CONTENTS

TEXTS AND MANUSCRIPTS: DESCRIPTION AND RESEARCH	3
 B. Babajanov. Biographies of Makhdūm-i Aʻzam al-Kāsānī al-Dahbīdī, <i>Shaykh</i> of the Sixteenth-Century Naqshbandīya S. Prozorov. A Unique Manuscript of a Biographical Dictionary by a Khorezmian Author I. Kulganek. A Mongolian Folk Songs Collection in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental 	3 9
Studies	18
M. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya. A Sanskrit Manuscript on Birch-Bark from Bairam-Ali: I. The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins	27
TEXT AND ITS CULTURAL INTERPRETATION	37
E. Rezvan. The Qur'an and Its World. IX. The Triumph of Diversity: Muslim Exegesis	37
ORIENTAL MANUSCRIPTS AND NEW INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES	58
E. Rezvan, N. Kondybaev. The ENTRAP Software: Test Results	58
PRESENTING THE MANUSCRIPT	65
T. Pang. A Manchu Manuscript on Acupuncture	65
BOOK REVIEWS.	71

Front cover:

Fragment of the drawing demonstrating acupuncture points which should be applied when healing back pain and a half-body paralysis. Sabsire sûiha sindara ferguwecuke argan, manuscript B 92 mss in the collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, illustration 13, fol. 42, 27.0×46.3 cm.

Back cover:

Drawing of a male figure with acupuncture points which should be applied when healing child's night crying and tooth-ache. The same manuscript, illustration 1, fol. 28, 27.0×46.3 cm.

RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES THE INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDIES ST. PETERSBURG BRANCH



Manuscripta Orientalia

International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research

Vol. 5 No. 2 June 1999



75ESA St. Petersburg-Helsinki

ORIENTAL MANUSCRIPTS AND NEW INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

E. A. Rezvan, N. S. Kondybaev.

THE ENTRAP SOFTWARE: TEST RESULTS

In the article published in Manuscripta Orientalia in September 1996 [1], we declared our intention to publish test results for the ENTRAP software, a program intended for the semi-automatic analysis of hand-written script. A large Qur'anic fragment (call number E20) [2], held at the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies. provided us with a good material to test the software suggested. This fragment. a vertical-format codex $(34.0 \times 52.5 \text{ cm})$, is undoubtedly one of the most valuable early copies of the Qur'an to have reached us. It consists of 81 folios; the text is written on a high-quality parchment and contains 39.3% of the whole text of the Our'an. In all, the surviving folios comprise (in full or partly) the text of forty-four sūras (2-11, 20, 24-39, 43-58, 70 and 71). The text of twenty-two of these is complete (sūras 10, 25, 31-34, 36-38, 45-57).

The surviving fragment reveals the hands of two copyists (we designate their hands as A and B), who divided their work into two equal parts. The first transcribed $s\bar{u}ras$ 2—11, which makes up the first half of the Qur'ān's text, and the other — the text beginning with $s\bar{u}ra$ 20 and further. It is, however, possible that the second scribe began his work with $s\bar{u}ra$ 17, the beginning of which corresponds to the beginning of juz' 15, which starts approximately in the middle of the Qur'ānic text. The number of lines per page varies widely (hand A — from 23 to 31 lines; hand B from 21 to 26), as does the size of letters. No sign of preliminary ruling can be seen.

Both hands of the fragment have common features with the style of the handwriting known from written texts from Cairo, Damascus, Şan'ā', as well as from the al-Tā'if's inscription dated to A.D. 677—78. The usual designation of this style is "late Hijāzī". Taking into account Fr. Déroche's classification, both hands can be considered as corresponding on the whole to styles BI and BII of the "early 'Abbāsid scripts" [3]. The fashion of writing medial $j\bar{i}m/h\bar{a}'/kh\bar{a}'$, however, corresponds mainly to style AI, according to the same classification. On the whole, the writing in our manuscript reflects a transitive phase of Arabic script development, from Hijāzī to later writing styles. Alif is usually written perpendicular to the line, although it is sometimes slightly inclined to the right. The same is with the vertical stroke of $t\bar{a}'$ and $l\bar{a}m$. Hand B, surer and more professional, is characterised by a distinctly rounded end of final $j\bar{i}m/ha'/kh\bar{a}'$, 'ayn and ghayn, which distinguishes hand B from hand A.

