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Praise be to Allah that is due from all grateful believers, a fullness of praise for all his favours: a praise that is abundantly sincere and blessed. May the blessings of Allah be upon our beloved Master Muhammad, the chosen one, the Apostle of mercy and the seal of all Prophets (peace and blessings of Allah be upon them all); and upon his descendants who are upright and pure: a blessing lasting to the Day of Judgment, like the blessing bestowed upon the Prophet Ibrahim (alaihissalam) and his descendants. May Allah be pleased with all of the Prophetic Companions (Ashabal-Kiram). Indeed, Allah is most worthy of praise and supreme glorification!

The following treatise is a response to the compilers of an e-book published on the internet in the year 1424 AH by Abu Khuzaimah Ansaari (alias - Imran Masum) and his colleague, Abu Hibban (alias - Kamran Malik), from Birmingham, England.  

The anti-Madhhabi movement generally epithetise's itself under the title: “Salafi”, being an ascription to the pious predecessors from the first three

---

1 The duo have also been exposed, humiliated and charged with flagrant lying by their anti-Madhhabi brothers in faith in the city of Birmingham, England, known as Maktabas-al-Salafiya (Salafi Publications). The latter organisation compiled an 81-page dossier in expose of the duo and their friends from the district of Alum Rock, in a pdf file that was available for wide scale distribution and readership on the Internet (early 2003). This work was entitled: “Advice and Guidance to the 4 of Alum Rock & Their Associates And an Explanation of Their Opposition to the Usool (Fundamentals) of A hl-us-Sunnah Concerning Ijtimaa’ (Uniting) and Tafarruq (Splitting ).” It was completed on: the 3rd of Rajab 1423 / 11th September 2002 by an unnamed author.
upright generations of Islamic history. Their claim to be “Salafi” is far from the truth in many ways and issues, and the outstanding scholars from the four Sunni Madhhab: Hanafi, Maliki, Shafi’i and Hanbali schools have written and exposed the falsehood of those who attack the following of the recognised Madhhab for over a century and a half now. To exemplify the beliefs, methodology and practices of the pseudo-Salafi movement would lead us to digress away from the main topic of this monograph, but the keen reader can search the Internet for books and articles in Arabic, English and other languages for this issue.

These two compilers produced their “magnum opus” in refutation of the major proofs used by the majority of the senior ranking scholars of the four established and reliable Sunni Madhhab of Islamic jurisprudence, who advocated the practice of 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh in congregation in the sublime month of Ramadan. In doing so, these two compilers made the following baseless brag in the opening page of their tract:  

In this booklet we have established, the evidences utilized for 20 rak’ats are weak and there is not a SINGLE Saheeh hadeeth or athar that mentions the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) prayed or commanded 20 raka’hs Taraaweeh. This booklet also contains the evidences for praying 8 raka’hs and establishes this to be the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam), the Practice of the Companions and those upon their way, All in light of the statements and understanding of the Scholars of Ahlus-Sunnah Wal-Jama’ah From amongst the Imaams of the Salaf, the Scholars of hadeeth of the past and present and the Jurists Up Until 1424H

The last portion of this claim is from one of the most ludicrous suggestions made by those who claim to be on the path of the Salaf in this age, and indeed, these two compilers have committed great injustice to claim that the bulk of the Salaf without exception advocated 8 rak’ats of Taraweeh, not to forget the major scholars of Hadith right down to the year 1424AH when they released their tract.

What is absolutely apparent, is that their claims in rejection of the evidences for 20 rak’ats Taraaweeh is in reality a culmination of the findings advocated from the pens of the following authors as admitted by the two compilers from the front cover of their e-book:


3 The spelling of the names is from the pen of the two compilers themselves
They also quoted their late Shaykh of Hadith in Pakistan as follows when saying⁴

Our Claim
The Imam the Muhaddith, al-Allamah Abu Muhammad Badee ud deen Sindhee said, “The Ahlul-Hadeeth claim it is not authentically established from any companion that they prayed 20 raka’hs of taraweeh and the narrations that are mentioned in this regard are all principally weak.” (Tanqeed as-Sadeed Bir-Risaalah Ijtihaad Wat-Taqleed (pg.264).

These two individuals who have styled themselves as The People of Hadith (Ahlul-Hadith) are mere copy and pasters of the findings of their anti-Madhhabi Shaykh’s - mainly from the Indian subcontinent and of the late Nasir al Albani (d. 1999 CE). Looking at their style of presentation and referencing to various books of Hadith and their commentaries, one is confident to assert that these two individuals have not had recourse to a number of the original works they gave reference to so boldly, and often very carelessly, with very little fear of Allah and justice to the scholars of Islam, let alone paid much attention and pain staking recourse back to the original books of al-Jarh wa Ta’dil (Books which

⁴ See p. 6 of their so called “al-Qaul as-Saheeh”
mention the biographies of individual narrators of Hadith listing any praise or disparagement made on them) on some occasions.

In this age of technology, it has become easy to claim something and cut and paste a barrage of references by most “researchers”, but how many people have the time, stamina and resources to check each and every reference that a party echoes forth as proof and contention for its arguments?!

Insha’Allah, in this reply one will mention with digitised scans or typed Arabic quotes when referring back to the original references that these 2 individuals supplied in order to expose their grave distortions and errors when need be. Their style of presentation was at times merciless and ruthless. This latter trend is noticeable in the writings of many of those who belong to pseudo-Salafism; especially so on internet forums. Hence, the counter reply from this pen with Allah’s aid will be directed mainly to the two compilers and their named authorities.

**The principle objective of this treatise** will be to examine and defend the authenticity of the major narration for 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh in the time of the Amir al-Mu’minin, the second Caliph, **Umar ibn al-Khattab** (radiallahu anhu), which has come via the route of the trustworthy narrator, Yazid ibn Abdullah ibn Khusayfa from the Sahabi, Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra). In doing so, the alternate narration from the trustworthy narrator known as Muhammad ibn Yusuf from his uncle, the same noble Sahabi, Saa’ib ibn Yazid, apparently mentioning 8 rak’ats of Taraweeh in the time of Umar ibn al Khattab (ra) will be shown to have a Shadh (aberrant) wording. Supporting narrations for 20 rak’ats in the time of Umar ibn al Khattab (ra) will also be mentioned.

In the latter part of this treatise, an examination and demonstration of why the variant narration for 8 rak’ats of Taraweeh as attributed back to the noble Sahabi, Jabir ibn Abdullah is also weak will be demonstrated, as well as an explanation of how the Ulama understood A’isha’s (ra) narrations on 8 rak’ats.

Let us now move onto observe their claims and how they are answerable without bias and distortion. The grammatical errors and spelling mistakes that the duo
made have been left in their original format for all to see the level of their “Scholarship.”  

5 NOTE – Readers who are unfamiliar with the terminology (Mustalah al-Hadith) employed by the Hadith specialists may refer to the following work in English in order to fully understand the usage of such terms in this treatise:  
http://www.4shared.com/file/126840739/ac065f5b/Tuhfatud_Durar_Palanpuri.html
A GLANCE AT THE NARRATION FOR 20 RAK'ATS TARAWEEH THEY REJECTED

The two compilers, Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban, said (pp. 15 onwards, their comments will be shown mainly in red):

The Second Narration – Of Saa’ib bin Yazeed

The hanafee’s cause much confusion regarding this narration by not mentioning clearly the text of the narration or its references with their chains so that a clear understanding can be achieved. So note the narrations and their variations alongside their specific chains and their answers thereafter, inshallaah.

I say:

It is a false assertion to claim that the Hanafi Ulama cause much confusion over the narration below from al-Bayhaqi’s Sunan or his other works. They made it sound as though there is a worldwide Hanafi conspiracy over the said narration! The most precise Hanafi Ulama who have discussed this narration in various books in the past have given the variant narrations they came across, and their chains of transmission for the narration these two compilers attempted to weaken via their shortsighted scholarship going back to Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra) with mention for 20 rak’ats.

They continued to say:

The Text
Saa’ib bin Yazeed said the people would pray 20 raka’hs during the time of Umar and in the era of Uthmaan they would stand for such long periods that the people would become tired and would lean on their sticks.” (Sunan al- Kubraa (2/496) of Imaam Baihaqee.)

The Chain
Informed me Abu Abdullaah al-Hussain ibn Muhammad ibn al-Hussain Finjuwayah ad-Dinawaree from Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Ishaaq as-Sunnee from Abdullahah ibn Muhammad ibn Abdul Azeez al-Baghawee from Ali ibn al- Ja’ad from Ibn Abee Dhi’b - Yazeed ibn Khaseefah from Saa’ib ibn Yazeed,

I say:

The text they are referring to was mentioned in Imam al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra (and in his Fada’il al-Awqat) as follows:

رواه في "السنن" ص 496 ج 2، قال: أخبرنا أبو عبد الله الحسين بن محمد بن الحسن بن فهد بن عبد الملك بن الرازي، قال: حدثنا عبد الله بن محمد بن أحمد بن إسحاق السفياني، قال: حدثني أبو عبد العزيز بن عبد اللطيف بن عبد الحليم بن خالد بن أبي بكر بن عبد الله بن النجاشي، قال: نحن عصيمين في عهد عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه في شهر رمضان بعشرين ركعة. قال: وكانوا يقرأون بالتين، وكانوا يتركون على عصيهم في عهد عثمان بن عفان رضي الله عنه من شدة القيام، إذ

In the above translation of the text, the two compilers left out the mention of the town known as Damghan (northern Iran) as well as not translating precisely the modes of transmission such as Haddathana correctly!

In a later section it will be shown that the variant narrations recorded by al-Bayhaqi were declared to be Sahih (authentic) in a precise manner by the following classical Ulama of Hadith, and fiqh who lived before the fall of the last Islamic Caliphate, in contradistinction to the 14th century revisionist writers on Hadith like al-Mubarakpuri, al-Albani and others from their school of thought, who attempted to weaken it with no precedence:

1) Sharaful-Din al-Nawawi (d. 676 AH)
2) Fakhrul-Din al Zayla’i (d. 743 AH)
3) Taqiul-Din al Subki (d. 756 AH)
4) Ibn al Mulaqqin (d. 804 AH)
5) Waliul-Din al-Iraqi (d. 826 AH)
6) BadruDin al-Ayni (d. 855 AH)
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7) Jalalud-Din al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH)
8) Zakariyya al-Ansari (d. 926 AH)
9) Ibrahim al-Halabi (d. 956 AH)
10) Al-Khatib al-Shirbini (d. 977 AH)
11) Ali al-Qari (d. 1014 AH)
12) Murtada al-Zabidi (d. 1205 AH)
13) Sulayman al-Bujayrmi (d. 1221 AH)
14) Abu Bakr al Dimyati (d. 1310 AH)
15) Muhammad Ali al-Nimawi (d. 1322 AH)

They continued to say:

Answer.

Firstly: - Abu Abdullaah al-Hussain ibn Muhammad ibn al-Hussain Finjuwayah al-Dinawaree

The narrator Abu Abdullaah al-Hussain ibn Muhammad ibn al-Hussain Finjuwayah al-Dinawaree, is unknown Majhool and no biography of him can be found to establish his trustworthiness. So this narration is weak.

Imaam Abdur-Rahmaan Mubaarakpooree said, “The chain includes Abu Abdullaah bin Finjuwayah al-Dinawaree and I do not know of his condition and so it is upon the people who claim its authenticity to prove (Abu Abdullaah al-Dinawaree) to be trustworthy….” (Tuhfatul-Ahwadhee (3/447).

Shaikh Taaj ud deen as-Subkee mentioned the biography of Ahmad bin Muhammad ibn Ishaaq as-Sunnee (the one who Finjuwayah al-Dinawaree is supposed to have narrated from) in great detail and with this he mentioned a list of his teachers and students and he fails to mention Finjuwayah al-Dinawaree to be from his students. (se Tabaqaat ash-Shaafiyyah (2/96).

The reader can see above how evidently they claimed that Abu Abdullaah al-Dinawari was said to be in their own words: unknown Majhool and no biography of him can be found to establish his trustworthiness. So this narration is weak.

6 I am not sure which edition of al-Mubarakpuri’s Tuhfatul Ahwazi they used or may be one of their authorities used, but the edition I have in front of me has the reference as 3/531, Dar al-Fikr.
This arrogant presumption that al-Dinawari was allegedly majhûl (unknown) was repeated by Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban in an earlier but shorter paper entitled:

An Answer to the article entitled Evidence for 20 rak’ahs of Taraweeh from authentic ahadith

On p.3 of the above tract, they showed their rancid side by saying:

May the curse of Allaah be upon the liar. The narrator Abu Abdullab al-Hussain ibn Muhammad ibn al-Hussain finjuwayh al-Dinawaris unknown Majhool and no biography of him can be found to establish his trustworthiness. So this narration is weak.

I say:

These two cursing amateurs who think themselves to be from the grand one’s from Ahlul-Hadith are in reality the one’s who have shot themselves in their feet, for indeed, the background to al-Dinawari is known and he is reliable as will be seen below.

In their haste, the un-dynamic duo continued to contradict, or should one say revise the false claim of theirs by speaking a bit of truth by saying:

However we find the statement of Imaam Dhahabee where he states, “Sherwiyah said in his Taareekh that (Finjuwayh al-Dinawari) is trustworthy, truthful but he would narrate many abandoned narrations readily and he authored many works.” (Siyar A’laam an-Nabula (17/ 383).

The above statement from the Ta’rikh of al-Shirawayh was quoted by Hafiz al-Dhahabi (d. 748 AH) in his Siyar a’lam an-Nubala as follows:

---

7 This short paper also has some major enormities in terms of claims and mistakes, and we will cross reference to it in this treatise when need be
The above quote is an admission that Abu Abdullah al-Dinawari was trustworthy and truthful, and as for narrating abandoned narrations, there is no proof that he narrated any abandoned narrations from the next Shaykh he took the narration from under discussion, viz: Ahmed ibn Muhammad ibn Ishaq al-Sunni.

Indeed, a similar quote from the Ta’rikh of Shirawayh was mentioned in the work entitled Taqyeed li-ma’rifa rawa al-Sunan wal Masanid (no. 298, pp. 247-8) by Shaykh Abu Bakr ibn Nuqta al-Hanbali (d. 629 AH) well before al-Dhahabi. Ibn Nuqta also mentioned that al-Dinawari did narrate from Ahmed ibn Muhammad al-Sunni, as well as the fact that al-Bayhaqi narrated from al-Dinawari (see below).

Also, Ibn Nuqta graded al-Dinawari to be “Thiqa Salih” – “Trustworthy and upright” in his Takmilat al-Ikmal as can be seen from the following quotation:

أبو عبد الله الحسين بن محمد بن الحسن بن عبد الله بن فنجوه الدينوري حديث عن أبي بكر أحمد
ابن محمد بن إسحاق السني يكتب السنن لأبي عبد الرحمن السنيي وحديث عن الفضيل الفضل
الكانيي وأبي القاسم عبد الله بن إبراهيم الجرجاني وأحمد بن إبراهيم بن شاذان وعبد الله بن محمد بن
شاذان وغيرهم وله مصنفات حديث عنه جماعة منهم
ابناء أبو القاسم سفيان وأبو بكر محمد وأبو الفتح عبيد بن عبد الله بن عبيد العديب الثاني وأبو طاهر
بن سلمان وأبو القاسم محيي بن محمد بن دنير وعبد الرحمن بن أبي عبد الله بن منهاء الأصبهاني وانتقل
إلي نيسابور فسكنه وحديث عنه من أهل نيسابور وأبو
سعد عبد الرحمن بن منصور بن رامش العدل وأبو بكر أحمد
ابن الحسين البيهقي الحافظ حديث عنه في مصنفاته توفي نيسابور في سنة أربع عشرة وأربعمائة

ثقة صالح

8 See 4:495-497, no. 4726. It was printed in 5 volumes, ed. Abdal Qayyum Abd Rabb al Nabi, Jamia Umm al-Qurra, Makka, 1990
Abu Abdullah al-Dinawari also resided in Naysabur where al-Bayhaqi and his Shaykh, Abu Abdullah al-Hakim resided. Al-Hafiz Abdal Ghafir al-Naysaburi (d. 529 AH) has mentioned a short biography of al-Dinawari in his work known as Kitab al-Siyaq li-Ta’rikh Naysabur (no. 556) as follows:

The above quote from Abdal Ghafir shows that al-Dinawari was a virtuous Shaykh who transmitted many Ahadith from many teachers, as well as authoring many good works and having ma’rifa of hadith. He is Thiqa (trustworthy) to Abdal Ghafir and the claim of narrating abandoned narrations was not retained or mentioned by him.

Al-Dhahabi himself said that Abu Abdullah al-Dinawari was also Thiqa in his al-Ibar.⁹

After Ibn Nuqta and al-Dhahabi, the verdict on Abu Abdullah al-Dinawari being thiqa and the claim that he narrated abandoned narrations was not retained by

---

⁹ See 2/227, Darul Kutub Ilmiyya edn. The name Ibn Finjuwayh has been mis-spelt in al-Ibar as Ibn Fath-hawayh.
the Hanbali Shaykh, **Shihab-Din Ibn al-Imad (d. 1089 AH)** in his *Shadharat al-$hahab* 10 who also declared al-Dinawari to be Thiqa (as scanned below):

One may also elucidate upon who was al-Dinawari’s Shaykh in al-Bayhaqi’s above chain of transmission (sanad). The two compilers (Abu Khuzaimah/Abu Hibban) mentioned the Tabaqat al-Shafiyya of Shaykh Tajud-Din al-Subki mentioning Ahmed ibn Muhammad ibn Ishaq al-Sunni’s biography. We find the following from this said Tabaqat:

It may be deduced from the above quote that Ahmed ibn Muhammad was also acknowledged famously as **Abu Bakr ibn al-Sunni**, who was one of the transmitting disciples of Imam al-Nasa’i.

Shaykh Tajud-Din al-Subki’s not mentioning Abu Abdullah al-Dinawari as a student of Ibn al-Sunni is not a proof that al-Dinawari never took from his

---

10 5/74, Dar Ibn Kathir edn
Shaykh (Ibn al-Sunni). It only indicates that he did not come across the precise information that linked al-Dinawari as a direct student of Ibn al-Sunni’s.

Proof that Abu Abdullah al-Dinawari took from Abu Bakr al-Sunni is available from the Taqyed (no. 187) of Ibn Nuqta al-Hanbali under the biography of Ibn al-Sunni as follows:

احمد بن محمد بن اسحاق الدينوري أبو بكر الحفظ المعرف عابن السنين القاضي
حدث بالسنن عن احمد بن شعيب النسيلي وقد كان سمعها منه يمتر في سنة ثلاثين ولا تلثمانة وحدث عن جماعة منهم أبو يحيى الموصلي وعبد الله بن محمد البغوي ويحيى بن محمد بن صاعد والمفضل بن محمد الجندى وأبو عروبة الحسين بن أبي معاذ الحرايى في آخرين

حدث عنه بالسنن أبو نصر أحمد بن الحسين القاضي المعرف بالكسار وأبو عبد الله الحسين بن محمد بن فنوجيه الدينوري وأبو طاهر ابن سلمة الهمداني

In addition, Ibn Nuqta mentioned the discipleship of al-Dinawari to Abu Bakr ibn al-Sunni under the former entry (no. 298) as follows:

الحسين بن محمد بن الحسين بن عبد الله بن فنوجيه الدينوري أبو عبد الله
حدث بنيسابور بكتاب السنن لأبي عبد الرحمن أحمد بن شعيب النسائي عن أحمد بن محمد السنين
وعنه وحدث عن الفضل بن الفضل الكندي
وجعيد الله بن محمد بن شهبة وأبي القاسم عبد الله بن إبراهيم الجرمنى وله مصنفات
حدث عنه ابنه أبو القاسم سفيان وأبو بكر محمد وأبو بكر أحمد بن الحسين البههفي وأبو الفتح
عبدوس بن عبد الله بن عبدوس الهمداني وأبو القاسم عبد الرحمن بن أبي عبد الله بن منده وغيرهم
وعنه بنيسابور بالسنن لأبي عبد الرحمن أبو سعد عبد الرحمن بن منصور بن رامش العدل

Al-Dinawari was one of those who transmitted the Sunan of al-Nasa’i from his Shaykh, Ibn al-Sunni, who took it directly from Imam al-Nasa’i

Additionally, if these two compilers were to have gone back to the originally printed copy of al-Dhahabi’s Siyar a’lam an-Nubala they would have had no
excuse but to mention the fact that al-Dhahabi also mentioned that al-Dinawari did take from Ibn al-Sunni. Quote from the Siyar\textsuperscript{11} of al-Dhahabi:

\begin{quote}

\textit{He is Thiqato the likes of Ibn Nuqta, Abdal Ghafir, al-Dhahabi and Ibn al-Imad.}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{11} 17/ 383, Muassasa al-Risala edition
THEIR VAIN DISMISSAL OF ALI IBN AL JA’D

Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban went onto display a major deception and digressory tactic to dismiss the credibility and veracity of another narrator in al-Bayhaqi’s sanad, namely the Hafiz of Hadith, Ali ibn al Ja’ad al-Jawhari (who was the Shaykh of al-Baghawi as found in al-Bayhaqi’s sanad).

They dismissed this Hafiz as follows:

Secondly: - Alee ibn al-Ja’ad
The narrator Alee ibn al-Ja’ad, is criticised for being a shee’ah, he would curse and criticise Mu’awiyyah and other companions. (See Tahdheeb ut-Tahdheeb (7/248-250 no.4763).

These poor fellows claim to be Ahlul-Hadith and its uplifting defenders, but here they have done nothing short of dismiss the status and narrations of Ali ibn al Ja’d, the compiler of a whole Musnad work that has been printed with more than 3400 narrations within it! The question that naturally arises is where did they get such a dismissive attitude over this key narrator of Hadith?

Indeed, these two compilers are probably aware of the short e-book entitled A Glimpse on a newsletter regarding the issue of Taraweeh by their authority from Pakistan, Zubair Ali Za’i.13

12 See here - http://ahlulhadeeth.net/article/Reply%20To%2020%20Taraaweeh.pdf

13 A note on Zubair Ali Za’i:
This individual’s Hadith gradings have been utilised in the most recent English translations of four of the Sihah Sitta. The publisher of these translations mentioned: the grade for each hadith in the Four Sunan compilations has been provided, from the Arabic work compiled by the Honorable Shaykh Zubayr ‘Ali Za’i, and included in the translation of each of the Four Sunans, clearly mentioning the grade after each and every hadith. (http://www.dar-us-salam.com/SihahSittahEnglish.html). The purchaser of these translations would do good to be aware of the classifications of the Ahadith by this authority for the two compilers, as he is also not totally reliable to even some of his own sect members. One may see the following file for more on Zubair Ali Za’i according to those who knew him in the past, entitled The Reality of Zubair Ali Zai and the Alum Rockers compiled by Yaser Salafi, Irfan Ahmed Butt and Khalil Ur Rahman. It seems that the one named Yaser is himself the subject of counter allegations by his former Shaykh, Zubair Ali Za’i. The file also mentions (p. 18) the traits of Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban: http://www.4shared.com/file/79999714/82895151/Zubair_Ali_exposed_by_Yasir_et_al.html
On p. 5 (under no. 5)

Zubair Ali said with adamant dismissiveness:

Secondly, one of the narrators of this narration Ali Ibn Al-Ja'ad has been disparagingly criticized with Shi'ism. He would criticize our leader Muawiyah and other companions (may Allah be pleased with them)22.

How then is it possible to present a transmitted narration from such a person regarding whom there are so many objections, in comparison to the authentic narration that can be found in the ‘Muwatta’ of Imam Malik?

If they were truly Ahlul-Hadith they would have done justice to mention all the praise on Ali ibn al Ja’d, as well as mentioning the overall grading of the later Huffaz (like al-Dhahabi and Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani) on Ali ibn al Ja’d’s rank in Hadith transmission, and more importantly that he is a Shaykh to the following major Imams from early times:


The two compilers also informed their readers to look at Ali ibn al Ja’d’s background by referring to al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar’s Tadhhib al-Tadhhib, when they said:

See Tadhheeb ut-Tadhheeb (7/ 248-250 no.4763).

Indeed, we shall not shy away from mentioning what was recorded in the Tadhhib as follows:

See here for a number of links exposing Zubair Ali Zai:
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Those who made praise on Ibn al-Ja'd have been highlighted above and right at the end it mentioned that Imam al-Bukhari narrated some 13 Hadiths from Ali ibn al Ja'd (in his Sahih). As for his personal belief on some of the Sahaba, this does not negate him to be a reliable transmitter of Hadith. The narrations of those who have innovative beliefs but are themselves reliable narrators are acceptable with some conditions as mentioned in the books of Mustalah al-Hadith (Hadith terminology). This is what Zubair Ali and his friends have failed to understand or admit with regard to Ibn al Ja’d, who was counted amongst the firmly established preservers (Huffaz) of Hadith by Hafiz al-Dhahabi in his Tadhkirat al-Huffaz (vol. 1) as follows:
The following is the verdict on Ali Ibn al Ja’d from al-Dhahabi’s al-Kashif describing ibn al Ja’d as a Hafiz (of Hadith)

Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar declared Ibn al Ja’d to be Thiqa (trustworthy) and Thabt (firmly established) despite his Shi’i leanings

Hence, the narrations of Ali ibn al Ja’d are not a problem to the major Imams of Ahlul-Hadith from the Salaf to the Khalaf, except to the claimants to their way like Zubair Ali and his two colleagues who dismissed the validity of Ali ibn al Ja’d. It would not be far fetched to also decipher the point that the latter group would also have to reject 13 hadiths in Sahih al-Bukhari, not to forget more than 3400 narrations found in the Musnad of Ali ibn al Ja’d!

Two points of benefit:

1) Despite the two compilers attempts to throw out the narration of Ali ibn al Ja’d, as well as their contradictory position on Abu Abdullah al-Dinawari, it is now appropriate to mention the fact that in the Musnad of Ali ibn al Ja’d, there does exist a variant of Saa’ib ibn Yazid’s narration with regard to 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh as follows:
This variant mentions that in the time of Umar (ra) the people stood for 20 rak'ats. This chain of transmission is shorter than what is in al-Sunan al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi, and it should be the first narration to be mentioned in advocacy for 20 rak'ats in Sayyidina Umar's (ra) time.

One of the notable “Salafi” writers in Egypt of this age is Mustafa al-Adawi, and he has compiled a short treatise on the Rak'ats of night prayer, entitled: Bahth fi adad rak'at qiyam al-layl. He has done justice in mentioning the authenticity of a number of narrations connected to proving that the Salafus Salihin performed 20 rak'ats Taraweeh. The narrations he authenticated will be mentioned in this treatise in the appropriate place. For now, what is beneficial for the reader to know is that he has declared the above narration from the Musnad of Ali ibn al-Ja’d to be Sahih in the above named work.

ii) Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban’s declaration that Al-Hafiz Ali ibn al Ja’d was a Shi’a liar!

In their shorter pamphlet mentioned earlier with the title: An Answer to the article entitled Evidence for 20 rak'ahs of Taraweeh from authentic hadith

The two haughty braggarts went one step further and declared Ibn al-Ja’d to be a LIAR! They said on p.4 the following:

Secondly:
The narrator Ali ibn al-J’ad, is criticised for being a sheeafah, he would curse and criticise Mu'awiyyah and other companions. (See Tahdheeb at-Tahdheeb), hence the narration is weak.

Thirdly:
The narrator Ibn Abi Dhib, and it is really ibn Abee Dhab'aib no Dhib. Ibn Abee Dhaba'ib's memory deteriorated. Ibn Abee Haatim said, my father said (Abee Haatim) “Darwardeew would narrate rejected narrations from him.” And hence he is not strong. (Jarh Wa'ta'deel). He was not trusted by Imaam Maalik as mentioned by Imaam Ibn Hajr in Tahdheeb at-Tahdheeb.

---

14 Published by Dar Majid Usayri, Jedda, 1st edn, 1999 CE
15 See p. 36 of his Bahth
How then can it be said, “All the men in the (above) isnad are trustworthy, as mentioned by the Indian research scholar, Shaykh al-Nimawi, in Athar al-Sunan.” Not what the muqallideen scholars say as they are mutassab as shown in this example. How on earth can you make someone trustworthy when he does not even exist and when there is a shee’ah liar in this chain.

The reader can now see the level of arrogance and unscholarly depths these two have sunk to with this false declaration of theirs. The bona fide Ahlul Hadith can also deduce by default that these two individuals must also have no choice now but to reject 13 Ahadith that Imam al-Bukhari transmitted in his Sahih via Ibn al-Ja’d, not to fail to mention the 3400 plus narrations transmitted by Ali ibn al Ja’d in his Musnad!

If the reader thinks that this is the height of folly, then let us also mention the blunder these two committed while bumbling over the real status of the narrator that Ali ibn al Ja’d heard hadith from, namely, Ibn Abi Dhi’b. The latter narrator is found in al-Bayhaqi’s sanad mentioned earlier and also in the Musnad of Ali ibn al Ja’d (quoted earlier). One can see that the un-dynamic partnership claimed above that:

The narrator Ibn Abi Dhib, and it is really ibn Abee Dhaba no Dhib.

I say:

They have confused two separate narrators thinking them to be one person! Indeed, Ibn Abi Dhi’b is known as Muhammad ibn Abdar Rahman ibn al Mughira, and he was ranked to be a Hafiz of Hadith by Imam al-Dhahabi in his Tadhkiratul Huffaz (vol. 1) as follows:
The above quote establishes the fact that Ibn Abi Dhi‘b’s narrations are found in all 6 main books of Hadith, and Ali ibn al Ja‘d did narrate from him also. Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani graded Ibn Abi Dhi‘b to be a trustworthy and virtuous jurisprudent in al-Taqrib al-Tahdhib as follows:

The other narrator known as Ibn Abi Dhubab is al-Harith ibn Abdar Rahman, and Ibn Hajar declared him to be truthful but suspected of making some errors in al-Taqrib as follows:

Shaykh Shu‘ayb al-Arna‘ut and Dr Bashhar Awwad Ma‘ruf in their follow up work to Ibn Hajar’s Taqrib al-Tahdhib, known as Tahrir al-Taqrib (no. 1030) opposed Ibn Hajar’s above grading on Ibn Abi Dhubab. They both said that Ibn Abi Dhubab is Saduq Hasan al-Hadith (truthful and good in Hadith), except...
for the narrations of al-Darawardi from him, as only then are Ibn Abi Dhubab’s narrations rejected. This latter point was derived from the statement of Abu Hatim al Razi, while Ibn Abi Dhubab had praise (ta’dil) on him from Abu Zur’ā al-Razi, Ibn Hibban and al-Dhahabi, and Imam Muslim used him as proof in Sahih Muslim.

Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban then mentioned another reason to reject the narration from al-Sunan al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi by stating:

Thirdly:
The chain also contains *Yazeed bin Khaseefah*. Imam al-Muhaddith al-Albaanee said, “This chain with the words 20 is good from the angle of the people of hold 20 rak’ahs permissible for the Taraweeh prayer and on its apparent the chain seems authentic and some have even said it is authentic however it contains defects which if looked at will render the narration weak and make it from the realms of weak rejected narrations due to the following reasons,

Here, they are trying to raise an objection over the narrator known as Yazid ibn Khusayfa.16 Al-Albani’s words indicate that he knew for sure that there were scholars of Hadith well before his time that did authenticate the report in al-Sunan al-Kubra. Al-Albani’s line of argument was to claim that Ibn Khusayfa was the only one who narrated it with 20 rak’ats and thus his narration is Shadh (aberrant), since it allegedly opposes the “more stronger” chained report suggesting 8 rak’ats (+3 Witr) reported via Muhammad ibn Yusuf (as found in the Muwatta of Imam Malik and elsewhere).

---

16 Some have written his name as Khasifa also
Answering their claim, that Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal said Munkar al-hadith (rejected in hadith) for Yazid ibn Khusayfa

The two compilers continued to suggest:

Number One.

Even though Yazeed ibn Khaseefah is trustworthy, Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal said he is “Munkar al-Hadeeth” (rejected in hadith), and him being mentioned in Dhhabee’s Meezaan ul-Ei’tidaal is sufficient to say he is not clear. So from the statement of Imaam Ahmad we find that ibn Khaseefah would sometimes narrate narrations in which he would be alone and other trustworthy narrators would not narrate. This is mentioned by the hanafee scholar Abdul Hay Lucknowee (Ar-Raf’a Wat-Takmeel (p.14-15). Hence this narration (of Ibn Khaseefah) opposes narrators who were more preserving then him and therefore this narration is shaadh (is A narration that opposes more authentic narrations) according to the principles of hadeeth.

In this section it will be demonstrated that Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal did praise Ibn Khusayfa on at least 2 occasions and the claim that he said that Ibn Khusayfa was munkar al-hadith will be shown to be baseless with no foundation. As for the term Munkar al-hadith, al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar explained what it meant to Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal in his Hadi al-Sari (p. 436) as follows:

“The Munkar is called by Ahmed and a group of the People of H adith about the singular, the one who has no follow-up for him.”

The facts that will be shown in this treatise will demonstrate that Ibn Khusayfa was not the only one who transmitted it with the wording for 20 rak’ats. He has been supported independently via the route of Ibn Abi Dhubab from Saa’ib ibn Yazid, as recorded in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq. Also, there is an independent narration not containing Ibn Khusayfa in the sanad
(chain of transmission) from Ubayy ibn Ka‘b (ra) mentioning 20 rak‘ats as recorded in the Musnad of Ahmed Ibn Mani’ and via the latter’s chain by Diya al-Maqdisi in al-Mukhtara.

The following is what al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar recorded in his Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (vol. 11) regarding Ibn Khusayfa:

From the above it can be surmised that Ibn Khusayfa:

i) Has narrated ahadith that are found in all 6 major books of hadith

ii) He reported from the Sahabi, Saa‘ib ibn Yazid

iii) Al-Athram reported his Shaykh, Ibn Hanbal, declaring him to be Thiqa

iv) Abu Hatim al-Razi declared him Thiqa

v) Al-Nasa‘i declared him Thiqa

vi) Ibn Ma‘een declared him Thiqah Hujja (Trustworthy and an authoritative proof)

---

17 This is found in Su‘alat al-Athram (p. 112, ed. Khayrullah al-Sharif, Dar al-Asima, Riyadh, 1st edn, 2001/1422 AH). This grading via al-Athram was also recorded in Kitab al-Jarh wa Ta‘dil of Ibn Abi Hatim al-Razi (9/274, no. 1153). The latter reference also mentions that Abu Hatim also declared Ibn Khusayfa to be Thiqa
vii) Ibn Sa’d mentioned that he was a reclusive worshipper (abidan nasikan), had many hadith and was established as a narrator (Thabtan) ¹⁸

viii) Ibn Hibban recorded him amongst the trustworthy narrators in his Kitab al-Thiqat.

viii) Ibn Abdal Barr mentioned that he was the nephew of Saa’ib ibn Yazid and was Thiqa Ma’mun (Trustworthy and reliable) ¹⁹

What Ibn Hajjar missed was the inclusion of Ibn Khusayfa as being Thiqa in Ibn Shahin’s Kitab al-Thiqat as follows:

As for the point allegedly reported by Abu Ubayd al-Ajurri from Imam Abu Dawud, that Imam Ahmed was reported to have said that Ibn Khusayfa is munkar al-hadith, then this is unconfirmed from Ibn Hanbal. Al-Ajurri’s Su’alat (questions) to Abu Dawud has been printed in two volumes with the tahqiq (editing) of Dr Abdal Alim Abdal Azim al-Bastawi, and having looked at the index, there is no mention of any narrator by the name of Yazid ibn Abdullah ibn Khusayfa or any variant to this name that could be seen. It seems as though a later scholar made an error in ascribing it to al-Ajurri. Wallahu a’lam

Besides the above quote from al-Athram mentioning Ibn Hanbal declaring Ibn Khusayfa to be Thiqa, there is also another statement of Ta’dil (praise) from Ibn Hanbal reported by his son, Abdullah, in his transmission of al-I’lal wa Ma’rifat al Rijal where the following was mentioned:

---

¹⁸ See later for more clarification on this statement from Ibn Sa’d

¹⁹ This statement from Ibn Abdal Barr is found in his al-Tamheed lima fil Muwatta min al-Ma’ani wal asanid as follows:
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Namely, Ibn Hanbal said: “Yazid ibn Khusayfa, I know nothing but good about him.”

This ta’ dil from Ibn Hanbal was mentioned to be a clear declaration of trustworthiness by Dr Bashhar Awwad Ma’ruf in his editing of the Tahdhib al-Kamal of Hafiz al-Mizzi. Dr Bashhar Awwad showed himself to be an admirer of the late Nasir al-Albani in his editing of Jamii al-Tirmidhi, and these are his precise words from his note to Tahdhib al-Kamal where he also rejected the claim attributed to al-Ajurri from Abu Dawud, that Ibn Hanbal allegedly declared Ibn Khusayfa to be munkar al-hadith:


Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban also mentioned that the statement attributed to Ibn Hanbal about Ibn Khusayfa being allegedly munkar al-hadith was recorded by al-Dhahabi in his Mizan al-l’tidal. Indeed, this is what is found in the Mizan:

Though al-Dhahabi mentioned this ascription to Abu Dawud, what the two compilers failed to take note of was the fact that the Mizan al-l’tidal of al-

---

20 Vol. 32/p. 173, fn. 3
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Dhahabi was compiled with the intent that even negative statements attributed to those who were generally thiqa would be mentioned, but as for Imam al-Dhahabi’s personal view on Ibn Khusayfa one may see that in al-Kashif he mentioned what Abu Dawud allegedly transmitted from Ibn Hanbal, while in one of his last works known as Siyar al-’alam an-Nubala he did not retain any ascription of Ibn Hanbal allegedly saying that Ibn Khusayfa was munkar al-hadith. Rather, we see al-Dhahabi declaring him to be a jurisprudent (faqih) and that he was related to the Sahabi, Sa’id ibn Yazid:

Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar did not retain the claim that Ibn Hanbal allegedly declared Ibn Khusayfa to be munkar al-hadith in his Taqrib al-Tahdhib, where he graded him to be Thiqa (trustworthy):

21 See (6/157-158)
The point that Yazid ibn Khusayfa was the nephew of Saa’ib ibn Yazid is mentioned in the Ta’rikh of ibn Abi Khaythama (4/303, no. 3040) from Mus‘ab ibn Abdullah al-Zubayri

- سَمَعْتُ مصعَب يقُولُ: يِزِيدُ بْنُ خَصِيفَةَ بْنُ أَخِي السَّابِبِ بْنُ يَزِيدٍ

One of the contemporaries of al-Mizzi (d. 742 AH) and al-Dhahabi (d. 748 AH), was a Shaykh by the name of Abul Mahasin Muhammad ibn Ali al-Alawi al-Hussaini (d. 765 AH). Indeed, al-Hussaini was one of al-Dhahabi’s students. This Imam has left a book mentioning the well-known narrators of Hadith found in 10 books of hadith. The title of this published work being: al- Tadhkira bi-Ma’rifa rijal al-Kutub al-Ashara

In the Tadhkira of Imam al-Hussaini, it may be seen that he did not know of or retain the claim that Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal had apparently informed Abu Dawud that Yazid ibn Khusayfa was munkar al-hadith. Scan from al-Tadhkira:

The later Hanbali Shaykh, known as Yusuf ibn Abdal Hadi (d. 909 AH) has also left a compilation entitled Bahr al-Damm listing those narrators that Imam

---

22 These 10 books being the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, Musnad al-Shafii, one recension of the Musnad of Abu Hanifa, Muwatta Malik, Sahih al-Bukhari, Sahih Muslim, Jami al-Tirmidhi, Sunan al-Nasa'i, Sunan Ibn Majah and the Sunan of Abu Dawud

23 Printed by Maktaba al-Khanji, Cairo

24 The editor (Ruhiiyya al-Suwayfi) mentioned that it was completed in the year 866 AH
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Ibn Hanbal made accreditation on (ta’dil) or dispraise (Jarh). In it, Ibn Abdul Hadi only knew of and retained Ibn Hanbal’s tawthiq (praiseworthy accreditation) upon Ibn Khusayfa as follows:

1180 - يزيد بن عبد الله بن خصيفة الكندي: وثقته أحمد.

Well before the days of al-Dhahabi and Ibn Hajar, a Hadith scholar by the name of Shaykh Abul Hasan ibn al Qattan (d. 628 AH) also mentioned his personal view on the overall status of Yazid ibn Khusayfa in his Bayan al-Waham wal Ieham, as reported by Imam al-Zayla’i (d. 762 AH) in his Nasb al-Ra’ya (3/371):

وقال ابن القطان في “كتابه”: ويزيد بن خصيفة وهو منسووب إلى جده، فمنه يزيد بن عبد الله بن خصيفة، وهو ثقة، بلا خلاف انتهى

The verdict from Ibn al Qattan on Ibn Khusayfa being:

“He is Thiqa without difference”

This quote from Ibn al-Qattan is for sure found in the printed edition of his Bayan as scanned below:

يزيد بن خصيفة يقع هكذا في الأكثر منسووبًا إلى جده، وهو يزيد بن عبد الله بن خصيفة، وهو ثقة بلا خلاف، فاعلمه.

The above quote was also mentioned by al-Hafiz Ibn al Mulaqqin (d. 804 AH) in his al-Badr al-Munir as follows:


---

25 5/298
26 8/675
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To conclude, Yazid ibn Khusayfa is Thiqá by agreement of the early Muhaddithin, and the claim of munkar al-hadith attributed to Ibn Hanbal is unproven or worth much weighty consideration when the very same Imam Ahmed Ibn Hanbal praised Ibn Khusayfa on 2 occasions. Ibn al-Qattan’s claim that there is no difference of opinion over Ibn Khusayfa being Thiqá was mentioned also by al-Zayla’i and Ibn al-Mulaqqin; which indicates their agreement with Ibn al Qattan, as well as the point that they did not know of the claim that Ibn Hanbal had apparently said that Ibn Khusayfa was munkar al-hadith, or that they never agreed with those who noted this claim attributed to Ibn Hanbal (provided such a quote actually existed in the the Su’alat of al-Ajurri to Abu Dawud in the first place).

On top of that, it has already been mentioned that there are two variant narrations going back to Saa’ib ibn Yazid as in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq and al-Mukhtara of Diya al-Maqdisi, which do not have Ibn Khusayfa in the chains, and they support the contention for 20 rak’ats Taraweeh narrated by Ibn Khusayfa. Some of the advocates of eight rak’ats knew these two narrations, but they dismissed them as weak. They will be mentioned in due course.

Point of benefit:

In al-Bayhaqi’s sanad the narrator known as Ibn Abi Dhi’b took from Yazid ibn Khusayfa. Under the notice for Ibn Abi Dhi’b in Ibn Hajar’s Tahdhib al Tahdhib (vol. 9/190) it mentioned the following within it:

وَقَالَ أَحْمَدُ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ بْنُ عَبْدِ مَرْيَمٍ عِنْبَنُ مَعِينٍ بْنُ عَبْدِ مَرْيَمٍ بْنُ أَبِي ذَنْبٍ تَقْلَةٍ وَكُلُّ مِنْ رَوَى عَنْهُ أَبِي ذَنْبٍ تَقْلَةٍ إِلَّا أَبَا جَابِرُ الْبَيْضَاءُ وَكُلُّ مِنْ رَوَى عَنْهُ مَالِكُ تَقْلَةٍ إِلَّا عَنْ عَبْدِ الْكَرِيمِ أَبَآ أَمْيَةٍ وَقَالَ أَبُو دَاوُدْ سَمَّعَ أَحْمَدٌ مَنْ صَالِحُ يُقُولُ شَخْبَ بْنُ أَبِي ذَنْبٍ كُلَّهُمُ تَقْلَا إِلَّا الْبَيْضَاءُ

This quote mentions that Ibn Ma’een held the view that Ibn Abi Dhi’b is Thiqá and so is every one that he reported from except Abu Jabir al-Bayadi, and every one that Imam Malik narrated from is Thiqá except Abdul Karim ibn Umayya; similarly, Ahmed ibn Salih said the same as Ibn Ma’een regarding Ibn Abi Dhib’s teachers.

As for their claim:
This is mentioned by the hanafi scholar Abdul Haiy Lucknowee (Ar-Raf’a Wat-Takmeel (p.14-15). Hence this narration (of Ibn Khaseefah) opposes narrators who were more preserving then him and therefore this narration is shaadh (is a narration that opposes more authentic narrations) according to the principles of hadeeth.

I did not see any mention of Ibn Khusayfa in the text of Raf wa Takmil of Shaykh Abdal Hayy, but the mention of what is attributed to Imam Ibn Hanbal on Ibn Khusayfa to be Munkar al-Hadith was pointed out by the editor of this work, namely, the late Shaykh Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda (d. 1997 CE), who quoted from Ibn Hajar Asqalani’s Hadi al-Sari. 27

It should also be pointed out that nor is it the case that Ibn Khusayfa opposed those: “… narrators who were more preserving then him and therefore this narration is shaadh (is a narration that opposes more authentic narrations) according to the principles of hadeeth.”

The latter point shall be disproved later with Allah’s permission.

The two compilers continued to say on p. 16 (utilising al-Albani’s claims):

We know two sets or reports stem from Saa’ib ibn Yazeed one from Muhammad bin Yoosuf and the other Yazeed bin Khaseefah

1) Muhammad ibn Yusuf – the narration that mentions 11 rakas in Muwatta Imaam Maalik

2) Yazeed ibn Khaseefah – the narration that mentions 20 rakas

Now both these narrations oppose each other and so precedence will be given to the narration of Muhammad ibn Yoosuf mentioning 11 raka’hs. As there are unknown narrators in the 20 raka’h (the Shaikh here is mostly likely referring to Abu Abdullaah al-Hussain ibn Muhammad ibn al-Hussain Finjuwayh al-Dinawaree,) chain and because Muhammad ibn Yoosuf is more trustworthy then Yazeed ibn Khaseefah. Haafidh Ibn Hajr said

27 See Raf wa Takmil (p. 202, fn. 3), printed by Maktabu al-Matbu 'at al-Islamiyya, 6th edn, Beirut, 2000 CE
concerning Muhammad ibn Yoosuf, "Thiqatun Thabt" ie trustworthy, firm and established whereas for Yazeed ibn Khaseefah he only says, "Thiqah" trustworthy only.

I say:

Yazid ibn Khusayfa has been consistent in narrating for 20 rak’ats while Muhammad ibn Yusuf (who also took from Saa’ib ibn Yazid) was inconsistent in the number of rak’ats.

In the Muwatta of Imam Malik, Muhammad ibn Yusuf has been recorded to have transmitted it as 11 Rak’ats (8 Taraweeh+3Witr) from Saa’ib (ra), while in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq he has been recorded to have transmitted as 21 Rak’ats from Saa’ib (ra). The compilers knew this but dismissed it later with a claim against Abdar Razzaq. This point will be refuted in due course. On top of this, Muhammad Ibn Yusuf transmitted it as 13 rak’ats from Saa’ib (ra) as recorded by Ibn Nasr al-Marwazi in his Qiyam al-Layl via the route of Muhammad ibn Ishaq.

As for their claim:

As there are unknown narrators in the 20 raka’h (the Shaikh here is mostly likely referring to Abu Abdullaah al-Hussain ibn Muhammad ibn al-Hussain Finjuwayh al-Dinawaree,)

In reply to this claim that there are “unknown narrators” in al-Bayhaqi’s sanad, then plainly and simply there are no unknown narrators, and this is why a number of Huffaz have authenticated its sanad. This will be mentioned later with appropriate quotes.
Elucidation upon the point whether Muhammad ibn Yusuf (the narrator for 11, 13 and 21 Rak'ats) was more trustworthy than Yazid ibn Khaseefah or not

The two compliers have been quoted above as saying:

"... and because Muhammad ibn Yoosuf is more trustworthy then Yazeed ibn Khaseefah. Haafidh Ibn Hajr said concerning Muhammad ibn Y oosuf, “Thiqatun Thabt” ie trustworthy, firm and established whereas for Yazeed ibn Khaseefah he only says, “Thiqah” trustworthy only."

Ibn Hajar mentioned the following about Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Kindi in his Tadhhib (vol. 9):

From the above one can determine the fact that Muhammad Ibn Yusuf was declared to be Thiqah (trustworthy) by a number of Huffaz of Hadith like: Ibn Ma'een, Ahmed ibn Hanbal, al-Nasa'i, Ibn Hibban and Ibn al-Madini. Also, al-Bukhari and Muslim narrated his hadiths, and al-Bukhari mentioned the praise of Yahya ibn Sa'eed for him.
The question that arises is how did al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar derive the declaration that Muhammad ibn Yusuf is not only Thiqa (trustworthy), but additionally Thabt (established)? One of those Imams named above was Yahya ibn Sa’eed al-Qattan, and he did declare Ibn Yusuf to be Thabt. This is evident from the Kitab al-Jarh wa Ta’dil (8/119) of Ibn Abi Hatim al-Razi and the Thiqat of Ibn Shahin (no. 1198) where Yahya Ibn Sa’eed said:

و كان ثبتا And he was established (as a hadith transmitter)

One of the last points Ibn Hajar mentioned which indicated how he came to grade Ibn Yusuf to be Thabt (in addition to Yahya ibn Sa’eed) was due to what he deduced from Ibn Shahin’s Kitab al-Thiqat. Ibn Hajar claimed that Ibn Shahin had quoted Ahmed ibn Salih as saying:

ثبته شأنا Meaning that he has the state of being established as a narrator of hadith

And then Ibn Hajar claimed that Ibn Shahin said:

قال وكان أحمد بن صالح به معجبًا وفي الزهرة روى عنه

Now, the above quotes that have been underlined are not found in the Tahdhib al-Kamal of al-Hafiz al-Mizzi, and it is known that Ibn Hajar summarised and added to al-Mizzi’s compilation and named his edition as Tahdhib al-Tahdhib. Hence, the underlined portions are from Ibn Hajar’s own addition to al-Mizzi’s edition.

Dr Bashhar Awwad, the editor of the Tahdhib al-Kamal has made a salient comment about the underlined part above in a footnote to Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Kindi’s background by saying:

قال ابن شاهين: قال علي بن المدني: كان نقصة. (ال.qqات، الترجمة 1198) وقال ابن حجر في "التهذيب": قال ابن شاهين في "النقات": قال أحمد ابن صالح - يعني المصري -:
It seems likely that what Ibn Hajar quoted from Ibn Shahin (28) (underlined portion) is not about Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Kindi the nephew of the Sahabi, Saa‘ib ibn Yazid, but about another Muhammad ibn Yusuf (al-Qurashi al-Madani) who was from the mawla of the Sahabi Uthman ibn Affan (ra) and some say he was from the mawl of Amr ibn Uthman ibn Affan. Dr Bashhar Awwad also repeated his point that Ibn Hajar had erred in his ascription of the underlined portion from Ibn Shahin to be allegedly relevant to Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Kindi, by saying similarly the following under the background to Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Qurashi: (29)

This alludes to the point that although Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Kindi is Thiqa, it can only be confirmed that Yahya ibn Sa‘eed al-Qattan declared him to be Thabt. The grading of Thiqa Thabt (trustworthy and firmly established) is al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar’s personal view based on what he mentioned in his Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, and what shows that Ibn Hajar’s grading is not agreed upon is the fact al-Hafiz al-Dhahabi in his al-Kashif graded Muhammad Ibn Yusuf to a lower level of being overall Saduq (truthful), Muqill (littleness in transmitting narrations).

This is from al-Dhahabi’s al-Kashif:

28 See his Thiqat (no. 1199)
29 Tahdhib al Kamal, 27/62
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In comparison to Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Kindi, we have mentioned earlier that the following Imams had declared Yazid ibn Khusayfa to be Thiqa:

Ibn Hanbal, Abu Hatim al Razi, al-Nasa‘i, Ibn Hibban and Ibn Shahin

As for those who graded Yazid ibn Khusayfa to a higher level than merely Thiqa we have seen that:

i) Yahya ibn Ma‘een said: Thiqa Hujja (Trustworthy and a Proof)

ii) Ibn Abdal Barr said: Thiqa Ma‘mun (Trustworthy and Reliable)

iii) While Ibn Hajar quoted Ibn Sa’d (d. 230 AH) apparently saying about Yazid:

Meaning: Yazid was a reclusive worshipper (abidan nasikan), had many hadith (Kathir al-hadith) and was established (Thabtan).

Naturally, Ibn Hajar took the above quote from Ibn Sa’d based on what al-Mizzi had recorded in his Tadhhib al-Kamal (32/173). The Tabaqat al-Kubra of Ibn Sa’d has been printed, and the above statement is missing one extra and crucial remark regarding Ibn Khusayfa, namely that Ibn Sa’d had also mentioned that Ibn Khusayfa was in his view not only a narrator of many hadiths, established (Thabtan), but also Thiqa (trustworthy).

The most recently printed edition of this Tabaqat has been edited by Dr Ali Muhammad Umar based on 5 manuscripts. The following is a scan from the printed copy of the Tabaqat of Ibn Sa’d proving this point:

---

30 Dr Umar used the manuscript found in Maktaba Ahmed al-Thalith in Istanbul (no. 2835) as his main copy, and this is a 7th century edition that has a chain of transmission going back from Hafiz al-Mizzi to Ibn Sa’d. The other manuscripts used were from the Mahad al-Makhtutat in Cairo.
Dr. Ali Umar did not mention any of the manuscripts he utilised as not having the extra word: “Thiqa” missing from them and it is safe to assume that the word: “Thiqa” is from the original words of Ibn Sa’d.

This now leads to clarifying for the record that Yazid ibn Khusayfa was declared to be not only Thiqa but additionally also Thabt (by Ibn Sa’d), Hujja (by Ibn Ma’een), Ma’mun (by Ibn Abdal Barr) which all shows that Ibn Khusayfa is of a higher rank that Ibn Yusuf.

On top of this, it is worth noting again that Ibn Khusayfa had also been graded as Thiqa Hujja by the foremost expert on the narrators in his time, namely, Imam Yahya ibn Ma’een, while the same Ibn Ma’een declared Muhammad ibn Yusuf to be merely Thiqa. The rank of being Thiqa Hujja is higher than Thiqa alone to Ibn Ma’een. This is evident from Ibn Hajar’s Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (9/24) as part of the long entry on Muhammad ibn Ishaq (who narrated the wording for 13 rak’ats from the same Muhammad ibn Yusuf under discussion) where it mentioned about him from Ibn Ma’een the following points:

وقال عباس الدوري عن ابن معين محمد بن إسحاق ثقة وليس بحجة وقال باقون بن شيبة سألت
بن معين عنه فقلت في نفسك من صدقه شيء قال لا هو صدوق وقال أبو زرعة الدمشقي قلت لابن
معين وذكرت له الحجة محمد بن إسحاق منهم فقال كان ثقة إنما الحجة مالك وعبد الله بن عمر

(which is a photocopy of a manuscript dated 679 AH), the Chester Beatty copy found in Dublin, the Maktaba Mahmudiyya copy in Madina, dated 591 AH and the copy found in Maktaba Janfa al-Riyadh which is a 6th century copy (which only has the section dealing with the female narrators).

31 7/ 486, Maktaba al-Khanji, Cairo, 2001
Ibn Ma'een clarified that though Ibn Ishaq is Thiqa (trustworthy) he was not a Hujja (authoritative proof), and those who are Hujja are Imams like Malik and Ubaydullah ibn Umar. Hence, to Ibn Ma'een, the narrator who is Thiqa Hujja is higher in rank than one who is merely Thiqa, which means that Ibn Khusayfa was a higher ranking narrator than Muhammad Ibn Yusuf to Imam Yahya ibn Ma'een.

A similar scenario applies to the grading provided by the later scholar and foremost expert on the Muwatta Malik in his age, namely, al-Hafiz Abu Umar ibn Abdal Barr. This latter Hafiz did indeed analyse the two sets of reports going back to Saa'ib ibn Yazid, one via Ibn Yusuf mentioning 11 rak'ats and the others mentioning 20 rak'ats. His findings are crucial and relevant in showing how he came to conclude that the correct version from Saa'ib was 20 rak'ats and that Muhammad ibn Yusuf erred in his wording. This will be demonstrated later with Allah’s permission. Ibn Abdal Barr mentioned Ibn Khusayfa to be Thiqa Ma'mun in his Tamheed as stated earlier.  

It is also to be noted that Ibn Sa'd, who had a section mentioning the famous Madinan narrators in his Tabaqat did not list a biography for Muhammad ibn Yusuf within it, though he narrated via him. This indicates that Ibn Khusayfa was of a higher standing than Ibn Yusuf to Ibn Sa'd, otherwise one would have expected even a short line or two on Ibn Yusuf in the said Tabaqat. Wallahu a'lam.

In concluding this section, it would not be far fetched to suggest that Yazid ibn Khusayfa is not merely Thiqa to some major Muhaddithin, but additionally Thiqa Thabt to Ibn Sa'd, Thiqa Hujja to Ibn Ma'een, and Thiqa Ma'mun to Ibn Abdal Barr. While Muhammad ibn Yusuf was Thiqa and Thabt to Yahya ibn Sa'eed al-Qattan, the overall grading provided by Ibn Hajar in his al-Taqrib is not agreed upon, and indeed, al-Dhahabi in al-Kashif gave a lesser grading for Ibn Yusuf of Saduq. Hence, the claim made from the pen of al-Albani as conveyed by the two compilers:

---

32 See 23/25 (Moroccan Awqaf edn)
and because Muhammad ibn Yoosuf is more trustworthy then Yazeed ibn Khaseefah. Haafidh Ibn Hajr said concerning Muhammad ibn Yoosuf, "Thiqatun Thabt" ie trustworthy, firm and established whereas for Yazeed ibn Khaseefah he only says, “Thiqah” trustworthy only.

Thus, holds no major weight or credibility since it is not proven conclusively that Ibn Yusuf is agreed upon to be more reliable than Ibn Khusayfa is. On the contrary it seems more appropriate to state that Yazid ibn Khusayfa is a higher ranking narrator than Muhammad ibn Yusuf overall, based on the gradings of the early Master of Jarh wa Ta’did, namely, Yahya ibn Ma’een. Hence, the narration of Ibn Yusuf for 11 rak’ats is at odds (shadh) with what is more authentically related by Ibn Khusayfa for 20 rak’ats. The latter also has supporting narrations to testify to his wording to be the most preferable and meticulous as suggested earlier.

In their continuation on why the two compilers and their authorities gave preference to the narration transmitted by Muhammad ibn Yusuf over the one from Yazeed ibn Khusayfa they said:

**Number Two**
There is Idhtiraab in the narration of Ibn Khaseefah in regard to the numbering, ie different number for the raka’hs are mentioned from Yazeed Ibn Khaseefah. Sometimes he mentions 11 and at other times he mentions 20 and 21. Further more this narrator is opposing a more trustworthy narrator then himself.

**I say:**

As for the claim that there is allegedly Idtirab (shakiness in wording) in Ibn Khusayfa’s narration as he allegedly narrated in 3 ways: i) 11 rak’ats ii) 20 rak’ats and iii) 21 rak’ats, then these compilers did not bring forth any proof from any single book of hadith or any other book with chains of transmission to prove their claim that Yazeid transmitted it with the wording for 11 rak’ats or 21 rak’ats for that matter! Indeed, they seem to have extracted this claim from al-Albani.
It is strange that they accused ibn Khusayfa of idtirab in wording while it is also known that Muhammad ibn Yusuf has also transmitted with clashing wording, where the latter has said 11, 13 and 21 rak'ats in his transmission, but the two compilers did not suggest that Muhammad ibn Yusuf was self contradictory (mudtarib) in wording as they did for Ibn Khusayfa.

Back in the year 1997, the views of al-Albani on the rak'ats of Taraweeh had been published by one of his loyal supporters, by the name of Muhammad al-Jibali, under the title: The Night Prayers, Qiyam & Tarawih. In this book al-Jibali agreed with his Shaykh without verifying some claims independently.

The narration that the two compilers relied upon to accuse Ibn Khusayfa of being self-contradictory (mudtarib) in his wording was reported from Isma'il ibn Umayyah as mentioned by al-Albani in his Risala on Salatul Taraweeh as the scan below shows:

The above scanned narration was claimed to have an authentic isnâd by al-Albani, but what is strange is that he gave no full isnâd back to Ibn Umayya nor was the source reference provided for independent verification!

33 Published by Al-Qur'an was Sunnah Society of North America, 1997
The translation of the above scan was provided by al-Jibali as follows on p. 53:

"Isma’il Bin Umayyah reported that Muhammad ibn Yusuf related to him a narration similar to that recorded by Malik (which preceded)\(^{34}\). Ibn Umayyah then asked him, ‘**Don't you mean twenty one** (rather than eleven)?’ Ibn Yusuf replied, ‘Ibn Khusayfa also heard it from as-Sa’ib Bin Yazid.’ Ibn Umayyah asked, ‘Do you mean Yazid Bin Khusayyah?’ But he said, ‘I think that as-Sa’ib said, ‘Twenty-one!’’

The actual narration quoted above by al-Albani is located in the **Fawa’id** of Imam Abu Bakr al-Naysaburi as follows:

34 Meaning for 11 rak’ats

35 The footnotes were quoted by Dr Kamal Qalimi in his Fasl-al-Khitab who appears to be the first writer to mention this dialogue from the Fawa’id of al-Naysaburi in its full format:
A number of points may be deduced from this dialogue between Ibn Umayya and Ibn Yusuf:

i) That Isma'il Ibn Umayyah heard two narrations. One narration from Muhammad Ibn Yusuf for 11 rak'ats and another from Yazid Ibn Khusayfa for 21 rak'ats

ii) Ibn Yusuf has confirmed that Ibn Khusayfa also heard directly from Saa'ib ibn Yazid

iii) Ibn Umayyah had asked Ibn Yusuf to acknowledge if this particular Ibn Khusayfa was Yazid ibn Khusayfa.

iv) It seems plausible to assume that Ibn Umayya had heard the 21 rak'at version from Ibn Khusayfa at an earlier sitting with him, and some time later Ibn Yusuf narrated it to Ibn Umayyah again, and instead of saying 21 rak'ats like Ibn Khusayfa, he said 11 rak'ats, and for this reason Ibn Umayya asked Ibn Yusuf inquisitively: 'Don't you mean twenty one?

iv) What also proves that Ibn Yusuf should have reported it as 21 rak'ats in this specific case, rather than 11 is what Abdar Razzaq narrated with an authentic isnâd (not via Ibn Khusayfa) from Dawud ibn Qays and other than him, who narrated from Muhammad ibn Yusuf, who narrated from as-Saa'ib ibn Yazeed, who reported that in the time of Umar he appointed Ubayy ibn Ka'b and Tamim al-Dari, who both performed 21 rak'ahs in total (and not 11).

This latter narration was rejected by al-Albani and his admirers, and the answer to why it is preferable to over the 11-rak'ats version as in the Muwatta Malik will be dealt with later. At the end of the report from the manuscript of the Fawa'id

36 In his Musannaf, (4/260, no. 7730) with the editing of Shaykh Habibur Rahman al-A'zami (d. 1992 CE). The Egyptian "Salafi", Mustafa al-Adawi in his Bahth fi adad rak'at qiyyam al-layl (p. 39) also declared the Isnad for this narration in the Musannaf to be Sahih, as did the late Saudi "Salafi" known as Abdullah al-Duwaish in his expose on al-Albani known as Tanbih al-Qari li-taqwiyyani ma du'afuhu al-Albani (p. 47) where he said all the narrators in Abdar Razzaq's chain of transmission were Thiqat (trustworthy), and similarly the Saudi "Salafi" known as Salman al-Awda authenticated it. This will all be shown later.
of al-Naysaburi, there are a few unreadable words, which end with the wording “twenty one” from Muhammad ibn Yusuf.

As for the claim that there is idtirab (shakiness in wording) from Yazid ibn Khusayfa for reporting it as 21 rak’ats\(^{37}\) to Ibn Umayya and 20 rak’ats to other reporters, then that is not a valid case to accuse Ibn Khusayfa of idtirab, since he has consistently narrated it with the bare minimum of 20 rak’ats, unlike Ibn Yusuf, who reported it in 3 ways as summarised below:

Imam Malik (in al-Muwatta), Isma’il ibn Ja’far (in his Ahadith), Abdal Aziz ibn Muhammad (in Sunan Sa’eed ibn Mansur) and Yahya al-Qattan (as in Ta’rikh Madina of Ibn Shabba and Musannaf ibn Abi Shayba) – who all reported it as 11 rak’ats from Muhammad ibn Yusuf

Muhammad Ibn Ishaq – who reported it as 13 rak’ats (as in Qiyam al-Layl of Ibn Nasr al-Marwazi) from Muhammad ibn Yusuf

Dawud ibn Qays and other than him – who reported it as 21 rak’ats (as in Musannaf Abdar Razzaq) from Muhammad ibn Yusuf

The narrations from Muhammad ibn Yusuf with his wording for 11 and 13 are likely to be errors in transmission, while that for 21 is more in line with what Yazid ibn Khusayfa transmitted, with support from Ibn Abi Dhubab’s narration found in the Musannaf Abdar Razzaq (see later), and what is narrated from Ubayy ibn Ka'b (ra) as found in the Musnad Ibn Mani and via his route in al-Mukhtara of Diya al-Maqdisi. The fact that Muhammad ibn Yusuf’s wording is an error was declared to be so by the foremost expert on the Muwatta of Imam Malik in his time, namely, \textbf{al-Hafiz Abu Umar ibn Abdal Barr al-Maliki} (d. 463 AH). The verdict of the latter Imam will be mentioned in due course.

Note also, that the report from Isma’il ibn Umayya does not mention Muhammad ibn Yusuf refuting or objecting to Yazid ibn Khusayfa reporting it with the wording for 21 rak’ats, and one may surmise that Ibn Yusuf’s non

---

\(^{37}\) The odd rak’ah on top of 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh refers to the Salatul Witr that follows it, thus there is no contradiction in the wording from Ibn Khusayfa
objection to Ibn Khusayfa’s wording is a form of implicit acknowledgement that Ibn Khusayfa was accurate in transmitting it with the wording for 21 rak’ats to Isma’il ibn Umayyah. Besides, even if Ibn Khusayfa said 21 rak’ats to Ibn Umayyah on an occasion, he is not alone in saying this, but Ibn Yusuf has himself supported him as may be seen from the report from the latter in the Musannaf Abdar Razzaq later on.

As for Ibn Khusayfa saying the following to Ibn Umayya in the above report from the Fawa’id of al-Naysaburi: “I think that as-Sa’ib said, Twenty-one!” Then, it is not due to speculation but said out of wara (scrupulousness) and Ihtiyat (precaution) on the part of Ibn Khusayfa.

The two compilers continued to say:

Number Three
Muhammad ibn Yoosuf was the nephew of Saa’ib ibn Yazeed and due to this closeness Muhammad ibn Yoosuf was more aware and knew the narration of his uncle better than anyone else and its preservation. (Salaatul-Taraaweeh pg.49-51) (Summarised)

Yazid ibn Khusayfa was also Saa’ib ibn Yazid’s nephew:

They only admitted half the story! For if, they were adepts in accurate tahqiq and going back to the books of al-Jarh wa Ta’dil, they would have seen the fact that Yazid ibn Khusayfa is also related to Saa’ib ibn Yazid, and is his nephew.

We have already quoted from Ibn Hajar’s Tahdhib al-Tahdhib from the entry on Yazid ibn Khusayfa that al-Hafiz Ibn Abdal Barr al-Maliki said that Ibn Khusayfa was the nephew of Saa’ib as follows:

---

Dr Kamal Qalimi said about this report from the Fawa’id of al-Naysaburi in his Fasl al-Khitab:

---
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Under the entry to Saa'ib ibn Yazid (ra) in Ibn Hajar's Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (vol. 3), we may also see that Ibn Khusayfa was the nephew of Saa'ib (ra):

Ibn Hajar's quote is also affirmed in the earlier Tahdhib al-Kamal of al-Mizzi (10/195).

