

**Tübingen M a VI 165 Quran Manuscript and its Compatibility with  
'Uthmān's Codices**

**Mohammad Said Mitwally Alrahwan\***

*Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt*

[msaid42@hotmail.com](mailto:msaid42@hotmail.com)

**Article Info**

Submitted	: December 27, 2020	DOI:
Accepted	: June 3, 2021	10.20885/ijis.vol5.iss1.art3
Published	: September 29, 2021	*Corresponding author

**Abstract**

*Being one of the presumably earliest Quran manuscripts which may belong to the Umayyad era, Tübingen M a VI 165 is referred to as an ideal material for a paleographical study to resolve inquiries on earlier muṣḥafs written at the time of 'Uthmān and were elaborately described in Muslim traditional sources. This paper attempts to measure to what extent does Tübingen M a VI 165 Quran Manuscript reflect and adhere to what traditional Muslim sources reveal on earliest codices of 'Uthmān, particularly textual patterns, consonantal and vocal variations reflecting modes of recitation in addition to their scripts, overall and detailed verse numberings, to develop our vision on the transcription of muṣḥafs at the Umayyad period.*

**Keywords:** *Quran, Manuscript, Tübingen M a VI 165, 'Uthmān, Muṣḥaf, Umayyad*

**A. Introduction**

The codex Tübingen M a VI 165 comprising seventy-seven folios of a Quran fragment does now belong to Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen. A radiocarbon was conducted on the parchment through *Documenta Coranica* and it was dated to between 649 and 675 CE with greater than 95.4% probability<sup>1</sup>, making it one of the earliest surviving manuscript of the Quran

---

<sup>1</sup> "[Rarität entdeckt: Koranhandschrift stammt aus der Frühzeit des Islam](https://uni-tuebingen.de/universitaet/aktuelles-und-publikationen/pressemitteilungen/newsfullview-pressemitteilungen/article/raritaet-)" at Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, Germany, <https://uni-tuebingen.de/universitaet/aktuelles-und-publikationen/pressemitteilungen/newsfullview-pressemitteilungen/article/raritaet->

produced between 20 and 40 years after the death of the Prophet of Islam and slightly earlier than the San‘ā’ palimpsest. The parchment contains continuous text of the Quran from 17:35 to 36:57, constituting 26.2% of the total text of the Revelation. The remaining portion is missing. They were brought to Germany by Gohann Gottfried Westzstein, while serving as first Prussian Consul to Damascus in the middle of the 19th century. Wetzstein made numerous acquisitions of ancient Arabic manuscripts. He forwarded a small catalogue he published with his confirmation that more than 1,100 Kufic folios of the Quran he had collected would be of some interest to those involved in paleography and Quranic criticism<sup>2</sup>. He was the first to provide a brief description for M a VI 165<sup>3</sup>. He labeled those folios as Kufic, though they are all *Hijazi*. He further provides the first verse of the manuscript as 17:37 instead of 17:35 according to modern printed editions of the Quran<sup>4</sup>.

The manuscript is vertical-format parchment leaves of 19.5 cm x 15.3 cm, with a range of 18-22 lines to the page (99.3% of the total of 154 pages having between 19 and 22 lines to the page). There is only one page which contains 23 lines. The script is fairly large, thick, rather narrow, slightly rounded, with high shafts and slight tilt to the right. In some folios, the script has faded and it has been retouched by a later hand with black ink. The manuscript seems homogenous to be written by one standard hand. The consonants are frequently, but not consistently, differentiated by little dashes on top or bottom of the letter. Those dashes are most probably added along with the original text with the same ink color and thickness. A set of 2 or 3 oval dots punctuate the end of verses. Every tenth verse is marked by a

---

[entdeckt-koranhandschrift-stammt-aus-der-fruehzeit-des-islam.html](http://entdeckt-koranhandschrift-stammt-aus-der-fruehzeit-des-islam.html), Accessed on 18th March 2019.

<sup>2</sup> J. G. Wetzstein, *Catalog Arabischer Manuscripte In Damaskus Gesammelt*, (Druck von Trowitzsch & Sohn: Berlin, 1863), p. 2.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.* p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> M. Weisweiler, *Verzeichnis Der Arabischen Handschriften*, Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, Volume II, Verlag von Otto Harrassowitz (Leipzig, 1930), p. 125. (No. 161).

red hollow circle surrounded by dots. The end of a *sūra* is characterized by a series of sets of dots forming triangles to fill the line. Sometimes it includes a word or two of the end of the *sūra* in addition to these triangles as in f. 5r (the end of Q. 17 and the beginning of Q.18). The name of a *sūra* is provided at the beginning, written in *naskh* script and black ink, different from the original color of script which is brown. Both names of *sūras* and the number of their verses were written inconsistently by a later hand. *Basmala* is written in same color of the text and is followed by oval dashes and is thus counted as a verse.

As they appear at the manuscript, the *alifs* are bending to the right, invariably have a marked tail or a lower hook with tiny end at the base that re-curves to the right, and sometimes seems like a right angle. There is no sharp contrast between the *alif* and the *lām*, both being often written as vertical strokes.

The final *mīm* is almost round and always terminates with a tail. In very few instances a protuberance is left as a reminder of the tail. The *nūn* is sickle-shaped and *yā'* goes to the left side underlining preceding letters. The initial and medial *hā'*s each looks like a circle straddling the line. Diacritical marks are present: the original dashes, very numerous, have been complemented by same hand and take the same color of the text. They include dashes to discern letters like *yā'*, *tā'*, *jīm* and *khā'*. The transcription of this manuscript complies with the rules of the *scriptio continua* adapted to the Arabic script, with words cut at the end of the line when the space left would not accommodate them conveniently.

The parchment includes many features to prove its *scriptio defectiva*. I am going to examine *alifs* in sample words such as *qāla*, *ibād*, 'adhāb and *shay'*, in addition to the *yā'* in words like *āyāt* (when introduced by a

preposition like *bi-*)<sup>5</sup> and the ending *alif* of *dhū*. Spellings without *alif* in words such as *qāla*, *qālat*, *qālū*, *qā'il*, and so on, are inconsistent throughout this manuscript, a situation largely similar to that found in Or. 2165 and Paris 328a as noticed by Dutton<sup>6</sup>, *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* and many others. Words like *shay'*, as the custom of other parchments was written inconsistently throughout the text. It is written, for instance in (Q. 18: 23; 6v, 7), (Q. 18:45; f. 7v, 17), (Q. 20:50; 16r,12) and (Q. 21:30; f. 21r, 2) with *alif* between *shīn* and *yā'* while it is written without *alif* in (Q. 18:54; f. 8r, 19), (Q. 18:70; f. 9r, 10), (Q. 18:76; f. 9r, 19), (Q. 18:84; f. 9v, 22), (Q. 20:50; f. 16r, 12) and (Q. 20:98; f. 18r, 13).

Other peculiar features include the word *bi-āyātīn*, *āyātī*, *bi-āyātīnā*, and so on, which was written with the *yā'* and with three denticles in the majority of the occurrences found on the fragment like (Q. Q.18:105; f. 10v, 15), (Q. 25: 37; f. 31r, 17), (29: 23; f. 55v, 20) and (30:10; f. 58v, 19), but in other examples it includes two denticles only such as in (Q. Q.18:57; f. 8v, 5), (Q. 20:127; f. 19r, 15), (Q. 23:58; f. 31r, 15) and (Q. 32:22; f. 64v, 16). Similarly, the word *dhū*, is spelled with an *alif* after the *waw*, but we have only one instance available at the parchment; (Q. 18:58; f. 58v, 11). Unlike Or. 2165 and Paris 328a, *ulū*, as in the phrase *ulū'l-faḍli* (Q. 24:22; f. 34r, 6) and *ulū quwattin* (Q. 27:33; f. 46, 6) is spelled with five letters (*alif*, *wāw*, *lām*, *wāw*, *alif*) rather than four (*alif*, *wāw*, *lām*, *wāw*). Both M a IV 165 (f. 46r, 10) and Or. 2165 (f. 78r, 11) add an *alif* after *lām* and before *dhāl* in the word *la-adhbaḥannahu* (Q. 27:21).

*'Ibād* and *'adhāb* exhibit the same inconsistency throughout the parchment. The word *'ibād* was written with *alif* in (Q. 21: 26; f. 20v, 13) while *'ibādī* was written without *alif* in (Q. 17:65; f. 2v, 4), (Q. 18:102; f. 10v,

<sup>5</sup> François Déroche, *Qur'ans of the Umayyads: A Preliminary Overview*, Leiden Studies in Islam and Society (Brill: Leiden and Boston 2014), vol. 1, p. 22.

<sup>6</sup> Yasin Dutton, Some Notes on the British Library's 'Oldest Qur'an Manuscript' (Or. 2165), in *Quranic Studies*, vol. 6, No. 1 (2004) p. 63.

11), (Q. 21:105; f. 24r, 1), (Q. 2<sup>r</sup>:10<sup>a</sup>; f. 2<sup>r</sup>v, 11), (Q. 25:17; f. 28v, 7) and (Q. 34:13; f. 70v, 3). Similarly, the word ‘*adhāb*’ was written inconsistently. It was rendered without *alif* in (Q. 17:57; f. 2r,3), (Q. 19:45; f. 12v, 19), (Q. 21:46; f. 21v,6), (Q. 22:4; f. 24r, 21), (Q. 22:9; f. 24v, 15), (Q. 22:22; f. 25v, 6), (Q. 22:57; f. 27v, 12), (Q. 24:19; f. 34v, 19), (Q. 24:23; f. 34r, 12), (Q. 24:63; f. 37v, 11), (Q. 25:65; f. 40v, 8), (Q. 26:135; f. 43v, 8), (Q. 26:156; f. 44r, 4), (Q. 29:23; f. 55v, 11), (Q. 31:6; f. 61v, 17), (Q. 34:12; f. 70r, 7), (Q. 34:42; f. 72r, 9), (Q. 35:7; f. 73v, 3) and (Q. 35:10; f. 73v, 15), while it is written with *alif* in (Q. 22:2; f. 24r, 18), (Q. 22:25; f. 25v, 15,16), (Q. 22:55; f. 27v, 8), (Q. 23:77; f. 31v, 11), (Q. 24:11; f. 33v, 5), (Q. 24:14; f. 33v, 11), (Q. 26:198; f. 44v, 5), (Q. 31:24; f. 63r, 2,3), (Q. 32:14; f. 64r, 14), (Q. 32:20; f. 64v, 4,5), (Q. 34:5; f. 69v, 11), (Q. 34:46; f. 72r, 19), (Q. 36:18; f. 76v, 4).

As observed by al-Ḥamd, this feature continued in later Kufic *muṣḥafs* like the Samarqand Quran Codex, Fustat Codex (Marcel 13) Sanaa codex and the Egyptian Library and Archives Manuscript 1157. The forgoing analysis confirms that early Hijazi and Kufian *muṣḥafs* did not consistently add *alifs* in middle position; a phenomenon which continued in modern scripts as in words like *ar-rahmān*, *ar-rahīm*, *Allāh*, and so on. Quran experts were, as Gallez and Lamsia confirmed, "aware of the ambiguous nature of the *alif* which, in its higher position, belongs to the set diacritical marks subsequently added."<sup>8</sup> Déroche assumed that copyists' 'relationship with the original they were transcribing was not of a complete subservience. They were willing to improve the *rasm* they were copying."<sup>9</sup> But the question remains why did not they accomplish at least a *scriptio plena* in one of those

<sup>7</sup> Ḥamd, Ghānim Qaddūrī al- and Iyād al-Samirrāʿī, *Ṣawāḥir Kitābiyyah fī Maṣāḥif Makḥṭūṭah, Dār al-Ghawthāʿī*, Damascus 1431/2010, p. 29.

