



ALCHORAN LATINUS I
PARIS, BIBLIOTHÈQUE
DE L'ARSENAL MS. 1162

edited by

ANTHONY JOHN LAPPIN





©

ISBN
979-12-218-0144-6

FIRST EDITION
ROMA 1 AUGUST 2022

Martino Ganeri, O.P.
socio optimo

CONTENTS

ix *Foreword*

xiii Introduction

1.0. How the *Alchoran latinus* came to be, xiii – 1.1. The journey to Cluny, xv – 1.2. Copying and copyists, xvii – 1.3. Corrections, annotations, rubrications, xxv – 1.4. From copy to codex, xxxiii – 2.0. The edition: text and annotations, xl – 2.1. The *textus criticus*, xli – 2.2. Glosses and annotations, xli – 2.3. The *index fontium*, xlii – 2.4. Apparatus to the *textus criticus*, xlii – 2.5. Punctuation, xliii – 2.6. Apparatus to the annotations, xlv – 2.7. The appendix, xlvi

I Alchoran Latinus: Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, ms. 1162

439 *Appendix*

Praefatio translatoris et initio Alchoran, 441 – *Prefacio Roberti translatoris*, 442 – *Capitulum azoare matris libri*, 445 – *Azoara de boue*, 448 – Addendum: “Deus multis nominibus...”, 450

FOREWORD

Rather like the *Alchoran latinus* itself, this edition has been the fruit of different countries and many years gestation. Begun in Rome, during time afforded by a grant from the Leverhulme Foundation, it followed our family as we moved north to Sweden, and, slipping into the background as positions in Manchester and Maynooth demanded other types of attention, was continued thanks to fellowships at the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Studies in Uppsala, although subsequently teaching duties, other projects and the further demands of life have held it back, as I passed between positions in the Universities of Uppsala and Stockholm. Most recently, involvement in conferences organized under the auspices of the *Islamic Legacy* and *The European Qur'an* projects has enabled me to deepen my analysis of the manuscript itself, and solve some of the its riddles that have held me back from bringing out an edition with too many loose ends.¹ It gives great satisfaction now that at least part of the puzzle of the 1143 translation of the Qur'ān can be made available in the printed form of a semi-diplomatic edition of the earliest surviving version of the *Alchoran latinus*.

The present edition, though, is by no means the complete story of the *Alchoran latinus*, whose text here is already at some steps removed (and, indeed, in some respects, wholly separate) from the translators' original. This latter was a serious attempt at translating the Qur'ān into an elegant

(1) The first is a Cost Action project, CA18129 IS-LE, "Islamic Legacy: Narratives East, West, South, North of the Mediterranean (1350-1750)" (<https://is-le.eu/>), led by Antonio Urquizar-Herrera and Alicia Miguélez; the second, an ERC Synergy Project, "The European Qur'an. Islamic Scripture in European Culture and Religion 1150-1850 (EuQu)" (<https://euqu.eu/>), led by Mercedes García Arenal, Jan Loop, John Tolan and Roberto Tottoli.

Latin that reflected the aesthetic principles of the twelfth century. By no means a word-by-word reproduction, it was, rather, an attempt to capture, through its use of traditional and contemporary qur'anic commentaries, the then-current freight of verses and passages,² at times even taking advantage of the source-text's repetitious nature to generate a stylistically-preferable *variatio* through the deployment, in sequence, of conflicting or dissonant interpretations.³ The translation also preserves earlier materials in the form of a partial Mozarabic translation of the Qur'ān. Rubrication and the numeration of the sections of the work (which depart from qur'anic usage) were added at a later point, almost certainly in Cluny and possibly some time after the translation itself was copied. The complacent use of the subsequent evolution of the text after the translators' involvement in order to devalue their intentions and achievement should consequently be avoided.

The present edition provides these various levels of development together, and will, hopefully, provide a step towards relieving the translators of much of the *damnatio memoriae* that has followed them since John of Segovia's criticisms down to the present day, taking them to task for both ignorance of, and lack of respect for, the original.⁴ Quite the contrary, in fact; but authors and translators are unable, in a manuscript culture, to control the reception, development and subsequent implementation of their work. Importantly, the Arsenal manuscript, much more than later versions, offers a revealing vision of the *Alchoran latinus* in a still-experimental shape, still *in fieri*, allowing the various levels of contribution by the translators themselves, scribes, glossators and rubricators to be taken into account. Manuscripts are, by their very natures, collaborative ventures, and the fact that they are copies means that texts are inev-

(2) An exemplary demonstration of this feature may be found in Michael Pollitt, "Translating the Muslim for Christian Europe: reassessing the interpretation of *aslama* in the First Latin Translation of the Qur'an", *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 32 (2021), 407–25.

