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ABSTRACT
From the perspective of Shiite jurisprudence, saying amen is not permitted in prayer while Sunni jurists believe that it is obligatory. Shia jurists refer to some general and specific hadiths to announce the prohibition; when the tendency is to abomination, on concludes from the integration of the related evidences about amen. The weak evidence of some narrations in Sunni references is the main reason for breach of their theory.
This article tries to explain the evidence and debates from both perspectives and prove the rule of its prohibition based on the principle of prayers detained status.
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INTRODUCTION

The importance of discussions on the subject of amen in prayer and the jurisprudential disagreements among Muslim jurists and its effects is obvious. Sunni jurists announce its permission but great Shiite scholars insist on its prohibition. This article tries to explain and determine policy of Muslim jurists through inference of precepts of saying amen in prayers after reading Al-Hamd sura in eight discussions.
Terminology of the Word Amen

In relation to its meaning, Taj al-Arous have presented two items. First, it is a name of God; this meaning has some problems from terminologists. Second, it is a sentence combined of a noun and a verb including "اﻟّﻠﮭﻢّ اِﺳﺘَﺠﺐ" or "ﮐﺬﻟﮏ ﻓَﻠﯿَﮑُﻦ" (Zobeidi, 18/26 & 27).

According to its rhythm, Razi al-Din Astar Abadi regards it a Syriac word meaning, “Do it”. Then, he mentions that it may be Arabic because it has been used as “أﻣﯿﻦ” which may be in the rhythm of “ﻓﻌﯿﻞ” (Razi al-Din Astar Abadi, 70/3 & 71).

In Al-Tahqiq, the reason for its briefing has been attributed to the language of Hijaz and its amplification is attributed to Bani Amer tribe (Mustafavi, 1/152).

Saying Amen after al-Hamd in Prayer from the Shi'ite perspectives

Discussion One: Idea of Imamiya Jurists

Thorough investigation into the sources of Shiite jurisprudence shows that all Shiite jurists announce the prohibition of saying amen after al-Hamd in prayer. Meanwhile, some few jurists argue that it is abomination due to the agreement among all relevant narrations about saying amen.

The ideas presented by Shiite jurists are categorized in eight general groups; they are discussed in the following.

First group: Theory of Tasking and Legislative Prohibition to Say Amen Based on Specific Arguments about Saying Amen

Most Shiite jurists are categorized in this group. The proponents of this theory are Tabatabaei Haeri (179/3), Vahid Behbahani (248/7), Sahib Jawahir (Najafi, 5/1), Seyyed Kazem Yazdi (Tabatabaei Yazdi, 720/1). Moreover, Imam Khomeini (190/1), Ayatollah Khameniei (86/1), Seyyed Abdol A’la Sabzevari (215/7), Seyyed Taqi Qomi (Tabatabaei Qomi, 43/5-47), and Muhammad Taqi Bahjat Fomani (228) are the contemporary jurists believing in this theory. Vahid Khorasani has the same idea in this regard; but he announces the prohibition in some cases in terms of precaution not obligation (Vahid Khorasani, 215/2). In addition, Seyyed Ali Sistani argues that the prohibition of saying amen here is certain for follower prayers; for, non-followers, it is precaution. Finally, he recalls that the prayer is breached if the person says it as a certain word belonging to prayer (Hosseini Sistani, 237/1).

Second group: Theory of Tasking and Legislative Prohibition to Say Amen Based on General Arguments about Invalidation of Prayer due to Entrance of Human Speech

Sheikh Tousi (332/1), Seyyed Norteza (Sharif Razi, 144), and Allameh Helli (Helli, Tazkara al-Foqaha, 162/3), and Fazil Hindi (15/4) believe in this theory.
Third group: Theory of Tasking prohibition and legislative non-prohibition of saying Amen
Amoli believes in this theory. He argues since the prohibition is due to an affair outside the prayer, saying amen is not an invalidator of prayer (Mosavi Amoli, 374/3). The idea of Bahrani (in Al-Hadaeq) is close to this theory (Bahrani, 202/8).

