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The material in the present volume is offered to students of Islam as a contribution to the problem of the history of the Qur'ān text. For many years the present writer has been collecting materials for a critical text of the Qur'ān, and in 1926 agreed with the late Prof. BERGSTRÄSSER to collaborate in the much bigger task of preparing an Archive of materials from which it might be some day possible to write the history of the development of the Qur'ānic text. It is hoped that it will be possible to publish shortly, as one step in that plan, a text of the Qur'ān with apparatus criticus giving the writer's collections of textual variants gathered from the Commentaries, Lexica, Qur'āt books and such sources. Meanwhile Dr PRETZEL, BERGSTRÄSSER's successor at Munich, has begun to organize the Archive for the Korankommission set up by the Bavarian Academy at BERGSTRÄSSER's initiative, and has already assembled a goodly collection of photographs of early Kūfī Codices and early unpublished qiraʻat works.

The need of the moment is the publication of material that will bring the subject into discussion amongst Islamic scholars. This is a field of Islamic study which offers almost unbroken ground, and presents numerous problems for investigation. One of them is the question of the Old Codices which represented the pre-Uthmānic stage of the Qur'ān text. It was the merest chance that led the present writer to unearth the MS of the Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif of Ibn Abī Dāwūd which now lies in the Zāhiriya Library at Damascus, and which is apparently the sole surviving example of the little group of Maṣāḥif books which studied the state of the Qur'ān text prior to its canonization in the standard text of Uthmān.

The text of this work of Ibn Abī Dāwūd is presented here as accurately as it can be settled on the basis of this unique MS.
The MS is an early one finished on the 17th of Jumādā al-Ākhirah of the year 852 A.H = 1283 A.D, and with every jad' are given the isnaḍs of the authorities through whom the text had descended.

The original from which this text was copied has apparently lost some leaves and suffered some disarrangement. The only serious case of such disarrangement where part of the material of one chapter is found inserted into and breaking the connection of another chapter, has been tacitly corrected in this edition. The MS also contains a number of explanatory interpolations which in this edition have been enclosed in square brackets [ ], round brackets ( ) being used for small particles etc. which had dropped out through the negligence of the scribe. The Zāhirīya MS is imperfect at the beginning, but probably only one or two leaves are missing. In its present state it consists of 100 folios 17 × 10 cm, the text varying from 21 to 23 lines to the page.

The MS as a whole is well written though sparingly pointed, so that the difficulties of establishing the text are mostly such as arise from the nature of the subject matter. Occasionally a later hand has inserted vowels or made a correction on the margin, not always happily. The greatest difficulty has been with the isnaḍs quoted by the author, and although all available controls were applied to them, there may still be some that will not stand the scrutiny of isnaḍ critics. The assistance of Muslim savants in this matter was not very helpful for we could not overcome the principle that every isnaḍ that led to a statement at variance with orthodoxy was ipso facto condemned.

Much of the material given by Ibn Alī Dīwānī regarding the history of the text of the Qurān, though extremely unorthodox, yet agrees so closely with conclusions one had reached from quite other directions that one feels confident in making use of it, however weak orthodoxy may consider its isnaḍs to be. It seemed therefore, important to expose the text at once to the criticism of scholarship. The most significant material, naturally, is that concerning the Old Codices, and for this reason the text itself has been preceded by a collection of the textual variants that have survived to us from the various non-Usmānī Codices, whether primary or secondary. In the cases of Ibn Mas‘ūd and Ubay h. Ka'b, whose readings are important from another point of view, all the readings have been given, but in the others as a rule only those variants which assume a consonantal text differing in some respect from the standard text of Uthmān. The standard text is quoted from the Egyptian standard edition of 1342, though I have not slavishly followed its orthography, intelligibility being more important than consistency. The verses are quoted according to the Kufan verse numbering given in the 1342 edition followed by the number of the verse in Flügel's edition; where Flügel's numbering agrees with the Kufan numbering only one verse number is given.

These variants from the Old Codices have been read over with several Muslim savants in the East, in the hope of testing them by the criticism of those whose acquaintance with the text is more intimate than any Western scholar can hope to attain. Invariably these savants took the position that the Usmānī text is perfect and unchallengeable, and the variants must therefore be regarded as conscious or unconscious corruptions of this text. Some contested the authenticity of the variants, arguing that they were nothing more than deliberate tampering with the text by later heretics who sought to gain currency for their heretical readings by attributing them to these ancient authorities. Others, though they were but few, were willing to admit the variants, but explained them by the theory that in the early days many of the Companions made for themselves copies of the Qurān in which they inserted for their own private edification many explanatory additions, synonyms for words that they did not fully understand, and such like annotations. The text they recited, however, was the original text as it was delivered by the Prophet and afterwards written out officially by Uthmān. Thus the variants that have come down from them are only those little peculiarities that were remembered as having been in their private copies, and so have no value whatever for the study of the text.

Modern scholarship naturally cannot accept so easy a way out of the difficulty, for it is quite clear that the text which Usmān
canonized was only one out of many rival texts, and we need to investigate what went before the canonical text. On the one hand it seems likely that in canonizing the Madinan text-tradition, 'Uthman was choosing the text that had all the chances of being nearest the original. On the other hand there is grave suspicion, that 'Uthman may have seriously edied the text that he canonized. It was therefore worth attempting an assembling of all the material that has survived from the rival texts. It is unfortunate that not sufficient has survived to enable us to get a real picture of the text of anyone of them. Such material as is available at the moment, however, is here offered to the criticism of scholars. Some of the variants seem linguistically impossible, and indeed are occasionally noted as such in the sources which quote them. Some give one the impression of being the inventions of later philologists who fathered their inventions on these early authorities. The great majority, however, merit consideration as genuine survivals from the pre-'Uthmanic stage of the text, though only after they have passed the most searching criticism of modern scholarship by scholars approaching them from different points of view, shall we be free to use them in the attempted reconstruction of the history of the text.

If sufficient interest is created among students of Islam to enable systematic search to be made, it is possible that we may yet recover some of the other Maqāṣif books or copies of some of the early qirā‘at works of ad-Dīnārī, al-Mahwī, al-Ahwāzī or Ibn ‘Aṭiyya.

My special thanks are due to two Oriental savants, Mina Jārullah Rostovdī of Kazan and Shaikh Sayyid Nawwār of Cairo, both of whom have read with me all the shāhādah qirā‘at from the Old Codices and taught me many things that a Christian can hardly learn for himself. Thanks also are due to Dr Otte Priel who photographed for me the Zahirīya MS and to Amin al-Khānji for his personal care over the printing of the Arabic text in Cairo. Finally there is due an expression of thanks to the Trustees of the de Goeje Foundation whose generosity made possible the publication of the volume in its present form.

Cairo, 1936

ARTHUR JEFFERY

INTRODUCTION

Critical investigation of the text of the Qur’ān is a study which is still in its infancy. ‘Within the fold of Islam it seems never to have attracted much attention. The growth of the Qurān’ is evidence that there was some interest in the question in the early days of Islam1) but with the fixing of the text as varietas by the Wazirs Ibn Muqal and Ibn ‘Asī in 322 A.H. at the insistence and with the help of the savant Ibn Majshid († 324), and the examples made of Ibn Miqām († 352) and the unfortunate Ibn Shanabīd († 352) who persisted in making use of the old readings after this fixing of the text2), such interest as there was seems to have come to an end. Variant readings within the limits of the Seven systems3) that were admitted as canonical by the decision of Ibn Majshid naturally continued to be studied by a limited group of scholars, and the readings of the other uncanonical Readers occasionally received attention, more parti-

1) Fīhris 56 mentions a number of works on Maqāṣif al-Maṣūḥ, such as those by Ibn ‘Anṣār († 110), al-Fārābī († 207), Khālif b. Ḥishām († 129), al-Madhī († 210), al-Warrāq, and one Muḥammad b. ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān. There was also a work with a similar title by Abū Dā‘ūd († 248) cf. Fīhris 59, a work derived from al-Kiṣā‘ī († 169) entitled Kitāb al-Maṣūḥ as-Sā‘ī al-Miṣrī wa Ṭiḥāb al-Bay'a ‘an al-Kiṣā‘ī, and a Kitāb al-Maṣūḥ wa ‘I‘jāţī by Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Muḥtār († 235). Ibn Miqām († 352) is also said to have composed a Kitāb al-Maṣūḥ (Fīhris 53), but the three famous Maqāṣif books were those of Ibn Abī Dā‘ūd († 169), Ibn al-Andalūsī († 126) and Ibn Abī Shihāb († 150), cf. Tāfṣīr 15.

2) Vide Mansūro’s al-Ṣawā‘il, 1, 242 and Bergsträsser, Geschichte des Quranex, 159 ff. Some account of the mas will be found in al-Kalbī, Thiqāt Bakhshīd, V, 144—148, Yūnī, Irshād, II, 116—119, and Ibn al-Jazari, Ṭaḥqīf, I, 139—142, No. 663.

3) On Ibn Miqām see Yūnī, Irshād, VI, 495; Ibn al-Jazari, Ṭaḥqīf, No. 2945; Mīrakawādī Tājīūf (ed. Amredes), I, 285; and on Ibn Shanabīd see Ibn Khālīkīn (tr. de Slane), III, 16—18; Yūnī, Irshād, VI, 502—504 and Ibn al-Jazari, Ṭaḥqīf, No. 7907.

4) The Seven were Nāṣī of Madīna († 119), Ibn Kāthīr of Mecca († 120), Ibn ‘Amr of Damascus († 118), Abī ‘Amr of Baṣra († 125), Abī ‘Amīr of Kūfa († 128), Ḥammān of Kūf († 156) and al-Kiṣā‘ī of Kūf († 119).
carily the systems of the Ten 1) and the Fourteen 2), who were nearest to canonical position, though at times others also were included 3). No definite attempt, however, was made to construct any type of critical position of the Qur’ān 4), and for the most part textual studies were confined to questions of orthography (ruz) and pause (waqf). Thus the older variants, even though they were known to be represented in some of the older Codices, for the most part survived only in the works of two classes of savants, firstly certain exegetes who were interested in the theological implications of such variants, and secondly the philologers who quoted them as grammatical or lexical examples.

