

Validity of Salaat al-Muftarid Khalif al-Mutanaffil

(The Prayer of a person praying Fard behind the one
praying Nafil is valid)

PART ONE

The Hadeeth of Mu'aadh

Proof # 1:

عَنْ جَابِرٍ قَالَ: كَانَ مُعَاذٌ، يُصَلِّي مَعَ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ثُمَّ يَأْتِي فِيَوْمَ قَوْمِهِ، فَصَلَّى لَيْلَةً مَعَ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ الْعِشَاءَ ثُمَّ أَتَى قَوْمَهُ فَأَمَّهُمْ فَافْتَحَ بِسُورَةِ الْبَقَرَةِ فَاَنْحَرَفَ رَجُلٌ فَسَلَّمَ ثُمَّ صَلَّى وَخَدَهُ وَانصَرَفَ فَقَالُوا لَهُ: أَنَا فُتِّتْ؟ يَا فُلَانُ، قَالَ: لَا. وَاللَّهِ وَلَا تَيِّنَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَلَا خَيْرَ لَهُ. فَأَتَى رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَقَالَ: يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ، إِنَّا أَصْحَابُ نَوَاضِحٍ نَعْمَلُ بِالنَّهَارِ وَإِنَّ مُعَاذًا صَلَّى مَعَكَ الْعِشَاءَ، ثُمَّ أَتَى فَافْتَحَ بِسُورَةِ الْبَقَرَةِ فَأَقْبَلَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى مُعَاذٍ فَقَالَ: «يَا مُعَاذُ أَفَتَانَ أَنْتَ؟ اقْرَأْ بِكَذَا وَاقْرَأْ بِكَذَا»

Jaabir (radiallah anhu) reported that: “Mu'aadh bin Jabal (radiallah anhu) used to pray with the Apostle (peace be upon him), then come and lead his people in prayer. One night he prayed the Isha prayer with the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him). He then came to his people and led them in prayer beginning with

Surat al-Baqarah. A man turned aside, pronounced the tasleem (salutation for concluding the prayer), then prayed alone and departed. The people said to him: Have you become a hypocrite, so and so? He said: I swear by Allah that I have not, but I will certainly go to Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) and will inform (him) about this. He then came to the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and said: Messenger of Allah, we look after camels used for watering and work by day. Mu'aadh prayed the Isha prayer with you. He then came and began with Surat al-Baqarah. Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) then turned to Mu'aadh and said: 'Are you there to (put the people) to trial? Recite such and recite such (and such a surah)'".

[Saheeh al-Bukhaari (1/97 H. 700), Saheeh Muslim (1/187 H. 465) and the wording is that of Muslim]

Imaam Tirmidhi (D. 279) said under this hadeeth:

«هَذَا حَدِيثٌ حَسَنٌ صَحِيحٌ»، " وَالْعَمَلُ عَلَى هَذَا عِنْدَ أَصْحَابِنَا الشَّافِعِيِّ،
وَأَحْمَدَ، وَإِسْحَاقَ، قَالُوا: إِذَا أَمَّ الرَّجُلُ الْقَوْمَ فِي الْمَكْتُوبَةِ وَقَدْ كَانَ صَلَّاهَا قَبْلَ
ذَلِكَ أَنَّ صَلَاةَ مَنْ اتَّمَّ بِهِ جَائِزَةٌ، وَاحْتَجُّوا بِحَدِيثِ جَابِرٍ فِي قِصَّةِ مُعَاذٍ، وَهُوَ
حَدِيثٌ صَحِيحٌ وَقَدْ رُوِيَ مِنْ غَيْرِ وَجْهِ عَنِ جَابِرٍ "

“This hadeeth is Hasan Saheeh; and this is what our companions have acted upon, among them are: (Imaam) Ash-Shaafi’ee, (Imaam) Ahmed (bin Hanbal), and (Imaam) Ishaq (bin Rahwayh). They said that if a person leads a people in the obligatory prayer and he has already prayed the same prayer before, then the prayer of the people following him is valid; and they (A’immah) took evidence from the hadeeth of Jaabir concerning the incidence of Mu’aadh, and it is a Saheeh Hadeeth, and it is also narrated through other routes from Jaabir”

[Sunan Tirmidhi (under H. 583)]

The Tabweeb of Muhadditheen on this Hadeeth:

Now let's also observe how the Muhadditheen have titled their chapters with regard to this hadeeth. This will prove what the Muhadditheen understood from this hadeeth.

1-

Imaam Tirmidhi titled the chapter (in which he added this hadeeth) as follows:

بَابُ مَا جَاءَ فِي الَّذِي يُصَلِّي الْفَرِيضَةَ ثُمَّ يَوْمُ النَّاسِ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ

“Chapter on what is narrated concerning the one who prays the obligatory prayer, then leads (other) people after that”

2-

Imaam ul-A'immah Ibn Khuzaymah (D. 311) titled the chapter as follows:

باب اباحة ائتمام المصلي فريضة بالمصلي نافلة، ضد قول من زعم من العراقيين

أنه غير جائز أن يأتهم المصلي فريضة بالمصلي نافلة

“Chapter on the permissibility of one praying Fard being led by the one praying Naafil, as opposed to those Iraaqi people who claim that it is not permissible for a person praying Fard to pray behind the one praying Naafil”

[Saheeh Ibn Khuzaymah (3/64, Baab: 130)]

3-

Imaam Ibn Hibbaan said:

ذكر الاباحة لمن صلي جماعة فرضه أن يؤم قوما بتلك الصلوة.

“Mention of the permissibility for one who has prayed his Fard payer in congregation that he goes and leads (his) people in that same prayer.”

[Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan (6/163 H. 2406)]

4-

Imaam Abu Dawood (D. 275) writes:

باب امامة من صلي بقوم وقد صلي تلك الصلوة

“Chapter on the one leading a people in prayer who has already prayed that prayer”

[Sunan Abu Dawood (H. 599)]

5-

Imaam Ad-Daaraqutni (D. 358) titles the chapter like this:

باب ذكر صلاة المفترض خلف المتفل

“Chapter mentioning the prayer of one praying Fard behind the one praying Naafil”

[Sunan ad-Daaraqutni (1/281)]

6-

Imaam Bayhaqi (D. 458) titles these narrations as follows:

باب الفريضة خلف من يصلي النافلة

“Chapter on Fard prayer behind the one who is praying Naafil”

[Al-Sunan al-Kubra lil Bayhaqi (3/85)]

7-

Haafidh Nawawi (D. 676) writes:

باب صحة صلاة المفترض خلف المتنفل

“Chapter on the correctness of the prayer of one praying Fard behind the one praying Naafil”

[Khulaasah al-Ahkaam by Nawawi (2/697)]

8-

Imaam Nasaa’ee writes:

باب اختلاف نية الإمام والمأموم

“Chapter on the difference in intention of the Imaam and the Follower”

Allaamah Sindhi al-Hanafi explains this saying of Imaam Nasaa’ee saying:

يريد اقتداء المفترض بالمتنفل

“He (i.e. Nasaa’ee) means the prayer of one praying Fard behind the one praying Naafil”

[Haashiah as-Sindhi Ala an-Nasaa’ee (2/102)]

It is established that Muhadditheen know their narrations better than the Muqallideen.

Dear Readers! As you can see, Muhadditheen are trying to prove the validity of the prayer of one praying Fard behind the one praying Naafil from this hadeeth. You’ve read the comments of Imaam Tirmidhi; now let’s also have a look at the words of Haafidh Nawawi:

فِي هَذَا الْحَدِيثِ جَوَازُ صَلَاةِ الْمُفْتَرِضِ خَلْفَ الْمُتَنَفِّلِ لِأَنَّ مُعَاذًا كَانَ يُصَلِّي
الْفَرِيضَةَ مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَيَسْقُطُ فَرَضُهُ ثُمَّ يُصَلِّي مَرَّةً ثَانِيَةً
بِقَوْمِهِ هِيَ لَهُ تَطَوُّعٌ وَلَهُمْ فَرِيضَةٌ وَقَدْ جَاءَ هَكَذَا مُصَرِّحًا بِهِ فِي غَيْرِ مُسْلِمٍ

“This hadeeth contains the permissibility of the prayer of one praying Fard behind the one praying Naafil because Mu’aadh used to pray the Fard prayer behind the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) so the obligation (of prayer) is elevated from him, then he would go and pray for the second time with his people; this will become supererogatory for him and obligatory for them; and this has been narrated explicitly in (books) other than Muslim”

[Sharh an-Nawawi Ala Muslim (1/187)]

Haafidh Baghawi writes:

وَفِيهِ جَوَازُ صَلَاةِ الْمُفْتَرِضِ خَلْفَ الْمُتَنَفِّلِ، لِأَنَّ مُعَاذًا كَانَ يُؤَدِّي فَرَضَهُ مَعَ رَسُولِ
اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ، ثُمَّ يَرْجِعُ إِلَى قَوْمِهِ، فَيُؤْمُهُمْ، هِيَ لَهُ نَافِلَةٌ، وَلَهُمْ
فَرِيضَةٌ.

“And it contains the permissibility of the prayer of one praying Fard behind the one praying Naafil, because Mu’aadh used to pray his Fard prayer with the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) then he would return to his people and lead them; this would become supererogatory for him and obligatory for them”

[Sharh us-Sunnah by Al-Baghawi (3/73)]

Haafidh Ibn Hazm (D. 456) writes:

وَجَائِزُ صَلَاةِ الْفَرَضِ خَلْفَ الْمُتَنَفِّلِ: وَالْمُتَنَفِّلِ خَلْفَ مَنْ يُصَلِّي الْفَرَضَ، وَصَلَاةُ
فَرَضٍ خَلْفَ مَنْ يُصَلِّي صَلَاةَ فَرَضٍ أُخْرَى، كُلُّ ذَلِكَ حَسَنٌ، وَسُنَّةٌ

“The prayer of one praying Fard behind the one praying Naafil, and the prayer of one praying Naafil behind the one praying Fard, and the prayer of one praying Fard behind the one praying some other Fard prayer is permissible; all of that is good and Sunnah”

[Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm (4/223, Mas’ala 494)]

Ibn Hazm further writes:

مَا نَعْلَمُ لِمَنْ ذَكَرْنَا مِنَ الصَّحَابَةِ - رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ - مُخَالَفًا أَصْلًا، وَهُمْ
يُعَظَّمُونَ هَذَا إِذَا وَافَقَ تَقْلِيدَهُمْ! وَقَوْلُنَا هَذَا: هُوَ قَوْلُ الْأَوْزَاعِيِّ، وَالشَّافِعِيِّ،
وَأَحْمَدَ بْنِ حَنْبَلٍ، وَأَبِي سُلَيْمَانَ، وَجُمْهُورِ أَصْحَابِ الْحَدِيثِ

“We do not know of any opposition of the Sahaabah that we have mentioned. When this (i.e. no difference of Sahaabah) goes in accordance to the Taqleed of Muqallideen then they present it as something very great (while they do not see it here)! This saying of ours is also the saying of (Imaam) Al-Awzaa’ee, (Imaam) Ash-Shaafi’ee, (Imaam) Ahmed bin Hanbal, Abu Sulemaan, and the Majority of the People of Hadeeth”

[Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm (4/236)]

Haafidh Ibn Hajar writes:

واستدلال بهذا الحديث علي صحة اقتداء المفترض بالمتنفل بناء علي أن معاذ
كان ينوي بالأولي الفرض بالثاني النفل.

“The evidence of the correctness of the prayer of one praying Fard behind the one praying Naafil is taken from this hadeeth because

Mu'aadh used to make the intention of Fard in the first prayer and the intention of Nafl in the second prayer."

[Fath al-Baari (2/195)]

Testimony from the House:

Allaamah Sindhi al-Hanafi writes:

فدلالة هذا الحديث علي جواز اقتداء المفترض بالمتنفل واضحة والجواب عنه
مشكل جدا وأجابوا بما لا يتم.

"This hadeeth clearly indicates the permissibility of a Muftarid's prayer behind a Mutanaffil; and it is very difficult to answer (i.e. refute) it; they (i.e. Ahnaaf) have (tried to) answer it with deficient answers"

[Haashiah as-Sindhi Ala an-Nasaa'ee (2/103)]

Look how clearly one of the Hanafi elders, Allaamah Sindhi Hanafi is saying that this hadeeth clearly proves the Maslak of Ahl al-Hadeeth and that it is very difficult to answer it, yet some people have put themselves into this difficulty and have taken support of many Ta'weelaat.

The indigence of Ahnaaf:

The condition of Ahnaaf in this issue is such that leave aside Saheeh, clear, and Marfoo narration they do not even have any Da'eef or Mawdoo narration. That is why, confirming the "I won't believe" behavior, Ahnaaf simply decided to attack the Saheeh ahaadeeth with Ta'weelaat; and the interesting thing is that Ibn al-Turkamaani al-Hanafi, who would not leave any chance of refuting Imaam Bayhaqi and making Ta'weel of narrations, also observed silence on the hadeeth of Mu'aadh without making any Ta'weel.