The manuscript of the Qur'ān dates to the late eighth early ninth century. It seems to demonstrate the mature stage of the development of one of the two early written styles of copying Qur'āns, closely linked to Northwest Arabia and to the region of Syrian border. A large number of the manuscript's orthographic and palaeographic features links it with the Hijāzī manuscripts discovered in Ṣan'ā'. They belong to the Qur'ān type designated by Estelle Whellan as "type 2" [4].

The establishing of even the smallest variance in hands can be of use for attributing Muslim manuscripts. This consideration explains our interest in the ENTRAP software. The question was whether the ENTRAP software can be used to distinguish hands' variance properly. To answer this question, hands A and B of our manuscript, very close to each other, were employed.

For our analysis, we chose different positions (from five to nine) of Arabic letters — initial, medial and final for 'ayn/ghayn and alif, final — for $n\bar{u}n$ and $t\bar{a}$ ', medial — for $m\bar{n}m$, initial — for $j\bar{n}m/h\bar{a}$ '/kh \bar{a} ', medial — for $h\bar{a}$ ', final for $q\bar{a}f$, and the ligature alif/l $\bar{a}m$ as they are written by the scribes of the Qur' $\bar{a}n$. The letters were chosen at random. The analysis was conducted as follows: (i) letter images were borrowed from the scanned variant of the manuscript's text; (ii) a group of parameters was obtained for every symbol for creating a statistical model; (iii) variances for two groups of symbols, representing hand A and hand B, were established and analysed; (iv) hypothesis based on the statistical model employed was tested.

The results of our calculations are shown in *Table 1*. The analysis was conducted with the aid of statistical methods (dispersion analysis was used). We tested hypothesis H_0 that the mean values (expected values) of the measured parameters for a certain symbol will coincide with the values obtained for the same parameters of the same symbol in each of the two groups (hand A and hand B).

This means that if hypothesis H_0 fails for even one of the parameters analysed, the expected values are not equal. In other words, the probability distribution of values of a parameter is divided by the sum of the two probability dis-

tributions. These groups are different for the writing of the same symbol because they belong to different hands.

The statistical criterion was formulated in the following manner: if $F_{r-1,n-r}>C$, then hypothesis H_0 on the coincidence of the mean parameter values from different groups fails, where

F --- distribution with r-1, n-r degrees of freedom

r --- number of groups

n --- number of copies of any symbol

C — constant from table of F-distribution under level of test value.

Mean values for all parameters of the symbol for each group are listed in *Table 2*. Three parameters were analysed:

As — degree of possible distortion En — entropy Ma — expected result The test of statistical hypothesis H_0 was conducted for the following level of criterion significance: $\alpha = 0.05$, C=5.32 and for $\alpha = 0.01$, C=11.26 and r=2.0. Results are shown in *Table 3*. Five symbols met our statistical criterion. Thanks to these symbols, we can distinguish hand A from hand B with a reasonable level of confidence.

The approach described in our previous article and realised by means of the ENTRAP software reveals the difference between very similar hands. It gives us the opportunity to identify hand-written symbols.

As is seen from *Table 2*, the approach described above can be of use for solving the problem of symbol classification as part of the task of automatic optical character recognition for hand-written texts. A statistical model employed enables us to see consistent separation of symbols by classes. Reflected in *Table 2* a powerful ICR (Intelligent Character Recognition) system could be based upon this approach.

Table 1

1	•		tial yn		2.	A	lif	
		A		В	А			В
	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter
As En Ma		186.75 7.319 29.825	4	185.806 7.664 32.574	L	189.252 7.078 33.528	L	189.05 7.006 33.537
As En Ma	-	186.356 6.989 28.575	-	184.455 7.33 30.631	T	189.503 6.976 33.065	L	189.307 7.03 33.636
As En Ma	-	185.513 7.416 30.508	-	186.583 7.346 28.939	L	188.593 7.442 32.858	l	189.606 6.876 32.438
As En Ma	~	184.957 7.511 30.883		186.21 7.514 31.74	L	189.708 7.06 32.652	L	189.279 7.076 33.889
As En Ma	4	186.194 7.503 30.234	4	186.421 7.309 30.808	L	189.458 7.055 34.073	L	189.271 7.052 33.752

