IJISI
International Journals of Islamic Studies Issues

International Journal of Islamic: Studies Issues (IJISI)
https://kalimasadajournals.com/index.php/IJISI

July 2026: Vol. 2. No. 2.
E-ISSN: 3089-6827
Pp: 15-24
DOI:
https://doi.org/10.59966/7tt1xe28

Uthmanic Orthography and Qur'anic Readings: A Critical Assessment of Functional and Numerical Explanations

Sukamta[a], Jarot Wahyudi[b*], Mu'tashim Billah[c], Azhar Ismail Hasibuan[d], Zulfa Khuriyatul Farah[e], Hüseyin Emin SERT[f]

[a,c] *ISQI Sunan Pandanaran, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*

[b,d,e] *Faculty of Adab and Cultural Sciences, UIN Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*

[f] *Istanbul Medeniyet Universitesi, Turkey*

*Email: jarot.wahyudi@uin-suka.ac.id

Manuscript received : 04-06-2026; revised : 11-09-2026; accepted : 30-10-2026. Date of publication : 11-11-2026

Abstract

Purpose - This study aims to investigate the complex structural and historical relationship between the standard orthographic script (*rasm imla'i*) and the codified Ottoman script (*rasm uthmani*) in the transmission, canonical recitations (*qira'at*), and divine preservation of the Holy Qur'an.

Design/Methodology/Approach - Employing a qualitative library research methodology with a descriptive-analytical framework, this study synthesizes primary data from the Holy Qur'an, canonical Hadith compendia, and classical *Kutub al-Turats*. It systematically evaluates the historical standardization under Caliph Uthman ibn Affan, the theological implications of *sab'ah ahruf*, orthographic anomalies (*ziyadah, hadf, ibdal, qat' wa wasl*), and preliminary numerical structures (*i'jaz 'adadi*).

Findings - The findings demonstrate that the departures of the Uthmanic script from standard orthographic rules were deliberate, divinely guided mechanisms designed to accommodate authenticated canonical recitations and preserve an intricate mathematical-linguistic harmony within the text.

Originality/Value - This research bridges classical ulumul Quran scholarship with contemporary structural textual analysis, offering profound insights into the dual preservation of the Qur'an through written codices (*sutur*) and oral transmission (*sudur*).

Keywords: *Ottoman script; orthographic script; qira'at; numerical miracle; ulumul quran*

Copyright © 2026, Author
This is an open-access article under the CC BY 4.0

I. INTRODUCTION

The Qur'an has been transmitted through recitation and writing. These modes of transmission are related, but they are not identical. Recitation preserves a vocal and performative tradition, whereas the muṣḥaf provides a written reference whose orthographic conventions are not always equivalent to those of ordinary Arabic spelling. The term rasm ʿUthmānī refers to the characteristic written form associated with the codices commissioned and distributed under the caliph ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān. It does not mean that ʿUthmān personally invented every orthographic convention found in the codices.

Reports in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī describe the collection of the Qur'an into a written codex during the caliphate of Abū Bakr and the subsequent preparation and distribution of regional copies under ʿUthmān (al-Bukhārī, 1993, reports 4986–4987). These accounts establish the importance of an authorised written reference in the early Muslim community. They do not, by themselves, explain the historical origin or intended function of every spelling convention. The classical literature on rasm, especially al-Dānī's al-Muqniʿ and the discussions collected by al-Suyūṭī, records both general rules and differences among transmitted descriptions of the regional codices (al-Dānī, 1978; al-Suyūṭī, 1974).

Rasm should therefore not be reduced to a list of letters that are either pronounced or unpronounced. The written form includes conventions involving omission, addition, substitution, hamzah, word separation and conjunction, and forms associated with more than one reading. Some classifications treat four broad categories as the principal rules, while other works distinguish six rules by separating hamzah and forms written according to one of two transmitted readings (Hula & Kasim, 2021; Saleh & Azmi, 2023). The distinction between rasm and ḍabṭ is also important. Rasm concerns the basic written form, whereas ḍabṭ includes marks that guide pronunciation, including vowel signs and other reading aids (Hula & Beddu Mala, 2021).

Recent manuscript research, including work on the Ṣanʿāʾ palimpsest, has complicated any account that treats early Qur'anic writing as uniformly undotted or fully standardised in every graphic detail. Studies of early codices, regional witnesses, and selective dotting show that consonantal writing, consonantal dotting, and vocalisation developed through interacting practices. The Tübingen manuscript has been compared with descriptions of the early codices (Alrahawan, 2021). Research on consonantal dotting has identified relationships between written forms and inherited oral reading traditions (Sidky, 2023). Studies of early manuscripts and regional rasm variants have also demonstrated the value of direct manuscript comparison rather than relying exclusively on later printed editions (Jannah et al., 2026; Muhammad, 2024; Nada et al., 2025; Saleh & Azmi, 2023; Sadeghi & Goudarzi, 2012; Syahrullah et al., 2024).