<sup>8</sup> Edouard-M. Gallez and M. Lamsiah, Suspicions of Ideological Manipulation and Codicology: A Provisional Synthetic Approach, in K.-H. Ohlig und M. Gross (ed.), *Die Entstehung einer Weltreligion III*, Inārah-Sammelband 7 (Schiler Verlag, Berlin-Tübingen, 2014), p. 12.

<sup>9</sup> François Déroche, *La Transmission écrite du Coran dans les débuts de l'islam. Le codex Parisien-petroplitanus*, (Leiden and Boston: Brill 2009), p. 174.

repeated *scriptio defectiva*. We can hardly identify a norm or a consistent rule for adding and deleting *alifs*, which appeared differently at the same page and sometimes at the same line. I strongly assume that their complete subservience to particular earlier codices resulted in this inconsistent *scriptio defectiva* of the dominant majority of words including *alifs*, a practice which continued even in *muṣḥafs* written in Kufian script. Each scribe attempted to brutally stick to the codex he used in transmitting the text. *Alifs*, *wāws* and *yā's* at dominant majority of positions were originally regarded as *matres lectionis* and mostly treated as diacritic additions. This is further substantiated by ascertaining that this inconsistency is exhibited in other numerous words such as *kāna/kana*, *'ibādātihi/'ibadatīhi*, *li-l'ābidīn/ li-l'ābidīn*, *khāshī'in/khashī'in*, *shurakā'* with or without *waw* at the end, *bi-'ayidin* with two or one *yā'*, *bi-ayyikum* with two or one *yā'*, *ra'aw* with or without *alif* at the end and many others<sup>10</sup>. Our preliminary conclusion that these differences are mostly attributed to a meticulous imitation of earlier codices is further supported by our analysis of consonantal variations of the Tübingen codex which belonged to the early Medinan *muṣḥaf*, a conclusion which was earlier confirmed with Or. 2165 and Paris 328a by Dutton who attributed them to the earlier Damascene *muṣḥaf* and the Reading of Ibn 'Amir.

## **B. Consonantal Variations of the Text Skeleton**

The surviving 77 folios of codex Tübingen M a VI 165 are extensive enough to contain several distinctive consonantal variants marked by the addition or omission of a particular letter in the consonantal outline of the text. Dānī could discern 38 cases where we could examine 12 which are available in those fragments.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ḥamad, *Zawāhīr*, p. 41-115.

1. Q. 18:36 (f. 7r, 20): *khayran minhumā*, with *mīm* after *hā'* to indicate dual (Ibn Kathīr, Nāfi', Ibn 'Amir, Abū Ja'far and Ibn Muḥayṣin), instead of *khayran minha*, which is the reading of the others<sup>11</sup>. Ibn Mujāhid confirms the former is consistent with the script of Meccan, Medinan and Syrian *muṣḥafs*<sup>12</sup>.
2. Q. 18:95 (f. 10r, 16): *mā makannī*, with emphatic *nūn* after *kāf* (all reciters except ibn Kathīr), instead of *mā makananī* with two *nūns* (according to ibn Kathīr)<sup>13</sup>. The parchment is consistent with the former and is, thus, compatible with all codices except the Meccan<sup>14</sup>.
3. Q. 21:4 (f. 20r, 2): *qul rabī ya'lamu al-qawl*, without *alif* after *qāf* (ibn Kathīr, Nāfi', Abū 'Amr, Ibn 'Amir, Shu'ba) instead of *qāla rabbī ya'lamu* with *alif* after the *qāf* (according to others including Ḥaḥṣ, Ḥamza, Kisā'ī, Khalaf and Al-A'mash)<sup>15</sup>. According to Dānī, the Kufi codex added *alif* while others did not. Shu'ba belongs to Kūfan reciters but he did not pronounce it according to the script of Kufi codex.
4. Q. 21: 30 (f. 20v, 18): *awalam yara*, with *waw* after *hamza* (all reciters except ibn Kathīr and ibn Muḥayṣin) instead of *alam yara*, without *waw* (ibn Kathīr and ibn Muḥayṣin)<sup>16</sup>. According to Dānī, the Meccan codex does not have *waw* and is therefore consistent with ibn Kathīr's *qirā'a*<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibn Mujāhid, Aḥmad b. Mūsa b. Al-'Abbās Al-Tamīmī. *Kitāb al-Sab'a fī al-Qirā'āt*. Ed. Shawqī Dayf. (Egypt: Dār al-Ma'ārif 1997), p. 390; ibn al-Jazarī, Shams al-Dīn abū al-Khayr Moḥammad b. Moḥammad b. Yūsuf, *al-Nashr fī al-Qirā'āt al-'Ashr*, ed. 'Alī Moḥammad al-Ḍabbā', (Egypt, al-Maktaba al-Tujāriyya, n. d.), vol., 2, p. 311; al-Bannā', Aḥmad b. Moḥammad b. Aḥmad 'Abdul-Ghanī al-Ḍumyātī, *Ithāf Fuḍalā' al-Bashar fī al-Qirā'āt al-Arba'at 'Ashara*, ed. Anas Muhra, (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 2006), p. 366.

<sup>12</sup> Ibn Mujāhid, *al-Sab'a*, p. 390.

<sup>13</sup> Al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 37; ibn Mujāhid *al-Sab'a*, p. 121.

<sup>14</sup> Dānī, "Uthmān b. Sa'īd b. 'Umar abū 'Amr al-, *al-Muqni' fī Rasm Maṣāḥif al-Amsār*, ed. Moḥammad al-Ṣādiq Qamḥāwī, (Cairo: Maktabat al-Kulliyāt al-Azhariyyah, n. d.), p. 108.

<sup>15</sup> ibn Mujāhid, *al-Sab'a*, p. 428; al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 391.

<sup>16</sup> Al-Bannā', *Ithāf* 391.

<sup>17</sup> Danī, *Muqni'*, p. 108.

5. Q. 21:112 (f. 24r, 9): *qul rabbī ihkum*, without *alif* after *qāf* (all reciters except Ḥafṣ), instead of *qāla* (according to Ḥafṣ alone). The parchment is consistent with all codices except the Kūfan.
6. Q. 22:23 (f. 25v, 9): *wa lūlu'ā* with *alif* at the end of the word to indicate that it is in accusative case (Nāfi', 'Aṣim, Ya'qūb and Abū 'Ja'far) instead of *lūlu'in* to indicate dative case in conjunction with prior nouns (other reciters)<sup>18</sup>. Dānī records disagreement on whether all codices added *alif* in Q. 22:23 or only Medinans<sup>19</sup>, but he confirms it did certainly exist in the two Medinan codices. He based his view on accounts he authenticated.
7. Q. 23:87 and 23:89 (f. 32r, 6,8): *sayaqūlūn Allah* without *lām* before the name Allah (Abū 'Amr Al-Baṣrī<sup>20</sup>, Ya'qūb and Al-Yazīdī<sup>21</sup>), instead of *li-llah* (according to all other reciters). Dānī confirms that the former is consistent with the codices of Baṣrans<sup>22</sup>. He recounts Abū 'Ubayd who observed that it was devoid of the *alif* at the early Medinan codex.
8. Q. 25:25 (f. 39r, 3): *nuzzila al-malā'ikatu* with one *nūn* and the word *malā'ikatu* in the nominative case (all other reciters except ibn Kathīr and ibn Muḥayṣin) instead of *nunazzilu al-malā'ikata* with two *nūns* and the word *malā'ikata* in accusative case (ibn Kathīr<sup>23</sup> and ibn Muḥayṣin<sup>24</sup>) Dānī and ibn al-Jazarī confirmed that the word was written with two *nūns* in the Meccan codex only <sup>25</sup>, while other *muṣḥafs* have only one *nūn*.

---

<sup>18</sup> Al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 397.

<sup>19</sup> Dānī, *Muqni'*, p. 147.

<sup>20</sup> Ibn Mujāhid, *al-Sab'a*, p. 447.

<sup>21</sup> Al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 405.

<sup>22</sup> Dānī, *Muqni'*, p.108.

<sup>23</sup> Ibn Mujāhid, *al-Sab'a*, p. 464. Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr*, vol. 2, p. 334.

<sup>24</sup> Al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 417.

<sup>25</sup> Dānī, *Muqni'*, p. 109.



9. Q. 26:217 (f. 45r, 9): *fatawakkal ‘ala al-‘azīzi ar-raḥīm* with the preposition *fa* at the begging (Nāfi‘ Abū Ja‘far and ibn ‘Amir). Dānī confirmed the replacement of *waw* with *fā’* was extant at Medinan and Syrian codices<sup>26</sup>. Ibn Al-Jazarī confirmed that *waw* was extant at the rest of codices<sup>27</sup>.
10. Q. 28: 37 (f. 51v): *wa qāla mūsa* with *waw* at the beginning of the verse (Nāfi‘, Ibn ‘Amir, Abū ‘Amr, Abū Ja‘far, Ya‘qūb, Khalaf, Kisā‘ī and Ḥasan), instead of *qāla mūsa* without *waw* (ibn Kathīr and Ibn Muḥayṣin)<sup>28</sup>. Dānī affirmed the existence of *waw* at all codices except the Meccan<sup>29</sup>.
11. Q. 36: 35 (f. 77r, 6): *wa mā ‘amilathu aydīhim* with *hā’* at the end of the verb *‘amilat-hu* (ibn Kathīr, Nāfi‘, Abū ‘Amr, ibn ‘Amir, Ḥaḥḥ, instead of *‘amilat* (Shu‘bah, Ḥamzah, Kisā‘ī, Khalf and Al-Muṭawwi‘<sup>30</sup>). Dānī recounted *hā’* as extant at all codices except the Kūfan<sup>31</sup>. Ibn Al-Jazarī affirmed him<sup>32</sup>.
12. Q. 33:35 (f. 75r, 4): *lūlūwā* with *alif* at the end (Nāfi‘, ‘Aṣim and Abū Ja‘afar) instead of *lu’lu’in* in dative case (other reciters). The first *waw* does not have a *hamza* according to Sūsī, Shu‘ba and Abū Ja‘afar while the rest add it<sup>33</sup>. The parchment is consistent with the former script and is thus compatible to the Medinan codices<sup>34</sup>.

Of these twelve variants, 11 are consistent with the readings of Nāfi‘ and Abū Ja‘far; the well-known reciters of Medina. Similarly, those 11 instances

<sup>26</sup> Dānī, *Muqni’*, p.110.

<sup>27</sup> Ibn Al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr*, vol. 2, p. 336.

<sup>28</sup> Al-Bannā’, *Ithāf*, p. 436.

<sup>29</sup> Dānī, *Muqni’*, p. 110.

<sup>30</sup> Ibn Mujāhid, *Al-Sab‘a*, p. 40; Ibn Al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, vol. 2, p. 353; Al-Bannā’, *Ithāf*, p. 467.

