

Series:

Arafat Al-Muhammadi's Reckless Approach to the Science of Hadith, His Evil Manners Toward Senior Scholars, and His Deliberate Targeting of Imam Al-Albani—may Allah have mercy on him

By Sheik Bilal Al-Salimi

24 March 2026

https://www.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=122166021086813592&id=61574407779137

Part Two: The Conclusive Proof Refuting the Challenge Against the Hadith of the Two Rak'ahs After the Eid Prayer

[Clarifying the issue, highlighting the inconsistency of the opposing view, and establishing the evidence for the authenticity of the Hadith]

Arafat Al-Muhammadi published this audio recording on his channel approximately four years ago and reposted it on the first day of Eid in the year 1447 AH. Here is the transcript:

“And this is the eleventh question: Is the Sunnah of praying two Rak'ahs at home after the Eid prayer established? And what is the name of this prayer? Is it the Duha prayer?”

The Answer:

“In reality, it is not established that the Prophet—peace and blessings be upon him—prayed two Rak'ahs at home after the Eid prayer.

The Hadith reported regarding this is shadh (anomalous/irregular) and is not authentic. This Hadith was recorded by Ibn Majah and Al-Hakim; perhaps Al-Hakim—may Allah have mercy on him—was the very person who popularized this matter. Why? He explicitly stated in his book Al-Mustadrak that this is a rare ('aziz) Sunnah—specifically, performing two rak'ahs at home after the Eid prayer.

This contradicts the reports found in the Sahihayn (the two authentic collections of Al-Bukhari and Muslim), which state that the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) did not pray either before or after the Eid prayer. When examining the chain of transmission for the narration suggesting otherwise, one finds it to be defective (ma'lul) and inauthentic.

In contrast, the narrations stating that he did not pray before or after Eid are found in the Sahihayn. As for the narration claiming he returned home and prayed two rak'ahs, it is recorded by Ibn Majah and Al-Hakim—as previously mentioned—and while some scholars have authenticated it, it is actually a defective, weak, and indeed munkar (highly objectionable/anomalous) narration.

It is deemed so because it contradicts the established reports in the Sahihayn; specifically, it conflicts with the hadith narrated by Ibn 'Abbas, which states that the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) used to pray neither before nor after the Eid prayer.

The reason for this rejection is that the chain of transmission includes 'Abdullah bin Muhammad bin 'Aqil al-Hashimi, a narrator whom many scholars have deemed weak due to poor memory. Consequently, when his narrations contradict established reports—such as the hadith in the Sahihayn—his account is not accepted.”

I (Bilal al-Salimi) begin, seeking aid from Allah—Mighty and Majestic is He:

All praise be to Allah, Lord of the Worlds, and peace and blessings be upon our Prophet Muhammad, and upon all his family and companions. To proceed:

One of the greatest trials facing the student of knowledge in this era is the audacity shown toward the Hadiths of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) and the disparagement of the scholarly conclusions reached by the Imams of Hadith—done without precision or fairness.

A case in point is the conduct of the individual known as Arafat Al-Muhammadi regarding the issue of prayer following the Eid prayer; he fell into evident methodological and scholarly errors, which we highlight below:

First: Unjustly attacking scholars is a dangerous path and a ruinous descent:

His words reveal a deliberate intent to dissent from and belittle the scholarly conclusions of the Imam and Hadith scholar Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani (may Allah have mercy on him). As noted in the previous episode, this was not done in the spirit of disciplined scholarly inquiry; rather, it was characterized by arrogance and disruptive contention—as if the speaker were addressing his own peers rather than the Imams of this discipline!

By Allah, this is not the methodology of the People of the Sunnah; it is, instead, the path of those who follow their own whims—those in whose hearts knowledge has not taken firm root, leading them to lash out at senior scholars with sharp tongues.

- * Where is the proper etiquette toward scholars?
- * Where is the recognition of their true stature?
- * And where is the restraint that keeps one within one's own limits?

