *sūra* arrangement of the codex of Ubayy b.  Ka'b as an approximation to that of C-1.  The DAM 01-27.1 folios are designated by numbers referring to their order in the upper text.  When we cite a *sūra* number, it refers to the ‘Uthmānic rank.  When we give a verse number, we follow the Kūfan scheme used in most of the Qur’āns printed in the Middle East.

Since they postdate the upper text, the lower modifier hand(s) that are in black are not included in the edition.  By contrast, apparent insertions or corrections that predate the upper writing or have a chance of predating it are discussed in the footnotes.  In particular, we discuss a greenish script that occasionally modifies the lower text.  We are not sure whether it came before or after the upper text.

In the case of the three and a half folios that were transcribed by Elisabeth Puin, despite numerous differences, our transcriptions and commentary overlap with hers to a significant degree.  Moreover, Alba Fedeli has identified and discussed a number of important variants.

---

| 18B | 15.33 – 15.74 | 28.74 – 28.86 |
| 19B | 15.87 – 25.8 | 29.43 – 29.54 | about ⅛ |
| 19A | 25.14 – 25.27 | 29.29 – 29.40 |
| 24A | illegible | 34.52 – 35.9 | about ⅛ |
| 24B | 30.38 – 30.50 | 35.10 – 35.18 |
| 3A | illegible | 9.112 – 9.115 | less than 1/10 |
| Christie 2008 verso | 63.1 – 62.11 | 5.3 – 5.9 | (almost) all |
| Christie 2008 recto | 62.11 – 89 – 90.6 | 4.171 – 5.3 |
| 1A | illegible | 6.49 – 6.61 | (almost) all |
| 1B | illegible | 6.61 – 6.73 |
| 8A | illegible | 18.22 | less than 1/10 |
| 8B | illegible | 18.32 |
| 12A | illegible | 21.16 – 21.19 | less than 1/10 |
| 12B | illegible | 21.38 – 21.42 |
| 17A | no guess | 27.25 – 27.29 | less than 1/10 |
| 17B | no guess | 27.46 – 27.49 |
| 27A | illegible | 38.73 – 38.75 | less than 1/10 |
| 27B | illegible | 39.6 |

---

83) On the lower modifier, see footnote 12 above.
Rather than cite every instance of overlap with their works individually in the footnotes, we have acknowledged their contributions in a collective manner above, and we do so also here and in the Bibliography below.

Reading the lower writing is a difficult and tedious task, and errors are inevitable. Pictures taken under a brighter light and with a higher resolution than those we have used for the 01-27.1 folios should allow more accurate readings. For these folios, ultraviolet photographs proved very useful. The method that will achieve the highest accuracy is X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) imaging, and one only hopes that someday it will be used for the entire manuscript. Uwe Bergmann’s application of the technique to Stanford 2007 revealed features of the text that are otherwise invisible, bringing to light the residues buried in the parchment of iron, copper, and zinc from the ink. For the Stanford 2007 and David 86/2003 folios, we had access to high-resolution, bright photographs. The images available to us for the Christies and Bonhams folios are low-resolution. It is our hope that greater effort by other scholars and better images yielding more accurate readings will render this edition obsolete.

Symbols and Conventions

(X) The text is only partly visible, but enough is visible to give a good reason for the reading X.

[X] Some visible traces of ink are consistent with the reading X. However, they may also be consistent with other readings. Hence, the reading is conjectural.

/ / The folio is physically present but there is barely any trace of text. No letter of the alphabet is recognizable. The space between the slashes is approximately proportional to the size of the lacuna.

{ } The folio is physically missing. The space between the curly brackets is approximately proportional to the size of the lacuna.

Verse division. The absence of this symbol normally does not mean that a verse division is lacking in the lower text; it only means that one is not visible.

~~~ Decoration.
There are traces above the tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter tā.\(^{\text{a}}\)
The illegible space before hāʾ is too small for the grapheme. Perhaps the word is bi-munāzihāki, which is reported for Ibn Masʿūd’s codex here.

The text seems to have wa-mā lāhā bi-ghāfīlin ʿamā yuwalāna.

There are two small, disc-shaped traces of ink above the tooth. The function of these dots is not clear.

Another word is written slightly below the line, below wa-bushrā. This word appears to be hudā. There is enough room before this word for wa, though such a morpheme is not visible. It is not clear whether the scribe was adding the putative hudā to wa-bushrā, or was trying to replace bushrā with hudā.

The text might have an additional qul at the beginning of this verse.

This word may be anbiyyāʾihi.

Since the last word in this line uses a second-person pronoun, the verb here is also probably in the second person, i.e., āhadtum.

The text seems to differ from the standard reading, because a visible vertical stroke in the second half of the illegible part cannot belong to the word farīqun. Maybe the text is tāʾ iḥātun instead of farīqun, in which case the vertical line would belong to tāʾ.

93) The text might have an additional qul at the beginning of this verse.

96) This word may be anbiyyāʾihi.

95) The illegible space before hāʾ is too small for the grapheme. Perhaps the word is bi-munāzihāki, which is reported for Ibn Masʿūd’s codex here.

94) The text seems to have wa-mā lāhā bi-ghāfīlin ʿamā yuwalāna.

93) There are two small, disc-shaped traces of ink above the tooth. The function of these dots is not clear.

92) Another word is written slightly below the line, below wa-bushrā. This word appears to be hudā. There is enough room before this word for wa, though such a morpheme is not visible. It is not clear whether the scribe was adding the putative hudā to wa-bushrā, or was trying to replace bushrā with hudā.

91) This text might have an additional qul at the beginning of this verse.

90) This word may be anbiyyāʾihi.

89) Since the last word in this line uses a second-person pronoun, the verb here is also probably in the second person, i.e., āhadtum.

88) The text seems to differ from the standard reading, because a visible vertical stroke in the second half of the illegible part cannot belong to the word farīqun. Maybe the text is tāʾ iḥātun instead of farīqun, in which case the vertical line would belong to tāʾ.
bility is that the text had these traces too can be later additions (their color is not quite clear). One possi-
ḥā'. Muqātil b. Sulaymān cites an exegetical tradition from al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, who interprets 95/ ḥā'.
Sulaymān. The amount of space before this putative rest is covered by an upper text alif. The amount of space before this putative alif is visible; the rest is covered by an upper text alif. The amount of space before this putative alif is small, implying āmanū instead of āmanū. 96/}

95/ The illegible part is big enough to accommodate the standard text between ya'allimūna and al-malakayn. However, the few remaining traces in this part do not quite match the standard text. Specifically, the first word does not seem to be al-nās (it might be al-yahūd).

94/ The traces do not match 3. The first letter is tooth-shaped (but may also be rā', or a lām the upper part of which is erased). The last letter may be mīm since there is a small horizontal line at the end that resembles the tail of a mīm.

93/ The illegible part preceding this putative la-bi'sa mā is visible; the first letter alif is visible; the rest is covered by an upper text alif. The amount of space before this putative alif is small, implying āmanū instead of āmanū.
108) It cannot be ruled out that the scribe wrote āqīmū and then corrected it to ātimmū.

109) There might have been a fāʿ before alif.
The third letter is probably \( \text{th} \), even though only two consonant-distinguishing marks are visible above it. The text seems to be \( \text{lla} \) instead of the standard \( \text{wa-} \).  

There is less room than expected for \( \text{min} \) \( \text{d} \) \( \text{a} \). It is possible that the text is \( \text{min} \), although there is more space than is needed for this word.
This verse separator has a special shape for marking the 200th verse.

The next line is only partially visible due to the fact that a horizontal strip has been cut off from the bottom of the folio. The traces suggest that there is *inna before allāh* unlike the standard text. The last word on this partially visible line seems to be *al-fāsād*, followed by an end-of-verse marker.

This tā’ has a tail similar to that of a final ʿayn.
Either it is missing or it (or a smaller phrase such as wa-ṣaddun bihi) is not clear what this word is, or whether it belongs to the present or the previous line. The traces might belong to a word that the scribe had initially written before it was corrected later. The traces match wa-kufrun bihi. Its first letter is fāʾ. The traces match sabīl allāh. The traces might belong to a word that the scribe had initially written before it was corrected later. The traces match wa-ṣaddun bihi. Its first letter is fāʾ. The traces match sabīl allāh. The traces might belong to a word that the scribe had initially written before it was corrected later.

117] Traces of a word are visible above fīhi. Its first letter is fāʾqāf and its second letter is a medial lām. It is not clear what this word is, or whether it belongs to the present or the previous line.

118] The space here is not sufficient for sabīl allāh. The traces match sabīlīkī. The phrase wa-kufrun bihi is not present immediately before al-masjid. Either it is missing or it (or a smaller phrase such as wa-kufrun) is written at the beginning of the line, before wa-saddun.

119] There are traces before ‘ayn that resemble an isolated rāʾ or an initial mīm. The traces might belong to a word that the scribe had initially written here.

120] The initial kāf might be preceded by a tooth.

121] Traces of an alif are visible over nūn. The alif has a darker, green hue than the other characters. It is possible that the nūn, a likely scribal error, was corrected later.

122] A vertical stroke (possibly belonging to an alif) is visible in the middle of the illegible part preceding nūn, suggesting the text may differ from the standard reading.

123] In criticizing Fedeli, Sadeghi previously assumed that this nūn belongs to the word ‘an in ‘an dinīki. However, this is not certain. Nor is there any reason for believing that ‘an dinīki is missing from the text as Fedeli assumed. The text is largely illegible, and it is difficult to conclude much. See Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 363.
125) There is not enough room for the standard text between this point and 

istemātā in the previous line.

126) The verb jāhadū is either absent or written after fī sabīli llāhi.