A second issue concerns the relationship between the seven aḥruf and the canonical qirāʾāt. The reports concerning the seven aḥruf are recorded in major hadith collections, but scholars have differed over their precise meaning (al-Bukhārī, 1993, report 4992; Muslim, 1991, report 818). The seven aḥruf should not be equated with the seven canonical readers associated with the later qirāʾāt system. The development of the reading traditions involved transmission, scholarly selection, and the establishment of criteria for acceptable readings. Dutton (2012) examines the relationship between oral variation and the written consonantal text, while Moqbel (2022) revisits classical explanations for the emergence of qirāʾāt. Ibn al-Jazarī's well-known criteria require a reading to accord with Arabic usage, correspond to one of the ʿUthmānic codices at least potentially, and possess a sound chain of transmission (Ibn al-Jazarī, 1980, vol. 1, p. 9).

A third issue is the use of numerical patterns to support claims about the composition or preservation of the Qur'an. Classical scholars did count verses, words, and letters for a range of scholarly purposes. Such counting traditions are not automatically equivalent to modern claims that a selected numerical pattern constitutes proof of miraculous design. Recent work on letter enumeration has shown that historical counts can be relevant to the comparison of manuscripts and printed editions (Al-Hemyari, 2025). That historical practice must be distinguished from claims based on selected concatenations, divisibility patterns, or letter totals whose selection procedures may not be disclosed.

Research on aḥruf and qirāʾāt, manuscript transmission, rasm rules, digital philology, and numerical claims has developed in partly separate conversations. This article brings these strands together to compare their evidentiary force. It does not claim that no previous study has addressed any one of these subjects. Its narrower contribution is to distinguish what each type of evidence can establish and where its limits lie.

This article asks three questions: how should rasm, qirāʾāt, and the seven aḥruf be related; what can selected orthographic examples establish about rasm's functional capacity; and under what conditions can numerical patterns support claims about textual composition? It argues that compatibility with transmitted readings is demonstrable, but does not by itself prove the historical intention behind every spelling. Numerical patterns likewise require transparent counting rules, selection procedures, and a defined comparison space.

II. METHOD

This study used a qualitative critical-review design combined with textual analysis of selected examples. It was not designed as a systematic review or an exhaustive census of every orthographic feature in the Qur'an. Its purpose was to compare the evidentiary claims made in classical and modern discussions of rasm, qirāʾāt, manuscript transmission, and numerical composition. The distinction is important because the study does not claim to have screened every publication or coded every occurrence in the Qur'anic text.

Primary sources were selected for their recognised role in the classical study of Qur'anic codification, rasm, and qirāʾāt. These included Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim for reports on collection, standardisation, and the aḥruf; al-Dānī's al-Muqniʿ for descriptions of rasm and regional

codices; al-Suyūṭī's al-Itqān and al-Zarkashī's al-Burhān for the history of scholarly positions (al-Suyūṭī, 1974; al-Zarkashī, 1957); Ibn Khaldūn's discussion as one historical explanation of early writing practices (Ibn Khaldūn, 1988); and Ibn al-Jazarī's al-Nashr for criteria governing accepted readings.

Secondary sources were selected when they directly addressed one or more of the following topics: the relationship between aḥruf and qirāʾāt; the consonantal text and oral transmission; early Qur'anic manuscripts and regional orthographic variation; the rules of rasm and ḍabṭ; digital philology; or numerical claims about the Qur'an. The original search channels reported by the author were Google Scholar, Garuda, DOAJ, and Shamela, using Arabic and English terms related to rasm, aḥruf, qirāʾāt, Qur'anic orthography, numerical composition, and manuscripts. The revised bibliography was cross-checked against journal, publisher, DOI, and institutional records where available. Because the process was not a fully documented systematic review, no exhaustive-search or PRISMA-style screening claim is made. Foundational sources were retained where necessary, while recent peer-reviewed research was prioritised.

The primary printed text used for the selected examples was the Muṣḥaf al-Madīnah al-Nabawiyyah, 1441 AH edition (Muṣḥaf al-Madīna al-Nabawiyya, 1441 AH). The verse-count convention was the Kūfan count of 6,236 verses used in the Madinah muṣḥaf. The attribution of this count was checked against the Indonesian Lajnah Pentashihan Mushaf Al-Qur'an, which traces the Kūfan count through Ḥamzah ibn Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt, Ibn Abī Laylā, Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, and ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib (Arifin, 2017). This attribution concerns the tradition of verse enumeration and should not be confused with the transmission chain of the Ḥafṣ reading from ʿĀṣim.

