The Transformation of the *Muṣḥaf*

In his description of the fragment Paris, BnF, Arabe 330, f. 11 to 19, Michele Amari stated that it was written in a “script of the Hidjâz, verging towards the Kufic script”¹ and suggested a date in the third century AH/ninth century AD.² When, more than a century later, I was asked to prepare a new catalogue of the Qur’anic manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale, I came across these nine folios, unique of their kind in the Parisian collection, and was in my turn puzzled by their script and illumination. They could obviously not be so late as Amari thought, but there was no parallel, which could help understand their position. In the end, I lumped them with the other fragments, which were eluding my palaeographic classification of the material.³

A few years later, while working in Istanbul on the fragments of the Damascus collection, folios written in a style which was exhibiting a close relationship with the script of Arabe 330 c began to surface. Slowly, what had been an isolated and thus hard to define script was turning into a rather homogeneous group from a typological point of view. The final element of the puzzle appeared a little later, at the end of the 1990s, while I was examining the Marcel collection in Saint Petersburg.⁴ By then, two manuscripts were providing clues as to the date of this script—one considerably earlier than what Amari had suggested.

Both *muṣḥaf* are in the state of fragments. The first one, which I previously suggested to call the “Umayyad codex of Damascus”,⁵ consists of seventy-eight

1 The descriptions prepared by M. Amari were included by W. Mc Guckin de Slane in the *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes*, Paris, 1883–1895, p. 91.

2 Ibid., p. 92.

3 F. Déroche, *Les manuscrits du Coran: Aux origines de la calligraphie coranique* [Bibliothèque Nationale, Catalogue des manuscrits arabes, 2^e partie, Manuscrits musulmans, I/1], Paris, 1983, pp. 143–149, nos 264–280 (“Non classé”).

4 O. Vasilyeva, Oriental manuscripts in the National Library of Russia, *Manuscripta Orientalia* 2–2 (June 1996), p. 20; F. Déroche, *La transmission écrite du Coran dans les débuts de l’islam. Le codex Parisino-petropolitanus*, [Texts and studies on the Qur’ān 5] Leiden-Boston, 2009, pp. 8–16.

5 F. Déroche, New evidence about Umayyad book hands, in *Essays in honour of Salāh al-Dīn al-Munajjid* [al-Furqan publication, n° 70], London, 2002, pp. 629–634. As the manuscript is being only tentatively reconstructed, the folio numbers used in this chapter are offered as a provisional reference.

parchment folios in vertical format scattered among the “Damascus papers” collection in the Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum in Istanbul. The manuscript was kept for a long time in a deposit for worn out manuscripts in the Umayyad mosque in Damascus, before it was transferred to Istanbul at the end of the Ottoman empire. Once the task of recovering the *membra disiecta* among the thousands of fragments was finished, the folios were brought together under the provisional shelf number TIEM ŞE 321 (fig. 19–24). By contrast, the other copy is kept in two collections under four different call numbers: Saint Petersburg, NLR Marcel 11, 13 and 15 and Paris, BNF Arabe 330 c. Together, they constitute the “Umayyad codex of Fustat” (fig. 25): sixty-four of its seventy-three parchment folios are kept in Saint Petersburg, whilst the remaining nine are in Paris.⁶ They were once all in the deposit of the ‘Amr mosque in Fustat and reached Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century.⁷ In both cases, two elements were particularly relevant for the history of the book during the Umayyad period: the illuminations—to which I shall turn in a moment—which became a major argument for the dating of these copies and the script which revealed a new chapter in the history of the Arabic script.

As for the structure of these parchment manuscripts, there are a few differences between the Fustat and Damascus codices. Both are vertical Qur’anic copies, as most of the manuscripts in *ḥijāzī* style discussed previously. The former is larger than the latter and its 37 × 31 cm folios are closer in size to those of the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* (33 × 24 cm). The height of the Damascus codex was slightly over 24 cm (the folios’ dimensions now range from 22,8 to 24,2 cm), its width being slightly over 19,5 mm (from 18,6 to 19,7 cm). Its quires are unfortunately not complete, but might be tentatively reconstructed on the basis of the material at hand: we can conclude with reasonable certainty that

6 F. Déroche, op. cit. (1983), pp. 144–145, no 268; id., *Colonnes, vases et rinceaux. Sur quelques enluminures d’époque omeyyade*, *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Comptes rendus des séances de l’année 2004* [2006], pp. 227–264; A. George, *The rise of Islamic calligraphy*, London, 2010, pp. 75–78 and fig. 50–51. I was initially reluctant to consider Arabe 330 c as a part of the Umayyad codex of Fustat. The style of the illuminations on the Parisian portion of the manuscript, different from those in Saint Petersburg, was my main argument in support of this view. However, both its material characteristics and the text itself (its last folio ends with the last word of 17: 59, whereas the first folio in the Saint Petersburg collection begins with the first word of 17: 60, coming after the verse separator) compel me to revise my initial opinion. In the references to the folios of this manuscript, a letter indicating the place of conservation, Paris (P) or Saint Petersburg (M), will appear before the folio number, e.g. ‘f. M 34a’.

7 The history of this collection is summed up in F. Déroche, op. cit. (2009), pp. 7–16.

they were usually made of ten bifolios, definitively a rare structure of quire in the Islamic tradition.⁸ The Fustat codex on the other hand is homogeneous as far as its quire structure is concerned (five bifolios).⁹ An estimate of the number of folios (ca. 250) and of the quantity of parchment required for the production of this copy led me to estimate that 28 square meters had been used, more than the earlier *ḥijāzī* copies of the first group.

The Fustat codex has 25 lines of text to the page (writing surface: 27,5 × 23,5 cm). The average height of a line (11,5 mm) is slightly inferior to that of the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* (roughly 15 mm), but close to the Damascus codex (between 10,5 and 11,5 mm, mostly 11 mm). The transcription of the latter's text has been carefully prepared, as indicated by the ruling with a dry point, consisting of an incomplete frame with two vertical lines and a horizontal one. However, the number of lines varies from 18 to 21, although their height remains relatively constant as we have seen before. The written surface varies accordingly from 19,6 to 21 × 16 to 16,7 cm.

The text found in the Damascus codex covers suras 17 to 54, with many lacunae.¹⁰ However, since two places corresponding to a *juz'* division are part of the manuscript (beginning of *j.* 16 and 23), the first being also one of the places where the middle of the Qur'anic text is located, and since the beginning of the sixth part of the division into seven sections (*sura* 34: 20) is found on one of the surviving fragments, we can exclude that the manuscript was a copy in two, four, seven or thirty volumes. The possibility of another kind of division cannot be excluded, but it seems unlikely; the manuscript was probably a Qur'an in one volume. The same conclusion can be reached more easily about the Fustat codex: with three main portions of text covering 17: 60 to 23: 12, 25: 16 to 27: 89 and 30: 3 to 41: 32,¹¹ divisions into two, three, four, six or seven volumes are excluded—as well as a division into thirty *juz'*.

In sharp contrast with most of the copies of the Qur'an in *ḥijāzī* style discussed previously, the short vowels are partially indicated with red dots. These were added after the transcription of the text had been completed, but we do not have any clues about the time which elapsed between the two operations.

8 Three quires can be reconstructed as follows:

I-2 *lost ff.*/ 24/25/26/27/28/29/30/31 + 32/33/34/35/36/37/38/39/2 *lost ff.*

II-40/41/42/43/44/45/46/47/48/49 + 50/51/52/53/54/55/56/57/2 *lost ff.*

III-2 *lost ff.*/58/59/60/61/62/63/64/65 + 66/67/68/69/70/71/72/73/2 *lost ff.*

9 F. Déroche, op. cit. (2006), p. 237, Table I.

10 See Annex I.

11 For the extent of Qur'anic text preserved in this manuscript, see F. Déroche, op. cit. (2006), pp. 236–237 and Annex I.

Were the dots added immediately afterwards or were they a later addition? In the case of the diacriticals, the Damascus codex exhibits two kinds of dots, one which is contemporary with the script itself, the other one being added at a later stage.

The usual stroke of the Umayyad codex of Damascus is ca. 2 mm wide, and the tip of the *qalam* appears to be only slightly concave on its lower side. The endings are never underscored by a widening of the stroke. As a whole, the script looks slightly heavier than *hijāzī* as written by Hand A of the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus*;¹² but Hand D of the latter¹³ or other *hijāzī* fragments like Or. 2165¹⁴ are rather close to both manuscripts in terms of the relation between the height of the shafts, the width of the stroke and its neatness. The letters are spread over the page either by regularly spacing the letters which are not connected—be they part of the same word or not—in a transposition of the principles of Late Antique *scriptio continua* to the Arabic script,¹⁵ or by the use of *mashq*—the horizontal elongation of some letters or connection between letters.¹⁶ It is however more irregularly used in the Damascus codex than in the Fustat codex. Letters with horizontal components—like the final *bā'*, the *ṣād*, the *ṭā'* or the *kāf* especially final—may also be extended, but others like *dāl*, which might also be subjected to this, are not significantly elongated. In the word Allah, the two *lāms* are set widely apart from one another, a solution that derives from prototypes in *hijāzī* style (fig. 7, 9, 10, 15 and 16), but may have been enhanced by the copyist in order to convey the impression of a solemn progression of the script on the line. On both sides of f. 74 of the Damascus codex, the copyist decided to have only the end of sura 46 and the illumination of the following sura: the reasons for this choice are not clear, but he had to make the best use of the few words left and the line could in some cases have

12 Ibid., pp. 31–34 and pl. 1–2. On the issue of the writing tools used, see the remarks of A. George (op. cit., p. 50).

13 Ibid., pp. 39–41 and pl. 7–8.

14 See the facsimile published by F. Déroche and S. Noja Nosedá, *Le manuscrit Or. 2165 (f. 1 à 61) de la British Library* [Sources de la transmission manuscrite du texte coranique, I: Les manuscrits de style *hijāzī*], Les, 2001.

