

A manuscript on the history of Muslim Granada: the Nubdhat al-‘aṣr fī akhbār mulūk Banī Naṣr and other texts *

Th. Marita Wijntjes **

Introduction

Leyden University has a long tradition of interest in the history of Al-Andalus, which is reflected in the manuscript collection of its library. A few decades ago this library acquired, from the legacy of the famous Lévi-Provençal, a small volume in an attractive red Moroccan binding, containing a collection of three texts, two of them concerning the history of Granada. (1) Professor Van Koningsveld was the first one to study it, and he described it as probably being a copy of a manuscript in Rabat. He suggested that it might have been made by order of Lévi-Provençal himself. (2) Later Van Koningsveld obtained photocopies of yet another similar manuscript in an unidentified private collection in Morocco. He called my attention to the Leyden manuscript and kindly put a photocopy of his photocopies of the Moroccan manuscript at my disposal. Those two manuscripts I studied, and I made use of additional information provided by two other manuscripts, the one in Rabat of which unfortunately I have not seen even photographs, and another one in the Escorial which is only partly similar to the other ones and which I have not seen either. Henceforward I'll call the Leyden manuscript L, the one in Rabat R, the one from the private collection T for reasons I will explain presently, and the one in the Escorial will be indicated by E.

The contents of the the majmū‘a or collection of three texts in those manuscripts are not entirely new. The first text has been published several times, the second one only once. Although both have been used extensively in studies of the period concerned, they have never been object of a critical analysis. So new light might be shed on them. The third one has not been published at all. First I will discuss the separate texts and the problems connected with them, and then I will try to establish time and place of origin of the collection as it has come down in at least two, maybe three copies.

Text I

This text is known in the literature as: Nubdhat al-‘aṣr fī akhbār mulūk Banī Naṣr (Contemporary booklet on the Naṣrid kings), cited as Nubdha. It is a chronicle of the last years of the independent Muslim kingdom of Granada, the first years after its fall and the forced christianisation of the remaining inhabitants which led to the exodus of many of them. It is almost the only extant testimony of those dramatic events in Arabic, and its value as a first rate source has long been realised. It was first published and brought to the attention of the learned public by the German orientalist Marc Müller in 1863. (3) His edition was based on E and bears the title: Akhbār al-‘aṣr fī inqīḍā’ dawlat Banī Naṣr (Contemporary news on the fall of the Naṣrid dynasty). At the end it contains the important message that the redaction was finished on 24 Jumādā II 947 (October 27th 1540). (4) The colophon of this manuscript, which combines the Nubdha with an 8th / 15th century text on the history of Meknes, seems to state that it was copied in 1257 /1841, according to the author of the catalogue of the historical texts in the Escorial. (5) Müller published the Akhbār al-‘aṣr as plain text, without

any punctuation or other devices for making it more accessible to the modern reader. The corrections and conjectures he considered necessary are faithfully recorded in the notes, further explanation is given in the notes to the German translation which accompanies the Arabic text.

In 1925 Shakīb Arslān added Müller's Arabic text as an appendix to his translation into Arabic of De Chateaubriand's short novel "Les aventures du dernier Abencerage". (6) He introduced punctuation and paragraphs, and added some short comments and remarks on expressions or words. His text contains hardly any mistakes compared with Müller's, the most severe being the omission of page 30. (7)

In the thirties Alfredo Bustani, on a manuscript searching tour through Morocco, came over a few pages on the final phase of the history of Granada which he recognised as parts of the text he had seen in Shakīb Arslān's book. He succeeded in finding a complete manuscript titled *Nubdhat al-‘aṣr fī mulūk Banī Naṣr* in the library of a learned man (he kept the name secret) in Tetuan, and he used that to publish an extended text. (8) Looking at the photographs that illustrate his book I discovered that the manuscript of which Van Koningsveld had obtained a photocopy was the very same one that Bustani had found in Tetuan. For that reason I call it T. The colophon has no indications about the date of the redaction or of the copying, but gives the names of the copyist and of the person who commissioned it. It is probably still owned by the latter's family, for although its present whereabouts are officially unknown, a reliable source indicated that it is preserved somewhere near Tetuan.

The way Bustani handled the manuscript is unsatisfactory. He described it very briefly, and only from the text accompanying the photographs can it be realized that the manuscript consists of two parts, called by him A and B. The *Nubdha* fills A, the colophon is at the end of B, but not a word about the contents of B. Bustani's edition is the most readable of the three extant ones, but the price to obtain that result was too high. The insertion of punctuation and paragraphs might be accepted, though it is not always in accordance with the indications of the manuscript. Obvious errors were corrected with the defective form being given in a note, as Müller did. But in order to get a smooth reading, phrases were altered, words added or omitted. It is obvious that Bustani had both manuscript T and Müller's edition on his desk, and that he compared them. When there was a divergence he chose which of the two he thought fitted best, but without a warning to the reader. And he committed not a few mistakes in reading the manuscript. He added as a final chapter the beginning of part B. This text was not included in Müller's edition and I consider it as an independent work which I will discuss as Text II.

The name of the author of the *Nubdha* seems to be provided by L. Inside its cover a typewritten piece of paper has been attached which reads: " b. al-Ḥaṭīb Lisān ad-dīn. *Nubdat al-‘aṣr fī a r mulūk Banī Naṣr*. Followed by an unknown *Qasīda* with commentary." In the catalogue of the manuscripts of the General Library of Rabat the same title and the same author are mentioned by Lévi-Provençal, and consequently Brockelmann inserted the work in the list of works by Ibn al-Khaṭīb as nr. 23. (9) Had Lévi-Provençal read the text before he made the catalogue (his pencilnotes prove that he did in fact read L), he would not have made this mistake. Ibn al-Khaṭīb cannot possibly have been the author since he was long dead when the events described in the manuscript took place. Besides, its style is lightyears away

from that of the famous author. When and why his name was connected with the manuscript remains unclear, in any case it will have raised its market value.