(3) A particularly visible example of this is the decision to use the bismillah only in the second half of the *Alchoran*, thus giving equal weight to the different views as to whether the bismillah was actually a part of the divine text or merely a convenient form of pious rubrication to mark the beginning of each surah.

(4) See Ulli Roth, "Juan of Segovia's Translation of the Qur'ān", *Al-Qanṭara* 25.2 (2014), 555–78, esp. p. 567.

itably shaped and shared and shaped again, de- and re-contextualized as they are passed from one locus of copying to another.

My edition has taken shape through consultation of a digitized microfilm and physical inspection of the manuscript *in situ*; the recent availability of digitized, colour scans of the manuscript on the Bibliothèque nationale's Gallica site does not dispense with the preparation and publication of an edition; the latter can offer (ideally) a systematic study of the peculiarities of the manuscript, much of which cannot be appreciated solely with a digital copy; and, further, this process of analysis is alive to the historical genesis of the manuscript, how it was prepared, copied, corrected and annotated. It is to be hoped that such labour will enrich the experience of other readers of the Arsenal manuscript, whatever the medium through which they engage with the text and its support, and provide assistance to those who wish to uncover the multiple levels of composition and interpretation within the *Alchoran latinus*.

An undertaking of this nature cannot be completed without much help and encouragement, and thanks should be offered not only to particular individuals who read and commented on drafts of the introduction and of papers, to students and academics who asked questions at seminars, to seminar organizers who invited me to speak, and fellow researchers who shared their own work with me. Mention should be made of Donald Prudlo, whose invitations to speak at the Universities of Jacksonville State and Tusla neatly bookended this project; Dirk Meyer, for his engagement with manuscript studies, and his fellow Sinologists, Zhang Pei and Marco Carboara, all of whom have sharpened my appreciation of manuscript culture as a worldwide phenomenon; to Björn Witrock, former director of SCAS who enabled such a fruitful exchange; to Charles Burnett for judicious encouragement; to Kurt Villads Jensen for unfailing support and an ever-welcoming seminar at the Centre for Medieval Studies at Stockholm University; and last, but not least, to Barbara Crostini, from whose wisdom I have benefitted more and for longer than I have deserved.

I have mentioned how long this work has been in gestation; yet, looking back into the mists of time, its roots were laid much earlier, and so the present volume is dedicated to the Rev. Dr. Martin Ganeri, OP, with whom I attended our first classes in Arabic, which were offered by the Oriental Institute in Oxford and taught by Dr Penelope Johnstone.

Kvarntorp, Knivsta, 22-02-2022

INTRODUCTION

1.0. How the *Alchoran latinus* came to be

The *Alchoran latinus*, the first of numerous Latin translations of the Qur'ān, provided the centrepiece of an array of works whose primary function was to provide, for Latin Christian eyes, a formative introduction to Islamic belief and practice, through the presentation of religious and historical texts. The translations were entrusted to Roger of Ketton and Herman of Carinthia by Peter the Venerable in 1142 as he made his way into the Iberian Peninsula for a profitable meeting in the kingdom of León with Alfonso VII (r. 1126–57) over matters of financial and political interest.¹ Peter the Venerable had been introduced to at least one work of anti-Islamic polemic, the *Risālat al-Kindī*, through Peter of Toledo, who was connected to, if not the leader of, an active proseletysing mission within the former Visigothic capital, and whom Peter the Venerable did use to translate that centuries-old polemic work as part of this collection. For understandable, yet highly regrettable, reasons, the abbot of Cluny did not deign to order the translation of more up-to-the-minute polemic works composed by roughly contemporary Mozarabs.