15 See ch. 1.

16 The word may be understood in various ways; for a recent presentation of the question, see A. Gacek, The copying and handling of Qur'āns: Some observations on the *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* by Ibn Abī Dā'ūd al-Sijistānī, *Mélange de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 59 (2006) [Actes de la conférence internationale sur les manuscrits du Coran (Bologne, 26–28 septembre 2002)], pp. 234–238.

eight characters only (f. 74a, 1. 13 for instance). Although both manuscripts are globally very close, it should be noted that the script of the Fustat codex is the most homogeneous one. One cannot exclude that the small discrepancies in the shape of the letters, the number of lines to the page or in the global appearance of the script of the Damascus codex are the result of team-work.¹⁷ This would after all be only another example of this kind of organisation of the work.¹⁸ However, and this is actually a significant difference with what can be observed in some of the manuscripts in *ḥijāzī* style, there is some coherence in the appearance of the script from the beginning of the copy to its end, but also between the manuscripts.

In both copies, the shaft of the *alif* is usually vertical, although in some instances one can find *alifs* of an almost *ḥijāzī* appearance. This also applies to the shafts of the *ṭā'* and final *kāf*. The lower return of the letter is short and the upper end of the shaft is bevelled—as is the case of the shaft of other letters. The *qāf*—as isolated or final letter—has a noticeably important down-falling tail which interferes somewhat with the line of text below. One of the most interesting letters is certainly the final or isolated *kāf*. Its very developed lower horizontal stroke is a noticeable feature of our manuscript: when the opportunity arises, it may be substantially lengthened. The upper horizontal stroke is strictly parallel to the lower one; at its extremity on the left, at a point located before the middle of the lower stroke, a vertical shaft surges from it. The letter is a good example of the evolution from the *ḥijāzī* forerunner to a more regular and solemn shape.

Another typical letterform is that of the *mīm* at the end of a word. One can clearly see it in the *basmala*: it looks like a semibreve set on the line; on the left side, there is usually no trace of a tail—as one would expect—but the shape is carefully rounded. The “eye” of the *mīm* is clearly visible. The letter cannot be confused with the *tā' marbuṭa*, which keeps the short rectilinear stroke of the *hā'* on its right side. It should be added that *mūms* with a horizontal tail are sometimes used by the copyist(s) of the Damascus codex, but this seems not very frequent. Later, users who were obviously disturbed by this shape have sometimes added a tail to those final *mūms*.

The final *nūn* retained some of the features of the *ḥijāzī nūn* as it appears for instance on the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* or BNF Arabe 6140a.¹⁹ But a

17 The far more homogeneous appearance of the script in the Fustat codex does not preclude that various copyists might have been working together.

18 See ch. 1 and 2.

19 F. Déroche, op. cit. (1983), p. 61, no 6; id., op. cit. (2009), pl. 16.

technical change (the use of another *qalam* or of another way of cutting the tip of the reed or of handling the tool) gives the scribe the opportunity to stress the contrast between the two halves of the crescent and the point where they are connected. The sickle shaped letter opens more or less widely; the upper part is in some cases almost vertical, but it is more commonly oblique.

As noted by Amari, this script (which I propose to call “O I”) retains something of its *ḥijāzī* origins.²⁰ As indicated previously, Hand D of the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* can be seen as a forerunner.²¹ It is still a little hesitant and some of the letter shapes, the *hā'* for instance, are very different from those of the new Umayyad script. What is more interesting is the relationship between the script of the Qur'anic manuscripts and some of the Umayyad inscriptions, notably 'Abd al-Malik's milestones: “[their] writing as a whole echoes manuscript calligraphy.”²² The isolated or final *qāf* is almost identical with that found on stone and the same can be said of the final *kāf* in the caliph's name on three of the milestones;²³ to these comparative examples can be added the shape of the *kāf* found on two of the inscriptions on the Dome of the Rock, that in mosaic and another one on a copper plate at the northern entrance of the building.²⁴ Alain George has suggested to identify in all these inscriptions the use of a grid defining the size of the various letters and of their constitutive parts.²⁵

Although it was not possible to submit both manuscripts to an exhaustive examination of their orthography, some sample material will allow us to get an idea of their position, following the same method as previously. The *scriptio defectiva*, mainly characterised by the omission of notation for */ā/*, is still used in both copies. On the other hand, changes appear and the *scriptio plena* is gaining ground. In the Damascus codex, *qāla* and *qālū* are still written defectively, although they may coexist—sometimes on the same page—with the

20 In principle, the next letter currently available in the typology is “G”. However, since other groups (*ḥijāzī* and NS) do not comply with the sequence, I decided for mnemonic reasons to choose the letter “O” (for “Omeyyade”) for the new group.

21 F. Déroche, op. cit. (2009), pp. 39–41 and pl. 7–8.

22 A. George, op. cit., p. 69. For a comparison between the script of Saint Petersburg, NLR Marcel 13 and 'Abd al-Malik's inscriptions, see F. Déroche, op. cit. (2006), pp. 231–234 and fig. 2.

23 M. van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un Corpus inscriptionum arabicarum*, 2nd part, *Syrie du Sud, Jérusalem “ville”*, I, Cairo, 1922, pp. 17–29; F. Déroche, ibid.

24 F. Déroche, op. cit. (2006), pp. 232–234.

25 A. George, op. cit., pp. 56–74.

scriptio plena. On f. 41a for instance, the copyist wrote on l. 5 *qālū* (34: 22), then *q(ā)la* (ibid.) and on the next line *q(ā)lū* (ibid.); on the verso, on l. 5, we find *qāla* (34: 32), then *q(ā)la* on l. 7 (34: 33) and again the *scriptio plena* on l. 14 and 15 (34: 34 and 35). A survey of part of the Fustat codex shows that *qāla* is written most of the time (88%) in the *scriptio plena*, whereas *qālū* is written conversely without medial *alif* in 80 percent of the occurrences. In the first sequence of the fragment preserved in Saint Petersburg, the *fā'il* and the *fi'al* do not appear to be treated in the same way by the copyist(s): */ā/* is not indicated by an *alif* in about 25 percent of the former and slightly more than 10 percent of the latter. However, it should be noted that the indefinite direct case ending represents only 20 percent of the *fā'il* against almost 60 percent of the *fi'al*.

Following with the cases involving the notation of */ā/* with *alif*, the words 'adhāb and 'ibād evince a contrasting approach in the Damascus codex. Keeping to the defective orthography, the plural 'ibād is written without *alif* (see for instance 34: 13, 38: 83, 40: 85, etc.), whereas the word 'adhāb reveals an almost complete transition to the *scriptio plena*: all its occurrences are written in this way, with the exception of 'adh(ā)b^{an} (48: 16, f. 77b), the indefinite accusative case which is written without the medial *alif*. The Fustat codex agrees on this last point with the Damascus copy, 'adhāb being clearly written with an *alif*. On the other hand, its copyist(s) hesitated about 'ibād: it is almost equally written in *scriptio defectiva* as in *plena*. The case of āya is quite specific: it only concerns the “three denticles” orthography of *bi-āyāt*. It is found in both manuscripts, in the Damascus codex at 45: 11 (f. 73b, l. 6) and in the other copy in various places (see for instance 39: 63, 40: 23 and 63).

The word *shay'* exemplifies an intermediary situation in the Damascus codex: its “old” orthography—with an *alif* following the *shīn*—is frequently found, as is the case in 33: 52 and 54 (f. 39b), but the “modern” version occurs on f. 40b (34: 16 and 17), for instance. The situation in the Fustat codex is somewhat different: the word is almost always written with the *alif* (94%)—although a careful hand erased it later.

As a rule, recording the */ā/* and the *hamza* remains a thorny issue in the Damascus codex. The former does not seem to be indicated in the case of the feminine plural ending *-āt*, for instance in *āyāt* which contrasts with *bi-āyāt* mentioned above, but with the notable exception of *jannāt*. A few words—feminine with *tā' marbūṭa* excluded—are exhibiting a possible alternation between the *scriptio plena*, used in most of the cases, and the *scriptio defectiva* preferred when the word is indefinite in the accusative case (ending with *tan-wīn -an*). This may be the case for 'adhāb/'adh(ā)b^{an} or for *Qur'ān*, written with an *alif* (20: 114), against *Qur(ā)n^{an}*, without *alif* (20: 113; 41: 3). For other words,

like *dhukr*(*ā*)*n*^{an} (42: 50), only one situation has been found, but they may also follow the same pattern.

In the conjugation, the peculiarities found in the Damascus codex are related to the orthography, especially in the case of verbs with a weak root, as is the case with *qāla* (see above), or derived verbs like *art*(*ā*)*ba* (24: 50). In addition to this, it should be noted that the third person of the plural of the perfective of *raʿā* (*raʿū*) is written without the *alif al-wiqāya* (40: 85; 42: 44), a situation which may also concern the verbs with third weak. A puzzling feature of the manuscript, perhaps a mistake, is the orthography of *Dāwūd* (34: 10 and 13) which was already present in the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* (4: 163).