Some clues to the real identity of the author might be gathered from his work, so it will be useful to scrutinize it. The chronicle starts with a very short resumé of the animosity between sultan Abū 'l-Ḥasan and his brother Muammad b. Sa'd al-Zaghal, and continues with the great army show organised in 882-3/1478 by Abū 'l-Ḥasan on a stage near the Alhambra. This spectacle, a festival for the entire population of Granada, lasted about a month, but ended in a catastrophe. After a thunderstorm the city was flooded, with heavy damage as a result. Abū 'l-Ḥasan had been a good popular king, but after this event he changed for the worse. Under the influence of bad counsellors and a hypocritical vizir he neglected the affairs of the state and led a life of luxury and (sometimes ignoble) pleasure. Most scandalous was his love-affair with the Christian slave-girl Thurayya, member of the household of the queen, his niece. (10) Abū 'l-Ḥasan went to the point of putting his new love in the position of first spouse. Since he had sons by both women, the stage was set for future complications. A period of anarchy followed, the sultan had first to fight his brother and later also his eldest son by his legal wife Abū 'Abd Allāh. The latter had lived under supervision in the Alhambra together with his younger brother and their mother. The mother got scared by "human satans" and, with help from outside, organised their escape from the control of their father. Abū 'Abd Allāh was recognised as sultan by several cities, among them the capital Granada, But when in the continuing wars against the Christians he attacked Lucena he was captured and handed over to the king of Castile. This is the fatal turningpoint in the history of the kingdom of Granada, states the Nubdha. The king of Castile treated him well and after releasing him used him as a tool to get control over the sultanate. After several years Abū 'l-Ḥasan, again sultan of Granada, fell severely ill and was replaced by his brother Muammad b. Sa'd al-Zaghal. Abū 'Abd Allāh however did not accept being passed over. The city of Granada with the Alhambra was in the hands of Muammad b. Sa'd, but the Albaicin, one of the suburbs, rebelled and chose the side of Abū 'Abd Allāh. The resulting civil war, whose horrors the author did not wish to describe, facilitated the advance and finally the victory of the king of Castile. First the enemy attacked and conquered the fortresses and towns west of Granada. Muammad b. Sa'd came to their rescue and lost the city of Granada to his nephew. He continued the struggle from Guadix, but then the enemy advanced his control over the eastern side of the kingdom of Granada. After the severe siege of Baza, Muammad b. Sa'd gave up and made peace with the king of Castile. Some said that his defection was intended to revenge himself on his nephew. Now only the city of Granada was still independent and had a peace treaty with Castile. Abū 'Abd Allāh however refused to fulfill the promises with which he obviously had obtained his freedom from the king of Castile and did not hand over the Alhambra and part of the city to him. Years of fighting and siege followed, until the city, on the brink of starvation, had to surrender. Rumour had it that there was a secret understanding between Abū 'Abd Allāh and the king of Castile. (11) Muammad b. Sa'd had lost the favour of the king in the process and had had to emigrate to North Africa. The conditions of surrender were rather favourable, many Muslims stayed in the city, many others emigrated. Abū 'Abd Allāh was forced to live in Andarax, later he crossed the sea as well and ended his days in Morocco. After some years the Muslims were forced to abandon their faith and way of living, many of them preferred exile. There was no longer a place for Islam in al-Andalus.

In the introduction the author apologizes for not being able to write in the usual elegant

literary manner. He wrote, indeed, a simple and not flawless Arabic, containing some colloquialisms. He did not add poetry or rhymed prose, he did however make use of rhetorical means as dialogue, anecdotes, discourse and fragments of letters. Well told are his stories (12) of the flood of Granada (p.3-5), Muammad b. Sa'd's victory in Moclin (p.14-15), the siege of Málaga where the starving citizens ate all their domestic animals and even leaves and bark (24-25), the siege and surrender of Baza (p.26-27) and Abū 'Abd Allāh's assault on Alhendin where three walls had to be broken before the central fortress could be forced to surrender to the Muslims (p.32-33). There are many details on the raids and counterraids round Granada and the precarious situation of the city when its foodsupply over the Sierra Nevada was cut off by rough winter weather. Very vivid is the picture of the discussion between Abū 'Abd Allāh and his people which led to the surrender of the city (p.39-41). But there are also scores of standard phrases on the conquest of fortress so and so after heavy fighting, or the loss of a town to the accursed enemy. However, hardly any military data as to numbers of cavalry and infantry, quantity and quality of weapons, tactics and logistics are provided. The author shows more concern with commercial matters, the foodmarket in particular. Furthermore, he evidently had no interest whatsoever in religious matters, he never cites the Qur'ān and he uses only the most common place religious expressions.

The chronicle has other remarkable features. First, only the names of three members of the Naṣrid royal family are mentioned, all the many other protagonists are anonymous. We do not learn the names either of Abū 'l-Ḥasan's bad counsellors or of his wicked vizir. The names of Abū 'Abd Allāh's supporters and of the initiators of the revolt in the Albaicin, of important generals, commanders and governors, of Christian kings, negotiators and knights remain in the dark. There are two exceptions, the Christian slave-girl called Thurayya (the name of the legal spouse is not given), and near the end the Banū Sarrāj who were "of course" allowed to stay in Granada at a time when all other inhabitants were forced to leave the city. And it is striking that, though the tone of the story is rather neutral with an occasional damnation of the Christian adversary, the author explodes with indignation when mentioning the supporters of Abū 'Abd Allāh and especially those who initiated the revolt of the Albaicin. For them he uses the word human satans, on several occasions.

As I stated earlier, manuscript E gives 947/1540 as date of completion of the text of the Nubdha. This means that the chronicle was written long after the events described took place. The most urgent question to be answered is whether the author was an eyewitness to the events he reported. Shakīb Arslān presented him as a person who had seen with his own eyes the fall of Granada. (13) Bustani considered the author as an old soldier who had taken part in the hopeless defense of his country. (14) But the chronicle does not bear the formal signs of a personal account. It is written in the third, not in the first person, and in a rather unemotional matter of fact style. Three times the expression "qāla al-mu'allif" or "qāla al-mu'arrikh" (the author or the chronicler said) occurs in the first part of the text, ruling out the possibility that he saw himself what he relates. (15) But even what looks like an eyewitness-report may be taken from another source, as will be shown by the story of the flood of Granada.

In order to understand the historiographic context in which the Nubdha was written, and as there are no other Arabic sources available, I consulted several contemporary Spanish chronicles. (16,17) Most useful of them was the chronicle by Hernando de Baeza, known as *Las Cosas de Granada*, or *Relación*, written in 1510. (18) I was surprised to find its text in Müller's edition of the Nubdha, especially because this author did not take the trouble to explain why he incorporated it here.

