The lower text of Ṣan‘ā’ 1 is at present the most important document for the history of the Qurʾān. As the only known extant copy from a textual tradition beside the standard ʿUthmānic one, it has the greatest potential of any known manuscript to shed light on the early history of the scripture. Comparing it with parallel textual traditions provides a unique window onto the initial state of the text from which the different traditions emerged. The comparison settles a perennial controversy about the date at which existing passages were joined together to form the ʿsūras (chapters). Some ancient reports and modern scholars assign this event to the reign of the third caliph and link it with his standardizing the text of the Qurʾān around AD 650. However, the analysis shows that the ʿsūras were formed earlier. Furthermore, the manuscript sheds light on the manner in which the text was transmitted. The inception of at least some Qurʾānic textual traditions must have involved semi-oral transmission, most likely via hearers who wrote down a text that was recited by the Prophet. This essay argues for these
conclusions by considering the broad features of the text. The essay also presents the edited text of the folios in the Dār al-Makhṭūṭāt, Ṣanʿā’, Yemen, in addition to four folios that were auctioned abroad. A systematic analysis of all the variants is postponed to future publications.

Introduction

The Manuscript and the Field of Qur’ānic Studies

Scholarly approaches to the early history of the standard text of the Qur’ān can be enumerated in a broad and rough manner as follows:

There is the traditional account that is associated with most pre-modern scholars. They held that the Prophet Muhammad (d. AD 632) disseminated the Qur’ān gradually. Some of his Companions compiled copies of the scripture. These codices had differences. Motivated by the differences and seeking uniformity among Muslims, the Caliph ‘Uthmān (d. AD 656), himself a Companion, established a standard version. He—or, more precisely, a committee of Companions appointed by him—did so by sending master copies of the Qur’ān to different cities—codices that themselves differed slightly in a small number of spots—and people in turn made copies of them. In subsequent decades and centuries, this standard text was read differently by different readers. For example, they often vowelled and pointed the consonants differently, but many of these readings—including those of the famous “Seven Readers”—adhered to the undotted consonantal skeletal form of the original master codices. Here, “skeletal form” requires explanation: one does not know the spelling of every word in the original codices of ‘Uthmān. For example, in most cases it is not known whether the ā sound in the middle of a word was represented by the letter alif. However, at the very least we know the text at the “skeletal-morphemic” level.2

2) The Islamic scholarly tradition does not purport to have preserved the spelling of every word in the codices sent out by ‘Uthmān. Rather, Muslim tradition preserves the original ‘Uthmānic codices at least at the skeletal-morphemic level, that is, with respect to features of the skeletal (unpointed) text that would necessarily change a word or part of word (morpHEME) into something else if they were different. Some skeletal variations, such as different spellings of a word, are not skeletal-morphemic because they do not necessarily change a word. Moreover, differences in the way consonants are pointed may change a word, but they are not skeletal-morphemic either since they do not change the skeleton. Normally, a reading is said to differ from the standard ‘Uthmānic rasm
It is convenient to call the adherents of this account “traditionalists.” The narrative continues to be fairly popular among the specialists in the Muslim world, in part because most of them have not come to entertain radical doubt about the broad outlines of early Islamic history. By contrast, scholars located in Europe and North America generally do not accept this account (which is not to say that they reject it). This is due to a prevailing distrust in the literary sources on which it is founded. These sources were compiled long after the events they describe, and the extent to which they preserve truly early reports has been the subject of an evolving academic debate. This Euro-American majority falls into two main groups.

The first group, a minority, consists of the “revisionists,” that is, those who consider the traditional narrative as wrong. They reject the idea that ‘Uthmān attempted to fix the text, or they hold that there continued to be major changes in the standard text after ‘Uthmān, or, in the case of Wansbrough, they think it may be anachronistic to speak of the Qur’an at the time of ‘Uthmān in the first place, since the text coalesced long after. Notable revisionists include John Wansbrough, Patricia Crone, Alfred-Louis de Prémare, and David Powers. The degree of textual stability that according to the traditional account had been reached by ca. AD 650 was according to John Wansbrough attained no earlier than the ninth century AD. Most revisionists are more conservative in their dating, focusing on the reign of the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik, that is, AH 65–86/AD 685–705 as the date of textual finality and/or canonization. Revisionists tend to support their views by citing documentary evidence, Christian sources, and Muslim traditions. Their use of the Muslim reports constitutes what they regard as judicious reading between the lines, but what their opponents view as marshaling cherry-picked, decontextualized, and misinterpreted reports.

The second group of scholars, the “skeptics,” is by far larger. Its members likewise do not accept the traditional account, considering it unreliable along with nearly every report in the Muslim literary sources only if it changes both the skeleton and the word, that is, if the change is skeletal and morphemic. All of this has been well-understood for many centuries and is simply taken for granted in the way most Muslim Qur’an specialists have written about the different readings (qirā’āt). (We are setting aside a caveat concerning cases in which nonetheless the original ‘Uthmānic spelling or pointing is knowable.)

3) For their contributions, see the Bibliography. Patricia Crone’s approach in her 1994 essay is different from the others we list (or from her 1977 work) in that she provisionally suggests the late canonization of a largely stable text rather than a late date for the attainment of textual stability.
bearing on Islamic origins. But they do not subscribe to the theories of the revisionists either, which they consider to be unsupported by the evidence. The scholars in this group are agnostics, so to speak. They may not assert that the standard text came into being or changed significantly after 'Uthmān, but they do not deny that it could have. They may be adamant that they are not revisionists, but they are de facto revisionists in respect of their attitude towards the literary sources. They may be called "skeptics" inasmuch as they are equally unconvinced by traditional and revisionist narratives. They tend to not publish much on Islamic origins, since as skeptics they have few firm beliefs to write about. This belies the fact that they form the larger group. An indication of their size is given by what has not been published: in recent decades, European and North-American academics have written relatively few accounts of the initial decades of Islamic religion based on the literary sources. Many academics have simply moved to later periods (focusing on how the initial decades were remembered), other topics, or languages other than Arabic.

There is also a minority among scholars in North America and Europe who support key features of the traditional narrative as recounted above. They do not take all the reports in the later sources at face value, but they believe that critical and detailed analysis of the literary evidence confirms elements of the traditional account. These scholars have their counterparts in the Muslim world. Notable members of this group include Michael Cook, Muḥammad Muḥaysin, and Harald Motzki, the first one being a defector from the revisionist camp.\footnote{For their works on the Qurʾān, see the Bibliography. For a brief discussion of Muḥaysin's work, see Behnam Sadeghi, "Criteria for Emending the Text of the Qurʾān." in Law and Tradition in Classical Islamic Thought, ed. Michael Cook, et al. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming, 2012). For a summary and discussion of Cook's work, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 364, 367–9.}

One may call scholars who support the traditional account based on a critical evaluation of the literary sources "neo-traditionalists." They are traditionalists who argue for the traditional account rather than take it for granted as a self-evident part of our scholarly heritage.\footnote{The labels traditionalist, revisionist, skeptic, and neo-traditionalist are merely convenient names for the four groups. We do not use these terms in their literal senses or imply other associations. For example, we do not imply that the traditionalists are attached to tradition or that the skeptics are philosophical skeptics.}

We do not believe that this climate of disagreement reflects sheer underdetermination of theory by evidence. This is not a case of takāfu'\footnote{For a summary and discussion of Cook's work, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 364, 367–9.}
al-adilla: the arguments for the different sides are not equal in strength. We also do not believe that the relative size of each group of scholars mirrors the quality of the evidence in its favor, or that the disagreements will dissolve completely if very strong new evidence were to surface in favor of a particular position, or that if a consensus were to emerge, that would necessarily signify a lack of ambiguity in the evidence. Patterns of human adherence to paradigms depend on sociological, psychological, and other irrational factors as well as on the quality of the evidence. Nonetheless, it also goes without saying that any evidence that can potentially shed further light on early Islam will be of great interest to historians and may sway at least some of us.

The Qurʾān under study is one such piece of evidence. Ṣanʿāʾ 1 is a palimpsest, that is, a manuscript of which the text, “lower writing,” was erased by scraping or washing and then written over. Recycling parchment in this manner was not uncommon. It was done, for example, for an estimated 4.5% of manuscripts from the Latin West produced from AD 400 to AD 800, though one should not rashly generalize this figure since the frequency of palimpsesting varied greatly depending on time and place. Beside Ṣanʿāʾ 1, we know of several other Arabic palimpsests.

6) The irrational factors have been famously emphasized in Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970). In the field of Islamic studies, the irrational factors that affect whether one accepts an author’s work include, for example, the eminence of the author, the author’s religious background, whether scholars whom one admires agree with the author, whether one’s mentors and peers agree with the author, whether the author’s work agrees with the consensus, the author’s rhetorical strategies, and whether the author’s positions match those of a particular academic, religious, philosophical, or ideological movement.


9) There are two Arabic palimpsests in the Monastery of St. Catherine in the Sinai Peninsula. They are discussed in Aziz S. Atiya, Arabic Manuscripts of Mount Sinai: A Hand-list of the Arabic Manuscripts and Scrolls Microfilmed at the Library of the Monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai (Baltimore John Hopkins Press, 1955), 19, 24; and Aziz S. Atiya, “The Monastery of St. Catherine and the Mount Sinai Expedition,” Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 96.5 (1952): 578–86. One palimpsest, no. 514, has five layers of text in three languages: two Arabic, two Syriac, and one Greek. Its top writing, consisting of a Christian hagiography and the Book of Job, is “in the middle Kufic of the eighth to early ninth century,” while its second layer, another Christian text, is “in ar-
In Ṣanʿā’ 1, as with some other palimpsests, over time the residue of the ink of the erased writing underwent chemical reactions, causing a color change and hence the reemergence of the lower writing in a pale brown or pale gray color. Color change is normal for metal-based ink. Thus, a black ink may turn brown over time, and the traces of ink buried deep in the parchment can bring an erased text back to life. Transition metals like iron, copper, and zinc are implicated in corrosion and color change.¹⁰ All three metals are present in the inks of both layers of Ṣanʿā’ 1, chaïc Kufic of the first century of the Hijra, that is, seventh to eighth century AD.²⁰ (Atiya, Arabic Manuscripts of Mount Sinai, 19). The image of a folio (Atiya, “Monastery of St. Catherine,” 584) shows that in the top writing the verses are separated by a number of dots, a feature found in early Qur’āns. The second Arabic palimpsest, no. 588, has three layers of Christian writing. The top layer is in Arabic and dates from about the 10th century AD. Underneath, there is a Syriac text. Underneath, “a third layer of Arabic could be traced in some places” (Atiya, Arabic Manuscripts of Mount Sinai, 24).


There are several other palimpsests in the Dār al-Makhṭūṭāt in Ṣanʿā’, all relatively late, and all represented by no more than a few pages apiece (Ursula Dreiholz, interview, July 30, 3011). The picture of a page from one of them appears as image 043020C.BMP in a CD published by the UNESCO. Both layers of text are Qur’ānic and seem later than the palimpsest under study in this essay, though the lower writing looks like it could be as early as the late first century AH.

though the lower ink has somewhat more copper and a much greater quantity of zinc than the upper one.\footnote{The scientific analysis of the inks on the Stanford 2007 folio was conducted by Uwe Bergmann. The details may be published separately. Cf. Behnam Sadeghi and Uwe Bergmann, “The Codex of a Companion of the Prophet and the Qur’ān of the Prophet,” Arabica 57.4 (2010): 348, 357.}

Both layers of writing are Qur’āns, and each layer appears to have once constituted a complete codex.\footnote{In addition to the writings corresponding to the putative full codices, there are occasional interpolations by different hands. For example, an “upper modifier” filled gaps in the upper writing where the text had faded. There is also a hand (or possibly more than one hand) on a few folios that we call the “lower modifier(s),” responsible for jottings that occasionally either modified the lower writing or filled its gaps where the text had faded or been erased irremediably. The lower modifier is black and was written with a narrower pen than all the other scripts. It appears on folios 2, Stanford 2007, David 86/2003, 22 (possibly different hand), and possibly 23. It dates from a period after the complete erasure of the lower writing, the addition of the upper writing, and the resurfacing of the lower writing. Four considerations establish this dating: First, the fact that the writing is black proves that it does not belong to a reemerged text, since lower writings in palimpsests come to light as pale brown or pale gray if they reappear at all. This argument alone is conclusive. Second, Uwe Bergmann’s examination of the Stanford 2007 folio has established that the lower modifier’s ink has no iron, copper, or zinc, the transition metals responsible for corrosion and color change over time (see above, footnotes 10 and 11), confirming that the script has not resurfaced and thus was never erased to begin with. The ink appears to be based on carbon and is thus relatively inert, invulnerable to corrosion-related color change and more easily erased or worn out than metal-based ink. This consideration, too, is conclusive by itself. Third, in terms of calligraphic style, width of the pen stroke, and the chemical composition of the ink, the upper writing is much closer to the lower writing than to the lower modifier, which again supports its predating the lower modifier. Fourth, the lower modifier’s calligraphic style suggests that it does not belong to the first two centuries AH. On folio 22, however, the calligraphic style looks early: either this is a different hand, or it is the same “lower modifier” hand as found on the other folios but is influenced here by the Hijāzī script it modified. Cf. Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 357–8, especially footnote 12.} The upper text is from the standard textual tradition and was probably written sometime during the seventh or the first half of the eighth century AD. With future advances in palaeography and the application of other methods, it may become possible to obtain a more precise date than this. Its verse division pattern displays a
marked affinity for the schemes reported for the Hijāz, but not precisely enough to distinguish between Mecca and Medina.  

The lower Qur‘ān is of enormous interest because it is so far the only manuscript that is known to be non-‘Uthmānic, that is, from a textual tradition other than the standard one. One of us previously did a detailed study of this codex based on four folios. We now extend the analysis to all the folios except one (of which the image we do not have). In this essay, we focus on the broad features of the text, postponing to future publications a systematic textual analysis of all the variants. We shall argue below that regardless of the date of the lower codex, the textual tradition to which it belonged and the ‘Uthmānic tradition must have diverged sometime before the spread of the ‘Uthmānic tradition in the mid-seventh century AD. Therefore, comparing these two traditions opens a window onto the earliest phase of the Qur‘ān’s history. We shall also argue, based on just such a comparison, that, contrary to a common view, the existing pieces of revelation were joined to form the sūras prior to ‘Uthmān’s famous and fairly effective attempt to standardize the text.

The date of origin of the textual tradition to which the lower text belongs, of course, is a different matter than the date of the lower writing itself. The lower writing, on paleographic and art-historical grounds, is almost certainly from the seventh century AD, and probably not from the latter part of that century. More precision may be obtained by radiocarbon dating, which assigns the parchment, and hence the lower codex, to the period before AD 671 with a probability of 99% (before 661 with the probability of 95.5%, and before 646 with a probability of 75%). This makes it significantly earlier than the few other Qur‘āns that have been radiocarbon-dated. The manuscript was not written long before the

13) See Appendix 2. This conclusion was reached previously based on an analysis of a more limited set of thirteen folios in Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 377–83.

14) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex.”

15) Radiocarbon dating was performed on a sample from the “Stanford 2007” folio. For the details, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 352–4.

Prophet Muhammad’s death in AD 632, since it contains the ninth sūra, which includes some of the last passages he disseminated.\(^{17}\)

The manuscript may be, from a textual-critical standpoint, the most important one among those discovered in 1972 between the ceiling and the roof of the Great Mosque of Ṣan‘ā’.\(^{18}\) It seems that the other ones in the collection, including the many others from the first century in the Hijāzī and Kūfī scripts, may all belong to the standard tradition.\(^{19}\) The collection includes some 12,000 Qur’ānic parchment fragments. As of 1997, all but 1500–2000 leaves or fragments were assigned to 926 distinct Qur’ānic manuscripts, none complete, and many containing only a few folios. There are about 150 non-Qur’ānic parchment fragments, and a large number of fragments written on paper. Among the Qur’ān manuscripts, twenty-two are in the Hijāzī script, and therefore are probably from the

---


\(^{19}\) In a response to a query from a historian, of which we were given a copy, Gerd-Rüdiger Puin wrote that the palimpsest is the only manuscript in the Dār al-Makhṭūṭāt with significant textual variants. We are unable to verify this because, like everyone else, we are denied access to the microfilms prepared by H. Bothmer, and because we have not been able to travel to Ṣan‘ā’. The claim, however, is consistent with a few images published of other folios in the Hijāzī script.
first century AH (7th century and early 8th century AD). All but eight of these twenty-two Hijāzī manuscripts are in the “vertical format,” that is, are longer in height than width. There are also many manuscripts in the Kūfī script, some of which are probably from the first century AH.

In 1980, a project was initiated to restore and preserve the parchment manuscripts. It was launched under the auspices of the Yemeni Department for Antiquities. The Cultural Section of the German Foreign Ministry funded the work, providing 2.2 million German marks (about 1.1 million Euros). Albrecht Noth (University of Hamburg) was the director of the project. Work on the ground began in 1981 and continued through the end of 1989, when the project terminated with the end of funding. Gerd-Rüdiger Puin (University of Saarland) was the local director beginning with 1981. His involvement came to an end in 1985, when Hans-Caspar Graf von Bothmer (University of Saarland) took over as the local director. Bothmer left Ṣan‘ā in the following year, but continued to run the project from Germany, traveling to the site almost every year. Beginning in 1982, Ursula Dreibholz served as the conservator for this project, and worked full time in Ṣan‘ā until the end of 1989. She completed the restoration of the manuscripts. She also designed the permanent storage, collated many parchment fragments to identify distinct Qur’ānic manuscripts, and directed the Yemeni staff in the same task. The manuscripts are located in the “House of Manuscripts,” the Dār al-Makhtūṭāt (DAM), in Ṣan‘ā, Yemen. After 1989, Bothmer would visit the collection periodically. In the winter of 1996–7, he microfilmed all of the parchment fragments that have been assigned to distinct Qur’ānic manuscripts. Of the remaining 1500–2000 fragments, he microfilmed a group of 280. The microfilms are available in Ṣan‘ā in the House of Manuscripts.

Not all of the manuscript under study is in Yemen. The largest portion is there, in the House of Manuscripts, bearing the catalog number 01-27.1. However, before the piles of manuscripts discovered in the Grand Mosque were secured, some folios must have been pilfered, as they eventually found their way to auction houses abroad. Between 1992 and

Puin wrote that there are about 90 Hijāzī manuscripts (Gerd-Rüdiger Puin, “Observations on Early Qur’ān Manuscripts in Ṣan‘ā,” in The Qurʾān as Text, ed. Stefan Wild (Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 108). This estimate is wrong by a factor of four. Bothmer cites Puin’s error and corrects it, mentioning that the correct number is twenty-two (Bothmer, “Die Anfänge der Koranschreibung,” 46, footnote 28).
2008, four folios from the palimpsest were auctioned in London. It is convenient to refer to them as Christies 2008, Stanford 2007, David 86/2003, and Bonhams 2000.\textsuperscript{21} Because the label DAM 01-27.1 applies only to the leaves located in the House of Manuscripts, it is necessary to have a label for the entire manuscript that covers also the other four folios and any others that may surface in future. We call the whole manuscript Ṣanʿā’ 1.