<sup>31</sup> Dānī, *Muqni’*, p. 101

<sup>32</sup> Dānī *Muqni’*, p. 110; Ibn Al-Jazarī, *Nashr*, vol. 1, p.28.

<sup>33</sup> Al-Bannā’, *Ithāf*, p. 397.

<sup>34</sup> Dānī, *Muqni’*, p. 47.

are compatible with the early Medinan codex as recounted by Muslim sources. The only exception is Q. 23:87 and 23:89 (f. 32r, 6,8) which are distinctive for the Baṣran codex and the reading of Abū ‘Amr Al-Baṣrī. I presume the script was consistent with the Medinan codex at an earlier stage but a scribe added the *alif* at a later stage. This probability is supported by the color of the *alif* which seems black and written by the same hand which added diacritic marks. My supposition is further supported by a red dot beneath the *hā’* in Q. 23: 89 (f. 32r, 8) which suggests the word was read in its dative case and is therefore consistent with the reading of Medina and its early codex. Our conclusion that Ma IV 165 was written as an imitation of the early Medinan codex and is consistent with reading of Abū Ja‘far and Nāfi‘ī is further confirmed by reference to other vocal variants which were represented by three different diacritical systems which were introduced to the parchment at different stages of improvement.

### C. Vocal Variations

The parchment exhibits three distinctive diacritic features which include: 1) Dots which were attached to a great number of consonants and added simultaneously with the text due to their shape, color degree and thickness which are all comparatively close to the original script. 2) Red dots which are spread throughout the parchment. However, they are not peculiar to this parchment. According to Déroche, the Fustat and Damascus codices are partially indicated with red dots too, as he exclaimed, "we do not have any clues about the time which elapsed between the two operations. Were the dots added immediately afterwards or were they a later addition?"<sup>35</sup> He further confirms that a fair portion of ŞE 6277, 10670, 12903 and 13009 exhibit the same feature of Damascus and Fustat codices, for example, short

---

<sup>35</sup> François Déroche, *Qur'ans of the Umayyads*, vol. 1, p. 77-8.

vowels marked with red dots<sup>36</sup>. Though he did not introduce a date for their introduction either, he suggested that "they could be contemporary with the diffusion of this script, which would be in agreement with what is reported of al-Ḥajjāj's "Maṣāḥif project"<sup>37</sup>. He based his suggestion on their multiplication on the O Ib manuscripts. I think we can draw an approximate answer on the date of those red dots by comparing them to other diacritics supposed to be added at the same or closely alter time in section three of this paper. 3) The third feature of this parchment is its inclusion of more developed diacritics such as *fatha*, *ḍamma* and *kasra* which appear in black ink similar to that used for *sūra* headings and overall verse-numbering. However, consonants in this manuscript are relatively frequently differentiated by dashes, thus allowing the identification of several more variants where a single consonantal shape is pointed in a distinctive way. This is the case of Paris 328a, b, c, d, e and f and Birmingham Mingana Islamic Arab. MS 1572a. The following table shows how the text is read according to vocal variations as represented by dashes, red dots and modern diacritics. We will compare them to reciters of 14 *qirāʿat* and their students<sup>38</sup>. Since it is too long to elaborate all vocal variations at the whole parchment, I only pursued them in Q. 17, 18 and 19. They almost include 25% of the parchment.

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid 99.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> I used the following symbols for the 14 reciters and their respective students according to *Shāṭibiyya*, *Nashr* and *Ithāf*: N: Nāfiʿ, Q: Qālūn, W: Warsh, K: ibn Kathīr, B: Bazzī, Qu: Qunbul, Ia: Ibn ʿAmir, H: Hishām, Dh: Ibn Dhakwān, Ab: Abū ʿAmr, D1: Dūrī, S: Sūsī, A: ʿAṣim, Sh: Shuʿbah, H: Ḥafṣ, Hz: Ḥamzah, Kh: Khalaf, Khl: Khallād, Ks: Kisāʿī, Ḥr: Abū al-Ḥārith, D2: Dūrī of al-Kisāʿī, Y: Yaʿqūb, R: Ruwyaṣ, Ra: Rawḥ, J: Abū Jaʿfar, Wr: Ibn Wardān, Jz: Ibn Jammāz, Kh10: Kalaf al-ʿAshir, Is: Iṣḥāq, Id: Idrīs. Ḥs: Ḥasan, Am: Aʿmash, Ya: Yazīdī, Mḥ: Ibn Muḥayṣin, Sha: Shannabūdhī. Mṭ: Muṭawwiʿī.

Table 1: Vocal variances of *surāt al-Isrāʾ, al-Kahf and Maryam*

No	Modern Quran Numbering - M IV 165	Variant 1	Variant 2 and 3	Dashes	Red dots	Later diacritics
1	Q. 17:38; f. 1r, 5	<i>Sayyiʿuhu</i> (Ia, A, Ḥz, Ks, Kh, Ḥs, Am)	<i>sayyiʿatan</i> (other reciters)	<i>sayyiʿatan</i>	<i>sayyiʿuhu</i>	Both variants
2	Q. 17:41; f. 1r, 11	<i>li-yadhkurū</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Kh, Am)	<i>li-yadhkarrū</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>li-yadhkarrū</i>	Both variants
3	Q. 17:42; f. 1r, 12	<i>Kamā yaqūlūna</i> (K, Ḥ, Mḥ, Sha)	<i>Kamā taqūlūna</i> (other reciters)	<i>Kamā taqūlūna</i>	Both variants	Both variants
4	Q. 17:43; f. 1r, 13	<i>ʿammā taqūlūna</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Kh10, R, Am)	<i>ʿammā yaqūlūna</i>	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
5	Q. 17: 44; f. 1r, 13	<i>yusabbiḥu</i> (N, K, Ia, Sh, J, R)	<i>tusabbiḥu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
6	Q. 17: 61; f. 2r, 15	<i>li-lmalāʾikatu sjudū</i> (Wr)	<i>li-lmalāʾikati sjudū</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>li-lmalāʾikati sjudū</i>	Both variants

7	Q. 17:64; f. 2v,2	<i>Wa-rajilika</i> (H)	<i>Wa-rajlika</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Wa-rajlika</i>	Both variants
8	Q. 17:68; f. 2v, 10	<i>Nakhsifa</i> (K, Abu, Mh)	<i>Yakhsifa</i> (other reciters)	Not visible	Both variants	Both variants
9	Q. 17:68; f. 2v, 11	<i>Nursila</i> (K, Abu, Mh)	<i>Yursila</i> (other reciters)	Not visible	Both variants	Both variants
10	Q. 17:68; f. 2v, 10	<i>Fa-tughriqakumu</i> (J, R)	<i>Fa-yughriqakumu</i> (other reciters)	Not visible	not visible	<i>Fa-yughriqakumu</i>
11	Q. 17: 76; f. 3r, 10	<i>Khalfaka</i> (N, K, Sh, J, Mh, Ya)	<i>Khilāfaka</i> (Ia, H, Hz, Y, Khl10, Hs, Am)	Both variants in case of excluding <i>alif</i>	<i>Khilāfaka</i>	Both variants
12	Q. 17:77; f. 3r, 11	<i>Ruslinā</i> (Abu, Ya, Hs)	<i>Rusulinā</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>rusulinā</i>	Both variants
13	Q. 17: 82; 3r, 19	<i>Wa-nunzilu</i> (K, Abu, Ya)	<i>Wa-nunazzilu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
14	Q. 17:90, 3v15	<i>Tafjura</i> (A, Hz, Ks, Y, Khl10, Hs, Am)	<i>Tufajjira</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Tufajjira</i>	Both variants
15	Q. 17:93, 4r, 2	<i>Tunzila</i> (K, Abu, Ya)	<i>Tunazzila</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Tunazzila</i>	Both variants
16	Q. 17:90; f. 3v, 18	<i>Kisafan</i> (N, Ia, A)	<i>Kisfan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>kisafan</i>	Both variants

17	Q. 17: 93; f. 4r, 2	<i>Qāla</i> (K, Ia, Mḥ)	<i>Qul</i> (other reciters)	Both variants in case of discarding <i>alif</i>	<i>qāla</i>	Both variants
18	Q. 17: 102; 4v, 4	<i>‘alimtu</i> (Ks, Am)	<i>‘alimta</i>	Both variants	<i>‘alimta</i>	Both variants
19	Q. 18: f. 5r, 8	<i>Ladnihi</i> (Sh)	<i>Ladunhu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Ladunhu</i>	Both variants
20	Q. 18: 2; f. 5r, 8	<i>Yabshura</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Am)	<i>Yubashshira</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Yubashshira</i>	Both variants
21	Q. 18: 16, f. 5v, 14	<i>Marfiqan</i> (N, Ia, J)	<i>Mirfaqan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Marfiqan</i>	<i>Marfiqan</i>
22	Q. 18: 17; f. 15	<i>Tazwarru</i> (Ia, Y)	<i>Tazāwaru</i> (A, Ḥz, Ks) <i>Tazzāwaru</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Tazāwaru</i> <i>Tazzāwaru</i>	Both variants
23	Q. 18: 18; f. 6r, 2	<i>taḥsabuhum</i> (Ia, A, Ḥz, J)	<i>taḥsibuhum</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>taḥsabuhum</i> <i>taḥsibuhum</i>	<i>taḥsabuhum</i> <i>taḥsibuhum</i>
24	Q. 18:18; f. 6r, 4	<i>Wa-tuqlibuhum</i> (Ḥs)	<i>Wa-nuqallibuhum</i> (other reciters)	<i>Wa-nuqallibuhum</i>	Both variants	<i>Wa-nuqallibuhum</i>
25	Q. 18: 18; f. 6r, 5	<i>iṭala‘tu</i> (Mṭ)	<i>iṭala‘ta</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>iṭala‘ta</i>	<i>iṭala‘ta</i>

26	Q. 18: 18; f. 6r, 6	<i>ru'uban</i> (Ia, Ks, J, Y)	<i>ru'ban</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>ru'uban</i>	Both variants
27	Q. 18: 19; f. 6r, 9	<i>Bi-wariqikum</i> (N, K, Ia, Ḥ, Ks, J, R, Mḥ, Ḥs)	<i>Bi-warqikum</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
28	Q. 18: 25; f. 6v, 10	<i>Thalāthami'ata</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Kh10, Ḥs, Am)	<i>Thalāthama'a</i> (J) <i>thalāthami'atn</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Thalāthami'ata</i>	<i>thalāthami'atn</i>
29	Q. 18: 25; f. 6v, 10	<i>tas'an</i> (Ḥs)	<i>tis'an</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>tis'an</i>	Both variants
30	Q. 18: 26; f. 6v, 14	<i>Wa-lā-tushrik</i> (Ia, Mḥ, Ḥs)	<i>Wa-lā-yushriku</i> (other reciters)	<i>Wa-lā-tushrik</i>	Both variants	<i>Wa-lā-tushrik</i>
31	Q. 18: 28; f. 6v, 20	<i>Bi-l-ghudwati</i> (Ia)	<i>Bi-l-ghadāti</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Bi-l-ghudwati</i>	<i>Bi-l-ghudwati</i>
32	Q. 18: 28; f. 6v,	<i>Wa-lā tu'addi 'aynayka</i> (Ḥs)	<i>Wa-lā ta'du 'aynāka</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Wa-lā ta'du</i>	<i>Wa-lā ta'du</i>
33	Q. 18:31; f. 7r, 9	<i>Min taḥtihimi l-anhāru</i> (Abu, Y)	<i>Min taḥtuhumu l-anhāru</i> (Ḥ, Ks, Kh10) <i>Min taḥtihilimu l-anhār</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Min taḥtihilimu l-anhār</i>	<i>Min taḥtihilimu l-anhār</i>

