



AL-MAJAALIS : Jurnal Dirasat Islamiyah

Volume 13 Number 1 November 2025

Email Jurnal : almajalis.ejournal@gmail.com

Website Jurnal : ejournal.stdiis.ac.id



ḌA‘ĪF JIDDAN VS. MAWDŪ‘: A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF ḤADĪTH BY IBN AL-JAWZĪ IN AL-MAWDŪ‘ĀT AND AL-‘IRĀQĪ IN AL-MUGHNĪ ‘AN ḤAML AL-ASFĀR FĪ AL-ASFĀR

Marwan Mas’ud, Imam Ghazali Said, Mohammed Alghiffar Alwalid

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Universiti Islam Antarbangsa Malaysia

masudmarwan14@gmail.com, imamghazalisaid@gmail.com, ghiffar98@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 02-October-2025

Revised : 10-October-2025

Accepted : 13-October-2025

KEYWORDS:

Al-‘Iraqi; al-Mughnī; Ḥaml al-Asfār; Ibn al-Jawzi; al-Mawḍū‘āt.

ABSTRACT

This study explores the methodological differences in ḥadīth classification between al-‘Irāqī and Ibn al-Jawzī, prompted by the broader discourse on the authenticity of Islamic traditions. The research primarily compares five *aḥādīth* judged as *ḍa‘īf jiddan* by al-‘Irāqī and as *mawḍū‘* by Ibn al-Jawzī, focusing on their distinct approaches in evaluating isnād and matn. A secondary focus lies in examining al-‘Irāqī’s precision in takhrīj and *isnād* analysis versus Ibn al-Jawzī’s critical stance toward unreliable transmitters and implausible texts. This qualitative, descriptive-comparative study adopts a library-based approach and deductive reasoning, relying on primary and secondary sources within the discipline of *jarḥ wa-ta‘ḍīl*. The research aims to determine which scholar’s assessment aligns more accurately with the standards of ḥadīth criticism. The findings reveal that one narration concerning the virtue of bread is more appropriately classified as *ḍa‘īf jiddan*, while the remaining four about ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb’s virtues, curbing desires, bringing goods from the market, and generosity are best regarded as *mawḍū‘*. These results highlight the richness of the ḥadīth critical tradition and affirm that ḥadīth authority in Islam must rest on rigorous scholarly verification, balancing both *isnād* reliability and matn coherence.

AI DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors used ChatGP and Deepseek to improve the language and readability of this article. All content was reviewed and verified by the authors, who take full responsibility for the integrity and originality of the work.

A. INTRODUCTION

Ḥadīth Studies represent one of the principal disciplines in Islamic scholarship, focusing on the transmission and authenticity of the sayings, actions, and approvals of the Prophet Muḥammad ﷺ.²³⁶ The evaluation of the *isnād* and *matn* of *ḥadīth* not only determines their degree of authenticity but also shapes the application of Islamic law and the understanding of religious teachings.²³⁷ As the discipline developed, classical scholars formulated various *manāḥij* to assess *ḥadīth* authenticity, which at times led to divergent judgments on the same report.²³⁸ *Ḥadīth* studies constitute a fundamental foundation within the Islamic intellectual tradition, as they determine the authenticity of the Prophet's ﷺ sayings and simultaneously influence the application of Islamic law and the understanding of religion. The divergence of *manāḥij* among scholars in assessing *ḥadīth* reflects a critical dynamism that, in fact, enriches the corpus of Islamic scholarship.

Al-'Irāqī, in his *Takhrij Ahādīth Ihyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn*, applied a method that treated *isnād* weakness with serious consideration, sometimes classifying certain reports as *ḍa'īf*