Scholars have not yet been granted access to the microfilms that have been in the possession of Puin and Bothmer, nor has any author traveled to Ṣanʿā’ and published a study using the microfilms or manuscripts there. As a result, the first public discussions of the lower text were based on the images of the four folios that were auctioned in London, and which therefore were readily available. Short entries in the auction house catalogs briefly addressed paleographic and art historical aspects.\textsuperscript{22} Subsequently, Sergio Noja Noseda (who made an independent set of photos of the DAM 01-27.1 manuscript), Yasin Dutton, and Alba Fedeli announced the non-ʿUthmānic status of the folios they examined.\textsuperscript{23} Alba Fedeli published the first article discussing the lower text. She focused on two folios (Bonhams 2000 and David 86/2003), noted some important variants, and pointed out three variants that are also reported as having been in certain Companion codices. She also has

\textsuperscript{21} On the history of these folios, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 354–5. Even though the upper writing in the Stanford 2007 and David 86/2003 folios is in a different script, it is almost certain that these four folios and the DAM 01–27.1 folios are from the same manuscript. The Stanford 2007 and David 86/2003 folios share a number of features with the other folios: the size of the folios is the same, the same intricate and colored ten-verse markers appear in the upper codex, and the lower modifier is found in Stanford 2007 and David 86/2003 as well. The same script seems to be used in the lower codex, but this provisional impression requires careful verification. It is apparent that scribes took turns to write the upper codex, a common practice, about which see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 357, and the references listed there.

\textsuperscript{22} See the references in Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 354 (footnotes 7 and 8), 360 (footnote 22).

an article in Italian that mentions the 01-27.1 folios. An extended study by Behnam Sadeghi focused on history, the role of orality, and textual criticism.

In 2007, S. Noja Noseda and Christian Robin took an independent set of pictures of DAM 01-27.1. It is conceivable that this stirred the Puins, who had not published anything on the palimpsest since G. Puin had become acquainted with it about twenty-six years earlier. Beginning in 2008, nineteen years after all the parchment manuscripts in Ṣan‘ā’ had been restored, in three successive articles published at the rate of one per year, Elisabeth Puin (the wife of Gerd-Rüdiger Puin) transcribed the lower text of three and a half folios (folios 2, 5, 6A, and 20). Her first essay (2008) mentioned the pictures taken “recently” by S. Noja Noseda and added that they might be published soon. The transcriptions are positive contributions, though the articles are not free from errors.

24) Fedeli, “Early Evidences.” For the contribution in Italian, see the Bibliography.
25) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex.”
28) Among the errors in E. Puin’s work, three are particularly significant. (1) The first one concerns the hand called “the lower modifier.” Preoccupied with the theme of textual suppression, E. Puin misses the signs that the lower modifier came after the upper text had been written and the lower writing had resurfaced (see above, footnote 12). She asserts that the lower modifier’s jottings were introduced before the lower text was fully erased and the upper text was written (E. Puin, “Koranpalimpsest [Teil 1],” 474; “Teil II,” 524; “Teil III,” 234–6, 253). The lower modifier occupies a prominent place in her discussion, signifying a “progressive canonization” of the text (“Teil III,” 235–6). (2) The second significant error concerns what she takes to be the standard text of the Qur‘ān. When a
her first two essays and presented without justification) that mirror the conclusions of Sadeghi and Bergmann’s “Codex” essay. She thereby moves away from the prevailing revisionist outlook of the authors in the Inārah series in which her previous two articles appeared.  

word in a manuscript is spelled differently than it is in her Saudi Qur’ān, she calls that a “deviation from the standard text.” Needless to say, many spelling variations in manuscripts do not match her Saudi Qur’ān, and so her essays are filled with statements like these: “even in the ... upper writing there are numerous deviations from the standard text with respect to spelling” (“Koranpalimpsest [Teil I],” 462), and “the spelling variant of the defective alif occurs frequently in Hijāzī manuscripts” (“Teil II,” 539). All of this points to a misunderstanding: she thinks that Muslim tradition has a “standard text” that purports to give the spelling of words in the original codices sent out by ‘Uthmān. She makes this explicit by referring to “the Standard text ... which according to Muslim tradition reproduces the Qur’ān in wording and spelling exactly as it had been specified by the redaction of the caliph ‘Uthmān” (“Teil II,” 524). On why this is wrong, see above, footnote 2. (3) The third notable error is her view that David 86/2003 and Stanford 2007 are possibly not from the same manuscript as the other folios (“Teil III,” 248; 251, footnote 30; 258, footnote 38). On this matter, see footnote 21, above.

29) In her third article, “Teil III,” Elisabeth Puin does not cite Sadeghi and Bergmann’s “Codex” and does not include it in her bibliography. However, she may have read it, at least in draft form, as she seems aware of its contents. She mentions Stanford five times and correctly identifies the folio studied at Stanford as the one formerly auctioned at Sotheby’s in 1993. The study of that folio at Stanford University was first mentioned in Sadeghi and Bergmann’s “Codex.” Indeed, she calls it the Stanford folio, a name that was given to it in “The Codex.” E. Puin mistakenly thinks that the folio is located permanently at Stanford University (“Teil III,” 248), which may have led her to think of its presence at Stanford as public knowledge, known independently of “The Codex” essay. In fact, the folio was brought to Stanford only briefly for X-Ray Fluorescence imaging. In any case, Sadeghi promptly sent G. Puin a copy of “The Codex.”

We welcome the new elements in Elisabeth Puin’s third essay (“Teil III”) that parallel Sadeghi and Bergmann’s “Codex”: (1) In her first two essays, E. Puin did not use the label “non-‘Uthmānic,” nor discuss Companion codices, the existence of which is questioned by skeptical and revisionist scholars. In “The Codex,” Sadeghi explained why the lower writing corroborates the reality of the Companion codices, and called the lower writing “non-‘Uthmānic,” preferring it to the oft-used “pre-‘Uthmānic.” In her third essay, E. Puin says that the lower writing confirms the reality of the Companion codices, and likewise calls it “non-‘Uthmānic” (“Teil III,” 233–7). (2) Sadeghi wrote that the lower writing represents a codex other than those of Ibn Mas‘ūd and Ubayy b.
Elisabeth Puin worked with inferior, “small and 6 × 6 photographs in black and white, taken by Dr. Gerd-R. Puin and Dr. Hans-Caspar Graf von Bothmer.” This may explain why her transcriptions have, by our count, forty-one errors. (Based on better photographs and ultraviolet images, our edition includes new transcriptions of the three and a half folios discussed by E. Puin.) It is surprising that in the seventeen years during which G. Puin had the opportunity to take (or have his colleagues take) adequate pictures of the palimpsest for his own use, he did not do so. Although media interviews with G. Puin over a decade ago

The upper and lower writing “seem to have been written … perhaps in the same kind of ink” (“Teil III,” 241) without explaining how she could determine the kind of ink. It is chemical analysis, as described in “The Codex,” 367–8, that reveals the inks as alike in being metal-based, and as different from the non-metallic inks of the lower modifier and upper modifier hands. (6) Sadeghi compared the sūra sequences in the folios with those reported for the codices of Ibn Masʿūd and Ubayy b. Kaʿb. E. Puin does this in her third essay (“Teil III,” 257) but not in the earlier ones.

31) In a written response to a query sent to him by a historian, of which we were given a copy, G. Puin attributed the poor quality of the microfilm pictures to obstacles erected by the Yemeni authorities, who, he stated, were not interested in the success of the documentation project. The problems caused by the Yemenis are a common motif in media interviews given by G. Puin for stories that suggest that the Yemenis sought to suppress evidence (see Andrew Higgins, “The Lost Archive,” The Wall Street Journal, January 12, 2008; Toby Lester, “What is the Koran?,” The Atlantic Monthly (January 1999), 44; see also the next footnote). It should be noted, however, that scholars who had much more limited access to the manuscripts than G. Puin was granted, and much less time, took much better photographs of the palimpsest. An ordinary camera should suffice for taking adequate pictures. A more plausible explanation than Yemeni obstructionism is that G. Puin did not seriously plan to study the lower writing of the palimpsest in the 1980s and the 1990s and therefore did not try to take, or have his colleagues take, adequate photographs. When eventually his wife decided to transcribe the text in the late 00s, shortly after Noseda had photographed the palimpsest, she had to rely on the pictures prepared by
described him as “thrilled” about studying the Ṣanʿāʾ texts and errone-
ously blamed the lack of published studies on the Yemeni authorities, it
seems that serious study of the lower writing of the palimpsest was not
on his agenda at that time.32

Textual-Critical and Historical Implications

Before the advent of the printing press, book manuscripts formed
lineages. Like animals and plants, they were subject to heredity and
mutation. Typically, a book manuscript was a copy of an earlier one,
which was in turn a copy of an even earlier one, and so forth. As a book
was copied, textual variants could arise that would be passed to its off-
spring.

The analogy with nature extends to questions of method. Biologists
usually learn about the past in two ways. One way is to find a specimen
that can be dated on external grounds, for example, by using radiocarbon
dating or other paleontological methods to establish the date of a fossil
(and, in rare cases, recoverable DNA within it). The equivalent in our field
is to find an old dated or datable manuscript or inscription. In the last
several decades, some scholars in the field of Islamic studies have come
to consider only such documentary sources as valid evidence for early

G. Puin and H. Bothmer in the previous decades. These may be fine for many of
the other manuscripts and for the upper writing of the palimpsest, but they are
inadequate for the lower writing.

32) Relying on interviews with G. Puin, Toby Lester wrote: “detailed exami-
nation ... is something the Yemeni authorities have seemed reluctant to allow.”
Lester added that Puin and Bothmer “have been reluctant to publish partly
because ... they felt that the Yemeni authorities, if they realized the possible
implications of the discovery, might refuse them further access.” Lester adds that
the microfilming of the manuscripts was completed in 1997. “This means that
soon Von Bothmer, Puin, and other scholars will finally have a chance to scruti-
nize the texts and to publish their findings freely, a prospect that thrills Puin.”
Lester thus implies that, as of 1999, G. Puin had not had the opportunity to
“scrutinize the texts.” In fact, Puin had this opportunity since 1981 when he
began working with the manuscripts, or since 1989 when the restoration of the
parchment fragments was complete, or since early 1997 after the microfilms
were made. See Lester, “What is the Koran?,” 44. For G. Puin’s publications, see
below, footnotes 33 and 78. For the theme of Yemeni obstructionism, see the
previous footnote and the section below entitled, “The Media and Manu-
scripts.”
Islam. Accordingly, their impression that there are not many early copies of the Qurʾān or other documentary evidence is one of the contributing factors to the common pessimism in early Islamic studies about our ability to learn much about the first century or two of Islam. Setting aside the revisionists’ and skeptics’ undervaluation of the potential of the late literary sources, it is noteworthy that they do not always recognize that the earliest manuscripts can be used to work one’s way back in time. Our knowledge can extend to the period before the manuscripts.

This brings us to another method biologists use to learn about the past. They begin with known organisms, modern ones and fossils, and group similar ones together, forming hierarchies of clusters and sub-clusters that correspond to trees of descent. By comparing sub-branches, they are able to learn about the branches from which they must have diverged. In this manner, they recursively work their ways back to earlier stages, identifying ancient species and their characteristics or the archaic attributes of extant species. With a number of important caveats, a similar method works in the study of manuscripts and is commonly used in textual criticism. One may use textual variants to group manuscripts into clusters corresponding to the branches of a family tree. One can also compare the offspring to learn about the progenitors. In the case of Ṣanʿā’ 1, this method is a more fruitful method of discovery than radiocarbon dating, impressive as the results of radiocarbon dating may be.

As with other widely transmitted books, codices of the Qurʾān fall into clusters, called text types, when compared for textual similarity.33

---

33) Not everybody who has written on the Ṣanʿāʾ manuscripts thinks in terms of text types. For an approach that disregards the notion, see Gerd-Rüdiger Puin, “Observations on Early Qurʾān Manuscripts in Ṣanʿāʾ,” in The Qurʾān as Text, ed. Stefan Wild (Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), 107–11. In this article, G. Puin reaches a striking conclusion based on the discovery of two variants. He writes, “In 19:62 [the] original تسمع lā tasma’ūna was later corrected to lā tasma’ūna (instead of the usual lā yasma’ūna). Instead of قول jā’a l-ḥaqqu in 34:49 we find قول jā’a l-ḥaqqu. The systems of the seven, ten or 14 Qirāʿāt are, consequently, younger than the variants observed in Ṣanʿāʾ.” Puin does not say whether these readings appear in just one manuscript apiece. If they do, as seems likely, the only way in which his theory that these readings give the original text could be sustained is for all the other manuscripts to represent a later state of the text, an improbable scenario, and an impossible one if these other manuscripts have variants of their own, which would make them the original texts by Puin’s method. To avoid such contradictions, scholars normally take a singular reading to be a relatively late development or a scribal error, unless it occurs in a branch of the textual tradition that is different from all the others,
By far the best-known cluster is the standard one, called the ‘Uthmānic text type. We give it this name as a label of convenience because early Muslims believed that its ancestors were the manuscripts that the caliph ‘Uthmān (d. AD 656) had sent to the main cities of the state sometime around AD 650 as part of his attempt to establish a standard text. We accept this early dating for the spread of the text type, and in this essay we take it as a given. We do not provide an argument for it here, since one of us has already done so in a previous essay on the basis of the work done by Michael Cook, Yasin Dutton, Hossein Modarressi, and other scholars.34 Regardless of the date one assigns to its origin, it cannot be denied that the ‘Uthmānic text type represents a distinct branch of the textual tradition. That is so because it forms a genuine cluster: the differences between the texts within the text type are small compared to the texts outside it. The lower writing of Ṣan‘ā’ 1 clearly falls outside the standard text type. It belongs to a different text type, which we call C-1.

The relatively small number and scope of the variations within the standard (‘Uthmānic) text type entails a critical conclusion with also unlikely in this case. (For the treatment of singular readings in New Testament scholarship, see the references cited in Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 387–8, footnote 84. In some circumstances, pre-modern hadith specialists also viewed singular features in hadith variants in a similar light.) Textual critics usually begin by grouping texts into text types before evaluating what is early and what is late. By contrast, Puin begins with the assumption that the standard reading is a corruption in every case in which there is some other reading in any manuscript. He holds to this premise so firmly that even what is on the face of it a scribal error is for him the original text: the second variant mentioned above is a scribal error on the face of it since it does not fit the context. (On scribal errors, see, e.g., Alba Fedeli, “A.Perg.2: A Non Palimpsest and the Corrections in Qur’ānic Manuscripts,” Manuscripta Orientalia 11.1 (2005): 20–7; Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 372, footnote 53.) Furthermore, Puin does not even allow for the possibility that a standard reading and a variant reading could have at some point existed simultaneously: the standard one is for him automatically a later corruption, hence his conclusion that the readings in the qirā’āt literature are “younger [i.e., later] than the variants” he has mentioned.

34) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 364–70. Another indication, beside those given in the preceding reference, for the early date of the spread of the ‘Uthmānic textual tradition is the significant number of first-century ‘Uthmānic manuscripts.
important ramifications: the splitting off of the ‘Uthmānic and other textual traditions occurred no later than the spread of the ‘Uthmānic text type. The innumerable ‘Uthmānic manuscripts and the different ‘Uthmānic readings preserved in the literary sources provide a very clear picture of the degree and types of change that could arise during the period in which the ‘Uthmānic tradition flourished. These changes are small enough in scope and few enough in number to be compatible with written transmission or with dictation in which the result is checked against the original. The standard tradition thus appears to have reached a high level of transmission fidelity already around the mid-seventh century AD. This ‘Uthmānic cluster and the textual traditions that fall significantly outside it, such as the C-1 tradition to which the lower writing belongs, must have parted ways prior to the proliferation of the ‘Uthmānic tradition. This conclusion depends on the premise that once people began transmitting the scripture with a high level of accuracy, as in written transmission, a drastic reversion did not occur to a previous, less precise form of transmission, one that could have generated the differences of the sort seen between C-1 and the ‘Uthmānic text type. This premise, although not certain, is highly probable. It is, for example, natural to assume that once written transmission began, it continued. Incidentally, one can see a similar trend in New Testament manuscripts and hadīth variants.35

The conclusion that C-1’s origin must have predated ca. AD 650 is largely independent of the date of Ṣan‘ā’. For example, it would not be invalidated if it were found that the lower Ṣan‘ā’ codex was produced, say, in the eighth century AD. This codex would still be only a representative of a C-1 text type, and the late date of the manuscript would still beg the question of when this textual tradition originated. The codex would have shared a common ancestor with its contemporaneous ‘Uthmānic cousins, a progenitor which would have dated from before the spread of the ‘Uthmānic tradition. Moreover, since the differences between the C-1 text type and the ‘Uthmānic text type outstrip in magnitude and number the range of differences expected to arise in the period after ca. AD 650, most of these differences must have originated before then.

Until recently, no Qur‘ān manuscript was known outside the ‘Uthmānic tradition. Non-‘Uthmānic Qur‘āns were known only through descriptions

of them in the literary sources. According to these accounts, some Companions of the Prophet had compiled complete Qur’ān codices of their own. Three Companions are frequently named: ‘Abdallāh b. Mas‘ūd, Ubayy b. Ka‘b, and Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī. The variants of the codices of the first two are reported, while almost nothing seems to be remembered about the third. However, because the sources quoting these variants were written a long time after the Prophet Muḥammad, scholars such as John Wansbrough and John Burton took the position that the Companion codices never actually existed – they were concepts that allowed Muslims to assign their interpretations to fictive versions of the scripture.36 These scholars saw the reported textual differences not as genuine variants of the sort that normally arise in the course of transmission, but as instances of exegesis (or desired doctrines, for Burton) transformed into scriptural text. This view is implausible for a number of reasons. A small fraction of the variants do make a difference in meaning. But most variants do not affect the meaning significantly enough to warrant such a theory, and many variants do not change the meaning at all. Furthermore, most textual differences are candidates for being the products of assimilation of parallels, harmonization to context, or simple omission – phenomena that characterize genuine transmission.37 The one reason that is most relevant for our purposes, however, is that Ṣan‘ā’ 1 constitutes direct documentary evidence for the reality of the non-‘Uthmānic text types that are usually referred to as “Companion codices.”

Table 1 gives a few examples, in English translation, in which C-1 differs from the standard text.38 The C-1 type shares a number of variants


38) For a few other variants translated into English, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 355.
with those reported for the codices of 'Abdallāh b. Mas'ūd and Ubayy b. Ka'b, and these are listed in Appendix 1. These constitute a minority among its variants, as C-1 does not share the vast majority of its variants with these codices. Nor are most of their variants found in C-1. Thus, C-1 represents a text type of its own, a distinct “Companion codex.”