It is a very attractive chronicle told in a lively anecdotal and uncomplicated style. Hernando de Baeza spent several years in Granada, acting as intermediary between Abū ‘Abd Allāh and the Catholic kings, at the request of the first. He spoke Arabic, though his conversations with Abū ‘Abd Allāh were in Castilian. The true nature of his function remains hidden, he might have acted as a spy. Later he served the Catholic kings as their secretary. (19) In Granada he collected stories and chronicles about the past, as he tells in the title of the book, and in this way he was able to furnish many details which are not known from other sources. The story starts with the first years of Abū ‘I-Ḥasan and the vicissitudes of his reign, and evidently continued until the surrender of the city, although the end is missing. As to atmosphere the two chronicles are as far apart as possible, though roughly covering the same period. Hernando de Baeza gave much attention to the jealousy between the two wives of Abū ‘I-Ḥasan, for instance. For his Christian readers he explained functions and customs by giving Christian equivalents. One episode which is found in both the *Relación* and the *Nubdha* shows a remarkable similarity in wording, and that is the story of the flood of Granada. It looks like an eyewitness account in both, but it is known that Hernando de Baeza was not yet present in Granada when it happened, since he arrived in 891/1486. He must have taken it from some source, but not from the *Nubdha* since that was written in 1540, whereas the *Relación* was finished in 1510. (20)

Consequently the possibility has to be considered that the author of the *Nubdha* took the story from the *Relación*. However, the divergence in the dating of the flood seems to contradict this supposition. Hernando de Baeza, who generally shows no concern for dates, mentions casually that the catastrophe happened on St. John’s Day. This saint’s day was celebrated as *mihrajān* by Muslims and Christians alike on the 24th of June. (21) The author of the *Nubdha* gives the exact date of the catastrophe: “22 muarram 883 which equals April 26 of the Christian calendar” (p. 3). The purpose of communicating this (correct) equivalence to a supposed Muslim public is brought to light by another case of double dating followed by a remark on the state of the crop (p. 37). Here its function is obvious: because the Muslim calendar has no relation to the seasons it gives a clue to the importance of the moment, but only a public familiar with the Christian calendar could have appreciated it.

The next phrase in the *Nubdha* might provide an explanation of what happened. It says: “..on that day, the last day of the army show, which was for them the big festival (*mihrajān*) and the most important occasion of recreation ..” This is a strange remark as the author of the *Nubdha* isolates himself from the people of Granada or at least from the people celebrating the feast day. The implication is that he borrowed the story from someone else’s observations, probably the same source that served De Baeza. The crucial word is *mihrajān*, interpreted by the author of the *Nubdha* as an occasion to celebrate a feast day, not as a regular festival. With the double date he stressed the extraordinary nature of the event. It might even be considered a correction of a wrong date. De Baeza explained *mihrajān* for his Christian readers as St. John’s Day without knowing the correct date from his own experience. The question whether the author of the *Nubdha* was an eyewitness to the events he described cannot be answered with complete certainty. But it is likely that, having used other sources in the first part, in the last sections, on the siege of Granada and what happened after the surrender of the city, he is reporting what he has experienced himself.

When the history as told in the *Nubdha* is compared with what is known from other sources, some important facts appear to have been left out. Thus it is not told that as a result of Abū ‘Abd Allāh’s captivity Granada was confronted with a constitutional crisis: was it allowed to

obey a captive sultan? The high clergy decided that it was not and gave out a fatwā in which Abū ‘Abd Allāh was condemned. (22) That was the reason that he was not allowed back as sultan of Granada and that he had to fight his uncle from the Albaicin. And when, after the siege and loss of Baza, Muammad b. Sa‘d made peace with the king of Castile, it appears by implication that the city had been in his hands, but this is not said explicitly. It is remarkable too that the author did not criticize this defection of a sultan who seems to have been more to his liking than the detested Abū ‘Abd Allāh (p.28).

What we have learned about the unknown author of the *Nubdha* may now be summarized. He wrote a carefully designed account of the events that led to the loss of al-Andalus for Islam. It is composed of eyewitness accounts, not necessarily his own, of several expeditions of Muammad b. Sa‘d al-Zaghal and of inside information on the siege of Granada, intermingled with short reports of many events. The author was neither a soldier nor a theologian, but perhaps a merchant. He was a citizen of Granada, for the events in the Albaicin are told from the point of view of an inhabitant of that city, not by someone living in the Albaicin. The fact that he is as well informed about the movements of Muammad b. Sa‘d as about those of Abū ‘Abd Allāh when the latter had taken possession of the city, leads me to the supposition that he held some kind of (minor) office. For officials do their job regardless of the prince in power. The dislike for the people behind the revolt is in accordance with the official policy. The expression “human satans” is used in contemporary letters as well. (23)

The next questions to be answered are where the chronicle was written, for what purpose, and what audience the author might have had in mind. From the way the events which led to the expulsion of many Muslims from Spain are told, it seems likely that the author stayed in or nearby the city during that time. But as the story ends with the expulsion there is no information as to his whereabouts thereafter. There are however a few indications that he might have written his book in Spain. I found a remark in al-Maqqarī’s *Azhār al-riyāḍ* that is possibly connected with this author. When discussing the correct date of the surrender of Granada al-Maqqarī states that he had seen that date in a work written on these events by one of the persons who stayed behind (ba‘ḍ al-muta’akhhirīn). (24) Al-Maqqarī knew the *Nubdha*, for he based his own version of the fall of Granada on it (however without mentioning his source). (25) So he might have had our author in mind. What I observed on the use of the Christian calendar also points to the direction of a prolonged stay in a Christian environment.

The limited use of names certainly has a connection with the purpose of the book and the intended public. Its effect is to bring the work to a higher level of abstraction, and to give it a political character. By stressing the evil consequences of internal strife and by showing the treachery of the Christians the author wishes to warn his public. On the other hand, what happened to Granada was in conformity with the will of God, and the actions of men only served to execute His decision. In that framework the story of the flood of Granada which I discussed in a previous paragraph must be seen. I do not doubt that the city was flooded, though perhaps the damage was exaggerated. In any case no loss of lives is reported. But the main function of the story is that it serves as a foreshadowing of the God-willed fate of Granada. Al-Maqqarī also made use of this device, but he found another story, the discovery of a short poem on a weathercock predicting the fall of Granada. (He has an abridged version of the flood without giving it special attention.) And to stress the danger of internal strife, he took a passage from Ibn ‘Aṣim’s book *Rawḍat al-riḍā*. In al-Maqqarī’s case the warning must

be seen against the background of the anarchical political situation in Morocco at the beginning of the 17th century. (26) Hernando de Baeza was also a child of his time, he let the fall of Granada be preceded by the appearance of a comet, a certain sign of trouble to come.

The outcome of the analysis is, that the Nubdha must be handled with care when using it as a source. As is the case with many historical texts, its primary goal was not the recording of events but the bringing of a message, and its value as a source should be weighed against that message.