It is thus that in the Qur’ān Commentaries of al-Zamakhsharī († 538) 5), of Abū Ḥayyān of Andalus († 745) 6), and the more recent Yemenite writer ash-Shawkānī († 1256) 7) who seems to have used some good old sources no longer available to Western scholars, we find recorded a goodly number of old variants representing a different type of consonantal text from that officially known as the ‘Uthmanic text, and in the philological works of such writers as al-ʿUbarī († 616) the blind philologer

1) To the Seven were added Abū Jaʿfar of Madīna († 130), Khālid of Kīta († 229) and Yūsūf of Bāṣra († 265) to make the Ten, Islamic scholarship is still divided over the question as to whether seven only or all ten are canonical.

2) To the Ten were added Ibn Mahāsin of Moza († 123), al-Yaṣā of Bāṣra († 202), al-Ḥasan of Bāṣra († 110) and al-Naṣṣ of Kīta († 148) to make the Fourteen.

3) We hear of books composed on the Eight Readers, the Eleven Readers, the Thirteen Readers, and sometimes those included Readers not in the usual lists as given above. Thus the Ḍaruqī al-Augūrī of al-Makkiyy includes the readings of Ḥamṣ al-Qais, Ibn as-Samanī and Ṭalha b. Maqari (see Pettel “Die Wissenschaft der Koranlesungen” in Islamica, VI, p. 43). Also the Cairo MS of the Ṣuyūṭī’s Abū ʿAbd Allāḥ ʿAbd Allāḥ al-Tahtā contains numerous variations beyond the canonical authorities, and the lost Khams of al-Hudhayfī, though it is a work on the Ten, is said to have contained readings of forty extra Readers (N‘ār, I, 90).

4) A possible exception is the case of Abī Mūsā al-Qaṣwī who to whom my attention has been drawn by Prof. Manigound, and who seems to have prepared a text in which varied coloured dots represented alternative readings in the text. Some samples of this process are actually found in some Kūfī Codices of the Third and Fourth Centuries, but so far as I know never consistently carried out.

5) The Ḥudhayfī, ed. Nāṣir ʿAbd al-Raḥīm, 1 vol., Cairo, 1937 A.H. printed at the charges of the Sulṭān of Morocco, and unfortunately in the latter volumes printed in great haste and consequent inaccuracy.

6) Fihrist al-Qur’ān, 5 vols., Cairo, 1349 A.H. printed at the charges of the Sulṭān of Morocco, and unfortunately in the latter volumes printed in great haste and consequent inaccuracy.

7) Fihrist al-Qur’ān, 5 vols., Cairo 1349. In his MS the author used the text of Warsh ‘an ʿNH’, i.e. the Madinan text tradition, but in the printing of this edition the publishers have stupidly changed it in every case to the Kūfī text tradition of Ḥāfīz ʿan ʿĀjīm which is the one current in the east at the present day.

of Baghdād 1), Ibn Khālawayh († 370) 2) the savant of the Hamānī Court of Saʿīd ad-Dawla at Aleppo, and the even more famous Ibn Jinnī († 392) 3), a not inconsiderable amount of such material has been preserved, which in some cases, indeed, proves to be one source from which it came to the Exegetes.

To apply this material to a critical investigation of the text of the Qur’ān seems never to have occupied the attention of any Muslim writer. In the Ḫāṣṣī 4), as-Suyūṭī’s great compendium of Muslim Qur’ānic science, we have recorded a great deal that concerns matters of the Muslim Massora, matters of considerable interest for the history of the exegesis of the Qur’ān, but very little that bears on the investigation of the text.

Nor has the subject attracted much attention in the West. Nöldeke opened it up in 1860 in the first edition of his Geschichte des Qur’āns, and Goldziher drew attention to its importance in the first lecture of his Richtungen 5), but it received no systematic treatment until Bergsträsser undertook his Geschichte des Quranstextes 6) as the third part of the revised edition of

1) Al-Ṭabqāt 55, ‘al-ʿArab wa ʿl-Qarawī 1, Fis ʿAbd Allāh al-Qur’ān on the margin of Jamāl’s supercommentary to Jalālīn, 4 vols., Cairo 1348. (It was also printed separately at Cairo in 1302 and 1306, and with Jamāl at Teherān in 1860 A.D.). Of his Fīrūz al-Qur’ānī as-Shāhāl where there is a broken MS in the possession of Dr. Yahuda of London and a complete MS discovered by the present writer in the East and now in the Mīngan collection at Selsey Oak.

2) Ibn ʿAbd Allāḥ’s ʿArbaʿin mikhāli mukarnāth Kūfrūrūrūrūn, herausgegeben von G. Bergsträsser, Stambul 1934. (Bibliotheca Islamica, VII). There are also variants recorded in his Jāfīf Thalāštūn Sana’ar of which three MSS are known.

3) Vichkasmatikē Korinsatika im Mēsībat des Ibn Gīmī, von G. Bergsträsser, München 1933. (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1933, Heft 2). There are good MSS of the Madīna now available and it is hoped that the complete text may be published shortly. It is probable that other works of Ibn Jinnī would repay examination for there are not a few uncritical variants quoted in the Commentaries from Ibn Jinnī which do not figure in Bergsträsser’s list.

4) Suyūṭī’s Ḫāṣṣī on the Exegetical Sciences of the Qur’ān, ed. A. Spranger, Cattut 1872. (Bibliotheca Islamica).

The recent work of az-Sāiqūnī, ʿIṣrāʾīl al-Qur’ānī, Cairo 1935, may perhaps represent the beginning of a new day. The author is visibly inspired by Western work on the Qur’ān, and although bound hand and foot by the necessity of defending the orthodox position, he has made a useful assemblage of material from which others may start.

5) Die Richtungen der islamischen Korannumierung, Leiden 1920, being the Olaus Petri Lectures at Uppsala, published as No. VI of the De Goeje Foundation.

6) Erste Lieferung 1926; zweite Lieferung 1929; the filed and concluding section has now been issued by his pupil and successor at München, Dr. O. Pettel. Bergsträsser envisaged a much larger plan for a history of the text of the Qur’ān based
Nöldeke's work, and with characteristic thoroughness began to work down to bed-rock on the subject. It is an extraordinary thing that we still have no critical text of the Qur'an for common use. Flügel's edition which has been so widely used and so often reprinted, is really a very poor text, for it neither represents any one pure type of Oriental text tradition, nor is the eclectic text he prints formed on any ascertainable scientific basis. Some of the Kazan lithographs 1) make an attempt at giving the Seven canonical systems on the margin, but only very incompletely. The same is true of the curious Teheran lithograph of 1323, which prints parts of the text in Kufic script (with interlinear nashchi) and parts in ordinary script, with a selection of the Seven on the margins. The best text so far available is the Egyptian standard edition of 1342 (1923) 2) of which there are several later prints. This edition attempts to present a pure type of text according to one tradition of the Kufan school as represented by Hafs 'an 'Āṣīm, though unfortunately some corruptions have crept in owing to the use by its editors of younger authorities on the Kufan tradition instead of going back to older and better sources 3).

The orthodox Muslim theory of the text is well known. According to this theory the Prophet arranged to have the revelations written down immediately they were revealed and used to collate once every year with the Angel Gabriel the material that had on an assemblage of materials on a vast scale, and of which the publication of a critical text of the Qur'an by the present writer was to form part. (See his preliminary statement, "Plan eines Apparatus Criticus zum Koran" in the Sitzungsberichte of the Bavarian Academy, 1930, Heft 7.) The tragedy of the summer of 1933 which deprived Germany of one of her finest Arabists and the writer of a close personal friend, has necessarily delayed this project and somewhat changed it. Dr. Pretzl, however, has undertaken to continue with the plan and a new scheme for it is being elaborated. (See Pretzl, "Die Fortführung des Apparatus criticus zum Koran" in Sitzb. Bayer. Akad. 1934, Heft 2). 4)

1) e.g. the folio editions of 1857.
2) Bergsträsser has given an account of it in Der Islam, XX (1932), Heft 1 in his article "Koranlesen in Kairo".
3) Two of these older sources have been made available in careful editions in the Bibliotheca Islamica by Dr. Otto Pretzl, viz. the "Tisir" and the "Magh" of al-Din`at (f. 44a) the Spanish Muslims sayant. — Das Lehrbuch der Sitten Kuranserien vom AB.S. "Amr al-Dinat, 1930, and Orthographie und Funktionsweise des Korans: zwei Schriften von AB.S. "Amr al-Dinat, 1932. In the "Anmerkungen" to this latter text Pretzl notes a number of cases where the editors of the Egyptian standard text have deviated from the older tradition.

thus far been revealed. In the last year of his life they so collated it twice 5). When the Prophet died the text of the Qur'an was thus already fixed, and all the material gathered in an orderly fashion though it had not yet been written out, at least not in book form. Under the Caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik took place the writing of it out in a first official recension. Later, in the Caliphate of 'Uthman it was discovered that all sorts of dialectal peculiarities had crept into the recitation of the text, so 'Uthman formed a Committee, borrowed from Hafs the copy made by 'Abd al-Malik, and on its basis had a standard Codex written out in the pure dialect of Quraish. Copies of this were made and sent to the chief centres of the Muslim empire where they became Metropolitan Codices, and all other Codices that had been formed were ordered to be burned. This was the Second Recension and all modern editions produced in the East are supposed to be exact reproductions of the text (though not of the form) of this 'Uthmanic Recension 6).