C-1 confirms the reliability of much of what has been reported about the other Companion codices not only because it shares some variants with them, but also because its variants are of the same kinds as those reported for those codices. There are additions, omissions, transpositions, and substitutions of entire words and sub-word elements (morphemes). A large number of these variants involve “minor” elements of language such as suffixes, prefixes, prepositions, and pronouns. Many variants involve changes of person, tense, mood, or voice (passive or active), or the use of different words having the same root. Furthermore, the variants in C-1 and other Companion codices richly display the phenomena of assimilation of parallels – whereby a scribe’s writing of a verse is affected by his or her memory of a similar verse elsewhere in the Qur’ān – and assimilation of nearby terms, whereby a scribe’s writing is influenced by nearby expressions. The fact that all these features are found both in the codex of Ibn Mas'ūd, as described by al-A’mash, and in C-1 establishes that the literary sources preserve information about codices that actually existed. The question remains whether these real codices originated at the time of the Companions, which is what early Muslims recalled. A positive answer to this question is supported by textual criticism, as described above, which assigns the beginning of the C-1 text type to the period before the spread of the standard text type, that is, before ca. AD 650. In sum, the “Companion” codices indeed existed at the time of the Companions, as the literary sources maintain.

40) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 345, 390-4. There is, however, a conspicuous difference between C-1 and the codex of Ibn Mas'ūd: C-1 has a lot more variants – by a rough estimate perhaps twenty-five times as many.
41) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 390-4, 389 (Table 6), 393 (Table 7).
Table 1. Examples of Major Variants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant description</th>
<th>The text of the standard tradition</th>
<th>The text of the C-1 tradition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Q 2.196, C-1 does not have the word ru’ūsakum.</td>
<td>Do not shave your heads until the offering reaches its destination.</td>
<td>Do not shave until the offering reaches its destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Q 2.196, C-1 has fa-in kāna aḥadun instead of the standard fa-man kāna.</td>
<td>If any of you be sick</td>
<td>Should one of you be sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Q 2.196, C-1 has aw nusukin instead of the standard aw ṣadaqatin aw nusukin.</td>
<td>Fasting, or alms, or an offering</td>
<td>Fasting or an offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Q 2.201, C-1 has wa-l-ākhirati instead of the standard ḥasanatan wa-fī l-ākhirati ḥasanatan.</td>
<td>There are people who say, “Our Lord, give us in this world,” and they have no portion in the world to come. Then, there are those who say, “Our Lord, give us good in this world and good in the next.”</td>
<td>There are people who say, “Our Lord, give us in this world,” and they have no portion in the world to come. Then, there are those who say, “Our Lord, give us in this world and the next.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Q 63.7, C-1 has min ḥawliki after yaṣaṣaṭṭā.</td>
<td>They are the ones who say, “Do not spend (alms) on those who are with the Messenger of God in order that they may disperse.”</td>
<td>They are the ones who say, “Do not spend (alms) on those who are with the Messenger of God in order that they may disperse from around him.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-1, when combined with the other textual traditions, can shed light on the state of the text from which they all descended, that is, the prototype disseminated by the Prophet Muhammad. The literary sources provide fairly systematic information about the codex of Ibn Mas‘ūd, allowing one to compare it with C-1 and the Uthmānic text types. It emerges that where the texts of Ibn Mas‘ūd, C-1, and Uthmān disagree, usually the Uthmānic version is in the majority: that is, the Uthmānic text agrees with one of the others against the third. This is compatible with two scenarios. First, the Uthmānic text may be a hybrid formed on the basis of a number of Companion codices (and, conceivably, partial codi-
ces and free-standing copies of sūras) in which preference was usually given to the majority reading. This hybridity thesis happens to fit some early Muslim reports about the formation of the text. Second, the ‘Uthmānic Qur‘ān could have been a self-contained, existing codex like those of Ibn Mas‘ūd and C-1, the three text types being distinct descendants of a common source, the Prophetic prototype. In this scenario, the fact that the ‘Uthmānic text is usually in the majority suggests that it is overall a better reproduction of the common source. These broad, initial conclusions may be refined or even significantly modified once we have finished the detailed study of all the variants and performed a statistical comparison of C-1 and the ‘Uthmānic text. As another refinement, it may become necessary to come to terms with the fact that different sūras in a codex could have had different transmission histories before they came to be incorporated in a Companion codex. As explained in a previous essay, this likelihood arises since a Companion’s codex may have taken different sūras from different scribes. This possibility now seems particularly relevant, since, as compared to the other sūras in C-1 found in the fragment, sūra 20 in C-1 shows a greater affinity to the codex of Ubayy b. Ka‘b. Finally, one should investigate the extent to which the variants may be due to the Prophet reciting different versions.

Analysis resolves a fundamental question about the early history of the Qur‘ān: who joined the existing verses to form the sūras (chapters) and when? Many scholars and some early reports hold that this was accomplished after the death of the Prophet by the committee that

42) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 343–436. We owe the hybridity hypothesis to Michael Cook.
43) The work is in progress, and it involves comparing C-1’s text with the ‘Uthmānic Qur‘ān. The key question relating to the problem of textual priority is whether one text type has significantly more “irreducible pluses” than the other. A “plus” of a text type is a word or a phrase found in it that is missing from the other text type (without some other word or phrase taking its place). It is “irreducible” if it cannot be explained as an addition resulting from assimilation of parallels or nearby terms. Having more irreducible pluses is a sign of textual priority. Such an analysis was conducted previously on the variants in the four folios of Sanā‘ auctioned abroad (Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 385–90, 399–405), but, obviously, the results might be different once all the folios have been analyzed.
45) See Appendix 1.
‘Uthmān charged with the task of standardizing the Qurʼān. Some other early reports however indicate that this was done already by the Prophet himself. This last view is now found to be better supported. It follows from the fact that the ‘Uthmānic Qurʼān, C-1, and the Companion codices generally have the same passages within the sūras, that the sūras were fixed before these various textual traditions branched off, in particular before the spread of the ‘Uthmānic version. With only a few exceptions, the differences among the codices are at the level of morphemes, words, and phrases – not at the level of sentences or verses. The exceptions in C-1 include the very short consecutive verses 31 and 32 in sūra 20, which are three words long apiece, and which appear in C-1 in reverse order. Literary sources record that these verses were also transposed in the Codex of Ubayy b. Ka‘b. 47 Another exception concerns verse 85 of sūra 9, which is missing. At sixteen words, this omission is found to be an outlier when compared to the sizes of other missing elements in C-1, which are much shorter. The anomaly may be explained by the common phenomenon of parablepsis, a form of scribal error in which the eye skips from one text to a similar text, in this case, from the instance of āna followed by a verse separator and the morpheme wa at the end of verse 84 to the instance of āna followed by a verse separator and the morpheme wa at the end of verse 85. The conclusion that the sūras were constituted prior to the ‘Uthmānic text helps one assess the accuracy of some early Muslim accounts. It disproves the reports that imply that it was under ‘Uthmān that the sūras were assembled from the preserved pieces of the revelation. 48

There are some traditions about ‘Uthmān’s team finding the last two verses of sūra 9 with a man named Khuzayma, or Abū Khuzayma, or Ibn Khuzayma. 49 C-1 has these verses in the expected place. Since they are also found in the ‘Uthmānic Qurʼān, and since it is not reported that any Companion codex was without them, these verses must have belonged to the prototype from which the C-1 and ‘Uthmānic text types emerged. Therefore, one should not read too much into the report.

48) For a summary of traditions suggesting that the sūras were fixed only after the Prophet’s death, see Hossein Modarressi, “Early Debates on the Integrity of the Qurʾān: A Brief Survey,” Studia Islamica 77 (1993): 8–13. Modarressi questions their accuracy and calls them “extremely problematic” (p. 14).
The order in which the sūras were put together is a different matter. Different Companion codices had different sūra sequences, indicating that the order was not completely fixed at the time of the Prophet. This is supported by C-1, which adopts a non-standard sūra order. In a previous article, one of us mentioned three sūra transitions found in the lower writing, and subsequently another author mentioned two more.

In Table 2 we present a complete table of the eleven sūra transitions in the extant folios of Ṣanʿā'. (For convenience, in the table and elsewhere in this article, the sūra numbers give the 'Uthmānic rank.) Al-ʿĀʾZAMĪ has made the astute point that a non-standard sūra transition does not entail a non-standard Qurʾān if it occurs in a pamphlet with a selection of sūras. However, the point does not apply to the lower writing: it covers too much of the Qurʾān, including some of the largest sūras; its wording establishes its non-'Uthmānic status; and its sūra ordering is too similar to those reported for other Companion codices.

One may make three observations about C-1's sūra ordering. First, some transitions are found only in Ubayy b. Ka'b's codex, others only in Ibn Masʿūd's codex, and yet others in no reported sūra ordering. Second, the ordering is closer to those of Ibn Masʿūd and Ubayy b. Ka'b than to that of 'Uthmān. This pattern is so strong that one would expect it to hold in the lost remainder of the codex as well. Third, the ordering is closer to the one reported for Ubayy b. Ka'b than to that of Ibn Masʿūd; but the pattern is not strong enough and the sample size is not large enough to provide an inkling of whether that was also the case in the rest of the codex.

51) Sadeghi and Bergmann, "The Codex," 393 (Table 8); E. Puin, "Teil II,"
256–7.
Table 2. The sura orders in C-1, Ibn Mas’ūd, and Ubayy b. Ka’b. The numbers are the ‘Uthmānic ranks. The sequences in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm and the Itqān of al-Suyūtī differ due to errors in the transmission of the reports about sura orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-1</th>
<th>Ibn Mas’ūd</th>
<th>Ubayy b. Ka’b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11,8,9,19</td>
<td>Fihrist: 56 9,16,11, nine intervening suras, 8,19</td>
<td>Fihrist: 56 8,9,11,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itqān: 54 9,16,11, fourteen intervening suras, 8,19</td>
<td>Itqān: 56 8,9,11,19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,18</td>
<td>Fihrist: sura 18 is omitted; sura 12 is followed by 17</td>
<td>Fihrist: 12,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itqān: 12,18,17</td>
<td>Itqān: 12,18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,25</td>
<td>Fihrist: sura 15 is omitted</td>
<td>Fihrist: 15, ten intervening suras, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itqān: 25,15</td>
<td>Itqān: sura 25 is omitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,21</td>
<td>Fihrist: sura 20 is omitted</td>
<td>Fihrist: 20,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itqān: 21,20</td>
<td>Itqān: 20,21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,13</td>
<td>Fihrist: 13, 34</td>
<td>Fihrist: 13, four intervening suras, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itqān: 13,34</td>
<td>Itqān: 34, two intervening suras, 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39,40</td>
<td>Fihrist: 39, 40</td>
<td>Fihrist: 39, five intervening suras, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itqān: 39,40</td>
<td>Itqān: 39, six intervening suras, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63,62,89,90</td>
<td>Fihrist: 63, 62, twenty-nine intervening suras, 89,85,84, 96,90</td>
<td>Fihrist: 63,62,65,89 (sura 90 is omitted, unless la ʾaqīma refers to it rather than to sura 75, in which case it comes at eleven removes after sura 89.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itqān: 63,62,27, twenty-seven intervening suras, 89,85,84, 96,90</td>
<td>Itqān: 63,62,66,89,90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One report ascribes to ‘Uthmān’s team the decision to place sura 9 after sura 8, and to do so without inserting between them the basmala." In

---

56) Al-Suyūtī, al-Itqān, 1.175–6.
the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful," a formula found at
the beginning of all the other sūras.⁵⁷ The evidence of Ṣanʿā' 1 adds a
nuance to this claim. The transition point between sūras 8 and 9 happens
to be part of the surviving fragments of the lower codex, and it lacks the
basmala like the 'Uthmānic text. In putting sūra 9 right after sūra 8, the
manuscript agrees with the codices of 'Uthmān and Ubayy b. Ka'b, but
not that of Ibn Mas'ūd, which places sūra 8 at many removes after sūra 9.
It is unlikely, then, that the decision of 'Uthmān's team was an innova-
tion.

As mentioned above, most of the differences between C-1 and the
other text types must have arisen at the branching off of the textual
traditions. This happened probably as the Prophet recited the text and a
Companion wrote it down. Purely written transmission can be dis-
counted due to the significance of the variants in number and nature.
Purely oral transmission can be ruled out, too, for several reasons. The
variations that arose in the ḥadīth literature during the first century AH
provide a good idea of what to expect from purely oral transmission:
entire paragraphs would be worded differently, with additions, omissions,
and transpositions at the sentence and paragraph levels. The differences
seen in C-1, rather, compare to ḥadīth variants arising in the late second
century AH, when the use of writing was common. (Against this, one
might object that the transmission of the Qur'ān would have required a
high standard of memorization, and, therefore, perhaps memorization
could convey the text with precision. The objection is moot to a degree,
however, given that the C-1 variants show that the text was in fact not
transmitted precisely. Besides, the thousand or so pointing and vocaliza-
tion variants of the written 'Uthmānic text highlight the fallibility of
oral transmission, and certain 'Uthmānic variant readings presuppose a
written skeletal text that was on occasion read seemingly without a
memory of the spoken form: take 'inda versus 'ibād in Q 43.19, yaqṣṣu
versus yaqḍi in Q 6.57, and yusayyirukum versus yanshurukum in Q
10.22.) Another indication of the use of writing is that the textual vari-
ants in C-1, while numerous, remain the exception rather than the norm.
This holds even for “minor” elements of language, including particles,
prepositions, suffixes, etc.⁵⁸ Moreover, even a careful memorizer who re-
produces the words exactly is prone to getting the order of the verses
wrong; yet C-1 has the same verses and the same order of verses as the
standard Qur'ān.

⁵⁷) Rāmıyār, Tārīkh-i Qur'ān, 429.
The frequency and nature of the variants indicate that the branching off of the C-1 and the 'Uthmānic text types must have involved semi-oral transmission, that is, some combination of written and oral transmission. Ascertaining the precise manner in which orality and writing were combined requires a considerable amount of research. For now, two different hypotheses may be advanced. One theory would be that transmission involved the reciting of the text and the simultaneous writing down of the recitation by a Companion, but not precise, word-for-word dictation. The variants indicate a recitation that was performed faster than a hearer could take down with complete fidelity. The second theory would be that a Companion with a good memory wrote down a sūra not simultaneously with hearing it, but after the recitation had been complete, for example, after he went home. He could have taken notes during the recitation that would serve as a mnemonic. The use of such notes, the scribe’s good memory, and his prior familiarity with the Qur’ān may explain why most of the text remained unchanged, even when it came to the relatively small linguistic elements, while the time gap between the hearing and writing would explain the differences that arose.

There are several possible explanations for why the leaves of the original manuscript were reused to prepare a new one. The original codex may have been worn out due to extensive use over a number of decades. Just how quickly the pages were worn out would depend on how often the manuscript was used, something that we are not in a position to know. In addition, the orthographic and paleographic differences between the two layers are consistent with their being separated by a period long enough for the codex to have been worn out: though both scripts are Ḥijāzī, the upper writing is more compact, uses more alifs, and uses more dots for distinguishing the consonants. Alternatively, part of the lower codex may have been damaged in an accident. As a third possibility, the fact that the lower writing belongs to a non-'Uthmānic textual tradition may have been the motive, since C-1 would have become obsolete as the parallel 'Uthmānic tradition came to be regarded as the standard. These explanations, of course, are not mutually exclusive.

Some scholars will consider only a narrative of suppression. Indeed, it is possible that the original owner(s) recycled the codex due to a preference for the 'Uthmānic version. However, this would not necessarily mean that the scribe considered the lower writing wrong or illegitimate.

60) Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 370.
Early traditions preserve a wide spectrum of attitudes towards the codices of Ibn Mas'ūd and other Companions, some depreciatory, some adulatory, and some neutral. Many reports imply the legitimacy of Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex or other Companion codices. Even some of the reports that express preference for the standard text do so. However, we are aware of only one report that denies the basic legitimacy and divine origin of Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex. Kūfans who held Ibn Mas'ūd (d. AH 33) in high esteem quoted the statement from al-Ḥajjāj (d. 95). The latter was notorious for his opposition to Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex, and he was not remembered fondly for that in Kūfa, where the local school of law saw Ibn Mas'ūd as its founder, where Sulaymān al-A'mash (d. 147) continued to recite Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex alongside the 'Uthmānic text and transmit its variants, and where important Qur'ān reciters such as Ibrāhīm al-Nakhu’i (d. 96), Ibn Waththāb (d. 103), Ţalḥa b. Muṣarrīf (d. 112), al-A'mash (d. 147), and Ḥamza (d. 156) were influenced to varying degrees by Ibn Mas'ūd’s text type even when they were reciting 'Uthmān’s text.61

On closer examination, the quotation from al-Ḥajjāj appears as a possible exaggeration by Kūfan Qur’ān reciters, fashioned to make al-Ḥajjāj appear all the more outrageous.62

61) For an example of Ibn Mas'ūd's influence on 'Uthmānic readings in Kūfa, see Sadeghi, “Criteria for Emending the Text of the Qur'ān.”

62) The report was transmitted through the Kūfan Qur’ān reciter Abū Bakr b. Ayyāsh (d. AH 193) from the well-known Kūfan Qur’ān specialists ʿĀṣim b. ʿAbī al-Najūd (d. 128) and Sulaymān al-A’mash (d. 147). Here are two representative versions. (Version 1) Ibn Mas'ūd “says (or thinks) that his Qur’ān is from God. By God, it is nothing but Bedouin rajaz poetry (mā hiya illā rajaz min rajaz al-a'rāb); God almighty did not send it to his Prophet.” (Version 2) Ibn Mas’ūd recites the Qur’ān, versifying it as the Bedouin recite rajaz poetry, and calls this [reciting] the Qur’ān (yaqra'u al-Qur'ān rajzan ka-rajz al-a'rāb wa-yaqūlu hādhā al-Qur'ān). See Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh madīnat Dimashq, ed. ʿĀlī Shīrī (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1415/1995), 12:159-62; Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, Sunan, ed. Saʿīd Muḥammad al-Lahḥām (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1410/1990), 2:400. The first version quoted above is surprising as it depicts Ibn Mas'ūd’s codex as different in kind from the 'Uthmānic Qur’ān. That goes against everything else that has been related about that codex, including the detailed account provided by al-A'mash, whose authority this tradition invokes. (On al-A'mash's description of Ibn Mas'ūd's codex, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 391-3.) It is possible that this anomalous version adapts and embellishes the second version, which says something quite different and less unexpected. In the second version quoted above, the issue is not the contents of Ibn Mas'ūd's codex, but rather the manner in which he (and presumably his followers) recited the Qur'ān. He is accused of having recited it in the way a Bedouin would recite poetry, presuma-
One idea that seems to have been in fairly wide circulation already in the first century of Islam was that the Qur’ān was revealed in Seven Modes (sab‘at aḥruf).63 Translated from the language of metaphysics into that of history, this notion entails that the Companion codices were all legitimate despite their differences, as they ultimately represented what the Prophet’s scribes wrote down, and as they all enjoyed the Prophet’s endorsement. Such codical pluralism being an early notion, those who sought to elevate the ‘Uthmānic version above the others could not simply declare the other codices non-Qur’ānic. Some early scholars found a solution by making use of an existing tradition that said that the

63) Seven Modes (sab‘at aḥruf) traditions include Prophetic and non-Prophetic reports. For an overview of the *matn* and *isnād* of the Prophetic hadīths, see ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Qārī, *Hadīth al-aḥruf al-sab‘a: dirāsa li-isnādihi wa-matnihi wa-khtilāf al-‘ulamā’ fī ma’nāhu wa-ṣilatihi bi-l-qirā‘at al-Qur’āniyya* (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1423/2002), 9–41. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ’s work has the merit of including related traditions that do not use the words sab‘at aḥruf, and the demerit of excluding non-Prophetic āthār. For the English translation and brief discussion of a Seven Modes report that quotes Ibn Mas‘ūd instead of the Prophet, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 412–3. A detailed analysis of the Seven Modes traditions needs to be conducted. In the meantime, our impression is that the idea dates from the first century AH.
The Prophet used to present the Qur’an to the angel Gabriel every year. They linked these successive presentations with the different Companion codices, and they said that the 'Uthmānic text was the last presentation, implying that it superseded the others. The admirers of Ibn Mas‘ūd responded by pointing out that his reading would surely have been updated if a text had been abrogated, or they reacted by simply making Ibn Mas‘ūd’s Qur’an the final presentation. Both sets of traditions accepted that the Prophet introduced multiple versions of the Qur’an as the text was updated annually, and both took it for granted that Companion codices represented legitimate recordings of the revelations; they disagreed only over which codex was the last version.