Fourth group: Abomination of Saying Amen
This theory is proposed exactly by jurists such as Feiz Kashani (129/1-130) and Muhaqiq Ardebili (235/2).

Fifth group: Abomination of Saying Amen
This group belongs to jurist to whom the idea is attributed but it is not available in their books. This group includes Ibn jonaie Eskafi and Abu al-Salah Halabi (Amoli, 120/7-121).

Sixth group: The Ideas close to Abomination of Saying Amen
It is due to agreement among evidences about saying amen; this idea is found in Al-Mo’tabar by Mohaqiq Helli (Mohaqiq Helli, 186/2).

Seventh group: The Ideas of Prohibition of Saying Amen due to circumstances
The idea of saying amen has been explained in different situation by this group of jurists. If the worshiper says it just because it is an orison, it has no problem. If he says it because it is a part of the prayer or he has no intention for orison, he has committed sin and the prayer is breached. Ayatollah Khoie (Encyclopedia of Imam al-Khoei, 510/15-514; Menhaj al-Salehin, 193/2) and javad Tabrizi (197/1) are the advocates of this idea.

Eighth group: The Ideas of Prohibition of Saying Amen due to circumstances
The reason is mentioned in advance. The difference is the fact that this group focus on other parts of the prayer. After al-hamd, it is absolutely prohibited. Fazel Lankarani (186-187) and Hosseini Rowhani (540/4-541) have proposed this idea in their books.
After introducing the groups, their evidences are presented in the following.

Discussion Two: First type of Shiite Evidence: Arguments by Most Shiite Jurists Known as General evidence
Some Shiite jurists have regarded amen as a kind of orison but others has regarded it as human words; thus, they have different processes in the inference of its prohibition. In this manner, prohibition of saying amen is proved from three evidences: general documents, specific sayings, and the agreement among most jurists. This section presents the three types.
1. The first narration is from Abu Hamid Saedi. Here, he, as a companion of the Holy Prophet, describes the quality of the prophet’s prayer and explains it for ten of other companions; they accept his words without any disagreement. He state, “…Then, the prophet
said ‘Takbir’ and stood, he let the organs to relax on their positions; next, he real al-Hamd and said takbir…” (Mohaqiq Helli, 185/). Here, he does not refer to saying amen at all.

2. This is a narration by Hamad ibn Isa. Meeting Imam Sadeq, he was asked to say prayer in front of Imam Sadeq but Imam Sadeq did not approved his praying because it was not conform to the rituals required for a Muslim. Then Imam said the prayer with full details (Hur Amili, 459/5 & 460). Hamad ibn Isa describes in this narration the quality of Imam Sadeq’s prayer. There is no sign of saying amen in the explanation. However, Hamad’s narration has been reported in different words (Hur Amili, 461/5; tousi, 83/2; koleini, 311/3).

Discussion Third: Second Type of Shiite Evidence: Arguments by Most Shiite Jurists Known as Specific evidence

1. Jamil narrates from Imam Sadeq tha he states, “When you have been followed the Imam of prayer and he read al-Hamd, say "مَتَّى أَن تَنَشُّطُ" ” not amen after he finished” (Hur Amili, 67/6).

2. Moaviya ibn Vahab narrates when he ask Imam Sadeq, “May I say amen when the Imam of prayer finished al-Hamd? He answered: They are Jews and Christians; he did not answer about the question” (Ibid).

3. A part of a narration by Zarareh from Imam Sadeq, “and when you finished reading al-Hamd, never say amen; you can say "مَتَّى أَن تَنَشُّ" if you like” (Ibid, 68/6).

4. Ibn Abi Amir quotes from Jamil that he asked Imam Sadeq about saying amen after al-Hamd, which is said by most people in prayer, he answered: it is nice but say it in low voice. This narration has been read in different forms and requires much discussions. It is explained fully in following.

