1. Chapter 19 Lesson 2: The Obligations of the Prayer

(0:33:00) و (واجباتُها): التكبيرُ غيرَ التَحْرِيْمَةِ والتَّسمِيعُ والتَّحميدُ وتَسبيحَتَا الرُّكُوْعِ والسُّجُودِ، وسُؤالُ الْمَغفِرَةِ مَرَّةً مَرَّةً، ويُسَنُّ ثَلاثًا، والتَّشَهُّدُ الأَوَّلُ وجَلْسَتُهُ، وما عَدَا الشَّرائِطِ والأركانِ والواجباتِ المذكورةَ سُنَّةٌ، فمَنْ تَرَكَ شَرْطًا لِغَيرِ عُذرٍ غَيْرَ النِّيَّةِ – فإنَّها لا تَسْقُطُ بحالٍ – أو تَعَمَّدَ تَرْكَ رُكْنٍ أو واجِبٍ بَطُلَتْ صَلاتُه، بخِلافِ الباقي وما عَدَا ذلك سُنَنٌ، أقوالٍ وأفعالٍ، ولا يُشْرَعُ السُّجودُ لتَرْكِه، وإِنْ سجَدَ فلا بَأْسَ .

Its obligations are:

1) the *takbīr* other than the opening one
2) the *tasmīʿ* (to say *samiʿ Allāhu liman-ḥamidah*)
3) the *taḥmīd (*to say *Rabbana wa lakʾl-ḥamd*)
4) the *tasbīḥ* within the bowing (to say *Subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*) and prostration (to say *Subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*)
5) to ask for forgiveness (by saying *Rabbigh-firlī*) once in each unit (between the two prostrations) but it is *sunnah* to say it three times
6) the first *tashahhud*
7) to sit for this first *tashahhud*

Everything other than the conditions, pillars and obligations that have been previously mentioned are considered *sunnah*.

Whoever (a) leaves a condition without an excuse, other than the intention—for it can never be "left out"—or (b) intentionally leaves a pillar or obligation, their prayer is invalidated. (The prayer is sound) in all cases other than this.

Everything else from actions and statements are all considered *sunnah*. It is not legislated to have to perform the prostration (of forgetfulness) if they are left out, but if one was to perform it then there is no problem with that.

First of all:

التكبيرُ غيرَ التَحْرِيْمَةِ

The *takbīr* other than the opening one.

We already covered this at the end of last year. We said that the *takbīratʾl-iḥrām* is the opening *takbīr: Allāhu akbar.* Every other *takbīr* is what we call the *takbīratʾl-intiqāl,* the *takbīrs* of movement i.e., *Allāhu akbar* as you go into *rukūʿ, samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah Rabbana wa lakʾl-ḥamd* as you are coming up from *rukūʿ*, *Allāhu akbar* as you go into *sujūd*, when you are getting up from *tashahhud* etc. All of these *takbīrāt* are the ones which are obligatory—unlike *takbīratʾl-iḥrām* which is a *rukn*.

We already covered *tasmīʿ*, to say *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah.* We said it is obligatory and we went into detail covering the various forms: when the imām says it, what the one who is behind him says, and then the one who is praying by himself.†

(0:43:00) The Shaykh says:

وتسبيحتا الركوع والسجود

[And its obligations are] the *tasbīḥ* within the bowing (to say *Subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*) and prostration (to say *Subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*).

Now, when I said that in the previous reading, I said: *wa tasbīḥatʾl-rukūʿi waʾl-sujūd*. This is a nice point. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, may Allāh have mercy upon him, a great scholar. We are using his commentary and then making some comments on top of that. When he goes through the book and he sees an opportunity to make a *ʿaqīdah* point, an Arabic point, a poetry point, he will make it. Not all the time, but when I feel that there is some benefit and I have the ability to be able to add something, then I will. So, let me just stop here and say something that he mentions as well.

He says, how do you say *tasbīḥatā al-rukūʿ waʾl-sujūd*? What does it mean?

Because the translation is to say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* and *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* in the (1) *rukūʿ* and (2) *sujūd*. This is *tasbīḥatā,* which means there are two *tasbīḥs*. In Arabic, when you put this *alif* there to indicate the dual (that there are two things involved), when you pronounce it you do not pronounce the dual. You pronounce it as if it were a singular. So, we say, *wa tasbīḥatʾl-rukūʿi waʾl-sujūd*, even though when you look at it, you are thinking you are meant to say: *wa tasbīḥatā al-rukūʿi waʾl-sujūd.* That is not how you pronounce it. You pronounce it: *tasbīḥataʾl-rukūʿi waʾl-sujūd* [i.e., when you connect *tasbīḥatā* to the word after it without stopping, the *alif* at the end of *tasbīḥatā* is dropped and you only pronounce the *fatḥah* on the *tā*].

† Standing up from *rukūʿ* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lessons 27 and 28.

I will give you an example. The Shaykh gives an example which is nice. If you look at *Sūrat al-Naml* which is *sūrah* 27, verse 15.‡ If you look at the Arabic:

﴿وَلَقَدْ آتَيْنَا دَاوُودَ وَسُلَيْمَانَ عِلْمًا وَقَالَا الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ ﴿١٥﴾﴾

"We gave knowledge to Dawūd and Sulaymān, and they both said, 'Praise to be God.'"

[*Sūrat al-Naml*: 15]

Normally, if it's a singular person it says: *wa qāla*, but it's *qālā* which indicates that it's two peopl—so both of them, Dawūd and Sulaymān ﷺ both said *alḥamdulillāh*. Now that's how it's said when you're looking at it. But when you're reciting it, you say *wa qālaʾl-ḥamdulillāh*. You say it as if there's no *alif*. You don't say *wa qālā alḥamdulillāh*, that's not how you recite the Qurʾān. You say *wa qālaʾl-ḥamdulillāh*.

Similarly, you pronounce it *tasbīḥataʾl-rukūʿi waʾl-sujūd* even though it's *wa tasbīḥatā al-rukūʿi waʾl-sujūd*, even though it's *wa qālā alḥamdulillāh*. Rules of Arabic say that when you're reciting, you say *tasbīḥataʾl-rukūʿi waʾl-sujūd*, *qālaʾl-ḥamdulillāh.* So that's a nice example.

Shaykh actually then takes it to the next level. He says:

فإذا قال قائل: إذا قلتم: «وقالَ الحمد لله»، أوهم السَّامع أن يكون القائل واحداً وهو سليمان؛ لأنه أقرب مذكور؟

He says that someone who's listening to you recite that, then he will say: '*Well hold on! This is like Sulaymān speaking only*.' Because in Arabic, you look at the closest male subject. So, whenever you want to try to identify who's speaking, because *wa qālaʾl-ḥamdulillāh* means one person said *alḥamdulillāh*, you look at the list and then you see the Sulaymān and you'd think that. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that's not the *qāriʾs* problem, that's the problem of the listener. The *qāriʾ* (reciter) has to stick to the rules.

By the way I don't know if you remember, maybe about a year or two ago, we had a little *masʾalah* where I identified, in class, I showed you some of the problems with the apps. So, you have some of the Qurʾān apps, a lot of the modern ones that are not using
(0:50:00) what we call the *rasm* of ʿUthmān. They're not using the *rasm ʿUthmāni* in the actual

‡ In the version of *Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ʿala Zād al-Mustaqniʿ* we are using (*Dār* Ibn al-Jawzi), the reference for this example on page 319 is incorrect. They have referenced this *ayah* as being [*Sūrat al-Naḥl*: 15]. It is actually [*Sūrat al-Naml*: 15].

muṣḥaf, rather they are writing the Arabic like it's pronounced. So, when you write the Qurʾān in a way that it's pronounced, that's great in terms of the one who's reciting it and the one who's listening to it etc. But that's not *rasm ʿUthmāni*. And there is an almost—it's not correct to say consensus—but there's an almost consensus that you must never, ever move out of the codex of ʿUthmān ﷺ and that you should write the words, even if they were to be pronounced differently if you were to break it down. But then if you were to actually read knowing it by the aural transmission, which is what it is, then you will not actually [mispronounce it].

And [the word] *ṣalāh* [in the *muṣḥaf*] is the classic example: *ṣalāh* with the *alif* and the *ṣalāh* with the *alif* [above] the *wāw,* and that to include the *wāw* in *ṣalāh* is something which is part of *rasm ʿUthmān*i even though it's much easier just to put *ṣād lām alif*. In using the *wāw*, there is a potential for a person to mispronounce it. But you never will if you memorise the Qurʾān properly. But that's *rasm ʿUthmān*i. And some of the apps what they did, using modern Arabic, they put *ṣād lām alif* and then a *ta,* which pronounces perfect but again...Anyway, it is important to know the difference between what you read and what you recite. How it is written and how it is recited.

وتسبيحتا الركوع والسجود

[And its obligations are] the *tasbīḥ* within the bowing (to say *Subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*) and prostration (to say *Subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*).

The author says: the two types of *tasbīḥ.* Shaykh says that he hasn't actually told us (the author) in this particular moment what type of *tasbīḥ* he's referring to, and how it is said, and what its form is. But we know that earlier on, on page 91 and page 123.

The Shaykh says: the *tasbīḥ* of the *rukūʿ* is to say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*, and in *sajdah* we say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*. This is an obligation at least once and it's an obligation in the *sajdah* at least once—this particular form, not just to say *subḥān Allāh* but to say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* in the *rukūʿ* and *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* in the *sujūd* and that is *wājib*.

And the Shaykh says: What is the evidence for this?

He says that when Allāh ﷻ revealed the *ayah*:

﴿فَسَبِّحْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الْعَظِيمِ ٧٤﴾

"So [Prophet], glorify the name of your Lord the Supreme." [*Sūrat al-Wāqiʿah*: 74]

The Prophet ﷺ said:

اجْعَلُوهَا فِي رُكُوعِكُمْ

"Say this in your *rukūʿ*." [1,2,3]

So put what? *Fasabbiḥ bismi Rabbīkʾl-ʿAẓīm*

﴿فَسَبِّحْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الْعَظِيمِ ۝٧٤﴾

"So [Prophet], glorify the name of your Lord the Supreme." [*Sūrat al-Wāqiʿah*: 74]

When that was revealed, the Prophet ﷺ, he said put this in your [*rukūʿ*]. So, if you are going to now make *tasbīḥ* in the name of your Lord *al-ʿAẓīm*, then that translates to: *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*. Glory be to my Lord *al-ʿAẓīm,* The Almighty, The Supreme.

Student (online): Should you keep it an odd number if you do more than one?

Ustādh: If you are going to do it more than one, then yes—three times, five times. The *sunnah* is to keep it odd if you are going to do it more than once. We will come to that in the section of the *sunnah* in a couple of weeks' time.

This is a classic example of the Prophet ﷺ explaining the Qurʾān. So, let's tangent off to *tafsīr* for a little bit or *uṣūlʾl-tafsīr*. It is important to know that even when you are making *tafsīr* and when we are talking about *tafsīr* we are not talking *tadabbur.* The difference obviously for those, we haven't seen you now since Ramaḍān, in Ramaḍān, I did the Qurʾānic ART series and that was of course on the *tadabbur* of the Qurʾān which is personal reflections on the Qurʾān.

As I said before, the Shaykh right now, he has kind of already covered a lot of the description of the prayer but now he's categorising. So, we have already gone through the prayer in detail—all of the actions. Now what we are doing is categorising them, putting them into *sunnah*, putting them into obligation, putting them into *arkān*, etc.

---

[1] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 887*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*
[2] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What a Person Should Say In His Rukūʿ and Prostration, ḥadīth no. 869*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf* by al-Albāni.
[3] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 4/155*.

From a *tafsīr* point of view, whenever you want to try to find the exact meaning of an *ayah* and not just your own personal rumination, your personal pondering, your personal reflection, your personal benefit, but an actual meaning of the *ayah*, we have a list of actions of what to do. We have a priority kind of set of principles. The first of those is that we look for the Qurʾān to explain the Qurʾān itself. There are some times where Allāh ﷻ makes it easy for us. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn here gives the example. He says that when you are going to explain the Qurʾān by the Qurʾān, *tafsīrʾl-Qurʾān biʾl-Qurʾān* then an example is:

﴿الْقَارِعَةُ ﴿١﴾ مَا الْقَارِعَةُ ﴿٢﴾ وَمَا أَدْرَاكَ مَا الْقَارِعَةُ ﴿٣﴾ يَوْمَ يَكُونُ النَّاسُ كَالْفَرَاشِ الْمَبْثُوثِ ﴿٤﴾ وَتَكُونُ الْجِبَالُ كَالْعِهْنِ الْمَنفُوشِ ﴿٥﴾﴾

"The Crashing Blow! What is the Crashing Blow? What will explain to you what the Crashing Blow is? On the Day when people will be like scattered moths and the mountains like tufts of wool." [*Sūrat al-Qāriʿah*: 1-5]

Allāh ﷻ says: *al-Qāriʿāh*—the like mega slap, the Crushing Blow, the Big Rendering Asunder, boom!

Maʾl- Qāriʿāh: What is the Crashing Blow? And what is going to make you know what the Crashing Blow will be on that day that the earth is rendered asunder? What will make you know that?

Then Allāh ﷻ actually answers that question:

﴿يَوْمَ يَكُونُ النَّاسُ كَالْفَرَاشِ الْمَبْثُوثِ ﴿٤﴾ وَتَكُونُ الْجِبَالُ كَالْعِهْنِ الْمَنفُوشِ ﴿٥﴾﴾

"On the day when people will be scattered like moths and the mountains like tufts of wool."

Basically, it would be such an impact, such a blow that would destroy everything, that everything will be in pieces. There is a metaphor being given of the humans being like something very weak, that does not have strength in its wings so that it is completely flattened and it is sent miles. And the solid things that people think never will move will be like the most lightest of things, which is wool. So Allāh ﷻ has in the Qurʾān explained the Qurʾān, given us exactly what the meaning is. That is the first thing that you do.

The second then in the absence of the Qurʾān explaining an *ayah* is to go to the Prophet ﷺ. And in this *ayah*:

﴿فَسَبِّحْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الْعَظِيمِ ۝٧٤﴾

"So [Prophet], glorify the name of your Lord the Supreme." [*Sūrat al-Wāqiʿah*: 74]

Shaykh says the Prophet ﷺ when he said:

اجْعَلُوهَا فِي رُكُوعِكُمْ

"Say this in your *rukūʿ*."[1,2,3]

The Prophet ﷺ has given us a meaning of that verse, a context, and allowed us to apply it as well.

And Shaykh says that we have other examples of that one of the most famous ones in *Sūrat* Yūnus verse 26:

﴿لِّلَّذِينَ أَحْسَنُوا الْحُسْنَىٰ وَزِيَادَةٌ ۝٢٦﴾

"Those who did well will have the best reward and more besides." [*Sūrat Yūnus*:26].

For those people who would practice *iḥsān*, they will get *al-ḥusnā* which is they will get something incredibly beautiful, incredibly excellent, and then something extra. And when you are reading that, it is difficult to work out what it actually means. But it was
(1:00:00) the Prophet ﷺ who told us that the *ḥusnā* for people who do good, *al-ḥusnā* is *Jannah* and *al-ziyādah* is to look at Allāh ﷻ which is above and beyond, an extra bonus than just being in *Jannah.*[4,5] *Jannah* is all your delights and all of your desires. To be in the company of Allāh ﷻ, to look upon His countenance is the whole thing which is beyond our imagination. That is *al-ziyādah*. That is not possible to work out. That is not possible for you to sit there and do *tadabbur* over or Qurʾānic ART (Alternative Random *Tadabbur).* No. That has to come from a very clear source, either (1) from the Qurʾān

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Faith, Chapter: Affirming that the Believers Will See Their Lord, Glorious Is He and Most High, in the Hereafter, hadīth no. 181 a.*
[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Faith, Chapter: Affirming that the Believers Will See Their Lord, Glorious Is He and Most High, in the Hereafter, ḥadīth no. 181 b.*

itself, (2) from the Prophet ﷺ or (3) from the consensus of the Companions that they have heard something or understood something and they all agreed upon it with no difference amongst them. So that is a classic example of a process that we should follow when it comes to the Qurʾān.

So that is for the *rukūʿ*.

As for the *sujūd* when Allāh ﷻ revealed:

﴿سَبِّحِ اسْمَ رَبِّكَ الْأَعْلَى ۝١﴾

"[Prophet], glorify the name of your Lord, the Most High." [*Sūrat al-Aʿla*:1]

The Prophet ﷺ said:

اجْعَلُوهَا فِي سُجُودِكُمْ

"Say it in your *sujūd.*"[1,2,3]

So:

﴿فَسَبِّحْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الْعَظِيمِ ۝٧٤﴾

"So [Prophet], glorify the name of your Lord the Supreme." [*Sūrat al-Wāqiʿah*: 74]

Became:

اجْعَلُوهَا فِي رُكُوعِكُمْ

"Say this in your *rukūʿ*."[1,2,3]

And:

﴿سَبِّحِ اسْمَ رَبِّكَ الْأَعْلَى ۝١﴾

"[Prophet], glorify the name of your Lord, the Most High." [*Sūrat al-Aʿla*:1]

Became:

اجْعَلُوهَا فِي سُجُودِكُمْ

"Say it in your *sujūd.*"[1,2,3]

Therefore, you now have the creation of these two phrases: *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* in the *rukūʿ and subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* in the *sujūd*. This *ḥadīth* by the way is narrated and it is authentic, narrated by Imām Aḥmad Volume 4/155, by Imām Abu Dāwūd in the Chapter of the Prayer the subsection: What a Man says in His *Rukūʿ* and in His *Sujūd*, *ḥadīth* number 869. Both are narrated in the same version. Ibn Mājah as well 887. This *ḥadīth* was authenticated by al-Ḥakīm and it was agreed upon thereby by Imām al-Dhahabi. So that is I think something which is useful. That is one of the sources. There are many other sources as well for this which you should be aware of, but that is beyond the scope of this kind of basic class.

Student: If someone says *subḥān Allāh wa bi-ḥamdih* instead of what is obligatory, is their *ṣalāh* still valid? Their intention is to add to what has been narrated but they have the strange habit of skipping the middle of what they are saying (e.g., *Wa ʿalykum assalām wa barakātuh*)

Ustādh: This question the scholars differed over. And the truth is that technically speaking it should be fine. Practically speaking, the scholars have never supported it. Like they move away from it. They shy away from it. I have taught this now and I have repeated this before as well, that a Muslim in practice should always assume even though absolutely accept the argument. I would not be invalidating a person's prayer if they come to me and say: *Wallāhi* brother I did not say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAzīm* in the prayer, I said *subḥān Allāhi wa bi-ḥamdihi subḥān Allāh al-ʿAẓīm* or *Subbūḥun Quddūsun Rabbʾl-malāʾikati waʾl-Rūḥ*. i.e., the different versions that have been authentically narrated from the *tasbīḥāt* of *rukūʿ* and *sujūd*. Our position and the position of the scholars throughout history has always been to put those as supplementary and to keep *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* as the *aṣl* and to keep *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* as the *aṣl*, as the basic status quo.

Is there evidence for that?

There isn't actually an evidence other than this *ḥadīth* that kind of specifies these phrases. But then in fairness, the other *ḥadīth* specify those phrases as well. I think it's because of the Prophet ﷺ taking it from the Qur'ān that kind of ups the ante a bit, that kind of made its position the number one said thing. And that's why, it is a very interesting question actually—historically it has been an interesting question. Because technically speaking all of them should replace one another, and there are some of the scholars that said that.

I am telling you from a **<u>class position</u>** we practically would not risk that. We would consider these extra ones to be extra—all of the versions of the *tasbīḥāt*, even though I can't prove that. But I'm happy to say I don't have any evidence for that statement because none of the scholars presented any evidence which is super clear and strong and says only this can be the *aṣl* and everything else is out of the window. If it's *tasbīḥ* like the author has said, *tasbīḥ* of the *rukūʿ* and *sujūd*, then it should be the generic *tasbīḥ* of the *rukūʿ* or *sujūd*, and *subḥān Allāhi wa bi-ḥamdihi subḥān Allāh al-ʿAẓīm* should be absolutely fine. But were not going to go that far. We are going to say that's what you add to elongate your *rukūʿ* and *sujūd*. Stick to *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* and don't get any further than that.

Student: Isn't it good to sometimes change it up?

Ustādh: No, we are not talking about changing it up. We are saying a 100% it's good to change it up. You have to increase the numbers for example. So instead of saying three *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*, you go to nine and eleven, then you will say three and add *Subbūḥun Quddūsun*, and you will repeat that maybe two or three times. And then on the next one you will take *Subbūḥun Quddūsun* out and then you will add *subḥān Allāhi wa bi-ḥamdihi subḥān Allāhʾl-ʿAẓīm*. You will increase, decrease, increase, decrease, but always there will be a bare minimum *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* in the *rukūʿ*, a bare minimum *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* [in *sujūd*]. The variation is in everything else all the time. The variation maintains itself in the other ones.

Student (online): So, just to clarify: You cannot add anything else to it?

Ustādh: No. You absolutely add to it, 100% you add to it.

Student (online): The fact that the Prophet ﷺ said do it in the *rukūʿ*, does that within itself make it an obligation?

Ustādh: Correct.

Student (online): I am mindful of the fact that I have heard the Ḥanafi *madh-hab* say it is *sunnah*.

Ustādh: And that is correct as well. Of course, we are focusing on the Ḥanbali school and then the class position, which is effectively my position, from my understanding, what I want to promote, what I personally want to promote.

And for those who have taken this class for the first time, *fiqh* is that flexible. And you are obligated to discover the ruling yourself unless you don't have the ability to. And you are specifically obligated when you don't have the ability to, to follow someone who is teaching you that you trust And that normally comes down to one of the *madhāhib*, or a teacher who is teaching you their own positions based upon orthodoxy. And that's the basic obligation that is facing you.

Yes, there are some scholars who say that the *tasbīḥ* is not obligatory, but that's the position of the vast majority of the scholars. And it is in the Ḥanbali school that we are doing right now as well. So *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* are the *aṣl*.

And let me make it very clear you will definitely add other stuff to it, like I said bare minimum you have to say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*, and *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* and then you add or don't add that's up to you. We are going to come to that in a couple of weeks' time.

The next part then:

وسُؤالُ الْمَغفِرَةِ مَرَّةً مَرَّةً، ويُسَنُّ ثَلاثًا

[It is an obligation] to ask for forgiveness (by saying *Rabbigh-firlī*) once in each unit (between the two prostrations), but it is *sunnah* to say it three times.

Now here's interesting: What number obligation is *suʾālʾl-maghfirah*? If you are looking at the notes. What number is *suʾālʾl-maghfirah* number five yes?

I made *takbīr* number one, *tasmīʿ* number two, *taḥmīd* number three, and then I said number four is the *tasbīḥ* that you make in *rukūʿ* and *sajdah*. And then number five is to ask for forgiveness. I made this point a number of times before. In actual fact, there are two there. You can say the *tasbīḥ* of *rukūʿ* and the *tasbīḥ* of *sujūd*. That should basically be four and five and then number six should be to ask for forgiveness.

Who can remind me, in the comments, of the point that I have made when it comes to enumerating anything in *fiqh*? Whether it's enumerating how many conditions there are or how many pillars there are or enumerating obligations. You know when people say: I've learned how to pray, there are six pillars, there are five obligations, there are fifteen *sunnah*s, etc. What have I said about that?

Student (online): It's not Qurʾān.

Ustādh: It's not Qurʾān. Correct. It is human interpretation.

Numbers are irrelevant. It's simply a learning tool. One person's two is another person's one. The author there has put two because he's trying to keep it together. Another one who is writing in a modern phrase where it's modern style to put numbers in brackets has put it separately. That's why Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn now says:

وسؤال المغفرة مرَّة مرَّة «هذا هو الواجب السادس من واجبات الصلاة»

He says that the asking of *maghfirah marratan marrah*, this is the sixth obligation from the obligations of the prayer. And according to the way that I have written it and according to the way that Imām al-Ḥajjāwi himself wrote it, it is actually the fifth. And that goes to show that you should never memorise *fiqh* like there are six this or five that. Understand the obligations. Understand your *fiqh*. Don't understand the numbers because they are all human interpretations. It is so important to understand this point. It will benefit you a lot when you move forward because a lot of people get confused, '*Why is it five over there*? *Why is it seven over here?*' Forget the numbers, understand the issue.

That is actually correct, there are five that we have said so far. And the sixth one, but I am going to the numbering that I have used here because that is clearer. The fifth in the list but actually the sixth of the obligation is to ask for forgiveness once in each unit, although it is *sunnah* to say it three times. The brackets in the translation, I've added myself.

Student (online): What about the five pillars of Islam? Same thing?

(1:10:00) Ustādh: The truth is that yes and no. First of all, we are not talking about the Prophet ﷺ. Let's make that clear. We are talking about the human divisions of categorisations. You don't often see the Prophet ﷺ say, and this *ḥadīth* is like kind of rare where the Prophet ﷺ will mention a number in a definitive way.[6] We know that some of the scholars differed over the different narrations and they added a sixth pillar, for example, and most stuck to the various narrations that establish five. So, the scholars differed: Are only five pillars of Islam or is it not intending the number five at all, but in fact it is actually meaning these are very, very important?

My personal opinion is that there are no five pillars in Islam. I believe that is a very common way of teaching people how something is important. I believe that the pillars of Islam are whatever the Prophet ﷺ emphasised to the level of the pillars of Islam. So, when you see the way that the Prophet ﷺ goes at the prayer or the *shahādah* or Ramaḍān or *Ḥajj* and we do not see *jihād* there, which is such an important pillar, to me

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Belief, Chapter: Your Invocation Means Your Faith, ḥadīth no. 8.*

I think that five is not an exclusive number. And for people to use it, it's fine, but also for people to understand that the pillars are very few, restricted in number, and are that important, then I think that is fine as well.

But that reasoning is different to the reasoning that I am teaching you right now. What I just spoke about five minutes ago was explaining that the scholars are using their own mind to work out different ways of presenting information. So, they put it into either categories and tables. They put it into either flow charts or a Venn diagram. These are the kind of varieties that we should be comfortable with. But the Prophet ﷺ does not do that. He ﷺ does not from his own mind say, '*I am presenting information differently*.' But what he ﷺ will sometimes do is to use a number when he ﷺ does not actually intend a number. So, that is very different.

When Imām al-Ḥajjāwi is saying that there are six obligations or seven obligations, he means that there are seven obligations. He does not mean that, '*I am saying seven, but I mean ten*.' No. He is a saying, '*I mean seven*.' Another scholar will look at his seven and say, '*Well, from these seven, I actually only think that there are six, really*.' So, that is very different.

Student: Isn't there a *ḥadīth*:

بُنِيَ الإِسْلاَمُ عَلَى خَمْسٍ

"Islam is based upon five (pillars)."[6]

Ustādh: Yeah. *Buni'l-Islām ʿala khams* is clear. There is no doubt about that. I am saying that it did not say that *buni'l-Islām ʿalā khams faqaṭ.* The *ḥadīth* does not say that the religion is built upon only five. And I am even happy to accept that it is five. I am even happy to put *jīhād* under something else. My point is this: More often than not, unless there is an absolute 100% categorical statement from the Prophet ﷺ denying and omitting any other possibility of a number to be added, then that is when the number is intended. Many, many times though, when the Prophet ﷺ says three, or seven, or seventy, or 100, then the indication is for many—unless it is absolutely certain. By the way, let me make it clear, a large number of scholars said that there are only five pillars of Islam. I am with the scholarly opinion that when you look at what a pillar is, it was never… Those who are brought up in modern times who need things broken down, I think they are the ones who created the concept of five pillars. Because the *ḥadīth* says that Islam is built upon five. It never said that there are five pillars of Islam. I do not know of any other narration. I cannot remember a *ḥadīth* that says that there are five individual pillars or that it [Islam] is held up by.

The *ḥadīth* indicates *buni'l-Islām*, that the building is being held up by some fundamental things. And I think that there are some other things there as well. But

when you are a parent and you are teaching your children, whether it is in school or kids, then it is much easier to say that there are five pillars. There are six points. There is x, y, z. And I am happy with that. I am fine with it. Because ultimately, it does not make much difference.

Student (online): Does this ruling apply to that which is more abstract? For example, the five pillars allude to a way of life and therefore the number can be relative to each person. Whereas the number of *farḍ ṣalāh* stay consistently at five regardless of interpretation.

Ustādh: No. That is a very dangerous door to open because once you start opening that door, then people will start coming up with all kinds of nonsense. It gives them the license to then start taking things out and adding in.

Student (online): And that is an Arabic *balāghah* thing? To say something to emphasise but not mean it?

Ustādh: Yes. Sometimes that can be at play. You see, the five *farḍ* prayers is not even a good example to use because there is absolutely no doubt that there are only five prayers. Because not only did the Prophet ﷺ make that clear, not only did Allāh ﷻ indicate that as well, but the Prophet ﷺ has never done anything other than pray five times a day in an obligatory fashion. So, there is no doubt. But when you have the *ḥadīth* that Islam is built upon five, the way that we in our modern education—and I cannot say Western because you find this in Pakistan.

Student: Traditionally, [inaudible] taught in numbers.

Ustādh: Yeah, numbers are a tool. Five is also from the Prophet ﷺ...

Student (online): What about the *ḥadīth*: Ibn ʿAbbās ؓ reported: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, peace and blessings be upon him, said: "Take advantage of five before five: your youth before your old age, your health before your illness, your riches before your poverty, your free time before your work, and your life before your death."[7]

Ustādh: This does not mean that you do not take advantage of a sixth, and a seventh, and an eighth. It is very important to understand when a *ḥadīth* is indicating a lot and not indicating a lot.

I will stop here but I will say this: It is fascinating the next point. What's fascinating about this next point?

It is a point which is unique to the Ḥanbali school. Only the Ḥanbali school—and not even the school, even the school debates this issue amongst themselves—they are the only ones who say that to say *Rabbi-ghfirli Rabbi-ghfirli* between the two *sajdahs* is an

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Jāmiʿ, no. 1077.*

obligation. Which is a very big statement to make. And you know *subḥān Allāh* you often see a lot of Ḥanbalis backpedaling from this. And even there are some narrations from Imām Aḥmad that this is not his position. But as you can see this is Imām al-Ḥajjāwi representing the *madh-hab*—and you know there are different interpretations of who represents the *madh-hab* and who doesn't. That is a big debate that I have very little interest in. But they are the only ones who go with that. And it is a big statement because every scholar said it is *mustaḥabb*, it is a *sunnah* only. And that is what we are going to cover next week in *shāʾ Allāh*. It is going to be interesting.

2. Chapter 19 Lesson 3: The Obligations of the Prayer

(0:15:15) So, we are now, from a text point of view, on number five from the obligations:

وَسُؤَالُ الْمَغْفِرَةِ مَرَّةً مَرَّةً

[It is an obligation] to ask for forgiveness (by saying *Rabbigh-firli*) once in each unit (between the two prostrations) but it is *sunnah* to say it three times.

So, in each time that you are between the two *sajdah* you have to say it at least once.

This is a unique position in the Ḥanbali school—but not without controversy. Because not only is, well almost the entire scholarly community against that and they consider this only to be a recommended matter and not an obligation, but more importantly within the school itself.

Obviously, those folks who have been studying for a while now will understand this point. The point to realise is that there is a maturity that once you start to study *fiqh,* at the beginning it is all very harsh and all very, '*That is wrong and this is right.'* And then you start to appreciate that the scholars are all coming from different angles, with different interpretations, etc. Then you start to realise that there are nuances, you start to realise that other scholars have very strong evidences. And then you start maybe even to choose a *madh-hab*, which you know my position on. If you don't because you are new, then I think a *madh-hab* is very useful. It has been a safe and protective way of practicing your Islam and it helps. But I'm very much against a person restricting themselves to just a *madh-hab* and more importantly the mindset of restricting yourself to a *madh-hab*, meaning that '*I won't go anywhere else*,' and '*I won't consider anything else*,' and '*This is the be all and end all of Islam*,' and that will stunt your growth. But for the vast majority, to spend most of the time just sticking to a *madh-hab*, the Ḥanafi school, Ḥanbali school, is going to be a safe practicing way to actually get to where you need to in order that your Islam is orthodox, is wholesome.

You know *subḥān Allāh*, the biggest blessing of the *madh-hab* is not its *fiqh* position. The biggest blessing of a *madh-hab* is that it concretes in your mind orthodoxy. I want you to know that in today's battleground for ideas, the biggest problem that we have and our biggest enemy, our biggest enemy without a shadow of a doubt is what? It is the war between orthodoxy and liberalism.

When I say liberalism, I mean liberalism in a very generic way. I don't just mean liberal values. I mean liberalism, secularism, humanism—the isms which take authority away from the source of orthodoxy and they give you the belief that you have the right to determine. That is what I'm trying to express. Once you believe that you have the right to question sources, to question the authenticity of sources—when you are not qualified to do so—but more importantly to believe that even if a source is authentic, if it goes against my own understanding, it goes against my interpretation, then this mindset is completely at odds with orthodoxy.

And orthodoxy by the way has enough problems. So, when you see the intra Muslim wars between Sufis and Salafis and Ashʿaris and Maturidis and Atharis etc. I want you to know that all of these *fitnah* and some of them are very serious, pale into insignificance—I want you to quote me on that—compared to the problem between all of us, and the problem or the destruction of their *ʿaqīdah*, philosophical liberalism, or the philosophy of you believing that you have the ultimate say in a position. And there are many names that you can call them: reformists, modernist, secularist. It doesn't actually matter. But when people believe that authority belongs with the scholarly class, when authority is restricted to those who know, who have prepared and trained for it, that accept the finality of the *Sunnah*, that accept the uniqueness of the Qurʾān, our differences with them are minor. We can get through all of that. We actually even go as far as to say we will celebrate these differences—even to the level of *ʿaqīdah*. That is much more controversial, and I don't mean it in an absolute sense. But I want you to know that if you think that Ashʿari folks are your biggest enemy, you have no idea who your enemy is. That is my point. And even though some of the differences between the Ashāʿirah and Ahlʾl-Sunnah when it comes to *ʿaqīdah* and belief in Allāh ﷻ are serious but both groups very firmly believe in scholarship and in *Sunnah* and in interpreting *ayāt* and *ḥadīth* within a very strict framework, which the Muʿtazilah or which the modern-day philosophers, or modernists, etc. reject the framework completely, scholarship completely. That is something which is very, very important for you to realise. And you pick this up with the maturity of your studying Islam.

When it comes to a *madh-hab*, as I was saying the journey of the *madh-hab* when you start studying *fiqh*, you start to become more relaxed and start to become more easy upon people and start to appreciate the depth of religion much more as well. Then what will happen is that you will realise that even within a *madh-hab* there are significant differences. So even within a school of thought the founder will have a position and the rest of the school will go against him. The vast majority of time not openly. There will be claims that, '*No actually, that is his position, but you don't get it.*' Sometimes they will go against him. And frankly, a lot of times people will see this as some kind of something to be embarrassed about or that this is a weakness or that this is a problem. We laugh a lot about when we say the Shāfiʿi position is this and the Mālikis say this and then we say for the Ḥanbalis we have three *riwāyāt*, we have three narrations. It is always the Ḥanbali school that has so many narrations of the position of their Imām or the position of their school and it is like a joke. And in a way it is a joke. However, it is not. Because it also shows the actual aim of *fiqh* which is to educate the people upon the evidences,

the understanding of the principles of what we call *uṣūl*, how people arrive to positions and decisions using those evidences and then that they are free to differ. We know it is common within the Ḥanafi school where the imām will be on one position, Imām Abu Ḥanīfah's position, and his companions and students who are taking a different school. But Abu Ḥanīfah himself is celebrating that.

Student (online): Sometimes the Imām himself will have multiple *riwāyāt.*

Ustādh: So, that is something which is normal. The Imām having a position and the school then developing and taking a position itself, the *muʿtamad*, the established position in the *madh-hab*, which is normally the same but sometimes it can be different. You go a whole different next level then, when actually there is that split and then on the authority of the Imām you have different multiple narrations from what was the Imām holding. What was his position actually? So that nuance is something that really, basic folks don't need to be aware of. And even advanced folks don't need to be so lost in unless you are an aficionado of the *madh-hab*—you really want to get into nitty-gritty. And it is good that people do that. Me? I am not interested in the slightest. I am not even interested in the Ḥanbali School per se as such. I celebrate their school. I celebrate the work of scholars that come after, that develop and build and that sometimes go back and establish and protect. For me, my life goal is to protect orthodoxy, not the *madhāhib*. My war, open war, is against the liberal, secular classes that have used modernity and created philosophy out of modernity. And that philosophy is that we are king, the *ʿaql* is king and the *ʿaql* is what determines and not what texts and tradition and so on. That's the real war, not this other one.

(0:25:00) So, anyway, from the famous, famous points is this issue: *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli*. And what I want to bring to you is that Prophet ﷺ, narrated on the authority of ʿAbdullāh ibn Abbās ﵄:

أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم كَانَ يَقُولُ بَيْنَ السَّجْدَتَيْنِ " اللَّهُمَّ اغْفِرْ لِي وَارْحَمْنِي وَاجْبُرْنِي وَاهْدِنِي وَارْزُقْنِي. "

"Between the two prostrations the Prophet ﷺ would say: *Allāhumma-ghfirli warḥamni wajburni wahdini warzuqni*." [1,2]

[1] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What Is Said Between the Two Prostrations, ḥadīth no. 284*. Imām al-Ḥākim (1/271) and Imām al-Dhahabi considered it *ṣaḥīḥ*. (As cited in *al-Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ʿala Zād al-Mustaqniʿ*, Volume 3, page 130, footnote 3.)
[2] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 898*. Imām al-Ḥākim (1/271) and Imām al-Dhahabi considered it *ṣaḥīḥ*. (As cited in *al-Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ʿala Zād al-Mustaqniʿ*, Volume 3, page 130, footnote 3.)

There are a number of versions of this *ḥadīth*. In each version there is an increase and a decrease of words. So, *wa ʿāfini* is a very popular one as well. We have another version which has been collected by Abu Dāwūd for example:

أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم كَانَ يَقُولُ بَيْنَ السَّجْدَتَيْنِ " اللَّهُمَّ اغْفِرْ لِي وَارْحَمْنِي وَعَافِنِي وَاهْدِنِي وَارْزُقْنِي. "

"The Prophet ﷺ used to say between the two prostrations: *Allāhummagh-firli warḥamni wajburni wa-hdini warzuqni wa ʿāfini warfaʿni*."[3]

Warfaʿni is in there as well. My little studies lead me to believe that out of all of the wordings that have been used, *warfaʿni* is the weakest addition. Therefore, my own personal *duʿāʾ* between the *sajdah* is: *Allāhummagh-firli warḥamni wa ʿāfini wajburni warzuqni*. This is my own version and I restrict my words to this. But we will develop this in a second.

And all of the *ḥadīth* that are on this matter, each time the order changes slightly each time, little bit, little bit. Now, we have a separate *ḥadīth* narrated by Ḥudhayfah ﵁, he said:

كَانَ يَقُولُ بَيْنَ السَّجْدَتَيْنِ " رَبِّ اغْفِرْ لِي رَبِّ اغْفِرْ لِي

"Between the two prostrations [the Prophet ﷺ] used to say: *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli*." [4]

This is the smallest one. Now, you can imagine, when you have *ḥadīth* like this you have a mixture of *ḥadīth* of what the Prophet ﷺ used to say between the two *sajdah*. And just in case you are not understanding what I mean, I mean when you are in *sajdah* [and say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, [then you come up from *sajdah* saying] *Allāhu akbar* [and while you are sitting and before you go down for the next *sajdah* you say] *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli*. [Then as you go into the next *sajdah* you say] *Allāhu akbar* [and whilst you are in *sajdah* you say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*. This is the position—*al-jalsah baynʾl-sajdatayn*—the seated position between the *sajdah*. This is obviously obligatory prayer, *sunnah* prayer, every prayer.

---

[3] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: The Supplication Between the Two Prostrations, ḥadīth no. 850*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan*.
[4] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of the Clasping One's Hands Together, Chapter: The Supplication Between the Two Prostrations, ḥadīth no. 1145*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

We have a variety of *ḥadīth* which are starting with *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli* as a bare minimum and a number of narrations affirming that (nearly all authentic) and then other versions that don't have *Rabbigh-firli* but *Allāhummagh-firli* but part of longer versions, three and then four and then five and then six. All different wordings, all different orders. Quite a lot of variety. So, you then have an approach to how you're going to deal with it.

The vast majority of scholars—so that means the Ḥanafi school, Māliki school, Shāfiʿi school, a number of the *ahlʾl-ḥadīth*, the reformers out of it, and fascinatingly very strong narrations from Imām Aḥmad himself, and I will go further, an acceptable position in the school as well but seen as a minority, seen as an offshoot—consider any *dhikr* or *duʿāʾ* to be said between the two *sajdah* to be a *sunnah* only, meaning it is recommended, meaning not an obligation.

Student (online): I've been adding *warfaʿni* for ages.....

Ustādh: *Warfaʿni*, by the way, is authentic according to a number of scholars. Don't at any moment remove it from your *duʿāʾ*. A number of *muḥaddithīn* have authenticated the addition of *warfaʿni*. I am saying just my own personal take on this is that *warfaʿni* is not as strong as the other wordings. But believe me I am much more comfortable with people adding it than not adding it, if that makes sense. Because I found less scholars on my side critiquing that word than supporting it. So, that's important. But listen, hold that for a second. We will come to what we say in a second. Let's just think about the principles.

So, we have these *ḥadīth* and the vast majority of the scholars they all saw these *ḥadīth* with one lens. They basically said: It's clear for us that the variety, the amount that basically is there, and the flexibility is indicating this is a *sunnah*. And that the variety is a proof of it. Just like lack of variety is a proof of not being *sunnah*—like the *Fātiḥah*. You don't get versions of *Fātiḥah*. It's *Fātiḥah* and that's it. The *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*, *Allāhu akbar*, you don't get versions of that. So, when you see that rigidity in terms of its form, you get a rigidity of ruling as well. That's not a definitive proof but it's what helps create a case.

Now, we can see that with such a relaxed number of *duʿāʾ* and all the Companions narrating various ones that they have heard and seen, that's flexibility. That's the definition of flexibility. And that's how all the scholars saw it. And to be honest it is upon the others really to try and prove the difference.

Shaykh says *suʾāluʾl-maghfirah*, to seek *maghfirah* at least once, this is the sixth *wājib* from the *wājibātuʾl-ṣalāh*. This is Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn speaking on behalf of the Ḥanbali school.

سؤال المُصلِّي المغفرة مرَّة مرَّة

And Shaykh says this is obviously between the *sajdatayn*, between the two prostrations. He says: Let's remind ourselves what *maghfirah* is. What is it that we are actually asking for?

Maghfirah is:

هي سَتْرُ الذَّنْبِ والتجاوز عنه

It is the covering of the sin, the covering, the hiding and then forgetting about it as well—pardoning it, as if it doesn't exist. So, it is one thing which is hiding it from people and hiding it from it being seen or even understood or being judged and then forgiving it. Two stages. Shaykh says that is taken from the *mighfar*. *Mighfar* is the helmet which protects the head and everything underneath it is hidden. So, that's linguistic connection, so it hides things underneath it. The *mighfar* not only hides but it gives protection. That's why making *istighfār*, when you seek forgiveness from Allāh ﷻ, what you are actually doing is asking Allāh ﷻ to hide your sin and to protect you from its consequences, which is like an arrow coming to hit you. Same way that you will have your helmet on your head to do that. Shaykh says it's important to remember that forgiveness is not just hiding the sin.

ولا هي العفو عنها فقط

There are two stages. It's not just hiding of the sins and it's not just the forgiving of the sin or the *ʿafw* or the pardoning of the sin. It's:

السَّتر مع العفو، ولهذا يقول الله سبحانه وتعالى إذا خلا بعبده يوم القيامة وقرَّره بذنوبه : «قد سترتُها عليك في الدُّنيا، وأنا أغفِرُها لك اليوم»

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that's why when Allāh ﷻ in the *ḥadīth qudsi* narrated by Imām al-Bukhāri,[5] Allāh ﷻ will say on the Day of Judgment, when the slave admits to his sins and is standing in front of Allāh ﷻ, He will say: "I hid it for you in the *dunya* and today I will forgive you for it." So, there is a hiding and a forgiving, a pardoning. And that is what *maghfirah* is.

[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Oppressions, Chapter: The Statement of Allāh ﷻ: "... No Doubt! The Curse of Allāh ﷻ Is on the Ẓālimūn."* [ḥadīth no. 2441].

It is the greatest thing that a person can ever do, *istighfār*. You know, a lot of people they think that *istighfār* is something that you do when you are guilty. *Istighfār* is something you do when you want power. *Istighfār* is what you do when you want *rizq*. *Istighfār* is what you do when you want rain. *Istighfār* is what you do when you want children. *Istighfār* is what you do when you want mercy. When you want more, you make *istighfār*. *Istighfār* strengthens you because it makes you appreciate who you really are, your weaknesses, your dependency upon Allāh ﷻ, your mistakes in front of Allāh ﷻ and it allows you to appreciate just how much you are in need of Allāh's ﷻ mercy, because He is hiding so much for you all the time.

Not just hiding from other people. Don't think it's just about a PR campaign. It's not. When it comes to sin it's not about PR. It's about you being affected by the action as well. You see, because not everyone makes *istighfār*. I want you to think about this. To do *istighfār* you have to have *tawfīq*, you have to have blessing from Allāh ﷻ. The vast majority of people they don't make it at all. The vast majority of people on this planet do not make *istighfār* for their sins. They do not even recognise it as a sin, which is the next level of misguidance. And then they take it to the worst of misguidance—they
(0:35:00) celebrate their sin, and they expose to people their sin, and they are proud of it. And that is what the Prophet ﷺ condemned more than any other action, those people who make this *jahr* with their sin.[6] So, I want you to appreciate that the people who make *istighfār* are great people. Self-awareness is the greatest of blessings. For a person to seek forgiveness, *wallāhi* it's such a blessing. I think everybody feels that. I think everybody realises that.

I will give you an example. Especially in the age of social media, if you see like a big celebrity or a big something who is meant to be Muslim but they don't practice at all, maybe they only have a Muslim name, if you see any sign of regret or they make a statement or write a tweet or Instagram post expressing some kind of regret or sadness or asking for forgiveness, it's a real *imān* booster. It really is because you realise that this person still has something left. There is still something inside—that they know, that they are aware, that the heart is still alive. The heart is dead of the person who does not react, when you become desensitised to sin. And that is the whole point of why Allāh ﷻ in the Qurʾān focuses so much upon the heart being sealed. And the heart is sealed in different levels and different stages. There are different words to use according to different films and seals which are applied to the heart—each one more blocking and more permanent than the previous one.

If you look at many aspects of the *dīn* whether it's good deeds and actions and so on about the health of the heart being so essential amongst that. Or for example random things like going to *Jumuʿah* and the Prophet ﷺ saying that the one that leaves three

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Good Manners and Form, Chapter: A Believer Should Conceal What Sins He May Commit, ḥadīth no. 6069*.

intentionally in a row, their heart is sealed.[7] These are all indicating that the essence of the need for *istighfār* is a huge blessing.

So when Allāh ﷻ says:

سَتَرْتُهَا عَلَيْكَ فِي الدُّنْيَا

"I did screen your sins in the world."[6]

You might be thinking, '*Thank You yā Allāh! You did that because my behsti wasn't done. So and so did not find out.*' That is not the actual blessing. It's a blessing, but it's not *the* blessing. *The* blessing is that you were actually protected from the worst possible outcome. The worst possible outcome of the sin is that you disregard it and carry on sinning. But the fact that you turned to Allāh ﷻ to seek forgiveness, let alone the bonus of the pause in the sin, maybe you even stopped sin, or maybe you cry over that sin and then return to it. All of this is better than just carrying on sinning. And all of that is better than carrying on sinning and then not recognising it and celebrating it. So, please appreciate how blessed it is to have your sin hidden, consequences hidden, the *satr*. That's stage one.

And then for Allāh ﷻ then to forgive it. Now what does that mean?

You owe Allāh ﷻ now. He gave you everything and He said that this is its cost. You did not pay the price. Therefore, you owe Him a debt. Whatever way you look at it whether the payment of the debt is with the currency or whether you have to work for it, which is otherwise known as being punished, you either have the ability to pay it off, so you have done enough good deeds to pay it off your debt and if you haven't (and you won't), then it is His right to put you to work. And using that restaurant example: If you can't pay the bill, it's washing the dishes. And washing the dishes in the restaurant is not a job, it's a punishment. The punishment on the Final Day will be the Fire. So, if you are not able to pay it off then you have a debt to Allāh ﷻ, because you have nothing to offer Him and you are empty then you are going to be punished. And that is what will happen to a number of people. Most of them will be the high level *munāfiqīn* and the *kuffār*. As for the believers who made *istighfār*, even though they did the sin, even though they owe Allāh ﷻ a debt, Allāh ﷻ forgives them that debt. That has nothing to do now with the *satr,* the *tawfīq* the blessing, your consequences. That is all your benefit. Here now Allāh ﷻ waived His right. That is a beautiful thing as well *subḥān Allāh*.

So, I want you to understand that, we say *yā Sittīr*, the Arabs say this more than the Paks. *Yā Sittīr*—Oh the One who hides everything, help us *yā* Allāh, hide this. Or

[7] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: The Severity Of Leaving The Friday Prayer, ḥadīth no. 1052*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

Allāhummustur yā Rabb—protect us *yā* Allāh, keep this away from us. It's different from saying *Allāhummigh-firli.* When we say *Allāhumma ʿāfini yā Rabb*, *Allāhumma innaka ʿafuwwun tuḥibbʾl-ʿafwa faʿfu ʿani*, what we are actually saying is Allāh ﷻ forgive the actual sin. That's the specific second part. *Satr* is the first part. *Maghfirah* is all of it combined. It is the most beautiful concept. So, I want you to know that it's going to be the essential part of any act. It is the essential part of our day, let alone how essential it is as a part of the *ṣalāh*, which is that great moment between you and Allāh ﷻ in a direct sense. Of course, you expect it to be an essential part of the prayer, and that is in line with some of the thinking when we are seeing scholars that obligate it in the prayer as well, meaning it's never just one evidence.

Some of their arguments are going to be that the Prophet ﷺ said this *duʿāʾ* at a time when it's all obligation so has to be an obligation. By the way that makes no sense for me whatsoever. The logic behind that is just weird. And I read this from Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shinqīṭi. He said that the *sajdah* is a *rukn*, what is said in the *sajdah* from *dhikr* is an obligation, this (to sit back up again) is a *rukn* and to be there a pillar of the prayer, whatever is going to be there is of obligatory value. And as the Prophet ﷺ never stopped saying it, then it becomes an obligation as well. So, they are arguing from a logical point of view not from a specific evidence point of view. Now when you have argument like that, you need supplementary arguments to try and develop your cause.

And I tell you the idea that the prayer is dependent upon *maghfirah* is as good as any because it is part of our life. So anyway, that was a bit of a [tangent], but Shaykh sometimes does that. We ask Allāh ﷻ to bless him for that. Sometimes he will go into a reminder that is needed amongst the dryness of the *fiqh*. And so that is something which I think we should remember.

The Shaykh says: The author at this moment in time, does not actually specify how to actually say it. He says:

سؤال المغفرة

But we know, that's why it is a *Logical Progression*, we know that when we covered the prayer, the description of the prayer you know last year (and you will find that in the notes), you will see that it actually says that you say *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli*.† He has actually specified it, it is actually on page 130 of Volume 3, where he told us that the form of asking for forgiveness is in *Rabbigh-firlī,* meaning my Lord forgive me, my Lord forgive me, very personal and so on.

† What is said between the two prostrations was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16. Lesson 32. MT

But Shaykh says if therefore a person said *Allāhummagh-firli*, *Allāhummagh-firli* this would not be sufficient according to this position of the Ḥanbali school which is obligating the wording *Rabbigh-firli* according to them.

لا يجزئه

That is based upon that interpretation. However, Shaykh says:

لكن يمكن أن يُقال :إنه لا يلزم أن نُحيل هذا الكلام على ما سَبَقَ، فيكون المراد بذلك سؤال المغفرة بأي صفة

I do not think that they will make a big issue of it and we do not need to make it so specific because there is supporting evidence that would indicate that. So, Shaykh says:

فلو قال: «اللَّهُمَّ اغفِرْ لي» لأجزأ

If a person did actually say *Allāhummagh-firli*, this will be sufficient. And this is the correct position according to Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn. But he says: However, the Ḥanbali school, (and he gives from the highest of authorities for this position, *Al-Muntaha*, in Volume 1 page 207) he says:

والمذهب: أنه لا بُدَّ أن يقول: «ربِّ اغفِرْ لي» فلو قال: «اللَّهُمَّ اغفِرْ لي» ما أجزأ.

So, according to this particular position in the school, which is the official position (I do not want to take it away from that), if you said *Allāhummagh-firli* you have not fulfilled
(0:45:00) what the Ḥanbali school wants. They are insisting it must be *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli*.

What is interesting to me is that Shaykh did not really develop this. In other places he has gone into a bit more. But I want to say to you that we will not accept this as our class position. Our **class position** is the position of Imām Ahmad which I consider to be correct and the position of Ibn Qudāmah, which I believe is what he held. And that is what I studied when I was younger. But that is not the reason I hold it. I hold it because it is the position of the majority. And that is that all of these varieties that we have, all of these versions, the idea behind it is that these are in variety forms that

indicate a *sunnah,* that just the fact that the Prophet ﷺ did not miss it is not in of itself an obligation, even though we do not know that he ﷺ never missed it. We do not know. The only time that we know that definitively is if the Prophet ﷺ specifically says: '*Do not leave this*,' or '*You must do this*,' but we don't. All we have is the Companion saying the Prophet ﷺ used to say…, the Prophet ﷺ used to say…. We do not have a text coming from him which specifies it. So, this also helps the majority as well. So, I just want to say that we are going to go with the majority. This is not an obligation according to the **class position,** but it is an obligation in the Ḥanbali school.

Now let us go through some of the questions and try to develop this.

The issue of positions of Imām Ahmad and what it is and who narrates from him and the *riwāyah* and whatever. It is a science in itself, PhDs and books have been written on this for those who are really into it. I am not into it. I will be honest with you, but you know it is what it is.

Student (online): Couldn't it be argued (and maybe some Ḥanbali scholars did) that there are very little (if any) that the Prophet ﷺ did not recite *duʿāʾ* of *istighfār jalsah bayn'l-sajdatayn* hence it becomes *wājib*?

Ustādh: Yes, it can be. But like I just said that in itself would not be enough to indicate an obligation. We would need something more than that. So, like I will give you an example. How is it understood if *Rabbigh-firli Rabbigh-firli* is narrated, but and then in other *ḥadīth Allāhummagh-firli warḥamni, wagburni, warzuqni, warfaʿni* is narrated. So, what happened, only obligating *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli*?

Or for example if the Prophet ﷺ has not been heard—and I do not know of a narration in which the Prophet ﷺ only said *subḥān Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm* once. I do not know of that. What is always narrated is that he ﷺ did it multiple times and that *witr* (an odd number) is the one which is narrated.[8] Why are we not obligating the one that we have always heard? Why do we minimise it to one? Because of the direct evidence where the Prophet ﷺ said that make this in your *sajdah* and make this in your *rukūʿ* like we covered last week.[9] That *ḥadīth* does not indicate number, which would indicate that one is a minimum. So no, you do require more than just constant habit to indicate obligation.

Now by the way that's not a consensus on that principle. There are some scholars, especially when it comes to the *ahl'l-ḥadīth* or the more literalist kind of folks (the Ẓāhiriyyah), for them any narration that shows any kind of regularity, for them that would be a very important obligation, if not a *rukn*, or whatever. And so it is not surprising to see that you find a lot less *sunnahs* in the prayer with the people like *ahl'l-*

---

[8] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of Clasping One's Hands Together, Chapter: Another Kind, ḥadīth no. 1133*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

[9] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 887*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

ḥadīth and more obligations, whereas with the people of *fiqh, ahl'l-fiqh* or *ahl'l-ra'i,* you will find less obligations and more *sunnah,* more nuance basically.

I remember back in the day some of my Salafi teachers, they would be like: Listen, anything that the Prophet ﷺ does is obligatory because:

صَلُّوا كَمَا رَأَيْتُمُونِي أُصَلِّ

"Pray as you have seen me pray." [10]

And this indicates order therefore everything that he ﷺ does is therefore to be obligated upon you in the prayer. My goodness. Now let's just pause there.

That is a very good argument by the way because that is what he ﷺ said: Pray like you have seen me pray." So, it does not matter whether he ﷺ does it once or doesn't or misses it out or not or whatever, you are going to have to do it because he ﷺ said pray like you see me pray. So, when you build your house of *fiqh* upon this principle, then of course you are going to make the majority of things obligatory. If you understand this *ḥadīth* in a different way though, pray as you have seen me pray, which means basically pray as you have seen me pray (i.e. what I indicate to be a pillar then make it a pillar and what I indicate to be an obligation then it would be an obligation, what I indicate to be optional then keep it optional). That is how the vast majority of the *ahl'l-fiqh* are going to take that *ḥadīth*.

So, it is important to understand the basis and or the underlying principles. And there will always be valid *ijtihād* here. There is no doubt about that. We are okay with that. We are not rejecting and saying this is *ḥarām* to believe this position, but it is a minority position. I would even argue it is a minority within the school itself, even though it did a great PR job and it became the official face of the Ḥanbali school. And well done to them for that.

Student (online): Should we say it 100 times in the morning and 100 in the evening, is that sufficient?

Ustādh: There is never a minimum and there is no maximum for *istighfār*.

Student (online): Can *istighfār* be done in the heart or does it have to be verbalised?

Ustādh: *Istighfār* in the heart is something which is completely acceptable. Sometimes *istighfār* in the heart is stronger than the fake one you say on your tongue. However, when it comes to something like a ritual act of worship, then you have to fulfill terms

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, Book of Good Manners and Form, Chapter: Being Merciful to the People and to the Animals, ḥadīth no. 6008.*

and conditions. In *ṣalāh*, if the obligation is the statement then you have to say it. But conceptually, *istighfār* is something which continues with a person all the time, internally, thinking, saying.

As for the *ḥadīth* around the Prophet ﷺ that he ﷺ used to seek forgiveness seventy times,[11] more than seventy times,[12] 100 times.[13] There are a number of *ḥadīth* that describes these three in particular and others as well. And that is actually said on the tongue. That saying on the tongue is just an affirmation, a stronger form, brings it home. Sets out a warning to yourself. It's like a sensor to yourself. It's the sensitisation of yourself. It is almost like putting on a force field. So, saying it is very important.

That *ḥadīth* of 100 times does not mean 100 in the morning and 100 in the evening. It means 100 across the day. I don't want people to focus on the number. The whole point of these *ḥadīth* is to indicate that it's meant to be done thousands of times, millions of times, tens of times. The more that you are aware and protecting yourself, that's the aim of the Prophet's ﷺ *ḥadīth* of *istighfār*. That's 100% guarantee from me. Never ever will *istighfār* be about the numbers. Never.

Student (online): When you spoke about the debt. If Allāh ﷻ not only hides the sin but then forgives you, I assume the 'debt' isn't then just payable?

Ustādh: The debt is payable. It's Allāh's ﷻ mercy that allows you to get off it being payable. But it is payable. Payable is punishment. This is an awesome question if you think about it. There were some Companions who took exactly what you just said. They said, '*I have to pay this debt*.' So, what did they do? Or he did? I forgot his name. He ﷺ said: *Yā* Allāh bring this debt that I owe, bring it to me now. Basically, punish me for it now. He thought that's the way that he will have to deal with it. And it destroyed him.

The Prophet ﷺ said that's not how you pay back your debt. He didn't say that but that's effectively what he's saying. He ﷺ said you should say, *Allāhumma ʿāfini*. O Allāh forgive me my debt—meaning write it off and not, '*Okay let me pay it*.' So, the Prophet ﷺ is actually telling us how to get that debt payed, in the right way. Because the other way you can't handle. And we shouldn't be trying to deal with it.

Student (online): How can one claim it is a *sunnah* just due to the variety, and the lack of the Prophet ﷺ specifically saying this is *wājib* etc. I feel Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shinqīṭi's reasoning is strong in that it was mentioned in a narration in which *arkān* and *wājibāt* was mentioned.

(0:55:00) Ustādh: I don't think that Shaykh Muḥammad Mukhṭār al-Shanqīṭi himself holds this position as strongly as some people may feel. Let me just make that clear. But let's just

---

[11] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book of Tafsīr, hadīth no. 3259.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*
[12] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Invocation, Chapter: Seeking Allāh' s ﷻ Forgiveness by Daytime and at Night, hadīth no. 6307.*
[13] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Pertaining to the Remembrance of Allāh ﷻ , Supplication, Repentance and Seeking Forgiveness, Chapter: Encouragement to Remember Allāh ﷻ, Exalted Is He, ḥadīth no. 2702_a.*

assume that he does. That logic does have a position. Every position of the *ṣalāh* has a *dhikr* in it, is your argument. So, how can this position not have any *dhikr* in it?

Every position of the *ṣalāh* does not have an obligatory form of *dhikr*. For example, the *qiyām*. I hope everyone is understanding the question. It's a very good one. If you look at the prayer, first of all, who said you have to divide it into positions? Let me just make that clear. It's only scholars, right? It's not from the Prophet ﷺ. We don't have a classification system in which the Prophet ﷺ said stage one, stage two, stage three, stage four. Why am I making this point?

I'm saying that I could argue that the Prophet ﷺ, when he starts the prayer *Allāhu Akbar*, you are going to say that he's entered into *qiyām*. I'm going to say, no he has entered into the opening of the prayer. I'm going to say that the *qiyām* starts with the *Fātiḥah*. You couldn't logically argue against that.

If you said: What is your evidence?

I will say: Why do we need to have evidence? We have a statement of the Prophet ﷺ, nearly every single time, in fact, obviously scholarly difference as the Companions differed over it, that he ﷺ would say *subḥānak Allāhumma wa bi-ḥamdika wata bārak asmuka* or *Allāhumma bāʿid bayni wa bayna khaṭayāya.*[14,15] These *duʿāʾs* are being said. So that's the position and a *duʿāʾ* is being made. Why are we not saying that's its own position?

The scholars will say: No, it's a *qiyām*. That's the full position right there and the *Fātiḥah* is fulfilling that. So that is the obligatory *dhikr* of that position.

I'll say: No. That's a position in and of itself and the *dhikr* in it is not obligatory either.

My point is that even though that's not exactly the strongest of arguments, the reverse argument is also not a priori argument—that every position must have an obligatory *dhikr* in it per se. Because at what point do we start creating positions or what is a position, what is not a position?

Rather we should stick to the much safer and much obvious one, which is that there should be some indication of its obligation. That's why the vast majority—I repeat the vast majority—got it right. And it's not a surprise. And this is the same amongst the Companions as well. This *khilāf* amongst the Companions. A number of Companions never ever dreamed obligating this form of *dhikr*.

---

[14] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Proof of Those Who Say That the Basmalah Should Not Be Recited Aloud, ḥadīth no. 399 c.*
[15] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, Book of the Call to Prayer, Chapter: What to Say After the Takbīr, ḥadīth no. 744.*

If someone said to me that the concept of *istighfār* should be obligated, I'd feel a lot more comfortable doing that. But even that I'm not going to accept and neither did the majority.

Student (online): The whole *ṣalāh* is a *dhikr*.

Ustādh: But what is basically being talked about is the verbal *dhikr*. That the *afʿāl* always have *adhkār*.

Look! Exactly. Actually what I am just saying has been said has been said here:

Student (online): Class position—Are we concluding that the seeking of some form of forgiveness is still a *wājib,* but the wording can be your choice or that the seeking of forgiveness is not a *wājib* but a *sunnah*?

Ustādh: That's the perfect question. I want to say to you that any prayer that doesn't have *istighfār* in it in principle, then it's something which has defeated the concept of the prayer. But to specify it in a specific place in a specific way and obligate it? No. And that's the position of the majority. The position of the majority is to keep it as a concept that should be applied. But am I going to obligate it? No. I'm not going to obligate it because I don't want to obligate something which I do not see a specific evidence for, which is that you must say the word *astaghfir Allāh* in the prayer at some point some time. It's not there.

The reason why this is an academic point is because you can do *taʾwīl* and see certain *adhkār* already from the *tashahhud*, from *ihdinaʾl-sirāṭʾl-mustaqīm*, or *ghayrʾl-maghḍūbi ʿalayhim wa laʾl-ḍālīn* as a form of *istighfār*. So, the concept is there any way in the prayer. But in wording, this is the position of the majority that there is no wording specified obligating *istighfār*.

Student (online): Ḥanbali *madh-hab's* second opinion is if somebody says *Allāhummagh-firli* then no problem (*Kashf al-Qana* 2/349).

Ustādh: Yeah. *Jazāk Allāh khayr* that is a nice addition.

So, as I said at the beginning, that in the Ḥanbali school on this issue I know [that there are many narrations]. By the way, I do not take any interest in these narrations because they blow my mind. Narration this, position that. Narration this, position that. But this one, I did look into, or classically I have looked into because it is the big famous one. There are only a few of these in which there is a real big politics around. And you have: he ﷺ did not say it, he ﷺ did say it, he ﷺ said it before but it is abrogated, it was his last position—that's just from Imām Aḥmad. Then for the school itself: you must say it, you must say it twice, you must say it once, you must say it once exactly, you are allowed to say *Allāhummagh-firli* (just as we have seen in the second position here), etc., etc.

Student (online): Could you repeat what you mentioned was the position of Ibn Qudāmah please? And if different from Imām al-Ḥajjāwi's position, is the Ḥanbali position the former or the latter?

Ustādh: As far as I know Ibn Qudāmah's position is the position of Imām Aḥmad. And obviously I am biased. I consider Imām Aḥmad's position to be that it is *sunnah*, it is *mustaḥabb*, meaning it is recommended not obligatory. And Ibn Qudāmah is upon that opinion. I have not checked that, but that is always what I have believed for the last, maybe 15-20 years which is the last time I studied the Ḥanbali school formally.

Nayeem please if you can add if you have anything or any knowledge about that then please indicate that—what Ibn Qudāmah's position is.

Student (Nayeem): *Mustaḥabb* according to Ibn Qudāmah 2/207.

Ustādh: *Jazāk Allāh khayr* Nayeem. *Alḥumdulillāh*.

Student (online): By the way, I know the matter is flexible *in shāʾ Allāh*. I am just pressing for the academic side of things.

Ustādh: Well, you are saying that I am just looking for an academic side of things, that is the Ḥanbali school's problem. The academic side is missing on their side. The majority of scholars cannot see the evidence like as the evidences which establish every other thing in every other part of the prayer that leads to clear differences. Here, they went against the grain. Do not get me wrong, they developed their school. As you said, you can see the strength of their argument. They are saying that this is a separate position, it is surrounded by *arkān*, *arkān,* it is its own position itself. You have said it is a *rukn* in itself. There has to be a *dhikr* in it.

First of all, the idea that there has to be a *dhikr* in it is itself up for debate. Let me just make that clear. Just because the rest of the prayer has that kind of reality does not mean that this has to have that reality. What if I said there are positions themselves which are new that are not obligatory? Are you trying to say to me, and if you say yes, then you are creating a whole new principle?

Student (online): I meant covering the different angles for us as students.

Ustādh: Yeah, I know. I am just saying, continuing as a student, if we continue down this line, that every position has to have a *dhikr*, are you meaning...I have already opened up the idea that what is a position? Who defines what a position is? What is the threshold for when a position starts and ends?

Then I will throw another curve ball in. I will say: What if that position is not an obligatory position in the prayer? Or are you going to say that no, those positions have something different? If a person sits or does a position in the prayer that is not from its obligatory positions, are you saying that they are obligated within that non-obligatory

position to say a *dhikr*? Meaning, these are all human constructs. That is what happens. When you do not have the strength of a clear evidence with you, you are free of that kind of headache. Bro, I know man. It is like anything. Once you get yourself into a pickle, you are just struggling. You are going to have to believe it, and you are going to go with it, and it might be legally valid, but it is not very great. You are not going to show it off, are you? And this is not the Ḥanbalis' greatest moment of glory, put it that way. I do not even think that a Ḥanbali would even admit that.

Student (online): Example?

Ustādh: The example is obvious, like the *jalsat'l-istirāḥah.* So, the sitting of rest, all scholars allow it if there is a reason. Some scholars even consider it to be a *sunnah*. Okay, what are you meant to say when you are in that position? It is a definite, different position, is it not? I just want you not to get too caught up on the idea of positions, and not positions, and all the rest of it.

(1:05:00) Student: I am sorry if this has already been mentioned, but is there an aspect of wanting to slow people down by obligating some *adhkār*?

Ustādh: Absolutely! But you know what? That is me. That is my statement. I have not read that from some other scholar or anything like that. That was my own take. That is what I teach in *Fiqh of Ṣalāh*. I believe that *adhkār* are your best friend in perfecting your prayer. Not just because of what it brings, but in terms of it forces you to slow down. And some scholars could, for example, say we are going to obligate. Like, imagine what would happen to the Ḥanafis if we obligated *Rabbigh-firli Rabbigh-firli* as a basic minimum? Because you know Ḥanafis are all about [quickly moving from one *sajdah* to the next without pausing]. I mean, not practicing Ḥanafis, proper practicing Muslims. But I mean the majority of Ḥanafis. It is like they can't straighten their back.

Student: Our teachers teach to sit at complete rest [during] the *jalsah*, I take your point though.

Ustādh: Well, it is in the Ḥanafi school, it is the Pakis who are the ones who are doing it. But it comes from the Ḥanafi principle that to actually straighten the back and settle down is not from the *arkān* of the prayer.

Student (online): Wannabe Ḥanafis.

Ustādh: It is not even "wannabe" Ḥanafis. This is the irony. It is actually the door has been opened by the scholars in the school. Once you allow a person to believe that it is not a *rukn*, which technically by the way is not the worst argument in the world. Let me just make that clear. That to come up from the *sajdah* and then to sit there and let everything relax and so on and so forth. If you do not make that a *rukn*, if you do not make that an essential part of the prayer, then over time, what do you expect people to do? If you have been brought up that this [to sit up straight after coming up from *sajdah* and letting everything relax] is as important as reciting *Fātiḥah*, you are never going to

that business [quickly go into *sajdah* without straightening your back and letting everything relax].

Student (online): I honestly thought it was just people being lazy.

Ustādh: Yes, this is what everyone thinks, that it is people being lazy. That is why I said practicing Muslims. The practicing Muslims amongst the Ḥanafi school, which is different than practicing Ḥanafis. Because the Ḥanafi school has allowed them the *rukhṣah.* The practicing Muslims would not dream of praying—whatever *madh-hab* you follow—in this kind of manner: up, down, up, down. They wouldn't dream of it. And the practicing Muslims, whatever *madh-hab* you belong to, are going to welcome *adhkār* to add to the prayer. They are going to welcome not just reciting the *Quls* in the prayer. They want to learn the longer *sūrahs*. They want to make more than three *tasbīḥ* in the *rukūʿ*. They want to stand up [straight and say] *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah Rabbanā wa lakʾl-ḥamd*. Are there any *duʿaʾ* that I can learn? My Ḥanafi school does not obligate me to straighten my back in this position, but if there is a *sunnah* here that I can say, *milʾ assamawāti wa milʾ al-arḍ wa mā baynahuma wa milʾa mā shiʾta min shayʾin baʿd*. And I am now making *duʿāʾ* and I am standing here and praising Allāh ﷻ. I will take that. That is what we're meant to do. It is the practicing Muslims who want to embrace their prayer. Now, it is just unfortunate that the majority that we see, which is of course without a shadow of doubt no one can argue that, that the Paks are the biggest presentation of the people who do pray quickly.

Student (online): The same for Turkish people in Germany definitely a Ḥanafi thing.

Ustādh: Of course, it is a Ḥanafi thing. There is no doubt about it. I did not need any validation but *Jazāk Allāhu khayr* because 100%. You go across the world, you will see all of the people. Even in Syria—when I was in Syria I saw the Ḥanafis there.

It starts with a concession and then the humans take it to a whole *ḥarām* level. Once the scholarly position is established, not with the intention of people doing it like that [moving quickly from position to position] but because they do not believe it, that you have to obligate in that way.

Anyway, the **<u>class position</u>** is that it is a *sunnah* from the *sunan* of the prayer to make *duʿāʾ* in between the two *sajdah*. It is not obligatory. And whatever *duʿāʾ* you make [from the narrated versions] is acceptable in whatever order. That means, saying *Rabbigh-firli Rabbigh-firli.* If a person said it twice, he is fulfilling a specific *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ.[4] So, that is something which is rewarded. As the text says, that once is obligatory (that's the Ḥanbali position), and three times is the *sunnah*. Likewise, if a person did say *Rabbigh-firli Rabbigh-firli Rabbigh-firli* three times, that is good. If he says it two times, that is good as well. If he said *Allāhummagh-firli* once, twice, or three times, that is good.

Student (online): "Whatever *duʿāʾ* you make" you mean from the narrated versions, right?

Ustādh: Correct. Sorry. "Whatever *duʿāʾ* you make" I mean from the narrated versions.

And the order, I do not say that you make it up, although I have to tell you that in my heart, I am comfortable with that. What do I mean by that?

There is a principle that when a *duʿāʾ* is narrated a number of times in not a set way, then there is an indication that order is not obligatory. There is a general principle that the majority of scholars hold that *duʿāʾ* itself is not actually so rigid and fixed. Order is flexible. And so therefore, whether you said *Allāhummagh-firli waʿāfini wajuburni warfaʿni warzuqni wahdini*, this will be permissible because it is focusing more on the natural expression as it is, as opposed to the specific wording and order. That is not something you just make up willy nilly. You look for an indication of that. The indication is there because (1) it is a *duʿāʾ*, and I do not mean normal *dhikr*; it is a *duʿāʾ*, and (2) the versions that have been narrated it have indicated it.

Student (online): Is the class position that it is of the *sunan* of the prayer to make *duʿāʾ masnūn* between the two *sajdah* or is the class position that it is of the *sunan* of the prayer to make *duʿāʾ masnūn* for forgiveness between the two *sajdah*?

Ustādh: The **<u>class position</u>** is that it is *sunnah* to make a *duʿāʾ* from that which is narrated, and sometimes that will have the words *Allāhummagh-firli*, sometimes it will not. Whether the words *Allāhummagh-firli* are used or not, it is not obligatory. You can use any of them. Nothing is specifically obligated. Nothing.

Student (online): Is *ṭumaʾnīnah* not a *wājib* of the prayer, even in the Ḥanafi school?

Ustādh: Kind of yes, kind of no. There are debates over the interpretation of what it actually is.

Shaykh then says that this is to be done three times, *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli*. Again, it is the Ḥanbali position. He said that the *ḥadīth* of Ḥudhayfah ﵁:

والدليل على أنه يُسَنُّ ثلاثاً :حديث حذيفة بن اليمان رضي الله عنه: حين ذَكَرَ أنه صَلَّى مع النبيِّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم فلما جَلَسَ بين السَّجدتين جَعَلَ يقول: «ربِّ اغفِرْ لي، ربِّ اغفِرْ لي» وكان دُعاء النبيِّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم غالباً التكرار ثلاثاً.

Normally the *duʿāʾ* of the Prophet ﷺ used to be three times.

I am going to tell you something else by the way. This is from my own pocket. I personally prefer twice over thrice, and I always have. That is because, even though what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn has said is correct, which is that you should do it three times, because even though the *ḥadīth* says twice,[4] the Prophet ﷺ most of the time would make *duʿāʾ* three times. I am comfortable with the fact that the Prophet ﷺ said it twice and sticking to that. What I am discussing is not something big. I am discussing maybe the difference in reward of maybe a minimal sense. I do not know. I do not think it is a major issue.

Student (online): Could a person therefore add to *Rabbigh-firli, Allāhumma innaka ʿafuwwan* and can a person say *Allāhummagh-firli wa li-wālidaya*?

Ustādh: This is important because these are well-established principles to seek forgiveness for yourself and for your parents. That is the basic principle in *Sharīʿah*, in Islam. Therefore, why wouldn't you do it?

However, I want you to know that there is no doubt that sticking to what is narrated is better. There is no way that I can say that it is *ḥarām* to make *duʿāʾ* in the prayer in a part where it is open and relaxed. And there are certain parts of the prayer that are relaxed. The *sajdah* is the most relaxed of the prayer, where a person opens up and says what they want. So much so, that as you know, many scholars (even though I like to avoid it as much as possible, in the *sunnah* I do not mind it) allow you to make your *duʿāʾ* in Urdu and in English as well. The *sajdah* is where you open your heart and you say what you want. And even though, as we said the Qurʾān are not meant to be recited
(1:15:00) in the *sajdah*, but even if there are *duʿāʾ* which are in the form of *ayāt*, I think there is some flexibility there as well. That is where you would normally say it.

There are not many positions of the prayer where you can make *duʿāʾ*. There are probably, off the cuff, four positions? There are more than that. Let us be technical and count them all. You have the beginning, which is the part of *al-istiftāḥ.* That is the part of *duʿāʾ*. The next one is then going to be in your *rukūʿ.* The next one is when you stand up after *rukūʿ.* The next one is going to be in your *sajdah*. The next one is going to be when you are sitting in between the *sajdahs.* The next one is going to be before your *taslīm*, in the *tashahhud*. These are the six places. This is not based upon evidence. This is from my pocket.

If you look at these six places, you get a feel that some are kind of stricter than others, and some are more relaxed than others. No doubt about it that the *sajdah*, out of these six categories of times for *duʿāʾ*, is the one which is most flexible. Go for it. Do anything.

Let us have a poll. Let us give them names. Let us call them: opening, *rukūʿ*, standing, *sajdah*, sitting (between the two *sajdah*), *taslīm*. That is the chronological order. I want you, from your own *ʿaql*, feeling, *fitrah*, put them in order, the top is the most flexible, least flexible is last.

Student (online): You're saying in the *farḍ ṣalāh* we can say any *duʿāʾ* we want in *sajdah*?

Ustādh: I didn't actually say that.

Student (online): I was confused about that since I heard in a recent lecture that we can't do that in *farḍ ṣalāh* in our own language.

Ustādh: I actually said that in the *farḍ* prayer, we shouldn't. And I even in the *sunnah* prayer, I don't, but there are a number of scholars that allow it. And I reluctantly allow it in the *sunnah*. And I even allow it in the *farḍ* prayer for people who don't pray *sunnah*, because I'm not going to cut them off from the greatest gift of the prayer which is *duʿāʾ* in *sajdah*. I am not going to cut them off. I don't have that amount of guts. But there's no doubt about it that a person should stick to the Arabic because you're really taking a risk going to the English. However, in *nafl* prayer, night prayer, etc. no problem. Knock yourself out. I'm not going to say it's *ḥarām*, but I'm just saying.

This is interesting. I want the most flexible at the top, so *sajdah* should be at the top. There is no doubt about that.

Student (Maysa): *taslīm, sujūd,* sitting, opening, *rukūʿ*, standing

Student (Rija): *sujūd*, *taslīm*, opening, sitting, *rukūʿ*, standing

Ustādh: Let's go with Maysa. I like the fact that she's gone all out. She's put *taslīm* first (which I think is a wicked shout), *sujūd* next, controversial one where she's gone in with the sitting next, she's put opening after that. I can't believe she's put *rukūʿ* so far down. But then Rija's done the same.

Student (Harun): *sujūd, taslīm*, *rukūʿ*, standing, sitting, opening

Ustādh: Now Harun has gone somewhere where I'm at, which is: *sajdah*, *taslīm*, *rukūʿ*, then he's gone standing between sitting and opening. I'd probably move sitting up.

Student (Sehar): opening, *taslīm*, standing, sitting, *rukūʿ*, *sujūd*

Ustādh: Sehar has got the opening first. I don't know about that bro.

Student (Hajra): *sujūd*, *taslīm*, sitting, opening, *rukūʿ*, standing

Student (Rahil): *Sujūd*, *taslīm*, standing, sitting, *rukūʿ*

Ustādh: Rahil has *sajdah*, *taslīm*, standing—you've put *rukūʿ* so far down as well!

Student (Fatima): *sujūd*, *taslīm*, opening, standing, sitting, *rukūʿ*

Ustādh: Fatima's got *sajdah*, *taslīm*, standing, and you've got *rukūʿ* last!

Student (Saarah): *sujūd*, sitting, *rukūʿ*, *taslīm*, standing, opening

Student (Riaz): *taslīm, sujūd*, sitting, standing, *rukūʿ*, opening

Student (Tahmid): *sujūd*, sitting, standing, opening, *taslīm*, *rukūʿ*

Student (Maryam): *sujūd*, *taslīm*, standing, opening, sitting, *rukūʿ*

Ustādh: Now what I'm looking at is Tahmid has standing in the middle.

Student (Maryam): *sujūd*, *taslīm,* standing, opening, sitting, *rukūʿ*

(1:26:00) Student (Javed): *sujūd, taslīm, rukūʿ,* sitting, *rukūʿ*, standing, opening.

Student (Juwayriyah): *sujūd*, *rukūʿ*, sitting, standing, opening, *taslīm.*

Ustādh: Oh! That's a disappointing end. I'm not gonna lie Juwayriyah. Disappointing.

Ustādh: Rayhaan said *sujūd*, *taslīm,* another *sajdah* in for good measure, standing, *rukūʿ*, sitting, opening.

Student (Jiva): *sujūd*, *taslīm, rukūʿ,* opening, sitting, standing

Student (Gassan): *sujūd,* sitting, *taslīm,* opening, *rukūʿ,* standing

I'm going to say my personal take on all of this. We proved a point. What was the point?

The point is that there is no 100% guaranteed way how we understand what's the right thing or not. We've got small indications, and then we go off that.

So why is this theoretical list of flexibility important?

It's important because when someone asks a question like: Can I say *Rabbigh-firli wa li-wālidayya?* And you don't have someone to ask but you want to make that *duʿāʾ* in the prayer, you'll look at your list in your head and think to yourself, '*You know what? That's* a *sajdah kind of duʿāʾ*.'

Look at everybody. Everybody put sitting at least after fourth position. When you look at it sitting was either third, or fourth, fifth. It didn't get high up. Now if you're there answering your own question, you'd be thinking, '*Yeah that's too far down the list*.'

Now Maysa, I know what her evidence was. She has the strongest evidence for putting *taslīm* first because the Prophet ﷺ said to make *duʿāʾ* for what you want.[16] That's a text. However, we also have a text where the Prophet ﷺ said you're closest to your Lord [in

[16] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Tashahhud in the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 402 a*.

sajdah] so by definition you ask and you praise.[17,18] So frankly, it's a toss-up between *sajdah* and before *taslīm*. These are your two big moments. These are your two moments that there's no doubt about it that you make *duʿāʾ* in the prayer. They are the emotional moments. They are the private moments. They are the personal moments. They are the ones you really go in and go out and just say whatever you want.

In the other positions all of you are feeling some kind of suffocation, some restriction, like I don't feel comfortable to be able to open up. And what makes it even more restrictive is that you get quite a few, very small, oft repeated *duʿāʾ* that are being said there.

So why did *rukūʿ* get pushed down?

Because we don't see lots of options for *rukūʿ.*

Why did standing (*samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah, Rabbana wa lakʾl-ḥamd*) get pushed down?

Because there's very little there.

For me, standing is last. Standing is last. Reason?

Very few comparatively speaking.

Student (online): But he literally said ask for what you want. So, I would have liked to put before *taslīm* as number one.

Ustādh: 100%! That's why I said to you Maysa is the one for me who won. It is a completely strong argument to put *taslīm* first. But when you think about it, it's a toss-up. It literally is.

Now my evidence for standing being last: very little narration of any other *duʿāʾ* other than two or three. That's the first thing. The bigger issue for me is that standing there making *duʿāʾ* for a long period of time would in of itself come across quite weird. This is not a position which you stand there, hands down. You know, ''*What's happening*? *Is he praying? Not praying? What's going on?*' That's the kind of guy that I would walk up to and shake his hand. You know when you come to a person—is he praying or not praying? If the person's in there for three seconds, I'm not.

Student (online): Not a position of humility?

Ustādh: No, I don't think it's not a position of humility.

---

[17] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: What Is to be Said While Bowing and Prostrating, ḥadīth no. 482.*

[18] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of Clasping One's Hands Together, Chapter: When Is a Person Closest to Allāh ﷻ the Mighty and Sublime, ḥadīth no.1137.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

Student (online): But what about *qunūtʾl-nāzilah*?

Ustādh: In *qunūtʾl-nāzilah* you're making *duʿāʾ.*

Student (online): That's a bit unfair. A person can be praying with hands to the side.

Ustādh: So, hands down like I just said, I'm not feeling it. There is *duʿāʾ* there. I'm saying I'm putting it as most restrictive. But a person who's praying with hands to their side is them praying. That's in the *Fātiḥah, qiyām*, reciting *sūrah*. But if you've just seen a person, it's like…

Student (online): Or you think he forgot which *rakʿah* he's on.

Ustādh: Exactly, you're going to think there's a problem. He got it spot on.

I'll give you an example. If a person is standing making *duʿāʾ* for five minutes after you've seen him stand up from *rukūʿ*, you are 100% going up to that guy and saying, '*Are you okay bro?*' 100%. Whereas if a person is in *duʿāʾ* in *sajdah* for ten minutes, you're not going to say anything. Twenty minutes, you're going to get worried and see if he hasn't fainted or you know something worse or anything like that. That's *fiṭrah*. Don't be arguing against people's *fiṭrah* bro. I'm not saying this is Qurʾān and *Sunnah* evidences. I'm just saying this is what people, you lot are saying. I'm saying the same thing.

Now that's not the same as opening. I'd put opening higher up because lots of *duʿāʾ* narrated compared to other positions. And it's moving into *qiyām*. So, I put opening actually quite high. I might even put my opening at maybe a three or a four. I'd put the sitting position lowish, maybe a five or a four.

Student (online): Surely, it's got to be *taslīm?*

Ustādh: See? She said: Surely, it's got to be *taslīm*. And so did Maysa because that's where the *duʿāʾ* was mentioned. What if I say to you it's not about what you're told to do, it's about what you're feeling? Yes bro. *Allāhu akbar*.

Ustādh: *sujūd*, *taslīm,* opening, *rukūʿ*, sitting, standing

That is what I would do. I would be thinking *sajdah, taslīm*—and it's a toss-up between them. Opening and *rukūʿ*—and it's a toss-up between them. Sitting definitely less and standing definitely the one which is most restricted.

Student (online): When the Prophet ﷺ said you are closest to your Lord in *sajdah,* is it the *sajdah* when you are in prayer or just the action of prostrating even outside of the prayer?

Ustādh: So, the action itself is implied, but it is the prayer. It is the prayer. The *ḥadīth* indicate that it is the prayer.

(1:35:00) Student (online): Opening, you mean only before *Fātiḥah*?

Ustādh: Opening definitely before *Fātiḥah*. Goodness me! So many *duʿāʾ* narrated for that position.

LP students that have been here for a while, you have no excuse for not putting standing high. I spoke for like maybe one or two sessions about the importance of setting moods. Remember we spoke about that. We said mood and how important it is, how it sets the scene and the *duʿāʾ* etc. But then in fairness you might argue, you'll say: Yeah but that's what was narrated not that which was not narrated. Now I want to say to you, first of all let me make it clear.

Student (online): Yes, but I thought it was only narrated *duʿāʾ*?

Ustādh: Very good.

And I do want you to know that this list was not just what is the list that has the most *duʿāʾ* that are narrated, because *sujūd* doesn't have any *duʿāʾ*. However, I'm saying that we should stick to narrated *duʿāʾ* in their positions. But if we are going to use personal *duʿāʾ*, let me make this a final position, my list is what it is:

- *sajdah* is the most flexible
- *taslīm* is then next
- then the opening
- the *rukūʿ*
- then sitting
- standing

That's my list of flexibility to least flexible with respect to *duʿāʾ* and elongating it—whether with other stuff or the narrated *duʿāʾ*.

But if people are going to ask: I want to enter into prayer and really feel and really call to Allāh and I want to make *duʿāʾ* from my heart where am I going to do it?

I'm going to say do it in *sajdah* and *taslīm* and avoid the rest. That's what I'm going to say. No doubt about that. If you're going to go off the record, if you're going to go off the script, go off the script in *sajdah*. And I'm even going to say go into your own English and your Urdu and so on.

Student (online): We also said it is not a *sunnah* to recite more than one opening *duʿāʾ*, didn't we? Hence, we would not spend as much time elongating it.

Ustādh: Correct, it is not a *sunnah* to recite more than one opening *duʿāʾ*. So, we would not spend as much time elongating it. That is true, but it has the flexibility, the permissibility, and the options to do some damage in that opening. You can really get through some big heavy ones.

Student (online): Damage?

Ustādh: Damage is a positive phrase bro. Damage meaning get work done.

Student (online): There are some long *duʿāʾ* narrated for the opening. So, you can spend a significant amount of time there making *duʿāʾ*.

Ustādh: Absolutely correct.

3. Chapter 19 Lesson 4: The Obligations of the Prayer

(0:10:15) وسُؤالُ الْمَغفِرَةِ مَرَّةً مَرَّةً، ويُسَنُّ ثَلاثًا، والتَّشَهُّدُ الأَوَّلُ وجَلْسَتُهُ، وما عَدَا الشَّرائِطِ والأركانِ والواجباتِ المذكورةَ سُنَّةٌ، فمَنْ تَرَكَ شَرْطًا لِغَيرِ عُذرٍ غَيْرَ النِّيَّةِ – فإنَّها لا تَسْقُطُ بحالٍ – أو تَعَمَّدَ تَرْكَ رُكْنٍ أو واجِبٍ بَطُلَتْ صَلاتُه، بخِلافِ الباقي

[Its obligations are:]

5) to ask for forgiveness (by saying *Rabbigh-firli*) once in each unit (between the two prostrations) but it is *sunnah* to say it three times
6) the first *tashahhud*
7) to sit for this first *tashahhud*

Everything other than the conditions, pillars and obligations that have been previously mentioned are considered *sunnah*.

Whoever (a) leaves a condition without an excuse, other than the intention—for it can never be "left out"—or (b) intentionally leaves a pillar or obligation, their prayer is invalidated. (The prayer is sound) in all cases other than this.

If you can turn to page 322 in *al-Mumtiʿ*.

The author says that it is a *sunnah* to say this three times—that's *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli.* The evidence that they consider is a *ḥadīth* that is narrated by Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān ﵁.[1]

والدليل على أنه يُسَنُّ ثلاثاً: حديث حذيفة بن اليمان رضي الله عنه: حين ذَكَرَ أنه صَلَّى مع النبيِّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم فلما جَلَسَ بين السَّجدتين جَعَلَ يقول: «ربِّ اغفِرْ لي، ربِّ اغفِرْ لي» وكان دُعاء النبيِّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم غالباً التكرار ثلاثاً.

[1] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of the Clasping One's Hands Together, Chapter: The Supplication Between the Two Prostrations, ḥadīth no. 1145*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

This is very interesting. There is a *ḥadīth* narrated by the Prophet ﷺ which we actually covered last week, a *ḥadīth* which is authentic, the *ḥadīth* of Ḥudayfah ؓ where the Prophet ﷺ, when he was in between his *sajdahs*, he ﷺ would say *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli*—which is obviously super clear that it is twice. However, we said that obligatorily speaking, it is only once—to say *Rabbigh-firli* is sufficient. Whether you consider it to be an obligation or a *sunnah*, forget that for a second. But the statement itself is sufficient to say once, but it is *sunnah* to say it more. They said three times. But the *ḥadīth* says twice. So, why would it then get to become three?

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that the fact that the Prophet ﷺ said the *duʿāʾ* (this is very interesting), he ﷺ said the actual *duʿāʾ* twice indicates that it is allowed to increase upon it. It is not just meant to be said once, like *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* for example. Theoretically, if the Prophet ﷺ had recited *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* in the prayer twice, there would be a discussion right now that it is a *sunnah* to say it three times, or five times, or seven times. We could open the door to that discussion. The fact that the Prophet ﷺ said it twice opens the discussion to the fact that this is a *duʿāʾ* and a *dhikr* which the Prophet ﷺ normally has a principle that he says the *adhkār* three times.

We said this last week, on the issue of positions. So, we have just come from a position of the *sajdah* where we have said *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* and we know that [to repeat it] three times is *sunnah*, or five times, or seven, etc. with one being an absolute obligation. And then it is going to be followed by the same. We have just come from *rukūʿ* that had something similar. So, we have had repetitions and three is coming up. Therefore, that is why the Ḥanbali school consider it to be a *sunnah* to say it three times even though the *ḥadīth* indicates two. But you understand the value of the *ḥadīth* indicating two. Because the *ḥadīth* indicating it was said twice takes it out of the 'one-only' bracket. And once you take something out of the 'once-only' bracket, then *witr*, or the 'odd factor' as opposed to even, the odd number rule comes into play that everything is great when it is odd. Every *dhikr* that you make should be odd. Every action you do should be odd. In general. It is difficult without evidence to take that too far. But I think you get the idea.

So, that is the Ḥanbali position.

The majority of scholars are relaxed upon that. They are saying that any kind of *duʿāʾ* that you say at this point is sufficient. It is okay. And I am okay with the **<u>class position</u>** to stick with the three as well. I do not want to make it though, only three. I definitely do not want to do that. So, my idea is that it is good to increase on the *duʿāʾ*. I believe that it should be opened up from *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli* anyway. I do not believe that *Rabbigh-firli* in this wording is obligation anyway as my position—as the **<u>class position</u>**. I am happy with *Allāhummagh-firli, Allāhummagh-firli.* I am happy with that being said once. I will be happy with that being said three times. The *ḥadīth* says *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli.*[1] In this point, I think there is flexibility. To repeat it more than once, as a *sunnah,* is an acceptable position obviously according to a number of scholars.

Student (online): A *fiqh* instructor said the odd preference is only in the Ḥanafi school.

Ustādh: The odd preference is not just the Ḥanafi thing. The odd preference is a *sunnah* aspect. So, the Prophet ﷺ, when he used to pray *ṣalāt al-Witr*, he used to go to three, five, seven, eleven.[2,3] We know that in the *tasbīḥāt*. We know that in his ﷺ *sunnah* in general. Maybe you could say that the Ḥanafi school might be emphasising it, but I would actually opine, that of all the *madhāhib* that I get the feeling that restrict numbers most, it is actually the Ḥanafi school when it comes to the prayer.

Student (online): Is it not better to do what the Prophet ﷺ did himself, i.e. twice?

Ustādh: This is why I do not want to say that this statement being said three times is the *sunnah*. That is why you would have seen me say in the way that I am trying to say—I get it in the Ḥanbali school, they are saying that three times is the *sunnah,* but I am saying not even this statement is *sunnah*, to say it three times. I am saying that if a person were to say *Rabbigh-firli*, he should say it twice like the *ḥadīth* states.[1] But he has the permission to increase on it because the fact that the Prophet ﷺ said it more than once, he ﷺ has already opened up the door for it to be said five times, seven times.

We know that him saying *Allāhummagh-firli warḥamni waʿāfini wajburni warzuqni wahdini*,[4,5] that being present in the *ḥadīth* takes the pressure off the word *Rabbi* not being necessary. So, *Allāhumma* can be the operative command, Oh Allāh forgive me, *Allāhummagh-firli*, as opposed to *Rabbigh-firli.*

My personal practice is that I will never say *Rabbigh-firli* three times. I will say *Rabbigh-firli* twice. I will mix it up with *Allāhummagh-firli warḥamni,* that what is narrated. But in principle with all of the *adhkār* and *tasbīḥāt* it is flexible in the aspect of *witr*.

Student (online): Why is everything better when it is done in odd numbers?

Ustādh: Because it is a *sunnah*. The Prophet ﷺ loves *witr*. The Prophet ﷺ told us that Allāh ﷻ loves *witr*.[6] The Prophet ﷺ practiced *witr*.[7] We have a statement from Allāh ﷻ,

---

[2] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of the Night Prayer and Voluntary Prayers During the Day, Chapter: Mentioning the Different Narrations From al-Zuhri, for the Ḥadīth of Abi Ayyūb concerning Witr, ḥadīth no. 1710*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Virtues and Merits of the Prophet ﷺ and his Companions ؓ, Chapter: The Eyes of the Prophet ﷺ Used to Sleep, but His Heart Used Not to Sleep, ḥadīth no. 3569*.

[4] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What Is Said Between the Two Prostrations, ḥadīth no. 284*. Imām al-Ḥākim (1/271) and Imām al-Dhahabi considered it *ṣaḥīḥ.* (As cited in *al-Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ʿala Zād al-Mustaqniʿ*, Volume 3, page 130, footnote 3.)

[5] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 898*. Imām al-Ḥākim (1/271) and Imām al-Dhahabi considered it *ṣaḥīḥ.*

[6] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions About Witr, The Recommendation to Pray Witr, ḥadīth no. 1416.* This narration has been graded *ṣaḥīḥ.*

[7] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad*, *5/218*.

a *ḥadīth qudṣi*.[8] We have an indication from the Prophet ﷺ, which is not *ḥadīth qudṣi*, about Allāh ﷻ. We have the Prophet ﷺ doing it. We have the Prophet ﷺ saying it. All of these are differing levels of evidence, different forms (if you like) of evidence.

Student (online): So, the Ḥanābilah say at least once is obligatory, three times is *sunnah*, then twice is classed as (for them)?

Ustādh: This is a good question for Ḥanābilah to answer: What would two actually be? It would be something which would be better than one. That is the answer, with no authority. I am not answering that with Ḥanbali authority. But I can tell you from a scholarly point of view, that if one is a bare minimum and it is understood that to increase upon *duʿāʾ* and *dhikr* is better, and that three is the *sunnah*, then two would be better than one but not being the *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ. I am guessing. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Student (online): How would you pray five *Witr*? All five without any sitting other than the last sitting?

Ustādh: When I gave the example of *Witr* being one, three, five, seven, nine, then you will always have the two ways of doing it. That will be two, two, two, two and then the final *rakʿah* by itself. When I say two, I mean giving *salāms* from two, and then starting again, and then starting again. So, in the case of five, you would do two, then *salāms*, two, then *salāms*, and then a single unit. The second way of doing it would be that you have no sitting down at all. Five, up, down, up, down, up, down, up, down, up, down and then one *tashahhud*. That is the basic principle.

Student (online): So, the class position is that it is *wājib* to say *duʿāʾ* at least once?

(0:20:00) Ustādh: Yes. The class position is not that one is *wājib*, as we covered last week.

Student (online): Is saying once mandatory as a class position?

Ustādh: We said last week that the **class position**, as is the position of all of the *fuqahāʾ* other than the Ḥanbali school (and we even argued last week that even the Ḥanbali school is differing over this), that none of it is mandatory at all, whatever it is between the two *sajdah*. Once you are sitting down, you do not need to say anything. But it is a *sunnah* to make the *duʿāʾ* as we mentioned last week.

The next point then:

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Invocations, Chapter: Allāh ﷻ Has One Hundred Names Less One, ḥadīth no. 6410*.

وَالتَّشَهُّدُ الأَوَّلُ وجَلْسَتُهُ

The first *tashahhud* and to sit for the first *tashahhud* [are obligations].

So, the first *tashahhud*, and then to sit for it. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says this is the seventh and the eighth [obligations].

Student (Nayeem): Ibn Qudāmah says twice is *sunnah* and thrice is completion.

Ustādh: This is very interesting. Nayeem is our resident Ḥanbali expert. Ibn Qudāmah says that twice is *sunnah*, and thrice is completion. Nayeem, what is the *muʿtamad* with the Ḥanābilah? What is the established position with the Ḥanābilah? And what does completion here in terms of reward mean, if it is better than the *sunnah*? How are they justifying that being better than the *sunnah*? What is the actual phrase, as opposed to translating it, and can you explain to the student here the two things that I mentioned?

Student (Nayeem): Once is *wājib* and *al-kamāl* is thrice.

Student (online): Can something be better than the *sunnah*?

Ustādh: So, here's the question: By definition, if something is established to be the *sunnah*, which is the perfection of an action, what is going to be better than that if we understand that to be the optimum? Because there's an idea that to repeat the *sunnah* more times than one is what's perfection and optimum. But to say that something different to the *sunnah*, as opposed to repeating the *sunnah*, it would be interesting for the explanation of what Ibn Qudāmah intends by that.

More important though, what's the established Ḥanbali position as opposed to Ibn Qudāmah? Because you know he's already gone against Imām Aḥmad according to our Ḥanbali school interpretation. Imām Aḥmad doesn't consider it to be at all *wājib* for it to be said once, as you know the difference. So, what's the established position with the twice and the three times?

When we say *al-tashahhud'l-awwal*, what are we referring to?

We're referring to the words, as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says:

فالتشهُّد الأول هو: «التحيات لله والصلوات والطيبات، السلام عليك أيها النبي ورحمة الله وبركاته، السلام علينا وعلى عباد الله الصالحين، أشهد أن لا إله إلا الله، وأشهد أن محمدا عبده ورسوله»

This is known as the *tashahhud* that's being referred to. And this of course we covered early on in Year 8.† And we are saying here now that it is an obligation.

Student (Nayeem): The Ḥanbalis would think that such is done as *wuḍū'*, as reported by ʿUthmān ﷺ, doing twice washing, but general practice of the Prophet ﷺ is the washing thrice. The *muʿtamad* (*bayn'l-sajdatayn*) is thrice.

Ustādh: So, the established position in the Ḥanbali school is to consider it to be three times.

You know what it is? I have a principle, but this comes across quite rude. So, you have to understand that that's not my intention. But this is the kind of way that students of knowledge would speak about an issue. Because these are not just our scholars. These are our imāms, they're the pillars of our religion, and their knowledge is not just miles above us. it's in a different universe. It's a whole different level.

But I personally think that once you dig a hole for yourself, you just unfortunately, you are trying to get out, you keep digging. You'll find that throughout the *madhāhib*. You'll find that in every *madh-hab*, every scholar, every teacher, that they mess up, and you just keep digging a hole. Now, this is something that everybody is guilty of. All of us. I can think of the last time that I did that was an absolute classic. I was teaching inheritance and I mistook something, and I was asked a question. And instead of saying '*That's interesting*, *let me think about that*,' I dug a hole so deep for myself that I literally drowned in that hole.

When I was drowning in that, I'll tell you now that I wasn't drowning without basis. I had some *ṣaḥābah* on my side. I had a few imāms on my side. But you fall into—not a dishonest—but a weak form of *fiqh* where you're scrambling around to try to find people to support your position because you messed up. Or rather, not even you messed up but you want it for some kind of reason, maybe some personal reason. Maybe you even have a nefarious kind of intention. We face this all the time by the way, with scholars out there that are very liberal, or have become liberal, or are under pressure, or scholars for example who are pandering to women, or feminists, or men who don't have any kind of female following so they become very macho towards men and they want to hold on to that support. So, they interpret things in a way where effectively they come across as being objective and evidence-based, but instead they have already put forward a hypothesis which is already flawed because the whole study is actually trying to prove what they want to follow, as opposed to actually bring out the evidences for the correct position.

I'm not saying that's what's happening here, but what I'm saying is that when you are going to go out on a risky position, like saying that it's obligatory to make this *duʿā'* once, which by all accounts is as risky and controversial a *fiqh* position that you will find in the kind of mundane area of non-controversial *fiqh* which is *ṣalāh*. Because it is

† The first *tashahhud* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 16, Lessons 35-39. MT

not exactly politics or *imān, ʻaqīdah* and you know belief in the *ḥākim*, that he is a *kāfir* or some you know crazy behavior like that. It is prayer at the end of the day. It is a *duʻāʾ*. You can only be so controversial in this area. But once you have gone as controversial as it gets, you are going to come up with problems and you have to keep batting off these problems. And it is a difficult one. How do you start justifying the concept of *kamāl*? That there is 'perfection' after the repetition of the statement being said twice, and three times being his ﷺ normal act. And it is there twice and you are saying it is three times etc. etc. etc.

Student (online): Ah so that is what really happened behind the scenes in *Fiqh of Death* regarding *radd* etc. I did think, '*Why is Shaykh mentioning the few aṣḥāb that back it up?*

Ustādh: That is exactly what happened. And by the way I want you to know that I was actually upon the opinion of ʻUthmān ؓ myself, but I should not have been so happy to go against the majority. Everybody is obviously not understanding what we are talking about but he clocked onto exactly when I dug a hole for myself recently and that was in the very kind of not very important issues of *fiqh* among students. This happens all the time when people are becoming, you know, under pressure to please other people, they have a job issue, politics, saying things to please people. Look at the Sudais *khuṭbah* for example at the moment, you know just chatting nonsense. You can see that a person once they are compromised, and he has been compromised for a good few years now since the Egyptian uprising, then you start to see everything else then falling apart, falling apart.

Student (online): But *kamāl* is not a technical term, right? So, it's not as problematic, right?

(0:30:00) Ustādh: It is not, it is not mega problematic at all. People are reading that and you have a question left. You are hearing *sunnah* and *kamāl* and you are requiring explanation. We now have to go to a commentary. We have to find some other scholars to explain it. We have to find someone who can try and justify it. It has made a simple issue really messy. And that is my point. The right position, the correct position, it does not need that kind of stuff.

That is one of the interesting things about Ibn Taymiyyah by the way. You know why am I a massive fan of Ibn Taymiyyah? In fact, why is everybody a big fan of Ibn Taymiyyah? A lot of the time he says things and he holds position that just make sense. That in itself does not mean someone is right. But when you get to a certain level of *fiqh*, teaching and studying, you start to notice that some positions and some *madhāhib* and some scholars have just really have the situation clocked on. Like the Shāfiʻis when it comes to the *ṣalāh*. You know, different schools have different games when it comes to their areas. There is an understanding that the Shāfiʻi school has real game when it comes to the prayer, almost like a specialist area. Now it is difficult to say that statement except to people who appreciate that. Because there is almost an indication that is almost kind of like saying, '*Oh what? So, the Ḥanbalis don't or the Ḥanafis don't?*' No.

But it is just that that they are particularly strong. You will hear that statement a lot and when you study it, then you will realise it.

Student: Like the Ḥanafis for *ḥalāl* chicken.

Ustādh; I don't know whether the Ḥanafis are strong in *ḥalāl* chicken or not. I don't know about that. I know the Ḥanafis are very good in Islamic finance, modern days, utilisation. It is very interesting Islamic finance because if you look at it, today's major founders of the science are Ḥanafi. However, they have not made that from just Ḥanafi positions. In actual fact, it can be argued that the single greatest tool that they used out of the Ḥanafi school to try and create some space for themselves in the modern era was using a Māliki move, which is the concept that a promise can be held as binding. So, be less than a contract, so it is not binding, but still be taken to court over, so it is binding. Just this little move by the way opens up so many doors that the Ḥanafis had closed, Shafiʿīs had closed, Ḥanbalis had closed. The Mālikis probably didn't even realise its power. The Ḥanafis of the modern times were like, *'You know what? We'll take that,'* and they ran with that. And they ran with it to a way where they were able to create contracts… I mean it is controversial, there is no doubt about it. But it is what it is. And there is so much to say about that.

Student (online): That's such a great example of the synergies within *madhāhib.*

Ustādh: You know this is a great response to people who are obsessed with *madhāhib*, that even the greats of the *madhāhib* they know that their *madhāhib* are restricted. You have to step out and you have to be open-minded and you have to borrow from other schools and that no truth is within one *madh-hab*. Anyone who does not believe that, then they should not be teaching or you should not be taking knowledge from them. However, it is also true the reverse argument or the counter argument that this is only the case with modern issues, *ijtihādi* issues, relative issues. Whereas the day-to-day nuts and bolts of Islam should just be kept within a *madh-hab* to stop confusion and that is pretty much going to work. And that is true. Frankly, that is true.

So that is the *tashahhud.* What are we saying? We are saying it is obligatory. Why are we saying it is obligatory?

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says on page 323 that's because of the *ḥadīth* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﵁, he said:

كنا نقول قبل أن يُفرَضَ علينا التشهُّدُ

"Before the *tashahhud* became *farḍ* upon us we used to say…."[9]

[9] *Sunan al-Dāraquṭni, 1/350.*

This statement indicates the *tashahhud* became *farḍ*. This *ḥadīth* is not the strongest. It's an *athar*, we covered this in detail in Year 8. It is an indication basically that it was considered to be obligatory. The *tashahhud* becomes obligatory. That's nice and easy, really simple that allows us to able to consider that to be not a *sunnah*, not a light matter, but an obligatory matter.

Someone might say: '*Hold on, if that's the evidence you are using to make this important, "before it became farḍ upon us", then what's the evidence of not taking it all the way to the level of rukn, to make it a pillar of the prayer? To make it so important like the farḍ is, like an obligation, hard-core matter is?*'

That's a really good question actually. And the answer to that is no, no, it is obviously more than a *sunnah* because the *ḥadīth* states that it used to be an obligation but it's not to the level of *rukn*. Why? Because a *rukn* is such a thing, a pillar in the prayer is that thing which if it's not there in the prayer, the prayer collapses. It cannot be compensated for. If it's missing, the prayer is over. It can't be just, '*Oh, I forgot to recite Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*,' or '*I forgot to do the whole first rakʿah*,' or '*I forgot to do sajdah so at the end of the ṣalāh I will just say assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh, Allāhu akbar and do sajdatʾl-sahw two times and that's the end of it*.' No. we are going to cover *sajdatʾl-sahw* in the next few months. That's the next big chapter.

The *sajdatʾl-sahw*, the prostration for forgetfulness, the prostration for fixing problems, can only fix minor problems. It cannot compensate for the missing of a *rukn*. If you miss out a *rukn*, the only way to fix that prayer is to go back and add that *rukn* back in again. And not only that, you have to do *sajdatʾl-sahw* as well. We're going to learn this obviously in its section. So, remember that rule: If something is a *rukn*, you not only have to do the act that you missed out, but you also have to then compensate as well, meaning do the *sajdatʾl-sahw*. Whereas a *wājib*, an obligation, is important but not to the level of a *rukn*. It can be missed out by accident, by forgetfulness—not intentionally—and you do not need to go back and fix it. You just do the actual *sajdatʾl-sahw* at the end and it's compensated for it.

Student (online): So, the difference between a *rukn* and a *wājib* is that a *wājib* can be compensated for?

Ustādh: The difference between the *rukn* and the *wājib* is that the *wājib* can be compensated for and the *rukn* can't. The *rukn* has to be repeated, has to be done.

So, that's the principle. Now, do we have any evidence then that this *tashahhud* is either a *rukn* or an obligation?

We so far don't. We just know that it's very important. At the moment actually, it's coming across that it's like a *rukn*. But how do we bring it down from a *rukn* to an obligation?

Because of this *ḥadīth* narrated by Bukhāri, the *ḥadīth* doesn't indicate with definitive clarity whether it was a *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr* or *ṣalāt al-ʿAṣr,* but it was one of those two. It does not clarify definitively how early did the Prophet ﷺ cut the prayer but basically, he ﷺ made a mistake in the prayer. He ﷺ finished early. He ﷺ missed out a whole unit of the prayer. And when he ﷺ did that he ﷺ went back and he ﷺ made up the unit(s)—so one
(0:40:00) or two units. We covered this *ḥadīth* last year. He ﷺ actually exits the prayer then he ﷺ turns around, he ﷺ has some doubt and he ﷺ knows something is wrong, he ﷺ feels it in his bones. He ﷺ turns around, people start giving him you know, '*Is this a new prayer?*' '*What's going on?*' Abu Bakr ؓ said, '*Yup, they are right what they are saying. You haven't prayed the prayer completely*.' So, the Prophet ﷺ went back straight in *Allāhu akbar*, did, that which had been missed out from the prayer and then did *sajdat'l-sahw* at the end.[10] This *ḥadīth* proves that if you ever miss a *rukn* you must complete the thing that you missed out and then do *sajdat'l-sahw*. However, we know that when the Prophet ﷺ missed out the *tashahhud*—and he ﷺ did that once, he ﷺ missed out the *tashahhud'l-awwal* i.e. this middle *tashahhud*, this first *tashahhud*, [he ﷺ compensated for it with a *sajdat'l-sahw*.][11,12]

By the way, I have been saying *tashahhud*. When I say *tashahhud*, first and second or rather more correctly, first and last because it's theoretical that you can pray three *tashahhuds*. You could do three *tashahhuds* if you came late to a prayer. You would join one, then you would do a second one, and then you would do the third one. That's why it's best to say first and [last]. Even though if you are praying by yourself or praying correctly with an imām, you will never pray more than two *tashahhuds*. But it's theoretically possible to have three or you end up doing three. So, the first and the last. I want you to know that the first is obligatory. And the last is an actual *rukn* meaning that it's an absolute essential part of the prayer itself. That is what's been indicated in the text earlier and that is what's being indicated here.

Why have we relegated the first *tashahhud* from level of *rukn* down to obligation?

Simply because when the Prophet ﷺ missed this, he ﷺ didn't make it up. So, we know that the Prophet ﷺ was praying a prayer, a *Ẓuhr* prayer. So, he ﷺ has done the first and he ﷺ stood back up again. He's done the second and he ﷺ should be sitting. He ﷺ didn't. He ﷺ stood back up again. So, he ﷺ forgets to sit for the *tashahhud*—the first *tashahhud*. What does he ﷺ do? He ﷺ carries on like the prayer has been unaffected. So, he ﷺ went down for the third, stood back up again, went down for the fourth, sat. And as he ﷺ sits now, he ﷺ is now sitting in the last *tashahhud* having missed out the first *tashahhud*.

If this were a *rukn* then at some point when he ﷺ remembers, he ﷺ would have just sat down and done it. He ﷺ didn't. He ﷺ ignored it. And at the end of the prayer, he ﷺ says

---

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: To Clasp One's Hands by Interlocking the Fingers in the Mosque or Outside the Mosque, ḥadīth no. 482.*
[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 570 a.*
[12] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: Saying of the Tashahhud in the First Sitting, ḥadīth no. 830.*

goes into *sajdatʾl-sahw* [before *taslīm*][‡‡], proving to us that it's not the same process for missing out a *rukn*. Which would indicate that it's not a *rukn*. Which indicates that it's an obligation. Which indicates a new rule: Every obligation in the prayer that is missed out by forgetfulness or by accident, it is not repeated. It is not gone back to. You do not revert to the *rakʿah* you missed it in. You carry on and you then compensate for it with *sajdatʾl-sahw*. All of this is coming up later in detail in the *sajdatʾl-sahw* section.

And of course, though let me make it clear (and you should write this down), that it is absolutely the case only if you forget or you make a mistake when it comes to the missing out of an obligation. If you intentionally miss out an obligation, the prayer is finished.

Then something interesting, he said: The sitting for it.

وجَلْسَتُهُ

[It is an obligation] to sit for the first *tashahhud*.

And this word *jalsah*, if you look at the text, this word *jalsah* has a *fatḥah* on it. And the word *jalsah*, it can be said with a *fatḥah* and it can be said with a *kasrah*: *wa jilsatuhu*. *Jalsatuhu* [with a *fatḥah*], *jilsatuhu* [with a *kasrah*]—they mean two different things.

In the Arabic language, when you have this particular type of *wazn*, and this is upon the *wazn* of *faʾla* as opposed to *fiʾla*. *Faʾla* is *jalsa*, *fiʾla* is *jilsa*. The meaning is actually different. They are very similar but subtly different.

Wa jalsatuhu means to sit for it is obligatory.

So, the penultimate obligation of the prayer is to make sure you say the first *tashahhud* in the middle of a *Ẓuhr* prayer, *ʿAṣr* prayer, *Maghrib* prayer *ʿIshāʾ* prayer. Obviously, it's not referring to the *Fajr* because there is no first *tashahhud* in *Fajr*. There is only one and that's the last one and that's a *rukn* of the prayer. It's an absolute pillar. So, we are really only talking about the rest of the prayers, all the *sunnah* prayers, all the *witr* prayers, all the *Ẓuhr*, *ʿAṣr*, etc. Basically, prayers that are more than two *rakʿah*, so three and above.

The obligation is to say the *tashahhud* and then the second obligation is to sit for it. What that basically means is that it is theoretically possible to say the *tashahhud*, standing. And that is true. I have on more than one occasion read *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* in the *tashahhud*. And I have on more than one occasion recited the *tashahhud* in the *Fātiḥah* position. I stood back up [while saying] *Allāhu akbar*, [then reciting the

[‡‡] Please note that this is modified from the audio because Ustādh misspoke and said the Prophet ﷺ did the *sujūdʾl-sahw* before the *taslīm*. He ﷺ did it after the *taslīm*. MT

tashahhud in the standing position]. It's only when you get to *ashhadu an lā ilāha illa Allāh wa ashhadu anna Muḥammadan ʿabduhu wa rasūluh*, and you say *amīn*. And then you think, '*What am I doing? What have I just said amīn to?*' And then you realise obviously your mind has gone somewhere. So, it is technically possible to even be in a position where you are in *sajdah* and you start *tashahhud* or you stand up and do *tashahhud*. Meaning that it's crazy obviously but it's there for completion.

Student (online): By mistake?

Ustādh: Yes, by mistake of course.

So, it's there just to kind of dot the i's and cross the ts, that you have to do the *tashahhud* but it's only valid when you're doing it sitting down. That's the basic principle.

If however the obligation were: *wa jilsatuhu* [with a *kasrah*], to sit with a *jilsah*, then it would be obligating the manner of the sitting. And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn explains that it's the *hayʾah,* then it would be the form. Now what does that mean?

We know that when it comes to the sitting, there are different ways of sitting. We've covered that in Year 7 and Year 8 in huge detail.[‡] You will know that there's a *sunnah* way of *al-iftirāsh*—right foot up, left foot down. That's a *sunnah* position all the time. And then you have the *sunnah* of *tawarruk*, which is to slide the left foot underneath yourself so your buttock then sits on the floor, your left foot comes underneath your thigh and that's in the third and the fourth *rakʿah* when you're sitting.

I want you to know that for *tashahhud,* there's a *sunnah* way of sitting. In the *tashahhudʾl-awwal*, meaning the first *tashahhud*, there's only one *sunnah* way of sitting, and that's *iftirāsh*. Let me make that clear. In the first *tashahhud* which is going to be the first sitting in the *Ẓuhr*, *ʿAṣr*, *Maghrib*, *ʿIshāʾ*, the only *sunnah* way is to sit like normal (sit on your left foot, right foot up). It's only one way. If the obligation was *wa jilsatuhu*, it would mean that it is obligatory for you to sit like this [*al-iftirāsh*].

What do we believe?

The Ḥanbalis, the majority of scholars (in fact, I don't know if there's any difference on that) certainly the **<u>class position</u>**: It is *sunnah* to sit like this [*al-iftirāsh*]. But if you were to sit on your toes or x, y, z, whilst you're in *tashahhud*, your *tashahhud* would be valid and your prayer would be valid. That's the position of everybody. And that's so important. Even if you were to sit cross-legged. If you have a need because you've had an operation and you can only sit cross-legged or legs straight out for example, and you have a need then you get fully rewarded for the prayer. There's no problem with that whatsoever. However, if you have no need and you are sitting cross-legged or whatever

[‡] The manner of sitting between the two *sajdah* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 32. The seated position in the first *tashahhud* was covered in *Logical Progression,* Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 35. The manner of sitting in the final *tashahhud* was covered in *Logical Progression,* Year 8, Chapter 16, Lesson 50. MT

then this is not good. Some scholars even considered it *makrūh*, because what are you doing? But the prayer is not invalidated according to the vast majority of scholars.

The prayer is not invalidated if you are sitting down. And that's the point of this *wa jalsatuhu*—that it is obligatory to say the *tashahhud* and it is obligatory to be seated (however you sit down) is basically being indicated. And that would mean even if you were cross-legged, even if you were this, even if you were that. However, if the Arabic said *wa jilsatuhu* [with a *kasrah*] then it would mean it is obligatory to make the *tashahhud'l-awwal* (the first one) and obligatory for you to sit like this [*al-iftirāsh*] for it. And if you don't, then the prayer is invalidated, unless you then make up for that mistake at the end. So, every time you sit like this, you have to make *sajdat'l-sahw* at the end. And even that's not right because if you're doing it intentionally, then your prayers are invalidated as you're going to come and see.

(0:50:00)

Student (online): Seated on the floor though?

Ustādh: Seated on the floor in principle. If there's a person who had some kind of problem, then only the chair. But it's never allowed for a person to sit on a chair without any reason. Never. It has to be the floor. Obviously if a person has a reason, then that's something which is allowed.

And the next statement is:

وما عدا الشرائط، والأركان، والواجبات المذكورة سُنَّة

Everything other than the conditions, pillars and obligations that have been previously mentioned are considered *sunnah*.

So basically, we have come to this part now where the author is going to definitively state that everything we have covered before, which are conditions, which are pillars, which are obligations, all of these things are the very important things. Everything other than that is supererogatory, i.e. it is *sunnah*, it is rewarded, great acts, but none of it is obligatory, none of it is vital and essential in that as much, that if you were not to do it then the prayer will be invalidated.

So that is basically a nice and easy way. The other way is to say that this is *sunnah*, that's *sunnah*, that's *sunnah*, that's *sunnah*. It is basically easier for us to say we are able to identify the small number of obligations and pillars. Let's identify those and say everything else is basically a *sunnah*. Everything else is then supererogatory.

Student (online): If due to some medical reason can a person switch the position of the right and left legs in *tashahhud*?

Ustādh: I will say to you that you don't even need a medical reason. If there is pain that is enough. I want you to know that one of the blessings of the *sunnah* in that the sitting position has not been made obligatory but rather a *sunnah*, is to allow people in what is well known to be a painful position, to not elongate it so much and if you are feeling pain to swap here and there if needed. So, it is something which is permissible. It is *sunnah* of course to stick to the right form, but it is permissible.

Just to summarise everything: The *sharāʾiṭ* we will come to that in a second. *Arkān* we have already mentioned, *wājibāt* we just mentioned all of their evidences etc. However, we do know all of the *wājibāt* we have mentioned that there is some difference of opinion. So, for example that there are some scholars certainly in the Shāfiʿi school, certainly others, that consider for example the *tashahhudʾl-awwal* to be a *sunnah* not to be an obligation (the one we are talking about right now). What would their evidence be?

Their evidence is that you didn't have to go back and repeat the actual act itself. Just the fact that you forgot it, you weren't having to repeat it again, that would indicate it's not so important. That would indicate it's only a *sunnah*.

We of course would go back and say: That's true. However, you are obligated to do the compensatory *sajdah* at the end, which would indicate that it is not just a *sunnah* but something more.

But still, that is a discussion back and forth. You can see their argument. You can see our argument. So, therefore you can say that there is *khilāf*, there is a difference of opinion upon this.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: Also, the other obligations that we said are obligatory are: *takbīratʾl-intiqāl* i.e. all the other *takbīrāt* in the prayer, other than *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*. So *takbīratʾl-iḥrām* is the opening *takbīr* which makes everything *ḥarām*. Every other *takbīr,* what did we say? It is obligatory.

What did we say about the *tasmīʿ* (*samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*)?

What did we say about the *taḥmīd* (*Rabbana wa lakʾl-ḥamd*)?

We said it is obligatory. That's the Ḥanbali position.

However, there is also a scholarly position held by some of the Shāfiʿis and some of the other scholars as well that they said that it is a *sunnah* as well—that all of these are not obligatory.

So, I want you to know that there are major scholars—it is a minority position but major scholars amongst them—that said *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah, Rabbana wa lakʾl-ḥamd,* all the *takbīrāt*, they are a *sunnah* not an absolute obligation or whatever. What is their evidence?

They argued that well when the Prophet ﷺ was indicating to the person who erred in his prayer (again if you do not know what that is you need to go back to Year 8 and you will find that), the one who messed up in his prayer and the Prophet ﷺ then said to him: I am going to teach you the prayer right now listen very carefully, and he ﷺ taught him the bare bones of the most essential parts.[13] In that *ḥadīth,* he ﷺ did not mention *Rabbana wa lakʾl-ḥamd, samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah,* he ﷺ did not mention to say *Allāhu akbar*, etc. That is their argument.[§]

Our counter argument is that there are many things that were not mentioned in that *ḥadīth* that separate individual *ḥadīth* have been indicated to be obligatory. And that is a back and forth again.

And then of course I do not need to cover the issue of *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli*. They said it is obligatory. The vast majority of scholars said it is not and we actually agree with the vast majority and said it is not. So, even these obligations are differed over.

As for *takbīratʾl-iḥrām,* that is a *rukn*. Nobody is disputing that. There is no doubt about that.

Let us have a quick reminder what the *sharāʾiṭ* are. *Sharāʾiṭ* is the plural of the word *sharīṭah* and *sharīṭah* means condition.

Student (online): Does anyone have a link where I could purchase an English copy of the textbook?

Ustādh: Which textbook are you talking about? First of all, this text has not been completely translated into English. Let me make that clear, that is the class text. As for the commentary, that of course does not exist at all. It does not exist at all in English. All of the text that you need so far that we have covered that is available from what we have translated. You know the class positions and everything that you will find that in the transcriptions.

Student (online): So, can I clarify the first *tashahhud* can be prayed standing up as it is not obligatory but the last *tashahhud* must be prayed sitting down as it is an obligation (*rukn*)? Does that make sense?

(1:00:00) Ustādh: I am glad you asked for clarification. It does make sense what you are saying but you have mixed up the words. The first *tashahhud,* we currently have just finished the list of the obligations. It is an absolute obligation to pray the first *tashahhud* sitting down. Absolute obligation to do the *tashahhud* and to make it whilst sitting down. As for the last *tashahhud*, that is an even higher obligation. That is where the confusion is coming in. It is called a *rukn*.

---

[13] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Oaths and Vows, Chapter: If Someone Does Something Against His Oath Due to Forgetfulness, ḥadīth no. 6667.*

[§] The *ḥadīth* of the one who erred in his prayer is covered multiple times in the Book of Prayer. See *Logical Progression*, Year 6, Chapter 16, Lesson 5 for an overview of this *ḥadīth.* MT

Let us remind ourselves of the three levels:

Sunnah (lowest level): you are not obligated to do that.

Wājib (the second level): is an obligation.

Rukn (third level): is a pillar, so important, beyond belief important.

Again, go back to the earlier lessons where we covered these to go through the details. Simply put, the last *tashahhud* is of the highest importance, it is a *rukn.* And then you have the obligations which is what the first *tashahhud* is. You have to sit for all the *tashahhuds*.

<u>Class positions</u>:

1) The *takbīr* other than the opening one: Obligation
2) The *tasmīʿ* (to say *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*): Obligation
3) The *taḥmīd* (to say *Rabbana wa lakʾl-ḥamd*): Obligation
4) The *tasbīḥ* within the bowing (to say *Subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*) and in the prostration (to say *Subḥāna Rabbīyyʾl-Aʿla*): Obligation
5) To ask for forgiveness (by saying *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli)* once in each unit (between the two prostrations): *sunnah*

   To say it three times: not a *sunnah*. We consider the mixture to be a *sunnah*, i.e. so saying that two times, one time, three times, mixture of everything else, we think all of it, as Ibn Qudāmah indicated, *kamāl*, excellence in utilising, saying it three times is great, two times would be in line with the *ḥadīth*. That is how I understand it. You see, I don't have that problem of trying to balance *sunnah* versus *kamāl*. I am saying to you that all of the narrations indicate that all of it and its use, this is something of *tanawwuʿ*, meaning that these variations are there to use, to build a different mood each time, just like we covered in a lot of detail about [*duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ*], the *duʿāʾ* to open the prayer, different ones, different types, different moods, different feel.
6) The first *tashahhud*: Obligation
7) To sit for this first *tashahhud*: Obligation.

Sharīṭah is a single condition and *sharāʾiṭ* are conditions. What are conditions?

Conditions are those things which happen before the prayer, the obligations which happen before the prayer and without it, the prayer is invalid. So, for example, facing the *Qiblah*, to be in a state of purity, to cover your *ʿawrah* etc. That was covered in page 291 of the text. The *arkān* have also been covered.

What is the difference between a *rukn* and a *sharṭ*? These are absolutely essential as well. Both are essential for the validity.

Student (online): *Rukn* is in the prayer.

Ustādh: Correct. *Sharṭ* is linked to the prayer, but before it. The precondition. Whereas the *rukn* is in the prayer. It is part of the prayer. It is actually from the structure of the prayer itself.

Then the *wājibāt*, we said that is from the obligations and that is straightforward.

And then the *sunnah*—what is this last statement? He said:

قوله: «سُنَّة» السُّنَّة في اصطلاح الفقهاء: هي ما أُمِرَ به لا على سبيل الإِلزام بالفعل. فتجتمع هي والواجب في أن كلا منهما مأمور به، وتنفصل عن الواجب أن :الواجب على سبيل الإِلزام، والسنَّة على غير سبيل الإِلزام.

He said that the conditions, the pillars, and all of the obligations mentioned before are what they are, the rest of the entire prayer is a *sunnah*. By *sunnah*, what does he mean?

It means that which is required to be done in the form of preference as opposed to a *wājib* which is something which has been commanded to be done, it is obligatory for it to be performed, it is absolutely necessary.

الواجب على سبيل الإِلزام، والسنَّة على غير سبيل الإِلزام.

Whereas *sunnah*, we will ask a person to do it, but if he doesn't do it, he doesn't do it.

The question will be asked: What is better then? A *wājib* which you are being requested to do and you must do, and if you don't do, you have to make it up somehow, or a *sunnah* which is parts of life and parts of the prayer and parts of the *dīn*, which you are not required to do. Which one is better?

Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says there are two ways of answering this: that which is from a divine point of view or from a textual point of view, and that which is just common sense.

From a textual point of view, it is super clear. Textually, Allāh ﷻ in the *ḥadīth qudsi* which is narrated by Bukhāri, the Prophet ﷺ said that Allāh ﷻ said:

وَمَا تَقَرَّبَ إِلَيَّ عَبْدِي بِشَيْءٍ أَحَبَّ إِلَيَّ مِمَّا افْتَرَضْتُ عَلَيْهِ

"And the most beloved things with which My slave comes nearer to Me, is what I have enjoined upon him." [14]

That a slave will not get closer to me with anything better than that which I have obligated upon him. So, what I have obligated upon my slave, he does that, that is how he is going to get close to Me. So, there is no doubt that that is more beloved to Allāh ﷻ.

From a *ʿaql* point of view, if there were no text, it is absolutely clear that anything which Allāh ﷻ insists upon is clearly something which He appreciates more. And anything that He is saying is easy I am not so fussed about, I am not worried about, I am not going to hold you accountable for, I am not obligating it upon you, is obviously a level down. So, that is something which is not very difficult.

One thing which I think is a valuable point, a reminder that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn gives to us all is that you would think that is a cut and dry job. But he says that you will find that the Muslims often fall into the mistake where they make the *nafl* so important but they become weak in the obligations. So, they will do the obligatory prayer and they will be struggling for *khushūʿ* and their mind is all over the place and whatever but somehow in the *sunnah* prayer they are smashing it, they are very, very good. Like giving *ṣadaqah*, no problem, giving it all over the place without any question and no issue. But when it comes to *zakāh*, trying to find loopholes, '*Do I really need to? Is this something which is obligatory on me?*' '*But my taxes, but I have debts*…,' etc.—always trying to find excuses.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said this is *shayṭān* classically owning you. He knows that, '*You know what? I don't care what he gets up to in nafl, it's the obligations I am going to mess up for him*,' because that is what you are required to do. So, it is a reminder for us to be on point, being very, very careful.

Student (online): Such as *tarāwīḥ* vs. *ʿIshāʾ* or *Fajr* in the *masjid.*

Ustādh: You know what? That is the perfect description: people coming to *tarāwīḥ* for example, and they are in their droves and they have never been for *Fajr* for example. And they are so still in that prayer, and so focused, they put in so much effort and they do not pray the other five prayers or the other obligatory prayers in normal times and they are worried about *tarāwīḥ*. For me, I do not even consider it a *sunnah* per se to pray *tarāwīḥ* in principle. I think it is a prayer that should be prayed at home. But I do not want to make too much controversy because that is then going to derail the class. That drives me nuts by the way, that is a very good example.

[14] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of to Make the Hearts Tender, Chapter: The Humility or Modesty or Lowliness, ḥadīth no. 6502.*

Q & A

Q (online): Would 'prerequisite' be a better translation for *sharṭ* or would that be inaccurate?

A: Yes, I think it is okay, I do not think it is a major.

Q (online): Is the class position with respect to: 5) To ask for forgiveness in between the two *sajdah*s (by saying any prescribed *duʿāʾ*)—*sunnah*?

A: Yes, it is a *sunnah* but not in a specific form.

(1:10:00) Q (online): What is the ruling regarding getting mixed up between the letters in *ṣalāh*? I recently find myself accidently getting mixed up between *sīn* and *ṣād* or make the light letters heavy and vice versa and sometimes realise too late that I have done that and move on to the next position.

A: I think the answer to that is that it depends upon how serious the mistake is. I want you to know that in *qirāʾah* there are certain letters in which there is a lot of leeway. The *ḍād* for example there are *riwāyāt* or ways of saying *ḍād* which are very *dāli* and very *ẓāli*.

So, you could have a bad version being which is *da* on the [side of *dāl*], and you have *ẓa…* So, you have a letter which is in between and there is a lot of leeway on where it leans to and you might kind of get mixed up.

Sīn and *ṣād*, is also one which is close, there is some laxity in the *qirāʾāt.* I want you to appreciate that that kind of minor mistake is not something you should worry about unless the meaning was super differentiated between the two, the meaning is definitely changed, the intention to change it as well, I do not consider it to be something significant Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): That *ḥadīth* about what is beloved continues as to how it is increased upon, until the ultimate status. So, you can say the *sunnah* and *nawāfil* are more beloved?

"My servant draws not near to Me with anything more loved by Me than the religious duties I have enjoined upon him, and My servant continues to draw near to Me with supererogatory works so that I shall love him. When I love him I am his hearing with which he hears, his seeing with which he sees, his hand with which he strikes and his foot with which he walks."[14]

A: That *ḥadīth* about what is beloved continues as to how it is increased upon. But an increase can never be seen as more important than the *aṣl* itself. That *ḥadīth* is a proof against you. The increase is great, but the *aṣl* is what is most important. So, there is absolutely no doubt, there is a consensus in actual fact, that the obligation is more important than the *sunnah*.

Student: No, the question was: What is better?

Ustādh: Yes. So, the obligation is what is better. He continues to get more closer to Allāh ﷻ. Allāh ﷻ then loves him more and more and more. But the obligation has to be done first. A person leaves the obligation, how can Allāh ﷻ love that person? That is impossible. It is an oxymoron.

Q (online): What should one do when they experience disturbance in *farḍ ṣalāh* alone and not *sunnah* or *nawāfil* prayers other than seeking refuge in Allāh ﷻ and spitting on the left?

A: We covered that previously.††

Q (online): Which book on *uṣūl'l-fiqh* really benefitted you in your thinking in a *fiqhi* way? I know the question is a bit open-ended

A: That is too big *Allāhu aʿlam*. I need to think about that. But to be honest I used to really enjoy *uṣūl'l-fiqh*. And one of things that I did is that I studied *uṣūl* with nearly every *madh-hab* or a teacher in every *madh-hab* and that is something that I found very, very beneficial. The Ḥanbalis did their thing, the Shāfiʿis did their thing, and I also studied *uṣūl* with some scholars that were not so fussed about the *madh-hab*. So, that helps to understand where people are getting their principles from. But Allāh ﷻ knows best.

†† There a number of *Logical Progression* classes where focus in the prayer has been discussed including: Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 14 (during the discussion on *duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ*); Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 22 (during the discussion on the importance of looking at the place of *sajdah* for *khushūʿ*); Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 27 (benefits of cycling through different versions of *dhikr in ṣalāh*); Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 2 (discussion on closing the eyes in the prayer to achieve focus). MT

4. Chapter 19 Lesson 5: The Obligations of the Prayer

فمن ترك شَرْطاً لغير عُذر غير النية – فإنها لا تسقط بحال – أو تعمد ترك ركن، أو واجب بطلت صلاته, بخلاف الباقي وما عدا ذلك سُنن, أقوال وأفعال, ولا يُشرع السجود لتركه، وإن سجد فلا بأس

Whoever (a) leaves a condition without an excuse, other than the intention—for it can never be "left out"—or (b) intentionally leaves a pillar or obligation, their prayer is invalidated. (The prayer is sound) in all cases other than this.

Everything else from actions and statements are all considered *sunnah*. It is not legislated to have to perform the prostration (of forgetfulness) if they are left out, but if one was to perform it then there is no problem with that.

Let's start from the original text.

فمن ترك شَرْطاً لغير عُذر غير النية – فإنها لا تسقط بحال

Whoever leaves a condition without an excuse, other than the intention—for it can never be "left out" [the prayer is invalidated].

Whoever leaves out a condition, and they don't have an excuse, their prayer is going to be basically invalidated. For example (at the top of page 328 of *Sharḥ al Mumtiʿ*), Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: Someone who prays naked, but he had the cloth and he had the clothes to cover his *ʿawrah*. He's left a condition of the prayer which is to cover one's *ʿawrah*. And he has no excuse (so, he's not on a desert island or something) then his prayer is invalidated. Also, one who prays opposite to the *Qiblah* and he knows where the *Qiblah* is but for whatever reason he prays the other way. He did that without reason, so his prayer is invalidated. Or for example, someone who leaves the *wuḍūʾ*. His prayer is invalidated because he left a condition without an excuse. However, if he leaves it with an excuse or forgets it with an excuse, then Shaykh says the prayer is valid. So:

فلو صَلَّى بغير وُضُوء ولا تيمُّم ـــ لعدم القدرة عليهما ـــ صحَّت صلاته

For example, if the person doesn't make *wuḍū'* and doesn't do *tayammum* and the reason is because he is unable to do so. So, not just lack of water but basically he is physically in a bad case, he is ill in bed, etc., and then he prays in that position. Then even though two conditions of the prayer have been left out the prayer is valid because he has a valid excuse.

It's all about the *'udhr* in the Arabic. *'Udhr* means legitimate excuse.

Shaykh says that our author did something interesting, he made an exception. He said: "except for the *niyyah"*. He said that all [conditions] can be left out if you have an excuse, except the *niyyah* because it is inexcusable to leave the *niyyah* out. Because it is in the heart, it's always there, you are always intending something. So, it will always going to be done.

A lot of the scholars were okay with this point as well. They were saying that when you think about it, a person is always thinking. Obviously, unless someone doesn't have the mental capacity. And if the person doesn't have the mental capacity to even have the intention for the act of worship that they are doing then they don't even have to do the act of worship anyway. They are innocent in front of Allāh ﷻ. That is a side point. But the idea is that if the *niyyah* is being left out, that's just not possible. There is always going to be a *niyyah* of some sort. Now Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says (and I have to say that I agree entirely):

لكن في الحقيقة يمكن النسيان فيها، مثل أن يأتي الإِنسان ليصلِّي الظُّهر، ثم يغيب عن خاطره نيةُ الظهر، وينوي العصر

He says that to be honest, in truth, it is possible to forget the *niyyah*. A person can rock up to *Ẓuhr* and completely forget that he hasn't prayed *Ẓuhr* and think it's *'Aṣr*. Especially if he is praying *Ẓuhr* late or *'Aṣr* very early. It's very possible to get mixed up between the two. So, Shaykh says: If a person made the intention for *ṣalāt al-'Aṣr* at the *Ẓuhr* time, would that prayer be valid?

According to the Ḥanbali position that's being stated here, theoretically, even though… If someone asked the question like I'm asking, they are never going to say that. But according to how the question is being put, if a person messes up the *niyyah*, is the prayer valid or not? And Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn is asking that question right now. He is saying that if you rock up for *Ẓuhr* and if you have the *niyyah* for *'Aṣr*, what is the status of the prayer?

الجواب :لا تصحُّ؛ لأنه عَيَّنَ خِلاف فَرْضِ الوقت، فلا تصحُّ، لأن النيَّة لا تسقط بحال.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says the prayer is invalid. The prayer is invalid because he has indicated to himself, he has made the intention for something which is different to the actual act of worship that is in front of him now.

He's actually using the principle almost against what the author is saying. He says that we agree that one can never leave their *niyyah* out. As I said to you before, if you are unable to articulate your intention in your heart, which is where the *niyyah* lives, of course, we have covered many times before, and in detail, the fact that you know to [verbally articulate the intention for the prayer], that's all *bidʿah* of course. There is no doubt about that. And that's not what we are talking about. We are talking about the *niyyah* of the heart.†

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that I also agree that the *niyyah* cannot be left out, just like what they are saying. However, they are saying because the *niyyah* cannot be left out, it is an exception to the rule of excuse or non-excuse. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says no, the (0:10:00) *niyyah* cannot be left out and a person needs to ensure they have the right *niyyah*. They can't make a mistake with the *niyyah*. There is no such thing as an excuse or non-excuse, etc. He says that no, that prayer would be invalidated.

Student (online): Sounds like he is agreeing with the author.

Ustādh: No, he is not agreeing with the author.

Student (online): The intention is the basis of any action. How can you excuse the intention? Wouldn't it make sense that if you were intending to pray the prayer of that time, it would be okay. But if you were intending to a prayer that is not for that prayer time, it wouldn't (like intending *ʿAṣr* at the time of *Ẓuhr*).

Ustādh: How can you excuse the intention? That's effectively the point. Exactly as she has written. If you are intending to pray the prayer of that time, it would be okay. But if you are intending a prayer that is not for that prayer time, it wouldn't.

Student (online): Before or during?

Ustādh: We mean before, of course.

Student (online): Isn't it *bidʿah* to say *niyyah* out loud?

Ustādh: It is *bidʿah* to say the *niyyah* out loud. Not just out loud but even just to say the *niyyah* is *bidʿah*. There is no basis for that. There is no basis to say the *niyyah*. It's not the *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ or the Companions or the *tābiʿīn* or anything. So, we should avoid that but go back to the section on *niyyah* in the notes for more details.†

† The intention for the prayer and its articulation were covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 6, Chapter 15, Lessons 51-52. MT

Another scenario Shaykh puts forward, he says: If a person prays before the time (and of course to be in the time is another condition of the prayer) and he believes though that the prayer time has entered, what is the ruling on that prayer?

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn (I'm going to quote his answer) said:

صلاته لا تجزئه عن الفرض، ويجب عليه إعادة الصلاة بعد دخول الوقت، وهذا مما يُستدرك على المؤلِّف

He said: The obligatory prayer itself would not be accepted. It is not valid. It is obligatory upon him to repeat his prayer after the time has entered. And this is something which can be understood also from the author as well.

He says:

لأن ظاهر قوله: «لغير عذر» أن هذه الصورة التي ذكرت تصحُّ فيها الصلاة، مع أن الصلاة لا تصحُّ، فكلام المؤلِّف فيه شيء مِن الاستدراك على حسب التفصيل الذي ذكرنا.

What the Shaykh is basically saying is that when you think about what Imām al-Ḥajjāwi (the author) is saying, the phrase is not comprehensive enough to cover everything. Because there's a difference between someone who prays and then realises that they prayed in the wrong time. Meaning they prayed before the time has entered, and then they look at the watch and they realise, *'Hold on! The time is incorrect.'* So, then they have to pray the prayer again. That's the correct opinion. That's the correct ruling. And that's the position of Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn.

This excuse here would be invalid, the fact that they understood the time to be the wrong time. They would have to go and pray in the right time especially as they have the right time in front of them now. And that is the inaccuracy (if you like) of this statement. This statement is not an absolute statement.

A *qāʻidah fiqhiyyah* that Shaykh al-Mukhtār al-Shanqīṭi mentions which is well known when you study *fiqh*, is that *al-taklīf sharṭahu al-qudrah*. That when it comes to being judged by Allāh ﷻ, held accountable by Allāh ﷻ for the acts of worship that you're meant to do, the condition of that holding of accountability is that you are able to do that act. If you are unable to do that act because you completely forgot, it went out of your mind entirely, so you're not aware of it at all, or for example, you are sleeping entirely, or you don't have the cloth, or you don't have the direction, you don't have the ability to work out the direction for *Qiblah*, or you don't have any water, or you don't

have any soil, or you're locked up, then all of these will fall. That's the concept of the excuse.

Student (online): Mixing: (is as you mentioned) he entered at *ʿAṣr* time but did *niyyah* for *Ẓuhr*. Leaving: Does that mean he made no *niyyah* at all?

Ustādh: How is that mixing? That is the same as no *niyyah* because to just make a *niyyah* for prayer is meaningless. You have to be indicating the prayer.

Now, you might be referring to (I don't know if you are) the fact that we said that a person doesn't have to specify the *Ẓuhr* as *Ẓuhr* at *Ẓuhr* time because that is the prayer at that time. He doesn't have to be thinking *Ẓuhr, Ẓuhr*, *Ẓuhr* in his mind and heart because that is what they're always praying. But I'm saying that someone who is actively saying *ʿAṣr* has made the complete different *niyyah.* It's not mixing *niyyah*, he's made the wrong *niyyah*. He's praying something else in the wrong time. So, I don't consider that to be mixing. Leaving here is irrelevant. The point is that you didn't have the correct *niyyah* which is a condition for that prayer. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Student (online): Sometimes our parents call us by the wrong name, but they know internally which child they want to call for even if they mix up the names. Could we apply that analogy to mixing up the prayer names (verbally or mentally) but knowing deep down which prayer you mean to intend?

Ustādh: Absolutely you can apply that. We're not talking about someone making a mistake in the actual phrase because the phraseology is not a condition anyway. The analogy in theory is right. In practice it is wrong because as you said deep down, we know who we're calling. I mean I call Hiba Mani all the time. Like all the time. Now I don't even bother. I don't even bother thinking about it. And I know I am saying it wrong, but I don't bother. I know in my heart what I want to say, on the tongue it's something else. Now here, that's a mistake on the tongue. To say *ʿAṣr* and know that you meant *Ẓuhr* and you're praying *Ẓuhr* and you are doing nothing *Ẓuhr*, it has nothing to do with *ʿAṣr*, this is not a problem at all. We're not referring to this. We are referring to an actual person who thinks that they're praying *ʿAṣr,* not the example you're giving. Not at all. It's the opposite to what you're thinking. This is someone who actually thinks they're praying *ʿAṣr*.

And then Shaykh says in the next part:

أَوْ تَعَمَّدَ تَرْكَ رُكْنٍ أَوْ وَاجِبٍ بَطُلَتْ صَلاَتُه

Or intentionally leaves a pillar or obligation, their prayer is invalidated.

(0:21:00) So basically, he has to go for *rukūʿ* and he says, '*Forget that,*' and he just goes for *sujūd*. Shaykh says that if he is in *rukūʿ* and he thinks, '*Oh man! Why did I do that? Let me now go back to the rukūʿ*.'

What do you think?

And in fairness I am asking you this question before we have covered how to correct the prayer. So only those who have studied in *Fiqh* of *Ṣalāh* with me with AlMaghrib before can probably answer this question accurately.

Let's imagine a person is meant to go for *rukūʿ,* instead going for *rukūʿ* he goes for *sajdah*. And now while he is in *sajdah* he thinks, '*That was so stupid. I don't know why I did that.*' But he did it intentionally. So, he goes into *sajdah*. Now he wants to go back. So, what does he do? What would the process be now?

So far, students are saying: repeat the *rakʿah*, repeat the *rakʿah,* repeat the *rakʿah,* which obviously makes sense. But of course, the answer is no, you can't because you did it intentionally. What did the author say?

The prayer is invalidated.

Whereas what you guys are thinking is the person missed it out or forgot it and so and so forth. When a person does it unintentionally then that's exactly what he would do. He would get straight back up and go to *rukūʿ* and then he will carry on praying from there as you are going to learn in the next couple of months or weeks and then he would do *sajdat'l-sahw* and the prayer is fixed. But when a person intentionally (as I said very clearly) does that, it does not matter if he is remorseful. If he is remorseful then maybe Allāh ﷻ will forgive him. By the way we have two problems here. We don't just have the fact that the prayer is invalidated, we have the problem that he is a sinner and he has done *ḥarām.*

That's the leaving of a *rukn.*

Student (online): Intentionally out of laziness or something like that?

Ustādh: I mean like laziness or arrogance or whatever a person would do to do it. We are not talking about mistakes. Mistakes are coming *in shāʾ Allāh* later.

And that's an example of leaving out a *rukn*.

Leaving out a *wājib*:

لو تَرَكَ التشهُّد الأول متعمِّداً

So for example, he leaves out the first *tashahhud*. We said that the first *tashahhud* is an obligation. And he leaves it out intentionally. So, he does two *rakʿah* and he stands up. Then he feels, '*Man! That was so stupid. I'm going to sit down again, and I am going to do it.*' And you might think because it's *wājib* it's less, it's not as important as the *rukn*. The prayer is invalidated. He has to start the prayer again from new. Why does he have to start the whole prayer again?

Because he did it intentionally.

Now as you guys are indicating you guys are completely shocked. And that's because you should be shocked because it would be the most insane thing ever for a person to intentionally leave something out.

Student (online): If the person does it intentionally the person has done a *bidʿah*?

Ustādh: Yes. No doubt the person has done *bidʿah*. Technically it's a *bidʿah* there is no doubt about it. Technically it's *bidʿah,* legally it's *ḥarām*, and practically you have to start the prayer again.

Student (online): He felt compelled to prostrate.

Ustādh: That is intentional. That could happen. I can actually see that happening.

Student (online): In what scenario in real life does someone intentionally leave part of the prayer?

Ustādh: I can completely see that. A person meant to go for *rukūʿ*, and he feels… Because *ṣalāh* is meant to be an experience, right? So, a person will be like, '*You know what? I need something bigger than this right now. I need something more than it. I am just going to go straight for sajdah*.' I can see it happening.

By the way, seeing it happening means, still, one in a million. But I can see that one in a million. That is my point. And, I can see that in real life.

Student (online): Folks, it is an example.

Ustādh: It is an example. But they are right to ask because through the example and through the extreme, we obviously learn the actual principle. But at the same time, we do not want to be just throwing out examples that are pointless. So, I get the point.

بخلاف الباقي

(The prayer is sound) in all cases other than this.

As for the rest of the things, whether you leave it out intentionally or not, then it is okay. Even if you do it intentionally—any of the *sunnah*.

Student (online): Isn't that an unintentional mistake?

Ustādh: What is an unintentional mistake? The point is that if you leave out the *sunnah* act, whether it is a statement or [an action] intentionally, then what you have done is you have decreased the quality of the prayer, but you have not made the prayer invalid. So, you do not need to then worry about the invalidation of the prayer.

وَمَا عَدَا ذٰلِكَ سُنَنٌ أَقْوَالٌ وَأَفْعَالٌ

Everything else from actions and statements are all considered *sunnah*.

So, everything other than the *arkān* (the pillars) the most important, and the *wājibāt* (the obligations), anything other than that, is then *sunnah*—whether that is a verbal *sunnah* or whether that is an action *sunnah*.

The meaning of *sunnah* according to the jurists, may Allāh ﷻ have mercy upon them, we discussed this before, so I do not want to go into so much detail. The word *sunnah* means different things to different people at different times in different sciences. That is something which is an important point. And when we are saying *sunnah* here, we do not mean the *sunnah* as understood by the *Ṣaḥābah* and *Tābiʿīn*—the phrase *sunnah*. Because whenever the word *sunnah* is used in their context, i.e., the *ṣaḥābah* and *tābiʿīn*, it means 'the way of Islam'. It means, 'the path'. It means the acceptance of the Prophet ﷺ, as opposed to the following of the Prophet ﷺ in minor actions. The *sunnah* is your *ʿaqīdah*. The *sunnah* is your belief. The *sunnah* is your *fitrah*. The *sunnah* is the system. I think you guys remember when we covered this, that *sunnah* in *uṣūl'l-fiqh* means something different to what it means in *fiqh*, which means it is different when it comes to *manhaj*. The *sunnah* when it comes to talking about Allāh ﷻ in terms of His Way, in terms of the means that the Earth has been given for us to interact with, etc.

(0:30:00) There are some aspects, for example, of the *sunnah* that are obligatory. That would be for example, the acceptance of the Prophet's ﷺ statements in general. Sometimes, they are recommended. For example, the Prophet ﷺ, in a *ḥadīth* narrated by Bukhāri, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn quotes, Anas ibn Mālik ؓ, said:

السُّنَّةُ إِذَا تَزَوَّجَ الْبِكْرَ أَقَامَ عِنْدَهَا سَبْعًا، وَإِذَا تَزَوَّجَ الثَّيِّبَ أَقَامَ عِنْدَهَا ثَلاثًا.

"It is from the *sunnah* that when you marry the virgin over the non-virgin, that you will stay with her for seven nights and then the time will be equally divided." [1,2]

So, the equal division of time (as is obligated to do between the wives) there is an exception to that which is when you marry the virgin bride. This word, *sunnah*: *min'l-sunnah*, is not saying that it is a recommendation to do so. But this is the way of the Prophet ﷺ. And indeed, according to the majority of scholars, this is an obligation. So, this word *sunnah* is not the word of the legal realities. Like I said, if you can go back and find that littered throughout the years we have been studying this point.

Student (online): The ways that *shayṭān* tries to throw off believers who pray is not always obvious to us, and this could be one example.

Ustādh: Yeah. Correct.

I do get the point though, you know, what a crazy example. When is that going to happen? And it is very unlikely, but you do see things. You got me thinking. My head has been turned. I am thinking in my head, '*When was the last time I saw a total madness?*' I cannot remember it. I cannot remember a total madness. But I could see it happening that a man thinks, '*You know what? I need something a bit extra right now*,' and go straight for *sajdah*.

Student (online): Only psychiatrists see total madness.

Ustādh: I think there is a lot more madness out there that you are not getting to see. I will give you an example. What if you are really tired? Like, really, really, tired. And you really want to get to the *sajdah*? I reckon someone is tired, they are going to do it.

Student (online): The guy in the Ḥaram who went to *sajdah*, missed *rukūʿ* and even after he realized, he didn't go back to *rukūʿ*.

Ustādh: That was a mistake.

Student (online): You once mentioned that some guy did three *sujūd* and when you flagged it he said, '*I know. I always do that.*'

Ustādh: That was intentional and that is not the same. That guy really did think that you're meant to do three *sajdah*. That's different. He was not adding intentionally. He thought that's what you're meant to do.

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Wedlock and Marriage, Chapter: Marrying a Virgin while Already Having a Matron Wife, hadīth no. 5213.*
[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Wedlock and Marriage, Chapter: Marrying a Matron While Already Having a Virgin Wife, ḥadīth no. 5214.*

On top of page 330 (this is a really good example): ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr ﵁ says:

وَوَضْعُ الْيَدِ عَلَى الْيَدِ مِنَ السُّنَّةِ

"It is a *sunnah* to place one hand on the other [in the prayer]."[3]

The same kind of statement has also been narrated from ʿAli ﵁.[4]

This statement is not actually referring to the *sunnah* of recommendation that the *fuqahāʾ* would be using, even though we know that this act is only recommended and not obligatory, as per the vast majority of scholars. I'd love to say consensus, but you know there are some Ẓāhiriyyah, this is one of the problems with Shaykh al-Albāni and his kind of interpretation that if something is done, it has to be obligatory. I'm not saying that's exactly what it is, but it's where that thinking leads you to. That is benefit of the *madhāhib* and that is a learning point that people should be aware of. But I want you to appreciate that ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr ﵁ is not using the word *sunnah* like the jurists are using it. He's using it to say this is the way of the Prophet ﷺ, this was his way; this was how he ﷺ used to present the prayer; this is how Allāh ﷻ expects it; this is how the Muslim stands, like this. That I think is important.

Whereas, the word *sunnah* here, according to the later scholars, because the word *sunnah* for us is part of a classification of whether to make an act *ḥarām* or *makrūh* or *sunnah*, that means recommended or *mustaḥab/mustaḥabban*. It only means *sunnah*.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that sometimes it is good that when you are explaining these words, you do explain what context you're trying to say it in. That is important when you're speaking to people and you say: '*It is from the sunnah to do this*,' it is important or useful (depending upon circumstance) to explain what you mean. It is important that you establish that what we are talking about is from the fundamentals of Islam versus from the minutiae of *fiqh*. Because normally *sunnah* is from the minutiae of *fiqh*.

Shaykh then gives an example about different things:

فمثلاً :الاستفتاح: سُنَّة، البسملة :سُنَّة، التعوذ :سُنَّة، قول آمين :سُنَّة، الزيادة على قراءة الفاتحة :سُنَّة، الزيادة على تسبيح الركوع والسجود :سُنَّة، وهذه سنن قولية

[3] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: Placing the Right Hand on the Left in the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 754*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf* by al-Albāni.
[4] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: Placing the Right Hand on the Left in the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 756*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf* by al-Albāni.

He says *al-istiftāḥ*—the opening *duʿāʾ*—he said it is a *sunnah*. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn himself says the *basmalah* is a *sunnah*. You know that in my opinion I consider it to be part of the *Fātiḥah* and 100% whether I am right or wrong, you should always on the safe side recite the *Fātiḥah* with the *basmalah* like as if it is an obligation.‡ However, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn considers the *basmalah* not only to not be part of the *Fātiḥah*, but to only be a *sunnah* of the prayer. *Taʿawwudh—aʿūdhu billāhi minʾl-shayṭānʾl-rajīm—sunnah*. To say *āmīn*, *sunnah*, to recite a *sūrah* after *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*, a *sunnah*, anything that you say other than *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* or *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* in the *rukūʿ* or *sujūd* is a *sunnah*. All of these Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says are verbal *sunan* (the word *sunan* is plural of *sunnah*).

والجهر بالقراءة في موضعه :سُنَّة فعلية؛ لأن الجهر صفة للقراءة، وكذلك تطويل القراءة يُعتبر سُنَّة فِعْلية، أما المطول أو المجهور به فإنه قولي، الإِسرار بالقراءة في موضعه :سنة فعلية.

And then he says: to recite out loud in its right place, *ṣalāt al-Fajr* or in *ʿIshāʾ* or *Maghrib* for the imām. He doesn't call this a verbal *sunnah*. He says this is a *sunnah* action, which I agree with.

لأن الجهر صفة للقراءة

For example, to elongate the recitation, the elongation of the recitation in *Fajr* compared to *Maghrib*, this is a *sunnah*. But this is not a verbal *sunnah*, even though it will be a verbal elongation, but this is an action. This is the action of recitation. It is a
(0:40:00) description of the recitation. Likewise, to recite silently in *Ẓuhr* and *ʿAṣr*, this would be another *sunnah*. This will fall under the category of the *sunnah* action.

So, you have been given examples [of *duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ*], *Ṣubbūḥun Quddūṣun Rabbʾl-malāikati waʾl-Rūḥ*, etc. these are all verbal sunan. Then the practical *sunan* are the ones we just discussed, for example elongating the choice of the *sūrah*, to recite out loud in the loud prayer, the *jahri* prayer, to recite quietly in the *sirri* prayers. That is an example of each category.

Student (online): What do you mean usually when you use the word obligation?

Ustādh: When I say the word obligation, I mean that which if you do not do it, then you are sinful, and you are required to do it by necessity.

‡ The discussion regarding the *basmalah* in *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lessons 19 and 20. MT

Student (online): It means *wājib*. Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn covers the difference between a *rukn* (pillar) and *wājib* (obligation) in the first lesson of this chapter (Year 8, Chapter 19, Lesson 1).

Ustādh: Sorry I thought you were talking about when I just say the word 'obligation'. But if you mean in the text, then I mean it different: that which itself is obligatory to do however if it is forgotten then you can fix it with *sajdatʼl-sahw*. However, the *rukn* is something that if you forget to do it in the prayer, you must go back and do it wherever you are in the prayer and then do *sajdatʼl-sahw*. I explained this actually in the beginning of a few lessons of this year as well. And that is coming up by the way.

Here is the interesting part which is the final part of our discussion and the lesson today. [Imām al-Ḥajjāwi] says:

ولا يُشرع السجود لتركه، وإن سجد فلا بأس

It is not legislated to have to perform the prostration (of forgetfulness) if they are left out, but if one was to perform it then there is no problem with that.

That is a very interesting statement. So, we do not have to do it, if you miss out a *sunnah.* For example, if you did not say [*duʻāʾ al-istiftāḥ*], or you did not recite a *sūrah* then as the author in this statement is technically saying, if you did not do that, then you left it out, and intentionally as well, you do not have to do the *sajdatʼl-sahw*.

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says:

فقوله: «لا يُشرع السجود لتركه»، أي :لا يجب ولا يُسَنّ.

When a person says 'it is not legislated', in legal terms, then this means it is neither obligated (this very important, this is why this discussion is going to get very interesting) nor a *sunnah*. It means it has not been legislated. It has not been asked of you to do it, neither in the way of obligation and neither in the way of a recommended act. So, you are neither obligated to do so, and neither are you recommended.

For example, a person forgets to recite the [*basmalah*] in the *Fātiḥah* (this again is according to Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn):

رَجُلٌ نسيَ أن يقرأ البسملةَ في الفاتحة، فإذا قلنا بالقول الصحيح أنها ليست من الفاتحة، وإنها سُنَّة فهل يسجد للسهو؟

And he gives a reference to Volume 3, page 57 [of *Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ʿala Zād al-Mustaqniʿ*] which is where we discussed this.‡ He basically says: If we assume the position that the *basmalah* is not from the *Fātiḥah*, and that is the correct position (Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says)… So, he is indicating that there is a difference of opinion. He is indicating his own position. As I said again, I think it is from the *Fātiḥah* and at the very least even if it is not, you should assume so. That is my basic principle when it comes to *fiqh* that whenever there is a difference of opinion on a matter whether something is a *sunnah* or obligatory, I always treat it like it is obligatory—especially when it is within an act. The *basmalah* for example is part of *Fātiḥah,* it is there, there abouts anyway. Why wouldn't I include it? *Rabbigh-firli Rabbigh-firli* what else am I going to say between the two *sajdah*? I am going to treat it like an obligation. The *wuḍūʾ* as I am starting, *bismillāh*.

This is not a scientific method, or certainly not an academic method, it is what I call a practical method. Anecdotally speaking the masses like to practice Islam like this and there is a reason why the masses like to practice Islam like this. It is because the nation has agreed upon this principle. It is a natural easy way of practising *dīn*. You avoid the differences of opinion. You avoid that which is risky and that is a point of contention, by just covering it and doing it. Now some will argue, '*Hold on! That is putting into the religion that which is not from it*.'

I said: I never said it was legislated. I never said that it was obligatory. I never said that you must do it. I am saying it is an easy practical way of practising your Islam.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: If we say and assume that the *basmalah* is not part of *Fātiḥah* therefore not obligatory, and there was a person and he forgot to recite the *basmalah* in his prayer, it is a *sunnah*. Does he then make a *sajdah* for *sahw* at the end of it or not?

Shaykh says there is no *sajdah* legislated for him.

لا يُشرع له أن يسجد للسهو، لأن هذا سُنَّة إنْ جاء به فهو أكمل، وإن لم يأتِ به فلا حَرَجَ، وعلى هذا فلا يُشرع السُّجود لتركه.

This is only a *sunnah* act. If he was to do it, the action would become high quality, the prayer would be complete, it would be *akmal,* it would be the most complete version of the prayer offered. And if he did not do that *basmalah* then there is no harm that is being caused and therefore there is no *sajdatʾl-sahw* that he needs to do. Neither is he

obligated to do it, neither is he recommended to do so. Again, this is based upon the opinion that the *basmalah* is a *sunnah*.

Student (online): If someone recited aloud in *Ẓuhr* or *ʿAṣr* intentionally, where would that stand? Given that reciting in those quietly is a *sunnah*.

Ustādh: This is something that would not invalidate the prayer. The prayer is not invalidated by this act. It is not *ḥarām* to do so. And he has basically gone against the *sunnah* because it is *sunnah* to keep it quiet.

Student (online): If you recite loudly in the prayers that are meant to be silent (praying by yourself), what does that fall under? *Makrūh*?

Ustādh: This is what I understand it to be, to be a disliked act. But I do not think that the prayer is affected in terms of invalidated. You have left the *sunnah* and done something which the Prophet ﷺ did not do.

Student (online): If the legal status is neither recommendation nor obligation, *sajdatʾl-sahw* for a missed *sunnah*, how does that stand concerning introducing an unlegislated act? Could some say that this is *bidʿah*?

Ustādh: Absolutely they could. You could. Others will say that this is a permissible act and they will make an analogy to where it is normally done. And I will give an example of that soon. But that is the danger. When something is not legislated, you are opening the door for it to be a *bidʿah*, but not exclusively as we are about to see. Let Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn argue it out.

Shaykh then gives another example at the top of page 331:

مثال آخر :رَجُلٌ تَرَكَ رَفْعَ اليدين عند الركوع، هل يُشرع أن يسجد للسهو؟

He says there is a person who forgets to raise his hands as he goes into *rukūʿ*. Is it legislated for him to make the *sajdatʾl-sahw?*

The answer is no. It's not legislated because this act of raising of the hands as you go into *rukūʿ* is a *sunnah*. And therefore, we can say as our rule after these two examples, that every *sunnah* that the praying person (the *muṣalli*) leaves out, they are not required to do the *sajdatʾl-sahw*. Neither are they obligatorily required, neither is it recommended for them to do so. And that is basically what the author is saying.

وعُلِّلَ ذلك :بأنه تَرْكٌ لا تبطل به الصلاةُ، فلا يجب به السجود، وإذا لم يجب فلا دليل على مشروعيته، فلا يكون السُّجود له مشروعاً، لا على سبيل الوجوب، ولا على سبيل الاستحباب.

And the reason for all of what we said is because if you leave these items, the prayer is not invalidated. So why are we having to ask someone to make a *sajdat'l-sahw*? We've already said that the prayer is valid without them. If you say the prayer is valid without them, then why would, when you leave them out, you'd have to make *sajdat'l-sahw*? That's a contradiction in terms. That's clear. That's the point.

Then he says:

وإن سجد فلا بأس

But if one was to perform it then there is no problem with that.

This is a really big statement to make for some of the reasons as has been mentioned already. Let's take this apart.

وإن سجد فلا بأس أي لو سجد لترك السنة فلا نقول إن صلاتك تبطل

(0:50:00) So, if a person did that, if a person intentionally left the *sunnah* aspect out, and you then do the *sajdah* because you left the *sunnah* out, then we will not say that your prayer has been invalidated.

(I'm going to translate literally. It is better than me summarising because this is pretty meaty stuff.) Shaykh basically says that you have increased in your prayer something which has not been legislated and something which is not legislated (according to our author) is not something which is not allowed, (if you like) in Islam. It's not *nafiy muṭlaq*.

لأنك زدت زيادة غير مشروعة، ونفيُ المشروعية في كلام المؤلِّف ليس نفيًّا مطلقاً

Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn is saying that obviously, according to our author, the way that he has defined the word 'legislated' is clearly something different to the other *fuqahā'*, to the other scholars (and I would argue to the majority of scholars but we'll come to that

in a second). And according to him, if you do an action that is not legislated, you've only done an action which is not legislated. You haven't done an action which is completely new. That's the argument.

And this dovetails with this idea from some of the scholars about the concept of *bidʿah*. Now you'll remember that I have spoken before that there are some approaches to *bidʿah* which are very straightforward and clear, and they are very beneficial because you just don't mess about, and something's dodgy and new and not practiced, then it's just *bidʿah* and end of story.

I want you to think about this for a second.

That is clearly the approach where people want to keep religion simple and easy and that's it. And there are others that want to be more academic about it and they say: Well, *bidʿah* is not all the same, and there are different types, and we need to be more academic about it. And you can see their argument as well.

A classic example of this would be the differentiation of *bidʿah,* innovation, into two categories: the first category is a *bidʿah maḥḍah*, which is a pure *bidʿah*, and a second would be a *bidʿah iḍāfiyyah*, or you might translate that as a supplementary *bidʿah*.

Now a number of the classical scholars introduced this differentiation. A *bidʿah maḥḍah* basically means a pure *bidʿah,* an action for which there is absolutely no basis, i.e. on a third *rakʿah* of a *Ẓuhr* on Wednesday, we will read the *Fātiḥah* [with our hands on our heads] with one foot off the floor hopping around and whatever.

Now you'd say to yourself, '*What on God's earth is that?! What's the foot off the floor for? Why the hands on the head? Why the third rakʿah? Why only Ẓuhr? Why on a Wednesday?*'

This is pure *bidʿah*, versus (in my book, in my opinion) celebrating your birthday.

So, if a person was to celebrate their birthday, I think this is problematic for many reasons, the least of them being the Islamic. That's my personal opinion. I don't celebrate birthdays. I don't like my kids celebrating birthdays. Ee don't have that system in our house, etc. despite the obvious pressures from family and so on and so forth. However, I want you to appreciate that Islamically I think this is a minor issue even though it could be argued to be a *bidʿah*, an innovation. And you might say, '*Hold on! This has got nothing to do with religion*.'

And the answer to that is that, yeah religion itself is not the point. It's *ʿibādah,* and *ʿibādah* are those things that a person starts to hold dear, do regularly, feel that there is some kind of (this is an argument that can be put forward, by the way) that this is something which should be done, and can't be missed out, and it comes back around again and comes from the word *ʿāda yuʿīdu*, and it becomes a *ʿīd*, and of course the

Prophet ﷺ said you only have two *ʿīds*, you only have two days which reoccur and you celebrate regularly.[5]

Now some scholars said this is referring to that which is purely religious, not referring to things that need to be marked. So for example, every year you might need to do a check on something, or you might need to commemorate something, or you might need to memorialise something, or you might need to... So, there's already that argument, whether it's religious or not.

But let's just assume it is religious. Even if it religious, it's not completely baseless to say that the birthday is a nice moment. It is the day that you came into this world. It is a way of remembering that you can be grateful to Allāh ﷻ for your life. I don't think it makes mega sense. I mean it doesn't make sense to me because you are getting older and getting closer to the death and once you start getting older you realise what a stupid idea the whole birthday is anyway. But in principle—in principle—people want something to celebrate and just to chill out with, no one is claiming to be religious.

But the real interesting thing is of course that we have the *ḥadīth* in *Muslim* in which the Prophet ﷺ, said that I fast on Mondays and this was the day that I was born.[6] Now what this *ḥadīth* shows, is how you celebrate a birthday—with *ʿibādah*. Some scholars said: '*Well, hold on! The Prophet ﷺ could have given a number of ʿilal or reasons to actually fast, however the reason that the Prophet ﷺ gave was to connect it to him being born*.' Others will say, '*Hey, the Prophet ﷺ being born and saving all of humanity is something to celebrate versus you. What have we done?*'

My point is that the difference between a pure *bidʿah,* and something that we can see has some dodgy, weak, tenuous connection. When we have someone trying their very best to make a connection, you could not possibly, you would have the greatest con artists on the planet and he could not make the third *rakʿah* praying [with their hands on their heads], a connection to it being correct. Whereas I could sit here and I could give a good account of how celebrating a birthday is not the worst thing in the world, especially if you don't do anything *ḥarām*. You don't do anything actual proper *ḥarām*. Then it could be. That is the difference between *bidʿah maḥḍah* and whatever.

So of course in this position right here (and I'm going to carry on reading okay, that is important), but Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is basically saying that according to Imām al-Ḥajjāwi there is a difference when a person removes entirely the act, a brand new act that has no basis, versus we have an act already and we already use it in *arkān*, we already use it in *wājibāt,* I can see it working in *sunnah* as well. Even though the sense is not there.

---

[5] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of the Prayer for the Two ʿĪds, ḥadīth no. 1556.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: It Is Recommended to Fast Three Days of Every Month, and to Fast on the Days of ʿArafah and ʿĀshūrāʾ, and to Fast on Mondays and Thursdays, ḥadīth no. 1162 e.*

Now you may think this has no base, but I have been thinking about this and I'll give you some examples in a second. But let's just carry on with what Shaykh is saying.

Shaykh then says some of the *fuqahāʾ* of course disagree with what the Shaykh is saying (what Imām al-Ḥajjāwi is saying) i.e. if you do an action which is not legislated, then all you have done is done an action which is not legislated—you have not created a brand new action and is *bidʿah*.

Other scholars beg to differ, as in *al-Inṣaf.* They said:

إنه إذا سَجَدَ لِتَرْكِ السُّنَّة فصلاتُه باطلة؛ لأننا إذا قلنا: لا يشرع؛ صار بدعة

There are other mainstream scholars from the Ḥanbali school themselves who said: Hold on! If you left out a *sunnah* and you did a *sajdah*, then your prayer is invalidated because you have done an outright *bidʿah*. So, this is straight down the line shooting, (1:00:00) which makes a lot of sense. You have introduced an act which is not from it, no reason for it, no basis for it, no evidence for it, bam! That is *bidʿah* and your *ṣalāh* is invalidated because once you said it is not legislated it becomes *bidʿah*:

وكل بدعة ضلالة

And every *bidʿah* is a misguidance.[7]

فإذا سَجَدَ فقد أتى بزيادة غير مشروعة فتبطل الصلاةُ، لكن المذهب: أن السجود لا بأس به، إلا أنه غير مشروع.

He says: But the scholars will clearly say that you come and do an innovation, it is misguided, it is something which has no basis, and your prayer is invalidated.

Student (online): I like that position. It makes more sense.

Ustādh: As she says, this is definitely what makes more sense.

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: Keeping the Prayer and Khuṭbah Short, ḥadīth no. 867 a.*

Student (online): Isn't that just the same as adding a third *sujud*? That you think it is okay to add it? An "intentional unnecessary addition" that disrupts the required order of the prayer.

Ustādh: You know what? What she just said, it is not a million miles from that. It is like adding a third *sajdah*. I mean it is not, but it is along the same way. So, that is the position.

However, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that the *madh-hab* though, the position of the Ḥanbali school (and this is the official position), is that if you do this act then, it is okay. It is no problem. But it is not legislated.

Now as we're saying right now what does 'not legislated' even mean then?

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says the second position in this matter or the second statement or second opinion rather, on this matter is:

أنَّ سجودَ السَّهو مشروع لترك المسنون،

That to make the *sajdat'l-sahw* when you leave out a *sunnah* act is actually legislated, it is actually part of the prayer. This is regardless of whether the *sunnah* is from the *aqwāl* or the *afʿāl*, meaning whether it is a verbal *sunnah* or whether it is from the actions. This is because of the generality of the *ḥadīth* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﵁ that the Prophet ﷺ said:

فَإِذَا نَسِيَ أَحَدُكُمْ فَلْيَسْجُدْ سَجْدَتَيْنِ

"When any one of you forgets, he must perform two prostrations." [8]

ولأنه إذا طُلب منه السجود انتبه لفعله حتى لا يتكرَّر منه السُّجود في كلِّ صلاة؛ لأن الغالب نسيان تلك السُّنَن؛ خصوصاً مَنْ لم يُواظب عليها.

So, the Shaykh says that especially if you know that you have left out that *sunnah* and you forgot about it, if you do *sajdah* then you are going to always be aware of that. You are going to mentally and emotionally remember that action and you are not going to

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 a.*

then forget next time because you don't want to be praying a prayer that has *sajdahs* all the time in it, that you are having to do *sajdat'l-sahw* all the time in it. So, you'll stop then forgetting that *sunnah*.

وهذا الذي ذكره المؤلف ـــ مِن كونه لا يُشرع السجود لتركه، وأنه إنْ سجد فلا بأس به

Shaykh says what the author mentioned in his original statement that it's not legislated but if he does it then it's not a problem, actually leads to a beneficial principle.

أنَّ الشيء قد يكون جائزاً، وليس بمشروع

The Shaykh is saying that actually what the author is indicating is that it's possible for something not to be legislated but it is permissible. This is what Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn is saying is a principle that can be taken from what Imām al-Ḥajjāwi said i.e. that it is something it's not legislated but it can still be permissible.

أي :يكون جائزاً أن تتعبَّد به، وليس بمشروع أن تتعبَّد به، وقد ذكرنا لهذا أمثلة فيما سبق يحضرنا منها:

Shaykh says I have mentioned this before. (I can think of a few examples of the top of my head and he is going to mention them now.) He says that basically it is permissible to use to worship Him but it's not legislated to worship Him with.

This is going to take some time. I don't want to rush this. This is really important.

Q & A

Q (online): Say you enjoy reciting out loud in *ṣalāh* and hence look more forward to the loud prayers and lose focus in the silent ones. Is it always better to follow the *sunnah* or would it be okay to recite out loud as it gives you more *khushū'*? Will *sunnah* always trump your personal *khushū'*? Kind of like how closing the eyes is not *sunnah* but you might have a more focused *ṣalāh* if you do.

Ustādh: This is a very, very good question because if she were asking: I am struggling so much in my prayer can I close my eyes? I would always say yes. And yet when she

asked the question: Can I now pray out loud in the silent prayer? I don't know of any scholar that is going to whole-heartedly say that. They might allow a temporary x, y, z.

Now, in fairness there is a difference between the two because closing the eyes in the prayer is something which is accepted for a reason and been seen and allows focus and not all the scholars said it's *makrūh*, some said it is permissible. So, there's not the same difference of opinion on the eyes. But the answer to your question is absolutely no doubt that the *sunnah* is better than what you consider to be the key matter in your *khushūʿ*. And that's the key point. You are saying that my *khushūʿ* is affected. In actual fact, what really you are saying is that I have only developed my *khushūʿ* within this paradigm and I need to work on my back issues, and researches, and *tafsīr*s, and my connection to the *ayāt*, and my prayer area that I am in, and in the silence of where I am, etc. etc. as opposed to just immediately saying: Well, let's sacrifice the *sunnah* on that altar. That's the issue.

Q (online): If reciting quietly in *Ẓuhr* is *sunnah*, could one recite aloud?

A: When we say *sunnah* we are not only indicating that it is *sunnah* to recite out loud, we are also indicating it is disliked to go against the system as well. Now, that might not make sense, but it's something which the Prophet ﷺ never did despite his every single prayer being noted.

Q (online): Do you have to be consistent with the *sunnah* aspects of the prayer? E.g. raising of the hands before *rukūʿ* in some prayers but not in others.

A: In general, yes. Although legally speaking the point is that you don't have to be consistent or you don't need to do it all the time. The issue is this… (And this is why I didn't want to cover the rest of it today because there is actually a lot more to discuss. There is something that I want to add as well.) There is a difference between *sunan* that you do all the time versus *sunan* that you only do irregular. There is also another aspect (which is why we have to do this next week) and that is that sometimes you intentionally leave out or add a *sunnah* to mix up the prayer to make it alive again. And this is the big shocker (and again we will cover this next week) you might not recite a *sūrah*.

Now, hardly anyone would miss out a *sūrah* in the first *rakʿah* of the prayer. But you'd miss it out just to slap you back into life because you are in this zone where you are going to read [*Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*] and that's it you are going to carry on. Imagine if you said to yourself *āmīn* and you said to yourself, '*No. I am not going to recite. I am not going to do it.*' [Then you say *Allāhu akbar* and go into *rukūʿ*.] Bro, you do that your whole head is messed up. In that *tasbīḥ* you are going to be thinking, '*What did I just do? What on earth did I just do?*' You will be thinking, you realise you are in the prayer again. Vis-à-vis your normal four *rakʿah* autopilot, brain-dead prayer which had zero meaning anyway and you weren't connecting and at the end of the prayer you just went through

(1:10:00) the whole thing. At least you stopped in the prayer and thought and reflected and it was something. So, that's a strategy point. I am going to talk about that next week.

Q (online): We got the giggles in *Maghrib* today—totally lost our minds for no reason whatsoever, ploughed on until the end but then repeated the prayer as we felt it was just messed-up. We didn't miss any *arkān*, we just giggled a lot. Were we correct to repeat or was our prayer still valid, albeit poor?

A: You were correct to repeat because in the section of the invalidators of the prayer we mentioned laughing and smiling. Smiling is the limit and once smiling with sound comes out then this is called laughing and that is an invalidator of the prayer.

Q (online): So Imām al Ḥajjāwi's understanding of legislated is the backdrop to *bidʿah iḍāfiyyah*?

A: It's not the backdrop but it's a corollary to the *bidʿah iḍāfiyyah.*

Q (online): Is it wrong to celebrate to make family/parents happy?

A: I don't think it's wrong to celebrate your birthday to keep your parents happy. No problem. I don't think it's a major issue.

Q (online): What about anniversaries?

A: Anniversary is the same. It's not major. It really isn't. I just don't like it. But I am old school. When I say I don't like it, I don't mean I don't like it personally. I don't like it because of its connotation. I don't like weak religious values. I don't like people who are forcing to have to do things that are not from their *dīn*. But that's just me. I am very jealous about the religion itself. And I hate to think that people cannot make themselves happy, entertain themselves within *dīn* and religious practice. And birthdays are not our practice, by the way, just so that you know. But that's it.

Q (online): So, is fasting on birthday a recommended act?

A: Fasting on your birthday is not a recommended act. Let me just make that clear. I was just using that as an example.

Q (online): Candles on a cake and making a wish is what is more worrying.

A: This is the point. Candles on a cake and making a wish and all the rest of it, that's the problem.

Q (online): Attending family birthday invite to keep family ties.

A: But attending a family birthday invite to keep the family ties, I am okay with that. I don't think that's a problem.

Q (online): Saying *taqabbal Allāh minnā wa minkum* to each other after praying in congregation?

A*:* I do believe that is a *bidʿah*.

Q (online): Sometimes a *sunnah* to miss a *sunnah* i.e. not making it become *farḍ* by always doing it, is that a valid statement?

A: Absolutely, that is a valid statement. That is very much a part that we need to establish in the prayer. 100%.

Q (online): You would not recite after the *Fātiḥah* if you are trying to catch the prayer on time as well, like we discussed before as an example.

A: But that is a bit different. That is because you are doing that for a need. I am saying you have plenty of time and you intentionally leave it out to try and freshen up the prayer, to try and bring you out of your malaise. That is very different.

Q (online): Is that the same as praying the four *sunnah* of *ʿAṣr* and four *sunnah* of *ʿIshāʾ* as the Prophet ﷺ used to occasionally pray them then leave them out as well?

A: No this is different. This is not part of our discussion at all. The four *sunnah* of *ʿAṣr* and four *sunnah* of *ʿIshāʾ*, some *madhāhib* do not accept it and other scholars do accept it but they accept it with the caveat of calling *ghayr mukadah* as us Paks call it, which is their way of saying *ghayr muʾakkad,* it is not an emphasised *sunnah*, not one that the Prophet ﷺ did regularly.[9,10] But it is allowed to do it because he ﷺ did it a few times.

---

[9] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the Four Rakʿah Before ʿAṣr, ḥadīth no. 429.* This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Knowledge, Chapter: To Speak About (Religious) Knowledge at Night, ḥadīth no. 117.*

Now someone like me would bring into question the evidences that would even establish even it being done a few times. I do not think it was. However, according to these scholars of the *madhāhib*, they do consider it to be something which is a legislated and regular act. Have you noticed that they consider it to be a regular *sunnah*? But that is something different, that is not part of the prayer itself. That is the part of the debate around *sunnah* prayers.

Q (online): Wishing *Jumuʿah mubārakah*?

A: I think there is some space for that. Again, these are judgment calls. And that is so important. And that is the important thing about studying.

Theoretically, things are *ḥarām* and *ḥalāl, bidʿah*, not *bidʿah.* But when you are with a teacher, a teacher will indicate to you that listen this does not make sense, it goes against the rules, but there is some nuance here. And at that point you just learn a very important lesson that nothing is black and white and there are things that I sometimes do not get and not everything always makes sense. That is one thing.

Secondly, when you question your teacher on the reason because you want to understand, then there is this idea that some things are political, or some things are based upon strategy or some things are based upon outlook. So, the word *Jumuʿah mubārakah*, you can either look at it from a very strict point of view which is that the Prophet ﷺ did not do it and that is the end of it. And that is a very safe, valid way of accepting something.

At the same time there are other scholars that are saying it is clearly a great day. And it is a *ʿīd* of the week as the Prophet ﷺ indicated. And it is a day that is the greatest for our actions and it is the day which is the greatest of our celebrations. So, we are celebrating on that day practically.[11] All I have done is to put my happiness of it being Friday into words and I am indicating it to people. So, it is a viewpoint. It is a different angle of looking at the same action.

Now clearly from someone who is more academic based, the position that it has no basis has more strength. But would you consider this to be *ḥarām*?

The level that you call a person out over an action is based upon just how unacceptable the act is and more than just what the evidences suggest, but also what the scholars are suggesting, and their leeway, and so on and so forth.

And people need to be careful. Like I am currently teaching *The Last Breath* right now. And *The Last Breath* obviously, there is a lot of detail and we put it all into a single weekend and it is a really nice class *mā shāʾ Allāh*. And in the issue of (for example):

[11] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 1098*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*

What do you do when your beloved is passing, is in *al-iḥtiḍār* meaning in the last moments? What do you say, what do you do, what do you recite?

And I speak a lot about creating a zone and a mood and an ambiance which is one that the angels appreciate. I talk about mood, lighting, *dhikr*, Qurʾān. And then of course the *ḥadīth* comes up of *iqraʾū Yāsīn ʿalā mawtākum*. The Prophet ﷺ is reported to have said recite *Sūrat Yāsīn* upon your dying ones.[12] Now by all intents this *ḥadīth* is weak. And my personal belief is that it is weak as well. And by all intent the vast majority of scholars (from the early generations) did not practice this *ḥadīth*. And so therefore, we would avoid it. But it is not the end of the world, even if someone was agreeing or disagreeing.

The point is that when it comes down to the issue of Qurʾān, nobody is going to argue that the Prophet ﷺ said that when you are with the sick and the angels are present then only say good because the angels say *amīn*. This *ḥadīth* is in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*—only *falyaqul khayrā*, say good.[13] Now when you say, 'say good', then there is nothing better in saying good than reciting the Qurʾān. So, we already have a general evidence to recite the Qurʾān. So, the only problem is that we are now focusing only on *Sūrat Yāsīn*. So, that could potentially be the *bidʿah* act. And at maximum it is going to be *bidʿah iḍāfiyyah*, and that is only if you do not accept the *ḥadīth.* And what if you think that *ḥadīth* is authentic? So, you are not going to go to town on this issue.

Now there are people that will be saying, '*Yeah, no the ḥadīth is weak. End of story. The ḥadīth is weak, what can you say?*'

If I suddenly say: By the way Ibn Taymiyyah used to practice this act. People are like, '*Rahs! Oh my God*.' And for them it is like, '*Oh okay. If Ibn Taymiyyah did it, well then that is it*.'

But this is my point. My point is that these issues are never straightforward—these ones that have *ijtihād*, interpretation of principles versus exceptions. Is an act covered by a general act, a general recommendation? And it is a point upon practicing Muslims who are students of knowledge to not treat everything as black and white. This knowledge will benefit you in your own *ʿibādah,* in your teaching but it will also benefit you in not embarrassing yourself. You know making yourself look so stupid in what you do and in *daʿwah.*

At the moment, it is not hidden. If you do not know what I am talking about, then do not bother Googling, but I know that the majority of you do. This Daniel Haqiqatjou, a guy from the U.S, and all of the *fitnah* which surrounds when he writes and shares. It is clear that the guy has some skills in debating. He takes on lots of things, which we have

---

[12] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Funerals, Chapter: Reciting Qurʾān for the One Who Is Dying, ḥadīth no. 3121*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf* by al-Albāni.
[13] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What Is to Be Said in the Presence of the Sick and the Dying, ḥadīth no. 919*.

been doing for donkey's years. But the guy does it in a way by attacking individuals, (1:20:00) which again is not a problem if they deserve attacking, but straight out slander. You say about a person, '*This is what he intended*,' when the person himself [says they do not]. Like Omar Suleiman, for example. He says about him that he is someone who promotes lesbians or gays, when he very clearly states what the belief of Ahl'l-Sunnah is, unacceptable, etc. This is the problem, when you have dishonesty.

But that is not the issue. The issue that I am talking about is that when you are criticising a person for making a decision which is at best only politically problematic—there is no supporting that act, there is no believing that that is what the Muslims should do, but recognising that the community is making a stand, and I need to be there representing the Muslims as well. I know there is going to be problems there, so I have tried to minimise that. I know guilt by association is going to be made, so I have to try and minimise that as well, and so on and so forth. My view is that the greater benefits that will be achieved of my presence being there is what I am going to go with, even though I do not want to be there. And then you go.

Then, you have another person who says, '*Obviously we cannot be making alliances with these people and we cannot be promoting their act*, 'etc.

'*So, by the way, are you trying to say that you justify that behaviour? Oh, you don't? Okay. Alright, that is good. Alḥamdulillāh, at least you do not. Then, you know what? Do not go there. And, it doesn't matter if the Muslims are not on the front page as being condemning, and there is no loss in the long-term because we have protected our principles*.'

That is also a valid position by the way. A very valid position. What is completely and utterly disgraceful and invalid, is to make this difference in political strategy, or opinion, or the idea, or the appreciation of where the community should go, in the land of the *kuffār* by the way, people who are living and dependent on the *kuffār* day and night, so they are doing *ijtihād* day and night—to differ so much so on the further extension of how far we should go, not on fundamental beliefs or fundamental *ʿaqīdah* issues, but on the application of the political position. That a person should be attacked and called x, and called y. That is disgraceful. And it betrays such a lack of knowledge, experience, and immaturity. Normally, you see people grow out of this nonsense. That is the problem. You should not be speaking if you need to grow out of something. It is really problematic.

So, this is my point. The reason that I mention that is because it is the same principle. There are always correct principles to hold, but all principles were not created equal. There are some principles that are quite okay to differ on. When I say, all principles were not created equal, that is also in *ʿaqīdah* as well. Not all *ʿaqīdah* points are the same. To believe in Allāh ﷻ or not believe in Allāh ﷻ is not the same as: Did the Prophet ﷺ see Allāh ﷻ in the *dunya* or did he ﷺ not see Allāh ﷻ in the *dunya*? These are both points of *ʿaqīdah*, both points of belief. The Companions ؓ completely differed over these two, even words got a little bit exchanged: '*Ahh... he said that, but in actual fact,*

he doesn't know that this is what I saw. This is what the Prophet ﷺ said.' Straight down the line refutation against one another without any emotion, without cussing, without saying, '*He is a plum*!' '*He is uncompassionate!*' '*He is this*, *he is that, he is x, he is y*.' Versus we are going to destroy a person who says it is okay to believe in Allāh ﷻ or not believe in Allāh ﷻ, or something stupid like that. That is also in the same chapter of *ʿaqīdah,* but they are not the same. All principles are not created the same.

Q (online): Can I make *duʿāʾ* personally for Allāh ﷻ to forgive the mistakes in the prayer and accept it from me?

A: Of course, you can. What would be the point preventing that?

Q (online): If a child does something constantly during your prayer and you can no longer hold your laugh with sound, despite a lot of effort, do you need to repeat the prayer? It was completely unintentional and after a lot of effort to avoid it.

A: We covered this in detail, so you need to go and check it.[§] Laughing is [emitting sound while smiling]. Laughing is an invalidator. Smiling is not an invalidator. [Emitting a small cough instead of laughing] is not an invalidator even though it was a laugh, because you were not smiling and emitting sound at the same time. If you cannot hold your laugh, the prayer is invalidated. I have been in that scenario. When you cannot hold something, it is impossible. The way that I get around it is that you cough it out, because it is the sound that is trying to get out of your chest. And that does not invalidate the prayer. But if you are smiling at the time, and you make that sound, that is a laugh.

Q (online): Can I make *duʿāʾ* personally for Allāh ﷻ to forgive the mistakes in the prayer and accept it from me immediately after completely *ṣalāh*, after every *ṣalāh*? Will that become a *bidʿah*?

A: No. It is a *sunnah* to say *astaghfir Allāh* after the prayer anyway. And some said three times, as the *ḥadīth* mentions.[14]

Q (online): Such a norm here in the Philippines, that right away they will play *Sūrat Yāsīn* or assign a *ḥāfiẓ* to recite it upon a dying person.

A: Yes. I think the problem is just the artificialness of it.

[§] Laughter in the prayer is covered in *Logical Progression,* Year 9, Chapter 20, Lesson 9. MT

[14] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: It Is Recommended to Recite Statements of Remembrance After the Prayer, and How That Is to Be Done, ḥadīth no. 591*.

Q (online): If you control the giggle in a way that the body moves but no sound comes out, it is valid?

A: Yes.

Q (online): Do you have to complete the prayer and then repeat, or do you cut short if you laugh and start again?

A: If you laugh in the prayer, your prayer is invalidated. You have to start again. You do cut it short.

5. Chapter 19 Lesson 6: The Obligations of the Prayer

(0:06:15) Let's read the part we are covering:

وما عَدَا ذلك سُنَنٌ، أقوالٍ وأفعالٍ، ولا يُشْرَعُ السُّجودُ لتَرْكِه، وإِنْ سجَدَ فلا بَأْسَ .

Everything else from actions and statements are all considered *sunnah*. It is not legislated to have to perform the prostration (of forgetfulness) if they are left out, but if one was to perform it then there is no problem with that.

As a reminder, that basically means that if there is any *sunnah* action in the prayer for example: [*duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ*], or to say *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm* three times in the *rukūʿ* or to say *Allāhumma inni ẓalamtu nafsi ẓulman kathīran* at the very end before you say *assalamu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, or you were to make *duʿāʾ* after *Rabbana wa lak'l-ḥamd* and you were to continue standing and say *ḥamdan kathīran ṭayyiban mubārakan fīh.* These are just some different examples. Or for example you recited a long *sūrah* in *ṣalāt al-Fajr* as opposed to a shorter one which comes under an action of the *Sunnah.* These are all actions and statements which are considered *sunnah* in the prayer.

They are neither *shurūṭ* obviously (because that would be outside the prayer). They are not *arkān*, they are not pillars of the prayer because the Prophet ﷺ did not insist that they have to be prayed. They are not obligations in the prayer because the Prophet ﷺ whilst he ﷺ was praying, missing these things out, we do not have any evidence or any incident where he ﷺ did a *sajdah*. For example, when Abu Hurayrah ؓ did not know what the Prophet ﷺ was saying at the beginning of the prayer [*duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ*].[1,2] He didn't know that and so therefore he himself wasn't saying it. Then when he asked the Prophet ﷺ, the Prophet ﷺ said that this is *al-istiftāḥ*: *subḥānak Allāhumma biḥamdik, wa tabārak assmuk, wa taʿāla jadduka*. And the Prophet ﷺ telling him, clearly knows that Abu Hurayrah ؓ has not been saying it and yet he ﷺ did not tell him, '*Right you need to now go and do sajdat'l-sahw because you missed it*.'

So you see all of these clues give a very clear indication to us what is a *rukn, wājib*, *sunnah*. And to be honest, the scholars don't differ that much on this. Like there are no massive, massive differences. I mean there is the odd discrepancy. Like obviously

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of the Call to Prayers, Chapter: What to Say After the Takbīr, hadīth no. 744*.
[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Proof of Those Who Say That the Basmalah Should Not Be Recited Aloud, hadīth no.* 399c.

Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli, virtually every scholar considers that to be a *sunnah* and there are some of the Ḥanābilah that consider it to be an obligation. I mean it doesn't happen very often that they disagree to that level. So, from the supporting evidences it is quite easy to be able to confirm which level of action you are dealing with in the prayer—with of course, discussion, debates around some of them.

Now, by definition the prayer is valid without these extra *sunnah* actions. By definition if they are missed out, you do not need to do something to compensate for missing them out. And that is what the statement says:

ولا يُشْرَعُ السُّجودُ لتَرْكِه، وإِنْ سجَدَ فلا بَأْسَ .

It is not legislated to have to perform the prostration (of forgetfulness) if they are left out, but if one was to perform it then there is no problem with that.

It is not legislated to do the prostration for forgetfulness… We are going to maybe start this week more than likely next week, huge subject in of itself, very important one, because it is the single tool that we have to fix the mistakes in our prayer. It is the single tool, not only fix the mistakes in our prayer but it is actually a weapon, *subḥān Allāh*. It is an incredible tool, gift from Allāh ﷻ. When we have doubts, when we have major issues, when we make major mistakes, and so on, so forth, it is there to help us out. It is there to pick up the pieces. You don't have to go back to the prayer (unless it is a *rukn*) and do the whole unit again or even worse, write it off the prayer and start the whole prayer again. We have this wonderful institution called *sajdat'l-sahw* or *sujūd'l-sahw.*

(0:14:20) It is a tool which helps us out and it is important to study the ins and outs of it. And in actual fact, what is very interesting is that although there is a lot of detail that we are going to cover about when you do the *sajdat'l-sahw* or *sujūd'l-sahw*, the prostration for forgetfulness, or the compensatory prostration. You can call it what you want in actual fact, because the Prophet ﷺ never gave it a name. There are some weak *ḥadīth* that said:

لِكُلِّ سَهْوٍ سَجْدَتَانِ

"For each forgetfulness there are two prostrations." [3,4,5]

---

[3] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: One Who Forgets the Tashahhud While He Is Sitting, ḥadīth no. 1038*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan* by al-Albāni.
[4] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 1219*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*
[5] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 5/280*.

"For every forgetfulness there is *sajdah,"* which is why it then got called by the scholars afterwards the *sajdah* of *sahw*. However, the truth is that it is a compensating *sajdah* because it is not always technically you forgetting something. However, if you are going to play semantics, then I guess every mistake goes back then to some form of forgetfulness. Even doubt is ultimately you forgetting where you are. So, the point is that this *sajdat'l-sahw* is there to help us out and it is not needed for *sunan* acts.

Now we are going to now in this lesson go word by word by this argument so that everybody appreciates where the scholars are coming from. So at the bottom of page 330 in *al-Mumtiʿ* Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: "The author has obviously said that it is not legislated to do the *sajdah* when you leave out *sunan*," which I think everybody is happy with, everybody is comfortable with, makes a lot of sense, that's fine, "but if you do then no problem." He says:

لا يُشرع

Basically, (as I said last week) that covers both the *sunnah* acts, it is neither recommended, it is neither obligatory, it is not legislated. And when I say legislated from *sharaʿa*, it means that it is required. That is what we mean, 'required'. It is not requested from you, it is not legislated, it is not something which the Prophet ﷺ has asked for and put in into the *dīn* from his side. If I say it like that, it kind of maybe will become a little bit easier for you to swallow the difference of opinion. So, it is not obligatory or recommended to have to make the *sajdah* when you miss something out.

For example, if he misses out the *duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ* for example, then he doesn't have to do anything. [After *Allāhu akbar*] he just [says the *istiʿādhah* followed by *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*]. He doesn't need to do anything.

He misses out a *rafʿ al-yadayn.* It is *sunnah* to raise the hands and then to go into *rukūʿ*. But he forgets to raise the hands (which is a *sunnah* act of the prayer at this moment) and he goes straight into *rukūʿ*. Is it legislated for him to do the *sajdat'l-sahw*?

The answer is no. And this is the dominant position. This is the position of the *madhhab* and the position of the vast majority of scholars. That is basically the position. And I think we are all very comfortable with that. As I said before, the proof is that if there is something which itself is not required in the prayer and the prayer is not invalidated for leaving it out, then why would you then do something to compensate for something that doesn't need to be there in the first place or to keep the prayer valid? I don't think that there needs any explanation for that.

Then we got to this issue of:

وإِنْ سجَدَ فلا بَأْسَ .

But if one was to perform it then there is no problem with that.

A statement which almost seems contradictory, that if you do decide to make the *sajdah* then that's okay. And in this statement there are going to be two positions.

The first one is going to be: Well, hold on it wasn't legislated. So, you are therefore increasing in the religion an act which would indicate that it is *bidʿah*. And some of the *fuqahāʾ*—a minority of them (and that's very important, a minority of them) they took this position. They said:

قال: إنه إذا سَجَدَ لِتَرْكِ السُّنَّة فصلاتُه باطلة؛

They said actually what our common sense is indicating, that if you do make the *sajdah*, you've added something to the prayer because you don't need to do it in the first place and therefore the prayer is *bāṭilah*. It is invalidated because we said that it's not legislated and if something is not legislated and you doing it then it becomes a *bidʿah* and every *bidʿah* is a *ḍalālah* and you have brought an increase into the prayer and so on.

(0:20:00) However, the *madh-hab* position is that no, there is no problem for you to do it, but it is not legislated, it is not required. But if you decide to do it, it's not a problem. That's the first position.

But the other position is to argue that it is *mashrūʿ*.

We are now covering two positions. Forget the position that it is okay whether you do it or not, just go back to the previous sentence:

ولا يُشْرَعُ السُّجودُ لتَرْكِه

It is not legislated to have to perform the prostration (of forgetfulness) if they (*sunnah* acts) are left out.

That's the Ḥanbali position.

The second position that some of the Ḥanbali scholars flirted with and a few other scholars outside of the *madh-hab* is that it is actually a legislated action to do the *sajdat'l-sahw* for missing out a *sunnah* (and this is regardless of whether it's a verbal *sunnah* or whether it's an action *sunnah* so it is *qawliyyah aw faʿliyyah*). Why?

Because of the *ḥadīth* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﷺ that the Prophet ﷺ said:

إِذَا نَسِيَ أَحَدُكُمْ فَلْيَسْجُدْ سَجْدَتَيْ

"When any one of you forgets, he must perform two prostrations." [6]

They said that this *ḥadīth* we are going to take in its absolute generality. This *ḥadīth* does not specify if you forget a *rukn* or a *wājib*, or x, or y. It just says "if you forget". And that's true it does say that.