The codex of Ibn Mas‘ūd eventually lost popularity, but codical pluralism did not vanish altogether. Although many different interpretations of the “Seven Modes” arose over time, many scholars continued to regard them as encompassing the Companion codices. Ibn al-Jazarī (d. AH 833) wrote that the majority of scholars held that the Seven Modes are not limited to the master codices 'Uthmān sent to the cities – that is to say, they can include non-'Uthmānic variants – and that they held the 'Uthmānic codices to constitute precisely the Prophet’s “final presentation.” He thus found some Companion textual variants “acceptable” (yuqbal) even though he disapproved of reciting them in prayers. He

---


66) Ibn al-Jazarī writes, “Most scholars from earlier and more recent times and the imams of the Muslims have held that these ‘Uthmānic codices contain only that portion of the Seven Modes that fits their rasm” (wa-dhahaba jamāhīr al-‘ulamā‘ min al-salaf wa-l-khalaf al-muslimīn ilā anna hādhāhi l-maṣāḥif al-‘uthmāniyya mushtamila alī mū yaḥtamilikhur rasumukh min al-ahraf al-sab‘a faqah), and adds that the ‘Uthmānic codices constitute precisely the Prophet’s final presentation of the text to Gabriel. See Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr fī l-qirā‘āt al-‘ashr*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Dabbā‘ (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, n.d.), 31. I was led to this reference by a forthcoming essay of Yasin Dutton, entitled, “Orality, Literacy and the Seven Aḥruf Hadīth.”
mentions however that some other scholars did endorse the use of Companion codices in worship. Many pre-modern scholars, if they were with us today, might have looked reverentially at the lower writing’s variants as instantiations of the Seven Modes while perhaps denying the text the status of the ‘Uthmānic Qur’ān in prayers. In sum, neither in early Islam nor later did the preference for the standard text always entail a dismissal of the Companion codices.

The Media and Manuscripts

As much as we would like to disregard the media, it is difficult to do so. Academic publications increasingly rely on them, and professors assign newspaper articles for their classes. Moreover, it is instructive to take note of the rumors that circulate among modern academics and the journalistic articles that mirror and feed them. Stories, after all, spread better if they capture the worldviews, hopes, and fears of their host populations.

In the late 1990s, a narrative swept a number of Western universities, and it can be epitomized by one word: suppression. One version was that Yemen was prone to concealing the precious newly-discovered manuscripts in its possession, leading the Europeans who were restoring the parchments to keep their secrets under wraps for the time being. One journalist, Toby Lester, asserted as much based on interviews with G. Puin. He added that “detailed examination … is something the

67) For Ibn al-Jazari’s views on the Seven Modes and legitimate recitations, see Ibn al-Jazari, al-Nashr, 7–9, 14–15, 26–8, 31–3. 44. He holds that any reading is authoritative and belongs to the Seven if (i) it is in good Arabic, (ii) it does not differ skeletally-morphemically from one of the ‘Uthmānic regional codices, and (iii) it is transmitted soundly from individuals. If the reading does not fit the ‘Uthmānic text (khaṭṭ al-muṣḥaf) but the other two conditions are satisfied, then it is “accepted, but not recited” in rituals (p. 14). He writes that, unlike him, some scholars permit the recitation of such Companion variants in ritual prayers, while others take the middle ground by allowing their use in worship except in the case of the Fātiha (pp. 13–4). This opens the door to the acceptability of some non-‘Uthmānic variants even in his relatively restrictive approach, and he gives as examples two acceptable Companion variants that differ significantly from the ‘Uthmānic text at the phrase level. Cf. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Qāri, Ḥadīth al-ahrafi al-sab’a, 45–8.

68) Toby Lester, "What is the Koran?", 44.
Yemeni authorities have seemed reluctant to allow. A more forward version of the motif had Yemen prevent the publication of manuscripts outright. In any case, the narrative implied that European academics had met the resistance and intolerance of people who are beholden to religious dogma and unaccustomed to rational inquiry.

The media weaved the suppression motif within martyrologies and harrowing tales of victimization. Reports touching the Ṣan‘ā’ manuscripts mentioned the Rushdie affair and the persecution of Naṣr Hāmid Abū Zayd. The New York Times presented as fact hearsay about a Palestinian scholar of early Islam, Suliman Bashear, being injured when his students threw him out of a second-story window. (Several people who were close to the late Bashear told us that the event never happened. For example, Bashear’s wife, Dr. Lily Feidy, in an e-mail message dated August 14, 2011, wrote, “Please note that Suliman was never attacked or injured by his students; nor was he physically attacked by anybody else. I have been asked this question a million times”). The New York Times made much of a book of Christoph Luxenberg being turned down by a publisher. The Wall Street Journal related an account narrated by G. Puin about Yemen seizing the images of the Ṣan‘ā’ manuscripts that Bothmer had prepared. (In a tele-

---

69) Toby Lester, “What is the Koran?,” 44. See above, footnotes 31 and 32, for assertions about Yemeni obstructionism.


72) Stille, “Scholars are Quietly Offering New Theories of the Koran.” Stille assumes that publishers normally accept a book if there is some good scholar somewhere who likes the book. Thus, the fact that there may be some scholars who like Luxenberg’s book is for Stille proof of discrimination. Incidentally, one of the scholars who, according to Stille, praised Luxenberg’s book is Patricia Crone. Yet, in reference to the works by Günter Luling and Christoph Luxenberg, Crone writes, “both books are open to so many scholarly objections (notably amateurism in Luxenberg’s case) that they cannot be said to have done the field much good” (Patricia Crone, “What do we Actually Know about Mohammed?,” http://www.opendemocracy.net/faith-europe_islam/mohammed_3866.jsp).

74) Higgins, “The Lost Archive.”
phone interview on August 26, 2011, Bothmer called the account “ridiculous” and blamed the journalist. And the New York Times reported that Euro-American academia is experiencing a chill due to Muslim threats of violence. 75

The narrative of oppression resonates with the self-image of academics as upholders of reason and with archetypical notions about the conflict between rationality and traditional religion, a clash that is most commonly symbolized in modern culture by Galileo’s struggle with the Church. 76 The suppression motif also seemed to resolve a conspicuous

75) Stille writes that Muslim threats of violence have sent “a chill through universities around the world” that has “affected non-Muslim scholars in Western countries” (Stille, “Scholars are Quietly Offering New Theories of the Koran”). However, he does not mention any instance of a European or North American university professor receiving a threat or being harmed. According to an anonymous “researcher” in the U.S. whom he quotes, the situation is so bad that “it’s not possible to say anything other than sugary nonsense about Islam.” Yet, most academic publications are non-sugary, and some are even sensible. Stille’s examples include the striking rumor about Bashear, beside Luxenberg’s initial difficulty in finding a publisher. His picture of Euro-American scholarship may not be real, but it probably accurately reflects the siege mentality of some of his informants. Stille’s, Lester’s, Higgins’, and Kristof’s portrayals of the state of scholarship in the Muslim world suffer from similar shortcomings.

76) The historian of skepticism, Richard Popkin, has highlighted how European skeptics selectively appropriated and imagined Galileo’s experience to make it a symbol for an essential conflict between reason and religion. See Richard Popkin, “Skepticism, Theology and the Scientific Revolution in the Seventeenth Century,” in Problems in the Philosophy of Science: Proceedings of the International Colloquium in the Philosophy of Science, London, 1965, volume 3, ed. Imre Lakatos et al. (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1968), 1–28. It should be noted that while a general attitude of unease with religion best explains the wide acceptance of the media’s claims among academics, some of the interlocutors target Islam in particular rather than religion in general. G. Puin, for example, frames his work as a reaction against Muslim criticisms of Christianity that focus on the textual issues of the Gospels – an approach that was made popular in the mid-1980s among English-speaking Muslim non-specialists by a meagerly-trained charismatic speaker named Ahmed Deedat. Puin goes on the counterattack with a tu quoque argument about textual corruption in the Qur’an: “Muslims... like to quote the textual work that shows that the Bible has a history and did not fall straight out of the sky, but until now the Koran has been out of this discussion. The only way to break through this wall is to prove that the Koran has a history too. The Sana’a fragments will help us do this” (Puin, quoted in Lester, “What Is the Koran?” 44).
paradox: on the one hand, it was indicated that the Ṣan‘ā’ manuscripts refuted core religious doctrines; on the other hand, it was not explained how they did so, as nothing was revealed about the manuscripts beyond the finding that there are variants, a banal observation from the standpoint of traditional Muslim scholarship. The mysterious information gap was explained by putting the responsibility at the door of Yemen and its presumed propensity for withholding purportedly embarrassing evidence.

The suppression narrative is inaccurate. It is true that G. Puin did not share his photographs with scholars who asked for them, nor publish a great deal on them himself, but this was his personal choice (to which

77) The journalists and some of their academic informants suggest that Muslim scholars are unaware of textual variants. They disregard the dozens of volumes written on variants and the textual-critical discussions about them in the tafsīr genre and other sources. They also imply that it is only Western scholars who are now applying proper “analytical tools” to the Qur’ān (Kristof, "Islam, Virgins, and Grapes"). The journalists disregard evidence that complicates their narrative that modern scholarship has upended core Muslim beliefs. Those who discuss both Wansbrough’s theories and early manuscripts do not draw the elementary inference that the latter refutes the former: they are interested in the manuscripts only because they believe they refute traditional views. They also do not note that the palimpsest undermines the modern theory that the Companion codices were fictitious. Evidence is deemed interesting only when there is at least a vague sense that it supports revisionist theories.


In the first article, Puin writes, “My observations do not claim to be either new or unexpected, except for the last paragraph which discusses the different arrangements of the Sūrahs” (p. 108). This refers to his idea that sūra transitions in the manuscripts that do not match the standard sūra ordering point to non-standard textual traditions. However, the author does not reveal any information that can be used to evaluate the evidence (Are the manuscripts in question early or late? Do their texts support a non-‘Uthmānic classification? Is there any indication that the manuscripts constituted complete codices or simply selections of sūras?). For more on this article, see above, footnote 33.

G. Puin’s second article focuses on the already well-known fact that in ancient orthography a tooth could signify the ă sound. He says that the tooth
corresponding to the second ʾ in Ibrāhīm and the ʾay in Shayṭān were originally pronounced as ʾā, yielding Abrāhām and Sāṭān, but that these pronunciations were forgotten later. In fact, several reciters, including one of the Seven, the Syrian Ibn ʿĀmir (d. 118), read the name as Ibrāhām, as noted, for example, in al-Khatib, Mu‘jam, 1:187, 2:600, which in any case does not prove that this was the name in early seventh-century Mecca. In addition, Puin notes that the ambiguity of the tooth means that the word ʾilāh (اﻟﻪ “, God,”) could, in principle, be spelled in the same way as the word ʾilayh (اﻟﻴﻪ “, towards Him.”) This leads him to propose, “hypothetically” an emendation that replaces ʾilayh with ʾilāh in lā ilāha illā huwa ilāhu l-maṣīr (Q 40.3), which means, “There is no god but Him; to Him is the journey.” The substitution yields lā ilāha illā huwa ilāhu l-maṣīr, which means, “There is no god but Him, the god of destiny.” Puin exclaims, “What a beautiful Qur’ānic sense! What a beautiful Biblical sense as compared to the traditional interpretation!” But then he immediately rejects his hypothetical proposal, stating, “the link between the word ‘destiny’ and the preposition ʾilā is so well-established in many parallel passages of the Qurʾān that one should consider the interpretation ‘God of destiny’ as a hasty conclusion.” Indeed, Puin is right that the proposal is wrong (see Q 3.28, 24.42, 35.18, 5.18, 31.14, 42.15, 64.3, 22.48, 31.14, 50.43, 2.285, 60.4).

Puin thus imagines an emendation to a verse that is fairly clear and straightforward, expresses excitement about the proposed reading, and then says that his proposal cannot be right. What might bring about such an approach? The verse in question may be among those that Puin considers as “incomprehensible” and hence in need of emendation. He avers that a large part of the Qurʾān “simply doesn’t make sense” (Puin, quoted in Lester, “What is the Koran?,” 54), and he holds that Muslims, too, think of much of the Qurʾān as meaningless. These premises have led to further conclusions: “This is what has caused the traditional anxiety about translation. If the Koran is not comprehensible – if it can’t even be understood in Arabic – then it’s not translatable. People fear that” (ibid.). This theory features a key idea in Puin’s conceptual repertoire, namely that of the suppression of embarrassing data: it attributes the Muslims’ misgivings about translations to the fear that the scripture will be exposed for the largely meaningless text they recognize it to be.

G. Puin’s third article, by way of new information, mentions some spelling variations in the manuscripts.
that they were granted greater access than would have been possible in some European libraries. Robin and his colleagues have the blessing of the Yemeni authorities to publish the images. We also asked Ursula Dreibholz, the conservator for the restoration project, whether the Yemeni authorities hampered research. She said no, and described the Yemeni authorities as supportive.79

Moreover, other participants in the project in Yemen do not confirm G. Puin’s statement that Yemeni authorities “want to keep this thing low-profile” or that “they don’t want it made public that there is work being done at all.”80 Ursula Dreibholz continued working on the project in Yemen for four more years after the end of Puin’s involvement. She spent more time on the project than anybody else, and for the last three years she was the only foreigner to work fulltime in the Dār al-Makhṭūṭāt. She told us that Yemeni authorities “were very grateful” for the work done by the foreigners. They were “proud” of their treasures, and “they brought school children, university students, foreign delegations, religious dignitaries, and heads of state, like François Mitterrand, Gerhard Schröder, and Prince Klaus of the Netherlands, to see the collection.”81 Although the Yemeni authorities’ openness proved a boon to scholarship, they were to be punished for it. The American media amplified the erroneous words of G. Puin, purveying a narrative that belittled Yemen and misrepresented the work done there. The Arab press in turn exaggerated the American story. The outcome was a media discourse in Yemen borne of three stages of misrepresentation. This embarrassed the Yemeni authorities responsible for the House of Manuscripts, and the Head of the Antiquities Department had to defend before Parliament the decision to bring in the foreigners.82

79) The only credible instance of obstruction of which we know was related to us by Dreibholz: a librarian claimed to have lost the key (to the study room, if we recall correctly) (Dreibholz, telephone interview, August 8, 2011). Bothmer volunteered that the key remained “lost” for a week (Bothmer, telephone interview, August 26, 2011). We have not interviewed the librarian, and, in any case, this incident was an aberration.
80) Puin, quoted in Lester, “What Is the Koran?,” 44.
81) Dreibholz, telephone interview, July 30, 2011.
82) We rely on Dreibholz for the controversy inside Yemen (telephone interview, July 30, 2011, and e-mail dated August 8, 2011).
A Note on the Edition

In late 2009, when we asked Robin for the photographs and the ultraviolent images of DAM 01-27.1, he agreed immediately and went through some expense and trouble to make them available. The present essay would not have been possible without Christian Robin’s initiative and his exemplary openness and generosity. This edition of the lower writing of Ṣan‘ā’ 1 is based on all the folios except one, namely folio 21 of DAM 01-27.1, a picture of which we do not have. The folios are listed in the following table.

Table 3. The Folios of Ṣan‘ā’ 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Lower Text</th>
<th>Upper Text</th>
<th>Surviving Fraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2.87 – 2.96</td>
<td>6.149 – 6.159</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2.96 – 2.105</td>
<td>6.159 – 7.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford 2007 recto</td>
<td>2.191 – 2.196</td>
<td>2.265 – 2.271</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford 2007 verso</td>
<td>2.197 – 2.205</td>
<td>2.271 – 2.277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David 86/2003 recto</td>
<td>2.206 – 2.217</td>
<td>2.277 – 2.282</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David 86/2003 verso</td>
<td>2.217 – 2.223</td>
<td>2.282 – 2.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonhams 2000 recto</td>
<td>5.41 – 5.48</td>
<td>4.33 – 4.43</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonhams 2000 verso</td>
<td>5.48 – 5.54</td>
<td>4.43 – 4.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>11.105 – 11.112</td>
<td>14.32 – 14.41</td>
<td>less than ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>11.120 – 8.3</td>
<td>14.52 – 15.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>8.73 – 9.7</td>
<td>16.73 – 16.89</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>9.7 – 9.16</td>
<td>16.89 – 16.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>9.17 – 9.26</td>
<td>16.102 – 16.118</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>9.26 – 9.34</td>
<td>16.118 – 17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20A</td>
<td>9.70 – 9.81</td>
<td>30.26 – 30.40</td>
<td>more than ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20B</td>
<td>9.81 – 9.90</td>
<td>30.40 – 30.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A</td>
<td>9.106 – 9.113</td>
<td>31.24 – 32.4</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21B</td>
<td>9.114 – 9.120</td>
<td>32.4 – 32.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22A</td>
<td>9.121 – 19.5</td>
<td>32.20 – 33.6</td>
<td>more than ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22B</td>
<td>19.6 – 19.29</td>
<td>33.6 – 33.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A</td>
<td>19.29 – 19.53</td>
<td>33.18 – 33.29</td>
<td>more than ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23B</td>
<td>19.54 – 19.74</td>
<td>33.30 – 33.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>22.15 – 22.26</td>
<td>17.40 – 17.58</td>
<td>about ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>22.27 – 22.39</td>
<td>17.59 – 17.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31A</td>
<td>12.17 – 12.20</td>
<td>43.63 – 43.69</td>
<td>less than ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31B</td>
<td>12.27 – 12.31</td>
<td>43.89 – 44.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32A</td>
<td>12.111 – 18.5</td>
<td>47.15 – 47.20</td>
<td>less than ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32B</td>
<td>18.15 – 18.18</td>
<td>47.32 – 48.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13A</td>
<td>16.26 – 16.37</td>
<td>21.42 – 21.72</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td>16.68 – 16.69</td>
<td>21.111 – 22.1</td>
<td>less than 1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14B</td>
<td>16.78 – 16.79</td>
<td>22.15 – 22.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>33.51 – 33.57</td>
<td>19.38 – 19.64</td>
<td>about ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>33.57 – 33.72</td>
<td>19.64 – 19.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25A</td>
<td>39.25 – 39.36</td>
<td>37.38 – 37.59</td>
<td>less than ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A</td>
<td>39.51 – 39.70</td>
<td>37.102 – 37.134</td>
<td>less than ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26B</td>
<td>39.70 – 40.8</td>
<td>37.134 – 37.172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15A</td>
<td>20.23 – 20.61</td>
<td>25.10 – 25.34</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B</td>
<td>20.61 – 20.80</td>
<td>25.34 – 25.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30B</td>
<td>20.122 – 20.133</td>
<td>42.38 – 42.48</td>
<td>about ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30A</td>
<td>21.5 – 21.19</td>
<td>42.21 – 42.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>? – 24.13</td>
<td>20.1 – 20.43</td>
<td>more than ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10B</td>
<td>24.13 – 24.23</td>
<td>20.44 – 20.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>24.23 – 24.32</td>
<td>20.74 – 20.98</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B</td>
<td>24.32 – 24.40</td>
<td>20.98 – 20.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33A</td>
<td>34.13 – 34.23</td>
<td>55.16 – 56.4</td>
<td>about ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33B</td>
<td>34.23 – 34.33</td>
<td>56.5 – 56.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34A</td>
<td>34.40 – 34.47</td>
<td>57.1 – 57.10</td>
<td>about ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34B</td>
<td>13.1 – 13.5</td>
<td>57.16 – 57.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35A</td>
<td>13.6 – 13.14</td>
<td>57.27 – 58.6</td>
<td>about ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B</td>
<td>13.16 – 13.21</td>
<td>58.11 – 58.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36A</td>
<td>13.25 – 13.31</td>
<td>59.1 – 59.10</td>
<td>about ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36B</td>
<td>13.33 – 13.40</td>
<td>59.14 – 60.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28A</td>
<td>37.15 – 37.33</td>
<td>41.17 – 41.27</td>
<td>about 1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28B</td>
<td>37.43 – 37.68</td>
<td>41.33 – 41.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29A</td>
<td>37.82 – 37.103</td>
<td>41.47 – 42.5</td>
<td>about 1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29B</td>
<td>37.118 – 37.144</td>
<td>42.10 – 42.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18A</td>
<td>15.4 – 15.33</td>
<td>28.58 – 28.74</td>
<td>(almost) all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The order in which we transcribe the folios in our edition is given in the above table, and it broadly follows the *sūra* arrangement of the codex of Ubayy b. Ka'ab as an approximation to that of C-1. The DAM 01-27.1 folios are designated by numbers referring to their order in the upper text. When we cite a *sūra* number, it refers to the ‘Uthmānic rank. When we give a verse number, we follow the Kūfan scheme used in most of the Qur’āns printed in the Middle East.