[See, Al-Jawaahir al-Naqi (3/58)]

The saying of "Hakeem ul-Ummah" of Aal-e-Deoband, Ashraf Ali Thaavi Deobandi is worth mentioning here. He said:

"اکثر مقلدین عوام بلکہ خواص اس قدر جامد ہو جاتے ہیں کہ اگر قول مجتہد کے خلاف کوئی آیت یا حدیث کان میں پڑتی ہے، ان کے قلب میں انشراح و انبساط نہیں رہتا، بلکہ اول استنکار قلب میں پیدا ہوتا ہے پھر تاویل کی فکر ہوتی ہے خواہ کتنی ہی بعید ہو اور خواہ دوسری دلیل قوی اس کے معارض ہو بلکہ مجتہد کی دلیل اس مسئلہ میں بجز قیاس کی کچھ بھی نہ ہو بلکہ خود اپنے دل میں اس تاویل کی وقعت نہ ہو مگر نصرت مذہب کے لیے تاویل ضروری سمجھتے ہیں، دل یہ نہیں مانتا کہ قول مجتہد کو چھوڑ کر حدیث صحیحہ پر عمل کریں۔"

"Sometimes many Muqallid Awaam, in fact Khawaas (i.e. 'Scholars'), become so stubborn that if they hear of any verse or hadeeth against the saying of Mujtahid, their hearts cease to remain calm and relaxed, in fact the first thing that comes in their heart is rejection, then they worry about its Ta'weel no matter how fat-fetched it may be, and no matter the other stronger evidence is contradictory to it, in fact, no matter even if the evidence of Mujtahid in that issue be nothing more than Qiyaas; in fact even their hearts would not agree to accept that ta'weel, but they consider this ta'weel to be necessary for the aid of their Madhab; their heart does not accept that they should follow a hadeeth leaving the saying of Mujtahid"

[Tadhkirat ur-Rasheed (131)]

Dear Readers, you imagine yourself that how, exactly in accordance to the saying of Thaavi, the stubborn Muqallideen are doing so many Ta'weelaat in a Saheeh and Clear hadeeth based only on one Qiyaas (i.e. a strong one being dominated by a weak one); but they are not ready to accept.

Objections on the Hadeeth of Mu'aadh and their

Answer:

Besides this hadeeth, there are many other ahaadeeth which are a clear proof in this issue, which will be mentioned later; however, we shall first observe the lame objections made on this hadeeth of the Prophet. As Haafidh Ibn Hazm says:

واعترضوا في حديث معاذ بأشياء نذكرها، وان كنا غانين عن ذلك بحديث أبي بكر و جابر، لكن نصر الحق فضيلة، وقمع الباطل وسيلة الي الله تعالى.

“And they have objected on the hadeeth of Mu'aadh with several things which we are going to mention; although we are in no need of answering these objections due to the hadeeth of Abu Bakrah and Jaabir (narrated on this issue), but (we'll still answer each one of them due to the fact that) aiding the truth is a virtue and refuting the Baatil is a way of getting closer to Allaah the Most High”

[Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm (4/229)]

Objection # 1:

The Famous Muqallid, Muhammad Sarfaraz Khan Safdar Deobandi writes:

“There are many answers to this narration; three of which are given by Tahaawi and the remaining are given by others, the first answer is that Imaam Tahaawi said,

لو ثبت أن معاذًا فعله في عهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لم يكن في ذلك دليل علي أنه بأمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم... الخ

, which means that this act of Mu'aadh was through his own opinion, not as a command of the Prophet (peace be upon him)”

[Khazaain al-Sunan (2/203)]

Answer:

The objection of Imaam Tahaawi is that even if it is proven that Mu'aadh did this in the lifetime of Allaah's Messenger (peace be upon him), it does not still contain the evidence that he did this with the command of Allaah's Messenger (peace be upon him). There are many answers to this objection:

- 1- To say that Sayyidunah Mu'aadh did this without the command of Allaah's Messenger (peace be upon him) is Baatil and rejected because there is no proof for it, because this is also not proven that Mu'aadh did this on his own and he did not have any evidence.
- 2- The command of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is not necessary for the permissibility of something; in fact the Prophet's observance of silence on an issue after coming to know about it is also an evidence of permissibility which, in Istalaah, is called "**Taqreer**".

Zafar Ahmed Thaanvi Deobandi writes:

وعلي المتسدل باثبات علم النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بفعل معاذ.

"It is necessary for the one taking evidence from this hadeeth to prove that the Prophet (peace be upon him) was aware of the action of Mu'aadh"

[I'laa us-Sunan (3/1359)]

So here we go Sir, the narration of Saheeh Muslim explicitly says:

وَإِنَّ مُعَاذًا صَلَّى مَعَكَ الْعِشَاءَ، ثُمَّ أَتَى فَافْتَحَ بِسُورَةِ الْبَقَرَةِ

“(The person who complained, said, O Prophet) Mu'aadh prayed the Isha prayer with you. He then came and began with Surat al-Baqarah.”

[Saheeh Muslim (465)]

This is clear evidence that the Prophet had come to know about this incidence that Mu'aadh has adopted this way; despite this, he just ordered him to be light in recitation and he did not stop him.

- 3- The mosque of tribe Banu Salamah, in which Mu'aadh used to go and lead the prayer, consisted of thirty companions who pledged allegiance in Aqabah and forty five companions who participated in Badr as mentioned by Haafidh Ibn Hazm; among them were: Jaabir bin Abdullah, his father Abdullah, Ka'b bin Maalik, Hubaab bin Mundhir, Uqbah bin Aamir, and Mu'aadh bin Mu'awwidh radiallah anhum. Is it possible that this action took place in front of all these Sahaabah and yet they did not object to it if it was against the Sunnah? Absolutely Not! In fact this is the Ijmaa of Sahaabah proving that the action of Mu'aadh (radiallah anhu) was correct. There is no refusal or opposition of this act narrated from any Companion.

Haafidh Ibn Hajar writes while narrating from Haafidh Ibn Hazm that:

ولا يحفظ عن غيرهم من الصحابة امتناع ذلك، بل قال معهم الجواز عمر وابن عمر وابو الدرداء وأنس وغيرهم.

“No opposition of any other Companion is preserved on this; in fact its permissibility in accordance to them is narrated from Umar, Ibn Umar, Abu ad-Darda, and Anas etc”

[Fath al-Baari (2/196)]

Haafidh Ibn Hajar further writes:

انهم لا يختلفون في أن رأى الصحابي اذا لم يخالفه غيره حجة.

“They (i.e. Muqallideen) would agree with us on the issue that an opinion of a Sahaabi is Hujjah when it is not opposed by others.”

[Fath al-Baari (2/196)]

Objection # 2:

As for the objection of Khaleel Ahmed Sahaaranpoori Deobandi in “Bazl al-Majhood Sharh Abi Dawood” that the silence of Sahaabah is not reliable, because the Prophet (peace be upon him) rebuked Mu’aadh (radiallah anhu) and said:

لا تكن فتانا، اما أن تصلي معي، واما أن تخفف علي قومك. (مسن الإمام

أحمد ٧٤/٥)

“O Mu’aadh do not infuriate the people, either you pray with me, or be light on your people” [Musnad Ahmed]

[I’laa us-Sunan (3/1360-1361)]

Answer:

1-

These words are not proven from the Prophet (peace be upon him) with an authentic chain because the meeting of Mu’aadh bin Riffa’ah is not proven from “Rajul min Bani Salamah”, nor is his meeting proven from the Prophet (peace be upon him).

Haafidh Ibn Hazm writes:

ان هذا خبر لا يصح، لأنه منقطع، لأن معاذ بن رفاعة لم يدرك النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم، ولا أدرك هذا الذي شكوا الي رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم بمعاذ.

“This report is not authentic because it is Munqati (disconnected); Mu’aadh bin Rifaa’ah neither met the Prophet (peace be upon him) nor did he meet the person who complained about Mu’aadh to the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him)”

[Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm (4/230)]

Haafidh Mizzi writes:

عن رجل من بني سلمة يقال له سليم قصة معاذ بن جبل في الصلوة مرسل.

“The story of Mu’aadh concerning the Prayer narrated from a man of Banu Salamah is Mursal”

[Tahdheeb al-Kamaal (18/171)]

Haafidh Noor ud-Deen al-Haythami also said the same thing in Majma az-Zawaaid [2/73]

Moreover, Haafidh Ibn Hajar writes:

وهذا مرسل لأن معاذ بن رفاعة لم يدركه.

“And this is Mursal as Mu’aadh bin Rifaa’ah did not meet him”

[Fath al-Baari (2/194)]

Therefore, taking evidence from this is Baatil.

The words of this narration contain Ihtimaal (possibilities). Although the claim of Ahnaaf is still not proven from this narration, Imaam Tahaawi has taken it to mean that the Prophet prohibited him from doing one of the two things; whereas Haafidh Ibn Hazm and Haafidh Ibn Hajar etc have explained that it only refers to the “lightening of Qira’at”; therefore how can the clear and authentic narrations of the Muhadditheen and A’immah be left for these doubtful and unproven words?

Objection # 3:

Muhammad Sarfaraz Khan Safdar Deobandi writes under the Answer # 2 of the hadeeth of Mu’aadh that:

“Imaam Tahaawi writes in Vol. 1 & P. 199 that:

فقد يجوز أن يكون يصلي مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم نافلة ثم يأتي قومه
فيصلي بهم الفريضة

It is possible that he would pray Nafil with the Prophet then come and pray Fard with his people”

[Khazaain al-Sunan (2/203)]

Answer:

- 1- It is not permissible to take evidence from possibilities, because the words of Saheeh Muslim clearly say that the person complaining to the Prophet (peace be upon him) came to him and said:

وَإِنَّ مُعَاذًا صَلَّى مَعَكَ الْعِشَاءَ، ثُمَّ أَتَى فَافْتَحَ بِسُورَةِ الْبَقَرَةِ

Mu'aadh prayed the Isha prayer with you. He then came and began with Surat al-Baqarah.”

[Saheeh Muslim (465)]

Therefore, it is proven from the explicit words of Saheeh Muslim that Sayyidunah Mu'aadh (radiallah anhu) used to pray the Fard with the Prophet (peace be upon him) while Nafl with his people.

- 2- Imaam Ibn Khuzaymah names the chapter in which he added this hadeeth of Mu'aadh as follows:

باب ذكر البيان أن معاذًا كان يصلي مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فريضة لا تطوعًا كما ادعى بعض العراقيين.

“Chapter mentioning that Mu'aadh used to pray Fard with the Prophet, not Nafl, as some people of Iraaq have claimed”

[Saheeh Ibn Khuzaymah (3/65, Chapter: 131)]

- 3- Imaam Ibn Hibbaan titles his chapter on the same hadeeth as follows:

ذكر الخبر المدحض قول من زعم أن معاذًا كان يصلي بالقوم فرضه لا نافلة.

“Mention of the report in refutation to the saying of one who claims that Mu'aadh used to pray Fard with his people, not Nafl”

[Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan (6/163)]

- 4- Haafidh Baghawi writes:

لأن معاذًا كان يؤدي فرضه مع رسول الله.

“Because Mu'aadh used to pray his Fard with the Messenger of Allaah”

[Sharh us-Sunnah (3/73)]

Muhadditheen know their narrations better than the Muqallideen.

5- In the narrations of Sunan al-Kubra of Bayhaqi and others, the hadeeth of Sayyidunah Mu'aadh (radiallah anhu) also contain the following words:

فيصلي بهم تلك الصلاة، هي له نافلة ولهم فريضة.

“Thus he would pray with them (i.e. his people) that same prayer; it would be Nafl for him and Fard for them”

[Al-Sunan al-Kubra lil Bayhaqi (3/86), Al-Umm by ash-Shaafi'ee (1/173), Sunan ad-Daaraqutni (1/374), Sharh Ma'aani al-Athaar (1/409), Chain Saheeh]

Ibn Jurayj, who is agreed upon to be Thiqah Haafidh, has affirmed his hearing in the chain of this narration. The other narrators not mentioning these words do not mean that they do not exist; the addition of a “Thiqah Haafidh” is accepted because this is not against the Thiqaat.