Moreover the translation of the other works were not handed over to active polemicists, but rather to figures whose interest in and knowledge of Arabic was born of its high-status as the pre-eminent scientific

(1) The historical circumstances and details of Peter's journey were established by Charles Julian Bishko, 'Peter the Venerable's Journey to Spain', in his *Spanish and Portuguese Monastic History*, 600–1300 (Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1984), XII: 163–75 [originally published in *Petrus Venerabilis 1156–11956*, ed. Giles Constable & James Kritzeck, *Studia Anselmiana* 40 (1956)].

language,² and who, when Peter the Venerable's invitation came, were busy deciphering the mysteries of the heavens and astronomical lore rather than confounding dogmas or encouraging apostasy. Their year-long immersion into the heart of Islam did not awaken any further enthusiasm to join in anti-Muslim controversy: Hermann continued to plough his furrow as a scientific translator; Robert found fame as an ecclesiastical diplomat.³ Their employment by Peter the Venerable, then, indicates that a particular type of translation was being sought, formed by the rigours of scientific translations where exactitude and representativeness were key, rather than born within an-already polemical, deformative depiction of Islam. Needless to say, given the short time that Robert and Hermann had to work, they relied upon an earlier, Mozarabic, most probably partial, translation of the Qur'ān, whose origins were not forged in the heat of polemic but the rather more humdrum requirements of episcopal responsibilities of good governance of a subject Muslim population in Toledo after its fall to the Christians in 1085.⁴ The rather rustic style of Latinate Mozarabs was explicitly rejected by Peter as well; Robert and Hermann were, however, familiar with the stylistic demands of twelfth-century Latin prose which had been brought to such a height of finesse in the linguistically playful and intellectually demanding arena of that century's monastic epistolary correspondence. Again, had Peter the Venerable sought to demean Islam through his translation project, he

(2) See Julian Yolles, "Scientific Language in the Latin Qur'ans of Robert of Ketton and Mark of Toledo", *Journal of Quranic Studies* 22.3 (2020): 121–48.

(3) Ángel J. Martínez Duque, "El inglés Roberto, traductor del Corán: estancia y actividades en España a mediados del siglo XII", *Príncipe de Viana* 63/227 (2002), 567–81; Charles Burnett, "Ketton, Robert of (fl. 1141–1157)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

(4) See my "A Mozarabic Qur'an? Some reflexions on the evidence", in *The Iberian Qur'an*, ed. Mercedes García Arenal (Berlin: de Gruyter, forthcoming). In the light of the existence of a Mozarabic version and its traces within the *Alchoran latinus*, it is to be suspected that at least some of the variation around the alternating reproduction or translation of Arabic words is also due to the assimilation of an earlier text; on the adaptation of Arabic words into Latin and their varied translations, see my "An Inter-Religious Example of Translation, Transmission and Dissemination: the *Alchoran latinus* of 1143", in *Text and Transmission in the European Middle Ages, 1000–1500*, ed. Carrie Fisher and Eamer Purcell (Turnhout: Brepols, 2019), pp. 71–100.

could have had translations made in the barely-literate but highly-confused offerings that his Mozarabic collaborator, Peter of Toledo, had provided of the *Risālat al-Kindī*, which had required a thorough re-write at the hands of Peter the Venerable's trusted secretary, Peter of Poitiers.⁵ And indeed, Robert, as he expressed himself in his preface to the translation, was painfully away of the difficulties of translating the Qur'ān due to its distance from contemporary stylistic norms, even as he followed the abbot's instruction to present the Qur'ān "pro sui modo prorsus arabico tamen semoto" (3,201; in its own fashion, just with the veil of the Arabic language removed).⁶

1.1. The journey to Cluny

The translations that were formed into the *Corpus cluniacense*, including that of the *Alchoran*, made their way north to France piecemeal; at least some of these were sent on to Bernard of Clairvaux to encourage him to write a refutation of Islamic belief.⁷ Despite its completion in 1143, the *Alchoran* had not been sent to Bernard even by 1145, when Peter the Venerable wrote his long reply to him (letter 111),⁸ in the latter part of which he described the translation project and mentioned some of the

(5) See my "On the Genesis and Formation of the *Corpus cluniacense*", in *The Latin Qur'an, 1143–1500: translation, transition, interpretation*, ed. Cándida Ferrero Hernández and John Tolan (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021), pp. 27–56, at p. 38.

(6) See José Luis Alexis Rivera Luque, "Translatological Remarks on Rendering the Qur'an in Latin (Robert of Ketton, Mark of Toledo and Egidio da Viterbo): purposes, theory, and techniques", in *The Latin Qur'an, 1143–1500: translation, transition, interpretation*, ed. Cándida Ferrero Hernández and John Tolan (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021), pp. 123–38, at pp. 128–30.