Since they postdate the upper text, the lower modifier hand(s) that are in black are not included in the edition.\(^{83}\) By contrast, apparent insertions or corrections that predate the upper writing or have a chance of predating it are discussed in the footnotes. In particular, we discuss a greenish script that occasionally modifies the lower text. We are not sure whether it came before or after the upper text.

In the case of the three and a half folios that were transcribed by Elisabeth Puin, despite numerous differences, our transcriptions and commentary overlap with hers to a significant degree. Moreover, Alba Fedeli has identified and discussed a number of important variants.

---

83) On the lower modifier, see footnote 12 above.
Rather than cite every instance of overlap with their works individually in the footnotes, we have acknowledged their contributions in a collective manner above, and we do so also here and in the Bibliography below.

Reading the lower writing is a difficult and tedious task, and errors are inevitable. Pictures taken under a brighter light and with a higher resolution than those we have used for the 01-27.1 folios should allow more accurate readings. For these folios, ultraviolet photographs proved very useful. The method that will achieve the highest accuracy is X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) imaging, and one only hopes that someday it will be used for the entire manuscript. Uwe Bergmann’s application of the technique to Stanford 2007 revealed features of the text that are otherwise invisible, bringing to light the residues buried in the parchment of iron, copper, and zinc from the ink. For the Stanford 2007 and David 86/2003 folios, we had access to high-resolution, bright photographs. The images available to us for the Christies and Bonhams folios are low-resolution. It is our hope that greater effort by other scholars and better images yielding more accurate readings will render this edition obsolete.

Symbols and Conventions

( X ) The text is only partly visible, but enough is visible to give a good reason for the reading X.

[ X ] Some visible traces of ink are consistent with the reading X. However, they may also be consistent with other readings. Hence, the reading is conjectural.

/ / The folio is physically present but there is barely any trace of text. No letter of the alphabet is recognizable. The space between the slashes is approximately proportional to the size of the lacuna.

{ } The folio is physically missing. The space between the curly brackets is approximately proportional to the size of the lacuna.

