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This is a contribution to the study of the Qur’ānic text through an edition and study of three folios, called K176, K182, and K185, that are paleographically relatively early. The folios do not belong to the same codex but are separate leaves; they are kept at a private collection in Finland called the Ilves Collection. We can place them, tentatively, to the third/ninth century. The Qur’ānic folios presented here attest some variant spellings to the text of the Cairo Royal edition. The parchments have, in many cases, the scriptio plena where Cairo has a more defective writing (the medial ā). They give us more evidence that the rasm of Qur’ānic manuscripts was not completely stable.

INTRODUCTION

Research into the textual history of the Qurʾān has progressed immensely in recent decades with the study of early Qurʾānic codices and fragments. Of these studies, one can mention especially Jeffery & Mendelsohn (1942) and Ibn Warraq (2011) on the Samarqand codex; Déroche (2009) on the Codex Parisino-Petropolitanus and (2014) on the Umayyad-era Qurʾāns in general; G. Puin (2011) on the Šanʿāʾ manuscripts; as well as Small (2011) for a comparison of the early Qurʾānic manuscripts. For other recent significant studies on the Qurʾān, see McAuliffe (2006), Reynolds (2008), and Neuwirth et al. (2011). Scholars should also note the translation of Theodor Nöldeke’s work into English (2013). The recent studies seem to indicate that the Qurʾānic rasm, consonantal skeleton, became more or less stable very on and the variants in the early Qurʾānic manuscripts concern mostly orthography: whether and how to write the hamza, how to write the long vowel ā, especially the medial one, and so on. The theory of Wansbrough (1977) that even the Qurʾānic rasm postdates the life of the Prophet Muḥammad by some two centuries seems to be disproven by the documentary evidence (mostly early Qurʾānic manuscripts but also inscriptions and coins), which Wansbrough does not take into account.

Perhaps the narrative, found in the Islamic historiographical, exegetical, and literary sources that the third Caliph, ʿUthmān, ordered a group of scholars to codify the Qurʾānic rasm has a ring of truth to it. There is only scant manuscript evidence of Qurʾānic recensions that do not belong

---

1 I thank Abbas Bahmanpour, Prof. Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila, Jouni Harjumäki, Kaj Öhrnberg, and Irmeli Perho as well as the two anonymous reviewers for comments on an earlier draft of this article.
to the ’Uthmānic tradition. The codification of the Qurʾān should probably not be placed later than circa the AH 30s/650s CE.

Let me offer here a modest contribution to the study of the Qurʾānic text through an edition and study of three folios, called K176, K182, and K185, that are paleographically relatively early. The folios do not belong to the same codex but are separate leaves. We can place them, tentatively, to the third/ninth century or, perhaps less likely, the fourth/tenth century. K185 is probably earlier than K176 and K182 (see below). The scripts, with no or next to no diacritics differentiating between similar consonant forms but rather extensive vocalization, resemble other Qurʾānic manuscripts and fragments that have been dated paleographically to the third–fourth/ninth–tenth centuries, such as the University of Cambridge MS Add.743.2 and MS Add.1138. The fact that there are no verse markers in the parchments, except in K185 in a few unclear instances, also suggests an ’Abbāsid rather than an Umayyad date. This is further corroborated by the folios’ horizontal format (the width is greater than the height), which is usual in the ’Abbāsid Qurʾāns; in contrast, earlier Qurʾānic manuscripts often have a vertical format (Gacek 2012: 34).

The Qurʾānic folios are from a private collection in Finland called the Ilves Collection. The sigla are those given by the collector, who wishes to remain anonymous. The exact origins of the folios are unclear, but they have been bought at auction houses in the United Kingdom. The photographs, reproduced below, are courtesy of the collector.

When the orthography of the rasm in the folios differs from the standard Cairo edition, the spelling of the latter is given in the notes (referred to with the siglum ٓ). Damaged parts are completed with the text of the Cairo edition. The folios will also be compared with two early Qurʾānic codices: Saray Medina 1a (K176 and K185) and Codex Parisino-Petropolitanus (K182).

THE TEXT OF K176

K176 is a Qurʾānic folio containing a part of sura 33 (al-aḥzāb). It is written in black-brown ink on a parchment, the width of which is 17.8 cm and the height 11.5 cm. Both sides of the parchment have 15 lines of text. K176 does not have verse markers contained in some other Qurʾānic manuscripts. There is some wear in the text. The acid of the ink has damaged the right corner of the recto and the left corner of the verso. Vowel signs are written in red ink; where these are legible, they are included in the edition below with modern vowel marks. The system in K176 (and, for that matter, K182) is the following: fathā is written with a dot above the letter, kasra with a dot below the letter, and dama with a dot near the base of the letter. Nunation is marked with two dots next to each other.