Three procedures were applied. First, conceptual analysis distinguished rasm, ḍabṭ, oral transmission, and historical intention. Second, selected examples were checked against the named printed edition and classified using classical and modern rasm literature. Third, the numerical examples considered in this article were recalculated under explicit rules. Base Arabic letters were counted as written. Hamzat al-qaṭʿ and hamzat al-waṣl each counted as one letter, and shaddah as one consonant. Alif maqṣūrah and tāʾ marbūṭah each counted as one letter. Short vowels, tanwīn, sukūn, tatwīl, superscript letters, madda signs, pause marks, and verse numbers were excluded.

The analysis was limited in three respects. It did not establish the historical intention of the Companions or scribes. It did not compare all surviving early manuscripts directly. It also did not test every numerical claim published in the iʿjāz ʿadadī literature. The conclusions are therefore restricted to the selected textual examples and numerical claims explicitly reproduced in this article.

III. Result and Discussion

3.1. Rasm as an Orthographic System

The first finding is that rasm ʿUthmānī is not adequately described as ordinary Arabic spelling with a small number of exceptions. It is a historically transmitted orthographic system whose conventions are recorded in specialised works. Its forms must be examined in relation to the written tradition, the reading tradition, and the later marks used to guide pronunciation. This distinction is particularly important when a modern printed muṣḥaf displays small letters or vowel signs that are not part of the basic consonantal skeleton.

Classifications of rasm vary in the way they group the rules. Four broad categories are often used: ḥadhf, ziyādah, badal, and faṣl wa-waṣl. Other treatments separate the writing of hamzah and the cases in which a form associated with two readings is written according to one of them, producing a six-rule classification (Hula & Kasim, 2021; al-Suyūṭī, 1974). These classifications are not necessarily contradictory. The six-rule system makes explicit two areas that may be treated as subcategories within a broader taxonomy.

Table 1 presents the six-rule classification as a practical analytical framework. The examples are illustrative and are not presented as a complete inventory of all occurrences. The table also avoids assigning a theological or semantic purpose to an orthographic feature unless that purpose is supported by a specific source.

Table 1. Six-rule classification of rasm and illustrative examples

Rule	Description	Illustrative example or scope
Ḥadhf (omission)	A letter that is represented in ordinary spelling may be omitted from the basic rasm, although a small sign may later guide its pronunciation.	The alif of al-ʿālamīn in Q 1:2 is represented through a small alif in the vocalised Madinah muṣḥaf.
Ziyādah (addition)	A written letter is retained in the rasm although it is not required by ordinary contemporary spelling.	The form bi-aydin, written بأييد, in Q 51:47 is commonly discussed as an example of additional yāʾ.
Badal (substitution)	One letter or graphemic form is used in place of another conventional spelling.	Forms such as الصلوة, الزكوة, and الحيوة are discussed in rasm literature as examples of alif represented by wāw.
Hamzah	The written body or seat of hamzah is governed by conventions that may differ from ordinary spelling.	The form of hamzah is examined according to its position in the word and the surrounding vowel context.
Faṣl wa-waṣl (separation and conjunction)	Words or particles may be written separately or joined according to transmitted conventions.	Examples of joining include كلما, فيما, and لكيلا. The exact separation or conjunction of a form must be checked against the verse and the rasm transmission being discussed.
Mā fīhi qirāʾatān wa-kutiba ʿalā iḥdāhumā	A written form may correspond to one of two transmitted readings or to a form that allows a reading distinction.	The form وسارعوا / سارعوا in Q 3:133 is associated with a reading difference. Some readings retain the initial wāw, while others omit it (Saleh & Azmi, 2023, pp. 14–15).

The classification follows the six-rule treatment discussed by al-Suyūṭī (1974) and Hula and Kasim (2021). The examples of faṣl wa-waṣl and forms associated with more than one reading are drawn from Saleh and Azmi (2023, pp. 14–15). The table is illustrative and is not an exhaustive concordance.

The examples demonstrate why the rasm and ḍabṭ layers should not be conflated. The omission of a full alif in the basic rasm does not mean that a reader is left without guidance in a modern muṣḥaf. A small alif or another sign may be supplied in the ḍabṭ layer. Likewise, the presence or absence of consonantal dots in an early manuscript cannot be described by a single rule that applies uniformly to all witnesses. Fedeli (2025) shows that vowel-dotting in an early manuscript can be selective and that the absence of a dot may itself reflect a scribal practice. Fedeli, Kinne-Wall, and Sidky (2025) further demonstrate how digital imaging and structured encoding can support the analysis of vocalisation systems.