⊙ Verse division. The absence of this symbol normally does not mean that a verse division is lacking in the lower text; it only means that one is not visible.

~~~ Decoration.
The Lower Text of Ṣanʿāʾ 1

Folio 2 A (Q 2.87–2.96)

{ } [ ] 1
{ } 2
{ } [ ] 3
{ } 4
{ } 5
{ } 6
{ } 7
{ } 8
{ } 9
{ } 10
{ } 11
{ } 12
{ } 13
{ } 14
{ } 15
{ } 16
{ } 17
{ } 18
{ } 19
{ } 20
{ } 21
{ } 22
{ } 23
{ } 24
{ } 25
{ } 26
{ } 27

There are traces above the tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter lām.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{41}}\) There are traces above the tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter lām.\]
85) The illegible space before bi-munziḥiḥi is too small for the grapheme that may have been intended. Perhaps the word is bi-munziḥiḥi, which is reported for Ibn Masʿūd’s codex here.

86) The text seems to have wa-mā llāhu bi-ghāfilin ʻammā yaʿmalūna. Since the last word in this line uses a second-person pronoun, the verb wa-bushrā appears to be farīqun, in which case the vertical stroke in the second half of the illegible part cannot belong to the word farīqun. Perhaps the text is tāʾ ifṣatun instead of farīqun, in which case the vertical line would belong to tāʾ.

87) This word may be hudātum, in which case the vertical stroke in the second half of the illegible part cannot belong to the word farīqun. The text might have an additional putative morpheme is not visible. It is not clear whether the scribe was adding the putative hudātum to wa-bushrā, or was trying to replace bushrā with hudātum.

88) This word may be anbiyāʾiḥi. Perhaps the text has an additional qul at the beginning of this verse. Since the last word in this line uses a second-person pronoun, the verb here is also probably in the second person, i.e., āhadtum.

89) The text seems to differ from the standard reading, because a visible vertical stroke in the second half of the illegible part cannot belong to the word farīqun. Maybe the text is tāʾ ifṣatun instead of farīqun, in which case the vertical line would belong to tāʾ.
The illegible part preceding this verse separator has a special shape for marking the 100th verse.

The illegible part preceding this alif is small, implying āmanū instead of annahum āmanū.

The traces do not match ل. The first letter is tooth-shaped (but may also be rā' or laūm the upper part of which is erased). The last letter may be mīm since there is a small horizontal line at the end that resembles the tail of a mīm.

The traces in the preceding illegible part are perplexing. The first letter in this part is fā', but it seems to be a later addition. It is written in a script similar to that of the lower text, but appears in a slightly different color (with a stronger green hue), and its shape suggests it has been inserted later. (Similar additions appear in Folio 10 A (line 7) and Folio 11 B (line 14).) It is not clear if the lower text initially had fitna or not. Traces of a consonant-distinguishing mark for the letter tā' (after fā') suggest the text had fitna from the start, but these traces too can be later additions (their color is not quite clear). One possibility is that the text had miḥna because the traces after the inserted fā' conform to khā'. Muqātil b. Sulaymān cites an exegetical tradition from al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, who interprets fitna as miḥna (See Muqātil b. Sulaymān, Tafsīr Muqātil b. Sulaymān, ed. Ahmad Farīd (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʾIlmiyya, 2003), 1.69).

The illegible part is big enough to accommodate the standard text between ya'allima'na and al-malakayn. However, the few remaining traces in this part do not quite match the standard text. Specifically, the first word does not seem to be al-nās (it might be al-yahūd).

The traces do not match ف. The amount of space before this putative alif is visible; the rest is covered by an upper text alif. The amount of space before this putative alif and the traces suggest that the text cannot be la-bi'sa mā. It might be a connected bi'samā (سما).

The illegible part preceding this page is that the text had these traces too can be later additions (their color is not quite clear). One possibility is that the text had miḥna because the traces after the inserted fā' conform to khā'. Muqātil b. Sulaymān cites an exegetical tradition from al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, who interprets fitna as miḥna (See Muqātil b. Sulaymān, Tafsīr Muqātil b. Sulaymān, ed. Ahmad Farīd (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʾIlmiyya, 2003), 1.69).
Behnam Sadeghi and Mohsen Goudarzi

Folio Stanford 2007 Recto (Q 2.191–2.196)

\{ ( \) و ( ا) هم و ا حور و ) ( 2
من حَب ا حور ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 1
من ا حور و لِئْلا 26
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 27
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 28

\{ ( ) و ( ا) هم و ا حور و ) ( 1
من حَب ا حور ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 2
من ا حور و لِئْلا 102
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 3
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 4
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 5
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 6
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 7
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 8
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 9
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 10
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 11
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 12
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 13
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 14
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 15
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 16
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 17
(ا حور و ) ( ا) هم  \{ ( 18

100) This word may be allāh.
101) The few remaining traces in this part match
102) Only one dot is visible above the first tooth.
103) There does not seem to be an alif at the end of this word.
104) Only one dot is visible above shīn.
105) The small space after mīm suggests there is no alif here.
106) The word aḥsinū does not seem to end with an alif.
107) A tooth is missing.
108) It cannot be ruled out that the scribe wrote aqīmū and then corrected it to atimmū.
109) There might have been a fā’ before alif.
Folio Stanford 2007 Verso (Q 2.197–2.205)


110) The third letter is probably thāʾ, even though only two consonant-distinguishing marks are visible above it.

111) The text seems to be inna llāha instead of the standard wa-tamānna anna llāha.

112) This word might be maʿādīdāt.

113) There is less room than expected for min al-nās. It is possible that the text is minhum, although there is more space than is needed for this word.
کر / 111 الله في اِنَّ علُوته و من بَحْر علُوته
بوس فلا أَنَّ علُوته و من بَحْر علُوته
ائمَي و (ا) لَه لَه والْأَمَك، اَي
حضْر و رُبَّ و من اللَّنَاس من يُحَفِّظ مُقْر
[۱۲۱] في [ه] اللَّنَاس لَه و سَبِيل الله
علي ما في / و هو الفِات السَّمُّ [۱۲۲] و ۱۷۱۲
ولِي سعِي في الاِسْر فتُصُّ قُبَّام و نهْلٌ۱۱۵

۱۱۱) This verse separator has a special shape for marking the ۲۰۰th verse.
۱۱۵) The next line is only partially visible due to the fact that a horizontal
strip has been cut off from the bottom of the folio. The traces suggest that there
is *inna* *الله* unlike the standard text. The last word on this partially
visible line seems to be *الْفَسَّد* followed by an end-of-verse marker.
۱۱۶) This *تَاء* has a tail similar to that of a final *ءَاء*. 

Folio David 86/2003 Recto (Q 2.206–2.217)
Either it is missing or it (or a smaller phrase such as corrected later.

The second letter is a medial longs to the present or the previous line. It is possible that the other characters. It is possible that the phrase wa-kufrun bihi is not present immediately before wa-ṣaddun. Its first letter is rā’ and its second letter is a medial lām. It is not clear what this word is, or whether it belongs to the present or the previous line.

The space here is not sufficient for sabīl allāh. The traces match sabīlihi. Either it is missing or it (or a smaller phrase such as wa-kafrun) is written at the beginning of the line, before wa-ṣaddun.

There are traces before ‘ayn that resemble an isolated rā’ or an initial mīm. The traces might belong to a word that the scribe had initially written here.

The initial kāf might be preceded by a tooth.

Traces of an alif are visible over nūn. The alif has a darker, green hue than the other characters. It is possible that the nūn, a likely scribal error, was corrected later.

A vertical stroke (possibly belonging to an alif) is visible in the middle of the illegible part preceding nūn, suggesting the text may differ from the standard reading.

In criticizing Fedeli, Sadeghi previously assumed that this nūn belongs to the word ‘an in ‘an dīnīhi. However, this is not certain. Nor is there any reason for believing that ‘an dīnīhi is missing from the text as Fedeli assumed. The text is largely illegible, and it is difficult to conclude much. See Sadeghi and Bergmann, “The Codex,” 363.
125) There is not enough room for the standard text between this point and istata 'ā in the previous line.
126) The verb jāhādā is either absent or written after fī sabili llāhi.
127) There is perhaps insufficient room for ʿab Y. The text may be āyātihi.
128) The morpheme ʿum has a dark greenish hue similar to the alif on line 2.
129) The traces and insufficient space suggest that the word li-l-nās is missing.
130) It is not clear whether this verse starts with wa-.
Folio Bonhams 2000 Recto (Q 5.41–5.48)

1. The last letter might be a final ṭā' instead.
2. The letter before mīm may be lām or a tooth-shaped letter. The letter after mīm may be wāw, fā', qāf, or even dāl. A vertical stroke is visible next. If it belongs to a letter of this word, then the word cannot be bi-l-mu'minīn. However, if it is a smudge or a corrected letter, then the word may be bi-l-mu'minīn.
3. The first letter in the illegible part might be kā'. In this case, the word may be ihtadaw instead of aslamā.
4. This wāw has a slightly darker hue.
5. There is less room than would normally be expected for a grapheme such as dāl.
6. The free space here is unusually large.
7. Considering the available space after the word jurūḥ on the previous line, there seems to be more room here than would be required for the standard text.
8. Apart from the traces of ink belonging to anzala, there are other traces. There might be a wāw slightly above the second grapheme. Perhaps the scribe had initially written a different word here, such as awkāh. Alternatively, the extra traces may be smudges.
fa-ḥkum 139) The distance between the initial lām and the ḥa’ā is unusually long.

140) This missing part is too small for the word ʾahl, and the word seems to be missing.

141) This part at the beginning of the line appears empty, perhaps because writing here would have interfered with the previous line.

142) A portion of the upper part of the text on this line is physically missing, since a strip has been cut off from the top of the folio.

143) The traces and amount of space suggest fa-ḥkum instead of wa-ani ḥkum.
This letter may be the lām.

The text may be ẓā'.

Before the final nūn, two vertical strokes are visible that may belong to a lām and a zā'.

The text may be man adhīna lāhu instead of bi-idhnihi.

This letter may be the nūn of the word khālidīn.
There are traces before wāw that resemble a tooth, which would not match the standard text. Otherwise, this may be the conjunctive wāw preceding lā taṭghaw.

This grapheme may belong to the word nuthabbitu.

A horizontal line is visible here beneath dāl. This line could belong to a final yāʾ.

The text may be innā maʿakum muntaẓirūn.

The upper section of a vertical stroke is visible the lower part of which is in the physically missing part. This stroke probably belongs to an alif. There are two possibilities: First, there may be another alif after āyātinā (there is enough space for such an alif), in which case the word here may be izdādū. Second, a tooth may come before the alif preceding the missing part, in which case the word could be zidnāhum.
Hence, the text came to be short of one instance of being written on line 9. He then wanted to write lā taqul bi-smi llāhi

Folio 5 A (Q 8.73–75 - 9.1–7)

{ ... } 14
{ ... } 15

\[\text{155} \quad \text{lā taqul bi-smi llāhi} \]

\[\text{156} \quad \text{There is no decoration here, only a horizontal line.}\]

\[\text{157} \quad \text{Pale traces of the grapheme \text{3} and another grapheme ending in a final \text{lām} are visible exactly above the word \text{sūra}. These traces may belong to the word \text{al-anfāl}. Slightly above these traces are others that are not quite legible, but might belong to another instance of the word \text{sūra}. Therefore, the end of line 8 contains traces for three words: \text{al-anfāl}, \text{sūra}, and another word that is also possibly \text{sūra}. Traces of this latter word and \text{al-anfāl} are paler than those of the first instance of \text{sūra}. Considering that the next line begins with the grapheme \text{lām}, the following conjectural scenario can explain the situation at the end of line 8. The scribe first wrote the word \text{al-anfāl} there, forgetting to write \text{sūra}. He then added the word \text{sūra} to the text, slightly above \text{al-anfāl}. However, this made the text cluttered, so he erased both \text{al-anfāl} and \text{sūra} (explaining why they are pale), and wrote the phrase \text{sūrat al-anfāl} anew, the last part being written on line 9. He then wanted to write lā taqul bi-smi lāhi after this end-of-sūra caption, but mistook the \text{lām} of \text{al-anfāl} (which was on line 9) with the graphically identical \text{lām}. Therefore, he wrote bi-smi lāhi immediately after this \text{lām}. Consequently, the text came to be short of one instance of \text{lām}.}\]
Behnam Sadeghi and Mohsen Goudarzi

Folio 5 B (Q 9.16)

1. سوهلِ الاَئَلِسِ عَهْدِ مَ (عَادِ اللَّهُ)

2. فاَ (قُصُّهمَ) مَ [سُرُّهَا] مَثْمَرُهَا (عَادِ اللَّهُ)

3. سَلَّمُهُمَّ [وَكُفُّهَا] مَنْ طَيْبُهَا وَأَعْوَدُهَا (عَادِ اللَّهُ)

4. فَوْهُ بَكِمَ الاَّوَلِدُهُمَا بِصُورُ دَوْمَهُمَا لَبِسَهُمَا (عَادِ اللَّهُ)

5. وَباَيُٰنِ مَبُسُومَهَا وَأَكْرِمُهُمَا (تَعُمَّدُهُمَا) فَوْهُ بَكِمَ الاَّوَلِدُهُمَا بِصُورُ دَوْمَهُمَا (عَادِ اللَّهُ)

158) There is not enough space for the word and the traces do not match it. The text may be *thaqitumūhum* instead of *wajad tumūhum*.

159) This comparatively small rá’ is written very close to the next letter (hā’) and is slightly above the line, suggesting that the scribe had initially forgotten to write it.

160) Although the missing part at the beginning of the line is rather large, the text is not necessarily longer than the standard one. The previous line’s text starts somewhat after the beginning of the line. The same could hold in the present line.

161) The illegible letter before kāf may be a tooth-shaped one instead of lām.
164) There are traces above the tooth preceding *mīm* that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter *tā‘*.

165) One consonant-distinguishing mark is visible above each tooth. Slightly above these marks is an upper text grapheme that probably covers the second mark of each tooth.

162) Only one consonant-distinguishing mark is visible above the first tooth.
One can see the remnants of an
other words, the scribe may have caught himself in the course of an inadvertent
perhaps the scribe first wrote
ulā'ika
dāl
vertically above each other; one is to the right and slightly lower than the other.

167) Traces that match the phrase 'inda lā'āhi are visible beneath the word ulā'ika. Perhaps the scribe first wrote 'inda lā'āhi, but then erased it and wrote ulā'ika in its place.

168) Traces of an initial lām are visible here. Perhaps the scribe began writing 'askiratukum, which is the next word, but then erased it and wrote azwājukum.

169) There are two strokes above the preceding tooth that might be consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter lāhā. The two strokes are not placed vertically above each other; one is to the right and slightly lower than the other.

165) The letters wāw and alif are written in the small space available after dāl, suggesting that the scribe had not written them initially. This emendation is
wrong, however, as the plural jāhadū does not agree with the singular pronoun man preceding it. Perhaps the scribe conflated this word with the next verse's jāhadū, which should be in plural.

166) It seems a different word had been initially written in place of daraja. One can see the remnants of an alif and another letter (possibly an initial lām) exactly where the grapheme ʼind is written.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio 6 B (Q 9.26–9.34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

170) One can see traces matching an initial هاء. In light of the first visible letters on the next line, it seems the scribe initially attempted to write هاء here but then changed his mind, erased what he had written, and wrote هاء on the next line. This suggests the folio was physically incomplete at the end of this line already when the scribe was writing the text, because if the folio were complete, it would have enough room for the grapheme هاء.

171) Nothing is written at the beginning of this line due to lack of space. Space opens up further to the left due to the upward slope of the previous line.

172) The legible letters on lines 25 and 26 (and also the first letters on side B) suggest nothing was written on the triangle-shaped missing part of the folio. Therefore, this part of the folio was probably missing or damaged already when the lower text was being written.

173) The traces at the beginning of this part do not quite match фа-لا. The second letter may be دال, كاف, or ساد.

174) There is not enough room for sawfa yughnikum, and the meager traces do not match this phrase. The text may be fa-sa-yughnikum.

175) Assuming the putative هاء in the middle of the line belongs to the word هاكيم, and considering the traces in the next line, there might be more space than is needed for the standard text.

176) There is less room than expected for وا-لا bi-l-yawmi. Perhaps the text has وا-لا bi-l-yawmi instead.

177) This letter probably belongs to the word راسيلان.
ilāhan wāḥidan

Having instead.

subḥānahu

That is, it probably lacks.

li-ya‘budū

throughout this part is probably non-standard.

180) The traces here do not quite match alif, which would lean to the left. Maybe the text is an ya’budū instead of li-ya’budū.

181) Considering the traces and the amount of space, the text might be li-ya’budū Allahu ilāhu illā huwa subhānahu wa-ta’ālā. That is, it probably lacks ilāhu wāhidūn (having instead Allāh), but has an additional wa-ta’ālā after subhānahu.

182) This word might be allāh.

183) There is more space between this spot and rāʾ in the previous line than needed for kāf. The traces at the beginning of this part do not match an yutīfī ‘a. They might belong to li-yutīfī ‘a.

184) The illegible part is too small for wa-ya’bā Allahu illā an yutīmna. Moreover, the first letter seems to be alif, not a tooth-shaped letter. The text could be wa-Allahu yutīmna nāraku/jutmumā nūrihi.

185) Traces resembling an initial or medial hu’ appear exactly above the verse division marker. Perhaps the scribe initially forgot to put the verse division marker and wrote huwa, but then erased huwa and added the marker. This is not very probable, however, since there is enough room before this spot for a verse division marker. Alternatively, the traces may belong to a special symbol for designating the thirtieth verse. Or else, the traces may be smudges.

186) The traces here do not quite match kūfī, so it is probably a non-standard letter.

187) Traces resembling an initial or medial kāf appear exactly above the verse division marker. Perhaps the scribe initially forgot to put the verse division marker and wrote kāf, but then erased kāf and added the marker. This is not very probable, however, since there is enough room before this spot for a verse division marker. Alternatively, the traces may belong to a special symbol for designating the thirtieth verse. Or else, the traces may be smudges.

188) This wa- is probably non-standard.
Folio 20 A (Q 9.70–9.80)

\[ \text{(194) There is not enough room in this physically missing part for the standard text between qālū and hammū. Perhaps the phrase } \text{wa-kafarū ba'da } \text{islāmi-him is absent.} \]

...
nūn and initially forgot to write the marker and added it later. Since there is little space between the previous and next letter, it seems the scribe wrote an accusative ending (_vars). There are traces above the verse division marker that match the letter nūn. These traces are darker than the other characters and have a green hue.

\[\text{\textit{f}}\text{\textit{a}}\text{\textit{i}}\text{\textit{r}}\text{\textit{a}}\text{\textit{h}}\] (\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{\textit{a}}\text{\textit{i}}\text{\textit{r}}\text{\textit{a}}\text{\textit{h}}\)) here, but this was changed later, since there are traces above the verse division marker that match the letter nūn. These traces are darker than the other characters and have a green hue.

There is not enough room for a final wāw and an isolated nūn. It seems that the scribe wrote an accusative ending (\(\text{\textit{i}}\text{\textit{n}}\)) here, but this was changed later, since there are traces above the verse division marker that match the letter nūn. These traces are darker than the other characters and have a green hue.

This verse division marker is placed above the previous letter. Since there is little space between the previous and next letter, it seems the scribe initially forgot to write the marker and added it later.

The folio is partly missing here, but traces are visible that may belong to nūn and alif.

Nothing is written before this point due to lack of space. Space opens up further to the left due to the upward slope of the previous line.

Since this missing part has enough room for farīka, it is not clear what is written on the last third of the last line of side A. Either the latter part of line 25 on side B was damaged already when the lower text was being written, and therefore contains no text, or the text is longer than the standard one.

This word may be qa‘idū.
and others that match a final space for rather close to it, that might represent a part of a correction to the end of verse 84 to the instance of followed by a verse separator and the morpheme \( \text{wa} \) at the end of verse 85.

\[ \text{san'ā'1 and the Origins of the Qur'ān} \]

\[ \text{202) The text seems to have been al-nāru Johannama, the definite article being a scribal error. There are traces after the alif of the definite article, placed rather close to it, that might represent a \( \text{nūn} \) or \( \text{lām} \). These traces have a high likelihood of being a smudge, but if not, then the putative letter may have been part of a correction to \( \text{inna nāru} \) or, less likely, \( \text{qul nāru} \).} \]

\[ \text{203) Verse 85 is missing. The omission may represent a scribe’s eyes skipping from the instance of \( \text{ūna} \) followed by a verse separator and the morpheme \( \text{wa} \) at the end of verse 84 to the instance of \( \text{ūna} \) followed by a verse separator and the morpheme \( \text{wa} \) at the end of verse 85.} \]

\[ \text{204) The letter after \( \text{hā} \) is more similar to \( \text{wāw} \) than \( \text{mīm} \).} \]

\[ \text{205) There are no traces of the letter \( \text{wāw} \) in this part, and there is not enough space for \( \text{hā} \) or \( \text{wāw} \) either. There are traces that may belong to the letter \( \text{jīm} \) and others that match a final \( \text{alif} \), but the space between them is rather large, as if another letter were written between them.} \]

\[ \text{206) The space after the putative \( \text{mīm} \) is larger than is needed for \( \text{'ayn} \) and \( \text{dhāl} \). Perhaps the word is \( \text{al-muṭadhirūn} \), which is reported here for Ibn Mas'ūd and Sa‘īd b. Jubayr (al-\text{Khatīb, Ma'jam}, 3:436).} \]
ally moves upward, freeing space for another line beneath it. why is that the previous line begins close to the bottom of the folio and gradually moves upward, freeing space for another line beneath it. This v-shaped figure may belong to a word the scribe had initially written between them. It is possible that the word is synonymous with li-yafqahū.

210) A shape resembling a medial 'ayn is visible above and slightly to the right of mim. This v-shaped figure may belong to a word the scribe had initially written here.
Regarding the traces at the beginning of Folio 22 B (Q 19.6–19.29)

- Considering the traces, the missing parts in lines 2 and 3 might have had yā Zakariyyā ʿīnā and bī- ʿayn lam najīl labū respectively.
- It seems the scribe initially wrote wa-kāna here, but then erased it and wrote ghulūm instead.

---

211) This word is probably ʿannatakum.
212) There are traces that match the word rabb, but the traces before the tentative rabb do not match wa-ka'īna, nor is there enough room for it.