Both manuscripts stick to the Arabic adaptation of the *scriptio continua* which is found in the earlier *muṣḥafs* in *ḥijāzī* style. However, the lay out follows an orientation described in the previous chapter. The Fustat codex has three large outer margins—a feature which explains why the size of the line is smaller than in the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* although their folio size is almost identical. In the Damascus codex, the margins are not as generous as in the Fustat copy, but they are clearly larger than those of the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* and the first generation of *muṣḥafs* in *ḥijāzī* style.²⁶ It might be due either to the destination of the copy or to the status and the means of the patron. It is however a copy of relatively high quality.

The copyist(s) of these manuscripts also used the line-end fillers which we have seen in the second group of *ḥijāzī maṣāḥif* in vertical format.²⁷ They look like horizontal strokes and are found principally at the end of lines which the script failed to fill up to the theoretical vertical line which limits the writing surface to the left. With these horizontal strokes, the left hand side of the text block would appear as vertical, thus providing a more satisfactory rectangular appearance for the justification. The copyist(s) of the Damascus codex used these devices rather conservatively, whereas the copyist(s) of the Fustat codex eventually used them in other parts of the line, when they had to cope with a descender—usually the tail of a *qāf* or of an *ʿayn* written on the previous line—interfering with the line below. If there was no space to accommodate a word before this obstacle, the copyist(s) may use a similar filler in order to avoid leaving a too conspicuous blank space.

Illumination is certainly what most distinguishes both manuscripts and the first group of quarto copies written in *ḥijāzī* style. Neither the *Codex Parisino-*

26 See ch. 1.

27 See ch. 2.

petropolitanus, nor the manuscript London, BL Or. 2165 contain ornamented headbands between the suras.²⁸ Those present on Saint Petersburg, NLR Marcel 19 are probably an addition. In the Damascus codex, the illumination is limited to the twenty sura headings that survived which I shall present with those of the Fustat codex. The verse-dividers can hardly be considered as illumination: short strokes written in the same ink as the text itself and grouped in various fashions have been used to indicate the end of each verse; they happen to be organised as a column (1.1.1, mostly with five or six strokes), or as a triangle (1.1.5, with six strokes).²⁹ The groups of ten verses are singled out by an approximately circular shape, also in ink (1.A.I); but these crude ten-verse dividers are an addition. In the present state of the research on this manuscript, it is not possible to provide a complete overview of the division into verses and relate it to any school. We can nevertheless note that they are thoroughly indicated in the folios available for examination and that the *basmala* is marked as a verse.

The verses are in this case again coherently indicated in the Fustat codex with columns of dashes set one above the other. The groups of verses are indicated in two ways which do not overlap. Rough concentric circles in red and black indicating groups of ten verses are most frequently used in the manuscript in its present state, but in some places the groups of five and ten verses are marked off by *abjad* letters in gold. “Twenty-five” will for example be written *kāf+hā’*. From hundred onwards, the *qāf* (value= 100) is always added, but remains independent, so that “125” will be written: *fā’+hā’* (joined), *qāf*. If compared with the data compiled by Anton Spitaler,³⁰ some similarities can be found between the manuscript and the Syrian reading. In the thorny case of sura 20, a few divisions seem more in accordance with *hijāzī* readings, although as a whole a preference for Damascus is visible.

All the early copies as well as the Damascus and Fustat codices share a common characteristic: they lack any indication of a title—at least in their original state.³¹ Crude sura dividers and sometimes a title are found on the

28 See the facsimiles of both manuscripts (F. Déroche and S. Noja Nosedá, *Le manuscrit Arabe 328 (a) de la Bibliothèque nationale de France* [Sources de la transmission manuscrite du texte coranique I, Les manuscrits de style hijāzī, 1], Lesa, 1998; id., op. cit. [2001]).

29 See the typology of verse dividers in F. Déroche, op. cit. (1983), pp. 27–28.

30 A. Spitaler, *Die Verszählung des Koran nach islamischer Überlieferung*, Munich, 1935 [Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung, Jahrgang 1935, Heft 11].

31 Titles have been added in the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* and in Or. 2165. The sura headings of the Damascus codex do not contain information about the text (title of the sura,

smaller *muṣḥafs* as well as on the *Codex Ṣanʿāʾ I* (fig. 10, 12 and 16). In all extant instances in the Damascus and Fustat codices, the space left between the suras is the equivalent of at least two lines of text. On this point, both manuscripts differ from earlier Qurʾanic copies in which the copyist did not always leave a full blank line between two suras when a significant part of the preceding sura's last line had not been used for the text. In most cases, the copyists of the Damascus and Fustat codices tended to occupy most of the last line with text when they reached this point. However, when they left the last line partly blank, the illuminators never tried to cover all the space available—in contrast with what can be observed later.

In both manuscripts, the quality or even the presence of illumination is quite irregular. The Fustat codex as we know it today contains twenty-one beginnings of a sura.³² From those, only twelve are provided with an illumination. The situation is to some extent similar to that of the groups of verses, as we have seen above, without any clear distribution pattern which would account for the presence or absence of ornament. There seems however to be a connection between the quire structure of the manuscript and the illuminated sura headbands, as if the illuminator had been working on loose quires, which would explain why three quires are almost completely decorated, two do not have any ornament at all and one is partly illuminated. Moreover, two illuminations are actually preparatory drawings which never received paint or gilding. The situation is different in the case of the Damascus codex: all the spaces between two suras have been decorated, but there are huge variations in their quality which ranges from crude to sophisticated. As in the codex of Fustat, it is difficult to find a satisfactory explanation for their distribution within the manuscript since it does not seem to be related in any way to a material feature, like the quires, nor to a possible division of the work between two illuminators, for instance. The palette is based on four components: gold, dark red, light blue and green, varying in the codex of Damascus from a darker hue to a lighter one. Unpainted parchment has been used instead of white—notably between coloured stripes.

number of verses, e.g.); when some information appears in the case of s. 33, it has been written afterwards in red outside the frame of the illumination. The same can be said of the Fustat codex: the structure of the illuminations itself makes clear that it was not meant to receive a title. Later, someone added below the old formula: *fātiḥatu al-sūra* ... followed by the title and the number of the verses. For convenience sake, I shall only refer to the sura which begins after the illumination, although we do not know whether it was originally meant as an initial or final ornament.

32 F. Déroche, op. cit. (2006), p. 241, Table III.

The sura ornaments of the two manuscripts can be allotted to two broad groups based on a purely formal feature, the frame. The first one comprises the decorative headbands with a roughly rectangular shape, with long straight sides; the frame itself can be clearly indicated by a coloured line, but this is not always the case. The short sides are treated in a variety of ways, but they only rarely include an element extending into the margin. The other group includes all compositions which are not physically inscribed within a frame and develop freely between the two suras. As a rule, the illumination is contained within a theoretical rectangle, the long sides of which are the horizontal of the upper line of script and that of the line left empty for the heading, whereas the short vertical sides are defined by the vertical limits of the justification. It should be noted that no component of the illumination significantly encroaches on the margins. At most, a small tip of the ornament extends into the margin.

The repertoire of illuminations relies on various sources: geometric and vegetal shapes, architectural as well as some specific Umayyad ornaments. In many instances, the same component is repeated various times across the line. Among the surviving examples, the framed sura headbands are more frequently associated with compositions based on geometric shapes than other ornaments. Concentric circles are arranged in a single row in the Fustat codex, between sura 15 and 16 (f. P 12b), with green leaves arranged in a X-shape separating the circles, and in the Damascus codex (f. 35a, sura 33), with three-step crenellations arranged face-to-face along the long sides and between the circles. The centre of the circles is painted alternately in green, red or blue; in the Fustat codex, the outer circle is gilded. In the latter manuscript, another headband contains half-circles set against the long sides. Both frames have concave short sides. A combination of both compositions appears in an illumination with rosettes instead of circles which will be discussed below. There seems to be a relationship between the use of circular ornaments on a white background in framed headbands and what Daniel Schlumberger described as the third type in the painted decoration of Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbī.³³ On f. 50a (sura 37) of the Damascus codex, the frame with concave short sides contains half circles arranged quincuncially in a way, with their diameter in contact with the long sides.

A very simple rope pattern with two components—one is green, the other has been left unpainted—runs across a red rectangular band in the Damascus

33 D. Schlumberger, *Qaṣr el-Heir el Gharbi*, Contributions de M. Ecochard et N. Saliby, Mise au point par O. Ecochard et A. Schlumberger [Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, CXX], Paris, 1986, p. 14.

codex (f. 71a, sura 44); the rope coils up around small gilt dots. Its only surviving small side is slightly curved, the corners being rounded as well. In the axis of the illumination, a spear-like element surges from the last loop of the rope and is projected toward the margin.

In the same manuscript (f. 76a, sura 48), a frame ending on both extremities with a triangle crowned by a pearl and set between two hooks is among the few examples of sura headbands encroaching upon the margin. The inner space is filled with a row of green, red and yellow (gold?) chevrons.

