

Şan‘ā’ 1 and the Origins of the Qur’ān

BEHNAM SADEGHI and MOHSEN GOUDARZI¹

Stanford University / Harvard University

Abstract

The lower text of Şan‘ā’ 1 is at present the most important document for the history of the Qur’ān. As the only known extant copy from a textual tradition beside the standard ‘Uthmānic 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 Qur’ān 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 Qur’ānic 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

¹) We are grateful to Christian Robin, the Noja Nosedá Foundation, and CNRS (UMR 8167, Orient et Méditerranée) for giving us their photographs and ultraviolet images of the DAM 01–27.1 folios. We thank Michael Cook, David Powers, Patricia Crone, and Ursula Dreiholz for reading the essay and providing valuable written comments. We thank Ursula Dreiholz for graciously agreeing to be interviewed by telephone, and Ursula Dreiholz, Lily Feidy, Sharif Kanaana, Sari Nusseibeh, Ghassan Abdullah, Lawrence Conrad, and Alexander Stille for patiently answering our questions by e-mail. We also thank the following persons for their help with various other aspects of the project: Uwe Bergmann, the anonymous owner of the Stanford 2007 folio, Mette Korsholm of the David Collection, Michael Cooperson, Devin Stewart, Robert Waltz, Scott Lucas, M.S.M. Saifullah, Sarah Kistler, Bryce Cronkite-Ratcliff, Robert Gregg, Burçak Keskin-Kozat, the staff at the Abbasi Program in Islamic Studies at Stanford University, Ceci Evangelista of the Office of Development at Stanford University, and the staff at Stanford University Libraries and the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory. This essay was submitted for publication on August 31, 2011.

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 Qur’ān 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 Qur’ān 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 ‘Uthmān (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 Qur’ān 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 ‘Uthmān. For example, in most cases it is not known whether the *ā* 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

² The Islamic scholarly tradition does not purport to have preserved the spelling of every word in the codices sent out by ‘Uthmān. Rather, Muslim tradition preserves the original ‘Uthmānic 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 ‘Uthmānic *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.³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵

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

⁴) For their works on the Qur’ān, see the Bibliography. For a brief discussion of Muḥaysin’s work, see Behnam SADEGHI, “Criteria for Emending the Text of the Qur’ān,” in *Law and Tradition in Classical Islamic Thought*, ed. Michael Cook, et al. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming, 2012). For a summary and discussion of Cook’s work, see SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 364, 367–9.

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.⁶ Nonetheless, it also goes without saying that any evidence that can potentially shed further light on early Islam will be of great interest to historians and may sway at least some of us.

The Qur’ān under study is one such piece of evidence. Ṣan‘ā’ 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 parchment 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 800,⁷ though one should not rashly generalize this figure since the frequency of palimpsesting varied greatly depending on time and place.⁸ Beside Ṣan‘ā’ 1, we know of several other Arabic palimpsests.⁹

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, religious, philosophical, or ideological movement.

⁷) Georges DECLERCQ, “Introduction: Codices Rescripti in the Early Medieval West in Early Medieval Palimpsests,” in *Early medieval palimpsests*, ed. Georges Declercq (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2007), 12.

⁸) DECLERCQ, “Introduction,” 11–13.

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: Johns Hopkins 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 languages: 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 Ṣan‘ā’ 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.¹⁰ All three metals are present in the inks of both layers of Ṣan‘ā’ 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 AD. 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 publications: Alphonse MINGANA and Agnes S. LEWIS, *Leaves from Three Ancient Qur’āns, Possibly Pre-‘Othmānic* (Cambridge: University Press, 1914); Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-A‘ZAMĪ, *The History of the Qur’ānic Text*, 2nd ed. (Riyadh: Azami Publishing House, 2008), 342–5; Alba FEDELI, “Early Evidences of Variant Readings in Qur’ānic Manuscripts,” in *Die dunklen Anfänge: Neue Forschungen zur Entstehung und frühen Geschichte des Islam*, ed. Karl-Heinz Ohlig et al. (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-A‘zamī 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 characterization 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-Makḥṭūṭāt in Ṣan‘ā’, all relatively late, and all represented by no more than a few pages apiece (Ursula Dreiholz, interview, July 30, 2011). 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.

¹⁰ Christoph KREKEL, “The Chemistry of Historical Iron Gall Inks,” *International Journal of Forensic Document Examiners* 5 (1999): 54–8.

though the lower ink has somewhat more copper and a much greater quantity of zinc than the upper one.¹¹

Both layers of writing are Qur’āns, and each layer appears to have once constituted a complete codex.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

¹¹) 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.

¹²) 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 Ḥijāzī script it modified. Cf. SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 357–8, especially footnote 12.

marked affinity for the schemes reported for the Ḥijāz, but not precisely enough to distinguish between Mecca and Medina.¹³

The lower Qurʾān is of enormous interest because it is so far the only manuscript that is known to be non-ʿUthmānic, 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.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 ʿUthmānic tradition must have diverged sometime before the spread of the ʿUthmānic tradition in the mid-seventh century AD. Therefore, comparing these two traditions opens a window onto the earliest phase of the Qurʾān'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 *sūras* prior to ʿUthmān'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%).¹⁵ This makes it significantly earlier than the few other Qurʾāns that have been radiocarbon-dated.¹⁶ The manuscript was not written long before the

¹³) See Appendix 2. This conclusion was reached previously based on an analysis of a more limited set of thirteen folios in SADEGHI and BERGMANN, "The Codex," 377–83.

¹⁴) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, "The Codex."

¹⁵) Radiocarbon dating was performed on a sample from the "Stanford 2007" folio. For the details, see SADEGHI and 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.

¹⁶) Yasin DUTTON, "An Umayyad Fragment of the Qurʾan and its Dating," *Journal of Qurʾanic Studies* 9.2 (2007): 57–87; Efim REZVAN, "On the Dating of an ʿUthmānic Qurʾān' from St. Petersburg," *Manuscripta Orientalia* 6.3 (2000): 19–22; Hans-Caspar Graf von BOTHMER, "Die Anfänge der Koranschreibung: Kodikologische und kunsthistorische Beobachtungen an den Koranfragmenten in Sanaa," *Magazin Forschung* (Universität des Saarlandes), 1 (1999): 45.

Prophet Muḥammad’s death in AD 632, since it contains the ninth *sūra*, which includes some of the last passages he disseminated.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 Şan‘ā’ī.¹⁸ It seems that the other ones in the collection, including the many others from the first century in the Ḥijāzī and Kūfī scripts, may all belong to the standard tradition.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 Ḥijāzī script, and therefore are probably from the

¹⁷) On the problems of the relative chronology and composition of the Qur’ān, see Behnam SADEGHI, “The Chronology of the Qur’ān: A Stylo-metric Research Program,” *Arabica* 58 (2011): 210–99. See that essay also for references to the works of Theodor Nöldeke and Mehdi Bazargan. For two different evaluations of Nöldeke’s efforts, see Nicolai SINAI, “The Qur’an as Process,” in *The Qur’ān in Context: Historical and Literary Investigations into the Qur’ānic Milieu*, ed. Angelika Neuwirth, Nicolai Sinai, and Michael Marx (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 407–40; and Emmanuelle STEFANIDIS, “The Qur’an Made Linear: A Study of the *Geschichte des Qur’āns*’ Chronological Reordering,” *Journal of Qur’anic Studies* 10.2 (2008): 1–22.

¹⁸) This paragraph and the next one on the project to preserve the manuscripts are based on the following sources: BOTHMER, “Die Anfänge der Koranschreibung,” 40–6; Ursula Dreibholz, telephone interview, July 30, 2011, and e-mails dated July 20, August 3, 4, 8, 10, and 27, 2011; Bothmer, telephone interview, August 26, 2011; Ursula DREIBHOLZ, “Preserving a Treasure: The Şan‘ā’ī Manuscripts,” *Museum International* (UNESCO, Paris), No. 203 (Vol. 51, No. 3, 1999): 21–5; Ursula DREIBHOLZ, “Treatment of Early Islamic Manuscript Fragments on Parchment,” in *The Conservation and Preservation of Islamic Manuscripts, Proceedings of the Third Conference of al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation*, ed. Yusuf Ibish et al. (London: al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation, 1417/1996), 131–45; Claudia BRETTAR, “UdS: Neues Zentrum für Koranforschung? Teil 1,” *Campus* 29.3 (July 1999), http://www.uni-saarland.de/verwalt/presse/campus/1999/3/20-UdS_neues_zentrum.html.

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-Makḥṭūṭāt 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 Şan‘ā’ī. The claim, however, is consistent with a few images published of other folios in the Ḥijāzī script.

first century AH (7th century and early 8th century AD).²⁰ All but eight of these twenty-two Ḥijāzī 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 Ṣan‘ā’ 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 Ṣan‘ā’ 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 Qur’ānic manuscripts, and directed the Yemeni staff in the same task. The manuscripts are located in the “House of Manuscripts,” the Dār al-Makḥṭūṭāt (DAM), in Ṣan‘ā’, 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 Qur’ānic manuscripts. Of the remaining 1500–2000 fragments, he microfilmed a group of 280. The microfilms are available in Ṣan‘ā’ 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

²⁰ Puin wrote that there are about 90 Ḥijāzī manuscripts (Gerd-Rüdiger PUIN, “Observations on Early Qur’ān Manuscripts in Ṣan‘ā’,” in *The Qur’ān 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 2000.²¹ 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 Şan‘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 Şan‘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.²² 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-‘Uthmānic status of the folios they examined.²³ 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).

²³) Sergio NOSEDA, “La Mia Visita a Sanaa e il Corano Palimpsesto,” *Istituto Lombardo (Rendiconti Lett.)* 137 (2003): 43–60; ANONYMOUS, “‘The Qur’an: Text, interpretation and translation’ 3rd Biannual SOAS Conference, October 16–17, 2003,” *Journal of Qur’anic Studies* 6.1 (2003): 143–5 (mentioning DUTTON’s paper, “Three Possibly pre-‘Uthmānic Folios of the Qur’ān”); FEDELI, “Early Evidences.”

an article in Italian that mentions the 01-27.1 folios.²⁴ An extended study by Behnam SADEGHI focused on history, the role of orality, and textual criticism.²⁵

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 Ṣan‘ā’ 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).²⁶ Her first essay (2008) mentioned the pictures taken “recently” by S. Noja NOSEDA and added that they might be published soon.²⁷ The transcriptions are positive contributions, though the articles are not free from errors.²⁸ In the third article (2010), she states views (not found in

²⁴) FEDELI, “Early Evidences.” For the contribution in Italian, see the Bibliography.

²⁵) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex.”

²⁶) Elisabeth Puin is an external lecturer in the Department of Evangelical Theology in Saarland University in Saarbrücken. Her publications are as follows: Elisabeth PUIN, “Ein früher Koranpalimpsest aus Ṣan‘ā’ (DAM 01–27.1),” in *Schlaglichter: Die beiden ersten islamischen Jahrhunderte*, ed. Markus Groß et al. (Berlin: Hans Schiler, 2008), 461–93; Elisabeth PUIN, “Ein früher Koranpalimpsest aus Ṣan‘ā’ (DAM 01–27.1) – Teil II,” in *Vom Koran zum Islam*, ed. Markus Groß et al. (Berlin: Hans Schiler, 2009), 523–81; Elisabeth PUIN, “Ein früher Koranpalimpsest aus Ṣan‘ā’ (DAM 01–27.1) – Teil III: Ein nicht-‘uṭmānischer Koran,” in *Die Entstehung einer Weltreligion I: Von der koranischen Bewegung zum Frühislam*, ed. Markus Groß et al. (Berlin: Hans Schiler, 2010), 233–305. These articles are not cited in SADEGHI and BERGMANN’s “Codex,” which was completed in 2008 and modified and submitted for publication in 2009 before the authors became aware of Elisabeth Puin’s 2008 essay.

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 Qur‘ān. 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 In‘ārah 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 ‘Uthmān. 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 ‘Uthmān” (“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-‘Uthmānic,” 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-‘Uthmānic,” preferring it to the oft-used “pre-‘Uthmānic.” In her third essay, E. PUIN says that the lower writing confirms the reality of the Companion codices, and likewise calls it “non-‘Uthmānic” (“Teil III,” 233–7). (2) SADEGHI wrote that the lower writing represents a codex other than those of Ibn Mas‘ūd 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.”³⁰ 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.³¹ 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.

³⁰) Elisabeth PUIN, “Koranpalimpsest [Teil I],” 461–2, footnote 2.

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 Nosedā had photographed the palimpsest, she had to rely on the pictures prepared by

described him as “thrilled” about studying the Ṣan‘ā’ 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

G. Puin and H. Bothmer in the previous decades. These may be fine for many of the other manuscripts and for the upper writing of the palimpsest, but they are inadequate for the lower writing.

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.”

Islam. Accordingly, their impression that there are not many early copies of the Qur'ān 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'ān fall into clusters, called *text types*, when compared for textual similarity.³³

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'ān Manuscripts in Ṣan'ā'," in *The Qur'ān 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 لا تسمع *lā tasma'* was later corrected to *lā tasma'ūna* (instead of the usual *lā yasma'ūna*). Instead of *qul jā'a l-ḥaqqu* in 34:49 we find قيل جا الحق *qīla jā'a l-ḥaqqu*. The systems of the seven, ten or 14 *Qirā'āt* are, consequently, younger than the variants observed in Ṣan'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.³⁴ 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 compared to the texts outside it. The lower writing of Şan‘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 Testament 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 standard 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 Corrections in Qur’ānic Manuscripts,” *Manuscripta Orientalia* 11.1 (2005): 20–7; 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 mentioned.

³⁴ SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 364–70. Another indication, beside 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 ‘Uthmānic 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-1 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-1 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 *ḥadīth* variants.³⁵

The conclusion that C-1’s origin must have predated *ca.* AD 650 is largely independent of the date of Ṣan‘ā’ 1. For example, it would not be invalidated if it were found that the lower Ṣan‘ā’ 1 codex was produced, say, in the eighth century AD. This codex would still be only a representative of a C-1 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-1 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 Qur’ān manuscript was known outside the ‘Uthmānic tradition. Non-‘Uthmānic Qur’āns were known only through descriptions

³⁵) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 396, footnote 103.

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, Ubayy 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.³⁶ 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.³⁷ The one reason that is most relevant for our purposes, however, is that Ṣan‘ā’ I constitutes direct documentary evidence for the reality of the non-Uthmānic text types that are usually referred to as “Companion codices.”

Table I gives a few examples, in English translation, in which C-1 differs from the standard text.³⁸ The C-1 type shares a number of variants

³⁶) John BURTON, *The Collection of the Qur‘ān* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 228; John WANSBROUGH, *Qur‘ānic Studies* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2004), 44–5, 203–5. Wansbrough’s book was originally published in 1977.

³⁷) For the assimilation of parallels and harmonization to context in the Jewish Bible, see Emanuel TOV, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd rev. ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 261–3. For the literature on the assimilation of parallels and nearby terms in New Testament manuscripts, see the references given in SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 388, footnotes 85 and 87. For assimilation of parallels and nearby terms generating differences between Companion codices, see SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 388, 391–2, 401–3. For a likely example of assimilation of parallels in the *ḥadīth* literature, see Behnam SADEGHI, “The Traveling Tradition Test: A Method for Dating Traditions,” *Der Islam* 85.1 (2008): 222.

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. Mas‘ūd and Ubayy b. Ka‘b, 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.”³⁹

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.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹ 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 Qur’ān – 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 Mas‘ūd, as described by al-A‘mash, 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.

³⁹) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 344, 360, 390–4.

⁴⁰) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 345, 390–4. There is, however, a conspicuous difference between C-1 and the codex of Ibn Mas‘ūd: 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

Variant description	The text of the standard tradition	The text of the C-1 tradition
In Q 2.196, C-1 does not have the word <i>ru‘ūsakum</i> .	Do not shave your heads until the offering reaches its destination.	Do not shave until the offering reaches its destination.
In Q 2.196, C-1 has <i>fa-in kāna aḥadun</i> instead of the standard <i>fa-man kāna</i> .	If any of you be sick	Should one of you be sick
In Q 2.196, C-1 has <i>aw nusukin</i> instead of the standard <i>aw ṣadaqatin</i> <i>aw nusukin</i> .	fasting, or alms, or an offering	fasting or an offering
In Q 2.201, C-1 has <i>wa-l-ākhirati</i> instead of the standard <i>ḥasanatan wa-fī l-ākhirati ḥasanatan</i> .	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.”	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.”
In Q 63.7, C-1 has <i>min ḥawlihi</i> after <i>yanfaddū</i> .	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.”	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.”

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 Muḥammad. The literary sources provide fairly systematic information about the codex of Ibn Mas‘ūd, allowing one to compare it with C-1 and the ‘Uthmānic text types. It emerges that where the texts of Ibn Mas‘ūd, 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 ‘Uthmānic Qur’ān could have been a self-contained, existing codex like those of Ibn Mas‘ūd and C-1, 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.⁴² These broad, initial conclusions may be refined or even significantly modified once we have finished the detailed study of all the variants and performed a statistical comparison of C-1 and the ‘Uthmānic text.⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ This possibility now seems particularly relevant, since, as compared to the other *sūras* in C-1 found in the fragment, *sūra* 20 in C-1 shows a greater affinity to the codex of Ubayy b. Ka‘b.⁴⁵ Finally, one should investigate the extent to which the variants may be due to the Prophet reciting different versions.⁴⁶

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-1’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.

⁴⁴) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 404, footnote 115.

⁴⁵) See Appendix 1.

⁴⁶) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 404, footnote 115.

‘Uthmān charged with the task of standardizing the Qur’ān. 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 Qur’ān, 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.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 *ūna* followed by a verse separator and the morpheme *wa* at the end of verse 84 to the instance of *ūna* 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.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.⁴⁹ C-1 has these verses in the expected place. Since they are also found in the ‘Uthmānic Qur’ān, 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.

⁴⁷ ‘Abd al-Laṭīf al-KHAṬĪB, *Mu‘jam al-qirā’āt* (Damascus: Dār Sa‘d al-Dīn), 5:430.

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 Qur’ān: A Brief Survey,” *Studia Islamica* 77 (1993): 8–13. Modarressi questions their accuracy and calls them “extremely problematic” (p. 14).

⁴⁹ Maḥmūd RĀMYĀR, *Tārīkh-i Qur’ān*, 2nd ed. (Tehran: Amīr Kabīr, HS 1362/1983), 313–6.

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.⁵⁰ 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.⁵¹ In Table 2 we present a complete table of the eleven *sūra* transitions in the extant folios of Ṣan‘ā’ 1. (For convenience, in the table and elsewhere in this article, the *sūra* numbers give the ‘Uthmānic rank.) Al-A‘ẒAMĪ has made the astute point that a non-standard *sūra* transition does not entail a non-standard Qur‘ān if it occurs in a pamphlet with a selection of *sūras*.⁵² However, the point does not apply to the lower writing: it covers too much of the Qur‘ān, 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. Ka‘b’s codex, others only in Ibn Mas‘ūd’s codex, and yet others in no reported *sūra* ordering. Second, the ordering is closer to those of Ibn Mas‘ūd and Ubayy b. Ka‘b 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. Ka‘b than to that of Ibn Mas‘ūd; 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.

⁵⁰) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 409–10.

⁵¹) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 393 (Table 8); E. Puin, “Teil II,” 256–7.

⁵²) Al-A‘ẒAMĪ, *History*, 77–81.

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.

C-1	Ibn Mas‘ūd	Ubayy b. Ka‘b
11, 8, 9, 19	<i>Fihrist</i> : ⁵³ 9, 16, 11, nine intervening sūras, 8, 19 <i>Itqān</i> : ⁵⁴ 9, 16, 11, fourteen intervening sūras, 8, 19	<i>Fihrist</i> : ⁵⁵ 8, 9, 11, 19 <i>Itqān</i> : ⁵⁶ 8, 9, 11, 19
12, 18	<i>Fihrist</i> : sūra 18 is omitted; 12 is followed by 17 <i>Itqān</i> : 12, 18, 17	<i>Fihrist</i> : 12, 18 <i>Itqān</i> : 12, 18
15, 25	<i>Fihrist</i> : sūra 15 is omitted <i>Itqān</i> : 25, 15	<i>Fihrist</i> : 15, ten intervening sūras, 25 <i>Itqān</i> : sūra 25 is omitted
20, 21	<i>Fihrist</i> : sūra 20 is omitted <i>Itqān</i> : 21, 20	<i>Fihrist</i> : 20, 21 <i>Itqān</i> : 20, 21
34, 13	<i>Fihrist</i> : 13, 34 <i>Itqān</i> : 13, 34	<i>Fihrist</i> : 13, four intervening sūras, 34 <i>Itqān</i> : 34, two intervening sūras, 13
39, 40	<i>Fihrist</i> : 39, 40 <i>Itqān</i> : 39, 40	<i>Fihrist</i> : 39, five intervening sūras, 40 <i>Itqān</i> : 39, six intervening sūras, 40
63, 62, 89, 90	<i>Fihrist</i> : 63, 62, twenty-nine intervening sūras, 89, 85, 84, 96, 90 <i>Itqān</i> : 63, 62, twenty-seven intervening sūras, 89, 85, 84, 96, 90	<i>Fihrist</i> : 63, 62, 65, 89 (sūra 90 is omitted, unless <i>lā uqsimu</i> refers to it rather than to sūra 75, in which case it comes at eleven removes after sūra 89.) <i>Itqān</i> : 63, 62, 66, 89, 90

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*, “In

⁵³) Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, ed. Riḍā Tajaddud (n.d. and n.p.), 29.

⁵⁴) Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān fī ‘ulūm al-Qur’ān* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1416/1996), 1:176.

⁵⁵) Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, 29–30.

⁵⁶) Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, 1:175–6.

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’ 1 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, *yaquṣṣu* 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.

⁵⁸) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 385–90.

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 *sūra 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 *alifs*, 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.

⁵⁹) SADEGHI and BERGMANN, “The Codex,” 358–60.

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‘ī (d. 96), Ibn Waththāb (d. 103), Ṭalḥa b. Muṣarrif (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.⁶¹ 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.⁶²

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 ‘Āṣim b. Abī al-Najūd (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’rīkh madīnat Dimashq*, ed. ‘Alī Shīrī (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1415/1995), 12:159–62; Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, *Sunan*, ed. Sa‘īd Muḥammad al-Laḥḥām (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 (*sab‘at aḥruf*).⁶³ 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

bly a sacrilege. Another version of al-Ḥajjāj’s speech transmitted through a Baṣran *isnād* also suggests that the issue was the manner of recitation: it says that Ibn Mas‘ūd would “recite the Qur‘ān as if it were Bedouin *rajaz* poetry (*yaqra‘u l-Qur‘ān ka-annahū rajaz al-a‘rāb*; Abū l-Ḥasan al-Mas‘ūdī, *Murūj al-dhahab*, ed. Yūsuf 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 tahudhdhū l-Qur‘ān ka-hadhdh al-shi‘r*; *wa-lā tanthurū nathr al-daḡal*, quoted in Ibn Abī Shayba, *Muṣannaḡ*, ed. Sa‘īd al-Laḡḡām (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1409/1989), 7:186). A related point of controversy was the chanting or singing of the Qur‘ān. See Muḡammad b. Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfi*, 4th ed. (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, HS 1365), 2:614; al-Suyūṡī, *Itqān*, 1:243; M. TALBI, “La qirā‘a bi-l-alḡān,” *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.

⁶³) Seven Modes (*sab‘at aḥruf*) traditions include Prophetic and non-Prophetic reports. For an overview of the *matns* and *isnāds* of the Prophetic *ḡadīths*, see ‘ABD AL-‘AZĪZ ‘ABD AL-FATTĀḡ AL-QĀRI’, *ḡadīth al-aḡruf al-sab‘a: dirāsa li-‘isnādihi wa-matnihi wa-khtilāḡ al-‘ulamā’ fī ma’nāhu wa-ṡilatīhi bi-l-qirā‘āt al-Qur‘āniyya* (Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1423/2002), 9–41. ‘Abd al-Fattāḡ’s work has the merit of including related traditions that do not use the words *sab‘at aḡruf*, and the demerit of excluding non-Prophetic *āthār*. 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 Qur'ān to the angel Gabriel every year. They linked these successive presentations with the different Companion codices, and they said that the 'Uthmānic text was the last presentation, implying that it superseded the others.⁶⁴ The admirers of Ibn Mas'ūd 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 Mas'ūd's Qur'ān the final presentation.⁶⁵ Both sets of traditions accepted that the Prophet introduced multiple versions of the Qur'ān 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 Mas'ūd 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 'Uthmān sent to the cities – that is to say, they can include non-'Uthmānic variants – and that they held the 'Uthmānic codices to constitute precisely the Prophet's "final presentation."⁶⁶ He thus found some Companion textual variants "acceptable" (*yuqbal*) even though he disapproved of reciting them in prayers. He

⁶⁴) See, for example, Ibn Abī Shayba, *Muṣannaḥ*, 7:205; Ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968), 2:195; Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak*, ed. Yūsuf al-Mar'ashlī, Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifa (n.d.), 2:230; Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Nasā'ī, *al-Sunan al-kubrā*, ed. 'Abd al-Ghaffār al-Bandārī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1411/1991), 5:71–2; Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, *al-Durr al-manthūr fī l-tafsīr bi-l-ma'thūr* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifa li-l-Ṭibā'a wa-l-Nashr, 1979), 1:106.

⁶⁵) Ibn Abī Shayba, *Muṣannaḥ*, 7:205; al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak*, 2:230; al-Suyūṭī, *al-Durr al-manthūr*, 1:106.

⁶⁶) Ibn al-Jazarī writes, "Most scholars from earlier and more recent times and the imams of the Muslims have held that these 'Uthmānic codices contain only that portion of the Seven Modes that fits their *rasm*" (*wa-dhahaba jamāhīr al-'ulamā' min al-salaf wa-l-khalaf wa-a'immat al-muslimīn ilā anna hādhihi l-maṣāḥif al-'uthmāniyya mushtamila 'alā mā yaḥtamiluhu rasmuhā min al-ahruf al-sab'a faqat*), and adds that the 'Uthmānic codices constitute precisely the Prophet's final presentation of the text to Gabriel. See Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī l-qirā'āt al-'ashr*, ed. 'Alī Muḥammad al-Ḍabbā' (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, n.d.), 31. I was led to this reference by a forthcoming essay of Yasin DUTTON, entitled, "Orality, Literacy and the 'Seven *Ahruf* *Ḥadīth*."

mentions however that some other scholars *did* endorse the use of Companion codices in worship.⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ He added that “detailed examination ... is something the

⁶⁷) For Ibn al-Jazarī’s views on the Seven Modes and legitimate recitations, see Ibn al-Jazarī, *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-muṣḥaf*) 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 *Fātiḥa* (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-QĀRĪ, *Ḥadīth al-ahruf 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 Ṣan‘ā’ manuscripts mentioned the Rushdie affair and the persecution of NAṢR ḤĀMĪD 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 Ṣan‘ā’ 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.

⁷⁰) LESTER, “What is the Koran?”; Alexander STILLE, “Scholars are Quietly Offering New Theories of the Koran,” *The New York Times*, March 2, 2002; HIGGINS, “The Lost Archive.” Nicholas KRISTOF, “Islam, Virgins, and Grapes,” *The New York Times*, April 22, 2009; Nicholas KRISTOF, “Martyrs, Virgins, and Grapes,” *The New York Times*, August 4, 2004. With the exception of Higgins’ story, these articles celebrate revisionist scholarship.

⁷¹) LESTER, “What is the Koran?,” 45, 50. Compare to KRISTOF, “Islam, Virgins and Grapes.”

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 Lüling 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.⁷⁵

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.⁷⁶ The suppression motif also seemed to resolve a conspicuous

⁷⁵) 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.

⁷⁶) 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, “Scepticism, 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‘ān: “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).

paradox: on the one hand, it was indicated that the Ṣan‘ā’ 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.⁷⁷ 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,⁷⁸ 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 Qur’ān (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.

⁷⁸) G. PUIN’s scholarly output on the Ṣan‘ā’ collection consists of three publications in which he says very little about the manuscripts and does not discuss the palimpsest: Gerd-Rüdiger PUIN, “Observations,” cited above in footnote 33; Gerd-Rüdiger PUIN, “Über die Bedeutung der ältesten Koranfragmente aus Sanaa (Jemen) für die Orthographieggeschichte des Korans,” *Magazin Forschung, Universität des Saarlandes*, 1 (1999): 37–40, 46; Gerd-Rüdiger PUIN, “Die Utopie einer kritischen Koranedition,” in *Schlaglichter: Die beiden ersten islamischen Jahrhunderte*, ed. Markus Groß et al. (Berlin: Hans Schiler, 2008), 516–71.