In addition, it has been mentioned from al-Dhahabi’s Siyar a’lam an-Nubala (6/157-158) that Ibn Khusayfa was related to Saa‘ib ibn Yazid as follows:

Imam Abul Walid al-Baji (al-Maliki) in his al-Ta’dil wal Tajrīh has quoted from Mus’ab (ibn Abdullah al-Zubayri) affirming Ibn Khusayfa to be a nephew of Saa‘ib ibn Yazid’s as follows:
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Indeed, the point that Yazid ibn Khusayfa was the nephew of Saa’ib ibn Yazid is mentioned in the Ta’rikh of ibn Abi Khaythama (4/303, no. 3040) from Mus’ab ibn Abdullah al-Zubayri:

Hence, we have Ibn Abdal Barr, al-Baji, al-Mizzi, al-Dhahabi and Ibn Hajar affirming some form of blood link between Yazid ibn Khusayfa and Saa’ib ibn Yazid. The firmest report mentioning Ibn Khusayfa’s blood link to Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra) is that from Mus’ab al-Zubayri as in the Ta’rikh of ibn Abi Khaythama.

Besides, kinship alone is not a yardstick of being more meticulous than other narrators who relayed similar narrations. What counts are the Jarh and Ta’dil on a narrator and whether or not an individual’s wording of a specific text is free of hidden defects in some way, and is not at odds with others who may be more precise than the specific individual at concern.

As for the claim by the two compilers that:

Fourthly: This opposes the more authentic narration of Saa’ib ibn Yazeed. See further ahead.

They mean by it that Ibn Khusayfa’s narration for 20 rak’ats is at odds with what Muhammad ibn Yusuf narrated from Saa’ib ibn Yazid for 11 rak’ats. This point will be revisited below to see whose narration is actually Shadh (aberrant).

Later on p. 36, the two compilers brought in their main narration to substantiate the claim that in the time of Umar ibn al Khattab (ra) the people performed 8 rak’ats (+ 3 Witr) Taraweeh by saying:

The Second Evidence - The Hadeeth Of Umar - From Imaam
Maalik from Saa’ib bin Yazeed

Imaam Maalik from Muhammad bin Yoosuf from Saa’ib bin Yazeed that Umar (Radhiallaahu Anhu) ordered Ubayy ibn Ka’ab and Tameem ad-Daaree to lead the people in 11 rak’ahs.


Reply:

The narration they are referring to is for sure found in the Muwatta of Imam Malik as follows:

[251]

The above is mentioned in the English edition as follows:

Book 6, Number 6.2.4: Yahya related to me from Malik from Muhammad ibn Yusuf that as-Sa’ib ibn Yazid said, “Umar ibn al-Khattab ordered Ubayy ibn Ka’ab

39 Translated by Aisha Bewley
and Tamim ad-Dari to watch the night in prayer with the people for eleven rak'as. The reciter of the Qur'an would recite the Mi'in (a group of medium-sized suras) until we would be leaning on our staffs from having stood so long in prayer. And we would not leave until the approach of dawn."

They further mentioned the other books of Hadith which contain the above narration which all run back to only Muhammad ibn Yusuf narrating it with the wording for 11 rak'ats. The references they mentioned were not from their own investigation but it appears to be mainly from the analysis provided by their trusted authority, Zubair Ali Za'i, who mentioned the references in his Urdu work on Salatul Taraweeh (p. 22).

A look at the references mentioned above is appropriate. What these individuals did not clarify is the fact that not all of the books mentioned above are early books of Hadith with chains of transmission going back to Sa'ib ibn Yazid via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf. One may ask if this is such a “big deal”?! The fact of the matter is that Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban objected in their shorter pamphlet entitled "An Answer to the article entitled Evidence for 20 rak'ahs of Taraweeh from authentic hadith" when a narration from al-Bayhaqi’s Ma'rifatus Sunan wal Athar was presented by saying tempestuously:

This narration, in the manner presented by the Hanafee is riddled with many mistakes and errors, some of which were done deliberately and it proves the hanafee method of lying and deceiving the people in order to convey their falsehood.

Firstly: Where in Mārifus Sunan Wal-Aathaar is this mentioned in? It is not sufficient to say Zaila’ee mentioned it, as it is not a book of hadeeth.

It is very clear that if they were to reference a narration to a work, which is not an original compilation of Hadith or Athar, it is fine, but if a Hanafi was to do it then they have a problem with it! This shrieks of crass double standards from their pens. As for the narration alluding to al-Bayhaqi’s Ma'rifatus Sunan, then this will be dealt with later as these two had also later on rejected it in their “al-Qaul as-Saheeh.”
Nonetheless, the books listed by them above, which are not original compilations of Hadith from early times, include the following references they mentioned:


They claimed that the narration was found in the Sahih of Ibn Khuzayma (1/184), and having looked at this volume on p. 184 (and also no. 184), the said narration was not there. This is a work that was edited by Dr Mustafa al-A’zami and followed up by al-Albani with his notes. If it exists, then one may suggest they produce it with its original isnâd and matn as a scanned image from Ibn Khuzayma’s Sahih!

They also claimed that the narration was recorded by the 7th century Hanbali Shaykh, Diya-ud-Din al Maqdisi in his al-Mukhtara, and earlier on in the Musananafof Abdar Razzaq. They did not give precise references to the published editions of these two hadith collections which are both in print but relied on the claim that it was mentioned in the Kanz al-Ummal of Shaykh Ali al-Muttaqi al-Hindi (d. 975 AH).

In the Kanz al-Ummal (8/407, no. 23465) it is recorded as follows:

عن السبب بن يزيد قال : أمر عمر بن الخطاب أبي بن كعب وتعميم الداري أن يقوما للناس في رمضان بإحدى عشرة ركعة، فكان القدارة يقرأ بالمثاتين حتى يعتمد على العصا من طول القيام وما كنا نصرف إلا في فروع الفجر. (مالك وابن وهب ظع والطحاوي وجعفر الفريابي في السنن)

The books which were said to contain this narration for 11 rak’ats was ascribed to Muwatta Malik, Ibn Wahb, Musannaf Abdar Razzaq, Diya al-Maqdisi, al-Tahawi, Ja’far al-Firyabi in his al-Sunan and al-Sunan al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi.
These references were not ascribed by Ali al-Muttaqi initially, but what he reproduced from Imam al-Suyuti’s Jamī al-Ahadith (25/409) as follows:

أخرج مالك (1/115، رقم 251)، وعبد الرزاق (4/260، رقم 7730)، والظحاوية (1/293)، والبيهقى (2/496، رقم 4392).

The editor did not find it in any of Diya al-Maqdisi’s printed works (see below), but he mentioned a precise reference to the Musannaf Abdar Razzaq (4/260, no. 7730) by giving the impression that it is found in the latter work with the wording for 11 raka’ats! Rather, what is found in the precise reference in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq (4/260, no. 7730) is actually for 21 rak’ats as the scan below demonstrates:

The two compilers also claimed that the narration for 11 rak’ats was reported in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq by relying on the references in the Kanz al-Ummal of Shaykh Ali al-Muttaqi al-Hindi. The Musannaf has been in print for over 35 years thanks to the late Shaykh Habibur Rahman al-A’zami, so one would have expected Zubair Ali and his cohorts to have resorted to the relevant section to prove their case! Despite their claim of it being in the Musannaf we find instead two narrations mentioning 21 and 23 rak’ats respectively, one via Muhammad ibn Yusuf himself (see the above scan from the Musannaf) and the
other via Ibn Abi Dhubab (no. 7733) as follows respectively, reporting from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid as follows:

7730

عبد الرزاق عن داود بن قيس وغيره عن محمد بن يوسف عن السائب بن يزيد أن عمر جمع الناس في رمضان على أبي بن كعب وعلى شم الداري على إحدى وعشرين ركعة يقرؤن بالمذبدين وينصرفون عند فروع الفجر

7733

عبد الرزاق عن الأسلمي عن الخرث بن عبد الرحمن بن أبي ذبابة عن السائب بن يزيد قال كنا نتصرف من القيام على عهد عمر وقد دنا فروع الفجر وكان القيام على عهد عمر ثلاثة وعشرين ركعة

Al-Albani and his cohorts also dismissed the last two narrations for reasons that will be mentioned from them in due course.

There appears to be no narration from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid (ra) for 11 rak‘ats in the Musannaf Abdar Razzaq or the two works by Diya al-Maqdisi that are referred to below.

Looking at the printed edition of al-Mukhtara of Diya al-Maqdisi, one may notice only one narration from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid mentioning the rak‘ats of Taraweeh and this is how it was presented in al-Mukhtara

1161

أخيرنا أبو عبد الله محمود بن أحمد بن عبد الرحمن السمعي بأصبهان أن سعيد بن أبي الرجاء الصنف في أخبرهم قراءة عليه أنه عبد اللوه بن أحمد البقال أن عبد اللوه بن يعقوب بن إسحاق أنه جدي إسحاق بن إبراهيم بن محمد بن حبل أن أحمد بن أبي الحسن بن موسى أبو جعفر الروزي عن الربيع بن أنس أن بني آدم في رمضان فقال إن النافذ يصومون النهار ولا

40 3/367, no. 1161
This latter narration affirming 20 rak'ats of Taraweeh in Umar ibn al-Khattab’s (ra) time was weakened by al-Albani, despite al-Hafiz Diya al-Maqdisi considering it Sahih and the editor of al-Mukhtara,\(^{41}\) Dr. Abdul Malik Dahish declared its isnâd to be Hasan. This narration will be defended in due course.

Additionally, Diya al-Maqdisi in his work known as al-Sunan wal Ahkam (3/50-51) has also forwarded al-Bayhaqi’s narration from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid as one of three narrations in support of 20 rak’ats. Scanned quotes:

41 This work is similar to the Mustadrak of al-Hakim where the stipulation was that the compiler would include narrations that were likely to be based on the standards of al-Bukhari and Muslim but not recorded in their respective Sahihis. Indeed, later Hanabila like Ibn Taymiyya have indicated that al-Mukhtara is a higher-level compilation than al-Hakim’s Mustadrak as there are less inauthentic types of narration within it.
It may also be plausible to suggest that a portion of Diya al-Maqdisi’s al-Mukhtara may be still unpublished and is still in the manuscript format mentioning the 11 rak’ats version via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf. Wallahu a’lam.

The two compilers also mentioned that the narration for 11 rak’ats was mentioned in: “Sharh As- Sunnah of Baghawee (4/ 120).”

Imam al-Baghawi (d. 516 AH) mentioned this narration as part of his discussion on the number of rak’ats. He did not give it a grading but straight after it he mentioned the narration for 23 rak’ats (meaning 20 Taraweeh + 3 Witr) reported in mursal form from Malik’s Muwatta on the authority of Yazid ibn Ruman, and after that he mentions what shows conclusively that most of the Salaf held it to be 20 rak’ats, and in doing so he did not know of a single Sahabi or Imam from the Salaf who advocated a maximum of 8 rak’ats as being the ideal Sunna.

Let us quote from the above reference in Sharh al-Sunna to mention what al-Baghawi actually said after mentioning the 11 rak’at narration via Muhammad ibn Yusuf:

وقال مالك، عن يزيد بن رومان: كان للناس يقومون في رمضان عمراً بثلاث وعشرين ركعة في

ورأى بعضهم أن يصلي احدى وأربعين ركعة مع الوتر، وهو قول أهل المدينة، والعمل على هذا عندهم، وهو أختار إسحق

وأما أكثر أهل العلم، فعلي عشرين ركعة يروى ذلك عن عمر وعلي وغيرهما من أصحاب النبي، وهو قول الثوري، وابن المبارك، والشافعي، وأصحاب الرأي، قال الشافعي: وهذا أدرك ببلدنا بركة يصلون عشرين ركعة ولم يقض أحمد فيه شيء

One may deduce that al-Baghawi was certain that most of the people of knowledge (akthar ahlul ilm) were upon 20 rak’ats and he ascribed that to Umar (ra), Ali (ra) and other Sahaba, and then said that 20 rak’ats was the view of also al-Thawri, Ibn al Mubarak and al-Shafi’i, as well as the Ahlul Râ’î, while the
people of Madina and Ishaq (ibn Rahawayh) were upon 41 rak’ats. The chief editor of Sharh al-Sunna, Shaykh Shu’ayb al-Arna’ut, also put a footnote to prove that Imam Malik and the people of Madina were upon 36 rak’ats plus 3 Witr by quoting from Qadi Sahnun’s al-Mudawwana al-Kubra.

One wonders why Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban left out the summary of all that was said by Imam al-Baghawi?! The answer seems to lie in the assertion that they did not access the original printed edition of Sharh al-Sunna but relied on their authority from Pakistan, Zubair Ali Za’i, who mentioned the partial reference from Sharh al-Sunna.

As for the books mentioned by them as follows:


All of the above references have the narration with chains going back to Muhammad ibn Yusuf from Saa’ib ibn Yazid. Thus, Muhammad ibn Yusuf is the common link in all of these references and it is our contention that only he narrated it from Saa’ib (ra) with the wording for 11 rak’ats in total.

The 2 compilers then mentioned the opinion of some scholars on the grading for the chain going back from Imam Malik from Muhammad ibn Yusuf from Saa’ib ibn Yazid. They mentioned the following points on p. 37:

42 Meaning 20 Rak’ats of Taraweeh behind the Imam, and 16 rak’ats of nafl individually plus 3 rak’ats Witr followed by 2 rak’ats nafl

43 Sharh al-Sunna, 4/122, fn. 1

44 1/193
Muhaddith Mubaarakpooree aid, “Narrated also by Sa’eed bin Mansoor, Abu Bakr bin Abee Shaybah. Nimawe said in Aathaar as-Sunan, “The chain is authentic.” (Tuhfatul-Ahwadhee (3/442)

Haafidh Ibn Abdul-Barr said, “Maalik mentioned 11 raka’hs and others have mentioned 21 raka’hs.” (Tamheed (8/114).

Imaam Bukhaari has brought a hadeeth in his Saheeh in the Book of Hajj with the exact same Chain, therefore the narrators are trustworthy according to the conditions of Imaam al-Bukhaari. Similarly Imaam Tirmidhee said about a chain like this Hasan-Saheeh.

Imaam Suyootee said about its chain “This athar is at the highest level of authenticity.” (al-Masaabib Fee Salaatul Taraaweeh (pg.15) of Imaam Suyootee and in his al-Haawee lil-Fataawa (1/350), Qiyaam ul-Layl of Marwazee (pg.200)

Dhiyaa al-Maqdisee authenticated this athar. (See Ikhtisaar Uloom al-Hadeeth (p.77) of Ibn Katheer). As did Imaam Baaji (Zurqaanee’s Sharh of Muwatta (1/238)

Imaam Badee uddeen after mentioning the narration above said, “The chain of this hadeeth is absolutely authentic. Saa’ib bin Yazeed is a famous companion and Muhammad bin Yoosuf is from the famous trustworthy narrators and his biography is mentioned in Taqreeb and in Tahdheeb ((9/534) and there is no defect in this chain, it is continuous and authentic and its wording is also clear that Ameer Umar (Radhiallaahu Anhu) ordered 11 raka’hs.” (Tanqeed as-Sadeed (pg.264).

The Hanafee Scholar, Nimawe said “The chain is authentic” Aathaar as- Sunan (pg.250)

A look at some of the above references in a bit more detail:

i) They said:

Muhaddith Mubaarakpooree aid, “Narrated also by Sa’eed bin Mansoor, Abu Bakr bin Abee Shaybah. Nimawe said in Aathaar as-Sunan, “The chain is authentic.” (Tuhfatul-Ahwadhee (3/442)

It is found in the Sunan of Sa’eed Ibn Mansur and Musannaf Ibn Abi Shayba via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf. Indeed, Shaykh al-Nimawi (al-Hanafi) did
say in his Athar al-Sunan (p. 249-250) that it’s Sahih, but, what al-Mubarakpuri and his admirers in this time failed to mention here is that al-Nimawi placed a footnote (p. 249, no. 776, fn. 279) in his comments to Athar al-Sunan known as Ta’liq al-Hasan, where he clearly mentioned the following crucial point:

قوله باحدى عشرة ركعة قلت قال الحافظ ابن حجر في الفتح ورواه عبد الوزار من وجه آخر عن محمد بن يوسف قال انحدى وعشرين انتهى

This is a very concise statement from Shaykh al-Nimawi clarifying the fact in the footnote to Athar al-Sunan that though the sanad found in the Muwatta Malik is determined by some to be Sahih, it has been mentioned by al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his Fath al-Bari from Abdar Razzaq via another chain of transmission from Muhammad ibn Yusuf where he said 21 rak’ats, and not 11! This narration from Abdar Razzaq has been mentioned already and it will be examined in due course.

This chain was mentioned by al-Hafiz ibn Hajar with silence on its grading which usually means that he considered the narration to be Hasan (good). Ibn Hajar’s own Shaykh in Hadith, Hafiz Zaynud-Din al-Iraqi, also performed 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh as will be mentioned in the section mentioning those who authenticated the narrations from al-Bayhaqi’s hadith collections via Ibn Khusayfa stating 20 rak’ats.

On top of this, Shaykh al-Nimawi had also produced a section from p. 250 to p. 255 in determining the proofs for 20 rak’ats. The very first narration he mentioned (p. 250, no. 778) was from al-Bayhaqi’s Sunan via the route of Yazid ibn Khusayfa and he declared its sanad to be Sahih. There is little doubt that Shaykh al-Nimawi was in favour of 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh.

ii) They said:

---

45 See later for a scan of this from an older edition of this work
Haafidh Ibn Abdul-Barr said, “Maalik mentioned 11 raka’hs and others have mentioned 21 raka’hs.” (Tamheed (8/114).

The above quote from Imam Ibn Abdal Barr means little in the context presented since the fact of the matter is that if they had checked the whole context and presentation of the narrations from the Tamheed of Ibn Abdal Barr, one cannot fail to notice that Ibn Abdal Barr was an advocate for 20 rak’ats.

Indeed, in his later work known as al-Istidhkar, Ibn Abdal Barr analysed the narration transmitted by Imam Malik from Muhammad ibn Yusuf for 11 rak’ats, and in doing so he demonstrated why Ibn Yusuf’s narration is not acceptable, as well as showing why it is actually 20 rak’ats. This will be mentioned soon from al-Istidhkar, bi-idhnillahi ta’ala. For now, let us quote in Arabic the words of Ibn Abdal Barr from his al-Tamheed (8/113-115):

وختلف العلماء في عدد قيام رمضان فقال باللائق تسع وثلاثون بالوتر ست وثلاثون والوتر ثلاث وزعم
أنه الأمر القديم وقال الثوري وأبو حنيفة والشافعي وداود ومن تبعهم عشرون ركعة سوى الوتر لا يقام بأكثر منها استحباباً. اجتمع عدائزرعاق عن داو بن قيس وغيره عن محمد بن يوسف عن السائب بن يزيد أن عمر بن الخطاب جمع الناس في رمضان على أي بن كعب وعلى تميم الداري على إحدى

وعشرين ركعة يفرزون باللائق وبضفرون في فروع الفجر روى مالك هذا الحديث عن محمد بن يوسف عن السائب

بن يزيد قال أمر عمر بن الخطاب أي بن كعب وقيامة الداري عن يقسم الناس بأحد عشرة ركعة قال وكان القاري.

يقرأ باللائق حتى كنا نتحدم على العصى من قول القيام وما كنا نصفر إلا في فروع الفجر هكذا قال مالك في هذا.

الحديث إحدى عشرة ركعة وغيره يقول فيه إحدى وعشرين وقد روى الحارث بن عبدالرحمن بن أي ذياب

على السائب ابن يزيد قال كنا نصرف من القيام على عهد عمر (ب خطاب) وقد كنا نصرف من القيام على عهد عمر (بالخطاب) وهو من فروع الفجر

وكأن القيام على عهد باللائق وعشرين ركعة. وهذا معمول على أن الثلاث لترتوذ عدائزرعاق عن ابن

جريح قال آخره عن عمر بن موسى أن يزيد بن خصيبة أخبرهم عن السائب بن يزيد عن عمر جمع عمر الناس

على أي بن كعب وقيمة الداري
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In the above quote the highlighted points mention from Ibn Abdal Barr that:

i) Imam Malik said it is 39 rak'ats with Witr, while Imams Sufyan al-Thawri, Abu Hanifa, al-Shafi‘i, Dawud (al-Zahiri) and those who followed them said it was 20 rak'ats beside the Witr and that one of the proofs used by them was the narration from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid for 20 rak'ats, and Ibn Abdal Barr mentioned after this the narration via Ibn Yusuf for 21 rak'ats as found in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq. Ibn Abdal Barr also mentioned the narration via the route of Ibn Abi Dhubab from Saa‘ib stating 23 rak'ats in the time of Umar (ra), as has been mentioned earlier to be found in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq.

ii) What becomes apparent also is that Ibn Abdal Barr thought it was only Imam Malik who reported it with the wording for 11 rak'ats from Muhammad ibn Yusuf, and in attempting to prove this claim he said that Ibn Yusuf narrated it with 21 rak'ats from Saa‘ib (as in Musannaf Abdar Razzaq) and Ibn Abi Dhubab narrated it from Saa‘ib with 23 rak'ats. Later Ulama have clarified that Ibn Abdal Barr’s claim that only Imam Malik narrated from Ibn Yusuf with the wording for 11 rak'ats is an error on his part, since in other books of Hadith where Imam Malik is not in the sanad, it has been reported with chains going back to Ibn Yusuf with the wording for 11 rak'ats. This can be seen in the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba, Ta‘rikh Madina of Ibn Shabba, Sunan Sa’eed ibn Mansur and the Ahadith of Isma’il ibn Ja‘far as follows:
Musannaf Ibn Abi Shayba:

Thus, besides Imam Malik, Yahya ibn Sa‘eed al-Qattan, Abdal Aziz ibn Muhammad and Isma‘il ibn Ja‘far also narrated it with 11 rak‘ats from Muhammad ibn Yusuf.

46 As quoted by Imam al-Suyuti in his al-Masabih fi Salatul Taraweeh
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Hence, the claim of the two compilers mentioned above: Haafidh Ibn Abdul-Barr said, “Maalik mentioned 11 raka’hs and others have mentioned 21 raka’hs.” (Tamheed (8/114)
- Does not prove that Ibn Abdal Barr advocated 11 rak’ats with the Witr, or that Imam Malik also affirmed it as his personal view. On the contrary, Ibn Abdal Barr said Imam Malik said it was 39 with Witr, and he did not know of a single Imam from the Salaf who said that the practice in Umar’s (ra) time was agreed upon to be 8 rak’ats.

iii) They said:

Imaam Bukhaari has brought a hadeeth in his Saheeh in the Book of Hajj with the exact same Chain, therefore the narrators are trustworthy according to the conditions of Imaam al-Bukhaari. Similarly Imaam Tirmidhee said about a chain like this Hasan-Saheeh.

The only chain in Sahih al-Bukhari via Muhammad ibn Yusuf from Saa’ib that is found in the Book of Hajj was the following:

الحدثنا عبد الرحمن بن يوتس ، حدثنا حاتم بن إسماعيل ، عن محمد بن يوسف ، عن النبي يزيد ، قال : حج بي مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأنا ابن سبع سنين

Thus, their claim that in Bukhari it has been reported “with the exact same Chain” - as we find in the Muwatta Malik (for 11 rak’ats via Ibn Yusuf) is not entirely accurate. What is correct is that al-Bukhari has reported alternate chains in his Sahih via Ibn Yusuf from Saa’ib ibn Yazid, but it is not in its entirety like the one in the Muwatta Malik.

What is important to realize by now is that it is not the authenticity of the sanad found in Muwatta Malik and elsewhere from Ibn Yusuf relating it as 11 rak’ats that is disputed, but the precise wording mentioning 11 rak’ats is what is rejected by those who are convinced that the versions from Yazid ibn Khusayfa, Ibn Abi Dhubab and the alternate one from Ibn Yusuf himself (as in Musannaf Abdar Razzaq) - all point towards Taraweeh being 20 in essence.
What is being said here is that Ibn Yusuf’s wording is Shadh (aberrant). Thus, Ibn Yusuf’s wording is isolated to the degree that he is the only one who transmitted the wording for 11 rak’ats, while Ibn Khusayfa and Ibn Abi Dhubab, as well as the alternate narration going back to Ubayy ibn Ka‘b (not Sa‘îb this time) as in Diya al-Maqdisi’s al-Mukhtara and by Ibn Mani’ - all mention 20 rak’ats.

iv) They said:
Imaam Suyootee said about its chain “This athar is at the highest level of authenticity.” (al-Masaaheeh Fee Salaatul Taraweeh (pg.15) of Imaam Suyootee and in his al-Haawee lil-Fataawa (1/ 350), Qiyaam ul-Layl of Marwazee (pg.200)

If they had bothered to look at the original text from al-Suyuti the real facts and figures would have been displayed for their eyes. This is what al-Suyuti said in his al-Masabih:
Thus, al-Suyuti was actually quoting from Imam Taqiud-Din al-Subki’s Sharh al-Minhalj, who did mention the narration from the Muwatta Malik and Sunan Sa’eed ibn Mansur, via Muhammad ibn Yusuf for 11 rak’ats, but he also mentioned the variant from al-Bayhaqi for 20 rak’ats where he also declared the sanad to be Sahih. This variant is the one from the Ma’rifatus Sunan of al-Bayhaqi. The red highlighted and underlined portion also mentions al-Subki affirming that in his Madhhab (Shafi’i) it is 20 rak’ats based on al-Bayhaqi’s authentic report, and he also mentioned that he saw in the Sunan of Sa’eed ibn Mansur narrations for 20 and 36 Rak’ats after the days of Umar ibn al Khattab (ra).

What is thus apparent is that despite Muhammad ibn Yusuf’s variant for 11 rak’ats having an apparently authentic sanad, its matn (text) is at odds with the one’s which mention 20 rak’ats, and thus, since al-Subki affirmed 20 rak’ats as his Madhhab, it shows that he didn’t act upon the variant for 11 rak’ats. This indirectly supports the contention that Ibn Yusuf erred by saying 11 rak’ats, as al-Hafiz Ibn Abdul Barr demonstrated in al-Istidhkar.

This is another example of how the 2 compilers quoted something out of its real context to attempt to strengthen their claims for 8 Rak’ats. Will they be prepared to also accept al-Subki’s authentication of al-Bayhaqi’s sanad?!

v) They said:

Dhiyaa al-Maqdisi authenticated this athar. (See Ikhtisaar Uloom al- Hadeeth (p.77) of Ibn Katheer). As did Imaam Baaji (Zurqaanee’s Sharh of Muwatta (1/238)

I say: They have taken this claim from Zubair Ali Za’i. 47 Having looked into this work by Ibn Kathir I did not locate what Zubair Ali claimed, and I only noticed the following point made by Imam Ibn Kathir regarding Diya al-Maqdisi’s al-Mukhtara:

---

47 P. 23 of his Risala on the Rak’ats of Taraweeh
Having looked at Ahmed Shaki'r's Sharh on this work by Ibn Kathir called al-
Ba'ith al-Hathith Sharh Ikhtisar Uulum al-Hadith, with editing by al-Albani. Looking
at the index to this Sharh by Shakir; Diya al-Maqdisi's name was mentioned only
on p. 112 with the above Arabic quote just provided. Besides not finding what
Zubair Ali claimed we have already shown that on the contrary, in al-Mukhtara,
Shaykh Diya al-Maqdisi al-Hanbali recorded a narration for 20 rak'ats from
Ubayy ibn Ka'b, which he considered to be Sahih, while in his Sunan wal Ahkam
he only mentioned 3 narrations advocating 20 rak'ats. Hence, the followers of
Zubair Ali may wish to present to the inquisitive readers the original Arabic
quote from Ibn Kathir's book for all to see what they have claimed.

vi) They said:

Imam Badee ud deen after mentioning the narration above said, “The chain of this hadeeth is
absolutely authentic. Saa'ib bin Yazde is a famous companion and Muhammad bin
Yosuf is from the famous trustworthy narrators and his biography is mentioned in
Taqreeb and in Tahdheeb ((9/534) and there is no defect in this chain, it is continuous and
authentic and its wording is also clear that Ameer Umar (Raddhallaahu Anhu) ordered 11
raka'hs.” (Tanqeed as-Sadeed (pg.264).

The authenticity of the sanad is not the bone of contention but its matan (text) is
Shadh (at odds with other variants) when it proclaimed 11 rak'ats in one version.
This is borne out by mentioning the alternate versions transmitted by Ibn
Khusayfa, Ibn Abi Dhubab and Ibn Yusuf himself - who all related well in
excess of 8 rak'ats from Saa'ib ibn Yazid. On top of that there is the
independent narration reported by Ibn Mani' (as in Kanz al-Ummal of Shaykh
Ali al-Muttaqi) and from him it was related with his sanad by Diya al-Maqdisi in
al-Mukhtara from Abul Aliya narrating from Ubayy ibn Ka'b (ra) - for 20 rak'ats.
These narrations will follow later with analysis.
They said on p. 37:

Note- The Claim of Idhtiraab

The compiler of Al-Albani Unveiled (pg.59-61) cites the research of a pamphlet from Madrasah Arabia Islamia, Azadville, South Africa) where both hanafee parties eventually conclude this hadeeeth of Imaam Maalik is Mudhtarib (ie interchanged) and hence weak and unacceptable.

The point here is that from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid there are 3 students taking from him. Namely, Muhammad ibn Yusuf who narrated with 11 rak‘ats as in the Muwatta of Malik and recorded elsewhere, Yazid ibn Khusayfa who transmitted with 20 rak‘ats and then Ibn Abi Dhubab who narrated with 23 rak‘ats. Additionally, Muhammad ibn Yusuf was inconsistent in the manner he transmitted the precise number of rak‘ats, since in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq his wording was 21 rak‘ats, while in the Qiyam al-Layl of al-Marwazi it was mentioned from him as 13 rak‘ats. What is being implied is that Muhammad ibn Yusuf has erred, and the reader will be shown that this is not a modern deduction but it has the backing of a major Hafiz of Hadith from the 5th Islamic century.

They continued to say:

The Answer

Imaam Abdur-Rahmaan Mubaarakpooree after bringing a narration of Saa‘ib bin Yazeed via a different chain including Abu Uthmaan Basree and Abu Taahir Faqeeh which mentions in the time of Umar (RadhiAllaahu Anhu) the people would observe 20 rak‘hs and witr, he cites Nimawee as saying he could find out about these two narrators and then agrees with him.

Thereafter he says, “...It also opposes that which has been transmitted by Sa‘eed bin Mansoor in his Sunan, he said, “Hadathana (narrated to us) Abdul- Azeez bin Muhammad Hadathanee (narrated to me) Muhammad bin Yoosuf Sami’tu (I heard) as-Saa‘ib bin Yazeed Yaqool (say), “In the time of Umar (RadhiAllaahu Anhu) we used to observe 11 rak‘hs.” Haafidh Jalaal ud deen Suyootee said in Risaalah al-Masaabeeh Fee Salaatul-Taraaweeh after mentioning this athar, “This athar is at the highest level of authenticity.”
Allaamah Mubaarakpooreewent onto say, “It also opposes what has been narrated by Muhammad bin Nasr in Qiyaam al-Layl via the route of Muhammad bin Isaak from Muhammad bin Yoosuf from his grandfather as- Saa’ib bin Yazeed who said, “In the time of Umar (Radhiallaahu Anhu) we would pray 13 raka’hs in Ramadaan.” It also opposes that which has been narrated by Maalik in his Muwatta from Muhammad bin Yoosuf from Saa’ib bin Yazeed who said, “Umar bin Al-Khattaab ordered Ubayy bin Ka’ab and Tameem ad-Daareetoleadthepeoplein11raka’hs.” So the athar of Saa’ib bin Yazeed narrated by Bahaqee (mentioning 20 raka’hs) then it is not correct to use it as evidence.” (Tuhfatul-Ahwadhee (3/447)

Shaikh al-Imaam al-Albaanee after mentioning the hadeeth says, “I say This chain (of this hadeeth of Muhammad bin Yoosuf from Saa’ib bin Yazeed) is very authentic and Muhammad bin Yoosuf the teacher of Imaam Maalik is trustworthy with agreement. And the Shaikhain (ie Imaams Bukhaari and Muslim) have used his as proof. Saa’ib bin Yazeed is a minor Companion and he performed Hajj with the Prophet (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam). This narration is by the way of Maalik, transmitted by Abu Bakr Neesaabooreeinal-Fawa’a'id (1/135), Faryaabee (1/76 2/75) and Bahaquee in as-Sunan al-Kubraa (1/496).

Maalik is supported in his narration of 11 raka’hs by Yahyaa bin Sa’eed al- Qattan in Musannaf Ibn Abee Shaybah (2/89/2) (2/391-392), Ismaa’eel bin Umayyah, Usaamaah bin Zaid, Muhammad bin Isaaq with al-Neesaabooreee and Ismaa’eel bin Ja’afar al-Madaneet with Ibn Khuzaimah in the hadeeth of Alee bin Hujr (1/1864), and all of they mention from Muhammad bin Yoosuf (11 raka’hs). Except Ibn Isaeeq as he says, “13 raka’hs.” As narrated by Ibn Nasr in Qiyaam al-Layl (pg.91).

The Shaikh goes onto say, “I say: The number 13 as mentioned by Ibn Isaeeq then he is alone in reporting it. However this narration coincides with the narration of A’aishah in the standing in Ramadaan and It has been mentioned previously that the Sunnah’s for Fajr have been included in this, in the footnotes (pg.16-17) in this manner the narration of Ibn Isaeeq is coincided with the narrations from the group.

As for the saying of Ibn Abdul-Barr that, “I do not know a single person say 11 raka’hs except Maalik.” So this is a clear error, al-Mubaarakpooore said in Tuhfatul-Ahwadhee (2/74), “An false error.” Zurqaanee also refutes this in Sharh al-Muwatta (1/25) and says, “It is not as he (Ibn Abdul-Barr) has said. This narration has been narrated by Sa’eed bin Mansoor from Muhammad bin Yoosuf by mentioning 11 raka’hs as Maalik said.”

I say: The chain is very authentic as Suyootee said in al-Masaabeeh and this report alone is sufficient to refute the statement of Ibn Abdul-Barr…”
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Point by point reply:

They said:

Imaam Abdur-Rahmaan Mubaarakpooree after bringing a narration of Saa'ib ibn Yazeeed via a different chain including Abu Uthmaan Basree and Abu Taahir Faqeeh which mentions in the time of Umar (Radhiallaahu Anhu) the people would observe 20 raka'hs and witr, he cites Nimawee as saying he could find out about these two narrators and then agrees with him.

The narration that al-Mubarakpuri was referring to is the alternate version from Saa'ib ibn Yazid via the route of Yazid ibn Khusayfa as recorded by al-Bayhaqi in his Ma'rifatus Sunan wal Athar (4/42, no. 5409) and al-Sunan al-Saghir (no. 852). As for the claim that the 2 narrators, Abu Uthman al-Basri and Abu Tahir al-Faqih have no known background, and thus implying them to be unknown narrators, then this is incorrect and will be answered later.

They said:

Thereafter he says, “…It also opposes that which has been transmitted by Sa'eed bin Mansoor in his Sunan, he said, “Hadathana (narrated to us) Abdul-Azeez bin Muhammad Hadathane (narrated to me) Muhammad bin Yoosuf Sami'tu (I heard) as-Saa'ib bin Yazeed Yaqool (say), “In the time of Umar (Radhiallaahu Anhu) we used to observe 11 raka'hs.”

It has already been said above that Muhammad ibn Yusuf was inconsistent in the manner he transmitted the wording and it will be demonstrated further later.

They said:

. “Haafidh Jalaal ud deen Suyootee said in Risaaalah al-Masaabeeh Fee Salaatul-Taraaweeh after mentioning this athar, “This athar is at the highest level of authenticity.”
This point and its answer will be elucidated upon with the full context of what al-Suyuti mentioned in due course, and his actual position on the number of Rak'ats.

They said:

Allaamah Mubarakpooree went onto say, “It also opposes what has been narrated by Muhammad bin Nasr in Qiyaam al-Layl via the route of Muhammad bin Isbaaq from Muhammad bin Yoosuf from his grandfather as- Sa'ib bin Yazeed who said, “In the time of Umar (RadhiAllahuAnhu) we would pray 13 rak'ahs in Ramadhaan.” It also opposes that which has been narrated by Maalik in his Muwatta from Muhammad bin Yoosuf from Sa'ib bin Yazeed who said, “Umar bin al-Khattaab ordered Ubayy bin Ka'ab and Tameem ad-Daaree to lead the people in 11 rak'ahs.” So the athar of Sa'ib bin Yazeed narrated by Baihaqi (mentioning 20 rak'ahs) then it is not correct to use it as evidence.” (Tuhfatul-Ahwadhee (3/447)

The narration they quoted via Ibn Nasr's Qiyam al-Layl is also from Muhammad ibn Yusuf, but as for the wording 13 rak'ats, then this proves the contention that Ibn Yusuf was not precise in his transmission of the exact rak'ats from Sa'ib ibn Yazid (ra). Ibn Yusuf also transmitted it with the wording for 21 rak'ats as found with a good chain (sanad) in the Musannaf of Abdar Razaq. It has already been said that all of this will be shown in greater detail in good time below.

As for al-Mubarakpuri’s claim that:  

So the athar of Sa'ib bin Yazeed narrated by Baihaqi (mentioning 20 rak'ahs) then it is not correct to use it as evidence.” (Tuhfatul-Ahwadhee (3/447) - Then this claim is rejected as a number of earlier scholars of Hadith like, al-Nawawi, al-Iraqi, al-Ayni and al-Suyuti who have declared al-Bayhaqi’s sanad as found in his al-Sunan al-Kubra to be Sahih, as have some contemporary Hadith scholars. This will be mentioned in a section below with quotes from a number of scholars.

They said:
Shaikh al-Imaam al-Albaanee after mentioning the hadeeth says, “I say This chain (of this hadeeth of Muhammad bin Yoosuf from Saa'ib bin Yazeed) is very authentic and Muhammad bin Yoosuf the teacher of Imaam Maalik is trustworthy with agreement. And the Shaikhain (ie Imaams Bukhaari and Muslim) have used his as proof. Saa'ib bin Yazeed is a minor Companion and he performed Hajj with the Prophet (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam). This narration is by the way of Maalik, transmitted by Abu Bakr Neesaabooree in al-Fawa'ید (1/135), Faryaabee (1/76 2/75) and Bahaquee in as-Sunan al-Kubraa (1/496).

Maalik is supported in his narration of 11 raka'hs by Yahyaa bin Sa'eed al- Qattan in Musannaf Ibn Abee Shyaabah (2/89/2) (2/391-392), Ismaa'eel bin Umayyah, Usamaah bin Zaid, Muhammad bin Ishaaq with al-Neesaabooree and Ismaa'eel bin Ja'afar al-Madane with Ibn Khuzaimah in the hadeeth of Alee bin Hujr (1/1864), and all of they mention from Muhammad bin Yoosuf (11 raka'hs). Except Ibn Ishaaq as he says, “13 raka'hs.” As narrated by Ibn Nasr in Qaiyaam al-Layl (pg.91).

The Shaikh goes onto say, “I say: The number 13 as mentioned by Ibn Ishaaq then he is alone in reporting it. However this narration coincides with the narration of A’aishah in the standing in Ramadhaan and It has been mentioned previously that the Sunnah’s for Fajr have been included in this, in the footnotes (pg.16-17) in this manner the narration of Ibn Ishaqq is coincided with the narrations from the group.

As for the saying of Ibn Abdul-Barr that, “I do not know a single person say 11 raka'hs except Maalik.” So this is a clear error, al-Muhaaraka pooree said in Tuhfatul-Ahwadhee (2/74), “An false error.” Zurqaanee also refutes this in Sharh al-Muwatta (1/25) and says, “It is not as he (Ibn Abdul-Barr) has said. This narration has been narrated by Sa’eed bin Mansoor from Muhammad bin Yoosuf by mentioning 11 raka’hs as Maalik said.”

I say: The chain is very authentic as Suyootee said in al-Masaabeeh and this report alone is sufficient to refute the statement of Ibn Abdul-Barr... “

(Salaatul-Taraaweeh (pg.45-47)

The above points are not in line with the totality of the facts when one sees all the variants that Muhammad ibn Yusuf transmitted as has been indicated already. On top of this, despite Ibn Abdal Barr’s slight error mentioned by al-Zurqani, then at the end of the day it doesn’t harm his claim that Ibn Yusuf’s narration is actually an error, and that Imam Malik did not practice 8 rak’ats witr with 3 rak’ats witr. The same applies with al-Suyuti as indicated above. More will follow on Ibn Yusuf’s error soon below.
As for the point from al-Albani:

The Shaikh goes onto say, “I say: The number 13 as mentioned by Ibn Ishaaq then he is alone in reporting it. However this narration coincides with the narration of A’ishah in the standing in Ramadhaan and It has been mentioned previously that the Sunnah’s for Fajr have been included in this, in the footnotes (pg.16-17) in this manner the narration of Ibn Ishaaq is coincided with the narrations from the group.

Then, al-Albani has not provided any proof that Ibn Ishaq’s narration is actually referring to 8 rak’ats Taraweeh, plus two rak’ats of Fajr and three rak’ats of Witr. Rather, what is apparent is that Ibn Ishaq’s narration implies that it was 10 rak’ats Taraweeh followed by 3 rak’ats of Witr.

As for al-Albani’s point:  and Muhammad bin Yoosuf the teacher of Imam Maalik is trustworthy with agreement. And the Shaikhain (ie Imams Bukhaari and Muslim) have used his as proof. Then what is also known is that Yazid ibn Khusayfa’s narrations are also found in the Sahihayn.48 What needs to be demonstrated is to show by exemplification which versions should be given preference to, that of Ibn Yusuf or that from Ibn Khusayfa and the latter’s supporting narrations.

48 Meaning Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim
A LOOK AT THE VARIANTS TRANSMITTED BY
MUHAMMAD IBN YUSUF FROM SAA‘IB IBN YAZID

The narration from Muhammad ibn Yusuf although it appears Sahih (authentic) in its chain of transmission (sanad) is not actually authentic in a portion of its textual wording. This is a subtle point that many fail to point out and only those who have compared all the versions transmitted by Muhammad ibn Yusuf to his various students would possibly notice to isolate and identify.

a) Muhammad ibn Yusuf and 11 rak‘ats:

To date the reader may have noticed the version for 11 rak‘ats as recorded in the Muwatta Malik as follows:

The above is mentioned in the English edition as follows:

Book 6, Number 6.2.4: Yahya related to me from Malik from Muhammad ibn Yusuf that as-Sa‘ib ibn Yazid said, “Umar ibn al-Khattab ordered Ubayy ibn Ka‘b and Tamim ad-Dari to watch the night in prayer with the people for eleven rak‘as. The reciter of the Qur’an would recite the Mi‘în (a group of medium-sized suras) until we would be leaning on our staffs from having stood so long in prayer. And we would not leave until the approach of dawn.”
b) Muhammad ibn Yusuf and 13 rak’ats:

Secondly, there is a variant of this recorded by Imam Muhammad ibn Nasr al-Marwazi in his Qiyam al-Layl via the route of Muhammad ibn Ishaq from Muhammad ibn Yusuf reporting from Sa‘ib ibn Yazid as 13 rak’ats. Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban said on p. 49 of their treatise by quoting Muhammad ibn Ishaq the well known writer on Maghazi:

“I have not heard any narration more affirmed and established than the hadith of Sā‘ib that mentions the Messenger of Allah (Sallallahu Alayhe Was-Sallam) prayed 13 raka’hs in the night” (Qiyaam al-Layl (pg.157).

They seem to be referring to the following quote from Ibn Nasr al-Marwazi’s Qiyam al-Layl which they have not meticulously translated:

قال ابن إسحاق رحمه الله: وما سمعت في ذلك حديثا هو أثبت عندي ولا أخر بأن يكون من حديث السند، وذلك “أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كانت له من الليل ثلاث عشرة ركعة”

The Qiyam al-Layl is not available in its full format with complete chains of transmission going back to many of the original reporters. Even if one acknowledges that Ibn Ishaq said this, and that it is verifiable with a sanad back to him, then it may be said that this was his personal view, and it is opposed by the views held by Imams greater than him in Hadith and fiqh, like Imam Malik ibn Anas and Imam al-Shafi‘i, who both transmitted the narration via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf saying 11 rak’ats, but did not act upon his variant for 11 rak’ats. Rather, these two Imams accepted it to be no less than 20 rak’ats.

Ibn Ishaq was listed in Ibn Hajar’s Taqrib al-Tahdhib as follows:

محمد بن إسحاق بن يسار أبو بكر المطالي مولاهم المدني نزيل العراق إمام المغازي

صندوق يدئم ورمي بالتشريع والقدر من صغار الخمسة مات سنة خمسين وثمانية ويعال بعدها خت م
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Ibn Ishaq was Saduq (truthful) but would sometimes commit tadlis (not clarify exactly how he heard from his Shaykhs) and he was also reproached by some for Shi’ite leanings (Tashayyu) and Qadr (holding some views akin to the Qadiri sect).

In Ibn Hajar's Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (9/24) as part of the long entry on him the verdicts of the foremost Imam of al-Jarh wa Ta’dil in his time, namely, Imam Yahya ibn Ma’een (d. 233 AH) are worth noting about ibn Ishaq:

Ibn Ma’een clarified that though Ibn Ishaq is Thiqa (trustworthy) he was not a Hujja (authoritative proof), and those who are Hujja are Imams like Malik and Ubaydullah ibn Umar.

Imam Abu Abdullah Ahmed Ibn Hanbal has also said that Ibn Ishaq is laysa bi-hujja (not an authoritative proof) as recorded in the Tahdhib al-Kamal of al-Mizzi (24/422)

NotethatIbn Hanbal has also indicated to Ayub ibn Ishaq ibn Safiri that the narrations whose wording is uniquely transmitted (tafarrud) by Ibn Ishaq are not

49 This is a special branch of the Science of Hadith detailing the disparagement and praise on individual narrators made by prominent Hadith scholar from early times
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acceptable, meaning, if they are not supported by other confirmatory reporters stating the rak'ats to be thirteen. The above report from Ibn Hanbal is also mentioned in the Ta'rikh Baghdad (1/ 230) of al-Khatib al-Baghdadi.

Similarly, al-D hahabi (d. 748 AH) mentioned the following in his Mizan al-I’tidal (3/ 475) on Muhammad ibn Ishaq:

 FAA ئالح يظهر لى أن ابن إسحق حسن الحديث، صالح الحال صدوق، وما انفرد به ففيه تكاسة. فإن في حفظه شينا

Which indicates that though al-D hahabi regarded Ibn Ishaq to be good in hadith (hasan al-hadith), but what he was alone in transmitting (in firad) contained rejected wording(s) as there is something with regard to his preservation of narrations. Meaning his preservation of some narrations is questionable as he was prone in transmitting lone reports that he was not supported in wording by other transmitters of the said narration at hand.

Hence, since Ibn Ishaq is alone in transmitting it with the wording for 13 rak’ats from Muhammad ibn Yusuf specifically, then this is not a Hujja to use as a basis to advocate 8 rak’ats of Taraweeh. It is also not a strong point to claim that Ibn Ishaq’s wording is in line with A’isha’s (ra) narration, as both sets of narrations are not connected to the same prayer at hand. A’isha’s (ra) narration is regarding Tahajjud as will be verified later.

Also, in the Musanna of Abdar Razzaq there is a variant from Muhammad ibn Yusuf from Saa’ib with the wording for 21 rak’ats as mentioned earlier.

Now, the two compilers knew that Abdar Razzaq had mentioned the 21 rak’ats version and thus they had to come off with a way to explain it away, and in doing so they did not succeed in quoting a single Hafiz of Hadith from early or later times to declare its sanad to be weak, but their reliance came from the tahqiq

---

50 Ayub ibn Ishaq was declared Saduq (truthful) by Abu Hatim al-Razi (see Kitab al-Jarh wa Tadil, 2/241, no. 856, by Ibn Abi Hatim al-Razi)
(investigation) of al-Albani and his associates. Thus, the two compilers said on p. 39-40:

The narration of Imaam Maalik is preferred over the narration of Abdur-Razzaaq because the strength of the memory of Imaam Maalik was preferred over Abdur-Razzaaq's therefore it is not muqhtarrab.

The narrator who narrates Abdur-Razzaaq's book of Fasting is Ishaq bin Ibraheem ad-Dabaree. (see Musannaf Abdur-Razzaaq (4/ 153).

So Dabaree heard the works of Abdur-Razzaaq from him when he was seven (7) years old and he was not a companion of hadeeth. He would also report rejected ahadeeth from Abdur-Razzaaq, which contradict what is authentic. Some scholars have even authored whole books containing the mistakes and errors in transmission of ad-Dabaree with regards to the Musannaf. (See Meezaan ul- E'tidaal 1/ 331-332 no.732).

Imaam Muhaddith al-Albaaneesaid this narration (of Abdur-Razzaaq that mentions 21 rak‘ahs) cannot be presented and firstly trustworthy narrators mention 11 rak‘ahs. Secondly Abdur-Razzaaq is alone in reporting and although Abdur-Razzaaq is trustworthy the Haafidh and the famous author his memory deteriorated as he became blind. Haafidh Ibn Hajr has mentioned this in Taqreeb and Haafidh Ibn as-Salaah counted him from those people whose memories deteriorated at the end. Hence he said in his Muqaddimah Uloom al-Hadeeth (pg.407), Ahmad bin Hanbal mentioned he (Abdur-Razzaaq) became blind at the end so whoever would inform him he would accept it, and those who heard after he became blind are nothing. Nasaa‘ee said look into those who wrote from him in the end.”

And he (ibn as-Salaah said in the introduction of the aforementioned chapter (pg.391), “The ruling concerning such narrators is that the ahadeeth narrated by them before they started to forget are accepted and the ahadeeth they narrated after they started to forget are not accepted. Also concerning the narrators there are doubts about (is which ahadeeth of theirs) was narrated before or after they became forgetful are not accepted.”

51 Like his two disciples, Ali Hasan al-Halabi and Salim al-Hilali who both attempted to discredit Abdar Razzaq’s narration with the same line of argument against al-Dabari’s transmission of the 21 rak‘at version via his Shaykh, Abdar Razzaq al-San‘ani. This is viewable in al-Halabi and al-Hilali’s joint work published as “Fasting in Ramadan as observed by the Prophet (peace be upon him)”, pp. 107-108
I say: This athar is of the third type (of the ones mentioned by Haafidh Ibn as-Salaah) i.e. we do not know when this hadith was narrated from him after or before he started to forget. So there are contraindications and contradictions in this narration so how can it be accepted." (Salaatul-Taraaweeh (pg.47-49) Summarized).

Reply:

The narration from Ibn Nasr’s Qiyam al-Layl saying 13 rak'ats from Muhammad ibn Yusuf and the one from Abdar Razzaq from Muhammad ibn Yusuf saying 21 rak'ats were known, and presented by al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his Fath al-Bari (4/253) as follows:

Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar has remained silent on the authenticity of all 3 variants from the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid. This is an indication that al-Hafiz considered all 3 variants to be at least Hasan (good) in grading. No scholar in his time or after him opposed this silence, except that in our time, al-Albani and his admirers have decided to attack the credibility of Abdar Razzaq’s variant by bringing forward some arguments that are weak and unfounded from the perspective of scholarly quotations from the earlier Huffaz.
The enigma that needs solving is which of the variants via Muhammad ibn Yusuf are actually from his own wording, and which one is the correct wording in line with the versions for 20 Rak’ats from the other students of Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra).

c) Muhammad ibn Yusuf and 21 rak’ats:

The narration from the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq\(^\text{52}\) was mentioned earlier, and it is as follows:

> Abdar Razzaq from Dawud ibn Qays and other than him from Muhammad ibn Yusuf from al-Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra) that Umar (ra) gathered the people in Ramadan (to pray behind) Ubayy ibn Ka’b and Tamim al-Dari for 21 rak’ats, reciting some 200 verses (per rak’at) then leaving before the rising of fajr.

They said:

> The narration of Imaam Maalik is preferred over the narration of Abdur- Razzaaq because the strength of the memory of Imaam Maalik was preferred over Abdur-Razzaaq’s therefore it is not mudhtarib.

The issue here is not about whether Abdar Razzaq had a weaker memory than Malik on this narration, or vice versa. Rather, the concern here is about what is the correct version that Muhammad ibn Yusuf transmitted to his students like as mentioned earlier. Muhammad ibn Yusuf’s wordings are recorded as follows:

Imam Malik (in al-Muwatta), Isma’il ibn Ja’far (in his Ahadith), Abdal Aziz ibn Muhammad (in Sunan Sa’eed ibn Mansur) and Yahya al-Qattan (as in Ta’rikh Madina of Ibn Shabba and Musannaf ibn Abi Shayba) – who all reported it as 11 rak’ats

\(^{52}\) 4/260
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Muhammad Ibn Ishaq - who reported it as 13 rak'ats (as in Qiyam al-Layl of Ibn Nasr al-Marwazi)

Dawud ibn Qays and other than him - who reported it as 21 rak'ats (as in Musannaf Abdar Razzaq)

The narrations from Muhammad ibn Yusuf with his wording for 11 and 13 are likely to be errors in transmission, while that for 21 is more in line with what Yazid ibn Khusayfa transmitted with support from Ibn Abi Dhubab’s narration found in the Musannaf Abdar Razzaq (see later). The fact that Muhammad ibn Yusuf’s wording is an error was declared to be so by the foremost expert on the Muwatta of Imam Malik in his time, namely, al-Hafiz Abu Umar ibn Abdal Barr al-Maliki (d. 463 AH).

His verdict shall be mentioned below when demonstrating that Muhammad ibn Yusuf erred in his transmission of the narration from Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra) by saying 11 rak'ats to a group of his students, and on another occasion he transmitted it as 13 rak'ats to his student, Muhammad ibn Ishaq, and finally, he also narrated with the wording for 21 rak'ats to his student Dawud ibn Qays.

Next, they mentioned in summary from al-Albani the following method in rejecting what Abdar Razzaq narrated for 21 rak'ats:

The narrator who narrates Abdur-Razzaaq’s book of Fasting is Ishaaq bin Ibraheem ad-Dabaree. (see Musannaf Abdur-Razzaaq (4/153).

So Dabaree heard the works of Abdur-Razzaaq from him when he was seven (7) years old and he was not a companion of hadeeth. He would also report rejected ahadeeth from Abdur-Razzaaq, which contradict what is authentic. Some scholars have even authored whole books containing the mistakes and errors in transmission of ad-Dabaree with regards to the Musannaf. (See Meezaan ul-El'tidaal 1/ 331-332 no.732).
Imaam Muhaddith al-Albaanee said this narration (of Abdur-Razzaq that mentions 21 raka’hs) cannot be presented and firstly trustworthy narrators mention 11 raka’hs. Secondly Abdur-Razzaq is alone in reporting and although Abdur-Razzaq is trustworthy the Haafidh and the famous author his memory deteriorated as he became blind. Haafidh Ibn Hajr has mentioned this in Taqreeb and Haafidh Ibn as-Salaah counted him from those people whose memories deteriorated at the end. Hence he said in his Muqaddimah Uloom al-Hadeeth (pg.407), Ahmad bin Hanbal mentioned he (Abdur-Razzaq) became blind at the end so whoever would inform him he would accept it, and those who heard after he became blind are nothing. Nasaa’ee said look into those who wrote from him in the end.”

And he (ibn as-Salaah said in the introduction of the aforementioned chapter (pg.391), “The ruling concerning such narrators is that the ahadeeth narrated by them before they started to forget are accepted and the ahadeeth they narrated after they started to forget are not accepted. Also concerning the narrators there are doubts about (is which ahadeeth of theirs) was narrated before or after they became forgetful are not accepted.”

I say: This athar is of the third type (of the ones mentioned by Haafidh Ibn as- Salaah) ie we do not know when this hadeeth was narrated from him after or before he started to forget. So there are contraindications and contradictions in this narration so how can it be accepted.” (Salaatul-Taraaweeh (pg.47-49) Summarized).

Reply:

The claim that al-Dabari only transmitted the Book of Fasting from Imam Abdar Razzaq’s Musannaf is not entirely accurate to claim. The fact of the matter is that the most well known recensions of this Musannaf have all been transmitted in totality by the young al-Dabari.

The foremost and meticulous Hadith Master in his age was the Amir al-Mu’minin in Hadith, Shaykh al-Islam, al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852 AH). In his work known as Mu’jam al-Mufahris (no. 41) which lists all his main chains of transmission back to earlier books of Hadith primarily, he has listed his personal chains back to this very Musannaf. The following are the precise routes he mentioned in receiving the Musannaf:
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All this is a proof that al-Hafiz ibn Hajar received the Musannaf with only routes going back to al-Dabari from his Shaykh, Abdar Razzaq al-San`ani. Now let us re-investigate whether Ibn Hajar accepted the narration for 21 rak`ats to be at least Hasan (good) from a technical perspective or not. In his Fath al-Bari he mentioned the variants from Muhammad ibn Yusuf, and it has already been quoted from Fath al-Bari (4/ 253) above the following quote:

"لم يقع في هذه الرواية عدد الركعات التي كان يصلي بها أبي بن كعب، وقد اختلف في ذلك ففي الموطأ "عن محمد بن يوسف عن السائب بن يزيد أنها أحيى عشرة، ورواه سعيد بن مصوص من وجه آخر وزاد فيه " وكانوا يفروون بالمائتين ويلومون على العصي من طول القيام "ورواه محمد بن نصر المروزي من طريق محمد بن إسحاق عن محمد بن يوسف قال ثلاث عشرة ورواه عبد الرزاق من وجه آخر عن محمد بن يوسف فقال أحادي وعشرين روا، وروى مالك من طريق يزيد بن خصيفة عن السائب بن يزيد عشرين ركعة وهذا محكم على غير الرتوت، وعن يزيد بن رومان قال " كان الناس يقومون في رمضان عمر ثلاث وعشيرين " وروى محمد بن ناصر من طريق عطاء قال " أدركتهم في رمضان يصلون عشرين ركعة وثلاث ركعات الوتر.
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The underlined quote proves that al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar knew of Abdar Razzaq’s narration from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf stating it was 21 rak’ats. This indicates that al-Hafiz knew no valid claim that al-Dabari may have transmitted incorrectly from Abdar Razzaq with the wording for 21 rak’ats, as well as indicating the point that al-Hafiz remained silent on all 3 variants stating 11, 13 and 21 rak’ats, and thus all 3 variants are of similar authenticity.

After this, al-Hafiz has claimed that Imam Malik also transmitted from the route of Yazid ibn Khusayfa from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid stating 20 rak’ats, as well as mentioning the mursal narration of Yazid ibn Ruman stating that the people stood for 23 rak’ats in the time of Umar (ra), and the statement from Ata (ibn Abi Rabah, the Mufti of Makkan Tabi’in) that it was 20 rak’ats with 3 rak’ats of witr.

It is thus evident that al-Hafiz did not have any objection to al-Dabari’s narration from Abdar Razzaq mentioning 21 rak’ats. Those who raised the objection that al-Dabari may have incorrectly transmitted this narration from Abdar Razzaq have not been able to quote a single Hafiz of Hadith from the past in agreement with their claim. On the contrary we have seen one major Hafiz accepting it. One may add to this list the names of 2 more major Huffaz who knew of Abdar Razzaq’s narration for 21 rak’ats and held no objection to it or its transmission by al-Dabari.

The foremost expert commentator in his age on the Muwatta of Imam Malik was al-Hafiz Abu Umar ibn Abdal Barr (d. 463 AH). He has left two major works relating to the Muwatta. The earlier one being his al-Tamheed lima fil Muwatta min al-Ma’ani wal A sanid and the later one being his al-Istidhkar.

---

53 This route is not in the recensions of the Muwatta that have reached us and some have claimed that al-Hafiz erred in claiming that Malik narrated from Yazid with 20 rak’ats. Wallahu a’lam.
Ibn Abdal Barr has also left an example of his personal sanad back to the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq⁵⁴ via al-Dabari in his al-Tamheeda as follows:

أخبرنا خلف بن سعيد قال حدثنا عبد الله بن محمد قال حدثنا أحمد ابن خالد قال حدثي اسحاق بن إبراهيم الديري قال أخبرنا عبد الرزاق قال أخبرنا ماهر عن الزهري عن ابن لعب بن عجرا قال حدثني عمتي وكانت تحت أبي سعيد الخدري أن فرحة حدثتها أن زوجها خرج في طلب أعلام أبيقام حتى إذا كان بطرف القعود وهو جبل أدركهم فقتلهو قلت فأتت رسول الله صلى الله وسلم فذكرته له أن زوجها قتل وأنه تركها في مسكن ليس له وأسألتته في الانتقال فأنف لها فقال إذا كنت بباب الحجرة أمر بها فردت وأمرها أن تعبد عليه حديثها ففعلت ففرماها ألا تبرح حتى يبلغ الكتاب أجله قال وأخبرنا ماهر عن سعد بن إسحاق قال أحمد بن خالد أخبرني الدبري سعيد بن إسحاق وانمأي أعرفه سعد بن إسحاق فقرأ عليا عن عبد الرزاق عن ماهر عن سعيد بن إسحاق عن كعب بن عجرا أنه حدثه عن عمة زينب ابنته كعب بن فرحة بهذا الحديث وزاد ماهره لما كان في زمن عثمان اتفرجت في امرأة تساعف عن ذلك قالت فرحته فذكرت له فأرسل إلى فضلاني فأخبرته فامرأه لا تخرج من بيتها حتى يبلغ الكتاب أجله

Ibn Abdal Barr knew of Abdar Razzaq’s narration from Muhammad ibn Yusuf mentioning 21 rak’as as follows in his al-Tamheed (8/113):

وباختير العلماء في عيد قيام رمضان فقال مالك تسع وتلاتون بالوتيرة سبت وتلاتون والوتير ثلاث وزعم أنه الأمر القديم وقال الثوري وأبو حنيفة والشافعي وداود ومن اتبعهم عورون ركعة يوم الوتر لا يقام بأكثر منها استحبوا وأصحاب الحديث السائب بين يزيد أنهم كانوا يقومون في زمن عمر بن الخطاب بعشرين ركعة ذكر عبد الرزاق عن داود بن قيس وغيره عن محمد بن يوسف عن السائب بن يزيد أن عمر بن الخطاب

⁵⁴ The narration is found in the printed edition of the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq (7/33-34, no. 12073) as follows:

عبد الرزاق، عن ماهر، عن الزهري، عن ابن لعب بن عجرة قال: حديثي عمتي. وكانت تحت أبي سعيد الخدري أن فرحة حدثتها أن زوجها خرج في طلب أعلام أبيقام، حتى إذا كان بطرف القعود، وهو جبل - أدركهم فقتلهو، قال: فأتت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، فذكرته له أن زوجها قتل، وأنه تركها في مسكن ليس له، واستأدائته في الانتقال، فأنف لها فانطلقت حتى إذا كانت بباب الحجرة أمرها فردت وأمرها أن تعبد عليه حديثها، فقالت: "ففعلت، فأمرواها أن لا تخرج حتى يبلغ الكتاب أجله.

⁵⁵ 21/28 (Moroccan Awqaf edn)
This is sufficient attestation from the words of Imam Ibn Abdal Barr that he:

i) Had no problems with the transmission of al-Dabari's report from Abdar Razzaq for 21 rak'ats

ii) The narration for 20 rak'ats from Saa'ib ibn Yazid was used as proof by the Imams like al-Thawri, Abu Hanifa, al-Shafi'i, Dawud al-Zahiri and their followers

iii) Imam Malik said it was 39 rak'ats with the witr included

Imam Ibn Abdal Barr has also repeated the narration from Abdar Razzaq in his al-Istidhkar as follows without raising any objection against al-Dabari or his Shaykh, Abdar Razzaq:

The third Hafiz of Hadith who has quoted this very narration from Abdar Razzaq without any objection to al-Dabari was a contemporary to Ibn Hajar, namely, Imam Badrud-Din al-Ayni (d. 855 AH). In his commentary to Sahih al-Bukhari, known as Umdatul Qari (11/ 126) he mentioned the 21 Rak'at variant as follows:

56 5/154, no. 6274, Qal ‘aji edition
The above is clear to show that Imam al-Ayni had no objection to the claim made by al-Albani and his followers that al-Dabari transmitted it incorrectly from Abdar Razzaq with the wording for 21 rak'ats. These are thus three well known Huffaz of Hadith, namely, Ibn Abdal Barr, Ibn Hajar and al-Ayni, who all knew of and quoted Abdar Razzaq's narration via Muhammad ibn Yusuf from Saa'ib ibn Yazid (ra) mentioning it as 21 rak'ats. This is sufficient to dismiss the claims of the Albani’ites against this narrations transmission by al-Dabari.
Two recent contemporaries who authenticated or accepted the narration for 21 rak’ats from the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq

In recent times two acknowledged Hadith specialists have also quoted Abdar Razzaq’s narration for 21 rak’ats without any objection against al-Dabari or Abdar Razzaq himself. The first being, Shaykh Muhammad Ali al-Nimawi (d. 1322 AH) in his notes to Athar al-Sunan, printed as Ta’liq al-Hasan. It has been said before:

“A l-N imawi placed a footnote (p. 249, no. 776, fn. 279) in his comments to Athar al-Sunan known as Ta’liq al-Hasan, where he clearly mentioned the following crucial point:

قُولَتْ بِأَحَدِ إِثْرَةِ رَكْعَةٍ قَالَ الْحَافِظُ ابْنِ حِجرِ فِي الْفَتْحِ وَرُوَاهُ عِبَادُ الرَّزَاقِ مِنْ وَجْهٍ أَخْرَجَ مُحَمَّدُ الْبَ شَيْكْحُ الْبَ حَسَنُ فَقَالَ أَحَدِ إِثْرَةِ وَعَشْرِينَ اِنْتَهَى

This is a very concise statement from Shaykh al-Nimawi clarifying the fact in the footnote to Athar al-Sunan that though the sanad found in the Muwatta Malik is determined by some to be Sahih, it has been mentioned by al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his Fath al-Bari from Abdar Razzaq via another chain of transmission from Muhammad ibn Yusuf where he said 21 rak’ats, (and not 11!).

This clearly shows that Shaykh al-Nimawi did not know of any claim that al-Dabari may have mistakenly reported it with 21 rak’ats from Abdar Razzaq, but on the contrary he has accepted Ibn Hajar’s silence on this narration which indicates it to be at least Hasan (good) as a narration.
The second being Shaykh Shu‘ayb al-Arna‘ut of Amman in Jordan. In his editing of the Siyar a‘lam an-Nubala\(^{57}\) of Hafiz al-Dhahabi he mentioned the narration from Abdar Razzaq for 21 rak‘ats and declared its sanad to be strong (qawi):

سنده منقطع، أخرجه أبو داود (1429) في الصلاة: يلب القنوت في الوتر، من طريق شجاع بن مخلد، عن هشيم، عن يونس بن عبيد، عن الحسن، "أن عمر بن الخطاب جمع الناس على أبي بن كعب، فكان يصلي لهم عشرين ركعة. ولا يقت بهم إلا في النصف الثاني، فإذا كتب العشر الآخرين تخلف، فصلى في بيته، فقالوا يقولون: أين أبي؟" وأخرج ابن أبي شيبة من حديث عبد العزيز بن رفيق قال: كان أبي بن كعب، رضي الله عنه، يصلي بالمدينة عشرين ركعة، ويوتر ثلاث. وهذا مرسلاً قوياً السند. وأخرج أيضاً عن بني بن سعيد، أن عمر بن الخطاب أمر رجلاً يصلي بهم عشرين ركعة. وأخرج عبد الرزاق، في "المصنف" (7730)، من طريق داود بن قيس وغيره، عن محمد بن يوسف، عن السائب بن يزيد، أن عمر جمع الناس في رمضان على أبي بن كعب - على تيم الداري - على إحدى وعشرين ركعة يقرون بالمفتي، ويصرفون عند فروع الفجر "، وهذا سنده قوي. وأخرج البهقلي في "سنن" 2 / 496 من طريق علي بن الجعد، عن ابن أبي نبى، عن يزيد ابن خصعة، عن السائب بن يزيد، قال: كانوا يقومون على عهد عمر بن الخطاب، رضي الله عنه، بعشرين ركعة. قال: وكانوا يقرون بالمفتي، وكانوا يقرون على عهد عثمان، رضي الله عنه، من شدة القيام، وهذا إسناد صحيح، رجاله كلهم أدلوا تقات.