Very little examination is needed to reveal the fact that this account is largely fictitious. Nothing is more certain than that when the Prophet died there was no collected, arranged, collated body of revelations. Recent research by Dr. Bell of Edinburgh and Prof. Torrey of Yale has suggested that there is internal evidence in the Qur'an itself that the Prophet kept in his own care a considerable mass of revelation material belonging to various periods of his activity, some of it in revised and some of it in unrevised form, and that this material was to form the basis of the Kitāb he wished to give his community before he died. Death, however, overtook him before anything was done about the matter. If this is so we are at a loss to know what became of this material, which obviously would have been the community's most precious legacy 7). The earliest strata of tradition

1) Iṣra', 146.
2) Thus in the Preface to the above-mentioned Egyptian Standard edition (student's edition of 1934) we read —
3) The consonantial text has been taken from what the Masoretes have handed down as to the Codices which 'Uthman b. 'Affān sent to Basra, Kūfa, Damascus and Mecca, the Codex which he appointed for the people of Madina, and that which he kept for himself, and from the Codices which have been copied from them 8).
4) There is a 'Abī's tradition (Kādāhīn, 97, p. 37) that before his death the Prophet
available to us make it quite certain that there was no Qur'anic text left ready as a heritage for the community. The Prophet had proclaimed his messages orally, and, except in the latter period of his ministry, whether they were recorded or not was often a matter of chance. Some pieces of revelation material seem to have been used liturgically and so probably would have been written. Some pieces he himself caused to be written down in permanent form as they were of a definite legislative character. Besides these there were numerous portions, generally small pieces, though sometimes pieces of considerable extent, that were in the possession of different members of the community, either memorized or written down on scraps of writing material that happened to be handy. Certain individuals among the early Muslims, perhaps even a little before the Prophet's death, had specialized in collecting or memorizing this revelation material. They and their successors became known as the Qur'ānūs — the Reciters, later the Readers, who constituted as it were the depository of revelation. Tradition says that it was the slaughter of a great number of these at the Battle of Yamāma in 12 A.H. that caused interest to be aroused in getting all the revelation material set down in permanent written form, lest with the passing away of the Qur'ānūs much of it should be lost.

That Abū Bakr was one of those who collected revelation material was doubtless true. He may possibly have inherited material that the Prophet had stored away in preparation for the Kitāb. That he ever made an official recension as the orthodox theory demands is exceedingly doubtful. His collection would have been a purely private affair, just as quite a number of other Companions of the Prophet had made personal collections as private affairs. It was after the death of the Prophet that these collections became important. We have well-known stories of how 'Uthmān, Abū Bakr, Abū Simāl, and others had collections, and there are traditions which give lists of those who had commenced making collections or memorizing during the lifetime of the Prophet. As no two of these lists agree with one another to any great extent one is driven to conclude that while it was known that such collections were made there was no accurate information, save with regard to a few names, as to who made them.

Orthodox theory, even to the present day, has insisted that the word jama'a "to collect" used in these traditions means nothing more than "to memorize" and so does not imply that the collection was made in written form. As, however, 'Uthmān brought along what he had collected on the back of his camel, as some of the collections had come to have independent names, and as 'Uthmān, after sending out his official copies to the Metropolitan cities, had to order all other copies to be burned, there cannot be the slightest doubt that there were written collections.

What we find in early Islam, as a matter of fact, is only what we might have expected to find. Different members of the community who where interested began to collect in written form so much as they could gather of the revelation material that had been proclaimed by the Prophet. Later, with the gradual expansion of the Muslim empire, some of these collections began to acquire notoriety as they came to be in some sort authoritative in different centres. Naturally it would be those collections that could claim some completeness that would attain to this position of prominence. Thus we read that the people of Ḥimṣ and Damascus followed the Codex of Mūsā b. al-Āsāwad, the Kufans that of Ibn Ma'sūd, the Basrans that of Abū Simāl al-Āsāhīrī, and the Syrians in general that of Uba'ī b. Ka'b (Ibn al-ʿAţbirī, Kāmil, III, 86). Here we have the beginning of Metropolitan

1) Ibn al-Jazārī, Kāmil I, 64; Fihrist, 87; Bihārī (ed. Krekl) III, 397; Ibn Sa'd, Tanqīh, II, 123—124. See also Nöldeke-Schwally II, 8—11.
2) This name is probably a mistake for Mūsāh b. Jahl, as indeed Heinzle has noted, Vorarabien, 173.4
Codices, each great centre following that collection, or perhaps we may say that type of text, which had local fame. Now when we come to the accounts of 'Uthmān’s recension, it quickly becomes clear that his work was no mere matter of removing dialectal peculiarities in reading, but was a necessary stroke of policy to establish a standard text for the whole empire. Apparently there were wide divergences between the collections that had been digested into Codices in the great Metropolitan centres of Madīna, Mecca, Bayṣra, Kufa and Damascus, and for political reasons if for no other it was imperative to have one standard Codex accepted all over the empire. 'Uthmān’s solution was to canonize the Madīnān Codex) and order all others to be destroyed. It is very significant that the Qurūṣ were violently opposed to 'Uthmān because of this act), and there is evidence that for quite a while the Muslims in Kufa were divided into two factions, those who accepted the 'Uthmānic text, and those who stood by Ibn Mas'ūd, who had refused to give up his Codex to be burned.2) 

There can be little doubt that the text canonized by 'Uthmān was only one among several types of text in existence at the time). To canonize the Madīnān text was doubtless the natural thing to do, since in spite of the fact that Kufa early came to have the reputation of being par excellence the centre of Qur’ānic studies, the prestige of Madīna, the Prophet’s own city, must at that time have been enormous, and the living tradition would doubtless have been most abundant there. We may even say that a priori the Madīnān text had all the chances in its favour of being the best text available. Nevertheless it is a question of the utmost importance for any study of the history of the Qur’ānic text, whether we can glean any information as to the rival types of text that were suppressed in the interests of 'Uthmān’s standard edition.

In the works of the exegetes and the philologers we not infrequently come across variant readings that have been preserved from one or other of these displaced Codices. Sometimes the reference is merely to a “Codex of the Śaḥāba’u” or “a certain old Codex” or “in certain of the Codices” (في عصر الصحابة) or “in the former text” (في الكتب الأولى). At times it is to one of the cities “a Codex of Bayṣra”, “a Codex of Iḥṣa’, a Codex of Ahl al-‘Aliya” (Baghawi II, 52). Sometimes it is to a Codex in the possession of some particular person, as “a Codex belonging to al-Ḥajjāja” (Khal. 122; Gin. 60), or “a Codex belonging to the grandfather of Malik b. Anas’ (Maqṣūr 120), or a Codex used by Ibn Ḥanifa (see Massion's al-Hallaj, 1, 243 n. 5), or one of Ḥammād b. ʿaz-Zibriqān (Khal. 55; Muḥājir II, 187). Mostly, however, the references are to the well-known old Codices of Ibn Mas’ūd, Ibn Ḥanifa, etc., which were known to go back to the time before the canonization by 'Uthmān of one standard type of text.

The amount of material preserved in this way is, of course, relatively small, but it is remarkable that any at all has been preserved. With the general acceptance of a standard text other types of text, even when they escaped the flames, would gradually cease being transmitted from sheer lack of interest in them. Such readings from them as would be remembered and quoted among the learned would be only the relatively few readings that had some theological or philological interest, so that the great mass of variants would early disappear. Moreover, even with regard to such variants as did survive there were definite efforts to suppression in the interests of orthodoxy. One may refer, for instance, to the case of the great Baghdādī scholar Ibn Ṣanāḥīd (245-328), who was admitted to be an eminent Qur’ānic authority, but who was forced to make public recantation of his use of readings from the Old Codices.

Ibn Ṣanāḥīd’s was not the only case, and such treatment of famous scholars1) was not encouraging to the study of the

1) In the accounts of Ibn Ṣanāḥīd will be noticed the effort made to paint
variants from the pre-'Uthmānic period. That orthodoxy continued to exert this same pressure against uncanonical variants is revealed to us from many hints from the period subsequent to Ibn Shanabūth. For example, Abū Hayyān, Baḥr VII, 268, referring to a notorious textual variant, expressly says that in his work, though it is perhaps the richest in uncanonical variants that we have, he does not mention those variants where there is too wide a divergence from the standard text of 'Uthmān. In other words, when we have assembled all the variants from these earlier Codices that can be gleaned from the works of the exegetes and philologists, we have only such readings as were useful for purposes of Ṭafsīr and were considered to be sufficiently near orthodoxy to be allowed to survive.

Modern Muslim savants almost invariably set aside the variants recorded from the Old Codices on the ground that they are Ṭafsīr, or as we should say, explanatory glosses on the 'Uthmānic text, and they roundly condemn such ancient scholars as Ibn Khālawayh and Ibn Jinnī for not knowing the difference between qirāṭ and Ṭafsīr. It is clear, however, that only such qirāṭ as were of the kind that could be used for Ṭafsīr had any likelihood of being preserved.

The Maṣāḥif Books

In the fourth Islamic century there were three books written on this question of the Old Codices which had some influence on later studies. These were the works already mentioned of Ibn al-Anbārī, Ibn Ashta and Ibn Abī Dāwūd. In each case the book was entitled Kiṭāb al-Maṣāḥif, and in each case the work, him as an ignoramus and a weak-minded person. This was the usual procedure with regard to all those suspected of unorthodox views and is not to be taken seriously. It is perfectly clear from the sources that he was a famous scholar and drew large numbers of students, who in those days as in these did not flock to listen to the ignorant and weak-minded.

1) An interesting modern example occurred during the last visit of the late Prof. Bertramsen to Cairo. He was engaged in taking photographs for the Archive and had photographed a number of the early Kūfī Codices in the Egyptian Library when I drew his attention to one in the Ashur Library that possessed certain curious features. He sought permission to photograph that also, but permission was refused and the Codex withdrawn from access, as it was not consistent with orthodoxy to allow a Western scholar to have knowledge of such a text.

while dealing with the 'Uthmānic text, its collection, orthography, and the general Massoretic details with regard to it, dealt also with what was known of the Old Codices which it had replaced. The most famous of the three was that of Ibn al-Anbārī († 328), a work which was doubtless composed before the canonization by Ibn Muḥiḥ of the Seven Readers. The work is lost but from the use made of it by later writers such as-Suyūṭī, one gathers that it contained a certain amount of Ṭafsīr as well as information as to the readings from the Old Codices. The work of Ibn Ashta († 360) seems to have been of somewhat similar scope. He was a pupil of Ibn Muḥiḥ and wrote a special work al-Muṣūṣ on the subject of the uncanonical variants), besides this work on the Codices which was also used by as-Suyūṭī. The only work of this kind that has survived, however, is that of Ibn Abī Dāwūd († 316) which, unfortunately, seems to have been the narrowest in scope of them all.