---

2 See Sadeghi & Bergmann (2010), who present a surviving non-’Uthmānic manuscript, and G. Puin (1996), who notes that some of the Šan ā’ manuscripts follow a different order from the ’Uthmānic recension in their arrangement of suras.

3 For the date of the Qurʾānic consonantal text, see Small 2011: 162–176; Sinai 2014. For a convincing refutation of a late codification of the Qurʾān, see Donner 1998: 1–63. For the regional variant codices, see Cook 2004.

4 On dating Qurʾānic manuscripts on paleographic grounds, see Déroche 1992; Gacek 2012: 97–98, 123–125, 157–158, 160–162, 167–168, 216–222. However, it should be noted that the dates provided here are tentative.

5 MS Add.743.2 viewable online at <cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-00743-00002/1> and MS Add.1138 viewable online at <cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01138/1>.

6 Déroche (2009: 143) notes that while our earliest Qurʾānic manuscripts scrupulously mark the verse endings, the third/ninth century manuscripts rarely do.

7 One of the reviewers noted that the red vowel signs in K176 and K182 might be later additions.

different consonants. Below, K176 will be compared to the early (dated to “before 800??” in Corpus Coranicum) Qur’ānic manuscript Saray Medina 1a (= Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi: M 1), abbreviated here as SM1a.9

K176 Recto

K176 recto (Figure 1) contains Q. 33:40 (partly) – 33:50 (partly):

1. [رح]الله ولکن رسول الله حامٌ النبي وكا
2. [الله] بكل سما العلما لنابها الذين أتّموا انكروا
3. [الله] ذكرى كبيرا وسجوة بكرة وأصلها هو
4. [الله] صلى علكم وملكك الارض الحكم من الطفلك
5. [الله] ذو النور وكان بالقومين رحما تحديهم يوم نفذته سم
6. [الله] لقد أعدهم أجرها كرمتها نامها ان أرسلنك
7. [الله] bingo وكبري وداعنا إلى الله يا
8. [الله] ذهب وسراحنا! رمث السوميين بالله من الله
9. [الله] صلنا كبيرا ولا تجعل الكافرين والعصراض ودع أ
10. [الله] إننا على الله وكفى بالله وكونا نامه الد
11. [الله] إننا إذا نكحتون المومنين! مطموعون

9 Viewable online at <corpuscoranicum.de/handschriften/index/sure/33/vers/42/handschrift/56>.
10 This vocalization (khātim), rather clearly visible on the parchment, differs from that of the Cairo edition (khātam). However, khātim is actually dominant in the canonical readings; see al-Dānī 1930: 179; ‘Abd al-Laṭīf al-Khaṭīb 2002: VII, 292–293. SM1a, folio 186 verso, spells the word without the medial alif as kh-t-m.
11 The word appears to have two red dots under the shīn, probably indicating nunation. SM1a spells the word sh-ʾ-y, which is usual in early Qur’āns. It is not certain what kind of pronunciation sh-ʾ-y indicates.
12 The medial ā is missing in SM1a, fol. 186 verso.
13 See fn. no. 12.
14 The Cairo ed. and SM1a, fol. 186 verso, omit the medial ā.
K176 Verso

K176 verso (Figure 2) continues the text where K176 recto ends. The verso is in better shape than the recto but the last word or so on most of the lines is illegible. K176 verso contains Q. 33:50 (partly) – Q. 33:53 (partly):

1. ب حالك وساب حاليك ١٣ ٢٣ ها حارن ٢٣ معك [و]
2. أمراءً مومية إن وهب بعثها للنبي إن آذان [النبي]
3. أن بسببها حالصاً ١٤ لك من دون المؤمنين ٢٤ [علما]
4. ما فرصنا عليهم ١٥ في أروجهم وما ملكك أمان٢٥ [معك]