34	Q. 18: 34; f. 7r, 16	<i>Wa-kāna lahu Thamarun</i> (A, J, R, Mḥ)	<i>Wa-kāna lahu Thumrun</i> (Abu, Ḥs, Ya) <i>Wa-kāna lahu Thumurun</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Variants 2 and 3	Both variants
35	Q. 18: 34, f. 7v, 9	<i>Wa-uḥīṭa bi-thamarihi</i> (A, J, Mḥ)	<i>Wa-uḥīṭ bi-thumrihi</i> (Abu, Ḥs, Ya) <i>Wa-uḥīṭa bi-thumurih</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Variants 2 and 3.
36	Q. 18: 43, f. 7v, 12	<i>Wa-lam yakum lahū</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Kh10, Am)	<i>Wa-lam takun lahū</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>Wa-lam takun lahū</i>
37	Q. 18: 44; f. 8, 13	<i>Al-wilāyatu</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Kh10)	<i>Al-walāyatu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants		<i>Al-walāyatu</i>
38	Q. 18: 44; f. 8, 13	<i>Lillahi-l-ḥaqqu</i> (Abu, Ks)	<i>Lillahi-l-ḥaqqu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Lillahi-l-ḥaqqu</i>	<i>Lillahi-l-ḥaqqu</i>
39	Q. 18: 44, f. 7v, 14	<i>‘uqban</i> (A, Ḥz, Kh10)	<i>‘uquban</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>‘uquban</i>	<i>‘uquban</i>
40	Q. 18: 47; f.7v, 20	<i>Tusayyaru-l-jibālu</i> (K, Abu, Ia)	<i>Tasīru-l-jibālu</i> (Mḥ)	<i>Tasīru-l-jibālu</i>	Both variants	<i>Tusayyaru-l-jibālu</i>



			<i>Nusayyuru-l-jibāla</i> (other reciters)	<i>Tusayyaru-l-jibālu</i>		
41	Q. 18: 51; f. 8r, 11	<i>Mā-ashhadnāhum</i> (J)	<i>Mā-ashhadtuhum</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>Mā-ashhadtuhum</i>
42	Q. 18: 51; f. 8r, 13	<i>Wa-mā kuntu mutakhidh</i> (J)	<i>Wa-mā kuntu mutakhidha</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>Wa-mā kuntu mutakhidha</i>
43	Q. 18: 51; f. 8r, 13	<i>‘aḍadan</i> (Ḥs)	<i>‘aduḍan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>‘aduḍan</i>	<i>‘aduḍan</i>
44	Q. 18: 55; f. 8r, 13	<i>Wa-yama naqūlu</i> (Ḥz, Am)	<i>wa-yama yaqūlu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>wa-yama yaqūlu</i>
45	Q. 18: 55; f. 8v, 2	<i>Qubulan</i> (A, Ḥz, Ks, J, Kh10, Am)	<i>Qiblan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Qiblan</i>	Both variants
46	Q. 18: 56; f. 8v, 6	<i>Huzuwan</i> (Ḥ)	<i>Huzu’an</i> (Ḥz, Kh10) <i>Ḥuzu’an</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Huzuwan</i> and <i>Ḥuzu’an</i>	Both variants
47	Q. 18: 59; f. 8v, 14	<i>li-mahlakihim</i> (Sh)	<i>li-mahlakihim</i> (Ḥ) <i>li-mohlakihim</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>li-mohlakihim</i>	<i>li-mohlakihim</i>
48	Q. 18: 66; f. 8v, 14	<i>Rashadan</i> (Abu, Y, Ḥs, Ya)	<i>Rushdan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>Rushdan</i>

49	Q. 18: 71; f. 9r, 12	<i>li-yaghraqa ahluha</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Kh10, Am)	<i>li-tughriqa ahlaha</i>	Both variants	Both variants	<i>li-tughriqa</i>
50	Q. 18: 74; f. 9r, 17	<i>Zākiyatn</i> (N, K, Abu, J, R, Mḥ, Ya)	<i>Zakiyyatan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
51	Q. 18: f. 9r, 16	<i>Nukuran</i> (Sh, Dh, J, Y)	<i>Nukran</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Nukuran</i>	<i>Nukuran</i>
52	Q. 18: 76; f. 9r, 19	<i>Ladunī</i> (N, J)	<i>Ladunnī</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
53	Q. 18: 77; f. 9v, 2	<i>yudīfuhuma</i> (Mḥ, Mṭ)	<i>yudayyifūhma</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>yudīfuhma</i>	<i>yudīfuhma</i>
54	Q. 18: 77; f. 9v, 3	<i>yanqada</i> (Mṭ)	<i>yanqadḍa</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>yanqadḍa</i>	<i>yanqadḍa</i>
55	Q. 18: 81; f. 9v, 10, 11	<i>Yubaddilahuma</i> (N, J, Abu)	<i>Ybadilahuma</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Ybadilahuma</i>	<i>Ybadilahuma</i>
56	Q. 18: 81; f. 9v, 11	<i>ruḥuman</i> (Ia, J, Y)	<i>ruḥman</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>ruḥuman</i>	<i>ruḥuman</i>
57	Q. 18: 85, 98, 92; f. 9v, 19, f. 10r, 8, 11	<i>Fa-'atba'a, thumma-'atba'a, thumm-'atba'a</i> (Ia, A, Ḥz, Ks, Kh10, Am)	<i>Fa-t-taba'a, thumma-t-ttba'a, thumma-t-ttba'a</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants

58	Q. 18: 86; f.10r, 2	<i>Ḥami'atin</i> (N, K, Abu, Ḥ, Y, Ya)	<i>Ḥāmiyatan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
59	Q. 18: 88, f. 10r, 7	<i>Jazā'ani l-ḥsna</i> (Ḥ, Ḥz, Ks, Kh10, Y, Am)	<i>Jazā'u l-ḥusna</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>Jazā'u l-ḥusna</i>
60	Q. 18: 93, f. 10r, 11, 12	<i>As-saddayni</i> (K, Abu, Ḥ, Mḥ, Ya)	<i>As-suddayni</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>As-suddayni</i>
61	Q. 18: 93, f. 10r,	<i>Yufqihūna</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Kh10, Am)	<i>Yafqahūna</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
62	Q. 18: 93; f. 10r, 15	<i>Kharajan</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Kh10. Ḥs, Am)	<i>Kharjan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
63	Q. 18: 96; f. 10r, 18	<i>aş-şudfayni</i> (IA, Abu, K, Y, Ya, Mḥ)	<i>aş-şadafayni</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
64	Q. 18: 97; f. 10v, 3	<i>Fa-mā-astā'ū</i> (Ḥz)	<i>Fa-mā-astaṭā'ū</i> (other reciters)	<i>Fa-mā-astaṭā'ū</i>	Both variants	<i>Fa-mā-astaṭā'ū</i>
65	Q. 18: 98; f. 10v,	<i>dakā'a</i> (A, Ḥz, Ks, Kh10)	<i>Dakkan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Dakkan</i>	<i>Dakkan</i>
66	Q. 18:104; f. 10v, 14	<i>yaḥsabūna</i> (Ia, A, Ḥz, J)	<i>yaḥsibūna</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>yaḥsibūna</i>
67	Q. 18: 109; f. 11r, 4	<i>Yanfada</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Am)	<i>Tanfada</i> (other reciters)	<i>Tanfada</i>	Both variants	<i>Both variants</i>
68	Q. 18: 109; f. 11r, 5	<i>Midādan</i> (Mḥ, Mṭ)	<i>Madadan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>Madadan</i>

69	Q. 19: 6; f. 11r, 19	<i>Yarithnī</i> (Abu, Ks)	<i>Yarithunī</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>Yarithunī</i>
70	Q. 19: 7; f. 11v, 1	<i>Nabshuruka</i> (Ḥz)	<i>Nubashshiruka</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>Nubashshiruka</i>
71	Q. 19: 8, 69; f. 11v, 3	<i>'itiyyan</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Am, Ḥ)	<i>'utiyyan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>'utiyyan</i>	Both variants
72	Q. 19: 68, 72, 9; f. 14r, 7	<i>Jithiyyan</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Am, Ḥ)	<i>Juthiyyan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
73	Q. 19: 70; f. 14r, 4	<i>ṣiliyyan</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Am, Ḥ)	<i>Suliyyan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Suliyyan</i>	Both variants
74	Q. 19: 58; f.13v, 4	<i>Bikiyyan</i> (Ḥz, Ks, Am)	<i>Bukiyyan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Bukiyyan</i>	Both variants
75	Q. 19:19; f. 11v, 17	<i>li-yahaba</i> (Q1, W, Abu, Y, Ḥs, Ya)	<i>li-'ahaba</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>li-'ahaba</i>	Both variants
76	Q. 19:23; f. 12r, 4	<i>mittu</i> (N, Ḥ, Ḥz, Ks, Kh10)	<i>muttu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
77	Q. 19:23; f. 12r, 5	<i>Nasiyyan</i> (Ḥ, Ḥz)	<i>Nisyyan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Nisyyan</i>	Both variants
78	Q. 19: 24; f. 12r, 5	<i>Min-taḥtihā</i> (N, Ḥ, Ḥz, Ks, J, R, Kh10)	<i>Man-taḥtahā</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Min-taḥtihā</i>	Both variants
79	Q. 19: 25, f. 12r, 7	<i>tasāqaṭ</i> (Ḥz, Am)	<i>tusāqiṭ</i> (Ḥ, Ḥs) <i>yassāqaṭ</i> (Sh, Y)	All variants	<i>tassāqaṭa</i>	All variants

			<i>tassāqāṭa</i> (other reciters)			
80	Q. 19: 34; f. 12v, 2	<i>Qwla l-ḥaqqi</i> (Ia, A, Y, Ḥs, Sha)	<i>Qawlu l-ḥaqqi</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Qawlu l-ḥaqqi</i>	<i>Qawlu l-ḥaqqi</i>
81	Q. 19: 34; f. 12v, 4	<i>Kun fa-yakūna</i> (Ia)	<i>Kun fa-yakūnu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Kun fa-yakūnu</i>	
82	Q. 19: 35; f. 12v, 4	<i>Wa-anna allaha</i> (N, K, Abu, J, R, Mḥ, Ya, Ḥs)	<i>Wa-inna allaha</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Wa-inna allaha</i>	Both variants
83	Q. 19: 40; f. 12v, 11	<i>Yarjī'ūna</i> (Y)	<i>Yurja'ūna</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	<i>Yurja'ūna</i>
84	Q. 19: 44,45, 46; f. 12v, 13, 14, 16	<i>Yā-abata</i> (Ia, J)	<i>Yā-abati</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Yā-abata</i>	<i>Yā-abata</i>
85	Q. 19: 59; f. 12v, 2	<i>aṣ-ṣalawāti</i> (Ḥs)	<i>aṣ-ṣalāta</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>aṣ-ṣalāta</i>	<i>aṣ-ṣalāta</i>
86	Q. 19: 51; f. 13r, 10	<i>mukhlaṣan</i> (A, Ḥz, Ks, Kh10)	<i>mukhliṣan</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
87	Q. 19: 60; f. 12v, 2	<i>Yudkhalūna</i> (K, Abu, Sh, J, Y)	<i>Yadkhlūna</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
88	Q. 19: 61; f. 13v, 8	<i>Jannatu 'adnin</i> (Ḥs)	<i>Jannata 'adnin</i> (Mṭ)	All variants	<i>Jannatu 'adnin</i> <i>Jannati 'adnin</i>	<i>Jannatu 'adnin</i> <i>Jannati 'adnin</i>