To the group of sura illuminations enclosed with a frame, I shall add three items from the Fustat codex. Their ornamentation does not rely on geometric shapes strictly speaking. As it often happens, the frame is filled by the repetition (from seven to twelve times) of a compartment filled by various elements: between sura 16 and 17, it has the form of a horizontally oriented diamond with a heart shape occupying its right half and a small spearhead-like leaf on the other half; on f. M 9a (sura 20), that of an oblong hexagon with a central ornament; on f. M 29b (sura 35), that of a mandorla with a central ornament related to the previous one, alternating with a cross-shaped device consisting of two hearts in contact by their tip and two spearhead leaves in contact by their base.³⁴ Another illumination from the same manuscript, on f. M 20b (sura 40), can be related to this group, but I shall turn to it later.

Turning now to the illuminations which are not contained within a frame, both manuscripts exhibit a similar composition of alternating geometric shapes (circles, squares, diamonds) in a row, the Damascus codex on f. 13b (sura 20) and the Fustat on f. M 34a (sura 37). The latter is only a preparatory drawing, whereas in the former colours are used for the frames of the individual figures and as a background for their inner decoration. This very simple composition is frequently attested in Umayyad times as a frame on the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock³⁵ as well as on stucco *claustra* at Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbī.³⁶

A horizontal row of small squares alternately coloured in green, red, blue or gold, set on a corner like diamonds and connected by tiny rings is found on f. 61b (sura 42) of the Damascus codex. Two heart shapes take place symmetrically on both sides of each ring, between the squares, their points in contact with the ring; at the opposite, a point surges from between the two lobes. The

34 Compare with a stucco decoration from Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbī (D. Schlumberger, op. cit., pl. 65a).

35 O. Grabar and S. Nuseibeh, *The Dome of the Rock*, New York, 1996, pp. 103–104 for instance.

36 D. Schlumberger, op. cit., pl. 78c. See also R.W. Hamilton, *Khirbat al Mafjar, An Arabian mansion in the Jordan valley*, Oxford, 1959, fig. 225f.

illumination changes slightly when it reaches the edge of the justification: a horizontally set heart shape replaces the square and combines with the two vertical heart shapes. As in the previously described illumination, the colours of the various components are alternately green, red, blue or gold. To the group of sura headbands without frame belong two examples from the same copy which rely on a zigzag. On f. 73a (sura 45), a single gilt zigzag line, with a heart shape at each angle, connects the two margins. Three coloured zigzags, a red between two green ones, are separating sura 30 from sura 31 (f. 31a).

Vegetal components, more or less stylised, are used in variable proportion in the two manuscripts, either within a frame or not. In the Fustat codex, they are pervasive, although often assuming a minor role. In two instances, the full width of the justification is covered by an ornament which relies primarily on them. On f. M 6a (sura 19), a series of cornucopiae with stripped body grows out of a vase with a double body, a neck and two almost kantharos-like handles. From the mouth of each cornucopia grows a twig supporting grapes and leaves of various shapes. The last scroll slightly encroaches on the margin. The illumination found on f. M 32a (sura 36) is not unlike the former one in its overall appearance, but a gilded twig describing seventeen loops with a flower in their centre replaces the cornucopiae. Leaves and grapes grow from the twig towards the outside, between the loops.³⁷

A composition recalling that found on f. 50a (sura 37) in the Damascus codex may be mentioned here, although its geometric aspect should not be neglected. On f. M 13a (sura 21) in the Fustat codex, a gilded frame contains three quincuncially ordered rows of rosettes with alternating red and green petals separated by white lines. Only the rosettes of the central row are complete, those of the two other rows being half rosettes in contact with the frame. A miscalculation explains why the right-hand side of the headband encroaches onto the margin in order to accommodate a full rosette of the central row whereas on the left there was only room for a quarter of a rosette in each of the corners. Closely related rosettes appear in the frame of one of the paintings of Qaṣr al-Hayr al-Gharbī.³⁸

Two sura illuminations of the codex of Damascus are also based on rosettes, but these are not enclosed within a frame. On f. 58a (sura 41), the headband consists of eight rosettes made of four spear-head like petals in cruciform position, linked by an arc painted in green or red or blue—the colour being

37 Compare with O. Grabar and S. Nuseibeh, *op. cit.*, p. 86, 90–91, 92, 96.

38 D. Schlumberger, *op. cit.*, pl. 65 a, but also on a parapet (pl. 69 a) and on the floor fresco in the staircase, room XIX (pl. 34). See also O. Grabar and S. Nuseibeh, *op. cit.*, p. 84 and 86–87.

different from that of the petals; a strip of unpainted parchment divides the arc from a gilt area close to the centre. What is left of the illumination on f. 78a (sura 54) suggests that it was made of three—possibly four—rosettes which are very close to the previous ones. The difference consists in the shape of the arc between the petals: with its two lobes, it actually looks like a green number “three”.³⁹ A rope was apparently connecting the ornaments, possibly with other motifs.

The four extant spearhead-like palmettes of the damaged illumination found on f. 43a (sura 35) in the same manuscript are less clearly vegetal (fig. 21). They are set on the tip of a gilt chevron (that is set close to the fold on two blue commas arranged as a chevron) within a frame and point in the direction of the outer margin.

In both copies, the vegetal components are usually less prominent. In each of them, a composition combines a twig and a column as a support. In the Damascus codex, the illumination is located on f. 9a (sura 19; fig. 20). Two symmetrical twigs rise from a basket depicted on top of a column. They spread out comma-like scrolls—alternately red, green and blue with golden leaves—which reach the edge of the parchment in its present state—a small portion of the heading seems to have been lost. Strangely enough, the visible portion of the inner part of the basket—painted in blue—is cut by the two twigs so that the space between them is left unpainted. The outline of the basket is crudely indicated by a green line; its body is divided into two halves in the same way. The basketwork is unconvincingly rendered by red and green lines, with stripes of unpainted parchment between them in order to enhance the contrasts and suggest the relief.

The composition on f. M 1a (sura 17) in the Fustat codex sounds like a direct replica of the former, by a more skilled artist (fig. 25). Here again, a basket is located on top of a column. A Y-shaped gilded element stands in the basket and supports between its branches a twig—as suggested by its green colour. It develops towards the outer margin in a way similar to the illumination on f. M 32a (sura 36): in the centre of each loop, there is a rosette or a stylised flower, and grapes and leaves grow towards the outside of the twig, between the loops. The illuminator was more skilled than his counterpart who oddly adapted the scrolls to the space available between the suras.

In the Damascus codex, sura 31 is separated from sura 32 (f. 33b) by a headband of which the main element is a series of long striped cones, derived

39 Ibid., pl. 33 (centre left) and 34.

from the cornucopia.⁴⁰ The mouth of each cone is gilt and releases, in addition to the body of the next cone, two symmetrically arranged leaves. From the last cone in the row, close to the outer margin, develops a central spearhead-like central figure which is hemmed in by what might be seen as either two bunches of palms or two wings. The latter were probably originally gilt, but only a few gold flakes are still visible; the centre of the spearhead-like element is also gilt, with green and red lines underlining the contour. A detail of the illumination, namely the leaves, is also found at the basis of a column in the Damascus codex (f. 9a, sura 19) and in the Fustat codex between the compartments of the headband preceding sura 20 (f. M 9a) and at the basis of a vase (before sura 37, f. M 37a).

Architecture is another important component of the decorative repertoire of sura illuminations. The column plays a comparatively important role in both manuscripts, although the space available between the suras does not seem suited to such a component. Actually, the artists had to disregard verisimilitude and to depict columns lying on the side, not as if they had fallen, but as if they had evaded gravity. This could have led to disproportionately long columns in the Fustat codex, but a sense of proportion led the artist(s) to avoid drawing columns which would occupy more than half of the width of the page. In this manuscript, the first instance, found on f. M 1a in the space between sura 17 and 18, has been mentioned previously, next to its counterpart in the Damascus codex (fig. 20 and 25). The shaft and the capital are minutely depicted. The lower part of the shaft is fluted, as suggested by the stripes alternating between green and gold, and the upper part looks like a torsade. The capital is unmistakably Corinthian. In the Damascus codex, the parallel illumination, found on f. 9a (sura 19; fig. 20), has already been discussed. Due to the size of the column, the components are treated in a more schematic way than in the other manuscript. The base is close to the inner margin, but does not reach the edge of the writing surface; two leaves grow from its upper torus. The gilt shaft occupies less than half the line and bears a small capital; a green shape with three points recalling the acanthus leaves outlines both sides of the latter.

In the same manuscript, a column with a vase on top of it is found at the bottom of f. 57b, after the last line of sura 38 (fig. 24). But the column's size is more important than in the previous case and the depiction far more accurate. The basis is a careful reproduction of a real one, with the various components in contrasting colours; the shaft, painted in green and red, with the contour of the red area left unpainted, suggests the veins of the marble. The upper part

40 F. Déroche, *op. cit.* (2002), fig. 11.

of the shaft up to the bottom of the capital has been lost. The capital itself is a good rendition of an original with acanthus leaves: here again the various parts are depicted in a realistic way. The open calyx which has been placed on top of the capital is rendered with more skill than the basket found on f. 9a (sura 19; fig. 20): its base is conical and is connected to the calyx by a short stem. On both sides, the rim turns down widely. The cup itself is fluted—as suggested by the use of various colours. From the calyx surges a cross-like element with a cylindrical body which, in the tradition of the Late Antiquity, is meant for water or a water sprinkling device—for instance in the manuscript Paris, BNF Syriaque 33, f. 8b which provides a nice parallel to this detail.⁴¹

In the Fustat codex, a striking parallel is found on f. M 37a, between sura 37 and 38. The artist has depicted two columns, complete with their basis and capitals, that close to the fold supporting a small arch in which a lamp is seen hanging, the second column being set “above” the arch. The capital of the upper column supports a calyx containing a T-shaped element with a cylindrical body, in other words a stylised stream of water gushing out of it. In the same manuscript, there is a second example of two columns set one upon the other (although depicted horizontally): in the illumination on f. M 19b (sura 23), a red and gold circle plays the same role as the arch in linking the two columns. All their components, basis, shaft and capital, are rendered with great accuracy, as was the case for the illumination on f. 9a (sura 19) in the Damascus codex. In the Fustat codex, the columns of the sura ornament between sura 22 and 23 (f. M 19b) are supported by a vase—a hydria?—depicted close to the fold. At the opposite, a lanceolate device covered with scales is set directly on top of the second column capital, its tip slightly encroaching on the margin.