15 The word is damaged and only the last two letters can be read.
16 Once again, the medial َā is missing in SM1a, fol. 186 verso.
17 Damaged.
18 The Cairo ed. and SM1a, fol. 186 verso, omit the medial َā.
19 The middle of the word is damaged.
20 The vowel mark that comes after the alif probably denotes the hamza in this word: afāʾa.
21 The Cairo ed. and SM1a, fol. 186 verso, omit the medial َā.
22 The Cairo ed. omits the medial َā. However, surprisingly, it is present in SM1a, fol. 187 recto.
23 The medial َā is omitted in SM1a, fol. 187 recto.
24 The vowel mark (fatḥa) on the alif probably marks the medial hamza: imraʾatan.
25 The medial َā is omitted in SM1a, fol. 187 recto.
26 In this word, again, there is a vowel mark on the َā that seems to indicate a hamza.
27 According to the rules of classical Arabic, the word should, of course, be pronounced ʿalayhim, but ʿalayhum appears in other early Qur’anic manuscripts too (Dutton 1999: 116, 125). According to the Arabic grammarians, ʿalayhum, instead of ʿalayhim, was the Hijazi pronunciation of the word (Rabin 1951: 99).
28 The medial َā is omitted in SM1a, fol. 187 recto.
Discussion of K176

We can see that K176 contains the same text as the Cairo edition with minor orthographic variation. The text of K176 is less defective than the Cairo text, save for diacritics and vowels, which are fully supplied in the latter. K176 often has the medial alif, representing the long vowel ā, where Cairo does not have this: K176 recto, l. 11, al-muʾmināt; l. 15, ʿammātika; K176 verso, l. 10, azwāj. However, this does not mean that K176 always marks the medial ā. In many instances, K176 and Cairo agree in their spelling, for example, K176 verso, l. 13: nāẓirīn, in both recensions written without the medial alif: n-ẓ-r-y-n. The many plene spellings of the long ā are also an indication that K176 is not among our earliest Qurʾānic manuscripts. Rather, K176 postdates the earliest manuscripts by a century or two.

In l. 15, K176 verso contains the non-contracted verbal form yastaḥyī, and not yastaḥī as in the Cairo edition. In two cases, it seems that the copyist of K176 wished to write the medial ā, while in the rasm of Cairo it does not appear. These are K176 verso, l. 6, where the rasm seems to reflect the reading tuʾyī, while Cairo has the consonantal text t-w-y. The correct form, according to the rules of classical Arabic, would be tuʾwī (2nd p. sing. imperfect form IV verb of the root ʾ-w-y), not appearing in either consonantal skeleton. The other, clearer, instance of a hamza is K176 verso, l. 14, where the consonantal text appears to represent the reading mustaʾnisīna, contained in the Cairo edition’s vocalized reading but not in its rasm.

The vocalization of K176 is unsystematic. Sometimes the fatḥa sign is used to denote the long ā, as in the vocative yā-ayyuhā (e.g. 176B, l. 6). For some reason, the scribe often marks with fatḥā the nūn of the sound masculine plural ending -na, even though the vowel should be reasonably clear to the readers. The scribe also feels the need to mark the feminine plural suffix

---

29 The word is somewhat damaged. However, the nunation mark is clearly visible after the word.
30 The vowel mark follows the alif and probably denotes the hamza: tashāʾa. This phenomenon recurs in the parchment.
31 The Cairo ed. and SM1a, fol. 187 recto, omit the medial ā.
32 SM1a, fol. 187 verso, spells the word sh-ʾ-y.
33 Similarly in SM1a, fol. 187 verso.
34 SM1a, fol. 187 verso, omits the medial ā.
35 SM1a, fol. 187 verso, agrees with K176.
37 For this word, see the different readings in Abd al-Latif al-Khaṭīb 2002: VII, 303. The reading tuʾ yi does not appear among the canonical or non-canonical readings.
-hunna similarly. All in all, it seems that a final nūn is the letter that most often obtains a vowel mark. Whether this is related to the fact that the final nūn often also receives a diacritic point explicating the consonant (see K185, below), is unclear. The vocalization in K176 is in many cases redundant and does not really help the reading.

THE TEXT OF K182

K182 is a Qur’ānic parchment containing a fragment of sura 23 (al-muʿminūn). It is written in black-brown ink on a parchment with unfortunately some holes in it. The width of the parchment is 12.9 cm and the height 7.0 cm. The writing on K182 verso is so damaged that only a few words can be read. K182 recto is better preserved and easily legible save for a few holes in the parchment. K182 does not have verse markers. There are vowel signs written in red ink. K182 recto has 15 lines; the same is probably the case with the verso, but since it is not preserved well, this is not completely certain.

