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I don’t see why this would require a separate encoding. This strikes me as something that should rather be expressed through fonts.

To answer the [SAH’s] questions:

- Does this “superscript” alef only occur with a lam?

  Yes it only occurs with a lam. It is a purely positional variant of the normal dagger alif used when it occurs next to a lam, and in that position it is obligatory for those that use this type of dagger alef. Therefore there is no distinction between lām + normal dagger alef, and lam + diagonal dagger alef. You either use one or the other.

  Traditionally, this just a feature of the Maghrebi style of the Arabic script.

  In modern print Qurans it has been introduced in eastern script styles as well, but since it is entirely positionally conditioned and in complementary distribution with the regular dagger ʿalif, it strikes me that this should be encoded in a font, not as a separate character in Unicode.
• Cite the actual Arabic word transcribed in the character name as MOTAHAFAR.

Presumably MOTHAFAIR i.e. mużaffar "victorious", مُظَفْر but I don't know the term.

• How does the superscript alef work with multiple diacritics in the context of UTR #53 (that is, specify the order of the diacritics and provide details on how they interact as described in UTR #53)?

Identically to the dagger alef, since it simply is the dagger alef. But since it only occurs next to a lām, there are fewer cases where it occurs.

The only combinations that exist are:

1. lam, fatha, dagger alef
2. lam, fatha, dagger alef, madda
3. lam, sukun, hamzah, fatha, dagger alef

The last of these three is used only to spell al-ʾāna which is rendered as follows:

Note that the hamzah ends up in front of the lām ʾalif. This is identical to the way lām sukun, hamzah, fatha, regular alef is rendered in Qurans in this Maghrebi-inspired style is rendered, such as in bi-l-ʾāxiratī.

Once again this strikes me as something that should be solved by a font, not by encoding it in Unicode.