Recent studies of Indonesian manuscripts also show that actual manuscript practice may combine features associated with rasm ʿUthmānī and rasm imlāʾī. The Pedir Museum manuscript, the Lingga manuscript, the Pakubuwana X collection, the Al-Banjari manuscript, and the Surau Tuo manuscript each provide evidence of variation in the use of rasm and qirāʾāt across historical witnesses (Hermawan & Putra, 2023; Imdad, 2025; Jannah et al., 2026; Rhain et al., 2026; Saleh & Azmi, 2023; Sari et al., 2025; Sholihah & Mustakim, 2025). Rhain et al. (2026) further distinguish copying anomalies from authentic qirāʾāt variation in a Surakarta manuscript, while Sari et al. (2025) report mixed use of rasm ʿUthmānī and rasm imlāʾī in a West Sumatran manuscript. Such findings caution against treating every surviving manuscript as a uniform instance of a single later printed standard.

3.2 The Aḥruf, Qirāʾāt, and the Consonantal Text

The second finding is that the relationship between rasm and qirāʾāt must be described without collapsing distinct historical and technical concepts. The reports concerning the seven aḥruf belong to the early hadith discussion of permitted variation in recitation. The canonical qirāʾāt, by

contrast, are named reading traditions that were transmitted, taught, selected, and systematised by specialist readers. The number seven in the aḥruf reports is therefore not a direct reference to the seven canonical readers. Dutton (2012) and Moqbel (2022) show that the meaning and historical implications of the aḥruf reports have been interpreted in different ways.

The relationship between the written text and recitation is also more complex than the claim that one was simply designed to produce the other. The consonantal text can leave room for more than one vocalisation or reading, but the existence and authority of a qirāʾah are not established by graphic possibility alone. In Ibn al-Jazarī's formulation, an accepted reading must be compatible with Arabic usage, correspond to one of the ʿUthmānic codices at least potentially, and have a sound chain of transmission (Ibn al-Jazarī, 1980, vol. 1). The rasm is therefore one criterion within a broader framework of transmission and linguistic evaluation.

Recent research supports a reciprocal rather than a one-directional account. Sidky (2023) examines consonantal dotting patterns and argues that regional oral traditions can be studied through the relationship between reading data and manuscript evidence. Van Putten (2022) documents cases in which canonical readers do not appear to follow the consonantal text in a straightforward manner and analyses the reasons for such cases. These studies indicate that the written form and oral reading tradition are closely related, but neither can be reduced to the other.

The claim that the rasm accommodates transmitted readings is defensible when it is stated at the level of compatibility. A consonantal form may be capable of supporting more than one reading, and the reading tradition may preserve distinctions that are not fully represented by the basic written form. However, this compatibility does not prove that every spelling was deliberately created to encode a particular reading. The same written form may result from inherited orthographic practice, regional transmission, or later standardisation. A claim about historical intention requires evidence beyond the fact that a written form can be read in more than one way.

Regional codices should be discussed with similar care. Classical sources record differences among regional copies, and manuscript research has investigated how early witnesses relate to the codices described in the Islamic tradition (al-Dānī, 1978; Alrahawan, 2021; Muhammad, 2024). Such variation should not automatically be labelled scribal error. At the same time, it should not automatically be interpreted as a deliberate device for distributing readings among regional copies. The historical status of each variant must be assessed through its manuscript witness, its transmission history, and the relevant reading tradition.

The aḥruf reports and the canonical qirāʾāt therefore address related but distinct questions. The former concern early permitted variation, while the latter are transmitted reading traditions with their own criteria and histories. Rasm can constrain or permit readings, but oral transmission remains indispensable to their authentication.

3.3 Interpreting the Divergence

The third finding concerns the difference between historical letter enumeration and modern numerical claims. Classical scholars recorded counts of verses, words, and letters. These counts could be relevant to textual description, manuscript comparison, and the verification of orthographic forms. Al-Hemyari (2025), for example, compares historical reports of letter counts with early manuscripts and printed muṣḥafs. This type of research should not be grouped automatically with claims that a numerical pattern proves divine encoding. The purpose, method, and evidentiary claim are different.

One numerical pattern considered here concatenates the verse counts of six sūrahs that begin with the letters Alif-Lām-Mīm. Under the Kūfan count used in the Madinah muṣḥaf, the relevant verse counts are 286, 200, 69, 60, 34, and 30 for sūrahs 2, 3, 29, 30, 31, and 32 respectively. When the counts are concatenated in descending sūrah order, the resulting integer is 30346069200286, which is divisible by seven. The sum of the six counts is 679, which is also divisible by seven.