Additionally, Shaykh Shu‘ayb also mentioned other supporting narrations for 20 Rak‘ats that shall be mentioned with exemplification in due course.

\(^{57}\) 1/401, fn. 1
“Salafi” writers who authenticated
the narration for 21 rak'ats in the
Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq

One of the contemporaries from the same sect as Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban is the Saudi writer, Salman al-Awda. In 2007, he gave an answer on a website where he declared the above narration from Abdar Razzaq for 21 rak'ats to have a Sahih sanad, as well as the one from the Muwatta Malik stating 11 rak'ats as follows:

Note also how he acknowledged the narration from Sa‘îb ibn Yazid in al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra to have a Sahih sanad in line with a group of Huffaz of Hadith.

58 http://islamtoday.net/pen/show_articles_content.cfm?id=64&catid=38&artid=6295
It has also been mentioned earlier that another “Salafi” writer known as Mustafa al-Adawi (of Egypt) has also declared the isnad for Abdur Razzaq’s narration mentioning 21 rak’ats to be Sahih in his Bahth fi adad rak’at qiyam al-layl. 59

Lastly, another writer from the same sect as Abu Khuzaimah, Abu Hibban, al-Awda and al-Adawi is the late Saudi writer known as Abdullah al-Duwaish (d. 1407 AH). The latter wrote two works in discreditation of al-Albani’s weakening some authentic narrations and al-Albani’s authentication of some apparently weak narrations. In the former work entitled: Tanbih al-Qari li-taqwiyya ma du’afuhu al-A Ibani (p. 47) where he said all the narrators in Abdar Razzaq’s chain of transmission were Thiqat (trustworthy) as follows:

All this goes to show that writers from al-Albani’s own sect disagreed with him on this variant for 21 rak’ats found in the Musannaf Abdar Razzaq via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf.

One possible way of showing that Abdur Razzaq narrated this alternative account for 21 rak’ats accurately, and without a poor memory after his blindness, is to compare other narrations in this section of his Musannaf to other independent collections of Hadith

Fortunately, one other narration proves two points:

i) That Abdur Razzaq was accurate in this section of his Musannaf, and more importantly,

ii) That this same narration proves that more than eight rak’ats were

59 See p. 39
performed either by the Tabi'in\(^{60}\) or may be some Sahaba as well.

The narration in question has been reported by Imam Malik ibn Anas in his Muwatta.\(^{61}\) The chain of transmission and text is as follows:

\[ 253 \]

Yahya related to me from Malik from Dawud ibn al-Husayn that he heard al-A`raj say: “I never saw the people in Ramadan, but that they were cursing the disbelievers.” He added: “The reciter of the Qur’an used to recite Surah al-Baqara in eight rak’ahs and if he did it in twelve rak’ahs the people would think that he had made it easy.”

This narration has an authentic chain of transmission (Sahih) as Shaykh al-Nimawi has affirmed in his Athar al-Sunan.\(^{62}\) The same narration has been recorded with very similar wording (with the mention of twelve rak’ats as above), by Abdur Razzaq in his Musannaf\(^{63}\) via the following chain of transmission:

\[ 7734 \]

Book 6, p. 48, no. 6 of the English edition by A. A. Bewley. It was also recorded via the route of Imam Malik by al-Bayhaqi in the following of his works: al-Sunan al-Kubra (2/497), Fadil al-Awqat (no. 123), Shu`ab al-Iman (3/177, no. 3271), as well as Kitab al-Siyam (no. 161) of al-Faryabi

\[^{60}\text{The students of the Sahaba in general}\]

\[^{61}\text{Book 6, p. 48, no. 6 of the English edition by A. A. Bewley. It was also recorded via the route of Imam Malik by al-Bayhaqi in the following of his works: al-Sunan al-Kubra (2/497), Fadil al-Awqat (no. 123), Shu`ab al-Iman (3/177, no. 3271), as well as Kitab al-Siyam (no. 161) of al-Faryabi}\]

\[^{62}\text{P. 250, no. 777.}\]

\[^{63}\text{4/262, no. 7734.}\]
Isnad:

Abdar Razzaq from Malik, from Dawud ibn al-Husayn, from Abdur Rahman ibn Humuz (al-A’raj).

Dawud ibn al-Husayn was declared to be Thiqa (trustworthy) by Ibn Hajar in al-Taqreeb.64

Abdur Rahman ibn Humuz was commonly known as al-A’raj. He has been declared to be not only trustworthy (thiqah) but also meticulous (thabt) by Ibn Hajar in al-Taqreeb.65

What may be concluded from this authentic narration is as follows:

i) Al-Dabari related this narration from Abdar Razzaq who relayed this same narration from his teacher, Imam Malik ibn Anas without any noticeable change in wording. This could lead one to conclude that Abdar Razzaq and his pupil (al-Dabari) were not confused in their preservation of this narration, and particularly this section of the Musannaf.

ii) That more than 8 rak‘ahs of Taraweeh was performed, since al-A’raj mentioned it taking 12 rak‘ats to recite the whole of Surah al-Baqara alone sometimes.

iii) Al-A’raj was a student of some of the Sahaba and he died in the year 117 AH. Hence, the people that he referred to as cursing the disbelievers in Ramadan and performing more than 8 rak‘ats were either Sahaba or fellow students of the Sahaba. This narration proves that Taraweeh was in excess of 8 rak‘ats in the first century of Islam. Al-A’raj does not mention the maximum limit for Taraweeh to be 8 rak‘ahs as some people have claimed, and this includes the claims made by al-Qadi Abu Bakr ibn al-Arabi66 (in his commentary to Jami al-Tirmidhi), Muhammad ibn Isma’il al-San’ani and

64 No. 1779

65 No. 4033

66 A Maliki scholar of Hadith, Qur’anic commentary (Tafsir) and an Ash‘ari in Creed. He died in the year 543 AH. See later for more on Qadi Ibn al Arabi’s view.
al-Albani. What ultimately counts is the proof and not views of individuals.

**Additional point of benefit:**

One of the later scholars of Hadith who was anti-Taqleed and made his own Ijtihad at times was the former Zaydi Yemeni Shaykh, **Muhammad Ali al-Shawkani** (d. 1250 AH). In his well known work known as نيل الموارث شرح متناقث الأخبار (3/60-61) he has mentioned the following claim with regard to a narration from Muhammad ibn Nasr al-Marwazi:

The crucial bit from the scan above being:

---

$^{67}$ Printed by Mustafa al Babi al Halabi in Egypt. The same wording from al-Shawkani is found in the edition of نيل الموارث (5/179) printed by Dar Ibn al Jawzi (Riyadh, 1st edn, 1427 AH) with the tahqiq of Muhammad Subhi Hallaq (who seems to be an Albani admirer)
Points from the above:

i) Al-Shawkani claimed that Muhammad Ibn Nasr has also transmitted a narration from Muhammad Ibn Yusuf with the wording for 21 Rak'ats. This narration that he referred to is not found in the present edition of Ibn Nasr’s Qiyam al-Layl which has only been printed to date in an abridged format (mukhtasar). It may be that al-Shawkani had access to the full edition of Ibn Nasr’s work and saw the route from Ibn Yusuf for 21 rak’ats.

ii) If al-Shawkani is correct in his assertion that Ibn Nasr transmitted from Ibn Yusuf with the wording for 21 rak’ats, then it is possibly a support for the narration from Abdar Razzaq mentioning also 21 rak’ats.

iii) On the other hand, it may be that al-Shawkani has mistakenly claimed it to be recorded by Ibn Nasr from Ibn Yusuf with 21 rak’ats, and he should have actually mentioned the name of Abdar Razzaq. This is said on the basis that al-Shawkani had at hand the quotations from Ibn Hajar’s Fath al-Bari where he mentioned some points from it in his own expressive format.

iv) Like Ibn Hajar, al-Shawkani also claimed similarly that in Imam Malik’s al-Muwatta it has been recorded via Ibn Khusayfa that Sae’ib (ra) related the wording as 20 rak’ats, though this does not appear so in the printed recensions of the Muwatta in our time. Wallahu a’lam.
IMAM IBN ABDAL BARR'S VERDICT ON
MUHAMMAD IBN YUSUF'S NARRATION FROM
SA‘A’IB IBN YAZID FOR 11 RAK’ATS

It has been shown above that the narration from Abdar Razzaq for 21 rak’ats was not criticized to be a mistake by al-Dabar or his Shaykh Abdar Razzaq, based on what was quoted from the pens of Huffaz of Hadith like: Ibn Abdal Barr, Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani and al-Ayni, as well as what recent writers on Hadith like al-Nimawi, Shu‘ayb al-Arna’ut, Salman al-Awda, Mustafa al-Adawi and the late, Abdullah al-Duwaish had all stated in affirmation of its authenticity.

What now remains is the demonstration that Muhammad ibn Yusuf’s variant from Sa‘a’ib ibn Yazid for 11 rak’ats is an error on his part, and it is thus Shadh (aberrant due to contradicting something more stronger) in its wording as it contradicts that which has been correctly preserved by Yazid ibn Khusayfa and Ibn Abi Dhubab, both from Sa‘a’ib ibn Yazid, as well as the independent narration from Ubayy ibn Ka’b (as in Musnad Ibn Mani’ and al-Mukhtara of Diya al-Maqdisi), and the supporting mursal narrations from Yazid ibn Ruman, Yahya al-Qattan, Muhammad ibn Qa‘b al-Qurazi and Abdal Aziz ibn Rufa‘i.

Imam Abu Umar ibn Abdal Barr (d. 463 AH) mentioned in his al-Istidhkar68 the following points:

وفي حديث مالك عن محمد بن يوسف عن السلب بن يزيد قال أمر أبي بن كعب
وتسبب الاداري ان يقوما للناس بإحدى عشرة ركعة (هذا قال مالك في هذا الحديث) إحدى عشرة ركعة (وعشرين) ولا أعلم أحدا قال في هذا الحديث إحدى عشرة ركعة غير مالك والله أعلم
إلا أنه يحتمل أن يكون القيام في أول ما عمل به عمر بإحدى عشرة ركعة ثم خلف عليهم طول القيام ونقلهم إلى إحدى وعشرين ركعة يخففون فيها القراءة ويزيدون في الركوع والسجود إلا أن الأغلب

68 5/154-158 in the edition printed and edited by Dr Abdul Mu’ti Qal’aji using 5 manuscripts, Cairo, 1993 CE, and it is in vol. 2/pp.66-70 of the edition printed by Darul Kutub Ilmiyya, Beirut, 2000CE
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وعندى في إحدى عشرة ركعة الوهيم واللهم أعلم
وذكر عبد الرحمن بن عساى وقد بعض عن عبد الرحمن بن يزيد أن عمر بن الخطاب جمع الناس في رمضان على أبي بن كعب ولهم إذا رماهم ركعة يقومون بالمنين ويتشرعون في فروع الفجر.
وذكر عـمر بن عـمان عن يحيى بن سعيد أن عمر بن الخطاب نـع رجلاً صلى بهم عشرة ركعـة

وروي الحارث بن عبد الرحمن بن أبي ذاب عن الساـبق بن يزيد قال كنا ننصرف من القيام على عهد عمر (وقد نان فروع الفجر) وكان القيام على عهد عمر بن يـزيد ركعتين ركعة.

وذكر عبد الرحمن بن عبد الرحمن بن أبي موسى أن يـزيد يحـسـب أخبره عن الساـبق بن يـزيد قال جمع عمر الناس على أبي بن كعب وتمام المارد فكان أبي يوتيت بثلاث ركعتين.

وروي محرر بن كنان عن الأحمر بن يزيد أن الأحمر بن رضوان قال: "كنا نحن نلتزمن في ما أنزل الله من للناس.

وروي مالك عن يزيد بن رومان قال: كان الناس يقومون في زمن عمر بن الخطاب في رمضان.

بلغت وتعني ركعتين.

وـهذا كله يشهد بأن الرواية بإحدى عشرة ركعة وهـم وـبلغت وأن الصحيح ثلاث.

وـعـرى وـأحـدى وـعـشرون ركعة واللـه أـعلم.

وقد روى أبو شيبة واسمه إبراهيم بن عليه عن عثمان عن الحكيم عن يـزيد أن رسول الله عليه السلام كان يسـل في رمضان عشرين ركعة وـالتر والـيـلي أبو شيبة بالقوي عدهم.

ذكره بن أبي شيبة عن يزيد بن رومان عن أبي شيبة إبراهيم بن عثمان.

وروى ثقـرر ركعة عـلى وشـتـر يـن شـكـيـر وـأمي مـلهـما وـالـحـاـرث الـهـمـدـاني وأمي البـخـتـرـي.

وـهـو قـول جمـهور الـعـلـامـ وـهـم قـالوـن الكـوـفـيـون وـالـشـافـعـيـ وـأـثـر الـفـقهاء.

وـهو الـصـيـحـبـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ~~~~~~~~~~~~

السورة الباقية في الصحابية.

وقال علياء أدرك الناس وهم يصلون ثلاثاً وعشرين ركعة بالوتر، وكان الأسود) بن يزيد بصلي أربعين ركعة يوتيت يسيع.

وروى مالك عن يزيد بن زيد بن رضوان وثلاث ركعـة حتى يـنـبـذ

وروى مالك عن يزيد بن رومان.

وذكر عبد الرحمن بن مهدي عن داوود بن قيس قال: "أدرك الناس بالمدينة في زمن عمر بن عبد العزيز وأبان بن عثمان صلى ستة وثلاثين ركعة ويوتيت بثلاث.

وقال الثوري وأبو حنيفة والشافعي وأحمد بن داوود قيل رمضان عشرون ركعة سوى الوتـر لا يقام.

وبالتواجد الأصل.

وذكر عن وكيل عن حسن بن صالح عن عمرو بن قيس عن أبي الحسن عن علي أنه أمر رجلاً.
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Some of the crucial points that Ibn Abdal Barr raised above include:

i) Abdar Razzaq narrated via Muhammad ibn Yusuf from Saa‘ib for 21 rak’ats in the time of Umar (ra)

ii) Malik ibn Anas reported from Yahya al-Qattan (in mursal form) that in the time of Umar a man lead for 20 rak’ats

iii) Al-Harith ibn Abdar Rahman ibn Abi Dhubab related from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid that in Umar’s time it was 23 rak’ats (inclusive of 3 rak’ats of witr). This narration is found in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq and it will be analyzed below.

iv) Abdar Razzaq has narrated with his sanad back to Saa‘ib ibn Yazid that in Umar’s time 3 rak’ats of Witr was performed by Ubayy ibn Ka‘b (ra)

v) Malik narrated from Yazid ibn Ruman in mursal form that in Umar’s time it was 23 rak’ats

With all of these variant and supporting narrations mentioned above this lead Imam Ibn Abdal Barr to pass his verdict as follows:

و هذا كله يشهد بأن الرواية بإحدى عشرة ركعة وهم و غلط وأن الصحيح ثلاث و عشرون واحد وعشرون ركعة

---

69 The Mursal narrations that Imam Malik recorded in his Muwatta are Sahih to him
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“And all this testifies that the narration for 11 rak'ats is an erroneous mistake (wahm wa ghalat) and that the authentic (Sahih narration) is 23 and 21 rak'ats.”

This is a clear cut declaration from a Hafiz of Hadith that the version for 11 rak'ats transmitted by Muhammad ibn Yusuf is an error on his part since he narrated it also with the wording for 21 rak'ats. This latter variant found in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq was declared by Ibn Abdal Barr to be the Sahih variant, as well as the one from al-Harith ibn Abdar Rahman ibn Abi Dhubab from Sa'a'ib with the wording being 23 rak'ats.

Note also, that a few lines later Ibn Abdal Barr said:

وهو قول جمهور العلماء ويه قال الكوفيون والشافعي وأكثر الفقهاء وهو الصحيح عن أبي بن كعب (من غير خلاف من الصحابة وقال عطاء أدرك الناس وهم يصلون ثلاثاً وعشرين ركعة بالوتر وكان الأسود بن يزيد يصلي أربعين ركعة ويوتر بسبع وذكر بن القاسم عن مالك تسع وثلاثون والوتر ثلاث وزمانه الأمر القديم

وذكر بن أبي شيبة قال حدثنا عبد الرحمن بن مهدي عن داود بن قيس قال أدرك الناس بالمدينة في زمن عمر بن عبد العزيز وأبان بن عثمان يصلون ستاً وثلاثين ركعة ويوتران ثلاث وقال الثوري وأبو حنيفة والشافعي وأحمد بن داود قام رمضان عشرون ركعة سوى الوتر لا يقام بأكثر منها استحباباً وذكر عن وكيع عن حسن بن صالح عن عمرو بن قيس عن أبي الحسن عن علي أن الرجلا

يصلي بهم في رمضان عشرين ركعة وهذا هو الاختيار عندنا وباينه توافقنا

This last quote is a Hujja (proof) from Ibn Abdal Barr that:

i) The majority of scholars from the Kufans (in Iraq), al-Shafi‘i and the majority of Fuqaha (jurisprudents) held the position for 20 rak'ats
ii) It is Sahih from Ubayy ibn Ka'b - meaning it is proven that this noble Sahabi did lead for 20 rak'ats and Ibn Abdal Barr said there was no difference of opinion from the Sahaba on this

iii) Ibn al-Qasim reported his teacher, Imam Malik saying 39 rak'ats with witr

iv) In the time of the noble Caliph of Madina, Umar ibn Abdal Aziz and Aban ibn Uthman it was also 36 rak'ats with 3 witr on top

v) Al-Thawri, Abu Hanifa and al-Shafi'i, all affirmed 20 rak'ats besides the witr. In the Arabic text it states the name of Ahmed ibn Dawud affirming this also, but what is correct is that this is a scribal error as it should be Ahmed (ibn Hanbal) and Dawud (al-Zahiri).  

Finally, Ibn Abdal Barr declared his own position to be 20 rak'ats by saying:

و هذا هو الاختيار عندنا وبيان الله توفيقتنا

Meaning that: “And this, it is the preferred choice we have with us and our success is with Allah.”

What was mentioned above from Ibn Abdal Barr’s al-Istidhkar was also mentioned partially by a well known pseudo-Salafi Fatwa site71 as follows:

---

70 This distinction was correctly printed in the Mawsua Shuruha al-Muwatta (5/46) published under the supervision of Abdullah al-Turki. Besides, Ibn Abdal Barr mentioned it as Dawud in his earlier al-Tamheed as we have quoted in this treatise
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Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said in al-Istidhkaar (2/69):

Twenty rak’ahs was narrated from ‘Ali, Shateer ibn Shakl, Ibn Abi Mulaykah, al-Haarith al-Hamadaani and Abîl-Bakhtari. It is the view of the majority of scholars and it is the view of the Kufis, the Shaafa’is and most of the fuqahâ. It was narrated in saheeh reports from Ubayy ibn Ka’b, and there was no difference of opinion among the Sahaabah. “Ata” said: I grew up at a time when the people prayed twenty-three rak’ahs including Witr.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said in al-Istidhkaar (2/68):

It may be understood as meaning that at first qiyaam at the time of Umar was eleven rak’ahs, then he reduced the length of qiyaam for them and made it twenty-one rak’ahs, to make the recitation lighter for them and so that they would bow and prostrate more. But it seems most likely to me that the report about eleven rak’ahs is a mistake. And Allaah knows best. End quote.

One point that can be deduced from the above points is that Ibn Abdal Barr like al-Tirmidhi in his al-Jami before him did not know of a single faqih or Sahabi from the Salaf who said the Sunna of the Sahaba in the time of Umar ibn al Khattab (ra) was definitely 8 rak’ats perpetually and not 20 rak’ats at all.
SUPPORTING NARRATIONS FOR 20 RAK’ATS IN UMAR IBN AL KHATTAB’S (ra) TIME

The two compilers knew of some other narrations from Saa’ib ibn Yazid via routes not coming through Muhammad ibn Yusuf or Yazid ibn Khusayfa, and they also affirm 20 rak’ats Taraweeh (not counting the rak’ats of Witr). These other narrations were all dismissed by them.

A) Another variant narration from Saa’ib ibn Yazid for 20 Rak’ats Taraweeh

As in the Ma’rifatus Sunan of al-Bayhaqi

Imam al-Bayhaqi narrated with his isnad the following report in his Ma’rifatus Sunan wal A’thar (4/42, no. 5409):

أَخْبَرْنَا أَبُو طَاهِرٍ الْقَفِيَّةَ قَالَ: أَخْبَرْنَا أَبُو عُثْمَانَ الْبَصَّرِيَّ قَالَ: حَنْتَنَا أَبُو أَقْحَدُ مُحَمَّدٌ بْنُ عُبَيْدَ الْوَهْفَابَ قَالَ: أَخْبَرْنَا حَالِدَ بْنُ مُحَلَّدُ قَالَ: حَنْتَنَا مُحَمَّدٌ بْنُ جَعْفَرٍ قَالَ: حَنَّا يَزِيدُ بْنُ خَصْيَقَةٍ قَالَ: عَنِ السَّمَّارِيَّ بْنِ يَزِيدٍ قَالَ: كَلَّا نَقُومُ فِي زَمَانِ عُمَّرٍ بَنِ الخطَّابِ بِعَشْرِينَ رَكَاعَةٌ وَالْوَلَدَر

The Isnad being: Abu Tahir al-Faqih -> Abu Uthman al-Basri -> Abu Ahmad Muhammad ibn Abdal Wahhab -> Khalid ibn Makhlad -> Muhammad ibn Ja’far -> Yazid ibn Khusayfa -> Saa’ib ibn Yazid, who said:

"In the time of `Umar ibn al-Khattab (radiallahu anhu) we used to observe 20 rak’ats and the Witr.”
The above version from al-Bayhaqi was also mentioned by al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his al-Diraya fi Takhrij ahadith al-Hidayah (1/203) as well as the mursal narration from Yazid ibn Ruman (for 23 rak’ats inclusive of Witr) as in Muwatta Malik:

روى البُيْتِيُّ من طريق السَّبَّابِ بن يَزِيد كَانَتَا نَقُومَ في زمن عمر بِعْشَرَينَ رَكْعَةٍ وَأَوْلَدُ وَقَالَ رَكانَكَ.

Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban in their short article mentioned earlier entitled, An Answer to the article entitled Evidence for 20 rak’ahs of Taraweeh from authentic ahadith, said about the above narration on p. 2:

The two narrators Abu Tahir al-Faqih -> Abu Uthman al-Basri, are unknown i.e. are majhool and their biographies to establish their trustworthiness cannot be found, so the this narration is rejected due to it being weak because two people in the chain are unknown. The hanafi scholar72 you oft quote and the one you have pride in also say:“Abu Taahir is in need of some reliance and he said about the second narrator, Abu Uthmaan al-Basri, I could not find his biography or condition in any of the books!” (Ta‘leeq al-Hasan A’la Aathaaras-Sunan (p.252) Maktabah Imdaadiyyah)

Reply:

Rather the two narrators: Abu Tahir al-Faqih and Abu Uthman al-Basri were more known than Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibbaan in the world of Hadith Mastership! With their grammatical errors, they have shown their lack of investigation into these two narrators and what the scholars of the past have mentioned about them. These two narrators are known and the narration is not weak or rejected as they baselessly claimed.

72 The Hanafi scholar they are referring to is Shaykh Muhammad Ali al-Nimawi, whose words were cut up by these two compilers (see later).
Rather, the narration is Sahih without doubt and a number of scholars have accepted it or declared it Sahih. It is corroborated by the longer version that al-Bayhaqi mentioned in his al-Sunan al-Kubra and Fada'il al-Awqat, as well as that in the Musnad of Ali ibn al Ja’d and al-Siyam of al-Firyabi – all via the route of Yazid ibn Khusayfa. It is also independently strengthened from the narration recorded in the Musnad of Ibn Mani’ and via his route by Diya al-Maqdisi in al-Mukhtara.

In claiming that the 2 narrators are unknown they have made Taqleed of the claims of the anti-Hanafi commentator of al-Jami al-Tirmidhi, known as Abdur Rahman al-Mubarakpuri (d. 1935) of India from his Tuhfat al Ahwadh (3/530)! The latter mentioned some major Ulama of the past who had authenticated this narration, but he was unconvinced due to his not finding any Jarh or Ta’dil on Abu Tahir and his Shaykh, Abu Uthman, when he said:

Thus, al-Mubarakpuri admitted that the narration at hand was declared to have a Sahih isnad by Imams Taqiud-Din al Subki (d. 756 AH) in his Sharh al-Minhaj and Ali al-Qari al-Hanafi (d. 1014 AH) in his Sharh on Muwatta (Muhammad).

Imam al-Suyuti also mentioned this grading from Imam Taqi al-Subki’s Sharh al-Minhaj in his al-Masabih fi Salati Taraweeh by mentioning:

Similarly, the late Ubaydullah al-Mubarakpuri who was one of the students of Abdur Rahman al-Mubarakpuri also failed to find any background notices to Abu Tahir al-Faqih and Abu Uthman al-Basri in his commentary to Mishkat al-Masabih (of Waliud-Din al-Tabrizi) known as Mi’atul Mafatih
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The above quote mentions from al-Subki that it is not known exactly how many rak'ats that al-Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) prayed for the Taraweeh Salah, and his Madhhab (Shafi'i) is upon 20 rak'ats according to what al-Bayhaqi and other than him reported with a Sahih Isnad from Saa'ib ibn Yazid; then al-Subki mentioned the text that is found with this wording in al-Bayhaqi's Ma'rifatus Sunan.

The fact that al-Subki and al-Qari authenticated the isnad indicates that they had positive information to show that both Abu Tahir al-Faqih and Abu Uthman al-Basri were trustworthy; otherwise, it does not make much sense that they would have declared the Isnad to be Sahih without knowing the trustworthiness of these two narrators.

A look at the two narrators:

**Abu Tahir al-Faqih**

His biography was mentioned by al-Hafiz Shamsud-Din al-Dhahabi (d. 748 AH) in his *Siyar a'lam an-Nubala,* by Imam Abu Sa'd al-Sam'ani (d. 562 AH) in his *al-Ansab* (3/ 207, no. 4897), Imam al-Nawawi in his *Tahdhib al-Amsa wal Lughat* (1/ 829) where he mentioned Abu Tahir's biography from al-Hakim's Ta'rikh Naysabur; and according to the Hanafi Hadith expert that the duo were referring to: Shaykh Muhammad Ali al-Nimawi, the biography of Abu Tahir is also found in Tajud-Din in al-Subki’s well known work: Tabaqat al-Shafiyya al-Kubra. Shaykh al-Nimawi in his *Ta’liq al-Hasan ala A tahr al-Sunan* (p. 252) mentioned what al-Subki mentioned in his Tabaqat.

According to al-Dhahabi’s Siyar (17/ 726), Abu Tahir was: **"The Faqih (jurisprudent), al-Allama (greatly knowledgeable), al-Qudwa (the exemplary), Shaykh of Khurasan, Abu Tahir Muhammad ibn**

---

74 *Siyar a’lam an-Nubala* (17/ 276 onwards), Muassasa al-Risala edition, editing supervised by Shaykh Shu’ayb al-Arna’ut
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Al-Dhahabi said that he was born in 327 AH, but this is incorrect as the editor to the Siyar mentioned. In fact, he was born in the year 317 AH as al-Sam’ani affirmed in his al-Ansab (no. 4897) and al-Hakim in his Ta’rikh Naysabur (no. 821). The latter said that Abu Tahir heard Hadith in the year 325 AH. Al-Bayhaqi narrated well over 500 narrations from him in a number of his books, and al-Dhahabi in the Siyar said that Abu Tahir was "The Imam of their Madhhab (Shafi’i)" and that "He was the Imam of the Companions of Hadith (Ashab al-Hadith)...

This is mentioned to show that the real Hadith masters and companions of Hadith were mainly adherents of the recognised Sunni Madhhabs and no serious attention should be paid to many of those who claim to be the Ahlul Hadith (People of Hadith) of this age, shun Taqleed of the Sunni Madhhabs and declare it to be Haram or even Shirk!

Al-Nimawi mentioned al-Subki as saying also in his Tabaqat that Abu Tahir was the, "Imam of the Hadith scholars and jurisprudents in Naysabur in his age and he was a Shaykh, a man of letters (adiban), a master of Arabic language...

According to al-Dhahabi in al-Siyar and Abdal Ghafir al-Naysaburi (d. 529 AH) in his Kitab al-Siyaq li Ta’rikh Naysabur, Abu Tahir al-Faqih died in the year 410 AH.

As for his status as a Hadith narrator, then he was no doubt Thiqa (trustworthy) to al-Dhahabi. Moreover, his praise of him is no less than his acknowledgement that Abu Tahir is reliable in Hadith. Nevertheless, if the likes of the duo dispute

75 In some chains of transmission he is mentioned as Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Ziyadi, and he is also known as Abu Tahir ibn Mahmish

76 Al-Dhahabi’s laudatory remarks seem to emanate from Kitab al-Siyaq li Ta’rikh Naysabur by al-Hafiz Abdal Ghafir, who mentioned the following entry on Abu Tahir al-Faqih:

أبو طاهر الزيداني محمد بن محمد بن محمص بن علي بن أبو طاهر الإمام ويعرف بالزيداني لأنه كان يسكن ميدان زياد بن عبد الرحمن إمام أصحاب الحديث بفخارسان وفقتهما وثقاتهما بالإضافة إلى مدافعة وكان له تبحر في علم القدر والاذاب وصفه كتابا في القدر ولد سنة ثلاثة عشرة وكلاطم ومات سنة عشر وأربع مانة ودفن في مغفرة الحبها
this claim then it is worth them knowing that Hafiz al-Dhahabi in his Siyar a’lam an-Nubala ⁷⁷ has given a Hadith via an Isnad containing Abu Tahir going back to Ibn Umar (ra), and al-Dhahabi said: “This Hadith has a Sahih Isnad.” For al-Dhahabi to say this indicates that he held Abu Tahir to be Thiqa in Hadith.

Besides this, al-Hakim did list Abu Tahir al-Faqih in his Ta’rikh Naysabur as mentioned above, and his methodology in this work appears to be that all the narrators he listed to be his teachers in the Ta’rikh with no Jarh on them may be reliable narrators to him. There are a number of narrators that he listed in the Ta’rikh where he made no Jarh upon or explicit Ta’dil, but he did narrate via them in his al-Mustadrak ala’l Sahihayn.

Indeed, **Imam al-Nawawi** (d. 676 AH) mentioned that al-Hakim praised Abu Tahir al-Faqih in his Tahdhib al-Asma al-Lughat as follows:

The point that al-Hakim praised Abu Tahir al-Faqih was also mentioned by **Imam Ibn Qadi Shuhba** (d. 851 AH) in his Tabaqat al-Shafiyya (1/ 193).

**Imam ibn Kathir** (d. 774 AH) also mentioned an example in his al-Sira al-Nabawiyya (2/ 203) with an isnâd containing Abu Tahir as recorded by al-Bayhaqi:

---

⁷⁷ 18/421-421, under the biography of Abu Salih Ahmed ibn Abdal Malik al-Muaddin, the Sufi from Naysabur, where al-Dhahabi also affirmed that Abu Salih took Hadith from Abu Tahir ibn Mahmish
Ibn Kathir declared the above isnâd to be Jayyid Qawi (good and strong). This is an indication that Ibn Kathir did not consider Abu Tahir to be majhûl (unknown) and he must have known some form of tawthîq (praiseworthy grading) on Abu Tahir al-Faqih.

If this was not explicit enough for the duo then they may wish to note that Al-Hafiz Abu Ya’la Al-Khalili (d. 446 AH) who lived close to the time of Abu Tahir al-Faqih has mentioned in his al-Irshad fi Ma’rifa Ulama al-Hadith 78 a short biography for Abu Tahir al-Faqih as follows:

أبو طاهر محمد بن محمّد بن محمّد الزيدي التقي المبرز كان يقدم في الفقه على من أدركته بنيسابور وقرأ عليه أبو يعقوب البوردي وأبو حامد الإسغري وهم هو أقدم منهم سمع أبو حامد بن بلال الميداني ومحمد بن الحسين القطان والأصم والأشرم وأقرانهم ملت بعد الأربعمائة ثقة متفق عليه.

Hence, al-Khalili declared Abu Tahir to be, “Thiqatun Muttafaqun alayh: Agreed upon to be trustworthy.”

This is sufficient to demonstrate that Abu Tahir al-Faqih is Thiqâ and not an unknown (Majhul) narrator as the duo claimed.

78 Al-Irshad (3/862, no. 774), edited by Muhammad Sâ’d Umar Idris, Maktaba al-Rushd, Riyadh, 1989 CE
Abu Uthman al-Basri

Al-Hafiz Shamsud-Din al-Dhahabi has given a short biography of Abu Uthman once again in his Siyar a’lam an-Nubala (15/364-365), where he gave his full name as: Abu Uthman Amr ibn Abdallah ibn Dirham al-Basri al-Muttawwi al-Ghazi. Al-Dhahabi declared Abu Uthman to be, “The Imam, the exemplary (al-Qudwa), the ascetic (al-Zahid), the good (al-Salih).” 79

Al-Dhahabi’s laudation of Abu Uthman is an indication that he considered Abu Uthman to be acceptable as a trustworthy narrator of Hadith, especially since he used the word: “al-Salih” for him, which in the terminology of the Imams of al-Jarh wa Ta’dil is an indication that such a narrators Hadith’s are at least Hasan (good).

Indeed, al-Dhahabi also mentioned Abu Uthman in his biographical dictionary of the major preservers of Hadith (Huffaz), known as Tadhkirat al-Huffaz, 80 where he included those major Hadith masters who died under the year 334 AH, “And the Musnid of Naysabur Abu Uthman A bu Uthman A mr ibn A bdullah ibn D irham al-Muttawwi...”

In this work, al-Dhahabi declared Abu Uthman to be the Musnid of the city of Naysabur in Iran. The title “Musnid” is only given to the most major Hadith narrator of his day in a certain city or territory who had the most chains of transmission handed down to him from other Hadith scholars. Such a Musnid in those days in a scholarly city of Hadith like Naysabur could only have been a reliable narrator of Hadith to deserve such a title. Otherwise, one would have expected some from of disparagement (Jarh) to be recorded against him. Wallahu a’lam.

Another narrator that al-Dhahabi mentioned to be a Musnid in Naysabur in his Tadhkiratul Huffaz (4/55) was a companion of al-Bayhaqi’s known as Abu Bakr Abdar Rahman ibn Abdullah ibn Abdar Rahman al-Bahini. Al-Dhahabi said in the aforementioned work:


80 3/45, no. 825, under the biography of Abu Ali Muhammad ibn Sæed ibn Abdar Rahman al-Qushayri al-Harrani al-Hafiz)
Al-Dhahabi also mentioned him in his Siyar a’lam an-Nubala (20/ 156) where he declared him as a Trustworthy and good Shaykh who was the Musnid of Naysabur (al-Shaykh al-Thiqa al-Salih, Musnid Naysabur):

Abu Uthman al-Basri was also mentioned in al-Khalifa al-Naysaburi’s, Talkhis Ta’rikh Naysabur (p. 69), from Imam Abu Abdullah al-Hakim (d. 405 AH) with the following short entry

Al-Hakim was the Shaykh of al-Bayhaqi in Hadith and since he did not make any Jarh (disparagement) on Abu Uthman al-Basri, there is an indication that al-Hakim possibly considered him to be a trustworthy narrator (Thiqa).
Proof that Abu Uthman al-Basri was a trustworthy narrator to Imam al-Bayhaqi

Indeed, what demonstrates the above points that Abu Uthman al-Basri was a trustworthy narrator is due to the fact that al-Hakim’s pupil, al-Bayhaqi himself reported a narration going back to the noble Sahabi, Ibn Mas‘ud (ra) via the route of Abu Uthman al-Basri in his al-Sunan al-Kubra. Before he mentioned the isnâd, al-Bayhaqi mentioned that the isnâd is Sahih:

The fact that al-Bayhaqi declared the isnâd to be Sahih is sufficient proof that he considered Abu Uthman al-Basri and the rest of the narrators in the sanad to be Thiqâ (trustworthy).

Another example is found in al-Bayhaqi’s Ma‘rifatus Sunan wal Athar via the route of Abu Uthman al-Basri:

Once again, the sanad containing Abu Uthman al-Basri was declared Sahih by al-Bayhaqi.

---

82 See his Ma‘rifatus Sunan (3/15, no. 3485, edited by Dr Abdal Mu’ti Amin Qal’aji)
After al-Bayhaqi’s time, the later Hanbali known as Diya al-Maqdisi (d. 643 AH) also compiled a work on similar lines to the Mustadrak of al-Hakim known as al-Mukhtara. Al-Hakim and al-Maqdisi both attempted to collate narrations that fit the conditions of al-Bukhari and Muslim but not recorded in the two Sahih works of the latter named Imams of Hadith.

In al-Mukhtara (6/47, no. 2018) there is one narration recorded via the route of Abu Tahir al-Faqih from Abu Uthman al-Basri as follows:

وأخيرنا أبو الظفر عبد الرحيم بن عبد الكريم بن محمد بن منصور السمعاني بموافق أن آبا علي
الحسين بن علي بن الحسين الشامسي أخبرهم آبا أبو بكر أحمد بن علي بن عبد الله بن عمر بن
خلف الشيرازي آبا أبو طاهر محمد بن محمد بن محمتم الزيادي آبا أبو عثمان عمر بن
عبد الله البصري يتيمابور آبا أبو أحمد محمد بن عبد الوهاب بن حبيب العبدي الفراء
النبيسابور آبا خالد بن ملكل آبا محمد هو ابن جعفر آخر اسماعيل بن جعفر المدني حديثي حميد
الطويل عن نسقالرسطول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إذا أفلتم إلى الصلاة فعليكم بالمسكينة فما
أدركتم فصلوا وما فاتكم فاضروا.

This narration was Sahih to Diya al-Maqdisi and the editor of al-Mukhtara, the Saudi based Dr Abdul Malik Dahish said that its Isnad is Sahih. This indicates that both Diya al-Maqdisi and his editor both held Abu Uthman al-Basri to be reliable to say the least. Note also, that Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban made a point in their Qaul ul-Saheeh by saying:

The authors of the books of Saheeh by bringing a narrator of a saheeh hadeeth in their books indicates their authenticity according to them (ie Imama Is Ibn Khuzaimah and Ibn Hibbaan). (See al-Iqtaraah (pg.55) of Ibn Daqeeq al-Eed and Nasb ur-Raayah (1/149) and (3/264). Haafidh Ibn as-Salaah mentioned the same in is Uloom al-Hadeeth.

If they truly agree on this principle, then the onus remains on them to revise their claim that Abu Uthman al-Basri is majhûl (unknown) as well as the application of the above point they mentioned!
Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani has also mentioned an example in his al-Amali al-Mutlaqa, where he narrated a Hadith via the route of Abu Uthman al-Basri as follows:

أخبرنا أحمد بن أبي بكر بن عبد الحميد المقدسي وأبو هريرة بن الذهبي وخديجة بنت إبراهيم قراءة
عليها وإجازة من الآخرين قال الأول أخبرنا التقي سليمان بن حمزة وقال الآخران أخبرنا القاسم بن
أبي غالب قال أبو هريرة سمعنا الأخرين إن لم يكن سمعنا إجازة قالا أخبرنا محمود بن إبراهيم في
كتابه قال أخبرنا محمد بن أحمد بن عمر قال أخبرنا أبو عمر.

وأي أبي عبد الله بن منده قال أخبرنا أبو عثمان عمرو بن عبد الله البصري قال
حديثًا أبو أحمد محمد بن عبد الوهاب بن حبيب قال حدثنا يعلى بن عبيد قال حدثنا إسماعيل بن أبي
خلد ( ح )

وأخبرنا أبو هريرة إجازة أيضا بهذا الإسناد إلى ابن منهد قال أخبرنا أحمد بن إسماعيل العسكري قال
حديثًا يونس بن أبي الأعلى قال حدثنا سفيان بن عيينة عن إسماعيل بن أبي خالد عن أبي بكر بن
أبي زهير عن أبي بكر الصديق رضي الله عنه تعالى عن جدته بارسول الله كيف الصلاح بعد هذه الآية
( من يعمل سوءًا بغير الله ياتي بالعذاب في الآخرة ) أخبرنا أبو حاتم عن أبى داود عن جده
الأنبياء، وذكرنا به نفسي، على، لكن لم يقل للأسف تكثيف في رواية ابن ععينة أنها
تقصيب الأولاد، فقال، إنا قد ت경ون به نفسي، لكن لم يقل للأسف تكثيف في رواية ابن ععينة أنها
هذا حديث حسن.

The above hadith was narrated via 2 chains back to Ibn Manda, who took it once from Abu Uthman al-Basri and once from Ahmed ibn Isma'il al-Askari. Ibn Hajar declared the narration to be Hasan (good).

---

83 pp.77-78, printed by Maktaba al-Islami, Beirut, 1st edn, 1995 CE, edited by Hamdi Abdal Majid (an Albanii'tic)
A glance at Nasir al-Albani’s stance on Abu Tahir al-Faqih and Abu Uthman al-Basri

Al-Albani, who is the admired and foremost Hadith Shaykh of the two compilers being responded to, has mentioned the following about Abu Tahir and his Shaykh, Abu Uthman al-Basri, in his Silsila al-Da’eefa (11/786-787):


قلت: وهذا إسناد جيد؛ من فوق البصري كله ثقات من رجال "التهذيب".

وأما أبو عثمان البصري، فهو عمو بن عبد الله، كما في ترجمة محمد بن عبد الوهاب - وهو الفراء النيسابوري - من "التهذيب". وقد ذكره الحافظ الذهبي في وفيات سنة أربع وتلاتين وثلاث مننة، وسمى جده "أشرهما المطوعي"، ووصفه بأنه:

"المستند نيسابور" في كتابه "تذكرة الحافظ" (4/847).

وأما أبو طاهر الفقيه، فهو من شيوخ الحاكم المشهورين الذين أكثر عنهم في "المستدرك"، وشاركه في الرواية عنه تلميذه الذهبي، وسمه: محمد بن محمد ابن محنم الزيداء، أورده الذهبي في "التذكرة"، أيضًا في وفيات سنة عشر وأربع مننة.

وصفه بالله:

"المستند نيسابور العلامة"، وله ترجمة في "طبقات الشافعية" للسكيبي (3/82).

Thus, al-Albani, after mentioning a narration from al-Bayhaqi’s Shu’ab al-Iman with the latter’s chain of transmission (sanad) running via the route of Abu Tahir al-Faqih from Abu Uthman al-Basri has declared the sanad to be Jayyid (good), and in doing so he has depended on al-D hahabi mentioning the points that both Abu Tahir and Abu Uthman were the Musnîd’s of Naysabur in his Tadhkirat al-Huffaz. This is an indication that al-Albani held these two narrators to be not only known, but good enough to be not regarded as weak narrators. His grading of the specific chain to be Jayyid indicates that he held some form of ta’âlî (praise) for them.
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Another “Salafi” who indicated that Abu Tahir and Abu Uthman are trustworthy:


The above named Shu‘ab al-Iman of al-Bayahqi has been reprinted by Maktaba al-Rushd (in Riyadh), and the seventh volume was edited by Mukhtar Ahmed al-Nadwi of India. The latter was the publisher of an Indian edition of the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba, where he signed the end of his name with the appellation, “al-Salafi”. In volume seven (p. 68, no. 4659) there is a narration via Abu Tahir al-Faqih from Abu Uthman al-Basri going back to A’isha (ra). In the footnote, Mukhtar Ahmed said the following:

Hence, he considered the isnad to be Sahih and the subnarrators to be trustworthy, thus indicating Abu Tahir and Abu Uthman are Thiqa, despite not providing any references to attest why the two narrators are trustworthy according to his tahqiq.

Thus, both Abu Tahir al-Faqih and his teacher Abu Uthman al-Basri are not unknown (majhul), and the narration found in Bayhaqi’s Ma’rifatus Sunan wal Athar is Sahih in its Isnad according to al-Subki and al-Qari; it was mentioned by Ibn Hajar al Asqalani in al-Diraya without weakening it, accepted to be Sahih by al-Nimawi when he mentioned that al-Subki (in his Sharh al-Minhaj) and al-Qari (in his Sharh on Muwatta Muhammad) had authenticated it, and by Zafar Ahmed al-Uthmani (d. 1974 CE) in his 18 volume work on Hanafi proof texts known as I’la al-Sunan where he relied on al-Subki’s authentication of it.

84 Printed in Bombay by Dar al-Salafiyya, 2nd edn, 1979 CE

85 Ta’liq al-Hasan (p. 252) printed under his Athar al-Sunan

86 7/69, no. 1821
B) The narration from Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra) as recorded in the Musnad of Ahmed ibn Mani and al-Mukhtara of Diya al-Maqdisi al-Hanbali

The two compilers mentioned on p. 25 of their “Qaul ul Saheeh”:

The Second Narration

This has a different wording and at the end of the narration it mentions “And Ubayy ibn Ka’ab led them in 20 rakāhs” (cited by adh-Dhiyā al-Maqdīsī in al-Mukhtarāh (1/384) with the following chain, from Abee Jafar ar-Raazee from Rabee’a bin Anas from Abee A’aaliyyah from Ubayy bin Klab.

The Answer

Imaam al-Albaanees said this chain is weak. Abu Jafar who is Eesa bin Abee Eesaa bin Mahhaan. Imaam Dhahabee mentioned him in adh-Dhaafa and said, “Abu Zur’ah said, ‘Would err excessively?’ Ahmad said, “Not strong.” Another time he said, “Good in hadeeth.” Falaas said, “Bad memory.” And others have said he was trustworthy.” Imaam Dhahabee also said in al-Kunna,

“All of (the scholars) have criticised him.” Haafidh Ibn Hajr said in Taqreeeb,

“Bad memory.” Ibn Qayyim said in Zaad al-Maād (1/99), “One of abandoned narrations and he is not proof when alone in reporting even with one of the Ahlul-Hadeeth.

The Shaikh went on to say his narrations oppose more trustworthy narrators and then the Shaikh mentioned some example of such narrations. (Salaatul- Taraaweeh (pg.69-70)

The narration at hand was recorded by the later Hanafi Imam, Ali al-Muttaqi al-Hindi (d. 975 AH) in his Kanz al-Ummal87 as follows:

---

87 8/409, Muassasa al-Risala edition
It may also be added that al-Hafiz Ahmed ibn Abu Bakr al-Busayri in his Ithaf al-Khiyara (2/ 384) also mentioned it from Ahmed ibn Mani with its wording for 20 rak’ats, and he claimed it was found also in the Sunan al-Kubra of al-Nasa’i. Al-Busayri remained silent on the grading of this narration, as did Imam al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH) after him since he mentioned it in his Jami al-Ahadith (no. 28604).

The Musnad of Ahmed ibn Mani has not been printed to date, and its isnâd is nevertheless known since the Hanbali Shaykh, Diya al-Maqdisi (d. 643 AH) has transmitted it with his own sanad going back via Ibn Mani in his al-Mukhtara as follows:

```
1161 أخبرنا أبو عبد الله محمود بن أحمد بن عبدالرحمن الثقفي بأصبهان أن سعيد بن أبي رجاء الصيرفي أخبرهم قراءة على أنا عبد الواحد بن أحمد البقال أنا عبد الله بن يعقوب بن إسحاق أنا جدي إسحاق بن إبراهيم بن محمد بن جميل بن أحمد بن منيع أنا الحسن بن موسى بن نا أبو جعفر الرزاز عن الربيع بن أنس عن أبي الأثالية عن أبي بن كعب أن عمر أمر أبيا أن يصلي بالناس في رمضان فقال إن الناس يصومون النهار ولا ينسون أن ( يقرأوا ) فلو قرأت القرآن عليهم بالليل فقال يا أمير المؤمنين هذا شيء لم يكن قال فكلت ولكنه أحسن فصلى بهم عشرين ركعة.
( إسناده حسن )
```

88 Though it doesn’t appear to have reached the printed or manuscript copies used by other scholars

89 3/367, no. 1161 with the tahqiq of Dr Abdal Malik Dahish
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Thus the sanad from Ibn Mani is:

Al-Hasan ibn Musa - Abu Ja'far al-Razi - al-Rabi' ibn Anas - Abul Aliyya
from Ubayy ibn Ka'b (radiallahu anhu):

The text states:

"Umar (radiallahu anhu) ordered Ubayy to lead the people in prayer at night in Ramadan, saying, 'The people fast during the day and can not recite (the Qur'an) well, so will you recite the Qur'an for them at night? He said, 'O commander of the believers, this thing was not done before.' He said: 'I know, but it is better (ahsan)', (Ubayy) led them (the Companion's) for 20 rak'ats."
A LOOK AT THE RELIABILITY OF ABU JA’FAR AL RAZI AND HIS NARRATIONS

The only objection that al-Albani and his associates have raised is due to their weakening of the sub-narrator, Abu Ja’far al-Razi. Before going into examining their claims on this narrator, it is worth notifying the reader that Diya al-Maqdisi considered this narration to be Sahih as per his criteria for including this narration in al-Mukhtara, and the editor of this work, Dr Abdal Malik Dahish has graded the sanad to be Hasan (good).

A glance at the isnad mentioned above:

Ahmed ibn Mani’ was declared to be a Thiqah Hafiz (trustworthy preserver of hadith) by ibn Hajar in al-Taqrib al-Tahdhib:

أحمد بن منيع بن عبد الرحمن أبو جعفر البغوي الأصم ثقة حافظ من العاشرة مات سنة أربع وأربعين وله أربع وثمانية ع

The first narrator in Ibn Mani’s above isnâd was al-Hasan ibn Musa. The latter was declared Thiqah (trustworthy) by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his Taqrib al-Tahdhib:

الحسن بن موسى الأشيب بمعجمة ثم تحتانية أبو علي البغوي قاضي الموصل وغيرها

ثقة من التاسعة مات سنة تسع أو عشر وثمانية ع

Abu Ja’far al-Razi’s teacher was al-Rabi ibn Anas. Ibn Hajar said that al-Rabi was Saduq (truthful) but had some errors (lahu awham)90 in his al-Taqrib:

90 Ibn Hajar’s claim that al-Rabi had errors and his link to the Shi’a was disputed by Shaykh Shu’ayb al-Arna’ut and Dr Bashhar Awwad Ma’ruf in their Tahrir Taqrib al-Tahdhib (no. 1882)
Al-Rabi ibn Anas’s teacher was **Abul Aliyya** and he is **Rufa’i ibn Mihran Abul Aliyya al-Riyahi**. Ibn Hajar said in al-Taqrib that Abul Aliyya was Thiqa and he transmitted many narrations via means of Irsal.⁹¹

---

⁹¹ Al-Ijli said that Abul Aliyya was from the major Tabīn and he narrated by means of Irsal from Ali (ra). Refer to Ibn Hajar’s Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (3/168) for more clarification.
From the above one may observe some Jarh (disparagement) and Ta’dil (praiseworthy accreditation) on al-Razi as summarized below:

i) Abdullah reported his father, Ibn Hanbal, as saying that al-Razi was not strong in hadith, while Hanbal reported Ibn Hanbal saying that he was Salih al-Hadith (good in Hadith)

ii) Ishaq ibn Mansur reported Yahya ibn Ma’een declaring him to be Thiqa (trustworthy), Ibn Abi Maryam reported Ibn Ma’een saying that his hadiths are written but he had some errors, Ibn Abi Khaythama reported Ibn Ma’een declare him to be Salih (good/passable), al-Duri reported Ibn Ma’een saying that he was Thiqa and he would make mistakes when reporting from Mughira

---

92 Ibn Hajar did not mention that in the Ta’rikh Baghdad of al-Khatib al-Baghdadi (11/146) it is mentioned from al-Ghallabi that Ibn Ma’een declared Abu Ja’far al-Razi to be Thiqa and similarly this declaration of al-Razi being Thiqa is reported by Ibn Muhriz in his Su’alat (2/90) from Ibn Ma’een. Also, in the work printed under the title, Min Kalam Abi Zakariyya Yahya ibn Ma’een based on the transmission of Yazid ibn al-Haytham ibn Tahman al-Badi (d. 284 AH), Ibn Ma’een declared Abu Ja’far al-Razi to have no problem with him:

The term: Laysa bihi ba’s is another way of saying the narrator is Thiqa to Ibn Ma’een as Ibn Hajar mentioned in the introduction to Lisan al-Mizan from Ibn Abi Khaythama:
iii) Abdullah the son of Ali ibn al Madini reported his father saying that he was like Musa ibn Ubayda and he would confuse what he narrated from Mughira and like him

iv) Muhammad ibn Uthman ibn Abi Shayba related Ibn al Madini saying that he was Thiqa to them

v) Ibn Ammar al-Mawsili declared him Thiqa

vi) Amr ibn Ali (al-Fallas) said that there is weakness in him and he is from the people of truthfulness though poor at preserving narrations (sayy al-hifz)

vii) Abu Zur'a said he is a Shaykh who is suspected to err excessively

viii) Abu Hatim said he was Thiqa (Trustworthy), Saduq (truthful), Salih al-Hadith (good in Hadith)

ix) Zakariyya al-Saji said he was truthful but not precise

x) Nasa'i said that he was not strong

xi) Ibn Khirash said Saduq but poor at preserving

xii) Ibn Adi said that he had good ahadith, the people narrated from him, his ahadith are generally upright, and he hoped there is no harm with him

xiii) Ibn Sa'd declared him Thiqa
xiv) Ibn Hibban went to the level of saying that he would relate rejected narrations singularly from well known narrators, and that his narrations are not used as evidence unless in agreement with trustworthy narrators.

Note, this judgement by ibn Hibban does not appear to have an earlier precedent from the Imams before him, and he was born in the year 270 AH and died in the year 354 AH. Ibn Hibban’s verdict was unsupported by the experts of Hadith who lived in his time or came immediately after him like: Ibn Shahin (b. 297 AH - d. 385 AH), Ibn Adi (b. 277 AH - d. 360 AH), al-Daraqutni (b. 306 AH - d. 385 AH), al-Hakim (d. 405 AH), al-Bayhaqi (d. 458 AH), Ibn Abdal Barr (d. 463 AH) and others. See below for the views of these named scholars of Hadith.

xv) Al-Ijlisaid he is not strong (Laysabil Qawi) though in the printed edition of his Ma’rifatul Thiqat (no. 2108) it mentions his saying that Abu Ja’far al-Razi is da’eef al-hadith (weak in hadith)

xvi) Al-Hakim said he was Thiqa

xvii) Ibn Abdal Barr said that he was to them (meaning the Hadith scholars) Thiqa and a scholar of Qur’anic exegesis

Looking at the above quotes in Arabic from Tahdhib al-Tahdhib it may be suggested that those who made some form of Jarh include:

1) Ibn Hanbal - as one report from his son Abdullah indicated

2) Ibn al-Madini as reported from his son Abdullah

3) Amr ibn Ali al-Fallas

---

93 Al-Hafiz Ibn Mulaqqin said in his al-Badr al-Munir (3/623) that the quote from Ibn Abdal Barr is found in his “al-Istigna”, which is a work listing the names of narrators according to their kunya. Indeed, it is found in the Umm al-Qurra University doctoral thesis edition of al-Istigna (p. 412, no. 515)
4) Ibn Ma’een as reported by Ibn Abi Maryam – though this Jarh is clarified in another report from al-Duri from ibn Ma’een to apply to Abu Ja’far’s narrations from Mughira specifically. There is far more accreditation (tawthiq) from Ibn Ma’een on al-Razi as mentioned above.

5) Abu Zur’a al-Razi - (whose Jarh was not explained in detail in the case of al-Razi relating from Rabi ibn Anas)

6) Al-Nasa’i

7) Ibn Khirash who admitted that al-Razi was Saduq but poor at preserving narrations - this Jarh doesn’t explain if he meant this for all narrations that al-Razi related from Rabi ibn Anas

8) Zakariyya al-Saji - whose grading was not severe against al-Razi as he mentioned that al-Razi was Saduq but not precise. On the contrary, Dr. Abdul Aziz ibn Salih al-Luhaydan mentioned the above grading from al-Saji to be actually a form of ta’dil and not Jarh in his work known as “Shuyukh Shu’ba alladhina da’afuhum al-Imam Ahmed” (p. 118).

9) Al-Ijli

For arguments sake let us presume that 8 (or 9 if one counts the name of al-Saji) Hadith scholars made some form of Jarh as listed above, of which Ibn al-Madini, Ibn Hanbal and ibn Ma’een were attributed with two variant views. Now, let us list the Ta’dil on Abu Ja’far al-Razi:

1) Ibn Hanbal - as reported by his nephew Hanbal

2) Ibn al Madini as reported by Muhammad ibn Uthman ibn Abi Shayba (see the latter’s Su’alat (no. 148))

3) Ibn Ma’een as reported by a number of students (see above)

4) Ibn Ammar al Mawsili

5) Abu Hatim al-Razi
6) Ibn Adi
7) Ibn Sa'd
8) Al-Hakim
9) Ibn Abdal Barr

This makes an equal tally (of 9 on both sides) if we count the grading emanating from al-Saji to be a form of Jarh, but if the latter's grading is counted as a form of Ta'dil (as Abdal Aziz al-Luhaydan did) then there is more Ta'dil than Jarh on Abu Ja'far al-Razi.

What is also in need of mention here are the names of those who made explicit Ta'dil or indicated that Abu Ja'far al-Razi’s narrations are acceptable in some format but were not explicitly listed above in the Tahdhib al-Tahdhib of ibn Hajar:

a) Other Imams of Jarh and Ta’dil not listed exclusively by Ibn Hajar include the following in some format:

1) Amir al-Mu’minin fil Hadith, Shu’ba ibn al Hajjaj was one of those who took from Abu Ja’far al-Razi as mentioned in the above quote from ibn Hajar’s Tahdhib al-Tahdhib. Ibn Abdal Barr mentioned in his al-Tamheed (1/17) that Shu’ba took from trustworthy narrators.

This is a general rule that applies to most of his teachers and Shaykh Zafar Ahmed al-Uthmani (d. 1974) also mentioned this point about Shu’ba in his Qawa’id fi Ulum al-Hadith (p. 217) with the editing of his student, Shaykh Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda (d. 1997), who mentioned in the footnote also from ibn Hajar’s Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (1: 4-5) the following:
2) **Imam al-Bukhari** remained silent on the status of Abu Ja’far al-Razi in his Ta’rikh al-Kabir (6/403) and Ta’rikh al-Saghir (2/104). The silence of al-Bukhari on a narrator in his Ta’rikh works is taken by some later Ulama⁹⁴ to be an indication by some that the narrator is not absolutely da’eef but his narrations can be utilised in some form.

Indeed, Imam al-Mizzi (the Shaykh of al-Dhahabi and ibn Kathir) mentioned the following in his Tahdhib al-Kamal (18/265, Awwad edn) from al-Hafiz Abu Muhammad al-Ishbili (d. 522 AH), who quoted from the manuscript of the Ta’rikh of al-Bukhari that he had in his possession (though it is not found in the present copies of the Ta’rikh):

Some contemporaries take this last quote as a proof that those narrators who had no Jarh on them in the Ta’rikh works of al-Bukhari may be utilised in some format.

Note also, that Imam al-Bukhari did narrate via Abu Ja’far al-Razi on an occasion in his al-Adab al-Mufrad:

---

⁹⁴ Like the late Shaykh Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda and his Shaykh, Zafar Ahmed Uthmani. See the former’s editing of Shaykh Abdal Hayy al-Lucknawi’s al-Raf wa Takmil and the latter’s work known as Qawa’id fi Ulum al-hadith (p. 223)
3) Imam Ibn Khuzayma (d. 311 AH) has listed two narrations via the route of Abu Ja’far al-Razi in his Sahih. Hence, it is likely that al-Razi was Thiqa to him.

4) Imam Ibn Shahin (d. 385 AH) declared Abu Ja’far to be Salih (good) as follows in his Ta’rikh Asma al-Thiqat (a book of trustworthy narrators)

5) Imam al-Daraqutni (d. 385 AH) related a narration regarding Qunut in Salah in his al-Sunan (2/39) via the route of Abu Ja’far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas from Anas ibn Malik (ra):

 حدثنا الحسين بن إسماعيل ثنا أحمد بن منصور وأحمد بن محمد بن عيسى قالا ثنا أبو نعيم ثنا أبو جعفر الرازي عن الربع بن أسس قال كنت جالسًا عند أسس بن مالك فقال له إنهما قلت رسول الله ﷺ شهرا فقال ما زال رسول الله ﷺ يقتني في صلاة الغدّة حتى فارق الدنيا

He is said to have declared this isnâd to be Sahih containing al-Razi (see below)

b) Other classical scholars:

Imam Abu Abdullah al-Qurtubi (d. 671 AH) in his Tafsir (2/241, under Sura Aal Imran: 128-129) mentioned the last narration from al-Daraqutni by saying that its isnâd is Sahih:

وروي الدارقطني بإسناد صحيح عن أنس أنه قال: ما زال رسول الله ﷺ يقتني في صلاة الغدّة حتى فارق الدنيا

Likewise, Imam Sirajud-Din in Ibn al-Mulaqqin (d. 804 AH) in his al-Badr al-Munir (3/624) also mentioned similarly from Imam Abul Abbas al-Qurtubi’s (d. 656 AH) Mufhim:

وقد قال الدارقطني في « almufhim »: الذي استقر (عليه) أمر رسول الله ﷺ وصح الله عليه وسلم - في الغدّة - 128 -
This narration was also discussed by al-Hafiz Waliu’d-Din al-Iraqi in his Tahril Tathrib (2/149)\(^{95}\) where he mentioned that not only did al-Daraqtuni declare it to be Sahih, but other Shafi’i Imams like Abu Abdullah al-Bajali, Abu Abdullah al-Hakim, al-Bayhaqi, al-Nawawi\(^ {96}\) and other than them.

This indicates that Abu Ja’far al-Razi is at least Saduq (truthful) if not Thiqa to al-Munir where he mentioned additionally that this narration was declared to be Sahih by Imam Abu Bakr al-Hazimi (d. 584 AH) in his book on Nasikh wa Mansukh\(^ {97}\) and that al-Hazimi also declared Abu Ja’far al-Razi to be Thiqa, as

---

\(^{95}\) Al-Iraqi said:

\(^{96}\) This is mentioned by al-Nawawi in his Sharh al-Muhadhab (2/101) as follows:

---
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well as the point that Ibn Shahin included Abu Ja'far in his Thiqat (as mentioned earlier). Quote from Ibn Mulaqqin:

وذكره ابن شاهين في مقالة

ومنسوخة: هذا حديث صحيح، وأبو جعفر ثقة. وقال الشيخ تقي

Ibn al Mulaqqin repeated his conclusions in a more concise manner regarding the Qunut narration via the sanad of Abu Ja'far al-Razi as used by the Shafi'i Madhhab in his Tuhfatul Muhtaj (no. 296) as follows:

واعتنى رضي الله عنه قال مなぜ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يثنى في الفجر حتى فارق الدنيا رواد أحمد والدارقطني والبيهقي والحاكم في أربعه وقال حديث صحيح ورواه كلهم ثقات وأقره البيهقي على هذه القولة في كتابه وقال الحزمي حديث صحيح قال أبو جعفر الذي في سنده ثقة وقال صاحب الإمام بعد أن خرجه في إسناده أبو حفص الرازي وقد وثقه غير واحد وقال التسائي ليس بالقوي وقال ابن الصلاح هذا حديث قد حكم بصحته غير واحد من حفاظ الحديث منهم أبو عبد الله محمد بن علي البلخي من أئمة الحديث وأبو عبد الله الحاكم وأبو بكر البيهقي

Note also, al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani also declared this Hadith on Qunut to be Hasan via the route of Abu Ja'far al-Razi in his Nata'i j al-Afkar (2/ 136) as follows:

هذا حديث حسن، أخرجه أحمد عن عبد الرزاق عن أبي جعفر

الرازي.

97 In the printed edition of this work by al-Hazimi known as af Ibar fi bayan al Nasikh wal Mansukh min al-Athar (p. 96), the meaning of what Ibn Mulaqqin ascribed to al-Hazimi is there but not the exact quote he mentioned. It is possible that the manuscripts of al-Hazimi's work differ slightly. Wallahu 'lam
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This demonstrates the point that these earlier Imams of Hadith (mainly Shafi’ites) had accepted the narration at hand via Abu Ja’far al-Razi and thus considered him to be a sound narrator.

**Al-Hafiz Abu Bakr al-Bayhaqi** (d. 458 AH) the student of al-Hakim mentioned the narrations of Abu Ja’far al-Razi in several of his hadith collections. In his al-Sunan al-Kubra (no. 2927), he mentioned the following narration via the route of al-Hakim running via Abu Ja’far al-Razi:

> وأخبرنا أبو عبد الله الحافظ أنباّ بكر بن محمد الصيرفي بمرو ثمّا أحمد بن محمد بن عيسى ثنا أبو نعيم ثنا أبو جعفر الرأزي عن الربيع بن أنس قال كنت جالسا عند أنس فقال له إنما أقتلت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم شهرًا فقال ما زال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقتنون في صلاة الغدًا حتى فارق الدنيا قال أبو عبد الله هذا إسناد صحيح سنده ثقة رواه والربيع بن أنس تابعوي معروف من أهل البصرة سمع أنس بن مالك روي عنه سليمان التيمي وعبد أنس بن المبارك وغيرهما وقال أبو محمد بن أبي حاتم سألت أبي وأبا رزعة عن الربيع بن أنس فقالوا صدوقاً.

This is an indication that al-Bayhaqi was inline with al-Hakim that the above sanad is Sahih and the narrators are trustworthy, inclusive of Abu Ja’far al-Razi. Al-Bayhaqi also mentioned some tawthiq (accreditation) on al-Rabi ibn Anas from Abu Hatim al-Razi and Abu Zu’ra al-Razi that al-Rabi is Saduq Thiqa (truthful and trustworthy).

**Al-Hafiz Ibn Tahir al-Maqdisi** (d. 507 AH) said that he hoped that there is no harm in (the narrations) of Abu Ja’far al-Razi in his Dhakiratul Huffaz (3/1774):

> حديث: كان النبي (يفتقف) ولا يتكلم، ويجعله الاسم الحسن. رواه أبو جعفر الرأزي عيسى بن ماهان: عن نيث، عن عكرمة، عن ابن عباس. وأبو جعفر أرجو أنه لا يابس به

This seems to be based on the judgment narrated from Ibn Adi (d. 365 AH).
Imam Abu Bakr al-Hazimi (d. 584 AH) in his Kitab al-I’tibar (p. 96) mentioned a narration which he related via the route of Abu Ja’far al-Razi as follows:

He declared the isnâd to be Muttasil (fully connected) and all the narrators are trustworthy, and he also mentioned some points of ta’dil in the main on al-Razi and he did not mention any form of acceptable Jarh on al-Razi even though he knew that Ibn Hanbal had differing views ascribed to him on the rank of al-Razi. Note also that al-Hazimi reported the tawthiq made by Ali ibn al-Madini on al-Razi alone and not the Jarh reported by Abdullah the son of Ali Ibn al-Madini.