²³⁶ Alwi Taufik, Juli Handoko, and Ihsan Mustofa, "Ilmu Hadits sebagai Pilar Keaslian Ajaran Islam: Kajian Kritis Sanad dan Matan," *Molang: Journal Islamic Education* 3, no. 1 (2025): 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.32806/tb6bp948>; Shofil Fikri et al., "Memahami Makna dari Hadis dan Ilmu Hadis menurut Pandangan Muhadditsin dan Ushuliyin," *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 1, no. 4 (2024): 12–12; Pajar Anwar and Sri Minarti, "Metodologi Ulumul Hadits," *Fatih: Journal of Contemporary Research* 2, no. 2 (2025): 612–22, <https://doi.org/10.61253/7ytxq209>; Muhammad Fawwaz Bin Muhammad Yusoff, "Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī's (d. 354/965) Contribution to the Science of Ḥadīth Transmission" (PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow, 2017); Saifuddin Zuhri Qudsy et al., "The Making of Living Ḥadīth: A New Direction of Ḥadīth Studies in Indonesia," *Culture and Religion* 23, no. 4 (2023): 353–72, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14755610.2024.2336461>; Hafiz Fahad Aziz and Mr Ghulam Qasim, "Exploring the Interplay between Hadith and Islamic Theology: Foundations, Impacts, and Interpretations," *Journal of Religion and Society* 3, no. 02 (2025): 846–59; Muhammad Nawaz, "Understanding Tadrīs: A Key Concept in the Science of Ḥadīth Criticism," *Al-Marjān (المرجان)* 2, no. 3 (2024): 50–58, <https://doi.org/10.1234/6mvsqw31>.

²³⁷ Ananda Nurul Hasanah, "Penerapan Syarat Kesahihan Hadis pada Skripsi Mahasiswa Prodi Ilmu Hadis UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta Tahun 2024" (B.S. thesis, Fakultas Ushuluddin UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, n.d.); Muhamad Rozaimi Ramle and Miftachul Huda, "Between Text and Context: Understanding Ḥadīth through Asbab al-Wurud," *Religions* 13, no. 2 (2022): 92, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13020092>; Mustafa Macit Karagözoğlu, "Contested Avenues in Post-Classical Sunni Ḥadīth Criticism: A Reading through the Lens of al-Mughnī 'an al-Ḥifẓ wa-l-Kitāb," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 29, no. 2 (2018): 149–80, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13020092>; Kumail Rajani, *Making Sense of Ismaili Traditions: The Modes and Meanings of the Transmission of Ḥadīth in the Works of al-Qāḍī al-Nu'mān (d. 363/974)*, University of Exeter, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14755610.2024.2336461>; Muhammad Gufran-ul-Haque, "Ḥadīth of Self-Knowing between Sufis and Ḥadīth Scholars," *ISLAMIC INSIGHT* 7, no. 2 (2024); Shatha Hamad Altammami, "Artificial Intelligence for Understanding the Hadith" (PhD Thesis, University of Leeds, 2023).

²³⁸ Bisri Tujang, "Al-Nasikh wa Al-Mansukh (Deskripsi Metode Interpretasi Hadis Kontradiktif)," *Al-Majaalis: Jurnal Dirasat Islamiyah* 2, no. 2 (2015): 69–98, <https://doi.org/10.37397/almajaalis.v2i2.28>.

jiddan, denoting severe weakness but not necessarily fabrication.²³⁹ By contrast, Ibn al-Jawzī, in his works, adopted a stricter stance, often declaring reports with significant defects as *mawḍūʿ* (fabricated).²⁴⁰ This divergence illustrates methodological variation in *ḥadīth* criticism, particularly regarding what constitutes fatal flaws in transmission.²⁴¹ The contrasting approaches of al-ʿIrāqī and Ibn al-Jawzī highlight how methodological differences shape judgments in *ḥadīth* criticism, especially in defining the threshold between severe weakness and fabrication.

Such differences reflect the richness of the tradition while also presenting challenges in determining the final status of a *ḥadīth*. Al-ʿIrāqī tended toward caution by distinguishing between *ḍaʿīf jiddan* and outright fabrication, whereas Ibn al-Jawzī took a more rigorous approach, classifying critically weak reports as *mawḍūʿ*.²⁴² These methodological differences were shaped not only by scholarly rigor but also by historical context, the evolution of legal schools, and concerns for safeguarding Islamic teachings. Ibn al-Jawzī, who lived in sixth-century Baghdad, operated in an era marked by intense sectarian debate, the spread of fabricated reports among popular preachers, and growing anxiety about the authenticity of transmitted knowledge.²⁴³

Ibn al-Jawzī strict approach to declaring *ḥadīths mawḍūʿ* reflected this polemical environment and his broader concern with protecting the Sunnah from distortion. In contrast, al-ʿIrāqī, writing in eighth-century Mamlūk Cairo, worked within a more structured academic milieu shaped by madrasah institutions and a pedagogical emphasis on precise classification rather than polemical refutation. His moderation and nuanced distinctions between *ḍaʿīf jiddan* and *mawḍūʿ* reflect the scholarly professionalism and teaching culture of his time.

²³⁹ Aʿan Mujibur Rohman, “Kritik Ibn Al-Jauzi terhadap Hadis dalam Kitab Ihya Ulum ad-Din dan Pembelaan Abu al-Fadl al-Iraqi,” *Jalsah: The Journal of Al-Quran and As-Sunnah Studies* 1, no. 1 (2021): 62–75.

²⁴⁰ Muhamad Ridwan Nurrohman, “Metodologi Tajrih Ibn al-Jauzi dalam Kitab ad-Dhuʿafā Wal-Matrūkīn (Bedah Kasus Riwayat Aflah Ibn Saʿid dalam Kitab al-Mawḍūʿāt),” *Al-Majaalis: Jurnal Dirasat Islamiyah* 4, no. 2 (2017): 73–90, <https://doi.org/10.37397/almajaalis.v4i2.66>.

²⁴¹ Nur Kholis Bin Kurdian, Abd Aʿla, and Muhammad Syarifudin, “Kritik Israr Ahmad Khan terhadap Hadis-Hadis Kitab al-Qadar dari Kitab Sahih Al-Bukhari,” *Al-Majaalis: Jurnal Dirasat Islamiyah* 12, no. 1 (2024): 121–40, <https://doi.org/10.37397/al-majaalis.v12i1.678>.

²⁴² Rohman, “Kritik Ibn al-Jauzi Terhadap Hadis dalam Kitab Ihya Ulum ad-Din dan Pembelaan Abu al-Fadl al-Iraqi.”

²⁴³ https://Yaqeeninstitute.Org.My/Read/Paper/Authenticating-Hadith-and-the-History-of-Hadith-Criticism?Utm_source=chatgpt.Com#fnt22, accessed October 10, 2025.

This study seeks to analyze and compare the assessments of al-‘Irāqī and Ibn al-Jawzī in their classification of reports as *ḍa‘īf jiddan* or *mawḍū‘*, focusing on their methodological criteria in evaluating transmitters, *isnād* integrity, and reliability of transmission. By understanding these differences, the research contributes to a deeper comprehension of classical evaluative standards and their implications for the use of *ḥadīth* in Islamic law and scholarship. These insights remain relevant for contemporary ḥadīth scholarship, as modern researchers and jurists continue to grapple with similar questions regarding the balance between textual plausibility and chain authenticity. Examining the approaches of earlier critics such as al-‘Irāqī and Ibn al-Jawzī offers valuable guidance for refining present-day methodologies in ḥadīth authentication and interpretation.

Previous research includes A‘An Mujibur Rohman’s “*Kritik Ibn Al-Jauzi terhadap Hadis dalam Kitab Ihya Ulum ad-Din dan Pembelaan Abu al-Fadl al-Iraqi*” (Criticism of Ibn al-Jawzī on the *Ḥadīth* in *Ihyā‘ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn* and the Defense of Abū al-Faḍl al-‘Irāqī)²⁴⁴, The study finds that al-Ghazālī holds a pivotal role as one of Islam’s most influential intellectuals, particularly in *taṣawwuf*. While celebrated for his ability to guide the Muslim community through philosophy, kalām, and other sciences, he faces criticism for employing *mawḍū‘* ḥadīths in *Ihyā‘ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn*, especially in the areas of *al-targhīb*, *al-tarhīb*, and *faḍā‘il al-a‘māl*. This reflects his perceived *tasāhul* (leniency) in transmission, sometimes overlooking authenticity even in matters of *ḥalāl* and *ḥarām*. Despite such critiques, the *Ihyā‘* remains a timeless magnum opus, uniting diverse disciplines and exerting enduring influence. The study thus underscores the tension between the grandeur of al-Ghazālī’s legacy and the methodological challenges it raises in ḥadīth epistemology.