These illuminations including an architectural component belong to the group of unframed headbands. Conversely, a fourth illumination of the Fustat codex, already mentioned before, also includes columns and could have been discussed with the other group. The frame consists of two parallel gilded lines terminated at both ends by a hook turning outwards. Between the lines, a compartment consisting of an oblong shape made of two tiny columns connected at both extremities by a half circle is repeated seven times. They are separated from each other by two crenelated devices joined by their tip.

The discovery of the “Umayyad codex of Sanaa” (Sanaa, DaM Inv. 20–33.1) provided an outstanding example of the way in which architecture was used

41 J. Leroy, *Les manuscrits syriaques à peintures conservés dans les bibliothèques d'Europe et d'Orient. Contribution à l'étude de l'iconographie des églises de langue syriaque*, Paris, 1964, pl. 1 [Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, vol. LXXVII].

by Umayyad illuminators in the decoration of the Qur'anic manuscripts. In the two copies under discussion, the architectural components do not reach such a sophisticated level, but they are clearly related to details of the two full-page depictions of the Sanaa codex.

Scrolls developing out of a vessel are a well-known feature of Umayyad art: they are found on various monuments of the period, the most famous instances occurring on the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock,⁴² with their varied vegetal repertoire. It was actually widely used in the Near-East during the sixth and seventh centuries: examples ranging from a mosaic from Daphne (dated between 526 and 540)⁴³ to Saint Christopher church in Qabr Hiram (575)⁴⁴ or the synagogue in Ma'on.⁴⁵

Turning now to the details, we can note that the basis of the columns in the Fustat codex, f. M 1a and M 19b are of the same type as that in the Damascus codex, f. 9a (sura 19; fig. 20). The capitals are usually inspired by a Corinthian model, a feature found earlier in Syriac manuscripts.⁴⁶ Those from Qaṣr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbī show a very similar structure to that found in the illumination of sura 39 (f. 57b; fig. 24).⁴⁷ In both cases, there is a central—and circular or nearly circular—element on the abacus which is divided into two halves by a horizontal furrow; on the other hand, an open V-shaped pattern ends with a hook on each side of the upper part of the capital. The first and smaller column (f. 9a) is more sketchy, but its capital could be compared with those on mosaics, with a

42 O. Grabar et S. Nuseibeh, op. cit., *passim*. See other examples in R.E. Brünnow and A. von Domaszewski, *Die Provincia Arabia auf Grund zweier in den Jahren 1897 und 1898 unternommenen Reisen und der Berichte früherer Reisender*, t. II, Strasbourg, 1905, p. 151, fig. 735, pp. 154–158, fig. 738–742, p. 166, fig. 750 and p. 168, fig. 752 (examples of bowls), and p. 153, fig. 737, p. 163, fig. 747 et p. 165, fig. 749 (vessels with a neck). A low relief in basalt from Azraq kept in Irbid museum provides another example of this pattern (*Les Omeyyades, Naissance de l'art islamique*, Madrid/Amman/Aix-en-Provence, 2001, p. 162). Also M. Almagro, L. Caballero, J. Zozaya et A. Almagro, *Qusayr 'Amra. Residencia y baños omeyas en el desierto de Jordania*, Madrid, 1975, pl. IX C et p. 54.

43 F. Baratte, *Catalogue des mosaïques romaines et paléochrétiennes du Musée du Louvre*, Paris, 1978, pp. 121–123.

44 F. Baratte, op. cit., pp. 132–144 (with bibliography).

45 Dated to the sixth century AD. See M. Avi-Yonah, Une école de mosaïque à Gaza au sixième siècle, *La mosaïque gréco-romaine II*, Vienne, 30 août–4 septembre 1971, Paris, 1975, pl. CLXXX, 1. The author shows how this iconography was used in churches as well as in synagogues.

46 See J. Leroy, op. cit., pl. 1.

47 D. Schlumberger, op. cit., pl. 71.

stylised version of the acanthus. In the Fustat codex, the shafts of the columns exhibit a variety of solutions: one of those on f. M 19b is entirely gilt, like that of the Damascus codex, f. 1a; there is nothing exactly similar to the shaft found on f. 57a, but an attempt at suggesting the veins of the marble can be seen in the illumination of sura 38 of the Fustat codex (f. M 37a). The solution used here is slightly more satisfying than is the case for some of the columns on the Yemeni fragment already alluded to—namely those of the main nave on the painting on the right hand page and the mihrab on the opposite painting.⁴⁸

Vases are commonly found in Umayyad works of art. In most instances, vegetal scrolls develop out of a vase or a basket located at the bottom of the composition; in one of the mosaics of the Great mosque of Damascus, a vase is depicted on the top of a column in a way similar to the illumination of f. 9a (sura 19) in the Damascus codex (fig. 20). However, in the latter, the object is not a vase, but a basket similar to that found in the illumination separating sura 17 and 18 in the Fustat codex (f. M 1a), but also in the decoration of Khirbet al-Mafjar⁴⁹ and even more clearly close to the various instances appearing on church mosaics of Transjordan from the middle or the second half of the sixth century.⁵⁰ The use of a fillet to underline the contour of the container and divide it into two parts can be paralleled to a representation of a jug at the bottom of a depiction of a mosque on the Qur'anic fragment Inv. 20–33.1.⁵¹ In both manuscripts, the baskets are rendered rather schematically whereas the vases, for instance the open calyx on f. 57b (sura 39) of the Damascus codex, have been depicted with great accuracy by the illuminators; the conical base of the calyx and its fluted body are well represented in Umayyad mosaics, on stone or stucco bas-reliefs, even on metal works (fig. 24).⁵²

Another component of the illumination can be related to an Umayyad repertory based on vegetal themes: the cornucopiae, probably derived from acanthus sheaths of the Antiquity. The illumination preceding sura 19 in the Fustat codex (f. M 6a) is a particularly clear example. A parallel may be found in the other manuscript, although in a slightly different presentation. Here, on f. 33b (sura 32), the elongated trumpet-like shapes recall the cornucopiae

48 H.-C. von Bothmer, *Architekturbilder im Koran. Eine Prachthandschrift der Umayyadenzeit aus dem Yemen*, *Pantheon* 45 (1987), colour plates I and II.

49 R.W. Hamilton, op. cit., fig. 215a and 229e; fig. 215e also gives an interesting parallel as far as the division of the surface is concerned.

50 M. Picirillo, *L'Arabie chrétienne*, Paris, 2002, p. 153, 177 (dated 565 AD), 216, 240 (dated 587).

51 H.C. von Bothmer, op. cit., p. 7, pl. II.

52 See above.

found on the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock⁵³—and also in the Great mosque of Damascus.⁵⁴ In the Damascus codex they evolved into a rectilinear version which could also be understood as candelabra. The way in which the end of each is fitted into the mouth of the next one is reminiscent of contemporaneous compositions using this component. On the manuscript, the mouths open in a fashion similar to that of the cornucopiae or the calyces of the mosaics; this induces us to consider the illumination as a series of cornucopiae, with vegetation gushing out of their mouths, as is the case in the Fustat codex as well as in both the Jerusalem and Damascus examples. The wide variety of leaf shapes appearing on the mosaics can be paralleled to those of the two illuminations under discussion.⁵⁵

The most distinctive feature of the illuminations preceding sura 32 (f. 33b) and 38 (f. 54a; fig. 23) in the Damascus codex is certainly the final ornament which is strongly reminiscent of the double wings or the paired foliage scrolls of the Dome of the Rock;⁵⁶ there, a composition with a twin bunch of palm leaves vividly recalls in every respect—calyx, shape of the leaves, bulbous axial motif—the first illumination. Although bulbous motifs recalling closely the other ornament under discussion can be found on the walls of the Dome of the Rock,⁵⁷ the most striking parallel is certainly the illumination on f. M 19b (sura 23) of the Fustat codex; on the other hand, scales associated with vegetal elements can be found on the mosaics, but also on stucco and stone in Umayyad times.⁵⁸ A simpler version found in the Damascus codex (f. 43a, sura 35) belongs here.

In the same manuscript, the illuminations preceding sura 18 (f. 1b; fig. 19), 30 (f. 28a) and 36 (f. 47a; fig. 22) are of a more intriguing nature. No direct parallel can be found in the manuscripts which so far proved a consistent source of comparative material. These ornaments may have been inspired by a component of the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock, namely the diadems, crowns and necklaces which distinctly share a few characteristics with the decoration

53 O. Grabar et S. Nuseibeh, op. cit., pp. 88–92.

54 Marg. van Berchem, in K.A.C. Creswell, *Early Muslim architecture*, I, Oxford, 1969, pl. 58 c–e (especially c and d) and pl. 60 b–d where the whole final setting is very close to the headband of S. XXXII; according to Marg. van Berchem, the last mentioned mosaics are a Seljuk repair (p. 360).