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 *Sūrah*s” (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 *sūrah*s?). 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 *ī* in Ibrāhīm and the *ay* in Shayṭān were originally pronounced as *ā*, 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 *ilāh* (الله), “God,” could, in principle, be spelled in the same way as the word *ilayh* (اليه), “towards Him.” This leads him to propose, “hypothetically,” an emendation that replaces *ilayh* with *ilāh* 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 ilāha 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 *ilā* 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 François 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 Dreiboldz: 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 ultraviolet 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

Name	LowerText	UpperText	Surviving Fraction
2A	2.87 – 2.96	6.149 – 6.159	(almost) all
2B	2.96 – 2.105	6.159 – 7.11	
Stanford 2007 recto	2.191 – 2.196	2.265 – 2.271	(almost) all
Stanford 2007 verso	2.197 – 2.205	2.271 – 2.277	
David 86/2003 recto	2.206 – 2.217	2.277 – 2.282	(almost) all
David 86/2003 verso	2.217 – 2.223	2.282 – 2.286	
Bonhams 2000 recto	5.41 – 5.48	4.33 – 4.43	(almost) all
Bonhams 2000 verso	5.48 – 5.54	4.43 – 4.56	
4A	11.105 – 11.112	14.32 – 14.41	less than ½
4B	11.120 – 8.3	14.52 – 15.16	
5A	8.73 – 9.7	16.73 – 16.89	(almost) all
5B	9.7 – 9.16	16.89 – 16.102	
6A	9.17 – 9.26	16.102 – 16.118	(almost) all
6B	9.26 – 9.34	16.118 – 17.6	
20A	9.70 – 9.81	30.26 – 30.40	more than ¾
20B	9.81 – 9.90	30.40 – 30.54	
21A	9.106 – 9.113	31.24 – 32.4	?
21B	9.114 – 9.120	32.4 – 32.20	
22A	9.121 – 19.5	32.20 – 33.6	more than ¾
22B	19.6 – 19.29	33.6 – 33.18	
23A	19.29 – 19.53	33.18 – 33.29	more than ¾
23B	19.54 – 19.74	33.30 – 33.37	
7A	22.15 – 22.26	17.40 – 17.58	about ¾
7B	22.27 – 22.39	17.59 – 17.77	

31A	12.17 – 12.20	43.63 – 43.69	less than $\frac{1}{4}$
31B	12.27 – 12.31	43.89 – 44.11	
32A	12.111 – 18.5	47.15 – 47.20	less than $\frac{1}{4}$
32B	18.15 – 18.18	47.32 – 48.2	
13A	16.26 – 16.37	21.42 – 21.72	(almost) all
13B	16.37 – 16.59	21.72 – 21.92	
14A	16.68 – 16.69	21.111 – 22.1	less than $1/10$
14B	16.78 – 16.79	22.15 – 22.16	
9A	33.51 – 33.57	19.38 – 19.64	about $\frac{3}{4}$
9B	33.57 – 33.72	19.64 – 19.98	
25A	39.25 – 39.36	37.38 – 37.59	less than $\frac{1}{4}$
25B	39.42 – 39.47	37.73 – 37.88	
26A	39.51 – 39.70	37.102 – 37.134	less than $\frac{1}{2}$
26B	39.70 – 40.8	37.134 – 37.172	
15A	20.23 – 20.61	25.10 – 25.34	(almost) all
15B	20.61 – 20.80	25.34 – 25.59	
30B	20.122 – 20.133	42.38 – 42.48	about $\frac{1}{2}$
30A	21.5 – 21.19	42.21 – 42.29	
10A	? – 24.13	20.1 – 20.43	more than $\frac{3}{4}$
10B	24.13 – 24.23	20.44 – 20.74	
11A	24.23 – 24.32	20.74 – 20.98	(almost) all
11B	24.32 – 24.40	20.98 – 20.130	
33A	34.13 – 34.23	55.16 – 56.4	about $\frac{3}{4}$
33B	34.23 – 34.33	56.5 – 56.69	
34A	34.40 – 34.47	57.1 – 57.10	about $\frac{1}{4}$
34B	13.1 – 13.5	57.16 – 57.22	
35A	13.6 – 13.14	57.27 – 58.6	about $\frac{1}{4}$
35B	13.16 – 13.21	58.11 – 58.22	
36A	13.25 – 13.31	59.1 – 59.10	about $\frac{1}{2}$
36B	13.33 – 13.40	59.14 – 60.1	
16B	28.19 – 28.24	26.198 – 26.221	about $1/10$
16A	28.30 – 28.35	26.155 – 26.176	
28A	37.15 – 37.33	41.17 – 41.27	about $1/3$
28B	37.43 – 37.68	41.33 – 41.43	
29A	37.82 – 37.103	41.47 – 42.5	about $1/3$
29B	37.118 – 37.144	42.10 – 42.16	
18A	15.4 – 15.33	28.58 – 28.74	(almost) all

18B	15.33 – 15.74	28.74 – 28.86	
19B	15.87 – 25.8	29.43 – 29.54	about ½
19A	25.14 – 25.27	29.29 – 29.40	
24A	illegible	34.52 – 35.9	about ½
24B	30.38 – 30.50	35.10 – 35.18	
3A	illegible	9.112 – 9.115	less than 1/10
3B	35.39 – 35.49	9.124 – 9.127	
Christies 2008 verso	63.1 – 62.11	5.3 – 5.9	(almost) all
Christies 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	

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.⁸³ 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.

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.

The Lower Text of Ṣan‘ā’ī

Folio 2 A (Q 2.87–2.96)

- 1 و ادا // (ب) موسى الكنب و ففـ[ب]ا على (ا) بر { }
- 2 نالر سل (و) ا (ت)بـ[ب]ا (ع)بسى ا (ن) مر (د)م ا /ـ[ب]ـ(ب) (و) ا [ب]ـ { }
- 3 نه نا [ب]ـ // (و) ح الفد (س) افكلـ[م]ا حا كمر { }
- 4 ل (نم) لا (ب)هـ[و] ا [ب]ـفسكم فر (ب)فـ[ب]ا كد نم [و] فر { }
- 5 بـ[ف]ـنـ[و] ن ○ و فـ[و] ا فلو بنا علف نل [ط]ـع ا [ل]ـله { }
- 6 علـ[ب]ـ(ه)ـ[ب]ـ(ط)لمهم فعـ(ب)ـلا ما بو منون ○ و لما حا هم (كنب) { }
- 7 مصدق لما معهم و فد كا نو امن هـل نستفـ[ت]ـ[ح]ـ[و] ن { }
- 8 على الد (ن) كفر و افلما حا هم فـ(ع)ـ[ر] فوه //
- 9 كـ(ر) و انه فلعنه الله على الكفر نـ ○ هـبـسـما
- 10 سر و انه انفسهم ان تكفر و انما نـر ل اللـ[ه]
- 11 بـ(ع)ـ[ر]ا و عد و ان نـر ل اللـ(ه)ـ(م) فصله على
- 12 من بسا من عده هـنا (و) بعصب على عصب و
- 13 للـكـفر نـ عـدا بـ (ل)ـ[نـم] ○ و ادا هـل لهم
- 14 منو انما نـر ل الله فالوا [نو] من نما [نـر]
- 15 ل علنا من كنب و تكفر و ن نما و راه و هو (ا)
- 16 لـحـو مصدق لما معهم فلـا (ف)ـبـعـلـون انسا اللـ[ه]
- 17 من هـل ان كنتم موـمـنـ[ب]ـنـ(○) و لـفـد حا كم مـ(و)
- 18 سى نالـنـسـب نم اـحـد⁸⁴ نم الـ(ع)ـحل من عده [و] (ا)
- 19 نم ظلمون ○ و ادا حد نا منـفـكم و (ر) فـ /
- 20 فو فكـم الطور حد و ما انـسـكم بـعـو [ه] //
- 21 اسمـعوا [ف]ـلو اسمـ[ع]ـنا و عـصـنا و اشـر نو (ا) { }
- 22 فى فلو بهم العـلـ تكفر هم بنسما نا مـر كم // (ه) { }
- 23 انـمـكم ا (ن) كنتم مو منـن ○ فل ان كـ(ب) لـكـرم { }
- 24 الدا (ر) الا حره عبد اللـ[ه] // (ن) [دو] ن ا { }
- 25 [ب]ـ[ب]ـ[س] فـمـنو الموبـان كنتم صدقـ[ب]ـ(ن) { }
- 26 و [لا] بـ[ب]ـ(م)ـ[و] [ب]ـهـا اند انما فد مـاند { }
- 27 و الله علم نا لـطـلـ[س] ○ و [ب]ـ(د)ـ[د]ـ[ص] { }

⁸⁴ There are traces above the tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter *tā’*.

- 28 الماس (ع)لى (ه) [د] (و) [ا] [ل] (ح) // [ه] [ا] (د) // (م)ن }
 29 لدن اسر كوا (نو) [د] [ح] // (هم) لو [د] [ع] // }

Folio 2 B (Q 2.96–2.105)

- 1 { } [ه] و (م) [ل] [و] (ه) و / د / ح [ه] ⁸⁵ من [ع] (د) اب ان (ع) مر و ما
- 2 { } [ل] (له) / / ل / / (ع) ملون ⁸⁶ ○ فل (م) كان عد (و) الح [د] ر دل ⁸⁷
- 3 { } // // [ه] على [ف] [د] (ك) د (ا) دن الله (ه) دى
- 4 { } // / (فا) لما (د) ند (ب) ه [و] (ب) [د] (ر) [ى] ⁸⁸ للم // م / ن (○)
- 5 { } // / [ن] ⁸⁹ كان [ع] (د) و الله (و) ملنك (نه) و ا / ⁹⁰ [و] ر سله
- 6 { } // / [ر] (د) ل (و) مكن (ل) (فا) ن الله عد (و) للكر (ر) ن ○ و
- 7 { } [ل] فد ابر [د] (ا) [ب] / / نب ما (ك) [ر] [ف] نهن الا الفسعو
- 8 (○) ا [و] كلما عهد // ⁹¹ عه [د] ا / ⁹² منكم
- 9 (دل) اكر ه [م] لا [د] (و) م [و] ن (و) لما حا (ه) [م] ر (س) ل
- 10 [م] ص (د) و لما معهم [د] (د) [ر] [د] (و) [ا] [ل] (ا) لكتب
- 11 (ك) [د] (ب) الله (و) ر ا طهور هم كانهم لا نعلمو
- 12 ن (○) و ا [د] [ع] و ا ما [د] [ل] و ا السطر (د) على ملك سلنم
- 13 و ما كهر [د] (م) ن و لكن الس (د) طنن كهر و ا نعلمو

⁸⁵) The illegible space before *hā'* is too small for the grapheme مر. Perhaps the word is *bi-munzihihi*, which is reported for Ibn Mas'ūd's codex here.

⁸⁶) The text seems to have *wa-mā llāhu bi-ghāfilin 'ammā ya'malūna*.

⁸⁷) There are two small, disc-shaped traces of ink above the tooth. The function of these dots is not clear.

⁸⁸) 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*.

⁸⁹) The text might have an additional *qul* at the beginning of this verse.

⁹⁰) This word may be *anbiyā'ihī*.

⁹¹) 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*.

⁹²) 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 *īā'ifatun* instead of *farīqun*, in which case the vertical line would belong to *īā'*.

14	ن ا /	93/ (ل)ملا / ن / [ل] / (ه)ر و ب
15	(و) م ر و ب و ما تعلمون (ن) [م] ن (ا حد) حنا (ب) [فو] / 94/	
16	ا بما [ب] (ح) ن / [ب] (ه) 95/ فلا ب (ك) [ف] (ر) و ا فتعلمون منيها ما	
17	/ / و ما (ع) ر ق [ب] ن / المر (و) ر و	
18	(ح) ه و ما نصر ن 96/ نه (م) ن ا حد ا لا ناد ن الله	
19	و بتعلمون ما نصر ه [م] و لا ن نفعهم و لعد (ع) [م] (و)	
20	{ } ا لمن اسرى نه ما له فى الا حره من خلق	
21	{ } (و) / / [ب] 97/ نسر / نه ا ب [فسد] [م] لو كانوا (ب) [ع] [م] ن 98/	
22	{ } (و) لو ا / / (و) ابو المر (و) نه (م) ن الله حنر	
23	{ } و (ك) با (و) ا (ب) [ع] لمون (ا) ن (ب) ها الدس امنوا لا	
24	{ } // (و) لو ار عا و (ف) و لو ا نظر // [ل] (و) اسمع	
25	{ } لل [ك] [ف] (ر) [ب] ن عد (ا) ب المر (م) ما بودا	

⁹³) The illegible part is big enough to accommodate the standard text between *yu‘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 لا. 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*.

⁹⁵) The traces in the preceding illegible part are perplexing. The first letter in this part is *fā’*, but it seems to be a later addition. It is written in a script similar to that of the lower text, but appears in a slightly different color (with a stronger green hue), and its shape suggests it has been inserted later. (Similar additions appear in Folio 10 A (line 7) and Folio 11 B (line 14).) It is not clear if the lower text initially had *fitna* or not. Traces of a consonant-distinguishing mark for the letter *tā’* (after *fā’*) suggest the text had *fitna* from the start, but these traces too can be later additions (their color is not quite clear). One possibility is that the text had *miḥna* because the traces after the inserted *fā’* conform to *ḥā’*. Muqātil b. Sulaymān cites an exegetical tradition from al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, who interprets *fitna* as *miḥna* (See Muqātil b. Sulaymān, *Tafsīr Muqātil b. Sulaymān*, ed. Aḥmad Farīd (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 2003), 1:69).

⁹⁶) The word is probably *yaḍurrāni*.

⁹⁷) Only a small portion of the upper part of this putative *alif* is visible; the rest is covered by an upper text *alif*. The amount of space before this putative *alif* and the traces suggest that the text cannot be *la-bi‘ša mā*. It might be a connected *bi‘šamā* (بسم).

⁹⁸) This verse separator has a special shape for marking the 100th verse.

⁹⁹) The illegible part preceding this *alif* is small, implying *āmanū* instead of *annahum āmanū*.

- { } [د] [ب] كفر و [ا] من [ا] هل الكتب او المسر 26
- { } {كو} ن ا ن سر ل عليكم [م] (ن) ا (ل) / 100 من حبر و لكن {} 27
- { } {الله} / 101 ن ح(م)ه (م) / [س]ا و (ا) لله {} 28

Folio Stanford 2007 Recto (Q 2.191–2.196)

- 1 و (ا) فتلا [و] هم / / (ب) / [ب] مو هم و ا حر حو / / {}
- 2 من حب ا حر / / كم و ا (ل) / (ه) ا {} سد
- 3 من (الف) بل و لا فتلو¹⁰² هم عند المسد
- 4 (ا) لحر م د / / بعد (لو) كم ف ا ن فتلو كم ف ا فتلو
- 5 (ه) م (د) لك جز الكفر ب (ن) ف ا (ن) انت (ه) و¹⁰³
- 6 [ف] (ب) [ن] ا // له عفور رحم (ن) و فتلو هم حتا
- 7 (لا) بكو (و) // (ف) / / و كونا الد ب كله
- 8 ل[ل]ه ف[ب] ن انتهو افلا عد و ن الا على
- 9 الظل / ن (ل) السهر¹⁰⁴ لحر م با الشهر احر
- 10 م و // لحر مت فصص و من اعتدى عليكم
- 11 ف ا عد / (و) عليه بمثل ما اعتدى عليكم به
- 12 و (ا) تف (و) الله و اعلموا ان الله
- 13 (م) // 105 المتف (ن) (ن) و (ا) ن (ف) // ا في سبل الله و لا
- 14 نلوا انا نكم الى التهلكه و ا
- 15 ح[س] (ن) // 106 ن الله حب المحسن¹⁰⁷ و ا نمو¹⁰⁸
- 16 الح و العمره لله¹⁰⁹ ن احصر [ب] //
- 17 فم // تنسر من الهدى و لا تحلفوا حتا نل (ع)
- 18 الهدى محله فان كا ن احد منك (م) مر

¹⁰⁰) This word may be *allāh*.

¹⁰¹) The few remaining traces in this part match *بدخل في*.

¹⁰²) Only one dot is visible above the first tooth.

¹⁰³) There does not seem to be an *alif* at the end of this word.

¹⁰⁴) Only one dot is visible above *shīn*.

¹⁰⁵) The small space after *mīm* suggests there is no *alif* here.

¹⁰⁶) The word *ahsinū* does not seem to end with an *alif*.

¹⁰⁷) A tooth is missing.

¹⁰⁸) It cannot be ruled out that the scribe wrote *aqīmū* and then corrected it to *atimmū*.

¹⁰⁹) There might have been a *fā* before *alif*.

بضا او نه اذى من ر (ا) سه فد نه	19
من صم او نسك فاذا امنتكم فمن بم(ب) //	20
بعمر ته الى ا / / فما تنسر من ا (ل) // (ى)	21
فمن لم يحد فصنم ثلثه ¹¹⁰ ا بم فى الحح //	22
سبعه اذار حعتم تلك عشره كمله	23
{ } دلک لمن لم يكن اهله حضرى الم // { }	24
{ } الحر // و / / (ا) ا (ل) [ه] // (ا) / / (ا) // { } ¹¹¹	25

Folio Stanford 2007 Verso (Q 2.197–2.205)

{ } (ا) سهر (مع) // ب ¹¹² فم(ن) ف // ص [ف]ـ[ه]ـ[ن] الح	1
ف(ل) ر { } فب [ف]ـ[ه]ـ[ن] و لا فسو // (و) لا [حد] ل فى	2
ا (لح)ج (و) ما تعملوا من حبر تعلمه الله و بر و دو ا	3
ان حبر الر د الفوى و انفقو // نا و لا لالب	4
ليس عليكم حبح ان يسعوا (ا) (ل) فصل من (ر) بكم فا	5
دا ا [ف]ـصنم من عرف فادكر و الله عند	6
المسعر الحزم و ادكر و ه كما / و	7
ان كنتم قبله لمن الصلن ○ بم انصوا من حبح	8
افص الناس و اسعفر و الله ان الله	9
عفور ر حنم ○ و ادا ا فصنم منسككم فا	10
دكر و الله كد كركم انا كم او اسد	11
دكر او / / ¹¹³ من يقول ر بنا انا فى (ه) [د] (ه)	12
[لحنوه] الدنا و ماله فى الاحره من خلق ○ و	13
منهم من يقول ر بنا انا فى الدنا و الاحره	14
و ف(ب) ا عذاب النار ○ او لىك لهم نصيب	15
م/ا كسبون و الله سر بع الحساب ○ و اد	16

¹¹⁰) The third letter is probably *thā'*, even though only two consonant-distinguishing marks are visible above it.

¹¹¹) The text seems to be *inna llāha* instead of the standard *wa-lamū anna llāha*.

¹¹²) This word might be *ma'dūdāt*.

¹¹³) There is less room than expected for *min al-nās*. It is possible that the text is *minhum*, although there is more space than is needed for this word.

- 17 كُر // اللّٰه في ا [ب]م معد و د ب فمن يعجل في
 18 نوم من فلا انم عليه و من نا حر فلا انم عليه
 19 / / ا يعى و (ا) يعو اللّٰه و اعلمو انكم ا
 20 / / بحسرون ○¹¹⁴ و من الناس من يعنك فو
 21 [د] (ه) في [ه]ه الحنوه الدنا و بسهد الله
 22 { } على ما فى / / هو الد الحصد [م] ○ و ادا
 23 { } و لى سعى فى الارص لتفسد فيها و يهلك¹¹⁵ { }

Folio David 86/2003 Recto (Q 2.206–2.217)

- 1 { } د (ا) [ف] // له ابى (ا) [د] (له) احد // / (ر) // (نا لا) نم (فد) // / { }
 2 لنسنا [ب]مهاد ○ [و مرنا (ا) // (ناس) من (س)رى نعر(س)ه (اب)بعا // (صد) // / / { }
 3 // (ا) لله [ر] و (ف) نا [د] (ع) (د) ○ (نا) [ب]ها الد [د] انم (و) ااد [د] [و] ا [فى] //
 4 // [س]لم (ك)اهه و لا [د] [ب]عوا حظوب الس(بطن) انه لك(م) [ع] د (و)
 5 [م] // [ب] ان ○ فان (ر) للتم [م] ان [د] عد (ما ح)كم ال(هد) [ى] فاعلموا (ا) ن //
 6 (د) // (ع) [ر] [ح]كم ○ هل د // طر (و) الا ان (ب) (د) كم الله فى [ط] [د] //
 7 (من ا) لعم(م) و الملكه و (ف)صى الا (م)ر و الى الله بر (ح) [ع] الا [م] //
 8 [ر] ○ سل بنى اسر بل (م) اب (ب) [ب]م [م] من ا // (ه) // (د) [ه] [و] من ندل (بعم)ه الله
 9 // (ب) [ع] د ما حاهه فان الله سد(د) ند العف ○ ر بن للاد [د] // ك(ر) [و]
 10 (ا) الح(ب)وه (ا) [د] (ب) و بسح[ر] (و) ن من الدس امنوا و الد (بن) ا [ب] //
 11 [ب] (ف) و ف(م) [ب] نوم ال(ف) (ب)مه و الله بر (ر) و (م) بن (س)نا [ب] [ر] (ح) [ب] ○ [ب]
 12 كا (ن) ال(ب)اس امه و حده (ف) // (س)ل الله ال(ب) [ب] [ب] (س)ر (بن) و (م) [د]
 13 (ر) بن و ابرل مع(م)م الك[ب] (ب) نالحق ل(ب)حكمو اب(ب)نا (س) ف(ب) [م] (ا)
 14 [ح] [ب] (ف) افه و (م) (ا) (ح) (ب) (ف) (ب)ه) ا [لا] (د) // ن او توه (من) [ب] // د
 15 (م) [ب] (ح) (م) ال(ب) (ب)ت فهدى الل(ه) الد // ان [م] (ا) (د) // (م) (ح) (ب) [و]
 16 [ف] (ه) من الحق نا (د) نه و الل(ه) [ب] هدى من (ب)سا الى صر ط¹¹⁶ (م) // /
 17 (ا) (ح) (ب)م ان ند حلو ال(د) (ب)ه و لما (ب) // (ب)كم (م) [د] بن (م)

¹¹⁴) This verse separator has a special shape for marking the 200th verse.

¹¹⁵) 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-fasād*, followed by an end-of-verse marker.

¹¹⁶) This *tā'* has a tail similar to that of a final *ayn*.

[فـ]لكرم مسهم) النساء والصد // او // لر لر(و) ا حتى (نف)[و] ل الر	18
{ } [و] ل و الدس ا م(د) و امعه) متى نصر الله(ه) الا ان بصرن) // ا / /	19
// (د) [ب] [ب] (سا) لو نك (م) ا (د) ا ب(ف) [و] ن فل ما ب(ف) [م] (م) ن (د) [ب] (ر) / /	20
// (د) [ب] و الا فر) [ب] (ن) و) اللس(م)ى و) ا) ل(م) [ب] (د) ن و) ا (د) ن اللس(د) ل (و) //	21
// [ع] لو ا من [ب] // فان الله به) علم (ب) [ب] (ع) لکم الفعل (و) // /	22
[کر] ه لکم (و عس)ى ان ب(کر) ه(و) ا (س) با و) هو) حنر ل[کم] و [ع] // [ى] / / { } /	23
// (س) با و) ه(و) [س] ل[ب] (م) (و) الله ب(ع) [م] و ا [ب] [م] (لا) / / (ن) // / { } /	24
// [و] نك (ع) ن اللس(س)هر الحر (م) [و] ع(ن) فل فل [ب] (ه) ¹¹⁷ (ل) / / { } /	25
{ } / [و] [و] (ص) [د] عن / / / ¹¹⁸⁻¹¹⁹ و الم(س)ح(د) ل) / / (ا) / / { } /	26

Folio David 86/2003 Verso (Q 2.217–2.223)

{ } [کر] ¹²⁰ عند / / ا / [ا] (ل) [ه]سه / / ا / من (ا) // [ف] ل [و] لا // (لو) ن	1
2 [ف] [ب] لر(و) نکم (ح) دى / / (د) [و] ک / ¹²¹ ان ا (س) ب[ع] // (ن) ¹²² / / ¹²³ (ن) ¹²⁴	2

¹¹⁷) Traces of a word are visible above *fīhi*. Its first letter is *fā’/qāf* 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 *sabīlihi*.

¹¹⁹) 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-ṣaddun*.

¹²⁰) There are traces before *‘ayn* that resemble an isolated *rā’* or an initial *mīm*. The traces might belong to a word that the scribe had initially written here.

¹²¹) The initial *kāf* might be preceded by a tooth.

¹²²) 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.

¹²³) 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.

¹²⁴) In criticizing Fedeli, Sadeghi previously assumed that this *nūn* belongs to the word *‘an* in *‘an dīnihi*. However, this is not certain. Nor is there any reason for believing that *‘an dīnihi* 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/ او [ل] [ك] اصحب	/	3
ا [ل] بار هم [ف] [ب] [ه] حطد و ن (○) ان الد (ن) (ا منو) ا و هحر		4
126/ حر] ن ر [حم] ه (ا) [ل] له	/ (و) // (فى)	5
ا (ل) لره [ع] [و] (ر) [ر] حتم // (س) لو (نك عن) (ا) (ل) حم) ر (و) ا		6
(ل) م(د) سر فل فهما انم (ك) د / و م(د) فرع) لل(د) س (و) ا د // هما		7
(ا) كتر من (ن) عه // ا و [ب] سا لرو) نك) مرد) انبفع // ن (ف) ل الع [ف] { }		8
ك // (ك) بس الل [ه] لك (م) ا / 127/ [د] عل [ك] م // (ب) فك [ر] ن و (○) فى		9
(ا) (ل) د بنا و الا (ح) // (ه) [و] نسا لرو نك) عن ال (ب) // (ى) ف /		10
(ا) صلح) لهم) حبر و ا [ن] تحلطو هم ف(ا حو) // هم ¹²⁸ و (لا) { }		11
(ب) علم ال (م) فسرد) من المصلح) و لرو) سا الله لا		12
عسد(كم) ان الل [ه] عر بر ح [ك] // [م] ○ و لا ن(ب) [ك] (حو) ال (م) [سر]		13
/ / (ح) (ى) نو من (و) لا مه مرو) [م] نه (ح) بر من م(س) ر كه و		14
// (و) ا عذر(ن) كم و لا ن(ب) كحو ال مسر (ك) س (حنى) نو منو		15
// و لعند مرو) من ح(ر) من) مسر ك و لرو) ا ع / كم		16
/ / لنك ند [ع] (و) ن الى النار و الل (ه) ند [ع] (ا)		17
129/ // [ى] الحنه و الم [ع] فر ه (و) [ب] ن(ب) ا [ب] نه /		18
/ / و ن [○] 130/ (س) لو [ب] ك عن المحصن فل (هو) ا (د) ى [ف] (لا)		19
{ } // (نو) ال (ن) س) فى (محصن) // (ن) حنى [ب] ط [ه] [ر] ن فا دا (ا) ظهر		20
{ } // (ا) نو) هن من حبب ا (م) ر (م) الله ان الله ن(ح) ب ا		21
{ } // [و] / [و] / [ب] (ا) ل [م] // [طهر] / [س] (ا) كم) [حر] (ب) ل [ك] // { }		22

¹²⁵⁾ There is not enough room for the standard text between this point and *istaṭā'ū* in the previous line.

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

¹²⁷⁾ There is perhaps insufficient room for لا. The text may be *āyātihī*.

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 *li-l-nās* is missing.

¹³⁰⁾ It is not clear whether this verse starts with *wa-*.

Folio Bonhams 2000 Recto (Q 5.41–5.48)

- { } نظهر فلو نهم لهم في الد نسا حر (ى) و (ف)ى (ا) // {} 1
 ه لهم عد (ا) // عظيم (○) نس(م)عون للكد) ب اك[لن]ن(ن) {} 2
 للس(د)ر¹³¹ فا حكر(م) // س[م] [ا] و اع ر (ص) و ا // (ع)ر ص عنهم {} 3
 لا ن[ص]ر و [ك] سد/ا و ا (ن) // [م]ب فا / [ه]ا // نا/ا / {} 4
 ا ن (ل)ل[ه] [ب]ب ا / (ن) // (ك) // [ك] // [ك] و (ك) و {} 5
 لور نه [ف] // ها حكر(م) [ا] // (ع) [ب]د هم [ب]م) ن[ب] و [ل]و ن م / {} 6
 د لك فم[ا] [ا] و [ل] [ب]ك] / م / ¹³² ○ (و) // [ا] [ب]ا [ل] [ب]و ر (ه) {} 7
 ف(ها) // (و) ر (و) [ه] (د) [ى] فح[ك] كم [ب] (ها) لا (ب)نا (ا) لد [س] // ¹³³ {} 8
 او الد [ب] (ن) هد (و) ا حكر[م] و (ن) [م]ا بر ل (الله) هه / {} 9
 حكر[م] بها (ا) ل(ر) / او و ¹³⁴ الا // ¹³⁵ [ن]ما اسحفظ(و) ام[ن] ك[ن]ب {} 10
 لله) // كا نو (ا) ع // (ه) سهد افلا حسو هم و (ا) ح [سو] // {} 11
 و لا (س)د // او [ا] ناسى بمن(ا) فلنلا و من لم يحكم [ن]م // {} 12
 ا بر (ل) الل(ه) (ف)ها و لك هم الك(ف) [ر] و ن ○ (و) // [ب]سا {} 13
 (ع)لى (ب)ى اسر بل فيها ان ا (ل) [ب]ع[ا] (س) نا ل(د) // {} 14
 لعبر(ن) [ب]العس و الا لا ف(ب) (ب)لا [ب]ف و (ا) // {} 15
 بلا ¹³⁶ (د) [ن] و [ا] [س] (ب)ها ل(س) (و) الحر و / {} 16
 / ¹³⁷ (ا) ن [ب] (صد ف) و انها [ف] // {} 17
 / لکم و [م] // [م] // [ن]ما ا بر ل ¹³⁸ (ا) لله / {} 18

¹³¹) The last letter might be a final *tā'* instead.

¹³²) The letter before *mīm* may be *lām* or a tooth-shaped letter. The letter after *mīm* may be *wāw*, *fā'*, *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-mu'minīn*. However, if it is a smudge or a corrected letter, then the word may be *bi-l-mu'minīn*.

¹³³) The first letter in the illegible part might be *hā'*, in which case the word may be *ihṭadaw* instead of *aslamū*.

¹³⁴) This *wāw* has a slightly darker hue.

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

حز.

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 *awḥā*. Alternatively, the extra traces may be smudges.

هم الـ(ط)لم(و) 139 ن ○ و ففينا على ابر هم [نـ] / /	19
/ / [مـ] / (م) // [صـ] د فالما نس ند نه م(ن ا) / /	20
نه (و ا) / / الا بحل(ل) فيه هدى و (ب) // [ر] / / { }	21
{ } // [فا] لما (ا) بر (لـ) ما من النور [نه] { }	22
و مو عطه لفو (م) نو (م) نو // [و] (لـ) بحك { } 140	23
الا (د) بحل نما ا بر ل ع(لهم) ف[نه] (و) [م] [م] { }	24
{ } بحكم) نما [ا] (د) ر (ل) الله (فا و) [لـ] (ك) [ه] // { }	25
{ } / / 141 (و ا) [ر لـ] / / [نك] // { }	26

Folio Bonhams 2000 Verso (Q 5.48–5.54)

{ } / [ق] / / [ن] / / [د] / / [م] 142	1
{ } / [و مهـ] [نـ] [مـ] [عـ] [لهم] فا (ح) [كم] [نـ] [هـ] (م) ما ا بر ل	2
{ } // [لله] (و لا) [نـ] (ع) ا هرو هـ) [م ع] (ن) ما حاك من ا	3
{ } // (و) [لك] (ل) [مهم] جعلنا [سر نعه] (و) [منه] [حا] (و) [ل و] (س) ا	4
{ } // (لحعل) [كم] ا (مه و) حد (ه) و (لـ) [ك] (ن) / / [و] كم فـ(م) ا	5
{ } // (نـ) [كم] (فـ) [سـ] // [نـ] (فو) ا (الحنر ب نم) ا (لى) الله [مـ] (ن)	6
{ } / / [كم د] (م) / / [ا] (ف) [نكم د] (م) [كـ] // [نم] فـ[هـ] (بحل) [فو] ن ○ [فـ] (ا)	7
{ } // [كم] 143 [نـ] (نـ) [مـ] // [نـ] ل ا (لـ) [هـ] (و لا) [نـ] (ع) ا [هو] هم	8
{ } // [ا حـ] (د) [ر] ا (ن) [نـ] (ك) ع(ن) [عـ] ما ا (و) حى	9
{ } [ا] (لله) الـ(نك فان) [نو] (لـ) [و] ا (فـ) نما (بر ند)	10
{ } // [هـ] (لـ) [نصيهم نـ] [عـ] [صـ] د نو (هـ) [م و] ا (ن) كـ[نـ] ا من	11
// (لـ) [نـ] (س) [فـ] / / [و] [ن] ○ (ا) / / [م] (الـ) [هـ] / / [نـ] (عو و م) //	12
/ / [كمـ] (م) ا (لله لـ) [م] (نو) [منو] ن ○ [نـ] (ا) [هـ] ا	13

¹³⁹) The distance between the initial *lām* and the *zā'* is unusually long.