Haafidh Ibn Hajar explains this very conclusively saying:

وَتَعْلِيلُ الطَّحَاوِيِّ لَهُ بَانَ بْنِ عُيَيْنَةَ سَأَلَهُ عَنْ عَمْرٍو أْتَمَّ مِنْ سِيَاقِ بْنِ جُرَيْجٍ وَلَمْ يَذْكُرْ هَذِهِ الزِّيَادَةَ لَيْسَ بِقَادِحٍ فِي صِحَّتِهِ لِأَنَّ بِن جُرَيْجٍ أَسْنُ وَأَجَلُ مِنْ بِن عُيَيْنَةَ وَأَقْدَمُ أَخْذًا عَنْ عَمْرٍو مِنْهُ وَلَوْ لَمْ يَكُنْ كَذَلِكَ فَهِيَ زِيَادَةٌ مِنْ ثِقَّةٍ حَافِظٍ لَيْسَتْ مُنَافِيَةً لِرَوَايَةِ مَنْ هُوَ أَحْفَظُ مِنْهُ وَلَا أَكْثَرُ عَدَدًا فَلَا مَعْنَى لِلتَّوَقُّفِ فِي الْحُكْمِ بِصِحَّتِهَا

“And the reasoning of Tahaawi that Ibn Uyaynah did not mention these words from Amr bin Deenaar as Ibn Jurayj has mentioned, and he did not mention this addition; is not harmful to the authenticity of this narration because Ibn Jurayj was elder

than Ibn Uyaynah and he was more exalted than Ibn Uyaynah; plus Ibn Jurayj learned from Amr even before Ibn Uyaynah; and even if it were not the case then this is still an addition from a Thiqah Haafidh narrator which is not against the narration of someone who is a bigger Haafidh than him nor more in number than him; thus there is no point of rejecting its authenticity”
[Fath al-Baari (2/196)]

As for the claim of Tahaawi that this part is a Mudraj from Ibn Jurayj, then Haafidh Ibn Hajar refutes this claim saying:

وَأَمَّا رَدُّ الطَّحَاوِيِّ لَهَا بِإِحْتِمَالٍ أَنْ تَكُونَ مُدْرَجَةً فَجَوَابُهُ أَنَّ الْأَصْلَ عَدَمُ
الْإِدْرَاجِ حَتَّى يَثْبُتَ التَّفْصِيلُ فَمَهْمَا كَانَ مَضْمُومًا إِلَى الْحَدِيثِ فَهُوَ مِنْهُ وَلَا
سِيَّمًا إِذَا رُويَ مِنْ وَجْهَيْنِ وَالْأَمْرُ هُنَا كَذَلِكَ فَإِنَّ الشَّافِعِيَّ أَخْرَجَهَا مِنْ وَجْهِ
آخَرَ عَنْ جَابِرٍ مُتَابِعًا لِعَمْرٍو بْنِ دِينَارٍ عَنْهُ

“As for the rejection of this narration by Tahaawi due to the possibility that it could be a Mudraj, then the answer to it is that the default in any given narration is absence of Idraaj until the details prove otherwise; so until it is proven to be Mudraj from evidence, it would be considered a part of that hadeeth; especially so when it is also narrated likewise through another route; and this is also the case here for verily Ash-Shaafi’ee has also narrated it through another route from Jaabir as a Mutaabi’ah in narrating from Amr bin Deenaar”
[Fath al-Baari (2/196)]

Thus, the addition ((It would be Nafl for him and Fard for them)) is absolutely authentic.

6- The Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) has said:

صَلَاةٌ فِي مَسْجِدِي هَذَا أَفْضَلُ مِنْ أَلْفِ صَلَاةٍ فِيْمَا سِوَاهُ إِلَّا الْمَسْجِدَ الْحَرَامَ

“Offering prayer in my mosque (Masjid Nabawi) is better than one thousand prayers elsewhere, save for the prayers offered in al-Masjid al-Haram.”

[Bukhaari (1190), Muslim (1394)]

It is agreed upon that the prayer referred here is the Obligatory Prayer, because the Supererogatory prayers are; in fact, better to be prayed at home.

So would a Noble Companion of the Prophet (peace be upon him) abandon the reward of praying one thousand prayers in Masjid al-Nabawi behind the Prophet and get the reward of just one prayer in his own mosque? Certainly Not!

Haafidh Ibn Hazm writes:

فليت شعري، الي من كان يؤخر معاذ صلاة فرضه حتي يصلها معه راغبا أن يصلها مع رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم؟ ألا ان هذا هو الضلال المبين، قد نزه الله تعالي معاذا عنه عند كل ذي مسكة عقل.

“If only I knew, who - more virtuous - could it be that Mu’aadh would delay his Fard prayer to pray with him instead of praying with the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him)? This is indeed a clear misguidance; Allaah the Most High had protected Mu’aadh from such thing according to every person having sound mind”

[Al-Muhalla (4/231)]

7- Is it permissible according to Ahnaaf that a man, who has not yet offered his Isha prayer, that he, should make the intention of Nafl behind the Obligatory Isha prayer of the Imaam? The answer could never be in affirmative; certainly this is not correct; so then why do you attribute such wrong thing to Mu'aadh (radiallah anhu)?

Objection # 4:

Zafar Ahmed Thaanvi Deobandi writes:

ولو سلم أنها زيادة ثقة فلا شك أنها ليست من كلام رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا من كلام معاذ، هذا ظاهر جدا، فيحتمل أن تكون من كلام ابن جريج أو من قول ابن دينار أو من قول جابر، فمن أى هؤلاء الثلاثة كان فليس فيه دليل علي حقيقة فعل معاذ، لأنهم لم يحكوا ذلك عنه، انما قالوا قولاً علي عندهم كذلك، وقد يجوز أن يكون في الحقيقة بخلافه، كذا قاله العيني نقلاً عن الطحاوي.

“And even if it is accepted that it is an addition of a Thiqah narrator then certainly these are not the words of Allaah’s Messenger (peace be upon him) nor are they the words of Mu’aadh, this is clearly evident; therefore there is a possibility that it could be from the words of Ibn Jurayj or from the words of Ibn Deenaar or from the words of Jaabir, so of whichever these three the words are, it does not contain the evidence that this was actually the practice of Mu’aadh, because they did not narrate these words from Mu’aadh; rather they only said whatever they thought; it is possible that the reality might be opposite to this, this is what Aynee has narrated from Al-Tahaawi”

[I'laa us-Sunan (3/1359-1360)]

Answer:

- 1- Although Ahnaaf said up to the point that it is “possible” that these words could be of Jaabir, but we say that this is not a possibility rather these words are certainly the words of the Prophet’s Companion, Sayyidunah Jaabir (radiallah anhu). Declaring them to be Mudraj based only on “possibility” or attributing them to Ibn Jurayj or Ibn Deenaar is not correct, because a clear and solid proof is necessary to declare something Mudraj.

Haafidh Ibn Hajar writes:

الإدراج لا يثبت بمجرد الدعوي والاحتمال.

“Idraaj can not be proven merely based on claims and possibilities”

[Fath al-Baari (2/91, 3/96)]

- 2- A Narrator knows his narration better than any other person.

Muhammad Sarfaraz Khan Safdar Deobandi writes:

“The narrator of hadeeth, especially when it is a companion, knows the meaning of his narration better than others”

[Ahsan ul-Kalaam by Safdar (1/268)]

Similarly, Aynee al-Hanafi has also said the same thing

[Umdat ul-Qaari (4/16)]

Therefore, even if it is accepted that Jaabir said these words based on his opinion (whereas this is not the case, because Jaabir himself used to pray behind Mu’aadh), then so what? Based on this Usool, the

opinion and understanding of a Prophet's Companion takes preference over the possibilities of Ahnaaf, walhamdulillah!

Zafar Ahmed Thaanvi Deobandi writes:

فالموقوف عندنا حجة

“Thus a Mawqoof narration (i.e. saying of a Sahaabi) is Hujjah according to us”

[I'laa us-Sunan (3/1101)]

When the saying of a Sahaabi is hujjah, then why don't you accept it here; while it is not even against the narration of any other Sahaabi?

A Joke:

Anwar Shaah Kaashmiree Deobandi writes:

ولوجدان يحكم بأنه مدرج، لأن في اسناده ابن جريج ومذهبه جواز اقتداء

المفترض خلف المتنفل.

“My instinct rules that this is Mudraj because its chain contains Ibn Jurayj and his Madhab is to allow the Salaat of a Muftarid behind a Mutanaffil (therefore, he added these words to support his Madhab)”

[Faydh ul-Baari (2/226-227)]

Look how daring this Deobandi individual is; in order to make Ta'weel of the words of hadeeth going against his Taqleed; he did not even hesitate to attack an agreed upon Thiqah narrator with his Jarh saying that he tried to make the hadeeth in accordance to his Madhab.

Whereas, upon pondering a little, we come to know that the attempt to change the hadeeth was not done by Ibn Jurayj, rather it is actually a

practice of the Muqallideen that they try to judge authentic narrations on the scale of their minds and instincts. As Ashraf Ali Thaavi said above: **“if they hear of any verse or hadeeth against the saying of Mujtahid...”**

Moreover, as confessed by Kaashmiree, this was the Madhab of Ibn Jurayj, so this gives even more strength to our saying, because even Muqallideen agree that a narrator knows his narration better than others.

Objection # 5:

Muhammad Sarfaraz Khan Safdar Deobandi Hayaati writes under the Answer # 3 that:

“Imaam Tahaawi writes in P. 199 of Vol.1 that:

لاحتمل أن يكون ذلك من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في وقت ما كانت الفريضة تصلي مرتين، فذلك قد كان يفعل في أول الاسلام حتي نهى عنه النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم.

It is possible that this permissibility from the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) was at the time when the Fard prayers used to be performed twice, as this was something used to be done in the beginning of Islaam, then the Prophet (peace be upon him) forbade that.”

[Khazaain al-Sunan (2/204)]

Answer:

1- Ahnaaf finally agreed that Sayyidunah Mu’aadh prayed the Fard behind the Prophet, but now they have presented another new proof-less claim.

2- The claim that Sahaabah Karaam used to pray one obligatory prayer twice is a lie and an accusation, because the narration that is presented in this regard in reference to Tahaawi (1/221) is severely weak, because:

- a. It contains Qataadah who is a Mudallis; Aynee al-Hanafi writes:
“Certainly Qataadah is a Mudallis, evidence cannot be taken from his ‘An’ana until the proof of his sama is found.”
[Umdat ul-Qaari (1/261)]
- b. The meeting and hearing of Khaalid bin Ayman is not proven from the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him); those who claim otherwise must provide proof. Therefore, taking evidence from this is rejected.

As for Tahaawi taking evidence from the Marfoo narration of Ibn Umar which says: **“The Messenger of Allaah forbade from offering one obligatory prayer twice a day”** (Abu Dawood: 579, Nasaa’ee: 861, Tahaawi: 660 etc, Chain Hasan) that the Sahaabah Karaam used to do this before and later the Prophet forbade them because: “Prohibition always comes after permissibility”; then the answer to it is that it is not necessary that the act from which the Prophet forbids, must have been permissible before and Sahaabah must have been doing it before.

To give an example, Abdullah bin Yazeed Al-Ansaari (radiallah anhu) narrates:

نهى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم عن النهي والمثلة.

“The Prophet forbade robbery (taking away what belongs to others without their permission), and also forbade mutilation (or maiming) of bodies.”

[Saheeh Bukhaari (5516)]

So does this mean that before this prohibition of the Prophet, it was permissible in Islaam to rob and disfigure the bodies; and Sahaabah also used to do this before? Na'uzubillah! These things have never been permissible in any era.

Therefore, whoever claims that in the beginning of Islaam, Sahaabah used to pray the Fard prayers twice a day must provide authentic and clear proof.

Objection # 6:

Muhammad Sarfaraz Khan Safdar Deobandi Hayaati writes under the Answer # 4 that:

“Qaadhi Abu Bakr Ibn al-Arabi says in Vol. 2 P. 66 of Aaridat al-Ahwadhi that Hadhrat Mu'aadh used to pray the morning prayer with him, then would lead the night prayer to his people; meaning, the prayer which he would pray with the Prophet was separate, and the prayer which he would lead the people in was some other prayer”

[Khazaain al-Sunan (2/204)]

Answer:

This is an extremely useless objection from Safdar, because the narration of Saheeh Muslim contains the clear words:

«أَنَّ مُعَاذَ بْنَ جَبَلٍ كَانَ يُصَلِّي مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ الْعِشَاءَ الْآخِرَةَ،
ثُمَّ يَرْجِعُ إِلَى قَوْمِهِ، فَيُصَلِّي بِهِمْ تِلْكَ الصَّلَاةَ»

“Mu'aadh bin Jabal offered the Isha prayer with the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and then returned to his people and then led them in this (same) prayer.”

[Saheeh Muslim (465)]

Even if Qaadhi Ibn al-Arabi has mistakenly said this, then why is Safdar Sahab narrating it despite knowing it is a mistake? Can he “sincerely” say that it is a reliable answer according to him? If the answer is in negation then it is clearly evident that the blameworthy Taqleed and the rejection of Prophet’s Ahaadeeth have forced him to do that.