Al-Hafiz Diya al-Maqdisi al-Hanbali (d. 643 AH) has recorded a number of narrations via the route of Abu Ja’far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas in his al-Mukhtara. All of these routes were Sahih to al-Maqdisi; hence, he must have considered al-Razi to be at least Saduq if not Thiqa. Some examples from al-Mukhtara with the grading of its editor (Abdal Malik Duhaish) in brackets:
1141 أخبرنا الإمام أبو علي عمر بن علي بن عمر الواضع الرازق الحربي قراءة عليه ونحن نسمع بالربية قيل له أخبركم أبو القاسم هبة الله بن محمد بن عبد الواد بن الحسين الشباني قراءة عليه وأثبتت تسميم أن أيو علي الحسن بن علي بن المذهب أيو أبو بكر أحمد بن جعفر بن ملك الطقيعي نا أبو عبد الرحمن عبد الله بن أحمد بن جحش حذينة روح بن عبد الملك المقرئ نا عمر بن شقيق أيو أبو جعفر الراري عن الربيع بن أسس عن أبي العالية عن أيو بن كعب قال انكشفت الشمس على عهد رسول الله ﷺ وأن رسول الله ﷺ صلى بهم فرقاً بسورة من الطول ثم ركع خمس ركعات وسجدتين ثم قام في الثانية فقرأ بسورة من الطول وركع خمس ركعات وسجدتتين ثم جلس كما هو مستقبلي القبلة دعا حتى انجلت كسوتها ( إسناده حسن )

1150 وأخبرنا أبو بكر محمد بن محمد بن أبي الاسم التميمي المؤدب بأصبخان أن أيو أيو محمد بن رجاء بن إبراهيم بن عمر بن الحسن بن يونس أخبره قراءة عليه أنا أحمد بن عبد الرحمن الذواني أيو أبو بكر أحمد بن موسى بن مردوية الحافظنا محمد بن علي بن دهيم قلت أنا أحمد بن حرم نا عبيد الله بن موسى نا أبو جعفر الراري عن الربيع عن أبي العالية عن أيو بن كعب قل ها القادر على أن بسعى عليكم عدباً من فوقكم أو من تحت أرجلكم أو يلبسكم شيئاً ويدعمكم بتعكم بعض قل في فتى أربع خلاف قال قال فجأة منها تثنان بعد وفاة رسول الله ﷺ بخمس وعشرين إلوا وشيئ وذاق بعضهم ولهف بعض وبقيت اثنان لا بد منها وافقتان الرجم والخشف ( إسناده حسن)

1161 أخبرنا أبو عبد الله محمود بن أحمد بن عبد الرحمن الثقفي بأصبخان أن سعيد بن أبي الرجاء الصيرفي أخبرهم قراءة عليه أنا عبد الواد بن أحمد البقال أنا عبد الله بن يعقوب بن إسحاق أنا جدي إسحاق بن إبراهيم بن محمد بن جميل أنا أحمد بن منيع أنا الحسن بن موسى نا أبو جعفر الراري عن الربيع بن أسس عن أبي العالية عن أيو بن كعب أن عمر أمر أبا بن كعب أن صلبه بالناس في رمضان فقال إلا الناس بصومون إنه ولا يحسنون أن يصومون ( 1 ) فلو قرأت القرآن عليهم بالليل فكل يا أمير المؤمنين هذا ( شيء ) ( 2 ) لم يكن فقال قد علمت ولكنه أحسن قسلي بهم عشرين ركعة ( إسناده حسن)

Imam Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Salihi (d. 942 AH) in his Subul al-Huda wal Rashhad fi Sira Khair al-A bbad 98 said:

وأبو هريرة رضي الله عنه رواه مطولا ابن جرير وابن أبي حاتم والبيهقي والحاكم وصححه من طريق أبي العالية، وفي سنده أبو جعفر الراري وهو صدوق الحفظ

98 3/38, Darul Kutub Ilmiyya edn, Beirut, 1414 AH
Thus, al-Salihi declared Abu Ja’far al-Razi to be saduq al-hifz (truthful in his preservation of narrations).

Now, if one returns back to the quote spread by the two compilers from al-Albani, they mentioned the following:

Imaam al-Albaanee said this chain is weak. Abu Ja’far who is Eesa bin Abee Eesa bin Mahhaan. Imaam Dhahabee mentioned him in adh-Dhaa’aa and said, “Abu Zur’ah said, “Would err excessively.” Ahmad said, “Not strong.” Another time he said, “Good in hadeeth.” Falaas said, “Bad memory.” And others have said he was trustworthy.” Imaam Dhahabee also said in al-Kunna, “All of (the scholars) have criticised him.” Haafidh Ibn Hajr said in Taqreeb, “Bad memory.” Ibn Qayyim said in Zaad al-Maad (1/99), “One of abandoned narrations and he is not proof when alone in reporting even with one of the Ahlul-Hadeeth.”

I say:

The above declaration is based on a very partial presentation of the truth regarding Abu Ja’far al-Razi! Al-Albani did not bother to quote all of the other Huffaz from early times who praised al-Razi and this seems to be convenient in his methodology to persuade his loyal admirers to side with him in weakening this narration. One may wish to reflect on why al-Albani did not mention the exclusive ta’dil that has been mentioned above about Abu Ja’far.

As for the point made by the 2 compilers:

Imaam al-Albaanee said this chain is weak. Abu Ja’far who is Eesa bin Abee Eesa bin Mahhaan. Imaam Dhahabee mentioned him in adh-Dhaa’aa and said, “Abu Zur’ah said, “Would err excessively.” Ahmad said, “Not strong.” Another time he said, “Good in hadeeth.” Falaas said, “Bad memory.” And others have said he was trustworthy.”

What al-Albani quoted here is from al-Dhahabi’s Diwan al-D u’a as follows:
The editor of this work was the late Hammad al-Ansari, who was also from the same sect as al-Albani and the two compilers. He placed the following footnote to the above quote:

Meaning, that if one was to look at the final ruling on this narrator in Ibn Hajar's al-Taqrib al-Tahdhib one would notice that he was declared to be truthful (Saduq), but poor at preserving narrations - specifically from Mughira. This tells us a lot, for what Ibn Hajar said is based on the verdict of Ibn al Madini from one report recorded from him, as well as from Ibn Ma'een. Both of these two last named Imams have also been ascribed with declaring Abu Ja'far to be Thiqa. Here is what is found in Ibn Hajar’s al-Taqreeb in full:

Additionally, Ibn Hajar mentioned Abu Ja'far al-Razi in his Lisan al-Mizan (7/ 457, Hyderabad edn) as follows:
The reader may observe that al-Hafiz Ibn Hajjar did not mention any of the Jarh on Abu Ja'far al-Razi except one Ta'dil (praiseworthy remark) from Imam Ibn Ma'een whom he quoted as declaring al-Razi to be Thiqa (trustworthy).

A contemporary writer by the name of Ali ibn Na'ief al-Shahud mentioned the following in his work entitled: al-Hafiz ibn Hajjar wa manhaji fi Taqrib al-Tahdhib (al-Hafiz ibn Hajjar and his methodology in Taqrib al-Tahdhib, p. 264):

He mentioned that Abu Ja'far al-Razi is Saduq sayy al-hifz (as Ibn Hajjar mentioned) and that Ibn Hajjar had indicated al-Razi’s narrations to be Hasan (good) in his Taghliq al-Ta’liq and Talkhis al-Habir, and ibn Khuzayma also narrated via al-Razi in his Sahih (see below).

What al-Shahud mentioned in the above named work on Abu Ja'far al-Razi is a mere replication of the findings of the late author, Dr. Walid ibn Hasan al-Aani, as mentioned in the latter’s work entitled: Manhaj dirasa al-A sanid wal hukm alayhā.

Al-Dhahabi’s position on Abu Ja’far al-Razi:

Al-Albani claimed that Hafiz al-Dhahabi had said in his al-Kuna: "All of (the scholars) have criticised him" In Arabic the wording ascribed to al-Dhahabi by al-Albani being:

99 425/5 و تغلب التعليق (ج 1 / ص 327) الشاملة 2
100 - 99/2 حديث رقم (298)
101 - 19/2 حديث رقم (533).

102 See p. 117, printed by Dar al-Nafa’is, Amman, Jordan, 1997, with a foreword by a “Salafi” from Jordan known as Umar Sulayman al-Ashqar
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This ascription by al-Albani to al-Dhahabi is not found in his Mizan al-I’tidal (section on al-Kuna), nor in his al-Muqtana fi sard al-Kuna which is an abridgment of an earlier work by al-Hafiz Abu Ahmed al-Hakim, by the title of al-A sami wal Kuna. In the Muqtana the only mention on Abu Ja’far al-Razi was the following point:

This quote in Arabic mentioned no disparagement (jarh) on Abu Ja’far and similarly nor did Abu Ahmed al-Hakim’s earlier work which had the following entry on him:

Hafiz Shamsud-Din Al-Dhahabi mentioned the following Jarh and Ta’dil in his Mizan al-I’tidal (no. 6595) on Abu Ja’far al-Razi:

©SUNNICOURSES.COM 2009/1430 AH
Al-Dhahabi knew very well the Jarh recorded from the earlier authorities like Ibn Hanbal (one report from him), al-Nasa'i, Ibn al-Madini (as attributed to him with a sanad back to Abdullah the son of Ali ibn al-Madini), al-Fallas, Ibn Hibban, Abu Zur'a; but despite all this, his personal judgement was that Abu Ja'far al-Razi is Salih al-Hadith (good in Hadith).

While he also mentioned some Jarh on al-Razi in his al-Mughni fil du'afa (no. 4820), al-Dhahabi also graded al-Razi to be Saduq (truthful):

Al-Dhahabi also mentioned in his Siyar a'laman-Nubala (7/346) that Abu Ja'far al-Razi was the scholar of the city known as Rayy (Alim al-Rayy).

One of the students of al-Dhahabi known as Imam Abul Mahasin Muhammad ibn Ali al-Hussaini (d. 765 AH) compiled a work listing the short biographies of the narrators found in 10 books of Hadith under the title: Tadhkira bi ma'rifat Rijal al-Kutub al Ashara.

In the latter work, al-Hussaini only recalled some of the Ta'dil on Abu Ja'far al-Razi from Ibn al-Madini and Ahmed ibn Hanbal:
Since he did not mention any form of Jarh on al-Razi, there is indication to suppose that al-Hussaini considered al-Razi to be a sound narrator.

Al-Hafiz Nurud-Din al-Haythami\textsuperscript{103} (d. 807 AH) in his Majma al-Zawa'id also implied that Abu Ja'far al-Razi has some kalam upon him (meaning Jarh) but this does not harm him and according to al-Haythami, Abu Ja'far is Thiqa (trustworthy):

\textbf{Majma al-Zawa'id, \textsuperscript{103} (d. 807 AH), Khwaaja Nurud-Din al-Haythami, p. 8140:} ص. 94 عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَمَرْ مَتَّى قَالَ: أَنَا شَهِدتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّي اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وسلم حين نهى عن نبِيذ الجر، وأنا شهدته حين رخص فيه، وقال: "اجتنبا المسكر". رواه أحمد ورجاله ثقات، وفي أبي جعفر الرازي كلام لا يضر وهو ثقة، ورواه الطبري في الكبير والوسط.

Al-Hafiz Ahmed al-Busayri (d. 840 AH), who was a contemporary to al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his Ithaf al-Khiyara \textsuperscript{6/164, no. 5583} mentioned a narration via the route of Abu Ja'far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas as reported in the Musnad of Ishaq ibn Rahawayh:

\textbf{Ithaf al-Khiyara, \textsuperscript{6/164, no. 5583}, Khwaaja Ahmed al-Busayri, p. 94:} قال إسحاق بن راهويه: لقينا حكام بن سلم الرازي، حثتنا أبو جعفر الرأوي، عن الربيع بن أنس قال: السموات أولها موج مكشوف، والثانية من صخرة، والثالثة من حديد، والرابعة من نحاس، والخامسة من فضة، والسادسة من ذهب، والسابعة من باقوت.

\textsuperscript{103} He was one the Shaykhs of al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani
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The above narration was declared to have trustworthy narrators (Thiqat) in its isnâd; hence, Abu Ja'far al-Razi was Thiqa to al-Busayri.

Al-Hafiz Sibt ibn al-Ajami (also known as Burhanud-Din al-Halabi, d. 841 AH) mentioned a short biography on Abu Ja'far al-Razi in his al-Ightibat, and despite knowing of some of the Jarh and Ta'dil on al-Razi declared him in the opening line to be:

 صالح الحديث - Good in Hadith

Al-Aulaud-Din Ali Rida, who was the editor of one edition of this work, published this book with his extensive footnotes to the narrators listed by Sibt ibn al-Ajami under the title Nihayatul Ightibat (p. 378). The editor mentioned most of the Jarh and Ta'dil on Abu Ja'far al-Razi and concluded by stating that Abu Ja'far is Sadaq in himself though there is some weakness in his Hadiths, specifically from Mughira (ibn Miqsam). The latter is a good judgment in similar nature to the stance of al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar in his Taqrib al-Tahdhib.

Al-Albani was also quoted by the two compilers claiming that al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar had declared the following about Abu Ja'far al-Razi: Haafidh Ibn Hajar said in Taqreeb, “Bad memory.”

This is a clear cut example of al-Albani cutting up the words of a major Hafiz of Hadith to serve his own aims in further weakening the status of al-Razi! Let us not forget how these two compilers also claimed about the Hanafi’s on another narration for 20 rak'ats:

This narration, in the manner presented by the Hanafee is riddled with many mistakes and errors, some of which were done deliberately and it proves the hanafee method of lying and deceiving the people in order to convey their falsehood.

104 See p. 376, no. 122, edited by Alauddin Ali Rida, Dar al-Hadith, Cairo, 1988
Now let us show how their Shaykh, al-Albani, cut up with deliberate intent the actual declaration of Ibn Hajar on Abu Ja’far al-Razi. The reader has seen above that, al-Albani claimed that Ibn Hajar only said about al-Razi: “Bad memory.”

The truth is that Ibn Hajar actually said:

وداعاً، أبو جعفر الرزق هو مصدق، وسهو في حفظ الأحاديث خاصة عن مغيرة.

Meaning that Abu Ja’far al-Razi is Saduq but poor at preserving narrations specifically from Mughira! The reader may have also seen above that Hammad al-Ansari also quoted this portion from Ibn Hajar correctly, unlike al-Albani on this occasion.

Dr Abdal Aziz ibn Salih al-Luhaydan (who may be a “Salafi”) from Imam Muhammad ibn Sa’ud University in Riyadh, mentioned a lot of the Jarh and Ta’dil on Abu Ja’far al-Razi in his work entitled “Shuyukh Shu’ba alladhina da’afuhum al-Imam Ahmed” (p. 118). He concluded after mentioning the Jarh and Ta’dil on Abu Ja’far al-Razi by declaring him to be:

أنه مصدق لا بأس به.

Meaning, that al-Razi is Saduq (truthful) and there is no harm in him.

Next, the loyal followers of al-Albani mentioned the latter quoting Ibn al Qayyim as saying in his Zad al-Ma’ad:

"One of abandoned narrations and he is not proof when alone in reporting even with one of the Ahlul-Hadeeth.”

This is a poor translation of what Ibn al Qayyim said, and al-Jibali had translated it in his, “The Night Prayers: Qiyam & Tarawih" 105 as:

105 P. 63
“He is known for his munkar reports. None at all among the scholars of Hadith would accept his lone reports.”

The fact of the matter is that a number of major Huffaz of Hadith have praised Abu Ja’far to be Thiqa and his errors in transmission are mainly those from Mughira as Ibn Ma’een, Ibn al Madini and Ibn Hajar mentioned. His overall grading was Saduq and Salih al-hadith to al-Dhahabi, and Ibn Hajar has been quoted already on his view.

In this report on 20 rak’ats recorded in the Musnad of Ibn Mani’ and via his route by Diya al-Maqdisi in al-Mukhtara, the link from Abu Ja’far al-Razi is not Mughira, but from al-Rabi’ ibn Anas. Thus, there is no sufficient proof from any of the Huffaz from early times suggesting that al-Razi would transmit errors solely in the hadith he narrated from al-Rabi ibn Anas specifically.

As for Ibn al-Qayyim’s statement, then the two compilers have not mentioned the full context of which narration ibn al Qayyim was mentioning with Abu Ja’far al-Razi in the isnād, nor have they mentioned what others had to say about the narration(s) that Ibn al Qayyim was critical of via Abu Ja’far al-Razi. Ibn al-Qayyim’s brief discussion as found in his Zad al-Ma’ad (1/ 99) is regarding the narration regarding Qunut in Fajr prayer, and this has been mentioned above and it is an indirect reply to Ibn al Qayyim’s claims.106

Besides this point, Abu Ja’far al-Razi narrating it with the wording for 20 rak’ats is supported and thus he is not alone in narrating as such for 20 rak’ats, as may be seen from 2 routes from the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq (who related via Muhammad ibn Yusuf and Ibn Abi Dhubab both from Saa’ib ibn Yazid) and the one via the route of Yazid ibn Khusayfa (as in the Musnad of Ibn al Ja’d, al-

106 See the paragraph starting with the following lines a few pages earlier on the discussion regarding Abu Ja’far al-Razi: “This narration was also discussed by al-Hafiz Waliud-Din al-Iraqi in his Tarhil Tathrib (2/149) where he mentioned that not only did al-Daraqutni declare it to be Sahih, but other Shafi’i Imams like Abu Abdullah al-Bajali, Abu Abdullah al-Hakim, al-Bayhaqi, al-Nawawi and other than them.”
Sunan al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi and elsewhere), all from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid stating a bare minimum of 20 rak‘ats.

Hence, there is no objection on what Abu Ja‘far transmitted with this wording. Indeed, before ibn al-Qayyim, his fellow Hanbalite, Diya al-Maqdisi recorded the narration for 20 rak‘ats via the route of Abu Ja‘far, and considered the narration to be Sahih since he included it in his al-Mukhtara.
Some examples of narrations via the link of Abu Ja'far al-Razi which were authenticated by some earlier scholars of Hadith:

There are several examples of Imam Abu Abdullah al-Hakim (d. 405) authenticating asānid (chains of transmission) via the links containing Abu Ja'far al-Razi, with the agreement of al-Hāfiz al-Dhahabi in line with al-Hakim.

The 3 examples below contain the link - Abu Ja'far al-Razi - al-Rabi' ibn Anas - Abul Aliya from Ubayy ibn Kā'b (radiallahu anhu), as found similarly in the Musnad of Ibn Mani’ and Diya al-Maqdisi’s al-Mukhtara in favour of 20 rak’ats:

i) In the Mustadrak of al-Hakim (2/ 276):\(^{107}\)

ii) Mustadrak al-Hakim (2/ 373):

\(^{107}\) Hyderabad edition, printed with al-Dhahabi’s Talkhis al-Mustadrak
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Al-Dhahabi declared the above narration to be Sahih:

iii) Mustadrak al-Hakim (2/399-400):

Al-Dhahabi declared the above narration to be Sahih in his Talkhis al-Mustadrak:
These examples are ample testimony to the claim that al-Hakim and al-Dhahabi had no major problems with Abu Ja'far's narrations, and consider his narrations to be not only acceptable but Sahih.

**Abu Muhammad Ibn Hazm al-Zahiri (d. 456 AH)** mentioned an isnâd via the route of Abu Ja'far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas in his famous book of Zahiri fiqh known as al-Muhalla (4/76) as follows:

 حدثنا عبد الله بن ربيع ثنا عُمر بن عبد الملك ثنا محمد بن يُكَر ثنا سليمان بن الأشعث ثنا زُبير بن حرب ثنا محمد بن عبيد الله الأنصاري ثنا أبو جعفر الرُّؤيِّي عن الربيع بن أسس عن جْنَبِي قَالَ: سمعنا يا مؤسِّس الأئِثْنَى يُقَال قَالُ رَسُول اللَّهِ صَلَّى الَّلَهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لا يُقَالُ اللَّهُ صَلَّى رَجُلٌ في جَسَدٍ شَهِيدٍ من خَلْوَة

Such a narration appears to be authentic to Ibn Hazm based on his words in the introduction to al-Muhalla (p. 1) as follows:

 وَلَبِيعُمْ مِنْ قَأْرَ يَكِتَانِي هَذَا أَنَا لَمْ نُحْكُمْ إِلا بِيَحْرِ صَحِيحٍ مِنْ رَوَايَةِ النَّفَات مَسْتَدْ وَلَا خَالِقُ ثَانِهَا إِلا بِيَحْرِ صَحِيحٍ قَبَّيْنَا صَغَا، أَوْ مَسْوَحًا فَوْقَصَحَا نَسْخًا. وَمَا تَنْفَقُتْهَا إِلَّا بِاللَّهِ تَعَالَى

**Meaning:**

Let it be known for the one who reads this book of ours that we did not draw evidence except from sahih narrations reported from trustworthy narrators with connected chains, and we did not leave anything except that which is weak and having explained its
weakness or that which is abrogated except that we made clear by that which it is abrogated by and that tawfeeq is only from A llah

Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani has mentioned a number of narrations in his Fath al-Bari via chains containing Abu Ja’far al-Razi where he remained silent on the status of the narration, thus indicating them to be Hasan narrations via al-Razi:

قال أبو العالية الغوّاز النصّف بين البيك والهرمة فاقع صحّ صناعَا لا تقولُ لم يُذُهَّبُوا العلمُ ثاني الأرْضِ ليست بثُّنَانٌ ثُّنَانِي الأرْضِ ولا تقول في الحَرَّث مسلمّة من الغَوْي بعثت بيضاء صفراء إِن شِئْت سُوَاكَ وَيَقُولُ صَفْرَاء كَثْوَارٍ جَالِسُونَ صَفْرَاء قَالَ إِنْ أَمْتُمْ اخْتَلُفْتُم الشرح: قوله: (باب وأذفال موسى لقومه إن الله يأمركم أن تذبحوا بقرة الآية) ثم يذكر فيه سوئي شيء من التفسير عن أبي العالية، وقصة البقرة أوردتا إمام أبي إسحاق في تفسيره قول: (حَدَّثتَا أَبُو جعفر الرازي عن الربيع بن أنس عن أبي العالية في قوله تعالى: (إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُفْرَعِكُمْ أن تذبحوا بَقَرَةً) قال: كان رجل من بني إسرائيل غنيا ولم يكن له ولد وكان له قرب وأثر فقتلته ليبرثه ثم أدخله على مجمع الطريق، واتى موسى فقال إن قريبي قتل واتى إلى أمر عظيم، واتى لا أجد أحداًبين مجيئه غريب يا نبي الله، فنادى موسى في الناس: من كان عنده علم من هذا فليلعنه، فلم يكن منهم علم. فقلل الله إليه: قل لهم قلذبحوا بقرة، فعجبوا ووقفوا: كيف تطلب معرفة من قتل هذا القتيل فنمر بذبح بقرة، وكان ما قبضه الله تعالى قال: (إِنَّهُ يَقْلُ إِنَّها بَقَرَةٌ لَا فَارِضٌ لَّا بَكْرٌ) يعني لعدم هرمة ولا صغرية (عن ابن ذلك) أي تعالى بين البكر والهرمة قلنا ادع لنا يرك بين ما لونها، قال إنه يقول إنها بقرة صفراء فإن فعقت لونها أي صف (تستر البيض) أي عجبهم قلنا ادع لنا يرك بين ما لونها أي صغرية (الآية) قال إنه يقول إنها بقرة لذاذ – أي لم يدنها العلم – صغرية الأرْضِ يعني ليست بذبح فتثر الأرْض (ولا تسقي الحَرَّث مسلمّة) أي من العيوب إذا صغرية فيها – أي لا بيضاء - قالوا الآن جئت بالحق) قال ولي أن القوم حينأمروا بذبح بقرة استرضوا أي بقرة كانت لأجزائها عنهم، ولكنهم شددوا فشذ لهم، ولولا أنهم استثنوا قلناو (وإنا إِن شاء الله لمهذونا) لما اهتدوا إليها أبداً.
Another example of Ibn Hajar declaring a narration via Abu Jafar al-Razi to be a Hasan hadith was mentioned earlier from his Nata'ij al-Afkar (2/136).

If this is not sufficient for the enquiring reader then may be the thirst will be quenched further by noting other places where al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani narrated chains of transmission containing al-Razi without discrediting him as being weak or rejected in any manner.

In Ibn Hajar’s Taghliq al-Ta’liq one may see the following examples:

Taghliq (4/26):

قَالَ أَبُو جَعْفَرُ الْطَّبِيرِيُّ: ثَنَا المَثْلِيُّ ثَنَا آدَمَ ثَنَا أَبُو جَعْفَرُ عَنِ الرَّبِيعِ عَنْ أَبِيِّ الْعَالِيَةِ (عَوْانٌ). (نَصِفَ بَيْنَ يَوْمِيَ: أَيَّ بِنَابِلِيَّةَ وَالْحِرَاطِةَ
وَبَيْنِيَّ فِي كُلِّ ذِلِّكَ، فَأَتَى لَهُمَا، (أَيَّ صَافِءُ) قَالَ:
وَقَالَ أَبُو أَمَيْرٍ نَحْساً صَوْمَهُ، ثُمَّ رُوِّدَ ثَنَا آدَمَ ثَنَا أَبُو جَعْفَرُ الْرَّبِيعِ عَنِ الرَّبِيعِ عَنْ أَبِيِّ الْعَالِيَةِ (عَوْانٌ).

(148)
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The above two examples from Tafsir al-Tabari (2/196, Shakir edn) and Tafsir Ibn Abi Hatim (no. 724) contains the chained link under discussion, viz: Abu Ja’far al-Razi - al-Rabi ibn Anas - Abul Aliyya

Also, Taghliq (4/27):

 وقال أبو جعفر الطبري حدثني المثنى ثنا آدم ح 194 ثنا أبو جعفر عن الربيع عن أبي العالية

 مسلمة (من العيب)

 وقال أبو جعفر الطبري ثنا المثنى ثنا آدم ثنا أبو جعفر الرازي عن الربيع ابن أنس عن أبي العالية في قوله، لا شالة (يقول لا يبيض فيها)

Another example that al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar mentioned in his Fath al-Bari:

In the Sahih of Ibn Khuzayma the following narration is present via the route of Abu Ja’far al-Razi:

1479 - أخبرنا أبو طاهر نا أبو بكر نا عيسى بن أبي حرب نا يحيى بن أبي بكير نا أبو جعفر

الرازي ثنا حسين بن عبد الرحمن عن عبد الله بن شداد عن ابن أم مكتوم: أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم استقبل الناس في صلاة العشاء فقال: فأنه همته أن يأتي هوا الذين يخلون عن هذه الصلاة فافورق عليهم بيوتهم فقام ابن أم مكتوم فقال: يا رسول الله، لقد علمت ما ينبغي لي قد قُدِّضت فإني أتعين الإقامة؟ قال: فاحضرها ولم يرخص له قال أبو بكر: هذه اللغة، وليس لي قائد فيها اختصار أراد - علمي - وليس قائد يلازمني كخير أبي رزق بن سبأ مكتوم

The last narration from Ibn Khuzayma (no. 1479) had the following footnote by the editor, Dr Mustafa al-A’zami:

1479 - استاده صحيح. وآثار الحافظ في الفتح 2: 128 إلى رواية ابن خزيمة، وأخرجه الحاكم والإمام أحمد.
He declared the sanad via this route containing Abu Ja'far al Razi to be Sahih and said that al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar in his Fath al-Bari (2:128) indicated this by referencing this narration to Sahih Ibn Khuzayma, Mustadrak al-Hakim and the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal. Note also, that al-Albani looked over this edition of Sahih Ibn Khuzayma and added brief notes here and there, but he did not oppose what Dr A’zami mentioned above!

Indeed, the above narration from Sahih Ibn Khuzayma was mentioned in Fath al-Bari (2: 128) as follows:

These examples from Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani serve to prove the point that Ibn Hajar regarded Abu Ja’far’s narrations to be at least Hasan if not Sahih.

The above narration is also found in the Mustadrak of al-Hakim as indicated above and it has been mentioned earlier that Imam Abu Abdullah al-Hakim (d. 405 AH) declared a number of chains of transmission (asanid) via Abu Ja’far al-Razi to be Sahih with the agreement of al-Hafiz al-Dhahabi (d. 748 AH).

Indeed, al-Hafiz Badrud-Din al-Ayni (d. 855 AH) also mentioned al-Hakim’s above narration with its authentication by the latter as follows in his Sharh on Sahih al-Bukhari known as Umdatul Qari (5/162):

قال الحاكم وله شاهد بإسناد صحيح فذكر حديث أبي جعفر الرازي عن حسين بن عبد الرحمن عن عبد الله بن شداد عن ‘أن النبي استقبل الناس في صلاة العشاء فقال ‘ يعني ابن أم مكتوم’ فقال لقد هممت أن آتي هؤلاء الذين يتخلقن عن هذه الصلاة فلأحرق عليهم يبونهم قال فقلت يا رسول الله لقد علمت ما بيت الحديث
Imam Jalalud-Din al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH) mentioned in his al-Itqan fi Ulum al-Qur'an the following point:

وأما أبي بن كعب فعنه نسخة كبيرة برويها أبو جعفر الرازي عن الربيع بن أنس عن أبي العالية عنه وهذا إذن صحيح
وقد أخرج ابن جرير وابن أبي حاتم منها كثيرا وكذا الحاكم في مستدركي وأحمد في مسند

This point from al-Suyuti mentions that a large work mentioning the narrations from Ubayy ibn Ka'b (ra) were transmitted with an authentic chain (Isnâd Sahih) via the route of Abu Ja'far al-Razi from al-Rabi' ibn Anas from Abul Aliyya from Ubayy (ra). Many narrations from this route can be seen in the Qur'anic commentaries of Ibn Jarir al-Tabari and Ibn Abi Hatim, as well as some narrations in the Mustadrak al-Hakim and Musnad Ahmed.

The well known Islamic literature expert known as Haji Khalipha (d. 1067 AH) in his Kashf al-Zunun an-Asami al-Kutub wal Funun mentioned:

وأما أبي بن كعب المتوفي سنة 20 عشرين على خلاف فيه فعنه نسخة كبيرة برويها أبو جعفر الرازي عن الربيع بن أنس عن أبي العالية عنه وهذا إذن صحيح

Hence, Haji Khalipha declared the isnâd for the route Abu Ja'far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas from Abul Aliyya (who took from the Sahabi, Ubayy ibn Ka'b, radiallahu anhu) to be Sahih just al-Suyuti had before him.

Other examples of authentication by later authors:

The Indian “Salafi” scholar known as Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan (d. 1307 AH) has also affirmed with identical wording to Haji Khalifa that the isnâd Abu

---

109 1/429, Darul Kutub Ilmiyya, Beirut, 1992/1413
Ja’far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas from Abul Aliyya is Sahih in his Abjadul Ulum\textsuperscript{110}.

وأما أبي ابن كعب الموتفي سنة عشرين على خلاف فيه فمن نسخة كبيرة يرويها أبو جعفر الرازي

\textbf{Muhammad ibn Abdal Azim al-Zurqani} (d. 1367 AH) also declared the said isnâd via Abu Ja’far al-Razi back to Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra) to be Sahih in his Manahil al-Irfan fi Ulum al-Qur’an\textsuperscript{111}.

Hamza Zayn in his continuation of the editing of the Musnad of Ahmed ibn Hanbal (no. 16748) that was left incomplete by the “Salafi” editor known as Shaykh Ahmed Shakir declared the isnâd to the following hadith via the route of Abu Ja’far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas to be Sahih:

حدثنا وكعب، قال: حدثنا أبو جعفر الرازي، عن الربيع بن أنس، عن أبي العالية، أو عن غيره، عن عبد الله بن مغل المزني، قال: أنا شهدت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حين نهى عن نبذ الجر، وأنا شهدته حين رخص فيه، قال: واجتنبا المسكن

\textbf{Wasiullah Abbas} (a well known “Salafi” from the Indian subcontinent and currently based in Makka) who has frequented England on a few occasions declared an isnâd via the route of Abu Ja’far al-Razi to be Hasan (good) in his editing of the work known as Fada’il al-Sahaba (1/ 139-140) of Imam Ahmed Ibn Hanbal.

\textsuperscript{110} 2/179, Darul Kutub Ilmiyya, Beirut, 1978, edited by Abdal Jabbar Zakkar

\textsuperscript{111} 2/13, Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1996/1416 AH
Muhammad Hussain al-Dhahabi mentioned the authenticity of the link containing Abu Ja‘far al-Razi in his well known work entitled, al-Tafsir wal Mufassirun (2/24):

أولاً، طريق أبي جعفر الرزي، عن الربيع بن أنس، عن أبي الالية، عن أبي رضي الله عنه. وهذه طريق صحيح، وقد ورد عن أبي، نسخة كبيرة في التفسير، يرويها أبو جعفر الرازي بهذا الإسناد إلى أبي، وقد خرج ابن جرير وأبي حاتم منها كثيرا، وأخرج الحاكم منها أيضا في مسندك، والإمام أحمد من مسنده

And again in the same work (3/7) he declared the chain to be Sahih via Abu Ja‘far back to Ubayy ibn Ka‘b (ra):

وثروى عن أبي بن كعب نسخة كبيرة في التفسير، يرويها أبو جعفر الرازي، عن الربيع بن أنس، عن أبي الالية، عن أبي، وقدنا فيما تقود: إن هذا الإسناد صحيح، وقدنا أيضا: إن ابن جرير وأبي حاتم أخرجوا من هذه النسخة كثيرا، كما أخرج منها الحاكم في مسندك، والإمام أحمد في مسنده.

وكانت وفاته سنة 90 هـ (تسعين من الهجرة) على أرجح الأقوال في ذلك.

Muhammad ibn Muhammad Abu Shuhba in his al-Isra‘iliyyat wal Mawdu‘at fi Kutub al-Tafsir (p. 204) also mentioned that the Tafsir based narrations from Ubayy ibn Ka‘b (ra) emanate from a bulky written compilation transmitted via a Sahih isnād from the route of Abu Ja‘far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas from Abul Aliyya from Ubayy (ra):

- تفسير أبي بن كعب والطرق عنه
- تفسير أبي بن كعب والطرق عنه:
  - وأما أبي بن كعب، فتعني نسخة كبيرة يرويها أبو جعفر الرازي عن الربيع بن أنس، عن أبي الالية، عن أبي، وهذا إسناد صحيح.
  - وقد أخرج ابن جرير، وأبي حاتم منها كثيرا، وكذا الحاكم في مسندك، والإمام أحمد في مسنده.

Much of the Tafsir via this route is found in the Tafsir collections of al-Tabari, Ibn Abi Hatim and also some in the Mustadrak al-Hakim and Musnad Ahmed according to the above named author.
Shaykh Shu‘ayb al-Amna‘ut in his editing of the Musnad of Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal also admitted to the possibility that Abu Ja‘far al-Razi is Hasan al-Hadith (good in Hadith) and his narrations can be used for following up other witnessing narrations (Mutabi‘at wal Shawahid) as follows:

As for al-Albani, we find him being critical of Abu Ja‘far al-Razi in his weakening of the narration for 20 rak‘ats and elsewhere, but strangely enough, he too has declared some narrations via Abu Ja‘far al-Razi to be Sahih and Hasan! May be he authenticated these specific narrations due to them being strengthened via other witnessing routes (shawahid), and if this is the case, then this leaves more option to contend that Abu Ja‘far al-Razi’s narrations can be strengthened to at least Hasan due to the 20 rak‘at version being reinforced via other independent routes.

In his editing of the Sunan of Abu Dawud (no. 2571) one may observe the following scan via the route of Abu Ja‘far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas from Anas (ra), which he declared to be Sahih:

In his editing of al-Jami’ al-Tirmidhi (no. 3364) he declared a narration running via Ahmed ibn Mani’ (who narrated the 20 rak‘at narration) via the route of Abu Ja‘far al-Razi from al-Rabi ibn Anas from Abul Aliyya from Ubayy ibn Ka‘b, to be Hasan except the portion of the narration saying:

112 19/414
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Insha'Allah, the truth of the matter is that the sanad recorded by Ahmed ibn Mani is no less than Hasan as Abdul Malik Dahish declared in his editing of Diya al-Maqdisi's al-Mukhtara, while Diya al-Maqdisi regarded it as Sahih, and its text is strengthened regarding the portion affirming 20 Rak'ats via the independent routes from Yazid ibn Khusayfa, Ibn Abi Dhubab (see below) and also Muhammad ibn Yusuf himself - all from their Shaykh, the Sahabi, Saa'ib ibn Yazid (ra). Hence, the wording is Sahih, insha'Allah.
C) Another narration from Saa’ib Ibn Yazid (ra) as recorded in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq al-San’ani

On p. 17 of their “Qaul ul-Saheeh” they both said:

Another Narration

There is another narration from Saa’ib bin Yazeed reported by Ibn Abdul Barr which states the people would stand for 23 rak’ats during the time of Umar (Radhiyallaahu Anhu) (cited from Umdatul-Qaaree (5/357) via al-Haarith bin Abdur-Rahmaan bin Abee Dhabaab.

Ibn Abee Dhubaab

Imaam al-Albaanee said the narrator Ibn Abee Dhubaab’s memory deteriorated. Ibn Abee Haatim said, my father said (Abee Haatim) “Darwardee would narrate rejected narrations from him, he is not strong.” Abu Zur’ah said, “There is no harm in him.” Ibn Hazm said, “Weak.” He was not trusted by Imaam Maalik nor was he narrated on by him, as mentioned by Imaam Ibn Hajr. (Refer to Tahdheeb ut-Tahdheeb (2/135-136 no.1090), Meezaan ul-Ei’tidaal (2/172-172 no.1631), al-Jarh Wat-Ta’deel (3/79-82 no.365) (see Salaatul-Taraaweeh (pg.52)

Reply:

The narration they are referring to was indeed mentioned by Ibn Abdal Barr in his al-Tamheed and al-Istidhkar mentioning 23 rak’ats as follows:

i) al-Tamheed (8/113):
They also said that it was also mentioned by al-Ayni in his Umdatul Qari (11/126). It is mentioned in the latter work as follows:

وَقَالَ أَبِي الْبَرْحَانِ الْحَارُثُ بْنِ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنِ أَبِي ذَيَابٍ بْنِ السَّابِبِ بْنِ يُزَيْدٍ قَالَ: كَانَ القِيَامُ عَلَى عَهْدِ عُمْرَةِ بِثَلَاثِ وَعَشْرِينَ رُكْعَةٍ

Thus, al-Ayni utilized Ibn Abdal Barr’s quotation for this narration. Both of these Imams presented the narration with a partial sanad, and the narration is found with its complete sanad in the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq as follows:

Abdar Razzaq --> al-Aslami --> al-Harith ibn Abdar Rahman ibn Abi Dhubab --> al-Saa’ib ibn Yazid

This narration mentions from Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra) that in Umar’s (ra) time it was 23 rak’ats, which is understood to be 20 Rak’ats Taraweeh and 3 rak’ats witr.

The full isnad is thus:

Abdar Razzaq --> al-Aslami --> al-Harith ibn Abdar Rahman ibn Abi Dhubab --> al-Saa’ib ibn Yazid
A look at the sanad:

i) **Al-Aslami, the Shaykh of Abdar Razzzaq.**

This narrator is actually Ibrahim ibn Abi Yahya al-Aslami as al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar confirmed in his Fath al-Bari (3/459) by saying:

و رو ي ع ب الد ر ز اق ع ن الأ س ل م ي ه و إ ب راه يم ب ن ع ب ي ح ب ي ع ن ه ش ا م ب ن ع ر و أ أ ن أ ع ل
من ك ساهَا ال دب ي ب ش ع ب الد الله ب ن ال ز ب ي ر إ ب راه يم ض ع ي ف

Al-Aslami is accurately known as Ibrahim ibn Muhammad ibn Abi Yayha and he was a somewhat controversial narrator who has some heavy Jarh (disparagement) on him, and for this reason Ibn Hajar initially said he was Matruk (abandoned) overall as a narrator of Hadith in al-Taqrib as follows:

ابراهيم بن محمد بن أبي حضري الإسلامي أبو إسحاق المدني متروك من السابعة
مات سنة أربع وثمانين وقيل إحدى وتسعين ق

While in the above quote from Fath al-Bari, Ibrahim was said to be da’eef (weak) by ibn Hajar.

Note, Ibn Hajar completed his Taqrib al-Tahdhib in the year 817 AH as the manuscript found in Darul Kutub al-Misriyya affirmed, while Fath al-Bari was compiled over a 25 year period between the years 817 AH to 842 AH as mentioned by Ibn Hajar’s student, al-Sakhawi, in his al-Jawahir wal Durar fi tarjama Shaykh al-Islam ibn Hajar. ¹¹⁴

---

¹¹³ No. 533 of the Taymur collection. This copy is in the handwriting of al-Hafiz ibn Hajar and I have a digitised copy of it in my possession

¹¹⁴ See p. 675 of the edition printed by Dar Ibn Hazm, Beirut 1st edn, 1999 CE
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Hence, the final ruling by Ibn Hajar is that al-Aslami is da’eef and not Matruk as he mentioned in his earlier work.

The question that arises is whether the sanad from Abdar Razzaq is now by default da’eef (weak) due to al-Aslami’s presence in the sanad, or can this report be used as a supporting narration, especially so when we have the narration from Sa’iib (ra) recorded by Ali ibn al Ja’id in his Musnad and al-Bayhaqi in his Sunan al-Kubra, the narration from Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra) as in Musnad Ibn Mani’ and elsewhere, via routes not containing him, but their asanid (chains of transmission) are Sahih to a number of Huffaz?

Al-Aslami was mentioned by Abdar Rahman al-Mubarakpuri in his “al-Qaul as-Sadeeq” (p. 25) which was translated by the two compilers, Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban as follows:

**Question 7:** The chain of the fourth narration contains Ibraheem bin Abee Yahyaa, who was declared to be a liar by Yahyaa al-Qattaan, so how can his narration be used as a support?

**Answer 7:** Ya’qub Yahyaa Qattaan did say Ibraheem bin Abee Yahyaa was a liar, however Imaam Shaafi’ee authenticated him and said he was trustworthy in hadeeth and Imaam Shaafi’ee used many hadeeth from him and other major scholars of hadeeth used his hadeeth from the likes of Sufyaan ath-Thawree and Ibn Juraij.

Ibn Aqdaah said I looked at the hadeeth of Ibraheem bin Yahyaa with dept and I found he was not Munkar al-hadeeth. Ibn Adjyy also said I looked at the hadeeth of Ibraheem and found none of them to be Munkar. (refer to Meezaan ul-Ei’tidaal). So when these are the statements of Imaam Shaafi’ee, Ibn Aqdaah and Ibn Adjyy there is no harm in using Ibraheem bin Abee Yahyaa’s narrations as supports.

This is a clear ruling from al-Mubarakpuri that al-Aslami’s reports can be used as supporting narrations with some conditions. Note also, that having looked at al-Aslami’s notice in al-Hafiz Abu Ahmed ibn Adi’s (d. 365 AH) al-Kamil fil du’a’fa

---

115 The Indian “Salafi” commentator of Jami al-Tirmidhi, entitled, Tuhfatul Ahwazi
al-Rijal (1/353-367), besides Yahya al-Qattan accusing Ibrahim al-Aslami as being a liar, Imams Malik and Ibn Ma‘een are also said to have said the same, and Ibn Hanbal said he was a Qadri and Jahmi, while al-Bukhari said he was a Jahmi. Ibn Adi mentioned that Imam al-Shaf‘i did declare him to be Thiqa (trustworthy) as did Ibn al-Asbahani. Al-Aslami also had a Muwatta to his credit, but it was weaker in standing than that of Imam Malik.

Now, the likes of Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban need to ponder over why they declared Ali ibn al Ja‘d to be a “Shi‘a liar”, but they ignored all the heavy Jarh on al-Aslami by leading Huffaz of Hadith. Al-Mubarakpuri mentioned above about al-Aslami: “Ibn Adiyy also said I looked at the hadeeth of Ibraheem and found none of them to be Munkar”.

If this is al-Mubarakpuri’s judgement as well, then Insha‘Allah, such a statement may be utilised to suggest that al-Aslami’s narration as in the Musannaf Abdar Razzaq for 23 rak‘ats from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid is not absolutely munkar (rejected) by itself, since he is supported by what Yazid ibn Khusayf narrated from Saa‘ib, and the independent narration from Ubayy ibn Ka‘b (ra) for 20 rak‘ats as in the Musnad of Ibn Mani, and via the latter’s route in Diya al-Maqdisi’s al-Mukhtara, all giving further credibility to al-Aslami’s narration.

ii) Al-Harith ibn Abdar Rahman ibn Abi Dhubab

The two compilers said about this narrator:

Imaam al-Albaanee said the narrator Ibn Abee Dhubaab’s memory deteriorated. Ibn Abee Haatim said, my father said (Abee Haatim) Darwardee would narrate rejected narrations from him, he is not strong. Abu Zur‘ah said, “There is no harm in him.” Ibn Hazm said, “Weak.” He was not trusted by Imaam Maalik nor was he narrated on by him, as mentioned by Imaam Ibn Hajr. (Refer to Tahdheebohut-Tahdheeboh 2/135-136 no.1090), Meezaaun ul-Eftidaal 2/172-172 no.1631, al-Jarh Wat-Ta’deel 3/79-82 no.365) (see Salaatul-Taraaweeh (pg.52)
The following was said about this narrator earlier:

The other narrator known as Ibn A bi D hubab is al-H arith ibn A bdar Rahman, and Ibn H ajar declared him to be truthful but suspected of making some errors in al-Taqrib as follows:

[الحربة بن عبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن سعد بن أبي ذياب بضم المعجمة]

ووحدتين الدوسي بفتح الدال المدني صدوق بهم من الخامسة مائة سنة ست وأربعين عش م مدة ق ي

Shaykh Shu’ayb al-A ma’ut and Dr Bashhar A wwad Ma’ruf in their follow up work to Ibn H ajar’s Taqrib al-Tahdhib, known as Tahrir al-Taqrib (no. 1030) opposed Ibn H ajar’s above grading on Ibn A bi D hubab. They both said that Ibn A bi D hubab is Saduq H asan al-H adith (truthful and good in H adith), except for the narrations of al-D rawardi from him - as only then are Ibn A bi D hubab’s narrations rejected. This latter point was derived from the statement of A bu H atim al-R azi, while Ibn A bi D hubab had a form of praise (ta’dil) on him from A bu Z ur’a al-R azi, Ibn H ibban and al-D hahabi, and Imam Muslim used him as proof in Sahih Muslim.

Indeed, al-D hahabi declared Ibn A bi D hubab to be Thiqa in his al-Mughni:

الحربة بن عبد الرحمن بن أبي ذياب عن المقبري ثقة وقال أبو حامد ليس بالقوي روى عنه

الدراوشي مناكر وقال ابن حزم ضعيف

Al-D hahabi also declared Ibn A bi D hubab to be Thiqa in his Mizan al-I’tidal also:
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In Ibn Hajar’s Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (2/89) the entry for Ibn Abi Dhubab is as follows:

People of Madina did relate from him. Ibn Hajar mentioned that Ibn Hibban agreed upon to be da’eef in Madina. Al-Saji was quoted above as saying that the People of Madina did relate from him. Ibn Hajar mentioned that Ibn Hibban considered Ibn Abi Dhubab to be not only Thiqa but also from the precise (mutqanin) narrators, as did Ibn Qani in his Ta’rikh. Abu Zur’a al-Razi said that there is no harm in Ibn Abi Dhubab.

Therefore, the chains of transmission which do not have al-Darawardi narrating from Ibn Abi Dhubab are not automatically rejected but acceptable for ‘Itibar (consideration), and in this case it was al-Aslami who took from Ibn Abi Dhubab and not al-Darawardi. In this regard our contention is that Abdar Razzaq’s sanad is at worst da’eef (weak), and since its wording is supported by the Sahih narrations via Yazid ibn Khusayfa found in the Musnad of Ibn al Jād, al-Bayhaqi’s asanid and the independent sanad from Ubayy ibn Ka’b, the text

116 This is mentioned by Ibn Hibban in his Mashahir Ulama al-Amsar as follows:

117 As recorded in the Musnad of Ibn Mani and from his route by Diya al-Maqdisi in al-Mukhtara.
from Ibn Abi Dhubab as in the Musannaf Abdar Razzaq may be classed as being Hasan (good) overall.

It is strange how al-Albani attempted to discredit Ibn Abi Dhubab in this narration but has himself declared a sanad via this very same Ibn Abi Dhubab to be Jayyid (good)! An example is mentioned by al-Albani in his editing of al-Sunna of Ibn Abi Asim as follows:

Note also, that if the Albani'ites hope to discredit the narration of Abdar Razzaq presented here as an alleged mistake transmitted by al-Dabar from his Shaykh, Abdar Razzaq, then it is said in reply that no evidence exists to prove this is the reality for this specific narration. It has been seen above that Ibn Abdal Barr and after him, al-Ayni, did not level any charges against al-Dabar or mention any accusations against al-Aslami or Ibn Abi Dhubab for that matter as well.

This is an indication that Ibn Abdal Barr had no problem with this narration from Saa'ib transmitted by Ibn Abi Dhubab (for 23 rak'ats) as a good supporting narration to show that Muhammad ibn Yusuf erred by transmitting it with the wording for 11 rak'ats. Recall, Ibn Abdal Barr did say in al-Istidhkar:

وهد كله يشهد بأن الرواية بإحدى عشرة ركعة وهو غلط وأن الصحيح ثلاث وعشرون
واحدة وعشرون ركعة
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“And all this testifies that the narration for 11 rak’ats is an erroneous mistake (wahm wa ghalat) and that the authentic (Sahih) is 23 and 21 rak’ats.”

Note also, that Imam Malik did not act upon Muhammad ibn Yusuf’s narration for 11 rak’ats, nor did Imam al-Shafi’i. This will be shown in the later chapter dealing with A’isha’s (ra) variant narrations for 8 rak’ats, which we maintain refer to Salatul Tahajjud alone.
D) The Mursal narrations from Yazid ibn Ruman and Yahya al-Qattan on 20 rak’ats in Umar ibn al Khattab’s (ra) time

In the Muwatta of Imam Malik there is the following narration from Yazid ibn Ruman:

Book 6, Number 6.2.5:

Yahya related to me from Malik that Yazid ibn Ruman said, “The people used to watch the night in prayer during Ramadan for twenty-three rakas in the time of Umar ibn al-Khattab.”

The two compilers mentioned this narration and the reasons for rejecting it as follows (pp. 14-15 of their “Qaul ul Saheeh”):

The Second Evidence – The Narrations of Umar
The First Narration - Of Yazeed bin Rumaan
Yazeed bin Rumaan said, “The people in the time of Umar used to pray 23 raka’hs.” (Muwatta Imam Maalik (1/38), Sunan al-Kubraa (2/496) of Imaam Baihaqee.

The Answer
Concerning Yazeed bin Rumaan, Haafidh Ibn Hajr said, “Trustworthy, a narrator of the fifth level and he died in 130H.” (Taqreeb ut-Tahdheeb (no.7763 pg.1074) and Tahdheeb ut-Tahdheeb (11/282 no.8033)

And the Haafidh said in the introduction to Taqreeb, “The fifth level is of the smaller (successors) ones, they saw either one or two companions and some of them hearing from the companions is not established, like A’amash.” (Muqaddimah Taqreeb ut-Tahdheeb (pg.82)

Imaam Badee ud deen said, “This narration is not authentic because Yazeed bin Rumaan did not encounter the time of Umar, rather he was of a later time and we do not know who he heard this from and whether that individual was truthful or a liar. So relying upon an unknown narrator is issues pertaining to the religion, is wrong. The narration is not clear and it also opposes a clear and authentic narration that mentions 11 raka’hs.
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The hanafie’s themselves have admitted Yazeeed bin Rumaan did not meet Umar, see Allaamah Zailaa’ee’s Nasb ur-Raayah (2/154), Ainee Hanafie’s Banaayah Sharh Hidaayah (1/867) and Nimawee in Aathaar as-Sunan (2/158). (Tanqeed as- Sadeed pg.265)

Allaamah al-Albaanees said, “Imaam Baihaqee mentioned this narration in his book al-Ma ‘arifah and it has a weakness and he said, Yazeeed ibn Rumaan did not encounter Umar. Haafidh Zailaa’ee also supported this in Nasb ur-Raayah (2/154). Imaam Nawawee also said this athar is weak (al-Majmoora (4/33), he said “Imaam Baihaqee narrated this but it is mursal because Yazeeed ibn Rumaan did not encounter Umar. ” Similarly Ainee also weakened it and said, “The chain is disconnected.” (Umdatul-Qaaree Sharh Saheeh al-Bukhaari (5/357). Therefore this narration is not worthy that it be used as proof when this narration is weak due to being disconnected between Ibn Rumaan and Umar. Similarly it opposes the authentic narration from Umar which mentions 11 raka’hs.” (Salaatul-Taraaweeh pg.53-54).

Imaam Baihaqee also said, “The chain is disconnected, Yazeeed bin Rumaan who was trustworthy, did not meet Umar.” (al-Jaami Shu ‘bal-Eemaan (6/444 no.3000)

The hanafie author of Kabeereed said, “Yazeeed bin Rumaan did not meet Umar, hence this athar is disconnected.” (Kabeereed pg.351). Shaikh Nimawee Hanafie said, “Yazeeed bin Rumaan did not encounter Umar bin Khattaab.” (Ta’leeq al-Hasan A’la Aathaar as-Sunan (pg.253 no.284).

Reply:

It is correct that Yazid ibn Rumaan did not not encounter the time of Umar (ra) when the rak’ats were 20 rak’ats, and the narration is thus disconnected between them, and said to be technically a mursal narration.

As for their claim that: Therefore this narration is not worthy that it be used as proof when this narration is weak due to being disconnected between Ibn Rumaan and Umar. Similarly it opposes the authentic narration from Umar which mentions 11 raka’hs.”

Their claim that the 11 rak’ats variant narration from Umar (ra) is authentic is unjustified and it has a defect in its textual content (I’lla) as has been shown earlier by quoting the findings of al-Hafiz Ibn Abdal Barr al-Maliki (d. 463 AH) from his al-Istidhkar:
“And all this testifies that the narration for 11 rak’ats is an erroneous mistake (wahm wa ghalat) and that the authentic (Sahih) is 23 and 21 rak’ats.”

The 11 rak’ats variant also opposes the Sahih narrations from Sa‘îb via the routes of Yazid ibn Khusayfa as in al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra and Ma’rifatus Sunan, as well as the independent narration recorded by Diya al-Maqdisi via the route of Ibn Mani in al-Mukhtara. The latter narration is not via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf, Yazid ibn Khusayfa or Ibn Abi Dhubab, all of whom took from Sa‘îb ibn Yazid.

Since these latter set of narrations are stronger then the one for 11 rak’ats as in the Muwatta Malik, they are fully connected to strengthen the mursal narration from Yazid ibn Ruman. This narration from Yazid ibn Ruman is from the mursal narrations of the Muwatta, and it is well known that such a mursal narration is Sahih to Imam Malik.

It is worth quoting what Dr Suhaib Hasan, who is from the same school of thought as Abu Khuzaimah/Abu Hibban mentioned about the mursal narration in his Introduction to the Science of Hadith. As part of his discussion on the mursal he mentioned the following about the 4 major Mujtahid ImAMS:

To be precise in this issue, let us investigate in detail the various opinions regarding the Mursal Hadith:

1) The opinion held by Imam Malik and all Maliki jurists is that the Mursal of a trustworthy person is valid as proof and as justification for a practice, just like a musnad hadith. This view has been developed to such an extreme that to some of them, the mursal is even better than the musnad, based on the following reasoning: “The one who reports a musnad hadith leaves you with the names of the reporters for further investigation and scrutiny, whereas the one who narrates by way of Irsal, being

---

118 See http://www.sunnahonline.com/ilm/sunnah/0008_page6.htm
a knowledgeable and trustworthy person himself, has already done so and found the hadith to be sound. In fact, he saves you from further research.” 14

2) **Imam Abu Hanifah** (d. 150) holds the same opinion as Malik; he accepts the Mursal Hadith whether or not it is supported by another hadith.15

3) **Imam al-Shaf‘i** (d. 204) has discussed this issue in detail in his al-Risalah; he requires the following conditions to be met before accepting a mursal hadith:

(i) In the narrative, he requires that one of the following conditions be met: that it be reported also as musnad through another isnad; that its contents be reported as mursal through another reliable source with a different isnad; that the meaning be supported by the sayings of some Companions; or that most scholars hold the same opinion as conveyed by the mursal hadith.

(ii) Regarding the narrator, he requires that one of the following conditions be met: that he be an elder Successor; that if he names the person missing in the isnad elsewhere, he does not usually name an unknown person or someone not suitable for reporting from acceptably; or that he does not contradict a reliable person when he happens to share with him in a narration.16

On the basis of these arguments, al-Shaf‘i’i accepts the Irsal of Sa‘id b. al-Musayyab, one of the elder Successors. For example, al- Shaf‘i’i considers the issue of selling meat in exchange for a living animal: he says that Malik told him, reporting from Zaid b. Aslam, who reported from Ibn al-Musayyab that the Messenger of Allah (may Allah bless him and grant him peace) forbade the selling of meat in exchange for an animal. He then says, ‘This is our opinion, for the Irsal of Ibn al-Musayyib is fine.’17

4) **Imam Ahmad b. Hanbal** (d. 241) accepts mursal and (other) da’if (weak) ahadith if nothing opposing them is found regarding a particular issue, preferring them to qiyas (analogical deduction). By da’if here is meant hadith which are not severely weak, e.g. batil, munkar, or maudu’, since Imam Ahmad classified ahadith into sahih and da’if rather than into sahih, hasan and da’if, the preference of most later traditionists. Hence, the category da’if in his view applied to ahadith which were relatively close to being sahih, and included many ahadith which were classed as hasan by other scholars.18 Overlooking this fact has caused misunderstanding about Imam Ahmad’s
view on the place of da'if hadith in rulings of Fiqh and in matters of Fada'il al-A'mal (virtues of various acts of worship). 119

The above is clear that Imam Malik accepts the Mursal narration to be authentic and the narration from Yazid ibn Ruman was acceptable to him, since he recorded it in al-Muwatta, especially more so since he accepted 20 Rak'ats of Taraweeh to be his Madhhab, with the additional 16 rak'ats of superoragatory prayer.

Additionally, since Imam Malik did not act upon the 11 rak'at narration from his Shaykh, Muhammad ibn Yusuf, then this is an indication that Imam Malik and the Madinan jurists considered it to be inapplicable in action for some reason or another, and they acted upon the version transmitted by Yazid ibn Ruman.

Indeed, Imam al-Shafi'i was a disciple of Imam Malik’s who is reported to have said about the contents of Muwatta Malik the following:

“The most authentic book after the book of Allah is the Muwatta of Malik.” 120

The later Shafi'i Muhaddith, al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani mentioned the narration from Yazid ibn Ruman in al-Dirayaf al-Takhrij hadith al-Hidaya (1/203) with full knowledge that it is mursal but it is supported with the fully connected

119 Footnotes:
13) Yusuf b. ‘Abdullah Ibn ‘Abdul Barr, Tajrid al-Tamhid lima fi l-Muwatta’ min al-Asanid (Cairo, 1350), 1:2.
14) ibid.
15) al-Suyuti, 1:198.
16) For the discussion in detail, see al-Shafi’i, al-Risalah (ed. Ahmad Shakir, Cairo, 1358/1940, pp. 461-470; English translation: M. Khadduri, 2nd ed., Islamic Texts Society Cambridge, 1987, pp. 279-284, where the mursal hadith has been translated as “interrupted tradition”).
120 As quoted by Shah Waliullah al-Dehlawi in his Hujjatullah al-Baligha (p. 48). Al-Shafi’i’s statement with variant wordings has been collated by Ibn Abdal Barr al-Maliki with his chains of transmission in al-Tamheed lima fil Muwatta min al-Ma’ani wal Asanid (1/76-77, Moroccan Awqaf edition)
and authentic version from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid (as in the Ma‘rifatus Sunan of al-Bayhaqi). This is what was mentioned in al-Diraya:

Also, in Ibn Hajar’s Fath al-Bari the narration from Yazid ibn Ruman (mentioning 23 rak‘ats) was mentioned since it is supported by the fully connected versions for 20 rak‘ats from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid (ra) via the route of Ibn Khusayafa and 21 rak‘ats from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid (ra) via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf as follows:

Some of the supporting narrations were also mentioned by the late “Salafi” writer known as Abdullah al-Duwaish in his reply to al-Albani’s weakening of some strong narrations as follows in his Tanbih al-Qari li-taqwiyya ma du‘a‘ahu al-A’lbani (p. 48):
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The above quote shows his use of some narrations from the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba as summarized below:

i) The mursal narration reported from Yahya al-Qattan that Umar ibn al-Khattab (ra) ordered a man to perform 20 rak‘ats of Salah

ii) The narration from Nafi ibn Umar mentioning Ibn Abi Mulayka leading for 20 rak‘ats

iii) The mursal narration from Abdal Aziz ibn Rufa‘i that Ubayy ibn Ka‘b (ra) lead for 20 rak‘ats with 3 rak‘ats Witr

iv) The report from the Tabi‘i, Ata ibn Rabah that the people performed 23 rak‘ats inclusive of the Witr. Al-Duwaish mentioned that this narration was authentic according to the conditions of Imam Muslim

To conclude this section let us quote from a portion of a pseudo-Salafi Fatwa site¹²¹ allowing the premise to not only act on 20 rak‘ats but also admit to a number of the proofs mentioned earlier:

The report that ‘Umar ibn al-Khattaab ordered that Taraweeh prayer should be twenty rak‘ahs came from four of the Taabīeen. These are their reports:

1 – It was narrated that Saa‘ib ibn Yazeed said: ‘Umar ibn al-Khattaab (may Allaah be pleased with him) gathered the people together in Ramadaan to be led by Ubayy ibn Ka‘b and Tameem al-Daari in praying twenty-one rak‘ahs, and they used to recite hundreds of verses, and they dispersed before dawn broke.

A number of narrators narrated it from al-Sadīb, some of whom mentioned twenty rak‘ahs or twenty-one or twenty-three. They were:

Muhammad ibn Yoosuf, the son of the sister of al-Saa’ib, from al-Saa’ib, as was narrated by ‘Abd al-Razzaaq in al-Musannaf (4/260) from the report of Dawood ibn Qays and others.

Yazeed ibn Khusayfah. This was narrated by Ibn al-Majd\textsuperscript{122} in al-Musnad (1/413), and via him by al-Bayhaqi in al-Sunan (2/496).

Al-Haarith ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmaan ibn Abi Dhubaab. This was narrated by ‘Abd al-Razzaaq in al-Musannaf (4/261).

These reports are saheeh reports narrated by trustworthy narrators from al-Saa’ib ibn Yazeed. They mention twenty rak’ahs at the time of ‘Umar ibn al-Khattaab (may Allaah be pleased with him). The extra amount mentioned – twenty-one or twenty-three, refers to Taraweeh plus Witr.

2 – It was narrated that Yazeed ibn Rumaan said: At the time of ‘Umar ibn al-Khattaab the people used to pray twenty-three rak’ahs of qiyaam in Ramadaan. This was narrated from him by Maalik in al-Muwatta’ (1/115). Al-Nawawi said in al-Majmoo’ (4/33: It is mursal, because Yazeed ibn Rumaan did not live at the same time as ‘Umar. End quote.

3 – It was narrated from Yahya ibn Sa’eed al-Qattaan that ‘Umar ibn al-Khattaab (may Allaah be pleased with him) ordered a man to lead them in twenty rak’ahs of prayer. This was narrated by Ibn Abi Shaybah in al-Musannaaf (2/163) from Wakee’ from Maalik. But Yahya ibn Sa’eed did not live at the same time as ‘Umar.

4 – It was narrated that ‘Abd al-‘Azeez ibn Rafee’ said: Ubayy ibn Ka’b used to lead the people in praying twenty rak’ahs during Ramadaan in Madeenah, and he would pray Witr with three rak’ahs. This was narrated by Ibn Abi Shaybah in al-Musannaaf (2/163).

From all these reports it is clear that twenty rak’ahs was the way that Taraweeh was usually done at the time of ‘Umar ibn al-Khattaab (may Allaah be pleased with him). A matter such as Taraweeh prayer is

\textsuperscript{122} This is a typographical error, the name is Ibn al-Ja’d, not Ibn al-Majd
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something that is well known among all people, and is transmitted from one generation to another. The report of Yazeed ibn Rumaan and Yahya al-Qattaan is to be taken into account even if they did not live at the same time as 'Umar, because undoubtedly they learned it from a number of people who had been alive at the time of 'Umar, and this is something that does not need and isnaad, rather all the people of Madeenah are its isnaad.

Imam al-Tirmidhi (may Allaah have mercy on him) said in his Sunan (3/169):

Most of the scholars are of the view that what is narrated from 'Umar, 'Ali and other companions of the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) is twenty rak'ahs. This is the view of al-Thawri, Ibn al-Mubaarak and al-Shaafa'i.

Al-Shaafa'i said: This is what I learned in our land, in Makkah they pray twenty rak'ahs.
THE TWO COMPILERS AND THEIR ATTACK ON SHAYKH HABIBUR RHAMAN AL-A’ZAMI (d. 1992 CE)

They said in their “Qaul ul Saheeh” (p. 30):

Shaikh Habeeb ur-Rahmaan Hanafee said: “Although the mursal narration is not accepted by Imaam Shaafi’ee, he clarifies this and says it is only accepted when a mursal narration is supported by either another mursal or a Musnad narration…” (See his Rak‘aat Taraaweeh (pg.62).

The Answer

This is a distortion of the words of Imaam ash-Shaafi’ee and missing out his exact opinion concerning mursal narrations as well as his explanation of this issue. The distortion here, and a very very cunning one indeed, by Shaikh Habeeb ur-Rehmaan Aadhamee is that he mentions Imaams Shaafi’ee’s position as, “he clarifies this and says it is only accepted when a mursal narration is supported by either another mursal or a Musnad narration…” However Imaam Shaafi’ee only said this about the mursal narrations from the MAJOR SUCCESSORS (Kibaar Taabi’een) and not from the Minor Successors (Sighaar Taabi’een). So Habeeb ur-Rehmaan attempted to deceive the people by showing any mursal narration from any of the successors is accepted, as long as it is supported in some way.

Imaam Shaafi’eees position was as Imaam Ibn Katheer mentioned; He (Shaafi’ee) said in his book ar-Risaalah the mursal narrations of the Major Successors are evidence, on the condition they are also narrated via another route, even if the other route is mursal or if they are supported by a statement of a companion and the majority of the Scholars or the narrator names his man (ie narrator) he is except but trustworthy. So with these conditions the mursal narration will constitute proof but it will still not reach the level of Musil (ie a continuous chain to the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam)Imaam Shaafi’ee also said, “Mursal narrations from other than the major successors (ie those successors who were from the middle or minor level), then I do not know anyone who
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accepted them.” (Ikhtisaar Uloom al- Hadeeth (pg.15) Haafidh Ibn Hajr has also something similar to this in Fath ul-Baaree.).

So these mursal narrations are the narrations of Yazeed ibn Rumân’s, Yahyaa bin Sa’eed’s, Abdul-Azeez bin Rufâ’e’s and A’amash from Abdullaah ibn Maâood.

Reply:

What Shaykh al-A’zami asserted is not a novel claim with regard to the use of Yazid ibn Rumân’s mursal narration. Two famous Maliki Imams from some 9 centuries ago, and they were also acknowledged commentators of the Muwatta of Imam Malik, known as al-Baji and ibn al-Arabi positively ascribed this mursal narration to be a proof used by Imam al-Shafi’i.

The Maliki Imam, Abul Walid al-Baji (d. 474 AH) has mentioned the following in his commentary to the Muwatta Malik known as al-Muntaqa Sharh Muwatta Malik:123

123 2/149 (Darul Kutub Ilmiyya edn, Beirut, 1st edn, 1999)
The above quote mentions the point that Imam Malik preferred 39 rak’ats Taraweeh inclusive of 3 rak’ats Witr; while his one time disciple, Imam al-Shafi’i preferred 20 rak’ats Taraweeh based upon the narration of Yazid ibn Ruman. Hence, Imam al-Baji was of the opinion that Imam al-Shafi’i did utilise the Mursal narration from Yazid ibn Ruman.