213) Writing before this point would have interfered with the text from the previous two lines.
214) It seems another letter, possibly ḫāʾ or ʿayn, had initially been written in place of lām.
215) There is enough room between sīn and mīm for one letter. Moreover, there are traces before the initial sīn that match a tooth. Either the word is not samīyian, or the scribe had initially written another word (such as shabīhan) before replacing it with samīyian.
216) Considering the traces, the missing parts in lines 2 and 3 might have had yā Zakariyyā ʿīnā and bī- ʿayn lam najīl labū respectively.
217) It seems the scribe initially wrote wa-kāna here, but then erased it and wrote ghulūm instead.
the scribe wrote rather than a consonant-distinguishing mark. 220) There is a small chance that the dash above the first tooth is a smudge (in which case the word would be fa-qālat), or to a qāf and an alif (in which case the word would be gālaṭ, spelled with alif). 221) The tooth-shaped letter is followed by an alif or a lām. After this letter are some traces that are below the line and may belong to a third or fourth letter, perhaps a final hāʾ or ghayn (these traces do not seem to belong to the next line). It is possible that the scribe initially wrote (part of) a word here and erased it later, since both the tooth-shaped letter and the traces after it are paler than the adjacent words. Alternatively, these traces may constitute a word (e.g. ba’liyya). This second scenario is unlikely, however, since such a word should be in the accusative, whereas the traces do not seem to include an accusative ending. 222) This alif is probably a scribal error.

There are traces above the second tooth that may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter tāʾ. 223) This word may be thumma. 224) A small dash, such as appears in end-of-verse symbols or consonant-distinguishing marks, is visible slightly to the right of fāʾ. 225) This alif may be preceded by one or two letters. 226) The traces before lām cannot belong to an initial qāf alone. They may belong to a fāʾ and a qāf (in which case the word would be fa-qālat), or to a qāf and an alif (in which case the word would be gālaṭ, spelled with alif). 227) There is a small chance that the dash above the first tooth is a smudge rather than a consonant-distinguishing mark. 228) Traces of a final gāʾ are visible immediately after lām. It is not clear if the scribe wrote ‘ulayya and changed it to ‘alayhi or the other way around.
Folio 23 A (Q 19.29–19.54)

There are traces in the middle of this part that might belong to a lām. There is also a long horizontal line with some traces above it—the line and the traces match a final kāf. The word may be malak.

It is not clear if sin is preceded by a letter or not.

There are no traces of a jā before the initial lām, and there is little free space before lām.

This word might be bi-dhi.

The missing part has enough room for three words. Therefore, the putative lām preceding this part probably belongs to the verb ja‘alānī from verse 30 (not the one in verse 31). If we take the barely visible letters preceding this lām to belong to the word al-kitāb, then it seems there is enough room between this hypothetical al-kitāb and wa-ja‘alānī for another word. The text might have wa-l-hikma after al-kitāb.

Considering the presence of kāna, it is possible that the text has kāna l-nāsu in addition to the standard text. Ubayy b. Ka‘b’s codex reportedly had this phrase (al-Khaṭīb, Mu‘jam, 5:366).
It might be interrogative. It might be [verse number] [verse text]. Also, the traces do not match that text.

236) The word in the preceding illegible part may be [unknown word]. Yet the corresponding standard text does not feature a final [unknown character].
kāna rasūlan nabiyyan here.

Other phrase in its stead, for which see the previous footnote.

The letter before the tooth may be mīm. The word may be munʿīmīn, or, less likely, muttakīʿin.
conformance to the rhyme,
grapheme probably form a single word,
the Beneficient."

may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter
wāw
grapheme
consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter
251) The presence of two teeth before
252) The last grapheme does not seem to be an independent predicate. There-
250) The traces after the tooth do not quite match
248) This letter may be
mīm instead.
249) There are traces above the line after the initial ḥāʾ that may belong to
consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter thāʾ.
250) The traces after the tooth do not quite match َ; they may belong to the
grapheme ُ. This word may thus be la-nufrīghanāna, yielding, “We shall surely
pour out from every sect of them the most obdurate ones in rebellion against
the Beneficent.”
251) The last grapheme does not seem to be an independent predicate. Therefore,
the wāw preceding it probably is not conjunctive. The wāw and the following
grapheme probably form a single word, waṣiliyyan or, less likely due to lesser
conformance to the rhyme, wiṣāliyyan. It is noteworthy that the corresponding
word in the standard text puzzled the readers, who read it variously as siliyyan,
saliyyan or sulīyyan. Ibn Mujāhid said that this word was not known to him at
all (al-Khaṭīb, Mūjādān, 5.384).
252) The presence of two teeth before nūn instead of one is a scribal error.
253) There is not enough room after lām for the word al-ẓālimīn. Considering
the remaining traces, the word here may be al-kuffār.
254) In the middle of the illegible part, there are traces above the line that
may belong to consonant-distinguishing marks for the letter tāʾ.
Folio 7 A (Q 22.15–22.26)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\scriptsize If not, it is possible that the scribe mistakenly wrote} \\
\text{\scriptsize this line may contain the noun} & \\
\text{\scriptsize al-nujūm and} & \\
\text{\scriptsize the traces here match an isolated} & \\
\text{\scriptsize al-shajar}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{\scriptsize There are greenish traces here that may belong to an isolated} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize the text may be} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize traces here after} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize The traces here match an isolated} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize instead of the standard} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize instead of fa-lā mukrima lahu} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize that might belong to a} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize the word may be} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize instead of fa-mā lahu min mukrimin} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize There are traces after rā' that might belong to a wāw} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize The text may be idhā hadmā instead of the standard kullamā arādū} \]

\[\text{\scriptsize There are greenish traces here that may belong to an isolated wāw or rā'}. \]

---

255) This word may be disyikim.
256) This word may be ta'awwiyarav.
257) The last letter may be dāl or bā'. The word may be yukhbitu. Alternatively, it is possible that the scribe mistakenly wrote fa-mā lahu min mukrimin instead of fa-lā mukrima lahu.
258) This word may be al-shajar.
259) Considering the visible words on lines 8, 9, and 10, the missing part on this line may contain the nouns al-nujūm and al-dawābb as well as an additional item.
260) The traces here match an isolated rā'; but could also represent the beginning of an isolated bā'.
261) The text may be fa-lā mukrima lahu instead of fa-mā lahu min mukrimin.
262) There are traces after rā' that might belong to a wāw.
263) The text may be idhā hadmā instead of the standard kullamā arādū.
264) There are greenish traces here that may belong to an isolated wāw or rā'.
| فلوجه 7 ب (Q 22:27–22:39) |
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265) The text may have *wa-saddū* instead of *wa-yasuddūna*.

266) The hole in the parchment in front of *wa* seems to have been there already because the lower hand avoided it.

267) The letter preceding *nūn* may be *mīm* or *ʿayn*.

268) This word may be *wa-li-yashhadū*.

269) Considering the words on lines 2–5, the text may be *wa-li-yasuddūna lahum fī ayāmīn maḏūdat in wa-li-yadkurū* sma llāhi ʿalā mā razaqāhum min bahāmatī l-aŭāmī wa-li-yuṭīnī l-bāʿīsa l-faqīra.

270) This word may be *yakhīru*.

271) The presence of *nūn* instead of *yāʾ* might be a scribal error.
Şan‘āī 1 and the Origins of the Qur‘ān

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Folio 31 A (Q 12.17–12.20)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{\textsuperscript{273}}\text{The area here may be mansakān hum nāsikāhū.}
\]

\[
\text{\textsuperscript{274}}\text{The word following ummatu may be nākidatūn.}
\]

\[
\text{\textsuperscript{275}}\text{This word is probably sawāfīnā (pl. of sawīna صفا). Alternatively, it may be sawāfiya صفاً or sawāfī صفاً, or a scribal error for sawāfiya or sawāfī صفاً. See al-Khāṭīb, \textit{al-\textit{Mu‘jam}}, 6.115–7.}
\]

\[
\text{\textsuperscript{276}}\text{The absence of nūn is probably a scribal error.}
\]

\[
\text{\textsuperscript{277}}\text{The area after ẓay seems damaged.}
\]
The space between al-madīna in the previous line and qad in the present line is too small for the corresponding standard text. Perhaps the phrase turāwidu fatāhā ʽan nafsihi is absent.

In addition to the traces that may belong to the word ḥubb, there is a small horizontal line slightly above the line, near the end of the word. The function of this line is not clear. It may belong to a letter initially written but subsequently erased.

The text might have tafsīl al-kitābi instead of tafsīla kulli shay'in.

The first letter in this illegible area might be an initial ʾayn, and the last letter may be alif. The text may be ʿamilū instead of yaʾmallūna.
The space available between *li-yundhira* from the previous line and the present point is too small for the corresponding standard text. The phrase *mā lahūm bihi min ʽilmin wa-lā li-ābā'ihim* may be missing.

If the preceding *alif* belongs to the word *kadhiban*, it should be noted that there is no trace of an end-of-verse marker after *alif*, which is very close to the letter that follows it.

The particle *illā* is missing before *allāh*. Perhaps the text has *min dānī llāhī* instead of *illā llāhā*.

Pale traces of two other letters are visible here: a *dāl* (after *wāw*), an *alif* (immediately before *dāl*). Perhaps the scribe initially wrote ٧٣ here, forgetting the initial *alif* of *idhā*, but realized his mistake, deleted these two letters and wrote *idhā* again.

The text seems to have *min dānī lāhī* in addition to the standard text.
If the visible mīm is part of the word al-qīyāma, it is rather distant from the lām of the article.

The putative wāw and qāf do not seem to be connected. Therefore, this word might be something other than tūshāqqūna.

The traces here do not quite match fīhim.

The traces in the illegible part are compatible with al-kudā.

The traces at the beginning of this illegible part match the grapheme lūsūn better than yūlqūna.

The presence of this dāl establishes that the text differs from the standard reading. This dāl might belong to the word al-‘adhāb (the traces before dāl match lām and ‘ayn). However, it is not clear what precedes this putative al-‘adhāb.

This putative mīm might belong to the word al-yawm. Considering the traces in the previous line, the text after al-‘ilm may be inna l-sū’a wa-l-‘adhāba l-yawma ʿalā l-kāfirīna.

Considering the initial tooth and the other traces, the text might have yulqūna instead of the standard fa-alqawwū.

The illegible space after the initial lām is rather large for a medial sīn.

The traces here do not quite match kunūn (they are compatible with nakūn).

The letter alif suggests the text may have sūʿan instead of min sūʿin. However, the illegible space before alif is rather large for the grapheme س.

The illegible space is small, suggesting this word may be fa-biʿsa instead of fa-la-biʿsa.

The available space here is rather small for li-lladhīna.
might have not. This part, and there is not sufficient space there for an article.

The word may be li-lladhīna aḥsanū. However, the traces at the beginning of this line do not quite match li-lladhīna or li-man ʽamila in which case the text may have li-man ʽamila instead of the standard li-lladhīna aḥsanū. However, the traces at the beginning of this line do not quite match li-lladhīna.

The traces represented by this wāw are close to the next word. Therefore, this word may be wa-la-niʿwa or fa-la-niʿwa.

This word may be khūliṭa. This word may be fīhā. It is not clear whether another grapheme is written after alladhīna or not.

It seems the text has wa-qūla instead of yaqūlūna. The available space is rather large for yaqūlūna. The word may be yaqūlūna.

The letter preceding this illegible part is certainly not alif. It may be kāf in which case the text may have kafarū instead of ash rakū.

The traces are compatible with ash rakū.

This word may be harramnā.

This space is rather small for the phrase min shayʾin nakhu. The text might have shayʾan instead of min shayʾin.

Considering the presence of wāw here, this word may be al-rasūl instead of al-rasūl.

There does not seem to be a definite article before the tooth preceding this part, and there is not sufficient space there for an article.
ṣād

end of this part resemble a final khayrun

shaped traces may also be part of a letter such as the text here is written. Perhaps the scribe first wrote ḥā' instead of ḥā'. However, the traces following it suggest the text here is fi sabīli llāhi, which would require this letter to be ḥā'.

Folio 13 B (Q 16.37–16.59)

Perhaps fi umāmī is followed by min qablikum.

There does not seem to be more than two teeth between ḥā' and the putative wāw.

This word may be fa-l-yāsīrū.

There is no trace of an alif after wa'il, and there is not quite enough room for it.

Considering the alif at the end of the previous line and the traces in this part, the text may be ikhtilafū fihi instead of yākhtalifūna fihi.

This word may be wa-il-yālānnu.

This verse does not seem to begin with a wāw.

Traces of an initial ḥā' jīm are visible exactly where the initial ḥā' is written. Perhaps the scribe first wrote jāhādū but then changed it to ḥājārū.

This letter may be wāw or fā'. However, the traces following it suggest the text here is fi sabīli llāhi, which would require this letter to be fā'.

This word may be mubāwa'an.

The illegible part seems to begin with a tooth. However, the tooth-shaped traces may also be part of a letter such as sād or kāf. The traces at the end of this part resemble a final nūn, but can also be part of a final sīn/shīn or sād/dād.

This phrase may be la-mubawwa'ākum or la-mathwāhum fi l-ākhirati khayran.

This word may be riğālan, spelled as رحالة.
between kullu possibly a tooth representing the long vowel

This word may be

Perhaps the scribe wanted to write inianna anā llāku, but mistakenly wrote huwa before anā.

No wāw seems to be written here.

It is not clear if alif is attached to the previous letter or not.

This word may be ju'zan.
The traces match ʼan mā as well.

This word may be khizy.

This word may be immā, in which case the text may have immā yumsikuhu instead of a-yumsikuhu.

The meagerness of the text makes it difficult to rule out that it belongs to a different part of the Qurʾān.

The text may have al-baṣar instead of the standard al-abṣār.

Traces of a lām are also visible at the beginning of this grapheme. Perhaps the scribe made a mistake and corrected it later.
Folio 9 B (Q 33.57–33.72)

---

351] The text may be wa-lā būnāyī, with the hamzah al-wasl having been dropped and the hamza at the end turned into yā'. Softening (tashīl) is reported for the hamza at the end of the instance of abnā' that is followed by ikhwāni- hinna (al-Khāṭīb, Mu'jam, 7:311). Alternatively, maybe the scribe wanted to write banī, which is also a plural of ibn, but made a mistake and wrote alif before yā'.
The final niña is not separate from the previous letters, suggesting that this word is *al-munāfiqīn*, which would be grammatically incorrect.

This is an error of the hand generated by the assimilation of a nearby term.
Folio 25 B (Q 39.42–39.47)

354) The text may have kadkhālika najīzī l-muḥsinīna instead of ḍhālika jazā'u l-muḥsinīna.

355) The letter before mīm might be hā' instead, in which case this grapheme may be part of the word yajziyahum.
Considering this letter and the length of the physically missing part of line 2, the text may be *wa-lāhhu* instead of *a-wa-lam yātānū anna lāhhā*.

The first tooth is preceded by a letter that might be *sīn*. The word may be *fa-nasītahā*.

The text seems to have *fīhimā* instead of *fī l-samāwāti wa-l-ardī*.
The text may have "ūtiyat" instead of "wuffiyat". Cf. Q 32.13.

The text may have "al-nāri" instead of "Jahannama".

Considering the traces and the amount of space, there may be "yundhirūnakum 'adhāba rabbikum" instead of the standard text between "minkum" and "qālū".

The last letter in this illegible part may be "alif" or "lām". The text after "al-janna" might be "zumaran ḥattā idhā wa-qāla lahum khazanatuhā udkhulūhā salāmun ʿalaykum tibtum fīhā khālidīn".
Behnam Sadeghi and Mohsen Goudarzi

Folio 15 A (Q 20.23–20.61)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(ک) و} \quad & 21 \\
\text{\ldots} \quad & 22 \\
\text{\ldots} \quad & 23 \\
\text{\ldots} \quad & 24 \\
\text{\ldots} \quad & 25 \\
\text{\ldots} \quad & 26 \\
\text{\ldots} \quad & 27 \\
\text{\ldots} \quad & 28 \\
\text{\ldots} \quad & 29 \\
\end{align*}
\]
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There seems to be

The text seems to have

The text might have

This word may be

The last letter in this part might be

This word may be

This word may be

This word may belong to

fa-akhrajnā instead of fa-mā.

fa-akhraja instead of fa-āyātinā.

fa-arsil instead of fa-arsil.

fa-arsila instead of fa-arsil.

fa-ilayka instead of ḥīna.

fa-ākhraja instead of idh.

This word may be bi-āyūtinā.

This word may be tattawaṣa.ān.

This word may be fa-raddaduṇa.ākā.

This word may be mīn.

This word may be bi-āyūtinā.

This word may be tatavaṣa.ān.

This word may be fa-raddaduṇa.ākā.

The text probably has ilayka an arsil instead of fa-an.

The text seems to have fa-mā instead of fa-man.

The text may have arsila instead of anzala.
The text may be translated as in the parallel in Q 6.21, 6.135, 10.17, 23.117, 28.37, and 30.45.
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**Folio 15 B (Q 20.61–20.80)**

382. This word may be a-ataytanā.
383. This part may contain bi-sihrika.
384. The last letter in this part may be kāf.
385. The text may be gā wāylakum.
386. The text may have ifkan instead of the standard kadhiban.
387. This word may be sīhišīm.
388. Considering the amount of space, the word khifah may be missing.
389. This word may be amēlī.
390. This word might be innahu. See the parallels in Q 6.21, 6.135, 10.17, 23.117, 28.37, and 30.45.
391. The text may be fa-alqā mà ma'āhu.
392. The scribe has copied qāla twice.
case the previous letter would be text. Cf. Q 20.48.

24. Also, the phrase saḥarnā (اسم) 395) The text may have Ḥarám, but it has al-Qādir al-Ḏā'ī (سعود) 398/420). A Ḥádiq (اسم) 399) This word may be ʻāțānā.

394) This word is probably saḥarnā/saḥbānā.

395) The text may have innā qad ʻāḥiya ilaynā in addition to the standard text. Cf. Q 20.48.

396) This putative alif may be disconnected from the previous letter, in which case the previous letter would be wa-.

397) The text seems to have fa-awḥaynā instead of wa-laqaq awḥaynā.

398) Considering the traces, the text might have ihbiṭā ṭīnā ʻajma`īn instead of ihbiṭā ṭīnā ʻamal`ān. Also, the phrase ba`d al-mu`aṣir bi-lad`īn ʻaduwwan is either missing or precedes the putative ihbiṭā.

Folio 30 B (Q 20.122–20.133)
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 Folio 30 A (Q 21.5 – 21.19)

\[
\text{(1) This word may be } \text{ajul an.}
\]

\[
\text{(2) This word may be } \text{fa-ṣtabir.}
\]

\[
\text{(3) The text appears to have } \text{li-ḥukmi rabbika } \text{instead of } \text{aʿlā mā yaqūlūna.}
\]

\[
\text{(4) The text might be } \text{li-ḥirrī wa-l-taqwā (cf. Q 5.2 and 58.9).}
\]

\[
\text{(5) The text might be } \text{wa-hādhā kītābun anznān } \text{aʿlākum.}
\]
would have interfered with the previous line.

may have been added after the first guess would be bi-mu'minūn. But the greenish traces that follow the second mu'mīn conform to the word tu'minān.
four letters. Therefore, would be part preceding it seems rather small for the grapheme.

The traces here do not quite conform to insān has a dark green hue like the tooth at the beginning of line 7. alif might be the last letter of alif. The traces match both innī and innanī.

Folio 10 B (Q 24.13–24.23)

The traces here could also represent four teeth, in which case the word would be insān.

The missing and illegible parts together can accommodate no more than four letters. Therefore, minhum is probably missing.

This alif has a dark green hue like the tooth at the beginning of line 7. The traces here might be the last letter of bi-l-shuhādā, although the illegible part preceding it seems rather small for the grapheme.

The traces here do not quite conform to insān; they are closer to innī.
This word might be another tooth before this mīn, in which case the word would be li-yatabayyana.

413 This word could be yaqdhifūna.

414 There is enough room in the illegible area before dāl for two letters. The word may be al-mutasaddiqāti.

415 The pale traces in the illegible part preceding mīn are more likely to belong to two graphemes than one. Specifically, they might belong to mīn.

416 This word may be ajr.
بند حاول انسا حاابا على الهامه و نسند دو 1

لکم حاول لکم لکم سرد کر و ن [ه] ن [ه] [ه] [ه] (هجه)
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separating verses. The lowest dash overlaps with

at first, as the horizontal traces of a

modified to

appear greenish, similar to those seen in other folios (e.g. folio 10 A, line 7).

The last letter looks more like a final ḫāʾ than a final fāʾ.

It seems that the scribe forgot to write this rāʾ initially, as it is written slightly above the line, in the small space available between the last letter of ghaflat and the hāʾ of raḥim.

There are three small marks above the mīm, arranged vertically on top of one another. They resemble the dashes used for distinguishing consonants or separating verses. The lowest dash overlaps with mīm. Their function is not clear.

This word appears to have been pronounced at first, as the horizontal traces of a final gāʾ are visible beneath the initial tooth and sād. However, the word was modified to mīm by adding a tooth and alif at its end. These modifications appear greenish, similar to those seen in other folios (e.g. folio 10 A, line 7).

The traces match ḥāʾ better than fāʾ.
in addition to the standard reading.

429) It seems that the scribe initially forgot to write mīm but added it later.

430) This letter might be connected to the previous letter, in which case they may be a scribal error.

432) The traces do not match mīn. The first letter is round, but does not seem to be mīn (it might be wāw or fāʿ/qāf). The second letter might be kāf.

434) The text may have something like wa-hum kānū Yaʿmalūna lathu kawālan in addition to the standard reading.

435) This word may be qulūmahum, the subject of which could be Sulaymān.

436) The text may have ʿan shīmālin wa-yāmīn.
Folio 33 Verso (Q 34.23–34.33)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\ldots} & \quad \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \quad \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \quad \text{\ldots} \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

437) The text seems to have fi shakkin minhā instead of minhā fi shakkin.
438) The text might have wa-lladhīna yadʽūna/ instead of qul idʽū lladhīna zaʽamtum.
439) This word may be rabbunā.
440) This word may be wa-qīla or fa-qīla.
441) Considering the amount of space before this word, the phrase thumma yaftaḥu baynāna may be missing.
442) A small dash above the tooth means that perhaps tāʾ is pointed.
443) The traces before mīm match ٮآ better than ٮـآ.
444) This word may be yashkurūna or yatafakkarūna.
445) The first letter in the preceding illegible part may be wāw or fāʾ/qaʿf. This word may be wa-qīla or fa-qīla.
446) There is a small chance that the letter preceding dāl is ʼayn. The illegible part preceding mīm may contain one or two letters. There are also traces there above the line that resemble lām. Perhaps the scribe added lakum to the text later.

447) The traces match لطلمو ن لطمس better than ںلطم studying the text.

448) The text may have yulqī baʻḍuhum.

449) The letter before ḍād may be ʼayn. It seems that the scribe made a mistake and wrote ʼayn before ḍād instead of after it.

450) The presence of this alif suggests that the text is different from the standard reading.

451) This grapheme may belong to a-hā’alā’i.
Considering the traces on the neighbouring lines, this instance of kafarū does not seem to belong to verse 43. Maybe verse 44 features alladhīna kafarū.

