The Narrative Change in Muslim Historiography within the Context of the Expedition to al-Kharrār

Ahmet Topal [1]

Abstract

The first written sources of Islamic history, which scholars of various fields within Islamic studies, such as Arabic literature and Islamic law rely on for inquiry into historical events and figures, are generally accepted to date to the third Hijrī century. This historical data, though same in general, shows variations across texts. The present work analyzes the expedition to al-Kharrār in classical sources, most importantly in al-Wāqidī's al-Maghāzī, Ibn Saʿd's al-Ṭabaqāt, and Ibn Hishām's al-Sīra, in an effort to make sense of the changes and overlaps that occur in the descriptions of the same event in these texts. It argues that the changes in the narrative structure of the expedition seen in the sources should be attributed especially to Ibn Saʿd's efforts to provide a more cohesive narrative of the event rather than a disingenuous effort to twist history, as it is sometimes claimed without justification by orientalists.

Keywords: Textual Analysis, Narrative Change, Islamic law, Historical Data about Companions as a Source of Law, Arabic (Auto)biographical Writing.

[1] Asst. Prof., Hitit University, Theology School, Department of Arabic Language and Rhetoric, Çorum, Türkiye, ahmettopal@hitit.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3127-1674.

Harrār Seriyyesi Özelinde Müslüman Tarih Yazıcılığında Anlatı Değişimi

Ahmet Topal [1]

Öz

İslâmî çalışmalar alanının çeşitli bilim dalları olan Arap Edebiyatı ve İslam Hukûku gibi alanlarında faaliyet yürüten ilim adamlarının tarihi olaylara ve şahıslara dair malumat elde etmek üzere kullandıkları ilk yazılı İslam Tarihi kaynaklarının, Hicret'in 3. yılına gittiği genel olarak kabul edilir. Temelde aynı olmakla beraber, bu tarihi malumat farklı metinlerde arasında değişiklik göstermektedir. Bu çalışma, Harrār Seriyyesi özelinde, başta el-Vākidī'nin al-Meğāzī'si, İbn Saʿd'ın al-Ṭabakāt'ı ve İbn Hişām'ın al-Sīre'si olmak üzere klasik tarih eserlerinde mezkûr olaya dair anlatılardaki ortak ve farklı yönleri incelemektedir. Bu makale, bu seferin anlatımına dair bu üç eserde görülen farklılıkları, bilhassa İbn Saʿd'ın bu seriyyeyi daha tutarlı ve akıcı bir şekilde işleme gayretinin bir neticesi olarak görmenin daha doğru olduğunu ve oryantalistlerin bazen iddia ettiği gibi bunun tarihi çarpıtmaya yönelik olmadığını iddia etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Metin Analizi, Anlatı Değişimi, İslâm Hukûku, İslâm Hukûku Kaynağı olarak Sahâbe hakkında Tarihi Bilgi, Arap Edebiyatı (Oto)biyografi Yazımı.

[1] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Hitit Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi, Arap Dili ve Belagatı Anabilim Dalı, Çorum, Türkiye, ahmettopal@hitit.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3127-1674.

Introduction

In an expedition sent by the Prophet Muḥammad to Kharrār,[3] a place located on the way which connects Mecca to Medina, and in the south of Rābigh and Jufayna,[4] a group of companions commanded by Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ[5] set off from Medina with the purpose of intercepting a Meccan caravan. The campaign of al-Kharrār is one of the first campaigns Muslims made against Meccans, which took place in the first year of the Hijra (May 623) according to some sources.[6]

Classical sources for the study of Islamic history which provide information on the expedition to al-Kharrār do not agree on some of the details of the expedition, such as the date in which it took place. For instance, Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr notes that the expedition happened sometime after the end of the year 623,[7] which is a dating that contradicts to those mentioned in other sources such as al-Wāqidī's *al-Maghāzī*.[8] Thus on the matter of the date of the expedition, the classical sources are not in agreement.

The dating is not the only aspect of the expedition to al-Kharrār about which classical sources provide variant and sometimes even conflicting narratives with each other. In fact, reports vary on the number of companions who participated in the expedition. These types of variations in the narrative structure is not peculiar to the expedition to al-Kharrār. Such variations may be true for many other historical data found in the primary sources which we have at our disposal for the study of Islamic history.[9]

This is an area of research related not only to Islamic History, Historiography as well as Arabic literature but also other disciplines within Arabic and Islamic studies, including but not limited to, Islamic law, Quranic studies, Ḥadīth studies, and Kalām studies. To illustrate, all of these fields rely on the historical data available in biographical dictionaries as well as in *maghāzī* and *akhbār* literature that provide information on the identities of historical events or figures that the authors regarded significant to be included in their works.[10]

---

[3] For a general perspective on the expedition, see İbrahim Sarıçam, "Harrâr Seferi", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/harrar-seferi (04.01.2023).

[4] Mustafa Sabri Küçükaşçı, "Râbiğ Seriyyesi", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/rabig-seriyyesi (30.08.2022).

[5] Abū Isḥāq Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ al-Qurashī al-Zuhrī (d. 55/675) was one of those who were referred to with the agnomen of '*Fāris al-Islām*' (horseman/warrior of Islām), for he was one of the pioneering commanders in Islamic history. He was also among the ten Companions whom the Prophet gave glad tidings that they were among those who would go to paradise. He was the founder of the city of Kūfa and its first governor. There were 271 traditions narrated from him, fifteen of which made their way into the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. He participated in the expeditions of Rābiğ and Baṭn al-Nakhla and led the expedition to Kharrār, which we explore in the present work (for more information about Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ and his career, see Ibrahim Hatiboğlu, "Saʿd b. Ebû Vakkās", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, 35/372-374. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/sad-b-ebu-vakkas (30.08.2022)).

[6] Sarıçam, "Harrâr Seferi", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, 242.

[7] Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Abū ʿUmar Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf b. ʿAbd Allāh b. M. ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Durar fī al-Maghāzī wa al-Siyar*, ed. Shawqī Ḍayf (Qairo: n.p. 1966), 98.

[8] Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Wāqidī, *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*, ed. Marsden Jones (Bayrūt: ʿĀlem al-Kutub, 1984), 11.

[9] R. Stephen Humphreys, *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991), 99.

[10] For more information on the various genre of historical writing within Arabic and Islamic studies, see Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 71-76. For example, in order to determine at least the first addressees of a given chapter or verse in the Qurʾān, one would need to determine when that chapter or verse was revealed. This might well have an influence on the way a given exegete interprets the relevant verses (see, in this regard, Harun Abacı,

Perhaps, the most important biographical and historical data for the study of these fields of research is that which is about the Prophet and his Companions.[11] Constituting the second most important source of law after the Quran, the Sunna is, in fact, especially significant for all of these disciplines. And in particular, traditions are vital for establishing law, as the bulk of law relies on traditions,[12] which makes the importance of the historical and biographical data about the Prophet and the Companions— who constitute the first generation that narrated down the traditions to next generations— obvious.