![Figure 3 K182 recto](image)

K182 Recto

The recto is easily readable (Figure 3), and the edition of the text is given below. It contains Q. 23:64 (partly) – 23:77 (partly):39

لا يحروا الىومَ اِيَكم مِىا لا يُىصرو

وںَ

[40]

[40.1] ڇاىٮ اَىىى ىُىلى علىكم ڇكىىم على اَعڇىِكم ىَىكِصو

[41] اَلَم ىدَىروا الڇو

[42]

[42.1] مسىكىرىںَ ىه سَامِرا

39 For this section, see also the (earlier) Codex Parisino-Petropolitanus in Déroche 2009: 236–237 (the Arabic section). The differences between K182 and Codex Parisino-Petropolitanus (CPP) are the following: 1) Q. 23:67, sāmiran: s-ʾ-m-r-ʾ in K182, s-m-r-ʾ in CPP; 2) Q. 23:72, fa-kharāj: f-kh-r-ʾ-j in K182, f-kh-r-j in CPP; 3 & 4) Q. 23:73 and 74, (al-)ṣirāṭ: ṣ-r-ʾ-ṭ in K182, ṣ-r-ṭ in CPP; 5) Q. 23:76, bi-l-ʿadhāb, b-ʾ-l-ʿ-dh-b in K182, b-ʾ-l-ʿ-dh-b in CPP.

40 The word is damaged.

41 ق: سمرا

42 A hole in the parchment.
The complete reading of K182 verso (Figure 4) is not given because of the poor state of the text, but it continues K182 recto, thus starting from Q. 23:77.

Only a couple of words at the end of lines 10–13 are legible (Q. 23:86–90).51

See fn. no. 42.

See fn. no. 42.

See fn. no. 42.

The last letter is not legible.

A hole in the parchment.

The two words, rahimnāhum and kashafnā, are damaged on the parchment, as are some other words at the bottom of the recto. The reading is completed with the help of the Cairo edition.

I want to thank the other reviewer for very helpful comments on these lines.
Discussion of K182

At the top of the recto, the scribe has divided the last words (the plural verbs ʿunṣarūna and tankiṣūna) at the end of verses 23:65 and 66 onto two lines, so that the nūns belonging to the verbs and ending the verses start lines 2 and 3. The consonantal text of K182 recto is identical to the Cairo edition, save for the spelling of the word sāmiran, line 3, and (al-)ṣirāṭ, occurring twice, lines 11 and 12. Similar to K176, the text of K182 gives the scriptio plena in these cases whereas the Cairo edition has a more defective orthography, not spelling the medial alif. In other cases, K182 recto gives the same scriptio defectiva as Cairo: for example, l. 7, al-samawāt, and l. 12, la-nākibūn. In some cases in K182, there is a faṭḥa on or immediately after an alif. This seems to indicate the ḥamza: for example, jāʿahum in line 4 and ahwāʾahum in line 7. The vowel mark that usually stands for faṭḥa (a dot above the letter) is sometimes used in K182 for the long ā, for example, l. 12, la-nākibūn.

THE TEXT OF K185

K185 is a Qurʿānic parchment with a size of 17.8 cm (width) × 12.5 cm (height). It includes verses from sura 19 (Maryam). The ink is brownish. There are no vowel signs, it appears. Diacritical marks often distinguish the final nūn but not other consonants (indeed, where the diacritic for the final nūn is missing, it can be supposed that the ink has worn away). Elisabeth Puin (2008: 468) has noted elsewhere that it is a rather frequent orthographic convention in early Qurʿāns to supply final or independent nūns with a dot. There seems be verse markers in K185 in a few, somewhat ambiguous, cases: recto, line 4, and verso, lines 2 and 6. Both sides have eighteen lines. The lack of vowel signs and the possible presence of the verse markers could indicate that K185 is earlier than K176 or K182, perhaps second/eighth–third/ninth century, but this is not certain. Like K176, K185 will be compared to the Qurʿānic manuscript Saray Medina 1a (= Istanbul, Topkapı Saray Müzesi: M 1), abbreviated here as SM1a. 52

Figure 5 K185 recto

---

52 Viewable online at <corpuscoranicum.de/handschriften/index/sure/19/vers/4/handschrift/56>.
K185 Recto

K185 recto (Figure 5) comprises Q. 19:4–17 (partly). The last lines of the recto are somewhat damaged and difficult to decipher:

53. ِفاَلَ رَبُّكَ إِنَّكُم ُعِلَمُوا مَنْ يَتَوَلَّى، وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْمَاءَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ الْأَرْضَ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَاحَكُمُ وَأَسْأَلُ السَّمَاوَاتِ، فَاَلْبَتَ أَفْلَح

K185 Verso

K185 verso (Figure 6) represents Q. 19:17 (partly)–31 (partly):