¹⁴⁰) This missing part is too small for the word *ahl*, and the word seems to be missing.

¹⁴¹) This part at the beginning of the line appears empty, perhaps because writing here would have interfered with the previous line.

¹⁴²) A portion of the upper part of the text on this line is physically missing, since a strip has been cut off from the top of the folio.

¹⁴³) The traces and amount of space suggest *fa-ḥkum* instead of *wa-ani ḥkum*.

	/ /	14
[نصر ی]	/ /	15
/ /	/ /	16
○ /	/ /	17
/ /	/ /	18
/ /	/ /	19
/ /	/ /	20
{ }	/ /	21
{ }	/ /	22
{ }	/ /	23
{ }	/ /	24
{ }	/ /	25
{ }	/ /	26
{ }	/ /	27

Folio 4A (Q 11.105–11.112)

{ }	1
{ }	2
{ }	3
{ }	4
{ }	5
{ }	6
{ }	7
{ }	8

¹⁴⁴) There is not enough room for *allāhu an*. Perhaps the scribe forgot to write *an*.

¹⁴⁵) The traces here do not quite match *بی*.

¹⁴⁶) This word may be *ruḥamā’*.

¹⁴⁷) Before the final *alif*, two vertical strokes are visible that may belong to a *lām* and a *zā’*.

¹⁴⁸) The text may be *man adhina lahu* instead of *bi-idhnihi*.

¹⁴⁹) This letter may be the *nūn* of the word *khālidīn*.

{	[ند] // [ند]{	}	9
{	{ [سد]فب // [لم] // {	}	10
{	} / [و ا] / / {	}	11
{	} / / [ه]{	}	12
{	{ () / / [ـ] / / ¹⁵⁰ (و) // {	}	13

Folio 4 B (Q 11.120–123 – 8.1–3)

{	{ سدب ¹⁵¹ نه }	}	1
{	{ مو عطه و د ¹⁵² }	}	2
{	{ ا ن ا [م] [و] ا }	}	3
{	{ ¹⁵³ // [ك] (مع) // () {	}	4
{	{ و // (لا) ر ص }	}	5
{	{ (د) // و // {ك }	}	6
{	{ هد (ه) ح/م [ه سور] (ه) ا }	}	7
{	{ ~ (سد) [م] الله ال (ر) / / }	}	8
{	{ نعل (ل) ال لا [نع] (ل) ل }	}	9
{	{ ا { } ا }	}	10
{	{ [و] (مدس) [○] اسملا }	}	11
{	{ (لله) (ر) [ب] }	}	12
{	{ هم ان (سد) رد ¹⁵⁴ }	}	13

¹⁵⁰) 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*.

¹⁵¹) This grapheme may belong to the word *nuthabbitu*.

¹⁵²) A horizontal line is visible here beneath *dāl*. This line could belong to a final *yā'*.

¹⁵³) The text may be *innā ma'akum muntaẓirūn*.

¹⁵⁴) The upper section of a vertical stroke is visible the lower part of which is in the physically missing part. This stroke probably belongs to an *alif*. There are two possibilities: First, there may be another *alif* after *āyātīnā* (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*.

{	}	الد [ب] ○	{	14
{	}	و ممارر فه ¹⁵⁵	{	15

Folio 5 A (Q 8.73–75 – 9.1–7)

{	}	وا [لد] بن ا (منو) او {	1
{	}	وا في سنبل) الله نا [مو] لهم وا [ب]فسد[ه] {	2
{	}	وا // لنك هم المو مسن حر(ف) [با] لهم م[ع] (ف) [ر] ه // / {	3
{	}	ك(ر) نم ○ // { // بن امنوا من بعد و (ه) // وا [و] {	4
		جهد) [و] امعكم ف(با) و لنك منكم و اولى الا // حم	5
		نعص(ه)م ا [و] لنا) [ب]عص في كتب اللله] (و ان الله	6
		نكل ساى علم ○ ----- ¹⁵⁶	7
		نسم الله الر حر(م)ن الماز حنم] ○ ه[د] (ه) (حب) [مه سو] (ر) ه ¹⁵⁷	8
		لا نفل نسم الله [ب] ر] ا (ه) من الله و رسو ل(ه) الى الد	9
		بن (عهد) نم من المسر كس فلسحو ا في الار ص	10
		ا (ر) [نع] ه اسهر و لنعل(م) و (ا) ابهم عنر (م)عحر(ر) ي اللله] ه	11
		و رسوله (و) ان الله محر (ى) الكرف) [ر] بن ○ وا (د) ن	12
		من الله و رسو ل[ه] { } الى (ل) [ب] (اس نو) // الحح	13

¹⁵⁵) The space between the beginning of the verse (*alladhīna*) and the present point seems larger than would be needed for *yuqīmūna l-ṣalāta*.

¹⁵⁶) There is no decoration here, only a horizontal line.

¹⁵⁷) Pale traces of the grapheme لا and another grapheme ending in a final *lām* are visible exactly above the word *sūra*. These traces may belong to the word *al-anfāl*. Slightly above these traces are others that are not quite legible, but might belong to another instance of the word *sūra*. Therefore, the end of line 8 contains traces for three words: *al-anfāl*, *sūra*, and another word that is also possibly *sūra*. Traces of this latter word and *al-anfāl* are paler than those of the first instance of *sūra*. Considering that the next line begins with the grapheme لا نفل, the following conjectural scenario can explain the situation at the end of line 8: The scribe first wrote the word *al-anfāl* there, forgetting to write *sūra*. He then added the word *sūra* to the text, slightly above *al-anfāl*. However, this made the text cluttered, so he erased both *al-anfāl* and *sūra* (explaining why they are pale), and wrote the phrase *sūrat al-anfāl* anew, the لا نفل part being written on line 9. He then wanted to write *lā taqul bi-smi llāhi* after this end-of-*sūra* caption, but mistook the لا نفل of *al-anfāl* (which was on line 9) with the graphically identical *lā taqul*. Therefore, he wrote *bi-smi llāhi* immediately after this لا نفل. Consequently, the text came to be short of one instance of لا نفل.

- 14 { } الا كبرا (ن) الله برى من (ن) ا (ل) [م] (سر كس) و ر { }
- 15 [سو] [ل] [ه] // (با ن) سدو (دو افهجو) حدبر لهم و ا [ن] سدو // (ل) // (ل) // { }
- 16 به [م] // (بر) مع (ح) [ر] دن الله و (ر) // [و] [ل] [ه] فسر ا (ل) دن { }
- 17 كور و اسعد) اب ال (م) ○ الا [ل] [د] (د) عهد (د) (م) // (ن)
- 18 المسر كس فلم يفض [و] كم سنا و لم (ط) بهر و ا
- 19 (ع) [ل] [ك] [م] احد افو (ا) ال (ب) (م) عهد هم ال (ل) // /
- 20 بهم ان الله [ب] حب المنعس ○ فا دا اسلح (ا) // /
- 21 سهر الحر [م] فا [ف] // (ل) ال (م) سر ك [ن] حد [ب] // /¹⁵⁸
- 22 هم و حد و هم (و) احد [ص] (و) هم (و) افعد) و ا (لهم)
- 23 كل مر صد فان ناوا (و) افمو الصلوه
- 24 و ا (د) و ا (لر) كوه فحل [و] استلهم // (ا) // { } لله
- 25 عفا / ر¹⁵⁹ حنم و ا (ن) احد // ان { } سر (س) { } / ك
- 26 فا حره حنا // [س] [م] (ك) لم ال (ل) [ه] [م] ا { } م [ب] منه
- 27 ذلك نا { } { } [فو] م لا [ع] [فلو] [ن] / / (ك) // [ف] // / { }
- 28 { } // [س] [ر] كس¹⁶⁰ (ع) ه / الله { }

Folio 5 B (Q 9.7–9.16)

- 1 { } سوله الا الدس عهد بم (ع) بد المسحد
- 2 { } // ر م فمما (س) [مو] // ا [ك] [م] ¹⁶¹ فا (س) [م] بهم ان ال (ل) [ه]
- 3 { } [ب] ال (م) (ف) ○ و ك (ف) ان نظهر و ا [ع] [ل] [ك] [م] لا [ن]
- 4 { } فهو بكم الا و لا دمه بر صو (ك) م نا (س) بهم
- 5 و ناى فلو بهم) و ا كبر هم (س) [فو] ن ○ اسر (و)

¹⁵⁸) There is not enough space for *وحد سمو*, and the traces do not match it. The text may be *thaqiftumūhum* instead of *wajadtumūhum*.

¹⁵⁹) 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.

¹⁶⁰) 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.

¹⁶¹) The illegible letter before *kāf* may be a tooth-shaped one instead of *lām*.

- 6 {بِع}هد الل(له)ه و ائمهم نما فل[ب]لا فصد و ا عن
- 7 س[ب]ل(ل)ل الله انهم سا ما كانوا يعملون ○ لا [ب] [ر]
- 8 فنون في مو [م]ن الا و لا (د) [مه] ا و ل[ب]ك [ه]م [الم]ع[ر]// (د)
- 9 و ن فان نيو¹⁶² او اقموا الصلوه و انوا ا
- 10 لركوه فاحو نكم في الدين و مولنكم
- 11 بعص(ل) الله ال(با) تب لعلكم بعقل[و] ن ○ و ان تكونو
- 12 ائمهم من بعد عهد [ه]م [ط]عنو ا [ي] د
- 13 { } نكم فصلوا ا (نم) // الك(ف)ر ا (ه) لا ا (ن) من (ه) [م]
- 14 { } [ع] [ه] // سنه [و] ن ○ و مالكم الا [ب] [ف] [ل] (و) ن [م]
- 15 (تكونو) ائم[ب]هم و هم ند و كم اول مر (ه و)
- 16 (ه)م [و] ا (با) حر ح الرسول احد (سو) بهم ف(با) لله
- 17 // حق ان بحسوا ان ك[ب]م مو (ب) ن (○) فلو هم بعد بهم
- 18 [ا] لله ناند نكم و نحرهم و نصركم عليهم
- 19 و ندهب عنط صدور قوم مؤمنس ○ و نده
- 20 هب عنط فلو بهم (و) نبوب الله على من بسا و
- 21 الله عل[ب]م حكيم ○ ا فحسبم ان نتر¹⁶³ كو (ا) [و] لما
- 22 [ب] [ع] { } // { } ا { } دس جهد و امكم في سنله (ه) و
- 23 لم نحد[د] و (ا) من د و ن الل(له) و لا (ر) [س] و له / لا //
- 24 { } لمؤمنس و لنحه و الله ح/ب(ر) نما يعملون ○

Folio 6A (Q 9.17–9.26)

- 1 { } ما كان للمسر كين ان يعمر و امسجد الل(له) سد { }
- 2 على ا [ب] فسهم [ب] ل / ا و لنك الد [ب] ن (حب) ط // { }
- 3 في الد (ب) با و الا حر [ه] و في الد (با) ر هم حلد و ن ○ ا { }
- 4 ب(ع)م [ر] مسحد الل(له) من ا [م] ن) نال الله و الن[و]م [ا] لا (ح) [ر] (و) { }
- 5 جهد (ف) [ي] سنل الله و لم بحس الا الل(له) فعسى او لن // { }
- 6 ان سكو // بوا من المفلح(ب) ن ○ ا حعلم¹⁶⁴ س[ف] // (ح) ا ح (و) { }

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’*.

- 7 عمر ه الم (س) حد الحرم (ك) من امن بالله واليوم ا
 8 لا (ح) // و جهد و 165 في سنبل الله لا سنون عبد (د) الله
 9 ا ن الله لا يهدى الف [و] م الظلمن () الد ن ا [منو] ا
 10 و ه / و ا [و] جه [د] و ا ف (ى) سد (ب) ل الله نامو لهم
 11 و انفسهم ا [ع] [ظم] (د) ر ح [ه] 166 // (ا و ل) [ب] (ك) 167 [م] الف [نر]
 12 و ن (ب) // ا ر هم ر // [م] نر (ح) [م] (ه) [منه و ر ص] // (ن) // [ح] // [ب] {}
 13 لهم / / بها نعم معنم () هم) [فه] حلد و // (ا ن الل) [ه] { }
 14 ه ا حرر) عظم () نايها الد ن ا مو ا لا // حد و (ا) [ا] { }
 15 كم (و) لا بنا كم و لا احو (ك) م ا (و) ل [نا] ن اسح { }
 16 الكف [ر] على الا ن و من بنو ل [ب] [م] فا (و) لك هم [م]
 17 الظلمون () فل ان (ك) ن ا (نا) كرم و [ا] [ب] (ك) [م] و [ا]
 18 حو بكم و 168 (و) حكم و [عسر] // [ك] م و (ا مو) ل ا [ف] //
 19 {} ف [ب] م // ها (و) حد // [ه] نحون ك (س) د ها و (م) / ان (نر) صوبها
 20 {} ا [حب] الل [كم] من ا (ل) [ه] و ر سوله و جهد في سنن /
 21 {} ف [نر] بصوا ح [ب] (ى) [ب] [ا] [ب] ا لى الله نامر ه ا ن ا // [ه] (لا يهدى)
 22 {} الفوم الفسفن () لعد (ب) صر (ك) م الل [ه] [ف] (ى) // / ط (ن) [كن] ر ه
 23 {} و يوم حسن ا د ا عد (ب) [ك] م كتر 169 ب / [ب] [ن] {}

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 *jāhadū* 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 *daraja*. One can see the remnants of an *alif* and another letter (possibly an initial *lām*) exactly where the grapheme *ح* is written.

¹⁶⁷) Traces that match the phrase *inda llāhi* are visible beneath the word *ulā'ika*. Perhaps the scribe first wrote *inda llāhi*, but then erased it and wrote *ulā'ika* in its place.

¹⁶⁸) Traces of an initial *'ayn* are visible here. Perhaps the scribe began writing *'ashvratukum*, 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 *thā'*. The two strokes are not placed vertically above each other; one is to the right and slightly lower than the other.

	{ } 170/ / ر [نما] (ص) [لا ر (ص) [نما] ر / / { }	24
	{ } 171/ / [سكينة] / / [م] (و) / / [ب] / / [م] (و) / / [مد نر] / / [د] [م] (ا) [بر ل] [ل] [ل] (ه) (ا) / / { }	25
	{ } 173/ / / / 172/ / / { }	26

Folio 6 B (Q 9.26–9.34)

	{ } 1 { } { لمو مس و [نر] ل [حب] (و د) [] / / [نر] (و) [ه] (و) { }	1
	{ } 2 { } { [ب] (ا) [د نر كور و] [و] [د] [ك حرا الكعـر] // [ب] (ن) [م] }	2
	{ } 3 { } { ب (الل) / / [بعد] // (لك) [عل] // (من) [نسا و] ا [الله] [عل] [م] }	3
	{ } 4 { } { (ح) [ك] // [ب] // [نا] // [ب] // [د] // (ل) / / [نما] // [مسر كور] }	4
	{ } 5 { } { ن // (حسن) / / 174/ (ل) [] / / [د] (ل) / / [عد] / / [م] (ه) }	5
	{ } 6 { } { [هد] (ل) [و] / / [ع] / / [ف] / / 175/ (ل) [] // [] (ه) [] }	6
	{ } 7 { } { [س] // [ا] [] / / [ح] / / 176/ (ل) / / }	7
	{ } 8 { } { [ل] / / [لا ن] / / [م] // (و) [ب] // [ل] / / 177/ [لا] [ح] [ر] و // }	8
	{ } 9 { } { ن [مو] [ما] / / [ل] / / 178/ [] / / }	9

¹⁷⁰) One can see traces matching an initial *ḥā’*. In light of the first visible letters on the next line, it seems the scribe initially attempted to write *حب* here but then changed his mind, erased what he had written, and wrote *حب* 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 *حب*.

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 *sakīnatahu*.

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-lā*. The second letter may be *dāl*, *kāf*, or *ṣād*.

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 *ḥā’* 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-yawmi*. Perhaps the text has *wa-bi-l-yawmi* instead.

¹⁷⁸) This letter probably belongs to the word *rasūluhu*.

{ } / [م] [لا] / [ن] (ا) [م] / { } /	24
{ } لرو / [نا] / ن ¹⁸⁹ // [م] و (ل) // (لناس) { }	25
{ } ل ¹⁹⁰ // [لنا] / / بصد / و (ن) [ع] [سب] [نل] (ا) ل { }	26

Folio 20 A (Q 9.70–9.80)

{ } [سب] [ه] // نال نسب فما كان ا (له) // [نظلمهم] و ل { }	1
{ } [و] (ا) [نفسهم] [نظلم] // ن () ا (ل) [مو] // [ن] [و] // (ل) [م] و (سب) (نع) { }	2
(م) [ن] [ع] (نا) [م] و [ن] [معر] و (ف) و (سب) [ه] و (ن) [ن] [ع] [م] { }	3
{ } المصلو) ه و نوبو (ن) الر كرو) ه و طنعر) و ل { }	4
{ } سوله او لك سبر حمهم) الله [و] اللله) (ع) // ل { }	5
{ } (فا) // د ¹⁹¹ الله للمو منس و المو منس حبب { }	6
{ } [ن] [ع] (ها) ¹⁹² لا بهر حلد بن فيها و (م) [سكن] [ن] { }	7
{ } عد (ن) د لك الر (فو) ر ال (ع) [نظم] [ن] [ن] [س] [ح] [ه] { } ¹⁹³	8
{ } [و] اعط [ع] // [ه] [م] و [م] [و] [ن] [هم] [نار] و [ن] [س] [ل] { }	9
{ } [ن] [ع] [م] و [ن] [لله] [م] (ف) [ل] [و] او [ل] [ف] [د] [فا] [ل] [و] [ا] [ك] { } ¹⁹⁴	10
{ } [و] [ه] // (ا) [ن] [م] [ل] [م] [ن] [ل] [و] او (م) [ن] [ع] [م] [و] [ا] [ا] [ن] [ع] [ن] [ن] { }	11
{ } [و] // [سو] [ه] [م] [ن] [ف] [ص] [ل] [ه] و (ا) [ن] [ن] [و] [ن] [و] [ف] [و] [ا] [ح] [ن] [ل] [م] [و] [و] (ن)	12
{ } [و] [ل] [و] [ع] [د] [ن] [م] [لله] في [ل] [د] [ن] [و] (م) [لهم] [ف] [و] [ا] [ل] [ح] // [د]	13
{ } [م] [و] [ل] [و] لا [ن] [ص] [ن] [و] [م] [ن] [ع] [د] [لله] [ن] [ن] [ا] [ن] [س] [ا] [ن]	14
{ } [ف] [ص] / [ن] [ص] [ف] و [ن] [ن] [ن] [م] [الصلحس] فلما [ن] [ن] //	15

¹⁸⁹) The traces before *nūn* match the graphemes حد and (less likely) حو. Therefore, the word is probably *ya'khudhūna*.

¹⁹⁰) 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.

¹⁹¹) This word is probably *fa-a'adda*.

¹⁹²) There are traces above the second tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter *tā'*.

¹⁹³) There is not enough room for the phrase *al-kuffāra wa-l-munāfiqīn*. The text might lack either *al-kuffār* or *al-munāfiqīn*. The limited space favors *al-kuffār*, which is shorter.

¹⁹⁴) There is not enough room in this physically missing part for the standard text between *qālū* and *hammū*. Perhaps the phrase *wa-kafarū ba'da islāmihim* is absent.

- 16 // [لله] من فصله) نطو (ا) نه و نو¹⁹⁵ لو معر صد / 196/ ○ (ف)ا (ع)ف / /
- 17 [الله] نفعاً الى نو // (ف)و نه ذلك بما ا حل[فو ا]
- 18 ا [ل] (ه) ما و عد (و) ه و ما كا (ب) و انك (ن) و (ا) و (لم)
- 19 (ر)د / / ا ا ن الله نعل(م) سر هم) و (ن)و هم و ا ن [ا] / /
- 20 علم ال(عد) [و] ب ○ 197 [ل]د [ن] (ب) لمر (و) ن المنطو عد(ن) من ا [ل] (ل) [م] //
- 21 منس في ال(صد)د [ب] و ال(د) بن لا حد و ن ا (لا) [ح]ه //
- 22 هم سحر(ر) و امنهم فسح الله منهم و لهم (ع)د ا [ب]
- 23 { } (ا) ل(م) ○ اسعور ل(ه)م او لا (ب)د-ع[ف]ر ل(ه)م [م] ا ن (ب)د-ع[ب]ر //
- 24 { } [ل] (م) [سعد]-(ن) مر // لا بعن الله لهم ا [ا] 198 [ل] له لا ب(هد) //
- 25 { } 199 [ا لوم] [م] // [فسف] [ن] // ○ { } / /

Folio 20 B (Q 9.81–9.90)

- 1 { } 200 [ل] / [ل] (ف)و (ن) نا (ن) ف // و (ا) 201 حل[ف] ر سر(و) [ل] { }
- 2 { } و (كر) [ه] (و) ا (ا) / / (ب)د[ه] (د) [و] (ا) / / (م)و / /
- 3 { } [م] / [ف] / [نل] (ا) [له] // فل[و] ا [لا] [س]ه // (و)

¹⁹⁵) There are traces above the tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter *tā*'.

¹⁹⁶) There is not enough room for a final *wāw* and an isolated *nūn*. It seems that the scribe wrote an accusative ending (*īn*) 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.

¹⁹⁷) 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.

¹⁹⁸) The folio is partly missing here, but traces are visible that may belong to *nūn* and *alif*.

¹⁹⁹) 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.

²⁰⁰) Since this missing part has enough room for *fariḥa*, 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.

²⁰¹) This word may be *qa'adū*.

{ (ل)حر و ا (ل) / / (ر)202 (ح) [سم] اسد حر // (و) كا	4
{ // [ه] // // [ف] [ل] [صد] [د] [ك] [و] ا فلن] [لا] (و) لسك // اكس (ا)	5
{ كيو (ا) نعملون / / [] / / [ع] ك اللله الى	6
{ [هم] فاسد نو ك في الحر و ح فـل	7
{ و امعى اند (ا) و (لن) بـفـ(د) لو ام [ع] ي عد [و]	8
{ [م] ر صنم نالـفـ(ع) ده ا و [ل] (م) ره (فا) فـ(ع)ـد	9
{ الحلفـ(د) ن () [و] لا (بصل عـلـى) ا (حد) مـ[ن]ـ(ه) [م]	10
{ ند (ا) و (لا) نعم على فـ[ن]ـ(ر) ه اـ(هم) [كفر] و	11
{ // [له] (و ر) [سد] [و ل] [ه] (و) ما نو (ا و) هم [م] فسـ(ف) [و] ن	12
203 { او اد ا [فـ] [ل] امنوا [نا] لـ(ل) [ه] و حـ(ه) [د] و (ا) [م] ع ر (سو	13
// (ا) سد [ن] ك (ا و) [لو] ا (لط) و ل منه [م] و [ف] [ل] //	14
15 (در) [نـا]ـ[كـون] (م) ع (ا) لـعـد ن [] [ر] صـ(و) // (ب) نـ[كو] [نو]	
16 [ا م] ع [الـ] [و] [لـف] [فـ] [ط] [بـع] [ع] لى فـلو نهم فهم	
17 لا نـعـفـ[ه] و (ن) [] [ك] [ن] (ا) لـر [س] و ل و الد [ن] [م] نو ا	
18 // [ه] [حـد] و ا [نا] م [و] لـه [م] و (ا) [ن] [س] // [م] فى / (سـ) [ل]	
19 اللله) ا و لـ(ك) لـ(هم) (الـ) [ن] (ر) [ب] و ا و لـ(ك) ه / 204	
20 // / (عـلـ) // (و) [ن] (ا) عـدا (لـلـ) [ه] لـ(هم) حـب حـر (ى	
21 // (ن) حـ[نـها] (لا) (بـ) [هـر] حـلـد ن [فـبـ] (هـاـد) [ن] ك ا	
22 // / [ر] (لـ) [عـظـم] () // / 205 [م] [ل] [م] // / 206 [ر] و ن [م] (ن) (لا)	

²⁰²⁾ The text seems to have been *al-nāru Jahannama*, 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 nāra* or, less likely, *qul nāru*.

²⁰³⁾ Verse 85 is missing. The omission may represent a scribe’s eyes skipping from the instance of *nāra* followed by a verse separator and the morpheme *wa* at the end of verse 84 to the instance of *nāra* followed by a verse separator and the morpheme *wa* at the end of verse 85.

²⁰⁴⁾ The letter after *hā’* is more similar to *wāw* than *mīm*.

²⁰⁵⁾ There are no traces of the letter *wāw* in this part, and there is not enough space for *حا* or *حـا* 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.

²⁰⁶⁾ The space after the putative *mīm* is larger than is needed for *‘ayn* and *dhāl*. Perhaps the word is *al-mu’tadhirūn*, which is reported here for Ibn Mas‘ūd and Sa‘īd b. Jubayr (al-KHAṬĪB, *Mu‘jam*, 3:436).

19	عر بر (ع)[د]-(ه) ما عنكم ²¹¹ حر نص [ع]لكم نا [مو] منس ر [و]
20	ف ر ح[م] [] فا // (د) و لو ا [ع]-(د)ك فعل ح(د)[د]ى ال(ل)ه
21	(ا) لد ي لا ال[ه] [الا هو] علنه // كلب / ²¹²
22	العر س ال[ع]-(ط) // (ه)د ه ح(م)ه سور ه ا //-(د)
23	(د)ه ~~~~~ (د)س(م) الله الر (ح)[م]س
24	الر ح(م) كهبعص دكر [ر] ح[م]ه ر نك عند ه (ر) [ك] //
25	{ } (نا) اد نادى ر نك ر [ر] نا ندا ح(ف) [] () و فل ر بى
26	{ } اسئعل الرايس سنا ولم اك ر ب (د) عا (ك) { }
27	{ } سغنا () و ح(ف)ب المول من و [ر] اى [و] ك // { }
28	{ } (ا) / [د] // [ع]را (ف) [ه] (ب) لى من لد نك { }

Folio 22 B (Q 19.6–19.29)

1	{ } ا ل (د) [ع]-(ف) // ب و ا جعله ر ب ر ص(د) () { }
2	{ } (فد) و هينا لك ²¹⁴ علما ر كنا () و سر نه
3	{ } (ه) من ف(ل) سد/منا ²¹⁵ () ²¹⁶ فل ر ب ا // لى (ك) و لى (ع) لم ²¹⁷
4	{ } ل [ك] بر عسا () ²¹⁸ (ف)ل كد لك فل [ر] (ك) ه [و] على
5	{ } (ح)ف [د] ك من ف(ل) و لم نك ساي () فل ر ب ا
6	{ } ل انك (ا) لا نكلم لنا س ن(ب) ل/ل سونا ()

²¹¹) This word is probably *‘annatakum*.

²¹²) There are traces that match the word *rabb*, but the traces before the putative *rabb* do not match *wa-huwa*, nor is there enough room for it.

²¹³) Writing before this point would have interfered with the text from the previous two lines.

²¹⁴) It seems another letter, possibly *ḥā’* or *‘ayn*, had initially been written in place of *lām*.

²¹⁵) There is enough room between *sīn* and *mīm* for one letter. Moreover, there are traces before the initial *sīn* that match a tooth. Either the word is not *samiyyan*, or the scribe had initially written another word (such as *shabīhan*) before replacing it with *samiyyan*.

²¹⁶) Considering the traces, the missing parts in lines 2 and 3 might have had *yā Zakariyyā innā* and *bi-Yaḥyā lam naj‘al lahu* respectively.

²¹⁷) It seems the scribe initially wrote *walad* here, but then erased it and wrote *ghulām* instead.

²¹⁸) Considering the length of the physically missing part at the beginning of the line, the text probably lacks the phrase *wa-kānat imra‘atī ‘āqiran*.

- 7 { } [م] 219 حر ح (ع) لى ف (و) م // 220 من الم (ح) ر ب ا (و) ح (ى) ال (ب) هم ان سحر
- 8 انكره (و) عسها (ب) [ب] (ى) ا ح (د) ال (ك) (ب) بعوه و علمه ا
- 9 ل (ح) كم صنبا ○ حننا من لدنا [و] [ر] كرو) ه و كان بعنا ○ و بر ا د / 221
- 10 بولده (و) لم تك حبرا [عصبا] ○ و علمه السلم يوم ولد
- 11 و (و) م (مو) ب (و) [و] [م] [د] [ع] حنا ○ و اذكر 222 فى المكتب [
- 12 مرم ادا سبذ 223 ت من اهلها مكناسر ف/ا (○) (ف) ا (ب) حدب من
- 13 (د) [و] [ب] هم ح (ب) ا (ف) 224 (ر) // [ل] / ا لنها ر و // (ا) 225 ف (تم) ثل لها سر (ا) سر (و)
- 14 // ○ // (ل) 226 ا [ب] ا [ع] (و) دنا ل (ر) حمن [م] ك ان كبت بعنا ○ فل ا
- 15 // ا / (ب) // (س) [و] [ل] // (ك) لتهب 227 لك علما ز كنا ○ فلب ا // لى [ب] كو
- 16 [ن] // [ل] [ع] لم [و] [ل] م (س) / (س) // و لم اك بعنا ○ فل كد لك
- 17 [ف] (ل) ر بك و هو عا // (ه) 228 ه (ب) ن ○ و لنحطه انه للناس و رحمة منا
- 18 (و) [] مر امعصبا ○ فحملت فانتبذ به م (ك) ا فصبا ○
- 19 (فلم) // ا ح ا ها المحص الى حد ع النحل (ه) فل (ب) نلسى (م) ب

²¹⁹) This word may be *thumma*.

²²⁰) The traces after *mīm* are more similar to an initial or medial *hā'* than a final one. Perhaps the scribe first wrote a medial *hā'* but then tried to change it to a final *hā'*.

²²¹) 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 *hā'* 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. *balīgh*). 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.

²²²) This *alif* is probably a scribal error.

²²³) There are traces above the second tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter *tā'*.

²²⁴) A small dash, such as appears in end-of-verse symbols or consonant-distinguishing marks, is visible slightly to the right of *fā'*.

²²⁵) This *alif* may be preceded by one or two letters.

²²⁶) The traces before *lām* cannot belong to an initial *qāf* alone. They may belong to a *fā'* 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 *qālat*, spelled with *alif*).

²²⁷) There is a small chance that the dash above the first tooth is a smudge rather than a consonant-distinguishing mark.