55 O. Grabar et S. Nuseibeh, op. cit., pp. 86–87 and 126–127.

56 Ibid., p. 92 inf. or 119–121 for instance.

57 Ibid., p. 85 (upper ill.), 86 (lower ill.), etc.

58 D. Schlumberger, op. cit., pl. 76e; also R.W. Hamilton, op. cit., fig. 89 a–b, 216c and pl. XXXII.

of the manuscript. The row of gilt diamonds on the headband on f. 1b (sura 18; fig. 19) could eventually be paralleled with a composition which appears on the vases of the Dome of the Rock mosaics.⁵⁹ The repertory of the jewellery also seems to be the source for some details of this illumination: the oval ornaments and the small rectangles, even the tiny circles which are seen immediately below each component are very close to the jewels represented on the mosaics.⁶⁰ The same can be said of the illumination on f. 28a (sura 30; fig. 22): it vividly recalls some of the diadems which are made of a band—with a row of squares, or of circles (for gems) crowned by triangles;⁶¹ a similar composition also appears on a vase.⁶² Smaller parts of the jewellery can also be compared to details of this illumination—for instance series of tiny triangles from which pearls hang.⁶³ A unpublished manuscript from the deposit of Damascus has a clearer version of the jewellery: it can support the interpretation I have suggested here.

Both manuscripts are particularly important as they can be dated with some precision. Their script has some connections with the *ḥijāzī* style, not so much the version exemplified in the portions of the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* transcribed by Hands A or B (fig. 1–2), but more with the work of Hand D (fig. 4) or the copyists of London, BL Or. 2165 (fig. 8). The latter on the one hand as well as both the Damascus and Fustat codices on the other hand witness a completely new feature in the—young—history of the Arabic script: the deliberate iteration of a style of writing. The two hands cooperating in the transcription of Or. 2165 or the two (or more) copyists of the other two copies of the Qur'an were able to transcribe the text in such a way that the difference between the hands was not immediately detectable. In other words, they belonged to a world where scribes had a professional approach to their trade, learning a specific style and using it. We may go a step further: we have before our eyes the beginnings of a new concept, that of Qur'anic script. Such a specialization is perhaps not completely new in the area, but is assuredly new in the Arabic manuscript tradition, a style becoming specific to a certain use. These elements point into the same direction: at the end of the first/seventh century, under the reign of caliph 'Abd al-Malik, a fateful change occurred in the chancery of

59 O. Grabar et S. Nuseibeh, op. cit., pp. 120–121, 124–125, etc.

60 Ibid., p. 119, 124–127, 131.

61 Ibid., pp. 124–127.

62 Ibid., p. 118.

63 Ibid., p. 119 and 129.

the empire.⁶⁴ Arabic, both language and script, became the official medium of the administration. From some sources, we know that the caliphs had specific scripts devised for their own correspondence.⁶⁵ The relationship between the script of 'Abd al-Malik's milestones and that of contemporaneous *muṣḥafs* suggests that the latter were involved in this transformation which concurred with reforms involving the Qur'anic text. In addition, the use of the same script for a large number of copies stressed visually the fact that the text found on these manuscripts was identical.

It is difficult to determine when the original page setting was modified by the introduction into the Qur'anic manuscript of margins and line-end fillers. As the folios of Or. 2165 do not exhibit these features, I suggest that they were introduced slightly later and influenced the customs of the copyists who were still producing copies in a variety of *ḥijāzī*. This would explain the case of the manuscripts analysed previously, closer to the new standards of lay out but with an older variety of script. They may be contemporary with copies like the Damascus and Fustat codices, or even slightly later. In this case again, the study of the material suffers from the lack of any information about the place of production of these *muṣḥafs*.

The illuminations tell a similar story: the repertory of the illuminators of both manuscripts belongs to the Umayyad period and is found on many contemporary works of art. They provide us with an important chronological argument, but they also show that a major change was occurring, at least in some circles. The conception of the Qur'an as a book was modified. The austere presentation of the Qur'anic text which was the hallmark of the earliest copies in *ḥijāzī* style which have come down to us and was probably a faithful replication of older codices, lost its attraction and its meaning for some patrons who felt the necessity to have a book which would have a nicer appearance and use a visual repertory in accordance with the taste of Near Eastern elites of that time. It is no surprise that, in the same way as the first generation of Muslims adopted the techniques they needed for the writing down of the Qur'an—like the codex or the *scriptio continua*—from the dominant manuscript tradition, in the last quarter of the first/seventh century, the illuminators and their patrons, with the aim of beautifying the *muṣḥaf*, appropriated from the Late Antique tradition

64 Al-Jahshiyārī, K. *al-wuzarā' wa-l-kuttāb*, ed. M. al-Shaqqā', I. al-Abyārī and 'A. Shalabī, Cairo, 1938, p. 37; transl. J. Latz, *Das Buch der Wezire und Staatssekretäre von Ibn 'Abdūs Al-Ġahšiyārī. Anfänge und Umayyadenzeit* [Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte des Orients, 11], Walldorf-Hessen, 1958, pp. 85–86.

65 Ibid., p. 47; transl., p. 94.

a suitable decorative repertory. Judging from the illuminations, artists familiar with this tradition were entrusted with the task of decorating the Qur'anic copies, which means that we cannot discard that professional Christian or Jewish illuminators were hired to carry out this task. Arabic sources have preserved accounts about Christian scribes transcribing the Qur'an for Muslim patrons.⁶⁶ The same situation may have been the case for the illumination.

Al-Samhūdī, transmitting an account going back to Mālik b. Anas, mentions the codex sent by al-Ḥajjāj to Medina.⁶⁷ He goes on reporting that he was the first to send copies of the Qur'an to the major cities, and that the *muṣḥaf* in Medina was used on Thursdays and Fridays during the dawn prayer.⁶⁸ Al-Ḥajjāj also sent a copy to the 'Amr mosque in Fustat. His action roused the anger of 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Marwān who decided to have a copy made for the same purpose.⁶⁹ The Fustat codex could be one of these two manuscripts,⁷⁰ although the unfinished state of its illuminations can be an argument against such an attribution. However, if such was the case, it would then be an outstanding example of the copies produced for the higher levels of the Umayyad Empire.

There is no doubt that the ruling circles of the Umayyad state became concerned with the Qur'an as a written text. As Omar Hamdan has shown, a project was set up under al-Ḥajjāj's supervision between 84 and 85AH;⁷¹ it aimed at providing the Muslim community with an improved *muṣḥaf*: according to the sources, the orthography was reformed, the diacriticals added to a *rasm* which did not have any, the components of the Qur'an were numbered and, in the

66 A. George, op. cit., pp. 52–53. See above p. 44, n. 26.

67 Al-Samhūdī, *Wafā' al-wafā bi-akhbār dār al-Muṣṭafā*, ed. M. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, Beirut, 1984, vol. 2, p. 668.

68 Ibid.

69 Ibn Duqmāq, *Description de l'Egypte*, ed. K. Vollers, part 1, Cairo, 1893, pp. 72–74; al-Maqrīzī, *al-Mawā'iz wa-l-i'tibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭā' wa-l-āthār*, ed. A. Fu'ad Sayyid, vol. IV-1, London, 2001, pp. 30–31. M. Tillier suggested that the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* may have been Asmā's *muṣḥaf* (review of *La transmission écrite du Coran dans les débuts de l'islam. Le codex Parisino-petropolitanus*, Brill, 2009, *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 13–2 [2011], pp. 112–113). Actually, I stated that it seemed unlikely that the manuscript was transcribed “dans un contexte officiel” (F. Déroche, op. cit. [2009], p. 153, which excludes Tillier's interpretation) and that it was in any case produced before the “*Maṣāḥif* project” of al-Ḥajjāj.

70 As the word *na'ja* is apparently written correctly in the Fustat codex, this would exclude that it could have been 'Abd al-'Azīz' copy (see Ibn Duqmāq, *ibid.*; al-Maqrīzī, *ibid.*).