Thus, any attempt to study the biographical and historical information about the Prophet and the Companions, whether within the field of Islamic law, Arabic literature, or any other field of research within Arabic and Islamic studies cannot be ignorant of, at least, the rudiments of historiography and its various types which includes *ṭabaqāt*, *maghāzī* and *akhbār* literature. Therefore, the authenticity and reliability of classical sources available at our disposal for the study of Islamic history is thus vital for all the disciplines within Arabic and Islamic studies.

However, the variations in reports with regard to historical events that are reported to had taken place in classical sources of Islamic history might cause confusion on the part of the readers at best or might compromise the reliability of these sources and of the methodology of historiography adopted therein. In fact, there is a wide-spread mistrust among some contemporary scholars towards the authenticity of classical sources on Islamic history that seems to have resulted at least partially from an attempt to make sense of these changes in the narrative structure of a given event across various sources on Islamic history. And this mistrust seems to be fairly common in the study of early Islamic history in the Western academia.[13]

Commenting on *al-Maghāzī* of al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823), Cahen (d. 1991),[14] for instance, argues that the accounts recorded in the extant Muslim historiography are "imaginative reconstructions" of a later period, albeit without providing any support or citation.[15] Similar remarks had been made with regard to especially legal reports attributed to the Prophet in classical sources. In fact, Schacht (d. 1902-1969) argues that legal traditions

---

"Tefsîrü'l-Celâleyn'i Okuma Yöntemi ve Müfessirlerin Dili: Fâtiha Sûresi Tefsiri Örneği" in *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 21 / 40 (December 2019): 415-439*, pp. 421-423. https://doi.org/10.17335/sakaifd.613972. Similarly, even the established rules of pronunciation and intonation of verses of the Qurʾān go back to the Prophet through the Companions and subsequent generations, the information regarding the identity of whom we rely on the historical data recorded in Muslim historiography (see, for instance, Fatma Çakır, "Yazım İtibariyle Farklı Algılanan Bazı Kelimelerin Tecvit Tahlili" in *Batman Akademi Dergisi* 6 (2023): 113-120, pp. 115.)

[11] See in this regard, Mahmut Yazıcı, *Sahâbe Bilgisi'nin Tespiti* (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2015), who primarily through a meticulous comparative analysis of the first biographical dictionaries and description of the structure and the contents of the Dīwan of ʿUmar as mentioned in reports in early collections of Islamic history, argues, rather successfully, that the earliest documents containing biographical information about the Companions most likely date further back in history as early as to the turn of the second century and even to the end of the last quarter of the first century of the Hijra.

[12] The amorphous corpus of these traditions is referred to as the Sunna, which had proof-value in Islam after the Qurʾān (see Khaled Abou El Fadl, *Speaking in God's Name: Islamic Law, Authority and Women* (Oxford: Oneworld, c2001), 101).

[13] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 98.

[14] For more information about Cahen's studies and career, see Muhammet Kemaloğlu "Claude Cahen Çalışmaları ve Hakkında Yapılan Araştırmalar" in *İSTEM / 22 (Aralık 2013): 187-207*.

[15] Claude Cahen, "History and Historians," *in The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Religion, Learning and Science in the ʿAbbasid Period*, ed. M.J.L. Young et al., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 192.

were put into circulations for the purpose promoting one's own opinions on legal matters.[16]

As a result of this mistrust towards the data available in classical sources for the study of Islamic history, their analysis of a given event in the history of Muslim societies focuses upon analyzing the intention of a given Muslim historian behind his preference of certain texts in his work and not others which were also available to him, his omission of certain reports from his texts in spite of the fact that, again, they were available to him, and his way of organizing certain reports in his work.[17]

Humphreys, for instance, adopts such an approach to the way a particular event in Muslim history is described in classical sources of Islamic history, namely the caliphate of ʿUthmān (23–35/644–56), the third patriarchal caliph. In fact, he focuses on "the intentions and concerns of the historians who composed classical sources that purport to describe the social and political "realities" of the Muslim societies with regard to the reign of ʿUthmān."[18] Humphreys studies the caliphate of ʿUthmān through al-Balāḏurī's *Kitāb Ansāb al-Ašrāf* in comparison to other sources which al-Balāḏurī had access to.[19]

However, the question that needs to be asked is how a contemporary scholar can practically discover the 'intention' of a given scholar who lived in several centuries ago in the way he chooses to describe a historical event and to what extend embarking on such a journey for a contemporary scholar would yield objective interpretations with regard to that event?

Obviously, there could be many reasons why a given scholar such as al-Balāḏurī to arrange the data available to him in the way he actually arranged it. One could argue that his remarks might potentially be ideologically driven. Yet, it is not less likely that his treatment of the caliphate of ʿUthmān could be based on his objective scholarly opinions. He could have even arranged, omitted, or included certain information with regard to the caliphate of ʿUthmān for practical reasons or even by mistake, too.

Attempting to discover which one of these options was in fact the case for al-Balāḏurī is a subjective enterprise. The subjective nature of this attempt is something that Humphreys himself admits when he notes that his solutions to answer the aforementioned questions with regard to the "intentions" of al-Balāḏurī will only be hypothetical and that there will always be room for subjective interpretation.[20]

Moreover, his findings turn out to be in contradiction to his initial thesis, which further

---

[16] Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 152, 153. For a critical analysis of Schact's remarks on the matter of fabrication of certain traditions with regard to the Prophet's marriage with Maymūna, see Bekir Özüdoğru, "Bir Olay İki Rivayet: Rasûlullâh (s.a.v.) ile Meymûne'nin (r.a.) İhramlı(sız) Evlenmesi Özelinde İlk Dönem Hadis Rivayeti ve Mezheplere Yansıması" in *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 9 / 2 (Eylül 2022): 1348-1372, pp. 1358-1359. https://doi.org/10.51702/esoguifd.1138803. In this regard, also see Bünyamin Korucu, "Fıkıhta Mezhep Çalışmalarını Müstakil Bir Alt Disipline Dönüştürmenin İmkânı: Yeni Bir Perspektif" *Universal Journal of Theology (UJTE)*, 7 / 2 (December 2022): 19-45, pp. 29-30. https://doi.org/10.56108/ujte.1127219. For another perspective of how the Ḥanafī school of law was developed especially in the 5th century of the Hijra, see Bünyamin Korucu, *Hanefî Fıkhında Ruhsat: Teori ve Pratik*, ed. Harun Abacı (İstanbul: Gümüşev, 2020), 7-27.