Objection # 7:

Safdar Deobandi further writes:

“Some Hanafi Fuqaha have answered that the reality is that the passage is like this:

فَصَلَّى لَيْلَةً مَعَ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ الْعِشَاءَ

In this, the word ‘Ishaa’ refers to Ishaa al-Uula i.e. Maghrib prayer as the narration of Tirmidhi contains the clarification of Maghrib while in the narration:

«أَنَّ مُعَاذَ بْنَ جَبَلٍ كَانَ يُصَلِّي مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ الْعِشَاءَ الْآخِرَةَ، ثُمَّ يَرْجِعُ إِلَى قَوْمِهِ، فَيُصَلِّي بِهِمْ تِلْكَ الصَّلَاةَ»

Ishaa is meant to be the actual Ishaa prayer; and the meaning of ‘Tilk as-Salaat’ is the salaat similar to it in length of the recitation etc... (al-Ma’aarif: 5/104) and not that they (both) are the same prayers”

[Khazaain al-Sunan (2/204-205), also see Haashiah Faydh ul-Baari (2/229)]

Answer:

Readers! See what kind of objections Taqleed has forced these Muqallideen to make which are not even accepted according to them. Sarfaraz Safdar has himself proven a few pages before that the word Maghrib in the hadeeth of Mu'aadh is not correct, it is defective; now read his confession in his own words:

“Benefit: The word Maghrib is Ma’lool (defective). It is said in Al-Urf ash-Shazi: 255 that Al-Bayhaqi said in al-Ma’rifah as-Sunnah wal Athaar that the word Maghrib is defective due to the presence of the word Isha in all the other narrations. And al-Mubaarakpooree writes in Tuhfat al-Ahwadhi: 1/404 that in the narration of Saheeh Muslim, the words of ‘Isha al-Akhirah’ are found”

[Khazaain al-Sunan (2/202)]

We ask Safdar Sahab that, what this **“Benefit”** is for? And hasn't this **“Benefit”** given any **“Benefit”** to Safdar Sahab? If we should not call this sheer Ta'assub and Blind Taqleed then what else is this called?

When the word Maghrib itself is Ma'lool then the above mentioned claim automatically becomes rejected.

As for the claim that **“Tilk as-Salaat”** does not refer to the Isha prayer, rather it refers to the prayer similar to it in length of the recitation then this is the peak of uselessness, and the height of foolishness. How is this possible that Sayyidunah Mu'aadh would lead the prayer exactly in accordance to the way of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and recite in the same length as the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) would recite, and still the Prophet rebukes him saying:

«أَتُرِيدُ أَنْ تَكُونَ فَتَانًا يَا مُعَاذُ؟ إِذَا أَمَمْتَ النَّاسَ فَاقْرَأْ بِالشَّمْسِ وَضُحَاهَا، وَسَبِّحْ
اسْمَ رَبِّكَ الْأَعْلَى، وَاقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ، وَاللَّيْلِ إِذَا يَغْشَى»

“O Mu'aadh, do you want to become a person putting (people) to trial? When you lead people in prayer, recite: ‘By the Sun and its morning brightness’ (Surah xci), ‘Glorify the name of thy most high Lord’ (Surah lxxxvi) and ‘Read in the name of Lord’ (Surah xcvi), and ‘By the night when it spreads’ (Surah xcii).”

[Saheeh Muslim (465)]

Is it that the Prophet himself would make lengthy recitations, and rebuke Mu'aadh for the same action declaring it a trial? How strange!

In any case, the narration of Saheeh Muslim mentions that Sayyidunah Mu'aadh would pray Isha al-Akhirah and then lead his people in the same prayer; therefore, this ta'weel is Baatil.

After mentioning the Ta'weelaat of Ahnaaf on the hadeeth of Mu'aadh, Haafidh Nawawi said:

وكل هذه التأويلات دعاوي لا أصل لها فلا يترك ظاهر الحديث بها.

“All these Ta'weelaat are claims which have no basis, thus the Zaahir (apparent meaning) of Hadeeth cannot be left for them”

[Sharh Al-Nawawi Ala Muslim (1/187)]

With the blessing of Allaah, we have answered all the objections and Ta'weelaat made up to this day on the hadeeth of Mu'aadh. If any person still has any doubt or Ta'weel in his mind, let him not confine it to himself, rather he should inform us of it so that we can analyze it fairly.

Instead of giving worthless answers and thinking useless Ta'weelaat of Authentic Ahaadeeth, we pray to Allaah that may He grant us the ability

to act upon them and make our lives dedicated to the defense of
Hadeeth and make this act a way of success for us in the hereafter.

Ameen

PART TWO

The ahaadeeth of Jaabir and Abu Bakrah

Proof # 2:

((عَنْ جَابِرٍ، قَالَ: أَقْبَلْنَا مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ حَتَّى إِذَا كُنَّا بِذَاتِ الرَّقَاعِ - فَذَكَرَ الْحَدِيثَ، الْيَاقَانُ قَالَ - فَنُودِيَ بِالصَّلَاةِ، فَصَلَّى النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بِطَائِفَةٍ رَكَعَتَيْنِ، ثُمَّ تَأَخَّرُوا، وَصَلَّى بِالطَّائِفَةِ الْأُخْرَى رَكَعَتَيْنِ، قَالَ: فَكَانَتْ لِرَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَرْبَعُ رَكَعَاتٍ، وَلِلْقَوْمِ رَكَعَتَانِ))

Jaabir (radiallah anhu) reported: "We went forward with the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) until we reached Dhaat ar-Riqaa' - then the narrator mentioned the full hadeeth up to when he said - Then call to prayer was made and he (the Holy Prophet) led a group in two rak'ah. Then (the members of this group) withdrew and he (peace be upon him) led the second group in two rak'ahs. So the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) observed four rak'ahs and people observed two rak'ahs."

[Saheeh al-Bukhaari ta'leeqan (2/593 H. 4136), Saheeh Muslim mawsoolan (2/279 H. 843)]

Proof # 3:

عَنْ أَبِي بَكْرَةَ، قَالَ: «صَلَّى النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فِي خَوْفِ الظُّهْرِ، فَصَفَّ بَعْضُهُمْ خَلْفَهُ، وَبَعْضُهُمْ بِإِزَاءِ الْعَدُوِّ، فَصَلَّى بِهِمْ رَكَعَتَيْنِ، ثُمَّ سَلَّمَ فَاَنْطَلَقَ الَّذِينَ

صَلُّوا مَعَهُ، فَوَقَفُوا مَوْقِفَ أَصْحَابِهِمْ، ثُمَّ جَاءَ أَوْلِيكَ فَصَلُّوا خَلْفَهُ، فَصَلَّى بِهِمْ
رَكْعَتَيْنِ، ثُمَّ سَلَّمَ، فَكَانَتْ لِرَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَرْبَعًا، وَلِأَصْحَابِهِ
رَكْعَتَيْنِ رَكْعَتَيْنِ»، «وَبِذَلِكَ كَانَ يُفْتِي الْحَسَنُ»

Narrated Abu Bakrah: “The Prophet (peace be upon him) offered the Zuhr prayer in time of danger. Some of the people formed a row behind him and others arrayed themselves against the enemy. He led them in two rak’ahs and then he uttered the salutation. Then those who were with him went away and took the position of their companions before the enemy. Then they came and prayed behind him. He led them in two rak’ahs and uttered the salutation. Thus the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) offered four rak’ahs and his companions offered two rak’ahs.”

The narrator said: “Al-Hasan used to give legal verdict on the authority of this tradition.”

[Sunan Abu Dawood (1248), Sunan Nasaa’ee (1553), Saheeh]

The understanding of these ahaadeeth by the Muhadditheen:

1-

Imaam Ibn Khuzaymah (D. 311) names the chapter of these ahaadeeth as follows:

بَابُ فِي صِفَةِ صَلَاةِ الْخَوْفِ وَالْعَدُوِّ خَلْفَ الْقِبْلَةِ «وَصَلَاةِ الْإِمَامِ بِكُلِّ طَائِفَةٍ
رَكْعَتَيْنِ، وَهَذَا أَيْضًا الْجِنْسُ الَّذِي أَعْلَمْتُ مِنْ جَوَازِ صَلَاةِ الْمَأْمُومِ فَرِيضَةً خَلْفَ
الْإِمَامِ الْمُصَلِّي نَافِلَةً، إِذْ إِحْدَى الرَّكْعَتَيْنِ كَانَتْ لِلنَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ تَطَوُّعًا
وَلِلْمَأْمُومِينَ فَرِيضَةً»

“Chapter on the description of prayer when the enemy is behind the Qiblah; and the Imaam leading each group with two rak’ahs; and this is also from the type that I had informed before about the permissibility of a person praying fard behind an Imaam who is praying Nafl; because the two of those four rak’ahs were Nafl for the Prophet and Fard for the followers”

[Saheeh Ibn Khuzaymah (2/297, Ch. 615)]

2-

Imaam Ibn al-Mundhir (D. 318) said:

وَهَذَا الْخَبْرُ يَدُلُّ عَلَى إِبَاحَةِ أَنْ يُصَلِّيَ الْمَرْءُ الْفَرِيضَةَ خَلْفَ مَنْ يُصَلِّي نَافِلَةً؛ لِأَنَّ
الْآخِرَةَ مِنْ صَلَاةِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ كَانَتْ نَافِلَةً

“And this report is evidence that a person can pray Fard behind the one praying Nafl, because the last (two rak’ah) prayer of the Prophet (peace be upon him) was Nafl”

[Al-Awsat by Ibn al-Mundhir (5/32)]

3-

Imaam Bayhaqi (D. 454) titled the chapter of these ahaadeeth as follows:

باب الْفَرِيضَةَ خَلْفَ مَنْ يُصَلِّي نَافِلَةً

“Chapter on praying Fard behind the one praying Nafl”

[Al-Sunan al-Kubra lil Bayhaqi (3/85)]

4-

Haafidh Ibn Hazm (D. 456) has also taken evidence from these ahaadeeth for the permissibility of praying Fard behind the one praying Nafl.

[Al-Muhalla (4/226)]

5-

Haafidh Nawawi (631 – 676 H) writes:

وَكَانَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مُتَنَفِّلاً فِي الثَّانِيَةِ وَهُمْ مَتَفَرِّضُونَ وَاسْتَدَلَّ بِهِ
الشَّافِعِيُّ وَأَصْحَابُهُ عَلَى جَوَازِ صَلَاةِ الْمُفْتَرِضِ خَلْفَ الْمُتَنَفِّلِ

“And the Prophet (peace be upon him) was a Mutanaffil (i.e. praying Nafil) in the second congregation while they were praying Fard; Ash-Shaafi’ee and his Companions have taken evidence from this hadeeth for the permissibility of Salaat al-Muftarid Khalf al-Mutanaffil”

[Sharh Al-Nawawi Ala Muslim (1/279)]

Moreover, Haafidh Nawawi has titled the chapter of these ahaadeeth in “Khulaasah al-Ahkaam” as follows:

باب صحة صلاة المفترض خلف المتنفل.

“Chapter on the correctness of praying Fard behind the one praying Nafil”

[Khulaasah al-Ahkaam by Nawawi (2/697)]

6-

Allaamah Zayla’ee Hanafi writes:

وعلي كل حال، فالاستدلال علي الحنفية بحديث جابر صحيح.

“In any case, taking evidence from the hadeeth of Jaabir against the Hanafiyyah is correct”

[Nasb ur-Raayah (2/57)]

7-

Allaamah Sindhi Hanafi writes:

ولا يخفي أنه يلزم فيه اقتداء المفترض بالمتنفل قطعاً ولم أر لهم عنه جواباً شافياً.

“And it is clearly evident that this hadeeth proves the permissibility of praying Fard behind the one praying Nafil, and I have not seen a good answer to this (hadeeth) from them (i.e. Hanafiyyah)”

[Haashiah as-Sindhi Ala al-Nasaa’ee (3/178-179)]

Analyses of the Ta’weelaat & Objections:

As you can see, the respected Imaam of Ahnaaf, Allaamah Sindhi Hanafi is in fact saying that Ahnaaf do not have any good answer to this hadeeth, but still some later people have tried their best to experiment their Taqleedi tricks. Let’s analyze each of them here:

Ta’weel # 1:

Anwar Shaah Kaashmiree Deobandi writes:

قد علمت أن فيه حجة للشافعية في مسألة جواز اقتداء المفترض بالمتنفل وعجز عن جوابه مثل الزيلمي وابن الهمام، وحمله الطحاوي علي زمان كانت الفرائض فيه تصلي مرتين، وقد أجبت عنه جواباً شافياً.

“I know that this hadeeth contains evidence for the Shaafi’eeyyah on the issue of the permissibility of praying Fard behind the one praying Nafil; and even the likes of az-Zayla’ee and Ibn al-Hammaam have not been able to answer it, while Tahaawi held it restricted to a particular period in which the Fard prayers used to be performed twice; however I have answered it with a good answer”

[Faydh ul-Baari (4/104)]

Answer:

Anwar Shaah Kaashmiree has at least confessed that this hadeeth contains the evidence for this issue; on top of that, even the major Hanafi Scholars are unable to answer to it. Imaam Tahaawi restricted it to a particular period to which we have already answered before (under the objections on the Hadeeth of Mu'aadh) that the evidence which he based this opinion on is severely weak so the claim is destroyed by itself. Nonetheless this answer (of Tahaawi) was not a good answer according to Kaashmiree as well, so the objection of Tahaawi is demolished by the ahnaaf themselves.

Now as for the so-called "good answer" of Kaashmiree then let us inform you that Kaashmiree sahab is known for doing such trials against the authentic narrations. A similar "good answer" to the issue of one witr, which is proven from the Prophet in Saheeh Muslim which many major Hanafi Scholars have also attested to, also came in the mind of Kaashmiree sahab after a lengthy "hard work" of about fourteen (14) years.