Imam al-Albani (may Allah have mercy on him) was no ordinary figure in this field; he was one of the era's leading Imams of Hadith—acknowledged as such by both supporters and detractors alike. He dedicated his life to serving the Sunnah of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) through verification, source-tracing, and distinguishing between the authentic and the weak.

Whoever disagrees with him should do so based on firm knowledge, evident courtesy, and clear argumentation—not through vague accusations of ignorance, inconsistent rulings of weakness (as will be discussed later), or selective cherry-picking driven by personal desire.

May Allah have mercy on the eminent scholar of Hadith, Muqbil bin Hadi al-Wadi'i. Despite his vast expertise and profound mastery of the science of Hadith, whenever he was asked why he did not refute

Sheikh al-Albani regarding the specific Hadiths or issues where they disagreed, he would say: “Brothers, Sheikh al-Albani is an Imam, and I hold him in great reverence; let those present convey this to those who are absent.”

Such is the etiquette of scholars and the standard of the People of Hadith: recognizing true standing and according people their proper status, while ensuring that scholarly inquiry remains grounded in evidence rather than in audacity or presumption.

Secondly: Inconsistency in the use of Hadith terminology:

Anyone who examines Arafat al-Muhammadi’s response regarding his classification of this Hadith as weak—the link to which is provided in the first comment—will observe a clear inconsistency in his judgment.

He did not settle on a single description; instead, he fluctuated between disparate rulings, describing the Hadith at times as *shadh* (anomalous), at others as *munkar* (denounced), then as *ma’lul* (defective), and at other times simply as *da’if* (weak)!

This fluctuation in applying rulings—given the distinct meanings these terms hold for specialists—is clear evidence of a failure to precisely define the point of contention and a lack of thorough understanding regarding the true nature of these terms. They are not mere synonyms to be used haphazardly; rather, each possesses a specific definition and precise meaning among experts in this field.

Thus, combining these terms in a single ruling on a specific Hadith—without explaining the basis for preferring one over the other or the specific reason for the defect—constitutes a glaring confusion that would be obvious to anyone with even the slightest familiarity with the science of Hadith terminology.

Indeed, it reveals a lack of conceptual clarity, a weakness in precision, and a failure to correctly apply rules to specific cases. *Shādh* (anomalous) has a specific meaning, and *munkar* (denounced/rejected) has another; *mu’allal* (defective/containing a hidden flaw) is a subtle category discussed only by leading critical scholars due to the

obscurity of such defects; and *ḍaʿīf* (weak) is a general descriptor encompassing various aspects.

Thus, conflating these terms regarding a single hadith—without precision or an explanation of the basis for the ruling—indicates confused understanding and a lack of proper conceptualization; indeed, it reveals a lack of mastery over this noble discipline.

Abu Zurʿah was once asked, “What is the proof [or basis] for your identification of a hidden defect (*ʿillah*) in a hadith?” He replied, “The proof is this: ask me about a hadith that contains a hidden defect, and I will state that defect. Then, go to Ibn Warah—meaning Muhammad ibn Muslim ibn Warah—and ask him about it without telling him that you asked me; he will state the defect. Then, go to Abu Hatim, and he will identify the defect. Finally, compare what each of us said about that hadith. If you find a disagreement among us regarding the defect, know that each of us spoke according to his own understanding; but if you find our statements in agreement, then you will realize the true nature of this science.”

The man did so, and their statements agreed; he then declared, “I bear witness that this science is a form of divine inspiration.”

Al-Balqini stated in *Mahāsin al-Iṣṭilāḥ*: “This anecdote recounted by Al-Hakim demonstrates that the master critics distinguish between authentic hadith and those that are unsound, flawed, or straight and upright—just as a money changer distinguishes between high-quality and inferior currency—a task in which many fail to find the right path.”