'Abd Allāh b. Sulaymān b. al-Anbārī Abū Bakr b. Abī Dāwūd' as-Sijistānī was born in 230 A.H. the son of the Imām Abū Dāwūd whose collection ranks third among the canonical collections of Ḥadīth. He was born in Sijistān but his father took him early on his travels and he is said to have visited Khorasan, Ḥaftā, Fars, Bāṣra, Bāghdād, Kūfah, Madīnah, Mecca, Dāmascus, Egypt, al-Jazīra and ath-Thūrūr. In every place there were scholars his father set him to learn from them, so that he may be said to have been the pupil of most of the great savants of his day). There is a story that when he came to Kūfah he had only one dirham which he spent on thirty bushels of broad beans. Each day he ate a bushel of the beans and by the time they were finished he had mastered a thousand Traditions (or some say 30,000) from the Kūfī master Abū Sa‘īd al-Asḥaḥājī.

His chief fame all his lifetime was as a Traditioner. There is a story that he returned to Sijistān in the days of 'Amr b. al-
Laith and some of his fellow townsmen gathered, together to request him to recite to them Hadith that he had learned on his journeys. He refused on the ground that he had no book, but they retorted “What need has the son of Abu Dawud of books?” So he submitted with good grace and dictated a great number of Traditions from memory. When he got back to Baghdād he found that the story had preceded him and the Baghdādist were saying that he had fooled the innocents of Sijistān. But when they hired scribes to go to Sijistān and bring back copies of what Ibn Abu Dawud had dictated there, they found that on comparing them with the authorities in Baghdād they could find only six mistakes in all that he had dictated from memory.

In Qurānic studies he was a pupil of Abū Khalīl Sulaimān b. Khalīl († 261), Abū Zayd ʿUmar b. Shabba († 262), Yūnus b. Ḥabīb († 267), Murūz b. Ḩizm al-Tirmidhī (c. 260), and Yaʿqūb b. Sufyān († 277), and was one of the teachers of Ibn Mūjāhid († 324) and an-Naqqāsh († 351). He wrote a number of works on Qurānic subjects. In the Fihrist, pp. 232, 233 we find mentioned:

A book of Tafsīr (see also Fihrist 3411; Dhatībī, II, 80; al-Khaṭṭībī, IX, 464).
Kiṭāb an-Nisākīk wa l-Mansūkī (see Fihrist 3715; Dhatībī, II, 80).
Kiṭāb Naẓm al-Qurʾān.
Kiṭāb Fadlullī al-Qurʾān.
Kiṭāb Sharīf al-Tafsīr.
Kiṭāb Sharīf al-Muṣāfī.

Dhatībī also mentions a book called al-Qurʾān, which probably means his Kiṭāb al-Maṣūḥīf1), which is also sometimes called, though with less justice, Kiṭāb Ikhwāf al-Maṣūḥīf. Al-Khaṭṭīb mentions a book on gīrādat which may refer to the Maṣūḥīf-book or may be another work, for Abu l-Maṭḥalīn in an-Najīm an-Zāhīrī (Eg. ed. III, 222) mentions him as a writer on gīrādat.

There are a number of traditions going back to him that are not pleasing to orthodoxy and so there was put into circulation the legend that his father had branded him as a liar, and therefore no attention is to be paid to material that is dependent on his authority. This, of course, is tendential, and the biographers usually regard him as trustworthy (42), the Muṣāfī even noting that his father’s branding him as a liar was over something other than Hadith1). To the last he seems to have held the respect of his townspeople for there is a pleasing story of how when he was old and blind he used to come and sit on the minbar while his son Abū Maʾmūr would sit on the step below him with the book. From his book the son would mention the particular hadith and then from memory the old man would go on reciting to the people.

Of his Kiṭāb al-Maṣūḥīf there are three manuscripts known, one in the Zahirīya Library at Damascus (Hadith, No. 497), one in the Egyptian State Library (Qiraʾat, No. 504), and one in my own possession. Both these latter, however, are copies of the Zahirīya MS, so that we are really dependent on the one manuscript for establishing the text.

The number of actual variants given in this text is very small and obviously represents only those that happened to be found in his particular collection of traditions. Most of the variants he notes are also to be found in other Qurānic works. His chief importance is that he brings before us so many Codices of which we have no mention as much in any other source at present available. The Codices of Ibn Maṣūd, Ubāb b. Kaʾb, Ḥafṣa, Anas and others are mentioned in numerous other sources, but though we find numerous references to shāhidā readings of such early authorities as Ubāb b. Umr, ʿIrīna, al-Aʾmash, Saʾīd b. Jabur and others we did not know of actual Codices of theirs, though in some cases we strongly suspected their existence. An interpolation in the text (p. 50) might seem at the first glance to be seeking to avoid the implications of this fact by making Ibn Abū Dawūd say that he uses the word nuṣḥāf (Codex) in the sense of harf or qiraʾat (reading) so that the variants he quotes need not be regarded as coming from actual written Codices. There can be little doubt, however, that, when he speaks of the nuṣḥāf of So and So he really means a written Codex. In the case of most of the Codices he mentions

1) Fihrist 5611 attributes this book to his father Abū Dawūd the Traditionist.
we have, of course, ample evidence from other sources of their independent existence, and in the case of some others the nature of the variants quoted strongly suggests that they must have been derived from written Codices.

There are a few other Old Codices mentioned in other works which are not given by Ibn Abī Dāwūd. Adding them to his lists in the interests of completeness we can draw up the following scheme of the Old Codices.

(a) Primary Codices:
- Salīm †12.
- ʿUmar †23.
- Ubaʾī b. Kaʿb †29.
- Ibn Maṣʿūd †33.
- ʿAlī †40.
- ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmr †65.
- Ibn ʿAbbās †68.
- Ibn ʿAz-Zubair †73.
- Anas b. ʿUmair †74.
- Zaid b. Thābit †48.
- ʿAʾisha †58.
- Umm Salama †59.
- ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmr †65.
- ʿAlī †40.
- ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmr †65.
- Ibn ʿAbbās †68.
- Ibn ʿAz-Zubair †73.
- Anas b. ʿUmair †74.
- Zaid b. Thābit †48.
- ʿAʾisha †58.
- Umm Salama †59.

(b) Secondary Codices:
- ʿAlqama b. Qais †62.
- ʿAb-Raḥīm b. Khūthāmīn †64.
- Al-Ḥarīth b. Suwaid c. 70.
- Al-Awād †74.
- Hītān †73.
- Tallās b. Muṣarrif †112.
- Al-Aʾmash †148.
- Saʿīd b. Juḥār †94.
- Muḥājir †101.
- Iṭriḳīa †105.
- ʿAtāʾ b. ʿAbī Rabāḥ †115.
- Sālīḥ b. Kaisān †144.
- Jaʿfar aṣ-Ṣādiq †148.

All of which are based on the Codex of Ibn Maṣʿūd.

It is of course obvious that all the information we can gather regarding the text of these early Codices is of the utmost importance for the textual criticism of the Qurʾān. This in the absence of any direct manuscript evidence reveals our sole

It was at first thought that Dr. Mingana’s find in the palimpsest leaves published by him in 1914, Leaves from three ancient Qurʾāns: possibly for ʿUbayy, with a list of their variants, might provide us with fragments of one of these

witness to the types of text which ʿUthmān’s standard text superseded. It is possible, as we have already seen, that in choosing the Madinan text tradition for canonization ʿUthmān chose the best of the texts available. We can never know this for certain the same way or the other unless the unexpected happens and we recover some considerable portion of one of the rival texts. A collection of the variants still surviving from the Old Codices is our sole means of forming any judgment as to the type of text they presented.

The question arises, of course, to the authenticity of the readings ascribed to these Old Codices. In some cases it must be confessed there is a suspicion of readings later invented by the grammarians and theologians being fathered on these early authorities in order to gain the prestige of their name. This suspicion is perhaps strongest in the case of distinctively Shiʿa readings that are attributed to Ibn Maṣʿūd, and in readings attributed to the wives of the Prophet. It is also felt in regard to some of the readings attributed to Ibn ʿAbbās, who as the übermensch des tafsīr (Goldziher, Richtungen 65) tend to get his authority quoted for any and every matter connected with Qurʾānic studies. On the whole, however, one may feel confident that the majority of readings quoted from any Reader really go back to early authority.

The more difficult question is that of defective transmission. Occasionally in reading the Commentaries one finds a reading that is commonly known as coming from a certain early Reader attributed to quite another source. Where authorities can be weighed it is generally possible to decide which attribution is correct, but in cases where a variant is quoted by only one source which is otherwise known for the carelessness of its citation of authorities, one can never be sure that that particular variant is correctly attributed to the Reader given. A similar problem of accurate transmission naturally attaches to the variants themselves. Being uncanonical variants there was none of the

earlier Codices. Closer examination, however, has shown that neither they nor the curious variants found by him in Syriac in a MS of Barahlī (see an ancient Syriac Translation of the Qurʾān exhibiting new Verses and Variants, Manchester, 1953), have any relation to the text of these Old Codices with which we are here concerned. See Ber gratten, Geschichte des Quranetextes, pp. 53—57 and 97—102.
meticulous care taken over their transmission such as we find for the canonical readings, and we not infrequently have various forms of the variant attributed to the same Reader in different sources. In such cases nothing can be done but to give them all in the hope that further information may enable us to decide between them. Some of the variants in the form in which they have survived to us seem linguistically impossible, and in certain cases this has been noted in the source which quotes the variant. The defect is doubtless due to faulty transmission, and it is possible that some scholar may even now spot where the corruption lies and restore us the original reading.