**Imam Abu Bakr ibn al-A’rabi al-Maliki** (d. 543 AH) also mentioned similar to al-Baji that Imam Malik preferred 39 rak’ats with the witr, and the point that al-Shafi’i preferred 20 rak’ats based on the mursal narration of Yazid ibn Ruman. This is what Ibn al A’rabi said in his al-Masalik fi Sharh Muwatta Malik:

All this goes to show that both Imam Malik and Imam al-Shafi’i did not act on the 11 rak’at variant transmitted via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf as in Muwatta Malik; but on the contrary these two Maliki Imams (al-Baji and Ibn al A’rabi) were both convinced that Imam al-Shafi’i did accept 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh based on Yazid ibn Ruman’s mursal narration.

The question that remains now is will the two compilers attack these two Maliki Imams for saying that Imam al-Shafi’i accepted the Mursal narration from Yazid ibn Ruman or not?!

The loathsome manner which Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban dealt with the name of Shaykh al-A’zami was further seen in their weak article entitled, “al-Jawaab ar rabbaanee (p. 4):

Then came the mu’tassub hanafee rabid animals from India and Pakistan full of hatred and blackened faces and hearts, from the likes of Habeeb ur-Rehmaan A’dhamee whilst

---

124 2/481 (Dar al Gharb al Islami, Beirut, 1st edn, 2007)
sitting in India who after being refuted and shamed for his lying and distorting the ahadeeth of the Messenger of Allah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) by the Salafi Scholars of Hindh, he ran to Abu Guddah.

The reader may take heed of how they described the Hanafi’s of India and Pakistan to be “rabid animals”!! If only they could prove just the last point that Shaykh al-A’zami who was the Shaykh of Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda apparently went running to his own student! The treachery and double dealing of these two compilers over the late Shaykh al-A’zami was further dealt with by this writer in my article entitled: “Those who truly lied against the late Hanafi Muhaddith: Shaykh Habibur Rahmn al-A’zami and the Hanafi school on other related issues.”

They accused al-A’zami of: for his lying and distorting the ahadeeth of the Messenger of Allah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam).

If they truly believe this, then the challenge is set for these self declared People of Hadith to show us where did their late Shaykh Muhammad Salih Ibn Uthaymin (d. 2001 CE) and his reference - Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya obtain the following narration from as ascribed by them to the Musnad of Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal which they allege contains a Hadith from Ibn Abbas stating that Istiwa means Julus (seating) for Allah:

وأما تفسيره بالجلوس فقد نقل ابن القمي في الصواعق عن خارجة بن مصعب في قوله تعالى: {الرحمن على العرش استوى} قوله: "وهل يكون الاستواء إلا الجلوس". أه. وقد ورد ذكر


Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya also mentioned this narration regarding Julus (sitting) in his al-Ijtima al-Juyush al-Islamiyya (p. 70):

If having failed to locate the narration ascribed to the Musnad of Ahmed with the wording for “sitting”, one would expect the likes of Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban to resort to the similar declaration they made against the late al-A’zami. Alas, justice is rare these days, hence, the reader cannot expect this type of admission from their likes but merely a string of petty excuses to save the necks of their Imams.

The two compilers also mentioned the mursal narration from Yahya al-Qattanas found in the Musnand of Ibn Abi Shayba when they said in their “Qaul ul Saheeh” (p. 18):

The Third Narration – Of Yahyaa bin Sa’eed

Ibn Abee Shaybah in his Musannah narrates from Wakeef from Maalik from Yahyaa bin Sa’eed that Umar binal-Khattaab ordered a man to lead them in prayer for 20 raka’ahs. (Musannaf Ibn Abee Shaybah (2/89/2).

The Answer.

Allaamah al-Albaanee said, “Then this is also disconnected. Allaamah al-Mubaarakpooreee said in at-Tuhfah (2/85), “Nimawee said in Aathaar as-Sunan, “The narrators are trustworthy but Yahyaa bin Sa’eed did not encounter (meet) Umar?” So Nimawee is correct in saying that there is disconnection in the chain and therefore it is not correct to deduce from it. It also opposes the authentically established chain of Umar (Radhiyallahu Anhu) in which he ordered Ubayy bin Ka’ab and Tameem ad-Daaree to lead the people in 11 rak’ahs, transmitted by

127 In the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba the arabic quote being:
Maalik in Muwatta as cited previously. It also opposes that which is established from the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) in an authentic hadeeth” (Salaatul-Taraaweelah pg.54-55), Tuhfatul-Ahwaadheeh (3/445).

Imaam Ibn Hazm said Yahyaa ibn Sa’eed was born approximately 25 years after the death of Umar (Radhiallaahu Anhu). (al-Muhallaah (10/60)

Haafidh Ibn Hajr said, “Yahyaa bin Sa’eed bin Qais al-Ansaari al-Madanee (Abu Sa’eed al-Qaadhee, Thiqatun-Thabt), from the Fifth level. He died in 144H or after it” (Taqreeb ut-Tahdheeb (no.7609 pg.1056)

And the Haafidh said in the introduction to Taqreeb, “The fifth level is of the smaller (successors) ones, they saw either one or two companions and some of them hearing from the companions is not established, like A’Amash.” (Muqaddimah Taqreeb ut-Tahdheeb (pg.82)

As cited above, Shaikh Nimawee Hanafee said, “I say the narrators are trustworthy but, Yahyaa bin Sa’eed did not meet Umar” (Taalieeq Aathaaras-Sunan (pg.253 no.285).

Reply:

Though the narration is mursal and Yahya al-Qattan did not encounter Umar (ra), it is not correct for them to claim once again:

It also opposes the authentically established chain of Umar (Radhiallaahu Anhu) in which he ordered Ubayy bin Kâb and Tameem ad-Daaree to lead the people in 11 rakâs, transmitted by Maalik in Muwatta as cited previously. It also opposes that which is established from the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) in an authentic hadeeth.”

The nature of the 11 rak’at narration has already been discussed and the claim that Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) himself lead for such a number of rak’ats in total is also not proven. Indeed, a pseudo-Salafi Fatwa site 128 mentioned from Imam al-Suyuti the following:


- 179 -
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Al-Suyooti said:

What is narrated in the saheeh and hasan ahaadeeth is the command to observe night prayers during Ramadaan, which is encouraged without specifying a particular number. It is not proven that the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) prayed twenty rak’ahs of Talaaweeh, rather that he prayed at night, with an unspecified number of rak’ahs. Then he delay it on the fourth night lest it become obligatory for them and they might not be able to do it. Ibn Hajar al-Haythami said: There is no saheeh report that the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) prayed twenty rak’ahs of Talaaweeh. The narration which suggests that he “used to pray twenty rak’ahs” is extremely weak (da’eef).

Al-Mawsoo’ah al-Fiqhiyyah, 27/142-145

The above narration from Yahya al-Qattan was related by Imam Malik and it has been shown above that Imam Malik accepted the mursal narrations unconditionally, unlike Imam al-Shafi’i.

Besides, the mursal narration from Yahya al-Qattan is independently supported by the report that Diya al-Maqdisi recorded in al-Mukhtara via the route of Ahmed ibn Mani with the following chain and text as mentioned earlier:

Al-Hasan ibn Musa – Abu Ja’far al-Razi – al-Rabi’ ibn Anas – Abul Aliyya from Ubayy ibn Ka’b (radiallahu anhu):

The text states:

"Umar (radiallahu anhu) ordered Ubayy to lead the people in prayer at night in Ramadhan, saying, “The people fast during the day and can not recite (the Qur’an) well, so will you recite the Qur’an for them at night?” He said: ‘O commander of the believers, this thing was not done before.’ He said: ‘I know, but it is better (ahsan)” (Ubayy) led them (the Companion’s) for 20 rak’ats."

This narration was Sahih to Diya al-Maqdisi as was shown earlier and it is a good supporting narration to strengthen the mursal of Yahya al-Qattan.
THE MURSAL NARRATION OF ABDAL AZIZ IBN RUFA’I FOR 20 RAK’ATS AND OTHER REPORTS FROM THE SALAF

The two compilers also mentioned their rejection of another mursal from the trustworthy narrator known as Abdal Aziz ibn Rufa’i as follows in their “Qaul ul Saheeh” (p. 24):

The Fourth Evidence – The Narrations of Ubayy bin Ka’ab

The First Narration

This is the chain which includes Abdul-Azeez bin Rufâe and he narrates, that Ubayy bin Ka’ab would lead in 20 raka’hs and 3 witr in Ramadhaan in the Prophets city. (Musannaf Ibn Abee Shaybah (2/90/1)

The Arabic text from the Musannaf Ibn Abi Shayba stated:

 حدثنا حمّيّد بن عبد الرحمن عن خسّان عن عبد العزيز بن رقعي قال قل كل أبي بن كعب يصلى بالثام في رمضان بالمدينة عشرين ركعة ويوتير بثلاث

Once again, despite it being a mursal narration it is supported with fully connected chains as shown earlier from 4 of al-Bayhaqi’s Hadith collections, once in the Musnad of Ali ibn al Ja’d and Kitab al-Siyam of al-Firyabi all via the route of Yazid ibn Khusayfa from Saa’ib ibn Yazid; the independent narration mentioned above from Dîya al-Maqdisî, as well as the narration of Muhammad ibn Yusuf (the narrator who transmitted it also with 11, 13 and 21 rak’ats) as in the Musannaf Abdar Razzaq.

Ibn Rufa’i was a trustworthy narrator and in al-Ma’rifa wal Ta’rikh (3/ 177) of Ya’qub ibn Sufyan al-Fasawi (d. 277 AH) he is praised as follows by al-Fasawi:

 وهو ثقة يقوم حديثه مقام الحجة
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Meaning, he is trustworthy and his hadith stand in the rank of being authoritative evidence (hujja).

Note, the “Salafi” writer, Mustafa al Adawi declared the narration from Ibn Rufa’i to be Sahih mursal (authentic but mursal) in his Bahth fi adad rak’at qiyam al-layl\textsuperscript{129} as it is a Shahid (witnessing narration) to the connected chained one’s like in the Musnad of Ibn al Ja’\d, Sunan al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi and elsewhere mentioning 20 rak’ats in the time of Umar (ra). Shaykh Shu’ayb al-Arna’ut declared this mursal narration from Ibn Rufa’i to be strong in its chain of transmission (Qawi al-Sanad) in his editing of Imam al-Dhahabi’s Siyar a’lam an-Nubala (1/ 401, fn. 1) as was quoted earlier on.

In the Qiyam Ramadan of Ibn Nasr al-Marwazi there is a mursal narration from Muhammad ibn Ka’\b al-Qurazi as follows:

وَقَالَ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ كَعْبِ الْقُرَزِيَّ: "كَانَ الْقَانِسُ يَصِلُّونَ فِي زِمَانِ عُمْرَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنَّهُ فِي رَمَضَانِ عَشَرِينَ رَكَعَةً رَكَعَةً يَطِلُّونَ فِيهَا الْقِرَأَةَ وَيَوْتُونَ بِثَلَاثٍ" 

This narration is found in the abridged edition of Ibn Nasr's work and the full sanad is not mentioned, thus the authenticity of the sanad back to al-Qurazi is indeterminable. The text itself mentions that the people would pray 20 rak’ats Taraweeh and 3 rak’ats witr in the time of Umar (ra).

Additionally, there are some narrations mentioning some of the Salaf al-Salihin (pious predecessors) performing 20 rak’ats Taraweeh that were not mentioned by the two compilers, which may be due to them not coming across them. They are found in the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba, the abridged edition of Qiyam Ramadan by Ibn Nasr al-Marwazi, Fada’il Ramadan of Ibn Abi Dunya and elsewhere.

It has been mentioned earlier that a contemporary Egyptian “Salafi” writer known as Mustafa al-Adawi has authenticated some of the narrations mentioning 20 rak’ats Taraweeh. In his Bahth fi adad rak’at qiyam al-layl\textsuperscript{130}, he

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item [129] See p. 40
\item [130] See pp. 46-48
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
has declared some narrations from the Salaf (pious predecessors of the first three
generations of Islam) performing at least 20 Rak’ats of Taraweeh as recorded in
the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba (d. 235 AH) to be Sahih. These include:

i) **Ata ibn Abi Rabah** mentioned 23 rak’ats inclusive of witr in his time,
and he is from the leading Tabi’in of Makka:

\[
\text{7770- حنّتَنا ابنَ مُتَمُّر، عنَ عَبَّادَ الْمَلَك، عنَ عَطاءٍ، قالَ: أَذَكَّرَتَ التَّاسَم وَهُمْ يَصِلُّونَ ثَلاَثًا وَعَشَرِينَ رَكْعَةً بِالْوَعْرُ}\\
\]

Shaykh Muhammad Ali al-Nimawi declared the isnâd for this narration to be Hasan (good) in his Athar al-Sunan.\(^{131}\)

ii) **Ibn Abi Mulayaka** lead for 20 rak’ats:

\[
\text{7765- حنّتَنا وَكِيَّمَ، عنَ نافعٍ بنَ عُمَرَ، قالَ: كَانَ ابنَ أَبِي مُلَكَةٍ يُصِلِّي بِنَا فِي رَمَضَانِ عَشَرَيْنَ رَكْعَةً وَيُقَرَّاً بِحمْدِ المَلَكَةِ فِي رَكْعَةٍ}\\
\]

Shaykh al-Nimawi declared the isnâd for this narration from Ibn Abi Mulayaka to be Sahih in his Athar al-Sunan.\(^ {132}\)

iii) **Ali ibn Rabi’a** lead for 5 tarweehat (which is the same as 20 rak’ats) plus 3 rak’ats witr:

\[
\text{7772- حنّتَنا القَفْضَةُ يَنْ ذَكَّرَهُمْ، عَنِ سُعِيدٍ بنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، قَالَ: أَذَكَّرَ التَّاسَم وَهُمْ يُصِلُّونَ بِهِمْ فِي}\\
\]

Shaykh al-Nimawi declared the isnâd of this report to be Sahih in his Athar al-Sunan.\(^ {133}\)

---

\(^{131}\) See p. 253  
\(^{132}\) See p. 254  
\(^{133}\) See p. 254
iv) Abul Bakhtari also prayed 5 Tarweehat with 3 rak'ats witr:


cHuffa 25 Musa’ab a’rRahim an- nabiyyah, an-nabii, an-naby, an-nabii

vi) The people in Madina in the time of Umar ibn Abdal Aziz and Aban ibn Uthman prayed 36 rak’ats plus 3 rak’ats witr:


cHuffa 26’Abd arRahmaan ibn alAswad la’d for 40 rak’ats plus 7 rak’ats of witr:
MAJOR SCHOLARS WHO AUTHENTICATED THE NARRATION IN AL BAYHAQI’S AL-SUNAN AL-KUBRA OR HIS MA’RIFATUS SUNAN

From the early part of this tract the reader may have noticed the contemptible claim by the late Badi-ud-Din al-Sindi who was quoted by the two compilers as saying:

“The Ahlul-Hadeeth claim it is not authentically established from any companion that they prayed 20 raka’hs of taraaweeh and the narrations that are mentioned in this regard are all principally weak.” (Tanqeed as-Sadeed Bir-Risaalah Ijtihaad Wat-Taqleed (pg.264).

They claim to be the People of Hadith (Ahl-ul hadith), but less us glimpse at what the real scholars of Hadith had to say on the narration discussed earlier from al-Sunana! al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi or his Ma’rifatus Sunan. Some of the quotes are abridged versions from al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra whose wording begins with the following sentence:

1) Imam al-Nawawi (d. 676 AH) authenticated the sanad from al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra in his al-Majmu Sharh al-Muhadhab 134 as follows:

---
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Al-Nawawi also declared al-Bayhaqi’s sanad to be Sahih in his Khulasatul A ḥkām (1/ 576)\textsuperscript{135} as did the editor of this work, Hussain Isma’il Jamal of Cairo University as follows:

1961 - وعن السبب بن يزيد الصحابي رضي الله عنه، قال: "كانا يصومون على عهد عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه في شهر رمضان بعشرين ركعة. وكانوا يقرأون بالمنين، وكانوا يتوزعون على عصيهم في عهد عثمان من شدة القيام "رواية البيهقي بإسناد صحيح.

2) Imam Fakhrud-Din al Zayla’i (d. 743 AH) authenticated the chain of transmission for al-Bayhaqi’s narration in his Tabyin al Haqa’iq\textsuperscript{136} as follows:

والثاني في عند ركعتها وهي عشرون ركعة وعهد مالك استثنائها وعهد النجاشي واحتدت على ذلك بعمل أهل المدينة ولهما رواية البيهقي بإسناد صحيح أنهم كانوا يصومون على عهد عمر رضي الله عنه في عهده اثنين بعشرين ركعة، وعليه مثله قصار إجماعًا بما رواه مالك وغيره من السيوURI وهو صحيح، على أنهما كناراً يصومون بين كل ترويجتين مقدر نحو ثلاثة فائدة كما هو مذهب أهل المدينة على ما يأتي بيدها إن شاء الله تعالى.

\textsuperscript{135} Printed by Muassasa al-Risala, 2 volumes, Beirut, 1st edn, 1997CE/1418 AH

\textsuperscript{136} 1/178, printed by Dar al-Kutub al Islami, Cairo, 1313 AH
3) Imam Taqiud-Din al-Subki (d. 756 AH) also authenticated the sanad as found in al-Bayhaqi’s Ma’rifatus Sunan. Al-Suyuti quoted from al-Subki’s Sharh al-Minhaj while discussing this issue of the rak’ats of Taraweeh in his al-Masabih fi Salatul Taraweeh:

4) The Shafi’i Hafiz, Ibn al-Mulaqqin (d. 804 AH) in his al-Badr al-Munir also declared the sanad recorded by al-Bayhaqi to be Sahih as follows:

5) The Shafi’ite Hafiz, Waliud-Din al-Iraqi (d. 826 AH), in his Tarhil Tathrib fi Sharhil Taqrib also authenticated al-Bayhaqi’s sanad by saying:

---

137 4/350

138 2/365, this Sharh also has the views of his father, Shaykh Zaynud-Din al-Iraqi mentioned within it also
A few lines later, al-Iraqi mentioned the earlier Imams who advocated 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh as follows:

From the above one can deduce that the Imams like: Abu Hanifa, Sufyan al-Thawri, al-Shafi‘i, Ahmed ibn Hanbal and the Jumhur (majority) of Ulama according to Ibn Abdal Barr al-Maliki (d. 463 AH) were upon 20 rak’ats Taraweeh and this was like an agreement (kal-Ijma).

Indeed, Waliud-Din al-Iraqi mentioned that his father would also pray 20 Rak’ats of Taraweeh then 16 rak’ats later on: 139

The Shafi‘i commentator of Sahih al-Bukhari, known as Imam al-Qastallani (d. 923 AH) has also mentioned that the sanad in Sunan al-Bayhaqi is Sahih by quoting in line with Hafiz Waliud-Din al-Iraqi as follows in his Irshad al-Sari: 140

139 This was also affirmed by al-Sakhawi as has been quoted in this treatise. Imam Nurud-Din al-Samhudi (d. 911 AH) mentioned in his Khulasataul Wafabi-akhbar Dar al-Mustafa (1/31) that in his time the people of Madina prayed 20 rak’ats Taraweeh at the beginning of the night followed by 16 rak’ats in the last part of it as follows:

140 3/426, printed with Imam al-Nawawi’s Sharh on Sahih Muslim on the margins by Bulaq press, Egypt, 1304 AH
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6) Imam Badrud-Din al-Ayni al-Hanafi (d. 855 AH) in his al-Binaya fi Sharh al-Hidaya\textsuperscript{141} also clarified that 20 rak'ats is the Madhhab of the Hanafi's, as well as being the view of Imams: al-Shafi'i, Ahmed ibn Hanbal and the view of the majority according to a certain al-Qadi\textsuperscript{142}. He also mentioned Imam Malik's view for 9 Tarweehat which equates to 36 Rak'ats (viz. 20 Rak'ats Taraweeh+16 rak'ats of individual nafl during the rest period):

\[ \text{(كل روضة بستينميم) فيصر الجلة عشرين رکة وهو معنی } \nu \text{ وله قال القانوني } \]

\[ \text{وأحد، وتقی الفاضی عن جهر العلماء، وحکی أن الأسود بن زيده كان يهم بأربیشین } \]

\[ \text{رکة بیلیة، وعند مالک مرح، تسع روضاته بستین وثلاثین رکة غیر الوار، واستحج } \]

In his al-Binaya (1/660), al-Ayni also authenticated al-Bayhaqi’s sanad as found in his al-Sunan al-Kubra as well as quoting from Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi al-Hanbali’s al-Mughni that 20 rak'ats was like an Ijma (an agreement):

\[ \text{والله} \]

\[ \text{وفی تفسیر السبیق} بانسان مثله كل فیمحا ابن المراق فی ضریب النقرین عن سایب بن زیدرشی الله } \]

\[ \text{اًمّا فی قSHOW IN TEXTAL} \]

\[ \text{فیضاً ملکین ونیقین وقیفین ونیقین من عرضی لله عنیه بالثلاث } \]

\[ \text{وعشرین وفی راوة واحدین عشرة رکة بیلیة، زیده الیها بیمه مکانیة بمومین بحیدة عشرة } \]

\[ \text{فیما ویسره بیریة وقیفین وقیفین وتقدیبها وما الى في رکة غیر الیه كلاً عاجاً وفي مصنّف } \]

\[ \text{6} \]

\[ \text{Vol. 1/659, Dar al-Fikr edition} \]

\[ \text{It seems to be Qadi Iyad, as this is what we quoted al-Nawawi saying from his Majmu Sharh al-Muhadhhab} \]

\[ \text{©SUNNICOURSES.COM 2009/1430 AH} \]
Furthermore, in his Sharh on Sahih al-Bukhari known as Umdatul Qari (7/ 177), Imam al-Ayni repeated the above in similar style by saying:

Al-Ayni affirmed not only the authenticity of al-Bayhaqi’s sanad (as in his Sunan al-Kubra) but also the point that it was used as evidence by, "Our companions (H anaﬁ’s), Shaf`i’s and Hanbali’s.”
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7) The Shafi’i Imam, Jalalud-Din al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH) also authenticated al-Bayhaqi’s sanad in his al-Masabih fi Salatul Taraweeh.\footnote{Printed as part of his al-Hawi lil-Fatawi (1/387)}

وفي سنن البيهقى وغيره يبندان صحيح عن السبه بن يزيد الصحابي قال كانوا يقومون على عهد عمر بن الخطاب في شهر رمضان بعشرين ركعة

Some people also promote the claim that Imam al-Suyuti was also finally a proponent for 8 rak’ats taraweeh! Rather, his final positions in fitq do not contravene the verdicts of Imam al-Nawawi (who we have seen advocated 20 Rak’ats). Indeed, al-Suyuti said in his al-Radd `ala man A khlada ila al-A rd wa Jahila anna al-Ijtihada fi kuli `A srin Fard ("Refutation of the Shiftless Who Have no Idea that Ijtihad is a Religious Obligation in Every Age"):\footnote{As translated by Dr GF Haddad}

“I did not mean by this that I was similar to one of the Four Imams, but only that I was a School-affiliated mujtahid (mujtahid muntasib). For, when I reached the level of tarjih or distinguishing the best fatwa inside the school, I did not contravene al-Nawawi’s tarjih. And when I reached the level of ijtihad mutlaq, I did not contravene al-Shafi’i’s school.”

8) One of the well known students of al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani and given the title of Shaykh al-Islam by the Shafi’i Madhhab, was the elderly faqih, Shaykh Zakariyya al-Ansari (d. 926 AH). In his Fath al-Wahhabbi-Minhaj al-Tullab,\footnote{1/68} he not only affirmed 20 rak’ats but also declared one of al-Bayhaqi’s chains of transmission to be Sahih as follows:

وطراويح وقت وتر) وهي عشرون ركعة بعشر تسليمات في كل ليلة من رمضان. روى الشيخان أنه صلى الله عليه وسلم خرج من جوف الليل ليالي من رمضان وصل في المسجد، وصل الناس بصلاةها فيها وكتابروا قلم يخرج لهم في الرابعة. وقال لهم صلى الله عليه وسلم خشيت أن تفرض عليكم صلاة الليل فتعمروا عنها. وروى البيهقى بإسناد صحيح أنهم كانوا يقومون على عهد عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه في شهر رمضان بعشرين ركعة. وروى مالك في الموطأ بثلاث وعشرين وجمع البيهقى بينهما بأنهم كانوا يوترن بثلاثة وسميت كل أربع منها تروية لأنهم كانوا يترواحون

\footnote{143 Printed as part of his al-Hawi lil-Fatawi(1/387)}

\footnote{144 As translated by Dr GF Haddad}

\footnote{145 1/68}
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Shaykh Zakariyya al-Ansari also authenticated it in his Asna al-Matalib fi Sharh Rawd al-Talib\(^\text{146}\) as follows:

> رواة البههقى ورواى أيضاً هو ورآه بساند صحيح أنهم كانوا يقومون على عهد عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه في شهر رمضان بعشرين ركعة ورواى مالك في الموطأ بناثر وعيثرين.

9) The Hanafi faqih known as Ibrahim al-Halabi (d. 956 AH) has mentioned in his Ghunyatul Mutamalli\(^\text{147}\) which is famously known as “Kabiri” the following:

> تتبيه: علم من هذه المسائل أن التراويح عندها عشرون ركعة بعشر تسليمات وهو مذهب الجمهور، وعند مالك ست وثلاثون ركعة احتاجا جعل أهل المدينة، وللمجهر ما رواه البههقى بإسناد صحيح عن السبب بن يزيد قال: كانوا يقومون على عهد عمر بعشرين ركعة وعلى عهد عثمان وعلى مثله، وفي الموطأ بن يزيد بن رومان قال: كان الناس في عهد عمر يقومون في رمضان بثلاث وعشرين ركعة، وفي المعفى عن علي أنه أمر رجلاً أبيهم في رمضان بعشرين ركعة، قال وهذا كالإجماع قال البههقى: والثلاث في حديث ابن رومان هي ألزء ولكن لم يدرك عمر فيكون منقطعاً وهو حجة علينا وعند مالك.

Hence, Imam al-Halabi declared al-Bayhaqi’s sanad as found in his al-Sunan al-Kubra to be Sahih. The above quote was translated in the English edition of Fatawa Rahimiyya (1/242)\(^\text{148}\) of the late Mufti Abdur Rahim Lajpuri as follows:

> “It is concluded from the above discussion that according to our conviction, the Taraweeh, undoubtedly consists of twenty rak‘ahs with ten salams and this is the common belief. According to Imam Malik, it has thirty six rak‘ahs. He argues from the practice of the people of Madina, and the argument of the majority of people is the report which Imam Bayhaqi has reported with sound authority\(^\text{149}\) that during Hadrat Umar’s as well as Hadrat Uthman’s and

\(^{146}\) 1/201, Darul Kutub Ilmiyya, Beirut, 1\(^{\text{st}}\) edn, 2000 CE

\(^{147}\) P. 388

\(^{148}\) With slight correction of the spelling

\(^{149}\) Bi-isnād Sahih
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Hadrat Ali’s periods,²⁰ twenty rak’ahs were performed. It is reported in the Mu’atta on the authority of Yazid ibn Ruman, that people used to say in Ramadan twenty three rak’ahs including the Witr rak’ahs, and in the book al-Mughni there is a report concerning Hadrat Ali that he ordered a man to lead twenty rak’ahs of prayer during the Ramadan; he said it was like consensus. Although Ibn Ruman’s narration is ‘cut off’ (munqata) but, according to Imam Malik, it is a proof and hence authentic.³⁰

10) The Shafi’i faqih, Khatib al-Shirbini (d. 977 AH) in his Mughni al-Muhtaj declared al-Bayhaqi’s sanad to be Sahih in affirmation of 20 rak’ats as follows:

اللهم عصراً ركعة بعشر تسليمات في كل ليلة من رمضان لما روي البهقي بإسناد صحيح أنهم كانوا يقومون على عهد عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله تعالى عنه في شهر رمضان بعشرين ركعة وروى مالك في الموتو بثلاث وعشرين

11) The Hanafi Imam, Ali al-Qari (d. 1014 AH) also authenticated al-Bayhaqi’s sanad in his Sharh al-Nuqayah (1/250) as follows:


Al-Qari also mentioned that Imam Malik held the view for 36 rak’ats. In addition, he mentioned in his Mirqat al-Mafatih (1/227) that 20 rak’ats was

---

²⁰ The wording in al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra from Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra) does not mention 20 rak’ats to be from Ali ibn Abi Talib’s (ra) era but only during the era of Umar (ra), and in the era of Uthman (ra) the prayer was so long that some were leaning on sticks

³⁰ Of Imam Malik ibn Anas

³¹ Of Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi al-Hanbali (d. 620 AH)

³² 1/226, Dar al Fikr, Beirut
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established in Umar ibn al Khattab’s time (ra) and he mentioned the variant from al-Bayhaqi’s Ma’rifatus Sunan:

Shaykh al-Qari claimed that its chain of transmission was declared Sahih by Imam al-Nawawi in his al-Khulasa, but what is correct is that al-Nawawi authenticated the wording as found in al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra and not the Ma’rifatus Sunan of the same al-Bayhaqi.

12) The Hanafi Hafiz of Hadith, Imam Muhammad Murtada al-Zabidi (d. 1205 AH) has also declared al-Bayhaqi’s sanad to be Sahih in his monumental commentary to Imam al-Ghazali’s Ihya Ulum ud-Din known as Ithafus-Sadatul-Muttaqin as follows:

Note also that Imam Zabidi also mentioned in the same work (3/422) the following point which establishes that the Ijma (agreement) that was reached in Umar’s time (ra) - meaning upon 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh was held by the likes of major Imams like Abu Hanifa, al-Nawawi, al-Shafi’i, Ahmed (ibn Hanbal), the majority, and preferred choice of Ibn Abdal Barr. Al-Zabidi also gave the names of those who transmitted for 20 rak’ats from the Musannaf of ibn Abi Shayba:

154 3/415
13) Shaykh Sulayman al-Bujayrmi al-Shafi’i (d. 1221 AH) in his notes (Hashiyya) to Sharh Minhaj al-Tullab\(^{155}\) declared al-Bayhaqi’s sanad to be Sahih:

\[
\textit{ورَوَى البِيْهْقِيُ بِإِسْتِخْدَامِ صَحِيحٍ أَنَّهُمْ كَانُوا يُقْوَمُونَ عَلَى عَهْدِ عُمَّرٍ بِنِ الحَطَابِ رَضُيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ فِي شَهْرِ رَمَضَانِ بِعَشَرِينَ رَكْعَةً، وَرَوَى مَالِكَ بِالْمُوْطَّأِ بِثَلَاثِ وَعَشَرِينَ}
\]

14) The Shafi’i Mufti, Shaykh Abu Bakr al Dimyati (d. 1310 AH) in his Iyanatul Talibin\(^{156}\) also declared al-Bayhaqi’s sanad to be Sahih:

\[
\textit{ورَوَى البِيْهْقِيُ بِإِسْتِخْدَامِ صَحِيحٍ أَنَّهُمْ يُقْوَمُونَ عَلَى عَهْدِ عُمَّرٍ بِنِ الحَطَابِ رَضُيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ فِي شَهْرِ رَمَضَانِ بِعَشَرِينَ رَكْعَةً}
\]

15) Shaykh Muhammad Ali al-Nimawi (d. 1322 AH) declared al-Bayhaqi’s sanad from his al-Sunan al-K ubra to be Sahih in his Athar al-Sunan (p. 251), and he also mentioned the alternate version from al-Bayhaqi’s Ma’rifatsu Sunan with its authentication by Taqiud-Din al-Subki (in his Sharh al-Minhaj) and Ali al-Qari (in his Sharh Muwatta Muhammad), as mentioned in this treatise elsewhere.

\(^{155}\) 1/370, Maktaba Islamiyya, Diyarbakr, Turkey

\(^{156}\) 1/265, Dar al Fikr, Beirut
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SOME CONTEMPORARIES WHO AUTHENTICATED AL-BAYHAQI’S SANAD:

1) The Hanafi Muhaddith, Shaykh Shu‘ayb al-Arna’ut has also declared the sanad in the Sunan al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi to be Sahih (and all of its sub narrators to be upright and trustworthy) in his editing of the Sharh al-Sunna of al-Baghawi as follows:

Shaykh Shu‘ayb continued to advance why the sub narrators were trustworthy on the next page, and if one was to make an analytical guess it would not be far fetched to note that his defence of this sanad seems to be directed to al-Albani without naming him. Additionally, Shaykh Shu‘ayb mentioned it to have a Sahih isnâd with all the sub-narrators being upright and trustworthy in his editing of the Siyar a’lam an-Nubala of Hafiz al-Dhahabi as follows (last line):

---

157 4/ 120
158 1/401, fn. 1
“Salafi” scholars who authenticated or accepted it:

2) Abdar Rahman al-Muallimi al-Yamani\(^{159}\) (d. 1386 AH)

It is sufficient to say that the likes of Badi al-Sindi and al-Albani have no early scholar to support their weakening of the narration from al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra for 20 rak’ats in the time of Umar (ra). On the contrary, one of their fellow sect members, who some from their likes epithetised with the title of “al-Dhahabi al-Asr” (The Dhahabi of the Age), known as Abdar Rahman al-Muallimi has done some justice by declaring the sanad of al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra to be Sahih in his Kitab Qiyam Ramadan.\(^{160}\)

3) The late “Salafi” opponent to al-Albani, known as Isma’il al-Ansari (d. 1996/1417 AH) wrote a number of refutations on the former, and one such work is connected to the rak’ats of Taraweeh. In his Tashih Hadith Salatil Taraweeh Ishrin rak’a wal radd ala al-Albani fi Tad’ifihi,\(^{161}\) he mentioned the narration for 20 rak’ats in the time of Umar (ra) as mentioned in al-Sunan al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi, and noted that it was declared to be Sahih by Imams: al-Nawawi in his

---

\(^{159}\) Al-Muallimi was one of the chief editors of classical texts at the famous Hanafi publishing and research center known as Da’iratul Ma’arif in Hyderabad, India. He is also a reference to his admirers for his reply to his contemporary, Shaykh Muhammad Zahid al-Kawthari (d. 1371 AH)

\(^{160}\) See p. 57, Maktaba al-Makkiyya, 1st edn, Makka, 1997

\(^{161}\) See p. 7, Maktaba al-Imam al-Shafi’i, Riyadh, 2nd edn, 1988

©SUNNICOURSES.COM 2009/1430 AH

4) The late Damascenen based advocate of the “Salafi’s” known as Abdal Qadir al-Arna’ut (d. 2004/1425 AH) has also declared the narration from al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan al-Kubra to be Sahih in his editing of the Jamia al-U sul fi ahadith al-Rasul of Imam Ibn al Athir al-Jazari (d. 606 AH). Scan of the relevant portion:

آقول : لكين جاء الحديث من طريق آخر موصول صحيح، رواه البيهقي في السنن الكبرى 2/99 عن السائق بن زيد قال : كنا يقولون على عبد عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه في شهر رمضان، بعد ركعتين ركعتان قال : وكانوا يفرزون بالعطشين، وكانوا ينكرؤون عصيم في

5) It was said earlier that another writer from the same sect as Abu Khuzaimah, Abu Hibban and al-Adawi is the late Saudi writer known as Abdulllah al-Duwaish (d. 1407 AH). The latter wrote two works in discreditiation of al-Albani’s weakening some authentic narrations and his authentication of some apparently weak narrations.

In the former work entitled: Tanbih al-Qari li-taqwiyya ma du’a’fuhu al-A lbani (p. 47-48), al-Duwaish refuted al-Albani’s weakening of the narration for 20 rak’ats as in al-Sunan al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi as follows:

162 6/123-124
It may be seen from the above that al-Duwaish declared all the sub-narrators to be Thiqā (trustworthy) and also showed that the narrator that Abu Khuzaímah and Abu Hibban said was majhūl (unknown),\(^{163}\) namely, Abu Abdullah al-Hussain al-Dinawari was declared to be Thiqā by Ibn al-Imad in his Shādrat al-Dhahab. The reader may wish to look back on the quotes earlier in refutation of their claim that al-Dinawari was allegedly majhūl.

6) Hamūd al-Tuwajirī (d. 1992) who was also a well known Saudi “Salafi” writer has also declared Imam al-Bayḥāqī’s isnād to be Sahih in his al-Radd al-La Katib al-Majīn (p. 132) as the following scan shows:

\(^{163}\) This is what they said in their Qaul ul-Saheeh (p. 15):
7) The Egyptian “Salafi” writer, Mustafa al-Adawi has already been quoted as authenticating not only the narration mentioning 20 rak’ats in Umar’s (ra) time as recorded in the Musnad of Ali ibn Ja’d in his Bahth fi adad rak’at qiym al-layl, but also some of the reports from the Tabi’in also.

This all indicates that even those who are acknowledged to belong to the same sect as Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban are not in total agreement that al-Bayhaqi’s narration via the route of Yazid ibn Khusayfa is da’eeef (weak). On the contrary, it is clear that some have agreed with some major Huffaz of Hadith, that it is actually Sahih. The latter scenario is the dominant position as shown from the list above mentioning no less than a dozen scholars from the past.
AN EXAMINATION OF A'ISHA'S [ra] NARRATIONS ON 8 RAK'ATS

The duo said on p. 31 of their “Qaul ul-Saheeh”:

Ummul Mu’mineen A’aishah (RadhiAllahu Anha) narrates The Messenger of Allah (Sallalahu Alayhee Wasallam) after finishing the Eesha prayer he would pray 11 rakâhs till the morning and after every 2 raka’ah he would make the salutation and he would pray one witr…” (Saheeh Muslim (1/254).

Abu Salamah bin Abdur-Rahmaan asked A’aishah, “How was the prayer of the Messenger of Allah (Sallalahu Alayhee Wasallam) in Ramadhaan.” She replied, “Whether Ramadhaan or other than the month of Ramadhaan, he would not exceed 11 rakâhs.”


Reply:

These are the primary narrations they used to claim that Allah’s Messenger (sallallahualaihiwasallam) only performed a maximum of 8 rak’ats Taraweeh. As they mentioned, the Hanafi’s generally deny its relation to it being connected to Salatul Taraweeh, but are firm in declaring the above narrations from A’isha (ra) to be linked to Salatul Tahajjud.

They said:

The hanafee’s object here and say this hadeeth is concerning Tahajjud and not Taraweeh
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After claiming unconvincingly that: Tahajjud, Taraaweeh, Qiyaam al-Layl, Qiyaam Ramadhaan are all different names for the same prayer

And that:

If this is the case as the hanafee’s claim that the hadeeth of A’aishah is pertaining to the Tahajjud prayer then we say it is not established at all that the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee-Wasallam) prayed Tahajjud and Taraaweeh separately (in the month of Ramadhaan). Therefore it is upon the hanafee’s to prove he prayed these two prayers separately.

They then quoted one of their Shaykhs as follows (p. 32):

So Imaam Abdul-Jabbaar Khandaalwee said, “Some hanafee’s have limited this hadeeth of A’aishah in Bukhaari to tahajjud, then firstly this is a fallacy which is given to the general folk because it is not established from any narration the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee-Wasallam) prayed taraaweeh and tahajjud separately in the month of Ramadhaan. The three (3) nights the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee-Wasallam) prayed with the companions is referred to as taraaweeh, whereas in these 3 nights, in one night he prayed from the beginning of the night right to its end. So we also find from this the time of taraaweeh prayer is from after Eeshaa up until sunrise…” (al-Insaaf Raf’a Ikhtilaaf Musama bih Khaatimah Ikhtilaaf (pg.63-64).

Reply:

The time for Taraweeh is as he said, but what suggests that Allah’s Messenger (sallallahualaihisallam) performed in general Tahajjud separately from Salatul Taraweeh is the following Hadith from Sahih Muslim:¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁴ See also Qiyam Ramadan of Ibn Nasr al Marwazi (no. 9), Musnad Ahmed (no. 12767), Musnad Abd ibn Humayd (no. 1274) and al-Awsat of ibn al Mundhir (no. 1996)
The English translation of Sahih Muslim\textsuperscript{165} mentions it as follows:

Narrated Anas ibn Malik:

The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) was observing prayer during Ramadan. I came and stood by his side. Then another man came and he stood likewise until we became a group. When the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) perceived that we were behind him, he lightened the prayer. He then went to his abode and observed such (a long) prayer (the like of which) he never observed with us. When it was morning we said to him:

Did you perceive us during the night? Upon this, he said: Yes, it was this (realisation) that induced me to do that which I did. He (the narrator) said: The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) began to observe Sawm Widal at the end of the month (of Ramadan). One of his companions also began to observe this uninterrupted fast, whereupon the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) said: What about such people who observe uninterrupted fasts? You are not like me. By Allah, if the month were lengthened for me, I should have observed Sawm Waldal, so that those who act in an exaggerated manner would (have been obliged) to abandon their excesses.

From the above narration we may deduce that the Salah that the Sahaba performed as a group behind the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) was Taraweeh, and when he departed to his lodging room, he began another Salah whose length was far longer than any Salah known to Anas (ra). This second Salah is most probably Salatul Tahajjud, which was usually performed by Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) in the last part of the night and continued until the onset of Salatul Fajr was approaching. Note how Anas (ra) did not say

\textsuperscript{165} 2/536, no. 2433
that the Salah that the group performed in the masjid was the same Salah that was performed in the separate abode, but his words indicate that they were 2 different prayers in one night.

An example from a Sahabi that some Hanafi scholars have used to show the distinction between two Salah’s in the nights of Ramadan is the one from Talq ibn Ali (ra) as found in Sunan Abu Dawud (no. 1434) as follows:

Qays ibn Talq said: **Talq ibn Ali** visited us on a certain day during Ramadan. He remained with us till evening and broke fast with us. He then stood up and led us in the witr prayer. He then went to his mosque and led them in prayer. When the witr remained, he put forward another man and said: Lead your companions in the witr prayer, for I heard the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) as saying: “There are not two witr’s during one night.”

This narration implies that after breaking the fast in Ramadan, Talq (ra) lead a group of the Sahaba in an unspecified venue, and for him to have lead them in Witr Salah indicates that he had lead Taraweeh before hand, followed by the Witr in congregation. Talq (ra) then went to his masjid and lead the people in prayer, and it does not make sense that he would have repeated praying Taraweeh all over again, but the implication here seems to indicate that he lead for Salatul Tahajjud, and since he had already lead in Witr he appointed someone else to lead the Witr. Wallahu a’lam.

Imam al-Tirmidhi mentioned an abridged version of the above narration in his al-Jami (no. 469) as follows:

---

166 Also found in Sahih Ibn Khuzayma (no. 1101) and its editor (Dr Mustafa Azami) declared the sanad to be Hasan, Sahih Ibn Hibban (no. 2449), Sunan al-Nasa’i (no. 1679), al-Mukhtara (no. 166) of Diya al-Maqdisi who considered it to be Sahih and its editor (Dr Abdal Malik Dahish) declared its sanad to be Sahih.
Ishaat, Pakistan

Say: “There are not two witr (prayers) in a night.”

Translation adapted from the English edition of Jamia al-Tirmidhi (1/220) as printed by Darul Qays ibn Talq ibn Alireported on the authority of his father that he heard Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) held the view that they must add a rak‘ah to it, and then offer the last portion thereof. Some of the People of Knowledge from the Companions of al-Nabi knowledgediffer about a person who offer the witr in the beginning of the night and then go to sleep only to awaken in the last portion of the night then he may offer as much salah as he likes and not cut off the witr, leaving it as it is. This is what Sufyan al-Thawri, Malik ibn Anas, Ibn al-Mubarak, al-Shafi’i, the People of Kufa and A’ms (ibn Hanbal) held. This is (more) Sahih because it is reported through other routes that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) did offer Salah after witr. ⁶⁶⁷

It will also be mentioned below how the Faqih of Iraq from the days of the Tabi’in, known as Ibrahim al-Nakhi‘i (d. 96 AH), himself witnessed the distinct prayers of Taraweeh and Tahajjud being performed separately in the confines of one room in the Masjid. As well as the verdicts of the Hanbali faqih, Imam Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi (d. 620 AH), the Shafi’i faqih, Imam al-Nawawi (d. 676 AH) and the much later Shaykh al-Islam of the likes of Abu Khuzaimah/Abu Hibban, known as Muhammad ibn Abdal Wahhab al-Hanbali (d. 1792 CE) of Najd.

---

⁶⁶⁷ Translation adapted from the English edition of Jamia al-Tirmidhi (1/220) as printed by Darul Ishaat, Pakistan
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The staunchest followers of the late Nasir al-Albani take his view that it is an innovation to exceed 8 rak’ats of Taraweeh, but their claim is at thorough odds with the following Hadith found in the Sunan of Abu Dawud:

The English edition of Sunan Abu Dawud (no. 1272) mentioned the above text as follows:

Amr ibn Abasa al-Sulami said: I asked: Apostle of Allah (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam), in which part of the night the supplication is more likely to be accepted? He replied: In the last part. Pray (Fasalli) as much as you like, for the prayer (Salah) is attended by the angels and it is recorded till you offer the dawn prayer; then stop praying when the sun is rising till it is high up about the length of one lance or two lances, for it rises between the two horns of the devil, and the infidels offer prayer for it (at that time). Then pray as much as you like, because the prayer is witnessed and recorded till the shadow of a lance becomes equal to it; then cease prayer, for at that time the Hell-fire is heated up and doors of the Hell are opened. When the sun declines, pray as much as you like, for the prayer is witnessed till you pray the afternoon prayer; then cease prayer till the sun sets between the horns of the devil, and (at that time) the infidels offer prayer for it. He narrated a lengthy tradition. Abbas said: Abu Salam narrated this tradition in a like manner from Abu Ummah. If I committed a mistake unintentionally, I beg pardon of Allah and repent to Him.

168 In the English edition it has been typed incorrectly as Anbasat
As for Salatul Tahajjud, it is mentioned in the Holy Qur’an:\(^{169}\)


Lo! Thy Lord knoweth how thou keepest vigil sometimes nearly two-thirds of the night, or (sometimes) half or a third thereof, as do a party of those with thee. Allah measureth the night and the day. He knoweth that ye count it not, and turneth unto you in mercy. Recite, then, of the Qur’an that which is easy for you. He knoweth that there are sick folk among you, while others travel in the land in search of Allah’s bounty, and others (still) are fighting for the cause of Allah. So recite of it that which is easy (for you), and establish worship and pay the poor-due, and (so) lend unto Allah a goodly loan. W hatsoever good ye send before you for your souls, ye will surely find it with Allah, better and greater in the recompense. And seek forgiveness of Allah. Lo! Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.

Surat al-Muzammil was revealed in Makka and the following is from the Tafsir of Imam Ibn Kathir (d. 774 AH) regarding the above verse:

Verily, your Lord knows that you do stand less than two-thirds of the night, or half of it.)
(73:20) until he reached,

[ما تَضَيَّعْ مَنْ هُمَّ وَأَقْيَمُواً]

(So recite of it what is easy.) (73:20) and Allah says,

[وَمِنِ الْيَلِينَ فَتَهْجَدُ يَدَّ عَبْسَى أَنَّ الْيَلِينَ رُسُلُ مَقَامًا مَّحْمُودًا]

(And Tahajjud in some parts of the night (also offer the Salah with it), as an additional prayer for you. It may be that your Lord will raise you to Maqam Mahmud.)
(17:79) In fact, this is as true as what he (‘Abdur-Rahman) said, The proof for this view is what Imam Ahmad recorded in his Musnad, that Sa`id bin Hisham divorced his wife and then traveled to Al-Madinah in order to sell some property he had with her. He intended to use its money to buy an animal and a weapon and then go for Jihad against the Romans until he died. In the process of this he met a group of his people and they informed him that a group of six men from his people had intended that in the time of the Messenger of Allah, upon which he said,

ألئنَّ لَكُمْ فِي أَسْوَأِهِ حَسَنَةٌ؟

---

\(^{169}\) The Meaning of the Glorious Qur’an, by Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall
Surah 73:20. [Al-Muzammil]
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(Is there not for you all an excellent example in me) So he forbade them from that and made them testify that they would take their wives back. Then he (Sa`id) returned to us and informed us that he went to Ibn `Abbas and asked him about the Witr (prayer). Ibn `Abbas said, "Shall I not inform you of the person who is the most knowledgeable person on the earth about the Witr prayer of the Messenger of Allah" He said, "Yes." Ibn `Abbas then said, "Go to `A'ishah and ask her, then return to me and inform me of what she tells you." He said, "Then I went to Hakim bin Aflah and requested him to go with me to her. But he said, `I do not want to be near her. Verily, I forbade her from saying anything concerning these two parties (the parties of `Ali and Mu`awiyah), but she refused and continued being involved with them (in their conflict).' So I adjured him by Allah, so he came with me and we entered upon her (in her house)." So she said, "Is this the Hakim that I know" He (Hakim) said, "Yes." Then she said, "Who is this that is with you" He said, "Sa`id bin Hisham." She said, "Who is Hisham" He said, "He is Ibn `Amir." She then asked Allah to have mercy upon him (`Amir). Then she said, "Yes, `Amir was a true man." Then I (Sa`id) said, "O Mother of the believers! Inform me about the character of the Messenger of Allah." She replied, "Have you not read the Qur'an" I said, "Of course." Then she said, "Verily, the character of the Messenger of Allah was the Qur'an." I was about to stand and leave, but then I remembered to ask about the night prayer of the Messenger of Allah. I said, "O Mother of the believers! Inform me about the night prayer of the Messenger of Allah." She said, "Have you not read the Surah,

(O you wrapped up.) I said, "Of course." She then said, "Verily, Allah made standing at night (for prayer) obligatory at the beginning of this Surah. So the Messenger of Allah and his Companions stood for an entire year during the night (in prayer) until their feet swelled. Allah held back the revelation of the end of this Surah for twelve months. Then, Allah revealed the lightening of this burden at the end of this Surah. Then, the standing for night prayer became voluntary after it used to be obligatory." I was about to leave when I remembered to ask her about the Witr prayer of the Messenger of Allah. So I said, "O Mother of the believers! Inform me about the Witr prayer of the Messenger of Allah." She said, "We used to prepare his Siwak (toothstick) for him and his ablution water, and Allah would awaken him whenever He wished to awaken him during the night. Then, he would clean his teeth with the Siwak and perform ablution. Then, he would pray eight (Rak`ahs) units of prayer and he would not sit during them except at the end of the eighth one. At this point he would sit and remember his Lord the Most High, and supplicate to Him. Afterwards he would stand without saying the greeting of peace (Taslim). He would then pray a ninth unit of prayer and then sit. He would remember Allah Alone and then supplicate to Him (during this sitting). Then, he would say the greetings of peace (to conclude the prayer) making
it audible to us. Then, he would pray two more units of prayer after this salutation of peace, while he would be sitting. So these are eleven units of prayer, O my son. Then, when he became older and heavier, he would perform Witr prayer with seven units of prayer, and then he would pray two extra units of prayer after them while sitting after the salutation of peace. So these are nine units of prayer, O my son. Whenever the Messenger of Allah used to pray a particular prayer, he liked to remain consistent in its performance. If he would ever be preoccupied from performing the night prayer by oversleeping, pain or illness, he would pray twelve units of supererogatory prayer during the day. I do not know of Allah's Prophet ever reciting the entire Qur'an in one night before morning nor did he fast an entire month other than the month of Ramadan. So I went to Ibn `Abbas and told him what she had said. Ibn `Abbas then said, 'She has spoken truthfully and if I had went to her house I would have remained until she spoke directly to me and I could see her lips moving.' This is how Imam Ahmad recorded this narration in its entirety. Muslim also recorded similarly in his Sahih. Ibn Jarir recorded from Abu `Abdur-Rahman that he said, "When the Ayah

(O you wrapped.) (73:1) was revealed, the people stood in night prayer for an entire year until their feet and shins swelled. This continued until Allah revealed,

(So recite of it what is easy.) (73:20) - Then the people relaxed." Al-Hasan Al-Basri and As-Suddi both said the same. Ali bin Abi Talhah reported from Ibn `Abbas that he said concerning Allah's statement,

(Stand (to pray) all night, except a little. Half of it or less than that, a little.) (73:2,3) "This became difficult on the believers. Then Allah lightened the matter for them and had mercy on them when He revealed after this,

170 This is also mentioned in Sahih Muslim (English edn, no. 1623) and a shorter variant in Sahih Muslim (no. 1628): ‘A’isha reported that when the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) decided upon doing any act, he continued to do it, and when he slept at night or fell sick he observed twelve rak’ahs during the daytime. I am not aware of Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) observing prayer during the whole of the night till morning, or observing fast for a whole month continuously except that of Ramadan.
Hence, the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) and the Sahaba performed Tahajjud together for about a whole year, and later on it was relaxed for them as a supererogatory prayer.

Also in Sura al-Isra, the Tafsir of Ibn Kathir mentions the following:

**The Command to pray Tahajjud**

(And in some parts of the night (also) offer the Salah with it as an additional prayer for you.)

Here Allah commands him (the Prophet) to offer further prayers at night after the prescribed prayers. It was reported in Sahih Muslim from Abu Hurayrah that when the Messenger of Allah was asked which prayer is best after the prescribed prayers, he said,

(The Night prayer) Allah commanded His Messenger to pray the Night prayer after offering the prescribed prayers, and the term **Tahajjud refers to prayer that is offered after sleeping.** This was the view of `Alqamah, Al-Aswad, Ibrahim An-Nakha`i and others. It is also well-known from the Arabic language itself. A number of Hadiths report that the Messenger of Allah used to pray Tahajjud after he had slept. These include reports from Ibn `Abbas, `Aishah and other Companions, may Allah be pleased with them. This has been discussed in detail in the
appropriate place, praise be to Allah. Al-Hasan Al-Basri said, "This is what comes after `Isha', or it could mean what comes after sleeping."

(an additional prayer (Nawafil)) means the Night prayer has been made an extra prayer specifically for the Prophet, because all his previous and future sins had been forgiven. But for other members of his Ummah, offering optional prayers may expiate for whatever sins they may commit. This was the view of Mujahid, and it was reported in Al-Musnad from Abu Ummah Al-Bahili.

Thus, Ibn Kathir has defined Salatul Layl (night prayer) to refer specifically to Salatul Tahajjud, and it is clearly mentioned to be an optional Salah (nafl).

As for Salatul Taraweeh, it was introduced by Allah's Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) to be performed only in Ramadan, and as such it is mentioned to be a Sunna prayer specific to Ramadan alone by some Ulama. Those who say that Taraweeh and Tahajjud are one and the same prayer need to prove that is the case from specific narrations, otherwise, they need to explain why according to the Hadith quoted above from Sahih Muslim as narrated by Anas ibn Malik (ra) he mentioned two distinct prayers in Ramadan, one in congregation with the Sahaba, and then Allah's messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) detached himself away from the Sahaba to perform an extraordinarily long Salah in his personal living quarters. Thus, Tahajjud is not restricted to any time frame but is performable any night of the whole year, while Taraweeh is limited to Ramadan alone.

The following narration from Sunan Ibn Majah mentions how Taraweeh was introduced by Allah's Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) specifically in Ramadan:

سنن ابن ماجه - لِلَّهِ أَنْ لَّا طَائِفَةٌ مَّاتَ بَعْدَهُ ؛ ابْتَرَأَ مِنْ قَلْبِهِ كَأَنْ تَوَزَّلَ عَلَى مَسَاءَةِ سَبْعِينَ، قَالَ مَعَاهُ عِنْدَهُ حَتَّى أَنْ يَتَابِعَ بِهِ قَلْبَهُ، وَقَالَ لَهُ مُعَجَّزٌ مَّنْ لَهُ قَلْبٌ قَلِيدٌ، عَنْ هَارِيْرَةَ بْنَ عُمَيْرَةَ بْنَ عَبْدُ رَبُّهُ مُحَمَّدٍ، عَنْ حَبَّانَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدَ، عَنْ نَضْرِ بْنِ شِيْبَانَ حُرَّ، ثُمَّ سَلَّمَ. حَدَّثَنَا حَبَّانُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدُ، عَنْ نَضْرِ بْنِ شِيْبَانَ حُرَّ، ثُمَّ سَلَّمَ، عَنْ حَبَّانَ بْنِ مُحَمَّدَ، عَنْ نَضْرِ بْنِ شِيْبَانَ حُرَّ، ثُمَّ سَلَّمَ. حَدَّثَنَا حَبَّانُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدُ، عَنْ نَضْرِ بْنِ شِيْبَانَ حُرَّ، ثُمَّ سَلَّمَ. حَدَّثَنَا حَبَّانُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدُ، عَنْ نَضْرِ بْنِ شِيْبَانَ حُرَّ، ثُمَّ سَلَّمَ. حَدَّثَنَا حَبَّانُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدُ، عَنْ نَضْرِ بْنِ شِيْبَانَ حُرَّ، ثُمَّ سَلَّمَ.
Nadr ibn Shayban said, I met Abu Salama ibn Abdar Rahman and said, relate to me some Hadith that you heard from your father regarding the month of Ramadan. He said, “Yes.” My father related to me that Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) mentioned the **month of Ramadan** and said, “It is a month the fasts of which A Ilah has made obligatory for you and I have introduced its qiyam (prayer)** upon you.** So, he who observed its fasts and stood (in devotion) in it with Faith and seeking reward (from A Ilah), came out of his sins as (he was on) the day his mother had given birth to him.

Some people have weakened the above narration, while al-Hafiz Diya al-Maqdisi recorded it in al-Mukhtara as being Sahih as follows via two routes:

171 Meaning standing at night for Taraweeh

172 3/106-107, no. 907 and 908
The editor of al-Mukhtara, Dr Abdal Malik Dahish, declared both routes to have no problem with them (isnaduhu la ba’sa bihi). Ibn Khuzayma also recorded it in his Sahih (no. 2201) with a slight variation of the wording from

\[
\text{- And I have introduced its standing (qiym) upon you}
\]

The sanad was mentioned to be Hasan (good) in Fayd al-Qadir (no. 1690) of Imam Abdar Rauf al-Munawi, while al-Dhahabi declared it to be Hasan Gharib in his Siyar a’lam an-Nubala (1/70-71). It is strengthened via another route going back to Abu Hurayra (ra) as mentioned by al-Hafiz Ibn Abdal Barr in al-Tamheed174 as follows:

\[
\text{أُخِرِّنا محمد حدثنا علي بن عمر الحافظ حدثنا أبو علي إسماعيل بن محمد بن إسماعيل الصفار حدثنا}
\]

\[
\text{أبو قلابة عبد الملك بن محمد الرقاشي حدثنا بشر بن عمر حدثنا مالك بن أسن عن الزهري عن حميد بن عبدالرحمن عن أبي هريرة قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إن الله عز وجل فرض عليكم صيام ( شهر رمضان وسننت لكم قيامه فمن صامه وقامة إيمانا واحتسابا غفر له ما تقدم من ذنبي (}
\]

\[
\text{ومن قام ليلة القدر إيمانا واحتسابا غفر له ما تقدم من ذنبي}
\]

According to A’isha (ra), Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) would pray the whole night only in Ramadan as reported in Sunan al-Nasa’i (no. 1641):

\[
\text{A’isha said: “I am not aware of Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) having recited the whole Qur’an in a night, or praying through a whole night till morning, or fasting a complete month except Ramadan.”}
\]

173 This latter wording is also found in the Musnad of Ahmed ibn Hanbal (no. 1688), Musnad Abu Ya’la (no. 865), Kitab al-Siyam (no. 134) of al-Firyabi and Qiyam Ramadan (p. 8) of Ibn Nasr al Marwazi

174 8/110, Moroccan, Awqaf edition
Thus, the night was long enough to accommodate the performance of both Salatul Taraweeh and Tahajjud separately.

As for those who claim that 8 rak’ats is the maximum for night prayers then they need to explain why the following narration from the Muwatta Malik mentioned 13 rak’ats with the witr from Zayd ibn Khalid al-Juhani (ra):

Muwatta (7: 12):

Yahya related to me from Malik from Abdullah ibn Abi Bakr from his father that Abdullah ibn Qays ibn Makhrama told him that Zayd ibn Khalid al-Juhani said one night that he was going to observe the prayer of the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace. He said, "I rested my head on his threshold. The Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, got up and prayed two long, long, long rak’as. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed two rakats which were slightly less long than the two before them. Then he prayed an odd rakat, making thirteen rakats in all."

And a variant in Sahih Muslim from Zayd ibn Khalid al-Juhani (ra) states:

I said: I would definitely watch at night the prayer observed by the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him). He prayed two short rak’ahs, then two long, long, long rak’ahs, then he prayed two rak’ahs which were shorter than the two preceding rak’ahs, then he prayed two rak’ahs which were shorter than the two preceding, then he prayed two rak’ahs which were shorter than the two preceding, then he observed a single one (Witr), making a total of thirteen rak’ahs.

---

175 This indicates that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) got up from sleeping and the first 2 rak’at performed here do not refer to the 2 rak’ats of Sunna performed after the 4 rak’ats Fard of Salatul Isha.
The two compilers continued to say (p. 32-33):

Shaikh al-Allaamah al-Muhaddith Ubaidullaah Mubaarakpooree said, “Taraaweeh, tahajjud and Qiyaam of Ramadhaan, all are really the one and same, the long hadeeth of Abu Dharr (Radhiyallahu Anhu) in Ibn Maajah is a clear evidence of this claim. The summary of it is that Abu Dharr (Radhiyallahu Anhu) said, “We kept the fasts of Ramadhaan with the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam), then he led us in Qiyaam (Taraaweeh prayer) on the 23rd night (when seven nights were left) till about one third of it passed. He did not observe it on the 24th, then on the 25th night he led us till about half the night passed. We requested to offer superarogatory prayer during the whole night. The Messenger of Allaah said, “He who observes Qiyaam along with the Imaam till he finishes it, then it is as if he offered prayer the whole night.” Then he did not observe the Qiyaam with us on the 26th night, then finally on the 27th night he gathered his wives, members of his household and the people and he led everyone in the Qiyaam (Taraaweeh prayer) till we feared of missing the dawn meal.”

(Ibn Maajah (no.1327) (2/287) (Arabic/English), (Saheeh Ibn Maajah no.1344 and no.1100) according to the numbering of Shaikh al-Albaanee (1/395) 1417edn, Abee Dawood (1/217 Saheeh no.1245), A’un al-Ma’bood (4/174 no.1372) Tirmidhee (1/72-73), Saheeh Nasaa’ee (1/338) Musannaf Ibn Abee Shaybah (2/90/21), Sharh Ma’anee al-Aathaar (1/206) of Tahaawee, Qiyaam al-Layl (p.89) of Muhammad ibn Nasr Marwazee, al-Faryaabee (2/71-72), Baihaqee (2/294) Irwaa (no.447) of Imaam Al-Albaanee, Mishkaat (no.1298), Salaatul Taraaweeh (p.16-17) of Shaikh al-Albaanee, Muhaddith Al-Albaanee who said “Saheeh” Nayl al-Awthaar (3/54 no.944) of Imaam Shawkaanee who said, “All The narrators of this chain according to Ahlus-Sunan are thenarrators of the Saheehs.” Tuhfatul-Ahwadhee (3/437-438 no.803), Athaara as-Sunan (p.347) of Shaikh Nimawee Hanafee, E’laas as-Sunan (7/38) of Dhafer Ahmad Thanawee Hanafee)


Reply:
There is little doubt that the above narration refers to Salatul Taraweeh, and Imam al-Tirmidhi mentioned this narration under the heading of standing in Salah in Ramadan:

بابًا ما جاء في قيام شهر رمضان

Imam al-Bayhaqi also mentioned it in his Shu’ab al-Iman and mentioned after the narration:

هذا تأكيدًا للضيافة صلاة التراويح في الجماعة

Meaning, that this narration confirms the virtue of praying Salatul Taraweeh in congregation.

Abu Dharr’s narration also proves the point that Salatul Taraweeh can be performed at various times of the night before the onset of the start of the fast. This narration from Abu Dharr (ra) mentions Taraweeh being performed on 3 alternate nights; while another Sahih narration from A’isha (ra) mentions its performance on consecutive nights as mentioned in Sahih al-Bukhari, Sahih Muslim, Muwatta Malik and others. The following is from the Muwatta Malik:

Book 6, Number 6.1.1: Yahya related to me from Malik from Ibn Shihab from Urwa ibn az-Zubayr from A’isha, the wife of the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, prayed in the mosque one night and people prayed behind him. Then he prayed the next night and there were more people. Then they gathered on the third or fourth night and the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, did not come out to them. In the morning, he said, “I saw what you were doing and the only thing that prevented me from coming out to you was that I feared that it would become obligatory (fard) for you.” This happened in Ramadan.
Note how the above congregational prayer occurred within the Masjid in Ramadan, and is thus an indication that Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) led for Taraweeh. The Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) would usually perform Tahajjud in his private quarters as can be deduced from other narrations from Ibn Abbas (ra), A’isha (ra) and Anas (ra). In the Sahih of al-Bukhari (1:696) there is a narration which states the following:

**Narrated A’isha:**

Allah’s Apostle used to pray **in his room at night**. As the wall of the room was low, the people saw him and some of them stood up to follow him in the prayer. In the morning they spread the news. The following night the Prophet stood for the prayer and the people followed him. This went on for two or three nights.

Thereupon Allah’s Apostle did not stand for the prayer the following night, and did not come out. In the morning, the people asked him about it. He replied, that he way afraid that the night prayer might become compulsory.

Now, this narration does not mention that it was in Ramadan, but it shows that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) used to pray in his room at night and for 2 or 3 nights people prayed behind the low wall by following the prayer of the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam).

What proves that the above incident occurred in Ramadan is the narration also found in Sahih Bukhari (1:698) from **Zaid ibn Thabit** (ra) as follows:

**Narrated Zaid bin Thabit:** Allah's Apostle made a small room in the month of Ramadan (Sa’id said, "I think that Zaid bin Thabit said that it was made of a mat") and he prayed there for a few nights, and so some of his companions prayed behind him. When he came to know about it, he kept on sitting. In the morning, he went out to them and said, "I have seen and understood what you did. You should pray in your houses, for..."
the best prayer of a person is that which he prays in his house except the compulsory prayers."

What we may deduce from these two sets of narrations from A’isha (ra) is that the few nights Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alihi wa sallam) lead in the Masjid was for Salatul Taraweeh, while the 2 or 3 nights that he prayed from within his room with some Sahaba praying behind him without being ordered to do so may have been the Tahajjud prayers that he usually prayed within his personal quarters. We have already quoted the narration from Anas (ra) which shows distinction between two prayers, one performed in the masjid and the other in a certain room and it is worth requoting it here so that the reader can follow the contention mentioned above.

The English translation of Sahih Muslim176 mentions it as follows:

Narrated Anas ibn Malik

The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) was observing prayer during Ramadan. I came and stood by his side. Then another man came and he stood likewise until we became a group. When the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) perceived that we were behind him, he lightened the prayer. He then went to his abode and observed such (a long) prayer (the like of which) he never observed with us. When it was morning we said to him:

Did you perceive us during the night? Upon this he said: Yes, it was this (realisation) that induced me to do that which I did. He (the narrator) said: The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) began to observe Sawm W isal at the end of the month (of Ramadan). One of his companions also began to observe this uninterrupted fast, whereupon the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) said: What about such people who observe uninterrupted fasts? You are not like me. By Allah, if the month were lengthened for me, I should have observed Sawm W isal, so that those who act in an exaggerated manner would (have been obliged) to abandon their excesses.