[See, Faydh ul-Baari (2/375), Al-Urf ash-Shazi (1/107), Ma'arif Al-Sunan by Binnoori (4/264), Dars-e-Tirmidhi by Taqi Uthmaani (3/224)]

One may ask, is this the cost of obeying a hadeeth that if it is against the saying of Imaam, then one should search for its answer his whole life instead of acting upon it? Was this the way of Sahaabah Karaam (radiallah anhum) and Taabi'een (rahimahumullah)? Was this the teaching of Imaam Abu Haneefah and other A'immaah of Deen?

Readers should decide themselves as to whether this behavior is compassion for hadeeth or? This is the acceptance of hadeeth or? And is this the accordance of hadeeth or?

Ta'weel # 2:

Now listen to the “Good Kaashmiree Answer” to the hadeeth of Salaat al-Khawf, he writes:

والجواب على ما ظَهَرَ لي: أن النبيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلّم صلاها في ذات الرِّقَاع على الصفة المختارة عند الشافعية، فصلّى بطائفةٍ ركعةً، ثم ثَبَتَ قائماً حتى أتمُّوا لأنفسهم، وجاءت الأخرى، فصلّى بهم كذلك، فاعتبر الراوي ركعته صلى الله عليه وسلّم ركعةً، ومُكثَّهُ بقدر ما أتمُّوا لأنفسهم ركعةً أخرى، فعبر عنه بالركعتين. وكانت الركعتان في الحقيقة لمن خلفه صلى الله عليه وسلّم وإنما نَسَبَهُمَا إليه أيضاً لتأخيره بتلك المدّة، ومُكثِّه فيها، فإذا تضمّنت ركعته صلى الله عليه وسلّم ركعتيهما، تضمّنت ركعته لأربعهم لا مَحَالَةَ. وهذا وإن كان يرى تأويلاً في بادئ النظر، لكنه مُؤَيَّدٌ بما يُروى عن جابر في عين تلك القصة. فقد أخرج البخاريُّ: عن صالح بن خوات، عمن شهد مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلّم يوم ذات الرِّقَاع صلاةَ الخوف: «أن طائفةً صَفَّتْ معه، وطائفةً وِجَاهَ العدو، فصلّى بالنبي معه ركعةً، ثم ثَبَتَ قائماً، وأتمُّوا لأنفسهم. ثم انصرفوا، فصَفُّوا وِجَاهَ العدو. وجاءت الطائفةُ الأخرى، فصلّى بهم الركعة التي بقيت من صلاته، ثم ثَبَتَ جالساً، وأتمُّوا لأنفسهم، ثم سلّم بهم». اهـ - (83/5) فهذا صريحٌ في أن القومَ فرَعُوا بعد ركعتين ركعتين، وأمّا النبيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلّم فلم يَفْرُغْ عن صلاته حتى فرَعُوا جميعاً. فكانت لهم ركعتان ركعتان، وكانت للنبيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلّم أيضاً ركعتان، كما ذكره الراوي ههنا، إلا أنه لَمَّا مَكثَ بعد ركعةٍ بقدر ركعةٍ، وانتظر القوم عبَّرَ عنه الراوي هناك بالركعة، وعدَّ له أربع ركعات بهذا

الطريق. ولا بُدَّ، فإن الواقعةً واحدةً، فلعلَّكَ عَلِمْتَ الآنَ حالَ تعبيرِ الرواةِ أَنه لا يُبْنَى على مسألةٍ فقهيةٍ فقط، بل يأتي على عباراتٍ وملاحظٍ تَسْنُحُ لهم عند الرواية.

“And the answer that has appeared to me is that in Dhaat ar-Riqaa, the Prophet (peace be upon) prayed in a way that is favored by Shaafi’eeyyah, i.e. the Prophet (peace be upon him) led the first group in one rak’ah, then he remained standing until those following him completed their prayer (i.e. both rak’ahs) on their own; then the second group came so he (peace be upon him) led them in one rak’ah likewise while they completed the second rak’ah on their own. Therefore, the narrator considered his rak’ah to be one rak’ah and his stay until the Sahaabah completed their prayer on their own as another rak’ah so like this he counted his two rak’ahs; whereas the two rak’ahs were actually that of those Sahaabah who prayed behind him but he attributed them to the Prophet as well because of his stay during that period. When the one rak’ah of the Prophet (peace be upon him) covered the two rak’ahs of the Sahaabah then the two rak’ahs of the Prophet (peace be upon him) covered the four rak’ahs of the Sahaabah without any doubt. Although this apparently seems to be a Ta’weel but it is supported by another narration of Jaabir concerning the same incident as narrated in Bukhaari (5/83) from Saalih bin Khawwaat who narrates from someone who witnessed the Salaat al-Khawf with the Prophet on the day of Dhaat ar-Riqaa that, ‘One batch lined up behind him while another batch (lined up) facing the enemy. The Prophet led the batch that was with him in one rak’ah, and he stayed in the standing posture while that batch completed their (two rak’aat) prayer by themselves and went away, lining in the face of the enemy, while the other batch came and he (i.e. the Prophet) offered his remaining rak’ah with them, and then, kept on sitting till they completed their prayer by themselves, and he then finished his prayer with Tasleem along with them’. Thus this

narration clearly proves that the Sahaabah finished completing their prayer as two rak'ahs each batch, but the Prophet (peace be upon him) did not finish his prayer until all of them had finished their prayer; thus the Sahaabah prayed two rak'ahs each while the Prophet (peace be upon him) prayed two rak'ahs also, as the narrator mentioned here. However, when he (peace be upon him) stayed standing after one rak'ah for as long as the period of one rak'ah while waiting for the Sahaabah, the narrator counted that (wait) as one rak'ah as well and like this he counted his rak'ahs to be four in number. There is no doubt that both these incidents are the same (i.e. this and that of al-Bukhaari narrated above). Probably now you understand the condition of the narrators' interpretation that this interpretation is not merely based on one Fiqhi issue, rather the passages that a narrator understands at the time of narration, is what he interprets based on!"

[Faydh ul-Baari (3/247)]

Answer:

Look how much difficulties and complications Kaashmiree sahab had to undergo just to get rid of the hadeeth! However, this great "hard work" of his could not also bear any fruit, because:

The narration based on which, Kaashmiree sahab has made such a huge and far-fetched Ta'weel is, according to the affirmations of Muhadditheen, a separate incident and not the same one.

Therefore, the saying of Kaashmiree sahab: **"And there is no doubt that the incident is the same"** is Baatil due to several reasons:

- 1- The words **"from someone who witnessed the Salaat al-Khawf with the Prophet on the day of Dhaat ar-Riqaa"** as mentioned in the narration presented above with reference to Bukhaari, do not at all denote **"Jaabir (radiallah anhu)"** as this unnamed person. There is no such thing narrated from the Mujtahid A'immah and Fuqaha. No

scholar, until today, has said such a thing; rather this is purely a
“Kaashmiree disclosure”

Haafidh Ibn Hajar said:

قِيلَ إِنَّ اسْمَ هَذَا الْمُبْهَمِ سَهْلُ بْنُ أَبِي حَثْمَةَ لِأَنَّ الْقَاسِمَ بْنَ مُحَمَّدٍ رَوَى
حَدِيثَ صَلَاةِ الْخَوْفِ عَنْ صَالِحِ بْنِ خَوَّاتٍ عَنْ سَهْلِ بْنِ أَبِي حَثْمَةَ وَهَذَا هُوَ
الظَّاهِرُ مِنْ رِوَايَةِ الْبُخَارِيِّ وَلَكِنَّ الرَّاجِحَ أَنَّهُ أَبُو خَوَّاتٍ بِنُ جُبَيْرٍ لِأَنَّ أَبَا أُوَيْسٍ
رَوَى هَذَا الْحَدِيثَ عَنْ يَزِيدَ بْنِ رُوْمَانَ شَيْخِ مَالِكٍ فِيهِ فَقَالَ عَنْ صَالِحِ بْنِ
خَوَّاتٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ أَخْرَجَهُ بِنُ مَنَدَةَ فِي مَعْرِفَةِ الصَّحَابَةِ مِنْ طَرِيقِهِ وَكَذَلِكَ أَخْرَجَهُ
الْبَيْهَقِيُّ مِنْ طَرِيقِ عُبَيْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عُمَرَ عَنِ الْقَاسِمِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ صَالِحِ بْنِ
خَوَّاتٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ وَجَزَمَ النَّوَوِيُّ فِي تَهْذِيبِهِ بِأَنَّهُ خَوَّاتٌ بِنُ جُبَيْرٍ وَقَالَ إِنَّهُ مُحَقَّقٌ
مِنْ رِوَايَةِ مُسْلِمٍ وَغَيْرِهِ قُلْتُ وَسَبَقَهُ لِدَلِيلِ الْغَزَالِيِّ فَقَالَ إِنَّ صَلَاةَ ذَاتِ الرَّقَاعِ
فِي رِوَايَةِ خَوَّاتٍ بِنُ جُبَيْرٍ

“It is said that the name of this unnamed person is Sahl bin Abi Khathmah because Qaasim bin Muhammad has narrated a hadeeth concerning Salaat al-Khawf from Saalih bin Khawwaat who narrated from Sahl bin Abi Khathmah and this is apparent from the narration of Bukhaari. However, the most authentic opinion is that it (i.e. the unnamed person) is (actually) his father, Khawwaat bin Jubayr, because Abu Uways has narrated this (exact) hadeeth from Yazeed bin Rumaan, who is the Shaykh of (Imaam) Maalik, from Saalih bin Khawwaat who narrated it from his Father. Ibn Mandah has also narrated it with this (same) chain in (his book) Ma’rifat is-Sahaabah; and similarly, Al-Bayhaqi has also narrated it from the route of

Ubaydullah bin Umar from al-Qaasim bin Muhammad from Saalih bin Khawwaat from his Father. (In fact) Al-Nawawi has said with the expression of certainty in his (book) Al-Tahdheeb that it is (actually) Khawwaat bin Jubayr and he said that this is established from the narration of Muslim and others. I (Ibn Hajar) say: Al-Ghazzaali has taken precedence to him in this when he said that, certainly the salaah performed in Dhaat ar-Riqaa is from the narration of Khawwaat bin Jubayr”

[Fath al-Baari (7/422)]

Haafidh further said:

وَيُحْتَمَلُ أَنَّ صَالِحًا سَمِعَهُ مِنْ أَبِيهِ وَمِنْ سَهْلِ بْنِ أَبِي حَثْمَةَ فَلِذَلِكَ يُبْهِمُهُ تَارَةً وَيُعَيِّنُهُ أُخْرَى إِلَّا أَنْ تَعَيَّنَ كَوْنُهَا كَانَتْ ذَاتَ الرَّقَاعِ إِنَّمَا هُوَ فِي رِوَايَتِهِ عَنْ أَبِيهِ وَلَيْسَ فِي رِوَايَةِ صَالِحٍ عَنْ سَهْلِ أَنَّهٗ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ....

“And it is possible that Saalih heard it both from his father as well as Sahl bin Abi Khathmah which is why he would make his name ambiguous one time and reveal it the other. However, the certainty of the narrator concerning (the narration of) Dhaat ar-Riqaa is only in his narration from his father; and it is unlikely in the narration of Saalih from Sahl that he would have prayed this prayer with the Prophet (peace be upon him) (as he was too young during that expedition).”

[Fath al-Baari (7/422)]

From these clarifications, it is as brightly evident as the brightness of the day that in this narration, Saalih bin Khawwaat is not narrating the Salaah al-Khawf of Dhaat ar-Riqaa from Jaabir (radiallah anhu), rather he is narrating it from his father Khawwaat bin Jubayr. Therefore, the saying of Kaashmiree sahab, “**but it is supported by**

another narration of Jaabir concerning the same incident as narrated in Bukhaari” is absolutely baseless.

- 2- The Muhadditheen have narrated several ways of performing Salaat al-Khawf from the Prophet (peace be upon him), so those methods that are authentically proven from him can all be acted upon.

Muhammad Sarfaraz Khan Safdar Deobandi Hayaati writes:

“Haafidh Ibn Qayyim writes in Zaad al-Ma’aad (1/147) that there are six or seven different ways of performing Salaat al-Khawf and all of them are permissible. Allaamah Ibn Hazm, in Al-Muhalla, and Abu Dawood, in al-Sunan, have mentioned thirteen (different) ways. Qaadhi Shawkaani writes in Nayl al-Awtaar (3/337) that there are seventeen ways. Haafidh Ibn Hajar narrates sixteen ways with reference to Abu Bakr Ibn al-Arabi (Fath al-Baari: 2/431). Ameer Yamaani writes in Subul al-Salam that ‘Ibn Hazm said that fourteen ways out of these are authentically proven, and Ibn al-Arabi said that there are numerous narrations concerning it, sixteen of which are authentic’. Whichever of these you follow, is correct.”

[Khazaain al-Sunan (2/202)]

Therefore, when this incident is proven to be separate on its own then there is no reason why it should be blended, through Ta’weel, with the method narrated from Jaabir (radiallah anhu).

That is why the Mujtahideen have mentioned the prayer of Dhaat ar-Riqaa narrated from Jaabir (radiallah anhu) as a separate method, and the way of prayer narrated from Saalih bin Khawwaat as a separate method. It is obvious that the Prophet (peace be upon him) would not have prayed just one prayer in this expedition; he would have adopted one way in one prayer while another way in another prayer. Therefore, there does not remain any disagreement between

both narrations, and they both stand alone as two separate (methods of) prayer.