Bergsträsser in his preliminary collection of the uncanonical readings of Ibn Mas‘ud and 'Ubayd 1) made an attempt to estimate the value of these two texts as compared with the ‘Uthmānic text. With the increase of material one feels less inclined to venture on such a judgment of value. It is true that in some cases the uncanonical variants from these Old Codices may be interpreted as improvements on the ‘Uthmānic text, as e.g. ُمَلَك نَابِيَة instead of َمَلَك نَابِيَة in II, 137/131 may have been suggested by motives of piety: or expansions thereof as in II, 275/276 where the added بَيْن الْيَبِّن may be regarded as an explanatory inflation. In such cases the ‘Uthmānic text would seem to be the more primitive text which the other types assume as their basis. But on the other hand there are equally many cases where the facts point the other way. For instance in II, 9/8 the ‘Uthmānic مِلْدَعَنْ may be regarded as an attempt to soften the idea of deceiving Allah which is suggested by the alternative reading مِلْدَعَنْ: or مَلَك in II, 196/192 may have been set for theological reasons instead of مَلَك, or the present form of II, 290/241 may be taken as an expansion of the simpler form given in the other Codices. Bergsträsser drew attention to the number of cases where the variant in the Old Codices was merely a synonym for the word in the text but the cases are about evenly balanced for the simpler word being in the ‘Uthmānic text or in the variant.

Remembering that we have in our hands only a very small portion of the variants from these Codices, and that what we have consists in the main only of such variants as were not too

1) Geschichte des Qurantextes, pp. 60–96.
Shawkānī, Fatḥ al-Qadīr, 5 vols., Cairo 1349.
Suyūṭī, Ad-Durr al-Manthūr fi 'Tafsīr al-Ma'thūr, 6 vols., Cairo 1314.
Suyūṭī, Al-Musāhir, 2 vols., Cairo 1282.
ʿUkbārī, 'Prāb al-Qirā‘āt ash-Shāhīda, MS Mingana Islamic Arabic 1649.

THE OLD CODICES

(a) Primary Codices.
Codex of Ibn Mas‘ūd.
Codex of Ubay b. Ka‘b.
Codex of ‘Alī.
Codex of Ibn ʿAbbās.
Codex of Abū Mūsā.
Codex of Ḥafṣa.
Codex of Anas b. Malik.
Codex of ʿUmar.
Codex of Ẓaid b. Thābit.
Codex of Ibn ʿAz-Zubair.
Codex of Ibn ʿAmr.
Codex of Ṭā‘īsha.
Codex of Salīm.
Codex of Umm Salama.
Codex of ʿU바id b. ʿUmair.
CODEX OF IBN MAS'UD † 33

‘Abdullah b. Mas'ud sometimes quoted in the sources as 'Abd Allah and sometimes as Ibn Umm 'Abd) was a Companion and one of the early Muslims who could boast that he had joined the faith earlier than Umar. As a youth he had herded cattle for Uqba b. Abi Mu'ahj and so was sometimes referred to contemptuously as the Hudhali slave (Tabari, Annals, 1, 2812). When he became a Muslim he attached himself to the Prophet and became his personal servant. He went on the Hijra to Abyssinia and also to Madina and was present at both Badr and Uhud. It was his boast that he had learned some seventy Suras directly from the mouth of the Prophet, and tradition has it that he was one of the first to teach Qur'an reading (Ibn Sa'd, III, i, 107). He seems not to have been a great success when tried in an official capacity, but at Kufa, to which the Caliph sent him, he became famous as a Traditionalist and as an authority on the Qur'an. Tradition tells that he was one of the four to whom Muhammad advised his community to turn for instruction in the Qur'an. It was doubtless his close personal contact with the Prophet over so many years that gave such prestige to his opinions on Sunna and Qur'an.

We have no information as to when he began to make his Codex. Apparently he began to collect material during the lifetime of the Prophet and worked it up into Codex form when he was established at Kufa and was looked to as the authority on Qur'anic matters. At any rate we find his Codex in use there and followed by the Kafans before the official Recension was made by 'Uthman. When 'Uthman sent to Kufa the official copy of his standard text with orders that all other texts should be burned, Ibn Mas'ud refused to give up his copy, being indignant that the text established by a young upstart like Zaid b. Thabit should be given preference to his, since he had been a Muslim while Zaid was still in the loins of an unbeliever. There seems to have been considerable difference of opinion in Kufa over this question of the Codex, some accepting the new text sent by 'Uthman, but a great many continuing to hold by the Codex of Ibn Mas'ud which by that time had come to be regarded as the Kafani text. The strength of the position of his Codex in Kufa is well illustrated by the number of secondary Codices of which some information has come down to us and which followed the text of Ibn Mas'ud. It was from its vogue in Kufa that his Codex came to be favoured by Shi'a circles, though one is not disposed to accept as genuine all the Shi'a readings that are attributed to his Codex, nor indeed those found in Sunni sources in favour of Ahi al-Bait.

It was well known in the early days of Islam that one peculiarity of Ibn Mas'ud's Codex was that it did not contain Suras I, CXIII and CXIV, i.e. the Fatiha, which is an opening prayer to the book, and the Musawwiatulnati with which it ends. Modern scholarship on quite other grounds holds that these were not originally part of the Qur'an but are of the nature of liturgical additions. That Ibn Mas'ud knew of these passages as used liturgically is evident from the fact that we have preserved to us notes of words in which he differed from the customary way of reading them.

A second peculiarity equally well known was that the order of Suras in his recension differed considerably from that of 'Uthman's recension. Two lists giving this Sura order have been preserved to us, which do not, however, entirely agree with one another. The earlier is that given by Ibn an-Nadim (377) in the Fihrist p. 26 (ed. Flügel) on the authority of Al-Faḍl b. Shadhān († before 280), which runs as follows:

1) Ibn Abi Dhiyān p. 13 ff.
3) On them see Nöldeke-Schwalbe I, 108 ff. The Fatiha was apparently added to some copies that gave Ibn Mas'ud's text. Cf. Iqdān, 152, 187 and the statement of Ibn an-Nadim, Fihrist 36.
4) This is the date he is said to have finished the Fihrist: the date of his death is uncertain.
The Suras missing here are 1, 15, 18, 20, 27, 42, 89, 113, 114. That Suras 1, 113, 114 were omitted in his Codex we have already seen, but as variants from all the others omitted here are found quoted from him the material of which they are composed must have been in his Codex. Indeed they are all to be found in the list of the Suras given in the Itiqān. When we examine these missing Suras we discover that 15 is the last in the 19th Sura (19) and is suspected to have had some connection therewith (Goosens in *Der Islam* XIII, 211); 20 is the sole Sura; 27 is the Sura which breaks in between two Suras; 42 is the Sura which breaks into the 42nd Sura, so that one may suspect that there is something behind their omission in the Fihrist. Yet in view of the fact that the missing Suras are in the list in the Itiqān, and the Fihrist itself expressly says that it reckoned 110 Suras whereas there are only 105 in the list, the probability is that the list as we have it has been defectively written.

The second list is in the Itiqān of as-Suyūṭī (ed. Calcutta, p. 151), quoting from Ibn Ashta a statement going back to Jarīr b. 'Abd al-Hamīd († 188), who related traditions from al-A'mash and others of Ibn Mas'ūd's school 1). This list runs:


Here we find missing besides the expected 1, 113, 114, the Suras 50, 57, 69, for whose omission no reason can be suggested save that they may have dropped out by scribal error. Well-known variants are quoted from each of them and they are all in the list in the Fihrist. The two lists correspond sufficiently closely for us to supply the missing members of the one from the other, and we may treat them as variants of a common tradition as to the Sura order in Ibn Mas'ūd's Codex.

The value of this tradition is another matter 2). It is not a priori likely that the arrangement of material in any of the rival Codices would have followed the same combination into Suras as in the text established for 'Uthmān by Zaid b. Thābit. In the accounts of that official Recension we find bits of material coming in and the Committee considering the most appropriate place to put them, and it is against all probability that the composite Suras made up of bits of Meccan and bits of Madinan material, of very different date and provenance, would have been fitted in exactly the same way by different collectors. Neither is it likely that the different collectors would have chosen the same titles for the Suras. The traditions as to the Sura order, in the case of this and of other of the Old Codices, come from persons who were familiar with the 'Uthmānic Sura order, but knew that the material was differently disposed in the other

1) In Tāhāt, *Annals*, 1, 1963 the Sura of Yūnis which is the Tenth Sura in modern editions is called the Seventh as here. Schwally suggests a misprint in the text of Tāhāt of 'al-Asma'iyah instead. See Bauer in ZDMG, LXXV, 15.
2) The text reads ʿal-Asmaʾiyah, which is the title of Sura 54, but as this is given later under the title of Sura 55 we must with Flügel, *Abhandlungen* 14 correct to ʿal-Asmaʾiyah which, as Schwally notes, is confirmed by the Itiqān.
3) ʿal-Asmaʾiyah means the group of Suras beginning with ʿal-ʾĀlam and is here doubtless but an introductory title to the group of six succeeding Suras.
4) This Sūra which gave Schwally trouble and was also a puzzle to Flügel is clearly but part of the title of Sura 59. There was a group of Sūras called ʿal-ʾĀlam, Sūra 57, 59, 61, 62, 64 (See Bauer in ZDMG, LXXV, 16). Fihrist says that some gave 58 as coming before 59.
5) Ibn Ḥajar Taḫqīḥ, II, 75—77.
6) There is a statement in the Fihrist, p. 26 from Mālik b. Idrīs, that there were many Codices in existence purporting to be exemplars of Ibn Mas'ūd's Codex, but no two of them agreed with one another. Ibn as-Nadīm claims to have seen a very old copy in which the Fihrist was included.
Codices, and so constructed a Surah list to express the difference. The variant readings which follow are necessarily arranged according to the order of the present official text. Sometimes in the sources the variant is expressly said to come from the Codex of Ibn Mas'ud. More often it is merely given as a reading (ṣūrā or qirā'āt) of Ibn Mas'ud. Occasionally also readings are given as coming from the Companions of Ibn Mas'ud, but as these obviously represent the tradition as to his text they are included here. In view of the great importance of the readings of Ibn Mas'ud and Ubai, all readings from them that survive are included in the lists even where they do not depend on a different consonantal text from that of 'Uthmān. It has also seemed worth while to note the places where they are especially recorded as supporting the textus receptus.

1) An alternative theory is that when the 'Uthmānic text was in general currency the material in Ibn Mas'ud's Codex was arranged in new copies made thereof under the Surah headings of the 'Uthmānic text, though not in the same order. It is obvious, of course, that later writers using material from one of these Old Codices would quote it according to Surah and verse of the 'Uthmānic text.