127) There is perhaps insufficient room for بَلْ. The text may be āyātihi.

128) The morpheme hum has a dark greenish hue similar to the alif on line 2.

129) The traces and insufficient space suggest that the word lī-l-nās is missing.

130) It is not clear whether this verse starts with wa-.
Folio Bonhams 2000 Recto (Q 5:41–5:48)


131. The last letter might be a final lāʾ instead.

132. The letter before mīm may be lām or a tooth-shaped letter. The letter after mīm may be wāw, fāʾ, qāf, or even dāl. A vertical stroke is visible next. If it belongs to a letter of this word, then the word cannot be bi-l-muʾminīn. However, if it is a smudge or a corrected letter, then the word may be bi-l-muʾminīn.

133. The first letter in the illegible part might be kāʾ, in which case the word may be iktadaʾ instead of aslamāʾ.

134. This wāw has a slightly darker hue.

135. There is less room than would normally be expected for a grapheme such as lām.

136. The free space here is unusually large.

137. Considering the available space after the word jurūḥ on the previous line, there seems to be more room here than would be required for the standard text.

138. Apart from the traces of ink belonging to anzala, there are other traces. There might be a wāw slightly above the second grapheme. Perhaps the scribe had initially written a different word here, such as aṣlāḥ. Alternatively, the extra traces may be smudges.
The traces and amount of space suggest fa-hkum instead of wa-ani hjum.
The traces here do not quite match lām or a zā‘.

145) This word may be ruḥamā‘.

146) Before the final alif, two vertical strokes are visible that may belong to a lām and a zā‘.

147) The text may be man adhīnā lāhu instead of bi-idhinihi.

148) The text may be nūn of the word khālidīn.

149) This letter may be the lām and a 149. This letter may be the nūn of the word khlādīn.
There are traces before wāw that resemble a tooth, which would not match the standard text. Otherwise, this may be the conjunctive wāw preceding lā taṭghaw.

This grapheme may belong to the word nuthabbītu.

A horizontal line is visible here beneath dāl. This line could belong to a final yā'.

The text may be innā ma‘akum muta‘ārin. This may be another alif after āyātinā (there is enough space for such an alif), in which case the word here may be izdādū. Second, a tooth may come before the alif preceding the missing part, in which case the word could be zidnāhum.
identical. Consequently, the text came to be short of one instance of it. After this end-of-sūra caption, the scribe wrote the phrase ُلَا تَقُولُ ِبِيْنَى ِلَّهَيْنِ ِبَعْضٍ (which was on line 9) with the graphically identical لَا تَقُولُ ِبِيْنَى ِلَّهَيْنِ and then wanted to write لَا تَقُولُ ِبِيْنَى ِلَّهَيْنِ ِبَعْضٍ. However, this made the text cluttered, so he erased both al-anfāl and sūra (ex-
The illegible letter before ālāmūhum may be a tooth-shaped one instead of lām.}

There is not enough space for ḫuṣūd and the traces do not match it. The text may be ṭhaqīṭumūhum instead of wajādūmūhum.

This comparatively small rā’ is written very close to the next letter (hā’) and is slightly above the line, suggesting that the scribe had initially forgotten to write it.

Although the missing part at the beginning of the line is rather large, the text is not necessarily longer than the standard one. The previous line’s text starts somewhat after the beginning of the line. The same could hold in the present line.

The illegible letter before kāf may be a tooth-shaped one instead of lām.
There are traces above the tooth preceding mīm that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter tā'.

162) Only one consonant-distinguishing mark is visible above the first tooth.

163) One consonant-distinguishing mark is visible above each tooth. Slightly above these marks is an upper text grapheme that probably covers the second mark of each tooth.

164) There are traces above the tooth preceding mīm that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter tā'.
exactly where the grapheme ʽashīratukum, which is the next word, but then erased it and wrote
One can see the remnants of an omission.
other words, the scribe may have caught himself in the course of an inadvertent
ulā'ika. Perhaps the scribe first wrote nant-distinguishing marks for the letter
dāl, vertically above each other; one is to the right and slightly lower than the other.

165) The letters wāw and alif are written in the small space available after dāl, suggesting that the scribe had not written them initially. This emendation is wrong, however, as the plural jāhadā wa does not agree with the singular pronoun man preceding it. Perhaps the scribe conflated this word with the next verse’s jāhadū, which should be in plural.

166) It seems a different word had been initially written in place of darajā. One can see the remnants of an alif and another letter (possibly an initial lām) exactly where the grapheme ḫaḍ is written.

167) Traces that match the phrase ʽinda llūkhave are visible beneath the word ulā’ika. Perhaps the scribe first wrote ʽinda llūkh, but then erased it and wrote ulā’ika in its place.

168) Traces of an initial ṣāʾa are visible here. Perhaps the scribe began writing ʿashīratukum, which is the next word, but then erased it and wrote azwājukum. In other words, the scribe may have caught himself in the course of an inadvertent omission.

169) There are two strokes above the preceding tooth that might be consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter lhā. The two strokes are not placed vertically above each other; one is to the right and slightly lower than the other.
170) One can see traces matching an initial ǧa‘. In light of the first visible letters on the next line, it seems the scribe initially attempted to write ǧa‘  here but then changed his mind, erased what he had written, and wrote ḥā’ on the next line. This suggests the folio was physically incomplete at the end of this line already when the scribe was writing the text, because if the folio were complete, it would have enough room for the grapheme ǧa‘.

171) Nothing is written at the beginning of this line due to lack of space. Space opens up further to the left due to the upward slope of the previous line.

172) The text seems to have al-sakīnata instead of sakīnahu.

173) The legible letters on lines 25 and 26 (and also the first letters on side B) suggest nothing was written on the triangle-shaped missing part of the folio. Therefore, this part of the folio was probably missing or damaged already when the lower text was being written.

174) The traces at the beginning of this part do not quite match fa-ลำ. The second letter may be dāl, kāf, or sād.

175) There is not enough room for sawfa yughnīkum, and the meager traces do not match this phrase. The text may be fa-sa-yughnīkum.

176) Assuming the putative kā‘ in the middle of the line belongs to the word ḥakīm, and considering the traces in the next line, there might be more space than is needed for the standard text.

177) There is less room than expected for wa-lā bi-l-gawmī. Perhaps the text has wa-bi-l-gawmī instead.

178) This letter probably belongs to the word rasūlahu.
ilāhan wāḥidan (having instead subḥānahu)

1. The traces at the beginning of this part do not match "lā ilāha illā huwa subḥānahu wa-taʿālā".

2. This word is probably mutimmu nūrihi.

3. The traces at the beginning of this part do not match "mīrām al-ḥafṣ.

4. This word is probably non-standard.

5. This word might be "wa-ya'bā llāhu illā an yuṭfiʿū".

6. The traces here do not quite match "wa-llāhu yutimmu nūrāhū".

7. The illegible part is too small for "wa-ya-bā llāhu illā an yuṭimma." Moreover, the first letter seems to be "alif", not a tooth-shaped letter. The text could be "wa-llāhu yutimmu nūrāhū" or "wa-llāhu yuṭimma nūrāhū".

8. This word might be "allāh".

9. At the beginning of this part is a vertical line leaning to the right. It probably does not belong to an initial lām, which would lean to the left. Maybe the text is "an ya'budū" instead of "li-ya'budū".

10. Considering the traces and the amount of space, the text might be "li-ya'budū ilāha li ilāha ilāh huwa sabḥānahu wa-taʿālā. That is, it probably lacks "ilāhān wūldōn" (having instead allāh), but has an additional "wa-taʿālā" after sabḥānahu.

11. There is more space between this spot and the previous line than needed for "illāhān wūldōn".

12. The traces at the beginning of this part do not match "an yuṭimma." They might belong to "li-yuṭimma".

13. Considering the traces and the amount of space, the text might be "li-ya'budū ilāha li ilāha ilāh huwa sabḥānahu wa-taʿālā. That is, it probably lacks "ilāhān wūldōn" (having instead allāh), but has an additional "wa-taʿālā" after sabḥānahu.

14. The traces here do not quite match "wa-llāhu yutimmu nūrāhū".

15. This word might be "allāh".

16. At the beginning of this part is a vertical line leaning to the right. It probably does not belong to an initial lām, which would lean to the left. Maybe the text is "an ya'budū" instead of "li-ya'budū".

17. This word is probably yattakhidhāna.

18. The traces here do not quite match "an ya'budū".

19. This word might be "allāh".

20. The traces at the beginning of this part do not match "an yuṭimma." They might belong to "li-yuṭimma".

21. The illegible part is too small for "wa-ya-bā llāhu illā an yuṭimma." Moreover, the first letter seems to be "alif", not a tooth-shaped letter. The text could be "wa-llāhu yutimmu nūrāhū" or "wa-llāhu yuṭimma nūrāhū".

22. Traces resembling an initial or medial hā' appear exactly above the verse division marker. Perhaps the scribe initially forgot to put the verse division marker and wrote "huwa", but then erased "huwa" and added the marker. This is not very probable, however, since there is enough room before this spot for a verse division marker. Alternatively, the traces may belong to a special symbol for designating the thirtieth verse. Or else, the traces may be smudges.

23. This word is probably non-standard.
Therefore, the word is probably ya khadhāna.

The placement of the graphemes in the last three lines suggests that the triangular missing part of the folio at the bottom-right corner was missing or damaged already when the lower text was being written.

This word is probably fa-aʿadda.

There are traces above the second tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter tāʾ.

There is not enough room for the phrase al-kuffār wa-l-munāfiqīn. The text might lack either al-kuffār or al-munāfiqīn. The limited space favors al-kuffār, which is shorter.