These calculations are arithmetically correct. However, the choice to concatenate the numbers in descending sūrah order requires an independent justification. When the same six counts are concatenated in ascending sūrah order, the resulting integer is 28620069603430, which leaves a remainder of four when divided by seven. The fact that one ordering produces divisibility while another does not shows that the ordering rule materially affects the result. Unless the ordering rule is

specified before the calculation and justified by an independent textual principle, the divisibility result cannot establish intentional numerical design

Table 2. Kūfan verse counts of the six Alif-Lām-Mīm sūrahs

Sūrah	Kūfan verse count
2	286
3	200
29	69
30	60
31	34
32	30

Table 3. Effect of concatenation order on divisibility by seven

Ordering	Verse-count sequence	Concatenated integer	Result
Ascending sūrah order (2, 3, 29, 30, 31, 32)	286, 200, 69, 60, 34, 30	28620069603430	Remainder 4
Descending sūrah order (32, 31, 30, 29, 3, 2)	30, 34, 60, 69, 200, 286	30346069200286	Divisible by 7. Quotient: 4,335,152,742,898
Sum of the six counts	679	679	679 = 7 × 97

Verse counts follow the Kūfan enumeration used in the Madinah muṣḥaf. The attribution of the Kūfan count is discussed by Arifin (2017). The arithmetic in the table was recalculated for this article.

The same issue arises in letter-count claims. The earlier manuscript reported that Q 15:9 and Q 53:3–4 each contain 28 letters. These counts can be reproduced under the explicit convention stated in the Method section. The examples below count base Arabic letters, include hamzat al-qaṭʿ and hamzat al-waṣl, and exclude small superscript signs, vowel marks, shaddah as a separate count, and other non-letter marks.

Table 4. Word-by-word letter counts under the stated convention

Passage	Word-by-word base-letter counts	Total
Q 15:9	إِنَّا (3) + نَحْنُ (3) + نَزَّلْنَا (5) + ٱلذِّكْرَ (5) + وَإِنَّا (4) + لَهُۥ (2) + لَحَٰفِظُونَ (6)	28
Q 53:3–4	وَمَا (3) + يَنطِقُ (4) + عَنِ (2) + ٱلْهَوَىٰ (5) + إِنْ (2) + هُوَ (2) + إِلَّا (3) + وَحْيٌ (3) + يُوحَىٰ (4)	28

Counting note. The small wāw in لَهُۥ and the superscript alif in لَحَٰفِظُونَ were treated as diacritic signs rather than independent base letters. The text was checked against the Uthmani text of the named Madinah edition and the Tanzil Uthmani text (Tanzil Project, n.d.). The total of 28 is therefore conditional on the stated convention. A different convention can produce a different total.

Even when the arithmetic is reproducible, the inference remains a separate question. A result that is divisible by seven is an arithmetic property of the selected integer. For a uniformly distributed integer, one of the seven possible remainders is zero. This elementary observation does not constitute a statistical test of a particular numerical claim. To assess the significance of a reported pattern, a researcher would need to define the full set of candidate numbers, the permitted ordering and grouping rules, the counting conventions, and the number of alternatives examined before selecting the reported result.

This issue is related to the broader methodological problem of undisclosed analytical flexibility. Simmons, Nelson, and Simonsohn (2011) show that undisclosed choices in data collection, analysis, and reporting can make apparently strong statistical results much easier to obtain. Their study concerns empirical psychology rather than Qur'anic numerology, so it is used here only as a

methodological analogy. The relevant principle is general: an exploratory pattern should not be presented as confirmatory evidence unless the selection process is disclosed and the analysis can be independently reproduced.

The numerical argument also risks circularity when the orthographic form is selected because it produces a desired count and the resulting count is then used to validate that same orthographic form. The count is not independent evidence if the written form and counting rule were chosen to obtain the pattern. This does not mean that every numerical observation is meaningless. It means that arithmetic accuracy, historical counting practice, and proof of intentional numerical design are three different claims and must be evaluated separately.

Sidrak (2016) provides a mathematical and historical examination of the number nineteen tradition associated with Rashad Khalifa. Khalifa's own work is a primary statement of the code-19 claim (Khalifa, 1981). These sources demonstrate that numerical claims should be assessed through their stated counting rules and historical assumptions rather than accepted or rejected solely through personal or theological characterisations of their proponents. The present article does not attempt to evaluate every code-19 claim. It assesses the methodological requirements that any numerical claim must meet.