Thus, the science of *ʿilal* (hidden defects)—in particular—is a deep ocean; none navigate it save the master critics, such as Abu ʿAbdullah Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Al-Bukhari, Muslim, and Ibn Mahdi, ...and Abu Hatim, Abu Zurʿah, and Al-Qattan—culminating with the master critic and eminent scholar Al-Albani (may Allah have mercy on them all).

Whoever speaks on this subject without precision exposes their own shortcomings and reveals their weakness, even if they believe they are doing a good job.

The issue is not merely making a mistake—for everyone errs—but rather presuming to take the lead without mastery, and issuing sweeping judgments without careful scrutiny.

Let Arafat, and anyone who speaks about the Sunnah of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him), fear Allah; for this knowledge is a matter of religion—it is not to be acquired through conjecture nor attained by guesswork.

Thirdly: A lack of fairness in citing the views of critics:

In declaring the narrator Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Aqil weak, Arafat Al-Makkar (the Plotter) relied solely on the criticisms leveled against him—as if the scholarly disagreement regarding him concerned only a single level of status. He disregarded the group of critics who declared him reliable or expressed a more lenient view of him.

Consequently, a number of scholars deemed his hadith to be hasan (sound/good), particularly when he did not stand alone in narrating something objectionable.

This is the very approach adopted by the Imam and Hadith scholar Muhammad Nasir al-Din al-Albani (may Allah have mercy on him) regarding this hadith; he based his classification of the hadith as hasan on a consideration of the scholarly disagreement surrounding the narrator, an examination of the collective views of the critics and the various chains of transmission, and the absence of any critically damaging irregularity (nakarah).

The approach taken by Arafat exemplifies a lack of fairness in analysis. A student of knowledge is duty-bound to gather the views of the critics, fully grasp their nuances, and then weigh them using the scales of knowledge and justice—rather than cherry-picking only what aligns with his own preference while ignoring the rest. Such behavior stems from personal bias rather than the methodology of the scholars of Hadith; for knowledge is not a matter of selective picking, but rather of rigorous verification and fairness.

Imam Muhammad bin Isma'il al-Bukhari (may Allah have mercy on him) said: I heard Ali bin al-Madini say: "Grasping the meanings of Hadith is half of knowledge, and knowing the narrators is the other half" (Source: Tahdhib al-Kamal 1/9).

Thus, understanding the status of narrators is not achieved by merely quoting a single statement or cherry-picking one critique while ignoring another; rather, it requires comprehending the collective views of the Imams, understanding the nuances of their disagreements, and grasping the bases of their rulings.

Whoever fails to master this discipline falls into the trap of blameworthy selectivity; they imagine they are weighing evidence to reach a conclusion, when in reality, they are merely following their own whims.

That is why the scholars warned: "Beware of adopting an opinion first and then searching for evidence to support it; instead, seek the evidence and examine the body of it as a whole, and it will guide you to the sound conclusion."

When Arafat adopted the stance of critiquing Al-Albani as his methodology, he sought evidence to reinforce the position he had descended into, while turning a blind eye—or feigning ignorance—regarding the rest of the evidence.

Consequently, he plunged into a deep abyss filled with the venom of snakes and the stings of hornets. Let the admirers of Imam Al-Albani (may Allah have mercy on him) rejoice, for Arafat has brought this ruin upon himself.

Fourthly: Belittling the sources of the Sunnah:

In the discourse of Arafat—the deceitful one—there appeared an attempt to disparage Sunan Ibn Majah, despite it being one of the six canonical books (al-Kutub al-Sittah) relied upon by scholars universally. He similarly belittled Al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn, despite its well-known status—even if it is not free from some leniency in grading.

This approach is unsound and fraught with malice, deceit, and offense—especially since the context was not a comparison between the Sahihayn and Sunan Ibn Majah, nor was such a comparison a valid criterion for determining the weakness of the specific Hadith in question.

For not every Hadith that contains an addition found in the Sunan al-Arba'ah (the Four Sunan collections) but is absent from the Sahihayn is thereby rendered weak.