There is not enough room in this physically missing part for the standard text between qālū and hammū. Perhaps the phrase wa-kafarū baʿda islāmik-him is absent.
There are traces above the tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter َtā‘.

There is not enough room for a final ِwāw and an isolated ِnūn. It seems that the scribe wrote an accusative ending (ِin) here, but this was changed later, since there are traces above the verse division marker that match the letter ِnūn. These traces are darker than the other characters and have a green hue.

This verse division marker is placed above the previous letter. Since there is little space between the previous and next letter, it seems the scribe initially forgot to write the marker and added it later.

The folio is partly missing here, but traces are visible that may belong to ِnūn and َalif.

Nothing is written before this point due to lack of space. Space opens up further to the left due to the upward slope of the previous line.

Since this missing part has enough room for ِfāriḥa, it is not clear what is written on the last third of the last line of side A. Either the latter part of line 25 on side A was damaged already when the lower text was being written, and therefore contains no text, or the text is longer than the standard one.

This word may be qa‘idā.
and others that match a final if another letter were written between them.

Rather close to it, that might represent a morpheme ing a scribal error. There are traces after the

There are no traces of the letter , which is reported here for Ibn Masʿūd. Perhaps the word is al-muṭadhirūn, which is reported here for Ibn Masʿūd and Saʿīd b. Jubayr (al-Khatīb, Maʾjam, 3:436).

The text seems to have been al-nāru Johannana, the definite article being a scribal error. There are traces after the alif of the definite article, placed rather close to it, that might represent a nūn or lām. These traces have a high likelihood of being a smudge, but if not, then the putative letter may have been part of a correction to inna nāru or, less likely, qul nāru.

Verse 85 is missing. The omission may represent a scribe's eyes skipping from the instance of āna followed by a verse separator and the morpheme wa at the end of verse 84 to the instance of āna followed by a verse separator and the morpheme wa at the end of verse 85.

The letter after āʾ is more similar to wāʾ than mīm.

There are no traces of the letter wāʾ in this part, and there is not enough space for hāʾ or ʾāʾ either. There are traces that may belong to the letter jīm and others that match a final alif, but the space between them is rather large, as if another letter were written between them.

The space after the putative mīm is larger than is needed for ʾāʾ and dhāl. Perhaps the word is al-muṭadhirūn, which is reported here for Ibn Masʿūd and Saʿīd b. Jubayr (al-Khatīb, Maʾjam, 3:436).
why is that the previous line begins close to the bottom of the folio and gradu-
the word is mīm. This v-shaped figure may belong to a word the scribe had initially
written between them. It is possible that the word is yaḥtadhirūn
onymous with
written here.

210) A shape resembling a medial āyn is visible above and slightly to the
right of mīm. This v-shaped figure may belong to a word the scribe had initially
written here.
Considering the length of the physically missing part at the beginning of the line, the text probably lacks the phrase *wa-kānat imraʿatī ʿāqiran*. The word is probably *ʿannatakum*.

There are traces that match the word *rabb*, but the traces before the putative *rabb* do not match *wa-kaura*, nor is there enough room for it.

Considering the traces, the missing parts in lines 2 and 3 might have had *yā Zakariyyā innā bī-Yahyā lam najʿal labī* respectively.

It seems the scribe initially wrote *wa*-*lād* here, but then erased it and wrote *ghulūm* instead.

It seems another letter, possibly *hā* or *ʿayn*, had initially been written in place of *lām*.

The word is probably *ʿannatakum*.

Writing before this point would have interfered with the text from the previous two lines.

There are traces that match the word *rabb*, but the traces before the putative *rabb* do not match *wa-kaura*, nor is there enough room for it.

It seems another letter, possibly *hā* or *ʿayn*, had initially been written in place of *lām*.

It seems another letter, possibly *hā* or *ʿayn*, had initially been written in place of *lām*.
the scribe wrote rather than a consonant-distinguishing mark.  

There are traces above the second tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter ġāʾ.  

This word may be *thumma*.

The traces after mīm are more similar to an initial or medial kāʾ than a final one. Perhaps the scribe first wrote a medial kāʾ but then tried to change it to a final ḥāʾ.

The tooth-shaped letter is followed by an alif or a lām. After this letter are some traces that are below the line and may belong to a third or fourth letter, perhaps a final hāʾ or ghayn (these traces do not seem to belong to the next line). It is possible that the scribe initially wrote (part of) a word here and erased it later, since both the tooth-shaped letter and the traces after it are paler than the adjacent words. Alternatively, these traces may constitute a word (e.g. *bāliyih*). This second scenario is unlikely, however, since such a word should be in the accusative, whereas the traces do not seem to include an accusative ending.

This alif is probably a scribal error.

There are traces above the second tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter ġāʾ.

A small dash, such as appears in end-of-verse symbols or consonant-distinguishing marks, is visible slightly to the right of fāʾ.

This alif may be preceded by one or two letters.

The traces before lām cannot belong to an initial qāf alone. They may belong to a fāʾ and a qāf (in which case the word would be *fa-qālat*), or to a qāf and an alif (in which case the word would be *gālaṭ*, spelled with alif).

There is a small chance that the dash above the first tooth is a smudge rather than a consonant-distinguishing mark.

Traces of a final gāʾ are visible immediately after lām. It is not clear if the scribe wrote *ʿalayya* and changed it to *ʿalayhi* or the other way around.
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There are traces in the middle of this part that might belong to a lām. There is also a long horizontal line with some traces above it – the line and the traces match a final kāf. The word may be malak.

It is not clear if sīn is preceded by a letter or not.

There are no traces of a fā’ before the initial lām, and there is little free space before lām.

This word might be bi-dhibi.

The missing part has enough room for three words. Therefore, the putative lām preceding this part probably belongs to the verb ja‘alānī from verse 30 (not the one in verse 31). If we take the barely visible letters preceding this lām to belong to the word al-kitāb, then it seems there is enough room between this hypothetical al-kitāb and wa-ja‘alānī for another word. The text might have wa-‘l-hikma after al-kitāb.

Considering the presence of kāna, it is possible that the text has kāna l-nāsū in addition to the standard text. Ubayy b. Ka‘b’s codex reportedly had this phrase (al- Khaṭīb, Mu‘jam, 5:366).

229) There are traces in the middle of this part that might belong to a lām. There is also a long horizontal line with some traces above it – the line and the traces match a final kāf. The word may be malak.

230) It is not clear if sīn is preceded by a letter or not.

231) There are no traces of a fā’ before the initial lām, and there is little free space before lām.

232) This word might be bi-dhibi.

233) The missing part has enough room for three words. Therefore, the putative lām preceding this part probably belongs to the verb ja‘alānī from verse 30 (not the one in verse 31). If we take the barely visible letters preceding this lām to belong to the word al-kitāb, then it seems there is enough room between this hypothetical al-kitāb and wa-ja‘alānī for another word. The text might have wa-‘l-hikma after al-kitāb.

234) Considering the presence of kāna, it is possible that the text has kāna l-nāsū in addition to the standard text. Ubayy b. Ka‘b’s codex reportedly had this phrase (al- Khaṭīb, Mu‘jam, 5:366).
This line has more room than needed for the corresponding standard text. Also, the traces do not match that text.

The word in the preceding illegible part may be *bashsharnāku*.

239. This line has more room than needed for the corresponding standard text. Also, the traces do not match that text.

238. This illegible part seems longer than needed for the standard text. Traces of a horizontal line, visible at the beginning of this part (and even before it, beneath *la 'in*), might belong to a final *yā*; yet the corresponding standard text does not feature a final *yā*.

237. The traces conform to ا as well.

236. If this letter is *wa*-, then perhaps the sentence preceding it is not interrogative. It might be *yā Ibrāhimu anta riğhibu 'an alīha*.

235. It is possible that the letter preceding it is *la*; yet the corresponding standard text does not feature a final *la*.

234. If this letter is *aw*-, it might be an interrogative: *lā yā Ibrāhimu*.

233. If this letter is *la*-, it might be an interrogative: *lā yā Ibrāhimu*.

232. If this letter is *wa*-, it might be an interrogative: *wā Ibrāhimu*.

231. If this letter is *la*-, it might be an interrogative: *lā Ibrāhimu*.
of verse marker for approximately two words.

243) The traces do not match either rasūlan or nabīyyan. Also, the missing and illegible parts together have more room than is needed for the phrase wa-kāna rasūlan nabīyyan.

244) There is no trace of an end-of-verse marker after alif, and the proximity of alif with the following letter suggests that perhaps there is no such marker here.

245) Some of the traces are consistent with 'aliyyan.

246) This word may be bi-l-qābyb.

247) The letter before the tooth may be mīm. The word may be mun'imīn, or, less likely, muttaki 'īn.

248) The letter after the alif suggests that perhaps there is no such marker here.

249) Some of the traces are consistent with 'aliyyan.

250) This word may be bi-l-qābyb.

Folio 23 B (Q 19.57–19.60)
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240) There is enough room between kāna (on the previous line) and the end-of-verse marker for approximately two words.

241) If the first word of the verse is ʿinnā, the following word could be a verb the object of which is Moses.

242) The text does not seem to have qarrabnūtu nabīyyan. There might be another phrase in its stead, for which see the previous footnote.

243) The traces do not match either rasūlan or nabīyyan. Also, the missing and illegible parts together have more room than is needed for the phrase wa-kāna rasūlan nabīyyan.

244) There is no trace of an end-of-verse marker after alif, and the proximity of alif with the following letter suggests that perhaps there is no such marker here.

245) Some of the traces are consistent with 'aliyyan.

246) This word may be bi-l-qābyb.

247) The letter before the tooth may be mīm. The word may be mun'imīn, or, less likely, muttaki 'īn.