So, that's their first evidence. They are saying that this *ḥadīth* we should keep it unrestricted in its most general basic form and therefore, it would then cover every form of forgetfulness even when we forget to do a *sunnah* act because we wouldn't be leaving that *sunnah* act out unless we forgot.

Obviously, you should be thinking, '*Well, the problem with that is what if I didn't forget but I intentionally left something out?*' That would be a problem right there, as an immediate response.

ولأنه إذا طُلب منه السجود انتبه لفعله حتى لا يتكرَّر منه السُّجود في كلِّ صلاة؛ لأن الغالب نسيان تلك السُّنَن؛ خصوصاً مَنْ لم يُواظب عليها.

This is the textual evidence, if you like. The *ʿaqli*, logical or common sense evidence (which of course as we know always follows textual evidence, never can take its place, but it's just useful for us to think) is that if we request a *sajdah* from each person who forgets a *sunnah* act, they will learn their lesson.

انتبه لفعله حتى لا يتكرَّر منه السُّجود في كلِّ صلاة؛

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 j.*

By that act they will be so affected by it emotionally, psychologically, that they will never want that to happen in their prayer again. I mean there is actually an interesting point here as well. You know and I know that if you are praying by yourself fair enough. But if you are praying in a room with other people, let alone congregational prayer late, but I mean just praying and you make a mistake, you know that everybody is watching you. It's an embarrassing thing. It's not a plus point. It's not something to be proud of. It might be proud for you that you caught on to it and you're fixing it but…

Like I will give you a classic example, those who have kids. When you have children, you always try to pray in front of them and with them. When they are younger then you don't really kind of bring them into the prayer, you want it to be a very soft *daʿwah* or soft *tarbiyah*. And you want them to observe more rather than feel that they have to stand with you and you only get them involved when you know that they feel comfortable with it. And what you will realise is that children observe you a lot and they start to learn a lot of things. And one of the interesting anecdotal angles to this issue is that it can really confuse children. So, if you are trying to teach children how to pray by the simple observation method or even if they are a bit older and you are trying to explain it (when I say a bit older, I don't mean 9-10. I mean 5-8. I am not talking 9-10 because this kind of stuff should not be understood by kids until much later).

Hibah is a classic example. In the last 1-2 years she will come, she is waiting to do something with me, maybe we are waiting to eat dinner, and she is waiting for me to finish *ṣalāh*. So, she will sit right there waiting for me to finish *ṣalāh*. She sees me in *tashahhud*. She might make a judgment call for example. You know how kids are or even adults. If you come to say something to someone and you see them in *sajdah* you don't just immediately walk off. You wait for them to see what happens after that *sajdah.* Do they stand back up or sit back down? If you stand back up, you are probably like, '*You know what? I am going to come back in five minutes*.' If you see them sit down you say to yourself, '*This is going to be over in about one minute*,' and you get used to that. Children understand that; adults understand that. And so often you know she will come and she will sit and she will wait. And when you do not finish by giving the first *salām* and you go back down again for another one minute you know for *sajdah* this that whatever, they become confused. You at the very least level, even if you are not embarrassed by this act, will not want to confuse other people. So, there will always be this concern that you do not do that act again and so therefore they said that by doing it once you learn your lesson.

لأن الغالب نسيان تلك السُّنَن

And Shaykh says: You know, most of the time you actually forgot to do those *sunnah* acts and therefore you are going to be more aware about it. He says especially those that you do not do regularly.

Now obviously textually this argument is questionable, common sense wise it is questionable and that is why it has not been held by hardly any of the scholars. It is a minority position.

Student (online): But you can't legislate on that basis?! Can you?

Ustādh: As she said: How can you legislate on that basis? It is a bit too much.

So that is actually the end of that. He says these are the two positions, (1) that there isn't— the vast majority hold and then (2) that it is legislated, which as you can see is a weak argument. End of story.

And clearly the **class position** is the Ḥanbali position, it is the majority position. That is the end of that.

Then Shaykh says but there is no doubt that this last statement:

وإِنْ سجَدَ فلا بَأْسَ .

But if one was to perform it then there is no problem with that.

He says this is a very interesting statement and it actually brings us to a very beneficial *qāʿidah*, a maxim, a very beneficial principle in *fiqh*.

يدلُّ على قاعدة مفيدة وهي :أنَّ الشيء قد يكون جائزاً، وليس بمشروع

It is possible for something to be permissible even if it is not legislated i.e.

أي :يكون جائزاً أن تتعبَّد به، وليس بمشروع أن تتعبَّد به

He says it is something that is permissible to worship with, however it is not legislated to worship thereby. And he says we have actually covered some examples of this without going into details, some of them that will come to mind.

(0:34:00)

The principle is that it is possible for something to be permissible to do in Islam without it being formally legally legislated, without it being formally required in the *Sharīʿah*, requested in the *Sharīʿah* or initiated in the *Sharīʿah* by the Prophet ﷺ itself.

Student (online): For something to be permissible without it being formally legislated, isn't that *bidʿah*?

Ustādh: Now you are going to realise soon, very quickly, why it is not *bidʿah*. It is not going to be *bidʿah* because the Prophet ﷺ has allowed it.

Here are some examples of understanding the point, the maxim. Then we will see whether we can apply it to our scenario. Because the maxim is a well-known one. When I give you the examples you are going to say, '*Oh yeah*.' But the question is: Is it applying to our scenario?

So, for example doing acts of worship on behalf of other people. For example, if a person gives *ṣadaqah* on behalf of the deceased. This is something which is permissible—yes or no?

Of course it is permissible. There is a consensus of the scholars that it is permissible to do acts on behalf of the deceased. So now let us look to where that comes from.

فِعْلُ العبادة عن الغير، كما لو تصدَّقَ إنسان لشخص ميت، فإن هذا جائز؛ لكن ليس بمشروع

This is not something which is legislated. We do not actually have a general *ḥadīth* where the Prophet ﷺ specifically says that you should give *ṣadaqah* on behalf of the deceased. We have some specific *aḥādīth* that focus on specific areas. And nearly all of those by the way, were when the Prophet ﷺ is approached by others. I'm just going to read what he says:

أي :أننا لا نأمر الناس بأن يتصدَّقوا عن أمواتهم؛ لأن النبي صلّى الله عليه وسلّم لم يأمرْ به، و لم يفعله هو بنفسه حتى يكون مشروعاً

Simply put, as scholars we do not command the people to give *ṣadaqah* on behalf of their deceased because the Prophet ﷺ never commanded that. So why would we encourage and command people to give *ṣadaqah* on behalf of the deceased when the Prophet ﷺ has never encouraged and demanded or recommended giving *ṣadaqah* on the deceased?

Now you may be surprised at that, but it's actually true. We don't have a *ḥadīth* where the Prophet ﷺ has said give *ṣadaqah* on behalf of the deceased. We don't. And he ﷺ never did it himself so that it then becomes an act which is legislated, and he ﷺ did not say to his *ummah*:

تصدقوا عن أمواتكم، أو صوموا عنهم، أو صلوا عنهم، أو ما أشبه ذلك، و لم يفعله هو بنفسه، غاية ما هنالك أنه أمر من مات له ميت وعليه صيام أن يصوم عنه لكن هذا في الواجب، وفرق بين الواجب وغير الواجب.

There's a very interesting statement here. I love it. He basically says neither did the Prophet ﷺ give the indication to go and tell the *Ummah* give *ṣadaqah* on behalf of your deceased, fast on their behalf, pray on their behalf, or any other similar form, nor did he ﷺ do it himself. The maximum that we can say is that he ﷺ commanded someone who came to the Prophet ﷺ and told him that (this *ḥadīth* is in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*) that my deceased, has fasting upon them. [The Prophet ﷺ said]:

مَنْ مَاتَ وَعَلَيْهِ صِيَامٌ صَامَ عَنْهُ وَلِيُّهُ

"If anyone dies in a state (that he had to complete) some fasts, his heir must fast on his behalf." [7,8]

(0:40:00) So, that is an act of worship on behalf of others. But Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says: Well hold on, but even this *ḥadīth* is referring to the obligatory things which are missing i.e. obligatory fasts not voluntary fasts. And there is a difference between something which is *wājib* and not *wājib*.

And in actual fact if you think of this *ḥadīth* (and we will come to it obviously in its right time) this *ḥadīth* which says that if a person passes away and they had fasts owing, then the representative should then fast, this *ḥadīth*, as Imām Aḥmad in his own opinion (as far as I remember) is that this is only in the *naẓr*, only in vows. This is not referring to Ramaḍān.

So, your mom has been trying to catch up for the last twenty years. She's had 4-5 kids, breastfed, etc. 200, 300, 500 fasts, you know how crazy it gets. You guys might know my opinion. I believe that there is no *qaḍā'* fasting required. That's my position. And if a person pays, then that's better. But I don't believe that it needs to be covered by fasting. But that's not the majority position. The majority do require those fasts to be made up. But that's by the person, meaning when they are alive. If they pass away with 300 fasts owing, there are some scholars that are saying that this *ḥadīth* would therefore mean—there are a number of scholars, from them *ṣaḥābah*—who said that you will need to fast these fasts for your deceased member.

---

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: Making Up Fasts on Behalf of the Deceased, ḥadīth no. 1147.*
[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: Can Somebody Else Observe Ṣaūm Instead of the Dead?, ḥadīth no. 1952.*

The narrator of this *ḥadīth* was ʿĀʾishah. We have a principle in *fiqh* that *al-rāwi adra bi-riwāyatihi*. This is not a universal principle, but it is a principal in *fiqh*.

Student (online): Representative meaning? Is friend counted?

Ustādh: No, when I say representative, I mean *wali* like the guardian, i.e. the main person, the one who is taking care of the inheritance and the family member. Their father, their son, whoever is left behind.

What this principle says is that the narrator of a *ḥadīth* is more knowledgeable of the narration than anybody else. They know about the thing that they are narrating. They saw it, they learnt it, they narrated it, so they understand it. And this *ḥadīth* has been narrated by ʿĀʾishah and ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbbās ﵄ and both of their opinions are that this refers to a vow only.[7,8,9] A vow, by the way, is when you say: If I pass my exams, I'm going to fast three days. If I do this then I'm going to do this, etc. That is what it means by a vow. And these are obligatory. That's a debt that needs to be paid back to Allāh ﷻ.

That's like if a person died in *ʿAṣr* time without praying *ʿAṣr*, I do not expect to have to pray *ʿAṣr* on behalf of my deceased because they didn't pray *ʿAṣr* in the time that they had to pray *ʿAṣr*. Likewise, a person dies and they hadn't done the fasting, they don't need to have that made up.

Now the *Ḥajj* is again a matter of discussion. And the majority of scholars said that the *Ḥajj* needs to be made up. They gave the *ḥadīth* in *Bukhāri* of the man who came and said: My mother has passed without doing the *Ḥajj* so can I do the *Ḥajj* on her behalf? And the Prophet ﷺ said yes because the *ḥaqq* of Allāh ﷻ is more deserving to be fulfilled.[10]

Even this *ḥadīth* which therefore leads to so many people doing *Ḥajj*—I certainly don't consider it to be obligatory to do *Ḥajj* upon someone who dies, and the person didn't do *Ḥajj*. That's been my position forever. And there are a number of scholars (and I have to say that this is the opinion that I follow) that this also applies to the one who had intended to go to *Ḥajj*, meaning that they were planning to, they had vowed, they had set it up, everything, etc. I mean above and beyond the normal obligation. The obligation is to do *Ḥajj*, not to do the *Ḥajj* this year. You can quite permissibly say that I'm going to do *Ḥajj* in two years' time because I've got exams, etc., and that's my intention *in shāʾ Allāh*. Some scholars don't like that, but it is permissible. Theoretically, that can be ten years and fifteen years, even though it is frowned upon. So, even the *Ḥajj* example is something which is not obligatory. And there are scholars that will interpret the *ḥadīth* which says "do the *Ḥajj*" as you have to do the *Ḥajj* if the vow had been done to do the *Ḥajj* and they died and now you are fulfilling the *Ḥajj*.

---

[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: Making up Fasts on Behalf of the Deceased, ḥadīth no. 1148.*
[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Penalty of Hunting While on Pilgrimage, Chapter: To Perform Hajj on Behalf of a Dead Person. A Man Can Perform Hajj on Behalf of a Woman, ḥadīth no. 1852.*

A classic example of this principle that some scholars would use, something which is not legislated but is something which is permissible would be? Who can think of a classic extension? Classic example, very much on topic, very much related to the previous *ḥadīth* that I just mentioned.

Student (online): *ʿUmrah*?

Ustādh: Correct. *ʿUmrah*. Multiple *ʿUmrah*. Not multiple *ʿUmrah* but *ʿUmrah* on behalf of the deceased.

This is a very culturally, big thing. There is a complete understanding that it's completely okay to do *ʿUmrah* on behalf of other people, especially on behalf of the deceased. Let's break this down for a second. (1) We don't have a single *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ ever telling people to make multiple *ʿUmrah*, (2) he ﷺ didn't command for *ʿUmrah* to be done on behalf of the deceased. They're two separate things because you could be doing multiple *ʿUmrah* for yourself and you could be doing it for someone who's deceased.

Multiple could be for yourself because I remember (I never forget this, I mean obviously I take *Hajj* groups every year) but there was one year, maybe 2011 or 2012, we had some Afghans in our group from Canada. My God they were madness. Next level madness. I reckon that he must have done 20-30 *ʿUmrahs* at least. Sometimes he'd do two a day. They were super tough, strong people, just spent the whole time doing *ʿUmrah*. And I would be saying to them bro this makes zero sense, what are you doing? He said, '*Honestly I've just got to do it.*' And they were not all for deceased people by the way. He's doing it for himself.

So, there are two different concepts: (1) multiple *ʿUmrah* for yourself and then (2) *ʿUmrah* for the deceased to pass the reward on. Now, why is this such a good example?

We can clearly straight out say the Prophet ﷺ did not legislate or it is not legislated to perform multiple *ʿUmrah* or *ʿUmrah* for the deceased. However, you will very, very rarely find a scholar that will say it is *bidʿah* to do *ʿUmrah* for the deceased. You get my point now? You won't find it. You will not find a scholar that will say it is *bidʿah* to do *ʿUmrah* for the deceased.

When I get asked that question, I find it impossible to say *bidʿah*. I'll just say it's not the
(0:50:00) action of the Prophet ﷺ. It's not the way the Companions. But would I allow it? Yeah. Imām Aḥmad himself allowed it, a couple of the *Tābiʿīn* allowed it, some of the other Imāms allowed it.

Student (online): Why won't you find a scholar who will say it's *bidʿah*? I am struggling to see the difference.

Ustādh: Because as an act itself, it is supported by generality, by general evidences.

First of all, they'll say ʿĀʾishah did a *ʿUmrah* more than once even though her first one was not whatever but she kind of repeated it in the year that she did *Ḥajj* and she was menstruating, and she missed out. So, she kind of did another *ṭawāf* and she did another *ʿUmrah*. That's why it's called Masjid ʿĀʾishah. That's where the whole name comes from, *tanʿīm*. They said: So, it's not like it's completely *ḥarām* to do *ʿUmrah* twice.

And they also said logically that it might not make sense to go and do *ʿUmrah* again because its headline value is that it expiates the sins from the previous *ʿUmrah*, which is a significantly powerful cleaner. Because if you went for *ʿUmrah* 3-4 years ago and you can now go and do an act which is so strong that it knocks out everything in the 3-4 years, that's a madness right there.

So, it's a pretty powerful act. And common sense would then say to you: Well, okay you're not going to be doing that every half an hour because if something is that powerful, you're going to be leaving it for a period of time to at least 'get the sins in'. So, if you're doing one now and then doing one tomorrow in the Ḥaram, I don't know what kind of sins you're up to or what the value is that you're looking for. So, it's not the headline value you're looking for. You're looking for the *ʿibādah*, the rest of it—the footsteps, the *duʿāʾ*, the x, the y, the effort, the tiredness. And that's what people are doing. My point is that logically speaking, it might not be common sense to do the *ʿUmrah* again but it's not impossible—logically. I think that's what I'm trying to say. You won't call a person stupid, you'd say, '*Well all right then*,' because it's tiring. When we do *ʿUmrah* we expect to take four hours, maybe sometimes five, maybe a quick three and a half on a certain good day.

Student (online): I always thought you had to go outside of the Ḥaram boundary i.e., Ṭāʾif*?*

Ustādh: You don't need to go out of the Ḥaram boundary. And you don't need to go to Ṭāʾif, no. The *Ḥaram* boundary is very small.

So, I just want you to appreciate that and already *Ḥajj* being legislated and if the big fish is being allowed, then the small one is easier to allow. If we're going to allow a person to do the big one, then why not the small one?

They will say well no because *Ḥajj* is obligatory. We'll say there are some scholars that consider the *ʿUmrah* obligatory by the way—minority—but that's what they said.

Let me go through a few more examples and then let's see if these questions come up. We've gone through two examples: to give charity on behalf of deceased, and we've done *ʿUmrah* as well.

He carries on:

ومنها :الرَّجُل الذي أمَّرَهُ رسول الله صلّى الله عليه وسلّم على سريَّة بعثها؛ فكان يقرأ ويختم لهم بـــ {قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ *} فأقره النبي صلّى الله عليه وسلّم على ذلك

There was a man, al-Nabi ﷺ placed him in command of a military unit. This Companion was the Amīr. The Amīr is the one who commands and he's also the one who leads the prayer. And every prayer that he led out loud (we don't know about the silent ones) he would recite *Sūrat al-Ikhlās* after every *sūrah*. So, he would recite like *Sūrat al-Dhāriyāt* or *Sūrat Qāf* or *Sūrat al-Ṭūr* in the *Maghrib* prayer he would then recite *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*, and he would go for *rukūʿ*. So, he would basically be reciting two *sūrahs* every single *rakʿah*.

So, when this unit came back to the Prophet ﷺ, the Companions came to him and said that *yā Rasūl Allāh* this is what happened by the way, the guy you put in charge, this is what he was doing. And the Prophet ﷺ said: Ask him why he did that. He said:

لأَنَّهَا صِفَةُ الرَّحْمَنِ

"[I do so] because it mentions the qualities of al-Raḥmān."[11,12]

Yadhkur ṣifat al-Raḥmān, because it mentions the qualities and the beauty and the description of al-Raḥmān, of Allāh ﷻ—He is *al-Aḥad,* He is *al-Ṣamad*, He is *lam yalid wa lam yūlad*. I love it so much and I love to recite it. So, al-Nabi ﷺ said to the Companions:

أَخْبِرُوهُ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّهُ

"Tell him that Allāh loves him."

Now that's a very important *ḥadīth*. He ﷺ never said anything about this action. Someone else did it and the Prophet ﷺ allowed it and he ﷺ actually praised him for it. However, even afterwards, let alone before, but even afterwards he ﷺ did not say to the *Ummah*: When you recite in your *ṣalāh* then end it with [*Surat al-Ikhlāṣ*].

---

[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Oneness, Uniqueness of Allāh ﷻ, Chapter: The Prophet ﷺ. Inviting His Followers to Tawḥīd of Allāh ﷻ., ḥadīth no. 7375.*
[12] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: The Virtue of Reciting Qul Huwa Allāhu Aḥad, ḥadīth no. 813.*

ولكنه لم يقل للأمة: إذا قرأتم في صلاتكم فاختموا بـــ {قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ *} و لم يكن هو أيضاً يفعله عليه الصلاة والسلام، فدلَّ هذا على أنه ليس بمشروع، لكنه جائز لا بأس به.

And neither did he ﷺ ever do this that we know authentically narrated (although that might be in question as well). This indicates that this act in itself is not legislated, however it is something which is permissible—it is not a problem.

Immediately, you are saying, '*Yes again this is the Prophet ﷺ signing off on the act. It is different.*' And I am with you. Let's just carry on.

ومنها أيضاً :الوِصال إلى السَّحر للصائم، فإنه جائز، أي :يجوز ألا يفطر إلا في آخر الليل

The Prophet ﷺ prohibited *al-wiṣāl*. *Wiṣāl* is continuous fasting, just fasting 24/7. However, he ﷺ said that if you are going to do it (meaning if you are not going to break your fast at *ifṭār* time like you should) then at the very least, do it in the last part of the night, basically at *ṣuḥūr* time.[13] So, instead of eating twice—at *Maghrib* and at *suḥūr* (just before *Fajr*)—*wiṣāl* would be just continuous fasting, not eating at *ifṭār*, not eating at *ṣuḥūr*. There are some scholars that said *wiṣāl* doesn't mean that, *wiṣāl* means to only eat once at *ṣuḥūr* time. Either way, it doesn't matter whatever the actual meaning of *wiṣāl* is because the Prophet ﷺ said:

فَأَيُّكُمْ أَرَادَ أَنْ يُوَاصِلَ فَلْيُوَاصِلْ حَتَّى السَّحَرِ

"If anyone of you intends to fast continuously day and night, he should continue until the *ṣuḥūr* time."[13]

Maximum 24 hours basically, you have to at least eat once every 24 hours.

لكنه ليس بمشروع، أي :لا نقول للناس: الأفضل أن يمسكوا حتى يكون السَّحَر، بل نقول :الأفضل أن يبادروا بالفِطر.

[13] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: To Observe Sawm Continuously Day and Night Until the Time of Saḥar, ḥadīth no. 1967.*

However, he ﷺ never legislated this act. He ﷺ never recommended this act. He ﷺ never practiced this act. He ﷺ never did this act. He ﷺ never said that this is better, etc.

وهذه المسألة التي ذكرها المؤلف رحمهُ الله أنه إذا ترك سنة قولية أو فعلية في الصلاة، لم يُشرع له السُّجود, وإن سجد فلا بأس

He says that these are the kinds of examples we are looking at, meaning that there are clear examples in the *Sunnah* of certain acts which are not in of themselves asked to do, requested to do, needed to be done, but if a person does it it's not a problem.

Our response to all of these clearly (and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn himself will have this concern as well because it opens the door to *bidʿah*) is that the difference is that these acts themselves have the Prophet ﷺ agreeing or accepting the basis of the act.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn then goes further.

وعندي في ذلك تفصيل، وهو :أن الإِنسان إذا تَرَكَ شيئاً من الأقوال أو الأفعال المستحبَّة نسياناً، وكان من عادته أن يفعله فإنه يُشرع أن يسجد جَبْراً لهذا النقص الذي هو نَقْصُ كمال، لا نقص واجب؛ لعموم قوله في الحديث: «لكلِّ سهو سجدتان»

(1:00:00) He says: I want to add a bit more detail to this. He says: If there was a person that was to leave something from the *sunan* of the prayer, whether it is a verbal *sunnah* or an action *sunnah*, out of forgetfulness, and it is from his habit that he does this act, then it is actually legislated.

So, we're not even talking about whether you can do it or not do it—he says it is legislated:

جبرًا لهذا النقص الذي هو نقصُ كمال

He says that it is legislated to do this *sajdah* because this is a deficiency to the prayer, just like the *wājib* missing is a deficiency to the prayer, just like the *rukn* missing is a deficiency to the prayer. This is also a deficiency, but not the deficiency to the validity of the prayer. This is a deficiency in the completeness of the prayer.

لهذا النقص الذي هو نَقْصُ كمال، لا نقص واجب

This is not an obligatory defect. This is a defect in the excellence, the completeness and the perfection of the prayer.

This is important. The scholars are not going to risk everything that everyone is saying and what you are feeling. There are always going to try and find an evidence for the act. I want everyone here to feel comfortable that the principle of *bidʿah* is definitely being protected. No way are they going to open that door. They are going to want to see some kind of evidence there to allow people to do it. That's why before he mentioned, it is the general meaning of the *ḥadīth* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﵁ that if you were ever to forget something then make the *sajdah*.[6] Look at this *ḥadīth* now.

He says:

لعموم قوله في الحديث لكل سهو سجدتان

And also, the general meaning of his ﷺ statement:

لِكُلِّ سَهْوٍ سَجْدَتَانِ

"For each forgetfulness there are two prostrations."

You can see that this *ḥadīth* is more specific than the previous one. If you thought that we were getting a bit desperate with the previous one: "If any of you forget something, then make *sajdah*."[6] This one is a bit more forceful. This is saying, "for every forgetfulness". You could make an argument here. You could say that means even if you forget a *sunnah*. This *ḥadīth* is a stronger evidence for your argument because it says "every forgetfulness". Technically, if you forget to pray a *sunnah*, then this *ḥadīth* could apply.

Obviously, I'm sure that you are going to agree with that. But we have a problem. This *ḥadīth*, according to the majority of scholars, is weak. It is narrated by Imām Aḥmad and it is narrated by Imām Abu Dāwūd, *ḥadīth* number 1038. It is narrated by Ibn Mājah, and Ibn Ḥajr said that its chain is weak.[14] And I don't know of any version of this *ḥadīth* that has an authentic chain, but Allāh ﷻ knows best.

[14] As referenced in *Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ala Zād al-Mustaqniʿ*, Volume 3, page 333, footnote 3.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is not going to stop there. He says: But also, we have the *ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* that we mentioned before: "If any of you forget then let them do two *sajdah*".[6] That obviously builds that up. And he says:

فإن هذا عام

And this *ḥadīth* is general. There is no evidence (Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is saying) to specify only for obligation, or for pillars, or for anything like that.

أما إذا تَرَكَ سُنَّة ليس من عادته أن يفعلها، فهذا لا يُسَنُّ له السُّجود، لأنه لم يطرأ على باله أن يفعلها

He says: However, if a person leaves a *sunnah* act that he does not normally do (not from his habit) then it is not a *sunnah* for him to do the *sajdah* because it never even occurred to him that he had to do it in the first place. So, how can he have forgotten it when he did not have to do it in the first place?

Student (online): Is it not kind of questionable to use *aḥadīth* from *Bukhāri* which are not in the proper chapters? Like the ones in *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, not *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*?

Ustādh: No, not at all in fact and I will tell you why. No. In actual fact let me put it on you. Why would it be a problem? Because Imām Bukhāri [in particular] does not organise his *ḥadīth* like Imām Muslim for example. Obviously, it's a science. Forget Imām Muslim. The reason that the collections of Ibn Mājah and Ibn Dāwūd are called *Sunnan* is because they are put in this kind of convenient categories of *ṣalāh*, etc. Do not for one second think that when Bukhāri does *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh* that he is following a formal *fiqh* structure. He is not.

Student (online): But he makes arguments with his chapter headings.

Ustādh: No, no he does absolutely. Bukhāri is obviously making arguments with his chapter headings. But the *fuqahāʾ* are not using his chapter heading as the primary argument. That could never be possible. That would just be an indicative kind of measure. My point is that using *ḥadīth* from *Bukhāri* wherever they are does not negate the usage in other places.

Student (online): But it does not negate the usage in other places.

Ustādh: Correct.

Let's just look at what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is saying, which is also the position of Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shanqīṭi, which is also the position of quite a few scholars, and that is if there is a person who regularly does certain *sunnah* whether it is an action or statement-wise and they forget to do it, then they should‡ make the *sajdat'l-sahw* at the end because they forgot. They technically forgot. They are not obligating it. That is important to remember as well. They are saying it is okay to do it because they forgot and the *sajdat'l-sahw* is for forgetfulness.

So, when you step back and look at this position, it is not as controversial as it sounded in the first place. They are not indicating that you can open the door and just because people think that this is good etc. If you think about what they are saying, they are not keeping as unrestricted as what it might seem that the author is indicating. He is actually indicating that if there are people who are regular in their *sunnah* acts.

Student (online): So, they are basing their argument on Ibn Masʿūd's ﷺ narration and it is all to do with forgetfulness?

Ustādh: That *ḥadīth* of Ibn Masʿūd ﷺ is absolute fundamental part of their argument.[6] If they did not do that, they would massively be opening the door to *bidʿah*. They are always going to leave some general evidences to show that something is permissible. They did not say 'any act', they said that it is possible for an act to not be legislated but be permissible. They did not say it is permissible for any act to not be legislated but not be permissible, meaning that the act is still an act of worship. It has to have some basis, but it might not be legislated in the religion. It might not be something that the Prophet ﷺ wants from the people, or is asking from the people, or is insisting from the people. That is the point that we are talking about.

(1:10:00) If you think about it, this is not actually an issue of *bidʿah*. It's not creating the point of *bidʿah*. And a classic example would be if you are reciting your *ṣalāt al-Fajr sunnah*, you know it is *sunnah* to recite [*Sūrat*] *al-Kāfirūn* in the first *rakʿah* and [*Sūrat*] *al-Ikhlāṣ* in the second *rakʿah*.[15] Let us say that you never, ever, leave that *sunnah* act, and it is *sunnah* to do it all the time. Let's say you forget and you say *Allāhu akbar* after [*Sūrat*] *al-Fātiḥah*. They are saying that you are now allowed to perform *sajdat'l-sahw.*

Student (online): But isn't the whole point of the *sajdat'l-sahw* to fix something in the prayer? *Sunnah* acts are to make an act of worship better, more complete, etc. It does not appear that this would be the function of a *sajdat'l-sahw* for forgetting a *sunnah* act. This still does not feel right to me...

---

‡ 'Should' not necessarily because they are obligating it as 'should' would mean, but they are saying that if you forget something then it is nice to maintain consistency and do that extra act of *sajdat'l-sahw* because you are letting yourself down at that moment. Otherwise, it is not something that is obligatory in any way. AE

[15] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: It Is Recommended to Pray Two Rakʿah for the Sunnah of Fajr. And Encouragement to Pray Them Regularly, and to Make Them Brief, and to Persist in Offering Them, and Clarifying What Is Recommended to Recite Therein, ḥadīth no. 726*.

Ustādh: You see now this is the problem. You are making it obligatory because you are using the word 'fix'. And when you use the word 'fix' that is because something is broken. They are saying if a person wanted to do it, that is okay. That is very important. They are not saying it is legislated. We are not arguing for the opinion that it is legislated. We are saying that if a person actually forgot and they were not happy…

Again, it comes back to another point as well. Let's step back a bit. Maybe we have gone too much into the trees. Step back a bit and look at the forest here. As I said right at the beginning, this is not something to be proud of, even forgetting a *sunnah,* because it indicates that you were not concentrating. Remember we are making it a bit more specific than the general idea. We are saying that if there is a regular, regular, *sunnah*.

I will give you an example. If I am regular upon an act and my mind is all over the place, you should not be praying with your mind all over the place. If as a result of my mind being all over the place I forgot to do something that I always do, even though it is by consensus a non-obligatory act, it is a *sunnah* act, I let myself down in my prayer by not doing an act that I always do. I am not obligated to fix the prayer because my prayer is valid. But I do not feel good about this. The scholars are saying that if you made a *sajdah* because you did forget, you let *shayṭān* take over, then that is okay. I actually think that this is a very reasonable position if you think about this.

Let me continue with this next closing statement to the chapter, then come back at me.

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says: We can connect to this discussion the issue of *khushūʻ*. From the general *sunnah* acts of the prayer (this is interesting) is the concept of *khushūʻ*.

وليس الخشوع الذي هو البكاء

He says: I am not talking about the *khushūʻ* that people kind of think, which is outwardly, eyes down, sighing, crying, long *sajdahs*.

ولكن الخشوع حضور القلب وسكون الأطراف

He says the internal and the hidden *khushūʻ*. Internal meaning that the heart is in the presence of Allāh ﷻ, enjoying the prayer. The mind is not wandering. You are following every single thing, the meaning etc. On the outside, you are doing those minimal acts that other people are not picking up on. So, you are still, and you are not itching, and you are not scratching. You are not fidgeting. Your heart is in the presence. It is in the game. In every single thing that you say and do, it is between the hands of Allāh ﷻ, and you know that you are calling upon Him. Then there is no doubt that this is the complete

and excellent, perfect state to be in the prayer. And a prayer that is performed without this kind of awareness in it, is like a body without a soul. It is a pointless action.

Some of the scholars said that the concept of *khushūʿ*, stillness of the heart and mind, in the prayer is obligatory.

وذهب بعضُ أهل العلم، إلى أن الخشوع في الصلاة واجب، وأنه إذا غَلَبَ الوسواسُ على أكثر الصَّلاةِ فإنَّها لا تصحُّ

To the extent that if *waswasah,* whisperings of *shayṭān,* dominated you in the majority of the prayer, it was with you through most of the prayer, which is 51%, most of the prayer it was like, '*What am I doing?*' '*What is going on?*' You were here. You were at dinner. You were at lunch. You were planning tomorrow. The standard stuff that happens to us in all our prayers, basically. Then the prayer is invalidated.

وهذه قد تشكل في بادئ الأمر ويقال :لو قلنا بهذا القول لأوجبنا على الناس غالباً كلَّما صلُّوا أن يعيدوا صلاتهم، وإذا صَلُّوا المعادة وحصل وسواس أعادوا وهلم جَرًّا!

Obviously, immediately when you hear this it causes some concern because when you think about that, we are in a lot of trouble then. This position is difficult to defend. It is an untenable position to consider *khushūʿ* to be *wājib*. This is your immediate reaction because if that was the case, then we are basically saying the entire nation, virtually every single person, that they have to repeat their prayers. That's the truth. The vast majority of the people, in the vast majority of their prayers do not have it all on lockdown.

Student (online): We would be repeating prayers night and day.

Ustādh: As she said, we would be doing prayers night and day, night and day, which is obviously common sense, by the way. This is why I am absolutely positive that *khushūʿ* is not an obligation to this level—this argument.

Look at what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says. He says: By the way, I am not so convinced by this emotional reaction. I am not so convinced by this argument that we are going to have to make all the people pray again.

This is out there. Look at what Shaykh says.

He says: If these people when they realise this, and they realise that we are not playing about, and that it is no joke, that if you are not going to focus in the prayer, then this is what is going to happen and they were commanded, just once, to make sure that they do this:

فإنه في المستقبل سوف يخشع ولا يفكر في شيء

Subḥān Allāh such an idealistic statement. Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn is obviously speaking about himself and the people he hangs around. He says that if just once he is commanded to do this because he knows it is obligatory, he will never ever in the future go back to that again because he has learnt his lesson, he thinks, '*I have done it. I cannot believe that I have embarrassed myself. I was not concentrating in the prayer, and so therefore, I am not going to mess that up again*.'

Of course, that should be our attitude anyway. The Prophet ﷺ said before every prayer:

فَصَلِّ صَلاَةَ مُوَدِّعٍ

"Pray like a man bidding farewell." [16]

So, you are always meant to be in the zone anyway when you are getting into the prayer and you say your *takbīr.*

فالقول بأنه من الواجبات، وأنه إذا غلب الوسواس على أكثر الصلاة بطلت الصلاة: لا شك أنه قول وجيه

You can see Shaykh likes this opinion that it is *wājib* and he does not want to care about the reaction of the people. He likes the argument that *khushūʻ* should be *wājib* and if the people are going to be told we are going to make you all repeat your prayers again because you are all rubbish, then, so what? Let them do it once. They will never forget. He carries on and says: You know what? This is a strong argument, except that there are problems with this argument. He says:

[16] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Zuhd, ḥadīth no. 4171*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*

لا شك أنه قول وجيه إلا أنه يعكر على وجاهته ما أخبر به النبي بأن الشيطان إذا سمع الأذان أدبر وله ضُرَاطٌ ــ من شِدَّة وَقْعِ الأذان عليه ــ ثم إذا فَرَغَ الأذان حضر، وإذا حضر دَخَلَ على الإنسان في صلاته، يقول له :اذكر كذا، اذكر كذا، لِمَا لم يكن يذكر، حتى لا يدري كم صَلَّ

It is very much a strong argument because *khushūʿ* is the *aṣl* of the prayer. What else is the prayer without *khushūʿ*? It is the soul of the prayer. It is the spirit of the prayer.
(1:20:00) Except that what are you going to say about the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ where he ﷺ told us that *shayṭān*, when he hears the *adhān* he turns his back and legs it and he lets off wind, he passes wind loudly to try to distract the sound of the *adhān* from him, because it hurts him. It burns him. The *adhān* burns him, and then when the *adhān* finishes he returns back to freak you out. Then the prayer starts, and he is right into your heart and your mind. And he will say to you:

اذْكُرْ كَذَا، اذْكُرْ كَذَا. لِمَا لَمْ يَكُنْ يَذْكُرُ، حَتَّى يَظَلَّ الرَّجُلُ لاَ يَدْرِي كَمْ صَلَّى

"[*Shayṭān* whispers into the heart of the person] (to divert his attention from the prayer) and makes him remember things which he does not recall to his mind before the prayer and that causes him to forget how much he has prayed." [17]

Now this *ḥadīth* is very famous in *Bukhāri* that is well established. Shaykh says this *ḥadīth* is a text. It is a *naṣ*:

بأن الوسواس وإنْ كَثُرَ لا يبطل الصلاة

Beautiful point. He said that this *ḥadīth* is a direct proof, direct textual proof, that however much *waswās*, whisperings, in the prayer dominates the prayer whether it's 51%, or 88%, or 99%, or whatever it is, it does not invalidate the prayer. Because the Prophet ﷺ did not say this person needs to pray the prayer again. He ﷺ said say *aʿūdhu billāhi min'l-shayṭān'l-rajīm*.[18] He ﷺ said focus.[19] He ﷺ said: Hey! Do you realise Allāh ﷻ is in front of you?[20] He said: Hey! Do you know that Allāh ﷻ has divided the prayer into

[17] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: Superiority of the Adhān, ḥadīth no. 608.*
[18] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Greetings, Chapter: Seeking Refuge With Allāh ﷻ From the Devil Who Whispers During Prayer, ḥadīth no. 2203 a.*
[19] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Purification, Chapter: The Virtue of Performing Wuḍū' and Ṣalāh, ḥadīth no. 228.*
[20] *Sunan al-Nisā'i, The Book of Forgetfulness (in Prayer), Chapter: Stern Warning Against Turning Around When Praying, ḥadīth no. 1195.* This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*

ten parts and, and, and… He ﷺ did not say you have to pray again, which is a direct proof that the Prophet ﷺ considers the prayer valid even with *waswās*—dare I say quite normal as well. And it's the good fight that that needs to be fought every single time that you pray.

He continues. Also, the statement of the Prophet ﷺ:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ تَجَاوَزَ لِي عَنْ أُمَّتِي مَا وَسْوَسَتْ بِهِ صُدُورُهَا، مَا لَمْ تَعْمَلْ أَوْ تَكَلَّمْ

"Allāh ﷻ has accepted my invocation to forgive what whispers in the hearts of my followers, unless they put it to action or utter it." [21,22]

So, not *waswās.* The *ḥadīth* is focusing on sin, like *zina* or '*I am going to steal that*,' or '*I want to do this*,' or '*I am going to do that*,' or '*Wouldn't it be great to kill that person off*?' or '*I hate that guy*,' etc... Allāh ﷻ has forgiven this *ḥadīth'l-nafs*. *Ḥadīth'l-nafs* is fleeting thoughts and ruminations. Allāh ﷻ has forgiven these as long as you do not actualise them. And actualising them happens in two ways: (1) you either act them out, you do it, or (2) you say it because it can be a statement, or it can be an action. And the Shaykh says this of course includes the *waswās* in the prayer as well, because it's internal ideas and things and your mind is all over the place, it is not focusing on what it should be doing.

By the way, just on this *ḥadīth*, just in case there is some kind of confusion, this is one of the great *ḥadīth* and it's a nice place to end and end this chapter as well. It's one of the great *ḥadīth* because it reminds us of the other *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ, the beautiful *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ that categorises all of our ruminations and our thoughts into four categories.

إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَتَبَ الْحَسَنَاتِ وَالسَّيِّئَاتِ، ثُمَّ بَيَّنَ ذَلِكَ فَمَنْ هَمَّ بِحَسَنَةٍ فَلَمْ يَعْمَلْهَا كَتَبَهَا اللَّهُ لَهُ عِنْدَهُ حَسَنَةً كَامِلَةً، فَإِنْ هُوَ هَمَّ بِهَا فَعَمِلَهَا كَتَبَهَا اللَّهُ لَهُ عِنْدَهُ عَشْرَ حَسَنَاتٍ إِلَى سَبْعِمِائَةِ ضِعْفٍ إِلَى أَضْعَافٍ كَثِيرَةٍ، وَمَنْ هَمَّ بِسَيِّئَةٍ فَلَمْ يَعْمَلْهَا كَتَبَهَا اللَّهُ لَهُ عِنْدَهُ حَسَنَةً كَامِلَةً، فَإِنْ هُوَ هَمَّ بِهَا فَعَمِلَهَا كَتَبَهَا اللَّهُ لَهُ سَيِّئَةً وَاحِدَةً

"Allāh ordered (the appointed angels over you) that the good and the bad deeds be written, and He then showed (the way) how (to write). If somebody intends to do a

[21] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Manumission of Slaves, Chapter: Manumission and Divorce by Mistake or Forgetfulness, hadīth no. 2528.*
[22] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Faith, Chapter: Allāh ﷻ Allows a Person's Thoughts and Whatever Occurs in His Heart So Long as They Do Not Become Established, ḥadīth no. 127 a.*

good deed and he does not do it, then Allāh will write for him a full good deed (in his account with Him); and if he intends to do a good deed and actually did it, then Allāh will write for him (in his account) with Him (its reward equal) from ten to seven hundred times to many more times: and if somebody intended to do a bad deed and he does not do it, then Allāh will write a full good deed (in his account) with Him, and if he intended to do it (a bad deed) and actually did it, then Allāh will write one bad deed (in his account) ." [23]

The first category those good ideas, the *hamm al-insān bi'l-ḥasanah*, if the person has the hope or the plan or the intention or the rumination or the thinking that I am going to do a good deed. And then he does go ahead and do that *ḥasanah* he will be rewarded for that act 10-700 times the reward for that act, which is a madness if you think about it. One act doesn't get one good deed, it gets 10-700 times multiplication of reward. It's a madness.

Then the second one the Prophet ﷺ said if the person *hamma bi'l-ḥasanah* , he intends to do a good deed then he doesn't do it, he says, '*I am going to pray two sunnah*,' then doesn't do it, or '*I am going to go and read some Qur'ān*,' and doesn't do it, whatever the reason but he doesn't then do it:

كَتَبَهَا اللَّهُ لَهُ عِنْدَهُ حَسَنَةً كَامِلَةً

"Allāh will write for him a full good deed (in his account with Him)."

Allāh ﷻ writes with Him, with Him. That is also a beautiful part of the *ḥadīth*, almost to emphasise still the huge aspect of the reward. Not just writes it as a reward, but writes it with Him, as this person he did try, he did have the intention, and he is a good person, he gets a full good reward.

Third is the person who intends to do bad. If he intends to do bad, think bad, say bad, whatever bad, and actually then goes and does it, then from the mercy of Allāh ﷻ—not from the justice of Allāh ﷻ—from the extreme generosity of Allāh ﷻ is that He is only going to punish the person just to the equivalent of one sin—that sin and that's it.

Madness continues, *raḥmah* unlimited, unrestricted.

The Prophet ﷺ said that if this person wanted to do the bad thing and decided not to, makes the actual decision not to, then this person gets the reward of a *ḥasanah*.

[23] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of to Make the Heart Tender, Chapter: Whoever Intended to Do a Good Deed or a Bad Deed, ḥadīth no. 6491.*

So, in these four scenarios three of them bring reward, even though two of them are bad intentions and two are good intentions. In all four, three are rewarded and the only one that is not rewarded is if the person goes ahead and does the evil act. And this of course is just their intention.

It is different if a person actually is then determined to do it. This is what we call in *sharīʿah al-ʿazm*. If a person *yaʿzam*, if a person intends to… Intend is one thing, but then they go and set out. So, for example a person says, 'Y*ou know what it is man? This is summertime and people are leaving their windows open I am going to do some robbery*.'

That is a bad thing now, right? But he is not getting punished for it.

Then he says, '*You know what? How can I be so stupid? Do not be so stupid. You are a Muslim*.' And so he does not do it. He gets the reward for that. That is it. Free reward.

Now, let us say that he decides to go ahead with it, and then nighttime comes, and he goes out there and gets there and he gets to the window, and he is expecting the window to be open, but it is locked. So, he cannot get in. This person is punished for this act because this person was intending to do it, but he was basically prevented from going ahead to do it.

And why is he punished?

Even though there is some discussion. I know there is, but we don't have time for that. The reason he is punished because the Prophet ﷺ said:

الْقَاتِلُ وَالْمَقْتُولُ فِي النَّارِ

"Both the slayer and the slain are doomed to Hell Fire." [24]

You know the *ḥadīth* where the Prophet ﷺ said if there where the two people come to blows, they come with the intent to fight with one another, and one strikes the other, and they both intended on fighting, when one kills the other, both of them are in the Fire. The killer and the killed. Because the one who was killed had every intention to go and kill the other one as well. He just did not get the chance. He was prevented.

I want to say to you that *khushūʿ* is such an important part of the prayer and it should not be seen as okay or normal if we forget things. Forgetfulness is a deficiency.

[24] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Tribulations and Portents of the Last Hour, Chapter: If Two Muslims Confront One Another With Their Swords, ḥadīth no. 2888 b.*

(1:30:00) And therefore, if a person said to himself, '*You know what? I have let myself down, I forgot*,' and he made *sajdah* for it, I do not think that it is a major issue and it comes under the general evidences. That is the key! That is what saves us from the *bidʿah*. It comes under the general evidences. And it is not something which has been formally required but it can be justified as a permissible act. No more than that. And as long as it is a permissible act, then we are not going to go… And we are closing the door very clearly on *bidʿah* because if the *bidʿah* has been opened up, then that is something else.

By the way, I will close on this. I will say this is also why in certain actions we are not so condemning in certain things as we would be in others. For example, (although I may be slightly hypocritical here myself, but that is because I detest this act) and that is the recitation of *Fātiḥah* at every single moment of everyone's life. *Al-Fātiḥah*! Let's recite *al-Fātiḥah.* Let's do *Fātiḥah. Fātiḥah. Fātiḥah. Fātiḥah.*
But technically speaking...certainly the recitation of the Qurʾān for the deceased, for me, it would be an example of this, which is why I do not have a problem with it hardly. Even though some scholars would call it *bidʿah*, this is an area of discussion amongst the scholars which shows that we are tolerant on this. *Fātiḥah*, theoretically, some people could argue it, I find it disastrous if it can be defended. But again, it is certainly not close to any of the proper serious *bidʿāhs* that exist. So, you learn that these principles are living. Application of them: living. There are differences at certain times in how to understand them and it is important for the student of knowledge to temper his or her reaction to each one. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

I think that is everything I wanted to say. And in his closing, he says: Regardless, a person should make the absolute biggest intention ever to fight *shayṭān* in the *ṣalāh*. He should always be ready for his enemy because *shayṭān* has made a *qasm:*

بعزَّةِ الله أن يغوي جميع الناس إلا عباد الله المخلصين، لكن كلما هاجمك استعذْ بالله من الشيطان الرجيم، كما أَمَرَ بذلك النبيُّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم ولا تزال تعوِّد نفسك على حضور القلب في الصلاة حتى يكون عادة لك.

He swore a vow to Allāh ﷻ that he will mislead and destroy all of mankind, except the sincere servants of Allāh ﷻ. So, fight him regularly by making *istiʿādhah*, saying: *aʿūdhu billāhi minʾl-shayṭānʾl-rajīm*. And to make sure you become strong upon that.

I think that was a really nice point by Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn in those last few pages. I really benefitted from it. I really enjoyed it.

Q & A

Q (online): What if because our mind was all over the place, we are not certain if we made that *sunnah* act (that we always typically do)? Is *sajdat'l-sahw* in this instance acceptable?

A: I think it is acceptable, yeah. But no more than that. Just like the text says: It is something which is acceptable. Not a *sunnah*. Not required. Not needed. But if you did it, I would get it.

Q (online): So, doing *sajdah* after each *ṣalāh* would be wrong?

A: No, that is a problem. That is a problem because you are now making it regular. I have seen that, that people make a *sajdah* after every *ṣalāh*. That is similar by the way, to some of the Ḥanafis (very few) but some of them, that pray *Ẓuhr* after every *Jumuʿah* to make up for the possible fact that their *Jumuʿah* was not accepted.

Q (online): What if habitual *sunnah* makes it less *khushūʿ*-filled? As you say, keep it real in the prayer, make it variable where possible...

A: That is not forgetfulness, right? That is you intentionally leaving it to try to intentionally bring in another *sunnah*. So, that is something different. Allāh ﷻ knows best. I would not include that in it.

Q (online):

دَاوُوا مَرضاكُمْ بِالصَّدقة

How does this apply when doing acts of worship for others?

A: I think this *ḥadīth* is weak. And if I can get some time I'll look into it. I don't like the position of Shaykh al-Albāni. I like to do my own research on it. But I think this *ḥadīth* is weak.[25]

[25] The majority of the early scholars considered this *ḥadīth* to be weak in its chain. However, the meaning is not problematic as all things are helped with *ṣadaqah* when they are done for the sake of Allāh ﷻ. Shaykh al-Albāni considered this *ḥadīth* to be *ḥasan li-ghayrihi* (*ḥasan* by supporting narrations). Imām al-Siyūṭi also considered it to be *ḥasan*. This *ḥadīth* is narrated by Imām al-Ṭabarāni, Imām Abu Yaʿla, and Imām al-Bayhaqi. According to AE, while this *ḥadīth* has a weak chain, the meaning is not bad. AE

Q (online): Still hung up on reconciling the maxim you mentioned today:

الأصل في العبادات الحظر والمنع

Could you explain generally? Not necessarily this example...

A: What I'm trying to say is that that *aṣl* is still the same. The basic principle in acts of *ʿibādah* is you don't go ahead with them unless they are permissible. You just don't make them up. And simply put, we're not making them up. That's the point. What the acts and the examples we've been given, at the very least, they've got some general evidence behind them. That's the easiest way to explain this point. And the acts that are being allowed in the general sense are not being recommended, they're just being told that it's allowed for you to do.

Now, very different if I then took those acts and I made it my habit—like the people of *bidʿah* do. They build their house upon it. That's so much different from Ahl'l-Sunnah, that you take an act which might be permissible here and there, and now you go and build your house upon it, all the time you are doing it. No, that's not something we are opening up.

Or you just take the position that no, as some scholars said, that there is a problem with it. And we said right at the beginning that some of the *fuqahāʾ*, they said no, you can't say that it is okay to make *sajdah* because that is you adding something to the prayer that is not from it. So, it shows that this issue is quite flexible. We don't need to make it an issue that confuses us, if that makes sense.

Q (online): Regarding their evidence of the Companion who recited *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ* after every *sūrah*

It sounds like that Companion did something because they loved it, in principle it's okay to recite different *sūrahs* in the *ṣalāh* that are not consecutive and he did it knowing that it wasn't the *sunnah*, and also didn't do it thinking that it 'should' be done per se. He just liked to do it and it was within the things that are permissible in the prayer. That sounds to me like it's okay.

But it's not like telling someone: You shouldn't do it, but it's okay if you do. I feel like those are two different things.

A: Yeah. I can see that argument. But also, let's give a more accurate interpretation of what the Ḥanbalis are saying. They said it's not legislated. They're not saying you shouldn't do it. They are saying it's not legislated, but it's okay if you do it. Which is

slightly different from "you should not do it". It's saying it's permissible. That's what they're saying. So, they're saying that listen, you don't need to do a *sajdah* if you don't forget something.

Q (online): Do you have to do *sajdat'l-sahw* if you forget to do *sajdat'l-tilāwah*?

A: There is no *sajdat'l-sahw* for *sajdat'l-tilāwah*. There is only the *sajdat'l-tilāwah*. You either did it or you didn't do it. And the reason that I don't believe there's neither a *sajdat'l-sahw* nor a repeat of the *sajdat'l-tilāwah* is because I don't consider the *sajdat'l-tilāwah* to be an obligation in the first place. But if you do consider it to be an obligation, then you would have to make sure that you do that *sajdat'l-tilāwah* when you remember later on.

Q (online): So, doing *sajdah* after each *ṣalāh* would be wrong?

A: Doing *sajdah* after each *ṣalāh* is a catastrophe. It is catastrophic. It's like the worst thing that I can imagine because this means that you are in doubt in every single prayer that you're praying. And that means that you are allowing *shayṭān* to completely destroy you.

Q (online): Sometimes, I repeat a verse because I think I might have made an error while reciting in the prayer. Do I need to do the *sajdah* after the prayer?

A: Here's the thing. Making an error in the recitation of the verse on one side you forgot the verse, on the other side you didn't forget, but you made an error. It's semantic. This is their example. They would say: If a person made *sajdah* for this, it would be okay.

Me? Not a chance. If we're talking about making *sajdah* after every mistake I make in the *ṣalāh*, I'd be doing prostrations every single prayer!

Q (online): So, for class position, we agree with the text that if we miss our regular *sunnah* of *ṣalāh* we do *sajdat'l-sahw*?

A: No. We agree with the text that if we miss our regular *sunnah* of the prayer, it's allowed for a person to do it if they want to. That's our position.

Q (online): On *Yawm'l-Qiyāmah* when Allāh ﷻ questions us on our *ṣalāh*, would this purely be on the basis of the quantity of our *ṣalāh* offered or would our *khushūʿ* also be taken into consideration?

A: At the base minimum, it's going to be the quantity, the obligation. The quality then is

what will have allowed you to have achieved certain things which would allow you to put it up, i.e. get more reward for it.

Q (online): Any resources (regarding the following of the law of the land in a *kuffār* country) in Arabic that you could point me to?

A: Resources in Arabic don't come to mind bro. *Sharḥ* of *al-Siyāsah al-Sharʿiyyah* of Ibn Taymiyyah is good by the way.

Q (online): Not *sajdat'l-sahw*, but *sajdah* after each *ṣalāh*. Always. (Some of my family does it).

A: That *sajdah* is even worse. The Pak *sajdah* that all the family go and do and all the rest of it. There are versions of that. Some versions are they just do it *iḥṭiyāṭan*, some do it as they say that the *dhikr* done in the *sajdah* is better. That's pure *bidʿah*. At least a *sajdat'l-sahw* has some basis.

Q (online): I never celebrate birthdays and I don't wish anyone on their birthdays. I do cake orders so Is it okay to make birthday cakes with a happy birthday sign?

A: I think it's okay for you to do that.

6. Chapter 20 Lesson 1: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

(0:15:40)

بابُ سُجودِ السَّهْوِ

Chapter: The Prostration for Forgetfulness Section I

يُشْرَعُ لزيادةٍ ونَقْصٍ وشَكٍّ، لا في عَمْدٍ في الفَرْضِ والنافلةِ ، فمتى زَادَ فِعْلًا من جِنْسِ الصلاةِ؛ قِيامًا أو قُعودًا أو رُكوعًا أو سُجودًا عَمْدًا بَطُلَتْ، وسَهْوًا يَسْجُدُ له، وإن زَادَ رَكْعَةً فَلَمْ يَعْلَمْ حتى فَرَغَ منها سَجَدَ، وإن عَلِمَ فيها جَلَسَ في الحالِ فتَشَهَّدَ إن لم يكنْ تَشَهَّدَ وسَجَدَ وسَلَّمَ، وإن سَبَّحَ به ثِقَتانِ فأَصَرَّ ولَمْ يَجْزِمْ بِصَوابِ نَفْسِهِ بَطُلَتْ صلاتُهُ وصلاةُ مَن تَبِعَه عالِمًا، لا جاهِلًا أو نَاسِيًا ولا مَن فارَقَه، وعَمَلٌ مُسْتَكْثَرٌ عادَةً من غيرِ جِنْسِ الصلاةِ يُبْطِلُها عَمْدُه وسَهْوُه، ولا يُشْرَعُ لِيَسِيْرِهِ سُجودٌ، ولا تَبْطُلُ بِيَسِيْرِ أَكْلٍ أو شُرْبٍ سَهْوًا، ولا نَفْلٌ بِيَسِيْرِ شُرْبٍ عَمْدًا، وإنْ أَتَى بِقَولٍ مَشروعٍ في غيرِ مَوْضِعِه كَقِراءةٍ في سجودٍ وقُعودٍ وتَشَهُّدٍ في قِيامٍ وقراءةِ سورةٍ في الأَخِيْرَتَيْنِ لم تَبْطُلْ ولم يَجِبْ له سُجودٌ ، بل يُشْرَعُ، وإن سَلَّمَ قَبْلَ إتْمامِها عَمْدًا بَطُلَتْ، وإن كان سَهوًا ثم ذَكَرَ قريبًا أَتَمَّها وسجَدَ، فإن طالَ الفَصلُ أو تَكَلَّمَ لغيرِ مَصْلَحَتِها بَطَلَتْ ككلامِه في صُلْبِها، ولِمَصلَحَتِها إنْ كان يسيرًا لم تَبْطُلْ، وقَهْقَهَةٌ ككلامٍ، وإن نَفَخَ أو انْتَحَبَ مِن غيرِ خَشْيَةِ اللهِ تعالى أو تَنَحْنَحَ مِنْ غيرِ حاجَةٍ فَبَانَ حَرفَانِ بَطُلَتْ.

(The prostration for forgetfulness) is legislated for:

1. an addition
2. an omission
3. some doubt

in the obligatory and supererogatory prayers, as long as it was not done intentionally.

When an action from the genus of the prayer itself is intentionally added i.e. a standing, a sitting, a bowing, or a prostrating, the prayer is invalidated. If it is unintentional, it can be prostrated for.

If one adds an extra unit and only realises after they exit the prayer, they simply perform the prostration. If they realise (during the prayer), they are to immediately sit down, perform the *tashahhud* if they haven't already done so, perform the prostration for forgetfulness, and then offer the *taslīm*.

If two trustworthy people alert the imām to a mistake but he continues whilst being unsure he is correct, his prayer is invalidated as well as for the one following him who knew what was correct. It is not invalidated for the one who was following unaware of what was correct, or had forgotten, or had left the imām's prayer.

Actions not from the genus of the prayer, performed in a quantity that would be considered 'a lot', invalidate the prayer whether done intentionally or forgetfully/unintentionally. It is not legislated to offer the prostration for an insignificant number of such actions. Unintentionally ingesting small amounts of food and drink does not invalidate the prayer; the supererogatory prayer is also valid if one drinks a small amount *intentionally*.

If one speaks during the prayer with a legitimate statement but offered in the wrong place, such as to recite (Qur'ān) in the s*ajdah* or sitting positions, or to say the *tashahhud* whilst standing, or to recite a *surah* in the last two (empty) units of a prayer, the prayer is neither invalidated nor does one have to prostrate, although it is legislated to do so.

If one intentionally gives the *taslīm* before the completion of the prayer, it is invalidated. If it was done forgetfully but one quickly realises, one completes the prayer and prostrates. If the time taken to realise is too long, or one speaks about anything other than the prayer, it is invalidated just like as if one did that during the prayer itself. Speaking a little in the interests of the prayer doesn't invalidate it.

Laughing is like speaking.

If one exhales loudly, with two letters articulated together, or weeps other than out of the fear of Allāh the Most High or clears their throat without reason whilst two letters can be heard, the prayer is invalidated.

(0:23:00) In terms of what Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn wants to offer in terms of discussion, he has a really nice opening discussion on this about the Arabic language. And I like that. That's always nice. This is in *al-Mumtiʻ* on page 336.

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says:

سجود السَّهو من باب إضافة الشيء إلى سببه

The phrase *sujūd'l-sahw* is one of the forms of *al-muḍāf* and *al-muḍāf ilayh*, something which is connected to its reason, i.e. the something of something.

What do they call *muḍāf ilayh* or *iḍāfah* in English grammar?

So *sujūd'l-sahw*, the prostration of forgetfulness.

Student (online): Possessed?

Ustādh: Possessed? I don't think it's that.

What do you call *iḍāfah*?

Student (online): Possessive phrase?

Ustādh: The possessive phrase? Yes, but who is going to read 'the possessive phrase' and have any idea what is going on?

What do we tell normal people to try to explain what *sujūd'l-sahw* means? Or is there no phrase like that? I don't even know.

Student (online): 'This' belongs to 'this'?

Ustādh: 'This' belongs to 'this'. It is the possessed and the possessor i.e., a noun which belongs to the noun.

Anyway, the point is that what Shaykh is saying is that the *sujūd'l-sahw*, the prostration for forgetfulness is showing a construct, a thing, which is connected to its reason. So, *sajdah* for the sake of [forgetfulness].

Basically, Shaykh says that the 'of', the added to thing, the way that you add something can either be added to it for a reason, in a reason, for the cause, added to it in terms of its place. So, in Arabic you use *li* to mean for. And you use *min* sometimes, from. And you use *fi* which mean within, etc. Shaykh gives an example. He says:

﴿بَلْ مَكْرُ اللَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ إِذْ تَأْمُرُونَنَا أَنْ نَكْفُرَ بِاللَّهِ ﴿٣٣﴾﴾

"No, it was your scheming, night and day, ordering us to disbelieve in God.' [*Sūrat Saba'*: 33]

You look at this particular construction in *Sūrat Saba'*. If you remember this verse, which is an interesting conversation between the *kuffār* and the believers. The *kuffār* basically blame the believers and the believers basically said that no, it is:

﴿مَكْرُ اللَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ ﴿٣٣﴾﴾

There is an *iḍāfah* here, there is a possession. The *makr*, which is the plot, "the plotting of the night and the day that was trying to convince us and make us and force us to make *kufr* with Allāh ﷻ…"

﴿أَنْ نَكْفُرَ بِاللَّهِ ﴿٣٣﴾﴾

The plot belongs to the night and the day. The *alif lām* indicates that.

﴿مَكْرُ اللَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ ﴿٣٣﴾﴾

Obviously, when you study the Arabic language you know that you are looking for clues, it becomes *majrūr*, etc. I don't want to go above and beyond this class because this is obviously not an advanced Arabic class or even a basic Arabic class. But obviously there are some people who are studying and reading in Arabic, so I just want to make this point.

Student (online): Genitive construction.

Ustādh: This is the phrase I was looking for, genitive construction. I knew there was an actual phrase. Not that it helps anybody. That's why I will never be an Arabic teacher.

So, this is the plotting of the night and the day even though of course the night doesn't, but it belongs to it because of what happened within it. That's the beautiful thing. The *taqdīr*. the assumed word, is the plotting that was done in the night and the day. But it's called the plotting of the night and the day. The plot of the night and the day. But the night doesn't plot, it's the people who are plotting. So, it's the plotting that was done in the night and the day.

And then, for example, if you have *khātim ḥadīd*, an iron ring. The ring of iron is actually the exact translation. But the assumed word is the ring from iron. So, the word *min* is assumed.

Then: *kitābu* Zayd, the book of Zayd, is *kitāb li*-Zayd, is the book for Zayd. So, there is
(0:30:00) always an assumed word in this genitive construction.

Student (online): In grammar, a genitive construction is a type of grammatical construction used to express a relation between two nouns such as the possession of one by another (e.g. "John's jacket"), or some other type of connection (e.g. "John's

father" or "the father of John"). A genitive construction involves two nouns, the head (or modified noun) and the dependent (or modifier noun). The dependent noun modifies the head by expressing some property of it. For example, in the construction "John's jacket", "jacket" is the head and "John's" is the modifier, expressing a property of the jacket (it is owned by John).

Ustādh: Yeah. You see how nice that looks? But it's so boring that even reading that paragraph I think I will die and everyone else will die.

Student (online): Aren't they weak ones who followed arrogant ones rather than believers and disbelievers?

Ustādh: In terms of the *ayah* about *al-mustakbirīn* and *al-mustaḍʿifīn*, are they all believers and disbelievers, that is one of the opinions. And I have to say that I lean towards the fact that this *kibr* was that of the level of *kufr*. But there are some that said no, these were two groups of the believers. And others said that they were two groups of the disbelievers. And others said that they were believers and disbelievers.

Anyway, what the Shaykh basically says is that when you say this phrase *sujūdʾl-sahw,* it means the prostration that belongs to forgetfulness. But what's the missing word in between? It's *lām*: the prostration 'for' forgetfulness. That's why we translated it as the prostration for forgetfulness.

Now, that's the first thing that he mentions.

The second thing is the word 'forgetfulness'. When you forget something, *sahw* or *saha*, to forget, in the Arabic language you can use different words before it that would indicate a kind of slightly different meaning, or a slightly different consequence of the sentence. For example, you have two words which precede the forgetfulness: *ʿan* and *fi*. So for example, if you say that the person forgot with the word before it being *ʿan*, then this is very blameworthy and a big problem because it means heedlessness and something which has been intentionally left out, or negligence. Whereas if you have *fi* before it, to be forgetful in something or (as I'll explain it better in a second) then this is like the forgiven one because it means the heart forgot about something that it didn't want to forget.

فإذا قلت :سها فلان في صلاته، فهذا من باب المعفو عنه

For example, if you say: *saha fulān fi ṣalātihi*. If we translate this statement that *fulān* (so and so) forgot *fī ṣalātihi* (in his prayer) versus *saha fulān ʿan ṣalātihi*, which would translate as: So and so forgot of his prayer, or forgot from his prayer, or forgot his prayer. In English you wouldn't give a point. The two are vastly different because to forget in the prayer and to forget the prayer—in English it is straightforward.

You might say: If you forget the prayer, you forgot the whole prayer.

No, I'm saying that what if you were praying *wa saha ʿanhu al-Fātiḥah*, for example or *ṣallā fī'l-Fātiḥah wa saha ʿanhu al-tasbīḥ* for example versus *saha fulān fī ṣalātihi, fī'l-tasbīḥ,* or *saha fī'l-tasbīḥ* or whatever.

In the Arabic using the *fī* and the *ʿan* has an entirely different connotation and Shaykh gives a really nice example. He says when you see Allāh ﷻ say:

﴿فَوَيْلٌ لِّلْمُصَلِّينَ ۝٤ الَّذِينَ هُمْ عَن صَلَاتِهِمْ سَاهُونَ ۝٥﴾

"So woe to those who pray but are heedless of their prayer." [*Sūrat al-Māʿūn*: 4-5]

'Of' their prayer.

قال بعض العلماء :الحمد لله الذي قال: (عن صلاتهم ساهون) و لم يقل: (في صلاتهم ساهون).

The *Salaf* would mention and they would say that *alḥamdulillāh* that Allāh ﷻ revealed this *sūrah* with the word *ʿan ṣalātihim* and not *fī ṣalātihim* because imagine if this was:

في صلاتهم ساهون

It's currently:

﴿الَّذِينَ هُمْ عَن صَلَاتِهِمْ سَاهُونَ ۝٥﴾

The Qur'ān as it is, it says: "So woe be upon those who pray, those who are heedless of their prayer," meaning that they're just, they don't give any importance. So, they pray it sometimes and sometimes they don't. They're not very good with it. Sometimes they are good one, sometimes they are bad one. They don't really care about it. Don't wake up for it. They don't set an alarm for it. Their day is about you know, if it fits it fits. That is them treating the prayer like that. These deserve all of the blame that they're going to get, the punishment they're going to get, the serious sin that it is.

Imagine if Allāh ﷻ had said: Woe be upon those who pray, those who are forgetful in their prayer.

That means we would all be dead. We would all be finished because there is none of us that does not forget in their prayer. All of us forget in our prayer or are heedless in our prayer. We make mistakes in our prayer. That just goes to show you the strength or the importance of knowing the grammatical constructs, the prepositions that are used, etc.

After that introduction, let us jump straight in. Effectively, what this is (as I said last week), is that *sajdat'l-sahw* or *sujūd'l-sahw* (*sujūd'l-sahw* is a better phrase to use to be honest) is a blessing and a mercy from Allāh ﷻ that helps us fix problems in the prayer.

Student (online): But doesn't the *sūrah* start with "woe to those who pray"? Which means they actually pray?

Ustādh: Yes. They do actually pray. But to someone who prays and someone who is a 'prayer', is very, very different—prays properly I mean. Just praying the odd prayer here and there does not mean much. Allāh ﷻ is saying: Woe be upon those people who pray in this way versus those people who pray properly.

The *sahw* itself, forgetfulness, is very much part and parcel of the human construct. Whether we can argue about the theological reality of that and whether it is true or untrue, what does that mean about us and how are we held accountable or not, etc. All you need to know is that the Prophet ﷺ forgot as well and used to forget in his prayer. And he ﷺ has also used this tool to fix his own prayer and the prayer of those behind him. If you want me to go even further, he ﷺ used to fix the prayer where he ﷺ made the mistake that the others spotted who did not make the mistake. Therefore, we learn a lot from these few *ḥadīth* that allow us to create a very detailed chapter that covers virtually every single scenario that you can think of, of when we mess up in the prayer.

When the Prophet ﷺ does this, then we know *alḥamdulillāh* that not only is he ﷺ a human and someone who is realistic to copy and emulate, but it also means that we should not beat ourselves up over it if it happens to us. Obviously, if it is happening every prayer, then it is a disaster. But if it happens here and there, then it is what it is. The Prophet ﷺ said:

إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ مِثْلُكُمْ، أَنْسَى كَمَا تَنْسَوْنَ، فَإِذَا نَسِيتُ فَذَكِّرُونِي

"I am a human being like you and liable to forget like you. So if I forget remind me." [1,2]

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: During the Obligatory Prayers One Should Face the Qiblah Wherever One May Be, hadīth no. 401.*
[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 a.*

Fadhakkirūni, then make sure you alert me to it, remind me to it. So, this is the nature of mankind. And it does not mean that a person is not concentrating on the prayer, or (0:40:00) does not care about the prayer, or he is *muʿriḍ* of the *ṣalāh*, because the greatest of mankind ﷺ used to establish the prayer and have this issue.

When you are forgetful in the prayer, it expresses itself in three ways. You will either add something to the prayer, you either forget something from the prayer—so that means, you take away from it. Adding something to the prayer is called *ziyādah*, which means increase. So, you are increasing something to the prayer. So, *ziyādatan aw naqṣ. Nuqṣān*. In Urdu we say *nuqṣān.* In Arabic, *nāqiṣ*, something which is deficient. So, you have taken something away from the prayer.

And the third form, which is trickier, and more difficult and very interesting, it is its own category, is *shakk.* This is forgetfulness as well. This is a form of forgetfulness because if you had remembered that you had prayed two, definitely prayed two, then you would not be in doubt now. The reason you are in doubt over whether you have prayed three or two, is because you forgot what you were reciting clearly and what you were doing in the first two so that you can't even work out whether you are on the third or not.

These are all three forms of forgetfulness. You become mindless, so you add another one. You start daydreaming and so you pray less. And then the third one is *shakk* which is doubt.

That is his introduction, done. Now let us get to the words of Imām al-Ḥajjāwi:

يُشْرَعُ لزيادةٍ ونَقْصٍ وشَكٍّ

(The prostration for forgetfulness) is legislated for:

1. an addition
2. omission
3. some doubt

Yushraʿ: (we had a lot of fun with this word last week), it is legislated, meaning it is possible in our religion. It means:

يجب تارة، ويُسَنُّ أخرى.

As Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says: that means that it is obligatory at certain times and it is recommended in other times. It is part of our religion on a case by case basis. It is something which is *ḥalāl*. Has a basis, so it is there.

The three reasons are for *ziyādah* (an addition), or omission, or some doubt because all of the problems will occur in these three expressions. This is so important, that does not mean that every increase, every addition, every *naqṣ* (omission), and every doubt that there is a *sajdah*. So, every removal of something from the prayer, every addition to the prayer, and every *shakk* in the prayer—it does not mean that every time that happens that there is a *sajdah*. That is very important. The author did not say that in every one of these cases. He said these are the three types. Because sometimes you might be praying a *sunnah* prayer and you might add a *sunnah* or decrease a *sunnah,* for example, you might have doubt over a *sunnah* aspect.

For example, (just off the top of my head) you are saying I am going to do fifteen *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʻla* and you get to thirteen and fourteen, you cannot remember which one it is, so you decide to just stop right there. That is doubt. Or you add something, you add an extra *sūrah*, or you leave out a *sūrah* for example—these are all *sunnah* acts.

So these are the three key areas: to add something, to remove something (omit something) from the prayer, and to have doubt over something in the prayer.

لا فِي عَمْدٍ

As long as it was not done intentionally.

But not in the case of doing this intentionally. This has to be done unintentionally. Because if you intentionally add something to the prayer or decrease or intentionally doubt yourself (if that is even possible), then the prayer is invalidated. It is not possible to have a *sajdat'l-sahw*. A *sajdah* of forgetfulness can never ever, ever (as I said last week) fix a prayer that is invalidated.

If you invalidate your prayer, your prayer is cancelled. It has to start again from the beginning. The *sajdat'l-sahw* can only fix a prayer and a prayer that is only damaged to a certain amount. If a prayer is invalidated because you came with a massive one, you came and killed it, like you intentionally added something to the prayer, then that is something which is too much. And of course, we are not talking about the *sunnah*. We are talking about in the obligatory aspects of the prayer and the pillars of the prayer. If you intentionally leave out an obligation, or leave out a *rukn*, then it makes no sense for *sajdat'l-sahw*.

وإن كان بترك سنَّة فالصَّلاة صحيحة، وليس هناك ضرورة إلى جَبْرِها بسجود السهو

Whereas if you were to leave a *sunnah* act or add a *sunnah* act, then the prayer is valid without that and there is no need to fix that prayer. Obviously, we had a big discussion about that last week.

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn said something interesting to add to it.

لكن ذَكَرَ بعض العلماء: زاد جاهلاً فإنه يُشرع له سجود السهو

If there is someone who increases *sunnah* acts whilst not being aware of it, not being in his or her mind, they were not expecting to that but they are so mindless at the moment that they start adding certain acts which themselves are not fundamental. For example, a person is reciting in the first *rakʻah*. He recites the *Fātiḥah*, says *amīn* and he starts off and wants to read *Sūrat al-Shams* for example and that is what his intention is. He then starts and he is on autopilot and his mind goes to work, and he is thinking about lunch, and he is thinking whether he can finish in time for the game, and he has now gone on to *Sūrat al-Layl* and he has now gone on to *Sūrat al-Ḍuḥa* and he ends up in *Sūrat al-Bayyinah*. And when he is in *Sūrat al-Bayyinah*, he's like '*Man! I'm in Bayyinah*,' so then he says *Allāhu akbar*.

Some of the scholars said that even though it is allowed for him to actually increase the prayer with *sunnah* acts, even though to read more Qur'ān is better, he never intended that. And what he did was done entirely mindlessly and it wasn't a positive thing because he did not intend it, but it happened with him being heedless about it. So, he should make *sajdat'l-sahw* for the fact that he let *shayṭān* come in and distract him.

You might say, '*Hold on! How can shayṭān come in and distract a person by increasing their ʻibādah?*'

For someone like me, it strengthens my own opinion about the recitation of the Qur'ān, that I believe that *tadabbur* of the Qur'ān over little is far better than the reciting of lots without *tadabbur*. But at the same time, nobody said that reciting lots without *tadabbur* is something sinful. Here though, it is not even the fact that it is sinful or not sinful. The person is not even realising that he is even reciting. He has no idea what he is doing. This might not be a very good example to be honest, but I just want you to appreciate that when the scholars said that it is legislated (and they are not saying that you have to do it,) they are saying that it is there, you might want to do a *sajdat'l-sahw* at the end to just basically apologise for how mindless you are, disrespectful. Now that, I have to say I am feeling that a lot. I really like the idea of someone being held accountable for being mindless in the prayer when they are being lazy, as opposed to the normal permanent problems that we have.

Student (online): Can you intentionally add more than one *sūrah* during the *farḍ* or *sunnah ṣalāh*?

Ustādh: Yes, you can add more than one *sūrah*, absolutely.

Student (online): So, like someone intending to do three *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm* in *rukūʿ* and ends up doing more?

Ustādh: That is the problem, it is not an easy one to hold down because it is not even about being intentional. You could have intended to do three, but you're just enjoying it. So, you add another two and we want that to happen. We want there to be lots. I'm
(0:50:00) talking about a person who is so heedless, that he doesn't even remember what he is doing. What we are saying is that even if the acts are *sunnah* kinds of acts, we should be aware and have respect of the prayer.

Student (online): Isn't this the same as the issue of *sajdat'l-sahw* for lack of *khushūʿ*?

Ustādh: No. I want to make it clear that I want to make a distinction between that because your normal lack of *khushūʿ* I would argue (you tell me) that 99 times out of a 100, does not lead you to do what I kind of described which is seventeen forms of *tasbīḥ* instead of three, or reciting seven *sūrahs* instead of one. It normally is you reciting whatever you were meant to be reciting and you suddenly you come to your end and feel empty. You realise you have come to the end of it and you were not there during the reciting.

Student (online): What if a person is unsure whether they read *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*, while they are still in the *qiyām* of the same *rakʿah* reading a *sūrah*?

Ustādh: If you are not sure, then of course you have to recite it again. If you are in the same *qiyām* and about to read a *sūrah*, or even reading a *sūrah*, then you would absolutely because you just don't know. We are going to learn what you will do as a result of that.

Student (online): Kind of like driving and the mind wanders and you start daydreaming. You do not even remember the last part of the drive.

Ustādh: Yes. But we have to be careful. It is very important that we do not at any moment fall into that *waswās* trap because that would be a disaster. We cannot allow ourselves to be held hostage like that. That is why a lot of scholars just made it nice and simple. They said no, there is no *sajdat'l-sahw* in *sunnah*, up, down nothing.

And I like that. I like people who boldly make a statement to try to get rid of problems that they see. It is like ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbbās ﵄—I give this example a lot when it comes to wetness after going to the toilet especially for males. And you could go into big long issues about how long you have got to clean this and dry and wash this and that whatever what not. And ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbbās ﵄ is like listen no more than 10-15

seconds wash and if you are that worried then just put some water in your undergarments, underpants whatever it is and that is it. Just pull up the pants and off you go. Ignore what you feel. Like literally ignore the wetness because the wetness that you feel is the wetness that you yourself put into those pants knowing full well that is very likely possible, probable, whatever (depending upon person to person) that it is leaking from that person or part of the reason that causes *waswās* in the first place. But this is how we are going to slap it down. We are going to be absolutely, '*Bam! Not interested in this issue. Waswās*, *get out of my head*,' like that.

فِي الفَرْضِ والنافلةِ

In the obligatory and supererogatory prayers.

So, this is something which is very interesting. Shaykh says it is legislated either as an obligation or as a recommendation in the obligatory prayer and the non-obligatory prayer, what we call the supererogatory prayer.

For those who are joining us for the first time, we do not call it voluntary prayer because it is not the right word. Voluntary means that something is up to you whether you want to do or not do it. That is not what *sunnah* and *nafl* mean. *Sunnah* and *nafl* in the English language means supererogatory. It is not obligatory and if a person does it, they are rewarded for it which is not what voluntary means.

So, this is legislated for both.

Now you might be thinking, '*Well hold on! How can it be legislated for a sunnah prayer or nafl prayer in which the prayer itself is not even obligatory?*'

We are going to come to that in a second. Let us just focus on the statement first because Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn makes a really good point.

He said that *sajdat'l-sahw* is legislated, it is to be performed, in every obligatory prayer and *nafl* prayer.

Question for you folks: Does that mean every single type of prayer? Is that statement correct? Every obligatory prayer and every *sunnah* prayer, what do you think? Can you think of some potential problems? Who can think of an exception and why?

Student (Online): *Janāzah* prayer maybe?

Ustādh: Correct the *Janāzah* prayer.

So, the *Janāzah* prayer is an exception. So therefore, this is only applying to those prayers that have a *rukūʿ* and a *sujūd*. *Ṣalāt al- Janāzah* there is no *sajdatʾl-sahw*. There is no *sajdatʾl-sahw* legislated for *ṣalāt al- Janāzah* because it, itself does not have a *rukūʿ* or a *sujūd.* And so how can you fix a prayer that does not have *sajdah* legislated in it then you fix it by making a *sajdah* for it?

But every single prayer that does have a *rukūʿ* and a *sujūd*, then it is fixed with the *sajdatʾl-sahw*, whether it is a *farḍ* prayer or a *nafl* prayer.

Now Shaykh says what if someone says: You are telling me that you are going to obligate upon me a *sajdatʾl-sahw* in a non-obligatory prayer if I were to leave one of the *wājibāt* of the *ṣalāh*?

Like for example saying *Allāhu akbar* whilst I go to *rukūʿ*. So, I finished the *sūrah* in my two *rakʿah nafl* that I am praying, and I am going for the *rukūʿ* and I say *Allāhu akbar.* That *Allāhu Akbar*, that *takbīratʾl-intiqāl*, the *takbīr* of moving from standing to *rukūʿ*, that is an obligation of the prayer. It is not a *rukn*, but it is an obligation. You are saying that if I miss that out, or I miss that first *tashahhud* out, I have to do the [*sajdatʾl-sahw*]?

Shaykh says: Yes. We will obligate that.

They will say: How are you making something obligatory in a non-obligatory prayer and the prayer *aṣlan* is *ghayr wājibah?* The prayer itself is not obligatory.

We say:

إنه لما تلبَّس بها وَجَبَ عليه أن يأتي بها على وَفْقِ الشريعة، وإلا كان مستهزئاً

Once you start that act, once you enter into that act of worship, whether it is obligatory or non-obligatory, or *nafl*, or *sunnah*, or *ghayr muʾakkad*, etc., you have to do that act according to the *Sharīʿah*. If you do not, then you are just mocking the *Sharīʿah*.

Student (online): You should finish a started act.

Ustādh: Not just finish a started act but finish a started act properly. It has a proper system, proper rules. You have to do it properly. Otherwise it is *mustahzaʾ*, you are humiliating, mocking the prayer itself.

وإذا كان لا يريد الصلاة فمن الأصل لا يصلي

If a person does not want to pray, then do not pray. If you do not want to pray properly, then do not pray. You are not obligated to pray in the first place, so what are you doing? Once you start to pray, and you do that, then you are just playing around with it. And that is something which is not possible, Shaykh says. It is just not possible.

Student (online): You can't just do a *nafl* and do it the way you want just because it's not an obligation.

Ustādh: Correct.

This is important because maybe some people think that when I am praying my *sunnah,* I never can make a mistake because it is a *sunnah* prayer. Now that has been debunked.

The next sentence is:

فمتى زَادَ فِعْلًا من جِنْسِ الصلاةِ؛ قِيامًا أو قُعودًا أو رُكوعًا أو سُجودًا عَمْدًا بَطُلَتْ

When an action from the genus of the prayer itself is intentionally added i.e., a standing, a sitting, a bowing, or a prostrating, the prayer is invalidated.

(1:00:00) There are two points which you must underline: (1) that it is an action, therefore, we do not mean a statement, (2) from the genus of the prayer, meaning it is from the actual prayer itself. So, if you do actions which are not part of the prayer, then it does not matter.

In terms of this section here, basically the author is about to tell us that the prayer will be invalidated if you intentionally add an action from standing, sitting, bowing or prostrating. If you add any of these to the prayer intentionally, the prayer is invalidated. The two things to remember here: (1) it is an action, (2) it is from the prayer.

That means that if you intentionally add a statement, that has a different ruling.

That means that if you intentionally add an action that is not from the prayer, that is not part of the prayer itself, that has a different ruling.

What we are focusing on in this section are those actions which are from the prayer, which are from the essential parts of the prayer, that describe the prayer, they are from the structure of the prayer. If they are added to it intentionally, then the prayer is invalidated.

What are these actions?

It is to stand, it is to sit, it is to do *rukūʿ*, and it is to do *sujūd*.

By mentioning these four, does the author basically mean just these acts? Does he mean it in a general sense or is he specifying that it is only these four?

In the opinion of the author, he is saying only these four. He is referring to only these four actions. And when he is referring to them, he does not just mean random standing. He basically means: If you stand when you should be sitting, or if you sit when you should be standing, or you go into *rukūʿ* in any of its positions other than when you should do, or you go into *sujūd* in any of the positions of the prayer other than when you should be doing the *sajdah* and you do that intentionally, the prayer is invalidated.

And I think that is not very difficult for anybody to accept. That is something which is allowed.

Student (online): You see people who pray *nafl* sitting down.

Ustādh: Now praying *nafl* sitting down, is not praying, is not sitting in the position of standing because that particular sitting whilst you should be standing is the actual act of that particular prayer because that is a concessionary prayer. Anything which has *naṣ,* anything which is done intentionally following a text from the Qurʾān and *Sunnah* can never be in of itself a problem.

The Shaykh then gives some examples:

وأنه لو زَادَ فِعْلاً غير هذه الأفعال الأربعة كرَفْعِ اليدين مثلاً في غير مواضع الرَّفْع، فإنه لا يدخل في عموم كلام المؤلِّف، فلا تبطل الصلاة بعمده، ولا يجب السجود

Shaykh says for example if a person, he raises his hands doing *rafʿ al-yadayn*, and he was to do that, say for example, [after completing the recitation of *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* the person does *rafʿ al-yadayn*, remains in the standing position and then recites a *sūrah*].

This [*rafʿ al-yadayn*] is obviously meant to happen when you go into *rukūʿ*. It is not meant to happen when you say *amīn*. According to the statement of Imām al-Ḥajjāwi and the Ḥanbali the school, if you were to intentionally do *rafʿ al-yadayn*, even though that is from the prayer in a place where it is not meant to happen, the prayer is not invalidated, and you don't need to do *sajdatʾl-sahw* either.[‡]

Now, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: I'm okay with that, if that is what the author is saying then that is what we are going to go with. And the reason that he is going to go with that is because the school does believe that these four actions are the big mainstay

[‡] For those who have an earlier version of the transcription or are listening to the audio of the class, please note that at this point in lesson Ustādh said: "If you forget about it. I mean if you did it forgetfully." That was said in error and it has been deleted from the transcription. MT

actions. We will develop on this over the next couple of months but let's just focus on that. The raising of the hands is seen as a much more minor act. And obviously we know that it is not an obligatory act anyway. So, we start to get a bit of a clue about the way that the Imām is thinking. These four acts are being intended in of themselves: the standing, the sitting, the *rukūʿ* and the *sujūd* which are the four dominant acts, the mainstays of the prayer, the main things which describe it and its spirit and its power and its everything. These are the ones that we are going to be looking at very closely. If any of these come in the wrong places then it really shows that a person has messed it up big time, let alone do that intentionally. So that is a problem.

Then Shaykh give some examples. So, for example if there is a person who did a *rukūʿ* twice intentionally, then the prayer would be invalidated unless of course this is a…? Unless of course…?

Student (online): *Kusūf.*

Ustādh: Well done.

(1:12:45) So, Shaykh says unless a person:

ولو رَكَعَ مرَّتين عمداً في غير صلاة الكسوف بطلت صلاتُه

So, if a person was to do the *rukūʿ* intentionally twice in other than the eclipse prayer (because the eclipse prayer has two *rukūʿ* four *sujūd*, it is a very different prayer), then it is invalidated. Or if a person was to do *sajdah* three times, like that mate I met in the UAE, remember him? Then that invalidates the prayer.

ولو قَعَدَ في محلِّ القيام عمداً

And if he were to sit down whilst reciting *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*, then the prayer would be invalidated. Or if he stood up whilst reciting the *tashahhud*, the prayer would be invalidated. And this is a point of *ijmāʿah*, there is an absolute consensus on this point, that the scholars have agreed upon this. And their evidence for this for them having *ijmāʿ* upon this issue. Is the statement of the Prophet ﷺ whoever does an action that is not from our actions then it is rejected.[3] And the word rejected here does not mean in terms of *ḥarām* or *ḥalāl,* but it means it is not even to be considered an action. So, that is why it is invalidated.

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Peacemaking, Chapter: If Some People Are Reconciled on Illegal Basis, Their Reconciliation Is Rejected, ḥadīth no. 2697.*

And to finish this particular sentence:

وسَهْوًا يَسْجُدُ له

If it is unintentional, it can be prostrated for.

قوله: «وسهواً يسجد له» هذه معطوفة على «عمداً» أي: ومتى زاد قياماً، أو قعوداً، أو ركوعاً، أو سجوداً سهواً يسجد له؛ لأن النبيَّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم أمر مَنْ زاد في صلاته أن يسجدَ سجدتين، هذا دليل من القول.

دليل من الفعل: أنه صلّى الله عليه وسلّم لما صَلَّى خمساً في حديث عبد الله بن مسعود، وقيل له: صَلَّيت خمساً، ثنى رجليه فَسَجَدَ سجدتين

Listen. To finish off this entire section: If he was to add those four actions: the standing the sitting the *rukūʿ* or *sajdah* in a place other than what it should be (like I described), but he did it unintentionally, then he will just make the *sajdah* and that's it. So, after the prayer he would make the *sajdah*.

And obviously we will come to all of this. This will take time. Everyone is bursting at the seams because not many people know. So obviously there are a lot of questions.

We have two bases for this, we have a verbal evidence for this, and we have an action as well.

Verbally the Prophet ﷺ he saw a person who increased in his prayer and he ﷺ commanded him to perform two *sajdahs,* This is him ﷺ telling someone to do it. The action is him himself ﷺ the famous *ḥadīth* narrated in *Bukhāri* and *Muslim*, but in this particular version it is narrated by Imām Muslim. And this is the famous *ḥadīth* and we are going to be taking this *ḥadīth* apart in these few weeks maybe months.

The *ḥadīth* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﵁, the famous one in which the Prophet ﷺ prayed, and they told him that he ﷺ had prayed five when he ﷺ finished.[4] And you could see he ﷺ had doubt. He ﷺ wasn't sure. And so then he ﷺ did two *sajdahs*. So, if he ﷺ prayed five, then he ﷺ added to the prayer in places where it shouldn't have happened. And he ﷺ did it unintentionally. So, that is a basic broad evidence for if a person was to add these things then they would have to make the *sajdah* for it.

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in the Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 h.*

Q & A

Q (online): What if you repeat if you are in doubt?

A: This is not from the *Sunnah*. We don't repeat or doubt or anything like that. That is the same as last week that we are talking about. That is opening the door to *shayṭān*, *waswās*. It's a complete disaster.

Q (online): Please can you define what do you mean by unintentional and intentional? All actions we do are intentional, but some might be in a state of error.

A: When we say intentional and unintentional, this will become clearer. But there is no more to add right now because it is exactly that. It is not right to say all actions that we do are intentional. That's not right. A person never wants to pray five *rakʿah* in a four *rakʿah* prayer. If you did, then that's done unintentionally unless you knew from the beginning this is a *ʿAṣr* prayer and I want to pray five. That's game over. You've invalidated the prayer straight away. Just keep it simple in your mind. The simpler you keep it, the easier it will be. That if there is something you didn't want to do, that's unintentional. That's it.

Q (online): How can you tell if medicine is *ḥalāl* or not?

A: If it says its *ḥalāl* or not. I don't know any other way.

Q (online): Can we hang *ayahs* of Qurʾān written in a frame on the wall?

A: I don't think it's good. I don't think it's *ḥalāl* or *ḥarām*.

(1:20:00) Q (online): What if you repeat one of the four actions you mentioned intentionally because you realise that you forgot the statement and want to go back and do it properly e.g. you get up from *rukūʿ* and realise that you didn't say *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah* so you go back into *rukūʿ* position and get up again, is the prayer then invalidated?

A: That's wrong. That's a mistake and you have invalidated the prayer. Exactly the way that you have described it—you get up from *rukūʿ* and you realise you didn't say *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah* so you go back into *rukūʿ* and you get up again—the prayer is invalidated. Correct. Because there is a way to react to that scenario. We are going to learn in this section over the next 1-2 months that you ignore the fact that you didn't

say it and you carry on when you miss out something like that. And then you do *sajdat'l-sahw* at the end.

Q (online): In *Bāb al-Ḥayḍ* lecture one, we saw Brother Shazad's picture in a frame. Based on that a picture related question, is it okay to keep pictures in frames in home?

A: Yes, it is. As long as they are not on display.

Q (online): I know this is coming up, but is the class position regarding crying in *ṣalāh* that your *ṣalāh* is invalidated?

A: No. But if a person is messing around, you know the *Witr* version (excessive crying), no way. That is out.

Q (online): What about keeping pictures in albums?

A: No problem if you keep it [covered].

7. Chapter 20 Lesson 2: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

(0:04:00) Last week we covered:

يُشْرَعُ لزيادةٍ ونَقْصٍ وشَكٍّ، لا في عَمْدٍ في الفَرْضِ والنافلةِ ، فمتى زَادَ فِعْلًا من جِنْسِ الصلاةِ؛ قِيامًا أو قُعودًا أو رُكوعًا أو سُجودًا عَمْدًا بَطُلَتْ، وسَهْوًا يَسْجُدُ له

(The prostration for forgetfulness) is legislated for:

1. an addition
2. omission
3. some doubt

in the obligatory and supererogatory prayers, as long as it was not done intentionally.

When an action from the genus of the prayer itself is intentionally added i.e. a standing, a sitting, a bowing, or a prostrating, the prayer is invalidated. If it is unintentional, it can be prostrated for.

This week:

وإن زَادَ رَكْعَةً فَلَمْ يَعْلَمْ حتى فَرَغَ منها سَجَدَ، وإن عَلِمَ فيها جَلَسَ في الحالِ فتَشَهَّدَ إن لم يكنْ تَشَهَّدَ وسَجَدَ وسَلَّمَ، وإن سَبَّحَ به ثِقَتانِ فأَصَرَّ ولَمْ يَجْزِمْ بِصَوابِ نَفْسِهِ بَطُلَتْ صلاتُهُ وصلاةُ مَن تَبِعَه عالِمًا، لا جاهِلًا أو نَاسِيًا ولا مَن فارَقَه،

If one adds an extra unit and only realises after they exit the prayer, they simply perform the prostration. If they realise (during the prayer), they are to immediately sit down, perform the *tashahhud* if they haven't already done so, perform the prostration for forgetfulness, and then offer the *taslīm*.

If two trustworthy people alert the imām to a mistake but he continues whilst being unsure he is correct, his prayer is invalidated as well as for the one following him who knew what was correct. It is not invalidated for the one who was following unaware of what was correct, or had forgotten, or had left the imām's prayer.

(0:12:45) We are now entering into the nuts and bolts of what type of mistake you make and how you rectify it with respect to the *sajdat'l-sahw*. This is going to get quite detailed. You are going to realise that to 'follow the *Sunnah'*, there is no such thing as: Oh you just do *sujūd'l-sahw* and that is it. Each different type of mistake falls into a category and every category of mistake will have a specific time and location for the *sujūd'l-sahw*. So, let's say that at the beginning to set the scene. The one that we are doing now is the addition aspect. That is what we are focusing on.

I want you to think in your mind of every increase and I want you to be outside the box. So, I want you to think an increase is not just you know, '*I was praying four rakʿah*, *now I ended up praying five rakʿah*.' An increase is any act of the prayer that is essential to the prayer that is added. Even if by mistake. Even if done unintentionally because you are trying to fix a problem in the prayer. All of this will start coming into addition. The mind is probably thinking, an addition to the prayer is if I stand up for the fifth *rakʿah,* which of course it is.

Let's imagine I am in the first *rakʿah* and I have gone down to *sajdah* and I thought that I did the two the *sajdahs* but in actual fact I only did one and I stand up for the *rakʿah*. When I stand up for the second *rakʿah* and I realise that, '*Oh! I only did one sajdah*,' you are going to learn that I have to immediately go back down and do the *sajdah* again or the extra *sajdah*. So I now go back down and I do that *sajdah* and I stand back up again. You need to know that other than the mistake and the forgetfulness, what you have technically done is you have added to the prayer. You added to the prayer in going down back into *sajdah*, you added to the prayer technically when you stood back up again (even though that is the right thing to do) because you added an extra standing when you stood up erroneously before the *sajdah*, the correct *sajdah*.

So I am just saying that as an introduction to the concept that an addition to the prayer does not just mean what you might think in your mind, that it is just something which is you are adding a number, a fifth *rakʿah* or a third *sajdah*. Addition is unintentional things that happen whilst you are trying to correct things and these lead to an addition.

So for example, Shaykh says in commentary to his statement:

وإن زَادَ رَكْعَةً فَلَمْ يَعْلَمْ حتى فَرَغَ منها

If one adds an extra unit and only realises after they exit the prayer…

And if you increase in a unit, *rakʿah* and he is not aware of it until he has passed on from there. Now "passed on from there":

فَرَغَ منها

There are two interpretations from that. Does he mean passing on from that *rakʿah* or passing on from that *ṣalāh*?

Minhā, the female pronoun, is it returning back to that single unit that he added? Has he moved on from that *rakʿah* now, there? Or does it mean he has finished, moved on from the prayer itself?

Technically speaking it is not going to actually make much difference. But I just want you to be aware that there is some potential flexibility in what that means.

An easy example of that is a person will be praying *Ẓuhr* and he prays five *rakʿah* instead of four and he does not realise that until he is sitting in *tashahhud*. So this person right now is fulfilling the example that the author is giving because he has finished from the
(0:20:00) *rakʿah*, he has already added the fifth. It is done and dusted, he has messed it up now and he is finished from that scenario, and he is in the last straight now. The home straight, he is in the *tashahhud* he is about to give *salāms* and he now realises.

And then Shayk says on top of page 341:

«حتى فرغ منها» أي فرغ من الصلاة فيكون المثال المطابق لهذا الاحتمال: رَجُلٌ لما سَلَّم مِن الصلاة ذَكَرَ أنه صَلَّى خمساً

He then says: That could also mean if he has left the prayer as well completely. So, the second example would be he has prayed *Ẓuhr*, he has prayed five. He finishes the prayer and whilst he is sitting there, he realises that he has prayed five. So, the scenarios are both the same. In the first one he realises whilst he is in the t*ashahhud*, he has finished from that *rakʿah*. In the second scenario he has finished from that extra *rakʿah* he has added, but he has actually finished from the *ṣalāh* as well.

وعلى هذا فيكون قوله: «سَجَد» أي: بعد السلام. فإذا زاد ركعة و لم يعلم حتى فَرَغَ منها فإنه يسجد للسهو وجوباً، فإن عَلِمَ قبل أن يُسلِّم فهل يسجد قبل السلام، أو يسجد بعده؟

This is important.

According to the *madh-hab* (the Ḥanbali school), because he is still inside the prayer and he has realised that he has added to the prayer an extra *rakʿah*, then as the text says he does *sajdah*. That basically means before the *taslīm*, before the *salām*.

You are going to learn in this session as we go on over the next few weeks that this is me introducing the idea that the scholars differed over when the *sajdah* should occur: before the *salām* or after the *salām*?

I have always followed the position of Ibn Taymiyyah on this. It is the one that makes the most sense, the one that combines all the evidences. It was popularised by Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn who wrote a little essay on this called *Sajdatʾl-Sahw,* which we studied like twenty years ago. And that is what I am going to be teaching as the class position as well. Obviously, he is teaching that here anyway. But he wrote that separately to the teaching of *Zād al-Mustaqniʿ* (to the commentary of this book), a little basic thing.

Just remember this. The Ḥanbali school, their basic rule is that for every mistake—any mistake—the *sajdatʾl-sahw* happens before the *taslīm*. So, before you exit the prayer you do the *sajdatʾl-sahw*. That is the general rule. The only time in the Ḥanbali school do you have a *sujūdʾl-sahw* after the *taslīm* is if you have left the prayer already—when you find out after the *ṣalāh*.

This is a very logical, sensible position when you combine the evidences, except that it will not cover all the *ḥadīth* that are on the subject. The other *ḥadīth* necessitate for us to have a more nuanced approach to it. But that is the interesting point about the Ḥanbali school, that they say all of their *sujūdʾl-sahw* are before the *taslīm* except if you exit the prayer. If you exit the prayer, you cannot go back anyways, so you might as well. It is not even like they want to but it's kind of reluctant, '*Well we're here now, so we might as well do it.*'

As you are going to find out, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn and Ibn Taymiyyah and a number of scholars from amongst the *Salaf*, they considered that it is more nuanced. There are some after and some before.

This is the single most important statement that you are going to write down of this entire subject: All of the *fuqahāʾ* are agreed that the timing of the *sajdah*, whether before or after, is a matter of *istiḥabāb* (a matter of recommendation) not a condition of the mistake rectifier.

In other words, if a person intentionally or unintentionally (because they didn't know) messed up where the *sajdah* should go, before the *salām* or after the *salām* (depending on the mistake) it is sufficient to rectify the mistake. Whereas putting the *sajdah* in the right place (before the *salām* or after the *salām*) according to the scholars who push that position (whatever that position is), is more rewarded.

According to the Ḥanbalis, in this scenario, if you increase with a *rakʿah*, so you pray *Ẓuhr* five *rakʿah* and then in the *tashahhud* you realise that, then you now finish off the *ṣalāh*. You do your *durūd sharīf,* you do your *duʿāʾ*, and then you say, *Allāhu akbar and* go into *sajdatʾl-sahw* two times as normal. You say, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* as per normal. Then you say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right]*, assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the left]. This is called the *sujūdʾl-sahw qablʾl-salām* or *qablʾl-taslīm*. This is the prostration for forgetfulness before the *taslīm*. That is what it is known as. As I said, the Ḥanbali school they have all of these. And that is what it says in the text.

Our **<u>class position</u>**, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position, and Ibn Taymiyyah's position is that every addition to the prayer, any time you add something to the prayer, the *sujūdʾl-sahw* is after the *taslīm*, after the *salām*, after the exit. These three words are synonyms: *taslīm* means *salām* means exit. That's what you are doing when you say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, you've exited the prayer.

Obviously, we'll come to the details later. But the minimum requirement to exit the prayer, according to the majority of scholars, is just one *taslīm* (*assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* to the right). That is why they only say one and they go. But I want you to know that if a person did *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the right]*, assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the left] then said *Allāhu akbar* [and went into *sajdatʾl-sahw*], that is fine as well. He has just properly, properly exited the prayer, if that makes sense. Because when you exit the prayer with one, you have exited legally, with the minimum, because only one *taslīm* is required to exit the prayer. The second *taslīm*, according to many scholars (not all of them), is only a *sunnah*. It is only an extra one that is required, as we covered in the last couple of years. Go back and review that.[†] Then you will do the *sajdatʾl-sahw,* then you would sit back up, then you would give the *salāms* again. This is what it looks like when we call it after the *taslīm*.

Again, the details are coming. Shaykh is not going into details of *sujūdʾl-sahw* right now, that is coming up later. I know what is immediately on your hearts and minds (for the majority of you) is that we now start *durūd sharīf* again, do the *tashahhud* again. That is of course the Pak way. Or at the very least, if you do not do *al-taḥiyyātu*, then at least you will do the *durūd sharīf* again. And yes, that is the Ḥanafi position. And by the way, yes, that is not made up for fun. It is based upon a narration of the Prophet ﷺ as collected by Imām Abu Dāwūd.[1]

The criticism of this position is that this *ḥadīth* is too weak to be established as an evidence, and the plethora of evidences to the contrary, and which are not only authentic but held by so many of the Companions drown out this *ḥadīth*, even if it were not weak. So, you have one *ḥadīth* standing on its own and then a whole sea saying that there is no evidence to indicate that there is a big pause and you are reciting the

---

[†] The ruling on the *taslīm* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 16, Lesson 49. MT

[1] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: Those Who Said He Should Complete (the Prayers) Based Upon His Strongest Judgment, <u>ḥadīth no. 1028</u>.* This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf* by al-Albāni.

tashahhud again, but rather it is an immediate two *sajdahs* and then *salām,* versus one saying that it is. That would be considered falling into the category of *shādhdh* anyway, that it is odd compared to the majority of *ḥadīth*. Then throw into the mix that the *ḥadīth's sanad*, its chain, is not very strong. So, you know that the overwhelmingly preponderant position is that there is no need to recite anything.

Just for the sake so that you are not confused for weeks, this is how the *sajdatʾl-sahw* would go. So, you would be in *tashahhud*. You know that you have added a *rakʿah*, for example. You have realised that you have done five effectively. You are sitting there saying [the *ṣalawātʾl-Ibrāhīmiyyah*] and you realise, '*You know what? I've prayed five*.' According to the **<u>class position</u>**, you are going to finish off the *ṣalāh* and then you are going to say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [turning the head to the right], then *Allāhu akbar* [go into prostration and say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, Allāhu Akbar* [come up from prostration]. In this position [sitting between the two prostrations] there is no requirement to say *Rabbigh-firli* because this is not copying the prayer per se. If you added it, would it be a problem? I do not think it would be a problem if you said *Rabbigh-firli Rabbigh-firli*. It is not a requirement. Then [say] *Allāhu akbar* [go into prostration and say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* [and while coming out of the
(0:30:00) prostration say] *Allāhu akbar*, [then while turning the head to the right]: *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [and while turning the head to the left]: *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*. That is the *sujūdʾl-sahw* (two of them, always two) after the *taslīm*. That is what it means by "after the *taslīm*".

In the Ḥanbali school, it would be: *Allāhumma ṣalli ʿala Muḥammad...,* finish the *ṣalāh*, (saying whatever *duʿāʾ* you say before *taslīm*), you are about to say *salām,* but you just suddenly go say *Allāhu akbar* [and go into prostration saying] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla,* and then [while coming up from prostration say], *Allāhu akbar*. [Then go into the second prostration as you say] *Allāhu akbar* [and while in prostration say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*. *Allāhu akbar* [while coming up from prostration]. Then *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the left]. That is the *sujūdʾl-sahw* before the *taslīm.* That is what it would look like. That is what happens in the Ḥanbali school for all additions. Whereas the **<u>class position</u>** and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position is that it is to be done afterwards.

Why is that? Why are we doing it afterwards?

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: The first evidence is that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, in one famous incident, that is narrated by Imām Muslim, he ﷺ prayed a four *rakʿah* prayer

five.[2,3] It was either *Ẓuhr* or *ʿAṣr*—that is the doubt on the narrator, whether it was *Ẓuhr* or *ʿAṣr*. And after he ﷺ said *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh, assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh...* The *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ is to turn around, to sit around, like this kind of angle:

Student (online): Facing the congregation?

Ustādh: Not directly facing them, but kind of at an angle facing the congregation and he would then make *dhikr.* But it is not direct facing, but it is kind of facing. That was his *sunnah* ﷺ.

Student (online): Oblique.

Ustādh: Thank you.

When he ﷺ would do that, he ﷺ would continue his *dhikr*. And that is why the Companions knew about the *dhikr*, they knew about the fingers, because they observe it directly face to face. Straight on. There are many *ḥadīth* that talk about that. So, he ﷺ did that and the Companions said to the Prophet ﷺ, "You prayed five."

Now, I want you to know before we move forward, that you may think that the Prophet ﷺ only made a mistake once. By the way, this is actually a fascinating area of *ḥadīth* for those who are students of *ḥadīth* or those who are advanced students. The fascinating thing here is how many times actually did the Prophet ﷺ really, really, from a *ḥadīth* critique point of view, did he ﷺ make a mistake?

There is a real temptation there to almost believe (and I do not want to cause controversy and *fitnah*) that this only happened once or twice. And that the Companions have their own versions of that story and it comes across as if it happened ten times because there are ten different versions from ten different Companions. This is a delicate kind of discussion because you can imagine, if we are saying, that it only happened a couple of times, or once even, and it is turned in to this big kind of, '*He ﷺ made a mistake here, forgot here, forgot there*..." It is a fascinating area, that is what I want to say. It is not so important in the scheme of things because the only thing that matters is: Did he ﷺ make a mistake and show us how to rectify it?

The answer is yes.

And are we covered for every type of mistake?

The answer is yes.

---

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 h*.
[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 a*.

So, ultimately that is the only thing that matters, isn't it really? But I want you to be aware that in one version it is narrated by ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﷺ. In another narration it is narrated by Abu Hurayrah ﷺ.[4] In another narration it is narrated by another Companion, and in one them it is saying it was definitely *Ẓuhr*.[5] In the other one it is saying that he ﷺ just prayed five, it does not mention the prayer. In another one, explicitly, it says it was either *Ẓuhr* or *ʿAṣr*.[6,7] Again, technically, it does not have any major consequences, but it is interesting to be able to... You know what this thing does?

I was having this discussion with Yasir Qadhi. You know the whole thing with Yasir at the moment, the guy is burned off the whole Salafī movement, blah, blah, blah. Got lots of hate over it for the last 20-30 years, 25 years. And he is on this mission to try and.... every *dāʿī* sees himself on this big crusade. He sees his own crusade as this intellectual requirement to educate, when it comes to the masses, educate them to the depth and the level of difference of opinion that you were not aware of, so just calm down and recognise that even those things that you thought were set in stone are not set in stone. Wake up. That kind of crusade. And then towards the students of knowledge and those who are advanced, the same lesson but in a more intense way to try to humble them. Tell them to shut up and sit down. #SitDown, #StayInYourLane, all that kind of stuff. You do not know what you are talking about, there are people who are older than you who know, and you stay quiet. And obviously this is a very controversial approach. It is not a good approach actually. I have told him frankly and he has been cussed heavily for this. There are pros and cons.

Student (online): His talk on the *Sharḥ'l-Sunnah* author (or not) was very good (Shaykh Barbaḥāri).

Ustādh: See, she has said that the *Sharḥ'l-Sunnah* author or not, on Barbahāri, for those who study theology, we found it to be very weak. So, in my opinion that was a very poor version. The general students who have been brought up on the Salafi *daʿwah* especially when that was a key fundamental book for them. For me, I could not care less about the book but do not tell anyone that. In fact, it was not the most, but probably the second most overrated book in history.

But you can see there is way too much bias coming through. And he knows that. He recognises that. Even in the attempt to revive critical thinking it is still going to come from an angle. And it is the most difficult thing in the world to drop your influence, to leave behind your bias. It is so, so difficult. Everybody has it. I have it. His bias is so, so dominant. The Western academic influence upon him, the Yale side of his study, being

---

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: To Clasp One's Hands by Interlocking the Fingers in the Mosque or Outside the Mosque, ḥadīth no. 482.*
[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Forgetfulness in Prayer, Chapter: What Is Said Regarding the Sahw, ḥadīth no. 1225.*
[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Forgetfulness in Prayer, Chapter: If One Offers Five Rakʿah (Instead of Four), ḥadīth no. 1226.*
[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Forgetfulness in Prayer, Chapter: If One Finishes His Ṣalāh With Taslīm After Offering Two or Three Rakʿah (by Mistake), ḥadīth no. 1227.*

burnt personally so much by people attacking day and night, and anyone who used to be of that ilk creates a level which is difficult to overcome. My point is not really to focus on the individual aspects of how he is doing it, but the point is for you to realise that this is a very distasteful way of dealing with it. At the same time there are many benefits of doing it.

The perfect example of what I am trying to explain is the Ismāʿīl/Isḥāq debate. Who was the one that was offered to be slaughtered by Ibrāhīm ﷺ?

Unless you have seen the lecture and even if you saw the lecture frankly, every single one is: How is it anyone other than Ismāʿīl? Of course, it is Ismāʿīl. Those of us who have studied that a long time ago (studied *tafsīr*) we knew that the dominant position has always been Isḥāq. But those who do not know they are like, '*Whoa?! How is it possible that we got it so wrong? All this time I have been thinking that it is Ismāʿīl ﷺ but it was actually according to the predominant position of the early Imāms it was Isḥāq ﷺ?*'

(0:40:00) That is a classic example of educating the masses to be critical thinkers, to not assume anything at face value, etc. It is politically free. This is the point. And I spoke to him about this last night about him having to use better examples to establish his point. He mashed it up something chronic by trying to use the Qurʾān and he has made *tawbah* for that because it was the stupidest thing ever. In fairness to him (as he said openly) he never intended for it to come out. But actually, he was very irresponsible with it because he did lead to it coming out into the open. But the reason he is doing these kinds of subjects is because he is wants to try to get people to be critical thinkers which, by the way, we have to be because the intellectual quagmire that we are stuck in is horrible. It is just so depressing. And it is one of the reasons why I genuinely believe that we have to start moving on from the rigidity of being restricted to *madhāhib* and only being stuck in *madhāhib* unless you are an educated, real critical-thinker, within a *madh-hab*. Then 100% you should stick to a *madh-hab*.

For example, people in this class here, I have no problem whatsoever in sticking to the Ḥanbali school or any school whilst you are studying and being aware that there evidences etc. because you are humble in your position of the *madh-hab*. Because you are first-hand learning and understanding where and why others differ. But when you try and achieve that using areas that the scholars do not open doors to, or that are controversial, or that are difficult, then you have to have a level of responsibility. So, he messed that up. And he knows that. And he apologised for that. The Ismāʿīl and Isḥāq one was about as good as it gets as choosing the right example because it shocks people. It really does make them more critical. It makes them aware. It makes them more tolerant. It has no political connotation. It has no Western liberal agenda attached to it. The consequences of having to change your opinion does not lead to an *imān* crisis. This is the skill of educating people.

The list of things to choose are many to use as examples to educate people to open their eyes and ears, but most of them are very dangerous. The one that I just gave you is an example of one which is not dangerous. It does not cause a big upheaval, and it does

allow people to be more critical of what they are reading and understanding i.e. '*You know what? I am going to put the theory forward that there is only one time the Prophet ﷺ prayed five rakʿah not the 10-15 that are being indicated and I think that they were mistakes (mistake is a relative word) on behalf of the Companions that were narrating it, that made it out like they were multiple incidents. Actually, it was a single incident*.'

And by the way this is an area of the *Sunnah* which is a very interesting area and a very difficult one: Are certain people actually two different people or are they the same person? And by that extension, are certain incidents two separate incidents or are they single incidents?

For example, I have just finished obviously teaching the *Fiqh of Death*. In the double weekend version that we used to teach, which is double the depth, I spent a significant amount of time explaining that the famous woman that was stoned because she did *zina* and came to the Prophet ﷺ to admit, you will see the vast majority of scholars saying that this is one woman.[8] The famous incident, and that all the different narrations are versions of that. Actually, I have no doubt whatsoever that there are two separate women, two separate incidents—*al-Ghāmdiyyah* (it is known as *al-Ghamādiyyah*, one of them is *al-Ghāmidiyyah*) and the other one is of child. Meaning that the nuances (I don't want to go into that now either, obviously I'm going on crazy tangents now and I have to stop). But the point is that in this scenario if I explain it, no one's *imān* is going to crash. They are going to say, '*Oh! that is really interesting, jazāk Allāh khayr*,' even though the statements that are going to be made are going to be big statements. Actually, Ibn Ḥajr got it right. But I'm going to say, '*Ibn Taymiyyah got it wrong*,' or '*Ibn al-Qayyim made a mistake on this when he said that*…,' or, '*The Salaf had this position*,'etc.

You can educate people to differences and tolerance etc. without having to go into super controversial areas and crash people's *imān* or cause controversy or want to keep yourself relevant. The problem is that at the moment, it is okay at one level when someone like Yasir is doing it because he doesn't need the 'relevance'. He has a reputation for the last 10 years for doing this since he left Madīnah. But you have too many other folks who are not qualified, who don't use these examples per se, but use the principle of talking about controversial things to create a name for themselves. Because controversy obviously is viral, and it spreads, and it is interesting. A lot of people listening to this will find this very interesting because it is about names, and interesting and controversy. That is just human nature. I mean, it is what it is, right?

I don't know. I can't remember why we went that way, but I just wanted to say that I don't believe that these *ḥadīth* are as many as is suggested. We are certain of one incident and one incident, I don't want to say alone, but that is when the Prophet ﷺ prayed and a Companion known as Dhuʾl-Yadayn ؓ corrected the Prophet ﷺ with a lot

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Legal Punishments, Chapter: The One Who Confesses to Zina, hadīth no. 1695 a*.

of confidence and the Prophet ﷺ then asked for [clarification].[4] But then it seems like there are so many other points.

Student (online): His talk on the *Sharḥ'l-Sunnah* author (or not) was very good (Shaykh Barbaḥāri). I am very much enjoying his critical thinking lectures.

Ustādh: That is the main thing, to watch with a critical mind. And this is the matrix. Whilst you are watching the one which is critiquing the reality, you make sure you are watching the critiquing of the reality, you are critiquing it and knowing it is coming from a biased position as well. Inception and all that kind of stuff, even though I never understood Inception at all. What a waste of time that was.

Student (online): I listened to the Ismāʿil/Isḥāq one too but knew about that so it wasn't as amazing a revelation. I do think both examples so far have been interesting.... Agree critical thinking needs a revival and those seminary classes look fascinating.

Ustādh: Actually, all of them. All of his library chats are aimed at doing that. So the ones that he released today for example (although not all of them) but they are aiming, certainly on masturbation for example, that is a very controversial concept, not just from the *fiqh* point of view, to try to suggest that it is okay or not as *ḥarām* as people might think. So, that does come as a shock. But much more so the socio-political ramification of that and whether we want that to be an option to young people or not.

The differences in parenting and those that have been working incredibly hard to ensure that that does not need to be an option and suddenly it becoming an option versus those who have struggled (regardless of how good or not they are) and it now being there to help them. Because there is no doubt it will help some people. That is a constant. But you have to be critical, especially the people who are claiming to be critical. And frankly Yasir would expect nothing less. Me and him go back and forth at least twice a day or once a day, on average once a day on various issues. Long detail going back especially on investment, especially on 401ks, especially on pensions, etc. Because he knows that he doesn't need yes men. He needs people to challenge his position and he needs to also see that there are other people out there that have a position which is even more well formulated that he might go to etc.

(0:50:00) Let's just finish the evidences of why Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is saying that we make *sajdah* afterwards. He said because when the Prophet ﷺ was praying, he ﷺ prayed five, he ﷺ finishes the prayer. He ﷺ gives *taslīm.*[2,3] He ﷺ finishes the prayer, he ﷺ turns around and he ﷺ says:

إِذَا شَكَّ أَحَدُكُمْ فِي صَلاَتِهِ فَلْيَتَحَرَّ الصَّوَابَ فَلْيُتِمَّ عَلَيْهِ

"When any of you is in doubt about his prayer, he should aim at what is correct."[3]

If one of you has doubt in what he prayed, then let him make *taḥarri*. The best way that I can describe *'taḥarri'* is to have a deep reflection on it and decide what is the correct position.

So, if you are doubting, '*Have I prayed three or have I prayed four?*' Think of what you have recited and now come to the right decision. That right decision is either going to (as you will see a little bit later), '*I don't know so I'm going to assume the lesser to be on the safe side*,' or, '*No. I'm okay. I've actually prayed four so I'm now going to finish off.*' And you are confident. You had some doubt, you thought about it. You had to stop, pause, think about it. You worked it out, now you can move on. This is known as *taḥarri*.

If you are unable to have that confidence, you thought about it and you can't work it out, then the Prophet ﷺ said: Work out where you think you are at, meaning at a base minimum or at least as close to certainty as possible and then build upon that.[9] What that means is that if you are not sure if it's three or four then assume it to be three and then build on top of that.

He ﷺ didn't in this *ḥadīth* indicate when he ﷺ explained what to do when you have doubt about how to pray the *sajdah*. And he ﷺ did not say that do the *sajdah* before the *salām*.

فلما سجد بعد السلام و لم ينبِّه أن محل السجود لهذه الزيادة قبل السلام؛ علم أن السجود للزيادة يكون بعد السلام

He ﷺ did not mention in his explanation, of how to fix a mistake, to make the *sajdah* before the *taslīm*. Rather, he ﷺ then turned around back towards *Qiblah* and he ﷺ went straight down to the *sajdah*. And then he ﷺ gives the *taslīm*. And because he ﷺ doesn't add anything further, and nobody else questions it or says anything, we understand therefore from this incident that we have learned that once you make a mistake and you finish, or once you add and you have finished, then you do the *sajdah* after the *taslīm*. Because that's what Prophet ﷺ did. Because he ﷺ explained: In the future, when you have this problem do this, i.e. fix the prayer by doing this.

As for the *taslīm*, he ﷺ didn't say anything. He ﷺ just went for *sajdah*. So, if you are observing someone explaining something to you. '*Have I prayed five? Okay. Next time when you are praying, if you have doubts, do this, do that*,' etc. And I don't say to you: '*And once you have done that, then do the sajdah before the taslīm. And then say assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*.' I don't say that. But rather, I then finish explaining to you what you need to do and then turn around and then go for the *sajdah*. That's indicating

[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 571 a*.

to you that this is the correct ending, practically I am showing you that this is the correct ending of how to fix the problem. And that is what Ibn Taymiyyah said and that's what some of the *Salaf* said. And that is one of the key arguments that when you add to the prayer [the *sajdat'l-sahw* comes after the *taslīm*].

It's important this part by the way, where we say that he ﷺ didn't talk about this in the future. Because the Ḥanbalis would turn around and say, '*Well hold on! Of course, it's after the taslīm because you only caught the mistake after the taslīm*.

So, the response to that would be: That's true, but then the Prophet ﷺ actually gave instructions of what to happen in the future. And in the future, if it happens again, he ﷺ then should have added 'and do it before the *taslīm*'. But he ﷺ didn't which means that it continues.

The second evidence is the *ḥadīth* of Dhu'l-Yadayn ؓ.[4] This is a Companion who used to be a friend of Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddīq ؓ (a personal friend). Imām al-Bukhāri narrates this *ḥadīth* in the *Book of Ṣalāh*, The Chapter of Crossing the Fingers in the *Masjid* and in Other Places. We said before that Bukhāri is always indicating these little weird things. He's always observing. People are looking for one thing in a *ḥadīth* and Bukhāri is on a whole different planet. We are trying to work out how to do *sajdat'l-sahw* and Bukhāri is looking at what the Prophet ﷺ was doing with his fingers. That's a madness!

This *ḥadīth* is very famous because the Prophet ﷺ prays two *rakʿah* in a *Ẓuhr* or *ʿAṣr* (we still don't know for certain, but it seems like a *Ẓuhr*). He ﷺ prays two *rakʿah* and he ﷺ gives *taslīm*. And he ﷺ immediately (well we don't know if immediately but pretty much immediately) stands up. And he ﷺ starts pacing. One narration says that he ﷺ goes out the door, comes back through another door. In another narration, he ﷺ leant against the pillar. The Companions are all looking at him ﷺ, like, '*What's going on?*' All are quiet, no one is saying anything. And then he is like this [intertwining his fingers and thinking]. He's deep in thought. Thinking, thinking, thinking… And that's why Bukhāri said that this [intertwining the fingers] is something which is allowed to do because, by the way, this as we said in year three or four? This is one of the actions that you are not allowed to do in the prayer.[‡] So, this is an evidence (Bukhāri jumped on this) which shows that it's not because of this [the act of intertwining the fingers], it's the respect of the prayer that's important. As for doing this outside the prayer, it's fine.

What's fascinating is that Dhu'l-Yadayn ؓ, he's like that whole kind of Bedouin type speak up no flaffing about no filter kind of people. You know, they just shout out in the *ṣalāh*. So, he's like, "Has the prayer been reduced or did you forget?"

And the Prophet ﷺ said, "No, the prayer has not been reduced."

[‡] The issue of interlocking the fingers in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression,* Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 4. MT

So Dhu'l-Yadayn ﷺ says, "Okay so you forgot then," just straight out like that. That's a madness!

And then the Prophet ﷺ turns to Abu Bakr ﷺ and says in one narration—maybe in my top five of best narrations—he ﷺ says: "Is what your friend saying true?" Your mate. Not my mate. Is what your mate saying, is that true? "Yes, *yā Rasūl Allāh*. It's true."

(1:00:00) In other narrations, he ﷺ checks with everybody. So this is what convinces me… Certainly this is one single narration, but just people's perception. So, the other Companions are like, "Yeah that's the case, you definitely prayed two. You haven't prayed four."

Anyway, so they told him ﷺ. He ﷺ then jumped straight back into the prayer, completed the prayer, we don't have explicitly exactly how he ﷺ did that, before everyone asks: Did he ﷺ do *takbīrat'l-iḥrām* again?

The answer is no. But we don't have an explicit statement of what he ﷺ physically did or didn't do. Let me just make that clear.

He ﷺ comes back into the prayer, completes it, gives the *taslīm*, then does the two *sajdahs*, then does the *taslīm* again.

And so, what we have now is a very strong evidence. Because in the first one you could say, '*Well, he did sajdat'l-sahw there after the salām, because the prayer is done*.' We'll say, '*Okay. Fair enough*.'

What are you going to say to this *ḥadīth* then?

The Prophet ﷺ went back into the prayer. If he's gone back into the prayer, if it's meant to happen before the *taslīm*, well he ﷺ can do it before the *taslīm*. But he ﷺ didn't. He ﷺ went back into the prayer, and completed it, and now this is a prayer with increases, would you agree? The prayer has been increased. Why has it been increased?

If I pray two *rakʿah* and I exited, and I stand up and do two more, where are the increases?

Student (online): You did extra *salām.*

Ustādh: I did extra *salām*, very good.

Student (online): Sitting.

Student (online): *Tashahhud*.

Student (online): Sitting and *taslīm*

Student (online): *Durūd sharīf*

Ustādh: Sitting, t*ashahhud, taslīm, durūd sharīf,* bare increases. All of these increases have happened, these are therefore additions. So, I still have the chance. If the correct way was to do it before the *salām*, I'd do it. But he ﷺ didn't. He ﷺ completed the two extra *rakʿah* with all the extra additions, and he ﷺ still gave the *salām*.

سلم مرة واحدة: السلام عليكم ورحمة الله، الله أكبر، سبحان ربي الأعلى، الله أكبر، سبحان ربي الأعلى، الله أكبر، السلام عليكم ورحمة الله.

[After completing the missing *rakʿāt*, he ﷺ gave one *taslīm*, said *Allāhu akbar* and went into *sujūd* where he ﷺ said *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*. He ﷺ then came up from *sujūd* into the sitting position while saying *Allāhu akbar*, went back into *sujūd* while saying *Allāhu akbar* and said *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* in *sujūd.* Then he ﷺ came up from *sujūd* into the sitting position while saying *Allāhu akbar*, then gave *taslīm* to the right and *taslīm* to the left].

So that's a devastating evidence to be honest.

وهذا السجود لزيادة السلام في أثناء الصلاة وليس كما يتوهمه بعض الناس سجوده النقص حيث سلم قبل إتمام الصلاة

It's important that this *sajdah* was done because of an increase in action, not because of the decrease of anything. Nothing was decreased here. It was increased. Actions were added to the prayer. And that goes back to the point I was saying at the beginning, that if you're thinking of addition purely in the term of numbers, I did a fifth *rakʿah,* I did a sixth *rakʿah*, or I did four instead of three for *Maghrib*, you're not understanding addition. Addition is adding things when you didn't even intend to add it, but when you step back and think and you count them up, then you've added things to it like the extra *taslīm* that you exited from. That shouldn't have been there. That's an addition to the prayer.

Student (online): In the *ḥadīth* of Dhu'l-Yadayn ؓ did the Prophet ﷺ do *taslīm* on one side only or both before he ﷺ did *sajdat'l-sahw*? Does it clearly state one side only?

Student: Yes, because it says *sallama*. Now, theoretically, you could put an argument forward that when you say *sallama*, this means both. But linguistically of course it doesn't. *Sallama* means that he gave *salām*, so that's single in the Arabic. You could go

all the way around the houses and say *salām* is in principle always two, but that would be weak.

Student (online): And also, *Rasūl Allāh* ﷺ remembered or was told after the prayer?

Ustādh: The Prophet ﷺ was told after the prayer, but he ﷺ had a feeling anyway. We know that he ﷺ had a feeling because he was uneasy.

Student (online): So just to clarify again, are we allowed to give the two *salāms* at the end if you have to do the *sajdat'l-sahw* or is it just the one *salām*?

Ustādh: You are allowed to, but the *sunnah* is one *salām*.

Student (online): But the *ḥadīth* says *sallama* for both before and after *sajdat'l-sahw*.

Ustādh: Two points on this: a number of the narrations of the *ḥadīth* don't mention actually *sallama* after the *sujūd'l-sahw*. Just to put that argument to bed of the word *sallama*. As for those that do, then the principle is going back to the fact that we know that the obligation is only one. This is not a *ḥadīth* that is trying to prove two *salāms*. Remember what we believe. We already believe there's only one *taslīm* to exit from the prayer. The only reason that we add a second *taslīm* is because we know it's from the *Sunnah* to do so from other *ḥadīth*. Those other *ḥadīth* are *ḥadīth* that literally only focus on the *taslīm*. Now when the *taslīm* is an afterthought and irrelevant (not irrelevant, but not the focus) then you're going to get very vague or very general references to it.

So yeah, it does actually only say 'only one'. And that would be fine if you did only one.

Let me just finish off the final part because there's another evidence. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn wanted to do textual evidences, so he's done two (textual evidences) based upon *naṣ*. Third he wants to give an *ʿaqli* evidence, a logical evidence.

So, he says number three on the top of page 342. He says that an increase (any increase) is going to be an increase in the prayer. And the *sujūd* is an increase as well (the *sujūd'l-sahw*). So, it is from the wisdom or from the beauty of this act, that it is delayed until after the prayer so that we do not end up just willy-nilly increasing the prayer. You know, add *another* increase to the prayer. We've already messed it up by adding a *salām*, we already added… Why are we adding a *sujūd* into the mix as well?

Now this is an *ʿaqli* evidence, which you might think doesn't make sense because later on we're going to allow the *sajdah* before the *taslīm*. But that's where you would be wrong. We are only allowing it in scenarios where there are no already increases. So, it is not adding to the increase problem.

So anyway, that's an *ʿaqli* evidence. It's not meant to be the strongest of evidences. But his point is that the *sujūd* is an actual increase. So, if it's an increase then let's not take it to a different level.

(1:10:00) I hope everybody understands the point that they are making. It's a very good point. They're saying if the *ḥadīth* states *sallama thumma sajada thumma sallama*… This translates as: he ﷺ gave one *salām*—this is technically what it says—he ﷺ gave one *salām* then he ﷺ prostrated. By the way, the text of the *ḥadīth* (most versions) didn't say two prostrations. "And then he ﷺ gave one *salām*."

So, the question is: If that is what the text says, how do we not know that it wasn't two?

Student (online): Basically, the evidence for one *taslīm* does not seem so *sarīḥ*.

Ustādh: Of course it is not *ṣarīḥ*.

The issue is that it is not *sarīḥ* in the second part because it doesn't need to be. But for the first part, it needs to be clear about whether you have to wait for the first or not.

Now I want to say to you, before you go to a textual argument your *uṣūl* would automatically push you towards when a person is in a problem, or in a mistake scenario, they do not have the time to be flaffing about.

What is fluffing about?

Flaffing about is a disrespectful phrase obviously, but it means in non-obligatory stuff. So, the classic example is praying *ṣalāt al-Fajr* late. If you are praying *ṣalāt al-Fajr* late and sunrise is about to occur, you know that you have to at least get one *rakʿah* done (*sajdah* and stand back up), before the sun starts to rise. If a person is in that first *rakʿah*, this is not the time to start reciting *Sūrat al-Nabaʾ*—as much as I am loving your connection with the Quran. But you have 30-40 seconds or one minute, or let's even say you have three minutes. So, you have plenty of time to go for *rukūʿ*, go for *sajdah* and then stand back up. I'm not even giving the thirty second example. You are not going to be taking your time and reciting. No. This is disrespect. This is not understanding priorities which is why the scholars, the *fuqahāʾ*, said that the first *rakʿah* is done quickly. There is no *sunnah*, and *istiḥbāb*, and enjoying yourself, and second, and optionals. You focus on the obligations. Once you get into the second *rakʿah*, now you slow back down. Now you start to bring the *istiḥbāb* and start reciting long, because as you know a person who is praying through sunrise after having completed a complete *rakʿah* before, that person is allowed [to continue praying as the sun rises].[§]

Student (online): This goes for all prayers which are about to expire, yes?

[§] When the prayer has been caught was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 4, Chapter 15, Lesson 8, and Year 5, Chapter 15, Lesson 9. MT

Ustādh: Correct. This goes for all prayers that are about to expire.

Student (online): Wouldn't you try to hurry and finish the full two *rakʿah* in the three minutes?

Ustādh: That's the point. You wouldn't. This is exactly the point. You need to get your minimum done and then the *sunnah* is to pray the second one properly because the reason for prohibition is not applicable if you start the prayer beforehand. The reason for prohibition is the starting of the prayer in the prohibited time. Once you have started the prayer and completed the complete *rakʿah* before the prohibition time starts, you carry on with your prayer properly, unless there are other time restrictions etc.

Likewise, if you know that you have made a mistake in your prayer (if not all of the schools of *fiqh*, then certainly the majority will say to you), if you know you've made a mistake, you know you need to fix it, to allow myself to fix it with the *sujūdʾl-sahw* which has to happen after the *taslīm* I need to jump straight into the *sajdatʾl-sahw*. To be delaying it, even for one second, does not fit with the principle of *Sharīʿah*. I know that one *salām* is obligatory—that's the exit. We know that all of the scholars are not even wanting you to be talking and they're measuring the time afterwards and it's super restricted. So, after you have exited the prayer, they want you to immediately fix the problem, not to be chilling.

Like Imām al-Nawawi said for example, in the *Janāzah* prayer he said it's not legislated to recite a *sūrah* because it's actually an obligation to quicken the prayer. And so the general obligation applies to the internal components of the prayer as well. So here my point is that you have an obligatory act that needs to be done which is to do *sujūdʾl-sahw*. And it is also obligatory to do it quickly. Therefore, as all the scholars said, that one should hurry up and get it done. You wouldn't delay it. You wouldn't unnecessarily delay even if by just this.

Now you might say, '*Well hold on! It's only one second.*' The point is that the scholars here will afterwards start counting in seconds by the way.

So, once you say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, whether you're sitting there or not. Just so that you understand, from a legal point of view, when you say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, if you were to just literally like this:

(1) Saying the *taslīm* [then immediately getting up and walking off, then returning a moment later and continue by saying], *Allāhu akbar* [and going into *sujūd*]… or,

(2) Saying *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the right and pausing for a moment], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the left and pausing for a moment before saying], *Allāh akbar* [and going into the *sujūdʾl-sahw*].

From a *Sharīʿah* perspective these two are the same.

You've delayed or done other things that were not necessary or paused you and stopped you from doing the obligation. Now you're going to see if you read through the notes that are coming that when you go off now, every second that you spend, every word that you utter, is going to determine whether you have the right to even fix this prayer or not. And according to a subjective scale (which we're going to come to) if you are delaying too much, then the prayer is invalidated you have to pray the whole prayer again.

So that's just a simple principle that I'm trying to explain, (1) that one does not 'waste time' in recommended matters when there's an obligatory action that needs to be done, (2) back to the point about the wording of *ḥadīth*, *ḥadīth* have primary roles, each *ḥadīth* have fundamental functions.

Student: (online): I'm not sure what the issue is, it's obligatory to give one *taslīm* which exits the prayer and then you have *sajdat'l-sahw* to fix the prayer, why would you move onto a recommended matter?

Ustādh: That's what I've just proven and there's no doubt about that. But what they're saying is: What's the evidence from the narrations that he ﷺ didn't do that? Because if
(1:20:00) you say the word *sallama* (that means one) and if the word occurs twice, he ﷺ *sallama* (he ﷺ gave *salām*) then did two *sajdahs* and then *sallama*, what does that mean then?

I'm saying that the statement of second *sallama* could either mean both, because that's the understood thing to be done in that position, or not a problem it also means one because that's what's obligatory. So, I don't know what's actually too difficult to understand that. But they weren't happy with that answer. Which is fair enough.

The other point I'm trying to make is the principle of not going to recommended matters, which again is neither here nor there.

The third point I want to make which is important for everybody to realise is (these are very important actually that you're thinking like this, this is good) that *ḥadīth* are not talking about the details of positions all the time. And you have to use basic assumed rules from before. So, that's why I am very comfortable (as the majority) of when they see: *sallama thumma sajada sajdatayn thumma sallama*, that they're giving the first *salām* only one *taslīm* meaning and the second one two, even though the word is the same because of what's understood from previous *ḥadīth*. And it doesn't need to specify this because this *ḥadīth* is not meant to be focusing on the nature of the *taslīm* but rather of the location of the *sujūd'l-sahw*. And that happens all the time in the *Sunnah* especially when it comes to the prayer and the *arkān*.

When the *ḥadīth* that we all remember, the most important *ḥadīth* which establishes the obligations of the prayer or the *arkān* of the prayer, is the *ḥadīth* of the one who

erred in the prayer.[10] That *ḥadīth* doesn't mention so many obligations in the prayer because its aim was not to focus on the obligations. It just focuses on *ṭuma'nīnah* and *rukūʿ* and *sujūd* and so on so forth.

Q & A

Q (online): There is *ikhtilāf* on what is *mustaḥabb* here, one *taslīm* or two *taslīm*?

A: Of course, *ikhtilāf* on whether you do two or not, it is one absolutely. We're obviously supporting our position.

Q (online): The only thing I can think of is by not doing both *salām* before, it is some way of indicating you are still semi within the *ṣalāh* and not completely out of it... then your two indicate complete closure.

A: No. That's incorrect. Completely in correct. That's the great thing about a legal position, it's either this or that. There's no thought possible to be thinking you're either out of it or not. The second one in the Ḥanbali school, in the majority of scholars, is a recommended one. You are exited after the first one.

Q (online): Are there any specific lectures that we should avoid?

A: No. I'm not a fan of this approach. I'm a fan of people being paranoid about everything controversial and having good people around them and having teachers and sitting with teachers and being humble enough to always be accepting to be challenged and humble enough to be able to assume that your teacher is wrong. I say a lot of things, most of it could be wrong. Most of it probably is wrong. Who knows? You need to be studying elsewhere. I don't like the idea of avoiding. I think that there's lots of benefit for people out there. I think people need to just make themselves stronger, that their filters should be stronger.

Q (online): Where are these lectures available?

A: If you are talking about Yasir's one they are on his YouTube channel. Like I said, it is so important. We have spoken a lot about him for 25 minutes just chatting about him. You have to understand I find it problematic lots of stuff that he does, we go back and forth on it. Just yesterday we were speaking about it, I said that is a disaster that is

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: The Order of the Prophet ﷺ. to a Person Who Did Not Perform His Bowing Perfectly That He Should Repeat His Prayer, ḥadīth no. 793.*

rubbish don't say that again. And he said I'm not going to do that again, that was a mistake. He knows and other times he doesn't.

And I said to him if you want to open the thing for discussion to critique you have to stick to areas that do not have consequences. No one is stepping on people for critical thinking. We need that a lot more. 100%. However, I also hate that people censor things. That is a disaster censoring. The only people who should be doing censoring are absolute basic Joes, basic, basic Muslims who don't have teachers or will not go back to other people but are just going to listen to one lecture and take it. But this is the worst form of learning Islam possible. And it would be so disrespectful that I would assume anyone on this portal would be thinking like that.

You are all educated people, you should always be criticising everything that you study. Just like I said, most of you all quiet just assuming it, some students were like, '*Hold on! That doesn't make sense.*' I don't like that. That is what you are meant to do. That is the whole point of this class is. You are meant to think for yourself and have confidence in yourself and you are either right or you're wrong. But the whole process is a learning process. That has got to be the aim. Otherwise, it is a waste of my time if it is just If I just have a bunch of sheep telling you to move here and there.

Q (online): Yesterday I was praying *'Ishā'* and forgot to do *tashahhud* in the fourth *rakʿah* I only realised when I was in my two *sunnah* then went and repeated my four *farḍ*. Is that right?

A: I will say this much, that there would be a small minority of scholars that will say it is okay for you to try and fix that. But there is no doubt that what you did is better. And I would have done what you did. And I will explain why later in class, because we have not come to that section. But what you did is the right thing, to repeat the prayer because it is not fixable, because too much time has gone by, you have entered into a whole different act of worship, time has gone by. It's too late. You have to repeat the prayer. I would have done exactly what you did.

Q (online): In the second evidence does it mention whether the Prophet ﷺ did *dhikr* after praying the two *rakʿah* or did he ﷺ stand straight up after he exited the prayer?

A: No. None of the versions of the *ḥadīth* as far as I know mention he ﷺ did *dhikr*.

Q (online): If I finish a four *rakʿah ṣalāh* praying three *rakʿah* and remember after the *taslīm* then should I make it up by praying one more *rakʿah* and *sajdatʾl-sahw*?

A: Praying one more *rakʿah* and then giving the *salām* and then doing *sajdatʾl-sahw* and then giving two *salāms.* That's what you should do.

Q (online): So, if I have it right, in the *Ḥanbali madhhab*, for every *ziyādah* in the *ṣalāh*, you do *sajdah* after the *salām*?

A: No. In the Ḥanbali *madh-hab*, the *ziyādah* in the *ṣalāh*, when you do a *ziyādah* you do it before the *taslīm*. It is our taught position. This is I think one of the *riwāyāt i*n the Ḥanbali school. I seem to remember it. But regardless, this is the position of Ibn Taymiyyah (the one that we are talking about) and other scholars as well, that it is after. The **class position** is not the Ḥanbali position.

Q (online): What shall I do if I finished my prayer and I only remember much later or even a couple of prayers later that I've done a mistake added or reduced in that particular prayer?

A: So, depending upon the mistake or the reduction (well the reduction obviously), depending upon the mistake that you added, you have to repeat the prayer. It's too late. We are going to come to that.

Q (online): What if you have done *tasbīḥ* twice in *sujūd* instead of three?

A: That is fine because remember we said that only one *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* is obligatory. The rest are all *sunnah*.

Q (online): What is the Ḥanbali response to the second evidence?

A: I have no idea. I don't know. Nayeem what is the Ḥanbali response to the second evidence to the *ḥadīth* of Dhu'l-Yadayn ﷺ of two *rakʿah*?

(1:30:00) Q (online): The obligation of washing hands after waking up is it for nighttime sleep only or for any every time you sleep?

A: The scholars (if we take the position of obligation) is because it's a deep sleep, and in deep sleep your hands are all over the place so that's why, but not normal naps and things like that. In principle.

Q (online): Criticising food is *makrūh.* My notes say so. But transcribed notes don't mention that.

A: It's not good definitely,

Q (online): If love and fear are two aspects of *ʿibādah*, where do we put hope in the equation?

A: Love is hope. Love is what builds hope. So, that's that.

Nayeem (online): I remember hearing that Imām Aḥmad explicit *riwāyah* is that he did not give a blanket *fatwa* for *sajdatʾl-sahw*, rather he suggested we need to act on every single *ḥadīth* which is found on *sajdatʾl-sahw*. And it is hardcore.

Ustādh: And it is hardcore. As I said, I don't know if you were there in the beginning, but like I said as far as I know there is a consensus of the scholars of the people of knowledge that one's rectification of the prayer, one's performing of *sujūdʾl-sahw*, is accepted whether if done before and after. And that is a great relief to students. So, you don't need to worry too much. For the advanced students though, and certainly the students on this portal, 100% you should be aware and choose a position. You either chose the Ḥanbali school position, which is what we are doing as we are going through, or the class position, which is whatever we decide, and we try to convince ourselves of it intellectually. If you are convinced you choose it, if you aren't you go with it.

Q (online): If you realise that you're in your fifth *rakʿah*, you have to immediately sit down, per what was said earlier. If you are reciting at that moment, do you need to complete the *ayah*, or at least the sentence (assuming you understand the grammar/meaning)?

A: No. You have to sit down immediately. That second. Whatever you are doing you have to immediately sit down. If you are adding to the prayer and you realise that, it is *ḥarām* to continue on that act intentionally.

Q (online): Similarly, when the imām makes the *takbīr* for *rukūʿ*, should you complete at least the sentence you are reciting? This situation comes up all the time.

A: Yes, you should, based on your understanding of how long it will take to complete the sentence. No imām says *Allāhu akbar*, *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah* [without a pause]. So, you know you have at least five seconds. You have to make a judgment call. It is not correct to intentionally allow to do that, to miss it. But it's not an absolute rule. If you know it's going to be a quick one or you know you are on a long *ayah,* you have to break it. 100% have to break the *ayah* and go into *rukūʿ*. That's the basic principle. But you know that something can be completed then it's okay to continue 1-2 seconds.

Q (online): Question from previous years, if praying with shoes on it is very difficult to do right foot *manṣūb*, toes in. What is best?

A: So, we know that all of *naṣb* and *iftirāsh* and *tawarruk*, are all *sunnah* acts. So, it is completely fine for the person [to not do these]. The shoe, by the way (this is an important point) depending on the shoe. If I am wearing trainers, then I am doing full. If I am wearing pointy shoes then pointy shoes are not even moving, are they? So, it's only going to be the point that's going to be on the floor. That touching of the point of the shoe is an extension of your foot so *naṣb* is performed regardless. And if it is a trainer, then you try to get as much grip down. And if you didn't and it was just touching even in the trainer it's still fine. It is *mustaḥabb* anyway, as I said.

Q (online): You mentioned Shaykh Yasir Qadhi talking about that minority opinion regarding masturbation isn't healthy generally for the socio-political scenario.

A: Well, I personally think that, but I don't believe in it so strongly that I want to say it is unhealthy for the socio-political scenario. But I personally don't think so. But I want you to understand that it's an issue which can definitely have an impact upon the socio-political reality and when it can and it is so variable, we have to be careful. Just like as I was saying, you have to be careful in bringing up issue that have *imān* issues like the Qurʾān catastrophe. That was a disaster and an embarrassment, and he knows that very well. Even though his intention was the same for Ismāʿīl/Isḥāq, was same for the Qurʾān, look how different the consequences. It just shows how perilous the whole game is.

Q (online): You mentioned something similar in the recent online *Protect This House*. Was it different because that was the subject of the course?

A: No, no. In the class I was teaching the fact that it exists, and it can be used. Now, wording has to be very careful. His wording was, "We have plenty of *athār* from early scholars which either mildly disapproved or considered permissible. And given the sexual promiscuity rampant in our times, it is definitely the lesser of two evils to allow this for those who are struggling and single."

This opening paragraph, for me is very problematic. And it reflects what I said, when you have a socio-political reality that is waiting for facts, the language that you state is going to have a consequence in that social scene. When you choose to use the word 'mildly' and 'definitely the lesser of the two evils' even though it's obviously nothing compared to *zina*, obviously. However, there are other ways of putting that forward that doesn't put it into the minds of people that, '*Well, if I'm not going to…*' That's my point. That's the issue. Now when you are studying in a class and you are going through it, you're putting the scenarios out there and you are stating it.

Listen. It's not *ḥarām* what he did. I am just saying I didn't like the language. And in the class you have context and you can control it. When you go into the public it's... To be honest, I also see the argument for it. I mean the situation is a bad problem out there. It's very, very different. Every generation is suffering a very different problem. When

we were young, we would've been as bad as the generation right now. We just didn't have access. You'd have to go and purchase magazines from shops, embarrassment, blah, blah, blah. You have to understand the reality of accessibility. It's ridiculous what a phone does. It's the nightmare of all nightmares.

Q (online): Once I was following an imām in a *jamāʿah* who prayed the whole *ṣalāh* again after he was told he prayed five *rakʿah* for *Ẓuhr*. I understand from class this was the wrong thing to do, or is it a *madh-hab* difference of opinion? Should he have just gone back into prayer to do only *sajdatʾl-sahw*?

A: Yeah, Paks are a bit crazy on that. It is a Pak thing. They do mad ones. Like for example, you would often be in a Pak *masjid* in *Tarāwīḥ,* and they would have made a mistake… Oh my God it's murder praying *Tarāwīḥ* in a Pak *masjid* man. They made one mistake in the *ayah* and they didn't catch it then and they tell him afterwards. And he makes him read the whole section again. Like it had to be read in a section. Madness! Or do the whole prayer again.

8. Chapter 20 Lesson 3: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

(0:08:45) We are on page 342 of *al-Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ*, the commentary.

وإن زاد ركعة فلم يعلم حتى فرغ منها سجد، وإن علم فيها جلس في الحال فَتَشَهَّد إن لم يَكُنْ تَشَهَّدَ وسجد وسَلَّم، وإن سَبَّحَ به ثقتان فأصَرَّ، و لم يَجْزِمْ بصواب نفسه بطلتْ صلاتُهُ وصلاة من تبعه عالماً، لا جاهلاً أو ناسياً، ولا من فارقه

If one adds an extra unit and only realises after they exit the prayer, they simply perform the prostration. If they realise (during the prayer), they are to immediately sit down, perform the *tashahhud* if they haven't already done so, perform the prostration for forgetfulness, and then offer the *taslīm*.

The immediate thing that you'll notice right there is that the Ḥanbali position (we kind of discussed it earlier on) is indicating that the *sajdah* is before the *taslīm*. We'll come back to that in a second.

So:

وإن علم فيها

So, he is in the prayer. He basically realises that he has added a *rakʿah*. He is in *Fajr* for example, and whilst he's in *Fajr* he has done two, suddenly he gets up for the third. He is in *Ẓuhr*, he is doing four he then suddenly stands up to do five. He realises.

في حال علمه، ولا يتأخَّر حتى لو ذَكَرَ في أثناء الرُّكوع أن هذه الرَّكعة خامسة يجلس

It doesn't matter where he is or where she is in that extra unit—they're in the middle of *Fātiḥah*, they are in the *rukūʿ*, they are standing up in the process, or moving down into *rukūʿ* in the process—whatever the situation, they will immediately sit down. Immediately.

So, the simple principle is that whenever you increase in the prayer then you have to immediately stop. Because the second you realise it and you then continue, at that moment you're doing it intentionally. And an intentional increase on the prayer, which is a divine act of worship which has been specified by Allāh ﷻ, is not only *ḥarām* (if you break it down into its kind of component parts), but it absolutely invalidates the prayer. Without a shadow of a doubt. Logically, if you think about it that makes a lot of sense.

And, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn mentions that some mistakes some people make is that they think that you should do what happens when you stand up after you miss the *tashahhud*—the first one.

So, let me just go back. You know in some scenarios you're praying *Ẓuhr* and you're in your second *rakʿah* and you're in *sajdah* and you finish your *sajdah* and instead of sitting down for the *tashahhud* you actually stand up and you forget. This is a unique scenario which we have covered before. But simply put, what is happening here is not the addition of an extra *rakʿah* [you have missed an obligation]. In the case where you miss an obligation, it is not allowed to go back to that obligation. And so you continue in the prayer ignoring it intentionally, and then you do the *sajdat'l-sahw* at the end. That is for the obligations.

The mistake that many students make is that when you add a *rakʿah* and stood up for the fifth *rakʿah*, for example in *Ẓuhr*, or the fifth in *ʿAṣr*, or the fifth in *ʿIshāʾ*, or the third in *Fajr*, or the fourth in *Maghrib* because, '*Now I've 'started' I need to continue*.'

What did Magnus Magnusson (Mastermind) used to say? '*I've started, so I'll finish*.'

That is the principle when it comes to the missing an obligation. But it's not the same principle when you add an extra *rakʿah*. And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn makes a point of it that don't make that mistake they are not the same. Once you have added a *rakʿah*, once you have gone into a completely new unacceptable zone, then you have to sit down immediately wherever you are in the prayer. It is *ḥarām* to continue in fact and obligatory to sit down immediately, to not allow the new extra continuation. That's invalidation. It's intentional as well.

Shaykh then also says:

فَتَشَهَّد إن لم يَكُنْ تَشَهَّدَ

One performs the *tashahhud* if they haven't already done so.

Shaykh asks a question: Is it possible to be doing a *tashahhud*? How does that statement make sense? He sits down and he does the *tashahhud* if he has not already done *tashahhud*.

وهل يمكن أن يزيد بعد أن يتشهَّد؟

Is it possible that a person can pray extra after the *tashahhud*? What do you think?

Student (online): If for example you missed *tashahhud'l-awwal*, stood up, then realised then sat back down?

Ustādh: No.

Who can think of the example?

Student (online): If you pray four believing you've only prayed two, so have sat the second *tashahhud* believing it to be the first *tashahhud* and continue to a fifth *rakʿah*.

Ustādh: Well done. You got it spot on.

(0:20:00) So it is basically you are praying *Ẓuhr* and you have finished your entire prayer and you have done the *tashahhud* and you are about to read *durūd sharīf* for example, and at that moment you suddenly think (because you know the mind goes into autopilot and you finish the *tashahhud*), '*I've prayed two*.' So that person what he's done is that he's reached that mental kind of autopilot where he finishes the *tashahhud* and he thinks, '*This is the second rakʿah,*' he's actually prayed four. And then he stands up to pray the fifth.

That is the example that is in the notes. That is the classic example. So, you have actually prayed four, you think that suddenly, '*I've only done two*,' you stand up. When you are standing up you realise, *'Hold on! I've already been up here four times. I am in my fifth*.' And so, at that moment you have to sit right down immediately. And then what do you do?

You now complete the prayer.

Now what does complete the prayer mean?

If you have already done the *tashahhud* then you start reading *durūd sharīf*. You don't now sit down and say, '*Right! I am now sitting down, I am in a fresh position, and so I say al-taḥiyyāt all the way and then Allāhumma ṣalli ʿala Muḥammad*.' No.

You stood up at *ʿabduhu wa rasūluh,* you finished the *tashahhud*, or you finished the first part of the *tashahhud*, or… depending upon when you stood up. And by the way, even if you had said all the *duʿāʾ* and you finished the [*durūd sharīf*] and you are just about to say [*taslīm*]… You know mentally this can happen because you are now into that period of silence, that silent pause just before you say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh.* And it is that silence which throws you, theoretically. The silence you think, '*Ah! This is the silence of when I am meant to stand up*,' and so you stand up. And now if you did stand up, that means you have prayed everything except the *taslīm*. So in this scenario you would sit straight down after you have realised that you have prayed extra (you have already recited everything that needs to be recited while sitting down) and then you would give the *taslīm* to exit the prayer and then make the *sajdah*, as is about to come up.

Just to carry on with this, if you were sitting down after coming up from the *sajdah* and you had not started [*tashahhud*] but you are sitting there and then you think '*Oh! I've only done three here*,' and you stand up and as you stand up you start *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* and you realise, '*Hold on! This is my fifth*.' You then sit down immediately and then you would start [*tashahhud*] because you haven't recited that which is required.

Student: What if you were near *taslīm* and you thought maybe you did three *rakʿah* and you stand up, then you remember you did four? So, then you sit and just do *taslīm*?

Ustādh: That is right. That is exactly what I just described now. You stand up, realise that you are now doing a fifth, then you sat back down. And because you have prayed everything, then you just make the *taslīm*.

Student (online): I thought *durūd* was *wājib* in the Ḥanbali *madh-hab*.

Ustādh: *Durūd sharīf* being *wājib* has nothing to do with this.

Student (online): Even if you have started the *Fātiḥah* in the fifth *rakʿah*, do you need to complete it before sitting down?

Ustādh: Yes. That is the whole point. He comes down immediately.

The Shaykh then says that in the Ḥanabli school (as we said last week), every time there is a mistake you do the *sajdah* before the *taslīm*, before you say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh.* That is always the case unless you learn your mistake after the prayer, then it is too late anyway. So, they say that by definition you are going to pray after afterwards.

He says: As for us, we go with what we think is stronger, which is also chosen by Ibn Taymiyyah, also the position of many of the scholars. It is referenced in the Ḥanbali *fiqh*

book *al-Inṣāf* that any time you increase on the prayer, then you will do the *sajdah* after the *salām*.[1] So, that is the first point.

Student (online): So, if it is within the *ṣalāh* and not something at the end like the last *tashahhud*, it's a matter of perspective then? You see it as either missing an obligation or doing an addition?

Ustādh: No. Why is the last *tashahhu*d not in the *ṣalāh*? I don't understand that. What is the difference between the two? In the *ṣalāh* means before the *taslīm*.

Student (online): What if the increase is not adding a fifth *rakʿah* but some other increases?

Ustādh: Give some examples of increase.

Student (online): For example: extra *sujūd*, not remembering if he did one or two but accidentally did three in the first *rakʿah*.

Ustādh: In terms of increase we covered some last week. We said that if there is a mistake and you are trying to fix it that is going to lead to an automatic addition. It means every single type of addition. It just doesn't mean an extra *rakʿah*. Let me just make that clear.

Every time there is an addition to the prayer, three *sujūd* for example, x, y, z.

Student (online): What if you read three *rakʿah* before the first *tashahhud*?

Ustādh: It doesn't matter. Whenever you add something to the prayer in any of the *rakʿāt*, it doesn't just have to be standing up for the fifth one, the rule is the same in terms of the *sajdah*. We are going to come to the section soon about what you do in terms of prayer.

Student (online): Every addition, does that apply only to obligatory matters? E.g. *rafʿ al-yadayn*

Ustādh: It is referring to actual obligations or *arkān* of the prayer. It doesn't include the *sunan*.

(0:30:00) And depending upon the nature of the addition, the reaction to the rest of the prayer will differ each time. But it is really simple. Actually, addition is the easiest of all of the problems. It's missing out which causes a bit of a difficulty, which we are going to come to.

So addition. Every single time you add any single significant movement, which is

[1] As referenced in *Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ala Zād al-Mustaqniʿ*, Volume 3, page 343, footnote 2. MT

basically one from the structure of the prayer, from the obligations, or from the *arkān*, then you will have to do *sajdat'l-sahw* at the end. And the other condition is that you must stop the act when you realise it (the addition). So for example, you were in the first *rakʿah*, then you went for *sajdah*, then you went for second *sajdah*, then you went for third *sajdah* and before you have said anything you realise you are in the third, you immediately get up from it.

If for example you are in the first *rakʿah* and you do two *sajdah*, and instead of standing up you sat down to read *tashahhud* and you started. You stand up immediately mid-*tashahhud* because this is an addition to the prayer doing an obligation in its wrong place, stand straight up.

Every addition at any stage, whether you add an action or whether you add an entire unit, all of it results in two things: (1) stopping that thing immediately and carrying on with what is necessary in the prayer, and (2) to do *sajdat'l-sahw* at the end of the prayer after the *taslīm*. Simple.

Student (online): This wouldn't invalid the prayer (if you have done three *sujūd*)?

Ustādh: No action invalidates the prayer as long as you do these two things. If you don't do these two things like I said at the beginning of the lesson, if you carry on in that action, so that third *sajdah* you say, '*Well I am here now. I might as well finish it off*,' you invalidate the prayer.

So again, I said that it is two conditions. Whenever you add something you must stop it if you realise it. If you do not realise it, that does not matter. You have forgotten anyway.

Student (online): If I start *tashahhud* after one *sajdah*, can I consider it either a missed *rukn* or an addition of *tashahhud*?

Ustādh: No. If you start a *tashahhud* after one *sajdah*, you have added a *tashahhud*.

Now Shaykh says: Let's look at a scenario. He says: If you stand up for a third *rakʿah* in the *Fajr* prayer, what do you need to do?

You have to immediately sit down. He says whether that is in the *qirāʾah*, whether that is in the *rukūʿ*, you sit down immediately and you read your *tashahhud*. That is based upon the assumption you did not read the *tashahhud*. When it says in *fiqh* text:

فقام إلى الثالثة

When someone "stands up for a third", that phrase means that after *sajdah* he stood up. It does not mean that he did it after the *tashahhud*. So, the question I am asking is: What if a person stands up to do a third *rakʿah* in the *Fajr* prayer?

Then as soon as he realises he sits back down, he does his *tashahhud* then he says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, then he goes down to do *sajdat'l-sahw* (two of them), and then says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*. This is based upon the position of the majority, which is that it is afterwards i.e. you do the *sajdat'l-sahw* afterwards.

According to the Ḥanbali school, you do it before, before the [*taslīm*].

Student (online): Just for clarity, if you have said the *tashahhud*, stood up for the third, realised it is the fifth then you would sit down, and start from *ṣalawāt'l-Ibrāhīmiyyah* then do *sajdat'l-sahw* then *taslīm,* according to al-Ḥajjāwi. But the class position is that we would do the *sajdat'l-sahw* after *taslīm*.

Ustādh: Correct. That is the Ḥanbali school, that is according to al-Hajjāwi. According to our **class position** it is start from *ṣalawāt'l-Ibrāhīmiyyah* then do all your *duʿā'* and everything, then say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*. Then do *sajdat'l-sahw* (two) and then say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the right]*, assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the left]. That is Shayk al-ʿUthaymīn's position, Ibn Taymiyyah's position, **class position**. The Ḥanbali school is exactly what he has said above.

Student (online): Just to clarify-after the two *sajdah*, it is two *taslīms*?

Ustādh: Correct.

So that is the *Fajr* example.

Listen to this one, this is even better. This is very nice. Shaykh says:

مسألة :إذا قام إلى ثالثة في صلاة مقصورة، أي :رَجُلٌ مسافر قام إلى ثالثة، والثالثة في حَقِّ المسافر زيادة، فهل يلزمه الرُّجوع في هذه الحال، أو له أن يكمل؟

Situation: What if a person stands up for a third in a prayer that has been shortened? So, you are a *musāfir*, you are praying *Ẓuhr* or *ʿAṣr* or whatever.

Student (online): Can you increase to four?

Ustādh: So actually, only one person is saying that you carry on or increase to four. And then you have got others who are saying same thing. The same thing means sit down. So good we have got 50-50.

Student (online): So, your intention is to shorten but you go over your number of *rakʿāt*?

Ustādh: Correct. That is exactly what just happened.

The answer to this is based upon how you understand *qaṣr*. So, the *qaṣr* prayer according to the Ḥanafis is an obligation. To shorten itself is obligatory.

Student (online): Your *niyyah* was to do two?

Ustādh: Your *niyyah* is to do two regardlesss. You know it is *Ẓuhr* prayer, you know I am a *musāfir,* and when you are a *musāfir, Ẓuhr* becomes two*.* So, you started off with two.

Now you stand up after the *tashahhud* to do the third because you forgot you are a *musāfir* and you are going into autopilot. So, you are about to pray the third *rakʿah*. What you do now depends upon how you understand the prayer.

According to the literalists which is the *Ẓāhiri* school, according to the Ḥanafi school, then *qaṣr* itself is obligatory.

Student (online): So, if it's *wājib* for you, going back is *wājib*. If it is *sunnah*, you can continue (so long as you do it in two units)?

Ustādh: Exactly as he has summarised it. So, if it is *wājib* for you to do *qaṣr* then going back is *wājib*. So, you have to sit down immediately and do *sajdatʾl-sahw* as per normal. If it is *sunnah* (the *qaṣr*), which it is according to the vast majority of scholars, then you can continue.

Student (online): So, do not carry on and finish four but if we do it's no big deal.

Ustādh: Absolutely correct. You do not have to but you are allowed to.

It is optional for him to either continue because if you continue and you pray four, you have not invalidated your prayer. And if you go back and sit back down again and pray two *rakʿah* (just complete the two *rakʿah* because that is what you intended) then that is also something which is your option.

By the way, if you sat back down again, you would have to then do *sajdatʾl-sahw.*

(0:40:00) What is better is to stay seated because that is what he intended, and he carries on with what he has intended. That is certainly my position. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn indicates that this is the position of Ibn Taymiyyah.

Student (online): But then how do we explain the *niyyah*? Because your *niyyah* was two in the first place.

Ustādh: So, continuing for four according to these scholars is permissible because he has not increased on the prayer in its legislation, meaning in its creation. He has increased on his *niyyah* which as he is saying would be a problem—you've gone against your *niyyah*. You have prayed separate to your *niyyah*.

However, we know that in the *Sharīʿah*, in *fiqh* especially and in *ṣalāh* especially, the changing of the *niyyah* is a flexible one. Especially when it comes to prayer, especially when it comes to when changing from x to y, especially when it comes to changing from small to better. So, when the Prophet ﷺ prayed alone then Ibn ʿAbbās ؓ joined and he ﷺ increased it to *jamāʿah niyyah*, that is an extra reward of the prayer.[2] Some of the scholars mentioned that. I'm just saying that when it comes to changing the *niyyah*, there is a lot more leniency—obviously it's not good, there's no doubt about that. But there is leniency when the change that you make 'increases' the size, length, quality of the prayer. Obviously, you cannot increase it to something which does not exist. You cannot increase it to five, or a six, or an eight for example.

And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn gives that example. He says that the problem with the Ḥanafi school is that when they are sitting down for their *Ẓuhr* (two) and they stand up, if they stood up and remained standing up to finish off four *rakʿāt* (so they did three and then four, and you're a Ḥanafi) this is like you invalidating your prayer by praying eight for *Ẓuhr* as opposed to four. That is the consequence of considering, *qaṣr* (shortening the prayer) as obligation.

Whereas the Ḥanbalis, and the Mālikis, and the Shāfiʿiyyah and Awzāʿi and so and so forth, they considered the *qaṣr* to be *sunnah*. Therefore, you are not obligated. Therefore, the only 'problem' of standing up and continuing with the third and fourth if you forgot and you stood up, is the fact that you changed your *niyyah* from something which is a *sunnah* to do and the *aṣl* actually is four. So, the better, original prayer in one way is four, but you have been given permission to pray two. You decided not to, so you return to the *aṣl* which is four. Which is why they don't say it is *ḥarām* to continue.

However, if you ask them all what is better to do? I don't know about *all* actually, but Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn certainly takes that position. And I certainly take that position and it is the **class position**, that if you stood up for the third or whatever whilst praying *qaṣr* (because we don't believe it to be obligatory), you should sit back down and carry on and complete that prayer in line with your *niyyah*. In this scenario, in these two *rakʿah* (the one that you stood up and then sat back down again), you would say

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Ablutions, Chapter: to Perform a Light Ablution, ḥadīth no. 138.*

assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh [once to the right], *Allāhu akbar*, do two *sajdah* and then *taslīm* and that's it. That is the **class position**.

Student (online): So, don't carry on and finish four. But if we do, it's no big deal.

Ustādh: Correct. Don't carry on and finish four. Sit back down, that is better. If you carry on, no big deal.

By the way, I just want to say that if I carried on and did four, I would also do *sajdat'l-sahw*. I would. Why would I do that?

It is not an obligation. It is because I didn't feel right. I let myself down.

And the reason that I asked this question is to remind ourselves of the discussion we had four or five [lessons] ago about the '*bidʿah*' of doing *sajdah* when you miss a *sunnah*, even though the *sunnah* is not required.† This question is linking that up. I let myself down in forgetting a practiced *sunnah*. And here, the *niyyah* is not even a *sunnah*.

Student: I am finding it difficult switching *niyyah* in the middle of *farḍ ṣalāh*, just like the Ḥanbalis won't allow switching from *munfarid* to imām in the middle of the *ṣalāh* just because someone tapped you from the back and took you as an imām.

Ustādh: You know the Ḥanābilah are alone on that? You know that switching from *munfarid* to imām in the middle of *ṣalāh*, according to the Ḥanābilah (as far as I know) is not just restricted to *nafl* prayer. Because they will say in a *nafl* it is allowed because of what happened with Ibn ʿAbbās ﵄ and the Prophet ﷺ in *tahajjud*.[1] What do you say about that? Are you saying that is only for the *nafl* prayer?

Student: Also Ḥanafis I believe?

Ustādh: You can't include the Ḥanafis. The Ḥanafis are disqualified when it comes to the *niyyah*. They are the strictest people across the board. If you are going to stick to Ḥanafis when it comes to all of their rulings on the *niyyah* in the prayer, then you know that the Ḥanābilah are not going to be able to do anything.

We covered this a couple of years ago in detail, the changing of *niyyah*, etc.‡ We spoke about all of the differences within the Ḥanbali school on the issue of the changing of the *niyyah*. By the way, I am also not a big fan. You remember that when we discussed this that I'm the guy who doesn't. You know, someone taps me on my shoulder and I'm praying my *sunnah* and they are expecting me to be their imām, I am not changing.

Student (online): It is not from the *mufradāt* of the Ḥanābilah. That's what I am just referring.

---

† The issue of doing the prostration for forgetfulness when missing a *sunnah* act in the prayer was discussed in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 19, Lessons 5 and 6. MT

‡ The intention was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 6, Chapter 15, Lessons 51-58. MT

Ustādh: I wouldn't know. You know that *mufradāt* and the *muʿtamad*, etc. is not my cup of tea. But just so that we know, what is not from the *mufradāt* of the Ḥanābilah? Just so that we are clear. Oh! Sorry! You are saying this is not some weird individual… Yeah. It's not. It's not the weirdest opinion they have ever had. I'll give you that. But we are happy to stick to the position that we are on.

Another scenario:

مسألة :رَجُلٌ يُصلِّي ليلاً وصلاة الليل مثنى مثنى، فقام إلى الثالثة ناسياً فهل يلزمه الرُّجوع؟

You're praying *tahajjud*, two and you stand up. What do you do? What happens?

(0:50:00) Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says:

يرجع، فإن لم يرجع بطلت صلاته؛ لأنه تعمَّد الزيادة، وقد قال النبيُّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم: «صلاة الليل مثنى مثنى»

If he doesn't go back and sit down, then he has invalidated his prayer because "*mathnā, mathnā*" is indeed a command. The Prophet ﷺ said:

صَلاَةُ اللَّيْلِ مَثْنَى مَثْنَ

"The night prayer is offered in two *rakʿah* followed by two *rakʿah* and so on." [3,4]

This is a strict interpretation by Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn. I just want to put it out there. I have to say that in my heart, *fī qalbi shayʾ*, as they say. However, this is the Ḥanbali position and this is the consistency that the student was focusing on, that there is a general kind of consistency when it comes to changing the *niyyah*. Imām Aḥmad is quoted as (and you should take that with a tiny pinch of salt in terms of the validity of this narration) but there is no reason to not accept this because there will always be contradictory narrations from Imām Aḥmad in terms of *riwāyāt.* That is quite normal in the *madh-hab*. It is stated from Imām Aḥmad that he said:

---

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Witr Prayer, Chapter: What Is Said Regarding the Witr Prayer, ḥadīth no. 990.*

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: The Night Prayers Are Two by Two, and Witr Is One Rakʿah at the End of the Night, ḥadīth no. 749 i.*

إذا قام في صلاة الليل إلى ثالثة فكرجُلٍ قام إلى ثالثة في صلاة الفجر، أي :إن لم يرجع بطلت صلاته

He said that if a person is in *tahajjud* prayer and he stands up for a third *rakʿah*, then this is exactly the same as if he stood up in the third *rakʿah* of *ṣalāt al-Fajr.* If he does not sit down, then the prayer is invalidated. That is the position of Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, and it is also the position of Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn.

I have to say that I find that difficult, but I think it is a safer position. I think definitely it is the safer position.

As for *Witr*, then that is an exception. The *Witr* prayer, meaning odd, as opposed to even. In the *Witr* prayer it is allowed for a person to increase that.

So, when we are talking about this, we are talking about a person for example moving up from two to three, or from four to five. My point is that if you are praying your *Witr*, you have that flexibility. And I will quote what he says:

فإن الوتر يجوز أن يزيد الإنسان فيه على ركعتين، فلو أوتر بثلاث جاز، وعلى هذا فإذا دخل الإنسان بالوتر بنية أنه سيصلي ركعتين ثم يسلم ثم يأتي بالثالثة، لكنه نسي فقام إلى الثالثة بدون سلام، فنقول له: أتم الثالثة؛ لأن الوتر يجوز فيه الزيادة على ركعتين.

Shaykh is saying that for *Witr*, this is the only exception and there would be two scenarios for this. So, imagine you have done all of your eight *tahajjud* prayers, four times two units. You have done it all perfectly. You follow the opinion that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said. You cannot mess about and stand up for thirds. You make a mistake here and there, you sit down, and that is it. You are particularly tired this day, so you are making mistakes left, right, and centre. You finish the eight, you now stand up to pray *Witr*. You know it is *sunnah* every night to pray eight *rakʿāt* of *tahajjud* and then follow it by three *rakʿah* of *Witr*. This is the established *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ.

We also know that to pray *ṣalāt al*-W*itr* can be done in a number of ways. If you are praying three *rakʿah* then it can be done in three different ways. If you are praying other *rakʿāt*, then it can be done in different ways. The *Witr* prayer has levels. We are going to come to that in its right time. In the **class position**, the preferred best way is to pray two *rakʿah*, give *taslīm*, and then pray a single *rakʿah*. All of this is counted as a *Witr* prayer. This is a *Witr* prayer: a two and a one. There are three ways of praying it. Two are the most authentic, the third one is questionable. The third one it is to pray it like *Maghrib*. Let's put that to the side. That is not according to the majority of scholars. The second way of doing it correctly is to not sit down at all, just to keep going up and down

and no *tashahhud*. So, it's three units all in one go: first, second, and third, and there is only a *tashahhud* at the end. This first and second way is the correct way.

Shaykh says: If you have finished your [*tahajjud*], you have started your *Witr* and your intention was to pray the *Witr* as a two and a one and instead of giving *salām*, you stand up. You stand up, and you make it into the three.

So, in this particular scenario, you would continue. You would not sit back down immediately and say to yourself, '*Oh no, I had the intention of doing two and then one*,' because *Witr* is allowed in these two scenarios. Therefore, it is allowed for you in the **class position**, recognising that there is a difference, recognising that the Ḥanbalis may also have a discussion on that as well, or disagree with that as well, you would stand up. You would continue the prayer. This is a legitimate expression of the *Witr* prayer. It goes down the same path as we said with the *qaṣr ṣalāh*. You are moving from one way of praying it to another.

The reason that we are giving this exception to the *Witr* prayer and the *qaṣr* prayer earlier on is because the alternative that you are entering into is a valid, legitimate prayer. The reason that we did not give this exception to the two *rakʿah* of a *tahajjud* prayer is because there is no second option.

Student (online): *Witr*: two and one—technically no addition? Other way is addition surely, three changed to two and one.

Ustādh: Correct. See, *Witr*, two and one into a three is technically no addition. And three, going into two and one is technically no addition—no addition in its total, but there are additions in terms of the actions. The going up extra and the sitting back down again, or praying extra *tashahhud* etc. Again, we are dealing with this in terms of extra actions.

Student (online): Does this ruling for *witr* apply when you intend to pray one *rakʿah*?

Ustādh: Correct. Well done. This shows that the *Witr* scenario does not need to be just a three and a three. It can be a one intended and three, or a three intended and one, because all of that are permissible, legislated forms. As I said though, I would do *sajdatʾl-sahw* afterwards. Is it obligatory? No. But, would you do it? Yes. From a point of view that you forgot, you did *mukhālafah* of your intention.

Student (online): What is the class position on *qiyām ṣalāh* then if you add an extra *rakʿah*?

Ustādh: The **class position** on *qiyām* is that I am happy to stick to Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position, and I have in general, historically. I do not see any reason to change that, simply because standing up from a two to a third is going from a legislated

prayer to a I-don't-know-what-kind-of-prayer that was. Whereas, standing up from a two of *Ẓuhr* as a *musāfir* to a four, is him standing from a *qaṣr* prayer to a *muqīm* prayer.

Student (online): But here you would have done the first *tashahhud*, so it will correspond to the Pak style which you said is not correct.

Ustādh: Which is why I said that I will do the *sajdat'l-sahw* afterwards, because I have added to the prayer.

وإن سَبَّحَ به ثِقَتانِ فأَصَرَّ ولَمْ يَجْزِمْ بِصَوابِ نَفْسِهِ بَطُلَتْ صلاتُهُ

If two trustworthy people alert the imām to a mistake but he continues whilst being unsure he is correct, his prayer is invalidated.

If two trustworthy people indicate to the imām that [the imām] has made a mistake, that he has added, corrected, x, y and he himself is not absolutely certain of his own position, and he carries on with the prayer, ignoring the people who are saying *subḥān Allāh, subḥān Allāh,* meaning stand up or sit down, whatever they are telling him to do. So, I am the imām and I am praying and I have messed it up completely, and a couple of people, I mean, one person says it. You hear the voice and you recognise it. Then another person says it, so that is two. You can hear. And they are saying to you *subḥān Allāh*, making it clear, '*Sit down, you have just stood up for the fifth*,' or, '*You have just stood up for the fourth instead of sitting down at the third for Maghrib*.' Whatever [the scenario]. And you are not sure. So, you have a little think, and you think, '*I am not sure here. I am just going to continue*.' If you do that, the prayer is invalidated. You have ruined your prayer. If you know you are fine, or you believe that you are fine, regardless of what they did, then the prayer is not invalidated. The most important thing is that you must know. If he is confused because of himself, and then ignores them, he has invalidated his prayer. If he is confused about what they are saying, that is not a problem because it means that he did not understand what they were saying. The whole point is understanding what they were saying.

(1:00:00)

Remember by the way, women clap their hands or their thighs and the men say s*ubḥān Allāh* when you make some kind of mistake. For example, if you stand up in *Ẓuhr* prayer for the fifth and two people say *subḥān Allāh*, it is obligatory to sit down unless you are absolutely sure that you are in the fourth. Even if you are wrong. It does not matter if you are wrong. You think that you are right. It doesn't matter about anything. And, of course, *yaqīn* is not removed by doubt. This is why it is important that it is two people, not just one.

If you are not sure though, so when you stood up, you were like, '*You know what? I am not sure about this*,' and then they say it, then that's just the validation you required and you are going to sit down anyway. Now, if you stood up knowing that you are okay or

thinking that you are okay, and two people say, '*Subḥān Allāh*, [*you need to sit back down again*],' at that moment, you have a decision to make. You are going to pause (it does not matter how long, a few seconds, obviously), and you are going to think, '*Hold on! Let me go through this in my head. First rakʿah, second, third, fourth. No! I am alright*,' and then you carry on. It does not matter if you have got it right or wrong but you have to believe that you have got it right or wrong. If, however, you go, '*One, two, three, four.... hmmm... you know what? I am not sure. You know what? Maybe they have a point. I am not sure*,' at that point, if you continue, the prayer is invalidated.

Now, the first question we should ask is why is it that we need two?

The reason that we need two is because when this happened to the Prophet ﷺ, when the Prophet ﷺ was in the *ṣalāh* and he ﷺ was meant to pray four *rakʿah Ẓuhr*, after two he said *assalāmu `alaykum wa raḥmat Allāh.* He ﷺ exited the prayer. He ﷺ felt something was wrong. Regardless of whether he ﷺ feels something is wrong, Dhuʾl-Yadayn ؓ, the Companion, says, "Is this what? Is this like a new prayer or what? Has the prayer been decreased?" And the Prophet ﷺ is like, "No, it has not been decreased." [Dhuʾl-Yadayn ؓ says,] "Then, okay, you forgot then."[5]

If one was enough, then the Prophet ﷺ was obligated to take that statement. He ﷺ did not. He ﷺ took a second opinion. He ﷺ asked for the second witness. When the second one chimes in, who in this case was Abu Bakr ؓ, Abu Bakr ؓ confirms the scenario. He ﷺ does not look left or right. He ﷺ jumps straight back in and adds the other two, exits the prayer, does *sajdatʾl-sahw*, gives *taslīm*. And that is it. That shows that the situation becomes very serious when two people are indicating that. The text says *thiqatān.*

Student (online): Did they all to the extra *rakʿahs* or only the Prophet ﷺ?

Ustādh: Yes. They all did the extra *rakʿāt*. Of course! All of them gave *salām*. This is very interesting by the way. It is going to become very interesting now. We will come back to the point of what happened in that *ḥadīth*. You will see the point.

Therefore, what we can understand is five scenarios. Five scenarios can be built out of this scenario where the imām makes a mistake and we have a *jamāʿah*. We are not talking about a single prayer now. Five options:

(a) He is sure of what he is doing so he carries on and he does not listen to them.

(b) He is sure that they are right, the two people who said to him, '*Hey you are wrong, sit down*.' So, he is sure that they are right and he follows them.

(c) He thinks they are right. The probability is that they are right, meaning he is more sure than not that they are right.

---

[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: To Clasp One's Hands by Interlocking the Fingers in the Mosque or Outside the Mosque, ḥadīth no. 482.*

يغلب على ظَنِّه

The preponderant opinion for him is that they are probably right.

The second opinion is that he is positive. In the second one the example is you know something is wrong and you are just waiting for anybody just to add that. If you have ever led the prayer you know what that feels like. You know that something is wrong but you are not sure. The second someone indicates (something is wrong), you know for certain they are right. That is the second one.

The third one is that you are not actually 100% sure but you are thinking, '*Listen, there are two of them, they are probably right.*'

The fourth scenario is that you think they are wrong. You have got a good opinion of yourself. You do an assessment. You are not 100% sure but you think that they are wrong.

The fifth is that you do not know, 50-50 they could be right they could be wrong. Those are the five possible scenarios.

In these five possible scenarios:

ففي هذه الأحوال الأربع يأخذ بقولهما على كلام المؤلِّف، والصحيح أنه لا يأخذ بقولهما إذا ظَنَّ خطأهما

According to Imām al-Ḥajjāwi, the Ḥanbali school, in these five possible scenarios, you will follow them in the four of them.

والصحيح أنه لا يأخذ بقولهما إذا ظَنَّ خطأهما.

But the more correct position Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says is that you will not follow them if you think they are wrong.

(1:10:00)

In the first scenario, everybody agrees that you are going to ignore them because he is sure of his own position. In the scenarios of two, three, four, and five, he knows that they are right, or he thinks that they are right, or he thinks they are wrong, or the situation is equal. According to the Ḥanbalis, in all four of these you will follow them.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that if you think that they are wrong, then you won't. The fourth scenario, which is where you think that they are wrong, then that is not. Why is that?

Student (online): Why in four?

Ustādh: Because in four of them, you are not sure. That's the whole point.

You have five scenarios. In only the first one you are absolutely positive you are right. In every other scenario you are not positive that you are right. The Ḥanbali position is that therefore in scenario two, three, four, and five in all of these you are not sure that you are right—as in sure, meaning positive—then you must follow their position.

The **class position** is that this is not correct. In position one and in position four, you will go with your own position. If you think, meaning you are confident that they are wrong, or you know they are wrong, then we are not going to follow them. But in the other three we follow them.

Student (online): So, according to *muʾallif* you follow the *thiqatān* in two, three, four, five but the class position is you would not in 1 and 4?

Ustādh: Yes.

Student (online): Because certainty replaces doubt. You are more certain that you are correct than they are correct.

Ustādh: Yes, because certainty replaces doubt. You are more certain that you are correct than they are correct.

Student (online): The position four again?

Ustādh: Position four is you are pretty confident that they are wrong. You are not positive.

Student (online): Thinking they are wrong is different to knowing that they are wrong, hence why four requires a follow?

Ustādh: Thinking they are wrong is different to knowing that they are wrong, hence why four requires a follow with the Ḥanbali school.

According to our position we have as per the rule of *fiqh*, when you go over 51% then you are pretty sure of what is going on. All of this is thinking. There is no absolute certainty because two people are already saying that they are right, so there is no certainty here. Knowing that I am absolutely right or thinking that I am absolutely right—it is not about knowing I am absolutely right—it is thinking that I am absolutely

right, and thinking that I am probably right, which is 51%. And then 50:50 is: I could be right or I could not be.

Student (online): Beyond reasonable doubt.

Ustādh: Correct, beyond reasonable doubt. Position four is that I believe beyond reasonable doubt that they are wrong, and I am right. I have made my assessment. I think I am alright. By the way, this is not necessarily a numbers game.

Student (online): Beyond reasonable doubt is well over 51%.

Ustādh: It is. Beyond reasonable doubt is more than 51% in maths. But in *Sharīʿah* the *fiqh* breakdown of percentages shows the difference between the way mathematicians do percentages and how we phrase our percentages in terms of *fiqh*.[§]

Student (online): So, basically, you will go with your *yaqīn* and *ghalabatʾl-ẓann* (class position)?

Ustādh: That is exactly correct. He has summarised it that the class position is *yaqīn* and the preponderant belief, the probability that I think that I am good. The Ḥanbali position is no, only *yaqīn* can carry you through and you can see that there is some common sense behind that. So, this is one of valid *khilāf*, like all of this is of course.

Student (online): (a) he is sure of what he is doing so he carries on, (b) he is sure that they are right, so he sits down, (c) he thinks they are right but not 100% sure, (d) he thinks they are wrong but not 100% sure of it, (e) 50:50- unsure.

Ustādh: Thank you very much. Absolutely spot on. In our scenario, in (a) and (d) we will stick to our position and in (b), (c) and (e), we will follow them.

Student (online): Some folks always think they are right.

Ustādh: Exactly. This is the point. There has to be agency for the imām here. I am very happy with this position by the way. Very, very, comfortable with what I just said, what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said. That is music to my ears what he says. Because if you are an imām and you practice this a lot, you will know that scenarios are different, prayers are different. I mean there are some people here who lead the prayer regularly. Anybody want to throw in an anecdote?

[§] From Chapter 8, Lesson 10: The scholars have divided knowledge (*ʿilm*) into four levels: *yaqīn*, *ẓann*, *shakk*, and *wahm*. To make it clearer Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhtār al-Shanqīṭi puts percentages down. He says *wahm* is the beginning of trying to achieve knowledge, the beginning part of certain knowledge. On a scale of likelihood, *wahm* is 1-49%. *Shakk* is 50%—both positions are equally likely. *Ẓann* is when one of the two possibilities is more likely (51%-99%). *Yaqīn* is 100% certainty. Levels of certainty in the *Sharīʿah* was originally covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 3, Chapter 8, Lesson 10, then again in Year 5, Chapter 15, Lesson 10. MT

If you don't have one, let me give you the anecdote for the rest of your life. *ʿAṣr* prayer and the *Ẓuhr* prayer—people mess up to a level which is untrue. If I compare the amount of mistakes that are made in *Fajr, Maghrib* and *ʿIshāʾ* they are like, hardly non-existent. Whereas *Ẓuhr* and *ʿAṣr* oh my goodness! And I mean from the imām angle and from the people's angle. It is like these two prayers, the silence makes it worse. And by the way, it is not a surprise is it that the *ḥadīth* which mention the mistake of the Prophet ﷺ is on the whole restricted to the *Ẓuhr* and *ʿAṣr* prayer?[4] So silence plays an important role, the number of *rakʿāt,* because they are four etc. etc. I want to say that people are tired, but people are going to say, '*No, I wake up at 10:00, 11:00. I am not tired at all*.' Normally people are tired at that time. I know that I struggle in those prayers. Definitely. I mean to keep a track on the position.

Student (online): It seems very *ʿaqli* behind, not following them in four. The *muʾallif* mentioned the *sharṭ* of *thiqatān*.

Ustādh: But as you said, how are you going to know the exact nature of the voice behind you? Are you going to go by its identification? What is your evidence for that?

This itself, is, and you can see what Imām al-Ḥajjāwi is doing or the Ḥanbali School, I should say more accurately, it is trying to create a scenario where you are more certain than not of your mistake. Hence, the adding of a second person, hence the adding of that they must be trustworthy. We will come to that in a second though, we will come to that.

Student (online): Reinforces the idea of having choice people right behind you.

Ustādh: Thank you. It reinforces what we have been saying all the way through, that you have got the key people behind you.

Student (online): I am trying to apply it to the *ḥadīth* more so, Shaykh.

Ustādh: Yes. But this is about applying it to the *ḥadīth* and our interpretation of it.

Student (online): When you say your heart isn't with the Ḥanbali and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's opinion on additions to *tahajjud* invalidating the *ṣalāh* if one doesn't sit down, please could you explain why? Based on what line of argument?

Ustādh: The truth is because I am a Ḥanafi at heart. The Aḥnāf authenticate a number of the narrations of four *rakʿah* prayers when it comes to *sunnah*. That is the reason. Pakistan *Zindabad.* That is the reason. But I also from a *ḥadīth* student point of view, recognise that those *ḥadīth* are on the whole problematic.

Q & A

(1:23:00) Q (online): If you started with two and one *Witr*, you've done the two with *taslīm* and now you started with the last one *rakʿah*, and you forget and stand up, can you now convert this one *rakʿah* to three, doing five in total?

A: Yes, you can. Or you can just sit down and then do *sajdatʾl-sahw* and that's it.

Q (online): So, no more four, four, two for *Ẓuhr*?

A: Definitely. We were just talking about how the *sunnah* is that it's best to keep it in twos for *Ẓuhr* and every prayer. I'm just saying that the conceptual idea of a *sunnah* being not just in two *rakʿāt* but existing in a four *rakʿāt* wrapper as well. It's a big push to then extend that, first of all to accept it authentically (that's a push) and then to extend it to the *nafl* of the night prayer, *sunnah ghayr muʾakkadah* in the daytime, pushing it to nighttime. There are jumps but those jumps are not mega jumps. That is why I am sympathetic to the idea that I'm not going to be saying to the person that your prayer is invalidated. *Nafl* prayer, relaxed prayer, up and down, lots of *rakʿāt*, etc. I still agree with the position. I think that you should sit down the two.

Q (online): In regard to adding things to prayer, what if you start reciting another *sūrah* after *Fātiḥah* in the third or fourth *rakʿah* of the *farḍ* prayer, would you stop mid-*ayah* and do *sajdatʾl-sahw* at the end of prayer?

A: This is what we did about four lessons ago, if you review it, concerning adding a *sunnah* to the prayer. The **<u>class position</u>** is that you do not need to. You can read it and that's fine because it's only a *sunnah* not to recite, it's not *ḥarām*. But if you did *sajdatʾl-sahw*, that's something which is allowed. If you wanted to do it then you would stop.

Q (online): Seeing a person (*ḥāfiẓ*, scholar) to ask if magic is done on one and do the treatment he tells if he says there is magic. He first asks your name and your mother's name, if there are any body pains or bad dreams, etc. Asks you to call after few minutes, then he will tell if there is a magic done on you or not. If he says yes then he gives some treatment, example: read certain name of Allāh ﷻ, x, y, z number of times on black pepper and burn that black pepper after a specific *ṣalāh* daily for x, y, z number of days or read certain *sūrah* in a certain way daily for x, y, z days. One of us is saying it is not the right way and we should just stick to *Sūrat al-Baqarah* and reading *Quls*. Other is saying there is no problem in it.

A: In summary, you are saying that if there is a suspicion that there is magic, some *siḥr* done, and then you go to someone and they tell you to do all this kind of stuff, what should we do?

Let me give you my position on this. First of all, a *ruqyah* is a specialist area. Never at any point, just like a consultant telling you x, y, z and you are sitting there saying yes or no, you are not expected to understand. So, don't think that *ruqyah* is as something as really straight forward as just reciting *Sūrat al-Baqarah*. *Ruqyah* can get funky. It can get physical. There is a basis, by the way, for the physical hitting, smacking, etc. That can freak people out. There is a basis to reciting on food and drink and eating it. And this basis is not in the *Sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ, not entirely, but it is with some of the *Tābiʿīn* here and there.

The problem is that it's very, very, very sparse and restricted. And therefore, you have to almost entirely go on the trust that you have in the knowledge of the *rāqi*, the exorcist, the faith healer I prefer to call them. I personally believe that that level of knowledge is not there in 99% of the *rāqis* who are doing this which is why I treat them with a lot of skepticism—but not the art and not the science. Obviously, the funkier that it gets, the more doubtful you will become, such as certain foods… In the *sunnah* it's pretty much restricted to milk and water. When it comes to x, y, z, black pepper, etc. 23 times, 43 times, and get crazy numbers, you are getting the right idea that this is a problem.

I want you to know that we should not throw away the baby with the bath water, that the science does have lots of aspects that are for specialist use. It is far more complicated than just reciting *Sūrat al-Baqarah* and the *Quls*. This is an art and a science. However, there is far too much to doubt about it both in principle, in its sources and the practitioners today which is why I would not be going to these people. I would not be trusting them most of the time without dissing and having doubts in the science. And I would be sticking to the basic *Sūrat al-Baqarah* and the *Quls*. *Allāhu aʿlam*.

9. Chapter 20 Lesson 4: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

وإن سَبَّحَ به ثِقَتانِ فأَصَرَّ ولَمْ يَجْزِمْ بِصَوابِ نَفْسِهِ بَطُلَتْ صلاتُهُ وصلاةُ مَن تَبِعَه عالِمًا، لا جاهِلًا أو نَاسِيًا ولا مَن فارَقَه

If two trustworthy people alert the imām to a mistake but he continues whilst being unsure he is correct, his prayer is invalidated as well as for the one following him who knew what was correct. It is not invalidated for the one who was following unaware of what was correct, or had forgotten, or had left the imām's prayer.

(0:14:50) After we have been speaking about the idea if there are two people and they tell him [the imām] that I think you made a mistake, I think you had a problem…

We said that there are [five] scenarios when someone says *subḥān Allāh* to you in the prayer and you realise there is a problem.

1. You know that you are right, so you do not take anyone's position.

2. You are positive that they are right, so you take their position.

3. You think that the likelihood, beyond reasonable doubt that they are right, *ghalabat'l-ẓann* as we say, i.e. the preponderant position. You thought about it and thought, '*Yeah, that's probably the case that they are right.*'

4. You are thinking that it is beyond reasonable doubt that they are wrong, you are pretty okay with the fact that you think that they are wrong.

5. They are the same.

As we said, (according to the Shaykh) you have to follow their decision in four of those situations and in ours (in the class position), if you think that they are wrong, that is another time that we do not need to take their position. Your *ghalabat'l-ẓann* is enough for you stay on your position. This is the position of the Shāfiʿi school (this position that we are holding) that is our **<u>class position</u>**, that is Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position that if you think beyond reasonable doubt (that is somewhere in between 50, 60, 70% sure that they are wrong) even though two of them shouted out, then you carry on.

It is important you understand why the Ḥanābilah and so many scholars actually do consider that if even if you think they are wrong you should go with it. That is because when the Prophet ﷺ made that mistake in the prayer and (depending upon how you see it) he ﷺ prayed three instead of four or two instead of three. Because the narrations we mentioned, it is a stunning area of study: Exactly which case was Dhu'l-Yadayn ؓ involved with? Anyway, the Prophet ﷺ stands up. He ﷺ is stressed out. He ﷺ is pacing up and down and everybody does not know what to say or what to do and then suddenly Dhu'l-Yadayn ؓ straight out just says to him:

أَقُصِرَتِ الصَّلاَةُ أَمْ نَسِيتَ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ

"Has the prayer been shortened or have you forgotten Messenger of Allāh? [1,2]

I.e. Has there been a ruling that has come back from Allāh ﷻ?

And you know what the Prophet ﷺ said right? Do you know what the Prophet ﷺ said?
(0:20:00) Does anybody know the *ḥadīth*?

Student (online): Neither did I forget, nor has it been shortened.

Ustādh: Correct.

He ﷺ actually said a statement which was wrong. Well, this is the beauty actually. When you study the books of *ḥadīth* you will see that there is a huge discussion about this statement. He ﷺ said: "Neither did I forget, nor has it been shortened."

So, he ﷺ has made a statement directly contradicting Dhu'l-Yadayn ؓ. He's made the statement ﷺ then he ﷺ has thought to himself, '*You know what?*' So, he has gone to Abu Bakr ؓ and 'Umar ؓ both of them. Some narrations only mention Abu Bakr ؓ other narrations mentioned 'Umar ؓ as well. And then he ﷺ confirms with them.

In some narrations it says he ﷺ said, "Is it true what your friend is saying?" I think that is my favourite question ever in history—'your friend', not mine. Your friend. "Is it true what your friend is saying?" Then they said, "Yes. It is exactly like that." So, then he ﷺ goes back and then he ﷺ fixes it.

That is the reason why the scholars said that you need to go with the two people because of these two. That is why the Ḥanābilah stick to this. The irony is that you could

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: To Clasp One's Hands by Interlocking the Fingers in the Mosque or Outside the Mosque, ḥadīth no. 482.*
[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in the Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 573 c.*

actually use that *ḥadīth* as an evidence against the idea of two people… in a way. But that does not matter. The point is that you need to understand where their position is.

Can anybody think of explanations?

When he ﷺ made that statement: "I have not forgotten", the truth is that "I have not forgotten" is a definitive statement. He ﷺ did not say, '*I do not think*.' He ﷺ said, "I have not," in the past tense. So, what do you think? Do you have any interesting interpretations of how we understand this? Or is it just simply a mistake, he ﷺ thought he ﷺ did and he ﷺ did not?

Student (online): Sounds like this could be used as proof of prophethood.

Ustādh: And like she said: That is why he ﷺ is a Prophet of Allāh. That is why he is a *bashar*.

Student (online): So, why was the Prophet ﷺ pacing and frustrated if he ﷺ didn't forget?

Ustādh: Because he ﷺ was not sure. He ﷺ felt something wrong. And he ﷺ did forget. This is the whole point.

Student (online): He ﷺ believed he ﷺ did not forget. Doesn't mean he ﷺ did not make a mistake.

Ustādh: Correct, he ﷺ believed he ﷺ did not forget.

So, he ﷺ is in that situation where as far as he ﷺ is concerned, he ﷺ cannot remember making a mistake. Now we know that he ﷺ made a mistake because in the other *ḥadīth* he ﷺ specifically told the Companions that a mistake is going to happen, that he ﷺ will forget. He says:

فَإِذَا نَسِيتُ فَذَكِّرُونِي

"So, when I forget remind me."[3]

"So, remind me if I forget," indicating that is what happens. It will happen to everybody.

Student (online): It's not a mistake if there's a lesson in it, right? E.g. like with the beginning of *Sūrat ʿAbasa*. Is that how we reconcile it?

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 a*.

Ustādh: That doesn't mean it is not a mistake. It doesn't mean that it is not *khilafʾl-awla* because obviously we have a very careful *adab* with the Prophet ﷺ in his actions. It doesn't mean that we don't consider it to be something that should not be followed just because it is a lesson in it. In all of the actions of the Prophet ﷺ there is a lesson. It doesn't mean that there can't be a mistake.

Student (online): The lesson is that mistakes will happen.

Ustādh: Indeed! One of the key lessons, is that mistakes can happen and then the lesson is then intrinsic.

I was reading *al-Mughni* earlier on and I read something that made me laugh out loud. Ibrahim al-Nakhaʿi… Now Ibrahim al-Nakhaʿi is like from the imāms of the *Salaf*. I mean we are talking top dog. I mean we are talking like *bismillāh ma shāʾ Allāh*. The king of Iraq, all right. The king of Kūfa. The founder and the source of the Ḥanafi school and just a don. He is narrating this narration. He says that I was in the *masjid* and ʿAlqamah was leading the prayer. ʿAlqamah is one of the imāms of the *Tābiʿīn,* took from so many Companions, major scholar, end of story. So, he says that ʿAlqamah was praying *Ẓuhr* and he prayed five and then he finished. As soon as he finished the people said to him, "You prayed five."

He said, "No. I didn't."

They said, "No. No, you did. You did."

He said, "No. I don't think I did."

They said, "No. No, you did. You did."

He says, "All right then."

And he says I was a little kid back then and I was sitting in the corner (and the cheeky fish wasn't even praying by the way). He says I was sitting in a corner and I said, "Hey! You did pray five."

You know what ʿAlqamah said to him? He says, "What?"

He says, "You did pray five."

He says, "Shut up *yā aʿwar*," you blind fish. *Miskīn* Imām Ibrahim al-Nakhaʾi. He got cussed for nothing. Then he says that he then made the *takbīr* and did the two *sajdah*.

Now one of the lessons from that incident is the same lessons from the *Sunnah* which is: What happens with the people who are praying behind when they know that there is a mistake?

That is what this entire subject of today is. The people who are praying behind an imām and feel that there is a mistake and maybe even indicate there is a mistake, is it possible for you to continue with the same imām? Especially when you have that level of confidence to be arguing with him afterwards, so what were you doing during the prayer?

So, just I will leave that in your head and let's just jump on with the rest of the text.

Shaykh says what if the people who are in the prayer, they forget to say *subḥān Allāh* or chose not to? You know like the Paks do? The Pak say *Allāhu akbar.* They say *Allāhu akbar, Allāhu akbar*. They say all kinds of stuff. So, if that happens, are you obligated to listen? Because our author Imām al-Ḥajjāwi ﷺ he says:

وَإِنْ سَبَّحَ بِهِ ثِقَتَانِ فَأَصَرَّ

If two trustworthy people alert the imām to a mistake but he continues.

If two trustworthy people make *tasbīḥ*, meaning say *subḥān Allāh*. Now so does it mean only if they say *subḥān Allāh?* What if they say *alhamdulillah* or clear their throat, you know they bring attention to, '*Hey! You messed up*.' Because all of these other ways are permissible, but the *sunnah* is to say *tasbīḥ*.[4]

So, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says absolutely you go with whatever. As long as you understood you made a mistake and as long as they bring your attention to the mistake.

Student (online): The point is that they are bringing your attention to a mistake.

Ustādh: Exactly. The point is that they bring your attention to the mistake.

And as long as they are doing that, you should accept it.

He makes a point that it would have been better for the author to have said:

إن نَبَّهَه ثقتان

(0:30:00) "And if two trustworthy people inform him" as opposed to making it specific to *tasbīḥ*. But obviously he did that because it is the *sunnah*, of course. It is a *sunnah* to say *subḥān*

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: If Somebody Is Leading the Prayer and (in the Meanwhile) the First (Usual) Imām Comes, the Prayer Is Valid Whether the Former Retreats or Does Not Retreat, ḥadīth no. 684*.

Allāh. For the women the *sunnah* is to clap the hand. Make a clapping sound.† Now it is very difficult obviously, especially if you are in the boiler room, three rooms away locked underneath in the basement. So, in that situation, you know what it is? Good luck to you all right. I mean literally women praying in their *masjid*, I just want to say to you I have no idea what is going on. Honestly, I have absolutely no idea why women even pray in a *masjid*. Like what is the *masjid* feel for women praying in a *masjid.*

Student (online): How about those two people (reminding) is not part of the congregation such as somebody already prayed etc... What will happen then? How about no verbal reminder of the mistake but a gesture to indicate the mistake such as a gesture to indicate you should have sat rather than standing?

Ustādh: He makes the point that other people who are not part of the congregation, first of all we covered this a couple of years ago.‡ There are two positions by the way, we are coming to that actually, but I'll just say it right now as he is asking.

If you are sitting not part of the prayer, you know you are allowed to say whatever you want. Don't forget that in the prayer you are restricted you can't just say, '*Hey you messed up*.' We were speaking about it [in the section where we covered] correcting the imām's recitation. We were speaking about how my mum was speaking to me whilst I'm praying. The truth is that Paks do that automatically. I was making the point that a lot of our culture, that we have these crazy things we all relate to, actually have a basis in the books of *fiqh*. So, the scholars they give complete carte blanche for people to have conversations. Now of course, we have evidence for that as well.