5. It is known by most people and jurist that can be regarded as a valid document (Behbahani, 247/7).

Discussion Four: Third Type of Shiite Evidence, Other Hadiths and general evidences

1. It is narrates from the Holy prophet, “Indeed, it is not true to say any human speech in this prayer” (Mohadith Noori, 427/5).

2. The Messenger of Allah said, “Indeed prayer is only for Takbir, worship, and reading Quran” (Ibn Abi Jomhour Ehsaei, 85/3).

3. Muhammad ibn Moslen narrates from Imam Sadeq, “If the prayer utters a word, he should pray again” (Hur Amili, 282/7).

Discussion Five: Overview of the Discussions by Shiite Jurists

According to the evidences provided by the first type, it is clear that saying amen has no place for the Infallibles and there is no sign of any approval by them. Since worship has a stopping
nature, the prayers should avoid saying it (Mohaqiq Helli, 186/2). In this stage, the is no
disagreement among jurists about its prohibition. In addition to no-approval in the other stage,
the rejection of this action has been proved for many Shiite jurists. Some has regarded the
breach of prayer due to human speech; then, they have announced the invalidity of prayer after
saying amen. It can be proposed in brief that a prayer with human speech is invalid and amen
is human speech. Thus, a prayer with amen is invalid (Ibid, 185/2; Allameh Helli, Tazkara al-
Foqaha, 162/3; Sharif Morteza, 145).

Part One: The Arguments Proposed by Believers in Prohibition

Tasking Prohibition of Saying Saying Amen: the presence of first four narrations and the
agreements confirm the prohibition of saying amen (Mosavi Khoei, Encyclopedia of Imam al-
Khoei, 510/15) because the inhibiting sentence indicates the prohibition (Akhond Khorasani,
149).

There is no problem in the first narration by Jamil in terms of accuracy and documentation.
Ayatollah Khoei states, “Although the narration is about the followers of a prayer but it is a
sentence about individual persons and Imam since they have the same criteria” (Mosavi
Khoei, Encyclopedia of Imam al-Khoei, 511/15). Considering the narration by Zarareh and
Muhammad Halabi, some jurists comment on its problematic documentation (Ibid, 512);
others have accepted it and they use it as a reference. Ayatollah Khoei believes that saying
amen is absolutely forbidden and it invalidates the praying because there is no reason for its
legitimacy; moreover, reliable evidences are in contradiction to it.

He adds in the explanation of the narration that, “it is indicated from the appearance of the
verses and their explanations that Imam’s speech targets the performance of Ahl Sunna that
they say amen as a rule in praying; thus, saying amen by this intention is forbidden. Thus, if it
is said just because it is a orison, it has no problem, especially when it is somewhere other
than after al-Hamd (Ibid, 511). However, many jurists have not accepted this argument with
these references (Fazel Lankarani, 186-187; Hosseini Rowhani, 540/4-541).

Legislative Prohibition of Saying Saying Amen: After proving the tasking prohibition of
saying saying amen, mos jurists have accepted its legislative prohibition (Allameh Helli,
Tazkara al-Foqaha, 162/3; Mosavi Khoei, Menhaj al-Salehin, 193/2; Javad Tabrizi, 197/1).
Ayatollah Borujerdi states, inhibiting part of an action lead us to the idea that doing the part
invalidates the whole action. With these words, he rejects the idea proposed by the author of
al-Madarik indicating that amen is not part of the prayer. He adds that if the narrations by
common people about saying amen have been accepted by him as a document, it was true,
and the explanation was correct. In this manner, saying amen after could be a tradition inside
prayer after al-Hamd either in form of as a part or as a favorable action. Nevertheless, the Ahl al-Bayt’s speech refers to the idea that saying amen is not a part of prayer and it is outside of the prophethood traditions. Thus, you should at least avoid it (Borujerdi, 6/196-197).