176 2/536, no. 2433
What is apparent from the narrations of Abu Dharr (ra), A’isha (ra), Zaid ibn Thabit (ra) and Anas (ra) is that no specific numbers of rak’ats were mentioned. The narrations from some of these noble Companions are sufficient to indicate the distinction between Salatul Taraweeh performed in the masjid for a few nights and the consistently performed Salatul Tahajjud from within a room. Wallahu a’lam.

Imam al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 AH) also narrated Abu Dharr’s narrations as mentioned earlier, and he mentioned the following points that were left out by the two compilers. If they had mentioned al-Tirmidhi’s discussion it would have become very apparent that he didn’t know of any authentic proof to substantiate the claim that Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) himself lead the Sahaba for 8 rak’ats alone in Taraweeh. Al-Tirmidhi said in his al-Jami (3/ 169-170, no. 806):

Al-Tirmidhi mentioned after the Hadith:
"The People of Knowledge have differed over the (rak’ats for) standing in Ramadan. Some held the view that one prays 41 rak’ats with the Witr, and it is the saying of the People of Madina, and such is their practice in Madina. The majority of the People of Knowledge held it to be 20 rak’ats as it is related from Umar, Ali and other Companions of al-Nabi (salallahu alaihi wa sallam), and it is the saying of (Sufyan) al-Thawri, (Abdullah) ibn al-Mubarak and al-Shafi’i. Al-Shafi’i said: “I found the people of our city, Makka, praying 20 rak’ats.’ A hmed (ibn H anbal) said: ‘There are various reports concerning it, but no specific number is settled upon.’ Ishaq (ibn Rahawayh) said: “We prefer 41 rak’ats according to what has been reported from Ubayy ibn Ka’b. Ibn al-Mubarak, A hmed and Ishaq preferred praying with the Imam in the month of Ramadan, while al-Shafi’i preferred a man pray by himself if he was a Qari, and in this chapter (there are similar reports like Abu Dharr’s from) A’isha, Nu’man ibn Bashir and Ibn A bbas.”

If the position for 8 rak’ats was known to be a valid opinion before al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 AH), an Imam who lived in the third Islamic century, then he would have validated that position back to Allah’s Messenger (salallahu alaihi wa sallam), his Companions or at least an Imam before him in the section that this quote has been culled from. On the contrary, Imam al-Tirmidhi has given credence to a bare minimum of 20 rak’ats.

In Madina it is said that after every 4 rak’ats Taraweeh behind the Imam the people would individually perform 4 rak’ats. Thus, this makes a total of 20 rak’ats Taraweeh behind the Imam(s) and 16 rak’ats individually, followed by 3 rak’ats of Witr. This is a sum of 39 rak’ats and if 2 extra rak’ats of nafl are added after the Witr, then this totals 41 rak’ats. The view of Imam Ishaq ibn Rahawayh for 41 rak’ats is confirmed from him as reported by Imam Ishaq ibn Mansur al-Kawsaj from him in his Masail al-Imam A hmed wa Ishaq ibn Rahawayh.

See later for his reply to Ishaq al-Kawsaj

See later for what Ishaq ibn Rahawayh said to his student, Ishaq ibn Mansur al-Kawsaj later

May be al-Tirmidhi is referring to the following narration found in Sahih Bukhari (2:229): Narrated A’isha, the mother of the faithful believers: One night Allah’s Apostle offered the prayer in the Mosque and the people followed him. The next night he also offered the prayer and too many people gathered. On the third and the fourth nights more people gathered, but Allah’s Apostle did not come out to them. In the morning he said, “I saw what you were doing and nothing but the fear that it (i.e. the prayer) might be enjoined on you, stopped me from coming to you.” And that happened in the month of Ramadan.

As found in Sunan al-Nasa’i (no. 1609) and al-Nawawi declared its sanad to be Hasan in his Khulasatul Ahkam (no. 1960)
According to the Hanbali faqih of his age known as Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi (d. 620 AH) the preferred opinion of Imam Ahmed is also 20 rak'ats.

In his famous commentary to the Mukhtasar of al-Khiraj, known as al-Mughni (2/167), he said (comments in brackets are mine):

“...and what is preferred with Abu Abd al-Rahman, may Allah have mercy upon him, in it (Taraweeh) is 20 Rak’ats and with this is the saying of: (Sufyan) al-Thawri, Abu Hanifah, al-Shafi’i, and Malik said 36 Rak’ats...”

In the Mughni, Ibn Qudama also mentioned that in the days of Umar (ra) the Sahaba gathered together behind the Sahabi: Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra) and prayed 20 rak’ats, and he mentioned after reporting the mursal narration from Yazid ibn Ruman that in Umar’s (ra) time it was prayed with 23 rak’ats, as well as the narration about Ali (ra) ordering a man to lead for 20 rak’ats - that this was like an Ijma (consensus of the Sahaba). This type of Ijma on the rak’ats being 20 is denied by the likes of the duo being replied to, as well as al-Albani before them.
Indeed, Abul Qasim Umar ibn al Hussain al-Khiraqi also mentioned 20 rak'ats as being the only Hanbali view in his al-Mukhtasar (p. 31). This is al-Khiraqi, who died in the year 334 AH, and received fiqh from the line of those who received it directly from Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal. Al-Khiraqi said:

وقيم شهر رمضان عشرون ركعة

Meaning: “The standing (in Salah) in the month of Ramadan is 20 rak'ats.”

Another later commentator of the Mukhtasar al-Khiraqi, known as Shaykh Muhammad al-Zurqani also affirmed it to be 20 rak'ats by quoting the narration from Yazid ibn Ruman and affirmed the claim of it being Ijma

Imam al-Shafi'i was no doubt in line with 20 rak'ats as this is the number mentioned from him by his student, Imam al-Muzani in his Mukhtasar as follows:

(قال) قال، أقام شهر رمضان فصلاة المنفرد أحب إلى منه ورايته بالمدينة يقومون بتسعة وثلاثين وأحب إلى عشرون لأنه روى عن عمر وكذلك يقومون بمكة ويوثرون بثلاث (قال) ولا يقتن في رمضان إلا في النصف الآخر وكذلك كان يفعل ابن عمر ومعاذ الرازي

---

181 Al-Zurqani mentioned in his Sharh:
This quote from Imam al-Shafi'i mentions that he saw the People of Madina standing for 39 rak'ats and 20 rak'ats was beloved to him personally as this has been related from Umar (ra), and this is the Makkan practice with 3 rak'ats of Witr. Thus, what al-Tirmidhi mentioned is not just an anecdotal report from Imam al-Shafi'i, but authentically verified from Imam al-Muzani from his Shaykh, al-Imam al-Shafi'i, rahimahullah. The above quote is also found in Imam al-Shafi'i’s Kitab al-Umm and a similar report was mentioned from al-Shafi’i by al-Bayhaqi in his Ma’rifatus Sunan wal Athar.183

Imam Abul Hasan al-Mawardi (d. 450 AH) in his commentary to Mukhtasir al-Muzani known as al-Hawi al-Kabir185 has also held it to be 20 rak’ats in line with the report from Umar ibn al-Khattab’s (ra) time as follows with the explanation of why the Madinans performed more:

فلا تقرر هذا و ثبت فاذئ اختار عشرون ركعة جمع ترويحات كل ترويحات شفعين
كل شفعين ركعتين بمائة ثم يرث بثاق؛ لأن عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه جمع الناس
على أبي بن كعب فكان يصلي بهم عشرين ركعة جرى به العمل و عليه الناس بمكة
قال الشافعي: "ورأيتهم بالمدينة يقومون بست وتثاثين ركعة بسبع ترويحات،
ويثرون بثاث؛ ألا أنا خلفها أهل مكة في ذلك و زادوا في عدد ركعتهم؛ لأن أهل مكة
كانوا إذا صلوا ترويحة طفاوا سابقاً إلا الترويحة الخمسية فإنهم يثرون بعدها، و لا يطوفون
فيحصل لهم خمس ترويحات وأربع طوافات، فإنما لم يكن أهل المدينة مساوينهم في
الطواف الأربع، و قد ساواهم في الترويحات الخمس جعلوا مكان أربع طوافات أربع
ترويحات زوايد فصار لهم تسع ترويحات تكون ستة و ثلاثتين ركعة لتكون صلاتهم مساوية
لصلاة أهل مكة و طوافهم، وقيل: إن كان السبب فيه أن عبد الملك بن مروان كان له تسع
أولاد فراد أن يصلي جميعهم بالمدينة فقدم كل واحد منهم فصلى ترويحة فصارة سنة

Now, the duo continued by saying (on p. 33):

Allaamah Muhaddith Ubaidullaah Mubaarakpooree Rehmanee went onto say, “It is clear from
this narration that the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) led the taraaweeh

184 4/40, no. 5403 and 5404, Qal’aji edition
prayer in three parts of the night and by praying it after Eeshaa until the end of the night he informed us of its time. It is likely that no time would have remained for tahajjud, (as taraweeh on the 27th night was prayed so late in the night to the extent that there were fears of missing the dawn meal) therefore no doubt remains about taraweeh and tahajjud being one prayer.

The apparent meaning of Abu Dharr’s narration does not deal with whether or not Allah’s Messenegr (sallallahualaihiwasallam) peformed a seperate Salah that we call Tahajjud, since this narration only mentions what Abu Dharr (ra) witnessed in a public gathering. Tahajjud was usually performed by al-Nabi (sallallahulaihiwa sallam) in one of his living quarters out of the gaze of most Sahaba. Some of the Sahaba did witness him performing the Tahajjud, like his beloved wife, A’isha (ra), Ibn Abbas and Zayd al-Juhani, radiallahu anhum.

Now, the late Ubaidullah Mubarakpuri has made his conclusion that Taraweeh and Tahajjud are one based upon the Salah performed on the 27th night by saying:

It is likely that no time would have remained for tahajjud, (as taraweeh on the 27th night was prayed so late in the night to the extent that there were fears of missing the dawn meal)

To this point it may be answered that even if there remained no time to perform Tahajjud on the 27th night, this does not prove that Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) never performed it on other nights of Ramadan. Indeed, if one reads carefully what Ibn Kathir quoted from A’isha (ra), she mentioned:

*Whenever the Messenger of Allah used to pray a particular prayer, he liked to remain consistent in its performance. If he would ever be preoccupied from performing the night prayer by oversleeping, pain or illness, he would pray twelve units of supererogatory prayer during the day.\(^{186}\)*

From this we can gather that Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) was accustomed to performing Tahajjud throughout the year, including Ramadan, on

\(^{186}\) As found in Sahih Muslim
a consistent basis, but on some occasions a certain reason may have held him back from performing Tahajjud. Thus, even if al-Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) did not perform it on the 27th night due to shortage of time at the end of that night, it does not mean that he never performed Tahajjud on the other nights by himself. What proves our point that al-Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) would perform two distincts prayers in the nights of Ramadan has been quoted already from Anas ibn Malik (ra) from Sahih Muslim, with the crucial distinction mentioned as follows:

The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) was observing prayer during Ramadan. I came and stood by his side. Then another man came and he stood likewise until we became a group. When the Apostle of Allah (peace be upon him) perceived that we were behind him, he lightened the prayer. He then went to his abode and observed such (a long) prayer (the like of which) he never observed with us. When it was morning we said to him: Did you perceive us during the night? Upon this he said: Yes, it was this (realisation) that induced me to do that which I did.

Hence, if Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban hold that Tahajud and Taraweeh are one and the same Salah in Ramadan, then it is advisable that they quote an authentic narration from the days of the pious predecessors (al-Salaf al-Salihin) that this is so, rather than the personal views of much later authors. One also wonders why they also use two terms, Tahajjud and Taraweeh, if it is one and the same prayer. It’s our contention that these two terms are separate in meaning and its number of rak’ats.

We have already quoted the narration from the Sahabi, Talq ibn Ali (ra) performing what indicates his leading people with Taraweeh and Tahajjud separately, and now, it is worth quoting the practice of Taraweeh and Tahahhud as witnessed by the Iraqi Fiqh of his time, Imam Ibrahim al-Nakha’i (d. 96 AH). Al-Nakha’i was one of the Tabi’in who took fiqh from some of the leading students of the noble Sahabi, Abdullah ibn Mas’ud (ra).
In the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba\textsuperscript{187} the following narration from him is mentioned:

 حدثنا أبو بكر قال: ثنا أبو الأموِّص عن مُغَيِّرَةً عن إِبْرَاهِيم قَالَ كَانَ الَّذِينَ مُتَهِجِّدُونَ يُصِلُّونَ في جَلَاةِ الْمَسْجِدِ، وَالإِمَامُ يُصِلُّيَ بالْأَشَّامِ فِي شَهْرِ رَمَضَانِ

Abu Bakr (ibn Abi Shayba) said that Abul Ahwas (Sallam ibn Sulaym) informed us from Mughira (ibn Miqsam) from Ibrahim who said: “Those who prayed Salatul Tahajjud did so at the side of the masjid, and the Imam would lead the people in prayer in the month of Ramadan.”

Ibn Abi Shayba was a trustworthy Hafiz of high standing, and the one he took from, viz. Abul Ahwas (Sallam ibn Sulaym) was declared to be Thiqa mutqin (trustworthy and perfect) by Ibn Hajar in al Taqrib al-Tahdhib:

مَاتِيَةَ سَنَةَ تَسْبِعَ وَسِعَ عَشَانَ

Mughira ibn Miqsam is also Thiqa mutqin as Ibn Hajar mentioned in al-Taqrib:

المَغِيَّرَةِ يِنْ مَقِسَمُ بِكَسَرِ الْمُيْمِ الْمُضِيِّ مَوْلَاهُمْ أَبُو الأَوْحَسَ الكُوفِيُّ ثِقَةٌ مَتْقَنٌ صَاحِبُ حُدِيثٍ مِنَ السَّابِعَة

As for the claim that Mughira would make tadlis (concealment of how he received the narration precisely) when reporting from Ibrahim, then this has been opposed by Shaykh Shu‘ayb al Arna‘ut and Dr Bashhar Awwad in their Tahrir al-Taqrib based on a report from Imam Abu Dawud. Additionally, they mentioned that both al-Bukhari and Muslim have recorded narrations where Mughira transmitted from Ibrahim using the expression “an” (from), which is an unclear method of transmission known as “an-ana”. The reader may see Sahih al-

\textsuperscript{187} 5/233-234, no. 7805, edited by Shaykh Muhammad Awwama. Two similar reports from Ibrahim are recorded by Imam al-Tahawi in his Sharh Ma‘ani al-Athar (1/351) and Imam Ibn Abi Dunya in his Fada’il Ramadan (no. 56) via routes going back to Mughira from Ibrahim al-Nakha’i
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This was mentioned by Imam al-Bayahqi in his al-Sunan al-Kubra as follows:

As for Ibrahim he was graded to be a Thiqa faqih (trustworthy jurisprudent) who reported a lot via the method of Irsal according to Ibn Hajar in al-Taqrib:

Note, the mursal narrations of Ibrahim are all Sahih except two according to Imam Yahya ibn Ma‘een.

The above narration from Ibrahim has been transmitted with a similar meaning once again by Ibn Abi Shayba in al-Musannaf (no. 7809) via the route of Abu Khalid al-Ahmar from al-A‘mash al-Kufi taking the report from Ibrahim al-Nakha’i as follows:

Abu Khalid is Sulayman ibn Hayyan al-Azdi and he is Saduq though he made some errors as Ibn Hajar mentioned in al Taqrib:

---

188 This was mentioned by Imam al-Bayahqi in his al-Sunan al-Kubra as follows:
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His narrations are also found in the 6 major books of Hadith.\textsuperscript{189}

As for al-A’mash, he is Sulayman ibn Mihran and he is mentioned as follows by Ibn Hajar in al-Taqrib:

\[ 2615 \]

\[ \text{سليمان بن} \text{مهمان} \text{الكاهلي أبو محمد} \text{الكوفي} \text{الأعش ثقة حافظ عارف بالقراءات} \]

A’mash was declared to be a Thiqa Hafiz by Ibn Hajar though he used to commit tadlis at times. Al-Dhahabi mentioned the following about al-A’mash and his tadlis in Mizan al-I’tidal (no. 3517):

\[ \text{تطرق إلى احتمال التدليس إلا في شيوخ له أكثر عنهم: كتاباهيم، وابن أبي وائل، وآبي صالح} \]

This statement indicates that al-A’mash reporting from Ibrahim, Ibn Abi Wa’il and Abu Salih al Samman does not entail tadlis if he used the expression “an”, but rather he did take from them with direct hearing. Indeed, there are at least 40 chains in Sahih al-Bukhari and even more so in Sahih Muslim via the route of al-A’mash reporting with an-ana from Ibrahim al-Nakha’i.

The upshot from all of this is that the narration from al-Nakha’i is Sahih, and it is an unequivocal proof that in the time of this learned Tabi’, the other pious people who are most likely to have been fellow Tabi’in, as well as may be some of their students, or may be some Sahaba in that masjid would pray behind the Imam for Salatul Taraweeh in congregation, while those who opted to perform Salatul Tahajjud segregated themselves to a section of the masjid away from the main Jama’at and prayed by themselves. This re-inforces our position that in the days of the early Salaf, there was a distinction between Salatul Taraweeh and Tahajjud.

\textsuperscript{189} Meaning Sahih Bukhari, Sahih Muslim, Jami al-Tirmidhi and the Sunan ‘s of Abu Dawud, Nasa’i and Ibn Majah. His narrations are also in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, once in Sahih ibn Khuzayma, Sahih ibn Hibban, Mustadrak al-Hakim, al-Mukhatar of Diya al-Maqdisi etc
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Ibrahim al-Nakha'i was also an advocate of 20 rak’ats as can be deciphered from a sanad that is Sahih at least to the Hanafi Ulama recorded by Imam Abu Yusuf in his Kitab al-Athar from his Shaykh, Imam Abu Hanifa from his Shaykh, Hammad ibn Abi Sulayman from Ibrahim al-Nakha’i as follows

"The people would pray 5 tarweehat in Ramadan" 190

Each Tarweeh is represented by a rest period after every 4 rak’ats. This narration was not opposed by Imam Abu Hanifa, and is thus a clear indication that his view is also for 20 rak’ats Taraweeh as a number of Imams have declared.

Hanbali’s who mentioned the difference between Tahajjud and Taraweeh:

---

190 The fact that 5 tarweehat equates to 20 rak’ats in units of two rak’ats at a time with a rest period after every 4 rak’ats was also clarified by Imam Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr al-Razi (d. 666 AH) in his Hanafi fiqh work known as Tuhfatul Muluk (1/80, Dar al-Basha ‘ir al-Islamiyya, 1st edn, 1417 AH) as follows:

A similar stance is mentioned by the Hanafi Imam, Abdullah al-Mawsili (d. 683 AH) in his al-Ikhtiyar li ta ’il al Mukhtar (1/75, Darul Kutub Ilmiyya, Beirut, 2nd edn, 2005) as follows:

As well as in the Fatawa al-Hindiyya (1/115, Darul-Fikr, 1991) as follows:

---
i) Shaykh Abdar Rahman Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi (d. 682 AH) has made the following comment which shows the distinction between the two prayers in his Sharh al-Kabir:

وعن السائب بن زيد قال: كانوا يقومون على عهد عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه في شهر رمضان بعشرين ركعة و كانوا يقومون بالعائدين، وكانوا يتوكؤن على عصيهم في عهد عمر رضي الله عنه من شدة القيام، رواه البيهقي. وعن أبي عثمان النهدي قال: دعا عمر بن الخطاب بثلاثة قراء فاستقر امامهم فقرأهم قراءةً أن يقرأا للناس بثلاثين آية وأوسطهم أن يقرأا خمسا وعشرين آية، وأمر أبيه أن يقرأا عشرين آية، رواه البيهقي، وكان السلف يستعجلون خمسم بالطعم مخافة طلوه الفجر (فصل) فكان له تجديد جعل الوتر بعده فلقول النبي ﷺ واجعلوا آخرا صلاكم بالليل وترا "

This statement mentioned the narration from al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunna al-Kubra for 20 rak’ats Taraweeh, and the author mentioned that if one wishes to perform Tahajjud then one should perform the Witr after it as one Hadith mentions that Witr should be the last prayer of the night.

Ibn Qudama in his al-Maqa also mentioned the following point:

ثم التراويح وهي عشرون ركعة يقوم بها في رمضان في جماعة، ويوتر بعدما في الجماعة القلم البقرة الألفام فإن كان له تجديد جعل الوتر بعده

This also mentions that Taraweeh is 20 rak’ats in congregation followed by the Witr, but if one wishes to perform Tahajjud then one should pray Witr after it instead.

ii) The Shaykh al-Islam of the two compilers, Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab al-Najdi al-Hanbali (d. 1206 AH) mentioned the following in his Adab al-Mashi ilal-Salah (p. 20):

191 1/751
The above mentions that Ibn Abdal Wahhab in his Mukhtasar al-Insaf wal Sharh al-Kabir fi fiqh Imam al-Sunna Ahmed ibn Hanbal (p. 105) that Imam Ibn Hanbal and al-Shafi’i were for 20 rak’ats, while Malik was for 36 rak’ats. Ibn Abdal Wahhab supported 20 rak’ats based on Umar (ra) gathering the people behind Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra) for 20 rak’ats.

A contemporary Saudi writer from the same school of doctrine as Abu Khuzaymah and Abu Hibban is Dr Salih al-Fawzan. In the English edition of his “A Summary of Islamic Jurisprudence” he mentioned the following in a footnote:

192 1/165, al-Maiman publishing house, Riyadh, KSA, 2005 CE
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“The Tarawih Prayer is to be performed in two rak‘ahs successively the same as Tahajjud (the Night Vigil Prayer). Some imams of mosques who are not well versed in Fiqh (Islamic Jurisprudence) may not say taslim after every two rak‘ahs in the Tarawih or Tahajjud, which is wrong and contradictory to the Sunnah...”

This quote also goes to show that al-Fawzan made the distinction between Taraweeh and Tahajjud to be separate prayers and not interchangeable names for one Salah alone.
A look at how the Ulama applied A'isha's (ra) narrations on 8 rak'ats to Tahajjud and not Taraweeh

1) Imam Malik’s (d. 179 AH) implied stance

In the early Hadith collection known as the Muwatta of Imam Malik ibn Anas the following narrations were mentioned from A’isha (ra):

1st variant:

Book 7, Number 7.2.8: Yahya related to me from Malik from Ibn Shihab from Urwa ibn az-Zubayr from A’isha, the wife of the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, used to pray eleven rakas in the night, making them odd by a single one, and when he had finished he lay down on his right side.

2nd variant:

Book 7, Number 7.2.9: Yahya related to me from Malik from Said ibn Abi Said al-Maqburi from Abu Salama ibn Abd ar-Rahman ibn Awf that he asked A’isha, the wife of the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, what the prayer of the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, was like during Ramadan. She said, "The Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, did not go above eleven rakas in Ramadan or at any other time. He prayed four - do not ask me about their beauty or length. Then he prayed another four - do not ask me about their beauty and length. Then he prayed three." A’isha continued, "I said, ‘Messenger of Allah, are you sleeping before you do the witr?’ He said, A’isha, my eyes sleep but my heart does not sleep.'"
3rd variant:

Book 7, Number 7.2.10: Yahya related to me from Malik from Hisham ibn Urwa from his father that A’isha, umm al-muminin said, “The Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, used to pray thirteen rakas in the night and then would pray two rakas when he heard the adhan for the subh prayer.”

These are therefore 3 variants from A’isha (ra), the first mentioned 11 rak’ats with an odd rak’at at the end. The second mentioned 11 rak’ats but it was performed with a 4 rak’at unit followed by another 4 rak’ats and then 3 rak’ats witr. Lastly, it states 13 rak’ats and on hearing the Azan he performed two rak’ats before Fajr.

In Sahih Muslim (no. 1608) there is another variant stating the following:

Abu Salama asked ‘A’isha about the prayer of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) She said: He observed thirteen rak’ahs (in the night prayer). He observed eight rak’ahs and would then observe Witr and then observe two rak’ahs sitting, and when he wanted to bow he stood up and then bowed down, and then observed two rak’ahs in between the Adhan and Iqama of the dawn prayer.

In Sahih al-Bukhari (2:241), another variant mentions:

Narrated `Aisha: the Prophet (sallallahu alai wa sallam) used to offer thirteen rak`at of the night prayer and that included the witr and two rak`at (Sunna) of the Fajr prayer.

There is also a narration from Ibn Abbas (ra) recorded by Imam Malik in his Muwatta which demonstrates a full 13 rak’ats of Tahajjud inclusive of the witr, followed by two rak’ats of Fajr when the azan was called, in line with the third variant from A’isha (ra) above:
Maalik’s Muwatta, Book 7: Tahajjud >> Section 2: How the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, Prayed the Witr

Book 7, Number 7.2.11:
Yahya related to me from Malik from Makhrama ibn Sulayman from Kurayb, the mawla of Ibn Abbas, that Abdullah ibn Abbas told him that he had spent a night at the house of Maimuna, the wife of the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, who was also Ibn Abbas’ mother’s sister. Ibn Abbas said, "I lay down with my head on the breadth of the cushion, and the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, and his wife lay down with their heads on its length. The Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, slept until halfway through the night or a little before or after it, he awoke and sat up and wiped the sleep away from his face with his hand. Then he recited the last ten ayats of sura Ali Imran (Sura 3). Then he got up and went over to a water-skin which was hanging up and did wudu from it, doing his wudu thoroughly, and then he stood in prayer."

Ibn Abbas continued, "I stood up and did the same and then went and stood by his side. The Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, put his right hand on my head and took my right ear and tweaked it. He prayed two rakas, then two rakas, then two rakas, then two rakas, then two rakas, and then prayed an odd raka. Then he lay down until the muazzhin came to him, and then prayed two quick rakas, and went out and prayed subh."

The dilemma raised for those who limit Taraweeh to 8 rak’ats is the need for them to explain why Ibn Abbas (ra) affirmed more than 8 rak’ats, but they act on one the variants from A’isha (ra) mentioning 8 rak’ats alone?! Ibn Abbas’s narration explicitly mentions that they prayed Tahajjud after sleeping until around the middle of the night, and thus the first two rak’ats do not refer to the 2 rak’ats performed after the 4 rak’ats of Salatul Isha.

These variants from A’isha were known to some of the Maliki scholars like al-Hafiz Ibn Abdal Barr and Imam al-Qurtubi. These Ulama had some problem
with the consistency of the textual variation, and it appears as though they had gone to the level of suggesting that A’isha’s narrations have shakiness in them (idtirab). These narrations from A’isha are authentic in their chains of transmission and they are also found in the Sahih’s of Bukhari and Muslim, and elsewhere, nevertheless, this is what al-Hafiz Ibn Abdal Barr mentioned in his al-Tamheed (21/72) when analyzing the variant narrations from A’isha (ra):

Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani has mentioned the following in his Fath al-Bari from Imam al-Qurtubi on the problematic nature that many from the People of Knowledge (kathir min ahl ilm) faced over the variant narrations from A’isha (ra) with the mention that they ascribed shakiness (idtirab) to it:

There are narrations from Abdullah ibn Umar (ra) mentioning that night prayers should be performed in units of two followed by two until the onset of Fajr, and thus some have used these narrations not to limit the rak’ats exclusively to 8 rak’ats. In Sahih al-Bukhari (2:107) it mentioned the following:
Narrated Abdullah bin Umar:

The Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) said, "Night prayer is offered as two rak'at followed by two rak'at and so on, and if you want to finish it, pray only one rak'at which will be witr for all the previous rak'at." Al-Qasim said, "Since we attained the age of puberty we have seen some people offering a three-rak'at prayer as witr and all that is permissible. I hope there will be no harm in it."

As for Imam Malik, he recorded all 3 variants from A'isha (ra) in the section known as: "Kitab Salatul Layl" (Book on Night prayer), under the heading known as "Bab Salatul Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) fil Witr." (Chapter of the Prophet's (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) Witr prayer."

The above title headings are implicit to Salatul Tahajjud and not Salatul Taraweeh. Imam Malik mentioned the following narrations under the section known as “Kitab al Salah fi Ramadan" (The Book of Prayer in Ramadan) under the chapter heading: “Bab ma-jafiqiyam Ramadan" (Chapter on what has been related on standing (in Salah) for Ramadan.” :

Book 6, Number 6.2.4: Yahya related to me from Malik from Muhammad ibn Yusuf that as-Sa'ib ibn Yazid said, "Umar ibn al-Khattab ordered Ubayy ibn Kab and Tamim ad-Dari to watch the night in prayer with the people for eleven rakas. The reciter of the Qur'an would recite the Mi'in (a group of medium-sized suras) until we would be leaning on our staffs from having stood so long in prayer. And we would not leave until the approach of dawn."

Book 6, Number 6.2.5: Yahya related to me from Malik that Yazid ibn Ruman said, "The people used to watch the night in prayer during Ramadan for twenty-three rakas in the time of Umar ibn al-Khattab."

Book 6, Number 6.2.6: Yahya related to me from Malik from Da'ud ibn al-Husayn that he heard al-Araj say, "I never saw the people in Ramadan, but that they were cursing the disbelievers." He added, "The reciter of Qur'an used to
recite Surat al-Baqara in eight rakas and if he did it in twelve rakas the people would think that he had made it easy."

As for the first narration from Muhammad ibn Yusuf saying 11 rak’ats, it has already been shown to be an erroneous mistake from Ibn Yusuf alone, and what proves this further is that Imam Malik himself did not act upon 8 rak’ats, but rather he was upon 20 rak’ats Taraweeh, plus 16 rak’ats of additional Salah individually, followed by 3 rak’ats Witr. It is confirmed that Imam Malik was upon at least 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh based on what is in the Mudawwana of al-Sahnun, al-Risala of Ibn Abi Zayd al-Qayrawani al-Maliki, al-Istidhkar of Ibn Abdal Barr, al-Mughni of Ibn Qudama al-Hanbali, Bidayatul Mujahid of Ibn Rushd al-Maliki, Fath al-Bari of Ibn Hajar and others. There is no authentic report to prove that Imam Malik acted upon or advocated 8 rak’ats of Taraweeh.

All of this goes to show that Imam Malik did not apply A’isha’s narrations to be for the explicit number of rak’ats for Taraweeh, and his placing them under the section for night prayers indicates that he knew them to be applicable to Tahajjud as a separate Salah. The reader is requested to refer to a later section on the Maliki view on the rak’ats of Taraweeh.

2) Imam al-Shafi’i (d. 204 AH), was a student of Imam Malik’s, and it is well known that he took the Muwatta from his Shaykh. In the Musnad (no. 953) of al-Shafi’i he mentioned one of the variants from A’isha (ra) as follows via Imam Malik:

أخبرنا مالك ، عن ابن شهاب ، عن عروة ، عن عائشة رضي الله عنها أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كان يصلي بالليل إحدى عشرة ركعة ، يوتر منها واحدة

It has been shown above that al-Shafi’i approved 20 rak’ats Taraweeh as this was what he saw the People of Makka perform, and it is clear that he did not understand A’isha’s variant narrations that he must have heard directly from Imam Malik to be applicable to the rak’ats of Taraweeh, but on the contrary he must have applied them to Salatul Tahajjud alone. Al-Shafi’i also knew that the People of Madina used to pray 39 rak’ats and he never knew his Shaykh, Imam Malik or anyone else perform 8 rak’ats of Taraweeh in his time, be it in the Hijaz,
Iraq or Egypt, as these are the regions he traversed. Had such an Imam seen people perform 8 rak'ats, he would have mentioned this divergence.

Note also, Imam al-Shafi’i also knew of the 11 rak’at narration from Muhammad ibn Yusuf as he transmitted it via Imam Malik, but he too, like Imam Malik did not act upon it. Al-Bayhaqi mentioned the point that al-Shafi’i narrated the 11 rak’at version in his Ma’rifatus Sunan as follows:

3) Imam Ishaq ibn Rahawayh (d. 238 AH), was the Shaykh of al-Bukhari who advised him to compile his Sahih. In his Musnad (2/ 554), Imam Ishaq also mentioned the second variant from A’isha (ra) via the route of Imam Malik as follows:

In the work known as Masa’il al-Imam Ahmed wa Ishaq ibn Rahawayh by Ishaq ibn Mansur al-Kawsaj (Masa’il no. 387, pp. 755-7), the latter asked both Ibn Hanbal and Ibn Rahawayh about the number of rak’ats that should be prayed in Ramadan:
The answer by Ishaq ibn Rahawayh mentions his preference for 40 rak'ats. This number may be arrived at by allowing oneself to pray an extra 4 rak'ats individually after every 4 rak'ats behind the Imam in congregation, thus making 20 rak'ats in congregation with 20 rak'ats of individual nafl Salah. Once again, this shows that such an Imam like Ibn Rahawayh did not restrict himself to 8 rak'ats by relying on A’isha’s (ra) narration. This is also an indication that he accepted 20 Rak’ats from the days of Umar (ra) and must have considered A’isha’s (ra) narration to refer to Tahajjud alone.

4) Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal (d. 241 AH) has also recorded the second variant from A’isha via the route of Imam Malik in his Musnad as follows:

There is no firm evidence that Imam Ahmed thought the above narration implies that Taraweeh is strictly 8 rak’ats, but on the contrary, it has been mentioned a few pages earlier that the early Hanbali Mukhtasar work by Shaykh Abul Qasim al-Khiraqi (d. 334 AH) mentioned that the only known early Hanbali view was upon 20 rak’ats. The later commentators of this Mukhtasar, known as Ibn Qudama (in his al-Mughni) and al-Zarkashi (in his Sharh al-Mukhtasar) also affirmed twenty rak’ats, and Ibn Qudama clarified explicitly:
“And what is preferred with Abu Abdulllah (Ahmed ibn Hanbal), may Allah have mercy upon him, in it (Taraweeh) is 20 Rak’ats and with this is the saying of: (Sufyan) al-Thawri, Abu Hanifah, al-Shafi’i, and Malik said 36 Rak’ats... ”

It will be demonstrated below from Ibn Qudama’s al-Mughni that he understood A’isha’s narrations to refer to Tahajjud.

5) Imam Abu Isaa al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 AH) in his al-Jami also mentioned A’isha’s narration (the second variant) as follows via the route of Imam Malik

Despite knowing of this narration and declaring it to be Hasan Sahih, al-Tirmidhi did not say that it is a proof that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) prayed only 8 rak’ats Taraweeh plus 3 rak’ats Witr, nor did he mention this from any of the Sahaba or major Imams before him. We have already mentioned al-Tirmidhi’s precise discussion on the rak’ats of Taraweeh as repeated below:

"The People of Knowledge have differed over the (rak’ats for) standing in Ramadan. Some held the view that one prays 41 rak’ats with the Witr, and it is the saying of the People of Madina, and such is their practice in Madina. The majority of the People of Knowledge held it to be 20 rak’ats as it is related from Umar, Ali and other Companions of al-Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam), and it is the saying of (Sufyan) al-Thawri, (Abdulllah) ibn Mubarak and al-Shafi’i. Al-Shafi’i said: "I found the people of our city, Makka, praying 20 rak’ats.’ A hmed (ibn Hanbal) said: ‘There are various reports concerning it, but no specific number is settled upon.’ Ishaq (ibn Rahawayh) said: ‘We prefer 41 rak’ats according to what has been reported from U bayy ibn Ka’b. Ibn al-M ubarak, A hmed and Ishaq preferred praying with the Imam in the month of Ramadan, while al-Shafi’i preferred a man pray by himself if he was a
Qari, and in this chapter (there are similar reports like A bu D harr’s from) A ‘isha, Nu‘man ibn Bashir and Ibn A bbas.

The above is clear enough to show that al-Tirmidhi must have applied A’isha’s narration to refer exclusively to Tahajjud, and his Shaykh, Imam al-Bukhari has also mentioned the narration from A’isha in different places of his Sahih, but what is also apparent is that had al-Bukhari accepted A’isha’s narration to be in reference to 8 rak’ats Taraweeh alone and not Tahajjud, then one would have expected al-Tirmidhi to have mentioned a divergent view from al-Bukhari in contradistinction to those from the majority who said it is 20 Rak’ats.

6) Imam Abu Ja’far al-Tahawi (d. 321 AH)

This famous Hanafi Mujtahid Imam has mentioned A’isha’s (ra) narration in two of his well known Hadith works. In his Sharh Ma’ani al-Athar (1/246) he mentioned a few variant narrations from A’isha (ra), which included the following one found in the Muwatta Malik (which is the 2nd variant listed earlier):

١٩٣ May be al-Tirmidhi is referring to the following narration found in Sahih Bukhari (2:229): Narrated A’isha, the mother of the faithful believers: One night Allah’s Apostle offered the prayer in the Mosque and the people followed him. The next night he also offered the prayer and too many people gathered. On the third and the fourth nights more people gathered, but Allah’s Apostle did not come out to them. In the morning he said, “I saw what you were doing and nothing but the fear that it (i.e. the prayer) might be enjoined on you, stopped me from coming to you.” And that happened in the month of Ramadan.

١٩٤ As found in Sunan al-Nasa’i (no. 1609) and al-Nawawi declared its sanad to be Hasan in his Khulasatul Ahkam (no. 1960)
This specific narration from A‘isha (ra) was also mentioned in his Sharh Mushkil al Athar. What proves the point that Imam al-Tahawi did not regard the above narration to be a means for limiting the rak‘ats to a maximum of 8 rak‘ats for Taraweeh is the fact that in his book known as Ikhtilaf al-Ulama (Differences of the Scholars on fiqh issues) which has reached us in the abridged format known as Mukhtasar Ikhtilaf al-Ulama lil-Tahawi by Imam Abu Bakr al-Jassas (d. 370 AH), the following is the verdict on the rak‘ats of Taraweeh by Imam al-Tahawi:

قال أصحابنا والشافعي يقومون بعشرين ركعة سوى الوتر وقال مالك تسعة وثلاثون ركعة بالوتر ست وثلاثون والوتر وقال هذا الأمر القديم الذي لم يزل الناس عليه عن الساني بن يزيد أنهم كانوا يقومون في رمضان بعشرين ركعة وأنهم كانوا يعتمدون على العصي في زمن عمر بن الخطاب الحسن بن حي عن عمو بن قيس عن أبي الحسناء أن على بن أبي طالب أمر رجلا أن يصلي بهم في شهر رمضان بعشرين ركعة.

The above quote mentions al-Tahawi saying that “Our companions” (meaning the Hanafi Madhhabin aggregate) and al-Shafi‘i held the position for 20 rak‘ats besides the Witr, while Malik ibn Anas said it was 39 rak‘ats with the Witr (of 3 rak‘ats). Al-Tahawi also mentioned a variant from Sa‘ib ibn Yazid (ra) mentioning 20 rak‘ats in the time of Umar (ra), as well as mentioning a (weaker chained) narration from Ali ibn Abi Talib (ra) ordering a man to pray with 20 rak‘ats in Ramadan.

Hence, what can be concluded is that Imam al-Tahawi did not know of a practice of less than 20 rak‘ats in his time or from the time right back to the days of Umar (ra). This quote also indirectly alludes to the point that Imam Abu Hanifa (ra) and his disciples also accepted 20 rak‘ats Taraweeh. The points made by al-Tahawi will be revisited later in reply to another false claim raised by the two compilers.
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7) Imam al-Bayhaqi (d. 458 AH) has mentioned A’isha’s 2nd variant narration in his al-Sunan al-Kubra under the chapter on the number of rak’ats for standing for night prayers in Ramadan as follows:

أبو عبد الله الحافظ أخريني إسماعيل بن محمد بن الفضل البيهيقي ثنا جدي ثنا أبي
أويس حدثني مالك بن أسح حثنا أبو عبد الله ثنا أبو بكر بن إسحاق ثنا إسماعيل بن قتيبة ثنا
يحيى بن يحيى قال فرأى على مالك عن سعيد بن أبي سعيد عن أبي سلمة قال سألت عائشة رضي الله
عليها كيف كانت صلاة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في رمضان فقالت ما كان رسول الله
صلى الله عليه وسلم يزيد في رمضان ولا في غير رمضان على إحدى عشر ركعه يصلي أربع فلا
تسلل عن حسنين وطولهن ثم يصلي أربع فلا تسلل عن حسنين وطولهن ثم يصلي ثلاثا قالت عائشة
فقالت يا رسول الله أنت قال أن توتر فقال يا عائشة أن عيني تثمان ولا ينام قلبي لفظ حديث يحيى بن
يحيى وفي حديث من أبي أوس أنه سأل عائشة زوج النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم رواه البخاري في
الصحيح عن إسماعيل بن أبي أوس ورواه سلم عن يحيى بن يحيى

In the same section he mentioned the two variant narrations from Sa‘ib ibn Yazid, one via Muhammad ibn Yusuf for 11 rak’ats and the other via Yazid ibn Khusayfa for 20 rak’ats, followed by the mursal narration for 23 rak’ats from Yazid ibn Ruman (as in the Muwatta Malik). After mentioning Ibn Ruman’s narration, al-Bayhaqi gave his personal verdict on how to join between the two narrations on 11 rak’ats and 20 rak’ats going back to Sa‘ib (ra) by saying:

ويمكن الجمع بين الروايتين فإنهم كانوا يقومون بإحدى عشرة ثم كانوا
يقومون بعشرين ويوثرون بثلاث والله أعلم

Meaning:

“It is possible to combine between the two narrations, because they (the Sahaba) would (initially) stand for 11 rak’ats then they (later on) would stand for 20 (rak’ats) and 3 rak’ats of Witr, and Allah knows best.”

This analysis from al-Bayhaqi suggests that the Sahaba finally agreed upon 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh, and this must have included the assent of A’isha (ra), for no dissension is known from her on it not being 20 rak’ats. The weakness in al-Bayhaqi’s initial claim that the Sahaba originally performed 11 rak’ats is due to his not being able to quote any narration from the days of the Sahaba or Tabi’in.
saying what he surmised. In short, there appears to be no authentic narration to suggest the Sahaba used to perform 11 rak’ats and then raised it up to 20 rak’ats (plus 3 rak’ats of Witr).

Nevertheless, al-Bayhaqi was an Imam of the Shafi’i school, and the above manner of reconciliation shows that he was an advocate for 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh. Al-Hafiz Jamalud-Din al-Zaylai’al-Hanafi (d. 762 AH) has also quoted the above statement from al-Bayhaqi with similar wording in reconciliation of the two variants in his Nasb al-Ra’ya (2/154) as follows:


This is an indication that al-Zaylai’i was inline with al-Bayhaqi’s conclusion that the Sahaba’s eventual stance was upon 20 rak’ats Taraweeh, and both of them knew of A’isha’s narration(s) on 8 rak’ats as well.

8) Al-Hafiz Abu Umar Ibn Abdal Barr al-Maliki (d. 463 AH) was the famous commentator of the Muwatta Imam Malik and for sure he knew of the variant narrations from A’isha (ra), and it has already been demonstrated from his al-Istidhkar that not only did he advocate 20 rak’ats to be his personal view, and knew no Maliki Imam before him, let alone Imam Malik himself advocating less than 20 rak’ats. This is a clear indication that Ibn Abdal Barr did not apply A’isha’s (ra) narration to be a proof to limit Taraweeh to 8 rak’ats. The reader is advised to recourse to the relevant sections where Ibn Abdal Barr was quoted.

9) Imam Hussain ibn Mas’ud al-Baghawi (d. 516 AH) mentioned A’isha’s second variant as follows in his Sharh al-Sunna, as well as a few others. Before he mentioned them he also mentioned the Qur’anic verses significant to Salatul

---
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Tahajjud, and this is a clear indication that he held the variant reports from A’isha (ra) to be related to Tahajjud alone:

Earlier on it was said:

He did not suggest later on when discussing the issue of the rak’ats of Taraweeh that A’isha’s (ra) variant narrations are a proof to limit Taraweeh to a maximum of 8 rak’ats, let alone mention it as a valid proof for advocating 8 rak’ats Taraweeh.

Earlier on it was said:

Let us quote from the above reference in Sharh al-Sunna to mention what al-Baghawi actually said after mentioning the 11 rak’at narration via Muhammad ibn Yusuf:

وقال مالك، عن يزيد بن رومان: كان للناس يقومون في زمن عمر بكلا ثلاث وعشرين ركعة في رمضان
ورأى بعضهم أن يصلي إحدى وأربعين ركعة مع الوتر، وهو قول أهل المدينة، وعمل على هذا
عندهم، وهو اختيار إسحاق
وأما أكثر أهل العلم، فعلم عشرين ركعة برؤى ذلك عن عمر وعلي وغيرهما من أصحاب النبي،
وهو قول النوري، وأبي المبارك، والشافعي، وأصحاب الرأي، قل الشافعي: وهذا أدركته بفضلنا
بمكة يصلون عشرين ركعة ولم يقض أحمد فيه بشيء

198 See 4/120 onwards
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One may deduce that al-Baghawi was certain that most of the people of knowledge (ahlul ilm) were upon 20 rak’ats and he ascribed that to Umar (ra), Ali (ra) and other Sahaba, and then said that 20 rak’ats was the view of also al-Tawhiri, Ibn al-Mubarak and al-Shafi’i, as well as the A’isha (ra), while the people of Madina and Ishaq (ibn Rahawayh) were upon 41 rak’ats.  

10) Imam Abu Muhammad Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi al-Hanbali (d. 620 AH) also mentioned the variants from A’isha (ra) in al-Mughni (1/ 440-441):

This quote from Ibn Qudama mentions that there was difference of opinion on the rak’ats of Tahajjud from al-Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam). Now, in the discussion on the rak’ats of Taraweeh, Ibn Qudama did not opine that Taraweeh should be a maximum of 8 rak’ats. On the contrary, he has supported 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh as mentioned earlier:

199 Meaning 20 Rak’ats of Taraweeh behind the Imam, and 16 rak’ats of nafl individually plus 3 rak’ats Witr followed by 2 rak’ats nafl
And what is preferred with Abu Abdullah (Ahmed ibn Hanbal), may Allah have mercy upon him, in it (Taraweeh) is 20 Rak’ats and with this is the saying of: (Sufyan) al-Thawri, Abu Hanifah, al-Shafi’i, and Malik said 36 Rak’ats...

11) Imam al-Nawawi (d. 676 AH) knew of A’isha’s narration in his commentary to Sahih Muslim, but despite it being found in the Sahih collections of Bukhari and Muslim, al-Nawawi introduced a chapter heading in his Khulasatul Ahkam (1/579) where he listed what he considered to be weak narrations regarding Taraweeh as follows:

(فصل في ضعيفه)

1971 - منه، عن ابن عباس: "كان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يصلي في رمضان [70 / أ] في غير جماعة بعشرين ركعة ووالتر "ضعفه البهذي وغيره. (إسناده ضعيف)

1972 - وفي "الصحيحين" عن عائشة: "ما زاد النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في رمضان، ولا غيره على إحدى عشرة ركعة".
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May be the factual reason why al-Nawawi placed it in the section on weak narrations is because it is a weak opinion to apply it to the rak‘ats of Taraweeh specifically, and thus refers to other than it, meaning, Tahajjud.

Imam al-Nawawi said in his voluminous work known as al-Majmu Sharh al-Muhadhab (4/32)\(^{200}\) (comments in brackets are mine):

“Our Madhhab (Shafi‘i school) it is 20 Rak‘ats with ten salams (meaning the salams after every two Rak‘ats) besides the Witr, and that is 5 Tarweehat and a Tarweeza is 4 Rak‘ats with two tasleems (meaning after every 2 Rak‘ats there is a salam to the right and left side), this is our Madhhab, and it is also the saying of Abu Hanifah and his Companions, Ahmed (ibn Hanbal), Dawud (ibn Ali al-Zahiri) and other than them, and it has been transmitted by al-Qadi Iyad (a Maliki Imam) from the majority of the scholars…”

Note also, that al-Nawawi mentioned the mursal narration from Yazid ibn Ruman mentioning 23 rak‘ats in the time of Umar ibn al-Khattab (ra) as reported in the Muwatta of Imam Malik, and straight after it he mentioned the 11 rak‘at narration that is also in the Muwatta (via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf). He then quoted the verdict of al-Bayhaqi as quoted above from the latter’s al-Sunan al-Kubra where he attempted to join between the two variant narrations from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid (ra).

What is clear from the Khulasatul Ahkam of al-Nawawi is that he did not promote the 11 rak‘at version via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf from Saa‘ib ibn Yazid (ra), nor did he accept the narration from A‘isha (the 2nd variant quoted earlier) as an evidence for 8 rak‘ats of Taraweeh. It is thus apparent that al-Nawawi knew the distinction between A‘isha’s (ra) variant narrations for Tahajjud being different from what is known as Salatul Taraweeh in terms of its number of rak‘ats and differing names for two distinct prayers.

\(^{200}\) Al-Majmu Sharh al-Muhadhab of al-Nawawi, printed with Fath al-Aziz of al-Rafi‘i (d. 623 AH) in the middle section and Talkhees al-Habeer fi Tahreej Ahadith al-Rafi‘i al-Kaheer of al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852 AH) in the footnotes; printed by Idara al Tab’a ’til-Muniriyya, Cairo, no date given
Indeed, al-Nawawi also mentioned in his Kitab al-A dhkar (p. 156) the following verdict:

“Do know that Taraweeh prayers are Sunna which is agreed upon by the scholars, and it is 20 rak’ats, with the taslim after every 2 rak’ats.”

One well known pseudo-Salafi Fatwa site\(^{201}\) has allowed 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh and mentioned the following regarding A’isha’s (ra) narration:

With regard to the evidence quoted by those who say that it is not permissible to do more than eight rak’ahs in Taraweeh, they quote the hadeeth of Abu Salamah ibn’ Abd al-Rahmaan, who asked ‘Aa’ishah (may Allaah be pleased with her), “How did the Messenger of Allaah (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) pray during Ramadaan?” She said: “He did not pray more than eleven rak’ahs in Ramadaan or at other times. He would pray four, and do not ask how beautiful and long they were, then he would pray four, and do not ask how beautiful and long they were, then he would pray three. I said, ‘O Messenger of Allaah, will you sleep before you pray Witr?’ He said, ‘O ‘Aa’ishah, my eyes sleep but my heart does not.’”

Narrated by al-Bukhaari, 1909; Muslim, 738

They said: This hadeeth indicates that the Messenger of Allaah was consistent in his prayers at night in Ramadaan and at other times.

The scholars refuted this use of the hadeeth as evidence by saying that this is what the Messenger of Allaah (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) did, but the fact that he did something does not imply that it is obligatory.

The evidence that there is no set number for prayers at night— which include Taraweeh— is the hadeeth of Ibn’ Umar according to which a man asked the Messenger of Allaah (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) about prayer at night. The Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) said: “Prayers at night are to be offered two by two (two rak’ahs at a time). If any of you fears that the time of dawn is approaching then let him pray one rak’ah as Witr.”

(Narrated by al-Bukhaari, 846; Muslim, 749)

\(^{201}\) http://www.islam-qa.com/en/ref/9036
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AN EXAMINATION OF TWO NARRATIONS FROM JABIR IBN ABDULLAH (ra) MENTIONING 8 RAK'ATS

The two compilers mentioned on pp. 40-41 of their “Qaul ul-Saheeh”:

The Third Evidence - The First Hadeeth of Jaabir al-Ansaari

Jaabir (RadhiAllahu Anhu) narrates that the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) led us in prayer in Ramadhaan and he prayed 8 raka’hs and witr. (Saheeh Ibn Khuzaimah (2/138 no.1070), Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan (4/62,64 no.2401, 2406), A’un al-Ma’bood (4/175), Mu’ajam as-Sagheer (1/190) of Tabaraanee, Mukhtasar Qiyaam al-Layl (pg.197), Subl as-Salaam (3/28), Nayl al-Awthaar (3/58)

The chain is hasan as indicated by Haafidh Ibn Hajr Asqaalanee in Fathul-Baaree (3/10) and in Talkhees al-Habeer (1/119).

The authors of the books of Saheeh by bringing a narrator of a saheeh hadeeth in their books indicates their authenticity according to them (ie Imaams Ibn Khuzaimah and Ibn Hibbaan). (See al-Iqtaraah (pg.55) of Ibn Daqeeq al-Eed and Nasb ur-Raayah (1/149) and (3/264). Haafidh Ibn as-Salaah mentioned the same in is Uloom al-Hadeeth. Nimawee Hanafee also authenticated it in Aathaar as-Sunan (p.248)

Also authenticated by Maulana Abdul Hayy Lucknowee Hanafee in Umdatur Raayah (1/207) and Ta’leequl Mumajjid (p.138) who said it was extremely authentic

Reply:
Once again they have attempted to give the impression to the non-Hadith specialist readers that all of the references listed above are original compilations of Ahadith with asanid going back to the Sahaba! Of the references they mentioned, the following are original Hadith works mentioning the Hadith in question:

Sahih Ibn Khuzayma, Sahih Ibn Hibban, Mu'jam al-Saghir of al-Tabarani, and Mukhtasar Qiyam al-Layl

As for the Prophet (sallallahualaihiwasallam) allegedly leading for 8 rak'ats as reported from Jabir (ra), then the mention of the rak'ats being eight is also at odds with the confirmed Sahih Hadith found in Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim as follows which does not mention the precise number performed:

i) Al Jami` Al Sahih by Imam Al Bukhari, 2.229:

Narrated A'isha, the mother of the faithful believers:

*One night Allah’s Apostle offered the prayer in the Mosque and the people followed him. The next night he also offered the prayer and too many people gathered. On the third and the fourth nights more people gathered, but Allah’s Apostle did not come out to them. In the morning he said, “I saw what you were doing and nothing but the fear that it (i.e. the prayer) might be enjoined on you, stopped me from coming to you.” And that happened in the month of Ramadan.*

ii) Sahih Muslim – (Translated by Abdul Hamid Siddiqui)

Book 4: The Book of Prayers (Kitab Al-Salat) >> Chapter 116: ENCOURAGEMENT TO OBSERVE PRAYERS DURING RAMADAN AND THAT IS TARAWIH, Book 4, Number 1666:

---

202 The Mukhtasar edition does not mention all the chains of transmission in their full format as the title implies
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A’ishah reported that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) prayed one night in the mosque and people also prayed along with him. He then prayed on the following night and there were many persons. Then on the third or fourth night (many people) gathered there, but the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) did not come out to them (for leading the Tarawih prayer). When it was morning he said: I saw what you were doing, but I desisted to come to you (and lead the prayer) for I feared that this prayer might become obligatory for you. (He the narrator) said: It was the month of Ramadan.

They then mentioned another narration from Jabir ibn Abdullah (ra) as follows:

The Second Hadeeth of Jaabir—Of Ubayy ibn Ka’ab

On the authority of Jaabir (Radhiyallaahu Anhu) that Ubayy Ibn Ka’ab (Radhiyallaahu Anhu) came to the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) and said, “I did something yesterday night” the Messenger of Allaah said, “What did you do?” he said, “Some women came to my house and said they did not know much Qur’aan so we shall pray behind you and will listen to the Qur’aan.” So I led them in 8 raka’ths of prayer and offered the Witr prayer.” The Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) remained silent and thus it became the Sunnah. (Musnad Abee Ya’ala (3/336-337 no.1801), Qiyaam al-Layl (no.155) Majma’a az-Zawaa’id (2/74) Haafidh al-Haithamee said, “Narrated by Abu Ya’ala, Tabaranee in al-Awsthand its chain is Hasan.” (Majma’a az-Zawaa’id (2/74).

The compilers then mentioned that the above narrations were weakened by two Indian Hanafi’s, namely Mufti Abdur Rahim Lajpuri (d. 2001 CE) and Shaykh Habibur Rahman al-A’zami (d. 1992 CE). The reasons utilized for weakening this narration revolve around the veracity of two sub-narrators found in the chains of transmission of the above two narrations they mentioned, namely: Ya’qub ibn Abdullah al-As’hari al-Qummi and Isa ibn Jariyya. These 2 narrators are found in every single chain for these two variants.

They went onto defend the status of Ya’qub ibn Abdullah by quoting from some early Imams of Hadith, and Imam al-Dahabi did declare him to be Saduq in al-Kashif as they claimed, but what they did not mention was the grading of Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his Taqrib al-Tahdhib which stated:
Meaning, that Ibn Hajar thought Ya’qub to be Saduq but suspected of making errors (Saduq yahim). Ibn Hajar’s contemporary, the Hafiz, Ahmed al-Busayri (d. 840 AH) went further and declared Ya’qub al-Qummi to be da’eef in his Ithaf al-Khiyara (2/1721). See later for the scan and the narration connected to al-Busayri’s weakening of al-Qummi.

Now, on p. 42 they said about Ya’qub ibn Abdullah that:

Imaam Ibn Khuzaimah graded his hadeeth to be authentic and Shaikh Noor ud deen Haithamee said his hadeeth were Hasan.
As mentioned by Imaam Dhahabee, Imaam Bukhaari has narrated from him in his Saheeh al-Jaami in ta’leeq form and he does not criticize him in his Taareekh al-Kabeer (8/391 no.3443), therefore he (Ya’qoob) is trustworthy with Imaam Bukhaari according to Dharar Ahmad Thanawee Deobandee Hanafee. (See Qawaad Uloom al-Hadeeth (pg.136).
Haafidh Ibn Hajr remained silent on the hadeeth reported by him alone in Fath ul-Baaree (3/10) and this keeping silent by him is an evidence for the authenticity of this hadeeth. (see Qawaad Uloom al-Hadeeth (pg.55) of Dharar Ahmad Thanawee Deobandee Hanafee).

Reply:

They were content to mention that al-Dhahabi had declared Ya’qub al-Qummi to be Saduq (truthful) on this occasion, but they were not painstaking in their research to mention that Abu Ja’far al-Razi was also declared to be Saduq by the same al-Dhahabi in his al-Mughni (no. 4820) as quoted earlier!

---

203 He is the one that transmitted the wording for 20 Rak ʿats going back to Ubayy ibn Kāb as recorded in the Musnad of Ibn Mani and via his route by Diya al-Maqdisi in al-Mukhtara
They mentioned that Ibn Khuzayma graded Ya’qub’s Hadith to be authentic, but if they were meticulous they would have realized that Abu Ja’far al-Razi is also found in Sahih ibn Khuzayma! Examples:

998 - أخبرنا أبو طاهر نا أبو بكر ثنا أبو يحيى محمد بن عبد الرحمن البزار ثنا عبد الصمد بن النعمان ثنا أبو جعفر الرazi عن يحيى بن سعيد عن ابن السيب عن بلأل قال: كنا مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في سفر فنام حتى طلعت الشمس قام بلالا فقال: فتوضأوا ثم صلوا الركعتين ثم صلوا الغداء قال أبو بكر: في خبر عبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن مسعود عن أبيه قال: فرم بلالا فقال ثم أقسم فصلني بنا.


The last narration from Ibn Khuzayma (no. 1479) had the following footnote by the editor, Dr Mustafa al-A’zami:

1479 - استاده صحيح. اشار الخاقي في الفتح 2: 128 إلى رواية ابن غزية، وأخرجه الحاكم والإمام احمد.

He declared the sanad via this route containing Abu Ja’far al-Razi to be Sahih and said that al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar in his Fath al-Bari (2:128) indicated this by referencing this narration to Sahih Ibn Khuzayma, Mustadrak al-Hakim and the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal. Note also, that al-Albani looked over this edition of Sahih Ibn Khuzayma and added brief notes here and there, but he did not oppose what Dr A’zami mentioned above!

They also mentioned that Shaykh Nurud-Din al-Haythami said his Hadith was Hasan, but they did not provide any evidence that al-Haythami said this in direct connection to al-Qummi. Rather, they may have inferred this based on his grading the second narration they mentioned above where al-Haythami said the...
Isnad was Hasan. This latter point is not agreed upon, and other Huffaz of Hadith, as well as contemporaries will be mentioned below who disputed the authenticity of the sanad via Ya’qub al-Qummi from his Shaykh, Isa ibn Jariyya.

They said:

As mentioned by Imaam Dhahabee, Imaam Bukhaari has narrated from him in his Saheeh al-Jaami in ta’leeq form and he does not criticize him in his Taareekh al-Kabeer (8/391 no.3443), therefore he (Ya’qoob) is trustworthy with Imaam Bukhaari according to Dhafer Ahmad Thanawee Deobandee Hanafee. (See Qawaid Uloom al-Hadeeth (pg.136).

If they truly believed in the principle mentioned by Shaykh Zafar Ahmed Uthmani al-Thanawi (d. 1974), that any narrator that Imam al-Bukhari left un-criticised in his al-Ta’rikh al-Kabir must therefore be trustworthy with Imam al-Bukhari, then will they be consistent enough to apply this same principle to Abu Ja’far al-Razi who transmitted the narration for 20 rak’ats going back to Ubay ibn Ka’b?! The fact is that Imam al-Bukhari did not make any Jarh

One wonders also if they would be glad to declare Malik al-Dar to be Thiqah as Imam al-Bukhari mentioned no Jarh on him in his Ta’irkh al-Kabir (vol. 7) as follows:

This is the same Malik al-Dar that is found in the following narration as mentioned by another translator:

It is related from Malik al-Dar, ‘Umar’s treasurer, that the people suffered a drought during the successionship of ‘Umar, whereupon a man came to the grave of the Prophet and said: “O Messenger of Allah, ask for rain for your Community, for verily they have but perished,” after which the Prophet appeared to him in a dream and told him: “Go to ‘Umar and give him my greeting, then tell him that they will be watered. Tell him: You must be clever, you must be clever!” The man went and told ‘Umar. The latter said: “O my Lord, I spare no effort except in what escapes my power!” Ibn Kathir cites it thus from Bayhaqi in al-Bidaya wa al-nihaya and says: isnaduhusahih; Ibn Abi Shayba cites it in his Musannaf with a sound (sahih) chain as confirmed by Ibn Hajar who says: rawa Ibn Abi Shayba bi isnadin sahih and cites the hadith in Fath al-bari. He identifies Malik al-Dar as ‘Umar’s treasurer (khazin ‘umar) and says that the man who visited and saw the Prophet in his dream is identified as the Companion Bilal ibn al-Harith, and he counts this hadith among the reasons for Bukhari’s naming of the chapter “The people’s request to their leader for rain if they suffer drought.” He also mentions it in al-Isaba, where he says that Ibn Abi Khaythama cited it.
(disparagement) on Abu Ja'far al-Razi in his Ta'rikh al-Kabir and al-Saghir respectively as follows:

i) Ta'rikh al-Kabir (6/179):

They said:

Haafidh Ibn Hajr remained silent on the hadith reported by him alone in Fath ul-Baaree (3/10) and this keeping silent by him is an evidence for the authenticity of this hadith. (see Qawaid Uloom al-Hadeeth (pg.55) of Dhafar Ahmad Thanawee Deobandee Hanafee).

If they were honest they would also have to admit that al-Hafiz ibn Hajar also remained silent on at least 2 chains going via Abu Ja'far al-Razi in his Fath al-Bari (as mentioned earlier), thus indicating his narrations to be an evidence for a form of authenticity, which is usually his way of saying the narration is likely to be Hasan.

Besides this, if the silence of al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar is a hujja (evidence) for the likes of Abu Khuzaimah, Abu Hibban and their Shaykhs like Zubair Ali Za'i on every occasion, then if they are to be free of the claim of having double standards, and picking and choosing what suits their purpose, they should also admit that al-Hafiz remained silent on the main narration for 20 rak'ats from Saa'id ibn Yazid
in his Fath al-Bari as follows via the route of Yazid ibn Khusayfa, and the one from Muhammad ibn Yusuf (as recorded by Abdar Razzaq in his Musannaf) for 21 rak'ats, as well as the mursal narration from Yazid ibn Ruman for 23 rak'ats (as found in the Muwatta Malik) and the narration from the well known Makkan tabi'i, Ata ibn Abi Rabah for 20 rak'ats (as Ibn Nasr al-Marwazi reported)

The fact of the matter is that Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban both rejected al-Hafiz’s mention of these variants for 21, 20 and 23 rak’ats respectively, but then expect their readers to be convinced that the one’s via Yaqub al-Qummi from Isa ibn Jariyya are at least Hasan in the sanad, and therefore more authentic than these two variants mentioning 21 and 20 from Saa’ib ibn Yazid! This is a double edged sword on their necks.

They also said about the first variant from Jabir (ra):

The chain is hasan as indicated by Haafidh Ibn Hajr Asqaalane in Fath ul- Baaree (3/10) and in Talkhees al-Habeer (1/119).

Looking at the Talkhis al-Habir of al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar he also mentioned the 20 rak‘at narration from the time of Umar (ra) with silence over its authenticity, and thus these two compilers are also faced with another dilemma as this means that
the chain for the 20 rak'at narration as follows from the Talkhis (2/21) 205 must be Hasan if not Sahih to Ibn Hajar:

وفي المَوْطَأِ وَالْبَيِّنَةِ وَالْبَيِّنَةِ عَنْ عُمَّرَ أَنَّهُ جَمَعَ النَّاسَ عَلَى أَبِيِّ بْنِ كَعْبٍ فَكَانَ يَصِلُّونَ فِي شَهَرٍ رَمَضَانٍ عَشَرٌ رَكَعَتَينَ الحَدِيثُ

It is also our contention that Imam Ibn Hajar (d. 852 AH) was most likely to have practiced 20 rak'ats of Taraweeh in Ramadan since he was from the Shafi'i school which advocates 20 rak'ats. His student, Imam Zakariyya al-Ansari affirmed 20 rak'ats in his Fath al-Wahhab bi-Minhaj al-Tullab, 206 and elsewhere, and none of Ibn Hajar’s students like al-Hafiz Qasim ibn Qutlubugha, Imam Ibn al-Humam, Hafiz al-Sakhawi and the young, Imam Jalalud-Din al-Suyuti ever mentioned a claim that their Shaykh, Ibn Hajar, ever practiced 8 rak'ats taraweeh. On the contrary, Ibn Hajar’s Shaykh in Hadith, the Hafiz of Hadith in his age, Zaynud-Din al-Iraqi also performed 20 rak'ats. We may also surmise the same for al-Hafiz Nurud-Din al-Haythami, who was al-Iraqi’s student and a Shaykh to Ibn Hajar Asqalani.

No Shafi’ite has ever mentioned to our knowledge that Ibn Hajar and his associates ever performed 8 rak'ats; rather they were likely to have been in favour of 20 rak'ats as advocated by their Madhhab. Hafiz al-Sakhawi (d. 902 AH), who was one of the principal students and main biographer of his Shaykh, Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, has also mentioned in his Tuhfatul al-Latif fi Ta’rikh al-madina al-Sharifa 207, a useful quote about the Rak'ats of Taraweeh in Makka and Madina as follows:

---

205 Edited by al-Sayyid Abdullah Hashim al-Yamani al-Madani

206 See the earlier discussion on those Imams who authenticated al-Bayhaqi’s chain in al-Sunan al-Kubra or his Ma’rifatus Sunan from Saa `ib ibn Yazid on 20 rak’ats

207 2/164, Darul Kutub Ilmiyya, 1st edn, Beirut, 1993 CE
The above quote mentions that in his time it was 20 rak'ats in Makka, 36 rak'ats in Madina, and al-Hafiz Zaynud-Din al-Iraqi (the Shaykh of Ibn Hajar Asqalani and al-Haythami), would lead for 20 rak'ats Taraweeh and 3 rak'ats of witr; then later on in the night he would pray 16 rak'ats. Had Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani prayed 8 rak'ats, then one would have expected his student al-Sakhawi to mention it in his biography of Ibn Hajar or elsewhere, but this appears not to be the case.

Note also, Ibn Hajar mentioned Jabir's narration in his Fath al-Bari under the section related to Tahajjud while he mentioned the narrations for 20 rak'ats under the section on Salatul Taraweeh, as was appropriate. One wonders if he was trying to establish by the inclusion of these narrations under these two separate headings that the two sets of narrations relate to Salatul Tahajjud and Salatul Taraweeh being 2 separate prayers in Ramadan?