So, for example *taḥwīl'l-Qiblah*, when the *Qiblah* was changed, the Companion (who is still nameless we don't know the name of the Companion—in both scenarios by the way, neither in al-Qubā' and neither in Qiblatayn (Masjid Abu Salamah it should be called because obviously Qiblatayn is a modern name). In both *masājid* people were praying and both times the people came up and said, "*By the way the Qiblah has changed*." [5,6] This is *Bukhāri naṣ* so you don't need to go into, '*Oh they can't speak,*' or '*They can't gesture*.' You can do whatever you want. First of all, you are not in the prayer. Number two: people need to get used to noise and sound etc. People are not meant to pray in isolation. Number three: We have text that indicates that you can speak to people and tell them about doing something etc.

---

† The manner in which women bring the imām's attention to something in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 11. MT

‡ Correcting the imām was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lessons 7-8. MT

[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prophetic Commentary on the Qur'ān (Tafsīr of the Prophet ﷺ), Chapter: The Statement of Allāh ﷻ "The Fools (Pagans, Hypocrites and Jews) Among the People Will Say, 'What Has Turned Them (Muslims) From Their Qiblah [Ṣalāh (Prayer) Direction (Towards Jerusalem)] (V.2:142), ḥadīth no. 4486.*

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Changing the Qiblah From al-Quds (Jerusalem) to the Ka'bah, ḥadīth no. 527.*

The second opinion is that you don't say anything because it has nothing to do with you (which is a very weak position), it's not your prayer, don't know what's going on, etc.

So, my point is the person who is on the side should indicate.

In summary (Shaykh says on top of page 346): If two people that he trusts tell him that he made a mistake, he has to listen to them unless he is 100% that he is confident he is right and that they are wrong. If he isn't 100% right and he is not sure of himself and he doesn't then follow what they want him to do, and go back to the previous position, the prayer is invalidated because he has left an obligation intentionally. And that is because of the *ḥadīth* that we saw, the Prophet ﷺ said to Abu Bakr ؓ:

أَحقّ مَا يَقُولُ ذُو اليَدَين

"Is what Dhu'l-Yadayn saying true?"[2]

And he said, "Yes." It's obligatory to go back to that.

Now: What if it is one person?

If it's one person, it is not obligatory for him to go back to him. And the reason it's not obligatory is because Dhu'l-Yadayn ؓ did that and he ﷺ didn't take his position.[1,2]

So, what is more accurate to say? Is it about numbers?

Now the *madhāhib* make it about numbers. The more contemporary scholars and the more Ahl'l-ḥadīth, Salafi approach, is a bit more relaxed approach to it, consider it to be not about numbers at all. What is it about folks? What do you think it is about?

Student: Trustworthy and certainty.

Ustādh: Correct. It is certainty or *ghalabt'l-ẓann.*

Student: It's about confidence.

Ustādh: Confidence. Correct.

So therefore, Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn's position is that if one person told him and he is confident, i.e., he thinks that it is more likely than it's not that he is right, then he does go with him. And if he is more confident than he is not that he is right in himself, then he sticks with himself. It does not actually matter about the numbers. And that is the **class position**. The **class position** is that it is not restricted to two people, it is not restricted to three people, to one person. It is restricted to how he believes the scenario

because ultimately that is what's going to matter. Now if he is confident that the other person is right, then it helps.

(0:40:00) Now next scenario: If one of the *muṣallīn* behind says *subḥān Allāh* indicating that you have done more. If a person indicates to the imām that he has increased in the *ṣalāh* and another person says *subḥān Allāh* to indicate that he has not increased in the *ṣalāh,* but that he has decreased in the *ṣalāh.* So, one is saying that you have increased it, one is saying that you have decreased it. What is the sum conclusion?

Student (online): Cancel each other.

Ustādh: They cancel each other out. Correct.

That is what the *fuqahā*' used to say, that he is probably about right and that he cancels out and he carries on. Of course, unless he knows something that the others do not. That is something different.

So next scenario, top of page 347: What if two unknown people. All the time we have been saying *thiqatān,* which means two trustworthy people.

So up until now the idea has been that these two people are imāms, or they are clever, or they are scholars, or they are on point. What about if you have absolutely no idea? *Majhūlān,* two completely unknown people and they suddenly start speaking in the background.

So, Shaykh says according to the Ḥanbali school you do not listen to them. Basically, they are ignored because their trustworthiness has not been established.

Student (online): Speaking as in say *subḥān Allāh*?

Ustādh: Speaking as in to say *subḥān Allāh,* to indicate that there is a mistake. Oh sorry did I say speak? I mean two people behind you. You are praying in a *masjid* or maybe you are a visitor. That is a good point, that is a good example. You are visiting an area and they put you forward, and you start leading the prayer and you have got all kinds of people behind you and you have no idea who is who. So, they are unknown.

So, you are praying and one of them says *subḥān Allāh* and then another one says *subḥān Allāh.* So, you think to yourself, '*Right there are two people out there that think I have made a mistake*,' and you have no clue what is going on. According to the Ḥanbali school, you do not listen to them because you have no idea whether they are trustworthy, whether they are beginners, first time praying, even know the rules of what is going on. That is the Ḥanbali position. And you ignore them.

The truth is that that is the reality every day for us. At what point do we know for certain that there are going to be two *thiqah* people behind us, that we are always knowing that they are behind us in the *ṣalāh,* they are people who know what is going

on? And even if we know that there are some people in there, how do we know to always differentiate by the voice?

So, the correct position, as Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says, is that he should reflect upon the issue more than the people. And that goes back to what we said as well. It is not about the people per se, it is not about the identification per se, it is not about all of that. It is about how likely is what they are saying something to be taken seriously. And so he needs to consider that. So, he should pause—especially if it is two. If it is one, he should be considering it. If it is two, it is a serious consideration. He should pause, make a reflection and if he thinks that they have got a possibility then he follows them as well. That is the **class position** and it is not the Ḥanbali position. So, we will accept the position of two *majhūl* people because ultimately it is about you as opposed to them whether they are trustworthy or whether they are *majhūl* or whatever, they are.

لأن القول الراجح أنه يبني على غَلَبة الظَّنِّ.

The stronger position is that one should build upon his own confident belief, not necessarily certainty because then there would be no discussion, but what he generally thinks.

Student (online): What about husbands and wives? How to handle this well from both spouses?

Ustādh: It is not to do with men or women, it is to do with what you understand. We are coming to that in a second.

We are still focusing on all of the scenarios of someone making a correction. The last one is: What if two women indicate? *Thiqatān* means two trustworthy men. The text says two trustworthy men. What if it is two trustworthy women?

There is no evidence—and this is a big mistake by the way that causes the problem where Muslims then feel that inferiority complex and have to start defending themselves. Like those that have studied *tafsīr Āli ʻImrān* with me, you will remember me making a really strong point. Meaning me really emphasising again and again and again about how mature men and women need to be when reading the Qur'ān about little wins because you know how politicised things are.

Sūrat Āli ʻImrān is beautiful like this because you will see and you will go through it and you will see a little move and it's one for the men, one for the boys basically. And the boys will go, '*Yeah*, *that's one for us*.' Then you will see another one and it's definitely a win for the women. And the women should go like that, ['*That's one for us.*'] And then you will see another win for the men. And that's how it happens.

(0:50:00) And the maturity of the Qurʾān reader or I should say the maturity of the Muslim is to recognise that this is not a game. That Allāh ﷻ puts restrictions on women in this scenario and He lifts it off in that scenario. He puts restrictions on men in this scenario and He lifts it off them in that scenario. He makes specific things in this scenario and then puts another thing in that scenario. There is absolutely no basis Islamically, let alone logically, let alone in real life, to think that men and women in their *ʿaql*, or in their capacity to teach, study, be expert, be x, y, z, are any different to men. And it is not there in Islam either.

A specific *ayah* which refers to a witnessing of what could be a complicated transaction that has little trick moves, that has little plays going on behind the scenes, from women who have just come out of *Jāhiliyyah*.

Student (online): Our teacher Shaykh Akram says we have plenty of male liars in *ḥadīth,* but we don't have a single female liar in *ḥadīth*.

Ustādh: Absolutely. Al-Dadu and Shaykh Akram al-Nadawi obviously has done a study on this in the women narrators, but people at the level of al-Dadu, he said that he spent twenty years studying the books of *rijāl*, he has not come across a single woman considered to be a liar in *ḥadīth*. In terms of men I won't show you a book, I'll show you a set encyclopedia Britannica!

My point is not to make the women happy today or the men happy. The point is to recognise context.

In *Jāhiliyyah* women were owned. Not only where they owned, the only transaction that would recognise is just sitting there being sold. Imagine! Sold from this one person to another person. Suddenly, they are now Muslim, recognised, honoured, etc. and sometimes in the absence of men they are required to be witnesses and this and that and whatever. And now you are telling me, '*We have a problem because there needs to be one to make sure they don't make any mistake*.' Come on bro.

So anyway, straightforward. The Prophet ﷺ has not indicated any difference. He told us that when you make the men say this, the women say that. So, there is no differentiation. Two women would be the same.

For us it wouldn't matter, even one woman would be fine—for our **class position**, I mean. But for the Ḥanbalis they would also accept two women as well.

Student (online): What about the *ḥadīth* in relation to women weaker in mind which always put forward to say that women cannot aspire to be of the same mind?[7,8]

---

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Faith, Chapter: Clarifying That Faith Decreases With Shortcoming in Obedience, and the Word Kufr May Be Used With Regard to Matters Other Than Disbelief in Allāh ﷻ, Such As Ingratitude for Blessings and Not Fulfilling One's Duties, ḥadīth no. 79 a.*

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Menstruation, Chapter: A Menstruating Woman Should Leave Fasting, ḥadīth no. 304.*

Ustādh: It doesn't say that they are weaker in mind.

نَاقِصَاتِ عَقْلٍ وَدِينٍ

I think *nāqiṣāt'l-ʿaql* means that women are operating on 50% capacity. That's how I understand this *ḥadīth*. And even some narrations indicate 50%. The more accurate way would be to describe this that they are working on reduced capacity. Now what does that mean?

That means that, you know in a race when you have different cars in Formula 1, which is the highest form of racing that you can get, every engine has to fit a certain regulation. The rule and the law is that they cannot be over above a certain horsepower. Now, also you know for example, when you're fighting in a weight class you cannot be one single pound above that weight class in terms of weight. However, people who are on the same [level] they don't normally always win. So, the two cars that have the same horsepower (engine power), they don't both win. One always wins and the other one always loses. And in the fighting, they both come in and they both have a set weight class (and they are limited to that) and yet one will win and the other won't. Some are close fights, some are draws, others are dominant, meaning that the thing which is the restricting factor is not always the dominant factor in consequence.

And the wisdom is with Allāh ﷻ. In my opinion, the wisdom—not the *ʿillah*—is to increase their reward and that's why Allāh ﷻ gave women that greater sense of empathy, mercy, and patience compared to men. They are calmer. So that's the irony. Women are far more emotional than men. But when they're told that in a way when you're cussing a woman saying you're just always emotional, always emotional, the irony is that when you're saying that you're trying to say that she is not logical or not methodical etc. Yet her emotional state which is you indicating that is very erratic, in real time, in practicality, is very calm, very measured, running everything, very patient, always the one who just seems so calm. Men are all over the flipping place.

So, that's the irony that you can't cuss a woman saying that she's emotional intending by that the emotional aspect and then praise her for the same emotions. Like, what is that all about?

So, on that point I think Allāh ﷻ gave them that reduced capacity because they don't need it. That is my opinion. They are able to keep up with the men at reduced capacity.

Student (online): How authentic is this *ḥadīth*?

Ustādh: It is as authentic as they come.

Student (online): I always say: They have never fasted 29/30 days straight!

Ustādh: We had this laugh (I don't know where this joke was). Last week was it this class or was another class? That you know women all having the time off every five days off, seven days off, ten days off and men think you're lucky especially about summertime. Whereas women say no it's *ʿadhāb*, because obviously it hurts so much and the mood swings and all the rest of it. So, no one's going to be happy on that.

(1:00:00) But I think it's a gift—number one. Number two they are *nāqiṣāt'l-ʿaql* that they have reduced capacity.

Student (online): So, they don't need their full capacity to deal with men?

Ustādh: Exactly that. You've summarised exactly my waffling for the last ten minutes: They do not need their full capacity to deal with men. And men are at their full capacity...

In practice we see that. In practice we see women are able to exceed men significantly in many areas and therefore I do see the weakness is actually in men. But I don't want to say that aloud and I don't want to say that too… because you know women take advantage. Women cannot be trusted in these scenarios. They see these little things because they've been abused for so long and then they run with it and then they destroy your name forever. But that's what I believe. I believe that this *ḥadīth* is praising the women and not the men—in this scenario.

Listen! Men have got enough *ḥadīth* looking after them and so on and so forth. So, *Allāhu aʿlam*.

Student (online): Is that a common angle to take?

Ustādh: It's not a common angle. I don't care about the angle. This is my belief. This is my interpretation of the *ḥadīth*. And I became aware of this more and more when they had to deal with bad treatment from their husbands.

And I remember Shaykh Kehlan once was given a case—and you know sometimes you have a theory and you believe it and then you come across something many years later and it cements your position. I want you to imagine. I'm there for the number of years believing this position and then suddenly I'm sitting there, and he wanted me to be a witness. And there was a man and a woman who were kicking off silly. They were both really at one another. And he told the man to calm down and he said, '*She always responds like that*.'

Now listen. Women have their own group, they always believe that the men are wrong. And men are absolutely insistent that women overreact in absolutely everything, and exaggerate everything, and they never forget everything. These stereotypes will never go. I certainly believe it. It's a male thing. You base it upon your mother, your sister,

your wife, females that are around you whoever they are. You build up a picture and it is what it is. It doesn't matter what anybody else tells you.

It was very interesting what he said to this man. He said to him, “So what if she responds like that? You've already been told she's going to respond like that.” This is how he put it at that time. He said, “You have 50% more capacity to be able to correct yourself than she has, and she is working at reduced capacity. If she's working at reduced capacity and you're working at full capacity. So, someone is at 50% capacity and making a mistake and you are at 100% capacity and you cannot use your extra 50% to be able to swallow this mistake or use it to quash this mistake? So, if she had the other 50% like you then would she be like you?”

I know I’m not explaining it very well, but the point was that as soon as I heard that it all just fell into place. Allāh ﷻ knows best. I don't think that it is a curse in itself.

Student (online): How is it at the same time a cause for getting into Hell and a mercy?

Ustādh: It's not a cause. There's a difference between mentioning *ṣifāt*, there's a difference between characteristics and about people who make mistakes.

We know that the reason why the majority of women are in the Hellfire is because of their constant complaining, lack of gratitude, which is a crime against not just a husband but a crime against Allāh ﷻ—ingratitude. But we also know that that ingratitude occurs on men as well, it’s just there's a higher propensity for it to occur in women. The fact that it is then mentioned afterwards that these are the characteristics of women, then that can play into that, but that doesn't mean that that is a permanent state.

Let me make it easier for you. The fact that they are the majority in the Hellfire and then they mention that they are women, does that make women cursed?

No.

So, the same way if you mentioned that they are *nāqiṣāt al-ʿaql, nāqiṣāt’l-dīn* doesn’t mean that the actions of what they do in their *dīn* half the time because they're menstruating the other time, that that is cursed. So that's not a negative. If you're saying that *nāqiṣāt al-ʿaql* is a negative, then why are you only choosing that to be the negative? What’s the other negative? And where's the proof that a woman does 50% of effort in the *dīn* (even though it’s obviously more than that) and she gets the same reward from Allāh ﷻ?

Student (online): Correlation does not equal causation.

Ustādh: I don't even know what that means but it sounds good.

Let's look at some scenarios now folks.

وَصَلاَةُ مَنْ تَبِعَهُ عَالِماً لاَ جَاهِلاً أَوْ نَاسِياً، وَلاَ مَنْ فَارَقَهُ

As well as for the one following him who knew what was correct. It is not invalidated for the one who was following unaware of what was correct, or had forgotten, or had left the imām's prayer.

If there are two trustworthy people that say *subḥān Allāh* and he does not listen to them and he's definitely not sure about himself, he doesn't know what's going on himself, then his prayer has been invalidated because people told him and he didn't listen.

Why?

Because he left the *wājib*. He [the imām] left the *wājib*. He is in trouble.

Let's now deal with the people behind. What is their ruling? Are they all the same everyone who's praying behind me? What is their situation? How do we look at each person one by one?

Firstly, if the person behind me (any one of them) who's observing all of this, he's in the prayer, he's prayed behind me, he's either thought, '*The guy made a mistake. Did the guy make a mistake?*' Then someone says *subḥān Allāh*. Everybody has to be thinking in their own prayer. You're not like a sheep. When you're in the *ṣalāh* you have to be thinking to either correct the imām, to make sure you're doing the right thing yourself. So now you see this situation in front of you go off. You see two people make a statement as well. Everybody is in a different scenario. If you don't know what's going on, then you just carry on and you're going to follow the imām.

Now let's focus on the people themselves who do the *tasbīḥ*. So, the two people who do the *tasbīḥ*:

فإن كان عندهم عِلْمٌ كما عند المُنبِّهَين وَجَبَ عليهم أن يفارقوا الإمام

So, if the two people who are sure (because obviously they're sure) they say *tasbīḥ* that you've made a mistake and there are others that have the knowledge of the *ṣalāh* as well as the confidence that this one has been messed up and that the correcting guys are the correct people in this scenario, it is obligatory upon all of them to leave the prayer.

What does leave the prayer mean?

(1:10:00) It means that they pray by themselves, like we give the ruling for the women. Like we said when the speaker cuts off, and they can't hear and they are in a room somewhere, then you just break off from a *niyyah* point of view and you carry on praying by yourself. We also gave the option of another person moving forward and leading the *ṣalāh*. That second option cannot possibly work here as you are part of a congregation physically. So, in this scenario you will break off and you will carry on the prayer by yourself. We will speak about that detail in a minute.

If they didn't, so we're talking about people who are absolutely certain the imām messed up. They are bang on it. They know imām has fallen asleep, he doesn't know what is going on and you know that they made the mistake, whether you're from the people who are saying *subḥān Allāh* or the people in the [congregation] and you thought, '*You know what? My guy didn't listen to us*,' the imām ignored you. And you bottle it (you chicken out) and you carry on with the imām. What is the ruling?

If you did that intentionally, meaning that you are aware of the issue, you are aware that he's done it wrong, you are aware of yourself, and then [you carry on with the imām].

Student (online): Doesn't the imām swallow all mistakes in the prayer so you're not in the wrong even if you follow? And then you advise him after the *taslīm*?

Ustādh: He swallows your mistakes because his prayer is the king prayer. If the king prayer is messed up, it's not swallowing mistakes. He has to fix his mistakes. That is why when the imām is leading the people in the prayer, people can walk up and down the line, there is no *sutrah*, but they can't cut the imām's *sutrah* because that is the king prayer. It's the chief prayer. Likewise, little things that you forget, obligatory aspects of the prayer the [imām swallows them up].

So, if you are in the prayer and knew that there was a mistake, imām didn't budge, he carries on and you decide to carry on with the imām, you are either one of two people. If (a) you are someone who knows what is right, then your prayer has been invalidated, because you have left the obligation in the prayer and continued with a prayer that you know is invalid or a mistake, you are adding to the prayer, and that's intentionally which by definition is an invalidation of the prayer.

وإنْ كان ذلك نسياناً لم تبطل

But if you follow because you now have some doubt, or you're not sure what happens next, or you're not sure what to do, or you forget, so any of the other options as opposed to bottling it, which is to say, '*I don't have the guts to break off here there's going to be a kickoff*.' [The prayer is not invalidated.]

Student (online): I think many will bottle it in that scenario especially when praying somewhere like Victoria Park Masjid.

Ustādh: This is exactly why I am mentioning it because many will bottle it. Many will chicken out.

So, unless you genuinely don't know and him carrying on has put doubt in your own mind of whether you're right or not, or you're just not sure, or you've forgotten, then the prayer is not invalidated and you will then do *sujūd'l-sahw* at the end of the prayer, either with the imām because he realises (if he does, after the prayer) and if he doesn't then you will do *sajdat'l-sahw* yourself (we will come to that afterwards). This by yourself scenario is something we will cover in a couple of weeks.

Student (online): Even if you knew and chickened out?

Ustādh: If you knew and chickened out your prayer is invalidated. You have to pray again. That's like not having *wuḍū'*. It's all over.

Basically, the prayer is not going to be invalidated. The prayer is *ṣaḥīḥ*.

There are some scholars that say that one of the things that you should do is that when you know that they are wrong, you carry on and then you stay seated. Some of the *fuqahā'* mentioned that, that you carry on (with your prayer separate to them). So, you stay in the same place and you carry on and then you wait at the *taslīm* part so that you can give *salām* with them. So, you're not going to separate from them, basically like we do in *ṣalāt al-Khawf* which is the prayer of fear which we pray during war, that's how you pray. That was the position of some of the scholars.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that Imām al-Ḥajjāwi has made it clear that that is not an acceptable position with him, because he said you have to exit from the prayer. He doesn't sit and wait for the imām because Imām al-Ḥajjāwi and some of the Ḥanābilah considered this prayer to be invalidated, the imām's prayer has been invalidated. So, it is not possible to follow him in something which is invalidated.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn now throws a curveball:

لكن أحياناً يقوم الإمام لزائدة حسب علم المأموم، وهي غير زائدة

He says that sometimes the imām will stand up for what is an extra *rakʿah* according to the people behind, but in actual fact, it's not an extra *rakʿah*. And I mean an extra *rakʿah*. He will stand up for an extra *rakʿah* that the others behind will say, '*Well, that's an extra rakʿah*,' but technically, it is not an extra *rakʿah*.

For example, the imām forgot to recite *sūrah al-Fātiḥah* in one of the *rakʿāt*. Let us just say for example, in the fourth one. Let's say it is *Ẓuhr*. So, he prays *Ẓuhr* and he prays normally, everything is fine and in the fourth *rakʿah* when he stands up, he is standing there... By the way, this has happened to me as well. You are leading the prayer and you forget that you are leading the prayer, so you are not saying anything. You are just waiting around and then you suddenly realise, and then you say *Allāhu akbar* quietly to yourself. Then you realise that behind you there are people. So, now you have gone too far.

I am in *rukūʿ*. Now, when I am in *rukūʿ*, in this situation right now, I have realised, '*Oh my God, I am leading a prayer and I did not even recite Fātiḥah*!' So, now I am going to stand back up again, and the people behind me are going to expect me to say *Allāhu akbar* [and go] into *sajdah*. But instead, I am going to stand there and recite my *Fātiḥah*, silently of course because it is *Ẓuhr*, fourth *rakʿah*.

The people behind me are probably thinking this is one of those [situations where the imām is making an elongated *duʿāʾ* in the standing position after coming up from *rukūʿ*]. They are probably thinking that I am making the *duʿāʾ* between *rukūʿ*. And the *miskīn* women in the boiler room have no idea what is going on. Such a *ḥarām ẓulm*. *Kassem* those people over there. *Kassem* it's a disaster.

Student (online): Could you not recite the *Fātiḥah* slightly loudly?

Ustādh: It doesn't matter if you recite *Fātiḥah* slightly loudly. They still won't know what is going on.

Then I say, '*Allāhu akbar*,' and I go for *rukūʿ* whilst they all go for *sujūd*. Then they realise, '*What's going on?*' They are all standing up, they're going up now. What's going on?

So, right here is a classic scenario where the entire *masjid* knows 100% that you have added a *rakʿah*. You have done new stuff. You have definitely done it wrong. And they are all sure that you have done it wrong. And you have. But you did it the right way, meaning you fixed the mistake in the prayer. What is going to happen in that scenario?

In this scenario:

ففي هذه الحال ينتظره المأموم ليسلم معه

(1:20:00) In this scenario, what has to happen is that the imām will try to during this point indicate a little bit to the people what is going on. And if they carried on themselves and ignored the imām and then they realised during the *ṣalāh* that he was fixing it, then you would actually sit and wait. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is giving this example to indicate that

this is the exception where you would not move out of the prayer, where you would not leave the prayer.

So, imagine there are people behind you and they have seen you do this (go from *rukūʿ* into *Fātiḥah* again). They will think, '*This guy has lost the plot*.' They will say, '*Subḥān Allāh*,' but they are being ignored. The imām is carrying on. So, upon you is to carry on because as far as you are concerned the imām has lost the plot. So, I would go down to *sujūd.* I will do my two *sajdahs,* whilst you're with the imām and the rest of the people are still standing, I would carry on. As I am going, it is indicated to me somehow that he is actually catching up. In this scenario, it is allowed for him to remain there because he has now done that—to remain in *taslīm*, wait for the imām to catch up, let the imām give *salām*, and then give *salām* after him. This is a very rare, weird scenario by the way. One of those hypotheticals which make people laugh and are interesting for discussion. In actual reality, it does not make any sense.

Q & A

Q (online): What If a woman claps indicating that something is wrong but the imām did not hear it and carries on?

A: Listen. tThat is the same with the men. It is not about women here. It is about anybody who either does not hear or ignores you. So, you will just carry on.

Next week, we are going to cover what happens with you specifically. I can give you the spoiler now which is that if that leads you to not be sure, then you just carry on following the imām. And if you are sure that he is definitely making a mistake, then you would finish the prayer by yourself. That is not to do with a woman though, that is to do with anyone.

Q (online): If you are praying alone without the intention of being the imām and someone tries to join you in prayer, can you indicate to them to not join? Isn't the Ḥanbali position not that the lone worshipper can't suddenly become the imām?

A: I do not believe that it is the unanimously agreed Ḥanbali position, but certainly it is one of the main Ḥanbali positions. Yes. And not just the Ḥanbalis, a number of the *fuqahāʾ*. I am someone who strongly believes that it is permissible and I do not like it.

Can you indicate?

Yes, you can. Small actions are allowed in the prayer. You are not obligated to lead the prayer.

Q (online): If this was in *rakʿah* three, would he just wait on the floor for them to catch up with him and then pray the fourth with them?

A: No. If you are talking about the missing the *Fātiḥah* scenario, the only time he would actually give *salām* or pray with them is if he realises in the prayer that actually, he is wrong and the imām was right. That is the only time that he sits and hangs about. Otherwise, he is out of the prayer. That is next week.

Q (online): With regards to addition, I have realised that I have made many of the mistakes that people make that have invalidated the prayer without me knowing. Do I need to repeat these prayers?

A: No. You do not need to repeat any of these prayers. You just need to make sure that you understand the scenario and learn from it.

Q (online): I am still confused about the *Fātiḥah* being missed.

A: [It means that] I [the imām] did not say it. That is my point. I did not say it and then when I realised (as you will see as it is coming in about two or three weeks' time) when you miss a *rukn* you have to go back to it. So, I am now going to go back to it. That is basically what is happening.

Q (online): If one prayed *ṣalāh* with a regular pace and then on the final *rakʿah* whilst making *sajdah* they end up prolonging it by 1-2 minutes (as they are making extra *duʿāʾ*) would this invalidate the *ṣalāh* as the form of the prayer is not measured/similar?

A: No. I have covered this before. I do not think that it will invalidate the prayer. Some scholars said that it is not good, but I do not think it invalidates the prayer.

Q (online): It is okay to not read *al-Fātiḥah* if you are following?

A: No. It is not okay to not read *al-Fātiḥah* according to the Ḥanbalis and according to the vast majority of scholars. You need to read *Fātiḥah*.

Q (online): What is the difference between indicating that there has been an addition to the prayer and omission from the prayer?

A: There is no difference. What you are doing is basically, making the imām question himself. The imām then questions himself, and then he makes a decision of whether he is telling me it is short or not.

Q (online): During end of pregnancy cervix is checked and that results in some spotting/bleeding. Does that blood fall under *damʾl-fasād* since it doesn't fall under first three categories (*ḥayḍ*, *nifās* and *istiḥāḍah*)? What would be ruling about it (pure/impure, *wuḍūʾ* required/no)?

A: Correct. It does not fall under the first three categories and it is pure. *Wuḍūʾ* is good out of caution. But it does not, in my opinion, break the *wuḍūʾ*. But always in examinations, I prefer that *istinjāʾ* and *wuḍūʾ* is done. The main thing is that it is not the onset of *nifās* and it is not the one which stops you in the prayer.

Q (online): Within the *ṣalāh*, how would the imām know what mistake he made?

A: Like I said, when you are praying, you know. You will know. There are certain things of which you are not sure—whether it was going right or wrong. As I said, the people behind you, they normally confirm things. I can tell you that from experience that it is rare that they tell you something and bring new information. The only time that happens is when they recite the *ayah* that you are making a mistake in.

Q (online): Is there a window of opportunity for doing the *tasbīḥ*? You cannot have a good think on it and then say *subḥān Allāh* and the imām does not know what you are talking about.

A: You can. There is no window of opportunity. For example, I have done *tasbīḥ* to an
(1:30:00) imām three or four positions later and the imām clocked on immediately. Like I said to you, this is an experience thing. This is an intuition thing. When you lead the prayer, and the people behind you say *subḥān Allāh*, it is only them indicating and confirming that which you already know most of the time. In most cases. That is my personal opinion. And like I said, I have done that to someone miles down. I mean, we are talking literally in the next *rakʿah* and people have worked it out, the imām has worked it out. Because, you know. People know.

Q (online): We were praying once and we were in a different room and the imām went straight into *sajdah* instead of *rukūʿ*, but we assumed the mistake that was made was that he said *Allāhu akbar* instead of *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah* because we did not see him go into *sajdah*. And it was only when he started reciting in the second *rakʿah* instead of going into a second *sajdah* did we realise the mistake. So, the women made the second *sajdah* and then stood up to rejoin the *ṣalāh* with the Imām. Is this valid?

A: If you are behind an imām that does something like that or the other versions of that, you have the option of catching up the actions to get back to where the imām is and nothing having to be done or realising that the situation has gone belly up and separate from the prayer. And then you pray by yourself. Yes, some scholars said that you can

create your own *jamāʿah*, one woman steps forward and takes over. I am okay with that too, but I prefer that you pray by yourselves.

Q (online): Just to be clear this discussion is the imām making a mistake and not correcting a *rukn* only, correct? Not *wājibāt,* where we would break away and finish ourselves.

A: Correct.

Q (online): Do women clap or say *subḥān Allāh* when praying in a woman only congregation?

A: I am comfortable with *tasbīḥ* and the clapping of the hands. But I personally prefer the clapping and that is what I go with. If you try to work out the *ʿillah* to be she claps with men, and alone can say *tasbīḥ*. And that *men* are husbands as well.[§]

Q (online): The imām is leading *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr* and in one of the *rakʿāt* he forgets to recite *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* but the people behind him don't know because it's a silent prayer. Therefore, as the imām missed a *rukn* he replaces this with a *rakʿah* at the end so that he can make up the missed *rukn* (in which he missed *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*). So, the people behind him remain seated at the fourth *rakʿah* until the imām and finishes the fifth *rakʿah* and they do *taslīm* with the imām.

A: Again, this is only if you realise that the imām has got it right. If you are one of these people and you think the imām has got it wrong, you have to not do *taslīm* with the imām. So, even though Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn gave this example, it is a very rare scenario that this person would see this, think it's wrong, and then suddenly believe that the imām is right. Anyway, don't waste to much sleep over this. It is a really weird scenario.

[§] Women bringing attention to something in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 11. MT

10. Chapter 20 Lesson 5: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

(0:09:00) In terms of the text, we are just finishing off this part:

وإن سَبَّحَ به ثِقَتانِ فأَصَرَّ ولَمْ يَجْزِمْ بِصَوابِ نَفْسِهِ بَطُلَتْ صلاتُهُ وصلاةُ مَن تَبِعَه عالِمًا، لا جاهِلًا أو نَاسِيًا ولا مَن فارَقَه

If two trustworthy people alert the imām to a mistake but he continues whilst being unsure he is correct, his prayer is invalidated as well as for the one following him who knew what was correct. It is not invalidated for the one who was following unaware of what was correct, or had forgotten, or had left the imām's prayer.

And we're just on that issue of what does it mean to leave the imām's prayer. Can you pray your prayers by yourself and just sit around waiting and then do the *salām* with him? We said that's a form of leaving the prayer and that's okay. But what's better is that he just breaks away. He's seen this guy make a mistake, he knows he's 100% made a mistake, he's warned him and told him do this right, he's not interested. So, we know 100% that we're right and he's 100% wrong according to our opinion. So, we carry on with our prayer, ignore the *jamāʿah*, we give the *salām* and we go. We will come to that in a second.

The next part of the text that we're going to cover today is:

وعَمَلٌ مُسْتَكْثَرٌ عادَةً من غيرِ جِنْسِ الصلاةِ يُبْطِلُها عَمْدُه وسَهْوُه، ولا يُشْرَعُ لِيَسِيْرِهِ سُجودٌ، ولا تَبْطُلُ بِيَسِيْرِ أَكْلٍ أو شُرْبٍ سَهْوًا،

Actions not from the genus of the prayer, performed in a quantity that would be considered 'a lot', invalidate the prayer whether done intentionally or forgetfully/unintentionally. It is not legislated to offer the prostration for an insignificant number of such actions. Unintentionally ingesting small amounts of food and drink does not invalidate the prayer; the supererogatory prayer is also valid if one drinks a small amount *intentionally*.

Let's get to the *Sharḥ* then, the commentary. We're in that scenario where we're trying to understand one unique, rare, random scenario where the people behind know 100% this is *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr* and they have all counted four, everybody knows, and the imām has stood up for the fifth. He's stood up for the fifth and everyone behind is like, '*What's going on?*' Now, they know for a fact that this is a mistake. They say *subḥān Allāh,* women are giving it all their [clapping] behavior at the back. He ignores them. At this point right now, you in your mind know 100% that this imām has made a mistake because you know as far as you're concerned this is the case. So what you have to do, what you're obligated to do, otherwise your prayer is going to be invalidated, is to not follow him as we covered last week, because that's you intentionally changing the prayer.

As we covered this last week, we said if there's a person who doesn't know what's going on, he's a bit *miskīn*, doesn't know what's happening, it doesn't matter about him, or he's not sure about it himself, he's just following the imām, that's okay. But a person who does know, he can't follow. So what does he do?

He will continue the prayer by himself and then wait and then give *salāms* with the imām and that's it. And we said that's like *ṣalāt al-Khawf*, the prayer you pray in war, where you pray with the imām and then you wait and give the *salāms* with the imām. You entered into the prayer with the imām with *takbīr*, and you give *salām* with the imām. Or (which is certainly what I prefer and what the scholars generally prefer) is that the person just prays and does *taslīm* and that's it, gone.

Now, the unique scenario Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn threw out is that he said: Okay. Not all the time though when the imām stands up for the fifth is it a mistake. And we explained that because he's missed *al-Fātiḥah* in one of the *rakʿāt* earlier, so he's basically too far gone now so he's cancelled that *rakʿah* out and he's standing up again to do a *rakʿah* to replace the invalid *rakʿah*—the unit—because he didn't do *al-Fātiḥah* in it for example. So in this scenario, the people who are thinking it's a mistake, they will leave the prayer. What you need to know is that in this scenario, because the imām doesn't advertise what he's doing, if the people followed him because they weren't sure, their prayer is fine because they are not sure. If the people broke away because they can see he has clearly stood up for the fifth, they're fine as well. There's no problem sin-wise or anything like that. But what would be better is for people to use a little bit of lateral thinking and try to put some guesswork together.

What kind of things would you be looking for?

First of all, you look at your imām. If he's a don daddy imām and you know he doesn't mess about, got a spot-on memory, full of experience, not getting too old and senile like myself, not making lots of mistakes all the time, you're going to think, '*Something's up here*.'

Number two, massive clue if everybody is going *subḥān Allāh* and he's like blatantly ignoring everybody. That's a massive sign as well. That is an indication. But none of these things in and of themselves are enough.

A third thing would be a clue that happened earlier in the prayer that maybe you brought attention to the imām at that time as a result of it, or it struck you as something a bit strange at the time. This is all a kind of detective work basically.

The classic example would be if one of the *rakʿāt* was done very quickly, not the normal length of standing that it should have been if the imām had done *al-Fātiḥah* in it. So you're putting two and two together, '*He's ignoring everybody, he's a solid guy, knows what he's doing. And hold on! Yeah maybe that first rakʿah where we thought something was off…*'

Student: Like he did not sit in *tawarruk* in the fourth *rakʿah* is a clue.

Ustādh: Yeah. It's different things.

You look for a clue. And every scenario will have a unique clue. But this is tough. Of course, it's tough. How on earth do you actually know, know?

You don't. So, in that scenario Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn mentions that if the guy hangs around and follows because he has some doubt, or because of his doubt he actually prays his prayer—because remember you would be reciting your *al-Fātiḥah* if he left his *al-Fātiḥah* off, so your prayer is valid. So, if you were not sure and you followed him, that would be fine. And if you're not sure and you carried on your own prayer, meaning you didn't stand up with the fifth and you remained seated for the fourth, and you stayed there, and then did *taslīm* with the imām, that's also great as well.

So we're just covering all the bases, just making it clear that not every increase in the prayer from the imām is a 'mistake'.

Therefore, the different categories that we have now of people who followed the imām when the imām increases in the prayer i.e., he makes a mistake and increases in action or statement in the prayer, that is considered a 'mistake' and the imām does that, and the people that are following, they fall into four categories:

The first one: Those who think the imām is right in whatever he's doing. Whether he's doing extra or not, they're aware they think he's got this under control. Their prayer is valid or invalid? What do you think?

Student (online): So, if you decided not to do the extra *rakʿah* you would sit and wait for the imam's *taslīm* as opposed to breaking and doing your own *taslīm*?

Ustādh: That is an option. You could do that. But as I said, I prefer that a person goes.

Student (online): Their prayer is valid.

Ustādh: Correct. It's valid.

Second type: That a person looks at the imām and he considers him more than likely, so over 50%—*ghalabat'l-ẓann*— as mistaken. And they follow him knowing that he's mistaken. Mistaken, obviously, they believe that he's made a mistake and they're pretty sure.

We all know that that prayer is invalid.

The third group: They follow him in that mistake unaware of the actual mistake or unaware of what you're meant to do even if you know the mistake, or they forget. So *'Hold on! That is actually a fifth rakʿah*,' but they're not sure what to do. What do you do? Do you continue? Do you stop? What do you do?

This prayer is valid.

Or they forget. So, there are three subcategories to this:

- he didn't realise the mistake, or
- saw the mistake he doesn't know what to do as part of the mistake, or
- he realised there was a mistake but he forgot about it.

(0:20:00) All of that is forgiven because Allāh ﷻ quotes the people saying:

﴿رَبَّنَا لَا تُؤَاخِذْنَآ إِن نَّسِينَآ أَوْ أَخْطَأْنَا﴾

"Lord, do not take us to task if we forget or make mistakes." [*Sūrat al-Baqarah*: 286]

And the *ḥadīth* we know that Allāh ﷻ says, "I have done that," meaning I will accept your *duʿāʾ*.[1] So, that's something which is a mistake.

The final category of people are those people who just separate. They see what the imām does and they think that he's made a mistake and they leave the prayer. This prayer is valid.

Those are all of the categories of people who follow an imām.

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Faith, Chapter: Clarification That Allāh ﷻ, Most High Allows a Person's Thoughts and Whatever Occurs in His Heart, So Long as They Do Not Become Established, and the Clarification That He, Glorious Is He and Most High, Does Not Burden Anyone With More Than He Can Bear, and Clarifying the Ruling on Thinking of Doing Good and Bad Deeds, ḥadīth no. 126.*

Now we have a question, Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn asks on page 349:

هل يجب على المأموم أن يُنبِّه إمامه إذا قام إلى زائدة أو لا يجب؟

Is it obligatory for the person who's behind (being led) to indicate to the imām that he's made a mistake, that he's increased the prayer or not?

The answer is of course yes, it is. It is absolutely obligatory because the Prophet ﷺ said:

فَإِذَا نَسِيتُ فَذَكِّرُونِي

"If I forget something then remind me."[2]

What about someone who is not part of the *jamāʻah*?

وإذا عَلِمَ غير المأموم أن المُصلِّي زاد، كَرَجُلٍ يصلِّي إلى جانبه، فقام إلى خامسة، وهو ليس بإمام له، فهل يلزمه تنبيهه؟

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says that he is praying next to you. He's praying *sunnah* next to you. He's not even part of your *jamāʻah* but he works out clearly that you've done five. And this is not about *khushūʻ*. Everybody knows and everybody can see when someone's by them. In actual fact, sometimes being with a person helps you to keep track of your own prayer because sometimes you know that you're not sure whether you've done three or four, but you know that the guy next to you started at roughly the same time and if he's still going… If you're praying alone and you're roughly at the same kind of speed and stuff like that, you get a feel for what's going on. I've done that before certainly, where I'm not sure, '*Am I on three or am I on four?*' But that's made me think, so you have doubt.

Student (online): But that's not certainty...

Ustādh: Of course, it's not a certainty. The whole point is that I'm praying by myself, I'm not sure where I am. That's the whole point, it's not certain and I'm looking for clues to help me and then I look at my guy and I say, '*Yeah, we started roughly about the same*

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 a*.

time and he's just stood up for the fourth. Yeah that sounds about right.' If he's in *taslīm*, I'm now starting to think, '*Maybe I am now praying the fourth*.'

The point is that you do and you are aware of people around you. And I said before the *sunnah* is not to close your eyes.† You are meant to be aware of your surroundings. And as we covered at the end of last year there is even space to be looking.‡ We said not every look is a situation.

Student (online): No, I mean the guy correcting you if he is not in the congregation.

Ustādh: Obviously this is based upon the guy knowing. It's not based upon a guy who comes halfway through and thinks he's seen a mistake. This is a guy who's there, who is certain himself or herself.

So: Is it obligatory upon him to indicate, to shout out, to say something?

Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says that according to the majority of the *fuqahā'*, according to what we see from them, is that the guy is not obligated. He's not obligated because he's not his imām and he has nothing to do with his own prayer and he has no connection to his prayer. He's not affected by it. There's no link. There's no connection. But Shaykh says if we go back to the statement of Allāh ﷻ:

﴿وَتَعَاوَنُواْ عَلَى ٱلۡبِرِّ وَٱلتَّقۡوَىٰۖ وَلَا تَعَاوَنُواْ عَلَى ٱلۡإِثۡمِ وَٱلۡعُدۡوَٰنِۚ ٢﴾

"Help one another to do what is right and good; do not help one another towards sin and hostility." [*Sūrat al-Mā'idah:* 2]

Then it is no doubt that from righteousness we should consider it obligatory.

فالصحيح عندي: أنه يجب أن ينبِّهه

He says: "According to me, the correct opinion it is obligatory to shout out."

You notice, '*Yep! That guy has definitely done five*,' and you do it all the time. I mean this is obviously speaking about a guy who's praying next to him. Forget that guy. You're sitting in a *masjid* doing *dhikr*, what else do you do? If you're relaxing in a *masjid,* you're

† Closing the eyes in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 2. MT
‡ Turing and looking upward in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lessons 1-2. MT

up against the wall and you're just watching everybody. It's the weirdest thing ever. And you see all kinds of madness. You see the most classic things. So, these people keep an eye on things, and they know. I mean I've done it before. And the difference about me though is that I will actually indicate more than just say *subḥān Allāh.* And I've done that. When I've been in the *masjid* and seen a mistake I will say, *'Bro you just prayed three and you need to pray four*.'

Student (online): Would you say *subḥān Allāh* or would you actually say what the mistake is?

Ustādh: Yes. You are not restricted. *Subḥān Allāh* and the clap is for men and women in the prayer. A woman can also speak as well. We don't believe that the voice is *ʿawrah*.

For Paks, with Desi people, for us this is not a major issue as we all know that our mums (not our dads, but our mums) do this day and night. When you were young, I am sure that your mum is slating you in the prayer whilst you're praying, '*You fish! You call that a prayer?*'

My mum does that. My mum will come, she'll say, '*Alright listen, we're waiting for you. We want to go.*' That's the classic one. I'll be praying and she will say, '*Listen, we'll be waiting for you in the front room*.' That is allowed. I mean, it's not great, but it's not *ḥarām* to indicate something to someone who is praying.

On one hand, we definitely need to sanctify the prayer more than it is in our hearts. On the other hand, I think we do sanctify it too much where we fall into a ritualistic extremism (I think that's the way I want to put it), which is not from the *Sunnah*—the strictness that we approach the prayer with. That is why people are shocked when we hear that the Prophet ﷺ opened the door to ʿĀ'ishah whilst he ﷺ was praying—opened the door—knock on the door, walk to the door, opened it.[3] You are going to see some things that are going to make you think, '*What?!*' Obviously, we spoke about this a lot. And even statements here and there, there's some space. But anyway, the point is that it is allowed for a person to indicate. Now, you don't have full on conversations and so on.

Shaykh says that it is obligatory to correct it because Allāh ﷻ commanded people to cooperate in that which is good.

Student: Wouldn't that have an effect on the *khushūʿ*? If you talk to people while they pray?

Ustādh: I don't know. As our teachers used to say when we complain about children: Are we trying to remove children from our lives or is it more important for us to build a better defence, to have a higher quality focus? No one here is going to say that a prayer

[3] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: Actions During the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 922*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan* by al-Albāni.

done in silence is the same as a prayer done in noise. At least I don't think so. The majority of us will appreciate a silent, quiet prayer. However, there is a special *maza* to praying when it is all madness outside. A special *maza* when it's full hustle bustle and you are in prayer. Especially *sajdah*. *Sajdah* is on a whole different level when it is in front of other people and work and crowds. I mean, that's my favourite.

(0:30:00) My point is that the Muslim has to have the tools to be able to deal with real life. Islam is not practiced in a bubble and it is not a religion for the elite. It's a religion for the working classes. It's the religion for families. It's the religion for single parents. *Subḥān Allāh*, like we said at the beginning of lockdown that this *dīn* is based upon community and its secret is its community and the *jamāʿah* is an essential ingredient which has honestly made us suffer so much. However, it also goes to show how important it is for your own battery to be self-charging as well, for your level of *imān* to be that, that when you're alone, when you're in a difficult moment, that you've got enough to keep yourself going, when you don't have a community to push you, to embarrass you, for you to want to up your game. A community does so many things that you don't realise. But when you are on your own you realise.

Likewise, you have to have enough in the bank to be able to deal with the scenario of when people are talking. The music question is a classic example. A lot of people are praying in changing rooms, praying in shops, praying in a stadium, praying in a train station where the music is on, etc. And we use this example to explain to people the difference between *al-samāʿah* and *al-istimāʿah*. *Samāʿah* is when you hear something and *istimāʿah* is when you listen to something. There is a big difference when you are intentionally focused on the words of something and it is dominating your thought process versus just hearing things. Even in hearing, you could just recognise a song, recognise lyrics, recognise a tune, recognise people speaking, recognise a message. That's hearing. Listening is when you allow that to dominate.

Student (online): One is active and the other is passive.

Ustādh: Yes, active versus passive.

So, you would speak to him and you'd correct the point, even if there is no connection between you.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: What does the connection have to do with anything? He says: If a person says what do you say about a person who is fasting who is just about to eat, or to pick up something which he wants to drink, out of forgetfulness, is it obligatory to [remind them that they are fasting]?

This is interesting because me, I'm like, '*Let him enjoy that food and drink because Allāh ﷻ is about to feed him and give him drink.*' Because that's what the *ḥadīth* says:

مَنْ نَسِيَ وَهُوَ صَائِمٌ فَأَكَلَ أَوْ شَرِبَ فَلْيُتِمَّ صَوْمَهُ فَإِنَّمَا أَطْعَمَهُ اللَّهُ وَسَقَاهُ

"If anyone forgets that he is fasting and eats or drinks he should complete his fast, for it is only Allāh who has fed him and given him drink." [4]

It's a bonus. It's a charity. And it's okay. Nothing needs to be done. So, on the one hand, you are thinking, '*I'm not gonna… Allāh ﷻ has given my guy a gift and I'm going to have to rain in on his parade and say, "But, you know what I mean bro?"*'

Student (online): When Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says *ẓāhir kalāmʾl-fuqahāʾ,* is this to the same effect "the majority"?

Ustādh: No. It is not the majority. But it is the position of the majority. But *ẓāhir kalāmʾl-fuqahāʾ* doesn't in and of itself mean the majority, it only means the majority when you know it's the majority. *Ẓāhir kalāmʾl-fuqahāʾ* means exactly how you understand it, 'the apparent meaning of their statements', 'the apparent thing that they are saying'. That is what *ẓāhir kalāmʾl-fuqahāʾ* means.

Student (online): Let them enjoy it.

Ustādh: As she said, you'd think just let them enjoy it.

Student (online): That is the same as raining on someone's parade by telling them that a certain sweet has gelatine in it.

Ustādh: Gelatine is a bit different because obviously there is *khilāf* on it. There are some scholars that genuinely consider gelatine to be chemically changed, *istiḥālah* has occurred and so it is okay.

Shaykh says: Absolutely. He has to say it because Allāh ﷻ has commanded:

﴿وَتَعَاوَنُوا۟ عَلَى ٱلْبِرِّ وَٱلتَّقْوَىٰ ۖ ﴿٢﴾﴾

"Help one another to do what is right and good." [*Sūrat al-Mā'idah:* 2]

And enjoining the good and forbidding the evil is to prevent that which is *ḥarām*.

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of fasting, Chapter: The One Who Eats, Drinks, or Has Intercourse by Mistake Does Not Break His Fast, ḥadīth no. 1155.*

The way to explain this is to say that his ruling is different than your ruling. His responsibility is different than your responsibility. He is forgiven because he has forgotten. At this moment, you are being tested because you know. That is it. Let's not make a big drama out of it. You are going to have to rain on his parade and you cannot ignore things like that.

By the way, the issue of connection being there. You know, that you have to be connected to something. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said: If you saw a person making *wuḍūʾ* with water which is *najas,* you are not going to walk by and say, '*This has nothing to do with my wuḍūʾ.'* I mean it is ridiculous. Enjoining the good and forbidding the evil is an obligation. Incorporating righteousness and so on and so forth is something which is an obligation. And to want the best for your brother, want for your brother what you would want for yourself, is obviously a key principle in *Sharīʿah*.[5] You want to be helping people.

Shaykh says:

مسألة :رجل ليس معه إلا مأموم واحد فسَبَّحَ به، فهل يرجع إلى قوله، أو يأخذ بما في نفسه؟

Only two people are praying. One is leading the other. They are standing next to each other. He makes a mistake and the guy next to you (on your righthand side) he makes the *tasbīḥ*. What do you do in this scenario? In this scenario where you are there, and my guy now says something to you on the right, do you take his position or not? He is only one guy. That is as good as yours. What is the difference between yours and his?

Shaykh says that ultimately it is going to be dependent on your level of certainty.

Student (online): Why would it make any difference? Is the point that there is only one person bringing it to your attention?

Ustādh: Correct. The whole point of this question is that there is only one person. It is going back to that whole one-person thing. So, there is not absolute certainty because there is no other person backing him up. It's your *ijtihād* versus his *ijtihād*. That is the reason the question is being asked.

You already know what my answer is on that. I already told you before. I do not care if it is one person, ten people etc., it is dependent on what you believe. You will be judged according to what you believe, i.e. your level of certainty, not arrogance.

[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Faith, Chapter: The Evidence That One of the Attributes of Faith Is to Love for One's Brother Muslim That One Loves for Oneself of Goodness, ḥadīth no. 45 a.*

Shaykh says that no, you do not need to go back to him. None of the scholars are going to obligate you to have to depend upon his position because he is one guy by himself. So, that's that.

However, he says that sometimes if a person does mention it or says something out loud, says *subḥān Allāh*, you start to think. And the more that you think at that moment, you think, '*Maybe he is right*.' So, if he thinks that he is probably right (he is never going to get to certainty) but on the balance of probabilities, beyond reasonable doubt believes that, '*Yes*, *he is probably right*,' then it becomes obligatory for him to follow him whether it is taking his warning or indication in terms of decreasing something from the prayer or increasing something from the prayer, whatever it is to do with your prayer. If he says something and it makes you think that he is right, you are obligated to follow it. And, if he does not, then you are not. It is as simple as that.

(0:40:00) Even Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn makes a point that I was saying earlier on. He gives the example of people who come late to the prayer. They come late to the prayer and they join at the same time. This is what I was saying, but not as part of a *jamāʿah*, but two people arrive at a *masjid* and they start praying themselves. In this scenario, these people have both come to the *masjid* they've joined the prayer, joined the imām, and now they stand up. And then when they now stand up one of the guys, he forgets how much he's got to do. So, what he does is that he starts to kind of use the other guy as a guide. He knows, '*Well he joined with me. And so I am just going to slow down*.'

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn actually says he is in *sajdah* (my guy who has forgotten). He is in *sajdah* and he has forgotten right now: Does he need to get up to do another *rakʿah* or not?

So, he actually elongates the *sajdah.* He basically hangs around just does more *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla,* he carries on waiting for the guy to catch up, get into *sajdah* and then does he sit or does he stand. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that maybe that guy will stand, so then he realises '*Yeah, I was right to have a doubt*. *I do need to stand back up*,' so then he would stand up as well (or sit). We have all been there done that. I certainly have. 100%! So there you go.

So that is all the scenarios done in terms of correcting the imām.

Student (online): Is there a limit to how many times you can correct the imām?

Ustādh: No. Oh you mean the same mistake. Of course, yeah. You don't… if he refuses it then a big fight starts out that, '*No! You are not going to move on. You will listen to what I am saying. You got it wrong!*' No, no not at all. You just do enough to make it clear that the correction was done and that he understood it.

Student (online): I remember reading a statement that Allāh ﷻ does not require us to have *ʿayn al-yaqīn* in all acts of *ʿibādah* rather we need to be more than 50% certain. Is this a correct way of thinking about it?

Ustādh: I do not know if it is a correct way, but it is something which is okay. We just need to have a good beyond reasonable doubt approach.

Student (online): So, if the imām has some doubt then the imām is obligated to follow the indication even if it is only one person? Who holds that opinion?

Ustādh: No. I never said that. I said if the imām has some doubt and believes that the probability is with the other opinion, then they are obligated to follow the indication of probability even if it is only one person. That is what the position is. And that is our **class position** and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position.

Student (online): What if you have no idea what they are correcting you about, yet they keep insisting?

Ustādh: Yeah, I mean obviously that is the whole point. That is why I say being an imām is no joke. People think just because you recite Qurʾān, you lead the prayer—no.

أَقْرَؤُهُمْ لِكِتَابِ اللَّهِ

"The most versed in Allāh's Book." [6]

Aqraʾakum means the most versed. Most versed means you know its recitation, its *ḥifẓ*, and its meaning, and the system behind it, and the rules that go with it when using it. So you have to have an idea. Now obviously sometimes you just have no idea what on earth they are going on about. You check in your mind this, that, do the calculations and, '*I have not got anything wrong*.' You just carry on. It does not matter if they keep insisting. If you believe them to be right, then you follow what they are trying to indicate. If you have no idea what is going on, then you just carry on with the prayer.

Student (online): Only *tasbīḥ* allowed to indicate a mistake? I.e. I cannot say *sūrah* if he has missed a *sūrah* to recite after *Fātiḥah*?

Ustādh: This is a difficult question. Why is it a difficult question? The reason it is difficult is because the scholars will differ over whether the word *sūrah* is from the *jins* or the genus of the prayer itself because just Arabic in itself does not qualify. It has to be from the *duʿāʾ* and *dhikr* category. *Sūrah* is definitely not and saying the name of *sūrah* is definitely not. However, on the other hand, people will say that it is a word in the Qurʾān:

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Who Is More Entitled to Lead the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 673 a.*

﴿سُورَةٌ أَنزَلْنَـٰهَا ۝١﴾

"This is a *sūrah* We have sent down." [*Sūrat al-Nūr*: 1]

So, it is going to fall into that kind of doubtful thing. I would not consider a prayer invalidated if a person was trying to help out an imām who has just frozen up, does not know what is going on and you said *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*, or *Fātiḥah* for example.

Just a reminder, you would never say *sūrah* in a prayer because it is not obligatory to recite *sūrah* anyway—not by any imām of any *madh-hab*. So, you would not call out an imām for that even if you follow the opinion that we mentioned a couple of weeks ago which is even those who miss out *sunnah* actions, can they make *sajdah* or not?[§] That is even a separate category. Even that we said we do not like it.

But by the way I was reading (just for your own benefit), ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbbās ﵄ is authentically narrated as having done *sajdah.* And I told you that I like the idea. And when I said I like the idea is because I remember back in the day (like we are talking a long time ago) I used to read a lot of the statements from the *Salaf*. That even if they missed out on *sunnah* acts, they felt so disappointed in themselves that they would actually go and do the *sajdat'l-sahw* afterwards even though they do not need to if they miss out on a *sunnah* act, especially one that they do normally.

So yeah if a person missed out reciting a *sūrah* in the beginning two *rakʿah* of a prayer, even though it is a *sunnah* and there is no mistake done, it is acceptable according to the Ḥanbalis etc. to do that *sajdah*. And I do not have a problem with it and Ibn ʿAbbās ﵄ used to do it, that is fine. However, it is certainly not right for someone behind to say, '*Hey you missed out a sūrah*.' Don't be that guy.

Student (online): Right, a better example: Saying *tasmīʿ* when the imām rises from the *rukūʿ* and he says *takbīr*.

Ustādh: The irony is that there is not going to be a single person on that planet in that *jamāʿah* would have any idea what does *tasmīʿ* means by the way. You would have to say *sami Allāhu liman ḥamidah*. You would have to. And I think that is allowed.

And see that is a lot easier now. It is not a better example. It is too easy an example because you are just reminding that person of the exact prayer words that are from the prayer itself. So even though you would not do that because you are stepping a bit beyond… but if you have a guy where everyone is saying *subḥān Allāh, subḥān Allāh subḥān Allāh*. You know when the imām has got it or not because he freezes, and he

[§] The ruling on doing the prostration for forgetfulness when forgetting a *sunnah* act was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lessons 1-2. MT

does not know what is going on. And so when he is frozen and you can tell then you say, '*All right*: "*Sami Allāhu liman ḥamidah*."'

Then he realises. '*Oh yeah I am going for sajdah*.' Then he says *sami Allāhu liman ḥamidah* and you say *Rabbanā walak'l ḥamd*. I think that is okay. That is certainly not going to invalidate the prayer.

Student (online): FYI We covered whether a *ma'mūm* speaking in order to correct the imām invalidates the prayer of the person who speaks. This was covered last year (Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 12).

Ustādh: Thank you, that is important. We have actually covered this by the way. I do not want to spend more time on this because we have covered all of this already in the class earlier on.

So, now we are on:

وَعَمَلٌ مُسْتَكْثَرٌ عَادَةً

Actions not from the genus of the prayer, performed in a quantity that would be considered 'a lot'.

What is actually happening here? Shaykh is saying:

عَادَةً

ʿĀdah, meaning those which are done 'a lot' but only according to the people, according to culture, according to the era, according to how people would understand it.

(0:54:00) The question is that if the *Sharīʿah* is sending acts of *ʿibādah* upon us and not giving parameters for it, how is it possible that the parameters that are then chosen are ones that are made by the people's own emotions, estimations, and beliefs?

And the reason is because Allāh ﷻ intended it that way. It is not meant to be something which is easily defined, basically as Abu Barzata ؓ in the famous *ḥadīth* said it is meant to be easy. [7] I will give you these examples in a minute.

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Actions While Praying, Chapter: If an Animal Runs Away while One Is in Ṣalāh, ḥadīth no. 1211*.

For example, Allāh ﷻ never said anywhere through His Prophet ﷺ or directly in the Qur'ān that whoever moves three times in the prayer then his prayer is invalidated, or whoever moves four times in the prayer then his prayer is invalidated, whoever moves twice in the prayer then his prayer is invalidated, and if they scratch themselves this much the size of a 50 pence piece or *dinār* or an x or a y or if your arm moves. All of these statements can be found across the *madhāhib*. It is very interesting, I have spoken about this before, many times, that something which is not actually there in the *Sharīʿah* from an evidence point of view should make us comfortable about the ruling. And at the same time not attack the scholars and the *madhāhib* who do insist that, who do say if you move three times then your prayer is done etc. When they say that, you have to understand that they do not actually believe that, but the people are too stressed. Not everyone's a student of knowledge like you, have all the evidences like you, read and appreciate the flexibility on the issue like you do. The masses like things simple. They get freaked out when they hear things like that. And they spend their whole time trying to work out, '*Is this enough? Is it not? Is it enough? Is it not?'* They fall into *waswās*.

It is like the traveling thing. Even those who follow the opinion that there is no set distance for travel, even the majority of those people who are students of knowledge etc. they are stressed all the time. They are always thinking, '*I do not know. Am I? Am I not?*' etc. And these are the people who fully understand it and they believe in that opinion. I tell all these people, I do not care if they are scholars, I do not care if they are students of knowledge, even myself I do not like leaving the decision to be subjective. I like 50 miles. I like 80 km. I like something being there, you do not have to think about it etc. even though I am absolutely clear that the correct position is no set mileage what you *feel like* is the correct position. And I will adopt that when I feel comfortable with it. But if I don't want to think about something, I just want to take it easy, I just go by distance. So, it is important to respect the scholars even though we know that there have not been specific rules from Allāh ﷻ that have come down. But we are not also saying and neither are the scholars saying that they are putting rules where Allāh ﷻ hasn't. It is in a way, but it is being done because of the need of the people. The people have asked for it.

So, what is the correct answer? What is 'a lot' of action or 'too much' action etc.?

The answer to that is like I have always said in this class many times before and in other classes too, in *Fiqh of Ṣalāh* with AlMaghrib, is when you move that much or do that much, so much so that a person random walking by will not think you are praying, will think, '*This person is not praying. There is no way that this guy is praying*.' And that cannot be a non-Muslim because a non-Muslim would have no parameters. I am talking about a normal Muslim who prays, understands the prayer, understands what is going on, normal Joe Blogs Muslims. That is why it goes back to culture. They will look at that and they will say, 'T*his guy cannot be praying*.' And that's it. Don't complicate this issue. It really is that simple.

If a person's itching, it is allowed to itch yourself. If a person's doing this [vigorously and continuously itching their body] and he is turned around from the *Qiblah*, a person is going to think, '*What the hell is this?*'

Whereas if a person is itching in the same places [as the previous example] and he keeps his hand [on the chest where it is placed in the prayer during the standing position] and his eyes are down and puts one hand down and he transfers [the other hand to the chest and uses the hand that was previously on the chest to scratch another part of body]—massive difference.

My point is that a movement to be considered invalidating needs to have a buy-in from the people and what they understand. We have covered all of this in a lot of detail (movement in the prayer).¶

If the people think this guy is not praying, then that is too much and if the people look at this action and they say, '*You know what? That is something minor. It is insignificant,*' then it really actually is insignificant.

(1:00:00) Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn starts to give some examples of actions that you know: I don't invalidate the prayer because it is not too much movement and people will know.

He says for example someone who is praying and they have a child with them and the kid starts crying and is a bit distressed, and the person decides to pick the kid up to calm them down so you can be more relaxed. The kid is stressed out, so you play with the kid and hold them slightly rocking. He still focuses on the prayer or she focuses on the prayer and they carry the kid. When they go for *rukūʿ* they put the kid down and then they pick him up again, and then when they go to *sajdah* then they put the kid down to the side. So this pick up, put down, pick up, put down, Shaykh says there is loads of movements:

فعندنا عدَّة حركات

We have so many, so many movements here. Picking up and lifting, and down and this and that etc. and it is heavy as well. But all of us consider this to be something minor even though it is a lot, especially seeing that the Prophet ﷺ had done this himself. The Prophet ﷺ did this with Umāmah bint Zaynab in a *ḥadīth* which is in *Bukhāri*.[8]

Student (online): Can a woman breastfeed her child whilst praying?

¶ Fidgeting in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 3. MT

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: If a Small Girl Is Carried on One's Neck During the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 516.*

Ustādh: That is a mad one. That is a madness right there. Can a woman breastfeed her child whilst praying? I don't know how practical that is man.

Student (online): Especially *tahajjud.*

Ustādh: I mean *tahajjud* is a no-brainer. I have no problem with the *tahajjud*—long *nafl* prayer, very relaxed, you can even eat and drink, let alone give to eat and drink. I'm comfortable with that.

I just want you to know that it is very possible, and not just very possible, Muslim women do it all the time because we don't wear tight clothes. We know it is *ḥarām* for a Muslim woman to wear tight clothes that show limbs and this and that, if they are outside. If they are at home, they are normally wearing throw about this that, you know that big prayer kind of gown. Very easy, you put it underneath and when I say put underneath, none of the body is uncovered, a layer is lifted. The baby is then put into place, baby latches on, job done. It is automatic, it is all auto. I don't have a problem with that at all in *nafl sunnah* prayer. My issue, my concern is in an obligatory prayer. In an obligatory prayer, length of time… I don't know. I don't know. The answer to that is I don't know for the obligatory prayer. That is a good question.

Student (online): When you said put the baby down to make *rukūʿ* is that mandatory?

Ustādh: Of course not. It is just that it is very difficult. As someone who has done *rukūʿ* with the kid, holding, it messes up your *rukūʿ* it is really horrible. So, that is that.

Student (online): Can you pick up a child who wears a diaper that has done their business in it?

Ustādh: The answer is no. And this is according to my position, this is the position of the Ḥanbali school as well by the way. This is the position of Imām Aḥmad, that if a child has already done their business in a nappy or their diaper, you are not allowed to pick that child up. Vis a vis holding a child already and they then do their business and then you put the child down. That is something which is okay. The prayer continues. Whereas if they have done it already, you are not allowed to pick up the child from the beginning.

Student (online): Are mothers allowed to hold their child from the start of the prayer?

Ustādh: Yes, you can.

If someone knocks on the door and the door is close and it is in the direction of the *Qiblah* so you don't have to go left or right or x or y, and you can still face towards the *Qiblah,* or if he goes to the right whilst he is still facing the *Qiblah,* or he goes to the left while still facing the *Qiblah* (so he sidesteps) and opens the door—this is action. And if the door is close, then this is a minor and this is what the Prophet ﷺ did for ʿĀʾishah.[3]

This *ḥadīth in shāʾ Allāh* is authentic although Imām al-Tirmidhi said this *ḥadīth* is *ḥasan gharīb.* He had some issues with it, but he didn't consider it to be weak straight out. But still. There are some scholars that didn't act according to this, let me just make that clear. However, we are happy with it.

Another example, I love this. I was reading this earlier on and it just makes me smile because Shaykh says someone who has got a ride with them, a horse basically, a ride, or a camel. And so he holds their reins, whilst praying. Because he has got nowhere to [tie the animal] so he has to hold the reins. And what happens is that the animal will pull you, in each direction. So you are going to be pulled that way, pulled this way, pulled that way, pulled this way. And at that moment, is this too much action?

No. This is not too much action. As long as you are still trying to face the *Qiblah* and you
(1:10:00) are being pulled left, right and center I don't think this is a major at all, and neither does Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn. And this happened to a Companion. It is actually narrated in *Bukhāri*.[7] His name was Abu Barzata al-Aslamiyy ﵁. He is a well-known Companion.

The reason that this makes me smile, not just because of this *ḥadīth* (and I'll come to that in a second) is because obviously the whole Ertuğrul phenomenon has reset a lot of people's thoughts and ideas about how things are. But there are a lot of people who are not used to the way and understanding of how Muslims used to live, or people used to live. The fascinating thing about Ertuğrul is how much focus you see on all the little details. They don't cut it out. So one of the reasons that it is hours and hours and hours long is that, they don't have any problem making it hours long, they want to make content for TV and keep people you know connected to a TV every single thing for hours and hours, so they show the things. And one of the things that everybody notices is how much time they spend tying up their animal. Like if that was a Hollywood production, they would never ever allow the people to see that. It would be cut out. They would edit it so a person would get off their horse and the next scene they are there and the horse is tied up. But every single scene you will see that they go to the flimsiest of branches or trees and they just need something, and they will just make a basic knot with their reins (the rope which connects).

So, he didn't. Now in the desert kind of community, it is not like in Turkey. Turkey is madness isn't it? I mean just so beautiful it has got trees, forests, and everything. Now, that's not the case so much so in a rocky kind of deserty type of atmosphere or environment like in the Arabian Peninsula. So, he is holding it in his hand and the beast itself is pulling and this and that, so much so that it's starting to walk off and he's almost kind of following it. But he's still praying and still in the direction of the *Qiblah* as best as possible. And then there was a person who was passing by who was from the Khawārij. And he said:

اللَّهُمَّ افْعَلْ بِهَذَا الشَّيْخِ

"O Allāh be harsh with this shaykh."[7]

Now this as a statement is such a shocking statement. It's: "*Yā* Allāh deal with this person." It is the most amount of hate that you could ever show. You are seeing a guy, *subḥān Allāh miskīn*, who is struggling with his camel whilst praying, trying his best, and a guy comes and curses him: "Oh Allāh, deal with this person!" Basically, '*Punish this person yā Allāh, only You can punish him. Because look at him, how much he's disrespecting the prayer. Look how much he's disrespecting everybody*,' etc.

Abu Barzah ﵁ carries on praying, he finishes the prayer. I'm going to quote verbatim. Listen to his response. He says: "I heard what you just said. And I accompanied the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ in either six or seven or eight military excursions. And I witnessed firsthand his leniency."

إِنِّي سَمِعْتُ قَوْلَكُمْ، وَإِنِّي غَزَوْتُ مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم سِتَّ غَزَوَاتٍ أَوْ سَبْعَ غَزَوَاتٍ وَثَمَانِيًا، وَشَهِدْتُ تَيْسِيرَهُ، وَإِنِّي أَنْ كُنْتُ أَنْ أُرَاجِعَ مَعَ دَابَّتِي أَحَبُّ إِلَيَّ مِنْ أَنْ أَدَعَهَا تَرْجِعُ إِلَى مَأْلَفِهَا فَيَشُقَّ عَلَيَّ.

"I heard your remark. No doubt, I participated with Allāh's Messenger ﷺ in six or seven or eight holy battles and saw his leniency, and no doubt, I would rather retain my animal than let it return to its stable, as it would cause me much trouble."[7]

That I go back home whilst I still actually have a ride is better for me, is what I want more than the problems and the headaches and whatever of having lost my animal. End of story.

Slap down. What the hell's it got to do with you, you plum? I can't put my animal anywhere. I can't tie him up anywhere. I don't want to lose it. So, I want to hold on to it. I mean it's a mental one this one to be honest. This is an example of movement which is allowed.

Another example is itching as we said. Now, when you itch you cannot just be itching for the sake of just habit. If you have an itch and it irritates you, it affects your *khushūʿ*. And the reason a person itches is because it calms the skin down, that's the actual physiological response to the histamine response which is causing the itch. It is dumbed down by the itching process, temporarily of course. And Shaykh says if that itching process increases the quality of the prayer then it's a no-brainer that it is something which is allowed.

And I'm going to close this session with an absolute all-time classic, this is the last example that –

Student (online): Someone else has clearly a severe itch that they can't reach whilst you're in *ṣalāh* can you do it? Asking because it's happened in *iʿtikāf ṣalāh jamāʿah*, one brother scratched the brother's back next to him.

Ustādh: In the prayer? Like what? Was he going [leans back to indicate discomfort in back]? I think that's allowed.

I will tell you right now, that is a sick question. If you see a guy who is literally, you know, in agony in the prayer and you go and you do that? That's it. Absolutely.

(1:20:00) Shaykh says, final example: A man is in the prayer and he has a pen. So, the guy has a pen and he is in the prayer and he does not remember what he needs to remember because he has an exam coming up. It could be in a little while. But the exam is coming up and he cannot remember, and he is struggling. Then he says, '*It's time to pray*.' So, he is praying and he remembers. So, he pulls out his pen, pulls out his receipt, and he starts writing. In the prayer. And he writes, Shaykh says, five lines.

You do not even know what his answer is yet. We are just talking about examples.

Student (online): Wait, was this a hypothetical thing?

Ustādh: Yes, it is hypothetical.

So, she has pulled it out. Why did she do that? Why did she pull it out and write it down? Because she says to herself, '*If I leave this prayer, I will forget it*.' And maybe so that she can go back to focusing on the prayer and stop thinking about it. So she writes it down so she will not forget it. The whole point is to get it down.

Shaykh says this is too much. This invalidates the prayer. However (Shaykh continues), if it is a word or two, then that's minor. It's a minor. That is why we are the wobblers of the wobblers bro. I love this statement guys. Shaykh says:

فإذا احتاج إلى ذلك فلا بأس

If she needs to do that, then it is no major problem.

Student (online): So, he draws the line at the amount he is writing?

Ustādh: This is the irony. The dividing limit was five lines and a few words.

Student (online): What? Wow this feels a little arbitrary.

Ustādh: Remember the beginning of this:

عادَةً

Student: “Siri make a note of x. y, z for me.”

Ustādh: You see? This is the point. I said about era, about your era. This is the *fiqh.* A person could argue that to say that would be obviously… Well actually, it won't be because you're speaking. That’s worse. Now there’s not a shadow of a doubt that it is less *ḥarām*, or not even *ḥarām* at all (according to Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn) to text.

Let us do this. [Ustādh demonstrates being in the prayer, pulling out a pen, opening the pen, pulling out a receipt, writing on the receipt and putting them both back in his pocket.]

Okay, now the phone version. [Ustādh demonstrates being in prayer, pulling your mobile phone out of your pocket, unlocking the phone, opening the app, and texting, and putting the phone back in his pocket.]

Come on now, guys. There is no comparison between that [texting] and the writing.

Student (online): Paper and pen is way better, more acceptable.

Ustādh: You are saying the paper and the pen is more acceptable to what I just did there. How? I didn't even move one hand by the way. Not a single person would have thought [that I wasn’t praying]. I was still looking down and the movement was…

Student (online): Yes 100% she's right.

Ustādh: Am I losing my mind here? 100% she is right that there was less movement in the [paper and pen example]? My God. Unbelievable.

Alright guys we are going to do a vote. Type one if you thought the more movement we are talking about was in the pen paper putting it back or put two if there were movements in the two. Which one was more movements? That is not even a question off course it's number one, end of story. Number two you would be mad if you thought that it was too much.

Student (online): You exaggerated too much with opening the pen and crinkling the paper.

Ustādh: Oh my God! Opening the pen and crinkling the paper? How have you got paper ready in any way? Unbelievable!

Student (online): Write on your hand.

(1:30:00) Ustādh: Writing on your hand, maybe that maybe less.

I just want to add something, the people who are saying number two is worse [texting on the mobile phone during the prayer] is because of the distraction of the phone. At what point did distracting...?

Student (online): We can't open the door of texting in *ṣalāh* for this generation.

Ustādh: We are not opening no door of texting or anything.

Listen. I'm not saying this is *ḥalāl.* We are not talking about *ḥalāl.* What we are talking about is which one has more movement. And I'm saying that if writing two words on a piece of paper is all of that versus the phone, there is no comparison. If you are going to bring distraction into it, close that door because distraction is dominating everyone's single person's prayer. The mental side of the prayer is not the one which is considered because the Prophet ﷺ has already told us we are losing portions of the prayer.[9,10] And we already said that it's not one of the mistakes that invalidates the prayer (the lack of mind) it affects the quality of the prayer. And imagine that a person got into the habit of saying, '*I have to do sajdat'l-sahw because it was not a great prayer, I didn't feel it, it wasn't amazing*.' You would have to do *sajdat'l-sahw* after every single prayer you prayed.

Student (online): If someone saw you, they'd think '*What the heck?*' They'd think you weren't praying.

Ustādh: 100%! Which is why if you do it super quick, then that's the whole point.

Student (online): I think because of this whole conversation regarding *ʿādah* as a boundary regarding movement is so convoluted. Don't know what's the real solution!

Ustādh: Absolutely.

My point is folks it's just nice to hear it. I'm not saying ever that you are allowed to write or to do this, but I'm not saying it's *ḥarām* either. Let me make it clear. But it is just interesting to hear the example. But that is not the funny part. Can you believe I have not gotten to the funny part?

---

[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: To Look Hither and Thither in the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 751.*

[10] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What Has Been Narrated Concerning Shortening the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 796.* This narration has been graded as *ḥasan* by al-Albāni.

Shaykh says: If he writes one or two words then that's not a major problem.

لأنه أحياناً يكون للإِنسان أَمْرٌ ضروري لا بُدَّ أن يذكره، والشيطان إذا دَخَلَ الإِنسان في الصلاة أقبل إليه وجعل يقول :اذكر كذا، اذكر كذا، لِمَا لم يكن يذكره حتى يذكره، لا رأفة به؛ لكن إفساداً لعبادته؛ حتى تبقى الصَّلاةُ جسداً بلا روح.

He said because sometimes people have something really, really important that they need to remember and when you remember it at a time where it has come to you and you know at other times it's not going to be, and you know that *shayṭān* when you enter into the prayer, he makes you remember that which you didn't know. And he [*shayṭān*] says: '*Remember this, think about, that remember this*,' (That's what the *ḥadīth* says.[11] He is quoting the *ḥadīth*), which he never ever thought about before. This is not because he is being nice to you, but because he wants to try and corrupt your worship and destroy your prayer.

The reason I laugh is that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn on one hand is actually saying take advantage of *shayṭān's* tricks, which is a madness by the way. And that's exactly what he said. I don't care what anybody says. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn in other words has said '*Well if shayṭān has made you remember and been successful in him ruining your prayer then if you have something important take advantage. You remembered it. Write down because if you believe if you are going to forget it afterwards*.' He is not saying do it, but he says: If you also believe now that you are there you are not going to remember again then one or two words written down is not a problem. And that honestly, I love that. And that is why Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is a don.

So, the point is, it sounds weird, it is funny, but it is what it is. Again, this is the same when we come next week, and we start talking about eating and drinking.

Genuinely my **class position**—forget writing, forget texting—I think a person is allowed to do anything that they need to do as long as it doesn't dominate the prayer. You will see actually. The conditions later on, that we will cover next lesson, will explain my position what the class position is. But exactly what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn has said there so far, we are really happy with that. That is the position of many scholars in our times.

[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: Superiority of the Adhān, ḥadīth no. 608*.

Q & A

Q (online): What's your opinion on gelatin? Is it *ḥalāl*?

A: I have changed my opinion. In the early days, I used to consider that it has been changed enough. In later times (and this is very possible because the testing ability for detecting substances and DNA, etc. has gotten better or more accurate), I'm now starting to have doubts.

From a practical point of view, the change of state, what's called *istiḥālah* is obviously done. But at what level is enough for something to become *ḥalāl*? Is it just in a general sense? I get that. I'm happy with that. However, me, myself I know that I can sense this, that, etc. I prefer to avoid it. I won't say it's *ḥarām*. Just like I don't think that little bits and pieces of x, y, z or whatever it is in a food, makes it *ḥarām* when it's not intended to be there. I won't say it's out and out *ḥarām*. But definitely I believe that it should be avoided. And I prefer the side of caution. I didn't care about it before but now I prefer it's not.

Q (online): What happens if the dirty baby comes to you and like sits on you whilst you are praying or holds your hand or touches you/holds on to your leg?

A: That is fine. You then push them off. So, if that happens, then you remove it. It doesn't break *wuḍūʾ*, it doesn't break the prayer. Once you become aware of *najāsah*, you remove yourself from it.

Q (online): When the imām stands for fifth *rakʿah*, and you know it's his fifth, you can stay seated until he comes back down. Do you make *sajdatʾl-sahw* with the imām if he realises? If you end your *ṣalāh* yourself do you do *sajdatʾl-sahw*?

A: If you do the prayer yourself, there is no *sajdah*. If you are with the imām and he does the *sajdatʾl-sahw,* then you do it with him. And even if you didn't, it wouldn't be a problem. But you would do it with him. You would stick with the imām to do that.

Q (online): If I'm passing by a *jamāʿah* in certain places that are not comfortable with women's presence and I'd rather just quickly walk past, is that sufficient excuse to not notify them of a mistake I notice?

A: How can a person be able to work out a mistake in the actual number of the prayer if you are walking past? I don't know how that works. But if someone has some really pressing reason why they can't fulfill an obligation then okay, then it's not obligatory. They have to assess that. Your scenario doesn't make sense to me.

Q (online): Can a woman who's praying in *jamāʿah* with only her *maḥram*, at home, verbally correct or should she still only clap?

A: We covered that. We said that no, they should say *tasbīḥ* to be on the safer side. We went into a lot of detail.††

Q (online): As per our local secular state law, when the woman stayed home for the kids, then upon divorce the man had to provide financial support for wife and children. So, in cases where the man is not being good, can a woman use secular law for separation? Asking for a friend whose therapist wants her to use state legal system to enforce it upon the man.

A: It is not permissible to resort to *kufr* law unless every *sharīʿ* avenue is exhausted. This has nothing to do with women staying at home for the kids or not. It's to do with Islamic *Sharīʿah*. Women are meant to stay at home with the kids. There are details that need to be assessed. Woman needs to be interviewed, man needs to be interviewed, etc. scholars need to be involved, *masājid* need to be involved. Everything has to be exhausted. And only when that has been exhausted, then you are allowed to take the
(1:40:00) minimum of secular enforcement. But even that has to be according to Islamic law.

For example, if the secular law rules and says you are divorced and you get £50,000 or you get all of his wealth for example, you are not allowed to take that wealth. You are only allowed to take what is obligatory yours. For example, a scholar will say to you that this amount you are allowed because of you are looking after the child for example. If there is no child to look after, they've grown up, then you are not allowed to take any money, etc.

Q (online): I was owed 2 x £1500 rebate from the council and was paid 3 x £1500. I contacted them of the overpayment however, they're adamant they haven't, and case closed. What should I do?

A: If you have genuinely exhausted, not, '*Let me try halfway*.' You have told them the full story, '*Listen, trust me. This is the score*.' And they have said, '*100% no that's definitely, it's us*,' then that's yours. You are allowed to keep it. It is better to give it away in charity because you still know that there is a mistake that's being made. Even though they don't realise it. However, if they have the authority to give it, it's allowed for you to keep but you should give it away. What's better is for you to give it in charity. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

---

†† The ruling on a woman correcting her husband in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 11. MT

Q (online): If the female imām missed, for example *Sūrat Fātiḥah*, could you just recite the first *ayah* of *Fātiḥah* to trigger their memory?

A: If it's a female imām then you would say *subḥān Allāh*. That's something which is allowed in that scenario, or you can clap, for them to work it out. If they fail and everyone is confused then you would recite the first line, etc.

Q (online): Smacking/discipling kids whilst praying is alright?

A: Yes, minimal.

Q (online): Someone with OCD, they have a lot of movements, but my question is technically they don't need to move, they just think they do.

A: Someone who is suffering from a condition, they are not held accountable for that.

Q (online): Why is it that saying *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* in *sujūd* or *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* in *rukūʿ* is a *wājib* specifically when there are other *masnūn duʿāʾs* for the *sajdah* or *rukūʿ*? So if we were to, for example, say one of these other *masnūn duʿāʾ* in *sujūd* and not say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* then would we have to do *sajdatʾl-sahw*?

A: I answered this before in detail in the section of *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, etc.[‡‡] The short answer that I will give to you is that there is no logic behind the answer. That's it. I know exactly why you are asking that question. We also asked our teachers that question and all of them responded that it is what it is. Although we won't go all out and say that a person's prayer is invalidated if he said this instead, we consider it to be an absolute obligation to say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* and *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* because there is a consensus of the scholars on it, even though the evidence for it would suggest that any *subḥān* is allowed. Any *tasbīḥ* form is allowed. For that reason, we just follow them. It is blind following.

And I don't mean a *madh-hab*. I'm talking all *madhāhib*—classical and contemporary scholars. It's a position of safety. We will always say that the *masnūn duʿāʾs*, whatever they are, you add them to *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* and *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*. They don't replace them. There is a consensus on that. I completely agree with you, the evidence does not categorically state that. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

---

‡‡ *Tasbīḥ* said in *rukūʿ* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 26. MT

11. Chapter 20 Lesson 6: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

(0:06:40) We are on page 353 of the commentary. In terms of the section, the kind of section that we are doing right now, we covered it last week. We basically started the subsection of 'Actions in the Prayer'. And we had a little discussion about what actions could be, the various nature of actions and what would be too many, and so on. To be honest we have covered that in a lot of detail in the previous section. In a lot of detail. So, I don't think we need to go back over that again. Now saying that, there is more to talk about and it is important that we cover it because there is a connection which is outside of the normal discussion of just movement and more to do with how you compensate for it or not. It actually will get quite interesting.

But before I start that, I was just thinking and reviewing some notes and also some questions on the portal and I wanted to make sure that I cover a few theoretical points. When I say theoretical points, I mean questions that were relevant to different aspects of the class before that maybe we didn't get an opportunity to kind of go through. So one of them was for example—well this one is coming up and I repeat it often and I see on our Telegram group that someone actually even used this answer to respond to someone's question—and that is that when you are praying behind an imām, one of the blessings and one of the reasons you pray as much as you can in congregation, and one of the blessings and to take advantage of the *duʿāʾ* of the Prophet ﷺ for the imām that they are forgiven,[1] is that they soak up all the mistakes of the *muṣallīn*. It is important. This is not so relevant now. It is going to be relevant later on, in the next few weeks when we start going into more details of the how to actually fix mistakes and what kind of mistakes in the prayer. We start breaking it down. But I want you to know from now, to be confident that the actual mistakes that you make whilst you are praying by yourself, for example missing out *sunnah* aspects, or even *wājib* aspects, like even for example forgetting to say *Allāhu akbar* which is obligatory upon you to say, or to say *Rabbana wa lakaʾl-ḥamd* for example, or to say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*, or *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, etc. These are *wājibāt*. These *wājibāt* are swallowed up by the fact that you are praying behind the imām and they don't even require you to do *sajdatʾl-sahw*. They don't require *sajdatʾl-sahw*. As for *arkān*, if you missed a *rukn* then that is a problem. *Arkān* need to be fixed one way or the other and that is not covered or carried by the imām.

[1] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What Is Required of the Muʾadhdhin Regarding Keeping Track of Time, ḥadīth no. 517*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

(0:10:00) Now similar to that, move on to another point that we spoke about, is when the imām makes a mistake and when the imām has made a mistake you realise it—we spoke about the person who knows about it, who doesn't know about it, who knows about it, but forgets about it, or who recognises it but doesn't know what to do. So those are the four categories of people.

Let's talk about the guy who knows about it and tried to warn you and advise you and says, '*Subḥān Allāh! Subḥān Allāh!*' and the imām doesn't clock on. Let's just go through a couple of scenarios first of all.

The first scenario when the imām doesn't clock on, it is either because he's ignoring you or because he didn't understand. If we take the first scenario of didn't understand—I did speak a little bit about this, but I want to be even more clear. I think I gave my own personal example as well. You say *subḥān Allāh* and you know etc. etc. and the imām might not know what is going on, be confused, lots of voices doesn't trust them all. The classic is if you are reciting a *sūrah*. You are reciting and what happens is that you hear *subḥān Allāh* and immediately what you think is mistake. That is when people make *tasbīḥ*. So, you hear *subḥān Allāh* so you think mistake. Now your mind is thinking, '*What is [my] mistake?*' Your immediate thing is going to be going to the verse you are reciting. You are thinking that that is the problem. So, you might start the *sūrah* from the beginning again or you might start the *ayah* from the beginning again and that is actually not your problem.

So, you confuse the imām and he doesn't know what is going on now. He doesn't know where he is at, what is going on, so he keeps repeating the verse and he was getting told *subḥān Allāh, subḥān Allāh, subḥān Allāh*. In actual fact what he has done is that he has forgotten to recite *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*. He has jumped straight into the *sūrah* for example. It is allowed for you to now speak. Now, we had this discussion before.† We had a couple of years ago as well and we spoke about it a couple of weeks ago, that this is not called speaking because we are going to use specific words, super minimal, only what is necessary, and we are going to restrict them so that the prayer is not ruined. Now this is not normally called speaking. However, there is no doubt that it is speaking. Technically speaking, or linguistically speaking, it is speaking. However legally or Islamically in terms of a ruling, it is not considered speaking. And that is something which is important to get your head around.

You need to restrict yourself to phrases that are as congruent, or as connected, or as smooth with the prayer itself. So, Arabic has to be a must and trying to minimise any words which are not part of the prayer and *adhkār* itself has to be a must. And we should avoid *ʿāmiyyah* which is basically localised accents and versions, and English, and Urdu i.e. a foreign language. I never would say it is allowed publicly but in my heart I want to say that in an emergency scenario where it was a complete mess and the imām did not understand what on earth was going on, I think someone speaking out in

† The follower speaking in the prayer to alert the imām to where he made a mistake was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 12. MT

English with minimum words, I am sympathetic to the idea that the prayer would not be invalidated. For example, the scholars have generally (widespread across) accepted that a person can say, '*Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*.' There is no doubt that that is a poor choice because obviously you would say:

﴿ٱلْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ ٱلْعَٰلَمِينَ ۝٢ ٱلرَّحْمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ ۝٣﴾

That is what you should say. Imām immediately clicks on and he is like, '*Okay*.' If he doesn't, then you are allowed as Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhtār al-Shanqīṭi for example stated, '*Iqraʾ al-Fātiḥah*,' read *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*, or '*Nasīt al-Fātiḥah*,' you have forgotten *al-Fātiḥah*. That would be the minimum. You have literally used *al-Fātiḥah* which is okay as a part of Qurʾān, part of Arabic part of *dhikr*. *Nasīt* is the word which is foreign but not so foreign because it is from Arabic and pure Arabic etc. And basically you have just told the guy you forgot *al-Fātiḥah*. The guy should clock on.

Imagine that he was lost. As I said, in an emergency scenario if someone said that from the back, he said, '*You forgot Fātiḥah*,' for example, I don't think that prayer is invalidated. I would be hesitant to say your prayer is invalidated. I do not think I would have the confidence to do it myself. If the person does not understand Arabic, some Pak imām or an imām that does not know Arabic then you might need to say that to hook him up. But in principle there is no doubt that's speech and let alone speech outside of the *jins* of the prayer which means outside of *adhkār* and outside of *fuṣḥah*, classical Arabic, and then a foreign language. There is an agreement, consensus, that that invalidates the prayer. This however almost comes under a case of necessity. And even then I can see it much more preferable to cancel the prayer and start again, rather than to start telling people it is okay for you to speak in your language to the imām. So, I'm just putting that out there.

Al-Fātiḥah is easy though because you would say:

﴿ٱلْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ ٱلْعَٰلَمِينَ ۝٢﴾

And the imām would clock on. If the imām misses *rukūʿ* and he went for *sajdah* you might say *subḥāna Rabbi al-ʿAẓīm*, *subḥāna Rabbi al-ʿAẓīm*. You might say *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*. These are easy things. And then if not, you might say *rukūʿ*.

I just want to add a little point here. What I am talking about, this issue of speaking inside the prayer, this is different to what the Prophet ﷺ used to say when he ﷺ used to be on a journey as been narrated a few times—not the strongest of *ḥadīth* but good enough. When he ﷺ would be a *musāfir* leading the prayer and he ﷺ knows that he ﷺ has a congregation that has people that that are not travellers (residents) and they need

to pray the full four for example and he ﷺ is praying two, the practice of the Prophet ﷺ would be to say:

أَتِمُّوا صَلاَتَكُمْ فَإِنَّا قَوْمٌ سَفْر

"Complete your prayers because we are travellers."[2]

That is his *sunnah.* It is actually interesting (we will come to that in the right section), it was not one of the established *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ as far as I know, meaning that it was not something which is legislated to always insist like you see today where the imām turns around and says, '*Listen I am a musāfir and I am praying two so make sure you stand up after two*.' That is completely *ḥalāl* to do and it is an accepted etiquette and it makes sense especially in areas that do not get it, they might not have a lot of knowledge, or they might be confused, etc. However, the *sunnah* is actually to do it at the end, ironically, even if they give the *salām* with you which is why it is argued, or certainly my position, that when an imām is praying with only a few people of travellers
(0:20:00) and himself, and the rest of the people are not, my personal practice (because that is my personal opinion) is that I would say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [quietly to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [quietly to the left, then say to the congregation:]

أَتِمُّوا صَلاَتَكُمْ فَإِنَّا قَوْمٌ سَفْر

That is what I would do. I would give *salām* for me to exit the prayer quiet enough for maybe the guy behind me to hear because he is also a traveller and even if he cannot hear it does not matter, I just want to exit the prayer. Then I will say loudly, '*Complete your prayer because we are travellers*.'

This statement is what the Prophet ﷺ would say out loud, the people would then stand up and complete their prayers.[2] Now this, I tell people to just say in English. There are people who try to memorise this Arabic phrase and they think it is a *sunnah* to say the Arabic phrase. This is a classic example where it is not an act of worship to say this statement as it is. The act of worship here is that the Prophet ﷺ is trying to help people who might be confused and just making it easy for them, just clarifying for them. So, there is no *sunnah* aspect here or reward to sticking to the Arabic for example, in my opinion, because this is purely *min bāb'l-ikhbār*. This is an area of where the intention or the reasoning is just to inform people what the right thing to do is. So, here I often will say *assalām ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the right quietly], *assalām ʿalyīkum wa*

[2] *Muwaṭṭa' Imām Mālik, The Book Of shortening the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 21.*

raḥmat Allāh [to the left quietly, then say to the congregation,] '*Folks complete your prayers because we are travellers*.' That is my normal habit.

I do not want people to get confused between this, which is after the *salām* and it is therefore technically not part of the prayer—technically—and what I am talking about, which is inside the prayer.

Now, the second scenario is that when the imām has been told what is going on, and he ignores you. So, you say *subḥān Allāh* and he ignores you. So, he stood up for the fifth *rakʿah* at *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr* and he carries on. You know that definitely, you have prayed four. What did we say?

We said you sit down. And we said if you sit down, then you should exit the prayer. Finish the prayer then exit the prayer. No *sajdat'l-sahw* upon you. No *sujūd'l-sahw* upon you. You have not made any mistakes, and you have done the right thing.

We also said that another option for you is to sit down and wait for the imām and then give *salām* with the imām. And then afterwards, the imām is going to turn around and say, '*Why did you guys say that to me?*' And you say, '*You prayed five by the way*.' And when he confirms that, he is going to go down for *sajdah* to correct it. When he goes down for *sajdah* to correct it, do you go down with him or not? That is my question for you. And that is the one thing, I do not know whether I clarified or not. So, you, who is following, you did not actually separate from the prayer, you were waiting.

Student (online): Yes.

Ustādh: *Jazāk Allāhu khayr.* You got it right.

The reason that you will go down with him for *sajdah* is because you did not exit from the prayer. You waited with the imām. You are part of that same prayer. You are still connected to it. If you had exited before, there would have been no *sajdah*. But because you waited, because you hanged about, which is also fine, but I am just making sure you know that if you do hang about, then you are connected to the imām, regardless.

I am just making it clear that there is a principle that needs to be covered, which is that if you are part of a prayer, you make *sajdah* regardless of whether you made the mistake or not. It could potentially happen a lot in the prayer. You recite *tashahhud* for example. That is a classic example. The imām could sit down, and have a complete block out of the brain, and not recite *tashahhud* or recite *al-Fātiḥah*, for example whilst he is sitting down in *tashahhud*. Now you guys behind are all reciting *tashahhud.* Then he stands up. As he is standing up and starts reciting *Fātiḥah* again, he's like, '*Hold on! This sounds familiar*.' Then he realises, '*Hold on! I just said this while sitting down!*' And now that he's said that sitting down, he realised that he made a mistake. Now we are going to learn later on that you are not allowed to sit back down again. You are not allowed. That is gone. You have to carry on with the prayer. You have obviously added to the

prayer and missed the [*tashahhud*] and messed it up, but it is salvageable. What you are going to do is at the end of the prayer you are going to do a *sajdah*.

The imām has messed up this sitting down. It is now clear that he has realised that, '*Oh hold on! I have messed this up*.' So, he is an imām. He knows how to fix it. At the end of the prayer, he is going to do the *sajdat'l-sahw*. Now you did not do anything wrong, but you have to do the *sajdah.* Of course you do! So, that is the evidence for a person in our scenario, the one who decides to sit down. Just because you did not do the mistake does not mean that you do not have to do the *sajdah*.

(0:30:00) وعَمَلٌ مُسْتَكْثَرٌ عادَةً من غيرِ جِنْسِ الصلاةِ يُبْطِلُها عَمْدُه وسَهْوُه، ولا يُشْرَعُ لِيَسِيْرِهِ سُجودٌ، ولا تَبْطُلُ بِيَسِيْرِ أَكْلٍ أو شُرْبٍ سَهْوًا، ولا نَفْلٌ بِيَسِيْرِ شُرْبٍ عَمْدًا

Actions not from the genus of the prayer, performed in a quantity that would be considered 'a lot', invalidate the prayer whether done intentionally or forgetfully/unintentionally. It is not legislated to offer the prostration for an insignificant number of such actions. Unintentionally ingesting small amounts of food and drink does not invalidate the prayer. The supererogatory prayer is also valid if one drinks a small amount *intentionally*.

Now we want to focus on the phrase:

من غيرِ جِنْسِ الصلاةِ

Actions not from the genus of the prayer.

Everything that we spoke about last week are those actions not from the genus of the prayer. That means coughing, itching, opening the door, moving to the side, or your horse that you are holding starts to walk off and you are holding on to it. These are not from the genus of the prayer.

As for the actions from the genus of the prayer, we covered it a couple of weeks ago or maybe a couple of months ago. What are those? It is here, it is the first paragraph of this particular section. Those are the actions that are from the genus of the prayer, so, sitting, standing, bowing, *sajdah*. If you do any of those actions in the actual prayer, then we said that if you do any them intentionally, then the prayer is invalidated. I will explain all of this. When these actions are done intentionally, the prayer is invalidated. And when they are done unintentionally, then you fix it.

Whereas here, in this particular part, the difference is that according to the Ḥanbali school, when you do those actions that are not from the prayer—whether you do them intentionally or unintentionally or forgetfully—it invalidates the prayer. So, this is much stricter. And the reason for strictness is obvious. It is because it is actions not from the genus of the prayer. They are foreign to the prayer.

So, if you are going mad on the itching for example, then they are basically saying you know whereas if you keep sitting down in the wrong position, let us say even 20 times for example. Let's imagine that you completely lost your mind and you were just going for *rukūʿ* and you kept going for *rukūʿ* and then you keep standing up and realising, '*What am I doing? What am I doing?*' Whether you are doing that for whatever reason, however you forgot, but because it is an action of the prayer and it is just mad confusion. I mean there is obviously a limit where it gets too silly, but the point is that it is still a couple of times, you fix that with something. In here, we are talking about actions which are not from the genus of the prayer and therefore this is all a mess. And if it gets to that level, the Ḥanbalis are saying that these invalidate the prayer whether it is done forgetfully, whether it is done intentionally, or whatever it is—as long as it is a lot, as long as it is significant acts.

Now Shaykh says that what would have been helpful from the author is if he had added a few more explanatory statements because there are more facts that we need to know. We need to be more specific about these actions. So, for example Shaykh said that he should have mentioned 'without necessity'. So, a lot of action that is being done without there being a necessary reason because sometimes there is a necessary reason. And if there is a necessary reason, then it is permissible to continue that prayer. That prayer is still valid because Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿فَإِنْ خِفْتُمْ فَرِجَالًا أَوْ رُكْبَانًا ﴿٢٣٩﴾﴾

"If you are in danger, pray when you are out walking or riding."[*Sūrat al-Baqarah*: 239]

This is referring to the obligatory prayer and the *nafl* prayer. This is in an emergency scenario, in a state of war for example or in a state of great fear where you can't have the luxury of just being relaxed where you are. But the prayer still needs to go on. So, it is allowed for you to walk. Now when you walk, that is clearly outside the remit of the prayer, it is outside the *jins* of *ṣalāh,* it is outside the genus of the prayer. There is no walking or riding in the actual prayer. But the prayer is valid because there is a text. Is it because there is a text that is valid or is it because of the principle?

It is because of the principle. The principle is that if there is no necessity in place then the prayer is going to be invalidated but if there is necessity then even a large action is forgiven, and the prayer is still valid.

And also by the way, it is also important to add another restriction, another specific part that when we say 'a lot' we do not mean the cumulative. So, when we say a large action, a large number 'according to one's culture' of actions that are not from the prayer, they will invalidate it whether done forgetfully or whether done intentionally. When we say that, 'a lot', we do not mean a lot in the cumulative sense, we mean continuous. What does that mean?

Student (online): What is defined as necessity? Is an itch necessity?

Ustādh: The reason itch is not a necessity or irrelevant to this discussion is because an itch is not going to be a lot. So, when would an itch invalidate the prayer? An itch would invalidate the prayer if from the beginning to the end you have not stopped, with your right hand itching from the beginning to the end, in *rukūʿ*, standing up, in *sajdah* where it has completely just dominated the prayer. There is no doubt.

(0:40:00)

Student (online): When it doesn't look like you are praying?

Ustādh: Exactly. When it does not look like you are praying. It is just a joke.

However, cumulatively, some people would say it is the same. So, for example if I am praying *Ẓuhr,* every time I am in *Fātiḥah,* just about halfway through the itch comes back and I give it a proper itch, proper scratch and then I come back. And then while I am sitting there in between the two *sajdah* and I feel it again and I do it again, say for three seconds or something, which is significant. That is a lot. Now when you are adding it up at the end of the prayer, that is a total of say what 25 seconds? 24, 25, 30 seconds? Now imagine if I am in the prayer [scratching for six seconds straight]. 30 seconds is a huge, huge amount. But the ruling is not based upon cumulative totals. The ruling is about continuity.

So, if a person did small actions in each *rakʿah* which individually they would not bring attention to themselves, then that does not invalidate the prayer. You do not add up the time that has taken with the actions or the amount. It is not a cumulative total.

Student (online): Necessity = being worried you will forget the point, so you write it down. Isn't it very subjective?

Ustādh: No. Look. Let's not get confused between different things. When we spoke about writing something down, that was a 'minor' act. The idea that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is arguing is that something which is very important for what is going to come afterwards. And because *shayṭān* has reminded you and you may as well take advantage of the dog. So, he has put it into your head and you are going to need it so you might as well write it down. But the whole point of that was that it is not a significant move. The whole point is that it is minor, it is not *mustakthir ʿādah.* It is not something which is considered to be something too significant. And of course, it is subjective.

Student (online): A mother helping her child to wear a sweater while in *ṣalāh* because the child is yelling badly in *jamāʿah*?

Ustādh: I think there is space for that. I think that would be a permissible act. I don't even think that gets into the realm of necessity. Like I do not think you need to play the necessity card there. The simple fact that the Prophet ﷺ on a few occasions lifted children up in prayer[3] and we have already said it is allowed to lift the child up to keep them calm would obviously be a lot less, well not a lot less but at least the same for putting a jumper on a kid. So just put it like that.

Student (online): I have allergies in the morning. While praying I sneeze a lot and I need to blow my nose. What happens then?

Ustādh: That is completely fine. To take something out to blow your nose, again I remind you all of last lesson. There are a lot of actions, a lot of flexibility if you need to do things.

We covered this in a lot of detail.[‡] The main thing is that the action is not something which makes a person think that a person is not praying. It is something that needs to be done—wiping the nose, coughing, or putting tissue in and or out. The phone is another example, muting a ringing phone.

When people don't understand this, they cause a lot of harm to the rest of the people. They say, '*I can't do anything, I'm completely frozen. I'm not allowed to move. If I do two movements my prayer is invalidated*.'

Student (online): The Ḥanafis say that if you use two hands for something your prayer is invalidated.

Ustādh: And that's what we covered last week. We said there's no evidence that speaks about one hand or two hands or this. I covered that. Again, review the lesson. I spoke about this point in detail.

So, if their phone is ringing, they should look at their phone (to understand where it is), take out the phone, put it on silent or turn it off and put it in their pocket. And that is completely fine.

Student (online): An allergy itch does not go away easily. It can last the whole prayer.

Ustādh: My point is that there is a massive difference between an itch lasting the whole prayer. We never said the itch doesn't last the whole prayer, but a person just sitting there and just itching the whole prayer. That is a massive difference.

---

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: If a Small Girl Is Carried on One's Neck During the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 516*.

[‡] Fidgeting in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 3. MT

Student (online): Is it therefore permissible to check the time whilst in *ṣalāh* if there is a *ḥājah*?

Ustādh: I think so. I don't think it is *ḥarām* to check the time. We even spoke about this in the section of the 'looking at the *Qiblah*' for example.[§] Is *iltifāt*, turning away, something which is completely *ḥarām*?

We said that there are some evidences that indicate that the Prophet ﷺ looked away. But we can also see that there are clear justifications each time that he ﷺ did that, clear reasons why he ﷺ did that. Some of the Companions were a bit lenient in this looking away. And when you look away at something, it doesn't necessarily mean that you have invalidated the prayer. So, a person to look at the time, for example, because they know that they started the prayer and they have to keep it within a certain time gap, I think that's [okay]. It's not from the *adab* of the prayer. It doesn't look good. It's not that which is done by good practicing Muslims. It completely interferes with the *khushūʿ* of course it does. But we're saying if there's a person and there's a *ḥājah*, meaning there's a need, absolutely there's no problem with that. But in general we shouldn't do that, of course. In normal circumstances. Just because they're bored, '*Let me look at the time*.' What the hell is that all about? You're in the prayer.

إِنَّ فِي الصَّلَاةِ لَشُغْلاً

Al-Nabi ﷺ said that in the prayer you are meant to be busy, meaning in the *dhikr* of Allāh ﷻ.[4] This is actually one of the important things we are going to cover in a little while when we talk about whether it's true what the Ḥanbalis say about eating and drinking in the prayer.

So, the Ḥanbalis say that lots of action, big action, significant action, if you do that, whether you do it intentionally or unintentionally, in the Ḥanbali school [the prayer] is invalidated.

Again, for the people who keep asking about picking up the child and this and that, what we said is that these are not significant actions. If you are not getting that, definitely the last class is to be reviewed again. So, we are talking about major actions like walking 20 metres, or itching all the way through the prayer, or… I don't know. Just let your imagination run wild.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn wants to make a point. He disagrees with the statement:

[§] Turing away from the Qiblah during the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression,* Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 1. Looking at one's watch, a clock, or phone was mentioned in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 10, under the categories of non-*ṣalāh* related actions considered to be disliked. MT

[4] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: Returning the Salām During the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 923*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

وسَهْوُه

Forgetfully/unintentionally.

He's not happy with that.

عَمْدُه

Intentionally

Done intentionally, people do the actions on purpose, so an itch done all the way through even though it's for a reason, it is done continuously so that the whole prayer is ruined, then this is done intentionally, this is now not looking like the prayer. A person needs to go and fix up. Now that's different, of course, from a person who has taken the precautions, changed their clothing, taken medicine, has very little time left for the prayer, and they have got that itch which is destroying their prayer. This would then come under necessity. But in a normative scenario this would not be a necessity so the necessity card can't be played.

So, done intentionally, big actions invalidate the prayer. But the Ḥanbalis say that even done forgetfully they invalidate the prayer. Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says Allāh ﷻ has already forgiven us. And that's position of some of the scholars.

The second position, also existing within the Ḥanbali school by the way and many other scholars (not the majority though), and this is at the top of page 354:

والقول الثاني : انه اذا كان سهوا فانه لا يبطل الصلاة ما لم يغير الصلاة عن هيئتها

(0:50:00) That if it is done forgetfully and unintentionally, then it doesn't invalidate the prayer because you are not to be held accountable for that which you are not aware of. That's Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn's argument. Now Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn's argument is also restricted in that he says (and he admits) "but of course it can't completely destroy the nature of the prayer".

So, he says for example: If there's a person who is praying and in the middle of the prayer, he just completely forgets what's going on and he's hungry, so he goes and sits at the dinner table and he starts eating (completely forgetting that he's in the prayer). Then he says that this is no doubt obviously a big act (moving out, sitting down, eating)—that's one thing.

So, the question is anybody here can think of a mad one, like a mad one where they have done a mad one. Anyone?

I have been trying to think of it, where in the prayer, you see...

Student (online): Reflex. Someone says *salām* and you raise your hand.

Ustādh: That is not a significant hand.

Student (online): From real life or just imaginary?

Ustādh: No, no. I want real life. I want real life. Someone has done something.

Student (online): Muting someone else's phone that might be a bit further away from you on the floor?

Ustādh: No. You see these are not significant actions. I have turned someone else's phone off by the way. I have picked up someone else's phone and turned it off.

Salām and raising your hand, raising your hand is a *sunnah* in the prayer.[5,6]

Student: Answered the phone and chatted.

Ustādh: Answered the phone and chatted. Now that's what I am talking about.

Student (online): But the phone is like five meters away.

Ustādh: Five meters is a bit too much.

Student (online): ʿAli ﷺ smacking the man?

Ustādh: Smacking the man? I don't know about that. I think that is within the realms of people… because you're allowed to stop someone quite violently if they are cutting your prayer, right?

Student (online): Smacking a man can be for the benefit of the *ṣalāh* sometimes.

Ustādh: Absolutely. He is right. I consider this to be from the *jins* of the prayer. It is out of necessity (he would say). You guys know what happened. Obviously ʿAli ﷺ was in the line and the guy came behind him to stand alone and he wanted someone to be with him. So, he you know like the Arabs do because Paks would not even dare dream of

---

[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Prohibition of Speaking During the Prayer, and the Abrogation of Its Former Permissibility, hadīth no. 540 b.*
[6] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of Forgetfulness (in Prayer), Chapter: Returning the Salāms With a Gesture When Praying, ḥadīth no. 1190.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

touching you, because they would rather die than touch someone in the prayer. But Arabs every day and night slapping people, you know touching people, pulling people, '*Help me become the second person in the line I don't want to be alone*.'

Someone did that to ʿAli ﷺ, tried once, tried twice, the third time he turned around, box. This is not a lot of movement, just an arm slapped the guy, no major. We already know it is allowed for someone who is cutting the prayer. But here now, you know I'm okay with that.

Student (online): Someone joined me in prayer from the left side. So, I walked all the way around them to make them on the right of me. He clocked on and ended up leading the prayer.

Ustādh: That is a mess up.

Student: Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn pushed someone too I believe.

Ustādh: That is right. I was told that directly by the way from one of my friends who was in the *dars*, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn pushed someone in the prayer who kept putting the foot so close, standing on the toe kind of thing.[††]

Student: What about *tarāwīḥ,* brother next to you drops a kebab burp. Am I permitted to wallop him?

Ustādh: No. I don't think we can hit people who burp, otherwise we will be hitting all the uncles left and right.

So, this person who goes and sits down and eats has obviously forgotten. But the thing is not because it's a big action—we know that. The thing is the prayer has now been so destroyed it's like just too much. That's what I am trying to say. It's just too much. There is no doubt that this has completely ruined the prayer. But if it doesn't contradict the structure and the form of the prayer—even though it's a lot, the action is big—then the correct position Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn claims is that it does not invalidate the prayer. Because the maxim, the *qāʿidah sharʿiyyah*, is that the prohibited action is excused out of ignorance and forgetfulness. So basically, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position is that.

I want to say to you if we just focus on this, the Ḥanbalis are saying that whether you do it forgetfully or not, if you do a big act then the prayer is invalidated. Whereas if you want to follow Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position, then if you do it forgetfully and it's not a madness, it's not like a madness where you go and have a three-course dinner or something, then it does not invalidate the prayer.

Now, what's the **<u>class position</u>** or where am I in this debate?

[††] Ustādh told this story in *Logical Progression*, Year 6, Chapter 15, Lesson 45 at approximately 0:40:00.

I have to say to you that from an evidence point of view or from a *tasawwur* point of view, the way I understand this religion, I am with Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn in spirit. Yet I hesitate and I think I feel more comfortable with what the Ḥanbalis are saying. I'd rather a person stick to that. I remember Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shinqīṭi explaining this point once.

Student (online): Surely similar to eating unintentionally during fasting does not invalidate the fast?

Ustādh: This is an excellent example. Yes. There is no one who disputes that. Also, in the prayer if you do a small act unintentionally then that also doesn't invalidate the prayer. We're talking about a major one. So, if a person sits down and he starts eating and then eating more and more... Although you have a point. What if my guy felt this is completely normal? So, then he asks for another course, then he asks for another course. Technically, if he's forgotten then:

فَإِنَّمَا أَطْعَمَهُ اللَّهُ وَسَقَاهُ

"What he has eaten or drunk has been given to him by Allāh."[7]

You're right. I'm glad that you made that point. But anyway, this is why Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn and a number of other scholars did say and take this position—the second position—which is also in the Ḥanbali school, that forgetfulness forgives the act and the prayer is valid.

Now Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shanqīṭi argued, and I have to say I find it very convincing, and it's essentially the argument of the Ḥanbali school and maybe the majority of the scholars, and that is that forgetfulness only excuses the sin, not the *ḥukm*
(1:00:00) itself. That if there's a debt, as the Prophet ﷺ said, the right of Allāh ﷻ is more deserving to be fulfilled than anything else.

فَدَيْنُ اللَّهِ أَحَقُّ أَنْ يُقْضَى

"Allāh's debts have more right to be paid." [8,9]

---

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: If a Person Observing Fasting Ate or Drank Forgetfully, ḥadīth no. 1933.*
[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: Making up Fasts on Behalf of the Deceased, ḥadīth no. 1148 b.*
[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: Can someone else observe Fasting for the dead? ḥadīth no. 1953.*

This is the way of understanding it: If you were to eat intentionally in the prayer, not only have you done something which is *ḥarām*, you have invalidated your prayer, and you have to pray again, and you got a sin for it as well.

If you are unintentionally eating in the prayer, then what is the *madh-hab* saying?

They're saying that the prayer is still invalidated.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that the prayer is not invalidated because forgetfulness lifts everything.

And Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shanqīṭi is saying no, what forgetfulness lifts is the sin of eating because you didn't realise. Why is the prayer saved from this? The prayer is owed to Allāh ﷻ in the correct method, and so therefore you have to pray [again].

So, I'm torn between the two, and I always have been. So, that's why I've always acted, once I understood that from Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shanqīṭi, I took this as my own personal practice. We can say that the **class position** is the Ḥanbali school. However, I personally believe Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is right. I generally have that approach. I generally prefer to be stricter especially upon myself and in terms of the way I teach, I try to be anyway, or I prefer the safer approach as opposed to the risky one.

But here I feel that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's understanding of forgetfulness, allowing the prayer to continue (just like the example he talked about in the food), and the sin to be lifted, I think makes more sense from *maqāṣidʾl-Sharīʿah*. But when I think the logical argument, I think it's very strong, that actually forgetfulness only lifts the sin, not the ruling and you have to then do the act regardless.

So, I think that the **class position** should be just sticking to the Ḥanbali position, which is that whether you do it forgetfully or whether you do it intentionally, if you do a big, major, significant action in the prayer which is not from the genus of the prayer, then one has invalidated the prayer.

Student (online): What about when kids come up and are incessant about their request and you need to confirm or deny it by shaking of the head? Isn't the concern more that you would have to obviously take your attention away from your prayer to listen to their request?

Ustādh: Yeah. But taking your attention away from the prayer per se is not something which invalidates it because your attention is away from the prayer all the way from the beginning to the end. We've already been told that. The Prophet ﷺ said that if a person stands in front of Allāh ﷻ and he will either take a tenth of it, or he'll take an

eighth of it, or a sixth of it, or a half of it, meaning that he's already absentminded.[10] And we know that *shayṭān* comes. So, that's not the issue. You're fighting that always. I think it's okay to indicate with your hand, '*Be* quiet!' or '*Stop!*' or whatever.

Student (online): Can you please address the issue of these actions interfering with correct movements of *ṣalāh*? I didn't expect you to say that you need to put the child down to make *rukūʿ*. I used to hold my infant son all the time in the *masjid*, bending forward with him in my arms. I thought that kept everyone happy, so it was good for the *ṣalāh*.

Ustādh: No, you can hold the child. I explained this last week. Unless it's a tiny baby, who can hold a child in *rukūʿ*? You must have the abs and the arms of a bodybuilder. Unless it's tiny, then absolutely keep them. But I am saying that normally you're struggling so much to hold a kid that it messes you up even more. I remember when Eesa used to be small, I used to tuck him under my arm. So, when I was in *rukūʿ* and he was trying to do my nut in, I'd pick him up, put him under my arm and he was small. Try and do that for someone older, over one or two years old, or three years old, then it becomes a problem.

Now, if you've got the possibility of putting the child down and you know that putting the child down for a few seconds is not going to cause a problem and allow you to do a proper *rukūʿ*, that's what I prefer. Because to pick the kid up again, I don't think there's a problem with that. Whereas if you're saying that, '*No, I'd rather hold on to the kid but I'm not in rukūʿ properly like I'm halfway or not having my hands on my knees*,' for example, then I don't think that's justified unless the kid is going to continue to scream and cry and that's the only way out of that scenario. Then I think because of the need I think there's some laxity *in shāʾ Allāh*.

Student (online): Is it not right that there are scenarios where even if a person does something out of forgetfulness then at times there is still something due of that person even if he is not sinful?

Ustādh: That's exactly Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shanqīṭi's point.

Student (online): So, the **<u>class position</u>**: The prayer is invalid, but person is not sinful?

Ustādh: Correct, yes.

ولا يُشْرَعُ لِيَسِيْرِهِ سُجودٌ

It is not legislated to offer the prostration for an insignificant number of such actions.

---

[10] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What Has Been Narrated Concerning Shortening the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 796.* This narration has been graded as *ḥasan* by al-Albāni.

Shaykh then says that it is not legislated (there is no requirement) for minor actions in the prayer that you do that are not from the prayer, or like a quite a problematic itch or a kid came, and you felt you had to pick them up and you picked them up and you know that you wouldn't have done that normally. You wouldn't have taken your phone out and turned it off normally, you wouldn't have sent a message, for example very important message or look at a watch or made the movement to open a door or any of these things. You would not have done them normally, but they are small actions. Should you make *sajdatʾl-sahw* at the end?

The answer is that no. It is not legislated for that to be done simply because the Prophet ﷺ never did it. We know that these actions of moving and opening doors and x, y, z was done by the Prophet ﷺ, picking up a kid, carrying the kid in the prayer and never after the prayer did we have a report that he ﷺ did *sajdatʾl-sahw* or *sujūdʾl-sahw*.[3,11] There are some things from the Companions, but not from the Prophet ﷺ. So that's the reason why the Ḥanbalis are being very forceful and saying it.

However, we have a question here. Nobody said that you need to do that. And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn brings this point up. He says this is not the section in which you would talk about doing a *sujūdʾl-sahw*, a prostration for forgetfulness. Why would you talk about that right now? We're speaking about actions which invalidate the prayer which are major. So, why are we doing it now?

The reason Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that the author is mentioning it is because he knows that there's a difference of opinion on the issue. And because of the difference of opinion on the issue, he's wanting to kind of state his case. He wants to put his case forward and that's basically what's going on.

There is a principle in understanding *fiqh* texts. What's that principle?

When an author mentions something that is irrelevant intrinsically to the matter at hand, the general rule is that he's done that or she's done that to indicate that there's a difference of opinion on that issue. So, when something seems out of place or, '*Why is that being mentioned?*' then it indicates that either there's a difference of opinion on that particular issue and he wants to state his case or there's a controversy. And a controversy which is not necessarily a controversy which is acceptable i.e., it's a *khilāf* issue, but it might be a *bidʿah* that needs to be clarified.

That's why for example those who study *ʿaqīdah* you will find in texts especially written by the Ḥanābilah or the Ḥanbali school and especially anything which is connected to Imām Aḥmad when he's making statements of *ʿaqīdah* (creed), he will include like (I'm just giving an example), he will say something along the lines of '*And that we believe in Allāh ﷻ and His messenger ﷺ and we believe that the rightful khalīfah was Abu Bakr and ʿUmar ؓ and that you can wipe over the [khuff].*'

---

[11] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: Actions During the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 922*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan* by al-Albāni.

Like you're thinking, '*What has wiping over the khuff got to do with absolutely anything?*'
Student (online): To make a point against the Shīʿah.

(1:10:00) Ustādh: Exactly. What he is doing is making a very clear statement of creed, that the Sunni *ʿaqīdah* this is what we believe because the Rāfiḍah, the extreme Shīʿah, and maybe even we can argue actually even the moderate ones, do not accept the *masḥ*. So, it's a creedal point. It's now been elevated from a *fiqh* point to creedal point. So that's a general principle that you should know from authors that when they mention something that is not necessarily relevant to the issue at hand, it is because there is some difference of opinion or there is a significant thing that needs to be mentioned.

Student (online): In the opinion of Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn when where the prayer is not invalidated by unintentional acts does he at least require *sajdatʾl-sahw* or not?

Ustādh: According to him he doesn't mention it either way. So, we've got to now think: If a person has done extra actions in the prayer in of itself, if it's been forgiven then there should be no *sajdatʾl-sahw*. And that's why he doesn't mention it. And I have to say that you know that I like the idea that if a person forgot something and was just forgetful and they left something which they normally do and enjoy and be part of their prayer, then I find that person to be guilty. And I like the idea that a person would do *sajdatʾl-sahw* for that basis, not because they did a mistake per se but because of you know just that point.[‡‡]

Q & A

Q (online): On the question of *sajdatʾl-sahw,* after the *salām* and the two *sajdah*s do you start the *tashahhud* again?

A: I indicated that in the last lesson or the one before that I do not follow that position that you exit the prayer. And that's the position of the majority. It's only the Ḥanafi school that do that, but they do it with good reason. We are going to cover that later on. They do it because of a narration that's narrated by Imām Abu Dāwūd and some of them considered it to be authentic. The majority considered it to be weak. I consider that *riwāyah* to be weak. So that's why the majority of scholars they do exit the prayer immediately, they don't do [*al-taḥiyyāt* and *al-ṣalawātʾl-Ibrāhīmiyyah*] again, which is the Pak way which all of us were brought up, you do the *sajdah* then you start it again and then you do the *salām*. That's the Pak way.

[‡‡] The discussion on whether to perform a prostration for forgetfulness when leaving out a *sunnah* action in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Chapter 19, Lessons 5-6. MT

Q (online): If a baby with dirty diaper lies down on the prayer rug and we do *sajdah* from on top of them, is that fine? Worried if the prayer area would be considered unclean.

A: Yeah, unless there's a reason to think that the prayer area has been soiled with *najāsah*. And remember what I said in the Telegram group, a child is of two types: a male baby who only urinates (although I know you said dirty and by dirty you mean number two) but let's just make it clear that dirty is whether it is just urine or whether it's faeces as well, for boy and girl, if both of them are eating solids. Whereas if a baby boy who has not started eating solids urinates in a diaper then that is an exception and that would not be considered something which… I mean you would still put your kid down and so on but the *najāsah* level is much more reduced. So basically, assume all kids, all diapers, number one or number two. So in this scenario, if you're not touching the kid and the kid hasn't put any *najāsah* onto the area then it's okay.

Q (online): A menstruating woman's bleeding stops, based on experience she thinks menses have ended so she does *ghusl*. Couple then has marital relations. After a day her menses returns and she realises that that one day in middle was part of menstruation. Is the couple sinful and have to pay *kaffārah* in this case?

A: In my opinion the answer is no. And they are not sinful because they judged on all of the normal signs. And the only thing that they might have made the mistake on is thinking about the length of time, but they only did that because they saw that all of the external signs, internal signs, indicate that it's finished.

Q (online): In terms of betterment or safer side, women wearing t-shirts and trousers etc. tight clothing in front of their own young kids (under 10) at home, what is safer/better approach?

A: From a *Sharīʿah* point of view there is absolutely no problem how you dress at home, however tight this, that, etc. The problem is habit. And this all comes down to how you understand the psychology of kids especially and so on. I think there's definitely a lot to be said for how young boys and especially young girls pick up habit. And if they are wearing baggy clothing all the time at home, that would be my preference. Now, you know women are not interested in either my preference or their husband's preference. That's just a fact. Because women are women, they like to look beautiful, they like to look how they want to look. And strictly speaking, Islamically, in terms of evidence I can't say it's *ḥarām*.

And I have no problem telling you that in my own house I disagree with my wife on this point. But I also know my limits. I know my limits because if I cannot make it clear from a *Sharʿi* point, if I cannot state something to be *ḥarām*, I am never going to go and put upon people that which Allāh ﷻ hasn't. From evidence. Even though I am absolutely convinced, I have seen enough in my life, I have seen it with my own kids, and I have

studied this from a psychology point of view, let alone the sociology of it, which is even more dominant forget the psychology at the individual level, but the society, what it causes. When you start something like tight clothing through your young years it's that much more difficult to go to baggy. Whereas if you have all the time the concept of this modest baggy type of clothing, even though it's permissible to have the opposite, especially at home, then you just find it easier to then continue that outside. Now, obviously if there's someone who's that intelligent that they're able to divide very clearly between at home wearing as tight and revealing as I want, whether it's for family or whatever it is but outside I become a different animal, in front of foreign people I become a different animal, then that's the best. But how many people do you know that do that?

The people that I see, the internal always affects the external. Always. And that's my experience and that's why I would… But I can't force that upon people. I mean I can't complain against anybody else not doing this when even in my own family we have this
(1:20:00) discussion. Like I said, it is based upon *ijtihād*, how you see it.

Student (online): I feel girls are more willing to cover outside when they have freedom at home.

Ustādh: In my experience that's not the case. I am making a difference here between older girls who know and understand the ruling. We are not talking about those. We're talking about children. We're talking about children who don't know any better. Just like *ṣalāh*, no child likes to pray. When they're young they do it because they get lots of sweets and lots of love and, '*Awww! It's so cute*,' and then when they start to get a brain…. Like I look at Hiba. If she knows I am looking at her then she'll come and she'll stand with me to pray. But if she knows that I haven't seen her, she will avoid absolute all eye contact, she'll tiptoe and she'll hear all of us making the *iqāmah* and establishing the prayer, but she will not come. Because why would she? Why would you? I wouldn't. If I can now sit on an iPad and watch this, or eat that, or chill, why would I want to go and pray, 15-20 minutes standing bored out of my head?

That's why in our *dīn* we introduce things even though the consequences can't be seen immediately. So, at seven when you start to tell the kids to pray and at ten you discipline them over it, it's not because they have to at that age or not.

So same with little girls and clothing. The truth is that at that age the majority of them will want to dress like this and outside they would just continue with what they are used to and what they enjoy, etc. If you don't introduce the other idea of baggier clothing, then at a young age you are going to have a problem. When they get older, there is no doubt that's something different because then they know. I said my ideal scenario is for women to wear exactly what they want inside and then be perfect in front of the foreigners, strangers, and people outside. That's the dream. The question is, how do you get there?

And I understand the theory that when you are relaxed with people at home and allow them to get what they want, then they develop a trust with you, so they take you seriously when you request for them to dress [differently] outside. I completely accept that argument. Because they know that it's not oppression, etc. It's them understanding that this is how we dress in front of this type of people and this is how we dress in front of these kind of people. There is this paradigm.

Q (online): A person is bed bound due to a slipped disk and is only able to stand or sit for very short bursts and the time remaining for *ṣalāh* is not long enough for them to make it to the bathroom for *wuḍūʾ*. Could they do *tayammum,* or should someone assist them in doing *wuḍūʾ* at the bedside with water?

A: No. They can't make *tayammum* because water is present. They can absolutely use someone to help them make *wuḍūʾ*. They should 100% have someone who helps them make *wuḍūʾ*. I just want to say that *tayammum* shouldn't even be part of the conversation. Rather if there is a person who is unable to get up to make *wuḍūʾ*, then they keep their *wuḍūʾ*. Make their *wuḍūʾ* once and they keep it. They combine the prayer, for example. It's much easier for me to say that a person who is on the bed can combine their prayers versus water being there and ability being there and they just ignore it and do *tayammum*. *Allāhu aʿlam*.

Q (online): As a therapist, a patient disclosed issues related to gender dysphoria which they would like to work on. Basically, this means I would need to make a straight referral to LGBT foundation for them to access relevant support. I've blagged it to the patient that a more intense counselling service would be helpful for them to speak about their difficulties. I did this to keep things neutral i.e., the counselling service would not endorse the patient's difficulties just allow them to explore how it is impacting their mental health.

However, I am almost certain this referral to counselling services will be rejected based on the patient's problem descriptor. They will also advise within the rejected referral that the patient should be seen by the LGBT foundation as they offer more specialist support. What should I do if this referral gets rejected?

A: I can see obviously a solution there and that is, didn't you just say that when they reject it, they will say the person should be seen by the LGBT foundation? Wouldn't that be the referral that means you have been saved from it? If that's the case, then that's the job done. If the answer is no, they will reject it and you now have to make the next move and refer them to the LGBT even though you know that there is no basis, because a person who is a hermaphrodite, obviously there is a gender disparity there, that doesn't require counselling. But 99.9% of the market that we are seeing today, this is complete nonsense and *ḥarām* obviously. That's what everybody needs to know about what he is asking.

You know someone who wants to be considered gay or lesbian, etc. We know it's all nonsense. It's just *hawā'*, it's just desires. Are we sinful for saying, '*Okay go ahead and there is your support service?*'

I don't think it's permissible of course to send them on. The truth is that there are two ways of looking at this. I will give you the *fatwa* of one of my own teachers. It's a different scenario and I'll even say that it's not that analogous, but he was saying that if you are working within a system in which an action which is *ḥarām* is going to happen regardless, then for you to expedite that is not as *ḥarām* as it normally would be.

I don't think that that is as relevant here because that example was being given in the context of emergency contraception. And the idea was that even if you consider this to be impermissible and it to be an abortive procedure, and you were going to (like the Catholics do) refuse to dispense emergency contraception, then it is permissible for you to give it because if you don't give it then the only thing that will happen is, they will go to the next pharmacy and they will get it. Here, the *fiqh* is that if you do give it, you've actually done the lesser of the two evils because if you were to send her away and you know that in this country, 100% they are going to get it. Then the baby has developed that much more. And the aborting of it is that much more serious. Now I don't even consider it an abortifacient. Let me make that clear. But I'm just explaining what I heard from the shaykh in giving this *fatwa* to someone else who did think it was *ḥarām*. And I like this. This is the lesser of two evils.

In this case, the problem is that this is *qiyās maʿ al-fāriq.* This is a deficient analogy from a legal point of view in that yes, you are in a country where if you do not do it someone else is going to. But the difference is that if you facilitate it, you have not done the lesser of two evils. In actual fact, it is probably the greater one because the more time that they have to think about it, potentially they could go back, or you could then do the referral, etc.

If I am in your position, this is my approach to it. I am teaching Pure Paisa this weekend, and when we come to the concept of unlawful professions, you look at the profession and understand: Is it *ḥarām* in its principle? The answer is no. You are a therapist. It is
(1:30:00) a *ḥalāl* job. *Ṭayyib*. However, we also know that every *ḥalāl* job has some impermissible aspect. There is no possibility of avoiding absolutely every bit of *ḥarām,* which is why the *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ is to advise the people, even if you do a *ḥalāl* jobs:

فَشُوبُوهُ بِالصَّدَقَةِ

"Mix some charity with it." [12]

[12] *Sunan al-Nisā'i, The Book of Oaths and Vows, Chapter: Idle Talk and Lies, ḥadīth no. 3800.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

As he said to the businessmen of Madīnah. Meaning that even the most *ḥalāl* of the *ḥalāl* jobs will have some kind of problem. So, you would give some *ṣadaqah* away, and the amount is something nominal which is reflecting maybe the incidents, the pro rata of your week or year. You work out a percentage and you give it away.

That is what you do to cover your payment for said actions. As for said actions, I would either avoid the referral by giving it to a colleague who believes in that and is happy to pass it on, or I would delay it as much as possible. I would then make the referral to mental services. For me, absolutely the right thing to do. It is a mental problem. No doubt about it. It is a self-esteem problem. It is a desire problem. It is someone who cannot control themselves.

I would forward it on as much as possible. Then when it comes back and I am legally obligated, then I do not mind writing to the LGBT, because my job is *ḥalāl*, I was forced into this. If I do not do it, I lose my job, and you are not required to lose your *ḥalāl* job based upon a *ḥarām* aspect.

Student (online): Long answer to this: You have to consider you could be complained against and be suspended!

Ustādh: Of course it's a long answer. And as I said, you do what needs to be done within the law, without being hooked up. You just do whatever is required to avoid being.... You can credibly make a case that it does require a mental referral. And you can credibly ask for another person to get involved. But if it starts getting too many times and they realise that actually you are not being fair or you are being biased, then you are going to have to pull it back. You have to use your *ʿaql*. You have to be careful that you do not get complained against.

Q (online): My husband says that teenage girls should cover their chests in front of their father and brother. Is this cultural or in the *dīn*?

A: Well, it is actually both. Culture of course is stronger, than from a religious point of view because we do not have a direct text. However, from Islam we know that *ḥayāʾ*, modesty is a real thing. It is not just theoretical. And covering body parts is from *imān*. One should know that. Family and so on, they are *maḥram*, but they are not the husband. Only the husband is someone in which there is completely no fear of clothes and things like that. It is possible to make other people uncomfortable. And it is possible to create unnatural sexual responses, even in family. So, people need to be aware of that. And people should have respect for that.

Q (online): With the new restrictions kicking in tomorrow, we have been told that congregational prayers are not allowed and only individual prayers in the mosques. Some mosques have said that they will stay open. So, if we go to the mosque, ignore the rules and decide to do a *jamāʿah*, is it better for us to join a *jamāʿah*? Or if you go the

mosque and a few people turned up around the same time, is it better for them to do a *jamāʿah* keeping two metres apart, or is it better to follow the rules and just pray individually?

A: Even that individual prayer by the way is not going to happen realistically. The churches are separate, and different. People go in and there is one person, *miskīn*, who sits there in the church. In the *masājid*, that is not going to be allowed to occur.

In my personal opinion, I see absolutely no problem in a person going to the mosque. By the way, in COVID, I do not go to the *masjid*. And you know that I live in the *masjid*. Every day I am in the *masjid*, morning and evening. I cannot survive without the *masjid*. But I do not go in COVID. I do not like this congregation. I do not like the deadness. I cannot cover my face, I hate that. I do not like the idea that you cannot relax and do *dhikr*. I do not like it. That is all because we establish a *jamāʿah* at home. Now, if I was not establishing a *jamāʿah* at home, then I would go to the mosque. There is no doubt about that. But because I have a proper *jamāʿah* at home, why would I want to then go and put myself through that? So, I am happy for that. But that is me.

The times I've been, it's madness about how safe that place is. It is so extreme! '*Pick up your chappal*.'

'*Don't move*.'

Every single prayer.

We were all miles apart, etc. Can't stop, Put your chappal in the bag, etc. It is safest place on his planet bro. The safest place on this planet. So, I don't care. Anybody's in the *masjid* for whatever reason and they make the *jamāʿah*, I have no problem with that whatsoever.

12. Chapter 20 Lesson 7: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

ولا تَبْطُلُ بِيَسِيْرِ أَكْلٍ أو شُرْبٍ سَهْوًا، ولا نَفْلٌ بِيَسِيْرِ شُرْبٍ عَمْدًا

Unintentionally ingesting small amounts of food and drink does not invalidate the prayer. The supererogatory prayer is valid if one drinks a small amount *intentionally*.

(0:10:40) So we're talking about eating and drinking in prayer. Now eating and drinking in prayer has a lot of parameters. I mean you could be in *ṣalāh* and grab a burger and start smashing it down. So, you are talking about a couple of parameters: (1) the movements involved to get to the food, (2) the intentional nature of the act, or unintentional i.e., because it is done either out of forgetfulness or it done out of ignorance, (3) the amount, large amount, small amount.

Another parameter we should discuss is: Is it eating and drinking which is the problem? Or is it chewing? Is it swallowing?

Another aspect of it would be: Is there actually any difference between eating and drinking in of themselves?

To start off with, the Ḥanbali position is that the prayer is not invalidated if a person were to eat or drink a small amount of food out of forgetfulness—in all prayers. That's *farḍ* and the *nafl* prayer as well.

I do want you to know though that whilst I say that, there is difference of opinion upon that. The vast majority of scholars are upon this position.

However, there is also an independent opinion that is held by some scholars, Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shinqīṭi from one of them by the way, and he said that no the prayer is invalidated. And similar to what we discussed last week, what we discussed last week is that there is a difference between a prayer being invalidated and a person not being punished.

So, it is *ḥarām* to eat in the prayer because the Prophet ﷺ said:

إِنَّ فِي الصَّلَاةِ لَشُغْلاً

"Prayer demands one's whole attention." [1]

It is very difficult to translate this *ḥadīth*. I would translate it as the prayer is a *shughl*. Now *shuqhl* means work, job this, that, whatever. And to be *mashgūl* means to be busy.

Student (online): One is occupied.

Student (online): Keeps you occupied.

Student (online): Being actively occupied.

Ustādh: One is occupied, I'm liking that, that whole kind of line.

You would like to say one is occupied in the prayer, actually I'm okay with that as well. That is being a bit too artistic when you say one is occupied in the prayer, but it needs to be something like…

Student (online): Prayer is an occupation.

Ustādh: Like she started off with: Prayer is an occupation.

The problem is that this is actually one of the reasons why even the Arabic has been differed over, let alone us struggling to translate to English. Because Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shinqīṭi from this *ḥadīth* considers it *ḥarām* to eat forgetfully. Forgetfully for crying out loud! Forget intentionally, even forgetfully he is saying it is *ḥarām* to eat. Whereas we also use the same *ḥadīth* and we say it is not allowed to eat, but if you do so forgetfully it is not a major problem.

Even in the Arabic of the *ḥadīth* itself:

إِنَّ فِي الصَّلَاةِ لَشُغْلاً

Student (online): Busy?

Ustādh: Yes, it is busy…

[1] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: Returning the Salām During the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 923*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

I think yes, it is one is occupied in the prayer. Indeed, one is occupied in the prayer, of a certainty one must be occupied in the prayer. The entire sentence is quite flexible on how you put it. But the point I'm trying to make is that there is no way that a translation would suffice. You have to add lots of explanation.

Student (online): Engaged.

Ustādh: I like that.

Student (online): Focused.

Ustādh: Definitely.

Student (online): Engrossed.

Ustādh: Exactly. And that is the intended meaning.

And this is the *ḥadīth* that all parties used to make *ḥarām* speaking in the prayer, laughing in the prayer, moving in the prayer, the eating of the prayer, the drinking of the prayer. This is like the primary text for eating and drinking.

I want you to appreciate that if scholars used that and yet that they are differing over how far it means you can be engaged. We are kind of lenient on the issue saying that if a person does it out of forgetfulness, then it is not a major problem. We are going to go even further. The Ḥanbali school is going to go even further and they are alone in this. They are going to go further and actually say it is even allowed for you to drink a little bit in the *nafl* prayer. So that is adding a whole level next caveat to the idea of being busy, occupied, etc. And that goes to show that there are layers to this game because we know that once you start to go deeper, we see that ʿUmar ﷺ so famous, authentically narrated from him…

Student (online): If you are engrossed how can you be picking up food?

Ustādh: Okay. I put to you if you're engrossed, how can you be organising your military units and your strategy? '*We are going to attack from this side we are going to go from this side*.'

And that is what ʿUmar ﷺ used to do. And he used to say: "I prepare my army in the prayer." Now obviously there are scholars saying that's because *jihād* is *farḍ* and he was the leader at that moment and he is combining between *tadabbur*, and it is only *dīn* that he is thinking of, etc. My point is that there is nuance here.

Student (online): Absorbed

Ustādh: I like absorbed.

Like for example, we know it's allowed to ride on a camel in the *nafl* prayer. Listen man, it's not easy to ride on a camel. You have to hold balance. It's a skill thing. I'm telling you to ride a camel on top and be balanced or whatever, even just to do nothing requires some involvement. Like Teslas and these electric cars that are going to become auto-driving. You're still told, even though you can take your hands off the steering wheel, you still need to be 'in control of the car' or whatever the official phrase is.

So you might be saying to yourself, '*This is the perfect time for me to pray*,' whilst on that journey. And that's allowed. A *nafl* prayer sitting down in your auto car, do your prayer no problem whatsoever. But there's still going to be some attention taken up by you know whatever the legal requirement is to back up the auto system. So, your mind is going to be [occupied].

Student (online): I haven't tried the auto drive on a Tesla. I wouldn't risk it.

Ustādh: As he is saying, "I wouldn't even risk it." I mean people are going to be stressed. There's no doubt and the balance. It's the same. The two examples I gave are the same thing.

So being engrossed does not mean that you are not thinking about other things and doing other things.

In any case, Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shanqīṭi and a few of the scholars, what they said is that: This is the nature of the prayer, it must not be interrupted neither forgetfully neither intentionally. And if you do, then it's *ḥarām*. And if you do
(0:20:00) intentionally, you have done *ḥarām* and you have to repeat the prayer. If you do it forgetfully (which is what our discussion is about), then Allāh ﷻ will not punish you because Allāh ﷻ will lift from you the sin because of forgetfulness, as per the *ḥadīth* and *ayah* we covered these last few years.[2,3] But you need to repeat the prayer.

We discussed that last week. We discussed the difference between making something impermissible and still having to repeat the prayer versus [the sin of the act being lifted from you because it was done out of forgetfulness or ignorance and also still having to repeat the prayer because the act invalidated it]. That paradigm is important, that it exists. And we should respect that. That's quality scholarship. That's when people really dig deep and you can see what's going on.

However, let's just stick to the position of the majority. That's the **class position** as well. And that is because of forgetfulness being lifted from the *Ummah*, then there is no indication that this act needs to be repeated unless of course you've gone completely off the plot.

---

[2] [*Sūrat al-Baqarah*: 286]

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Faith, Chapter: Clarification That Allāh ﷻ, Most High Allows a Person's Thoughts and Whatever Occurs in His Heart, So Long as They Do Not Become Established, and the Clarification That He, Glorious Is He and Most High, Does Not Burden Anyone With More Than He Can Bear, and Clarifying the Ruling on Thinking of Doing Good and Bad Deeds, ḥadīth no. 125*.

We have evidences by the way. For those who want to know why we do not say that the prayer is invalidated is because eating and drinking is on the same level as speaking. Some scholars even said that whatever invalidates the fast invalidates the prayer. Now, that's an *aṣl*. I've been a bit lazy about that. I've always just assumed it. But let's think about it.

What breaks the fast?

Eating, drinking, marital relations, vomiting intentionally... So yes, these would all be falling into the category of breaking the *ṣalāh*. I think it works.

Some of the *fuqahā'* argued, they said that if you were to do any of these or you were to do the 'minor ones' as such, which is to eat or drink…

Student (online): Menstruation.

Ustādh: And yes menstruation. That's a good example.

If you were to eat or drink during the fast, if you did it intentionally it breaks the fast, if you did it forgetfully:

أَطْعَمَهُ اللَّهُ وَسَقَاهُ

"Allāh has made him eat and drink." [4,5]

Then Allāh ﷻ is the one who fed him and gave him to drink and the fast is valid.

So that's one of the reasons why they said that the prayer is also valid—because it's like the fast. If a person eats or drinks in the prayer forgetfully, then it is not invalidated just like fasting is not invalidated.

Another evidence, which is a strong direct evidence, is the famous *ḥadīth* of Muʿāwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam ؓ.[6] This is the *ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* in which he was praying with the rest of the Companions and someone sneezed and he said to him *yarḥamuk Allāh*. So, he spoke in the prayer. And when he said *yarḥamuk Allāh* nice and loud, the

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Oaths and Vows, Chapter: If Someone Does Something Against His Oath Due to Forgetfulness, ḥadīth no. 6669.*
[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: The One Who Eats, Drinks, or Has Intercourse by Mistake Does Not Break His Fast, ḥadīth no. 1155.*
[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Prohibition of Speaking During the Prayer, and the Abrogation of Its Former Permissibility, ḥadīth no. 537 a.*

Companions started [slapping their thighs]. We covered this *ḥadīth* a couple of years ago.† And he's like, '*What are you guys doing? What's up with you lot?*'

So, he started speaking. And they [vigorously slapped their thighs], you know with a level of urgency like, '*What are you doing man? Be quiet!*'

And then he goes, '*Oh my God! I'm done! This is serious. I've messed up now. I'm finished. It's all over. I'm dead.*' And then he carried on and the Prophet ﷺ didn't criticise him and just told him that this is *ṣalāh* it's not becoming that a person does this and that and talks etc. It's not befitting of the prayer but rather it is *tasbīḥ* and *taḥmīd*, and *qirā'at al-Qur'ān*.

So, the prayer was not invalidated. He was not told to repeat the prayer. That's the key.

So therefore, this position is the position of the vast majority of the scholars that the prayer is not invalidated when you eat or drink forgetfully as long as it's a small amount.

What is a small amount? Let's discuss that.

First of all, let's make sure that we are talking something very different to the norm. The norm is a person eats then goes to pray, or he's just drunk, and he goes to pray.

Now food which is the remainder in your mouth… that's why it's good habit to rinse your mouth. And that's why it is the *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ to do the *siwāk* before you actually start praying. It gets rid of food taste. It gets rid of bits and pieces, if there's some small morsels left behind you swallow it whatever. Or after you've eaten you go and rinse your mouth out properly. It's good and it removes any doubt, etc. But at the same time water is not always available and we don't want to make obligatory in the *dīn* that which is not obligatory and make life difficult. And it can be difficult.

Not just that it will become difficult, but my problem is the *waswās* that comes with it which is why I don't even want to tell you to do this. Because the *waswās*, for me, is significant. People start to feel that their prayer is deficient. They start to feel like, '*I've done something wrong and my prayer is at risk*.' And once you go into that mindset, once you start telling yourself that, then when you're unable to do it, you're not able to worship Allāh ﷻ like you should. That's unacceptable because it's not an obligatory requirement.

What's not an obligatory requirement?

To clear your mouth of every single substance and morsel that is stuck between your teeth.

---

† This *ḥadīth* was discussed when covering the issue of bringing attention to someone in the prayer other than the imām: *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 12. MT

Anything that is stuck between your teeth is normally small, what we call insignificant. This text we've translated as that the prayer is not invalidated if you unintentionally eating something insignificant, *yasīr*. Now what I'm talking about is something even less than insignificant. Normally insignificant means something next to non-existent. In this text insignificant does not mean next to non-existent. Insignificant means a grape. Insignificant means chewing gum, a newish one. Insignificant means actually quite significant, just not 'a lot'. And I'll get to that in a second.

The example I'm giving of something stuck in the teeth, that is like microscopic almost, but it's not really, is it? They're not microscopic. You're talking 3 mm, 4 mm? Miniscule, tiny, small amounts. Now that is what I'm talking about in between the teeth. If they get swallowed, this is not considered to be eating. The books of *fiqh* mention that it needs to be something that has *jirm*, meaning it needs to have mass, it needs to have body.

(0:30:00) We are talking about three different categories: eating a full meal—that's a lot. That's what we call a lot of food. The second category is a small amount of food, which is what the text is referring to. That small amount of food I would put at a grape, a bite of food, a peanut, a rice grain, even a mouthful of rice. That's the middle (maybe). The third category that we're talking about is not in the text. This is in my explanation. This is a super miniscule insignificant. This is the stuff that's stuck between the teeth.

Let's now talk about these small amounts. These small amounts, remnants, if they enter straight into the oesophagus, and they themselves don't lead to any mastication (chewing) and that goes in, it does not invalidate the prayer. Likewise, when your saliva is taking the remnants of liquid or juice or something which is already there and it goes down, that does not invalidate the prayer. So normative stuff that's in your mouth as long as you don't… Just like when you have this big hole in your tooth and let's say you're there in *ṣalāh* and [trying to remove the food stuck in that hole with your tongue] then you get it out, that great moment where you get it out. And you play with it and you realise it's actually a hefty piece of meat. It's a proper chunk. It is a proper fiber. Everyone I think gets what I am talking about. You feel satisfaction. It's out. Now, at this moment right now, that food cannot be chewed and then swallowed. That is significant, it has body. So, even taking that in you should avoid that. You might say, '*I freed it, I am just going to swallow it*.' If you can feel it and it has body and it has shape and you know it's there and you swallow it, you are now moving into the doubtful area.

And again, you have this problem where in our culture we won't touch our mouth or we won't take it out, for example. Why would you not do that? This is part and parcel of *ṣalāh*. We said last week the movements to make the prayer better—itching to calm things down, etc. etc. if it improves the prayer. Getting that out of your mouth is a priority because it's got you completely consumed. So, take it out. Get it to your tongue take it out and then put it on your hand. You don't need to rub it anywhere else, just put it on your hand and carry on praying. That's it. And that's what you should do.

That which has no body to it, that which doesn't have a meaningful mass to it and it gets swallowed, it does not ruin the prayer. That which is [like] you didn't rinse your mouth up but you swallowed or you spat out or you just swallowed your food and it's gone and now the saliva will gather and the saliva will take the rest of the stuff down, this does not invalidate the prayer. Again, I repeat this kind of stuff does not invalidate the prayer. It's when you're chewing and so on and the like, that's a problem.

Anything that has *jaram*, anything that has an amount because chewing is eating, as I already made it very clear, something which is swallowed straight, without any chewing. And if you're chewing then by definition it has body. For example, the Ḥanābilah do not consider chewing your saliva as something which invalidates the prayer. It has to have body. It has to have shape. It has to have meat (meat in the linguistic sense). And if it has shape, meat, size, chewability, then it is probably too big.

Student (online): For example, the sweetness left behind from dates.

Ustādh: Very good. So, the sweetness left behind from dates that gets swallowed from what you've got already in your mouth, small amount. And I am not talking the fleshy parts that require a little bit of a chew. I am talking about just the general taste in your mouth. Then this is in the position of a number of the scholars, certainly the **class position**, does not [invalidate *ṣalāh*]. These things which are insignificant in the mouth which just go straight in, then there's no problem. If you start chewing them, then of course, that's eating. And that's something which should not happen.

(0:42:00)

Anything which is in the mouth, tiny microscopic amounts, which the *Sharīʿah* does not consider to be eating or drinking or food *aṣlan*, it goes down, don't worry about it. Simple as that. Keep it simple. People are always make these things complicated, chewing, not chewing, this, that. If it goes down, tiny small amount can't even notice it whatever whatnot. You get hold of it and you feel it and [it has] shape to it, then you shouldn't be taking it down. By the way, a number of scholars said that's fine and I have to say my personal position is even if something has a tiny bit of shape to it that you can feel and that gets swallowed, no problem. And if that hits your teeth on the way down then I don't have a problem. You chew on it or whatever and it gets swallowed because it's half absent-minded, it's not even a food, it's not anything. My position is that there's not a problem. My own teacher's position was that is not a problem. In the Ḥanbali school, anything which is chewed or anything which dissolves and it has a taste to it, it is going to be invalidating. And that's also the position of the Shāfiʿi school as well. Anything which has some kind of action into it.

Student (online): Is on the lips and in the mouth the same?

Ustādh: Yeah. Natural, lips, gums. You might have something left on the lips and in *ṣalāh* you do that [move tongue over front teeth], you feel flavour maybe because you've eaten. But it's absent-minded, it's minimal, it's neither here nor there. This is *yuʿfa ʿanhu aṣlan*. So, don't worry about that.

Let's talk about small amounts. This is one of those scenarios where you understand small amounts by understanding what big amounts are and then when you understand what big amounts are then you understand that small amounts are exactly what they are. Large amounts are basically shocking amounts. Remember again as much of *fiqh*, large and small, great or little, big or small, they are defined by culture. There's no quantitative measure in the *Sharīʿah*. It is what you would be shocked at.

Student (online): Like when we talked about bleeding.

Ustādh: Yes. Bleeding and so many things, movement, eating, drinking.

Student (online): So, don't scoff a burger.

Ustādh: Absolutely you're not going to scoff a burger.

But no one's going to scoff a burger. I'll tell you what people are going to do. In the village what we do when we buy shopping is that we put it on our shoulders and upon our necks. The example that Shaykh has given is something I've done before. So, you get grapes that you can have on string and you put it over your neck. So, you're walking with the grapes. Now in the modern era this is not that dissimilar to the cyclist rucksack that has the little pipe which retracts. So, the strap which is [on your shoulder] you pull it out [and sip from it] and then you let it go.

Student (online): But nowadays what is culture? Like you said Shaykh, the prevalent culture is treating the *ṣalāh* like an exercise in rigor mortis so you can't even move to fix something that will ruin your *ṣalāh*.

Ustādh: Culture is not the practical application by Paks, it's commonsense people. It's like we said when it comes to bleeding. What invalidates the prayer when it comes to bleeding? We do not leave that judgment call to surgeons and we don't leave it to those people who faint at the sight of blood. So, you've got some *miskīn* who faints at the sight of blood, we're not using his judgment and we're not using a bariatric surgeon who opens up your stomach or a heart surgeon. Clearly, we want a normal reasonable guy who doesn't lose his mind if there is a bit of blood but knows that when there is serious blood then he says, '*Listen! We've got to call the ambulance this is serious. Put pressure on it*.'

Likewise, those people who think you're not allowed to breathe in the prayer, rigor mortis as you just said, they don't have a say. They don't have an agency to be able to speak to us about what is the actual culture of movement or not.

Can someone think of a good example of modern time of how you could have food with you? I'd like people to use their imagination and think of an example of how you might be eating whilst in the prayer.

Student (online): Sweet necklace.

Ustādh: A sweet necklace, I like that.

Student (online): Chewing gum.

Ustādh: Chewing gum is the obvious one. I'm going to come to that in a second.

The grape [necklace] is a really good example. You have the grapes on your shoulder and you're walking along [eating the grapes] then you go into the *masjid* because you hear the *iqāmah* and you go in and you're there in *ṣalāh.* You become slightly absent-
(0:50:00) minded, it's been the exact same time period since you last picked one up, you pick one up and you put it in your mouth. And as soon as you put it in your mouth and you swallow it you think, '*Oh my God! I'm in the prayer.*' Your prayer is valid. This was forgetfully and it was a small amount.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn gives the example of what would invalidate the prayer. Invalidating of the prayer is you in the whole prayer just carrying on [eating] until he finishes the entire bunch. Shaykh says this is invalidation of the prayer.

فهذا كثير؛ فتبطل به الصَّلاة، ولو كان ساهياً.

He said that's done.

The most common one in my opinion is chewing gum. This is a good example to give. You have been chewing gum and you enter into the prayer and you are still chewing. Once you are now chewing and you have entered into the prayer, you will never need to invalidate the prayer even if you are chewing for quite a while. Firstly, because it is a small amount. So, the chewing gum it is a small amount, and it is little and the key here is it is being done absentmindedly. That is the most important part here.

Now intentionally chewing gum in the prayer invalidates it. No doubt about that. The Shāfiʿis and the Ḥanbalis would say that just intentionally chewing invalidates the prayer. There are discussions in the more detailed books of *fiqh* especially in Ḥanbali books but also in Shāfiʿi books, where they start to discuss what if something has lost its taste and then the chewing is just purely the act of chewing? And does it have to go into the oesophagus? Does it have to reach the stomach or not? Is it something which remains in the mouth? And it starts to get really, really technical. I just want you to be aware that we don't need to make it so complicated.

There are two different types of chewing gum though of course. Chewing gum loses its flavour very, very quickly and then you are just chewing for the sake of the habit. Then you have the high-quality chewing gum or a fresh piece of chewing gum that just went into the mouth and every chew is releasing flavour, sugars, all the rest of it. Now as I said, all of this, that, like normal food, chewing gum would invalidate the prayer *farḍ* or

nafl, if done intentionally. And it is considered to be eating as opposed to drinking, let me just add that little side point in as well. If you were not aware of what you were doing and you just carried on, then it would not invalidate the prayer. The second you realise you have to stop. You take it out.

When I say you take it out, you have a number of options. You will either have a tissue and put it in the tissue, that is option one, or hold it if you want to. But if it has taste you cannot leave it in the mouth, if it has flavour. If it is flavourless, then you can just slap it in a corner.

Student (online): What if you leave the gum in the mouth above the top set of teeth over the gum?

Ustādh: Or as he just said, stick it onto the [top teeth]. You know, shape it on the top teeth and leave it there all the way. I've done that once by the way. Just want you to know that I have done that once. But it has to be non-flavourful.

Student (online): What about flavoured Chapstick that has a very strong taste?

Ustādh: Flavoured Chapstick goes I think with the normal principle of the insignificant food. That is a flavouring which is there in the mouth, if it goes down unexpectedly in the prayer this is not invalidating the prayer.

So now you know what 'a lot' is. Obviously, going and eating a meal, that is completely unacceptable. Even forgetfully. Because it is too much.

Now here's the interesting thing, there is actually an opinion from Imām Aḥmad, a *riwāyah* from Imām Aḥmad (it is not the official position of the Ḥanbali school) that even a large amount of food, eaten forgetfully does not invalidate the prayer because it was forgetfully. It is like the same as the fasting. He is being consistent in this narration to fasting, because in fasting you can knock down a full meal. In fasting, most people probably take a bite, then they enjoy it, then they realise. In fasting, I have seen peoples man, eat a full meal. That is quite normal actually. It is quite normal to smack a whole meal down and go around and then someone say, '*Aren't you fasting?*' And then it is like, '*What*?!'

(1:00:00) Student (online): Ḥanbalis say that leaving the food in the mouth without chewing is *makrūh*.

Ustādh: Good. Regardless, the position is that the prayer is not invalidated, and you would carry on the prayer.

Licking, ingesting (without even chewing), drinking, eating done intentionally, and which is considered by people to be swallowing something intentionally, is going to invalidate the prayer. You do it forgetfully? Definitely, that's a minor. Completely no problem.

Now, the exception to this is the *nafl* prayer.

ولا نَفْلٌ بِيَسِيْرِ شُرْبٍ عَمْدًا

The supererogatory prayer is valid if one drinks a small amount intentionally.

Minor drinking is something which according to the Ḥanbalis is allowed in the *nafl* prayer. Here is something interesting, this is unique to the Ḥanbali school. The rest of the schools, and the vast majority of scholars reject this. To be honest, my position is to be on the safe side we should avoid it.

Shaykh says basically, that if a person is in the two *rakʿah* of *Fajr*, or the four *rakʿah* before *Ẓuhr,* or the two for *Ẓuhr*, or the two after, or *ṣalāt al-Witr*, or the night prayer, or *ṣalāt al-Ḍuḥa,* or *taḥiyyatʾl-masjid,* he is allowed to drink a small amount intentionally. By this way we know that the prayer, whether it is *farḍ* or *nafl*, if you eat a lot, whether it is forgetful or intentional, then it is invalidated. However, if you [unintentionally/forgetfully] eat or drink a small amount it is not invalidated.

As for drinking, if you drink a lot intentionally, it is invalidated. If you drink a lot unintentionally (like you knock the whole bottle down), that is also invalidated, according to the standard Ḥanbali position. If you drink a small amount unintentionally/forgetfully, the prayer is not invalidated. But if you drink a small amount intentionally [in the *nafl* prayer] then that is not invalidated.

The Ḥanbalis base their argument upon two basic principles: (1) *al-athar*, as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says, and (2) *al-naẓar*.

In *al-Mumtiʿ*, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn basically says that, as for the *athar*, then this is narrated by ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr, ﵁ and from his father as well, that he used to pray the night prayer and he used to like to elongate it.[7]

أما الأثر :فقالوا: إنَّ عبد الله بن الزبير رضي الله عنه وعن أبيه: كان يطيل النَّفْل وربما عَطِشَ فشرب يسيراً

And he would get thirsty. It would be hot, of course and instead of cutting the prayer, and spending time… It's not exactly going to the tap. It requires effort to go and get water. It is important to understand the context. To take a break, then to go, and these
(1:10:00) are people who are really into the habit of prayer. They want to spend as much time as possible in the prayer, and so he used to drink, *fashariba yasīran*.

[7] *Ibn Abi Shaybah, 1/225.*

We have no indication of what *yasīr* means here, but a small amount. I can tell you right now, I am very comfortable accepting the actual premise, and the actual practice as well. The premise is that this is in a *nafl* prayer. A *nafl* prayer according to all of the scholars is a prayer that has lesser demands, requirements, and pre-conditions than the obligatory prayer. And because of that we can take a few more liberties. So, we can sit down when we are tired. We can do it whilst we are walking to save time. We can elongate it and not have to worry about people and their opinions, and all the rest of it, etc. Likewise, I am also feeling very tired and I do not have the energy to go and I want to carry on praying, and I will then take it. Like I said, the bag one is a very common thing for cyclists. A little thing here [flexible straw extension which is attached to a bladder stored in a backpack that can be accessed easily]. You will be in the prayer, you pull it out [the straw], and you take one sip. Two sips. Literally to wet your throat. To give you that energy to carry on. Especially, back in those times, where it was hot, dusty, and an open environment.

Student: An imām with a dry throat who has to lead *tarāwīḥ*.

Ustādh: Very good. An imām with a dry throat. Or not just an imām. A person who is leading the night prayer would be reading out loud. There are some scholars, and I have to say this is my position as well, that it is a *sunnah* to read out loud. All of us carry water with us when we are behind the imām, but he has more of a reason to take it.

ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr ﵄, he is narrated doing this. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn then says:

وهذا فِعْلُ صحابي، وفِعْلُ الصَّحابي إذا لم يعارضه نصٌّ أو فعْلُ صحابي آخر فهو حُجَّة.

This is the action of a Companion. This is important. This is a maxim: The action of a Companion if there is not a definitive text that contradicts that—neither Qurʾān, nor *Sunnah*, nor the action of another Companion—then it is an evidence. An evidence that can be used in the affirmative.

It is a *Ṣaḥābi*. This is important.

We also have a narration that is a lot weaker, but it is reported to have been the action of the *Tābiʿīn* as well such as Saʿīd ibn Jubayr and Imām al-Ṭāwūs. So, that is the basis.

Now, that is fine as an argument. The problem with this approach, if you take this kind of route, is that you are going to have to be accurate because we do have a *naṣṣ* that the prayer itself is that which is busy, that we do not eat and drink [in it].[1] Why are we making an exception for the *nafl* prayer?

The exception we are making is because of ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr ﵄.

The narration of ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr ﵄ is not authentic in my opinion. It contains in its chain, one of my favourite narrators. He is one of the imāms of *ḥadīth*, actually, Hushaym ibn Bashīr. Hushaym ibn Bashīr was one of the big *muḥaddithīn*. One of the *nuqqād.* When you get into *ḥadīth*, you will really enjoy all the study around him. He is a major scholar, *ḥujjah*, in *ḥadīth*. An Imām. When Imām al-Dhahabi calls someone an Imām, it means they are someone significant in *ḥadīth*. There is lots of discussion about Hushaym in the books of *ḥadīth* and the books of *rijāl*, as we call them. Imām Aḥmad used to be super impressed with him. But some said that he seemed to be exaggerating for some reason. Many huge praises from the big, big scholars. Bukhāri took from him. Bukhāri's teachers, who are more important in this particular area, they used to consider him the most worthy in terms of *ḥadīth*, when compared to other big giants like Yaḥya ibn Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān, or other major scholars. If I remember correctly, Imām Aḥmad used to consider him to be more knowledgeable in *ḥadīth* than Sufyān al-Thawri and al-Awzāʿi. So, he is a major scholar. But what is fascinating about this Imām in *ḥadīth* is that all of the people who praised him—all of them—said he is a *mudallis*. All of them.

Tadlīs is one of those problems which occurs in the science of *ḥadīth* when a person is concealing a certain issue because of a reason that they have justified to themselves, which they know if that became apparent to the rest of the scholarly community, they would write off the *ḥadīth*. For example, the most common example of *tadlīs* is me narrating a *ḥadīth* or statement that I know. Let's not use *ḥadīth* as an example. Let's say that I find out about a piece of information. And I know that the person who told me, you guys hate him. You just have hatred for the guy, for whatever reason. He's not your kettle of fish. But it is absolutely true. I have heard it from a number of sources, but you do not know all these sources. And this is the authority. And this is the one who confirms the deal. And that is 100% certain. But I now have to tell you this and I need you to learn this and I need you to spread it, but I have to now give it to you without naming this person. So, I tell you that piece of information and I either ignore his name or use a nickname for him or I completely cut him out entirely and use the person behind him that would have told him or another of the authorities. So, it is a form of cheating. And it is a form of unworthy behaviour and that is why the scholars do not like *mudallisīn*.

However, from certain people they will let it go because there are a number of the top imāms of Ahl'l-Sunnah that used to practice *tadlīs*. Therefore, if we were to call up everybody who practices *tadlīs* then we would be in big trouble. Rather, we have a nuanced system in dealing with *mudallisīn*. The people who do *tadlīs*, the *mudallis*, we have a nuanced system in which we make an assessment of what they are given, who they really are, are they like the absolute don. This is a big subject by the way. There are different categories of *tadlīs* and different opinions of *tadlīs*.

For example, Ibn Taymiyyah used to hate *tadlīs*. Whereas other scholars are quite lenient. I have to say myself personally, the way that I studied *ḥadīth* with my *muḥaddithīn* teachers, I have also been brought up with that lenient kind of look. I do

not know. Maybe I am a softy. I do not know what it is. But the people who are generally stricter are the people who generally safeguard this field better.

One thing that we can all agree on—the lenient ones and the strict ones—is that when you have a person who you know is a *mudallis* and they narrate a *ḥadīth* in a way which is suspicious, then you consider that to be a fault and this *ḥadīth* to be weak. Not fabricated, but you are not going to bet on it. It is not a guaranteed narration. Whereas if a *mudallis* made it super clear that he definitely heard this statement, then because he himself knows it is impermissible to lie… The whole point of *tadlīs* is to kind of obfuscate the issue, fudge the issue, blag the issue—but never outright lie. So, if he says "on the authority of" what we call *ʿan ʿanna*, when you say *ʿan fulān*, *ʿan* is a phrase which is like the word *yaʿni*. It is just a conversation filler and it makes a person look more than what they actually are, and it is meaningless. And *ʿan* is such a general phrase that it does not really give clear benefit in the science of *ḥadīth*.

This is why I have a leniency for the *mudallisīn*. The *mudallisīn* themselves know about *ʿan ʿanna.* They do not want to outright lie, but they know that when they do the *ʿan ʿanna*, and not clarifying the mode of transmission, they are kind of leaving a clue. They are kind of saying, '*Listen it is there. This is legit. I am okay with it. But I am not going to*
(1:20:00) *lie about it and say he absolutely definitely told me*.' So, he knows when he indicates. That is why I have a soft spot. It is still unacceptable, but I've got a soft spot. But if he does that, then he has to accept that we are going to reject it.

Student (online): Qatādah and Shuʿbah.

Ustādh: Many of the names that we love and respect so much, so many of them do *tadlīs*. We do not write people off for *tadlīs* just per se. There are sometimes reasons for it.

When a *mudallis* does *ʿan ʿanna*, is vague about his transmission, this is called one of the hidden faults of the *ḥadīth*, what we call *illāl*. And this is one of the reasons why we would not consider a *ḥadīth* to be strong.

Nearly every version of this narration of ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Zubayr ﵄ doing this comes from Hushaym. And virtually every version that I know of (and I need to do a revision and re-study, but this is one of those things that sticks in my mind) comes through Hushaym and all of them have *ʿan ʿanna*. So therefore, this *ḥadīth* is weak. It is not good enough for me to be considered an evidence. I wanted to just say that. But maybe one day we will look at it properly.

وأما النَّظر :فلأن النَّفْل أخفُّ من الفَرْض، بدليل أن هناك واجبات تسقط في النَّفْل، ولا تسقط في الفَرْض، كالقيام، واستقبال القِبْلة في السفر، فإذا كان النَّفْلُ أخفَّ وكان الإِنسان ربَّما يطيله كثيراً فيحتاج للشُّرب سُمِحَ له بالشُّرب اليسير تشجيعاً له على النَّافلة.

He says that if we look at it from a rational point of view or from a logical point of view or just common sense, he says well you know *nafl* is less than *farḍ* anyway. And we know that certain obligations are removed or relaxed in the *nafl* prayer which must be there in the *farḍ* prayer such as standing and facing the *Qiblah* when you are traveling. And if that is the case, then if a person needs to elongate the prayer for a long time in the *sunnah* prayer and he needs water and it is going to help him do it, it is going to help him go all the way, then what's wrong with that? That's what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says.

He says there will obviously be scholars that will say that no, it is not allowed to do a small amount and there were some Ḥanbalis themselves that held that position as well. As I said, this is unique to the Ḥanbali school. Ḥanafis reject it. Shāfiʿis reject it. Some of the *ahl'l-ḥadīth* even reject it. Myself even though I see the *ḥadīth* as weak, I am not going kill a person. I would not invalidate a person's prayer. I am relaxed on the issue. My **class position** is it should be avoided but if a person did that, I would not invalidate his prayer. As I said the vast majority of the scholars consider it to invalidate the prayer, even the *nafl* prayer, even a small amount, because it is being done intentionally.

And one of their big responses to the logical point, that if the *nafl* prayer is reduced in certain obligations, then we should reduce it in other obligations. They say this is not correct. They said that it is correct in principle, but you would need a *dalīl.* Basically, they are saying that the *sunnah* and the *farḍ* prayers are the same unless there is an evidence to reduce it. So, we have the evidence to reduce the standing or remove the facing of the *Qiblah.* That is why it came down from obligatory to *nafl*, not, '*Let me choose any aspect of the prayer that I want to choose and make it allowed in the nafl*.'

That is why in my heart of hearts I don't feel so comfortable in differentiating between the *duʿāʾ* in *sajdah*, in saying you should not do it in *farḍ,* and you can do it in the *nafl*. I am not going to make a scene out of it, but I don't feel comfortable. I would rather myself be that we remove it entirely or allow it in the obligatory prayer as well and say it is allowed because it is *duʿāʾ* and *duʿāʾ* does not need to have the Arabic language. And I would rather that than to just willy-nilly throw the *sunnah* prayer out there like a *dhabīḥah* and just basically allow it to be sacrificed for anything.

Student (online): You mean in non-Arabic languages?

Ustādh: Yeah, I am talking about non-Arabic *duʿāʾ.*

And just to finish this section:

فإذا قال قائل :إذاً فسامحوا بالأكل اليسير عمداً.

Shaykh says what if someone says: Well, why don't the Ḥanbalis allow eating small amounts intentionally as well? You have allowed drinking in small amounts so why not a small amount of food as well because he is hungry?

Shaykh says there is a difference between eating and drinking because eating is chewing. What he is saying is that well, there is chewing and action and taste and x and y and z. And also, in the prayer there is no need for it. The Ḥanbalis justified this because they said it is actually extending the *sunnah* prayer and it is actually helping the *ʿibādah*. The food is not, let's be honest. It is thirst that hits a person, not [hunger]. But as for the water drinking then that is something which is needed a lot.

And by the way when the author says you are allowed to drink, does that mean milk and juice?

According to the text that would indicate that you can drink all of that stuff. However, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that actually the Ḥanbalis clarified that. They said that anything in which you feel the sweetness and they specifically said where you swallow dissolving sugar effectively. Once it starts to kind of melt on your tongue and then you swallow, if a drink has it then that will be… And that is definitely the correct position to stick to because then we are starting to the getting into Magnum and popsicle territory.

Some of the Ḥanbalis basically said in *al-Muntaha* that when you have got the taste of sugar on your mouth and it melts or not just sugar but anything like sweet and it dissolves (no chewing) and you swallow that, that is like eating. And there are others that said no it is actually like drinking.

Now obviously if it is like eating, then they are never going to allow it. If it is like drinking then they would if the manner, the way that it is dissolving, and you then feel it or maybe the grains of it, or the thickness of it, and then it gets swallowed and you consider that to be drinking, then some of the Ḥanbalis would allow even a flavored or tasted drink because it is not like eating. It is in the category of drinking.

How can we summarise all of that? It all got a little bit messy and all over the place, but I can summarise this by saying the following **class positions** only. I am not going to get involved in *madhāhib.*

The **class position** is that when you come to the prayer and you have not rinsed your mouth out and you have got small amounts in your mouth, tiny amounts and flavor, if they get swallowed absentmindedly in the prayer this is something which does not invalidate the prayer. It has not got space. It has not got a mass.

If whilst playing around with the food in your mouth and a little bit falls in without your control, your prayer is not invalidated.

If you are able to get hold of food and take it out of the mouth, then you should keep it out of the mouth.

If you then enter into the prayer with a chewing gum or you had some food next to you and you absentmindedly grabbed some and put it into your mouth or you carried on chewing whilst through the *iqāmah,* carried on chewing, this would not invalidate the prayer if you had been doing it absentmindedly—even if you are doing it all the way through—small tiny amounts. The second that you realise, you have to stop. If you had the grape, you would spit it out. You would spit it out in whatever way. You wouldn't be able to, '*I will swallow this part now*.' You would have to spit it out. And this is an indication that you can spit. And obviously you are not going to do that at home are you? So, you have to work out some kind of way of doing it. You might have to do the old Paki thing and take one for the team, get your *thawb* and put it in and rub it so that the liquid is… whatever it is. I do not know.

Now chewing gum is gone anyway—the liquid. So, you would stop and as I said you would take it out and put in your pocket. Worst case scenario, let's say you cannot touch it then stick it in the top of your mouth. That is going to be okay. But if it has got taste then that is not acceptable. If it has got taste, then it is continuously going down and that is too risky. It is in between eating and drinking, you can't tell. So, as a basic ruling
(1:30:00) straight out of the mouth.

Intentionally eating or drinking in the prayer is unacceptable and it would break the prayer.

And then when it comes to the *nafl* prayer you're not allowed to eat according to all the scholars. And in terms of drinking, then in Ḥanbali school and alone in the Ḥanbali school, they allow you to drink a small amount intentionally. They're kind of flexible with a bit of flavour here and there—some of them—the majority of them not. The majority of the scholars won't allow the drinking. In my position you should avoid it as well. However, if someone was in a night prayer or some kind of prayer, it was difficult for them to go and they didn't want to lose time, this, that, whatever, and they considered that this *riwāyah* is authentic enough… And some scholars did consider it authentic. Let me just make it clear. But people who are into *ḥadīth*—I mean I enjoy my *ḥadīth* and *athār*—I don't consider it to be authentic. But if you did, then it's valid for you to go by this evidence of the Companions and therefore you would be allowed to drink a small amount in the prayer. But I would personally avoid it.

And also, I want to say that the Prophet ﷺ was the one who prayed the longest amount of units, he ﷺ prayed the longest amount of time, he ﷺ got the most tired, he ﷺ used to get edema in his feet because of how long he ﷺ was standing and yet we do not have this narrated from him.[8] The Prophet ﷺ said that the from the night prayers is two and

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prophetic Commentary on the Qur'ān (Tafsīr of the Prophet ﷺ), Chapter: The Statement of Allāh ﷻ the Exalted: "That Allāh ﷻ May Forgive You Your Sins of the Past and the Future and Complete His Favour on You and Guide You on the Straight Path." (V.48:2), hadīth no. 4836.*

two.[9] A person should just break the prayer, meaning, hurry up the *rakʿah*, finish off the *ṣalāh*, and then have a drink, take a break, and then start again. I don't think it's a major issue before.

Student (online): You mentioned mucus/phlegm before. Is this of a different category because it is from inside the body?

Ustādh: I did. On the issue of mucus and phlegm as we spoke about before, I said that it is less of a serious issue. According to some scholars it's because it's inside and is going back inside. There are others that said it is a waste material, it is a *najāsah*. And because it is a *najāsah* then is should be gotten rid of.

And I prefer definitely that you get rid of it, but if a person, especially if they have got mucus and they've got rhinitis, they've got a lot of fluid being created it is very, very difficult to keep up with that. And I consider that not to be one of the invalidators of the prayer and Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q & A

Q (online): Reading from the physical *muṣḥaf* with touching as she made a judgement call that she has become pure. (Her pattern has changed recently and has been varying from month to month. Her period days and signs of purity has changed - she is yet to understand what is her new norm).

Praying and reading from physical Qurʾān *muṣḥaf* requires one to be clean. So, what will happen to those *ʿibādah* done during the time of assumed purity? If she read *juzʾ* four, does she repeat *juzʾ* four when she actually becomes pure or can she continue from *juzʾ* five?

A: You do not need to repeat the recitation. The recitation is accepted. Anything which is done out of ignorance, meaning not being aware of what the ruling is, is accepted. That is one of our key principles in *Sharīʿah*.

Q (online): Someone was asking on the group they have home baking business and want to bake treats, more demand, but not necessarily Christmas themed.

A: Yes, baking Christmas treats is no problem as long as it is not being done to be given out or used in a way which is in line with celebrating that festival. However, it is allowed to bake at Christmastime because there's a greater demand or because the ingredients are more available. I have never drunk a pumpkin spice latte that you millennial,

[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Witr Prayer, Chapter: What Is Said Regarding the Witr Prayer, ḥadīth no. 990.*

Generation Z, *miskīn* do, but I think that only becomes popular around Halloween time or whatever. I'm guessing. It's every year around this time. It will be allowed for you to go and drink that for example. It would be allowed for you to go and make that for example, because there are pumpkins all over the place and it's cheap. The *ḥarām* is to bring worship into it. The *ḥarām* is to commemorate the thing, and even selling it.

Student (online): The question was about selling Christmas treats.

Ustādh: Selling Christmas treats, increasing your trade because more people are buying, and you are selling something which they like, or they enjoy, etc. and it doesn't have a congratulatory or celebratory aspect to it then I think that's something which is not a major problem *in shāʾ Allāh*.

The reason for this is that when we give a ruling on these kinds of professions and actions, what we do first of all is to look to see the actual act in it of itself: Is the thing *ḥarām li-dhātihi* or *li-ghayrihi* (or for a *sabab* or for a cause)? That is the first primary starting point.

And so when you look at the cooking of a bun or a treat or whatever, then that is a *ḥalāl* act in it of itself. The *ḥarām* part is a minor aspect in application. It is a minor aspect in terms of how you then do it or how it becomes specific.

Student (online): But I think what is meant is that someone orders a bunch of red/white cupcakes to serve at Christmas dinner. Is it *ḥalāl* for you to make that?

Ustādh: Yes. As long as it doesn't say merry Christmas or something like that.

Student (online): Hot cross buns?

Ustādh: By the way, also I just want to say I know a lot of people get a bit worried and think it's a bit lenient and sell out when people are expressing what I'm about to say. But it isn't. It's legitimate to say that there is an argument that when something loses its religious nature and it just takes on a cultural norm, then it also loses its *ḥarām* ruling as well, because the *ḥarām* ruling is to do with something which is religiously practised.

I've spoken about this in detail, did LP sessions as well, especially on Christmas, that a person who would say Merry Christmas, etc., first of all should avoid it. And if he says it or feels like he has to say it then say something neutral like happy holidays. And if he doesn't and he says Merry Christmas, then I don't think it's a major issue because it genuinely is a commercial, capitalist reality. Even though they might want to believe, that's the opposing argument, they do believe that this is in relation to the birth of ʿĪsa ﷺ. So, they do consider it. But there's not a single evidence and we know that it's months away from that anyway.

And just to make it a bit more complicated, there is also an argument that even certain symbols that certain people consider to be religious, there is also no meaning to them. On a hot cross bun for example, you would normally stay away from that. It's a cross and you'd be like, '*Oh man forget this! No way am I risking that*.' Some people would argue that the cross is meaningless. The crucifix is meaningless. It doesn't have any actual *ʿibādah* function. It has been de-religified. It has had its religious nature taken out. And when things come to this kind of level of discussion and *ijtihād*, then you don't say that this person has done the world's greatest *ḥarām*.

Student (online): As a convert, I don't think it is easy for Muslims to assess what is significant to others.

(1:40:00) Ustādh: If you go in certain areas where it's particularly important, very meaningful, why would we try to make it like, '*Oh it doesn't mean anything*.'

I once was involved in a debate with someone, and he said this to me, and I said that you know if the cross was meaningless (other than the obvious, its religious significance on display), then why in *Bukhāri*, did Prophet ﷺ say that ʿĪsa عليه السلام would come and he will break the cross?[10]

Yes, some people did say about this *ḥadīth* that it's not going to be all the crosses in the world. Whatever it is, whether it's metaphorical or not, but there will be something said or done in which Christianity is made very clear to be false. It might be the snapping of one big cross and everyone will think, '*Oh my God!*' Whatever it is, but there is value to it. There is meaning to it.

That's why I am always preferring the side of caution and will avoid these kinds of things. But also, as students of knowledge, you need to know that when there is *ijtihād* involved in interpreting something as: Is it cultural? Is it religious? Then we are more tolerant to the difference of opinion in that issue. That's my point. Even though we might practise caution ourselves, we are more tolerant.

As for someone who is just making food, types of food, certain colours, etc. There is absolutely no connection between Christianity and red and white, for example. That's more to Christmas. And I'm okay with that. It's when you start putting words down and you start putting crosses, that's a disaster. I would avoid it as much as possible. But if a person put trees because they wanted to take advantage, especially if there was a need as well. Maybe there was a lack of business, etc.

Just use your common sense. You would use a wintery scene. When you think of Christmas cards, the cheap ones are the ones that have Santa on it and Merry Christmas. The expensive ones, where there is no text on it whatsoever, and a wintery scene like

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Faith, Chapter: The Descent of ʿĪsa Ibn Maryam to Judge According to the Sharīʿah of Our Prophet Muḥammad ﷺ; And How Allāh ﷻ. Has Honored This Ummah; And Clarifying the Evidence That This Religion Will Not Be Abrogated; And That a Group From it Will Continue to Adhere to the Truth and Prevail Until the Day of Resurrection, ḥadīth no. 155 c.*

a cottage in the Swiss Alps with snow. You know that's a legit Christmas card. That's a proper one. Use your initiative. But Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): Is it permissible to take loan on interest from 401(k)? Asking for a friend. The imām she asked said it is allowed because it is her own money.

A: This is the problem when detailed questions of finance are just turned into a one line answer. How is it your own money? I don't understand.

401(k) money is in there. It's a pot. It's your own money. You take a loan from it.

You mean you are paying back into your own fund? The 'interest' is you paying back to yourself?

If you are paying the money back to yourself and the only legal way to take that money from your fund is to do it in the way of an 'interest-based loan' from your own fund, because that's the law that regulates it because if you take it out any other way you will be taxed, etc. but you can avoid it by taking an interest-based loan from your own 401(k) fund then, that's something which is permissible in my opinion. But I don't know what you mean.

13. Chapter 20 Lesson 8: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

(0:10:00) وإِنْ أَتَى بِقَولٍ مَشروعٍ في غيرِ مَوْضِعِه كَقِراءةٍ في سجودٍ وقُعودٍ وتَشَهُّدٍ في قِيامٍ وقراءةِ سورةٍ في الأَخِيْرَتَيْنِ لم تَبْطُلْ ولم يَجِبْ له سُجودٌ ، بل يُشْرَعُ، وإن سَلَّمَ قَبْلَ إتْمامِها عَمْدًا بَطُلَتْ، وإن كان سَهوًا ثم ذَكَرَ قريبًا أَتَمَّها وسجَدَ، فإن طالَ الفَصلُ أو تَكَلَّمَ لغيرِ مَصْلَحَتِها بَطَلَتْ ككلامِه في صُلْبِها

If one speaks during the prayer with a legitimate statement but offered in the wrong place, such as to recite (Qurʾān) in the s*ajdah* or sitting positions, or to say the *tashahhud* whilst standing, or to recite a *sūrah* in the last two (empty) units of a prayer, the prayer is neither invalidated nor does one have to prostrate, although it is legislated to do so.

If one intentionally gives the *taslīm* before the completion of the prayer, it is invalidated. If it was done forgetfully but one quickly realises, one completes the prayer and prostrates. If the time taken to realise is too long, or one speaks about anything other than the prayer, it is invalidated just like as if one did that during the prayer itself. Speaking a little in the interests of the prayer doesn't invalidate it.

We are on page 357 of the Arabic commentary. The Shaykh says:

وإِنْ أَتَى بِقَولٍ مَشروعٍ

If one speaks during the prayer with a legitimate statement.

Here *mashrūʿ* does mean legislated. That is what I have translated as: a legitimate statement, to indicate that this is something which has already been legislated. And that is what *mashrūʿ* means. It comes from the *Shāriʿ*, Allāh ﷻ, the Legislator. We know that *ṣalāh* is *ʿibādah*, and *ʿibādah* is *tawqīfiyyah*, that means that nothing is done in the acts of *ʿibādah* except that Allāh ﷻ has to give you the permission to do so. You just cannot randomly say different things in random acts. We have controlled acts, controlled statements.

فِي غيرِ مَوْضِعِه كَقِراءةٍ فِي سجودٍ وقُعودٍ وتَشَهُّدٍ فِي قِيامٍ وقراءةِ سورةٍ فِي الأَخِيْرَتَيْنِ

But offered in the wrong place, such as to recite (Qurʾān) in the *sajdah* or sitting positions, or to say the *tashahhud* whilst standing, or to recite a *sūrah* in the last two (empty) units of a prayer.

Here, the examples that the Shaykh gives such as reciting the Qurʾān when sitting down, such as doing *al-taḥiyyātu lillāh* i.e., you stand up [and recite the *taḥiyyāt* in the standing position] and then you think, '*Huh?*' And then you recite *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*.

How many times have you sat after *sajdah* in your second *rakʿah* and you are meant to say *al-taḥiyyāt* and you start reciting *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* whilst you are sitting down and you are looking at your finger? You are looking at your finger and you are thinking, '*Something is wrong here*.' That is what we are talking about. Also reciting [Qurʾān] in the *sajdah* etc. All of these are legislated. *Fātiḥah* is legislated, *al-taḥiyyāt*, the meanings are real, and they are part of the prayer anyway. So, they are legislated [in the prayer]. And also, such as reciting in the *sajdah*. Reciting in the *sajdah,* here the author means the Qurʾān even though he has left it open to indicate *Fātiḥah* very possibly, which is more of a likelihood. *Fātiḥah* is the Qurʾān anyway. He is basically indicating Qurʾān.

The Prophet ﷺ said:

وَإِنِّي نُهِيتُ أَنْ أَقْرَأَ الْقُرْآنَ رَاكِعًا أَوْ سَاجِدًا فَأَمَّا الرُّكُوعُ فَعَظِّمُوا فِيهِ الرَّبَّ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ وَأَمَّا السُّجُودُ فَاجْتَهِدُوا فِي الدُّعَاءِ فَقَمِنٌ أَنْ يُسْتَجَابَ لَكُمْ

"I have been forbidden to recite the Qurʾān in the state of bowing and prostration. So far as *rukūʿ* is concerned, extol in it the Great and Glorious Lord, and while prostrating yourselves be earnest in supplication, for it is fitting that your supplications should be answered."[1]

(0:20:00) Student (online): Have we already covered making Qurʾānic *duʿāʾ* in *sujūd* in another chapter or should we expect it today?

Ustādh: We have already covered it.[†]

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Prohibition of Reciting the Qurʾān While Bowing and Prostrating, ḥadīth no. 479 a.*

[†] Recitation of Qurʾān in *sujūd* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16. Lesson 31. MT

فَقَمِنٌ أَنْ يُسْتَجَابَ لَكُمْ

"It's going to happen."[1]

This *ḥadīth* of course is an important one. The interpretations of this *ḥadīth* have led to two basic opinions. The first opinion is that you cannot recite the Qurʾān at all. And if you want to make a favourite *duʿāʾ* that you really like then you should change for example, *Rabbana ātinā fiʾl-dunya* to *Allāhumma ātinā fiʾl-dunya*. So, little changes so that it does not technically become Qurʾān. And then there is a second opinion which is that it is okay to recite the Qurʾān as a *duʿāʾ* because your intention is not to recite the Qurʾān but rather it is a *duʿāʾ* that you are intending and by that as opposed to recitation of the Qurʾān and it is the nature of the Qurʾān. The truth is that the rest of the *ḥadīth* would indicate it is safer to not take that opinion, to not try to recite it. And the reason I say that is because the Prophet ﷺ said:

فَأَمَّا الرُّكُوعُ فَعَظِّمُوا فِيهِ الرَّبَّ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

"So far as *rukūʿ* is concerned, extol in it the Great and Glorious Lord."[1]

The Prophet ﷺ said there is no Qurʾān in the *rukūʿ* and the *sujūd*, but make *taʿẓīm* of Allāh ﷻ, meaning magnify Allāh ﷻ. Now you can magnify Him by the Qurʾān. What else does the Qurʾān do other than magnify Him? So, there is an indication there that you are just it is best to stay away from that.

As for Ibn Taymiyyah he was quoted actually by Ibn al-Qayyim. He is the one who wrote about this in most detail, basically positing the fact that it's not becoming to recite the *kalām* of Allāh ﷻ when in a low position. He is basically saying when your head is so low, and your mouth is so low, and you're reciting the Qurʾān in the *sajdah* this is not becoming of the *kalām* of Allāh ﷻ. He makes the point which he has made many times very beautifully before, that the position of *rukūʿ* is humility and subjugation and that *sajdah* is also subjugation, humiliation, submission. But of course, it is for Allāh ﷻ. So therefore, it is the greatest of all things. But it still does not change the fact that it is a humiliating low position. So, Ibn Taymiyyah's point is that it's not right. It's not becoming.

I personally have great difficulty with this concept. But it is the safer position, regardless.

Anyway, for our point, reciting the Qurʾān in the *ṣalāh* is legislated. It is very much part of the prayer. And likewise, to put it in the wrong place is basically what we're talking about. If a person does all of this, then what happens?

First of all, let's just make sure we go through the examples that he says.

كَقِراءةٍ في سجودٍ وقُعودٍ وتَشَهُّدٍ في قِيامٍ وقراءةِ سورةٍ في الأَخِيْرَتَيْنِ

Such as to recite (Qurʾān) in the *sajdah* or sitting positions, or to say the *tashahhud* whilst standing, or to recite a *sūrah* in the last two (empty) units of a prayer.

He says *tashahhud* in *qiyām* and then he mentions one which in the Ḥanbali school itself there is a difference of opinion on. He said:

وقراءةِ سورةٍ في الأَخِيْرَتَيْنِ

Or to recite a *sūrah* in the last two (empty) units of a prayer.

Al-akhīratayni means the two later ones. The two later ones is referring to the last two units of *Ẓuhr* and the last two units of *ʿAṣr*, where they are 'empty'. You are meant to recite the *sūrah* in the first two *rakʿah* and of course for *Maghrib* it would be only the last *rakʿah*, *al-akhīrah* the third one. And according to the majority of scholars and indeed according to all scholars most of the time, one does not recite in the last third or fourth *rakʿah* of these prayers. These lot go a bit further and they say well that is an example of reciting in the wrong place. Our **class position** is that actually no it is *sunnah* to revive the reciting sometimes on an occasional basis, the recitation of *suwar* in the third and fourth *rakʿah*.[‡] It was a habit from the Prophet ﷺ, we have from Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddīq ؓ, we have it from some of the *Salaf*.[2,3,4] So therefore, we'll just add that little point there. We will take exception to what has been said there.

In principle, basically what we are saying is that if all this happens what's the ruling?

لم تَبْطُلْ

The prayer is not invalidated.

[‡] Recitation of a *sūrah* in the third and fourth units of the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression,* Year 8, Chapter 16, Lesson 50. MT

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Recitation for Ẓuhr and ʿAṣr, ḥadīth no. 452 a.*

[3] *Muwaṭṭaʾ Imām Mālik, The Book of Prayer, ḥadīth no. 26.*

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Oneness, Uniqueness of Allāh ﷻ, Chapter: The Prophet ﷺ Inviting His Followers to Tawḥīd of Allāh ﷻ, ḥadīth no. 7375.*

Now let's just quickly understand exactly what's going on and justify that. But let's just make sure we understand what we are doing. So, we are standing in a position and instead of reciting that which we should be reciting, we recite something else and if that happens, according to the text that prayer is not invalidated.

Actually, this text is not sufficiently detailed enough—the translation. The text that I mean, Imām al-Ḥajjāwi, it would have been even better for him to clarify by adding a few extra words, that what the author is intending is when a person is saying this statement with the correct statement. And if that happens, then the prayer is not invalidated. For example, if a person comes up from *sajdah* stands up says *Allāhu akbar*, [then starts saying the *tashahhud*, realises their mistake, then says *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*]. So, that is a person standing up from *qiyām* reciting the *tashahhud*:

فِي غيرِ مَوْضِعِه

In the wrong place.

He is reciting the *tashahhud* or any other [legitimate statement] such as *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm*—like anything that is from the prayer. He recites it then realises, and then brings the right thing to say. So, he says the right thing. Only in that case is the prayer not invalidated. The prayer is valid.

Likewise, if he recites in the *sajdah*. So, he says *Allāhu akbar* and instead of saying *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* he [starts reciting *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*]. Why he would say it does not matter. Let's say he does that. Then he says *Allāhu akbar* [as he comes up from *sujūd*], *Allāhu akbar* [as he goes into the second *sajdah*]. [Then in the second *sajdah* recites *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*]. If he does that, this prayer is invalidated especially if he does not do a *sajdah* at the end of course. Why?

Because he left out the obligation. The obligation of the prayer is to say *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* at least once in every *sajdah*. And if you miss out on an obligation, you must make a *sajdah* of *sahw* at the end of the prayer. If you did not do that *sajdah*, then
(0:30:00) you have not compensated for your mistake and you did not fulfil the obligation. So, this prayer is invalidated.

When you read this statement that the prayer is not invalidated, meaning the prayer is still valid, what they mean is you went for *sajdah*, [started reciting *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* in *sujūd* then you realise your mistake and think to yourself], '*What am I doing?*' [Then while still in *sujūd* you say] *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*. So, you say the wrong one, which is a right legal valid statement but in the wrong place. You stop or you finish (it does not matter whether you said the whole thing) but you definitely said the right thing as well. And as long as you say the right thing as well, then the prayer is not invalidated. That is the point.

I also want to add that Imām al-Ḥajjāwi gives very clear, very obvious examples. He gave the example of reciting of Qurʾān which is absolutely pure and restricted to the Qurʾān there is no messing about, it is the best of all *dhikr,* and it is in the *ṣalāh*. He said *Fātiḥah*, he said *tashahhud*. These are all well established. What about a category that is less than that? Because we are adding. What about statements that are in the wrong place, or additions that might be considered above and beyond what should be said in that place?

For example, if someone [after completing *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*] said, '*Āmīn, yā Rabbʾl ʿālamīn*.' Or after reciting *iyyāka naʿbudu wa iyyāka nastaʿīn* said, '*Yā Allāh! Yā Allāh*!' [Then continued reciting:] *Ihdinaʾl-ṣirāṭʾl-mustaqīm*.

These are phrases which kind of occupy a different time, a different space. On one hand you can write them all off as part of the *duʿāʾ* process, but they are additional and you can say that that is always going to be allowed in the *ṣalāh* at all times. Or you can say that well really there are only certain parts of the prayer which are for *duʿāʾ* like the *sajdah* and so on so forth so you should keep them there. Or you will say that actually these are all *adkhār* in classical Arabic and so therefore we need to be more flexible etc.

Based upon the famous *ḥadīth* of the one who said:

رَبَّنَا وَلَكَ الْحَمْدُ، حَمْدًا كَثِيرًا طَيِّبًا مُبَارَكًا فِيهِ

"Rabbanā wa lakaʾl-ḥamd, ḥamdan kathīran ṭayyiban mubārakan fīh."

"Our Lord! All praises are for You, many good and blessed praises."[5]

And the Prophet ﷺ heard this in the *ṣalāh* and afterwards he ﷺ turned around and said: "Who was the one that said that?" And then someone said, "It was me," and obviously he was really worried that it is was all going to belly-up. And the Prophet ﷺ said, "I saw the angels literally competing with one another to write that down in your record," you know, as a just a sick statement i.e., you smashed it basically.

This *ḥadīth* in addition to this principle, I just want to say that I think there is some flexibility. The classic one that you find discussed and scholars differ over is the statement of *ṣalla Allāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam* and whether someone for example says *wa ʿalaykum assalāmu*. It is difficult because that is exactly what Muʿāwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam ؓ did in the *ḥadīth*. The man sneezed, he said *alḥamdulillāh*.[6] But the interesting thing is that Muʿāwiyah ؓ is the one who said *yarḥamuk Allāh* in the *ṣalāh*. This is before he

[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, hadīth no. 799.*
[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Prohibition of Speaking During the Prayer, and the Abrogation of Its Former Permissibility, ḥadīth no. 537 a.*

knew that speaking had been prohibited. The problem here is that this speech, it is talking. Saying 'may Allāh have mercy upon you' is talking. At the same time, it is a *dhikr* and it is a *duʿāʾ*. And it is pure Arabic. And it is narrated from the Prophet ﷺ.[7] So, it in itself is legislated, but not within the prayer. It is legislated as *duʿāʾ*, a religious bona fide, authentic phrase.

Now what is interesting is that afterwards, the Prophet ﷺ, he spoke to Muʿāwiyah ﷺ and he ﷺ said:

إِنَّ هَذِهِ الصَّلاَةَ لاَ يَصْلُحُ فِيهَا شَىْءٌ مِنْ كَلاَمِ النَّاسِ إِنَّمَا هُوَ التَّسْبِيحُ وَالتَّكْبِيرُ وَقِرَاءَةُ الْقُرْآنِ

"The speech of people is not fitting during the prayer for it consists of glorifying Allāh, declaring His greatness, and recitation of the Quran."[7]

When he ﷺ said that, he ﷺ did not make him repeat the prayer. Now by not making him repeat the prayer is he ﷺ:

a) Accepting that Muʿāwiyah ﷺ did this out of ignorance? And of course, people who do things forgetfully or out of ignorance, it is not taken into account.
b) Did he ﷺ let it go because it was small?
c) Did he ﷺ let it go because it in of itself was okay?

Well, it can't be okay. Let me also add that when he said *yarḥamuk Allāh*, the Companions did not speak but they were like nudging and you know looking at him and all this kind of stuff. He clocked on and he was really stressed out and in one narration he said, "What's up? What have I done?" In another narration, "May my mother lose me," like, '*Oh my God I am dead!*' He is saying that and then they were like [hitting their thighs indicating to him that he should] shut up.

So, is it the second statement that the Prophet ﷺ took exception to and was correcting him about? But then if that was the case, why did the Companions themselves tell him to be quiet about saying *yarḥamuk Allāh,* just by itself?

Then at the same time, if that was the case then why didn't the Prophet ﷺ correct the other Companion who sneezed? He should have been spoken to as well, yet in no narration has he been spoken to. And that is why the scholars, some went really deep into this issue. They said listen, if it is something which is an absolute bona fide *dhikr* which is part of the prayer, then we are going to let it go. *Alḥamdulillāh* occurs many times in the Qurʾān and the *ṣalāh*. So, that is why some said it is okay to say

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Good Manners and Form, Chapter: When Somebody Sneezes, What Should Be Said? ḥadīth no. 6224.*

alḥamdulillāh when you sneeze. It is a *dhikr* and it is part of the *jins*, it is part of the nature of *ʿibādah* and *ṣalāh* in general.

But then what about *ṣalla Allāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam*?

We do not have that phrase: *ṣalla Allāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam* in that phraseology in the Qurʾān or in the *ṣalāh.* We have *Allāhumma ṣalli ʿala Muḥammad*, which by the way is almost the same thing which is why some scholars then gave an exemption for saying that in the prayer and some did not.

So it is obvious that the safer position is to avoid all of these kinds of extra statements. But my personal position is that I am flexible with a person using *adhkār* which are not random. What would random be?

Like I would find it a problem if people started going into all these Arab type of *Witr duʿāʾ* specialists, you know started rhyming and going all kind of crazy just saying *'Yā Mannān, yā Mannān…'* like when it turns into like a song so that we keep the people busy for half an hour crying. So, all this kind of *bidʿah,* that itself even though it is one of the names of Allāh ﷻ being used, but in the way that is used I think that is where the red line will be. So, I am quite lenient in that for the evidences that I have just mentioned, when you gather everything together. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

(0:40:00) So, the prayer is not invalidated, shaykh says, even if you recite in the *rukūʿ* or the *sajdah.* Why did Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn make this point?

He makes that point because there are some scholars that said that it does invalidate the prayer, only a few, mostly the Ẓāhiriyyah, the Literalist school of thought. And the reason for that is because the Prophet ﷺ prohibited for anyone to recite the Qurʾān in the *rukūʿ* or *sajdah.*[1] And when you prohibit something then the basic principle is that it becomes *ḥarām.*

والأصل في النَّهي التحريم، وعلى هذا؛ فتكون قراءة القرآن في الرُّكوع أو السُّجود حراماً، ومعلوم أن الإِنسان إذا فَعَلَ ما يحرم في العبادة فسدت.

Therefore, to recite the Qurʾān in the *rukūʿ* or *sujūd* is *ḥarām* and it is known that when someone does something which is *ḥarām* and they do that in an act of worship, it becomes corrupted. If you do a *ḥarām* act in an act of worship, it becomes corrupted.

However, the *jamhūr,* the majority—and I want you to note Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's accuracy here. He did not say *ijmāʿ* or whatever, he did not just diss the Ẓāhiriyyah. He is making it clear that there is a difference. There are some scholars actually that consider it to be *ḥarām* and invalidates the prayer. Ibn al-Jawzi not Ibn al-Qayyim, but

the Ibn al-Jawzi. Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, there are two ways that you say his name: Ibn al-Qayyim Jawziyyah or Ibn Qayyim al-Jawzīyah. That is the student of Ibn Taymiyyah, someone completely different. And the other scholar is Ibn al-Jawzi, the author of *al-Mawḍūʿāt*. He has many books, but that is my go-to. Just an incredible book (Ḥanbali of course). He is someone who held this position and other scholars as well. Whereas the majority:

لكن الجمهور قالوا :هذا ليس محرَّماً بعينه، لكنه محرَّم باعتبار موضعه، بخلاف الكلام، فالكلام في الصَّلاة لا شكَّ أنه يبطل الصَّلاة؛ لأنه محرَّم بعينه، أما هذا؛ فالأصل أن القراءة غير محرَّمة في الصَّلاة بل مشروعة في موضعها، لكن النَّهي عن كونها في هذا الموضع فقط، فلم يكن ذلك مبطلاً للصَّلاة، وهذا هو الرَّاجح، أعني :أنها لا تبطل.

This is not *ḥarām* in of itself, meaning the prohibition of the Prophet ﷺ did not make the act itself *ḥarām* but *ḥarām* for where it is. So, it is not intrinsically *ḥarām*.

For those who were in *Pure Paisa*, I gave the example of things like that, to understand the difference between something which is *ḥarām* intrinsically, and something which is *ḥarām* for other reasons, and that the two are not treated the same. This is another good example of that. Unlike for example, speaking. Speaking in the prayer, saying, '*Hey! Hi! How are you doing?*' If I was to say something like that in the prayer, then this is, absolutely, no doubt about it *ḥarām*. It will absolutely invalidate the prayer, there and then. It is *ḥarām* intrinsically.

As for recitation, then that is something which is legislated in the prayer. How can it be something which is *ḥarām*? It is only *ḥarām* in this area. It is not an invalidator of the prayer. So, the prayer is not invalidated.

Shaykh asks: What about someone who does a recommended action different to where it should be done?

So far we have been talking about speech, saying something. What about doing something? Shaykh says: for example, he lifts his hands in a random place like when going into *sajdah*, or coming up from the *sajdah*, or in between the two *sajdahs*, or as he goes to *tashahhud*. The raising of the hands is not an obligatory action. It is a *mustaḥabb* action. It is not meant to be done at those times. It is meant to be done when you go to *rukūʿ*, or when you are coming up from *tashahhud* after the first two *rakʿah*. Does that indicate that you should do a *sajdah*? Is that a problem?

The answer is no. Why?

Because even if you were to leave that act out (when it is a recommended act in the right place), and you left it out because either you forgot it or because you wanted to leave it out. For example, it is a *sunnah* to raise your hands before you go into *rukūʿ*. Let's say you decided to leave it out intentionally, which is the worst thing to do theoretically, let alone if you have forgotten it. Let us say you forgot it or left it out. There is no *sajdah* to be done. You intentionally left it out. Shaykh says: How can we tell a person they should make a *sajdah* for something that they do which is recommended, even if it is done in the wrong place, when we do not make them do *sajdah* for something which they leave out in its recommended place, which is 'far more serious'?

Excellent point.

ولم يَجِبْ له سُجودٌ، بل يُشْرَعُ

Nor does one have to prostrate, although it is legislated to do so.

He says that it is not obligatory for you to do the *sajdat'l-sahw*, but it is legislated. This where I like to translate the word as, it is allowed. We covered this before, 5 or 6 weeks ago, that sometimes it is allowed when a person does something out of mistake, even though it does not invalidate the prayer.

For example, Shaykh says that if a person goes into *rukūʿ* and he says, *Allāhu akbar* and then [while in *rukūʿ* says] *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* [but then realise his mistake and says] *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm, subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm, subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm*, then this is all valid because he said what was needed. But he forgot at the beginning and added something which was not meant to be there.

Shaykh is saying that if he makes *sajdah* that is okay, and that is the position of the *madh-hab*. In actual fact, the *madh-hab* goes further and says that it is *sunnah*—some of the Ḥanbalis say that it is *sunnah* to do that.

Some of the Ḥanbalis went further and they divided between a statement and an action. They said that if a person says a legitimate statement like *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* in the wrong place, then it is *sunnah* for that person to do a *sajdat'l-sahw*. But if a person comes with an action in the wrong place, it is not *sunnah* to do *sajdat'l-sahw* for that action afterwards. They actually differentiate, for whatever reason they do. I cannot remember it from back in the day.

Anyway, our **<u>class position</u>** is that there is no difference. If you are going to do *sajdah*, under the principle that: 'I-do-not-like-to-forget-things-even-if-they-are-not-important, 'even-if-it-does-not-invalidate-the-prayer-I-don't-like-to-forget-things', then it should be done whether you do an action in the wrong place or whether you say

a statement in the wrong place. You should do it consistently across.[§] This is the position of Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn. I wholeheartedly agree. That is the **<u>class position</u>**.

(0:50:00)

Student (online): I am sure we agreed with Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn that *mashrūʿ* means *wājib* sometimes and *sunnah* other times. That's what I have in my notes.

Ustādh: Yeah. And allowed—as the basic principle.

Student (online): Can you please repeat the class position?

Ustādh: The **<u>class position</u>** is that the *sajdat'l-sahw* is an act that is allowed for a person to do if they want to, as Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shanqīṭi states very clearly, whether a person does the action in the wrong place or says the statement in the wrong place.

Student (online): Why is there that difference in the Ḥanbali *madh-hab* between speech and actions? Why would speech allow for *sajdah* but not actions?

Ustādh: I cannot remember why they differentiated between the two. But even the Ḥanbalis—let me just make it clear—they didn't all agree on that. Number one. And number two, even those that did say that, they didn't say it's *ḥarām* to make the *sajdah*. They just said that it's not something that we would recommend or is needed necessarily.

Student (online): Why is a legal statement in the wrong place not an addition to the prayer and therefore obligates a *sajdat'l-sahw*?

Ustādh: Because it is part and parcel of the prayer itself. It's not replacing that which is there already. It is not changing the fundamental structure because you've already made sure that you've included the right item.

Student (online): The point was made that Muʿāwiyah's ﵁ statement had a direct address to a human (*yarḥamuk Allāh*) and was not a general *dhikr* in *ṣalāh*.

Ustādh: Possible. But my wider point was that there were so many variables in this incident, you could take so much from it, meaning so many different opinions. You could justify your own opinion whether to allow it, not allow it, differentiate between types of speech, put categories, it just depends upon how deep you go effectively.

Let's get this next section done.

[§] Doing the prostration for forgetfulness for a non-obligatory act that one normally performs in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 19, Lessons 5-6. MT

وإن سَلَّمَ قَبْلَ إتْمامِها عَمْدًا بَطُلَتْ

If one intentionally gives the *taslīm* before the completion of the prayer, it is invalidated.

That's very straightforward. This is a person who is intentionally doing that, and whoever does an action which is not from our actions, then it is rejected as the Prophet ﷺ said in the *ḥadīth*.[8] That is absolutely clear. But as the statement says, *'amdan*, does it intentionally. Therefore, if he does it unintentionally, so he thinks the prayer has ended for example, we're going to find out that it's going to be okay as the next sentence is telling us.

وإن كان سَهوًا ثم ذَكَرَ قريبًا أَتَمَّها وسجَدَ

If it was done forgetfully but one quickly realises, one completes the prayer and prostrates.

The text says:

ثم ذَكَرَ قريبًا

Meaning he remembers 'close'. Now obviously you can't say that in English, so I've [translated it as] quickly realises. When you say the word *qarīb* in Arabic, close, the Arabic I feel, more than the English unless someone can give me some English example, but the Arabic certainly indicates both paradigms: time and place. *Qarīb* means close, not soon, close. Not prompt. Nearly every ethnic language knows the word *qarīb*. Everybody has *qarī*b. In Arabic, *qarīb* means that which is close, near. So, what I'm trying to say is that you can see space and time in the Arabic. In English do we have that? Is there an English word that has both space, close time and close location?

Student (online): Instant?

Ustādh: No, I want space. 'Instant' doesn't work for space.

Student (online): Shortly.

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Judicial Decisions, Chapter: Rejection of Wrong Rulings and of Newly Invented Matters, ḥadīth no. 1718 b.*

Ustādh: 'Shortly' doesn't work for space.

Student (online): Near?

Ustādh: I think 'near' actually. I think 'near'. Yes, well done. Near is the exact word.

Right so *qarīb* is 'near'. And actually, if you think to your own languages, you will also realise that in your own language *qarīb* is actually 'near'. You will see 'shortly'. *Qarīb* means it is close. When you use *qarīb* you would mean it to be in both those things.

The reason why I like this point, I want to make a point out of this, is because in the text only time is mentioned as a parameter. I want to add space. There are some scholars that said if you leave the *masjid* (if you are praying in a *masjid*)—there is no evidence for this. And there are ways to refute this of course as well, because what if you are praying at home?

What are we talking about?

If it (the *taslīm* before the completion of the prayer) was done forgetfully but one quickly realises, one completes the prayer and prostrates.

The idea here is that if you make a mistake like the Prophet ﷺ did, it was dealt with very quickly, very close to the original position it was *qarīb makānan* and *zamānan*. The Prophet ﷺ walked to the back of the *masjid*. He ﷺ didn't go past the *masjid*. He ﷺ walked to the back, leaned against the pillar.[9] So, that is close in space. Time, we know everything that he ﷺ said. He ﷺ was asked a question, he ﷺ responded, he ﷺ then asked the question. We are talking a few minutes. So, we get this idea that it has to be soon. Then he ﷺ immediately completes the prayer and then does the *sajdah*, which by the way for people who are asking we still haven't done yet. It is still coming up at the end of the section, so don't panic. We are doing all the rules first and the ideas and the theories. The actual practical application, we will do later.

(1:00:00)

Now, the reason I make this point is because as I said some scholars, they did like to bring physical space into it. And when I teach *Fiqh of Ṣalāh*, the al-Maghrib version, I call this part the time zone and the physical zone. I call it the prayer zone. The reason I like the word zone is because it actually fits the mindset. What I want to say is that time and place have a significant impact upon your being 'in the zone'. So, when a person ends the prayer, they are still in the time zone and they are still in the prayer zone. They are still in the kind of mood they like to continue to do *dhikr*, they feel in a really nice position, nice place. What diminishes that zone, that spiritual moment, what diminishes it?

[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: To Clasp One's Hands by Interlocking the Fingers in the Mosque or Outside the Mosque, ḥadīth no. 482.*

Time does. The longer it goes on, you become a bit kind of tired and *subḥān Allāh* by the *qadr* of Allāh ﷻ it lasts for the *tasbīḥ* and it lasts for [the post-*ṣalāh adhkār*]. Physical is very important. When you leave the *masjid…* I always used to say if you are in the shoes then… hmmm? But if you get into your car? Come on! Right? Now there is no evidence for getting in the car being too late. There isn't and I'm going to show you in a second. Likewise, there is no evidence that it is okay when you are doing it in the shoe place.

Student (online): It seems rather subjective, no?

Ustādh: Yes, but of course. Whenever you see, we said many times in this class. Whenever you see in *fiqh*—everybody memorise this—whenever you see in *fiqh* any kind of measure it is subjective. And it is going to be subjective which the scholars want your culture to give the solution to. So, when you hear 'far', when you hear 'close', when you hear 'small', when you hear 'lot', when you hear 'tiny', when you hear 'big', whenever you hear these phrases or read these phrases in *fiqh* it has been left vague on purpose. It is there for people to actually define according to what the people understand. Entirely subjective.

But there are certain subjectivities which are generally understood by the people. They are part and parcel of the actual game. And being in the zone, as I said, cannot be restricted to just time and space because as next week's section is:

أو تَكَلَّمَ لغيرِ مَصْلَحَتِها

Or one speaks about anything other than the prayer.

So, if a person says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the left], and he does not move from his space, and is saying *subḥāh Allāh, subḥāh Allāh, subḥāh Allāh,* and he notices the guy's phone next to him ringing on silent, so he says, '*Hey bro, your dad is calling. Bro, it is your dad, he is calling!*' He has gone out of the zone. Bam! So, these zones are very undefined. Very vague. They are not just restricted to time and place. What we get are some indicators and pointers to help us of what still keeps you in the zone and what definitely [takes you out of the zone].

Student (online): It is a feeling.

Ustādh: Yes, it is a feeling. 100%. It is a feeling. Yet, we do not want to make it so vague that everybody is having their own feeling.

So, it is a feeling. It is a zone. And there are certain things that will definitely cut it. What will cut it?

Intentional chit chat. Definitely will cut it. Intentional. Intentional chit chat, and I am going to explain that in a minute. I am basically doing my explanation before I go through the text that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says. And the obvious one is breaking *wuḍūʾ*. Breaking *wuḍūʾ*, the whole thing is legally broken.

Having said that, my position is that I am flexible with a person. It is not just time. And it is not just place. For example, al-Shāfiʿi is narrated as saying that the time limit that you have to fix your prayer when there has been a mistake in it is the time for one *rakʿah*. Which minimal is about one or two minutes, and maximum is not much more than three, four, five minutes. So, it is a small period of time. Whereas other scholars said it does not matter how long as long as he stays in the *masjid* because it is a *muṣallah*. It is a place of prayer, so he is always physically in the zone. I think these two, we need to work on this a bit more. That is the problem. Whenever you suggest a definitive answer, there is always going to be criticism against it.

I was having this discussion with Yasir Qadhi last night about the urgent importance and need for us to develop a *fatwa* on a percentage that we can give for our 401(k) holders and to pension holders and equivalent, to purify their funds at the end of a maturation period when they retire. And they have not had access to those funds. They have had them invested in a *ḥarām* manner by non-Muslims with no concern for *Sharīʿah* whatsoever. So, we are not just talking about *ḥalāl* stocks that require purification, but we are talking about *ḥarām* stocks like casinos, whisky, and all the rest of it.

We need to come up with a percentage that covers everybody, those people who do not have the ability to be able to investigate their stocks and purify them. And you know, what I have said in class. I have said that the worst-case scenario, you take the money that you put in – deferred salary, and the money that the contributor matched, and you give the rest away. That is a hardcore position—the position that gives you the least money. And then the position that gives you the most money is for you to somehow do the impossible, spend a whole month going through every historical transaction over fifty years of your fund, work out each company and each time the profit ratios, and then take the percentages off each one. That would be a madness. This approach would
(1:10:00) produce the maximum amount of money. This [the latter] is virtually impossible. This [the former] is easy to implement but you are throwing away a lot of money. We think that it is permissible to come up with a figure that a person would just blindly take their fund and give away 30%, for example.

Student (online): Higher is easy.

Ustādh: That is the point, right. It is literally murder. But then to give an average is impossible as well. If I give…

Student (online): 30%!!!

Ustādh: By the way, I wish it was 30%. You could get rid of those three exclamation marks. I reckon when you go into an average… And how are you going to calculate an average? We're going to have to get some bots and nerds to go into the financial markets and take the top twenty mutual funds, calculate an average time, an average length and analyse each one. I reckon if you get away with 50% for the people, you will be lucky.

30%? It will be incredible if we gave *fatwa* saying that you can give away 30%. Incredible! It'll be the best result of the year.

See right here I just threw a figure out and just immediately right now people are discussing that percentage.

So, whenever you suggest a number then you're always going to be… That's why the scholars leave it open, they say 'close'. And that's why 'zone', I like it. And I say that 'zone' is very much a feeling with some definite parameters.

Q & A

Q (online): What is the **class position** of Qurʾān in *sujūd*?

A: The **class position** on Qurʾān in *sujūd* is that it's best to avoid it. And to change it. *Rabbana ātina fiʾl-dunya* for example *Allāhumma ātina fiʾl-dunya*. But if a person did it, I'm flexible with it.

Q (online): Is there any exception for example in *Sūrat al-Raḥmān*?

﴿فَبِأَيِّ ءَالَآءِ رَبِّكُمَا تُكَذِّبَانِ ١٣﴾

"Which, then, of your Lord's blessings do you both deny?" [*Sūrat al-Raḥmān*: 13]

The *jinn* in response would repeat *La bi shayʾin min niʿmati Rabbina nukadhdhib* (We do not deny any of our Lord's blessings).

And should we do the same. Is this only outside the prayer listening or reciting?

A: So, you know this itself is an area which has some *ḥadīth* involved. *Bala wa ana ʿala dhālika minʾl-shāhidīn* at the end of *Sūrat al-Tīn* for example, and most of these statements. But most of these *ḥadīth* are weak.[††]

So, there's an indication when Allāh ﷻ asks a question, or Allāh ﷻ makes a statement that we should respond to it. We know that that exists. The Companions said the Prophet ﷺ, he would not pass an *ayah* of *ʿadhāb* except that he ﷺ would seek refuge from it, he ﷺ would not go past an *ayah* of *Jannah* except that he ﷺ would ask Allāh ﷻ for it [10,11]

There are a lot of evidences for my position. My position is that there is flexibility and leniency the more you stick to pure Qurʾān, *Sunnah*, *adhkār* in the *ṣalāh* as part of the entire *duʿāʾ* process. That's my position. But I prefer that it's authentic. So, I will feel better, for example, saying *Allāhumma lakʾl-ḥamd* or *alḥamdulillāh* for example in the prayer moments or *subḥānak yā Allāh*, *subḥānak*—responding to an *ayah*, responding to myself reciting an *ayah*, than to say: *bala wa ana ʿala dhālika minʾl-shāhidīn*. Even though that's from the *ḥadīth* because I consider that to be weak and this one to be on the basic principle.

Q (online): If one performs a legislated act in the incorrect position and does not correct it but performs *sajdatʾl-sahw*, is the prayer still valid?

A: There is nothing to correct. That doesn't make any sense what you just said. I'll give an example. If one performs a legislated act (which is raising their hands) in the incorrect position (for example in between *sajdah*) and I do not correct it, I don't have to do *sajdatʾl-sahw* anyway. And if I did *sajdatʾl-sahw* my prayer is of course still valid.

Q (online): If one says the wrong thing and does not correct himself, but compensates for it with the *sajdah* at the end, the prayer is not invalidated?

A: That depends. If one says the wrong things, like for example, if one says *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* in the *sajdah*. If you don't say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* then you've made a mistake there in the prayer. Like an unacceptable mistake. You have to do *sajdah* at the end. If you didn't and you said the *sajdah* at the end, you've covered it anyway.

Q (online): Is reading *durūd* in the first sitting considered an addition to the prayer which requires *sajdatʾl-sahw* at the end?

[††] Responding to *ayāt* recited in *ṣalāh* was discussed in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 31. MT

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: It Is Recommended to Recite for a Long Time in the Night Prayers, ḥadīth no. 772.*

[11] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What a Person Should Say in His Rukūʿ and Prostration, ḥadīth no. 873.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

A: No. That's the whole point of today's lesson. Any legislated statement in its wrong place does not invalidate the prayer. By definition it does not require a *sajdah*.

Q (online): Whoever says: '*Al-taḥiyyātu lillāhi* ... (oops!)... *Rabbigh-fili*, *Rabbigh-frli,' sajdat'l-sahw* is mandatory or recommended? I'm confused.

(1:20:00) A: It is not mandatory and if a person does it, it is allowed to do it. Back to the same original discussion—it is allowed. And I told you that *personally*, definitely not my class position, *personally,* I don't like to be forgetful in the prayer. I feel embarrassed. So, I do that to apologise. That's me.

Student (online):

يحمل الإمام أخطاء المأموم

Is this something that exists in the Ḥanbali *madh-hab*, i.e. if a person praying behind an imām makes a minor mistake (not in something obligatory) that would usually require *sajdah*, do they do *sajdah* after the imam's *taslīm* or is their prayer fine as the imām's prayer fine?

A: This is not something which is just in the Ḥanbali *madh-hab*. We're going to come to this a little bit later. When you are praying behind the imām, all of the scholars, all of the schools accept this principle that any obligation that's missed out is covered by the imām. Only something which is a fundamental break of the prayer, and even some *arkān* it can be argued. We will come to that later. That's all the schools. The imām is like a sponge. That's the great benefit of praying in *jamāʿah*, praying in congregation. When you pray with an imām, he soaks up all the mistakes of every single person who's praying. It's crazy!

Q (online): What if the addition is of a couple words, like starting *durūd Ibrāhīmiyyah* in the first sitting, does that require *sajdat'l-sahw*?

A: No. I am saying that you can say the whole *durūd*. But then you have to say the right thing. And you still don't need to make *sajdah*. That's the whole point of the class today. Look guys:

If one speaks during the prayer with a legitimate statement but offered in the wrong place, such as to recite (Qur'ān) in the *sajdah* or sitting positions, or to say the

tashahhud whilst standing, etc. The prayer is neither invalidated nor does one have to prostrate, although it is legislated to do so.

It is absolutely as clear as possible. "Although it is legislated to do so", meaning, it's allowed if you wanted to do it. But you don't have to.

Q (online): How do we differentiate between a legislated act in an incorrect position and an addition in *ṣalāh* that we studied last month? We studied similar examples like sitting for extra *tashahhud*, etc.

A: That's because you are fundamentally changing the nature of the prayer. That's a fundamental change.

Q (online): Ḥanbalis are all agreed on the point that if someone remembers within a short period time about doing *taslīm* before it's due (by mistake) then it does not break the *ṣalāh*?

A: Yes.

Q (online): Is wiping over the socks permitted during the day for prayers if a person has done *ghusl* for the first prayer or is it the case that wiping over the socks is only for those who have done *wuḍū'* for the first prayer?

A: It's simple. Person makes *wuḍū'* or *ghusl*. As soon as they have done that, they put on their socks. You can now wipe on those for the rest of the whole day. Don't worry about prayer this, that, etc. The time period starts much after. The time period starts, not when you pray or not when you make your *wuḍū'* or whatever. The time period starts when you are making *wuḍū'* and you wipe on those socks.

Q (online): Making assignments for students and getting paid for it, knowing that the teachers are unaware the assignment was made by someone else and not the student. Concerned due to deception/lying part. Is it *ḥalāl* to do that? Will the income be *ḥalāl*?

A: You mean like a third-party business? No, that is not allowed. If it is stated by the teachers that this must be done. That is the same as doing someone else's exam. It's very clear that you are not allowed to do that. If that same level of clarity is in the assignment, then it's something which is not allowed. For that particular job, the income wouldn't be *ḥalāl* because that's a deception. The job, in itself of writing assignments is something which is permissible.

Q (online): Killing insects that aren't necessarily harming us in general. Specifically, collecting insects for kids' study/observation and then they die while not being taken care of with food, etc.

A: Are you asking, is it *ḥalāl*? I don't think it's *ḥarām*. *Wa Allāhu aʿlam*.

Q (online): With respect to the *ḥadīth* about plucking/shaping eyebrows, why do some scholars say that it is allowed for married woman?[12] What is your position regarding this matter?

A: The reason they said that (even though they're the minority) is because they said everything which pleases the husband is more important and the reason it is *ḥarām* is because of the *fitnah* that it causes for other people. They made their justifications for it. [They also said:] and that she fears divorce and divorce is a bigger evil. I prefer the position of the majority. Not allowed to play around with your eyebrows. Leave the eyebrows as it is.

Q (online): Does it count as too long a gap before offering *sajdatʾl-sahw* if one has performed a *sunnahʾl-rātibah* prayer?

A: Yes.

Q (online): I have found two pieces of jewelry which I believed to have been stolen in a burglary seven years ago. They were actually hidden at my parents' house which none of us had realised at the time of making an insurance claim. Now that I have found the items what should I do? Inform the insurance company that they weren't in fact stolen and send the items to them? Or sell the items and repay the money that the insurance company paid out to me for them? Or donate the items to charity?

A: You've must call them and say to them that I received a pay out and this is what they were worth, and this is how much you paid it out. And you could probably argue that they probably didn't even pay you the right amount as well and then you basically come to a discussion on how much it actually is.

Q (online): If you put shoes on top of the socks can you wipe the shoes?

A: Yes, if the shoes themselves are above the ankle. If they are below the ankle, then no. That's my position. We've covered that in the Chapter of Wiping as well.

---

[12] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Marriage, ḥadīth no. 145*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ*.

Q (online): When *wuḍūʾ* breaks whilst making *wuḍūʾ*, does one have to start at the beginning again or continue making that *wuḍūʾ*?

A: No. You start again if you don't have a problem. If you don't have a medical problem, then you start again. If you have a medical problem, then that's something [else].

(1:30:00) Q (online): I remember you mentioning one time that there is no evidence for saying *ṣadaqah Allāhuʾl-ʿAzīm* after reciting Qurʾān. If one were to say it out of habit and then say it after reciting in the prayer, is that considered adding to the prayer?

A: That's a really good question. *Allāhu aʿlam*. I mean I think it should be avoided. I don't like it. It just makes me feel bad that. I don't know.

Q (online): In the class position, is it that both *rafʿ al-yadayn* and not doing *rafʿ al-yadayn* should be practiced and varied between, or did you just mention that not doing *rafʿ al-yadayn* can be done to "shock the system" and the default in the class position is to do *rafʿ al-yadayn*?

A: Yes, you've understood it correctly. The *sunnah* is the raising of the hands, sometimes you leave it on a rare moment.

Q (online): Does the *ḥadīth* about eyebrows apply to men too?

A: Yes, I think it does.

Q (online): I am more confused now. As long as you're in the *masjid* you can make *sajdatʾl-sahw*. But not if you've done a *sunnah* prayer?

A: Why are you confused? I said to you it is not just distance and I said to you it's not just time. I said it's a zone. I said we have indicators. That's what I've said already. Not one thing by itself is enough to determine this. It's a zone. It's a feeling. We will go into more detail in the next lesson.

Q (online): Can parents use *ʿĪd*/gift monies given to their kids? They spend on their kids anyway…

A: I think there's some space for that. I think that's allowed. Unless there comes something very contractual that you must give this to the kids and you promised and so on and so forth.

Q (online): Can the husband put the expectation on the wife to contribute to finances? Is she sinful for not obeying him if he wants her to work?

A: First of all, a husband cannot obligate a wife to work. Number one. Disgraceful. Number two: If a woman goes out to work, I think the husband has a right to ask for money/contribution/compensation etc. towards the house (not towards him) and the disruption or anything that has happened as a result of that happening just like the man does for him going out to work and him having to pay for the whatever.

Q (online): As people have gotten more online now during COVID and lots of mixed gender groups. There are some people more relaxed about the online chat between genders in groups and other side is extra strict not wanting anything to do with other gender. Where do we draw a balance in an online platform?

A: I don't know. That balance is the sensitivities of different people and different cultures. Certain cultures would never ever imagine it, other cultures where men and women are speaking to people all the time and it's never an issue then they're going to be much more liberal. I'm definitely on that side. I think it's complete madness the way Muslims act in this way, when we don't speak to them but flipping Lucy and Katie and all the rest of it, la di da.

Q (online): If someone faints during *ṣalāh*, can you leave your *ṣalāh* to help them?

A: Yes.

Q (online): With regards to *rafʿ al-yadayn*, what do you do if family doesn't agree with it?

A: No. We always said that the *sunnah* act is something which is only *sunnah*. And if it causes something which is going to become very bad like a big fight or something like that and because the family are watching, then no you wouldn't do it.

14. Chapter 20 Lesson 9: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

(0:05:30) وإن سَلَّمَ قَبْلَ إتْمامِها عَمْدًا بَطُلَتْ، وإن كان سَهوًا ثم ذَكَرَ قريبًا أَتَمَّها وسجَدَ، فإن طالَ الفَصلُ أو تَكَلَّمَ لغيرِ مَصْلَحَتِها بَطَلَتْ ككلامِه في صُلْبِها، ولِمَصلَحَتِها إنْ كان يسيرًا لم تَبْطُلْ

If one intentionally gives the *taslīm* before the completion of the prayer, it is invalidated. If it was done forgetfully but one quickly realises, one completes the prayer and prostrates. If the time taken to realise is too long, or one speaks about anything other than the prayer, it is invalidated just like as if one did that during the prayer itself. Speaking a little in the interests of the prayer doesn't invalidate it.

We ended last week's session with, if a person gives *salām* before the prayer is complete and they did it intentionally, the prayer is invalidated. It is game over. And I think that is very straight forward for all of us to accept and understand. But what if he does it forgetfully?

When the author, Imām al-Ḥajjāwi, says: What if he does it forgetfully? It is actually a very general statement. And Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn is not satisfied. He says it needs to be far more specific. It is up to interpretation whether Imām al-Ḥajjāwi did not intend to go into that level of detail. However, Imām al-Ḥajjāwi's statement: If a person gives the *salām* by mistake, out of forgetfulness, then realises, then he will complete the rest of the prayer, and he still has the ability to make the prostration for forgetfulness and the prayer is valid. So, that is the learning point.

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says we have to have some nuance here. For example, as it stands, it does not differentiate between a person who thinks that the prayer is complete and gives *salām:*

وبين أن يُسلِّم جازماً أنها تمَّت

Versus a second type of person who gives *salām*, absolutely convinced that the prayer is finished. The first one is kind of forgetfulness, the second one could be seen as forgetfulness, but in actual fact, it is still a mistake. So, in a *Ẓuhr* prayer for example, he

gives *salām* after two *rakʿah,* absolutely certain that the prayer is finished whilst he is praying *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr* with the rest of the people. (I am going to explain how that could happen.) How could he do that in a *Ẓuhr* prayer after two, knowing, sure, that the prayer is finished?

Normally, you would put him in the first category, which is someone who thinks that the prayer has finished. He forgot where he is at. Forgot that there are two more. So, this statement at the moment, it is slightly vague. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that there is a difference between the two scenarios.

فإذا سَلَّم ظانًّا أنها تمَّت؛ فهذا ما أراده المؤلِّف

If a person for example, gives the *taslīm* thinking that the prayer is over, then that is what the author is referring to. That is the 'forgetfulness' the author is referring to and as we mentioned last week and will talk about today, as long as he remembers very quickly afterwards, then he can make up for it. It is not too late, basically.

But the second scenario is where a person who has given the *salām* thinking that he is praying something else. Sounds crazy, but he thinks he is praying something else. If this happens then it is probably going to happen when you are praying *ʿAṣr* early and you
(0:10:00) are thinking it is *Ẓuhr*. Or you are praying *Ẓuhr* really late, normally you pray it at its beginning time, but you are praying it just before *ʿAṣr* starts, and because it is so close to *ʿAṣr* time and normally you would have prayed it at *Ẓuhr* time early, early, you think you are praying *ʿAṣr*. That is a more likely scenario.

What about if a person does, in the *Ẓuhr* prayer, actually think he is praying *Fajr,* and after two *rakʿāt* he gives the *taslīm*?

This person has given *taslīm* in the wrong place. He thinks he is praying *Fajr*. He is actually praying *Ẓuhr*. And he gives the *taslīm* in the wrong place, but he did it not out of forgetfulness, but a whole next level of forgetfulness. Because my guy all the time thought he was praying *Fajr*. Do you agree that these two cases are different? This is a person who was from the beginning flawed and messed up versus a person who actually thought he was praying *Ẓuhr* and he messed up in *Ẓuhr*. He forgot in *Ẓuhr*. And that is the differentiation that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn wants to make. What do you think the consequences are going to be for the second one? Is he able to make it up? Meaning, can he now stand up and do two more and then do *sajdat'l-sahw*?

Student (online): Invalid. Did not have the right intention.

Ustādh: Good. Well done. You are all right. It is invalidated. You cannot make it up. You cannot fix it because the intention was ruined from the first place.

And that is just what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn wants to bring attention to. He wants to make it clear that there is a big difference between a person who is absolutely convinced that this is where you need to do the *sajdah* versus a person who made a mistake whilst thinking he is praying a different prayer. We do not make up on that prayer because it was messed up from the beginning and so we start again with the new *Ẓuhr*.

As for what the author is saying, which is if a person thinks that the prayer has ended, they made a mistake, they gave the *taslīm*, and as long as they are still thereabouts in terms of time, space, and zone, then they can make up the prayer.

What is the evidence for that?

We have mentioned this a few times, but just again for completion, the *ḥadīth* of Abu Hurayrah ﵁ that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ prayed one day *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr* or *ṣalāt al-ʿAṣr*, (the uncertainty is from him) and he gave *taslīm* after two *rakʿāt*.[1,2] Exactly as the scenario that we are giving. Then he ﷺ (in this narration) stood up and walked to the front of the *masjid* and he ﷺ leaned on one of the trees which was there. Now, there is some discussion whether this is one of the original small trees that were there of whether it was the pillar. It is more likely to be the pillar. Remember that the *masjid* was very natural, they didn't clear absolutely everything, so it's much more likely this is one of the pillars of the *masjid* which of course were made of wood at that time.

Anyway, he ﷺ effectively leaned against the wall of the *masjid* and he ﷺ was angry, irritated, anxious but there was some kind of irritation:

كَأَنَّهُ غَضْبَانُ

"As if he were angry."[2]

As if he was like, you know, irritated. And the major Companions were there: Abu Bakr ﵁ was there, ʿUmar ﵁ was there. But because of their respect and the awe they had of the Prophet ﷺ, they did not speak to him even though they are the most specific about that. However, the Prophet ﷺ used to joke around with one of the Companions who was there because of the length of his hands, as in physically, because the hands were slightly elongated he would call him Dhuʾl-Yadayn ﵁, the father of two hands, in a kind of like exaggerated form. So, there was an easy-going relationship. And you know how it is, you are with different people and they're a bit loud, right? And they have less kind of filter, no filter kind of people. So, he's like straight out:

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, hadīth no. 573 a.*
[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: To Clasp One's Hands by Interlocking the Fingers in the Mosque or Outside the Mosque, ḥadīth no. 482.*

يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ، أَنَسِيتَ أَمْ قَصُرَتِ الصَّلاَةُ قَالَ " لَمْ أَنْسَ، وَلَمْ تُقْصَرْ.

"'Messenger of Allāh! Did you forget or has the prayer been shortened?' The Prophet ﷺ replied, 'I have neither forgotten nor has the prayer been reduced.'"[1,2]

"I have not forgotten," that statement is based upon what he ﷺ thinks. And "The prayer has not been shortened," is a legal statement which is true because the prayer has not been shortened. Then he ﷺ turned to the rest of the Companions:

فَقَالَ " أَكَمَا يَقُولُ ذُو الْيَدَيْنِ ". فَقَالُوا نَعَمْ.

"The Prophet ﷺ said, 'Is what Dhu'l-Yadayn said true?' They said yes."

So, then he ﷺ came back and he ﷺ—this is important:

فتقدَّم فَصَلَّى ما تَرَكَ، ثم سَلَّم، ثم سجد سجدتين ثم سَلَّم

He ﷺ came forward and he ﷺ prayed that which had been missed. Then he ﷺ gave the *salām*, then he ﷺ did the double prostration, then he ﷺ did the *salām* again. That's the *ḥadīth* which is in Muslim.

هذا هو دليل هذه المسألة

This is the direct evidence for what our author says, as long as he remembers it within a near time or closely, then it is okay. He can make it up. And we called it the zone.†

(0:20:00) Question (and a really good one):

لكن لو ذَكَرَ وهو قائم، فهل يبني على قيامه ويستمر، أم لا بُدَّ أن يقعد ثم يقوم؟

† This "prayer zone" is a mindset that also encompasses time and physical space. This is discussed in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lesson 8. MT

So, if a person remembers that he has to make up the prayer whilst he's standing up, when he now goes to the prayer, does he sit down to make up from where he's messed up? So, if you are praying *ṣalāt al-Zuhr* and you give *salām* after two *rakʿah*. You've made a mistake clearly. Straight after you realise or someone tells you, '*Hey what happened?*'

And you say, 'It is true right? Have I just prayed two?'

They say, '*Yeah you have*.'

'*Alright come on guys! Get ready*.' So, he goes back to his place.

The questions that should be asked: Does he say *Allāhu akbar*, for example? Does he enter back into the prayer, for example? Does he initiate something? Does he have to say something to the people? Has he said too much to the people? Is he in the prayer or outside the prayer right now, in this time? Does he sit back down to where he was? And the reason you do that is because you were going fine whilst sitting down but you were meant to get up at *ʿabduhu wa rasūluh*, *Allāhu akbar*—you were meant to get up after the *tashahhud* before the *darūd sharīf*. You need to sit back down so that you carry on from exactly where you are?

And the answer to that is based upon whether the getting up process from sitting to standing, this process in which you would actually say *Allāhu akbar*, whether that itself is a part of the prayer—whether it is an actual integral part of the prayer. Or alternatively is the getting up just a necessary requirement to get from this *rukn* of sitting (this pillar of sitting) to the pillar of the standing? And that's the debate that the scholars had.

So I just want to say as a general statement that you are still in the prayer. However you have thought and understood yourself what you are, what your state is, what you're doing, you are actually still in the prayer. And even when you are chatting or talking back and forth you are still in the prayer. This is why we're going to find out that some speech, if there's a reason or whatever and there's a circumstance, does not invalidate the prayer—intrinsically in of itself. So, there's a conversation which is happening right now. But you are technically still in the prayer. As a result of that, you do not need to re-enter the prayer. So, there is no *Allāhu akbar* to get back in again unless *Allāhu akbar* is the next stage of where you're meant to carry on, which in most circumstances is going to be the case.

But what about this issue? What about: Must you sit back down again or should you just carry on?

Shaykh says:

قال الفقهاء ــ رحمهم الله ــ :لا بُدَّ أن يقعد، ثم يقوم؛ « فَصَلَّى ما تَرَكَ »

Some of jurists, may Allāh ﷻ have mercy upon them, said one must sit back down and then stand up because of the statement of Dhu'l-Yadayn ﵁:

فَصَلَّى مَا تَرَكَ

"He ﷺ prayed that which he ﷺ left out."

The narrator indicates to us that he ﷺ then prayed that which he left out.

وهو قد تَرَكَ القيام من القعود

So, what are the things that he ﷺ left out?

He ﷺ left out the standing up from sitting position to standing position.

فلا بُدَّ أن يأتي بالقيام من القعود

So that's been left out, he has to bring that as well. So he ﷺ does that.

وهذا مبنيٌّ على أن النهوضَ نفسَه ركنٌ مقصودٌ.

And that's obviously based upon an interpretation that the standing itself is a *rukn* (the getting up).

فإن قيل: إنَّ النهوض ليس رُكناً مقصوداً، ولكنه مِن أجل أن يكون قائماً، وبناءً على ذلك لا يلزمه أن يجلس ثم يقوم،

But if it is said that this standing is not actually a *rukn* in of itself, it's not intended in of itself but it's something which is necessary to actually be standing but this getting up part is not actually in of itself intrinsically required, if you take that interpretation then you do not need to sit back down. You would stand back up. You would still need to say *Allāhu akbar* because the *Allāhu akbar*, the *takbīrat'l-intiqāl*, is an obligation of the prayer—that is an actual part of the prayer.

So, you would if you were standing, you will make the decision, then you just go and you would say *Allāhu akbar*. And you're already standing because that's where you need to start from. Whereas if you think no that sitting part is important—and you can see the evidence for that because the *takbīr* itself has been legislated to be the *takbīr* of moving. So, some will say that the movement itself is connected to *takbīr* itself too. The response to that would be that actually it's not the moving which is required, it's the *takbīr* itself. For example, if a person is paralyzed or in a different kind of situation where they're sitting down or lying down, one might not need to do the movement of one location to another but the *takbīr* continues, meaning the *takbīr* itself is independent.

And it could also be argued (as we said before) that when you do make the *takbīr*, there's laxity, there's flexibility (as we covered previously) that to say the *takbīr* doesn't have to be said absolutely all the way through.[‡] If it's a little bit here or a little bit at the end, as long as it's roughly there thereabouts then it's okay.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn when he says:

فإن قيل...

"And if it was said that you don't need to", what's really interesting is that this opinion was held by Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's own teacher Shaykh Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Siʿdi (some people call him al-Saʾdi but we always used to know him al-Siʿdi). And his personal position is that this movement itself is not legislated in of itself. It's legislated as a *tabiʿ* not as a as an original legislated thing. So, you wouldn't need to sit back down again. You would stand up. And that was his position.

And you know *subḥān Allāh* I studied the *fiqh* of al-Siʿdi and that was my first exposure to the Ḥanbali school before Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn. So, in the 90s when I completed my first Ḥanbali text with my Ḥanbali teacher (we learned it according to *Nūr'l-Basāʿir* of al-Siʿdi) Shaykh Aḥmad *ḥafīẓahu Allāh taʿāla*, Ḥanbali scholar from Azhar. And that was always his position as well. I remember it.

[‡] The timing of saying *takbīrat'l-intiqāl* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lessons 25 and 28. MT

Having said that, Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says that our response to this is what the *fuqahāʾ* have said (the majority of them) is more encompassing and safer. It's best to stick to the safe position, *aḥwaṭ*.

فنقول: إذا كان الإِنسان قد نَهَضَ ثم ذَكَرَ، أو ذُكِّرَ، جَلَسَ، ثم قَامَ، وأتمَّ الصَّلاة.

He's basically saying that if you do stand up like the Prophet ﷺ did and you walk around and ask, then it is safer and better to just sit down and then stand up. So you would sit down. That's when the prayer started, not when he actually stands up and says *Allāhu akbar* even though that's the process. Everybody's now sitting, he'll just turn around and say, '*Okay guys we're back in again. Everybody I'm sitting down yallah*.' Then he'll sit there, hands on the knees and then say *Allāhu akbar* and stand up, basically. And that is what Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says is a safer position.

I mean I have to say there's no real reason to disagree with that, it's definitely the safer position. My heart is with al-Siʻdi. I'm not going to lie. I don't think that this position is in of itself legislated.

(0:34:00)

ثم ذَكَرَ قريبًا

But one quickly realises

Meaning that he remembers whilst they're still in the prayer zone. Still in the prayer zone, still close, and also that you don't do something which invalidates the prayer.

So, in that small period of time, the whole point of saying a small period of time is that you are still within the prayer kind of zone. In that moment/time you do not do something which invalidates the prayer. So, for example, you break your *wuḍūʾ* or you eat or anything like that. So, it is not possible (according to the Ḥanābilah) for you to continue to make up your prayer if you have taken one of the conditions of the prayer away from it, which is to talk, etc. And this is not all the Ḥanābilah, but this is just one of the opinions in the Ḥanbali school. And everybody will agree without a shadow of a doubt when it comes to breaking *wuḍūʾ*. No doubt about that. If a person broke their *wuḍūʾ* then that is game over. That prayer cannot be made up. It is impossible to connect them because they have been permanently separated.

يُشترط أيضاً شرط آخر: وهو ألا يفعل ما ينافي الصلاة، فإن فَعَلَ ما يُنافي الصَّلاة، مثل :أن يُحْدِث، أو يأكل، وما أشبه ذلك، فإنه لا يبني على صلاته لفوات الشَّرط، وهذا ظاهر في الحَدَث؛ لأنه إذا أحدث تعذَّر بناءُ بعض الصَّلاة على بعض؛ لانقطاعها بالحَدَث.

But if he does something which invalidates the prayer because of it actually happening at that moment, like what would normally happen like if you spoke in the prayer or you laughed in the prayer or you ate in the prayer, what about that? Is that to be treated the same as for example breaking your *wuḍū'?*

According to Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn, the answer is no. He is okay. He says:

أما إذا فَعَلَ ما يُنافي الصَّلاة؛ فإن الصَّحيح :أنه لا بأس أن يبني على ما سَبَقَ؛ لأن فعله ما ينافي الصَّلاة بناءً على أنه أتمَّ صلاته، فيكون صادراً عن نسيان أو عن جهل بحقيقة الحال، والنسيان والجهل عُذر يسقط بهما حكم فِعْلِ المنهي عنه، وهو الأكل مثلاً أو الشُّرب، أو ما أشبه ذلك، ولهذا بَنَى النبيُّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم والصحابةُ على صلاتهم مع فِعْلِهم ما ينافي الصَّلاة، وهو الكلام.

If a person for example, you are praying in a *jamāʻah* and imām has finished then you are thinking, '*Alright*. *Okay*.' So, you are sitting there. Obviously, there is a little bit of confusion, what is going on, what is happening, what is not. And then you turn to my guy and he is starting to get something out and then he offers you a piece of fruit or toffee or whatever and then you take that, and you pop it in your mouth because you think the prayer is done. That of course would completely invalidate the prayer if you had done it in the prayer knowing you are doing it in the prayer. However, now you are still doing the same thing. You are doing it in the prayer, but the only difference is that you do not know that you are still in the prayer. You think that the prayer is finished. And that is the most important thing here.

The same as what the Companions and the Prophet ﷺ did. If they had spoken like that in a normal prayer intentionally, the prayer would have been invalidated, no way to make it up. The reason that they were able to make up that prayer is because they did the same level of speaking, maybe even more, a bit of walking around and everything, it is because they did not think they were in the prayer or there was discussion whether they are still in the prayer. And we learn afterwards because the Prophet ﷺ literally just carries on from where it was that they are still in the prayer.[1,2] So therefore we know that if a person is in this scenario thinking that the prayer is done and they do these things which would otherwise normally invalidate the prayer, some scholars will say that that is too much and it is gone.

But our position is: Not a problem even if they eat or drink something, even if they laugh, even if they have a joke, even if they look at their phone—doing things that would normally negate the prayer. And that is exactly what the Prophet ﷺ did, because these people are not doing that intentionally. They are not intentionally trying to break the prayer or trying to invalidate the prayer.

فإن طالَ الفَصلُ

If the time taken to realise is too long.

And if the time gap before realising that you have messed up the prayer takes too long, we are going to come to see then it is game over. You have to start again. Now as you can see:

فإن طالَ الفَصلُ

If the gap becomes a bit long or just long, he says long. Again, does not mention a time. As we said last week in the *qāʿidah fiqhiyyah,* when you see generally measurements of time and space and size and amount—large amounts, small amounts, bleeding large bleeding little, vomiting small, vomiting large—when you see no actual exact definitions, then you should know that the *ʿurf* is what determines it.

What would you consider to be a long period of time?

Al-Shāfiʿi said one *rakʿah,* the length of time that it takes to pray one *rakʿah.* That is his attempt at an objective standard. Some will live with it. some will say okay.

Some said as long as you remain in the *masjid.* If this is happening in the *masjid* then as long as you remain in a *masjid* because that is the place of the prayer. It has got the spirit and the soul of the prayer. You are kind of still connected to it. It is like a zone.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says well if you look at trying to work out what a small amount is
(0:40:00) then we can then define) and this is a very useful tool in *fiqh* (when you want to try to understand what a lot is, then work out what is not a lot. Then you know what a lot is. So, you want to try to define something, define what it isn't then you can define it.

I always give this example when it comes to *fiqh*. Someone says to me, '*Define fiqh.*' I say to them *fiqh* is not *ʿaqīdah.* Define what it is not, you will get a nice idea of what it is. When I say *fiqh* is not *ʿaqīdah,* you have learned that then *fiqh* is flexible, *fiqh* is not

absolutely one way, one thing and if someone disagrees with you then it is very serious. *Fiqh* is going to be relaxed, it is going to have interpretations. You get my point.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says well let's define the lot by understanding what is a little. A little has already been clearly shown to us—that is finishing, standing up, walking to a different location in the *masjid.* Different *ḥadīth* will indicate a few steps to a few more steps, a period of time where there is some leaning against that. There is some hesitation, people are sitting, a conversation occurs: "Has it been shortened? Have you forgotten?" A reaction, "Neither been shortened, nor forgotten." Reflection upon what one has said, speak to the Companions, get a response back, then go back.[1,2] That is a short time because the prayer was made up.

Shaykh says: three minutes, four minutes, five minutes, something like that. So, clearly, for three, four, or five minutes, you are okay. You are definitely okay because there is no way that what happened at the time of the Prophet ﷺ happened in anything other than three, four, or five minutes.

Obviously, an hour, or half an hour—they are well out. They are not even on the table for a discussion. Everybody asks the Shaykh, '*Just give us some kind of idea*.' There isn't. You just have to use your intuition.

I have always felt that the correct answer is a combination of all the factors. I do not think that we should just take time. That is why I have always called it a zone. I think it is physical and time related… not strictly. Sometimes when you are in one location, the place does not come into it. So, it is definitely more time than place, but I think that place also needs a shout. That is why I have always said: If you get to the carpark, I think you are going past the limit. But if someone says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the left], and then gets up immediately saying, *astaghfir Allāh, astaghfir Allāh, astaghfir Allāh*, and walks straight to the car, he could be at his car, in Cheadle Masjid for example, within thirty seconds. In the carpark. He could get a call saying, '*Hey*, *come back!*'. I am okay with that because that is so immediate.

But normally when people are getting to their car, it is like five or ten minutes after the *ṣalāh* has finished. I would consider ten minutes to be on the edge. I would consider fifteen and twenty minutes to be too much.

I think that getting out of the boundaries of the *masjid* to also be an indicator as well. Someone for example, fifteen minutes and in their car, I'm like, '*Bro! That is gone now*.' If it is gone and it is too late, then of course the prayer needs to be started again and re-done. You have to start the prayer again.

So, if the time gap has increased to too long (as we just defined), or:

أو تَكَلَّمَ لغيرِ مَصْلَحَتِها بَطَلَتْ

Or one speaks about anything other than the prayer, the prayer is invalidated.

Or a person speaks about something which is not in the interests of the prayer. The reason that Imām al-Ḥajjāwi is coming with this position is because a number of the scholars said that actually, when you look at what the Companions were speaking about, their talk was entirely in the interests of the prayer. They were not gossiping. They were not chatting. It was all about the prayer. It was all about the situation. Which frankly, is probably going to be what happens when that scenario occurs because most people have got some doubts, and they are suspicious. They normally turn and say, '*Was that three? Was that two?*' They have that kind of conversation. Then there is some affirmation and then job done.

But as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says, there might be people in the crowd. They have no idea what is going on. For them, whether it was the first or fourth, it was all a zone anyway. They have zoned out, and they are chatting amongst themselves, '*Hey, what's happening bro? I have not seen you for a while*.' They are not chatting about the prayer. According to Imām al-Ḥajjāwi, that is going to invalidate the prayer. According to Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, they are not to be blamed because they did not know that the prayer had not ended. For them, they thought the prayer was finished. So, it is not going to [invalidate the prayer].

If the gap is too long or a person speaks about something which is not to do with the prayer, or in the interests of the prayer, or part of the prayer, then these two categories are to be treated as if a person spoke inside the prayer. But if it was after *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah,* for example, or [coming up from *rukūʿ* saying] *samiʿa Allāhu li-man ḥamidah Rabbana wa lakʾl-ḥamd* and he stood there. Now, we know that it is allowed to then start making *duʿāʾ* etc. before you go to *sajdah.* But let's say you stood there for fifteen minutes, or let's say that you stood there for five minutes, or three minutes. That's fine. That is *sunnah* to make *duʿāʾ* and so on. Let's say you stood there for two or three minutes but you were chatting about something. Imām al-Ḥajjāwi says that just like the prayer would be invalidated by these things if you did it inside the prayer, they are invalidating the prayer even outside, afterwards, if you by mistake think that you are [outside] the prayer. The author of course is using his *qiyās* that this is based upon what they understand.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn has a comment to make. He says: If we look at actual speaking inside the prayer, then that has also occurred in the famous *ḥadīth* (which we spoke about a few times) the *ḥadīth* of Muʿāwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam ﵁, when he spoke in the prayer and the Prophet ﷺ turned to him and said:

إِنَّ هَذِهِ الصَّلاَةَ لاَ يَصْلُحُ فِيهَا شَىْءٌ مِنْ كَلاَمِ النَّاسِ

"Talking to persons is not fitting during the prayer." [3]

This is not right. It is not deserving of the prayer that people speak normal speech inside this prayer.

فإذا تكلم بعد السلام عن نقص نسيانا بطلت كما لو تكلم وهو يصلي و المذهب أن الصلاة تبطل في كلتا الصورتين

In the *madh-hab,* the more popular opinion of the Ḥanbali school is that if a person does speak like this, whether inside the prayer or outside, then the prayer is invalidated.

Of course, Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn's position is (as we said before), if a person does this after the prayer, thinking that the prayer is finished, then it does not. And that's where we differ with the Ḥanābilah, because the Ḥanbalis will say no, any conversation that's not about the prayer, that's just chitchat, then that invalidates it. We are saying that listen, if you think the prayer is over, why would you punish a person for that?

Student (online): What about the one who was certain that the prayer hadn't ended but still starts talking or takes that toffee and puts it in his mouth because everyone else is doing it? What would be his situation?

(0:50:00) Ustādh: So basically, you're saying that a person who knows and has worked it out, that a prayer is deficient. I think that's a real problem. *Allāhu aʻlam*. That's a serious problem. The Ḥanbalis would definitely invalidate the prayer. The majority of scholars would as well. The question is that would the lenient of lenient opinions, Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn's position, would he allow that to slide? I don't think he would. I find that a problem—if you know that there's a problem in the prayer that you've not finished. But remember, taking a toffee is clear. You're eating. But if you start chatting, '*Is it true or not true?*' That's part of the process of trying to find out. That's okay. But if you start talking about some other nonsense, then that's unacceptable.

Student (online): If you take the position of al-Saʻdi that getting up not being from the major pillars of the prayer, then does that mean that when getting up it doesn't matter at which point you say the *takbīr* (either while getting up or once you have stood up)?

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Prohibition of Speaking During the Prayer, and the Abrogation of Its Former Permissibility, ḥadīth no. 537 a.*

Ustādh: "If you take the position of al-Saʿdi that getting up not being from the major pillars of the prayer…" Not even major. It's not part of the prayer, that's his point.

"Then does that mean that when getting up it doesn't matter at which point you say the *takbīr*?"

That's why I said that the *takbīrat'l-intiqāl*, one of the reasons it's called *takbīrat'l-intiqāl* is because the *takbīr* is linked to the movement. And as I said, if you consider that to be a proof that the movement must be there, then clearly it says the movement is important and also the *takbīr* has to occur during it. If you consider that the movement is independent of the *takbīr*, the *takbīr's* name is only given because some people called it that but in actual fact it's the *takbīr* that you say from this to that position but the movement itself is not important, it's the getting into that position, but because it's impossible to get to that position without the movement, you have to make the *takbīr* regardless. I just want to say that there's no clear evidence which one is right. There's no *naṣṣ* because it's interpretation. The existing evidence of:

وَصَلُّوا كَمَا رَأَيْتُمُونِي أُصَلِّي

"Pray as you have seen me pray."[4]

Obviously, I go up and down. So, you'd follow that. Now a person following that will say that's what you have to pray because that's how he ﷺ prayed. Another one will say yeah, but that part wasn't necessary because that's the only way you can get to that position. So, it's how you interpret it. There's not going to be a winner here. That's why Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says because there's no defining evidence and there's not going to be a winner, it's just better to stick to the safer side. So, everything is linked to how you understand it. The *takbīr* is going to be a movement anyway during the process.

Student (online): What if a person was praying towards the end of a prayer time and then they remembered but the next prayer entered? Can it still be corrected?

Ustādh: I don't understand your question. Do you mean that you're praying the next prayer? Because if you are praying the prayer of the current time and then the next prayer time enters, you finish off your prayer. Your prayer is valid as long as you've done one *rakʿah* as we covered a couple of years ago, your prayer is fine. I'm not sure what your question means.

Student (online): So, if the imām doesn't engage in such a conversation which would be deemed invalidating and gets up to make up what needs to be made up but someone in

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayer, Chapter: If There Are Many Travellers, Adhān and Iqāmah Should Be Pronounced, (the Same Is to Be Observed) in ʿArafah and Muzzdalifah, ḥadīth no. 631.*

the *jamāʿah* does engage in such a conversation thinking their prayer is over, would that person in the *jamāʿah* get up and continue with the imām?

Ustādh: Yes, he would. That's exactly what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position is. That's exactly what we're trying to say. That the prayer is fine.

Student (online): That person continues completing their own prayer even if the imām stops, right? We've done that if you are sure that the imām has messed up you do your right thing.

Ustādh: Yeah, we did that earlier on. If you know the imām has messed up, then you have to continue yourself.

Student (online): The *maʾmūm* left the premises before the imām called it i.e., called all back to *ṣalāh*. Someone tells him later about the imām's error. Does he need to redo it or has the imām swallowed up that error for all *maʾmūm* who left before they knew?

Ustādh: We're going to cover that a little bit later. But for now, you assume just like you would when you start a subject then it changes later onwards, that the prayer is over. The prayer for that person is over. He has to start the prayer again. He has to correct that prayer—as it stands right now. And we'll come to that later.

Student (online): Most times you could repeat the prayer but what happens when that prayer time has ended, and you made the error? How can you repeat?

Ustādh: If the prayer has ended and you need to pray the prayer again, then you repeat the prayer. The prayer time might be ended but the prayer is still required from you. So, you'd still need to pray that prayer, hopefully keep it in order as well. If the order has been gone and you've already prayed the next prayer too, then you would make the prayer regardless.

Student (online): What if you prayed but then after the prayer you felt like you had no *khushūʿ* at all.

Ustādh: We covered this before. You do not redo the prayer. You will never ever make yourself feel better. And if you are making yourself feel better you are on a dangerous path. Dangerous, dangerous path. Nobody's prayer is brilliant. Ever. Everybody hopes and wishes that they could have done better. Everybody.

Student (online): He meant that they did the *taslīm* mistakenly but in the short time after that, the next *ṣalāh* came in. Does that cancel out the opportunity to carry on?

Ustādh: No, it does not. It does not cancel out the opportunity to carry on. That is the same if a person missed the prayer intentionally, unintentionally, went to sleep, was a sinner, was combining, whatever the reason—when you have not performed the

prayer for whatever reason of a time, it will come first in the ensuing time in one exception, one exception alone. what is that exception? Who can tell me what the exception is?

Student (online): If you are running out of time for the next one too.

Ustādh: Correct. When you are at the end of the time for the next prayer. Well done guys. Well done. That is the correct answer. Then you have to then pray. Because that is the only legitimate prayer that needs to be prayed. It can happen in any prayer but *ʿAṣr* would be the example, an easy example. *Maghrib* is about to start in three minutes, you have not prayed *ʿAṣr*, you realise you have messed up *Ẓuhr*. Do you now fix *Ẓuhr* or do you pray *ʿAṣr*? The vast majority of scholars says you pray *ʿAṣr* because you have only got three minutes to get it done in proper time. You have already messed up [*Ẓuhr*] so then you'll pray *Ẓuhr* in the *Maghrib* time.

وِلِمَصلَحَتِها إِنْ كان يسيرًا لم تَبْطُلْ

Speaking a little in the interest of the prayer does not invalidate it.

And if a person speaks, in the interests of the prayer and it is only something insignificant "*yasīr*" again, left open, then it does not invalidate the prayer. So now we know that our author has divided speaking into three categories:

Category number one: If he speaks or says something not in the interest of the prayer, this invalidates the prayer.

This is the three categories according to Imām al-Ḥajjāwi, according to the
(1:00:00) Ḥanbalis—not all the Ḥanbalis but this is their preponderant position. The three types of speech: You speak not in the interest of the prayer. Prayer is invalidated—number one.

The second category: You speak in the interest of the prayer, something very little. Something insignificant like what the Prophet ﷺ and the Companions did. With not much chat going on, all very focused. Then the prayer is not invalidated. This is little and in the interest of the prayer.

The third category is if it is a lot of speaking in the interest of the prayer. Example would be, we have a debate. We say, '*Right, everybody we are going to vote on this*.' And everyone is chatting, '*What did you say?*' '*What did you say?*' And then we say, '*Alright! Alright! There are too many people here. Forget that! Let's use the voting app. So everybody get your phones out*.' And then we start looking at the screen and it says: Team A (three *rakʿah*) and gets 40 votes and Team B gets 50 votes. That is a lot of speech, all very much in the interest of the prayer, way too much taking liberties. Even

though there is a legitimate concern here, you have to have your sensitivities link to the sacredness of the moment. So, this invalidates the prayer according to the Ḥanābilah.

As for a different approach to this, then the *ṣalāh* is not invalidated in all of these three scenarios.

لأن هذا المتكلِّم لا يعتقد أنه في صلاة

Because this person who is speaking does not believe that he is actually in the prayer. In all of these three scenarios he did not intend to do this sin or mistake or error (or whatever you want to call it), or *ḥarām*. He did not intend it. And of a surety Allāh ﷻ said:

﴿وَلَيْسَ عَلَيْكُمْ جُنَاحٌ فِيمَا أَخْطَأْتُمْ بِهِ وَلَكِنْ مَا تَعَمَّدَتْ قُلُوبُكُمْ ۚ﴾

"You will not be blamed if you make a mistake, only for what your hearts deliberately intend." [*Sūrat al-Aḥzāb:5*]

So, you are only blameworthy if you intend to do something, not if you do it mistakenly. And in all of these three scenarios, which is to speak but not in the interest of the prayer, little bit of speaking in the interest of the prayer and a lot of speaking in the interest of the prayer, you did not intend to do something *ḥarām* or do the impermissible speaking.

Shaykh then goes even further and he says: And according to the correct position, according to me, the prayer is also not going to be invalidated by eating, and by drinking, and by laughing—if he or she does that when they give the *salām* forgetfully—because they did not intend to do this invalidating action. He is ignorant of the reality of the situation. And anything that he does that would normally invalidate the prayer is the same, other than breaking the *wuḍūʾ*, *al-ḥadath*, entering into a state of ritual impurity because:

وذلك لأن الحَدَث لا يمكن معه بناء بعض الصَّلاة على بعض :لأنه يقطعها نهائيًّا

You can't build upon that. It's like a complete separation, a complete termination.

وكذلك لو تَكلَّم في صُلب الصَّلاة ناسياً أو جاهلاً، فإنها لا تبطل على القول الرَّاجح

And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says likewise if the person is in the prayer itself. He's saying if a person's in the prayer (meaning first *rakʿah*, second *rakʿah*) no *taslīm*, no coming out of the prayer, he is in the prayer and he speaks *nāsiyyan* or *jāhilan,* not knowing that it's prohibited for example. So, a very good example is someone who doesn't know the ruling of saying *alḥamdulillāh* when someone sneezes. So, he's in prayer and sneezes and says *alḥamdulillāh* or he's a Paki and says *shukr alḥamdulillāh*. And that's not even been narrated. And now imagine next guy says *yarḥamuk Allāh*. That's my point. A person who doesn't know the ruling is like the person of Muʿāwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam ﵁. The Prophet ﷺ did not invalidate his prayer.[3]

So according to the stronger position according to Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, this also, even inside the prayer, proper, let alone outside the prayer whilst still being inside the prayer forgetfully, neither of these invalidate the prayer because he does not know and he's not aware:

﴿وَلَيْسَ عَلَيْكُمْ جُنَاحٌ فِيمَا أَخْطَأْتُمْ بِهِ وَلَكِنْ مَا تَعَمَّدَتْ قُلُوبُكُمْ ۚ﴾

"You will not be blamed if you make a mistake, only for what your hearts deliberately intend." [*Sūrat al-Aḥzāb:5*]

As Allāh ﷻ has said.

And the Muʿāwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam ﵁ *ḥadīth* is absolutely clear about this. And as a reminder when he said *yarḥamuk Allāh*:

فقال له معاوية: يرحمك الله، فرماه الناس بأبصارهم فقال: واثكل أمياه، ما شأنكم تنظرون إليَّ! فجعلوا يضربون أفخاذهم ليُسْكِتُوه فسكت. فلما سَلَّمَ النبيُّ عليه الصلاة والسَّلام أخبره بأن الصَّلاة لا يصلح فيها شيء مِن كلام النَّاس

"May my mother be lost." They all started looking at him when he said *yarḥamuk Allāh*. And he says, "What's up with you guys? Why are you looking at me?" This is what he's saying in the actual prayer. And then the Prophet ﷺ told him after the prayer this is not right, this is *maqām al-tasbīḥ* etc. And did not make him repeat the prayer because he was not aware of the ruling and he didn't intentionally want to invalidate the prayer.

There's a third position as well. The second position is Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn's position. That's the **class position** as well. That's my position as well, that the prayer is not invalidated by this type of speech—even a lot of speech—because a person is not really aware.

القول الثالث: ان الصلاة تبطل بالكلام. ولو يسيرا لمصلحتها اذا سلم ناسيا، لانه فعل شيئا ينافي الصلاة فلا تصح معه.

This is an extreme position, *Allāhu aʻlam*, Allāh ﷻ knows best, the prayer is invalidated by any kind of speech. So, it's not like the Ḥanbalis. They said even small amounts of speech is invalidating and what happened with the Prophet ﷺ was an exception or that that was outside the prayer not really inside the prayer etc. They try to explain it away. No speaking. At any moment. At any time can be acceptable. *Wa Allāhu taʻāla aʻlam*.

وَقَهْقَهَةٌ ككلامٍ

Laughing is like speaking.

And laughing takes the ruling of speaking. So, everything we've just said now about *kalām*, the basic principle of speaking, how prohibited that is, laughing is in the same boat.

And Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says laughing is worse because at least speaking has some kind of dignity and integrity but laughing is like loose and it is not a positive all the time, it's only a positive some of the time etc.

And what is laughing?

Laughing has a very specific definition. Because it's allowed to smile in the prayer. So, laughing is when you laugh with sound, when you smile with sound.

الضَّحك المصحوب بالصَّوت، ويُسمَّى عند الناس «كهكهة»

But actually *ḍaḥik* [laughing here means] smiling with sound. Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says it is also known in Arabic as *kahkahah*.

So, if a person does that, then that is a disaster. If a person *kahkahah* in the prayer, the prayer is invalidated because this is like playing around and so on. But if a person smiles in the prayer, that's something which is permissible according to the vast majority of the scholars because there is no sound. The key is the sound.

But what about if a person can't help themselves? Something crazy happens, madness happens. Someone trips over, someone passes wind, and everybody gets the giggles. And the person is trying their absolute best and a little sound comes out and they're trying their best and punching themselves and you let out a sound, it's completely out of control (and it is). Because only Allāh ﷻ knows how much you tried and it literally went past your human capability to keep it in. And you then laugh out.

Then according to the stronger opinion, as per what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says, then this does not invalidate the prayer. And this is also the **class position** as well.

(1:10:00) Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn gives an example. He says imagine something fell on a person and the person says '*Ahh!*' Or someone stands on someone's foot and they say, '*Ahh!*' That is a proper sound and proper invalidator of the prayer, frankly. Not *dhikr*, not *jins* of the prayer, not of the Qurʾān, nothing, loud and open. '*Aakh!*' That's about three or four letters there involved. We'll speak about letters in next week's lesson.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that this is something that he could not help, not what he wanted to do, not intentional, does not invalidate the prayer. The laugh is the same. Why would we differentiate between that and this?

لم يتعمَّد المفسد

He did not intend the corrupting introduction.

Q & A

Q (online): There seems to be a bit of confusion in the group regarding 'the prayer zone'. Is this 'zone' something that only comes into effect when the *taslīm* is erroneously done i.e., when the *ṣalāh* is completed correctly that 'zone' doesn't exist?

A: Yes, the zone exists in my opinion to take advantage of spiritually. I think all of us feel after the prayer a moment which is very meditative. You can see the Companions are very jealous about this moment, speaking a lot about it. The Prophet ﷺ giving us so much *adhkār* to fill it. People who have experienced it would never swap it for anything in the world. For me it's like it's the most beautiful thing one of the highlights of being Muslim is to enjoy that particular moment.

So, it exists. But it exists in a very vague spiritual sense that has no parameters or legal reality in normative times. The zone takes some kind of legal reality. It is not exactly legally defined, is it? When the *taslīm* occurs mistakenly then it is the same as, and that is how we call it, it's how other scholars called it. The point is that it's just what the *fuqahāʾ* called *qarīb* and *baʿīd* or *qarīb* and *ṭawīl*. Something which is… I don't know what phrase that we went for, but something that happens soon, or close, or too long.

Student: We chose near.

Ustādh: Yes.

Q (online): Why would someone talk in the prayer?

A: No one talks in the prayer. It is the mistake of the prayer.

Q (online): People sneeze and yawn in prayer, can you give some advice to benefit them with knowledge please.

A: Sneezing is something which can be done. It is allowed and you should sneeze into the crook of the elbow. And it is allowed for you to say *alḥamdulillāh* quietly to yourself or to delay it after the *salām*. And also yawning is allowed, something which you are not in control of, and you should cover your [mouth with your left] hand and you can say *aʿūdhu billāhi minʾl-shayṭānʾl-rajīm* also quietly in the prayer, part of the *adhkār* of the prayer, or you can say it afterwards as well.

Q (online): A Muslim boy met a Muslim girl that he would like to get married to. The girl doesn't pray and is not practicing at all. Whereas the boy and his family are practicing Muslims *alḥamdulillāh*. The boy thinks it's fine that the girl doesn't practice but he'll try his best to get her to start praying, etc. and if she doesn't, he is willing to work hard to make sure the kids are raised practicing Muslims *in shāʾ Allāh*. The girl has agreed that she will help him raise the kids as practicing Muslims, but she cannot promise that she will pray or become a practicing Muslim, herself.

The boy's family is against this marriage due to this reason. They have heard from various sources that a person who doesn't pray (without reason) is considered a *kāfir* and that this *nikāḥ* would not be *ḥalāl*. Would this marriage be *ḥalāl*, considering the fact that the girl might or might not eventually start praying or would this marriage not be *ḥalāl*? What are your thoughts and advice on this situation?

A: So, whether it is *ḥalāl* or not goes back to your understanding of the person who doesn't pray. And we obviously covered that in the conditions of the prayer Shaykh

Waleed gave a brilliant guest session on that.[§] It is well worth listening to. It is one of the best sessions that has been given, which takes our focus away from *ḥalāl, ḥarām* or the legal [question of]: Are you a *kāfir* or not? And takes us to actually: Which believer would actually do that? Who in their right mind after being told to pray say I'm not going to pray?

So, I would always, myself, tend to the far more conservative approach when it comes to people who intentionally do not pray. There is a big difference between the Paks who blag. Because when they are embarrassed enough, they end up praying. So many Muslims do not pray. You do their *behsti* and they start praying. You embarrass them, they start praying. You can count on a hand, there are very few people (obviously that number is growing), but you embarrass them and tell them and say, '*No, no! You have to pray. I don't care*.'

If I have people around me, I will bully them into praying. I don't care. If you don't want to pray when I'm not around, that's up to you. But in my presence, in my moment, in my power, and I don't use that? Allāh ﷻ will hold me accountable. You are going to pray whether you like it or not. Obviously, I'm not going to physically force him, but they will realise I'm not messing about. It happens all the time and then they will pray. You come across a person who says, '*I'm not praying. Listen, you pray*.' I'm not going to force them. I can't do anything more than just tell them. I can't physically make them do it. This person should not be gone near with a barge pole. That's not to say that they are not going to get better to start practicing etc. But this is what is understood by the Companions when they say *kāfir billāh*, the one who has left the *dīn*. That is the kind of profile of the person. That's their kind of mindset. You stay a mile away.

Just generally I want to say to the concept of marrying projects, when you marry a project, you always have to be ready. And I always find it a disaster. Now leave Islam to the side let me use anecdotal experience. Marrying projects requires an incredible level of understanding and *tarbiyah* and 95% (and I'm being generous) can't do it and it ends up in some kind of problem or divorce. I advise against it. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): I know that if you make a mistake in *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* and not fixing it i.e., changing the meaning or letters being left out then the prayer is invalidated but what if the mistake was made in reciting a certain *sūrah* of the Qurʾān?

(1:20:00) A: It does not affect the legality of the prayer. And even *al-Fātiḥah*, there is some flexibility. It depends upon the exact nature of the mistake.[††]

[§] Shaykh Waleed Basyouni gave a *Logical Progression* guest lecture entitled *Ruling on the Abandoning of the Prayer*, in Year 4, Chapter 13 (Introduction to the Book of Prayer), Lesson 3. MT

[††] Things that invalidate *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* were covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 20. MT

Q (online): What would you do if a person has realised that they have prayed many times in clothes that reveal the colour of skin only when in sunlight without realising, would they need to repeat these prayers?

A: No. They need to make sure that they are wearing clothes that do not show the skin now. You don't need to repeat the prayer.

Q (online): Kids partaking in Christmas nativity in primary schools, is it acceptable if the role does not contain anything affecting *ʿaqīdah* or not allowed altogether?

A: In my personal opinion, I don't think it is a major issue. I've always said that there are certain things in school that are quite difficult to avoid. What's actually much better is for a person to be able to do that and your *tarbiyah* at home be better to show that they would never have a need to go back to that, that their *dīn* is that much more fun, more interesting, more play, cartoon, roleplay, etc., that they don't ever need to let that thing have a lasting effect. I'm only saying that if you can't get out of it and it's a headache.

My own method with all my kids is that I take them completely out of school during that time. Sometimes I'm not able to. Sometimes it's a bit difficult. That whole week they do nothing but memorise all those lines. They do absolute squat, they watch a couple of films, etc. We bring them home, chill out, go out, etc. That's my personal approach. However, I do not believe that it is a *ḥarām* or that you are being sinful if you allow them to do it.

Q (online): Can I just confirm the class position on position of hands in *qiyām*? My understanding was that default is above belly button but that below belly button and hanging at side are also *masnūn*. And since the *sunnah* is narrated in multiple ways, these *sunnahs* should be alternated between in order to revive the *Sunnah*. Or was it that below belly button and hanging at sides is used very rarely to shock the system and not really considered *masnūn*?

A: Correct, default is above the belly button. It is not *masnūn*. I don't want to say that it is established *sunnah*. I want to say that there is enough evidence to not be too hung up upon your own position. And my personal opinion is that it's allowed. It is not *mustaḥabb* or *sunnah*, but it is allowed to pray in the other positions. I do not consider it to be *masnūn*. I have no problem at all in the permissibility of using it to 'shock the system'.

Q (online): Is travelling to see family permissible at this time considering the *ḥadīth*, "When you hear that the plague is in an area do not enter that area and if you happen to be in a land where the plague appeared, do not get out of that place."[5]

A: I think it is permissible according to the rules and according to precautions. I've recorded the video on Faith IQ that shows that I do not believe that the use of this *ḥadīth* is applicable. I did that back in the beginning. And now that we know everything about the condition, even more so. I was right. It's not the plague and it shouldn't be seen that way.

Q (online): What's the view on females using male gynaecologists?

A: It's something which is only permissible if there is no other alternative. And they need to try their hardest. 'Hardest' is defined upon the time and context and availability, etc. and how urgent the situation is. If it comes to it, then it is permissible due to the need. Because it is a serious problem.

Q (online): We found two random eggs (duck?) dipped in blood, tied in rope, and hanging from our window. The person who did it said it's for some seasonal reason (dry weather does something to their skin and it somehow stops it from happening). Whether there is any actual science behind this I don't know, but the eggs are making me uncomfortable and I want them removed. Do I have religious standing in demanding this or should I just keep quiet?

A: Well, if it's true, then there is no religious basis for you to insist that they are removed. You can ask them to put it in their own room or something. If there is some scientific proof. What does the blood have to do with it? It doesn't make any sense that. Obviously, do some research and find out what the score is. Sounds like a load of *bakwās* to me though. I like to do more research.

Q (online): What is the ruling on what a grown woman can wear in front of her *maḥram* (not her husband) at home?

A: In general, a person should have some concept of dignity and self-respect. But it is allowed for a person to show their arms and hair. It's technically allowed. You do not need to cover the outline of your body for example. You would need to cover the skin, but you don't need to wear big baggy dresses, *niqābs* and *jilbābs* and all the rest of it in front of your father or brother, etc. However, it has always been understood from the culture of the Muslims that you do not wear the clothes that you would wear in front of

[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Greetings, Chapter: Plague, Ill Omens, Soothsaying, and the Like, ḥadīth no. 2218 a.*

your wife and husband, in front of your family—out of *adab*, not out of *sharʿ* (obligation).

Q (online): Can you drink water or a flavoured drink during a prayer if you have a sickness?

A: I personally hesitate. I don't think that flavoured drinks should be taken. The dextrose, glucose, sucrose that is in there I think is much, closer to food than it is just to water. As for water, it should be very, very minimal amounts and only in a *nafl* prayer. Just like the class.

Q (online): Position on music: When watching programmes, should you mute that part of the programme?

A: No, I don't think that music which is part and parcel of background, personally, I do not consider that takes the same ruling of music itself as such, per se.

Q (online): Is the opinion that says musical instruments are alright to listen to or play, one that can be taken? Only listen to classical music, spiritual songs, *anāshīd*, etc.

A: Personally, I think it should be avoided. It is better to stick to the position of the majority that it is impermissible. That should be avoided. I think that's a safe position.

15. Chapter 20 Lesson 10: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

Today we are going to complete this section of increasing, mistakes that are involved with doing things, increasing actions in the prayer. From next week we are going to have new notes, a new section, which is going to be focusing on what happens when we decrease from the prayer, when we leave something out, when we forget, etc.

So last week we said:

وقَهْقَهَةٌ ككلامٍ

Laughing is like speaking.

To laugh out loud is like speaking, it will invalidate the prayer. However, we did add a caveat. We said if a person laughed out without intent, really desperately trying to hold something back and it just took him by shock, he just could not resist and bam! Then we don't think that the prayer is invalidated.

So today we are covering:

وإن نَفَخَ أو انْتَحَبَ مِن غيرِ خَشْيَةِ اللهِ تعالى أو تَنَحْنَحَ مِنْ غيرِ حاجَةٍ فَبَانَ حَرفَانِ بَطُلَتْ.

If one exhales loudly, with two letters articulated together, or weeps other than out of the fear of Allāh the Most High or clears their throat without reason whilst two letters can be heard, the prayer is invalidated.

So, let's take this apart. The first opening statement is an interesting position in the Ḥanbali school, not alone by the way. Actually, you could probably argue the majority of the scholars, I would say majority of the later *fuqahāʾ* if I am going to be more accurate—the Ḥanafi school I believe, the Shāfiʿi school, there is this *riwāyah* in the Ḥanbali school and there is another *riwāyah* from Aḥmad, which obviously I prefer. There is also in the Māliki school, I am pretty sure that this is one of the well-known

riwāyāt from Imām Mālik. And some said this is even from the *al-aẓhar fi'l-madh-hab*, that the one who breathes out, exhales loudly:

لأنه تكلَّم

Because if you [exhale loudly] this is like indicating emotion, frustration. And what the author, Imām al-Ḥajjāwi, taking this position of Aḥmad (this one narration of Aḥmad). As one of the students online has confirmed, it is the main position of the Māliki school. It is *mubṭil*, that means that it is an invalidator. The example is uff.

مثل :أن يقول: «أف» يرفع صوته بها، فهذا تبطل صلاته به

If a person was to [loudly exhale while saying uff], then that's an invalidator. Now obviously we could argue that that is not really breathing out loud. The person who is saying uff, that's not breathing out loud. But if he's giving the example of the two letters that are coming together, [*hamzah*] and *fa* (uff). And in this exhalation, in this frustration, in this whatever you want to call it, you've put forward two letters, which for Imām al-Ḥajjāwi and some of the *fuqahā'* this is considered speech, and it's now no longer just sound, even though if you break these sounds down from an aural point of view, you'll probably hear one or two letters anyway. But what they kind of try to make a difference between where a natural sound would become something disturbing or something significant. And Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn obviously is going to take this apart.

وفي هذا التَّعليل شيء

He says, '*I don't know about this*...' He says that in the way that they're trying to justify this that it's like speech when you breathe out, '*I don't know about that*.' He is just going to take it apart from an Arabic point of view. He says:

لأنه قد يكون الكلام كلاماً تامًّا مع حرف واحد؛ كأفعال الأمر مِن الثلاثي إذا كانت مثالاً ناقصاً.

He says that it's possible to have complete speech, for a person to speak (when I say complete speech, I mean to actually say something) with only one letter, such as the commands that come from those unique three letter verbs. So, from *waqa*, for example,

(0:10:00) the root verb of *taqwa*, *qi.* That means protect yourself, if you say *qi, qāf* with just a *kasrah*. That's the obvious one that comes to my mind.

المثال :هو معتلُّ الأول، والناقص :هو معتل الأخير، فالأمر من هذا الفعل يكون على حرف واحد، وهو كلام تام مثل أن تقول لصاحبك: «عِ» من وعى، فـــ «عِ»

And Shaykh gives the example *ʿi,* from the *fiʿl waʿā*. *Waʿā,* the Arabic word to encompass and understand, and to take in, and to pay attention, the *fiʿl* [*amr*] would be *ʿi* with just the *ʿayn*, which technically means pay attention or listen, like take it in, focus.

هذا كلام تام

He says: That's a proper command.

أو «فِ» من وَفَّى، هذا أيضاً كلام تام، وهي مكوَّنة مِن حرف واحد، كما أنه يكون هناك ثلاثة حروف، ولا يكون كلاماً، فكون المسألة تعلَّل بأن ما كان حرفان فهو كلام، وما دون ذلك ليس بكلام، فيه نَظَرٌ.

The other verb, which is a form of *wafā*, *waffā*, which means to fulfill and to complete basically, *fi*, no *ya* at the end. That means fulfill it, complete. If you said *fi* in a context to someone, that would be indicating fill it in, complete it, do it now.

We've got *fi,* we've got *qi,* we've got *ʿi*.

And Shaykh makes a point. He says that this idea of two letters, where does that even come from? You could actually do it with one letter. You're going down a dangerous path when you're saying that it has to be two letters. He gives a good example. He says: Why two, why not say one? And then he says: What about three? He says that sometimes you can have three letters and it is not considered speech. I like that point as well.

The whole concept:

ما كان حرفان فهو كلام، وما دون ذلك ليس بكلام

This concept that anything which is two letters and above is speech, the evidence does not establish that. Anything which is less than two letters is not speech, the evidence does not suggest that. So, I think that is something which is very good.

And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: For that reason, we will say in breathing out loud (the **class position**, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's personal position), he says that we'll say:

ولهذا نقول في «النَّفخ»: إن كان عَبَثاً أبطل الصَّلاة؛ لأنه عَبَثٌ، وإنْ كان لحاجة فإنه لا يُبطل الصَّلاة، ولو بان منه حرفان، لأنه ليس بكلام، مثل :أن ينفخ الإِنسان حشرة دَبَّتْ على يده لإزالتها؛ لأنه أهون لها من أن يمسَّها بيده؛ لأنه ربَّما لو مَسَّها بيده لتأثرت، ولأنه أسهل لها، فالمدار في هذا على العبث، إنْ فَعَلَه عبثاً فإن الصَّلاة تبطل لمنافاة العبث لها، وإنْ كان لحاجة لم تبطل.

That if this person was messing about (playing around, just causing trouble, you know just being a plum), then this invalidates the prayer. So, intentionally, no need, etc., that is something which is unacceptable and it invalidates the prayer. However, if a person needs to exhale for a reason, then this does not invalidate the prayer, an allowed exhale.

And by the way, this *nafkh* is a very general word. And the *fuqahāʾ* don't always make it clear what they mean by this. But when it is said in a general way, we can keep it in a general way. So, it does include [taking a deep breath and exhaling], which to be honest you don't always need to do, so you need to be careful. But if we use *nafkh* in its other linguistic sense, which is to blow (because that is what exhaling is), then it's [for example you are standing in *ṣalāh* with your hands on your chest and there is an insect on your hand]. So, if we were to rub that ant off, we would [use one hand to brush the ant off of the other hand or shake the hand with the ant on it so it falls off]. The example that scholars give is if a person were to [blow the ant off of one's hand]. So, this is *nafkh* as well. And there's a need for that. And this is something which is far less than all the moving around etc. etc. (We are going to come to all the rest in a second.)

So, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says all of this is about *ʿabath*. And *ʿabath* is basically this flaffing about, just not doing anything for the right reason, troublemaking, and just wasting time. Just like someone might be [sighing, breathing loudly whilst in the prayer] like he is bored. This is disrespectful of the *ṣalāh*. I think this is super clear.

By the way, I just want to say something which I found very, very interesting. Obviously, non-UK folks, this is not very interesting. But for the UK folks I just want to mention…

I don't know if you guys remember back in March, when COVID started and the lockdown was being established, I remember saying to you that what the government is going to try and do is try to get one thing done with an intention but not commit so that they can't be held guilty afterwards. So, the reason that they were so lax on things

like lockdowns, and this, and that, and people, and they didn't define a lot of things, is because they were genuinely hoping that the people would use common sense. In actual fact, it proved that this country is absolutely rammed to the rafters with the daftest people on this planet. People are super dumb. And I told people then and I'm sure I said it in the class, and it was proven all the way throughout the year. And it has culminated right now in the discussion about the Scotch Egg.

So, if you have been following it, you will know that now that the lockdown has been cancelled or we're through it and the country is in different tiers and pubs are allowed to sell alcohol, which of course is a main source of revenue for a lot of business and there is massive pressure upon the government to allow that, because of the people. Because it keeps the people calm, it keeps the people happy, and it causes revenues for themselves as well. But [it is] on the condition that a substantiable meal is being served.

What is going on is that the media, and commentators, and papers are talking to death. Is a Scotch Egg a meal or not a meal? Whenever you see them interviewing Gove or Hancock or Boris Johnson, or whoever it is, they are always asking them, '*Can you define*
(0:20:00) *for us a meal?*' And it is super clear what the government wants to do. Basically, it doesn't want to prosecute.

My point is that there is a big lesson here and the *Sharīʿah* is exactly the same. When I say the *Sharīʿah*, I mean that the *ḥākim*, the ruler, the *qāḍi*, the scholar, should not be looking to prosecute people. And the people keep asking stupid questions again and again. And Allāh ﷻ condemned the people asking these questions. '*What is the type?*' '*What is the form?*' '*Give us the exact details*.'

It is clear that the government does not want to waste police time. It is willing to turn a blind eye even, against pub owners to allow them to make their own decision whether this meal is enough for them to be able to sell their alcohol. Obviously, these are *ḥarām* examples, but the principle is absolutely *ḥalāl*, that we should not be in a way where we have to keep going to such intrinsic detail, which the law itself does not even mention, but then feels obliged to because you keep asking, with the net conclusion only being you the one who comes out as the loser. That is what the Prophet ﷺ meant when he ﷺ said:

وَكَثْرَةَ السُّؤَالِ

"Asking too many questions (in religion)." [1]

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Good Manners and Form, Chapter: To Be Undutiful to Parents Is One of the Greatest Sins, ḥadīth no. 5975.*

The things which are cursed, the things which will destroy the people, too many questions. That does not mean, from a *fiqh* point of view, you asking for clarification etc. It is when people start to go to such a silly level.

What you are seeing right now, where the government is hoping that the people will just say to themselves, '*You know what? I do not think it is safe to go out. So, I am not going to go out*.' At the same time, it wants to be able to preserve the police and use them in the right places. It does not want to be saying to the pub owners that if you serve a Scotch Egg, then that is going to be against the law. Can you imagine, in the middle of a pandemic, having to prosecute and arrest people and fine people and waste police time because someone is selling a Scotch Egg instead of a sandwich? That is the same principle with all legal systems and the *Sharīʿah* is no different. There are a lot of parallels in these examples.

فالمدار في هذا على العبث، إنْ فَعَلَه عبثاً فإن الصَّلاة تبطل لمنافاة العبث لها، وإنْ كان لحاجة لم تبطل.

What this is all about is not about exasperation, a noise, this, that, whatever. It is a person who is playing around with the *dīn* of Allāh ﷻ, disrespecting the *ṣalāh*, not feeling the fact that they are praying, standing in front of Allāh ﷻ. But if there is a need then the prayer is not invalidated.

What is the next one?

أو انْتَحَبَ مِن غيرِ خَشْيَةِ اللهِ تعالى

Or weeps other than out of the fear of Allāh the Most High.

So, we are not talking crying or weeping but crying loudly, weeping loudly. *Al-intiḥāb* is when you make a sound of any type. If it is done not for the sake of Allāh ﷻ, therefore meaning that if you were in such a state, out of the fear of Allāh ﷻ in your prayer and you did cry out loud with significant sound, then it is okay. So, if it is for the *khashyah* of Allāh ﷻ or fear of Allāh ﷻ it is okay.

But if it is not, then it is a problem. If it is not and it starts to become so loud:

قوله: «انتحب» أي: فَبَانَ حرفان، والنَّحيب :رَفْعُ الصوت بالبكاء.

And you can put together two letters out of the sound... If there is anything I detest, I mean anything that I detest it is people crying out loud. I cannot stand people who cry out loud. Like it drives me insanely mad.

Student (online): Did ʿĀ'ishah not say that when Abu Bakr ﷺ would lead *ṣalāh*, he could hardly recite because of how much he would cry?

Ustādh: The crying of Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddīq ﷺ was in the chest. It was like breathing, not a wailing.

Honestly the *sunnah,* the best way of crying is exactly as al-Dadu when he cries. You should not be making sound. But sometimes you get overtaken. The point is the Shaykh said that if you do and it is for the sake of Allāh ﷻ, then it is not a problem. So, let me just make it clear. Crying out loud out of the fear of Allāh ﷻ does not invalidate the prayer. You are just going to get slapped by people like me. That's all. But it does not invalidate the prayer. Crying quietly is the *sunnah* and a blessed thing and you do not fall into any risk of speech either.

The next point is: What about then crying not for the sake of Allāh ﷻ?

So according to the author, if a person was to cry out loud because someone had died and he then was crying, crying then it's *ṣalāh* time and then he goes into the prayer and he is still crying because this person is crying over this person, then this would invalidate the prayer—according to our author, according to this position in the Ḥanbali school. It is only a position. This would invalidate the prayer. That is a big statement. Big statement. And we are not accepting that and not only did we not accept that, Ibn Taymiyyah also went against this. There is another opinion of Imām Aḥmad another narration from him as well, and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position as well, Qāḍi Abu Yūsuf as well (the companion of Abu Ḥanīfah), Muḥammad ibn Sirīn, Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī, many of the *Salaf*. They were a lot more relaxed when it comes to the issue of these sounds in the prayer, all the names I just mentioned. You will be able to apply that for yawning, and for breathing, and for exhaling, and for coughing. So, we will come to that in a second.

In summary, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn sums it up perfectly:

أنه إذا غلبه البكاء حتى انتحب لا تبطل صلاتُه؛ لأن هذا بغير اختياره، سواء كان مِن غير خشية الله كما سَبَقَ، أم من خشية الله

That if a person cannot control themselves (and remember this is not talking about quiet crying, that is all not a problem at any time), but if it becomes so much that it overtakes him and he just can't control himself, then the prayer is not invalidated. It

just comes out he can't control himself. This is not something that he chose to do, whether this is for the sake of Allāh ﷻ, crying out of the fear of Allāh ﷻ or not crying out of the fear of Allāh ﷻ.

(0:30:00)

He says that this does not matter whether it is out of your fear of Allāh ﷻ or out of your love for Allāh ﷻ. Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says that there is a type of crying where you become so emotionally affected due to your just experiencing the *raḥmah* of Allāh ﷻ. Sometimes it happens. If I am to think about when I get most emotional, I think it is the second, on a regular basis. The more extreme, is the first. That happens, right? Different moments, different times. I think the more extreme, the more intense I think would be the first type, for most people. This is not a rule, I'm just saying anecdotally. From the fear of Allāh ﷻ, is probably the more kind of occasional and the more intense. Certainly for me, the more common the more regular is out of anticipation, understanding, appreciation. So, there are different types. But even Shaykh says that even if someone is upset for another reason as well.

Sometimes they are the best prayers, when you've lost someone or you are very sad about something then that's something which you would, of course as I said, regardless of crying for any reason *ḥalāl*, *ḥarām*, good, bad, nice, honoured, whatever the reason is, it should be quiet and it's not a problem at all. But we're saying that even if it is out loud then it's something which does not invalidate the prayer. And Allāh ﷻ knows best. That's our **class position**.

أو تَنَحْنَحَ مِنْ غيرِ حاجَةٍ فَبَانَ حَرفَانِ بَطُلَتْ.

Or clears their throat without reason whilst two letters can be heard, the prayer is invalidated.

There are two letters there [when clearing the throat]. What is that letter even? Is it a *hamzah*? That's the worst *hamzah* in the world! *Hamzah* and then a *mīm*? I don't know.

تَنَحْنَحَ مِنْ غيرِ حاجَةٍ

So, a person clears his throat without reason, without a need. If a person has a need then it's okay. And Shaykh says:

والحاجة للتنحنح، إما أن تكون قاصرة، أو متعدِّية:

The clearing of the throat can be *qāṣirah*, meaning for oneself, for one's own personal reasons, or *mutaʿaddiyah*, it can be for external reasons, for someone else's benefit. So for example, if a person feels something stuck in the throat and that's him and he needs to clear it because he's choking so he [clears his throat] and that's something to get that out. This is *ḥājah qāṣirah*. Or the other one which I think we all know and that is when a person is in a room and the door is closed for example, someone knocks on the door to come in and you're praying. And if you're praying and they knock or they call you and you want to indicate that you're praying, so you [clear your throat]. You are in the prayer and you want to indicate that, '*I'm here but I can't speak*.' That's the kind of thing you normally do in the bathroom, right? So, if you're in a bathroom someone says, '*Are you in there?*' And you would [clear your throat] because you're not meant to speak in a bathroom, so people understand that he is in the bathroom. Likewise, when a person coughs or clears the throat, then they're indicating that they're praying.

Shaykh says that if there is no reason and two letters come out of it, then it becomes like speech then it invalidates the prayer. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says:

والقول الراجح :أن الصَّلاة لا تبطل بذلك، ولو بَانَ حرفان؛ لأن ذلك ليس بكلام، والنبيُّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم إنما حَرَّم الكلام. اللَّهُمَّ إلا أن يقع ذلك على سبيل اللعب، فإن الصلاة تبطل به؛ لمنافاته الصلاة فيكون كالقهقهة.

He says: The more preponderant opinion, the opinion which seems stronger to me, is that the prayer is not invalidated by that, even if he doesn't have a need and he just cleared his throat. Because sometimes we have a habit it doesn't need to happen, maybe they think they need to do it.

Student (online): Or letting your child know I am watching you....

Student (online): Honestly feel like most of my questions in relation to making sounds are about kids and disciplining them, making them aware that you can still see in prayer, etc. etc.

Ustādh: I mean letting your child know, that's a reason. There's an actual benefit in that and so on, without you know speaking, without moving your arm, hand, without indicating. It's much, much easier just to do a little clear of the throat, get people's attentions and get people under manners, right? So that's a reason. But we're talking without reason.

Shaykh said this is not speech. I don't care if a person tries to make out that he has a reason, not a reason. This is not speech. And it is speech which the Prophet ﷺ prohibited in the prayer.[2]

اللَّهُمَّ إلا أن يقع ذلك على سبيل اللعب

Allāhumma in Arabic is a nice way of saying, '*But Allāhu aʿlam*.' '*But wallāhi...*' When you say *Allāhumma* in that kind of context it means, '*But I'll tell you what. If someone is doing this playing around? Then the prayer has to be invalidated*.'

Shaykh says:

مسألة :هل مِن الحاجة أن يتنحنح إذا أطال الإِمام الركوع أو السُّجود من أجل أن يُنبِّهه أو ليس من الحاجة؟

He says: Is it justified if an imām is praying leading the *ṣalāh* and the *rukūʿ* or the *sujūd* has become super, super, long, what about clearing the throat? Do you think that is okay?

The Shaykh says:

الجواب: هذا ليس من الحاجة

He says this is not something which is a need. This is not justified basically. You should not be clearing the throat to tell the imām get up unless it is such an elongation that it is beyond all limits and acceptability, then I think it is okay.

خرجت عن حَدِّ المشروع

By that we are talking about ten minutes. But five minutes is a long time for a person to be in *sajdah* in a *farḍ* prayer or *sunnah* prayer in the daytime (not in *tahajjud*). But that is not enough for you to say something has gone wrong.

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Prohibition of Speaking During the Prayer, and the Abrogation of Its Former Permissibility, ḥadīth no. 537 a.*

Ten minutes?

Yeah. That is something gone wrong. You would [clear your throat] to wake up.

(0:40:00) Student (online): Why not just say *subḥān Allāh*?

Ustādh: You would not say *subḥān Allāh* because he has not made a mistake.

What if someone says: How is it permissible for you just to make a loud noise in the middle of the prayer and you have this *harfān* (two letters sound) as well?

Shaykhs says the evidence for that is the *ḥadīth* of ʿAli ﷺ:

أنه كان له مدخلان يدخل فيهما على النبيِّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم

ʿAli ﷺ used to have two set times during the day that he was given permission [to visit the Prophet ﷺ] or expected to come. One was that in the evening and the other one was in the daytime.[3,4,5] This *ḥadīth* is narrated by Imām Aḥmad. It is okay, but it does not have the strongest chain. We covered it in Year 8.[†] He came to visit the Prophet ﷺ on one of these occasions and the Prophet ﷺ was praying.

تنحنح له إشارة إلى أنه مشغول بصلاته

So, the Prophet ﷺ cleared his throat to indicate that I am busy with my prayer i.e., '*Just relax, wait, sit down, etc. I am busy with the prayer*.' That is something which is permissible.

Another question:

مسألة :إذا عطس فبَانَ حرفان فهل تبطل صلاتُه؟

If a person sneezes [and articulates the sounds of two letters].

---

[3] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, Vol. 1/77.*
[4] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of Forgetfulness, Chapter: Clearing the Throat While Praying, ḥadīth no. 1211.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*
[5] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Etiquette, Chapter: Seeking Permission to Enter, hadīth no. 3708.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*
[†] This *ḥadīth* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 12. MT

Student (online): Where does the *harfān* come from again?

Ustādh: The *harfān* comes from the idea that that is the minimum for speech.

Anyway, I have never seen anyone do 'ha-choo' [when sneezing]. I do not see where the 'ha' has come from. But the 'choo' is definitely there.

Let's say that you do make the sound and two letters form. Now, this is a dangerous area. If you keep going into this idea that: '*It's speech*,' and '*What's speech?*' And you are going to these levels of details, the answer is simple: No, it does not invalidate the prayer. This is not speech.

I was reading Ibn Taymiyyah in *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa* and it is just so interesting. He is such a don. He says that speech is so obvious, when a person is speaking. Why are we trying to make these things like speech? If a person is messing about or trying to send coded messages, we know, they know, we'll slap them. The prayer is invalidated. But we do not need to make everyone else paranoid.

Shaykh also says:

وكذلك لو تثاءب

"And if a person yawns." Let's assume that there are a couple of letters that are uttered, so it is very much close to 'speech' technically. Theoretically, this in some of the *madhāhib* will also invalidate the prayer.

Again, that is getting a bit crazy. But again, if a person is playing around, they are in the *ṣalāh* and they are [making exaggerated yawning sounds] and if that person was next to you, you would slap them silly. Let's not just sleep on the *madhāhib* just yet. There is a point there. They are trying to protect the integrity and sanctity of the prayer. However, a person who is not trying to cause trouble, then it is okay. This would not invalidate the prayer even though it's 'ha', Shaykh says, but he is indicating two letters are always there when a person yawns. But this is something the Prophet ﷺ himself specifically spoke against and he ﷺ told us to fight. He ﷺ never said that it invalidated anything. He ﷺ told us that whoever yawns, he should restrict himself as much as possible. He should control it as much as possible.[6]

يمنع ما استطاع

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Good Manners and Form, Chapter: Sneezing and Yawning, ḥadīth no. 6223.*

He will prevent himself going into that situation. And when we say prevent, we mean keeping the mouth closed. You know the whole eyes water and you turn into a fish basically. I think we all know when we talk about that. So that is what it means to stop. And that is why the Prophet ﷺ said that if you can't, then you use your hand because you could not keep your mouth closed.[7]

Shaykh mentions the point that when you put your hand over your mouth, you not only reduce the yawn, but you reduce the sound. So, even the yawning sound or Chewbacca sound is going to be protected and of course this will prevent *shayṭān* from coming in, *shayṭān* taking the mick.

Likewise, he says some people sneeze very, very loudly. You know those are very irritating people as well. [They sneeze so loudly that] you think, 'W*hat the fish? What happened?*' That is not even a sneeze, who sneezes like that? But you do. Everybody knows someone who sneezes like that, like they died.

Student (online): Not on purpose.

(0:50:00) Ustādh: I am telling you, that is on purpose. It is crazy. What the heck man? I am the exact opposite. I will not release a sound and I will cause all kinds of problems. I will hold my nose, hold my mouth, everything.

Anyway, according to Shaykh, he says that the *madh-hab* is going to frown on this—loud sneezing—that it is going to invalidate the prayer, according to the principle of the *madh-hab.* And Shaykh says because this is not actually something which a person is forced to do. And he is right. He has a point there. Shaykh does not commit himself to a position on this, but he does indicate that, you know what? Nobody needs to sneeze like that. And it is true. You can train yourself.

Student (online): It is a reflex.

Ustādh: It is not a reflex. Nope. Come on let's have a vote.

Student (online): You can definitely stifle a sneeze. No.

Ustādh: Absolutely. In fact, I'll tell you something, what she said is excellent. That is the way you have to answer this question. Can you stifle a sneeze? And the answer is yes and if it comes out, then it comes out [muffled].

Anyway, I just want to say that the majority went with 'no'. That is why the *fuqahā'* themselves will be very much in line with that. Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn as well. He does not say it, but you can see that he is trying to say, *'Listen! You have to be careful.'* He is

---

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Zuhd and Softening of Hearts, Chapter: Saying: "May Allāh ﷻ Have Mercy on You" to the One Who Sneezes, and Yawning Is Disliked, ḥadīth no. 2995 b.*

not saying it invalidates the prayer, but he says: '*Listen people who are doing that kind of sound in the prayer*…'

Student (online): You can stifle it, but it feels like your sinuses are exploding.

Ustādh: We take it for the team man, sinuses and exploding, this, that, whatever.

Student (online): If you press your finger under your nose you can stop a sneeze. At-least that works for me.

Ustādh: Like that [by holding index finger horizontally, parallel to nostril]? I thought that is people being polite. I see people do that.

Student (online): It works!

Student (online): Yes, it works.

Ustādh: Does it? I am going to try that. I am going to try that next time.

Student (online): There are nerves in that area that trigger sneezing.

Ustādh: Sick. I am one of these people who sneezes at everything, meaning that if someone touches my nose, if I get hit on the nose, I sneeze, (dust and all the rest of it).

Q & A

Q (online): What if you are communicating annoyance via a loud sigh? I've accidentally done it before (example, when the imām is again going so fast that I can't keep up). When I realized what I did, I considered it speech, and started my *ṣalāh* from the beginning.

A: That is exactly what we are talking about when there is an intention and a *qaṣd*, where you are trying to communicate. And the communication is one which in of itself is not for a need. Because the clearing of the throat is a communication, isn't it? You are trying to tell the person, '*Hey, I'm here praying*.' But there is a need for that. That person is wanting that from you. That person doesn't want you to sigh out of annoyance. No person wants you to do that. And if you know what you are doing but you carry on doing it, that's a problem.

Does it invalidate the prayer?

I don't want to go as far as to say that. But if a person was sure that they really stepped over the line, and they redid their prayer, I wouldn't have a problem with that.

Q (online): Where does making sounds to stop children doing something harmful fall under all this? Like to make a sound to scare a child so they don't do anything bad for them?

A: I think that's all okay. Like to make a sound to scare, I think that's okay. But you would do it within the generic categories that we already have [e.g., clearing the throat loudly]. That would be the obvious one, a loud cough. That would be the obvious one to avoid falling into something doubtful.

Q (online): Regarding the *ḥadīth* we discussed about ʿAli ﵁.[3,4,5] Does this therefore mean the best way to indicate to someone that you are praying is to clear the throat?

A: It does actually. That is the *sunnah* way. That *ḥadīth* as I said, even though it's not the strongest, it's good enough. It's the *ḥadīth* that we can see that it's clear.

Q (online): When teaching kids to pray *ṣalāh* daily, at the age of four or five, do we insist on *wuḍūʾ* before *ṣalāh* or do we just let them do *ṣalāh* and once they have figured it out, we insist on *wuḍūʾ* before *ṣalāh*?

A: When it comes to kids, the whole situation is so relaxed. It's all about the kids that you have. There is no doubt that you need to start early to make sure that they
(1:00:00) understand what it is. But no, we don't obligate it for each prayer, not at all. Far more want to get them to enjoy. I want to say to you that kids hate *wuḍūʾ*, right into their teens. They lie about it day and night. They will go and they will pretend to do it. I used to do that as well. And I was older than a teen, like late teens. I used to blag *wuḍūʾ*. Horrible.

And that's why the Prophet ﷺ said it is truly the sign of the believer.[8] Once you have the *imān*, you love it. But if you don't have the *imān*, *wuḍūʾ* is a nightmare. Let me tell you something. *Wuḍūʾ* and the need for *wuḍūʾ* and *ṭahārah* is what makes otherwise nice people justify to themselves that they will not pray today because they are at work and their clothes are *najas*, etc. It takes real *imān* to keep washing yourself. Ritual ablution is an incredible thing. So no, we don't want to go too hard on kids with that. We don't want to put them off. But when they are young, they enjoy it a little bit here and there.

Q (online): For *nifās*, do we look for white discharge (like *hayḍ*) or just stopping of blood is enough? Some women get lots of yellow discharge after *nifās*. Want to know if that would be *istiḥāḍah* or part of *nifās* if there is no white discharge?

---

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Purification, Chapter: The Recommendation to Increase the Area Washed for the Forehead, Arms, and Legs Well When Performing Wuḍūʾ, ḥadīth no. 247 a.*

A: No, you don't need a white discharge. Stopping of blood is enough. The white discharge is never a sign of anything. It is an additional factor. It's not proof, in of itself. The proof is always the stopping of blood. White discharge is what sometimes makes it clearer when there is continuous blood. When we move over into *istiḥāḍah*.

Again, some women don't get the white discharge and the yellow discharge would be considered to be *istiḥāḍah*, especially if the period of time has gone over forty days. The real challenge is: What about after two weeks or three weeks, a woman stops bleeding and then she has yellow discharge? That's very tricky. You'd be erring on caution. You'd be thinking this is still part of *nifās* if it's under forty days. But if you have gone past forty days and you are still getting discharge after discharge, just then treat it as *istiḥāḍah*.

Q (online): What if an imām yawns while making *takbīr* or another part of *ṣalāh*? Do they need to repeat the *takbīr*?

A: Yes, they do. It's like *Alḥamdu* [yawns].. *al-ʿālamīn*. You hear that a lot. People read the yawn into words. When I'm doing it and if it comes out by mistake, I always repeat that statement. Always. Allāh ﷻ knows best. But that's certainly my attitude.

Q (online): Can you clap to stop your children from doing something they shouldn't be?

A: I think that's too much. I'd rather do the cough. I don't like the idea of too much activity. But, even in an emergency there might be some space for that.

Q (online): Didn't we say no maximum or minimum period of *nifās*, so why be concerned about forty days?

A: On the issue of the period, minimum or maximum, we did. But I'm trying to say to you that if a person couldn't clarify, then they use these things to help them out. The forty days then would help. There is no minimum. If a woman stops bleeding after two weeks, that's the end of it. And if a woman is continuously bleeding, and it's the same as the blood… The evidence for forty days is not very strong. So, if it was 7-8 weeks, for example, but it's exactly the same type of blood, then we'll go with that. Forty days is a general kind of understanding.

Q (online): Can you nod or shake your head to signal something if someone is asking you a question (usually a parent)?

A: Yes, you can nod or shake your head. You are allowed to do that. You can indicate, even with your arm, lift your hand, etc.

16. Chapter 20 Lesson 11: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

(0:03:15) The author, Imām al-Ḥajjāwi, is now going to enter into the final two aspects of the principles of *sujūd'l-sahw*. There are three parts: (1) increasing in actions, (2) omitting actions, and (3) having doubt about things (statements and actions) in the prayer.

The author has already spent all this time, we've already been speaking about the principle and increasing in the prayer, increase in action, increase in statements (we'll have a little word about this). Now he is jumping straight into when you leave something, whether you do it intentionally or whether you forget it. He says:

ومَن تَرَكَ رُكْنًا فذَكَرَه بعدَ شُروعِه في قِراءةِ رَكْعةٍ أُخرى بَطَلَت التي تَرَكَه منها، وقَبْلَه يَعودُ وُجوبًا فيَأْتِي به وبما بَعْدَه، وإن عَلِمَ بعدَ السلامِ فَكَتَرْكِ رَكْعةٍ كاملةٍ ، وإن نَسِيَ التشَهُّدَ الأَوَّلَ ونَهَضَ لَزِمَه الرجوعُ ما لم يَنْتَصِبْ قائمًا، فإن اسْتَتَمَّ قائمًا كُرِهَ رُجوعُه، وإن لم يَنْتَصِبْ لَزِمَه الرجوعُ، وإن شَرَعَ في القراءةِ حَرُمَ الرجوعُ وعليه السجودُ للكلِّ.

ومَن شَكَّ في عَددِ الركعاتِ أَخَذَ بالأقلِّ، وإن شَكَّ في تَرْكِ رُكنٍ فكَتَرْكِه، ولا يَسْجُدُ لِشَكِّهِ في تَرْكِ واجبٍ أو زيادةٍ، ولا سُجودَ على مأمومٍ إلا تَبَعًا لإمامِه، وسجودُ السَهْوِ لِمَا يُبْطِلُ عَمْدُه واجبٌ. وتَبْطُلُ بتَرْكِ سجودٍ أفْضَلِيَّتُهِ قبلَ السلامِ فقطْ، وإن نَسِيَه وسَلَّمَ سَجَدَ إن قَرُبَ زَمَنُه، ومَن سَهَا مِرارًا كَفَاهُ سَجدتانِ.

Whoever omits a pillar (in their *rakʿah*) but only realises after he has started the recitation in another *rakʿah*, the entire *rakʿah* with the omission is voided. If he realises before (he starts the new recitation) then it is obligatory to go back to the omitted pillar and complete it along with that which follows it. If he realises only after he exits the prayer, it will be considered as if he has omitted one complete *rakʿah*.

If he forgets the first *tashahhud* and begins to stand up, it is obligatory for him to sit back down as long as he has not stood up straight. If he is fully erect, it is disliked for him to sit back down. However, if he is not standing fully straight then he must sit back

down. If he starts the recitation, it is impermissible for him to sit back down. The prostration must be offered in all these cases regardless.

Whoever doubts the number of units (they have prayed), should consider it to be the lesser number. If one doubts that they have omitted a pillar, it is considered as if it has been definitely omitted. There is no prostration required due to any doubt over whether he omitted an obligation or added anything.

There is no prostration for the follower, unless the imām does so.

The prostration of forgetfulness is obligatory in every case where something that invalidates the prayer is done intentionally.

If one intentionally leaves a prostration (of forgetfulness) that is better to do before the *taslīm*, that prayer is invalidated. If he simply forgot to perform it and exited the prayer but the time is still near, he can prostrate.

If one is repeatedly forgetful in the same prayer, one set of prostrations will be sufficient.

(0:16:30) Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn wants to do a review of what's basically been covered in the last couple of months. On page 370, he says that now we're going to be speaking about omissions. And omissions are mostly referring to obviously (just like in the additions) the *arkān* and the *wājibāt*. Because as we said before, when it comes to *sunnah* actions, the whole concept is a lot more relaxed because you don't have to do the *sunnah* acts anyway. So, if you added some and you decreased some, then it's not like a major.

Shaykh says that the previous chapter was about increasing and we said that when you increase, you either increase in a statement or you increase in an action. And if you increase in a statement then it's either from the same genus of the prayer or it's from other than the prayer. And likewise actions as well—they are either like actions of the prayer or they're foreign actions. And when you use the word foreign, that's what you mean, it's not from the same genus.

For example, if you were to increase in the prayer a statement that's not from the prayer and you did that intentionally, so you said, '*Hello!*' That's not from the prayer and you said it intentionally, then the prayer is invalidated. And according to the Ḥanbalis, likewise if you say it out of ignorance or you say it forgetfully, you didn't know the ruling or anything like that (that's according to the *madh-hab*). That's because the Prophet ﷺ said in the *ḥadīth* of Muʻāwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam ؓ:

إِنَّ هَذِهِ الصَّلاَةَ لاَ يَصْلُحُ فِيهَا شَىْءٌ مِنْ كَلاَمِ النَّاسِ

"Talking to persons is not fitting during the prayer."[1]

As for our **class position** and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position, as we said: No, the prayer is not invalidated if I say hello by mistake.

So say I'm praying, someone passes by, says, *'Hello!'* I say, '*Hi!*' And then I think, '*Huh! I'm praying!*' I did it without knowing, I didn't realise, and the prayer is not invalidated neither out of forgetfulness nor ignorance. That's the first category.

As for a statement that is from the prayer, it depends upon what type it is. For example, if it is *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* then you've exited the prayer, that's obviously a disaster. And if you did that intentionally, the prayer is invalidated. And if you did it out of forgetfulness, then what you would do is that you would effectively ignore it because it's from the prayer and that's the extra bonus. And you would complete the prayer, but you would have to then make the *sujūd'l-sahw*, the
(0:20:00) prostrations for forgetfulness, and that would be after the *taslīm*. And if it was a statement that doesn't exit you from the prayer, so like saying *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* twice for example or saying *tashahhud* again or something like that or to say *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm* in your *sajdah* as opposed to your *rukūʿ*, the Shaykh said that it is legislated for this to do at *sajdah*, but it is not obligatory (as we covered before).[†]

As for actions (at the top of page 371), he says that if it's not from the prayer (foreign actions), so say for example I'm praying and then I put my hands on my head. Any kind of action or movement (physical kind of movement) that falls into five categories and we covered these five categories a while ago.[‡] Shaykh says that they fall into five categories, these are foreign actions to the prayer and the reference is for page 258. This was describing for example that all of the actions that you could do, fall into the five possibilities: obligatory actions, recommended actions, permissible actions, hated actions and *ḥarām* actions. These are all actions that are not from the prayer.

So for example, something which is obligatory is if you are standing in the opposite direction to the *Qiblah* and you start then you realise that the *Qiblah* is the other direction so you turn around. Turning around is not from the prayer, but it is an obligatory action that you would do. It does not break the prayer.

And then recommended. So for example, you are in the prayer and you have a shawl covering both your shoulders but nothing else and then it falls off one shoulder. So, it is recommended to cover both shoulders. So, what you would do is that you would then reach across and you would lift it up. That is an action which is not from the prayer.

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Prohibition of Speaking During the Prayer, and the Abrogation of Its Former Permissibility, hadīth no. 537 a.*

[†] Increasing in the prayer by saying legitimate statements in the wrong place in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lesson 8. MT

[‡] Categories of non-*ṣalāh* related movements in the prayer were covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 8, Chapter 17, Lesson 10. MT

When we say 'not from the prayer' we're like it is not going to prostration, it is not putting your hands right on your left, it is not a prayer action. So it is a foreign action, but it is recommended in this case because the objective is recommended.

Then you have a permissible one which is like an itch or something like that or he wants to stand in the shadow and get a bit cold.

Something which is hated: looking at a watch or there is a clock on the wall in front of you and you are resisting but then you just have a quick cheeky look like that. That is a hated act but not *ḥarām*.

And then the *ḥarām* actions is itching yourself all the way through the prayer or looking at the clock all the way through the prayer. *Ḥarām* is basically any of these acts or any act which happens continuously, repeatedly, and it becomes such a large amount that it just becomes a joke.

So that is a summary of the actions that are not from the prayer.

As for the actions that are from the prayer like *rukūʿ*, *sujūd* and so on and so forth then as Shaykh explains that if they change the nature of the actual prayer, so for example you do *sajdah* three times, then you have made a material change to the structure of the prayer. If you did this intentionally, the prayer is invalidated. If you did it out of forgetfulness, or ignorance, or something like that, then you would do the *sujūdʾl-sahw* after the *salām*. And if these actions are from the prayer, you did it extra, but it did not change the structure of the prayer, so for example, you raised your hands, you did *rafʿ al-yadayn.* You finished [*Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* then did *rafʿ al-yadayn* then started reciting a *sūrah*]. I mean you are mentally just thinking *Allāhu akbar*. You did not even say it, but you just [*rafʿ al-yadayn* (raised your hands)] and then you went into your *sūrah*. So, you have done an extra raising of the hands that is not meant to be done at that moment. So, in this scenario the prayer is not invalidated but it is legislated for you because of the absent-mindedness, for you to do *sajdatʾl-sahw* if you want to. It is legislated. It is good even, it can be argued, and some said there is no evidence for that.

So that is a summary of everything that we have covered over the last few weeks, months I am not even too sure. And that was not me wasting time by the way. That is a very good summary. I am very happy that I did that, and it was done because Shaykh himself did it. He does not do that all the time. So, it is good that he gave us a quick summary of everything that we have covered. Now he wants to look at when we omit things.

Student (online): *Assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* exits you from the prayer even if there is no intention to exit the prayer? Isn't it the intention that removes you from the prayer rather than the statement?

Ustādh: Of course there is an intention. We said intentionally, right? That is what I said. It is when you do not do it intentionally that it does not exit the prayer.

Shaykh says:

وَمَن تَرَكَ رُكْنًا

Whoever omits a pillar (in their *rakʿah*).

So, we know what the *rukn* is (singular), plural pillars. The key things like standing, *rukūʿ*, *sujūd* and reciting *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*. You know, the main things. Now this statement by Imām al-Ḥajjāwi:

وَمَن تَرَكَ رُكْنًا فذَكَرَه بعدَ شُروعِه في قِراءةِ رَكْعةٍ أُخرى

Whoever omits a pillar (in their *rakʿah*) but only realises after he has started the recitation in another *rakʿah*...

You can even see that that is kind of indicating that it is kind of gone into the prayer and that is what is intended by the author because it cannot obviously refer to the first *rukn* of the prayer which is *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*, *al-taḥrīmah* as we call it. The reason it can't include the *taḥrīmah* is because the *taḥrīmah*, if you were to leave that out, you haven't even started the prayer. So, it is a kind of moot point. You can pray the whole prayer and finish it, but if you never said *Allāhu akbar* at the beginning with the intention to start the prayer, you were never praying at all in the first place. For that reason, this section is referring to all of them other than, all of the *arkān* other than *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*.

فذَكَرَه بعدَ شُروعِه في قِراءةِ رَكْعةٍ أُخرى بَطَلَت التي تَرَكَه منها

[Whoever omits a pillar (in their *rakʿah*)] but only realises after he has started the recitation in another *rakʿah*, the entire *rakʿah* with the omission is voided.

Then according to the Ḥanbali School (and this is very interesting), the entire *rakʿah* with the omission is voided. 'Voided' here does not mean invalidated. It means it is meaningless, it has become meaningless. So not invalidated but become meaningless. Yes, I like that.

Now what does that actually mean?

What it means, is that a person has started the prayer. He is in the first *rakʿah* and he is going along all fine *Fātiḥah, sūrah, rukūʿ, sujūd,* goes for *sajdah* and once he is into his first *sajdah*, he finishes the first *sajdah* and then he stands up to start [*Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*]. Obviously, he forgot to sit between the two *sajdahs*. Obviously, he forgot the second *sajdah*. These are *arkān* and so those have been left out and he is now stood up. That is what the author is talking about.

Student (online): Void—was never valid to begin with.

Ustādh: I translated [*baṭalat*] as 'void'. But I just wonder whether 'void' is a bit too strong. That is the only issue. For the translation, it is important that we don't make it out that it kind of has affected the validity of the prayer. It hasn't. When we say 'voided', we are basically saying that it has become meaningless and you know it is not a complete disaster.

(0:46:00) I was giving the example of a person who is in the first *rakʿah* and they missed the *sajdah*. And what then happens, is that he now stands up. According to the *madh-hab*, because he is now stood up and he stands and he is in the *qiyām* of the second *rakʿah* and he starts the recitation [of *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*], when he has done this, the entire first *rakʿah* is now cancelled. It is like meaningless. So, he has to start the prayer again from where he is.

Likewise, if this happened in the third *rakʿah,* the same. Any *rakʿah*. From a Ḥanbali *uṣūl* point of view, what they are arguing is that once you have entered into the next [*rakʿah*][§] intentionally, something which you have wanted to do to get into next [*rakʿah*][§], it is now too late to go now and fix that. And it is game over. So that whole unit is now cancelled, all because you missed just one small part of it. Not because you missed just one part of it, but you were also not quick enough to fix it. You tried to fix it when you had gone into a whole different *rukn*. That is what the Ḥanbali position is. That is what that statement basically is saying. So, now the second *rakʿah* that you are in actually becomes your first again.

Now:

مثال آخر :قام إلى الرَّابعة في الظُّهر، ثم ذَكَرَ أنه نسيَ السَّجدة الثانية من الركعة الثالثة، بعد أن شَرَعَ في القراءة فتُلغَى الثالثة، وتكون الرابعة هي الثالثة، لأنه شَرَعَ في قراءتها. وهذا ما قرَّره المؤلِّف.

Another example: A person stands up for the fourth *rakʿah* in *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr* and then he remembers that he forgot to do the second *sajdah* in the third *rakʿah*. So, he only did one *sajdah* and stood straight up. And he starts reciting the *Fātiḥah* in this fourth *rakʿah*.

---

§ Ustādh says *rukn*, but he actually meant the next *rakʿah* starting with the recitation. MT

And because he started, according to the *madh-hab*, then this third *rakʿah* is completely cancelled and now he is reading the third *rakʿah*. That is what the author has basically told us. That is the *madh-hab*.

The second position, which is a position of also some of the Ḥanābilah, but a number of other scholars, including Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, and it is also our **class position**, is that no. Just because you miss out a pillar in the previous *rakʿah*, and you have moved into the next *rukn*… And we are going to go even further. We are going to say, not only the next *rukn*, but it could be even ten *arkān* down. Stood up, did *Fātiḥah*, *rukūʿ*, *sujūd*, this, that. Did absolutely everything. Well, that is not entirely true. I will explain what I mean by that in a second, but it does not matter where I am. As soon as I remember that I have missed out a *rukn*, I will go back to it immediately. We will go back to it right there, at that moment. So, I have started *Fātiḥah*, I am half-way through it, or I have gotten to the *sūrah*, or I am going into *rukūʿ*, and I am in *rukūʿ*, and when I am in *rukūʿ*, I am looking at my *sajdah* area, and I think, '*Hold on! I only did one sajdah*.' Right there, I am just going to go into prostration, or rather, right there I am going to sit down to fulfill the sitting between the two *sajdahs*, then go into prostration. And then I am going to stand up and I will continue everything from there on afterwards. That does not matter whether I am in the fourth *rakʿah*, and I remember that is what I missed in the first, or whether I am in the second *rakʿah* and I remember that is what I missed in the first. It does not matter where I am. But, as soon as I remember, then I will go to that position. This is the second position. This is our **class position**.

There is an exception to this. The exception is if you come around to that action. Obviously, that depends upon whether you remember it or not. But if you realise that you have missed it out, if you realise when you are in the section itself, then of course there is no point going back because you are there anyway. You are going to restart.

What do I mean?

If in the first *rakʿah* of *Ẓuhr* you forgot to do the second *sajdah*, which is a *rukn* of the prayer. So, you only did one *sajdah* and you stood up. And you carry on in the prayer and you don't have a dally. You think everything is absolutely fine. When do you realise? When you are in the first *sajdah* of your second *rakʿah* that you are praying. And then you sit back up. And as soon as you sit back up, you feel yourself sitting down, it is at that moment you realise that that is exactly what you did not do in the first *rakʿah.*

So now, technically, what the Ḥanbalis have said is that your first *rakʿah* is gone. But we do not want to use their terminology. What we want to say is that actually, you are back where you started. You had not progressed past go anyways. This is always where you were meant to be. Because you did not do the sitting.

Basically, there are two scenarios.

(1) You are either going to remember that you have forgotten the *rukn* before you come back to its place again. If so, you go to it immediately and carry on again from there.

(2) You remember that you missed the *rukn* whilst you are in its same position in another *rakʿah.* You then carry on from there. You make that the *rakʿah*, the unit, that you missed and messed up in. And then you continue the prayer from there.

That technically means that you will end up praying at least five *rakʿah*. And theoretically, a person could end up praying seven or eight *rakʿāt* for *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr* from a time point of view. But legally, everything that he prayed before was all messed up because you have to have order. And order can only be maintained if you fill the gap. And this is not a case of: You just go back, fill the gap, and then come back to where you are. No! You go back, fill the gap, and then continue from there. So, if you have done already three or four *rakʿāt*, and you realise in the last one that you messed up something in the first, you are going to go back to first and then carry on and do the rest again.

Shaykh then basically gives an example just to make it even clearer:

مثاله :لما قام من السَّجدة الأولى في الرَّكعة الثانية وجَلَسَ؛ ذَكَرَ أنه لم يسجد في الرَّكعة الأولى إلا سجدة واحدة، فلا يرجع إلى الرَّكعة الأولى، ولو رَجَعَ فسيرجع إلى المكان نفسه الذي هو فيه، وهذا القول هو القول الرَّاجح :أنه يجب الرُّجوع إلى الرُّكن المتروك ما لم يَصِلْ إلى موضعه من الرَّكعة الثانية، فإنْ وَصَلَ إلى موضعه من الرَّكعة الثانية صارت الثانية هي الأولى.

This person has basically gone down for the *sajdah* [in the first *rakʿah*]. He has only done one [*sajdah*] and he's sitting down [in the second *rakʿah*] about to say *at-taḥīyyātu lillāh.* He has forgotten the second *sajdah* [in the first *rakʿah*]. Then he remembers. So, he remembers at that moment he missed out the second *sajdah* in the first *rakʿah*. Now he's sitting down for the *tashahhud* in the second *rakʿah*. Whilst he's sitting there he remembers. He doesn't go back to the first *rakʿah* because if he does, he's going to go back to the same position that he's actually in. So, he just goes back to the actual *rukn* that he omitted, he does it, and then he carries on from there.

Then the Shaykh says in the translation:

وقَبْلَه يَعودُ وُجوبًا فيَأْتِي به وبما بَعْدَه

If he realises before (he starts the new recitation) then it is obligatory to go back to the omitted pillar and complete it along with that which follows it.

(0:55:00) Which we of course agree with. Our point is that the second statement of him realising before he starts the recitation of the next *rakʿah*, that applies to us at all times whether he remembers later, before, same time. It doesn't matter when he remembers. We will always go back to the missing *rukn*. Whereas in the Ḥanbali school, they'll only go back to it if they have not reached the next *rukn* of the next unit.

So, the example that the Ḥanbalis are basically talking about is that if you're again in the same prayer, you have only done one *sajdah* and you stood up forgetting to do the second *sajdah* and you stood up for [*qiyām*]. And as you stand up, whether you only get halfway up then you think something's wrong, you just sit back down again and do the second *sajdah*, or even if you stand up then you will also then go into the *sajdah* and complete it. So, you would sit down between the two *sajdahs* then do the *sajdah* and then stand up again and just carry on from there. Now here, the first *rakʿah* has been saved. There hasn't been a cancelled *rakʿah*.

If you realise the only difference is this idea of whether entering into a new *rukn* changes the whole plan or not. And as we said, there's no evidence that that does. Rather, one goes back to it whether you started recitation or not. That's our **<u>class position.</u>**

وإن عَلِمَ بعدَ السلامِ فَكَتَرْكِ رَكْعةٍ كاملةٍ

If he realises only after he exits the prayer it will be considered as if he has omitted one complete *rakʿah*.

So, now it is not about he remembers in the second or the third *rakʿah*, he has actually now completed the prayer and then he realises it. If that is the case, when he realises after he has left the prayer, then according to the Ḥanbali school that single *rakʿah* has been left out. So, what they would do is that they would stand up and they would pray one single entire *rakʿah* and then they would do the *tashahhud*, and then they would do the *sajdatʾl-sahw* and then they would give the *salām*. That is what the Ḥanbali school would do.

If they had finished the prayer, realised that they had missed out a *rukn* in the prayer, it does not matter where the *rukn* was, what the *rukn* was, they will now consider it too late and that the whole unit is gone, just like a person who started the recitation in the second *rakʿah* the first one is gone. Here it is not even recitation, the whole prayer is gone. So, they said that whole unit it gone. And so what they will do is, they would treat it like a single unit. The Ḥanbalis will treat it like a single unit owing. So, immediately as they realise, obviously again you have to be in the time zone, be close, have to be close in distance front or back of the *masjid*, or at the door, or near the car and within

five or ten minutes—all of that kind of stuff.[§§] If you remember, then you would literally just stand up, pray that whole one *rakʿah*. According to the Ḥanābilah there are a couple of positions, but you would do the *tashahhud* as well. You would do the *sajdah* (before the *taslīm*), then you would do the *taslīm* and that is it. That is the Ḥanbali position.

The **class position** is a bit different we will come to that as I just remembered something.

When I was telling you before how we would do it, how the scholars like Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn and other Ḥanābilah, how would they do it? If you were in the prayer, I said to you as soon as you remember what you have missed you go to it, you make up what you have missed, continue from there. I did not tell you about how you do the *sajdatʾl-sahw.* The *sajdatʾl-sahw*, the prostration for forgetfulness, happens after the *taslīm*.

So, you say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the right], *Allāhu akbar* [and go into *sujūd*], then say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* three times. [Then come up from *sujūd* saying] *Allāhu akbar*, [say] *Rabbigh-firli* three times. [Then say] *Allāhu akbar* [as you are going into *sujūd*], [and say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla* [in *sujūd*] three times. [Then come up from *sujūd* saying] *Allāhu akbar*, [and exit by saying] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the left].

As we have learnt already, when you increase on the prayer, you always give the [*sujūdʾl-sahw*] after the *taslīm*. You might say, '*But hold on! You decreased in the prayer. You left something out*.'

And you would be right. However, if you ever miss out a *rukn*, you always will end up adding to the prayer because you have to sit down, stand up… all of these extra sittings and standings. So, that ends up as a total cumulative addition which is why at the end you would give the [*sujūdʾl-sahw*] after the *salām*.

Back to this point here. This is now remembering that you have made a mistake after the prayer has finished. The Ḥanābilah would stand up, do one *rakʿah*, do the *tashahhud*, give the *sujūd* before the *salām* and then give the *taslīm* and end of story.

What is their angle?

Basically, once he has given *salām*, it is not possible to build on what has been done before. So, the whole *rakʿah* is basically gone. That is the *uṣūl*, that the *rakʿah* is so far gone now that it is not possible to recover. It is wasted. It is gone.

As for the second position, and as I said this position from the Ḥanābilah as well. It is also Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position, and it is the **class position:**

[§§] Determining factors of when you are too far removed from the prayer to be able to fix a mistake within that prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lesson 9. MT

أنه لا يلزمه أن يأتي بركعة كاملة

That whatever you now realise that you have forgotten from the prayer, you do not need to do the full *rakʿah*. What you need to do, is to make up what has been missed. And ironically, this position will end up meaning you pray a lot more. Because if you had missed something in the first *rakʿah*, then we are saying you only need to go to that position. However, absolutely you have to do whatever follows it.

So, if you had missed the second *sajdah* of the first *rakʿah* of a *Ẓuhr* prayer and you finish *Ẓuhr* and you think, '*Oh my God! I did not do the second sajdah*.' Right there you will sit and you will say, '*I am now between the sajdah position*,' then [say] *Allāhu akbar* go and do that second *sajdah* and now you will stand up and you are in your second *rakʿah*, because you missed this in the first *rakʿah,* so now you will stand up and you will do the second, third, and fourth.

So, even though our point is that you only need to go to the missed out omitted *rukn* and then do what follows it, ironically most of the time we end up praying a lot of the prayer again. But it is not really 'again', it is from there what follows. Because for example, you might miss out the second *sajdah* in the last *rakʿah*. In this scenario we would pray a lot less than the Ḥanbalis would because remember you have exited the prayer so the whole unit is cancelled. They will stand up, they will pray that whole fourth unit again from *bismillāh*, *Fātiḥah*, *rukūʿ*, *sujūd*, those two *sajdahs*, and the *tashahhud* and everything.

Whereas what would we do?

We would whilst sitting down (if we were sitting down), we would just say, '*Right. I need to do the second sajdah of the last rakʿah*,' immediately assume the position of sitting between the two *sajdahs* and then bam! Go into the second *sajdah* of that fourth *rakʿah*, then come back up and I'm in my *tashahhud*. So literally I'm just doing that second *sajdah* and then *tashahhud*, and then I'd give the *taslīm* and then I would do the two *sajdahs* and then I would give the *taslīm*.

Why am I doing that?

Because I've added to the prayer. I've done at least a couple of *tashahhuds* extra, a couple of *durūds* extra, sitting extra, etc. You don't have to go back to *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*. There is no *takbīratʾl-iḥrām* here. If there is a *takbīratʾl-intiqāl*, one of the moving *takbīrs*, that we have lost out because we're moving into a position and didn't say it before, then you would say that. But otherwise, you wouldn't.

Student (online): How about you just start all over again, i.e., do the four *rakʿāt* anew?

(1:05:00) Ustādh: You don't ever start all over again. This is something which we must never, ever do. This is a very bad look, optics, approach, horrible for *waswās*, not becoming of the Muslim, because we know there are some key principles there. This prayer is not something that is a joke, that it's not to be treated like our personal plaything. Prayer is not offered twice. We have a solution for when all these things happen and it's quite okay. And more important than all of these reasons is the *waswās* that it festers in your system. It allows that concept to develop, and that's something which must never, ever happen.

So according to the author, if you miss out a *rukn* other than *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*, there are three scenarios:

(1) You will remember the mistake before you start the next *rakʿah*. So, you're going to go back to it and you're going to have to fix it and carry on from there.

(2) You're not going to realise it except that you realise it after the prayer has finished. Then you're only going to bring one more *rakʿah* and then do the *sujūd* after that.

(3) You actually realise after you start the recitation in the second *rakʿah*. Then it's too late and therefore it's all gone.

Student (online): In the first scenario there is no *sujūdʾl-sahw*, is that right?

Ustādh: In all of these scenarios, there's a *sujūdʾl-sahw* because in the first scenario where you realise and you go back and fix it, you've added to the prayer. You've done sitting down, standing up, done all kinds of things [extra]. That's according to the author.

However, according to the **<u>class position</u>** and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, we have three different scenarios. In our three scenarios, if a person misses out a *rukn*, omits a *rukn*, they will always fall into one of these three categories:

(1) You will remember that you've missed out a *rukn* before you come back to it in the next unit. For example, the second *sajdah* you've missed in the first *rakʿah*, you will realise that in the *Fātiḥah*, or in *rukūʿ*, or in *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*, meaning you'll realise it before you get to it in the second *rakʿah*. If so, you jump straight into it. You go straight back to it, make it up and carry on from there.

(2) You will realise that you've missed it out when you're in that same position or after it in the subsequent *rakʿah*, in a later *rakʿah*. So, here of course you don't go back. You don't go back anywhere. You just straight there and then start the prayer from where you are, basically. Because what good is it going to be going back? Going back to what? You've already reached it again. So, you're now going to here and you start from here again. It's like reset from this particular point that you missed.

(3) After you finish the prayer, you realise what you've missed. In this scenario you go immediately to where that *rukn* was, wherever it was in the prayer, identify the *rakʿah*, identify the position, go to it, do it, and then continue the prayer from there until the prayer is finished. And then you would do one *taslīm*, do the two *sajdahs*, and then two *taslīms*.

The whole key point here is that the *sajdah* occurs after the *taslīm*. Now I know that I broke it down in a methodological way, but this requires some thinking. You will need to revise this and read it a few times and listen to it a few times, but it will settle. All of this is about omitting a *rukn* (this is not including *takbīratʾl-iḥrām)*.

Q & A

Q (online): If we miss *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*, we restart the prayer and since we restart the prayer, we don't do *sajdatʾl-sahw* at the end? Am I right?

A: *Takbīratʾl-iḥrām* as I said, there is no such thing as *takbīratʾl-iḥrām* being missed. Because if you have missed *takbīratʾl-iḥrām* then you have not started the prayer in the first place. It is completely irrelevant. You have to come back and start the prayer again anyway.

Q (online): In terms of missing out a *rukn* pre-*taslīm* when you say you carry on and go from there, what does this mean? If you remember you missed the second *sujūd* in *rakʿah* number three, do you do *sujūd* straight away and get up and continue with *rakʿah* number three?

A: You're not telling us where you are, that's the problem. You are somewhere. I don't know, wherever you are. But if you missed a second *sujūd* in *rakʿah* number three, you will go to the second *sujūd* in *rakʿah* number three, and you will then finish off the prayer again from there. Obviously, you have already done that, but it was cancelled. You need to go back to that.

Q (online): Why is there such a difference between pre- and post-*taslīm* missing of *arkān*? When pre *taslīm* you go straight to the position and can make up for *rakʿah* one in *rakʿah* four. Whereas if post *taslīm* you have to pray potentially three additional *rakʿah*, if the mistake was made in *rakʿah* number one.

A: There isn't. It's the way you have worded it. There is no difference between post- or pre-, both are the same. Whether you realised it before [the exiting the prayer] or after the prayer, you're going to go to it. The only difference is the length of time that goes

by. Obviously, if you are doing it post, you are likely to end up with a lot of units to make up.

Q (online): Just to clarify, if moving immediately into the missed *rukn* you don't say *takbīratʾl-intiqāl*?

A: No, unless that was missed out. So if you missed it, then you would say it.

Q (online): How does one indicate to the followers who cannot see the imām that a missed *rukn* is being made up?

A: There is no reason why the followers should not see the imām. It just doesn't make any sense. Why wouldn't he? If an imām is suddenly standing and he suddenly goes into *sujūd*, the followers have to realise there is obviously a mistake here there is something going on. He doesn't have to say *Allāhu akbar* and he shouldn't say *Allāhu akbar* unless he needs to say *Allāhu akbar* because he forgot to say *Allāhu akbar*. Now if he sits down, then everybody should sit down. Then he should say *Allāhu akbar* and then go into *sajdah*.

Now, if he adds a *takbīr* going down (and I think this is maybe what you are asking), but that's not a *takbīr* of movement because he has already said *Allāhu akbar* when he stood up from the first *sajdah* and then he stood up. So, he had already said the *Allāhu akbar*. He was meant to sit down but he didn't, but he stood up. If he now says another *Allāhu akbar*, the only next *Allāhu akbar* is to go into *sajdah*, but he wants to sit down and then say *Allāhu akbar*. So, there is no space for another *takbīr*.

You are saying if he just sits down, people will be thinking, '*What's going on?*' So, can he say *Allāhu akbar* right in the middle of recitation, which would make it super clear to everybody. If he's like [reciting *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*, suddenly stops while reciting, says] *Allāhu akbar* and he sat down and he did that because he knows for certain that everybody is going to lose the plot. Then I don't think that is a complete disaster. There is no evidence for it, but if he said *subḥān Allāh* or *Allāhu akbar*, etc. He's added to the prayer, it's from the *jins* of the prayer, and he will have to do the *sajdatʾl-sahw* afterwards anyway. And as you will learn at the end of this section, a number of mistakes are fixed with one *sajdah* anyways. So, I'm okay with that if there was some kind of disaster.

(1:15:00)

Q (online): Why isn't the *shurūʿ* from one act to another included, i.e., you missed the movement from *sujūd* to sitting as well as the sitting. Why not go to *sujūd* so that you also do the *shurūʿ*?

A: When you miss out an action, you only have to do that action. As we said, if you missed out the second *sajdah*, by default you have also missed out the sitting in that

second *sajdah*. You've already done the first *sajdah* completely. You don't need to do anything with that. We need to now get back into the sitting position. Once we are seated, then we go into the second *sajdah*. That's the correct way of doing it. Otherwise, I don't understand what you mean.

Q (online): Is *sajdatʾl-sahw* legislated for *sunnah* acts that one intended to do but did not, e.g., one intended to read a *sūrah* in the first *rakʿāt* but forgot?

A: We covered this in the previous sessions.[††] We said that if a person is used to doing something like that and it's a habit and he decides to do it then it's okay. But there is no legal obligation and even it's not based in any evidence either because it's not obligatory to do that act in the first place. It's only a *sunnah*. We had a long discussion. In summary, the answer is that you do not need to do it, but it is legislated. It is permissible for a person to do because he might think that he let himself down, he should have been bang on in his game. But he doesn't need to do *sajdah*.

Q (online): What if a person feels like their *khushūʿ* was lost through the prayer, would it be wrong to pray again?

A: This is the worst. There is nobody who has good *khushūʿ* in the prayer. Nobody. Everybody knows that they messed up their prayer. And they mess up their prayer.

Q (online): If you realise the mistake a bit after *taslīm*, how long do you have to make it up?

A: This is what we have been speaking about for the last few weeks. As long as you are in the 'prayer zone'—time and space—then you can make it up.

Q (online): How do you reconcile the examples of hated movement (example, looking at the clock) with what Shaykh deemed as permissible movements not from the prayer (like making a note)?

A: Shaykh said that the making a note was something for an exam and a real need for it. Whereas looking at the clock, what's all that about? And continuously so, etc. And even he didn't make out that it's something which is absolutely okay (to make notes).

[††] The ruling for doing the prostration for forgetfulness for missing *sunnah* acts in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lessons 5 and 6. MT

Q (online): If in the fourth *rakʿah* I realised I have missed a *rukn* of the second *rakʿah* and I am taking the Ḥanbali position that this *rakʿah* is gone, do I make the second *rakʿah* only or the second and then the rest after it?

A: You make the second and then the rest after it. Well actually it is assumed (it's just common sense). So, in your scenario, once you go there everything after it is gone. You have to basically go back there. That's the whole point of the statement that the *rakʿah* is cancelled. He is only saying one *rakʿah* is cancelled because he's giving the example of someone being in the second *rakʿah*. But if you remember after three *rakʿāt*, all of those are cancelled. You go back to where you are and you start from there. So, the only prayer that you've got is what you had up to that missed *rukn*. And then you carry on from there.

Q (online): Just to clarify, if moving immediately into the missed *rukn* you don't say *takbīratʾl-intiqāl*? How does one indicate to the followers who cannot see the imām that a missed *rukn* is being made up? i.e., sisters.

A: Yes well, this is the problem. The sisters, what are they going to do if someone sits down? They are not going to know. This is why it's a *bidʿah* like I've said: the walls, barriers, this, that, blah blah, rooms, boiler rooms. It's a *bidʿah*. They should be behind and see everything. And if you're in that scenario, no choice because of the *masjid* or the physical nature of the building (because sometimes it's not possible) then you just jump ship. You break away from the imām and start praying your own prayer.

Q (online): When doing the *sajdatʾl-sahw* after the *taslīm*, we don't repeat *tashahhud* and *durūd* after it or do we?

A: No. We don't, even though a number of the scholars did. And we will speak about that *in shāʾ Allāh* next week or the week after.

Q (online): If we missed the *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*, we restart the prayer and since we restart the prayer, we don't do *sajdatʾl-sahw* at the end. Am I right?

A: Correct. Because there is no prayer. You are literally starting a new prayer.

Q (online): All of this is for when a person is sure about missing something, correct?

A: Correct. Yes. This is about a person who is has definitely missed something.

Q (online): In terms of going to the missed *rukn* after the *taslīm*, would we apply the same 'still in the zone' i.e., the period between the *taslīm* and remembering?

A: Yes, you do apply the same, 'still in the zone' scenario. It is the only way that any prayer at any time is able to be fixed is if you do it in a close time and place.

Q (online): Once you sit down and then do the second *sajdah*, do you then do the *takbīratʾl-intiqāl*?

A: Yes. Because you are moving up now. You are doing everything which follows after that.

Q (online): If you are in *rakʿah* number three, and you missed something in *rakʿah* number one, when you go to rectify *rakʿah* number one, do you then continue from there. i.e., read an additional three *rakʿāt* after that point?

A: When you go to rectify *rakʿah* number one, you continue from there and you read another three *rakʿāt*, exactly.

Q (online): By *shurūʿ* I meant the movement from one act to another? It is not considered that you have missed the movement itself from one to another.

A: That depends on (as we explained a couple of lessons ago) on whether movements are *arkān* or not or whether they are part of the prayer or not. So that depends on that. You know that I personally don't think that that is the case.

Q (online): In the zone of the prayer would be what? Like if you have talked to someone, or over the phone, or something like that, is it still being in the zone?

A: We covered this.§§ We said that if a person speaks and the Ḥanbalis are saying that's it. It's game over and all the rest of it. Whereas we said that no it's okay because he thought that the prayer was finished. As long he doesn't go and break his *wuḍūʾ* or go to the toilet. But if he talks, eats, has a chat, it is okay. Time and place. Actions are going to be forgiven. Speaking is going to be forgiven. Please revise the last couple of lessons.

(1:25:00) Q (online): Can one clap to make others know that they are praying?

A: Yes. I think that that is okay.

Q (online): If you realise after *taslīm*, and now you are making up, e.g., one more *rakʿah*, do you start with *takbīratʾl-iḥrām?*

A: No. You do not.

Q (online): But praying a *nafl* prayer is not forgiven. I still do not get that.

A: Because you have moved onto a significant new, that is why.

Q (online): When you bury a dead body without the box, do you place the body flat on the back and turn the face to the *Qiblah,* or do you turn the body onto the side?

A: You turn the body onto the side. If you are unable to, then you turn the face to the right. That is the *sunnah* as well. It is not obligatory. Ideally you turn the body up, but if not, you just turn the head.

Q (online): Am I right in thinking the two scenarios we have discussed are essentially the same in that whether it is the same *rakʿah* we remember or later, we go back to the *rukn* we missed and start from there?

A: You are absolutely right. People do complicate it. Obviously, there is a difference because one could be done in the first *rakʿah*, and the other can be done in the three. In the first scenario you would end up praying another three and in the second scenario you would pray another one. But, essentially, what you have said is correct. You just go back to that issue in the unit that it occurred and carry on from there.

Q (online): In the final sitting of the prayer, before making *taslīm*, should you keep your right index finger raised whilst making *duʿāʾ*, or should it be put down for the *duʿāʾ* after the *taḥiyyāt* is over?

A: According to our class position, it remains up. According to Ibn al-Qayyim and a few other scholars, it does go up and down in line with *duʿāʾ*. Very flexible, but for us, it is remaining up.[‡‡]

Q (online): When we go back to that position, according to class position, does that mean you have to repeat any *rakʿah* which fall between the mistaken *rakʿah* and your correct position? For example, you are in *rakʿah* four and the mistake is in *rakʿah* one.

A: You carry on from there. You just carry on from there. So, of course you are going to do two, three and four again. Of course you are going to do it again.

[‡‡] The position of the fingers in the *tashahhud* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 36. MT

Q (online): If I had the intention to wake up just before *Fajr* prayer to pray my *Witr* and didn't, and I only realise the next night when I was praying *Witr*. Shall I make up the *Witr*?

A: No. I think once it has gone that far I don't think you do not make it up. But if it is in the morning after *Fajr*, then you should just pray two *rakʿah*. That is my position. And the Ḥanābilah say you pray the actual three *rakʿah* of *Witr*. But in my position, it is just one.

17. Chapter 20 Lesson 12: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

We've done forgetting a *rukn* and now we are going to do the forgetting of an obligation. So any *rukn* that has been missed, we ascertained that if you miss a pillar ultimately you are going to end up having to stop wherever you are and go back to it, unless in some certain circumstances because you have come to it already again. And you are always going to do a *sajdah*. And it is always going to be after the *salām* because you have increased in the actions of the prayer—that is the generic way of looking at it.

Now, we are looking at what we do when you forget an obligation. An obligation is slightly different. Imām al-Ḥajjāwi in *Zād al-Mustaqniʿ* in this chapter says:

وإن نَسِيَ التشَهُّدَ الأَوَّلَ ونَهَضَ لَزِمَه الرجوعُ ما لم يَنْتَصِبْ قائمًا، فإن اسْتَتَمَّ قائمًا كُرِهَ رُجوعُه، وإن لم يَنْتَصِبْ لَزِمَه الرجوعُ، وإن شَرَعَ في القراءةِ حَرُمَ الرجوعُ وعليه السجودُ للكلِّ.

If he forgets the first *tashahhud* and begins to stand up, it is obligatory for him to sit back down as long as he has not stood up straight. If he is fully erect it is disliked for him to sit back down, however if he is not standing fully straight then he must sit back down. If he starts the recitation, it is impermissible for him to sit back down. The prostration must be offered in all these cases regardless.

We are on page 376 of the commentary. We've already started off the concept of forgetfulness, but now we're at forgetfulness of the obligations. The Shaykh doesn't say that if you leave an obligation, then you do this. He uses the most common popular example of the obligation in the prayer, and in my personal opinion (actually these are both my personal opinions because they are not factual), I think that the most common obligation that we all miss... In my opinion, I think it's the *tashahhud*.

(0:12:00)

Second question is: What is the most common mistake involving an obligation in the prayer?

I don't even need to ask that question. It is the *tashahhud'l-awwal*, forgetting it. It's basically people standing up after two *rakʿah* as opposed to sitting down.

With that being said, that's why Imām al-Ḥajjāwi himself has gone into using that as the most popular example. So, he's not even bothered saying the word *wājib*. The point I wanted to make, and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn brings attention to it as well, he says Imām al-Ḥajjāwi has spoken about *tashahhud* is not to try to indicate that this is about *tashahhud*, but rather this is about obligations in the prayer, i.e., the *wājibāt*. So, we're going to continue that because it's the best example. However, I want you to imagine that this applies to the *tasbīḥ* in the *sujūd*, it applies to the *tasbīḥ* in the *rukūʿ*, it is obviously applying to the various *takbīrs*, but they're so unlikely to happen. It's so rare that it happens, that it's not even worth considering. As for the *tashahhud'l-awwal*, this happens all the time.

So, what are we talking about here? What's the scenario?

A person is praying, and he's either praying a *Maghrib* or a four-*rakʿah* prayer, and he's meant to sit down, but he forgets and stands up. Now depending upon how far they stand up, what we've seen from the text, he said:

وعليه السجودُ للكلِّ

The prostration must be offered in all these cases regardless.

In all of the scenarios—whatever is going to happen—once you forget to do the *tashahhud*, you have to make a *sajdah*, according to our author. Even (as you're going to find out) if he does that *tashahhud* but depending how he gets to it.

I want you to understand this conceptually. The Prophet ﷺ leads the Companions in a prayer and it is a four *rakʿah* prayer. And after two *rakʿah*, he ﷺ forgets to sit down for the *tashahhud*, and so he ﷺ stands up. In this *ḥadīth*, the Prophet ﷺ did not do anything but carry on with the prayer. And then at the end of the prayer before he ﷺ gave *taslīm*, he ﷺ did the two *sajdah* and then he ﷺ gave the *salām*.[1]

The most important lesson in this *ḥadīth* is that the Prophet ﷺ did not sit back down. So, he ﷺ has forgotten to do the *tashahhud* but he ﷺ did not sit back down. Therefore, we learn our big teaching point in the issue of *sujūd'l-sahw*, that whenever you forget a *rukn* you must sit back down (or go to it and do it). But whenever you miss an obligation, you are not allowed to go back to it. So, it is the exact opposite ruling to the *arkān*. You are not allowed to go back to it. If you miss an obligation, you are not allowed to go back to it.

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: Whoever Considered That the First Tashahhud Is Not Compulsory, ḥadīth no. 829.*

Now the *fiqh*, the differences now come: What is defined as going back to it? How far do you need to go to be beyond it and now *ḥarām* to go back to it? And how far can you go where you haven't gone far enough, and you can still come back to it?

That is what this chapter, these next four pages, are going to be about.

And Shaykh basically (in the Ḥanbali position) gives us the three scenarios.

وإن نَسِيَ التشَهُّدَ الأَوَّلَ ونَهَضَ لَزِمَه الرجوعُ

So, if he forgets the *tashahhud'l-awwal*, and he starts to get up, he must sit back down again. (So, this is recovering the situation).

ما لم يَنْتَصِبْ قائمًا، فإن اسْتَتَمَّ قائمًا كُرِهَ رُجوعُه

As long as he has not stood up, or he has not started to stand up. If he has not started to stand up, he must sit back down. If he does stand up and he is standing erect, straight, it is now disliked [for him to sit back down]. Now this is where some scholars will say it's *ḥarām* to go back. But in the Ḥanbali position it is disliked to go back, meaning that you should not go [back] but if you did go back then it is fine, but it is *makrūh*.

And according to the Ḥanābilah, the *ḥarām* point of going back (meaning now what is done is done and you go forward) is once you start into the next *rukn*, once you start into the recitation. And that goes back to the difference of opinion whether the standing in it of itself is a *rukn* or not. Obviously for the Ḥanābilah this is just a means to an end and therefore that next *rukn* is (even though it is a state of standing) but it is the recitation of *al-Fātiḥah* while standing.

Therefore, when he says:

وإن شَرَعَ في القراءةِ حَرُمَ الرجوعُ وعليه السجودُ للكلِّ .

If he starts the recitation, it is impermissible for him to sit back down. The prostration must be offered in all these cases regardless.

Now that is important. There is going to be a *sajdah* in all, [meaning] even if you do go back and recover the situation, and you go and try to go back and do that first *tashahhud*, you still have to do a *sajdah*. Now I don't want to make it out to be flippant

and I don't want to devalue the *tashahhud*, but there is no reason why you should go back and do the *tashahhud*. That's what I want you to understand. Because you have to do a *sajdah* anyway. You have messed up the prayer anyway. You have to make *istighfār* and *sujūd'l-sahw* for your absentmindedness regardless.

(0:20:00) According to the Ḥanbalis, that is even if you are just on your haunches, meaning you are starting to get up and moving upwards, but you are nowhere near standing up. What I would present it as: If a person was looking at you would they say you are closer to sitting down or standing up? So that is also a way of kind of trying to understand it.

Certainly, in my position if a person is closer to sitting than standing—they have not even gone beyond halfway, yes the thighs have separated from the calves. You know when people stand up, you go forward and then your thighs and your calves are in contact. And then as you get up then obviously your thighs leave the forelegs and then your forelegs become straight and your thighs become straight. So, when they separate, that's you proper starting to stand up. Now according to this, he must go back. But if he stands up, he can still go back but it is *makrūh*. If he starts reciting, then game over it is *ḥarām*.

That is my explanation. Now let's see what Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says from that. A student has written something:

Student (online): So general principle one can extrapolate from this is that:

- if you miss a *wājib*, and you remember as you are moving into the next action, you must stop and go back to the *wājib*.
- if you miss a *wājib*, and you remember after you have reached the position of the next action, it is disliked to go back to the *wājib* (Ḥanbali)
- if you miss a *wājib*, and you have started the next action, it is impermissible to go back to the *wājib*

And *sajdah* before *taslīm* is necessary in all scenarios.

Ustādh: That is the correct scenario. And of course, it is assuming it is a *rukn*. "Of the next action" is being assumed to be a *rukn* of the prayer.

Student (online): If the *wājib* is recovered, do you still do the *sajdat'l-sahw*?

Ustādh: Correct. That is the most important point, that even if you catch the *tashahhud* (the *wājib* here) you still have to do the *sujūd'l-sahw* anyway.

So a person might say, '*Well*, *why would I go back?*' And that's fair enough. But you must go back if you have not gotten up because if you've not gotten up, you're still there.

Let's now summarise what Shaykh basically says. In these three scenarios:

(1) He remembers before he actually gets up, so he is only halfway. He must go back. He must complete the prayer. He must give the *sajdah*.

(2) In the second scenario the Shaykh says: He remembers after he stood up but before he started the reciting. He shouldn't go back because he has actually separated from the *tashahhud* completely and he has actually gotten to the next *rukn* and he shouldn't go back.

This is personally my position and the **class position** as well. He shouldn't go back. I don't want to say *ḥarām* this, that, whatever, but it is done. Once he is standing up the *tashahhud* is gone. The idea of having to start the next *rukn*, it's almost like, '*Well that's like gone, gone, gone*.' But technically, once you have moved into a standing position you have left *tashahhud* now. I just want to say that my personal interpretation of this is if you are more standing than sitting, like you are almost in a *rukūʿ* kind of position on the way back up—so, still not standing straight. Even in that scenario I'm not going to sit back down again. That's too far gone. And a number of the contemporary scholars take that position. (But I'm just saying that now. We will get to that in a second.)

(3) He remembers about the *tashahhud* after he started reciting *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* and here it is absolutely not possible for you to go back. It is 100% *ḥarām*. You've absolutely gone past the *tashahhud*.

And then you have to do the *sadjah* in all of these scenarios.

Shaykh says there is another scenario that's not been mentioned by the author and that is a fourth scenario. The reason it has not been mentioned is because in this scenario the *sujūdʾl-sahw* is not obligatory. And that is if you are just coming up from *sajdah* after two *rakʿah*, you need to sit down for *tashahhud* and you are getting ready to stand but you don't stand at all. You don't even get onto haunches or you don't even lift up from the floor or anything. And Shaykh actually defines it as saying the thighs don't even separate from the calves. So, we could be on our haunches [but your thighs and calves are still touching and they have not separated].

So, if I've come up from *sujūd* and I'm in this scenario (my thighs are touching my calves) [backside resting on the heels], now this is a seated position anyway. I could be sitting for *tashahhud* like this anyway. Normally, we are going to be in this state with my right foot up and my left flat [*iftirāsh*]. That is something different because if I come back to this position, I'm pretty much set for *tashahhud*. But it is very possible I am on my two feet [*iqʿāʾ*, backside resting on the heels of the feet].†

So, if I am on my haunches, I stand up like [from this position], now you can see the separation of thigh and calf. That's separation. [In that position one can be with] knees

† These seated positions are detailed in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 32. MT

on the floor[or] knees off [the floor] and I'm just on my balls of the feet, my thighs and my [calves] have not separated. So, even in this position I'm definitely sitting. And the author in the text starts when I get up and my thighs start to separate from my calves.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says a fourth scenario would be if I'm in this position and I rock backwards to start getting up, maybe even my knees start to get up and I might just be in that position [knees off the floor, thighs and calves not separated], or you know like some people do when they come up from *sajdah* they're in that kind of position and they are leaning backwards and this could be, '*Oh! Just sit back down*,' or it could be, '*Get up*.' In that particular scenario, as I said, the fourth scenario Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is talking about, if a person is still seated and has not gotten up and has not in any way shown getting up, then at this point he just carries on with the *tashahhud* and he doesn't do a *sajdah*. That's the learning point. But the author did not mention it because there is no *sajdat'l-sahw* involved in it.

And back to the point of: How far is it when a person should not sit back down again?

I think if a person gets to this stage, and I have always said if there is some contact with the floor, so he has got a hand on the floor or he is still kind of getting up, then I think this is closer to sitting. But once the hand comes up, I am pretty much along the opinion of once your hand gets off the floor, once you're starting to get space, whatever what not, I think it's too late. Once you have gone higher and all the rest of it, then I think it's too late.

(0:30:00) So, Shaykh basically says if he tries to get up, but he does not actually move and he remembers, he just remains where he is and it is not obligatory for him to do the *sajdat'l-sahw*. Not obligatory. Is it legislated for him to do so?

Well again back to that previous argument that we had about people that would do *sajdah* because you just do not feel right that you went into that little moment of *ghaflah,* of heedlessness and you forgot the [*sunnah*] then of course it is okay for you to do it, but it is not obligatory.[‡] That is the basic learning point.

The reason it is not obligatory is because there is no addition to the prayer and there has been no subtraction from the prayer. There is no doubt about where you are in the prayer. These are the three reasons that you have a *sujūd'l-sahw*: (1) either took something away from the prayer, (2) you added something to the prayer, or (3) you have some doubt about where you are and what you have done. There is no doubt. You know that you are meant to do the *tashahhud* and you've caught it just in time, but you were just heedless for just one second and remembered that you had to do it. So, that is why it is not obligatory.

[‡] Doing the prostration for forgetfulness when leaving out a *sunnah* action in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 19, Lessons 5 and 6. MT

So therefore, the Shaykh says that according to this there are four scenarios that we can complete this with. In these four scenarios, the returning back to *tashahhud* is either *ḥarām*, it is either *makrūh,* it is either obligatory, and in the fourth one it is *maskūtan ʿanhu*, meaning that it is up to you what you want to do. You can do the *sajdah* if you want but it is not obligatory. The *ḥarām* is if you start the recitation. And if you did that, of course that means you are intentionally going back, intentionally after you have moved on to the next part. And that is going against what the Prophet ﷺ did and that is what would invalidate the prayer.[1] If he does that knowingly, he invalidates the prayer. If he goes back. Not only is it *ḥarām* but invalidates the prayer. If he knows what he is doing. If he does that out of *jahl* then that is something else.

And the *makrūh* one is that if a person stands up and he does not start the *qirāʾah,* and if he does not, then it is okay. He can come back, and the prayer is not invalidated because he has not done *ḥarām*. Some of the scholars, some of the Ḥanābilah amongst them again (and it is narrated in *al-Mughni* the differences on this issue), they said it is *ḥarām* to go back if a person stands up:

سواءٌ شرعَ في القِراءة أم لم يشرعْ؛ لأنه انفصلَ عن محلِّ التشهُّد تماماً.

This is regardless of whether he starts the recitation or does not start the recitation because he has gone into a different position.

وهذا أقرب إلى الصَّواب.

The Shaykh says that this is what is closer to the truth. And that is as I said to you before that has always been my position. It is the position of a number of contemporary scholars. So, we consider it to be a more accurate representation. That is the **<u>class position</u>**.

The *wājib* is if you have not yet gotten up, but you [remember] during the process, then you would sit back down—as long as it is not too far up. And like I said I use the measure of the hand, if I'm not too far up with the hand, etc.

والمسكوت عنه :أن يذكر قبل أن ينهض .قال بعض العلماء :أي قبل أن تفارق فخذاه ساقيه، وبعضهم قال :قبل أن تفارق ركبتاه الأرضَ، والمعنى متقارب؛ لأنه إذا فارقت ركبتاه الأرضَ فقد نهضَ، وإذا فارقت

أليتاه ساقيه فقد نهضَ أيضاً، لكن إذا ذَكَرَ قبل أن ينهض فإنه يستقر، وليس عليه سجود سهو. هذا حكم المسألة على كلام المؤلِّف.

And the fourth scenario, this is interesting what Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says. He says: Well, you know some of the scholars (we are talking about whether it is obligatory or not), some of the scholars said that this is referring to just before your thighs separate from your calves and some of them said that this is before your knees leave the floor. And Shaykh says that both of these are pretty much similar.

لأنه إذا فارقت ركبتاه الأرضَ فقد نهضَ

Shaykh says: Because to be honest, if a person's knees have come off the floor, then he is on the way up. And if his thighs have separated, then he is on the way up. But if he does not even move in any of these scenarios, then there is no *sajdah*.

Now I just want to say, myself, that because there is no evidence on this issue this is entirely *ijtihād* about what is the definition of standing, I am comfortable that you make your own decision. I think that is important for us as an LP class. When you are explaining this to other people who do not have this kind of lecture of explanation, of understanding the thing in detail, then you explain how you want. But I want you to understand for yourself, all of you, that there is no evidence to ascertain or to cancel out any of these positions. But there is a principle. And the principle is that if you are pretty much standing up, if you are more standing than sitting down, then you should not be coming back. And if you are nowhere near the standing, more like sitting, then you should definitely sit back down. And there will be *sajdah* in all of these.

But where is a scenario where you have not made a mistake?

What is that scenario where you should not even have to think about doing the *sujūd* because, '*No I just haven't done anything wrong*. *I remembered before*.' And I think in that sense, in that scenario, it is like the example that I gave where you are just on the cusp of standing up and I would definitely believe that the knees should remain on the ground for that, and that you are in that kind of on your [backside resting on your heels, *iqʻāʾ* fashion) but you haven't gotten up off the floor. So, you haven't even entered into like a scenario. You haven't even entered into the problem yet. I think that is okay. I like that. And you should be the judge of that.

ويجب أن يُعلم؛ أن ما ذكرناه في التشهُّدِ الأول يجري على مَنْ تَرَكَ واجباً آخر

It is important for it to be said that whatever we have said about all of this (as I explained earlier on), this is not just about the *tashahhud*. This refers to the *tasbīḥ* in the *rukūʿ.* For example, if you went into *rukūʿ* and you forgot to say *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm* in *rukūʿ*. So you went into *rukūʿ* and you were just silent. It could happen. And then you started to stand up. So, you are in *rukūʿ* and if you start to [stand] and then you remember you must go back and say *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm*.

So, if I am in *rukūʿ* and I don't say anything. And then I [start to move out of *rukūʿ* into the standing position] and I haven't said *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*. So, I am about to say *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*. So, I am [starting to move out of *rukūʿ* into the standing position and have not yet said *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*]. I have to go back and say *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm*.

But if in the scenario where I come into *rukūʿ,* and I [move from *rukūʿ* into the standing position] and I haven't said *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah,* but I am about to say it, it is now too late. The late is not because I am saying *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah,* but because I am standing up. So, even if I said *samiʿa Allāhu liman…* If I said that, because *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah,* is a statement like *takbīr*. Like when we say *Allāhu akbar* it is a during the action statement. *Samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah,* is also a during the action. So, even if you said *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah,* but you were still closer to the *rukūʿ* than standing, you would go [back down into *rukūʿ* and say]: *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm, subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm, subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm*, [then as you move from the
(0:40:00) *rukūʿ* to the standing position you say] *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*. But you would have to do *sajdah* just like we have said for all of the others.

Now if he stands up straight, it is too late. It is finished now. That's it. He doesn't have now the permission to go back.

Student (online): If you are about to miss a *wājib* and go into the following *rukn* but then you remember the *wājib* but there is minimal or little movement to that effect, you continue with the *wājib* and there is no *sajdah*.

Ustādh: Yes.

Student (online): Sorry, so saying *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*, is not a cut-off point i.e., you can go back to *rukūʿ*?

Ustādh: Yes. *Samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*, is not the cut-off point. It is the next *rukn* which is the cut-off point, not the [obligation]. Remember *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*, is not a *rukn* of the prayer.

Then for example *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla,* if you are in the *sujūd* and you forget that and you haven't stood up yet, then you go back to it. But if you remember it once you have stood up, you ignore it.

I want you to basically be relaxed about the obligatory. You should be stressed about the *arkān* and relaxed about the obligations. If you are a little bit further down, you just leave it because you are going to have to make a *sajdah*. That is the whole beauty of the *sajdah*. That is why Allāh ﷻ gave us the gift of *sujūd'l-sahw* to fill up what we have missed. So, you shouldn't stress about it. I missed it. I missed the *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm*, I missed *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla,* I missed the *tashahhud,* I missed... And the reason you don't feel stressed about it, is because it is being covered for you. If you are praying by yourself, you are covering it through the *sujūd'l-sahw*. If you are praying behind an imām, he covers it for you (as we are going to come to at the end of this chapter). This is the beautiful point, that if you are praying in a *jamāʿah* behind an imām and you forget to say *subḥān Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm* or...

Student (online): Sort of waters down the importance of calling something an obligation, no?

Ustādh: It does water it down. But I don't think it waters down the obligation part. It waters it down from an *arkān* point. Because it is still an obligation. It is an absolute obligation. The power of the imām has been sucked and the *barakah* has been sucked into fulfilling your problem. For it to be moved from there to you shows how important your action was. For you by praying by yourself, obligated to make *sujūd'l-sahw*, if you don't do that you have to do the whole prayer again (we will come to that later as well). If you don't do the *sujūd* at the end, we are in a big issue. So, nobody has watered down the importance of the obligation. We have watered down the importance of this act from *arkān* to this concept of obligation. So now we have a real tangible difference of *arkān* and *wājibāt* that you can really now see right in front of you. But absolutely, the imām will never be able to cover missing a *rukn*. Even in that there is some discussion.

Student (online): If you straighten up just a bit and bend back right way, is it not too early to mandate the *sujūd'l-sahw*?

Ustādh: Yes. It is. If you are just on your movement, you have not really done anything. We are talking about someone who is closer to the position, closer to standing. It is not about a single movement, or a little bit of movement. You have to make your judgment call. You have to know that it is *ḥarām* to come back when I am standing.

Student (online): Like the *Fātiḥah*?

Ustādh: No. The *Fātiḥah* is not included in that discussion because there is a valid discussion on whether the imām saying it for you has lifted it from you. We are talking about forgetfulness, not something intentional.

ولو تَرَكَ «ربِّ اغفرْ لي» حتى سَجَدَ؛ فإنه لا يرجع، وعليه السُّجود

Then Shaykh says: [forgetting to say] *Rabbigh-firli*.

Obviously, you know that that is according to the Ḥanbali position that *Rabbigh-firli Rabbigh-firli* between the two *sajdahs* when you are sitting down, that that is an obligation. You know that we do not consider that to be an obligation, but assuming that it is, if he forgot it until he went into the second *sajdah*, then he does not go back, and he must do the *sujūd*. Therefore, we have our principle. Make your own analogy wherever you need it.

فكل من ترك واجبا حتى فارق محله إلى الركن الذي يليه فإنه لا يرجع ولكن عليه السجود لهذا النقص ويكون السجود قبل السلام

This is the thing to remember. This is the golden principle and the rule: Whenever you leave an obligatory action to the extent that you have now moved on from its position to the next pillar, to the next *rukn*, then you do not go back. You must do the *sujūd'l-sahw*, two prostrations for forgetfulness before the *taslīm*.

That is it. Simple rule.

If you have not gotten to that position, you are still in the nearby zone, then it is still okay for you to go back even though it is not necessary. And if you are super close to that position and you have not moved from it much at all, then you would then stay there anyway, you would complete it because you have remembered it. Do not overcomplicate it. It is really simple this point.

Student (online): Can we say then as a general principle underlying this that one does not go from a *rukn* to a *wājib* due to its lesser nature?

Ustādh: Yes. You could say that.

Student (online): If in *rukūʿ* and you do not say *tasbīḥ*, and you are about to stand up, but remember that you are closer to *rukūʿ* than standing. Then you would go back to *rukūʿ*, and you would say the *tasbīḥ*, but you would also do the *sujūd'l-sahw*, even though you did the *tasbīḥ*?

Ustādh: Correct. That is the same for all of these scenarios whether you went back down and did the *tashahhud*, whether you went back down and did your *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm.* Any obligation that you are close to going back to: (1) You must go back to it, (2) You do the *sujūd'l-sahw*—regardless of whether you miss it or not.

If a person asks: Why are you doing *sujūd'l-sahw* if you go back to it and you have fulfilled it?

At the very least, it is because you forgot on a significant level of forgetfulness. We said it is already legislated for that anyway. But what obligates it is that you have added actions to the prayer. There are added actions into the actual prayer, the re-sitting, the re-standing, all of this kind of stuff. That is the common sense behind it. Even if we understand it with common sense or we do not understand it with common sense, it does not matter. Those are the facts.

Student (online): What about people who cannot stand and have disabilities?

Ustādh: This has nothing to do with people who have problems in the prayer. This is about able people. People who do not stand do not do *sujūdʾl-sahw* because they cannot stand, or if they have disabilities. They pray in their state.

Student: Here we do two *sajdahs* before any *taslīm*. Am I correct in thinking that we said that when we add something, we do the one *taslīm* first then two *sajdahs*?

Ustādh: Correct. This is what we call *qabli* and *baʿdi*, meaning that you would do it before (*qabli*) or after (*baʿdi*). These are just nicknames. They are not Islamic terms. Before or after *taslīm*.

The scholars always differed over before or after, which one is it going to be. I want to say to you that the matter is flexible. However, if you are going to be academic about it, then before is for whenever you forget something. If you forget something, if you miss out an obligation—even if you fix it—it is to be done. Even if you end up then doing extra actions. Even so. It is an exception to the general rule. And if you add actions, all additions, then that has to be done afterwards.

(0:50:00) Student (online): In your scenario, having missed a *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* in *rukūʿ*, started saying *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*, but not stood up straight yet, gone back to say what you missed in *rukūʿ*, then say *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah* again. In doing that latter *wājib* twice, but due to the omission of the *wājib* in *rukūʿ*, are you to do *sujūdʾl-sahw* before or after *taslīm*?

Ustādh: That is the question, and it is a very good one, and I have answered it already. Tell me what the answer is.

Students (online): Before.

Ustādh: Well done. The reason the question was important is because from an *ʿaql* point of view, it should be after. Because you have done two *samiʿ Allahu līman ḥamidahs*. You have done an up and a down, etc. But as we said before, whenever the root cause of it was the forgetfulness or the leaving out of an obligation, when it gets recovered, it is done before.

ومَن شَكَّ في عَددِ الركعاتِ أَخَذَ بالأقلِّ

Whoever doubts the number of units (they have prayed), should consider it to be the lesser number.

Whoever has doubts. I am going to take this like Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn in that I am not going to jump into the explanation of the *fiqh*, but I am going to take it according to how he wants to speak. Because he wants to talk about *shakk* for a little bit.

He says: This is the third and final reason for *sujūd'l-sahw*.

قوله: «ومن شكّ» هذا هو السبب الثالث من أسباب سجود السَّهو .واعلم أن الشكَّ لا بُدَّ فيه من معرفة ثلاث قواعد

Shaykh says that when you want to deal with the issue of doubt, there are three principles, or three maxims.

القاعدة الأولى: إذا كان الشكُّ بعد انتهاء الصَّلاة، فلا عِبْرَة به إلا أن يتيقن النقص، أو الزيادة.

This is three principles on the issue of doubt concerning the prayer. That is how you entitle this subsection. The first principle is that if the doubt is after the prayer has ended, then it is discarded. The doubt is discarded except if it is absolutely certain that a person omitted something from the prayer or added something to the prayer. But then it would not be doubt, would it? I repeat again. If there is some doubt about something in the prayer after the prayer has finished, and it was a doubt, it did not appear in the prayer. It was only after you were sitting there musing, and thinking, and now it has come to your head. It is a doubt. It is to be discarded. Because the only thing that should be considered after the prayer is a definite omission and a definite addition.

مثال ذلك: بعد أن سَلَّمَ شَكَّ هل صَلَّى ثلاثاً أم أربعاً؟

An example of that is that he gives his *salām*. He is now thinking, '*Did I pray three or did I pray four?*' He is meant to be praying *Ẓuhr*. He has now given *salāms*. He has finished the prayer. '*Did I do three or did I do four?*'

We say just throw it away. Do not even consider this doubt. Doubt is not given any credence. Throw it away. No *sajdah* to be made. No prostrations. No consideration. Off you go home. And that is because this prayer has been completed according to how it has been legislated. There is no reason for you to question that. Once the *muṣalli* has given the *salām*, there is now no issue for him. The prayer is complete, and he is now absolved of any responsibility.

Another example, Shaykh says:

ومثال ذلك: لو شَكَّ في عدد أشواط الطَّواف بعد أن فرغ من الطَّواف، هل طاف سبعاً أم ستًّا؟

A person is doing *ʿUmrah*. Enters in. Does his seven *ṭawāf*. Come out of the other side and he is walking off to drink *Zamzam*. He is like, '*Did I do six or did I do seven?*' This is after. He has left it now. He has moved on to *Zamzam*. He has performed two *rakʿāt*. He is going off to *saʿī* now. '*Did I do six or did I do seven?*'

فلا عِبْرَة به

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that it is to be ignored because he is finished from the *ṭawāf* exactly as he was meant to have done it. We have rules. The rules are if you have doubt during it, you build upon the lesser number (as we are going to see). But when you have finished, you have finished. The doubt did not come at the right time. The doubt came at the wrong time. '*Sorry doubt, you missed your boat mate. Later!*' That is basically, what we are saying.

Another example:

لو شَكَّ في عدد حصى الجِمَار بعد أن فَرَغَ وانصرف، فلا يَلتفت إليه؛ لأنه بفراغ العبادة برئت الذِّمَّة، فورود الشَّكِّ والذِّمَّة قد برئت لا يُلتفت إليه.

In the stoning of the pillars in *Ḥajj*, you have to start off with seven. You have seven ready. You stone it with seven. He finishes. Then he says, '*Did I hit it with six or did I hit it with seven?*' You ignore this. That act of worship has been completed in its own manner.

Student (online): Is doubt to be treated like *waswās*?

Ustādh: Not at all. It is not the same. But it's true honestly, doubt can sometimes become *waswās*. In principle, doubt is very real. It is not *waswās*. But doubt then becomes *waswās* when you start to keep questioning yourself in normative scenarios. You should not be questioning yourself after you have finished. You should be questioning yourself inside.

Student (online): I wonder what counts as 'finished' the *ṭawāf*.

Ustādh: It is not even so technically as, '*What step am I done or finished ṭawāf?' Ṭawāf* is *ṭawāf*. Once it is completed, it's completed. Once you walk away from it, once you've now started to go to the *ṣalāh* or drunk the *Zamzam, Zamzam* obviously is a *sunnah* only, it is not an act per se and so is the prayer as well. This is not necessarily the legal cut off, it is from when you have moved on from it and it is complete according to its legal terms. What is the definition of *ṭawāf*? The definition of *ṭawāf* is seven times around. That's it.

So, now let's go to the second *qāʿidah*.

القاعدة الثانية :إذا كان الشَّكُّ وهماً، أي :طرأ على الذِّهن و لم يستقر، كما يوجد هذا في الموسوسين، فلا عِبْرَة به أيضاً، فلا يلتفت إليه

If the doubt is just *waswās*, it's just voices, it's just *wahm*. *Wahm* is just *kalām fāḍi*, it's just ideas, musings. It is not actual doubt that's built upon something. And by the way we covered doubt in immense detail, we made tables, charts.[§]

Anyway, Shaykh says that if it is just this kind of nonsense that is also discarded. So, now second *qāʿidah*: Inside the prayer any kind of doubt which is just fleeting thoughts
(1:00:00) and just imagination, just gossip to your head, just you chatting to yourself, rubbish, it is also to be ignored.

والإِنسان لو طاوع التوهم لتعب تعباً عظيماً.

He says something really interesting here. He says: If the people were to obey their fleeting thoughts and their imagination they would be ruined, they'd be wrecked in their prayer.

The third principle:

[§] Levels of doubt were covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 3, Chapter 8, Lesson 10. MT

القاعدة الثالثة :إذا كَثُرت الشُّكوك مع الإِنسان حتى صار لا يفعل فِعْلاً إلا شَكَّ فيه، إنْ توضأ شَكَّ، وإنْ صَلَّى شَكَّ، وإن صام شَكَّ، فهذا أيضاً لا عِبْرَة به؛ لأن هذا مرض وعِلَّة، والكلام مع الإِنسان الصَّحيح السَّليم مِن المرض، والإِنسان الشكّاك هذا يعتبر ذهنه غير مستقر فلا عِبْرَة به.

If the doubts reach such a level that there are just doubt, after doubt, after doubt, after doubt, that it starts to make this person do nothing except that he has doubt in it. So, everything that the person thinks about or does there's doubt. Like when he makes *wuḍūʾ,* he's doubting and when he prays, he's doubting. He doesn't know whether he covered this, '*Did I wash my arm or not?*' '*In the prayer did I do this or not?*' When he's fasting, '*Did I drink enough or not? Was I too late? Did I miss Fajr nor not?*'

This is also to be thrown out just completely ignore it. This is a level of no actual doubt. And I am glad I decided to cover this first before I speak about what I want to say. This is to be ignored. Why?

Shaykh says this is a sickness, this is an illness. This is an actual problem. This is like a disability. When a person is at this level, because this is never how humans are meant to be, doubting all their acts, let alone their acts of worship, let alone acts of worship which are being done in a normative fashion. Even more so when someone tells him that, '*By the way this is fine*,' and they carry on. And that is when a person has now fallen apart. He has no objective standard of normality and that's a problem.

So, then what's left then?

What's left is actual doubt.

And there are four types of doubt that the Shaykh is going to speak about and he's going to start with the first of them which is the doubt concerning the number of *rakʿāt*. That's the next sentence.

Now before I start this, I just want to say something. You know, when you are in a position of the community and people come to ask you questions, you know that you have like a top five or a top three that you just get again, and again, and again. Music is always there, and beards is always there, and working in a bank and all the rest of it. But *waswās* is at least top three, whether it's *waswās* in whether a person is dripping especially males, '*Have I washed my private parts enough? I feel wetness,*' etc, or whether it's *waswās* concerning their prayer that it is all over the place etc. etc. It is just so dominant in so many different aspects of the acts of worship, prayer specifically has its own kind of categories. When we are talking about *waswās* in the prayer, we're talking about that in which a person has no idea what they're doing, which is the rarer type and then the most common type is that a person is not in any kind of presence in the prayer.

And what's so important for us (students of knowledge) to get out to the masses, family members, community is that *waswās* is just the most despicable of *shayṭān's* tools. It is straight out of his toolbox a la par excellence. It is his pliers basically. It is his multi-purpose tool.

There is a saying: If you are going to be a tool at least be a plier. That is copyright by the way. If you hear anybody ever say that know that that came from me because to be a tool is a waste of time and a waste of space. When you get the whole tool analogies it is all very negative, '*He's a flipping tool that guy is*.' That means he is a plum. And '*He is not the brightest spanner in the toolbox*,' again it is a cuss. So, I just want to say, if you are going to be a tool, meaning if you are going to be useless, then at least be a plier. The beautiful thing about a plier is that it is the most useful of all tools. Why is a spanner pointless? Because anybody who has done any DIY knows it is a waste of time that you have this spanner. This spanner you only use it for number fourteen, and you need a fifteen or you need a twelve… Okay, the spanner is definitely the right thing to do that nut and a pliers is very difficult to do it, but at least a pliers will give it a go and the pliers will be able to you know open it up wide, or bring it, get a grip on it, this, that, whatever.

I want to say that this dog *shayṭān* knows that *waswās* messes a person up big time. And it is upon us to basically say you have to get in control and not allow *shayṭān* to have a field day with you. He must not be given the confidence that you are considering the *waswās.* And this is the statement I was going to make before, and it sounds really weird but now it will make sense: Doubt is actually a beautiful thing. Doubt is a real thing. You have to see it like a celebrated thing. It is a proper thing. When you have doubt and you know you have doubt you should be happy that you have doubt because you know it is not *waswās*. Because *waswās* is complete lies, complete nonsense—*shayṭān*'s absolute desperate attempts for him to ruin your mind, to psychologically break you down. Whereas doubt is very real, '*I either did three or I did four. And I am not sure whether I did three or four. I know I have definitely done three, but I might have done four. I am going go with three because of the doubt*.'

That doubt does not come up to you and say, '*Did I recite Fātiḥah*? *Was I looking the right way? Was I looking down enough? Was I concentrating enough? I did not think about my dinner, did I?*' That doubt does not play and destroy your life. It does not make you keep changing your underwear saying it is dirty, that a dog came it is impure. Doubt is based upon actual principles.

(1:10:00) It is based on numbers. If it is under 50%, if it is like 40% that is doubt. That is *shakk.* 40% is not certainty at all. We all know that. But it is doubt. 40% is a lot. If you were talking about 40% in any other field or arena, like a profit share for example in a business, or the 40% dirty your *qamīs,* or 40% whatever or 30% or whatever, this is a lot. Meaning that when we classify something as doubt, it is going to be based upon numbers, on stats, on real substance. 10%, 20%, 30%, 40% it's real. *Waswās*, *awhām*, *wahm* is just lies and nonsense. It is something which you have to understand.

Student (online): Shaykh Muḥammad al-Mukhṭār al-Shanqīṭi explains that scholars have divided *ʿilm* into four levels:

(1) *Yaqīn*: which is certainty and is 100% likely to happen.

(2) *Ẓann*: which is possibility/probable and is 51-99% likely to happen. This is also called *ghālibiṭʾl-ẓann* which is translated as most likely.

(3) *Shakk*: which is doubt and is 50% likely to happen. This is a scenario in which both possibilities are equal.

(4) *Wahm*: which is something not likely and is 1-49% likely to happen. This is also called *ẓannʾl-marjūḥ*, which is translated as something unlikely.

Ustādh: Doubt has basis. That is why I am saying that the millions of people that have doubt, have no psychological issues, no problems with the acts of worship.

I'm just going to give myself as an example purely just to illustrate the point. I'm the most sinful and the most *miskīn* of people but *alḥamdulillāh* I do not suffer from any *waswās* whatsoever. When that dog comes to me, I slap him so hard that stupid dog, flipping dog, get your dirty dog face out of here. I pity him when he puts *waswās*. Doubt? I get plenty of doubt all the time, three, four *rakʿāt,* I think, '*You know what? Subḥān Allah, I can't believe he got me there man. He actually got me there. I took my eye off the ball and I can't remember now whether I'm in the third or fourth*. *I'm going to assume it's the third, that's the sunnah, that's the ḥadīth, take it as the three and then build upon it.*'[2]

It never went anything beyond that. I never had a negative experience as a result of that. I knew exactly where I went wrong. I blamed myself there and then. Fool me once, shame on you, fool me twice shame on me. If I get done in *Ẓuhr*, my *ʿAṣr* is not getting done. Believe me. I'm not getting played like a kipper in my *ʿAṣr*. This is not doubt, it's part and parcel of life.

I don't want to celebrate it, celebrate it, but my point is that doubt is normal. The Prophet ﷺ recognises it as normal. We shouldn't make it abnormal. When it happens, we kick into action, we kick our process into action, and we fix it. *Waswās* is to be ignored. Nobody prays the perfect prayer. Nobody should be thinking that at the end of the prayer, '*That was poor I need to do it again*.' What makes you think that anybody has a prayer that they are happy with? If the justification is because I'm not happy with it, then it's game over, isn't it? Nobody's prayer is great. So, those are a few statements around doubt.

---

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 571 a.*

Q & A

Q (online): When you say doubt is a beautiful thing, you don't mean doubt in one's faith surely? You mean it within the context of legitimacy of ones *ʿibādah* right?

A: Of course I don't mean it in an unrestricted form. And I don't even mean it within the legitimacy of one's *ʿibādah*. I'm saying that doubt is a beautiful thing to save people from *waswās*. That's what I want to say. I want to say that everybody suffers from *waswās*. And if you actually suffer from doubt, legitimate real doubt, you will cling to that because of its contradistinction to the *ḥarām* plaything of that scumbag *waswās*. Even though doubt is also from *shayṭān* or he plays on it rather. But doubt, legitimate, legal, that's what I mean. Maybe you're right, legitimacy. Maybe that's why you used the word legitimacy, but legal doubt.

Q (online): If a person starts the second *sūrah* in the *rakʿah* but then doesn't recall if they recited *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* or not, do they go back to do it? I think they would have to because they missed a *rukn* if they were more than 50% sure they did not recite it. And do they make *sajdatʾl-sahw* at the end before or after *taslīm*?

A: In this scenario, if you were pretty sure that you had missed *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* and it doesn't matter where you would be, let alone in that scenario, then you would go back and you would recite the *Fātiḥah*. In this scenario it would be considered an addition because whenever you miss a *rukn*, it is by definition understood that you missed it and have to go back to it, which means that you have to add actions which is why you have to do the *sajdatʾl-sahw* after the *taslīm*. Ironically in your scenario, you haven't actually moved to another *rukn*. You are still standing, in the *Fātiḥah* position, in a *sunnah* act, which is the reciting of the *sūrah*. In this scenario, you should do the *sajdatʾl-sahw*. You should do it afterwards but if you did it before, no one would make a point of it. Meaning it is okay to do it before or after but in principle, it should be after.

Q (online): We have been mentioning Allāh ﷻ to my kids since they were very little. For example, your clothing is from Allāh ﷻ, say *alḥamdulillāh*, etc. So now at the age of three
(1:20:00) and four years, our kids sometimes while they are playing between themselves out of nowhere say incorrect things about Allāh ﷻ. For example, Allāh ﷻ went to sleep, He is wearing white clothes, etc. While I am happy that He is on their minds most of the time *alḥamdulillāh*, I am so confused if I should stop them every time I can overhear them and make it a teaching point? Or just ignore till they actually say it to me?

A: No, I think that you should make it a teaching point. There is no reason why you would wait just for it to be said to you because it is just a point that needs to be made. Allāh ﷻ is not like us. Allāh ﷻ is the One who made us. Allāh ﷻ doesn't go to sleep like we got to sleep. Allāh ﷻ doesn't need to be described in this sense or that sense, etc.

You just keep repeating that. There is not a maximum number of times that you can repeat that. I don't think there is any problem. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): An omitted *rukn* that led to additions, *sajdat'l-sahw* after *taslīm*. But an omitted *wājib* that one was able to return to, but it led to an addition, *sajdat'l-sahw* is still before. Why doesn't the principle of original mistake apply to the omitted *rukn*?

A: Correct. What's 'original mistake'? I don't know what that means. By the way, the reason that we have this differentiation is because when the Prophet ﷺ forgot the act, this is how he ﷺ did it, before the *taslīm*.[1] And when he ﷺ forgot a *rukn*, he ﷺ did it after the *taslīm*.[3] That's the reason.

Q (online): If I'm reading a three-unit prayer and in the first sitting of *tashahhud* I read up to the *taslīm* then realise I need to stand up, do I need to do a *sajdah* at the end?

A: Very good. There are some scholars, like the Ḥanafis are very strict on this issue. According to the Ḥanābilah, there is no problem. According to our class position, there is no problem. You do not need to do a *sajdah*.

Q (online): Why do we so clearly make a distinction for the *sajdah* before (for forgetting) or after *taslīm* (for adding)?

A: Only because the *ḥadīth* do so. Once the *ḥadīth* indicate the Prophet ﷺ did it before, did it after, that's the only reason. And despite that, the scholars then considered it still to be something flexible because they didn't all agree on what the reasonings were.

Q (online): What if I know for sure that I made an addition in *Ẓuhr* after *Maghrib*, due to someone telling me and then making me sure? Do I repeat all the prayers to maintain order?

A: No. I don't think you need to repeat all the prayers to maintain order. You just have to do your *Ẓuhr* again.

Q (online): When you do *sajdah* before *taslīm*, do you just read *tashahhud*, *durūd*, etc., and then do two *sujūds* and then *taslīm*?

A: Correct. That's our class position. The Ḥanafis say though that you should.

---

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 573 a.*

Q (online): When one is memorising Qurʾān or doing *tasmīʿ* of Qurʾān to a teacher, is it necessary to do the *sajdatʾl-tilāwah* every time?

A: No. Once for the session is sufficient.

Q (online): If I wonder whether I did one *sajdah* or two, is this doubt or *waswās*?

A: It depends whether it is likely or not. If you are just sitting there wondering to yourself then of course it is *waswās*. If you genuinely have reason to believe that for some reason you didn't do it then it's okay.

Q (online): I am not hardcore Ḥanafi, but my husband is. So, if I go by my class positions in almost everything except where he wants Ḥanafi ruling to be followed? I don't want to hop here and there for rulings, but I can't be hardcore Ḥanafi. That's just not me. And I also want to keep him happy.

A: That's a tough one. This idea that I should drop my *fiqh* position because of my husband, there is basis for it because if *fitnah* occurs as a result of it because of ignorance, then that legitimately allows you to change your *fiqh* position. But *fiqh* shouldn't be disrespected that much as well. So, it's flexible to the level of *fitnah*. But we shouldn't just assume. Normally we'd say for our dad who is going to write us out of the inheritance, or elderly, or ignorant, etc.

Q (online): We are the only Muslim-led medical aid charity operating in the area. The majority of beneficiaries are Muslims as is our coordinator. If our coordinator married the volunteer Islamically before any intimacy occurred between them then he hasn't broken our code of conduct if we interpret it Islamically, so then we couldn't reprimand him for that.

A: It is not your job or even Islamically correct for you to work out whether there were relations or not before he got married to this other girl. I just wouldn't go there. And I see no problem in you not doing any reprimand or reprimand which is on paper or reprimand which is private. Reprimand is a big word. You could bring him in and give him a good shout down and say this is disgraceful, etc. But the Muslims are then going to lose out, if you kick him out or kick the girl out or kick the family out.

I go back to my answer, the people should be protected primarily. The charity's interest should come second. And then the Islamic side, which doesn't really have an involvement for you. I have no problem with you not punishing anybody here. It is not exactly a punishable offence.

18. Chapter 20 Lesson 13: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

We are at the top of page 380:

ومَن شَكَّ في عَددِ الركعاتِ أَخَذَ بالأقلِّ

Whoever doubts the number of units (they have prayed), should consider it to be the lesser number.

I think we did this last week. We did a poll and we agreed that this is the main kind of problem that everybody has: When you are in the prayer you are just not sure whether you are on your third or your fourth *rakʿah*, or second or third, if it is like a lesser one than that. So, that is the issue. So, what do you do?

You take from the lesser of the two numbers because that is the one you are sure of.

The Prophet ﷺ said in the *ḥadīth*:

إِذَا شَكَّ أَحَدُكُمْ فِي صَلاَتِهِ فَلَمْ يَدْرِ كَمْ صَلَّى ثَلاَثًا أَمْ أَرْبَعًا فَلْيَطْرَحِ الشَّكَّ وَلْيَبْنِ عَلَى مَا اسْتَيْقَنَ ثُمَّ يَسْجُدُ سَجْدَتَيْنِ قَبْلَ أَنْ يُسَلِّمَ

"When any one of you is in doubt about his prayer and he does not know how much he has prayed, three or four (*rakʿah*), he should cast aside his doubt and base his prayer on what he is sure of then perform two prostrations before giving salutations."[1]

That is the meaningful piece of knowledge. There are two learning points: (1) that when you have some doubt about, '*Is it this or that?*' you go with that which you are sure of. You do not go based upon the doubt, you go with that which you are sure of, which is obviously the lesser number, and (2) you are going to make the two *sajdah* to

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 571 a.*

cover the doubt aspect (we will come to that in a second) and that is going to be before the *taslīm*. And that is because obviously the lesser number is absolutely certain.

والقاعدة: أن ما شُكَّ في وجوده فالأصل عدمه

And there is a *qāʿidah fiqhiyyah*: Whatever is doubted, whatever's existence is doubted, whatever you doubt has occurred, it should be assumed that it is absent. That which is doubtful in its occurrence or doubtful that it occurred, then the basic principle or the status quo is that it is absent. I cannot think of how to translate that very neatly right now, but what I am basically saying is that anything which you are not sure whether you have done or not then the basic principle is it has not happened. That is basically what the *qāʿidah* is.

It is much easier to explain than to get the perfect one sentence, but basically if you are praying and you are not sure if you prayed three or four, well you are not sure about the fourth. And if you are not sure about that which has not happened, then the basic principle is that it has not happened. We should only assume something has happened if we are sure it has happened, because it is in the future. We are absolutely sure that we have done the third. It happened. It is in the past. We have done it. So, its presence is certain. The fourth is something we are not sure about. Now, when you are not sure about something which is an addition to what has already occurred i.e., we are not sure about a present or a future event and we are not sure about it, the *qāʿidah*, the maxim is that it did not happen because it is in the present and in the future. So, if you are not sure it happened, then the basic principle is that it did not happen. That is a *qāʿidah fiqhiyyah*. You always apply this maxim.

Student (online): Certainty takes certainty over doubt?

Ustādh: All of this certainty overtakes doubt, that is a different *qāʿidah*. We are not translating that, that certainty is not overtaken by doubt. That is a different *qāʿidah*. We are not translating that. That's not what we are talking about, although of course it means the same thing, or this is a consequence of that mother *qāʿidah*. That is one of the major *qāʿidahs* of Islam, one of the major maxims.

So, if you have three or four not sure, then you go with three.

This is something which is very important which Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn makes and the Ḥanbali school and a number of the other scholars and certainly our class position will differ because of what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is going to say. He says that what the apparent position of our author is, is that it is very black and white and very straightforward, and he does not add nuance or caveats—according to what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says. He says that according to our author there is no difference between a

person who has doubt and is not sure and has doubt and then he thinks that he has got the right answer.

Now, when we have doubt about something and you have a little think about it… So, if I am now praying *Ẓuhr* and I stand up and I am now not sure, '*Am I in my third or I am on my fourth?*' And I am now not sure at all. There are two ways that this is going to go—actually there are more than two ways but fundamentally let's start at this point. I cannot work it out. I try absolutely everything and I cannot work it out. So, the *ḥadīth* is clear. I assume that this is my third one and that I am going to now pray another one
(0:10:00) to make to make it my 'fourth' even if I have actually prayed four and that that will make it five (and we will come to that later). So, that is obviously one way.

The other way, what is going to happen is that I am praying and I am not sure three or four. Then I stop and I think, and I go back to my first and I remember what the *sūrah* was, and I then go to the second and I remember what the *sūrah* was, and then I think to myself, '*Hold on! I didn't read another one*.' And so by process of elimination, I'm now confident that I am in the right *rakʿah*. This is what we call *al-taḥarri (man taḥarra'l-mas'alah). Taḥarra,* he threw the situation around in his head, thought about it, reflected upon it, and he came to a decision. It's the same as *tarjīḥ, man tarajjaḥah*, the one who thinks about what is better, what is not, what's stronger, what's not, and I think this is *al-rājiḥ*, this is what I think is the stronger preponderant position.

So, the author has not actually differentiated between the two. He's actually said that if you've doubted, you've doubted, whether you've worked it out or not, it's all the same and the *sajdah* is always going to be before the *salām*. You're going to go straight for the two *sajdahs* before you do the two *salāms*.

Shaykh says:

وظاهر كلام المؤلِّفِ: أنه لا فَرْقَ بين أن يكون لديه ترجيح أو لا، فإذا شَكَّ؛ هل هي ثلاث أم أربع ورجَّح الأربع؟ يأخذ بالثلاث. أو شَكَّ هل هي ثلاث أم أربع، ورجَّحَ الثلاث؟ يأخذ بالثلاث. أو شَكَّ هل هي ثلاث أم أربع و لم يترجَّحْ عنده شيء؟ يأخذ بالثلاث. ففي الصُّور الثلاث سواء ترجَّح الناقص، أم الزائد، أم تساوى الأمران، على كلام المؤلِّف يأخذ بالأقل، وهذا هو المذهب

I am going to translate this literally to show you how interesting this is. He says that he doesn't differentiate between a person who is able to make that decision or not. For example, there's a person who's not sure: three or four? And then he thinks about it, then he says, *'Right this is four*.' Then another person who has a little think about it and he says, '*Three or four?*' And he is pretty sure that it's three. Or there's a person who says, '*I'm not sure whether I did three or four and I can't make a decision between the two*,' so then he takes the three.

If you look at these three scenarios, these are three different scenarios: (1) he thought about it and he was pretty certain (not certain) *ghālibʾl-ẓann,* he was pretty confident that he did less, (2) then in the other scenario, he thought about it and he was confident that he did more, meaning that he has actually done the right amount, or (3) both scenarios are exactly the same, he can't work it out.

According to the author, in all of these scenarios all of it is *shakk* and all have to be based upon 'taking' the minimum number. There is no messing about. You take the minimum number, and you have to make the *sajdah*.

The second approach to this problem of when you're not sure, and then you have a little think about it, is that:

أنه إذا شَكَّ وترجَّحَ عنده أحد الأمرين أخذ بالمترجِّح

If you have two positions and you're not sure about which one it is that is right, is it the third or the fourth? And you think about it and it becomes clear to you that actually one of them is right, that actually I have prayed three or I have prayed four, whether it is the lesser number or the higher number, it doesn't matter, but you're sure. Then you take the sure one. When I say 'sure', I mean the one you're more confident of. If you were sure you'd never be having this question. So, it's not about certainty. But you have *ghālibʾl-ẓann*, you did the math and, '*No, I think so. I think that that's the one*.'

Now, when you say 'I think' in English, it's because you pretty much think that that's the answer. It's not one that is doubt. It's not the one which is 50/50. In the 50/50, we've already said you have to take the lesser number. But we're now talking about: What if you are able to say, '*I'm pretty confident that this is actually the right one,*' that I know that it's three or I know that it's four. In this one you will go with the one that you think is the right one, that which is most likely.

What's the evidence for this position of going with the most likely and not just going with the lesser of the two numbers as the previous *ḥadīth* said?[1]

ودليل هذا القول :حديث ابن مسعود رضي الله عنه أن النبيَّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم قال فيمن شَكَّ فتردَّدَ هل صَلَّى ثلاثاً أم أربعاً قال:

The evidence for this position is the *ḥadīth* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﵁ that the Prophet ﷺ said concerning a person who prayed and wasn't sure whether he did three or four, he ﷺ said:

فَلْيَتَحَرَّى الصَّوَابَ، فَلْيُتِمَّ عَلَيْهِ ثُمَّ يُسَلِّمْ، ثُمَّ يَسْجُدْ سَجْدَتَيْنِ

"He should follow what he thinks is correct and complete his prayer accordingly and finish it and do two prostrations."[2,3]

This *ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ* and we call this in *fiqh*, the *ḥadīth* of *taḥarri*. It's a unique *ḥadīth* and it's an addition to what we have.

Now this is actually really interesting because a number of the scholars accepted this *ḥadīth* and said that now means that there is a new category of *sajdah*: (1) there is missing out something, (2) there is adding something, (3) there is doubting something and fixing it, and now a fourth category. This category is called *taḥarri:* having doubts but fixing the doubts yourself in the prayer, making the decision you actually know now where you are. And even in this scenario, we are going to do a *sajdah,* and this is the *ḥadīth* which is the evidence because the Prophet ﷺ said: "Let him work out what is right." He ﷺ did not say: '*Let him take the lesser of the two,*' or '*Let him take the one he's certain of*.' Therefore, we have two different paradigms.

Now, what's fascinating to me is what some of the Ḥanābilah themselves responded. This is the Ḥanbali position and it's not stating that. It's not differentiating it. It's like they're almost ignoring this *ḥadīth*. Now of course no *faqīh* ignores *ḥadīth* and certainly not the Ḥanābilah. Ibn Qudāmah, the imām of this *madh-hab*, said that this *ḥadīth*, the *ḥadīth* of *taḥarri*, is actually not a fourth category. It's not a subsection or a new category different to doubt, but rather this is the same doubt, the same ruling, of the previous *ḥadīth* but only for the imām. So, he specified this *ḥadīth* to only be applicable to the imām. And his point is that if you could make *taḥarri* you wouldn't have been in doubt in the first place. It is actually an interesting argument.