71 O. Hamdan, *Studien zur Kanonisierung des Korantextes. Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrīs Beiträge zur Geschichte des Korans*, Wiesbaden, 2006, p. 141.

end, copies were sent to various large cities of the Empire.⁷² The information has probably to be taken critically since the diacriticals were in use at an earlier date and the manuscript evidence shows that the orthography had already begun to be upgraded before that date. However, some of these steps echo quite directly what has been observed in the manuscripts. In addition, the political overtone of the move is quite obvious and the implication of the ruling circles may have resulted in the commissioning of copies which were to reflect the might of the dynasty and its religious commitments. A detail in the account about ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Marwān’s codex might also indicate that some form of collation started to be applied at that moment: once the manuscript had been completed, a reward was offered to whom would find a scribal mistake in the copy and a *qārī*’ actually found one at 38: 23.⁷³

These conclusions are further strengthened by other copies of the Qur’an that can be directly related to the same group (O I) on the basis of their script. According to a tentative census of these copies in the four collections of early Qur’anic material, it turns out that a fair number of fragments are found among the “Damascus Papers” and two among the fragments from the ‘Amr mosque in Fustat.⁷⁴ No example of O I is present in the Kairouan collection and we shall have to wait the final publication of the Sanaa trove to know whether O I reached the Yemen.⁷⁵

Before examining some of the Damascus and Fustat fragments in O I script, I should briefly draw attention to a situation which may be compared to that described in the previous chapter, namely the coexistence of two formats of *muṣḥaf*, vertical and oblong. Among the latter, a version of O I close to that found on the Damascus and Fustat codices has been in use (fig. 26), next to another one, perhaps like Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 4321 (fig. 27) and certainly ŞE 3591 (fig. 28), which seems to verge on *ḥijāzī* style, with the shafts leaning to the right, although it is clearly more slender than the script of London, BL Or. 2165 (fig. 8). It would seem sensible to see in such fragments the forerunners of O I, a point which is partly supported by the orthography,⁷⁶ and to distinguish accordingly

72 See also Mālik b. Anas in Samhūdī: al-Samhūdī, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 668.

73 Ibn Duqmāq, op. cit., p. 73; al-Maqrīzī, op. cit., p. 31.

74 See Annex 1 below.

75 I was able to have an extensive overview of the Kairouan collection thanks to Dr. Rammah. As for the Sanaa fragments, I rely almost exclusively on what has been published to this day since I have only been able to have a look at a selection of material, mostly in *ḥijāzī* style.

76 Their margins vary from a copy to another one, as is the case for the Damascus and Fustat codices, suggesting a period of transition. O Ia points nevertheless to a more organized manuscript production.

between an earlier version (O Ia) and that illustrated by the Damascus and Fustat codices (O Ib). On the other hand, the probable swiftness of these developments may have allowed for some overlap.

In the “Damascus Papers” collection in the Museum of Turkish and Islamic art in Istanbul, a few fragments are related to O I.⁷⁷ Among them is a coherent group of vertical copies on parchment of about the same size, 25×19 cm (ŞE 4806, 6277, 7645, 10670, 12821/1 and 12903) to which can be added a smaller one (21×15 cm), with ŞE 1186 (fig. 29) and 5793; by their dimensions, they are directly related to the Damascus codex (24×19,5 cm). In addition, the fragments of three larger copies have also been preserved: ŞE 78 (32,5×28,5 cm), ŞE 63 (36,2×27,5 cm; fig. 30),⁷⁸ close to the dimensions of the Fustat codex (37×31 cm), and ŞE 71 (41,2×36 cm; fig. 31) which is slightly larger and might be a folio volume. On the other hand, there seems to be only one fragment (ŞE 5713, 14,4×12,8 cm), which indicates that copies of smaller size also existed. In the Marcel collection of the National Library of Russia, in addition to the leaves from the Fustat codex, a fragment from a Qur’anic manuscript written in O Ib script has been preserved: the folios of Marcel 12 (36,8×31 cm; fig. 32) are close to the larger variety of these Qur’anic codices exemplified by ŞE 63 or the Fustat codex.

The script of these various copies is—with some small variations—related to O Ib. The similitude is not only a matter of letter shapes or mise-en-page, it also has to do with the line module the various copyists have been using. The largest copies are in agreement with the Fustat codex as far as the number of lines to the page is concerned: ŞE 63 (fig. 30) and 71 (fig. 31) have 25 lines to the page. However, Marcel 12, in spite of its similarities with the Fustat codex, has only 22 lines to the page (fig. 32) and ŞE 78, 20 lines. Copies like ŞE 1186 (fig. 29), 4806 or 7645 are close to this model, although with a varying numbers of lines. A few copies illustrate what might be another tendency, with only 16 lines (ŞE 6277, 10670, 12903 [fig. 33] and 13009), which could point to multi-volume sets. In spite of this diversity, the module for those scripts remains fairly constant. In the majority of cases the lines measure between 10 and 12,7 mm in height, with only two instances of a clearly lesser value (ŞE 1186 and 5713), in spite of the variety of the manuscripts’ sizes: in the largest one, ŞE 71 (41,2×36 cm; 25 lines), a line is 12,7 mm high, very close to that of

77 As the work is still in progress, I shall give here only partial results.

78 A.S. Demirkol et al., 1400. *Yılnda Kur’an-ı kerim*, Istanbul, 2010, p. 147.

ŞE 10670 (12,5 mm), although the latter is written on substantially smaller folios (24,1×19,3 cm; 16 lines).⁷⁹ They retain the main characteristics which have been described (*scriptio continua*, margins, consistent division into verses), but a fair proportion exhibits a new feature: short vowels marked with red dots, as in the Damascus and Fustat codices. The date of their introduction remains open to debate. Their multiplication on the O Ib manuscripts suggests however that they could be contemporary with the diffusion of this script, which would be in agreement with what is reported of al-Ḥajjāj's "*Maṣāḥif* project". Among the copies which have been discussed here, some have the *basmala* written alone on the first line of the sura, ŞE 63, 78 or 4608 for instance. This was already the case of the *ḥijāzī* copy Saint Petersburg, NLR Marcel 19 (fig. 9)⁸⁰ and sometimes in the portion of the *Codex Parisino-petropolitanus* transcribed by Hand C, when the beginning of the new sura was on the top of the page.⁸¹

The ornamentation found on these fragments often only consists of drawings in black ink (fig. 29 and 31). An exception is an unpublished fragment with a sura divider (ŞE 4405a; fig. 34) based on the same composition with rosettes as in the Fustat codex (f. M 13) and another one with a succession of twigs supporting curved half-palmettes. The other examples are either relying on the repetition of a decorative compartment over the full width of the justification, or on a variety of braids or undulating lines. The end of the last line of a sura is often filled with clusters of dots (see fig. 27 and 29)—a presentation already noted on some of the manuscripts examined in the previous chapter, but a similarity with the final punctuation of a textual unit in some Syriac manuscripts can be detected in the two examples adduced here.⁸²

The results of this census are only indicative, as part of the evidence disappeared over the centuries and a few remaining fragments have still to be identified and reassembled. However, the concentration of such copies in Damascus and at a lesser degree in Fustat may indicate that O I was connected with the central region of the Empire. This palaeographically homogeneous group of manuscripts provides a fresh view of the changes which the Arabic

79 In ŞE 5793 and 13009 the height of a line is very close to the majority of cases (respectively 9,15–9,4 and 9 mm).

80 See ch. 2.

81 F. Déroche, op. cit. (2009), p. 30.

82 See for instance the MSS London, British Library, Add. 14571 and 14591, possibly also Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, folder No 20, f. 222b, dated respectively to 518AD, 569AD and 613–614AD (see W. Hatch, *An album of dated Syriac manuscripts*, Boston, 1946, pl. X, XXX and XL). I thank Mr. P. Neuenkirchen for drawing my attention to this point.

script and the *muṣḥaf* underwent by the end of the first/seventh and beginning of the second/eighth centuries. Two aspects seem especially important: the first one is that the work was undertaken by anonymous script designers who submitted the Arabic script to a complete revamp and the second one is the diffusion of the results among the copyists. The duration of this process of transformation remains unclear and it may have lasted some time, if the fragments Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 3591 (fig. 28) and 4321 (fig. 27) reflect a first step in the development of O I. The second point may imply that the Umayyad ruling elite played a role in the diffusion of O I and even exerted some form of control over the whole process of book production. The references common to those who transcribed these *muṣḥafs* (same shapes and some common habits) suggest that some sort of teaching/training had been set up for copyists/calligraphers. The B Ia script which can be related to the later development of the *ḥijāzī* style *muṣḥaf* could be a parallel evolution—in another milieu or in another region. The consistent size and mise-en-page of the largest copies can be the result of an official patronage—which the sources actually mention.⁸³ It is tempting to deduce from the account of al-Nadīm about calligraphy in Umayyad times that there was even a structure where the transcription was performed.⁸⁴ However, the diversity of the fragments in O I which have been preserved, ranging from the elegant Fustat codex to more common copies, indicates that this style had some success and that its diffusion was not restricted to the elite or to official patronage.

The graphical coherence of the copies should not hide some variety in the lay out of the text, notably in the use of colours. An unpublished oblong copy has the *basmala* written in red and in the fragment ŞE 10670 the junction between two suras is highlighted by a series of lines in red and green.⁸⁵ Other fragments, written in other kinds of scripts, may be contemporary with these. One of them (TIEM, ŞE 12914), an oblong format, has some of its lines written in colour, without any pattern of distribution which could for the moment allow us to understand the purpose of this presentation.⁸⁶ In another fragment from

83 The role of al-Ḥajjāj has been discussed previously. In his *Fihrist*, al-Nadīm tells the story of caliph ‘Umar II who commissioned a copy to Khālid b. Abī al-Hayyāj, then declined to pay for it (*K. al-Fihrist*, ed. R. Tajaddud, Tehran, 1971, p. 9).

84 I shall return to this topic in the next chapter.

85 F. Déroche, op. cit. (2002), fig. 14; id., Inks and page setting in early Qur’ānic manuscripts, in *From codicology to technology. Islamic manuscripts and their place in scholarship*, S. Brinkmann et B. Wiesmüller éd., Berlin, p. 84 and fig. 1.