**Explaining the narrations by Mo’aviya nib Vahab and Jamil:** After accepting the documentation of narrations, there are two possibilities of Mo’aviya narration:

**First Possibility:** Imam’s refusal to answer Mo’aviya was due to his Taqiya; thus, he refused to present a direct answer to Mo’aviya and he deliberately behaved as if Mo’aviya had answered about the last verse of the dura al-Hamd. Accordingly, Imam did not consent to say amen after al-Hamd since he did not present a direct answer to Mo’aviya. There is no rational reason for refusing to answer the question (Mosavi Khoei, Encyclopedia of Imam al-Khoei, 513/15).

**Second Possibility:** Imam refers to the believers in saying amen by saying Jews and Christians. In other words, he regarded them as Jews and Christians. Vahid Behbahani argues that this narration explicitly utters that Imam Sadeq was not satisfied of saying amen so that he uses these words to indicate it and regards its tellers as Jews and Christians (Behbahani, 7/245). In any case, this narration signifies Imam Sadeq’s dissatisfaction of saying amen.

In terms of the second narration by Jamil, it seems that the narration has an accurate documentation and it is valid in this regard (Sabzevari, 7/215; Mosavi Khoei, Encyclopedia of Imam al-Khoei, 15/513). Therefore, the discussions by jurists rising about the content of the narration; there are some disagreements about the positive indication of the narration.

**First Controversy:** The narration’s pronunciation is subject of conflicts; in this way, the authority of hadith is questioned (Sabzevari, 7/215). There are two forms of pronunciation for the narration:

**First form:** the word “” in the narration is negative, the verb “” is singular, and the verb “” is in past tense; accordingly, the meaning of the narration is “I do not seen favorable to say amen, and he lower his voice after these words.” It is contrary to the form presented in discussion three of this article.

**Second form:** The word “” is used as an idiomatic question in which the speaker means to say the answer is negative; thus, the narration means, “What has made is good? And Imam lowers his voice while saying this sentence.”

**Second Controversy:** It proposes the possibility of taqiya; therefore, as Imam’s speech is exactly what has been translated in the fifth discussion, this narration is issued in the case of taqiya with respect to other narrations by Ahl al-Bayt in this regard, the agreement among most jurists, and the behavior of all Shiites (Mosavi Khoei, Encyclopedia of Imam al-Khoei,
Ayatollah Khoei has accepted this idea and states, “It is far that other possibilities for pronouncing the sentence to be correct because in this regard the word “اﺧﻔﺾ” has been used by the Arabs in this meaning.

Vahid Behbahani has added two other dimensions to these dimensions; they reinforce the possibility of taqiya. First, the order to lower voice when saying amen by Imam is not consistent with the circumstances because if he says amen is favorable, it was better to order to utter it loudly not in lower voice since most ahl Sunna say it loudly. In the case of order to lower the voice, Shia would be endangering. Second, there are many narrations that lead us to put behavior of common people when there are two possibilities of an action (Behbahani, 7/246 & 247). Conclusion, the second narration by Jamil does not at least indicate anything the goodness of saying amen and its approval by Ahl al-Bayt.

**Part Two: The Arguments Proposed by Believers in the Permission of Saying Amen**

Mohaqiq Ardebili argues that the agreement on the prohibition of saying amen has not been proved; then, he he questions the evidence for Jamil’s first narration that signifies the prohibition. He states that the second narration has a correct documentation. Moreover, the popularity of its prohibition and the principle of precaution is considered by him. Finally, he arranges that making a conclusion and announcing its abomination is better than regarding it as taqiya. The requirement for principle of acquittance can be an evidence for it. Besides, it is not regarded by him as an instance of human speech and most evidences include it in the favorable status of orison. It is noteworthy that he does not accept its legislative prohibition in the case of its tasking prohibition because he rejects the principle of invalidating an action due to the presence of a prohibition in it (Mohaqiq Ardebili, 2/ 234-237).

**Saying Amen from the Perspective of Sunni Scholars**

**First Discussion: Referring to Various Statements**

It should be noted that the statements by great Sunni scholars contain many contradictions; but they refer to favorable status of saying amen.