²²⁸) Traces of a final *yā'* are visible immediately after *lām*. It is not clear if the scribe wrote *'alayya* and changed it to *'alayhi* or the other way around.

- 20 هبل هد ا ا ل(ب) [و] م و كتب نسنا منسا ○ (ف) د [د] بها من حبه //
- 21 / 229 لا بحر بي قد جعل (ل) // نك بحـ(ك س)ر (ب) ا ○ و هر ي
- 22 // [ل]ك بحد (ع) ا / ا / حل // // سعت 230 ع / // ك (ر) ط (ب) ا حنبا ○ [ف] ك ا لى
- 23 // [ا] س / // د [و] ف // [ى] ع (ن) ا ○ ف (ا) م (ا) [ب] // [ب] (ن) من ال (س)ر احد ا ف (و) لى
- 24 / / [د] ر [ب] [ل] (لر) / / (ن) ص [و] (ما) [و] صم [ب] (نا ل) 231 ا كلم اللو [م] ا
- 25 / / ○ / [ب] (ت) فو [م] (ا) // (حمله فلو) ا (م) ر د [م] لعد اتنت
- 26 { } / [ل] / [ا] / [و] // (ب) هر [و] ن (ما) كا (ن) ابو [ك] (ا) نا // [و] (ا) { }
- 27 { } [و] ما / / [ا] مك / / (ا) فاسر) ب ا لى [د] { }

Folio 23 A (Q 19.29–19.54)

- 1 { } // د (ى) 232 ا [م] (د) / / [و] { } (ك) [ب] (ك) / [ب] (د) { }
- 2 [ا] [ب] (نا) ع / د [ا] [ل] / [ل] / [ك] / [ل] / / { } 233 { }
- 3 { } كا انما كتب [و] امر بى [ب] / / [ه] / / { }
- 4 { } د مر ب // [ب] و بر ا د (و) ل (د) [بى] (و) ل (م) د [ب] ح (ع) [ب] / [ح] // { }
- 5 { } ال (س) لم (ب) و (م) و ل (ب) [و] (ب) / / (ه) و ب (و) / / { }
- 6 { } 234 د [ل] [ك] ع // سى ا (ب) م ر ب فو ل (ا) ل [ح] [ب] ال (د) ي كا ن { }
- 7 ممر و ن ما [ك] (ا) ن الل [ه] ا ن بحد (و) ل (د) ا [س] (ب) نه ا د ا فصى

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-dhī*.

²³³) The missing part has enough room for three words. Therefore, the putative *lām* preceding this part probably belongs to the verb *ja’alanī* 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’alanī* for another word. The text might have *wa-l-ḥikma* after *al-kitāb*.

²³⁴) Considering the presence of *kāna*, it is possible that the text has *kāna l-nāsu* in addition to the standard text. Ubayy b. Ka’b’s codex reportedly had this phrase (al- KHATĪB, *Muḥjam*, 5:366).

- 8 امر افا نما يقول له كي فسـ[ك]و ن ○ ان اللّٰه ر بي و ر
- 9 (ك)م (ف) عند [و] ه هدا صر نظم (س)م (ن) ○ فاحلف الا
- 10 حر ب سـ(ه) [م] عن امر هم فو بل للدين ك [ف] و ا (م) مسهد
- 11 نوم عظم ○ اسمع بهم وانصر بو (ب) او بنا لكن ا
- 12 لظلم (م) و النوم في صلال منـ(ب) ○ فاند [ر] (هم) نوم (ا) [حـ] [ر]
- 13 ه ا فصى الامر و هم في عطفه و هم لا نومـ[و] ن ○ ا
- 14 ناحن (ب) ر الارص و من عليها و النـ(ب) نر (ج) و ن ○ [و] ا [د]
- 15 ك // في (ا) لـ(ك) ب ابر هم انه كا (ن) صد بقا نينا ا د فل لا
- 16 نه نابت لم بعد ما لا نسمع و لا ننصر [و] ما لا [بـ] (ه) [بـ]
- 17 (ع) بك سنا ○ نابت ابي فد حا بي من العلم ما لم ناك
- 18 فابنعى ا (ه) د ك صر بطا سونا ○ نابت لا بعد [سـ] [ط] [ن]
- 19 ان السطن كان للرحم عصنا ○ نابت ا [بـ] (ي) ا (ح) ف ان
- 20 (م) سـ(ك) عدا [ب] من الرحم فسكون للسطن [و] لنا ○ (فل)
- 21 [نا بر] [ه] [م] (ا) [بـ] / (ن) الهـ // [ي] [و] 235 [لـ] (ن) [بـ] / [لـ]
- 22 حـ // [بـ] ك [و] ا 237 هـ ر بي ملنا ○ فل سلـ[م] عنك سا (سـ) بعـ[ر] [لـ] (ك)
- 23 ر بي انه كان بي حفنا ○ واعبر لكم و ما (بـ) / (ن) // (ن) //
- 24 و ن (ا) لله و ا دعوار بي (و) عسى ا (ن) لاكون [بـ] د (ع) / /
- 25 بي سفا ○ فلما اعبر لهـ // (و) ما بعد و ن (م) (د) و (ن) //
- 26 لله / / [نا] (سـ) حـ 238 و بعوف و كلا جعلنا بنا / /
- 27 [بـ] / / (لـ) / / [لـ] / / 239 / /
- 28 // د (ع) لنا ○ و ا ذكر فـ(ي) الكـ(ب) موسى انه كان / /

²³⁵) If this letter is *wa-*, then perhaps the sentence preceding it is not interrogative. It might be *yā Ibrāhīmu anta rāghibun 'an ālihatī*.

²³⁶) 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 *فا* as well.

²³⁸) The word in the preceding illegible part may be *bashsharnāhu*.

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

- { / الطو / / { } 29
 { / / { } 30

Folio 23 B (Q 19.54–19.70)

- { [ع] / / اسمعيل انه كان صدق الو ع[د] } 1
 { / [و] / [و] 244-243 (و كها ن [با] [مر] ا هله[ه] ناصلو } 2
 { / [و] / [و] [عند] ر به مر صبا و اد كر في } 3
 { [س] ا به) كان (صد) [د] بعا (ب) // (ا) [و] ر فع(د) ه ا } 4
 { / [و] 245 (و) او ل/ك الد // ان نعم الل [ه] ع[ب]هم } 5
 { // [ن] [د] [ر] نه ادم و [م] من (حم) ل/ا [م]ع بوح و (من) د } 6
 ر به ابر ه(د)م و (ا) [سم] // ل [و] م هد بنا [و] (ا) [ح] - [ب] (ب) ا اد } 7
 ا ب(ل)ى ع[ا] // (هم) اب ال(ر) (ح)م(ح)ر) و ا (س) حد ا (و) [ب] - [ك] ا } 8
 فحلف ب(ع) [د] [ه]م [ح]لف اص(ع) و ال [ل] صد لوب و ابسع(و) ا } 9
 السهو ب ف[ب] و ف بلفون // [با] [و] الا من ناب و [ام] (ن) و } 10
 عمل صلحا فا (و) لئك ند حل(و) ن ال(ح) [ب] - ه و لا نظلمون } 11
 سنا [و] حبب الحذ اللى و (ع) در (ب) ك ع(د) ه ا ن و عد } 12
 [ر] بك (ك) بان نا ل/ (ب) 246 م // (ا) // (م) / (ن) 247 [ف] (ب) ه ا على الار بك } 13
 // سمعون ف(ب) العرو) او لا ناسما (و) ل(ه) // (ف) بها [ر] } 14

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 *innā*, the following word could be a verb the object of which is Moses.

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

²⁴³) The traces do not match either *rasūlan* or *nabiyyan*. Also, the missing and illegible parts together have more room than is needed for the phrase *wakāna rasūlan nabiyyan*.

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-ghayb*.

²⁴⁷) The letter before the tooth may be *mīm*. The word may be *mun‘imān*, or, less likely, *muttaki‘in*.

- 15 [ف] [م] نكره و [ع] / [با] ○ [د] لك نور بها (من) عندنا من كان
- 16 [د] [ف] (ف) ○ و ما نن (د) ر ل لا [د] [ا] [م] [ر] 248 ر // بك له م / [ن] [ا] (د) د نكم و
- 17 / / حلفكم و ما نن [ن] دلک و ما (ك) (ن) ر نك نسد // ○ ر ب (ا)
- 18 // (سد) [مو] ب (و) الا (ر) ص و م (ا) نن (د) ه (م) فا ع (د) ه و اصط [ن] [ر]
- 19 [ل] [ع] [د] [ه] [و] لا (سد) ر (ك) (ه) هل نعلم (ه) له (سد) م (د) (ا) ○ و نعو
- 20 (ل) [ا] لا [ن] [س] [ا] د ا م ب و (ك) ب (د) ر نا و عظم (ا) ابى لمن (ع) و
- 21 [ب] [ح] (د) (ا) ○ ا و لا نن (د) ك ر الا (سد) انا حلفه من (ف) ل و
- 22 [م] نك (سد) با ○ [ف] و [ر] نك [ل] [د] [س] ر (ه) [م] [و] (سد) ط [ن] [د] هم (ح) و ل
- 23 / / [د] / [نا] 249 ○ [م] [د] / 250 [ع] [ن] من كل سد [ع] (ه) م كا (ن) اسد (ع) لى
- 24 (ا ل ر ح) [م] (ن) [ع] [ب] [د] (ا) ○ (و) [ف] [د] [د] [م] [ا] و لنكم بها (و) صل 251
- 25 / / ن (م) [د] كم (ا) لا و [ر] د (و) ها و ك (ا) ن على ر [ن] ك [ح] ما
- 26 [م] [ف] [د] (ا) ○ (م) [ن] [د] [ح] (ح) ا المنف نس 252 [و] [د] ر ا (ل) / 253 [ف] [د] (ه) [ا] [د] / ○ و ا
- 27 [د] [ن] [ل] [ى] [ع] [ن] [ه] [م] ا [د] / [نا] 254 (ن) [ب] [ف] [ا] ل ا ل د // [ن] [ك] و (ا) ل ل د
- 28 { } // [ا] [و] [ا] (ا) سا (ح) بر (م) [م] [ا] و (ا) حس د نا ○ (و) [م] [ا]
- 29 { } (ه) // [ك] [ف] / (ن) [ر] ر (هم) احس (ا) سا و ر [ن] (ا) ○ { }

²⁴⁸) This letter may be *mīm* instead.

²⁴⁹) There are traces above the line after the initial *hā'* that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter *thā'*.

²⁵⁰) The traces after the tooth do not quite match ب; they may belong to the grapheme ه. 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 Beneficent."

²⁵¹) The last grapheme does not seem to be an independent predicate. Therefore, the *wāw* preceding it probably is not conjunctive. The *wāw* and the following grapheme probably form a single word, *waṣṣiyyan* or, less likely due to lesser conformance to the rhyme, *waṣṣāliyyan*. It is noteworthy that the corresponding word in the standard text puzzled the readers, who read it variously as *ṣilyyyan*, *ṣaliyyan* or *ṣūliyyan*. Ibn Muḥāhid said that this word was not known to him at all (al-KHAṬĪB, *Muḥājam*, 5:384).

²⁵²) The presence of two teeth before *nūn* instead of one is a scribal error.

²⁵³) There is not enough room after *lām* for the word *al-ẓālimīn*. Considering the remaining traces, the word here may be *al-kuffār*.

²⁵⁴) In the middle of the illegible part, there are traces above the line that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter *tā'*.

Folio 7A (Q 22.15–22.26)

{ } [ا] { [لله] في [ا] }	1
{ [ب] (ا) لى [س]ما // [ل]قطع }	2
{ [م]ا [ع]نط) كد [ك] [ع]ل(ب)ها }	3
{ [ه] [د]ى) من بر بد ان ا (ل)دين }	4
{ الصدا / و ال // (ص) [ر] // و ال) [محو] }	5
{ بفصل [ب] (ب) // (ه) [م] في دنه // 255 ان }	6
{ ال [م] / (و) 256 ا (ن) ال (ل)ه (ح) // 257 }	7
{ ر ص و ا (ل) [س] (مس) و (ا) [م] }	8
{ // (ل) [س] 258 (و) (ا) ل (ط)ر) و (ا) ل (ح)ل) 259 }	9
{ حى علي(ه) ل) / / 260 }	10
{ // [م] [ه] 261 (ا) ن ال (ل)ه [ف] // (ل) ما }	11
{ [د] { } [د] { (ح) [نص] (مو) ا في (ر) نه) // [ف] لد / / }	12
{ كثر [و] ا [فط] [ع] (ب) { } من [ب] ار 262 نصب (و) [ق] ر // }	13
{ (س) / (ا) ل [م] (م) { } / { (ه) ما (فى) // (طو) بهم) و ال (ل) د }	14
{ و له (م) / / من حد (ب) // (ا) ه (م) // 263 ا (ن) [ح]ار (ح) [و] ا }	15
{ منه (ا) من عم اعد و اف [ه]ها / / فوا (ع) // [ب] }	16
{ لحر [ب] (ق) [] (ن) [ا] لله [ب] { } / { (ل) / (ا) [منو] او [عم] / / }	17
{ ا [ا] [ل]ص) / (ح) [ب] / / بحر ي // [ن] [س]ح [ها] ا (لا) نه [ر] [نحو] [ن] }	18
{ (ب)ها من (ا) [س] / / (م) د ه / و لو // [و] (و) ل (س)م (ف) / / }	19

²⁵⁵) This word may be *dīnīhim*.

²⁵⁶) This word may be *taraw/yaraw*.

²⁵⁷) The last letter may be *dāl* or *bā*. The word may be *yukhbitu*. Alternatively, it is possible that the scribe mistakenly wrote *سحد* instead of *سجد*.

²⁵⁸) This word may be *al-shajar*.

²⁵⁹) Considering the visible words on lines 8, 9, and 10, the missing part on this line may contain the nouns *al-nujūm* and *al-dawābb* as well as an additional item.

²⁶⁰) The traces here match an isolated *rā*, but could also represent the beginning of an isolated *bā*.

²⁶¹) The text may be *fa-lā mukrima lahu* instead of *fa-mā lahu min mukrimin*.

²⁶²) There are traces after *rā* that might belong to a *wāw*.

²⁶³) The text may be *idhā hammū* instead of the standard *kullamā arādū*.

²⁶⁴) There are greenish traces here that may belong to an isolated *wāw* or *rā*.

- 20 (ح) / / ○ (و هد و ا) [ا] // / ط[ب] من (ا) لعل (و) هد [] //
- 21 الى صر ط ا ل(ح) // / (و ا) [د] // / ك(ف) ر [و] ا [و] / /
- 22 و ا²⁶⁵ [ع س] // [ل] ا [ل] ه (و ا) لم[س] (ح) // (ا) ل(ح) // (ا) [ل] /
- 23 // [ع] // [ه] [ل] / / سوا (ف) ب(ه) ل(ل) [ك] // / (و ا) ل(ل) /
- 24 (م) / / د [ف] (به د) ل(ح) ب(ظلم) [د] (ف) ه (ن) [ع] ا (ب)
- 25 (ا) ل(ل) / / و ا [ب] و (ا) / / (لا) نر ه(ب) م[ك] ن [ل] (ب)
- 26 ا ن (لا سد) // [ك] نى [س] (ا) و { } ²⁶⁶ ط[ه] // [ب] (د) // / [ل] // [ط] /
- 27 { } والعكس و (ا) ل(ف) [م] ن و (ا) ل(ل) / / (ا) [ل] // [ح] / { }

Folio 7 B (Q 22.27–22.39)

- { } 1 / / [ن] // [ى] // / (لنا) [س] (ب) [ل] (ح) نا { }
- { } 2 / / [ب] (س) // / ²⁶⁷ ك(ل) ف(ج) [ع] (ن) ○ (و) ل(ل) { }
- { } 3 / / د(د) ب²⁶⁸ (و) ل(ب) د [ك] // / (و) ا { }
- { } 4 من // [ه] [م] (ا) لا نعم (و) ل(ل) [ك] // / (و) ا م // [ه] { }
- { } 5 [لغفر] ²⁶⁹ ○ و ل(ب) ف(صو) ا عنهم [و] { }
- { } 6 (فو) ا / (ل) ب(ل) (ل) ع(ن) ○ (د) ل(ل) // { }
- { } 7 ف(و) ح(ر) له (ع) د(ر) نه // ا حلب { }
- { } 8 (ب) ن(ل) [ع] ل(ك) (ف) (ح) // / (و) ا ل(ل) // (ح) { }
- { } 9 (فو) ل(ل) (ر) و ر ○ ح(ر) ف(ا) ل(ل) [ه] ع { }
- { } 10 ن(س) (ك) [ب] ا لله (ف) ك(ا) (ن) م(ا) (ح) ر²⁷⁰ [م] (ن) { }
- { } 11 ا و (ه) و ن²⁷¹ (ه) ا [ل] ر (ن) [م] م(ك) ن { }
- { } 12 [س] ع(ر) ا (ل) ل(ه) فا (ه) م(ن) [ن] ع(و) ي (ا) { }
- { } 13 (ف) [ب] (ه) م(ن) ع(ا) لى ا حل م(س) م[ح] { (ا) ل(س) [ا] }

²⁶⁵) The text may have *wa-ṣaddū* instead of *wa-yasuddūna*.

²⁶⁶) The hole in the parchment in front of *wa-* seems to have been there already, because the lower hand avoided it.

²⁶⁷) The letter preceding *nūn* may be *mīm* or *ʾayn*.

²⁶⁸) This word may be *maʿdūdāt*.

²⁶⁹) Considering the words on lines 2–5, the text may be *wa-li-yashhadū manāfiʿa lahum fī ayyāmīn maʿdūdātīn wa-li-yadhkurū sma llāhī ʾalā mā razaqahum min bahīmati l-anʾami wa-li-yaʿkulū minhā wa-li-yuʿīmū l-bāʿisa l-faqīra*.

²⁷⁰) This word may be *yakhirru*.

²⁷¹) The presence of *nūn* instead of *yā* might be a scribal error.

- 14 لعنق (○) و (لكل) ا م / / [ع] / / (ل) / / { } { بس(ك) و ه²⁷² (ند)
- 15 ك[ر] و ن اسم الله [ع]لى [م]ا [ر]ر [ف]ه[م] [م] من بهمه ا (لا)
- 16 (ب) [ع] [م] [و] ا م (ب) ك(م) ا م ه [و] ح { } // ²⁷³ (و) الهك ا (ل) ه [و] (ح د ف) [ل] ه
- 17 فاس(لمو) او بسر المخب(تس) ○ ال { } { (ن) ا [د] (ا) [د] // [ر] الله
- 18 // (ح) لب (ف) ل(و) // (ه) // و ال(ص) بر ن على { } { (ا) ص(ه) م و المع(ب) من ○
- 19 (ا) [لصلو] ه (و م م) / / فس(ه) [م] (ند) ف(ف) و (ن) [○] (و) ال دن (ح) علد(ه) لك م
- 20 من س[عبر] الله (ف) ا ذكر و ا (ا) // (م) الله (ع) ل(ه) صو (ف) ن²⁷⁴
- 21 ف ا د ا و حب // [ب] و نها [ف] ك(ك) [و] (ا) منها (و) اطعم(و) ال (ل) ف // ع
- 22 (و) (ا) ل(م) [ع] [ر] [ر] كما [س] [د] // (ه) ل(ك) م من قبل لعل(ك) م [س] [د] (ك) و ن ○
- 23 (ا) ن (ل) [ه] لا [ب] ل(ه) لحو م(ها) و لا [د] موها و لك²⁷⁵
- 24 [ب] ل(ه) الفوى (م) // (م) ف(ك) ب // و ا ا (ل) [ل] (ه) على (م) ا ه [د] ا كم
- 25 // (س) حر لكم من ال(س) م و ا (لا) ر ص و [س] // (ل) م (ح) س (ب) ن ○
- 26 [ا] ن الله [ند] { } ²⁷⁶ فع عن ال(س) ن (ا) [م] نو [ا] ن الله
- 27 لا حب كل [ح] و ا [ن] ك(و) ر ○ و ا د [ن] [ل] د (ن)
- 28 / / (ل) // (ن) [ف] [س] [ب] // (ب) / / (ل) [ه] ²⁷⁷

Folio 31 A (Q 12.17–12.20)

- 1 { } [ب] نمو { }
- 2 { } { (و ه) ع [ل] // (ف) م // / [د] / / { }
- 3 { } { (ل) [ب] [ك] م // / [ك] م (ا) م ر ا { }
- 4 { } { } // (ل) / / [ع] [ل] [م] [ا] [ص] [ف] (و) // [○] (و) { }
- 5 (ع) ل(د) // [ع] [ص] (ا) [ل] [س] / / (و) ²⁷⁸ س / (وا) و ر د ه { }
- 6 د [ل] [ى] (د) ل(و) // و (ل) ن(س) // [ى] هد (ا) [ع] لم و ا { }
- 7 نضعه و (ا) [ل] [ه] ع / م ن(ما) نفعلو { } ن ○ و سر و { }

²⁷²) The text here may be *mansakan hum nāsikūhu*.

²⁷³) The word following *ummatun* may be *wāḥidatun*.

²⁷⁴) This word is probably *ṣawāfīna* صوافن (pl. of *ṣāfīna* صافنة). Alternatively, it may be *ṣawāfīn* صواف *ṣawāfīyan* صوافيا, or a scribal error for *ṣawāfīya* or *ṣawāfī* صوافي. See al-KHAṬĪB, *al-Mu‘jam*, 6:115–7.

²⁷⁵) The absence of *nūn* is probably a scribal error.

²⁷⁶) The area after *ند* seems damaged.

²⁷⁷) The text here seems to be *yuqātīlūna fī sabīli llāhi*.

²⁷⁸) The *alif* might be connected to the previous letter, in which case the word would be *fa-arsalū* instead of *wa-arsalū*.

{	○ (د) ا /	{	8
{	ككرب ²⁸⁷ // {	{	9
{	}/[ف] ²⁸⁸ (ا) // {	{	10

Folio 32 B (Q 18.15–18.18)

{	ك د [ل]	{	1
{	}[له] ²⁸⁹ (ل) و ن ا	{	2
{	م (ن) ر حمد	{	3
{	س] (م) / ا	{	4
{	و] ا ع ر ب ²⁹⁰	{	5
{	فحو ه نس) د لك د [لك]	{	6
{	لله (فه) و الم (ه) د و من)	{	7
{	د و نه ²⁹¹ و لنا مر سدا ○ و	{	8
{	ر ف و (د) نعل] / م د ا [ب ا) ليم (ن) و	{	9
{	هم) سس] ط [د ر عه) نا (ل) // صر] ند]	{	10
{	لو لب [م] - [ه] [م] / / { (و) لملب	{	11

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 *mā lahum bihi min ‘ilmīn wa-lā li-‘abā’ihim* may be missing.

²⁸⁸) If the preceding *alif* belongs to the word *kadhīban*, 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 dūni llāhi* instead of *illā llāha*.

²⁹⁰) Pale traces of two other letters are visible here: a *dāl* (after *wāw*), an *alif* (immediately before *dāl*). Perhaps the scribe initially wrote *اد* 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 dūnihi* in addition to the standard text.

Folio 13 A (Q 16.26–16.37)

292/	د /	/ (م) /	و (نوم ال) /	○ (ن) /	/ [ب] [لا] [ب] /	{ }	1
ن [د] /	294/	/	293/ [و] // [ف] /	/ [م] /	/ [ك] /	/ [ل] /	2
/	297, 296/	/	1 // 1	/	295/ [و] [ع] [م] /	/	3
(م [ل] /	/	(لملك) /	/	○ (الدين [ف] [هـ]) /	/	298/ [م] /	4
[ن] (ا) [ي] [ل] /	302/ (ا) [ل] /	/	/	301/ (ل) /	/	299/ (ل) /	5
(ب) [ن] /	/	/	/	/	/	/	6
للد	/	/	/	/	/	/	7
/	/	/	/	/	/	/	8

²⁹²) If the visible *mīm* is part of the word *al-qiyāma*, it is rather distant from the *lām* of the article.

²⁹³) The putative *wāw* and *qāf* do not seem to be connected. Therefore, this word might be something other than *tushāqqūna*.

²⁹⁴) The traces here do not quite match *f̄him*.

²⁹⁵) The traces in the illegible part are compatible with *al-hudā*.

²⁹⁶) The traces at the beginning of this illegible part match the grapheme لسو better than لحرى.

²⁹⁷) The presence of this *dāl* establishes that the text differs from the standard reading. This *dāl* might belong to the word *al-'adhāb* (the traces before *dāl* match *lām* and *'ayn*). However, it is not clear what precedes this putative *al-'adhāb*.

²⁹⁸) This putative *mīm* might belong to the word *al-yawm*. Considering the traces in the previous line, the text after *al-'ilm* may be *inna l-sū'a wa-l-'adhāba l-yawma 'alā l-kāfirīna*.

²⁹⁹) Considering the initial tooth and the other traces, the text might have *yulqūna* instead of the standard *fa-alqawū*.

³⁰⁰) The illegible space after the initial *lām* is rather large for a medial *sīn*.

³⁰¹) The traces here do not quite match *kunnā* (they are compatible with *nakun*).

³⁰²) The letter *alif* suggests the text may have *sū'an* instead of *min sū'in*. However, the illegible space before *alif* is rather large for the grapheme سو.

³⁰³) The illegible space is small, suggesting this word may be *fa-bi'sa* instead of *fa-la-bi'sa*.

³⁰⁴) The available space here is rather small for *li-lladhīna*.

305/ [ف] [ي] [هده] [حسد] [ه] [وا] [دا] [را] [لا] [حر] // [ح] // [و] 306/ /	9
10 [دا] [ا] [ل] // [ح] // [ب] [ع] // [ح] [ر] [ى] [من] [حسد] [ه] // [ح] [د] // [ح] [د] //	10
307/ / 308/ [ا] [دا] [ك] [ك] [ب] [ح] [ر] [ى] [الله] [ل] [م] // [ف] // [و] [ل] [دا] [د] /	11
12 [ا] [ل] [ل] [ك] [ه] // [ب] [و] [ف] // 310/ [س] // [م] [ع] [ك] // ا د ح // [و] //	12
13 [د] [ع] // [ل] [و] // [ه] [ل] [ب] [ط] [ر] [و] [ا] [ا] [ن] [ب] [ل] [ه] // [ه] //	13
14 [ل] [م] // [ك] [ه] // [ا] [و] // 311/ [ع] [ص] // [ا] [ب] [ر] [ب] // [ك] [ل] [ك] // [ع] //	14
15 [م] // [ف] // [ا] [و] // [م] // [ظ] // [ا] [ل] [ه] // [ل] [ك] [ن] [ك] //	15
16 [د] // [ل] // [ا] [و] // [ف] // [ص] // [ه] // [م] // [س] // [م] [ا] [ع] [م] // [ل] // [ا] [و] [ح] //	16
17 [ب] [م] [م] [ك] [و] [ا] [ب] [س] [ب] // [و] // [و] [ف] [ل] [ا] [د] [ن] [ك] // 312/ [ا] [ل] [و]	17
18 { [س] [ا] // [ا] / 313/ [و] // [ر] [م] [ل] [ا] 314/ [ن] [و] [ه] / 315/	18
19 { [و] // [ا] // [ا] [نا] [ك] // [د] [ن] [م] [ن] [ف] [ل] [ه] [و] [ه] [ل] [ع] //	19
20 / / { [و] // 316/ [ا] [لا] [د] // 317/ [ل] [ف] [د] [ا] [ر] [س] [ل] // [ا] [ف] [ى] [ا] [م] //	20

³⁰⁵) Considering the traces at the end of the previous line, the text might have *li-man ‘amila* followed by a noun such as *al-ṣāliḥātī* instead of the standard *li-lladhīna aḥsanū*. However, the traces at the beginning of this line do not quite match *al-ṣāliḥāt*.

³⁰⁶) The traces represented by this *wāw* are close to the next word. Therefore, this word may be *wa-la-ni‘ma* or *fa-la-ni‘ma*.

³⁰⁷) This word may be *khālīdīna*.

³⁰⁸) This word may be *fīhā*.

³⁰⁹) It is not clear whether another grapheme is written after *alladhīna* or not.

³¹⁰) It seems the text has *wa-qīla* instead of *yaqūtūna*.

³¹¹) The available space is rather large for *ya‘tiya*. The word may be *ya‘tiyahum*.

³¹²) The letter preceding this illegible part is certainly not *alif*. It may be *kāf*, in which case the text may have *kafarū* instead of *ashrakū*.

³¹³) The traces are compatible with *ashraknā*.

³¹⁴) This word may be *ḥarramnā*.

³¹⁵) This space is rather small for the phrase *min shay‘in naḥnu*. The text might have *shay‘an* instead of *min shay‘in*.

³¹⁶) Considering the presence of *wāw* here, this word may be *al-rasūl* instead of *al-rusul*.

³¹⁷) 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.

- 10 ا (ن) ك// (نم) لا (ب) عل(مو ن) / / (ا) // [ب] [و] [نا] ل(ر ن) [و ما ا] ر [لنا] / / 331/
- 11 (ا لد ك) // (لا) [ل] (ع) ل(ك م ن د ك) و (ن) // (ا فم) // (ا) // [د] / / نم / / و ن 332 ا
- 12 [لس] [ب] (ا ن) / / (س) ف (ل) [ه] [بهم] (ا لا) ر ص // و // [ب] [بهم] 333 (ا) / /
- 13 [م] // [ح] // [ب] (لا) (س) ع(ر و) (ن) ○ ا (و) // (ص) [بهم] 334 في [ب] [بهم] [فما ه] // [م] / /
- 14 // [ن] // ا و [نا] (ح) د ك م (ع) لى نحو [ف] (ا ن) // ن / / 335 [ل] و (ف) [ر] [ح] [م] // (ا) //
- 15 // [و] 336 / / (ا) [ف] (ى) ا لار ص (ب) [ب] (نا ط) // [ه] // [ب] / / (ل) / / [و] 337 (و) ا (لا) [ص] [ل] [ع]
- 16 / / [م] [ن] [و] [ع] [ل] [ل] [ه] [س] [م] [ل] [ل] [ه] [س] [ح] [د] ا و هم (د) ح ر و ن (○) / /
- 17 / / 338 [م] [ن] [ف] (ى) [ل] [س] [م] [و] (ب) و (ا لا) ر ص و (ا) [م] [ل] [ب] [ك] [ه] [س] [ح] [د] و (ن) / /
- 18 / / 339 [ن] [س] / / (و) // [ح] [و] ن [ز] [ب] / / (ن) [ف] // [ف] / / م [و] [ف] [ع] [ل] و (ن) م / /
- 19 // [ن] [○] [ف] (ل) ا [ل] // [ه] // لا (ب) [ح] [د] (و) [و] ا // (ل) [ب] [ن] 340 // ا [ب] [ن] ا [م] (ا) ه (و) ا نا
- 20 / / 341 (ف) [ب] // [ب] // [ف] // [ب] // [ن] ○ [و] (ل) ه (ما) فى ا [ل] [س] / / ب و (ما) [ف] [ب]
- 21 (لا ر ص و) // [ه] // (ا) لد (ب) / / و / / [ب] (ا) فع [ب] (ا) / / ن // 342 [م] [ا] [ب] [ك] [م] [ن]
- 22 // [ع] // [ف] // (ن) الله (و) 343 (ا) / / (ا) ل (ص) (ف) [ل] // [ه] // (ح) [ر] و [ن] (○) (م) { }
- 23 / / (ا) ك (س) [ل] [ص] [ر] / / م / / (م) [ب] / / [ك] [و] { }
- 24 / / (ف) [ر] و [ب] (ا) [ل] [د] [ى] ا [ب] / / [ف] [ب] [ن] [م] / / (و) // [ف] [ب] [س] // (ل) / / [ن] / / { }
- 25 / / / لما (لا) ب (ع) لمو (ن ح ر ا) 344 [م] [م] // ر ر (ف) [ب] [ع] (م) [ب] / / ل [س] [د] { }

331) The traces match *‘alayka* better than the standard *ilayka*.