3.4 Evidence Synthesis

Taken together, the evidence types are not interchangeable. Transmitted readings, classical rasm descriptions, and manuscripts can establish the compatibility of some readings with written forms and document regional variation. They cannot, without further evidence, prove the intention behind every spelling or classify every manuscript variant as a canonical reading.

Numerical patterns can be recalculated, but their inferential force depends on declared conventions, a defined search space, and disclosure of alternatives. Historical letter counting is relevant to textual description and manuscript comparison, but does not by itself validate claims of numerical inimitability.

Table 5. Evidentiary scope of the principal arguments

Type of evidence	What it can support	What it cannot establish by itself
Transmitted qirāʾāt	The existence and authority of readings supported by recognised transmission and scholarly criteria.	That every graphic feature was intentionally designed to encode a particular reading.
Rasm compatibility	That a written consonantal form can accommodate one or more transmitted readings.	The historical intention of the original scribes or the origin of every reading.
Manuscript comparison	The presence, distribution, and development of orthographic variation across witnesses.	That every variant is a canonical qirāʾah or that every difference is an error.
Letter and verse enumeration	Reproducible textual counts under declared conventions and their possible use in manuscript comparison.	A miraculous or intentional numerical code without a pre-specified search procedure and independent evidence.
Divisibility patterns	An arithmetic property of a selected number.	Statistical significance or intentional design when the selection space is undisclosed.

3.5. Implications for Printing, Pedagogy, and Digital Qur'anic Texts

The distinction between rasm, ḍabṭ, and qirāʾāt has practical implications for the production and use of Qur'anic texts. Printed muṣḥafs should identify the orthographic and reading tradition they follow. A pedagogical transcription may be useful for learners, but it should be clearly distinguished from an authorised muṣḥaf and checked by qualified specialists. The history of printed editions also shows that standardisation involves decisions about which scholarly transmission of rasm and ḍabṭ is adopted (Hakim & Diman, 2025; Valfini et al., 2025).

In Qur'anic education, orthographic forms should not be taught merely as unexplained exceptions. Teachers can distinguish general rules from specific transmitted forms and explain that a graphic form may be connected to the history of recitation, copying, or standardisation. Where a traditional semantic explanation is disputed or does not generalise, it should be presented as an interpretation attributed to its proponent rather than as an established historical fact.

Digital Qur'anic applications require a further distinction between the base text, vocalisation, recitation metadata, and display font. Digital systems should preserve the exact orthographic form of a named edition, document the source text and encoding, and avoid transformations that silently replace one graphemic form with another. Research on Corpus Coranicum and recent manuscript digitisation projects demonstrates the value of high-resolution images, structured metadata, and reproducible comparison workflows (Aini et al., 2025; Fedeli et al., 2025; Syahrullah et al., 2024). Digital comparison should supplement, not replace, verification against the physical or authoritative textual witness.

IV. CONCLUSION

This article assessed the relationship between rasm ʿUthmānī, transmitted qirāʾāt, and numerical explanations of Qur'anic orthography. The analysis showed that rasm is a historically transmitted orthographic system rather than a simple phonetic transcription. Its rules are classified through both four-category and six-category schemes, depending on whether hamzah and forms associated with more than one reading are treated as separate rules or as subcategories.

The relationship between rasm and qirāʾāt is best described as one of compatibility within a wider system of oral transmission and scholarly authentication. The consonantal text can accommodate some transmitted readings, but graphic compatibility alone does not generate or authenticate a reading. Nor does it prove that every orthographic feature was deliberately designed for a specific recitational purpose. Historical intention must remain a separate question requiring additional evidence.

The numerical examples examined in this article were arithmetically reproducible under the declared conventions. However, the concatenation result depended on the chosen ordering, and the letter counts depended on the treatment of small signs and other orthographic marks. These findings show why a numerical claim must disclose its counting rules, selection procedure, denominator, and alternative analyses. Classical letter enumeration remains important for the history of rasm and manuscript comparison, but it should not be conflated with modern claims of numerical inimitability.

Because this study did not examine every early manuscript or every rasm occurrence, its conclusions remain limited to the selected examples. Future work should build a documented digital corpus linking orthographic variants to manuscript witnesses and transmitted readings, then test numerical claims through pre-specified procedures that disclose the full search space.