[17] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 99.

[18] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 99.

[19] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 98.

[20] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 99.

reveals the subjective nature of embarking upon a journey to discover the motivations behind the way al-Balāḏurī treated the reign of ʿUthmān. In fact, on the basis of no evidence but rather on the general acceptance which presupposes that classical authors' works are ideologically driven, Humphreys initially argues that al-Balāḏurī's primary sources, namely al-Wāqidī and Abū Mikhnaf (d. 157/773-74), might lead him to arrive at a pro-ʿAlid position in his analysis of the reign of ʿUthmān.[21] Yet, as he himself admits, his analysis of al-Balāḏurī's version of the story in comparison to his sources reveals that his initial thesis about the unreliability of al-Balāḏurī in his treatment of the reign of ʿUthmān falls to the ground.[22] Nonetheless, this does not lead Humphreys to openly revise his acceptance of the inauthenticity of classical sources on the history of Muslim societies.[23]

As such, the general mistrust to the authenticity of historical data available in classical sources on the part of the western scholars of Islamic studies might well be ideologically driven, and there is ample evidence to support this, some of which I explored above.[24]

In order to scrutinize the integrity of this general mistrust among some contemporary scholars towards the authenticy of classical works on the study of Muslim societies, this paper seeks to find answers to the following questions using the expedition to al-Kharrār as a case study: Why do classical historians provide variant, or sometimes even conflicting, reports about a given single event in the history of Muslim societies? Which one of the versions of the event mentioned in classical sources should one prefer over the others? What kind of information one should expect in them? How to read these sources? And perhaps most importantly, do such disparities with regard to the event's details indicate a distortion or reshaping of history?

In an effort to provide answers to these questions within the scope of the expedition to Kharrār, the present work analyzes some of the classical sources of Islamic history that provide information regarding this event. In doing so, I rely primarily on al-Wāqidī's (d. 207/823) *al-Maghāzī*, Ibn Saʿd's (d. 230/845) *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, and Ibn Hishām's (d. 218/833) *al-Sīra*, which are the earliest sources at our disposal[25] and will thus constitute the bedrock of my analysis of the expedition in this work. I will also make use of other primary sources of such as al-Samʿānī's *Kitāb al-Ansāb* and Ibn Ḥajar's *Tahḏīb al-Tahḏīb*.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no study that compares al-Wāqidī's *al-Maghāzī*, Ibn Saʿd's *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, and Ibn Hishām's *al-Sīra* to each other and certainly not one that is within the context of the expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ. Nor is there any work that analyzes the narrative structure of the event with an eye to providing insights into the integrity of the general mistrust among some of the contemporary scholars to the

---

[21] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 100.

[22] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 102.

[23] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 98-101.

[24] Similar ideologically driven ideas are to be found within Arabic and Islamic studies elsewhere. For instance, the theory which claims that 'The all-embracing Islamic law caused Islamic civilization to decline and hindered its ability to revive again.' has been in circulation for a long time in academia and media. However, it relies heavily on certain assumptions of 18th and 19th century Orientalists, which are in essence driven by various ideologies such as sects of Catholicism, Protestantism, secularism, German-Jewish reformism, and Marxism (see Ahmet, Topal," Did Islamic Law Cause Islamic Civilization to Decline?" in *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 53, Aralık 2022: 595-616. https://doi.org/10.17120/omuifd.1175270, 614.) See, in this regard, also Fatma Kızıl, *Müşterek Râvi Teorisi ve Tenkidi* (İstanbul:Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi (İSAM), 2013.)

[25] Mustafa Fayda, "İbn Saʿd", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/ibn-sad (21.02.2023).

authenticity of classical sources available for the study of Islamic history. Using the expedition as a case study, therefore, this work will fill an important gap in the scholarship as it will provide valuable insights into the nature of the narrative change seen across classical historical sources on Islamic studies and their relevance for Muslim historiography.

This paper consists of one introductory and five main sections followed by a conclusion. The introductory section introduces the subject matter of the present work, which is the narrative change seen in classical historical sources and provides a roadmap on the way in which the present work deals with this issue, which is through the comparison of al-Wāqidī's *al-Maghāzī*, Ibn Saʿd's *al-Ṭabaqāt*, and finally Ibn Hishām's *al-Sīra* within the scope of the expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ.

In section 1, in an effort to set the stage for the comparison, I present al-Wāqidī's account of the expedition to al-Kharrār, which is the earliest source among these three. In section 2, I present Ibn Saʿd's version of the expedition and compare it that of al-Wāqidī, tracing the narrative changes in the way the expedition is presented in these two works. This will be followed by a comparison of Ibn Hishām's account with that of al-Wāqidī in the next section (section 3), thus providing a comparison of the historical data available in these three sources for the study of Islamic history within the scope of the campaign to Kharrār.

The significance of comparing the narratives of texts of primary manuals of Islamic history within the scope of a single event such as the expedition to al-Kharrār, which is also known as the expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ, lies in the fact that it helps us gain more insights into the development of historical writing in Islamic historiography and hones our understanding of how to use these sources in historical research into Muslim societies, whether our research is centered within Islamic law, Arabic language and literature, Ḥadīth or Qurʾānic studies or any other field of study within the larger field of Arabic and Islamic studies. Such a comparison's importance is also due to the valuable information which it provides with regard to the integrity and reliability of using these sources for research in Arabic and Islamic studies. Section 4 is thus dedicated to the relevance of the present work for the study of Arabic and Islamic studies. Section 5 is a discussion section, which is followed by a conclusion.

1. Al-Wāqidī's Account of the Expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ

This section is dedicated to al-Wāqidī's version of the expedition to al-Kharrār. The most salient characteristics of al-Wāqidī's version of the story seems to be his inclusion of various information about the event into his book without a clear line of story that could have otherwise functioned to organize the data. In fact, this is a common characteristic of collections such as al-Wāqidī's al-Maghāzī, which places it under the *akhbār* literature.[26]

1.1. Al-Wāqidī's Version of the Expedition to al-Kharrār

Al-Wāqidī's version of the expedition thus provides valuable insights into the characteristics of *akhbār* literature. What follows is a translation of the expedition to Kharrār led by Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ as it is found in al-Wāqidī's *al-Maghāzī:*

---

[26] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 99.

The expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ to Kharrār[27]

Then the Prophet, piece and blessings be upon Him, tied the banner to Kharrār for Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ -- al-Kharrār is from al-Juḥfa,[28] near to Khum[29] -- in the month of *Ḏū l-qaʿda*, [which was] at the beginning of the ninth month of Prophet's migration.