			<i>Jannatu 'adnin</i> (sha) <i>Jannati 'adnin</i> (other reciters)			
89	Q. 19: 63; f. 13v, 12	<i>Nuwarriṯh</i> (R, Ḥs, Mṯ)	<i>Nūrithu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
90	Q. 19: 66; f. 13v, 18	<i>Mittu</i> (N, Ḥ, Ḥ, K, Kh10)	<i>Muttu</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	Both variants	Both variants
91	Q. 19: 72; f. 14r, 6	<i>Nunji</i> (Ks, Y)	<i>Nunajjī</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Nunajjī</i>	Both variants
92	Q. 19: 73; f. 14r, 7	<i>Yutla</i> (Mḥ)	<i>Tutla</i> (other reciters)	<i>Tutla</i>	Both variants	Both variants
93	Q. 19: 74; f. 14r, 8	<i>Muqāman</i> (K, Mḥ)	<i>Maqāman</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>Maqāman</i>	Both variants
94	Q. 19: 77; f. 14v, 10	<i>Wuldan</i> (Ḥz, Ks)	<i>Waladan</i> (other reciters)	Not visible	<i>Wuldan</i>	Both variants
95	Q. 19: 90; f. 14v, 11	<i>Yakādu</i> (N, Ks)	<i>Takādu</i> (other reciters)	<i>takādu</i>	Both variants	Both variants
96	Q. 19: 90; f. 14v, 11	<i>yatafaṭṭaran</i> (N, Ks, K, Ḥ, J, Mḥ, Ḥs, Mṯ)	<i>yanfaṭirna</i> (other reciters)	Not visible	Not visible	Not visible
97	Q. 19: 97; f. 15r, 1	<i>li-tabshura</i> (Ḥz)	<i>li-tubashshira</i> (other reciters)	Both variants	<i>li-tubashshira</i>	Both variants

From the above it can be seen that 9 instances could distinctively show a certain variant, while the rest are either written in a way susceptible to equally read words or phrases according to all possible variants or are invisible in the text. All those nine cases are consistent with the recitations of Nāfi' and Abū Ja'far. It affirms our prior conclusion on consonantal variations which pointed to the recitations of those two *qārīs*. This compatibility between consonantal and vocal variations further affirms that dashes which show short vowels were added to the text simultaneously when it was first written. The remaining 88 cases are either invisible in the text or they do show distinction and can, therefore, equally exhibit two or three variations. As far as the red dots are concerned, the total number of cases where those dots could discern two variants are 47 out of 97. Forty cases exhibit consistency with the recitations of Ja'far and Nāfi', 3 are compatible with Abū Ja'far alone and one point to the recitation of Nāfi' alone. The remaining 50 instances can be equally read in two or three variants. Black diacritics showed 3 cases of agreement with the recitations of Nāfi', 2 with Abū Ja'far and 27 consistent with both. The remaining 66 cases can tell two or three variants equally. Since the red dots reflect to a great extent the recitation of Abū Ja'far and Nāfi', we may conclude that they were most probably added immediately after introducing the parchment. There is a possibility that M IV 165 was produced fairly later than other copies of Qur'an in *ḥijāzī* style such as Arabe 328, B. L. Or. 2165, Mingana Islamic. Arab. MS 1572a and Saint Petersburg NLR, Marcel 18, which are mostly devoid of any red dots. This feature extended to later Quran copies such as, according to Déroche, the Fustat and Damascus codices which were partially indicated with red dots too. Déroche exclaimed, "we do not have any clues about the time which elapsed between the two operations. Were the dots added

immediately afterwards or were they a later addition?"<sup>39</sup> He further confirmed that a fair portion of ŞE 6277, 10670, 12903 and 13009 exhibit the same feature of Damascus and Fustat codices, i.e. short vowels marked with red dots<sup>40</sup>. Though he did not introduce a date for their introduction either, he suggested that "they could be contemporary with the diffusion of this script, which would be in agreement with what is reported of al-Ḥajjāj's "Maṣāḥif project"<sup>41</sup>. He based his suggestion on their multiplication on the O Ib manuscripts.

However, we can generally confirm that the parchment is of a Medinan origin or at least it was copied from the earlier Medinan codex. This conclusion is further emphasized by examining the overall and detailed verse numberings of the parchment and comparing them with major codices as described in traditional Muslim sources.

#### **D. Verse-Numbering**

The codex Tübingen M a VI 165 contains all or parts of the twenty *sūras* between *sūrat al-Isrā'* (Q. 17) and *sūrat Yāsīn* (Q. 36). In all instances where the beginning of a *sūra* is present, there is a gap of at least the major part of a line, if not a whole line or more, which includes the title and number of verses of the following *sūra*. This line has been written out in *naskh*, in a different, presumably later, hand than the main text, and in black ink rather than brown. This numbering accords consistently with that of the first among the Medinans as described in the traditional sources<sup>42</sup>. The following table compares the general verse numbering at the beginning of each *sūra* with standard numberings. 'K' stands for Kufa, 'B' for Basra, 'D' for Damascus, 'H'

---

<sup>39</sup> François Déroche, *Qur'ans of the Umayyads: A Preliminary Overview*, Leiden Studies in Islam and Society, Brill: Leiden and Boston 2014, vol. 1, p. 77-8.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid 99.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> I have primarily relied on al-Bannā's *Ithāf*.



for Hims, 'M' for Mecca, 'MedI' for early Medinan and MedII for the late Medinan system.)

Table 2 Overall verse numbering of *sūras* included in M IV 165

<i>Sūra</i>	M a VI 165	K	B	D	H	M	MedI	MedII
Q. 17 <i>Sūrat al-Isrā'</i>	-	111	110	110	110	110	110	110
Q. 18 <i>Sūrat al-Kāfh</i>	105	110	111	106	106	105	105	105
Q. 19 <i>Sūrat Maryam</i>	98	98	98	98	98	99/98	98	99/98
Q. 20 <i>Sūrat Tāhā</i>	134	135	132	140	138	134	134	134
Q. 21 <i>Sūrat Al-Anbiyā'</i>	111	112	111	111	111	111	111	111
Q. 22 <i>Sūrat Al-Ḥajj</i>	76	78		74	75	77	76	76
Q. 23 <i>Sūrat Al-Mu'minūn</i>	119	118	119	119	118	119	119	119
Q. 24 <i>Sūrat An-Nūr</i>	62	64	64	64	63	62	62	62
Q. 25 <i>Sūrat al-Furqān</i>	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77
Q. 26 <i>Sūrat al-Shu'rā'</i>	227	227	226	227	227	226	227	226
Q. 27 <i>Sūrat al-Naml</i>	95	93	94	94	94	95	95	95
Q. 28 <i>Sūrat al-Qaṣaṣ</i>	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88
Q. 29 <i>Sūrat al-'Ankabūt</i>	69	69	69	69	70	69	69	69
Q. 30 <i>Sūrat al-Rūm</i>	60	60	60	60	60	59	60	59
Q. 31 <i>Sūrat Luqmān</i>	34	34	34	34	34	33	33	33
Q. 32 <i>Sūrat al-Sajdah</i>	30	30	29	30	30	30	30	30
Q. 33 <i>Sūrat al-Aḥzāb</i>	76	73	73	73	73	73	73	73

Q. 34 <i>Sūrat Saba'</i>	54	54	54	55	54	54	54	54
Q. 35 <i>Sūrat Fāṭir</i>	45	47	47	46	44	45	45	46
Q. 36 <i>Sūrat Yāsīn</i>	82	83	82	82	82	82	82	82

From this table it can be seen that the only system that mostly matches the description provided in traditional sources in a consistent way is that of the first Medinian codex. There are two exceptions; the number of verses of Q. 31, which does not match Hijazi codices, and Q. 33, which seems to be a typist error by scribe, since the number 76 does not match any of the seven well known standards, which are all unanimous to regard it 73 *āyāt* only. By reviewing signs set for ten-verse clusters, the *surā* can only be 73. The reason for counting Q. 31 as 34 verses instead of 33 is the verse 31, where the oval dashes marking the end of verses is set after *lahud'dīn* instead of *kafūr*, thus being consistent with Damascene and Baṣran codices as described by traditional Arabic sources.

The ending of each verse is usually marked by 2 or 3 oval dots of the same size and color as those used to differentiate consonants. Those dots mark the ending of *basmala* without counting it a verse of each *sūra*. Groups of ten verses are usually marked by unsophisticated circle in red ink surrounded by five or six dots. I am going to use those marks to ascertain their consistency with overall verse-numbering announced at the beginning of each *sūra*.

### 1. *Sūrat al-Isrā'* (Q. 17:35-111; ff. 1r-5r)

Since the first part is missing from Ma VI 165, there is no overall verse-numbering provided for this *sūra*. The only disputable verse ending is Q. 17:107 (f. 4v. 15), where Kūfan system ends the verse by *sujjadan* while others end it by *l-amafūlan*. The parchment is consistent with all codices except the Kūfan. This conclusion is further confirmed by red circles marking ten verse clusters, which were added after *'aẓīman* (Q. 17: 40;1r, 10) *ḥadīdan* (Q. 17:50; f. 1v, 7), *kabīran* (Q. 17:60; f. 2r, 13)<sup>43</sup>, *tafḍīlan* (Q. 17:70; f. 2v, 18), *naṣīran* (Q. 17:80; f. 3r, 18), *yanbū'an* (Q. 17:90; f. 3v, 16), *qatūran* (Q. 17:100;

---

<sup>43</sup> The red dots are obliterated but the black circle remains.

f. 4v, 1); *sabīlan* (Q. 17: 109; f. 5r, 1). We can easily conclude that the parchment's numbering of *sūrat al-Isrā'* is at least consistent with the three Hijazi systems including the first Medinan.