The presence of an error—or errors—in certain hadiths within Sunan Ibn Majah, the other four major collections, or other books of the Sunnah does not warrant rejecting the work in its entirety or diminishing its value. The standard applied by scholars of hadith is the authenticity and established validity of the chain of transmission (isnad), not merely the title or status of the book itself.

Scholars accepted and benefited from these compilations while fully aware of their contents; they approached them with a methodology of critical verification and discernment, rather than with malicious intent aimed at disparagement or dismissal.

The proper course is to follow their example: accepting what is authentic and rejecting what is not established, while upholding the esteem of the Sunnah collections, their compilers, and their scholarly standing.

Fifth: Takhrij (Source Citation) and Tahqiq (Verification):

The hadith was recorded by Ibn Majah in his Sunan [1/295, no. 1290], who stated: Muhammad ibn Yahya narrated to us; al-Haytham ibn Jamil narrated to us; Ubayd Allah ibn 'Amr [al-Raqqi] narrated to us; 'Abd Allah ibn Muhammad ibn 'Aqil narrated to us, from 'Ata' ibn Yasar, from Abu Sa'id al-Khudri, who said: "The Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) used to offer no prayer before the Eid prayer; however, upon returning to his home, he would pray two rak'ahs." Ahmad recorded it in al-Musnad [17/323, no. 11225] with similar wording, as did al-Hakim in al-Mustadrak [2/66, no. 1114] via the chain of Ubayd Allah ibn 'Amr al-Raqqi from 'Abd Allah ibn Muhammad ibn 'Aqil.

Al-Hakim stated: “A rare Sunnah [tradition], and with an authentic chain of narration (isnad),” and al-Dhahabi concurred with him.

Furthermore, it was recorded by Ibn Abi Shaybah in al-Musannaf (3/8, no. 5645), al-Bazzar in al-Musnad (1/312), Abu Ya’la in al-Musnad (2/500), Ibn al-Mundhir in al-Awsat (4/297), Ibn ‘Adi in al-Kamil (4/129), Ibn Khuzaymah in al-Sahih (1469), Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in al-Istidhkar (7/38, no. 9570), and al-Bayhaqi in al-Sunan al-Kubra (3/424)—all via ‘Abd Allah ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Aqil.

However, while some narrated it in an abridged form and others in full, the source (makhrāj) of the hadith remains the same; thus, each narration is not considered a separate hadith, as is established in the principles of hadith scholars.

Al-Bazzar remarked after recording the hadith: “We do not know of it being narrated from Abu Sa’id except through this chain of narration.”

I say: The hadith revolves around ‘Abd Allah ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Aqil, and this is a hasan (sound/good) chain of narration. Given the well-known difference of opinion regarding ‘Abdullah bin Muhammad bin ‘Aqil—whose narrations are considered hasan (sound/good), God willing—it is appropriate to present the views of the critics regarding him in full.

This will clarify to the esteemed reader how authoritative scholars—including the “Imam of Imams” of our era, Al-Albani (may Allah have mercy on him)—concluded that the prevailing view is that his narrations are hasan, subject to certain details that will follow.

Al-Mizzi stated in Tahdhib al-Kamal [16/87]: (Bukhari [in al-Adab al-Mufrad], Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi, Ibn Majah): ‘Abdullah bin Muhammad bin ‘Aqil bin Abi Talib, al-Qurashi al-Hashimi, Abu Muhammad al-Madani. His mother was Zaynab al-Sughra, daughter of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib.

Muhammad bin Sa’d listed him among the fourth generation (tabaqah) of the people of Medina, stating: “He used to narrate munkar

(disapproved/anomalous) hadiths; his narrations are not used as evidence, yet he possessed extensive knowledge.”

Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali al-Hulwani reported—citing ‘Ali bin al-Madini, who cited Bishr bin ‘Umar al-Zahrani—that Malik did not narrate from him. ‘Ali added: “And Yahya bin Sa’id did not narrate from him.”

Ya’qub bin Shaybah reported—citing ‘Ali bin al-Madini—that Malik did not include Ibn ‘Aqil or Ibn Abi Farwah in his books.