Imaam Ibn Hibbaan has mentioned the narration of Sayyidunah Jaabir (radiallah anhu) as a sixth, while the narration of Saalih bin Khawwaat as a seventh method of performing Salaat al-Khawf. [Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan (7/135-140)]

Imaam Ibn Khuzaymah has also proven two separate methods of Salaat al-Khawf from these two narrations. [Saheeh Ibn Khuzaymah (2/297, 300)]

Imaam Ibn al-Mundhir has mentioned the narration of Sayyidunah Jaabir as a fourth, while the narration of Saalih bin Khawwaat as a sixth method of Salaat al-Khawf. [Al-Awsat by Ibn al-Mundhir (5/32-33)]

Imaam Bukhaari has also mentioned the narrations of Saalih bin Khawwaat and Sayyidunah Jaabir as separate.

In short, it is proven that these two are two separate incidents.

- 3- This ta'weel of Kaashmiree sahab can also easily be invalidated by the fact that the narration of Abu Dawood and Nasaa'ee mentions the words of "Thumma Sallam (then he uttered the salaam)" i.e. He (peace be upon him) said salaam after two rak'ahs, so if as per Kaashmiree sahab, the narrator confused his one rak'ah with two rak'ahs then does that mean he (peace be upon him) said salaam after one rak'ah? [After making that long and fictional Ta'weel] Kaashmiree sahab himself admitted to this fact saying:

ويخذه ما عند النسائي (ص: ٢٣٢) من ذكر تسليم النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أيضا بعد ركعتين.

“The mention of the Prophet’s Tasleem (peace be upon him) after two rak’ahs in the narration of Al-Nasaa’ee (P. 232), also tears my Ta’weel apart”
[Faydh ul-Baari (4/104)]

Ta’weel # 3:

Kaashmiree sahab himself confessed that the salutation of the Prophet (peace be upon him) makes this Ta’weel invalid, but still he did not leave his Ta’weel, rather to prove the same ta’weel, he suggested another Ta’weel. One may ask, is this what you call acceptance and obedience of hadeeth? He writes:

قد انكشف عندنا حقيقة الأمر، وأن لا نتبع الألفاظ ونقول: انه بالحقيقة تسليم القوم، ونسبت الي امامه لكونهم في امامته، لا أنه تسليم نفسه، أو يقال: انه لما انتظر تسليم القوم، عبر الراوي انتظارا للتسليم بالتسليم.

“The reality of the matter has become clear to us; we will not go by the (apparent) words but say that actually it was the salutation of the followers (not the Prophet’s); and it was attributed to him because he was their Imaam, not that it was his own Salaam; or it will be said that when he (peace be upon him) waited for the salaam of the followers, the narrator interpreted his wait with his salaam”

[Faydh ul-Baari (4/104)]

Answer:

Dear Readers! See where this accursed Taqleed has taken these Muqallideen up to; every hadeeth which goes against the saying of their Imaam ends up becoming a practice-board for their Ta'weelaat; and they do not even hesitate to attack the understanding of the Noble Companions who were the direct students of the Messenger of Allaah.

You'd see that the Noble A'immah, the great Muhadditheen, and the noble Fuqaha, so much so that even the Hanafi elders are explicitly proving the issue of Salaat al-Muftarid Khalf al-Mutanaffil from these ahaadeeth, but the Muqallideen say only those things which were not said by anyone before. Were Muhadditheen, A'immah Karaam, and the Hanafi elders more knowledgeable of this hadeeth or today's blind Muqallid? If we open the doors to Ta'weelaat like this then numerous methods of Salaat al-Khawf, which are accepted even according to the Ahnaaf, will become Baatil; in fact all the methods will be made one by doing Ta'weelaat!!!

Benefit:

All this "Ta'weeli hard-work" of Kaashmiree sahab will go in vain when we will mention the comments of Imaam Tahaawi on this hadeeth (of Saalih bin Khawwaat). He writes:

فَقَدْ خَالَفَ الْقَاسِمُ مُحَمَّدَ بْنَ يَزِيدَ بْنِ رُومَانَ فَإِنْ كَانَ هَذَا يُؤْخَذُ مِنْ طَرِيقِ
الْإِسْنَادِ فَإِنَّ عَبْدَ الرَّحْمَنِ عَنْ أَبِيهِ الْقَاسِمِ عَنْ صَالِحِ بْنِ خَوَّاتٍ عَنْ سَهْلِ بْنِ
أَبِي حَثْمَةَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَحْسَنُ مِنْ يَزِيدَ بْنِ رُومَانَ عَنْ صَالِحِ
عَمَّنْ أَخْبَرَهُ وَإِنْ تَكَافَا تَضَادًّا، وَإِذَا تَضَادَّا لَمْ يَكُنْ لِأَحَدِ الْخَصْمَيْنِ فِي
أَحَدِهِمَا حُجَّةٌ ; إِذْ كَانَ لِخَصْمِهِ عَلَيْهِ مِثْلُ مَا لَهُ عَلَى خَصْمِهِ. فَإِنْ قَالَ قَائِلٌ:
فَإِنَّ يَحْيَى بْنَ سَعِيدٍ قَدْ رَوَى عَنِ الْقَاسِمِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ صَالِحِ بْنِ خَوَّاتٍ عَنْ

سَهْلٍ مَا يُوَافِقُ مَا رَوَى يَزِيدُ بْنُ رُوْمَانَ وَيَحْيَى بْنُ سَعِيدٍ لَيْسَ بِدُونَ عَبْدِ
 الرَّحْمَنِ بْنِ الْقَاسِمِ فِي الضَّبْطِ وَالْحِفْظِ. قِيلَ لَهُ: يَحْيَى بْنُ سَعِيدٍ كَمَا ذَكَرْتُ
 وَلَكِنْ لَمْ يَرْفَعْ الْحَدِيثَ إِلَى النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَإِنَّمَا أَوْقَفَهُ عَلَى
 سَهْلٍ , فَقَدْ يَجُوزُ أَنْ يَكُونَ مَا رَوَى عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنُ الْقَاسِمِ عَنْ صَالِحٍ هُوَ
 الَّذِي كَذَلِكَ. كَانَ عِنْدَ سَهْلٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ خَاصَّةً ثُمَّ قَالَ:
 هُوَ مِنْ رَأْيِهِ مَا بَقِيَ فَصَارَ ذَلِكَ رَأْيًا مِنْهُ , لَا عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
 وَلِذَلِكَ لَمْ يَرْفَعَهُ يَحْيَى إِلَى النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. فَلَمَّا اخْتَمَلَ ذَلِكَ مَا
 ذَكَرْنَا , ارْتَفَعَ أَنْ يَقُومَ بِهِ حُجَّةٌ أَيْضًا. وَالنَّظَرُ يَدْفَعُ ذَلِكَ ; لِأَنَّ لَمْ نَجِدْ فِي
 شَيْءٍ مِنَ الصَّلَاةِ أَنَّ الْمَأْمُومَ يُصَلِّي شَيْئًا مِنْهَا قَبْلَ الْإِمَامِ , وَإِنَّمَا يَفْعَلُهُ الْمَأْمُومُ
 مَعَ فِعْلِ الْإِمَامِ أَوْ بَعْدَ فِعْلِ الْإِمَامِ , وَإِنَّمَا يُلْتَمَسُ عِلْمُ مَا اخْتَلَفَ فِيهِ مِمَّا
 أُجْمِعَ عَلَيْهِ.

“Qaasim has opposed Yazeed bin Rumaan in this narration. If we have a look at the chain then the chain of ‘Abdur Rahmaan from his father (Qaasim) from Saalih bin Khawwaat from Sahl bin Abi Khathmah from the Prophet’ is better than the chain of, ‘Yazeed bin Rumaan from Saalih from the one who informed him’. Even if they were equal, they are contradictory to each other, and when they are contradictory, they cannot become evidence for any of the two groups.... If someone says that Yahya bin Sa’eed has narrated it from the chain of Qaasim bin Muhammad from Saalih bin Khawwaat from Sahl matching with what Yazeed bin Rumaan narrated, and Yahya bin Sa’eed is no less in Dhabt and Hifdh to Abdur Rahmaan bin Qaasim; then the answer to this is that Yahya bin Sa’eed is as you said, but he did not mention this narration as

Marfoo up to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and he only stopped it up to Sahl. It is possible that what Abdur Rahmaan bin Qaasim narrated were from the exclusive words of the Prophet while that which is from Yahya bin Sa'eed might be his personal opinion which is why he did not narrate it as Marfoo. When our above mentioned possibility is present then taking evidence from it no longer remains valid. Secondly, this is not even correct intellectually because we do not see any prayer in which a Muqtadi performs a part of the prayer before the Imaam, rather he either performs with the Imaam or after the Imaam; in case of difference the matters of consensus are to be referred to”

He further writes:

وَلَمَّا لَمْ نَجِدْ لِقَضَاءِ الْمَأْمُومِ قَبْلَ أَنْ يَفْرُغَ الْإِمَامُ مِنَ الصَّلَاةِ أَصْلًا فِيمَا أُجْمِعَ عَلَيْهِ يَدُلُّ عَلَيْهِ فَانْعَطَفْنَا عَلَيْهِ , أَبْطَلْنَا الْعَمَلَ بِهِ وَرَجَعْنَا إِلَى الْآثَارِ الْأُخْرَى الَّتِي قَدَّمْنَا ذِكْرَهَا , الَّتِي مَعَهَا التَّوَاتُرُ وَشَوَاهِدُ الْإِجْمَاعِ . وَقَدْ رُوِيَ عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ خِلَافُ ذَلِكَ كُلِّهِ

“When we did not find a consented upon base to rely on - so that we turn the hadeeth toward it - for the completion of follower before the completion of Imaam from the Prayer, so we declared acting upon it to be invalid. And we turned towards the other Athaar, which have the accordance of Ijmaa and Tawaatur with them. Moreover, Abu Hurayrah (radiallah anhu) has narrated a complete opposite way of it from the Prophet (peace be upon him).”

[Sharh Ma'aani al-Athaar by Tahaawi (1/218-219 and 1/312 in Shamilah)]

Now, the followers of Kaashmiree sahab should tell us that what position does the saying of Kaashmiree holds in front of the saying of Imaam Tahaawi Hanafi? Will it be accepted from Tahaawi Hanafi or from Kaashmiree sahab? The narration based on which Kaashmiree made such huge and complex Ta'weelaat, Imaam Tahaawi declared that every hadeeth to be unworthy to take evidence from. Ahnaaf should now at least keep the honor of their elders.

Ta'weel # 4:

Ibn al-Turkamaani al-Hanafi writes:

هذا كان في صلاة الخوف والنبى صلى الله عليه وسلم كان في مسافة لا تقصر
في مثلها الصلوة.

“This prayer of the Prophet (peace be upon him) was at a distance at which the prayers are not shortened”

[Al-Johar al-Naqi (3/86), also see Sharh Ma'aani al-Athaar (1/220)]

Answer:

1- Anwar Shaah Kaashmiree Deobandi writes:

وحمله علي حال الإقامة باطل.

“Considering it to be at the condition of residency is Baatil”

[Faydh ul-Baari (3/247)]

2- Haafidh Ibn Hazm writes:

هَذَا جَهْلٌ وَكَذِبٌ آخَرٌ، أَبُو بَكْرَةَ مُتَأَخِّرُ الْإِسْلَامِ، لَمْ يَشْهَدْ بِالْمَدِينَةِ قَطُّ خَوْفًا،
وَلَا صَلَاةَ خَوْفٍ، وَلَا فِيمَا يَقْرُبُ مِنْهَا، وَإِنَّمَا كَانَ ذَلِكَ - قَالَ جَابِرٌ - :
بِنَخْلِ، وَبِدَاتِ الرَّقَاعِ، فَكِلَا الْمَوْضِعَيْنِ عَلَى أَزِيدَ مِنْ ثَلَاثَةِ أَيَّامٍ مِنَ الْمَدِينَةِ.

“This saying is based on ignorance and lie. Abu Bakrah was a late-comer to Islaam; he never saw in Madeenah any Fear, or the Prayer of Fear, or anything like that. And according to the saying of Jaabir, this Salaat al-Khawf was offered at the places of Nakhl and Dhaat ar-Riqaa’ and both these places are located at the distance of more than three days from Madeenah.”

[Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm (4/235)]

Therefore, this Ta’weel is Baatil and void because of being against the clear ahaadeeth, the sayings of A’immah Deen, the understanding of Muhadditheen, and the Faqaahat of Fuqaha Karaam.

What’s challenging is to accept a hadeeth, Ta’weel is not hard to make. Whoever is on Baatil can, anyhow, make a Ta’weel without proofs.

Allaamah Ibn Abi al-Izz al-Hanafi (D. 792) writes in the explanation of Aqeedah Tahaawiyyah:

ولا يشاء مبطل أن يتأول النصوص ويحرفها عن مواضعها الا وجد الي ذلك
من السبيل.