332) This word may be *yamkurūna*.

333) This word may be *ya‘tiyannahum*.

334) This word may be *yusūbahum*.

335) The traces following the tooth are more similar to *hā’* than *kāf*.

336) Considering the space available at the end of the previous line and beginning of this line, the text may be *a-lam yaraw/taraw*.

337) This word may be *bi-l-ghuduwwi*, and the next word may be *wa-l-āṣāli*.

338) Considering the following words, the beginning of the verse may be *wakullu*.

339) Considering the context, the phrase *li-llāhi wa-lā* might be written between *سجدون* and the putative *yastakbirūn*.

340) The initial *lām* and the putative *hā’* seem to be separated by a letter, possibly a tooth representing the long vowel *ā*.

341) Perhaps the scribe wanted to write *innamā anā llāhu*, but mistakenly wrote *huwa* before *anā*.

342) No *wāw* seems to be written here.

343) It is not clear if *alif* is attached to the previous letter or not.

344) This word may be *juz‘an*.

6	بعد و لا ان تبدل من) ار و حا و لوا [ع]حک
7	حسبہن الا) ما مل [ک] // [ب] [م] [ک] و ک) ان اللہ) ع { }
8	کل [س] ای ر (ف) بنا ○ نا (ھ) [ا] لدین امبو (ا) لا { }
9	حلوا نبوت ا (ل) بنی الا (ا) ن) نودن لکم ا (لی) { }
10	عبر نظرین (ا) ب- // و [ک] // [ا] [د] ا د (ع) [ب] م (ف) { }
11	فا د ا (ط) عم (ف) ا (ب) سر و او لا مسند { }
12	ان (د) لکم (ک) [ا] ن) نود [ی] ال (ب) ی (و) بسند { }
13	لا نسحنی (م) ا (ل) ح (و) / / دا سد (ل) { }
14	(ھ) [ن] من و را حن (ب) دلک ا ط (ھ) { }
15	ب (ھن) و م (ا) کاں ل (کم) ان (بو) دو ا { }
16	لا (ب) کحو ا (ر) و حہ من بعدہ { }
17	(ع) [ب] د اللہ عظما ○ ان ب- [ب] (د و) ا { }
18	ن اللہ کاں ب- (ک) ل س ای علم (ا) { }
19	بھ / و لا انا ب- (ھن) و لا ا [ح] { }
20	بھن و بنا) ی ³⁵¹ ا ح (و ب) ھن و لا { }
21	(ا) ب- { } و ا ب- [ھن] اللہ (ا) { }
22	// { } [ن] (ا) [لہ] (و) { }
23	{ } [ن] (ا م) // و (ا) { }
24	{ } [ا] / / { }

Folio 9 B (Q 33.57–33.72)

1	{ } { [عد] (نا) م (ھ) // [ا] (○) [و] (ا لد) // [ن] نود [و] (ن) ا (ل) مو
2	{ } { منس (و) المو (م) ب- (ب) [ع] // [ر] ما [ک] (س) و ا (فعد)
3	{ } { ا ح (م) لو ا بھنا) و [ا] ما (م) // (ب) بنا ○ (ب) ا بھا (ل) // (ی)
4	فل لا ر و حک و ب- (ب) ک و ب- (س) ا (ل) م) [و] م- (ب) ن) د (ب- بن
5	علیھن (م) ح (ل) بھن دل (ک) ا د بی ان ب- [ع] (ر) ھن (ل) (و) دین

³⁵¹) The text may be *wa-lā bnāyi*, with the *hamzat al-waṣl* 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 *ikhwānīhinna* (al-KHATĪB, *Muʿjam*, 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*.

6	و كان اللّٰه) عفو (ر) ار ح(م)با ○ لسن لم نس(ه) الم(ب)فع//ن ³⁵²
7	(و) الم(م)// حفو ن ف[ى] ا [ل]م[د] (ب) [نه] (و) الد ن فى فلو (ب) هم
8	{ } { [ص] [لد]// (ر) ن(ك) نه[م] [ب] [م] لا [ب] حو رو نك فيها الا
9	{ } { [ل]ا ○ ملعو (ب) ن(م) ما ن(ف) و ا (ح) د (و) ا (و) ف[ب] لو ا
10	{ } { (○) [نسب] اللّٰه) فى الد ن (م) ن ف(ل) و لن نحد لس(ه)
11	{ } { [د] (ب) لا [○] ن(س)ك ال(نا) س عن السا (عه) فل
12	{ } { عند الله (م) ما ندر نك لع(ل) السا [ع]ه
13	{ } { ان اللّٰه لعن الكفر) ن و اعد لهم
14	{ } { (ن ف) نه(ا) اند الا نحدو ن و لناو
15	{ } { ن(ف) [ب] و ح(و) هه(م) ف(ى) ال/ و /
16	{ } { طع(با) ا (ل) [ه] و اطعنا الرسو
17	{ } { ا (نا) ع(ص) با و (ا) طعنا (س) ما د // (ب) ا
18	{ } { // (ل) [س] / ال [○] ر / [ب] / [ا] د [ه] // صع[ف] ن من
19	{ } { [ب] / [م] [ع]د[ا] كن(ر) ا (○) نا نها الد ن
20	{ } { (ل) د [ن] // د و (ا) موسى هر (ا) [ه] ا
21	{ } { // (ن) ا [ل] له و ح(ب) بها نا [ب] ه // الد //
22	{ } { [ف] (و) لا ³⁵³ ف // (لا) س(د) ن(د) ا [○] (ب) صل[ح]
23	{ } { (د) نو نكم و من نط[ع] [ل] (ل) } // {
24	{ } { (ب) ا [○] [ا] نا ع[ر] // ا / } // {
25	{ } { [ف] (ب) / (ل) / / (ل) } // {
26	{ } { } // {

Folio 25 A (Q 39.25–39.36)

{	{	[○]	{	حب لا نس(ر و ن)	1
{	{	[ع] [د] [ب] [ا] [ح]	{	الد // ب // و [و] [ل] [ع] [د] [ب] [ا] [ح]	2
{	{	[ص] / (ا) لنا (س) فى	{	و ل(ف) // [ص] / (ا) لنا (س) فى	3
{	{	[ع] [ر]	{	لعلم نذكر و (ن) [○] هر (ب) [ع] [ر]	4
{	{	[ص] // (ل) [ه] / (ل) ر	{	نع(ف) و (ن) // [ص] // (ل) [ه] / (ل) ر	5

³⁵²) The final *nūn* is not separate from the previous letters, suggesting that this word is *al-munāfiqīn*, which would be grammatically incorrect.

³⁵³) This is an error of the hand generated by the assimilation of a nearby term.

{	د / د / [ه] / [ل] / [س]	{	6
/ / [و] (ن) / [ه] (ا) د [م] و	{	7	
(ا) / [ف] (ن) / د	{	8	
/ / [ص] / د / [ك]	{	9	
// [د] (ل) / [و] / [ف] (ل)	{	10	
{ } / (ل) / / {	{	11	
{ } / [ل] 354 (ي) // [ك] د // / {	{	12	
{ } // 355 [م] د // / / {	{	13	
{ } / د (ل) (ه) {	{	14	

Folio 25 B (Q 39.42–39.47)

{ } (د) / [س] (ل) / ا / ا / في (د) {	{	1
د و (ن) // (و) (ا) [د] (د) // ا (م) د و	{	2
{ (لو) كا // و (ا) [لا] د [م] لكو	{	3
{ فل ان (ا) لسف (ه) لله ح (م) نعا	{	4
{ [ر] ص و ال (د) ه بر (ح) [و] (ن) و	{	5
{ [د] ك رب الله و حد [ه] ا (س) {	{	6
{ (ب) الدين لا [د] و مند {	{	7
{ و به فا دا (هم) {	{	8
{ (ا) لسم (و) ب و ا [لا] {	{	9
{ { (ب) فا حكم ند // / {	{	10
{ { تلفون [و] لو [ل] (ن) ل {	{	11
{ { (ص) حم [ع] (ا) // {	{	12

³⁵⁴) The text may have *kadhālīka najzī l-muḥsinīna* instead of *dhālīka 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)

{ و ما هم بمعمر ن (و) ³⁵⁶ ○ }	1
{ فی د لک لا لب لرف } [و]	2
{ علی ارف [س] هـ [م] لا }	3
{ بُـ / (ا) لرد) نوب حمعنا }	4
{ // (ب) [ن] و ا (ا) لی (الل) [هـ] و ا }	5
{ [ب] نام لا نبص [ر] (و) ○ }	6
{ // (ف) (ل) ان تا د / کم }	7
{ ○ } [و] (ف) و ل نفس بح (س) ر }	8
{ (ک) تب (م) (ف) (ل) لمس ا }	9
{ فا کو ن (م) (ا) لرم) نفس (○) }	10
{ (ن) لی کر [هـ] ف // کو }	11
{ // (ب) [ب] هـ ³⁵⁷ (و) اسکنر }	12
{ (م) هـ // ی الرد) ن }	13
{ ا (و) ل [ب] س فی حهـ [م] }	14
{ (رفو) ا (م) [فر] نهـ (م) }	15
{ الله خلق کل }	16
{ [ف] ل / د الس (م) ب }	17
{ م الا حسر (و) ○ }	18
{ [هـ] (ا) ا (ل) حهل (و) ن (○) }	19
{ فیلک لیس) ا [س] // }	20
{ ر ن (ن) ○ تل ا [ل] // }	21
{ ر و الله }	22
{ // (ا) لرف) // (م) هـ (و) }	23
{ (و) نعلی ع (م) (ب) [س] // }	24
{ عرق) من (ف) لـ / (م) ³⁵⁸ }	25
{ ی فا (د) ا (هـ) // }	26

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

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-arḍi*.

{ (د) و ر ر بها //	}	27
/ هدا و ف //	}	28
بند(ب) 359 كل	}	29

Folio 26 B (Q 39.70–75 – 40.1–8)

{	/ ما ع [م] (د) /	1
{	نن ك / [ا] لى (ا) ب [ا] 360 }	2
{	نه // (و) // (ل) حر (ر) د // ه // (ا) }	3
{	عد (ب) ر / 361 / (و) /	4
{	عد (د) لى [ا] ل ك ف / [ف] (و) [ف] }	5
{	نن [ف] ه // فس [س] مو }	6
{	نن [ف] ه // [ا] لى الحد }	7
{	اد حل [و] ها / 362 }	8
{	ل (حمد) لل [ه] / }	9
{	فى (الا) ر ص د }	10
{	حر العطل (ن) ○ }	11
{	ر نه (م) د (سد) // (ن) }	12
{	نا (د) / و فس (ل) (ا) }	13
{	(حد) [مه] سو (ر ه) }	14
{	ب (سم) ا [ل] (له) ال }	15
{	من (ا) (له) ال }	16
{	ل / [ب] [سد] // }	17
{	(و) (ا) لئه ال (م) // }	18
{	(س) [ف] // [و] افلا د }	19
{	ف (ب) [ل] هم فو // }	20

³⁵⁹) The text may have *ūtiyat* 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 ‘adhāba 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 ḥattā idhā jā’ūhā wa-qāla lahum khazanatuhā udkhulūhā salāmun ‘alaykum ṭibtum fihā khālidīn*.

{	{ (کل) ام(ه)ر //	21
{	{ [ه] // ا [حصوص] //	22
{	{ [بف] 363 (ک) ن //	23
{	{ لد سن ک[فر] (و) //	24
{	{ [لعر] (س و م) //	25
{	{ [ن] 364 [لم] (ن) فی الا 365 //	26
{	{ ر حمه و //	27
{	{ / یک و [فه] //	28
{	{ / / [ن] [ل] [د] فی و (ع) //	29

Folio 15 A (Q 20.23–20.61)

- 1 / / [ک] ی / / (ک) 366 [م] ا (ا) [ند] نا (ل) / ی [ف] ا [د ه] (ب) [ل] [ی فر] // (ن) ا /
- 2 (ف) ل // [ب] (ا) / / ح ل (ی) // [د] // [د] // ی // [ل] 367 / / [ل] [ی (ر)] // () // (ا) ح (ل) [ع] [د] ه (م) //
- 3 (ل) / / [ل] [ی (ف)] // [ل] [ی (و)] (و) ا (ح) // [ل] [ی (و)] // (ر ا م) ا // (ل) [ی ()] [هر و] (ن) [ل] [ی ()] //
- 4 [و اس] (ر) // [ف] (ی) ا [م] (ر) ی (و) ا [س] / / [نه] ا ر ر ی () // [ند] / / ک / () ا /
- 5 // ند (کر) ک [ک] [سر] ا () ا (د) ک [ک] [ب (ند) با (صد)] // () ا [ف] (ل) ا (و) [ب] [ب (سو)]
- 6 / / [بمو] (سی) (و) [ف] [د] [د] [م] [د] [ع] [د] [ک] { (ر) [ه] 368 ا (د) ر (ی) () ا (د) [ل] [و] (ح) [ن] ا [ی] ا
- 7 // [ک] [م] [ب] (د) / / [ل] [ی] ا ن ا (ف) [ف] [نه] (فی) { (ل) / / [و] [ب] [م] (ا) / / [ه] [ف] [ی] ا (ل) / /
- 8 / / [فه] [ل] [م] (فی) [السد] (ل) (ح) // (ه) { / / [و] [ل] 369 / / (و) / / [و] [ه] (ا) [ل] / /

³⁶³) The missing part on line 22 has much more space than is needed for *al-ḥaqq* and *fa-akhadhtukum*.

³⁶⁴) The missing part on line 25 is rather small for the standard text between *wa-man* and *li-lladhīna*. Perhaps the phrase *wa-yu'minūna bihi* is absent.

³⁶⁵) The text may have *li-man fī l-arḍi* instead of *li-lladhīna āmanū*.

³⁶⁶) Perhaps the text is *kay nuriyaka* instead of *li-nuriyaka*.

³⁶⁷) The first letter in the illegible part may be *šād/dād* or *kāf*. The last letter may be *bā'/tā'/thā'*.

³⁶⁸) This word may be *tūratān*.

³⁶⁹) The text seems to have *lanā* instead of the standard *lī*.

(ه) [ند] /	/ [ه] /	25
26	/ [کل] / [ی] /	/ [ی] / [ف] [ل] [ند] / ³⁸² / [د] / (ا) [م] [ا] /
27	/ [ی] / [د] / [ر] / [م] / [د] / [ه] [ف] / [ل] / [و] / [د] / [نک] [مو]	
28	/ [د] / [لا] / [حل] / [ن] / [لا] / [ا] / [ب] / [ک] / [ی] / [ف] / [ع] / [د]	
29	/ [کم] / [و] / ³⁸⁴ / [د] / [و] / [ا] / [ن] / [ا] / [ن] / [س] / [ی] / [و]	
30	[فمع] [ر] / [ع] / [ن] / [د] / [ه] / [م] / [ی] / [موس] [ی] نو [د] / ³⁸⁵ / [ا]	
31	{ } / [ک] / ³⁸⁶ / [د] / [ی] / [و] / [و] / [و] / [و]	

Folio 15 B (Q 20.61–20.80)

1	[ع] [د] [و] [فد] // [ب] [م] [ن] [ا] [هنر] ی فد /	
2	نم [ف] [ا] [مو] [ا] [و] // [س] [ر] [و] [ا] [م] [ن] [د] [و] [ب] [هم] [ا] [ا] [ند] [و] [ی] [و] [ا] [و]	
3	(م) [د] [ا] [لا] [سحر] [ن] [نر] [ند] [ن] [سحر] [حک] [م] [م] [ا] [ر] [ص] [کم] [و] [ند] [ه] [نا]	
4	[م] [د] [م] [د] [ا] [ط] [ر] [ن] [ه] [ا] [ل] [م] [بلی] [و] [ف] [م] [و] [ک] [د] [کم] [ف] [ا] [و] [ا]	
5	[ص] [ف] [ا] [و] [ف] [د] [ا] [ف] [ل] [ح] [ا] [د] // [و] [م] [م] [م] { } [ا] [س] [د] [ع] [د] // [د] [و] [ف] [ا] [و] [ا] [موس] [ی] [ا]	
6	[د] [ح] [د] [ف] [ی] [ا] [و] [ا] [د] [ب] [ا] [و] [ل] [م] [ن] [ن] [ا] { } [ف] [ی] [ف] [ل] [ا] [ل] [و] [ا] [ف] [ا] [ف] [ا] /	
7	فاد [ا] [ح] [د] [ن] [ط] [م] [و] [ع] [ص] [د] [ه] [و] { } [و] / [ن] [ل] [ا] [ل] [ه] [ا] [ن] [ها] [م] [س] [د] / ³⁸⁷	
8	[ن] [س] [عی] [و] [ف] [ا] [و] [ح] [س] [ف] [ی] [د] // [س] [د] / ³⁸⁸ [ف] [د] { } [ن] [موس] [س] [د] // [لا] [ند] [ح] [ف]	
9	// [بک] [ا] [ب] [ا] [ع] [ی] [و] [ف] [ا] [و] [د] [ل] [ق] [م] [ا] [ی] [م] [ع] [ک] [ب] [ل] [ف] [و] [ف] [ما] // [م] [و] [ا]	
10	³⁸⁹ [ا] [ب] [م] [ا] [ع] [ل] [و] [ا] [ک] [ند] / { } [و] [ا] [ی] / ³⁹⁰ [لا] / [د] // [ا] [ل] [سحر] [ح] [ب]	
11	[ا] [ت] [ی] [و] [ف] [ا] / [ی] // [ا] [م] / ³⁹¹ [ف] [ا] [ل] [ف] [م] [ا] [م] [ا] [و] [ا] [و] [ا] [د] [و] [ا] [ی] [و] [ا]	
12	[ل] [س] [د] [ر] [ه] [س] [د] // [د] [و] [ا] [و] [ا] [و] [ا] / [د] // [ب] [ه] [ر] [و] [و] [موس] [ی] [و] [ف] [ل]	
13	[ف] [ل] [و] [ا] [م] [ب] [د] // [ف] [د] [ل] [ا] // [د] [ن] [ل] [کم] [ا] / [د] [ک] [س] [ر] [کم] [د] [ل] //	

³⁸²) This word may be *a-ataytanā*.

³⁸³) This part may contain *bi-sihrika*.

³⁸⁴) The last letter in this part may be *kāf*.

³⁸⁵) The text may be *yā waylakum*.

³⁸⁶) The text may have *ifkan* instead of the standard *kadhiban*.

³⁸⁷) This word may be *sihrikim*.

³⁸⁸) Considering the amount of space, the word *khifah* may be missing.

³⁸⁹) This word may be *'amilū*.

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'ahu*.

³⁹²) The scribe has copied *qāla* twice.

- 14 (ع)[لمك](م ا) [لسد] // [ف]س(عل) {} (و) ن (لا) // [ف]ط(عن) ا (ند) // {} (و) ار
- 15 حل(ك)[م] من (د)ل(ب)ف (و) لا // {} (ل) / [م]ف(ى) [ح]د(و) [ع] (ا) ل[ند] (ل) و // (ب) / /
- 16 ا د // [ا]س[د] عد (نا) / / [ب]ف(ى) (و) لا (لا) ص(بر) [ن] / / ك
- 17 [ع]ل(ى) ما ا // (ب)393 // [ن]ا من ا [ند] // [ب] و [ا] (ل) [د] (ف)ط(ر) نا // / [ف]ص[] / /
- 18 (ا)ب) // (فص) ا (ب) [م]ا // (فص) [ى] (فى) ه[د] ه [ا] ل[حو] ه [ل] / [ا] / /
- 19 ب [طمع] ا ن (نع) [ف] (ر) ل(ب)ا [ر] (ند)ا (د) [ظن]ب(ا) [و]م[ا] (ا) [ك] / / { } / / { }
- 20 (و)م[ا] // (س) [ح]ر // 394 // (ا) لل[ه] ح(ر) (و) ا [ف]ا [ى] (ا) (نا) [ف]د[] { } [ح] { } (ا) (ل)
- 21 [ل] / (ا)395 // نه (م)م[] م[] محر م[ا] [ف] (ا) [ن] لل[ه] (ح)هد[] م [لا] { } { } موب [ف] // (ه)
- 22 و [لا] / / [ى] (و) [و] / / (د)ا ر (نه) م(و) م(نا) (ف)د [ع]مل [ا] ل[صد] (ل) / / فا
- 23 / / (ل) (م) [ا] (ل) [ر] // [ب] ا [ل]ع[ل] (ل) (و) (د)ب(ب) [ع]د [ن] // [ح] (ر) [ى] // (ح)ب(ها)
- 24 (ا) لا [ب] / (ح)ل[د] [ب] [ن] (ف)ه(ها) دلک // [ر] [ا] (م) { } // [ى] (و)396 // [ا] / / 397
- 25 [ا]لى (مو) / / (ا) [ا] سر ب(عد) [ى] ل[ن]لا[] { } // [ص]ر [ب] ل[ه] / /
- 26 / / [ا] / / (ب) // [سا] لا [ب] (د) [ف] (ف)ه (د) [ر] / / (و) [لا] / / [ف]ا (ب) [نع] (ه)م
- 27 [لحو] // / [ف]ر [عو] ن [ف]ع[س] [ب] (ه) [م] (م) ا [ل] / [م] // [ع]س[ه] / [و]
- 28 { } [ص]د[] / [ع] / [م] // [و] ما [ه]د [ى] / [ى] ا (سر) / /

Folio 30 B (Q 20.122–20.133)

- 1 { } / /
- 2 { } / [م] // (ن)398 [و] (ا) /
- 3 { } / [و] (لا) /
- 4 { } / مع / (ه) ص[د] [ك]ا (و) [لحو]س[ر] /
- 5 { } / (لم) [لحو]س[ر] / [ع] [م] // [و] / /
- 6 { } / [ب] // (ا) [ف] // (ب) // (ه) [و] [ك] / /

393) This word may be *ātānā*.

394) This word is probably *saḥarnā/saḥḥarnā*.

395) The text may have *innā qad ūḥiya ilaynā* in addition to the standard text. Cf. Q 20.48.

396) This putative *alif* may be disconnected from the previous letter, in which case the previous letter would be *wa-*.

397) The text seems to have *fa-awḥaynā* instead of *wa-laqad awḥaynā*.

398) Considering the traces, the text might have *ihbiṭū minhā ajmaʿīn* instead of *ihbiṭū minhā jamūʿan*. Also, the phrase *baʿḍukum li-baʿḍin ʿaduwwun* is either missing or precedes the putative *ihbiṭū*.

	{	// [م] (د) و [ف] // (سد) / /	7
	{	} / // (لم) (ه) / / [سد]	8
	{	} و (ن) (مسو) ن فری (مسک) ه // [ا]	9
	{	} ا [لد] (هی) [و] (ل) و لا (ک) / / [سد] [ف] [ب]	10
	{	} // [ا] [ا] 399 م / (ف) ص [ط] // 400 (ل) (حکم) [ر] // 401	11
	{	} / / [سد] [م] [س] (و) (ف) بل / /	12
	{	} // [م] [م] (لا) (لا) [م] / /	13
	{	} [م] [ه] [م] // (و) (ح) [ل] من ر [هر] ه ا [ل] [ح] [نو] ه	14
	{	} و [ر] (ر) [ق] // نک (حد) [ر] (و) [ا] (بغی) [و] (ا) / /	15
	{	} { [و] ا صد [ط] [نر] (عل) / / لا (ب) [سد] (ک) [ر] (ف) [ل]	16
	{	} { [ل] { [ف] به لا } { [و] ا لغوی 402 و [فلو] ا }	17

Folio 30 A (Q 21.5–21.19)

	/ / {	/ (فلا) / /	}	1
	{	// [لک] [م] (ن) فر	}	2
	{	// [ل] [ل] (ک) [ا] (لا) [ر]	}	3
	{	// [د] [ک] (ا) // کن (م)	}	4
	{	کلون ال (ط) (م) و ما	}	5
	{	// او (عد) فا // (ح) بنا من (سد) ا (و)	}	6
	{	(کنب) ادر (لد) // علسکرم 403	}	7
	{	(و) کم فصما (م) فر (ر) // [ه]	}	8
	{	// (نسا) ناعد ها (و) ما	}	9
	{	// [سد] ا ا د ا ه [م] [م] // (ه) ا (ر) ک [صد] و	}	10
	{	// [و] ا ا (ل) ی (ما) ا [نر] / / (ه) و	}	11
	{	[ف] لو ا [د] و نلد (ا) ا (ب) ک (ب) ظل [مد] ن	}	12
	{	// / (حنا) ح (عل) د / (ح) [صد] ند ا	}	13

³⁹⁹) This word may be *ajalan*.

⁴⁰⁰) This word may be *fa-ṣṭabir*.

⁴⁰¹) The text appears to have *li-ḥukmi rabbika* instead of *‘alā mā yaqūlūna*.

⁴⁰²) The text might be *li-l-birri wa-l-taqwā* (cf. Q 5.2 and 58.9).

⁴⁰³) The text might be *wa-hādihā kitābun anzalnā ‘alaykum*.

{ [س]موت و الارص [و م]ا [س]د // [ه]ما }	14
{ (ا) ن [س]د [ح]د لهُوا (لا) [س]د (د) [ن]ه [م]ا (لد نا ا ن) }	15
{ / / (د ف) نا // [ح]ق [ع]لى (ل) [ط] // [د] / }	16
{ / / [ر] [ه]ق [و] / / [و] [ل] [م]م (ا) ⁴⁰⁴ }	17
{ [ص]د (ف) // ن ○ و [ل]له من فى السمو }	18

Folio 10 A (Q ? – 24.1–13)

{ / / { / الزر / }	1
{ / / { } }	2
{ / / { ○ سورة ا [ن]ر ل [ه]ه } }	3
{ / / { (ب) (م) [س]د [ب] لعلكم ند (س) }	4
{ / / { (ح) (د) اكل و حد // }	5
{ / / { [ح]د (د) كم بهما (ر) افه }	6
{ / / { / / (ه) / } ⁴⁰⁵ مو م / ن نا لله و ال }	7
{ / / { (م) (ن) [ل]مو [س]د (س) ○ } (كح ا) }	8
{ (د) به او (مسركه) و الر د // } { نكح } (ا) لا ر [ن]ا (و)	9
{ (مسر) كا و (حر) م (د) [ك] // } { [ل]مو [م]س (س) ○ } و الدس	10
{ بر مو المومنت و لم (نا) [ن]ا [ع] [ل] [ن]ه [ن] / } / [ه] /	11
{ افا حلد و هم بمنس حلد ه و لا / / لا (حد) [منهم] }	12
{ (سهده) اندا و اولك هم الف [س]د // / (الا لا) لدس }	13
{ [ن]ا (ب) و او (ا) صلحو افا (ن) الله (عفو) رر (حتم) ○ و الدس }	14
{ بر مو ار و جهم و (لم) نكن لهم / / الا [ن]ا (ف) [سهم] }	15

⁴⁰⁴) No text seems to be written before the present point, as writing here would have interfered with the previous line.

⁴⁰⁵) This tooth looks like an insertion. Also, the grapheme نون seems to have been added after the *mīm* that follows مو. These additions have the same thickness and curvature as the usual script, but have a dark greenish hue. The word may have been *mu'minūn* before these changes. It is less certain what the modifier wished to turn this word into. In light of the addition of a tooth before the initial مو, the first guess would be *bi-mu'minūn*. But the greenish traces that follow the second *mīm* conform to نون better than they do to مس. 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'minūna*.

- 16 (ف) // (ه) ده احد هم اربع (سهدت (نا) // (اى) 406 لمن) ا
 17 لصد فس ○ والحمس [ه] ان لعنه ا / / [نه] (ا) ن كرا (ن) // /
 18 الكذ بس ○ (و) // / 407 (ع) [د] (ها) العدا [ب] // / (سهدا ر) { }
 19 سهد (ب) ناللة // / (لمن) الكذ (بس) ○ و (ا) / / { }
 20 عصب الله عنهما ان كاں [م] ا (ك) [صد] / / [و] ل { }
 21 فصل الله [ع] ل [د] كم و (ر حمه) مار كى م [كم] من { }
 22 اندا (و) لكى الله (بوا ب حكيم) { } و (ا) [ن] (الد) ن { }
 23 نلافك عصه لكل ا [مر] 408 [م] / / ما اكسد // { }
 24 الا (د) م لا نحد (سبو) ه هو سر ل (ك) م [د] ل (هو حر) (لكم) { }
 25 لى [د] [ب] و (ل) / (ك) { } // 409 له عدا ب عظيم ○ لو { }
 26 (سمع) / / ه طن ا [لمو] م (ند) ن و (المو) م (ند) نا { }
 27 [د] / / [ا] [و] (فلو ا) [هد] (ا) افك م (ند) ن ○ لو لا د { }

Folio 10 B (Q 24.13–24.23)

- { } // { } 1 { } 410 (ا) / / (ا) / [نا] { }
 2 / / ل { } / / لا / / { }
 3 لله { } د بنا و الا حره { }
 4 // { } عدا ب (عط) [م] { }
 5 [ا] د [ب] / / { } // (ل) [و] نا فو هكم ما { }
 6 [لس] (لكم) { } نه ه (ند) ا (و هو عند)
 7 [ا] ل / / (ط) // { } د سمعمو ه فلن [م] (ما)
 8 / / لنا ا (ن) [ند] (ك) { } اسحكك (ه) [د] ا بهن
 9 (ع) // (له) { } ن / / 411 و المنله ا

⁴⁰⁶) The traces match both *innā* and *innanā*.

⁴⁰⁷) This *alif* has a dark green hue like the tooth at the beginning of line 7.

⁴⁰⁸) The traces here could also represent four teeth, in which case the word would be *insān*.

⁴⁰⁹) The missing and illegible parts together can accommodate no more than four letters. Therefore, *minhum* is probably missing.