## 2. *Sūrat al-Kahf* (Q. 18; ff. fr-11r)

At the beginning there are two dark black lines; one extending from the end of *Sūrat al-Isrā'* to next line telling the name of the *sūra* and its total number of verses. It is repeated twice in the same form of script and color. We are told that this *sūra* contains 105 *āyāt*, i.e. it is compatible to Hijazi systems including early and late Medinan in addition to the Meccan. It is held to be 106, 110 and 111 according to the Damascene, Kūfan and Baṣran codices respectively. There are 11 disputed verse endings in this *sūra*. They are summarized as follows:<sup>44</sup>

- a. *Wa- zidnāhum hudan* (Q. 18:13; f. 5v, 7) is marked as an *āya* although by three dots set under the *yā'* without there being a suitable gap and set as a triangle, thus being consistent with Hijazi, Baṣran and Kūfan codices<sup>45</sup>.
- b. *Illā qalīlan (qalīlun)* (Q. 18:18; f. 6v, 5) has a gap but does not show a mark due to a later addition of two red dots. If we presume it is the end of an *āya* which cannot be ascertained, it could be consistent with the early Medinian verse-numbering. Otherwise, it is compatible to Kūfan, Baṣran, Damascene, Ḥimṣī, Meccan and late Medinan only. By reference to ten verse cluster, we found out it is added after *ghadan* (Q. 18:23; 6v,7) which confirms that Q. 18:18 (f. 6v, 5) is counted as a verse and thus is compatible with the early Medinan codex.

---

<sup>44</sup> Our default numbering is the Kūfan system, even though it is often not relevant to our present manuscript.

<sup>45</sup> Al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 363.

- c. *Ghadan* (Q. 18: 23; 6v, 7) is counted a verse according to the manuscript, thus making it consistent with all codices except the late Medinan<sup>46</sup>.
- d. *Zar‘an* (Q. 18: 32; 7r, 14) does not have a gap but two vertical dots marking the verse ending exist. It is, thus, compatible with the late Median, Iraqi and Damascene codices<sup>47</sup>. This is compatible with the red ten verse cluster which was added after *zalaqn* (Q. 18:40; f. 7r, 8); i.e. after 8 verses from (Q. 18: 32; 7r, 14).
- e. *Min kulli shay’in sababan* (Q. 18: 84; 9v, 19) does not have a gap but is distinguished by three vertical dots marking its ending and therefore complies with the late Medinan, Iraqi and Damascene *muṣḥafs*<sup>48</sup>. The dashes were added vertically as if they were inserted in an inappropriate place, but it is, however consistent with the red dots marking ten verse clusters.
- f. *An-tabīda hadhihi abdan* (Q. 18: 35; f. 7r, 19) is marked by a gap where triangle shaped three dots are drawn, thus agreeing with early Medinan, Meccan and Iraqi codices.
- g. *Wa-wajada ‘idndaha qawman* (Q. 18: 86; f. 10r, 3) is counted as a verse according to the manuscript, early Medinan, Meccan, Baṣran and Damascene codices, and thus conflicts with the ten verse cluster which was added after *sitrān* (Q. 18: 90; 19r, 10). I think the mark for ten verse cluster appear as an end for a verse before (Q. 18:89; 9r. 8) but it is not endorsed with a red circle. It means that the ten verse cluster was added two times; one in the form of a circle surrounded by dots all in brown ink very similar to that of the original text and later in the form of a big oval dot in red. This

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

explains occasional contradiction we observed between those red dots and detailed verse numbering of disputable verses. Earlier ten-verse marks go by the early Medinan system.

- h. *Fa-'atba'a sababan* (Q. 18: 85; f. 10r, 1), *thumm atba'a sababan* (Q. 18: 89; f. 10r 6,7 and Q. 18:92; f. 10r, 10) are counted as full verses according to the manuscript, Kūfan and Baṣran codices. It is consistent with ten verse clusters.
- j. *hal nunabbi'ukum bi-al-akhsarīna a'mālan* (Q. 18: 103 f. 10v, 12) marks the end of a verse according to the manuscript, Baṣran, Kūfan and Damascene codices in contrast with the early and late Medinan and the Meccan. By reviewing detailed verse numbering it became evident that it does not go consistent with any system which means that it was an individual attempt to mark the endings of verses without reference to any original. Red ten verse clusters follow the Kūfan system in all of its 10 instances. Therefore, a perusal of detailed disputable verses of *surat* al-Kahf reveals that 6 cases out of 9 are compatible with the early Medinan codex, two are not consistent and one is inconsistent with all six standards. This raise a question on the date of adding those dots marking verses. Most probably those dots were added at a later stage after writing the whole parchment. The common line of all those 9 instances is that they are 100% compatible with Iraqi codices. It means that they were added according to Kufan and Basran numbering systems.

### 3. Sūrat Maryam (Q. 19; ff. 11r-15r)

There is a space of two lines filled with Islamic decorations in red ink of the same color of the dots filling the parchment. It seems that this decoration was added by a later hand. There is *scriptio superior* in black *naskh* showing the name of the *sūra* and the number of its verses being written twice on two

consecutive lines. The overall verse-numbering shows that it is 98 verses, which complies with MdI, K, B and D<sup>49</sup> and differs with MII and the Meccan. Muslim sources trace three disputable *āyāt* as follows; 1) *Ibrāhīm* (Q. 19:41; f. 12v, 12) which is marked as the end of a verse according to MdII and Meccan codices while it is not the end of a verse according to the rest of codices and M VI 165, 2) *maddan* (Q. 19: 75; f. 14r, 13) which is the end of a verse according to M VI 165 and all standards except the Kūfan, 3) The first part of the *sūra*; *kāfhā yā 'ayyin ṣād* (Q. 19: 1; f. 11, 11) which is not regarded as a verse by all standards except the Kūfan. M VI 165, however, complies with the majority. Therefore, a perusal of the three disputable cases of *sūrat Maryam* in traditional Muslim sources, the parchment complies with the detailed verse-numbering of the first Medinan and the Basran codices.

#### 4. *Sūrat Ṭāhā* (Q. 20; ff. 15r-19v)

According to the overall verse-numbering provided at the beginning of the *sūra*, it states that it is 134, exactly like the Hijazi codices. The Kūfan is 135, the Basran is 132, the Damascene is 140 while the Ḥimṣī is 138. The disputable *āyāt* are 23. The X sign means that the phrase does not mark the end of an *āya* according to the designated standard while the dot means it is counted as a verse. Adding two signs means that there is a doubt or the sign is not visible at the parchment.

Table 3 Disputable verses of *sūrat Ṭāhā* as shown in M IV 165 and the six provincial codices

	M IV 165	K	B	D	H	M	MdI	MdII
<i>Ṭāhā</i> (Q. 20:1; f. 15r, 5)	X	•	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>kay-nusbbihaka kathīran</i> (Q. 20: 33; f. 15v, 11)	•	•	X	•	•	•	•	•

<sup>49</sup> Al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 375.



<i>Wa-nadhkuraka kathīran</i> (Q. 20: 34; f. 15v, 11)	•	•	X	•	•	•	•	•
<i>Fī-al-yammi</i> (Q. 20: 39; 16r, 15)	X	X	X	X	•	X	X	X
<i>Wa- alqaytu ‘alyka maḥabatan minnī</i> (Q. 20:39; f. 15v, 17)	•	X	X	•	•	•	•	•
<i>Kay taqrra ‘aynuha wa-la-taḥzan</i> (Q. 20: 40; f. 16r, 1)	X	X	X	•	X	X	X	X
<i>Wa-fatannaka futūnan</i> (Q. 20: 40; f. 15v, 18)	•	X	•	•	•	X	X	X
<i>Fī ahli madyana</i> (Q. 20: 40; 16r, 2)	X	X	X	•	•	X	X	X
<i>Fa-arsil ma‘ī banī Isrā‘īl</i> (Q. 20: 47; f. 16r, 8)	X	X	X	•	•	X	X	X
<i>Wa-laqd awhayna ila mūsa</i> (Q. 20: 77; f. 17r, 14)	X	X	X	•	•	X	X	X
<i>Wa-aṣṭana‘tuka li-nafsī</i> (Q. 20: 41; f. 16r, 3)	•	•	X	•	•	X	X	X
<i>Mina al- yammi mā-ghashiyahumu</i> (Q. 20: 78; f.17r, 17)	X/•	•	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>ghaḍbana asifan</i> (Q.20:86; f. 17v, 9)	•	X	X	X	X	•	•	X
<i>Wa‘dan ḥasanan</i> (Q. 20:86; 17v, 9)	X	X	X	•	•	X	X	•
<i>Fa-kadhālika alqa as-sāmīriyu</i> (Q. 20:87; f. 17v, 13)	•/X	•	•	X/•	X	•	•	X
<i>Wa-ilāhu mūsa</i> (Q. 20: 88; 17v, 15)	•	X	X	X	X	•	•	X
<i>Fanasī</i> (Q. 20:88; 17v l.16)	•	•	•	•	•	X	X	•
<i>Alla yarji‘u ilayhim qawalan</i> (Q. 20: 89; 17v, 17)	•	X	X	X	X	X	X	•
<i>ṣafṣafa</i> (Q. 20: 106; 18v l.3)	X	•	•	•	•	X	X	X

<i>Idh ra'ytahum ḡallū</i> (Q. 20: 92; 18r, 3)	X	•	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Fa-'immā</i> <i>ya'tiaynnakum minnī</i> <i>hudan</i> (Q. 20: 123; 19r, 9)	•	X	•	•	X	•	•	•
<i>ma'īshatan ḡankan</i> (Q. 20: 124; 19r, 11)	•	X	X	X	•/X	X	X	X
<i>Zahrata al-ḡayāta ad-</i> <i>dunyā</i> (Q. 20: 131; 19v, 5)	•	X	•	•	X	•	•	•

By comparing the parchment detailed verse numbering with the early Medinan system, we could reach the conclusion that out of 23 disputable cases, 16 are consistent with the earlier Medinan codex, 5 are inconsistent and 3 are invisible. Let us compare these results with ten verse cluster. The first cluster mark is set after *yā-mūsā* (Q. 20:11; f. 15r, 14) and the second after *al-ūlā* (Q. 20:21; f. 15v, 5). They confirm consistency of numbering with all systems except the Kūfan, which regularly counts disjoined letters at the beginning of *sūras* an *āya*. The mark for thirty is added after *fī-amrī* (Q. 20:32; f. 15, 11). It is, however, inconsistent with all systems. The mark for forty is added after *futūnan* (Q. 20:40; f. 16r, 1), which confirms that Q. 20: 33 (f. 15v, 11), Q. 20: 34 (f. 15v, 11), Q. 20: 39 (f. 15v l. 17) and Q. 20: 40 (f. 16r, 1) are all counted as full verses. The fifth is presumed to be drawn at the end of the page, but there is a lacuna which makes it missing, yet there is no disputable *āya* in this part. The parchment shows a red mark after *suwan* (Q. 20:58; f. 16v, 4) which seems an error from the transcriber who set the number of three verses improperly. Moreover, there is no dispute at all among all standards from Q.20:58 to Q. 20: 58. The seventh mark is added after *al-'a'lā* (Q. 20:68; f. 16v, 17) and the mark for eighty stands after *wa-mā hadā* (Q. 20: 79; f. 17r, 18) which confirms that Q. 20: 78 (f. 17r, 17) is counted a verse. The ninth mark is added after *fanasiya* (Q. 20: 86; f. 17v, 9). It is consistent with the detailed numbering which counts Q. 20: 86 (f. 17v, 9) as a verse. The

tenth mark stands after *nasfan* (Q. 20: 97; f. 18r, 11), and therefore, considers Q. 20: 92 (18r, 3) as an *āyā*, though it does not have dots at the parchment. The 100-verse cluster is added after *wa-lā-amtān* (Q. 20: 107, f. 18v, 4) and thus Q. 20: 106 (18v l.3) must be counted as a full verse, though no trace of a mark is shown in the parchment. The 110 mark is added after *fa-tashqā* (Q. 20:117; 19r, 2) without showing any discrepancy with detailed numbering of those ten verses. The 120 cluster is *tunsā* (Q. 20:126; f. 19r, 14) and thus (Q. 20: 123; 19r, 9) is regarded a verse as the detailed verse numbering confirms. The 130 cluster is added at the last word of the *sūra; ihtadā* (Q. 20:135; f. 19v, 13). It means that Q. 20: 131 (19v, 5) is counted as a verse.