“No deviant person wishes to make a Ta’weel of texts and alter them from various sides except that he would find a way to do it”

[Sharh al-Aqeedah at-Tahaawiyyah (189)]

Moreover, he writes under the harms of corrupt Ta’weel:

وهذا الذي أفسد الدنيا والدين وهكذا فعلت اليهود والنصارى في نصوص التوراة والإنجيل وحذرنا الله أن نفعل مثلهم وأبي المبطلون إلا سلوك سبيلهم، وكم جنى التأويل الفاسد علي الدين وأهله من جناية؟ فهل قتل عثمان رضي الله عنه إلا بالتأويل الفاسد! وكذا ما جرى في يوم الجمل، وصفين، ومقتل الحسين رضي الله عنه، والحرّة! وهل خرجت الخوارج، واعتزلت المعتزلة، ورفضت الروافض، وافترقت الأمة علي ثلاث وسبعين فرقة، إلا بتأويل الفاسد.

“And this approach has played havoc with religion and life. This is what the Jews and Christians did with the texts of the Torah and Gospel. Allaah has warned us against doing the same. But vicious people have not heeded the warning and have in fact followed in their footsteps. What harm the Ta’weel has done to Islaam and Muslims! Was not Uthmaan (radiallah anhu) killed because of a Ta’weel of the texts? Did not the battles of the Camel and Siffeen, the killing of Al-Husayn (radiallah anhu), and the incidents of Al-Harrah take place on account of it? Did not the Khaarijis, Mu’tazilis, and Raafidis commit their heresies because of it? And did not the Muslim nation become divided into seventy three sects because of it?”

[Sharh al-Aqeedah at-Tahaawiyyah (189)]

He further writes:

وأما اذا تأول الكلام بما لا يدل عليه ولا اقترن به ما يدل عليه، فباخباره بأن هذا مراده كذب عليه، وهو تأويل بالراى وتوهم بالهوى.

“And if someone interprets a speech to mean what it does not imply and what is not indicated by other evidence, then his claim that what he is saying is what the speaker means, is a lie upon him; and it is nothing but a subjective interpretation and wishful imagining.”

[Sharh al-Aqeedah at-Tahaawiyyah (198)]

Is this Ta’weel not an allegation on the Prophet (peace be upon him) and wishful imagining against the Saheeh Ahaadeeth, understanding of Muhadditheen, and the sayings of Fuqaha?

Now on one side, Imaam Tahaawi Hanafi declares acting upon this hadeeth to be Baatil and against the Ijmaa & Tawaatur; while on the other hand, Kaashmiree sahab is making all sorts of Ta’weelaat to make the clear and authentic narration of Bukhaari and Muslim in accordance to it.

Readers! Do justice and let us know will the saying of Imaam Tahaawi be accepted in Hanafi Fiqh or the saying of Kaashmiree sahab? If a Mujtahid takes account of it that’s a different thing, but what right does a Muqallid have to oppose his Imaam? Is this not a contradiction?

Ta’weel # 5:

وان قصر الصلاة انما امره الله تعالى به بعد ذلك فكانت الأربع يومئذ
مفروضة علي رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم

“The command of shortening the prayer (during the travel) was given by Allaah after this incident; these four rak’ahs were fard upon the Prophet (peace be upon him) on that day”

[Sharh Ma’aani al-Athaar (1/221)]

Answer:

This saying of Imaam Tahaawi is not correct because it is agreed upon that the expedition of Dhaat ar-Riqaa', at the least, took place in **four (4)** hijri while the commandment of shortening the prayer during travel had revealed immediately after the Hijrah.

Haafidh Ibn Hazm writes:

وقد صح عن عائشة رضي الله عنها أن الصلاة أنزلت بمكة ركعتين ركعتين، فلما هاجر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم اتمت صلاة الحضر وأقرت صلاة السفر.

“And it is authentically proven from Aa’ishah (radiallah anha) that the prayer in Makkah was prescribed to be consisting of two rak’ahs; thus when the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) migrated, the prayer at the place of residence was completed while the prayer in travelling remained the same”

[Saheeh Bukhaari (1090), Saheeh Muslim (685), Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm (4/235)]

He further said:

فهذا آخر فعل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، لأن أبا بكره شهدته، وإنما كان إسلامه يوم الطائف بعد فتح مكة وبعد حين.

“This was one of the last actions of the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) because Abu Bakrah has witnessed it, and he became Muslim at the day of Taa’if after the conquest of Makkah and the expedition of Hunayn.”

[Al-Muhalla (4/227)]

Ta'weel # 6:

Imaam Tahaawi Hanafi writes:

قد يحتمل أن يكون ذلك السلام المذكور في هذا الموضع هو سلام التشهد الذي لا يراد به قطع الصلوة، ويحتمل أن يكون سلاما اراد به اعلام الطائفة الأولى بأوان انصرا فيها والكلام جيئذ مباح له في الصلاة غير قاطع لها.

“It is possible that the salaam mentioned in this hadeeth might be the salaam of Tashahhud which does not imply the disconnection of prayer; moreover it is also possible that this salaam was to inform the first group to leave, as speaking in prayer was permissible at that time without being an interruption for the prayer.”

[Sharh Ma'aani al-Athaar (1/221)]

Answer:

We have proven above that this incident of Salaat al-Khawf took place long after the commandment of shortening the prayer.

Haafidh Nawawi said:

وادعي الطحاوي أنه منسوخ ولا تقبل دعواه اذ لا دليل لنسخه.

“At-Tahaawi has claimed that it is Mansookh (abrogated), but this claim of his will not be accepted as there is no proof for its abrogation”

[Sharh Muslim by Nawawi (1/278)]

Therefore, if we take it to mean the salaam of Tashahhud (i.e. saying Assalaam-o-Alayka and Assalaam-o-Alayna in At-Tahiyyaat) then it will prove that the Prophet (peace be upon him) prayed four rak'ahs in Qasr; whereas according to Ahnaaf, praying four rak'ahs in Qasr is either Baatil or the last two will be considered Nafl.

Haafidh Ibn Hazm writes:

وَأَبُو حَنِيفَةَ يَرَى عَلَى مَنْ صَلَّى أَرْبَعًا وَهُوَ مُسَافِرٌ: أَنَّ صَلَاتَهُ فَاسِدَةٌ، إِلَّا أَنْ
يَجْلِسَ فِي الْإِثْنَيْنِ مِقْدَارَ التَّشَهُدِ فَتَصِحُّ صَلَاتُهُ، وَتَكُونُ الرَّكْعَتَانِ اللَّتَانِ يَقُومُ
إِلَيْهِمَا تَطَوُّعًا.

فَإِنْ كَانَ - عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ - لَمْ يَقْعُدْ بَيْنَ الرَّكْعَتَيْنِ مِقْدَارَ التَّشَهُدِ فَصَلَاتُهُ عِنْدَهُمْ
فَاسِدَةٌ، فَإِنْ أَقْدَمُوا عَلَى هَذَا الْقَوْلِ كَفَرُوا بِلَا مَرِيَّةٍ.
وَإِنْ كَانَ - عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ - قَعَدَ بَيْنَ الرَّكْعَتَيْنِ مِقْدَارَ التَّشَهُدِ، فَقَدْ صَارَتِ الطَّائِفَةُ
الثَّانِيَّةُ مُصَلِّيَةً فَرَضَهُمْ خَلْفَهُ، وَهُوَ - عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ - مُتَنَفِّلٌ، وَهَذَا قَوْلُنَا لَا
قَوْلُهُمْ؟

“Abu Haneefah held the opinion that if someone prays four rak'ahs while he is traveling, his prayer is Faasid. However if he sat down after two rak'ahs in Tashahhud then his prayer will become correct but his other two rak'ahs will be considered Nafl. So if he - peace be upon him - did not sit after the two rak'ahs then his prayer was (na'oozubillah) Faasid according to them (i.e. Ahnaaf), so if they say such a thing then they will be declared Kaafir without a doubt.

And if he - peace be upon him - sat after the two rak'ahs (according to them) in Tashahhud then certainly the second group offered their fard prayer behind him when he - peace be upon him - was praying Nafl; and this is our saying not theirs?”

[Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm (4/228)]

Allaamah Zayla'ee Hanafi writes:

وَعَلَى كُلِّ حَالٍ، فَالِاسْتِدْلَالُ عَلَى الْحَنْفِيَّةِ بِحَدِيثِ جَابِرٍ صَحِيحٌ، وَإِنْ لَمْ يُسَلِّمْ
مِنَ الرَّكْعَتَيْنِ، لِأَنَّ فَرَضَ الْمُسَافِرِ عِنْدَهُمْ رَكْعَتَانِ، وَالْقَصْرُ عَزِيمَةٌ، فَإِنْ صَلَّى
الْمُسَافِرُ أَرْبَعًا، وَقَعَدَ فِي الْأُولَى صَحَّتْ صَلَاتُهُ، وَكَانَتْ الْأُخْرَيَانِ لَهُ نَافِلَةً

“In any case, taking evidence against the Hanafiyyah from the hadeeth of Jaabir is Saheeh even if he (peace be upon him) did not say salaam after two rak’ahs, because according to Ahnaaf only two rak’ahs are fard upon a traveler, and Qasr is Adheemah (obligatory), so if the traveler prays four rak’ahs and sits after the first two then his prayer will still be correct, and the last two of his rak’ahs will become Nafil for him”

[Nasb ur-Raayah (2/57)]

Ta’weel # 7:

Ibn al-Turkamaani al-Hanafi writes:

وهذا الحديث اضرب فيه الحسن فرواه مرة عن جابر ومرة عن أبي بكر، ثم
أخرجه البيهقي من حديث أبي بكر وليس فيه أنه سلم بعد الركعتين الأوليين.

“And Al-Hasan (Al-Basri) has made Idtiraab in this hadeeth, as one time he would narrate it from Jaabir while another time he would narrate it from Abu Bakrah; then the narration of Abu Bakrah that Bayhaqi has narrated does not mention that he said salaam after the first two rak’ahs”

[Al-Johar al-Naqi (3/86)]

Answer:

- 1- The claim of Idtiraab is worthless because Abu Bakrah and Jaabir (radiallah anhum) both were present in this prayer and Hasan Basri narrated this incident from both of them. So what Idtiraab is there?
- 2- Imaam Tahaawi Hanafi is agreed upon to be superior to Ibn al-Turkamaani Hanafi in the field of Hadeeth. He (Tahaawi) has laid many objections on this hadeeth whose answers have passed before, but this objection was not even made by Imaam Tahaawi which is evidence that this defect is not in the hadeeth even according to him.
- 3- Allaamah Zayla'ee Hanafi writes about this hadeeth:

أخرجه ابو داود بسند صحيح.

“It is narrated by Abu Dawood with an authentic chain”

[Nasb ur-Raayah (2/646)]

Therefore, there is no Idtiraab. As for the claim that the narration of Abu Bakrah in Sunan al-Kubra lil Bayhaqi does not mention the salaam, then the answer to it is that if a narrator does not mention these words from Abu Bakrah while another mentions it, then according to the Imaams of Ahnaaf the addition of the Thiqah narrator in this authentic hadeeth should be accepted.

Allaamah Zayla'ee Hanafi says after mentioning the hadeeth of Abu Bakrah:

واعلم أن هذا الحديث صريح أنه عليه الصلاة والسلام سلم من الركعتين.

“Be aware that this hadeeth (of Abu Bakrah) is clear in proving that he – peace and blessings be upon him – said salaam after two rak’ahs”

[Nasb ur-Raayah (2/246)]

Proof # 4:

Sayyid ul-Malaa’ikah Jibreel (peace be upon him) has led the Prophet (peace be upon him) in five prayers.

[Saheeh Bukhaari (499), Saheeh Muslim (610-611)]

It is agreed upon that the prayer is not obligatory on Jibreel (peace be upon him) because he is not obliged to follow the Sharee’ah of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) and the prayer of a non-obliged child is Nafl. Therefore, these prayers of Jibreel (peace be upon him) were also Nafl, and the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) has prayed Fajr, Zuhr, Asr, Maghrib, and Isha in his leadership. This also proves that the prayer of a Muftarid is valid behind a Mutanaffil. This is a proof to which the Muqallideen have no answer.

Like many other issues, the Hanafi world is totally deprived of proofs in this issue as well. As compared to our above mentioned clear and authentic proofs, they do not even a single proof which proves the invalidity of the prayer of Muftarid behind a Mutanaffil. We will analyze their so-called proofs with details in the next part, in-shaa-Allaah.

PART THREE

Examining the Proofs of Ahnaaf

Proof # 1:

عَنْ أَبِي أُمَامَةَ قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: " الْإِمَامُ ضَامِنٌ وَالْمُؤَدِّنُ مُؤْتَمَنٌ "

Abu Umaamah narrated that the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) said: "The Imaam is a Dhaamin (guarantor) and the Mu'adhdhin is in a position of trust."