Abū Bakr b. Ismāʿīl b. Muḥammad narrated to me from his father, who transmitted from ʿĀmir b. Saʿd, who transmitted from his father who said: "The Messenger of God p.b.u.H. said: "Set off, o Saʿd, until you reach al-Kharrār. In fact, there is a caravan belonging to Quraysh that you shall come across."

So, I set off with 20 or 21 men on foot. And we camped during the day and walked during the night until we arrived in it [Kharrār] on the fifth day. And we found that the caravan had passed by the previous day. Certainly, the Messenger of God, peace and blessings be upon Him, had commanded me not to transgress al-Kharrār. Otherwise, I would have certainly hoped to catch them [i.e., the caravan]."

It is said: "The Messenger of God, peace and blessings be upon Him, did not send anyone from among the Anṣār to a place until he fought with them [i.e., the Anṣār] the battle of Badr.[30] This was because of the fact that they had laid down as a condition for him that they would defend/protect him [i.e., the Prophet] in their homeland [i.e., Medina].

This was transmitted to me by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAyyāš al-Makhzūmī,[31] who transmitted it from ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿUbayd b. Saʿīd b. Yarbūʿ,[32] who narrated it from Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab,[33] who narrated it from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Saʿīd b. Yarbūʿ.[34]

2. The Account of the Raid in Ibn Saʿd's *Ṭabaqāt* and its Comparison to Wāqidī's

Having thus provided with the account of the expedition to al-Kharrār in al-Wāqidī's al-Maghāzī, I will now provide with a translation of the account in his student Ibn Saʿd's *al-Ṭabaqāt*. This section also compares Ibn Saʿd's version to al-Wāqidī's account, tracing the similarities and differences between the two.

---

[27] Al-Wāqidī, *al-Maghāzī*, 11.

[28] Mustafa L. Bilge, "Cuhfe", TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/cuhfe (01.10.2022).

[29] Ethem Ruhi Fiğlali, "Gadîr-i Hum", TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/gadir-i-hum (01.10.2022).

[30] For more information on the Battle of Badr, see Ibn Saʿd, al-Ṭabaqāt, 13-25. See also Mustafa Fayda, "Bedir Gazvesi", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/bedir-gazvesi (30.09.2022).

[31] ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAyyāsh al-Makhzūmī: ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAyyāsh narrated traditions from ʿAmr b. Shuʿba and from others, and Abū Isḥāq al-Fazārī and others narrated from him (see Al-ʿAsqalānī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī b. Ḥajar Al-ʿAsqalānī al-Shāfiʿī, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, ed. ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd and ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwiḍ (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub ʿIlmiyya, 2004), VI, 247).

[32] ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿUbayd or ʿUbayda (see Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, VI, 409).

[33] Ibn Ḥazan b. Abū Wahb b. ʿAmr b. ʿĀʾidh b. ʿImrān b. Makhzūm b. Yaqaẓa. (see Ibn Saʿd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, III, 119-43).

[34] ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Saʿīd b. Yarbūʿ b. ʿAnkatha b. ʿĀmir b. Makhzūm al-Makhzūmī. His kunya is Abū Muḥammad al-Madanī (see Aḥmad b. ʿAlī b. Ḥajar Šihāb al-Dīn al-ʿAsqalānī, *Tahḏīb al-Tahḏīb*, ed. ʿAdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd and ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwiḍ (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiya, 2004), IV, 55).

2.1. Ibn Saʿd's version of the Expedition to al-Kharrār

The most obvious characteristics of Ibn Saʿd's version of the expedition to al-Kharrār seems to be its cohesiveness especially in comparison to al-Wāqidī's account. This is, I argue, due not to a disingenuous effort to manipulate the historical data, but rather, to organize it in such a way that it facilitates the reading process for each subsequent reader of the event in these sources by gathering the pieces of information into a single line of a story, which is one of the most common characteristics digests.

Ibn Saʿd describes the expedition as the following:

> ### The expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāş[35]
>
> Then [took place] the expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāş to Kharrār on the [month of] Ḏū l-qaʿda, in the beginning of the ninth month since the migration of the Prophet [to Medina], peace and blessings be upon Him, who tied a white banner for him to be carried by al-Miqdād b. ʿAmr al-Bahrānī.[36] He [i.e. the Prophet] sent him [i.e. Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāş] with 20 men from among the Muhājirūn to intercept a caravan of the Quraysh which was to pass by it [i.e. Kharrār]. And he [i.e. the Prophet] commissioned him [i.e. Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāş] not to go beyond al-Kharrār. Al-Kharrār is [the place where] wells [are located] on the way from al-Juḥfa to Mecca, which falls to the left of al-Muḥja near Khum. Saʿd said: "We set off on foot. We would camp during the day and travel during the night till arriving in it [i.e. Kharrār] on the fifth morning only to find out that it [i.e. the caravan] had left the day before. Thus, we returned to Medina."

2.2. A Comparison of al-Wāqidī's version with that of Ibn Saʿd

The most obvious difference between the two versions of the expedition, namely, that of al-Wāqidī and Ibn Saʿd, is that Ibn Saʿd's version of the account is more condense than al-Wāqidī's. In fact, the gest of the story is the same in both of them, but Ibn Saʿd, which is written later than al-Wāqidī, shortened al-Wāqidī's version of the story by eliminating the two chains of transmission in al-Wāqidī.

The purpose of Ibn Saʿd to do so appears to be that he wants to have a cohesive narration of the account rather than to provide disjoint *akhbār* (reports) with *isnād*s (chains of transmission) that make a story only through an intellectual effort by each reader aiming at bringing different pieces of the picture together to make sense of the picture, as in the case of al-Wāqidī's account.

In addition to omitting the two *isnād*s, therefore, he also reconciles the two *matn*s (texts) of these *isnād*s. In fact, instead of repeating the two distinct information in the two *matn*s of al-Wāqidī separately, i.e., information that a group of companions set off for a

---

[35] Ibn Saʿd, Muḥammad b. Saʿd Mabīʿ al-Zuhrī, *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr*, ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿUmar (Qairo: Maktaba al-Khānjī, 2001), II, 7.