**Sūra I**

4/3: الالك - He agreed with TR against the alternative reading علمت which, however, some gave from him also.


7/6: سف - So read also by 'Ali and Ibn az-Zubair.

7: - So read by 'Ali and Ibn az-Zubair.

**Sūra II**

2/1: - which involves کُنْتُك. It has been generally held that in this case the reading غُصُنَ which involves the Qumran MS. is the correct one. However, some said غُصُنَ. Given from Friends of Ibn Mas'ud.

9/5: - So read by Abū Ḥaiwa.

14/13: - So also Ubai.

17/16: - āsimā. Purely orthographic variant.

18/17: - 'Umar b. Abī Talib and Ḥaṭṭa. See also Ubai's reading.

20/19: - Thus read by 'Ali.

23/21: - which makes the following a zā'īda.

24/22: - or.

26/24: سَقَطَ، but others say he read سَقَطَ without.

So read by Ra'uba b. al-Jajjaj and others.

So by Zaid b. 'Ali and Ubai.

31/29: سَقَطَ. See also Ubai's reading.

32/30: سَقَطَ. See also Ubai.

36/34: سَقَطَ. So read also by al-'A'mash.

40/38: سَقَطَ, So read by 'Ala' b. Musarrif.

42/38: نَتَكْمِيْنَ. This is a reading with Idghám.

46/43: نَتَكْمِيْنَ. As read by 'Alqama and Ibn 'Abbas.

48/45: نَتَكْمِيْنَ, So Ubai, al-'A'mash and al-Hasan. It was also written thus in some of the 'Uthmānic Codices.

50/46: نَتَكْمِيْنَ. So read also by al-Hasan.

51/48: نَتَكْمِيْنَ. Thus also Ibn Abī 'Ablab.

61/58: نَتَكْمِيْنَ, So Qatāda, Ibn Waththāb and others.

As read by 'Alqama and Ibn 'Abbas.

Re: "تَكَمِّيْنَ". So Ubai, al-'A'mash and al-Hasan. It was also written thus in some of the 'Uthmānic Codices.

65/61: نَتَكْمِيْنَ, or some said نَتَكْمِيْنَ.

68/64: سَقَطَ. This is a reading with Idghám.

70/62: سَقَطَ, So read by Ubai, Tkrima and Ya'yū b. Ya'mar.

68/64: سَقَطَ, or some said سَقَطَ, or سَقَطَ which latter was the reading of al-Hasan and al-‘A’mash.

72/67: سَقَطَ. Read thus by Abū Ḥaiwa.


83/77: سَقَطَ, supporting the reading of Ḥammāz, al-Kisa'i and Ya'qūb.

85/79: سَقَطَ, a reading which some gave from Abū 'Amr also.

87/81: سَقَطَ. Purely orthographical variant.

89/83: سَقَطَ, So given in Ubai's Codex.

90/90: سَقَطَ. See also Ubai.

100/94: سَقَطَ. So read also by al-Hasan.

101/95: سَقَطَ. Thus also Ibn Abī 'Ablab.

102/96: سَقَطَ, or some said سَقَطَ.

104/98: سَقَطَ, or some said سَقَطَ.

105/99: سَقَطَ. So read by Abū l-'Aliya and al-'A'mash also.

111/105: سَقَطَ, Some say that he here read سَقَطَ as Ubai.

119/113: مَّتَّىٰ مَّسَّ أَنْ تَمُرَّ،
123/117: لَا تَخْرُجِي لَتُحْرِى.
124/118: تُقَلِّبُونَ — تُقَلِّبُونَ.
127/121: بَرَبَّوْنَا — بَرَبَّوْنَا.
128/122: أَرْمَىْ مَالِكُهُمْ وَسَيْسَمَ عَلَيْهِمْ. — أَرْمَىْ مَالِكُهُمْ وَسَيْسَمَ عَلَيْهِمْ.
132/126: أُوْصِيْ، — أُوْصِيْ،
As read also by ad-Ḍāḥīk.

137/131: أَنَّ هَذَا — بَيْنَ. As was read also by Ibn 'Abbas.
139/133: أَنْ هَذَا — أَنْ هَذَا.
So read by Ibn Mūhāsin and Abū's-Sammāl.
144/139: (؟) فَلَمْ — تَطَوَّرَ?
148/143: وَكَلَّمَ جَمَعَ رَوْحَانِي — وَكَلَّمَ جَمَعَ رَوْحَانِي. Mansūr from Ibn Masʿūd.
149/144: قُلْ — قُلْ.
150/145: أَسْمَىْ — أَسْمَىْ.

158/153: لَا — لَا
Similarly in Ubāi's Codex.
162/157: يَكُونُونَ — يَكُونُونَ. Making Allah the subject. So read also by Taḥha.

177/172: لَا تَصِبْ مَا أَكَضُوا — لَا تَصِبْ مَا أَكَضُوا.
So read by all save the Kīfāns. Al-A'mash, however, said that Ibn Masʿūd read لَا تَصِبْ مَا أَكَضُوا and Ibn Abī Dāwūd gives it as لَا تَصِبْ مَا أَكَضُوا.
As read also by Ubāi.

178/173: يَهُودُوْم — يَهُودُوْم.
184/180: أَمَّا مَعَوْدَاتَ — أَمَّا مَعَوْدَاتَ.
So Ibn Dharr read.


191/187: لَا تَطْلَعْمُ عِنْدَ الْمَسِيحَ الْأَقْصَى — لَا تَطْلَعْمُ عِنْدَ الْمَسِيحَ الْأَقْصَى.
which was the reading of Hāmza and al-Kisūf.

196/192: أُفَوَّمَا — أُفَوَّمَا.
So read by 'Alī and 'Alqama.
Similarly 'Alī read أُفَوَّمَا which some gave from Ibn Maṣūd.

197/193: حَدِيثُ — حَدِيثُ.

198/194: أَرْمَىْ — أَرْمَىْ.
Abī Ubaid said he added مِنْ رَمَيْنَ مِنْ رَمَيْنَ مِنْ رَمَيْنَ and Abī Dāwūd says he read لا جَالِحُ عَلَيْمُ أَبَنَيْنَ فَصِلَلَا من رَمَيْنَ مِنْ رَمَيْنَ. Fāvīq al-Hadīth.

202/198: قِبْضَةٌ، مَا أَكَضُوا — قِبْضَةٌ مَا أَكَضُوا.
So read by al-A'mash also.

203/199: لَقَدْ رَجَوْنَ لَنْ يَخْلُو — لَقَدْ رَجَوْنَ لَنْ يَخْلُو.

204/200: فَصِلَلَا — فَصِلَلَا. As the reading of Ubāi.

210/206: يَا أَبَاءِ — يَا أَبَاءِ.
As Qatādā, Abū Jaʿfar and ad-Ḍāḥīk. Ibn Abī Dāwūd, however, says he read as Ubāi.
As Ibn Abi 'Abba. See also Ubai's reading.

212/208: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר, i.e. with ṭālāfā. So Ubai.

213/209: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר, Likewise Ubai.

214/210: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר, Tabari adds ʿIlāl al-ʾislām. So read also by al-Ḥasan.

217/214: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר, So read also by al-Aʿmash.

219/216: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר, which was the reading of Ḥamza and al-Kisāʾi.

222: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר. Note Ubai's reading.

226: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר. Note Ubai's variant here.

228: Which was Ubai's reading also.

229: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר. Some, however, said he read ʿalāla. See also Ubai.

233: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר. As Ibn 'Abba.


237: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר. As Ubai.

238/239: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר. so, as in the Codices of Ubai and ʿUthmān.

240/241: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר. See also Ubai.

241/242: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר. As Ubai.

249/250: אִמְרָא שָׁנֶגֶד אֶת הָאָמֹר, which was the reading of Ubai and al-Aʿmash.
the reading of 'Umar, and ad-Daḥḥāk, but some said he read: 

(C) plural form).

as the reading of al-'A'mash, so 284: 42/37: So read by 'Abdallah b. Umar.

so read by 'Ali.

though others say he read as did Abū Razīn.

Abū Razīn.

SūRA III

2/1: as in II, 256/256.

3/2: 43/38: 44/40: Cf. v. 33. 48/43: and al-Kisā',

likewise for

though some thought this was the reading of Ubay.

So read also by Tālḥa b. Muṣarrif.

and al-Jaḥdari. See also Ubay’s reading here.

See also Ubay’s reading.

So read by Ibn Abī Ḥābla.

à reading also given from the Imāms of Ahl al-Bait.

a purely orthographic variant.
80/74: ُبُعِّلَةٍ - مَّ نَ بَ غُرْرِيَ. So Ubai and Mujāhid.
81/75: ُبُعِّلَةٍ - ُبُعِّلَةٍ - ُبُعِّلَةٍ - ُبُعِّلَةٍ. So Ubai and Mujāhid.
145/140: ُقَرْنَ - ُقَرْنَ - ُقَرْنَ - ُقَرْنَ - ُقَرْنَ - ُقَرْنَ - ُقَرْنَ. The reading of Ibn Kathīr and Niḥf. But some said he read ُقَرْنَ as ُقَرْنَ as ُقَرْنَ. See also the reading of Ubai and Ibn 'Abbas.
161/155: ُفَلَيْلَ - ُفَلَيْلَ - ُفَلَيْلَ - ُفَلَيْلَ - ُفَلَيْلَ. which was the reading of Niḥf', Ibn 'Amir, Ḥamza, al-Kisā'ī, and Ya'qūb.
169/163: ُفَلَيْلَ - ُفَلَيْلَ. So read also by Ubai.
Involving the omission of "بَأَسِيَ". See also Ubai's reading here.

20/24: فَبَثَّ مَسْكَنُ مِنْ ذَهَبٍ - فَبَثَّ مَسْكَنُ مِنْ ذَهَبٍ.


24/28: وَفَضَّلَ مَا نَفَرَانَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ نَارِهِ - وَفَضَّلَ مَا نَفَرَانَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ نَارِهِ.

25/30: - He agreed with TR against the alternative وَفَضَّلَ مَا نَفَرَانَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ نَارِهِ.