The *sūra*, according to these ten-verse marks is only 130 verses. It emphasizes the existence of an error in setting ten-verse clusters as mentioned earlier. The missing gap is 3 *āyāt* from (Q. 20:56; f. 16v, 1) to (Q. 20: 58; f. 16v, 4). We can safely conclude that the overall, detailed and ten-verse marks do not accord with one consistent system as described in Muslim traditional sources. This confirms our preliminary supposition that overall, detailed and ten-verse numberings were all later additions, which were gradually and independently attached to the text.

### 5. *Sūrat Al-Anbiyā'* Q. 21; ff. 19v -24r)

At the beginning of this *sūra*, we are told that it contains 111 *ayāt* (f. 19v, 17), which is the numbering of all systems except the Kūfan (see Table 2 above). It has only one disputable *āya'* (Q. 21:66; f. 22, 11); *mā lā yanfa'ukum shay'an wa lā yaḍḍurukum*, which is not the end of an *āya* according to all systems except the Kūfan. The parchment is consistent with the first Medinan codex<sup>50</sup> even by reviewing the ten-verse marks which is added after *lil 'ālāmīn* (Q. 21: 71; f. 22r, 16) which is the 7th *āya* according to the Kūfan codex.

---

<sup>50</sup> Al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 313.

## 6. *Sūrat Al-Ḥajj* (Q. 22; ff. 24r -29r)

At the beginning of this *sūra* the overall verse numbering tells us it is 76 verses<sup>51</sup>. It is consistent with the first and second Medinian codices but does not comply with the Meccan (77), Ḥimṣī (75); Baṣran (75), Damascene (74) and Kūfan (78). Disputable *āyāt* are five. They are included at the following table:

Table 4 Disputable verses of *sūrat al-Anbyā'* as shown in M IV 165 and the Six Provincial Codices

	M IV 165	K	B	D	H	M	MdI	MdII
<i>Yuṣabbu min fawqī ru'usimu al-ḥamīm</i> (Q. 22: 19; f. 25v, 3)	X/•	•	•	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Yuṣharu bi hī mā fī buṭūnim wa al-julūd</i> (Q. 22:20; f. 25v, 4)	X/•	•	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Wa 'ādun wa thamūd</i> (Q. 22: 42; 27 r, 1)	•/X	•	•	X	X	•	•	•
<i>Wa qawmu lūṭ</i> (Q. 22: 43; 27 r, 2)	•/X	•	X	X	X	•	•	•
<i>Huwa sammakum al-muslimīna min qal</i> (Q. 22: 78; f. 29r, 3)	•	X	X	X	X	•	X	X

By reviewing ten verse marks it is evident that Q. 22: 19 and 20 are not counted as verses in M IV 165 since the mark for twenty is added after *wa dhūkū 'adhāba l ḥariq.* (Q. 22:22; f. 25v, 6). It keeps this numbering for the mark indicating thirty verses which is added after *min taqwa al-qulūb* (Q. 22:23; f. 26r, 12). The parchment is thus consistent with Hijazi and Syrian

<sup>51</sup> This is the number that appears at the beginning of the surah in black color. In folio 29 r, there is a title that says '*surat al-ḥajj kamsun wa sab'un aya*' (Sura Al-Ḥajj contains 75 verses). It is followed by the name Allah repeated twice. It appears in bright brown color in a totally different script with dots. Most probably it is a later addition.

numberings. For (Q. 22: 42; 27 r, 1) and (Q. 22: 43; 27 r, 2), both are not counted as verses in accordance with the mark indicating forty which appears after *fakayfa kana nakīr* (Q. 22:44; f. 27r, 4), and thus is not in accord with the three Hijazi systems. The mark for fifty is added after (Q. 22: 54; f. 27r, 6) and for sixty after (Q. 22:64; f. 28r, 6). We do not have any indication for the end of the seventieth *ayāya* according to the parchment. Therefore, though overall numbering is consistent with the first Medinan numbering, it does not show complete consistency when analyzing disputable verses and ten verse clusters.

### 7. *Sūrat Al-Mu'minūn* (Q. 23; f. 29r-33r)

At the beginning of the *sūra* we are told it is 119 verses. This is the number according to the Meccan, two Medinian, Baṣran and the Damascene codices. It is 118 according to Kūfan and Ḥimṣī numberings. There is only one disputable *āya*; *thumma arslna mūsa wa akhāhu hārun* (Q. 23: 45; f. 30v, 10) which is counted by the Meccan, two Medinian, Baṣran, the Damascene codices in addition to the parchment as a full verse while it is not counted according to Kūfan and Ḥimṣī *muṣḥafs*<sup>52</sup>. Therefore, detailed verse numbering of this *sūra* is compatible with the early Medinan codex.

### 8. *Sūrat An-Nūr* (Q. 24; f. 33r-37v)

The overall verse numbering at the beginning of the *sūra* (f. 33r, 1) shows that it is sixty two *āyāt*, exactly as the Hijazi systems, while the Ḥimṣī is 103 and the rest are 104. Three *āyāt* are disputable: 1) *yusabbiḥu lahū fiha bi-l-ghuduwwi wa-l-āṣāl* (Q. 24: 36; 35v, 3), which is counted as a verse according to the parchment, Baṣran, Kūfan, Damascene and Ḥimṣī while it is not according to Hijazi numbering standards. 2) Such is the case of Q. 24: 43 (36r, 5) which does not seem clear in the parchment.

---

<sup>52</sup> Al-Bannā', *Ithāf*, p. 402.

### 9. *Sūrat Al-Furqān* (Q. 25; f. 37v-41r)

There are no verse-number variants in this *sūra* and no anomalous markings here.

### 10. *Sūrat al-Shuh'rā'* (Q. 26; 41r-54r)

At the beginning of this *sūra* it is announced as having 227 āyāt (f. 41v, 4), which corresponds with the early Medinan, Damascene, Ḥimṣī and Kūfan. According to the late Medina, Meccan and Baṣran, it is 226 āyāt. (see Table 1 above). There are four disputable āyāt which are shown at the following table and are all compatible with the early Medinan codex:

Table 5 **Disputable verses of *sūrat al-Shuh'rā'* as shown in M IV 165 and the six provincial codices**

	M IV 165	K	B	D	H	M	MdI	MdII
<i>Ṭā-sīn-mīm</i> (Q. 26:1; f. 41r, 5)	X	•	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Falasawfa ta'lamūna</i> (Q. 26:49; f. 42r, 8)	•	X	•	•	•	•	•	•
<i>Ayna mā-kuntum ta'budūn</i> (Q. 26: 92; 42v, 5)	•	•	X	•	•	•	•	•
<i>Wa-mā-tanazzalat bihi-sh-shayāṭīn</i> (Q. 25: 210; f. 45r, 4)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	X

### 11. *Sūrat al-Naml* (Q. 27; 41r-54r)

We are told at the beginning (f. 45r, 18) that this *sūra* consists of 95 āyāt, which is the overall numbering of the Meccan and the two Medinan standards, 94 according to the Syrian and Baṣrī and 93 according to the Kufi (see Table 1 above). There are two disputable āyāt: 1) *wa ulū ba'sin shadīd* (Q. 27:33; f. 64r, 7) which is not an āya according to the Syrian, Baṣran and Kūfan standards. There is a gap in the parchments, but the mark is not clear. It is almost missing. The fourth mark for ten-verse cluster is added after

*karīm* (Q27: 40) which affirms that *shadīd* (Q. 27:33; f. 64r, 7) is not counted an *āya*. It is, however, an *āyā* according to Hijazi codices. 2) *Qāla innahu ṣarḥun mumarradun min qawārīra* (Q. 27: 44; 47r, 9) which is the end of an *āya* according to the parchment and all standards except the Kūfan. Therefore, detailed verse numbering of the *sūra* is compatible with the early Medinan codex.

### 12. *Sūrat al-Qaṣaṣ* (Q. 28; f. 49r-54v)

There are no verse-number variants in this *sūra* and no anomalous markings here.

### 13. *Sūrat al-‘Ankabūt* (Q. 29; f. 54v-58r)

At the beginning (f. 54v, 3), this *sūra* is announced as consisting of 69 *āyāt*, which is the overall numbering of all *muṣḥafs* except the Ḥimṣī which is 70. Though the majority of *muṣḥafs* have consensus on the overall numbering, they have differences in details. Disputable *āyāt* are 5, which are listed at the following table.

Table 6 Disputable verses of *sūrat al-‘Ankabūt* as shown in M IV 165 and the six provincial codices

	M IV 165	K	B	D	H	M	MdI	MdII
<i>Alif-lām-mīm</i> (Q. 29:1; f. 54v, 4)	X	•	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Wa-taqṭa‘ūna as-sabīl</i> (Q. 29:29; 56r, 6)	X	X	X	X	•	•	•	•
<i>Wa-ta’tūna fī nādīkumu l-munkara</i> (Q. 29: 29; 56r, 7)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X/•	X
<i>Mukhlīṣīna lahu ad-dīn</i> (Q. 29: 65; 58r, 10)	•	X	•	•	X	X	X	X

By reference to ten verse clusters, they are added after the following *āyāt*: *almunafiqīn* (Q. 29: 11; f. 55r, 5), *tuqlabūn* (Q. 29:21; f. 55v, 7), *dhālimīn* (Q. 29: 31; f. 56r, 12), *law kānū ya'lamūn* (Q. 29:41; f. 56v, 18), *liqawmin yu'minūn* (Q. 29: 51; f. 57v, 2) and *tu'fakūn* (Q. 29: 61; f. 58r, 2). Therefore, there is no discrepancy between ten-verse clusters and detailed numbering of disputable *āyāt*, but it is inconsistent with the early Medinan detailed verse numbering. It is, however, compatible with the Baṣran codex.

#### 14. *Sūrat al-Rūm* (Q. 30; f. 58v-61v)

We are told at the beginning (f. 58v, 19) that this *sūra* consists of 60 *āyāt* which is the overall numbering of all *muṣḥafs* except the late Medina and Meccan. Five *āyāt* are disputable as follows:

Table 7 **Disputable verses of *sūrat al-Rūm* as shown in M IV 165 and the six provincial codices**

	M IV 165	K	B	D	H	M	MdI	MdII
<i>Alif-lām-mīm</i> (Q. 30:1; f. 58r, 1)	X	•	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Ghulibat ar-rūm</i> (Q. 30:2; f. 58r, 2)	•	•	•	•	•	X	•	X
<i>min ba'di ghalabihim sayughlabūn</i> (Q. 30: 3; f. 58r, 3)	•	•	•	•	•	•/X	•	•
<i>Fī bid'i sinīn</i> (Q. 30: 4; f. 58r, 3)	•/X	X	•	•	•	•	•	•

Ten-verse mark is set after *yastahzi'ūn* (Q. 30:10; f. 59r, 1) to confirm that (Q. 30: 4; f. 58r, 3) is not counted according to parchment and thus complies with the Kūfan numbering in that *āyā* only. Detailed verse numbering complies with the early Medinan codex.