Text II

The second text is a very short one, headed, after the invocation of the Prophet, by the words: wa-min shar qaṣīdat Ibn ‘Abdūn raimahu Allāh ta‘ālā mā naṣṣuhu. (27) Since Müller didn't mention this text, it is evidently missing in E. It is not certain that it is contained in R, in any case it is not mentioned in Lévi-Provençal's catalogue. Bustani published this text as final chapter of the Nubdha, as stated earlier, but without the heading. I think this is unjustified, for the following reasons. In T it occupies page 1-5 of part B, whereas the last page of A, the end of the Nubdha, is half blank. So the copyist did not consider the two texts as one work. The same holds for L, where it starts on page 22b and the Nubdha ends on page 21b, page 22a being a blank. That the text is not found in E might be considered as additional proof that it was not an integral part of the Nubdha. But my opinion is based first of all on the contents of the text. It begins with a short narrative of the events which took place after the surrender of Granada, in essence the same story that is told in the last paragraphs of the Nubdha. This section is followed by a survey of the emigration of Muslims to North Africa. The style of this short chronicle differs so much from that of the Nubdha, that I consider it the work of another anonymous author, written at an unknown date.

The opening words of this text are enigmatic, for they seem to have no relation to its contents. Ibn ‘Abdūn was an Andalusian poet who lived at the end of the 5th/11th and the beginning of the 6th/12th century. He acquired great fame by his poem Al-qaṣīda al-bassāma bi-atwāq al-amāma, which was a poem on the misfortunes of several dynasties from Darius till the Aftāsides. (28) Half a century later an equally famous commentary was written by Ibn Badrūn, titled Shar qaṣīdat Ibn ‘Abdūn. (29) This was a popular work, preserved in many manuscripts and published several times, among others by the Dutch orientalist Dozy. (30) The sad story of the emigration from Granada, however, is not to be found in this work. My guess is that this narrative was added, in the text or in the margin, to a manuscript of the Shar qaṣīdat Ibn ‘Abdūn, since the misfortune of the Naṣrids could be considered a case similar to those treated in the poem. The person who composed the collection had this (as yet unidentified) manuscript at his disposal, thought the story fitting and added it.

Text III

The third text has never been published, though its existence as part of the collection has been known for some time. Its title in T and L is: wa-min takmīl zahr al-riyāḍ lil-imām Abī ‘Abd Allāh sīdī Muammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qanṭrī al-Qaṣrī. But R has: Takmīl zahr al-riyāḍ fī radd mā shana‘ahu al-qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ. Therefore it was considered by Lévi-Provençal, who described the collection on the basis of R, and by Brockelmann and Van Koningsveld on his authority (31), to be a supplement written by Muammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qanṭrī al-Qaṣrī to a book called Zahr al-riyāḍ fī radd mā/man shana‘ahu al-qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ by Muammad b. Muammad al-

Ḥaydarī al-Dimashqī (821/1418-888/1483). (32) This description, however, is wrong both with regard to the author of the work as to the title of the supplemented book.

This author, Muammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qanṭrī al-Qaṣrī, (33) belonged to a family of savants in Al-Qṣar al-Kabīr (34), whose first recorded member was Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muammad b. ‘Alī, who died in 1018/1609. (35) This person’s grandson Muammad b. Muammad b. Muammad b. ‘Alī, who died in 1062/1652, is the one Lévi-Provençal and others after him considered as the author of the Takmīl. (36) The Muammad b. ‘Abd Allāh mentioned in the manuscripts, however, is a person whose place in the family remains unclear and whose vital dates are unknown. No other work by him is recorded.

The subject of the Takmīl was supposed to be the qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ (476-544 /1084-1149), a native of Ceuta and a man of immense renown both in Morocco and in al-Andalus. (37) Even as late as the 9th/15th century his work was considered of sufficient importance to write a reaction to it, and by the 11th/16th century he still had not been forgotten.

When I studied the text I discovered that it resembled very much al-Maqqarī’s *Azhār al-riyāḍ*. Which book, as I then remembered, has ‘Iyāḍ in its complete rhyming title: *Azhār al-riyāḍ fī akhbār ‘Iyāḍ*. (38) In theory it is possible that al-Maqqarī borrowed from the Takmīl, as the date of its redaction is unknown. The *Dalīl mu’arrikh al-Maghrib al-aqṣā* describes the Takmīl as a continuation of al-Maqqarī’s work with information on the qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ that had escaped that author. (39) That is only partially correct, as an analysis of the texts shows that al-Qanṭrī used the *Azhār al-riyāḍ* as the basis for his own book.

The biography of ‘Iyāḍ plays only a minor roll in both works. Al-Maqqarī did not follow a scheme fixed in advance but his book looks more like a file to which material was added when it came to the attention of the author. Al-Qanṭrī wrote a denser version by omitting non-relevant information and restoring a logical (chronological) order. (40) First some details of the genealogy and of the name of ‘Iyāḍ’s family are discussed. Then the book continues with descriptions of Ceuta by several authors, among others by al-Maqqarī’s favourite Ibn al-Khaṭīb. The loss of Ceuta to the Christians is commemorated with an elegy, which calls to the mind the sad fate of al-Andalus and the loss of all its cities, above all of Toledo. A list of emigrated families (41) is followed by a description of al-Andalus, an analysis of the causes of its loss to the Christians and a survey of its history with citations from literary works. Both al-Maqqarī and al-Qanṭrī continue with integral citations of poetry and prose relating to its fate. First the letter written by the vizir al-‘Uqaylī in the name of Abū ‘Abd Allāh, the last sultan of Granada, to the sultan of Fez. Then a poem of ‘Abd Allāh Abū ‘l-‘Abbās Amad al-Daqqūn on the situation of al-Andalus after the king of Castile had taken over the Alhambra, followed by a famous elegy on al-Andalus by Abū ‘l-Ṭayyib Ṣāliḥ b. Abī Sharīf al-Rundī (42) Next a poem by Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Abbār, poet of Valencia, with which he was sent to the emir of Tunis to implore his help for the city under siege. (43) The Takmīl has a longer version. The Takmīl seems to end with the poem that the Morisco's of Spain sent to the Turkish sultan Bayazet to ask his support for their cause, also a more extended version. (44) But after some phrases usually employed to end a book, there is surprisingly a final section with material that is not taken from al-Maqqarī. The Andalusian statesman Ibn Abī Rabī‘ sent a poem to Muḥammad b. Abī Ibrāhīm to be read by him to his master ‘Alī al-Sharīf, an Alawite heroic chief with a saintly reputation living in the first half of the 15th century. The purpose of the poem, that flattered both of them, was to invite ‘Alī al-Sharīf to come to the rescue of the Muslims in al-Andalus once again. When it became known that ‘Alī al-Sharīf preferred to do the pilgrimage, the Andalusians sent Abū Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ b. Abī Sharīf al-