26/30: So Ubai and Ibn ‘Abbās.


34/38: فَأَكَثَرَ مَعَ اِبْنِ عَلَيْ بَيْنَ اِبْنِ عَلَيْ وَعُثَامَانَ - فَأَكَثَرَ مَعَ اِبْنِ عَلَيْ بَيْنَ اِبْنِ عَلَيْ وَعُثَامَانَ.

53/56: ٍفَرَزْنِي لا يَرْقُمُ - هَٰلَكَ لا يَرْقُمُ. As Ibn ‘Abbās, though some said he read يَرْقُمُ.

55/58: صَدَّ - صَدَّ (Pass.). So read also by Ibn ‘Abbās, Tkrīma, and al-Jahdari. See also Ubai’s reading here.

56/59: كَلْنا - كَلْنا. A purely orthographic variant.


59/62: وَالْأَرْبَعِ - وَالْأَرْبَعِ.

60/63: يَبْعَلْ - يَبْعَلْ. So read by ‘Abbās b. al-Fadl.

66/69: - يُذَلِّلُ - يُذَلِّلُ. As in the Codices of Anas, Ubai and that of Damascus.

74/76: سَعْرَيْتُ - سَعْرَيْتُ. So Ubai.

75/77: أَخْرَجَهُمْ من الدَّرِيْرَةِ - أَخْرَجَهُمْ من رُهْقَةِ الدَّرِيْرَةِ اَمْنَاءً - كَاذَبَتْ طَائِلَةً.

78/81: وَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآياَتِنَا - وَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآياَتِنَا وَكَفَرُوا بِآياَتِنَا. So al-Sa‘d b. al-Qasim cited by Ibn ‘Abbās as Ubai, but others said that Ubai did say اَمْنَاءً. Some said اَمْنَاءً and yet others اَمْنَاءً which was given as the reading of Ibn ‘Abbās.

81/83: بَيْنَ مَا يَسْأَلُونَ مِنْ يَدُهُ - بَيْنَ طَائِلَةِ طَائِلَةِ.


88/90: - أَرْكَمْ - أَرْكَمْ. Or some said أَرْكَمْ. See also the reading of Ubai.

91/93: - أَرْكَمْ - أَرْكَمْ. Or some said أَرْكَمْ.


A reading also given from the Prophet.

He omitted as did Uba'i.

So al-A'mash. Some, however, say he read.

See also Uba'i's reading.

So also Uba'i and Ibn Abi Isbaq.

Read thus also by Ibn Abi Isbaq.

So Uba'i also.

The reading also of Zaid b. 'Ali and Abū Nabhāk.

Read thus by Uba'i, Anas, al-Jahdāri and Sa'id b. Jubair.

As was read also by as-Sulami and Uba'i.

So Uba'i and Zaid b. 'Ali.

SURA V

1: So Uba'i and Zaid b. 'Ali.

2: So Ibn 'Abbās and al-A'mash.

2/3: So Uba'i and Zaid b. 'Ali.

SURA VI

16: صَوْفُكَ أَنَّىٰ - صَوْفُكَ. So Ubai.

19: وَأَنَاٰ - وَأَنَاٰ.

23: وَيَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُواٰ - هَمْ لَنْ يَكُن ضَرْعُكُمُ. Others, however, say he read هَمْ لَنْ يَكُن ضَرْعُكُمُ. as Ubai and al-A’maash.


52: وَالْقُرْآنِ - وَالْقُرْآنِ. So Abi’l-Aliya.

56: مَا يَعْلَمُ - مَا يَعْلَمُ. which was the reading of Qatada, Ta’lha and Abi’l-Aliya.

57: يَجِّلِضُ يَا أَحَبُّ - يَجِّلِضُ يَا أَحَبُّ. So Ubai and an-Nakha’i.

61: وَكُلُّ هُدَيَّةٰ - وَكُلُّ هُدَيَّةٰ. So read by al-A’maash.


71: ۚ تَرَبَّىٰ - ۚ تَرَبَّىٰ.

107/108: سُخُوتُ الذَّاتِ - أسُخُوتُ الذَّاتِ. So Ubai ‘Abbás. It was the reading of Hamza and Ya’qub. See also the reading of Ubai.
SURA VII

20/19: أَوْرُنَ - وَرُنَ. So read also by Ubai.

23/22: نَأْوَأَ رَبِّيَّ أَلاَّ تُقْرَرَ - نَأْوَأَ نَأْوَأَ عَلَيْنَا أَمَّمُ أَنَّ مَعْذَرَهُ لَنَرَحْبَ أَنَا. So read also by Ubai.

26/25: حَبَّ - نَذَلَّ حَبَّ. So read also by Ubai.

34/32: أَضْعَفُ مَا أَضْعَفْتُ - أَضْعَفْتُ مَا أَضْعَفْتُ. So Ubai and 'Iśār Thaqafi.

38/38: أَلَّا أَكْرَمْكُمْ - أَكْرَمْكُمْ. So Ubai. Some said he read

40/38: أَكْرَمْ مَعَ أَكْرَمْ، but some said أَكْرَمْ مَعَ أَكْرَمْ. Others said

47/45: مَثَّلَ - مَثَّلَ. So Qatada and Abū Razin.

57/55: أَيْمَّكُ - أَيْمَّكُ. So al-'A'mash and Sulaim.

105/103: أَلَّمْ أَنَّهُ - أَلَّمْ أَنَّهُ. though some said that he read أَن كَانَ as Ubai.

127/124: كَبَرْنَا - كَبَرْنَا. like Anas and Nu'man b. Maisara. See also Ubai's reading which some gave from Ibn Mas'ud here.

158/154: وَمَا ذَكَرْنَ - وَمَا ذَكَرْنَ. though some said وَمَا ذَكَرْنَ. See Ubai.

154/155: الْأَعْلَى أَحَسَّ - الْأَعْلَى أَحَسَّ. See also Ubai's reading.

158/159: يَسَّعُ َبِسَيْنَ (bīs) - يَسَّعُ َبِسَيْنَ (bīs). So read by Ubai and Ja'far b. Muhammad.

159/160: مَرَّتْ. He supported Hafs against the مَرَّتْ of Ḥammāz, al-Kisā'i, 'Ali and al-Hasan.

137/133: فِيَّ - فِيَّ. See Ubai's reading.

145/142: بِأَحْمَدٍ - بِأَحْمَدٍ. So read also Ubai's reading.

148/146: حَمَّرْ - حَمَّرْ. the reading of Ḥammāz, al-Kisā'i and others.

By some it is given as the reading of the Friends of Ibn Mas'ud.

149/148: بِأَنْ - بِأَنْ. the reading of Ḥammāz, al-Kisā'i and others.

154/153: مُنْكَرَ. See also Ubai's reading.

170/169: فِيَّ أَلسَّنَ أَسْمَعْكُمْ - فِيَّ أَلسَّنَ أَسْمَعْكُمْ. So al-'A'mash. See also Ubai's reading.

171/170: فِيَّ - فِيَّ. So read also by Ibn 'Abbās.
SURA VIII

1. 'Asy’at al-An‘am - يُستكثَّر في الإثعال.
   Others.
   بَسْتَكْثَر فِي اثْثَعْلِمِمْ بَيْنَ يَمِينَ - يَمِينَ. Given from the Friends of Ibn Mas‘ud.

2. See also Ubai’s reading.

6. 6.

14. هذا - ذلك.

19. إنّ الله - يَنّ نَبِيٍّ.

25. So Ubai and many others, but some said he read أنْ يُصْبَحٍ.

27. (second occurrence) - َلا يُصْبِحٍ.

38/39. لا يُصْبِحٍ - َلا يُصْبِحٍ, which necessitates لَكَر instead of لَم.

42/43. بِالْمَلْكِ - بِالْمَلْكِ.

57/59. َلا يُصْبِحٍ - َلا يُصْبِحٍ, which some gave also from al-A‘mash.

Others, however, only note the addition of َلا يُصْبِحٍ.

SURA IX

In Ibn Mas‘ud’s Codex this Sura had the Basmala.

7. لَاتِي النَّفَرِينَ - كَفَتْ بُكْرَةُ السَّمَعِ.
   But some said he read عليهُ عَنْدَ أَبَوِهِ وَقَدَّمَ.

8. 8.

21. يَوْمَايْمَرْ - يَوْمَايْمَرْ.

28. عَلَيْهِ - عَلَيْهِ, which was the reading of al-Ja‘far and Ya‘qub.

37. So read also by Zaid b. ‘Ali.

38: لا يَنَبِّيغُ - أَتَأَفَّذِلَ. It was the reading of al-A‘mash.

47: هُوَ - هُوَ.

51: َبُنَى - َبُنَى, but some say he read َبُنَى as did Talha.

54: َمُحَوْبَهُ - َمُحَوْبَهُ.

61: َمُحَوْبَهُ - َمُحَوْبَهُ.

61/62: َمُحَوْبَهُ - َمُحَوْبَهُ, Which was the reading of Hamza, al-A‘mash and ‘Ali.

81/82: يَمْنُقُّ النَّفَرْ - يَمْنُقُّ النَّفَرْ.


107/108: َلَا يُصْبِحٍ - َلَا يُصْبِحٍ.

109/110: َلَا يُصْبِحٍ - َلَا يُصْبِحٍ. See also Ubai’s reading here.

110/111: َلَا يُصْبِحٍ - َلَا يُصْبِحٍ. Some gave Talha’s reading َلَا يُصْبِحٍ, as from the Friends of Ibn Mas‘ud.

See also Ubai’s reading.

111/112: َلا يُصْبِحٍ - َلا يُصْبِحٍ, a reading given from ‘Umar and al-A‘mash also.

112/113: َلا يُصْبِحٍ - َلا يُصْبِحٍ, etc. - َلا يُصْبِحٍ, which some gave also from al-A‘mash.

So Ubai.

117/118: مَا كَلَتْ مَعِيْنٌ - مَا كَلَتْ مَعِيْنٌ. See Ubai.

119/120: بِالْمَلْكِ - بِالْمَلْكِ. So read by Ibn ‘Abbas also.


So by Ibn ‘Abbas.