#### 15. *Sūrat Luqmān* (Q. 31; f. 61v-63v)



It is announced at the beginning of the *sūra* (f. 61v, 10) that it contains 34 *āyāt*, which complies with Kufi, Baṣran and Syrian numbering but differs with Hijazi systems which are reported as containing 33. There are two disputable *āyāt*; one is Q. 31:1 (f. 61v, 11) which is counted according to Kufi only and *mukhliṣīna lahu ad-dīn* (Q. 31:32; f. 63r, 19) which is counted according to the parchment in addition to Baṣri and Syrian numberings, thus complying in general with the Hijazi numbering though they differ in details.

### 16. *Sūrat al-Sajda* (Q. 32; f. 64r-65r)

The beginning of the *sūra* tells that it is 30 *āyāt*. It is consistent with all standards except the Baṣrī which is 29. There are two disputable *āyāt*; the first being *alif lām mīm* (Q. 32:1, f. 63v, 11) which is not a verse according to all standard except the Kufi and the second is *lafī khalqin jadīd* (Q. 32:10; f. 64r, 7) which is the end of an *āya* according to the parchment, Hijazi and Syrian codices. Therefore, the overall and detailed verse numbering complies with the Hijazī system.

### 17. *Sūrat al-Aḥzāb* (Q. 33; f. 65r-69v)

Though the *sūra* announces at the beginning (v.65r, 2) that it is 76 *āyāt*, it contradicts all verse-numbering standards which are all on consensus that it is 73. It is, however, a typist error since individual verse marks and ten-verse clusters affirm it is only 37. Ten-verse marks exist after *adhūnūnā* (Q. 33:10; f. 65v, 9), *qalīlan* (Q.33:20, f. 66r, 13), *yasīran* (Q. 33:30; f. 66v, 16), *‘alīma* (Q. 33:40; f. 67, 6), *raḥīman* (Q. 33:50; f. 68, 5), *illa qalīlan* (Q. 33:60; f. 68v, 20) and *qawlan sadīdan* (Q. 33:70; f. 69r, 16). After seventy, there are three verse ending marks immediately after *‘adhīman* (Q. 33:71; f. 69r, 18), *jahūlan* (Q. 33:72; f. 69v, 2) and *raḥīman* (Q. 33:73; f. 69v, 5).

### 18. *Sūrat Saba’* (Q. 34; v. 69v-73r)

It is 54 *āyāt* according to the parchment (f. 69v, 5-6) and all codices except the Syrians where sources confirm it is 55. There is only one disputable *āya*, i.e. *‘an yamīnin wa shimālin* (Q. 34:15, f. 70v, 9) which is not clear in the parchment, but by reference to ten verse cluster it shows that it is not counted as a verse and thus complies with all standards except the Syrians.

### 19. *Sūrat Fāṭir* (Q. 35; v. 73r-75v)

At the beginning the *sūra* (f. 73, 6) it announces that it is 45 *āyāt* which is the overall numbering of the Meccan and late Medina standards, while it is 44 according to the Ḥimṣī and 43 according to the early Medina, Baṣran and Kufi. There are nine disputable *āyāt* which are discussed in detail at the following table.

Table 8 **Disputable verses of *sūrat Fāṭir* as shown in M IV 165 and the six provincial codices**

	M IV 165	K	B	D	H	M	MdI	MdII
<i>Al-lathīn kafarū lahum ‘adhabun shadīd</i> (Q.35: 7, f. 73v, 4)	•	X	•	•	•	X	X	X
<i>Wa ya’ti bi khalqin jadīd</i> (Q. 35:16; f. 74r, 13)	•	•	X	•	X	•	•	•
<i>Wa mā yastawī al-‘amā wa al-baṣīr</i> (Q. 35:19, f. 74r, 20)	•	•	X	•	•	•	•	•
<i>Wa la adhulumāt wa an-nūr</i> (Q. 35: 20; f. 74r, 21)	•	•	X	•	•	•	•	•
<i>wa mā ‘anta bi musmi’in man fī al-qubūr</i> (Q. 35:22; f. 74v, ʿ)	•	•	•	X	•	•	•	•
<i>In anta illā nadhīr</i> (Q. 35:23; f. 74v, ʿ)	•	•	•	•	X	•	•	•
<i>Wa la‘allakum tashkrūn</i> (Q. 35:12; 74r, 4)	•	•	•	•	X	•	•	•
<i>An tazūlā</i> (Q. 35:41; f. 75v, 4)	X	X	•	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Fa lan tajida li sunnatillahi tabdīlan</i> (Q. 35:43; f. 75v, 12)	•	•	X	X	X	•	•	X

By reviewing those 9 cases, it became evident that they are all compatible with the early Medinan codex except (Q.35: 7, f. 73v, 4), which is confirmed by ten-verse cluster as a full verse and, thus, differs with the early Medinan codex in this verse only.

## 20. *Sūrat Yāsīn* (Q. 36; f. 76r-77v)

It is 82 *āyāt* according to all numberings except the Kufi which counts the first *āyā* (*Yā sīn* Q. 36:1; f. 67r, 2) and thus it is 83 according to it. The parchment is consistent with all other standards, which gives it 82 *āyāt*. There is no other disputable verses throughout the *sūra*.

Based on our analysis of the detailed verse numbering of disputable verses, the parchment is compatible with the earlier Medinan codex with regard to the detailed numbering of the majority of *sūras* (15 out of 19) including Q. 17, Q. 19, Q. 21, Q. 23, Q. 24, Q. 25, Q. 26, Q. 27, Q. 28, Q. 30, Q. 32, Q. 33, Q. 34, Q. 35, Q. 36. It is not compatible with the detailed numbering of four *sūras* only including Q. 18, Q. 20, Q. 29, Q. 31, which are consistent with the Basran numbering. The detailed numbering of Q. 20 does not, however, accord with any codex and the detailed numbering of Q. 22 is not visible in the parchment. In conclusion we can safely say that is compatible with the earlier Medinan codex in 15 out of 17 *sūras*.

## Conclusion

The text found in the Codex M a VI 165 is consistent with the ‘Uthmanic *rasm* since we can surmise for the moment that the differences in orthography are referred to, as confirmed in early Muslim sources, consonantal variants attributed to various modes of recitation rampant in various Muslim provinces. The text is almost compatible with the early Medinan codex according to traditional Muslim sources. The only exception is Q. 23:87 and 23:89 (f. 32r, 6,8) which is presumed to be originally Medinan

but later scribes added *an alif* to align it with Baṣran codex. This is supported by orthographic and paleographic analysis of the parchment in addition to the fact that some Muslim sources recount the addition of an *alif* by Naṣr b. ‘Aṣim<sup>53</sup>. I think it was added to prove the recitation of Baṣrans but there are some other evidences to its existence in some earlier codices<sup>54</sup>.

This conclusion is further intensified by ascertaining that the parchment was written in accordance with the reading attributed to the Medinen *qārīs* Nāfi‘ b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Nu‘aym al-Laythī (70/689-786/) and Abū Ja‘far Yazīd b. al-Qa‘qā‘ (d. 130/748). Abū Ja‘far was the teacher of Nāfi‘. It further confirms that even before the canonization of *qirāat* by Ibn Mujāhid, reciters in various Muslim provinces were restricted to read the Revelation according to a definite mode of recitation which was later standardized through chains of transmissions and later attributed to certain *qārīs*. This same conclusion was affirmed by reference to overall and detailed verse-numbering which belonged to a greater extent to the early Medinan codex.

Moreover, the *muṣḥaf* is vocalized by red dot, which vary inconsistently, and is of a later hand. According to traditional Muslim sources, marking short vowels with red dots started earlier at the time of Abū al-Aswad ad-Du‘alī (d. 69/689)<sup>55</sup>. The report affirms that those dots had an anomalous color from the original text, but it did not discern its type. According to a report attributed to Qatāda (d. 100 /680), marks for verse endings were first introduced by *ṣāḥāba* and then five and ten-verse clusters<sup>56</sup>. This is after introducing dots for *yā’* and *tā’* according to Yaḥyā b. abī Kathīr<sup>57</sup>. Therefore, diacritics were first introduced by Abū al-Aswad after the insertion of dots for *yā’*, *tā’* and after putting verse ending marks. Yaḥyā b. Ya‘mur and Naṣr b.

---

<sup>53</sup> Dānī, *Muqni‘*, p. 109.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> Abū Bakr al-Anbārī (d. 328/), *al-Waqf wa al-Ibtidā’*, ed. Muḥiy al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ramādān, Damascene Arabic Language Assembly 1390/1971, p. 41;

<sup>56</sup> Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 2.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

‘Aṣim were reported as adding dots in *muṣḥafs* but it seems after Abū al-Aswad<sup>58</sup>. Those reports are compatible with M IV 165 to a great extent for a number of reasons. Dots added to *tāʾ*, *yāʾ*, *nūn* and *jīm* are all mostly added at the same date and by same hand which transcribed this parchment. Similarly, dots are inconsistently attached to *shīn*, *khāʾ*, *fāʾ*, *ghayn* and *thāʾ*. This is evident in the color degree and thickness of the pen which mostly matches its respective letter and the fitting space given for these dots. Moreover, those dots are identical to dashes marking the ending of each verse. There is another evidence which prove that those dots were added simultaneously with the text, i.e. consistency between consonantal skeletons and variations related to dotted letters. The fact that those red dots were introduced after the time of Abū al-Aswad help us determine approximate date of the parchment under discussion. Most probably, it was produced between 69/689 and 86/705. This is explained by the partial introduction of red dots to later copies of the Quran such as the Fustat, Damascus, ŞE 6277, 10670, 12903 and 13009 codices as confirmed by Déroche<sup>59</sup>. Moreover, the government sponsored *muṣḥafs* which began to be produced in the more standard, later 'Kufic' scripts usually associated with a post-'Hijazi' period by at least the time of the Umayyad caliph Walid (r. 86/705-96/715)<sup>60</sup>.

This date is further supported by the examination of the parchment *scriptio defectiva*. We conclude that the spelling of *qāla*, *shayʾ*, *āyāt*, *dhū* and *ulū* have not been standardized at the time the parchment was written; a conclusion which was confirmed by most studies on Hijazi parchments. If we compare those words in our current parchment with similar manuscripts, we can easily confirm that none of those codices followed a

<sup>58</sup> Dānī, *Muḥkam*, p. 6.

<sup>59</sup> François Déroche, *Qurʾans of the Umayyads*, vol. 1, p. 77-8.

<sup>60</sup> Hans-Caspar Graf von Bothmer, 'Masterworks of Islamic Book Art: Koranic Calligraphy and Illumination in the Manuscripts found in the Great Mosque in Sanaa' in Werner Daum (ed.), *Yemen: 3000 Years of Art and Civilization in Arabia Felix* (Innsbruck & Frankfurt/Main: Pinguin-Verlag & Umschau-Verlag, 1987, p. 179.

standard rule. Their inconsistency is referred their imitation of earlier *muṣḥafs* which were used in the process of copying.

## **References**