The author’s research, entitled “*Ḍa‘īf Jiddan vs. Mawḍū‘: A Comparative Analysis of Ḥadīth Assessment by Ibn al-Jawzī in al-Mawḍū‘ūt and al-‘Irāqī in al-Mughnī ‘an ḥaml al-asfār fi al-asfār*”, shares common ground with the aforementioned three studies, namely its focus on comparing the manhaj of *ḥadīth* criticism between al-‘Irāqī and Ibn al-Jawzī. This study seeks to address the following questions: Who are al-‘Irāqī and Ibn al-Jawzī? What are the

²⁴⁴ Rohman, “Kritik Ibn Al-Jauzi terhadap Hadis dalam Kitab Ihya Ulum ad-Din dan Pembelaan Abu al-Fadl al-Iraqi.”

comparative outcomes of their assessments in classifying ḥadīth as *ḍaʿīf jiddan* and *mawḍūʿ*? And how does critical discourse analysis apply to the examined *ḥadīths*? The primary similarity lies in the examination of the diverse evaluations of classical scholars and their implications for *ḥadīth* status.

However, the present study emphasizes methodological aspects in a more systematic manner, particularly by comparing the criteria and justifications employed by the two scholars in distinguishing between *ḍaʿīf jiddan* and *mawḍūʿ*. In addition, this research highlights the historical context, al-ʿIrāqī’s moderation, and Ibn al-Jawzī’s rigor as key factors shaping their assessments, thereby offering a more holistic understanding of the dynamics of *ḥadīth* evaluation in classical literature. Thus, while the three previous studies provide an essential foundation concerning the diversity of *ḥadīth* assessments and the evaluation of *isnād*, the author’s research contributes an added analytical dimension with a sharper focus on methodological divergence, historical context, and the practical implications for the authenticity and application of *ḥadīth* in Islamic scholarship.

This study offers a new perspective in the field of *ḥadīth* studies by focusing on a comparative analysis of the methodologies of *ḥadīth* criticism employed by al-ʿIrāqī in *al-Mughnī ʿan ḥaml al-asfār fi al-asfār* and Ibn al-Jawzī in *al-Mawḍūʿāt*, particularly with regard to the classification of *ḍaʿīf jiddan* and *mawḍūʿ*. Unlike previous research, which has tended to be descriptive or limited to documenting the diversity of scholarly evaluations, this study emphasizes a systematic analysis of the criteria, justifications, and considerations applied by each scholar in assessing the reliability of transmitters and the integrity of the *isnād*. Furthermore, it highlights the historical context and personal characteristics of the scholars as significant factors influencing *ḥadīth* evaluation. The moderation of al-ʿIrāqī and the strictness of Ibn al-Jawzī serve as interpretive lenses for understanding the differences in *ḥadīth* classification. Thus, this study not only addresses the formal status of ḥadīths but also elucidates the intellectual dynamics and critical practices of *ḥadīth* scholarship within the classical tradition.

Moreover, this study provides a more holistic understanding of the implications of methodological differences for the authenticity and application of *ḥadīth* in religious literature and Islamic law. By emphasizing the nuance between *ḍaʿīf jiddan* and *mawḍūʿ*, his research

takes a closer look at how classical scholars drew the line between serious weakness and outright fabrication—distinctions that are often treated too simply in earlier writings. Rather than claiming to offer something entirely new, the study aims to revisit these issues with greater attention to method and context. By comparing the approaches of al-‘Irāqī and Ibn al-Jawzī within their respective historical settings, it adds to the broader discussion on how classical ḥadīth critics balanced precision, caution, and the need to protect the prophetic tradition.

B. METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach, namely research that focuses on understanding and explaining social phenomena from the perspective of individuals or groups. Qualitative research originates from scholars of Anthropology and Sociology, for whom the world and its environment can be studied scientifically.²⁴⁵ A library study serves as the data collection technique in this research. The library study is characterized by four features: direct engagement with texts, the availability of ready-to-use data, freedom from spatial and temporal limitations, and its secondary nature.²⁴⁶

This study employs both primary and secondary data as a means of data management.²⁴⁷ The primary data refers to information obtained directly from the object of research by utilizing data collection instruments applied directly to the subject as the source of the sought information. The primary source used in this research is al-Ghazālī’s (d. 505 H) *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn*.²⁴⁸ Meanwhile, secondary data refers to information acquired through second- or third-hand sources.²⁴⁹ The secondary materials employed in this study include journals, contemporary studies, and classical works such as *al-Mughnī ‘an ḥaml al-asfār fī al-asfār* by al-‘Irāqī, *al-Mawḍū‘āt* by Ibn al-Jawzī, *Musnad al-Bazzār*, *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* by al-

²⁴⁵ Haradhan Kumar Mohajan, “Qualitative Research Methodology in Social Sciences and Related Subjects,” *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People* 7, no. 1 (2018): 23–48.

²⁴⁶ Miza Nina Adlini et al., “Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Studi Pustaka,” *Jurnal Edumaspul* 6, no. 1 (2022): 974–80.

²⁴⁷ I. Gusti Bagus Rai Utama, Ni Made Eka Mahadewi, and Ni Putu Dyah Krismawintari, *Metodologi Penelitian Bidang Manajemen Dan Pariwisata (Dilengkapi Studi Kasus Penelitian dan Pembahasannya)* (Deepublish, 2023), 128.

²⁴⁸ Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm Al-Dīn* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, n.d.).

²⁴⁹ Dr Ahmad Tohardi, *Pengantar Metodologi Penelitian Sosial + Plus* (Tanjungpura University Press, 2019), 702.

Ṭabarānī, *al-Syaṅ'ah* by al-Ājurri, and others. Additionally, works on the biographies of ḥadīth transmitters, such as *Mizān al-ʿIḍāl* by al-Dhahabī, are also consulted.

This study employs the theories of *jarḥ wa-taʿdīl* and critical discourse analysis. The theory of jarḥ wa-taʿdīl explains the defects (*jarḥ*) and reliability (*taʿdīl*) of narrators through specific evaluative expressions. Its main aim is to understand how and why al-ʿIrāqī and Ibn al-Jawzī arrived at differing assessments rather than determining who was right. To identify the rājiḥ (stronger) view, several guiding principles were applied. The analysis employed a descriptive and deductive method, moving from general observations to specific conclusions. Subsequently, the data are concluded through a deductive approach, in which the collected information is first analyzed in general terms and then synthesized into specific conclusions.²⁵⁰

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Among the ḥadīths in the *Iḥyāʾ*, there are five ḥadīths classified as *daʿīf jiddan* by al-ʿIrāqī and as *mawḍūʿ* by Ibn al-Jawzī. A comparative study between the two, by tracing the chains of transmission (*riwāyāt*) and narrators (*rawīyūn*) of these five ḥadīths, becomes highly significant in broadening the perspective of critical ḥadīth studies. The exposition is as follows:

First:

حَدِيث «أَكْرَمُوا الْخُبْزَ»^{٢٥١}

قال العراقي: أخرجه البزار والطبراني وابن قانع من حديث عبد الله بن أم حرام بإسناد ضعيف جدا وذكره ابن الجوزي في الموضوعات.^{٢٥٢}

The ḥadīth “Honor the Bread” (supplemented with ḥaddathana) Al-ʿIrāqī stated that this ḥadīth was narrated by al-Bazzār, al-Ṭabarānī, and Ibn Qānī from the ḥadīth of ʿAbdullāh ibn Umm Ḥarām, with a chain of transmission (isnād) that is extremely weak (ḍaʿīf jiddan), and it is also mentioned by Ibn al-Jawzī in al-Mawḍūʿāt.

²⁵⁰ Theophilus Azungah, “Qualitative Research: Deductive and Inductive Approaches to Data Analysis,” *Qualitative Research Journal* 18, no. 4 (November 2018): 383–400, <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-D-18-00035>.

²⁵¹ al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyāʾ ʿUlūm Al-Dīn*. Vol. 2, p. 4.

²⁵² ʿAbd al-Raḥīm ibn al-Ḥusayn Al-ʿIrāqī, *Al-Mughnī “an Ḥaml al-Asfūr Fī al-Asfūr, Fī Takhrij Mā Fī al-Iḥyāʾ” Min al-Akhbār*, 1st ed. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2005), 435.

قال الطبراني: حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ، ثنا خَالِدُ بْنُ يَحْيَى، قَاضِي الرَّيِّ ثنا إِسْمَاعِيلُ بْنُ جَعْفَرٍ، عَنْ حُمَيْدِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ، عَنْ أَبِي سَكِينَةَ، أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ﷺ قَالَ: «أَكْرِمُوا الْخُبْزَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ أَكْرَمَهُ، فَمَنْ أَكْرَمَ الْخُبْزَ أَكْرَمَهُ اللَّهُ»
*Al-Ṭabarānī said: “‘Alī ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz taught us, saying: Khālid ibn Yaḥyā taught us, saying: Qāḍī al-Rayy narrated to us, saying: Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far narrated to us, from Ḥumayd ibn ‘Abd Allāh, from Abī Sakīnah, that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: ‘Honor the bread, for indeed Allah has honored it. Whoever honors the bread, Allah will honor him.’”*²⁵³

قال ابن قانع: حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ عَلِيٍّ الْخَزَّازُ، نا إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ عَزْرَةَ، نا أَبُو الْعَبَّاسِ، عَنْ إِبْرَاهِيمَ بْنِ أَبِي عَبْلَةَ قَالَ: رَأَيْتُ عَلَى عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ أُمِّ حَرَامٍ كِسَاءً، فَقَالَ: صَلَّيْتُ مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ الْقِبْلَتَيْنِ فَقَالَ: «أَكْرِمُوا الْخُبْزَ، فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ سَخَّرَ لَهُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ»

*Ibn Qāni‘ said: Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Khazzāz taught us, saying: Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ar‘arah taught us, saying: Abū al-‘Abbās narrated to us, from Ibrāhīm ibn Abī ‘Ablah, who said: “I saw with ‘Abd Allāh ibn Umm Ḥarām a blanket. Then he said: ‘I once prayed with the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, facing two qiblahs.’ Then he said: ‘Honor the bread, for indeed Allah has subjected to it the heavens and the earth.’”*²⁵⁴

قال البزار: حَدَّثَنَا الْحُسَيْنُ بْنُ أَبِي كَبْشَةَ، قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَعْلَى، قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا عُمَرُ بْنُ الصَّبِيحِ عَنْ مِقَاتِ بْنِ حِيَانَ، عَنْ الْأَعْرَجِ، عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ رَفَعَهُ قَالَ: مَهْوَرُ الْحُورِ الْعَيْنِ قَبْضَاتِ التَّمْرِ وَفَلْقِ الْخُبْزِ.
*Al-Bazzār said: “Al-Ḥusayn ibn Abī Kabshah taught us, saying: Muḥammad ibn Ya‘lā taught us, saying: ‘Umar ibn al-Ṣubḥ from Muqātil ibn Ḥayyān taught us, from al-A‘raj, from Abū Hurayrah, in a marfū‘ report, who said: The mahr for the al-ḥūr al-‘īn is a handful of dates and a piece of bread.’”*²⁵⁵

قال ابن الجوزي: أَنْبَأَنَا مَوْهُوبُ بْنُ أَحْمَدَ أَنْبَأَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ الْبَسْرِيِّ أَنْبَأَنَا الْمُخَلِّصُ أَنْبَأَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ نَصْرِ حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ أَبِي أُسَامَةَ حَدَّثَنَا إِسْحَاقُ حَدَّثَنَا نُمَيْرُ بْنُ الْوَلِيدِ حَدَّثَنِي أَبِي عَنْ جَدِّي عَنْ أَبِي مُوسَى قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: «أَكْرِمُوا الْخُبْزَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ سَخَّرَ لَهُ بَرَكَاتِ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَالْحَدِيدِ وَالْبَقَرِ وَابْنَ آدَمَ».
Ibn al-Jawzī said: “Mawhūb ibn Aḥmad taught us, saying: ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Busnī taught us, saying: al-Mukhalliṣ taught us, saying: Aḥmad ibn Naṣr informed us, saying: ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Usāmah taught us, saying: Ishāq narrated to us, saying: Numayr ibn al-Walīd taught us, saying: My father narrated to me from my grandfather, from Abū Mūsā, who said: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: “Honor bread,

المريطب، منيرة بنت عواد حامد، “رسالة في إحترام and 1143 ابن عبدالغني، عبدالغني بن إسماعيل، ت 253 000، no. 018 (2016): 141–88. مجلة قطر الندى

²⁵⁴ “تراث” accessed October 1, 2025, <https://app.turath.io/>.

²⁵⁵ “تراث”

*for verily Allāh has placed upon it the blessings of the heavens and the earth, of iron, cattle, and the offspring of Ādam.*²⁵⁶

قال ابن الجوزي: أَنبَأَنَا عَبْدُ الْخَالِقِ بْنُ عَبْدِ الصَّمَدِ أَنبَأَنَا ابْنُ النَّقُورِ أَنبَأَنَا الْمُخَلِّصُ حَدَّثَنَا الْبُغَوِيُّ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو رَوْحِ الْبَلْدِيِّ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو شَهَابٍ الْخَيَّاطُ عَنْ طَلْحَةَ عَنْ ثَوْرٍ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ بُرَيْدَةَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: «أَكْرِمُوا الْخُبْرَ، فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ أَنْزَلَ إِلَيْهِ بَرَكَاتٍ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ، وَأَخْرَجَ لَهُ بَرَكَاتٍ مِنَ الْأَرْضِ».

Ibn al-Jawzī said: “Abd al-Khāliq ibn ‘Abd al-Ṣamad taught us, saying: Ibn al-Naqqūr taught us, saying: al-Mukhalliṣ taught us, saying: al-Baghawī taught us, saying: Abū Rūḥ al-Baladī taught us, saying: Abū Shihāb al-Khayyāt taught us, from Ṭalḥah, from Thawr, from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Buraydah, from his father, who said: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: ‘Honor bread, for verily Allāh has sent down upon it blessings from the heavens, and has brought forth blessings for it from the earth.’”²⁵⁷

قال ابن الجوزي: أَنبَأَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ أَنبَأَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ عَلِيٍّ بْنِ ثَابِتٍ أَنبَأَنَا عَبْدُ السَّلَامِ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْوَهَّابِ الْقُرَشِيُّ قَالَا حَدَّثَنَا حَدَّثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ بْنُ أَحْمَدَ حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ جَعْفَرِ الرَّازِيِّ حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ الْجَعْدِ حَدَّثَنَا غِيَاثُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ حَدَّثَنَا إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ أَبِي عُبَلَةَ سَمِعْتُ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنَ أُمِّ حَرَامٍ الْأَنْصَارِيَّ يَقُولُ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: «أَكْرِمُوا الْخُبْرَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ سَخَّرَ لَهُ بَرَكَاتِ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ».

Ibn al-Jawzī said: “Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad taught us, saying: Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Thābit taught us, saying: ‘Abd al-Salām ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Qurashī taught us, both of them saying: Sulaimān ibn Aḥmad taught us, saying: Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far al-Rāzī taught us, saying: ‘Alī ibn al-Ja‘d taught us, saying: Ghiyāth ibn Ibrāhīm taught us, from Ibrāhīm ibn Abī ‘Ablah, who said: I heard ‘Abd Allāh ibn Umm Ḥarām al-Anṣārī say: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: ‘Honor bread, for verily Allāh has placed upon it the blessings of the heavens and the earth.’”²⁵⁸

Al-‘Irāqī ruled that this hadith is extremely weak (*ḍa‘īf jiddan*), whereas Ibn al-Jawzī judged it as fabricated (*mawdhū‘*) and included it in his book *al-Mawḍū‘āt*. In al-Ṭabrānī’s chain of transmission, there is a narrator named Humayd ibn ‘Abd Allāh, who was considered extremely weak by early critics such as al-Bukhārī, al-Nasā‘ī, and Ya‘qūb ibn Abī Shaybah, but they did not explicitly accuse him of fabrication. Some reported that he had “stolen” *hadith*, and several scholars even accused him of lying, including Abū Zur‘ah, Ishāq al-Kusaj,

²⁵⁶ ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Alī Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Mawḍū‘āt*, 1st ed., ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ‘Uthmān (al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah: Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Muḥsin, Ṣāhib al-Maktabah al-Salafiyah, 1966) Vol. 2, p. 289.

²⁵⁷ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Mawḍū‘āt*. Vol. 2, p. 290.

²⁵⁸ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Mawḍū‘āt*. Vol. 2, p. 290.