He says that the actual *ḥadīth* we need to go with is the *ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, *ḥadīth* number 571.[1] Abu Saʿīd al-Khudri ﵁ is the one who narrated this *ḥadīth*. Actually, I think it is narrated by Mughīrah ibn Shuʿbah ﵁ and a number of other Companions, the *ḥadīth* that if you are not sure three or four then you build upon that which you are certain of (which is the three) and then you just carry on praying and you make *sajdah* before the *taslīm*. The scholars said that's the only *ḥadīth* in the chapter. But this extra *ḥadīth* of the ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﵁ in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* as well, what this adds is only for the imām. Because now if he's in the prayer and they remind him, that's the only practical way that *taḥarri* can occur because otherwise he would be still in doubt. Otherwise, how is he going to work it out? The whole point is that he's in doubt. How does he know that he has fixed it? How does he know that his result of *taḥarri* is successful? It is an interesting argument.

(0:20:00)

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 a*.
[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: During the Obligatory Prayers One Should Face the Qiblah Wherever One May Be, ḥadīth no. 401*.

Anyways, the **<u>class position</u>**, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is saying no, none of that. This *ḥadīth* is making it very clear, if you are able to, you are able to. You have a little think about it, you work it out, '*Yeah, I'm okay. I'm all right*.' And so, in this scenario you then carry on with which one you are okay with. You have to remember that the previous scenario is you just don't know. And even when you're doing it, you still don't know.

So, my point is that imagine you have prayed four. And if you prayed four and you are not sure whether it's three or four, you assume it to be three (that's what the *ḥadīth* states), and even when you are doing the third one now again and then you're going to get up to a fourth one (because you're not sure), all the way through, you're still not sure. And even at the end you're still not sure. And that's what the *ḥadīth* is there for. You are not sure. Whereas, in the other *ḥadīth* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﵁, in this scenario you are sure. You weren't sure, but you've made up your mind and you've worked it out.

Now some of you might say, '*Well then what is he making sajdah for?*'

He is making *sajdah* because there was a portion of the prayer in which he wasn't sure. And for that period of doubt, for that deficiency in the prayer, he is making a *sajdah*. And the difference is that the *sajdah* is after the *taslīm*.

So, if a person doesn't know what he is praying, doesn't know where he's at and then just goes through the legal process, he's assuming the position of someone who has no idea and therefore he makes the two *sajdahs* before the *taslīm*.

If a person thinks about it and he works out with a good degree of certainty, enough, beyond reasonable doubt, that he knows what he is doing, he has worked it out, he will still make the *sajdat'l-sahw*, but he does not have to go on the lesser number. He goes with what he worked out. And then he also does the *sajdah*, but that's after the *taslīm*. He would say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [turning the head to the right], *Allāhu akbar* [goes into *sajdah* and in *sajdah* says], *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla,* [then comes up from *sajdah* saying] *Allāhu akbar,* [then goes back into *sajdah* saying] *Allāhu akbar,* [and while in *sajdah* says] *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla,* [then comes out of *sajdah* while saying] *Allāhu akbar,* [then turns the head to the right saying] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh,* [and turns the head to the left while saying] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*. That is what it means to be after the *taslīm*.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn summarises. He says therefore:

وهذا يدلُّ مع الحديث الأول على أن الشَّاكَّ له حالان:

When we combine these two *ḥadīth*, we understand that the *shākk*, the doubtful one, has two potential situations: (1) where he is able to try and work it out, he is able to do

taḥarri and he is able to beyond reasonable doubt choose a position between the two options, and (2) not able to do it:

الثانية :حال لا يمكن فيها التَّحري، وهي التي يكون فيها الشَّكُّ بدون ترجيح.

Can't work it out, completely lost. And he is basically going to act according to the doubt, he doesn't have the ability [to determine].

Student (online): So, in both opinions *sajdah* is after *taslīm*?

Ustādh: No. As I said, a person who has doubt always (as the *ḥadīth* says) [does the *sujūd'l-sahw*] before the salutation. Look at the *ḥadīth* [of Abu Saʿīd al-Khudri ﵁]—before giving salutation.[1] It's just when you don't know what's going on. You only do it afterwards when you do work it out in the prayer yourself what is going on.

Shaykh now gives a few examples.

مثال ذلك :رجلٌ صَلَّى وشَكَّ هل صَلَّى ثلاثاً أم أربعاً؟ ولكن ترجَّحَ عنده أنها أربع. نقول :اجعلها أربعاً؛ لأنَّه ترجَّح عندك، ثم سَلِّمْ، ثم اسجدْ سجدتين بعد السَّلام.

He says so for example, a person prays and he is not sure whether he prayed three or four, then he works out that it is four, '*This is my fourth rakʿah*.' So, we say right, well you are pretty sure so you now make it your fourth *rakʿah* you carry on. You've made *tarjīḥ,* you have made *taḥarri*, now give *salām* and now do two *sajdahs*.

وإذا ترجَّحَ عنده أنها ثلاث، يجعلها ثلاثاً، ويأتي بالباقي، ويسجد سجدتين بعد السَّلام.

If that same person says, '*Am I praying three or four? Am I praying three or four? Ah! It's three*.' So, he is now (unlike in the previous scenario where he was sure it was four so he carried on), he's worked out that it's actually three. So, I'm now going to carry on and make this my three and I'm going to now make my next one the fourth. So, he assumes it to be three, he continues and does another one for the four. And then he would then do exactly the same—he would give *salām* and make the two *sajdah* after this *salām*. That's the whole point.

Another scenario:

وإذا شَكَّ و لم يترجَّح عنده شيء، يأخذ بالأقل ويسجد سجدتين قبل السَّلام.

Same guy, three or four? Not sure. So, he's standing in that third one and he's not sure. He is praying *Ẓuhr*, '*Am I in my third or am I in my fourth?*' And he thinks about it, but he can't work it out. So, he says '*Okay*. *I can't work it out, so I have to take the safe side, I have to act according to the ḥadīth*.' So, he assumes it to be the lesser number. He assumes it to be three, he will add the fourth (regardless of what he has actually done in reality, that is how he will do it) and then he will do the *sajdah*. When? Before the *taslīm*.

Student (online): Why is the *sajdat'l-sahw* before the *taslīm* when not knowing and assuming the lesser number?

Ustādh: Because of the *ḥadīth* that I mentioned earlier on.[1] It's a text. There's no *ʿaql* to be applied. A person can try to find a wisdom behind it, but the *ḥadīth* is why we are doing it.

Student (online): Is there an approximate time to decide?

Ustādh: No, because you have to make it there and then. You can't stand there for hours. It has to be within the prayer. The decision obviously is within the prayer itself. It's not something which is happening outside of the game.

Student (online): When a person makes *taḥarri* the *sajdah* is after *taslīm*, and when a person is in doubt the *sajdah* is before *taslīm*. Is this correct?

Ustādh: Correct.

Student (online): Do you still make *sajdah* even if you know 100% that you have worked it out?

Ustādh: Correct. Even if you achieved 100%, the reason that you're making the *sajdah* is because you had a moment of doubt. You stopped, you paused, you had to think about it, and then you worked it out. Because otherwise, everyone is counting. Everybody is thinking, '*Is this second? Yeah. Is this my third? Yeah.*' That's normal, working out. That's not what we're talking about at all. Everybody is like, '*Is that two? Yeah, that's two*. *Is that three? Yeah, that's three.*' That's not doubt.

I'm talking about you standing there and you're like, '*I don't know whether this is my third or my fourth. Am I on my third or fourth or what?*' And you stop and you have doubt, and then you fix it. Then it's okay.

بقي عندنا مسألة، وهي هل يفرَّق بين الإِمام والمنفرد والمأموم، أو هم على حَدٍّ سواء؟

So, Shaykh says: We have an issue that remains (and I've already said what Shaykh has said): Do we make a differentiation between the imām and the one who is praying by themselves or the follower? Or are they all the same?

And as I said, some of the Ḥanābilah did make that difference. They said, as Ibn Qudāmah said, that the only way you're going to be able to make *taḥarri* is if someone helps you. And that makes sense and that's right. But anyway, Shaykh says the *ḥadīth* of Ibn Masʿūd ﷺ is talking about something in general.[2,3] That person goes upon what is more likely, and they should be confident about that. And that should therefore apply whether a person is imām, or whether he's *maʾmūm*, or whether he's praying by himself.

So therefore, I want you to know that that is the **<u>class position</u>**. Regardless of whether you're imām or whatever, if you work it out, then you will do the *sajdah* after the *salām*.

Shaykh now says, let's look at a couple of example scenarios:

مسألة :إذا جاء والإِمام راكع فكبّر للإحرام، ثم رَكَعَ، ثم أشكل عليه :هل أدرك الإِمام في الرُّكوع، أم رَفَعَ الإِمام قبل أن يدركه؟

He says: If a person were to arrive at the *masjid* and the imām is in *rukūʿ*, and the *maʾmūm* (the follower) says *Allāhu akbar* (*takbīratʾl-iḥrām*) and then *Allāhu akbar*, he goes into *rukūʿ*, and now he becomes stressed. He doesn't know whether he caught the imām in the *rukūʿ* or not because he was seeing some movement, he thinks that maybe as soon as he got down, did he make it or not? Did he catch him while the imām was still there or roughly in the *rukūʿ*, or did he see the movement and as he was going down did the imām stand up straight? Did he move on to the next part? Basically: Have I caught the *rakʿah*? '*Have I caught the rukūʿ so that I've caught the rakʿah?*' That's what he's now thinking.

According to what the Ḥanbalis say, he's to ignore this *rakʿah*. This *rakʿah* has not been caught.

فعلى ما مشى عليه المؤلِّف لا يُعتدُّ بها؛ لأنه شَكَّ هل أدركها أم لا؟ فيبني على اليقين، وهو أنه لم يدركها، فيُلغي هذه الرَّكعة.

(0:30:00) He's actually doubting whether he actually caught it or not. And because he's doubting whether he caught it or not, because that doubt is there, across the board, he has to take the 'certain' position. The 'certain' position is that of course: That which he knows for certain is that he didn't catch it. The doubt is whether he did catch it or not.

So according to the Ḥanbalis, in this scenario, because you have doubt you have to assume the certain one, the lesser one. The fact here in this scenario is that you didn't catch the *rukūʿ* in time. So therefore, he is now one *rakʿah* down. He will have to stand up after the *ṣalāh* and make up one extra *rakʿah*.

But according to our position, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position, the **class position**, and a number of other scholars, if he now has this doubt, he has to think about it. He thinks about it and he goes with what is likely:

وعلى القول الثَّاني :وهو العمل بغلبة الظَّنِّ

We'll say, do you think it's more likely that you caught the imām in the *rukūʿ* or not?

If he says, '*Yes I do think I caught him*,' then we say that *rakʿah* is to be assumed for you. You caught it. If you think you caught it, you say, '*Yes, I think I caught it. That's what I think. I am not 100% certain, but I am 70, 80, 90%... I'm there*.' So, the point is he has now caught the *rakʿah*.

The next question is: Should he now make *sajdah* or not?

We have already said that if this person is praying by himself or he is the imām, then we have already intimated that at the personal, individual level he will now have to make *sajdah* after the *taslīm* because he had a think about it, he came to a preponderant position, and therefore he carries on, and he makes *sajdah* after the *taslīm*.

But now he is behind an imām. If you are behind an imām the rules change. We will come to that later. The question is being posed now (but we'll answer it in maybe one- or two-weeks' time): Does he make *sajdah* by himself or not?

And you will find out that it's actually not obligatory for him to make that *sajdah* because the imām covers these kinds of scenarios. The only time that you need to do *sajdah* (as I said we will go into details later) is if you completely miss something from the prayer.

If the same guy thinking about it in the prayer says, '*It is more likely I didn't catch him*.' Therefore, we will say to him, if that is what you think is more likely then you cannot include that *rukūʿ*. That is what you have to go with. That therefore means you have now no *rakʿah* in the bank and after the *ṣalāh* finishes, when the imām gives *salām*, you

are owing one *rakʿah* because you are one *rakʿah* down because you were one *rakʿah* late because you didn't catch the *rakʿah* because you said you didn't catch him in the *rukūʿ*. So now you are going to stand up. You are going to act upon as if you didn't catch it because that is what you said was most likely.

Now the same question is to be asked (which again will be answered in a couple weeks' time): Does this guy make *sajdah* or not?

He is behind the imām right? We just said a minute ago that there's some special rulings when you are praying behind the imām. The imām covers you. But in this scenario, he separates from the imām because the imām now goes home and this guy is now praying that one *rakʿah* by himself. So, is he in like a unique scenario?

The answer is he is in a unique scenario because he has separated from the imām and he will make *sajdah* at the end of his prayer.

The question is: Before or after the *taslīm*?

I think all of you should now be saying after.

Why?

Because he made *tarjīḥ* i.e., he had a little think about it, he worked it out, and he said, '*Right. This is what I am upon*.' And we said whenever you do *taḥarri,* you do it [the *sujūd'l-sahw*] after the *taslīm*. We'll come to that.

And in the scenario the guy cannot work out whether he caught the *rukūʿ* or not (he is *mutaraddid*, he's not sure), we build upon that which is certain which is that he didn't catch it, and therefore he completes the prayer and now he does *sajdah*.

When is he going to do the *sajdah*?

He is going to do the *sajdah* before the *salām*. This is of course the person who is praying by himself but also the one praying behind the imām. Why?

Because he actually separated from the *jamāʿah* because he now has to stand up and pray that one *rakʿah*. He is still there while the rest have gone. So, he is by himself.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn then says:

مسألة :لو بَنَى على اليقين، أو على غالب ظَنِّه، ثم تبيَّنَ أنه مصيب فيما فَعَلَ، فهل يلزمه السُّجود؟

So, if this person, he is in a doubtful scenario in the prayer, a three or four kind of situation, '*Am I on my third or am I on my fourth?*' And he thinks about it and then he works out which one he is in. Does he have to make the *sajdah*?

What we are saying is that he has worked it out and he has worked it out that he is right. That's what I mean. You might say, '*Hold on! That's the same as what you have been talking about.*' No. This is being a bit more specific. He is not sure whether he is in the third or the fourth, he stands up for the third, he's not sure whether this is third or fourth, but he realises he is in the third. He realises that what he thought it was, it actually is. So, he carries on. So, he has not actually done anything. Here he has not actually increased or decreased the prayer from a physical actions point of view. Is it obligatory for him to make the *sajdah*?

مثاله :رجل شَكَّ هل صَلَّى ثلاثاً أم أربعاً بدون ترجيح؟ فجعلها ثلاثاً، وأتى بركعة رابعة، لكنَّه في أثناء هذه الرَّكعة تيقَّن أنها الرابعة.

For example, a person is not sure whether he prayed three or four, so he turns it into three (because he is not sure, he is in doubt). So, he turns it into three and he stands up for the fourth, and when he is in the fourth, he then realises he is actually right, '*I was right. I did only pray three. And this me standing up and praying the fourth, this is the right thing that I am meant to do*'. Do I now have to make *sajdah*? Because basically it all worked out. I had some doubt. I worked it out. And it's now all worked out.

There are two positions in this issue.

The first he does not need to make *sajdah*.

And why is that? They said that:

لأنه تبيَّنَ عدم الزيادة والنقص

He was certain, he reached absolute certainty that there is no deficiency, there is no omission and there is no increase in the prayer. He is certain. That is basically what he has arrived at. And the *sujūd* is only obligated, the Shaykh says, if a person has omitted something but he hasn't omitted anything, and he definitely hasn't increased something.

I just want to make it clear in this example I have given he is absolutely certain just like when you are in the normal prayer. So, he had doubt now he is absolutely certain, and the *ḥadīth* says:

فَلَمْ يَدْرِ كَمْ صَلَّى

"And he does not know how much he has prayed."[1]

But this person does know. He knows. Certain. So, the first position is you don't need to do the two *sajdah*. And this is the position of some of the Ḥanbalis.

The second opinion is that he must make *sajdah* because of the same *ḥadīth*. The *ḥadīth* says if a person doesn't know then he should build upon certainty and then make *sajdah*. And at that moment at the beginning, he didn't know, as we said before. He didn't know. So, we are making him make *sajdah* for the part he didn't know.

ولأنه أدَّى هذه الرَّكعة وهو شاكٌّ، هل هي زائدة أم غير زائدة؟ فيكون أدَّى جزءاً من صلاته متردِّداً في كونه منها فيلزمه السُّجود.

He actually did this *rakʿah* whilst he was in a state of doubt, even if he later became absolutely clear. And Shaykh says:

وهذا القول دليله وتعليله قويٌّ، وفيه أيضاً ترجيح من وجه ثالث، وهو الاحتياط.

He said that this is what I find to be the stronger position from the evidence point of view because the *ḥadīth* says if he didn't know and he really didn't know. Also from the *ʿaql*, also it is the safer position as well the Shaykh says. So, it is definitely the one he is going to go with, and it is our **<u>class position</u>** as well.

What am I saying basically is that even if you become certain—now we are not talking about *taḥarri*… Obviously, you went through a process of *taḥarri*. Now normally when you do *taḥarri* you go with which is most likely. You are still not 100% certain, but you
(0:40:00) go with that which is most likely, and we said you make *sajdah* afterwards. But now we are saying that you actually did *taḥarri* but now you're certain it's all calm, everything is good, we didn't do anything, we actually came right back to where we were. No, no you're not getting away with that. We are going to make you do two *sajdah*. That is our **<u>class position</u>**.

The Prophet ﷺ said:

إِذَا شَكَّ أَحَدُكُمْ فِي صَلاَتِهِ فَلَمْ يَدْرِ كَمْ صَلَّى ثَلاَثًا أَمْ أَرْبَعًا فَلْيَطْرَحِ الشَّكَّ وَلْيَبْنِ عَلَى مَا اسْتَيْقَنَ ثُمَّ يَسْجُدُ سَجْدَتَيْنِ قَبْلَ أَنْ يُسَلِّمَ فَإِنْ كَانَ صَلَّى خَمْسًا شَفَعْنَ لَهُ صَلاَتَهُ وَإِنْ كَانَ صَلَّى إِتْمَامًا لأَرْبَعٍ كَانَتَا تَرْغِيمًا لِلشَّيْطَانِ.

"When any one of you is in doubt about his prayer and he does not know how much he has prayed, three or four (*rakʿah*), he should cast aside his doubt and base his prayer on what he is sure of then perform two prostrations before giving salutations. If he has prayed five (*rakʿah*), they will make his prayer an even number for him, and if he has prayed exactly four (*rakʿah*), they will be humiliation for the devil."[1]

This is one of the great *ḥadīth* in the *Sunnah*. It is a beautiful *ḥadīth*. I just want to spend a second on this. Look at the *fawāʾid* of this *ḥadīth*. First of all, Allāh ﷻ has created us with the propensity to doubt and that's okay. I mean it's one thing to be forgetful and in doubt, but we are forgetful and in doubt and it is okay for that to happen. And Allāh ﷻ has allowed for that. And Allāh ﷻ allows us to recover from that however often that happens. Obviously, if a person is instrumental in his mindlessness, heedlessness, doesn't care about the prayer, very lazy towards it, that's something else that's a sinful action. But a normal person, normal Joe Bloggs Muslim trying his best, Allāh ﷻ has accounted for that person. That's a beautiful blessing in this *ḥadīth*. Again, the *raḥmah* of Allāh ﷻ that He understands us, knows us and He is merciful to us because of that. Because of our true human nature.

The other thing which is really interesting. A lot of people get confused about: "If he has prayed five *rakʿah* they will make his prayer an even number for him." "They" is referring to the *sajdah*. So, for example if a person is praying *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr* and he stands up on the fourth *rakʿah*. So, he has done three and he stands up for the fourth *rakʿah*. And he stands there and he says, '*Is this my fourth or is it my third?*' And he thinks and he thinks and he can't work it out. What have we told him to do?

He has to assume it to be three. And so therefore, he is going to now pray another one, which means he is going to pray five. If he is not sure between three and four and he assumes it to be three, he then will then add another one, and it was actually the fourth one. He thought it was three he is going to pray another one to make it four in his mind. In actual fact he has ended up praying five. The Prophet ﷺ said that this person needs to make *sajdah* and the *sajdah* will turn the prayer into even. The *sajdah*, the two *sajdahs* will almost take the place of a *rakʿah*. They represent a whole unit of prayer. That is very interesting from a Qurʾānic point of view.

Also, we did this debate 2-3 years ago when we were talking about what is the sufficient

minimum that a person has to pray before the time runs out, that would be considered that he caught the prayer.† And that when you do an analysis of the *ḥadīth*, is it the *takbīr* which is sufficient or does he need to do the *sajdah* (both *sajdah*), or get up from the two *sajdah*? We prefer that position. But to get to the answer, to work it out, the process of working out which opinion you are going to choose, is linked to how you understand the word *sajdah*, *rukūʿ*, *takbīr*, *ṣalāh* and whether an aspect of the prayer can represent the whole of the prayer or an aspect of the prayer can represent a unit of the prayer.

So, in this scenario, these two prostrations are representing a whole unit. That is going to make the prayer even, which is itself an interesting benefit from the *ḥadīth* because we can therefore learn the prayer is never meant to be odd. It is always meant to be even, unless there is a text for an exception. That text is *Maghrib*, which is the only exception of the obligatory prayers, and that text is the *Witr* prayer, which is by definition odd—one *rakʿah*, three, five, seven, etc.

What some of the scholars said about this *ḥadīth* is that it is a proof that it is not allowed for a person, even in the general *nafl*, [to pray an odd *rakʿah* prayer]. [For example,] when a person just wants to stand up and pray for the sake of Allāh ﷻ, you want to give *ṣadaqah*, you want to say thank you to Allāh ﷻ, you want to show some *ʿibādah*, it's a really good habit is to stand up and pray. Some people think you can stand up and pray just one *rakʿah*. Why? Because this is not a specified prayer. There is no specific reason behind it. It is not a restricted prayer. It is an unrestricted, general, *nafl* prayer. Therefore, you do not need an intention—just stand up and knock a prayer out. Actually, this *ḥadīth* indicates that is not allowed. If you want to pray for no reason or general, it has to be two *rakʿah* bare minimum and only the *Witr* prayer is to be odd from the *sunnah* or *nafl* categories (which is what the Ḥanābilah consider the *Witr* to be, which we will come to later).

The other thing I really love about this *ḥadīth* is the end of it. The Prophet ﷺ is basically saying that you have to make *sajdah* anyways, whatever happens. Either that *sajdah* is going to make your odd units even, so you win, or you did actually pray four *rakʿāt*, plus two prostrations. We are now not going to consider these two prostrations to be a whole *rakʿah* to turn four into five. So, the five into six is only unique if you have actually prayed five. But if you got it right, and you have prayed four and you have done something so powerful, it is like as if you have prayed another *rakʿah.* You have slapped *shayṭān* in the face.

تَرْغِيمًا لِلشَّيْطَانِ

"A humiliation for the *shayṭān*."[1]

† The necessary minimum one must do of the prayer in order to catch the prayer within its prayer time was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 4, Chapter 15, Lesson 8, and Year 5, Chapter 15, Lesson 9. MT

You have really rubbed his nose in the dust. You have humiliated him. Because there is nothing on this planet that *shayṭān* hates as much as the *sajdah, insān* making *sajdah*, *bani Adam* making *sajdah*. Because that is what he was told to do. That is what he refused to do. And even if he tries to do it now, he is in the Fire forever and ever. His sole stated aim is to make sure that he makes as many people not make that *sajdah* and get Jannah as a result, that they refuse as well whether out of arrogance, or stubbornness, or ignorance, or stupidity, '*Let them not make sajdah so they can join me in the Hellfire*.' [This is] his number one stated aim. That is why the Prophet ﷺ praised the *sajdah*. That is why the Prophet ﷺ said one is closest to his Lord in the *sajdah* when they are praying.[4]

This is a *qāʿidah dīniyyah* by the way, that to infuriate *kufr* and the *kuffār* is a rewarded act. When we say that that does not mean that you go to your neighbor's and keep them up at night and keep ordering pizzas to their house just because they are *kāfir*. No! I mean those people who are actively trying to subvert you, actively trying to cause problems for you. For example, if you want a modern-day interpretation, to troll that dog Douglas Murray or Katie Hopkins, to irritate them, to release videos, to boil their brains and freak them out is actually an act of reward. That is *ḥadīth*. It will be considered for him *ʿamal ṣāliḥ*, an *ajr*. This is referring to those that are in war, causing problems, difficulties, harm to the Muslims, etc., and its *aṣl* is *shayṭān*. Whenever you get the opportunity to slap *shayṭān*, you should. Whenever he is causing you problems, giving *waswās*, causing some headache, you have the opportunity to really go at him and take him down, to say, '*You know what? I am not going to give him the satisfaction*.' You should have that as a stated aim.

(0:50:00) Then Shaykh says:

وإن شَكَّ في تَرْكِ رُكنٍ فكَتَرْكِه

If one doubts that they have omitted a pillar, it is considered as if it has been definitely omitted.

So, if a person is doubtful about whether he omitted a *rukn*, then it is to be assumed that he did. For example, a person is praying *Ẓuhr* he stands up for the second *rakʿah*. And now he has doubt whether he did two *sajdahs* or one.

We obviously spoke about the idea that a person goes back. If he has started the *Fātiḥah*, he writes that off, or whether he can go back or not. What we said was that a person is going to go back whatever happens unless he has arrived at that place again.

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: What Is to Be Said While Bowing and Prostrating, ḥadīth no. 482*.

So, we agree with the Ḥanābilah in this, that if you are not sure that you did the *rukn*, then it is like you knowing that you did not do it. It is the same. And you will go back now, drop into that sitting position and you will make that second *sajdah* unless of course you only remember if you find [yourself in] that position in the second *rakʿah*. You are in the second *rakʿah*, second *sajdah*, or first *sajdah*, and you realise at that moment, '*Oh my God! I didn't even do that second sajdah in the first rakʿah*.' Then you do it there. Or in our example here, you are not sure, and you are doubtful, '*Did I do it?*' So, doubt, according to the Ḥanbalis in *arkān* is like as if you have left it. It is like it is gone. It is like you omitted it. *Katarkihi yaqīnan*.

وإِنْ شَكَّ فِي تَرْكِ رُكْنٍ فَكَتَرْكِهِ

Whoever doubts about the omitting of a *rukn* it is like he did. It is a done deal. It is done. It is gone. Again, because of the same principle:

لأن الأصل عدمُ فِعْله

Because the basic status quo is that you did not do the action unless you are absolutely sure of it.

However, what will we add different to the Ḥanābilah?

We will add that: If you stop and think about it and you realise that you did get it right (so you do the *tarjīḥ* and you worked out that you did do it), then the correct opinion is you carry on according to what you think is more likely. You do not need to now go and do it just for the sake of doing it and you will have to make *sajdah*. When?

After the *salām* of course. Remember whenever you have to do *taḥarri,* you are going to make *sajdah* after the *salām*.

So, the first type of doubt was the doubt of the number of *rakʿāt*, the doubt of forgetting.

The second doubt:

القسم الثاني :الشكُّ في تَرْكِ الأركان

The second doubt is concerning the omitting of *arkān*.

The third example:

القسم الثَّالث :الشَّكُّ فِي تَرْكِ الواجب

Now you are doubtful whether you left out, you omitted, a *wājib*. And for here the Ḥanbalis say something very interesting they say:

ولا يَسْجُدُ لِشَكِّهِ فِي تَرْكِ واجبٍ أو زيادةٍ

There is no prostration required due to any doubt over whether he omitted an obligation or added anything.

There are two scenarios where actually, despite the doubt that you have you do not need to make a *sajdah* for it. You don't need to make up for it. You might say, '*Hold on! How does that make sense?*' That's actually big. We'll stop there.

Q & A

Q (online): I can't help but get the feeling that the *sajdah* before or after *taslīm* is coming down to the moment at which you realise an error was made, that if you make *taslīm* already and are sitting in the *masjid* then you complete the prayer. Another example: If you are 50/50 you do the *sajdah* before the *salām*. The *ḥadīth* can be all strung together that way.

A: No. I do not know of any scholar that said that. The *ḥadīth* are very clear in certain examples and they are relaxed in other examples, the ones that we have covered.

Q (online): What is the actual evidence to say *taslīm* is after when one doubted but managed to deduce?

A: That is the *ḥadīth* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﷺ that I read earlier on and I gave the reference to it. It is on page 381 on the commentary:

فَلْيَتَحَرَّى الصَّوَابَ، فَلْيُتِمَّ عَلَيْهِ ثُمَّ يُسَلِّمْ، ثُمَّ يَسْجُدْ سَجْدَتَيْنِ

"He should follow what he thinks is correct and complete his prayer accordingly and finish it and do two prostrations." [2,3]

This is called the *ḥadīth* of *taḥarri.*

Q (online): What about a person who repeatedly has the doubt between three and four?

A: This is *waswās*. This should not happen all the time. There is absolutely no doubt about that.

Q (online): What if the doubt is continuous *waswās* in every *ṣalāh*, do you still do *sajdatʾl-sahw* or do you ignore it?

A: This is *waswās*. You can't allow yourself to be in this situation. You have to now get yourself together and say I won't allow this. This is really only to be used for new original, real actual doubt, uncertainty over what is going on, when it happens, not this '*I am never aware*.' I mean that is just so stupid if you think about it. And that is how you have to think about it. You have to tell yourself, '*This is so stupid*.

When I have my breakfast. I know I have my breakfast. Why is it that suddenly when I enter into the prayer, I become sub-human? This is *shayṭān* and it needs a whole re-assessment of, '*I won't get played like this by this dog*.'

Q (online): While doing the second *rakʿah,* I was not sure if it is first or second *rakʿah* and assumed it is the first *rakʿah* and carried on. But by the third *rakʿah* (by assumption it was second), I worked it out that I am on the correct *rakʿah* i.e., third *rakʿah*. I did *sajdatʾl-sahw* before salutation. According to the lesson, it should be after the *salām*, correct? Do I have to repeat the prayer?

A: That is correct. And no, you do not [have to repeat the prayer]. We said very early on in this chapter that the scholars are agreed that when a person is fixing the problem in the right way, but they decide to do the *sajdah* before or after, meaning the wrong way around, that it is acceptable. The key is to do it. As for should it be before *salām* after *salām* is *mahalʾl-ijtihad*, it is a matter of discussion and difference of opinion amongst the scholars.

As I said, some *madhāhib* say it is only before like what one of the students said, that the only time it is after is if the prayer is finished. Some said it is only after. And those in the middle say it is a nuance, that there is some before, some after. But If you get it wrong, you do not need to repeat the prayer.

Q (online): Are we of the opinion that it is not complete without *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*? If so, then one will know if he got the *rukūʿ*?

A: Our **class position** is that you do not need to recite *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* if you are trying to catch a person in their *rukūʿ*.

(1:04:00) Q (online): Do you have a view on the use of *rakʿah* counters (or even hand clickers which increase by one increment each time it is pressed) so you can always see the count of which *rakʿāt you* are on or would this be disliked because of the possibility of dependence on it or possibility of becoming more mindless in the prayer? Does it make any difference if the forgetfulness is due to a mental state or medical condition?

A: Yeah, I have a view—completely disliked. Absolutely. Unless there is absolutely some very strong medical position or whatever. But we don't want to open that because once you open that.

Now with *ṭawāf*, we are a little more flexible because it's a one-off, it's very emotionally overpowering, people don't do it very often, it's a larger number, it's so long, etc. It's a bit different. Even then we shouldn't. Use your fingers. And also, you are allowed to move, you're allowed to talk. *Ṣalāh* is a protected act, happening every day. It's a nightmare if we open the door and tell people it's okay to carry it out.

Anyways, maybe. I just want to say, I like what you said, that you would 'let' that person. If he had early onset Alzheimer's or dementia, 'let' that person. I would agree with that. I would let that person if it were really causing them distress. But I wouldn't obligate it. When a person is in that scenario, Allāh ﷻ has pardoned a lot of what happens to these people. They just do their best. They shouldn't try to kill themselves over that kind of thing. We can allow them to use it.

Q (online): Is "enough" or "pretty sure" after *taḥarri*/working it out beyond reasonable doubt (95%+) or balance of probability (51%+)?

A: If you look, you'll see that we don't actually have a number for beyond reasonable doubt. I know I might have said beyond reasonable doubt, but if I said that then that is mistaken. I said *ghālibʾl-ẓann*. *Ghālibʾl-ẓann* means 51%, it's likely, i.e., quite likely. That's what we are trying to say.[‡]

Q (online): To clarify our class position, if one has doubt about how many *rakʿah* they prayed and then becomes certain when do we perform the *sajdatʾl-sahw*?

[‡] Levels of doubt were covered in *Logical Progression,* Year 3, Chapter 8, Lesson 10. MT

A: You do it after. Always, when you become certain, you become clear, you become confident. Whenever *tarjīḥ* and *taḥarri* is involved, after, after, after.

Q (online): What about using something like the *takbīr* beads for *tarāwīḥ*?

A: No, it's not good.

Q: (online): Can we use beads on the floor?

A: No. We are opening such a big problem.

Q (online): What if you know you did the second or strongly feel like you did the second *sajdah* do you still need to assume the lesser number? Also, I didn't do *sajdatʾl-sahw* due to *waswās* doing *taḥarri* due to a wrong understanding of *taḥarri*, do I need to repeat my prayers or is it forgiven due to my ignorance?

A: No. We have already said that. Once you have thought about it and you think, '*Yes, I think I did that.*' That's it. You've done it. But you do the *sajdatʾl-sahw* due to *taḥarri*.

And no, there is no repeating of the prayer (as we are going to come to) because, (1) when you don't believe something is required for *ṣalāh*, you don't need to then make up for it, (2) with the *sajdatʾl-sahw*, there is a separate section that we will come to later when it comes to forgetting it.

Q (online): According to the Ḥanābilah if one misses a *rukn* and they find out after the prayer they then make up the whole *rakʿah*, does that include starting with the *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*?

A: If you are right there and then, you just got up from the prayer, then you don't need to because you are still in the prayer. That's the whole point. So, *takbīratʾl-iḥrām* is not required. It's a *takbīratʾl-intiqāl* that you will be doing. You won't be starting again.

(1:11:30) Q (online): Ibn Qudāmah's interpretation of the *ḥadīth* of *taḥarri*, was that purely his logical deduction despite the Prophet ﷺ not specifying imām in his statement or was that narration contextually related to a mistake by the imām?

A: Well, it certainly was not contextually related. It was his own opinion. From the text in *al-Mughni*, he does not mention his *taʿlīl*. His *taʿlīl* is the logical statement which I explained in the class, that: How are you going to be sure when you had the doubt in the first place? He is always saying: You are still going to be doubtful. That is his

argument—if you keep doing it yourself. You are only going to reach *taḥarri*, a differing state to your doubt, if someone else helps you. That is his argument. Logical.

Q (online): If there are a few minutes left before *Fajr* and you manage to pray *Witr*, but once you have prayed *Fajr*, you realise you made a mistake in your *Witr*, so you re-do *Witr* after *Fajr.* Is that the right thing to do?

A: In my opinion, if you know that you messed up the *Witr* and you know that you should do it again, you should do it after sunrise. I do not think that you should do it after *Fajr*. You should do it after sunrise in the *Ḍuḥa* time. And Allāh ﷻ knows best. You can do it as an odd or even. Both positions have arguments. But we will cover that later.

Q (online): Did we regard the rising after *rukūʿ* as a pillar in and of itself, or a necessary movement?

A: My understanding is that it is a necessary movement. It is the position of Shaykh Saʿdi. Not a *rukn* in of itself.

Q (online): Could you please clarify when and how we would do *sajdatʾl-sahw* before *taslīm*?

A: For example, you are sitting there in your *ṣalāḥ*, you have done your [pre-*taslīm duʿāʾ*] and you finished your *ṣalāh* you are about to say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh,* but you do not. You just say *Allāhu akbar* [and go into *sajdah* and while in *sajdah* say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla,* [then come out of *sujūd* while saying] *Allāhu Akbar*. [Then while in the sitting position between the two prostrations say] *Rabbigh-firli Rabbigh-firli.* Then [go back into *sujūd* while saying] *Allāhu Akbar* [and while in *sajdah* say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*. [Then come out of *sujūd* while saying] *Allāhu akbar* [and say] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning your head to the right, and], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning your head to the left]. That is what it looks like when you do the *sajdatʾl-sahw* before the *taslīm*.

If you are doing it after the *taslīm*, like in the examples today that we covered in *taḥarri*, you come to the end of the prayer, [you say] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning your head to the right]. Just once. [And go into *sajdah* and while you are in *sajdah* you say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla.* You then come out of *sajdah* while saying *Allāhu Akbar*. Then go back into *sujūd* while saying *Allāhu akbar* and while in *sujūd* say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla, subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*. Then come out of *sujūd* while saying *Allāhu akbar* and say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* while turning your head to the right, and *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* while turning your head to the left.][1]

Q (online): How does a *ḥadīth* saying *sajdatʾl-sahw* makes the *ṣalāḥ* even, humiliate *shaytān* apply to *Maghrib*?

A: It does not apply to *Maghrib.* The humiliation of *shaytān* of course applies, but the five will not apply to *Maghrib.*

Q (online): When one becomes certain after doubt, they did not perform any *taḥarri*, but rather built upon the lesser number of *rakʿah*, why the *taslīm* after the *salām*?

A: Because they said that it is not the conclusion. It is the process. So, you came to certainty, but you came to it through the process of *taḥarri.* That is the reasoning. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): Does someone need to make up their prayer if they have not prayed for years?

A: My **<u>class position</u>** is that the answer is no. It is not even 'need'. It sounds horrible, but we tell folks who are in this scenario (with the wisdoms of course, we are speaking to students of knowledge here, I can speak openly) but no one deserves to be given the right to make up the prayer. Because the prayer is such an obvious obligation, such a basic obligation, that someone who turns away from the prayer, for whatever reason, they do not deserve that honour of being able to make it up. Now, the majority of scholars say that he/she has to make every single one up. The position of our class and a number of scholars, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn as well, for example, is that the time has gone. You do not have the chance. You have to make *tawbah*, a very powerful and sincere *tawbah*, and *istighfār* for that. Now, you need to compensate for it through *nafl* prayers. So, you increase in *nafl*, random *nafl*, here and there. That is our answer to that person who has not prayed in years. And Allāh ﷻ knows best. And they should jump to that straight away.

Q (online): If there is one minute left before sunrise, do we pray the two *sunnah* of *Fajr*?

A: No. You do not pray the two *sunnah* of *Fajr.* You go straight to the *farḍ* and get the *rakʿah* in. Never ever do you do that.

Q (online): If someone thinks that in past years their prayers were not correct due to lack of knowledge, her *ʿawrah* was exposed, do they repeat the prayers?

A: No, they do not. This is *al-ʿudhr biʾl-jahl*.

19. Chapter 20 Lesson 14: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

We are at the top of page 385. Last week we did:

وإن شَكَّ في تَرْكِ رُكنٍ فكَتَرْكِه

If one doubts that they have omitted a pillar, it is considered as if it has been definitely omitted.

Today we start with:

ولا يَسْجُدُ لِشَكِّهِ في تَرْكِ واجبٍ أو زيادةٍ

There is no prostration required due to any doubt over whether he omitted an obligation or added anything.

So, [according to the Ḥanbalis] there is no prostration required due to any doubt over whether he (a) omitted an obligation, or (b) added anything, *ziyādah*, meaning added anything to the prayer itself like an extra *rakʿah*, an extra *rukūʿ*, an extra *sajdah*.

So, according to the Ḥanābilah, there is no prostration required if you doubt that you left an obligation, or you doubt whether you added something to the prayer. The key word here is doubt. Obviously, if you know, then that's not the case.

ولا سُجودَ على مأمومٍ إلا تَبَعًا لإمامِه

There is no prostration for the follower, unless the imām does so.

We are going to go into that in detail. That is what is going to make up today's lesson. It's not an easy issue actually. Even for me. A long time I've not been comfortable with this scenario. We'll have a little discussion about that.

Let's start with what Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn starts with at the top of page 385 (quoting Imām al-Ḥajjāwi):

ولا يَسْجُدُ لِشَكِّهِ في تَرْكِ واجبٍ

There is no prostration required due to any doubt over whether he omitted an obligation.

Shaykh says so, for example if he is not sure, '*Did I say the tashahhud or not?*'

أي: لو شَكَّ في تَرْكِ الواجب بعد أن فارق محلَّه، فهل هو كتَرْكه فعليه سجود السَّهو، أو هو كفعله فلا سجود عليه؟

Meaning that after that moment has gone... So, we are talking about not during the moment. For example, this would be like if you are standing in the third *rakʻah* of *Ẓuhr* and you are thinking, '*Did I do tashahhud or not?*' Just like, right now. '*Did I stand straight up after my two rakʻah or did I after my two rakʻah do the tashahhud then I stood up?*' And I am in my *Fātiḥah* and I am reading, and I am not sure, and I am thinking, '*Did I do tashahhud or not? Did I do tashahhud or not?*'

The Ḥanbali school says that there is no *sajdah* because this is a doubt. And they said there is no *sajdah* (in *al-qawl'l-thāni*) because they said:

لأنه شَكَّ في سبب وجوب السُّجود وهو تَرْك التشهُّد، والأصل عدم وجود السبب فينتفي عنه وجوب السُّجود وهذا هو المذهب

The Shaykh quotes the Ḥanābilah. And there is difference of opinion even in the Ḥanbali school on this issue, let me just make it clear, let alone the other schools. Basically, he is saying that there is no reason to doubt the performance of the *tashahhud*. So, we should assume that the *tashahhud* should have been done because this is after the act. After the act, why would you consider that you left it out? You need definite.

You can see what they are thinking. And you might say, '*Well hold on! Why is this different to last week then? Why is this different to the concept of the pillars?*'

One of the explanations given by the Ḥanābilah is that they differentiate between the *wājibāt* and the *arkān* because they consider the obligatory nature of having to make a *sajdah* for missing a *rukn* because the *ḥadīth* talk about the *arkān*. [The *aḥādīth* are] with respect to the *arkān* only. It is not applicable to the doubt concerning the *sujūd*. Because if you think about the *ḥadīth* that we covered last week, the Prophet ﷺ said: "If he is not sure whether he prayed three or four…,"[1] so then he goes with the lesser.

Three or four what?

Units. Units are *arkān*. It is like big things. So, the Ḥanābilah are like: Listen. This is talking about the big things. It is not talking about a 'minor' (relatively minor) individual matters inside like a *wājib*. It is not talking about like a *wājib* and the *ḥadīth* is talking about the big things like the whole unit, like the *rukn*, the absolute fundamentals. So, this is actually some of the reasoning why they kind of differentiated between it.

(0:10:00) Another position (because this obviously has two opinions) is that: No. If you doubt that you missed the *wājib* i.e., that *tashahhud*, whilst you are standing in that third *rakʿah*, then:

الشَّكَّ فِي تَرْكِ الواجب كتركه، وعليه

The doubt that you have missed out your *wājib*, your *tashahhud*, is like you left it out because you doubted it and you have to do the *sajdat'l-sahw*. Obviously, you don't go back (we have already covered that).[†] You are not going to go back and do it again because we have said that when it comes to obligations, once you have moved on from its area then you don't go back. Whereas for *arkān* everything gets stopped right there, you go straight back to the *rukn*. That is the big difference of course. So, if you have doubted that you have missed the *wājib*, then that is basically like you have missed it. You are not going to go back, but afterwards you are going to do the *sajdah.* The *sajdah* of course, when I say afterwards, I mean after the prayer, I don't mean after the *taslīm*. It is going to be before the *taslīm* because:

- Whenever we miss out an obligation, we said it is before.
- Whenever we have doubt, it is before.
- Whenever we add something to the prayer, it is after.

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, hadīth no. 571 a.*

[†] Compensating for missing an obligation in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lesson 12. MT

- Whenever we have thought about the situation and then we are pretty sure we are okay, *taḥarri*, it is after the prayer.

Four scenarios. So, that is the position.

What is their evidence?

Their evidence is the principle that:

الأصل عدم الفعل

The basic principle is that you did not do the action. That is the *aṣl.* The status quo is you never did the action. And so if you doubt it, then you have doubted in something which the basic principle is that you never did it.

It is like seeing it the exact opposite to the other opinion, right? In the other way of looking at it, is that the *aṣl* is that you have done the action. There is no reason that you wouldn't have done the action.

So you see, this is actually very interesting for students of *fiqh* or maybe not so much students of *fiqh,* I think it is just an obvious point when you are learning it but for teachers it is a useful example to explain to the masses why scholars differ.

You know Yasir Qadhi messaged me the other day. He says to me, I need some *masāʾil* in which all the four Imāms differed, all the four Imāms had an individual opinion. He has good intentions of course, always has good intentions. It is his execution which is a disaster. His intention is to indicate to the students why you need to be tolerant. You know he is all about tolerance and unity and all that kind of *bakwās*. So, to show to people that we should be tolerant. And he especially wanted examples. Now obviously, I have hundreds of those because I teach *muʿāmalāt*. In *muʿāmalāt*, for example finances and contracts and things like that, it is very common to have all of the scholars have all different types of opinions. But he was asking for something far more difficult. He was not asking just for the fact that there are different opinions, but he wants to be able to show that they all have different opinions because of the way they looked at it i.e., because they differed in their *uṣūl*. Now that is a lot more difficult to find. A lot more difficult, let alone in *ʿibādāt* like this *fiqh*.

This is kind of an example, it doesn't produce four different opinions, but this is an example of how an opinion can differ from a fundamental point of view. Because there is not necessarily a direct explicit text that is going to be, '*That is for me. My text is for me, and your text is for you. I think the ḥadīth is authentic, you think it is weak*.' That is like an easy kind of thing. No. A much more nuanced kind of example that would be interesting to the public, to try and make them calm down and realise to respect all of

the *madhāhib* and the scholars, is when you show a person that: It is quite acceptable, don't you think, for you to think that the basic principle is that you haven't done an action? And therefore, if you haven't done an action because the basic principle is that we don't do actions, then if you have doubted that you have done the action, then that doubt should be given more strength because the basic principle is that you have not done an action. Because we don't do actions unless we actually will them into existence (getting philosophical about it).

Then on the other side, another scholar could turn around and say: But we do these actions all the time. And you have moved on from that moment. And you do not normally miss it out. And once the action is there, we would need more than just a doubt to tell us that we have not done it because the normative position is that we are doing it. The normative position is that I would always do it. The normative position is that there would need to be a damn good reason for me to not do it or have not done it.

So, depending upon how you start, you come at two completely different rulings. This is like one of those examples, except that it only produces two. To find differing in your approach to lead to four different individual opinions is incredibly difficult. I gave some examples: the position of the hands in the prayer, the movement of the finger in *tashahhud*—although these are not great. They are four opinion examples, but they are not the perfect, golden example of four opinions with differing on *uṣūl*. In some of these four differing positions of the Imāms, the *uṣūl* is pretty similar, but it is differing on *ḥadīth* and availability of *ḥadīth* and interpretation of *ḥadīth*, which of course is a version of differing in *uṣūl*, but not like the example that I just gave, which is a really good example. [Another example:] the minimum number of people required for *Jumuʿah*—they have four different positions. These were the ones that I took off the top of my head. In *muʿāmalāt* there are so many, but he is not interested in *muʿāmalāt*. He was not interested in *muʿāmalāt* because he says that people are bored with *muʿāmalāt*. They do not find it exciting and interesting because they do not understand it. So, giving a really good kind of example comes across as highbrow, like it is above the level.

So, these are the two approaches.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn does not agree with either opinion. He says that our opinion has already been established—we go by *ghālib'l-ẓann.* We do not believe in this concept of *shakk*, or x, or y, or z. It is enough for us to believe with some level of probability, i.e., likely. I keep mentioning 'beyond reasonable doubt' but then one of the students made 'beyond reasonable doubt' like 95%, and I do not know what the evidence for that is. I do not think 'beyond reasonable doubt' is 95%. I thought it was between 55-60%, 70%, 80%. I don't know. My point is that it is not 50/50. You are 'likely', is what I want to basically say. Whatever you think to be more likely is what you go with.

Anyway, he still wants to make a comment on these two positions. He says that actually the correct approach is this latter one, which is that you say that if you doubt in the actual action, the *aṣl* is that you have not done it. So, if you have doubt, then it should

be taken seriously. Shaykh says that is the correct thinking. But that is not going to give the correct answer because doubt does not mean anything. You must have some kind of *ghālib'l-ẓann.* That is why Shaykh says at the bottom of the page:

وإذا أخذنا بالقول الراجح

If we take the more correct position, and that is to follow what you think is likely.

فإذا غلب على ظنك أنك تشهدت فلا سجود عليك

So, if you are pretty sure that you did do that *tashahhud*, then you do not need to make a [*sujūd'l-sahw*].

Remember this is after the place of the *tashahhud*, and it is only for an obligation. This is why I said that this is quite confusing. If this were a *rukn*, it would be a different matter. But because it is an obligation and you do not need to go back to it, that is the fundamental point. This is not *taḥarri* as such. This is not *taḥarri* because you do not need to make a big shout about whether to make a move or not, a fundamental move.

(0:20:00) The **<u>class position</u>** is: If you believe, more so than not, that you did do the first *tashahhud* whilst you were standing in the third *rakʿah* you are thinking, '*Did I do it? No, I did do it*,' [then] you have no *sajdah* you just move straight on. You have gone past it anyway. There is no *sajdah* at the end of the prayer.

Secondly:

وإن غلب على ظَنِّكَ أنك لم تتشهَّد فعليك السُّجود، والسُّجود هنا يكون قبل السَّلام؛ لأنه عن نقص، وكلُّ سجود عن نقص فإنه يكون قبل السَّلام.

If it is more likely to you that you did not perform the *tashahhud*, then you will need to make a *sujūd*, and the *sujūd* here is going to be before the *salām* because this is you doubting whether you missed an obligation. So, you are assuming that and you think that that is right, that you did miss this obligation. Therefore, when you miss an obligation, the *sajdah* is before, because this is deficiency. Deficiency is only going to be in the obligations. It can never be a deficiency in *arkān* because as I said before, if you ever miss out a *rukn,* you have to go back and do it again anyway which means that you end up adding. There is a sum cumulative adding to the prayer. That is why *sajdat'l-*

sahw is always after the prayer, even though you miss out the *rukn*, in principle. But then you go back to it and you do it which means you have done extra ups and downs and x's and y's, so more to the prayer. Therefore, it is going to be at the end, after the *taslīm*. So, every *naqṣ* is going to be beforehand.

We can summarise it by saying: '*Sorry doubt, you missed your boat mate! Later!*' It is too late now to be messing around with me. But if you are sure that you have missed something, or you did something after the time has gone, there is no *sujūd* for it (after the time, meaning that you have moved past that position) and of course, we are talking about obligations.

Student (online): The *madh-hab* is because you have doubt on it or not, you missed a *wājib*. You, in essence, have doubt in the condition that obligates the *sujūd*, and since the *aṣl* of that condition does not exist, then you do not do the *sajdah*.

Ustādh: Correct. That is the position of the Ḥanbali school.

Our **class position** is as long as you think that it is more likely, then you do it. If you do not think that it is more likely you have not missed it, then you do not make the *sajdah*. And that *sajdah* is going to be before *taslīm*.

Student (online): What if you are still 50/50?

Ustādh: If you are in doubt, then you need to consider it. If you are 50/50, '*Did I do it or not*?' and you have no preponderance whatsoever and then you assume that it is not done. You assume the ruling for doubt. So, 50/50 I don't know. I have a solution for this. When I don't know I make the *sajdah* before the *taslīm* at the end, basically going along with that position. See, what the Ḥanābilah are basically saying, they are putting forward that anything other than certainty is going to be doubt. We are saying no. There is a position in between that we believe that something is more likely. We believe in that position. And based upon that, even though we are not certain about something, we will either do the *sajdah* or not do the *sajdah* according to what we feel the preponderant likely position to be.

The second part is, *aw ziyādah*, at the top of page 386. So now we are talking about increasing in the prayer.

أو زيادةٍ

Or added anything.

أو زيادة أي: لو شك هل زاد في صلاته فيلزمه سجود السَّهو، أو لم يزدْ فلا سجود عليه فإنه لا يسجد، لأنه شَكَّ في سبب وجوب السُّجود، والأصل عدمه.

According to the Ḥanbalis if he doubts that he has added to the prayer, there is no *sajdah*. That is the Ḥanbali position. Why?

Because the *aṣl* is that you haven't done that increase, so why would you? The *aṣl* is that you haven't increased the prayer and you're doubting whether you have increased the prayer, so ignore it. That is basically the Ḥanbali position. And this of course is now more than just obligations. This is to do with everything in the prayer, *arkān*, serious matters in the prayer.

So, the Shaykh gives an example:

شَكَّ في التشهُّدِ الأخير من صلاة الظُّهر هل صَلَّى خمساً أم أربعاً؟

He is there sitting in the last unit of *ṣalāt al-Ẓuhr*, in the fourth *rakʿah* in the final *tashahhud* about to call it a day. Suddenly he says, '*Have I prayed four or five?*' He definitely knows that he has prayed four, but he actually thinks that he might have increased it by one. So, he is doubting in an increase. That's what it means by doubting in an increase. That's the scenario.

So, what's the position according to the Ḥanābilah?

The Ḥanābilah are saying there is no *sajdah* upon him. There is no *sajdah* to do:

لأنَّ الرَّكعة انتهت على أنها الرابعة بلا تردُّد، وإنما طرأ عليه الشَّكُّ بعد مفارقة محلِّها، والأصل عدمها.

The minimum number of the two is four and there is no doubt about that. So, he has no doubt in his mind that he has definitely prayed four. And now that he knows that he has definitely prayed four and the possibility is that he has prayed five, but he has already gone past the point of making some adjustment or not—that's important. He has gone past the moment. If he was coming up from the third and standing up and thinking, '*Is this my fourth or fifth?*' That's something else. He is in the moment. But now he has actually finished the fourth and he is doubting whether he has prayed four or five. But he knows for a fact that he has actually prayed four and he has gone past the point of 'no return', as such. And therefore, he should apply that principle that the basic *aṣl*, the status quo, is that he hasn't done another action. He hasn't increased it. The

basic status quo is the absence of an extra unit. That is what you should assume. So, he assumes that and therefore there is no *sajdah*. That's the Ḥanbali position, that's why you don't make a *sajdah* if you have a doubt about an increase.

Unlike last week which was you having a doubt of a decrease. '*Did I pray three or four?*' And then you are having to make a decision and normally going for the lesser one and then adding, you are doing serious changes, and you are in the moment to sort it out. How are you going to sort out four or five when you're not even sure if you have prayed five? It's a different scenario. This is a unique scenario. It is a good example.

So, you discard your *shakk*, you throw away your doubt, you don't even make *sajdah*. You say, '*Listen. I don't know whether four or five. Who knows? But I have definitely prayed four. That's the main thing.*' Ignore this five behaviour and just finish the prayer. No *sajdah*. That's the Ḥanbali position.

Shaykh continues:

فإن تيقَّن أنه صَلَّى خمساً، فهنا يجب عليه السُّجود للسَّهو؛ لأنه تيقَّنَ أنه زاد، فيجب عليه سجود السَّهو.

But if it becomes absolutely certain that he prayed five… So, he is now sitting there in what he thinks is the fourth *rakʿah* and he now counts and he counts and he sees himself moving up and down, and he realises the amount of times he got up after the first *tashahhud* and he sees three. Then he says, '*Oh my God! I have prayed five*.' So, now he knows he has prayed five. Now he has to make *sujūd'l-sahw.* And that's going to be after because he has added something to the prayer, and he knows he has added to the prayer.

And in fairness the Ḥanbali position is not talking about that. The Ḥanbali position said "doubt", if he has doubt about it. But here now what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is adding here: If you are certain, then you do need to make that *sajdah*.

So, there are a number of scenarios that come out of this, or examples that we can give.

So, for example, the first scenario:

الحال الأولى :إذا شَكَّ في الزيادة، ثم تيقَّنها فيجب عليه السُّجود؛ لأجل الزيادة.

If a person is doubting whether he increased or not, then he realised that he did. So, he thought about it, '*Have I done four or five?*' Thinks, thinks… And he is at the end of the fourth. That's the main point.

Student (online): What do we mean by 'he's past the moment'? He's too far from the completion of that fourth *rakʿah*?

Ustādh: We have been using 'past the moment' in the last couple of months talking about the prayer zone after the prayer has finished and you have moved away, and there is a time and physical dimension to that 10-15 minutes out in the car park, in the car. We have been speaking about that. That is not what we are talking about here now.

When we are talking about past the moment, we are talking about in the prayer, to make a difference about that, that point, to be able to fix it. So, for example past the moment if you are about to miss your *tashahhud*, you are about to stand up, is as I said to you the **class position** is that if you are closer to sitting down then you are standing up then you are still in the moment. But if you stood up, then you have gone past the moment to fix the missing out of the first *tashahhud*. If you have stood up, you have gone past the moment.

(0:30:00) So likewise, if a person sitting there in the fourth *rakʿah*, thinking, '*Have I prayed four or five?*' What are you going to do? You have gone past any moments anyway. And anyway, you know that you have prayed four. So what on earth is going on? Don't get too caught up on this point because it is already confusing as it is. And I can see you can make yourself more confused by it. I think.

So, the first scenario is if you are doubtful that you increased in the prayer and then you realised that you have, then it is obligatory for you to make the *sajdah* and that is going to be after the *salām*, for an increase in the prayer.

The second scenario:

الحال الثانية :إذا شَكَّ في الزيادة حال فِعْلِ الزِّيادة ثم تبيَّن عدمها فيجب عليه السُّجود على المذهب؛ لأنه أدَّى هذه الرَّكعة متردِّداً في كونها زائدة أو غير زائدة.

Now a person is doubting whether he has done more whilst in the act itself, and then it becomes clear that he didn't, it becomes clear that he didn't increase on the prayer. According to the *madh-hab*, because now there is certainty, he did a little bit of action of doubt, you must make the *sajdah* in this particular scenario because this *rakʿah* was done with doubt, *mutaraddidah*, meaning he was not sure whether it was likely or not likely. So, this is during it. So, he is doing the fourth *rakʿah* for example, and he is not sure whether this is the fourth or the fifth. And after he finishes he realises he is sure. The school is going to make him do *sajdah*. The **class position** and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position is in line with that because once you are certain of something, and

you were uncertain before, this is *taḥarri*. Therefore, we would also agree that you make the *sajdah,* and it would be after the *salām* for us.

الحال الثالثة :إذا شَكَّ في الزِّيادة بعد انتهائه فلا سُجود عليه؛ لأنه شَكَّ في سبب وجوب السُّجود والأصل عدمه.

The third scenario is if a person is doubtful about the increase but gone past it, then there is no *sajdah* because the basic principle is that he did not mess up and there is no reason for him to do a *sajdah*. So, there is no *sajdah*. This is just like the text of the school says.

Shaykh then adds a point and says that we have to remember that this does not apply if you know for certain. Of course, we know that because the author says: "if you doubt". If you have certainty about anything, that you have increased in the prayer, for example, then you would do it.

Student (online): So in this case it is after the *taslīm*?

Ustādh: This is after the *taslīm*. Correct. Whenever there is an increase, it is done after the *salām.* Whenever there is a decrease, it is before the *salām*.

Shaykh also mentions a point that if a person doubts in an action that he has increased whilst he is doing it (that increase, but he is doubting it), and then afterwards realises that he didn't, he must make the *sujūd'l-sahw* because he did some part of the prayer with doubt and then he became clear. We have always said that whenever you have doubt and then become clear (*taḥarri*), then there is a *sajdah* to be done. For us, again, this is after the *taslīm*.

Honestly, there is a lot of detail here. I am going to summarise it for you literally like I summarised it last week and I summarised it at the beginning of this class. When it comes to mistakes in the prayer, all of your problems, and mistakes, and issues will fall in to four categories, four possibilities: (1) doubt, (2) missing an obligation with certainty, (3) increasing an act of the prayer, (4) and having doubt and then becoming certain, what we call *taḥarri*.

If you have missed an obligation in the prayer and you realise for certain that you have missed it (i.e., you know for certain that you did not say *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm,* or *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*, or do the *tashahhud*), and you have gone past that act already, moved on to the next position in the prayer, then you have to make a *sajdah* and it will be before the *taslīm*. If you are certain, that is. If you are pretty sure, that you did the same, you also would assume the same. You will assume that you missed it, and you will make *sajdah* before the *taslīm*.

If a person has doubt that they did not do the *wājib*, and they are not sure about it, it is not clear to them whether they did it or not, then they should do the obligatory *sujūd'l-sahw* because of the doubt and that is before the *taslīm*.

Let me say it again. If you know for certain that you missed an obligation, and you have gone past its position, you have to make *sujūd'l-sahw* before *taslīm*.

If you think that you have missed an obligation, and you have gone past its position, then you need to perform *sujūd'l-sahw* before the *taslīm*.

If you are not sure about whether you have missed an obligation or not, and you have gone past its position, then you should do the *sujūd'l-sahw.* If you are within the moment of nearly moving on but you are closer to doing the obligation, and you can catch it, then you do it and you do not do *sujūd'l-sahw.* All of that is to do with missing out an obligation.

If you have doubt, then [the *sujūd'l-sahw*] is also before *taslīm.* Doubt in any part of the prayer, and missing out any obligations in the prayer, [the *sujūd'l-sahw*] will always be before the *taslīm.*

If you ever add anything to the prayer, or you miss out a *rukn*, then you will always do the *sujūd'l-sahw* after the *taslīm.* Always.

If you have doubt about *arkān* as well, and you cannot remember doing it. You then need to take the lesser number, and if it is *arkān*, you will then go back to it. And once you go back to it, you will automatically add actions to it. That is why it [the *sujūd'l-sahw*] will be after the prayer.

Likewise, if you come across a belief in your head, or a thought, you think that you have done this or that, and then you think about it, and you realise that you are okay, you had some doubt but now you have fixed it, you will then do the *sujūd'l-sahw* afterwards as well.

So, you have two before the *taslīm*, two after the *taslīm*. Doubt and missing an obligation: before. Adding to the prayer and doing *taḥarri* (becoming certain after having doubt before), then that is going to be after the *taslīm*. That is a summary. That is all you need to know.

One of the students of Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn summarised, not just from here, but from some of his *fatāwa* that he used to give on the radio station and other programmes on the issue of *sujūd'l-sahw*, he summarised all of his teachings into a little essay. It is a very well-known piece in Arabic, and I am pretty sure it is available in English as well. It is a very good summary of this entire chapter.

(0:43:00)

ولا سُجودَ على مأمومٍ إلا تَبَعًا لإمامِه

There is no prostration for the follower, unless the imām does so.

This is really interesting. A lot of it is quite easy but then it gets a bit complicated. When we say there is no prostration, we mean not for *shakk*, not for *ziyādah*, not for *naqṣ*, i.e., we are talking pretty much all of the *sujūd*. Why is that?

Because the Prophet ﷺ said:

إِنَّمَا جُعِلَ الإِمَامُ لِيُؤْتَمَّ بِهِ فَلاَ تَخْتَلِفُوا عَلَيْهِ

"The imām has been appointed to be followed. So, do not differ from him."[2]

The imām has been placed in front of you or has been made to be followed or has been placed in front of you to be followed so do not differ from him. Do not go off on your own little thing. Obviously, we talked about the exceptions to that earlier on in those scenarios where there is absolute certainty that you know he messed up the prayer, that was a couple of months ago, but don't bring that into it. But that is because that is an obligatory nature of absolute certainty from the whole crowd. It is not you just making your own judgment call. This is the whole audience, the whole *muṣallīn,* absolutely certain and he is messed up and then of course then you go and you separate. But that is like a very rare scenario. Remember, let me just also emphasise that even if a person believed that but was not sure about it, then he would be okay to carry on. To obligate a person to separate from their prayer requires a big shout and that shout is not something which is easy to justify.

Now *sujūd'l-sahw* is something which is *wājib*. It is not a *rukn* of the prayer, it is a *wājib* in itself. And there is a basic *qāʿidah fiqhiyyah*, a basic maxim:

الواجب يسقط عن المأموم من أجل متابعة الإِمام

The obligations are pardoned when following the imām, meaning that when a person misses out the obligations, like he forgets to say *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* or he forgets to do something else, but he is following the imām. When I teach *Fiqh* of *Ṣalāh,* I put it in a much more kind of friendlier way, the imām and the *barakah* of being in a *jamāʿah* is

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: The Straightening of the Rows Is Amongst Those Obligatory and Good Things Which Make Your Prayer a Correct and Perfect One, ḥadīth no. 722.*

more than just a reward, he soaks up all your mistakes. He picks it all up. Everything that you forget, poor quality *ṣalāh,* just poor spirituality, poor *khushūʿ,* you still get the reward of the *jamāʿah.* And then from a legal point of view as well, if you mess up inside the prayer then he is going to soak that up as well. So, if you do not say certain things. And also, it is not just so neat and convenient as saying it is just the obligations. Sometimes the odd *rukn* as well, like exceptional circumstances, like we know that if you catch the imām in *rukūʿ,* you have not for example said any of the obligatory *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm* with the imām and you still caught the *rukūʿ.* Even more than that, the *takbīrat'l-iḥrām* with the imām you didn't even get. Even more than that you did not even recite *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*, which is like from the most emphasised *arkān* in the prayer. I want you to feel that when you are praying behind an imām, one of the great reasons to pray behind an imām, they got your back. Big time. They are covering lots and lots of different scenarios for you. But there are limits. There are going to be lots of kind of examples of this. Let us go through all the different examples and look at the scenarios and outcomes.

For example, if the imām stands up after two *rakʿah* and forgets the first *tashahhud*, which is an obligation, you still have to do it. He forgot but you didn't. He stood up while saying, '*Allāhu akbar*,' and you are still in *sajdah* for example and you are thinking that he is sitting down. You are not meant to be rushing around, are you? You are taking your time, nice and slow. And when you are getting up, you actually look and you realise the imām is standing up and that he has actually started reciting. You are still sitting there. In fact, you are still in *sajdah*. How about that? You have plenty of time to sit there and do your 'obligatory' *tashahhud*. Correct? However, you don't. There is a consensus on that. You get up and you follow the imām. The *tashahhud* is gone. And the *tashahhud* going is no small matter. But it has gone, and it is pardoned because the imām is being followed. The imām soaks up this reality. That is the first example.

(0:50:00) The second example:

لو دخل المأمومُ مع الإِمام في ثاني ركعة في رباعية سَقَطَ عن المأموم التشهُّد الأول؛ لأنَّ التشهُّد الأول يقع لهذا المأموم في الرَّكعة الثالثة للإِمام، ومعلوم أن الإِمام لا يجلس في الرَّكعة الثالثة؛ فيلزم المأموم أن يقوم معه، فيسقط عنه واجب من واجبات الصَّلاة

You are praying a four *rakʿah* prayer (*Ẓuhr*) and you enter into the second *rakʿah* with the imām, meaning you start from this position i.e., you are late so your first *rakʿah* is the second *rakʿah* of the imām and the congregation. They are in the second *rakʿah* which is your first *rakʿah*. Your proper *tashahhud'l-awwal*, your first, legal proper *tashahhud*, needs to come after two *rakʿah* because this is your first *rakʿah*. However, the imām is going to sit down in a minute because he is praying his second *rakʿah* and you end up doing your *tashahhud* with him. Perfectly okay for him and them in their second *rakʿah*, but not a legal *tashahhud* for you actually because it is happening in your

first *rakʿah*. For you to do your *tashahhud* properly it has to be after two *rakʿah* i.e., in the third *rakʿah* of the prayer. However, the imām is not going to sit down for you. He is going to carry on with the prayer. That shows that the obligatory first *tashahhud* that should be done in the third *rakʿah* of the prayer is going to be pardoned from you and you are going to be expected to stand up and ignore the situation. That is because your obligation and when it should ideally happen for you, has been lifted due to you following the imām. It is obligatory to stand with him and to sit with him etc.

Shaykh says:

فإذا كان الواجب يسقط عن المأموم مِن أجل المتابعة، فسجود السَّهو واجب؛ فيسقط عن المأموم من أجل المتابعة، وبناءً على هذا التَّعليل :يشترط أن لا يفوته شيء من الصلاة.

If an obligation in the prayer is pardoned because of following the imām, *sujūdʾl-sahw* itself is also obligatory so this also is something which a person does not need to do because of the *mutābaʿah*, because of the following of the imām. That you having to fix that, that has been lifted just like the obligation itself has been lifted. That is why even though you are in the wrong place etc. it has actually been covered by the imām.

يشترط أن لا يفوته شيء من الصلاة.

"It is essential though that nothing is left out of the prayer." What does that mean?

We are at the top of page 388. I want you to understand that you must have started the prayer with the imām. And when I say 'start the prayer with the imām', I mean that there is nothing that needs to be made up afterwards. You cannot be *masbūq.* If you are *masbūq*, it means that one who has missed the first *rakʿah*. Missed the first *rakʿah* means that you missed the *rukūʿ* and that therefore after the *ṣalāh* you have something to make up, either one *rakʿah*, two *rakʿah*, three *rakʿah* etc. All of this rule is based upon that. You have to have joined the imām and caught him in the first *rakʿah* and nothing to make up after the prayer. That is the condition. If you have missed that first *rakʿah* or any more than that, then the rules are entirely different. And not only are the rules entirely different, you will almost always, if there are mistakes in the remaining prayer, do have to make *sujūdʾl-sahw* even though you are in a congregation and that is going to be at the end of your prayer when everybody else is gone and you are still making things up.

For example, there is a person who is behind the imām in the prayer. He is *a maʾmūm,* a *muṣalli*, a follower, and he forgets to say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* in the *rukūʿ*. *Subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm* at least once is an obligation from the *wājibāt* of *ṣalāh*. He has forgotten

it. However, he is praying behind the imām from the beginning, he did *Allāhu akbar* with him, he is absolutely from the beginning, or he came a bit late and joined in *Fātiḥah* or even worse he came in he joined him in the *rukūʿ*—but he still caught the first *rakʿah*. This person does not have to make *sujūd'l-sahw*. If he was praying by himself, he would have to do *sujūd'l-sahw* because he missed out on obligation. Because he is praying behind the imām and he did not miss any part of the prayer, he does not have to do *sujūd'l-sahw*.

Another example: If he came in the second *rakʿah*, missed the first *rakʿah* behind the imām, and in that second or third *rakʿah* he missed an obligation like *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm* in the *rukūʿ*. In this scenario after the imām gives *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, he stands up and carries on with his prayer. He says *Allāhu akbar* and he starts reciting *Fātiḥah* because he has to make up another *rakʿah*. In this scenario he has to do *sujūd'l-sahw* at the end of his prayer, his own. They might have gone, they might still be there, it does not matter. Why?

Because in this scenario the *ḥadīth* does not apply now.

The Prophet ﷺ said:

فَلاَ تَخْتَلِفُوا عَلَيْهِ

"Do not differ from him [the imām]."[2]

If you were praying behind an imām whilst you are all together and everybody says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the left], and you say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning your head to the right then say], *Allāhu akbar* [and go into *sujūd*], or even before the *salām*, at that moment you have differed from the imām. You have differed in the structure of the prayer and everything, and it is *fitnah,* and that is disrespectful, and it is not allowed, it is going against the *ḥadīth* etc.

Now. If the prayer is gone and done, by definition you are differing from the imām because you are standing up and the nature of your prayer is going to be different, and longer, and maybe shorter, etc., he's not even there, the *jamāʿah* is not even there, you might have three *rakʿāt* to make up. You're not differing from the imām. When I say 'not differing' (obviously you're differing) but you're not causing the difference. You're not creating the problem. You are an obligatory different person now and you take individual responsibility. It's like I say that you lose 'the protection of the imām'. Once you have to make prayers up, you've 'lost the protection of the imām'.

It's similar to what we talked about in the chapter of the *sutrah*. We said that when you're praying behind the imām, then people can go up and down, up and down. And if

you're on one of this really long kind of lines and you join the prayer super late and you're like in some of these mosques, especially like the Ḥaram and you join the *jamāʿah* late, you are miles from the imām. As soon as the imām says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* you are now naked. You are now not protected anymore. Now you have to start protecting your prayer zone because people are now walking up and down. You've lost his protection. Similarly, if you are going to have to get up now and you've lost physical protection, you've lost like a legal protection, and you've lost the spiritual protection as well. If you make any mistakes you have to make *sajdatʾl-sahw* because you become alone, you are now individual in your prayer.

إلاّ إذا كان سجوده تبعاً لإِمامه فيجب عليه

Likewise, the statement says:

ولا سُجودَ على مأمومٍ إلا تَبَعًا لإمامِه

There is no prostration for the follower, unless the imām does so.

And what does "unless the imām does so" mean? It means that even if he didn't make the mistake himself, then he needs to do it. If the imām gives a *sajdah* you're going to follow him. It doesn't matter whether you made a mistake or you prayed the perfect prayer or not. If the imām makes *sajdah* you must follow him because the Prophet ﷺ said that the imām has been placed to be followed and don't differ from him.[2]

(1:00:00)

And you will never know. Sometimes the imām will just say *Allāhu akbar* [and go into *sujūdʾl-sahw*] and when [he does] that you think, '*Oh he must have forgotten something, or he must have had some doubt*.' Your job is not to prove it or disprove it. He might be charitable and turn around afterwards and say, *'Yeah guys I forgot to say subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla in my sajdah*.' You would never know that because you don't hear that aloud anyway. Only he can make that decision. That's why you always follow the imām. When he makes *sajdah,* you follow him. If he doesn't make *sajdah* you follow him. You don't know. So, that's an important thing. It's not dependent upon your quality of the prayer. It's not dependent upon you.

Student (online): Is that the class position, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn or the School's position?

Ustādh: This is the **class position**. This is a position that all the scholars accept by the way that the imām protects the *maʾmūm*, the *muṣalli*—that's a widespread position.

Q&A

Q (online): If there are two situations in your *ṣalāh* for which one requires *sajdah* before *taslīm,* another one requires *sajdah* after the *taslīm,* which one should we do when he is praying by himself?

A: If there is only one (of course there's only one) which one should get preponderance? And the truth is that after will cover the much more likelihood of this reality. What do I mean by that? If you've got multiple problems you've almost always ended up adding to the prayer. That's my kind of breakaway kind of position. That's my rationale for doing it after. However, as I said many times and I will keep on saying it, if you did it before or after it is acceptable. This is one of those matters that is acceptable to differ over.

Student (online): You'll always be right if you did it after.

Ustādh: 100%, I think that when you do it afterwards, you'll always cover all the issues.

Q (online): If you have doubted whether you have prayed four *rakʿāt,* so you stand up and then you are sure that you have actually prayed four do you continue the *rakʿah*, finish it and then do *sajdatʾl-sahw*?

A: Correct, after. This is *taḥarri*. Afterwards.

Q (online): Interestingly, in the Māliki *madh-hab* a person can join *ṣalāh* and stay completely silent not even doing a bit of *dhikr* (other than *takbīratʾl-iḥrām* and one *taslīm*) and the *ṣalāh* is valid. The imām literally takes care of everything.

A: So, this is not a million miles away from the Ḥanafi school as well, and a number of scholars actually, because of some *ḥadīth* about the power of the imām. But a number of scholars they considered some of these *ḥadīth* to be weak.

Q (online): My sister went food shopping and only noticed at home that the cashier didn't scan an item, ergo the item isn't paid for. What would be the correct action in this case? The shop she went to is in another city and it would be an inconvenience to go back again. Besides the item in question is of the perishable sort.

A: So, in this scenario one is to contact the office and they should ask to speak to someone of authority that can make a decision about this issue. They should explain it. They should say, '*I'm so-and-so, this is what I've done and I'm in a different city and I've*

used it and it's something which is perishable. I can't go back to that city. Can I make a payment into a direct account of some sort?'

Now you have to do that part and it can't be just some spoon. It has to be someone who has the authority to make that decision. Because I can tell you now if I am there in that shop and I picked it up I am going to say, '*Oh don't worry about it*,' and put the phone down. I don't have the authority to do that, but I know that's what I am going to do. Now, I know I'm not even going to get in trouble for that because that's what my manager would do. But that's what it is. Now I just want you to know that they factor in, in their budgets for this happening and they're almost definitely going to let you off, but you need to put your effort in to say, '*Can I just make a payment?*' And let them say, '*No, no, it's okay. Don't worry about it. Thank you for being honest*,' and all the rest of it. You have to go through the process.

Q (online): What if your *waswās* turns you into a regular *sajdat'l-sahw* doer to the point that it's almost becoming part of your prayer? How do you deal with this?

A: You deal with this the same way with *waswās*. There is no difference, this is all a
(1:10:00) disease. This is all a major, major problem and everything that we've said before about dealing with *waswās* is how you deal with it.

Q (online): Have you done a review of the Oxford vaccine?

A: No. I can't do a review of the Oxford vaccine because they haven't released the full data which I like, by the way, because they should release the full data to the regulatory agencies and the individual bodies first before anybody else. So, I like that. However, it's such a mishmash and when I give a review, I like to do it properly. I have done a lot of study into it. I know more about the Oxford trials and its data and the dosing schedules easily beyond 99.99% of all of mankind because they don't care less, obviously it's my interest, but not enough for me to be comfortable with what to tell people to take, for example. And that's going to take a couple of weeks.

As for the basic stuff, then I have done my review of that. Its efficacy is good enough to take, it's better taking it than not taking it for the majority of the vulnerable people certainly. And it's pure. That's the beautiful point. It's a nice surprise from a complete omnishambles of a company because their vaccine is cultured in a cell culture that needs a medium which is human based, or animal based. It's not completely synthetic like mRNA vaccines and so therefore you know we were easy to be able to say they're pure. This one, I had doubts all the way. Although, you might remember the lecture that I gave one month ago and a bit ago, in that lecture you will remember that I said that you know what there's a chance that they're going to have gelatine in it but they'll be stupid to do it and there was a lot of pressure against them to not do it. I think they changed it. Anyway, it's pure, it's *ḥalāl*, it's good to take, no problem *in shāʾ Allāh* is a summary. I have just written a little summary on Facebook.

Q (online): If you have shares in a company which was *Sharīʿah* compliant at the time of investing but this company then announces a new revenue stream which may lead to a change in that status, e.g., the company is granted a banking licence. Is it permissible to wait until the next quarterly results to see if the revenue from *ḥarām* sources now exceeds 5% or should you sell your shares on the news as it may become difficult to work out at what point the stock became non-compliant within that quarter and therefore what percentage of the profits are *ḥalāl*?

A: Yes, it is permissible. I like your question. I like your detail. And I think it is permissible for you to wait. I do not think it is obligatory for you to sell your shares. It is allowed for you to wait and work it out regardless of whether it is difficult or not.

Q (online): If the imām misses a *wājib* and the *maʾmūm* is certain the imām missed the *wājib*, they follow the imām in continuing with missing *wājib* i.e., they do not do the *wājib* and stop following the imām?

A: Yes. Correct.

Q (online): When teaching kids *ṣalāh*, is it okay that both parents pray with a bit of variation (example: one doing *rafʿ al-yadayn* and other not doing it)? From one side it feels perfect way of teaching the young that some things are not hardcore and both ways are right but on other side it worries me that it can confuse young minds.

A: That is entirely based upon whether you think they are going to get confused or not. Obviously, when they are younger you don't want to introduce the concept of confusion. And when they are a bit older but still children, you can. There is not an Islamic answer to that. Islamically it's fine. But it has to be done according to the kid's ability.

Q (online): In *Maghrib* prayer, you join the imām on the second *rakʿah* and you end up doing three *tashahhud*. Is this correct?

A: That is correct. And there is no *sajdatʾl-sahw*. There is just making up that extra *rakʿah* that's all, the extra two.

Q (online): When you do *nafl* prayers at Masjid al-Nabawi at Riyāḍʾl-Jannah, because you don't have a *sutrah*, due to the number of people, shall we do the *nafl* prayers there or not?

A: It's okay to do *nafl* prayer. I don't think it's a major by the way, there is no *ḥadīth* about *nafl* prayer in Riyāḍʾl-Jannah or any actual act of *ʿibādah* but if a person prays there, it's fine. The place is meant to be taken opportunity for its *barakah* as opposed

to specifics, like acts of worship. There's no evidence for it being there other than the *ʿaql*, it's a garden of the gardens of Paradise therefore we should do worship in it. It's fair enough but it's not a necessity. And frankly, trying to do *nafl* there causes a lot of problems. It really does cause a problem, because people are walking around in front of you, you have to keep putting your hand up and this and that.

Q (online): How long before *Ẓuhr* can you pray *ṣalāt al-Ḍuḥa*?

A: If you're talking about your phone when your app says *Ẓuhr* then obviously you need to be doing it twenty minutes before that because *zawāl* which is the *ḥarām* part of the day which is going to establish the start time of *Ẓuhr* takes about 15-20 minutes. If you have a start time on an app or a calendar you should always look to do it twenty minutes, half an hour beforehand. That's the limit. Go back to the prayer times, we have done a lot of that in detail.[‡]

Q (online): Can you please clarify what you mean by before *taslīm* (after *al-taḥiyyāt*) and after *taslīm* (after *ṣalawāt'l-Ibrāhīmiyyah*?) Perhaps you could demonstrate?

A: Before *taslīm* means before you say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*. So, after you've finished everything that you want to say in your prayer, all of your *duʿāʾ*, just before you're about to say and finish the prayer and say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, you go into two *sajdah*. That's what it means to do the *sujūd'l-sahw* before the *taslīm*.

After *taslīm* is exactly the same thing, you've reached the absolute end of the prayer and you've finished everything, and then you finish it. You say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to theright] as if you're about to walk off. Then after one *taslīm* you do two *sajdah*.

Q (online): From an Islamic perspective can it be said due to what is happening to the Muslims in China, it is an action of reward, for not investing into Chinese companies, who have links with the Chinese government?

A: Yes. I believe it is rewarded if a person believes that they are trying to punish Chinese business or the government or the state by reduction of taxes or whatever and they want reward for it, to do it for the sake of Allāh ﷻ to show solidarity. I think they will get rewarded for it.

Is it an actual effective thing to do? Is it true? Does it work? That's something else. That's a political question. It is something of doubt. That is something which we don't know. But would a person get rewarded for that? In my opinion, I think they would be.

[‡] Prayer times were covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 4, Chapter 15, Lessons 2-7. MT

Q (online): If one uses a brush for the hair that has hair from a wild pig, is it allowed to be used? This was not mentioned in the class of tanning.

A: It's obviously best to avoid it because the majority of scholars do not consider the pig to be able to be tanned. However, I think it's flexible. If it's been absolutely tanned or it's now gone to a whole different level of a different substance and one cannot determine its nature, then we can use it. But it's best to avoid it.

Q (online): A close family member always paints humans and animals. What advice would you give them please?

A: It's not good man. It's just risky. I don't want to say it is *ḥarām*. I'm of the more liberal opinion. I've covered this in so much detail, painting humans, etc. I don't think it's *ḥarām*, but I am in the absolute minority.[§]

[§] Permissibility of photos, images, etc. were covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 5, Chapter 15, Lesson 31. MT

20. Chapter 20 Lesson 15: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

ولا سُجودَ على مأمومٍ إلا تَبَعًا لإمامِه

There is no prostration for the follower, unless the imām does so.

We started this subject last week. So, let me just repeat that again or summarise what we are talking about. When you are praying behind an imām, a couple of very special things happen, the first is that they cover you for all of your mistakes. As long as you start with the imām and end with the imām, it does not matter how rubbish your prayer is, without a shadow of a doubt poor quality prayer, poor quality like your mind is not there and you are all over the place, then that is just really poor quality. But even if you are praying that by yourself, you would not have to do *sajdah*. But in this case behind the imām, that is one of the blessings of being with the imām. It is almost like people should really look to try and be with the *jamāʿah*, especially if they have got poor quality prayers as a temporary fix to make sure they get the reward of at least the effort of going there, the angels being there, meeting the brothers, the sisters, the x, the y, the buzz, hearing the Qurʾān, at least makes up for how rubbish your prayer is or your concentration or your quality or your spiritual connection. But I am talking about little mistakes. I am talking about the kind of you forget to say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*, or you forget to say *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, or you forget to *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*, or you forget to say *Allāhu akbar* (the moving *takbīrs*).

So, we said that the imām covers all these mistakes. This is from the beginning to the end. When I say beginning to the end, what I mean by that is that you catch the first *rakʿah*. That does not mean you have to do *takbīratʾl-iḥrām*, it means that if you catch them in [*Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*] or you catch them in *rukūʿ*. If you catch the prayer basically, where you will end the prayer with the imām i.e., there are no units to make up, then any mistakes that you make you will be covered. That is one of the first lessons we learned from this, one of the blessings of this.

(0:10:00) If you join the prayer late and then you make a mistake, then you have to then make up that *sajdah* yourself. And depending upon whether the mistake is a mistake which is leading to the *sajdah* before the *salām* or after the *salām*, then you will do it yourself. And the reason you will is because you are not going to be differing with the imām.

And remember that the reason that we do not do a *sajdah* for mistakes we make whilst we are praying the whole prayer of the imām is because the Prophet ﷺ said that do not differ with the imām, do not change the structure of the prayer with the imām.[1] Therefore, once you are on your own (and you are on your own as soon as the imām says *salām* and you stand up), and if you have one to do, three to do, four to do, two to do, whatever you have to do, those mistakes now (here is the key) whether you made them whilst you were under the protection of the imām or you made them in the remaining that you are making up yourself, it does not matter. You have to now do the *sajdah* because you lost the protection of the imām.

You might argue, '*Well hold on! I had the protection of the imām for the first two rakʿah when I made the mistake*.' Yes, you did. But it was not the protection and the power of the imām that stopped you doing the *sajdah,* that is not the *ʿillah*. The *ʿillah* is to not differ from the imām. So therefore, almost Allāh ﷻ removed the obligation of doing it to avoid *fitnah* and confusion. But once there is no *fitnah* and confusion, you have to then do the *sajdah* if it is an obligatory form of *sajdah* (because not all the *sajdahs* are obligatory). I think it would be fair to say that is a summary of what we have covered so far.

Now we want to discuss a little bit of an interesting issue, on page 388 at the bottom:

وقوله: «إلا تبعاً لإِمامه» أي: إلاّ إذا كان سجوده تبعاً لإِمامه فيجب عليه، سواء سها أم لم يسهُ، فإذا سَجَدَ الإِمام وجب على المأموم أن يتابعه

Unless he is following the imām. If the imām does it then you have to do it. If the imām does the *sajdah* in the prayer, you have to do it. And that makes sense. Obviously, you are praying behind him why would you not do the *sajdah*? Of course you would. It does not matter if you as an individual made a mistake or not. It does not matter. If the imām does it, he either made a mistake which you saw or you did not see, you heard or did not hear, you realised it or you did not. But regardless, you are going to do it. If the imām makes the *sajdah* then the person the follower must do it and that is because the Prophet ﷺ said:

إِنَّمَا جُعِلَ الإِمَامُ لِيُؤْتَمَّ بِهِ فَلاَ تَخْتَلِفُوا عَلَيْهِ

"That imām has been placed there to be followed so do not differ from him."[1]

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: The Straightening of the Rows Is Amongst Those Obligatory and Good Things Which Make Your Prayer a Correct and Perfect One, ḥadīth no. 722.*

So, for example Shaykh says the imām might forget *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* in the *sajdah.*

Student (online): Is there any evidence for protection of imām?

Ustādh: There is actually evidence. And there are some people that said that a supporting evidence of why you do not need to make a *sajdah* yourself and the imām covers you because the Prophet ﷺ said:

الإِمَامُ ضَامِنٌ وَالْمُؤَذِّنُ مُؤْتَمَنٌ

This *ḥadīth* can be translated in different ways. But the way that I translate this *ḥadīth* is a famous *ḥadīth: al-imāmu ḍāmin*, the imām is the guarantor and the *muʾadhdhin* is the trustworthy one, the trusted one, the one who has an *amānah* and to be trusted with the *amānah*.[2] What is this *ḥadīth* referring to?

Many people said different things. You find this discussion when they are debating who gets more reward because there are some scholars that said that the *muʾadhdhin* gets more reward than the imām. It is very interesting actually. Because they call to Allāh ﷻ and because they are so trustworthy and because the prayer is established because of them.

When we say that the *muʾadhdhin* is the trusted one, we're not talking about people who have watches and apps etc. so that you know what time the *ṣalāh* is. The only way you know that the *ṣalāh* has entered is purely by the *muʾadhdhin* saying *Allāhu akbar*, *Allāhu akbar*. And if he messes it up, or he has bad intentions, or he is messing people around, then that is the community thrown down the pan. It is not like the imām in a *masjid* messing up, there are people that are going to deal with him, and the people know what is going on and all the rest of it. But in the community, you have the young, the old, women at home, men, people who know, people who do not know, the whole community is just waiting to see, '*Are we in or not? Do we start eating or not?*' *Ṣiyām*, right? Finish eating or not? The *Fajr adhān* etc. The people who do the *adhāns* must be very, very, trustworthy.

الإِمَامُ ضَامِنٌ

You can take so many different [interpretations]. Guarantor, *ḍāmin* means he has got your back basically. That would be the literal dictionary definition of the protection—he is the one who protects you. When we say *ḍāmin*, *ḍāmin* is one who

[2] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What Is Required of the Muʾadhdhin Regarding Keeping Track of Time, ḥadīth no. 517*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

puts the collateral forward. So, if you take a loan and you say that he is my guarantor, he is the one who is covering you. So, if you mess up, he pays. Likewise, if you mess up [then he pays]. That *ḥadīth* is definitely in play when it comes to covering mistakes. But the majority of scholars from a legal point of view use the *ḥadīth* that we said, that do not make a difference with him.[1] It does not have to be one or the other. These are the *ḥadīth* which are in play.

So, the imām is a protector, and he is protecting you as long as you are praying with him. But once you become on your own, you have lost the protection of the imām and also, you are not differing from the imām. There is no *fitnah* now. Everybody has gone. You are now praying by yourself, nobody hanging around, nobody is going to be confused for example and call you *fattān* and you are a *fitnah* maker, if after the prayer (or before) you do two *sajdah*. You are by yourself.

For example, the Shaykh says that if the imām forgets to say *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* in his *sajdah*, you have no idea whether he said it or not because you do not hear that. So suddenly in the prayer (because he has left out a *wājib*) before he says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* at the end of the prayer he going to say *Allāhu akbar* and go into *sajdah*. At this moment in time, you are also obligated to fall into *sajdah* and follow him in that.

I think I might have mentioned this last week as well.

الإِمَامُ ضَامِنٌ وَالْمُؤَذِّنُ مُؤْتَمَنٌ اللَّهُمَّ أَرْشِدِ الأَئِمَّةَ وَاغْفِرْ لِلْمُؤَذِّنِينَ

"The imām is the guarantor and the *muʾadhdhin* is the one to be trusted. O Allāh! Guide the imāms and forgive the *muʾaddhinīn*."[2]

And that *duʿāʾ* is apt. Oh Allāh guide the imāms to make sure that they understand what is going on, make sure that they appreciate this responsibility, that they take it very seriously. *Rushd* means maturity, knowledge, guidance etc.

وَاغْفِرْ لِلْمُؤَذِّنِين

I love this part: "forgive the *muʾaddhinīn* their mistakes", because they will make mistakes because it not an exact science. I have been making this point for a long time, in *Fiqh of Ṣalāh* especially (AlMaghrib class) and when we talked about [prayer] times and stuff the whole *fitnah*.[†]

[†] Prayer times were covered in *Logical Progression,* Year 4, Chapter 15, Lessons 2-7. MT

Can you believe we are three months way from Ramaḍān? It is going to basically be in the spring. April 13th, that's spring. We are proper, proper out of summer. But I can tell you now it feels like last year and the year before it felt like we were in the middle of summer fasting, mission, long hours, headache, all the *fitnah* about time, etc. We are now going to finish at the beginning of May. We have now moved finally from the *fitnah* of the summer persistent twilight, which happens when our Northern latitude is so high that during the summer (from mid-May to August) the angle of where we are on the globe is so high relative to the sun, that there is a perpetual level of twilight, meaning it is never fully dark. We have discussed this until the cows come home so you can review all of that. My point is that it is stunning what I believe is the correct solution and a couple of scholars, versus those that are going 18 degrees [solar elevation angle] and saying that you know even though outside you cannot see anything different and 18 degrees solar elevation angle means that you start fasting for 1:00 am etc. and it has got to be done by the time.

(0:20:00)

It's a *sunnah* to take it easy. The Prophet ﷺ actually gave the job of the *muʾadhdhin* to someone who was blind who would have to ask other people.[3] And people are saying, '*You have to see this*.' '*You have to see that*.' Bro just chill. It's a rough idea. That is what it is. It can't be someone who is messing around. But if you see something and you are not sure and he says, '*I think that is it*',' and he calls it and it's a bit early:

اللَّهُمَّ وَاغْفِرْ لِلْمُؤَذِّنِين

There is the *duʿāʾ*. I love that.

We've covered *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, for example he misses it out and he does the *sajdah*. That's pretty straightforward because the mistake was leaving something out and the *sajdah* is before the *salām*. So, that's straightforward.

Shaykh asks a question at the top of page 389.

لم تنقطع صلاته بعد، فإن كان بعد السَّلام فهل يجب متابعته أو لا يجب؟

He says: What about if the *sajdah* is after the *taslīm*?

So, you are now all sitting there in a *jamāʿah*. And we're not talking about you starting the prayer here because if you started the prayer with the imām and the imām says

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: It Is Permissible for a Blind Man to Call the Adhān so Long as There Is a Man With Him Who Sees, ḥadīth no. 381 a.*

assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh [while turning the head to the right], you are also meant to say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, you don't wait.

We covered this a couple of years ago that when the imām says: *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the left], if you look at the Shāfiʿis not the *fiqh* of the *madhhab*, but in the Egyptians for example, they will wait for the imām to say both of them before they get involved. And that is of course wrong. And then you have the Ḥanafis, and again not the *fiqh*, but the modern-day Ḥanafis, who are doing it before the imām does. We said the *sunnah* is to follow. So, as soon as he says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the left], we also say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [to the right, then to the left].

Obviously, if you start the prayer with the imām and he gives *salām* then you are going to give *salām* with him. So, the imām will say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, and you will say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*. Then he's going to say *Allāhu akbar* that is when you go, '*Oh wow!*' At that moment you're like, '*Oh!*' You also then go into *sajdah*.

But what if you have prayer to make up? What if you are late to the prayer?

You have to stand up now. Well, according to the Ḥanābilah and according to our author and actually according to many of the *fuqahāʾ*, you would do it. That is why he says:

ظاهر كلام المؤلِّف

That from the apparent statement of the author (*al-muʾallif* i.e., the author Imām al-Ḥajjāwi) you would have to do the *sajdah* even if it's after the *taslīm*, even if you have the prayer to make up. And this is as he says:

وهذا هو المعروف عند الفقهاء

And this is like a well-known position with the jurists. When he says *fuqahāʾ*, he's kind of talking about the classical scholars and he's talking about all of the different ones from the different *madhāhib* as well. He's not sticking only to Ḥanābilah. I want to say that this is a position of more than just the *fuqahāʾ* or the traditionalists or whatever but also contemporary scholars as well. For example, his colleague Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Bāz also said the same, that if it's after the *taslīm* and you still have something to make up, then you would also do the *sajdah* with him. But nearly all of the scholars who

say this, they add the caveat. They basically make the situation the same as if you were praying by yourself and you forgot to do the *tashahhud* and you stood up. So, we know that if you are closer to sitting down, you stay and if you are standing up then you could go back. If you have started reading the *Fātiḥah* then it's game over, you have lost it and it's gone.[‡] So, they said it's exactly the same.

(0:30:00) So, if the imām said says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* and you sprung. You don't want to waste any time, '*As soon as he said salām the prayer is finished. I am getting up now. I have to make up my own*,' and you stood up. And the imām might do a real slow one, *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right, then pause before saying] *Allāhu akbar* [and go into *sujūd'l-sahw*]. That [demonstration] is five seconds. In five seconds, it's very realistic that someone has actually stood up and started their *Fātiḥah*. So nearly all of them said that when you are that person, who stood up, it's too late now and now you don't go back and sit down, just like you wouldn't go back for the *tashahhud*. And you, after the prayer has finished, yourself, will do that *sajdah* after the *taslīm.* But the majority of the scholars don't even get to that level. The majority of the scholars, [say] if you are sitting down or near sitting down or halfway up then he goes back down and does the *sajdah*. And that makes sense because you have to follow the imām.

However, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, in what can be considered to be an almost unique position, says that no, the imām is not to be followed here. And so therefore, when the imām goes for *Allāhu akbar*, whether you are standing or you are sitting or whatever, you will stand up.

Now you can see that that is a shocking sight because they are 'still in the prayer'. They are in the *sajdah,* but they are still in the prayer. And you've definitely differed with the imām. But the reason why the Shaykh is saying that position, he's saying because if you think about this logically, it is untenable (he says impossible) for you to do that because that means that you are exiting the prayer.

This is important. You know when we talk about the *sajdah* before *taslīm* or after *taslīm*? When we're talking about an individual person praying alone it all makes sense. When you are praying behind the imām some people think that before *taslīm* is obviously straightforward but after the *taslīm* people think that they don't make *salām*. That is not correct.

Now, I know that it might be the case that in real life, in practicality nobody makes *salām* because the imām does it very quickly. But that shouldn't be the assumption. The assumption should be that when you are with an imām who has made a mistake that requires a *sajdah* after the *taslīm* (so we know that that is if he adds a *rukn* or adds an action to the prayer or he had some doubt and he fixes himself up after *taḥarri*, so in

---

[‡] Determining whether to go back and do the missed *tashahhud'l-awwal* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lesson 12. MT

these two scenarios), so he's now doing the *sajdah* after the *taslīm,* he will have to give *taslīm* first. When the imām gives *taslīm* you should be making *taslīm*. There is no justification from the *Sunnah* for you to just be sitting there and also no reason, this idea of waiting for two, waiting for x, waiting for y. So, when the imām says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* you should also say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn—based upon that completely acceptable and indeed the correct action—is saying: Well, hold on! How are *you* saying *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*? You are not allowed to intentionally exit the prayer in the wrong place because it is the wrong place for you because you still have prayer remaining to pray. You came late remember? (Remember we're talking about the guy who came late).

Don't get confused here, because it is already confusing and it is difficult to explain. But if a person started with the imām and ends with the imām we said there's no issue there. You make *sajdah* with him before and after—not a problem. But if you are late and you missed a *rakʿah* and you have to stand up, well hello? If you're standing up, you're standing up because you are still in the prayer. You cannot exit the prayer. If you give *salām* with the imām, you've exited the prayer.

Now, we know, I know, you know, everybody knows a lot of us people do that. A lot of us folks do that. When I say 'we do that', I mean by that… Let me talk about the two different people.

Let's start with the original one. If you are a person who has started the prayer with the imām properly, you know that many of us will be praying, the imām has made a mistake, he will say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [turning the head to the right] and before we've even got the chance to say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, the imām has already gone into *Allāhu akbar* and therefore the majority of the people go into the *sajdah*. He [the imām] has given the *salām* but I didn't, either because I didn't know, or it was too quick—it doesn't matter the reason.

Anecdotally I think, the majority of people actually either don't know or they make the mistake. I want you to know that the correct way is that you have to give *salām*. If you don't do that or you think you didn't do that, what you have done is turned the *sajdah* into a *sajdah* before *taslīm*—unwittingly. Which all goes to show what a blessing and a great, great statement it is from the scholars to say that there is a consensus that if a *sajdah* is done in the wrong position (i.e., one that was meant to be done before was done afterwards, one that was meant to be done afterwards was done before) then it is to be pardoned. It is not something which you need to repeat the prayer from. So ironically, it never mattered in all of your lives that you did it wrong. That is like the theory. Basically, even though you were meant to, the fact is that what harm did it do? It ended up that you did the *sajdah* technically before and he did it correct (the imām), he did it after. The imām covers your mistakes anyway. Is it a mistake or not? Who knows? So, it's not a biggie.

But correctly, what are you meant to do?

Correctly there's no doubt, you're meant to do it after the *taslīm*. And not the imām's *taslīm*, your *taslīm* because there's no differentiation between the two. There's no *ḥadīth* that says imām's *taslīm*, it says *after the taslīm*. So, the imām is meant to say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* and you're meant to say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*. Just like in the *ḥadīth*.[4,5]

Remember by the way, we don't have a single *ḥadīth* of the *sajdah* being made after *taslīm* in an addition (we have the *ḥadīth* in *taḥarri*,[6] but I mean in an addition, when there has been something added to the prayer), except that the *ḥadīth* that we have all had everybody give the *salām*.[4,5] Think about that. So, the *fiqh* that we have today is based upon *ḥadīth* where everybody gave the *taslīm*. And not just that, they are chatting. They're like, '*What's happening?*' '*Yes, you did make the mistake*,' etc. etc. So, everybody has now given *taslīm*. So, now if you think about your own action of you not making *taslīm*, you're not even doing it properly if you think about it.

So at least we can agree that the correct way if you're doing it after *taslīm* is to make the *taslīm*. You've done the *taslīm* and then you do the *sajdah*. My point is it doesn't matter if you've done it or not. The imām has covered you anyway. And if not, the imām has not covered you. If you don't believe the imām covers you, then the statement of the scholars that doing it before/after covers you.

Let's take one example here.

Student (online): I have always done the *taslīm* with the imām and then done the *sajdah* with the imām. Is that the correct thing to do or not?

Ustādh: Of course that's the correct thing. Who says it's not the correct thing? I am saying that the incorrect thing is to not do that. But it even being incorrect is not a major because everybody does it whether intentionally or unintentionally.

But intentionally, what should we be doing?

We should be making that *taslīm*. This is concerning a person who has started the prayer with the imām and has nothing to make up. He will give the *taslīm* and not just say, '*Oh the imām has done the taslīm, that's enough*.' (0:40:00)

Whatever the imām does. If the imām is on a one *taslīm* opinion, one *taslīm*. If the imām is on a two *taslīm* opinion, where he goes *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the

---

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 573 a.*
[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: To Clasp One's Hands by Interlocking the Fingers in the Mosque or Outside the Mosque, ḥadīth no. 482.*
[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 572 a.*

head to the left, then says], *Allāhu akbar* [and goes into *sujūd*], then you are expected to do two as well. But like I said it's not a major, even if you didn't do any of them. But that's what you should hope to do.

Now, let's go back to the scenario of the guy who is late, missed part of the prayer and needs to stand up.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is like: Well, hold on. If you're going to do this properly, you have to do *taslīm* with the imām. If you're going to do this properly. And if you do *taslīm* with the imām then you are exiting your prayer. You have invalidated your prayer because you have done it intentionally and that is something that cannot be covered because it's a *rukn*. When it comes to the issue of the imām protecting you against certain things that you miss out, he can never protect for you missing *arkān.* So, you have to do *arkān*.

So, if you follow the position of course that *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* is a *rukn* and you didn't recite *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* in *Ẓuhr* prayer, for example, and at the end of the four *rakʿah* (you started with the imām and everything was great) and at the end when you're just about to give *salām* with the imām you realise, '*Oh I didn't recite Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*.' It's going to take guts now because everybody's seen you. You might even be a frontline guy right behind the imām and you've got lines of people behind you. Oh my God nightmare scenario! That's going to take some cajones I tell you right now. So, he stands up. If he stands up, the reason he's standing up is because he has forgotten a *rukn*, meaning like *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*. And because we know that you can't make up for *rukn* without doing the *rukn* and then doing *sajdah*, he will stand up and he will do the *Fātiḥah* and everything that follows it because that whole unit was cancelled (and maybe even more). Obviously, if he missed it in the first *rakʿah* he will have to do the whole prayer again and if he missed it in the fourth *rakʿah* then there's just one. Then he will do *sajdatʾl-sahw*.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is saying that if you now give *salām* after this imām, you've now intentionally invalidated your prayer.

You can see that this is a kind of strict position and that's why it's a super minority. It is held by very, very few scholars frankly. Very few. I mean the logic is clear. The position is clear. It makes sense what he's saying, to an extent. But the fact is that we could say to him: Worst case scenario, so he did the *salām*, and he did it extra. If you do a *salām* in the wrong place absent-mindedly or because you weren't sure or because you were following the imām, then that in itself will require a *sajdah*.

So, you know Shaykh says it is *mutaʿadhdhirah*, it is impossible, to do that *sajdah* [with the imām].

We will say that listen. I mean it's not that it's impossible. You shouldn't do it but it's not like it's impossible. If you did it, then it is the same as when the imām has not made a mistake, you came halfway through the prayer… How many times does this happen to all of us folks? Answer this question: We have two *rakʿah* to do, completely gone, lost

our minds in the prayer, imām says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right], we also say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right]. And what normally happens is [you start to say the *taslīm*, realise your mistake] then you stand up. So, you do the old shrug of the shoulder because you realise that '*Hold on! I have two left.*' So, you stand up. That's obviously the blag that I do.

In this scenario what are you meant to do?

You have added to the prayer folks. There's nothing else here. And after the *ṣalāh* you will give *taslīm*, and you will then give the two *sajdat'l-sahw* because you have added to the prayer—that extra *taslīm*.

Now, if you are behind the imām and you have come late and the imām now does the *salām* and you now do the *salām,* but you are still sitting there… and this is why I don't subscribe to Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's opinion. The **class position** by the way is the position of the majority. And I say that you can almost argue, out of laziness as opposed to legal excellence. But frankly, I have studied this in a lot of detail (previously and I reviewed it right now as well), I didn't see anything to the level that I want to satisfy myself. Like just think about this *ʿaqlan*. Let's say I did give the *salām* because I saw the imām give the *salām*. Let's go through all the scenarios for a person who has come late to a prayer who has a couple of units to make up afterwards, and the imām has made a mistake, he says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right] and he wants to do *sajdah* after the *taslīm*. Let us go through the various scenarios what is going to happen practically.

You are going to be sitting there saying, '*I am just going to wait for the imām to finish then I am going to stand up*.' You are knowing everything that is going on and you are not giving the *salām.* That is completely fine. That is a good position to be in. So, in that scenario you are sitting there, and you are just waiting. You are sitting there, and you are just watching everything, and you have seen them go for *sajdah* and you are in control. You haven't given the *salām* because you are intending to stand up, but you are doing it nice and slow.

The second scenario is that you stood up immediately. So, you waited for the imām to say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* and you stood up immediately.

A third scenario would be that you forgot that you have prayer to make up and you also said *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* with the imām. And as soon as you said that you are kind of starting to remember that you need to stand up. But you did give the *salām.*

A fourth scenario is that you believe that you should do the *sajdah* with him. But being the Pak that you are, you didn't do the *taslīm* anyway. So, he is doing it after *taslīm,* you are waiting to get up, you realise that he goes down for *sajdah*, so just like you have done all your life you go down for *sajdah* anyway without making *taslīm.* Now

ironically, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn doesn't cover this particular scenario of this guy. You see, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn sticks to the proper way and is assuming that these people who cannot make this *sajdah* with the imām after the *taslīm*, he is assuming that everybody knows that you have to make the *taslīm* yourself and you exited from the prayer. The truth is, as I put forward to you and as anecdotally certainly we have got it, is that the majority actually don't even say *salām*. And if you didn't say *salām*, then you haven't exited from the prayer. You turned his 'after the *taslīm sajdah'* into a 'before *taslīm sajdah*' for yourself. So, it doesn't even matter.

(0:50:00) And that is why I personally believe that the *fuqahāʾ* almost adopted a 'lazy position' in this. Because very few of them, certainly from what I have read and very little reading frankly that I could have done. I could have done a lot more, but I am not going to waste my life on this because I don't think it is so important. And it must be there somewhere, but they didn't cover for all the scenarios that we are talking about. We are going into far more detail. They didn't make the differentiation. They didn't mention that he gives *taslīm* or not. For their assumption you have made *taslīm* as well. For their assumption, it happens so quick. Sometimes the imām, he is so embarrassed about it that he just [quickly] says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [as he turns his head to the right then quickly says] *Allāhu akbar* [and goes into *sajdah*]. He makes it like a short one, and his proper one is the one that he does after the *sajdah*, he says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning his head to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning his head to the left]. It is almost like, '*Well you know what? I am going to have to do it again in a minute, so I am going to just make this a quick one*.'

Anyway, having said all of that, let me summarise. I'll make it just nice and simple. The majority of scholars consider that the imām must be followed in a *sajdah* whether the imām does *sajdah* before the *taslīm* or after the *taslīm*. That's it. It doesn't matter whether you have prayer to make up or not. If you have prayer to make up, you do the *sajdah* with the imām and then you stand up and that is the end of the prayer. That's it. Like I said, I can give you the baby version. That's the baby version. I went into detail to give you some of the meat and obviously the devil is in the detail, isn't it? It gets confusing. You don't need to re-watch, rewrite, re-nothing. It is that simple.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says no you can't do that. No problem if it is before the *taslīm* because it is in the prayer. No problem if you started with the imām etc. But if you are someone who has prayer to make up, how can you do a *sajdah* after the *taslīm* with the imām because that will mean you have to exit from the prayer? So, he is just keeping it real.

Student (online): Clarification: I wait for the second *taslīm* to get up and finish my *ṣalāh?*

Ustādh: Honestly, the reason I ignored this question is because I have answered it maybe three or four or fifty times, I think. I know that people keep talking about it has to be twice or not. I said that it doesn't matter. One is the *aṣl*, two is not obligatory anyway. So, it doesn't matter. When the imām does one that is the only thing that

matters, meaning if you are doing it by yourself, I said the class position is that it is after one. But if you are with the imām, it doesn't matter whether the imām does one or two—you are following the imām.

I think that what I want to say is that I think Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn basically he sees it that surely if you are doing it after the *salām,* you are having to exit the prayer. So, if you are having to exit the prayer then you have messed up your prayer and how can you be doing that?

We will say okay, logically you are right. But considering that doing the *sajdah* before or after is not a major, and considering that most people don't even get the time or the wherewithal to know that they are meant to make the *salām* as well, whilst the imām has done it quickly and then gone into *sajdah*, and considering that the vast majority of *fuqahāʾ* (modern, contemporary, old, traditional, classic, and the *madhāhib*) consider that you have to do it even if you did do it correctly and give the *salām*, we are going with that. It is lazy, and I said that before. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's is technical and correct, and if someone followed it, respect.

If you are following Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position, what does that mean?

It means that if you join the prayer late, and you notice that the imām says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* and goes for *sajdah*, you will ignore it. You will stand up. You will finish off your prayer. Then at the end, after you give one *salām*, the *taslīm*, you will then go into *sajdah*, copying basically what the imām did. That is what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position is.

Our position, the position of the majority, the position of the Ḥanābilah, is that you will do the *sajdah* with the imām, even if you have prayer to make up, whether you gave *salām* or not. Like I said earlier on, even if you gave *salām* and you 'exited the prayer' like Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn has said, well guess what? (This is a bit bad to say) but the *sajdah* you are just making is covering up for it. These two *sajdahs* of mistake, of forgetfulness, that the imām is doing because of some mistake that happened in the prayer, whether you realised that mistake or not, you are just chucking in another mistake for free, and it is covered. That is why I do not think it is a very serious issue.

So, even if you give *salām*, or you do not give *salām*, the majority say you would do the *sajdah* with the imām. Then when the imām sits back up and says, *assalāmu alaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* to end the prayer completely (whether he says it once or twice) then at the end of the prayer, that is when you stand and make up the remainder of the prayer. And at the end of the prayer, your prayer, will you do anything? No. Because you did it with the imām. It is as simple as that. I can make this as easy as possible, or as complicated as possible.

The **<u>class position</u>** is exactly what the text says: There is no prostration for the follower unless the imām does so. If you read that statement it means that you do it before, you do it after, it does not matter. You do it whether you give the *salām*, don't give the *salām*,

forget the *salām*, you do not know what is going on—it does not matter. You just make the *sajdah* with the imām, and that is it. This is obviously, only if the imām makes a mistake.

Now, if you are praying behind the imām and he does not make a mistake, but you make a mistake (I think we covered this) you will have to do a *sajdah* yourself. You finish the *ṣalāh* with the imām, imām stands up, you will also stand up afterwards, and you will then finish the *ṣalāh*.

Shaykh wants to discuss a few points on page 390.

وإن كان سهو الإِمام فيما مضى من صلاته قبل أن يدخل معه لم يجب عليه أن يسجد.

He says: If the imām forgets in the prayer and he makes two *rukūʿ*, for example, in *Ẓuhr* in the second *rakʿah* (so, instead of doing one *rukūʿ* he does two), and you were part of that (meaning, you had joined the prayer and you saw that and you were part of it), then you, according to Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, will need to make a *sajdah* when your prayer is finished.

Why do I say that?

This is the assumption: (a) that you are late and you have more prayer to make up (you are going to stand up afterwards), and (b) that you know that when you add an action to the prayer, the *sajdah* is afterwards.

So, according to Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, you will not do the *sajdah* with the imām. You will stand up and make it yourself. That is what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is saying.

The majority, the rest of us, will say that when the imām goes down for the *sajdah*, because he will do it after the *taslīm* as is correct, we will also go down as well. Then we will stand up and make up the rest of the prayer ourselves.

Shaykh then gives another example. He says that the imām added a second *rukūʿ* in the first *rakʿah*, and you were not there for that. You entered the prayer in the second *rakʿah*. Shaykh says:

فإنه لا يلزمك السجود لأن الأصل وجوب السجود هنا كان تبعا للإمام

This is very interesting. This is a *sajdah,* first of all, that is going to be done by the imām after the *taslīm*. However, whilst you are sitting there and you see this imām going

down for the *taslīm*, you are going to say to yourself, '*For these three rakʿah that I have been with the imām, there is not a single mistake that he made*.' He did not make a mistake. He did not make a single addition. (You can see the problem with Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position here, but we will come to that in a second.) '*He did not make any addition, so this must have happened in the first unit that I was not there. So, when I was not there, that is when the mistake occurred*.' Therefore, you do not need to make *sajdah*, neither with the imām (because that is his position anyway), but also when you stand up and then you finish your prayer also, because you are not connected to the imām's prayer anymore. So, why are you having to make a *sajdah* for the imām's mistake?

(1:00:00)

I actually agree with this position. But the fact of the matter is that if I am going to make *sajdah* with the imām anyway, then it does not matter. Also, how are you going to know [the reason for his post-*taslīm sujūdʾl-sahw*]? How are you going to be able to work out for certain?

I remember Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn being asked this question in his *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa*: What if you do not know? Sometimes you are going to make a guess sometimes you are not.

Shaykh says of course if someone *iḥtiyāṭan*, out of caution, just assumes that it happened whilst he was praying, then that's safer. But he is speaking from a legal point of view, legally if certainly you knew.

I will just give you a hypothetical scenario. Remember again, when we say after *taslīm* in our minds we are thinking immediately, the *sunnah* actually means like a couple of minutes afterwards because you are trying to work out where the mistake was. So, imagine that you are there, imagine you are one of those guys who is a very slow mover. Imagine you are a slow, slow moving guy. The imām says *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning his head to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning his head to the left], '*Guys! Did I two rukūʿ in the first rakʿah?*' They say, '*You did you know*.'

That has all happened in five seconds. You are still there finishing [your *duʿāʾ* before *taslīm*] and you are getting ready to stand up, and you have actually caught five seconds of a conversation. So, you now know for certain that '*Hey, I came for second, third and fourth. I missed this first rakʿah*.'

So, this is also a legal position that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn could be describing. It is very real, meaning we don't need to make it imaginary and all the rest of it. So, he's right, meaning that now you know the mistake was not with you, but the mistake was in the first *rakʿah* when you were not there. So, now technically Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is saying and now as you stand up, a bit slow a bit late, but now that you stand up and finish off your prayer, you do not need to make the *sajdah* that they are going to do right now, nor the one by yourself at the end. But then he covers himself and says listen because if you don't know you're not sure then if you do the *sajdah* it does not really matter. When he says that, he is still sticking to his guns—not with the imām but he is talking

about afterwards. So, when you stand up to complete your odd unit you should then do the *sajdah* as well at that moment when you finish at the end, out of safety.

This is my opinion (Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says) in this issue, whereas the author is saying is that you follow the imām after the *salām* whether you caught the mistake, did not catch the mistake, understood where it was, did not understand where it was. In all scenarios you are not there to work things out. You follow.

And listen I am with that as well. The truth is that that is the easiest simplest position. For you sitting there and trying to work out did you catch it, not catch it, was it something that I was aware of or not aware of.

إذا كان المأموم مسبوقاً وسَهَا في صلاته، والإِمام لم يسهُ فهل عليه سجود

So, I think we have already said that if you make a mistake with the imām you don't need to do any *sajdah*. But if you make a mistake whilst you are separately praying whether you made it during your prayer or after the prayer, then you have to make *sajdah*.

Finally, Shaykh says you are praying behind the imām and he doesn't consider the *sujūdʾl-sahw* to be obligatory for the thing that you do. So, for example *al-tashahhudʾl-awwal*, if you leave out *tashahhudʾl-awwal*, then the majority of the scholars say you have to make a *sajdatʾl-sahw* before the *taslīm.*

But there are some scholars, Shāfiʿi in one position, does not consider it obligatory and that is because of some *taʾwīl* and some interpretation. So, for example it's not obligatory so he doesn't do it. And you, like the majority, know the *ḥadīth* is clear—you have to do it [*sujūdʾl-sahw*], obligatory, if you miss out an obligation, like the first *tashahhud*.[7] Then you have to make it up.

What do you do here? Does the *maʾmūm* make a *sajdah*, even though the imām hasn't? So, he hears the imām say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right], so he quickly cheekily does his two *sajdah* before. Does he do it afterwards? He says, '*You know, I'm not going to cause fitnah. I'm going to do it on a sly*.' What does he do?

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says no, he doesn't make the *sajdah* at all because al-imām that's his position and it's a valid position, there is some *ikhtilāf* on the issue. And your prayer is linked to the imām's prayer. And the imām has made that decision. The imām is covering for you, the imām is the *ḍāmin*. It's not some *bāṭil* fantasy, this is a well-

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: Whoever Considered That the First Tashahhud Is Not Compulsory, ḥadīth no. 829.*

established *fiqhi* position. So, he did not make a mistake. He did it knowingly—that is a very important point. It wasn't some kind of error of forgetfulness (which is different). He did it knowing, '*It is not obligatory for me. I'm not going to do it*.'

Not a million miles away from the idea of someone who wipes over socks. There are a number of scholars that don't accept that (wiping over socks) they said no, it has to be leather *khuff* not socks. This person didn't do that automatically, followed the position that it is permissible to do so and the prayer is absolutely valid behind this person without any issue.

However, if the imām does see it as obligatory and he forgets to do the *sujūd*, then the *fuqahāʾ* as narrated in *al-Muntahā* with its commentary, the *maʾmūm* should make the *sajdah* only if he genuinely thinks the imām is not going to do it, if he thinks that it's not going to happen. He gives him a chance, he waits, he waits, he waits, he waits, he waits and then the *salām* goes he might even say, '*You know what? He might do it afterwards so I'm just going to wait*,' and he waits and at that moment he would do it. Whether he does it before or after that is a practical consideration, but he would do it because the imām forgot.

But these are also hypothetical ones, because really you could also then finish with the imām and say to the imām, '*Hey! Do you know that you forgot to do this, that, whatever?*' And he will say, '*Oh yes*!' Now at that moment there is no possibility of doing the *sajdah* before *taslīm*, so you will do it there and then. It now automatically becomes after. That is another reason why there is a lot of flexibility on the issue of when: Should it happen before or after?

The *maʾmūm*, if he does it after the *ṣalāh* because he was waiting to give it a chance, I think that is good. Even though the mistake that was left out would have indicated that he should do it beforehand. He is with the imām. He does not know. The imām might do it before, the imām might have a different opinion and do it afterwards. But if the prayer finishes and he does not do it, then he should say to him. And if the imām does not do it—refuses—and the *maʾmūm* knows for certain that there was a mistake, then he does it himself. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

(1:10:00)

You might be thinking: How on earth can the Shāfiʿi school and some scholars consider there are some *sujūd* that are not obligatory? How did they come to that position when the *ḥadīth* is very clear?

In actual fact, there are some *aḥadīth* that state that let him do the *sajdatayn* and it will be for him a *nāfilah*. Some scholars understood *nāfilah* to mean supererogatory and therefore not obligatory. Actually, the correct understanding, if these *aḥadīth* are authentic, which I do not think they are, I don't hold them to be authentic, but let's play devil's advocate and say that they are authentic, then we want to say that *nāfilah* means rewarded. Because there is space for that in the Arabic language. When we say something is *nāfilah*, it means rewarded. So, they are obligatory and they are rewarded.

By the way, this is only for when you add something to the prayer. That is where the flexibility is. Almost every scholar considers it absolutely obligatory to do *sajdat'l-sahw* for matters of doubt or when you miss an obligation. Let's be very clear on that.

I want you to know if you think about this logically, that makes sense because if you have a deficient prayer, it makes sense that you have to fix it with something. But if you add something to the prayer, then you have done the original prayer, you've just done a bit extra. So, it can make sense that I do not really need to do the *sajdah*. And there are quite a few scholars who held that position. They did not obligate *sujūd'l-sahw* if you added something—even if you left out a *rukn*, you are going to end up doing the *rukn* and extra. I just want you to have that bit of flexibility in your minds.

Students are asking: How do you do the *sajdah*?

I have described it. But I just want to mention a few things about the ones that we know that we are used to, and what it is that we are saying in the class. When we are saying that the *sujūd* is done before the *taslīm* or after, it does not actually matter. There is a huge number of scholars, not the majority, or it could even be argued the majority, and they all differed on what were the key parts of the *sujūd'l-sahw*.

Do you need to do the *taslīm* for it or not?

Do you need to say *Allāhu akbar* for it or not?

Is the *Allāhu akbar* part of the *sajdah* or is it just the two *sajdahs*?

And the most differed over is the *tashahhud*: Should the *tashahhud* be recited or not? Like all the Paks do. The Shāfiʿis also do the *tashahhud.* Certainly, the Ḥanafis, the Paks, everybody does that. And the reason is because of the *ḥadīth* that is narrated by Imām al-Tirmidhi and it is the *ḥadīth* of ʿImrān ibn Ḥusayn ﵁:

النَّبِيَّ صلى الله عليه وسلم صَلَّى بِهِمْ فَسَهَا فَسَجَدَ سَجْدَتَيْنِ ثُمَّ تَشَهَّدَ ثُمَّ سَلَّمَ

"The Prophet ﷺ led them in *ṣalāh* and forgot (something) so he ﷺ performed two prostrations, then the *tashahhud*, then the *salām*." [8]

Imām al-Tirmidhi says this *ḥadīth* is *ḥasan gharīb.* This *ḥadīth* is good but it's odd. And there is a huge discussion which we are not getting into about what that even means. [§] But there is criticism against this *ḥadīth*. A number of the *muḥaddithīn* consider this

[8] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Prayer, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the Tashahhud in the Case of the Prostrations of Forgetfulness, ḥadīth no. 395.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ*

[§] We had a brief discussion about what *shādhdh ḥadīth* are and how they are dealt with in *Logical Progression,* Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 36. MT

ḥadīth to be weak. If this *ḥadīth* is weak, then it is the end of the discussion. The *ḥadīth* is not an evidence, and that is it. There should be no *tashahhud*. However, a huge number of scholars acted upon this *ḥadīth*. They took it as authentic. ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﷺ from the Companions, most of his students like Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī, all of *ahl* Kūfa and Irāq and so on. So, we are therefore talking about *ahl'l-raʿi*, all of them. I am not sure about the Mālikiyyah. I think that they might [do the *tashahhud* in the *sujūd'l-sahw*] but I have got some doubts about that. But certainly, Abu Ḥanīfah, Abu Yūsuf, al-Thawri, all of Iraq, the Shāfiʿīs as well—a number of scholars.

As for the rest, there is no *tashahhud*. They either said no *tashahhud* because the *ḥadīth* is weak, or the *ḥadīth* is not weak, but it is *ʿala'l-istiḥbāb*. Because we have so many *ḥadīth* that are far more authentic (as Ibn Qudāmah said in *al-Mughni*), far, far more authentic and far more in number that do not mention a whiff of the *tashahhud*. Not a single thing.

Therefore, when you have a *ḥadīth* that comes and says you do it, the *ḥadīth* is (1) either automatically *shādhdh*, it's odd, and the odd is always kicked out and made something to be considered weak when it goes up against the authentic, or (2) you try to make *jamʿ*, reconcile. So, if the *ḥadīth* is authentic enough, then we say, '*You know what? Let's take this ḥadīth and put it in with the rest*.' The reconciliation here is that it is okay for you to do it. And if you do it, it is fine. But the *sunnah*, most of the time, it is not. The actual way to do it is [without the *tashahhud*], or: It's not obligatory for you to do it. So, you can take any of those positions in between.

Our **<u>class position,</u>** the Ḥanbali official position, the evidence-based position, there's no doubt there's no *tashahhud*, but of course if you do it it's not a major problem at all.

Our **<u>class position</u>** is that if you are going to do the *sujūd'l-sahw*, this is how you would do it. You've now finished [the pre-*taslīm duʿā'*], I'm at the end of the *ṣalāh*, I'm just making my final *duʿā'*. I've done my *tashahhud* and everything, and I forgot *tashahhud'l-awwal*, my first *tashahhud*, so I need to make *sajdah* before the *taslīm*.

So, I've now finished my prayer and before the *taslīm* means I will not now say *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*. I will say [my pre-*taslīm duʿā'*]. [Then say] *Allāhu akbar* [as you go into *sujūd*]. [While in *sujūd* say] *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*. [Then come out of *sujūd* while saying] *Allāhu akbar*, [and while sitting between the *sajdahs* say] *Rabbigh-firli*, *Rabbig-firli*. [Then go back into *sujūd* while saying] *Allāhu akbar*. [While in *sujūd* say] *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*. [Then come out of *sujūd* while saying] *Allāhu akbar*. [Then while turning the head to the right say] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, [and while turning the head to the left say] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*.

Things to note here are that what you say in *sujūd'l-sahw* is exactly what you say in the normal *sujūd*. That means the *takbīr* carries over, *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla* carries over, *Rabbigh-firli* carries over, etc. And that's an *ijtihād* opinion but that's our position, and Allāh ﷻ knows best.

If it is after the *taslīm*, you added something to the prayer, you missed out a *rukn* and therefore you had to go back and make it up and you added extra things as a result without even intending to, or you had some doubt and you thought about it then realised you got it right, you did *taḥarri*, it is after. Then as you come to the end of the prayer: *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [while turning the head to the right]. Once is sufficient. If you did twice that's okay as well. [Then say] *Allāhu akbar* [while going into *sujūd*]. [While in *sujūd* say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*. [Then come out of *sujūd* while saying] *Allāhu akbar*, [and while sitting between the *sajdahs* say] *Rabbigh-firli*, *Rabbig-firli*. [Then go back into *sujūd* while saying] *Allāhu akbar*. [While in *sujūd* say] *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-Aʿla*. [Then come out of *sujūd* while saying] *Allāhu akbar*. [Then while turning the head to the right say] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*, [and while turning the head to the left say] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*.

No *tashahhud* ever needed, always going to have to make *taslīm* twice after each *sajdah* that you do, whether you did it before or afterwards.

(1:20:00)

Q & A

Q (online): If a late person who missed at least a *rakʿah* makes a mistake after doing a *sajdatʾl-sahw* with the imām, what do they do?

A: You would do a *sajdah*. You're basically saying: Is it possible to do two *sajdahs*?

The answer is yes, because that was for the mistake with the imām and you decided to go with it. If you followed Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position, you would only end up doing one because you wouldn't do it with the imām unless you did it before *sajdah*. If you did it before *sajdah* with the imām and then you made one yourself afterwards, then you would do it and Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): For the *maʾmūm* who is late for the prayer, he performs the *sajdatʾl-sahw* with the imām and then makes up the rest of his prayer. Does he also perform a *sajdatʾl-sahw* at the end as well? And if so then the *sajdatʾl-sahw* the *maʾmūm* did with the imām is not *ḥukman* but only done just to follow the imām is that correct?

A: No. He doesn't do another one.

Q (online): Our family was praying in *jamāʿah* and my husband said the *salām* after the second *rakʿah* of *Maghrib*. I automatically said *Allāhu akbar* to remind him he missed a *rakʿah*. Once we completed the prayer, he said I should have said *subḥān Allāh*. Did I

mess up my prayer if I did that? Would saying *Allāhu akbar* to remind the imām invalidate my prayer? Do I need to repeat my *Maghrib*?

A: He's right. You made a mistake. Did you mess up your prayer? No, we've already covered that. We said that sometimes even *Allāhu akbar* is required if a person is not catching on. Here, you made the mistake by assuming that he wouldn't realise. All you needed to say was *subḥān Allāh*. You do not need to repeat the prayer. The prayer is not invalidated. If you go back 5-6 lessons, those legislated statements which from the prayer that are said in the wrong place do not obligate *sajdat'l-sahw*, let alone repetition of the prayer.[††] And it's also from the *jins* of the *ṣalāh* as well. And we said that you can even speak in the *ṣalāh* if there's a real need for it. And we even said that if the person is not getting it and you're saying *subḥān Allāh*, then you might recite the *ayah* for them, you might even say *Allāhu akbar* or you might even say *samiʿ Allāh*, you would try to help a person. There's space for all of that.

Q (online): A sister has *istiḥāḍah* and was wondering if she has to change her tampon for each *ṣalāh*? She makes *wuḍūʾ* for each *ṣalāh* but doesn't change her tampon if the pad is clean.

A: If the pad is clean then of course she doesn't need to change it. Now on the issue of a *wuḍūʾ* for each prayer, that's the position of the majority. If she does that, that's fine—*wuḍūʾ* and *istinjāʾ* for each prayer. In my position you don't need to, and you can look on the group and someone will post the article that I've written about that.[9] So, check that out. Now if it is soiled, there is no doubt that it is best to replace it. But if it hasn't been soiled, there is no reason to change it. Absolutely not.

Q (online): For the *duʿāʾ* at the end of *ṣalāh*, Ḥanafis usually go with *Allāhumma inni ẓalamtu nafsi*. Is this authentic, if so, can you add to it with any other *duʿāʾ* or does it have to be *duʿāʾ* of forgiveness?

A: That is authentic. Absolutely. And as we have covered the issue of *duʿāʾ* before *taslīm* in a huge amount of detail. Very important for you to read.[‡‡] All *duʿāʾ* can be used there. Lots and lots of *duʿāʾ*. *Allāhumma inni ẓalamtu nafsi* is the best out of all of them.

[††] Saying legitimate statements in the wrong place in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lesson 8. MT

[9] "The Ruling on Making Wuḍūʾ for Those with Irregular Vaginal Bleeding (Istiḥāḍah), Incontinence, Excessive Flatulence, etc." *Ilm Source*, Oct. 2015, http://ilmsource.com/2015/10/11/the-ruling-on-making-wudhu-for-those-with-irregular-vaginal-bleeding-istihadhah-ibs-incontinence-excessive-flatulence-etc/

[‡‡] *Duʿāʾ* before *taslīm* was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lessons 41-49. MT

Q (online): Once I exited the prayer, I realised straightaway that I had missed a *rukn*. Shall I enter the prayer with *takbīrat'l-iḥrām,* or shall I go straight to that position?

A: Straight to that position. And then *sajdat'l-sahw* at the end afterwards.

Q (online): A woman has the habit, blood of menses for seven days then very little white discharge followed by one or two days of brown discharge and *istiḥāḍah* kind of blood then again white discharge. We tell her first seven days are *hayḍ* and rest is *istiḥāḍah* every month, right?

A: Yes, correct. You have to go by the nature of the blood. The menstrual blood only. It doesn't matter what happens afterwards. Whether it's brown or white or red or *istiḥāḍah*, etc. White discharge happens two times, three times, it doesn't matter. Only thing that matters is the blood that looks, smells, feels, etc. like *hayḍ*.

Q (online): Since you said I should have said *subḥān Allāh*, I assume it's okay to say *subḥān Allāh* for women with *maḥram*? My husband and I discussed whether or not women can say *subḥān Allāh* or if they have to clap, even with *maḥram*.

A: You are absolutely right. You shouldn't have said *subḥān Allāh*, you should have clapped. I don't know why I said that you should have said *subḥān Allāh*. I was thinking of you as a guy. You should have clapped. But anyway, I also think as I went over this, but I believe that if a woman says *subḥān Allāh* in her home, with her *maḥram*, I don't think that it's a major problem. I think it's okay.

Q (online): Off topic, but in your opinion is Ethereum crypto *ḥalāl* to invest into?

A: Yes, I think that Ethereum is allowed to invest in.

21. Chapter 20 Lesson 16: The Prostration for Forgetfulness

وسجودُ السَهْوِ لِمَا يُبْطِلُ عَمْدُه واجبٌ.

Anything which when done intentionally would invalidate the prayer, necessitates a prostration for forgetfulness (when done unintentionally).

(0:25:30) In *ṣalāh* there are actions that you have to do and there are actions that you don't have to do. And if you leave those actions out intentionally, there is a consequence. If I leave out reciting the *sūrah,* [*Sūrat*] *al-Ikhlāṣ* for example, after *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*. If I intentionally leave that out, I have left out a *sunnah*. Leaving out a *sunnah* intentionally does not do anything to the prayer. However, if I were to leave out the *Fātiḥah* intentionally, we know that invalidates the prayer. A person can't go in and say, '*I'm not going to recite Fātiḥah today in my prayer*.' Your prayer is gone, finished.

So, the author is saying that if you were to… (unintentionally is definitely the bracket word, it's assumed) …or out of ignorance—that's why he hasn't put brackets because it is unintentional, it is being forced, it is forgetful, it's a mistake—all of the possible reasons you could mess up. If you did a mess up with an action that belongs to the category of those actions that if you were to leave them the prayer is invalidated (if you were to do them or leave them out intentionally), then the *sajdat'l-sahw* is an absolute obligation. If you don't do it, then the prayer is messed up.

In other words, any leaving out or any messing up of the obligations or the *arkān* or whatever, obligates the need for a *sujūd'l-sahw*. I think everybody knows that. We have covered that. But the way that he has put it here is confusing, but the way he has put it here is very important for us to understand what he meant by that.

(0:31:00)

So, that's all the Shaykh is saying.

Shaykh gives an example of *Rabbigh-firli, Rabbigh-firli* between the two *sajdah*. Again, you know the class position is that this is a *sunnah* not an obligation, but let's just assume the Ḥanbali [position], that it is an obligation. Leaving that out intentionally invalidates the prayer. So, that's now put it in the serious category. Now that means if you were to forget—not leave out intentionally—if you were to forget to say *Rabbigh-*

firli, *Rabbigh-firli* and you remembered right at the end, '*Oh! I forgot Rabbigh-firli*, *Rabbigh-firli*.' You have to do the *sajdah*.

That is the taught point of this class. And then you can build upon that.

If you were to leave *Fātiḥah* out intentionally, you have invalidated the prayer. If you miss out *Fātiḥah*, you have to do the *sajdah*. But obviously, the difference is that not only do you have to do the *sajdah,* but you have to bring the *Fātiḥah* again. So, you will actually end up doing another *rakʿah* because you have to do the *rukn* as well.

For example, if you left out the *tashahhudʾl-awwal*, then likewise you would have to do the *sajdah* because the *tashahhudʾl-awwal* is obligatory. If you left it out intentionally the prayer would be invalidated. So, if you were to forget it, or you were to get doubtful about it, etc. but you remembered and you did not intend to mess it up and you remembered, you fix it with a *sujūd* and the *sujūd* is obligatory.

Likewise, what we said before: What about if we were to leave out an action intentionally that does not invalidate the prayer like *duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ*?

Then we said before that it is not obligatory to do the *sajdatʾl-sahw* and we even argued that it does not even make sense (if you remember that lesson).† But we said it is legislated, meaning that from an angle of people messing up something that is a common thing that that they should be doing and they let themselves down, so if they want to do it then it is something which is good, they can do it. But is it obligatory? No, it's not obligatory.

What about if you were to speak?

So, we know that, for example, that it's not just leaving things out but adding things as well. For example, when you speak. If you intentionally were to speak proper language. I mean, '*Hey listen! Come over here!*" Something like that, there is no doubt that you did that intentionally—that kind of conversation, those amounts of words—that is invalidating the prayer. However, if done mistakenly, it does not invalidate the prayer.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn asks a question. For example, if a person was to speak out, there is a difference between this and actions which are from the actual prayer itself. We cannot make complete exact analogies. For example, the first *tashahhud*, we know that it is an obligation. We know that the *rukūʿ* is a pillar, so it is an obligation plus some. These are things that if you were to leave them out intentionally, or do in the wrong place intentionally as well, so let's say you added a *rukūʿ* somewhere intentionally, this would invalidate the prayer. No doubt about it. If you were to do it mistakenly, leaving out or adding a *tashahhud* or *rukūʿ* in a certain place, then we know that you have to fix the prayer appropriately (as we have covered) and you have to definitely make the

† Doing a prostration for forgetfulness when leaving out a *sunnah* of the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 19, Lessons 15 and 16. MT

sajdah obligatorily because these are things which would normally invalidate the prayer.

However, speaking out in English in the prayer, this is similar but not the same. Similar, because if you were to do it intentionally, it invalidates the prayer. However, as is our **class position**, if it is not done intentionally, and done out of forgetfulness or ignorance, it not obligatory to make a *sajdat'l-sahw* for it (as we covered).‡ It is not considered to be one of the fundamentals of the prayer that you must obligate the *sajdah* for.

So, it is not in every single category. When we say: "that which invalidates the prayer", if done or left out intentionally, we are talking from the primary actions of the prayer itself.

Shaykh asks a question. He says: Okay. If we say that the *sajdah* does not need to be done for someone who speaks out in English, what about if you speak out in Arabic, the Qurʾān, in the wrong place? For example, if a person recites in the *rukūʿ* or in *sujūd*, Qurʾān out of forgetfulness, what happens in this scenario? Is it obligatory for him to do the *sajdah* or is it a *sunnah*?

The Shaykh says that the majority of scholars do not consider it to be obligatory because they do not see (as our text says) that the performing of this act intentionally invalidates the prayer. If a person wants to recite the Qurʾān in the *sajdah* intentionally, the majority of scholars do not consider it to invalidate the prayer. Some even allowed it.

The problem of course, is that there are *ḥadīth* that prohibit it. I want you to understand that if you do not think that doing it intentionally invalidates the prayer, then you can never obligate the *sajdah* to fix it because you have nothing to fix.

Now that this is in your head, I want you to imagine that there are some scholars that say no, we have a major problem. Some of the scholars and literalists, as Shaykh says at the bottom of page 393, said that if a person intentionally recites in the *rukūʿ* or *sujūd*, then definitely, the prayer is invalidated because it is not allowed. Because the Prophet ﷺ said:

أَلاَ وَإِنِّي نُهِيتُ أَنْ أَقْرَأَ الْقُرْآنَ رَاكِعًا أَوْ سَاجِدًا

"And see that I have been forbidden to recite the Qurʾān in the state of bowing and prostration." [1]

‡ The consequence of speaking in the prayer on the validation of the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lesson 8. MT

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Prohibition of Reciting the Qurʾān While Bowing and Prostrating, ḥadīth no. 479 a.*

Or you can translate that as: "Indeed, I was prohibited". This *ḥadīth* is narrated by [Muslim] and is something which is authentic. Shaykh then says that if a person is reciting the Qurʾān and he is in *rukūʿ* and *sujūd*, then he has done something which the Lawmaker has prohibited. Therefore, the prayer has been invalidated. Such as someone who would speak out. It is the same thing.

Zayd ibn al-Arqam ﵁ said:

فَأُمِرْنَا بِالسُّكُوتِ وَنُهِينَا عَنِ الْكَلاَمِ

"We were commanded to observe silence (in the prayer) and were forbidden to speak." [2,3]

And therefore, Shaykh says, this is a very strong evidence. However, he says that if you think about it, there's a difference between *nuhīna ʿanʾl-kalām*, meaning "we were prohibited from speaking", and: "I was prohibited from reciting the Qurʾān", because the prohibition of the recitation of the Qurʾān is only in certain places. The recitation of the Qurʾān is from the prayer. It's an essential part of the prayer. It's from the *arkān* of the prayer. Just a little bit extra in certain places we don't do, like in *sajdah* and in *rukūʿ*. Whereas the statement of Zayd ibn Arqam ﵁: "We were prohibited from *kalām*," *kalām*, speech, that's prohibited completely from the prayer. It's not even close to the prayer. It's not even part of the prayer. It's not from the *jins* of prayer. It's not from the *jins* of *ʿibādah*. It's not from *dhikr*. It's completely prohibited. So, both can't be put on the same pedestal.

(0:40:00)

And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is absolutely right there. We can't apply the same.

So, based upon that, what can we say?

We can say that the correct position, the **<u>class position</u>**, is that if a person was to recite in the *sajdah* or *rukūʿ* from the Qurʾān, that he is not obligated to make the *sajdah*. I also want to add (to strengthen our class position) that we don't even consider it to be prohibited *ʿalaʾl-iṭlāq*. That if a person was to recite parts of *ayāt* in the form of *duʿāʾ*, then that's not a problem. That's not coming under the prohibition. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Now you have to understand why of course it is prohibited, why the *ḥadīth* exists. The *ḥadīth* exists because the Qurʾān is meant to be recited in a manner, it's the *kalām* of Allāh ﷻ, and its honorable words that should not be coming forth in a humiliated,

---

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Actions While Praying, Chapter: What Speech Is Prohibited During Prayer, ḥadīth no. 1200.*

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Prohibition of Speaking During the Prayer, and the Abrogation of its Former Permissibility, ḥadīth no. 539 a.*

debased, low state. And the *sajdah* is the most humiliated, lowest part. But if you turn it into your own personal plea, your own *duʿāʾ*, like *Rabbana lā tuʾākhidhnā in nasīnā aw akhṭaʾnā*, if you were to read it as a *duʿāʾ* that's okay. Even saying *Allāhumma ātina fiʾl-dunya ḥasanah*, changing the *Rabbana*, changing the *ayah* so that you turn it into your own human speech because once you've changed a word it becomes human speech, then I think there's some space. We're flexible on the matter anyway. But even if you were to be super strict and say no, it's *ḥarām*, we'll say: Listen! It might be *ḥarām,* but it is not the invalidator of the prayer like speaking is.

In the next part, the Shaykh says:

وتَبْطُلُ بتَرْكِ سجودٍ أفْضَلِيَّتُهِ قبلَ السلامِ فقطْ، وإن نَسِيَه وسَلَّمَ سَجَدَ إن قَرُبَ زَمَنُه

If one intentionally leaves a prostration (of forgetfulness) that is better to do before the *taslīm*, that prayer is invalidated. If he simply forgot to perform it and exited the prayer but the time is still near, he can prostrate.

So basically, if you are meant to be doing the *sujūdʾl-sahw* before the *taslīm,* i.e., like when you miss out on an obligation, etc. then that prayer is invalidated if you intentionally do it [after the *taslīm*]. Now intentionally actually means intentionally, unlike in the previous section. So, this is like you saying, '*Right. I have missed it out and I have to make sajdah. I have to make sajdah… You know what? I am not going to make sajdah now. I am going to make sajdah afterwards*.' That invalidates the prayer.

I just want you to understand about this debate. Again, I will summarise that the *sujūdʾl-sahw* is either before or afterwards. That is super clear from the *ḥadīth*. All the authentic *ḥadīth*—*Bukhāri*, *Muslim*, everything—make it clear that we have a couple of incidences that happened before, a couple afterwards.[4,5,6,7,8] And according to Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, according to Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, they very neatly compartmentalised the kind of mistakes into four and they have put them two before *taslīm*, two after *taslīm*.

---

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: Whoever Considered That the First Tashahhud Is Not Compulsory, ḥadīth no. 829.*
[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 571 a.*
[6] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Prayer, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the Tashahhud in the Case of the Prostrations of Forgetfulness, ḥadīth no. 395.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*
[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: Forgetfulness in Prayer and Prostrating to Compensate for It, ḥadīth no. 573 a.*
[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: To Clasp One's Hands by Interlocking the Fingers in the Mosque or Outside the Mosque, ḥadīth no. 482.*

A reminder: If you have doubt about something, no idea what is right, then you just build upon that and you fix your prayer and you make *sajdah* before. That is called the *sajdah* of doubt—number one. That is before *taslīm*.

Number two: When you miss out an obligation. If you miss out on an obligation, if you are able to go back to it very quickly, then this is not considered to be a mistake. But if you were to do something which is silly, which is like you are standing up reciting *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* and then you go back to it—that is a major problem. But that kind of thing, you miss out an obligation, that is also before *taslīm.*

Those are the two before.

The two after is (1) if you miss a *rukn* or you add something to the prayer, then that is going to be *sajdah* after, and (2) if you had doubt but then you thought about it and you realised you are okay and you just carry on as normal, that is after the *taslīm.*

Those are the two categories.

Now what is very interesting is that the scholars differed over this. The *madhāhib*, they all had their different takes on how to understand these different *sajdahs.* Some said there is an exception, some said it is abrogated, some has said this, some said that.

For example, Abu Ḥanīfah said that all of the *sujūd'l-sahw* happen after the *taslīm*.

Al-Shāfiʿi said all of them are before the *salām*, that is the popular position of the *madhhab* or I can maybe more accurately say that is his own position because some of the school consider *al-mufta bihi* to be not that. But just keep that in mind.

Imām Mālik said (a little bit of nuance) that if you have missed something out then it is before and if you have added something then it is afterwards. But if you have some forgetfulness and you increase then it is before. So Mālik is very close to Imam Aḥmad.

And in the Ḥanbali school we have a couple of different positions (as always) but [in the text of Imām al-Ḥajjāwi] as you can see is that they are all before. They prefer all of them before the *taslīm* except (1) if you add something to the prayer and when you add something to the prayer by that they do not mean if you add something in of itself, but you add something because you gave *salām* before, you finished the prayer early. Now if you finished the prayer early, by definition you are adding to the prayer. It is another way of saying it. But if you give *salām* and you finish the prayer early—so, you prayed three instead of four, you prayed two instead of four, you give the *taslīm.* What you have done effectively is added a *taslīm,* haven't you? You might say, '*Oh! You have exited the prayer*.' Well okay, well you're going to stand up and pray so you have actually added the *taslīm* to the prayer and you are going to have to make up for it as well. So, they said
(0:50:00) that is after the *taslīm* and (2) they said that if you do this *taḥarri*, you know you have some doubt and you work out what is right, then that's after the prayer as well.

The Ḥanbalis have generally got it like the Mālik but with a bit of nuance and then Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn and Ibn Taymiyyah they came and made it super clear kind of categorisation and it is nice and it is useful.

That's why the Shaykh says:

If one intentionally leaves a prostration (of forgetfulness) that is better to do before the *taslīm*…

Now this word 'better to do before the *taslīm*' there's a problem in this statement because first of all, if you are admitting that the *sajdah* is sometimes better to do before and better to do after, the word 'better' indicates flexibility even if you don't believe it is flexible. As I said before, in general the *madhāhib* in their *fatwa* positions they are flexible in that if a person was to make the mistake and do the *sajdah* that is meant to be done before, afterwards or do the *sajdah* that was meant to be done afterwards, before, they considered the prayer to be valid. From the outside of the *madhāhib* that doesn't seem like the case, but once you go deep into each *madh-hab* and you look at the *fatwa* positions, then you find it very rare that they will say your prayer is invalidated because you got the *sajdah* in the wrong place. And if you think about this logically or certainly in my opinion, I think, this is the right thing to do. This is quite a complicated matter and to expect the masses to know and differentiate into each different category of mistake… Students of knowledge struggle with this, what about the masses? Now that might be a weak argument, it is an argument to common sense which is not necessarily the primary source of Islam, however I strongly believe this.

The reason I'm talking about this is because he then follows and says that the prayer is invalidated.

Now we're okay with that maybe, not because he is being strict but because he is saying that you did it intentionally. So, it is not like you weren't sure, so you just did it before or afterwards. The *fatwa* of the scholars is about not being sure. So, if you are not sure and you do it before or you are not sure and you do it afterwards, it is okay. If you were to ask them: What about if you know that it is meant to be done before or after according to your *madh-hab* or according to your position and you did it intentionally? Then even they will also say it is invalidated. And that is the important nuance to catch here. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

That's what I understand. I could be wrong but that's what I understand. Maybe some of the Shāfiʿi, Māliki, some of the Ḥanābilah who are into their *madhāhib* can make a comment about that. But that's what I understand. It is the intentional action that is the problem here and the unintentional one they're okay with. And that's because they do not consider the performance before and after to be obligatory in of itself. They think it is better to do it before and better to do it afterwards.

Now the problem occurs with Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's own position which is also supported by Ibn Taymiyyah.

Ibn Taymiyyah's position and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position is that it is obligatory to do the *sajdah* that is meant to be done before the *salām* to be done before the *salām*. And it is obligatory to do those *sujūd'l-sahw* that are meant to happen after the prayer, after the prayer. Therefore, if you were to leave that out it will be sinful. You have to [do the *sujūd'l-sahw* in its right place]. And he comes to this because the actual sajdah itself is *wājib* and whatever is needed to get that *wājib* done itself becomes *wājib*—that's that is Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's evidence. He's saying that we see the Prophet ﷺ very clearly do these actions in their place and he ﷺ said:

صَلُّوا كَمَا رَأَيْتُمُونِي أُصَلّ

"Pray like you see me pray."[9]

Therefore, we have to copy him ﷺ and we would never play around with the *rukūʿ* or the *subḥāna Rabbīyy'l-ʿAẓīm*, or the *tashahhud*, etc. So, he's saying it is obligatory.

I have to say that in my heart the safe position is to go with Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn and say the **class position** is that. And I'm fine with saying that. But I have to say personally, I think that it is not obligatory knowledge. It is not obligatory to do the *sujūd* before and the *sujūd* after in their respective places. I think there's flexibility—not complete flexibility. I mean that a person who did that and didn't know. I don't think their prayer is invalidated. Whereas Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said if he doesn't know, the prayer is invalidated because he must know which way the *sajdah* is going to be, in which part.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn has made it very clear that (for him obligatory but for us *sunnah*) that there are two types of *sajdah* before and two types of *sajdah* afterwards and that you are meant to do them in their right places. The rest of the scholars are either saying no they should all be done before, or they should all be done after, or there should be some nuance—they all have their different opinions as I suggested. But all of them said that however, if a person messed it up unintentionally, it's not going to invalidate the prayer. And that's the position of the majority of scholars, frankly. And that's what I personally believe. However, the **class position** considers it to be obligatory to pray these in the right place. And I think that's the safer position. It fits in line with the evidences. It fits in line with the detail of how the Prophet ﷺ showed us, it fits in line with the system. The system really works.

[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Good Manners and Form, Chapter: Being Merciful to the People and to the Animals, ḥadīth no. 6008.*

I have to tell you that when you study the prostration for forgetfulness, I didn't come across (and I did study this in detail from the *madhābib*) I didn't come across a better explanation for all of the variations like Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's explanation. That is just a straight up honest thing. It's not for any other reason. He's the only one who's able to account for all the *ḥadīth* which is the way of *ahl'l-ḥadīth*. Now I am from *ahl'l-ḥadīth*. That's my background. When I say *ahl'l-ḥadīth* I don't mean Jamāʿat Ahl'l-Ḥadīth. I'm talking about the people of *ḥadīth*. The *fiqh* of *ḥadīth* is my approach, the principles of *ahl'l-ḥadīth*. And the principles of *ahl'l-ḥadīth* is all about reconciling between *athār*. You must reconcile between the *ḥadīth*. You have to. And not go to weak answers like 'that's abrogated' or 'that's weak'. You have to be able to see complete quality positions. But Allāh ﷻ knows best.

So, it is okay to put our **<u>class position</u>** to be that it is obligatory to do these in the right place.

Student (online): So, for Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn and Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah what would be the ruling in the case of the one who doesn't know when the *sajdah* is done and they do all their *sajdahs* in one place or the other? Is their prayer lacking?

Ustādh: You see, that's the problem with Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn opinion. You have perfectly encapsulated the problem. And he skips the question. Now I might be being rude here, Allāh ﷻ knows best. He said (and I'm going to read this out literally) at the top of page 395: "The second position in this issue is that the *sujūd* before the *salām* or after it is to be considered obligatory. And that whatever if found in the *Sunnah* when it happened before it is obligatory to do those before, and whatever in the *Sunnah* shows that it happens after the *salām* then it must be obligatorily done after the *salām*. This is what was chosen by Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah and it is the stronger, preponderant position. The reason that has been arrived at is because of the statement of the Messenger ﷺ and as for his actions as well." (And he lists all of the *ḥadīth* we've been covering.)

Then he says: So therefore, based upon all of these *ḥadīth* that indicate he did this, he did that, therefore:

وعليه؛ فيجب على كُلِّ أحد أن يعرف السُّجود الذي قبل السَّلام، والسُّجود الذي بعد السَّلام، لأن ما لا يتمُّ الواجبُ إلا به فهو واجب.

It is obligatory upon every single person to know the *sujūd* that's meant to be done before the *salām* and to know the *sujūd* that's meant to happen after the *salām*, and that
(1:00:00) these obligatory *sujūd* cannot be done except by certain means which by themselves intrinsically become obligatory i.e., the positioning of them becomes obligatory.

And that's it. Very nice and neat and he avoids the question which is: What about a person who doesn't know? If he doesn't know, are you saying that his prayer is invalidated?

And here's my gut feeling, and this is why I have a problem with this position, that's why personally I don't follow this position. I am happy for it to be the class position, but personally I don't like it because you now have to say: Yeah, the prayer is invalidated. And I don't think that he would. I think if he were asked: '*There's a person who doesn't know… Then what's going to happen?*' He's going to answer like every scholar would answer which is that if he doesn't know then he has *al-ʿudhr biʾl-jahl*, he has the excuse of ignorance, didn't know what's going on, tried his best, the prayer is not invalidated. Honestly, I think he's going to say that.

Now, technically speaking, if you say that you're kind of going against your own position—if you think it's obligatory. Now, the *jamhūr*, the majority of the scholars, they have no problem saying that because they don't consider it to be an absolute obligation.

So, like I said there is nuance that is not there. You know one of my points I try to teach students is that whenever you want to understand the situation or get to the truth, apply the stress test to it. Put negative scenarios to it. Put it in the worst-case scenario, see how it holds up. When you put the worst-case scenario to this position, I think that it starts to fail a little bit. And I am comfortable with the fact that the majority of scholars [say] if the person does not know where it's meant to go and they do it, either side, thinking that's the right one or following the position of the scholars, I think it's okay. And that's a position that I personally believe. However, it's good that our **class position** is a stricter one, that our taught position is a stricter one, that we tell people learn and study this properly because it's actually very straightforward.

Student (online): That's a big statement. Better than comparative *fiqh* texts?

Ustādh: No doubt about it. I spent my whole life on comparative *fiqh* texts, and I can tell you that his summary paragraph is the best, simplest summary of all of the *ḥadīth* on the matter. No doubt about it in my mind. No doubt about it.

Shaykh then mentions another thing that we can learn from this statement is that this is only applicable for the *sajdah* before (that's what the author says). So, he's a lot more relaxed about the *sajdah* afterward. So, if you intentionally left out the *sajdah* afterwards, then that's something else. So, a person leaves out the *sajdah* for adding to the prayer, then that's something which is not going to invalidate the prayer.

Now let me just tell you something. There's actually a method to this madness with that statement. There are a number of scholars that didn't even consider the need to make a *sajdah* if you add something. And if you think about it, it makes sense. If the *ḥadīth* wasn't there, it would make sense. But the *ḥadīth* is there, that's why we make the *sajdah*. But even they are like well it is *sunnah*, the *ḥadīth* shows it is *sunnah* not

obligatory, because they're saying: What are we making *sajdah* for? In the Ḥanbali position, any *sajdah* which is to be done after the *taslīm* is always for something that you have fixed already. So, if you look at the two in our opinion: (1) it's done if you add something to the prayer and (2) it's done if you had doubt and then you knew that you got it right. So in actual fact, the *sujūd* that you do after the *taslīm* is for something that actually is a complete prayer with something added. Yeah, you messed up. You were a bit dumb and you forgot something. Okay. But the prayer was solid. And in the second scenario, you were a bit dumb you forgot something blah, blah, blah, but the prayer is fine. So, a lot of the *fuqahāʾ* actually considered all *sajdah* that occur after the *taslīm* to be meh, [meaning] if you do it is good, if you don't not a problem because you fixed the prayer. You invested more in your prayer already. Why need to do so *sujūdʾl-sahw*?

Obviously, our position is that it is a *sunnah* at the very least and Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn's position is that it is obligatory. Nothing about common sense or anything like that.

And some of them also indicated some other points. They said that the *sajdah* within the prayer is part of the prayer and therefore it becomes more important. Whereas the *sajdah* for after the prayer is like something separate. It is for the prayer, when it is done afterwards. It is something to be donated to the prayer. Whereas the *sajdah* which is done inside the prayer, it is in the prayer. It is part of the prayer. It is intrinsic to the prayer. It is fundamental to the prayer. Whereas all those *sujūd* that happened after the *taslīm* is after you finish the prayer. So, it is like kind of from afar. It is a foreigner. It is not like a full citizen. It has like a temporary visa, it is not got full rights, full heaviness.

Shaykh says for example if a person were to leave the *tashahhudʾl-awwal*, the first *tashahhud*, intentionally, the prayer would be invalidated. Like you just say, '*I'm not going to do it*.' However, if a person were to intentionally leave out the *iqāmah*, the prayer is not invalidated because the *iqāmah* is an obligation for the prayer, it is not part and parcel of the prayer. It is for the prayer.

He says for example, if you leave out the congregation and instead pray by yourself intentionally, you have not invalidated your prayer (although some said you did, Ibn Ḥazm was one of them, but anyway) because that congregation is for the prayer, it is not fundamental [to] the prayer itself. So that is a position which actually has some sense.

He then says:

وإن نَسِيَه وسَلَّمَ سَجَدَ إن قَرُبَ زَمَنُه

If he simply forgot to perform it and exited the prayer but the time is still near, he can prostrate.

But if he was actually wanting to do it before, but forgot, he gave the *salām* and then remembers, now you just do it there and then. And if you were to do it like that, again the whole rules that we covered a couple of weeks ago which is that as long as you are in the same place, in the same time zone and the same kind of you know, then five minutes, ten minutes and place, all of that 'zone thing'.[§] As long as you are close and near, then just knock it out. Afterwards, you just knock it out.

Question: What if a person forgets to do it? What if you know that you are meant to do a *sajdah*? Regardless of whether the *sajdah* was for before the *taslīm* or after the *taslīm*, it doesn't matter. You forgot to do it, or you forgot until you remembered like half an hour or an hour later, or you were at home—you prayed in a mosque and now you got home.

The Shaykh says that it is pardoned from him—which is interesting and is an important rule that once the person had the intention to do it, but they forgot, and time goes and everything goes, the prayer is not invalidated but the *sajdah* is just basically dropped from him. He doesn't have to go back to the *masjid*, it is gone. Unlike if you are in the prayer. If you are in the prayer still, you have to obviously do that *sajdah*. Whereas the one which is afterwards, it is like separate now from the prayer.

Now I'm going to say something in a second but let me just finish this.

This is obviously not referring to a *rukn* or anything fundamental. If you missed out a *rukn*, you must fix it in the prayer. If you forgot to do its s*ajdah* after the prayer and you remember 1-2 hours later, it is gone. You leave it. End of story.

Now, what is interesting is that Ibn Taymiyyah (Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn didn't follow him
(1:10:00) in this) said that no, he must make *sajdah*. Whenever he remembers, days later, weeks later, hours later, outside in the world, in his home, he must do it. And he used the *qiyās* with the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ about the prayer that "he should pray as soon as he remembers it".[10] This is the one who doesn't pray because he forgets or he oversleeps and wakes up, then he should do it. And he used that.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said that he doesn't think we can make *qiyās* on these two because the prayer is a fundamental thing that needs to be made up, whereas the *sajdah* is a small aspect. It's not even part of the prayer. It's a fixing kind of thing. You can't compare such a huge thing like the prayer that must be done versus a *sajdah* which is not so important.

He thinks that the position of the Ḥanābilah, what it says there, that's fine. He can prostrate as long as the time is near. But if the time is not near, you are far away, etc.,

---

[§] 'Proximity' to the prayer and determining whether one is still in the 'zone' to do the prostration for forgetfulness was covered in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 20, Lesson 8. MT

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Times of the Prayers, Chapter: One who Forgets Prayer Should Offer It When He Remembers It, and Should Not Repeat Anything Except That Particular Prayer, ḥadīth no. 597*.

then it's gone. The prayer does not need to be invalidated. Your prayer is good as it is. You missed out on the *sajdah*, this is your own ignorance or your own forgetfulness. That in itself has been forgiven. Again, *subḥān Allāh*, it's from Allāh ﷻ. It's from His bounty and His mercy. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

And to finish off:

وَمَن سَهَا مِرارًا كَفَاهُ سَجدتانِ.

If one is repeatedly forgetful in the same prayer, one set of prostrations will be sufficient.

So, this is quite simple. If we make a number of mistakes, then you don't need to make fifty *sujūd*. If you made fifty mistakes, they are all covered by one *sajdah*—one set.

Now the question arises: What if they are in different locations? So, let's say you added some and left some, meaning that your account shows that you have to make a *sajdah* before *taslīm,* and you have to make *sajdah* after the *taslīm*.

And the scholars differed over this. They have their own commonsense [rationalisations] and there is not much evidence.

However, I think from what I have explained so far, you can see that the *sujūd* that are in the prayer are part of the prayer and they are more important. And it comes first, so it's like a priority almost. So that is what should be given the preference and the priority. And that's what the majority of the scholars say.

What's interesting is that they said that if there were multiple mistakes, there were three mistakes that were needed before and one mistake that is afterwards, then you go where the numbers are. If you made three mistakes needing [*sajdah*] afterwards and one mistake that's needing it before, then you give the 'after' the weight. So, you do it after.

In each of these cases you only do one set. I'm just using numbers as an example of the mistakes you make. So, if you make loads of mistakes, you made fifteen mistakes and then two mistakes—fifteen that need it before and two that need it after—you would do one *sajdah* and you do it before.

So even if you go with the numbers argument, most of the time it is going to end up before. And even if you don't go with the numbers argument, but you go with the fact that inside the prayer is more important than outside the prayer, then you will go with inside the prayer. Each case it's only one set and Allāh ﷻ knows best. That's the **class position** as well.

So, for example, a person is praying, and he forgets to say *Subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm* in the *rukūʿ*. He forgets the *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah*. He forgets to say *Subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*. He forgets to do *tashahhud'l-awwal*. These are all obligations. All of these are just one *sajdah* to fix it. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q & A

Q (online): Just to confirm, if you miss a *rukn* and remember once you exited the prayer, and not in the time, place, etc., you do not repeat the prayer?

A: No. you repeat the prayer. That's a different scenario. If you missed a *rukn*, and you remember, your prayer is gone. Because that was fundamental [omission to the prayer].

Q (online): If someone is reciting a recently memorised *sūrah* in *ṣalāh* and gets *ayāt* jumbled and knows they have messed up, is *sajdat'l-sahw* necessary?

A: No, it's not because the *sūrah* itself is not obligatory. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): In the *Ḥaram*, do we need a *sutrah* for *sunnah* prayers?

A: It's *sunnah* to have a *sutrah* for all the prayers, including the *sunnah* prayers.

Q (online): When the *farḍ* prayers end, everyone starts leaving and it becomes difficult to pray as people constantly walk in front. What is recommended?

A: You must not pray in the place where the people are. It's not allowed for you to allow people to come, even in the Ḥaram. I've spoken about this in detail in the *sutrah* section.

Q (online): If one is leading the prayer and makes a mistake, let's say missing an obligation, and the people behind him are the Aḥnāf, is it okay to do the *sajdat'l-sahw* after the *taslīm* in order not to confuse the people even though the imām knows it is better to do the *sajdat'l-sahw* before the *taslīm* in this case?

A: This is a difficult one. It's a brilliant question. It's because we know what the *sunnah* is and do we take a position that we don't believe in, out of unity? My answer would be that it's not the biggest problem in the world. But obviously Ibn Taymiyyah, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, a number of scholars are not going to have this at all. At all. They will never

allow that. I want to say that you should not allow it either but if push comes to shove, you know best. If a huge *fitnah* is going to come out of it then you take it.

Q (online): If I do a mistake that requires *sajdat'l-sahw* before *taslīm* and one mistake that requires *sajdat'l-sahw* after *taslīm*, then one *sajdat'l-sahw* after *taslīm* would take precedence. Could you tell the final class position?

A: If I said that, then that is a mistake. I think I mentioned this last week as well. I said that if I said that before, I said that it should be before. And I just repeated it now, it should be before.

Q (online): From Shaykh's summary about it, the omission of a *wājib* that one returned to, he says that if one remembers it after having moved on from its place in the prayer, but before reaching the pillar that follows it, he returns to it and performs it. Then he completes his prayer and gives salutations, prostrates for forgetfulness, and gives salutation. So here, the *sajdat'l-sahw* is after *taslīm*?

A: That is right. But this is not omission of *wājib*, because he did not miss the *wājib*. This is, according to Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, addition of actions. It is the standing. And he has made the standing, even though it is not a *rukn*, he has said that it is an action. And, it is added, cumulative, to the prayer. That is why we always say that when you add, you do it after and when you miss out, you do it before. For example, Shaykh will also say that if he starts reciting *Fātiḥah*, it is too late now. Write it off. You have missed it. So, now you do it before. If you do not miss it, you sit down, and you have done it, and that is it. I am okay with that.

Q (online): Why should a person intentionally leave out an action that would invalidate the prayer, then do the *sajdat'l-sahw.* Why not do the prayer properly?

A: No, they do not intentionally leave it out. The word intentionally is being used to grade the importance of the action, meaning that if an action is so important, if you left it out intentionally, those are the actions that you need to make *sajdah* for.

Q (online): Isn't following *sajdat'l-sahw* of the imām similar to praying *Witr* differently in congregation? The Aḥnāf usually do it like *Maghrib* and you just follow?

A: Yes. But you leading it is something else.

Q (online): If one normally prays *ṣalāh* in the sitting position, can they lead *ṣalāh*?

A: That is the position of a number of scholars by the way. The answer is that it is the safer position to go with the *jumhūr*, and not lead the prayer. It is a position of the scholars. Where it comes from (I have done this before) because Abu Bakr ﷺ stood up when the Prophet ﷺ was down, and they said he was leading.[11] Personally, I think it is okay, meaning you do not have to do it.

[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: If a Person Follows the Imām and the Others Follow That Person (Then It Is All Right), ḥadīth no. 713.*

22. Chapter 21 Lesson 1: The Supererogatory Prayer

(0:13:15) This is the new chapter:

بابُ صلاةِ التطَوُّعِ

Chapter: The *Taṭawwuʿ* Prayer

The *taṭawwuʿ* prayer is all about the word *taṭawwuʿ*. What does the word *taṭawwuʿ* mean?

We translate it as supererogatory. In the early parts of this class, we used to translate it as voluntary. It's definitely not voluntary because when you look in the books of *fiqh* (as we are going to see right now), when they say: What is the technical definition of *taṭawwuʿ*? They say: It's not obligatory. So, when you say 'not obligatory', or ask for a word, an English word that means 'not obligatory', they say voluntary.

Student (online): It is the performance of more than is asked for.

Ustādh: You see, supererogatory is basically encouraging you to do extra. And that is the right mindset because the alternative, 'voluntary', has no kind of: 'I want you to do it.' It's just: 'It's up to you if you want to do it.'

That's what voluntary means, up to you whether you want to do it. You want to do it? It's up to you.

Supererogatory: I want you to do it. I would love it if you did it. I would be grateful if you did it. I am pushing you to do it, but it isn't what is required. It's more than what I'm asking for.

So definitely the right word is the supererogatory prayer and not voluntary prayer.

There might be even better words out there frankly, or easier words. But what we know is that we can't say the 'voluntary' prayer.

So this word, *taṭawwuʿ* is used generally, when it comes to doing an act of worship and also from its linguistic meaning it means to do something good. So, it means to do that which is any kind of *ṭāʿah*, obedience and worship.

So as Allāh ﷻ says in *Sūrat al-Baqarah* 158:

﴿ إِنَّ ٱلصَّفَا وَٱلْمَرْوَةَ مِن شَعَآئِرِ ٱللَّهِ ۖ فَمَنْ حَجَّ ٱلْبَيْتَ أَوِ ٱعْتَمَرَ فَلَا جُنَاحَ عَلَيْهِ أَن يَطَّوَّفَ بِهِمَا ۚ وَمَن تَطَوَّعَ خَيْرًا فَإِنَّ ٱللَّهَ شَاكِرٌ عَلِيمٌ ﴿١٥٨﴾ ﴾

"Safa and Marwa are among the rites of God, so for those make major or minor pilgrimage to the House it is no offence to circulate between the two. Anyone who does good of his own accord will be rewarded, for God rewards good deeds, and knows everything." [*Sūrat al-Baqarah*: 158]

So, we're talking about the *ṭawāf*.

﴿وَمَن تَطَوَّعَ خَيْرًا ﴾

"And whoever does good of his own accord will be rewarded, for God rewards good deeds, and knows everything."

Here, the word *taṭawwuʿ* has been used but it's not referring to its voluntary nature. It's referring to doing a great action of worship and that's why to translate it as: "anyone who does good of his own accord will be rewarded", I like that translation of this particular *ayah* because it doesn't necessarily make you feel that the act is not obligatory or obligatory. We know that *ṭawāf* is not just obligatory, actually it's even bigger than obligation. It's a *rukn*. It's a pillar of the act of *Ḥajj* and *ʿUmrah*. So, it doesn't actually get more important and yet the word *taṭawwuʿ*, which is the least important of the actual commands, is used.

This indicates that the word *taṭawwuʿ* has a general meaning and a specific meaning. In its generality it means to do good and it means to do obedience, it means to do acts of worship. That's the way we start.

(0:20:00) And then Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says (on the first page of the commentary page 5 in Volume 4) that it's also applied in its specific sense when it's used in *fiqh*, in the area of jurisprudence. And it goes back to that concept that a word means different things in different sciences. Like the word *sunnah*, it means *ʿaqīdah*, it means *dīn*, it's very, very important. And then you have in the chapter of *fiqh* it means something entirely different. It means not obligatory. In *ḥadīth* it means something else. In *ṭalāq* it means something else—you can have a *ṭalāq* which is *sunnah ṭalāq* or *bidʿah ṭalāq* etc.

So *taṭawwuʿ* also has that kind of essence—different meanings in different places. And when the *fuqahāʾ* use it they simply mean 'not obligatory'. But it is absolutely intended or an objective in of itself. It is requested, but it's not obligatory.

And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn makes some points. He says it's from His wisdom ﷻ that every time that He legislates for us an obligation, He legislates for it a partner from the non-obligatory as well, i.e., from its own form, its own type, its own species, its own *jins*, its own genus. So, from every obligatory act of worship from the genus of that act of worship Allāh ﷻ will partner it up with a supererogatory one or a supplementary one.

And what this does is that this gives a greater emphasis and a greater sense of importance and with the intention (hopefully) of more *imān* in the *aṣl* act itself, in the *aṣl* type of act, hoping therefore, thereby because of the emphasis on the original act by emphasising it with a partner that you start to take the partner more seriously because you're already taking the original one seriously.

And also, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn makes a throwaway comment, he says: And also, to complete the obligations on the Day of Judgment because the obligations that we perform will definitely be deficient on the final day.

There's absolutely no doubt about that. The Prophet ﷺ has told us. He has not mentioned the *ḥadīth* but the *ḥadīth* is narrated.[1] It is authentic. The Prophet ﷺ said that on the Day of Judgment, Allāh ﷻ will have the slave in front of Him, presenting his actions. Allāh ﷻ will tell the angels to reach into the 'vat', if you want, the 'container' (as it were) of obligatory deeds. And each one will be categorised, so *ṣalāh* and so on, and so forth. The obligatory acts of that category will end up deficient. The person will think, '*I am destroyed. It is game over. Finished. This is the bare minimum condition*.' Allāh ﷻ will command the angels for them to reach into the *nafl,* or the *taṭawwuʿ*, or the supererogatory backup. And those actions, the partner actions, will then mold, and fix, and fill the obligations. And that is basically our mentality. That is why we should be motivated all the time despite how difficult it is, or you not wanting to do it, or whatever your mentality. The *sunnah* aspects of this *dīn*, the non-obligatory aspects of this *dīn*, the extra things that we do out of love for Allāh ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ are essential.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says for example, *wuḍūʾ* has *wājib* and non-obligatory aspects. If you look at the bare minimum of *wuḍūʾ*, it is straight forward. But if a person multiplies it by two, and then by three, and goes higher [when washing the arms], and fresher, and goes colder, are aspects that are not obligatory in of themselves. The *ṣalāh* obviously [has] *wājib* and then extra: the night prayer and the ones that we are going to cover. Spending from your money, charity. That is *zakāh* which is obligatory but there are so many million times opportunity to pay extra. The fasting. Ramaḍān is just a couple of months away but then we should be doing the extras now—the Mondays and the Thursdays, etc. which is the *taṭawwuʿ*. The *Ḥajj* which is fixed by the *ʿUmrah*.

---

[1] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 624*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

The *jihād*, itself, also has an obligation which is when you are under attack and when a command comes, it is obligatory. But then other times when it is expansion time, foreign policy time of the state, and they want to go to check a few things out or expand, it is a call that goes out. And if people are up for it, they do not have to go. And if you do, it is a wonderful extra *taṭawwuʿ* act. And knowledge as well. There are certain aspects of knowledge that one has to know as a minimum. And then others that it is good to know, *taṭawwuʿ*. And so on, etc.

Student (online): Abu Hurayrah ﵁ reported: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, peace and blessings be upon him, said, "The first action for which a servant of Allāh ﷻ will be held accountable on the Day of Resurrection will be his prayers. If they are in order, he will have prospered and succeeded. If they are lacking, he will have failed and lost. If there is something defective in his obligatory prayers, then the Almighty Lord will say: See if my servant has any voluntary prayers that can complete what is insufficient in his obligatory prayers. The rest of his deeds will be judged the same way." Source: *Sunan* al-Tirmidhi 413

Ustādh: The *ḥadīth* that was put up is one of the versions of it. This is the version of Imām al-Tirmidhi. Just also, a point as you can see, that the source is *Sunan al-Tirmidhi* and I have said it before, that the correct phrase according to the majority of *ḥadīth* scholars is *al-Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi*.[2] The *Jāmiʿ of Imām al-Tirmidhi* as opposed to his *Sunan*.

"The Prophet ﷺ said that the first action of which a servant of Allāh ﷻ will be held accountable on the Day of Resurrection will be his prayers. If they are in order, he will have prospered and succeeded."

Do I like that? *Aflaḥa wa anjaḥa.* He will be successful and achieve salvation, I prefer.

"If they are lacking, then *faqad khāba wa khāsir*. He will have failed and lost. If there is something defective in his obligatory prayers, then the Almighty Lord will say: 'See if my servant has any…'"

See, they have used voluntary. Not good enough.

"See if my servant has any supererogatory prayers that can complete what is insufficient in his obligatory prayers. The rest of his deeds will be judged the same way. For every other category is going to be dealt the same way."

Everything. Whether it is a beard, clothes, beauty, and absolutely everything. Every act of worship will have a partner.

---

[2] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book of Prayer, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the First Thing the Slave (of Allāh ﷻ) Will Be Reckoned for on the Day of Judgment Is the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 413*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

The supererogatory prayers themselves come in different forms as well. They are categories themselves these non-obligatory prayers. They can be classified in different ways. Those types where it is legislated for you to pray them in congregation, and others where it is not legislated for you to pray in congregation. Or those which are connected to the obligatory prayers, meaning they follow the obligatory or come before it, meaning that they are linked to the obligatory prayers, and others which are completely free from the obligatory prayers like the two *rakʿah* of *wuḍūʾ.* The two *rakʿah* made after *wuḍūʾ* have nothing to do with the [obligatory] prayers. They can be done anytime you make *wuḍūʾ* or anytime of the day, obviously, remembering the rules of what time of the day you can pray and not pray. Obviously, that needs to be applied. Then you have those non-obligatory prayers, *taṭawwuʿ* prayers, which are time limited, meaning that you can only pray them at a certain time like *ṣalāt al-Witr*, for example, (which we are going to put into this category). It cannot be prayed all day. It is only between the night and the morning. Then you have other prayers that you can pray all the time.

Then you have:

ومنها ما هو مُقيَّدٌ بسبب، ومنها ما ليس مقيَّداً بسبب.

You have those supererogatory prayer or *taṭawwuʿ* prayers which are restricted by its cause, that something has to happen for you to be able to pray. The obvious one is *ṣalāt al-istisqāʾ* which is the prayer for rain. Therefore, there has to be a drought before you pray. The prayer for the eclipse, obviously there has to be an eclipse before you pray. So that is something which is restricted to a reason. And that which doesn't require any reason. So, it is not restricted, like I said the two *rakʿah* by itself etc. And all of these (what I have just said) are all non-obligatory prayers, *taṭawwuʿ* prayers.

Imām al-Ḥajjāwi says:

بابُ صلاةِ التطَوُّعِ

The Chapter of the Supererogatory Prayer

آكَدُها كُسوفٌ ثم استِسقاءٌ ثم تَراويحٌ ثم وِتْرٌ

(0:30:00)

Its most emphasised is the Eclipse prayer, then the Rain prayer, then *Tarāwīḥ*. Then it is the *Witr* prayer.

This is the Hanbali school classic. However, in the Hanbali school itself there is also some discussion whether this is the correct ranking. We will have a little go at that.

Now we know what *taṭawwuʿ* actually is, Shaykh still wants to go a bit more fundamental and say out of the *taṭawwuʿ* itself as a concept, supererogatory actions, good acts of worship that are not obligatory, what is the best of them all?

And he comes straight out and says that the most emphasised, the most recommended of the supererogatory actions from the physical acts of worship is *jihād*. And then he said: But some scholars also said that it is knowledge (meaning seeking knowledge).

Shaykh says the correct position—and this is a wonderful position, this is a position that he has obviously held from forever and this is a position that I remember, if you want to hear a story, I know that you guys love a story. No, I love a story.

Student (online): Do we see these terms mentioned in the other *madhāhib* as well or are they exclusive to the Aḥnāf?

Ustādh: No no. *Muʾakkad* is. Absolutely.

Let me tell you a story. I will tell you a story of my very early days of *daʿwah*. Let me tell you something. One of the very fortunate things of my moments when I started practicing in the 90s, is at that time I was never in the grasp of the kind of like mental madness Salafis. There was no doubt about it that the Salafi *daʿwah* was the best, still is the best. Absolutely incredible principles, lots of making people connect to their *dīn* in a way which was absolutely unique and still is. But as you know, back in the 90s it was very, very toxic. A lot of people went very cult in it and that is because it came from just actors and just you know showmen and all the rest of it. But the *ʿajīb* thing is, and to be honest I can definitely have seen myself—I had my own kind of character and I had my own kind of you know I was a jack the lad, so that would have really kind of been up my street that. You know someone who has got ego and always saw himself as better than everybody else, from down south, you know all you northerners, it was just, it was what it was. *Subḥān Allāh*, Allāh ﷻ protected me in that I never ever came across any of these neo Salafis when it came to my practicing side. And you know why? Because I, in my first year was with Arabs.

That was the basic thing. You see the Salafi movement in this country, never had any Arabs involved. Never historically had any Arabs involved. The only Arabs that were involved, it was just dumb Pakis basically, a couple of Bengalis, couple of x, y, z. When these people went and learned their Arabic, they then basically kept their scholars over there, over yonder, wherever that was, and made sure that there were no scholars here and that they were running the game. So, you can see that I would have loved that scene. I would have made myself a leader and that would be the end of it. So here nobody was keeping an eye on the kind of things that people were saying, and doing, and claiming, and the way they were acting, etc. etc. etc. That was one of the very big signs. And that is why it is utterly unforgivable in 10 years, 20 years, 30 years later, (now when we

look at it), that you have Arabs or you have scholars in this country and you have got these kinds of neo-Salafi, Madkhali kind of movements. I mean it is untenable because those who were practicing from the Arabs, they would look at these nutters and [think], '*What the hell is this? This like a cult from God knows what.*'

So, I started practicing around those people, but they were not really interested in titles and stuff. They were very much interested in knowledge, and study, and learning. My point is that I had a very pragmatic, moderate introduction to my practicing life, and my teachers around me. Different backgrounds. So, I was always trying, and because I took on a lot of studying and took my whole first year out from university and I started studying full-time. I went abroad that I accelerated a lot, and then I was already starting to do *daʿwah* when I was still at university. I always wanted to bring different people together. That came from a non-practicing background. That was very important. Your own history plays a massive role. I always wanted to try and be a unifier. Some people always want to build on their own brand. I was like, '*These people do not know how good they've got it*,' because you have not experienced non-practicingness.

If you had been really non-practicing, you see this whole thing as a blessing. You see anyone even wearing a turban and flying and doing all this *bakwās*, you still see it as a blessing. And these people have so much in common, as opposed to what they differ upon. I was massive on that. And so, at that time Hizb'l-Taḥrīr, Muhājirūn, especially Muhājirūn, early, early days, they were nutters. Mental. And people hated them with intense hate. They used to fight physically with Salafis, etc. And I was not one of those guys. I was always looking to try and unify people, trying to find common ground. (That was the background that was needed.)

You know this guy who is in prison right now. I have forgotten his name now, the black
(0:40:00) convert, the Muhājirūn guy. He was—still is, 20-30 years later—Muhājirūn's spokesman, and shouting and screaming. He was always calling people to *jihād*, and always calling people to x, y, z. And I remember on this issue giving a lecture in Queen Mary's in Westfield when these guys had gone to a gathering, and they knew me as the Salafi. I remember that I stood up in the crowd, and there was lots of booing and this and that, and I was respected even then as one of the Salafi students of knowledge. And I quoted to them a number of *ayāt* from the Qurʾān where Allāh ﷻ shows that the best, as a concept, is entirely flexible.

To say for example that the best prayer, or the most emphasised is *Kusūf* is a very black and white kind of statement. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, and actually no scholar agrees with this, but it is not even whether we agree with that answer or not, it is actually the principle. Ibn Taymiyyah spoke about… That is where I took it from. I never knew this statement of Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn existed, and that is that when it comes to what is the most emphasised and what is the best, it differs from time, and place, and person and their qualities.

So, when we see certain things from certain people, we can see a deficiency from them in other areas. Then we want to put them to use in certain areas in which we know that

they will actually produce something, and they work better. It might not even be a healthy pro- Islamic kind of point or area or good that that person might be doing, but we do not expect anything else from them or we expect their work in that area to be better. Vis a vis, someone who has qualities in a different area, we want to put them into *jihād*, or we want to put them into politics and whatever.

Anyway, I remember explaining this (and I am going to come to what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says in a second) and I cannot forget that this guy, he stood up, this Trevor Brooks, and he says, "*Allāhu akbar! Allāhu akbar!* This is the *ḥaqq!"* I cannot forget. They were making *takbīr* and the Salafis were like, '*Rahs! What's going on? This guy is cheering our guy*.' He said, "He's spoken the truth! He's spoken the truth!" Because I said that politics at a time like this now is one of the big obligations to ensure that the *ṣaḥwah* starts, the revival, which we see a lot of positive impact out of. We see a lot of negative as well and the *jihād* as well.

And I said, "By the way you can put your *jihād* to bed when it's time for Ḥajj, we need to go hard when it comes to Ḥajj." That was the point, meaning when it comes to the obligatory actions nothing gets close to *Ḥajj*. But that obligation and that emphasis and that whatever amongst 'obligations' I mean is something which is time limited. So, there is a far greater nuance to the concept of better.

My point is that (a) it is always good to unify and if you're going to unify people, unify them on knowledge not on what they want to hear or not, but proper generic high-quality knowledge. And that's why I was able to stay out of every single group because we were obsessed (our little group and our teachers) with knowledge, just generic hardcore text, what the scholars say, what they don't say, don't do this… And this approach by the way kept me out of the ISOC. I used to be very anti-ISOC because ISOC was very politics focused and that meant that they had to be very lax and lenient in matters of *dīn*. We were the second unofficial ISOC. We were the practicing kind of group of people that would support the ISOC when they needed it, when it comes to teaching etc. We didn't get involved in their kind of brand.

And what is the benefit? You people, some of you are young now in your 20s or teens and is that this way of thinking, this understanding of allowing people to go into certain areas that they have game in and we then tell those people that is the best thing that you can do, even if they are not very practicing, is actually from our *dīn*. And I do mean non-practicing people. And I do mean therefore that you will have a better understanding of the political situation.

For example, you have some sisters who are not going to inspire the world in the way they wear the *ḥijāb*, they wear their trousers etc. and you are just going to have to just turn around and say, *'Listen. Calm down. We're not expecting anything here. But this sister does incredible charity work*,' like a Sayeeda Warsi for example. Sayeeda Warsi is not going to do anything else for our community other than what she is doing, and she does a brilliant job even though honestly, me and that woman have so much beef it is incredible. But I'm going to say, '*Listen! You know what? I will shut up for the team. I*

will try to avoid criticising her.' And I don't just mean the washing dirty laundry in public line. I mean: What exactly am I going to get out of Sayeeda Warsi, or Sadiq Khan, or x, or y? Which Qurʾān are they going to memorise or *ḥadīth* or *jihād* are they going to fight, or *daʿwah*, etc.? But you know what? If he is the guy who's going to go and at least reduce the harm or bring some kind of benefit whatever whatnot.

And this is a very, very dangerous area because once you start to turn a blind eye… And there's a difference between turning a blind eye and supporting. Just as the example of Ilhan Omar [United States Congresswoman]. That's where the problem occurs, where they get that kind of blind eye support from the Muslims, tolerance from the Muslims, they take it and they run with it. And they run with it under the Islamic card and they start to try to promote the idea that this brand of whatever they're doing, whether it's politics or gender equality or some *kufr* or some *bakwās*, is actually Islamic. So that's where Linda has fallen and that is where Ilhan Omar has fallen. There is a big difference from staying quiet and just praying to Allāh ﷻ for their guidance and hoping that Allāh ﷻ will use that person in a good way. The Prophet ﷺ said that Allāh ﷻ will support this *dīn* with a *fāsiq* man, *rajulin fājir.*[3] And we have other narrations that involve the word *kāfir*, then someone who is *fāsiq* like these people are—they are because they openly celebrate sin. They openly promote sin. So, promoting lesbianism or promoting *zina*, etc. This is completely unacceptable. And if we don't speak against this then you have the rise of the alt-right, like the Daniel Haqiqatjou type of people, who are nuts on the other side by the way. But this is what they feed off because they see the Muslims supporting these people who are completely and utterly deviant. And there's a subtle nuance and a subtle difference.

I'm going to translate. You can never explain this point very well. You are going to get a beating for nothing trying to explain what I just said in public, in any wording, in any kind of way. And that doesn't matter whether it's now in a contemporary time and it doesn't matter whether it was back in the day either. Like I'm going to read something now. Look how politically incorrect this statement is. Amongst an absolute *ḥaqq* statement. Look at what he says. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn on page 6 says:

والصَّحيح :أنه يختلف باختلاف الفاعل؛ وباختلاف الزَّمن، فقد نقول لشَخصٍ :الأفضلُ في حَقِّك الجِهادُ، والآخرُ :الأفضلُ في حَقِّكِ العِلْم، فإذا كان شُجاعاً قويًّا نشيطاً؛ وليس بذاك الذَّكيِّ؛ فالأفضلُ له الجِهاد؛ لأنه أَليقُ به. وإذا كان ذكيًّا حافظاً قويَّ الحُجَّة؛ فالأفضلُ له العِلْم، وهذا باعتبار الفاعل.

The correct position is that the best and the most emphasised of actions are linked and differ according to different people and different times, what is a greater priority and so on. So, we might say to a person: The best thing for you to do is to go and perform

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Military Expeditions Led by the Prophet ﷺ, Chapter: Ghazwah of Khaybar, ḥadīth no. 4203.*

jihād. And to another person we might say: What is better for you is to go and seek knowledge. And so if a person is brave, and strong, and active, but he is not very clever, (0:50:00) then the best thing for him is *jihād*, because this is more his thing. And if he is clever and he has a great memory and he has a great way of establishing the evidences, then what is better for him is to study. That is when we are deciding what is best when you look at the actual person itself. So, he is more built for that, he is more built for that.

Now I am just going to pause and just tell you that's just not right. That is neither Islamically right nor is it politically correct because this idea that only the dumbos go and fight *jihād* is untenable. Now I know that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn does not mean that. But there is no nice way of saying...

وليس بذاك الذكي

He doesn't say *al-dhakiy*, he doesn't say that he is not clever. He actually says he is not of that level of cleverness. So, he does kind of cover himself frankly. But I mean just actually this would indicate that only dumb people do *jihād*. And that is unacceptable frankly. There has to be a different way to word that. That's Islamically. I'm just talking about Islamically, because this is not true. Our greatest scholars were *mujāhidīn*. Read about Ibn Taymiyyah. Read about ʿAbdullāh ibn Mubārak. Read about Imām Aḥmad. It just comes out wrong.

Now [from the perspective of being] politically correct, you can't go around saying things like that. I mean I can because that's what I do. I don't mind saying stupid things and it coming across stupid. I mean Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn saying that, it sticks out.

Listen. Ironically, this has created the whole let's get him into medicine, if he fails or he is not clever let him become a *moulvi*, the Pak kind of thing.

Like I said, there is no doubt about the correctness of this principle. But it doesn't matter how you say it you are going to be torn apart for saying it. And if you are saying let people play to their strengths, that would be the nice way of saying it. Don't get involved in details. That's my point.

Anyway, just so we can finish the point, he says that as for when we look at it from a time point of view, or priority in terms of at that time, so if there is a particular era we are in, or a time in which ignorance has become widespread and it has gone all over the place and there are lots of people giving *fatwa*, no knowledge, then knowledge is more important than *jihād* at that time. More people need to study and dilute out the ignorant. And if we are in a time where there are absolutely lots and lots of scholars, but we need some *murābiṭīn*, we need people to stand fast and to defend the borders, sort out the enemy, etc., then *jihād* becomes better. And if we don't have one or the other, everything is the same, then knowledge is better.

So, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn actually says in his opinion that knowledge is better.

Let's just pause there because we will come back to this point. The fact that all of you are thinking about the best way to say it shows the point I'm trying to say. If you talk about this or write about this, you are going to be ripped apart because it's more than just words. It's about the issue of what I said earlier on.

Let me put to you Ilhan Omar. What is it that you want her to do? She is not going to do anything else. What do you want her to do? Someone was saying to me she is this, she is that. Or Sadiq Khan, what do you want him to do? Or Nazir Afzal for example, the [former Chief Prosecutor]—all of these different high-profile people, Mo Salah for example or Paul Pogba. My point is that when you have Muslim people who are in the public eye who are not practicing to the level that we want, but they do a little bit of Islam here and there, there is a very fine line between let's warn against their deviancy. The guy put on a Christmas jumper I think or a Christmas tree or something like that. That's the danger. We sing his praises so much, he does that, then the masses think it is okay. You have that level of trying to make sure you don't over defend someone versus not.

I'll give you an example. Our absolute hero, I don't know of anybody who doesn't love Habib Noor Muhammad or Khabib Nurmagomedov. Everybody loves him. The problem is when you love someone too much, you are going to come with a mega crash. Don't put people on a pedestal, especially those that are not practicing Islamically the right things. We can defend him, and you can you know speak about that he's actually not hitting and striking, and it is wrestling and all the rest of it. Obviously, you have no idea what ground and pound is at all. But it's *ḥarām*. But anyway, he does so much good. "*Alḥamdulillāh*! I know you guys don't like it when I say this but I'm gonna smash your boy. *Alḥamdulillāh!* I know you don't like it when I say this!"

I was watching an interview with him the other day. He is launching his own, not rival, but MMA (mixed martial arts) that kind of thing and he is getting the whole kind of scene going. And is going to be a feeder to the UFC, which is obviously now becoming one of the world's biggest sports. Massive monies. He is going to come back probably and fight Conor again and he is going to make himself $50, $60, $70 million. You can see all kinds of craziness going on. But what's fascinating is that a person that everybody was thinking he's stopping for the sake of Allāh ﷻ, people don't understand that he's going in to promote the sport to a whole different level, a sport which is fundamentally *ḥarām*… Well fundamentally is the wrong word because actually fundamentally their version is brilliant. But the actual final version is proper *ḥarām ḥarām*. Not a shadow of a doubt about it. The way that they destroy people's faces regardless of whether it's for sport or whatever… And you can find *taʾwīl*, and you can find ways of blagging it. Believe me. I could do that for him better than anybody could, justify how benefits here, benefits there, this *ḥadīth* means this, this *ḥadīth* means that. It can be done. But you have to realise, once you start playing that public game that celebrity game… And we always know him to be very modest and always protecting. And I was watching the interview and he's in Russia. He is launching the EFC. He bought

a franchise out, renamed it as the Eagle Fighting Championship. He's talking about what he's going to offer as pay, and what he's going to do, and all the rest of it. And the woman reporter (there are always women reporters obviously, and the women's MMA is very big) and he was asked up straight out. She said: "You are going to have women in your championship, right?" Because every major championship has women fighting. And he said: "Who told you that we weren't?" He snapped back. I've forgotten whether he said that women will definitely be there or women will not definitely be there.

(1:04:00) As one of the students commented earlier on, don't hate someone too much, don't love someone too much, and be very, very careful about being too over critical about individuals that are doing something that you know we would never do. And I just think that if you have this approach without supporting these people and what they say, then I think you're going to be on the safe side. You have to be careful of falling either way, being too supportive of them and writing them off entirely as well.

Back to the issue of knowledge, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said that yeah, it's knowledge in my book, which is the absolute most emphasised point. He then reminds us of what Imām Aḥmad said:

العِلمُ لا يَعْدِلُهُ شيء لِمَنْ صَحَّت نيَّتُهُ.

He says nothing compares to knowledge but only for the one who perfects his intention, sorts out his intention. Imām Aḥmad said that *ʿilm* is the best for the person who perfects his intention because *ʿilm* for the one who has no intention or weak intention or poor intention or intentions all over the place and gets done by his ego, that's a disaster, absolute disaster.

And he was asked: How do you perfect your intention?

He said that you intend with humility and you remove ignorance from the entire process.

Shaykh says: In fact, that's absolutely correct. All of this *dīn* is based upon knowledge and even *jihād*.

So, he's not even saying that you're going to be dumb when you're doing *jihād* but *jihād* itself is predicated upon knowledge and it has to lead to knowledge, it's a means to an end and that end itself is knowledge. That's why Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿وَمَا كَانَ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ لِيَنْفِرُوا كَافَّةً فَلَوْلَا نَفَرَ مِنْ كُلِّ فِرْقَةٍ مِنْهُمْ طَائِفَةٌ لِيَتَفَقَّهُوا فِي الدِّينِ وَلِيُنْذِرُوا قَوْمَهُمْ إِذَا رَجَعُوا إِلَيْهِمْ ﴿١٢٢﴾﴾

"Yet it is not right for all the believers to go out [to battle] together: out of each community, a group should go out to gain understanding of the religion, so that they can teach their people when they return and so that they can guard themselves against evil."

[*Sūrat al-Tawbah*: 122]

In *Sūrah al-Tawbah* 122: "It's not for all the believers to go out together," meaning to go and fight—to all of them just leave. The translation I am reading of 122 *Sūrat al-Tawbah*: It's not the only good for the believers to go out all together to fight. Out of each group, out of each… I don't want to say community. Out of each unit or out of each army, a group should go out to gain understanding of the religion so that they can teach their people when they return and so that they can guard themselves against evil. So, meaning that there is more than *jihād* and it goes bigger and better than *jihād*.

So, you can see that then someone has to remain, someone has to study, someone has to get the whole game on point. So, *ʿilm* is right at the top. But obviously it needs *ikhlāṣ* for the sake of Allāh ﷻ. When you have knowledge, people love you for it because it's so beneficial, it opens the mind, it opens the heart. That can get to you. So, you have to be careful and not make it a curse. So, it's only good for the person who's going to work on the conditions for knowledge, which is to have the right intention.

Then he says:

آكَدُها كُسوفٌ

The most emphasised [*taṭawwuʿ* prayer] is the Eclipse prayer.

We're not going to go into this now, but *kusūf* in its general sense just means eclipse. But when it's used by itself, it means solar eclipse as well even though generically when you use *kusūf* with a *kāf*, then it means eclipse. When you have two phrases, *kusūf* and
(1:10:00) *khusūf*, *kusūf* is solar and *khusūf* with a *khā* is a lunar eclipse. But this one here is covering both categories because it's only the word *kusūf* so it's referring to both in its general kind of sense.

And why did the Ḥanbalis put this right at number one?

Because the Prophet ﷺ commanded it. He ﷺ commanded the believers to come out for it as in the *ḥadīth* in *Bukhāri*.[4,5] He ﷺ came out to it in a panic. He ﷺ was rushing. He ﷺ showed urgency when he ﷺ came out to it. And he ﷺ prayed an utterly unique prayer, meaning the prayer isn't anything seen like it before. We'll come to that in its right time. And when he ﷺ was praying this prayer (as in the *ḥadīth* in *Bukhāri*) he ﷺ was shown *Jannah* and *Nār* (Heaven and the Hellfire) in this prayer.[6,7] He also gave a *khuṭbah* after it.[5,8] Any prayer that gets a *khuṭbah* of itself makes the prayer very special. And it wasn't just an ordinary *khuṭbah*, but as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said:

بليغة عظيمة

A beautiful, mighty, clear, and impacting *khuṭbah*, again narrated by Bukhāri as well.

And it is legislated to pray this prayer in *jamāʿah* which itself is an excellent indication.[9,10] He ﷺ even gave it its own individual call, so he would say to a person, go around and announce: *al-ṣalātu jāmiʿah*! '*It's a group prayer! It's a group prayer!*' When people heard that and not getting an *adhān*, they knew it is serious. This is why the Ḥanābilah say that this the is most emphasised of the *taṭawwuʿ* prayers, the non-obligatory prayers.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says we can understand then from what the author says that *ṣalāt al-Kusūf* therefore is not an obligatory prayer from the *taṭawwuʿ* and we need to say here that this is something which is differed over.

Because if you think about it, in actual fact, the way that he's built up these reasons why it is emphasised, we should question ourselves: Does this prayer even exist in this chapter? Why are you discussing this prayer in the non-obligatory section when it's indicating so much that it's an obligation?

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn at the top of page 8 says:

---

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Eclipse, Chapter: The Prayer During a Solar Eclipse, hadīth no. 1040.*
[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer - Eclipses, Chapter: The Eclipse Prayer, ḥadīth no. 901 a.*
[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Eclipse, Chapter: To Offer the Eclipse Prayer in Congregation, hadīth no. 1052.*
[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Eclipses, Chapter: What Was Shown to the Prophet ﷺ of Paradise and Hell During the Eclipse Prayer, ḥadīth no. 907 a.*
[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Eclipse, Chapter: The Saying of Amma Baʿd During the Khuṭbah of the Eclipse, hadīth no. 1061.*
[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Eclipse, Chapter: Making a Loud Announcement of the Prayer in Congregation for Eclipse, hadīth no. 1045.*
[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer - Eclipses, Chapter: The Call for the Eclipse Prayer: The Prayer Is Being Assembled, ḥadīth no. 910.*

والصحيح :أَنَّ صلاة الكُسُوف فرضٌ واجب

As for the correct position is that this prayer is actually *farḍun wājib*. It is an obligation, which means it's disqualified from this category (according to Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn).

He says: Listen! I don't need to get involved in a debate about whether it's *farḍ kifāyah* or *farḍ ʻayn* (meaning is it obligatory upon the individual or upon the group). It is obligatory. Whether someone does it, or everybody has to do it, it's obligatory. And he makes a wonderful point.

وأَنَّه لا يمكن للمسلمين أن يَرَوا إنذارَ الله بكسُوف الشمسِ والقمرِ، ثم يَدَعوا الصَّلاةَ؛ مع أنَّ الرَّسولَ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم أَمَرَ بها، وأَمَرَ بالصدقة والتكبير والاستغفار والعتق والفزع إلى الصلاة، وحصل منه شيءٌ لم يكن مألوفاً مِنْ قبلُ، فكيف تقترنُ بها هذه الأحوالُ مع الأمر بها

He says: How is it possible that the Muslim sees something which is a warning from Allāh ﷻ, because remember that Allāh ﷻ does not bring the sun or the moon to eclipse except to frighten the people, except to bring shock, except to really bring the people to ask, '*What's going on here?*'

So, Allāh ﷻ causes that, legislates a prayer in which it is all about saying: I'm sorry *yā* Allāh ﷻ, you are the Greatest, and seeking forgiveness, and people just skank off the prayer and instead buy the stupid glasses to go and watch it. That's the kuff way of taking it. The believers are like, '*That's being done for a reason I've got to pray*.' And if I can't pray, it's because I've got a really good reason that I can't pray because I'm being warned with the biggest warning possible, the mini *qiyāmah* basically. Because the eclipse is the mini, legal, scientific version of the Day of Judgment of the sun rising from the west. Even though we have proper killed it and made it like a spectacle, the truth is that it is a magnificent sign of the power of Allāh ﷻ. Those people who are still connected to the earth in a normative way, it's a heart stopping moment, frankly.

Anyway, there is absolutely no doubt that this is done. I mean, if you didn't believe that than the fact that there is a prayer which is legislated for it is enough. And so the Prophet ﷺ being so stressed, and so upset, scared. You know, if you see the *ḥadīth*, you might say, '*That's because they never saw. They never knew. It was a real shock to those simple people*.'

The Prophet ﷺ is not simple. And desert Arabs are not simple. They are connected in a far more intelligent way than all of us. And I don't just mean because they are Companions and prophets. I mean everyone that we think is simple. No. The people who live out in the wild, people who live a proper life, they are not simple.

So, Shaykh ʿUthaymīn makes a wonderful point. He says that Allāh ﷻ sends something to warn you. He gives you a prayer to then heed the warning by it, and you leave the prayer? You say that you can't pray or that you don't want to pray or that you don't know how to pray or that you don't understand this prayer? Many people don't, you know. Many people don't know. The practising communities do revive this prayer quite a bit.

And this is despite the fact that the Prophet ﷺ commanded people to pray. The Prophet ﷺ said pay *ṣadaqah*, make *takbīr*, make *istighfār*, make *ʿitq*, free the slaves, and rush to the prayer:[11,12,13]

وحصل منه شيءٌ لم يكن مألوفاً مِنْ قبلُ

What Prophet ﷺ did had never been seen before, neither the attitude, neither the action, neither the fear, neither the prayer itself. And people are going to think that this is some kind of random *sunnah* act. How are you seeing all this and then saying it's *sunnah*?

So, Shaykh says: Are you telling me that people can say it's *sunnah* and if people leave this act then they are not sinful?

فأقلُّ ما نقول فيها: إنها فرضُ كفاية.

So, Shaykh says that the bare minimum that we can say about this prayer is that it's *farḍ kifāyah*. That there at least should be some believers, somewhere on the planet, that are basically protecting us.

You know this concept that someone is taking one for the team or that from the *barakah* of the people somewhere. Like about this idea that there is one person that is making *duʿāʾ*, or there is one *muttaqi*, or there is one *mustaghfir* somewhere that is praying for us otherwise, humanity will be sliced to pieces—or the believers certainly.

I mean what we did to Muslims in East Turkistan. What we did to the believers in Rohingya. What we did to the believers in Palestine. What we did to our own sisters even in this country for example. The *ẓulm* that occurs, etc. We've not just got shame

---

[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Eclipse, Chapter: To Give Ṣadaqah During the Eclipse, ḥadīth no. 1044.*
[12] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Eclipse, Chapter: To Remember Allāh ﷻ During the Eclipse, ḥadīth no. 1059.*
[13] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Eclipse, Chapter: Manumission (of Slaves) During the Solar Eclipse, ḥadīth no. 1054.*

on our face, we have been humiliated. Someone somewhere is keeping Allāh ﷻ happy. This concept is very important in religion. And it also comes across into our legal framework as well, in that if there is a group of people that are doing this prayer like it should be, then they did enough for the rest. I have to say that my heart gravitates towards this position. It's a *farḍ kifāyah*. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

(1:20:00) Our **class position** is that *kusūf* does not actually belong in this list at all because it actually is not *taṭawwuʿ*. That's the take home of this part.

Q & A

Q (online): The prayer for eclipse is done locally or anywhere?

A: The *sunnah*, in my opinion, is that it is linked to feeling that fear. It's not based upon the theory that you must see it. We'll come to that.

Q (online): Regarding the vaccine, I understand some centres at the end of the day offer the unused vaccines to NHS members outside. Could I send my parents to get the spare vaccine or is this dishonest?

A: No, it's not dishonest. Yes, that is correct. Even our centre. It is absolutely not dishonest, but I do want to say be careful about being disappointed.

Q (online): Investing: provided the debt to asset ratio is less than 33%, is there any reason we cannot invest into a company who is making a loss?

A: I do not think so, as long as it's not *ḥarām*. I actually even believe that the debt if it is greater, I think there is some space for that.

Q (online): Wanted to confirm in the case when one has doubt in the prayer and figures it out in the prayer, and realises they have not made a mistake, the *sajdatʾl-sahw* after *taslīm* is actually *wājib* i.e., cannot be missed/forgotten?

A: Yes. We do hold that position and that is Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's much more stricter position. I am not going to go as strict, but we spoke about that, that it is to be seen as very important and it is done after the *taslīm*.

Q (online): Someone asked me, is it *afḍal* to not use any Qurʾānic *duʿāʾ* in *sujūd* and use your own wording in Arabic (given the prohibition)?

A: So, we said before that this prohibition is in question *aṣlan,* that when the Prophet ﷺ was talking about the prohibition, he ﷺ said: "I was prohibited from reciting." And so, it is kind of trying to enjoy and worship Allāh ﷻ with the Qurʾān and you are in a lowly position, which is the prohibited part.[14] And scholars said that when you are making *duʿāʾ* then that is the best thing that you can do and the words of Allāh ﷻ are the best that you can use and so therefore you should. It is not applying to *duʿāʾ.* So that is a very valid position. So, a person should go with that.

Now having said that, there is no doubt that when it comes to what is *afḍal*, it is to use the Qurʾānic *duʿāʾ* in a way in which you remove the *ayah* part, like *Rabbana ātina* turn it to *Allāhumma ātina*, that is better than going to random Arabic. And the best *duʿāʾ* of all is neither Qurʾān, neither doctored, neither edited, neither your own—it is the *duʿāʾ* that you feel the greatest at that moment, in whatever language, saying whatever word. It is never ever a particular formula. It is *ikhlāṣ* and your heart connecting, which I have spoken about a lot of time in a lot of detail. Allāh ﷻ listens to the language of the hearts, not the language of the tongues.

Q (online): Is there anything that says if you want to recite a second *sūrah* in your third or fourth *rakʿah* then do so only for *sunnah* prayers not the *farḍ* prayers?

A: What is the second *sūrah*? If you mean after *Fātiḥah*, then there is no doubt that the Prophetʿs ﷺ obligatory prayer did not have these *sūrahs* in the third and fourth as a matter of norm, very exceptional.[15,16] And so we have to be very careful when it comes to affirming too much in the obligatory prayer. We would do that in the supererogatory prayer.

Q (online): Is there any basis to the scare mongering around the vaccine in relation to it reducing/adversely affecting fertility?

A: I do not know what the scare mongering is. But what we know is that someone who is trying should not be taking it. What you have to know is that we do not test vaccines in emotionally, politically, socially unacceptable groups of people. So, you do not go out there and do it in pregnant women, even though we end up doing it in pregnant women. But you are not going to go and say, '*Right. We'll have a group of pregnant women,*' or someone who is trying to get a kid because if a woman has a bad reaction, she can't have a kid, nobody is going to get over that. It is the same as that video of the nurse that faints straight after the [injection]. She has the injection, she falls, people said she died, people said this, that whatever. If it was not a nurse, it would not have had half the

---

[14] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Prohibition of Reciting the Qurʾān While Bowing and Prostrating, ḥadīth no. 479 a.*
[15] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: To Recite Only Sūrat al-Fātiḥah in the Last Two During a Four Rakʿah Prayer, ḥadīth no. 776.*
[16] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Recitation for Ẓuhr and ʿAṣr, ḥadīth no. 451 a.*

traction. So, who you are matters. So, if you are pregnant and you get a side effect, that company is dead. There is always a risk that it has a problem with fertility. But it is not quantifiable. There is no reason why it should. The risk is the simple fact that it has not been tried. It is not teratogenic. It is not a drug which actually works by being toxic or having a toxic kind of thing.

23. Chapter 21 Lesson 2: The Supererogatory Prayer

آكَدُها كُسوفٌ ثم استِسقاءٌ ثم تَراويحٌ ثم وِتْرٌ يُفْعَلُ بينَ العِشاءِ والفَجْرِ، وأَقَلُّه رَكْعةٌ وأَكثرُه إحدى عشرةَ مَثْنَى مَثْنَى، ويُوتِرُ بواحدةٍ، وإن أَوْتَرَ بخَمْسٍ أو سَبْعٍ لم يَجْلِسْ إلا في آخِرِها، وبتِسْعٍ يَجلِسُ عَقِبَ الثامنةِ ويَتَشَهَّدُ ولا يُسَلِّمُ ثم يُصَلِّي التاسعةَ ويَتَشَهَّدُ ويُسَلِّمُ، وأَدْنَى الكمالِ ثلاثُ رَكَعَاتٍ بسلامَيْنِ يَقرأُ في الأُولى بسَبِّح وفي الثانيةِ بالكافرونَ وفي الثالثةِ بالإخلاصِ ، ويَقْنُتُ فيها بعدَ الركوعِ ويَقولُ:

The most emphasised is the Eclipse prayer, then the Rain prayer, then *Tarāwīḥ*.

Then it is the *Witr* Prayer which is performed between *ʿIshāʾ* and *Fajr*. It is a minimum of one unit, and a maximum of eleven which is performed in twos and ends with a single unit. If one was to perform the *Witr* as five or seven, they would not sit until the very end. If nine is performed, one only sits in the eighth unit, performs *tashahhud* but does not do the *taslīm*, then prays the ninth unit, then does *tashahhud* again and does the *taslīm*. The basic complete version is three units with two *taslīms*, reciting *Sūrat al-Aʿlā* in the first, *Sūrat al-Kāfirūn* in the second and *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ* in the third. One performs the *qunūt* after the *rukūʿ* saying:

So last week we had an introduction to the chapter and we spoke about *Kusūf*, the Eclipse prayer. We said that that is the most emphasised. In the commentary we are halfway along page 8:

ثم استِسقاءٌ

Then the Rain prayer.

Istisqāʾ is the *istafʿala* verb in play, it's seeking *al-saqāʾ*. *Saqāʾ* meaning to be quenched. Literally speaking it is the seeking of quenching of the earth. The earth is parched. The person is not parched, right? But the earth itself has become bone dry, the ground is cracked, it requires water. You can see when it rains correctly it becomes quenched, satisfied, this is *al-saqāʾ*, to give to drink and to be satisfied. So, this is seeking satisfactory quenching—the prayer of that, which we just called the prayer for rain, the Rain prayer.

And in the Ḥanbali *madh-hab* and according to Imām al-Ḥajjāwi, which is just one position in the Ḥanbali school (I will come to that in a second), they have this little kind of list as we kind of started off last week. So, they put the best, the most respected and rated, they put *Kusūf* at the top then they made *Istisqāʾ* then they made *Tarāwīḥ* and then they made *Witr*. The basis for that, the general basis for that kind of prioritisation is whether a congregation is legislated for the prayer or not. And if a congregation is legislated for the prayer, then that raises its rank. That raises its status, if there is a congregation which is put for it.

Now Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn (I don't think we mentioned this last week) he has a problem with this and he gives an example. He says that's why the holders of this position they considered *Istisqāʾ* to be a more emphasised prayer than the *Witr* prayer because there is a congregation for *Istisqāʾ* but there is not a congregation for the *Witr* prayer. Now don't make the mistake (although we'll come to this later in a couple of weeks' time when we start going into a lot of *fiqh* detail about *Witr*) that just because we pray in Ramaḍān with the imām sometimes *ṣalāt al-Witr* that the congregation is linked for it. No. The congregation is a specific kind of temporary reality that only exists in Ramaḍān
(0:10:00) for the *Witr* and even that not at a highly expected or requested level. Fundamentally though, as you're going to learn, the *Witr* prayer is a very, very late private prayer, in your bedroom, in your home, in the dead of the night with nobody knowing so it's not a congregational open prayer.

So, if you are making the congregation to be a really big thing, and of course it is because obviously congregational prayers are normally the obligatory prayers and the *Jumuʿah* prayers which are the most obligatory prayers that we have and the most rewarded prayers. So, if you're carrying along that line, that logic that if there's a congregation for it then it becomes more important, then of course you put the Eclipse prayer first, you put the Rain prayer first, you put the *Tarāwīḥ* prayer, which obviously has congregation. And you put all of that in front of the *Witr*, if that's your logic, if that's your *aṣl* from your principles of *fiqh*. If you are using that *aṣl*.

We have to ask the question: Is that an acceptable basis? Is that an acceptable basis that you only raise a prayer status if it has the congregation legislated for it?

The answer is no, not necessarily because sometimes there might be individual evidences that negate that principle. So, for example, if we have individual *ḥadīth* that emphasise the *Witr* more as a prayer then it jumps the queue, simple as that. And we do have that. The Prophet ﷺ emphasised *Witr* in of itself far more than any actually of these prayers—even we can argue *ṣalāt al-Kusūf* as well, the Eclipse prayer. However, the difference with *ṣalāt al-Kusūf* is that through the action of the Prophet ﷺ and through the reality of how it comes about, we followed the position that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn put forward which is that it is an obligatory prayer or one of the pseudo-obligations meaning very close to obligatory. Certainly, the most emphasised of the *sunnah* prayers if it's not obligatory.

Now a *Witr* prayer is going to trump not just *Istisqāʾ* but it's also going to trump *Tarāwīḥ* despite the fact that there is a good logical argument that those two go higher because they have the congregation. In actual fact we say yeah it has a congregation, but none of them come close to the emphasis that the Prophet ﷺ put on *ṣalāt al-Witr*. And we'll speak about a few *ḥadīth* there.

But before I do that, I just want to also say an important point that *ṣalāt al-Istisqāʾ*, even though it does have this congregation for it, when we see the Prophet ﷺ not praying it sometimes, that's a massive *ishārah*, indication that it's not as important or as obligated as one may think. There were many times that there was a drought and many times the Prophet ﷺ didn't go out and pray it. And *ṣalāt al- Istisqāʾ* it could be argued, the minor of the event is the prayer, is the *ṣalāh*, and the major of the event is the rest of it, which we're going to come to in a second.

And just to emphasise this point, in the Ḥanafi school there isn't even a congregation for it. So, even the concept that you know congregation makes it more important, that in itself is something which is disputed by some scholars. The Ḥanafi school as I said, they don't even consider that there is a congregation or congregating for the *ṣalāt al-Istisqāʾ* and that a person should themselves make *duʿāʾ* and *istighfār*. Because of course in the Qurʾān and *Sunnah*, it is understood in our minds that rain is a sign of mercy, a sign of *barakah* and that sin is something which blocks mercy and specifically blocks children, blocks wealth, blocks rain, blocks flourishing nourishment, *rizq*. And so when there is no rain, it is your sins you look to. When there is no rain you have to increase *istighfār*. And the Ḥanafi school are like, yeah, what the evidences suggest is individual *istighfār* as opposed to congregational. So even from the whole congregational angle, it is in question. Anyway, clearly the other three schools (and they see it correctly as well) they see that it is actually a prayer. There is a congregation reality to it and therefore it does deserve pride of place. But does it go ahead of *Witr*?

No. The Prophet ﷺ said in a number of *ḥadīth* for example, one of them from the most authentic of *ḥadīth*:

اجْعَلُوا آخِرَ صَلاتِكُمْ باللَّيلِ وِتْراً

"Make the last prayer of your prayers of the night the *Witr* prayer."[1,2]

Make! *Ijaʿalu!* Make! Which in general is a *fʿil amr* which would indicate obligation.

In another *ḥadīth* the Prophet ﷺ said:

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Witr Prayer, Chapter: Witr as the Last Ṣalāh (at Night), ḥadīth no. 998.*
[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: The Night Prayers Are Two by Two, and Witr Is One Rakʿah at the End of the Night, ḥadīth no. 751 b.*

إِذا خَشِيَ أحدُكُمُ الصُّبْحَ صَلَّى ركعةً واحدةً، تُوتِرُ له ما قد صَلَّى

"If anyone of you is afraid of the approaching dawn (*Fajr* prayer) he should pray one *rakʿah* and this will be a *Witr* for all the *rakʿāt* which he has prayed before." [3,4]

"If one of you is worried that the dawn is about to break," meaning it is getting very, very close and the assumption is that a person is praying their *tahajjud*, their *qiyām al-Layl*, their *ṣalāt al-Layl* and we know that *ṣalāt al-Witr* is the last prayer. So that seals everything. So, if you are thinking, '*It is getting late! I haven't finished! It is getting late! I haven't finished and the dawn is coming close*,' then pray one *rakʿah*. Pray at least a *rakʿah*, that is the sense of the *ḥadīth*. Pray at least a *rakʿah* and it will make odd that which you have prayed already. Now what that means is that you have been praying twos, twos, twos, twos, and the obligation or the requirement is to end the night on an odd. That is what *witr* means, odd. So, to odd out the evens, you pray at least one. And so that is an emphasis.

Another *ḥadīth* which is collected by Imām Aḥmad and it is also collected by Imām al-Tirmidhi and Imām Abu Dāwūd. The narration of Tirmidhi is 453 and I give the narration of al-Tirmidhi in the number of al-Tirmidhi because that is to be considered the more authentic of all of these books of the *Sunan* and the *Musnad* and the *Jāmiʿ of al-Tirmidhi*, greater respect I just want to say, even though there is some discussion about that. Maybe some people would say we should give the narration or the reference to the *Musnad of Imām Aḥmad* because it is the Ḥanbali school. That is fair enough as well. But anyway, this *ḥadīth* is also *ṣaḥīḥ*.

يا أهلَ القُرآن، أوتِرُوا

"People of the Qurʾān do the *Witr* [prayer]." [5,6,7]

There are hundreds of *ḥadīth* actually on *ṣalāt al-Witr*.

---

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Witr Prayer, Chapter: What Is Said Regarding the Witr Prayer, ḥadīth no. 990.*
[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: The Night Prayers Are Two by Two, and Witr Is One Rakʿah at the End of the Night, ḥadīth no. 749 a.*
[5] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions about Witr, Chapter: The Recommendation to Pray Witr, ḥadīth no. 1416.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.
[6] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, Musnad ʿAli ibn Abi Ṭālib, ḥadīth no. 877.* This narration has been graded as *Qawi.*
[7] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of the Night Prayer and Voluntary Prayers During the Day, Chapter: The Command to Pray Witr, ḥadīth no. 1675.* This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*

فَمَنْ لَمْ يُوتِرْ فَلَيْسَ مِنَّا

"He who does not observe the *Witr* [prayer] does not belong to us." [8]

Famous, famous *ḥadīth* which has a little bit of weakness in the chain. And obviously some took that as a very serious *ḥadīth* saying that he is not Muslim. That is not what it means. It basically means that he is not upon our system. He is not upon our *dīn*, he is not upon our way. So that should be considered.

So, the *Witr* clearly is more emphasised than the rain prayer. That should be said. Therefore, it comes after *Kusūf* because *Kusūf* we consider it to be obligatory and then we consider then the *Witr* next. And we will have a proper discussion in its right place about what is the ruling on *Witr* whether it is an obligation or not. Of course, you know (I don't mind mentioning this very quickly), that in the Ḥanafi school everybody knows it is a w*ājib*. It is something just underneath obligation, meaning very, very, very serious. Call it obligation as far as you are concerned. The vast majority consider it to be a s*unnah* prayer and that is because a number of evidences. We will come to that. So, it is obviously a heavily, heavily established prayer.

So just to carry on then with the position of *al-Istisqāʾ*. *Istisqāʾ,* the Rain prayer what actually is it?

It will come later. We will discuss it in detail later. This is actually not even its natural home. But I want it to be clear that it is a prayer in which the Prophet ﷺ we do not even have a *ḥadīth* that emphasises its command. You know that kind of really brings you out, tells you that you have to go and pray it. Rather we pray it because it is established from the Prophet ﷺ.

(0:20:00) Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn makes a very nice point. He also says that sometimes when there was rain, he ﷺ didn't even make the prayer at all, he ﷺ just made the *duʿāʾ* in the *Jumuʿah khuṭbah*. So, you can imagine how it would be, all the people come from all miles out, you don't even see them all week and then they all come to Masjidʾl-Nabawi for that Friday *Jumuʿah* prayer. That is where they kind of come, they hear a *khuṭbah*, so important that they hear a bit of *dīn*, been working really hard, out with the flocks, out traveling, trade etc. They all come back and it's holiday, it's a bit of *dīn*. And so people would speak out in the *khuṭbah* and they would say, '*Yā Rasūl Allāh we're struggling big time. We really are struggling. There is a drought and my animals have been like this*,' and it could be quite far away. Anyway, they put their request forward. And then we have *ḥadīth* narrated from the Prophet ﷺ that he ﷺ would raise his hands and he would say *Allāhumma aghithnā*, *Allāhumma aghithnā*.[9] So, he ﷺ would make an *istisqāʾ*-esque

[8] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions about Witr, Chapter: Concerning One Who Does Not Pray Witr, ḥadīth no. 1419*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf* by al-Albāni.
[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer- Rain, Chapter: The Supplication When Praying for Rain, ḥadīth no. 897 a*.

action which would be *duʿāʾ*-based as opposed to *ṣalāh*-based and then at other times it's a very formal process known as *ṣalāt al-Istisqāʾ*.

Now a little intro into *ṣalāt al-Istisqāʾ* but I don't want to because we are covering that later. But *ṣalāt al-Istisqāʾ* when the drought is in and is kicked in and so on, there are a number of *ḥadīth,* most famous *ḥadīth* are from ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbbās and Abu Hurayrah ﵄, narrated by Imām Aḥmad, authentic.[10,11] The Prophet ﷺ would go out, there would be an announcement—but an informal one. There's no *adhān*, there is no *iqāmah*. It is done whenever in the day and generally, as we said before, that when it comes to this kind of congregational-esque prayers, *sunnah* supererogatory prayers, they are normally held in that mid-morning period—the *Ḍuḥa* period. And he ﷺ went out and gathered everybody, no *adhān*, no *iqāmah* and they would pray two *rakʿah*. In one of the narrations Ibn ʿAbbās ﵄ said he ﷺ prayed it like the ʿĪd prayer.[12] That would indicate it is prayed out loud. So he ﷺ prays it out loud, he ﷺ prays it out normal and then after he ﷺ finishes the prayer, he ﷺ then went on to the *minbar* and turned and reminded the people of why this is basically happening—he ﷺ gave a *khuṭbah*. And the *khuṭbah* almost always was about humbling themselves, seeking *istighfār*, recognising that they have angered their lord, that when it comes to the concept of rain being withheld is always linked to some kind of sin, or we have a *ḥadīth* for example the Prophet ﷺ said that if it wasn't for the animals, if it wasn't for the livestock, then we would have withheld the rain entirely because of how you guys don't pay *zakāh* properly.[13]

So, when people don't pay *zakāh* properly and don't fulfil the *ḥaqq* of the needy, then Allāh ﷻ withholds the rain. And He would have done that every single time if it wasn't for the animals that need the rain, meaning it's not their fault so they should get the rain regardless. So, you can see two common traits when it comes to rain: (1) people sin and (2) people's stinginess. Therefore, the solution to get rain is *istighfār*, seeking forgiveness for sin, and to be generous in charity. And that's what the Prophet ﷺ would encourage. He ﷺ would encourage charity and *istighfār*. And of course, we know that in the Qurʾān, Nūḥ ﷺ many times told his people that is what you need to do and He'll send down rain upon you and wealth etc.[14]

And then what would be fascinating is that when the Prophet ﷺ would make this kind of address and make the people aware, he ﷺ would then supplicate. This is one of the fundamental key evidences for the concept of congregational *duʿāʾ*.

---

[10] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, hadīth no. 466*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*
[11] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 2/326*.
[12] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of Praying for Rain, Chapter: How Is the Prayer for Rain Performed? hadīth no. 1521*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*
[13] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Tribulations, Chapter: Punishments, hadīth no. 4019*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*
[14] [*Sūrat Nūḥ*: 10-12]

Now the congregational *duʿāʾ* as a theory is actually not very supported in the *Sunnah*. What I mean by that is that it is not something you see all the time, every time. If you think about how many times the Prophet ﷺ has gathered with the Companions in a congregation whether in prayer, going out for battle, *ṣalāh, Jumuʿah* etc. you can literally count on two hands how many times a congregational *duʿāʾ* is mentioned. That is why the balanced opinion on the congregational *duʿāʾ* is that it is not *ḥarām* to do because the evidence is there. But it should not be legislated like the way we do, like the Paks do like after every *farḍ* prayer you have to do with the *moulvi* in the congregational prayer, or just like something very relevant right now is funerals. So, once you bury the deceased everybody is expecting, waiting around. I always turn around I will say, '*If you're waiting for a congregation duʿāʾ, let me tell you that I have never seen a single ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ ever do it after the death but rather this is what he ﷺ said Allāhummaghfir lahu wa thabbit-hu*.'[15] A person should make individual *duʿāʾ* and show proper sincerity as opposed to just waiting for the imām that doesn't even know the deceased making an impersonal general *duʿāʾ*.

I'm not sure if I spoke about this before but there is a very real cultural sense of really weak, weak culture, attitude when it comes to how we think 'closure' occurs. We are so diseased by our culture that we think that if we didn't make… You see it in the face of Paks all over. You can see it at a funeral. They literally in their simplicity and their basicness, it literally emanates from them, that if I don't do a congregational *duʿāʾ* or the *moulvi* does not do one and we don't say *amīn* to a *duʿāʾ* that we don't understand and coming from a guy who is not that interested or invested and we say *amīn* to it (even though we don't know what's going on), if we don't do that, we don't actually have closure on the death of our relative.

Wallāhi, it is disgusting. I absolutely detest this attitude and this culture, regardless of the fact that I consider it to be permissible. If a person feels that they want to do it or that it should be done on a case-by-case basis, it is allowed because this is the *ḥadīth* which opens up the permissibility of that. But there is a big difference between knowing that an act is possible and permissible to do, versus legislating it so that it becomes normalised every single time in a certain way. That is the learning point.

Anyway, the Prophet ﷺ then made a *duʿāʾ*, by looking at the *Qiblah*, and he ﷺ raised his hands. Then what he ﷺ did after that is something unique. He ﷺ would take off his cloak and he ﷺ would turn it inside out.[16] The *sunnah* here is establishing a pattern and a habit for whatever clothes you wear. If you wear a jacket, you turn it inside out. If you wear a shirt, you turn it inside out. If you have an *abaya* and it can be done in a modest way, you do the same. What this is indicating is that, '*I recognise my old state, I have turned over a new leaf, and I am into my new state*.' That is the 'implication', meaning I am not just talking the talk, I am walking the walk. So, I made *istighfār*, I cried, I sought

---

[15] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Funerals, Chapter: Praying for Forgiveness for the Deceased by the Grave at the Time of Departing (Burial), ḥadīth no. 3221.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.
[16] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of the Prayer for Rain, Chapter: Collection of Chapters Regarding the Prayer for Rain, ḥadīth no. 1161.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

forgiveness. I am then showing this in a symbolic way, and I am going to go out and give charity, etc. This is *ṣalāt al-Istisqāʾ*.

According to the vast majority of scholars. This is an emphasised *sunnah* because of the action of the Prophet ﷺ doing it. According to the Aḥnāf, the Ḥanafi school, they do not even consider there to be a congregational prayer for it. It is something that is allowed. If you do it, you do it. If you don't, then you don't. Shaykh says that the chapter on that in detail is going to come.

Then Shaykh says:

ثم تَراويحٌ ثم وِتْرٌ

Then *Tarāwīḥ*, then *Witr*.

According to the Ḥanābilah, *Tarāwīḥ* then follows *ṣalāt al-Istisqāʾ* in terms of its emphasised nature. *Tarāwīḥ* takes the third spot, and *Witr* takes the fourth spot. The only reason for that is because the Ḥanbalis put the congregational concept (because *tarāwīḥ* has congregation) so they put that forward. Of course, *Tarāwīḥ* has a *jamāʿah* legislated for it, because that is what the Prophet ﷺ did in Ramaḍān for the first night, the second night, the third night. He ﷺ came out and prayed with them each time. As you know, in the famous *ḥadīth* in *Bukhāri* the fourth night he ﷺ did not come out. The people waited, waited, waited, they were very disappointed. He ﷺ came out afterwards when it was done to make sure that nobody gets the wrong idea, and he ﷺ said:

أَنِّي خَشِيتُ أَنْ تُفْرَضَ عَلَيْكُمْ

"I feared that it might become obligatory upon you." [17,18]

"I fear this will become obligatory on you," if I keep coming out for it and keep doing it regularly and it becomes obligatory.

Again, brothers and sisters—logical progression. Clearly, we are learning a principle here, the concept of continuity. When you see continuity in an action of worship, it is a very strong indication of how emphasised that act is. So, when you see *Istisqāʾ* not happening often, that is an indication that it is not obligatory, or not as emphasised a

[17] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayer at Night, Chapter: The Prophet's ﷺ Exhorting to Tahajjud and Nawāfil Without Making Them Compulsory, ḥadīth no. 1129.*
[18] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers—Travellers, Chapter: Encouragement to Pray Qiyām During Ramadan, which is Tarāwīḥ, ḥadīth no. 761 a.*

sunnah as you may think. Likewise, the congregational *duʿāʾ*. When you do not see that
(0:30:00) it is happening all the time, when you do not see it happening regularly, then you get the idea that it is not as emphasised as people make, and it is not the action of the Prophet ﷺ. When you see *Witr* and you see that he ﷺ hardly ever has missed it—like hardly ever—you realise that it is super, super important.

Likewise, when you see him ﷺ actually, physically state that,"'I did not come out on this fourth night because I did not want it to become obligatory." He ﷺ is literally telling you, spelling it out. He has literally just told you that if I continue to do an action every single time, that is basically obligation. So, I cut it myself to make sure that it does not become an obligation. This is a very, very important maxim in the *Sunnah*, and it has nuance of course. It has nuance and it is not always the case, but as a basic [unintelligible], it is a good one.

After that day when the Prophet ﷺ came out, it actually remained in the *Ummah* for the next few years, and I mean by that the remainder of the life of the Prophet ﷺ, and certainly the *khilāfah* of Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddīq ؓ, which is a couple of years in of itself. The people prayed *Tarāwīḥ* by themselves. When we come to that section later on, I will speak about that in detail, because you will know that I have my own opinions on this, and I have done research in that, and I have a long, detailed video. The *Tarāwīḥ* has a separate section which is coming later. So, for this couple of years it remained singular prayer. People prayed their own private prayer, they prayed like how in my opinion it should be prayed, which is a singular night prayer, until ʿUmar ؓ. He realised—and again, another very important *dīn* establishing principle here, which is the concept of looking to the needs of the masses. ʿUmar ؓ basically looks and he sees a few of the imāms, tiny pockets praying here and there. He thinks, '*You know what? Wouldn't it be a great idea if we got one imām and we just did it? It's not like it wasn't done. I remember that the Prophet ﷺ used to do it. It is not ḥarām. He ﷺ didn't say it's ḥarām. He ﷺ just cut us down on the fourth [night] and said, "I did not want to make it obligatory." But he ﷺ still then continued to emphasise the prayer and we carried on praying it. Wouldn't it be great if we bring that back in the game?*' Of course, his motivation was not just the fact that it used to exist, but the primary motivation was that he thought the people were not getting it done.

Listen. That's the key. It goes back to my audio on the Telegram group, the long, long one, about women in the public eye. And that's what I said, that even though my heart is towards a more conservative take on it, I mean it would be complete ignorance of me to ignore the reality on the ground. The reality on the ground is that the vast majority of Muslims are not that practicing. And the vast majority of Muslims if you don't give them a replacement or you don't give them a role model, they will take the ones they have got. And frankly the Muslim community's role models are absolutely… Instagram models, *ḥijābi* models, how to put your *ḥijāb* on, all the makeup *bakwās*. And then you have got all of those other idiots the crap that they do, Muslim lifestyle influencers or whatever they do in the name of *daʿwah* or whatever. That is what you have—the podcast folks, the video vlog casts folks. You have got some Muslims that have multi-

million, million, million followers and you have got two categories those who are not practicing at all but are just Muslim, and then you have got fouseyTUBE (I don't know if he is still doing or not). And then you have those who are actually using Islam as a selling principle, like those that market themselves as *ḥijāb*. Then oh! Now once they get their contract the *ḥijāb* comes off and all the rest of it. Filth that use Islam to create that brand.

So how can we go round saying that sisters have to be careful reciting poetry, don't recite poetry, don't recite Qurʾān, don't lead, there is *fitnah*, the men etc.? Which is all true and you know that's my position. And at the same time, we tell these good practicing people, those who would not take of the *ḥijāb*, or wouldn't do anything stupid, nonsense like that and we keep our girls and the good men that want to do *daʿwah* and the girls who want to do their thing, and the good people we keep them away and we allow the Muslims to go to the dogs basically, because we only leave these folks as their role models. That's an argument that's got to be considered. And it's the same argument that you will see throughout history that allows Muslims to do things.

I am going to ask you a question. So ʿUmar ﵁ he sees the public benefit that let me unify the Muslims put them under one imām and that way they all kind of come. Hey, we are not going to make it obligatory, we are going to make it very clear that it is a *sunnah* act, but just keep coming. And great imām, great voice, Ubay ibn Kaʿb, Tamīm al Dāri ﵁ as well, great reciters, great voices, spread them out in *masājid* and then it started. He made it twenty *rakʿah* etc.

And there is a real motivation to try and give people something better than nothing, because they aren't doing what they should be doing at home which is definitely better in my opinion. And as I have said I have proven that and established that last couple of years in videos and I will go through that again later as well. However, what is better for me and what is better for the few that are able to do is not necessarily what is better for the masses.

So, I have a very clear example in my mind, I wonder if anyone is on my wavelength. If I say to you in this light, in this vein, who can think of the biggest and the most famous and the most popular example of this principle in play today in the Muslim community? The clue (because it could be anything) is that it is in reference to one of the five obligatory prayers, this way of trying to help the masses, trying to give them something as opposed to…

The counter argument is very important as well. The counter argument would be: Well, hold on! It's not like there is anything else available. There are role models. There are teachers. There are other brands. But they are not interested, so good luck to them. That's their problem.

And that's a very true point.

Student (online): Praying *ʿIshāʾ* early.

Ustādh: Well, done, I know it was not the clearest and obvious of points. But it was the *ʿIshāʾ* prayer.

It's the *ʿIshāʾ* prayer, as a congregational Muslim community thing. The way that all of our mosques pray *ʿIshāʾ* so early, which is so against the *Sunnah* by the way. But we do it because we know that people are going to work, we know that putting it at 7:00 pm-8:00 pm is going to ensure that there is stability of time, using a clock is more important than anything else. Literally six months of the year the entire Muslim community knows that at 8:00 pm its *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ*, or at 8:30 pm is *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ*. It gives it stability. It allows the community to build around it, we have circles to around it.

Look at LP for example. The time of 8:30 pm it makes no sense in lockdown if you think about it. 8:30 pm came because the fact that most of the year our *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ* is at 8:00 pm. It makes no sense when we do not even have a congregation. Our *ʿIshāʾ* congregation at home is at 6:30. Again, that is in our home. You should say, '*What on earth is the excuse for that?*' At home, we should be praying at 9:00 pm, 10:00 pm, 11:00 pm, 12:00 am—just before half the night, just after a third of the night has passed. So, that is very late. The reason that I do not do that in my home is because the congregation is my kids who still have be up early for school, and to make sure therefore that they all pray, including the young and the old, our *jamāʿah* time is at 6:30 pm. So, this looking for the public benefit, is looking for the family benefit and then making it wider you are making it for the community benefit. This is an example of this principle in play of doing an action in order to try and facilitate something, try to lessen the harm.

(0:40:00)

I just want to make it clear on the example of women in public, I very much believe in a principle that is on the other side of the argument, which is that Allāh ﷻ will not question you about the actions of the ignorant people and never does Allāh ﷻ want you to be putting yourself at risk. I have given this example many times in different classes and I must have done it in LP as well, but I will just say it again.

Shaykh Ibn Bāz was asked this question and it is such a golden principle in our *dīn*. He was asked: Listen. I have the opportunity to go and get military and intelligence training and I would know the strategies and the plots and plans of the *kuffār* and the enemies of the *dīn.* But to do that I would have to pray on the sly, I'd have to shave my beard, and x, y, z. I would have to do all these things—like the kinds of things that spies must do.

Shaykh Ibn Bāz said: No thank you.

Subḥān Allāh this answer is obviously a very deep answer that represents a lot and I do not have all that time, but what he is basically trying to say is that... I think we did speak about this during the Syrian revolution, the Arab Spring. I think I spoke about it in LP during the Arab Spring. The Tunisian who set himself on fire and the resulting [consequences], whether you call it good or bad. Obviously, looking back, we can see it

has been catastrophic. But let us just say that there was some good that came out of the Arab Spring. The idea is that guy put himself forward as the one who took one for the team.

Well, hold on! Taking one for the team has principles and limits. It has rules. You don't kill yourself. You don't commit suicide. Who cares about the Arabs or their spring or their countries? Who cares? You don't kill yourself over it—suicide I mean. I am not talking about *jihād.* I am talking about suicide.

And Ibn Bāz is basically like: Well, hold on! Shaving off your beard and going into a new community, assimilating to a level where you are having to erase all the external aspects of your *dīn.*

We have learnt over our experience is that the external very much builds the internal, even though they are two entirely different paradigms, and we need to focus on developing our internal identity very separately and independently of the external. That is important. Otherwise, your *imān* will always be weak. It will become fake. Regardless, your *khusūʿ* in *ṣalāh* is dependent upon your external movement, lack of thereof, etc. and, all the other aspects like the way that you dress your *ḥijāb,* your *jilbāb,* your beard, your hat, your x, your y—these all have an impact upon your *imān*.

I just want to say that I would not allow a person to say, '*I cannot pray during the day because I am spying*.' Bro, you are in the wrong job. And you know what? The *naṣr* is from Allāh ﷻ. The victory is from Allāh ﷻ. I don't mind someone doing some dodgy move or whatever, but to leave your prayer, leave your identity? Bro, that is going a bit too much.

When you are in personal danger for your life is one thing, versus you intentionally taking that thinking that you are going to help people. Bro, you have no idea. That is what I want to say to people that feel that pressure, '*I have to be the one. I have to step in and fill in the void. If I don't, then there will be others*.'

You know what it is? Do not put that pressure upon yourself. You are not actually that special. If you want the harsh way. That is the kind of film scene where the person says, '*I do not love you anymore. Go away. Leave me*.' You know, telling a lie to try to save their life. If you want the harsh version, then I will say, '*You are not special. Get lost*.' But if you want the truth, you are special, and you are so special that you should not risk your *imān* for whatever reason. Therefore, only the highest quality and the most stable people should enter into that field. And you can count on one finger—not even one hand—those people who enter into these risky kinds of fields thinking that they are going to make a difference and they are not drastically affected.

Wallāhi it disgusted me this morning. And I have really spoken a lot about these people but particularly Muslim celebrities and comedians who are in the TV kind of scene and

whatever whatnot. And those who are close to me, I am incredibly harsh with them and I have become harsher with them, those that I know that have a platform or whatever.

Mājid Nawaz is not the example here at all. I am talking about people who enter in with good intentions. Mājid Nawaz is from the *munāfiqīn.* That is something which always was. We are talking about people like, we do not need to name people but Muslim comedians thinking that they can keep *ḥalāl* and they can go and make it. They started off with Muslim charities and doing Muslim gigs and then they were promoted, they caught the public eye. You know that there are a good five odd that are in the public eye and then getting these big gigs and they have now gone on to movies and drama series in which they are doing *ḥarām* day and night.

And you know what? You can kind of somehow see—never allowed—but you can see if they did it because they were in a role and they were told, '*If you do not say this or you do not hold this woman in this way then you have lost the place*,' and that person finds some weird justification that I need to do this *ḥarām.* I mean you can understand that thought process even though it's *ḥarām* and he is condemned. But to not be in employment, not under pressure, on your own social media channel, for no reason whatsoever feel the need to f this, that, use the disgusting swear words, the worst, give examples of sexual euphemisms, making fun of *duʿāʾ* etc. purely to maintain a brand under no pressure. That is what happens. You look at them visibly from the outside, very Muslim, 4-5 people. And that is across the board.

And like I said these people, they all came to either me, not necessarily come to me first but meaning that at the very beginning of our relationships, it would be, '*Listen! I would be grateful if you could advise me and help me in this*.' And I would be very lenient being aware of the need, of the culture, and the cultural imperative that we have as Muslims. If I saw even the s-h-i-t word I would be like, '*Bro! What the hell is that? You really honestly needed to do that?*' [I would] maintain high standards, but definitely lenient. And that leniency got them the bigger parts, justified the little things here and there. Now they do not even give a monkey's about whether I exist or not, etc.

Those people who are now within that sphere at the moment, it is a nightmare for them because I do not allow them to do anything like Moeen *miskīn,* Moeen Ali, the cricketer. I must speak to him literally on a daily basis, like multiple times a day on these issues. Because you have to understand, minus the fact that he is obviously coming to the end of his career, a sporting superstar, literally he was number one ODI all-rounder not that long ago, there is a far bigger narrative because he is very openly practicing. And therefore, he has such value when it comes to brands and advertising and the
(0:50:00) government is on his case all the time wanting him to back this, back that, hook this up, record this video here, there, whatever whatnot. They want to give him roles in drama and in acting and they want to play off the huge respect that the Muslim community have for him because they have seen that he has not been brought out etc. So, he is under a great amount of *fitnah*. And he *miskīn* does not get the lenient AE. He gets the tell them to get lost, tell him to get lost AE because he needs to be protected. His family needs to be protected, other people need to be protected etc. And you can spread that.

I know I have gone off on a tangent, but it is important for you students and especially you guys who are all practicing, leaders in your own community, doing your own circles and things, you must understand this dichotomy. And you have to understand that to deal with the Muslim community's needs at the wider level should never mean that the individual, whatever their status, should sacrifice themselves and become the *baqarah* on the altar of acceptability. Assimilation or whatever you want to call it is not that important frankly. It really is not that important. These are *khuṭuwāt'l-shayṭān*. That is why Allāh ﷻ says steps of *shayṭān* because nobody just goes for *shayṭān*. You go for the little things—just the steps, little moves, little things then it builds up and it comes into the crescendo and then suddenly you are going beyond the point of no return.

Anyway, so that is what ʿUmar ؓ does, obviously that is building upon that audio we spoke about yesterday.

Anyway, based upon these *ḥadīth*, where does *Witr* really exist and where should *Tarāwīḥ* exist in the actual correct interpretation or certainly Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position and the **<u>class position</u>**?

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says the correct position is that *Witr* is way beyond *Tarāwīḥ* and above *Istisqāʾ* because the Prophet ﷺ commanded to it and he ﷺ never stopped doing it, meaning he ﷺ continued to do it regularly even to the extent that there are a number of scholars that said it is an obligatory prayer, which is true. The Ḥanafi school said that it is obligatory, straight out (and we will come to that) and Ibn Taymiyyah, his opinion is that it was obligatory as well but only upon the people who prayed the night prayer regularly. So, he used to consider that the people who used to pray the night prayer regularly that they have to pray the *Witr* prayer, similar to the way that *tahajjud* was for the Prophet ﷺ, it was obligatory upon him ﷺ above and beyond the others. So, Ibn Taymiyyah's opinion was that those who are the proper Muslims who pray the night prayer, it is obligatory upon them as a minimum for them to pray the *Witr* even if the actual *tahajjud* prayer is not obligatory. Regardless, you can see that the scholars see it as very, very, important because the bare minimum, which is the position of our school, the Ḥanbalis, the Shāfiʿis, everybody, the vast majority of scholars, that it is a *sunnah muʾakkadah*, a highly emphasised *sunnah.* However, it in its emphasis goes above *Istisqāʾ* and goes above *Tarāwīḥ*, and it does not take fourth place like the Ḥanbalis have here, but rather it takes second place after *ṣalāt al-Kusūf* and that is only because we think *ṣalāt al-Kusūf* is actually an obligation, *farḍ kifāyah*, as was said earlier on.

Shaykh says (at the bottom of page 10):

إذاً؛ فترتيب صَلاة التطوُّع :الكسوف، ثم الوِتر، ثم الاستسقاء، ثم التراويح، هذا هو القول الراجح؛ لأن الاستسقاء صلاة يقصد بها رَفْع الضرر، فالناس في حاجة إليها أكثر من التراويح.

So: "The correct order is *Kusūf*, then *Witr*, then *Istisqāʾ*, then *Tarāwīḥ*. This is the strongest opinion. You should also note that *ṣalāt al-Istisqāʾ* is a *ṣalāh* in which one is intending the lifting of harm and that actually makes it more important—the lifting of harm is more important than the bringing of a benefit." That is a principle in *fiqh* and just generally in Islam—to ensure that no harm is caused, 'do no harm' there is something about this in English what do we say?

Certainly, in our *dīn*, *darʾ al-mafāsid*, to ward off, stave off, push harm, is more important than bringing the benefit. And this is discussed amongst scholars. The Shaykh basically said that with *Istisqāʾ* being primarily to stave off harm and *Tarāwīḥ* to bringing benefit and *ajr*, and *thawāb* and all the rest of it, then it actually goes way above *Tarāwīḥ*. That is why Shaykh has in the list: *Kusūf*, *Witr*, *Istisqāʾ*, *Tarāwīḥ*. *Tarāwīḥ* becomes last because it is literally only the last thing.

Shaykh basically wants to have a little word about *Tarāwīḥ* we will come to that little bit later, but he reminds us that *Tarāwīḥ* is basically the night prayer in Ramaḍān. It is called *Tarāwīḥ* because in the nights of Ramaḍān the people would pray for a very long time, and they would elongate the prayer. And it had long *rukūʿ*, long *sujūd*, long *qiyām* etc., we are talking like five hours. My estimate is normally 5-6 hours, that is how long the prayer would be. And it would be divided up into blocks of four, and that is what the *ḥadīth* states (we will come to this in a second). After every four they would take a break, *istarāḥū*, the Arabic of *ista*, to seek. They would seek *rāḥah*, they would seek relaxation, chill, take a *rāḥah*, take a break, they were seeking a break. And so, it became known as the prayer of the rest breaks. So, you would chill, have a little chat, relax, a bit of *dhikr* etc., just sit down and give the legs a rest. This would happen after every four *rakʿah* and so it became known as the prayer of the rest breaks. This is detailed in the *ḥadīth* of ʿĀʾishah ﵂:

مَا كَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يَزِيدُ فِي رَمَضَانَ وَلاَ فِي غَيْرِهِ عَلَى إِحْدَى عَشْرَةَ رَكْعَةً يُصَلِّي أَرْبَعًا فَلاَ تَسْأَلْ عَنْ حُسْنِهِنَّ وَطُولِهِنَّ ثُمَّ يُصَلِّي أَرْبَعًا فَلاَ تَسْأَلْ عَنْ حُسْنِهِنَّ وَطُولِهِنَّ ثُمَّ يُصَلِّي ثَلاَثًا

"The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ did not observe either in Ramaḍān or in other months more than eleven *rakʿāt* (of the night prayer). He (in the first instance) observed four *rakʿāt*. Ask not about their excellence and their length. He again observed four *rakʿāt* and ask not about their excellence and their length. He would then observe three *rakʿāt* (of the *Witr* prayer)." [19,20]

[19] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayer at Night, Chapter: The Prayer of the Prophet ﷺ at Night in Ramaḍān and (in) Other Months, ḥadīth no. 1147.*

[20] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers—Travellers, Chapter: Night Prayers and the Number of Rakʿah Offered by the Prophet ﷺ at Night, and That Witr Is One Rakʿah, and a One-Rakʿah Prayer Is Correct, ḥadīth no. 738 a.*

Shaykh wants to add a little point. This is a nice point to discuss by the way. You will know, Paks will all know, that is very much in our psyche the concept of the four *rakʿah* prayer like *Ẓuhr* when it comes to *sunnah*. The Ḥanafis, all the Paks have been brought up to pray four *rakʿah sunnah* before the four *farḍ* of *Ẓuhr* or four *rakʿah sunnah ghayr muʾakkadah* before *ʿAṣr*. This idea is in our culture. But it is not just cultural, it is a position that a few of the scholars held. They considered it to be a valid idea and concept, and it is based upon mostly statements of the Companions and the *Tābiʿīn* but also interpretation of authentic *ḥadīth* like this one. A person could look at this and frankly, it looks very apparent that this is a four-unit prayer, that the Prophet ﷺ prayed four then gave *salām*. That's what it sounds like. So, you don't blame them. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn wants to go to pains to emphasise that actually, the *sunnah* all the time, day or night, is to pray *mathna mathna*—to pray in twos.[3,4] And that even this *ḥadīth* that is talking about four is to be understood as: (a block of) four.

So, we would retranslate this *ḥadīth* of ʿĀʾishah ؓ saying:

"He (in the first instance) observed (a block of) four *rakʿāt*. Ask not about their excellence and their length. He again observed (a block of) four *rakʿāt* and ask not about their excellence and their length. He would then observe three *rakʿāt* (of the *Witr* prayer)."

(1:00:00) Even the three, we know that the Prophet ﷺ used to pray the three as a two *rakʿah*, give *salām*, and then pray one *rakʿah* by itself. But ʿĀʾishah ؓ called it three. Likewise, her calling it four is not saying it was all done four, but she's calling it a four. And in actual fact, we know that it's a two and a two. And how do we know that it is a two and a two?

Because the Prophet ﷺ used to always make the *salām* after two *rakʿah*. In another *ḥadīth* from ʿĀʾishah ؓ she said:

كَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يُصَلِّي فِيمَا بَيْنَ أَنْ يَفْرُغَ مِنْ صَلاَةِ الْعِشَاءِ – وَهِيَ الَّتِي يَدْعُو النَّاسُ الْعَتَمَةَ – إِلَى الْفَجْرِ إِحْدَى عَشْرَةَ رَكْعَةً يُسَلِّمُ بَيْنَ كُلِّ رَكْعَتَيْنِ وَيُوتِرُ بِوَاحِدَةٍ

"Between the time when the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ finished the *ʿIshāʾ* prayer—which the people called *al-ʿAtamah*—until *Fajr*, he ﷺ used to pray eleven *rakʿāt*, uttering the salutation at the end of every two *rakʿahs*, and observing the *Witr* with a single one."[21]

[21] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers—Travellers, Chapter: Night Prayers and the Number of Rakʿah Offered by the Prophet ﷺ at Night, and That Witr Is One Rakʿah, and a One-Rakʿah Prayer Is Correct, ḥadīth no. 736 b-c.*

In this *ḥadīth* ʿĀʾishah ﵂ says that the Prophet ﷺ used to pray eleven *rakʿah* in the nighttime, giving *salām* after every two *rakʿah*. So that is super clear. And Shaykh says that even if we never came across this little extra information or clarification from ʿĀʾishah ﵂, we know from other *ḥadīth* that the Prophet ﷺ said that the night prayer is *mathna mathna*, that it's done in units of two.[3,4] So, it's no problem.

Here is an interesting thing that I wanted to mention. We understand from this *ḥadīth* that the actions of the Companions that they would only take this proper significant break. That doesn't mean that after every two *rakʿah* they jump straight back up to pray. That never was the way of the Prophet ﷺ. They were very relaxed about the whole *ṣalāh* process. So, they will pray two and wait 3-4 minutes and then stand up. I mean I don't know exactly, but you can assume this. Whereas, when it comes to the break of four, there are some narrations from the Companions/*Tābiʿīn*, you can say ten minutes, fifteen minutes—a proper break.

When you were growing up in the Pak mosque, you will remember that. They created an artificial reality to make that four block a proper break. Every Pak knows that, that when you are praying *tarāwīḥ* in the *masjid*, you'd pray the first two, you know that you get straight back up and pray the next two. And then everybody rests and breathes. That was their artificial way of creating the 'four *rakʿah* break'. It's just very interesting how you see the historical development. The Prophet ﷺ never prayed twenty anyway.

As for *Witr*, Shaykh says that is going to come *in shāʾ Allāh* that the minimum is a single *rakʿah* and the most that it can be is eleven. We will explain that. *Witr* is a *sunnah muʾakkadah*. And for those people who consider it to be a *sunnah*, then it is very, very highly emphasised to the extent that Imām Aḥmad said:

مَنْ تَرَكَ الوِترَ فهو رَجُلُ سُوءٍ لا ينبغي أن تُقبل له شَهادة

[He said] that the one who does not pray *Witr* prayer then he is an evil person. It is not acceptable. One should not accept his testimony, meaning that we don't trust him in his *dunya*, let alone in his *dīn.*

I want you to understand that. That's a bare minimum that you should understand about *Witr* prayer. A lot of people might pray the *sunnah* prayer and then they leave off the *Witr* because it's meant to be the last prayer of the night (as we are going to come to), but they don't pray it. They are very lax on *Witr* prayer. Brothers and sisters, at the very least let me just say this much: It is a super important prayer. It's a game changer. It's an identifier. It's your *dīn*. People who don't pray *Witr*, they are gone. They are on the way out. It's gone.

You might think Imām Aḥmad's statement is a harsh one, but as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says he describes the person as *rajulan sūʾ*. That just emphasises how important it is.

Q & A

Q (online): How can you eat food mid prayer and not need to brush your teeth after that?

A: We covered that about food. Tiny bits of food taken/swallowed is not a major problem. Obviously, a person swallows what's in the mouth and this *dīn* is easy like that. You don't need to be going out and brushing your teeth again. You might do a little swirl with a bit of drink.

Q (online): Can you translate what Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn calls the one who doesn't do *Witr*?

(1:10:00) A: It wasn't what Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn said. He was quoting Imām Aḥmad. Imām Aḥmad said that the one who leaves *Witr* prayer is an evil man and one would not accept their testimony. That's the translation.

Q (online): The fact the Prophet ﷺ said the night prayer is done in twos, does that mean that the day prayer is done in units of two?

A: There is an argument as well that both, day and night prayers, are twos.

Q (online): Can we say the *Witr* is more important than the two *sunnah* before *Fajr*?

A: I don't think you can. But it's one of those kind of theoretical ones, not something which is important to know. Both are super emphasised, both never missed, both always prayed, etc.

Q (online): Why is the Eclipse prayer more emphasised than the *sunnah* prayers before/after *farḍ* prayers?

A: It's not that it's more. First of all, the *sunnah* prayers are not in this discussion because it's a different category—number one. Number two, the other way that you could say that the Eclipse prayer is more emphasised is because we know that sometimes it's okay to leave the *sunnah* prayers, but the Eclipse prayer is an obligation.

Q (online): Can the COVID vaccine be taken during Ramaḍān?

A: Yes. You can take the COVID vaccine during Ramaḍān.

Q (online): How late should *'Ishā'* prayer be prayed?

A: It should be prayed just before half the night. Half of the night, what we call 'midnight' which is not 12:00 am, it's mid-night. It should be prayed before then—half an hour before something like that. That's the *sunnah* of when you should pray.

Q (online): If a three *rakʿāt Witr* is done in the recommended way, i.e., *salām* after two, is the *Allāhu akbar* when you get up for the third *rakʿah* a *takbīrat'l-iḥrām*?

A: Of course, yes. If you do it in the recommended way *salām*, then you've ended that prayer. So that's a new prayer. But we're going to come to that.

Q (online): I asked a few weeks ago about seeing a male gynaecologist and you advised to move to a female. I'm now being told that I should be trying to find a Muslim female gynaecologist. Is this in line with your views also?

A: No. I do not consider a Muslim to be a condition in any of the books of *fiqh* where they mention a Muslim doctor. I think I've mentioned that in a video somewhere and I've spoken about it. The scholars when they did that, they did that on the basis that the non-Muslims are looking to do the Muslims in and there's going to be a problem etc. Now if you feel that the doctors are doing you in, then even the non-Muslim ones are unacceptable. We need to have a trustworthy person. That's the point. It's a trustworthy person.

Q (online): Do we make *sajdat'l-sahw* for changing intention within the prayer obligatory to voluntary?

A: No. If it goes down, then it doesn't—but only if it's a correct changing. Remember as we said the other day in the Telegram group, that it's not allowed to come down from the *farḍ Fajr* down to *sunnah Fajr* because that's not an acceptable thing. Only in an acceptable change, then it's acceptable. There is no mistake so there is no *sajdat'l-sahw*.

Q (online): Just curious since *ṣalāt al-Istisqā'* is made with intention of removing harm, has *qiyās* been made by scholars for praying it for removing other types of harm or no because it was only legislated for lack of rain?

A: It's only legislated for a lack of rain. We have another action for that, that's the *qunūt'l-nāzilah* which we'll come to as well.

24. Chapter 21 Lesson 3: The Supererogatory Prayer

آكَدُها كُسوفٌ ثم استِسقاءٌ ثم تَراويحٌ ثم وِتْرٌ يُفْعَلُ بينَ العِشاءِ والفَجْرِ، وأَقَلُّه رَكْعةٌ وأَكثرُه إحدى عشرةَ مَثْنَى مَثْنَى، ويُوتِرُ بواحدةٍ، وإن أَوْتَرَ بخَمْسٍ أو سَبْعٍ لم يَجْلِسْ إلا في آخِرِها، وبتِسْعٍ يَجلِسُ عَقِبَ الثامنةِ ويَتَشَهَّدُ ولا يُسَلِّمُ ثم يُصَلِّي التاسعةَ ويَتَشَهَّدُ ويُسَلِّمُ، وأَدْنَى الكمالِ ثلاثُ رَكَعَاتٍ بسلامَيْنِ يَقرأُ في الأُولى بسَبِّح وفي الثانيةِ بالكافرونَ وفي الثالثةِ بالإخلاصِ ، ويَقْنُتُ فيها بعدَ الركوعِ ويَقولُ:

The most emphasised is the Eclipse Prayer, then the Rain Prayer, then *Tarāwīḥ*.

Then it is the *Witr* Prayer which is performed between *ʻIshāʾ* and *Fajr*. It is a minimum of one unit, and a maximum of eleven which is performed in twos and ends with a single unit. If one was to perform the *Witr* as five or seven, they would not sit until the very end. If nine is performed, one only sits in the eighth unit, performs *tashahhud* but does not do the *taslīm*, then prays the ninth unit, then does *tashahhud* again and does the *taslīm*. The basic complete version is three units with two *taslīms*, reciting *Sūrat al-Aʻlā* in the first, *Sūrat al-Kāfirūn* in the second and *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ* in the third. One performs the *qunūt* after the *rukūʻ* saying:

On page 12 in the middle, he basically says:

يفعل بين صلاة العشاء والفجر

[The *Witr* Prayer] is performed between *ʻIshāʾ* and *Fajr*.

This is the time for a *Witr* prayer. Between *ʻIshāʾ* and between *Fajr*. And *ʻIshāʾ* as you know is roughly about an hour and a half, an hour forty (depending upon where you are) after sunset. *Fajr* of course is the break of dawn, an hour and a half odd before sunrise. And we are talking true dawn and not false dawn, the second *Fajr* as such. Even though I explained to you what time *ṣalāt al-ʻIshāʾ* is, and *ʻIshāʾ* as I said is an hour and a half, hour forty after *Maghrib*, the majority of scholars (other than the Ḥanafis of course who do not accept the combining of prayers), the vast majority of scholars accept that actually technically speaking, the time of *ṣalāt al-Witr*, the time frame, is not actually after one and half hours after *Maghrib* but rather it is after *ʻIshāʾ*.

We know that *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ* can be prayed *jamʿ taqdīman wa taʾkhīran*. Obviously, we haven't done combining yet, but when we do you will realise that when you combine *Maghrib* and *ʿIshāʾ* for a reason (a valid reason in *Sharīʿah*) you can either combine it at the earlier time or the later time. If you combine it at the early time, it means you combine it with *Maghrib.* So, if the *Maghrib* was 5:00 pm. And let's just say for the sake of argument *ʿIshāʾ* is 7:00 pm. So normally people are thinking that *ṣalāt al-Witr* starts from 7:00 pm until let us say 6:30 am—*Fajr* (which is roughly what it is in Manchester these days). So from 7:00 pm until 6:30 am. Now what you find out though, is actually the time for *Witr* is from 5:00ish, if you were to combine. If you were outside somewhere or a traveler or whatever, and you prayed your *ṣalāt al-Maghrib* and you prayed your *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ* straight after it then the *Witr* can kick in. So *Witr* technically is after *ʿIshāʾ* the prayer not *ʿIshāʾ* the time. That is an important distinction.

The evidence of the time of *ʿIshāʾ* to *Fajr* is the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ قَدْ أَمَدَّكُمْ بِصَلاَةٍ وَهِيَ خَيْرٌ لَكُمْ مِنْ حُمْرِ النَّعَمِ وَهِيَ الْوِتْرُ فَجَعَلَهَا لَكُمْ فِيمَا بَيْنَ الْعِشَاءِ إِلَى طُلُوعِ الْفَجْرِ

"Allāh ﷻ has given you an extra prayer which is better for you then the red camels (i.e. high breed camels). This is the *Witr* which Allāh has appointed for you between the night prayer and the daybreak." [1,2,3]

"Allāh ﷻ has given to you a prayer which is better than the red camels" meaning better than anything that you can ever imagine, "it is called *ṣalāt al-Witr*", the odd prayer. *Witr* means odd as opposed to even, it is between the *ʿIshāʾ* prayer until the break of dawn, until the *Fajr* comes on board, until the break of dawn. This *ḥadīth* narrated by Abu Dāwūd 1418 and by Imām Tirmidhi as well 452, he said this is *ḥadīth gharīb* and Ibn Mājah also narrated it. This *ḥadīth* is not the strongest but it was considered acceptable by Shaykh al-Albāni. So, it is okay in terms of its authenticity.

Student (online): Allāh ﷻ has provided you?

Ustādh: I think that works as well all right.

Student (online): Do you combine because of the fear you cannot get up for *Fajr?*

---

[1] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions About Witr, Chapter: The Recommendation to Pray Witr, ḥadīth no. 1418.* This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf* by al-Albāni.
[2] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on al-Witr, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the Virtue of al-Witr, ḥadīth no. 452.* This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*
[3] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 366.* This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*

Ustādh: No, no there is no combining for fear of you cannot get up for *Fajr*. You have to sleep early if you cannot get up for *Fajr*. There is no combining unless there is some extraordinary emergency, crazy situation, one-off, then obviously a one-off is one-off. But there is no basic principle that you just combine because you can't get up for *Fajr*. Like I said, don't ask about things which we know are coming later. That is a whole separate chapter.

Not just this *ḥadīth* but the authentic *Sunnah* is full of evidences that show that the Prophet ﷺ used to pray this prayer not just at night time after *ʿIshāʾ* but very late as well.[4] Many *aḥādīth* direct and indirect, some are subtle, but super clear. So, whenever you pray *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ* you have completed the obligatory prayers of the night. When you have finished *ṣalāt al-ʿAṣr* you have completed the obligatory prayers of the day. When you complete *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ* you have completed the obligatory prayers of the night. The only thing which remains are the supererogatory prayers of the night and
(0:10:00) he can pray it immediately after *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ* if he wants.

We are going to come to that in a second, but you would obviously all know (most of you are Paks) so you will know generally the Paks have a very cautious approach to *sunnah* and *Witr* in general. So even though they are fully aware of the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ to not turn your homes into graveyards,[5] meaning to increase in the *sunnah* in your homes, they actually pray very little at home and they insist on praying their *sunnah* in the *masājid* and they then also pray the *Witr* which follows in the *masjid* as well, out of fear that if they didn't, then when they were to get home they wouldn't pray. So, they would rather bank a certainty (which has a lot of common sense frankly) even if it is against the *Sunnah* per se but they would rather bank it than take the risk. Likewise, with the *Witr* as well.

We might as well cover this now. When it comes to the actual *Witr* prayer we have a number of *ḥadīth* on this. There is no doubt that the best time to pray *Witr* is as late as possible just like *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ*. Whatever requires more sacrifice, normally as a general rule, is always rewarded. But then that is one thing. Then you have the statement of the Prophet ﷺ which is to delay *ʿIshāʾ*, which is to delay *Witr*.[4,6] Then you have the practice of the Prophet ﷺ. So, you have a general principle in the Qurʾān and *Sunnah* that anything which causes extra difficulty (without craziness), it is rewarded—extra sacrifice, extra hard work, extra steps for the towards the *masjid*, extra cold water for example for *wuḍūʾ*. The *dīn* has a plethora of *ḥadīth* about all the different sciences okay, the *ʿibādah* in the *waqt* of *fitnah* for example,[7] and, and, and. So that is the general principle. Then you have the statement of the Prophet ﷺ, then you have the action of the Prophet ﷺ.

---

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Witr Prayer, Chapter: What Is Said Regarding the Witr Prayer, ḥadīth no. 992*.
[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: Offering Prayers in Graveyards is Disliked, ḥadīth no. 432*.
[6] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of The Prayer, Chapter: The Time of the ʿIshāʾ Prayer, ḥadīth no. 690*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ*.
[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Tribulations and Portents of the Last Hour, Chapter: The Virtue of Worship at Times of Turmoil, ḥadīth no. 2948 a*.

One of the most famous *ḥadīth,* which all of you know is when the Prophet ﷺ was having a discussion about the *Witr* with *Sayyidina* ʿUmar and Abu Bakr ﷺ.

قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ـــ صلى الله عليه وسلم ـــ لأَبِي بَكْرٍ " أَىِّ حِينٍ تُوتِرُ " قَالَ أَوَّلَ اللَّيْلِ بَعْدَ الْعَتَمَةِ . قَالَ " فَأَنْتَ يَا عُمَرُ " . فَقَالَ آخِرَ اللَّيْلِ . فَقَالَ النَّبِيُّ ـــ صلى الله عليه وسلم ـــ " أَمَّا أَنْتَ يَا أَبَا بَكْرٍ فَأَخَذْتَ بِالْوُثْقَى وَأَمَّا أَنْتَ يَا عُمَرُ فَأَخَذْتَ بِالْقُوَّةِ " .

"The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said to Abu Bakr ﷺ: 'When do you pray *Witr*?' He said: 'At the beginning of the night, after *ʿIshāʾ*.' He said: 'And you, O ʿUmar?' He said: 'At the end of the night.' The Prophet ﷺ said: 'As for you, O Abu Bakr, you have seized the trustworthy handhold (i.e., you want to be on the safe side), and as for you, O ʿUmar, you have seized strength (i.e., you are confident that you have the resolve to get up and pray *Witr*).'" [8]

And when he ﷺ compared what both did, which was ʿUmar ﷺ taking the approach of praying later and Abu Bakr ﷺ taking the approach of praying early. The Prophet ﷺ praised both of them without any doubt that the [former] is the more rewarded, meaning the one that is prayed later at night. But he ﷺ acknowledged that ʿUmar ﷺ was taking the higher risk and getting the higher gains—the higher risk meaning that you might not wake up.

And by the way the Prophet ﷺ also missed *Witr* at least on one occasion.[9] That is the risk because you are not just waking up early for *Fajr,* but you are waking up a couple of hours before. So that is a risk especially if you have a late night or tired during the daytime. So, it is a risk. But there is a much greater reward for it. Or you bank what you have in your hand.

So, Abu Bakr ﷺ was like, '*You know what it is? I'm not that sure upon myself and I'll just pray it now*.' Now that's of a lesser level.

However, as we're going to come to later when we go into a deeper discussion concerning this, it's possible that you wake up. If you do wake up what happens then? So, you banked and you took home what you took home, and then you've got an opportunity by waking up later as well. *Subḥān Allāh* the *Witr* game is even better than *Deal or No Deal*. See, *Deal or No Deal*, once you've taken it you've taken it. End of story. However, in *dīn*, Allāh ﷻ gives you a second chance—if that makes sense—which is pretty sick if you think about it. But anyway, we'll speak about what you do later. What

[8] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 400*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*
[9] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of the Night Prayer and Voluntary Prayers During the Day, Chapter: Witr After the Adhān, ḥadīth no. 1685*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

are the options if you do wake up? Is it a case of: The Prophet ﷺ said that make your final prayer of the night the *Witr* prayer, I've already prayed it, what am I going to do now? That's an argument that some people said is a very important argument that restricts you in terms of what you can do.

I just want you to know, honestly—and I'm super serious about this—not only is there *fiqh* to this but there's also a huge dose of reality as well. The Ḥanafis or the modern day Deobandis I should say, which is far more accurate because it's not a Ḥanafi thing this. This is a Deobandi Pak kind of version of the Ḥanafi school that I'm talking about that does this. And in fairness a number of the other *madhāhib* and cultural kind of Muslims—which I know sounds like a bit of a cuss or a pejorative term, but I don't really mean it in that way. I mean it in like people who kind of keep their *dīn* basic. They're not too complicated, not too practising, not to knowledgeable; they just do what they need to do. They're obviously not cultural if they're praying in a *masjid* regularly. You get my point. These folks, they don't mess about. Whether they're Indonesian and Asians, whatever it is, a lot of them will pray their *Witr* in the *masjid* straight away. Which is so clearly against the *sunnah* of praying *sunnah* at home and then the *sunnah* of praying late. I also want to make a clarification: the *ḥadīth* of Abu Bakr ؓ doesn't support in any way the praying of *Witr* in a *masjid* like Paks do, like we do, like our culture does. It would mean that he would pray the last thing before he goes to sleep.

Now, I want you to just realise that once you have prayed your *farḍ* prayer in the *masjid* and you do not pray your *sunnah* in the *masjid* with the belief that you're going to go home and pray, you're now in the hands of Allāh ﷻ and a slave to your desires now (what happens next). I want to remind you that when the Prophet ﷺ explained this *ḥadīth* and the people were acting upon it etc. etc. you're talking about an environment which I doubt very few in this class or indeed most of the people around today have actually experienced in their lifetimes, which is going back to a home that has no light, that has no internet, that has no electricity, that has no TV, it has no entertainment, that has no distractions, etc. To do something would require extraordinary effort. It would require extraordinary cost. It would require candles, wax, burning, actively having to go out, freezing cold, getting dressed, wrapped, unwrapped—meaning, no joke.

The main thing I want you to focus on is a lack of distraction. The lack of distraction would mean that people have a very, very good chance of praying their *sunnah* as you're meant to do. *Sunnah* was never ever seen in the *masjid*. I'm talking about the two *rakʿah* after *Maghrib*, the two *rakʿah* after *ʿIshāʾ*—normal *sunnah* I mean—let alone the *Witr* prayer. It's impossible to think about the *Witr* prayer in the *masjid*. Because when they would go home, if they were to stay awake for one hour, two hours, or however long they were going to stay awake for at home, they would then pray the *Witr* and then go to sleep if they were taking the 'safe' Abu Bakr easy option. And don't forget, we're talking equator. So, in Makkah and Madīnah throughout the year, you're not looking much later than 8:00 pm.

A lot of the time a lot of people think that the Companions were like super religious—which of course they were—but it was not unrealistic. I mean they would do a madness here and there. But you know the problem is that if you turn it into too superhuman, too fantasy, then there's nothing there for us to achieve. The truth is that they were just super disciplined. That's what they were incredibly good at—discipline. The environment made things much, much easier and conducive to a person of discipline. Let me make that clear. They got a lot of help, but you've still got to be disciplined enough to use that help.

So, having nothing to do, expensive and difficult to even read let alone have devices, and entertainment, and TV, and sports, etc., having nothing to do and super dark, no concept of streetlights or environment. So, people go to sleep early. And being on the equator, the year is very stable and *ʿIshāʾ* never gets much later than whatever you may think, even if they delay it until the midnight. They're getting their *qaylūlah* in the [day] and you can see that because they start early, they get tired one or two hours after *Maghrib*. That's why they were all falling asleep when the Prophet ﷺ was delaying *ʿIshāʾ* even further.[10] Therefore, they're getting a solid night's sleep. Now despite all of that, they are going home and sometimes they're not sure and they're praying their prayer.

(0:20:00) Anyway, the thing that I wanted to say is that there's more here than *fiqh*. There has to be anthropology and politics involved. Like nowadays, especially with the new generation, especially our kids and so on, if they don't pray… Not just the kids actually, all of us. If you don't pray your *sunnah* in the *masjid* once you've prayed your *farḍ* prayer and you're living in that fantasy dream that you're going to go home—not even fantasy, you're living in cloud cuckoo land, that, '*I'm going to go home and pray sunnah*.' And what you do, you go home to your phone, and to the football, and to this, and to the that. It's just rubbish. People are living in dream world. The level of discipline to go and to even have a quiet room at that time (that's also a major concern) and then even if you were to go to your own bedroom, who even does that? Because when they do, immediately then you're on your phone and all that nonsense.

So it's a big concern for the young generation especially. Millennials etc. that's a major, major concern because these folks have grown up dependent upon their phones absolutely, horribly actually. And so it's not necessarily about *ʿurf* informing *fiqh*, it's about unfortunately bowing to *ʿurf* regardless of the *fiqh* and hoping that Allāh ﷻ forgives us for taking the poorer option. Because it's not acceptable. It's not acceptable to live a life like this. But it's because we're so pathetic that we can't break out of it—I speak the collective we. It is still our fault. If people think that Allāh ﷻ is going to forgive the Nation for not memorising the Qurʾān because they're obsessed with their phones, they're in for a big shock. There is no forgiveness for people being lazy.

You guys would have seen the video that I released well over a year now ago of Shaykh Abd al-Rashid Ali Sufi where he explained the example. Because I said to him: I don't understand how any millennial is going to learn any Islam because they're so lazy,

[10] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of the Times (of Prayer), ḥadīth no. 537.*

they're so ill-disciplined. They're obsessed with trying to do two things at once—watching the football whilst doing a *dars*, using their phones, this, that, whatever, whatnot. It's crazy. It's sad. There's a lack of focus, a lack of *ihtimām*, a lack of prioritisation. But even if they are super practicing and super focused and super disciplined, there is a really poor level of discipline just on making sure that you give time to whatever. People have to do all kinds of things, family, efforts, rooms, this, that whatever. It is the modern time.

So, I just want you to know that it's great speaking in a vacuum of theoretical *fiqh*, but in a modern world you would do things very different. So, I will give you an example. As I said the *ṣalāt al-Witr* should be prayed last thing before you go to sleep. That's the cop out option by the way. The proper *sunnah* is to go sleep and wake up later. There is no idea of praying *Witr* in the *masjid* in the *Sunnah* paradigm, in the narrated paradigms, in the Abu Bakr ﵁ paradigm. However, it is allowed. Not only is it allowed, I want to say to you that I think that as a parent or as a community leader you need to implement that.

Like I am going to tell you straight. With my children, you know the idea of '*I better make sure that they pray their sunnah in the masjid because they're not going to pray at home*,' I want to say to you that if we're like now in lockdown if we don't pray the *Witr* in our *jamāʿah* room, in our *muṣalla* where we pray, I don't even think that they'll pray it between the distance of downstairs to the bedroom. Absolutely convinced. I have caught those little rats out many times. I forced you to pray the *sunnah* and now I am going to start forcing people to pray *Witr* in front of me as well because the lack of discipline of getting five minutes, within five minutes to the room this is game over because once you've done, brush your teeth, going to bed those Paks aren't getting out of nowhere bro, of course they are not, that's Generation Z for you, that's millennials. Once it's game over, it's game over. The concept of making *wuḍūʾ* again even the best adult finds that a problem, let alone a kid, a kid who blags *wuḍūʾ* and lies about it anyway, right? It's kids isn't it? Teenagers! So that's what happens.

So the idea of the *ʿurf* is that the culture right now, the bar has been so lowered where before where we feared that people would not pray *sunnah* because there's an hour gap between praying in a *masjid* and then getting home to a better time, where it makes sense actually, you know there's a real chance of people missing out, lose the sense. I am saying if you pray *ʿIshāʾ* right here late, I don't even have enough trust that the *ihtimām* and the discipline is going to be there to pray it when you get to your room. And I don't honestly blame the kids frankly. I don't. It is this generation, it really is. And it was part of our generation as well. Like we're kind of holding on to it. You know, my own generation, I think are the… I mean I don't know. Maybe I am being incredibly generous to my generation, but certainly the previous generation is the one that were the last guardians of the *Sunnah*, guardians of praying *sunnah*, guardians of praying *Witr* anywhere, let alone at home, forget home.

So, I just want to say that it is important to understand time limits and that's good what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is doing because that's the correct thing to do. In the real world,

you won't be going anywhere near any of this. In the real world you have to do something very, very different where you pray your *farḍ* together especially in lockdown where people are praying at home and congregations (which you should be doing, there's many benefits as well), praying the *sunnah* there and then telling them to pray the *Witr* as well. Just to believe that they will have the discipline and to trust them? That's a big mistake. Unless of course you've practiced, and you've gone through it, and you check on them regularly, and you motivate them, etc., then that's something else if they're on the game. But if they're not, then you know.

Student (online): Right now, for the *masājid* that are open, we have no option but to pray *sunnah* at home with COVID restrictions and all.

Ustādh: You see what he says about the *masjid* being open and no option to pray *sunnah* home, that's again cloud cuckoo land that is. That's the theory that people are going to pray their *sunnah* at home. The elderly will and it's a wonderful thing. Because the elderly that come to the *masjid* are the ones that don't do this act. 99% of them don't. So, if they're being forced to learn the *Sunnah*, which is to pray your *sunnah* at home, that's a wonderful side effect of the lockdown of *masājid*. The problem is the millennials, Generation Z.

Shaykh then continues and says: As for *Fajr*, obviously we are talking about the break of dawn because of the Prophet's ﷺ other *ḥadīth*:

فَإِذَا خَشِيَ أَحَدُكُمُ الصُّبْحَ صَلَّى رَكْعَةً وَاحِدَةً، تُوتِرُ لَهُ مَا قَدْ صَلَّى

"If anyone is afraid of the approaching dawn (*Fajr* prayer) he should pray one *rakʿah* and this will be a *witr* (make odd) for all the *rakʿāt* which he has prayed before." [11,12]

"If you fear the encroaching break of dawn, then just pray one, it will make odd that which he has prayed." That is the true dawn.

The false dawn is what sets the alarm going. So, you are meant to carry on praying your *tahajjud*, your even twos and twos into the false dawn, which is like half an hour, 40 minutes, or sometimes an hour (depending on the different time of year) before your actual *Fajr*. When you see that, then you think, '*Right. Now I have to get into Witr now because I have to eat, I have to prepare for fasting*,' etc.

---

[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Witr Prayer, Chapter: What Is Said Regarding the Witr Prayer, ḥadīth no. 990.*

[12] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: The Night Prayers Are Two by Two, and Witr Is One Rakʿah at the End of the Night, ḥadīth no. 749 a.*

Once *Fajr* has started, once the break of dawn has occurred, then there is no *Witr* now. If you are late, you do not pray in this period of time. This is only the time now for the *sunnah* of *Fajr*, not a late *Witr*.

It has been narrated from some of the *Salaf*, as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn here quotes, and he quotes some references in the *Muwaṭṭa'*, but specifically you will find most of them in the *Muṣannaf Ibn abi Shaybah*, and actually many books. I will tell you now that most of these narrations are authentic as well, that a few of the *Salaf*, not Companions, but *Tābiʿīn*, *Atbāʿ al-Tābiʿīn,* they even prayed their *Witr* between the start of *Fajr*, meaning the *adhān* of *Fajr*, and then the start of the *iqāmah*. That is an act which has been narrated but does not necessarily mean that it is to be followed, because actually this *dīn* has many of these kinds of narrations.

(0:30:00)

This is similar to the narration of some of the *Ṣaḥābah* who would continue eating after the *Fajr*—clearly. So, the *adhān* would go, or people would say, '*It is Fajr! It's Fajr!*' And they would say, '*No, I am still eating*.' And I do not mean, finish off what is in your hand. I mean they would go the full hog. They would go all the way. Someone would say, '*I can see the Fajr now*,' and he would say, '*Just stand there. I cannot see any Fajr*.' That kind of thing. I mean bro, there is some madness. When you start to get into the *muṣannafāt*, if you are not solid of *dīn*, solid of mind, know that our methodology is not based on singular narrations and opinions, but rather the *Sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ and the consensus of the Companions, then it would be a madness.

Student (online): Break of dawn is when *Fajr* time starts?

Ustādh: Yes. The break of dawn is when the *Fajr* time starts.

Student (online): Is that the first *adhān* in the Ḥaram?

Ustādh: The first *adhān* in the Ḥaram in normal times, yes, is the false dawn. It is roughly around the false dawn, but I would not depend upon that because they are more focusing on giving you an opportunity to get to the *masjid* early, as opposed to giving you the accurate false dawn. What you should be seeing the first *adhān* in the Ḥaram as is the time to be getting to the *masjid*, more than any kind of legal reality.

Student (online): I had an uncle who would close the curtains to make sure he doesn't see *Fajr*!

Ustādh: Closing the curtains to not see the *Fajr*, by the way, as I said is narrated from *Ṣaḥābah*, one or two. More *Tābiʿīn*, three or four than the *Ṣaḥābah*, but it is not as mad as you may think.

Anyway, this as I said is against the action of the Prophet ﷺ, and something which is not held to the evidences.

Witr ends then with the beginning of *Fajr*, and if you have missed your *Witr*, then you cannot pray. So, what do you do?

There is some discussion amongst the scholars. Ibn Taymiyyah had his own position, and there are a few others as well who said that it is gone. But the majority say that you make it up. If you make it up, then according to the Ḥanābilah, they make it up by their interpretation of one of the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ which is narrated by ʿĀʾishah in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, *ḥadīth* number 746. This is where ʿĀʾishah said that when sleep would overcome the Prophet ﷺ, or he ﷺ missed *qiyām al-layl*. So, sleep would overcome him ﷺ or he ﷺ had a headache, or a fever, or a problem, meaning he ﷺ found it a mission and it overcame him and he ﷺ was unable to pray *qiyām al-layl,* he ﷺ would pray in the day twelve *rakʿah*.[13]

The majority of scholars who understood this *ḥadīth*, they did not think of it like some did, which is that this is an extra four *rakʿah* [of] *Ḍuḥa*. We know that *Ḍuḥa* is a minimum of two *rakʿah* in the mid-morning, and a maximum of eight. When you see twelve, you are thinking, '*Right. It is four extra*.' Rather, this is the explanation of the *ḥadīth* in *Bukhāri* in which ʿĀʾishah said that the Prophet ﷺ would pray eleven *rakʿah*—do not ask how beautiful and amazing they were, but that is what he ﷺ would pray—eleven *rakʿah* in the night.[14, 15] We understand that now as eight *rakʿah* of *tahajjud* and three *rakʿah Witr*—eleven *rakʿah*. With that *ḥadīth*, we know that is what he ﷺ does at nighttime. Then, we see that he ﷺ prays, when he ﷺ misses it, twelve. So, what we have noticed is that he ﷺ makes whatever he ﷺ prays in the nighttime even. So, the eleven becomes twelve. Therefore, the vast majority of Muslims, correctly so, pray the three *rakʿah* of *Witr* which is the *sunnah*, which is the most established *sunnah*, or, as I have translated later on, it is the most basic complete version of the *sunnah*. So, if you therefore, pray three *rakʿah* normally and you missed it, then in the morning you would pray four. If you normally pray five [at night] then you would pray six [in the morning]. If you pray normally seven, then you would pray eight. If you normally pray eleven (as is the *sunnah*)—in the nighttime because you regularly pray *tahajjud* (not every night)—then in the morning you will pray twelve *rakʿah*, because you will lift it up. And that's what it means to pray the even of your odd *Witr*.

There is an interesting discussion amongst the scholars whether this should be cut up into twos or not, whether it should maintain the same structure or not. So, we know as we are about to find out, that when it gets longer, when the *rakʿāt* become longer, eleven or nine and so on, that it's all one continuous prayer (as you are going to see). So, it is just standing up each time, one, two, no *tashahhud* no sitting down—one big unit.

---

[13] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: The Night Prayers, and the One Who Sleeps and Misses It or Is Sick, ḥadīth no. 746 e.*
[14] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayer at Night, Chapter: The Prayer of the Prophet ﷺ at Night in Ramaḍān and (in) Other Months, ḥadīth no. 1147.*
[15] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers - Travellers, Chapter: Night Prayers and the Number of Rakʿāt Offered by the Prophet ﷺ at Night, and That Witr Is One Rakʿah, and a One-Rakʿah Prayer Is Correct, ḥadīth no. 738 a.*

And so, what would you do (let's stick to four because most people pray three)? Would you just do that?

And there is a scholarly difference on that. Some said that is exactly what you do, to copy the *Witr* action. And others said (and this is where my heart feels more comfortable) that no you would pray:

مَثْنَى مَثْنَى

"Two *rakʿah* followed by two *rakʿah*."[11,12]

Because that is the established *ḥadīth,* the established principle for supererogatory prayers in both nighttime and daytime. So, if you had four to pray you would pray two and then you would pray two. But as I said, some scholars said you would make *qiyās* upon the *Witr* or the number you are going to do (as you are about to see right now). Therefore, you would pray without any breaks. So, keep that in mind.

Alright let's go through some of these numbers.

وأَقَلُّه رَكْعةٌ وأَكثرُه إحدى عشرةَ مَثْنَى مَثْنَى، ويُوتِرُ بواحدةٍ

It is a minimum of one unit, and a maximum of eleven which is performed in twos and ends with a single unit.

So, the eleven there is two and then *salām,* and then two and then *salām*, two and then *salām*, two and then *salām,* two and then *salām* and then a single unit. That's the manner in which eleven are prayed (as you are going to see in one of the *ḥadīth*), or one *rakʿah* which is like a bare-bones emergency *Witr* prayer, which is a legal minimum.

A lot of people get excited when they see one, they think, '*Great! Job done!*' This is as legal minimum as when you pray your *ṣalāh* and you think you are not going to recite a *sūrah* after *Fātiḥah*. You just wouldn't do it. Even though the prayer is valid without the *sūrah*, even if you are half dead, you are going to say [*Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*] at least. That is because you have a brain and you have a little bit of *taqwa*, which makes you realise that I can't be worshipping Allāh ﷻ in this legal minimum patheticness. But one *rakʿah* is valid, just like *ṣalāh* with just *Fātiḥah* is valid.

So, the *ḥadīth* that establish this—firstly, *ḥadīth* in Muslim, in which the Prophet ﷺ said:

الْوِتْرُ رَكْعَةٌ مِنْ آخِرِ اللَّيْلِ

"*Witr* is a *rakʿah* at the end of the night." [16]

And also, the Prophet ﷺ said:

صَلاَةُ اللَّيْلِ مَثْنَى مَثْنَى، فَإِذَا خَشِيَ أَحَدُكُمُ الصُّبْحَ صَلَّى رَكْعَةً وَاحِدَةً، تُوتِرُ لَهُ مَا قَدْ صَلَّ

"The night prayer is offered as two *rakʿah* followed by two *rakʿah* and so on and if anyone is afraid of the approaching dawn (*Fajr* prayer) he should pray one *rakʿah* and this will be a *witr* (make odd) for all the *rakʿāt* which he has prayed before."[11,12]

(0:40:00)

Here's the thing. Regardless of whether you have experienced this or not yourself, I can tell you right now, many of you obviously have been with me either in our *ʿUmrah* trips, in our *tarbiyah* programs or in our *Ḥajj* programmes where we have our *tahajjud qiyām* programme. And it is beautiful in that when you go and do that, you actually first-hand learn this point exactly. Especially when we are telling everyone to meet at the *masjid* for this time, a lot of people often underestimate just how long it takes once you get into the *masjid*, to get into a good forward position. So, they might get there on time in general, but they don't actually get into the good front part. So, it takes another 10-15 minutes. So, they had their intention, 'I'm going to come in and I have like 20-30 minutes. I'm going to pray at least 4-6 *rakʿah* and it's done. And then I will pray *Witr*.'

But what happens is 10-15 minutes is taken by just getting to the front and putting their shoes down. And therefore, once they start, I am literally, you literally did, anyone who has been in a group with me knows or who has been by themselves and prayed will know that you know exactly the meaning of this *ḥadīth*. That you are literally stressed that, '*I have no time. He is going to make the adhān! He is going to make the adhān! It's going to be any second*!' It is a very different reality to praying at home with an alarm or a watch or a time. There is a level of stress there is a murmur, there is a hum, and you can feel that pressure and you can feel that, '*I have to just cut this short and just pray one rakʿah quickly, I have to get it in*.'

I always tell my people that there are certain *ḥadīth* that only really come alive in the field. Now this *ḥadīth* you would think this is the most benign of them does not need any physical action. I tell you right now, you go out there in the field with this *ḥadīth* and you literally, you feel exactly what it is.

---

[16] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: The Night Prayers Are Two by Two, and Witr Is One Rakʿah at the End of the Night, ḥadīth no. 752 a*.

فقوله: «صَلِّى ركعةً واحدةً» يدلُّ على أن أقل الوتر ركعة واحدة، فإذا اقتصر الإنسان عليها فقد أتى بالسُّنَّةِ.

This indicates that one unit is a minimal acceptable [*Witr*], but in principle you pray in pairs, twos, and twos, and twos.

Student (online): I remember you demonstrated the 'minimal viable *ṣalāh*' without the *sunan*. Did you stop doing that (it was not a part of *Fiqh* of *Ṣalāh* second time I took it) because people will have an excuse to make a deficient *ṣalāh* even more deficient?

Ustādh: No, I did not stop doing that. Because I always explain it. I always give a physical demonstration—sometimes I do and sometimes I do not, to clarify— but I absolutely make a point of doing that. I absolutely make a point of trying to demonstrate it because people remember what they see better.

Student (online): If you are praying *qiyām al-layl* and you are on your second *rakʿah* of *Witr*, and the *adhān* for *Fajr* is called, should you go ahead and complete the third *rakʿah*?

Ustādh: Yes, you should. By the way, I just want to make a point. If you are intending to pray two, and give *salām* and then pray [one], I would not do the second *tashahhud* and stand up. So, do the one, two, and three non-stop. It would be a change in the intention. Now, it is not a change of intention of *Witr*, but it is a change in intention of the form. And changing one's intention during the *ṣalāh* in form is a very minor matter, which is excused. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Now, on page 14:

وَإِنْ أَوْتَرَ بِخَمْسٍ أَوْ سَبْعٍ لَمْ يَجْلِسْ إِلاَّ فِي آخِرِهَا، وَبِتِسْعٍ يَجْلِسُ عَقِبَ الثَّامِنَةِ فَيَتَشَهَّدُ وَلاَ يُسَلِّم، ثُمَّ يُصَلِّي التَّاسِعَةَ، وَيَتَشَهَّدُ وَيُسَلِّمُ .

If one was to perform the *Witr* as five or seven, they would not sit until the very end. If nine is performed, one only sits in the eighth unit, performs *tashahhud* but does not do the *taslīm*, then prays the ninth unit, then does *tashahhud* again and does the *taslīm*.

I am going to explain this as we go.

So, if you are praying five, or seven, then it is just all non-stop. There is no *tashahhud* until the very end. It is that simple. Do not make it any more complicated. There are no *tashahhuds* except for the very last one, if you are doing five or seven.

By the way, this is also allowed to do in three as well. But in three, you alternate between two and one. Conceptually, you know what a *Maghrib* is. A *Maghrib* is not a two and a one. A *Maghrib* is a *Maghrib.* Now, *Witr*, I know all us Paks do that, but that is something which is only performed nowadays by some of the Ḥanafi school. The correct position is that it is not a correct prayer. Of course, that does not mean that anyone who does that their prayer is rejected. It is *ijtihād*, ultimately. And I want to talk a little later about that *ijtihād* as well. But anyways, it is called doing a *Maghrib*. That is one way of praying *Witr.*

The *sunnah* of praying *Witr*, which is very well established authentically, it is to pray two and one. So, you give *salāms* after two *rakʿah*, and then you stand up and pray a single one. But also, you can pray three non-stop. If you are praying five, you should pray it non-stop, and if you are praying seven, you should pray it non-stop. But there is also some laxity there as well. (We will come to that in a second.)

"They would not sit until the very end", that's what that means.

If nine is performed, one only sits in the eighth unit.

Basically, they do a *Maghrib*. If you pray nine, you are going to do a *Maghrib*. What does that mean?

You are going to sit down after eight. So not [after] every two or anything like that. You will sit down in the eighth and you do *tashahhud* [and go back into the standing position after *tashahhud*] meaning you do a '*Maghrib*' and you pray that ninth unit, then you do the *tashahhud* again, then you do *taslīm*. So you exit, also, at the end of the ninth but it has two *tashahhuds*, unlike when you do five and seven.

As for the basic, complete version of the *Sunnah*, then it is three units with two *taslīm.*

(0:50:00) Now, what is very interesting is that when you pray eleven, the *Sunnah* is that you do two and two and two and two and two and you pray the single by itself. That is another unique one.

And you might say, '*Hold on! How is this so different that for the three units, you have two clear options, and one weak option (doing a 'Maghrib'). And then for five and seven, you are saying none, it is just non-stop, non-stop. Then for nine, it is like a 'Maghrib'. And then eleven, it is bam, bam, bam?*'

And the reason is because we have *ḥadīth* that specify all of this, individually, very clearly.

قوله: «ويوتر بواحدة، وإن أوتر بخمس أو سبع لم يجلس إلا في آخرها، وبتسع يجلس عقب الثامنة فيتشهد ولا يسلم، ثم يصلي التاسعة ويتشهد ويسلم» لقول عائشة: «كان رسولُ اللهِ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم يُصَلِّي باللَّيلِ إِحْدَى عَشْرَةَ رَكعةً، يُوتِرُ منها بواحدةٍ» وفي لفظ: «يُسلِّمُ بين كُلِّ رَكعتين، ويوتِرُ بواحدةٍ».

As for the eleven, then ʿĀ'ishah ﵂ said that he ﷺ would pray eleven units making odd one *rakʿah*, which means that he prayed ten as even. And giving *salām* after each one because in another version of the same *ḥadīth:*

يُسَلِّمُ بَيْنَ كُلِّ رَكْعَتَيْنِ وَيُوتِرُ بِوَاحِدَةٍ

"Uttering the *taslīm* at the end of every two *rakʿah* and observing the *Witr* with a single *rakʿah*."[17]

That is the version of the eleven units where you would do a *salām* after every two (two, two, two, two, two and then pray one *rakʿah*). So that is eleven done with this clear evidence.

If you are praying three *rakʿāt*, all in only one go with just one *salām,* then the *ḥadīth* for that is the *ḥadīth* of ʿĀ'ishah ﵂:

كَانَ النَّبِيّ صلى الله عليه وسلم يُوتِرُ بِثَلاَثٍ لاَ يَقْعُدُ إِلاَّ فِي آخِرِهِنَّ .

"The Prophet ﷺ observed *Witr* with three *rakʿāt* and only sat in the last of them."[18,19]

That he ﷺ would do *Witr* with three *rakʿah* and he ﷺ would not sit until the last *rakʿah*. Bang quality *ḥadīth* and authenticity, narrated by Imām al-Nisā'i as well and al-Ḥākim.

---

[17] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers—Travellers, Chapter: Night Prayers and the Number of Rakʿah Offered by the Prophet ﷺ at Night, and That Witr Is One Rakʿah, and a One- Rakʿah Prayer Is Correct, ḥadīth no. 736 b-c*.
[18] *Muwaṭṭa' Imām Mālik, ḥadīth no. 466* (as referenced in *Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ala Zād al-Mustaqniʿ* Volume 4, page 11, footnote 3).
[19] *Imām al-Ḥākim, 1/304* (as referenced in *Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ala Zād al-Mustaqniʿ* Volume 4, page 11, footnote 3).

Something nice in the footnotes which the *muḥaqqiq* mentions. He says that in one of the circles that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn gave in Ramaḍān—because every Ramaḍān scholars go and in the *masjid* they will give circles in the evening, most of these are recorded and you can find them—he was asked the question about *ṣalāt al-Witr*. And he said that if a person wants to prefer more often than not to pray the three *Witr* all as one go, so *tashahhud* just at the end, then that is great because that is what is narrated by Imām al-Ṭaḥāwi authentically from ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ﵁ that that is exactly what he used to do, pray three and only give *salām* at the very, very end.[20]

So, this is not just narrated from the Prophet ﷺ authentically, but it was also the action of the major Companions as well. So, this is method number one of praying three *rakʿah ṣalāt al-Witr* all in one go.

Then you have the standard basic version which is an excellent version which is that you give *salām* after two and then you stand up and pray one *rakʿah* by itself. And that is the *ḥadīth* narrated by Bukhāri and also many other sources.

Shaykh says all of this, the *Sunnah* has narrated many times in different places and also Shaykh says that… this is the kind of thing which I explained in the voice note on Telegram about those actions which are narrated in the form of *tanawwuʿ* meaning that they are there to be practiced in their variance and it is a *sunnah* to vary between them as opposed to different opinions that are held by scholars that lead to different expressions, which is not a *sunnah* to rotate between them. This is something which is good, sometimes do it two and one, sometimes do three all in one go. He says that is good.

If you pray five then you do not make any *tashahhud* except at the very, very end just give the *salām*. This is because of what was narrated by Imām Muslim in the Chapter of the Prayer of the Night and the Number of *Rakʿāt*, *ḥadīth* number 737, narrated on the authority of ʿĀʾishah ﵂ that:

انَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يُصَلِّي مِنَ اللَّيْلِ ثَلاَثَ عَشْرَةَ رَكْعَةً يُوتِرُ مِنْ ذَلِكَ بِخَمْسٍ لاَ يَجْلِسُ فِي شَىْءٍ إِلاَّ فِي آخِرِهَا

"The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ used to pray thirteen *rakʿāt* of the night prayer. Five out of them consisted of *Witr*, and he ﷺ did not sit, but at the end (for salutation)." [21]

---

[20] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Witr Prayer, Chapter: What Is Said Regarding the Witr Prayer, ḥadīth no. 991.*

[21] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: Night Prayers and the Number of Rakʿah Offered by the Prophet ﷺ at Night, and that Witr Is One Rakʿah, and a One-Rakʿah Prayer Is Correct, ḥadīth no. 737 a.*

Student (online): How do we know the eleven *rakʿāt* was *Witr* and not *tahajjud?*

Student (online): How do the scholars determine that eleven was *Witr* and not ten *tahajjud* or eight *tahajjud* as indicated by Imām Bukhāri's title of *Bāb al-Tahajjud*?

Let me explain his *ḥadīth*. It might be confusing.

The way to determine—most of the time—what is *Witr* and what is not when you just see a number of units being prayed at nighttime is two key tools. The first tool, which is the obvious tool, is the explanation of the narrator. Because we have a basic principle that when a narrator explains *ḥadīth* obviously there is a third (tool) as well but that is super obvious, when the Prophet ﷺ himself says something and so we know that he ﷺ has said many *aḥadīth* that he ﷺ describes what is a *Witr*, how many *rakʿah* is *Witr*, so that is just the end of the story right there. But let's just say that we want to go to the second source, the second source is the Companion that is narrating it.

Obviously, ʿĀʾishah ؓ is a big player in this, Anas, ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbbās ؓ, for the obvious reasons because this is a night prayer happening in the bedroom most of the time, therefore there are not enough other Companions telling us these details. And as I told you before, the Prophet ﷺ does not take the easy option, he ﷺ takes the proper one, the rewarded one, which is to get up after he ﷺ goes to sleep. So, only few people are going to have the privilege of being able to narrate this. ʿĀʾishah ؓ is the queen of *ḥadīth* anyway but then she knows absolutely everything when it comes to *fiqh* and the actions of the Prophet ﷺ so she will sometimes express it very clearly. Just like I just told you right now, look at what she said, she said that the Prophet ﷺ prayed in the nighttime thirteen *rakʿah*. Look at this: thirteen *rakʿah* five of those were *Witr*.

So, you see how the question is now not a question anymore? She clearly states how much was *Witr*. That is clearly indicating to you that the *qiyām* part was eight: 8 (*qiyām*) + 5 (*Witr*) = 13. That is the second way of proving this. (When I said the two tools, this is one of the two tools, ignoring the *ḥadīth* obviously from the Prophet ﷺ.)

The final tool is to remember the basic principle. The basic principle is the *ḥadīth* of Bukhāri and this is of course something which is going to bring discussion up in a couple of weeks' time that the Prophet ﷺ never prayed more than eight *rakʿah* of *tahajjud* at nighttime. And once you know that, it is just a maths equation. Everything else is weighed in the light of this principle. This frankly is not needed to be used so much because often, most of the time frankly, a Companion will clarify subtly or very directly (like here) how many *rakʿah* are *Witr*.

That is the evidence for five *rakʿah Witr* and when you pray *Witr* you pray like he ﷺ did, which is no sitting down except at the very, very end.

If you do seven *rakʿah*… And can you do seven?

Yes. The *ḥadīth* is narrated by Imām Muslim:

فَلَمَّا أَسَنَّ نَبِيُّ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم وَأَخَذَ اللَّحْمَ أَوْتَرَ بِسَبْعٍ وَصَنَعَ فِي الرَّكْعَتَيْنِ مِثْلَ صَنِيعِهِ الأَوَّلِ فَتِلْكَ تِسْعٌ

"When the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ grew old and put on flesh, he ﷺ observed *Witr* of seven, doing in the two *rakʿah* as he ﷺ had done formerly, and that made nine." [22]

(1:00:00)

Let me tell you about this *ḥadīth*. The *ḥadīth* says that when the Prophet ﷺ started to get old or started to age and the *gauchat* overtook him, the *laḥm*. So, it basically means he ﷺ put on weight, he became heavier and things became more difficult.

So, that is the evidence for seven.

As for the evidence of not doing the *tashahhud* except at the end, then that is the *ḥadīth* of Umm Salamah ؓ, again a wife of the Prophet ﷺ, again inside knowledge. She said:

كَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يُوتِرُ بِخَمْسٍ وَبِسَبْعٍ لاَ يَفْصِلُ بَيْنَهَا بِسَلاَمٍ وَلاَ بِكَلاَمٍ .

"The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ used to pray *Witr* with five and seven *rakʿāt* which he ﷺ did not separate with any *taslīm* nor talk." [23,24,25]

He would pray *Witr* at nighttime, sometimes seven, sometimes five and he ﷺ would not break that seven or five up with anything, neither with *salām*, nor with talking, meaning that he ﷺ would just go all in one go. All in one go. And this *ḥadīth* is narrated by Imām Aḥmad in Volume six, 290 and by Imām al-Nasāʾi *ḥadīth* number 1713 and 1194 by Ibn Mājah. And it has a good chain. So, now you know that seven is on, five is on.

Student (online): Just to support our Ḥanafi brothers, the second opinion of the Ḥanbali *madh-hab* is as Ḥanafi pray *Witr* i.e., three *rakʿah* (with two *jalsah*, one *taslīm*). Ḥanbali won't leave the Ḥanafi to live alone, don't worry.

Ustādh: So, I told you that I was going to mention something a little bit about this. So, I want to tell you something, a little story. When I started practicing and I started

---

[22] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: Night Prayer, and the One Who Sleeps and Misses it or Is Sick, ḥadīth no. 746 a.*
[23] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 6/290.*
[24] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 390.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*
[25] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of the Night Prayer and Voluntary Prayers During the Day, Chapter: How to Pray Witr With Five Rakʿāt, and the Differences Reported from al-Ḥakm in the Ḥadīth About Witr, ḥadīth no. 1714.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

studying *fiqh*, I was like any other Pak coming from the Ḥanafi school, but I was fascinated with *ḥadīth*. So, I came into the game wanting to study *ḥadīth* from how the Ḥanafis looked at it. So, one of the first books I was fortunate enough to study was *Naṣb al-Rāyah*. Now those who have studied *Fiqh* of *Ṣalāh* with me will know that this book is like my *jān*. I love this book. And this book is a masterpiece. I just want to straight out say that I am not going to flaff around. And I love it a lot and I always make a point of it in *Fiqh* of *Ṣalāh* because the Ḥanafis get a lot of cussing for the way that their *ṣalāh* is significantly different to the other three schools, let alone to the Ḥanbalis or the *ahl'l-ḥadīth*. It is actually always on its own. And I said to you before the Shāfiʿis have got it locked on when it comes to *ṣalāh*. Any objective observer will know that when it comes to most positions that seem to be supported according to *al-rājiḥ*—and *al-rājiḥ* of course is a subjective term—but *ḥadīth* and majority positions, then Shāfiʿis... you know.

So, the Ḥanafis are always different to them and you start to feel an inferiority complex, but they don't. And the reason they don't is because of the action of this one Imām al-Zaylaʾi. And this Imām al-Zaylaʾi, what he basically did is, like any other Ḥanafi following *al-Hidāyah*, which is a basic kind of book of *fiqh* which basically states all these kinds of facts and in a very blasé kind of way. Just for the sake of saying it, '*Witr you pray like Maghrib. And you do this, and you do that, and you do not recite Fātiḥah,*' and you do not find x and y, etc. etc.

And so al-Zaylaʾi, who was a Ḥanafi, he is like, '*You know what? My passion is ḥadīth*,' and he was a *muḥaddith.* And he is like, '*I need to do a service here. I am going to back up this text of al-Hidāyah in a way that has not happened previously*,' (or certainly not to that level anyway), '*and I am going to back up all of the things that are stated in the fiqh with an authentic narration in ḥadīth and a slap down of the alternative opinions with their ḥadīth,*' although he did not really focus too much or hardly or a little bit on them. His actual focus was on his own. And I want to say to you that obviously there have been many copies that have come afterwards. Obviously the Shāfiʿis are big on this and obviously we have our own *Irwāʾ al-Ghalīl* for example etc. Many people have tried, *muḥaddithīn* trying to take a particular *madh-hab*, focus on it, and back up their positions with *ḥadīth* because there is a reputation for *fuqahāʾ* that they are not so fussed with *ḥadīth.* Obviously, I am summarising it there and I am not being very generous but like you know they are more lax. They are in the game, they are sorting their own kind of behavior out. Principles slightly different to *ahl'l-athār* and *ahl'l-ḥadīth* versus *ahl'l-raʾi*. And the majority of *ahl'l-raʾi* are considered from the *fuqahāʾ* less so from *ahl'l-ḥadīth* etc. etc. There are a lot of generalisations going on there. But anyway, the interesting thing is that all of the opponents of the Ḥanafi school or al-Zaylaʾi after *Naṣb al-Rāyah* became either partners or fans or that level of begrudging respect.

Because you know what it is? And I've always told people this, in their personal lives, in their public lives, we speak about this in *Protect this House*, we speak about this in *Fiqh of Ṣalāh*. We speak about this in the free Friday session of *Protect this House* back

in the day when we used to be able to do the public Friday session, that the reason Bukhāri is who he is and his book is what it is, is because he said, '*I will be that level of discipline, that level of quality. I'll ignore the consequences of going so academic, so high quality, in that it means that I will have to kick out hundreds of thousands of ḥadīth when I'm writing my Jāmiʿ* (*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri*).' And having that ridiculously high standard. Ridiculously high standard. Nobody else ever in this history has matched it or requested it or required it for authentic *ḥadīth*. But he said this is what I'm going to do. So, he does that. And as a result, what happens is it is so good that even those who hate him (and there were many who had reason to) have to submit that it is the greatest ever.

Like I said in *Protect this House*, when you look at the Muslims and how split we are and how much we hate each other and all the sects and all the *madhāhib* and all the x and y and z, it's incredible that they all unify over Bukhāri. They all come to unity over it. And
(1:10:00) that is because excellence will never, ever go wasted in any field, in any area whether secular, religious, *ḥadīth, fiqh*, Qurʾān, *tafsīr*, speaking—any field. Any area, it is basically going to be appreciated by everybody. And after that the number of *muḥaddithīn* that just rate *Naṣb al-Rāyah* as one of the great books.

Anyway, that's the little story. I just want to say that I grew up on that book, my *dīni* growing up. And so I studied that and as a result when you do study that, as a Ḥanafi you don't feel inferior at all. In fact, you start walking around like you're the man and it's an absolute buzz. And you know, some of his opinions are a bit out there but he builds a case for each thing. Now the reason I said all this little story is because it's a wonderful thing and it's important for us especially when Ḥanafis do start to feel left out and think '*What is going on*?', it's important for us to sometimes dip in and say, '*Guys don't feel left out, you guys have got some proper game here*.'

Now what is very interesting is the vast majority of scholars considered the *ḥadīth* narrated by Abu Dāwūd and by other sources, of the Prophet ﷺ prohibiting the prayer of *Witr* to be like *ṣalāt al-Maghrib* and it is a massive discussion back and forth, back and forth. Imām al-Zaylaʾi in a number of places has launched a major defence of this *ḥadīth* and that's why he wouldn't dare ever say, (even though I strongly believe that it's not an acceptable [*Witr*] prayer), when we use the word 'not acceptable', we mean in my opinion that I believe it to be right with the possibility of being wrong. When you have that kind of position, it is very important to realise that if there are other schools or scholars or individuals that hold the *ḥadīth* to be authentic, it is not a wrong position. It might be wrong to me because I believe it is not. But if you hold the *ḥadīth* to be authentic…

This is wonderful methodology. This is the methodology of Ahlʾl-Sunnah. It doesn't matter the language. Obviously, you can have flowery language to say there is *ikhtilāf* on the issue or whatever. It doesn't matter whether you do that or not. But the point is that the Ḥanafis they consider either: (a) the al-Zaylaʾi approach or the *muḥaddithīn* from the Aḥnāf which is that the *ḥadīth* is weak and so we're going with that and that's what we're sticking with, or (b) which is a position in the Ḥanbali school and actually

it is a position of a few other scholars as well (the praying of *Witr* like *Maghrib*), they said that the *ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ*.

The *ḥadīth* is authentic that one should not pray [*Witr*] like *Maghrib* and al-Zayla'i said it was weak.

So, the Ḥanafis want to make the *ḥadīth* weak basically.

Now there are some Ḥanafis that said the *ḥadīth* is actually okay: '*We accept the ḥadīth. The ḥadīth says that the Witr is not to be prayed like the Maghrib prayer. But it doesn't mean not two and one like the Maghrib prayer, but rather in the way that the Maghrib prayer is actually prayed in terms of that the two rakʿah are said out loud and the third one is quiet, or that the two rakʿah are full and the third one is empty. And that is why we will not make our Witr prayer like the Maghrib prayer and we will recite out loud in the third rakʿah and we will recite a sūrah in the third rakʿah and we will recite the qunūt'l-Witr in the third rakʿah unlike in Maghrib. Three viable clear differences to [Maghrib], we actually implemented the ḥadīth*.'

I don't like to go too much into this we don't have the time. But it's just a nice anecdote. I told you at the beginning that I was going to mention it, but not to this level of detail. But it's useful to know that the Ḥanafis are often made to feel kind of inadequate when it comes to *ḥadīth* and *fiqh* etc. It couldn't be further from the truth frankly. Those guys have got game bro.

Anyway, still the majority considered that *ḥadīth* to be authentic and that the vast majority of scholars consider that the *ḥadīth* refers to the units. And the strongest evidence for that of course is that it has not been narrated from the Prophet ﷺ ever praying [*Witr*] in that way and that's a devastating fact. But like I said it is *khilāf* at the end of the day.

The last thing that I said was that in seven *rakʿah* you don't give a *salām* in any of them until the very end. Shaykh also says:

وإن تَشَهَّدَ في السَّادسة بدون سلام ثم صَلَّى السَّابعةَ وسَلَّمَ فلا بأس

But if you pray the seven by doing six and a *tashahhud*, basically doing a '*Maghrib*'. So, you pray six, do a *tashahhud*, don't give the *salām*, stand up and then pray the seventh. That is something which is not a problem. It's okay. Why?

Because of the *ḥadīth* of ʿĀ'ishah ؓ, narrated by Imām Aḥmad—it's not the weakest of *ḥadīth*, it's not the strongest either.[26] ʿĀ'ishah ؓ said that you pray seven *rakʿāt* and

[26] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 6/53*.

you do not sit in it, except in the sixth. This is an evidence which indicates that there is a little bit of ease in the matter if you are praying seven. Not that this is a really established way of praying the seven, but that there is some ease in the matter. And I want to go further but not in this lesson. I will go further in next week's lesson.

And if he does nine then he makes two *tashahhud*. First, he sits down in eight. Then he stands up and doesn't give *salām* and then he recites the ninth *rakʿah*. Then he sits down and then he does *tashahhud* again, and then he gives *salām*. And this is because of the *ḥadīth* of Umm Salamah ﵂.[23,24,25] That's how nine is prayed.

And if he does eleven then it's only done in one way: twos, twos, twos, twos, twos. Giving *tashahhud* and *salāms* all the way. Then he prays the one. And we spoke about that. That's *Bukhāri*. It's flexible and we'll speak about it.

Student (online): The *anti-madh-hab* discourse of the 90s went a long way towards dissing on the Ḥanafis and belittling their approach.

Ustādh: And that's what gave the *Salafi* movement such a bad name. *Alḥamdulillāh,* Allāh ﷻ saved me from this from the very beginning I never went down that path, not because I was anything special or clever. It's just that circumstances went that way. The Salafi *daʿwah* is an *ʿaqīdah* movement. It then morphed into a political movement. Where it got its focus on *fiqh* will never ever be understood in history. It just doesn't make any sense. But they did. They made it out that the whole *salafiyyah* is about bashing other groups' *fiqh*. And that's what caused it. Now some of us who were not on that scene couldn't care less. We were the best mates of Ḥanafis. Some of us were Ḥanafis.

Q & A

Q (online): I understood your explanation for how to differentiate between five *Witr*, but I don't understand the distinguishing of the eleven *rakʿah Witr*, as the *ḥadīth* referenced on page 16 is the *ḥadīth* on top of page 11, right?

A: I don't understand the question. But simple answer, study all the *ḥadīth* surrounding it and you will see that it's very clear using the three principles that I said: (1) *qawl al-Nabi* ﷺ, (2) *qawl al-rāwi*, and (3) the *aṣl* of eight *rakʿah* being the *tahajjud, qiyām al-layl*.

(1:20:00)

Q (online): If one misses the *ʿAṣr* prayer and it's now time for *Maghrib*, how will one make up *ʿAṣr*? Does the person pray *ʿAṣr* before *Maghrib*?

A: Correct. So, if you've missed *ʿAṣr* prayer and it is now *Maghrib*, you will pray *ṣalāt al-ʿAṣr* right now and then you will pray *Maghrib*. The only time that you won't do that is if *Maghrib* is about to expire.

Q (online): What is the best time to pray the *sunnah* of *Fajr*? Is it before *Fajr* time or after *Fajr* time has entered?

A: *Sunnah* of *Fajr* can only be prayed after *Fajr* has started, *Fajr* meaning 'dawn'. And it has to be prayed before the obligatory.

Q (online): Is it okay to draw web comics and animations?

A: I think it's permissible. Go back and listen or read the detailed lessons I did on that.

Q (online): Please clarify. If I only pray two *rakʿah* at *Ẓuhr*, do *tashahhud*, including [*ṣalawāt'l-Ibrāhīmiyyah*], and give *taslīm*, do I get straight back up, say *Allāhu akbar*, and pray the missed two *rakʿah* and then recite *al-taḥiyyāt* but no [*ṣalawāt'l-Ibrāhīmiyyah*], as these have already been recited, and then do *sajdat'l-sahw*, then give *taslīm*?

A: Yes. That is exactly what you do. But you do recite the *durūd*. Doesn't matter that you prayed it before. You are now continuing the action. To just complete your paragraph, you would pray the missed two *rakʿah* and then you would sit down and recite *al-taḥiyyāt* and then next is [*ṣalawāt'l-Ibrāhīmiyyah*]. Why would you just miss it out? I get it that you missed it out because you said it before. No. You carry on with [*ṣalawāt'l-Ibrāhīmiyyah*], then make your *duʿā'*, and then you would give *taslīm* first because you have added to the prayer and then you would do the *sajdat'l-sahw*. So, one *taslīm*, do the *sajdat'l-sahw* two times and then two *taslīms*.
Q (online): If you pray two and then one for *Witr,* how does the intention before each differ?

A: There is no intention. The intention is that I am praying three *Witr*. You don't need to make the intention that I'm doing it like this or like that. You don't have to say anything either, it's just in your head or in your heart.

Student (online): I never thought people were so concerned about *madhāhib*. I thought we were all just trying to keep our heads above water.

Ustādh: The reason is because Allāh ﷻ blessed Canadians and Americans to some extent. They stayed away from all this mess. They keep their *dīn* simple. Obviously, there is a cost to that. That's why Americans did the liberal label of North America comes because it's all just one melting pot.

Q (online): Follow up to the question about missed *rakʿah* at *Ẓuhr*, why would you do the *Allāhu Akbar*? Would that be a *takbīr* of movement?

A: The *Allāhu akbar* is not for the *takbīrat'l-iḥrām*. It is the *Allāhu akbar* for standing up.

Q (online): If one enters the *masjid* and sits down, then realises he hasn't prayed *taḥiyyāt'l-masjid.* Is he still able to stand up and perform *taḥiyyāt al-masjid?*

A: Yes, he is. He should pray it.

Q (online): What if you never managed to get up to pray *Witr?*

A: If you didn't pray *Witr*, then you should pray it afterwards as I said. In the way that I explained it, which is after *Ḍuḥa*, after sunrise. If you pray three then you would pray four.

Q (online): Is it established in the *Sunnah* to refer to the two before the one as *al-shafʿ*, meaning even? Arabs say *shafʿ wa'l-Witr* all the time. Or should the entire prayer be referred to as just *ṣalāt al-Witr*?

A: That's a good question and it comes to your intention. That's actually what one of the students has been asking about, i.e. How do you actually understand that? The *shafʿ* is it referring to all of the *rakʿāt* of *qiyām al-layl* before or is it not? And there is some laxity in phrases, unlike knowing how much the *Witr* is being prayed, which is something different. That phrase is okay.

25. Chapter 21 Lesson 4: The Supererogatory Prayer

وأَدْنَى الكمالِ ثلاثُ رَكَعَاتٍ بسلامَيْنِ يَقرأُ في الأُولى بسَبِّح وفي الثانيةِ بالكافرونَ وفي الثالثةِ بالإخلاصِ ، ويَقْنُتُ فيها بعدَ الركوعِ ويَقولُ:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ، إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ.

اللهمُّ إِني أَعوذُ برِضاكَ مِن سَخَطِكَ، وبعَفْوِك من عُقُوبَتِك، وبِكَ مِنْك، لا نُحْصِي ثناءً عليك أَنْتَ كما أَثْنَيْتَ على نَفْسِك.

اللهمَّ صلِّ على مُحَمَّدٍ وعلى آلِ مُحمَّدٍ.

ويَمْسَحُ وَجْهَه بيَدَيْه، ويُكْرَهُ قُنُوتُه في غيرِ الوِتْرِ إلا أن تَنْزِلَ بالمسلمينَ نازلةٌ غيرَ الطاعونِ فيَقْنُتُ الإمامُ في الفرائضِ.

The basic complete version is three units with two *taslīms*, reciting *Sūrat al-Aʿlā* in the first, *Sūrat al-Kāfirūn* in the second and *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ* in the third. One performs the *qunūt* after the *rukūʿ* saying:

"O Allāh, guide me along with those whom You have guided, pardon me along with those whom You have pardoned, be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to and bless for me that which You have bestowed. Protect me from the evil You have decreed for verily You decree and none can decree over You. For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty. O our Lord, Blessed and Exalted are You."

"O Allāh, I take refuge within Your pleasure from Your displeasure and within Your pardon from Your punishment, and I take refuge in You from You. We cannot enumerate Your praise. You are as You have praised Yourself."

"O Allāh, send salutations upon Muḥammad and the family of Muḥammad."

Then he wipes his face with both hands. It is disliked for one to perform the *Qunūt* except in the *Witr* unless there is a calamity which afflicts the Muslims, for which the imām does the *qunūt* in the obligatory prayers. This is not done for the plague.

On page 16 Shaykh says:

وأَدْنَى الكمالِ ثلاثُ رَكَعَاتٍ بسلامَيْنِ

The basic complete version is three units with two *taslīms.*

Adnaʾl-kamāl is difficult to translate. There is a literal translation of *adnaʾl-kamāl* which doesn't make any sense. And then you have the technical meaning of *adnaʾl-kamāl* which is probably what we go with. *Kamāl* means the perfect kind of thing. Now when you know that perfection is going to be doing more, and lots, and high quality, then we know it can become a little bit unrealistic or a bit difficult to achieve, like doing thirteen *rakʿāt* or like doing eleven *rakʿāt.* This is not necessarily the case, but it's almost like the word *adna* was kind of introduced to kind of say, '*Hey this is really good*.'

Student: The lowest perfection.

Ustādh: That's actually what it linguistically translates as, the lowest perfection. And I mean that's a horrible phrase. It doesn't make any sense, the lowest perfection. So, I translated it as the basic complete version.

(0:10:00) And *adnaʾl-kamāl*, we should have a discussion actually. Let's have your opinions, those who are aware of this phrase and what it means in different *madhāhib*. Because by the way, when you study *fiqh* in different schools *adnaʾl-kamāl* has almost a local meaning as well, almost like a local dialect kind of meaning, specific to the *madhāhib* in terms of what they are trying to say. Sometimes they even attach some kind of reward aspect on to it as well. That's when it starts to get a bit ropey to be honest.

I've gone with 'basic complete version'. What's your opinion? I think we can do better. But when I read it, I did feel comfortable. I wanted to go with 'bare minimum', but it's not because one [*rakʿah*] is the bare minimum. So, it's incorrect. That's why I like the 'basic complete version'. I haven't checked it with anyone. That's just me.

Student (online): The standard version?

Ustādh: I have to say I like [standard]. And also, we have to remember that the Prophet ﷺ liked three, but he ﷺ very rarely restricted it to three. That's why basic needs to be there.

Student (online): Now I feel bad about all the ones I have done.

Ustādh: But there is meant to be a feeling bad about the ones without feeling that you've done something *makrūh* or a sin. There is meant to be a 'feel bad'. The believers are meant to be acting, and aiming higher, going further, and so on. It's a minimum.

Student (online): Even if people knew they could do one, they wouldn't in my opinion. It's like praying without a *sūrah*.

Ustādh: When people use this phrase, they are not focusing on legality. One is frowned upon in certain audiences. Practicing Muslims should not be flaffing around with one *rakʿah*.

There is a reason I put 'complete'. The reason I put 'complete' is that it is a high-quality prayer [three *rakʿāt*]. You have to show some love there and some respect. We don't want Paks to know that they can do one.

Student (online): The 'basic acceptable version'?

Ustādh: When I see 'basic acceptable', that's the definition of one [*rakʿah*]. The basic acceptable version is one *rakʿah*. The basic complete version, the preferred version, recommended (without saying those words) is the three [*rakʿāt*]. Anyway, you now understand. And it's not looking at it from a legal angle. What I mean by that is that *adnaʾl-kamāl*, when it's used in *madhāhib*, when they're talking about prayer holistically and so on, they don't necessarily mean it in a legal sense.

So:

وأَدْنَى الكمالِ ثلاثُ رَكَعَاتٍ بسلامَيْنِ

The basic complete version is three units with two *taslīms.*

Shaykh says as we have covered before (I think we covered last week), that would basically mean praying two *rakʿah* and then saying *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [turning the head to the right], *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* [turning the head to the left, then] standing up praying one *rakʿah* by itself. That's what it means (three units and two *taslīms*). Two *taslīms* by the way, does not mean [one set of *taslīms*, i.e., turning the head to the right and saying *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* then turning the head to the left and saying *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*]. It means [two sets, i.e.,] one [turning the head to the right and saying *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh* then turning the head to the left and saying *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*].

Technically, two *taslīms* means [turning the head to the right while saying] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh,* [then turning the head to the left and saying] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh.* I wonder whether I need to change my translation because in the Arabic it says *bisalāmayn*, with two *salāms*. But *salām* doesn't in of itself also mean a set of *taslīms*. So, I might have to change that wording as well [to] 'two pairs of *taslīms*'. What do you think about that one?

So: The basic complete version is three units with two (pairs of) *taslīms*.

I might put a bracket around two 'pairs of' *taslīms* to indicate it means do two *rakʿah*, [turn the head to the right while saying] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh,* [then turn the head to the left while saying] *assalāmu ʿalaykum wa raḥmat Allāh*—that's a pair of *taslīm*. Then stand up again and start again and then finish that with two more *taslīms*].

Student (online): To be fair now that is legally speaking correct no, seeing as the one *salām* is the *wājib*?

Ustādh: Although, he has made a good point. Legally speaking it's correct because one is *wājib* each time. Once you have said *assalām* you are out of the prayer. I think that's probably the reason why they did it. That's a good spot. That's probably why they did that. That's very, very good.

(0:20:00) So now the question is: What do we translate it as? Do we stick to two *taslīms*? Might as well stick to two *taslīms*, because the author means by that: Exit from the prayer with just one.

And as we covered last week it's also allowed to do it with one, meaning the three *rakʿah* would be all in one go. So, it would start from the beginning right to the very end with only one *tashahhud.* That would be it.

Student (online): Well, this is the 'basic complete'? So, shouldn't it be two sets as part of that?

Ustādh: Because you do not say: two *taslīmatayni*. That's why. That's the reason.

Student (online): What about 'the standard number of *rakʿāt*' for *adnaʾl-kamāl* (even though it doesn't mention the number of *rakʿāt*, it is implied)?

Ustādh: Yes, he said *adnaʾl-kamāl* is three:

وأَدْنَى الكمالِ ثلاثُ رَكَعَاتٍ

The basic complete version is three units.

So, with this three *rakʿāt*, the second way of doing it which is with one *taslīm*. It is not done with two *tashahhud*. Only one because if you did it with two then you have made it like *ṣalāt al-Maghrib*, which the Prophet ﷺ prohibited in the *ḥadīth* which we consider it to be authentic.[1,2,3] This *ḥadīth* is narrated by Ibn Ḥibbān in his *ṣaḥīḥ*, by Imām al-Dāraquṭni, by Imām al-Ḥākim, and he said this is authentic according to the conditions of *al-Shaykhayn* (Bukhāri and Muslim) even though they did not narrate it. And Ibn Ḥajr said: Its chain is upon the conditions of *al-Shaykhayn*. As I said, a number of scholars consider the *ḥadīth* to be authentic. And Imām al-Zaylaʾi he didn't, or they did, and they explained why when you say 'don't make it like *Maghrib*' it does not mean don't pray it with two *tashahhud*. That whole discussion argument we have said what we have said.[†]

Student: I can't see how you are coming with two individual one *salāms*.

Ustādh: Well, it's technically possible, right? You only need one *salām* to exit from the prayer. He said two *salāms*. Whether his intention by the word singular *salām* means both or not is actually irrelevant because both work. It's just that to say 'two *taslīmatayn*', two twos, either way it's not so important.

Student (online): The minimum units of the optimal form of *Witr* is three.

Ustādh: Now you see that is a good sentence, the minimum units of the optimal form of *Witr* is three. A bit long though, isn't it? Basic complete version, 'the minimum units of the optimum form of *Witr*' has gone really far from the translation.

Student (online): The minimum units of the optimal form is three.

Ustādh: Yeah. I do not know. I will have a think about that. I like it in terms of its English, but I think it is a bit long.

Student (online): Doesn't al-Ḥākim's "upon the conditions of *al-Shaykhayn*" just mean the same *rijāl* are in the chain? That is not exactly a guarantee they are upon their conditions.

Ustādh: Obviously, that is something that *in shāʾ Allāh* one day, and certainly not in LP because that is very much a part of *ḥadīth*. The statement of al-Ḥākim "upon the conditions of *Shaykhayn*" literally is almost meaningless. I am not going to lie. When Ibn Ḥajr used to say that, that was not his intention. I will say that much for now without turning this into a *ḥadīth* class. But the point is that al-Ḥākim, with our greatest respect to him, he was a great scholar *subḥān Allāh*, but honestly it hardly has any value for toffee really. Without any disrespect. But then that is so much disrespectful. So, I do not even know how to say that.

---

[1] *Sunan al-Dāraquṭni, 2/24*.
[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān, ḥadīth no. 2429*.
[3] *Imām al-Ḥākim, 1/304*.
[†] This issue was discussed in *Logical Progression*, Year 9, Chapter 21, Lesson 3. MT

But absolutely, it does not mean the conditions of *al-Shaykhayn.* It absolutely does not. People get a bit carried away like that. And that is what happens today. When you start reading the modern books that are put together, a lot of people what they do, especially those who are not *muḥaddithīn*, their form of checking a *ḥadīth* is to find the *rijāl* of Bukhāri and Muslim, and if they are in the chain in some form, then they say, '*Yeah*.' And in fairness, not just the modern generation but in the old days as well. And that is why the *nāqid*, the top level *muḥaddith*, they look for *ʿillal*. *ʿIllal* means that the chain is absolutely sound. It looks great. The people are there, they are hearing from each other, but the *ʿillah* is a hidden fault—something that cannot be seen. And often it is behind the scenes, behind the names—what you are not basically seeing. That is the top guys. So absolutely, what you just said.

Let us go on. So, in the first unit, we recite from *Sūrat al-Aʿlā*—all of it. And then in the second *rakʿah*, we recite *Sūrat al-Kāfirūn*—all of it. And then in the third *rakʿah*, we recite *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*. This is based on the *ḥadīth* of Ubay ibn Kaʿb ﵁, narrated by Imām Abu Dawūd in his *Sunan*.[4] It is narrated in other books as well. This *ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ*.

These three *surahs*, I think everyone is aware. And also, the interesting one is to recite in the third *rakʿah* [*Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*] and then follow it up with [*Sūrat al-Falaq*], and then follow it up with [*Sūrat al-Nās*]. These three, when it is done together—although people have seen that and done it as well—from a *ḥadīth* point of view, it is not as authentically established as this version. I want people to know that. Even though it is there.[5,6]

(0:30:00)

Shaykh makes a point that the *sūrah* is, of course [*Sūrat*] *al-Kāfirūn*. However, if we are going to say this grammatically correctly, it would be *Kāfirīn.* But normally when you are talking about something that has an established name, and especially when it comes to Qurʾān, then we generally avoid applying the grammatical rules because a sentence has changed from *Kāfirūn* to *Kāfirīn*, just so that you are aware.

Then we have what is called the *qunūt*. I think everyone is happy with the *sūrah*, obviously after the *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*. Then we have the concept of the *qunūt.*

The word *qunūt* is a very interesting one. I was reading what Ibn al-Qayyim said about it. It is so nice actually.

فإن القنوت يطلق على القيام والسكوت ودوام العبادة والدعاء والتسبيح والخشوع

---

[4] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions about Witr, Chapter: What Should Be Recited in Witr, ḥadīth no. 1423.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.
[5] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions about Witr, Chapter: What Should Be Recited in Witr, ḥadīth no. 1424.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.
[6] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on al-Witr, Chapter: What Has Been Related [About] What Is Recited During al-Witr, ḥadīth no. 463.* This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*

Ibn al-Qayyim said in *Zād al-Maʿād* that the word *qunūt*, not just linguistically because it means to be devout, to be focused. It means to be intent. *Qunūt,* in its general, holistic, and technical game sense, it means to stand; it means to be silent; it means to continuously worship—that is where the 'devout worship' comes from. It means *duʿāʾ*. It means *tasbīḥ*. And it means *khushūʿ*.

Linguistically, it might be fair to say that it is closer to *khushūʿ* than any of these. And *khushūʿ* itself means to be very still. When you understand that, that *khushūʿ* means to be very calm, very still, q*unūt* is also one of those meanings—stillness. Then, everything else makes sense. Silence then fits with stillness. Being in the frame of mind of continual worship and being devout. Silence also indicates someone working very hard and and not being distracted.

Student (online): 'Submission' too?

Ustādh: Submission? I mean we can add it. Although none of these words are linguistically linked.

In any case, someone who is *qānit*:

﴿وَقُومُواْ لِلَّهِ قَٰنِتِينَ ٢٣٨﴾

"And stand before God in devotion." [*Sūrat al-Baqarah*: 238]

"Wa qūmu lillāhi qānitīn" includes all of these meanings. Stand for Allāh ﷻ, like stand up for something you believe in. That is the *ʿibādah* aspect. It means obviously, the physical standing as well. It means being devout. It means to be focused. That whole concept is great.

As Shaykh 'Uthaymīn says on page 17:

1_ الخُشوعُ، كما في قوله تعالى: {وَقُومُوا لِلَّهِ قَانِتِينَ} [البقرة: 238] وكما في قوله: {وَصَدَّقَتْ بِكَلِمَاتِ رَبِّهَا وَكُتُبِهِ وَكَانَتْ مِنَ الْقَانِتِينَ} [التحريم: 12].

He says one of the meanings: And *khushūʿ*, as Allāh ﷻ said *wa qūmu lillāhi qānitīn* in *Sūrat al-Baqarah* verse 238. And it is like He said:

﴿وَصَدَّقَتْ بِكَلِمَٰتِ رَبِّهَا وَكُتُبِهِۦ وَكَانَتْ مِنَ ٱلْقَٰنِتِينَ ١٢﴾

"She accepted the truth of her Lord's words and Scriptures: she was truly devout." [*Sūrat al-Taḥrīm*: 12]

And this is of course talking about Maryam ﷺ.

2_ الدُّعاءُ، كما هنا «يَقْنُتُ فيها بعد الرُّكوع».

And then a *duʿāʾ*, it means *duʿāʾ*. And here, its meaning is *duʿāʾ*. The *qunūt* here means *duʿāʾ*. So now we are speaking about *duʿāʾ al-Witr* or *qunūtʾl-Witr*. And that is how you have to appreciate this concept, that the *qunūt* is a *duʿāʾ* that occurs in the prayer.

And you are about to find out (if you didn't know) that actually the *qunūt* in the prayer, is actually least narrated in the *Witr*. In actual fact I am not sure that I know of a banging authentic *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ reciting himself, the *qunūt* in *Witr*. I am not sure—but that is probably my memory more than anything else. The most authentic *ḥadīth* that talk about the *qunūt* in *Witr* are in the obligatory prayer. And as we are going to come to see, those occur when there is a calamity that afflicts the Muslims, what we call *qunūtʾl-nāzilah.* So, when it comes to the issue of actual *qunūt* in the *Witr* prayer, we go with it. And you are going to see the reason we go with it, but I just want to kind of temper people's expectations about the *qunūt.*

Obviously, I have been teaching *Fiqh* of *Salāh* for many years and I think it is one of the big kind of areas that it does educate a lot of Muslims on—the fact that one should not do it all the time. It is not so established as people think it is, that it is very flexible where it goes, before the *rukūʿ*, after the *rukūʿ*, and so on and so forth. We will cover some of that now *in shāʾ Allāh*.

قوله: «بَعْدَ الرُّكُوعِ» أي: بعدَ الرُّكوعِ في الثَّالثةِ.

So, after the *rukūʿ* in the third *rakʿah*. Shaykh says that from the apparent statement of our author, what he is basically saying "after the *rukūʿ*" is, this is after *Rabbana wa lakaʾl-ḥamd*. Then obviously when you say that (*Rabbana wa lakaʾl-ḥamd*) we know that there are certain *duʿāʾ* that you say, *ḥamdan kathīran, ṭayyiban mubārakan fīh*, and these are of course the things that you say when you are standing up.

So, I want you to imagine when you are in *rukūʿ*. When you are in *rukūʿ*, [you say] *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah* [as you are moving from the *rukūʿ* position into the standing position, then you say] *Rabbana wa lakaʾl-ḥamd* [after you are in the standing

position].‡ And at this point now, you have completed the *rukūʿ* and you are standing, and your bones and body and limbs are all relaxed. And now what is going to happen is, you are going to say *ḥamdan kathīran ṭayyiban mubārakan fīhi*, *mil'assamawāti wa'l-arḍ* and then all of your *adhkār*.

If you look at what the author is suggesting from just a basic kind of a glance, it suggests that you make *duʿā'* after *Rabbana wa laka'l-ḥamd* and not include the *dhikr*. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn he makes a statement here which was explained very nicely by Ibn Taymiyyah in a famous statement—you know it goes around on social media and stuff.

وظاهرُ كلامِ المؤلِّفِ :أنَّه يدعو بعد أن يقول: «رَبَّنَا ولك الحَمْدُ» بدون أنْ يُكمل التَّحميدَ، ولكن لو كَمَّلَهُ فلا حَرَجَ؛ لأن التَّحميدَ مفتاحُ الدُّعاءِ، فإنَّ الحَمْدَ والثَّناءَ على الله؛ والصَّلاةَ على نبيِّهِ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم من أسباب إجابةِ الدُّعاءِ.

Shaykh says that if a person actually waits and carries on, '*Ḥamdan kathīran tayyiban mubārakan fīh*,' standing there and then, '*Mil'assamawāti wa mil' al-arḍ wa mil'a ma shi'ta min shay'in baʿd, ahl'l-thanā'i wa'l-majd, aḥaqqu ma qāla'l-ʿabd*,' and he carries on and carries on and he finishes off his *taḥmīd*. So, there will be like a maybe ten, fifteen, twenty second delay as you are finishing off your *adhkār*, your *taḥmīd*, your *tasbīḥ* and then you would normally say *Allāhu akbar* and go into *sajdah*. But you are not because you are going to make *duʿā'* after the *rukūʿ* like the author is saying. So, Shaykh is saying that even though it is okay to say [*duʿā' qunūt'l-Witr*] after *Rabbana wa laka'l-ḥamd* which is what the author is suggesting, if you want to finish off your *adhkār* and your *taḥmīd* then that is no problem.

(0:40:00)

Then he says that *taḥmīd*, to praise Allāh ﷻ is the key of *duʿā'*:

فإنَّ الحَمْدَ والثَّناءَ على الله؛ والصَّلاةَ على نبيِّهِ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم من أسباب إجابةِ الدُّعاءِ

He says that when it comes to praise, and glorification, and the exalting of Allāh ﷻ, as well as sending *salām* upon the Prophet ﷺ, these are from the reasons of *duʿā'* being accepted. So, there is no problem doing that.

Ibn Taymiyyah goes further. Ibn Taymiyyah in his discussion says that there are some scholars that said that there is no *duʿā'* in *Witr* (this is him reporting on the opinions of the scholars). He said that there are some who say there is no *duʿā'* at all in *Witr* which

‡ What to say when moving from *rukūʿ* to the standing position in the prayer was covered in *Logical Progression,* Year 7, Chapter 16, Lessons 27 and 28. MT

obviously there is an evidence for in fairness (from the Prophet ﷺ) because we don't have much *ḥadīth* from him ﷺ at all. Then we have him ﷺ making *duʿāʾ* before the *qunūt* in a couple of *ḥadīth,*[7,8] but they are outside of *Witr,* they are in obligatory prayers. Then we also have him ﷺ authentically (largely authentically) making the *duʿāʾ* after the *rukūʿ*.[9,10] And Ibn Taymiyyah said that this is one of those issues—and a number of scholars follow him, and this is my opinion, it is a **class position** as well—that the location and the place of the *qunūt* is from *ikhtilāfʾl-tanawwuʿ*.

And you will remember we had that discussion in Telegram—the difference between just 'differences of the scholars' versus 'varying ways of doing an act of worship from the Prophet ﷺ'. Now technically both of them are differences. Both are expressions of something that has been differed over. So, if you have someone that says that you don't recite *Fātiḥah,* you do recite *Fātiḥah* and you do this, whatever—those are differences but that is not from the Prophet ﷺ. Those are opinions. People have different opinions, but we all believe our own opinion is the only correct one and the other one is incorrect. So, this is not something that, '*Oh! Let me go and try different ones*,' versus something which we believe has been narrated differently intentionally, for ease, for freshness, for us to try one, one day, try one another day, create our own little mood, keep freshness going and so on. Like the different *duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ*, the different things that have been narrated in a way that are meant to be practiced in a different way. So, this is one of those.

Student (online): Like arms by the side.

Ustādh: So, the arms by the side, I was about to say that but then that is particularly controversial. That is very much my own opinion. When I say 'my own', meaning it is a minority position, not something said by the giants. The giants, they didn't go really that far. So, when they don't say it, then you feel shy to say the same thing. But I genuinely believe that the hand positions of the Prophet ﷺ is upon *al-tanawwuʿ*, that there is a lot of flexibility in order to keep the *ṣalāh* fresh. I believe that even though the *Sunnah* is on the chest—and that was his ﷺ most dominant position. And it is because it was such a dominant practice position, so dominant by him ﷺ compared to the rest, you feel very reticent to say that the rest are all as good. When you say *ikhtilāfʾl-tanawwuʿ*, you normally are indicating that all of them are kind of equal. And that's actually one of the problems of interacting with this concept because most of the time

---

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Witr Prayer, Chapter: To Recite Qunūt Before and After Bowing, ḥadīth no. 1002.*

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: It Is Recommended to Say Qunūt in All Prayers if a Calamity Befalls the Muslims—and Refuge Is Sought from Allāh ﷻ (Regarding That). It Is Recommended to Say Qunūt in Ṣubḥ at All Times. And the Clarification That It Is to Be Said After Raising the Head from Bowing in the Final Rakʿah, and It Is Recommended to Say It Out Loud, ḥadīth no. 675 a.*

[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prophetic Commentary on the Qurʾān, Chapter: [Sūrat Āli ʿImrān: 128], ḥadīth no. 4560.*

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Witr Prayer, Chapter: To Recite Qunūt Before and After Bowing, ḥadīth no. 1001.*

in all of these variations you can actually see that one has a slight kind of stronger position and then that kind of goes against the concept.

In any case, like Ibn Taymiyyah, what did he say about this?

He said: It's good that a person doesn't do *duʿāʾ al-qunūt* all the time, you should leave it, *tāratan tāratan* (here and there). And when he does do it, he should do it sometimes before the *rukūʿ*, like we do in the 'Ḥanafi' school. We'll come to how they do it, but just where, in terms of location, meaning it's before *rukūʿ*. So, they're standing and then they do it.

I just want to say by the way, there are some scholars that refuted this position. They refuted also the *ḥadīth* that stated that the Prophet ﷺ made *qunūt*. What was their justification?

They said that when the *ḥadīth* talk about the *qunūt* of the Prophet ﷺ *qablʾl-rukūʿ*, it's referring to the *qiyām* because *qunūt* means *qiyām*—which is actually quite a good argument. This is obviously those that favour the opinion after *rukūʿ* as an exclusive kind of position and in fairness there are much more *ḥadīth* about the Prophet ﷺ making *duʿāʾ al-qunūt* after the *rukūʿ* so you can see where the logic is coming from. So, if you're going with that position remember there's two ways obviously, you support your position and you rubbish your opponents'. So, you've supported your position by saying, '*Hey, the majority of the ḥadīth are about after rukūʿ. As for the ones before, well we can explain them away by looking at the fact that it's referring to when the Prophet ﷺ prayed longer, recited more, recited extra. Longer qiyām we're going to call it qunūt.*' It's a fair point.

In any case, as Ibn Taymiyyah said, we should make *qunūt* sometimes, not all the time. And when we do it, we should do it before, and then when we do it other times, it should be after.

Wa laʿalaʾl-baʿḍ akthar istidlālan he said that perhaps the afterwards is better because it fulfils the *sunnah* of *duʿāʾ*. We're in a position, in a place, where we want to make *duʿāʾ* to Allāh ﷻ and the *sunnah* of Allāh ﷺ in *duʿāʾ* is always to lavish the praises and the exaltations and the respects and salutations. You give basically before you take. The *sunnah* of *al-Fātiḥah*:

﴿ٱلْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ ٱلْعَٰلَمِينَ ۝٢ ٱلرَّحْمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ ۝٣ مَٰلِكِ يَوْمِ ٱلدِّينِ ۝٤ إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ ۝٥﴾

"Praise belongs to God, Lord of the Worlds, the Lord of Mercy, the Giver of Mercy, Master of the Day of Judgment. It is You we worship; it is You we ask for help." [*Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*:2-5]

It's all You, You, You, praising You. He is the greatest, He is *Raḥmān*, He is *Raḥīm*, He is the Master. It's all about Him.

سُبْحانَكَ اللّهُمَّ وَبِحَمْدِكَ وَتَبارَكَ اسْمُكَ وَتَعالى جَدُّكَ وَلا إِلهَ غَيْرُك

"Subḥānak Allāhumma wa bi-ḥamdika wa tabārarak assmuka wa taʿāla jadduka wa lā ilāha ghayruk."[11]

It's all bam! Bam! Bam! Bam! It's beautiful. That's the *sunnah* of *duʿāʾ*. That's why when we start our private *duʿāʾ* we always praise Allāh ﷻ, just maximum, then we start asking our things.

So Ibn Taymiyyah said that it makes sense to be after the *rukūʿ* because if you do it before *rukūʿ* you've just got general recitation, general Qurʾān which is good because that's fine, it's *ʿibādah* and all the rest of it. But getting into *rukūʿ* and making *tasbīḥ* of Allāh ﷻ *subḥānak*, *Subbūḥun quddūsun Rabbʾl-malāʾikati waʾl-Rūḥ*, *subḥāna Rabbiyyʾl-ʿAẓīm*, and then *samiʿa Allāhu liman ḥamidah*—Allāh ﷻ has heard the one who has praised Him. *Rabbana wa lakaʾl-ḥamd*—O Allāh to You is *al-ḥamd*. Now give me, give me;

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ...

I think that's sick to be honest. I love what Ibn Taymiyyah said. And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn has basically summarised that. He said that this praising and exalting of Allāh ﷻ is just one of the reasons that *duʿāʾ* is accepted in the first place.

Student (online): Would it be disliked to mostly not do *qunūt* and only do it sometimes?

Ustādh: I don't know that's difficult to say. Because what does that mean? What does 'sometimes' mean? This is completely random. I do fifty-fiftyish. If I judge my week, I'm a three one week and I'm a four another week. I completely keep it in a general sense.

Student (online): But you can argue that the exaltations have been done in the *Fātiḥah* (and *duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ*) before the *qunūt* that is done before the *rukūʿ*.

Ustādh: You could, yes. But they're kind of disconnected. They're kind of like you've recited *Fātiḥah* and then you might go off into [*Sūrat*] *al-Baqarah*, or you might go off to [*Sūrat*] *Āli ʿImrān*, you might go off to two three pages, you might be talking about

[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Proof of Those who Say the Basmalah Should not be Recited, ḥadīth no. 399 c.*

(0:50:00) something else. The *sunnah* of *Fātiḥah* is a very dramatic one. It's a very dramatic change.

﴿إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ ۝٥ ٱهْدِنَا ٱلصِّرَٰطَ ٱلْمُسْتَقِيمَ ۝٦﴾

"It is You we worship; it is You we ask for help. Guide us to the straight path." [*Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*: 5-6]

And from *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-ʿAẓīm, samiʿa Allāhu liman ḥamidah, Rabbana wa laka'l-ḥamd*, bam! *Allāhumma ihdni fī man hadayt…* bam bam bam!

Student (online): So, is the class position to mix it up both pre post and not at all?

Ustādh: It's going to come. But yes, the **<u>class position</u>** is to also on the odd occasion. So, like I told you before, and not many scholars kind of speak about this, the issue of the *qunūt'l-Witr* is not as established as you may think but still is there. So, as I said some weeks it'll be basically between 40%-60% is what I think the sums work out if I'm doing three one week and four another week.

Right, so that's how often you would do the *qunūt*.

And as for the amount of times you would do the before, I'm a one in twenty kind of guy. It is very minimal related, a 1:20 of doing it before *rukūʿ* versus after. I believe that it is to be mixed up and it is meant to keep you fresh but not necessarily practise a lot. Still the majority is after the *rukūʿ*.

And then Shaykh says that the author said that he makes the *qunūt* after *rukūʿ* and he says…

وَيَقْنُتُ فِيْهَا بَعْدَ الرُّكُوعِ ويَقولُ:

One performs the *qunūt* after the *rukūʿ* saying…

So, the Shaykh does not say what he does by doing this *qunūt.* Does he say it out loud? Does he recite it? Does he make *duʿā'*? Does he raise his hands? What do you do with the hands? etc. He does not mention about raising their hands.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: In fairness to the author, it is one of the positions of the scholars that one does not raise their hands. But that is not the reason why Imām al-Ḥajjāwi did not mention it. Imām al-Ḥajjāwi does believe that you should raise the

hands because the Ḥanbali position is to raise the hands and this is just obviously a small summary. You cannot put every detail in the summary. So, the question is now that he did not include raise the hands just to be brief and this is the position of the scholars. This is:

اختصاراً لا اعتباراً

That means that he only did that because of hastiness, trying to summarise, not because that is what he believes that you are not meant to raise your hands.

The correct position of course is that you do raise your hands. I say 'of course' meaning that the *Sunnah* establishes that more than not. It is completely permissible to not raise your hands. But we do raise our hands. And the reason we raise our hands is because of the *ḥadīth* of 'Umar ﷺ. 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ﷺ narrated by Imām al-Bayhaqi in his *Sunnan* (Volume 2, page 212) and this *athar* (narration from him) is authentic that he used to raise his hands in the *du'ā'* of *Witr*.[12]

Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says that he is from not just the *Ṣaḥābah,* but he is from the *al-khulafā' al-rāshidīn* and the *al-khulafā' al-rāshidīn* are a special group of the Companions that are also followed in of themselves and 'Umar ﷺ is even more emphasised. So, you are meant to follow the Companions generally, but that is normally for *ijmā'* and then you are meant to follow the big Companions because they are major, major players and they have *du'ā'* made for them, then the *al-khulafā' al-rāshidīn* are the special, special selected Companions. And then you have Abu Bakr and 'Umar ﷺ who have the Prophet's ﷺ specific *du'ā'*. They are the elite of the elite. These are two the Prophet ﷺ said that I want you to follow them specifically.[13,14] So, 'Umar's actions are to be followed legislatively, unless of course it goes against the *jamhūr*, goes against the majority, goes against the *Sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ, normal rules still apply. But especially when there is no information available or there are no narrations around, then you have got a 'Umar ﷺ narration? Bam! We are taking that with both hands.

Question: How do we actually raise our hands?

الجواب :قال العُلماءُ: يَرفعُ يديه إلى صَدرِهِ، ولا يرفَعُها كثيراً؛ لأنَّ هذا الدُّعاءَ ليس دُعاءَ ابتهالٍ يُبالِغُ فيه الإنسانُ بالرَّفْعِ، بل دُعاءُ رَغْبَةٍ، ويبسُطُ يديْهِ وبطونَهما إلى السَّماءِ. هكذا قال أصحابُنَا رحمهم الله.

---

[12] *Sunan al-Bayhaqi, 2/212.*
[13] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Model Behavior of the Prophet ﷺ, Chapter: Adherence to the Sunnah, ḥadīth no. 4607.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.
[14] *Jāmi' al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Knowledge, Chapter: What Has Been Related About Adhering to the Sunnah and Staying Away from Innovation, ḥadīth no. 2676.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

Some of the scholars said that you raise your hands to the chest and not so far. By the way, we are not talking about *duʿāʾ* generally, we are talking about the *duʿāʾ* of *Witr*.

So, you raise [the hands] to the chest. That is in terms of height. Do not follow the hands just yet. We are getting there.

So, raise it to the chest and not to the sky. And the reason that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that is because this is not the *duʿāʾ* of *ibtihāl*, this is not the *duʿāʾ* of absolute desperation. Even though *duʿāʾ* is a desperate act, but this is not the *duʿāʾ* of those kind of certain scenarios in which the Prophet ﷺ has requested that. And we know that he ﷺ did make *duʿāʾ* like this [arms raised to the sky] so much so that armpits were uncovered, so much so that *burdah* of the Prophet ﷺ came off and it was just hanging on loose, it came off.[15] We know that he ﷺ used to do that from time to time, especially in battle. We will come to that later. And this is a *duʿāʾ* of *raghbah*.

I want you to know that there are different times for different types of *duʿāʾ*. When a person is [raising their arms up to the sky], it is absolute desperation. When you are making *duʿāʾ*:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيْمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وَعَافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ...

This does not make sense to be saying Allāh ﷻ guide me amongst those whom You have guided [with your arms raised up to the sky]. This is like, I do not know what the word is. I do not want to say polite civilised *duʿāʾ*—that sounds horrible. Shaykh says it is like the *duʿāʾ* of yearning. A *duʿāʾ* being made in earnest, a *duʿāʾ* of longing.

Student (online): Intimate?

Ustādh: Intimate, maybe. I like that. Intimate? Maybe that is the word I am looking for. Well done.

So that is the height issue.

---

[15] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Rain, Chapter: Raising the Hands in Supplication When Praying for Rain, ḥadīth no. 895 c.*

(1:00:00) Obviously, the palms are not to the sky. I know you might be thinking, '*What's going on there?*' But that is possible [for the palms to be facing away from you] in certain narrations. But in this case the back of the hands are [facing] outwards and the [palms are facing towards you].

The majority of the people of knowledge, what is understood from them when they are speaking about *duʿāʾ* and trying to explain the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ—and it is very interesting how Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says this, for the students of knowledge and students of *ḥadīth* look at how he says:

وظاهر كلام أهل العلم

He says: "What seems to be apparent from the people of knowledge." He did not even say that 'from the *ẓāhir* of the *riwāyah*', or 'the *ẓāhir* of *ḥadīth*', or 'from the *ẓāhir* of the Prophet's ﷺ *sunnah*'. And that is because there are certain actions and narrations from the Prophet ﷺ which they themselves are actually quite general or not necessarily general but you have to rely on some major insight from deep big time scholars to try to unpack from a statement which does not say anything, some kind of secret behavior. It is like coming to a murder scene and you are thinking that you have seen the little clues and you have worked it out, you have taken your notes and you have worked it out and then one of these Poirot kind of guys is coming down and Sherlock Holmes and Mind Map Temples and they do a mad one. They see this, that, whatever and it is a lot of presumption, but that presumption is coming because they have got game. They have been there, or they were younger and they have done it themselves. And so I think it is very interesting that he does that. And that is because it is quite difficult to unpack exactly, super accurately, how the Prophet ﷺ 100% put his hands. But Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: What it seems from the scholars is that they are preferring that this was the *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ, to keep the hands together.

وظاهر كلام أهل العلم :أنه يضمُّ اليدين بعضهما إلى بعض، كحالِ المُستجدي الذي يطلب مِن غيره أن يُعطيه شيئاً، وأمَّا التَّفْريجُ والمباعدةُ بينهما فلا أعلمُ له أصلاً؛ لا في السُّنَّةِ، ولا في كلامِ العُلماءِ.

To keep the hands together like the one who is taking something and wanting something.

As for *al-tafrīj* and *al-mubāʿadah*, then we do not know of a basis for that.

Again, he does not say it is not from the *dīn* or something like that, or it is *bidʿah*, or whatever. He did not say that. He says: "I do not know of a basis for that neither from the *Sunnah* or from the words of the scholars."

Student (online): I have been interested in Shaykh al-Dadu's understanding as he always joins his fingers.

Ustādh: So, if you mean the *ḍamm*, because this is *ḍamm*, when you combine. Whether you do it fingers up, or [close your hands over each other], that's what I said.

When you put your hands together [is *ḍamm*]. This is *tafarruj* [spreading your hands apart so they are not touching], and this is *tabāʿud* [your arms being held out far in front of you]. [*Tafarruj*] is apart, [*tabāʿud*] is far.

And so what I mean by that is when we do *al-tafarruj* (or *tafrīj*, both of them work)…

Student (online): Not *ḍamm*, fingertips only.

Shaykh al-Dadu has always made *duʿāʾ* like that. I am trying to say to you that. *Ḍamm* means together, touching, not necessarily has to be like that [the sides of the hands coming together], or like that [one hand cradling the other], etc. What I am trying to say is that the hands are together. If I say your hands are together [it could take many different forms]. So, as I said from the Arabic, to be together (that is what *ḍamm* means, to be together), all of this is an interpretation of that.

One of the very interesting things about the Shanāqiṭah, especially those that are of the *ʿaqīdah* of Ahlʾl-Sunnah like al-Dadu school, like his uncle and so on, Shaykh Muḥammad al-Sālim, they are obviously hardcore on the evidences and they don't restrict themselves to the Māliki school. However, the *ʿulamāʾ* and the *athār* and the *Tābiʿīn* and the *Salaf* that were living around Madīnah, they take their narrations very seriously. And that is where you start to get very specific details. For example, putting the [thumb] in between [the middle finger and the ring finger] for *tashahhud*, not just making like the standard Māliki position which is to do this [for the hand to rest on its side during the *tashahhud*], and make movements. Also, with the feet. Anyway, my point is that these little moves they take it from the *Salaf*.

In any case, generally what I want to say to you is that normally we make *duʿāʾ* like this. And this is *tafrīj*, apart.

Sometimes you see people making *duʿāʾ* like that. You will see them standing there, like low down. Like they are carrying something.

They do make *duʿāʾ* like that. You will see them. You won't see a Pak. A Pak would die rather than do that because a Pak thinks his *duʿāʾ* is going to be thrown in the bin if he does something like that. But Arabs for example are all over the show. I have always told you that Arabs are very relaxed when it comes to *ṣalāh*. Paks have no idea what's going on, so they all do it in a very ritualistic, robotic kind of way.

So, [hands apart and low], [hands way out in front of you] have no basis as far as we know, and to be wide apart. It is all *ʿaql* kind of stuff.

Student (online): Isn't it a Pak thing that they say that the *duʿāʾ* answer will fall through your open fingers?

Ustādh: As she said that the *duʿāʾ* answer will fall through your open fingers, keep it tight. That is all cultural.

Student (online): If the hands are together, does that mean our eyes should now be looking at our hands instead of the place of *sajdah*?

Ustādh: In terms of the place of where you look at, there is no narration which indicates that the Prophet ﷺ continued or did not continue to look at the *sajdah*. So, if a person looks at his hands, that's okay. A person closes his eyes temporarily, that is okay even though we know that the *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ was not to close his eyes in this kind of situation.

So basically, I am saying that we should keep our hands together when we are making *duʿāʾ*. It should be in front of us.

This should be our default position of *duʿāʾ*.

That is not to say it is *ḥarām* to [raise your arms]. And it is not to say that when you are feeling desperate… but it is certainly in *ṣalāh.* And I think I have spoken about this before (I am pretty sure I have) that the Ḥanafis, in my opinion, have got many, many things spot on when it comes to the *Witr.* Reviving the before the *rukūʿ* thing I like that even though of course they only make it... that is a big problem. But we just take what we can get. The issue of keeping it very formal, not making it so much about the hands because I have to also say that I'm very comfortable with no hands being used. And I do that a bit as well because there is no necessary *sunnah* that you must raise your hands per se from the Prophet ﷺ even though ʿUmar ﷺ did it which means that I would do it most of the time. But I like the fact that the Ḥanafis don't. They just maintain, carry on like as if they are praying. You know their way.

Obviously *takbīr* that is a whole *bidʿah* no doubt about that. They say *Allāh akbar* [raising hands] ... I mean it is what it is. You get what you get.

But the timing—very short, minimal *duʿāʾ*, minimum elongation. We don't care if it's 27th, night 29th night etc. We are going to kill you, we are going to kill you afterwards
(1:10:00) with the *duʿāʾ* after the prayer. But in *ṣalāh,* we respect the *ṣalāh*. Nobody's raising their voice and screaming, singing, busting their poetry, busting their favourite lines, all the crowd pleasers bring them out, having everyone going, '*Yā Allāh! Yā Allāh!*' We can't have that behaviour. You won't have that madness in a Pak mosque. We have that under control. The fact that it is calm and cool and quiet and respectful and even though like I said the hands are not there, but the whole thing.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn also makes the point that if he makes the *duʿāʾ* before it then that is fine.

Student (online): How would you do the *qunūt* pre *rukūʿ* then?

Ustādh: It would be for example [finish *sūrah,* raise hands into the *duʿāʾ* position, then recite the *qunūt*]. We will discuss whether you wipe with the hands or not. It will then be *Allāhu akbar* [go into *rukūʿ* and complete the rest of the prayer].

That is how it would look if you are doing it before *rukūʿ*. So, you would just finish your *sūrah* and just go straight into *duʿāʾ* and then you would go into *rukūʿ.* That is what it looks like when you are doing it before. If you are doing it afterwards then as you know *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah, Rabbana wa lakaʾl–ḥamd* [recite *qunūt*], [say] *Allāhu akbar* and go straight into *sajdah*. So that is how it would look like.

And then the Shaykh says:

وقوله:« يقنتُ فيها» أفادنا رحمه الله: أَنَّ القنوتَ سُنَّةٌ في الوِترِ. وإلى هذا ذهب أصحابُ الإمامِ أحمدَ، وقالوا :إنه يُسَنُّ أن يَقْنُتَ في الوِترِ في كلِّ ليلةٍ .

[The author's statement] that he makes *qunūt* in the *Witr* indicates that the *qunūt* itself is a *sunnah*.

You already should have worked that out. A lot of people ask that question: What is the ruling of *qunūt*? What happens if you forget to do *qunūt*?

I've already told you that from the Prophet ﷺ we hardly have ever seen the *qunūt* in the *Witr aṣlan*. So how can a person say it is part of the *Witr* or it is an obligation? Nobody says that. Even the Aḥanāf don't say that (as far as I know). Like nobody says. It is a *sunnah* to perform according to some scholars. That is the position of Imām Aḥmad. And some of them said that it is a *sunnah* to do every single night—so [*qunūt*] every single night. And then some said that it is only sometimes. And then some of the scholars said that the *qunūt* is only in Ramaḍān. And some said that it is only in the second half of Ramaḍān, like al-Shāfiʿi for example and a position from Imām Mālik.

So, you've got [*qunūt*]:

- Every night in *Witr*
- Most nights of the year in the *Witr*.
- Only in Ramaḍān in the *Witr*.
- And then the minimum position, which is the position of Shāfiʿi and so on, is that it is in the second half of Ramaḍān only.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says on page 19 that it has not been established from the Prophet ﷺ any authentic *ḥadīth* that he ﷺ did *qunūt* in the *Witr* (something that I alluded to earlier on).

و لم يثبت عن النَّبيِّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم حديثٌ صحيحٌ في القُنوتِ في الوِتر. لكن؛ فيه حديث أخرجه ابنُ ماجه بسندٍ ضعيف، حسّنه بعضُهم لشواهده: « أَنَّ النَّبيَّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم قَنَتَ في الوِتْرِ »

However, in the *ḥadīth* which is narrated by Ibn Mājah with a weak chain which a number of scholars considered it to be acceptable, meaning *ḥasan* because of its supporting evidences and supporting chains. Shaykh al-Albāni is one of those people who considered it to be *ḥasan*. The narration indicates that the Prophet ﷺ did the *qunūt* in *Witr*.[16,17]

As for Imām Aḥmad himself, he straight out said it is not narrated, there is no authentic *ḥadīth* from the Prophet ﷺ at all neither before *rukūʿ* nor after *rukūʿ* that he ﷺ did *qunūt*

[16] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions About Witr, Chapter: The Qunūt During Witr, ḥadīth no. 1427*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.
[17] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 380*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ*.

in *Witr*. No. The only thing that we have is that narration from ʿUmar ﷺ and that is authentic and that is what we're going with.

Now Shaykh says the one who thinks about this and reflects on the prayer of the Prophet ﷺ especially the night prayer specifically, if you really think about the narrations, he ﷺ doesn't really do *qunūt* in *Witr*. And really what he ﷺ is doing is more focusing on making his prayer odd as opposed to making a separate *duʿāʾ* in the *Witr* itself. His ﷺ focus is ending the night on an odd with a prayer as opposed to a *duʿāʾ* in the actual single unit in of itself.

وهذا هو الأحسن؛ أنْ لا تداوم على قُنُوتِ الوِترِ؛ لأن ذلك لم يثبت عن رسول الله صلّى الله عليه وسلّم، ولكنه عَلَّمَ الحسنَ بنَ عليّ رضي الله عنه دعاءً يدعو به في قُنُوتِ الوِتْرِ، فيدلُّ على أنَّه سُنَّةٌ، لكن ليس من فِعْلِهِ؛ بل من قَوْلِهِ

And Shaykh says that is what I prefer, that is what is better that you do not continuously do the *qunūt* in the *Witr* because that has not been established from the Prophet ﷺ. However, don't think that that is something which is *bidʿah* or that it's not done, because the Prophet ﷺ himself taught al-Ḥasan ﷺ (meaning his grandson ﷺ) the *duʿāʾ* that you use in the *qunūt* of *Witr*.[18,19,20,21] So that means that this turns into what we call a *sunnah qawliyyah* and not *fiʿliyyah*. This is a *sunnah* that has been established verbally from the Prophet ﷺ as opposed to his own personal action.

Student (online): So, our focus is not in the right place when we are more obsessed about the *duʿāʾ* rather than the *Witr*-ness of it.

Ustādh: This wonderfully sums it up. Our focus is not in the right place and we've been speaking about this for so long. More obsessed about the *qunūtʾl-Witr* and the ritualistic nature of it than the *Witr* aspect of it.

So, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says the fact that the Prophet ﷺ taught al-Ḥasan ﷺ shows that it is *sunnah*, it's a recommended act to do here and there and you're never going to be punished for it or it's never going to be bad, but it's not from his own ﷺ personal action rather from his ﷺ statement.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that however, there are some scholars that said that this *athar* of al-Ḥasan ﷺ is weak because of hidden faults. Of course, al-Ḥākim said it is

---

[18] *Imām al-Ḥākim, 3/172.*
[19] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 1/199.*
[20] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions About Witr, Chapter: The Qunūt During Witr, ḥadīth no. 1425.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.
[21] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on al-Witr, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the Qunūt in al-Witr, ḥadīth no. 464.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

authentic according to the conditions of Bukhāri and Muslim, not that that means too much, but what does have a lot of weight is Imām al-Tirmidhi considered this *ḥadīth* to be good. He acted according to this *ḥadīth* as well. So, there are giants behind his *ḥadīth*. It's no joke.

Student (online): Can we say it's not an emphasised *sunnah*?

Ustādh: It's difficult to say that.

Student (online): The *qunūt* in and of itself is a prescribed *sunnah*.

Ustādh: I like that better.

Student (online): But not its performance in *Witr* specifically.

Ustādh: "Not its performance in *Witr* specifically"—I don't even know whether that's the most complete statement because this *duʿāʾ* if we accept this *athar* (and we should, the majority of scholars consider it to be authentic), it is specific to the *Witr*.

(1:20:00) Structurally, *qunūt* is in of itself a prescribed *sunnah*. The *duʿāʾ* that is said would change from place and time and so on. So for example, we know that the *qunūt* in the obligatory prayer is an absolute prescribed *sunnah* when there's a disaster. And it's also sometimes in *Fajr* time as well—and all the prayers—but then that could be classified as the disaster. We're going to come to that in a couple of weeks. That is done.

As for the content, you are not meant to be making: 'O Allāh guide me amongst those whom You have guided…' in a calamity. Whereas [O Allāh guide me amongst those whom You have guided…] the *duʿāʾ*, it is for *Witr*. That's why the answer is somewhere in between what the two of you are saying.

Just so that you know, something very interesting, one of the main reasons that some of the scholars said that this *ḥadīth* of al-Ḥasan ﷺ is unacceptable—it's not because of a weak chain. There are no narrators in the chain that are a problem. That's why Imām al-Tirmidhi had no problem with it. They said the *ḥadīth* has the fault that is hidden. From the outside the statement is fine, the action is fine, the *duʿāʾ* meaning is fine, the chain of narrators is fine—this is a really nice point, folks focus on this one—what is not fine is the common sense behind it. It's the common sense that lets this *ḥadīth* down. They said that al-Ḥasan ﷺ to have narrated this *ḥadīth* the maximum age that he could have been was eight years old. How could he have told us this *ḥadīth* with this accuracy at the age of eight years old?

And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says, come on, this is not a *ʿillah* which is *qādiḥah*, this is not a fatal fault or a fatal error. He says that many eight-year-olds are able to learn and study and teach and so on and so forth. What do you think about ʿAmr ibn Salamah al-Jarami ﷺ? He says that this young Companion used to lead the Muslims and he was

seven years old. Actually, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn here says that maybe he was even six. ʿAmr was even either seven or six and he led them because *kana aqraʾahum*, he was the most versed in the Book.[22] And at that age it wasn't understanding, it was memorised amount.

Student (online): He is the grandchild of the Prophet ﷺ, we can make an exception on his ability to articulate.

Ustādh: Very good. If we're going to find a kid who's going to have something special, it's going to be the grandson of the Prophet ﷺ.

وقوله: «بعد الرُّكُوعِ» ظاهرُ كلامِ المؤلِّف: أنَّه لا يُشرعُ القُنُوت قبل الرُّكوعِ، ولكن المشهور مِن المذهب :أنَّه يجوزُ القُنُوتُ قبل الرُّكوعِ وبعد القِراءة؛ فإذا انتهى مِن قراءته قَنَتَ ثم رَكَعَ، وبعد الرُّكوعِ؛ لأنه وَرَدَ ذلك عن النَّبيِّ عليه الصَّلاةُ والسَّلامُ في قُنُوتِهِ في الفَرائضِ

And then he ends with this point that when he says: "after *rukūʿ*", it indicates almost that the Shaykh is not including before *rukūʿ*, it is not allowed. But as we said the *madhhab* says it is allowed before and after and that's something which is straightforward.

And by the way, this is how it was done with the Prophet ﷺ in the obligatory prayer. We have a number of *ḥadīth* that have it narrated. [7,8]

وعليه؛ فيكون موضع القُنُوتِ من السُنَنِ المتنوّعةِ؛ التي يفعلُها أحياناً هكذا، و أحياناً هكذا.

That's a wonderful statement to end with, that therefore the position of the *qunūt* belongs to that category that we have called *al-sunanʾl-mutanawwiʿah*. Or you can call it a different thing. You can say that the *qunūt* of *Witr* is from *al-sunanʾl-mutanawwiʿah*, those *sunan* actions that you do by mixing it up. That one does sometimes like this and sometimes like that, sometimes before, sometimes after. And that's the end of the story folks.

[22] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Military Expeditions Led by the Prophet ﷺ, ḥadīth no. 4302.*

Q & A

Q (online): When we talk about age, e.g., eight years old, is this according to Roman twelve months or lunar?

A: Yes, lunar absolutely, of course—number one. Number two, we had girls getting married at nine, girls getting married at ten. And you are worried about what a person knows at eight years old? Killers they were. Lightyears ahead.

Q (online): How should *Sūrat al-Aʿlā, al-Kāfirūn* and *al-Ikhlāṣ* be applied in *Witr* of more than three *rakʿāt*?

A: It is a very good question. The truth is that there is no *ḥadīth* that specifies so the matter is open. As far as I know, every *ḥadīth* which specifies exact *sūrahs* are in the three *rakʿāt* iteration, which is another side proof that three is the most common, basic, complete version. Let us make sure we do not miss out that debate. I am still with it. I still want to go with it. I am still with two *taslīms* as well. If anyone wants to argue, I want to look forward to that argument.

Q (online): What class position are we going with respect to *qunūt* in *Witr*? *Sunnah* to do in *Witr*, or *sunnah* to vary, or abstain from it?

A: I think both are the same. It is *sunnah* to do [*qunūt*] in *Witr*, and that *sunnah* is to sometimes do it and sometimes not do it. *Sunnah* to do it sometimes *sunnah* to not do it. That is what the *sunnah* is. And we say that even though we do not have a *ḥadīth* from the action of the Prophet ﷺ, but he ﷺ told the people to do it.[23,24,25] So, that is that.

Q (online): Should we not be doing *takbīr* for *qunūt*?

A: No. There is no evidence for that. That is just a Pak thing, and in your case, an Arab Somali thing as well.

Q (online): If the Prophet ﷺ liked three *rakʿah* for *Witr* does this mean that three is better than five, seven, nine, eleven?

---

[23] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions About Witr, Chapter: The Recommendation to Pray Witr, ḥadīth no. 1418*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf* by al-Albāni.
[24] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on al-Witr, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the Virtue of al-Witr, ḥadīth no. 452*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*
[25] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 366*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*

A: No. I am just saying that that is something that he ﷺ prayed quite a lot, or we have quite a few *ḥadīth* about. There is probably more authentic *ḥadīth* for eleven than anything else. I need to think about that. I am not too sure which number gets the most. But three is very well established by all the scholars, as like the *adnaʾl-kamāl*.

Q (online): If *Fajr* starts as we pray the second *rakʿah* of *Witr*, would that mean that we missed the *Witr* prayer because there are two *taslīms*, i.e., when you give the first *taslīm* and stand up to do the third *rakʿah*, and it is already *Fajr* or do we need to change the intention during the prayer to pray three *rakʿah* with one *taslīm*?

A: You do not need to do that, but that is what I would do. You do not need to do that, but it is better than now ending the prayer—ending a two and then standing up to do a single. That has more basis in my opinion, because you should not really be praying any *Witr* now. The [*Fajr*] time has started and that is the end of it.

By the way, I just want to add, you know I said that some of the Companions used to pray the *Witr* prayer up until *iqāmah*. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said that that is just not on, it's against the *ḥadīth*, against the *Sunnah*, and everything. However, the point still stands. There are Companions who used to do it, and ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ؓ is one of them—and authentically narrated as well. So, I do not want to say that it is a major,
(1:30:00) major thing a person is finishing off the two *rakʿah*, and *Fajr* has started, and then standing up to do one, even though you know what I said, that it is gone, and in my opinion, you have to do it afterwards. But if I am doing it, then I am turning it into a three [with the only *taslīm* being after the third *rakʿah*], as opposed to a two and a one.

Q (online): If the imām at your local *masjid* prays *Witr* like *Maghrib*, should you stay silent during the first *tashahhud*?

A: No. You would recite the first *tashahhud*.

That is a very important question by the way. When you are following another imām, you follow the way they do it—number one. Number two, whenever you are in the *ṣalāh*, never is silence better than *dhikr*. I want you to remember that. Never. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): Should you avoid praying *Witr* regularly behind this imām?

A: Yes. I think so. If you do not believe that that is the right one, then why would you do it?

Q (online): If you wanted to make up *tahajjud*, is that possible?

A: Yes. If you wanted to make up *tahajjud*, you did not get it done that night, then you would pray in the daytime at *Ḍuḥa* time, similar to what you would do if you missed *Witr.*

Remember by the way, if someone missed *Witr*, it means that they did not pray *tahajjud*. There are some scholars that said that the Prophet ﷺ never made up *Witr*, it was just making up *tahajjud*. You know I said that you do even in the day, for making up the odd from the night? So, if you missed three *rakʿah* of *Witr*, then you make four *rakʿah* of *ṣalāt al-Ḍuḥa* prayer in the forenoon, mid-morning.

There are some scholars who have said that the *Witr* is a *sunnah* prayer, there is no making it up. It is not even from the *rawātib*. Do not make it up. And actually, what is being made up is the missed opportunity of the *tahajjud* prayer. Not that that is my opinion, but I just want you to be aware that if you wanted to, you did not pray *tahajjud*, you could do that. In the case, for example, if you did not pray your *tahajjud*, and you did not pray *Witr*, which totaled eleven *rakʿah* for example, then you could do twelve in the daytime—theoretically speaking. But I do not think that it should become a *sunnah*.

Q (online): Is it alright to say the *qunūt duʿāʾ* in *sajdah*?

A: Yes. It is allowed to do that.

Q (online): What is the evidence for those who say that *qunūt* is done in Ramaḍān only?

A: *Ḥadīth* that are coming, but this is basically the Prophet's ﷺ *duʿāʾ* against Muḍar, and against the *kuffār* of Quraysh.

Q (online): The bare minimum is one *Witr* without *qunūt*?

A: Yes.

Q (online): The basic standard is three *Witr*, mixing it up with or without *qunūt,* mostly after *rukūʿ*, but can occasionally be done before.

A: Yes. That is correct.

Q (online): What is the class position regarding three *Witr* done with two *tashahhuds*, and one *taslīm*, as proponents of it cite that it is still dissimilar to *Maghrib* by having a second *surah* in the third *rakʿah* and a *duʿāʾ* of *qunūt*?

A: As I said last week, some of the scholars said that. And no. Our position is that the obvious is what we go by, the majority position understanding that *ḥadīth* is what we go by, and that this is not an acceptable way. But when I say 'not acceptable way', I do not mean that a person cannot pray it. I just told you that if you are praying behind an imām, you would carry on doing it. It is acceptable prayer. It is a *mujtahad* position. It is a position of our scholars who are our *qudwah*. But it is not our class position at all. We should not be doing it like that. You should be doing it three, or two and one.

Q (online): If you started *Witr* with the intention of doing two-one, you can change it to do three?

A: Yes. You can. Some scholars have said no. I am okay with that. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): Question regarding eleven *rakʿāt Witr* evidenced last week in *ḥadīth* 736 in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*:

وَحَدَّثَنِي حَرْمَلَةُ بْنُ يَحْيَى، حَدَّثَنَا ابْنُ وَهْبٍ، أَخْبَرَنِي عَمْرُو بْنُ الْحَارِثِ، عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ، عَنْ عُرْوَةَ بْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ، عَنْ عَائِشَةَ، زَوْجِ النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم قَالَتْ كَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم يُصَلِّي فِيمَا بَيْنَ أَنْ يَفْرُغَ مِنْ صَلاَةِ الْعِشَاءِ – وَهِيَ الَّتِي يَدْعُو النَّاسُ الْعَتَمَةَ – إِلَى الْفَجْرِ إِحْدَى عَشْرَةَ رَكْعَةً يُسَلِّمُ بَيْنَ كُلِّ رَكْعَتَيْنِ وَيُوتِرُ بِوَاحِدَةٍ فَإِذَا سَكَتَ الْمُؤَذِّنُ مِنْ صَلاَةِ الْفَجْرِ وَتَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْفَجْرُ وَجَاءَهُ الْمُؤَذِّنُ قَامَ فَرَكَعَ رَكْعَتَيْنِ خَفِيفَتَيْنِ ثُمَّ اضْطَجَعَ عَلَى شِقِّهِ الأَيْمَنِ حَتَّى يَأْتِيَهُ الْمُؤَذِّنُ لِلإِقَامَةِ . وَحَدَّثَنِيهِ حَرْمَلَةُ، أَخْبَرَنَا ابْنُ وَهْبٍ، أَخْبَرَنِي يُونُسُ، عَنِ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ، بِهَذَا الإِسْنَادِ . وَسَاقَ حَرْمَلَةُ الْحَدِيثَ بِمِثْلِهِ غَيْرَ أَنَّهُ لَمْ يَذْكُرْ وَتَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْفَجْرُ وَجَاءَهُ الْمُؤَذِّنُ . وَلَمْ يَذْكُرِ الإِقَامَةَ . وَسَائِرُ الْحَدِيثِ بِمِثْلِ حَدِيثِ عَمْرٍو سَوَاءً .

"ʿĀʾishah, the wife of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, said that between the time when the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ finished the *ʿIshāʾ* prayer which is called *al-ʿAtamah* by the people, he used to pray eleven *rakʿāt*, uttering the salutation at the end of every two *rakʿah*, and observing the *Witr* with a single one. And when the *muʾadhdhin* had finished the call (for the) dawn prayer and he saw the dawn clearly and the *muʾadhdhin* had come to him, he stood up and prayed two short *rakʿahs*. Then he lay down on his right side until the *muʾadhdhin* came to him for *iqāmah*."

I could only find it clearly citing that the Prophet ﷺ did one *rakʿah Witr*. Is there another explicitly evidenced version?

A: Explicitly I think you will find one. But we don't need it because we know that the Prophet ﷺ only prayed eight *rak'ah* of *tahajjud* which by definition means that he was praying… And then we know that ʿĀʾishah said the Prophet ﷺ used to pray eleven *rakʿāt* in the night—his most common kind of [action]. So, eight being said and eleven being

mentioned, indicates that three *rakʿah* is was being what's going on there—that's one way of looking at it.

This one here also:

وَيُوتِرُ بِوَاحِدَةٍ

Observing the *Witr* with a single one (*rakʿah*).

Also does not negate the fact that ʿĀʾishah is watching him do that, but in actual fact is doing a two and a one. So, it's still three *rakʿah* with a two and a one. If that makes sense. If you go through all the *ḥadīth* you will work it out. You're going to have to put the hard work in. You have to put the work in.

26. Chapter 21 Lesson 5: The Supererogatory Prayer

ويقنت فيها بَعْدَ الرُّكُوعِ ويقول

One performs the *qunūt* after the *rukūʿ* saying:

That is where we stopped. We already spoke about the fact that the *duʿāʾ* itself should be alternated between before the *rukūʿ* and after the *rukūʿ*. All matters done there.

Now it is bam! Straight into the *duʿāʾ*—whether you say it before or after, obviously more towards after *rukūʿ* in general. But there are some interesting things I am going to show you as well in this lesson. But mostly like you all know or should know by now, only the Ḥanafi school really insists on doing it before the *rukūʿ*. Of course, the vast majority of scholars and Companions and *ṣaḥābah* their majority of the time was after it. However, we need to make sure that we keep it before. We want to do before the *rukūʿ* is something which is acceptable as well.

ويَقْنُتُ فيها بعدَ الركوعِ ويَقولُ:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ، إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ.

اللهمُّ إِني أَعوذُ برِضاكَ مِن سَخَطِكَ، وبعَفْوِك من عُقُوبَتِك، وبِكَ مِنْك، لا نُحْصِي ثناءً عليك أَنْتَ كما أَثْنَيْتَ على نَفْسِك.

اللهمَّ صلِّ على مُحَمَّدٍ وعلى آلِ مُحمَّدٍ.

We are only going to do a little bit of that today.

The translation of what we are going to be covering part of today:

One performs the *qunūt* after the *rukūʿ* saying:

"O Allāh, guide me along with those whom You have guided, pardon me along with those whom You have pardoned, be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to and bless for me that which You have bestowed. Protect me from the evil You have decreed for verily You decree and none can decree over You. For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty. O our Lord, Blessed and Exalted are You."

"O Allāh, I take refuge within Your pleasure from Your displeasure and within Your pardon from Your punishment, and I take refuge in You from You. We cannot enumerate Your praise. You are as You have praised Yourself."

"O Allāh, send salutations upon Muḥammad and the family of Muḥammad."

(0:14:00) One of the things the Arabs don't have, they just don't have, is the classic Pak *qunūt duʿāʾ* of *Witr*. Now, if you are a Pak if you don't know:

اللّهُمَّ إنّا نَسْتَعِينُك و نَسْتَغْفِرُك و نَسْتَهْدِك...

If you don't know that one, then you are not a Pak. You're a fake. It's as simple as that. In actual fact, when most people start practicing and they see all these people around them all following the other *madhāhib*, or Arabs, or the Paks who are studying or whatever, and they start hearing them say this:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ...

They are like, '*What is that?*' For them, it's foreign because they only know the original Desi OG *duʿāʾ*. That's how we are brought up. We are going to show this *duʿāʾ* some love because our shaykh (Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn) is going to show it some love. He is going to show it lots of love.

So, I told you last week if you guys didn't know that the Prophet ﷺ himself has never been narrated as saying:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ، إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ.

Number one.

Number two: However, it is the single most authentic *duʿāʾ* for *qunūt* and he taught it to the Companions and al-Ḥasan ﷺ specifically.[1,2,3]

Let's go through this *duʿāʾ*. There are a number of versions of this *duʿāʾ*. I am going to put down this one:

للّهُمِّ إنَّا نَسْتَعِينُك وَنُؤْمِنُ بِكَ وَنَتَوَكّلُ عَلَيْك وَنُثْنِي عَلَيْك الْخَيْرَ، وَلاَ نَكْفُرُك

اللّهُمِّ إيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَلَك نُصَلِّي وَنَسْجُدُ وَإِلَيْك نَسْعَى وَنَحْفِدُ نَرْجُو رَحْمَتَكَ وَنَخْشَى عَذَابَك إنّ عَذَابَك الْجِدَّ بِالْكَافِرِينَ مُلْحِقٌ

I put this because this is one of the narrations. This is the narration which is narrated by Ibn Abi Shaybah[4] or the one by ʿAbdʾl-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿāni in his *muṣannaf*.[5] I just want you to have a look at that because some of you will recognise it. I don't even think it is major amongst the Aḥnāf in Syria or Shām. I think this is more an Indian thing. By the way it is authentic, but culture plays a very important role in these things as well as *fiqh* and *madh-hab* and so on.

(0:20:00) Does the *Fortress of the Muslim* have it?

لَّلهُمَّ إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ، وَلَكَ نُصَلِّي وَنَسْجُدُ، وَإِلَيْكَ نَسْعَى وَنَحْفِدُ، نَرْجُو رَحْمَتَكَ، وَنَخَافُ عَذَابَكَ، إِنَّ عَذَابَكَ بِالْكَافِرِينَ مُلْحَقٌ، اللَّهُمَّ إِنَّا نَسْتَعِينُكَ، وَنَسْتَهْدِيكَ، وَنُثْنِي عَلَيْكَ الْخَيْرَ كُلَّهُ، وَنَشْكُرُكَ وَلا نَكْفُرُكَ وَنُؤْمِنُ بِكَ، وَنَخْلَعُ وَنَتْرُكُ مَنْ يَفْجُرُكَ

Here is what I want to show you. In *Ḥiṣnʾl-Muslim*, he (Farīd, the translator of this) gives it the reference (he has only copied Shaykh Saʿīd the author of *Ḥiṣnʾl-Muslim*), he puts here that the narration is collected by Imām al-Bayhaqi in *al-Sunan al-Kubrah* who graded its chain as authentic. But Shayk al-Albāni in his version of it said that it has an authentic chain as a statement of ʿUmar ﷺ.

---

[1] *Imām al-Ḥākim, 3/172.*
[2] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 1/199.*
[3] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on al- Witr, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the Qunūt in al-Witr, ḥadīth no. 464.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*
[4] *Muṣannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah, 2/315.*
[5] *Muṣannaf ʿAbd'l-Razzāq, no. 4969.*

Now I have a couple of problems with this. The first is that this particular version that he has mentioned is not the one in *Sunan Imām al-Bayhaqi*. That is just the first observation to make. After I make that observation, I want you to know that this *duʿāʾ* has been narrated—in my opinion—in maybe twenty or thirty different ways. Different wordings. You saw *biʾl-kāfirīn* and then in others, the most famous one is *biʾl-kuffāri*—it is the one that the Paks memorise, you don't memorise *biʾl-kāfirīn*.[6] And the wording of *Allāhumma inna nastaʿīnuk* and we always include *wa nastahdīk*,[7] but you'll find virtually every single narration of this *duʿāʾ* without the wording of *nastahdīk*. It took me ages to find the single version and I found it as 4978 in the *Muṣannaf of ʿAbdʾl-Razzāq*. I had to look in the *Muṣannaf of ʿAbdʾl-Razzāq* to find it. ʿAbdʾl-Razzāq said that it was told to him from Ḥasan, from Ḥabīb, from ʿAbdʾl-Raḥmān ibn al-Aswad al-Kāhili that ʿAli ﷺ:

كَانَ يَقْنُتُ بِهَاتَين السُورَتَين فِي الفَجْرِغَيرَ أَنَّه يُقَدِّمُ الاخِرَةِ ويَقُولُ: اللهمَّ إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ

Now this is very important. This lesson is going to go deep and it is about time we had a deep lesson. I am going to write down for you the *duʿāʾ* of ʿAli ﷺ in *Muṣannaf ʿAbdʾl-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿāni*, number 4978.

لَلَّهُمَّ إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ، وَلَكَ نُصَلِّي وَنَسْجُدُ، وَإِلَيْكَ نَسْعَى وَنَحْفِدُ، نَرْجُو رَحْمَتَكَ، وَنَخَافُ عَذَابَكَ، إِنَّ عَذَابَكَ بِالْكَافِرِينَ مُلْحَقٌ، اللَّهُمَّ إِنَّا نَسْتَعِينُكَ، وَنَسْتَهْدِيكَ، وَنُثْنِي عَلَيْكَ الْخَيْرَ كُلَّهُ، وَنَشْكُرُكَ وَلا نَكْفُرُكَ وَنُؤْمِنُ بِكَ، وَنَخْلَعُ وَنَتْرُكُ مَنْ يَفْجُرُكَ

By the way, this section right here is all about the *qunūt*. You have 10-15 different versions of the same *duʿāʾ*, but they have differences. Obviously, these differences are minor. Like *kuffār* for *kāfirīn* has exactly the same meaning just two different words. They both mean the *kuffār*. Not having *nastahdīk* is a slightly big issue. But it has been authenticated as an addition, it's just not very, very common. So, swapping words that mean the same *kāfirīn*, *kuffār*—no issue. Swapping order, no issue. So, for example *Allāhumma inna nastaʿīnuka wa nastaghfiruka wa nastahdīk*, versus *Allāhumma inna nastaʿīnuka wa nastahdīk wa nastaghfiruk wa nasjudu lak* and changing the slight order of things—no major.

We know and we have covered before in the issue of *duʿāʾ* this is flexible, let alone when it is authentically narrated with flexibility.

---

[6] *Sunan al-Bayhaqi, 2/211.*
[7] *Muṣannaf ʿAbdʾl-Razzāq, no. 4978.*

Student (online): I have heard '*mulḥiq*' as well as '*mulḥaq*'.

Ustādh: As he mentions, what about:

إِنّ عَذَابَك الْجِدَّ بِالْكُفَّرِ مُلْحِقٌ

Mulḥiq and *mulḥaq*. I think that as Paks all of us learnt it with *mulḥiq*. I am pretty positive that a Pak never said anything other than *mulḥiq.* Or is it the other way round? I know all of you will agree, I can't remember which one it is. Can you guys confirm whether as a Pak it was *mulḥaq* or *mulḥiq*? I am pretty sure that it's *mulḥiq.* That is what my kiddy memory tells me. It's *mulḥiq*.

Now this is different. This is not necessarily too different. This is not flexibility per se. There are some scholars that said it is intentionally narrated with both as two separate narrations. You can use either, use both, because they have two separate meanings. And I'm going to come to that when I explain the meaning of this.

What I am trying to say is that when you collect all of these narrations together, it is acceptable to be able to say the final version with words here and there in different order.

Now that is different order in the sentences. Now if you go back to my original post, I put two separate sentences.

اللّهُمِّ إِنَّا نَسْتَعِينُك وَنُؤْمِنُ بِكَ وَنَتَوَكّلُ عَلَيْك وَنُثْنِي عَلَيْك الْخَيْرَ ، وَلاَ نَكْفُرُك

اللّهُمِّ إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَلَك نُصَلِّي وَنَسْجُدُ وَإِلَيْك نَسْعَى وَنَحْفِدُ نَرْجُو رَحْمَتَكَ وَنَخْشَى عَذَابَك إِنّ عَذَابَك الْجِدَّ بِالْكَافِرِينَ مُلْحِقٌ

These two separate sentences or two separate *duʿāʾ* I should say, if you do it according to the *Sunnah* or you do it according to the ways of the *Salaf*, it makes it easier.

I want you to imagine that they are two *sūrahs*. The first one which I put up:

اللّهُمِّ إِنَّا نَسْتَعِينُك وَنُؤْمِنُ بِكَ وَنَتَوَكّلُ عَلَيْك وَنُثْنِي عَلَيْك الْخَيْرَ ، وَلاَ نَكْفُرُك

I want you to consider this to be a *sūrah* and we are going to call it *Sūrat al-Khalʿ*—*wa nakhlaʿu,* i.e., *man yakfuruk*. This comes from *khalʿ*. I will explain this in a second.

So, if we look at that first:

اللّهُمَّ إنَّا نَسْتَعِينُك وَنُؤْمِنُ بِكَ وَنَتَوَكَّلُ عَلَيْك وَنُثْنِي عَلَيْك الْخَيْرَ، وَلاَ نَكْفُرُك

You will see that this is not the version that the Paks know because it doesn't have what we used to say:

وَنَخْلَعُ مَنْ يَكفُرُكَ

This is what we used to say. And you will find that particular version in the books of *ḥadīth* and *athār*. I am going to come to its history in a second.

So, just to make it clear because of this unique word because we do not have many if any… obviously I am not a *muḥaddith* of any magnitude, but I don't know of the word *khalʿ* which means to remove. *Nakhlaʿ* like when we say *subḥānak* we are saying: '*You are removed yā Allāh, You are so high and exalted yā Allāh from their stupidity*.' We have spoken about that.† *Subḥān* means to swim away, to go away from the shore: '*Yā* Allāh, *You are removed, You are all mighty and exalted, and high and transcendent above what they claim*.' That is *subḥān*.

(0:30:00) *Nakhlaʿ* is almost the same. We are removing, and we avoid, and we purify You from the ignorance and the stupidity of the people who do *kufr* with You, and associate with You, and so and so forth. Because it is not used in many places, hardly any… I don't know any at all, but obviously that does not mean anything it is probably used somewhere. And its presence in this *duʿāʾ* in an authentic version, it was actually called *Sūrat al-Khalʿ*—the *Sūrah* of *Khalʿ*.

As for the second portion:

للّهُمَّ إيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَلَك نُصَلِّي وَنَسْجُدُ وَإِلَيْك نَسْعَى وَنَحْفِدُ نَرْجُو رَحْمَتَكَ وَنَخْشَى عَذَابَك إنَّ عَذَابَك الْجِدَّ بِالْكَافِرِينَ مُلْحِق

† The meaning of *subḥān* was discussed in the explanation of *duʿāʾ al-istiftāḥ* in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 15. MT

This portion which always in our Pak version of the *duʿāʾ* was the second part, this is called *Sūrat al-Ḥafd*. And its name *ḥafd* comes from:

وَإِلَيْك نَسْعَى وَنَحْفِدُ

Again, this verb, *naḥfid*, is very rare. Again, I don't know of it in another *duʿāʾ*, there must be, but my knowledge is limited.

Ḥafd means to like act quickly, very quickly. You know the *ḥafadah* is like your family, but your young family and it also means like a servant. The *ḥafīd* is a servant, who are so clocked in—in servitude—like your servant, your butler, your main guy, they act on autopilot. You don't have to move, and your glass is there because they know that you want your glass there. Everything is happening super quick. It is on auto. You don't even notice them because they are seamless.

So, *wa naḥfid* means that we act superfast. We hasten to Allāh ﷻ. We hasten to good deeds, we hasten to *istighfār*, we hasten to *tawbah* like a servant would. That is the best way. Anyway, this phrase and this concept is not narrated elsewhere in the *Sunnah* and that is why it is dominant, it is chosen. You understand the concept that when you name like *Sūrat al-Baqarah*, there are so many stories in [*Sūrat al-*] *Baqarah,* but we chose the cow one because actually the story of all of the other prophets, and the story of Adam, and the story of the *malāʾikah,* and the story of creation, and *Jannah*, and *Nār* etc. is repeated. But the cow itself and what happened, that is pretty unique. Now, it doesn't have to be 'it can't be repeated again', but something dominant. [*Sūrat*] *Āli ʿImrān* of course, the *sūrah* is full of stuff, but that family is very dominant in that *sūrah.* When it comes to naming, normally you pick someone who is dominant, something which is dominant. And of course, I remind you all that the naming of *sūrahs* is not *tawqīfi*. It is not from Allāh ﷻ or the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ.

Student (online): Like calling *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ Sūrat al-Ṣamad*.

Ustādh: Exactly.

So now that you understand why they have these two names, I am going to go even further. This is not a *ḥadīth*. Even though all our lives as Paks we have been saying:

اللّهُمَّ إِنَّا نَسْتَعِينُك ونَستَغْفِرُك وَنَسْتَهْدِيكَ وَنُؤْمِنُ بِكَ وَنَتَوَكَّلُ عَلَيْك وَنُثْنِي عَلَيْك الْخَيْرَ كُلَّهُ...

When I started practicing, I started adding more phrases that took me away from the Pak one which made me forget the Pak one. That's what happens. As soon as you start

practicing you find that this is authentic, you know how it happens, when you start practicing you start studying, your immediate thing, which is the biggest mistake of course ever, is to completely throw the baby out with the bath water. Everything that your parents taught you must be rubbish, everything must be wrong, they are misguided, they don't know, their village… This is the *jahl* of young people when they start practicing. I was very fortunate that in my first year when I did that dump, you know get rid of all of the way that I prayed, the way that I believe, the way that I make *duʿāʾ*, the way that I call upon the Prophet ﷺ you know from my kind of Barelvi background and everything that I picked up, '*Let me get rid of everything*.' But I was in touch with teachers very quickly that didn't leave me to my own devices. And I was very humble, meaning I didn't go up against them. And I was early able to see that '*Oh! Hold on! That is authentic what I have learned. That is right what my parents told me, but they just made a few mistakes here and there*.'

Like *Sūrat Yāsīn* is the best example. Every Pak learns *Sūrat Yāsīn* as a child. And it is a disaster. The *tajwīd* is up and down, pronunciation is wrong, *makhārij* are wrong, you have eaten and chewed up all the words because that is what your parents understood, or the *moulvi* understood—Pak *moulvis* who weren't qualified themselves. Then you start practicing and you learn it again and it is a disaster because it is having to learn the whole *sūrah* again because it is so messed up. It is so mutated, the one that you have memorised, it is not one that actually you memorised by meaning or by even words or letters. You have only memorised it as a string. You have to start and if you stop at any moment you have to start again from the beginning because you have no idea what you are reciting. It is a tone. It is a musical string. That's what it is. You get interrupted, it's game over. That is not how you are meant to memorise anything. You are meant to memorise everything by words, by meaning. You are not meant to be, '*Oh no! I have no idea what the next word is at all. I have to go back to the beginning of the page to create the whole sound again*.'

Student (online): The hardest thing is correcting a *sūrah* you have memorised incorrectly.

Ustādh: I found that a lot. I found memorising the Qurʾān to be so difficult if I knew the *sūrah* from before. I had to try to get it out of my head entirely because it was so difficult to relearn.

So, this is a reminder. Obviously *Protect this House* has just been launched as well by AlMaghrib for those who have not taken it. And in that we discuss the rights of our parents and how much of *ẓulm* we did towards them because even though they made many mistakes when it comes to educating us, it didn't mean that everything that they taught us was wrong.

So, this *duʿāʾ* was never actually stated by the Prophet ﷺ. That's amazing. Which now goes to show that we do not have any actual *ḥadīth* from the Prophet ﷺ to say in *qunūt,* that he himself ﷺ said, that we know; other than what we feel quite comfortable using in Ramadan or at the end of Ramadan when it is cursing the *kuffār* and the Quraysh and

so on.[8] That is very clearly narrated from him ﷺ. But there has to be context to that. So that is why the *qunūt'l-Nāzilah* is something very well established from the Prophet ﷺ whereas *qunūt'l-Witr* not so. It is all from the Companions and this is most authentically narrated from only as a narration of ʿUmar ؓ. So, this is *ṣaḥīḥ* as an *athar* only—as a narration of ʿUmar ؓ only. Yes, it is narrated from other Companions as well, but it is the chief narration of ʿUmar ؓ.

To make it even more interesting, there are a number of narrations in the *Muṣannaf ʿAbd'l-Razzāq al-Sanʿāni* and [the *Muṣannaf of*] *Ibn Abi Shaybah* who collect most of these kinds of narrations. They tell us a very interesting side story behind this. They tell us that this, according to some, was originally part of the Qur'ān and it was abrogated. Now, that is something not new, and especially when ʿUmar ؓ is involved, then we know that there are a number of things that he has been connected to—whether it is verses, whether it is *aḥkām* (rulings) such as breastfeeding, ten to five for example when you want to nurse a child, whether it comes to *zina,* various things when you study in *ʿulūm'l-Qur'ān.*

(0:40:00) When you study abrogation, and the different types, etc. I think we did it here as well in LP when we went through the different types of abrogation. I also discussed it in in *Fitnah* (the *tafsīr* of *Sūrat Āli ʿImrān*) where I discussed that there are certain types of abrogation where both the ruling is taken out and the recitation is taken out, or sometimes when the ruling is taken out, but the recitation is left in. Or sometimes when the recitation is taken out, but the ruling is left in. So, this is not a problem for us to have this kind of concept. However, I just want to say that the correct opinion, and Allāh ﷻ knows best, is that this was never a part of the Qur'ān.

Student (online): We did a whole lesson on it. It was a special lesson and the lesson after, you had to go back. I personally found it very interesting and eye opening, and yes, people are not ready—sadly.

Ustādh: Yes, good memory! Well done! We did speak about it, not in a lot of detail in fairness, but we spoke about the *muṣḥaf* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ؓ and, definitely covered it in *Fitnah*. It got all messy and people were not happy, and all the rest of it.

I want you to know that in the *muṣḥaf*, according to the majority of scholars, and this again shows that people are not ready for this knowledge. They have one narrative that they have learnt, and because the major scholars stick to it, they do not think that there are any other side narratives. In fairness, maturity of audience is important, and when there is little *fā'idah* then I do not think that people need to go into it.

What I want to say is this: I believe that the correct position is that this was not actually part of the agreed upon *muṣḥaf.* And when it is not part of the agreed upon *muṣḥaf* (when I say agreed upon, I mean the *muṣḥaf* of ʿUthmān), then we do not say, technically, that this is an abrogated verse. I hope that you understand that. Some of

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, hadīth no. 797*.

the major Companions had their own *muṣāḥif*, meaning that they would obviously memorise as the primary source of retaining the Qurʾān from the mouth of the Prophet ﷺ. Some of them never heard the Prophet ﷺ recite the whole Qurʾān because that is just normal.

I will give you an example. I have pretty much heard all of the Qurʾān recited by Shaykh Abdul Ghaffar. That is a very unique thing when you think about it. It is a madness. Now, imagine that this was the time of the *Sunnah*—role playing here, him as the Prophet ﷺ and me as the Companion not knowing any Qurʾān and then listening to him. The reason I can say that is because he has led us in this *masjid,* when I brought him here, about 10-12 years ago? And from the beginning we agreed, we did it to make sure we could increase the Qurʾānic literacy. I said, "I do not want you to do some lazy *bakwās*. I am bringing you here on the condition that you really push these people." So, we do *khatm*. Now, I know that this is very close to *bidʿah*. Let me make it clear, I am very sympathetic to that opinion. And I have to say that I have put my neck on the line, and I have tried to justify it from the benefits that it brings without also saying that we are doing it very strictly and we do not make it a religious thing, and we do not do it accurately. But in general, we do a *khatm*, meaning that Shaykh Abdul Ghaffar will recite the whole Qurʾān in all the prayers (the loud prayers only) every six months. And I have been here all this time and I have heard him do, I don't know how many *khatms*. Now, that would need you to be in the *ṣalāh* like every single day, super regular. Now, al*ḥamdulillāh* the *masjid* is close, and we love going there so that has been easy for us.