[36] Ibn Thaʿlaba b. Mālik b. Rabīʿa b. Thumāma b. Maṭrūd b. ʿAmr b. Saʿd Ibn Duhayr Luʾʾiyy b. Thʿlaba b. Mālik b. al-Sharīd b. Abū Ahwan b. Fāʾish b. Duraym b. Qaym b. Ahwad b. Bahrāʾ b. ʿAmr b. Alḥāf b. Quḍāʿa (see Ibn Saʿd, *al-Ṭabaqāt,* III, 161-163). According to al-Samʿānī, al-Bahrānī is a tribe descending from al-Quḍāʿa most of whose members migrated to, and resided in, Ḥimṣ, a city in al-Shām (see Samʿānī, Abū Saʿdʿ Abd al-Karīm b. M. b. Manṣūr al-Tamīmī al-Samʿānī. *al-Ansāb*, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥman b. Yaḥyā al-Muʿallimī al-Yamānī (Qairo: Maktaba Ibn Taymiyya, 1980), II, 344-345).

campaign against a caravan belonging to Meccans and that nobody from among the Anṣār participated in the campaign, Ibn Saʿd reconstructs a more cohesive story of the raid by combining the information found in the two *matn*s, by saying that it was a campaign in which 20 Muhājirūn participated.

There are other differences between the two versions of the story that make this purpose of Ibn Saʿd clear. For instance, while al-Wāqidī provides two alternative information regarding the number of those who participated in the campaign, i.e., 20 or 21, Ibn Saʿd prefers one of them over the other, i.e., 20.

Likewise, al-Wāqidī relates the information regarding the dialogue reported to had taken place between the Prophet and Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ prior to the expedition in the form of quotations. In fact, al-Wāqidī reports what he believes the Prophet had said to Saʿd with regard to target of the mission to Kharrār and to the cautioning of the Prophet of Saʿd of not to transgress Kharrār. Al-Wāqidī does all of these by directly quoting either the Prophet or Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ. On the other hand, Ibn Saʿd digests both the information about the purpose of the mission and the caution with regard to the territorial limit of the mission into a single line of story where it is related in third-person narration, thus achieving a more unified line of reporting of what they believed had taken place with regard to the expedition.

While Ibn Saʿd's version is thus more cohesive, al-Wāqidī's version is sometimes more illuminating in some respects. For instance, Ibn Saʿd provides no explanatory information regarding why the campaign was consisted only of companions from among the Muhājirūn, but al-Wāqidī explains this fact by referring to a treaty (probably the second ʿAqaba) between the Prophet and al-Anṣār.

Similarly, al-Wāqidī provides readers with more insights into the thoughts of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ upon not accomplishing the mission by stating what he said on the matter who noted "Certainly, the Messenger of God, peace and blessings be upon Him, commanded me not to transgress al-Kharrār. Otherwise, I would have certainly hoped to catch them [i.e., the caravan]." On the other hand, Ibn Saʿd seems to have less interest in detail such as these which appears to represent nothing of value for establishing the authenticity of the narrative being reported but rather seems to constitute more of a personal anecdote towards the result of the expedition on the part of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ.

Thus, Ibn Saʿd omits this personal note by Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ from his teacher al-Wāqidī's treatment of the expedition at the expense of achieving a more cohesive narration of the event. As such, al-Wāqidī's treatment sheds lights on the reaction of Ibn Saʿd to the result of the event, which might well constitute valuable information for researchers today who place emphasis in the study of history on in the inner-self of individuals in the past rather than outer events.[37]

---

[37] It was one of the characteristics of Arabic (auto)biographical writing to emphasize the outer events, rather than the mental development, of an individual's life (M.J.L. Young, "Arabic Biographical Writing," in *The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature. Religion, Learning and Science in the ʿAbbasid Period*, ed. M.J.L. Young et al., Cambridge 1991, 172). For an analysis, within the context of Taşköprüzâde's autobiography, of how the tradition of pre-modern Arabic (auto)biographical writing were received in the academia, see Ahmet Topal, "Arap Edebiyati Otobiyografi Yazin Geleneği: Taşköprüzâde Örneği" in *Universal Journal of Theology* 6 / 1 (Haziran 2021): 183-205 and The Autobiography of Taşköprüzâde: The Study of Pre-modern Autobiographical Writing in the Arabic Literary Tradition (Istanbul: Gümüşev, 2021).

3. The Expedition in Ibn Hishām's *al-Sīra* and its Comparison to Wāqidī's and Ibn Saʿd's

Having thus provided with a comparison of the account of the expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ by al-Wāqidī and his student Ibn Saʿd, this section provides with another version of the expedition, which is by another eminent historian contemporary to him, namely Ibn Hishām, as he describes in his well-known work *al-Sīra*. In this section, I will first provide with Ibn Hishām's version, followed by a comparison of his account of the story with that of al-Wāqidī and of Ibn Saʿd.

3.1. The Expedition to al-Kharrār in Ibn Hishām and its Comparison to The Versions of al-Wāqidī and Ibn Saʿd

Here I provide the account of the expedition as it is found in Ibn Hishām's al-Sīra. Perhaps the most salient feature of this version is its brevity. Ibn Hishām also mentions an important report with regard to the chronology of the raid, which is that "the raid was after Ḥamza-may God be pleased with him." This dating of the expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ might appear to be contradictory to the dating of the expedition given by al-Wāqidī, which is a matter that I will also cover in this section due to its relevance.

> *The expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ*[38]
>
> Ibn Isḥāq said:
>
> Among those which the Prophet sent to campaign was Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ together with 8 *rahṭ*[39] from among the Muhājirūn. He set off until he reached to Kharrār of the Ḥijāz region. Then he returned without a fight.[40]
>
> Ibn Hishām said:
>
> Some scholars mentioned that this sending of Saʿd was after Ḥamza.

Ibn Hishām's account of the raid is very short compared to that of al-Wāqidī. This is partly because of the fact that Ibn Hishām does not provide any chain of transmission unlike al-Wāqidī, except that Ibn Hishām indicates that he transmits the account from Ibn Isḥāq, which is usual in his book as he is narrating the book itself from him.

Regarding those who were involved in the raid, Ibn Hishām mentions that they were 8 *rahṭ* (one of the meanings of which is a number of men less than ten[41]), which would make a group of people less than 80 in total. On the other hand, in al-Wāqidī's account, the number of those who participated in the raid are given as either 20 or 21.

Also worthy of mentioning is that while in Ibn Hishām's account, it is explicitly stated that these people were from among the Muhājirūn, in al-Wāqidī's account this is not explicitly mentioned. In fact, al-Wāqidī—after mentioning the number of those who participated in the expedition and a brief description of the raid, which is more detailed compared to Ibn Hishām's account of the story—transmits a narration which states that

---

[38] Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya*, ed. Mustafa al-Saqa et al. (Cairo: Halabi, 1936), 251.

[39] See below.

[40] The original reads: ثم رجع ولم يلق كيدا (for the idiom, see Edward William, Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon Derived from the Best and Most Copious Eastern Sources* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1968), 2639).