126/127: َلا يُصْبِحٍ - َلا يُصْبِحٍ, as Ubai and al-A‘mash, but some say he read َلا يُصْبِحٍ.
SURA X

2:  عَبْدُ - عَبْدٍ. Ibn ‘Abbās so read also.


11/12:  يَدُودُ - يَدُود. So Ubay.


30/31:  نَفَاىَ - نَفَاىَ. So read by Ibn ‘Abī ‘Ala. See also Ubay’s reading.

35/36:  كَرَّ - كَرَّ. The reading of Hamza, al-Kisā‘i and al-A‘mash,

and said by some to have been the reading of Zaid b. ‘Ali.

SURA XI

92:  يُنْبِكُ - يُنْبِكُ. So read by Ubay and Ibn as-Sam‘ānī.

93:  يُنْبِكُ - يُنْبِكُ. Some however, say he read يُنْبِكُ.

98:  قُورُوجُ - قُورُوجُ. So read by Ubay also.


13/16:  يُصَعَرُ - يُصَعَرُ. So Ubay.

16/19:  يَطْلَبُ - يَطْلَبُ. So Ubay, and given by some from ‘Asim.


28/30:  أَنْ تَرَى - أَنْ تَرَى. He omitted the words من عينيه.

38/40:  كَيْنَانِ - كَيْنَانِ. A purely orthographic variant.

41/43:  حَمَّرَةً - حَمَّرَةً. He supported TR against the alternative reading حَمَّرَةً.

44/46:  وَدَعَسَتْ - وَدَعَسَتْ. as read by Isā ath-Thaqafi and al-A‘mash.

46/48:  أَنْ تَمُّ أَنَّا - أَنْ تَمُّ أَنَّا. And some say A‘mash.

49/51:  مِنْ قَالَ هَذَا الْفَرْقَانُ - مِنْ قَالَ هَذَا. So read by Hubaira ‘an Ḥafṣ.

57/60:  كَانَ - كَانَ. So read by Hubaira. Some said Ibn Mas‘ūd

read كَانَ. So read by Hubaira. Some said Ibn Mas‘ūd

read كَانَ.

71/74:  كَانَاتِهَا - كَانَاتِهَا. But others say كَانَاتِهَا and

others add that he read فَإِنْ كَانَتِهَا instead of إِنْ كَانَتِهَا.


78/80:  آخَذْتُ - آخَذْتُ.
81/83: He omitted the words "ولا بلغت نكر أحد" but some say that after "ولقد وفدنا على أهلهم كله من غير محرَّر" he added "آلامك..." (reminiscent of XXVI, 170, 171).

101/103: أَنْفَسْتَ أَنْفَسِي (without) َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ.

105/107: So al-'A'ishah. Others say he read بَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ like Ubaib.

111/113: َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ.

116/118: So read by Zaid b. 'Ali.

116/118: َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ.

SURA XII

8: َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ.

10: َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ. َبَيْنَ النَّفْسِ وَالْأَمْرِ.

117: َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا.

18: َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا.

22: َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا.

23: َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا.

25: َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا.

31: َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا. َفَرَحُوا وَقَلِيلًا.
SURA XIII

4: 76. فَطَعَّلَهَا مَا بَيَاءَ جَاءَهَا وَبَلَغَهَا عَلَى نَفْسِهَا وَبَعَضَهَا عَلَى نَفْسِهَا. So read also by Ubai and Ibn Qais.

8/9: 77. يَرَبِّ. but others say he read

10/11: 78. وَقَرْنَ. حَسَبًا - سَالِبًا. So read by Ubai and an-Nakha'i.

11/12: 79. مُسَبِّبًا - مُسَبِّبًا. So read by Ubai and an-Nakha'i.

14/15: 80. يَنْحُونَ omitting and ya'llin yuhun; Ya'llin yuhun; Ya'llin yuhun; Ya'llin yuhun; Ya'llin yuhun; Ya'llin yuhun;

16/17: 81. So Ubai. [i.e. with omission of and idghām of t with d or t]مُسَبِّبًا - مُسَبِّبًا. So read also by Ubai and Zaid b. 'Ali.

19: 82. وَقَرْنَ. حَسَبًا - سَالِبًا. So Ib'n Dharr.

26: 83. يَقُرُّرُ لَهُ - يَقُرُّرُ. بَيْطَسَم - بَيْطَسَم. So also Abi 'l-Bashashim. See also Ubai's reading.
SURA XVI

9:  "Alqamii". Said to have been so read by 'Ali also.


19:  "Ma-shakkar malakatii". So Talha b. Musarrif.


28/30:  "Malakatii". Similarly in v. 34.


41/43:  "Malakatii". So read by 'Ali, Nu'a'm b. Miasara and others.

43/45:  "Malakatii". So Ubay and Abi 'l-Barhshim.

48/50:  "Malakatii". So read by Ubay and Abi 'l-Barhshim.

51/53:  "Malakatii". So read by Ubay and Abi 'l-Barhshim.

54/56:  "Malakatii". So read by Ubay and Abi 'l-Barhshim.

62/64:  "Malakatii". Agreeing with the reading of Warsh.

65/67:  "Malakatii". Agreeing with the reading of Nafi', Iba' Amir and 'Ya'qub.

67/69:  "Malakatii". Agreeing with the reading of Nafi', Iba' Amir and 'Ya'qub.

69/71:  "Malakatii". Agreeing with the reading of Nafi', Iba' Amir and 'Ya'qub.

71/73:  "Malakatii". Agreeing with the reading of Nafi', Iba' Amir and 'Ya'qub.
SURA XVII

1: إِنَّ ذَٰلِكَ لَا يَضُرُّكَ شَيْئًا - إِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ رَّحِيمٌ.
4: فَبِأَيِّ نِعْمَةِ رَبِّكَ مَنْ يَمُتَّ أَنْ تُؤْمِنُ بِهِ - مَا ذَٰلِكَ لَا يَضُرُّكَ شَيْئًا.
5: مَثْلاً كَذُٰلِكَ سَأَّلَاهُ مُحَمَّدُ - عَلِيٌّ صَالِحٌ.
9: يَوْمَ يُبَصِّرُكُمُ الْمَيْلَتَينَ - مَيِّتًا وَكُنُوبًا.
23/24: وَأَمَّا ۚ يَوْمَ يُرَيَّ مَعْرُوفًا - عَذَابًا. So Ubai.

SURA XVIII

1: يَا يَطَّخُ مَعَنَا دِينَكَ - یسَبِيلَ ۚ أَنْ تَهْتَمَّ وَأَنْ تَعْمَلَانِ.
69/62: آَمَنَّا بِأَنَّ أَدْرَكَهُ الْجَيْشُ‭ -‬لَا تَرْسِخِي‭ -‬but others say his only variant was أَمَّا أَدْرَكَهُ الْجَيْشُ‭.

70/72: فَرَأَيْتُ‭ -‬أَرَى‭ -‬they say.

78/55: حَسَبُ‭ -‬حَسَبِ. Some, however, give this only from Ubai.

79/78: سَيْفُهُ‭ -‬سيف. So Ubai.

80/79: إِلَّا أَفْضَلُ‭ -‬فَضْلُ. Some, however, give this only from Ubai.


96/95: زُوَّرَ‭ -‬زور. So read also by Ibn Qais.


SCRA XIX

2, 3/1, 2: He read زَيْكَ رَجَعَهُ رَجَع. See Ubai's reading.
72/73:  نِمْ - نِمْ. So read by Ubai, al-Jahdari and others.
74/75:  وَرَيِّي - وَرِيي. So Ikrima and al-Jahdari. See also Ubai's reading.
75/77:  وَاللَّهُ يُعَفِّفُ - المَعْلُوّمِينَ.
90/92:  وَيَسْتَسْرُوكَ مَا بَحَتَ وَبَايِبَا كَرَّى لا سَلَى - وَيَسْتَسْرُوكَ مَا بَحَتَ وَبَايِبَا كَرَّى وَيَسْتَسْرُوكَ مَا بَحَتَ وَبَايِبَا كَرَّى.
93/94:  إِلَّا أَنَّهُ الْحَسْرُحُ كَذَٰلِكَ أَنَّهُ الْحَسْرُحُ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ الْحَسْرُحُ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ الْحَسْرُحُ.
97:  لَهُمْ - لَهُمْ.

SURA XX

1:  مَلَأَهُ - مَلَأَهُ. See Lišān al-'Arab, xvi, 407.
2/1:  وَرَكَّزَ عَلَى الْأَفْلَسِ - أَرْكَزَ عَلَى الْأَفْلَسِ.
15:  أَحْلَفَ مِنْتَ مِنْفَكْتُ أَحْلَفَ مِنْتَ مِنْفَكْتُ. See also Ubai's reading.
16/17:  مَنْ لَوْ هَمْهَا مَهْمَتْ وَجَرَبَتْ - مَنْ لَوْ هَمْهَا مَهْمَتْ وَجَرَبَتْ.
17/18:  وَمَا ذَا فِي مِسْبِكَ - وَمَا ذَا فِي مِسْبِكَ.
21/22: إنما سمعهما كتبية - سمعهما رسولي. So read also by Uhai.
31/32: أَتَنَبأَنَّكَ ذُكْرَ يَا - أَتَنَبأَنَّكَ ذُكْرَ يَا. So read also by Uhai.
58/60: فَهُمْ نَهْزُونِرِ. So read also by Ibn Qais.
59/61: فَهُمْ نَهْزُونِرِ. So read by al-Ja˘bdari, an-Nakha˘i and others.
60, 61, 62, 63: فَهُمْ نَهْزُونِرِ. So read also by Uhai.
63/66: فَهُمْ نَهْزُونِرِ. So read also by Uhai, or others said as Uhai, or others said.
69/72: فَهُمْ نَهْزُونِرِ. So read also by Uhai, or others said as Uhai, or others said.
72/75: فَهُمْ نَهْزُونِرِ. So read also by Uhai, or others said as Uhai, or others said.
80/62: فَهُمْ نَهْزُونِرِ. So read also by Uhai, or others said as Uhai, or others said.
81/83: فَهُمْ نَهْزُونِرِ. So read also by Uhai.