⁴¹⁰) This *alif* might be the last letter of *bi-l-shuhadā'*, although the illegible part preceding it seems rather small for the grapheme *بالسهد*.

⁴¹¹) The traces here do not quite conform to *بعود*; they are closer to *بعد*.

- 10 / / كنم مو مد(ن) ○ و لسن(ن) 412 الله لكم [و] ا [ل]له
 11 (علم) / / (ان الد [ن] ان [نحو] ان (سب)ع الفسه
 12 [ق]ى ا [لد] [ن] ا [منو] ال[هم] عدا ب عظم (○) [ق]ى
 13 / / [بنا] و [ا] [لا حر] (ه) (و ا) لله بعلم و (ا) نم لا
 14 (تعلمو) ن ○ (و لو) لا فصل الله علب(ك) [م] و ر حم[نه]
 15 // ا ا [ا] / / (ر و) ف / (نم) [○] نا (نها) الد ن ا م [نو] ا
 16 { } { تنعوا [حظو] ب السطن [و] من سنع حظو (ب)
 17 { } { [سطن] فا [نه] نا (مر) نا لفس(س) [ب] (و) المنكر(ر) و لو لا
 18 { } { ا [لل]ه علب(كم) و ر // [من]ه [ما] ر (ك)ى منكم م ا
 19 { } { // ا (و) لكى الله [ن]ر (ك)ى من سنا (و) ا
 20 { } { { سميع علم ○ و لا نا [نل] ا و لا الف(صل)
 21 { } { { والس(عه) ا (ن) بو نو الف[ق]ر ا و ا
 22 { } { { [ك]س و الم(ه)ر (ن) فى [س]بل ا (لله) و لنع[ق]و
 23 { } { { لنصفحو الا [ن]نو ن ان نعر الل[ه] لكم
 24 { } { { (ا) لله عفو ر ر (ح) [ن]م ○ و الد ن د//د [و] ن 413
 25 { } { { [م] [ح] صد / العلف ال(م) // د 414 فرب (لعبو) ا

Folio 11 A (Q 24.23–24.32)

- 1 (فى) الد [ن]با (و) [لا حر ه] [و] لهم [عد] // (ب) / / م [○ 415
 2 يوم سهد علمهم [ا] فو ههم و اند //هم و ار حلهم [م]
 3 // حلو (د) هم بما كا بو اكسو ن ○ نو (م) اد [ن] [فو] (ن)
 4 (ا) لله (فر د) فى [و] فـهم(م) د [ن] هم(م) (و) بعلم [و] ن ا // ه ا { }
 5 [ح] (ق) ال [من]س ا [لخ]نـب(ث)ت لل(ح)سـ[ن] و ال [ح]سـ[و] ن لل[ح]سـ[ب]
 6 و الطنـو ن للطنـب و الطنـب لل(طنـب) ن او لـ(ب) // { }
 7 منـر و ن مما نـفو لو ن لهم [م] (مع) فر ه (و) ا [ح] // 416 [ك]ر [ن] [م] ○ (و لا)

412) There might be another tooth before this *nūn*, in which case the word would be *li-yatabayyana*.

413) This word could be *yaqdhifūna*.

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

415) The pale traces in the illegible part preceding *mīm* are more likely to belong to two graphemes than one. Specifically, they might belong to اللـ.

416) This word may be *ajr*.

- 8 بد حل [و] اسنا ح [ب] اسلموا على اهل [ه] و بس (ند) بو // { }
- 9 لكم حبر لكم [ع] لكم بند کرو ○ (ف) ها ن (ل) [م] (نجد) // (ا)
- 10 فيه ا ح [د] افلا بد حلوا احنا نودن [لكم] { } ن فصل (ل) [د] [كم]
- 11 (ا ر) حع // ا (فا) [ر] (ح) عوا هو حبر لكم ان ال [ل] [ه] [ح] / [ر]
- 12 (ب) ما عمل [و] ن ○ [س] [ع] نكم ح (ج) في (نبت) [ع] [م] مور ا
- 13 (ب) ح (ط) ه [ف] (ه) م (بع) لكم ان الله يعلم ما بندون و ما
- 14 [ب] [ك] (مو) ن ○ فل لل / م / ن // ع / ا من اصبر هم و بد / (ط) و ا
- 15 ف // و حه / [د] لك (ا) // كي / ا ن ال (ل) [ه] (ع) لم // (ب) [ع] و
- 16 (ن) ○ و فل (ل) [مو] [م] [ب] [ع] (ص) من اصبر [ر] هم⁴¹⁷ و يحفظ [فرو]
- 17 ح (ه) // [و] لا [ب] [د] ن [ر] [ب] / [ه] ا لا // (ط) [ه] // [م] [ه] (و) [ل] (ص) ن
- 18 // [م] [ر]⁴¹⁸ (ه) ن (ع) لى ح [ب] و ه ن و لا [ب] [د] (ب) ر (ب) ه ن (ا) لا (لا) ر و ح { }
- 19 او انهن او انا نعو لهن او نى د // [و] [ل]⁴¹⁹ [ب] ه ن او { }
- 20 انهن او احو نهن او د // (ى) ا [حو] نهن ا (و) ن (ب) ى
- 21 احو (هن) او ا [ن] [ب] [ع] [د] ن [ع] // { } او لا الار (ه) [م] ن
- 22 المر حل او ما ملك (ا) { } (ه) ن الد ن [م]
- 23 // [ط] / (و) ا على ع [و] ر ه الن (ب) ا (و) الو [ل] (ط) // ⁴²⁰
- 24 [ا] [ل] (د) [ب] ن لم نسل / و اللحم او بسهن [و] لا
- 25 [ب] [ص] [ر] [ب] ن نار [حل] ن لعلم ما ح [ب] [ف] (ى) من ر (ب) ه ن و
- 26 / [و] ا (ل) ى { } (ا) لله (ح) م عا بها (ل) م و
- 27 / ن [د] [ع] لكم نفلحون ○ و انكحوا الا نى
- 28 { } [ك] م // [ه] { } [ع] ص (ا) ⁴²² [و] (ل) // [ل] / [ن] [م] (ن) { } [ب] ك م { } (ل) // { }

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

⁴¹⁸) The traces preceding the putative *mīm* do not quite conform to *بـ*.

⁴¹⁹) The traces after the tooth match a medial *hā'* better than a medial *'ayn*. Perhaps the scribe made a mistake and wrote *hā'* here.

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

⁴²¹) The *nūn* seems to be connected to a letter before it, and the traces before *nūn* conform to *مـ* better than to *مو*.

⁴²²) The text here might be *ba'ḍuhum ba'ḍan*.

Folio 11 B (Q 24.32–24.40)

- 1 { (ن نكو د) [و] / ا / ار⁴²³ ب(ن) نعنهما الله من (ف) صلته و ا
- 2 (الله) و سع علم ○ و (ل)ب[س]ع[ف] / ا⁴²⁴ [د] ن لا نسا[د] طع(و)
- 3 [ن] نكحا م(د) بكرم) حنا (ن)عظهم الله (من) (ف) صلته [و] ا
- 4 { د [د] ن [د] ب[ع] // ن (ا) ل[ك] ب(ب) مما مل(ل) / (ا) ن(م)ك(م)
- 5 [ف]ك(نو) هم ان [ع]لمنم فهم (ح)ر (ا) و ا عطا هم
- 6 م م ا ر فكم ا (الله) و لا نكر هو ا فد // نكم (ع)لى
- 7 { (ا) / ا ا ا ن (ر) [د] ن حصنا ل[ن]سبع[و] ا عر (ص) ا
- 8 { (نو) ه ا لد (نسا) و من ب(كر) هه[ن] فا (ن) الله (ع)د
- 9 ا (ك)ر ههين عفو (ر) ر⁴²⁵ حنم (○) و [ف] (د) (ا) بر لنا ا [ب] (ب) نيب
- 10 و [م]لا م(ن) ⁴²⁶ ا لد [د] ن (ن) حلو) [م] (ن) هلكم و [م] (و) ع[ط] (ه) للمفس ○
- 11 { // له نور السموب [و] // (لا) ر ص مزل(ل) نور [(ه) [ك]مسكو
- 12 // (ف)بها مصر(ح) و المصنح فى (ر) ححه و الر حح[ه] كا
- 13 // (ه)كا كو [ك]ب [د] رى ب(و) (ف)د من سحر(ر) ه (من) كه ر ب(د) [و]
- 14 // لا سرفه و (لا) عر [د] نه نكا در ننها نص(ب) ⁴²⁷ من فیل
- 15 // (ن) نمسه نار نور ع(ل)ى نور نهدي (ى) الله نور ه
- 16 // [ن] [ب] (س)ها (و) ب(ص)ر ب ا ل // (ه) [ا] [لا م] // ل (ل) [د] (ا) [س] لعظهم
- 17 { / / (و) ن (○) [ف]ى // بو [ب] ا د (ن) ا (ل) [ه] ا ن [د] ر [ع] [ع]
- 18 { ن د كر ف(نه)ها // ا / مه نسا(د)ح فيها نالعد و [و]
- 19 // لا صل ر حنل لا نلهب(هم) // [ح]ر ه و لا نبع عن
- 20 (د) [ك] // ا (ل)له و ا (ف)م ا ل[ص] ل(و) [ه] (و) ا (ب)ا الر كو
- 21 نحفون بو [م]ا [د] ب[ف] [ب] // { (الف)وب و الا [ص] // (○)
- 22 // ⁴²⁸ [نهم] الله ا ح { [ن] (م) عملوا او بر ند هم) // /

⁴²³) The traces before *rā'* match **ف** better than **فـ**.

⁴²⁴) The last letter looks more like a final *bā'*/*tā'*/*thā'* than a final *fā'*.

⁴²⁵) 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 *ghafūr* and the *hā'* of *rahīm*.

⁴²⁶) 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.

⁴²⁷) This word appears to have been **نصى** at first, as the horizontal traces of a final *yā'* are visible beneath the initial tooth and *ṣād*. However, the word was modified to **نصا** by adding a tooth and *alif* at its end. These modifications appear greenish, similar to those seen in other folios (e.g. folio 10 A, line 7).

⁴²⁸) The traces match **ح** better than **لح**.

[ف]صله [و] الله ير [ر] و من نسا يعبر حسا (ب) [○]	23
[] // [د] [ن] ك [فر] و ا عمل [ه] [م] ك [ر] [ب] يفتع [ه] بحسنه	24
(ا لظ) [من] ما (حب) ا ا ا ح ا ه لم بحد س (نا) و [و] ⁴²⁹	25
{ } (د) ا (الله) ع (بد) ه ه و ف (د) ه (د) ح (سد) ه (و) الل (ه) [س] ر (ع)	26
{ } (ا) ل { } (ا) ب ○ و كظ (ل) [م] (ب) ⁴³⁰ في (ح) ل (ح) ي ن ع [س] ه	27
{ } ⁴³¹ من فو فه م [و] [ح] { } / / ⁴³² / { }	28

Folio 33 Recto (Q 34.13–34.23)

{ } { } (ل) و ح (ن) / { }	1
{ } { } ا ⁴³³ ر { } [د] // [ك] [س] // ا { }	2
{ } { } (ى) ل { } [ك] و (ر) { } ف { } { } [ع] [ل] [ه] [ا] لم { }	3
{ } { } [ع] [ل] [ى] [م] [و] [ه] [ا] ل ا د ب [ه] [ا] ل ا ر [ص] ب [ا] ل م / { }	4
{ } { } [] [ب] [ع] [م] ل و ن ل ه [ح] و لا ⁴³⁴ [ف] [ل] [ا] ح [ر] ب [ب] [ب] // [ل] [ح] و { }	5
{ } { } و ك ه ا ن (ع) ل / ⁴³⁵ (ا) [ل] [ب] / [م] (ا) ل (ب) [و] // ا [ل] (ع) [د] (ا) [ب] ا	6
{ } { } [ل] [ف] [د] [س] / [ل] / [فى] [مسك] [ب] [هم] ا [ب] [ه] [ح] [ن] [ع] [ن]	7
{ } { } [س] [م] [ل] / ⁴³⁶ [م] [ن] (ر) [ر] // [ر] [ر] [سك] [و] [ا] [سك] // [و] ا { }	8
{ } { } (و) [ر] (ب) [عفو] (ر) ○ [و] [م] [ا] [ا] [ر] [ص] // ا { }	9
{ } { } [ل] [ل] / [ل] [ل] / [و] // [ل] [هم] [ح] [ن] [س] د [و] { }	10
{ } { } [س] [ا] [ى] [م] [ن] [سد] // [ف] [ل] [ل] د [ل] // { }	11
{ } { } [هم] { } [س] [فر] (و) // ا / (ب) // (ر) [ى] [ا] ل ا / [ف] [و] // [ل] // { }	12
{ } { } (و) / [ل] [ى] // [ر] // [ل] [ف] { }	13
{ } { } / [ل] [س] // [س] [د] [ب] [ر] [و] [ا] [ف] [ب] / { }	14

⁴²⁹) This letter might be connected to the previous letter, in which case they would form the grapheme *هو*.

⁴³⁰) It seems that the scribe initially forgot to write *mīm* but added it later.

⁴³¹) The scribe has left the beginning of the line empty to avoid interfering with the previous line.

⁴³²) The traces do not match *min*. The first letter is round, but does not seem to be *mīm* (it might be *wāw* or *fā' qāf*). The second letter might be *hā'*.

⁴³³) If this *rā'* belongs to *qudūr*, the following *alif* may be a scribal error.

⁴³⁴) The text may have something like *wa-hum kānū ya'malūna lahu ḥawlan* in addition to the standard reading.

⁴³⁵) This word may be *yu'allimuhum*, the subject of which could be Sulaymān.

⁴³⁶) The text may have *'an shimālin wa-yamīnin*.

{ } / [سفر] / / [رنا] / / { }	15
{ } / (م) / / { }	16
{ } (ف) / / { }	17
{ } [ا] [ط] // [م] / / { }	18
{ } ⁴³⁷ (ا) // (م) // [س] [ف] / / { }	19
⁴³⁸ (ن) // [د] (ن) [م] ن / (د عو) ن / { } / / { }	20
{ } / / (لا) // [س] مو (ب) / / { } / / { }	21
{ } / / { } / / { }	22
{ } [ح] (ح) { } / / { }	23

Folio 33 Verso (Q 34.23–34.33)

{ } / / { } / / { }	1
{ } / / { } / / { } // [كـ] (ك) [ا] / / { }	2
{ } ⁴³⁹ [ما] (م لا) [ك] // (ا) [و] (ا) // (ل) (لله) / / { }	3
{ } [عم] (ن) [و] (ن) [س] [لا] فل [⊙] (ن) // [م] (ل) [ص] (ل) [ف] (ل) (لله) / / { }	4
{ } (ح) ر منا و لا [ب] (س) ل عما بحر م(و) ن ⊙ فل / (ن) ⁴⁴⁰ بحم [ع] د // / { }	5
/ / (ل) (لحق) ⁴⁴¹ و هو الفعا ⁴⁴² ح العلم (ف) ل (ر) // [ى] (ا) لى	6
// (ل) هم (ب) لله سر (س) ل (ل) كلا (ه) [و] (ل) (ل) // (ا) [ع] ر [ر] ا	7
{ } // (م) ⁴⁴³ (⊙) و م(ا) / / (ل) [ب] (ك) لا لل (س) (ك) [ب] فه (ب) [س] د // ا و	8
{ } // (ا) و [ك] (ا) [ب] (ر) (ل) / (ا) س لا [ب] / ر و ⁴⁴⁴ ⊙ / ⁴⁴⁵ مى { }	9

⁴³⁷ The text seems to have *fī shakkīn minhā* instead of *minhā fī shakkīn*.

⁴³⁸ The text might have *wa-lladhīna yadūnā/tadūna* instead of *qul idū lladhīna za‘amtum*.

⁴³⁹ The text might be *wa-innā wa-īyyākum la-īmmā ‘alā hudan*.

⁴⁴⁰ This word may be *rabbunā*.

⁴⁴¹ Considering the amount of space before this word, the phrase *thumma yaftaḥu baynanā* may be missing.

⁴⁴² A small dash above the tooth means that perhaps *tā’* is pointed.

⁴⁴³ The traces before *mīm* match *ك* better than *كـ*.

⁴⁴⁴ This word may be *yashkurūna* or *yatafakkarūna*.

⁴⁴⁵ The first letter in the preceding illegible part may be *wāw* or *fā’/qāf*. This word may be *wa-qīla* or *fa-qīla*.

{	}	(د) ⁴⁴⁶	/	(فل)	/	فد	//	(د)	[نم]	(ك)	ا	ا	[و]	(د)	[ا]	{	}	10
{	}	[و]	○	ن	(و)	م	[قد]	/	[لا]	/	/	/	[و]	(ل)	/	{	}	11
{	}	[ن]	ن	(ب)	[ل]	ی	//	(ب)	و	لا	(ن)	[ل]	(د)	(ا)	/	{	}	12
{	}	[م]	ص	[م]	ص	[م]	ص	[م]	ص	[م]	ص	[م]	ص	[م]	ص	{	}	13
{	}	[و]	ل	(د)	ن	(س)	//	صد	[و]	ل	ل	ل	ل	ل	{	}	14	
{	}	[و]	[ل]	(ف)	[و]	//	(ن)	[م]	(و)	[م]	(و)	[م]	(و)	[م]	(و)	{	}	15
{	}	/	/	(ل)	/	(ا)	[و]	(ع)	(س)	(د)	ا	ا	ا	ا	{	}	16	
{	}	/	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	//	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	{	}	17	
{	}	/	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	//	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	{	}	18	
{	}	/	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	//	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	{	}	19	
{	}	/	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	//	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	{	}	20	
{	}	/	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	//	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	/	(ل)	{	}	21	

Folio 34 Recto (Q 34.40–34.47)

{	}	لا	⁴⁵¹	1
{	}	(و)	[ا]	2
{	}	ملك	[ع]	3
{	}	(ب)	[ا]	4
{	}	[ع]	[ا]	5
{	}	/	/	6
{	}	/	/	7
{	}	(و)	و	8

⁴⁴⁶) There is a small chance that the letter preceding *dāl* is 'ayn. 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 *لظلمن* better than *نظلمو*.

⁴⁴⁸) The text may have *yulqī baḍukum*.

⁴⁴⁹) The letter before *ḍād* may be 'ayn. It seems that the scribe made a mistake and wrote 'ayn before *ḍād* 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 *a-hā'ulā'ī*.

{	{ (و الله) }	}	16
{	{ [د] (ل) }	}	17

Folio 35 Verso (Q 13.16–13.21)

//{	}	1
(ى) [س] { } // [ق] {	}	2
/ / { } [م] ا [ن] {	}	3
(ل) [س] [ل] ا [ح] [م] (ل) {	}	4
/ / [ح] (ل) [د] // [ل] (ل) [ا] [ر] [ا] [ل] // [ل] [ا] [ق] (ف) {	}	5
{ } صر ب الله ا ل { } (ق) { } (ل) ل [ط] (ل) { }	}	6
س و ا (ما) / / (ف) (ل) ل [ل] ا س {	}	7
(ص) ر ب ا [ل] ه (لا) م [ل] ل {	}	8
(ن) / / (ل) [ح] [س] (و) ا ل (ن) {	}	9
[ل] // { (فى) لا ر ص {	}	10
م حو ⁴⁶⁴ و او ل (نك) ل [ه] م {	}	11
(○) [م] // [و] (ن) [س] ا (ل) لم [ه] د {	}	12
ر ب [ك] ا (ل) ح ك م هو {	}	13
{ } / / { } ل (ن) د {	}	14
{ } // ل د {	}	15
{ } // [م] (ه) // {	}	16

Folio 36 Recto (Q 13.25–13.31)

{ } } ⁴⁶⁵ // (ل) // (ل) {	}	1
{ } / / { } (و) // [ن] (ل) {	}	2
{ } (ل) [ل] (ن) ⁴⁶⁶ // { } // (ف) {	}	3
{ } [ل] [ا] حر [ه] {	}	4

⁴⁶⁴) The text is uncertain. It might have *yastakhrijūhu* or *li-yastakhrijūhu* as a plus. Alternatively, it may have *la-yastakhrijūhu* instead of *la-ftadaw bihi*.

⁴⁶⁵) The first and second *lām* might be connected, in which case this word may be *allāh*.

⁴⁶⁶) This word may be *fariḥū* (verse 26).

{ } { } ا لدس ا	○ // النا [ن] { } // [ك] { } // عسى (ا) [ل] [ك] { } // [و] // [و] // { }	7
{ } { } (ك) (ر) من (ر) بـ(ك) { }	471 // (ل) [ك] [ب] [ف] [ر] // { } // (بم) // ا بر ل ا ل // (ك) من (ر) بـ(ك) { }	8
من الا (ح) [د] // (ب) / / { }	صه [ك] (ل) د عو ا / / (ب) // (ك) // { } / / { }	9
(ح) [د] (ه) / / { }	472 // (ه) [ف] [ل] ا بـ(م) ا مر (ب) ا ن / / { }	10
[ع] [د] (لا) [ه] / / { }	473 // [د] [ع] (و) ا [و] ا لله / / { }	11
[ب] [ب] // { }	عز سا و لس (ن) { } // { } / / { }	12
{ } { } ا { }	[ك] م [ن] (ا) [ع] [ل] { } / / { }	13
{ } // { }	/ / { } / / { } // { }	14
{ }	ما كان / / { } / / { }	15
{ }	{ } لله ل / (ل) / / { } { }	16
{ }	{ } و عد // { } / [ل] [ا] // { }	17
{ }	{ } // { } / / { }	18
{ }	{ } [ب] // { } / / { }	19

Folio 16 Verso (Q 28.19–28.24)

{ } { } (ن) { }	كـو (ن) { }	1
{ } { } (س) عى فل { }	د سه بـ(س) عى فل { }	2
{ }	// لو ك فا (ح) ح { }	3
{ }	// [م] (ب) حفا بـ(ر) { }	4
{ }	{ } لطحس (○) و [م] // { }	5
{ }	{ } [د] نى (س) و ا { }	6
{ }	{ } حد عـ(ه) ام [ه] { }	7
{ }	{ } ام (ر) ا بـ[ن] { }	8
{ }	{ } ا ن فل بـ(ب) 474 // { }	9

⁴⁷¹) The traces here might belong to an *alif*, in which case the text may have *ūtū* instead of *ātaynāhum*.

⁴⁷²) The additional text may begin with *kullun yadū ... ilā janbihi/jānibihi*.

⁴⁷³) The traces before *hā’* do not quite match لـ. Specifically, the letter before *hā’* may be *lām* instead of *bā’*.

⁴⁷⁴) The horizontal line between *lām* and the tooth is darker than the other letters.

{ } {سج} [ك]	10
{ } {ل و (فل)}	11

Folio 16 Recto (Q 28.30–28.35)

{ } { // [ا] لله ر // }	1
{ } { هاد [ه] (د) ر كا }	2
{ } { (مو) سى ا (فل) (و) }	3
{ } { (د) ك [ف] (فم) (صد) ⁴⁷⁵ }	4
{ } { (صم) النك حنح }	5
{ } { ر بك الى (ف) ر [ع] }	6
{ } { (ف) (ف) (فل) ر ب }	7
{ } { (و) ا حى هر (و) [ن] }	8
{ } { [صد] د فنى ا (نى) }	9
{ } { (ح) // (ك و ح) }	10
{ } { (ب) (د) ا اند }	11

Folio 28 Recto (Q 37.15–37.33)

{ } { (و) فلوا هدا } { // نيس } (ا) د ا / / [نا] بر (نا) }	1
{ } { (ع) [ط] (ما) ا / (د) / (و) ن او / / [و] / / [و] لو ن [و] }	2
{ } { فل نعم و ا [ب] [م] [د] حر و ن (و) فا (ب) } { حر) ه (و) }	3
{ } { حده فاداه [م] مح(صد) [ر] ⁴⁷⁶ / / { } / / [نو] نلنا }	4
{ } { ه // (ا) (و) (م) الد بن (ه) // (ا) نو } { // [صل] // (ل) // (ى) }	5
{ } { ك [ب] // (م) / / (ب) [و] ن (و) (ب) (و) ⁴⁷⁷ } { (ط) // [م] (وا) // }	6
{ } { ما كا يوا (ب) [ع] (د) و [ن] ⁴⁷⁸ م [د] } { (فا) [ه] // / }	7
{ } { (م) الى صر نط ا (لح) حنم // } { / / }	8

⁴⁷⁵) This word may be *qamāšika*.

⁴⁷⁶) The text may have *muh̄ḍarūn* instead of *yanzurūn*.

⁴⁷⁷) This word may be *ib'athū*.

⁴⁷⁸) The space between the putative *nūn* and *mīm* is rather small for the two-column verse separator symbols used in this folio.

لروں (○) ملكم لا ينصر (و) // 479 { / / {	9
{ (م) // [نسد] (مو) ن (○) ف(ا) ف-[ل] // / {	10
{ (ف) ا { و ا ا (نكم) [ك] // [نم] }	11
{ نل لم نكو ن(و) ا / / }	12
{ (من) سلطن) نل [ك] - [ن] }	13
{ ل / ل (د) ا (ا) // }	14
{ (عو) // [ن] (فا) [○] // [ن] }	15

Folio 28 Verso (Q 37.43–37.68)

{ حب (ا) [ل] (نع) // ○ [علی] سر ر مند-[ل] (ل) { [○] نطاف عليه(م)	1
[د] (ك) س م[ن] م[ع] (ع) [د] / [د] (صا) لده لل[س] // [ند] (○) لا (ف) [د] بها عو {	2
ل و [لا] (ه) { / { [ل] ندر) ف[و] (ن) ع(د) [د] هم [فصرد] ب الط[ر] { }	3
// [د] (ن) [ك] [د] - { // (ص مك) - (و) (ن) ○ (فا) هل (ب) عص(ه)م (ع) لئا { }	4
(د) [ع] (ص ب) سلروں) { } نل مند(هم) ابى كان لى فر دن (○) نعو	5
ل انك لم[ن] { } ف [د] (○) ادا (م) [د] - [ا] و [ك] (ب) نر) ناو	6
(ع) ط/با (ب) { } // فه(ل) ا [د] (نم) مطل(ع) [و] ن (○) فاطلع	7
(فر) ا // فى { } (○) هل نا لله ان (ك) [د] ب (نع) و ن	8
[○] و [ل] [و] (لا) { } [ك] ب من المد(ص)ر نر) (○) و م(ا) نحن	9
// / (ن) [ن] // (ا) { } ل(ى) و ما (حد) نم(ع)د (ن) (○) ان	10
{ } [○] (لم) [د] ل هر(د) ا فل [د] (ع) [م] ل ا	11
{ } [] (م) [سح] // له الر { } [ف] و م	12
{ } // (ا) سحر) // [د] // [ح] فى	13
{ } [س] [س] / (ط) // ن [○] فا	14
{ } ا (ل) طو ن (○) // م ا	15
{ } ا [ن] مر جمع(م)	16

Folio 29 Recto (Q 37.82–37.103)

{ } (ا) لا حرن (○) و ان من (سد) نع // لا نر) [ه] { }	1
{ } نه بعلت سلم (○) (د) هل (لا) // / [هو] { }	2

⁴⁷⁹) This word may be *tanāṣarūn* (with the *alif* spelled) or *tatanāṣarūn*, which is reported for Ibn Mas‘ūd (al-KHAṬĪB, *Muḥjam*, 8:20).

{	ا	ب	ف	ك	د	و	ن	الله	له	ه	}	3	
{	م	ط	ظ	ر	ب	ن	ن	لعم	م	ن	ن	}	4
{	ف	س	ف	م	ن	ن	ن	ا	ع	ب	ه	}	5
{	ا	ل	ي	ا	ل	ي	ا	ل	ي	ا	ل	}	6
{	ن	ف	ر	ن	ن	ن	ن	لنهم	ص	د	ن	}	7
{	ن	ف	و	ن	ن	ن	ن	فل	ا	ب	ع	}	8
{	و	م	ن	ن	ن	ن	ن	فها	ل	و	ا	}	9
{	ف	ي	ا	ن	ن	ن	ن	دو	ا	ه	ن	}	10
{	س	ف	ل	ن	ن	ن	ن	ا	ي	د	ه	}	11
{	ل	ي	م	ن	ن	ن	ن	ص	ل	ح	ن	}	12
{	م	ع	ا	ل	س	ع	ي	فل	ن	س	ي	}	13
{	د	ح	ك	ا	ن	ن	ن	ب	ط	ر	م	}	14
{	س	د	ح	د	ي	ا	ن	س	ه	ا	ن	}	15
{	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	}	16

Folio 29 Verso (Q 37.118–37.144)

{	ا	ل	ص	ر	/	م	ن	و	ن	ك	ا	}	1		
{	ح	ر	ن	ن	ن	ن	ن	ع	ل	ي	م	و	ن	}	2
{	س	ب	ن	ن	ن	ن	ن	ع	د	ن	ا	ل	م	}	3
{	م	ن	ا	ل	م	ر	س	ل	ن	ا	د	ف	ل	}	4
{	ن	ب	ع	ل	ا	و	ن	د	ر	و	ن	ا	ح	}	5
{	ا	نا	ب	ك	م	ا	لا	ن	ن	ن	ف	ك	د	}	6
{	ن	ن	ن	ن	ن	ن	ن	ا	ل	ا	ل	ا	ل	}	7
{	لا	ح	ر	ن	ن	ن	ن	س	م	ع	ل	ي	ا	}	8
{	ك	ا	ن	م	ن	ع	د	ن	ا	ل	ا	ل	ا	}	9
{	ا	ل	م	ر	س	ل	ن	ن	ن	ن	د	ن	و	}	10
{	ا	ل	ع	ل	ن	ن	ن	ب	م	ن	ا	م	ر	}	11
{	ع	ل	ن	ه	ا	م	ص	ن	ن	ن	ن	و	ا	}	12
{	د	و	ن	س	ن	ن	ن	ل	م	ن	ا	ل	م	}	13

⁴⁸⁰) Considering the amount of space before the putative *dāl*, the text may have *kadhālīka* instead of *innā kadhālīka*.