They said on p. 43:

The Third Objection
The Hanafee's say Eesaa bin Jaariyyah in this chain is weak and 'Imam's Ibn Ma'e'en, Nasaa'ee, as-Saajee, Uqailee, Ibn Adiyy and Abu Dawood criticized him and some said he was Munkar al-Hadeeth he rejected in hadeeth. (Refer to Meezaan and Tadhheeb n the tarjamah of Eesaa)
The opening line of the last claim is fundamentally flawed in its assertion that it is the Hanafi’s alone that claim the 2 chains back to Jabir are weak! This is another example of their anti-Hanafi bias and imprecise attitude to being meticulous in their baseless suppositions. The fact of the matter is that it is not only the Hanafi’s from the Indian subcontinent who have weakened the 2 chains via Isa ibn Jariyya, but those outside it and before us all from early times. What may surprise them even further is what their chief revisionist Hadith writer had to say about two variants for 8 rak’ats found in the Sahih of Ibn Hibban!

Let us see the background to Isa ibn Jariyya in the Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (8/86) of al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani:

ق بن ماجة عيسى بن جارية الأنصاري المدني روى عن جرير البجلي وجابر بن عبد الله شريك رجل له صحبة وابن المسبب وأبي سلمة بن عبد الرحمن وسالم بن عبد الله بن عمر وعن أبي صخر حميد بن زيد وزيد بن أبي أنسية ويعقوب الفمي وعنبسة بن سعيد الرازي وسعيد بن محمد الأنصاري قال بن أبي خيثمة عن بن معين ليس بذلك لا أعلم أحد روى عنه غير يعقوب وقال الدورى عن بن معين عنده مناكير حدث عنه يعقوب الفمي وعنبسة قاضي الرب وقاق أبو زرعة لا بأس له وقال أبو حاتم عيسى الدورى عن أبي سلمة وعنه زيد بن أبي أنسية هو عندي عيسى بن جارية وقال الآخر عن أبي داود منكر الحديث وقال في موضع آخر ما أعرفه روى مناكير وذكره بن حبان في الثقات له عنه حديث جابر خرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بمكة فمر على رجل يصلي قلت وذكره الساجي والعقيلي في الضفاء وقال بن عدي أحديه غير محفوظة

In the above notice, Ibn Hajar mentioned the following Jarh (disparagement) on Isa ibn Jariyya:

i) Ibn Ma’een said that he had related manakir (rejected narrations)
ii) Al-Ajurri reported Abu Dawud saying that he is Munkar al-Hadith (rejected in Hadith) and in another place Abu Dawud said that Isa related rejected narrations (manakir)
iii) Al-Uqayli listed him in his book of weak narrators (al-Du’afa)
iv) Al-Saji listed him in his book of weak narrators (al-Du’afa)
v) Ibn Adi (in his al-Kamil) said that Isa’s hadiths are not preserved (ghayr mahfuza)

Only two of the Huffaz made some form of ta’dil (praise) on Isa:

i) Ibn Hibban in his Thiqat (Book of “trustworthy” narrators)
ii) Abu Zur’a said there is no harm in him (la ba’sa bihi)

What Ibn Hajar did not mention was that al-Nasa’i has been also ascribed with making Jarh on Isa. Indeed, in al-Nasai’s al-Du’afa wal Matrukin it mentions that Isa was munkar (rejected)

(423) عيسى بن جارية يروي عنه يعقوب القمي منكر

While al-Hafiz ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597 AH) also listed Isa in his own Du’afa wal Matrukin by mentioning that al-Nasa’i had declared Isa to be Matruk al-Hadith (rejected in hadith):

The Hanafi Muhaddith of India, Shaykh Anwar Shah al-Kashmiri has mentioned in his lessons on Jami al-Tirmidhi210 that most of the Muhaddithin have weakened Isa ibn Jariyya as follows:
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The two compilers have made a bold assertion on p. 45 of their treatise that:

_Eesaa bin Jaariyyah according to the majority of the scholars is trustworthy and truthful or Hasan al-Hadeeth._

This is a claim that has no precedence or truth in it, and the reader can see from the above points from Ibn Hajar's Tahdhib al-Tahdhib that there is more Jarh (criticism) than praise (ta’dil) on Isa ibn Jariyya.

**A look at what La’basabihi “There is no harm in him” meant to Ibn Abi Hatim al-Razi**

They also mentioned on the same page of their treatise regarding Isa ibn Jariyya:

_Imaam Abu Zur’ah said there is no harm in him. (al-Jarh Wat-Ta ’deel (6/273 no.1513), Meezaan ul-Ei’tidaal(5/385 no.6561), Tahdheeb ut-Tahdheeb (8/179 no.5508)_

The above quote from Imam Abu Zur’a al-Razi is indeed found in the work known as _Kitab al-Jarh wa Ta’dil_ compiled by Imam Abdar Rahman ibn Abi Hatim al-Razi (d. 327 AH). In this very work, Ibn Abi Hatim al-Razi has explained precisely what is meant by the above term - La’basabihi: “There is no harm in him.” Ibn Abi Hatim has related in this work many points of Jarh or Ta’dil expressed principally by his father (Abu Hatim al Razi) and his colleague, Abu Zur’a al-Razi, as well as from other major figures like Yahya ibn Ma’een and Ibn Hanbal.

The Shafi’i Hadith scholar known as _Abu Amr ibn al Salah al-Shahrazuri_ (d. 643 AH) has mentioned what Ibn Abi Hatim said in his well known Muqaddima (Introduction to the Science of Hadith) in the following manner of discussion:

Concerning the explanation of the terms the practitioners of this discipline employ in personality criticism: _Abu Muhammad Abdar Rahman b. Abi Hatim al-

211 See Kitab al Jarh wa Ta ’dil (2/37), printed by Da ‘iratul Ma ’arif, Hyderabad, India
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Razi ranked them in his book on personality criticism. He did this well and made a good job of it. We will rank them in the same way, giving what he said and adding to it the relevant material we read in other sources, God – He is exalted – willing. The terminology of accreditation has several levels.

a) Ibn Abi Hatim said, “If it is said of someone that he is ‘reliable’ (thiqa) or ‘exact’ (mutqin), his hadith may be cited as proofs.” The same is true if he is called “trustworthy” (thabat) or a “proof” (Hujja) and it is also the case if it is said about an upright transmitter (‘adl) that he is “retentive” (hafiz) or “accurate” (dabit). God knows best.

b) Ibn Abi Hatim said, “If it is said that a transmitter is ‘veracious’ (sadvq), ‘his station is veracity’ (mahallul al-sadq) or ‘there is nothing wrong with him’ (la ba’sabihi), he is someone whose hadith may be written down and examined.212 This is the second rank.” What he said is correct because these expressions do not imply the stipulation of accuracy. The hadith of this kind of transmitter are examined and investigated to determine the level of his accuracy. The way to do this was was explained in the beginning of this Category...

What Ibn Abi Hatim said regarding the term “la ba’sabihi” is most likely the view of his father and Abu Zur’a al-Razi also, and since he did not mention any difference in explanation between themselves, it is safe to assume that Abu Zur’a’s view that Isa ibn Jariyya being “la ba’sabihi” is explained by Ibn Abi Hatim’s above statement as mentioned and explained further by Ibn al Salah.

This leads us to surmise that what Abu Zur’a said about Isa ibn Jariyya is a form of ta’dil (accreditation) which falls under the second rank, and since Isa ibn Jariyya has more verbally recorded discreditation (jarh) upon him from a number of scholars, the term la ba’sabihi is likely only a ta’dil by Abu Zur’a in this case.

212 The exact arabic phrase used by Ibn Abi Hatim in his Kitab al-Jarh wa ta’ dil (2/37) being:

صدوق أو محله الصدق أولاً يأس به فهو ممن يكتتب حديثه وينظر فيه وهي المنزلة الثانية

213 See the English edition of the Muqaddima printed under the title “An Introduction to the Science of the Hadith” (p. 92), Garnet publishing, 1st ed., 2005
of early Hadith masters than explicit ta'dil; it is now a case of as Ibn al Salah stipulated:

The hadith of this kind of transmitter are examined and investigated to determine the level of his accuracy.

Thus, Isa ibn Jariyya is not considered by Ibn Abi Hatim al-Razi and most probably by Abu Zur'a al-Razi to be from the first rank transmitters, but rather from the second rank narrators whose narrations may be written down but they may also be examined further to see how they fair when comparing and contrasting their narrations on a specific text. This type of latter investigation was carried out to a certain extent by Imam Abu Ahmed ibn Adi (d. 365 AH) in his al-Kamil fi du‘afa al-rijal with reference to Isa ibn Jariyya. This point from Ibn Adi will be demonstrated below.

The gradings of 3 later Huffaz on Isa ibn Jariyya:

i) Hafiz Al-Dhahabi mentioned the following overall grading in his al-Kashif:

Al-Dhahabi admitted that there is difference over Isa and that Ibn Ma’een said that Isa had rejected narrations. Al-Dhahabi also listed Isa in two of his books on weak narrators. In al-Mughni fil du‘afa of al-Dhahabi he mentioned:

Once again he admitted the difference over Isa and added that al-Nasa’i said Isa was abandoned in Hadith while Abu Zur’a said there is no harm in him
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In his Diwan al-Du’afa he mentioned:

In this work, he did not mention any ta’dil (praise) on Isa, but retained the Jarh of al-Nasa’i that Isa was Matruk (abandoned)

ii) **Hafiz Abul Mahasin Muhammad ibn Ali al-Alawi al-Hussaini** (d. 765 AH) in his al-Tadhkira bi-Ma’rifa rijal al-Kutub al-Ashara mentioned that Abu Dawud and al-Nasa’i held Isa ibn Jariyya to be Munkar al-Hadith (rejected in hadith), and seems to agree with them as he mentioned no tawthiq (praise) on Isa:

iii) **Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani** in his al-Taqrīb al-Tahdhib mentioned the following:

Ibn Hajar said that Isa had softness (in his narrations), and he did not mention any explicit tawthiq on Isa.

**The view of three contemporaries on Isa ibn Jariyya:**
Two contemporaries who went over Ibn Hajar’s al-Taqrib al-Tahdhib are Shaykh Shu’ayb al-Arna’ut and Dr Bashhar Awwad Ma’ruf. They published their work under the title, al-Tahrir al-Taqrib, and within this work they went one step further than al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar by declaring Isa ibn Jariyya to be da’eef (weak) overall.\(^{214}\)

The late “Salafi” opponent to al-Albani mentioned earlier as Isma’il al-Ansari declared Isa ibn Jariyya to be da’eef in his Tashih Hadith Salatil Taraweeh Ishrin rak’a wal radd ala al-A ibani fi Tadhifi.\(^ {215}\)

The two compilers went onto clear Isa ibn Jariyya from all the Jarh listed above by suggesting on p. 43:

The Answer To the Third Objection.

The criticisms of Eesaa bin Jaariyyah are vague, unclear and non-detailed because none of the criticisms are backed up by evidence or reason.

Shaikh Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee said: “The condition for vague and unclear criticism to be accepted is that there is no praise (for the same narrator) and that is the narrator who has been criticized has not been praised by any scholar of hadeeth. Therefore if any scholar of hadeeth has praised him and spoken of his trustworthiness then the vague criticism will be rejected.” (ar- Raf’a Wat-Takmeel (pg.6)

The Scholars of hadeeth who criticized Eesaa bin Jaariyyah from the ones mentioned above, are considered to be “Mutashaddideen Fil-Jarh” (Severe and Harsh in Criticism) according to the HANAFEE’s themselves and the evidence for this is what the Hanafee Scholar Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee said about these Scholars of hadeeth when they criticized Abu Haneefah. (See his Zafar al-Amaanee (pg.282). Similarly Shaikh Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee said (concerning the Mutashaddideen Scholars), “From them is Abu Haatim and Nasa’ee and Ibn Ma’een and Ibn Qattaan and Yahyaa al-Qattaan and Ibn Hibbaan and other than them who are known to be severe and harsh in criticism.” (Raf’a Wat- Takmeel (pg.18)

\(^{214}\) See Tahrir al-Taqrib (no. 5288) where they also said that Isa was weakened by Ibn Ma’een, while Abu Dawud and al-Nasa’i said he was rejected in Hadith (munkar al hadith), Ibn Adi said Isa’s narrations are not properly preserved (ghayr mahfuza), while Abu Zu’a said there is no harm with him and Ibn Hibban listed him in his book of trustworthy narrators (Kitab al-Thiqat)

\(^{215}\) See p. 19
Reply:

If they are attempting to say that there is an agreement of all the major scholars of hadith of the past and the contemporaries of this age that since to them the Jarh on Isa ibn Jarinya is not detailed criticism (Jarh Mufassar), but remains vague (mubham), then most scholars must have taken their stance that the ta'dil of Ibn Hibban and Abu Zur’a take priority, and thus Isa’s narrations are at least Hasan; then it is said in reply to them - This claim of yours is not agreed upon or acceptable in principle, as you have not quoted a variant to show that Isa ibn Jarinya was not meticulous on the wording for 8 rak’ats.

Rather, if they were to have looked at the Kamil fi du’a’fa al Rijal of al-Hafiz Abu Ahmed ibn Adi (d. 365 AH), one would have noted that he mentioned the two variant narrations from Jabir ibn Abdullah (ra) mentioning 8 rak’ats as follows:

عباسي بن جارية حدثنا محمد بن أحمد بن حماد ثنا عيسى بن
جارية يروي عنه يعقوب المحمي لا أعلم روي عنه غبي وحديثه ليس ذاك وفي موضوع آخر عيسى بن
جارية عنده حداث ومنكر يحدث عنه يعقوب المحمي وعنمنه قاضي الرمي وقيل النمساني عيسى بن
جارية يروي عنه يعقوب المحمي منكر الحديث ولا أعلم أحدا حدث عنه غبي يعقوب وعندب عيسى حديثا محمد
بن الحسن البصري في الحديث ثنا عبد الله بن عبد الله بن محمد ثنا عيسى بن
جارية قال ثنا جابر بن عبيد الله قال جاوم أبي بن كعب فقال يا رسول الله صلي كأنى الليلة شيء
يعني في رمضان قال وما ذاك يا أبي قال نسوة في دارى قلن إذا لا نفرق الفرقان ففصلنا بصلاك
فصلت بهن ثماني ركعات ثم أوترت قال وكان نبي الرضا ولم يملك له شيدا حدثنا أحمد بن صالح
الثنيميمي قال ثنا محمد بن حميد قال ثنا عيسى بن جارية عن جابر بن عبيد الله قال
جاء بن مكثوف إلى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال إن منزلي شامع وأنما مكثوف البصر وأننا نسمع
الآذان فإن فحصنا الآذان فوجه وله حيوا أو قال زحفا حدثنا أحمد بن صالح ثنا بن حميد قال ثنا
يعقوب عن عيسى عن جابر قال أمر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بتكلم كلاد المدينة فجاء بن ألمكثوف
فقال يا النبي الصلي الله عليه وسلم فتوقف فضحك له أيا سما ثم أمر بقتل كلهو وهذا الإسناد ثماني أحاديث
أخر حدثنا بها غير محفوظة حدثنا بن ذريح قال ثنا جابر بن حميد الكوفي قال ثنا
يعقوب بن عبد الله عن عيسى بن جارية عن جابر قال صلى الله وسلم في
رمضان ليلة ثماني ركعات والوتر فكان في القبلة اجتمعنا في المسجد ورجعنا أن يخرج إليتنا فلم
نزل فيه حتى أصحا قال فدخلنا على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقلنا يا رسول الله اجتمعنا في
المسجد ورجعنا أن يخرج إليتنا فقال إلى كرهت أن يكتب عليكم الوتر حدثنا بن ذريح بهذا الإسناد
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Ibn Adi was clear that all of these variants from the route of Ya'qub al-Qummi from Isa ibn Jariyya are not preserved properly (ghayr mahfuza), and he did quote Ibn Ma‘een and al-Nasa‘i as making Jarh. It seems likely that Ibn Adi understood the Jarh of Ibn Ma‘een and al-Nasa‘i to be detailed enough to lead to his overall judgment that Isa ibn Jariyya’s hadiths are not preserved accurately.

Additionally, the statement of Abu Zur‘a al-Razi that Isa ibn Jariyya “has no problem with him” needs to be taken into consideration as was mentioned earlier.

**Point of benefit:**

Ali Hasan Ali al-Halabi, who is a student of the late Nasir al-Albani supervised the compilation of a multi volume work listing what he and his colleagues considered to be either weak or fabricated narrations. This work was printed under the title of *Mawsua al ahadith wal athar al da’ee wal mawdu’a* \(^{216}\) with editing by Dr. Ibrahim al-Qaysi and Dr Hamdi Murad. In this work, they mentioned both the variants from Jabir ibn Abdullah (ra) for 8 rak’ats with the wording from Ibn Adi’s al-Kamil.

The variant mentioned by the two compilers (Abu Khuzaimah/Abu Hibban) with their wording: *Jaabir (RadhiAllaahu Anhu) narrates that the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) led us in prayer in Ramadhaan and he prayed 8 rak’ats and witr*

This was recorded in the Mawsua as follows from Ibn Adi’s wording:

---

\(^{216}\) Printed by Maktaba al-Ma‘arif, Riyadh, 1419AH/ 1999 CE
The editors referenced the narration to a work entitled Dhakiratul Huffaz, which is a work listing the narrations in Ibn Adi’s al-Kamil by Ibn Tahir al-Maqdisi al-Qaysarani (d. 507 AH) in a systematic manner.

As for the second variant from Jabir (ra), which the two compilers referred to by saying: On the authority of Jaabir (RadhiAllaahu Anhu) that Ubayy Ibn Khaab (RadhiAllaahu Anhu) came to the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) and said, “I did something yesterday night the Messenger of Allaah said: ‘What did you do?’ he said, ‘Some women came to my house and said they did not know much Qur’aan so we shall pray behind you and will listen to the Qur’aan.’” So I led them in 8 rak‘ahs of prayer and offered the Witr prayer. The Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) remained silent and thus it became the Sunnah.

This last narration was mentioned in the Mawsua as follows with Ibn Adi’s wording:

What these editors did not mention is the actual verdict of Ibn Tahir al-Maqdisi himself, but it seems that they knew of it and for this reason they agreed with Ibn Tahir for its inclusion into their Mawsua.
Ibn Tahir mentioned the following on the variant regarding Ubayy ibn Ka'b (ra) leading women in Salah in his Dhakiratul Huffaz:

يا رسول الله كان من الليلة شيء يعن في رمضان؟ قال: وما ذاك يا أبي قال نسوة في وادي. قلت: أنا لا نقرأ القرآن، فنصلي بصلاتك، فصلبت بهن ثماني ركعات، ثم أورت، قال: وكان شهاب الرضى، ولم يقل له شيئا. رواه عسي بن جارية عن جابر بن عبد الله. وعسي ليس بذلك، ولم يرو عنه غير يعقوب القمي، وعسي قاضي الري، والحديث غير محفوظ.

The 2 main points that can be derived is that Ibn Tahir said that Isa is “not all that” as a transmitter of hadith, thus indicating his weakness, and most crucially Ibn Tahir said that the Hadith is not preserved properly (ghayr mahfuz). Hence, his verdict is inline with Ibn Adi before him.

As for the variant which suggests that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) allegedly led for 8 rak'ats, the following was mentioned by Ibn Tahir:


Here too, Ibn Tahir declared the narration to be ghayr mahfuz, hence indicating its weakness.

**Important point of benefit:**

---

217 Dhakiratul Huffaz (2/1194), printed by Dar al-Salaf, 1st edn, Riyadh, 1996, edited by Dr. Abdar Rahman al-Fariwaie

218 Dhakiratul Huffaz (3/1521)
Additionally, what proves Ibn Adi’s assertion that the hadith of Isa ibn Jariyya are ghayr mahfuza is that there exists a variant for the account where Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra) was said to have lead some women in Salah from the route of Yā’qūb al-Qummi from Isa ibn Jariyya, and it most crucially does not mention the portion for 8 rak’ats of Salah being performed by Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra)!

The narration that shall be mentioned below was recorded in the Musnad of al-Harith ibn Abi Usama, and it was not mentioned by al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar in his Fath al-Bari, or by al-Dhahabi, and if they had recalled it, then it may have caused them to say further on the overall grading of Isa ibn Jariyya’s transmissions with the wording for 8 rak’ats. Wallahu a’lam.

Al-Hafiz Nurud-Din al-Haythami mentioned the narration from the Musnad of al-Harith ibn Abi Usama in his Bughyatul Ba’ith an Zawa’id Musnad al Harith as follows:

باب في الرجل يوم النساء

[ حدثنا ابن أبي أمية ۲۱۹ ثان يعقوب ثنا عيسى بن جارية الأنصاري عن جابر بن عبد الله قال جاء أبي بن كعب إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال بالرسول الله أنه كان مني البئرية شيء قال وما هو يا أبي قال نسوة معني في الدار قلنا لبصلي الليلة بصلالات قال فسكت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وكان شبه الرضا قال وذلك في شهر رمضان

۲۱۹ This narrator known as Ibn Abi Umayya (Abdallah ibn Amr) was mentioned by al-Hakim in his Mustadrak via a route containing the same al-Harith ibn Abi Usama mentioned above. The narration from his Mustadrak is as follows, and since al-Hakim declared the sanad to be Sahih, it is thus clear that Ibn Abi Umayya was trustworthy to al-Hakim:

أخبرني عبد الله بن الحسين الفاضلي برسومه، رأيت بن أبي أمية، ثنا عبد الله بن عمرو بن أبي أمية، ثنا أبي الزناد، عن محمد بن عقبة، عن أبي عمران قال: “كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يجلى العين إجلال الورق وقد خفف الله العين منها بين الناس.” هنا حديث صحيح الإسناد، ولم يخرجه
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The above narration was also mentioned by al-Hafiz al-Busayri (d. 840 AH) in his al-Ithaf al-Khiyara (2/ 382,) as follows:

\[1721/1\] "... (quotation)

\[1721/2\] "... (quotation)

Note, al-Busayri went to the level of declaring Ya’qub ibn Abdullah al-Qummi to be da’eeef. This is a clear indication that he regarded this narration from Jabir (ra) to be weak. Additionally, al-Busayri also recorded the narration from Ahmed ibn Mani’s Musnad mentioning that Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra) lead for 20 rak’ats, and since he did not weaken it, there is a likelihood that he considered the narration for 20 rak’ats from the Musnad of Ibn Mani’ to be stronger in authenticity than the one’s narrated via the route of Ya’qub al-Qummi from Isa ibn Jariyya.

After digressing away from the main topic regarding Jabir’s two variants mentioning 8 rak’ats the two compilers said on p. 45:

The criticisms by the other scholars are also vague. Eesaa bin Jaariyyah according to the majority of the scholars is trustworthy and truthful or Hasan al-Hadeeth.

\[220\] Meaning the narration were Ubayy (ra) was said to have lead some women in Salah for the disputed 8 rak’ats的好处。
Reply:

This is a bold assertion which contradicts the facts! It has already been shown above that Isa was weakened by: Ibn Ma'een, Abu Dawud, al-Nasa'i, Ibn Adi, al-Saji, al-Uqayli and Ibn al Jawzi, while from the later Huffaz: al-Dhahabi, al-Hussaini and Ibn Hajar themselves did not grade Isa with any high form of trustworthiness. Indeed, Shaykh Anwar Shah al-Kashmiri has already been quoted saying that most of the Hadith scholars weakened Isa ibn Jariyya.

They claimed that Isa ibn Jariyya had vague criticism on him, but when the narrator known as Ibrahim ibn Uthman (Abu Shayba) was discussed by them on p. 8 they said:

Imaam Nasaa’ee and Daulaabee said, “Matrook al-Hadeeth” (he would narrate rejected ahadeeth) (Meezaan ul-E‘tidaal (1/170), Tadhheeb ut- Tadhheeb (1/130), Kitaab adh-Dhu‘afaa Wal-Matrookeen (1/41), Kitaab adh- Dhu‘afaa Wal-Matrookeen (no.11 pg.1) of Imaam Nasaa’ee

On this occasion they did not attempt to state that al-Nasa‘i declaring Ibrahim ibn Uthman to be Matruk al-Hadith was a form of vague criticism (Jarh mubham). This is the same Imam al-Nasa‘i who is on record as declaring Isa ibn Jariyya to be Matruk al-Hadith as well according to the quote earlier on from Ibn al Jawzi’s al-D u‘afa wal Matrukin.

They said:

Imaam Bukhaari mentioned him in at-Taareekh al-Kabeer (6/385 no.2721) and he did not mention any criticism on him.

Reply:

221 He is the one who narrated for 20 rak’ats back to Ibn Abbas (ra), though it is agreed by the majority that he is also weak.
This point has been dealt with previously when it was mentioned that Abu Ja'far al-Razi was also mentioned in al-Bukhari’s Ta'rikh al-Kabir with no Jarh on him. But, the two compilers rejected Abu Ja'far's narration for 20 rak'ats as in the Musnad of Ibn Mani! Hence, their mentioning this point with regard to al-Bukhari is of no consequence here.

They said:

Imaam Abu Zur’ah said there is no harm in him. (al-Jarh Wat-Ta’deel (6/273 no.1513), Meezaan ul-Ei’tidaal(5/385 no.6561), Takhheeb ut-Takhheeb (8/179 no.5508)

Imaam Abu Haatim ar-Raazee mentioned him and did not mention any criticism concerning him. (al-Jarh Wat-Ta’deel (6/273) and Abu Haatim remaining silent about a narrator, is his authentication of that narrator according to the hanafee scholar Dhafar Ahmad Thanawee Uthmaanee (See Qawa'id Uloom al-Hadeeth (pg.248) checked by Abu Guddah Abdul-Fattah al-Hanafee).

Reply:

Abu Zur’a’s saying, “there has no harm in him” did not lead to the overall status of Isa ibn Jariyya to be at least Saduq or Thiqa to later Huffaz like al-Dhahabi, al-Hussaini or Ibn Hajar, and nor does the silence of Abu Hatim al-Razi or his son upon Isa lead to automatic tawthiq for the likes of these two compilers in reality! For if it did then they should admit to their likes that the narrator known as Malik al-Dar was also mentioned in Ibn Abi Hatim’s al-Jarh wa Ta’dil with no Jarh from his father Abu Hatim al-Razi.

Indeed, al-Albani said in his book on Tawassul (p. 120, English edn): “We do not accept that this story is authentic since the reliability and precision of Maalik ad-Daar is not known, and these are the two principle conditions necessary for the authenticity of any narration, as is affirmed in the science of hadeeth. Ibn Abbe Haatim mentions him in al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel (4/1/213) and does not mention anyone who narrates from him except Aboo Saalih. So this indicates that he is unknown, and this is further emphasised by the fact
that Ibn Abee Haatim himself, who is well known for his memorisation and wide knowledge, did not quote anyone who declared him reliable, so he remains unknown.\(^\text{222}\)

The Arabic quotation from Ibn Abi Hatim’s al-Jarh wa Ta’dil (4/1 213) being:

مالك بن عباس مولى عمر بن الخطاب روآ عن أبي بكر الصديق وعمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنهما روآ عنه. أبو صالح السمان سمعت أبي يقول ذلك.

They said:

Imaam Ibn Hibbaan mentioned him in ath-Thiqaat. (ath-Thiqaat (5/214), Tadhheeb ut-Tahdheeb (8/179) Imaam Ibn Khuzaimah authenticated his hadeeth as well as Imaam Ibn Hibbaan. Shaikh Haafidh Ibn as-Salaah said, “It is sufficient for a hadeeth to be authentic, that it is present in the book in which their authors declared they would mention such hadeeth, like the book of Saheeh compiled by Ibn Khuzaimah.”(al-Muqaddimah pg.9).

Reply:

\(^\text{222}\) Despite al-Albani’s claim that Malik al-Dar is unknown, in his editing of al-Hafiz al-Mundhir’s al-Targhib wal Tarhib, printed under the title of Sahih al-Targhib wal Tarhib (1/551-552, no. 926, printed by Maktaba al Ma’arif, Riyadh, 1st edn, 2000 CE) he has also declared a narration from Malik al-Dar to be Hasan mawquf (a good narration halting at the Sahabi, Umar ibn al-Khattab, radillahu anhu) as follows:

- 276 -
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Ibn Hibban is known to be somewhat lenient in his approach to declaring some narrators to be Thiqa. Once again, the narrator known as Malik al-Dar was listed in Ibn Hibban’s Kitab al-Thiqat,\footnote{Ibn Hibban said in al-Thiqat:}{223} al-Bukhari listed him in his Ta’rikh al-Kabir\footnote{In Ta’rikh al-Kabir of al-Bukhari it is mentioned as:}{224} with no Jarh, as did Ibn Abi Hatim in his Kitab al-Jarh wa Ta’dil\footnote{The arabic quotation from Ibn Abi Hatim from his Jarh wa Ta’dil (4/1/213):}{225} but al-Albani and probably these two compilers from his school of revisionist Hadith criticism rejected any form of tawthiq on Malik al-Dar!

If they wish to be consistent in their methodology, then they should say the same for Malik al-Dar; rather than just for Isa ibn Jariyya! Similarly, Abu Ja’far al-Razi was weakened by them regarding the 20 rak’ats (based on al-Albani’s claims) narration from the Musnad Ibn Mani’, but he too has been mentioned in al-Bukhari’s Ta’rikh al-Kabir with no Jarh.\footnote{Ta’rikh al-Kabir of al-Bukhari(6/179):}{226}

As for the point that since Ibn Khuzayma and Ibn Hibban authenticated narrations from Isa ibn Jariyya in their respective Sahih collections for 8 rak’ats, then his narrations for 8 rak’ats must necessarily be automatically authentic; then this is a principle that is not agreed upon. Rather, there are a number of narrations recorded by Ibn Khuzayma and Ibn Hibban that have been identified to be weak by their respective editors in this age and in the past.

\footnote{Ibn Hibban said in al-Thiqat:}{223} 
\footnote{In Ta’rikh al-Kabir of al-Bukhari it is mentioned as:}{224} 
\footnote{The arabic quotation from Ibn Abi Hatim from his Jarh wa Ta’dil (4/1/213):}{225} 
\footnote{Ta’rikh al-Kabir of al-Bukhari(6/179):}{226}
Additionally, there are examples from the pen of Nasir al-Albani himself disagreeing with the grading on a specific Hadith from earlier Huffaz of Hadith, and at times siding with one section of Huffaz who may have graded it in one way while disagreeing with another group who held an opposing view on a specific narrations authenticity. Further than this, there are also cases where al-Albani gave his own personal grading in opposition to what earlier Huffaz had declared. 227

It has already been shown that Ibn Khuzayma transmitted two narrations in his Sahih via Abu Ja’far al-Razi, but the likes of al-Albani and these two compilers did not accept his narration for 20 rak’ats. It is also known that Abu Ja’far’s narrations are deemed to be Sahih by al-Hakim as he included a number of his ahadith in his al-Mustadrak, as did the later Diya al-Maqdisi on at least an occasion in his al-Mukhtara. The question is, would these compilers accept this for Abu Ja’far now, or will they just be biased towards Isa ibn Jariyya’s narrations?!

They said:

al-Haithamee has declared his hadeeth to be good (Majmā az-Zawaaid (2/72) and he also declared him (ie Eesaa) to be trustworthy (Majmā az- Zawaaid (2/185).

Having looked at the first reference from al-Haythami’s Majma (2/72), then the narration they referred to it is not in vol.2/ p. 72 but vol. 2/ p. 74. The narration at hand being as follows and it is regarding Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra) allegedly leading some women for 8 rak’ats:

المجلد الثاني. » 4 كتاب الصلاة. » 126. باب في الرجل يوم النساء.

2387 وعن جابر بن عبد الله قال: جاء أبي بن كعب إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال: يا رسول الله إنه كان مني الليلة شيء - يعني في رمضان - قال: "وما ذاك يا أبي؟" قال: نسوة في داري قلننا لا نقرأ القرآن فنصلي بصلائك قال: فصلبت بين ثمان ركعات وأوترت. فكان شبه الرضا ولم

An example may be seen in al-Albani’s Silsila al-da’eefa (3/219, no. 1099) where he disagreed with the authentication of a narration by Ibn Khuzayma (no. 2176), Ibn Hibban (no. 941), al-Hakim (1/436) with al-Dhahabi’s agreement with al-Hakim
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What is seen from the above is that al-Haythami said the Isnad is Hasan and it is found in the Musnad of Abu Ya’la and al-Tabarani’s al-Awsat. He did not classify the matn (text) to be Hasan (good), and there is a subtle difference when a isnad is declared Hasan it does not necessitate in all cases that the matn too is Hasan per se.

As for their claim that al-Haythami declared Isa ibn Jariyya to be trustworthy in his Majma (2/185) - then they may care to read what their Muhaddith al-Asr, Nasir al-Albani had to say in his Silsila al-Da’eefa wal Mawdu’a (14/495-496).\footnote{See later for what al-Albani’s later stance on Isa ibn Jariyya was and how he weakened the variants for 8 rak’ats in his editing of Sahih Ibn Hibban} This latter volume of the Silsila was printed after al-Albani’s death. It should also be mentioned again that al-Haythami also declared Abu Ja’far al-Razi to be Thiqa in his Majma al Zawa’id (no. 8140), but the two compilers had sided with al-Albani in rejecting his transmission for 20 rak’ats as in the Musnad of Ibn Mani’ and via his route by Diya al-Maqdisi in al-Mukhtara.

The narration they referred to from al-Haythami’s Majma (2/185) appears to be the following one

\footnotesize

\begin{quote}
وعن جابر قال: دخل عبد الله بن مسعود السعد والنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يخطب فجلس إلى جنبي أبي بن كعب فقاله عن شيء أو كلمة شيء فلم يرد عليه أبي فظن ابن مسعود أنها موجودة فلما انقتل النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم من صلاة قال ابن مسعود: يا أبي ما منعكس أن ترد علي قالت أمما أفلا تضر معنا الجماعة قال: ولم قال: تكلمت والنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يخطب فقام ابن مسعود يدخل على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فذكر ذلك له فقال رأسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: "صدق أبي أطلع أبيا." \\
رواه أبو يعلى والطبراني في الأوست بنحوه وفي الكبير باختصارات رجل أبي يعلى ثقة.
\end{quote}

This narration was recorded by Abu Ya’la and al-Tabarani in al-Awsat, and it was also mentioned by al-Mundhiri in al-Targhib wal Tarhib as the two compilers.
mentioned. The narration will be looked at in more detail later when mentioning their quote from al-Mundhiri.

As for al-Haythami’s view on the sanad being Hasan, it is disputed and thus open to further clarification by recouring to the views of other scholars of Hadith from the past and present. Indeed, al-Haythami mentioned the alternative narration for 8 rak’ats from Jabir (ra) as follows in his Majma al-Zawa’id, and it is regarding the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) himself allegedly leading for 8 rak’ats:

This narration was recorded by al-Haythami from Abu Ya’la and the Mu’jam al-Saghir of al-Tabarani. He said that in the sanad is Isa ibn Jariyya who was declared Thiqa by Ibn Hibban and other than him while he was weakened by Ibn Ma’een. The only other place that I noticed al-Haythami mention the Jarh and Ta’dil on Isa ibn Jariyya is as follows:

Here, Isa was mentioned to have been weakened by Ibn Ma’een and Abu Dawud, while Abu Zur’a and Ibn Hibban are said to have made tawthiq on him.
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Hence, al-Haythami did not declare in all 3 chains mentioned above from his Majma al-Zawa'id to be Hasan via the routes containing Isa ibn Jariyya. Only once did he do that, and it may be that when al-Haythami mentioned the Jarh on Isa, he did not recall to mention the Jarh made on Isa by other Hadith Masters from the early days, like that of al-Nasa’i, Ibn Adi and his being included in the Du’a’afa of al-Uqayli and al-Saji.

**Examples from those who disagreed with al-Haythami’s declaration that Isa ibn Jariyya’s narration had a Hasan isnâd:**

Indebt, we have already quoted al-Haythami’s (d. 807 AH) younger contemporary, **al-Hafiz Ahmed al-Busayri** (d. 840 AH) mention the second narration recorded by al-Haythami above in his Majma (2/74), and al-Busayri weakened the chain due to his weakening of Ya’qub ibn Abdullah al-Ash’ari al-Qummi (who took from Isa ibn Jariyya). Hence, al-Haythami’s grading of the second narration from Jabir (ra) to have a Hasan isnad is disputed by al-Busayri, and before them all, we have quoted al-**Hafiz Abu Ahmed ibn Adi** (d. 365 AH) from his al-Kamil declaring the narrations from Isa ibn Jariyya to be ghayr mahfuza (not preserved properly) with the backing of Ibn Tahir al-Maqdisi later

---

229 This section is dealing specifically with what the 2 compiles said:

**The Second Hadeeth of Jaabir – Of Ubayy ibn Ka‘ab**

On the authority of Jaabir (Radhiallaahu Anhu) that Ubayy Ibn Ka‘ab (Radhiallaahu Anhu) came to the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) and said, “I did something yesterday night” the Messenger of Allaah said, “What did you do?” he said, “Some women came to my house and said they did not know much Qur’aan so we shall pray behind you and will listen to the Qur’aan.” So I led them in 8 raka’as of prayer and offered the Witr prayer.” The Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) remained silent and thus it became the Sunnah.” (Musnad Abee Ya’ala (3/336-337 no.1801), Qiyaam al-Layl (no.155) Majma’a az-Zawaa’id (2/74))

Haafidh al-Haithamee said, “Narrated by Abu Ya’ala, Tabaraanee in al-Awsth and its chain is Hasan.” (Majma’a az-Zawaa’id (2/74)).

230 See what was quoted earlier from al-Busayris **al-Ithaf al-Khiyara** (2/382), where he mentioned also the variant from the Musnad of al-Harith ibn Abi Usam with no mention of 8 ra’as in its wording!
on. See earlier for this point from Ibn Adi, where he mentioned both variants from Jabir (ra).

Al-Haytham mentioned that the second variant from Jabir (ra) as mentioned in his Majma (2/74) was located in the Musnad of Abu Ya’la and Mu’jam al Awsat of al-Tabarani. Both of these two latter books have been published with editing, and it will be mentioned below what their editors had to say.

Al-Haytham’s Majma al-Zawa’id has also been printed separately under the title Bughyatul Raa’id fi tahqiq Majma al Zawa’id 231 with editing by Abdullah Muhammad al-Darwish. Indeed, al-Darwish also disagreed with al-Haythami by declaring the sanad to be da’eef due to Isa ibn Jariyya as follows (by referring it to be found in the Musnad of Abu Ya’la):

As can be seen above, the two compilers mentioned that al-Haythami had ascribed Jabir’s second narration to the Musnad of Abu Ya’la, and they went further by giving a precise reference to the printed edition of the Musnad by saying:

Musnad Abee Ya’ala (3/336-337 no.1801),

The edition of Abu Y’a’la’s Musnad they mentioned is most likely to be the one edited by one of those from their school of doctrine, namely, Hussain Salim Asad al-Darani. Having had recourse to this edition under the very precise reference they mentioned (3/ 336-337, no. 1801), one may see the following:

---

231 Vol. 2/p. 222, printed by Dar al-Fikr, Beirut, 1994 CE
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Hence, al-Darani graded the sanad to be da‘eeef (weak) in disagreement with al-Haythami’s claim. One may also see above that no. 1802 from Abu Ya‘la is regarding the variant from Jabir (ra) that the Holy Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) himself allegedly led for 8 rak’ats. On the next page, al-Darani mentioned in his footnote that this sanad is also da‘eeef due to Isa ibn Jariyya.

Al-Haythami had also compiled a work listing the Zawa‘id narrations from al-Tabarani’s Mu‘jam al-Saghir and Awsat under the title, Majma al-Bahrayn fi Zawa‘id al-Mu‘jamayn 232

The editor of this book, Abdul Quddus Nadhir mentioned the following (2/ 69) from al-Haythami:

---

232 Maktaba al-Rushd, Riyadh, 1992 CE
Under no. 727 he mentioned that al-Tabarani’s Shaykh, Uthman ibn Ubaydullah al-Talhi had no known status in terms of having any Jarr or Tadil on him, and thus indicating that he is unknown (majhûl). After mentioning other books of Hadith which have a similar narration he mentioned that al-Haythami declared the sanad to be Hasan in his Majma (2/74), and the editor gave his own verdict in the last line by saying Isa ibn Jariyya is layyin (“soft”) and his Hadith is not Hasan. Note also, that al-Albâni also mentioned in his Silsilah al-Da’ee’ah (14/495) that he couldn’t find any mention of Uthman al-Talhi in the books recording the background to narrators.

This is clear to show that al-Haythami’s verdict of the sanad being Hasan is disputed and especially so if al-Tabarani’s above Shaykh is majhûl (unknown), it may be that al-Haythami used a later principle whereby those of al-Tabarani’s Shaykhs not mentioned in al-Dhahabi’s Mizan al-I’tidal with weakness are to be considered Thiqa. This principle of his is not agreed upon. Leaving aside the status of Uthman al-Talhi, the real reason for weakening the two variants from Jabir (ra) centre around the veracity of Isa ibn Jariyya.
In the Kitab Qiyam Ramadan of Imam Ibn Nasr al-Marwazi (d. 294 AH) which was abridged by Shaykh Ahmed ibn Ali al-Maqrizi, with one edition being printed with editing by Dr. Muhammad Ashur and Jamal Abdal Mun‘im; on pp. 42-43 the two variants from Jabir (ra) were also mentioned.

The first variant (no. 22) is the one via Muhammad ibn Humayd al-Razi from Ya’qub ibn Abdullah from Isa ibn Jariyya from Jabir (ra) suggesting that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) lead for 8 rak’ats. The two editors declared this hadith to be da’eef (under footnote no. 5), and on the next page (p. 43, no. 23) the narration mentioning Ubayy ibn Ka‘b (ra) allegedly leading some women for 8 rak’ats was mentioned. The two editors mentioned clearly their overall grading that Isa ibn Jariyya is da’eef (weak) as well as declaring the second variant to also have a da’eef sanad as follows with highlighting:

Thus, Huffaz of Hadith from the past like Ibn Adi, Ibn Tahir al-Maqdisi and al-Busayri were not inline with al-Haythami; while from this age the same was seen from Abdullah al Darwish, Hussain al-Darani, Abdul Quddus Nadhir; implied so by Ibrahim al-Qaysi and Hamdi Murad in their editing of the Mawsu al adhith wal athar al da’efa wal mawdu’a, as well as Muhammad Ashur and Jamal Abdal Mun‘im in their editing of Ibn Nasr’s Qiyam Ramadan.
They said:

Haafidh Ibn Hajr remained silent on his hadeeth. (See Fath ul-Baaree (3/10)

This point about al-Hafiz remaining silent on Isa ibn Jariyya's narration for 8 rak'ats has been dealt with already; hence, the reader should refer back to it.

They said:

Haafidh Dhahabee mentioned this hadeeth in Meezaan ul-Eltidaal (5/385) and said, “The chain is of a middle level.”

The narration they are referring to is the one where the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) himself is alleged to have prayed with 8 rak’ats in congregation. The reference for this is Mizan al-I’tidal (4/311), 233 and in the later printed edition it is (5/374-375), thus one would assume that there reference is a typographical error. As for the actual quote from al-Mizan it is as follows:

The above quote shows that al-Dhahabi mentioned only the Jarh from Ibn Ma’een and al-Nasa’i as well as a form of Ta’dil from Abu Zur’a. He did not mention the Jarh of Ibn Adi that Isa’s narrations are ghayr mahuza (not preserved), that Abu Dawud considered him to be munkar al-hadith (rejected in hadith) or the point that al-Uqayli and al-Saji also considered him to be weak.

233 Edited by Ali al-Bijawi, Dar al Mârifa, Beirut
(da’eeef). If al-Dhahabi had mentioned all of this then it may have lead him to give a verdict different than saying that, “the chain is of a middle level.” Wallahu a’lam.

The above narration with the ascription of 8 rak’ats being performed by Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) was also mentioned in the Mukhtasar Kitab al-Witr234 by Shaykh Ahmed ibn Ali al-Maqrizi as follows:

- حدثنا إسحاق أخبارنا أبو البرهان ثماني يعقوب ثلا عيسى بن جارية عن جابر رضي الله عنه صلى الله عليه وسلم في شهر رمضان ثمانين ركعات وأوتر فتما كانت الليلة القابئة اجتمعنا في المسجد رجونا ان يخرج فيصلى بننا فقلنا فيه حتى أصبحنا فقلنا يا رسول الله رجونا ان تخرج فتصلي بننا فقال كلما كرهت او خشيت ان يكتب عليكم الوتر // إسناده ضعيف

This work was edited by Ibrahim Muhammad al-Ali and Muhammad Abdullah Abu Sa’leek, who both declared the isnâd to be da’eeef

One also wonders if Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban would be happy to accept the fact that al-Dhahabi himself had declared a narration for 20 rak’ats from Suwayd ibn Ghafla235 to have a Salih (good) sanad236 in his al-Muhaddhab fi

234 No. 19, printed by Maktaba al-Manar, Zanqa, Amman, 1st edn, 1413 AH
235 Ibn Hajar mentioned the following about Suwayd in al Taqrib:

2695 ] سويد بن غفلة نفح المعجمة وأقرأ أبو أسامة الجمعي مخلص من 카يثر الترابين قدم المدينة يوم دفن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وكان مسلما في حياته ثم نزل الكوفة ومات سنة ثمانين وله مائة وثلاثون سنة ع

Thus, Suwayd was from the major students of the Sahaba and though he never met the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) he was a Muslim in his life time (mukhdaram) and entered Madina on the day al-Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) was buried. He later moved to Kufa and his narrations are found in the 6 main books of Hadith. Suwayds practice for 20 rak’ats could only have been inherited from his learned teachers from the Sahaba.

236 Shaykh al-Nimawi declared the sanad for Suwayds narration to be Hasan in his notes to Athar al-Sunan (p. 253)
Ikhtisar al-Sunan al-Kabir\textsuperscript{237} (of al-Bayhaqi) as the editor pointed out in the footnote as follows:

This narration from Suwayd ibn Ghafla was also mentioned by Imam al-Bukhari in his al-Kuna (no. 234) without mentioning any weakness:

\textsuperscript{237} 2/928
A look at how they distorted Shaykh al-Nimawi’s words:

The two compilers also claimed (on p. 40 of their risala) earlier about the narration from Jabir ibn Abdullah (ra) that: “Nimawee Hanafee also authenticated it in Aathaar as-Sunan (p.248)”

The following is a scan from an early edition of Athar al-Sunan with Shaykh al-Nimawi’s own notes printed beneath the narrations known as Ta’liq al-Hasan. The edition they used seems to be the one printed by Maktaba Imdadiyya and edited by Shaykh Fayd Ahmed. Both of these editions mention Shaykh al-Nimawi saying the following:

---

This is Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ali al-Nimawi who died in India in the year 1322 AH at around the age of 44, rahimahullah
Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban claimed that Shayk al-Nimawi authenticated the narration! What can be seen from the above scan is that in actual fact he said after mentioning the references for the Hadith that the Isnad is layyin ("soft"), meaning it has weakness in it, and then in the footnote (no. 3) he clarified the reason for the softness in the sanad is due to Isa ibn Jariyya. He then went onto mention some of the Jarh and Ta’dil on Isa. Now, let us continue with a scan from the very next page of Athar al-Sunan which crucially shows what al-Nimawi had to say about al-Dhahabi’s claim on the sanad being of a middle level:
The highlighted portion (in blue) shows that al-Nimawi clearly disagreed with al-Dhahabi’s judgement by saying that it is not of a middle level as al-Dhahabi claimed. Besides this distortion of al-Nimawi’s words by these two compilers who seem to have based this claim from someone else who they blindly trusted, if they had returned to the original work by al-Nimawi, they would have noticed that he also had a short section on Taraweeh in excess of 8 rak’ats (as found in Muwatta Malik from al-A’raj) and then nearly 6 pages of evidences and discussion to validate 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh! It may also be seen in the last line of the above scan that al-Nimawi quoted from Ibn Hajar’s Fath al-Bari who quoted from the Musannaf of Abdar Razzaq the other route via Muhammad ibn Yusuf narrating it as 21 rak’ats (from Sa‘īb ibn Yazid). This point has been mentioned earlier on.
THEIR CLAIM REGARDING
SHAYKH AL-LUCKNAWI

They also mentioned earlier a claim about Shaykh al-Nimawi's own teacher, Shaykh Abdal Hayy al-Lucknawi (d. 1304 AH) by saying:

Also authenticated by Maulana Abdul Hayy Lucknowee Hanafee in Umdatur Raayah (1/207) and Ta’leequl Mumajjid (p.138) who said it was extremely authentic.

Reply:

It is strange of them to claim this about Shaykh Abdal Hayy al-Lucknawi (d. 1304 AH) but not quote a single line to substantiate it! If they could quote it in full the reality of the matter could be better established. In both works he referred the reader to his more detailed work on this issue known as Tuhfatul Akhyar. Referring to his Ta’liqul Mumajjad239 which is his Sharh on the Muwatta Muhammad he said:

و أما عدد ما صنّفت، ففي حديث ضعيف أنه صلى عشرين ركعة و الوتر أخرجه ابن أبي شيبة من حديث جابر: أنه صلى بهم ثمان ركعات ثم أوتر و هذا أصح كذا في التنوير

This quote from al-Lucknawi mentions that as for the number of rak’ats that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) prayed, it is mentioned in a weak hadith that he prayed 20 rak’ats and the wiitr as related by Ibn Abi Shayba from the hadith of Ibn Abbas, and Ibn Hibban related in his Sahih a hadith from Jabir saying that

239 Vol. 1/p.618
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He (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) performed 8 rak‘ats and the witr and that this is more authentic (wa hadha as-sah) as found in al-Tanwir (of al-Suyuti)

What can be gathered from this is that Shaykh Abdal Hayy did not have the sanad for Jabir’s narration as in Sahih Ibn Hibban, and nor did he say that the sanad is “extremely authentic” as these two compilers claimed! Rather, he was quoting from al-Suyuti’s Tanwir al-Halik (see below) that Jabir’s narration is more authentic in comparison to the weak chained narration from Ibn Abbas. The reason for this is because it is known to us that Isa ibn Jariyya is less problematic than the narrator known as Ibrahim ibn Uthman (Abu Shayba) who is a narrator in Ibn Abbas’ (ra) sanad. Ibrahim ibn Uthman has more severe Jarh on him. From this, it can not be concluded that al-Lucknawi declared the sanad for Jabir’s narration to be Sahih as they claimed!

One also wonders why they did not mention what he said later on in his Ta’liq al-Mumajjad\(^\text{240}\) where he mentioned how Ibn Abdal Barr said that it was finally settled upon for 20 Rak‘ats in the end:

Indeed, Shaykh Abdal Hayy al-Lucknawi mentioned in his Tuhfatul Akhyar\(^\text{241}\) the fact that al-Bayhaqi has reported with a Sahih chain of transmission (wa rawa al-Bayhaqi bi-sanad Sahih) as mentioned by Imam Badrud-Din al-Ayni (d. 855 AH) in his Minhatus-Suluk Sharh Tuhfatul Muluk, with the wording for twenty rak‘ats from the days of Umar (ra). Al-Lucknawi also mentioned from Imam al-Qastallani’s Irshad al-Sari that Imam Waliud-Din al-Iraqi had also authenticated al-Bayhaqi’s sanad (as in his Sunan al-Kubra) mentioning 20 rak‘ats in the time of Umar (ra).

\(^{240}\) 1/626

\(^{241}\) See p. 103, edited by Shaykh Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda, Maktaba al-Matbu‘at al-Islamiyya, Halab, 1\(^{\text{st}}\) edn, 1992 CE
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The fact that al-Lucknawi did not weaken al-Bayhaqi’s narration is an indication that he was in agreement with these earlier authorities who authenticated it.

The two compilers also said on p. 46 of their ‘Qaul ul Saheeh” with regard to Isa ibn Jariyya:

Shaikh al-Bausaree said his hadeeth are good in Misbah uz-Zajaajah az- Zawaa’id Sunan Ibn Maajah (no.4241).

The narration they are referring to is the following from Sunan Ibn Majah:

سنن ابن ماجه - للإمام ابن ماجه الجزء الثاني » 37، كتاب الزهد » (28) باب المداومة على العمل.

1424. - حديثا عرمو بن نافع. حديثنا يعقوب بن عبد الله الأشتر يعن عيسى بن جارية، عن جابر يعن عبد الله. قال: مَرَّ رَسُولُ الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على رجل يصلى على صفقة، فأتى ناحية مكانة. فمكثت مائة، ثم انصرف. فوجد الرجل يصلى على حاله. فقال: فجمع يدئي ثم قال: (يا أيها الناس! عليكم بالقصص، تكلنا (فإن الله لا يفعل خالق ثملوا).)

The most recent edition of Sunan Ibn Majah with the editing by Dr Bashhar Awwad Ma’ruf declared the sanad to be weak due to Isa ibn Jariyya as follows:

4241 - إسناده ضعيف، لضعف عيسى بن جارية الأنصاري.

As for al-Busayri declaring the above narration to have a Hasan sanad, then this appears to be an error on his part according to Shaykh Shu‘ayb al-Arna’ut in his editing of Sahih Ibn Hibban (vol. 2/ no. 357) as follows:
The above narration from Ibn Majah is also in Sahih Ibn Hibban, and it is clear that Shaykh Shu’ayb al-Arna’ut also declared its isnād to be da’eef, as did Bashhar Awwad after him.

Besides, it has already been shown that al-Busayri himself declared Ya’qub ibn Abdullah al-Qummi (who took from Isa Ibn Jariyya) to be da’eef in his Ithaf al-Khiyara, when mentioning the narration from Jabir (ra) regarding Ubayy ibn Ka’b (ra) leading women in Salah – allegedly for 8 rak’ats. Hence, this is what matters regarding this narration from Jabir (ra) and not what al-Busayri mentioned for a completely different narration unrelated to the matter at hand on the rak’ats for Taraweeh being allegedly eight.

They said:

Haafidh Mundhiri said concerning one of his hadeeth: “The chain of this is good.” (Targheeb Wat-Tarheeb (1/507).

The narration they seem to be referring to from al-Mundhiri’s al-Targhib was also mentioned earlier when the two compilers said:
al-Haithameehasdeclaredhis hadeethtobe good (Majmā‘ az-Zawaa‘id (2/72) and he also declared him (ie Eesaa) to be trustworthy (Majmā‘ az- Zawaa‘id (2/185).

The following is what was mentioned by al-Mundhiri in al-Targhib wal Tarhib (no. 1081) from Jabir ibn Abdullah (ra):

As Hafiz al-Mundhiri said, the hadith is found in the Musnad of Abu Ya‘la and Sahih Ibn Hibban. As for al-Mundhiri’s claim of it having a jayyid (good) chain of transmission, then once again this is disputed due to the presence of Isa ibn Jariyya in its sanad. This narration is also found in al-Bayhaqi’s Shu‘ab al-Iman, and the editor, Dr Abdul Ali Abdal Kabir, said that its isnad is weak due to Isa ibn Jariyya.

The reader may recall that before al-Mundhiri, al-Hafiz Ibn Adi had already passed his ruling on all of Isa ibn Jariyya’s narrations not being preserved correctly (ghayr mahfuza), and after him, Ibn Tahir al-Maqdisi also did the same for the 2 variants from Jabir mentioning 8 rak’ats.

---

242 See 4/412, no. 2736, Maktaba al-Rushd, Riyadh, 1st edn, 2003/1423, edited by Dr Abdul Ali Abdal Hamid
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Its sanad was weakened by Shaykh Shu‘ayb al-Arna‘ut in his editing of Sahih Ibn Hibban as follows due to Isa ibn Jariyya:

As well as by Hussain Salim Asad in his editing of Musnad Abu Ya‘la (vol. 3/335) as follows:

Another example of Isa ibn Jariyya’s narration (as transmitted by Abu Ya‘la) and it being weakened is from the pen of Dr Sa‘d ibn Nasir al-Shathari, who is a Saudi based writer on the same school of doctrine as the two compilers being replied upon. In his editing of al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar’s Matalib al-Aliyya (8/612) under the following narration:

\[\text{1803} - \\
\text{وقال أبو عتيج حديثنا جميل بن حمدي حديثنا يعقوب القطي عن عيسى بن جارية قال كان رجل يحمل الخمر من خيبر فيبيعها من المسلمين فعمل منها مالاً فقدم به المدينة فلقه رجل من المسلمين فقله يا فلان أن الخمر قد حرمت فوضعها حيث انتهى على نم وسجى عليها بالأكاسية ثم أتى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال يا رسول الله بلغني أن} \]

\[\text{243 Sahih ibn Hibban (Tartib of Ibn Bulban, vol. 7/no. 2794)}\

- 297 -
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Al-Shathari weakened this narration by mentioning:

Thus, he admitted that Isa ibn Jariyya has weakness in him, and he mentioned the Jarh of Abu Dawud, al-Nasa’i and Ibn Adi as support for this contention.

All this goes to show that al-Mundhiri’s opinion is not accepted or agreed upon due to the weakness in Isa ibn Jariyya.
IMAM AL-SUYUTI'S POSITION ON THE RAK’ATS OF TARAWEEH

They said:

Imaam Suyootee after mentioning the statement of Ibn Abdul-Barr said,

“Transmitted by Ibn Hibbaan in his Saheeh from the hadeeth of Jaabir from the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) that he prayed 8 raka’hs and witr and this is what is authentic.” (Tanweer al-Hawaalik (1/103).

What Imam al-Suyuti (d. 911 AH) said in his Tanwir al-Halik (no. 248) was also quoted by Shaykh Abdal Hayy al-Lucknawi similarly. This is what al-Suyuti said:

وأما عدد ما صلى ففي حديث ضعيف أنه صلى عشرين ركعة والوتر أخرجه بن أبي شيبة من حديث بن عباس وأخرج بن حبان في صحيحه من حديث جابر أنه صلى بهم ثمان ركعات ثم أوتر وهذا أصح

Thus, al-Suyuti did not say as these two claimants said: “and this is what is authentic.” On the contrary, al-Suyuti merely said that the 8 rak’at narration recorded in Sahih Ibn Hibban is more authentic (wa hadha as-sah) than the 20 rak’at narration from Ibn Abbas as reported by Ibn Abi Shayba! This does not prove that al-Suyuti was finally an advocate for 8 rak’ats, but rather what is known from his own words is that in fiqhi positions he is inline with the Muhaqqiq (research scholar) of the Shafi’i school that he belonged to, namely, Imam al-Nawawi. 244

244 Imam al-Suyuti’s authentication of the sanad is not an endorsement that the wording of the text was applied in his own practice in Ramadan, nor does it prove that he advocated 8 rak’ats as the practice of the Sahaba. Indeed, al-Suyuti said in his al-Radd `ala man Akhlada ila al-Ard wa Jahila anna al-Ijtihad fi kulli `Asrin Fard (“Refutation of the Shiftless Who Have no Idea that Ijtihad is a Religious Obligation in Every Age”).244

"I did not mean by this that I was similar to one of the Four Imams, but only that I was a School-affiliated mujtahid (mujtahid muntasib). For, when I reached the level of tarjih or distinguishing the best fatwa inside the school, I did not contravene al-Nawawi’s tarjih. And when I reached the level of ijtihad mutlaq, I did not contravene al-Shafi’i’s school.”
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In fact on a well known website on the same sectarian belief as the two compilers, they mentioned the following quote from Imam al-Suyuti:

Al-Suyooti said:

What is narrated in the saheeh and hasan ahaadeeth is the command to observe night prayers during Ramadaan, which is encouraged without specifying a particular number. It is not proven that the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) prayed twenty rak’ahs of Taraaweeh, rather that he prayed at night, with an unspecified number of rak’ahs. Then he delayed it on the fourth night lest it become obligatory for them and they might not be able to do it.

The above quote was taken from the Kuwaiti al-Mawsu’a al-Fiqhiyya (27/ 142-145) which actually took it from al-Suyuti’s Risala on Taraweeh known as al-Masabih fi salatul Tarawih, which mentions the above quote in the following Arabic sentences:

الذي وردت به الأحاديث الصحيحة والحسن والضعيفة الأمر بقيام رمضان والترغيب فيه من غير تخصيص بعدد ولم يثبت أنه صلى الله عليه وسلم صلى عشرين ركعة وإنما صلى ليالي صلاة لم يذكر عددها ثم تأخر في الليلة الرابعة خشية أن تفرض عليهم فبعجزوا عنها

This is a decisive quote that al-Suyuti was sure that no Sahih Hadith mentions the exact number of rak’ats that were performed on those few nights with the Sahaba by the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam). Hence, it is a clear refutation of the claims of Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban. Indeed, al-Suyuti was for 20 rak’ats inline with al-Nawawi.

Imam al-Nawawi was for sure a proponent of 20 rak’ats (as can be seen in his Kitab al Adhkar and al-Majmu), and this quote proves that al-Suyuti is in line with al-Nawawi’s preference for 20 rak’ats.

Similarly, it has already been quoted from al-Suyuti’s al-Masabih that he quoted from Imam Taqiu-Din al-Subki’s Sharh al-Minhaj, saying that it’s not known exactly how many rak’ats Taraweeh was performed by Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam).

Another line of argumentation used by Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban was their claim that some later Hanafi Imams themselves mentioned Jabir’s narration for 8 rak’ats. In asserting this they mentioned that Hafiz Jamalud-Din al-Zayla’i (d. 762 AH) mentioned the narration with no criticism as follows:

Haafidh Zailaa’ee also cited this hadeeth and did not mention any criticism regarding it in two places in his book, therefore this proves this hadeeth was authentic according to him. (See Nasb ur-Raayah (1/ 276) and (1/ 293).

I am not sure which edition of Nasb al-Ra’ya they used but the earliest printed edition mentions Jabir’s narration from Sahih ibn Hibban on vol.2/ p. 152. The silence of al-Zayla’i is not a proof of his agreement with Ibn Hibban that it is Sahih. The fact of the matter is that al-Zayla’i also quoted Saa’ib ibn Yazid’s narration for 20 rak’ats and he quoted Imam al-Nawawi’s authentication of the sanad for one variant of it as follows:

نحوه آخر: موقوف، رواه البديهي في “المعرفة” أخبرنا أبو طاهر الفقيه حدثنا أبو عثمان البصري حدثنا أبو أحمد محمد بن عبد الوهاب حدثنا خالد بن مخلد حدثنا محمد بن جعفر حدثني يزيد بن خصيفة عن السائب بن يزيد، قال: كنا نقوم في زمن عمر بن الخطاب بعشرين ركعة وAuthToken، انتمى قال النووي في الخلافة، إسناده صحيح، وكان ذكره من جهة السند، لمن جهة المعرفة، فإنه ذكره بزيادة

This variant is found in the Ma’rifatus Sunan (4/ 42, no. 5409) of al-Bayhaqi, but once again the two compilers rejected its authenticity! See earlier for the authenticity of this narration.

246 See p. 46 of the “Qaul ul-Saheeh”

247 Nasb al Ra’ya (2/154)
Indeed, these two compilers (Abu Khuzaimah/ Abu Hibban) have also put out a short book in reply to most of the proofs used by the Kufan scholars and the position of the Hanafi and most of the Malik school on not raising the hands (raful yadayn) in Salah after the first Takbir, and they also dismissed al-Zayla'i’s own authentication of some non-raful yadayn narrations from his Nasb al ra'ya as a consequence. What is bewildering to note is that they released this book under one pseudonym of "Abu Asaakir al-Araqee"! Despite it being known that it was compiled by two individuals!

Additionally, al-Zayla'i’s Shaykh, Imam Fakhrud-Din al Zayla'i (d. 743 AH) affirmed 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh in his Hanafi fiqh manual known as Tabyin al Haqa’iq248 as follows using al-Bayhaqi’s narration:

وَالثَّانِيْ فِي عَدَدِ رَكَعَتَيْهِ وَهِيَ عَشْرُونَ رَكَعَةً وَعَدَّةَ مَاكَأَبِيَّ سَبْعَةً وَتَناَوَّلَ رَكَعَةَ وَإِخْتَلَّ عَلَى ذَلِكَ يَعْلَمُ أَهْلُ النَّيْمَةِ وَلَّا مَا رَوَى الْبِيْهْقِيُّ يَسْتَنَادُ صَحِيحُ أَنَّهُمْ كَانُوا يَقْمُونُ عَلَى عَهْدِ عُمَّرٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ هُمْ بِعِشْرَةِ رَكَعَةٍ وَعَلَى عَهْدِ عُمَّانْ مَعْتَصِمُونَ بِمَنْ فَسَاءَ مَعْتَصِمُونَ بِمَنْ شَأَّنَّ اللَّهَ وَهُمْ عَشْرُونَ وَأَرْضَيْهِمْ مَمْطُولُونَ عَلَى أَنْهُمْ كَانُوا يَصُلُّونَ بِكَلِّ تَرْوَيْحِيْنَ مَقَانَتُ تَرْوَيْهَا قَرَأَيْيْ كَمَا هُوَ مُكْتَبٌ أَهْلُ النَّيْمَةِ عَلَى مَا يَأْتِي بِبَيْانٍ إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَ

They also made similar claims with regard to Imam Ibn al-Humam, Shaykh Ali al-Qari249 and Shaykh Anwar Shah al-Kashmiri, but once again they did not have the courage to quote the full context of the discussion on this issue from these Imams from their various works! If they care to prove their points with regard to these Ulama and their stance on 20 rak'ats, then it would be advisable that they take up the challenge to quote in full every single line from the works of these

248 1/178, printed by Dar al-Kutub al Islami, Cairo, 1313 AH

249 Shaykh Ali al-Qari in his Sharh al-Wigaya (1/250) authenticated the sanad from al-Bayhaqi’s al-Sunan for 20 rak’ats and also mentioned Imam Malik’s view for 36 rak’ats as follows:

لَمَّا رَوَى الْبِيْهْقِيُّ يَسْتَنَادُ صَحِيحُ أَنَّهُمْ كَانُوا يَقْمُونُ عَلَى عَهْدِ عُمَّرٍ بِعِشْرَةِ رَكَعَةٍ، وَعَلَى عَهْدِ عُمَّانْ مَعْتَصِمُونَ بِمَنْ فَسَاءَ مَعْتَصِمُونَ بِمَنْ شَأَّنَّ اللَّهَ وَهُمْ عَشْرُونَ وَأَرْضَيْهِمْ مَمْطُولُونَ عَلَى أَنْهُمْ كَانُوا يَصُلُّونَ بِكَلِّ تَرْوَيْحِيْنَ مَقَانَتُ تَرْوَيْهَا قَرَأَيْيْ كَمَا هُوَ مُكْتَبٌ أَهْلُ النَّيْمَةِ إِلَّا أَحَدُهُ، كَمَا عَلَى عَهْدِ عُمَّانْ مَعْتَصِمُونَ بِمَنْ فَسَاءَ مَعْتَصِمُونَ بِمَنْ شَأَّنَّ اللَّهَ وَهُمْ عَشْرُونَ وَأَرْضَيْهِمْ مَمْطُولُونَ عَلَى أَنْهُمْ كَانُوا يَصُلُّونَ بِكَلِّ تَرْوَيْحِيْنَ مَقَانَتُ تَرْوَيْهَا قَرَأَيْيْ كَمَا هُوَ مُكْتَبٌ أَهْلُ النَّيْمَةِ
Hanafi scholars. This line of argumentation is a reminder of what their Shaykh, Abdal Jalil Samrodi\textsuperscript{250} attempted to do, and he was refuted by his contemporary Hanafi Mufti, Abdur Rahim Lajpuri (b. 1903 – d. 2001 CE)\textsuperscript{251}.

They have also made a claim that the Hanafi Imam, Abu Ja’far al-Tahawi (ra) himself advocated 8 rak’ats! While others went further and claimed the same for Imam Abu Hanifa (ra). This will be replied upon later Insha’allah. But for now, let them see what their greatest authority in Hadith of this era declared in his final classifications for Jabir’s variant narrations below.

\textsuperscript{250} Indeed, the 2 compilers also advised their readers in this by saying on p. 49: “Please refer to the treatise of Shaikh Allaamah Abdul-Jaleel Saamroodee in this regard.”