248) The letter after the alif suggests that perhaps there is no such marker here.

249) Some of the traces are consistent with 'aliyyan.

250) This word may be bi-l-qābyb.
conformance to the rhyme,
or Khaṭīb grapheme probably form a single word,
pour out from every sect of them the most obstinate ones in rebellion against
may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter wāw;
 Ibn Mujāhid said that this word was not known to him at
The presence of two teeth before
The traces after the tooth do not quite match
This letter may be mīm instead.
There are traces above the line after the initial hāʾ that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter thāʾ.
The traces after the tooth do not quite match ۡiated they may belong to the grapheme ۡiated This word may thus be la-nufrighanna, yielding, “We shall surely pour out from every sect of them the most obstinate ones in rebellion against the Beneficient.”
The last grapheme does not seem to be an independent predicate. Therefore, the šadd preceding it probably is not conjunctive. The šadd and the following grapheme probably form a single word, wasliyyan or, less likely due to lesser conformance to the rhyme, wisaliyyan. It is noteworthy that the corresponding word in the standard text puzzled the readers, who read it variously as siliyyan, saliyyan or suliyyan. Ibn Mujāhid said that this word was not known to him at all (al-Khaṭīb, Muṭjamah, 5.384).

The presence of two teeth before nūn instead of one is a scribal error.
There is not enough room after lām for the word al-ṣālimin. Considering the remaining traces, the word here may be al-kuffār.

In the middle of the illegible part, there are traces above the line that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter tāʾ.
Folio 7 A (Q 22.15–22.26)

\[
\{ \text{ن لنصر} [\text{ا} (\text{الله} في [\text{ا}]} \} \quad 1
\]

\[
\text{ما} \quad 2
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 3
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 4
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 5
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 6
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 7
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 8
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 9
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 10
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 11
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 12
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 13
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 14
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 15
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 16
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 17
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 18
\]

\[
\text{م} \quad 19
\]

---

255) This word may be diswihim.
256) This word may be tarawiyuwarw.
257) The last letter may be dâl or bâ'. The word may be yukhbitu. Alternatively, it is possible that the scribe mistakenly wrote instead of سدح.
258) This word may be al-shajjar.
259) Considering the visible words on lines 8, 9, and 10, the missing part on this line may contain the nouns al-nujûm and al-dawâb as well as an additional item.
260) The traces here match an isolated râ', but could also represent the beginning of an isolated bâ'.
261) The text may be fa-lâ muârima lâhu instead of fa-mâ lâhu min muârimin.
262) There are traces after râ' that might belong to a wâw.
263) The text may be idâb hammâ instead of the standard kullamâ arâdû.
264) There are greenish traces here that may belong to an isolated wâw or râ'.
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النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: "لا ترجعوا إلى=target. 1
أنتم بخير، لأن الأذن تبكر، ولا يذكروا الله في أوقاتهم، وربمما أن يبكيهم يومئذ مما قد باقيون."

الجواب:

(269) Considering the words on lines 2–5, the text may be

(268) This word may be

(267) The letter preceding

(266) The hole in the parchment in front of

(265) The text may have

(264) The lower hand avoided it.

(263) ٍ而非 a scribal error.

(262) ٍ而非 a scribal error.

(261) ٍ而非 a scribal error.

(260) The text may have wa-ṣuddt instead of wa-yaṣuddtina.

(259) The hole in the parchment in front of wea- seems to have been there already, because the lower hand avoided it.

(258) The letter preceding nān may be mīm or 'ayn.

(257) This word may be ma’dūdāt.

(256) Considering the words on lines 2–5, the text may be wa-li-yaṣhadū

manāfi'a lahun fī ayāmin ma’dūdātūn wa-li-yadkurū sma lâhi 'alā mā razaqahum min bahimati l-an'mi wa-li-yaf'ulū minib wa-li-yu'finū l-bâ'isa l-faqîra.

(255) This word may be yâkhīrū.

(254) The presence of nān instead of yâ' might be a scribal error.
The area after 275) The word following may be connected to the previous letter , in which case the word would be fa-arsalū instead of wa-arsalū.

274) This word is probably a scribal error.

273) The word following seems damaged.

272) The text here may be mansakan hum nāsikūhu.

271) The word following ummatan may be nāhidatun.

270) This word is probably sawāfīna (pl. of sawīna). Alternatively, it may be sawāfīna sawāfīyan sawāfīya sawāfīya sawāfī, or a scribal error for sawāfīya or sawāfī sawāfī. See al-Khāṭīb, al-Mujām, 6.115–7.

269) The absence of nūn is probably a scribal error.

268) The area after 267) The text here seems to be yuqūțilūna fi sabīlī illāhi.

267) The alif might be connected to the previous letter, in which case the word would be wa-arsalū instead of fa-arsalū.
Folio 31 B (Q 12.17–12.31)

{ / / / } 1
{ ) ) ( )  / / / /  } 2
{ ) ( ) ( ) / / / } 3
{ ) ( ) ( )  / / / / / /  } 4
{ ) ( ) ( )  / / / / / /  } 5
{ ) ( ) ( )  / / / / / /  } 6
{ ) ( ) ( )  / / / / / /  } 7
{ / / / / / /  } 8
{ / / / / / /  } 9

Folio 32 A (Q 12.111 – 18.1–5)

{ / / / / / / } 1
{ ) / / / / / /  } 2
{ ) ( ) ( )  / / / / / /  } 3
{ ) ( ) ( )  / / / / / /  } 4
{ ) ( ) ( )  / / / / / /  } 5
{ ) ( ) ( )  / / / / / /  } 6
{ ) ( ) ( )  / / / / / /  } 7

279) The space between al-madīna in the previous line and qad in the present line is too small for the corresponding standard text. Perhaps the phrase turāwidu fatāhā ʽan nafsihi is absent.

280) In addition to the traces that may belong to the word ḥubb, there is a small horizontal line slightly above the line, near the end of the word. The function of this line is not clear. It may belong to a letter initially written but subsequently erased.

281) The text might have tafsīl al-kitābi instead of tafsīla kulli shay'in.

282) The initial mīm does not seem to be preceded by a tooth.

283) The text might have tafsīl al-kitābi instead of tafsīl al-kitābi.

284) The first letter in this illegible area might be an initial ʿayn, and the last letter may be alif. The text may be ʿamilū instead of yaʿmalūna.
Folio 32 B (Q 18.15–18.18)

---

287) The space available between *li-yundhira* from the previous line and the present point is too small for the corresponding standard text. The phrase *mi laahun bihi min ilmin wa-lā li-ābā'ihim* may be missing.

288) If the preceding *alif* belongs to the word *kadhiban*, it should be noted that there is no trace of an end-of-verse marker after *alif*, which is very close to the letter that follows it.

289) The particle *illā* is missing before *allāh*. Perhaps the text has *min dāni ilāhi* instead of *illā ilāhā*.

290) Pale traces of two other letters are visible here: a *dāl* (after *wāw*), an *alif* (immediately before *dāl*). Perhaps the scribe initially wrote ¹ ² here, forgetting the initial *alif* of *idhā*, but realized his mistake, deleted these two letters and wrote *idhā* again.

291) The text seems to have *min dānihi* in addition to the standard text.
If the visible mīm is part of the word al-qiyāma, it is rather distant from the lām of the article.

The putative wāw and qāf do not seem to be connected. Therefore, this word might be something other than tushāqqūna.

The traces here do not quite match fīhim.

The traces in the illegible part are compatible with al-hudā.

The traces at the beginning of this illegible part match the grapheme ﻟﺴﻮ better than ﯽﻟﺤﺮ.

This putative mīm might belong to the word al-ʽadhāb. Considering the traces in the previous line, the text after al-ʼilm may be inna l-su‘a wa-l-ʻadhāba l-yawma ʿalā l-kafirīna.

Considering the initial tooth and the other traces, the text might have yulqūna instead of the standard fa-alqawū.

The illegible space before alif is rather large for the grapheme ﺱﻮ. However, the illegible space before alif is rather large for the grapheme ﺱﻮ.

The illegible space is small, suggesting this word may be fa-bi’sa instead of fa-la-bi’sa.

The available space here is rather small for li-lladhīna.
There does not seem to be a definite article before the tooth preceding this part, and there is not sufficient space there for an article.
ṣād
end of this part resemble a final
part, the text may be
written. Perhaps the scribe first wrote
fī sabīli llāhi, which would require this letter to be
fī umamin, instead of
wa-li-yālamanna.
fa-l-yasīrū
hājarū
or
wāw. However, the traces following it suggest
yakhtalifūna fīhi. Perhaps the scribe first wrote jāhadū but then changed it to
hājārū.
fā' or fā'. However, the traces following it suggest
this text here is fi sabīli llāhi, which would require this letter to be fā'.
mubawwa'ān.
the illegible part seems to begin with a tooth. However, the tooth-shaped traces may also be part of a letter such as sād or kāf. The traces at the end of this part resemble a final nūn, but can also be part of a final shīn or sadīdū.
This phrase may be la-mubawwa'ākum or la-mathwākum fi l-ākhivatī
khayrūn.
Ruhmā.

318) Perhaps fi umamān is followed by min qablīkum.
319) There does not seem to be more than two teeth between hā' and the putative wāw.
320) This word may be fa-l-yāsīrū.
321) There is no trace of an alif after wād, and there is not quite enough room for it.
322) Considering the alif at the end of the previous line and the traces in this part, the text may be ikhtalafā fihi instead of yakhtalifūna fihi.
323) This word may be wa-li-yālammānā.
324) This verse does not seem to begin with a wāw.