{ [س]حو [ن] [○] ف[س]ه[م] فکان }	14
{ (و) ب [و] هو [م] ملثم (م) }	15
{ [ن] / [ف] (و) / د / }	16

Folio 18 A (Q 15.4–15.33)

{ } / { } / (لا) و (له) // كتب م // (د) [و] (م) / (ا) / { }	1
{ } / (ا) و (ب) // [ن] // سنحر و ن ○ (ف) لو انا نه (ا) الد (ى) ا ن ر ل علقه [ه] { }	2
{ } / 481/ { } { [ك] (د) [م] [ح] و ن ○ (ل) [و] ما نا نه (ب) نا (م) (ك) [ه] (ا) ن (ك) [ب] { }	3
{ } // (ا) (ل) { } (ن) [○] (و) م [ب] نر [ل] ا (ل) ملثم [ك] ه الا (ب) (ل) و (م) (ا) كا { }	4
{ } // (ا) ادا (م) نظر (ب) (ن) [○] (ا) // (ا) (ب) نر [ب] (ل) الد (ك) // (و) // (ا) (ل) { } { } (د) فط { }	5
{ } ن ○ و لقد ار سلنا من (ف) (ك) فى سبع الا و (ل) (ن) (○) و ما د // نه { }	6
{ } من رسول الا (كا) [نو] (ا) نه سنهر و ن ○ كد لك سلكه { }	7
{ } فى فلوب (ا) [م] (د) [ر] / [ن] // لا نو م (ب) و انه و فد حلت سبه (ه) الا { }	8
{ } { [ب] (ن) ○ و لو ف [ب] (د) (ع) له // نا (با) (م) ن السما [ب] (ط) و افه 482 نعر { }	9
{ } حو ن ○ لفل [و] ا انما س (ك) ر ب انصر نا نل نحن قوم مسحو { }	10
{ } ر 483 (ن) ○ (و) (ل) ف (د) ح (ع) لنا فى ا (س) ما نر [و] (ح) (ا) و (ر) نهها (ل) طر [ب] (ن) ○ و { }	11
{ } (ح) فط (ب) ه من كل سنطن [ر] (ح) م (ن) ○ (ا) لا من اسر و السمع { }	12
{ } فابنعه سهبا م / (ن) ○ (و) الا ر ص مدد نه (ه) (و) الف { }	13
{ } (ف) نه (ه) [ر] (و) سى) و انسا // نهها من كل ساي (مو) // [و] ن (○) و حعل (ل) // { }	14
{ } [ك] م [ف] [ب] ه مع (س) و من لسم له (ه) نر (ر) // [ب] (ن) ○ (و) / 484 (م) ن سا [ى] { } (ا)	15
{ } لا [ب] (ب) [ب] نسا حر (ب) ه و (م) نر (له) 485 الا بعد [ر] معلوم ○ و ار { }	16
{ } (س) لنا الر يح (ل) و (ف) [ج] فا (ب) ر (ل) (م) ن السما ما [ب] (س) فبكمو { }	17
{ } ه (و) [م] (ا) [ب] [ن] م [ل] له حر 486 [ب] (ن) ○ و انا نحن نحن (ى) و (ب) م / و (ا) [ب] (ا) { } (ب) [ح] [ن] { }	18

481) The traces here match *al-qur’ān* better than *al-dhikr*.

482) A horizontal line is visible beneath *fā’* and the tooth. Perhaps the scribe first wrote *fī* here but then changed it to *fīhi*.

483) There is no trace of a *wāw* after *rā’*, nor is there enough room for a letter.

484) The traces here match *mā* better than *in*.

485) It seems the scribe made a mistake here, writing one tooth instead of two at the beginning of the word.

486) It is not clear if a tooth precedes the initial *hā’* or not.

- 19 { } (الو ر بون) ○ و ا [ب] (ا) لبعلم [م] (سد) بعد (من) م(نكم) و [ع] لم ا { }
- 20 لمس [بحر] ن ○ و ا // ر بك (ل) بحسر ه // ا [نه] [ح] (ك) // [م] علم (○) و { }
- 21 { } (د) // [ح] (ف) (ا) لا نس (من) صلصل من [ح] ما م(سد) بون ○ و { }
- 22 ا (ل) ح حلف / / من ف(ل) (م) ن (د) ر (سم) و [م] (○) و ا د ل ر فل [ك] { }
- 23 لل (م) لـ كـه ا (د) // [ح] [ق] ب(سد) [ر] (ا) م(ن) ص(د) ل(ص) ل من حما مس(و) ن { }
- 24 ف // (د ا) سو ننه و نعب (ف) [ه] (م) ن ر و ح(ى) فف [ع] و له { }
- 25 سجد ن [○] فسجد الم (ل) لـ كـه ك(ل) [هم] (ا) جمع ن ○ الا ا لـ لـ س [س] { }
- 26 // [ن] (ا) ن (ك) و (ن) م(ع) (ا) ل [سجد] ن ○ (ل) نا لـ لـ س (س) مال ك { }
- 27 { } [لا] نكو [ن] من ا (ك) [سجد] [ن] (○) (ل) لم // / (لا) // / { }

Folio 18 B (Q 15.33–15.74)

- 1 { } لـ [س] حلف / / من صلصل [م] (ن) حما مسون ○ فل [ف] (ح) ح / / 487 { }
- 2 { } 488 بك (ر) حنم (○) و ان عليك لعن (ب) الى نوم الد (ن) (○) فل
- 3 { } ب فانظر نى الى نوم (ب) نعو ن ○ فل فانك م(ن) (ا) { } [ب] (ن) ○
- 4 { } لى نوم الو (ف) المعلوم ○ فل (ر) ب نما [ا] // [ب] // لا ر
- 5 { } ن لهم فى الا (ر) ص و لا عو نهم ا [حم] عس ○ ا [لا] (ع) با
- 6 { } (دك) منه (م) المخلص ○ فل هدا صر ط // لى 489 (م) سفس (م) ○ ان 490 عدى
- 7 { } (بهم) 491 لرس) لك عليهم (سد) لطن و لاس { } ل 492 الا من ا (ب) عك من
- 8 { } // [ع] و [ب] (○) و ان هبهم (م) ع(د) ه [م] // / [ع] (ن) // / لها نسعه ا (ب) و { }
- 9 { } (ك) ل (ب) ا ب م // (م) حر (مفسو) [م] ○ ان الم (م) نين فى حن (و)
- 10 { } [نو] ن ○ ا [د] [ح] (و) ها (سد) لم ا م (ب) ن ○ ا حو نا على سر ر م [ف] [ن] ○
- 11 { } (ا) 493 نمسهم ف [ب] ها (م) ن [ب] [ص] ب و م (ا) هم منها (م) حر حن ○ // (ب) عدى

⁴⁸⁷) The traces before *hā'* do not quite match an initial *mīm* followed by a tooth. They match one *mīm*, or two teeth, or a *lām* and a tooth.

⁴⁸⁸) It is not clear if this *alif* is connected to a letter before it or not.

⁴⁸⁹) It seems the scribe initially forgot to write *'alā* here, since it is written slightly above the line, in the small space available between *širāṭ* and *mustaqīm*.

⁴⁹⁰) The letter *nūn* may be pointed, as there is a small dash inside it.

⁴⁹¹) This word may be *minhum*, in which case the sentence would be awkward, or *'alayhim*, in which case this would be a scribal error, since *'alayhim* appears again after *laka*.

⁴⁹²) This word may be *sabīl*.

⁴⁹³) The shape of this *alif* suggests it is not part of a *lā*. Perhaps the text has *mā* here.

- 12 { } بی انا (ا) [ع]و // (ا) لُر (ح)م (○) و ا ن عدی هو الع(د) اب
- 13 { } لُم (○) و ن(د)هم عن (ص)ب ا بر هم (○) ا د د حلوا ع(ل)ه
- 14 { } [ف]ـ(ل) و اسل(م)ا (ف)ل ا (د)ا منکم⁴⁹⁴ و حل(و) ن (○) فلوا لا نو (ح)ل (م)نا
- 15 { } [نا] نسرک نعل(م) عل(م) (○) فل نسر نمو //ی علی ان م(س)دی
- 16 { } [ا] [ل]ک[ا]بر فما⁴⁹⁵ ن(س)ر و ن (○) ف(ل)وا (د)نسرک نالحو ف(ل)ا ن(ک)س (م)ن
- 17 { } [ا] لفظ(ن) (○) فل [و] من نبط من ر (ح)م(ه) ر نه (الا) ال(ل)ص[و] [و] (○)
- 18 { } [فل] (و) [م] // حطنکم انه المر(س)لون (○) فلوا انا ر // لنا ا
- 19 { } [ی] // / م محر من (○) الا ال لوط انا منح(و) هم ا ح[م] //س (○) الا
- 20 { } (مر) نهم ا ن(ه)ا (ک)ا تب من العبر ن (○) فلما حا (ل) ل(و) ط ا
- 21 { } [مر] سل(د)ن (○) فل ف(و) م (م)کرو (ن) (○) فلوا (د)ل حنک نما (ک)ا نو
- 22 { } // (ه) [نم]ر[ر] ⁴⁹⁶ و ن (○) و اسنک نالحو و انا ل(ص)د ف(ن)س (○) // { [س]ر
- 23 { } [ا] هلك ن(ف)طع (م)ن الل و ا ن(د)ع ا د بر (ه)م و لا ن(ل) // ب
- 24 { } // (ک)م ا حد و امصوا حب نامرو ن (○) (و) ف[ص]ا نا اله
- 25 { } [د] لک الامرو ان دبر هو لا م[ط] و ع مصنح (○) و حا ا
- 26 { } // الم د نه ن(س)ل[ن] //سر و ن (○) فل صنفی فلا ن(ف)ص(ح) و ن (○) و ا ن(ف)وا
- 27 { } لله فلا بحر و ن (○) فلوا او لم ننهک (ع)ن ال(ع)لم//ا ن (○) فل هو (لا)
- 28 { } // [ی] ا [ن] کنم فعلن (○) ل(ع)مرک ا نه(م) لفی (س) [ک]ر (م) ⁴⁹⁷ / /
- 29 { } // حد نهم ال(ص)د[ح] ⁴⁹⁸ م(س)ر ف(ن) //ا ن (○) و [ح] //ل(نا) //ل[ل] //ه(ا) س(د) //ل[ه]ا

Folio 19 B (Q 15.87–99 – 25.1–8)

- 1 { } (ا) ن [ا] ل[ع]ط // /
- 2 { } [م] و لا (بحر) ن [ع] ل[س] [هم]
- 3 { } بر (منس) ⁴⁹⁸ (○) [ک]م ا //ر لنا
- 4 { } بحر (ا) ن [ع]صا //ا ن (○) و [ر] ن[ک]
- 5 { } نعملون (○) فا (صدع) / (ا)

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 *rā* later.

⁴⁹⁷) There is no trace of a tooth before *hā*. This word may be *sukrihim*, which is reported for al-A‘mash here (al-KHAṬĪB, *Mu‘jam*, 4:577).

⁴⁹⁸) The text seems to have *nadhīrun mubīnun*.

Folio 19 A (Q 25.14–25.27)

	{	و (اد) }	1
	{	ا (لح)[د] (لـرى) }	2
	{	// (مصد)[ر] ا (○) له(م) فد(ه) }	3
	{	(ع) د امسولا ○ و نوم //	4
	{	انم اصل(ب)م [ع] ندى هو }	5
	{	فلو ار بنا ما كان نبنى }	6
	{	من او لنا ولكن منع هو (لا) }	7
	{	كر و كانوا افو ما نور ا ○ فـ }	8
	{	ن ⁵⁰⁷ لك صر فا ولا نصر(ر) او من(ن) }	9
	{	عدا [ب] 508(ك) بن[ر] ا ○ و ما ا (ر) [س] لنا }	10
	{	الا من هو(و) نا (ك)ل من الطعم و }	11
	{	و (ح) علنا نعصم لعص فيه ا (ب) صد }	12
	{	نصر (ا) ○ و فل الدس كفر و ⁵⁰⁹ لا بـ }	13
	{	{ [ب] بر ل الملن(ك)ه (ل) فدا (س) بكر(ر) و ا فـ(رى) }	14
	{	{ عـ(رو) اكـ(ب) ر ا ○ و [ب] [و] م (ننر) ل الملـ }	15
	{	مند [ل] المـ(ر) من و فالو احـ(ر) ا محـ(و) ر (ا) }	16
	{	{ [لو] ا (م)ن (عم)ل فد[ع] لئه هنا منبو (ر) ا ○ }	17
	{	{ حـ[ر] مسفر او احس معلا ○ }	18
	{	{ (و) بر لب الملنكه د / (ب) لا ○ ا }	19
	{	{ حص و { (ا) } لى الك[ف] ر [ب] [د] و (ما) }	20
	{	{ ⁵¹⁰ (ا) لـ } على نده نعو }	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 *ṣarfān*. 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 narjū liqā'a llāhi ḥattū*, or *lā nu'minu laka ḥattū*.

⁵¹⁰) There is no writing in this line before this point, perhaps since it would have interfered with the previous line.

Folio 24 Verso (Q 30.38–30.50)

{ [م]سكنس (و) ا ين ا ل / ب [ل] (د) }	1
{ [ه] (ا) لل(ه) و (ا) و ل [ل] (ك) [ه]م }	2
{ (ب) // (ل) // [ر] نو [ا] في (ا) [مول] }	3
{ و [م]ا اسهم من ر [ك] (و) }	4
{ (ا و ل) (ك هم) ا (ل) / / }	5
{ [نم] (نم) / م نم (نح) نكم }	6
{ (ل) / (ا) ي / / (نح)نه و يعلى }	7
{ [ف] (ى) (ا) [ل] / / و (ا) ل [بحر] [م] (ا) }	8
{ (ه) [م] (ع) // (ع) / ا لى (ع) [م] (لو) ⁵¹¹ }	9
{ (ر) و ا (فى) ا (لا ر ص) فا }	10
{ لد ين [م] ن ف (ب) ل (ه) م كا (ن) }	11
{ ا و (ح) ه (كم) ⁵¹² قل (نو) ⁵¹³ }	12
{ [د] عو ن ○ من ك [ف] (ر) ف (ط) نه }	13
{ // [ه] // [سمه] د [و] ن ○ ل // // }	14
{ // (ل) / / (ا) // }	15
{ // (ب) / / (ا) ل (ر) // (ج) }	16
{ ل (ب) ح [ر] ي (ا) [ل] [ل] (ك) فى ⁵¹⁴ }	17
{ // (ل) [و] // (ل) // (ل) / [ك] (و) }	18
{ (ر) سلا) (ل) / [هم] }	19
{ [م] (ن) [ل] / (و) ا }	20
{ [ن] [○] (ه) // ⁵¹⁵ // ا [ى] بر }	21
{ [ط] // [فى] (ا) / [ك] // [ف] ⁵¹⁶ }	22

⁵¹¹) The text seems to have *ya'malūn* instead of *'amilū*.

⁵¹²) The text might have *fa-aqīmū awjuhakum* or *fa-aqīmū wajhakum* (Ubayy b. Ka'b reportedly had *awjuhakum* instead of *wujūhakum* in Q 4.43 (al-KHAṬĪB, *Mu'jam*, 2:81)).

⁵¹³) The phrase *an ya'tiya* appears to be missing.

⁵¹⁴) The text may have *fī l-baḥr* in addition to the standard reading.

⁵¹⁵) The text may have *huwa* instead of *allāhu*.

⁵¹⁶) The text might have *fa-yabsuṭuhu fī l-samā' i kisafan*.

{ } [ب]نه // (ا) [د]ا / { }	23
{ } / { } [س]س-	24
{ } [ب] // [ف] // (ل)س/ان // [م] 517	25

Folio 3 Verso (Q 35.39–35.40)

{ } // { }	1
{ } // { } ا /	2
{ } { } هم / (ف) / (ر) { }	3
{ } { } (ن) [و] د [م]ن / { }	4
{ } { } لهم // ص ا // { }	5
{ } { } م(ه) [ف] [ب]ا 518 // [ه] (ب) { }	6
{ } { } ا [ص]ا // [هم] / { }	7

Folio Christies 2008 Verso (Q 63.1–11 – 62.1–11)

1 [بسم] (ا) (ه) (ل)ر / (ن) (ا) [ر] / (م) () (ا) [د] (ا) ح)ك // لم [ب]فون / دو 519	1
ر [ب] (ول) الل [ه] (و) الل (ه) [ب] علم انك ر سوله و // [ب]هدا (ن) ا /	2
لكنون () احد و احد و احد [م] (ه) (ح) // [ه] فصد و ا [ع] سن (ل) الله ا [ب] هم / /	3
م (ا) كانوا / ملو (ن) () د لك نابهيم امنوا م (ك) [ف] (ر) و ا // م // د د و (ا) / /	4
520 فظن [ع] على فلو بهم د // ك نابهيم قوم (لا بعه) فهو ن () و (ا) // ا ح و ك [ب] ع // /	5
احسم // م و ان فعو لو (ا) سمع ل // ل [ه] م (كا) د / / حسب مسنده [ب] سنو ن / /	6
7 صحه // لنهم (ه) الم // [و] ف [ا] (ح) د // و [ه] 521 // [م] [ا] ل // ه ا نى (و) فكو [ن] () (و) اد // [ف] / /	7
8 لهم (ه) // [ع] ل (و) ا) د / / ل (ك) م / / [و] (ل) الل [ه] ل / / (و) [ب] هم و ر نهم بصد و ن (و هم)	8

517) This letter might belong to *‘alayhim*, in which case *min qablihi* would be missing.

518) The text may have *anzalnā ‘alayhim* instead of *ātaynāhum*.

519) The text may have *shahidū* instead of *qālū nashhadu*.

520) The text seems to have *thumma zdādū kufran* in addition to the standard reading.

521) This word may be *fa-ḥdharūhum*.

- 9 م[س] (سك) / ن / / ا / / ا / / اسعور [ب] ل[ه] / / [س] [نع] // (هم لى [ب] [ع] فر الله [هم])
- 10 ا [ن] الل[ه] لا [ب] [د] // الف(و) م // لف(س) ف(ب) ن ○ (هم) الد / / [ب] // ل[ن] (لا ب) نفوا على / /
- 11 [ع] بـ / سول ا [ل] [ه] ح(با) [ب] [ف] [ص] [و] ا من ح(و) [ل] [ه] (و) لله حر [ب] [ن] ا ل[ا] / [ب] و (ا) لا ر [ص]
- 12 و [ل] [ك] [ا] (ا) ن الم(ب) ف(س) (لا) / (هو ن) ○ / (و) ⁵²² ل(و) [ن] (لا) ن ر (ح) عبا الى ا لم / [ن] [ه] // [ح] [ر]
- 13 (ح) ا لا [ع] [ر] [م] (ه) ا لا (د) ل و لل[ه] ا [ع] [ر] ه (ح) [م] // [ع] [ا] [و] [ل] ل[ر] [س] [و] ل و ال(م) و [م] /
- 14 و [ل] [ك] [ا] (ا) [م] [ن] (ب) // (ن) لا (ب) ل(م) ن ○ (با) نه // الد د / / ا من(و) الا [ب] [ل] [ه] ك(م) (مو ل) [ك] [م]
- 15 و (لا) ا // ل[د] [ك] // (ع) د ك ر ال[ل] [ه] و [م] [ن] [ب] [ع] [ل] د ل[ا] / (ف) [ا] [و] [ل] / [م] [ا] / (ا) / /
- 16 [و] [ن] ○ [و] (ا) ب [ف] [و] ا من فل (ا) [ن] [نا] / / ا حد كم [ا] [ل] / [ب] و / / ل [ر] [ب] (د) (لو)
- 17 لا (ا) ح) // ⁵²³ الى ا حل [ف] // (ب) ف[ا] [ب] [د] ق و [ا] [ك] // [ن] ⁵²⁴ م[ا] [ل] [ب] [د] [ل] [ح] [ن] (○) و (ل) نو حر [ا]
- 18 لله / / [س] [ا] [ب] [ع] [د] ا ن ح[د] // ⁵²⁵ ا ح(ل) [ه] و الله (ح) // [ب] [ما] // [ع] // ل[ا] ن ○ [ه] [د] [ه] (ح) [م] (ه سو) / /
- 19 ا (ل) // ف(ب) ن ○ ~~~~~ [س] [م] (ل) [ل] [ه] ا ل[ر] ح[م] /
- 20 ل[د] حنم ○ [ب] [س] ح لله ما فى (ا) ل[س] [م] (ا) [و] [ب] و ما فى ا (لا) [ر] [ص] (ا) ل[د] // ل[ك] (ا) لف // (و)
- 21 س ا // [ع] [ر] [ب] ا [ل] [ح] [ك] [م] (○) ا [ل] [د] / / [ب] فى الا من(ن) [ر] [س] و لا منهم [ب] [د] // ل[ا] (ا) ل[ا] // [ه] [م] ا نه
- 22 و بر ك // [ه] // و [ب] [ع] [ل] [م] ا (ل) [ك] // و ا // (ح) [ك] [م] (م) [ه] // ا ن كا نو (ا) [م] [ن] ف(ل) ل(ف) // (ص) [ل] [ل]
- 23 من[ب] [س] // (و) ا [ح] [ا] [ن] / / ن / د / / ⁵²⁶ (ل) // [ب] // (ل) // [و] (ا) [ب] [ه] // ه / / ل(ع) ر (ا) ل[ا] (ك) [م] ○

⁵²²) The illegible part preceding *wāw* is rather large for the grapheme *بـ*. Moreover, there are traces at its beginning that might belong to an *alif*. There may be an *aw* in addition to the standard text.

⁵²³) This word may be *akhkhartanā* as in Q 4.77.

⁵²⁴) This word may be *wa-akūna*.

⁵²⁵) This word may be *yajī'a*.

⁵²⁶) The text might be *wa-ākharīna minhum min ba'dihim*.

Folio 17 Recto (-)⁵³⁹

{	} ⁵⁴⁰ (ا) // {	}	1
{	} // ل {	}	2
{	} م لا [○] {	}	3
{	} ع (ع) // {	}	4

Folio 17 Verso (-)

{	} ⁵⁴¹ د ع {	}	1
{	} ⁵⁴² ط // (س) [ى] // س {	}	2
{	} ⁵⁴³ ط // (ح) {	}	3
{	} م (ح) نو {	}	4
{	} نسا {	}	5

Appendix I: 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, *Mu‘jam al-Qirā‘āt*; KM = Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā‘ir al-Islāmiyya, 2002); IM-A = the reading of Ibn Mas‘ūd according to the report of al-A‘mash 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.

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

⁵⁴⁰) The letter before *alif* may be *ḥā’* or a tooth-shaped one.

⁵⁴¹) Either *‘ayn* and *dāl* are connected or a tooth-shaped letter is between them.

⁵⁴²) This word may be *bi-sultān* or a conjugation of *istatā‘a*.

⁵⁴³) It is not clear whether *ḥā’* and *ṭā’* are connected or not. This word may be *ḥabītat*, *aḥātat*, *aḥattu*, or *khiṭāb*, among other things.

Sūra, verse, Folio:line	Lower Text	Standard Text	Readings Similar to the Lower Text
2.96, 2A:28	[د] (ع) لى (ه) [د] /(ح) [ل] (ه) [د] ال (د) [د] / //ند	'alā ḥayātīn	Ubayy b. Ka'b: 'alā l-ḥayātī (MQ, 1:156).
2.96, 2B:1	[ه] ح / د	bi- muzahzi- ḥīhī	Ibn Mas'ūd: bi-munziḥīhī (MQ, 1:156).
2.98, 2B:6	(ل) مك (ل)	Mikāla	Ibn Muḥayṣīn: Mikayl (MQ, 1:160). This word has been read in many ways, but Ibn Muḥayṣīn's reading is the only one compatible with the <i>rasm</i> in C-1.
2.105, 2B:26	او المسر ن (كو)	wa-lā l-mush- rikīna	Al-A'mash: wa-lā l-mushrikūna (MQ, 1:169).
2.217, David r:25	[و] [ع] (ن) هل ف [د] (ه)	qitālin fīhī	Ibn Mas'ūd, Ibn 'Abbās, 'Ikrima, al-A'mash, al-Rabī: 'an qitālin fīhī (MQ, 1:298). IM-A: 'an qitālin fīhī (KM, 1:307).
2.222, David v:19	/ { } (لا) [ف] ۱۱ (نو) / ل (نس) ا فى (محص) // ن ح (د) ی [د] ط [د] (ه) [ر] ن yathurna	fa-ṭazilū l- nisā' a fī l- maḥīḍī wa-lā taqrabū- hunna ḥattā yathurna	Ibn Mas'ūd and Anas: wa-lā taqrabū l-nisā' a fī maḥīḍihinna wa-ṭazilūhunna ḥattā yataṭāharna (MQ, 1:308–9).
2.222, David v:20	[د] ط [د] (ه) [ر] ن	yathurna	The reading <i>yataṭāharna</i> is reported for Ibn Mas'ūd, Anas, and Ubayy b. Ka'b, while <i>yathāharna</i> is reported for Ḥamza, al-Kisā'ī, 'Aṣīm (via Abū Bakr and al-Mufaḍḍal), al-A'mash, al-Jahdarī, Ibn Muḥayṣīn, and Khalaf (MQ, 1:308).
5.45, Bonh. r:13	[ا] [نسا] / (و) ا (ع) لى (د) ی ا سر نل	wa- katabnā 'alayhim	Ubayy b. Ka'b: wa-anzala llāhu 'alā Banī Isrā'īla (MQ, 2:278).
5.48, Bonh. v:4	[سر نعه]	shir'atan	An early Baṣran who apparently had <i>sharī'atan</i> in his own copy of the Qur'ān accused al-Ḥajjāj of having “changed” the Qur'ān and written the synonym <i>shir'atan</i> instead. On a discussion of the report about al-Ḥajjāj, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “Codex,” 365, footnote 36; cf. MQ, 2:286.

Sūra, verse, Folio:line	Lower Text	Standard Text	Readings Similar to the Lower Text
5.54, Bonh. v:26	[علط] <i>a‘izzatin</i>		Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>ghulazā‘a</i> ; al-Māwardī: <i>ghuluẓin</i> (MQ, 2:294)
8.2, 4B:12	[فـر] <i>wajilat</i>		Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>fariqat</i> ; Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>fazi‘at</i> (MQ, 3:258).
9.90, 20B:22	/ [م] <i>al-</i> [ر] <i>mu‘adh-</i> <i>dhirūna</i>		Ibn Mas‘ūd and Sa‘īd b. Jubayr: <i>al-mu‘adhīrūna</i> (MQ, 3:436).
9.126, 22A:13	(ر) // [و] <i>a-wa-lā</i> و <i>yarawna</i>		Al-A‘mash: <i>a-wa-lam taraw/yaraw</i> ; Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>a-wa-lam tara</i> (MQ, 3:482). IM-A: <i>a-wa-lam tarā/tara</i> (KM, 1:318).
19.19, 22B:15	لنهب <i>li-ahaba</i> (لاهب).		Abū ‘Amr: <i>li-nahaba</i> ; Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ubayy b. Ka‘b, and several other readers had <i>li-yahaba</i> (MQ, 5:348–9).
19.21, 22B:17	(هـ) <i>huwa</i> هو عل/ (هـ) <i>‘alayya</i> <i>hayyīnun</i>		The reading <i>wa-huwa ‘alayya hayyīnun</i> is reported for al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī for Q 19.9 (MQ, 5:344).
19.23, 22B:19	ا حا ها <i>fa-ajā‘ahā</i>		Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>fa-lammā ajā‘ahā/jā‘ahā</i> (MQ, 5:350).
19.24, 22B:20	(فـ) [د] بها من <i>fa-nādāhā</i> / / حنها <i>min tahtihā</i>		Ibn ‘Abbās: <i>fa-nādāhā malakun min tahtihā</i> (MQ, 5:353).
19.26, 22B:24	(ص) [و] (ما) [و صـ] (نا)	<i>ṣawman</i>	Anas b. Mālik: <i>ṣawman wa-ṣumtan</i> and <i>ṣawman ṣumtan</i> ; Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>ṣawman ṣumtan</i> ; Anas, Ubayy, Ibn Mas‘ūd, and Abū Razīn al-‘Uqaylī: <i>ṣumtan</i> (MQ, 5:359).
19.34, 23A:6	(د) ی کان { } <i>yamtarūna</i> نمر و ن	<i>alladhī fīhi</i>	Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>alladhī kāna l-nāsu fīhi yamtarūna</i> (MQ, 5:366).
19.59, 23B:9	[صـ] لوت <i>al-ṣalāta</i>		Ibn Mas‘ūd, al-Ḥasan, Abū Razīn al-‘Uqaylī, al-Ḍaḥḥāk, and Ibn Miqsam: <i>al-ṣalawāt</i> (MQ, 5:376).
19.63, 23B:15	[بـ] لک نور بها <i>tilka l-</i> <i>jannatu</i> <i>llatī nū-</i> <i>rithu</i>		al-A‘mash: <i>nūrithuhā</i> instead of <i>nūrithu</i> (MQ, 5:378).
19.67, 23B:21	(د) د کر <i>yadhkuru</i>		Ubayy b. Ka‘b and Abū l-Mutawakkil: <i>yatadhakkaru</i> ; Ibn Kathīr, Abū ‘Amr, Ḥamza, al-Kisā‘ī, Khalaf, Abū Ja‘far, and Ya‘qūb: <i>yadhdhakkaru</i> (MQ, 5:382).

Sūra, verse, Folio:line	Lower Text	Standard Text	Readings Similar to the Lower Text
22.23, 7A:19	[و]// لو	<i>wa-lu'lu'an</i>	Ibn Kathīr, Abū 'Amr, Ibn 'Āmir, Ḥamza, al-Kisā'ī, Talḥa, Ibn Watthāb, al-A'mash, Warsh, al-Ḥasan: <i>wa-lu'lu'in</i> (MQ, 6:97).
22.35, 7B:18	والمعد(د)من (١) ○ ه [صلو] ه	<i>wa-l-muqīmī l-ṣalāti</i>	Ibn Mas'ūd, al-A'mash, and Ibn Muḥayṣin (via al-Bazzī): <i>wa-l-muqīmīna l-ṣalāta; wa-l-muqīmīna l-ṣalāti</i> is also reported by al-'Ukbarī (MQ, 6:113).
22.36, 7B:20	صو(ف)ص (صواف)	<i>ṣawāffa</i>	Ibn Mas'ūd, Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn 'Umar, Ibrāhīm, Qatāda, Mujāhid, 'Atā', al-Ḍaḥḥāk, al-Kalbī, al-A'mash, and Abū Ja'far: <i>ṣawāfīna</i> (MQ, 6:116).
22.39, 7B:28	//(د)/ / (ن) [ف]ـى ١ / [د]ـ(د) / [ك]ـ(ك) ه	<i>yuqāta-tūna</i>	Abū 'Amr, Ibn Kathīr, 'Āṣim (via Abū Bakr), Ḥamza, al-Kisā'ī, Khalaf, and Ya'qūb: <i>yuqātītūna</i> (MQ, 6:121).
18.16, 32B:2	ا [د] و ا [ه]ـ(ه)	<i>illā llāha</i>	Ibn Mas'ūd: <i>min dūni llāhi, min dūninā</i> (MQ, 5:161).
16.37, 13A: 24	[و] ا [ح]ـ ص /	<i>in taḥriṣ</i>	Al-Nakha'ī: <i>wa-in taḥraṣ</i> (MQ, 4:627).
16.38, 13B:2	[و] [ع]ـ (عد)	<i>wa'dan</i>	Al-Ḍaḥḥāk: <i>wa'dun</i> (MQ, 4:630).
16.44, 13B: 10	[و] (با) لـ (ر)ـ ز	<i>wa-l-zuburī</i>	The reading <i>bi-l-zuburī</i> instead of <i>wa-l-zuburī</i> is reported in Q 3.184 for the codices of the Shām and the following readers: Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn 'Āmir, Ibn Dhakwān, Hishām, and al-Ḥulwānī (MQ, 1:638).
33.51, 9A:4	ـ(ما) او ـ(ن)ـ ح	<i>bi-mā ātayta-hunna</i>	Ibn Mas'ūd: <i>bi-mā ūtīna</i> (MQ, 7:304). IM-A: <i>bi-mā ūtīna</i> (KM, 1:330).
33.53, 9A:13	سحى (يستحى)	<i>yastahyī</i>	The majority have read <i>yastahyī</i> , which is compatible with the lower text's spelling, and is considered a Ḥijāzī pronunciation (<i>luḡha</i>), whereas Ibn Kathīr, Ibn Muḥayṣin, Ya'qūb and Mujāhid have read <i>yastahī</i> , which is considered a Tamīmī way of reading this word (MQ, 1:67; 7:310).