53 There is a dot at the end of this and the next line, the significance of which is not certain, but it is probably to fill the line.
54 The Cairo ed. and SM1a, fol. 97 verso, omit the medial ā.
55 In the Cairo edition, this word is spelled with the medial alif: َِّٰ-ْرُبُّ-ُّ. SM1a, fol. 97 verso, like K185, omits the medial ā. In K185, there are three strokes after the word, possibly indicating nunation, or, as one of the reviewers suggested, a verse marker.
56 SM1a, fol. 98 recto, writes the word q-l, as is common in some early Qur’āns (Déroche 2014: 22).
57 SM1a, fol. 98 recto, omits the medial ā.
58 The ink is partially worn away.
59 SM1a, fol. 98 recto, writes the word q-l.
60 The word wa-ı is not present in the Cairo edition nor in SM1a, fol. 98 recto, but clearly present in K185.
61 In SM1a, fol. 98 recto, again q-l.
62 The parchment is hard to read at this point.
63 SM1a, fol. 98 recto, omits the medial ā.
64 This is not a part of the text.
65 Similarly in SM1a, fol. 98 verso, which usually does not spell medial ās.
66 SM1a, fol. 98 verso, omits the medial ā.
67 There is a dot (in the same ink as the rasm) following the word. It is somewhat unclear whether it represents nunation or, perhaps, a verse marker.
Discussion of K185

As in K176 and K182 as well as Cairo, the scribe of K185 is not systematic with his writing of the medial ā. The same word, ʿāqiran, is spelled in two divergent ways in K185 recto: in line 4, the medial alif is missing, but in line 8 it is present. In the Cairo edition, the medial

68 The word is followed by two dots, the only function of which seems to be the filling of the line.
69 On the parchment, there are two dots in brown ink and a circle in red ink (possibly a later addition) after this word. The marks seem to indicate, as the anonymous reviewers suggested, a ten verse marker.
70 But SM1a, fol. 98 verso, omits the medial ʾā like K185.
71 SM1a, fol. 98 verso, spells the word ‘-y-y-h-’.
72 There is a dot or a dash following this word, probably to fill the line.
73 SM1a, fol. 99 recto, agrees with K185.
74 SM1a, fol. 99 recto: ʿāṣa. It is unclear what this spelling indicates; maybe it is merely a scribal mistake.
75 SM1a, fol. 99 recto, agrees with K185 in not spelling the medial ʾā.
76 The ink is worn out.
77 See fn. no. 76.
alif is present both times. K185 verso, line 9 (Q. 19:24), fa-nādāhā, represents an interesting example. In the Cairo edition, the word is spelled f-n-ʾ-d-y-h-ʾ, while in K185 the first medial ʾā is missing: f-n-d-y-h-ʾ. K185 does not seem to have any clear cases of hamza represented in its rasm. Significantly, K185 recto, line 9 (Q. 19:9), has an additional wa-, not present in the text of Cairo or the variant readings in the qirāʾāt literature that I have consulted.

CONCLUSIONS
The Qurʾānic folios presented here attest some variant spellings to the text of the Cairo edition. The parchments have, in many cases, the scriptio plena where Cairo has a more defective writing (the medial ʾā). They do not, however, offer us anything spectacularly new in the field of Qurʾānic studies. Still, they give us more evidence that the rasm of Qurʾānic manuscripts was not completely stable and of the fact that the writing of the long vowel ʾā was a problem that different scribes solved in different ways, the solutions offered being the letters alif, yāʾ, or to leave it unwritten. The scholarly problem of whether or not the Ḥijāzī dialect of the Prophet contained the hamza continues to be interesting. It is rather significant that the scribe of K176 wrote what seems to be the matres lectionis for the medial hamza in two instances where they are lacking in the Cairo edition. The following picture most likely still holds true: while the Ḥijāzī dialect of the Prophet’s time had lost the hamza, other dialects (and, later, classical Arabic) did include the hamza as a distinct phoneme.\(^78\) Since the Arabic script did not have an unambiguous way of marking the hamza, scribes struggled to create means to write the phoneme in the early Islamic era (at least until the late second/eighth century).\(^79\) We can thank them for the rather difficult rules of writing the hamza in classical Arabic. While the rules of how to write the hamza were already solved by the time these folios were copied, the earlier Qurʾānic rasm still affected the way the scribes were spelling the hamza, either leaving it unwritten or devising ways to use the vocalization marks to denote the phoneme. The rasm was tinkered with more rarely. However, the introduction of the hamza to the consonantal text seems to be attested in K176 verso, l. 6 (tuʾy?) and l. 14 (mustaʾnisīna).
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