Rundī to win the support of the faqīhs of Fez for this appeal. He attracted their attention by reading the famous poem by Abū l-Ṭayyib Ṣāliḥ b. Abī Sharīf al-Rundī (which had been cited earlier in the Takmīl) at the entrance of the Qarawīyyīn mosque. Moved by the fate of the Andalusians, the faqīhs wrote a letter to Muḥammad b. Abī Ibrāhīm, and as a result ʿAlī al-Sharīf changed his mind and once more crossed the strait. (45)

A shorter version of the poem by Ibn Abī Rabīʿ and parts of the accompanying story are found in the Kitāb al-istiḡṣāʾ by al-Nāsirī (46), who borrowed it from al-Ifrānī's Nuzhat al-ḥādī. (47) This author mentions old letters as his source.

The work to which the Takmīl was said to be a supplement was a book called Zahr al-riyād, in the singular. This made the person who made the heading of R follow the wrong track, and Lévi-Provençal made the same mistake. It is in fact a supplement to al-Maqqarī's Azhār al-riyād, in the plural. The difference might be explained in several ways. Al-Maqqarī's book is divided into eight sections called gardens, each one characterized by the name of a flower. As al-Qanṭrī followed the first section (only at the end of the Takmīl some material might have been borrowed from a later section, but it might also have come from another source since it is no literal citation), that might be an indication that only that one was available when he started writing and that al-Maqqarī's book had not yet got its full title. That this book not always was known under the present title is confirmed by a notice in the biography of al-Maqqarī in the Nashr al-mathānī by al-Qādirī, where it is called Nasīm al-riyād fī akhbār ʿIyad.,(48)

Why the Takmīl was written, when and for whom are questions presently to be answered. There are no indications about the date of its composition, Al-Maqqarī wrote the Azhār during his stay in Fez, between 1014 and 1027 (1605-1617). (49) If al-Qanṭrī was acquainted with him - since there were frequent contacts between al-Qṣar al-Kabīr and Fez this is a possibility provided they were contemporaries - he may have reacted to the book before it was completed, or immediately after a partial publication. The last section reflects probably his interest in the Alawites, who occupied the throne in Fez in 1079/1668 but had already begun to play a role in Moroccan affairs at an earlier time. (50) Thus, the earliest possible date is shortly before 1027/1617, but a (much) later date is not to be excluded,

Research in the extant manuscripts of the Azhār will be necessary to determine which manuscript al-Qanṭrī had at his disposal, The edition which I used is a composition of several manuscripts, with abundant references to variant readings. The Takmīl is very close to the manuscript T used in this edition, a manuscript that is nowadays preserved in Cairo. (51)

Al-Qanṭrī probably wrote the Takmīl for circulation among his learned friends, or else he used it as a reference book for himself. Such an adaptation is not an isolated phenomenon, in the introduction to his edition of the Nafḥ al-ṭīb Iḥsān ʿAbbās mentions a similar one of this great work. (52) This indicates that there must have existed a critical approach towards historical texts and an awareness of their defects and possibilities of improvement, In this regard, Lévi-Provençal's judgement on the level of historical writing in Morocco is not completely fair, though it must be taken into account that he was discussing official historiography, which had to be in accordance with the official view.,(53)

The manuscripts and the composition of the collection

After having surveyed the three texts and having proposed solutions for the problems of a spurious author, an enigmatic title and an erroneous description, I will try to evaluate the manuscripts and to define the time and place where the original was written.

Only manuscript E is provided with a date, it was written in 1257/1841. R is held to be a modern copy, and L is viewed as a copy of R. (54) T has no date, but its colophon mentions the scribe and the man who commissioned it. The manuscript was written by al-Ḥasan b. °Abd al-Qāhir b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. °Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Sa°īd b. °Uthmān b. al-Ḥasan al-Yadarāsmānī al-Wāfalāwī al-Majdānī (or: al-Majghānī) al-Ḥalkūsī al-Yālūlī al-Ṭālibī for the merchant al-Ḥāj°Abd al-Karīm Rāghūn al-Andalusī al-Mariī al-Raghūqī aṣ-Ṣāmitī. (55) Bustani found a few references to this person in the biography of sultan Muḥammad III by Mulay °Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zaydān. (56) They prove that he was an important merchant from Tetuan acting as ambassador on behalf of this sultan. In 1180/1766 he was sent to Istanbul on a special mission to offer a letter of condolence on the occasion of the losses caused by a Russian attack on the Turkish fleet. The next year he returned with a valuable gift, one in the chain of gifts and counter-gifts that linked Morocco to the Turkish sultan, consisting of a shipload of war material and a group of 30 Turkish military specialists to help Morocco launch a fleet and start a gun foundry and an ammunition factory. This production of guns and cannonballs was vital for the sultan's campaigns to regain the Moroccan ports under Spanish occupation (Ceuta and Melilla). From Spanish sources it is known that, notwithstanding the conflict between Morocco and Spain, there existed commercial relations between Tetuan and several ports in southern Spain. (57) °Abd al-Karīm Rāghūn (Abdelkrim Aragon) is mentioned in those sources. This connection might have aroused his curiosity about the origins of his ancestors, and inspired the idea to order a book on the history of Granada for the library of his still-existing palace in Tetuan. (58)

It is not known when °Abd al-Karīm died, but it seems reasonable to suppose that the manuscript he ordered was completed before 1800. That makes it the oldest extant manuscript. Manuscript L is very similar to T but it is an inferior version. Several poems miss a few lines, and on the whole it is executed with less care. The scribe may not always have understood what he was copying. The calligraphic style of L is different from T, but there are many places where the form of words is exactly copied, evidently because their meaning was unclear. T is divided into two parts, as stated before, and so is L. I have not seen R, but it seems unlikely to me that L has been copied from R, and I would not be surprised if R were a copy of T, and this might be the case even with E.

There is one last difficult question to which I have no answer. Did this scribe al-Ḥasan copy an existing collection, or was he himself its author? If he was the author, it is not surprising that Tetuan, with all the ties it had with al-Andalus, were the city where the collection originated, If not, the collection could have been composed anywhere in Morocco at any time between circa 1615, the earliest possible date of the latest part of the collection, the Takmīl, and circa 1800.