\textsuperscript{251} The reader may find Mufti Abdar Rahim Lajpuri’s response to such claims by Samrodi and his followers here: http://www.mediafire.com/?mponnemoin
http://www.4shared.com/file/122247777/e7d18894/Radd_on_Samrodi_on_rakats_of_Taraweeh.html
AL-ALBANI’S FINAL VIEWS ON THE TWO VARIANTS FROM JABIR (RA) ON 8 RAK’ATS

Al-Albani mentioned his main views on the Rak’ats of Taraweeh in his Risala called Salatul Taraweeh. He had also edited the Sahih of Ibn Hibban with his personal notes of authentication and weakening of the narrations within it. This work was printed after his death under the title of al-Ta’liqat al-H isan ala Sahih ibn Hibban.

In the Sahih of Ibn Hibban, both variants from Jabir (ra) are recorded. The first narration that Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban mentioned was mentioned earlier as follows:

Jaabir (RadhiAllaahu Anhu) narrates that the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) led us in prayer in Ramadhaan and he prayed 8 rakhs and witr. (Saheeh Ibn Khuzaimah (2/138 no.1070), Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan

The following is what al-Albani mentioned in his Ta’liqat to Sahih ibn Hibban (vol. 4):
Thus, he declared this narration to be Hasan li-ghayrihi (good due to supporting narration(s)), and he mentioned that the wording “al-Witr” is not actually part of the Hadith but it should be “al-layl” (the night), based on the narration from A’isha (ra) as we have mentioned earlier from Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim. Despite his disagreeable opinion on this narration to be Hasan li-
ghayrihi, he said under footnote no. 2 that the wording for Witr is munkar (rejected) due to Isa ibn Jariyya having softness (fihi layyin) in his narrations, as Ibn Hajar indicated in his al-Taqrib al-Tahdhib (see earlier for the quote).

Al-Albani’s grading is not consistent nor meticulous for he knew A’isha’s narration found also in Sahih Ibn Hibban (no. 2533) as he mentioned, as well as in the Sahihayn, but he did not admit that all of these variants from A’isha (ra) do not mention the rak’ats performed by Allah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam).

Now, the second variant from Jabir (ra) as the two compilers mentioned as being:

On the authority of Jaabir (Radi-Allaahu Anhu) that Ubayy Ibn Ka’ab (Radi-Allaahu Anhu) came to the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) and said, “I did something yesterday night the Messenger of Allaah said, “What did you do?” he said, “Some women came to my house and said they did not know much Qur’an so we shall pray behind you and will listen to the Qur’aan.” So I led them in 8 rak’a’hs of prayer and offered the Witr prayer.” The Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) remained silent and thus it became the Sunnah.”

Is also found in Sahih Ibn Hibban, and what is surprising to note is al-Albani’s stance on this narration which goes to strengthen our claims regarding Isa ibn Jariyya’s narrations on 8 rak’ats to be da’eef. The following is a scan from al-Albani’s editing of Sahih Ibn Hibban:
ذكر الإيحة للHELLAR في شهر رمضان أت تَوَّهُ بِالنَّاسِ
الهلال جمعة:
040 - أخبرنا أبو عبيدة - قال: حدثنا عبد الأعلى بن حي بن عكرمة، حمل: حدثنا يعقوب بن أبي شيبة، قال: حدثنا عيسى بن جارية، قال: حدثنا جابر بن عبد الله، قال: جاء أبو عبيدة بكسرى إلى النبي ﷺ، فقال: يا رسول الله! كان ابن النبي ﷺ
 этому: في تَوَّهُ النَّاسِ؟ قال:
040 - 284

الصلاة 22 - فصل في الادرار

سميف - فصل في الادرار (79 - 80):
ذكر إحياء الإجراء للHELLAR في شهر رمضان جمعة:
260 - أخبرنا أحمد بن علي بن الناجي، قال: حدثنا عبد الأعلى بن جرار، قال: حدثنا يعقوب بن أبي شيبة، قال: حدثنا عيسى بن جارية، قال: حدثنا جابر بن عبد الله، قال:
جاء أبو عبيدة بكسرى إلى النبي ﷺ، فقال: يا رسول الله! كان ابن النبي ﷺ
فَصَلَّى بالجامع، قال: فصليت بهما فثاني ركعتان، ثم أوترت ؟ قال: فكان في الكرة ركعتين، ولم يذكَّ رضاء.
024 - 304 (5)

صميف - أماناً قلبه.
The above scan shows that there are 2 variants in Sahih Ibn Hibban (no. 2540 and 2541) from Jabir (ra) mentioning Ubayy ibn Ka'b (ra) allegedly leading some women for 8 rak'ats, and crucially, al-Albani declared both narrations to be da'eeef (weak)! The only reason that he could have done so is due to the weakness of Isa ibn Jariyya, and had he been consistent on the other variant mentioned above from Sahih Ibn Hibban, he would have done well to weaken the portion mentioning 8 rak'ats in its wording also.
Nasir al-Albani’s fellow Albanian countryman, Shaykh Shu’ayb al-Arna’ut, has also edited Sahih Ibn Hibban, and he has shown consistency in weakening both variants from Jabir (ra) via the route of Isa ibn Jariyya as follows:

Two variants of the first narration:
2415 - أخبرنا أبو بكر: حدثنا أبو البربع الزهرقي قال: حدثنا يعقوب بن عبد الله القمي قال:

 حدثنا عيسى بن جارية

 عن جابر بن عبد الله قال: صلى الله عليه وسلم في شهر رمضان ثمان ركعات وأوتر فلما كانت الليلة القبلة اجتمعنا في المسجد ورجنا أن يخرج فيصلي بننا فأقمنا فيه حتى أصبحنا فقنتنا: يا رسول الله رجنا أن تخرج فيصلي بننا قال: (إني كرهت - أو خشيت - أن يكتب عليكم الوتر).

(2) إسناد ضعيف لضعف عيسى بن جارية. وهو في (مسند أبي بكر).

Two variants of the second narration:

[جزء 6 - صفحة 290] صحيح ابن حبان

ذكر الإباحة للقارئ في شهر رمضان أن يؤم بالناسة التراويح جماعة

2549 - أخبرنا أبو بكر: حدثنا عبد الأعلى بن حماد النربي قال: حدثنا يعقوب القمي قال:

 حدثنا عيسى بن جارية. قال:

 حدثنا جابر بن عبد الله قال: جاء أبي بن أبي كعب إلى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال: يارسول

©SUNNICOURSES.COM 2009/1430 AH
It has already been mentioned earlier that the 2 variants narrations from Jabir (ra) are also found in the Musnad of Abu Y'la and the facts that its editor, Hussain Salim Asad al-Darani had also weakened both chains.

To conclude this section, it is thus not proven that Ubayy ibn Ka'b lead some women for 8 rak'ats in Ramadan, or al-Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) himself did so, and the narrations mentioning this all contain weakness due to Isa ibn Jariyya in their asanid (chains of transmission). It has also been shown that Isa also transmitted one variant from Ubayy (ra) leading women in Salah without mentioning the number of actual rak'ats as recorded in the Musnad of al-Farith ibn Abi Usama. This goes to re-inforce Ibn Adi’s claim that Isa’s narrations are ghayr mahfuza (not preserved properly).

Indeed, one is certain that Ubayy ibn Ka'b (ra) lead for 20 rak'ats as the narrations from Musnad ibn al Ja'd, Kitab al-Siyam of al-Firyabi, various works
by al-Bayhaqi, Musannaf Abdar Razzaq, and the one recorded by Ibn Mani in his Musnad and via his route by Diya al-Maqdisi in al-Mukhtaara all support each other to the level of it being clearly Sahih that Ubayy (ra) lead for 20 rak’ats. In addition to this are the supporting mursal narrations from Yazid ibn Ruman and Yahya ibn Sa’eed al-Qattan all mentioning 20 rak’ats from the days of Umar (ra). This is what al-Hafiz Ibn Abdal Barr also affirmed regarding Ubayy’s narration for 20 rak’ats. These latter narrations are more stronger in their authenticity, and if the one’s from Ubayy (ra) allegedly reporting his action for 8 were at least Hasan, then it conflicts with his own later action for 20 rak’ats in the days of Umar ibn al Khattab (ra).

The two compilers have not been able to quote any prominent Muhaddith from early times denying the strength of Ubayy’s (ra) variant narrations for 20 rak’ats to be da’eef, while it has been shown above that an early Muhaddith known as Abu Ahmed ibn Adi (d. 365 AH) had weakened the two variants for 8 rak’ats as transmitted via Isa ibn Jariyya back to Jabir ibn Abdullah (ra). As did Ibn Tahir al-Maqdisi (d. 507 AH) in line with Ibn Adi. Their view is stronger and preferable than those who came long after them. Additionally, a number of contemporay editors have already been mentioned who have also mentioned or declared weakness with Isa ibn Jariyya’s two variant narrations regarding 8 rak’ats.
Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban said on p. 29-30 of their "Qaul ul Saheeh":

Hence it is narrated from Imama Tahaawe that he said, "Without doubt the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) did not pray 20 raka'hs but rather he prayed 8 raka'hs and this is also the position of Ibn Humaam Hanafee and others." (See Radd ul-Mukhtaar Sharh Durr al-Mukhtaar (1/295).

The fallacy of their stance starts with their claim that it was Imam al-Tahawi (d. 321 AH) who was ascribed with the above quote! Rather, they meant the later Hanafi Imam known as Ahmed al-TAHTAWI (d. 1231 AH). The latter lived after Imam ibn al-Humam (d. 861 AH). As for their claim that some of the Hanafi Ulama themselves were in line for 8 rak'ats, then this line of misconstrued argumentation was also propagated by Abdal Jalil Samrodi as mentioned earlier.\(^{252}\)

\[\text{IMAM ABU YUSUF'S (d. 182 AH) NARRATION AFFIRMING 20 RAK'ATS AS THE HANAFI VIEW}\]

In his work, known as Kitab al-Athar (p. 41), Shaykh Yusuf the son of Imam Abu Yusuf, transmitted as follows (the words in brackets are my clarifications):

\(^{252}\)The reader may find Mufti Abdar Rahim Lajpuri's response to such claims by Samrodi and his followers here: http://www.mediafire.com/?mponncmoin or http://www.4shared.com/file/122247777/c7d18894/Radd_on_Samrodi_on_rakats_of_Taraweeh.html
Yusuf related from his father (Abu Yusuf) from Abu Hanifa from Hammad (ibn Abu Sulayman) from Ibrahim (al-Nakha'i):

“The people prayed 5 Tarweehat in Ramadan.”

The fact that Imam Abu Hanifah transmitted this narration from his teacher Hammad, who narrated from his teacher, the Faqih of Iraq, Imam Ibrahim al-Nakha'i, is a proof on the exact number of Rak'ats Imam Abu Hanifah accepted as well as his teachers and pupils after him, as well as his Madhhab. The Fatawa of Imam Ibrahim al Nakha'i are generally taken as a Hujja (definitive proof) within the Hanafi Madhhab. This narration from Ibrahim is a mursal type of narration and according to the Imam of al-Jarh wa Ta'dil in his age: Yahya ibn Ma'een, all the mursal narrations of Ibrahim are acceptable except 2 narrations, and the above narration does not fall under the 2 non-acceptable one's. 253

A Tarweeha is the name of the resting period after every 4 Rak'ats of Taraweeh Salah. After 5 resting periods this naturally tallies to a total of 20 Rak'ats of Taraweeh. Imam Ibrahim al-Nakha'i lived in the time of some of the Sahaba (Companions) and took many Hadith's and sayings from the students of the famous Sahabi, Abdullah ibn Masud (radiallahu anhu). The people he is referring to who offered 5 Tarweehat in Ramadan can only be either the Sahaba or their students from the major Tabi’in, like his famous teachers: Alqama, Aswad and their generation. This saying with this Sahih chain according to the Hanafi Hadith scholars is a decisive proof that Imam Abu Hanifah was of the view of 20 Rak’ats as were his teachers and his pupils.

IMAM AL-TAHAWI (d. 321 AH) ON 20 RAK’ATS TARAWEEH

It has been said earlier:

In his book known as Ikhtilaf al-Ulama (Differences of the Scholars on fiqh issues) which has reached us in the abridged format known as Mukhtasar Ikhtilaf al-Ulama lil-Tahawi254 by Imam Abu Bakr al-Jassas (d. 370 AH), the following is the verdict on the rak’ats of Taraweeh by Imam al-Tahawi:

253 See the Sunan al-Kubra of al-Bayhaqi, vol. 1/ p. 148, for this quote from ibn Ma’een

254 Printed by Dar al Bashair al-Islamiyya, Beirut, 1417 AH, ed. Dr Abdullah Nadhir Ahmed
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The above quote mentions al-Tahawi saying that “Our companions” (meaning the Hanafi Madhhab in aggregate) and al-Shafi’i held the position for 20 rak’ats besides the Witr, while Malik ibn Anas said it was 39 rak’ats with the Witr (of 3 rak’ats). Al-Tahawi also mentioned a variant from Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra) mentioning 20 rak’ats in the time of Umar (ra), as well as mentioning a (weaker chained) narration from Ali ibn Abi Talib (ra) ordering a man to pray with 20 rak’ats in Ramadan.

Hence, what can be concluded is that Imam al-Tahawi did not know of a practice of less than 20 rak’ats in his time or from the time right back to the days of Umar (ra). This quote also indirectly alludes to the point that Imam Abu Hanifa (ra) and his disciples also accepted 20 rak’ats Taraweeh.

We may also add that the above quote from Imam al-Tahawi serves to show also that despite his narrating the variant for 8 rak’ats Taraweeh via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf from Saa’ib ibn Yazid (ra) in his Sharh Ma’ani al-Athar, al-Tahawi did not advocate it to be the strongest narration to be acted upon, rather, the above quote mentions from him a variant of Saa’ib’s narration for 20 rak’ats as being a dalil (evidence) for not only the Hanafi’s, but also al-Shafi’i.

The two compilers said in their “Qaul ul Saheeh”, p. 50:

Imaam Shaafi’ee narrates the hadeeth, which is in Imaam Maaliks Muwatta from Imaam Maalik himself and says, (Ahkbarana) informed me Maalik from Muhammad bin Yoosuf from Sa’ib bin Yazeed who said Umar bin al-Khattaab commanded Ubayy bin Kaab and Tameem ad-Daaree to lead the people in 11 rak’hs. (See Sunan al-Kubraa (2/496), Sharh Ma’aneel-Althaar, Kunzul A’maal (8/263), Aathaaras-Sunan (pg.255) of Nimaweel.
What is now apparent is that Imam al-Sha’bī did not promote the narration for 11 rak’ats as transmitted to him by Imam Malik, nor did the latter, and nor did Imam al-Tahawi as is apparent from the above quote from the Mukhtasar Ikhtilaf al-Ulama. All of this is a subtle indication that such Imams knew of the weakness in the wording transmitted for 11 rak’ats in total from Muhammad ibn Yusuf, and had they thought it to be a Sahih narration free of any hidden defect (I’lla), then they wouldn’t be on record as promoting at least 20 rak’ats Taraweeh.

Indeed, the Maliki Muhaddith of his time, Abu Umar Yusuf ibn Abdal Barr is a witness to what is been said here decisively also. This will be re-iterated from him below.

**IMAM AL-SARAKHSI (d. 483 AH) ON 20 RAK’ATS:**

Imam Abu Bakr al-Sarakhsi, commonly known as Shams al-A’imma (The Sun of the Scholars) in his 30-volume encyclopaedia on Hanafi fiqh, known as al-Mabsut has discussed this issue. Imam al-Sarakhsi was highly versed in the vast majority of the proof texts used by the Hanafi School as well as the jurisprudence of its founding Imam Abu Hanifa and his disciples.

Imam al-Sarakhsi said in al-Mabsut (2/ 144):

“In our view Taraweeh is composed of twenty Rak’ats apart from witr. Malik, may A’llah most high have mercy upon him, said that in it (Taraweeh) is 36 Rak’ats. If anyone wishes to pursue the saying of Malik, may A’llah most high have mercy upon him, he must act according to the saying of Abu Hanifah, may A’llah most high have mercy upon him, and pray 20 Rak’ats as it is the Sunna...”

**THE FATWA OF QADI KHAN (d. 592 AH):**

One of the leading Hanafi Imams of the sixth century was al-Imam Fakhrud-D in Hasan ibn Mansur Awzjandi. In his famous work known as Fatawa Qadi Khan (1/ 112) he said:
In the later Hanafi School, the foremost Fatwa resource for the majority of Hanafi scholars is the views of Imam ibn Abidin of Syria. In his commentary to the Hanafi scholar: Allama Haskafi’s Durr al-Mukhtar known as Radd al-Mukhtar or simply as the Hashiyya of ibn Abidin (2/495), he said:

“His saying (al-Haskafi’s) : <<It is 20 Rak’ats>>: It is the saying of the majority and upon it is the practice of the people in the East and the West, and from Malik 36 rak’ats...”

The Hashiyya of ibn Abidin is based on many Hanafi fiqh books before his day and usually details the strongest position from within the Hanafi Madhhab. Those people who claim that Imam Abu Hanifa was also an advocate for 8 rak’ats should take note of the above statements from well known Hanafi Imams; since the dependable position (mu’tamad) of the Madhhab is 20 Rak’ats as the early Imam, Abu Ja’far al-Tahawi mentioned.
A WEAK VIEW ATTRIBUTED TO IMAM ABU HANIFA AND IMAM AL SHAYBANI

BY BADIUD-DIN AL-SINDI

The "Salafi" magazine known as al-Ibaanah quoted their late scholar, Badiud-Din as-Sindi as claiming that Imam Abu Hanifa and Imam Muhammad ibn Hasan al-Shaybani preferred 11 rak'ahs! He claimed:

"Rather, what is apparent from looking into al-Muwatta of Imam Muhammad (one of the main students of Abu Haneefah) is that Abu Haneefah's madhhab was to pray eleven rak'ahs. So Imam Muhammad includes a chapter in al-Muwatta (p. 110), stating: 'Chapter: Establishing the Night Prayer in the month of Ramadhaan, and the virtues contained in it.' Under this chapter he relates four ahaadeeth. The first, third and fourth narrations do not make mention of any specified number of rak'ahs for the Taraaweeh Prayer, rather they just mention the excellence of establishing Prayer in congregation and the excellence of the night Prayer in Ramadhaan. However, in the second narration eleven rak'at is mentioned. Then Imaam Muhammad said (p. 111): "And we take all of this." ... Thus, he has shown that his madhhab is eleven rak'ahs, and this can only be the madhhab of Imam Abu Haneefah - rahmatullaah alayhi - as well."

Reply:

This assertion made by al-Sindi is not the Hanafi view or of its scholars. As for what he claimed from the Muwatta of Imam Muhammad, then this is a grave distortion of what Imam Muhammad actually implied. The Muwatta of Imam Muhammad is actually, what al-Shaybani transmitted from Imam Malik ibn Anas. The second narration that al-Sindi referred to from this recension of the Muwatta is from A'isha (radiallahu anha), and it does mention the rak'ats to be 11; but it does not refer to the Taraaweeh prayer, but the Tahajjud prayer.

255 No. 3/April 96, pp. 39
The fact that it refers to Tahajjud has been demonstrated earlier under the chapter heading: **A look at how the Ulama applied A’isha’s (ra) narrations on 8 rak’ats to Tahajjud and not Taraweeh.** The reader is advised to review that section for further clarification.

The Tahajjud prayer is also performed in Ramadan and it consists of 8 rak'ats followed by the Witr prayer of 3 rak'ats, hence adding up to 11 rak'ats. This is why Imam Muhammad declared: "And we take all of this." If Imam Muhammad had rejected 20 rak'ats, he would have mentioned it in at least one of his major works, which the Hanafi scholars rely upon to infer the views of the Hanafi Madhhab.

It is also strange how al-Sindi dared to make such an ascription to Imam Muhammad, and his teacher, Imam Abu Hanifa, since none of the early Hanafi scholars deduced this from any of the two Imams statements or works. The verdict mentioned by Imam al-Tahawi in his Ikhtilaf al-Ulama is a decisive proof that all Hanafi’s before, and in his time, only knew of 20 rak'ats to be the Madhhab of Abu Hanifa and his disciples.

The reader may also review the last section where the actual Hanafi position has been outlined, specifically the quote from Imam Abu Yusuf’s Kitab al-Athar.
IMAM MALIK’S VIEW WAS NO LESS THAN 20 RAK’ATS TARAVEEH

In the Maliki Fiqh work, which comprises many of the famous Fatwa’s of Imam Malik ibn Anas with chains of transmission (Asanid) known as al-Mudawwana al-Kubra\(^{256}\), compiled by Qadi Sahnun (d. 240 AH), the official view of Imam Malik’s Madhhab is written as follows:

"Ibn al-Qasim said, ‘The Rak’ats (of Taraweeh) with witr are thirty nine, thirty six rak’ats and three witr .’

This is the most authentic Maliki opinion with a known and authentic chain of transmission. As for the claim that Imam Malik was for 8 Rak’ats or 11 with the addition of the 3 Rak’ats, then the claimants need to provide an authentic narration from Imam Malik affirming this as well as explaining why the Master commentator on the Muwatta of Imam Malik that has been quoted earlier (Ibn Abdal Barr) knew no other position other than 36 Rak’ats and 3 Rak’ats of witr from Imam Malik.

Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban also stated on p. 49 in dismissal of Ibn al Qasim’s report the following:

As for the narration of 39 from Imaam Maalik from Ibn al-Qaasim (in Mudawwanah) Then firstly clearly contradicts the more authentic narration from Imaam Maalik mentioning 1 rakâhs.

\(^{256}\) See vol.1/ p. 222
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Secondly although Ibn al-Qaasim was trustworthy, the issues he narrates from Imaam Maalik need to be looked into because Imaam Abu Zuhah said, “The People talk about (negatively) the issues Ibn al-Qaasim mentions from Maalik.” (Kitaab adh-Dhu’afa (pg.534)

In their poor grammar they meant 11 rak’ats and not “1 raka’hs.” First off, they have not been able to show with a sahih sanad back to ImamMalik for 11 rak’ats to be free of error in its wording, or that Imam Malik himself acted upon 11 rak’ats!

Secondly, they have not been able to quote a single authority that dismissed Ibn al-Qasim’s narration for 39 rak’ats from his Shaykh, ImamMalik, as recorded by al-Sahhun in his Mudawwana, from his Shaykh, Ibn al-Qasim. Thus, we have a connected chain found in a recognized Maliki fiqh work saying that Imam Malik was for 39 Rak’ats inclusive of Witr, while the likes of these two anti-Madhhabi writers tried to denounce this specific report by saying: “Imaam Abu Zur’ah said, “The People talk about (negatively) the issues Ibn al-Qaasim mentions from Maalik.” (Kitaab adh-Dhu’afa (pg.534)”

As for what they mentioned from Imam Abu Zur’a al-Razi then the people talking about Ibn al-Qasim’s reports from Imam Malik is not a detailed criticism (Jarh Mufassar), and it is thus a vague form of criticism (Jarh Mubham). Imam Abu Zur’a has not specifically criticised or rejected the narration that Ibn al-Qasim related 39 rak’ats from Imam Malik, nor has anyone been quoted by these two compilers from the other students of Imam Malik narrating anything less than 20 rak’ats from him. For this reason, the narration from Ibn al Qasim in the Mudawwana of al-Sahhun is acceptable and Ibn Abdal Barr is in line with what Ibn al Qasim has affirmed from Imam Malik.

Additionally, an abridged edition of the Mudawwana of al-Sahhun has been produced by the 4th century Maliki Imam, Abu Sa’eed al-Bara’ızee al-Azdi al-Qayrawani, and printed under the title of al-Tahdhib fi Iktisar al-Mudawwana. On p. 373 it mentioned that the only known Malikite position was for 39 rak’ats inclusive of 3 rak’ats of witr as the following quote shows:

257 Dar al-Buhuth lil-dirasat al-Islamiyya wa Ihya al-turath, Dubai, 1st edn, 1999 CE, edited by Muhammad al-Amin
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It should also be noted that Imam Abu Zur’a has also made ta’dil (praiseworthy accreditation) on Ibn al Qasim as recorded by Ibn Abi Hatim al-Razi in his Kitab al-Jarh wa Ta’dil (5/279, no. 1325) as follows:

Thus, Abu Zur’a had declared Ibn al Qasim to be a Trustworthy Egyptian who was an upright man. Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani has also declared Ibn al Qasim to be Thiqa in al-Taqrib as follows:

In the Mukhtasar (abridged) edition of Ibn Nasr’s Qiyam al-Layl it mentioned the following from Imam Malik as ascribed back to Ibn al Qasim:
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This narration if proven to be authentic mentions Imam Malik holding it to be 39 rak'ats with witr; and it has been mentioned already from Ibn Abdal Barr the following from his al-Tamheed (8/113) that Imam Malik was for 39 rak'ats inclusive of witr; and this was the old practice:

فقال مالك تسع وثلاثون بالوثر ست وثلاثون والوثر ثلاث وزعم أنه الأمر القديم

Ibn Abdal Barr's later judgement from his al-Istidhkar will be mentioned towards the end of this treatise.

Imam Ibn Abi Zayd al-Qayrawani (b. 310 AH – d. 386 AH), who is known as “the little Malik” has also affirmed no less than 20 rak'ats Taraweeh in his well known Risala on Malikí fiqh. The following is what he mentioned (in blue) with the commentary (known as al-Thamral Dani) of Shaykh Salih Abdal Sami al-Abi al-Azhari:

23.16d. How the Salaf first did them

The righteous people of the first community used to do these prayers in the mosque. They did twenty rak'as followed by three rak'as two for shafí and one for witr with a salam in between.

[These are the Companions, peace be upon all of them. They did them in the time of 'Umar ibn al-Khattab in the mosque with 20 rak'ats That is preferred by a group, including Abu Hanifa, ash-Shafi'i and Ahmad, and the action now does that followed by the shafí and witr. Abu Hanifa says that there is no salam between the two, and ash-Shafi says that there is a choice.]

23.16e. The later practice of the Salaf

Later they began praying thirty-six rak'as not including the shafí and witr. Both of these are acceptable.

[Then the Salaf other than the first Salaf, namely the Tabi'un, increased it. 'Umar ibn 'Abdu'l-'Aziz commanded that to do that since it contained benefit because they were making the recitation long which caused boredom and weariness, and so he commanded}
them to shorten the recitation and increase the rak’ats. That which 'Umar ibn 'Abdu'l-'Aziz did was preferred by Malik in the Mudawwana.]

It has already been mentioned that other Malikis like Abul Walid al-Baji and Qadi Abu Bakr ibn al A’rabi also affirmed that Imam Malik affirmed at least 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh, when we said:

The Maliki Imam, **Abul Walid al-Baji** (d. 474 AH) has mentioned the following in his commentary to the Muwatta Malik known as al-Muntaqa Sharh Muwatta Malik: 258

The above quote mentions the points that Imam Malik preferred 39 rak’ats Taraweeh inclusive of 3 rak’ats Witr, while his one time disciple, Imam al-Shafi’i preferred 20 rak’ats Taraweeh based upon the narration of Yazid ibn Ruman.

258 2/149 (Darul Kutub Ilmiyya edn, Beirut, 1st edn, 1999)
Imam Abu Bakr ibn al-Arabi al-Maliki (d. 543 AH) also mentioned similar to al-Baji that Imam Malik preferred 39 rak‘ats with the witr and the point that al-Shafi‘i preferred 20 rak‘ats based on the mursal narration of Yazid ibn Ruman. This is what Ibn al A‘rabi said in his al-Masalik fi Sharh Muwatta Malik.²⁵⁹

Qadi Abul Walid Ibn Rushd al-Maliki (d. 595 AH) has mentioned the following in his well known Bidayatul Mujtahid²⁶⁰:

“They disagreed about the preferred number of rak‘as that are to be undertaken by the people during the nights of Ramadan. Malik, in one of his opinions, Abu Hanifa, al-Shafi‘i, Ahmad, and Dawud preferred twenty rak‘as excluding witr. Ibn al Qasim has recorded from Malik that he used to prefer thirty six rak‘as²⁶¹ plus three of witr.

The reason for their disagreement comes from the conflict of transmission over this, as Malik has related from Yazid ibn Ruman that he said, ‘The people, in the time of Umar, used to pray twenty three rak‘as.’ Ibn Abi Shayba has reported from Dawud ibn Qays, who said, ‘I prayed with the people during the time of Umar ibn Abdal Aziz and Abban ibn Uthman and they used to pray thirty six

²⁵⁹ 2/481 (Dar al Gharb al Islami, Beirut, 1st edn, 2007)


²⁶¹ The translator (Imran Nyazee) mentioned in the footnote (no. 158): “The reason behind this number, Allah knows best, was that those in Mecca performed circumambulation around the Kba between each set of four rak‘as in Tarawih. Those in Medina, to compensate for this, added four rak‘as for each tawaf. This made sixteen (4x4) additional rak‘as, making it a total of thirty six (20+16) of tarawih.”
rak’as and offered (another) three as witr.’ Ibn al-Qasim has reported from Malik that this was the earlier directive, that is, praying thirty six rak’as.”

Note, Ibn Rushd never knew of 8 rak’ats being the practice of the Sahaba, let alone the successors (tabi’in) and their successors (taba tabi’in), and this includes Imam Malik. What he mentioned is similar to what the earlier Maliki Muhaddith, Ibn Abdal Barr mentioned in his al-Istidhkar.

It has already been said earlier that:

The Shafi’i Imam, al-Nawawi, said in his voluminous work known as al-Majmu Sharh al-Muhadhhab (4/ 32)\(^{262}\) (comments in brackets are mine):

“Our Madhhab (Shafi’i school) it is 20 Rak’ats with ten salams (meaning the salams after every two Rak’ats) besides the Witr. and that is 5 Tarweehat and a Tarweeha is 4 RaK’ats with two tasleems (meaning after every 2 Rak’ats there is a salam to the right and left side). this is our Madhhab. and it is also the saying of Abu Hanifah and his Companions Ahmed (ibn Hanbal). Dawud (ibn Ali al-Zahir) and other than them, and it has been transmitted by al-Qadi Iyad[a Maliki Imam] from the majority of the scholars...”

Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani has also mentioned in his Fath al-Bari that in Madina in the time of Umar ibn Abdal Aziz and Aban ibn Uthman the people stood for 36 rak’ats and 3 rak’ats witr; and Malik said it was the old command to them, meaning the performance of such a number of rak’ats was what Imam Malik only knew in his time and well before:

\(^{262}\) Al-Majmu Sharh al-Muhadhhab of al-Nawawi, printed with Fath al-Aziz of al-Rafi’i (d. 623 AH) in the middle section and Talkhees al-Habeer fi Takhreej Ahadith al-Rafii al-Kabeer of al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852 AH) in the footnotes; printed by Idara al Tabafil-Muniriyya, Cairo, no date given
Ibn Hajar’s young student, Imam al-Suyuti also affirmed that Imam Malik’s position was for 36 rak’ats in his article on Taraweeh known as al-Masabih as follows:

This section is conclusive in demonstrating the fact that the following Maliki Ulama from early times all affirmed at least 20 rak’ats to be the Madhhab of Imam Malik, and no reliable evidence exists to affirm that Imam Malik was an advocate for 8 rak’ats Taraweeh:

i) Ibn al Qasim (d. 191 AH) - as quoted in the Mudawwana of Qadi Sahnun al-Maliki (d. 240 AH)

ii) Ibn Abi Zayd al-Qayrawani (d. 386 AH)

iii) Abu Sa’eed al-Bara-zi’ee al-Azdi al-Qayrawani (4th century)

iv) Ibn Abdal Barr (d. 463 AH)

v) Abul Walid al-Baji (d. 474 AH)

vi) Abu Bakr ibn al Arabi (d. 543 AH)

vii) Qadi Iyad (d. 544 AH)
viii) Ibn Rushd (d. 595 AH)

Additionally, the above section has also mentioned that the Shafi’ite Imam, Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani himself knew that the view of Imam Malik was for 36 rak’ats plus 3 rak’ats witr.
WEAK VIEWS ASCRIBED TO IMAM MALIK
A REPLY TO BADI UD-DIN AL-SINDI

In an article entitled: The Four Imaams on Taraweeh Prayer. The compiler(s) claimed:

Imaam Maalik (d.179H) (rahimahullaah) also supports eleven rak’ahs, as Shaykhul Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned in al Ikhtiyaraat (p.38) and as Jalaalud-Deen as- Suyootee mentions in al-Haawee lil Fataawaa (p.350), where he said: al-Jooree, one of our companions said, from Maalik who said: "That which ‘Umar Ibnul-Khattaab gathered the people upon is more beloved to us, and that was eleven rak’ahs, and that was the prayer of Allaah’s Messenger (sallallaahu ‘alayhi wasallam)." It was said to him: Eleven rak’abs with the Witr. So he said: Yes, and thirteen is close." Then he said: "I do not know from where they have introduced these numerous rukoo’s (bowings)." (2)

The last quote was referenced in footnote no. 2 to Tanqeedus-Sadeed bi Risaalati Ijtihaad wat-Taqleed (p.266-268) of Badee’ud-Deen as-Sindee.

Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban also mentioned similarly in their “Qaul ul Saheeh” (p. 50):

Imaam Suyootee mentions the position of Imaam Maalik and says: Allaamah Jauree informed us concerning Imaam Maalik that his statement was 11 rak’ahs of Taraaweeh was beloved to him because Umar (Radhiyallahu Anhu) also gathered the people to pray 11 rak’ahs and the prayer of the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) was also 11 rak’ahs. Another narration mentions 13 rak’ahs with witr, now I do not know where these additional rak’ahs have come from.” (al-Masaabeeh Fee Salaatul-Taraaweeh (2/77). Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah also mentions 11 rak’ahs to be position of Imaam Maalik (see his Ikhtiyaraat ilmiyyah (pg.38)

263 Published in, al-Istiqaamah magazine, issue No 5 Ramadaan 1417H / January 1997 - 329 -
Imaam Badee uddeen says after mentioning the above statement of Imaam Suyootee, We find the following things from the words of Imaam Maalik,

(1) The Imaam (Maalik) held the position of 11 raka’hs and not 20.

(2) This amount was beloved and favoured with him

(3) This number (of 11) was also acted upon by Umar.

(4) This is the number which Umar gathered the companions upon and this is what the Ijmaa is upon.

(5) This is also the number prayed by the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee-Was-Sallam)

(6) There is no evidence as regards to an increase to 11 raka’hs.

(7) According to Imaam Maalik this increase (ie more than 11) is something new and created in the religions.

Reply:

The above quotes emanate ultimately from Badiud-Din al-Sindi, the Shaykh of Zubair Ali Za’i. The latter being the authority for Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibban.

Firstly, the work mentioned above as al-Ikhtiyarat was compiled by Shaykh Alaud-Din Abul Hasan Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Abbas al-Ba’li al-Dimashqi, who based it on the verdicts of Ibn Taymiyya. As for the page reference they mentioned, here is what Badiud-Din in al-Sindi was referring to:
The tadlis (deceptive quoting) of Badiud-Din al-Sindi:

The above Arabic quote was also mentioned in a well known pseudo-Salafi Fatwa website as follows from the words of Ibn Taymiyya:

If a person prays Taraaweeh according to the madhhab of Abu Haneefah, al-Shaafa`i and Ahmad, with twenty rak`ahs, or according to the madhhab of Maalik, with thirty-six rak`ahs, or with thirteen or eleven rak`ahs, he has done well, as Imam Ahmad said, because there is nothing to specify the number. So the greater or lesser number of rak`ahs depends on how long or short the qiyaam (standing in the prayer) is. Al-Ikhtiyaar, p. 64

What the late Badiud-Din al-Sindi clearly avoided mentioning from the above quote in al-Ikhtiyarat was that it mentions that the Madhhab of Abu Hanifa, al-Shafi`i and Ahmed ibn Hanbal was for 20 rak`ats! As for the Madhhab of Malik it was ascribed to have held the view for 36 rak`ats, 13 or 11 rak`ats! It is rather surprising that al-Sindi failed to mention all of this, and his disseminators made out as though only the view for 11 rak`ats was mentioned by ibn Taymiyya!

Besides this, what is clear is that even Ibn Taymiyya knew no second opinion for the Madhhabs of Abu Hanifa, al-Shafi`i or ibn Hanbal, besides it being 20 rak`ats. As for the position for 11 and 13 rak`ats ascribed to be a Maliki view, then this is not the view of most of the Maliki fuqaha (jurisprudents). It has already been mentioned above what the most famous view of the Maliki Madhhab is, and it is no less than 20 rak`ats.

Ibn Taymiyya on the narrations for 20 Rak`ats

What the likes of Badiud-Din al-Sindi and his followers would have done good to mention was what the same pseudo-Salafi Fatwa site has mentioned from Ibn Taymiyya as follows:

---
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Ibn Taymiyah (may Allaah have mercy on him) said in Majmoo al-Fataawa (23/112):

It is proven that Ubayy ibn Ka‘b used to lead the people in praying twenty rak‘ahs in qiyaam in Ramadaan, and he used to pray Witr with three rak‘ahs. Many scholars think that this is the Sunnah, because he established that among the Muhaajireen and Ansaar and no one objected to that. Others regarded it as mustahabb to pray thirty-nine rak‘ahs, based on the fact that this was the practice of the people of Madeenah in the past. End quote.

As for their quote:

Ibn Taymiyah (may Allaah have mercy on him) said in Majmoo al-Fataawa (23/113):

When Ubayy ibn Kāb led them in praying qiyaam in a single congregation, he could not make them stand for too long, so he increased the number of rak‘ahs to make up for the long standing. So they doubled the number of rak‘ahs. He used to pray eleven or thirteen rak‘ahs of qiyaam al-layl, then it seems that after that the people of Madeenah found it difficult to stand for so long during the recitation, so they increased the number of rak‘ahs until it reached thirty-nine. End quote.

Then, there appears to be no Sahih narration indicating that the Sahaba prayed 8 rak‘ats initially, and then increased the number to 20 rak‘ats. These are merely assertions made by some scholars to harmonise the two sets of narrations from Sa‘îb ibn Yazid (ra).

They also quoted their late grand Mufti (Bin Baz) as saying:

Shaykh Ibn Baaz (may Allaah have mercy on him) said in Majmoo al-Fataawa (11/322):

It is proven that ‘Umar (may Allaah be pleased with him) told the one whom he appointed among the Sahaabah to pray eleven rak‘ahs, and it is proven that they prayed twenty-three
rak’ahs based on his command. This indicates that the matter is broad in scope and that the matter was flexible according to the Sahaba. That is also indicated by the words of the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him): ‘The night prayers are two by two.’

End quote.

What is conclusively proven to the majority is that the Sahaba prayed 20 rak’ats in congregation in Umar ibn al-Khattab’s (ra) time, and as for them allegedly praying 8 rak’ats (plus 3 Witr) as Bin Baz mentioned, then this is a view that is not conclusively established, but rather the narration from the Muwatta Malik they use to assert this via the route of Muhammad ibn Yusuf is an error in the wording from the latter, as Imam Ibn Abdal Barr al-Maliki has been mentioned earlier as demonstrating.

**Who was al-Juri?**

Secondly, as for the quote from Imam al-Suyuti’s al-Hawi lil Fatawi, then, Al-Juri was not a Maliki, because they quoted from al-Suyuti as saying: “One of our companions.” What they failed to mention was that al-Suyuti was quoting Imam Taqiud-Din al-Subki mentioning the quote from al-Juri, as shown earlier on from his Sharh al-Minhaj.

This means that al-Juri was a Shafi’i like al-Subki, and he was not a student of Imam Malik, nor did he provide any evidence from Imam Malik’s works, let alone other Maliki scholars, who have affirmed at least 20 rak’ats. This whole narration provides no evidence that Imam Malik preferred 11, because it contradicts what is established from the early Maliki Madhhab via an authentic isnad related by Qadi Sahnun, from Ibn al-Qasim, who affirmed 36 rak’ats as has been mentioned above.

---

266 The quotation is actually from al-Suyuti’s Risala known as *al-Masabih fi Salatul Taraweeh*, which has been included in his al-Hawi lil Fatawi
Al-Albani in his “Salatul Taraweeh” attempted to identify who was al-Juri and in the process he named three different individuals that may be the one mentioned in al-Suyuti’s above quotation. On the other hand, Isma’il al-Ansari in his refutation of al-Albani’s above named work on Taraweeh, entitled, *Tashih Hadith Salatil Taraweeh Ishrin rak’a wal radd ala al-Albani fi Tad’ifihi* (p. 20). Identified al-Juri to be **Ali ibn al-Hussain al-Qadi Abul Hasan al-Juri** based on his biography in Imam Tajud-Din al-Subki’s, *Tabaqat al-Shafiyya al-Kubra*. 268

This precise al-Juri was a student of Imam Abu Bakr al-Naysaburi’s. The latter Imam was born in the year 238 AH and died in 324 AH as mentioned by Tajud-Din al-Subki in his *Tabqat al-Shafiyya*. 269 Hence, if it is this specific al-Juri that was quoted by Imam Tajiud-Din al-Subki, then it is apparent that he was born well after the death of Imam Malik ibn Anas (d. 179 AH). This leads to the point that this specific al-Juri never heard from or met Imam Malik and thus the report is munqati (broken chained), hence, weak and rejected since it contradicts the well established report from Ibn al-Qasim that the only known practice of Imam Malik was for 36 rak’ats.

What shows that al-Juri’s narration ascribed to Imam Malik is gharib (unusual) is the point claiming that Imam Malik said:

*Then he said: “I do not know from where they have introduced these numerous rukoo’s (bowings).”*

It is strange that Imam Malik would have said this when it is known from his own Muwatta that he knew of Yazid ibn Ruman’s narration for 23 rak’ats with the witr. As well as the report he narrated from Yahya ibn Sa’eed al-Qattan for 20 rak’ats as recorded in the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba. The two compilers also mentioned this latter narration when they said in their “Qaul ul Saheeh” (p. 18):

---

268 See p. 79

269 3/310, no. 200
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The Third Narration — Of Yahyaa bin Sa’eed

Ibn Abee Shaybah in his Musannaf narrates from Wakee from Maalik from Yahyaa bin Sa’eed that Umar bin al-Khattaab ordered a man to lead them in prayer for 20 rak’ahs. (Musannaf Ibn Abee Shaybah (2/89/2).

Both of these narrations are mursal, and such narrations are acceptable to Imam Malik and Imam Abu Hanifa, but the two compilers did not wish their readers to know this point with much significance.

Imam Al-Tirmidhi never recorded this view attributed to Malik for 11 rak'ats in his al-Jami, or to anyone else. The scholars of Hadith prefer a Sahih isnad to a statement attributed to an individual without an isnad. This is sufficient to show the unreliability of their claim based on a chainless narration from a certain al-Juri.

Hence, the conclusions of al-Sindi are not only baseless but go against the judgements of great Muhaddithin who not only accepted al-Bayhaqi’s narration from Umar’s time stating 20 rak’ats, but more than a dozen of them have been quoted earlier saying it is Sahih in some manner. This includes the fact that even people from the same sect as al-Sindi accepted our position on its authenticity in line with the majority of scholars, namely, what was seen from Abdar Rahman al-Muallimi, Abdal Qadir al-Arna’ut, Hamud al-Tuwayjiri and Mustafa al-Adawi.

The two compilers also mentioned on p. 50 of their treatise:

Shaikh Ainee Hanafee mentioned the position of Imaam Maalik himself was that he prayed 11 raka’hs. (see Umdatul-Qaaree (11/127).

What they were referring to was mentioned in the printed edition of Umdatul Qari with this wording:

وقبل إحدى عشرة ركعة وهو اختيار مالك لنفسه

- 335 -
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Now, whether or not Imam al-Ayni said this or not with full discernment is debatable, for it may be that a scribe(s) who copied Umdat al-Qari may have made an error in transcribing the text, or it may be that al-Ayni actually wrote this but erred in his claim while ascribing this position to Imam Malik for 11 rak’ats.

What tends to indicate that someone may have erred in this ascription to Imam Malik is that Imam al-Ayni has also mentioned the view of Imam Malik in the same Umdat al-Qari (11/125) with conviction that the most well known position (mashhur) known from Imam Malik is actually for 36 rak’ats and 3 rak’ats of witr. Al-Ayni said:

المشهور عن مالك ست وثلاثون و الوتر ثلاث و واحد و وقف ست و ثلاثون وهو الذي عليه عمل أهل المدينة

Also, al-Ayni mentioned in an earlier volume to his Umdat al-Qari (7/177) that Imam Malik’s position was for 36 rak’ats:

الثاني أن عدها عشرون ركعة ووه قال الشافعي وأحمد ونقوله القاضي عن جمهور العلماء وحكي أن الأسود بن يزيد كان يقوم بأربعين ركعة ويبعث بين وعند مالك ستة وثلاثون ركعة غير الوتر واحتم على ذلك بعمل أهل المدينة واحتم أصحابنا والشافعي والحنابلة بما رواه البهيلي بإسناد صحيح عن السائب بن يزيد الصحابي قال كانوا يقومون على عهد عمر رضي الله تعالى عنه بنن ركعة وعلى عهد عثمان وعلي رضي الله تعالى عنهما مثلاً وهو من المغني عن علي أنه أورجلاً أن يصلي بهم في رمضان بعشرين ركعة قال وهذا كالجماع (فإن فلت) قال في الموطأ عن يزيد بن رومان قال كان الناس في زمن عمر يقومون في رمضان بثلاث وعشرين ركعة.

It has also been mentioned earlier in this treatise that Imam al-Ayni had mentioned in his al-Binaya fi Sharh al-Hidaya that Imam Malik’s view was for 9 Tarweehat which equates to 36 Rak’ats (viz. 20 Rak’ats Taraweeh + 16 rak’ats of individual nafl during the rest period) besides the Witr:

\[270\] Vol. 1/659, Dar al-Fikr edition
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Hence, what is correct is that in 2 places of Umdat al-Qari he mentioned Imam Malik’s view being 36 rak’ats, as he did once in his al-Binaya. This seems to indicate that the quote for 11 rak’ats in Umdat al-Qari (11/127) may be an error in transcription of a scribe(s) or an error on al-Ayni’s part. Wallahu a’lam.

Nevertheless, the most acknowledged position from Imam Malik is what has been mentioned above from some famous Maliki Ulama, and it is no less than 20 rak’ats in essence.
THE MOST WELL KNOWN POSITION OF IMAM IBN HANBAL AND HIS MADHHAB

It has been stated earlier:

Indeed, **Abul Qasim Umar ibn al Hussain al-Khiraqi** also mentioned 20 rak’ats as being the only Hanbali view in his al-Mukhtasar (p. 31). This is al-Khiraqi, who died in the year 334 AH, and received fiqh from the line of those who received it directly from Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal. Al-Khiraqi said:

وقيام شهر رمضان عشرون ركعة

**Meaning:** “The standing (in Salah) in the month of Ramadan is 20 rak’ats.”

It has also been mentioned earlier that the Hanbali faqih, Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi (d. 620 AH) has also affirmed Imam Malik’s view to be 36 rak’ats in al-Mughni (2/167), as well as affirming it to be the position of Imam’s, Sufyan al-Thawri, Abu Hanifa, al-Shafi’i and Ibn Hanbal:

“A nd what is preferred with A bu A bdullah (A hmed ibn H anbal), may A llah have mercy upon him, in it (Taraaweeh) is 20 Rak’ats and with this is the saying of: (Sufyan) al-Thawri, A bu H anifah, al-Shafi’i, and Malik said 36 Rak’ats...”

Imam Ibn Hanbal holding it to be 20 rak’ats was also affirmed by Imam Ibn Abdal Barr as will be seen below.
IMAM ABU BAKR IBN AL ARABI’S FINAL POSITION ON THE RAK’ATS OF TARAWEEH

With regard to the Maliki Muhaddith known as al-Qadi Abu Bakr ibn al Arabi (d. 543 AH), the two compilers claimed on p. 50 of their “Qaul ul Saheeh”:

Imaam Ibn al-Arabi (the author of Ahkaam al-Quraan and not the Kaafir soofee Ibn Arabi) said after bringing the various reports of the number of raka’hs for Taraaweeh says, “The correct position is that Taraaweeh is 11 raka’hs. The Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) prayed 11 raka’hs and the origin of more raka’hs is not established. Then why should not this be adhered to, the limit to which was adhered to in the time of the Prophet when the Messenger of Allaah’s prayer as 11 raka’hs in the month of Ramadhaan or in any other month, hence following him is obligatory” (A’aridhal Ahwadhee Sharh Jaami at-Tirmidhee (4/19).

Reply:

The quote from Ibn al-Arabi appears to be his earlier position as ascribed to his commentary known as A’ridatul Ahwazi. Ibn al-Arabi has also left two commentaries on the Muwatta of Imam Malik. The first being his al-Qabas fi Sharh Muwatta Malik ibn Anas and the later one was his al-Masalik ila Muwatta Malik.

The A’rida was finalized in the year 540 AH as can be adduced from the printed edition. The Qabas was dictated to a student in the year 532 AH - some 11

271 A’ridatul Ahwazi (13/540), Darul Kutub Imiyya edition
272 The printed edition of al-Qabas (1/66, Dar al-Gharb al Islami, 1st edn, Beirut, 1992 CE) mentioned this date from the scribe known as Abul Qasim Abdar Rahman ibn Muhammad ibn Abdullah ibn Yusuf ibn Hubaysh
years before the Imam’s death. In his A’rida (8/ 218), Ibn al Arabi referred to his Qabas, thus indicating that the A’rida was a later work than the Qabas.

In his Masalik (1/ 331), Qadi ibn al Arabi referred to his al-Qabas at least once, thus indicating that al-Masalik was a later work than his al-Qabas. What proves that al-Masalik was not only compiled later than his Qabas, but also his A’rida, is the point that in the Masalik the scribe has referred to the A’rida (3/ 15, 4/ 99, 4/ 167).

Assuming that al-Masalik was a work composed later than the A’rida and al-Qabas, Ibn al Arabi mentioned the difference of opinion on the rak’ats of Taraweeh in his al-Masalik (2/ 481). In the latter work, he mentioned that Imam Malik preferred 39 rak’ats (inclusive of the Witr) while Imam al-Shafi’i preferred 20 rak’ats based on the narration from Yazid ibn Ruman as found in the Muwatta Malik. Scanned quote from the last reference:

Since, Ibn al Arabi did not oppose what these Imams held; it is safe to assume that since he was a Maliki, he was finally in line with his Madhhab for 36 rak’ats Taraweeh. He did not propose that the upper limit should be 8 rak’ats and 3 for Witr in the Masalik. Wallahu a’lam.

---

273 Printed by Dar al-Gharb al-Islami, 1st edn, Beirut, 2007 CE
Al-Hafiz ibn Abdal Barr in his later work known as Al-Istidhkar,\textsuperscript{274} which is a further commentary to the Muwatta of Imam Malik said (comments in brackets are mine or the Arabic mentioned in the original text):

وهو قول جمهور العلماء وبه قال抛弃وين واشافعي وأكثر الفقهاء وهو الصحيح عن أبي بن كعب (من غير خلاف من الصحابة وقال عطاء أدرك الناس ولهم يصلون ثلاثين وعشرين ركعة بالوتر وكان الأسود) بن يزيد يصلى أربعين ركعة ويوتر بسبع وذكر بن القاسم عن مالك تسعة وثلاثون والوتر ثلاث وزعم أنه الأمر القديم وذكر بن أبي شيبة قال حدثنا عبد الرحمن بن مهدي عن داود بن قيس قال أدرك الناس بالمدينة في زمن عمر بن عبد العزيز وأبائل بن عثمان يصلون ستة وثلاثين ركعة ويوترون بثلاث وقال الثوري وأبو حنيفة والشافعي وأحمد بن داود قيم رمضان عشرون ركعة سوى الوتر لا يقام بأكثر منها استحبابة وذكر عن وكيج عن حسن بن صاحب عن عمرو بن قيس عن أبي الحسين عن علي أنه أمر رجلا يصلي بهم في رمضان عشرين ركعة وهذا هو الاختيار عندنا وبالله توفيقتنا

“And it is the saying of most of the scholars (Jumhur al-Ulama), and it is the saying of the Kufiiyun (the scholars of the city of Kufa in Iraq), al-Shafi’i and most of the jurisprudens (wa Akthar al-Fuqaha), and it is

Sahih (authentic) from Ubayy ibn Ka’b (a Sahabi) without any difference from the Sahaba...”

Ibn Abdal Barr then mentioned the views of i) Ata ibn Abi Rabah (one of Abu Hanifah’s teachers), the Mufti of Makka in his age and a student of some of the Sahaba that the people performed 23 Rak’ats with the witr included, ii) The view of al-Aswad ibn Yazid, iii) that ibn al-Qasim reported his teacher Imam Malik as holding the position of 39 Rak’ats of which three were witr and that this was claimed to be the old order, iii) and in the time of the famous Caliph of Madina: Umar ibn Abdul Aziz, and Aban ibn Uthman the people performed 36 Rak’ats and 3 Rak’ats of witr. After this ibn Abdal Barr once again affirmed:

“Al-Thawri, Abu Hanifah, al-Shafi’i, and Ahmed ibn Dawud275 said: Standing of Ramadan is 20 Rak’ats, besides the Witr...”

After narrating a report from Ali ibn Abi Talib (radiallahu anhu) ordering the performance 20 rak’ah, Ibn Abdal Barr declared:

“And this, it is the preferred choice with us, and our success is with Allah.”

---

275 What is correct is that this is a scribal error as it should be Ahmed (ibn Hanbal) and Dawud (al-Zahiri). This distinction was correctly printed in the Mawsua Shuruhaul-Muwatta (5/46) published under the supervision of Abdullah al-Turki. Besides, Ibn Abdal Barr mentioned it as Dawud in his earlier al-Tamheed as we have quoted in this treatise.
A GROSS LIE AGAINST THE HANAFI MADHHB BY THE TWO COMPILERS

Abu Khuzaimah and his colleague Abu Hibban mentioned in the introduction of their Qaul ul-Saheeh (p. 5) the following:

Throughout their books the hanafee's use ahadeeth from the Musannaf of Imaam Abee Shaybah when they feel obliged to do so but look at some of bigotry of these people against this very same book of Musannaf.

So Asbaq bin Khaleel said, “It is more beloved to me that a head of a Pig is put in my books then I have (to read) Musannaf Ibn Abee Shaybah.” (refer to Siyar A’lam an-Nabula (13/288.290), Leesaan ul-Meezaan (1/458), Nafh at-Tayyib (3/273), Tarteeb al-Madarak (3/143-144), Tadhkirratul-Huffaadh (2/630)

The above quote was also mentioned by them in another work entitled al-Jawaab ar-Rabbaanee Raf al-Kaadhibah anil Imaam al-A lbaanee (p. 3). Indeed, I have already refuted this blatant lie against the Hanafi Madhhab already as part of my refutation to them entitled: "Those who truly lied against the late Hanafi Muhaddith: Shaykh H abibur Rahmn al-A ‘zami and the Hanafi school on other related issues." 276

What is presented below is taken from the last article, which they have failed to address in a systematic manner, let alone admit that they lied in the dissemination of the claim that Asbag ibn Khalil was a Hanafi! I had said about these two anti-Hanafi’s the following to mention their true state of affairs:

“Alas, justice is rare these days so the pro-Hanafi reader should not hold too much hope that these two abrasively amateur writers would take back their claim.”

Note also that one pseudo-Salafi colleague of theirs and vehemently anti-Hanafi in his attitude from Pakistan, known as Abu Alqama Ali Hassan Khan also failed to admit that his colleagues lied against the Hanafi’s. Rather, he made petty excuses that went to show his fanatically biased slant whereby he is prepared to overlook any obvious lies created and disseminated by people from his own sect, but make a great mountain out of a molehill if his opponents were to make any mistakes.

What is pertinent is that these two compilers mention who from their Scholars did they borrow the lie from in the first place, or did they actually read the references they mentioned all by their own effort. If the latter is the case, then they deserve more severe condemnation for wanton dissemination of falsehood as I mentioned below:

THE LIE OF ABU KHUZAIMAH AND ABU HIBBAAN THAT ASBAG IBN KHALIL WAS A HANAFI WHO ATTACKED THE MUSANNAF OF IBN ABI SHAYBA

The above named individuals mentioned in the introduction to their defence of Nasir al-Albani\(^ {277} \) regarding the issue of where the hands should be placed in Salah, the following claim in order to demean the Hanafiyya and to promote the allegation that Asbag ibn Khalil was a Hanafi who derided the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba!

Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibbaan claimed:

\(^ {277} \) Entitled as: al-Jawaab ar-Rabbaanee Raf al-Kaadhibah anil Inmaam al-Albaanee, see p. 3
Throughout their books the hanafee's use ahadeeth from the Musannaf of Imaam Abee Shaybah when they feel obliged to do so but look at some of bigotry of these people against this very same book of Musannaf.

So **Asbaq bin Khaleel** said, "It is more beloved to me that a head of a Pig is put in my books then I have (to read) Musannaf Ibn Abee Shaybah." (refer to Siyar A‘lam an-Nabula (13/288-290), Leesaan ul-Meezaan (1/458), Nafh at-Tayyib (3/273), Tarteeb al-Madarak (3/143-144), Tadhkirratul-Huffaadh (2/630)

And **Abu Khuzaimah** bragged further on a forum of fitna and fasad run by ahya.org by:

i) Lying in his claim that I was the contributor on that forum under the screen name: “Salafist”, as had others before him!

ii) He said:

i thought according to the ahnaf only a zindeeq looks into musannaf ibn Abee Shaybah so what are you guys doing

Asbaq bin Khaleel said, "It is more beloved to e that a head of a pig is put into my books then I have to read Musannaf ibn Abee Shaybah." (Siyar A‘lam an-Nabula 13/288-290), Leesaan 1/458, Nafih at Tayyib 3/273, Taarteeb al-Madarak 3/143-144, Tadhkirratul-Huffad 2/630

**The response to the above:**

What is self evident from the above grammatical farce is that these two anti-Hanafi’s firmly believe that Asbag ibn Khalil was a Hanafi who derided the Musannaf! Indeed, this is far from the truth! Rather, if any fair minded researcher was to look into just a few of the references given above one would no doubt soon discover that **Asbag ibn Khalil was in actual fact a Mufti of the Maliki Madhhab from the 3rd Islamic century!**

---
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Let us demonstrate how these two deceived not only their fellow “Salafi” readers but openly lied against Asbag ibn Khalil by declaring him a Hanafi, not to forget their open slander of the Hanafi Ulama and laity of the past and present!

**The first reference they provided:**

*Siyar Al'lam an-Nabula (13/288.290)*

This work is by the well known Shafi'i Muhaddith of Syria, al-Hafiz Shamsud-Din al-Dhahabi (d. 748 AH). I looked into the edition printed by Muassasa al-Risala, which was supervised by the Hanafi Muhaddith, Shaykh Shu’ayb al-Arna’ut with some other co-editors. The reference provided has no mention of Asbag being a Hanafi or the story about the Musannaf, but looking at the same volume of the Siyar of al-Dhahabi under page 202 he mentioned Asbag as being the Maliki Mufti and faqih of Qurtuba as well as the story mentioned about the Musannaf as follows with a slight difference in wording:

- أصبع بن خليل * فقيه فرطنة وفقيهاً أبو القاسم الإندلسى المالكي. أخذ عن:
  - الغازى بن قيس قليلاً، وعن بحى بن بحى، وأصبع بن الفرج، وسحنون، وطائفة. وبرع في
  - الشروط، وكان لا يذكر إلا التأثين، وقد انهم في النفل، ووضع في عدم رفع اليدين - فيما قبل - وقال
  - قاسم بن أصبع: هو منعتي السماع من بقي (2). وسمعه يقول: أحب أن يكون في عيدة ختام.
  - ولا يكون فيه مصفف ابن أبي شيبة. ثم دعا عليه قاسم.

**The second reference they provided:**

*Leesaan ul-Meezaan (1/458)*

The above was compiled by the Shafi’i Muhaddith of his time, Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852 AH) in continuation to al-Dhahabi’s Mizan al-I’tidal.
The fourth reference they provided:

Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar mentioned the following under Asbag:

Once again, it may be seen from the above quotation from Ibn Hajar that Ibn al Faradi said that Asbag ibn Khalil was a Hafiz on the scholarly views of the Madhhab of Imam Malik. So how did Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibbaan conclude that Asbag was a Hanafi?!
They mean Tartib al-Madarak by the Maliki scholar Qadi Iyad. The Tartib is a biographical dictionary listing the biographies of many famous Maliki Ulama and not Hanafi's! The following is what was mentioned under Asbag ibn Khalil in an online copy of the Tartib (pp. 396-397):

اصبع بن خليل قرطي. يكن أبا القاسم. سمع بالأندلس من الغازي بن قيس، ويحيى بن مضر، ومحمد بن عيسى والأعثي، ويحيى بن حبيش، ورحل فسمع من أصبع وسخوين، حدد عنه أحمد بن خالد، وابن أين ومحمد بن قاسم. وأبا محمد بن أصبع. قال ابن أبي ليدي: كان له بصر بالوائت. قال أحمد بن سعيد: هو من أهل العلم والفقه، والورع والرياسة، فيما قالني أحمد بن خالد. غير مره. فطأه بالمسال والفقه. قال ابن حسن القرية والقياس. وقال ابن لبيبة: كان وابن من الحفاظ حسن القيم والتمير. قال ابن الفرسى: وكان حافظًا للرأي على مذهب مالك، وأصحابه. فقيه منسوبي إلى الصلاح، والورع. صبرًا بالشروط دارته عليه الفتاوى، خمسين عامًا، وطاع عمره، والد ابن عبد البر. وكان لا يقبل من أحد هدية. وكان متقلا. وكان الأشعثي يتألق عليه. وكان عاديين للأثار. وليس له معرفة بالحديث شديد التخصص لم يكن مالك، وأصحابه، والد القاسم بين بنيهم. وبلغ له التخصص فيما قاله ابن الفرضي وغيره: أن أفعال حديثا في رفع القيم في الصلاة بعد الإحرام. و زمن أنه راه عن غازى بن قيس. عن سلمة بن وردن، عن ابن شهاب عن عبد الحكيم بن حشيم، عن ابن مسعود. طلعت ورود رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وخلف ابن أبي بكر، سنتين وخمسة أشهر. وخلف عمر عشر سنين، وخلف عمر الله تسعين سنة. وزينع الله تسعين سنة. وخلف على بالكشف خمس سنين. فما رفع واحد منهم به إلا في كبيرة الإحرام. وحدها فوقع في خطأ بين عينيهم، منها: أن الإسناد غير منقوق. لأن سلمة بن وردن لم يرو عن ابن شهاب ولا ابن شهاب عن الربيع، ولا راه. وأعظم منه في المال ديره أن ابن مسعود صلى خلف على بالكشف. وهو لم يدرك إياهم على رضى الله عنه. وكذلك أيضًا يحدث آخر، في إسناد الفرضي عن سلمة عن عمر عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، عن جرير عن علي، عن أهل العلم. فيه أن نافع -شيخ الغازى بن قيس- هو مولى ابن عمر. وإنما هو نافع القارئ. قال أحمد بن خالد: إن أصبع لم يقصده الكتب، عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم. وإنما ظهر له أنه يريد تأباه مذهبه. وهذا كلام من أحمد لا معنى له. وكل من كتب على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقد كتب كتاب تأباه عرض، ولو قال: إنه إذا كتب في السنن وعلي النبي، إذ روى عن النبي أنه رفع أولًا. لم يرفع بعد، بما جاء في الحديث في النبي هذا، يعني ما أتي معه هو، كان أشيئ. لكن الكتب في العلم، أن نوع كان مبطلًا لصاحبه مسقفة له بشهادة الزور. قال قاسم بن أصبع: سمع أصبع بن خليل، أن يكون في تابوي رأس خنزير. أحده من أن يكون فيه مسند ابن أبي شيبة. وكان يعذر أن حذر الأثر. وكان قاسم يدعو عليه، ويقول: هي الذي حرمني أن أسمع من بقي بن مخلد. ونهى أبي أن يحملني إليه. وقال: إذا كتب بالله، وقيل: هو الذي حرمني أن أسمع من بقي بن مخلد. ونهى أبي أن يحملني إليه. كما يصرح. أما ابن الحكيم، فبوبن ابن الحكيم. ت ألف خطيبان. ويذكر ولون اسمه بجي. مسمع من ابنه وطيبته، ورحل فسمع من عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل، ونظرته في سنة خمسين وثلاثمائة.
Once again the above quote suffices to advance our position that Asbag was a Maliki and not a Hanafi!

As for the last reference they provided, known as Tadhkiratul Huffaz by the above named al-Dhahabi, I did not find Asbag being listed in there as a Hafiz of Hadith, let alone the story about the Musannaf or that he was a Hanafi!

Of the later Maliki biographical dictionaries is the one known as al-Dibaj al-Mudhib fi ma’rifaa’yanulamâ al Madhhab279 of Qadi Ibn Farhun al-Maliki (d. 799 AH) who mentioned Asbag as follows:

Ibn Farhun did not mention that anyone ever held Asbag to be a Hanafi and nor did he retain the story linked to the Musannaf in his short notice on Asbag.

To conclude this section it is not unjust to say with certainty that Asbag ibn Khalil was not a Hanafi but a Maliki in fiqh, and that Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibbaan lied in the way they presented some references, which they thought, would indicate that Asbag was a Hanafi! This concoction on their part was partly fulfilled in order to justify their claim that the Hanafi’s apparently despise the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba but also recourse to it when needed to prove a point in fiqh!

This is far from the truth since one may see major Hanafi Ulama of the past (like al-Ayni and Ibn al-Turkmani) and present utilising its contents as well as editing the work itself; like the edition by Shaykh Habibur Rahman al-A‘zami, the one by

279 See p. 159-160, Darul Kutub Ilmiyya edn
Idaratul Qur’an in Karachi, and the most recent one printed by the Syrian Hanafi, Shaykh Muhammad Awwama in 2006.

The likes of Abu Khuzaimah and Abu Hibbaan need to explain to their duped readers were they got such a claim that Asbag was a Hanafi and more so if they did not actually read the references they provided, where exactly did they possibly plagiarise the references from? Let them be scholarly enough to name their actual source if any, otherwise, they stand not only accused but also guilty of lying against the Hanafiyya and Asbag ibn Khalil.

As for the unscholarly jibe made by Abu Khuzaimah:

i thought according to the ahnaf only a zindeeq looks into musannaf ibn Abee Shaybah so what are you guys doing

Then this is also another figment of untruth from his anti-Hanafi imagination; for he would be hard pressed to find a statement from any major Hanafi Imam saying that only a zindeeq looks into the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba!
CONCLUSION

It is hoped that the sincere and unbiased reader can decipher for themselves having thus reached this far, that the truth of the matter is that the vast majority of Sunni scholarship has accepted 20 Rak’ats of Taraweeh in the blessed month of Ramadan. The evidences for it far outweigh the one’s used to substantiate 8 rak’ats in terms of not only number of narrations, but in terms of authenticity, acceptability and applicability throughout the ages also. In short, the narrations for 8 rak’ats are not free of some form of weakness or do not apply to the matter of Taraweeh directly.

One leaves it to the protagonists for 8 rak’ats to examine our claims meticulously, and if they wish to hold to their claim, then the onus remains upon them to re-proove their case with classical quotes from acknowledged reference works and credible scholars. Alternatively, those who are convinced by our findings, then it is our hope that they will tread inline with the majority of scholars and the Way of the Sahaba to perform 20 rak’ats of Taraweeh in Ramadan. A Way that can only have been inherited from the Prophet, Muhammad, sallallahu alaihi wa sallam.

Peace and Blessings on the Prophet Muhammad, his Family, and all his Companions.

Abul Hasan
London, UK
1st of Ramadan 1430 AH/ August 22nd 2009
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