[41] Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 1169. Another meaning of the word *rahṭ* is given as "a man's people, and tribe, consisting of his nearer relations" (see Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*).

the Prophet did not send anyone from among the Anṣār outside of Medina for campaign or raid,[42] which is something that implies that those participated in the raid of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ were from among the Muhājirūn.

As to the chronology of the raid, while it is before the Battle of Badr according to al-Wāqidī, Ibn Hishām provides a narration in which it is said, "the raid was after Ḥamza-may God be pleased with him." This should be the uncle of the Prophet. The question that needs to be asked here is "what does "after Ḥamza" (or "*baʿda* Ḥamza" as it is mentioned in Arabic) refer here?" Two main potential interpretations of the expression '*baʿda* Ḥamza' might come to mind immediately: either "after Ḥamza's conversion to Islam" or "after the death of Ḥamza."

As to the first possibility, we know that the Prophet did not start publicly inviting people to Islam until the conversion of Ḥamza. His conversion to Islam therefore gave Muslims strength.[43] It might be that Muslims made the first campaign against the polytheist Quraysh with this new impetus.

If we would take the second possibility to be the case here, we would ascertain that the campaign to al-Kharrār took place after Ḥamza was murdered in the Battle of Uḥud, which itself happened in the year 3/625, which would place the expedition to sometime even after the Battle of Badr. Both of the interpretations seem to have some historical problems in that there are narrations that contradict to them as is the case with the versions of the story mentioned by Ibn Saʿd and al-Wāqidī, as explored above. For instance, the second possibility would place the expedition to al-Kharrār sometime after the Battle of Badr, which would contradict with the dating given by al-Wāqidī.

It appears to me that the chronology of the raid given by Ibn Saʿd and al-Wāqidī seem to be more convincing because they look free from self-contradictions. The account which al-Wāqidī narrates from some of the *ʿulamāʾ* (scholars, who was probably referring to other historians whom al-Wāqidī fell back upon[44]) poses some historical problems if we interpret the expression "*baʿda* Ḥamza" in these two potential ways.

Thus, the expression 'after Ḥamza' ('*baʿda* Ḥamza') needs to be interpreted at the light of other narrations on the matter in a way that we have an account of the story that is not self-contradictory. As a matter of fact, there can be yet another reading of "*baʿda* Ḥamza," which is '*baʿda [sariyyati]* Ḥamza', that is, 'after the expedition of Ḥamza.' In fact, when one checks classical sources to find out if there was a campaign led by Ḥamza, one realizes that there was actually such an expedition, as described in classical sources of Islamic history.

This expedition, which is referred to as *Sariyya al-Ḥamza* (the Expedition of al-Ḥamza), apparently took place before the expedition by Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ in the seventh month of the migration of the Prophet to Medina,[45] which seems to pose no historical problems

---

[42] Al-Wāqidī, *al-Maghāzī*, 11.

[43] For more information on Ḥamza, see Hüseyin Algül, "Hamza", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/hamza (01.10.2022).

[44] Some claim that such expressions refer to Ibn Isḥāq, and that al-Wāqidī was actually plagiarizing Ibn Isḥāq's material and not giving the credit to him by citing him as one of his sources (see Mustafa Fayda, "Vâkidî", TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/vakidi (06.10.2022)). However, there is no evidence proving that this was in fact the case.

[45] Ibn Saʿd, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, I, 6. See also Ibn Hishām, *al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya*, 245-248.

if we interpret Ibn Hishām's expression "*baʿda* Ḥamza" in this way.

4. The Narrative Change and Its Relevance to Islamic Historiography

The problem of narrative change in early Arabic historiography seems to have been addressed mostly in terms of the process of transmission of reports from one generation to the next.[46] In this regard, the likes of Wansbrough believed that not only Ḥadīth, let alone historical reports that made their way into such historical writings as al-Wāqidī's al-Maghāzī, but also the Qurʾān itself, was produced more than two centuries after the time when it is claimed by Muslims to be revealed to the Prophet Muḥammad between the 6th- 7th centuries AD in the course of sectarian controversy.[47]

Going beyond Wansbrough, Crone and Cook argued that the traditional version of Islamic history down to the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik was a later fabrication. [48] Crone dismisses the entire Arabic tradition down to 680s and considers the historical narratives in classical sources for the study of Islamic history as useless fictions.[49]

There were more optimistic scholars towards the classical Arabic sources for the study of Islamic history and Watt is one of them. He believes that the narrative structure given in the extant Arabic sources for the study of Islamic history is fundamentally sound.[50] Yet, he firmly believes that later theological, legal, or political controversies distorted and shaped the way historical events were told in the classical sources.[51]

Thus, the narrative change in the Arabic historical sources were attributed, even by the most optimistic views of the classical Arabic historical sources, to the distortions and retellings that reshaped these sources during the transmission of the information down to the next generations.

Unlike the previous scholarship in the West, the present work argues that the variations or even sometimes conflicts seen in these classical sources with regard to a single event should not be taken at the outset to represent bias, pejorative editions, or even disingenuous manipulations of history, but rather as representations of personal choices of scholars to choose what they consider the most correct report. Their efforts aimed at achieving a more cohesive narrative of the events as illustrated in Ibn Saʿd's version of the expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ especially when compared to al-Wāqidī's version of the event, which is in line with the general characteristics of collections (*akhbār*) literature and digests.[52]

5. Discussion

With the comparison of the three primary sources of Islamic history within the scope of the expedition to al-Kharrār led by Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ, namely al-Wāqidī's *al-Maghāzī*, Ibn Saʿd's *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, and Ibn Hishām's *al-Sīra*, the present work provides valuable insights into the nature of these sources and what to look for in them when

---

[46] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 86.

[47] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 86. See also John Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).

[48] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 87. See also Patricia Crone and Michael Cook, *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1977).

[49] Humphreys, *Islamic History,* 87.

[50] W. Montgomery, Watt, *Muhammad at Medina* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 336.

[51] Watt, *Muhammad at Medina*, 336-337.

[52] Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 73.

conducting research in any area of Arabic and Islamic studies, including but not limited to, Arabic language and literature, Islamic law, Ḥadīth and Qurʾānic studies.

In this regard I have shown, for instance, when compared to al-Wāqidī's version of the expedition to al-Kharrār, Ibn Saʿd's version of the story might be less useful for scholars who are interested in the history of ideas and mental developments of individuals, which is an approach towards historical sources that has gained a foothold in the study of pre-modern (auto)biographical writings in the Arabic literary tradition in recent times.[53] For those who are interested in the personal development of individuals and ideas, al-Wāqidī's *al-Maghāzī* might be a better place to look at.