Appendix

Fragments from the manuscript of the Takmīl not found in the Azhār al-riyād (within brackets the Azhār-text)

B 13 (extended compared with Azhār I 46)

وكان اخذ سبته اعادها الله دار الاسلام سنة تسع عشر وثمانمائة بعد ما استولى العدو الكافر على معظم بلاد الاندلس مثل قرطبة ومرسية وطليلة وبلنسية ودانية وقرمونة وبيونة وشاطبة وشريش وسرقسطة وغيرهم ممن يطول تعداده

B 14-15 (extended compared with Azhār I 71)

(ومنهم بتلمسان بنو داوود المذكورون فى فهرست ابن غازي وهؤلاء خرجوا عن الاندلس قبل اخذ غرناطة لما راوا استطالة العدو عليها وانه اخذها لا محالة خوضوا رحالهم عنها و نزلوا تلمسان) ومنهم اولاد غريب خرجوا بتلمسان بجماعة وافرة ومنهم اولاد الرندى والرندوا والرندا والكل من غسان واولاد النجار واولاد السراج واولاد قردناس واولاد رميرس والكل من بني عبد الدار خرجوا الى العدو لما اخذت بسطة واستقر جلمهم بقبائل الهبط ومنهم اولاد رعون واولاد طفير خرجوا عن رعونة لما اخذت الى المرية ومنها جازوا / الى قبيلة غمارة من العدو واصلهم من ذرية السيد عبادة بن الصامت رضى الله عنه ومن البيئات ايضا اولاد مريونا واولاد لوكاس واولاد برماجة واولاد طريق والكل من الانصار خرجوا من الاندلس لما اخذت وادي آش الى العدو واستقر جلمهم بقبائل الهبط

B 22 (extended compared with Azhār I 68)

(ثم ارتحل السلطان ابو عبد الله الى مدينة فاس حرسها الله وتوفي رحمه الله بفاس عام اربعة وعشرين وتسعمائة ودفن بازا ء المصلى خارج باب الشريعة وخلف ولدين احدهما يوسف والاخر احمد) فمن اولاد يوسف بنو يوسف بفاس ومن اولاد احمد زاز واولاد فرج (والكل من جملة الضعفاء) والمساكين وكان وزيره بقى بالريف يقال له احمد الدودار فسبحان المعز المذل المانح المانع لا اله الا هو (وارث الارض ...

Notes

* Unpublished paper, based on a lecture entitled *Un manuscrit sur la dernière période de l'histoire de Grenade musulman*, which was given by the author on 12 December 1994 during the Colloque *Nouvelle lumière sur des sources Andalusiennes* in Tétouan, Morocco.

** Th. Marita Koornwinder-Wijntjes, Bussum, Netherlands,
Marita.Koornwinder@xs4all.nl

1 Leyden University Library Cod. Or. 10.784.

2 P.S.van Koningsveld, Ten Arabic manuscript-volumes of historical contents acquired by the Leyden University Library after 1957, in: "Studies on Islam". A symposium held on Islamic studies, Amsterdam 1974, 92-110. E. Lévi-Provençal, Les Manuscrits Arabes de Rabat, Bibliothèque générale du Protectorat Français au Maroc, Paris 1921, no. 491, nr. 28 de l'inventaire.

3 M.J.Müller, Die letzten Zeiten von Granada. München 1863. See also Muammad al-Manūnī, Al-maṣādir al-‘arabiyya li-ta’rīkh al-Maghrib, vol. I, Rabat 1404/1983, no. 286 (p.132), where the Nubdha is mentioned as third part of a majmū‘, no. K 1177 in the General Library in Rabat.

- 4 Müller, *op. cit.* 56, transl. 159 (erroneously 945, Müller says in a note that he was not sure of the correct reading). See also Mohamed Soualah, *Une élégie andalouse sur la guerre de Grenade*, Alger 1914-1919, 37. Soualah gives a short description of the chronicle.
- 5 Braulio Justal Calabozo, *La real biblioteca de El Escorial y sus manuscritos árabes. Sinopsis histórico-descriptiva*, Madrid 1978, 257, codice 1877. The manuscript is not described in E. Lévi-Provençal, *Les manuscrits de l'Escorial*, Paris 1928, which is Vol. III of Derenbourg's catalogue. The title of the other text is: *Al-rawḍ al-hatūn fī akhbār Miknāsāt al-Zaytūn*, by Muammad b. Amad b. Muammad b. 'Alī b. Ghāzī al-'Uthmānī al-Miknāsī (d. 841/1437). A lithographed edition of this text came to light in 1908 in Fez, it was also published in 1964 in Rabat. There is a partial translation by M.O Houdas, *Monographie de Mequenez*, in: *Journal Asiatique* 5 (1885) 101-147. The text is discussed in E.Lévi-Provençal, *Les historiens des Chorfas*, Paris 1922, 227-230.
- 6 Shakīb Arslān, *Riwāyat ākhir Banī Sarrāj. Wa-yalīhā: Khulāṣat ta'rīkh al-Andalus ilā suqūṭ Gharnāta. Wa-yalīhā: Kitāb Akhbār al-'aṣr fī inqidā' dawlat Banī Nasr li-mu'allif shahada waqā'i' suqūṭ al-Andalus bi-nafsihi. Wa-ithāra ta'rīkhiyya rasmiyya, fī arba'a kutub sultāniyya andalusiyya*. Cairo 1343/1925. I would like to thank Mr. Ḥannāna, antiquarian in Tetuan, for the reference. The author was mentioned by Bustani (see note 8) in his foreword, but without the title of his book. Chateaubriand wrote his short novel in the first years of the 19th century, but it could only be published for the first time in 1826 after the fall of the Napoleonic empire. See the preface on p. 275-276 of the French edition, Paris, Gallimard Folio 1017, 1971.
- 7 On page 390, line 6 between the first and the second word p. 30 of Müller's text is missing. The error is understandable because in Müller's edition the pages are numbered the European way, from left to right. Page 30 was a left page and easy to be missed by an Arab reader who starts at the right side.
- 8 *Fragmento de la época sobre noticias de los Reyes Nazaritas o Capitulación de Granada y Emigración de los andaluces a Marruecos*. Ed. A. Bustani, transl. C.Quiros. Larache, Instituto General Franco para la investigación hispano-árabe, 1940.
- 9 C.Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, Supplement II 373. In the winter of 1968-69 the manuscript was exhibited in the Royal Library Albert I in Brussels. In the accompanying catalogue by J.Bauwens, *Maktūb bilyad*, Brussels 1968, nr. 108, it was of course also described under the name of Ibn al-Khaṭīb.
- 10 Here the author made a mistake, the wife of Abū 'I-Ḥasan was a daughter of one of his predecessors, sultan Muammad IX al-Aysar who was however not his uncle but a more distant relative.
- 11 That he was right in thinking so was only recently proved. See: Maria del Carmen Pescador del Hoyo, *Cómo fué de verdad la toma de Granada a la luz de un documento inédito*, in: *Al-Andalus* 20 (1955) 283-344.
- 12 The references are to the Arabic text in Bustani's edition, checked against T.
- 13 See note 6 for the title of his work.
- 14 Bustani 17/XXII (transl).
- 15 Bustani 2, 15 and 5.
- 16 Juan de Mata Carriazo, *Crónica de los Reyes Católicos por su secretario Fernando del Pulgar*, version inédita, 2 vols., Madrid 1943. Fernando del Pulgar was present at the siege of Granada, as Hernando de Baeza tells in his chronicle (see note 18). But his *Crónica* is a monument of classical-humanistic history-writing, and so different in scope and conception, besides breaking off in 1490, that it is no match for the *Nubdha*.

17 Juan de Mata Carriazo, *Historia de la Casa Real de Granada*, in: *Miscelánea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos* 6 (1954) 7-56. This chronicle resembles in many places the *Compendio Historial* by Estevan de Garibay, finished in 1566, published in 1571 in Antwerp, but who followed whom is not easy to decide. The *Compendio* also contains much material on Granada and Morocco. This *Historia* resembles in some respects the *Nubdha*, but as it is a chronicle on all the Naṣrid kings, the section that covers the same period as the *Nubdha* is only small.

18 Las cosas que pasaron entre los Reyes de Granada desde el tiempo de el rrey don Juan de castilla segundo de este nombre, hasta que los catholicos Reyes ganaron el rreino de Granada, scripto y copilado por hernando de baeça el qual se halló presente á mucho parte de lo que cuenta y lo demas supo de los moros de aqel Reyno y de sus corónicas , in: M.J. Müller, *Die letzten Zeiten von Granada*, München 1863, 57-95 (cited as Hernando de Baeza, *Cosas de Granada*). Juan de Mata Carriazo, *Una continuación inédita de la "Relación" de Hernando de Baeza*, in: *Al-Andalus* 13 (1948) 431-442. Both manuscripts of the *Cosas de Granada* break off at the same moment, which means that they go back to an incompletely preserved original manuscript. All these chronicles, and also the *Nubdha*, are discussed by Maria del Carmen Pescador del Hoyo, *Cómo fué de verdad la toma de Granada a la luz de un documento inédito*, in: *Al-Andalus* 20 (1955) 283-344.

19 On Hernando de Baeza, see also: Mata Carriazo, *Una continuación inédita*, 1948; L.Seco de Lucena Paredes, *La Granada Nazari del siglo XV*, Granada 1975, 76; R.Arié, *L'Espagne musulmane au temps des Naṣrides (1232-1492)*. Paris 1990 2nd impr., 316.

20 The date in Mata Carriazo, *Una continuación inédita*, 1948, 431.

21 See Müller 72 and 108. F. de la Granga, *Fiestas cristianas en al-Andalus*, in: *Al-Andalus* 34 (1969) 1-53; *Encyclopedia of Islam* 2nd. imp. I 515 (Art. 'Ansāra by Ph. Marçais).

22 L.P.Harvey, *Islamic Spain 1250 to 1500*, Chicago-London 1990 (paperback 1992), 278-285. F. de la Granga, *Condena de Boabdil por los alfaquíes de Granada*, in: *Al-Andalus* 36 (1971) 145-176. The fatwā has been recorded by al-Wansharīsī.

23 Shihāb al-dīn Amad b. Muammad al-Maqqarī al-Tilimsānī, *Azhār al-riyād fī akhbār 'Iyād*, ed. Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī and 'Abd al-Ḥafīz al-Shalabī, 3 vols., Kairo 1939-1942, I 69-71.

24 Al-Maqqarī, *Azhār* I 65.

25 Amad b. Muammad al-Maqqarī al-Tilimsānī, *Naf al-ṭīb min ghuṣn al-Andalus al-raṭīb*, ed. Isān 'Abbās, 8 vols., Bayrūt 1388/1968, IV 507-529.

26 Luis Seco de Lucena Paredes, *Los Banū 'sim intelectuales granadinos del siglo XV*, in: *Miscelánea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos* 2 (1953) 5-14. Milouda Charouti Hasnaoui, *Nuevos datos sobre los últimos Naṣrīes extraídos de una fuente árabe: Ÿunnat al-riḍā de Ibn 'ṣim*, in: *Al-Qanṭara* 14 (1993) 469-477. Abū Yaya Muammad b. 'ṣim, *Djannat al-riḍā fī al-taslīm limā qaddara Allāh wa-qaḍā*. Ed. Ṣalā Djarrār. 3 vols., 'Ammān, Dar al-bashir, 1989. Only since the recent publication of Ibn 'Aṣim's book, which had long been considered lost, has it become possible to place that quotation in its context; it was part of a book on all kinds of trials, with and without hope of salvation.

27 Van Koningsveld, *Ten Arabic manuscript volumes*, 1974, read wa-fī. A photograph of the first manuscript page of this text, fol. 22b, is on p. 100 of this article.

28 GAL I 271 and S I 480.

29 GAL I 340.

30 R.P.A.Dozy, *Ibn-Badrūn, Commentaire historique sur le poème d'Ibn-Abdoun*. Publié pour la première fois, préc. d'une introduction et accomp. de notes, d'un glossaire etc.,

Leyden 1846. ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Badrūn, Šar Qašīdat Ibn ‘Abdūn al-ma’rūfa bi l’Bassāma, Cairo 1340/1921-2.

31 Lévi-Provençal, *Les Manuscrits Arabes de Rabat*, no. 491/2. The name of the author not being mentioned in the title, it must have been taken from the text. Van Koningsveld, *Ten Arabic manuscript volumes*, 1974, 98.

32 For Al-Ḥaydarī see GAL II 98, GAL S II 116. GAL has the reading “man”, whereas Lévi-Provençal has “mā”. The work has not been published; two manuscripts have been preserved, both in England.