V. REFERENCES

Aini, A. F., Prajawinanti, A., Sulton, A., & Alifa, A. Z. (2025). Digital preservation of Qur'anic manuscript: Developing the Manuscript Al-Qur'an Digital Application (MAQDA). Khizanah Al-Hikmah: Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan, Informasi, dan Kearsipan, 13(1), 37–53. https://doi.org/10.24252/v13i1a4

Alrahawan, M. S. M. (2021). Tübingen M a VI 165 Quran manuscript and its compatibility with ʿUthmān's codices. Indonesian Journal of Interdisciplinary Islamic Studies, 5(1), 45–83. https://doi.org/10.20885/ijiis.vol.5.iss1.art3

Arifin, Z. (2017, July 27). Mengenal jumlah hitungan ayat dalam Al-Qur'an. Lajnah Pentashihan Mushaf Al-Qur'an, Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia. https://lajnah.kemenag.go.id/info-lpmq/berita-dan-artikel/artikel/mengenal-jumlah-hitungan-ayat-dalam-al-qur-an.html

al-Bukhārī, M. I. (1993). Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (M. D. al-Bughā, Ed.). Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Ibn Kathīr.

al-Dānī, ʿU. S. (1978). Al-Muqniʿ fī maʿrifat marsūm maṣāḥif ahl al-amṣār (M. A. Dahmān, Ed.). Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Fikr.

Dutton, Y. (2012). Orality, literacy and the 'seven aḥruf' ḥadīth. Journal of Islamic Studies, 23(1), 1–49. https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/etr092

Fedeli, A. (2025). Patterns of selective vowel-dotting in early Qurʾānic manuscripts. In A. Fedeli, G. Khan, & J. Lundberg (Eds.), The intertwined world of the oral and written transmission of sacred traditions in the Middle East (pp. 307–386). Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers. https://doi.org/10.11647/obp.0498.08

Fedeli, A., Kinne-Wall, C., & Sidky, H. (2025). New approaches to analysing the vocalisation of early Qurʾānic manuscripts. In A. Fedeli, G. Khan, & J. Lundberg (Eds.), The intertwined world of the oral and written transmission of sacred traditions in the Middle East (pp. 387–436). Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers. https://doi.org/10.11647/obp.0498.09

Hakim, A., & Diman, H. (2025). Standardization of the rasm of Qur'anic printed editions and the end of qiyasiy orthography: A review of Tauhid ar-Rasm wa ad-Dabt fi Tiba'ah Masahif by Ganim Qadduriy al-Hamad. SUHUF, 18(2), 347–370. https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v18i2.637

Al-Hemyari, B. H. (2025). The sum of letters in Qur'anic chapters and its implications for the Uthmanic script: A case study of Surah al-Zalzalah and from Surah al-Qāriʿah to Surah al-ʿAsr. Journal of College of Sharia and Islamic Studies, 43(2), 19–46. https://doi.org/10.29117/jcsis.2025.0415

Hermawan, W., & Putra, A. (2023). Manuskrip mushaf Al-Qur'an Kerajaan Lingga di Pulau Penyengat Kepulauan Riau: Analisis sejarah, rasm, dan qirāʾāt. QOF, 7(1), 81–102. https://doi.org/10.30762/qof.v7i1.994

Ḥula, I. R. N., & Beddu Mala, A. (2021). Al-furūq al-ḍabṭiyyah bayna al-rasm al-muṣḥafī wa al-rasm al-imlāʾī. Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa, 6(1), 85–111. https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v6i1.1930

Ḥula, I. R. N., & Kasim, A. (2021). Al-qawāʿid al-sittah dalam rasm al-mushaf (Six rules of rasm and the uniqueness in Qur'an). 'A Jamiy: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Arab, 10(2), 385–418. https://doi.org/10.31314/ajamiy.10.2.385-418.2021

Ibn al-Jazarī, M. M. (1980). Al-Nashr fī al-qirāʾāt al-ʿashr (ʿA. M. al-Ḍabbāʿ, Ed.). Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah.

Ibn Khaldūn, ʿA. (1988). Muqaddimat Ibn Khaldūn (Vol. 1). Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Qalam.

Imdad, M. K. (2025). Heterogeneity of Ulumul Qur'an in Al-Qur'an manuscripts: A study of rasm and qira'at in the Pakubuwana X collection manuscripts. SUHUF, 18(1), 77–106. https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v18i1.1174

Jannah, A. R., Nugraha, E., & Arif, B. (2026). Beyond passive copying: Orthographic fluidity and intellectual agency in Al-Banjari's 18th-century Qur'anic manuscript. SUHUF, 19(1), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v19i1.1517

Khalifa, R. (1981). The computer speaks: God's message to the world. Tucson, AZ: Renaissance Productions.