And in another place, he said, citing Ali ibn al-Madini: Sufyan ibn Uyaynah said, “I saw him talking to himself, so I concluded that his mental state had deteriorated.”

Ali added, “Neither Malik ibn Anas nor Yahya ibn Sa’id al-Qattan narrated from him.” Ya’qub remarked, “And these two were among those who were highly selective regarding narrators.” Ya’qub stated, “Ibn Aqil is truthful, yet his narrations suffer from severe weakness.”

Sa’id ibn Nusayr said, “I asked Yahya ibn Ma’in, ‘Ibn Uyaynah used to say there were four men from Quraysh whose narrations should be avoided.’ He asked, ‘Who are they?’ I replied, ‘So-and-so, Ali ibn Zayd, Yazid ibn Abi Ziyad, and Ibn Aqil—who is the fourth.’ Yahya said, ‘Yes.’ I asked, ‘Which of them do you consider the most problematic?’ He replied, ‘So-and-so, then Ali ibn Zayd, then Yazid ibn Abi Ziyad, then Ibn Aqil.’”

‘Amr ibn ‘Ali said, “I heard both Yahya and ‘Abd al-Rahman narrating from ‘Abd Allah ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Aqil, noting that people held differing opinions regarding him.”

Abu Ma’mar al-Qati’i said, “Ibn Uyaynah did not regard his memory favorably.” Al-Humaydi reported from Sufyan: “There was an issue with Ibn Aqil’s memory, so I disliked meeting him.”

Salih ibn Ahmad ibn Hanbal reported from Ali ibn al-Madini: “We mentioned the weakness of ‘Asim ibn ‘Ubayd Allah in the presence of Yahya ibn Sa’id. Yahya said, ‘In my view, he is on par with Ibn Aqil.’”

Hanbal ibn Ishaq reported from Ahmad ibn Hanbal: “Ibn Aqil’s narrations are munkar [rejected/unreliable].” ‘Abd Allah ibn Ahmad ibn Hanbal reported from Yahya ibn Ma’in: “The narrations of these four do not constitute authoritative proof: Suhayl ibn Abi Salih, al-’Ala’ ibn ‘Abd al-Rahman, ‘Asim ibn ‘Ubayd Allah, and Ibn Aqil.” It was asked, “What about Muhammad ibn ‘Amr?” He replied, “He is superior to them.”

‘Abbas al-Duri reported from Yahya ibn Ma’in: “Ibn Aqil’s narrations are not used as evidence.” Mu’awiyah ibn Salih and Ahmad ibn Sa’d ibn Abi Maryam reported from Yahya: “He is weak in narration.” Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj said: I asked Yahya ibn Ma’in, “Do you prefer ‘Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Aqil or ‘Asim ibn ‘Ubayd Allah?” He replied, “I do not favor either of them”—meaning regarding their standing in Hadith.

Abu Bakr ibn Abi Khaythama reported from Yahya ibn Ma’in: “He is not highly regarded.” Al-Mufaddal ibn Ghassan al-Ghallabi reported from Yahya ibn Ma’in: “Ibn ‘Aqil and ‘Asim ibn ‘Ubayd Allah are alike in the weakness of their Hadith.”

Muhammad ibn ‘Uthman ibn Abi Shaybah reported from ‘Ali ibn al-Madini: “He was weak.” Ahmad ibn ‘Abdullah al-’Ijli said: “A Medinan Tabi’i (Successor); his Hadith is acceptable.”

Ibrahim ibn Ya’qub al-Jawzjani said: “One should withhold judgment regarding him; most of what he narrates is gharib (uncommon/singular).” Abu Zur’ah said: “There are inconsistencies in the chains of transmission (isnad) attributed to him.”

Abu Hatim said: “His Hadith is soft (weak); he is not strong, nor is he someone whose Hadith is used as authoritative proof, though his Hadith is recorded; he is preferable to Tammam ibn Najih.”

Al-Nasa’i said: “Weak.” Abu Bakr ibn Khuzaymah said: “I do not use him as an authority due to his poor memory.” Al-Hakim Abu Ahmad said: “Ahmad ibn Hanbal and Ishaq ibn Ibrahim used to cite his Hadith as authority, though he is not considered solidly reliable.”

Al-Tirmidhi said: “Truthful (saduq), though some scholars criticized him regarding his memory. I heard Muhammad ibn Isma’il say: ‘Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Ishaq ibn Ibrahim, and al-Humaydi used to cite Ibn ‘Aqil’s Hadith as authority.’ Muhammad ibn Isma’il added: ‘His Hadith is of acceptable standard.’” Abu Ahmad ibn ‘Adi said: “A group of well-known, trustworthy narrators reported from him; he is better than Ibn Sam’an, and his Hadith is recorded.”

Khalifah ibn Khayyat said: “He died after the year 140 AH.” Muhammad ibn Sa’d said: Muhammad ibn ‘Umar stated: “He died in Medina before the uprising of Muhammad ibn ‘Abdullah ibn Hasan,” and Muhammad ibn ‘Abdullah ibn Hasan rose up in the year 145 AH. Al-Bukhari narrated from him in Al-Adab and Af’al al-Ibad, as did Abu Dawud, Al-Tirmidhi, and Ibn Majah.

Al-Hafiz stated in Tahdhib al-Tahdhib: Al-Uqayli said: He was a virtuous, righteous man known for his devotion to worship, though there were issues regarding his memory. Ibn Khirash said: People criticized him. Al-Saji said: He was truthful, but not precise in Hadith. Mas’ud al-Sijzi reported from Al-Hakim: He lived a long life, and his memory deteriorated; consequently, he would narrate based on conjecture.

In another place, [Al-Hakim] said: His Hadith were sound. Al-Khatib said: He had a poor memory. Ibn Hibban said: He had a very poor memory; he would narrate based on mistaken assumptions, presenting reports incorrectly, so his narrations must be avoided. Ibn Qani’ dated his death to the year 142 AH.

Al-Ajurri reported from Abu Dawud: He used to reside in Al-Hirah. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said: He is more reliable than anyone who criticized him. [Al-Hafiz commented:] This is an exaggeration.

Al-’Ayni stated in Maghani al-Akhyar: Ibn Sa’d mentioned him in the fourth stratum of the people of Medina, saying: “His narrations are munkar (rejected/anomalous); his Hadith are not used as evidence, though he possessed extensive knowledge.”

Ibn al-Madini reported from Bishr ibn ‘Umar al-Dahrani: Malik did not narrate from him. Ibn al-Madini added: Yahya ibn Sa’id did not

narrate from him either. Ya'qub and Ibn 'Aqil said: He was truthful (saduq), but his Hadith suffered from severe weakness. Yahya ibn Ma'in said: His Hadith do not constitute a valid proof (hujjah); he also said: He is weak in Hadith; and: He is not highly regarded.

Al-'Ijli said: A Medinan of the Tabi'in generation whose Hadith are acceptable. Abu Zur'ah said: There are discrepancies in the chains of transmission (isnad) attributed to him. Abu Hatim said: His Hadith are weak (layyin); he is not strong, nor is he someone whose Hadith are used as evidence, though his Hadith are recorded; he is preferable to Tammam ibn Najih.

Al-Nasa'i said: Weak. Al-Tirmidhi said: Truthful (saduq). Some scholars have commented on his memory. Al-Bukhari said: "His hadith is acceptable" (muqarib al-hadith). Al-Waqidi stated: "He died in Medina before the uprising of Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hasan," and Muhammad bin Abdullah's uprising took place in the year 145 AH.

Hadiths narrated by him were included by Al-Bukhari in Al-Adab and Af'al al-Ibad, as well as by Abu Dawud, Al-Tirmidhi, Ibn Majah, and Abu Ja'far al-Tahawi.

Al-Hafiz said of him in Al-Taqrib: "Truthful (saduq) in his hadith but 'soft' (layyin); it is said his memory deteriorated towards the end of his life."

When Imam Ibn Abd al-Hadi mentioned the hadith (i.e., the hadith of Ibn Majah) in Al-Muharrar, he said: "On the authority of Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Aqil, from Ata' bin Yasar, from Abu Sa'id al-Khudri, who said: 'The Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) used to offer no prayer before the Eid prayer; but when he returned to his home, he would offer two rak'ahs.' Narrated by Ibn Majah; and there is a difference of opinion regarding 'Ibn Aqil'."

I say: In summary:

The chain of narration (isnad) for this hadith is hasan (sound/good). Regarding Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Aqil, the prevailing view is that expressed by Al-Dhahabi: "The hadith of Abdullah bin

Muhammad bin Aqil is at the level of hasan,” subject to the details mentioned by Al-Hafiz in Talkhis al-Habir (2/108): “He had poor memory; his hadith is suitable for corroboration (mutaba’at). If he narrates it uniquely (infirad), it is considered hasan; but if he contradicts [others], it is not accepted.”

He is indeed the sole narrator of the phrase: “When he finished his prayer, he offered two rak’ahs.” This might appear to contradict what is reported in the Sahihayn (the two authentic collections)—that he prayed neither before nor after it—but the two accounts can be reconciled (as will be explained later) by interpreting the negation as referring to prayer [performed] in the prayer ground, and establishing the performance of two rak’ahs at home after returning.

A group of distinguished scholars have deemed the hadith hasan (sound/good), including:

1- Al-Hafiz classified its chain of narration (isnad) as hasan in Al-Fath, and Al-Hakim said: “This is a rare (‘aziz) Sunnah with a sound (sahih) chain of narration.”

2- Al-Busiri said in Al-Zawa’id (1/423): “This is a hasan chain of narration.”

3- Al-Mubarakfuri endorsed this classification in Tuhfat al-Ahwadhi, stating: “I say: This hadith of Abu Sa’id was recorded by Ibn Majah; Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar deemed its chain of narration hasan in Fath al-Bari, and noted that Al-Hakim declared it sahih.”

4- Ibn al-Mulaqqin (may Allah have mercy on him) said in Al-Badr al-Munir: “Its chain of narration is good (jayyid).”

5- Al-Munawi said in Al-Taysir bi-Sharh al-Jami’ al-Saghir: “Its chain of narration is hasan.”

6- Imam Al-Albani (may Allah have mercy on him) classified the hadith as hasan in Sahih al-Jami’ al-Saghir and Sahih Ibn Majah. In Al-Irwa’, he stated: “Also reported regarding this topic from Abu Sa’id al-Khudri with the wording: ‘The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) used not to pray anything before the Eid prayer; but when he returned to his home, he would pray two rak’ahs.’ Recorded by Ibn Majah (1293), Ahmad (3/28 and 40)—with similar wording—and Al-Hakim (1/297), from whom Al-Bayhaqi narrated the second half. Al-Hakim said: ‘It has a sound (sahih) chain of narration,’ and Al-Dhahabi agreed with him. I say: It is merely

hasan, because there is some criticism regarding Ibn ‘Aqil’s memory. For this reason, Al-Hafiz in *Bulugh al-Maram* and Al-Busiri in *Al-Zawa’id* (f. 80/2) stated: ‘This is a hasan chain of narration.’ The reconciliation between this hadith and the aforementioned hadiths that negate the performance of prayer after Eid is that the negation applies specifically to prayer at the prayer ground (musalla), as Al-Hafiz indicated in *Al-Talkhis* (p. 144). And Allah knows best.”

Sixth: Refuting the claim of contradiction between the hadiths:

This unsound claim led Arafat to deem the hadith of Abu Sa’id munkar (denounced/rejected). He initially judged ‘Abdullah bin Muhammad bin ‘Aqil to be weak, then ruled that the hadith contradicted what is found in the *Sahihayn* (the two authentic collections of Al-Bukhari and Muslim). Thus, in his view—being weak and contradictory—the hadith was deemed munkar. How astonishing!