33 I have here always written al-Qanṭrī, but several variations can be found, such as al-Qniṭrī, al-Qunaiṭrī.

34 Muammad b. ‘Abd al-Ramān Ben Khalīfa, *A‘lām adabiyya ‘ilmiyya ta’rīkhiyya al-Qšar al-Kabīr*, Tangier 1994, 73-77. I thank my colleague Khaled Samadi in Tetuan for the reference and for his kindness to provide me with the book.

35 GAL S II 687, d. 1187/1773. Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-‘ayyib b. ‘Abd al-Salām al-Ḥasanī al-Qādirī, *Nashr al-mathāni li-ahl al-qarn al-ḥādī ‘ashar wa-l-thānī*. Trad. *Nachr al-Mathāni de Mouhammed al-Qādirī*, par Graulle, Meillard, Michaux, Bellaire, in: *Archives Marocaines XXI et XXIV*, 1913-1917; I 144.

36 *Nashr al-mathāni* II 57 (205). Ben Khalīfa considers him as the son, but as the *Nashr al-mathāni* calls him Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad he is evidently of the third generation. Besides, the year of his death also seems to be more in accordance with a grandfather - grandson relationship.

37 Maria José Herмосilla Llisterri, *En torno al qaḍī ‘Iyād. I: Datos biograficos*, in: *Miscelánea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos* 27-8 (1978-79) 149-164. The book by al-Ḥaydarī is not mentioned in this article, neither is the *Takmīl*. I did not find a second part of the article.

38 See note 23.

39 ‘Abd al-Salām b. ‘Abd al-Qādir b. Sūda, *Dalīl mu’arrikh al-Maghrib al-aqṣā*, 2 vols., Casablanca 1960 2nd imp., I 180 nr. 680. Its number in the General Library is given as 29, but this must be based on an error in Lévi-Provençal’s index to his catalogue. Ben Khalīfa, *A‘lām* 77, is not very careful in citing the *Dalīl*.

40 The *Takmīl* is composed of the following pages of the *Azhār*: *Azhār* I 23-32, 45-46, 71-72, 60-61, 50-53, 65, 66, 65-66, 67, 68, 67, 68, 69, 70, 69-70, 70-71, 68-69, 63-64, 64-65, 72, 83-102, 72-83, 83, 102, 103-108, 47-50, *Azhār* III 205, 207-210 (?), *Azhār* I 108-115.

41 The list will be given in an appendix, as will also the other texts which differ substantially from those given in the *Azhār*.

42 Al-Maqqarī, *Nafḥ al-ṭīb* IV 487-488. Al-Maqqarī knew more verses, but did not consider them authentic.

43 This is an adaptation of the text in *Azhār* III: 205, 207-210, 205-206, a slightly different text in *Nafḥ al-ṭīb* II 590-591. The text in the *Takmīl* cannot be understood without consulting al-Maqqarī’s works. The poem is not in the *Azhār* but in *Nafḥ al-ṭīb* IV 457-460.

44 *Azhār* I 108-115. James T. Monroe, *A curious Morisco Appeal to the Ottoman Empire*, in: *al-Andalus* 31 (1966) 281-303. Mercedes García Arenal, *Los Moriscos*, Madrid 1975, 33-41. Mohammed Soualah, *Une élégie andalouse*, was the first one to have called the attention to an incomplete copy in Algiers dating from 1265/1848, and that has disappeared since his time. Ms. Bibl.Nat. d’Alger no. 1620 (781b): E.Fagnan, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements - Alger*, Paris 1893, 450.

- 45 A short reference to these events in J.M.Abun-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge etc., 1971; 1975 2e impression, paperback, 224-225. They are not mentioned by Arié, *L’Espagne musulmane aux temps des Naşrides*.
- 46 GAL S II 888, 1250-1315/1835-1897. Aḥmad b. Khālīd an-Nāşirī as-Salāwī, *Kitāb al-istişā’ li-akhbār duwal al-Maghrib al-aqşā*, Cairo 1912, IV 4-7; Aḥmad ben Khāled Ennāşirī Esslāoui, *Kitāb Elistiqşā li Akhbāri doual almāgrīb alaqsā*, éd. E.Fumey, T.IV, *Chronique de la dynastie Alaoui du Maroc*, Archives Marocaines 9 (1906) 8-14. The catalogue of Leyden University Library has listed this author under the name al-Salāwī.
- 47 GAL II 457, d. after 1151/ 1738. Al-Ifrānī, *Nuzhat al-ḥādī bi-akhbār mulūk al-qarn al-ḥādī*. Edition: Nozhet-elḥādī. *Histoire de la dynastie Saadienne au Maroc (1511-1670)*, par Mohammed Esseghir ben elhadj ben Abdallah Eloufrāni, texte arabe et traduction française par O.Houdas, Paris 1888 et 1889, Publications de l’*école des langues vivantes*, série III 2 and 3, 2 Ar. 293-296 and 3 Fr. 487-491.
- 48 Al-Qādirī, *Nachr al-Mathānī I* 348 (157-8).
- 49 Al-Maqqarī, *Azhār*, Introduction d.
- 50 Abun-Nasr, *History of the Maghrib* 224-227.
- 51 Al-Maqqarī, *Azhār*, Introduction h-w. It regards manuscript ta’rīkh no. 2013 in the *Dār al-kutub* in Cairo.
- 52 Al-Maqqarī, *Nafḥ al-ṭīb*, ed. Iḥsān ‘Abbās, Introduction 21. It is a manuscript that he calls m, no. 430 k in the General Library in Rabat.
- 53 E. Lévi-Provençal, *Les historiens des Chorfa*, Paris 1922, *passim*.
- 54 See notes 2 and 3.
- 55 Bustani has a photograph of the colophon, and also a transcription and translation of its text on p.75.
- 56 Bustani XXIII and 18. GAL S II 892 nr.57: Mulay ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zaydān, *Ithāf a’lām al-nās bi-jamāl akhbār ḥāḍirat Miknās*. 5 vols., Rabat 1347-1352/1929-1933. Vol. III 166-7, 259, 300, 347. A shorter version of the same story, based mainly on Ibn Zaydān, is given by Muḥammad Dāwud, *Mukhtaşar ta’rīkh Taṭwān*, Tetuan 1375/1955, 97.
- 57 Ramón Lourido Diaz, *La Ciudad y region de Tetuán durante el sultánato de Muḥammad III a través de la documentación española*, in: *Tétouan au 18ème siècle (1727-1822)*, Tetuan 1994, 18-39.
- 58 Nadia Erzini, *The Architectural Patronage of the Basha Ahmad ar-Rifī in Tetuan and its region*, in: *Tétouan au 18ème siècle (1727-1822)*, Tetuan 1994, 91-111, plate 7.