[Musnad Ahmed (5/260), Al-Mu'jam al-Kabeer by al-Tabaraani (8/286 H. 8097), Chain Saheeh]

Answer:

- 1- This hadeeth does not even contain a hint of the invalidity of the prayer of Muftarid behind a Mutanaffil. The narrations that we took evidence from are absolutely clear in their meaning. In fact the famous and major Muhadditheen and some Hanafi Scholars have also confessed to their explicitness. Taking evidence from ambiguous narrations leaving such clear narrations aside is not something an impartial person would do. Presenting the Ishaarat un-Nass (necessary intendment) or Dalaalat un-Nass (logical extension of meaning) against the Ibaarat un-Nass (plain meaning of text) is an open violation of Usool and is an outcome of ignorance from the Usool of Istidlaal.
- 2- The confession of the permissibility of Salaat al-Muftarid Khalf al-Mutanaffil is done from the hadeeth of Mu'aadh, Jaabir, and Abu

Bakrah by the great A'immah and Muhadditheen and also by the elders of Ahnaaf themselves. However, unfortunately this deduction from this hadeeth did not come in anyone's mind except the later Taqleed lovers. Whereas, deducting issues from hadeeth is the job of Muhadditheen not the Muqallideen.

Readers! Now you do justice! Several Muhadditheen have mentioned this hadeeth in their books but none of them deducted this issue from this hadeeth. See:

Sunan Tirmidhi (207), Sunan Abu Dawood (517), Sunan al-Kubra lil Bayhaqi (1/430, 3/127, 1/425, 426, 431), Saheeh Ibn Khuzaymah (5131, 5132), Al-Umm by ash-Shaafi'ee (1/128), Sharh us-Sunnah by Haafidh Baghawi (2/280) and also see: Sharh Mishkaat by Mulla Ali Qaari Hanafi (1/427)

None of these Muhadditheen took evidence from this hadeeth for the invalidity of the prayer of Muftarid behind a Mutanaffil; whereas, a numerous number of Muhadditheen have taken evidence from our Daleel i.e. the hadeeths of Mu'aadh and Jaabir to prove the permissibility of the prayer of Muftarid behind a Mutanaffil, as we have mentioned before.

What right does the people – who have worn the collar of Taqleed-e-Shakhsi on their necks considering themselves unable to understand Qur'aan and Sunnah – have that they should extract a ruling from Hadeeth which was not even extracted by their early A'immah?

Imaam Tahaawi Hanafi has also tried his best to prove the Hanafi Madhab on this issue in Sharh Ma'aani al-Athaar, but this narration was not even presented by him. It is obvious that this ruling is not deducted from this hadeeth; otherwise Imaam Tahaawi had a deeper insight of Ahaadeeth and Athaar than today's Muqallideen.

3- In Sunan ad-Daaraqutni (1214), the meaning of this narration is also mentioned. It says:

«الإمام ضامنٌ فما صنعَ فأصنعُوا».

“The Imaam is a guarantor, so do what he does”

Imaam Abu Haatim said after narrating this hadeeth:

هَذَا تَصْحِيحٌ لِمَنْ قَالَ بِالْقِرَاءَةِ خَلْفَ الْإِمَامِ

“This hadeeth authenticates the saying of one who holds the opinion of reciting behind the Imaam”

[Sunan ad-Daaraqutni (1/321)]

As per the indications of Muhadditheen, instead of becoming a proof for Ahnaaf, it – instead – became a collar of their necks. If someone still persuades then this would be nothing but stubbornness.

4- By the words **“Al-Imaamu Dhaaminun (The Imaam is guarantor/responsible)”** taking the meaning of responsibility as in the equality of the prayer of Imaam and Muqtadi, or the fard of Imaam and Nafl of Muqtadi – is not only against the affirmations of Muhadditheen, but it is also contrary to the other Principles of Fiqh Hanafi. On this issue, the Ahnaaf only take support of this one Faasid Analogy saying that the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) declared Imaam a Dhaamin, and a person can only become someone’s Dhaamin when he dominates him, or at least equates him, because an inferior thing cannot take a superior thing under its responsibility.

No doubt that this Qiyaas is Baatil and void because of being against the Saheeh and clear texts of ahaadeeth.

Now upon pondering, you'd know that Ahnaaf themselves have opposed their so-called Usool on this issue at many places, for example, in Hanafi Fiqh:

- a. A Slave can lead a free person in prayer.
- b. A Faasiq (one who repeatedly commits sins) can lead a righteous person in prayer and so on.

[See, Qadoori (P. 29)]

Whereas, the Qiyaas demands that in these conditions also, the Imaam should not become a “Dhaamin” because of being an inferior.

Proof # 2:

Zafar Ahmed Thaanvi writes while giving the proof:

عن أنس رضي الله عنه أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: انما جعل الامام ليؤتم به، فلا تختلفوا عليه. أخرجه البخاري ومسلم (زيلعي).

Anas (radiallah anhu) narrated that the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: “The Imaam is (appointed) to be followed, so do not differ from him” Narrated by Bukhaari and Muslim (Zayla’ee).

احتج به أصحابنا علي المنع من اقتداء المفترض بالمتنفل قالوا: واختلاف النية داخل في ذلك.

“Our companions took evidence from this hadeeth for the prohibition of a Muftarid following a Mutanaffil (in prayer); they said: The difference in Niyyah (intention) is also included in that (command)”

Answer:

- 1- We could not find the words of “**So do not differ from him**” from the narration of Sayyidunah Anas (radiallah anhu) in Saheeh Bukhaari and Saheeh Muslim; rather these words are present in the narration of Sayyidunah Abu Hurayrah (radiallah anhu). Therefore, it is necessary to correct this mistake.
- 2- Just as before, this narration does not as well prove the claim of Ahnaaf at all. On the contrary, a total opposite case comes out once you read the complete hadeeth. The complete words of hadeeth are as follows:

عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ، أَنَّهُ قَالَ: خَرَّ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَنْ فَرَسٍ، فَجُحِشَ، فَصَلَّى لَنَا قَاعِدًا فَصَلَّيْنَا مَعَهُ قُعُودًا، ثُمَّ انْصَرَفَ، فَقَالَ: "إِنَّمَا جُعِلَ الْإِمَامُ لِيُؤْتَمَّ بِهِ، فَإِذَا كَبَّرَ فَكَبِّرُوا، وَإِذَا رَكَعَ فَارْكَعُوا، وَإِذَا رَفَعَ فَارْفَعُوا، وَإِذَا قَالَ: سَمِعَ اللَّهُ لِمَنْ حَمِدَهُ، فَقُولُوا: رَبَّنَا لَكَ الْحَمْدُ، وَإِذَا سَجَدَ فَاسْجُدُوا " وفي رواية: فَإِذَا صَلَّى قَائِمًا، فَصَلُّوا قِيَامًا وفي رواية أخرى: وَإِذَا صَلَّى قَاعِدًا، فَصَلُّوا قُعُودًا أَجْمَعُونَ

Anas bin Maalik (radiallah anhu) narrated: Allaah's Apostle (peace be upon him) fell from a horse and got injured so he led the prayer sitting and we also prayed sitting. When he completed the prayer he said, “**The Imam is to be followed; if he says Takbeer then say Takbeer, bow if he bows; raise your heads when he raises his head, when he says, 'Sami`a Allaahu liman Hamidah say, 'Rabbana laka l-Hamd', and prostrate when he prostrates.**” In another narration it adds: “**When he prays**

standing, you should also pray standing” and another narration says: “And when he prays sitting, all of you should pray sitting”
[Saheeh Bukhaari (732-733), Saheeh Muslim (411)]

It is apparent that the purpose and intention of this blessed saying of Allaah’s Apostle (peace be upon him) was to make the Sahaabah aware that Imaam is to be followed i.e. if he prays standing then you should also pray standing, and if he prays sitting then you should also pray sitting. Similarly, following the Imaam in other physical acts of the prayer is also necessary. Therefore, there is no proof of the prohibition of Salaat al-Muftarid Khalf al-Mutanaffil in this hadeeth. Presenting such ambiguities against the clear ahaadeeth is similar to persecuting the justice.

Benefit:

During the Maradh al-Maut (the disease in which he died) of the Prophet (peace be upon him), Abu Bakr’s performing the prayer standing in leadership of the Prophet while he was sitting; and similarly after the death of the Prophet, the Sahaabah performing their prayers standing while the Imaam was sitting, explains that this commandment is either Mansookh (Abrogated) or its not meant to be obligatory.

- 3- This narration is mentioned in abundance by the A’immah and Muhadditheen in their books, but the opportunity of this deduction only came to the Deobandis. See:

Bukhaari (734), Muslim (414), Ibn Maajah (864), Nasaa’ee (832, 1200), Abu Awaanah (2/110), Ad-Daarimi (1/286), Al-Bayhaqi (3/79), Al-Baghawi (852), Abu Dawood (604), Ibn Abi Shaybah (2/326), Ahmed bin Hanbal (2/341), Al-Humaydee (958), Abdur Razzaaq (4082), Ibn Hibbaan (2107), Ibn Khuzaymah (1613) and many others.

Not one of these Muhaddith or Imaam ever took out this issue from this hadeeth. What position the saying of Taqleed lovers hold against such vast number of Muhadditheen?

- 4- The words **“Fala Takhtalifoo (So do not differ from him)”** does not refer to the difference of intentions rather it refers to the apparent difference, as is also clarified in this very hadeeth with clear words that **“bow when he bows, raise your heads when he raises his head from rukoo, prostrate when he prostrates”**. There is not even a hint of the difference of intention.
- 5- If this hadeeth also refers to the difference of intention, then it will make the prayer of a person praying Nafil behind an Imaam praying Fard to be invalid as well. Whereas, no one holds such opinion.

As for the saying of Zafar Ahmed Thaanvi Deobandi that:

واقْتِدَاءُ الْمُتَنَفِّلِ بِالْمُفْتَرِضِ لَيْسَ مِنَ الْاِخْتِلَافِ عَلَيِ الْاِمَامِ.

“And the prayer of a Mutanaffil in leadership of a Muftarid is not considered differing from the Imaam”

[I'laa us-Sunan (3/1356)]

So we say then the prayer of Muftarid behind a Mutanaffil is also not considered differing from the Imaam.

He further writes:

أَوْ نَقُولُ: اِنْ مَفَادُ قَوْلِهِ: لَا تَخْتَلَفُوا عَلَيْهِ الْمَنْعُ مِنْ ذَلِكَ أَيْضًا وَلَكِنْ جُوزَنَاهُ
بِنَصِّ آخِرِ فِي ذَلِكَ خَاصَّةً.

“Or we will say in answer to this objection that: ‘Do not differ from him’ also forbids from the prayer of a Mutanaffil behind a Muftarid, but we declared it permissible due to the other Khaas evidence.”

[I’laa us-Sunan (3/1256)]

Answer:

If, as per your saying, **“Do not differ from him”** refers to the difference of intention, and this difference includes both the prayer of a Muftarid behind a Mutanaffil as well as the prayer of a Mutanaffil behind a Muftarid. In spite of this, you excluded the prayer of a Mutanaffil behind a Muftarid based on some other evidence, then even we, as per the affirmations of Muhadditheen, have excluded the prayer of a Muftarid behind a Mutanaffil based on the other Saheeh and clear evidences.

Now the result comes out to be the same that the difference referred to in the mentioned narration is not meant to be the difference of intention at all, otherwise the following conditions will also become Baatil due to this difference:

- a. The prayer of a traveler behind a resident.
- b. The prayer of a resident behind a traveler.
- c. And the prayer of a Masbooq (the one who missed some rak’ahs) and others.

Benefit:

Readers! You saw that on one side there are the Saheeh and clear ahaadeeth, the actions of the Messenger of Allaah (peace be upon him) and his Sahaabah, the affirmations of Muhadditheen in great numbers, and the confession of some Hanafi elders; while on the other side, leave aside Saheeh, there is not even a single clear Da’eef Daleel but still the

Ahnaaf are persistent on this; they become culprits of altering the meanings of texts by doing all sorts of Baatil Ta'weelaat in them; and they clearly deny the Faqaahat of Muhadditheen; moreover, in order to satisfy themselves and their Blind Muqallideen, they present narrations which have nothing to do with the actual issue at the farthest, because these poor people are totally deprived of proofs and often times Allaah the Most High also makes them confess the truth from their tongues. Therefore, Anwaar Khursheed – the graduate of Jaami'ah Ashrafiyyah Lahore, writes in his worthless and rubbish book "Ghayr Muqallideen Imaam Bukhaari ki Adaalat main (which means: 'Ghayr Muqallideen in the court of Imaam Bukhaari')" that:

“Whereas, we do not even claim that the proof of every issue is found in Hadeeth”

[P. 5]

See how clearly this Deobandi individual is confessing that the proof of every issue of Fiqh Hanafi is not found in Hadeeth.

We ask this person that when the complete Fiqh of yours is not proven from hadeeth, then why do you try so hard to prove these issues by doing far-fetched Ta'weelaat of the hadeeth and alteration of the texts!!?

Readers! We have finished analyzing all the proofs of ahnaaf presented, to this date, on the prohibition of a Muftarid's prayer behind a Mutanaffil. Now its time for you to decide that:

Is this the accordance of hadeeth or opposition to it?

Extracted & Translated from the researched article of Shaykh Abu Yahya Noorpoori (hafidhahullah).