325) Traces of an initial hā' jīm are visible exactly where the initial hā' is written. Perhaps the scribe first wrote jāhadū but then changed it to hājārū.
326) This letter may be wāw or fā'. However, the traces following it suggest the text here is fi sabīli llāhi, which would require this letter to be fā'.
327) This word may be mubawwa'ān.
The traces match ʿalayka better than the standard ilayka.

This word may be gamkuruša.

This word may be ya tiyaa-na-kun.

This word may be yusibahum.

The traces following the tooth are more similar to ḥāʾ than kāf.

Considering the space available at the end of the previous line and beginning of this line, the text may be a-lam yarawat taraw.

This word may be bi-l-ghudawwi, and the next word may be wa-l-āsāli.

Considering the following words, the beginning of the verse may be wa-kulā.

Considering the context, the phrase li-llāḥi wea-lā might be written between ʿalayka and the putative yastakhbirūn.

The initial lām and the putative hāʾ seem to be separated by a letter, possibly a tooth representing the long vowel ā.

Perhaps the scribe wanted to write innamā anā ʿalāku, but mistakenly wrote hawaa before anā.

The traces might be yaraw at the beginning of this line.
The traces match ʽan mā as well.

This word may be khizy.

This word may be immā, in which case the text may have immā yumsikuhu instead of a-yumsikuhu.

The meagerness of the text makes it difficult to rule out that it belongs to a different part of the Qurʾān.

The text may have al-baṣar instead of the standard al-abṣār.

Traces of a lām are also visible at the beginning of this grapheme. Perhaps the scribe made a mistake and corrected it later.
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Folio 9 B (Q 33.57–33.72)

351) The text may be wa-lā būyi, with the hamzat al-wasāl having been dropped and the hamza at the end turned into yā'. Softening (tashīl) is reported for the hamza at the end of the instance of abnā' that is followed by ikhwānī-binna (al-Khaṭīb, Mu'jam, 7:311). Alternatively, maybe the scribe wanted to write banī, which is also a plural of ibn, but made a mistake and wrote alif before yā'.
352) The final nūn is not separate from the previous letters, suggesting that this word is al-muṣāfiqin, which would be grammatically incorrect.
353) This is an error of the hand generated by the assimilation of a nearby term.
Folio 25 B (Q 39.42–39.47)

354) The text may have kadhālika najzī l-muḥsinīna instead of dhālika jazā’u l-muḥsinīna.

355) The letter before mīm might be hā’ instead, in which case this grapheme may be part of the word yajziyahum.
Folio 26 A (Q 39.51–39.70)

356) Considering this letter and the length of the physically missing part of line 2, the text may be *wa-lāhū* instead of *a-wa-lam ya'lamū anna lāhā*.

357) The first tooth is preceded by a letter that might be *sīn*. The word may be *fa-nasītahā*.

358) The text seems to have *fīhimā* instead of *fī l-samāwāti wa-l-ardī*.
The text may have ʿūtiyat instead of wuffiyat. Cf. Q 32.13.

The text may have al-nāri instead of Jahannama.

Considering the traces and the amount of space, there may be yundhi-rūnakum ʿadhāba rabbikum instead of the standard text between minkum and qālū.

The last letter in this illegible part may be alif or lām. The text after al-janna might be zumaran hattā ʾidhā jāʿābā wa-qāla lakum khazonatuhā adkhulūhā salāmun ʿalaykum ʿībtam fīhā khālidīn.

359) The text may have ʿūtiyat instead of wuffiyat. Cf. Q 32.13.
360) The text may have al-nāri instead of Jahannama.
361) Considering the traces and the amount of space, there may be yundhi-rūnakum ʿadhāba rabbikum instead of the standard text between minkum and qālū.
362) The last letter in this illegible part may be alif or lām. The text after al-janna might be zumaran hattā ʾidhā jāʿābā wa-qāla lakum khazonatuhā adkhulūhā salāmun ʿībtam fīhā khālidīn.
\( \text{Folio 15 A (Q 20.23} - \text{20.61)} \)

\[
\text{...}
\]

\( \text{\footnote{363} The missing part on line 22 has much more space than is needed for al-baqq and fa-akhdadhthum.} \)

\( \text{\footnote{364} The missing part on line 25 is rather small for the standard text between wa-man and li-llandhiwā. Perhaps the phrase wa-yu'minūna bihi is absent.} \)

\( \text{\footnote{365} The text may have li-man fī l-ardī instead of li-llandhiwā āmanū.} \)

\( \text{\footnote{366} Perhaps the text is kāy nuriyaka instead of li-nuriyaka.} \)

\( \text{\footnote{367} The first letter in the illegible part may be sād/dād or kāf. The last letter may be bā' tartā/thā'.} \)

\( \text{\footnote{368} This word may be tāratan.} \)

\( \text{\footnote{369} The text seems to have lanā instead of the standard lī.} \)
There seems to be some confusion in the transcription. The text might have ki̇na instead of idh.

This word might be tatavea'īn.

This word might be fa-radadu'ūka.

The last letter in this part may be mīm.

This word might be bi-'ayūtīnā.

The text is probably wa-an instead of wa an.

The last letter in this part might be kāf.

The text might have ilayka an arsīl instead of fa-arsīl.

The text seems to have fa-mā instead of fa-man.

This gā'ī may belong to fi (verse 52).

The text may have arsala instead of anzala.

There seems to be fa-akhirra'ī instead of fa-akhirra'īnā.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Arabic Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>مَّن لَّهُ جَنَّةٌ فَلَيْيَنَّ</td>
<td>He who has paradise, let him take it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>سَيْقَانُ الْكَافِرِينَ مِنْهُ</td>
<td>The disbelievers shall have the recompense of the Fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>الْمُشْرِكُونَ مِنْهُ عَاطِرُ</td>
<td>The innovators have been away from it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>مَّن قَالَ حَلَّوَتِي الْقُرْآنَ</td>
<td>He who says, “I have had the Qur’an explained.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

382 This word may be a-ataytanā.
383 This part may contain bi-siḥrika.
384 The last letter in this part may be kāf.
385 The text may be yā wayyakum.
386 The text may have ifkan instead of the standard kadhiban.
387 This word may be siḥrikim.
388 Considering the amount of space, the word khifah may be missing.
389 This word may be āmilī.
390 This word might be innahu. See the parallels in Q 6.21, 6.135, 10.17, 23.117, 28.37, and 30.45.
391 The text may be fa-alqā mā ma’āhū.
392 The scribe has copied qāla twice.
also, the phrase fa-awḥaynā instead of wa-laqad awḥaynā.

397 Considering the traces, the text might have ihbiṭū minhā jamīʻan instead of ihbiṭū minhā ajmaʻīn. Also, the phrase ba’dal-kum li-ba‘ilin ‘aduwwan is either missing or precedes the putative ihbiṭū.
wa-hādhā kitābun anzalnā ʽalākum.

(5.2 and 58.9).

wa-hādhā kitābun anzalnā ʽalakyum.
would have interfered with the previous line. It is less certain what the modifier wished to turn this word into. In light of the addition of a tooth before the initial م, the first guess would be bi-mu’minūn. But the greenish traces that follow the second mīm conform to another бěз better than they do to س. Perhaps the modifier conflated the first mīm with wāw (due to not seeing the wāw that follows it), and tried to make the remaining legible traces conform to the word tu’minūn.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{404}}\] No text seems to be written before the present point, as writing here would have interfered with the previous line.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{405}}\] This tooth looks like an insertion. Also, the grapheme seems to have been added after the mīm that follows م. These additions have the same thickness and curvature as the usual script, but have a dark greenish hue. The word looks like an insertion. Also, the grapheme looks like an insertion. It is less certain what the modifier wished to turn this word into. In light of the addition of a tooth before the initial م, the first guess would be bi-mu’minūn. But the greenish traces that follow the second mīm conform to another бěз better than they do to س. Perhaps the modifier conflated the first mīm with wāw (due to not seeing the wāw that follows it), and tried to make the remaining legible traces conform to the word tu’minūn.
would be

The traces here do not quite conform to the grapheme

This alif has a dark green hue like the tooth at the beginning of line 7.

The traces here could also represent four teeth, in which case the word

The traces here do not quite conform to the grapheme

The missing and illegible parts together can accommodate no more than

Therefore, minhum is probably missing.

This alif might be the last letter of bi-l-shuhadā', although the illegible

The traces here would be

The traces match both innī and innanī.

The traces here could also represent four teeth, in which case the word

would be insān.

The missing and illegible parts together can accommodate no more than

four letters. Therefore, minhum is probably missing.

This alif might be the last letter of bi-l-shuhadā', although the illegible

part preceding it seems rather small for the grapheme

The traces here do not quite conform to the grapheme

they are closer to

Behnam Sadeghi and Mohsen Goudarzi
There might be another tooth before this nūn, in which case the word would be li-yatabayyana.

413 This word could be gaqdhifūna.

414 There is enough room in the illegible area before dāl for two letters. The word may be al-mutasaddiqāti.

415 The pale traces in the illegible part preceding mīn are more likely to belong to two graphemes than one. Specifically, they might belong to الله.

416 This word may be ajr.
and wrote تدحؤو إسنا إلإا سمعبا على اهلها)و نسند(سند 1

417) The use of the masculine pronoun here is a scribal error.

418) The traces preceding the putative مين do not quite conform to

419) The traces after the tooth match a medial  ); better than a medial ‘ayn. Perhaps the scribe made a mistake and wrote  Kahā here.