Moreover, the comparison also reveals that for those of us who study these texts now, it is important to keep in mind that al-Wāqidī allows different voices to be heart in the account of the expedition of Saʿd b. Abū al-Waqqāṣ in comparison to Ibn Saʿd, and this attitude of al-Wāqidī towards different opinions may be true in the rest of his *al-Maghāzī*.[54]

As a matter of fact, I have highlighted several places in Ibn Saʿd's account of the expedition where he eliminates certain reports and thus does not include them in his *Ṭabaqāt*, reports which had made their way into his teachers' account of the expedition to al-Kharrār in his *al-Maghāzī*. This should not come to mean that Ibn Saʿd's selectiveness is pejorative or bias, but rather, it means that although Ibn Saʿd's intellectual efforts to choose the most correct opinion(s) in this account should be considered as important contributions to biographical writings in the Arabic literary tradition and historiography. On the other hand, this paper also demonstrates within the scope of the expedition to al-Kharrār that one should not content himself with Ibn Saʿd's version of accounts and should also consider seeing al-Wāqidī's version of events if one is interested in different opinions about any given event which made its way into the Islamic historiography.[55]

In an effort to eliminate what initially might appear as disparities in the description of the events mentioned in these classical sources for the study of Islamic history, one should not content himself/herself with one version of the story and should rather take into consideration of the same event in other sources. Ibn Hishām's account of the campaign to al-Kharrār included several aspects of the event which are somewhat vaguely described, such as is the case with the dating of the expedition, where he notes that it took place after Ḥamza, which could be interpreted in three different ways. Looking at other sources such as Ibn Saʿd's *al-Ṭabaqāt* and al-Wāqidī's *al-Maghāzī*, we found that only one of them holds true when judged against the historical data available therein.

---

[53]Especially noteworthy, in this regard, is Dwight F. Reynolds, (ed.) *Interpreting the Self: Autobiography in the Arabic Literary Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), which represents a turn in the study of pre-modern Arabic autobiographical writing in the West, which was hindered for more than half a century after Rosenthal wrote his influential work on the subject (see Franz Rosenthal, "Die arabische Autobiographie," in *Studia Arabica* I (1937): 3-40).

[54] This is not to say that al-Wāqidī does not make any choices between the historical data available to him. On the contrary, al-Wāqidī also does make editions and selections when he deems necessary and does not necessarily leave it to each reader to go through the process of choosing the best and most correct opinion about the details of a given event (see, in this regard, Ramazan Topal, "Ahmed b. Hanbel'in Müsned'inde Yer Alan Medine Dönemi ile Alâkalı Siyer Rivayetlerinde Olayların Tarihlendirilmesi" in *Hadis ve Siyer Araştırmaları 8/1 (2022) 7-45, pp.* 14-15.) See also, in this regard, Ramazan Topal, *Siyer-Hadis İlişkisi Ahmed b. Hanbel'in Müsned'i Özelinde* (İstanbul: Siyer Yayınları, 2022), 28.

[55] See Ibn Saʿd, Muḥammad b. Saʿd Mabīʿ al-Zuhrī, *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr*, ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿUmar (Qairo: Maktaba al-Khānjī, 2001), II, 7.

We should also keep in mind that there will always be variations, especially in the details of events not only those which had taken place in the distant past but also even those which have taken place in recent years. As long as one can ascertain the core of a given event in several sources, one should consider himself/herself in a good position to talk about or comment on the event in their research. Overemphasizing the variations and conflicts with regard to the details of the event that are found in various classical sources with regard to past events does not seem to go beyond manifestations of an unjustified mistrust towards Muslim historiography.

Furthermore, this unjustified mistrust towards the classical sources for the study of Islamic history sometimes leads scholars to adopt an inconsistent methodology in their works. Crone, for instance, make use of the historical data in classical historical sources for personal and tribal names.[56]Even going beyond that, she uses the historical data available in these classical works to make a case. For instance, she claims that Muʿāwiya allied with the Syrian tribe known as Kalb, which in its turn was allied with many other Syrian tribes and all the allies, who were collectively known as the Quḍāʿa. Apparently relying on classical sources as al-Masʿūdī, Crone describes the details of how much the caliphate should pay each one of the 2000 members of the confederacy of the Quḍāʿa stipends of 2000 dinars a year (i.e., *sharaf al-ʿatāʾ*) on a hereditary basis.[57]

Thus, even those scholars who show almost complete mistrust to historical data found in classical sources for the study of Muslim societies make use of this very data which they consider untrustworthy, which constitutes a methodological problem on their part.

6. Conclusion

The present study shows, within the scope of the expedition of Saʿd b. Abū Waqqāṣ, that changes in the narrative structure seen in classical Arabic sources for the study of Islamic history should be attributed to the genuine intellectual efforts of historians.

I argued that Ibn Saʿd seem to have aimed at having a cohesive narrative of the expedition. Thus he combines the disjoint pieces of information found in *al-Maghāzī* by his teacher al-Wāqidī together into a smooth narrative, as the latter's aim, just like that of other authors of *akhbār* literature, was probably mainly to collect all the data available to him rather than digesting them into a single line of narration.

Ibn Saʾd's efforts to achieve a single line of a story in the description of the expedition to al-Kharrār should be taken as a positive contribution to the study of Islamic historiography on the part of Ibn Saʿd. Moreover, I showed that there is no evidence to support the idea that the narrative change seen between the description of the event by Ibn Saʾd and al-Wāqidī and others is a representation of a disingenuous manipulation of the *akhbār* literature. Furthermore, I demonstrated the inconsistencies of adopting such an approach towards these classical sources.

I also showed within the scope of the expedition to al-Kharrār that this process of refining the historical data which a given historian receives from their predecessors does not seem to have a malicious intent on the part of the historian. Rather, I argued that combining

---

[56] Patricia Crone, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 30.

[57] Patricia Crone, "Were the Qays and Yemen of the Umayyad period political parties?" *Der Islam*, 71 (1994): 44.

pieces of information into a single line of story as much as possible naturally includes preference of one opinion over another, omissions of chains of transmissions, etc., which all come down to the process of refinement of one's predecessors' draft into a better monograph, which manifests itself, as explained above, in a comparison such as the one carried out in the present work of the general characteristics of collections (*akhbār*) literature and digests. This is further supported by the fact that this refinement process, which is seen even in *al-Maghāzī* of al-Wāqidī as noted above, is not peculiar to *maghāzī* literature; rather, this seems to be a continuing effort on the part of the historians across collections and digests, though one that seems to be more apparent in the latter.