But if a person did not do that, like ʿUmar ؓ who, as we know from *Bukhāri*, we have the *ḥadīth* right at the beginning of *Kitāb al-ʿIlm* in the Chapter of Knowledge, that he used to live outside of Madīnah, wasn't let alone able to hear the recitation of the Prophet ﷺ, he wasn't even able to be in the lessons.[9] And he had that deal with his neighbor that, '*Listen! You go today, you go learn and come back and tell me what you have learnt. Then I will memorise it and I am going to go, and I will learn. Then when I come back, I will tell you what I learnt, and you will memorise it. And basically, we are going to keep having this partnership system*.' That is what he had.

Despite that, there are two observations that I would make. Despite this fractured approach, he became the most knowledgeable and the greatest of the Companions, the leader of the Companions after Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddīq ؓ, which is insane. Allāh ﷻ confirms his opinion in the Qurʾān. Allāh ﷻ confirms his opinion over the Prophet ﷺ. Allāh ﷻ supports ʿUmar ؓ in ways that will blow your mind. So, that's interesting, despite a fractured approach. At the same time, he definitely missed information. The famous attack on Abu Hurayrah ؓ. ʿUmar ؓ definitely went after Abu Hurayrah ؓ [saying], "I have never heard that before. Where did you hear that?" And Abu Hurayrah ؓ became angry, and rightfully so. He replies, "Woah! Some people are chasing the *dunya* and some mans are following at the foot of the Prophet ﷺ," meaning that obviously he was very poor. He used to live with the Prophet ﷺ. I want you to know that if you are not

[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Knowledge, Chapter: To Fix the Duties in Rotation for Learning (Religious) Knowledge, ḥadīth no. 89*.

there, you do not hear everything. And that's okay. And that is why we have so much difference of opinion amongst the *ṣaḥābah*. That is one of the main reasons. Not everybody can be there all the time.

ʿĀʾishah, we know what her strengths are. We also know her weaknesses as well. She is not like some of the elderly wives of the Prophet ﷺ. So, she is much more knowledgeable in that sense because normally the elderly wives are remaining at home. So, they are not going out. They are not seeing the day to day which the other Companions are. So, we restrict them to what they are doing, what they are seeing at nighttime, at home etc. ʿĀʾishah is different. She was young, so she would go out on a lot of units and battles. She was young and fit, *Ḥajj*, this, that, whatever. She is out and about. But still, she is not there all the time.

Anas ﷺ, hardly anybody can compare to. Anas ﷺ is like madness, because he is inside the house, outside the house, serving him ﷺ, he is growing up, he is a young kid, so he is milling around the wives as well. Madness. Madness. Just a whole different next level of madness. ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbbās ﷺ, likewise. Very young and obviously family as well but not *maḥram* close, but young. So, he is around the house as well. He has a relative who is married to the Prophet ﷺ, so he gets in. Then you have got the other Companions, the major players, who are with him ﷺ but not in the home zone.

So, ʿUmar ﷺ has a lot of portions that he is going to miss out on. He is going to miss out on day portions. He is going to miss out on night portions. So, his knowledge is deficient in certain areas, and he openly asks. You will see so many narrations ʿUmar ﷺ asking other Companions. So many times, he takes *fatwa* from ʿAli ﷺ, for example, or asking the opinions of others and taking it. He might say something of anger, and he might get put in his place, but he never took it personally. He knows his limits. And at the same time, just for the little that he was there for, he took to a whole different level, which is amazing.

That is important. As students of knowledge, you need to understand the foundations here.

ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﷺ is no different. ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﷺ not having contact all the time. ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﷺ has a unique approach, like some of the other Companions in which, while he is memorising the Qurʾān—and he memorised a lot of the Qurʾān from the Prophet ﷺ, in fact, he is right at the top of them along with Ubay ibn Kaʿb, along with Sālim mawla, Abu Hudhayfah, along with Zayd ibn Thābit ﷺ for example. These are big heavy ones on the Qurʾān, and even they would check with some Companions for the ending of a *sūrah*, the beginning of another *sūrah*, an *ayah* missed out there, a bit of order here, '*I have it in chronological order but what about the revealed order?*' '*I was there when this happened. But what about the final muṣḥaf in which the Prophet ﷺ recited from beginning to end, in Qurʾān order, in Ramadan?*' for example.[10]

[10] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of Fasting, Chapter: The Fast of the Prophet ﷺ, hadīth no.2348*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

(0:50:00) So, if you start to develop the correct narrative, the authentic one, that some Companions had their own *maṣāḥif* to keep a note of things, in addition to strengthen their memory, then we start to get involved in the potential controversial and difficult area of when they started writing notes. We have *ḥadīth* where the Prophet ﷺ prohibited the writing of *ḥadīth* and writing in the *muṣḥaf*.[11] And when you read these without any context [you think], '*What do you mean? How is that possible?*'

Of course, people are missing the fact that these prohibitions were about writing things down and in the same manner, and with the same lack of gravitas as the rest of your writing, allowing it to then get mixed up with your own notes and your own writing and then people becoming misguided therefore. So, some of the Companions took that very, very strictly and didn't do it. Others understood this prohibition as it is general for the basic people, similar to the *ḥadīth* of the two groups that were told to not pray *ṣalāt al-ʿAṣr* until they get to the city.[12] Some understood that as: '*That's not actually a prohibition of not praying but he ﷺ wants us to get there quickly. So, let's actually pray, and then we'll shoot.*' Others took it literally and said: '*No. We are going to shoot there and then we are going to pray over there because that's what he ﷺ said. We are not messing around with it.*' So, just like that, the Companions differed on the meaning of "don't write it down", that it means: (1) don't write it down at all, end of, or (2) some said: '*Actually, no. When he ﷺ says, "Don't write it down," it means, don't you dare mix it up. Do not get confused.*'

Now, with ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ؓ, we know that his *muṣḥaf* had certain things that were added, and some things that were taken out. There are a number of narrations—we are not going to go into that because that is already a problem.

Student (online): My Qurʾān teacher tells us not to write in our *muṣḥaf*.

Ustādh: I just want you to know that in our time, when your Qurʾān teacher is telling you that, it is not at all to do with the reason that it was from the *Sunnah*. Now, when you are told not to write in your *muṣḥaf,* it is purely because of *adab*, because of disfiguring the words, because it is the *kalām* of Allāh ﷻ. It is purely out of respect and so on. Actually, maybe that is not even right because in fairness to the Qurʾān teachers, also maybe what they are trying to say is that sometimes on a *fatḥah* or a *kasrah,* you might deface it, and it looks like a *ḍammah* for example. Then people that would be reading it that are only reading in your *muṣḥaf* might be misguided. Actually, in fairness, maybe they have still got the original *ʿillah* going as well. I want you to know that in the original *ʿillah* it was not about respect per se. It was about confusion. And that's why we have these differences.

---

[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Zuhd and Softening of Hearts, Chapter: Verification of Ḥadīth and the Ruling on Writing Down Knowledge, ḥadīth no. 3004.*
[12] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Military Expeditions Led by the Prophet ﷺ, Chapter: The Return of the Prophet ﷺ From Aḥzāb and His Going Out to Bani Qurayẓah, ḥadīth no. 4119.*

You know that for example as is narrated that [*Sūrat al-Falaq*] and [*Sūrat al-Nās*] are not from the Qurʾān, but rather they are *duʿāʾ*, for example. This was only held by some of the Companions who hadn't heard it recited and… I have to laugh here because if I said to you people didn't think it was from the Qurʾān, you would say, '*That's insane! How can nobody hear [Sūrat al-Falaq] and [Sūrat al-Nās]?*'

And that's because in our time that's the only *sūrahs* people recite in their *ṣalāh* because they're lazy Pakis basically and they just want to get it over and done with. In the *ṣalāh*, in the *Sunnah*, they're not regularly recited by the way. I mean I struggle to think of a… I have the worst memory in the world, so I hope someone corrects me. But I think that the most narrations *Sūrat al-Falaq* and *Sūrat al-Nās*, is probably some of the weaker narrations…

Student (online): I have come across a narration that the Prophet ﷺ did recite *Sūrat al-Falaq* and *Sūrat al-Nās* in the *sunnah* of *Fajr* whilst travelling.

Ustādh: I don't know about *Fajr sunnah*. I don't know of a *ḥadīth* that says that.

But anyway, is the *Witr* prayer.[13,14] As far as I know, those narrations are either weak or not amazingly strong.

So, you recite [*Sūrat al-Aʿlā*], [*Sūrat al-Kāfirūn*] and in the third one [*Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*], [*Sūrat al-Falaq*], and [*Sūrat al-Nās*]. Or you do first *rakʿah* [*Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*], second *rakʿah* [*Sūrat al-Falaq*] and then that last one [*Sūrat al-Nās*]. I think nearly all of these—I think—are not very strong.

So, I want you to imagine that you're not hearing that very regularly in the *ṣalāh*, you're hearing the rest of the Qurʾān. You're hearing the Prophet ﷺ. He's ﷺ smashing it. You're not hearing the same old thing people just taking cheap shot out just [*Sūrat al-Falaq*], etc. like what people do, which is a lesson to all of us.

And by the way, I just want to say that a lot of people are making the point about no writing in the Qurʾān. I think it's okay to do that. But I also believe that there should be a study Qurʾān and a recitation one. I've got a *muṣḥaf* that I've been writing notes in for 25 years. It was my first *muṣḥaf* that had a translation with it, and I started the learning of my Arabic with that. So, I think that's fine. Like I said, the big issue was writing over the Arabic and playing around. Now I know that when you're memorising you often are told by a teacher to circle the world you keep getting wrong so that you keep looking at it, or underline it, because you often get stuck on a particular word and mispronounce it. That's all fine.

---

[13] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions about Witr, Chapter: What Should Be Recited in Witr, hadīth no. 1424.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.
[14] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on al-Witr, Chapter: What Has Been Related [About] What is Recited During al-Witr, ḥadīth no. 463.* This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*

Anyway, so the Prophet ﷺ calls it the *al-Muʿawwidhatayn* and in some narrations *al-Muʿawwadhatayn* and that would basically indicate *Muʿawwidhah* and *Muʿawwadhah* meaning these are the two *sūrahs* that you use to seek refuge with Allāh ﷻ and these are the two *sūrahs* that you seek refuge with Allāh ﷻ in—you seek refuge within them, for protection.[15]

So, when you're seeing that and *ḥadīth* like that, ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ؓ, you can see that his mind is going to… It's completely understandable that this is more in your mind as a *duʿāʾ* when you're not really hearing it so much in the Qurʾān. So, I'm just giving you the example that there are in the individual Companions within their notes, if you go deep into this subject, you will find certain notes which were either making the Qurʾān not be part of the Qurʾān or that which is not from the Qurʾān to be part of the Qurʾān.

That doesn't worry us and concern us.

Why?

Because that's why the Companions said: '*Listen! We've got too many different people doing their own little thing. Let's just get the big boys together, recite it all out, and write it all down and what's agreed upon by the Companions is agreed upon.*' That's what happened and then that's what we got from the ʿUthmāni *muṣḥaf*—keeping the narrative nice and simple.

However, saying all that, in the *muṣḥaf* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ؓ these were two *sūrahs*:

اللَّهُمَّ إِنَّا نَسْتَعِينُك وَنَسْتَغْفِرُكَ وَنُؤْمِنُ بِكَ وَنَتَوَكَّلُ عَلَيْك وَنُثْنِي عَلَيْك الْخَيْرَ

And this was *Sūrat al-Khalʿ*.

And:

اللَّهُمَّ إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَلَك نُصَلِّي وَنَسْجُدُ وَإِلَيْك نَسْعَى وَنَحْفِدُ

This was known as *Sūrat al-Ḥafd*.

[15] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: The Virtue of Reciting al-Muʿawwidhatayn (the Two Ṣūrahs Seeking Refuge with Allāh ﷻ), ḥadīth no. 814 b.*

These two *sūrahs* were part of the *muṣḥaf* of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﷺ according to some scholars, according to some narrations which are authentic. And I'm okay with that.

And now add to it that one of the reasons ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ﷺ felt comfortable with that is because ʿUmar ﷺ used to recite these two in his *qunūt*. This was his *duʿāʾ*. And most of the narrations that you find is that they were recited in the *Fajr* prayer. In some *ḥadīth* it is mentioned that he recited it before the *rakʿah* and in others very clearly after *rakʿah*. And in each group of narrations (the group of narrations that say before *rakʿah* and after *rakʿah*) you will find that it will say he used to make *qunūt biʾl-sūratayn*, with the two *sūrahs*. So, it became widely known as the 'two *sūrahs*'. And when someone would say he is making *qunūt* with the two *sūrah*s it means:

اللَّهمَّ إِنَّا نَستعينُكَ . . .

And:

اللَّهمَّ إياك نعبدُ، ولك نُصلِّي ونسجدُ . . .

(1:00:00) These are the two *sūrah*s being referred to: *al-Khalʿ waʾl-Ḥafd*. And even in the group of narrations that say that he used to make this *duʿāʾ* after the *rukūʿ*, they were also called: "He ﷺ used to make the *qunūt* with the two *sūrahs*."

That is a bit difficult to understand. But imagine that you are seeing someone who at the end of *Fātiḥah* is now making *qunūt* with a *duʿāʾ* which is being said at the *sūrah* time that has got a *sūrah* name and has been treated at the end of the *Fātiḥah* like what you recite from the Qurʾān. So, you can see that the narrative to include it in your '*muṣḥaf*' is not something which is odd or weird or random or whatever.

I have a narration here that Ṭāwūs authentically said that he heard Ibn ʿAbbās ﷺ say that ʿUmar ﷺ made *qunūt* with these two *sūrah*s before the *rukūʿ*. That is narrated by ʿAbdʾl-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿāni, Volume 3/114. It is narrated by Ibn ʿAbbās ﷺ in is his *musnad*. And it is also narrated by Imām al-Ṭabri as well.

We have another narration from Maʿbad ibn Sīrin—one of *Salaf*, one of the *Tābiʿīn*: "I prayed behind ʿUmar ﷺ the *Fajr* prayer and he made *qunūt* with these two *sūrah*s after the *rukūʿ*."

So, you see authentic narrations that call it *sūratayn,* consider it to be from the Qurʾān—after, after.

Let me make it clear there is an absolute consensus that this is not from the Qurʾān. I'll make that very clear. But that is me giving you the end consequence. As the build up to it, it is very possible that it was abrogated. It is very possible that it was never ever even part of it and this was ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd's ﷺ own *ijtihād*, mistake, understanding. Names were given—certainly not by the Prophet ﷺ—and maybe it is possible they got mixed up that he did use it before the *rukūʿ* or after the *rukūʿ*. They could get mixed up. Or we assume: No, he did sometimes before, he did it sometimes afterwards and because it happened before they applied the name to it.

Like I said in the beginning, when a word is so unique, they are not hearing it in any *sūrah* and any *duʿāʾ,* in anything, you give it a name and then like Chinese whispers it can develop. I do not know. I do not want to keep going like that because then we create too many questions. But my point is that it is so interesting. And it is important for students of knowledge to understand the background behind what is going on, there is a massive world out there. So, I just want to say that the Arabs they really dropped the ball on this one. Paks were onto this bad boy, like we were on the *sunnah* of ʿUmar ﷺ, shout out to the Paks it is the only time it is going to happen. Arabs, you missed out on your entire lives from this *duʿāʾ*. Can you imagine? Oh my God.

Student (online): Which Companion prayed behind ʿUmar ﷺ?

Ustādh: No. It wasn't a Companion. Ibn ʿAbbās ﷺ narrated directly, so obviously he must have prayed behind him because he said that he prayed. But the one that said "I prayed" was Maʿbad ibn Sīrīn, he is from the *Tābiʿīn*. Ibn ʿAbbās ﷺ himself has prayed.

قوله: «اللهم اهدني فيمن هديت» ظاهر كلامه: أنه لا يبدأُ بشيءٍ قبل هذا الدُّعاءِ

Shaykhs says that if you look at what our author says that the *duʿāʾ* for *Witr* or *duʿāʾ* of *qunūt* is *Allāhumma ihdini fīman hadayt*, it's almost like this is how it starts.

The reason Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that is because he evens adds at the end:

اللهمَّ صلِّ على مُحَمَّدٍ وعلى آلِ مُحمَّدٍ.

O Allāh, send salutations upon Muḥammad and the family of Muḥammad.

Which is the ending. So, he goes through a couple of *duʿāʾ*, a couple of *ḥadīth*, and then ends. When you say the *duʿāʾ* is *Allāhumma ihdini fīman hadayt*, then that is basically what he is saying is the beginning of the *duʿāʾ*.

And Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says: That is what it seems is apparent but is not necessarily what should happen. Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says what is more correct is that you actually start with this *duʻāʾ* and he now quotes:

اللَّهمَّ إِنَّا نَستعينُكَ، ونَستهديكَ، ونستغفِرُكَ، ونتوبُ إليكَ، ونؤمنُ بك، ونَتوكَّلُ عليك، ونُثْنِي عليكَ الخيرَ كُلَّه

I think when we were Paks we do not memorise the word *kulluh.*

ونَشْكُرُكَ ولا نَكْفُرُكَ. اللَّهمَّ إياك نعبدُ، ولك نُصلِّي ونسجدُ، وإليكَ نَسعَى ونَحْفِدُ، نَرجو رحمَتَكَ ونخشى عذابَكَ، إِنَّ عَذَابَكَ الجِدَّ بالكُفَّار مُلحِق

"Then you say," Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn is carrying on:

ثم يقول: «اللَّهمَّ اهدني فيمن هَدَيتَ» إلخ

Allāhumma ihdinī fīman hadayt until the end.

Then Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says that is actually what Imām Aḥmad himself preferred and stated and taught in his *madh-hab*. And the reason for that is because of the general principle that before you start asking you follow the *sunnah* of giving something first. So, we praise Allāh ﷻ first before we start asking.

هكذا قال الإمامُ أحمدُ رحمه الله؛ لأنه ثناءٌ على الله، والثناءُ مقدَّمٌ على الدُّعاءِ؛ لأنه فَتْحُ بابِ الدُّعاءِ.

That praising Allāh ﷻ is that which opens up the door to asking from Allāh ﷻ.

Now let us break this down because this is absolutely fascinating. I do not want to repeat this. If this is the first time you are hearing this, we spent a good one or two lessons going into the wisdom of this when we spoke about *duʻāʾ al- istiftāḥ* and the various different needs.‡

‡ *Duʻāʾ al-istiftāḥ* was covered in in *Logical Progression*, Year 7, Chapter 16, Lesson 15. MT

Just so that the guys are not getting confused, the narration of the ʿAbd'l-Razzāq has it that Ṭāwūs said that he heard Ibn ʿAbbās ﷺ. Correct.

Now let us just go through this *duʿāʾ*. First of all, for the version that I read, which is obviously different to the one that you guys know with a little bit there. That is the one which is narrated in the footnotes [in *Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ʿalā Zād al-Mustaqniʿ,* Volume 4, page 20, footnote 3] by Imām al- Bayhaqi (Volume 2, number 211). And actually, what is very interesting is in this particular version, in the version of al-Bayhaqi, look how the *ḥadīth* starts:

عن عبد الرحمن بن أبزى قال: «صليت خلف عمر بن الخطاب صلاة الصبح فسمعته يقول بعد القراءة قبل الركوع اللهم ... » وذكره.

It is narrated on the authority of ʿAbd'l-Raḥmān ibn Abzā, he said: "I prayed behind ʿUmar ﷺ in the *Fajr* prayer, and I heard him say after the recitation," meaning *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*, "but before *rukūʿ Allāhumma inna nastaʿīnuk*." So, even in the narration of al-Bayhaqi reference here. Obviously, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn has not got time to go into that. This is on page 20 of Volume 4 of *Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ,* right at the bottom.

Let me just quickly go through the meaning of this *duʿāʾ.*

And people are asking: Can you say *inni*?

Of course, you can. *Allāhumma inna* means when you are making a *duʿāʾ* for the congregation: O Allāh us.

So:

اللَّهمَّ إِنَّا نَستعينُكَ

"O Allāh, we seek your help." So, whether you say Allāhumma *inni nastaʿīnuk,* but it's better I think in my opinion to say *Allāhumma inna.* That is more grammatically correct.

ونَستهديكَ

"We seek Your guidance."

ونستغِفرُكَ

"We seek forgiveness from You."

ونتوبُ إليكَ

"We openly come back to You in repentance."

ونؤمنُ بك

"We believe fully in You."

ونَتوكَّلُ عليك

"And we place our faith and our trust in You alone."

ونُثْنِي عليكَ الخيرَ كُلَّه

"And we praise You with all the good that there possibly is."

ونَشْكُرُكَ

"And we are grateful to You."

ولا نَكْفُرُكَ

(1:10:00) "And we seek refuge from being ungrateful to You." We do not want to be ungrateful to You.

And in the ones that we used to learn when we were kids:

وَنَخْلَعُ وَنَتْرُكُ مَنْ يَفْجُرَكَ

Or:

وَنَخْلَعُ مَنْ يَكْفُرَكَ

If you look at the different versions in the *Muṣannaf* when you say:

وَنَخْلَعُ

And of course, this is built upon *khalʿ*. So, let's include that wording—which is not being quoted by Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn because it is not in the version of al-Bayhaqi.

وَنَخْلَعُ مَنْ يَكْفُرَكَ

Those people doing *kufr* on You, to hell with them, basically. We are free of those people; we remove that from ourselves.

And when you say:

وَنَتْرُكُ مَنْ يَفْجُرَكَ

We leave those who are evil towards You and do evil, who transgress against You, who go beyond Your limits. We abandon those who do *fujūr* against You. And that is of course where it gets its name. But that is a side note.

Now let us go back to the one that Shaykh is quoting from al-Bayhaqi. That is the end of *Sūrat al-Khalʿ*.

Now *Sūrat al-Ḥafd:*

للَّهمَّ إياك نعبدُ

"O Allāh, alone it is You that we worship."

Again, the beautiful change of:

﴿إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ ۝٥﴾

"It is You we worship; it is You we ask for help." [*Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*: 5]

If you have ever heard the explanation of *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* and you know that this is grammatically not the way you should do it, but it has been done like that to make it clear that only Allāh ﷻ alone is worshipped as opposed to 'Allāh, we worship You' which allows the door to be opened for and we worship you and we worship you, *naʿbuduk, naʿbuduk.* But when you say *iyyāka naʿbudu*, it means: O Allāh You alone, nobody else, we worship. So, this is using that grammatical framework which is beautiful.

اللَّهمَّ إياك نعبدُ

"O Allāh, alone it is You that we worship."

ولك نُصلِّي ونسجدُ

"To You alone we pray and we prostrate."

وإِليكَ نَسعَى ونَحْفِدُ

The *duʿāʾ* is built upon this portion here. *Wa ilayka nasʿā wa naḥfid*, the scholars differed in what it means. In my interpretation I will translate this as: For You we strive and to You we hasten. *Wa ilayka nasʿā,* for You we strive, or to You we strive, or to get to You we strive, and to You we hasten. We hasten in our action, in our *tawbah*, in our intention etc.

نَرجو رحمَتَكَ

"We long and we hope for Your mercy."

ونخشى عذابَكَ

"And we are afraid of Your punishment."

إِنَّ عَذَابَكَ الجِدَّ

"Because of a surety, certainly, verily and indeed Your true punishment"—not a blag—Your absolute 100%, true, serious, not messing about punishment…

بالكُفَّار مُلحِق

Bi'l-kuffāri and *bi'l-kāfirīn* in some narrations—that will occur to the non-Muslims *mulḥiq*. And in other narrations, *mulḥaq*.

Mulḥiq, the one that we learned, if we use *mulḥiq*, then it means that they can't escape. It's after them. It's pursuing them. It's *mulḥiq*. It will attach itself. Like when you are running, and running, and running and you think you are going to get away, but you know you can't escape. So, that would then be translated as: "We are afraid of Your true punishment to the *kuffār*. It's something that they will never be able to escape from. Or: Verily, the *kuffār* will never be able to escape Your very real punishment. That is if you go *mulḥiq*.

If you go *mulḥaq*, then it means it's them. They are the punishment. It's attached to them. It's intrinsic to their reality. There is no way that they are getting away with it. It's because it's *mulḥaq*, it's attached to them. Whether you go *mulḥiq* or *mulḥaq*, it means that they are not escaping from the punishment. They will be punished. That's why it's okay to use either word. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Student (online): *Jidd* is new to me. Is that essential?

Ustādh: I think that when it comes to how flexible we should be in saying certain words and not saying certain words, I think that which is narrated in a certain order should be. And I don't know of it being without the *jidd*. And I think that we should.

I think everybody should relearn this *duʿāʾ*. It's authentic. It's a part of our *qunūt* experience. And when you see its phrase, obviously there is a little bit of asking for things, *hidāyah*, *maghfirah*, etc. But mostly it's about just stating the big ones. You are the King. You are the One. It's Your mercy. It's Your power. It's praise.

I think what Imām Aḥmad said is fine. I think everything is fine. I think we'll stop there. I know we didn't do anything, but I think it's good that we know the history.

Q & A

Q (online): What's the class position again please?

A: The **class position** with respect to what we covered today is that this is a *duʿāʾ* from the *Sunnah* because ʿUmar ﷺ needs to be followed. He is an authority in the absence of Prophet ﷺ. And this is authentically narrated from him.

Q (online): I'm a home baker. Is selling treat boxes and cakes for Easter allowed? Is this the same for Christmas or any other celebration?

A: I think it's allowed. These are not religious aspects, this chocolate, cakes, baking, etc. is purely for the holiday, gathering, etc. If you are making crucifix cookies, that's *ḥarām*. Otherwise, it's okay.

(1:20:00)

Q (online): When you finish your prayer and then notice hair poking out of your *ḥijāb*, is the *ṣalāh* still fine or does it depend on how much is poking out?

A: It is. And it does depend on how much is poking out. But in general, there would be a need for literally the whole thing [to be] off for a long period of time for it to really go against the whole thing.

Q (online): If you own a building, can you let it out to someone who will operate a *ḥarām* takeaway?

A: So, this is a difference of the scholars over how much you are involved. I think that you should avoid that. Some of the scholars said that you are not responsible for what they do. But we said that:

﴿وَلَا تَعَاوَنُوا۟ عَلَى ٱلْإِثْمِ وَٱلْعُدْوَٰنِ ۚ﴾

"Do not help one another towards sin and hostility." [*Sūrat al-Mā'idah:* 2]

[This *ayah*] from the Qurʾān makes it something that we should not do.

Q (online): So, you have ʿUmar ﷺ doing this for *qunūt* of *Fajr*. Then the narration taught to al-Ḥasan ﷺ for *qunūt* of *Witr* by the Prophet ﷺ. The context here is *qunūt* of *Witr*. Which tops it?

A: There is a more fundamental question which is: If the Prophet ﷺ has not been narrated as saying either of these, how can we top either of these? And that's why we learn that the scholars were relaxed with both of them, and they are both as good, and we can add more to it as well, etc.

Q (online): Can you read one or the other *duʿāʾ*? Does it need to be both?

A: Absolutely does not need to be both. Remember we said you don't even need to recite a *duʿāʾ* of *qunūt*.

Q (online): Can I go into the following job role? GMP require dog handlers for the Specialist Operation. As a BAME [Black, Asian, and minority ethnic] police officer I have a good opportunity to get in and it is very rewarding work. As a dog handler you will be training the dog and eventually the dog will be your colleague and I will become its caretaker. As a dog handler you will only be using the dog for work purposes and not as a pet. That being said, the dog will have to stay with you. GMP provide a dog kennel which has to be placed in a garden. Also, I will be responsible for the dog's full-time care, feeding and exercise. The dog will be licking me. The dog will need to be touched by myself.

A: I think the job is *ḥalāl*. And I think that it's a great opportunity as there will be a lot of benefit. But I think that the harm or the cost of it in terms of just how much it's going to affect him and his purity, because of that necessary closeness. I am lenient with dogs and dog ownership, and dog use anyway. I take the most lenient of all the positions. I think they are incredible. Even with the *najāsah* I am happy to take the lenient position. I am evolving in that area the more that I look into it and study.

But I can tell you this much that when you take it to the level that you are talking about, that level of training required, it has to become an extension of your arm. I have watched documentaries on it. And that I think is going to cause him so much requirement of having to wash, remove clothes, *ṣalāh*. It's going to affect it. That's all

I'm saying. It's going to affect it. Because it's not like the companion of dog of old days in which there would be a closeness but a very clear separation. In our country [UK] and in the West, it's very much based upon love and feeding and hugging, etc. It's a culture. And this version would not work in this country. But Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): When traveling, if in a cold area can we pray *Fajr* in car by doing *tayammum* and sitting in the car?

A: I don't think so. I think that to pray in the car, you have to have an extraordinary situation going on outside. Extraordinary. Now, if you are snowed in physically where there is no place to sit due to snow, I think that could be it. But like rain, etc., I don't think necessary that that is an excuse. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

27. Chapter 21 Lesson 6: The Supererogatory Prayer

Today we are going to take it from the top of page 21 in the commentary. The class text is:

ويَقْنُتُ فيها بعدَ الركوعِ ويَقولُ:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لِي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ، إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ.

We'll stop there because that is going to take a couple of weeks by itself I think.

Obviously, we've started *duʿāʾ* of the *qunūt* as we call it, or the *qunūtʾl-Witr*. The translation of that is:

One performs the *qunūt* after the *rukūʿ* saying:

"O Allāh, guide me along with those whom You have guided, pardon me along with those whom You have pardoned, be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to and bless for me that which You have bestowed. Protect me from the evil You have decreed for verily You decree and none can decree over You. For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty. O our Lord, Blessed and Exalted are You."

Basically, as a recap of last week's lesson, we confirmed that the scholars and *ahlʾl-fiqh* prefer, even if the *aḥadīth* are not the strongest about it, that we use from the *duʿāʾs* available, something like:

اللَّهمَّ إِنَّا نَستعينُكَ، ونَستهديكَ، ونستغفِرُكَ، ونتوبُ إليكَ، ونؤمنُ بك، ونَتوكَّلُ عليك

And its variations.

The *ḥadīth* establishing it are good enough for the *duʿāʾ* to be used, no doubt about that. The *ḥadīth* to establish it being used with *Witr* are not so strong but the scholars like the idea that this one is a far more kind of 'giving' *duʿāʾ* if you like, a *dhikr duʿāʾ* like I like to call it, one in which you are giving back to Allāh ﷻ by praising Him before the heavy stuff starts i.e., when you start asking. The whole concept of:

﴿إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ ۝٥﴾

"It is You we worship; it is You we ask for help." [*Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*: 5]

Then: we seek help from You. Give us, give us, guide us, etc. The idea is well established in our *dīn* and Imām Aḥmad liked this idea of praising Allāh ﷻ before jumping in.

I just want you to know that it's the principle which is more important than the *duʿāʾ*, per se. Something for example that I myself, I don't want to say prefer, but I like to mix up with is:

سبُحَانَكَ جلَّ وَجْهُكَ عَزَّ جَاهُكَ وَتَبَارَكَ اسْمُكَ وَتَعَالَى جَدُّكَ وَلا إِلَهَ غَيْرُكَ

And various phrases of this type.

اللهُمَّ لَكَ الْحَمْدُ كَمَا يَنْبَغِي لِجَلالِ وَجْهَكَ وَعَظِيمِ سُلْطَانَك

اللَّهُمَّ لَكَ الْحَمْدُ مِلْءَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَمِلْءَ الأَرْضِ، وَمِلْءَ مَا شِئْتَ مِنْ شَيْءٍ بَعْدُ

Those kinds of *duʿāʾs* which you are expressing your thanks and praise of Allāh ﷻ—effusing His praise ﷻ before you ask. Just good *adab*.

Student (online): It is for that reason why the Paks love making *duʿāʾ* after *ṣalāh*?

Ustādh: It is not just the Paks. If you think about it, all good actions should be treated in this sense like a key. This is why I am encouraging everybody to fast tomorrow, and the White Days as well. Fasting is good in these months: Rajb, Shaʿbān, etc., before Ramadan. The Prophet ﷺ said about Thursday specifically, which is obviously the fasting day tomorrow (or today for our Malaysian friends,) that actions are lifted to Allāh ﷻ, so they are seen, and they are noticed, and they are given attention to, and

(0:10:00)

weight. And this statement is not meant to be taken linguistically as such because Allāh ﷻ sees everything all the time, and the angels are recording all the time, but they are presented to Allāh ﷻ. That is what the Prophet ﷺ said. And he ﷺ said:

تُعْرَضُ الأَعْمَالُ يَوْمَ الاِثْنَيْنِ وَالْخَمِيسِ فَأُحِبُّ أَنْ يُعْرَضَ عَمَلِي وَأَنَا صَائِمٌ

"Deeds are presented on Monday and Thursday, and I love that my deeds be presented while I am fasting." [1]

When you are giving your actions to Allāh ﷻ, what you are making *duʿāʾ* is for *qubūl*.

﴿رَبَّنَا تَقَبَّلْ مِنَّآ ۖ إِنَّكَ أَنتَ ٱلسَّمِيعُ ٱلْعَلِيمُ ١٢٧﴾

"Our Lord, accept [this] from us. You are the All Hearing, the All Knowing." [*Sūrat al-Baqarah*: 127]

That is the *duʿāʾ* of the greatest of the prophets after the Prophet ﷺ. It is the absolute top way of understanding our actions, that the biggest focus is upon acceptance. Acceptance. Acceptance. And once you have been accepted, then it's game over. That's it. You have won. You are in a big state of *duʿāʾ* when your actions are given. It is like filling in an exam. You fill in the exam and you put the paper in, and you are praying all the way home, '*Yā Allāh make this happen, make that happen*.'

The Prophet ﷺ said that my actions are presented to Allāh ﷻ, so therefore he ﷺ wants them to be accepted. So he ﷺ goes, '*You know what? I am going to fast this day to help it. To help my chances of getting it accepted*.' So, all good deeds should almost be seen as a precursor to things that you want. All good deeds.

We have spoken about this before, not just in *Protect This House* but in general as well, when it comes to the elders and the next generation. There are things that they do automatically as part of their culture which is pure Islam. And there are things that the younger, 'more knowledgeable' generation who think they are 'pure Muslims' have abandoned out of their ignorance. And they are suffering as a result. The *sunnah* prayers is an obvious example. It is a shame that the younger people do not realise just how much trouble they are going to be in by not praying their *sunnah* prayers because their obligatory prayers are as rubbish as anybody else's. All generations. Their obligatory *zakāh* and their obligatory fasting are [the same]. We know that the *sunnah*

[1] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Fasting, Chapter: What Has Been Related About Fasting on Monday and Thursday, ḥadīth no. 746*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*

ones are there to back up the obligatory. So, in the desperate moment when we need them fixed, as the Prophet ﷺ said, that the container that has the *sunnah* act will then be taken out and it will mould, like putty, and fix the gaps in the obligatory one.[2] Two containers, obligatory and *sunnah*. Every act of worship has a *farḍ* version and a *sunnah* version—obligatory and non-obligatory. And the non-obligatory is essential. This is what gets you to *Jannah*. It is this what confirms your place. It is that what a person uses to confirm their situation.

Student (online):

﴿إِلَيْهِ يَصْعَدُ ٱلْكَلِمُ ٱلطَّيِّبُ وَٱلْعَمَلُ ٱلصَّٰلِحُ يَرْفَعُهُۥ ﴿١٠﴾﴾

"Good words rise up to Him and He lifts up the righteous deed." [*Sūrat Fāṭir*: 10]

Ustādh: Exactly. The righteous actions, they lift up everything that you have to offer, as Allāh ﷻ says in the Qur'ān.

He ﷺ said to [Rabīʿah ibn Kaʿb] ؓ:

فَأَعِنِّي عَلَى نَفْسِكَ بِكَثْرَةِ السُّجُودِ

"Then help me to achieve this for you by devoting yourself often to prostration."[3]

"If you want me to make *duʿāʾ* for you, and help you get to *Jannah*, help me. Help your cause *bi-kathratʾl-sujūd*," by increasing the amount of *sujūd* that you do. The increase cannot come in the obligations. It can only come in the supererogatory—the extra.

So, that is a major, major catastrophic loss in the younger generation. When I say younger, I am Generation X, millennials, Generation Z, boomers maybe. But our parents, the elderly, they have got it on lock. They may not have the greatest mental intellectual connection with it, but they have got their reserves sorted. So, they have got themselves out of trouble.

I always bring it down to these two—the first one is the lack of *sunnah*. The second massive one is the importance of giving *ṣadaqah* when you want something. It is just not even in the ballpark of our imagination as a generation, as a culture. Is that because

[2] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of Ṣalāh, Chapter: Being Brought to Account for the Prayer, ḥadīth no. 466*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ*.
[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Virtue of Prostration and Encouragement to Do So, ḥadīth no. 489*.

we are tight? Is that because we are stupid? I think it is because we are stupid. That to give *ṣadaqah*, and by extension, to do good deeds before making a *duʿāʾ* is something that we have already established quite clearly. Our parents will all the time, automatically, the elderly generations always be thinking: '*If someone is in need or I need a duʿāʾ to be accepted, then I am going to give some ṣadaqah, I am going to do a khayrāt. I am going to do a daʿwah. I am going to feed some people*.'

I will give you an example. My mum—and every one of our mums does this day and night—I will use mine as an example. She called me a couple of days ago and asked, "What is £70 in Rupees?" And I told her it was like 15,000. She says, "Okay, that is fine." My mum leaves a little bit of money there [in Pakistan] and when she wants it spent, she will say, '*Take 10,000 out*. *Take 15,000 Rupees out*.' The point is, then she says to me, "Make *duʿāʾ* for my friend," our neighbour, "she has had a very serious operation." *Alḥamdullilāh* it went well. She [my mother] was very upset. You could feel the desperation. And that is the difference. When these folks are desperate, they turn to Allāh ﷻ—immediately. That is the immediate thought. When we are desperate, we kind of turn to people, we turn to *dunya*, we turn to professionals, we turn to secularism, or secular sciences. This will be our destruction. I'm telling you.

A lot of people get very excited at the nonsense of YouTube videos and refuters. It is a big thing—*daʿwah* people. I am not talking just about the idiots amongst them—those who are clearly deviant who have nothing of knowledge. I do not need to name them. You know the fools who go around thinking they are enjoining the good all day and night, just cussing everybody. I am not talking about those. I am even talking about the well-meaning people, all the folks who are guided, and they have some knowledge, and they are spending a lot of time refuting this, refuting that, because '*Somebody has made a video against us*.' I get that. But this is sweating the small stuff. I need to say it in a way without denigrating the science. What I mean is that the importance of refutation and responses is there, but it has been way exaggerated more than it needs. Our problem is not with the minor things. Like: ʿĀʾishah got married at what age? Did the dinosaurs do this? Is there alien life? Does this verse have a problem? I cannot see my gay neighbour who I love so much, what will happen to him? You know, all of the doubts and the things that you have. And you have all these people spending all their time making all these videos. And in actual fact, it is just a money-making platforms, and Patreons and sponsorship. That is all it is.

The fundamental problem is that we do not have a *tawakkul* in Allāh ﷻ. That is a fundamental point. Ask me about 100 of these doubts. Name your top 100 doubts that you have or have heard. I have not got a clue how to answer it. Do you know why? Because it is not a doubt for me. And I cannot even see what's to doubt about it. Now I am not trying to praise myself, I am just trying to say that why would I need to worry about small things that I know is my own patheticness and my own limited nature that is holding me back. Not the truth itself, but me. I am the limiting factor here. And I know for absolute certainty that it is Allāh ﷻ on the other side, that is it truth on the other side. So, people have lost that connection with Allāh ﷻ.

The people who have it are the simple people. That is why I always say that simplicity is the absolute diamond of this religion, and one's character. It really is. We do not need to make things complicated so much.

Student (online): It's like when the old lady said about and to Imām al-Ḥaramayn: "If he didn't have 1000 doubts, he wouldn't need 1000 proofs."

Ustādh: Absolutely. If you look at Imām al-Juwayni, Imām al-Ḥaramayn, and his works, he has got some killer quotes.

Student (online): May Allāh ﷻ allow us to die upon the religion of the elderly.

Ustādh: That is what we need to be making *duʿāʾ* upon. May Allāh ﷻ allow us to die upon the religion of the old women. The old women keep it simple. They do not mess
(0:20:00) about. She thinks, '*I need my duʿāʾ to be accepted. I am going to give some ṣadaqah. Let me just call my guy and find out how much it is.*' She calls me. I give her the number, and do not know what is going on. I put the phone down. I find out later that she has basically told so and so whatever. *Ṣadaqah* given. Making *duʿāʾ* all night. Then the operation goes ahead. *Alḥamdullilāh* it went well. That's, for them, a good day at the office. You know what? Sleep. Repeat. Sleep. Repeat. And that is what will happen. It is so important, *subḥān Allāh*.

So, you can use your own kind of phrases.

Now that we know that you're meant to make these *duʿāʾ* before you actually make *Allāhumma ihdiniyy fīman hadayt*, let's try now to break down the actual meaning of this *duʿāʾ*, linguistically.

So, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says *Allāhumma*:

وقوله: «اللَّهُمَّ» أصلُه: يا اللهُ، لكن حُذِفت ياءُ النِّداءِ، وعُوِّضَ عنها الميمُ وبقيت «الله»، وإنما حُذفت الياءُ لكثرةِ الاستعمالِ وعُوِّضَ عنها الميمُ للدّلالةِ عليها، وأُخِّرت للبَدَاءة باسم الله، وجُعلت ميماً للإشارة إلى جَمْعِ القلب على هذا الدُّعاءِ؛ لأن الميم تدلُّ على الجَمْعِ.

Allāhumma is very interesting because it is not an original Arabic word. It's a combined phrase. *Allāhumma* means 'O Allāh'. But it's 'O Allāh' as a consequence because it should be '*Yā Allāh*':

لكن حُذِفَت ياءُ النِّداءِ

The *yā* of calling has been removed to make it easy. And that happens in the Arabic language. Often you will find that—not by people of course, but by the language itself—it will sometimes break its rules but then that in itself is a rule where it will take out certain letters to make it easy either to say more often or to say quicker or to have less hesitation in a sentence etc. Sometimes they will show that, sometimes they won't.

In the phrase *Allāhumma* it has been shown. What's happened?

You have: *Yā Allāh*, remove the [word] *yā* [composed of the letters] *yā* and the *alif* (the *yā* of *nidāʾ*) so you remove two letters, and you replace it with one. Because it's not *yallah*. You have people thinking, '*I don't see how it's shorter*.' Well, just linguistically it's shorter, because it's not *yallah*—not at all. It's: *Yā Allāh*. You have to have a *mad*—*alif*—to give it *yā*. So, that's taken out and what replaces it is the *mīm*. So, it should technically be *mallāh* however as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said the *mīm* has been put to the end to make Allāh's name prominent, to put Allāh's name in its right place which is at the beginning. Shaykh mentions the *mīm* replaces the *yāʾ* and *mīm* is a very nice and easy letter by the way, very kind of natural, it doesn't require much effort. There is no comparison between the *mīm* [sound] and the *yā* [sound]. Just on the mouth it's more effort. And when you go into *makhārij* and you study *tajwīd* at that advanced crazy level you will start to understand all this kind of stuff.

So, remember from now on every time you hear *Allāhumma* you know now, *mā shāʾ Allāh*, that actually this means *yā Allāh* with the *yāʾ* removed with the *mīm* replacing it, *mīm* taken from the beginning and placed at the end. And *mīm* also, as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says, is an indication in the language of the plural—in general—that's a bit more advanced. And Shaykh says but maybe there is a slight indication of not necessarily plural but the gathering together.

وجُعلت ميماً للإشارة إلى جَمْعِ القلب على هذا الدُّعاءِ؛ لأن الميم تدلُّ على الجَمْعِ.

Student (online): Does it encompass all of Allāh's ﷻ names? I've heard this position.

Ustādh: Well, it's not impossible—not by meaning no—it's not impossible in terms of its implication. Because the *mīm* will be indicating gathering together.

So, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says it's gathering the heart together, it's a gathering of all of your thoughts and your scattered wants into a single focus and then saying *yā Allāh*.

I don't know whether that works better. But the point is that that's not linguistically so strong anyway but Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's just making, perhaps this is what the *mīm* also helps, makes the heart more focused, and so on.

Student (online): Is it right or wrong to say that Allāh is the contraction of *al-Ilāh*?

Ustādh: That's the position of Ibn Taymiyyah and it's the position that I certainly follow that Allāh is *al-Ilāh* the God, the only God. And some said there's some basis but there's some opinions on that.

The next *Allāhumma*:

اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيتَ

Guide me along with those whom You have guided.

This is clearly the *duʿāʾ* of a person who is making *duʿāʾ* by himself or herself should say. However, if someone is leading *ṣalāh*, leading a congregational *Witr* such as *Tarāwīḥ* or in Ramadan then it is not permissible from them to make this *duʿāʾ* in this way.

It's not permissible for you to make *duʿāʾ* for yourself and have the people say *āmīn* for you.

People could argue, '*No no! He's making duʿāʾ and when we say āmīn we mean it for ourselves*.'

No. You might have thought that that kind of lazy approach is acceptable, but it's clearly not because the Prophet ﷺ obviously in a very famous *ḥadīth* said:

مَن أمَّ قوماً فخَصَّ نفسَه بالدُّعَاءِ فقد خَانَهُم

"Whoever leads a people and he specifies himself in the *duʿāʾ* then he has betrayed them." [4,5,6]

So, you have the imām instead of saying:

اللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنا فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنا فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ

---

[4] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Prayer, Chapter: What Has Been Related About It Being Disliked for the Imām to Specify Himself with Supplications, ḥadīth no. 357.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*
[5] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 5/280.*
[6] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Establishing the Prayer and the Sunnah Regarding Them, ḥadīth no. 121.* This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*

That *nūn* and *alif* at the end is what obviously makes it for everybody. It's the *nūn* of the plural. So, if you are an imām, or leading your family, or whatever it is, you should always make:

ٱللَّيمَّ ٱغْفِرْ لَنَا وَٱرْحَمنَا ٱللَّهمَّ عَافِنَا وَٱعْفُ عَنَّا

We always make it the plural for everyone. When you're by yourself then you should say:

ٱللَّيمَّ اغْفِر لَي وَٱرْحَمنَي وَٱهدِنِي وَٱجْبُرْنِي

Whatever you want to make *duʿāʾ* for then you make it for yourself.

The question arises: What about if a person is not all that with Arabic and is not on the ball with learning the different versions? They just want to keep it simple.

I am just going to learn the plural because it is easier. I find it more difficult to change it to the [first-person singular]. I have learned it in [the first-person plural]. I have learned it as:

اللَّهُمَّ إِنَّكَ عَفُوٌّ كَرِمٌ تُحِبُّ الْعَفْوَ فَاعْفُ عَنِّا

The *duʿāʾ* of course is:

فَاعْفُ عَنِّي

Which is how you should say it. It is: "Pardon me."[7] But let's say that because you only hear this *duʿāʾ* in Ramadan, it is only shared on your social media in Ramadan and of course there is a reason for that because it is the best *duʿāʾ* you can make in *laylatʾl-qadr* as ʿĀʾishah said. Of course, it is a key *duʿāʾ* to be said at other times. But you can

(0:30:00)

[7] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, Chapters on Supplication, Chapter: Concerning the Virtue of Asking for ʿĀfiyah and Muʿāfah, ḥadīth no. 3513.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

see how a person would learn the plural before the singular. So, you might have learnt the *duʿāʾ*. Is that okay?

I think that is okay. If you are going to get confused by changing it to the first-person [singular] then you can stick to [first-person] plural. So you can use the plural and assume everybody that you want to be included. That is okay, that is not *khiyānah*.[4,5,6] Even though that is not the *sunnah*, I just want to make it clear and there is something in my heart. I like the idea that people are not lazy in *duʿāʾ*.

As anyone who is with me in *ʿUmrah* and *Ḥajj*, you guys know how big I am on this issue. We spend 95% of our time making *duʿāʾ*, focusing on *duʿāʾ*, understanding the *adab* of *duʿāʾ* and the *sunnah* of the Prophet's ﷺ *duʿāʾ*. And this is not his *sunnah*—to use plural. I just want to say that. I think when the Prophet ﷺ makes *duʿāʾ*, he is very specific. He ﷺ is so specific. And I love that focus. But it is allowed to make plural *duʿāʾ* and we know that there is a basis for that because when you make *duʿāʾ* for your brother in absentia then you will get the reward for it, they will get their reward for it. They will get accepted, your *duʿāʾ* is accepted. But I make it very clear that it is a *duʿāʾ*. That is an actual *duʿāʾ*—not the laziness.

I do not want to go into one of my *Ḥajj* rants, but you will see that. A lot of people are given lists. People are really invested. They hear, they get so excited, cultural Muslims they say, '*Oh! You are going for Ḥajj?! You're going for Ḥajj?!*' And then they write them lists and they give it to them. They are organized! They write them *duʿāʾ* requests and everything and make all this effort. And there is this Paki, he goes and he basically says, '*Oh forget that!*' And then says:

ٱللَّهمَّ ٱغْفِرْ لِلمُسْلِمِينَ وَٱلْمُسْلِمَاتِ وَٱلمؤمِنِينَ وَٱلمؤمِنَاتِ ٱلأَحْيَاء مِنْهُم وَٱلأَمْواتِ

And then he goes back and they say, '*Did you make duʿāʾ for me?! Did you make duʿāʾ for me?!*' All excited and he says, '*Yeah I did*.' And obviously, technically he did because he said: O Allāh forgive all of the believers and the female believers and the Muslims and the female Muslims. So, this is lazy.

I know that folks who were asking this question are not intending that laziness. I just want you to be more invested in your *duʿāʾ* process. And people asking you, then I want you to be honest with them.

In short, plural is okay.

Student (online): Can you change the pronouns to plurals even in Qurʾānic *duʿāʾ*?

Ustādh: Of course you can change it to that in the Qurʾānic *duʿāʾ*, it just does not become a Qurʾānic *duʿāʾ* anymore. That is important. It does not become a Qurʾānic *duʿāʾ*.

اللهم اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيت

O Allāh Guide me along with those whom You have guided.

Shaykh makes a nice point here. He says:

في جُمْلة مَنْ هديتَ، وهذا فيه نوعٌ مِن التوسُّلِ بفِعْلِ الله سبحانه وتعالى

So, what the Shaykh is saying is that if you look at the wording: O Allāh guide me along with those whom You have guided. 'O Allāh guide me' should be enough.

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنِي

That is enough.

But look at the back part, it is interesting: *fī man hadayt.*

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيتَ

O Allāh guide me along with those whom You have guided.

"Along with those whom You have guided." Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn correctly points out you are asking for a thing based upon others receiving it. It is not: O Allāh guide me because I want guidance or I need guidance or whatever—which obviously you do but you're not saying it here. There is an extra statement here. So, we want to break it down. What are the extra statements trying to say?

O Allāh guide me through *fī man hadayt*, meaning like the ones You have guided, along with those whom You have guided, however you translate it. But Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says this is a form of *tawassul.*

Tawassul is as controversial a subject as it gets when it comes to the *'aqīdah* of Ahl'l-Sunnah wa'l-Jamā'ah. *Tawassul* basically means to use the means—linguistically— and to seek intercession thereby. So that is the key.

Normally when you make *tawassul* it basically means that you're going to someone, you need something, you know you can't do it, or you believe you can't do it so you're now going to do it through the x of something or through the x of someone, through the good efforts or the good deeds or the whatever. You're going to use an intercession or someone to intercede. So, you might go to like a friend who is able to refer you quicker than you doing it yourself to medical treatment or to whatever it is—this is a form of *tawassul*. And I am not going to go into *tawassul* because it is a huge subject. And I want you to know that the scholars have a variety of different opinions on the different aspects and it is very detailed. But there is no doubt that a lot of *bidʿah* occurs and some scholars even called it *kufr* and *shirk.* At its worst level, they didn't like it because you're attributing powers to those that don't have it.

So first of all, let's understand the concept: Is it okay to go to a person that you believe is special and ask them because you believe that they are more holy, more pious and their *duʿāʾ* will be accepted? My point is that you believe that is someone who is good and going to get the job done.

(0:40:00) In principle this is something which is agreed upon by the scholars, this is something which is not *ḥarām*. There are some that consider it *makrūh*—that's bringing in the whole idea of not putting your trust in Allāh ﷻ entirely, and putting confidence in yourself, and so on and so on.

Student (online): No one is saying they are holy, but people mistakenly go to them.

Ustādh: No, I am not talking about people mistakenly going to them. I am saying your parents. Why do you ask your parents to make *duʿāʾ* for you? Why do you ask someone who is practicing?

This is something which is allowed. It happened to the Prophet ﷺ. He ﷺ was often approached to make *duʿāʾ* for people. Sometimes he ﷺ would say okay. Sometimes he ﷺ would say, '*You know what? I can, but it is better for you if you make the duʿāʾ yourself*.' So, we know it is allowed.

So, what we are saying is that normally the *tawassul* happens through a living person and asking them. This is, like I said, not great but it is allowed.

The *ḥarām* is obviously the going to the deceased, going to their graves, saying, '*Listen. You are in a better place. You are free of sin. You were pious*,' you were x, y, z, '*and I want you to put forward my duʿāʾ*. *You are with Allāh ﷻ put forward my duʿāʾ*,' etc. which is absolute madness because you have no idea what you are doing and that is *bidʿah* anyway.

And of course, the most famous is to do it via the Prophet ﷺ whilst he ﷺ has passed away. And that is where the massive dispute is. And frankly I can't imagine anybody in our current time finding that remotely logically acceptable. But of course, a number of the Muslim Sunni sects or Sunni scholars they do allow. And there is a lot more than

meets the eye when it comes to the *tawassul* debate. You do need to know that it's not as cut and dry as it may be sold to or has been sold to you. I do want to say it should be treated like it is cut and dry. There is not a single benefit, not a single benefit of you having an approach to your *dīn* that has a *tawassul* by the passing of the Prophet ﷺ. It was not the action of the Companions.

My point is whether it's *shirk* or not whether it's *ḥarām* or not, it is a disgrace. It is a disgracing of anyone's Islam. Can you imagine a convert? And that's why I always like to keep things simple. We honestly don't need to get involved in these debates.

My point is this. If there is a convert coming to this *dīn*, and they come to this *dīn* and they have left all of their Catholicism, and their x, y, z. And they come and see people who are actually trying to justify the same things backwards. They are like, '*What the hell is this man? I came into Islam just wanting to communicate with Allāh* ﷻ *and just have confidence*.'

I just want to say that there is a lot of nuance in this discussion. *Tawassul* is something which is permissible in principle. And this is a good example of a very specific type. Obviously, I speak about this a lot more in *Fitnah* (in the *tafṣīr* of [*Sūrat*] *Āli ʿImrān*) where we go into a number of examples of *tawassul*. And specifically, the greatest of all *tawassul* is what we have been speaking about for this entire class which is your good deeds.

So, when you praise Allāh ﷻ you are making *tawassul* with your praise. You want something from Allāh ﷻ. And you want to intercede—you want to boost. When you are going to a dead person, or a grave, or an x, or y. I just want you to know what was taught back in the day. What was taught back in the day is that if a person then goes to a grave and says, '*You give me a child*.' '*You give me this*.' '*You give me that*,' etc. and thinking that's where it comes from, this is *kufr billāh*, *shirk billāh.* This person is *mushrik*. There are very few people who do that.

The second category is where the majority of the people that do this fall into. They go to that grave, that dead person, that dead saint (that is not buried there by the way) and they go to that grave and they ask and they say, '*You are special and only Allāh* ﷻ *gives but you are better than me in asking*.' How is this *shirk*?

And there are scholars that consider it to be *shirk* and the *Najdi daʿwah* considers this to be *shirk*. And okay. It's their position. This is not the position of the mainstream scholars. This is *bidʿah* and it's *ḥarām*. It's not *shirk.* That action of the people who don't in any way believe that person in the grave is the cause, the *mutasabbib* but rather *al-mutawassil bihi,* the one who is being used for *tawassul* is just being used as a *wasīlah*, Allāh ﷻ is the One who gives, Allāh ﷻ is the One who is in control, Allāh ﷻ will maybe reject even him, but I am going to ask him because I don't think Allāh ﷻ will accept me.

(0:50:00)

This is weakness. It is pathetic. It is a disaster. It is *ḥarām*. I don't think it's *shirk*.

The *tawassul* that we love and that we praise and that we should encourage is the *tawassul* of your own good deeds.

Student (online): Like the three who were trapped by the boulder using their actions for *tawassul*.

Ustādh: As he mentioned, the most beautiful *ḥadīth*.

Student (online): Thoughts on asking Allāh ﷻ to give you something for the sake of His love for His beloved Prophet ﷺ?

Ustādh: It's all the same, asking Allāh ﷻ to give you something for the sake of His love. That is exactly what the people try to explain what the people meant when they make *tawassul* by: O Allāh give me this by virtue of your Prophet ﷺ, by virtue of this, by virtue of that. This is all *tawassul.* It is a disaster.

Why are you doing that?

It's not from our *dīn*, not from our *Sunnah*. But people say: This is for our love of our Prophet ﷺ.

It should be the love of *dīn*, not the love of your Prophet ﷺ—your love of following your Prophet ﷺ, the *dīn* itself.

This is a *bidʿah* there is no doubt. I say that there is no doubt, obviously there are scholars who allow it, that's the *taʾwīl* they make. They say: We are not asking by him; we are asking because of our love for him. And that love for him is a good action. So, they agree with us.

What's our position?

Our position is that to make *tawassul* with your good deeds, you do a good action and you ask Allāh ﷻ: '*By virtue of what I have done then give me this, give me that*.'

And that's what happened when the people got trapped in the cave and the boulder fell shut, fell down, closed the hole.[8] They are going to die. They are going to suffocate. One of them says, '*Listen! Why don't we think of the great things we have done in our life, that one big thing, and we asked Allāh ﷻ through it?*' And each time they would say, '*Yā Allāh if You know I did it for Your sake*….' So, each time they put forward their good deed and they ask Allāh ﷻ and the rock moved, rock moved, rock moved. This is the clearest *ḥadīth* of proof of *tawassul* with your own good deeds.

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Sales and Trade, Chapter: If Somebody Buys Something for Another Without His Permission and the Latter Accepts It, ḥadīth no. 2215.*

And the people who tried to blag the one by the Prophet ﷺ said (which is shocking frankly), what did they say?

They said we are doing it because of the love of the Prophet ﷺ and the love of the Prophet ﷺ is a good deed.

So, this is like one of those Jewish arguments, right? Because of course loving the Prophet ﷺ is a good deed, and to express that is a good deed, and to promote it is a good deed. But to try to make it out like this is the *tawassul* route, it is just disingenuous frankly.

Now back to here, this is a *tawassul* but not a *tawassul* of your good deeds or indeed their good deeds that is why Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says: This is

التوسُّلِ بفِعْلِ الله سبحانه وتعالى

I am seeking *tawassul* by Your generosity. '*Hey! You have guided them. What about me as well?*'

I love this because it just encapsulates how beautiful the mercy and the generosity of Allāh ﷻ is, which is so above and beyond human beings who obviously love to take and hate to give, but even the Prophet ﷺ.

You know the *ḥadīth* of ʻUkāshah ؓ. We call it the *ḥadīth* of *al-zumrah*.

يَدْخُلُ مِنْ أُمَّتِي زُمْرَةٌ هُمْ سَبْعُونَ أَلْفًا، تُضِيءُ وُجُوهُهُمْ إِضَاءَةَ الْقَمَرِ لَيْلَةَ الْبَدْرِ

"From my followers there will enter Paradise a crowd, 70,000 in number, whose faces will glitter as the moon does when it is full." [9]

And ʻUkāshah ؓ says:

يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ادْعُ اللَّهَ أَنْ يَجْعَلَنِي مِنْهُمْ

'O Messenger of Allāh! Invoke Allāh that He may make me one of them."[9]

[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of to Make the Heart Tender, Chapter: Seventy Thousand Will Enter Paradise Without Accounts, ḥadīth no. 6542.*

Now look at this. The Prophet ﷺ makes a factual statement: 70,000 are going to get into Paradise without any *ḥisāb*. (Obviously, we know about this from other *ḥadīth* but not in this particular narration.[10]) 70,000 smashed it, top level. Bam! Bam! Bam! ʻUkāshah ؓ says, '*Ask Allāh that I be included from them*.

And the Prophet ﷺ said:

اللَّهُمَّ اجْعَلْهُ مِنْهُمْ

"O Allāh make him from among them."[9]

He actually made that *duʻāʾ*. The other man stood up: "And me *yā Rasūl Allāh*! Can you make *duʻāʾ* that Allāh makes me one of them?"

ثُمَّ قَامَ رَجُلٌ مِنَ الأَنْصَارِ فَقَالَ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ادْعُ اللَّهَ أَنْ يَجْعَلَنِي مِنْهُمْ. فَقَالَ " سَبَقَكَ عُكَّاشَةُ "

"Another man from the Anṣār stood up and said, 'O Messenger of Allāh! Invoke Allāh to make me one of them.' The Prophet ﷺ said [to him], ''Ukāshah has preceded you.'"[9]

He ﷺ didn't make *duʻāʾ* for that second person. This *ḥadīth* is a madness *ḥadīth* by the way. There are so many lessons from this *ḥadīth*. But it also supports what I was saying earlier on [about] the laziness in *duʻāʾ*. The Prophet ﷺ was very specific in his *duʻāʾ*—very specific in his energy, very specific in his focus. Yet he ﷺ is the one who is making *duʻāʾ* for all of us all the time. Believe me, those other Companions got plenty of *duʻāʾ*. But it is in the right place, right time, invested. It is not lazy. It is not mindless. It is not:

ٱللَّهمَّ ٱغْفِرْ لِلمُسْلِمِينَ وَٱلْمُسْلِمَاتِ وَٱلمؤمِنِينَ وَٱلمؤمِنَاتِ ٱلأَحْيَاء مِنْهُم وَٱلأَمْواتِ

'*Oh yeah! I made duʻāʾ for you*.' It is not that at all. He ﷺ literally said to him, '*No, ʻUkāshah got there before you and you know this is limited*.'

Now what I was reflecting upon is: Imagine if Allāh ﷻ said that. Imagine if Allāh ﷻ said: '*Those people have already got the guidance, they asked for it, that is it*.' It is not dissimilar you know.

---

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of to make the Heart Tender, Chapter: "... And Whosoever Puts His Trust in Allāh ﷻ, Then He Will Suffice Him ...", ḥadīth no. 6472.*

When we say:

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيتَ

O Allāh guide me along with those whom You have guided.

That is as close to:

ادْعُ اللَّهَ أَنْ يَجْعَلَنِي مِنْهُمْ

'Invoke Allāh that He may make me one of them."[9]

O Allāh guide me along those whom you have guided.

Here ﷺ, he has kept it specific right and said, '*I am afraid I can't,*' in the politest way possible. And here you have Allāh ﷻ who has actually told you how to make this *du'ā'* and He is not going to stop. He is not going to explain.

I just think that is great. What this *du'ā'* does is recognise the generosity of Allāh ﷻ. And it is so great that we are going to make *tawassul* because of that generosity. And that is Shaykh 'Uthaymīn (although he doesn't explain it) that is what he means. That is:

التوسُّلِ بفِعْلِ الله سبحانه وتعالى

It is not just the *hidāyah* but the generosity of Allāh ﷻ to guide everybody else who is only asking for guidance because of His generosity of guiding others. And this principle is going to continue all the way through the [*du'ā'*].

Student (online): I didn't quite get that point.

Student (online): I'm lost.

Ustādh: All right. I have got one person you think, '*Okay*.' But two people means I didn't do a good job. I am just trying to think of the best way to express this.

I don't actually think that there is a real problem in the way that you translate it. I don't think that's the issue.

Student (online): So, basically we are asking for *hidayah*?

We are absolutely asking for *hidayah*. There is no doubt about that. There is no doubt.

(1:00:00) Like I said to you at the beginning, if you want guidance [you can say]:

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنِي

O Allāh guide me.

Khalās. Right? And we have that.

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنا وَٱهْدِ بِنَا وَٱجْعَلنَا سَبَبًا لِمَن ٱهْتَدى

There are many *du'ā'* in the *Sunnah* of guidance—and by itself. This *du'ā'* is fascinating because of its ending. Like I said at the beginning, you could just say:

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنِي

O Allāh guide me.

And that is it. But it is:

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيتَ

O Allāh guide me along with those whom You have guided.

'Amongst those whom You have guided', 'along with those whom You have guided', or whatever you want to translate it as. 'With those You have guided', or even 'because of those you have guided'—I don't even hate that either, although that is stretching it in translation terms. My point is that after that second part is an example of the generosity of Allāh ﷻ and Allāh ﷻ wanting you to know it! And the Prophet ﷺ wanting you to know it and telling you that this is how you make this *du'ā'*, and if you make this *du'ā'*, then make *du'ā'* seeking *tawassul* through the generosity of Allāh ﷻ.

It's like you see someone giving out money or sweets or whatever and [being] generous, and you think, '*You know what? Let me chance my arm today as well. I'll try and get in there as well*.' You see someone in a good mood, you say, '*Right! Well, I'm going to take advantage*.' That's my point—taking advantage. What's the advantage?

Normally I would not be able to get it done. Today I can.

The same in *duʿāʾ*. Normally I'm not getting responded to, so now today I can because the person is in a giving mood. You've got one day when you ask them to stamp your passport quickly and he says '*No! come back tomorrow*.' You go back tomorrow, '*No! I am not interested*.' You come back the next day he's in a good mood, he sees you at the back of the queue, '*Come here*,' and stamps it for you. When you see an opportunity, you get the job done. It gets accepted.

Here, throughout:

وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ

[O Allāh] pardon me along with those whom You have pardoned, be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to…

You will see that this is a *duʿāʾ*, a unique one, which is focusing on the generosity of Allāh ﷻ and actually encouraging us to make *tawassul*, take advantage of the generosity of Allāh ﷻ in of itself. Not just ask for guidance, which you should be doing anyway, we do in *ṣalāh* anyway, all the time everyday anyway. Here, we're being educated to the generosity of Allāh ﷻ. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

فكأنَّك تتوسَّلُ إلى الله الذي هَدى غيرَك أنْ يهديَكَ في جُملتِهم، كأنَّكَ تقول :كما هَديتَ غيري فَاهْدِنِي.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: It's like you're saying just like you have guided others, guide me. I don't even deserve it, but you guided other people, *yā* Allāh guide me as well.

That's a pure, emotional appeal. It's a desperate appeal to one's generosity. You're making *tawassul*, you are seeking intercession through the action of Allāh ﷻ which is pure mercy and generosity. And that's what I see. Allāh ﷻ knows best. I don't think I'm doing a great job of explaining it, but I hope that makes sense. You're not just asking for guidance. That's my point.

والهداية هنا يُرادُ بها :هدايةُ الإرشاد، وهدايةُ التوفيق.

So, Shaykh says that when you're saying:

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنِي

O Allāh guide me.

Guidance is always of two types: the guidance of *irshād* and the guidance of *tawfīq*. The guidance of *irshād*, I might say is the right direction. The guidance of *tawfīq* is the ability.

To give some kind of populist examples, they say: You can take a horse to water, but you can't make it drink.

So, imagine you have a horse and it's lost. In this example, guidance, the objective, *hidāyah*, is for the horse to drink the water. Unfortunately, the horse is in a desert right now and its camp, where its owner will be, is in a certain direction and that's where the water trough is, and the water has been preserved. But the horse is lost.

There are two things that need to go right for the *hidāyah* objective to be achieved, which is for the horse to drink water. (I am making this up as I am speaking so forgive me. This could be rubbish.) Two things need to happen. First of all, the horse needs to find its way back to the trough of water in its camp outside of the desert. That's going to require an effort which is very easy. A person could go and drag it, a person could go and ride it, a person could slap it and make its way, etc. It just needs to get there.

But as the phrase goes: You can bring a horse to water, but you can't make it drink. It then needs to be given the ability to drink, whether the ability is to know that it's water, for example. What if a person is looking at water and seeing something else? What if a person is looking at water and can't see it at all? What if the person is seeing the water but has forgotten how to drink, keeps dipping its nose into it, doesn't know that he's meant to drink it? My point is that getting the horse back to the trough is the *hidāyah* of *irshād*. To get the horse to drink is the *hidāyah* of *tawfīq*, the ability, *tawfīq* from Allāh ﷻ.

Shaykh keeps it simple.

فهدايةُ الإرشادِ :ضِدّها الضَّلالُ.

وهدايةُ التوفيقِ :ضِدُّها الغَيُّ.

He says the *hidāyah* of *irshād*, the guidance of *irshād* or direction, its opposite is being lost. And the *hidāyah* of *tawfīq* which is the guidance of ability, the opposite of that is misguidance and error. Misguidance is when you look at water and you think it's hay. Misguidance is when you look at water and you see it as petrol.

So in the real world, *hidāyah* is of two types. We teach people and we establish the proof of Allāh ﷻ and we bring all the evidences and we refute all the falsehoods. That is the *hidāyah*. This is the *balāgh*. This is *tablīgh*. That is our obligation. That is the only *hidāyah* that we are obligated to do.

The second part is entirely in Allāh's ﷻ hands. The first one is what we do. The second is in Allāh's ﷻ hands whether He wants to open his heart because Allāh ﷻ sees in that person a real genuine sincerity. A person is sincere, Allāh ﷻ opens that heart. A person is insincere, He knows of course what that person will say and do, that is of course *qadr* then that heart will not be opened even if the Qurʾān is clear in front of them. That is what happens to so many of the *mushrikīn*, the orientalists, these academics who are day and night sharing gems and depth and academia and incredible things but no *īmān*, nothing, because the sincerity to actually worship Allāh ﷻ is not there. The sincerity is there to make a name, to be an expert, to be respected, to be honoured, to be the most knowledgeable, but not to worship Allāh ﷻ. So, this is the difference between *hidāyatʾl-irshād* and *hidāyatʾl-tawfīq*.

What Shaykh wants to basically say is that whenever you say:

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنِي

You are always by definition asking for both the *hidāyah of al-irshād* i.e., show me the right way, close off the roots of evil, open up the roots of *khayr*, put me in good company, make me understand knowledge etc. And then you are asking Allāh ﷻ for *hidāyah* of *tawfīq* at the same time which is that Allāh ﷻ gives you the ability, opens your heart, protects you from evil etc.

Shaykh ends with something very nice.

فأنت إذا قلتَ: «اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي» تسألُ الله سبحانه وتعالى الهِدايتين :هدايةَ الإرشادِ وذلك بالعِلْمِ، وهدايةَ التوفيقِ وذلك بالعمل؛ لأنه ليس كلُّ مَنْ عَلِمَ عَمِلَ، وليس كلُّ مَنْ عَمِلَ يكون عملُه عن عِلْمٍ وتمامٍ، فالتَّوفيقُ أن تعلَمَ وتعمَلَ.

He says when you make that *duʿāʾ* of:

ٱللَّهُمَّ ٱهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيتَ

O Allāh guide me along with those whom You have guided.

You are asking for both *hidāyah*s, the *hidāyah* of *irshād* and that comes with knowledge. So, you are asking Allāh ﷻ to teach you knowledge. And that is teaching knowledge by you being given the opportunity to study like this, take a class, read a book, listen to a person who is speaking that you might have considered whatever, to understand certain things that you might come across, to choose to play a certain video versus not playing certain video when you are on your news feed. This is the *hidāyah* of *irshād*. This is the knowledge. When you are asking this *duʿāʾ* you are asking for both types of guidance. The first guidance is *hidāyatʾl-irshād*. The only way that can be responded to is through knowledge. So, you are asking for knowledge.

(1:10:00)

وهدايةَ التوفيقِ وذلك بالعمل

This is so good. Shaykh says: And then you are also asking for *tawfīq* and the way that *tawfīq* occurs is sincerity. And sincerity as we all say, is the guy who 'doesn't talk the talk but walks the walk'. Whenever you see someone who walks the walk you say, '*That's a guy who believes in his product. That is a guy who stands up for his principles*.'

Think about the cliches that we use in our culture. When we see someone who walks the walk, what is talk? Talk is not an 'action' meaning he does not physically prove it, 'it's all talk'. And then you have the people who walk the walk, which is get up and put their money where their mouth is. So, action is what proves sincerity.

In our *dīn* we find people who say, '*I'm a good Muslim*. *I'm a good Muslim*.' You are not a good Muslim squat, if you are not waking up for in the morning when it is hard, and tough, and you're tired, and you're knackered, and you're not praying *Fajr*, I do not care how good you are, you are insincere. You have *nifāq* in your heart. You have *nifāq* just missing *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ* and getting tired about *ṣalāt al-ʿIshāʾ* what about *ṣalāt al-Fajr*?

Shaykh says:

لأنه ليس كلُّ مَنْ عَلِمَ عَمِلَ، وليس كلُّ مَنْ عَمِلَ يكون عملُه عن عِلْمٍ وتمامٍ، فالتَّوفيقُ أن تعلَمَ وتعمَلَ

Shaykh says that not everybody who knows the right thing to do does it. That is the example of the person who says, '*I am a good Muslim*,' knows everything about the prayer, but then does not do the prayer.

And not everybody who does actions does it correctly and based upon knowledge. There is much ignorance out there and sometimes, as you see, they fall into *shirk* and they mess everything up for themselves and everybody else as well.

Tawfīq is that you know what to do and then you do it. So, the knowledge is the precondition and then the action is the proof of the pudding. So, you walk the walk, and you talk the talk. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

There are other scholars that divided *hidāyah* up into different types and as I have said many times before, when it comes to dividing things up the Prophet ﷺ never divided *hidāyah* into *tawfīq* and *irshād*, or x, or y. This is what the scholars use to try to explain things.

Q & A

Student (online): One problem with the analogy, 99% horses would drink the water, i.e., take that *hidāyah*, whereas we know the majority of people are given the first stage of *hidāyah* walk away from the water (second stage of *hidāyah*).

Ustādh: I also don't understand. Where does that saying comes from that you can take a horse to water but you cannot make it drink? Normally these sayings come because it is a real thing. Horses refuse the water so maybe you are wrong and it is not 99% of the horses that drink the water. Maybe in real life it is 30-40% or something. I do not know. But I was not giving that as an example of our *daʿwah* situation, I was giving that as an example of how to understand the word *hidāyah* of *irshād* and *hidāya* of *tawfīq*, not the numbers or the stats. I am not talking about our modern time right now. What if I said that my analogy is referring to the time of the Prophet ﷺ? Nearly every person that he ﷺ gave *daʿwah* to spoke. So, that refutes your argument there. I am not talking about the application today I am talking about just the principle.

Q (online): If a person does not take action, is it proof of their insincerity? Like a person wanting to pray *tahajjud* but being weak.

A: There is a big difference between someone trying. As Allāh ﷻ says, if they really wanted to go out then they would have prepared. A person cannot be saying that I intend on going to *jihād*, I intend to go and defend the Muslims and not do a single bit of physical preparation, dieting, weight training, weapon training etc. It is 100% a sign of insincerity. A person trying and failing not even setting the alarm, are you kidding me?! You have to put the alarm on.

Q (online): One can have *hidāyat'l-tawfīq* without *hidāyat'l-irshād*, for example, a lot of simple people haven't studied but they have solid *tawḥīd*. Or are we saying you have to have both to have complete *hidāyah*?

A: No, that's not true. If they have *tawfīq* it's because they got there. This is not one of those chicken and egg arguments. When a person gets to the moment, that is the *hidāyah* of *irshād*. The moment then is *tawfīq*, if that makes sense.

Q (online): I'm wondering if the *fī* also makes it a request to be among the *muḥtadīn*, to live among them, as one of them?

A: I think that is something which works.

Student (online): The phrase dates to the 16th century. It appears in a book during that time by John Heywood called *A Dialogue Conteinyng The Nomber in Effect of all the Prouerbes in the English Tongue*, 1546: "A man may well bring a horse to the water, but he cannot make hym drinke without he will."

Student (online): It's not that the horses don't drink, it's that you can't make them drink. They have to do it themselves.

Q (online): Muslims visit graves not just for *tawassul*, or to be reminded of death but to see famous Muslims too, be they *ṣaḥābah*, saints or modern-day public figures to remember their life and history. Trying to understand where this practice of visiting graves sits in this instance?

A: I think it's okay. It's not the worst thing in the world.

Q (online): In *The Last Breath* we said the grave is intended to become indiscernible and *duʿā'* is not linked to being at the grave, but is it okay to visit the grave of a specific personality just to remember them?

A: Absolutely. It's not like it's *sunnah* to keep going. As I said in the class, the Prophet ﷺ warned his people not to go too much, turn it into a place where people come and make it as a site of pilgrimage, etc.[11]

It is okay to visit the grave to remember what is going on, etc.? I think that's okay.

Q (online): Can I give money to someone who will get a non-Islamic mortgage to buy a house?

A: I think that is allowed to give to someone unless you believe that if you say no, it will stop them from doing it. If you know that, then I think that is a reason to not give.

Q (online): Who would you recommend listening to for *ʿaqīdah* or books to study for *ʿaqīdah*? Are there any specific *sharḥs* you would suggest?

A: I'm assuming you mean in English. If you are meaning in English, there are two people that I like a lot. Shaykh Waleed Basyouni, even if he has conservative opinions. Listen. In *fiqh*, which is the least important of Islamic matters (that's an exaggeration but you get my point), we say that just to be on the safe side, pray extra or don't eat that food, etc. To be on the safe side be a bit more conservative, be a bit stricter and you will avoid the difference of opinion. That is the approach that we need to have in *ʿaqīdah* to avoid the nonsense, avoid the risk, avoid the *shirk*. I like conservative people when it comes to *ʿaqīdah*.

So, Shaykh Waleed and Abu Rumaysah. I know that both of them have done bits and pieces, *al- ʿAqīdah al-Wāsiṭiyyah*, for example. Those are the two that I think should be the sources of *ʿaqīdah*. In the UK, Haytham al-Ḥaddād. I think all these three people have done some kind of *ʿaqīdah*.

Q (online): How about the *Islamic Creed* series by Dr. ʿUmar S. al-Ashqar?
A: Yes, the *Islamic Creed* series is great. I haven't read it for like twenty years, but he's great. Definitely. Nice and straightforward. Wonderful and simple.

Q (online): Regarding *ḥarām* vs *shirk*, if you think that a person can hear you although they are dead, isn't that *shirk* in the *sifāt* of Allāh ﷻ since only Allāh ﷻ is all-hearing?

A: Yes, technically. But it's technically. I'll tell you why. What if you believe from a *fiqh* point of view that the dead can hear because the Prophet ﷺ said that they can hear your

[11] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of the Rites of Hajj, Chapter: Visiting Graves, ḥadīth no. 2042*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by *al-Albāni.*

footsteps?[12] Like I explain in the *Fiqh of Death* class, when I am describing the *ḥadīth* at the burial, it's something very interesting. The Prophet ﷺ didn't say *naʿlayn*, that they can hear the *naʿlayn*. A word was used which indicates a very specific type of sandal. The scholars differed over what this means. I don't want to get into a long discussion. My point is that it is possible that a scholar makes it out that the dead can hear you. You could make that weakest of weakest arguments. But if you did, that's not *shirk* then. That's you just being stupid, thinking that people can hear.

Student (online): What about:

﴿إِن تَدْعُوهُمْ لَا يَسْمَعُوا۟ دُعَآءَكُمْ ﴿١٤﴾﴾

"If you call them they cannot hear you." [*Sūrat Fāṭir*: 14]

Ustādh: It's not about that. You are not trying to convince me. They can't hear. But I'm just trying to say that there is enough to be the weakest of weakest arguments, and close your eyes to all of the *ayāt*, etc. What I'm trying to say is that we do not declare Muslims out of the faith based upon possible errant *taʾwīl*. We declare Muslims out of the faith when they go against consensus, do major *taḥrīf* of the sources, etc. It's a dangerous thing to do and a very silly thing to think that the dead hear. And it raises a lot of problems.

People go to the graves all the time, not to ask them for anything, but just to speak to them. They know that they can't *hear them, hear them*, but they have this emotional satisfaction that '*You can hear me. And I just want you to 'hear me out'*,' even though they can't hear. I don't want to turn this into an *ʿaqīdah* class.

[12] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Paradise, Its Description, Its Bounties and Its Inhabitants, Chapter: The Deceased Is Shown His Place in Paradise or the Fire; and Confirmation of the Torment in the Grave—We Seek Refuge with Allāh ﷻ From That, ḥadīth no. 2870 a.*

28. Chapter 21 Lesson 7: The Supererogatory Prayer

وَيَقْنُتُ فِيْهَا بَعْدَ الرُّكُوعِ ويقول:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لِي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ، إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ.

One performs the *qunūt* after the *rukūʿ* saying:

"O Allāh, guide me along with those whom You have guided, pardon me along with those whom You have pardoned, be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to and bless for me that which You have bestowed. Protect me from the evil You have decreed for verily You decree and none can decree over You. For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty. O our Lord, Blessed and Exalted are You."

Last week we covered:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ

We spoke about *hidāyah*, the different types of it, the fact that you have to make sure that if you're leading the *ṣalāh* to make it plural.

And now we come to:

وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ

[O Allāh] pardon me along with those whom You have pardoned.

That is at the top of page 22. So we'll start off by saying that if you're making that *duʿāʾ* then the same way you will need to say *wa ʿāfina fi man ʿāfayt*. You will need to also speak in the plural. When you are by yourself you should practice and be accurate and say *wa ʿāfini fi man ʿāfayt*.

Again, like last week this is a form of *tawassul*, getting close to Allāh ﷻ, interceding to Allāh ﷻ using what? What are we using?

Not anything dodgy, anything doubtful, anything whatever. We are using the action of Allāh ﷻ, the generosity of Allāh ﷻ. *ʿĀfini fi man ʿāfayt* so pardon me along with those whom You have pardoned. '*You have pardoned them yā Allāh! They are as I am. They don't deserve pardoning neither do I, none of us do. But You have shown Your generosity to them, yā Allāh show Your generosity to me. Include me along with them*.' So, this act that He has done, *subḥānah*, when people are undeserving, He has shown His generosity so *yā* Allāh include me as well. So, that's another example.

And this will of course continue and continue, as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says:

فكأنَّكَ تقول : كما عافيتَ غيري فعافِني .

So, it is almost like he is saying: Well, just like You are pardoning other folks then pardon me as well.

والمعافاة

What does *al-muʿāfāh* mean or pardoning mean?

المُراد بها المعافاةُ في الدِّين والدُّنيا،

When you say *ʿāfini* it's a very general phrase. The problem is that I can't for the life of me work out a word (maybe we can in this class) which combines between the two objectives or the two intentions by the word. Most people who are non-Arab, when they hear the word *ʿāfiyah* or they hear any of its versions or *Allāhumma ʿāfini*, etc. they're thinking of the *duʿāʾ* of *maghfirah*, of forgiveness, specifically pardoning. And as I said last week:

اللَّهُمَّ إِنَّكَ عَفُوٌّ كَرِيمٌ تُحِبُّ الْعَفْوَ فَاعْفُ عَنِّي

"O Allāh, indeed You are pardoning, [generous], You love to pardon, so pardon me."[1]

This is nice, straightforward, focusing on sins, mistakes etc. So, that's *ʿāfiyah* of the heart, the internal.

ʿĀfiyah, it is strange actually. When it comes to dialectal kind of Arabic, when it comes to the *ʿawwām*, the masses, they kind of mean it in a kind of like a polite kind of phrase. It's like saying everything's good and wishing good and so on. Now *ʿāfiyah* in Arabic also has a connection to health. So, when we actually say 'we ask for *al-ʿāfiyah*', we are asking for sound body, sound health, purifying from disease, conditions etc. etc.

Student (online): Isn't it like health?

Ustādh: So it is like health. It is absolutely health. But when we say *bi'l-ʿāfiyah* depending upon the tone and the question mark being said, it's: '*How are you?*' versus '*How are you doing?*' or '*I am all good*'—in colloquial Arabic. And the colloquial Arabic kind of takes the *ʿāfiyah* as far as you want to go.

But from an Arabic, from a *fuṣḥah* point of view, it means pardon in terms of sins; and it means health in terms of being in good health and well-being. That's what *ʿāfiyah* basically means.

Student (online): Bless you or bless it.

Ustādh: Bless you. That's the word.

But like I said, I have seen a wide spectrum.

So now that you understand its connotations and so on and so forth. Let's now look at it from a Qurʾān and *Sunnah* point of view, from a pure Arabic usage. Shaykh says:

(0:10:00) والمعافاة :المُراد بها المعافاةُ في الدِّين والدُّنيا، فتشملَ الأمرين :أنْ يعافيكَ مِنْ أسقام الدِّين، وهي أمراضُ القلوب التي مدارُها على الشَّهوات والشُّبُهاتِ، ويعافيك من أمراضِ الأبدان، وهي اعتلال صِحَّةِ البَدَنِ.

So, when we ask for *ʿāfiyah* we are asking for *ʿāfiyah* in two particular paradigms: the internal and the external. The internal is the spiritual, it is the matters or the sicknesses

[1] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Supplication, Chapter: Concerning the Virtue of Asking for ʿĀfiyah and Muʿāfāh, ḥadīth no. 3513*. This narration is graded as *ṣaḥīḥ*.

of the heart—*amrāḍʾl-qulūb*. And *amrāḍʾl-qulūb* are two main ones: *shubuhāt* and *shahawāt*, doubts and desires. So things that you're unsure of because of either *waswās* or mostly because of *jahl*, because you don't know, or maybe even because the matter is difficult, maybe it requires some faith.

This is an unscientific breakdown (my one) of the types of *shubuhāt*. I have seen scholars talk about *shubuhāt* into detail and whatever whatnot. And like I have said before one scholar's fifteen versions is the same as another person's three as another person's five. It depends on what their intention is or how they're trying to break it down. But for me the *shubuhāt*, the doubts, are either because a person's so weak in *imān* so the most obvious point is going to be a problem for them, or the doubt comes because they have *jahl* because they have no knowledge about something. And so when you don't have any knowledge then you always say silly things, stupid things and that just leads you to go worse and it leads you into doubt. I forgot the third one. I gave three examples. I can't think of the third one.

Then the *shahawāt*, the desires, the desire to want to eat more, or to sleep more, or to use your body in ways that you know are impermissible etc. These are what we call the *asqāmʾl-dīn*, the diseases of the religion, the diseases of the internal, the diseases of the heart. And that is when you want *ʿāfiyah.* You want protection from that.

And then you have *amrāḍʾl-badn* that is basically everything,

Student (online): *Waswās*.

Ustādh: *Waswās*. *Jazākum Allāh khayr*. You have good knowledge and your *imān* is high, but you know *shayṭān* is always looking for a weak point. And they get in and they start to throw doubts against you when you know what's right, when you know the truth, you have got good knowledge, you have got good *imān*.

I really felt I needed to say that because Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn does not really elaborate on this point. But like I spent quite a bit of last week's session, I really do think it is important for us to understand this concept of doubt especially with so many people so amazed and wowed by the bigger wider world and what they are seeing and the internet, and the information superhighway, and what they are being exposed to, and so on and so forth.

That's the internal and that's the external—external meaning the body. Of course, the body is an internal reality as well, but I mean physical. Better to say physical and spiritual, I think something like that. That is *al-muʿāfah*.

Shaykh continues and says that of course mankind, humans, they need both. They need protection from both. They need to cure their internal, their spiritual ills and their physical ones. But there is no doubt that the protection or the curing of the sicknesses of the heart is far, far more important. Far more important because the consequences

of the sickness of the body is the destruction of the *dunya*. The destruction of your *dunya*—miserable *dunya*, painful dunya, and maybe even the death of you in the *dunya*, which of course is serious.

We should not make out, '*Oh this dunya is nothing!*' This *dunya* is very much something. Allāh ﷻ has made it a place that's meant to be peaceful. Allāh ﷻ can put people in difficult situations, situations of war, situations of *hijrah*, situations of migrations, situations of turmoil and then He gives that peace

﴿وَءَامَنَهُم مِّنْ خَوْفٍۭ ٤﴾

"[Who provides them with] safety to ward off fear." [*Sūrat Quraysh*: 4]

That is in the *dunya.* That is fear. And then He gives them *sakīnah* and tranquillity which is a blessing which makes the *dunya* liveable. And He is proud of saying that. We are happy when we receive that.

﴿وَلَا تَنسَ نَصِيبَكَ مِنَ ٱلدُّنْيَا ٧٧﴾

"Do not neglect your rightful share in this world." [*Sūrat al-Qaṣaṣ*: 77]

Allāh ﷻ says: "And don't forget your share of this *dunya*," meaning it's part of you to work there, enjoy family, enjoy relationships, *ḥalāl* desires. So, don't think that just because it's the *dunya* it's something pointless and the *amrāḍ* of the *badn* if it's only ruining the *dunya* making *dunya* difficult for you, that is not important. No. The person who is having weakness and problems in *dunya*, in their physical health in the *dunya*, they are going to suffer in a number of different ways. That suffering can lead a person away from Allāh ﷻ as well. That suffering can make it more difficult to worship Allāh ﷻ as well.

That's why the scholars when they spoke about the ruling on medicine, a lot of them went down the angle of: What is the impact of this medication on your *ṭāʿah*, on your obedience? And they said that if not taking the medicine is definitely going to reduce your obedience of Allāh ﷻ, then it is obligatory to take the medicine.

On the other hand, there are some people that thrive in illnesses. The majority of those folks are in limited illnesses, limited time. We have spoken about this before. You know how a person is in top health, good health and then they are struck by something, something temporary, acute condition like a flu, like a heavy bout of the flu. And then they become so much closer to Allāh ﷻ. They become closer for a number of reasons:

because they taste weakness, they see so many limitations of their body. Automatically, by feeling that limitation they recognise the Unlimited. They remember the Unlimited, the All-Powerful, the One who does not sleep, the One who does not nap, the One who doesn't feel pain, the One who isn't weak. So, it is a great reminder.

And also sometimes—I can speak about myself—but there is also like as masochistic thing going on as well. It's like the example of when sometimes a person gets punched in a fight, like in a boxing match and you smack them in the face, and they start laughing. It's kind of funny. There is a sweetness to being smacked, especially if you get smacked proper and you taste that proper pain. It's so painful it sends you a bit doolally. I don't want to make a major point of that, but I'm just saying sometimes there are special kinds of things that people experience.

So, I don't want to just go to one extreme or the other extreme that illness is all very good for you, or we should have no illness whatsoever. But it has its importance it needs to be dealt with.

But it pales into insignificance compared to the sicknesses of the heart because that will lead to the destruction of the *ākhirah*. If you have *shubuhāt* that lead you to deny Allāh ﷻ and His messenger ﷺ or doesn't allow you to make them your priority i.e., *nifāq*, so you become from the *munāfiqīn*, you become from the *kuffār*, you have destroyed your *ākhirah* into eternity. For whatever reason that you thought, whatever benefit you achieved in this life, you thought everything was going great. Actually, your heart was complementary diseased and riddled actually, all the way through. So, that's a disaster.

As for the *shahawāt*, they are those things that you have to be very, very careful [about]. That's why when it comes to the *shahawāt* you see often examples in the *Sunnah* or from the *ṣaḥābah* of how the *shahawāt* must not be taken lightly. Whether it's the Prophet ﷺ explaining the concept of sin as being small stones, small pebbles that keep developing, they keep developing, until it suddenly becomes a mountain, or the idea of sins being like a smell that if a person were to do it, they would only carry on and so on then it becomes a stench that a person would not even want to get close to them—it always escalates. That's one way of looking at it.

The other way of looking at it, or the other kind of angle, is to consider it in the manner like we see from the Prophet ﷺ in the story of (there are different stories) but the story of the monk who was protecting himself from all the people, avoiding relationships etc. Then he was tempted by the girl who then came and put the food for him in the tower, at his door etc. and he is keeping himself away. But then that one slight slip, which led to that one moment, which led to the *ḥarām* because desires couldn't be controlled. She then said, '*I'm going to tell the people*.' He was terrified that was going to happen. He then kills her. My point is that it escalates. And then it escalates into maybe even *kufr*.

(0:20:00) And for example, the statement of ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd ؓ that alcohol is *umm'l-khabā'ith* for example. These stories and these statements are there to really cement

that when it comes to desires, even the smallest ones, even what you think is minor, once it gets out of control you will not be able to stop it. And alcohol is one of those crazy things where the next day when you see a person who is regretful for what they did the day before or night before, they are completely and utterly unrecognisable to the person from the previous day. Like respectable, normal, decent people. Alcohol goes in, it just goes absolutely mental. They can go all the way to rape, to killing, murder, killing themselves, stupidity. It is a madness. Once you think, '*Ah! Just let me a little bit of escapism*,' etc.

So let there be absolutely no doubt about that, that the *amrāḍ'l-qulūb*, that the sicknesses of the heart are far, far, far more important and more serious than the sicknesses of the body.

Shaykh says that it is absolutely obligatory upon us, for us to always keep an eye and keep a check on our hearts. Because from the body it is so clear, so obvious. You feel a pain, you immediately feel it. You know where it is. You understand. This is one of the reasons why the Ḥanābilah (we will come to this maybe sometime) they didn't like painkillers, especially the modern kind of Ḥanābilah. They really didn't like it. The same as actually doctors. The same reason. Because once you keep taking painkillers especially during the onset of a pain, in a condition that is not very clear, the pain, its location, its intensity etc. is normally the biggest clue to actually trying to work out what the problem is. Sometimes you can continue taking painkillers and you mess up and you get so far down the line, and it is a disaster. From another angle, taking these painkillers makes the body even weaker. Your pain threshold is reduced, is reduced, is reduced, is reduced. The less painkillers you take, more pain that you can deal with. It is just like any muscle. It is like any cardiovascular exercise. You keep running 5 km every single day, very soon you will be able to add a sixth kilometre and a seventh and an eighth and you never, ever imagined. Never ever imagined that that could be possible. Once the body gets used to something you can then lift the game. So, pain is the same. Once you keep avoiding something, you will make yourself to be stronger and so on and so forth. So, just keep that in mind

However, my point is that if anything happens to the body, you are spot bang on to it. You know exactly what is going on. Whereas with the heart, people dismiss it. You are not sure. You have yes men around you who keep telling you that you are fine, or you are great or whatever. Or maybe you have nobody around you, and you just carry on. You feel you know like a righteous keyboard warrior; you are doing what you are thinking is good. It is very difficult to see. It's not like it bleeds. It's not like it aches. It's not like it bruises. It's not like it coughs. The heart itself is silent. It requires deep introspection. It requires a person with insight to appreciate how they are feeling etc., what is their sincerity saying, what is their levels of hypocrisy—because everybody has some form of level of hypocrisy. Every person has something of it, minor forms of it, minor aspects of it. It is when it starts to build up and develop, then it becomes serious. Hypocrisy is a spectrum. It goes all the way to *kufr*. The vast majority of people who have the *nifāq* is in the early 20-30% of the kind of the bars of hypocrisy.

So, he says: Have they become dirtied, or are they clean? And he says that if you are regularly keeping your heart clean by your relationship with Allāh ﷻ and the Prophet ﷺ through His *dīn* and also you are constantly keeping it clean with your relationships with the people, how they see you, it's a test isn't it? You put yourself to the test by exposing yourself to people or situations. How legit are you? There is a difference between sparring and a real fight. So, when you are placed in front of the people and they test you and they push you and they test your patience, how are you? How are you in your dealings with them? If you do that regularly, then you are not only doing a great deed, this auditing act is an act of *ʿibādah*, but you are protecting yourself in the future as well. And you are also becoming very aware.

I want to add to this that keeping yourself in good company as well, not just good company in terms of people around you, but also keeping a pure environment around you. One of the things that you need to know is that we are entirely conditioned by our environment. You watch too much filth, your heart will become completely used to filth. You listen to music, then your ears will become accustomed to that nonsense. It will turn away from Qurʾān. It will turn away from purity. You will pollute your own system.

It is again, to use the example of diet, a person eats load of rubbish. Most people they can't tell and they rubbish the idea. People like me rubbish the idea of organic food, this, that, blah, blah, blah. I rubbish it because I have just put filth day and night into my body. For me, organic eggs, organic milk—organic is not going to do jack squat for me bro. Organic milk is not going to help me when I'm dashing ten gallons of Diet Coke. You see a person who changes their diet from junk food, from sugar, refined sugar for example, stops refined sugar, it is an incredible effect upon a person's health. They stop diet soda drinks, etc, I've been there (a long time ago), and I see it with the people around me. And forget that it's my professional advice to folks. People look after themselves in terms of what they put in, it's incredible. Likewise, the heart is the same. If you are seeing pictures of nakedness, advertising boards, magazines, and films, and you become used to it.

Ertuğrul is a very good example. I want you to bottle the shock that you felt when you saw Ḥalīmah's hair, or when you saw Selcun's hair. You felt so disappointed. You felt so let down. It was so extreme. (This is not a spoiler.) What did you feel when Bamse does what he does in that episode? It quite literally was disgusting to look at. That is how easy you condition the heart and mind. That is how powerful it is. And this is not about binge watching. It's the same as being in the Ḥaram. When you're in the Ḥaram and when you're in these kinds of places, and you come to a different place and everything kind of goes, it really hurts. It really, really, really hurts.

Imagine if you are only in a community where everyone is practicing, everyone is doing right, everyone is praying, everyone is wearing *ḥijāb* and *jilbāb*, everyone is doing the beards and the *sunnah* of the looking. Everything.

(0:30:00)

Student (online): Like when the *ḥijāb* comes off on the airplane home from *ʿUmrah*?

Ustādh: Yeah. Like when a *ḥijāb* comes off. Like on the way there a woman might not be wearing a *ḥijāb* and you didn't even notice, and when you're coming out… It's just so much more extreme. That's just how the body is conditioned.

So, it's so important to keep ourselves, to create that artificial force field. It's one thing moaning about it and saying, '*Oh that's a disaster*,' and all the rest of it. But it's another thing to take a lesson from it. The lesson from it is to stick with the good people. You're able to do that in your life. You can cut people out. You can change your company. You can change your work. You can change things.

The main thing is that you must be careful from becoming heedless. That's the most important thing. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: Because if you do become heedless, then you lose that connection to Allāh ﷻ, then sometimes it's very difficult to go back.

Shaykh says then:

فحافظ على أن تفتش قلبك دائما

Get into the habit of regularly auditing yourself, examining your heart, checking that you're in the right kind of place. Sometimes you might have the illness of doubt, and sometimes you might have the illness of desires. But *alḥamdulillāh* every single thing has a cure.

فالقرآن دواء للشبهات والشهوات

The Qurʾān itself is a cure for the *shubuhāt* and the *shahawāt*—for both of them. (I will elaborate on this in a minute.)

فالترغيب في الجنة والتحذير من النار دواء الشهوات.

To encourage people to think about *Jannah*, the warning of the Hellfire and avoiding punishment is the cure for the *shahawāt*. Desires are very uncomplicated. They are very unsophisticated. That's why we call them base desires, because it's just pathetic really. It's about discipline. That's why I've always told my children, I've always told everyone that's close to me that literally the only single thing between the best and the rest is discipline.

You know that I translate *taqwa* as discipline as well. I know that it doesn't work so well in a lot of the cases because obviously *taqwa* means to protect oneself and you're protecting yourself from the anger of Allāh ﷻ. But my twist on that is that the only way that a person protects themselves from Allāh's ﷻ anger is by being disciplined in the *dīn*. Because when the Companion explained what *taqwa* is to the other Companion and he said to him: '*Think of it like this. When you're going through a field and it's full of thorns, how do you get through?*' So he said, '*I get my thawb and I tie it close, and I manoeuvre myself like this and like that so I avoid the thorn catching up on me*.' He said, '*That's taqwa*. *You see the dangers everywhere and you then protect yourself*.'

For me, this is discipline. The dangers are all our desires being elicited every single moment, and a person says, '*I'm going to go to sleep now*.' '*I'm going to read my Qurʾān now*.' '*I'm going to turn off my phone now*.' '*I'm going to eat only good now*.' '*I'm going to make my ṣalāh now*.' '*I'm going to wake up no matter what happens*.' It's just straightforward discipline.

And the people of… whether it's the Bill Gates or the Steve Jobs or the top scholars that you see, etc., etc., they're just more disciplined. They gave up TV. These people put in hours of memorising, sitting in deserts, sitting in *madrasahs* for hours, back and forth with the Qurʾān which is so boring, so repetitive. At that moment in time, it's very difficult to tell the person, '*It's going to be so great*.' These are children mostly, even if you are older, you do not have time during *ḥifẓ* to be thinking about all the meanings, and all the beauties, and all the *tadabbur*. Memorisation is memorisation. It is cold. It is all about repetition. So, you require discipline.

When you think about the Stanford test, obviously there has been papers against it saying it was fake etc.—that is all nonsense. Ignore that. It is very simple. The test that was given to children. One by one they were brought into the room, and they were given a marshmallow. And they said to them that here is a marshmallow. You can have it right now and enjoy it. But if you can wait 15-20 minutes then we will give you a full bowl of marshmallows instead. You can imagine that little stress, that mission upon the child that is looking at that, counting the seconds and thinking. Most of them were going for it (they ate the marshmallow). They said, '*Forget that!*' They are young. Those who had no discipline, or poor discipline, or not thought about it, or trained in discipline or even being given that *tarbiyah* from their parents, they took it and that is the end of it. Those few that did hold out for 15-20 minutes, were patient and just took it, the guy came on time, put the bowl there and said, '*Knock it out!*' They got a whole bowl and smashed it. And they deserved it.

Student (online): Delay of instant gratification.

Ustādh: Exactly! The difference between instant gratification and deferred gratification.

That's not the interesting thing, the interesting thing is that the control group and these two groups then were studied for the next thirty years. They looked at these people.

The ones that preferred deferred gratification that waited, those folks were far more advanced in all measures of life and all qualities of life, in all the 'qualities' as they say in terms of wealth, financial, etc. because discipline is the key to everything. Absolutely everything.

Patience comes under discipline. Being patient is being disciplined. When you see something that you really like then discipline.

Student (online): Like the debate with Hiba of watching two episodes instead of like eight over the weekend.

Ustādh: Exactly. It has been a very, very difficult journey to watch Ertuğrul in one whole year—5000 episodes or maybe like 450 or something like that. She makes a good point. Hiba is six, and we are making a deal with her. And trust comes into it, but when someone is really into it, frankly Hiba has been the driver of our entire Ertuğrul thing. Without her it was never going to happen. She is the one who is the most into it, she is the one dragging us along. Two episodes right now, and I am like, '*I can't do it, but I promise over the whole weekend we will do eight*.' And sometimes she took it. I must admit, I don't think she took it all the time. But sometimes she did. She had that discipline.

Discipline is so, so, so important in every life skill. And patience is the biggest expression of it. When you are fasting, you are being patient with hunger and thirst. When you are seeing your desires in something which you know is going to be great, you are being patient because deferring that gratification, deferring that self-gratification, deferring that opportunity to enjoy what you know that you are going to enjoy right now, and deferring it to a time where you will get infinitely more, is the skill. It is called *imān*, it is what Muslims should perfect. It is what the Prophet ﷺ said, as Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says:

ولهذا كان نبيُّنا صلّى الله عليه وسلّم إذا رأى ما يعجِبُه مِن الدُّنيا قال: «لبيَّكَ إنَّ العَيْشَ عَيْشُ الآخِرةِ»

If he ﷺ saw anything which impressed him from the *dunya*, that amazed him, he ﷺ would say:

لبيَّكَ إنَّ العَيْشَ عَيْشُ الآخِرةِ

"O Allāh! Indeed, the real life is only the life of the *ākhirah*." [2]

[2] *Muṣannaf Ibn abi Shaybah*, *4/107*.

Labbayk is like: 'O Allāh!' in this particular context. "The real life is only the life of the next life or the *ākhirah*." That's the real deal. The real deal is the *ākhirah*. Seeing that and saying, '*Yeah you are good, but that's the one I am waiting for*.' '*Yeah, you be nice, but*..'

(0:40:00) Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says something nice here. He says when he ﷺ would say *labbayk*

يعني: إجابةً لك، مِن أجلِ أنْ يكبَحَ جِمَاحَ النَّفْسِ

Maybe this not the way Shaykh is saying it, but how I would like to explain it. You know when you have your desires and they become excessive, and to curb the excess of your desire is a success. It's a battle to try and control yourself. Sometimes when you recognise the fight, you appreciate it. Sometimes when you recognise the threat, you appreciate it. So it's *labbayk*: '*Yā Allāh! I see that. I see it. I feel it. But I am here for You yā Allāh. I am going to do better. I am in control. I am going to rein that in. I am going to curb that desire*.' It does this kind disciplining of the soul. So, anything that he ﷺ sees from the delights of the *dunya* he ﷺ turns to Allāh ﷻ and disciplines himself and he ﷺ says that the real life is the life of the *al-ākhirah*.

لا عيشُ الدُّنيا

Not the life of this life. And indeed, the Prophet ﷺ was true. As Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn says:

فإنه عيشٌ دائمٌ ونعيمٌ لا تنغيصَ فيه

Of course, it is true because that *'īsh*, that *ākhirah*, that life, is a continuous one, entirely blissful, no deficiencies, as opposed to the enjoyment of this *dunya* which is deficient, which is limited. It is going to go. It's a madness actually, if you think about it. Just rationally and logically think about what people are selling just because of their absolute insatiable desire to be instantly gratified. It is a madness to be honest.

Shaykh says:

وأما دواءُ القُلوبِ مِن أمراضِ الشُّبُهَاتِ فالقُرآنُ كلُّه بيانٌ وفُرقانٌ تزولُ به جميعُ الشُّبهات

As for the cure for the hearts who are suffering from the sickness of doubts, the Qurʾān, it is an explanation, it is a criterion, and with it, it removes all doubts. All doubts. Because the Book of Allāh, all of it is full of knowledge and explanation. It removes the poison and the sickness of doubts. It is full of *targhīb wa tarhīb* (encouragement and warning), which removes the poison of the desires.

You think, '*Is it worth it?*' I might take this *riba*. I might do this *zina.* I might do this x, y, z. You read what Allāh ﷻ says will happen in the Hellfire, what will happen to the people and their skin getting burnt, and they are going to eat from *al-zaqqūm*, and drink from this. '*Forget that bro. Flippin' heck! I'm going to go camping. Forget that.*' Some people become weak. They need the *thappar* (slap). And that is the slap!

And as the Shaykh says, the problem is that we are heedless of this Book. We just do not recognise how powerful this Book is. We do not recognise that all of it is just so good for us in so many ways that we don't realise. Also, the pure *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ.

I just want to mention something here before I go into the next section that he talks about in terms of sickness. It's very nice and interesting what he says.

Shahawāt are straightforward, like I said. Nobody needs to be speaking about them. A person who falls for *shahawāt*, they are petty, they are minor, and they are just embarrassing.

Shubuhāt are the real problem. They are the real problem. It is undoubted that there are a number of things that a person will read and understand, and they won't get it. Add to that the fact that people are emotionally affected as well. Emotionally affected.

An example that comes to me is feminism. Feminism is complete *kufr*—its foundations, its principles. It is a system to change the natural order of Allāh ﷻ when it comes to relationships and gender roles, and so on, and so forth. Whenever you break it down like that to any Muslim male or female, anyone who believes in Allāh ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ, they easily see that. The problem is that not everyone is in their right state of mind. When you have been emotionally abused, domestically abused, when you have not been given your rights, when you have been x, y, z—more so, women than men—then your emotional damage turns the desire to be self-respected and get some dignity into a weapon. Or it creates holes in your creed, in your *imān*, and in your faith that should not have ever been there.

So, this is a doubt which the *ʿilm* of the Qurʾān would solve—detailed *ʿilm* and basic *ʿilm*. Detailed *ʿilm*, you would learn that actually there are huge rights for women, etc., etc. And you will recognise that you are far more looked after in Islam than any other system, etc.

But the basic *ʿilm* of the Qurʾān is what?

The basic *ʿilm* is that do not mix up the message with the messenger. That is a basic Qurʾānic message. That is why when we say that the Qurʾān is the cure for *shubuhāt*, that is an absolute classic message. A universal message. That just because everyone is abusing women and so on and so forth, that should not lead you to be thinking that Islam has got the problem so that you now go and embrace another -ism, another, -ology, another x or a y. No! The *dīn* is still straight. Maintain your values. Stick to what Allāh ﷻ says and wants you to be, act, say, believe, dress, express, whatever. And the people who are doing it in a wrong way, Allāh ﷻ will deal with them. That is like a one basic example.

Another more serious example would be something that is genuinely difficult to understand. Like genuinely difficult where we cannot appreciate the wisdom of Allāh ﷻ in His Decree. I think probably the most genuinely difficult one, the one, if I am going to ask myself emotionally that I find difficult, is eternal punishment… Even that I don't find difficult. I was thinking of the condemning to the Fire those who don't believe in Him, meaning salvific exclusivity.

Student (online): Deformed children?

Ustādh: No. I have no problem with deformed children. At all. At all.

Student (online): Right hand possession.

Ustādh: At all. I have no problem with that. No.

I have no problem with slavery. I have no problem with evil. *Subḥān Allāh*. I celebrate the existence of evil.

Student online: Eternal punishment.

Ustādh: Eternal punishment. This is basically what I want to speak about. That's exactly it. Well done.

I have no problem with the *kuffār* being punished. Eternal punishment is something that… And there is not a single person on this planet that can explain away eternal punishment. Not a single person.

Student (online): Large numbers of Muslim young people cannot accept the idea of the prohibition of LGBTQ behaviours.

Ustādh: Yeah, but that is just so stupid. We are not talking about that. That is complete and utter lack of *tarbiyah*. I am not talking about stupidity. I am talking about genuine problems. That is not a genuine problem. That is a pleb. That is a person who wants to be slapped silly—at the very basic level.

No, I am talking about eternal punishment. The Qurʾān for me is the only solution for that.

Student (online): Even eternal pleasure.

(0:50:00) Ustādh: No bro. I have no problem with eternal pleasure. Let me just make that very clear.

Student (online): The concept of forever itself is something beyond our comprehension.

Ustādh: Obviously, it is beyond our ability. I know that is what you mean.

But I just want you to understand that like I've told you guys many times before, the same analogy of the *sajdah*—sometimes you go into *sajdah* and you just connect with Allāh ﷻ and bam! That's it. Everything disappears from my heart—problems, difficulties, doubts, questions, this, that, blah blah blah. Like everything. The most difficult doubt. Because you see, I know, you know, everybody knows that we've got a very limited understanding of reality.

We've got the examples in the Qurʾān and in the *dīn* and anecdotal life. Forget Qurʾān and *dīn*. How many non-Muslims are there that go through an experience and say it's the worst thing ever; this is the worst moment of my life whatever. And just two weeks later—let alone two years, let alone 22 years later when they look back and say, '*That was the greatest thing that happened to me because it led me to do this*.'

'*I killed someone, I went to prison, in prison I met a person, that person showed me Islam*,' etc.

When you look back in hindsight everything sounds okay. So that's my point.

Even with the eternality of punishment for the *kuffār*, which would probably be the single thing which I find just you know… not *shubuhāt* or whatever, just like mmm... I say that knowing that when I get there *in shāʾ Allāh* I will understand fully the wisdom. When I get there, I'll understand that our minds and its capacity was created only for this *dunya* and if Allāh ﷻ expands it then we'll understand so much more and it won't even be a question, it won't even be a problem anymore. That's the beauty. That's the first thing you have to tell people, that you don't know anything. And once you do know, then you'll realise. And so many times in life we're proven wrong. And so therefore, despite saying that I still have that there [in my heart]. And that only goes away when I make *sajdah*. You know why? Because I'm connected to Allāh ﷻ. And once you connect to Allāh ﷻ you then realise none of it matters. '*This is Allāh. None of it matters. This is Allāh and He knows*.' Once you've reached that certainty of Allāh ﷻ, and this is the defence of *imān*, nothing matters anymore, any single thing. Because I know Allāh ﷻ will explain. And this is a very basic thing.

Student (online): Sometimes it is the recital of the Qurʾān that enters the heart more than any explanation ever did and creates peace with those *ayāt*/concepts.

Ustādh: It's just like you said, the recital of the Qurʾān enters the heart, more than any other explanation and creates peace. Just a peace.

Student (online): I don't find a problem with eternal punishment. Is that a problem or I didn't think enough about it?

Ustādh: No! Don't think there is some bigger problem that I have to find because I don't find a problem with it. No, no. It is not a problem at all. I am just giving you an example that sometimes the Qurʾān just prioritises things. Let me give you an example.

You're always told your brain is limited. You know that you are limited. You learn every day because you make mistakes every single day, you forget things. So you know that you are limited, you are deficient. You know that. And yet somehow, we act like we're not. We act like we understand everything. When you connect with Allāh ﷻ—the Infinite, and the Unlimited—especially in *sajdah* or when you read His Book, it's a bam! At that moment. '*Oh sugar! You know what? I just realised who I am. Of course, I don't understand because I'm an idiot, because I'm a human*.' It's that reminder of who Allāh ﷻ is. That is what it means by the Qurʾān. That is what it means by *imān*. That is what it means by that *sajdah* because you just meet Allāh ﷻ. You see Allāh ﷻ. You feel Allāh ﷻ. That is what gets rid of it—not because it's getting rid of the doubt, but it's reminding you that, '*How do you even rate yourself to understand this issue anyway?*'

I can tell you right now, that there was never ever in many years—I've lived a painful long many years of many issues, many *fatwas*. I am not older than most of you, but many of you I am older than. And when you're in the position of *fatwa* people bring the worst things. The worst cases of abuse, the worst cases of *zina* children, murder, etc., the kinds of things that you see from the people, what they're doing, what they've done… Honestly, if I were to tell you some of the real life *fatāwa* I've been asked to work out/comment on etc., and we would turn these into films, it would be like the Oscar for the greatest screenplay goes to this guy. Because just the imagination, you wouldn't be able to imagine it. But human beings, they do actually do it. The craziest things.

Aright, so let's go on to the next part. He says: As for the curing or ensuring well-being or asking for the well-being, then its treatment is to be divided into two categories. The first category is:

طِبٌّ جَاءَتْ بِهِ الشَّرِيعَةُ

That which is mentioned in our *dīn* specifically.

And the second one is outside of the *dīn*. I don't know what we're going to call that. We'll call this one *Sharʿi* medicine and we'll call that one [conventional] medicine.

As for the *Sharʿi* medicine, the medicine that comes from the *Sharīʿah*, then it presents itself into two main forms. There are two expressions of *Sharʿi* medicine. The first one is the physical. The first example at the bottom of page 23 is what Allāh ﷻ says*:*

﴿يَخْرُجُ مِنْ بُطُونِهَا شَرَابٌ مُخْتَلِفٌ أَلْوَانُهُ فِيهِ شِفَاءٌ لِلنَّاسِ ﴿٦٩﴾﴾

"From their bellies comes a drink of different colours in which there is healing for people."

[*Sūrat al-Naḥl:* 69]

We all know that honey has medicinal properties, antiviral properties, antibacterial properties. It is good on the skin. It is good for clearing the system out etc., etc. So that is fine. And this is similar.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn continues: Such as the statement of the Prophet ﷺ in relation to *ḥabbatʾl-sawdāʾ,* the black seed:

وكقول النَّبيِّ صلّى الله عليه وسلّم في الحَبَّةِ السَّوداءِ «إنها شفاء من كل داء إلا السام»

It is a cure for every illness except death. This is *ḥadīth* narrated by Bukhāri, Muslim, and other places.[3,4]

On page 24, he says this is also similar, these are all physical forms of *Sharʿi* medicine, like what you might call Prophetic medicine. I think that is what people call it. But it is like *Sharʿi* medicine.

وكقوله صلّى الله عليه وسلّم في الكَمْأَةِ: «الكَمْأَةُ مِنَ المَنِّ وماؤُهَا شِفاءٌ للعَيْنِ»

Such as his statement ﷺ [about] *al-kamʾah*, truffles. The Prophet ﷺ said:

---

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Medicine, Chapter: (To Treat with) Black Cumin (Nigella Seeds), hadīth no. 5687.*
[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Greetings, Chapter: Healing Sickness with the Black Seed, ḥadīth no. 2215 a.*

الْكَمْأَةُ مِنَ الْمَنِّ، وَمَاؤُهَا شِفَاءٌ لِلْعَيْ

"The *kamʾah* is like the *manna* and its water is a cure for the eyes." [5,6]

(1:00:00) Translation here is that truffles are from *mann* and its water is a cure for the eyes or a healing for the eyes. And there are many other examples of that. And all of this is physical medicine that is found in the Qurʾān and in the *Sunnah*.

By the way, just on this *ḥadīth* because every other *ḥadīth* is pretty straightforward. This one is a funky one:

الْكَمْأَةُ مِنَ الْمَنِّ

I don't even know whether you guys know what truffles are, but they belong to the mushroom family. They are underground, they look like a potato, but they are softer. They are smaller, underground, supremely expensive, beautiful taste, hugely expensive, very rich in aroma. Lots of fake out there. The Muslim World has loads of it especially in the *Maghrib*, so in Morocco, Jazāʿir, Libya, these kinds of places. And especially those which are close to France. And then France, of course, has a very expensive developed market. Everybody loves a bit of truffle, it is beautiful. But the interesting thing is that it is a very special type of fungus. And it is an interesting one because it does not have any chlorophyll.

Anyway, here is the thing. The Prophet ﷺ said that this is from *mann.* First of all, I want you to know that there are a number of studies (I mastered this in pharmacy donkeys' years ago) and the water of it is actually very effective, more effective than chloramphenicol, more effective than steroids, for certain conditions of the eye. Now I know that we should not be saying that…

Student (online): Are you saying people call herbal remedies mentioned in the Qurʾān and *Sunnah ṭibb Sharʿi*? Usually in Arab countries that term refers to forensics (crime scenes etc.).

Ustādh: So that's why I told you that I'm not a big fan of the wording here. But not all herbal remedies, but that which is mentioned in the Qurʾān, and *Sunnah* is like an added level of validation.

---

[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prophetic Commentary on the Qurʾān, Chapter: "And We Shaded with Clouds and Sent Down on You al-Manna and the Quail, (up to) Wronged Themselves." [Sūrat al-Baqarah: 57], hadīth no. 4478.*

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Drinks, Chapter: The Virtue of Truffles, and Treating the Eyes with Them, ḥadīth no. 2049 g.*

The point is that it is very effective in certain eye conditions. The really interesting thing for me is not that, it is that the Prophet ﷺ said that it is from *al-mann* (*mana*). You know, in the Bible, and in wider society…

Student (online): My husband is currently suffering from retinal inflammation, please Shaykh show us how to use truffles for eyes?

Ustādh: I don't know. I've never done it myself and it's not like something which I have experience in. Because how much, what concentration, dilution, or not etc., that is an *ʿilm* in itself.

But anyway, they themselves have never been able to determine what *manna* actually is. What kind of food it actually was. There's a lot of huge research articles etc. And then our *dīn*, the Prophet ﷺ comes boom! Drops this *ḥadīth* here and it just puts the cat amongst the pigeons because they were going with the opinion that *manna* is like referring to all delightful food. Some said that it was a food that only existed back then, doesn't exist now etc. For the longest time, like when I was younger like 20-22 [years old], I thought *manna* was truffles. And I still have a part of me that, especially when I look at this *ḥadīth*, I kind of think that maybe that there's some kind of genus thing going on and that *manna* is still truffles.

Truffle is a very healthy thing as well by the way. It is packed full of protein, lots of enzymes and metals in, it's got copper, magnesium etc., very healthy, very good for you. It is valuable simply because of how difficult it is to find. You have to use all kinds of things to get hold of it. It takes ages to grow and so it is hidden under the ground. It is pure missions. And so, I think that maybe *manna* itself is some kind of wider fungal thing. You know some of the Jews used to say that in the Sinai Peninsula it was that which grew on the floor like a mushroom, like a luxury type of mushroom from which truffles is one form of it.

(1:10:00) So, I said that the *Sharʿi* medicine is of two types: (1) the physical, which is everything that we've just spoken about and (2) the spiritual.

طِبٌّ معنويٌّ رُوحيٌّ

This is the metaphysical, the spiritual. And that is for example reciting over the sick one, reciting over the one who is ill. And this is sometimes even better and quicker in its effect and in curing the one who is ill. Look at for example the *ruqyah*—and that is what we call *ruqyah*, a spiritual healing or faith healing (which I prefer calling it) for those who are sick. So, you will see that sometimes they are cured immediately.

For example, on the eve of the Battle of *Khaybar,* the Prophet ﷺ said:

أُعْطِيَنَّ الرَّايَةَ غَدًا رَجُلاً يُفْتَحُ عَلَى يَدَيْهِ، يُحِبُّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ، وَيُحِبُّهُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ

"Tomorrow I will give the flag to somebody who will be given victory (by Allāh) and who loves Allāh and His messenger and is loved by Allāh and His messenger." [7,8]

Remember that the flag bearer is like the main guy, the front, he is the honour, it's the respect, it's the proper position that everyone's desperate for. And he ﷺ said that tomorrow I'm going to give the flag representing the Muslims to a man that Allāh ﷻ will bless everything at his hands, bless him and everything will open at his hands. He loves Allāh ﷻ and His messenger ﷺ and Allāh and His messenger love him. And he ﷺ said this on the night before. And all these people are there, just like minds are blown. The Companions are like, *'Oh my God!'* And the whole night they can't sleep. They're thinking, '*Is it me? Hopefully that I can be that person. Who is it going to be?'* And all the rest of it etc.

And then the next morning when the Prophet ﷺ was in front of them and every single person is like hooked on what is going to come next. The Prophet ﷺ said: "Where is ʿAli ibn Abi Ṭālib ؓ?" They said to him: "*Yā Rasūl Allāh* he's got a problem with his eye. He didn't come out." He ﷺ said, "Bring him out."

So, they called him and they brought him and he ﷺ spat into his eye or actually in the *riwāyah* that he is mentioning here he says both eyes. So, he ﷺ spat into both his eyes and he ﷺ made *duʿāʾ* for him. And there and then the eyes cleared up and they were back to being fully functional like there was not a trace of the disease. And he ﷺ gave him the flag as in the *ḥadīth* of Bukhāri.

Likewise, the example of the military unit that was on the way. They were far away from home. They decided to take shelter. The tribe didn't allow them to come in, so they had to camp on the outside. Allāh ﷻ, making an example, sent a scorpion that went and bit the chieftain. They couldn't deal with it and it became serious. They became desperate and tried to find a doctor but couldn't find anyone. Someone then said to go and ask those foreigners outside because they look like they might have someone that can help, etc.[9,10]

They said: Yes, we have someone that can sort this out. But we did ask you for a little bit of hospitality and you guys refused and so we will do it, but it will cost you. So, they said: Alright, we will give you some sheep. Then one of them went and he started to

---

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Fighting for the Cause of Allāh ﷻ, Chapter: The Superiority of the One Through Whom a Man Embraces Islam, ḥadīth no. 3009.*
[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of the Merits of the Companions, Chapter: The Virtues of ʿAli ibn Abi Ṭālib ؓ, ḥadīth no. 2406.*
[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Hiring, Chapter: What Is Paid for Ruqyah, hadīth no. 2276.*
[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Greetings, Chapter: The Permissibility of Accepting a Reward for Reciting Ruqyah with Qurʾān and Supplications, ḥadīth no. 2201 a.*

recite *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah* repeatedly over the bite. As he did that, the bite was disappearing as he was reciting. It healed completely.

The next day when they went to the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, they told him about it. Obviously, the response is a long one, but the opening statement was:

وما يُدْرِيكَ أَنَّها رُقيةٌ

"How did you come to know that it (*Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*) can be used to heal people?"[9,10]

This was the Companion's own initiative. He hadn't even been taught by the Prophet ﷺ and yet the Prophet ﷺ recognised that it was a *ruqyah*. And as you know he ﷺ was very happy with how it went and even the payment that they asked for. And he ﷺ asked for a share, himself.

So, this is 'prophetic medicine'. Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn calls it something different here. At the beginning they used this *Sharʻi* kind of concept, this is '*Sharʻi* medicine'. Now he calls it prophetic medicine.

I've always found a problem with this phrase. I always find it inaccurate. Not that it is a major problem, but I just think that the phraseology of all this could work a lot better. Anyway, this is prophetic medicine, but it is done in a spiritual way. It is based upon *qirāʾah*.

I like what Shaykh says:

وما أكثرُ الذين نشاهدهم ونسمعُ بهم يُؤثِّرونَ تأثيراً بالغاً في المرضى

He says: How many people have we seen and how many people have we heard of, that have gotten a bigger, better affect from the spiritual realm, in the spiritual dimension of healing, than from the physical one? So, it had a much greater impact upon the sick person, much more than any other physical medicine, which people come around via experimenting, study, and artificial medication, or whatever the word is called.

So, what I liked about this is that a lot of people themselves don't know of these practises. Why do I say that? Meaning that a lot of people think that the scholars are masters in *ruqyah*. *Ruqyah* is such a specific field. Like someone asked me: How do you [use] it [the truffle for healing the eye]?

I have no idea how to make the truffle. Everything comes with training. It's like in any other profession. You go to university and study that in of itself. Scholars don't know about *ruqyah* or the different forms of the *duʿāʾ* that I recited in certain ways and certain manners. Reciting Qurʾān upon water or upon milk, washing people in a certain way, etc. It can get crazy out there. And if you don't trust the person, then they can get away with murder. Whereas, if you trust the person, and they stick to Qurʾān and *Sunnah*, don't do any weird and dodgy stuff and don't hide anything away, *taʿwīḍ* and all that kind of stuff, then this is something which is specialist. So, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that we hear a lot about this, we don't know about it. 'We hear a lot about this.' I like that.

He says: As for the second category of medicine… So, I told you that he said two categories of medicine: (1) *Sharʿi* medicine which itself is two types, physical and spiritual, (2) then you have this second category. He calls this:

طِبٌّ ماديٌّ يُعرفُ بالتَّجاربِ

So, this is basically [conventional] medication, which is basically discovered by discovery, experimentation, self practise, etc. He says that this is what basically the doctors use today. It doesn't matter whether they study it formally or learn it in their industry experience, etc., or they are the people of the rural lands and they are trying it themselves. So, wild herbs or wild x, y, z, etc. It doesn't matter. You find *ʿĀmmat al-nās*, they go there and they try a few plants and find that it works. All of this is one big category. It's not mentioned in the *Sharīʿah*. It's not spiritually healing, but Allāh ﷻ *anzala daʾa wa anzala dawāʾ*—He sent down the illness and He sent down the cure.[11, 12, 13] And we know obviously from practise that the vast majority of our medication is excellent, vaccines amongst them.

(1:20:00) By the way I have to say, for all of the love and the hate for vaccines, by the *faḍl* of Allāh ﷻ, it's having an astonishing impact. There have been over 230,000,000 doses given of these vaccines. Now I know that we are probably going to die in about 5-10 years, so my *behsti* is going to be done about halfway through LP if we are alive, but so far so good. I mean it is crazy.

Anyway, experimental is obviously being mentioned, like traditional medicine—just let me make it very clear—traditional medicine comes under this category. That is why I am not too sure about contemporary, because contemporary indicates that traditional

---

[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Medicine, Chapter: Allāh ﷻ Has not Sent a Disease Except That He Has Also Sent its Cure, ḥadīth no. 5678.*
[12] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, Chapters on Medicine, Chapter: Allāh ﷻ Has not Sent a Disease Except That He Has Also Sent its Cure, ḥadīth no. 3438.*
[13] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, Chapters on Medicine, Chapter: Allāh ﷻ Has not Sent a Disease Except That He Has Also Sent its Cure, ḥadīth no. 3439.*

is not included. So, I need a phrase that is encompassing everything which is non-*Sharʿi*. I admit that experimental would technically cover contemporary, and traditional, and herbs, and homeopathy and all the rest of it, but it is just a horrible phrase.

Student (online): Conventional medical care/medicine.

Ustādh: Conventional, not contemporary! I knew that there was a problem with that word. I knew that when I was saying it, it felt wrong. Conventional medication, thank you. Conventional is the exact phrase. I do not need any other phrase *alḥamdulillāh*. It basically is understood that it is the rest. Now, the problem with conventional is that there are some people who are into conventional medication that do not accept traditional medication. But that is just ignorance because traditional medicines are often the source for 'conventional', 'new', 'modern', 'experimental', 'scientific' medication.

Student (online): Empirical.

Student (online): Revealed/experiential.

Ustādh: There might be a bigger word out there that covers it all. Empirical is not the one. Revealed, experiential is not the one.

Q & A

Q: Regarding prophetic medicine, we tend to go to conventional medicine. Is there a standard *adkhār* we can do to make *duʿāʾ* for cure, for long-term conditions or does the form of *ruqyah* vary per condition?

A: Of course, the form of *ruqyah* does vary, but there are *adkhār* that we need to be going back to first. So, for example, when we have pain:

أَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ وَقُدْرَتِهِ مِنْ شَرِّ مَا أَجِدُ وَأُحَاذِرُ

"I seek refuge with Allāh and with His Power from the evil that I find and that I fear."[14]

To repeat that three times, after you say *bismillāh* three times.[14] So many of the *adkhār* in general. People do not even do that at the beginning.

[14] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Greetings, Chapter: It is Recommended to Put One's Hand on the Site of the Pain When Supplicating, ḥadīth no. 2202.*

Student (online): Conventional does not cover the herbal.

Ustādh: That is the problem with the word conventional.

Q (online): Does that mean that there is a cure for everything, it just needs to be found?

A: That is what the *ḥadīth* says.[11,12,13] This is also an encouragement for the scientific method, that we should be very much invested in the scientific method, to always be studying, always be looking into it.

Q (online): Do you know if the story of Khālid ibn al-Walīd ﷺ reciting this *duʿāʾ* before drinking poison is authentic?

A: As far as I can remember, it is. But this would be an exception. There are many things out there that are exceptions, exceptions to the general rule.

Q (online): Where does cupping fall? Is it something that is prescribed Islamically or a habit of the people of the time?

A: No. I think that cupping, of course it is pre-Islamic, but it becomes Islamic because the Prophet ﷺ recommended days and times. He ﷺ made it more specific in that kind of way.[15]

Q (online): I have a relative that has been diagnosed with OCD and she suffers from a lot of *waswasah* that her *imān* is not true. Now she has been feeling like she does not believe in Allāh ﷻ and feels suicidal too. She keeps asking everyone to make *duʿāʾ* for her. I tell her not to think too much and focus on doing the basics of her *ʿibādah* even though she does not feel like it. Is that good advice?

A: I mean, yes. I do think that that is the right advice, especially in line with what I was saying, that a lot of the time people, when they fall into this, they have just got to fall back in love with Allāh ﷻ. They have just become distant from Him. I mean, there are so many ways, so many different angles that a person could take in trying to answer this. Most of the time, people who are close can identify what the real problem actually is. I just really believe that sometimes a person just needs to get right back into the game. Keeping things simple. Exactly like you said, the basics of *ʿibādah*, not making things complicated. Just remind them of what made them love Allāh ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ.

---

[15] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Medicine, ḥadīth no. 2051.* This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*

Q (online): What are your thoughts on learning *tafsīr* or other similar subjects from Brother Nouman Ali Khan?

A: I have heard very little of Nouman Ali Khan. The problem with Nouman Ali Khan is that he uses very little *tafsīr*, but then I am a *tadabbur* fan. Because he is not traditionally trained, because he is not Islamically trained, from a scholarly point of view, he has never traditionally understood the difference between *tadabbur* and *tafsīr*. Now he does because he has Sohaib sorting him out. Sohaib is one of my guys (Sohaib Saeed). But, when he did all of this material, he was going out there thinking that this is *tafsīr*. In actual fact, it is his understanding of the way he understands the linguistics of things, which is a problem. It is not a problem if people say: This is my opinion. This is how I understand it. This is how I benefit from it. These are the lessons I take from it—which is great. If people see it like that, then it is great. The problem is that he has written *tafsīr* all over it, and people think that it is *tafsīr*. It is not even close to what the actual intended meaning of the *ayah* actually is. That's it really. You are not going to study anything else form him because he does not have the requisites to teach *ʿaqīdah* or anything else. But, from a Qurʾān benefit, from his ideas, and knowing that it is only ideas, I think it is fine.

That is why we went ahead with Qurʾānic Progression, because the complete difference is doing it with Aḥsan, who is sticking to all of the *tafāsīr*, smashing it proper. Legit. Everything you learn is from our Islamic sources. No danger, no messing around.

Q (online): Is a flamingo *ḥalāl*?

A: Why not? I do not even know what it is. That thing that stands on one leg?

Q (online): A buyer has to send a specific amount to the seller for his purchase. He sends it via PayPal and then PayPal charges the seller some fees which could have been avoided if they sent as Friends and Family. Should the buyer be responsible for those fees or the seller?

A: It does not matter who should be responsible. It is upon agreement. If people are using a platform and there is a fee, it is allowed for the seller to incorporate it. It is allowed for the buyer to say that I want it to be refunded, I do not want to pay it. It is based upon agreement. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

29. Chapter 21 Lesson 8: The Supererogatory Prayer

(0:08:30) We are in the middle of the *duʿāʾ* of *Witr*:

وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لِي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ، إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك

Be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to and bless for me that which You have bestowed. Protect me from the evil You have decreed for verily You decree, and none can decree over You.

So, in terms of the *Sharḥ* we're on page 25 at the bottom.

تَوَلَّنِي

Be an ally to me.

Shaykh says, this verb, *tawallani*, is a command—be an ally to me, take me under Your care, take me under Your protectorship—you can translate all of that as it is. This word, what does it actually mean? Where does it come from in the Arabic?

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says it is from *wali*:

هَل هِي من (الوَلي) بِفَتح الوَاو، والسُّكون اللَّام مخفَّفة، بمعنى القُرب. أو هي من التَّولِّي بمعنى الولاية والنُّصرة. أو هي منهما جميعاً؟

It is from *wali* which is to be close, so keep me close to you? Or is it from *tawallani*, be my protector, be my guardian, be my helper? So you're now talking about authority, you're talking about protection, you're talking about help, you're talking about victory. An ally, the idea of you allying with someone is that you have a better chance of winning. When the allies go into war, it's because allies have a better chance than singular. So just even being an ally with anybody is going to give you a better chance, let alone being an ally with the Lord of the worlds.

So, the second one is very much, with respect to winning, victory, protection, guardianship. Whereas the first is purely closeness—just to be close to You. To be close would have the implications of love, of support, of forgiveness, of friendship—those kinds of connotations. The two are actually not massively different, but they're different. Because obviously you're going to protect the people who are close to you. You're not really going to care so much about those that are far from you. Which is an interesting point, because we're going to come to that in a second as well, the idea of: Is the *wilāyah* of Allāh ﷻ the ally-ship, the protector-ship—is it for everybody or not? Those that He likes, doesn't like, those that are close to Him, those that are not close to Him? So, it is actually quite relevant.

In any case, when we say:

وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ

Be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to.

Then we are appealing for that protector-ship because of being close to Him and wanting to be close to Him *subḥānah*. And that's why Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says that both of these words are intended in the *duʻāʾ*:

وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ

Be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to.

And that's why he says:

كما يُقال :وليَ فلانٌ فلاناً، وقال النَّبيُّ عليه الصَّلاة والسَّلام: «ليلِني منكم أُولُو الأحْلامِ والنُّهَى» أي: مِنَ الوَلْي، وهو القُرْبُ.

So and so was close to so and so, e.g., Zayd was close to ʻUmar ﷺ.

And this very well-known *ḥadīth* gives us a much clearer example when you put it in the present [tense of the] verb. The Prophet ﷺ said:

لِيَلِنِي مِنْكُمْ أُولُو الأَحْلاَمِ وَالنُّهَى

"Let those of you who are people of *al-aḥlāmi wa'l*-nuha." [1]

[*Yalani*] from *wala* to be close. I would translate *ulu'l-aḥlāmi wa'l-nuha* as the people of knowledge and discernment, the people of knowledge and politics, the people of wisdom and power—all of these combinations work. Basically, what the Prophet ﷺ is indicating is what actually should be around every leader figure, the top people in the country should be around him.

That's not just in the prayer line, as this *ḥadīth* was indicating. But also, in day-to-day affairs, in government of course, in action—the key people are around the big man. The one who is at the top, the people around them are at the top of their game. We can't have *piendus* around that person. These people have to be the cleverest, the quickest, the best. And that's on the assumption that the top person is as well. They need to be at least on that level to be advising. And they might not have all the knowledge, each other might not have their respective knowledges, however they can support one another through your trust in their ability, through your trust in their skill, etc.

I think that's very important to understand this *ḥadīth* in its context. The Prophet ﷺ always wanted behind him in the *ṣalāh* those people that are going to fulfil a number of key functions. For example, if I make a mistake, they need to know the Qurʾān well enough to correct it. For example, if I make a mistake in the actions of the *ṣalāh* they have got the guts enough to correct me, the knowledge enough to know that I've made a mistake or not made a mistake. If I break *wuḍūʾ*, for example, then they will have the knowledge enough to step forward and lead the prayer, be my representative if I'm not here. They have the wherewithal from a *daʿwah* point of view to correct the situation behind me when I'm busy i.e., fixing the lines, getting everybody straight. They also have the physical protection, they got my back as well from any attack.

So, that is the way. And I am just going to give it like a little lame example but in *Tarāwīḥ* in the kind of celebrity type mosques like Ḥaram, like Masjid al-Nabawi. When I say 'celebrity', I mean like all of the reciters, you know them all. So, you will see that they pray behind them. So, in Masjid al-Nabawi for example you will have the rest of the ones that are going to lead the *ṣalāh* and even those that are not leading that night and they are on the next night, they will be behind. They are the top people.

So, that is from *al-wali*. And that is *al-qurb*, that's closeness. That's the first one.

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: Straightening the Rows; the Virtue of the Front Row and Then the Next; Competing With One Another for the Front Row; the People of Virtue Should Take Precedence and Be Closest to the Imām, ḥadīth no. 432 a.*

This *ḥadīth* by the way is narrated by Imām Muslim. As I said, this *ḥadīth* even though it means in life in general but this *ḥadīth* was revealed by the Prophet ﷺ in the issue of the prayer, the people should be behind you. Children should not be there for example. This is the basis as well that even though we do not make children stand in their own separate line as the *fuqahāʾ* say, there is no basis for that. What this *ḥadīth* shows is that there are caveats and exceptions to what you think are general rules. So, we know for example, it is not allowed for a person to bagsy their place to always insist on a certain prayer place, like they put their chair down, they put their *muṣḥaf* down, they put their jacket down. '*You're not moving my place, I got here first*,' and they go off to make *wuḍūʾ* or they go off wherever they go for an hour then they come back, and they insist on sitting there. This is not acceptable in general. As for the top people behind who normally are there early anyway, but even if they weren't, that is only the top people, the top position because of the function that they play, then that is the exception. Likewise, children are not meant to be in a separate line or pushed away, and therefore they are allowed to pray in the front row if that is where they get to early enough. They get their reward, and they pray as long as they know how to behave themselves and they are old enough. But it is not complete freedom to pray wherever you want. So, they can't be praying behind the imām. That is just a joke. So, I think that is a nice little point and that is why you can see that Imām Muslim narrated it, *ḥadīth* number 432 in the Book of Prayer, in the Chapter of Straightening the Lines and Establishing Them and the Excellence of *al-Awwal faʾl-Awwal Minha*—the excellence of those that are foremost in those lines.

As for if we take the second meaning:

اعْتَنِ بي فكن لي وَلِيًّا وناصراً ومعيناً لي

So, if we take the second meaning, then: be a supporter of me, being someone who helps
(0:20:00) me, be my protector, all that kind of stuff in all of my issues. Shaykh, says that even though when you say:

وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ

Your mind immediately goes to protection and be my helper, be my supporter. That is the obvious and the mind goes to that. Actually, it also includes that closeness as well.

Shaykh says: And also, when we are talking about allyship or protection or guardianship then this is not a general guardianship but a complete guardianship.

So, the guardianship is of two types, a general one and a specific one. The general one is for all human beings. Allāh ﷻ is their protector. Allāh ﷻ is their creator. Allāh ﷻ is their lord—whether they like it or not, whether they appreciate it or not, whether they thank Him or not, whether they believe in Him or not. He is the one who actually protects them. When one of them doesn't die, it was their guardian angel that Allāh ﷻ, the *ḥafaḍah* that Allāh ﷻ sent that protected them. When they have an illness, Allāh ﷻ is the One who cures them—whether they thank Him for it or not. And if they do not thank Him Allāh ﷻ holds them accountable for it. That is ultimately *kufr*, ingratitude. If they are grateful, they deal with it. If they are not, they are going to get dealt with in a different way. So, that is the general guardianship.

So, because this *wilāyah al-ʿāmmah*, this is general guardianship, I am not sure guardianship is the right word if we are talking about Muslims and non-Muslims and everybody. Anyway, it encompasses every believer, every *kāfir.* It encompasses all the good people and all the bad people. Every single person, Allāh ﷻ is their *mawla*, their protector, their patron, their guardian. There must be a nice word that fits the whole non-Muslim, Muslim narrative. Someone work it out.

Because Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿وَهُوَ ٱلْقَاهِرُ فَوْقَ عِبَادِهِۦ ۖ وَيُرْسِلُ عَلَيْكُمْ حَفَظَةً حَتَّىٰٓ إِذَا جَآءَ أَحَدَكُمُ ٱلْمَوْتُ تَوَفَّتْهُ رُسُلُنَا وَهُمْ لَا يُفَرِّطُونَ ﴿٦١﴾ ثُمَّ
رُدُّوٓا۟ إِلَى ٱللَّهِ مَوْلَىٰهُمُ ٱلْحَقِّ ۚ أَلَا لَهُ ٱلْحُكْمُ وَهُوَ أَسْرَعُ ٱلْحَٰسِبِينَ ﴿٦٢﴾﴾

"He is the Supreme Master over His subjects. He sends out recorders to watch over you until, when death overtakes any of you, those sent by Us take his soul—they never fail in their duty. Then they will all be returned to God, their true Lord. The Judgment truly belongs to Him, and He is the swiftest of reckoners." [*Sūrat al-Anʿām*: 61-62]

"Up until that moment and then they taste death, our messengers take them," meaning angels of death, "and they will never fail in doing so. And then they are returned to—their true protector or true patron or true custodian—*Mawlāhumu'l-ḥaqq*. Is it not He that will have the rule that Day? He will be swift in taking to account."

So, Shaykh says that when Allāh ﷻ calls Himself the *Mawla*…

Student (online): Master.

Ustādh: Master. I'll take that.

Then that is including every person who dies from them—believer, non-believer, good man, not good man. This is the general. Because Allāh ﷻ is the Custodian, I think this is it, yes. I think Custodian is the word. So Allāh ﷻ is a Custodian of every single person because—of every creation in actual fact.

Student (online): Custodian: a person or organisation that is responsible for protecting, caring for, or maintaining something or someone.

Ustādh: If you look: a person, or organisation that is responsible for maintaining, caring for, maintaining—that's Allāh ﷻ. Allāh ﷻ is protecting, caring, maintaining everything on this planet. Especially maintaining and caring, when you add those phrases, that's it. It's done.

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says:

لأن الله يتولَّى شؤون جميع الخَلْقِ

Allāh ﷻ is maintaining all of the creation. So that is that.

أما الولاية الخاصَّة فهي المذكورة في قوله تعالى: {اللَّهُ وَلِيُّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا} [البقرة: 257] وفي قوله: {أَلاَ إِنَّ أَوْلِيَاءَ اللَّهِ لاَ خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلاَ هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ *الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَكَانُوا يَتَّقُونَ} [يونس] والسَّائل الذي قال: «تولَّني فِيمَنْ تولَّيتَ» يريد الولاية الخاصَّة.

As for the specific benefaction, custodian, custody, help, ally, alliance, (whatever the noun is), as for the specific form, then this is only for the special people.

﴿ٱللَّهُ وَلِيُّ ٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُواْ يُخۡرِجُهُم مِّنَ ٱلظُّلُمَٰتِ إِلَى ٱلنُّورِۖ وَٱلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوٓاْ أَوۡلِيَآؤُهُمُ ٱلطَّٰغُوتُ يُخۡرِجُونَهُم مِّنَ ٱلنُّورِ إِلَى ٱلظُّلُمَٰتِۗ أُوْلَٰٓئِكَ أَصۡحَٰبُ ٱلنَّارِۖ هُمۡ فِيهَا خَٰلِدُونَ ٢٥٧﴾

"God is the ally of those who believe: He brings them out of the depths of darkness and into the light. As for the disbelievers, their allies are false gods who take them from the light into the depths of darkness, they are the inhabitants of the Fire, and there they will remain." [*Sūrat al-Baqārah*: 257]

In the other very relevant verse:

﴿أَلَآ إِنَّ أَوۡلِيَآءَ ٱللَّهِ لَا خَوۡفٌ عَلَيۡهِمۡ وَلَا هُمۡ يَحۡزَنُونَ ٦٢ ٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُواْ وَكَانُواْ يَتَّقُونَ ٦٣﴾

"But for those who are on God's side there is no fear, nor shall they grieve. For those who believe and are conscious of God." [*Sūrat Yūnus*: 62-63]

"And is it not of course that the allies of Allāh ﷻ, the *awliyā'* of Allāh ﷻ, the friends of Allāh ﷻ, they have no fear and that they shall not grieve, and they are those people who believe and they used to be disciplined and conscious of their rights to Allāh ﷻ"—they used to have *taqwa* (the two things).

So, the specific *wilāyah* is given to those people who have *imān* and who are *muttaqīn.* people who give it up for Allāh ﷻ. They sacrifice for Allāh ﷻ. They are disciplined for Allāh ﷻ. They are so careful. They are protecting themselves from the anger of Allāh ﷻ. *Taqwa* comes from *wiqāyah*, protection. So, they are always aware, they are always conscious of Allāh's right ﷻ upon them in every single thing. So, those are the two things.

The main take point is that when we make this *du'ā'*:

وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ

Be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to.

Again, it is another example of *tawassul* by His action and His generosity, that those that You have been a friend to because they are friends to You, those that You are protecting because they deserve it because they are believers and they are people of *taqwa*. Because of that generosity that You show towards them, include me in that as well.

وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ

Then also be a protector for me as well in this way. Keep me close to You. Look after me because of what I have done to ask for that, which is the *imān* and the *taqwa*.

All right that is good, *wa bārik li fīman 'aṭayt*.

وبارِكْ لي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ

And bless for me that which You have bestowed.

At the bottom of page 26.

So: "bless for me that which You have bestowed", meaning send Your *barakah* down. *Barakah* means to increase. *Barakah* means to flow, *barakah* means to be a lot—the word itself it means 'a lot', 'quick', quicker than what it should be, more than what it should be. Excessive is what we are talking about.

Therefore, what this *duʿāʾ* is basically saying is *yā Allāh*, send Your *barakah* in what You have given me from wealth, from knowledge, from honor, from children—everything that You have given me.

﴿وَمَا بِكُم مِّن نِّعْمَةٍ فَمِنَ ٱللَّهِ ۝٥٣﴾

"Whatever good things you possess come from God." [*Sūrat al-Naḥl*: 53]

So:

بارِكْ لي في جميع ما أنعمتَ به عليَّ

So, bless me in all of that which You have bestowed upon me. And when Allāh ﷻ sends *barakah* down, the small turns into a lot. It increases. And when *barakah* is taken out, then the lot becomes the small. So much becomes little when you remove *barakah* from it.

And as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: How many people have you seen *subḥān Allāh* that at their hands, they get so much good done in such a small period of time. And that's because of *barakah*.

There's not a single person in this class right now that doesn't know that if you start early in the morning, you take advantage of your morning, you will get double of what you would normally get done in that day. Now that doesn't make sense, but you would've done something else normally in that day. You would not have taken advantage of that morning. And when people say that concept that the mornings are blessed, or you've had a blessed day, most people who have had a blessed day have had

(0:30:00) a sick morning. That's the proof. The time is the same. What about the other 364 days of the year where you didn't take benefit of your morning? You still had the morning, but you did something else with it, whether you laid in, or you just dossed about, or whether you didn't procrastinate, or whatever it is that you did. Every human will attest to this. It's not even religious. You'll go through it, and you'll see that day at the end, you will be so satisfied, and in the same time.

Student (online): It is alleged that Ibn Taymiyyah wrote *al-ʿAqīdah al-Wāsiṭiyyah* in an afternoon.

Ustādh: Ibn Taymiyyah wrote *al-Wāsiṭiyyah* in an afternoon, and that's only because he smashed it in the morning. Anything that you do, it will be blessed. This principle is very easy for us to see.

Student (online): Does the morning Islamically have any specified *barakah* in it?

Ustādh: The morning does have a specified *barakah* in it. Yes.

But in any case, the time of the angels, the time of *saḥr* is something that is so emphasised. That's why the Prophet ﷺ always used to go to sleep early.[2] And I get it that some people are night people, or they've got work, but that's something else.

When you read books about the most successful people in the world, and people spend all this money and time on these courses on how to be Tony Jones or whatever his name is, that's it really. Go to sleep early, eat well, drink well. The most successful people in the world, they are just ones that don't watch Ertuğrul, and they work in the mornings. They wake up early, they stay fit, that's it.

Shaykh carries on. He says: How many people have a little bit of money, and Allāh ﷻ puts blessing in them and it's incredible. Blessing, as I said, there are so many different types. Blessing can express itself in so many ways—something lasting longer, something happening quicker, a greater amount of activity being done in a short period of time, wealth increasing, happiness for example, to have *barakah* in your life.

This is as I said the *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ and it will never ever be abrogated. Whatever our personal habits are, mistakes are, strengths are, but Allāh ﷻ told us that He created the day for activity, and He created a night for sleep and for rest, it is important.

I remember giving a lecture about this years back that it is amazing and wonderful to have 24/7 services and to have 24/7 supermarkets and only God knows how much I am dependent upon that. I have never done shopping at any time of the day, always in the nighttime. I am the night owl of all night owls but that's because I have contracts

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayer at Night, Chapter: Sleeping in the First Part of the Night and Getting Up in Its Last Part, ḥadīth no. 1146.*

that I have to fulfil at different time zones. So, I am up at crazy hours. My sleep pattern is all over the place. I kind of sleep small pieces here and there. But the truth is that is just us our selfishness speaking. We then become very good at doing that. I am very productive in those times, that quiet, and we get on and do it. But the truth is that we have created an artificial system.

Similar to our dependency upon shoes. It is impossible to think about life without shoes, or sandals, or footwear because we have accepted the cost of wearing all of these shoes. The amount of back problems, spine problems, and orthopaedic problems that we have, studies have shown that a large portion of it is due to modernity. When our feet as they were flat were dealing with it in a natural way, the body was accommodated at a certain kind of manner. The thing is nobody is going back to that. Nobody is ever going to go back to that. It does not matter how many times Nike make one of those socky-sock kind of things. We have now accepted that the benefits of wearing shoes and being comfortable is what I want and the associated costs of that we have accepted. I want you to know that all of life is like that. Modernity is like that. But at no point should you then overly praise the current status quo, just because the world has accepted the cost. So, the world has accepted the cost so we should praise shoes. No. We should wish that we could be back in our original way and more importantly that we were happy with that, that we would be content with that. Because you wouldn't be. If you had to walk everywhere like that, then you would be so upset, you would be in pain, etc.

Like COVID. COVID will become a norm with a cost that everybody will accept, no problem. People will easily handle 30,000, 40,000, 50,000 deaths a year because it will be coming around in certain moments and certain kind of seasons etc.—whatever that thousand is. We came to accept the modern flu death 20-30,000 a year, very easily in the UK. Very easily. So, you don't think COVID is going to be after how many people? Flu never turned the world against it, COVID has. Businesses have collapsed, people are suffering. So, people will turn against COVID very quickly and accept double the flu figures very easily. And I just want to say that does not mean that we should then praise COVID.

My point is, the fact that 24/7 shops and businesses, and work, and people answering on live chat 24 hours a day, how amazing that is, how convenient it is, how wonderful it is, how much it helps us—we all agree on that. That doesn't mean that we should be happy about this, or this form of life. That is basically what I am saying.

The next part is on top of page 27:

وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ

Protect me from the from the evil You have decreed.

Allāh ﷻ of course decrees every day absolutely everything. All of it is good in the purest sense, in the true sense, in the actual sense. However, in its consequence it is good and bad. This *du'ā'* is referring to the consequence or our perception of it. Consequence is probably not the best word, perception is probably better—our actual perception of what is decided by Allāh ﷻ or decreed by Allāh ﷻ is ultimately the way that we define it.

Shaykh al-'Uthaymīn makes a nice point.

ما قَضَاهُ الله عزّ وجل قد يكون خيراً، وقد يكون شرًّا، فما كان يُلائمُ الإنسانَ وفِطرتَه فإن ذلك خير، وما كان لا يُلائِمه فذلك شرٌّ، فالصِّحَّةُ والقوةُ والعِلْمُ والمالُ والولدُ الصَّالحُ وما أشبه ذلك خير، والمَرَضُ والجهل والضَّعف والولد الطالحُ وما أشبه ذلك شرٌّ؛ لأنه لا يُلائم الإنسانَ.

He says: That which the people are inclined to and like, their *fitrah*, their human nature readily accepts, then that is what they call *khayr*. And that which humans generally turn against, then that is what we call *sharr,* or evil. So, for example, good health, strength, knowledge, wealth, righteous children, all of that, everybody sees that as good. And sickness, ignorance, weakness, and evil or disobedient children, everybody sees that as *sharr*.

(0:40:00)

وما أشبه ذلك شرٌّ

That is seen as evil because that is what human beings turn away from, are put off by them and that is their innate dislike and aversion to these things. So, innate desire for is *khayr*, and the innate aversion from is like the *sharr*. Everything that Allāh ﷻ decrees is, by us, put into these two categories.

Even if in the perception of all the people, even the wisest—the people who understand—and they all say that this is evil, this is wrong, or the thing is evil (for example, an earthquake, a disabled child)… And this is the basic principle behind the 'problem of evil', as it is called. How can God allow these kinds of things? (The ones that some people find difficult.) And I find it surprising. But at the end of the day, it depends how you are thinking.

People being murdered, or children being brought up in war zones and famines, and x, and y, and z. Then there is a consensus. And a correct consensus because Allāh ﷻ does not try to hide that this is something which is evil, or bad, or miserable, or *sharr*. Nobody will say this is great, unless they are evil. Like arms manufacturers just trying

to abuse the situation. That is obvious. Forget them. But I am saying everybody will agree that this is bad, terrible, problematic, etc.

Those who are Muslim, those who read *Sūrat al-Kahf* every week, as opposed to just trying to get through it in 20 minutes. [Those who] actually look at the translation and reflect upon it. *Sūrat al-Kahf*, the *ḥadīth* that indicates its reading every week, is not the strongest, by the way.[3,4,5] It is not the strongest of *ḥadīth*. But I believe that it is authentic—if not in chain, then certainly by need. The Muslims need a weekly reminder for their *imān* to remind them just how arrogant they can sometimes get. I mean, you are this pathetic little creation who bigs himself up so much, thinking so much of themselves. A little thing happens, and you make out that you have been oppressed to the whole world, that your creator is evil, or x, or y. And that humbling that we have when we read the story of Khiḍr with Mūsa ﷺ [doing] all these very bad things—not helping someone, destroying something, killing someone—which are by consensus *sharr* things. In every single case, all of them were pure good. But you cannot see it.

So, in the sickness, or in death, or in the calamity, a lot of people become scared as a result of that. They fear Allāh ﷻ as a result of that. They become more aware of their sins as a result of that.

There is absolutely no doubt that COVID is a terrible catastrophe. We have had like a million people die, or something like that? I do not even know. 35 million infected and hurt. By any measure, trillions lost in business, many people now divorced, abused, x, y, z, as a problem.

But what if we change the measure?

That is from a *dunyā'i* point of view. If you are looking from an *ākhirah* point of view, there is no evil at all in COVID if it makes us wake up, if it makes us regret that we did not speak to our parents, that we did not look after them properly, that we did not fulfil the rights of our loved ones, that we did not fulfil the obligations of Allāh ﷻ when we were warned of a punishment coming, or we did not take our health seriously, even though the Prophet ﷺ said that it is something you better do right now.[6,7] Our wealth. Every single thing. And that comes from *Sūrat al-Kahf. Sūrat al-Kahf* is literally that.

Because many *ayāt* in the Qur'ān, and many *dīni* and Qur'ānic principles destroy this ignorance and concepts of evil and concepts of silliness. The difference with *Sūrat al-Kahf* is that it's that weekly reminder because *insān* always falls back into this arrogance, falls back into this ignorance that, '*Yeah. I've been done over here. I didn't get this job. I didn't get this result. I didn't get this. I've been done over*.' You know this

---

[3] *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ, The Book of the Excellent Qualities of the Qur'ān, ḥadīth no. 2175*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan* by al-Albāni.
[4] *Imām al-Ḥākim, 2/399.*
[5] *Sunan al-Bayhaqī, 3/249.*
[6] *Imām al-Ḥākim, 7846.*
[7] *Sunan al-Bayhaqi, no.10248.*

negative thinking, always that Allāh ﷻ has done me a bad hand here or whatever it is. Because a week is a long time. A lot of things happen in a week. And I think that's one of its wisdoms. I really do. It keeps people in order.

Normally, when you see the scholars talk about *Sūrat al-Kahf* and so on, they talk about its *Jannah* aspects and its rewards etc. but there are so many messages of course in *Sūrat al-Kahf* that needs to be reminded.

Anyway, so a person might become ill, Shaykh gives an example:

فالمرضُ مثلاً قد لا يَعرفُ الإنسانُ قَدْرَ نِعمة الله عليه بالصِّحَّة إلا إذا مَرِضَ،

Obviously, as Shaykh said as I've said already, many people don't just recognise the blessing of good health until they get hit. And when they get hit and they realise how dependent they are and how weak they are, then they recognise the blessing of good health only because they became ill. And it doesn't matter. You can say a thousand times like the Arabs do that the wise one is the one who learns from his mistakes but the wiser one is the one who learns from the other people's mistakes.

We are not wise or wiser. We don't learn from our own mistakes and we are not looking at others and learning from their mistakes. The only time that we will learn is bam! When we get slapped over the head. So, you're told all day don't do this, don't do that, don't do this, don't do that. COVID is a classic example, people are not doing isolation or quarantining and mixing and thinking it doesn't matter. '*I have to get married*,' or whatever it is. And what happens as a result? They get hit. They get ill, family gets ill. Then they suddenly all become religious. Now you suddenly become health flipping advocate. This is a problem.

Another time a person might fall into this if he becomes *ḍaʿīf.*

وقد يُحْدِثُ له المرضُ توبةً ورجوعاً إلى الله، ومعرفةً لِقَدْرِ نفسِهِ، وأنه ضعيفٌ، ومُحتاجٌ إلى الله عزّ وجل

A lot of time people make *tawbah* and they go back to Allāh ﷻ in their weakness and in their sickness. They recognise the limitations of themselves which is an act of *ʿibādah*. They recognise the blessing of the One who gives to them which itself is an act of *ʿibādah*. So, the sickness is one thing and about a hundred acts of *ʿibādah* come out of it. So, there's no doubt that sickness is a *sharr* but the decision and the way that it was decreed was only for your good. And that is ultimately the big difference, that when we say [in the *duʿāʾ*]:

وَالشَّرُّ لَيْسَ إِلَيْكَ

"Evil is not attributed to You."[8]

That good is to be attributed to You but evil is not, even though all of it comes from Him *subḥānah*. And that is because the evil that comes at His hand by His decree, all of it is for our betterment. All of it is for our rectification. All of it is for our benefit. All of it.

This discussion can get a bit dark but let's just say for example someone comes to your house—armed robbery. What is the worst nightmare? Armed robbery. Armed robbery, come in take the money, get lost. Either you have insurance or no insurance whatever it is. That's the normal thing that you would expect.

What is the worst case?

The worst case is that some complete psychopath comes in and he is as interested as creating fear and pain as he is in taking whatever he wants to take. So, you know you might have the family begging whatever what not on the floor and he just feels that power rush and he shoots the baby, shoots the wife, for example.

(0:50:00) Now my point is that if this person does that, there is not a single possibility, not a single intention, not a single way that this can be seen as a good act from that person because there is no further play to this. This is what we call pure evil. However, this is the *qaḍā'* of Allāh ﷻ. This is the decision of Allāh ﷻ. It is decreed for it to happen. It has happened. It is a *sharr* that He ﷻ allowed to happen, and in it is the potential for great good if a person learns from this, recognises this, builds upon that, makes *tawbah* as a result of it, is patient with that trial, is patient with that pain. As the scholars and *ṣaḥābah* used to say that there are some people that cannot get into *Jannah* through their actions. They don't have anything to give to get in, but rather it is by their patience of the difficulties that they go through, just being patient through it.

I was giving a talk somewhere—I think it was on Facebook—I said you have no idea where Allāh ﷻ puts your *Jannah*. A lot of people are so confident about themselves, and you have no idea what Allāh ﷻ has written for you in your path. And I reflect upon this because the Prophet ﷺ said that when your parent passes away then one of your gates to *Jannah* closes which is an indicator.[9] It is like really solidifying this point that there are certain actions, certain people, certain things that are such an intense, easy, obvious way of going to Paradise, that you just carry on working in that field. So that would be looking after them, making them feel happy, whatever it is, whatever it takes I've just got to keep making them happy. I've just got to keep smashing it whatever it is. The

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers—Travellers, Chapter: The Prayer and Supplication of the Prophet ﷺ at Night, hadīth no. 771a.*

[9] *Al-Adab al-Mufrad, The Book of Parents, Chapter: Dutifulness to Parents Even if They Are Unjust, ḥadīth no. 7.* This narration has been graded as *ḍa'īf* by al-Albāni.

second they leave, you've lost an opportunity. If you understand that concept. There are some people that might not be the people who pray properly or often, or understand what they're saying, or *ṣalāh*, or anything like that etc. etc.

Student (online): Positive people snatch victory from the jaws of defeat, they look at the opportunity or upside of anything. Why is someone interested in the nature of evil, we should be concerned with how we react to it.

Ustādh: *Jazāk Allāh Khayr*. What you just said is just gold. *"Why is someone interested in the nature of evil, we should be concerned with how we react to it"*.

This phrase is something that I've been using as a principle in *daʿwah* to non-Muslims for so long. And as you know when it comes to *daʿwah* to non-Muslims, it's mostly the Muslims who benefit. People are always obsessed with the situation at hand. Ultimately, it doesn't really matter. It's the same reason why people make excuses for not accepting Islam. [They say] *'But it is this, but it is that.'* But you accept this truth? But you accept this truth? Okay, if you accept this truth, your job is to act upon this not to worry about the minor things. What actually is it that you are going to achieve by understanding the exact theological basis for what is happening? It's how you react.

I think the best example that I see in this are those people who get a six-month scan. This happens a lot now because the tests have become more advanced. The test or the scan comes back and says that your baby is going to be brain damaged, or that there is a high likelihood that they are not going to be able to walk. People are so quick to rush, '*Shaykh can I get an abortion?*'

What is wrong with people? *Subḥān Allāh*. Or where did this confidence come, that maybe Allāh ﷻ did not send you that because this is your life now? This kid will be your *Jannah*. This sacrifice and destruction of all of your dreams that you had planned with a healthy child, healthy life, free time to go and do what you want, is now all taken away because it has to be done in the care of this child, or the support of this child. And that would mean you giving up work, and giving up x, and giving up y, and giving up z. You just do not know. And that's an easy example. I think people can relate to that. A lot of people get that and connect with that example. People need to be deeper than that and see it in the more day-to-day normative examples.

Anyway, Shaykh says something really beautiful.

بخلاف ما لو بقيَ الإنسانُ صحيحاً معافى، فإنه قد ينسى قَدْرَ هذه النِّعمة، ويفتخرُ كما قال الله تعالى

So, look at the opposite. Let us say we keep a person super fit, super healthy, never gets ill, never gets sick, never gets tested by any kind of illness. First of all, there is a large

chance that this person will become a bit arrogant and say, '*Check that out! See this?*' Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿وَلَئِنْ أَذَقْنَا ٱلْإِنسَٰنَ مِنَّا رَحْمَةً ثُمَّ نَزَعْنَٰهَا مِنْهُ إِنَّهُۥ لَيَـُٔوسٌ كَفُورٌ ۝٩ وَلَئِنْ أَذَقْنَٰهُ نَعْمَآءَ بَعْدَ ضَرَّآءَ مَسَّتْهُ لَيَقُولَنَّ ذَهَبَ ٱلسَّيِّـَٔاتُ عَنِّىٓ إِنَّهُۥ لَفَرِحٌ فَخُورٌ ۝١٠﴾

"How desperate and ungrateful man becomes when We let him taste Our mercy and then withhold it! And if We let him taste mercy after some harm has touched him, he is sure to say, 'Misfortune has gone away from me.' He becomes exultant and boastful." [*Sūrat Hūd*: 9-10]

I mean this is a killer *ayah*. He thinks this because of his own skill, his own blessing. He falls into that scenario because he just allowed that situation to take his head away.

Then on page 28, Shaykh says:

وفي قوله: «ما قضيتَ» إثباتُ القضاءِ لله.

The decree of Allāh ﷻ is of two types, just like His will, His desire, His intention which is of two types. Also, maybe you could say His love as well. Let's just stick to *qaḍāʾ*, the decree of Allāh ﷻ.

وقضاءُ الله :شرعيٌّ، وقَدَريٌّ.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that the decree of Allāh ﷻ is of two types—it is either *sharʿi* or *qadari*. He uses *qadari* here, but I prefer when he says *kawni*. I prefer the phrase *kawni* which is something which is used more in the books of theology. Translating these are horrible. In fact, I never ever was able to translate this. Even I remember when we studied *al-ʿAqīdah al-Wāsiṭiyyah*, 23 or 24 years ago, I remember then we were struggling to work out the translation for it. Basically, when I explain the two types, maybe you can help me and we can come to it.

The two types of *qaḍāʾ*, the decree of Allāh ﷻ. The first one is *sharʿi.*

﴿وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوٓاْ إِلَّآ إِيَّاهُ ﴿٢٣﴾﴾

"Your Lord has commanded that you should worship none but Him." [*Sūrat al-Isrāʾ*: 23]

That is an example of *sharʿi* decree.

Then, the *qadari* decree, or *kawni* [decree], *kawni* for creation, the decree for creation is like when Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿وَقَضَيْنَآ إِلَىٰ بَنِىٓ إِسْرَٰٓءِيلَ فِى ٱلْكِتَٰبِ لَتُفْسِدُنَّ فِى ٱلْأَرْضِ مَرَّتَيْنِ وَلَتَعْلُنَّ عُلُوًّا كَبِيرًا ﴿٤﴾﴾

"We declared to the Children of Israel in the Scripture, 'Twice you will spread corruption in the land and become highly arrogant.'" [*Sūrat al-Isrāʾ*: 4]

(1:00:00) So, hold on! That's bad, right? They're going to cause problems, they're going to cause harm, they're going to kill, they're going to whatever.

And Allāh ﷻ says: That's My *qaḍāʾ*, that's my decree.

So, you have a *sharʿi* decree and a *qadari* decree. The difference between them can be explained like this.

الوجه الأول :أنَّ القضاءَ الكونيَّ لا بُدَّ مِن وقوعِهِ، وأما القضاءُ الشَّرعيُّ فقد يقع مِن المقضيِّ عليه وقد لا يقعُ.

From one angle it can be described that the *qaḍāʾ kawni* (see he uses *kawni*, there we go he was using *qadari* all the time), so *al-qaḍāʾ al-kawni* or *al-qaḍāʾ al-qadari* has to happen and it will always happen. It is necessary. That's what we used to call it: the necessary decree. You know like we say 'it's a necessary evil'. Yeah. I think necessity has to be involved in there somewhere, but I am sure that you'll find a good example. It has to happen, and it will happen, and it doesn't matter.

So, *al-qaḍāʾ al-sharʿi* is something that sometimes will happen, sometimes won't because it's elective. I will explain this now from the second angle.

الوجه الثاني :أنَّ القضاءَ الشَّرعيَّ لا يكون إلا فيما أحبَّه الله، سواءٌ أحبَّ فِعْلَه أو أحبَّ تَرْكَهُ، وأما القضاءُ الكونيُّ فيكون فيما أحبَّ وفيما لم يحبَّ

From the second angle, the *qaḍāʾ sharʿi*, that decree does not occur except in that which Allāh ﷻ loves. Allāh ﷻ wants it. Allāh ﷻ loves it and He has shown us somewhere that He loves it—either loves that you do the action or that you don't do the action.

So, when we say to not drink alcohol and you don't drink alcohol, that's the *qaḍāʾ* of Allāh ﷻ that you don't drink it. Allāh ﷻ loves it that you don't drink it. And when Allāh ﷻ decrees that you pray then that's because Allāh ﷻ loves that people pray. And when you do it, then you fulfil that. The *qaḍāʾ sharʿi* is only in that which Allāh ﷻ loves.

As for the *qaḍāʾ al-kawni* or *al-qadari*:

فيكون فيما أحبَّ وفيما لم يحبَّ

Qaḍāʾ al-kawni applies to that which Allāh ﷻ likes and doesn't like. So, Allāh ﷻ does not like *kufr*. Allāh ﷻ doesn't like *Shayṭān* but He let him loose. Allāh ﷻ does not like people not praying.

Student (online): The decree of legislation, the decree of pre-destination.

Ustādh: I mean that's a literal translation. That's not what's intended here.

Student (online): *Sharʿi*—Legislative decree, *kawni*—Empirical decree.

Ustādh: I also think that's very translation kind of based.

Student (online): Decree for the existence of something, decree for the legislation of something.

Ustādh: You see this is the problem. When you go through the example, it makes a lot of sense. When you use the terminology, *al-qaḍāʾ al-sharʿi*, *al-qaḍāʾ al-kawni* or *al-qaḍāʾ al-qadari*, it doesn't make sense from those terminologies.

So, if I say for example, the decree of necessity, you'd be like, '*What on earth does that mean?*' It has no connection to all the definitions here, but it is maybe closer to what we'd understand if you said that. I don't know maybe.

Then the decree *sharʿi* it would be like His desired decree. The necessary decree and the desired decree. Do you guys feel what I'm trying to say? Honestly, I think that's the closest.

Student (online): Pre-destination entails that it has to happen regardless of whether perceived good or bad.

Ustādh: Right, maybe then. But then it will just be called *qaḍāʾ*, isn't it? Because that's what *qaḍāʾ* is. *Qaḍāʾ* is predestination, or *qadar* really is actually. Maybe actually you got it right. Decree of predestination. I see your point because *qaḍāʾ* is not *qadar* and *qadar* is pre-destiny.

Student (online): I explained it as 'decree of the laws of nature' and 'decree of the laws of morality' before.

Ustādh: I don't like the word morality because it takes it away from Allāh ﷻ, it makes it too generic.

Student (online): Desired doesn't make sense.

Student (online): Necessary for who?

Ustādh: Necessary for who? Necessary for Allāh ﷻ because if Allāh ﷻ doesn't like it, then it shouldn't happen. But Allāh ﷻ is testing the people. Allāh ﷻ has obligated upon Himself that this is what He will create.

Student (online): But nothing is necessary for Allāh ﷻ. *Kawni* has to do with *kāna yakūnu* so why not just 'existence'?

Ustādh: Our problem is not the literal translation. We don't have a problem of trying to understand what the word *kawni* means. The issue is not existence or the creation. The *kawn* is the creation. The *kawn* is also existence. We don't have a problem trying to translate it. We're trying to find a phrase that represents.

Student (online): But nothing is necessary for Allāh ﷻ.

Ustādh: This is where you're wrong. Of course it does. When you study *ʿaqīdah*, it's like: 'Allāh obligates upon Himself.' Allāh ﷻ doesn't have to obligate anything. Allāh ﷻ is not restricted by anything. We are talking paradoxical phrases. When you study *ʿaqīdah*, these are the difficulties that you get over when you study it—*tawḥīd* especially, from the *asmāʾ waʾl-ṣifāt*.

Student (online): Isn't the term *irādah* used sometimes instead of *qaḍāʾ*?

Ustādh: That's why I said at the beginning. I mean it is different to *qaḍāʾ* however, we're not getting into this. This is full *ʿaqīdah* from the beginning.

Let me just answer the question of how you can say it is necessary [for Allāh ﷻ].

It is necessary because Allāh ﷻ intended it. That's why. It's not necessary because someone else obligated it upon Allāh ﷻ. It's not that someone said to Allāh ﷻ this is necessary. No. This is because Allāh ﷻ has obligated upon Himself justice. Allāh ﷻ is going to give reward to those people who stay away from those things. So, those things have to exist.

That parallel reality—evil, temptation *fitnah*, *ḥarām*—must exist if you want to be able to be rewarded from avoiding it, avoiding *ḥarām* etc. It's necessary. It's a necessity that Allāh ﷻ himself has created. Allāh ﷻ has obligated upon himself. If Allāh ﷻ says I am going to give you *Jannah* if you worship Him, it is obligatory upon Allāh ﷻ to do that. Allāh ﷻ does not break His promise. I know that people find this terminology weird. You are not talking about humans here. We are talking about that which Allāh ﷻ Himself has obligated on Himself.

I do think that we need some phrases. *Al-qaḍāʾ al-qaḍari*, the decree of predestination, I actually think is not a bad phrase. It's actually a good translation. But do people understand what it means?

As for the other one, the desired decree, I think it is a really good translation.

Student (online): Is this *sunnatʾAllāh* ﷻ?

Ustādh: Yes, it is synonymous to the *sunnah* of Allāh ﷻ the laws of nature for example.

Student: Divine decree?

(1:10:00) Ustādh: Divine decree is the whole game, talking about the two different types.

All of these words are going to have a problem.

Q & A

Q (online): If the *imām* is obliged to use the plural form when doing the *qunūt*, does that apply to other *duʿāʾ* in the *ṣalāh* e.g., saying *Rabbigh-firli* between *sujūd*? Does that go for the congregation as well?

A: No. That's his own *duʿāʾ*. The other one is a public one.

Q (online): With regards to the attribution of evil, please comment on the difference in these two *ayahs:*

﴿أَيْنَمَا تَكُونُوا۟ يُدْرِككُّمُ ٱلْمَوْتُ وَلَوْ كُنتُمْ فِى بُرُوجٍ مُّشَيَّدَةٍ ۗ وَإِن تُصِبْهُمْ حَسَنَةٌ يَقُولُوا۟ هَٰذِهِۦ مِنْ عِندِ ٱللَّهِ ۖ وَإِن تُصِبْهُمْ
سَيِّئَةٌ يَقُولُوا۟ هَٰذِهِۦ مِنْ عِندِكَ ۖ قُلْ كُلٌّ مِّنْ عِندِ ٱللَّهِ ۖ فَمَالِ هَٰٓؤُلَآءِ ٱلْقَوْمِ لَا يَكَادُونَ يَفْقَهُونَ حَدِيثًا ﴿٧٨﴾ مَّآ أَصَابَكَ
مِنْ حَسَنَةٍ فَمِنَ ٱللَّهِ ۖ وَمَآ أَصَابَكَ مِن سَيِّئَةٍ فَمِن نَّفْسِكَ ۚ وَأَرْسَلْنَٰكَ لِلنَّاسِ رَسُولًا ۚ وَكَفَىٰ بِٱللَّهِ شَهِيدًا ﴿٧٩﴾﴾

"Death will overtake you no matter where you may be, even inside high towers.' When good fortune comes their way, they say, 'This is from God,' but when harm befalls them, they say, 'This is from you [Prophet].' Say to them, 'Both come from God.' What is the matter with these people that they can barely understand what they are told? Anything good that happens to you [Prophet] is from God; anything bad is [ultimately] from yourself. We have sent you as a messenger to people; God is sufficient witness." [*Sūrat al-Nisāʾ*: 78-79].

A: In the first *ayah*… This is actually a really good example of *al-qadāʾ al-kawni*. The *qaḍāʾ* of Allāh ﷻ is that all good and bad, everything, all is a reality and a decree and a test from Allāh ﷻ.

In the second it is not referring to the *qaḍāʾ*. It is referring to the consequence, or the perception, or the way you acted upon it, or what you turned it into. So, whatever happens which you consider to be a *ḥasanah* then it is from Allāh ﷻ, and whatever you have turned into a *sayyiʾah*—*sayyiʾah* is not evil, *sayyiʾah* is not evil decree—meaning you turned it into that. You sinned in your reaction to it. You created that sin yourself. The scenario is put in front of you and your reaction and perception was the wrong one.

It's like I gave you the knife, you cut the apple. This is a blessing from Allāh ﷻ. I gave you a knife, you stabbed someone with it, that is your problem. So, the first one is establishing the game, the rules—all of it is from Allāh ﷻ. And then the second *ayah* is referring to the application of it. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): Other than working through the mornings, are there other ways we can achieve *barakah* in our lives i.e., time, wealth, actions etc.?

A: That would need some thinking. I need to think about that. I am sure that can be put together. But certainly, that elderly are blessed with *barakah*, the *akābir* as used to be stated with the *Salaf.* So, people who spend time with the elderly, who are more aware of value, who are often reminding people that, '*Listen I didn't do this, I didn't do that,*' etc.—real talk kind of stuff. I need to think about that. I don't want to talk fluff. There are *ḥadīth* and *ayāt* about that.

Student (online): As you said, legal decree and a decree of fate.

Ustādh: I didn't say legal decree. I didn't like legal decree for *sharʿi*. I just think it removes the desire and the love of Allāh ﷻ from it. The decree of fate, I can live with. I think it's quite good—the decree of fate or the decree of predestination.
Student (online): Legislation is exactly what *al-fiqh al-sharʿi* is though.

Ustādh: No, we are not saying it's not legislation. Of course, it is. What else is *sharʿi*? It is 100% legislation. But the point is that what has the word legislation got to do with Him legislating, which is the same as decreeing that which He loves? What's the link between that?

In the other definition, the fate one, the predestination, there is a link. It indicates that it's everything that will happen, regardless. That 'regardless' part is the part which explains it's going to happen whether you like it or not. There is a link. Where is your legislation connected to the actual consequence of this type of *qaḍāʾ*?

Q (online): What are we asking for in the *duʿāʾ* if evil is subjective based on perspective?

A: The evil of that which you have put out there, remember that we said it has a wide meaning: (a) don't put me in a situation where I am tested—protect me from that, (b) but it also means if I'm put in there then make me strong. Make me succeed. Don't let me fall on the wayside. It's a very comprehensive *duʿāʾ*.

And also, the perception as well. You know we said consequence, i.e., an act which I do wrong which then becomes *sharr*, or perception which is, '*I don't want to lose my kid*,' or '*I don't want to lose all my wealth*,' or '*I don't want to be put into a warzone*,' etc.

Q (online): Can *duʿāʾ* change the outcome of *qaḍāʾ kawni*?

A: Yes, it can. That is obviously deep. That's a whole different level. It doesn't change, per se, the scholars said. It changes, but actually that change was already part of what was going to happen. It's going to become all Matrix.

Student (online): http://www.aqidah.com/creed/articles/nealf-the-difference-between-the-the-hukm-qadaa-that-is-kawnee-creational-and-that-which-is-shariyy-legislative.cfm

Ustādh: There you go. There is a link, but I can't click on it as I don't want to crash my computer.

Student (online): *Irādah kawni*, the will that occurs. *Irādah sharʿi*, the will in line with the *Sharīʿah* of Allāh ﷻ, and therefore necessarily loves.

Ustādh: As I said, the *irādah* is very similar. Again, I think they both come up short. It's just too long. I want something nice. That's a full sentence there.

Q (online): Is it possible or allowed even to do *duʿāʾ qunūt* while sitting before *taslīm*?

A: Yes, it's permissible. It's a *duʿāʾ* like any other.

Student (online): Innate decree.

Ustādh: Innate decree, I don't like.

Q (online): Can I give out my *zakāh* in parts throughout the year or do I have to give it in one go?

A: You can give your *zakāh* in parts, but only in advance. Not afterwards. Unless you can't afford it. And many scholars didn't like this either, but ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه used to do that. You calculate and estimate next year's *zakāh* and then you give it out now in parts. As for the *zakāh* that is due today, that must be paid today unless you don't have it.

Q (online): Don't some scholars say that there is no difference between *qaḍāʾ* and *qadar*?

A: Yes, some said there is no difference between *qaḍāʾ* and *qadar*.

Q (online): Is a specific element to *sharʿi* that the subject of that decree is rewarded for their action and abstention?

A: Of course.

Q (online): What is the class position on women reciting Qurʾān whilst on menses?

A: It's allowed for the Qurʾān to be recited upon menses.

Q (online): My mother was planning to give her *zakāh* money early this year around. Would that mean she would then have to give *zakāh* at one-year full circle or could it be beyond this twelve-month period?

A: I don't understand the question. But if you give early, then you give one year early and then you should spread it out.

30. Chapter 21 Lesson 9: The Supererogatory Prayer

(One performs the *qunūt* after the *rukū*ʿ saying):

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لِي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ

O Allāh, guide me along with those whom You have guided, pardon me along with those whom You have pardoned, be an ally to me along with those whom You are an ally to and bless for me that which You have bestowed. Protect me from the evil You have decreed.

We have covered up until there. From today:

إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ.

For verily You decree and none can decree over You. For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty. O our Lord, Blessed and Exalted are You.

Now page 29 Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says:

إِنَّكَ تَقْضِى وَلَا يُقْضَى عَلَيْكَ

For verily You decree and none can decree over You.

The text says: "For verily You decree and none can decree over You." And Allāh ﷻ of course judges and rules and decrees as He wishes.

By the way, this whole *dars* is going to be just me paraphrasing what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says. I think we can cover quite a few pages today. So, the language may be a little bit weird. It's just easier that way I think.

And there's not a single person that can overrule Allāh ﷻ—that's the meaning of this statement. When He makes a decision, it is end of. There's no changing, there's no this, that, whatever, whatnot. There's no playing around with it. It's final.

(0:10:00) Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿وَٱللَّهُ يَقۡضِي بِٱلۡحَقِّۖ وَٱلَّذِينَ يَدۡعُونَ مِن دُونِهِۦ لَا يَقۡضُونَ بِشَيۡءٍۗ إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ هُوَ ٱلسَّمِيعُ ٱلۡبَصِيرُ ٢٠﴾

"God will judge with truth, while those they invoke besides Him will not judge at all. God is the All Hearing, the All Seeing." [*Sūrat Ghāfir*: 20]

And those that they call upon other than Him, they can't do squat. I think that's straightforward.

إِنَّه لا يَذِلُّ من وَالَيْتَ، ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ

For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty.

"For a surety", that's of course *innahu*, absolutely, verily, 100%.

لا يَذِلُّ من وَالَيْتَ

He whom You show allegiance to is never abased.

He whom you show allegiance to, the *walaʾ*, is never abased.

Lā yadhillu, that *dhillah*, humiliation/embarrassment. To be *dhalīl* means to be pathetic. That *dhillah*, that patheticness, humiliation, etc., that is not going be tasted by those that You support: *man wālayta anta yā Allāh*—those that You have supported, been an ally to.

That's what the Arabic says. In the translation, I've said "he whom You show allegiance to is never abased". And I don't like the 'never' because as the question is going to come up: Does that mean the believers who of course are the ones that receive this very specific type of *walāʾ*—so we're not talking about the general one now, we're talking about the *sharʿi* one. We're talking about the one that Allāh ﷻ wants for the believers

and He protects the believers with especially, over the general protection and the guardianship and governorship (or whatever the words were that we agreed on), custodianship (or God knows what it was), for the whole of mankind. Because He is obviously their protector. He's the one who supports them. But then for the believers, there is a special ally/allyship/ally-ness, friendship, supporting-ness. So, that specific form we're talking about.

And obviously then:

ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ

And he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty.

Those that You take as an enemy, they will never become honoured because You've become their enemy. And they will never become powerful because they've been destroyed by You.

And I have written: "and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty." Now the translation is absolutely correct and fine. The question then comes… Actually, let's first explain that.

قوله: «إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ من وَالَيْتَ» أي: لا يلْحَقُ مَنْ واليتَهُ ذُلٌّ وخُذلان، و المراد الولاية الخاصَّة المذكورة في قوله تعالى:

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says that Allāh ﷻ will not associate *dhull* and *khudhlān*, to be abased or ruined, etc. with those that He has taken as an ally. And the ally-ness, the *wilāyah* here is [*al-wilāyah'l-khaṣah* which is mentioned in the following *ayāt*]:

﴿أَلَآ إِنَّ أَوْلِيَآءَ ٱللَّهِ لَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ ﴿٦٢﴾ ٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُواْ وَكَانُواْ يَتَّقُونَ ﴿٦٣﴾﴾

"But for those who are on God's side there is no fear, nor shall they grieve. For those who believe and are conscious of God." [*Sūrat Yūnus: 62-63*]

That is what this *ayah* is referring to.

And then the opposite:

ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ

And he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty.

That the ones that You have taken as an enemy, they will never win. In fact, they are the ones who are abased:

بل هو ذليلٌ، لأَنَّ مَنْ والاه الله فهو منصورٌ

Because obviously their opponents are being supported by Allāh ﷻ. So, how are they going to be the ones who win? As Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿إِنَّا لَنَنصُرُ رُسُلَنَا وَٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُواْ فِى ٱلْحَيَوٰةِ ٱلدُّنْيَا وَيَوْمَ يَقُومُ ٱلْأَشْهَـٰدُ ۝٥١﴾

"We support Our messengers and the believers, in the present life and on the Day when witnesses arise." [*Sūrat Ghāfir*: 51]

And Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿وَلَيَنصُرَنَّ ٱللَّهُ مَن يَنصُرُهُۥٓ ۗ إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ لَقَوِىٌّ عَزِيزٌ ۝٤٠﴾

"God is sure to help those who help His cause—God is strong and mighty." [*Sūrat al-Ḥajj:* 40]

Whenever you see '*man yanṣuruh*', meaning Allāh ﷻ, to help Allāh ﷻ, we do not help Allāh ﷻ. But what we do is we help His cause. We do the thing that He has told us to do, which obviously is going to increase His Islam, the practice of it etc. So, we are 'helping Allāh ﷻ'. That is always what it means whenever you see us giving the help to Allāh ﷻ.

And indeed, Allāh ﷻ is *qawiyyun ʿazīz*: That is the *ʿizzah* and the believers take the *ʿizzah*. And so those that Allāh ﷻ takes as an enemy, they will never receive that. So, they are *dhalīl*, they are finished.

And then he finishes:

فالعِزُّ للأولياءِ، والذُّلُّ للأعداء

So, the power, the might, the honour, is for the friends of Allāh ﷻ. *Waʾl-dhullu lil-aʿdāʾ.* That is an absolute fact and that is an absolute truth and end of story.

The question obviously is going to come up: Well, hold on! Why is it that we see so many Muslims being abased, humiliated, defeated? How do we understand the *kuffār* winning, supported, strong etc?

The answer to that of course is (and Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says this as well) is that these *duʿāʾ* and these statements are *biʾl-ʿumūm,* meaning they are to be taken generally. They are not to be applied in individual circumstances. So, for example a lot of people struggle with this idea of obedience to parents and respecting parents and whatever, what not. And then the question is often put into terms of like: What if there is something horrific like a whole different level like sexual abuse or something crazy (which we know exists among some very misguided and devious or deviant people)?

So that doesn't change the rule. The rule is obedience, and kindness, and whatever to parents, except in this case where it is too much for a person, or there is a physical danger, etc.

So, I want you to understand that this rule in Islam is a very basic, simple rule, that a statement is *biʾl-ʿumūm,* a statement is always made in general with always the possibility of exceptions.

And what would the exceptions be?

The exceptions would be whatever the exception is.

So, I gave you an example of the obedience thing and an abuse scenario where the situation was too bad. In this example, it would be when the Muslims are defeated. It would be as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says *Uḥud*. When *Uḥud* occurred, that was no doubt a humiliation for the believers. We were sent packing, our whole thing was messed up, our Prophet ﷺ was hurt, hit, etc. The believers let the Prophet ﷺ down. It was a very depressing part. We had martyrs that shouldn't have occurred. The Prophet's ﷺ sadness over the death of those was next level. Waḥshi, he ﷺ did not forgive for killing Ḥamzah. It was a disaster. It was a disaster. But two points…

Obviously, those who have done gone to *Ḥajj* and *ʿUmrah* with myself, you know that specific presentation that I give on *Uḥud,* kind of touches upon this. And really, the class that we teach which is *Fitnah*, the *tafsīr* of *Āli ʿImrān*, is the one in which we really do a deep dive. Because it's *Āli ʿImrān* out of all of the *sūrahs* in the Qurʾān (I do not want to say only but it is certainly in the majority), it is the *sūrah* which really brings the believers and calibrates their expectations of consequences to one's actions and beliefs.

It makes us realise that if it was Allāh ﷻ just giving victory, then a certain level of apathy sets in and everything turns off. And when it is a good day, bad day, good day, bad day then people are on their toes and people are thinking and appreciating the good when they have the bad.

﴿وَتِلْكَ ٱلْأَيَّامُ نُدَاوِلُهَا بَيْنَ ٱلنَّاسِ ﴿١٤٠﴾﴾

"We deal out such days among people in turn." [*Sūrat Ali 'Imrān*: 140]

And sometimes it is just to test people. Sometimes if it was just winning, winning, winning and not taking anybody then how do we get *shuhadā'*?

﴿لَمَّا يَعْلَمِ ٱللَّهُ ٱلَّذِينَ جَٰهَدُوا۟ مِنكُمْ وَيَعْلَمَ ٱلصَّٰبِرِينَ ﴿١٤٢﴾﴾

"God first proving which of you would struggle for His cause and remain steadfast." [*Sūrat Āli 'Imrān*: 142]

How does Allāh ﷻ then take the people of *jihād* from us and how will He then know who are the patient, unless He tests them?

So good and bad is important. Bad days are important. In fact, there is the *ḥadīth* narrated in *Bukhāri* in which the Quraysh said after the disaster in Uḥud, they said:

يَوْمٌ بِيَوْمِ بَدْرٍ

"[This] day compensates for our loss at Badr."[1]

Because they got destroyed in Badr and now they have done revenge, even though frankly, the Prophet's ﷺ tactic to maintain morale of even after defeat, chasing them all
(0:20:00) the way to the edge to show that, '*Listen! We have not given up!*' or '*We haven't pulled out!*' I think is an indication (but that is a deeper point). You know, they said something:

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Military Expeditions Led by the Prophet ﷺ, Chapter: The Ghazwah of Uḥd, ḥadīth no. 4043, 4044.*

وَالْحَرْبُ سِجَالٌ

"And (in) the battle (the victory) is always undecided."[1]

Sijāl means ups and downs. What's the phrase? A day for you a day for us? There is a nice phrase for that.

The point is that there will be times but nearly every single time that happens, if the believer understands it, then it is always going to be in their benefit. If the believer understands that trial, then that abasement, that humiliation will be for their benefit.

Student: Peaks and troughs.

Ustādh: No, you do not say that in the issue of war. There is a phrase to do with war. It's like: You might have won the battle, but you have not won the war. That is probably the best phrase for it. When you say that, by definition you mean that there is a bigger game going on and you have just taken one little moment but there are many more to come. Who is going to take the rest of the battles? I think that is the phrase I am looking for: You may have won the battle, but you have not won the war. The war here (in this example) is referring to the *dunya* in its entirety.

﴿وَٱلْعَـٰقِبَةُ لِلْمُتَّقِينَ ﴿٨٣﴾﴾

"The happy ending is awarded to those who are mindful of God." [*Sūrat al-Qaṣaṣ*: 83]

Student (online): You may have won the battle, but you will lose the war.

Ustādh: You may have won the battle, but you will lose the war.

That is why these verses that say 'the end' and the end is referring to the end of the war, that is going to be for the *muttaqīn*. And in between there are going to be ups and downs and ups and downs. And so therefore when we talk about the *duʿāʾ*:

إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ

For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty.

There are three rules: (1) this is in its general form only, that specific exemptions apply. There will be times that the *kuffār* are *dhalīl*, there will be times that the Muslims are [honoured]. There will times that the *kuffār* are *muʿazz* and Muslims are *adhillah*, humiliated, or beaten, or x, or y.

Student (online): This reminds me of Ibn Khaldūn's cyclical theory of the rise and fall of empires.

Ustādh: And this is of course—exactly—the basic rule of civilisation, the cyclical theory of the rise and fall of empires. Absolutely. Many people way before Ibn Khaldūn spoke about this, but Ibn Khaldūn put it in a nice way.

So, three things:

(1) It is in general. [There are] exceptions.

(2) There is always a benefit—even in the humiliation and abasement—when it makes you return back to Allāh ﷻ. If it doesn't, then it is not going to work.

(3) This is only temporary. So, abasement for the believers and honour for the disbelievers (which is the opposite of this *duʿāʾ*) is only ever—even in the exception cases—only temporary. Therefore, by definition, what this *duʿāʾ* is basically saying: For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to might taste humiliation here and there but in the end will never be abased and he whom You take as an enemy, although they might win a few along the way, will never be the honoured and the mighty in the end. That is the actual kind of meaning, definition of:

إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ

For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty.

Having said that, what is the best way to translate this phrase?

Maybe it is more accurate to not use the word 'never', because the *duʿāʾ* is not:

إِنَّهُ لن يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولن يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ

There is a reason it is not *lan*, never. It is *lā*:

إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ

He who You show allegiance to is not abased, or will not be abased, or a phrase that kind of makes it potential for it to be temporarily [but not ultimately].

Student (online): He whom you show allegiance to will not be abased.

Ustādh: I like that because it looks in the longer... And he whom You take as an enemy will not be honoured and mighty.

'Will' really works very nicely when you are looking at it in the overall picture of the war. The reason that there is a problem and why scholars do not explain it like that, or translators do not put it like that, is because of the 'will'. The word 'will' always indicates the future, and it's like you are excluding the past and present.

I want you to know that one of the reasons that the present is used is because the present verb *yadhillu* and *yaʿizzu* is indicating a continuity that takes in account now, it has always been happening, and will continue. That is why people do not put the word 'will not', because it kind of restricts it to the future.

And that statement potentially indicates, if we said: 'For a surety, he whom You show allegiance to will not be abased', it indicates that those whom You showed allegiance to before were abased.

And: 'He whom You take as an enemy will not be honoured and mighty', but they were honoured and mighty. Well, no.

Whereas, if I say: 'He whom You show allegiance to is never abased', then that is covering previous, now, and later. But then you have this problem… It is not even a problem, frankly because when you read these statements you should always accept that there are exceptions. So, I do not have a major problem with 'never', to be honest. That is the more accurate one.

Student (online): What is wrong with 'is not'?

Student (online): For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is not abased and he whom You take as an enemy is not honoured and mighty.

Ustādh: Yes, 'is not' is definitely better than 'will not'. Definitely.

Student (online): Indeed, those whom You show support are ultimately not debased…

Ustādh: You see, this is the problem of teaching an exception. It dominates your mind so much that it just ruins everything. The exception should never ever dominate your

work, your presentation. This is a huge mistake people make, by the way. The exception should just be important. It should never become dominant. The classic example of this by the way, because it is impossible to put 'ultimately'. It is just not right. That is of course the meaning, but it is not right to put into a translation.

The example that I want to give is people, who when I am teaching a class for *Al-Maghrib*, especially on the Family Friday, there are a lot of people who pass by, walk in, sit down. And if it is done at a university, then it is often the one that they bring the head of faculty down who have helped book the room—non-Muslims, I mean. And there is a basic principle that *Al-Maghrib* HQ, from a legal, safety, and intelligence point of view, they always tell their instructors that listen, there are a couple of non-Muslims, or that there is a particular non-Muslim. And I always say, "Don't bother telling me.' And even if you tell me it is going to be, '*La-la-la! I can't hear you. I can't hear you*,' because once you hear that, you cannot help but tone down on the truth and the things that you want to say, and the sincerity and honesty of what you want to put forward, x, y, z.

(0:30:00) I want you to think about that for a second. That might be the prudent thing to do, but I have sacrificed 400-500 people for the sake of one fish. I couldn't give a monkey's about that fish. When did he become so important? When did the exception become so important that it dominates the actual content and *dars*?

That is a lesson to everybody. And this is something we found out with *The Last Testament*. When we recorded it, and we were thinking about editing it, changing, and releasing it, we realised that this has little benefit for the non-Muslims but why are we taking the Muslims out of it for? And the way we then released it, we chose the Muslims as the focus to listen to it. So, the exception should never ever allow you to... We have to get our priorities right. This obsession with *daʿwah*—*daʿwah* to the believers is more important than the *daʿwah* to the people who require all the amount of work, and blah, blah, blah, while still giving *daʿwah* to everybody. We don't throw the other lot under the bus. I mean, it can be significant sometimes.

Student (online): When I think of ultimately, I do not think about the exception I think about focusing on winning the war and not the battle... maybe not appropriate here, but that was my thought process.

Ustādh: That is the correct thought process. That is the thought process that you are meant to have. That is the actual translation.

Student (online): "He whom You show allegiance to will ultimately never be abased. He whom You show enmity to will ultimately never be honoured."

Ustādh: I don't like it. It is basically setting us up for losing. It's a very defeatist almost. Obviously, that is not the intention by the wording, but it comes across as *'Right, you*

are going to lose. You're losing. But hey! You know what? It's going to be okay in the end.' As a commander, if you said that on [the battlefield]…

I'm not going to lie. I don't mind this: For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased.

And 'never abased' doesn't mean that it is never going to happen to an individual, I just think 'is not' is the best.

I don't know if anybody put that down: For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is not abased. It doesn't put a 'will' in there which is indicating the future. It is not talking about only ultimately and not focusing on the present reality. So, I rather that we translate words for what they are and understand them for what they mean. So, that statement there does not say 'will' or 'ultimately' at all, it says:

إِنَّهُ لاَ يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ

Literally translated: And verily he whom You support is not humiliated.

It actually is 'is not'. It is the 'never' which was the mistake. So, I think we go with 'is not'. I'll be honest with you I like 'never' and I like 'is not'. I am happy with 'never' and I am happy with 'is not'.

Student (online): For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is not abased and he whom You take as an enemy is not honoured and mighty.

Ustādh: I'm happy with that. I'm happy with 'never' and I'm happy with 'is not' as well.

He ends this at the bottom of page 30 and he says:

لا يَذِلُّ ذُلاً دائماً، ولا يَعِزُّ عِزًّا دائماً

So basically, the eventual summary of this *duʿāʾ* is that the intention by these statements is that these are to be taken in general. There are sometimes specific scenarios which will go against this and the believers will not be always and continuously humiliated and they will not always continuously be honoured and mighty, that is basically the meaning or the implication.

تبارکت رَبَّنَا

O our Lord, Blessed and Exalted are You.

Tabārakta Rabbana is short for *tabārakta yā Rabbana*. This *yā* has been removed because of the amount of times that we make this *duʿāʾ* and the *yā* gets in the way. It is like a barrier, so we get rid of it to make it flow. *Tabārakta yā Rabbana* is a lot worse than *tabārakta Rabbana.* Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that the second reason that it has been removed is to allow the power of the name, the beauty of the name to shine and the blessing of the name to come first, which is *Rabb*. So: Blessed is You the Lord, but the 'O' is like kind of just delaying things from the blessing of using the name immediately linked to the blessing—*tabārakta Rabbana. S*traight after *tabārakta* we want Allāh ﷻ to be mentioned immediately without any delay so that it is very clear that we're honouring Him immediately, powerfully, no delay. This is one of the reasons that the Arabs remove the *yā*.

And *barakah* is a phrase that we spoke about last time. It means lots of good and plenty of good and it comes in principle from the phrasal *birkatʾl-māʾ* which is a large vat or container of water which overflows. The meaning of *tabārakta Rabbana* is that Allāh ﷻ is blessed, that He is of huge *barakah*, that He is the one who sends down the *barakah*, that when we mention His name, we achieve *barakah*. When we think about Him and reflect upon Him and we remember Him in any way, we achieve *barakah.* And that's seen in the power of His name when we use His name, when we say *bismillāh* with the name of Allāh ﷻ then we can slaughter an animal and it turns from *ḥarām* into *ḥalāl* just by saying *bismillāh*—same action you don't say it, it is *ḥarām*, you say it, it becomes *ḥalāl*.

For those scholars who consider the *bismillāh* to be an obligation for *wuḍūʾ*, like some of the Ḥanābilah, then for those people the *wuḍūʾ* is not done, the ritual ablution has not been performed. Whereas when it's associated with the name of Allāh ﷻ, it is blessed to the level that it validates the *wuḍūʾ*.