420) There is probably one letter between the first لام and تاء, because they are not very close to each other. The second illegible part contains one letter which can be  فاء or  غين or any of the tooth-shaped letters. Maybe the scribe wanted to write  al-tifl, but conflated it with  al-wildān, writing an extra  ال. The gap between the first لام and تاء may also be explained by this scenario: the scribe first wrote a  دال (belonging to  al-wildān) after this لام but then erased it and wrote  تاء slightly after this  دال.

421) The  نين seems to be connected to a letter before it, and the traces before  نين conform to  سند better than to  مين.

422) The text here might be  ba’dhukum ba’dan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The traces before rā’ match ۜしたもの better than ۤしたもの.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The last letter looks more like a final bā’/tā’/thā’ than a final fā’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It seems that the scribe forgot to write this rā’ initially, as it is written slightly above the line, in the small space available between the last letter of ghafr and the ۗ of rakīm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There are three small marks above the mīm, arranged vertically on top of one another. They resemble the dashes used for distinguishing consonants or separating verses. The lowest dash overlaps with mīm. Their function is not clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>This word appears to have been written at first, as the horizontal traces of a final ۤ are visible beneath the initial tooth and ۤ. However, the word was modified to ۤ by adding a tooth and ۤ at its end. These modifications appear greenish, similar to those seen in other folios (e.g., folio 10.A, line 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The traces match ۰ً ۰ً ۰ً better than ۵ّ۵.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The text may have

...
Folio 33 Verso (Q 34.23–34.33)

437) The text seems to have *fi shakkin minhā instead of minhā fi shakkin.

438) The text might have *wa-lladhīna yad‘ana‘adūna instead of qul id‘ū lladhīna za‘amūn.

439) The text might be *wa-innā wa-igyākum la-immā ‘alā kudūn.

440) This word may be *raebūnā.

441) Considering the amount of space before this word, the phrase *thumma yuqṭaḥu baynaanā may be missing.

442) A small dash above the tooth means that perhaps tāʾ is pointed.

443) The traces before *mīn match ƙ better than ƙ.

444) This word may be *yaḥṣukrāna or yatafakkārāna.

445) The first letter in the preceding illegible part may be *wāw or fā’/qāf. This word may be *wa-qīla or fa-qīla.
Folio 34 Recto (Q 34.40–34.47)

446) There is a small chance that the letter preceding dāl is ʿayn. The illegible part preceding mīm may contain one or two letters. There are also traces there above the line that resemble lām. Perhaps the scribe added lakum to the text later.

447) The traces match لطلمس better than ںطلمس.

448) The text may have yulqī baʿḍuhum.

449) The letter before dād may be ʿayn. It seems that the scribe made a mistake and wrote ʿayn before dād instead of after it.

450) The presence of this alif suggests that the text is different from the standard reading.

451) This grapheme may belong to aḥāʿulāʾī.
Folio 34 Verso (Q 13.1–13.5)

\[\text{\textbullet~452\textbullet~} \] Considering the traces on the neighbouring lines, this instance of kafarū does not seem to belong to verse 43. Maybe verse 44 features alladhīna kafarū.

\[\text{\textbullet~453\textbullet~} \] It is not clear if this mīm is initial, medial, final, or isolated.

\[\text{\textbullet~454\textbullet~} \] The text may have fa-amlaytu li-lladhīna kadhdhabū/kafarū in addition to the standard reading.

\[\text{\textbullet~455\textbullet~} \] The traces before alif match better than māx更好地 than māx.

\[\text{\textbullet~456\textbullet~} \] Nothing is written before this point, since writing here would have interfered with the previous line.

\[\text{\textbullet~457\textbullet~} \] Considering the legible words, the text might have wa-ja‘āla fihā min kullī l-thamarāti wa-ambata/wa-ja‘āla fihā min kullī zavejānī thalātah instead of the standard text between al-nahār and yughshī.

\[\text{\textbullet~458\textbullet~} \] The phrase wa-jannātun min a‘nābin might follow wa-zar‘un rather than precede it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio 35 Recto (Q 13.6–13.14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{                     } 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

459) This word may be *mitnā*.

460) Assuming that the visible letters on line 2 belong to *al-ţiqāb* (verse 6), the letters on the present line cannot belong to *kafārū*, which is only two words away, unless *kafārū* appears in a different place than it does in the standard text. Also, lines 2 and 3 have less room than expected for the text between *al-ţiqāb* and *taghīḍ* (verse 8).

461) Considering the traces on the next line, the text following *mu‘aqqibāt* may be *min khalfihi wa-min bayni yadayhi* or even a longer phrase such as *min khalfihi wa-raqībun min bayni yadayhi*, which is reported for Ibn ‘Abbās (al-Khaṭīb, *Mu‘jam*, 4:394).

462) The text may have *yarqūbūnahu* instead of *yaḥfaẓūnahu*.

463) The following missing part is rather small for the standard text between *bi-qawmin* and *min wālin*.!
Folio 35 Verso (Q 13.16–13.21)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Folio 36 Recto (Q 13.25–13.31)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\text{ٮـل} & \text{(ٮـل)} \\
\end{align*}
\]
The missing and illegible areas before this word are much larger than is needed for qad khalat min.

Assuming that the grapheme near the end of the previous line is lā, the visible mīm here might belong to tuṣībuhum or bi-mā. However, the space between the putative lā and the present point is too small for the standard text between lā and tuṣībuhum. Perhaps the text has ẓalamū (which features mīm) instead of kafarū, a reading reported for Ibn Masʿūd and Mujāhid (al-Khaṭīb, Muʿjam, 4:427).

Assuming that the putative fā at the end of line 2 belongs to fa-mā, the missing parts at the end of line 2 and beginning of line 3 have much more space than is needed for the remainder of verse 33.

The text might have ukuluhā wa-ẓilluhā dāʾīmūn.
The traces here might belong to an alif, in which case the text may have ātūtū instead of ātaynāhum.

The additional text may begin with kullun yadʽū ilā janbihi/jānibihi.

The traces before hāʼ do not quite match lām instead of bā’. Specifically, the letter before hāʼ may be lām instead of bā’.

The horizontal line between lām and the tooth is darker than the other letters.
Behnam Sadeghi and Mohsen Goudarzi

Folio 16 Recto (Q 28.30–28.35)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Folio 28 Recto (Q 37.15–37.33)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\text{\text{}} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

475) This word may be qamīṣika.
476) The text may have muḥḍarūn instead of yanẓurūn.
477) This word may be ibʽathū.
478) The space between the putative nūn and mīm is rather small for the two-column verse separator symbols used in this folio.
which is reported for Ibn Masʿūd (al-Khaṭīb 479). This word may be tanāṣarūn (with the alif spelled) or tatanāṣarūn, which is reported for Ibn Masʿūd (al-Khaṭīb, Muʿjam, 8:20).
Considering the amount of space before the putative dāl, the text may have kadhalika instead of innā kadhalika.
It is not clear if a tooth precedes the initial ḥāʾ. Perhaps the scribe first wrote ʾfāʾ but then changed it to fīḥī.

A horizontal line is visible beneath fāʾ and the tooth. The traces here match al-qurʾān better than al-dhikr.
The traces before ُهَ do not quite match an initial ُمَمَ followed by a tooth. They match one ُمِمَ, or two teeth, or َلَمَ and a tooth.

It is not clear if this ُلِلَف* is connected to a letter before it or not.

It seems the scribe initially forgot to write ُلَلَاف* here, since it is written slightly above the line, in the small space available between ُسِرَّات* and ُمُسْتَقِيم.

The letter ُنَن* may be pointed, as there is a small dash inside it.

This word may be ُمِنْحَم, in which case the sentence would be awkward, or ُلَلَاف* in which case this would be a serical error, since ُلَلَاف* appears again after ُلَاث*.

This word may be ُسَبِيل*.

The shape of this ُلِلَف* suggests it is not part of a ُلَاف* Perhaps the text has ُلَا here.
The letter *nūn* is rather pale except its base. Maybe the scribe erased it.

It seems the scribe initially wrote *wāw* at the end of this grapheme, but changed it to *rāʾ* later.

There is no trace of a tooth before *ḥāʾ*. This word may be *sukrīhim*, which is reported for al-ʼAmash here (al-Khaṭīb 498, 4577).

The letter *nūn* may be pointed, as there is a small dash above the tooth.

The text seems to have *nadhirun mubahin*.  

---

494. The letter *nūn* may be pointed, as there is a small dash above the tooth.

495. The final *alif* is rather pale except its base. Maybe the scribe erased it.

496. It seems the scribe initially wrote *wāw* at the end of this grapheme, but changed it to *rāʾ* later.

497. There is no trace of a tooth before *ḥāʾ*. This word may be *sukrīhim*, which is reported for al-ʼAmash here (al-Khaṭīb, Muḥajjam, 4:577).

498. The text seems to have *nadhirun mubahin*.  

---
Perhaps here the text has an additional phrase, such as beginning that might belong to an 
baynahumā, after wa-l-ardī. Perhaps the text has an additional phrase, such as wa-mā 
 baynahumā, after wa-l-ardī.

The distance between zā'ī and lām is rather long, but it is not clear if a letter is written between them.

\[1\) It is not clear whether the initial mīm is preceded by a tooth or not.

\[2\) It is not clear whether something is written here. There are traces at the beginning that might belong to an alif.

\[3\) This word may be ‘alā, in which case the word al-furqān is probably written after ‘abdihi.

\[4\) The missing part on this line is bigger than is needed for the phrase wa-l-ardī wa-lam. Perhaps the text has an additional phrase, such as wa-mā baynahumā, after wa-l-ardī.

\[5\) The phrase wa-lam yakun lahu sharikun fi l-mulki appears to be missing.

\[6\) This physically missing part would have had room for about three words. Perhaps here the text has yakhluqūna shay' an wa-lā.