Abdorahman ibn Muhammad Juzairi argues that saying amen is obligatory in Hanafi, Hanbali, and Shafei sects; but is is favorable in Malekiya. They mention two conditions for its obligation including not a long silence after finishing al-Hamd and not sayning any orison after al-Hamd. Then, he explains Malekiya idea in these words, “Saying amen is definitely favorable unless for followers when they are in a prayer with low voice and they hear Imam’s voice who saying “ولاالضالين” or he is reading al-Hamd in the prayer for a secret” (Juzairi, 1/ 283). It is understood from the words of Juzairi that saying amen for follower is obligatory due to these two conditions; in other conditions, saying amen is favorable.
Ala al-Din Samarqandi, a Hanafi scholar, states most scholars believe that the praying person must say amen after reading al-Hamd. There is no difference whether he is Imam or follower. However, some scholars believe in the favorable status of saying amen without any obligation.

Malik ibn Anas’s speech suggests that the follower should say it but it is not an obligation for individual prayer and Imam (Samarqandi, 1/132). Ibn Abi al-Khayr Emrani, a Shafei scholar, has regarded it as an obligation in his book (Emrani Yamani, 2/191-192).

Al-Tha’labi al-Baghdadi, a Maleki scholar, argues that saying amen after al-Hamd is obligation for both follower and Individual praying person but he states about Imam that followers’ amen is enough and it is not obligation for Imam (Tha’labi al-Baghdadi, 1/45-46). With reference to the relevant hadiths, Shaukani accepts saying amen; he quotes from Hafiz that all scholars agree on the preference to do it.

It is narrated from Ibn Barizeh that since the relevant hadith in this regard is command, saying amen is obligatory for followers.

Muhammad Ibn Ali Shaukani has confirmed the use of this meaning. He adds that the hadith expresses the obligation of amen for follower when Imam says amen. Therefore, saying amen for Imam or the person saying prayer individually is favorable. Navavei, a master in Shafei religion, attributes favorable status of saying amen to his own sect (Muhi al-Din Navavei, 3/373).

Second Discussion: Arguments by Believers in its Permission from the Perspective of Sunni Scholars

Most documents of Sunni scholars proving legitimacy and favorable status of saying amen are the narrations mentioned in their fiqhi books. Sunni scholars have almost a single understanding of the relevant narrations; the difference is only about saying amen in congregational prayer. The most important evidences proposed by them are in the following:

1. Abu Horaireh said, “The Holy Prophet accustomed to say amen after reading the last part of al-Hamd so that his voice was heard by the persons praying in the first line” (Abu Davood Ashath al-Sajestani, 1/352).

2. Abu Horaireh said, “The Holy Prophet stated: When Imam said amen, you must say amen; indeed, when a person’s amen coincidence with the angels’ amen God will forgive all his sins” (Bokhari, 3/316; Abu Isa Tirmidhi, 1/438; Abu Bakr Beihaki, 2/28).

3. It is narrated from Abu Horaireh that people left saying amen while the prophet said amen after finishing al-Hamd so that the prayers in the first line heard it; then, the sound of amen echoed in the mosque (Ibn Maja, 1/278).
4. It is narrated from Vael ibn Hajar that he was saying prayer behind the Holy Prophet; he heard the voice of Muhammad who said amen loudly; he said Salam at the end of the prayer and turned his face to right and left as his face was clear (Ibid; Abu Bakr Beihaji, 2/208).

5. Abdoljabbar ibn Vael reports from his father that he was saying prayer behind the prophet; he said amen after finishing al-Hamd and we heard amen (Ibn Maja, 1/278).

6. It is quoted from Imam Ali, “I heard the prophet said amen after finishing the last part of al-Hamd” (ibid).

7. It is narrated from Ayesheh who reports from Muhammad, “Jews were not jealous of you unless for Salam and saying amen (Ibid).

8. In addition, the content of some quotations indicate that some companions were saying amen as a custom (3/315).

In Nayl al-Awtar Sharh Muntaqa, Shaukani restates Ibn Bazizeh’s words that the appearance of narrations about saying amen that it is an obligation because the imperative sentence indicates its obligation. At beginning, he accepts favorable status of saying amen as a general rule. He argues that hadiths do confirm its legitimacy. After stating Ibn Bazizeh’s words, he accepts the idea. Then, he limits the idea and presents a new explanation. Ibn Bazizeh’s speech is correct but the hadith determines a rule about saying amen with respect to followers and Imam since it relies followers obligation to Imam’s obligation. Therefore, saying amen in prayer is absolutely obligation for Imam and individuals saying prayer; it is an obligation for follower when Imam saya amen (Shaukani, 3/ 385).

As mentioned in the former discussion, Abdorahman ibn Muhammad Juzairi has set two conditions for obligation of amen. First, it should not be long silence after al-Hamd; second, the person saying prayer just says an orison (Juzairi, 1/ 283). Many jurists have inferred its favorable status from the appearance of the sentence (Muhi al-Din Navavei, 3/ 373).

Third Discussion: Analysis of the documents and evidences presented by Sunni Scholars

It is clear from former discussions that the most notable evidences of Sunni scholars about saying amen are the hadiths having been discussed in advance.

The subject of narrators’ adjustment about jurisprudential contexts is very concerned by scholars in order to infer the verdict. With this introduction, the first problem in the evidences proposed by Sunni scholars relates to their documentation. There are some persons in the hierarchy of narrators of discussion four whose reputations have been invalidated due to other wrong speeches in the religious books. Thus, they cannot be used as a reference to understand whether an action is obligatory or favorable.
1. Abu Horaireh

Many narrations of Ahl Sunna have been reported by his companion of the prophet. He is the narrator of some of the discussed documents. In Comments on the Peak of Eloquence, Ibn Abi al-Hadid mentions to the below points about Abu Horaireh and his narrations.

A. After stating a narration for criticism of Ali ibn Abi Talib. He expresses, “It is far from Ali, Ali is much more pious …” in fact, Aibn Abi Hadid is shouting in the denial of Abu Horaireh.

B. HE narrates from his master Abu Jafar that Abu Horaireh’s words are not consistent with our intention.

C. He reports from Sofian Thaori that many of Abu Horaireh’s narrations are wrong.

D. It is narrated from A’mash that he refused to consider the hadiths comes from Abu Horaireh.

E. HE quotes from Ali ibn Abi Talib, “Be aware that the most liar person in relation to the Prophet is Abu Horaireh” (ibn Abi al-Hadid Madaeni, 1/105-106).

Other expressions are also available about Abu Horaireh that has not been mentioned in this article.

Ibn Qotaibeh Dinvari has also mentioned in his book that Ali ibn Abi Talib, Omar, Othman, and Ayesheh introduced Abu Horaireh as a liar (Abu Muhammad Dinvari, 22). Moreover, Abu Horaireh has confessed that if he says realities, his confession would lead to his invalidation.

This quote has been mentioned in many places. After a narration by Abu Horaireh from the prophet was questioned that whether the prophet had said them in fact or not; he answers, “No they are from Abu Horaireh’s pocket” (Bokhari, 18/64). The fact that he uses his pocket and attributes them to the prophet is not strange. Ayesheh and other companions’ behaviors to him and their surprise of the multitude of his sayings by the Prophet uncovers his mask and show his personality as one knows that he has been accompanied the Prophet for a short time” (Shams al-Din al-Zahbi. Seir A’lam al-Nabala, 2/ 604). In one of his books, Zahabi states that Abu Horaireh was a liar (Ibid, 608). It is obvious from the appearance of expressions that Abu Horiareh was a liar.

2. Muhammad ibn Kathir

Ibn Hajar Asqalani states that some persons have invalidated his narrations due to employment of some wods in his reports; some has counted his weak points (Ibn Hajar Asqalani, 19/37). Zahabi has also refers to lack of strength in his sayings. Some believe that he has suffered from mental disorders in the last years of his life (Shams al-Din al-Zahbi. Seir A’lam al-Nabala, 10/382).
3. Ali ibn Saleh

Ibn jauzi have referred to his weak points in his books (Ibn jauzi, 2/194). In Tahzib al-Tahzib, he refers to his weak understanding of ibn Moin (ibn Hajar Asqalanli, 7/292). Some have questioned his religion as well as the religion of his brothers and they regard them as men of exaggeration (jauzajani, 1/68). Zahabi has also count his weak points and regards him as an unknown person (Shams al-Din al-Zahbi. Seir A’lam al-Nabala, 2/449).

4. Ibn Namir

In tahzib al-Tahzib, he is regarded as an unknown person for many of great Sunni scholars (Ibn Hajar Asqalanli, 10/66). Moreover, Zahabi asserts that he has not been recognized (Shams al-Din al-Zahbi. Al-Moghni fi Zoafa, 2/539).

5. Abdorahman ibn Abi Layli

Many of his narrations are invalid (Shams al-Din al-Zahbi. Seir A’lam al-Nabala, 4/264). In addition, many have criticized him for his weak memory. Abu Davood narrates from Sho’ba that he has not met a person with weak memory as Ibn Abi Layli (Ibid, 6/311).

6. Abdoljabar ibn Vael

It is said that he has not heard any hadith from his father (Shams al-Din al-Zahbi. Seir A’lam al-Nabala, 1/367) because he has not educated by him and his father had died when his mother was pregnant (Ibn Hajar Asqalanli, 6/95).

7. Soheil Ibn Saleh

It is said that he was not powerful and his hadiths are not proof (Ibn jauzi, 2/30). Moreover, Zahabi argues that he suffered from an illness that influenced on his mind; then, it presents a strange hadith by him from Abu Horaireh (Shams al-Din al-Zahbi. Seir A’lam al-Nabala, 5/458).

Consequently, all narrations in this regard are questioned; since worships have stopping nature and requires firm documents to be proved, none of the narrations has the quality od documentation for inference of a religious sentence.

Another major problem in this regard is the narration about Muhammad’s prayer that has no accurate document (Ibn Maja, 1/337). Abu Hamid Saedi’s description of his prayer indicates that he did not say any amen in his prayer because he explains prayer in details. In addition, companions were very sensitive to his behavior, but they did not protest to him.

There is a sentence from Ibn Zobair at the time of Friday prayer, “All traditions of the prophet, even traditions of prayer” (Beihaqi, 5/83). It shows, “In Jamal War, we prayed along with Ali ibn Abi Talib and this prayer was lik the prophet’s prayer; it seemed we had forgotten the prophet’s prayer” (ibn Maja/1/296).
There is a disagreement about whether it should be pronounced loud or not. It should be noted that the disagreements among are trivial. Hence, the claim of tawatur for the narrations confirming saying amen is also rejected and no cannot disregard the weak points in terms of documentation.

CONCLUSION
Saying amen is a subject of many challenges in the context of Shiite and Sunni jurisprudence. Its obligation or favorable status has been discussed by Sunni scholars while its prohibition or abomination is the result of religious documents for Shiite scholars. There are some disagreements about the details of rules derived from the method of inference in Shiite scholars; they have been categorized in eight groups.

This article tried to present the evidence and jurisprudential process used by Shiite and Suni scholar as much as possible. Two important points in this regard are their disagreement on finding the meaning of amen as a human speech or not. Some regard it as an attachment to orison. Some has regarded it as human speech and a cause for breach of prayer. Few jurists have not concluded anything more than abomination from collection of narrations.
Two important criticisms have been rised due to weakness of documentation, non-compliance between quality and their issuance, and understanding of Sunni scholars with respect to the the discussion on the subject of saying amen are two important
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