The hadith of Abu Sa’id al-Khudri states: “The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) used not to pray anything before the Eid prayer; but when he returned to his home, he would pray two rak’ahs.”

As for the report in the *Sahihayn* from Ibn ‘Abbas, he said: “The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) went out on the day of Fitr and prayed two rak’ahs”—meaning he prayed the Eid prayer as two rak’ahs—”praying neither before nor after them. Then he went to the women, accompanied by Bilal, and commanded them to give charity; so they began to cast [their jewelry]—a woman would cast her earring and her necklace.”

Arafat claimed there was a contradiction between the hadith of Abu Sa’id and the hadith of Ibn ‘Abbas. However, the correct view is that there is no contradiction; rather, the two can be reconciled:

—The negation of prayer in the phrase “praying neither before nor after them” refers to the *Sunnah* (voluntary) prayer, and this negation applies specifically to prayer at the Eid musalla (prayer ground).

—The affirmation of the two rak’ahs in the hadith of Abu Sa’id refers to prayer performed at home after returning, as explicitly stated in the text.

This is a matter of reconciling evidences—a fundamental principle among Ahl al-Sunnah (the People of the Sunnah)—whereby acting upon both texts is preferable to disregarding one of them. Ibn Khuzayma affirmed the recommended nature of these two rak’ahs in his Sahih, titling a section: “Chapter on the Recommendation of Praying at Home After Returning from the Musalla [Prayer Ground].” Al-San’ani, in Al-Subul, also held the view that this practice is prescribed, stating: “The hadith indicates the prescription of praying two rak’ahs at home after the Eid prayer.”

Furthermore, Ibn Rajab stated in Fath al-Bari (9/94): “It was narrated that Ibn Mas’ud used to pray at home after Eid, and this is the position held by Ahmad and Ishaq.”

In conclusion, I state:

An examination of Arafat’s words reveals a flagrant transgression against authoritative scholars, singling them out for rebuttal in matters where they had correctly identified the truth and grasped the very essence of the reality.

This approach cannot be considered scholarly ijtiḥad—as one person claimed (and what a wretched vehicle for one’s argument such a claim is)—but rather an act of insolence toward the people of knowledge and a violation of the etiquette of research and fairness.

You have witnessed his methodology, which involves:

- * Declaring a hadith weak without regard for the valid differences of opinion among critics.
- * Disregarding the views of scholars who classified the hadith as hasan (sound/good) or relied upon it.
- * Confusing precise scholarly terminologies.
- * Belittling the sources of the Sunnah.
- * Overlooking established Sunan (prophetic practices) in order to advance his own shortsighted viewpoint.

* Claiming a contradiction between hadiths—where the fundamental principle is to reconcile them—and subsequently deeming the hadith in question munkar (denounced/anomalous).

All of this demonstrates a fundamental scholarly weakness and adherence to an unorthodox approach to criticism—one far removed from the proper recourse to evidence, the gathering of scholarly opinions, and the fair weighing of those views against one another.

Instead, he turned to cherry-picking only what suited his own inclinations, heedless of the Almighty’s command: “And when you speak, be just” [An-Nisa: 58].

Persistently seeking to refute scholars and deliberately opposing them on matters where they were correct poses a danger to both knowledge and students. It tarnishes the image and standing of scholars in the eyes of the general public, undermines the proper methodology of scholarly inquiry, sows confusion among followers, and shakes confidence in the sound Salafi methodology.

Ultimately, true success comes only through Allah’s guidance; in Him we seek aid and place our trust. He is the Guarantor of all goodness, our Sufficiency, and the Best Disposer of affairs.

Written by:

Abu al-Abbas Bilal bin Abdul-Ghani al-Salimi—may Allah pardon him.

Alexandria

Tuesday morning, 5 Shawwal 1447 AH.