Folio 19 A (Q 25.14–25.27)

{ ... (ال) ... } 1
{ ... (ال) ... } 2
{ ... يتم ... // ... } 3
{ ... عدم ... و ... // ... } 4
{ علم ... اصل ... } 5
{ ... علم ... و ... ل ... } 6
{ ... و ... } 7
{ ... كر ... وما ... وما ... } 8
{ ... لک صر ... } 9
{ ... ل کا ... } 10
{ ... و ... } 11
{ ... } 12

بصیر (لا) و ... فلم ... كر ... و ... لا س ... 13
{ ... } 14
{ ... } 15
{ ... } 16
{ ... } 17
{ ... } 18
{ ... } 19
{ ... } 20
{ ... } 21

507) The physically missing part of the previous line would have had room for about four words, hardly enough for the standard text before sarfan. Perhaps the phrase bi-mā taqūlūna is missing.
508) One can see a pale, horizontal line touching alif. Perhaps the scribe first wrote a final bā' here but then erased its tail and added an alif instead.
509) Considering the visible words, the physically missing part may have contained lā nasūr liqā' a lāki hattā, or lā nu'minu laka hattā.
510) There is no writing in this line before this point, perhaps since it would have interfered with the previous line.
The text seems to have *ya'malīḫ* instead of *ʿamīlū*.

The text might have *fa-aqīmū* *awjihakum* or *fa-aqīmīn* *awjihakum* (Ubayy b. Ka'b reportedly had *awjihakum* instead of *waṣṣīhakum* in Q 4.43 (al-Khaṭīb. *Majām*, 2:81)).

The phrase *an yaʿtiya* appears to be missing.

The text may have *fī l-bahr* in addition to the standard reading.

The text may have *huwā* instead of *allāhu*.

The text might have *fa-yabṣūṭuhu fī l-samā'i kisafan*. 

\[\text{Folio 24 Verso (Q 30.38–30.50)}\]

\[\text{\(\text{fa-yabṣūṭuhu fī l-samā'i kisafan.}\)}\]
This letter might belong to ālayhīm, in which case min qablihi would be missing.

The text may have anzalū ālayhīm instead of ālaynāhūm.

The text may have shakādīn instead of qālū nashkadū.

The text seems to have thumma zilādī kūfrān in addition to the standard reading.

This word may be fa-khdhrāḥān.
Moreover, there are traces at its beginning that might belong to an alif. There may be an aleph in addition to the standard text.

This word may be akkhartanā as in Q 4.77.

This word may be wa-akānā.

This word may be ya'ājā a.

The text might be wa-ākhārīna minhum min ba'dihim.
This word may be bi-ț-salātī.

This dāl is unusually long and therefore resembles an initial kāf.

The letters after mīm might be ۝.
pronoun (al-āmina, which is reported for Ubayy b. Ka'b here (al-Khatīb, Mu'jam, 10:432).

531) The traces match ۝ as well.

532) The word following ۝ may be a verb, the object of which could be the pronoun ۝ referring to al-insān. The penultimate letter of this word may be an initial bā', a medial 'ayn, or a tooth-shaped letter.

533) This letter may be fā' instead.

534) Perhaps no verse separator was written here, since there is not quite enough room for the type of two-column separator used in this folio.

535) This word may be al-āmina, which is reported for Ubayy b. Ka'b here (al-Khatīb, Mu'jam, 10:432).

536) It is not clear whether this alif is preceded by fa-.
Appendix 1: On the Lower Text

The following table identifies readings ascribed to the Companions and other authorities that match a non-standard reading in the lower text. The following abbreviations are used: MQ = al-Khaṭīb, Muʿjam al-Qirāʿāt; KM = Ibn Abī Dāwūd, Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyya, 2002); IM-A = the reading of Ibn Masʿūd according to the report of al-Aʿmāsh quoted in KM, 1:302–38.

In the cases of Q 2.96, 9.90, 19.24, and 90.1, the corresponding footnotes in the edited text explain how the lower text differs from the standard one. The variants in Q 2.217, 2.222, and 5.45 have been mentioned already in Fedeli, “Early Evidences,” 293–316.

---

Folio 17 Recto (−)

\{ \} 540(1)/ / \{ \}
\{ \}  / / ل\{ \}
\{ \}  \(\not{\text{لا}}\)\{ \}
\{ \}  \(\text{k} \) عفا\{ \}

Folio 17 Verso (−)

\{ \} 541(1)/ / \{ \}
\{ \} 542(1)/ (ساس)\{ \}
\{ \} 543(1)/ (حاء)\{ \}
\{ \} 544(1)/ (سم)\{ \}
\{ \} 545(1)/ (سم)\{ \}

---

\[539\] Due to the meager amount of text, we have not yet identified the passage.

\[540\] The letter before alif may be ḥāʾ or a tooth-shaped one.

\[541\] Either ʿayn and dāl are connected or a tooth-shaped letter is between them.

\[542\] This word may be bi-sulṭān or a conjugation of istaṭāʿa.

\[543\] It is not clear whether ḥāʾ and ūʿ are connected or not. This word may be habībat, aḥāṭat, aḥaṭtu, or khiṭāb, among other things.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sūra.</th>
<th>verse, Folio:line</th>
<th>Lower Text</th>
<th>Standard Text</th>
<th>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.98, 2B:6</td>
<td>مکال</td>
<td>Mikāla</td>
<td>Ibn Muhaysin: Mikayl (MQ, 1:160). This word has been read in many ways, but Ibn Muhaysin's reading is the only one compatible with the rasm in C-1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.105, 2B:26</td>
<td>او لمس</td>
<td>wa-lā l-mushrikūna</td>
<td>Al-A'mash: wa-lā l-mushrikūna (MQ, 1:169).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.222, David v:19</td>
<td>fa-ţazilū l-nisā'a fī mahīḍihinna wa-lā taqrabū-hunna ḥattā yataṭahharna</td>
<td>Ibn Masūd and Anas: wa-lā taqrabū l-nisā'a fī mahīḍihinna wa-ţazilū l-nisā'a fī l-mahīḍihinna wa-lā taqrabū l-nisā'a fī l-mahīḍihinna ḥattā yataṭahharna (MQ, 1:308–9).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.222, David v:20</td>
<td>yatharnā</td>
<td>The reading yataṭahharna is reported for Ibn Masūd, Anas, and Ubayy b. Ka'āb, while yattaḥharna is reported for Ḥamza, al-Kisā'ī, 'Āṣim (via Abū Bakr and al-Mufaḍḍal), al-A'mash, al-Jahdhari, Ibn Muhaysin, and Khalaf (MQ, 1:308).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.48, Bonh. v:4</td>
<td>shir'atan</td>
<td>An early Baṣran who apparently hat shari'atan in his own copy of the Qurʾān accused al-Hajjāj of having “changed” the Qurʾān and written the synonym shir'atan instead. On a discussion of the report about al-Hajjāj, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “Codex,”365, footnote 36; cf. MQ, 2:286.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūra.verse, Folio:line</td>
<td>Lower Text</td>
<td>Standard Text</td>
<td>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.54, 4B:12</td>
<td>علبط] a’izzatin</td>
<td>Ibn Mas‘ūd: ghulazā‘a; al-Māwardi: ghluţin (MQ, 2:294)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.21, 22B:17</td>
<td>ﻧوهو عاٌٍا kuwa</td>
<td>The reading wā-kuwa ‘alayya hayyinun is reported for al-Ḥasan al-_BUSRI for Q 19.9 (MQ, 5:344).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūra.verse, Folio:line</td>
<td>Lower Text</td>
<td>Standard Text</td>
<td>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.23, 7A:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | wa-l-
| | lu’lu’īn (MQ, 6:97). | |
| 22.35, 7B:18 | 
| | wa-l-
| | muqīmī l-
| | ṣalātī | al-Maʾṣūd, al-ʿAṭāʾ, Ibn ʿAbbās, Ibn ʿĀmir, Hishām: wa-l-
| | muqīmīna l-
| | ṣalātīa; wa-l-
| | muqīmīna l-
| | ṣalāti is also reported by al-ʿUkbarī (MQ, 6:113). | |
| 22.36, 7B:20 | 
| 22.39, 7B:28 | 
| | yuqāta-
| 18.16, 32B:2 | 
| | illā lāhā | Ibn Maṣʿūd: min dūnī lāhī, min dūnīā (MQ, 5:161). | |
| 16.37, 13A:10 | 
| | in taḥriṣ | Al-Nakhaʾī: wa-in taḥris (MQ, 4:627). | |
| 16.38, 13B:2 | 
| | wa-l-
| | ṣubūrī | Al-Ḥaḍhir: wa-l-
| | ṣubūrī (MQ, 4:630). | |
| 16.44, 13B:10 | 
| | wa-l-
| | ẓubūrī | The reading bi-l-
| | ẓubūrī instead of wa-l-
<p>| | ẓubūrī is reported in Q.3.184 for the codices of the Shām and the following readers: Ibn ʿAbbās, Ibn ʿĀmir, Ibn Dhakwān, Hishām, and al-Ḥulwāni (MQ, 1:638). | |
| 33.51, 9A:4 |
| 33.53, 9A:13 |
| | yastaḥyī | The majority have read yastaḥyī, which is compatible with the lower text’s spelling, and is considered a Hijāzī pronunciation (lugha), whereas Ibn Kathīr, Ibn Muḥaysin, Yaʿqūb and Mujāhid have read yastaḥī, which is considered a Tamīmī way of reading this word (MQ, 1:67; 7:310). | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sura.verse, Folio:line</th>
<th>Lower Text</th>
<th>Standard Text</th>
<th>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.67, 9B:18</td>
<td>Ibn Mas'ūd reportedly had the text here in verse 10 and the spell in verse 66 (MQ. 7:257). The following Kūfan and Baṣran readers also reportedly did not pronounce the final alif either in <em>waqf</em> or <em>waṣl</em> for verses 10, 66, and 67.</td>
<td>Ibn Mas'ūd reportedly had the text here, in verse 10 and the spell in verse 66 (MQ. 7:257).</td>
<td>Ibn Mas'ūd reportedly had the text here, in verse 10 and the spell in verse 66 (MQ. 7:257). IM-A: <em>al-rasūla</em> (KM, 1:330).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.128, 30B:8</td>
<td>// (َاوَا لَامْ مَعْ) / (َاوَا لَامْ مَعْ)</td>
<td>Ibn Mas'ūd: <em>a-weak yahdi</em> (MQ. 5:512).</td>
<td>Ibn Mas'ūd: <em>a-weak yahdi</em> (MQ. 5:512).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūra.verse, Folio:line</td>
<td>Lower Text</td>
<td>Standard Text</td>
<td>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.14, 33A:5</td>
<td>fa-lammā tabayyanati l-jinnu</td>
<td>Ibn Masʿūd reportedly had wa-kum yadʿabūna lahu ḥawlan in addition to the standard text. Al-Ṭabarī gives the following reading for Ibn Masʿūd: fa-makathū yadʿabūna lahu min baʿdi mawtihi ḥawlan kāmilan (Jāmiʿ al-bayān, 19:242). The following reading featuring ḥawlan is also reported for Ibn Masʿūd, Ibn ʿAbbās, and Ibn Shan-nabūdh: tabayyanati l-insu anna l-jinnu law kānū yaʿlamūna l-ghayba mā labithū ḥawlan (MQ. 7:350).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.24, 33B:3</td>