References / Kaynakça

Abacı, Harun. "Tefsîrü'l-Celâleyn'i Okuma Yöntemi ve Müfessirlerin Dili: Fâtiha Sûresi Tefsiri Örneği." In *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 21 / 40 (December 2019): 415-439. https://doi.org/10.17335/sakaifd.613972.

Abou El Fadl, Khaled. *Speaking in God's Name: Islamic Law, Authority and Women*. Oxford: Oneworld, c2001.

Al-ʿAsqalānī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī b. Ḥajar Al-ʿAsqalānī al-Shāfiʿī, *Tadhīb al-Tahdīb*. Edited by ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd and ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwiḍ. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub ʿIlmiyya, 2004.

Bilge, Mustafa L. "Cuhfe". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *8/82-83.* İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1993. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/cuhfe.

Cahen, Claude. "History and Historians." In The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: Religion, Learning and Science in the ʿAbbasid Period. Edited by M.J.L. Young et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Crone, Patricia. *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Crone, Patricia. "Were the Qays and Yemen of the Umayyad period political parties?" In *Der Islam*, 71 (1994).

Çakır, Fatma. "Yazım İtibariyle Farklı Algılanan Bazı Kelimelerin Tecvit Tahlili" In *Batman Akademi Dergisi* 6 (2023): 113-120.

Hüseyin Algül, "Hamza", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *15/500-502.* İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1997. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/hamza.

Fayda, Mustafa. "Bedir Gazvesi." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *5/325-327.* İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1992. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/bedir-gazvesi.

Mustafa Fayda, "İbn Sa'd." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *20/294-297.* İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1999. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/ibn-sad.

Fayda, Mustafa. "Vâkidî." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *42/471-475.* İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 2012. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/vakidi.

Fığlali, Ethem Ruhi. "Gadîr-i Hum", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *13/279-280.* İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1996. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/gadir-i-hum.

Hatiboğlu, Ibrahim. "Sa'd b. Ebû Vakkās." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *35/372-374.* İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 2008. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/sad-b-ebu-vakkas.

Humphreys, R. Stephen. *Islamic History: A Framework For Inquiry*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Abū ʿUmar Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf b. ʿAbd Allāh b. M. ʿAbd al-Barr. *al-Durar fī al-Maghāzī wa al-Siyar*. Edited by Shawqī Ḍayf. Qairo: n.p. 1966.

Ibn Hishām. *al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya*. Edited by Mustafa al-Saqa et al. Cairo: Halabi, 1936.

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Šihāb al-Dīn. *Tahḏīb al-Tahḏīb*. Edited by ʿAdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd and ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwiḍ. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-

ʿlmiya, 2004.

Ibn Saʿd, Muḥammad b. Saʿd Mabīʿ al-Zuhrī, *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr*. Edited by ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿUmar. Qairo: Maktaba al-Khānjī, 2001.

Kemaloğlu, Muhammet. "Claude Cahen Çalışmaları ve Hakkında Yapılan Araştırmalar." In *İSTEM / 22 (Aralık 2013)*: 187-207.

Kızıl, Fatma. *Müşterek Râvi Teorisi ve Tenkidi*. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi (İSAM), 2013.

Korucu, Bünyamin. "Fıkıhta Mezhep Çalışmalarını Müstakil Bir Alt Disipline Dönüştürmenin İmkânı: Yeni Bir Perspektif". In *Universal Journal of Theology 7 / 2 (Aralık 2022)*: 19-45. https://doi.org/10.56108/ujte.1127219.

Bünyamin Korucu. *Hanefî Fıkhında Ruhsat: Teori ve Pratik.* Edited by Abacı Harun. İstanbul: Gümüşev, 2020.

Küçükaşçı, Mustafa Sabri. "Râbiğ Seriyyesi", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *34/382-383*. İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 2007. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/rabig-seriyyesi.

Lane, E. W. An Arabic-English Lexicon Derived from the Best and Most Copious Eastern Sources. Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1968.

Önkal, Ahmet. "Akabe Biatlari." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *2/211.* İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1989. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/akabe-biatlari.

Özüdoğru, Bekir. "Bir Olay İki Rivayet: Rasûlullâh (s.a.v.) ile Meymûne'nin (r.a.) İhramlı(sız) Evlenmesi Özelinde İlk Dönem Hadis Rivayeti ve Mezheplere Yansıması". In *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 9 / 2 (Eylül 2022): 1348-1372. https://doi.org/10.51702/esoguifd.1138803.

Reynolds, Dwight F. (ed.). Interpreting the Self: Autobiography in the Arabic Literary Tradition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Rosenthal, Franz. "Die arabische Autobiographie," Studia Arabica I (1937):3-40.

Samʿānī, Abū Saʿd ʿAbd al-Karīm b. M. b. Manṣūr al-Tamīmī al-Samʿānī. *al-Ansāb*. Edited by ʿAbd al-Raḥman b. Yaḥyā al-Muʿallimī al-Yamānī. (Qairo: Maktaba Ibn Taymiyya, 1980).

Sariçam, İbrahim. "Harrâr Seferi." *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *16/242-243.* İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1997. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/harrar-seferi.

Schacht, Joseph. *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Topal, Ahmet. "Did Islamic Law Cause Islamic Civilization to Decline?". In *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi - / 53* (December 2022): 595-616. https://doi.org/10.17120/omuifd.1175270.

Topal, Ahmet. "Arap Edebiyati Otobiyografi Yazin Geleneği: Taşköprüzâde Örneği" in *Universal Journal of Theology* 6 / 1 (Haziran 2021): 183-205.

Topal, Ramazan. "Ahmed b. Hanbel'in Müsned'inde Yer Alan Medine Dönemi ile Alâkalı Siyer Rivayetlerinde Olayların Tarihlendirilmesi." In *Hadis ve Siyer Araştırmaları*

8/1 (2022) 7-45.

Topal, Ramazan. *Siyer-Hadis İlişkisi Ahmed b. Hanbel'in Müsned'i Özelinde*. İstanbul: Siyer Yayınları, 2022.

Topal, Ahmet. *The Autobiography of Taşköprüzâde: The Study of Pre-modern Autobiographical Writing in the Arabic Literary Tradition* (Istanbul: Gümüşev, 2021).

Wansbrough, John. *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Watt, W. Montgomery. *Muhammad at Medina.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

al-Wāqidī, Muḥammad b. ʿUmar. *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*. Edited by Marsden Jones. Bayrūt: ʿĀlem al-Kutub, 1984.

Yazıcı, Mahmut. *Sahâbe Bilgisi'nin Tespiti.* İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2015.