Shaykh says that *Rabbana* is one of the names of Allāh ﷻ (at the bottom of page 31) and it sometimes comes *muḍāf muḍāf ilayh* when it's connected to something like it is here, it's connected to us, our Lord. Or for example when Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿رَبِّ ٱلسَّمَٰوَٰتِ وَٱلْأَرْضِ رَبِّ ٱلْعَرْشِ عَمَّا يَصِفُونَ ﴿٨٢﴾﴾

"The Lord of the heavens and the earth, the Lord of the Throne—He is far above their false descriptions." [*Sūrat al-Zukhruf*: 82]

(0:40:00) So, we have two *muḍāf ilayh* constructs, that He is *Rabb,* but He is *Rabbʾl-samāwāti waʾl-arḍ*, the Lord of the heavens and the earth and He is *Rabbʾl-ʿarshi ʿamma yaṣifūn*, He is the Lord of the Throne, He is the *Rabb* of the Throne. So, He is the Lord of ..., the Lord of ..., but He is also just the Lord.

Student (online): Genitive construction.

Constructive possession. That's what I meant. But it means nothing to most people. But you know what I mean, when it's something of, 'the Lord of'.

ويأتي غير مضاف مُحَلاًّ بأل؛ مثل قوله صلّى الله عليه وسلّم: «فأمَّا الرُّكوع فَعَظِّمُوا فيه الرَّبَّ»

But sometimes it's not the Lord of, it just means the Lord. So, for example, Prophet ﷺ said in the *ḥadīth* narrated by Imām Muslim that:

فَأَمَّا الرُّكُوعُ فَعَظِّمُوا فِيهِ الرَّبَّ

"So far as *rukūʿ* is concerned, extol in it the Lord." [2]

Also, his statement ﷺ narrated by Imām Aḥmad in his *Musnad*:

السِّوَاكُ مَطْهَرَةٌ لِلْفَمِ مَرْضَاةٌ لِلرَّبِّ

"The *siwāk* is a purification for the mouth and it is pleasing to the Lord."[3]

So, *al-Rabb* sometimes occurs in a constructive possessed form or by itself.

Tabārakta Rabbana, that's done.

وتَعَالَيْتَ

[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: The Prohibition of Reciting the Qurʾān While Bowing and Prostrating, ḥadīth no.479 a.*
[3] *Musnad Imām Aḥmad, 3/ 1.*

If you look in the translation, I have written: 'O our Lord, Blessed and Exalted are You.'

Tabārakta Rabbana: Blessed You are, our Lord.

Wa taʿālayt: And You are the most high.

Is a pretty good translation as well. Pretty good I mean by meaning, I don't know if it is a nice translation or not. But I've gone with exalted. Exalted isn't a bad word. I like it. It's a very useful word actually. It helps. But the problem with the word exalted is that it does come across as trying to avoid the obvious and that's what I don't like about the word exalted. I don't like the fact that when we use the word exalted, it's almost like we're trying to hide the fact of saying that He is the most high. And I mean high in everything—high in Himself *subḥānah*, high in His royalty and the way that He should be treated. So, I don't know whether we change that.

So, let me explain then what Shaykh says. *Taʿālayt* is from *taʿāla* or *taʿāli* which means highness, like loftiness, like above-ness. And this *ta* is an exaggeration to emphasise His highness, *wa taʿālayt* (meaning the first one).

Student (online): Why doesn't exalted show that though?

Ustādh: Because the word exalted means honoured and so, on and doesn't have to be something tall or high.

That's why exalted is like a word that is used for regency, royalty and honored. Now, you could say, that's what high also means, even though high is obviously meaning high, it also means someone is acting very high, very proud and arrogant. So, I get the point. It's just that I think it is more obvious with high and is less obvious with exalted. Now I always use exalted myself. But I do take the point. And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is going into quite a bit of detail on making sure that the Muslims understand what Ahl'l-Sunnah's belief is on the *ʿuluw* of Allāh ﷻ, the highness of Allāh ﷻ.

Student (online): So not literal enough?

Ustādh: Yes, basically what she said. It is not just literal enough. It's perfect in its explanation, but you are playing into the hands of people who don't actually believe in Allāh's ﷻ *ʿuluw*.

Let me go through this we will come back to it. Let's spend the rest of this session giving this it's *ḥaqq*. I think it's about time—obviously nine years in—to do some serious *ʿaqīdah*.

Get ready everyone. This is gold. The next few pages are gold for your *ʿaqīdah*.

[Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says:] The 'highness' of Allāh ﷻ is of two types: (1) the highness of the self, and (2) the highness in description or His descriptive highness, *ʿuluwʾl-ṣifah*—the characteristics of being high, like control, power, and honour, and things like that. And *ʿuluwʾl-dhāt*, the highness of His self, His actual own realities, physical reality. His self. The word physical is not necessary here and causes its own problems, but His *dhāt*, His self.

Student (online): The literal and metaphysical characteristics of being high.

Ustādh: Yeah. That sounds like we are smoking something. But it's okay.

So, now:

فأما عُلوُّ الذَّات فمعناه أنَّ الله نَفْسَهُ فوقَ كُلِّ شيء

What does the 'highness of the self' mean?

It means that Allāh ﷻ by Himself is above everything—above His throne in the heavens. That's where He is ﷻ.

وأمَّا عُلوُّ الصِّفة أنَّ الله تعالى موصوفٌ بكلِّ صفاتٍ عُليا

As for the highness in terms of the characteristics of Allāh ﷻ, then it means that Allāh ﷻ is described with every possible exalted characteristic—high characteristic, honourable powerful, on top, in control, characteristic.

As for the first one, *ʿuluwʾl-dhāt*, for the highness of Himself, the highness of Allāh ﷻ, there have been groups of course, Muslims unfortunately, that have denied this, rejected this reality. From them of course, are the Jahmiyyah, the tribe that is known as the Jahmiyyah, and then those that followed them and the offshoots of them. And then of course some of the extreme Sufi groups that believe in this kind of *waḥadatʾl-wujūd*, that everything is all one and one is you, and one is me, and one is God, and everything is whatever.

For example, the Jahmiyyah's opening statement, or key point of *ʿaqīdah* is:

إنَّ الله في كُلِّ مكان بذاته

That Allāh ﷻ by Himself is in everything single place, everywhere. He is everywhere. Physically He is everywhere. And this was followed by those that went to extremes of the rejections of the attributes of Allāh ﷻ. These are people who have a genuine concern. And here I think Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is referring to the more mainstream of people, like the Ashāʾirah, some of the Māturīdiyyah—maybe not so much them certainly the Ashāʾirah and certainly others who of course were a rebel movement, a correct one if you think about it, when you follow the history of *ʿaqīdah*. When Islam started to spread and we came bam up against the Greco-Roman kind of culture, and philosophies, and writings, and education methodologies, etc. especially their interpretation of God, which was very anthropomorphised, very physical, and so on, in certain sects.

(0:50:00) The Muslims, to avoid that becoming like the Christianisation if you like, of our own *ʿaqīdah* were it turns into the human form of ʿĪsa ﷺ, which is obviously the worst connotation, but to not anthropomorphise it, which means to humanise which means to give body to, and arms, and legs—to make physical and human. It was like a rejection, a rebel movement to avoid that. And in that effort they went so far... Ahlʾl-Sunnah of course were doing the same thing, but they knew where to stop. Whereas these guys, some of them went—I don't mean the Ashāʾirah all of them—some went even further. They went so far that they started to deny absolutely everything and just went too far. For example, they would say: 'Allāh ﷻ is neither above the world, nor below the world. He is not on the right. He is not on the left. He is not in front. He is not in the back. He is not connected to the world. He is not separated from the world.' That is how they would describe Him.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn, basically mocking this phrase, he says: Basically, He is nothing then. He is neither here, neither there, neither right, neither left.

You can see what they are trying to do. If you are trying to avoid someone making Allāh ﷻ physical, and restricting Him to size, space, dimensions, weight, height, width, diameter, location, which is obviously what happens when you say that Jesus is God. It is a disaster when you put Him into a human form. It is not even the fact that he is a human. It is the fact that you have restricted Him in every single thing. That's obviously extreme *kufr*, but I am saying that even in between, like lesser than that, when it comes to our understanding of Allāh ﷻ.

[Video/audio connection disconnects then reconnects.]

I don't know whether you heard what I said, but basically they are just trying to protect Allāh ﷻ from being humanised and restricted. And they went so far that they just denied everything about Allāh ﷻ, to leave Him meaningless.

Now, the problem with that is that Allāh ﷻ does not make Himself meaningless. In fact, it is one of the great successful attributes of Islam that Allāh ﷻ is so personal with us, and that we are so intimate with Him ﷻ, that He is so close to us that we feel and thrive

off His energy, off His blessing, off His guidance, off His direction. He is the hand that we strike with, and He is the walk of our walk etc., when we are in the right zone and so on. At the same time, He is not so close that we have Christianised Him, but He is not so far that we've [Judaised] Him.

Student (online): Are we saying mainstream Ashʿarism went too far? Or the fringes?

Ustādh: Even mainstream Ashʿarism went a bit far, but what we are talking about is the fringes. There is no doubt. *Taʿṭīl*. When you have people who are making *taʾwīl*, it is very different from *taʿṭīl*. *Taʿṭīl* means to reject all of the attributes, and say, no, no, no. *Taʾwīl* is to say, '*Well we are okay with that one. And this one, I think it means this and not that. And this one, I know what it means literally but we are going to assume it to be that.*' They are trying to fine-tune it.

Ahl'l-Sunnah, just a wonderful people, wonderful *ʿaqīdah*, don't mess about. Whatever the Prophet ﷺ says, Allāh ﷻ says, we just take it as it is. We are not going to add anything, we are not going to take away anything, we are not going to assume anything. We just know that is what Allāh ﷻ is saying about Himself and that's it. Otherwise, it becomes meaningless. As Ibn Taymiyyah wrote so much about this, when we go this way, it becomes meaningless.

Now, I will tell you something that is very interesting. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn gives a description of what they say, He is not left, He is not right, etc. We get what you are trying to say. It is not like we are trying to restrict Him either. We are not saying that He has to live in the right, which is *kufr*, to restrict Allāh ﷻ.

أمَّا أهلُ السُّنَّة والجَمَاعَة، فقالوا :إنَّ الله سبحانه وتعالى فوقَ كُلِّ شيءٍ بذاتِهِ.

We are saying that Allāh ﷻ is above everything. He is the One who has told us that. We point up there [i.e. upwards], we are not saying in that dimension, in that pixel, or in this area of the galaxy He is restricted. When we say that He is above His Throne, we do not need to go into the detail of whether that is right, or left, or above, or x, or y, or z. We are just saying what He has said about Himself. If He didn't say that, what is the meaning? If He wanted Himself to be this kind of fluid, vague nothing, then He would not be speaking like He does, *subḥānah,* and neither would the Prophet ﷺ describe Him like he ﷺ does.

Student (online): They object to the idea of direction, right?

Ustādh: This is all about obviously direction. But it is not direction. It is limitation. The *ʿillah* is limitation. It's not direction. Direction is one of the things along what causes limitation. So, they will focus on direction and timing and presence. The whole discussion of whether He was first and then there was nothing with Him, and was He

the equal etc. All of this nonsense comes from Muslims who try to remove restriction from Allāh ﷻ. They say, '*Because if you say that He is the first, then you are only restricting Him to*…' It is stupidity. It goes mental.

Student (online): Because Allāh ﷻ exists outside the space-time continuum?

Ustādh: That is exactly it. Because of the space-time continuum and its limitations, etc.

Student (online): Their premise is that God commanded them to know Him and they jump off and philosophise about His nature.

Ustādh: We are going to come to that in one second.

I just want to just quote to you something. It is just interesting what example he gives. So after he has described this, he then says of his own self, 'so basically He is nowhere, He is nothing, He doesn't exist then, He is neither here, neither there, He is not this, you basically made Him not existing.' "And that is why," Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says, "that Maḥmūd ibn Subuktikīn..."

When I read that literally I thought to myself, '*That is my guy Ertuğrul right?*' But this is obviously, this tikīn is their kind of word, you know Sungurtikin and all the rest of it. These kinds of guys, they are all part and parcel of that whole 'prince' in Turkish original language or whatever. I mean actually he was born in Afghanistan, and he was one of the kings of the East. And he was one of the righteous kings of the East actually. He was one of the good guys. And he is one of those that conquered India or went to India in the early days. And when he got there, there are lots of stories. We used to always know him as Muḥammad abu al-Qāsim as opposed to Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim. We always knew him as the ruler Muḥammad abu al-Qāsim. But it is this name that I was not familiar with Subuktikīn.

Anyway, he had lots of conquests and everything and he was one of the big guys. When he went to India especially, there is a lot in Ibn Kathīr especially in *Al-Bidāyah wa'l-Nihāyah*, writes a lot about his adventures in India and with the *mushrikīn,* you know with the Hindus and with all the worshipers and stuff. Lots of interactions which you kind of expect at the low level but when it is a king interacting and all of the drama that comes with that, it is actually quite interesting. It is actually quite interesting as a king.

There is one really interesting story that I remember (again that we knew as the Malik Abu al-Qāsim, Muḥammad abu al-Qāsim) that he came across a load of Hindus or *mushrikīn,* they were worshiping this huge idol and bringing lots and lots of money to it etc. etc. And he thought to himself, '*Let me do this. Let me take this money and use our own money and pay these people off and say to him, 'Listen! Avoid this and or use it to benefit the other people, let it continue."* So let them continue to bring the money and we will use that money basically (huge amount of money) to support the believers and support the *daʿwah* and…

He is saying to himself that if I let this little cash cow continue—literally—and I like the word cash cow because it was literally a cash cow although he doesn't mention what the idol was, but let's assume it is a big cow, but whatever it is, I mean obviously if it was Hindus at that time then it could have been a cow. Anyway, it definitely was a massive cash cow and he wanted to use this cash cow to be able to benefit the *jihād,* benefit the believers, do *daʿwah* with it, etc. So, his soldiers and advisers, they said to him, '*Listen, this is what* we *think, and I don't know. You make the call*.' He said, '*Let me make istikhārah*.' So, he did *istikhārah* and he came to the decision that no, we have to stand up for what is right.

(1:00:00)

And that is what he got his reputation for, that he was a major promoter of the *ʿaqīdah* of Ahl'l-Sunnah even though he was not in a kind of Ahl'l-Sunnah stronghold in terms of the East, like Afghanistan, etc. in that kind of time. He was born 361 *Hijri*, died 421 in Afghanistan. So, it wasn't like the stronghold of the Ahl'l-Sunnah in terms of *ʿaqīdah*. However, he was actually a real big supporter of *tawḥīd* and *athar*. And has this *istikhārah* he says, '*No. We have to stand for our principle here. We have to destroy this idol and we have to show these people this is wrong what they are doing*.'

Now from our point of view this is a great act—major sacrifices, major loss of money. Major loss of funds. And it comes across as very aggressive etc. However, look at the pros. The pros: India with 100,000,000 Muslims today, it had to start somewhere. If you are going aggressive and smashing all that down and setting a message very clear, there is no doubt that that would have had an impact upon the numbers that are coming down the line. So think about that.

But the really interesting thing that Ibn Kathīr says is that when they smash the cash cow, they found hundreds of times worth underneath and inside—the money/wealth, that had been gathered there. Like their intention was what it was and Allāh ﷻ gave them back so many times over.

It's just one of those really nice stories. It's a very famous story actually. You'll find it is said a lot by the Muslim *duʿāt*, storyteller kind of folks. Because obviously this is a historical story. It doesn't have *sanad*. It's talking about the fourth century. It's not exactly *ḥadīth* standards that need to be maintained, but it is a nice anecdote.

Anyway, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn uses this ruler and says:

ولهذا أنكر محمودُ بن سُبُكْتِكين رحمه الله على مَنْ وَصَفَ اللهَ بهذه الصِّفَة، وقال: هذا هو العَدَمُ. وصَدَق؛ فهذا هو العَدم

He basically said that someone described Allāh ﷻ to him in these terms. And he said to him, "What is this? This is nothingness. You have made nothing out of Allāh ﷻ. You have

made Him pointless, bodyless, everything-less, like it's just nothing." And Shaykh ʿUthaymīn says: He was right, there is *ʿaqīdah* from a guy who understood it.

And this is a very important point here that *ʿaqīdah*, the one that is going to be the essential belief in Allāh ﷻ, by necessity must be so clear and obvious for everybody. It has to be essential and understood by everybody. Otherwise, it's not the *ʿaqīdah* of the Muslims.

So, to that point, let me now finish this lesson by the following.

Shaykh says on the top of page 33: Ahl'l-Sunnati wa'l Jamāʿah say that we say that Allāh ﷻ is above everything with His self. And they base this creedal statement upon five evidence:

1. The Book (the Qurʾān).
2. The *Sunnah*
3. The *Ijmāʿ* (the consensus)
4. The *ʿAql* (the intellect points to this)
5. The *Fiṭrah*

فالكتاب: كلُّ ما يمكن مِن أجناس الأدلَّةِ فهي موجودة في إثبات عُلوِّ الله.

As for the Book, then every possible type of evidence is in the Qurʾān which establishes the highness, loftiness of Allāh ﷻ. Sometimes Allāh ﷻ uses the word *ʿuluw*, itself, the highness:

﴿سَبِّحِ ٱسْمَ رَبِّكَ ٱلْأَعْلَى ۝١﴾

"[Prophet], glorify the name of your Lord the Most High" [*Sūrat al-Aʿla:1*]

In *Sūrat al-Aʿlā*, *The High*.

وتارة بلَفْظِ الفَوقيَّةِ

And sometimes with a word which indicates highness.

﴿وَهُوَ ٱلْقَاهِرُ فَوْقَ عِبَادِهِۦ ۚ﴾

"He is the Supreme Master over His creatures" [*Sūrat al-Anʿām:18*]

Above, *fawq*, that word is using a height word, 'above' word.

وتارة بذِكْرِ عُروجِ الأشياء وصُعُودِها إليه

Sometimes by talking about things that go up and rise up to Him ﷻ.

﴿تَعْرُجُ ٱلْمَلَٰٓئِكَةُ وَٱلرُّوحُ إِلَيْهِ﴾

"The angels and the Spirit ascend to Him." [*Sūrat al-Maʿārij: 4*]

And when Allāh ﷻ says:

﴿إِلَيْهِ يَصْعَدُ ٱلْكَلِمُ ٱلطَّيِّبُ﴾

"Good words rise up to Him." [*Sūrat Fāṭir:* 10]

And sometimes Allāh ﷻ indicates it by using language where something is coming down from Him. So, He must be above.

﴿يُدَبِّرُ ٱلْأَمْرَ مِنَ ٱلسَّمَآءِ إِلَى ٱلْأَرْضِ ثُمَّ يَعْرُجُ إِلَيْهِ﴾

"He runs everything, from the heavens to the earth, and everything will ascend to Him in the end." [*Sūrat al-Sajdah: 5*]

So that's the Qur'ān. It's so clear. I think Ibn Taymiyyah said 1000 (I can't even remember) evidences direct from the Qur'ān. No messing about. Not subtle or interpreted—direct—1000 evidences of the *ʿuluw* of Allāh ﷻ. The highness of Allāh ﷻ.

He's not in the Earth. He is above the heavens. He is above His Throne as high as high can be.

As for the *Sunnah*. From the *Sunnah*, Shaykh says that we can combine all the three expressions of the *Sunnah*. Which is:

القولُ، والفِعْلُ، والإقرارُ

Those are the actions of the Prophet ﷺ, the statement of the Prophet ﷺ, and his affirmation, meaning him ﷺ remaining silent as someone else says something which means that he ﷺ confirms what someone else says. These are the three expressions of *Sunnah* as you all know.

أما القول :فكان رسولُ الله صلّى الله عليه وسلّم يقول في سجوده: «سبحان رَبِّيَ الأعلى»

As for a statement, then the Prophet ﷺ used to say in his *sujūd*: *subḥāna Rabbiyy'l-Aʿla*, and glory be to You, my Lord, the Most High.[4]

وأما الفعل :فإنه لما خَطَبَ النَّاسَ يومَ عَرَفَة، فقال: «ألا هل بَلَّغْتُ، قالوا :نعم، قال :اللَّهُمَّ فاشهدْ، يرفعُ إصبَعَهُ السَّبَّابَةَ إلى السَّماء ويَنْكُتُهَا إلى النَّاسِ» وهذا إثبات للعلوِّ بالفعل.

As for his actions ﷺ, when he ﷺ gave a sermon to the Muslims on the day of *ʿArafah*. And after he ﷺ finished and he ﷺ gave the famous speech, then he ﷺ said: "Tell me. Have I done what I was meant to do? Have I fulfilled my message? Have I said what I needed to say?" They said: "*Naʿm*."

Then he ﷺ said:

اللَّهُمَّ فاشهدْ

"*Yā* Allāh, bear witness [that I have done it]." [5]

---

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: It Is Recommended to Recite for a Long Time in the Night Prayers, ḥadīth no. 772.*
[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Pilgrimage, Chapter: The Hajj of the Prophet ﷺ, ḥadīth no. 1218 a.*

'You heard me. They've said it. Bear witness,' he ﷺ lifted his finger to the heavens. So, his ﷺ action itself.

31. Chapter 21 Lesson 10: The Supererogatory Prayer

We are on page 34 of the text (*Mumtiʿ*). And what we are explaining is the part of the *duʿāʾ*:

إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ.

For verily You decree and none can decree over You. For of a surety, he whom You show allegiance to is never abased and he whom You take as an enemy is never honoured and mighty. O our Lord, Blessed and Exalted are You.

We are on:

وتَعَالَيْتَ

We started discussing the concept of the *ʿuluw* of Allāh ﷻ—the highness, the loftiness, the exaltedness, the transcendence—all of these are wonderful words which describe a physical reality but a metaphysical or a spiritual reality as well. The problem is that these phrases can be problematic. The wording themselves, the wording that we try to use can cause more problems than you want. In any case, the loftiness and the highness of Allāh ﷻ I think what we said is that we wanted to change 'Exalted are You'.

تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ

O our Lord, Blessed and Exalted are You.

I'm not going to bust a nut over 'Exalted are You', but I do find that it is a kind of like just an easy, lazy, kind of whatever. So that's the problem.

Student (online): 'Exalted' wouldn't include the literal meaning of *istawa ʿalaʾl-ʿarsh* although it would imply the figurative meaning of being high and lofty. But 'High' implies both literal direction (above) and figurative meaning of being exalted.

Ustādh: That's the problem. 'Exalted' kind of fudges, it doesn't not include it, but it does not exactly help the literal meaning of how He ﷻ is above the heavens, above the Throne. That's the only issue.

This is the problem, you see. Once you start getting involved in this discussion, you start using for example: "But 'high' implies both literal direction (above) and figurative meaning of being exalted."

So, 'literal direction', we don't want to restrict Allāh ﷻ we just mention words that Allāh ﷻ uses. 'Figurative', well that is not a figurative word but we are talking about the extra implications of the highness and the loftiness of Allāh ﷻ, the spiritual implications, and so on.

So, we were establishing this according to the Qurʾān and *Sunnah* and we said Ahlʾl-Sunnah waʾl-Jamāʿah will establish the highness of Allāh ﷻ.

Student (online): I have "Blessed are You our Lord and You are the Most High" written down.

Ustādh: *Tabārakta Rabbana wa taʿālayt*: And You are the Most High. You know what it is? I think that is the best one: 'Blessed are You our Lord and You are the Most High'. But it just needs a bit of tidying up. But that is I think the more accurate. I'm sure that can probably be put into some nice English.

So, to establish the loftiness of Allāh *jalla wa ʿala*, there are five key evidence areas: (1) the Book (Qurʾān), (2) the *Sunnah*, (3) *Ijmāʿ*, (4) the *ʿaql* and (5) the intrinsic primordial nature that we are created on. So that's the five.

And we spoke about the Qurʾānic *ayāt* last week and then we started on the *Sunnah* and we didn't really complete it. No, we did. We said from the *Sunnah* we have three different expressions of the *Sunnah*: (1) a statement, (2) the action, and then (3) the agreeing or what we call the approval, or the tacit approval (as academics like to call it) of the Prophet ﷺ i.e.—his remaining silent when others are speaking about it and not changing the narrative, which of course is obligatory upon the Prophet ﷺ if he hears something wrong. So, it's a very powerful form of *Sunnah.*

And we said that from the *qawl*, the Prophet ﷺ would say *subḥāna Rabbīyyʾl-Aʿla,* Glorified be my Lord the Most High.[1]

As for his ﷺ action then he ﷺ pointed his finger into the air and he ﷺ said: "Allāh bear witness."[2] And that is where we stopped.

---

[1] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Travellers, Chapter: It Is Recommended to Recite for a Long Time in the Night Prayers, ḥadīth no. 772.*
[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Pilgrimage, Chapter: The Hajj of the Prophet ﷺ, ḥadīth no.1218 a.*

(0:10:00) This is now the top of page 34:

وأما إقراره: فبإقراره للجَارية حين سألها: «أينَ اللهُ؟» قالت: في السَّماءِ

This is very famous *ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.[3] For those who know about what happened, there was a man, a Companion, and he slapped his maid or female slave for all intents and purposes. He slapped her and this was then brought to the Prophet ﷺ. Obviously, the girl is not happy, he wasn't even happy frankly about what he had done (loss of control). And so the situation needed judgment by the Prophet ﷺ. And so, he ﷺ decided that the way I'm going to do this, first of all, is to understand whether she is a Muslim or not. And so, to examine her Islam, he ﷺ asked her about Allāh ﷻ which would be a nice and simple easy way. All he ﷺ said was: "Where is Allāh?" And she said: "In the heavens."

Now, that is literally translated, *fi'l-samā'*. The truth is there is a huge debate about the word *fī. Fī* of course means 'in', in the normal language. However, we have seen a number of cases (this is not *'aqīdah* class) that there are a number of times that the word *fī* 'in' means 'on'. I'm not thinking of the right word, maybe some of you can think of English examples, but in the Qur'ān, when they *yamshi fi'l-arḍ*, when they walk in the land. When you say 'walk in the land', you don't mean they are walking in the land, that their feet are going in the land. It means on the land. It is a way of speaking.

So, on context, *fī* is either 'in' or 'on' or 'above', like on top of. And so effectively what she said was that He ﷻ is above the heavens. That's how the vast majority of Ahl'l-Sunnah and the *Salaf*… And this is where the whole concept of the Salafi methodology comes from, that when it comes to *ḥadīth* or *athār*, statements of the Companions, which are maybe differed over and there are some issues in terms of potential difference of opinion because of linguistics, etc. then hey, let's just interpret it like the Salaf used to. If we can find something from the Companions, it's game over.

Student (online): Pedestrians in the road.

Ustādh: That's a good one.

Student (online): Is this *ḥadīth* of the slave girl universally accepted as authentic?

Ustādh: The *ḥadīth* is universally accepted of course. It is in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.[3]

So that's what's universally accepted of course. What's not universally accepted is what the actual meaning is. Now, I just want to make it clear that even that small minority

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: The Prohibition of Speaking During the Prayer, and the Abrogation of Its Former Permissibility, ḥadīth no. 537 a.*

that translated this—you know, even those—they said it still doesn't deny that Allāh ﷻ is above everything, that the heavens is a general understanding.

So, the key point here is that this is the third evidence from the *Sunnah* that expresses *iqrār* because when he ﷺ said: "Where is Allāh?" She said: "In heaven." They've translated it like that. But like I said, whether you translate it in the heaven, above the heaven, in the sky, above the sky, the point is what is being understood. Anyway, this was enough to establish her *imān* and the Prophet ﷺ said to let her be set free. The key is that the Prophet ﷺ did not deny what she said, did not correct what she said, didn't say, '*Need more detail*,' '*No you got it wrong*,' etc. So, his silence ﷺ is proof.

So that's the Qurʾān and the *Sunnah* done. By the way, there are hundreds—I mean when you study *ʿaqīdah* when you study the *ʿuluw* of Allāh ﷻ you will literally… I'm not saying this as an exaggeration because 'hundreds' is an exaggerative term. People say, '*There are hundreds of ways that we can do that*,' when there are only two ways. There are hundreds of evidences from Qurʾān. I once gave a *khuṭbah* where I must have mentioned fifty. Easily. Within twenty minutes—not even a detailed lesson. So, from the Qurʾān, hundreds and hundreds from the *Sunnah* but we've just been obviously like Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn himself, just being incredibly summarised.

The next thing that he's going to use is *ijmāʿ*, consensus. And he says that:

فإن السَّلف من الصَّحابة والتَّابعين، والأئمة كلّهم مجمعون على هذا، وطريق إجماعهم أنهم لم يَرِدْ عنهم صَرْفٌ للكلام عن ظاهره فيما ذُكِرَ مِن أدلَّة العُلوِّ

So as for the early predecessors, the early forefathers, those who set a precedent in our religion—which are the first three generations: the Companions, the *Tābiʿīn*, and the *Atbāʿ al-Tābiʿīn*. As for those *Salaf*, and the *aʿimmah* meaning the major Imāms, the leaders of this nation, they are entirely in consensus that Allāh ﷻ is above His throne, that He is the Most High, that He is not within His creation, or everywhere, or x, z, y or etc.

And Shaykh says that the manner of this *ijmāʿ*—because of course remember that the concept of *ijmāʿ* itself falls into a little bit of difficulty because sometimes its value is questionable—sometimes—when you're not finding it very clear or there's some discussion. And it's also a very abused word. A lot of people say *ijmāʿ*, *ijmāʿ*, *ijmāʿ*… Actually, the briefest research or the quite basic level of knowledge will show you that there is no actual *ijmāʿ* in the issue. And so some scholars were not very happy with people using the concept of *ijmāʿ*. So, it's certainly not one of our primary evidences from Qurʾān and *Sunnah*, but it's certainly fine enough to use as a number three. Especially when it's well proven.

And the proving of an *ijmāʿ*, or the establishing of a consensus is done in two ways.

The first way is the rarest way, which is that you literally have everyone making a statement on the issue and therefore everybody's just said the same thing so it's *ijmāʿ*. That's very rare.

The second way is the most common which is that there's a statement which is well known from the Qurʾān or the *Sunnah* we don't have anybody saying anything against it, which some scholars like to call *ijmāʿ sukūti*, a silent *ijmāʿ*—because none of them disagreed, by definition then they therefore all agreed.

Now you might say: Well that doesn't make sense.

Well, it does when your only job is to speak about what you agree with and what you don't agree with. When your only job and role is to correct the people, then it does actually make sense, that concept.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says and the way that we know this *ijmāʿ* from them is because it has not been narrated from any of them anything other than that, anything other than the literal meaning of the *ʿuluw* of Allāh ﷻ or anything against the evidences of the *ʿuluw* of Allāh ﷻ. And this is something which is good.

So for example, if someone was to come to you and say to you:

مَنِ الذي يقول إنهم أجمعوا؟

Who's told you that they've agreed upon it?

إذا قال لك قائل :مَنِ الذي يقول إنهم أجمعوا؟ فمن قال :إنَّ أبا بكر ذَكَر أن الله في العُلوِّ بذاته؟ ومَنْ قال :إنَّ عُمَرَ قال هذا؟ ومَنْ قال :إنَّ عثمانَ قال هذا؟ ومَنْ قال :إنَّ علياً قال هذا؟

Who said that Abu Bakr ﷺ said that Allāh is the Most High with respect to Himself, *bi-dhātihi*, that He in His physical self is above everything? And who said that ʿUmar ﷺ said that? And who said that ʿUthmān ﷺ said that? And who said that ʿAli ﷺ said that?

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that if someone came to you and said this, you would say to them:

أنه لّما لم يَرِدْ عنهم ما يُخالف النُّصوصَ، عُلِمَ أنهم أثبتوها على ظاهرها.

(0:20:00) We will say that from neither of any of these is there anything which goes against the obvious meaning of Allāh ﷻ being above His creation and high and exalted and transcendent over everything. And once we do that then we know that they have accepted that because that's their job. They correct. They clarify. They argue against. They disagree. That's what they do.

And they do that in *ʿaqīdah* as well. Like the Companions never held back when it came to discussing Allāh ﷻ as well. You know the discussion of whether the Prophet ﷺ saw Allāh ﷻ (I gave this example before) is a point of *ʿaqīdah*. Whether the dead can hear or not, whether Allāh ﷻ gives them the temporal hearing or not—that's a point of *ʿaqīdah*. Some would hold it, some would not. When their understanding of the Qurʾān and its power in its physical nature —when I say physical nature, I mean can it be used to protect, like you put in a *taʿwīdh* or *tawīz* as the Pakis say. So, there are big issues out there that Companions have different opinions about.

My point is that they don't hold back. Someone hears a *ḥadīth* they don't like... ʿUmar and Abu Hurayrah ﷺ, it was like, '*Where did you get this ḥadīth from?*'

It's actually a very powerful, very simple but very powerful point. Why on earth did not a single Companion question the absolute facts of the highness of Allāh ﷻ? And this is why even though we have a history of course of major scholars in our history from the Ashāʿirah and even from some sects of the Sufis without going to the mad ones, Sunni Sufis you can almost say, that did believe that Allāh ﷻ is not to be said to be above and high and brought philosophy and *kalām* and *bakwās* into it. And we respect them and we say they got that part wrong and that's it. It doesn't matter if they're huge scholars, massive scholars, and so on and so forth.

The concept of the Salafi methodology genuinely only comes into play when there's a discussion or a disagreement in which generations are being pitted against one another when it comes to understanding something. And that's why the true Sunni Muslim is Salafi by definition if they are a proper Sunni Muslim, in that they say that when there's some discussion, or difference, or misunderstanding, or whatever, and we need guidance and clarification… Because it is possible to see the word that Allāh ﷻ is the Most High and to believe that He can go or He is everywhere or physically or whatever. It's not like impossible logic. It goes against so many things, but it's not like it's impossible. So, to clarify the confusion we look to see what the best people, that the Prophet ﷺ told us to follow and go on, what they said.

Student (online): What if the response is that the question was never asked then?

Ustādh: That's even more damning. That indicates it is even more obvious to them, not the issue. Not the issue. Because if the issue was that obvious—obviously, I think it's

that obvious. I would never question it. That's where I thought Allāh ﷻ was before I became practicing, or a student, or a teacher, or studied Islam, or whatever…

I don't want to spoil what's coming. So, what I want to say is that it was only afterwards that the problem occurred. And that does not mean that there's a problem with the issue. It means there's a problem with the people. So, the idea of the highness of Allāh ﷻ was such an obvious clear point which is so devastatingly proven by this clarificatory statement by the girl.[3]

You're saying: What if the question was not asked then?

They are there and the Prophet ﷺ points [upwards and says:] "O Allāh, bear witness."[2]

They are there and the Prophet ﷺ is doing this [holding his hands up in *duʿāʾ* and looking towards to sky].[4,5]

They're there and [when the Prophet ﷺ asks her where Allāh ﷻ is] the woman she says: *fi ʾl-samāʾ*.

And then you're saying, '*Well, you know*…'

Come on bro! The reason the question wasn't asked is that you'd have to be pretty stupid to start thinking about that. And that's what happened. We went full stupid. Once the whole Greeks Romans started to say '*But …*', *But*…,' '*When you say that He's over there, I thought you said He's omnipotent, I thought that you said that your god is*…'

Student (online): Can I do devil's advocate?

Ustādh: No, no, it's the right thing to do. We want to play devil's advocate.

'*I thought you said He is omnipotent, He is all-powerful, He is beyond the whatever of the humans so you're restricting and limiting?*' That was always their argument. When you read the books of *ʿaqīdah* and *kalām* there is always this *taḥdīd*. *Anta ḥaddadt Allāh*, you have restricted Allāh ﷻ. This *taḥdid* meaning you're putting direction upon Him and then keeping Him there. This is the stupidity.

Now you can either be really academic about it, and say, '*Right, okay, let's now you know*…' Or you can just say, '*Shut up man, you're so stupid. Like everybody knows what we mean by that. Allāh said He is the Most High, that's the end of it.*' It's not about that I have restricted Allāh ﷻ, Allāh ﷻ can't do this, Allāh ﷻ can't do that. That's just stupidity. It's just the nonsense, the *waswās* of stupid people. That though developed. And then a

---

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Drinks, Chapter: Honoring Guests and the Virtue of Showing Preference to One's Guest, hadīth no. 2055 a.*
[5] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Wages, Chapter: Regarding the Price of Khamr and Dead Meat, ḥadīth no. 3488.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

science had to develop to defend and argue against. And once the people started to argue against, the arguing people then became lost in their own arguments. You'll find this. The more that you go into the books of *ʿaqīdah* amongst the Muʿtazilah versus the Ashāʿirah versus the Māturidiyyah verses the x, y, z. The groups then started to get defined then they started arguing amongst themselves, and differing amongst themselves—to what level? To this, to that… It's a huge area. Anyway, so that's that.

That is the three down. Two left. The next one is logic, *ʿaql*.

Logic, the brain, tells you that loftiness is a sign of excellence. Highness is the characteristic of excellence, of perfection. And down and low and bottom and under are not just words, but they're realities of the opposite—'base' emotions. '*I'm feeling down*,' '*I'm feeling low*,' '*How could you be so low?*' Versus: take the high road, high and mighty, etc. I think you get the point that people, at the basic *ʿaql* level, recognise that highness is a characteristic of perfection and excellence and supreme, whereas lowness is the opposite.

And then Shaykh just gives some examples. He says: That's why a person is placed on a throne. When you want to respect something, you lift it up, you put them high, they sit higher, they are over you, etc. That's the logic.

And finally, the *fiṭrah*. The *fiṭrah*, which is this primordial, fundamental, original fundamental algorithm, fundamental code, fundamental nature. Depending on what I'm teaching and the mood, I'll use a hundred different phrases for *fiṭrah*. Sometimes I'll call it one's intrinsic nature, sometimes I'll call it the primordial reality, and if I have a thesaurus on hand, then I go way into next level behaviour then I am like super impressive. But the key is, you understand that it's the basic code, the basic feel, the basic moral, the basic disposition, the basic conscious, the basic conscience as well. It's everything. It's amazing. The *fiṭrah* is mind blowing, by the way. But it can blow your brain, so be careful.

Shaykh says:

فحدث ولا حرج

Bro, say whatever you want. There's so much evidence from our natural *fiṭrah*. There's so much. Like everything indicates it, he's saying, all of humans, creatures…

Student (online): Innate disposition.

Ustādh: Innate disposition. Lovely.

There's so much indicating the highness and loftiness of Allāh ﷻ which just comes naturally. I'll give you his examples and we'll speak a little bit about it ourselves.

(0:30:00) Shaykh says: You might have an old lady, old widow, who doesn't even know the Qurʾān or how to recite it. She doesn't know the *Sunnah* or *ḥadīth* or *dīn* or this or that. She didn't go to study the *fatāwah* of Shaykh al-Islam ibn Taymiyyah or any of the books of the *Salaf*, and she didn't think about Allāh ﷻ and His realities above the Throne and how He's above the heavens. But all of the [people], when they call upon Allāh ﷻ, they lift their hands to the sky.

لا أحد من الناس يقول اللهم اغفر لي ويحط يديه على الأرض أبدا

There's not a single human being—he said human being, he didn't even say Muslim—who says, '*O my Lord [forgive me]!*' and points to the ground. It's a natural thing.

And then Shaykh gives some examples which I'm not completely convinced of, historical ones. There used to be a lot of debates about the *fiṭrah*. A lot of the scholars used to debate amongst themselves, the Atharis vs the Ashāʿirah, each one sometimes being polite with one another, other times cussing each other out, it's all there.

So, this is something which, as I said, every religion, even those people who don't even pray, who only believe in God, they always look up. Even those who say they don't believe in God, those people who say they're atheist or agnostic, which is a bunch of nonsense. Everyone believes in something. They look up. The Christians.

Subḥān Allāh I think that's probably the best. If there was ever going to be an evidence, *subḥān Allāh* it would be the Christians. These Christians they went and done a mad one. A mad one. Whether it's the Catholics or whoever else. They made God into a human being, and they put it there in a cross and they made symbols to symbolise the anthropomorphisation of the Creator. So, here is the thing. They actually did what the very extreme Sufis wanted to do, which is to make Allāh ﷻ into the present right here with you. So, they went a bit further. They did it. They put him into a human figure. And with the human figure in front of them or on a cross, you will still see them [look up], like Messi.

Look at cricket. Look at anything. Any footballer comes on, doesn't know nothing about nothing, he comes on, he touches the pitch for whatever reason, crosses himself, and a brief look up. Always a brief look up. You look at the cricket. England are playing India, *mushrikīn* of the biggest *mushrikīn* on the planet. They are literally worshipping anything that moves versus the *goray* who has absolutely no idea what's going on. And you've got these folks, when they scored fifty, [he] looks up. He's not even Christian, he's a basic guy. When Pandya made his 50, he was [looking] up at the sky, the other

one also [looking] up at the sky, even with so many differences. So, even when they actualise it. *Subḥān Allāh*, even when they actualise it.

I saw something the other day. Those that carry the cross that has the crucifix with a figure of Jesus on it, even then you will see them they will make their *duʿāʾ* like this [grasping the crucifix in their hand] and then they will kiss it, like they are making *duʿāʾ* to their God there and then they will do that [look up]. *Subḥān Allāh* it's like the *fiṭrah*, is like you are going to say your stupid thing, you are going to do your stupid thing but at the end you are going to be forced to do something that you are not in control of. Like an involuntary kind of reaction. It's a madness *wallāhi* when you observe people. It's a madness. There is nothing more that I love more about our *ʿaqīdah* than the *ʿuluw* of Allāh ﷻ. It is so pure. It is so, so pure. It is so beautiful. It's a mad one.

Shaykh then gives some nice stories (some are not so authentic) but he said even the animals are *mafṭūr*. He said that even the animals in their intrinsic nature have an idea of *ʿuluw* even though you might not see it, or notice it, or realise it. And so, look at this. He narrates a story that happened to Sulaymān عليه السلام. This is narrated by Imām al-Dāraquṭni and by al-Ḥākim in his *Mustadrak*. The *sanad* is not weak, but Imām al-Ḥākim said it has an authentic chain. But like I said they are not super authentic these narrations. *ʿAla kulin* it's only talking about general stories, so it's not a major.

So, he was thirsty (Sulaymān عليه السلام) and he went out to look for water and he came across an ant, and the ant was lying on her back, so you know legs [flailing about] on the back. I was just giving that as an example. Sometimes you see these ants, or beetles on their back and their legs are panicking [flailing about], so then you flick it over then it walks off. He saw it and it's legs and arms they all towards the heavens and it said:

اللَّهُمَّ إِنَّا خَلْقٌ مِنْ خَلْقِكِ، ليس بنا غِنًى عن رِزْقِكِ، فقال: ارْجِعُوا فقد سُقيتُم بدعوةِ غَيرِكم، وسُقوا بدعوة هذه النَّملة.

Obviously, he could understand what the animals were saying and so he heard the ant saying: "O Allāh we are but a creation from Your creation and we are entirely dependent upon Your provision, Your generosity. We are not independent. We can't do anything. We do not have any source other than from Your *rizq*."

So Allāh ﷻ said to Sulaymān عليه السلام: "You can go back now. You are about to now be quenched because of the *duʿāʾ* done by other than you (to Sulaymān عليه السلام)"—meaning that this ant smashed it, right words, right *duʿāʾ*, right kind of nature, i.e. the pointing towards the sky. It is a bit of left field kind of reference. He is just trying to go through the gears, he is going through everything animals, so he may as well use that. I can't think of an animal. Can anyone think of an animal as an example?

So, and anyway Shaykh says it's crazy that despite all of this absolute madness...

Student: The *fiṭrah* disposition to pray to the 'sky' is an indication that the *Maʿbūd* has to be out of reach and out of view from creation and separate from it. For the Bedouins at that time the 'sky' was the extent of creation that they could see and envision, so Allāh ﷻ being there or above it would make sense. But not an evidence of Him physically being 'there'.

Ustādh: So, I know you are playing devil's advocate.

Student: Even when they are angry, they look up at the sky and shout.

Ustādh: I like that. Even when they are angry, they look up at the sky and shout. *Wallāhi*, such a good point that. Even those who don't believe or do *kufr* day and night, they shout at the sky. That's amazing. I love that statement.

(0:40:00) Playing devil's advocate, everything that you said makes sense. Meaning it could be an argument. I would have no problem with that. There isn't necessarily anything wrong with what you just said because being physically out of reach and out of view does not mean that He is out of reach and out of view, which is why Allāh ﷻ revealed the Qurʾān so we could know Him. That is the whole point of the Qurʾān, that we can know Him so we know ourselves. Once you know Him and you know yourself, then you know what's meant to be done in this life, why these Prophets came, what my job is. Allāh ﷻ then goes to great extent, great effort (to what extent you see in the Qurʾān) to tell us.

﴿وَإِذَا سَأَلَكَ عِبَادِى عَنِّى فَإِنِّى قَرِيبٌ ۖ أُجِيبُ دَعْوَةَ ٱلدَّاعِ إِذَا دَعَانِ ۖ ﴿١٨٦﴾﴾

"[Prophet], if My servants ask you about Me, I am near. I respond to those who call Me."

[*Sūrat al-Baqarah*: 186]

﴿وَنَحْنُ أَقْرَبُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْ حَبْلِ ٱلْوَرِيدِ ﴿١٦﴾﴾

"We are closer to him than the jugular vein." [*Sūrat Qāf*: 16]

And so one and so forth. We feel Allāh ﷻ. We feel the presence of the love of Allāh ﷻ, the power of Allāh ﷻ, the wisdom of Allāh ﷻ.

So, there is no problem in us or people back then, or even people thinking the sky is the limit or not the limit etc. There is no problem with that. But your last sentence does not make any sense whatsoever. To say that He is out of reach and above, and that is the

sky, but then to say, "But that is not evidence that He is physically there." What is the whole point of the statement then? What would the whole point of the statement be? That's a classic madness of the deviance, that last one, which makes no sense. The rest of it, I get it. What I am trying to say is that the rest of it does not actually contradict anything.

Student (online): If the world is round, then Allāh ﷻ is above us in all circumstances. Will Allāh ﷻ not be above for the North Pole and the opposite?

Ustādh: The scholars used to talk about that. This was when they used to refute those that think that the world was flat. Obviously, you realise that everything is turning all the time in an orbit. So, it does not matter. When something is moving around, the direction is not as obvious as it may look. This is the key. I am just going to give you an example. This is not how I would normally answer this in public, but I am just going to give you an example, and there is nothing to give an example better than the good old salt packet.

I am only saying this purely just to show that if anyone were to use such a ridiculous form of logic, how you can use a ridiculous piece of logic…

This is full of grains of salt. There are at least a thousand grains of salt in here. At least. And we know that there are galaxies and there are solar systems. Which one is bigger? Is it the solar system that is bigger or the galaxy? I think the galaxy is bigger.

So, we have thousands of solar systems which are in thousands of galaxies. We know that the universe is full of galaxies. I am just using pure nonsensical logic. If this is the galaxy, and these grains of salt are the solar systems, and you have all of these in a galaxy and this is the universe. The direction of the tiny little thing inside that tiny little thing—even if it is this way or that way—within a wider system, the nature of that is irrelevant entirely to heaven or *Jannah*, or Allāh ﷻ, or *ʿarsh*, if it is above this. Whatever the nature of this is. Wherever this goes—which is a universe, or a galaxy, or whatever you want to call it, and there are hundreds and billions of these as well.

When we are talking about 'high', it is not high with respect to what I am seeing in the sky. And it is not so restricted to just a person looking up because exactly that. As you said, we are on two different sides. Anyway, I do not think that that was a very good explanation, but I just saw that.

I just want to finish off what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says. He now just wants to respond. He says it is crazy how, despite all of these evidences, Allāh ﷻ made them blind to it. They denied the loftiness of Allāh ﷻ, and they said it is not possible for Allāh ﷻ to be high in Himself, His body, His physical nature, to be high. So, anyone who says that Allāh ﷻ is above everything with respect to Himself, then he is a *kāfir* because you have restricted Allāh ﷻ. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says that Allāh ﷻ is above:

إن الله فوق هل هو محدد لله؟

Allāh ﷻ is above. Does that restrict Allāh ﷻ?

أبداً؛ فهو فوقُ و لم يُحطْ به شيءٌ، والذي يُحدِّد الله هو الذي يقول :إنَّ الله في كلِّ مكان، إنْ كنت في المسجد فاللهُ في المسجد، وإن كنت في السُّوق فاللهُ في السُّوق، وهكذا.

Never. Not at all. He is above. And nothing encompasses Him. And the one who is actually restricting, and limiting, and giving definition and boundaries to Allāh ﷻ is the one who is saying that Allāh ﷻ is everywhere, actually. '*If you are in the masjid, then He is in the masjid*. *If you are in the market, then He is in the market*.'

Actually, if you think about it logically, they are the ones who are restricting Allāh ﷻ, whereas we are saying that He is above everything. This is where He has said that He is. He is the high. He is the lofty. He is the above, and that's it.

إنَّ الله في السَّماء

Allāh ﷻ is above the heavens. He is not encompassed by anything from His creation, and this is the highest level of perfection of transcendence. This is the perfect transcendence.

As for the way that we describe Him in His Highness, then Allāh ﷻ also told us:

﴿وَلِلَّهِ الْمَثَلُ الْأَعْلَىٰ ۚ﴾

"And God should have the highest one." [*Sūrat al-Naḥl*: 60]

We want to make it clear that when we give these examples of comparing Allāh ﷻ, we do not compare Allāh ﷻ to the human, or the *nāqiṣ*, or the deficient, but Allāh's ﷻ supreme, perfect example, of course.

(0:50:00) Also, when we are talking about the attributes and characteristics of Allāh ﷻ, and how everything about Him is so high, then from the text, Allāh ﷻ says in *Sūrat al-Naḥl*:

﴿وَلِلَّهِ ٱلْمَثَلُ ٱلْأَعْلَىٰ ۚ﴾

"And God should have the highest one." [*Sūrat al-Naḥl:* 60]

"Allāh has the highest of examples," meaning, everything that He does comes across as high, is supreme, is perfect.

As for the *ʿaql*, it refuses to accept that the Creator of the universe would be anything other than the Most High in His attributes, in His royalty, in His regalness, in His exaltedness—and, I mean here the metaphysical realities of being lofty and supreme, etc.

That is the end of the *duʿāʾ* that we know is one of the most commonly recited:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لِي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ، إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ.

Finished!

Then, Shaykh says let's move on to the next *duʿāʾ* that he mentions. The next one that he mentions is a highly authentic *duʿāʾ* narrated in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.[6] And it is:

اللهمُّ إِني أَعوذُ برِضاكَ مِن سَخَطِكَ، وبعَفْوِك من عُقُوبَتِك، وبِكَ مِنْك، لا نُحْصِي ثناءً عليك أَنْتَ كما أَثْنَيْتَ على نَفْسِك.

O Allāh, I take refuge within Your pleasure from Your displeasure and within Your pardon from Your punishment, and I take refuge in You from You. We cannot enumerate Your praise. You are as You have praised Yourself.

The author has said that when you are making your *qunūt* in *Witr*, he has already indicated that you do not just say one but you say as many as you want. He actually has not indicated that. He has only indicated two, but we have already added that it is nice if we add a little prelude, that we add a little praising of Allāh ﷻ using the Pak *duʿāʾ* from our childhood. Then we have moved on to that which is narrated, nice and authentic

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: What Is to Be Said While Bowing and Prostrating, ḥadīth no. 486*.

for this actual *maqām*, this position. And these two are probably your top winners—three really, but these two that are being mentioned.

This, again, is *tawassul*. Using the pleasure of Allāh ﷻ, the happiness of Allāh ﷻ, the fact that He is happy with people, creation, and the *ʿibād*. I am seeking protection, using *tawassul* within that, from that. The fact that You are Happy, I want to use that. We have made His pleasure our refuge. O Allāh I take refuge within Your pleasure from Your displeasure and within Your pardon from Your punishment.

وبعَفْوِك من عُقُوبَتِك

And within Your pardon from Your punishment.

Now, this has been narrated but not so authentically: *wa biʿafwika*. The more authentic one is the one you all have learnt and taken from the *ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, the *ḥadīth* of ʿĀʾishah.[6]

وَبِمُعَافَاتِكَ

Muʿāfa and *ʿAfwa* are the same thing, by the way. It's just that this is more authentically narrated.

That also allows us to revise again, obviously we went really big on this during the Chapter of *Ṣalāh* three, four, or five years ago. When it comes to the issue of *duʿāʾ*: Is it allowed to change order? Is it *tawqīfi*? Is it something that has to be stuck to according to the text or are there realities and the like?

Anyway, I think that there is laxity with this. *ʿAfw,* and *muʿāfa* can be used. And you can use some of this *duʿāʾ*, mix it, etc., etc. We will come to that in a second.

So, the more authentic one is:

وَبِمُعَافَاتِكَ مِنْ عُقُوبَتِكَ

"And within Your pardon from your punishment."[6]

I just want to remind you of the *ḥadīth* because the *muḥaqiq* has quoted the whole *ḥadīth* and it is a really nice *ḥadīth* that has got some benefits. I do not know whether we have covered it in LP before.

عَنْ عَائِشَةَ، قَالَتْ فَقَدْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم لَيْلَةً مِنَ الْفِرَاشِ فَالْتَمَسْتُهُ فَوَقَعَتْ يَدِي عَلَى بَطْنِ قَدَمَيْهِ وَهُوَ فِي الْمَسْجِدِ وَهُمَا مَنْصُوبَتَانِ وَهُوَ يَقُولُ " اللَّهُمَّ أَعُوذُ بِرِضَاكَ مِنْ سَخَطِكَ وَبِمُعَافَاتِكَ مِنْ عُقُوبَتِكَ وَأَعُوذُ بِكَ مِنْكَ لاَ أُحْصِي ثَنَاءً عَلَيْكَ أَنْتَ كَمَا أَثْنَيْتَ عَلَى نَفْسِكَ " .

"'Ā'ishah reported: One night I missed Allah's Messenger ﷺ from the bed, and when I sought him my hand touched the soles of his feet while he was in the state of prostration; they (feet) were raised and he was saying: 'O Allāh, I take refuge within Your pleasure from Your displeasure and within Your pardon from Your punishment, and I take refuge in You from You. We cannot enumerate Your praise. You are as You have praised Yourself.'"[6]

ʿĀ'ishah said that I woke up one night and could not find the Messenger ﷺ, did all that behaviour [feeling around with her hands], and there are no lights. Remember, there are no streetlights outside. Darkness is darkness. It is proper. She cannot see anything, literally. So, she is doing this [feeling around with her hands], doing that, and she says that when I did that, my hands touched the feet (the soles) of the Prophet ﷺ and I could tell by the way they were, that he was in *sajdah*.

وَهُمَا مَنْصُوبَتَانِ

"And [his feet] were up in a state of *naṣb*."

This is *naṣb*, you know when you sit like that [sitting position in which the left foot is laying on the ground and the right foot is planted on the ground, toes facing the *Qiblah*, foot erect].

This is why a number of the scholars said that the *sunnah* in *sajdah* is to keep the feet like that [feet next to each other toes facing the *Qiblah*]. This *ḥadīth* does not explicitly say that you cannot have your feet [apart] like this, as some people have, but this *ḥadīth* certainly suggests that they were together, *manṣūbatān.* So, he ﷺ is in *sajdah*.

"So, I have felt it. I have seen his feet. So, that means he ﷺ is in *sajdah*. He is praying and I heard him say":

" اللَّهُمَّ أَعُوذُ بِرِضَاكَ مِنْ سَخَطِكَ وَبِمُعَافَاتِكَ مِنْ عُقُوبَتِكَ وَأَعُوذُ بِكَ مِنْكَ لاَ أُحْصِي ثَنَاءً عَلَيْكَ أَنْتَ كَمَا أَثْنَيْتَ عَلَى نَفْسِكَ".

Student (online): *Subḥān Allāh*. We forget how small his ﷺ apartments were.

Ustādh: So small, so dark, so simple, so small *subḥān Allāh.*

I think on the Ḥajj with AE Facebook page I don't think it is anywhere else, it might be on the YouTube channel or even on the website, but definitely I know it is on the Facebook page because they put it there. If you look in the video section, you might see an actual really good replica. Obviously, it is difficult when you see a picture. You have to have it explained when we are there.

والمعافاة هي: أنْ يعافيكَ اللهُ مِن كُلِّ بَلِيَّة في الدِّين، أو في الدُّنيا، وضِدُّ المعافاة: العقوبةُ

Shaykhs says that *muʿāfah* (pardoning), you are asking for the pardon of Allāh ﷻ. We said about pardon that pardon is the phrase you would use when you referring to the *ākhirah* and when it comes to sin and so on. And health and safety and protection of the body is what you define it as when you are speaking purely in the *dunya*. When we say *ʿāfiyah*, good appetite etc., stay safe, stay well, stay healthy. I am sure we had this discussion a couple of weeks. When you are saying that I seek refuge in Your *muʿāfah*, then that is what we are asking for—everything in our *dīn* and everything from our *dunya*.

What from?

From the opposite. The opposite is the punishment. So, pardon [and] punishment—if you do not pardon someone, you punish them. If you do not punish them, this means you pardoned them. They are dictionary opposites. Punishment, *ʿuqūbah*, only occurs in light of sin. That is a condition. There is no punishment without sin, without *dhanb*:

إلا بذَنْبٍ

When you seek refuge with Allāh's ﷻ pardon from His punishment, what you are actually doing is seeking refuge with Allāh ﷻ from sin.

فإنك تستعيذُ مِن ذنوبك

You are seeking protection from sin, from your sin. That is done in two ways:

(1) just from His excellence to protect you from sin. So, just from His excellence, from His generosity that He just protects you. You do not even go anywhere near it. It is just not even an option. It is not even on the table. Allāh ﷻ gave you good company, never let you go that way, etc.

(1:00:00)

(2) to guide you to *tawbah*—that is a protection from sin. If you have fallen into the sin, you made the mistake, it is not over. You can start again, but you have to make *tawbah*. A lot of people don't. They enjoy the sin, repeat the sin, they drown in the sin. So, the second way of that protection is for Allāh ﷻ to guide you to making *tawbah*.

It is a beautiful point that Shaykh makes there by the way. It is nice to think of it like that, to break it down. So, when you make this *duʿāʾ* and Allāh ﷻ guides you to *tawbah*, that is the protection from the sin. That is the protection from the punishment because the punishment is the consequence of the sin.

We see this in when you are seeking refuge in Allāh ﷻ, you are seeking refuge from the opposite. So, when you are seeking refuge with His *riḍa*, in His pleasure, it is from His displeasure. When you are seeking refuge in His *muʿāfah*, His pardon, it is because you are seeking refuge from the opposite of that, which is His punishment.

وبِكَ مِنْك

And I take refuge in You from You.

This is of course referring to the anger of Allāh ﷻ, anything that would come from Allāh ﷻ that would lead you to the wrong way. So, I seek refuge with You *yā Allāh* to protect me, to bring me close. When we say 'from You', Allāh ﷻ can let you go, and drift away. If I seek refuge with You it means I want You to bring me close. So, I seek refuge in You, with You, from You because if You go against me nobody can help me. It is game over. The only way that I can survive in this life and the next is to seek refuge with You ﷻ.

This *wa bika mink* has got to be (in my opinion anyway) if not top three, then certainly at the top, the most profound small statement in the whole of the *duʿāʾ* diaspora—in my mind. Now you've got me thinking, but I cannot think of a more impactive [statement]: I seek refuge with You, from You. That's a madness man. It fries my brains when I think of this statement. Every time I make this *duʿāʾ*, it is like goosebumps in my head. It is perfection.

لا نُحْصِي ثناءً عليك

We cannot enumerate Your praise.

By the way, just on that point of the most kind of deep profound few words—most statements of the Prophet ﷺ are like that. This is of course a *ḥadīth,* so it falls into that. But I think this *duʿāʾ* honestly has all the big boys in there. This is in my top two favourite *duʿāʾ* by the way. I need to think about it more, but this is one of my favourites. I told you I love:

وبِكَ مِنْك

But:

لا نُحْصِي ثناءً عليك

Obviously, those of you have done *ʿUmrah* and *Ḥajj* with me know how much I really love this. And those who have studied *Fitnah*, *tafsīr* of *Sūrat Āli ʿImrān,* you also know why I love this because I do believe that the best *duʿāʾ* is when you just become raw and you just speak to Allāh ﷻ. You would never think in a normative *duʿāʾ* book or in a basic introduction to prayer or supplication that this would be included. You know, like when you read the statement:

لا نُحْصِي ثناءً عليك أَنْتَ كما أَثْنَيْتَ على نَفْسِك.

"We are not even able to work out how to enumerate Your praises, Your excellence, Your perfection," it is the kind of thing that you say to yourself. It is like, '*Yā Allāh, You are the Most Supreme. You are the Most Exalted. You are the Perfect. You are the Praiseworthy. I can't even think of enough terms to describe You with. You are just perfection*.' It is like you are speaking to yourself.

Student (online): The first time I heard this *duʿāʾ* I loved it.

Ustādh: That's why she said: The first time I heard it I loved it. People love this *duʿāʾ* because it is so chatty. It is so human. It is a madness.

You would never ever, until you studied *Sūrat Āli ʿImrān* and the end especially of *Sūrat Āli ʿImrān* and Allāh ﷻ describing how the believers make this *duʿāʾ*… It is just like chatting. Imagine throwing that into your *duʿāʾ*:

لا نُحْصِي ثناءً عليك

And it is not referring to a third party. You are directly saying to him: '*Yā Allāh*,' it is like you'd laugh, '*I can't even enumerate You! I am here asking this, that, whatever. I can't. You know what? You are as You have described. That is the best thing I can say about You yā Allāh.*' That's for me like the way that this *duʿāʾ* goes.

You are saying this, that and you are going on, you are going on, you are making praise, praise, *duʿāʾ, duʿāʾ* and you are like, '*What am I even doing? I am trying, I have just realised there is no way that I can do this properly. You know what yā Allāh? You are like You have described Yourself. That is it. That's the perfect way*.' And that is why I think this *duʿāʾ,* these phrases you can't… You can't. I am not going to lie. This is my top one. This is my favorite *duʿāʾ*. There is no doubt about that. When I was thinking about the second one, I realised…

Student (online): It is such a personal *duʿāʾ*, so intimate.

Ustādh: Exactly. It is so personal, so intimate, so real.

If you do not know this *duʿāʾ* folks, then your only task that you have is to memorise this *duʿāʾ*. It is so easy to memorise. It is just so comforting to say that:

أَنْتَ كما أَثْنَيْتَ على نَفْسِك.

You are as You have described. That is the best thing I can say about you, *yā* Allāh. And because You are the Perfect and You have told us who You are, you know what? We take that.

So, what does it mean:

لا نُحْصِي ثناءً عليك

We cannot enumerate Your praise.

We can't count up all the *thanāʾ*. It means we can't encompass You, we can't enumerate, we can't work it out.

And *thanāʾ* is the repetition of repeating the attributes of excellence. That is what *thanāʾ* is, as opposed to *ḥamd*. So, this is something really interesting what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says because a lot of people get mixed up about *ḥamd* and *thanāʾ*. And it is difficult because we don't have an English word for *thanāʾ* (unless someone can put one out there what *thanāʾ* is).

Let me describe *thanāʾ*. *Thanāʾ* is to consistently and continuously repeat the perfect descriptions of Allāh ﷻ. You are the greatest, You are the Most Merciful, You are the Most High, You are the Most Strong, You are the Most…, You are the Most... That is what *thanāʾ* is.

Praise is… I have no idea how to describe praise. Praise blows my mind. It is just basically praise.

Now how you differentiate between them in terms of English, I don't know. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn gives an example in Arabic though. In the Arabic he says that in the *ḥadīth* from *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.

" قَالَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى قَسَمْتُ الصَّلاَةَ بَيْنِي وَبَيْنَ عَبْدِي نِصْفَيْنِ وَلِعَبْدِي مَا سَأَلَ فَإِذَا قَالَ الْعَبْدُ {الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ}. قَالَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى حَمِدَنِي عَبْدِي وَإِذَا قَالَ {الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ} . قَالَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى أَثْنَى عَلَىَّ عَبْدِي."

"Allāh ﷻ had said: "I have divided the prayer into two halves between Me and My servant, and My servant will receive what he asks. When the servant says: *Alḥamdulillāhi Rabbiʾl ʿālamīn*, Allāh ﷻ says: My servant has praised Me. And when he (the servant) says: *al-Raḥmānʾl-Raḥīm*, Allāh ﷻ says: *Athna ʿalayya ʿabdi*.'" [7]

(1:10:00) This is *ḥadīth qudsi* talking about when you say *alḥamdulillāhi Rabbʾl-ʿālamīn,* Allāh ﷻ hears that and then He responds. And then you say *al-Raḥmānʾl-Raḥīm*, and Allāh ﷻ says to the angels: "Did you see that? *Athna ʿalayya ʿabdi*." You see that? My slave there, he did *thanāʾ* upon me.

When did you do *thanāʾ*?

When you said *al-Raḥmānʾl-Raḥīm*, the Most Merciful, the Especially Merciful. It is *raḥmah* that we are focusing on, His perfect *raḥmah* that we are focusing on. It is His attribute and they are only slightly different, *al-Raḥmān* and *al-Raḥīm* but they are

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: It Is Obligatory to Recite al-Fātiḥah in Every Rakʿah ; If a Person Cannot Recite al-Fātiḥah or Cannot Learn It, Then He Should Recite Whatever Else He Can Manage, ḥadīth no. 395 a.*

perfect attributes. We are repeating them, going through the list. And Allāh ﷻ, He said: "There is the *thanāʾ* that he did upon Me."

Here we go, let's have a look:

Student (online): Homage, exalt.

Ustādh: Nice.

Student (online): Commendation, extolment, laudation.

Ustādh: Extolment, I love all that. It is all good.

Student (online): Maybe *thanāʾ* can be likened to hymns in English?

Ustādh: I don't know about that.

Student (online): I like to extoll, you 'extoll someone's virtues'.

Ustādh: Praise and extolment, you extol someone's virtues, smashed it. Love that. Well done. Extolment of Allāh ﷻ.

Thanāʾ is to describe Him in how excellent He is, to describe His excellence, etc. This is the *duʿāʾ* that is part of the *qunūt*. You cannot tire from the tributes to Him ﷻ. We are not able to do it. Ever. If you were to live for eternity, you still could not do it because the actions of Allāh ﷻ cannot be limited and every single action of His is perfection. And His statements cannot be limited, they are unlimited. And every statement is perfection. So therefore, it is not possible for a person to enumerate Him because it would go on for infinity.

The perfection of a human being—this is what we said, that this *duʿāʾ* is not only about recognising Allāh ﷻ but also importantly recognising yourself—that the highest station that mankind will reach is recognising their own deficiency and their inabilities. That is when they realise that and that is when they humble themselves. That is when they recognise they are the *ʿabd* and He is the *Rabb.* That is when they recognise that I was not created except to worship, when he says:

أنت يا رَبَّنَا كما أثنيت على نفسِكَ، أمَّا نحنُ فلا نستطيع أنْ نحصيَ الثَّناءَ عليك. وفي هذا مِنَ الإقرار بكمال صفات الله ما هو ظاهرٌ معلومٌ.

You my Lord, You are exactly as You have praised Yourself, described Yourself. As for us, we are not able to count them, enumerate them, encompass them… And that is you addressing the perfection of Allāh ﷻ.

Q & A

Q (online): Is there any benefit from the structure of the *duʿāʾ* of *qunūt*? I thought when structuring your *duʿāʾ* you begin praising Allāh ﷻ, send *ṣalawāt* on the Prophet ﷺ then ask for what you want. The *duʿāʾ* of *qunūt* doesn't seem to follow this.

A: So, let's not forget that not any *duʿāʾ* does this within the singularity of the *duʿāʾ* itself. So that doesn't necessarily take away you putting something before. And that is what we believe, praising Allāh ﷻ, that's why Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn said to say that yourself. That is why you see some imāms say (at the beginning):

اللّهُمَّ لَكَ الْحَمْدُ كَمَا يَنْبَغِي لِجَلاَلِ وَجْهِكَ وَلِعَظِيمِ سُلْطَانِكَ

"Allāhumma lakʾl-ḥamd kama yanbaghi li-jalāli wajhika wa ʿaẓīmi sulṭānik."

We actually explained this. I said to you that some scholars said that the fact that this is in the *ṣalāh* you have done all the praising of Allāh ﷻ in *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*. *Ṣalawāt* upon the Prophet ﷺ is coming and that's not part of the structure of *duʿāʾ* by the way. And we'll speak about that next week.

Q (online): Can I take eye drops whilst fasting (if it is because of a voluntary procedure)?

A: I believe you can. I believe that you tasting it in your mouth is not a problem. If you take it, then you should immediately spit it out, I think it is okay. That's my personal opinion.

Q (online): As part of the same procedure if I can't wash my eyes for seven days, would this be an issue? Or can I just close my eyes as I wash my face as part of *wuḍūʾ*?

A: If you are unable to wash your eyes that's okay. You are not required to wash the inside of your eyes in *wuḍūʾ*. You are meant to clean your eyes. [It is] not an eye bath.

Q (online): What is the opinion on student loans? If an individual can afford the first few years with a bit of struggle, but later on will find it very difficult, should they try to do whatever they can?

A: If you mean on the taking of it, then obviously it is a *riba* based loan. According to the position of the majority of scholars this is something which is not permissible unless for a necessity. Some scholars believe that university education is a necessity. I'm on the fence with that. There was some discussion about that among scholars and
(1:20:00) I'm sympathetic to it. But that is the position of the majority, that if a person cannot afford it then they make *istighfār* and they take that because there is no other option.

The safer position is certainly to stay away from it, to consider it that this (university education) is not a necessity. Because it is a big statement to say it is a necessity. But it is not without basis. So, I think it should be avoided. But I do not believe that a person is in sin for one who is in need, doesn't have any funds, and needs to support the family, and the family will be dependent upon that person.

Then you have the position of those scholars who are a minority, like Shaykh Haytham al-Haddad, who do not consider student loans to be a loan but rather a form of delayed salary, a form of a grant, a form of benefit in kind. And by the way, even though most scholars disagree and so do I, I'm also sympathetic to the thinking and the working behind it, especially if you hold government accountable for its obligation to look after its [people].

So, what I want to say is that student loans, I do believe them to be an interest-bearing loan and should be avoided. But I think that anybody who is able to justify that their education is a necessity—and there comes a lot of issues in that—then I think there's some space in that. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): You said pure women for pure men. So, if one spouse is abusive, does that mean the other spouse kind of deserves it? I couldn't understand that statement in the light of troubled marriages.

A: The statement is not for troubled marriages. When the marriage goes wrong it's gone wrong. So, obviously it's not good people for good people. But likewise, a troubled marriage does not negate that both men and women were good and are still good, they just hate each other and there's nothing wrong with that, if you guys have nothing in common, etc. Someone abuses someone, that's something different. The situation has gone wrong. People are sinning.

Q (online): During the first stages of someone's first pregnancy, what would be the top things you suggest the parents focus on *duʿāʾ* and *tarbiyah*-wise?

A: *Tarbiyah*, nothing. In *Protect This House,* I had that big discussion. Someone mentioned something on Telegram about listening to some kind of therapy that has music, etc. This is all *bakwās*, by the way. Meaning that this idea that we should justify opening that door. As the person said, there is bird song in there and there is rain, and God knows what. Natural sounds will do the same. Listening to the Qurʾān will do the same. We shouldn't be opening the door to music and all that rubbish. Anything which calms and is repetitive and rhythmic, anything, it becomes a soother.

White noise. It's the most horrible thing ever. You know how many people use white noise apps to calm themselves down and go to sleep? It's horrible. It's just so stupid, people trying blag this whole play classical music to my kid in the belly, etc.

Listen, I don't want to be doing *Protect This House*. I have done it in detail there. The idea that we should play Qurʾān to the child. I'm neither for it nor against it. I think it is very good that a woman [listens to it], but don't try to blag that it is for the kid. But there is no doubt if a kid listens to Qurʾān, it's just like anything they are listening to, it's rhythmic, etc. But I don't think that there is any extra benefit to the child. For you, loads. For me, the music and the Qurʾān to the child, I don't see much difference because it's just rhythmic. It doesn't have an understanding. For you though, listening to Qurʾān, etc., that's great.

There is nothing else from *tarbiyah* or anything else at that stage, it's just prep work. You are making sure that you are ready mentally, psychologically, getting your life in order, give yourself to this child. All the things you will not be able to do because you will be busy, getting that done. So, you get lots of study and lots of things memorised before you get hooked up. Because when kids come, missions mate.

Q (online): Regarding the highness of Allāh ﷻ, isn't it better to follow the *muhkamāt āyāt* as well as the *duʿāʾ* we just discussed to say: 'Allāh, You are as You have described Yourself'?

A: Yes, it is better.

Q (online): If someone starts the *ṣalāh* and then realises that his garments are folded or rolled, is unrolling them an acceptable movement in the prayer?

A: Not for me, no. I think that you should not busy yourself doing that. The prohibition of rolling up garments is people rolling them up for the prayer. If they have already been rolled up because that is what you were doing, you were making *wuḍūʾ*, etc., you do not need to roll them down. However, if you did, I don't think this breaks the prayer. I just think it's unnecessary.

Q (online): As we go over the meaning of the Qurʾān without reciting actual Arabic, does it count, or do we have to read the Arabic as well?

A: No, it is not counted as reciting the Qurʾān, but it is counted as *tadabbur* of thinking and reflecting on the Qurʾān, which in my opinion it is more rewarded than the recitation of it.

Q (online): If you don't know this *duʿāʾ* or the *qunūt* we discussed just before this (whilst learning one or both) is there anything that can be recited in their place, for example, any other learned *duʿāʾ*?

A: The answer is yes and that's coming up next week. This is an open place for *duʿāʾ*. The best *duʿāʾ* are obviously those which are narrated in the *Sunnah* or in the Qurʾān but all of them go. No prohibitions here. You are standing up. We'll cover a few of the variations. So, if you don't know these then you can use any *duʿāʾ*. Absolutely. Also, don't forget that this *duʿāʾ qunūt* is not a *sunnah* to be done all the time as well. So, it is not something a person should stress over if they don't have anything yet. But they are missing out. This is a great moment, great time, end of day, closing off, signing off for the night, wonderful *duʿāʾs* that have been narrated in this issue. *Allāhumma-ihdini fī man hadayt* is another very emotional *duʿāʾ*. Beautiful, beautiful *duʿāʾs*.

Q (online): When the imām makes a *duʿāʾ* we respond *āmīn*. When the imām praises Allāh ﷻ do we say *subḥān Allāh*, in *qunūt*?

A: We don't say *subḥān Allāh*, per se. Even by the way, I just want to say, saying *āmīn* does not have very much evidence. Saying *āmīn* to the *duʿāʾ* of the imām is not based in a direct evidence. It is not based in direct text. It is based upon analogy of: *wa laʾl-ḍālīn*, *āmīn*, so when you hear someone making *duʿāʾ*, you say *amīn*.

I am not aware of the majority of scholars supporting this saying of *āmīn* to someone else's *duʿāʾ*. Out loud anyway. If you are going to say it, say it to yourself. Why are you saying it out loud for? What's the function? Who are you telling? He's making *duʿāʾ* so you can hear it. Are you saying *āmīn* to say, '*Thank you very much?*' What are you saying *āmīn* (out loud) for? If you think about it logically, it doesn't actually make sense, meaning the continuation of it. Because in *ʿibādah*, in worship, to make *qiyās*, analogy, is very much frowned upon. It's very difficult to do so.

But, okay, at least we have an *āmīn* in the *ṣalāh*. So, we are not going to come down like a ton of bricks on someone who says *āmīn* in *duʿāʾ*. I don't say *āmīn* out loud. I don't believe that it's a *sunnah*. I don't believe it is narrated from any of the Companions. I don't do it. But I can see an argument if someone wanted to do it.

Where did *subḥān Allāh* come from? *Subḥān Allāh* is people's own *ʿaql* saying: Well, if someone says: *lā nuḥṣi thanāʾan alayk*, this is not a *duʿāʾ*. It's a statement. You are not

going to say *āmīn*. Obviously the Paks, who have no idea what is going on, they are saying *āmīn*, *āmīn*, all the way through.

And in that mixed gathering, the Arabs will be saying *subḥān Allāh* because they don't want to say *āmīn* since he is not making a *duʿāʾ*. He is making a statement which is like a great statement. It's praising Allāh ﷻ so you say *subḥān Allāh*. So, it's *ʿaql*. It's not narrated from the *Sunnah*. Actually, both don't have much evidence. *Āmīn* has a bit more, generally, than the *subḥān Allāh*. The *subḥān Allāh* doesn't. But if someone says it, then it's okay because it's allowed to make *tasbīḥ*. It's allowed to make *dhikr*. These are general statements. But personally, I don't think so. But it is okay to say.

Q (online): Would having a small procedure to remove an implant from the arm during fasting invalidate it?

A: No. As long as the blood loss is not something significant that would make a person feel faint.

Q (online): Some use Qurʾān for the relaxing part, but isn't that also not recommended? As you should reflect upon hearing it, and not just as background audio.

A: Yes, absolutely. That argument can be a very good argument to use, that there is a disrespect when you start making the Qurʾān like a healing thing where it just becomes background. It's healing because you feel it, reflect upon it, understand it.

32. Chapter 21 Lesson 11: The Supererogatory Prayer

Let's start with:

اللهمَّ صلِّ على مُحَمَّدٍ وعلى آلِ مُحمَّدٍ.

O Allāh, send salutations upon Muḥammad and the followers of Muḥammad.

That he should end the *duʿāʾ* with *ṣalawāt* (sending peace and blessings) upon the Prophet ﷺ.

I think everybody knows the whole cultural thing of when you are making a *duʿāʾ*, at the very end, once you get to the end [you say]:

Wa ṣalallāhu wa sallam wa barik ʿala nabiyyina Muḥammad wa ʿala ālihi wa ṣaḥbihi ajmāʿīn.

[After which you wipe your face with your hands.] That is just one ending. People have a cultural understanding that you send *ṣalawāt* upon the Prophet ﷺ at the end, and then wipe your face, and like your process is done. So, people see it as part of a process. People see it as part of a ritualistic insertion, like there is an order of things. Even—as we gave the example of the Ertuğrul series—whenever they make *duʿāʾ*, [they wipe the face with the hands then wipe the beard]. It is interesting. It is a move and then a wipe of the beard as well. Even those with short beards were doing the same. Almost like this is what you do.

And this is not entirely baseless—both aspects. Let us first look at some *ḥadīth*. Let's actually read what Shaykh says and then I will mention a few things from myself.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: What the author is intending is that the *duʿāʾ* should be ended with sending salutations upon the Prophet ﷺ because this is one of the things that helps the *duʿāʾ* get responded to. If you want your *duʿāʾ* to be responded to, you should send more *salāms* upon the Prophet ﷺ.

By the way, in case I forget to say it later on, this is an absolutely undisputed aspect because one of the best *adhkār*, the best *adhkār*, is to send *ṣalawāt* upon the Prophet ﷺ.

And *dhikr*, helps everything because *dhikr* is *ʿibādah*. And *ʿibādah* helps everything because *ʿibādah* is the key to your *duʿāʾ* being accepted. And there are not many acts of *ʿibādah* that get as good as sending *salām* upon Allāh's most beloved person. Period. If you imagine, Allāh ﷻ has commanded us:

﴿يَٰٓأَيُّهَا ٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُواْ صَلُّواْ عَلَيۡهِ وَسَلِّمُواْ تَسۡلِيمًا ٥٦﴾

"You who believe, bless him [the Prophet ﷺ] and give him greetings of peace." [*Sūrat al-Aḥzāb*: 56]

Not just *ṣallu ʿalayhi* but also *wa sallimu taslīma*—salutations and peace and blessings. The full shabam.

You know Allāh ﷻ commanded for us to make *duʿāʾ* for the believers as well. If you are making *duʿāʾ* for yourself, Allāh ﷻ says then make *duʿāʾ* for *al-muʾminīna waʾl-muʾmināt*—the believing men and believing women. He ﷻ is *awla* by all of them.
(0:10:00)

So, it is a command. It is obligated. He ﷻ is His beloved one.

There are so many *aḥādīth* where the Prophet ﷺ said that the one who says this *duʿāʾ* [after the *adhān*] for example:

اللَّهُمَّ رَبَّ هَذِهِ الدَّعْوَةِ التَّامَّةِ وَالصَّلاَةِ الْقَائِمَةِ آتِ مُحَمَّدًا الْوَسِيلَةَ وَالْفَضِيلَةَ وَابْعَثْهُ مَقَامًا مَحْمُودًا الَّذِي وَعَدْتَهُ

Allāhumma Rabba hādhihʾl-daʿwatʾl-tāmah, waʾl-ṣalātʾl-qāʾimah, āti Muḥammadanʾl-wasīlata waʾl-faḍīlah, wabʿath-hu maqāman maḥmūdaniʾl-adhi waʿadtah.

"O Allāh! Lord of this perfect call and of the regular prayer, which is going to be established, give Muḥammad the right of intercession and illustriousness, and resurrect him to the best and the highest place in Paradise that You promised him." [1,2]

So many different narrations that speak about the excellence of *duʿāʾ* upon the Prophet ﷺ.

---

[1] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on al-Witr, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the Virtues of Sending Ṣalāh Upon the Prophet ﷺ, ḥadīth no. 485*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ*.
[2] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, Chapter: Invocation at the Time of Adhān, ḥadīth no. 614*.

The Prophet ﷺ said that whenever any one of you prays, let him begin by praising Allāh ﷻ, then let him send blessings upon the Prophet ﷺ, and then let him ask whatever he wants.[3] These are not the strongest *aḥadīth*, not going to lie. But this *ḥadīth* is *in shāʾ Allāh ṣaḥīḥ*.

Imām al-Tabarāni also narrated: "If any one of you wants to ask, then let him begin by praising Allāh ﷻ as He deserves to be praised."

We have spoken a lot about that, about putting something forward and then asking. So, we get that part. "Then let him send blessings upon the Prophet ﷺ."

Clearly, Allāh ﷻ sees that in the same vein as: Put an action of worship forward, give *ṣadaqah* (as Allāh ﷻ says in the Qurʾān) before you ask him ﷺ a question:

﴿يَٰٓأَيُّهَا ٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوٓاْ إِذَا نَٰجَيۡتُمُ ٱلرَّسُولَ فَقَدِّمُواْ بَيۡنَ يَدَيۡ نَجۡوَىٰكُمۡ صَدَقَةٗ ١٢﴾

"You who believe, when you come to speak privately with the Messenger, offer something in charity before your conversation." [*Sūrat al-Mujādalah*: 12]

Do *ʿibādah* before you ask.

﴿إِيَّاكَ نَعۡبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسۡتَعِينُ ٥﴾

"It is You we worship; it is You we ask for help." [*Sūrat al-Fātiḥah*: 5]

The whole template of *Sūrat al-Fātiḥah.* The idea that on Thursdays, the actions, as the Prophet ﷺ said… And a reminder to fast tomorrow as there are many practise days left in Shaʿbān. It is a *sunnah* to fast Shaʿbān, a *sunnah* to fast on a Thursday. Hours have been added, so it is a longer length. Test yourself tomorrow. And one of the main reasons is because the Prophet ﷺ said that on Thursdays, the actions are lifted to and presented in front of Allāh ﷻ, and "I love that to happen whilst I am fasting".[4]

Because worship gives everything a boost. It gives everything a positive shine. It gives everything a greater chance of being responded to. So that *ḥadīth*:

---

[3] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Supplication, Chapter: Concerning the Confirming of the Supplication by Preceding It with Gratitude, Praise, and al-Ṣalāh Upon the Prophet* ﷺ, *ḥadīth no. 3476*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*

[4] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Fasting, Chapter: What Has Been Related About Fasting on Monday and Thursday, ḥadīth no. 747*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan.*

"If any one of you wants to ask, let him begin by praising Allāh ﷻ as He deserves to be praised, then let him send blessings upon the Prophet ﷺ, then let him ask after that for that is more likely to be answered."[3]

This is where the idea comes from and that is why he says that in a very clear way:

لأن ذلك مِنْ أسباب الإجابةِ

Shaykh says this will get you a response.

كما يُروى ذلك في حديثٍ فيه مقال: أنَّ الدُّعاءَ موقوفٌ بين السَّماء والأرض حتى تُصلِّي على نَبيِّكِ

Just like it has also been more explicitly mentioned in a very famous narration where it is narrated that the Prophet ﷺ was meant to have said:

إِنَّ الدُّعَاءَ مَوْقُوفٌ بَيْنَ السَّمَاءِ وَالأَرْضِ لاَ يَصْعَدُ مِنْهُ شَيْءٌ حَتَّى تُصَلِّيَ عَلَى نَبِيِّكَ صلى الله عليه وسلم

"Indeed, the *duʿāʾ* is suspended between the heavens and the earth. Nothing of it is raised up until you send salutations upon your prophet.'"[5]

First of all, what that basically means is that the *duʿāʾ* is not going to go anywhere. It is not basically going to be responded to. It is not going to be taken by Allāh ﷻ and processed unless you unlock it. Send *salām* upon the Prophet ﷺ and then we are quids in.

This *ḥadīth* is in line with all of the *ḥadīth*, and principles, and Qurʾān, etc. that I mentioned, but it does go a little bit further. And it is certainly more explicitly saying that it is not just from the reasons of *ijābah*, but it is now a condition of *ijābah*. And that is where the problem is. That is a big statement. That basically means that if you do not do *ṣalawāt* upon the Prophet ﷺ in your *duʿāʾ*, it will not be responded to. That is a big statement and I do not know of many scholars that obligated that. I do not know of many scholars that said that.

[5] *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on al-Witr, Chapter: What Has Been Related About the Virtues of Sending Ṣalāh Upon the Prophet* ﷺ, *ḥadīth no. 486*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʿīf.*

Two angles. First angle: Some scholars said the *ḥadīth* is *ḍaʿīf*. Many said that it is good. Ibn Kathīr for example said that the *ḥadīth* has a good chain, Shaykh al-Albāni considered the *ḥadīth* to be *ḥasan* in our current time. A number of the critics said yes, it is possible the *ḥadīth* is *mawqūf* and that it is a statement of ʿUmar ﷺ, meaning it is an *athar* and it is not that of the Prophet ﷺ. However, as you know, we have said when it comes to big major issues it is not possible for *mawqūf* statements to be baseless. Meaning a statement of a Companion in big issues of the *ākhirah*—especially of the *ākhirah*… In the *dunya* it is something else, personal perception, interpretation, but when a Companion, and then significant ones, say something like: This is what happens in the *ghayb* or the *ākhirah* (which obviously is when you say that the *duʿāʾ* is suspended), this cannot come from their own selves. And this like the position of a *ḥadīth* itself. That's why you say the *ḥukm* is *marfūʿ*, that the ruling is as if it were actually being stated by the Prophet ﷺ.

The vast majority of scholars said that therefore this makes the ruling highly recommended. All these *aḥādīth* are indicating high recommendation to push that. And there is absolutely no doubt that we agree with that principle. Some people even said the *ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ*, meaning acceptable enough. Regardless of whether they said that from the *mawqūf* angle, that is *ḥukm marfūʿ,* that its ruling is like it was said by the Prophet ﷺ because ʿUmar ﷺ could have never worked it out by himself, he must have been told the Prophet ﷺ, or you say that the *ḥadīth* is weak, but it is supported by the general evidences.

Student (online): Regarding your comment about *mawqūf ḥadīth* Shaykh that is only if the *ḥadīth* is authentic up to the Companion, right?

Ustādh: And yes, absolutely correct what he just said. The *mawqūf ḥadīth* being *ḥukm marfūʿ* is of course dependent on it fulfilling the conditions of *ṣiḥḥah*, authenticity, in the rest of the chain. Meaning it has to be *mawṣūl*. The *ḥadīth* needs to be connected. It has to have no *shudhūdh,* no hidden faults in between—the normal rules of *ḥadīth*.

I will also say that the scholars spoke and Ibn al-Qayyim is one of them who speaks a lot. Obviously, the majority of Ibn al-Qayyim's books are very much about spiritual matters as opposed to legal… Maybe that's also not fair because *Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn* for example, *Zād al-Maʿād* is very historical. But you know, he gets into a lot of the deep thinking, etc. And he used to categorise *ṣalawāt* upon the Prophet ﷺ in different ways and different manners—those that open it up, those that say it in the middle, those that say it at the end, etc. You will notice actions like *ṣalāh* have various aspects that people see from an obvious point of view and then a hidden kind of point of view. Obvious ones like someone is reciting a *sūrah* and someone is reciting *Fātiḥah*. The hidden, this is the *qunūt*. The hidden thing is that the longer that you read the *sūrah*, this itself takes on the feeling of a *qunūt*. The obvious would be doing the *tashahhud* and finishing the prayer. The hidden: sending *salāms* upon the Prophet ﷺ in advance of making *duʿāʾ* at the end of the prayer just before you give *salāms*.

A lot of people spoke about things like this, trying to understand the relationship between acts of *ʿibādah* and *duʿāʾ* like what Sufyān al-Thawri said for example, that fulfilling the rights of the parents…What is the *ayah*? The *ayah* has gone out of my head. The basic principle is that the *ṣalāh* is an opportunity… that a person should put forward *ʿibādah* before they make *duʿāʾ*. And Sufyān al-Thawri said this is one of the reasons why *duʿāʾ* should be done after *ṣalāh*.

Student (online):

وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ

Ustādh: It might have been that.

﴿وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوٓاْ إِلَّآ إِيَّاهُ وَبِٱلْوَٰلِدَيْنِ إِحْسَٰنًا ٢٣﴾

"Your Lord has commanded that you should worship none but Him, and that you be kind to your parents." [*Sūrat al-Isrāʾ*: 23]

I think it could be that. I've just forgotten. My mind has gone blank. And if it is that, then it works. But I am kind of forcing upon it. I'm sure it's something else. Anyway:

﴿وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوٓاْ إِلَّآ إِيَّاهُ ٢٣﴾

That Allāh ﷻ has decreed that He alone is worshipped would be the *ṣalāh*.

﴿وَبِٱلْوَٰلِدَيْنِ إِحْسَٰنًا ٢٣﴾

(0:20:00) And that you show *iḥsān* to your parents, which is charity. And we know that charity, and that *iḥsān*, and kindness and gentleness—when they are alive it is a reality, but what about when they have passed? When they have passed, we know that it is done by charity and by spreading knowledge, but also *duʿāʾ*. And so, showing that *iḥsān* would be extra, above and beyond, meaning that you have now done the *ṣalāh*, now make *duʿāʾ* for them. That would be the *iḥsān*. I am forcing it upon the *ayah,* but it is something similar, and I just can't… My mind has gone blank. But this would be the perfect example. Even the one I'm giving, if that's not what it is, it's a very good example

that the *ʿibādah* is the *ṣalāh*—that's for Him *subḥānah*—and yours is the moment afterwards. And instead of making it just for yourself, Sufyān al-Thawri said that you should do *iḥsān* towards your parents in this. And he's making the comparison between that if you look at the *ayah* of *Sūrat al-Isrāʾ*:

﴿وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوٓا۟ إِلَّآ إِيَّاهُ وَبِٱلْوَٰلِدَيْنِ إِحْسَٰنًا ﴿٢٣﴾﴾

That it is Allāh ﷻ, followed by parents. So therefore, if it's Allāh ﷻ followed by parents, find an act of worship that naturally has Allāh ﷻ followed by parents. There is no act of worship to any human except *duʿāʾ* for them, or charity for them, or expiating for them, so it's doing something for them. And *duʿāʾ* being the most emphasised, as the Prophet ﷺ said in the *ḥadīth*, it's one of the three things that's left behind by the deceased, you should make that *duʿāʾ* with a focus on the parents.[6]

And if you note, nearly every culture (and we did this before in the exercise) has this within them, not just that they make *duʿāʾ* after *ṣalāh*, even though from an Islamic point of view we know that this is more problematic from a *Sunnah* point of view than isn't. It's certainly not *sunnah* to make *duʿāʾ* after every single prayer. But making *duʿāʾ* after *ṣalāh* makes complete sense—but not all the time. But also, that in that *duʿāʾ*, it's a very heavy *duʿāʾ* upon the Prophet ﷺ, at the beginning, at the end, etc. That's a taught thing. It's a learned behavior. I would go so far as to say that people learn that before they learn to send *salām* upon the Prophet ﷺ in *duʿāʾ*. Meaning that they are told when they're kids in that cultural setting, that after the *ṣalāh* when you make this *duʿāʾ* you send *salām* upon the Prophet ﷺ in this way. That is a more natural home for this *ṣalawāt*. And then later I think maybe when they're doing other *duʿāʾ* they might introduce it, or maybe even not. Maybe they tell you to focus on all other kinds of *duʿāʾ*. Certainly, in *duʿāʾ qunūt al-Witr* for example, the Paks are not told to send *salām* upon the Prophet ﷺ.

I've gone off on a tangent. So, yeah. I think that's something we should reflect upon, that this is a very special principle, an important principle, and sending *ṣalawāt* upon the Prophet ﷺ should always be one of our priorities all the time.

وظاهرُ كلامِ المؤلِّف :الاقتصارُ على هذا الدُّعاء.

Shaykh then says that it seems that the author is saying that this is the only *duʿāʾ* you should recite and that's it, i.e. (these two separate *duʿāʾ*):

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Wills, Chapter: What Reward Reaches a Man After His Death, ḥadīth no. 1631.*

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لِي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ، إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ. اللهمُّ إِنِي أَعوذُ برِضاكَ مِن سَخَطِكَ، وبعَفْوِك من عُقُوبَتِك، وبِكَ مِنْك، لا نُحْصِي ثناءً عليك أَنْتَ كما أَثْنَيْتَ على نَفْسِك. اللهمَّ صلِّ على مُحَمَّدٍ وعلى آلِ مُحمَّدٍ.

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn himself added the *duʻāʾ* before that.

ولكن لو زاد إنسانٌ على ذلك فلا بأس، لأنَّ المقامَ مقامُ دُعاءٍ، وكان أبو هريرة رضي الله عنه يقنتُ بلعن الكافرين، فيقول: «اللَّهُمَّ الْعَن الكفرة» وفي هذا ما يدلُّ على أن الأمر في ذلك واسع.

Shaykh says: If a person though increases upon these *duʻāʾ*, then there's no problem with that because this is one of the moments of *duʻāʾ*. And we've spoken a lot about that already, so we don't need to repeat that the prayer has moments of *duʻāʾ*. And this is one of the not just natural, but a *sunnah* initiated natural moment of *duʻāʾ*—hands raised… Hands raised. That's very important. There are no other parts of the prayer in which hands are raised. The reason we said that the *sajdah* is such a natural home is not just because of the *ḥadīth*, but because when you're in *sajdah*, you are completely at the will of Allāh ﷻ.[7] You feel it. It's just so powerful.

You know my two focus ones: the *sajdah* and just before the end of the *salām*. And you know that the *sajdah* is the most open and the other one is the next where you can add and throw in all kinds of stuff. And if I'm talking about the position helping you, then *sajdah* goes without saying how that helps. It puts a person in a mood, it makes them emotional, etc. you know that you're home, you know that you're nothing compared to Allāh ﷻ, you feel so glad to throw yourself on the floor in front of Allāh ﷻ. It's the best. And that's why the Prophet ﷺ said you're closest to your Lord whilst you're in *sajdah*.[7]

At the end of the prayer, if I was going to put an argument forward, a *ʻaqli* argument, I would say desperation of something ending—time ending, opportunity ending. The best example to give you is how strong your *duʻāʾ* is at the beginning of Ramadan and towards the end of Ramadan. The best example of course, and my *Ḥajj* group knows this very well, about how we leverage on the last moments, we use temperature, color and light to leverage and create an artificial sense of desperation, except that it's not artificial at all. In fact, it's the ultimate sense of desperation because it's real time, real reality. Obviously, if we ever do *Ḥajj* together, you know exactly what I'm talking about.

---

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayers, Chapter: What Is to Be Said While Bowing and Prostrating, ḥadīth no. 482*.

It's incredibly powerful. The *ṣalāh* has a similar version, in that the big moment is up, a lot of people suddenly wake up. You know how people do a mindless prayer, and when they're at the end they kind of realise that '*Oh my God! I've done it and I don't even know what I recited*.' People get desperate at that moment. At the very least they wake up at that moment. So, that's powerful.

Then this, raising your hands in the *ṣalāh*, a *ṣalāh* which is characterised by everything other than loose movements, free movements, raising hands, etc. is its own powerful kind of reality. Obviously, the problem of course is people then lose their minds over that. And I don't think I need to speak to you about it. I am sure I have shared the videos. My favorite video in the world is the video of the guy complaining about the guy who's making *duʿāʾ* loudly. He is making *duʿāʾ* loudly in the *ṣalāh*, isn't he? But that is what happens. People start screaming, shouting, doing this, doing that, and you know raising their hands and shaking, and then shouting loudly going on for hours. All that *bakwās*. It's a madness. They unfortunately went so far into the emotional reality of that moment that they went and took it to *bidʿah* levels where it destroys the prayer of theirs, it destroys the prayers around, introduces ideas, and concepts, etc.

So, Shaykh says this is a moment of *duʿāʾ*, this is the place of *duʿāʾ*. We have authentically narrated additions in the *duʿāʾ*, of *qunūt*. Abu Hurayrah ﵁ has been narrated:

فَكَانَ أَبُو هُرَيْرَةَ ــ رضى الله عنه ــ يَقْنُتُ فِي الرَّكْعَةِ الآخِرَةِ مِنْ صَلاَةِ الظُّهْرِ وَصَلاَةِ الْعِشَاءِ، وَصَلاَةِ الصُّبْحِ، بَعْدَ مَا يَقُولُ سَمِعَ اللَّهُ لِمَنْ حَمِدَهُ. فَيَدْعُو لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَيَلْعَنُ الْكُفَّارَ.

"Abu Hurayah ﵁ used to recite *qunūt* after saying *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah* in the last *rak'ah* of the *Ẓuhr*, *'Ishāʾ*, and *Fajr* prayers. He would ask Allāh's Forgiveness for the true believers and curse the disbelievers." [8,9]

And this establishes that the issue is very flexible, a person can say what he wants.

Also, Shaykh says:

وأيضاً لو فُرِضَ أنَّ الإنسان لا يستطيع أنْ يدعوَ بهذا

[8] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Call to Prayers, hadīth no. 797.*
[9] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: It Is Recommended to Say Qunūt in All Prayers if a Calamity Befalls the Muslims—and Refuge Is Sought from Allāh ﷻ (Regarding That). It Is Recommended to Say Qunūt in Ṣubḥ at All Times. And the Clarification that It Is to Be Said After Raising the Head from Bowing in the Final Rakʿah, and It Is Recommended to Say It Out Loud, ḥadīth no. 676.*

If a person is even unable to say this narrated *sunnah*:

اللَّهُمَّ اهْدِنِي فِيمَنْ هَدَيْتَ، وعافِنِي فِيْمَنْ عَافَيْتَ، وتَوَلَّنِي فِيمَنْ تَوَلَّيْتَ وبارِكْ لِي فِيما أَعْطَيْتَ وقِنِي شرَّ ما قَضَيْتَ، إِنَّك تَقْضِي ولا يُقْضَى عَلَيك، إِنَّهُ لا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ ولا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ، تَبارَكْتَ رَبَّنَا وتَعَالَيْتَ.

Which is what should be said, because it's the *sunnah*, it's in the Arabic, it's the right thing to do, it's the right place, the Prophet ﷺ asked us to say it, [if he is unable to say this narrated *sunnah*] he can then make *duʿāʾ*, with anything which comes to him at that moment. So, he can make any *duʿāʾ*. Especially a person making their *duʿāʾ*, themselves, he can add *duʿāʾ*, he can replace *duʿāʾ*, and he can go as long as he wants, Shaykh says.

ولكن إذا كان إماماً فلا ينبغي أن يطيلَ الدُّعاء بحيث يشقُّ على مَن وراءَه أو يملُّهم، إلا أن يكونوا جماعة محصورةً يرغبون ذلك.

But if he is an imām then it is not right that he elongates *duʿāʾ*. He bores the people behind him and he makes it difficult upon the people behind him. An excellent statement that he adds: unless it is a small group, it is restricted private gathering that has requested that. So, if there is a small private group that has requested that, then that's fine.

(0:30:00) And I want to say that *subḥān Allāh* back in the day, and I say back in the day… I don't know man. But back in the day especially Manchester a lot of good brothers were around, and things were good. And a lot of them then unfortunately they got hooked up. So, we used to have a lot of these gatherings in this country in the time of *daʿwah* pre-9/11. Pre-9/11 there used to be wonderful hook ups in London, Birmingham, Manchester. Especially these places.

Student: I find it odd that people ask an imām to lengthen the *duʿāʾ.*

Ustādh: Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn does not really mean that. What he means is that closed gatherings can be more flexible in elongation in general. And if that means to the *duʿāʾ* as well, because for example they are not very good at *duʿāʾ,* but they are mad for standing all night. There are many people like that.

Like I remember when I started practicing, I'm talking obviously long time ago, that's the kind of joint that I used to hook up at. I didn't even know what the Qurʾān meant. I didn't know how to make *duʿāʾ*. I didn't know anything. And I would be like, '*Man! This is it!*' You know how it is. When you're young you are full of zeal and everything that is stricter, longer, more difficult is always more religious.

Student: "Unfortunately then a lot of them got hooked up." Isn't it a good thing they got married?

Ustādh: I wish that 'hooked up' meant married. But I just didn't know the right phrase. And you know these things are recorded. So, I don't want to say what happened. But they are in a better place than where we are now. Put it that way.

And then obviously I started studying, went abroad, learnt, etc. And then when I came back, again pre-9/11, in the good times, we were even more buzzed by the whole thing. We would swap between us, *ḥifẓ* was strong. I used to be a lion in those days. Now I am not even the lamb of a sheep of the lamb of the sheep of the lamb lamb sheep. Our *Tarāwīḥ* used to last six hours on average. Sometimes 5-6 hours, sometimes longer. We used to do a *khatm* every couple of days.

Now I want you to know, in my village they do a *khatm* every two or three days. That's not what I am talking about by the way. *Khatm* every 2-3 days over there, they are *khataming* (just made a new verb there)… They are *khataming* it in two hours, three hours a night in 2-3 days. That is the madness. They did that in my village, obviously we are a very a conservative area anyway. But it is not conservative with light and guidance. It is conservative in a ritualistic way. You know in a Desi kind of Pak way. It is not like the Ferarri imām. The *rukūʿ* is very good, and then *sajdah* is very good, but the recitation is [very quick and unintelligible]. That is the difference over there. They will get it done in two hours. So, six hours approximately the Qurʾān is finished. And they do it again, and again, and again. And they keep doing *khatm, khatm, khatm, khatm, khatm*.

Whereas, what we will be doing… and it was closed—this is my point. It would be in the *masjid* (because we could not find any better place) but it was not the main *jamāʿah*. It would be another *jamāʿah* after. Ours would be slow recitation. Not slow, but *ḥaḍr*. We would be really into it. The *duʿāʾ* would be long because we want him to do this *duʿāʾ*.

Anyway, my point is that the *ʿillah* with respect to not causing a problem, etc., is all about the public. People want to be religious, be religious by yourself. Don't think that other people are upon your level, other people have got the same time as you, people are *rozghar* like you, unemployed, etc. I think that is a really, really important statement that he says.

إلا أن يكون جماعة محصورة يرغبون ذلك

Except if it is a small *jamāʿah* which are up for it like that.

Shaykh then says:

وصلاة الله على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وثناء عليه في الملأ الأعلى

When you say, *Allāhumma ṣalli ʻala Muḥammad*, what you are saying is, O Allāh, praise him amongst the angels. O Allāh, speak good of him, bless him, everything good about him in the very best of companionship, i.e., amongst the angels.

أي أن الله تعالى يُبيِّنُ صفاته الكاملة عند الملائكة

That Allāh ﷻ describes how perfect he ﷺ is amongst the *malāʼikah.* They love hearing that. They then start making *duʻāʼ.* Allāh ﷻ is happy. The angels are happy. It is just madness.

هكذا نُقل عن أبي العالية رحمه الله.

That is something which was quoted by Abu al-ʻĀliyah. Abu al-ʻĀliyah—you should know, in case you do not know—is one of the major Imāms of the *Tābiʻīn*. One of the major Imāms of the *Salaf.* A very important figure. He had so much *ʻilm*, so much *fiqh.* He was born in *jāhiliyyah.* He is a contemporary of the Prophet ﷺ. I do not mean young. He is a contemporary of the Prophet ﷺ, but guess what? He became Muslim after the Prophet ﷺ passed away. Proper madness. You know that the vast majority of scholars say that for someone to be a *ṣaḥābi*, you have to have met the Prophet ﷺ in a meaningful way and died upon Islam. He interacted, as far as we know, we are not too sure. There are claims, but from a thingy (*sic*) point of view, it's up in the air. Born early, lived through that entire period of that 23 years of that whole *daʻwah* scene, becomes Muslim after his death ﷺ but then studies with all of the major Companions. So that was his explanation by the way. Such a treasure trove of *ʻilm.* And so he does not get *ṣaḥābi* status basically, he is *Tābiʻi.*

So that is what it means to send *salām* on the Prophet ﷺ. It is so beautiful what he says.
(0:40:00) You are asking Allāh ﷻ to just describe his ﷺ excellence and perfection and his ﷺ beauty in front of the angels. So, they then carry on, they then do this, etc. etc.

And then you should say:

مُحَمَّدٍ وعلى آلِ مُحمَّدٍ

By the way, amongst the Ḥanābilah this is not an agreed upon position—this idea of sending *salām* upon the Prophet's ﷺ family. It is narrated in the majority of the books of the Ḥanābilah that it is only:

وصَلَّ الله وَسَلِّمَ على نبيِّنا مُحَمَّد

Only *salāms* upon the Prophet ﷺ. You do not need to add the second.

But our author here has added the second, which is *āli Muḥammad.* Now *āl* we know means family in the Arabic language, but Shaykh says:

أتباعُه على دِيْنِهِ؛ لقوله تعالى

Shaykh says but this means his followers.

﴿وَيَوْمَ تَقُومُ ٱلسَّاعَةُ أَدْخِلُوٓاْ ءَالَ فِرْعَوْنَ أَشَدَّ ٱلْعَذَابِ ٤٦﴾

"On the Day the Hour comes, it will be said, 'Throw Pharaoh's people into the worst torment.'" [*Sūrat Ghāfir*: 46]

Āl Firʿawn—all of *Firʿawn* and his army, and his fellow believers, and all the ones who supported him—throw them into the worst of punishment, *ashadd'l-ʿadhāb.* Like chuck them into the Fire.

Shaykh says:

أي: أتباعه على دِيْنِهِ

I.e., the followers of *Firʿawn* according to his *dīn*.

فإن قيل: وعلى آلِهِ وأتباعِهِ

Shaykh said that if it is said:

اللهم صَلِّ على مُحَمَّدٍ وعلى آلِهِ وأتْبَاعِهِ

If it is said send *salām* upon him ﷺ and upon his family and upon his followers, then the meaning of *āl* becomes the believers from his ﷺ family. Basically, *āl* becomes his ﷺ family. You know, it's important whenever you say 'send for peace upon Muḥammad and his family', you always only see the translation 'family'. Much of his family were non-Muslims. This *duʿāʾ* is only of course for the believers of the family. That is important. So, when you have:

وعلى آلِهِ وأتباعِه

'Upon his family and upon his followers', then followers obviously means the rest of the believers and *āl* means the family, specific members, *ahl'l-bayt*, who are believers.

And then Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn on page 39 quotes like a line of poetry:

آلُ النَّبيِّ همو أتباعُ مِلَّتِهِ
مِن الأعاجم والسُّودان والعَرب
لو لم يكن آلهُ إلا قرابتُه
صَلَّى المصلِّي على الطَّاغي أبي لهب

(Translating this horribly:) The *āl* of the Prophet ﷺ, they are his followers from his nation from the non-Arabs, [and the Sudanese and the Arabs].

Sudan is referring to the whole area actually, so African is better.

So: From the non-Arabs and the Africans and the Arabs. And if it was not from his family that it was intended only his close ones from the believers, then every time a person saying *Allāhumma ṣalli ʿala Muḥammad*, he would be sending *salāms* upon that rebellious dog, Abu Lahab.

That actually nearly rhymed by the way. I just want to say that the explanation actually rhymed—helped by Arab and Abu Lahab not gonna lie. But it did.

The poet's point is that when you say *āl*, family of the Prophet ﷺ, we don't mean his ﷺ direct family. We mean the believers. Basically, the believers in general.

Student (online): Like the son of Nūḥ ؑ: "He is not from your family." So, family in general is contingent upon *dīn*.

Ustādh: That is a very good example.

﴿قَالَ يَٰنُوحُ إِنَّهُۥ لَيۡسَ مِنۡ أَهۡلِكَۖ ٤٦﴾

"God said: 'Noah, he was not one of your family.'" [*Sūrat Hūd*: 46]

Many of the scholars said that this is an indication that *ahl* has more to do with than just closeness. There has to be *dīn* there as well.

So that should be the followers of Muḥammad in the translation, in the notes.

The author is trying to say you don't say this is his family, the *āl* Muḥammad are his believing followers. Because if we said his family, then you are basically sending *salām* upon Abu Lahab who was the paternal uncle of the Prophet ﷺ—don't forget that.

وَيَمْسَحُ وَجْهَه بِيَدَيْه

Then he wipes his face with both hands.

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says that what it seems from the author that he [wipes] both his hands with his face that this is indicating that this is a *sunnah* i.e., that to wipe one's face with both hands after *duʻāʾ* of *qunūt* is a *sunnah*.

The evidence that they use for that is the *ḥadīth* of ʻUmar ؓ that he said:

كَانَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم إِذَا رَفَعَ يَدَيْهِ فِي الدُّعَاءِ لَمْ يَحُطَّهُمَا حَتَّى يَمْسَحَ بِهِمَا وَجْهَهُ.

"Whenever the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ would raise his hands for supplication, he ﷺ would not lower them until he ﷺ had wiped his face with them." [10]

[10] *Jāmiʻ al-Tirmidhi, The Book on Supplication, Chapter: What Has Been Related About Raising the Hands When Supplicating, ḥadīth no. 3386*. This narration has been graded as *ḍaʻīf.*

ʿUmar ﷺ said that when the Prophet ﷺ would lift his hands, he ﷺ would not return them (meaning he ﷺ would not put them down) until he ﷺ wiped his face with them both. This *ḥadīth* is narrated by Imām al-Tirmidhi, *ḥadīth* number 3386. And it is narrated by Imām al-Ḥākim, and by Abu Bakr al-Khallāl as well, and so on.

I was looking at one of the *asānīd* here and it is via the chain of Ḥammād ibn ʿĪsa al-Juhani. Shaykh says this *ḥadīth* is *ḍaʿīf.* Actually, the vast majority of scholars say this *ḥadīth* is *ḍaʿīf* because of Ḥammād ibn ʿĪsa al-Juhani. This *ḥadīth* was considered to be *ḍaʿīf* by Imām al-ʿIrāqi who is the authority. Bam. End of. The rest are just followers frankly. Imām al-Nawawi, Ibn al-Jawzi. Imām Yaḥya ibn Maʿīn—no joke. Abu Zurʿah—no joke. These are the Imāms of *al-naqaḍ*.

Remember obviously the imāms of *naqḍ*, they are *nuqqāḍ*. They are *ḥadīth* critics. They are at the absolute pinnacle of *ḥadīth* sciences.

Yaḥya ibn Maʿīn (the companion of Imām Aḥmad al-Ḥanbal and teacher of Imām al-Bukhāri) and Abu Zurʿah, both said *ḥadīth munkar*—rejected *ḥadīth*. Abu Zurʿah also added and said: I fear that it doesn't even have a basis. Like you know sometimes
(0:50:00) there's a basis etc. [he said:] "I fear it doesn't even have a basis."

Imām al-Ḥākim also narrated this in his *Mustadrak*. He was quiet about it. He didn't say anything after it. Silence is deafening. He didn't make it authentic.

Imām al-Dhahabi also didn't say anything about it. Imām al-Dhahabi is normally commenting upon the ruling of Imām al-Ḥākim.

Imām al-Nawawi said something very interesting (and I think this is why I wanted to bring it out because of this sentence here and I want you to just to listen to this). After Imām al-Nawawi considered this *ḥadīth* to be weak… After narrating and commenting upon it and saying that the *ḥadīth* is *ḍaʿīf*, Imām al-Nawawi said (in his book *al-Adhkār*):

وأما قول الحافظ عبد الحق رحمه الله تعالى: إن الترمذي قال إنه حديث صحيح، فليس في النسخ المعتمدة من الترمذي أنه صحيح ، بل قال: حديث غريب.

And this is not just ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq, but a number of scholars that said [this].

إن الترمذي قال إنه حديث صحيح، فليس في النسخ المعتمدة من الترمذي أنه صحيح ، بل قال: حديث غريب.

He basically said that not only is this *ḥadīth* weak, but those who actually said that Imām al-Tirmidhi said that this *ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ* (which is what gave it traction), that statement has not been found in any of the relied upon manuscripts, the original copies.

And that sometimes happens, a bit of mistake whatever what not. I know this sounds crazy but sometimes you can write things wrong and copy things wrong. How many times have you thought this, and you have done that?

Imām al-Nawawi said this *ḥadīth* is *gharīb*.

This *ḥadīth* is pretty weak.

I just want to continue with what the *muḥaqqiq* says. He says and it also has some supporting evidence from the *ḥadīth* of Yazīd ibn Ṣāʾib that's narrated by Imām Abu Dāwūd and Imām Aḥmad but also it is weak even more so because the chains in both of them have Ibn Lahīʿah. Everybody knows that he is weak. And also narrated by Ḥafṣ ibn Hāshim—he is an unknown narrator. So, all of these—even put together—unfortunately because the weaknesses are too much. Therefore, they cannot be put together.

So, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn basically summarises. He says this *ḥadīth* is weak and all of these supporting evidences are weak.

ولهذا رَدَّ شيخُ الإسلام ابنُ تيمية هذا القول،

And that is why Ibn Taymiyyah rejected this whole concept and this statement. He just rejected it. He just said, '*Listen. Forget that.*'

إنه لا يمسحُ الدَّاعي وجهه بيديه لأن المسحَ باليدين عبادة تحتاج إلى دليل صحيح

The one who is making *duʿāʾ* is not to wipe his face with his two hands because to wipe the face with your hands is an act of *ʿibādah*, it requires *dalīl*. It requires an authentic evidence so that he has an argument in front of Allāh ﷻ that what he did had a basis.

أما حديث ضعيف فإنه لا تثبت به حُجَّة

As for the weak *ḥadīth* then this is not something that can be used as an evidence.

Now where is the big issue?

The reason this is an issue is very famous because Ibn Ḥajr al-ʿAsqalāni, the Imām of the *muḥaddithīn* in his time, the great Ibn Ḥajr, considered this *ḥadīth* to be *ḥasan*. He considered this chain to be *ḥasan*. And he's not alone.

I spent all my life studying scholars that found the chain to be acceptable. And when I say that, it wasn't necessarily obvious (I don't want to bore you with the chains) but it is a combination of the fact that none of the narrators are *kadhdhāb*. They are not the greatest of chains but the *ḥadīth* has so many other supporting narrations, different types. Some were going to be disqualified because they're outright just a waste of time, some were not. And whenever you see an action which is depending upon a *ḥadīth* which is not in *Bukhāri* and *Muslim*, you should automatically lower your guard and relax and expect differences of opinion. Automatically. Because ultimately if the discussion is going to be about the strength of a narrator or not, that will determine whether that action becomes as famous as it does or it is to be completely rejected.

That is why I know of no scholar from Ahl'l-Sunnah that has condemned the wiping of the face with the hands as the most heinous *bidʿah* that needs to be called out. In actual fact, it could be argued that the sign of one's lack of knowledge is the one who calls that out not recognising that this is something that many scholars (even though they are lesser than the scholars that said it is weak and they are lesser in rank, especially when you look at the earlier *muḥaddithīn*) accepted this. And the action of the Muslims is behind it. This is me before reading Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's statement. I'm going to read his statement in a second. But I just want you to know that this is one of the issues of flexibility. And I don't mean flexibility because we want it to be flexible. Flexible because there is possibly an argument there for the other side. And *fiqh* is all like that.

Student (online): Does this relate just to *Witr duʿāʾ* or all *duʿāʾ*?

Ustādh: This is referring to all *duʿāʾ.* This is a very good point.

The reason that Imām al-Ḥajjāwi is bringing it up right now is because we have not so far in *Logical Progression* come to any part where the hands have been involved in *duʿāʾ*. This is the first mention of the hands. That is why he is throwing it in.

Student (online): What do you mean when you say "the action of the Muslims is behind it"?

Ustādh: Which country of the Muslims ever in your entire life in the whole massive world do you not see all of the Muslims (all of them) not wipe their face with their hands bro?

So, that's why I want to just say that people need to chill on this issue.

(1:00:00) Now, let me quote, translate verbatim (because this is an important piece of text) what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says.

He says: However, Ibn Ḥajr in *Būlghʾl-Marām* (which is a book that we studied with Shaykh Kehlan many years ago and indeed he makes a point of it there and narrates it there), he says:

إن مجموع الأحاديث الشاهدة لهذا تقضي بأنه حديث حسن

He says ultimately when you combine all of the narrations together, even though they are all weak, but when you put them together it would really let raise the level of this *ḥadīth* to that which is acceptable, *ḥadīth* which is *ḥasan*. That can be found on 1554, *ḥadīth Būlghʾl-Marām*. If you look at the actual *ḥadīth* 1554 you'll see it there.[11]

Shaykh says so whoever then considers this *ḥadīth* to be *ḥasan* (acceptable), then this act of wiping the face according to them becomes a *sunnah*. And those who do not consider this *ḥadīth* to be acceptable, then this *ḥadīth* remains weak according to them and the action of wiping the face is *bidʿah* and that's why we then get three positions on the matter: (1) it is *sunnah*, (2) it is *bidʿah*, and (3) it is neither *sunnah* and it's neither a *bidʿah*, it's a permissable action—if someone does it, we're not going to consider him to be a *mubtadiʿ*, an innovator, and if a person didn't do it, we would not say that you are deficient in your actions, you did a lesser *duʿāʾ* than everyone else, yours is incomplete. These are three acceptable positions in this issue: it's *sunnah*, it's *bidʿah*, it's neither *sunnah* nor *bidʿah*, it's something which is permissible, it's neither here nor there.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says the closest according to me (that's Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn) is that it is not *sunnah* because the *ḥadīth* which have been narrated concerning it are all weak and we cannot possibly go and establish, ascertain, an act and state that it is a *sunnah* with *ḥadīth* which are weak. And that was what Ibn Taymiyyah, Shaykh al-Islam, opined. And there are so many *ḥadīth* in this issue of the *duʿāʾ* especially in the *ṣaḥīḥayn,* in *Bukhāri* and *Muslim*, and so many other places where the Prophet ﷺ used to raise his hands and it's stated so many times.[12,13,14] So many times the Prophet ﷺ—whether it is *istisqāʾ* or whether making *duʿāʾ* for the people, the Prophet ﷺ has raised his hands, the Companions are describing it and none of them have seen him ﷺ wipe his face [with his hands]. Where are the *ḥadīth*?

---

[11] *Ibn Ḥajr al-Asqalāni, no.1554.*
[12] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Friday Prayer, Chapter: To Raise Hands During the Khutbah, ḥadīth no. 932.*
[13] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Friday Prayer, Chapter: Istisqāʾ in the Khutbah on Friday, ḥadīth no. 933.*
[14] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Rain, Chapter: The Supplication When Praying for Rain, ḥadīth no. 897a.*

Shaykh al-ʻUthaymīn says so many places:

ولا يمسحُ بهما وجهه

And he did not when he raised his hands wipe his face:

مثل هذه السُّنَّة التي تَرِدُ كثيراً؛ وتتوافر الدَّواعي على نَقْلِها إذا لم تكن معلومةً في مثل هذه المؤلَّفات المعتبرة كالصحيحين وغيرهما، فإن ذلك يَدلُّ على أنها لا أصل لها.

And when it comes to certain actions, you know some are hidden, some are private—you expect a lack of information. When it comes to the act of public making *duʻāʾ* in such an open way, such an act, so many people doing it, and such a comprehensive collection, such a big focus, why are there not any narrations collected and how on earth could these two greats ignore it, or forget it, or not see it?

So, all in all:

وعلى هذا؛ فالأفضل ان لا يمسح ولكن لا نُنكرُ على مَن مَسَحَ اعتماداً على تحسين الأحاديثِ الواردة في ذلك؛ لأن هذا مما يختلف فيه النَّاسُ

It's better that he does not wipe his face. But we will not criticise or attack another person for wiping his face based upon the making the *ḥadīth* acceptable, because of the *ḥadīth* narrated in this issue, because this is something which the people have differed over.

And that last sentence I think is very, very important. This is area of general difference of opinion.

And listen. I want to say, obviously, this class is not about wiping the face, but there are a number of scholars throughout Islamic history that supported the wiping of the face. And that's just the way it is. The majority of scholars' scholars, didn't. But then some things have their own power, and some actions fall into very naturally convenient categories.

I want to say to you that making the *adhān* for example in the baby's ear when they're born is a very comfortable overpowering emotion. And we've spoken about this before.

People who are not religious, don't know anything about *dīn*, they are religious at the beginning and at the end of people's lives. At the beginning and at the end. That's the only thing they care about—identity being established in the beginning and that hopefully, even though he does nothing for that identity all their life, at the end let's hopefully suddenly believe in heaven and God whatever. It becomes relevant now. There are certain actions that people take from worship and turn into realities that fit mindsets and psyches.

The fact that the idea that the *duʿāʾ* you want it to be spread upon you, the *barakah* upon you, the whole concept whilst we have authentic *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ making *taʿawwudh* every night—of course *ḥadīth* Bukhāri—when you are doing dry spit and you should then do this.[15] But this not a *duʿāʾ*. This is Qurʾān and its protection. *Taʿawwudh* of the *muʿawwidhatayn*, the protection of going to sleep. So, added concept which has basis, have *ḥadīth* which don't have authenticity, create the human need…

I love wiping my face. I'm not going to lie. I'm not serious on this. I have a soft spot for this action. But in my heart, I know that this is not the *sunnah*. And I'm convinced of that.

Student (online): I have not been able to get over that awkward feeling of just putting hands down.

Ustādh: You see? If people reflect upon their *ʿibādah*… You know, that's obviously what we did a lot in *Fiqh* of *Ṣalāh* when we spoke about *niyyah*, spoke about people's uncertainty. We have spoken a lot about it in LP as well in fairness, about how many *madhāhib* become popular in areas that have certain characteristics. I don't wipe my face intentionally. I wipe my face in more out of a cultural kind of emotion and completion. But when I am wanting to, then I don't. Or I should say that I don't consider it to be a *sunnah*. Everybody I think agrees that it's just a very difficult thing to do.

Q & A

Q (online): I have seen this *ḥadīth* from *Bukhāri* being quoted as a discouragement from adding and subtracting words from prophetic *duʿāʾ*, so I am wondering how this fits in with what you said about how it's flexible that you can add/subtract from the *duʿāʾ* of *qunūt*? Perhaps I misunderstood your point.

[15] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Virtues of the Qurʾān, Chapter: The Superiority of Sūrat al-Falaq and Sūrat al-Nās, ḥadīth no. 5017*.

(1:10:00) قَالَ قَالَ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم " إِذَا أَتَيْتَ مَضْجَعَكَ فَتَوَضَّأْ وُضُوءَكَ لِلصَّلاَةِ، ثُمَّ اضْطَجِعْ عَلَى شِقِّكَ الأَيْمَنِ، ثُمَّ قُلِ اللَّهُمَّ أَسْلَمْتُ وَجْهِي إِلَيْكَ، وَفَوَّضْتُ أَمْرِي إِلَيْكَ، وَأَلْجَأْتُ ظَهْرِي إِلَيْكَ، رَغْبَةً وَرَهْبَةً إِلَيْكَ، لاَ مَلْجَأَ وَلاَ مَنْجَا مِنْكَ إِلاَّ إِلَيْكَ، اللَّهُمَّ آمَنْتُ بِكِتَابِكَ الَّذِي أَنْزَلْتَ، وَبِنَبِيِّكَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلْتَ. فَإِنْ مُتَّ مِنْ لَيْلَتِكَ فَأَنْتَ عَلَى الْفِطْرَةِ، وَاجْعَلْهُنَّ آخِرَ مَا تَتَكَلَّمُ بِهِ ". قَالَ فَرَدَّدْتُهَا عَلَى النَّبِيِّ صلى الله عليه وسلم فَلَمَّا بَلَغْتُ " اللَّهُمَّ آمَنْتُ بِكِتَابِكَ الَّذِي أَنْزَلْتَ ". قُلْتُ وَرَسُولِكَ. قَالَ " لاَ، وَنَبِيِّكَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلْتَ"

"The Prophet ﷺ said to me, 'Whenever you go to bed perform ablution like that for the prayer, lay on your right side and say, "*Allāhumma aslamtu wajhi ilayka, wa fawwaḍtu amri ilayka, wa aljaʾtu ẓahri ilayka raghbatan wa rahbatan ilayka. Lā maljaʾa wa lā manja minka illā ilayka. Allāhumma āmantu bi-kitābikʾl-ladhi anzalta wa bi-nabiyyikʾl-ladhi arsalt* (O Allāh! I surrender to You and entrust all my affairs to You and depend upon You for Your Blessings both with hope and fear of You. There is no fleeing from You, and there is no place of protection and safety except with You O Allāh! I believe in Your Book which You have revealed and in Your prophet whom You have sent). Then if you die on that very night, you will die with faith. Let the aforesaid words be your last utterance (before sleep).' I repeated it before the Prophet ﷺ and when I reached *Allāhumma āmantu bi-kitābikʾl-ladhi anzalta* (O Allāh I believe in Your Book which You have revealed). I said: *Wa rasūlika* (and Your Messenger). The Prophet ﷺ said, 'No, (but say): *wa bi-nabiyyikʾl-ladhi arsalt* (Your prophet whom You have sent) instead.'" [16]

A: She is saying that the correction of the Prophet ﷺ is indicating that you have to fit the words word for word. You don't have the flexibility to add your own *duʿāʾ* etc.

The vast majority of the scholars rejected this argument. Like entirely. They said that this is one thing and that's something else. You narrating a *ḥadīth* with an authentic *duʿāʾ* which is a specific entity and enclosed, that is what you should be saying because every word is important in the context of that particular unit. And as a result of that, it needs to be said accurately. There is an intended meaning by Allāh ﷻ choosing 'Your Prophet that You have sent'. I want you to know that the *rasūl* is a higher *maqām*, *nabi* is not a lesser one but less responsibility. A prophet carries on the *Sharīʿah* from before, a messenger comes with a book—huge responsibility. There are different opinions by the way, why the Prophet ﷺ wanted to be known as the 'prophet that you have sent' at that moment as opposed to the messenger.

This *ḥadīth* is in no way contradicting the fact that there is flexibility in *duʿāʾ.* Many narrations we see—in fact I'll take it there—multiple hundreds of narrations of the same *duʿāʾ* in different order. Multiple hundreds. So, any *duʿāʾ* in which the Prophet ﷺ

[16] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Ablutions, Chapter: The Superiority of a Person Who Sleeps with Ablution, ḥadīth no. 247.*

does not want the wording to be changed—and we have other *ḥadīth* where the Prophet ﷺ was very careful about how his name was mentioned after Allāh ﷻ's name, that they're not put on the same pedestal, that they're not considered in the same way. So, when the meaning is going to be affected by the change the Prophet ﷺ will cut in. This is not the same as people who add *duʿāʾ*, take away *duʿāʾ*, and so on and so forth.

Also, it is important to define the place and the time. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn will give some examples next week about exactly that. Is it permissible to be making certain *duʿāʾ* in certain ways, in certain times? What makes it into a *bidʿah* and what doesn't? There are principles. So, we'll do that.

Q (online): Would you say that commencing *duʿāʾ* by praising Allāh ﷻ is also a condition and not just a reason for *ijābah*, in analogy to the *ḥadīth* that infers likewise regarding the salutation?

A: No, it's not a condition. I don't know of any scholar that said that there are absolute fundamental conditions. We don't even consider Arabic to be a condition. The *duʿāʾ* is *duʿāʾ* of the heart. Whatever a person calls upon, is a *duʿāʾ* Allāh ﷻ will respond to. Allāh ﷻ responds to the *duʿāʾ* of the *kuffār*. There is no condition of *duʿāʾ*. There are things that raise it. There are things that make it better.

When we do the *Ḥajj* and *ʿUmrah* training and *tarbiyah*, it's a long process. People are like, '*What's going on man? How much more are you going to speak about duʿāʾ?*' On a scale of 0-10, with zero being rejected *duʿāʾ* and ten being the greatest thing ever, one is an accepted *duʿāʾ*. I love saying that, by the way. I have to copyright that. Level one is an accepted *duʿāʾ*, meaning *duʿāʾ* being accepted and responded to by Allāh ﷻ requires so little, if anything. If Allāh ﷻ wills. If Allāh ﷻ wants it. Give it to non-Muslims, etc. But then every other level then confirms it, pushes it, praises it, makes it a great act for you, makes it a sense of salvation for you, etc., until you get to ten. And then you have done an incredible act of *ʿibādah*, upon which sins are forgiven. You know, above and beyond, etc. So no, it is not a condition. Praising Allāh ﷻ is perfecting your *duʿāʾ*.

Q (online): If you were to show respect to a bad person who, legitimately, claims descent from the Prophet ﷺ, purely out of respect for his heritage and not for himself, can this still be a rewardable act? For example, you don't insult that person out of respect and shyness to the Prophet ﷺ even though they aren't a great person.

A: Obviously, it is according to your intention. Your intention is in its right place, but I don't think the application is. People who are the family of the Prophet ﷺ—it is differed over whether that is something restricted to his generation or whether that applies to people today. That's a scholarly difference of opinion. A very strong argument actually, that they are not applied to today.

This comes through in *zakāh*. We spoke about that in *zakāh* class briefly, that there are certain characteristics that make the *ahl'l-bayt* or the family of the Prophet ﷺ unique in not accepting *zakāh*. Whereas today it is not applicable anymore because there is no booty, there is no *fayd*, there is no *ghanīmah* which is paid to them which would support them. I want to say to you that the evil people get treated like the evil people. However, if a person, out of respect and out of *hayā'* and *sharam* said, '*I am not going to say anything*,' I think that is okay.

(1:22:00)

Q (online): If praising Allāh ﷻ would never be a condition, why would some accept a narration that cites salutations to be a condition?

A: That's okay. If a *ḥadīth* is emphasising the status of the Prophet ﷺ, that doesn't mean that the Prophet ﷺ is over Allāh ﷻ, or that the praise of Allāh ﷻ is better. This is not like a competition between the two. They are two entirely different categories.

Q (online): We get sent food on the fifteenth of Shaʿbān by our neighbors. Is it permissible to eat it?

A: Of course it is.

Q (online): Why do some people not raise their hands in *Witr*? Is the class position to raise hands?

A: I have to tell you that I am also not a massive fan of raising the hands. There is evidence to suggest that the Prophet ﷺ did not raise his hands in some of the *qunūt*.[17] But there are *ḥadīth* also to indicate that he ﷺ did. That's why the people do it that way.

Q (online): In addition to saying the *salām* on the Prophet ﷺ with one's tongue, are there any *ādāb* of the heart we need to observe while saying the *salām* at the end of a *duʿā'*?

A: That's a very specific question. I haven't thought of it like that. All I know is that one of my favourite parts of the prayer is *tashahhud*. I can only share my personal experience. In the *ṣalāh*, I do like saying *Allāhumma salli ʿala Muḥammad wa ʿala āli Muḥammad*. I like Ibn al-Qayyim's position that the finger is not just a focus of attention in *ṣalāh,* but it makes *duʿā'*. So, I like picturing. I like feeling. I think that is the kind of thing that you should have in the heart. That's all I can say.

[17] `*Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Model Behavior of the Prophet ﷺ, Chapter: Adherence to the Sunnah, ḥadīth no. 4607*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

Q (online): If that's the Ḥanbali position, to send *ṣalawāt* upon the Prophet ﷺ after *duʿāʾ*, then why is it that they don't also say it at the end of the prayer before *taslīm* where it's open for *duʿāʾ*? If one does send *ṣalawāt* upon the Prophet ﷺ at the time, is it wrong?

A: The answer to that is kind of going to be mentioned by Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn when people become a little bit close to making something regular when it is not narrated that it is. I will speak about that next week. Basically, the Ḥanābilah are not saying that it's the Ḥanbali position to end *ṣalawāt* upon every *duʿāʾ*. That's not what's being said. They are saying that on the *Witr duʿāʾ*, it is a *sunnah* to say *Allāhumma salli ʿala Muḥammad*, and some of them said *wa ʿala āli Muḥammad*—not in general in all their *duʿāʾ*. That is not their official position. They are saying that it can be said and that it can be said in the beginning, at the middle and in the end. I don't know of that. Ḥanbali experts will know more about it than I do. But I don't know of the Ḥanābilah making this a condition or an absolute emphasised aspect of all their *duʿāʾ*. Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q (online): While all *duʿāʾ* are accepted, what is the reason for times when *duʿāʾ* is accepted?

A: No. I did not say that all *duʿāʾ* are accepted. If you mean in my scale, I'm talking relative to my scale. I don't mean all *duʿāʾ* are accepted. Of course all *duʿāʾ* are not accepted.

فَأَنَّى يُسْتَجَابُ لِذَلِكَ

"[The Prophet ﷺ said:] 'How then can his supplication be accepted?'" [18]

Duʿāʾ are not always accepted. I am saying to you that on a scale of 0-10, zero not being accepted, one is being accepted.

[18] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Zakāh, Chapter: Acceptance of Charity That Comes from Good Earnings, and the Growth Thereof, ḥadīth no. 1015.*

33. Chapter 21 Lesson 12: The Supererogatory Prayer

Today *in shāʾ Allāh* we are doing the statement:

ويُكْرَهُ قُنُوتُه في غيرِ الوِتْرِ إلا أن تَنْزِلَ بالمسلمينَ نازلةٌ غيرَ الطاعونِ فيَقْنُتُ الإمامُ في الفرائضِ.

It is disliked for one to perform the *qunūt* except in the *Witr* unless there is a calamity which afflicts the Muslims, for which the imām does the *qunūt* in the obligatory prayers. This is not done for the plague.

There is a lot to unpack here. A lot. There is *qunūt*. There is position, its reality, its location, its meaning in different prayers. Did the Prophet ﷺ do it all the time? Where does that come from etc.?

We basically finished with the wiping of the face. We said that it is an action which the Muslims differed over, that the strongest position from the evidences seems to be that the lack of legislative strength or evidence to wipe, but if one does it is not the biggest issue in the world. And that's where we stopped.

Now we are on page 41 and finally only when we are *in shāʾ Allāh* coming to the end of it we finally reached it. The irony of this lesson is that we're going to speak about probably COVID, the only section in the entire book of *al-Mumtiʿ* which would talk about anything to do with COVID in any kind of way is this one right now. We cover it a year and a half after it actually comes—COVID—and the irony is that the one thing that we need for next week (this makes me laugh)—*tarāwīḥ*, which is next week—is coming up in the next page which we are not going to cover until *tarāwīḥ* finishes. And when we cover it, it will be a year or 8-10 months or whatever before *tarāwīḥ* comes around. *Qaddar Allāhu wa mā shāʾ faʿl*. I could have broken it up and could have taken this one last year and I could have done the *tarāwīḥ* tonight, but that is not logical progression, that is illogical progression. So, we are not doing that.

Let's start with this:

وَيُكْرَهُ قُنُوتُهُ فِي غَيْرِ الوِتْرِ

It is disliked for one to perform the *qunūt* except in the *Witr*.

This is talking about the person who's praying, that it is disliked for that person to do *qunūt*. And by *qunūt* we are talking about the *qunūtʾl-khāṣ* meaning the specific *qunūt*. And we said before that *qunūt* means obedience and loyalty and worship and it means *duʿāʾ* in general. All of these meanings are okay. So, with respect to this particular statement, the *qunūt*, what is considered disliked, then this is the *qunūt* specifically, not *duʿāʾ* in general.

Then Shaykh says that what the author is trying to say, what the intention of the author is, is that this *duʿāʾ Witr*… When I teach this, I call it the nice happy *qunūt*. That way people don't get confused. Happy *qunūt* lives in *Witr* prayer—nice happy moment, everybody waits for it, gets it done that is it.

Happy *qunūt* does not get performed in any of the prayers anywhere. I mean if it happens, it does not invalidate the prayer because it is actually still a form of *duʿāʾ*. And
(0:10:00) I said maybe before in the early weeks that some of the scholars even used to think that sometimes a long recitation is also coming under the general category of *qunūt* because *qunūt* is *ʿibādah*, *qunūt* is obedience, *qunūt* is loyalty—like I said before. And so, some of the scholars used to say that *aḥādīth* which talked about the *duʿāʾ al-qunūt* before *rukūʿ* because the vast majority of the narrations and the scholars also prefer the *duʿāʾ al-qunūt* after *rukūʿ* even though as I said before the *ḥadīth* are very authentically narrated for the *duʿāʾ al-qunūt* before you go for *rukūʿ* and after the *rukūʿ* of course even more. That is why you see the Ḥanafi school for example only do it before and the rest of the three Imāms they will do it before and after with the preference for after because the evidence is stronger.

One of the explanations for the fact that the *ḥadīth* around the *qunūt* being before is that they said that that isn't actually a formal *qunūt,* but it is just general part of the *qunūt* of that person, that obedience of that person, that devoutness of that person in *ṣalāh*, very humble, very eyes down reciting away. So, that just expands your horizons on the issue.

So, when we are talking about it being disliked to do the *qunūt*, we're talking happy *qunūt*, happy *duʿāʾ* big smiles, buzzing about that.

Shaykh says: Hold on! (This is a really good point. It's a learning point.) How can a person say it is disliked to do a *duʿāʾ* which in of itself is *sunnah*, which in of itself is a *mustaḥabb* action? Like let alone *qunūt* obviously being a specific form, specific words, specific manner, but ultimately it is *duʿāʾ* and is *duʿāʾ mustaḥabb*. *Duʿāʾ* is something which is recommended, and which is good and all the rest of it. So, what exactly is the problem here? How can this be something which should be disliked? And in fact, Shaykh asks a question:

أليس القُنُوت دُعاء فليكن مستحبًّا؟

Isn't *qunūt* essentially *duʿāʾ* so it should be recommended all the time in every prayer? Why are you telling me it is disliked to do it in my *Fajr* prayer, in my *Maghrib* prayer? Why only in the *Witr* prayer?

And the Shaykh says that if someone said this, we'd say to them because it is a specific *duʿāʾ*, in a specific place, in a specific act of worship. So, there are three specifics which have made this act very, very targeted and specific. And *bidʿah* (an innovation) and something *muḥdath* (something which is new and innovated in the religion), if you want to identify those things in the religion, these are the things you're looking at, when people specify the general as Shaykh is going to explain.

In fact, I am just going to translate what he says. This is actually very, very good. He says: When you do something in a specific way, in a specific manner, in a specific act of *ʿibādah* even if the starting point is a general, permissible, *ḥalāl* thing or a *mustaḥabb* thing even, it does require evidence.

When you go specific, we need specific evidence. You keep it general, you have already the general evidence, we have no problem with you. A person here and there does something which is meant to be done here and there, and a person does it in a general way, then you are doing it the way that the evidence says. When you take it and say, *'I only want to do it after rukūʿ.'* '*I only want to do on a Thursday.*' '*I only want to do when I finish the prayer*.' '*I only want to do it on Monday*.' Once you specify its place, its time, its day, its act of worship that it is found in, once you start bringing the specifics out, we want to know why. That is the simple case.

فإنَّ الشيءَ الذي يُستحبُّ على سبيل الإطلاق لا يمكن أنْ تجعله مُستحبًّا على سبيل التَّخصيص والتقييد إلا بدليل

This is a maxim. Something which is considered recommended in a general fashion, in an unrestricted fashion, in a non-defined fashion, it is not possible that you make it a recommended act in a specific manner and restrict it except with an evidence.

That is why if a person was to say: I am going to make *duʿāʾ* on the *mawlid* of the Messenger ﷺ with a *duʿāʾ* which is narrated in the *sunnah*, authentic and correct *duʿāʾ* of the *sunnah*, we would say to that person do not do that because what you have done is that you have taken the general—which is a *duʿāʾ* which is *sunnah*, maybe something like:

اللَّهُمَّ إِنَّكَ عَفُوٌّ تُحِبُّ الْعَفْوَ فَاعْفُ عَنِّي

"O Allāh You are forgiving and love forgiveness, so forgive me." [1]

This *duʿāʾ* which is well-known, well-established etc. and you take this and you are putting it into a specific timeframe. You decide, '*No. This is the time to bring it out.*'

Okay. Why today?

The person turns around and says, 'Today I felt good about it, today I felt its need.' We say no problem. That is fine.

The person turns around and says, '*Well, it is the Prophet's ﷺ birthday*.' You have now just added more *masala* to the issue and now we need to see some evidence.

Shaykh says:

وهذا يحتاج إلى دليل، فليس كُلُّ ما شُرع على سبيل العُموم يمكن أنْ نجعله مشروعاً على سبيل الخُصوص

This requires evidence. In principle, why does this require evidence? Because not every single thing which has been legislated in a general sense can be made legislated in a specific sense. As Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says:

فليس كُلُّ ما شُرع على سبيل العُموم أنْ نجعله مشروعاً على سبيل الخُصوص

Not every single which is legislated in a general sense can be legislated in a specific and a restricted sense, like: This is the night that I am going to do it on.

There is no doubt that this is difficult because the scholars will differ, and it is risky. I will give you the classic example and you can see the difference of even contemporary scholars on it. The difference for example between two of my own teachers Shaykh Abdullah ibn Yusuf al- Judai and Shaykh Kehlan. This happened many years ago.

Student (online): Another example of this would be reading *ṣalawāt* on the Prophet ﷺ before and after the *adhān.*

Ustādh: Yes, I think that is a good example. Reading *ṣalawāt* on the Prophet ﷺ before and after the *adhān*. I think that is a very good example. It is a general excellent act

[1] *Sunan Ibn Mājah, The Book of Supplication, Chapter: Supplicating for Forgiveness and to Be Kept Safe and Sound, ḥadīth no. 3850*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

being made into a specific place at a specific time. This would be considered *bidʿah*—there is no doubt about that—when you are doing it in this manner.

Shaykh Abdullah gave the *fatwa* that every month or every x period of time in the student calendar at university the ISoC [Islamic Society on Campus] could do a youth *qiyām* night where they try and gather the students, they get someone to lead them, they do some kind of activity etc. which back then was non-existent. When he gave that *fatwa*, that's now trickled down. As you know FOSIS [Federation of Student Islamic Societies] picked it up, took it to the universities, those guys grow older they go to the *masājid*, it's trickled down to the *masājid*. I do not know now of any *masājid* in the West that does not have a youth *qiyām*. And this is where this came from, from this *fatwa* from Shaykh Abdullah Yusuf al-Judai.

Shaykh Kehlan was very upset with this *fatwa*. And the reason is exactly this point here, that the act of *tahajjud* is a general one and it is to be recited in a general sense and in general by yourself and sometimes if a person wants to make it specific i.e. pray in congregation and do it on a certain moment and a certain time: Oh! Suddenly in
(0:20:00) Ramaḍān let's pray *tahajjud* in a congregational sense. We would say: '*Hold on! Where did you get that from?*'

'*Well actually we got it from here. Here is the ḥadīth*.'

'*Oh. You know what? That's fair enough. That's a pretty good argument*.' We let that slide. Then we suddenly say *tahajjud* is not to be prayed in congregation [in a specific sense] except in *tarāwīḥ* because there is the evidence we needed. We needed the evidence. Otherwise outside the evidence people should pray by themselves, at home etc. and carry on, in fact that is the *aṣl*.

When we get to the section on *tarāwīḥ* and other prayers you will see my own personal opinion on it and what people should be doing at home and all the rest of it. Many of you have seen the Faith IQ video that I recorded on it. It is a really long one and caused a lot of problems. People get very upset by it, but whatever. The point is that this action of specifying the general requires an evidence. How and what is the evidence for every month or the last Friday or the last Saturday in a month to do it? That is specifying the general and actually when you think about it, it is an innovation. It is a specifying the general in a very specific way.

The problem is that we have got so used to it as a culture, we have seen so many benefits come from it, and it is a form of *daʿwah*, and it is the only thing that people go to the mosque for because obviously it is connected food, PlayStation, chatting around, and the rest of it. That's what all the kids go for, not really that. That's the worst part for them. They grin and bear it because they know that the pizzas are coming and the burgers are coming etc. So, they say, '*You know what? Sack it. We'll do an hour. We'll just stand around and shift our weight from one foot to the other just to get through*,' and

they will do it. A few people will start to develop a bit of companionship, some people will be pulled in, others will just turn up for the night event to see their mates.

Now, with that Western sensitivity and now that we have this idea that this is how *daʿwah* should be done, it has now become a staple diet. That, of course, is the thing. When you do not stop something at the beginning—if you do believe it to be wrong—it will just get out of control. Similar to that is the combining of *Maghrib* and *ʿIshāʾ*, which again, is another Shaykh al-Judai *fatwa* which has completely gotten out of control.

I just want to say that if you now look at this as students, you can see Shaykh Abdullah's argument and you can see Shaykh Kehlan's argument. Both of them have a clear methodology and a valid path, meaning that you can see the basis and you can see Shaykh Abdullah's basis. His argument is that it is not about restricting, this is about *daʿwah* for the sake of *daʿwah*. The ends justify the means and the means here, we are not taking it out of control completely, he would say. Because it is not just logistics. That is the problem. When it is just logistics, we know. But he is not actually saying 'just logistics'. It is like when people ask me about the *ʿaqīqah*. I tell them to do it on the weekend if you are going to have people coming in, and it may not be the seventh day. You would do it in the mosque normally, and you would get all the people in. It is difficult to do that on a weeknight. And so you might do the slaughter a couple of days before and the meat you keep in the fridge, and you cook it etc. I am saying that logistics, we understand that. It is when it has gone beyond logistics, and it turns into a kind of event, and a reality that becomes normative.

Truth be told, I always debated this point with Shaykh Kehlan. This is a matter of genuine difference of opinion. And you are going to see a few examples of that in today's class. I wanted to give you a modern example of this issue, that it is not always so easy as Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is putting it.

Student (online): How are you reconciling this position with what we have at Cheadle Masjid?

Ustādh: That is a very good point. [He is referring to us] doing a *khatm* in the *farḍ* prayers every six months. This is from the same category—it could be argued. Obviously, the reason I do not have a problem with this is because I do not see it like that. We are not specifying Qurʾān only in that manner. You are meant to read the Qurʾān, and we do not always fit like that. Sometimes it is said in the loud, sometimes it is not. There is no prohibition per se in following the order. We are not going back and forth. We are not doing it backwards, for example. We are not reciting it backwards, in terms of *sūrahs*. We are actually reading through it.

This argument is such a nuanced one. The argument would be: Okay then, but you are definitely not doing the *sunnah*, which is we know that the Prophet ﷺ used to only recite

the shorter *sūrahs* in *ṣalāt al-Maghrib* or that he ﷺ used to recite, for example, *Sūrat al-Sajdah,* in *ṣalāt al-Fajr* etc. [2,3]

Now, that is a valid point. Obviously, our response is that we do actually mix it up. We tell the Shaykh, and he does. And he is intelligent himself to know. He will only recite one or two *ayāt* from where we are in the *muṣḥaf* at *ṣalāt al-Maghrib*, so it feels like the same. On Friday morning, we will recite *Sūrat al-Sajdah.* And where there is a *sunnah* to be established, we will do it. Like in *Jumuʿah*, you will hear [*Sūrat] al-Aʿla* and [*Sūrat*] *al-Ghāshiyah.* So, the *sunnah* is still maintained when there is a preference for particular *sūrahs*, but in the rest of the time the Qurʾān is being said.

Now, here is the beautiful irony that is making me smile, that the argument of course, carrying on from the whole idea that we have got to have the *qiyām* in the monthly programme because it attracts the people to come to the *masjid*, the argument for the Qurʾān being recited throughout the year is that the people do not recite it, do not have connection to it, are completely bored silly with the same old, [*Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*] in the *ṣalāh*. They actually come for it. People come to the *masjid* to hear some Qurʾān that they have not heard, to get some *murājaʿah*, revision, of that which they do not know. Then again it is falling into the black hole of the ends justify the means, where the means seem to be innovatory in its principle.

Student (online): Long *khuṭbah* because people only come to learn on Fridays is a similar issue I guess.

Ustādh: No, I do not think the long *khutbah* will ever fall into this category. Ever. Not at all. People have got to get far, far better. This is not an example. That would be the exact example that is not applicable here. A long *khutbah* is not justified in any time, in any case. I just want to make that point. That is not the way that the Prophet ﷺ specifically criticised the one who elongates the *khutbah*.[4] So, we cannot say it is better for us when he ﷺ specifically criticises.

Student (online): I feel Shaykh Judai's argument would be it should not be called *bidʿah* (1) if we do not attribute it to the Prophet ﷺ, (2) do not think it is more rewardable to do it on certain days. For example, if someone says, '*I will allocate the weekend for the tahajjud for logistical purposes,*' not because the Prophet ﷺ specified it, or because it is more rewarded. That should not be a *bidʿah*, if that makes sense. However, the problem is that over time people forget why it was initially specified.

Ustādh: That is a beautiful point at the end. There is absolutely no doubt that Shaykh Abdullah does not consider it a *bidʿah* because of exactly that reason. He will always

---

[2] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of the Commencement of the Prayer, Chapter: Reciting the Short Mufaṣṣal Sūrah in Maghrib, ḥadīth no. 983*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

[3] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Friday, Chapter: What Is to Be Recited on Friday, ḥadīth no. 879 a*.

[4] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Prayer—Friday, Chapter: Keeping the Prayer and Khutbah Short, ḥadīth no. 869*.

claim the logistical argument. That is the simple point. The 'don't attribute to the Prophet ﷺ' is a moot point because it automatically always is. It always is. So, it does not matter whether a person is doing that or not when it is an act of *ʿibādah* to people who do not generally know.

Anyway, my point is that I am actually very comfortable accepting the difference here, although I have something in my heart against it. Not a massive fan. But there are many times that you are going to pick this out.

Let me just finish this now, just to give you an idea. Remember that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is on the Shaykh Kehlan side, they are much stricter. When you get that strict, you kind of cause problems for yourself. Case in point, he says:

ومِن ثَمَّ قلنا :إنَّ دُعاء خَتْمِ القرآن في الصَّلاة لا شَكَّ أنه غير مشروع

And likewise, we can say, the *duʿāʾ* of *khatmʾl-Qurʾān fiʾl-ṣalāh,* the *duʿāʾ* of when a person finishes the Qurʾān, and then in the prayer and they actually make a *duʿāʾ* inside the prayer. He says: There is absolutely no doubt that this is not legislated.

The language is very important. He is careful: "Not legislated."

لأنه وإنْ وَرَدَ عن أنس بن مالك رضي الله عنه أنه كان يجمعُ أهلَه عند خَتْمِ القُرآن ويدعو، فهذا خارجُ الصَّلاة، وفَرْقٌ بين ما يكون خارجَ الصلاة وداخلها

(0:30:00) Because even though it has been narrated from Anas ibn Mālik ؓ that whenever he completed a *khatm* of the Qurʿān, he would gather his family, they would pray the *ṣalāh*, and then do the *duʿāʾ khatmʾl-Qurʾān* [the principle being the same as offering the] *qunūt* after the *rukūʿ* (in some of the narrations)—a long *duʿāʾ,* with the general understanding (like I have been telling you all this time) that the principle in *duʿāʾ* in and of itself is praising Allāh ﷻ and then asking for what you want. But the principle of *duʿāʾ* itself is: If I want this, then let me get some work done, so I put something forward to Allāh ﷻ. I fast to Allāh ﷻ so I ask in the last moment and I get my *duʿāʾ* before we do *ifṭār*. I do my prayer, and I make *duʿāʾ* afterwards, as we said before. I give *ṣadaqah*, I ask the Prophet ﷺ, I do *duʿāʾ*. In this case here, I put forward a whole *khatm* of the Qurʾān—huge reward. Now I am going to use the *barakah* of this act that I have done to make a *duʿāʾ* with the hope that it is responded to. So, this action of Anas ؓ is actually in line with so many of our Islamic principles. But look at what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says.

Even though it has been narrated from Anas ﷺ, this is actually outside the prayer.

That was the position of some of the scholars, but the minority.

He says: This is outside the prayer, not inside the prayer. And there is a difference between someone keeping it general and then being general about it, and then taking something general and bringing it and only applying it only to the prayer, which is actually specifying it in two ways: (1) You are specifying it in an act of worship, and then (2) in a place where people have done that *duʿāʾ* in a specific way, like *qunūt*. Meaning, you are really adding in a specific restriction to it.

فلهذا يمكن أنْ نقول :إنَّ الدُّعاء عند خَتْمِ القرآن في الصَّلاة لا أصلَ له، ولا ينبغي فِعْلُه حتى يقومَ دليلٌ مِن الشَّرعِ على أنَّ هذا مشروعٌ في الصَّلاة.

Again, it is so nice to see what Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says. Even though he has what I think is an incorrect position, his language is very academic, controlled, and measured. He did not say *bidʿah* straight out, but he said:

فلهذا يمكن أنْ نقول

It is possible for us to say, as a result:

إنَّ الدُّعاء عند خَتْمِ القرآن في الصَّلاة لا أصلَ له، ولا ينبغي فِعْلُه حتى يقومَ دليلٌ مِن الشَّرعِ على أنَّ هذا مشروعٌ في الصَّلاة.

That to make a *duʿāʾ* once you complete the Qurʾān and make that *duʿāʾ* in the prayer has no basis. And it is not right for it to be done until an evidence from Islam establishes it, that this is legislated in the prayer.

Now, this is a statement, which you have to say, he would never have said that if there was maybe, ʿUmar ﷺ, or if there was a *ḥadīth*. He is saying this because Anas ﷺ, by himself, is just one of the younger Companions. Great Companion, no doubt, but not of the major *fuqahāʾ*. And obviously you guys know, especially those of you who have done *Protect This House* or *al-Adab al-Mufrad*, Anas ibn Mālik ﷺ is a giant. He brings us so much *dīn*. But he is not considered from the *mujtahidīn*. He is not considered from the

ḥuffāẓ. He is not considered from the *fuqahāʾ* of the *Ṣaḥābah*. Young, as well. And so, this act, in and of itself, is just kind of relegated to Anas's ﷺ own action.

Let me just say, I do not want to get emotive about this. That is correct. We must not get too carried away with an individual Companion's actions. But it is narrated. And it is established. To then say it has no basis, that is where you will kind of fall into the problem where you have a principle that you believe in, which is no doubt correct—the principle of avoiding specifying the general, because that leads to *bidʿah*—at the same time, applying it in the real world is a lot more difficult.

Let me give you a practical application of what I am trying to say.

I might not do it. In fact, I will not do it. And I will use this principle myself, personally. I feel incredibly comfortable with it. You know, when you follow this principle where you are wanting to be on a more cautious kind of path. You want definitive evidences from the Prophet ﷺ. You are quite happy if there is a lack of evidence of *ḥadīth*, but then we have a number of Companions upon it, a number of the *Salaf*. But when there is not, even though there are very authentic narrations that there might be one or two did or said, the great thing that I can say here is: You know what? I am not going to do it. I am not really going to do it. But I am not going to come down like a tonne of bricks on someone who does do it. Because, they have a *salaf*. They have a precedent.

In fairness, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is very much like that. Only once or twice he might not follow that line, but you saw in wiping of the face example last week that that is his approach. And that is generally the right one. Today, as I said, when you apply in the example of the *qiyām* of the youth, I allow it. Students ask me that all the time, and I say go ahead because of the logistics. Because I know. Because, I have been there. Because I understand. But would I do it in an organised fashion? Would I do it in a way like that? No. I think that when you gather people together, then you should take the opportunity. Then I see the argument: Well, that is the gathering of the people together, so we are going to take the opportunity. So, I say, you know what? That's okay.

So, I am relaxed with it. I just want you to understand how difficult this is to apply in the real world. That's, I think what the entire lesson that I wanted you to take from it.

Alright, let us now get to the actual point of the sentence.

وَيُكْرَهُ قُنُوْتُهُ فِي غَيْرِ الوِتْرِ إلا أن تَنْزِلَ بالمسلمينَ نازلةٌ

It is disliked for one to perform the *qunūt* except in the *Witr* unless there is a calamity which afflicts the Muslims.

It is disliked to be making happy *qunūt*, in the obligatory prayer unless there is a calamity which afflicts the Muslims—a *nāzilah*. And this is the chapter of *qunūtʾl-nāzilah*.

Now, *qunūtʾl-nāzilah* is… It is not right to say angry *qunūt*. But if we have happy *qunūt*… If I say serious *qunūt*, then that makes the first one not serious. This is obviously a bad path to go down. But I am going to call it serious *qunūt.* Happy *qunūt* [and] serious *qunūt.* Now, we are going to discover the mistakes that people make.

So, the author has basically suggested, that there is an exception to the rule. That in the rest of the prayers, in the obligatory prayers, there can be a *qunūt* and a regular *qunūt.* Desperate *qunūt.* Upset *qunūt.* None of these words are going to work, but someone is going to say, why, are you not upset? Are you not desperate in the normal ones? So, whatever. I am down with desperate *qunūt.* Let us put down desperate *qunūt.* Happy *qunūt.* Desperate *qunūt.* I am going to give you some examples of that in a second.

So, Shaykh says that this is the exception except for *ṭāʿūn*.

Let me just quickly speak about the concept. First of all, we have a problem. The problem is that there are a number of scholars like Imām Mālik, like Imām al-Shāfiʿi who think that the *qunūt* is a part of the prayer that can be pulled out any time, in any of the obligatory prayers, and there does not need to be a disaster for it, etc. This is on one side.

On the other side, you have the Ḥanafis, who are like: You must be joking!

I have spoken a lot about this especially in *Divine Link* (*Fiqh* of *Ṣalāh*). When you see the Ḥanafi approach to *ṣalāh* and everything, the *qunūt* and its *ḥarakāt,* its movements and everything it is like seriously OCD triggering for the Ḥanafi School. We are gas lighting that school when you start doing anything in the prayer, let alone speak out loud, let alone make *duʿāʾ*. I mean the Ḥanafi School just about allowed the *qunūtʾl-Witr*. And I will tell you straight, they only allowed the *qunūtʾl-Witr* on the condition that it is blink and you miss it. Blink and you have missed it! Super short, super subtle, super quick, absolutely nobody can hear what is being said. It is done silently. It does not take up any new position in the prayer. For example, they are reciting the *sūrah* and it is like *Allāhu akbar* [raises hand quickly], like a little cheeky *Allāhu akbar*. I mean as cheeky
(0:40:00) as it gets, quick one and our hands are back here [on the navel] and they are like praying. Like they went and proper did *qunūt* in like *ṣalāh* is *qunūt*, *qirāʾah* is *qunūt* you know that kind of fashion. No lifting of the hands, no whatever.

Student (online): So how do they do it in congregation?

Ustādh: See? She is like, '*What? What? Who? What?*' You see, she hasn't seen the Paks in the mosque do this. She is in a state of shock already, she is like, '*What? The only thing that I understood even about qunūt is big loud amīns and big loud crying and shouting whatever what not.*' Ḥanafis are literally there are dying. You know when they are in

the back there, they don't know what's going on. '*What is this? This is the ṣalāh, this is the prayer, this is namāz have you lot gone pagal or what?*' They literally are not having it. And like I said it fits their school, it fits the *sakīnah* you are meant to have. What is all this raising of the hands, what is all of this, that, whatever? And it is done very [subtly], *Allāhu akbar* and you go into *rukūʿ* meaning that everything about the other way of doing the *qunūt*, there is like you know it is after the *rukūʿ* where nobody hangs around for a long period of time. You are going into *sujūd*. Hanging around and lifting hands and seeing the folks going whatever what not blah, blah, blah. So I mean it's like what you are saying, if you have grown up on any normal kind of *qunūt* and you go and pray in the Ḥanafi mosque, you will come out most unfulfilled sir. You will want your money back. You will be like, '*What's happened there bro? I came for the qunūt. I came for the qunūt bro and I don't know what happened*.' So there is that funny side to it.

Now as I said personally. Personally. I don't want to put my personal opinion upon the class but I'm a massive fan of the Ḥanafi approach to *ṣalāh*. Massive fan. And I genuinely think that they have the general understanding of *ṣalāh* better—the mood I mean—than others.

You know, people always will say… This is very famous, that the Shāfiʿis should be followed in *ṣalāh*, that the Shāfiʿis smashed the *ṣalāh*. It is a well-known principle when you are looking at the *madhāhib*, their specialties, etc. I just think that is unfair. Maybe from a legal point of view yes. But when it comes to the mood and the environment and the kind of you know the quietness and humility in the eyes, I think the Ḥanafi school got it right and especially when it comes to *qunūt*. I am not going to lie bro. You know that I really dislike all the shenanigans that people going like this [making *duʿāʾ* loudly with a lot of emotion], '*Yā Ḥannān yā Mannān*,' screaming, crying this, that, whatever what not. You know half an hour, 45 minutes. I want you to imagine if you are Ḥanafi, you are there, you are locked, you are imprisoned you are like General Zod that is locked up in that thing, banished to go for 300 sun-cycles around in the universe, like this. Twisted, stuck, hands down here you don't even think, '*How can I lift my hands? I am in the ṣalāh*,' so you put your hands down there and you are looking and you are trying to stay there. And for half an hour you are just standing there and they are going, '*Amīn! Amīn!*' And they are like, '*This is namāz bro*.'

So, it is not a surprise to hear that in the Ḥanafi school, there is no exception to the *qunūt,* only allowed in the *Witr* prayer, no *qunūtʾl-nāzilah*. No happy *qunūt.* No desperate *qunūt*. Nothing. Nothing. all right.

By the way, where does this come from?

All of this comes from the many authentic *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ making *qunūt* in the various prayers. So, that is found all over the *Sunnah*. So, let me just say that. The Ḥanafis don't necessarily say that they are all weak, although they did weaken some of them. And the big one of course is the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet's ﷺ *duʿāʾ* against the [tribes of] Riʿl and Dhakwān and ʿUṣayyah, these tribes for example that attacked the Muslims,

the *munāfiqīn* and the Prophet ﷺ made major *duʿāʾ* against them.[5,6] And then of course we have the *ḥadīth* in which the Prophet ﷺ made *duʿāʾ* against [the tribe of] Muḍar and then got angry against them.[7] Allāh ﷻ then revealed that this is not your job. This is not your reality. You were not sent down, *nakkālah*, to be the bearer of bad news and cursing everyone and whatever, but:

﴿وَمَآ أَرۡسَلۡنَٰكَ إِلَّا رَحۡمَةٗ لِّلۡعَٰلَمِينَ ١٠٧﴾

"It was only as a mercy that We sent you [Prophet] to all people." [*Sūrat al-Anbiyāʾ*: 107]

The Prophet ﷺ then stopped that. That is by the way an evidence of certain actions being abrogated in the *Sunnah* by Qurʾān. But anyway, that is maybe for another day.

So the Prophet ﷺ he made *qunūt* and we know for example that in one Ramaḍān he made *qunūt* in every prayer, and another narration every *Fajr* continuously through Ramaḍān.[7,8] Some said only the last 15 nights, some said the first 15, some said the whole month. The reality is that there are different narrations.

And the Shāfiʿis of course, for those people who are in the modern kind of observing Shāfiʿis or living in the Shāfiʿi kind of environments or in Egypt etc. then you will see every Shāfiʿi in every morning *Fajr* prayer that they will have a *qunūt* in the obligatory prayer. What is happened here basically, the Ḥanafis said all of these were specific to the Prophet ﷺ, specific to the imām but the grand imām and it can't be done by anybody else and it is not to be carried forward and that is their principle. And they actually use the fact that some of the actions were abrogated as a proof. And then you have on this side, you have the Shāfiʿis who took the specific and they made it absolutely general and they applied it to all of the prayers and they said that the one could make *qunūt* and they put it into the *Fajr* of every *Fajr* prayer in a formal sense. And then you have the Ḥanbalis in the middle. And the Ḥanbalis is in the middle is where many of the contemporary scholars are, a lot of the *muḥaqqiqīn* a lot of *ahlʾl-ḥadīth*, certainly the **class position** and that is what?

---

[5] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Military Expeditions Led by the Prophet ﷺ, Chapter: The Ghazwah of al-Rajīʿ, Riʿl, Dhakwān and Biʾr Maʿūna and the Narration About Khubayb and His Companions, ḥadīth no. 4090.*

[6] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Mosques and Places of Prayer, Chapter: It Is Recommended to Say Qunūt in all Prayers if a Calamity Befalls the Muslims—and Refuge Is Sought from Allāh ﷻ (Regarding That). It Is Recommended to Say Qunūt in Ṣubḥ at All Times. And the Clarification That It Is to Be Said After Raising the Head from Bowing in the Final Rakʿah, and It Is Recommended to Say it Out Loud, ḥadīth no. 675 a.*

[7] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Invoking Allāh ﷻ for Rain, Chapter: Invocation of the Prophet ﷺ, ḥadīth no. 1006.*

[8] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions About Witr, Chapter: The Qunūt in the (Other) Prayers, ḥadīth no. 1443.* This narration has been graded as *ḥasan* by al-Albāni.

That actually, as our author says:

إلا أن تَنْزِلَ بالمسلمينَ نازلةٌ

Unless there is a calamity which afflicts the Muslims.

When a calamity afflicts the Muslims, when a situation occurs that requires the big guns to come out, for the serious *duʿāʾ* to be made, then that is what we are going to do in emulation of the Prophet ﷺ who didn't do this in every prayer, at all regular. So clear. We would have hundreds of *ḥadīth* if that were the case. We know 100%. We have so much evidence from the *ṣaḥābah* as well.

One of the *ṣaḥābah,* Abu Mālik al-Ashjaʿiy, was asked by his son: You prayed behind the Prophet ﷺ, you prayed behind Abu Bakr, you prayed behind ʿUmar, you prayed behind ʿUthmān and ʿAli ﷺ, did they used to make *qunūt* in the prayer? He said: This is something *muḥdath*. This is just what you lot are doing. This is a *bidʿah.* Hardcore answer. This is not something which is a *sunnah.*[9]

So anyway, big up statement. And anyway this debate will go on. But I just want you to know the evidences and the fact that you know the evidences that are there and the reason that they differ is their interpretation of them.

So you can see like the Ḥanbalis have said: We completely agree with evidences that you have got there but this is not to be applied in every prayer.

And they said: Well, to be honest we saw it in every prayer. Okay, we didn't see it every day but we saw it in every prayer. We saw *Fajr* be a big thing…

So, it is interpretation, meaning if you are praying behind a Shāfiʿi, there will be absolutely no issue whatsoever doing it and praying it with them. But it is not the *sunnah*. There is no doubt—in our humble opinion—that this is the correct way, that this *qunūt* has a function and it was brought in for a time to be used in a certain way, with a certain emotion, a certain desperation. And each narration that you take it back
(0:50:00) to, you can see that—the wording of that, the statements of the Prophet ﷺ in those *duʿāʾ* and what happened before that, in the death of the people who were killed or the treachery that occurred, etc. So, I just want to put that out there.

That is what the *qunūtʾl-nāzilah* is according to the Ḥanbalis—that the one that can be done is to be done in the obligatory prayers, is to be done only in a specific situation. We are going to come to in a second who actually does it, but for now what we are going

[9] *Sunan al-Nisāʾi, The Book of The Clasping One's Hands Together, Chapter: Not Saying the Qunūt, ḥadīth no. 1080.* This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ.*

to say is that respecting the Ḥanafi position which is that we don't want to do it at all, respecting the Shāfiʿis and the Mālikis—the Mālikis are a bit different but they say that it is something which is applicable in all the prayers and can be done on a regular basis. The key thing is regular. The Ḥanbali position and the **class position** is as the text says when something occurs and there is a reason to do it we will go full as well. As we said before, Ahl'l-Sunnah always try to reconcile. It is really difficult when you take a position and you try to blag away a *ḥadīth* when it is obvious that it is there.

Anyway, here is the interesting part I want to speak about:

غيرَ الطاعونِ

This is not done for the plague.

So, he says that the *qunūt'l-nāzilah* is done when a calamity afflicts the Muslims, but this is not done for the plague.

Student (online): I always assumed they just felt desperate every morning. The nature of their prayer and even their Friday sermon can feel constantly desperate. Puts you in a negative headspace.

Ustādh: Don't confuse our happy *qunūt* and our desperate *qunūt.* In fact, I put to you as an avowed Shāfiʿi, Masri: Is it meant to be happy *qunūt* or desperate *qunūt*? And I think you will say it is meant to be happy and that in itself goes against the actual legislative basis for where that *qunūt* started from because it was very desperate *qunūt.* It was very much destroy, destroy, destroy *qunūt.* So, I just want to put that out there. I am feeling what he is saying there.

I just want to speak about *ṭāʿūn*. This is fascinating by the way. Imagine that I say to you right now that the Muslims should make *qunūt* when a calamity strikes and there is destruction and disaster. And we are talking lives, we're talking finances, we're talking destruction! Calamity! But not against the coronavirus. You guys would be like, '*Bro! That is the biggest calamity, destruction that our community has ever seen. It took out hundreds and thousands and took millions in fact from us and it destroyed our economies, where else are we going to make duʿāʾ against if we are not going to do against Coronavirus?*' That is the modern application of this statement. He is saying that you make the *duʿāʾ* of the *qunūt'l-nāzilah* as an exception, any *farḍ* prayer, any time, but not against *ṭāʿūn*.

Ṭāʿūn is the plague in its absolute purest form. And of course, that happened throughout history and of course it happened in the time of the Companions, at the time of ʿUmar ﷺ. You know the plague of Amwās of course. And in Amwās many of the Companions themselves were killed. We have *ḥadīth* that make it very clear that we're

not allowed to go to the land which is infected and once we're in that land we're not allowed to leave to control the actual spread of this killer.[10,11]

Now the reasoning or the argument that's being put forward is that the Prophet ﷺ said in a *ḥadīth* that the plague is a disaster for the disbelievers and a mercy for the believers.[12] That *ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ*. And Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn didn't make a reference to that, but he did make a reference to another *ḥadīth*:

الْمَطْعُونُ شَهِيدٌ

"[The Prophet ﷺ said:] 'He (a Muslim) who dies of the plague is a martyr.'" [13]

So in one *ḥadīth* we know he's a martyr. In another *ḥadīth* we know it's a *raḥmah*. And these scholars basically said how on earth can you make *duʿāʾ* against something, or to ask Allāh ﷻ to remove something which is very clear, the Prophet ﷺ has said it is a mercy and the Prophet ﷺ said that the one who dies of it is *shahīd*? [13,14] Why would you ask Allāh ﷻ to remove that?

So you think about that, that's pretty scary. Above and beyond the point of whether that's a correct analogy or not, the real question is that it should make us reflect on what we consider to be a problem. Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn makes a point later, he says: By the way, note that the author said that *qunūts* are not done in prayer unless it's one where in a calamity afflicts the Muslims. And if it afflicts the non-Muslims, then that's something that we don't make *duʿāʾ* against. But if it's something that afflicts the Muslims then we'll make a *duʿāʾ* against.

So, you can imagine that the scholars were back and forth.

Student (online): But all material *fitan* can be seen in that light.

Ustādh: As you can see, just as he is saying there are so many things that are normative in life which are blessings for us, but which are problems themselves. And to make *duʿāʾ* against all of them.

Student (online): Rain is a mercy and he prayed for it to stop.

---

[10] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Medicine, Chapter: What Has Been Mentioned About the Plague, ḥadīth no. 5728.*
[11] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book of Greetings, Chapter: The Plague, Ill Omens, Soothsaying and the Like, ḥadīth no. 2219 d.*
[12] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Narrations of the Prophets, ḥadīth no. 3474.*
[13] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Medicine, Chapter: What Has Been Mentioned About the Plague, ḥadīth no. 5733.*
[14] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book on Government, Chapter: About the Martyrs, ḥadīth no. 1914.*

Ustādh: Like she says about the rain.

So, I just want to say that we get this position. In actual fact, we should learn a lot of lessons from it. It should humble us in our *duʿāʾ* making. That's all I want to say. Do I think this is applicable today? No, I don't, as probably the majority of scholars. And they will argue—very much like how you are arguing—everything has a *khayr* in it and that doesn't mean that we shouldn't make *duʿāʾ* for protection, and so on so forth. Every *fitnah* purifies you, but that doesn't mean that you should throw yourself into it.

For me, we have more *ḥadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ telling people not to be kind of embracing the danger and we spoke about that a couple of months ago about the one who wanted the punishment of the *ākhirah* to be applied to him now so that he doesn't get punished afterwards. And the Prophet ﷺ went to visit him and he'd turned into a skeleton and it was a disaster.[15] And he ﷺ goes what have you done? He says this is what I've done. He ﷺ said: Don't do that but rather ask Allāh ﷻ for His *ʿāfiyah*. So, I think that his ﷺ actions and statements go against this principle. Of course, it's important to remember that the Prophet ﷺ never said don't make *duʿāʾ* against *ṭāʿūn*, he ﷺ just said it is a mercy.[12]

So, what does this *ḥadīth* mean?

For me this *ḥadīth* is very, very clear. It's like the other one:

الْمَطْعُونُ شَهِيدٌ

"[The Prophet ﷺ said:] 'He (a Muslim) who dies of the plague is a martyr.'"[13]

Meaning that in the sadness and the desperation when you see young people and beloved who are fit and not expecting to die at that age, when something shocking occurs we give them a balm to heal their wounds, to heal their hearts with when they're hurting. People are meant to die when they're old. You're not meant to see you kids die before you. You're meant to go through life—you're strong, and then you struggle, and then you're old, and then you die. And you shouldn't lose your mind over it because everybody's going to die and everybody's getting old. And that's fine. It's when people die in unexpected circumstances. When someone drowns, when it's a big shock to people. When someone's murdered—big shock to people. When someone gets killed in battle, brave, young, had all the world to live for—shocking.

I did a whole video of this where I was explaining the whole concept of the Prophet's ﷺ *ḥadīth*:

---

[15] *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The Book Pertaining to the Remembrance of Allāh ﷻ, Supplication, Repentance and Seeking Forgiveness, Chapter: It Is Disliked to Pray for Punishment to Be Brought Forward in This World, ḥadīth no. 2688 a.*

قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صلى الله عليه وسلم: " الشَّهَادَةُ سَبْعٌ سِوَى الْقَتْلِ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ الْمَطْعُونُ شَهِيدٌ وَالْغَرِقُ شَهِيدٌ وَصَاحِبُ ذَاتِ الْجَنْبِ شَهِيدٌ وَالْمَبْطُونُ شَهِيدٌ وَصَاحِبُ الْحَرِيقِ شَهِيدٌ وَالَّذِي يَمُوتُ تَحْتَ الْهَدْمِ شَهِيدٌ وَالْمَرْأَةُ تَمُوتُ بِجُمْعٍ شَهِيدٌ " .

"[The Prophet ﷺ said:] 'There are seven types of martyrdom in addition to being killed in Allāh's cause: one who dies of plague is a martyr; one who is drowned is a martyr; one who dies of pleurisy is a martyr; one who dies of an internal complaint is a martyr; one who is burnt to death is a martyr; who one is killed by a building falling on him is a martyr; and a woman who dies while pregnant is a martyr.'" [16]

You know he ﷺ went through the list in so many *aḥādīth* of all the people who are [*shahīd*]: those who are burned are *shahīd*, who drowned are *shahīd*, the building falls on them are *shahīd*, the one who dies of pleurisy is *shahīd*, the one who dies of a stomach condition is *shahīd*, etc. The question is asked: Are these exhaustive lists?

The answer is: The scholars differed, obviously. My opinion is that there's a common thread behind it. The common thread is that it's shocking, unexpected, untimely, in some general sense that society recognises. Anything which has involved a lot of pain, a lot of shock—I think all of this has been given an honorary [*shahīd* status]. And let's not lose our minds over it. They're not *shahīd shahīd*. The only *shahīd shahīd* is the one who dies on the battlefield. But these are honorary *shahīds* meaning that they are the *shahīds* of the *ākhirah*. And by the way, that's beyond our dreams as well because that's the only thing that matters. But the difference is that if you die on the battlefield, you are bona fide, legit, legit hero. Get those poems written, get those songs sung, let's have those parties, legit hero. And you're going to be saving all the people that you can save, interceding left, right, and centre and you're going to be smashing it in the next life.

(1:00:00)

Whereas the rest of the *masākīn*, pseudo *shahīd*—again not hating on the pseudo *shahīds*—but they are what we call the *shuhadāʾ* of the *ākhirah* meaning that they are still washed, still prayed over, still sought forgiveness for. Remember *ṣalāt al-Janāzah*, there's a difference of opinion as we said for the *shuhadāʾ*. In principle, it's not—according to the majority. You know all of that whole thing. *Ṣalāt al-Janāzah* is not even a *ṣalāh* as you know. Anyone who studied *Fiqh of Death*, you saw my explanation of why I think the Ḥanafi position to it is very strong—they see it as a *duʿāʾ*. That's why they don't request *Fātiḥah* in it. And you see that the way that they understand it, you can really, really feel that *ṣalāt al-Janāzah* is really *duʿāʾ al-Janāzah* not really a *ṣalāh*. And it's being done for them. And that's why we don't do it for children. There are a lot of *ḥadīth* that suggest the Prophet ﷺ did not make *ṣalāt al-Janāzah* for the death of his

[16] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Funerals, Chapter: The Virtue of One Who Dies of the Plague, ḥadīth no. 3111*. This narration has been graded as *ṣaḥīḥ* by al-Albāni.

own son, Ibrāhīm.[17] Because it is a *duʿāʾ al-janāzah*, it is an interceding for the one who's died. Bro! Who are you trying to intercede for? A one-and-a-half-year-old? A five-year-old? A kid, who's going to *Jannah* anyway who's from the believing families? Who's chilling with Ibrāhīm ﷺ? And you know what it is? The guy on the battlefield he's not the guy who needs *duʿāʾ* bro, you're the one who needs *duʿāʾ*. So, there's a huge system around this, a beautiful symmetry when you dive in and you start looking.

So, I think that that the *aḥādīth* of the Prophet ﷺ kind of calming the situation down for those that are lost in the plague is more about calming them down, making them feel relaxed, this is a positive situation, this is something which is a blessing. And I think it is allowed to make *duʿāʾ* against it, asking Allāh ﷻ to rid the *Ummah* of it, especially when it's causing destruction for the Muslims. How can this point be argued when it is making the Muslims weak or it's killing out all the Muslims? And we're saying. '*Right might as well be shuhadāʾ*.' That's not what we're here for. The whole *Ummah* is not here to all die. The aim of this *dīn* is to raise the word of Allāh ﷻ, to make the:

﴿وَكَلِمَةُ ٱللَّهِ هِيَ ٱلْعُلْيَا﴾

"God's plan is higher." [*Sūrat al-Tawbah*: 40]

That's not going to happen if we just say, '*Well, it's a mercy let everybody be killed off and let everyone die shahīd*.' Come on bro!

What I found interesting is that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn does not commit. He puts the argument forward and he says: Come on! What's a bigger *muṣībah* than the *Ummah* of Muḥammad ﷺ dying out? Of course, you make *duʿāʾ* against it. And he says there are others that said you don't and for the reasons that I mentioned, and he just stayed absolutely silent. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

So, Shaykh says: What happens then, this *qunūtʾl-nāzilah* is done in the obligatory prayers—not done in the *sunnah*. It's done in the obligatory prayers, this *qunūtʾl-nāzilah* when a disaster occurs. So, this is the exception to the opening statement:

ويُكْرَهُ قُنُوتُه في غيرِ الوِتْرِ

It is disliked for one to perform the *Qunūt* except in the *Witr*.

[17] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Funerals, Chapter: Funeral Prayer for a Child, ḥadīth no. 3187*. This narration has been graded as *ḥasan* in chain by al-Albāni.

And why is there an exception?

Because it has been established from the Prophet ﷺ through all of the *ḥadīth* that we mentioned.

فيَقْنُتُ الإمامُ في الفرائضِ

For which the imām does the *qunūt* in the obligatory prayers.

The author says the imām. Who does that refer to? What does the imām mean? Imām of the *masjid* or the imām?

Shaykh says that in *fiqh* (and this is well known) when the word imām is used it's always referring to the supreme leader, it is leader to the believers, the *Amīr'l-Mu'minīn*.

إذا أطلقَ الفقهاءُ «الإمامَ» فالمرادُ به: القائدُ الأعلى في الدَّولة

The supreme leader of the Islamic state. So, he does it basically on behalf of the entire *Ummah*. That's very important that phrase al-imām. That's first explaining imām.

Now what about the issue who should do it?

Some of the scholars said it's only him who does it nobody else. This is a national, international, *Ummah* problem and that's what has to happen. This is not about some small thing that afflicts the community that the *nāzilah* comes out. The *qunūt'l-nāzilah* we're talking the big guns. When you start doing big loud *du'ā's* in the *masjid* and *āmīns* and you know it's a serious matter, it has to be a serious matter. It has to be world class. Put it that way. It can't be Sunday league behaviour. So, they said that the main imām is the one who understands that, who understands where the realities are, what the things of political importance are. He's the one who decides and the rest of the people don't do it, neither in their homes nor in their local *masājid*. And the reason for that is that because the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ whenever he ﷺ did it no one else ever did it. It was not done in the smaller mosques, in the houses. He ﷺ was the only person who did that and he ﷺ did not tell anybody else to do that, neither as recommendation or whatever. This was a fact. So, whoever is in control of the matters of the Muslims it is his responsibility and it's not legislated [for others].

This is one of the most well-known statements of Imām Aḥmad and it became the *madh-hab* of Imām Aḥmad, the Ḥanbali position that this is done by the major imām.

And by the way I just want to say that as a draw down from this first position, they of course allow then that if the imām says I want the imāms to do it, this is a matter that is very serious and I want all of you guys [to do it], and that's of course then permissible. So according to them that's fine because the big imām has said, the king, or whoever… Especially today when they can't even read *bismillāhi'l-Raḥmān'l-Raḥīm* themselves, then you know they're not going to do their own *behsti* they're going to tell their imāms to do [it].

The second position is all the imāms do it, meaning all the imāms of the mosques.

And the third position is that every person does it, every *muṣalli* does it—the one who is the imām, the one who is following, the one who is praying by himself, the ones at home, the one who's away. Everybody does it. And this was the position of Ibn Taymiyyah and he said basically that the *aḥādīth* do not indicate any specificity to imām. The Prophet ﷺ did it, the Prophet ﷺ himself is teaching us how to pray. He ﷺ said: "Pray as you see me pray."[18] So, we're just praying as we see you pray, so we're going to copy him ﷺ as well. There's no evidence to restrict it. And that's a very strong point, frankly that: Why are we restricting it only? So he ﷺ continuously used to do it and whatever a person does continuously and when we see that the Prophet ﷺ is doing it when a *nāzilah* occurs. And then whenever the *nāzilah* occurs, whatever the calamity is war, famine, x, y, z and he's ﷺ making a *duʿāʾ* and he's ﷺ doing it continuously and so then therefore it becomes legislated for us to then follow him ﷺ and do that as well.

Shaykh says: As for myself in this issue I like to restrict this act to the overall leader. I think that it should be done by the overall leader. So, if he wants us to do it, he can command us to do it. That leader should make that decision it shouldn't be anyone. He
(1:10:00) wants to kind of control the situation. It would be chaos if everybody was making *qunūt*.

Student (online): This is not personal calamity, right?

Ustādh: Absolutely not personal calamity. Let me make that absolutely clear. When we say *nāzilah,* it by definition means the full behavior.

And Shaykh says: If the leader stays silent, then we stay silent. And he makes a really important point. He says: Let's not lose our heads over this. The Prophet ﷺ is the only one who did it. We don't have any others doing it at that time. That shows that there is some kind of authority thing going on. And it's not just like Ibn Taymiyyah said that "pray as you see me pray", because that's what the Companions used to do and they never used to do it when the Prophet ﷺ did it, nor did others who were far away. And many Companions were not praying in the *jamāʿah* of the Prophet ﷺ. Many. So, they didn't do it. So, there's a strong point there to be noted.

[18] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Good Manners and Form, Chapter: Being Merciful to the People and to the Animals, ḥadīth no. 6008.*

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says: If he tells us to do it, and if he says don't do it then we're not going to do it, we have plenty of other places to make *duʿāʾ*.

This is not the only place you can make *duʿāʾ*! If you want to look out for the Uyghur community, you want to look out of the Kashmiris, you want to look out for the Syrians, you want to look out for whoever, Shaykh says you've got your *sujūd* and *tashahhud*—the two places we spoke about in the prayer that need to be utilised for personal *duʿāʾ*—if you want to make it in the actual prayer. Then there are a million other places outside of the prayer as well. So, it's not like we can't make *duʿāʾ*, but this is an official, formal *duʿāʾ*. And you know my opinion, I like control in the *ṣalāh*. I like it calm like the Ḥanafis. That's how I like it. So this opinion, I've got to say, resonates with me. I do like control.

I'll give you a practical example of what happened in Cheadle once. I can't remember the actual details, but in one of the countries something happened, it could've even been the onset of the Syrian situation, which is as big a calamity as it gets. We have two main imāms: Shaykh Salim and Shaykh Abdul Ghaffar. Shaykh Salim is Syrian and he's one of the leaders of the *daʿwah* in Manchester, just one of the great people. When he would lead the prayer (which was rare), if he leads the prayer he is making the *nāzilah*. It's as straight as that. This was when it was in the news, when the situation was really bad. Now it's not like it's let up right now. It's worse now, but it's so far out of the hearts and minds of the people. So, he would. And Shaykh Abdul Ghaffar when he leads the prayer (which is the majority of the time), he's not. And so many people were like, '*Why are you not doing it? Why is he doing it?*' And he's been put in a difficult situation because it was at the time where something really bad happened in Somalia and I can't remember what. He asked me and said this is the situation, we should be making.... or maybe I said even, '*I think this is good for the nāzilah*,' that we should do it. And he said to me, '*You know if I do it what's going to happen. They are going to say that he's making duʿāʾ for his own people, for his own personal pain, personal calamity, as opposed to the Ummah's calamity, I'm not going to do it. I can't do it*.'

This is a very real example of the practical problems just on a small scale. And the imāms don't need this. The imām is not a politician. He's not meant to be dealing with politics. He's meant to lead the prayer. He's meant to keep the Muslims together. He's meant to try to keep consistency. That's the problem, that's the dirty work of the leader. The leader can come in and when he says, this is what we're going to make *duʿāʾ* for, that's not what we're going to make *duʿāʾ* for, we put our trust in the leader that he knows best. He's the representative of us, he didn't make *duʿāʾ* for this army of his… Obviously, I'm talking about when there is a *khilāfah*. Now it's different. But I just want to give you an example where the *fiqh* is coming from. So the ruler, he can write off Somalia and Syria and we trust him on that. We'll say he knows something behind the scenes that we don't, etc. There's a lot of muck and flack and *fitnah* that's going to be caused. Blame it on them, not me. I'm happy to make *duʿāʾ* all night.

What do you think, that these people can't make *duʿāʾ*? These are the people who come while you're sleeping in bed, they're there at 3:00 am in the *masjid* every single day in

winter and whatever, and they're the last ones out. They're leading the *ṣalāh* while you're doing the job and on the holidays. The imāms are the greatest people on this planet, the most underappreciated people ever. Don't for a second think that this is because the imāms are not up for it. That's the only thing they want. They want the Muslims to come to the *masjid* and make *duʿāʾ* and get them together. It's *fitnah*. It's difficult. That shouldn't be their problem. So, I just want you to see where that theory is coming from, where Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn is talking about.

Now the bigger question for us is: does this mean anything to us? Does it mean anything to us in the West where we have no authority, we have no Muslim leader, we have no Islamic state in the world let alone here. How should we be dealing with this?

I just want to say that I think what Shaykh says about calming people down is very important. We've needed a central authority in the non-Muslim countries from day dot. It will never happen because, as I've said many times on social media, because… Muslims! We absolutely detest each other, distrust each other, we're not unifying on jack diddly squat. We need the one to establish the rules, our engagement with government, what the principles of law should be, *ʿĪd*, Ramaḍān, fasting, etc. We need central authorities. But it's not going to happen. And because that's not going to happen, and if it did happen it would be the ones that would put a unified statement of condemnation forward and it would make the Muslims do this, and we would pay money to support them, every single Muslim would. That is in the ideal scenario—in a non-Muslim country we have a representative and that would be *al-qāʿidʾl-Aʿla*. He would be the leader and we would accept that. That is something which is *mashrūʾ* that is something which is legislated and required. Not going to happen.

So, if it is not going to happen, then the truth is that we actually end up practically—even though we want Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's opinion—we end up with Ibn Taymiyyah's opinion where people are just going to have to get along and do it as much as they can in a kind of you know as respecting the authority of the *masjid* and the trustees and their principles and their thinking forward to avoid *fitnah*.

And the overruling principle is if I get upset by the decision, I am not going to get upset by the decision. Because if they decide not to, it's not because they hate my suggestion, or they hate me, or they are racist. There is no need for the Muslim to go there. It is a *fitnah*. I understand where you are coming from. Don't worry. I will make *duʿāʾ*. I will write it on social media. I will send a WhatsApp to every person… And that's what you do. You go and make the charity, you go and make the organisation, etc. The making of the *duʿāʾ* in the *masjid* is not the be all and end of all. It's not going to break the matter. It's not the deal breaker. So that I think is a really important point that the Shaykh says—we still have the *tashahhud* and the [*sujūd*].

The main thing that Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says is: And by the way, when we say the imām makes *qunūt* in the [*ṣalāh*] we do not mean happy *qunūt*. That's never ever been narrated. Never ever. When we are talking *qunūtʾl-nāzilah* it's not even *duʿāʾ* like some

(1:20:00) kind of narrated *duʿāʾ*. It's a very specific one, you will say in the Arabic according to the vast majority don't ask about an English because that becomes very messy because you are now speaking in the *duʿāʾ*. For example, you will literally say: *Allāhumma irfaʿ hadhaʾl-balāʾ ʿanna*, or *Allāhumma irfaʿ* COVID *ʿanna*. You are literally speaking in Arabic. And you are making a *duʿāʾ* of course, but it is an informal one. And you will be saying: *Allāhumma ʿalayka biʾl-kafarah*, or *Allāhumma ʿalayka biʾl-Yahūd* or *Allāhumma ʿalayka… biʾl-dhāt*, you would be very specific. This is not: O Allāh forgive the believers, O Allāh whatever. You are not making personal *duʿāʾ* here. This is a straight, targeted, focused—20-30 seconds, bam! This is focusing the Muslims' priority, getting them in the mood, sharp, shock, dunk in the cold water, they come out of the prayer they are all mad for it donating, focusing, *daʿwah* starting.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says when we see what he ﷺ did, he made *duʿāʾ* against the people, he made *duʿāʾ* against [the tribes of] Riʿl and Dhakwān and ʿUṣayyah for a whole month. And he ﷺ did some specific ones as well before. He ﷺ cursed some people specifically until Allāh ﷻ revealed *Sūrat Āli ʿImrān*:[19]

﴿لَيْسَ لَكَ مِنَ ٱلْأَمْرِ شَىْءٌ أَوْ يَتُوبَ عَلَيْهِمْ أَوْ يُعَذِّبَهُمْ فَإِنَّهُمْ ظَـٰلِمُونَ ﴿١٢٨﴾﴾

"Whether The Family of Imran God relents towards them or punishes them is not for you [Prophet] to decide: they are wrongdoers." [*Sūrat Āli ʿImrān:*128]

And then the Prophet ﷺ stopped specifically cursing individuals. And that's something which we would try to stick to.

So, this is something which is done in all of the obligatory prayers. Some scholars said not the *Jumuʿah* prayer, because the *Jumuʿah* prayer is not considered to be one of the five daily prayers. There is no analogy to be made between *Jumuʿah* and *Ẓuhr*. *Jumuʿah* is separate to *Ẓuhr*, it's not in place of *Ẓuhr*. It does not take the rulings of *Ẓuhr*. That's why the combining (those scholars that allow the combining of the prayer say) it is not allowed to combine *Jumuʿah* and *ʿAṣr.* It is only *Ẓuhr,* and *ʿAṣr.* which are to be combined because they said *Jumuʿah* it's not like *Ẓuhr.* It is separate prayer that replaces it in entirety. The point is that it is separate. It has no connection. So, they said it's not done in *Jumuʿah*. They also argued that there is no need to do the *qunūt* in *Jumuʿah*. because you would do it in the *duʿāʾ*. So, in the *khuṭbah* you make *duʿāʾ*, at that place and that is replacing the *qunūt*. So, you don't need to do it in that moment either.

Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn says no, there is no evidence to restrict this *duʿāʾ* to only those prayers and not do it in *Jumuʿah*. If he makes *duʿāʾ*, that's fine. But if the matter is

[19] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prophetic Commentary on the Qurʾān, Chapter: "Not for You (O Muḥammad ﷺ, But for Allāh ﷻ) Is the Decision." [Sūrat Āli ʿImrān: 128], ḥadīth no. 4560.*

important, people are there, then might as well make that quick clear *duʿāʾ* in the *Jumuʿah* prayer as well.

And Shaykh says that this is not something which is restricted to the loud prayers (as some of the scholars did). And he said that it should also be said in silent prayers. And it is said out loud because we have *ḥadīth* especially narrated from ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbbās ﵄ and others they were saying *amīn*.[20] And the only they could say *amīn* to the *qunūtʾl-nāzilah* is if they can hear it—and that is in the *ʿAṣr* prayer, that is in the *Ẓuhr* prayer. So, when that situation comes, it is done. And if it is something which is lasting, then it is done continuously.

And how is it done?

It is done exactly at the same time and in the same manner as the *qunūt* of *Witr*. And so therefore, a person should make it hands up (raised) after the *rukūʿ* (possible to do before *rukūʿ* as well, but after *rukūʿ* which is better). And when we say after *rukūʿ*, what do we mean? [After coming up from *rukūʿ* and saying] *samiʿ Allāhu liman ḥamidah Rabbana wa lakaʾl-ḥamd*, [you say your *duʿāʾ*:] *Allāhumma ʿalyaka* or *Allāhuma irfaʿ* and so on. We would go straight into it like that. And then [close the *duʿāʾ* with] *wa ṣalla Allāhu wa sallim wa bārik ʿala nabiyyina Muḥammad*, *Allāhu akbar* and then go into the *sajdah*.

So yes, I think that's that. And as I said most of the *ḥadīth* say are about afterwards. I think that's all I wanted to say.

The next statement is:

والتراويح عشرون ركعة

The *Tarāwīḥ* prayer is twenty units.

If you want me to have a whole load of fun then all I say that the Ḥanbali position as is the position majority of all the scholars is that *Tarāwīḥ* the *sunnah* is twenty. Our position, Shaykh al-ʿUthaymīn's position, Ibn Taymiyyah's position is that this is not the case, that the *sunnah* is eleven with *Witr*—so eight *rakʿah* in twos.[21] This is a beautiful *sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ. This is what he ﷺ used to do.

As the majority of you will be doing it at home this year then let's try to revive that *sunnah* as well. Two, two, two, two and then three *rakʿah Witr*. Make it slow. Make it

[20] *Sunan Abu Dāwūd, The Book of Prayer: Detailed Injunctions About Witr, Chapter: The Qunūt in the (Other) Prayers, hadīth no. 1443.* This narration has been graded as *ḥasan* by al-Albāni.
[21] *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhāri, The Book of Prayer at Night, Chapter: The Prayer of the Prophet ﷺ at Night in Ramaḍān and (in) Other Months, ḥadīth no. 1147.*

nice. No rush. You have got now early nights now. Don't think, '*It's so late now*,' when you are still there at 11:30 pm. Bro! We used to start at 11:30 pm not too long ago. So, a lot of us will be able to go until 12:00 am so let's not lose that spirit. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Q & A

Q (online): Is it permissible to sell digital art as a non-fungible token (NFT)?

A: I have to say that it's the stupidest thing I've heard in my life, NFTs. But I think it is permissible. And I think what's most permissible out of it is digital art. The rest of it, *Allāhu aʿlam.*

Q (online): I was under the impression that the position about not praying over children is an anomalous position. And they prayed over the Prophet ﷺ, so I don't understand this point about it being for the deceased to be forgiven.

A: Just to unpack your point—praying over the Prophet ﷺ does not negate the wider point, especially when all of the evidences are indicating that it is a *duʿāʾ* for the deceased. Because that is exactly what it is. There is a strong argument to be made that this is not a proper prayer. Where is the *rukūʿ*? Where is the *sujūd*? Where is the structure? What is this even?

Then there is the other glaring fact that the person has just been buried, why don't we have the plethora of *ḥadīth* that show us making *duʿāʾ* at the grave, or *duʿāʾ* while we are carrying the person, or *duʿāʾ* afterwards, or the gathering afterwards? Why do you think that so many *bidʿah* of the people that do that? Because it's not there. And they want it there. Their emotional need is there. And we have to try and educate them that's what the *janāzah* prayer is about. Make more use of your *janāzah* prayer. Make your *janāzah* prayer more real.

So, praying over the Prophet ﷺ doesn't negate that at all. Just because he ﷺ was forgiven. In fact, I would argue back and say that none of the Companions knew what to do about the death of the Prophet ﷺ. And even if they did, it would be *ijtihād* of the Companions. Some wanted to bury. Some wanted to wash. Some didn't know, they tried to take his ﷺ clothes off, and they all got knocked out. Allāh ﷻ knocked them all out. He ﷺ died on the Monday and was buried on the Wednesday night.

The death process of the Prophet ﷺ is not to be followed in the way that you may think. So, no I don't think that praying over the Prophet ﷺ means that this is not primarily a deceased thing. But absolutely it's anomalous. There is a difference of opinion. The *ḥadīth* out there on whether Ibrāhīm was prayed over—some *ḥadīth* suggest that he was, some suggest that he wasn't, etc. That's very much a point of debate. But the

(1:30:00) general idea about this concept is it's not in doubt. You can see everything pointing towards it. Now how important that is, what the relevance of that is? Not very important. Not very relevant. So what if a person thinks it's a *duʿāʾ* for the deceased or not? But it has some nice things that come off it.

Q (online): I have recently learned that some people do *ṣalāt al-istikhārah* for more general decisions about life. For example, before applying for a specific job, investing in a type of stock, and travelling. If one made *ṣalāt al-istikhārah* like this, that's almost 1-2 times a week, especially if one is investing in stocks regularly. Please could you share your opinion on when it would be recommended to do *ṣalāt al-istikhārah*?

A: In my opinion, it is not done so regularly that it becomes almost meaningless, or doesn't have its unique, special kind of big decision factor. The problem is though that doesn't give you a frequency. I think it just has to give you the magnitude, that you kind of sense it. Number one.

Number two, there is no problem applying it for the matters that you've said—but not the way that you've said. I don't believe that *ṣalāt al-istikhārah* is a decision-making reality. I've explained this many times before. I strongly believe that it's a prayer of blessing, that the *ṣalāt al-istikhārah* is not there to make the decision for you. It doesn't show you the decision afterwards. It blesses the decision that you make.

You make your decision based upon all of the factors you have around you and then you go ahead with that decision. And you pray the *ṣalāh*. Whether you pray before the act or after the act, doesn't matter. But you are praying to ask Allāh ﷻ to give you the best of that and to keep the evil away because I've gone for it now, '*Yā Allāh* ﷻ, *I have left it in your hands now*.' That's basically what you are saying.

Q (online): A group of friends send their monthly *ṣadaqah* to a PayPal pool created by one of the friends. This money is given to three widows with children on a monthly basis. There is an amount kept as a buffer if in case someone forgets to send their monthly *ṣadaqah*. Is there any *zakāh* upon this *ṣadaqah* money in the pool?

A: What a brilliant question. The answer is no. There is no *zakāh* upon charity.

Q (online): People have made a tradition of praying the *ṣalāt al-tasbīḥ* in congregation. Is there any leeway for this or would this be straight up *bidʿah*?

A: Plenty of leeway. Shaykh Waleed did a *Faith IQ* video on this. Check it out.

Q (online): How do you make *duʿāʾ* against COVID-19, cancer, illness when Allāh ﷻ is the one that willed the illness?

A: Allāh ﷻ sends down the illness and you ask Him to send it back. That's it. That's your *duʿāʾ*.

Student (online): And we pray over the insane, new converts, etc.

Ustādh: Yeah. I am not saying that if a person is the most innocent person, because first of all, how do you know? We pray anyway. We don't know the situation of people, so we pray generally anyway. We do it. But there is an ethos. What actually is it?

Q (online): Does the eight plus three *tarāwīḥ* specific number matter if done after sleeping and pre *Fajr*?

A: In my opinion, as we will come to next year, it is best to stick to one prayer in the night. Whether you do it straight away after *ʿIshāʾ*, like people do now, or you go to sleep and you wake up early. I think both are good. That's a big discussion that we will have in its right time.

Q (online): If a woman is going through a miscarriage, does she stop praying and fasting for its duration? Is there any reward for the difficulty for the woman even though the miscarriage is occurring very early in the pregnancy (since there wasn't an actual growing fetus)?

A: Yes, it is *nifās*, post-partum bleeding. Yes, there is a reward. Definitely. Every *mashaqqah* [has a reward].