The results of computation

3.		Fina nūi			4.	Midd <i>'ayı</i>		
		A	•	В		A		В
	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter
As En Ma	1	188.419 7.48 35.371	j	188.94 6.909 31.635	*	180.264 8.126 37.332	*	177.062 7.938 41.906
As En Ma)	187.611 7.634 35.195)	187.891 7.285 32.61	×	185.442 8.06 32.964	*	180.92 8.107 40.422
As En Ma	3	188.717 7.526 34.356	0	189.294 7.504 35.206	×	178.272 8.306 45.113	*	179.057 8.133 43.881
As En Ma)	188.477 7.677 37.78	j	187.826 7.06 28.649	*	177.5 8.037 47.437	2	175.051 7.913 48.414
As En Ma	Ĵ	188.128 7.62 34.951)	188.374 7.571 34.488	×	177.845 8.123 41.481	4	179.262 8.086 44.646
As En Ma					*	180.804 8.134 38.554	sL.	182.596 8.229 42.547
As En Ma							x	176.906 7.995 45.003
As En Ma							2	182.127 8.095 36.98
As En Ma							*	184.687 8.041 32.267
En							æ	

5.		Ţč	ā'		6. Final <i>'ayn</i>			
		A		B	Α		В	
	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter
As En Ma		188.491 7.925 45.0		190.379 7.418 40.517	Ł	189.226 7.45 32.024	U	191.242 7.109 43.139
As En Ma		188.026 8.002 46.078	L	189.948 7.575 41.568	L	189.311 7.749 36.823	C	191.505 6.837 42.477
As En Ma		188.612 7.932 44.17	L	190.262 7.518 43.574	ι	190.522 7.574 42.664	l	190.412 7.257 32.676
As En Ma	L	186.884 7.709 36.424		189.941 7.686 45.274	Ł	190. 134 7. 571 39. 136	2	190.802 7.38 41.598
As En Ma	Ľ	188.164 8.038 47.29		190.062 7.565 44.5	L	189.834 7.634 39.556	L	190.439 7.474 43.009

Continuation	of	Table	1
Communion	~		-

7.		Mid mī			8. Initial jīm/ḥā'/khā'				
		Α		В		A]	В	
	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	
As En Ma	٠	178.565 8.467 39.144	4	180.497 8.23 36.718		182.397 8.042 35.369	*	186.744 7.62 29.057	
As En Ma		179.925 8.183 36.318	۵	179.25 8.29 37.415	-	181.453 7.775 33.673	-	184.939 7.886 32.831	
As En Ma	۲	180.112 8.471 37.245	٥	179.292 8.214 35.537	-	183.92 7.963 32.982	*	183.291 8.051 35.522	
As En Ma		179.669 8.281 40.219	4	181.053 8.424 35.347	*	183.542 7.844 31.681	*	181.586 8.013 35.983	

7.	7. Middle 8. mīm				8.	Initial jīm/ḥā'/khā'			
		A		В		A		3	
	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	
As En Ma	4	179.909 8.367 42.024	-	177.953 8.452 40.455	•	182.589 7.922 35.128	*	185.282 7.738 29.545	
As En Ma					*	182.934 7.947 35.461		182.61 8.143 36.764	
As En Ma					۹.,	185.22 7.867 31.719	•	184.411 7.888 32.062	
As En Ma					-	185.259 7.714 30.85			

9.	•	Middle <i>hā'</i>				m/alif		
		A	В		А		В	
	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter
As En Ma	4	182.894 8.186 32.722	4	182.116 8.242 34.252	X	184.853 7.668 33.391	X	184.899 7.621 34.238
As En Ma	4	181.683 8.26 34.505	4	183.628 8.269 32.903	X	185.097 7.734 33.581	X	188.705 7.294 32.596
As En Ma	4	182.153 8.074 32.602	4	182.593 8.198 32.496	X	185.621 7.605 32.199	X	186.849 7.42 31.488
As En Ma	4	182.88 8.102 31.371	4	181.884 8.239 34.365	X	184.874 7.55 31.938	X	185.997 7.502 31.925
As En Ma	4	182.214 8.074 31.938	4	180.939 8.024 33.017	X	186.154 7.723 31.878	X	186.605 7.561 31.099

11.	l. Final <i>qāf</i>							
		A	В		<i>y</i>	A		В
	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter	symbol	parameter
As En Ma	ÿ	188.538 6.999 28.849	3	189.591 7.202 27.071	ع	189.777 7.183 28.578	Ś	189.41 7.136 26.031
As En Ma	ŝ	189.001 7.388 28.851	3	189.621 7.175 28.224				
As En Ma	ŝ	188.567 7.153 29.863	ğ	188.71 7.028 27.966	3	189.744 6.911 29.152	Ż	186.507 7.326 27.346

Table 2

Mean values of symbols

Symbol	Hand	Number	As	En	Ma
1	A	5	185.954	7.3476	30.0050
Initial 'ayn	В	5	185.895	7.4326	30.9384
		10	185.925	7.3901	30.4717
2	A	5	189.303	7.1222	33.2352
Alif	В	5	189.303	7.0080	33.4504
	All	10	189.303	7.0651	33.3428
3	A	5	188.270	7.5874	35.5306
Final <i>nūn</i>	В	5	188.465	7.2658	32.5176
	All	10	188.368	7.4266	34.0241
4	Α	6	180.021	8.1310	40.4802
Middle 'ayn	В	9	179.741	8.0597	41.7851
	All	15	179.881	8.0953	41.1326
5	A	5	188.035	7.9212	43.7924
Ţā'	В	5	190.118	7.5524	43.0866
	All	10	189.077	7.7368	43.4395
6	Α	5	189.805	7.5956	38.0406
Final 'ayn	В	5	190.880	7.2114	40.5798
	All	10	190.343	7.4035	39.3102
7	A	5	179.636	8.3538	38.9900
Middle mīm	В	5	179.609	8.3220	37.0944
	All	10	179.623	8.3379	38.0422

Symbol	Hand	Number	As	En	Ma
8	A	8	183.414	7.8843	33.3579
Initial jīm/ḥā'/khā'	В	7	184.123	7.9056	33.1091
	All	15	183.769	7.8949	33.2335
9	A	5	182.365	8.1392	32.6276
Middle <i>hā</i> '	В	5	182.232	8.1944	33.4066
	All	10	182.298	8.1668	33.0171
10	A	5	185.320	7.6560	32.5974
Lām/alif	В	5	186.611	7.4796	32.2692
	All	10	185.965	7.5678	32.4333
11	A	5	189.125	7.1268	29.0586
Final <i>qāf</i>	В	5	188.768	7.1734	27.3276
	All	10	188.947	7.1501	28.1931

Table 3

Results of analytical treatment

(for $\alpha = 0.05$, C = 5.32 and $\alpha = 0.05$, C = 11.26)

Symbol		As	En	Ma
3	F _{1.8}	0.31846	5.9701	5.37534
Final <i>nūn</i>	$\alpha = 0.05$		+	+
	$\alpha = 0.01$	—		
5	F _{1.8}	42.6509	26.3858	0.11159
Ţā'	α = 0.05	+	+	
	$\alpha = 0.01$	+	+	
6	F _{1.8}	10.7735	9.92659	0.9074
Final 'ayn	$\alpha = 0.05$	+	+	
	$\alpha = 0.01$	_	_	
10	F _{1.8}	3.70392	6.93993	0.2451
Lām/alif	$\alpha = 0.05$		+	
	$\alpha = 0.01$		—	
11	F _{1.8}	0.30403	0.23913	15.24
Final <i>qāf</i>	$\alpha = 0.05$	—	_	+
	$\alpha = 0.01$			+

Notes

1. E. A. Rezvan, N. S. Kondybaev, "New tool for analysis of handwritten script", Manuscripta Orientalia, II/3 (1996), pp. 43-53.

2. E. A. Rezvan, "The Qur'ān and its world: VI. Emergence of the Canon: the struggle for uniformity", *Manuscripta Orientalia*, IV/2 (1998), pp. 13—54.

3. F. Déroche, The Abbasid Tradition. Qur'ans of the 8th to the 10th Centuries AD. (Oxford, 1992), pp. 11-2. — The Nasser D. Khalili Collection of Islamic Art, II.

4. E. Whellan, "Writing the word of god: some early Qur'an manuscripts and their milieu", pt. 1, Ars Orientalis, XX (1990), pp. 119-23, figs. 19-22.