(7) Florence Ninette, "The Contribution of the *Speculum historiale* to the History of the Latin *Risālat al-Kindī* and the *Corpus cluniacense*", in *The Latin Qur'an, 1143–1500: translation, transition, interpretation*, ed. Cándida Ferrero Hernández and John Tolan (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021), pp. 139–58; and my "Riccoldo di Monte di Croce and the *Corpus cluniacense*", in *Riccoldo di Monte di Croce*, edd. Kurt Villads Jensen and Davide Scotto (Stockholm: Vitterhetsakademien, forthcoming).

(8) Giles Constable, ed. *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, 2 voll. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 1: 274–99.

works he had had translated and sent on. Peter the Venerable had left Spain before Robert drew up his colophon that dated the conclusion of his labours; post from Spain could be both slow and uncertain, and it may be that the *Alchoran* travelled through early fascicules and then later, more complete versions, with inevitable loss, partial copying and miscomprehension contributing to vitiate the text and its presentation.

Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, ms. 1162 has, though, since d'Alverney's investigations into Peter the Venerable's collection of translations,⁹ and her identification of the numerous configurations in which the texts have been transmitted, been considered the archetype of later versions; in this view, the codex was been copied and transported out of Spain and provided the model for subsequent Cluniac copying.¹⁰ Such a view is no longer tenable: the Arsenal manuscript was assembled in at least three or four stages, using exemplars of the texts which were either incomplete, disordered or in some way imperfect.¹¹ This assemblage certainly did not provide the archetype to later versions of the collection;¹²

(9) The manuscripts containing the collection were both identified and their relationships first sketched by Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, "Deux traductions latines du Coran au Moyen Age", in *La Connaissance de l'Islam dans l'Occident médiéval*, ed. Charles Burnett, Variorum Collected Studies Series CS 445 (Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1994), 1: [reprinted from *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age*, 16 (1948),] pp. 69–131; further refined in her "Quelques manuscrits de la 'Collectio Tolemana'", in *La Connaissance de l'Islam*, IV: [originally published in *Petrus Venerabilis*, ed. Constable & Kritzeck, pp.] 202–18. A significant contribution in tracing the development of the transmission of the *Corpus cluniacense* was subsequently provided by Angelo Michele Piemontese, "Il Corano latino di Ficino e i Corani arabi di Pico e Monchates", *Rinascimento: rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento*, 2nd ser., 36 (1996), 227–73. For additional bibliography, see *Christian–Muslim Relations: a Bibliographical History*, III: 1050–1200, ed. David Thomas & Alex Mallett (Brill: Leiden, 2011), pp. 497–519.

(10) See d'Alverny, "Deux traductions", p. 78, for the first occasion of this suggestion.

(11) See the discussion in Lappin, "On the Genesis", pp. 45–47.

(12) For the identification of that archetype, see Lappin, "On the Genesis", pp. 50–55; Fernando González Muñoz, "Corrections to Robert of Ketton's Translation of the Qur'an in MS Paris Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal 1162", in , p. 109, suggests that it was a "working codex" from which a clean, reordered copy was made, which in turn became the archetype of the successive copies of the collection. Nevertheless, numerous examples of the striking out of words and phrases (see *op. cit.*, pp. 97–98) are not evidence of

and, indeed, the piecing together of the collection – given, for example, the confusion over the rubrication of the *Alchoran* itself – certainly took place at a distance, both geographically and temporally, from the actual labours of the translators.

1.2. Copying and copyists

If Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, ms. 1162 is not to be considered the archetype of the cascade of copies from the late thirteenth century to the early sixteenth, then, we may ask of its significance. On the one hand, although it is extra-stemmatic, it was “corrected”, or “emended”, or simply “altered” to bring it in line with an evidently authoritative Cluniac archetype. Since we no longer possess that archetype, and the closest copies to survive are at one or two removes,¹³ it provides us with an excellent witness to salient aspects of that archetype. Yet since the text is extra-stemmatic – earlier, in some aspects, than the archetype – it also preserves key information about the earliest stages of transmission, and how the translator’s original texts were copied at Cluny and combined with various annotations and rubrications.