Sūra, verse, Folio:line	Lower Text	Standard Text	Readings Similar to the Lower Text
33.67, 9B:18	ل / [س] (ل) //	<i>al-sabilā</i>	Ibn Mas‘ūd reportedly had السبيل here, الطنون in verse 10 and الرسول in verse 66 (MQ, 7:257). The following Kūfan and Baṣran readers also reportedly did not pronounce the final <i>alif</i> either in <i>waqf</i> or <i>wasl</i> for verses 10, 66, and 67: Ḥamza, Abū ‘Amr, al-Jaḥdarī, Ya‘qūb, and al-A‘mash (MQ, 7:256). IM-A: <i>al-rasūla</i> (KM, 1:330).
20.31, 15A:4	/ [و] [س] (ر) / ا [ف] [ي] (ى) / ○ [م] (ر) ي ○ / [و] [س] (و) / رى [نه] ار رى (○)	<i>ushdud</i> <i>bihī azrī</i> <i>wa-ash-</i> <i>rikhu fī</i> <i>amrī</i>	Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>ashrikhu fī amrī</i> ○ <i>wa-shdud bihī azrī</i> (MQ, 5:430).
20.40, 15A:10	// (ف ر د) [ب] (ك)	<i>fa-</i> <i>raja‘nāka</i>	Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>fa-radadnāka</i> (MQ, 5:434).
20.63, 15B:3	(م) د ا ن ا لا (س ح ر ن)	<i>in hādhāni</i> <i>la-sāḥirāni</i>	Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>mā hādhāni/hādhā illā sāḥirāni, in dhāni/hādhāni illā sāḥirāni, in dhāni la-sāḥirāni</i> ; Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>in dhāni/hādhāni illā sāḥirāni, an hādhāni illā sāḥirāni, inna dhayni/dhāni la-sāḥirāni</i> (MQ, 5:452–3).
20.63, 15B:3	(و) ند ه (نا) مب [ك] (م ب) ر [ظ] (ر) ف [ه] (ف)	<i>wa-</i> <i>yadhhabā</i> <i>bi-ṭarī-</i> <i>qatikumu</i> <i>l-muthlā</i>	Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ubayy b. Ka‘b, Abdallāh b. ‘Amr, Abū Rajā‘ al-‘Uṭāridī: <i>wa-yadhhabā bi-l-ṭarīqati</i> (MQ, 5:453).
20.128, 30B:8	/ (لم) (ه) / <i>yahdī</i>	<i>a-fa-lam</i> <i>yahdī</i>	Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>a-wa-lam yahdī</i> (MQ, 5:512).
24.27, 11A:8	ح [ب] ا سلموا على ا ه [ه] و س (س د) نوا	<i>ḥattā</i> <i>tasta‘nisū</i> <i>wa-tusal-</i> <i>limū ‘alā</i> <i>ahlihā</i>	Ibn ‘Abbās and Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>ḥattā tusallimū/yusallimū ‘alā ahlīh wa-tasta‘dhinū/wa-yasta‘dhinū</i> ; Ibn ‘Abbās and Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>ḥattā tusallimū aw tasta‘nisū</i> ; Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>ḥattā yusallimū wa-yasta‘dhinū, ḥattā tasta‘dhinū lakum</i> . In addition to Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn Mas‘ūd, and Ubayy b. Ka‘b, the readers al-A‘mash and Sa‘īd b. Jubayr also reportedly had <i>tasta‘dhinū</i> instead of <i>tasta‘nisū</i> . Ibn ‘Abbās reportedly said that <i>tasta‘nisū</i> was the result of a scribal error (MQ, 6:252–4).

Sūra, verse, Folio:line	Lower Text	Standard Text	Readings Similar to the Lower Text
24.31, 11A:25	ما ح[ف] (ى) م ر هن (سند)	<i>mā yukh- fina min zīnati- hinna</i>	Ibn Mas'ūd: <i>mā surra min zīnatihinna</i> (MQ, 6:259).
24.31, 11A:26	اها	<i>ayyuha</i>	Abū 'Amr, al-Kisā'ī, and Ya'qūb: <i>ayyuhā</i> (MQ, 6:260).
34.14, 33A:5	/ { } ملو [ع] [] / ن (ه) [حو] لا (ف) [] / ح (ر) د (د) [] / د (د)	<i>fa-lammā kharra tabayya- nati l-jinnu</i>	Ibn Mas'ūd reportedly had <i>wa-hum yad'abūna lahu ḥawlan</i> in addition to the standard text. Al-Ṭabarī gives the following reading for Ibn Mas'ūd: <i>fa-makathū yad'abūna lahu min ba'di ma'wṭihī ḥawlan kāmilan</i> (<i>Jāmi' al-bayān</i> , 19:242). The following reading featuring <i>ḥawlan</i> is also reported for Ibn Mas'ūd, Ibn 'Abbās, and Ibn Shanabūdh: <i>tabayyanati l-insu anna l-jinna law kānū ya'lamūna l-ghayba mā labithū ḥawlan</i> (MQ, 7:350).
34.24, 33B:3	[ا] (د) // م [ك] // (ل) } [ما] (لا) (ى) // {	<i>wa-innā aw iyyā- kum la'ālā hudan</i>	Ubayy b. Ka'b: <i>wa-innā aw/wa iyyākum la-immā 'alā hudan; wa-innā aw iyyākum immā 'alā hudan</i> (MQ, 7:370–1).
13.11, 35A:8	[ا] / [ع] (م) } / د (د) {	<i>mu'aqqi- bātun min bayni yadayhi wa-min khalfihi</i>	Ibn 'Abbās, Abū 'Abdallāh: <i>mu'aqqibātun min khalfihi wa-raqībun min bayni yadayhi</i> ; Ibn 'Abbās and Ubayy b. Ka'b: <i>mu'aqqibātun min bayni yadayhi wa-raqībun min khalfihi</i> . Ibn 'Abbās: <i>mu'aqqibātun min bayni yadayhi wa-ruqabā'u min khalfihi</i> (MQ, 4:394).
37.25, 28A:9	// (و) س	<i>tanāša- rūna</i>	Ibn Mas'ūd and Khālid: <i>tatanāšarūna</i> (MQ, 8:20).
37.56, 28B:8	(ع) س	<i>la-turḍīni</i>	Ibn Mas'ūd: <i>la-tughwīni</i> (MQ, 8:31).
15.54, 18B:15	س نمو //	<i>a-bash- shartu- mūnī</i>	Al-A'mash and al-A'raj: <i>bashshartumūnī</i> (MQ, 4:562).

Sūra, verse, Folio, line	Lower Text	Standard Text	Readings Similar to the Lower Text
15.66, 18B: 24	(و) [ف-صد]با اله [د] لك ا لا مر و ان د ر هو لا مف[ط]و ع	<i>wa-qaḍay- nā ilayhi dhālika l-amra anna dābira hā‘ulā‘i maqṭū‘un</i>	Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>wa-qaḍaynā ilayhi dhālika l-amra wa-qulnā lahu inna dābira hā‘ulā‘i maqṭū‘un</i> (MQ, 4:573).
15.72, 18B: 28	[س] [ك]ر (م)ه	<i>sakratihim</i>	Al-A‘mash: <i>sukrihim</i> (MQ, 4:577).
25.19, 19A:8	{ } ن لك ص ر ف ا	<i>fa-mā tastaṭī‘ūna ṣarfan</i>	Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>fa-mā yastaṭī‘ūna laka/lakum</i> ; Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>fa-mā [fa-lā yastaṭī‘ūna laka</i> ; al-A‘mash: <i>fa-mā yastaṭī‘ūna lakum</i> (MQ, 6:334).
25.25, 19A: 19	ر ل ا ل م ل ك ه	<i>nuzzila l-malā‘i- katu</i>	Ubayy b. Ka‘b: <i>nazalati nuzzilatī tanazzalati tunazzalu tatanazzalu l-malā‘ikatū</i> ; Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>nazalati l-malā‘ikatū</i> ; Abū ‘Amr: <i>tanazzalu tunazzilu l-malā‘ikatū</i> (MQ, 6:342–4).
30.43, 24B: 12	{ } ا و (ح) (ك)م	<i>fa-aqim wajhaka</i>	Ubayy b. Ka‘b reportedly had <i>awjuhakum</i> instead of <i>wujūhakum</i> in Q 4.43 (MQ, 2:81).
30.49, 24B:25	{ } (م) [م] // [ل] (ل) س ا ن	<i>‘alayhim min qablihi la-mubli- sīna</i>	Ibn Mas‘ūd: <i>‘alayhim la-mublisīna</i> (MQ, 7:170).
63.7, Chris. v:11	(ل) ح ن [ف] [ص] و ا م ح و [ل] ه	<i>ḥattā yanfaḍḍū</i>	The phrase <i>ḥattā yanfaḍḍū min ḥawlīhi</i> appears in a report about the <i>sha‘n al-nuzūl</i> of this verse, and is ascribed to Ibn Mas‘ūd and Zayd b. Arqam. Ibn Ḥajar questions the ascription to Ibn Mas‘ūd’s codex (MQ, 9:474–5).
63.10, Chris. v:17	ف [ا] [صد] ق	<i>fa-aṣṣad- daqa</i>	Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ubayy b. Ka‘b, and Sa‘īd b. Jubayr: <i>fa-ataṣaddaqa</i> (MQ, 9:478).
63.10, Chris. v:17	[ن] // [ك] ا	<i>wa-akun</i>	The reading <i>wa-akūna</i> is reported for Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ubayy b. Ka‘b, and all the readers except for Ibn Kathīr, Nāfi‘, Ibn ‘Āmir, ‘Āsim, Ḥamza, and al-Kisā‘ī. ‘Ubayd b. ‘Umayr: <i>wa-akūnu</i> (MQ, 9:479–80).

Sūra, verse, Folio:line	Lower Text	Standard Text	Readings Similar to the Lower Text
89.27, Chris. v:20	ها [ـه] (-)ها	<i>yā ay- yatuhā</i>	Zayd b. 'Alī: <i>yā ayyuhā</i> (MQ, 10:431).
89.27, Chris. v:20	/ / [ـس] / المطم / / م [ـه] /	<i>al-nafsu l-muṭma- 'innatu</i>	Ubayy b. Ka'b: <i>al-nafsu l-āminatu l-muṭma 'in- natu, al-āminatu l-muṭma 'innatu</i> (MQ, 10:432).
89.28, Chris. r:21	ك ر سى ر ك	<i>irjī' ilā rabbikī</i>	Ubayy b. Ka'b: <i>itī rabbakī</i> (MQ, 10:433).
90.1, Chris. r:24	[م] / لا	<i>lā uqsīmu</i>	Ibn Kathīr, al-Ḥasan, al-A'mash, 'Ikrima, Mujā- hid, Abū 'Imrān, Abū l-'Āliya: <i>la-uqsīmu</i> (MQ, 10:437).

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 (*yaṣḍifūna*), 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; Ḥ = Ḥimṣ.

Disputed Verse Division	Up. Text	Cities like the Upper Text	Cities unlike the Upper Text
2.282 (<i>wa-lā shahīdun</i>)	N	M, K, B, C (a), D, Ḥ	C (b)
4.44 (<i>al-sabīla</i>)	N	B, C, M	K, D, Ḥ
5.1 (<i>al-'uqūdi</i>)	Y	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K
6.66 (<i>bi-wakīlin</i>)	N	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K
6.73 (<i>fa-yakūnu</i>)	Y	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K
6.161 (<i>mustaqīmīn</i>)	Y	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K
7.1 (<i>ALMS</i>)	N	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K
14.33 (<i>wa-l-nahāra</i>)	Y	K, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	B
19.41 (<i>Ibrāhīma</i>)	Y	C, M2	K, B, M1, D, Ḥ
19.75 (<i>maddan</i>)	Y	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K
20.1 (<i>ṬH</i>)	N	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K
20.33 (<i>kathīran</i>)	Y	K, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	B
20.34 (<i>kathīran</i>)	Y	K, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	B
20.39 (<i>fī l-yammī</i>)	N	K, B, C, M1, M2, D	Ḥ
20.39 (<i>minnī</i>)	Y	C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K, B
20.40 (<i>tahzana</i>)	N	K, B, C, M1, M2, Ḥ (a)	D, Ḥ (c)
20.40 (<i>futūnan</i>)	N	K, C, M1, M2	B, D, Ḥ
20.40 (<i>madyana</i>)	N	K, B, C, M1, M2, Ḥ (a)	D, Ḥ (c)
20.41 (<i>li-nafsī</i>)	N	B, C, M1, M2	K, D, Ḥ
20.77 (<i>Mūsā</i>)	N	K, B, C, M1, M2, Ḥ (a, c)	D, Ḥ (e)
20.78 (<i>mā ghashiya-hum</i>)	N	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K
20.86 (<i>asīfan</i>)	Y	C, M1, Ḥ	K, B, M2, D
20.86 (<i>hasanan</i>)	N	K, B, C, M1, D (a, b, c), Ḥ (a, c)	M2, D (d), Ḥ (e)
20.87 (<i>al-Sāmīriyyu</i>)	Y	K, B, C, M1, D (a, b), Ḥ (a, c)	M2, D (c, d), Ḥ (b, d, e)
20.88 (<i>Mūsā</i>)	N	K, B, M2, D, Ḥ	C, M1
20.88 (<i>fa-nasiya</i>)	Y	K, B, M2, D, Ḥ	C, M1
20.89 (<i>qawlan</i>)	N	K, B, C, M1, D (a, d), Ḥ (a, c, e)	M2, D (b, c), Ḥ (b, d)
20.92 (<i>dallū</i>)	N	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ	K
20.95 (<i>Sāmīriyyu</i>)	Y	K, B, C, M1, M2, D (a, c, d), Ḥ (a, c, e)	D (b) and Ḥ (b)
20.106 (<i>şafşafan</i>)	N	C, M1, M2	K, B, D, Ḥ
20.123 (<i>hudan</i>)	Y	B, C, M1, M2, D, Ḥ (b)	K, Ḥ (a, c, e)

Disputed Verse	Division	Up. Text	Cities like the Upper Text	Cities unlike the Upper Text
20.124	(<i>dankan</i>)	N	K, B, C, M1, M2, D, H (e)	H (a, b, c)
21.66	(<i>yaḍurrukum</i>)	N	B, C, M1, M2, D, H	K
29.29	(<i>al-sabīla</i>)	Y	C, M1, M2, H	K, B, D
35.7	(<i>shadīdun</i>)	N	K, C, M1, M2	B, D, H
55.35	(<i>nārin</i>)	N	K, B, D, H	C, M1, M2
55.43	(<i>al-mujrimūna</i>)	N	B	K, C, M1, M2, D, H
56.8	(<i>fa-aṣḥābu l-maymanati</i>)	Y	B, C, M1, M2, D, H	K
56.15	(<i>mawḍūnatin</i>)	Y	K, C, M1, M2, H (a)	B, D, H (b)
56.18	(<i>wa-abārīqa</i>)	Y	C, M2	K, B, M1, D, H
56.22	(<i>ʾnūn</i>)	N	B, C, M2, D, H	K, M1
56.25	(<i>ta'thīman</i>)	N	C, M1	K, B, M2, D, H
56.27	(<i>wa-aṣḥābu l-yamīni</i>)	Y	B, C, M1, D, H	K, M2
56.35	(<i>inshā'an</i>)	Y	K, C, M1, M2, D, H	B
56.47	(<i>yaqūlūna</i>)	N	K, B, M1, M2, D	C, H
56.48	(<i>al-awwālūna</i>)	Y	K, B, C, M1, M2, D	H
56.49	(<i>wa-l-ākhirīna</i>)	N	M2, D, H	K, B, C, M1
56.50	(<i>la-majmū'ūna</i>)	N	K, B, C, M1	M2, D, H

The upper text has a number of unique skeletal-morphemic features. It has *السنااتكم* instead of *السنتكم* (Q 16.116), *موعدتى* instead of *موعدى* (Q 20.86), and *لنبثوا* instead of *تلبثوا* (Q 33.14). There are also a number of unique morphemic (pointing) features, such as *nadhra'ukum* in Q 42.11. There are also skeletal-morphemic features that match some cities but not others. These are given in the following table:

Disputed Point	Upper Text	Cities like Upper Text	Cities unlike Upper Text
6.63	<i>anjaytanā</i> (انحيثنا)	All the other cities	Kūfa: <i>anjānā</i> (انجنا)
7.3	<i>tadhakkarūna</i> (تذكرون)	All the other cities	Shām: <i>yatadhakkarūna</i> (يتذكرون)
25.25	<i>wa-nuzzila</i> (و نزل)	All the other cities	Mecca: <i>wa-nunazzilu</i> (وننزل)
43.68	بعادی, but the final <i>yā’</i> looks like a later addition	Medina, Shām	Kūfa, Bašra, and maybe Mecca: <i>yā’ ibādi</i> (يعباد)
47.18	<i>an ta’tiyahum</i> (ان تاتيهم)	Mecca, and maybe Kūfa	All the other cities: <i>in ta’tihim</i> (ان تاتيهم)
55.78	<i>dhī l-jalāli</i> (دى الحلال)	All the other cities	Shām: <i>dhū l-jalāli</i> (ذو الجلال)

Bibliography

- ‘ABD AL-‘AZĪZ ‘ABD AL-FATTĀḤ AL-QĀRĪ’. *Hadīth al-aḥruf al-sab‘a: dirāsa li-isnādih wa-matnih wa-ikhtilāf al-‘ulamā’ fi ma’nāh wa-šilatih bi-l-qirā’āt al-Qur’āniyya*. Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla li-l-Ṭibā‘a wa-l-Našr wa-l-Tawzī‘, 1423/2002.
- Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān b. al-Ash‘ath al-Sijistānī. *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*. 2 vols. Edited by Sa‘īd Muḥammad al-Laḥḥām. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1410/1990.
- ANONYMOUS, “The Qur’an: Text, Interpretation and Translation 3rd Biannual SOAS Conference, October 16–17, 2003,” *Journal of Qur’anic Studies* 6.1 (2003): 143–5.
- ATIYA, Aziz S. “The Monastery of St. Catherine and the Mount Sinai Expedition.” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 96.5 (1952): 578–86.
- ATIYA, Aziz S. *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 Hopkins Press, 1955.
- A’ZAMĪ, Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-. *The History of the Qur’anic Text*, 2nd ed. Riyadh: Azami Publishing House, 2008.
- BOTHMER, Hans-Caspar Graf von. “Die Anfänge der Koranschreibung: Kodikologische und kunsthistorische Beobachtungen an den Koranfragmenten in Sanaa,” *Magazin Forschung* (Universität des Saarlandes), 1 (1999): 40–6.
- BRETTAR, Claudia. “UdS: Neues Zentrum für Koranforschung? Teil 1.” *Campus* 29.3 (July 1999), http://www.uni-saarland.de/verwalt/presse/campus/1999/3/20-UdS_neues_zentrum.html.
- BURTON, John. *The Collection of the Qur‘ān*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

- COOK, Michael. "The Stemma of the Regional Codices of the Koran." *Graeco-Arabica* 9–10 (2004): 89–104.
- COOK, Michael. "A Koranic Codex Inherited by Mālik from his Grandfather." In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress on Graeco-Oriental and African Studies, Graeco-Arabica*. Edited by Vassilios Christides and Theodore Papadopoullos, VII–VIII, Nicosia, 7–8 (1999–2000): 93–105.
- CRONE, Patricia and Michael COOK. *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- CRONE, Patricia. "Two Legal Problems Bearing on the Early History of the Qur'ān." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 18 (1994): 1–37.
- CRONE, Patricia. "What do we Actually Know about Mohammed?" *Open-Democracy* (http://www.opendemocracy.net/faith-europe-islam/mohammed_38666.jsp).
- Dānī, Abū 'Amr 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd al-. *Al-Bayān fī 'add āy al-Qur'ān*. Kuwait: Dār al-Nashr, 1414/1994.
- DECLERCQ, Georges. "Introduction: Codices Rescripti in the Early Medieval West in Early Medieval Palimpsests." In *Early Medieval Palimpsests*. Edited by Georges Declercq, 7–22. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2007.
- DREIBHOLZ, Ursula. "Preserving a Treasure: The Sana'a Manuscripts." *Museum International* (UNESCO, Paris), No. 203 (Vol. 51, No. 3, 1999): 21–5.
- DREIBHOLZ, Ursula. "Treatment of Early Islamic Manuscript Fragments on Parchment." In *The Conservation and Preservation of Islamic Manuscripts, Proceedings of the Third Conference of al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation*. Edited by Yusuf Ibish and George Atiyeh, 131–45. London: al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation, 1417/1996.
- FEDALI, Alba. "Early Evidences of Variant Readings in Qur'ānic Manuscripts." In *Die dunklen Anfänge: Neue Forschungen zur Entstehung und frühen Geschichte des Islam*, edited by Karl-Heinz Ohlig and Gerd-Rüdiger Puin, 293–316. Berlin: Verlag Hans Schiler, 2007.
- FEDALI, Alba. "Mingana and the Manuscript of Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis, One Century Later." *Manuscripta Orientalia* 11.3 (2005): 3–7.
- FEDALI, Alba. "I Manoscritti di Sanaa: Fogli Sparsi che Diventano Corani." *Quaderni di Acme* 101 (2008): 25–48.
- FEDALI, Alba. "A.Perg.2: A Non Palimpsest and the Corrections in Qur'ānic Manuscripts." *Manuscripta Orientalia* 11.1 (2005): 20–7.
- FEDALI, Alba. "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.
- Ḥākīm al-Naysābūrī, Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥamdūya al-. *Al-Mustadrak*. 4 vols. Edited by Yūsuf 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mar'ashlī, Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifa (n.d.).
- HIGGINS, Andrew. "The Lost Archive." *The Wall Street Journal*, January 12, 2008.
- Ibn Abī Dāwūd. *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif*. 5 vols. 2nd ed. Edited by Muḥibb al-Dīn Wā'iz. Beirut: Dār al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyya, 1423/2002.
- Ibn Abī Shayba, Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. 'Uthmān.

- Muṣannaḥ Ibn Abī Shayba fī al-aḥādīth wa-l-āthār*. Edited by Sa'īd al-Laḥḥām. 8 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1409/1989.
- Ibn 'Asākir, Abū l-Qasim 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. Hibat Allāh. *Ta'riḫ madīnat Dimashq*. 70 vols. Edited by 'Alī Shīrī. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1415/1995.
- Ibn al-Jazarī, Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Dimashqī. *Al-nashr fī al-qirā'āt al-'ashr*. 2 vols. Edited by 'Alī Muḥammad al-Dabbā'. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya. (n.d.).
- Ibn al-Nadīm, Abū l-Faraj Muḥammad b. Abī Ya'qūb Ishāq, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*. Edited by Riḍā Tajaddud (n.p. and n.d.).
- Ibn Sa'd, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad. *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*. 8 vols. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968.
- КНАҒІБ, 'Abd al-Laṭīf Muḥammad al-. *Mu'jam al-qirā'āt*. 11 vols. Damascus: Dār Sa'd al-Dīn, 1422/2002.
- KREKEL, Christoph. "The Chemistry of Historical Iron Gall Inks." *International Journal of Forensic Document Examiners* 5 (1999): 54–8.
- KRISTOF, Nicholas. "Martyrs, Virgins, and Grapes." *The New York Times*, August 4, 2004.
- KRISTOF, Nicholas. "Islam, Virgins, and Grapes." *The New York Times*, April 22, 2009.
- KUHN, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Kulaynī, Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb al-. *al-Kāfī*, 4th ed. 8 vols. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, HS 1365.
- LESTER, Toby. "What is the Koran?" *The Atlantic Monthly*, January 1999, 43–56.
- Mas'ūdī, Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī al-. *Murūj al-dhahab wa-ma'ādīn al-jawhar*. Second printing, edited by Yūsuf As'ad Dāghir. Qum: Dār al-Hijra, 1409.
- MINGANA, Alphonse and Agnes S. LEWIS. *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurāns, Possibly Pre-'Othmānic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- MODARRESSI, Hossein. "Early Debates on the Integrity of the Qur'ān: A Brief Survey." *Studia Islamica* 77 (1993): 5–39.
- MOTZKI, Harald. "The Collection of the Qur'ān: A Reconsideration of Western Views in Light of Recent Methodological Developments." *Der Islam* 78 (2001): 1–34.
- MUḤAYSIN, Muḥammad Sālim. *Al-Faṭḥ al-rabbānī fī 'alāqat al-qirā'āt bi-l-rasm al-'Uthmānī*. Saudi Arabia: Jāmi'at al-Imām Muḥammad b. Sa'ūd al-Islāmiyya, 1415/1994.
- Muqātil b. Sulaymān. *Tafsīr*. 3 vols. Edited by Aḥmad Farīd. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1424/2003.
- Nasā'ī, Aḥmad b. 'Alī b. Shu'ayb al-. *Al-Sunan al-kubrā*. 6 vols. Edited by 'Abd al-Ghaffār Sulaymān al-Bandārī. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1411/1991.
- NOSEDA, Sergio. "La Mia Visita a Sanaa e il Corano Palinese." *Istituto Lombardo (Rendiconti Lett.)* 137 (2003): 43–60.
- POPKIN, Richard. "Scepticism, 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*, edited by Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave, 1–28. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1968.
- POWERS, David. *Muhammad is not the Father of any of Your Men: The Making of the Last Prophet*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- PRÉMARE, Alfred-Louis de. “Abd al-Malik b. Marwān et le Processus de Constitution du Coran.” In *Die dunklen Anfänge: Neue Forschungen zur Entstehung und frühen Geschichte des Islam*, edited by Karl-Heinz Ohlig and Gerd-Rüdiger Puin, 179–210. Berlin: Hans Schiler, 2007.
- PRÉMARE, Alfred-Louis de. *Les fondations de l’islam: Entre écriture et histoire*. Paris: Le Seuil, 2002.
- PUIN, Elisabeth. “Ein früher Koranpalimpsest aus Ṣan‘ā’ (DAM 01–27.1).” In *Schlaglichter: Die beiden ersten islamischen Jahrhunderte*, edited by Markus Groß and Karl-Heinz Ohlig, 461–93. Berlin: Hans Schiler, 2008.
- PUIN, Elisabeth. “Ein früher Koranpalimpsest aus Ṣan‘ā’ (DAM 01–27.1) – Teil II.” In *Vom Koran zum Islam*, edited by Markus Groß and Karl-Heinz Ohlig, 523–81. Berlin: Hans Schiler, 2009.
- PUIN, Elisabeth. “Ein früher Koranpalimpsest aus Ṣan‘ā’ (DAM 01–27.1) – Teil III: Ein nicht-‘uṭmānischer Koran.” In *Die Entstehung einer Weltreligion I: Von der koranischen Bewegung zum Frühislam*, edited by Markus Groß and Karl-Heinz Ohlig, 233–305. Berlin: Hans Schiler, 2010.
- PUIN, Gerd-Rüdiger. “Observations on Early Qur’ān Manuscripts in Ṣan‘ā’.” In *The Qur’ān as Text*, edited by Stefan Wild, 107–111. Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- PUIN, Gerd-Rüdiger. “Über die Bedeutung der ältesten Koranfragmente aus Sanaa (Jemen) für die Orthographiegeschichte des Korans.” *Magazin Forschung, Universität des Saarlandes* 1 (1999): 37–40, 46.
- PUIN, Gerd-Rüdiger. “Die Utopie einer kritischen Koranedition.” In *Schlaglichter: Die beiden ersten islamischen Jahrhunderte*, edited by Markus Groß and Karl-Heinz Ohlig, 516–71. Berlin: Hans Schiler, 2008.
- RĀMYĀR, Maḥmūd. *Tārīkh-i Qur’ān*, 2nd ed. Tehran: Amir Kabir, HS 1362/1983.
- SADEGHI, Behnam. “The Traveling Tradition Test: A Method for Dating Traditions.” *Der Islam* 85.1 (2008): 203–42.
- SADEGHI, Behnam, and Uwe BERGMANN. “The Codex of a Companion of the Prophet and the Qur’ān of the Prophet.” *Arabica* 57.4 (2010): 343–436.
- SADEGHI, Behnam. “The Chronology of the Qur’ān: A Stylometric Research Program.” *Arabica* 58.4 (2011): 210–99.
- SADEGHI, Behnam. “Criteria for Emending the Text of the Qur’ān.” In *Law and Tradition in Classical Islamic Thought*, edited by Michael Cook, et al. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming 2012.
- SINAI, Nicolai. “The Qur’ān as Process.” In *The Qur’ān in Context: Historical and Literary Investigations into the Qur’ānic Milieu*, edited by Angelika Neuwirth, Nicolai Sinai, and Michael Marx, 407–40. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- SPITALER, Anton. *Die Verszählung des Koran nach islamischer Überlieferung*. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1935.

- STEFANIDIS, Emmanuelle. “The Qur’an Made Linear: A Study of the *Geschichte des Qorāns*’ Chronological Reordering,” *Journal of Qur’anic Studies* 10.2 (2008): 1–22.
- Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr al-. *Al-Durr al-manthūr fī al-tafsīr bi-l-ma’thūr*. 6 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifa li-l-Ṭibā‘a wa-l-Nashr, 1979.
- Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr al-. *Al-Itqān fī ‘ulūm al-Qur’ān*. 2 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1416/1996.
- Ṭabarī, Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-. *Jāmi‘ al-bayān ‘an ta’wīl āy al-Qur’ān*. 30 vols. Edited by Şidqī Jamīl al-‘Aṭṭār. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr li-l-Ṭibā‘a wa-l-Nashr wa-l-Tawzī‘, 1415/1995.
- TALBI, M. “La qirā‘a bi-l-alḥān.” *Arabica* 5 (1958): 183–90.
- TOV, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd rev. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- WANSBROUGH, John. *Qur’anic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2004.