Moqbel, T. (2022). The emergence of the qirāʾāt: The divine permission hypothesis. Journal of Islamic Studies, 33(3), 299–330. https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/etac032

Muhammad, W. I. (2024). The discourses of Rasm 'Usmaniy and the dynamics of early Quran manuscripts prior to Abu Amr ad-Daniy (d. 1053/444). SUHUF, 17(2), 319–344. https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v17i2.1036

Muṣḥaf al-Madīna al-Nabawiyya. (1441 AH). Al-Muṣḥaf al-Madanī al-Nabawī. Madinah, Saudi Arabia: King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Holy Qur'an.

Muslim, I. al-Ḥ. (1991). Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim (M. F. ʿAbd al-Bāqī, Ed.). Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī.

Nada, T. Q., Faizah, S. N., & Azzahra, S. N. (2025). The orthographic identity of Rasm ʿUthmānī in the Qur'an: Tracing substitution, hamzah, and word structure. An-Nur International Journal of The Quran & Hadith, 3(1), 44–53. https://doi.org/10.62032/aijqh.v3i1.79

Rhain, A., Azizah, A., Dahliana, Y., Nirwana AN, A., Nurrohim, A., Maulana, R., Muhajir, M., & Musa, M. A. (2026). Manuscript of the Qur'an of the Kasunan Palace of Surakarta (coded MAA.001): A historical-philological study of writing errors and their implications for interpretation. ZAD Al-Mufassirin, 8(1), 953–976. https://doi.org/10.55759/zam.v8i1.417

Sadeghi, B., & Goudarzi, M. (2012). Ṣanʿāʾ 1 and the origins of the Qurʾān. Der Islam, 87(1–2), 1–129. https://doi.org/10.1515/islam-2011-0025

Saleh, F., & Azmi, U. (2023). Rasm manuskrip mushaf Al-Qur'an: Kajian terhadap naskah koleksi Pedir Museum Aceh nomor 278/16. Tafse: Journal of Qur'anic Studies, 8(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.22373/tafse.v8i1.17986

Sari, N., Jusnita, & Putra, B. (2025). Analisis rasm terhadap manuskrip Al-Qur'an kuno karya Syaikh Ibrahim Mufti di Surau Tuo Kabupaten Lima Puluh Kota. Al-Fahmu: Jurnal Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Tafsir, 4(1), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.58363/alfahmu.v4i1.249

Sholihah, F. A., & Mustakim, A. (2025). The dynamics of rasm Uthmani and rasm Imla'i in the Qur'anic mushaf: A historical and practical study in Indonesia. Al Furqan: Jurnal Ilmu Al Quran dan Tafsir, 8(1), 223–238. https://doi.org/10.58518/alfurqon.v8i1.3460

Sidky, H. (2023). Consonantal dotting and the oral Quran. Journal of the American Oriental Society, 143(4), 785–814. https://doi.org/10.7817/jaos.143.4.2023.ar029

Sidrak, Y. (2016). A mathematical and historical analysis and verification of the miraculous number nineteen in the Noble Qur'an. Quranica: International Journal of Quranic Research, 8(2), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.22452/quranica.vol8no2.2

Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. Psychological Science, 22(11), 1359–1366. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632

al-Suyūṭī, J. ʿA. (1974). Al-Itqān fī ʿulūm al-Qurʾān (M. A. Ibrāhīm, Ed.). Cairo, Egypt: al-Hayʾah al-Miṣriyyah al-ʿĀmmah li-l-Kitāb.

Syahrullah, S., Muhammad, W. I., Nugraha, E., & Jannah, A. R. (2024). Corpus Coranicum and digital philology: A methodological model for advancing Qur'anic manuscript studies in Indonesia. Khazanah Theologia, 6(3), 201–222. https://doi.org/10.15575/kt.v6i3.45610

Tanzil Project. (n.d.). Tanzil Quran text (Uthmani). Retrieved November 10, 2026, from https://tanzil.net/download/

Valfini, Q. B., Aminullah, M., Sipahutar, R. T., & Sharubutu, O. N. (2025). The variants of orthographic control in the Qur'anic manuscripts of the Qiraah of Abu 'Amr, narrated by ad-Duri: An analytical-comparative study of the Madinah Mushaf, the Sudanese Mushaf, and the digital Mushaf at-Taysir. SUHUF, 18(1), 219–251. https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v18i1.1258

van Putten, M. (2022). When the readers break the rules: Disagreement with the consonantal text in the canonical Quranic reading traditions. Dead Sea Discoveries, 29(3), 438–462. https://doi.org/10.1163/15685179-02903008

al-Zarkashī, B. M. (1957). Al-Burhān fī ʿulūm al-Qurʾān (M. A. Ibrāhīm, Ed.). Cairo, Egypt: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyyah.