

INTRODUCTION

1. *History of the text*

The Funj Chronicle is a title conventionally given to a Sudanese Arabic work which narrates the history of the Funj sultanate, centred at Sinnār on the Blue Nile, and which continues into the succeeding Turco-Egyptian regime (*al-Turkiyya*) to the varying dates reached by the original chronicler and his continuators. The work has long been known. It provided most of the information for the historical introduction to Col. Stewart's *Report on the Soudan* (1883),¹ and it was the principal source used by Na'ūm Shuqayr (Naum Shoucair) for the account of the Funj dynasty in his *Ta'rīkh al-Sūdān* (Cairo, 1903).² By way of Shuqayr's book, data from the Funj Chronicle passed again into English in E.A. Wallis Budge's *The Egyptian Sūdān* (London, 1907).³ An English summary translation of the final recension of the Chronicle was published by H.A. MacMichael in *A history of the Arabs in the Sudan* (Cambridge, 1922).⁴ The Arabic text of this recension was published by the late Professor Makkī Shubayka (Mekki Shibeika) of the University of Khartoum as *Ta'rīkh mulūk al-Sūdān* (Khartoum, 1947). The original version of the Chronicle was published by the late al-Shāṭir Buṣaylī 'Abd al-Jalīl (Chater Bosayley A. Galil) under the title *Makḥṭūṭat Kātib al-Shūna*, n.d., n.p. [Cairo, 1963]. A critical edition of the text of the Chronicle is now under preparation by Professor Yūsuf Faḍl Ḥasan of the University of Khartoum.

Shubayka's introduction to his edition of the Chronicle was the first serious study of the history of the text, although some of the previous users (all of whom worked directly or indirectly with the final recension) had realized that more than one author was involved. Shubayka established that the original chronicler was a certain Shaykh Aḥmad, the son of al-Ḥājj Abū 'Alī, generally known as *Kātib al-Shūna* because he was the clerk of the Turco-Egyptian government

¹ *Report on the Soudan by Lieutenant-Colonel Stewart*. Parliamentary Papers: Egypt No. 11 (1883). C 3670. Pp. 2-6.

² Part II, pp. 71-98.

³ Vol. II, pp. 200-4.

⁴ Vol. II, pp. 354-430.

granary. His version was edited and continued by Shaykh al-Zubayr b. ‘Abd al-Qādir w. al-Zayn al-Ya‘qūbābī, usually known al-Zubayr w. Ḍawwāh from his mother’s name; and a second recension was made by Shaykh Ibrāhīm ‘Abd al-Dāfi‘ al-Jamū‘ī. The narrative of events was briefly continued by Shaykh al-Amīn Muḥammad al-Ḍarīr, ending the Chronicle in 1288/1871. It is in this final form that it has become generally known, especially through MacMichael’s translation.

The framework and data established by Shubayka form the basis for a fuller textual history of the Chronicle. The first stage, as indicated by Shubayka, is the original version, written by Kātib al-Shūna and ending in 1254/1838. Shubayka identified this version in a manuscript in Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya in Cairo (MS. 18 Tārīkh *mīm*; hereafter MS. Cairo). A second and identical copy is extant in Istanbul (Library of Cevdet Paşa 138; hereafter MS. Istanbul). Internal evidence indicates that Kātib al-Shūna began to write the Chronicle before the Turco-Egyptian conquest in 1235/1820; e.g. after the name of Sinnār in his introduction, he adds the epithets *al-maḥrūsa al-maḥmiyya*, “the divinely protected and guarded”, which are traditionally applied to Muslim capitals, and so would be appropriate for Sinnār during the Funj sultanate; it is significant that after the conquest, *al-maḥrūsa* is employed only as a synonym for Cairo, and is so rendered in this translation. The text may reflect the point at which the new regime was established. Under the events of A.H. 1213, the Kātib refers to the deposition of Bādī VI, and adds *wa-huwa al-mawjūd al-ān*, “who is living now”. When, however, he refers to Bādī’s restoration in A.H. 1219, he writes *wa-aqām ilā hīn huḍur al-dawla al-‘Uthmāniyya*, “and he remained until the coming of the Ottoman regime”.

There is a variant of the original version of the Chronicle which was unknown to Shubayka. It is extant in two manuscripts; one of them in the Austrian Nationalbibliothek in Vienna (MS. Mixt. 677a), the other in the Library of the University of Nottingham (Parkyns of Bunny Manuscripts, MSS. Pa X 3, Pa X 3/1). One detached folio of this manuscript is among the Mansfield Parkyns Papers at the Royal Geographical Society, London. These are hereafter designated MS. Vienna and MS. Nottingham respectively. Both are of nearly the same date. MS. Vienna was transcribed for the Catholic missionary Ignaz Knoblehar (Knoblecher),⁵ who was in the Sudan

⁵ Hill, *Biographical dictionary*, 205–6, 403.

between 1848 and 1857, while MS. Nottingham was transcribed by a Lebanese ivory trader, Ibrāhīm Bāz, for the English traveller Mansfield Parkyns,⁶ who was in al-Khurṭūm in 1847. Both manuscripts are fragments: MS. Vienna breaks off just before the end of the Funj period, while MS. Nottingham is cut short in 1257/1841–2, i.e. some three years later than MSS. Cairo and Istanbul. MS. Vienna is execrably written, and while MS. Nottingham is much more clearly written, Ibrāhīm Bāz was at times obviously puzzled by what he was transcribing, and there are numerous corruptions, especially of names in the earlier part of the Chronicle.

In an autobiographical note prefixed to his manuscript, Ibrāhīm Bāz describes in his somewhat florid Arabic (very different from the style of the Chronicle) how the translation came to be made. To Mansfield Parkyns during his stay in al-Khurṭūm word came of “the book of the chronicles of the divinely guarded town of Sinnār and of other towns and villages, and of the former kings. As soon as the *khawāja*’s ears tingled at the information of this book, he started out for it at once. The news greatly excited him, for it was a particular reason for his travel. He found it with a friend who was concealing it and watching over it, because it was a unique copy. He made him welcome to examine it. He asked it of him, so that he might take a copy and return it to him. The owner refused out of fear for it. He made terms with him on oath, which he gladly accepted: that he would not take it out of his house, and that no-one should look at it except the copyist, the reader, and he who examined it. On that day the *khawāja* Ibrāhīm Bāz, a Bayrūtī by origin, was in the Peninsula. The *khawāja* Mansfield went directly to him, and asked him to copy this book. When the *khawāja* Ibrāhīm saw his eagerness for it, and that he especially desired it, and also since he [Ibrāhīm] was under the protection of Great Britain, and he wished, and indeed strove to the limit of his capacity and power for everything that would conduce to the benefit of every individual among the sons of this great state, he responded to his enquiry, and started to copy it verbatim, without the addition or omission of a single letter. That was on Friday, 14 Shubāt [February], A.D. 1847.”⁷

The continuator of the Chronicle gives his name in MS. Nottingham

⁶ *DNB*, XV, 319; Duncan Cumming, *The gentleman savage. The life of Mansfield Parkyns 1823–1894*, London, 1987.

⁷ MS. Nottingham, pp. 1–2.

at p. 149 as Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Janqāl. Where he covers the same ground as Kātib al-Shūna, i.e. from the opening of the Chronicle to the recall of Khūrshīd Pasha in 1254/1838, the text is largely identical. There are, however, 17 longer or shorter passages which are not found in MSS. Cairo and Istanbul. These are as follows:—

No.	Translation	MS. Nottingham	Subject
	pages	pages	
1.	3	5	Spiritual guides of Idrīs w. al-Arbāb
2.	3–3a	5–6	Funj origins and accession ritual
3.	15	22	Death of the <i>ʿarīf</i> Dāwūd
4.	25–6	33	The four cities of the Funj
5.	34	40–1	Events of A.H. 1206 and 1208
6.	53	61	The reconciling <i>marātib</i>
7.	66–7	76–7	<i>Karāmāt</i> of Muḥammad w. Ḍayfallāh
8.	70	82–3	The <i>Arbāb</i> Farajallāh
9.	82–5	94–7	Hamaj origins and relations with Funj
10.	90–2	98–100	Shāyqiyya and Ismāʿīl Pasha
11.	102–5	105–9	Killing of Ismāʿīl Pasha; operations of Defterdar
12.	107–10	111–14	<i>Karāmāt</i> of Ḍayfallāh w. Muḥammad
13.	115	121	Birth of son to Chronicler
14.	118	122	Spiritual guides of Muḥammad al-Majdhūb
15.	119	127	Death of Chronicler's brother; birth of son
16.	123	138	Death of Chronicler's brother
17.	125	139	Death of Chronicler's brother

Of these additional passages, two (nos. 10 and 11) supplement material in MSS. Cairo and Istanbul, and may probably be taken as interpolations by the continuator. This is all the more likely since no. 10 deals with the exploits of the Shāyqiyya, and as will appear, the continuator was probably a Shāyqī. Passages nos. 1, 3, 6, 7, 12, and 14 are concerned with the deeds and *karāmāt* of holy men, which MSS. Cairo and Istanbul show to have been a preoccupation of Kātib al-Shūna. The details of family history in nos. 13 and 15–17 resemble similar notices in MSS. Cairo and Istanbul. I would therefore suggest that these passages (with the exception of nos. 10 and 11) formed part of a version of the Kātib's text *antecedent* to that given

by MSS. Cairo and Istanbul, which manuscripts give a version perhaps edited by the Kātib himself for presentation to Khūrshīd Pasha. Two passages of great interest nowadays, nos. 2 and 9, which deal with the origins and customs of the Funj and the Hamaj, may have been excised as redolent of a primitive barbarism inappropriate to territories lately incorporated (at least notionally) in the Islamic Ottoman Empire.

Turning now to the later recensions of the Chronicle, that of al-Zubayr w. Ḍawwāh is represented by MS. Paris, i.e. MS. Arabe 5069 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. This opens with a deliberate and intentionally scholarly attempt to correct and extend the Kātib's introduction to his Chronicle. He takes exception to the Kātib's statement that there was no school of Islamic studies before the coming of Maḥmūd al-ʿArakī, and adduces semi-legendary evidence in support of his claim. Of greater importance is his attempt to link the coming of the Funj with the earlier history of Nubia, drawing for this purpose on the recently published work of al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1422), *al-Khiṭaṭ*, of which the portions dealing with Nubia are in fact excerpted from the fourth/tenth-century account by Ibn Sulaym al-Aswānī. Al-Zubayr's failure to recognize the gap of five centuries between this material and the beginning of the Funj Chronicle vitiates his attempt to set the Funj-ʿAbdallābī hegemony in the Sudanese Nile Valley in a wider historical perspective. Apart from this, he gives a more polished version of the Kātib's account, and usefully continues the Chronicle to 8 Jumādā II 1280/20 Nov. 1863 in the governor-generalship of Mūsā Pasha Ḥamdī.

The second recension of the Chronicle, prepared by Ibrāhīm ʿAbd al-Dāfiʿ, seems to have circulated widely in manuscript form. A copy was presented by General Gordon to the British Museum (MS. Or. 2345), and another copy made for the late Revd. Dr. A.J. Arkell is now in the School of Oriental and African Studies, London (Arkell Papers, Box 2, File 6, ff. 4–87). A copy made for Sir Harold MacMichael in 1914 from a manuscript belonging to a descendant of the Funj kings was the basis of his summary translation. It was this recension which was edited by Professor Makkī Shubayka, whose published text is used in this translation. Apart from much reducing al-Zubayr's introduction by cutting out the long citations from al-Maqrīzī, Ibrāhīm ʿAbd al-Dāfiʿ contributes to the development of the Chronicle notably by the information he gives about the career of al-Zubayr's father, Shaykh ʿAbd al-Qādir w. al-Zayn. He does

not appear to have continued the Chronicle beyond the point reached by al-Zubayr, but it concludes with an account of the administrations of Ja‘far Šādiq, Ja‘far Maẓhar and Aḥmad Mumtāz. This was contributed by the eminent ‘*ālim* al-Amīn Muḥammad al-Ḍarīr, who does not attempt to conceal his rancour against the last of these. On this sour note the Chronicle ends in Ramaḍān 1288/November 1871, a decade before the manifestation of the Mahdi Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh, who was to overthrow the Turco-Egyptian regime in the Sudan, and set up an Islamic theocracy on its ruins.

2. *The structure and scope of the Chronicle*

The structure which the Kātib gave to his Chronicle, and which persisted in the later recensions, is worth some consideration. It opens with a formal pious exordium, including the *basmala* and an elaboration of the *shahāda*. An allusion to the subject-matter of the Chronicle may perhaps be seen in the Chronicler’s praise to God as the destroyer of kings and the subduer of tyrants. In the introductory section which follows, the Kātib expresses his wish to follow the pattern of other dynastic chronicles in writing an account of Sinnār and its kings. He notes that his sources are confused anecdotes, but proceeds immediately to give a citation from one of the probably two written authorities available to him—the beginning of Wad Ḍayfallāh’s *Ṭabaqāt*, a biographical dictionary of the holy men and religious teachers of the Sudan, compiled between 1166/1753 and 1219/1804–5. The citation is important because it gives a curiously hard date (miscopied in the manuscripts but corrected in the later recensions) for the foundation of Sinnār, and also because it links the coming of Islamic religious teachers to the Sudan with the establishment of Funj power—a linkage which is angrily refuted by al-Zubayr w. Ḍawwāh in his recension of the Chronicle.

The Kātib then turns to the history of the Funj, giving the origin legends of the dynasty and Sinnār (most fully in MSS. Nottingham and Vienna) and the traditions of the relationship between ‘Amāra Dūnqas and ‘Abdallāh Jammā‘ al-Quraynātī. For the kings from ‘Amāra Dūnqas to at least Bādī IV Abū Shulūkh, a period of over two and a half centuries, the Kātib clearly relied upon another written source, a king-list similar to, but not identical with, that given by Aḥmad *Sīd al-Qōm* to the Scottish traveller James Bruce in 1772.

Such a list gave merely essential data: the name of each king, his relationship to his predecessor, the date of the end of his reign and its length. The king-list is, however, fleshed out in various places with traditional anecdotes, e.g. the campaign of Bādī II Abū Dīqin against Taqalī, or other literary material of diverse provenance.

With the reign of Bādī IV Abū Shulūkh, the nature and style of the Chronicle begin to change, and the regnal framework is submerged under detailed narrative, finally disappearing with the reign of ‘Adlān II in 1203/1788–9. “From here”, says the Kātib, “the power of the Funj ended, and no list of them was kept. Their kingship became a customary institution, and the regnal dating passed in reality in the name of the Hamaj, and their trace was obliterated.”⁸ In the last years of Bādī IV’s reign, Muḥammad Abū Likaylik emerges as the dominant figure in the kingdom, of which he was ultimately the regent for Bādī’s sons, Nāṣir and Ismā‘īl. The change of regime in 1175/1761–2 took place about a generation before Kātib al-Shūna’s own birth in 1199/1784–5, and so from here he is no doubt drawing on the recollections of his father, grandfather and their contemporaries, and setting them with some care in their chronological order. Still later he is writing the memoirs of his own lifetime with occasional personal touches such as the looting of his village and his flight in 1227/1812–13.

In effect, the Chronicle offers a detailed narrative of the Hamaj regency under Muḥammad Abū Likaylik, his brother, and seven of his sons and grandsons. The account at times attains the quality of a saga of the House of Abū Likaylik with such memorable episodes as the story of the Regent Bādī riding out to die in his perfumed robe, fey, and summoning his opponents to single combat by the names of their mothers. Then there are the dark sayings such as that of the daughters of Muḥammad Abū Likaylik calling on their brothers for revenge on the Ja‘aliyyūn who had imprisoned them—“One hobbled the steed, and one confined the women. To whom will you give the territory?”⁹ In addition to the history of the Hamaj regents, Kātib al-Shūna also gives much information about the Islamic teachers and holy men, with many of whom he was personally acquainted. This hagiographical material virtually forms a supplement to the *Ṭabaqāt* of Wad Ḍayfallāh.

⁸ P. 31 *inf.*

⁹ P. 39 *inf.*

The geographical range of this part of the Chronicle is never very extensive. The territories west of the White Nile are almost unmentioned apart from Bādī II Abū Diqin's march to Taqalī and Muḥammad 'Uthmān al-Mīrghanī's missionary journey to Kordofān. The powerful chiefs of the 'Abdallāb, the viceroys of the north, receive only occasional notice, the politically important and economically significant Ja'aliyyūn even less; in the words of the Kātib, "As for the state of the 'Abdallāb and the Sa'dāb, we have given no account of them for lack of information about their affairs, or because they were one kingdom."¹⁰ Further downstream, the successful revolt of the bellicose Shāyqiyya against their 'Abdallāb and Funj overlords towards the end of the seventeenth century passes completely unremarked.¹¹ Nearer home, the Kātib's information is equally limited. The shaykhs of Khashm al-Baḥr, the riverain district south of Sinnār, were important during the Hamaj regency, and one of them, 'Adlān w. Ṣubāḥī, was particularly close to Muḥammad Abū Likaylik. The Kātib devotes an appendix to them, but he is unable to say whether or not there was a shaykhdom before 'Adlān's time.¹²

The scope of the Chronicle is thus virtually confined to the regions on the east and west banks of the Blue Nile, north to its junction with the White Nile, south to the cradle of the Funj dynasty, the unidentified Lūl. In a telling parallel, the Kātib contrasts the Regent Nāṣir b. Muḥammad Abī Likaylik with his three powerful contemporaries, the sultan of Dār Fūr, Murād Bey in Egypt and Aḥmad al-Jazzār in Syria, and concludes with unconscious irony that "Nāṣir was the most outstanding of them because of the narrowness of his realm, for it was restricted to part of the Peninsula [of Sinnār]."¹³

With the coming of the Turco-Egyptian conquerors, the range of Kātib al-Shūna's vision is abruptly extended. The second part of his Chronicle opens with the conflict between the invaders and the previously unnoticed Shāyqiyya, and then follows Ismā'īl Pasha up the main Nile and the Blue Nile to Sinnār. Thrusts into the country of the Dinka and the highlands on the marches of Ethiopia ensue within the next few months, and later the Kātib describes the military operations of Khūrshīd Pasha in these regions. Nevertheless, he remains

¹⁰ P. 76 *inf.*

¹¹ On the revolt of the Shāyqiyya, see MacMichael, *Arabs*, I, 215–16.

¹² P. 74 *inf.*

¹³ P. 34 *inf.*

primarily a chronicler of the Blue Nile. No account is given of the important conquest of Kordofān, which opened the way to a future annexation of Dār Fūr. The conqueror of Kordofān, the Defterdar Bey, is first mentioned when he is already at al-Ubayyīd, and about to march on Shandī to undertake punitive operations against the Ja‘aliyyūn who had killed Ismā‘īl Pasha.

The Kātib’s section devoted to the period in office of Khūrshīd Pasha, the first governor-general of the Egyptian Sudan, sets the structural framework for the continuators of the Chronicle. Aḥmad Muḥammad Janqāl’s account of the governor-generalship of Aḥmad Pasha Abū Widn is unfortunately defective, but in the recensions of al-Zubayr w. Ḍawwāh and Ibrāhīm ‘Abd al-Dāfi‘ the periods of office of the governor-generals form the historiographical units of the last part of the Chronicle.

3. *The writers of the Chronicle and their outlook on events*

For information about the original chronicler, designated as Kātib al-Shūna, we are wholly dependent upon the scraps of information that he has himself provided. Aḥmad b. al-Ḥājī Abū [*sic pro* Abī] ‘Alī was born in 1199/1784–5 in the vicinity of al-Masallamiyya, near the left bank of the Blue Nile and about 130 miles from al-Khurṭūm. He evidently had a traditional Sudanese Islamic education, and seems to have been well acquainted with the religious teachers and holy men of his region. He refers to two of these as ‘amm, “paternal uncle”, but this may have been a term of respect rather than an indication of blood-relationship. His father made the Pilgrimage to Mecca in 1215/1800–1, but died after his return in the following year. He records the birth of a son, Muḥammad, in Dhu’l-Qa‘da 1224/Dec. 1809–Jan. 1810, and the death of his mother in 1233/1817–8. If we accept the relevant additional passages in MS. Nottingham as parts of his original Chronicle, two more sons, Muḥammad ‘Alī and Muḥammad ‘Uthmān, were born in Rajab 1244/Feb. 1829 and Sha‘bān 1248/Dec. 1832–Jan. 1833 respectively. Their names may be seen as a genuflection to the new ruler and the founder of the influential new Khatmiyya *ṭarīqa*. The additional passages also mention the deaths of three of the Kātib’s brothers: ‘Umar in Ṣafar 1248/July 1832, and both al-Sharīf Aḥmad and al-Ḥājī Ḥusayn in 1252/1836–7, which was a year of sickness.

On 2 Šafar 1240/26 Sept. 1824 he was at the new Turco-Egyptian settlement of al-Khurṭūm, which was to replace the remote and dilapidated Funj capital of Sinnār as the military and administrative centre of the Egyptian Sudan. The Sudanese notables were assembled there to meet ‘Uthmān Bey, appointed commander of the Turco-Egyptian forces in the newly conquered territories. The Kātib’s patron, Shanbūl w. Madanī, was made the paramount shaykh over a vast region stretching from the Sixth Cataract to the Funj Hills, and under his sponsorship Aḥmad entered the service of the new administration. He started work in the following month as a clerk in the government granary (much of the newly imposed taxes on the peasantry being paid in kind), and from this employment he obtained his sobriquet. He tells us nothing of his work, which ended in Dhu’l Qa‘da 1250/March 1835 in circumstances which he does not particularize, although his narrative at this point is heavy with hints of false friends. In Sha‘bān 1253/Nov. 1837 he left al-Khurṭūm for his native village. He died at some date after Rabī‘ I 1254/May–June 1838, where his Chronicle ends.

For the continuator, Aḥmad al-Ḥājj Muḥammad Janqāl, we are again dependent for biographical information on what he tells us, and that is very little indeed. He probably came from much the same traditionally educated milieu as the Kātib, whose father like his made the Pilgrimage. His name suggests that he may have been a kinsman of two Shāyqī chiefs whom he mentions, Muḥammad Nūr Janqāl (d. 1252/1836–7), and his similarly named son.¹⁴ He tells us that he was at the military parade held by Aḥmad Pasha Abū Widān to impress the Abyssinian envoys at al-Qallābāt in 1257/1842, which suggests that he held some official appointment, perhaps in the Shāyqiyya irregular cavalry.

Of the author of the first recension of the Chronicle, by contrast, a fair amount is known. The father of al-Zubayr, ‘Abd al-Qādir w. al-Zayn, belonged to the important tribe of the Ya‘qūbāb,¹⁵ a clan of holy men who were closely associated with the Funj rulers. Al-Zubayr is curiously silent about his father, but the author of the second recension, Ibrāhīm ‘Abd al-Dāfi‘, makes good the deficiency, and marks the main steps by which ‘Abd al-Qādir rose in impor-

¹⁴ P. 80 *inf.*

¹⁵ On the Ya‘qūbāb, see A.J. Arkell, “Fung origins”, *JNR*, XV/2, 1932, at pp. 237–8.

tance under the Turco-Egyptian regime. In 1241/1825–6, having advised the acting governor of the Sudan, Maḥū Bey, on the means of effecting a settlement in the Peninsula of Sinnār, ‘Abd al-Qādir was promoted, and given a robe of honour. In the following year he was made the paramount shaykh of the region formerly under Shanbūl w. Madanī. This was during the governor-generalship of Khūrshīd Pasha, who is shown as depending on ‘Abd al-Qādir’s advice. He enjoyed the same importance under Aḥmad Pasha Abū Widn. In 1261/1845 he was taken to Cairo, and presented to Muḥammad ‘Alī Pasha, who decorated him. He was subsequently appointed *mu‘āwin* to the governor-general, and on his death from cholera in 1272/1856, al-Zubayr visited Cairo, where the viceroy Muḥammad Sa‘īd appointed him to succeed his father. It was presumably during this visit that al-Zubayr became acquainted with the *Khīṭaṭ* of al-Maqrīzī, first published in Cairo in 1270/1853–4, of which he was to make use in his recension of the Chronicle.

Al-Zubayr’s tenure of office was to be brief. According to Ibrāhīm ‘Abd al-Dāfi‘, he lost the confidence of the Armenian governor, Arākīl Bey as a result of the interference of trouble-makers, and fled to Cairo, where he became a *mu‘āwin* in the Ministry of the Interior. However this may be, his name appears (as Shubayka has shown) among those released from detention in Egypt under an amnesty from Muḥammad Sa‘īd Pasha in 1277/1860–1. In favour with Mūsā Ḥamdī Pasha, governor-general of the Sudan, he reappears as paramount shaykh with the additional appointment of inspector general of Sudanese district administrative officials. Other appointments were noted by Shubayka from documentary sources, but on the outbreak of the Mahdia al-Zubayr was accused of supporting the rising. There are oral reports that he was put to death by drowning on the orders of the governor-general ‘Abd al-Qādir Pasha Ḥilmī, but his end remains obscure. It may be noted that his recension of the Chronicle ends during the governor-generalship of Mūsā Ḥamdī, when al-Zubayr was entering on his second period of good fortune.

Ibrāhīm ‘Abd al-Dāfi‘, who was responsible for the second and final recension, was, like the other writers associated with the Chronicle, a Sudanese from the educated religious elite, and the holder of an appointment under the Turco-Egyptian regime. His grandfather, ‘Abd al-Dāfi‘ al-Qindīl (d. 1180/1766–7) taught in the mosque school in Ḥalfāyat al-Mulūk, then the ‘Abdallābī capital. Shaykh Ibrāhīm himself was apparently a member of Kātib al-Shūna’s circle, since several

of his elegies are cited at length in the original version of the Chronicle. Under the Turco-Egyptian administration he became a deputy judge, and in 1270/1853–4 he was appointed *muftī*. However, in 1273/1856–7 he was sent to Egypt with a number of judges and other persons who were accused of corruption, but returned under the amnesty of 1277/1860–1. He appears never to have held office again, and he died on the eve of the Mahdia, when Raʿūf Pasha was the governor-general.

Al-Amīn Muḥammad al-Ḍarīr, the writer of the short and venomous summary of events which concludes the Chronicle, had perhaps the most successful career of these five writers. He came from the settlement of Maḥas tribesmen from Nubia, which had long existed on Tūtī Island at the meeting of the Blue and White Niles. His work as a religious teacher was crowned during the governor-generalship of his friend Jaʿfar Maẓhar Pasha (1282–88/1866–71) by the award (by firman of the Ottoman sultan) of the unique dignity of *raʿīs wa-mumayyiz ʿulamāʾ al-Sūdān*, i.e. president and rapporteur of the *ʿulamāʾ* of the Sudan. As *muftī* of the eastern Sudan, he was an opponent of the Mahdi's claims, and wrote (or was a signatory of) two manifestos against him. The Mahdi wrote to him twice, and on the eve of the fall of al-Khurṭūm particularly ordered his life to be spared.

From this it is clear that the Funj Chronicle was produced by a group of men of similar background and experience. Two, probably three of them, had grown up before the Turco-Egyptian conquest in the conditions of political fragmentation which characterized the former Funj realm. Under the new administration they achieved varying degrees of remunerative employment and social standing; they were still members of a Sudanese elite, although under changed political masters. So it is hardly surprising that they depict the revolutionary changes brought about by the Turco-Egyptian conquest without apparent anger or resentment, in spite of the bloodshed and distress it entailed for many of their compatriots. While individuals are censured, the alien regime as such (like the indigenous Funj and Hamaj regimes before it) is not criticized or denounced. The Chronicle ends before the outbreak of the Mahdia was to assert the incompatibility of indigenous and alien, Sudanese and Turco-Egyptian, albeit that the nascent nationalism was still concealed behind a traditional Islamic ideology.

4. *The Translation*

This translation is based on four versions of the Funj Chronicle. These are:—

1. MS. Cairo as printed in al-Shāṭir Buṣaylī ‘Abd al-Jalīl, *Makḥṭūṭat Kātib al-Shūna*, collated when necessary with the original MS. and with MSS. Istanbul and Nottingham. This provides the basic text to 1254/1838. Its pagination is given in square brackets in the translation.

2. MS. Nottingham, collated when necessary with the inferior and shorter MS. Vienna. This provides some additional material for the period covered by MS. Cairo, which is inserted where appropriate in the translation, and also a fragmentary continuation to 1257/1841–2.

3. MS. Paris, the first recension of the Chronicle, made by al-Zubayr w. Ḍawwāh, again provides material additional to MS. Cairo, which is inserted where appropriate. Its independent treatment of the Turco-Egyptian period, continued to 1280/1863, is translated in full, and its variant introduction is given in Appendix IA.

4. The final recension of the Chronicle by Ibrāhīm ‘Abd al-Dāfi‘ differs from the first recension chiefly in the abridgement of the introduction (Appendix IB), and provision of some additional material (especially about the career of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir w. al-Zayn). A concluding section (down to 1288/1871) was added by al-Amīn Muḥammad al-Ḍarīr. The additional material is inserted in the translation in the appropriate places. The translation is made from Makki Shubayka, *Ta’rīkh mulūk al-Sūdān*, a sound text of the final recension.

One or two points of translation should be noted. The Chroniclers frequently use the term *bilād al-Sūdān* to signify broadly the territory with which they are concerned. In classical Arabic terminology, this phrase, meaning “the land of the Blacks”, designated a belt of territory south of the Sahara from the Red Sea to the Atlantic, in contradistinction to *bilād al-Bīḍān*, “the land of the Whites”, lying north of the Sahara. The Chroniclers clearly have a more limited region in mind, approximately those parts of *bilād al-Sūdān* lying adjacent or near to the Blue and White Niles. I have tried to indicate this distinction by the phrase “the land of the Sūdān”. After the Turco-Egyptian conquest, when an expanding area was brought under the rule of the viceroy of Egypt and his lieutenants, the term began to acquire its modern meaning in such phrases as *al-aqālīm al-Sūdāniyya*, “the Sudanese provinces”, and “the Sudan” emerges as a specific political and territorial unit.

Certain terms are left untranslated, and their explanation relegated to the Glossary. These are mainly religious (especially Sufi) technical terms, and titles of political and military rank both in the Funj and the Turco-Egyptian periods. With regard to the latter, it should be borne in mind that the establishment of the Turco-Egyptian administration in the Sudan synchronized with Muḥammad ‘Alī Pasha’s reform and modernization of the governmental system in Egypt. In this state of flux both old and new terms for officials and administrative units appear, especially in the early years of the new regime.

I have left untranslated the verse-passages, some of considerable length, which Kātib al-Shūna, following traditional chronicle-style, delighted to intersperse in his prose narrative, and which are largely edited out by his continuators. I can only plead in mitigation (apart from my own linguistic limitations) that the verses are of literary rather than historical importance, and that I am following the precedent set by Gaston Wiet in his French translation of Ibn Iyās’s *Badā’i’ al-zuhūr*.

In conclusion, I wish to express my thanks to those libraries which have by means of photocopies of their manuscripts made possible this translation: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya in Cairo for MSS. Cairo and Istanbul, the Library of the University of Nottingham and the Royal Geographical Society in London for MS. Nottingham, the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna for MS. Vienna, and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris for MS. Paris. The Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies in London and its staff have helped me in many ways, and I am particularly obliged to Mr. Peter Colvin (Principal Assistant Librarian for the Islamic Near and Middle East) for his good offices. I am deeply grateful to my former colleagues, Professor Edward Ullendorff and Dr. Colin Heywood for advice on Ethiopian and Ottoman matters respectively, and to my Sudanese friends Dr. Mansour Y. Elagab, Mr. Osman Wagiallah and Dr. Khalid Almubarak Mustafa for advice on Sudanese dialect and other help. For remaining errors of fact and translation, I am solely responsible. Finally, I have drawn extensively on the work of my predecessors in this field, the late scholars al-Shāṭir Buṣaylī ‘Abd al-Jalīl and Makkī Shubayka, for material, especially in the notes and appendixes to this translation, which I dedicate to their memory.