It is, regrettably, difficult to date the Arsenal *Alchoran latinus* precisely, other than to, roughly, the second half of the twelfth century. The *Alchoran* is copied throughout by a single hand, in two lead-ruled columns of thirty-five lines’ length, averaging 252 mm in height and 85

authorial or scribal emeliorative revision (since they improve nothing), but rather are a systematic attempt to bring the text into line with a more authoritative copy that was missing those words; the suppressed phrases are neither extraneous additions to the text of the Qur’a*n, nor could they disturb the reader through their presence. Indeed, in some cases, the text becomes incomprehensible without them. It should come as no surprise, then, given the numerous infelicities which the translation by Robert and Hermann suffered, that the manuscript chosen in Cluny to correct the *Alchoran* text against was, in fact, inferior. It would seem, however, that the Arsenal text of the *Alchoran latinus* was used partly as a working copy: certainly in relation to the numeration of the *azoara* and possibly in regard to the combination of glosses, annotations and other marginalia (for which, see Lappin, “On the Genesis”, pp. 47–50).

(13) Lappin, “On the Genesis”, p. 54; the highest mss. in the stemma are Oxford, Corpus Christi College, ms. 184; and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. latin 6064.

mm in width, with a narrow separating margin of 15 mm. The folio size is currently 333 x 230 mm, although this has been cut down from the original extension: catchwords are not present, and one marginal annotation has been partially lost. The text is divided into discrete paragraphs, separated by rubricated indications, the vast majority of which are identified as being an “Azoara”, numbered in sequence, and often accompanied by a brief summary of the contents of the section, informative to varying degrees. (Reference to the text is thus by this *Azoara*-number followed by the line-number).

The hand that copied the text and that which reproduced the glosses are not easy to date precisely. They were probably involved in the copying of what remains of Peter the Venerable’s *Aduersus Iudeos* and a collection of his sermons found between Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. latin 12410 fol. 17r–41r (originally foll. lxxiii–xcvii), and NAL ms. 1436, pp. 1–148, 149–387 with a near identical mis-en-page (two columns of thirty-five lines each, on a folio measuring 335 x 255 mm and the same simple style of ruling); the manuscripts came to the Bibliothèque nationale via Saint-Germain-des-Prés, but the texts present in them are undated.¹⁴ Another point of comparison are the two hands witnessed in another Cluniac manuscript, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. latin 12603 (with two columns of forty lines on a folio size of 335 x 226 mm) dated no more precisely than to the second half of the twelfth century,¹⁵ and which again passed through the library of Saint-Germain.

These hands may, however, be further compared with those produced by scribes active towards the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century, such as Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. latin 17716, copied by a single hand at Cluny after 1189, and which also offers a similar mis-en-page (two columns of thirty lines each on a page measur-

(14) See Yvonne Friedman, ed., *Petri Venerabilis Aduersus iudeorum inveteratam duritiam*, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, LVIII (Turnhout: Brepols, 1985), pp. xxxvi–xxxviii.

(15) Charles Samarin & Robert Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste*, III: *Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latin (nos. 8001 à 18613)* (Paris: CNRS, 1974), p. 295 & plate ccxxxv. Roman numerals for foliation were added in the sixteenth century: see Léopold Deslisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale: Fonds de Cluni* (Paris: Champion, 1884), p. 329.

ing 360 x 255 mm);¹⁶ with BnF, ms. n.a.l. 2244, from the end of the twelfth century; or the necrology of Saint-Martin-des-Champs, BnF ms. latin 17742, foll. 329r–336v, of c. 1174–1176.¹⁷

The Arsenal manuscript, then, may have been copied in the years immediately after the translation had been completed, and so in the late 1140s.¹⁸ But, equally, it could be significantly later – not as late as other extant manuscripts bearing the text, which date from century and a half after the translators finished their work – but perhaps a generation, or even two, later. The scarcity of Cluniac manuscripts, dissipated by the passing centuries, and, above all, by revolutionary fervour, makes the task of situating the Arsenal manuscript at a precise moment particularly difficult.

The text of the *Alchoran* at present occupies 114 folios and fifteen gatherings, extending between folios 26–138 according to the present foliation of the manuscript. All, apart from the last gathering, were composed of four bifolia.¹⁹ Regrettably, the text is acephalous, beginning towards the start of the second surah. Comparison with later copies would suggest that the first surah, the initial verses or *ayat* of the second and, possibly, the translator's prologue have been lost. Nevertheless, the foliation would suggest only one folio has been lost, which would probably not have provided enough space for the missing texts, and so it would be better not to speculate about, nor assume from later copies,

(16) The date 1189 is the last entry of the *Annales cluniacenses* (fol. 100r); for D. Iogna-Prat the manuscript was assembled slightly later, under the aegis of Guillaume II (1207–15); see his *Études clunisiennes* (Paris: Picard, 2002), p. 21; and 'Un recueil liturgique et historique du tournant des années 1200 (Paris, BnF, ms. latin 17716)', *Bucema*, 9 (2005): <http://cem.revues.org/792>.