It is not clear if this min is initial, medial, final, or isolated.

The text may have fa-amlaytu li-lladhīna kadhdhabū/kafarū in addition to the standard reading.

Considering the legible words, the text might have wa-ja'ala fihā min kulli l-thamarāti wa-anbata/wa-ja'ala fihā min kulli zawaiyin thwaynī instead of the standard text between al-nahār and yughshī.

The phrase wa-jannātun min a'nābin might follow wa-zar'ūn rather than precede it.
Folio 35 Recto (Q 13.6–13.14)
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Folio 35 Verso (Q 13.16–13.21)

/ /{ }
( )

/ /{ }
( )

/ /{ }
( )

Folio 36 Recto (Q 13.25–13.31)

\[ \text{(verse 26).} \]
The missing and illegible areas before this word are much larger than is needed for qad khalat min.

Assuming that the grapheme near the end of the previous line is lā, the visible mīm here might belong to tuṣībuhum or bi-mā. However, the space between the putative lā and the present point is too small for the standard text between lā and tuṣībuhum. Perhaps the text has ẓalamū (which features mīm) instead of kafarū, a reading reported for Ibn Masʿūd and Mujāhid (al-Khaṭīb, Muʿjam, 4:427).

Assuming that the putative fā’ at the end of line 2 belongs to fa-mā, the missing parts at the end of line 2 and beginning of line 3 have much more space than is needed for the remainder of verse 33.

The text might have ukuluhā wa-ẓilluhā dāʿīmun.
Folio 16 Verso (Q 28.19–28.24)

{ } { } 1

{ } { } 2

{ } 3

{ } 4

{ } 5

{ } 6

{ } 7

{ } 8

{ } 9

471) The traces here might belong to an alif, in which case the text may have ūtū instead of ātaynāhum.

472) The additional text may begin with kullun yadʽū ... ilā janbihi/jānibihi.

473) The traces before hā’ do not quite match ٮـا. Specifically, the letter before hā’ may be lām instead of bā’.

474) The horizontal line between lām and the tooth is darker than the other letters.
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Folio 16 Recto (Q 28.30–28.35)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\{ } & // \text{ \{ } \text{ \\
\text{\{ } } & // \text{ \{ } \text{ \\
\text{\{ } } & // \text{ \{ } \\
\text{\{ } } & // \text{ \{ } \\
\end{align*}
\]

Folio 28 Recto (Q 37.15–37.33)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\{ } & // \text{ \{ } \text{ \\
\text{\{ } } & // \text{ \{ } \\
\text{\{ } } & // \text{ \{ } \\
\text{\{ } } & // \text{ \{ } \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[475^4\] This word may be qamīṣika.

\[476^4\] The text may have muḥḍarūn instead of yanẓurūn.

\[477^4\] This word may be ibʿathū.

\[478^4\] The space between the putative nūn and mīm is rather small for the two-column verse separator symbols used in this folio.
which is reported for Ibn Mas'ūd (al-

\[\text{Mu}'jam, 8:20}\].)

\[\text{Folio 28 Verso (Q 37.43–37.68)}\]

\[\text{Folio 29 Recto (Q 37.82–37.103)}\]

\[479\] This word may be tanāṣarūn (with the alif spelled) or tātanāṣarūn, which is reported for Ibn Mas'ūd (al-Khaṭīb, Mu'jam, 8:20).
have kadālika instead of dāl, the text may

\[
\text{(480) Considering the amount of space before the putative dāl, the text may have kadālika instead of innā kadālika.)}
\]
It is not clear if a tooth precedes the initial ḥāʾ or not.
The traces before hā' do not quite match an initial mīm followed by a tooth. They match one mīm, or two teeth, or a lām and a tooth.

It is not clear if this alif is connected to a letter before it or not.

It seems the scribe initially forgot to write ʿūlā here, since it is written slightly above the line, in the small space available between ʿirār and mustaʿqīm.

The letter nān may be pointed, as there is a small dash inside it.

This word may be mīhām, in which case the sentence would be awkward, or ʿalayhīm, in which case this would be a scribal error, since ʿalayhīm appears again after lākā.

This word may be sabil.

The shape of this alif suggests it is not part of a lā. Perhaps the text has mā here.

Folio 18 B (Q 15.33–15.74)
12. al-Khaṭīb changed it to <494>.

13. The letter nadīrun mubīnun.

14. /<إِن>، (بما) <حَذَّرُهُ الْمَسْكِمِ 493 وَحَلَّوْنَ > (بما)

15. /<لَا ءَبَّارٌ فَلَسَرْتُمْ > (بما) ً/ على أن (بما)

16. (لِكَمْ يَتَرَيَّدُ) <نَمْرُوْنَ > (<بما) لمَّا كَانَ تَنَحَّى فَأَنَّا (مِن) /

19. <مَحِرَمٌ> أَتَالْأَلْوَانَ مَسْحِرٌ (بما) ً/ أَلِا (بما) /

20. (مَرَى مِهِمُّ (بِهَا) كَبِهَا نَمْرُوْنَ (بما) فَأَنَّا (بما) /

22. /<ذَٰلِكَ أَحَدَوْا مَصُوبَةً حَلِبَهُ مَا وَٰنَمٌ > (بما) ً/ أَلِا (بما) /

23. /<فَرَسَتُهَا (بما) إِلَّا فَرَسَ (بما) ً/ أَلِا (بما) /

25. /<دَلْيِ اَلْأَمْوَهَانَ دِرْهُمْ وَلَا مَنْظُورٌ مَّسْحِرٌ > (بما) ً/ وَحاً (بما) /

26. <لَا مَعْنِيَ سَيْلٌ (بما) لَسْوَ (بما) ً/ لَسْوَ (بما) /

27. <لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ فَأَنَّا (بما) ً/ لَلَّهُ Foliow 19 B (Q 15.87–99 – 25.1–8)

/ /<لَعْطِ / (أَلْوَانِ (بما) ً/ لَعْطِ / (أَلْوَانِ (بما) ً/ لَعْطِ / (أَلْوَانِ (بما) ً/ لَعْطِ / (أَلْوَانِ (بما) ً/ لَعْطِ / (أَلْوَانِ (بما) ً/ لَعْطِ / (أَلْوَانِ (بما) ً/ لَعْطِ / (أَلْوَانِ (بما) ً/ لَعْطِ / (أَلْوَانِ (بما) ً/ L /<بَلْ (بما) ً/ لَعْطِ / (أَلْوَانِ (بما) ً/ L /

494. The letter nūn may be pointed, as there is a small dash above the tooth.

495. The final alif is rather pale except its base. Maybe the scribe erased it.

496. It seems the scribe initially wrote wāw at the end of this grapheme, but changed it to rā later.

497. There is no trace of a tooth before hā'. This word may be sukrihim, which is reported for al-A'ฉash here (al-Khaṭīb Muṣanjām, 4.577).

498. The text seems to have nadhīran mubīnun.
Perhaps here the text has an additional phrase, such as "wa-l-arḍi wa-lam". It is not clear whether a letter or not.

The missing part on this line is bigger than is needed for the phrase "wa-l-arḍi wa-lam". Perhaps the text has an additional phrase, such as "wa-mū baynahumā, after wa-l-arḍi".

The phrase "wa-lam yakun lahu sharikun fi l-mulki" appears to be missing.

This physically missing part would have had room for about three words. Perhaps here the text has yakhluqūna shay'an wa-lā.

It is not clear whether something is written here. There are traces at the beginning that might belong to an "alif".

It is not clear whether the initial "mīm" is preceded by a tooth or not.

This word may be "alā" in which case the word al-furgān is probably written after "abdīhī".

The missing part on this line is bigger than is needed for the phrase "wa-l-arḍi wa-lam". Perhaps the text has an additional phrase, such as "wa-mū baynahumā, after wa-l-arḍī".

The distance between "zā'ī" and "lām" is rather long, but it is not clear if a letter is written between them.
Folio 19 A (Q 25.14–25.27)
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507) The physically missing part of the previous line would have had room for about four words, hardly enough for the standard text before sarfan. Perhaps the phrase bi-mā taqūlūna is missing.

508) One can see a pale, horizontal line touching alif. Perhaps the scribe first wrote a final bā‘ here but then erased its tail and added an alif instead.

509) Considering the visible words, the physically missing part may have contained lā narjū liqā‘a llāhi ḥattā, or lā nu’minu laka ḥattā.

510) There is no writing in this line before this point, perhaps since it would have interfered with the previous line.
Beohnam Sadeghi and Mohsen Goudarzi

Folio 24 Verso (Q 30.38–30.50)

511 The text seems to have ya’malūn instead of ‘amilū.

512 The text might have fa-aqīmī waqīhakum or fa-aqīmī wajhakum
(Ubayy b. Ka’b reportedly had wajhakum instead of waqīhakum in Q 4.43 (al-
khaṭīb, Mu’jam, 2:81)).

513 The phrase an ya’tiya appears to be missing.

514 The text may have fi l-bahr in addition to the standard reading.

515 The text may have huwa instead of allāhu.

516 The text might have fa-gābūtuḫu fi l-samā’i kisafan.
This letter might belong to 'alayhim, in which case min qablihi would be missing.

The text may have anzalū 'alayhim instead of ālayyāhum.

The text may have shahidū instead of qālū nashhadu.

The text seems to have thumma zdādū kufran in addition to the standard reading.

This word may be fa-khābārāhum.
Moreover, there are traces at its beginning that might belong to an adīf. There may be an ʾāʾ in addition to the standard text.

The illegible part preceding wāw is rather large for the grapheme ـ. Moreover, there are traces at its beginning that might belong to an adīf. There may be an ʾāʾ in addition to the standard text.
This word may be bi-l-salāti.

This dāl is unusually long and therefore resembles an initial kāf.

The letters after mīm might be ʾā.

The verse seems to begin with aw tara (paralleling a-lam tara from verse 6).
The traces match as well.

The word following \textit{sa-} may be a verb, the object of which could be the pronoun \textit{hu} referring to \textit{al-insān}. The penultimate letter of this word may be an initial \textit{hā}, a medial \textit{ayn}, or a tooth-shaped letter.

This letter may be \textit{fā} instead.

Perhaps no verse separator was written here, since there is not quite enough room for the type of two-column separator used in this folio.

This word may be \textit{al-āmina}, which is reported for Ubayy b. Ka'b here (\textit{al-Khāṭīb Mu'jam}, 10:432).

It is not clear whether this \textit{alif} is preceded by \textit{fa-}.

The text after \textit{kātiya} may be \textit{al-fāri wa-layālih 'ashrin}.

The traces after \textit{Y} match \textit{fām} better than \textit{fām}. The text may be read as \textit{lā-'aqīmā} or \textit{lā-aqīima}. 

\textsuperscript{534} The traces match \textit{lā} as well.

\textsuperscript{535} The word following \textit{sa-} may be a verb, the object of which could be the pronoun \textit{hu} referring to \textit{al-insān}. The penultimate letter of this word may be an initial \textit{hā}, a medial \textit{ayn}, or a tooth-shaped letter.

\textsuperscript{536} This letter may be \textit{fā} instead.

\textsuperscript{537} Perhaps no verse separator was written here, since there is not quite enough room for the type of two-column separator used in this folio.

\textsuperscript{538} This word may be \textit{al-āmina}, which is reported for Ubayy b. Ka'b here (\textit{al-Khāṭīb Mu'jam}, 10:432).

\textsuperscript{539} It is not clear whether this \textit{alif} is preceded by \textit{fa-}.

\textsuperscript{540} The text after \textit{kātiya} may be \textit{al-fāri wa-layālih 'ashrin}.

\textsuperscript{541} The traces after \textit{Y} match \textit{fām} better than \textit{fām}. The text may be read as \textit{lā-'aqīmā} or \textit{lā-aqīima}. 

\textsuperscript{542} The word following \textit{sa-} may be a verb, the object of which could be the pronoun \textit{hu} referring to \textit{al-insān}. The penultimate letter of this word may be an initial \textit{hā}, a medial \textit{ayn}, or a tooth-shaped letter.
Appendix 1: On the Lower Text

The following table identifies readings ascribed to the Companions and other authorities that match a non-standard reading in the lower text. The following abbreviations are used: MQ = al-所提供之ا, Mu’jam al-Qirā‘āt; KM = Ibn Abī Dāwūd, Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā’ir al-Islāmiyya, 2002); IM-A = the reading of Ibn Mas‘ūd according to the report of Al-A’mash quoted in KM, I:302–38.

In the cases of Q 2.96, 9.90, 19.24, and 90.1, the corresponding footnotes in the edited text explain how the lower text differs from the standard one. The variants in Q 2.217, 2.222, and 5.45 have been mentioned already in Fedeli, “Early Evidences,” 293–316.

539) Due to the meager amount of text, we have not yet identified the passage.
540) The letter before alif may be ḥā’ or a tooth-shaped one.
541) Either ‘ayn and dāl are connected or a tooth-shaped letter is between them.
542) This word may be bi-sulṭān or a conjugation of ḯata’taşa.
543) It is not clear whether ḥā’ and ā’ are connected or not. This word may be habiṭat, aḥaṭat, aḥaṭtu, or khiṭāb, among other things.
Behnam Sadeghi and Mohsen Goudarzi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sūra.verse, Folio:line</th>
<th>Lower Text</th>
<th>Standard Text</th>
<th>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l-ḥayūtī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibn Masūd: bi-munzi`hihi (MQ. 1:156).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.96, 2B:1</td>
<td>bi-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibn Muhaysin: Mikayl (MQ. 1:160). This word has been read in many ways, but Ibn Muhaysin's reading is the only one compatible with the rasm in C-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>muzakzi-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kīhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.98, 2B:6</td>
<td>Mikāla</td>
<td></td>
<td>Al-ʾAmash: wa-lā l-mushrikūna (MQ. 1:169).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.105, 2B:26</td>
<td>wa-lā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibn Masūd and Anas: wa-lā taqrabū l-nisāʾa fī mahīḍihinna wa-ʿtazilūhunna ḥattā yataṭahharna (MQ. 1:308–9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kīna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.217, David r:25</td>
<td>qitālin fīhi</td>
<td></td>
<td>The reading yataṭahharna is reported for Ibn Masūd, Anas, and Ubayy b. Ka'b, while yataṭahharna is reported for Ḥamza, al-Kisāʾi, ʿĀṣim (via Abū Bakr and al-Mufaḍḍal), al-ʾAmash, al-Jahdari, Ibn Muhaysin, and Khalaf (MQ. 1:308).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.222, David v:19</td>
<td>fa-ʿtazilū l-</td>
<td></td>
<td>An early ʿAṣrī who apparently had shariʿatan in his own copy of the Qurʾān accused al-Ḥajjāj of having “changed” the Qurʾān and written the synonym shirʿatan instead. On a discussion of the report aout al-Ḥajjāj, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “Codex,” 365, footnote 36; cf. MQ. 2:278.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nisāʾa fi l-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mahīḍi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taqrabū-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hunna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kātāt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yathurna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>katabnā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ʿalājīm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.48, Bonh. v:4</td>
<td>shirʿatan</td>
<td>An early ʿAṣrī who apparently had shariʿatan in his own copy of the Qurʾān accused al-Ḥajjāj of having “changed” the Qurʾān and written the synonym shirʿatan instead. On a discussion of the report about al-Ḥajjāj, see Sadeghi and Bergmann, “Codex,” 365, footnote 36; cf. MQ. 2:278.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūra.verse, Folio:line</td>
<td>Lower Text</td>
<td>Standard Text</td>
<td>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.54, Bonh. v 26</td>
<td>a‘izzatin</td>
<td>Ibn Mas‘ūd: ghulazā‘; al-Māwardi: ghuluzin (MQ: 2:294)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.19, 22B:15</td>
<td>fa-lammā ajā‘ahā</td>
<td>The reading we-kuwa ‘alayya hayyinun is reported for al-Ḥasan al-Başrī for Q 19.9 (MQ: 5.344).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.21, 22B:17</td>
<td>fa-nādāhā min taḥtihā</td>
<td>Ibn ‘Abbās: fa-nādāhā malakūn min taḥtihā (MQ: 5.353).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūra.verse, Folio:line</td>
<td>Lower Text</td>
<td>Standard Text</td>
<td>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 22.23, 7A:19            | [\[\]] /wa-
lu'lu'an/ | Ibn Kathīr, Abū 'Amr, Ibn 'Āmir, Hamza, al-
Kisā‘ī, 'Alī, Ibn Waththāb, al-'Amash, Warsh, al-
Hasan: wa-lu'lu'in (MQ, 6:97). |
| 22.35, 7B:18            | [\[\]] /wa-
muqīmī l-
salātī/ | Ibn Masūd, al-'Amash, and Ibn Muḥayṣin (via
al-Bazzī): wa-l-muqīmīna l-salāta; wa-l-muqīmīna
l-salātī is also reported by al-'Ukbarī (MQ, 6:113). |
| 22.36, 7B:20            | [\[\]] /sawāffa/ | Ibn Masūd, Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn 'Umar, Ibrāhīm,
Qatāda, Mujāhid, 'Aṭā', al-Ḍaḥḥāk, al-Kalbī, al-
'Amash, and Abū Ja'far: sawāfina (MQ, 6:116). |
| 22.39, 7B:28            | [\[\]] /yuqāt-
lūna/ | Abū 'Amr, Ibn Kathīr, 'Āṣim (via Abū Bakr),
Hamza, al-Kisā‘ī, Khalaf, and Ya‘qūb: yuqātilūna
(MQ, 6:121). |
| 18.16, 32B:2            | [\[\]] /illā llāha/ | Ibn Masūd: min dūni llāhi, min dūninā (MQ,
5:161). |
| 16.38, 13B:2            | [\[\]] /wa’dān/ | Al-Ḍaḥḥāk: wa’dān (MQ, 4:630). |
| 16.44, 13B:10           | [\[\]] /wa-l-
zuburi/ | The reading bi-l-zuburi instead of wa-l-zuburi
is reported in Q 3.184 for the codices of the Shām
and the following readers: Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn 'Āmir,
Ibn Dhakwān, Hishām, and al-Ḥulwāni (MQ, 1:638). |
| 33.51, 9A:4             | [\[\]] /bi-
utina (KM, 1:330). |
| 33.53, 9A:13            | [\[\]] /yastahyā/ | The majority have read yastahyā, which is com-
patible with the lower text's spelling, and is con-
sidered a Hijāzī pronunciation (lugha), whereas
Ibn Kathīr, Ibn Muḥayṣin, Ya‘qūb and Mujāhid
have read yastahī, which is considered a Tamīmī
way of reading this word (MQ, 1:67; 7:310). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sura.verse, Folio:line</th>
<th>Lower Text</th>
<th>Standard Text</th>
<th>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 33.67, 9B:18           | Ibn Mas‘ūd reportedly had the final alif either in verse 10 and in verse 66 (MQ.7:257).
<p>|                        |            |               | The following Kūfan and Baṣran readers also reportedly did not pronounce the final alif either in waqf or waṣl for verses 10, 66, and 67. Hamza, Abū ‘Amr, al-Jahdari, Ya‘qūb, and al-’Amash (MQ.7:256). IM-A: al-rasūla (KM.1:330). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sūra.verse, Folio:line</th>
<th>Lower Text</th>
<th>Standard Text</th>
<th>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.14, 33A:5</td>
<td>fa-lammā luhu havelan in addition to the standard text. Al-Ṭabarī gives the following reading for Ibn Masūd: fa-makathū yad’abūna lahu ḥawlan kāmilan (Jāmi‘ al-bayān, 19:242). The following reading featuring ḥawlan is also reported for Ibn Masūd, Ibn ʿAbbās, and Ibn Shan-nabūdh: tabayyanati l-insu anna l-jinnu law kānū ya’lamūna l-ghayba mā labithū havelan (MQ. 7:350).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.24, 33B:3</td>
<td>wa-innā wa iyyākum la’alā hudan; wa-innā wa iyyākum innā wa-lalā hudan</td>
<td>Ubayy b. Ka‘b: wa-înnā wa iyyākum l-îmmā ‘alā hudan (MQ. 7:370–1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.56, 28B:8</td>
<td>la-turdīni</td>
<td>Ibn Masūd: la-turgānī (MQ. 8:31).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.54, 18B:15</td>
<td>a-bash-shartumūnī</td>
<td>Al-A’mash and al-A’raj: basharthumūnī (MQ. 4:562).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūra.verse, Folio:line</td>
<td>Lower Text</td>
<td>Standard Text</td>
<td>Readings Similar to the Lower Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibn Mas‘ūd: wa-qaḍaynā ilayhi dhālika l-amra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibn Mas‘ūd: wa-qulnā lahu inna dābira hā′ulāʾī maqṭūʿān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.72, 18B: 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Al-‘Ā’īṣ: sakratihim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.7, v: 11</td>
<td>hattā min gablihi la-mublisīna</td>
<td>Ibn Mas‘ūd: ḥattā yanfaḍḍū min ḥawlihi</td>
<td>(MQ. 7.170).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yuṣafdaḏaḏ min hawlihi</td>
<td>The phrase ḥattā yanfaḍḍū min ḥawlihi appears in a report about the sha‘n al-nuzūl of this verse, and is ascribed to Ibn Mas‘ūd and Zayd b. Arqam. Ibn Ḥajar questions the ascription to Ibn Mas‘ūd’s codex (MQ. 9.474–5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: On the Upper Text

At a number of points, the upper text differs with every codex described in the literary sources in adding or omitting a verse division. Its unique additions are as follows: Q 2.267 (tunfiqūna), 2.285 (wa-l-mu‘minūna), 6.157 (yaṣdifūna), 32.22 (al-mujrimīna), 33.35 (wa-l-ṣābirīna). The last two endings might be scribal errors. Its unique omissions are as follows: Q 33.4, 55.44, 55.46, 55.47, 55.48, 56.41, 56.43. The four omissions in sūra 55 all occur in folio 33A, lines 17–8. These two lines are much more compact than usual and contain no visible verse endings. It seems the scribe initially forgot to write part of the text, and thus later deleted these two lines and rewrote the text compactly so as to make it fit. The verse endings may have been omitted to save space.

The following table gives the disputed verse divisions in the upper text based on the works by al-Dānī and Spitaler (for which see the Bibliography). When there are different reports about a city, Spitaler labels them (a), (b), (c), etc. We imitate him. We use the following abbreviations: Y = there is a verse division; N = there is no verse division; M = Medina; C = Mecca; K = Kūfa; B = Baṣra; D = Damascus; H = Himṣ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disputed Verse Division</th>
<th>Upper Text City</th>
<th>Cities like the Upper Text</th>
<th>Cities unlike the Upper Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.282 (wa-lā shahidun)</td>
<td>N, M, K, B, C (a), D, H</td>
<td>C (b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 (al-‘aqīdī)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.66 (hi-nakilin)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.73 (fa-yakūnu)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.161 (mustaqīmin)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 (ALMṢ)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.33 (wa-l-nahāra)</td>
<td>Y, K, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.41 (Ibrāhīma)</td>
<td>Y, C, M2</td>
<td>K, B, M1, D, H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.57 (maddan)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1 (TH)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.33 (kathīran)</td>
<td>Y, K, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.34 (kathīran)</td>
<td>Y, K, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.39 (fi l-yammi)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, M2, D</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.39 (minnī)</td>
<td>Y, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K, B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.40 (tahzana)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, M2, H (a)</td>
<td>D, H (c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.40 (futūnan)</td>
<td>N, K, C, M1, M2</td>
<td>B, D, H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.40 (madhama)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, M2, H (a)</td>
<td>D, H (c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.41 (li-nafī)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2</td>
<td>K, D, H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.77 (Mūsā)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, M2, H (a, c)</td>
<td>D, H (e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.78 (mā ghosha-ya- hum)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.86 (asifan)</td>
<td>Y, C, M1, H</td>
<td>K, B, M2, D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.86 (ḥasanan)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, D (a, b, c), H (a, c)</td>
<td>M2, D (d), H (b, d, e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.87 (al-Sāmiriyu)</td>
<td>Y, K, B, C, M1, D (a, b), H (a, c)</td>
<td>M2, D (c, d), H (b, d, e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.88 (Mūsā)</td>
<td>N, K, B, M2, D, H</td>
<td>C, M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.88 (fa-naviyya)</td>
<td>Y, K, B, M2, D, H</td>
<td>C, M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.89 (qawlan)</td>
<td>N, K, B, C, M1, D (a, d), H (a, c, e)</td>
<td>M2, D (b, c), H (b, d, e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.92 (dallū)</td>
<td>N, B, C, M1, M2, D, H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.95 (Sāmiriyu)</td>
<td>Y, K, B, C, M1, M2, D (a, c, d), H (a, c, e)</td>
<td>D (b) and H (b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.106 (ṣafṣafan)</td>
<td>N, C, M1, M2</td>
<td>K, B, D, H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.123 (hudan)</td>
<td>Y, B, C, M1, M2, D, H (b)</td>
<td>K, H (a, c, e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The upper text has a number of unique skeletal-morphemic features. It has ١٠٥instead of ١٠٥(١٦.١١٦), ١٠٥instead of ١٠٥(٢٠.٨٦), and ١٠٥instead of ١٠٥(٣٣.١٤). There are also a number of unique morphemic (pointing) features, such as ١٠٥in Q ٤٢.١١. There are also skeletal-morphemic features that match some cities but not others. These are given in the following table:
### Disputed Point

| 6.63 | *anjaytanā* (الجنّتان) | All the other cities | Küfa: *anjānā* (الجَنَّة) |
| 7.3 | *tadhakkarūna* (بتكرّون) | All the other cities | Shām: *yatadhakkarūnā* (بتكرّون) |
| 25.25 | *wa-nuzzilā* (وننزل) | All the other cities | Mecca: *wa-nuzzilā* |
| 43.68 | *yā* but the final *yā* looks like a later addition | Medina, Shām, Küfa, Başra, and maybe Mecca: *yā ʽibādi* (عباد) |
| 47.18 | *an ta’tiyhum* (ان تاَتٌتهم) | Mecca, and maybe Küfa | All the other cities: in *ta’tihim* (ان تاَتیتهم) |
| 55.78 | *dhī l-jalāli* (ذِی الجَلَلِ) | All the other cities | Shām: *dhū l-jalāli* |
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