<td>wa-ɪnna aw iyyākum laʿalā hudan</td>
<td>Ubayy b. Kaʿb: wa-ɪnna aw iyyākum laʿalā hudan (MQ. 7:370–1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.56, 28B:8</td>
<td>la-turdīni</td>
<td>Ibn Masʿūd: la-turdīni (MQ. 8:31).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūra.verse, Folio:line</td>
<td>Lower Text</td>
<td>Standard Text</td>
<td>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.66, 18B: 24</td>
<td>wa-qaḍay- na ilaghi dhālika l-amra</td>
<td>Ibn Masʿūd wa-qaḍaynā ilaghi dhālika l-amra (MQ. 4:573).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wa-qaḍaynā laku inna dābira hāʾulāʾī maqtūʿun</td>
<td>(MQ. 4:573).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.72, 18B: 28</td>
<td>wa-qaḍaynā ilayhi dhālika l-amra</td>
<td>Ibn Masʿūd: wa-qaḍaynā ilayhi dhālika l-amra (MQ. 4:573).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wa-qulnā laku inna dābira hāʾulāʾī maqtūʿun</td>
<td>Al-ʾAʾmash: sukrihim (MQ, 4:577).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.43, 24B: 12</td>
<td>fa-aqīm wa-ajhaka</td>
<td>Ubayy b. Kaʿb reportedly had awjuhakum instead of wujhakum in Q 4.43 (MQ: 2.81).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.7, Chris. v:11</td>
<td>hattā min āyda</td>
<td>The phrase hattā min āyda appears in a report about the shaʾn al-nazūl of this verse, and is ascribed to Ibn Masʿūd and Zayd b. Arqam. Ibn Ḥajar questions the ascription to Ibn Masʿūd’s codex (MQ. 9:474–5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: On the Upper Text

At a number of points, the upper text differs with every codex described in the literary sources in adding or omitting a verse division. Its unique additions are as follows: Q 2.267 (tunfiqūna), 2.285 (wa-l-mu’minūna), 6.157 (yaṣdifūna), 32.22 (al-mujrimīna), 33.35 (wa-l-ṣābirīna). The last two endings might be scribal errors. Its unique omissions are as follows: Q 33.4, 55.44, 55.46, 55.47, 55.48, 56.41, 56.43. The four omissions in sūra 55 all occur in folio 33A, lines 17–8. These two lines are much more compact than usual and contain no visible verse endings. It seems the scribe initially forgot to write part of the text, and thus later deleted these two lines and rewrote the text compactly so as to make it fit. The verse endings may have been omitted to save space.

The following table gives the disputed verse divisions in the upper text based on the works by al-Dānī and Spitaler (for which see the Bibliography). When there are different reports about a city, Spitaler labels them (a), (b), (c), etc. We imitate him. We use the following abbreviations: Y = there is a verse division; N = there is no verse division; M = Medina; C = Mecca; K = Kūfa; B = Baṣra; D = Damascus; H = Ḥimṣ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disputed Verse Division</th>
<th>Cities like the Upper Text</th>
<th>Cities unlike the Upper Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.282 (wa-lā shakidun)</td>
<td>N, M, K, B, C (a), D, H</td>
<td>C (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 (al-‘aqīdī)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.66 (bi-wakilin)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.75 (fa-yakānu)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.161 (mustaqīmin)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 (ALM)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.33 (wa-l-nahāra)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.41 (Ibrāhīma)</td>
<td>Y, C, M2</td>
<td>K, B, M1, D, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.75 (maddan)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1 (TH)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.33 (kathīran)</td>
<td>Y, K, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.34 (kathīran)</td>
<td>Y, K, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.39 (fi-l-yammī)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, M2, D</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.39 (minī)</td>
<td>Y, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.40 (taḥzana)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, M2, H (a)</td>
<td>D, H (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.40 (mutūnān)</td>
<td>N, K, C, M1, M2</td>
<td>B, D, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.40 (madyana)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, M2, H (a)</td>
<td>D, H (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.41 (li-naṣī)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2</td>
<td>K, D, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.77 (Miṣā)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, M2, H (a, c)</td>
<td>D, H (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.78 (mā ghoshiya-hum)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.86 (asīfan)</td>
<td>Y, C, M1, H</td>
<td>K, B, M2, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.86 (ḥasana)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, D (a, b, c), H (a, c)</td>
<td>M2, D (d), H (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.87 (al-Sūmīriyya)</td>
<td>Y, K, B, C, M1, D (a, b), H (a, c)</td>
<td>M2, D (c, d), H (b, d, e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.88 (Miṣā)</td>
<td>N, K, B, M2, D, H</td>
<td>C, M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.88 (fa-naṣīya)</td>
<td>Y, K, B, M2, D, H</td>
<td>C, M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.89 (qawlan)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, D (a, d), H (a, e, v)</td>
<td>M2, D (b, e), H (b, d, e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.92 (dallū)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.95 (Sūmīriyya)</td>
<td>Y, K, B, C, M1, M2, D (a, c, d, H (a, e, v)</td>
<td>D (b) and H (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.106 (ṣaṣafan)</td>
<td>N, C, M1, M2</td>
<td>K, B, D, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.123 (hudan)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H (b)</td>
<td>K, H (a, c, e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The upper text has a number of unique skeletal-morphemic features. It has ﺣاﻟﺴﻨﺎﺗﮑﻢ instead of ﺭاﻟﺴﻨﺘ (Q 16.116), ﺣﻮاﻟﻤﻮﻋﺪﺗﯽ instead of ﻋﻮاﺪﯼ (Q 20.86), and ﺣﻮاﻟﺒﺜﻮا instead of ﻋﻮاﻟﺒﺜﻮا (Q 33.14). There are also a number of unique morphemic (pointing) features, such as ﻣﻮﻋﺪﺗﯽ in Q 42.11. There are also skeletal-morphemic features that match some cities but not others. These are given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disputed Verse Division</th>
<th>Cities like the Upper Text</th>
<th>Cities unlike the Upper Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.124 (d ankarr)</td>
<td>N K, B, C, M1, M2, D, H (e)</td>
<td>H (a, b, c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.66 (ya’durrakum)</td>
<td>N B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.29 (al-sabila)</td>
<td>Y C, M1, M2, H</td>
<td>K, B, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.7 (shadidun)</td>
<td>N K, C, M1, M2</td>
<td>B, D, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.35 (nârin)</td>
<td>N K, B, D, H</td>
<td>C, M1, M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.43 (al-mujrimûna)</td>
<td>N B</td>
<td>K, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.8 (fa-ashâbu l-maymanati)</td>
<td>Y B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.15 (maw’dînatin)</td>
<td>Y K, C, M1, M2, H (a)</td>
<td>B, D, H (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.18 (wa-abûriqa)</td>
<td>Y C, M2</td>
<td>K, B, M1, D, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.22 (ûnun)</td>
<td>N B, C, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K, M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.25 (ta khîman)</td>
<td>N C, M1</td>
<td>K, B, M2, D, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.27 (wa-ashâbu l-yamini)</td>
<td>Y B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K, M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.35 (inshâ’an)</td>
<td>Y K, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.47 (yaqülûna)</td>
<td>N K, B, M1, M2, D</td>
<td>C, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.48 (al-awa’ilûna)</td>
<td>Y K, B, C, M1, M2, D</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.49 (wa-l-âkhi’îna)</td>
<td>N M2, D, H</td>
<td>K, B, C, M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.50 (la-majmû’ûna)</td>
<td>N K, B, C, M1</td>
<td>M2, D, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputed Point</td>
<td>Upper Text</td>
<td>Cities like Upper Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>anjagtanā (الحنين)</td>
<td>All the other cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>tadhakkarūna (تنكر)</td>
<td>All the other cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>wa-nuzzila (ونزل)</td>
<td>All the other cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.68</td>
<td>yu'adai, but the final yā' looks like a later addition</td>
<td>Medina, Shām Kūfā, and maybe Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.18</td>
<td>an ta'tiyahum (إن تاتيهم)</td>
<td>Mecca, and maybe Kūfā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.78</td>
<td>dhī l-jalāli (دن الجلالة)</td>
<td>All the other cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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