(17) Catchwords have all been cut away, and Cluniac manuscripts that might be compared with Arsenal, ms. 1162, are Paris, BnF n.a.l. ms. 1436 (320mm x 236 mm), and lat. ms. 12603 (335mm x 222 mm; Saint-Germain-des-Prés), and, further, n.a.l. ms. 17716 (360mm x 265mm). One should note, however, that these Cluniac manuscripts, such as lat. 12603, have folio numeration in roman rather than arabic: see Léopold Deslisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale: Fonds de Cluni* (Paris: Champion, 1884), p. 200.

(19) I (originally four bifolia, foll. 26–32: initial folio excised); II–XIV (four bifolia, foll. 33–40, 41–48, 49–56, 57–64, 65–72, 73–80, 81–88, 89–96, 97–104, 105–12, 113–20, 121–28, 128bis–135), XV (probably three bifolia; currently 3 folios followed by two stubs, foll. 136–38).

what that folio (or folio + missing gathering) would have contained. What is particularly revealing in the Arsenal *Alchoran*, when compared with its later sister-texts, however, is the arrangement of the text, which suggests a significant loss of information between the translators and their copyists and which would have been impossible to detect without the witness provided by the Arsenal manuscript.

The scribe of the Arsenal *Alchoran* has used two means to divide the text he was copying: major divisions indicated by the leaving of varying amounts of blank space; and a minor division through the deployment of an unusual symbol (ϰ.), helpfully glossed by the annotator as a “paragrafum arabicum” (1.7), and usually responding to the *’ushr* (that is, a “tenth”, an early sequence of divisions by which the Qur’ān was separated into sections of ten verses).²⁰ Moreover, for our purposes, between the sura and the *’ushr* lies another textual division, the *hizb* (plural: *ahzab*), of which there are sixty of equal proportions in the Qur’ān.²¹

Initially (that is, from fol. 26ra to fol. 52ra), the copyist generally marked the *hizb* by leaving half a line blank and, below or contiguous with that, space for an inset initial majuscule.²² The *hizb* is, quite properly,

20) See, further, the description in Thomas Burman, *Reading the Qur’ān in Latin Christendom, 1140–1560* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), pp. 80–81; on the *’ushr*, see A. Jeffrey and I. Mendelsohn, “A Variant Text of the Fatiha: the orthography of the Samarqand Codex”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 63 (1943), 175–95.

(21) The link between *ahzab* and divisions in the *Alchoran* was established by Harmut Bobzin, *Der Koran im Zeitalter der Reformation: Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Arabistik und Islamkunde in Europa* (Beirut: Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart, 1995), pp. 226–29; see, further, Burman, *Reading*, n. 105 at p. 239. The *hizb* still has a para-liturgical function in North Africa, where survives the tradition of reading a *hizb* after morning and evening prayers respectively: Yasin Dutton, “Sufism in Britain: the Da’wa of Shayk Abdalqadir al-Sufi”, in *Sufism in Britain*, ed. Ron Greaves & Theodore Gabriel (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 93–110, at p. 103.

(22) Almost all of the *ahzab* are indicated by the scribe by the leaving blank of part of the previous line (or, if this is almost completely taken up, then by leaving blank the latter part of the first line of the new *hizb*) and by leaving space for a two-line-deep inset majuscule to indicate the beginning of the *hizb*: *Azoara* III.1 (equivalent to 2:203 – *hizb* 4), IV.1 (2:253 – *hizb* 5), VI.1 (3:92 – *hizb* VII), IX.1 (4:24 – *hizb* 9), XI.1 (4:148 – *hizb* 9), XIII.1 (5:82 – *hizb* 13), XV.1 (6:36 – *hizb* 14), XVI.1 (6:111 – *hizb* 15). Variations are found by a three-line-deep inset majuscule: II.1 (2:141 – *hizb* 3), and X.1 (4:87 – *hizb* 10); or by no space left for a majuscule, either with two-thirds of the previous line left