86 See F. Déroche, op. cit. (2002), p. 634 and fig. 15; id., op. cit., pp. 85–88 and fig. 2.

the Damascus collection (TIEM, §E 362), also in oblong format, the colours are used in progressively more elaborate compositions, starting with alternating groups of lines in brown, green or red and culminating in the small portion of the manuscript which has been preserved in a chessboard-like composition, then in a diamond extending across the writing surface.⁸⁷ This use of coloured inks reminds one of the Late Antique *carminata figurata*. However, there is no link whatsoever between the text and the figures.⁸⁸

The Umayyad codices of Damascus and Fustat are of course important for the information they provide about the date and the chronological implications they entail. They also show a dramatic change in the conception of the *muṣḥaf*, reflecting the control over the text the Umayyads were trying to implement. The diffusion of a regularised version of the early script, O I, closely related to that of official inscriptions, coincided with the emergence of a new concern, that of a book reflecting through its beauty the importance and the perfection of the text. This change is meaningful as it reveals the aspirations of a more sophisticated community—at least in some circles, well aware of their cultural environment. The reasons behind this new concern can be sought in a general tendency which has been described in the following terms by Barry Flood about the architectural realisations of the Umayyads in Damascus: “the desire to rival the best efforts of the Christians and the need to convince by appearances were adequately addressed by the construction of a monumental ensemble which was not only worthy of an imperial capital, but strongly redolent of that most familiar by sight or reputation to the Syrian subjects of the Umayyads.”⁸⁹ In the field of manuscript production, the new *muṣḥaf*, eventually produced under official patronage, was challenging the Christian luxury Bibles by its appearance. Its also conveyed visually the idea that the text transcribed in the same script, O I, was identical. An aesthetic and ideologically motivated change, based on material choices (the regularised script, the calamus adapted

87 F. Déroche, op. cit. (2002), p. 634 and fig. 16; id., op. cit. (2009), pp. 88–93 and fig. 3–4.

88 On the *carmina figurata*, see U. Ernst, *Carmen figuratum, Geschichte des Figurenedichts von den antiken Ursprüngen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* [Pictura et poesis, 1], Cologne/Weimar/Vienna, 1991. The case of this fragment seems however more related with what Ernst calls “Randformen des Figurenedichts”, among which the *Codex aureus*, MS Stockholm, Kungl. Bibl. Cod. A 35, is certainly the best known example (see K. Bierbrauer, s.v. *Codex Aureus*, I.C.A. aus Canterbury, *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, t. 2, p. 2199).

89 B. Flood, *The Great mosque of Damascus. Studies on the makings of an Umayyad visual culture*, Leiden-Boston, Leiden, 2001, p. 226.

to it, the margins and in some cases the illuminations), had taken place. Judging from the number of surviving fragments in O I script, this style succeeded in quickly gaining a handsome diffusion.

Appendix I

A selection of Umayyad Qur'anic manuscripts in O I script and vertical format.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 63 (fig. 30)

Text: 2: 91–119; 3: 199–4: 2; 4: 4–7; 5: 71–6: 38; 6: 78–161; 7: 74–95; 9: 19–36; 28: 78–29: 12; 29: 57–30: 38; 31: 24–32: 12; 34: 3–22; 39: 9–32

Parchment. 71f.

Folio size: 36,2 × 27,5 cm.

25 l. Writing surface: 30,5 × 22 cm

[module = 12,7 mm].

Vowel signs (red dots).

Basmala alone on the first line of the sura, followed by dashes.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 71 (fig. 31)

Text: 23: 77–24: 16.

Parchment. 2 f.

Folio size: 41,2 × 36 cm.

25 l. Writing surface: 30,6 × 26,7 cm [module = 12,7 mm].

No vowel signs.

Sura headbands in ink, with a vignette.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 78

Text: 25: 77–31: 27.

Parchment. 31 f.

Folio size: 32,5 × 28,5 cm

25 l. Writing surface: 24,5–25 × 22 cm [module = 10,4 mm].

A few vowel signs (red dots).

Basmala alone on the first line of the sura.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 321 (the Umayyad codex of Damascus; fig. 19–24)

Text: 17: 101–20: 120; 23: 78–100; 24: 1–24; 24: 40–60; 29: 7–33; 55: 34: 9–38; 88: 40: 84–45: 16; 46: 32–47: 13; 47: 38–48: 17; 53: 52–54: 22.

Parchment. 78 f.

Folio size: 24 × 19,5 cm.

18–21 l. Writing surface: 19,6/21 × 16/16,7 cm. [module = 10,5–11,5 mm]. Ruling with a dry point.

A few vowel signs (red dots).

Illuminated sura headbands.

Bibliography: F. Déroche, New evidence about Umayyad book hands, in *Essays in honour of Salāh al-Dīn al-Munajjid* [al-Furqān publication, n° 70], London, 2002, pp. 629–634.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 1186 (fig. 29)

Text: 30: 41–31: 25; 32: 21–33: 28; 34: 14–28; 35: 28–40; 40: 22–41: 21.

Parchment. 18 f.

Folio size: 20,7 × 14,6 cm.

19–26 l. Writing surface: 16,2/16,7 × 11,8 cm [module = 6,7–9 mm]. Ruling with a dry point.

No vowel signs.

The end of the sura is followed by a line of dashes and triangles of dashes. A crude ornament separates the suras.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 4806

Text: 21: 36–57; 23: 6–27; 24: 55–38: 88.

Parchment. 47 f.

Folio size: 24,6 × 20 cm

19–26 l. Writing surface: 20,6/21 × 17,3 cm (in one case 21,5 × 14 cm) [module = 8,6–11,4 mm]. Ruling with a dry point.

Basmala alone on the first line of the sura, followed by dashes.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 5713

Text: 6: 119–126; 7: 22–30; 7: 43–89; 8: 9–9: 18.

Parchment. 18 f.

Folio size: 14,4 × 12,8 cm.

16–19 l. Writing surface: 12,1/12,5 × 10 cm [module = 6,9–8 mm].

No vowel signs.

The end of sura 8 is followed by a line of dashes between two *hā'* and interrupted by a *mīm* (?). A blank line separates the suras.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 5793

Text: 9: 15–38; 9: 116–10: 10.

Parchment. 4 f.

Folio size: 21,5 × 17,7 cm.

19–20 l. Writing surface: 17–17,4 × 13–13,5 cm [module = 9,1–9,4 mm].

No vowel signs.

Basmala stretched out alone on the first line of the sura.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 6277

Text: 24: 61–34: 45: 35: 40–36: 11: 36: 40–37: 61: 91: [11]–93: [8].

Parchment, with replacements in paper. 90 f.

Folio size: 25 × 18,4 cm.

16 l. Writing surface: 15,3/17 × 13,3 cm [module = 10,2–11,3 mm]

A few vowel signs (red dots).

Basmala alone on the first line of the sura.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 7645

Text: 3: 115–4: 75.

Parchment. 22 f.

Folio size: 24,8 × 20,5 cm.

21–23 l. Writing surface: 21,4/22,4 × 17,5/18,1 cm [module = 10,2–10,7 mm]. Ruling with ink.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 10670

Text: 4: 173–5: 4: 5: 41–44: 5: 48–61: 5: 66–72: 5: 98–106: 5: 110–6: 1: 6: 11–20.

Parchment. 10 f.

Folio size: 24,1 × 19,3 cm.

16 l. Writing surface: 18,8 × 14,3 cm [module = 12,5 mm].

Modern vocalisation has been added in red.

The last three lines of the sura are written in green ink, then the *basmala*, alone on the first line of the next sura, is written in red, followed by the first two lines in green.

The sura titles are written in green and probably contemporaneous with the copy.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 12821/1

Text: 17: 23–108.

Parchment. 6 f.

Folio size: 24,9 × 17,3 cm.

20–21 l. Writing surface: 19,7/20 × 13,4 cm [module = 10–10,3 mm]. Ruling with a dry point.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 12903/1 (fig. 33)

Text: 2: ??–[29]; 2: 113–[116]; 2: 177–186; 2: [206]–215.

Parchment. 4 f.

Folio size: 25 × 18,5 cm.

16 l. Writing surface: 15,5–16 × 13,2 cm [module = 10,3–10,6 mm].

Vowel signs (red dots).

Frame ruling.

Istanbul, TIEM ŞE 13009

Text: 5: 6–12.

Parchment. 1 f.

Folio size: 18,6 × 17,4 cm.

16 l. Writing surface: 13,5 × 15 cm [module = 9 mm].

Saint Petersburg, NLR Marcel 12 (fig. 32)

Text: 10: 22–11: 102.

Parchment. 10 f.

Folio size: 36,8 × 31 cm.

22 l. Writing surface: 26,7 × 23,1 cm. [module = 12,7 mm].

Vowel signs (red dots).

A title (in red) has been added.

Saint Petersburg, NLR Marcel 13 (the Umayyad codex of Fustat; fig. 25)

Text: 15: 14–17: 12; 17: 36–23: 12; 24: 49–61; 25: 16–27: 89; 30: 3–41: 32.

Parchment: 64 f.

Folio size: 37 × 31 cm.

25 l. Writing surface: 27, 5 × 23,2 cm [module = 11,5 mm].

Vowel signs (red dots).

Illuminated sura headbands.

Bibliography: F. Déroche, *Les manuscrits du Coran: Aux origines de la calligraphie coranique* [Bibliothèque Nationale, Catalogue des manuscrits arabes, 2^e partie, Manuscrits musulmans, I/1], Paris, 1983, pp. 144–145, no 268; id., *Colonnes, vases et rinceaux. Sur quelques enluminures d'époque omeyyade*, *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 2004* [2006], pp. 227–264; A. George, *The rise of Islamic calligraphy*, London, 2010, pp. 75–78 and fig. 50–51.