Ibn Jazrah, and Ibn Kharrāsh.²⁵⁹ Although some critics labeled him a liar, the stronger view is that his narrations are to be regarded as *matrūk* (abandoned). This position rests on three considerations.

First, the evaluations of leading authorities consistently portray Ḥumayd as unreliable, which in the science of *jarḥ wa-ta'dīl* generally warrants the “abandoned” classification. Second, the detailed criticisms (*jarḥ mufassar*) preserved in the biographical works describe specific faults in his transmission, namely alteration of *isnāds* and confusion of texts, indicating serious weakness even if not deliberate fabrication. Third, the variation and inconsistency found in the reports transmitted through him further support the conclusion that his narrations cannot be relied upon. That said, it must be acknowledged that some critics did use stronger terms, and the difference between describing a narrator as *matrūk* or *kadhdhāb* often reflects the scholar’s broader methodological approach. In this study, the choice to follow the *matrūk* assessment reflects a preference for the wording supported by the majority of early authorities and by explicit, detailed criticism, while recognizing that other interpretations remain valid within the bounds of *ḥadīth* scholarship.

The chain of transmission of Ibn Qāni‘, there is a narrator named Abū al-‘Abbās ‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dhamārī al-Ṣan‘ānī, who was judged extremely weak (*ḍa‘īf jiddan*) by al-Bukhārī and Abū Zur‘ah, and weak (*ḍa‘īf*) by ‘Amr ibn ‘Alī and Abū Ḥātim. In the chain of al-Bazzār, there are narrators named Muḥammad ibn Ya‘lā and ‘Umar ibn al-Ṣubh. As for Muḥammad ibn Ya‘lā, he was considered extremely weak (*ḍa‘īf jiddan*) by al-Bukhārī and Abū Ḥātim. As for ‘Umar ibn al-Ṣubh, he was judged extremely weak (*ḍa‘īf jiddan*) by Abū Ḥātim, al-Darqūthī, and others.²⁶⁰

According to the book *al-Mawḍū‘āt*, this hadith has three chains of transmission. The first chain is the hadith of Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī, whose chain includes ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Usāmah, who was considered a liar by Ibn Ḥibbān and whose status in the science of *Jarḥ wa Ta‘dīl* is *mutasāḥil* (permissible with caution in authentication).²⁶¹ The

²⁵⁹ Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān Al-I‘tidāl Fī Naqd al-Rijāl*, 1st ed., ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah lil-Ṭibā‘ah wa al-Nashr, 1963). Vol. 3, p. 530.

²⁶⁰ Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān Al-I‘tidāl Fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Vol. 4, p. 71.

²⁶¹ Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān Al-I‘tidāl Fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Vol. 2, p. 491; ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Alī Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Ḍu‘afā’ Wa al-Matrūkūn*, 1st ed., ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qādī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1986). Vol. 2,

second chain is the hadith of Buraydah, in which the chain includes Ṭalḥah al-Khadharī, who was judged extremely weak (*ḍaʿīf jiddan*)— from Aḥmad and al-Nasāʿī, who considered him *matrūk* (abandoned), Ibn Māʿīn, who regarded him as insignificant, and Ibn Ḥibbān, who did not approve of his narration.²⁶²

The third chain is the *hadith* of Ibn Ummī Ḥarām al-Anṣārī, whose chain includes Ghiyāth ibn Ibrāhīm and ʿAbd al-Malik ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. As for Ghiyāth ibn Ibrāhīm, he was judged *matrūk* (extremely weak) by Aḥmad, al-Bukhārī, al-Nasāʿī, and al-Darqūthnī, while Ibn Māʿīn, Ibn Ḥibbān, and al-Saʿdī considered him a liar. However, the strongest opinion (*rajiḥ*) is that Ghiyāth ibn Ibrāhīm is *matrūk* (extremely weak) because the majority of critics from the *muʿtadilīn* (moderate) school judged him as such.²⁶³ As for ʿAbd al-Malik ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, al-Bukhārī judged him as *munkar* (extremely weak), whereas al-Fallās and Ibn al-Jawzī considered him a liar.

However, the strongest opinion (*rajiḥ*) follows al-Bukhārī, who takes a more *muʿtadil* (moderate) approach, judging him as *munkar* (extremely weak). Thus, the difference between al-ʿIrāqī, who judged this hadith as *ḍaʿīf jiddan* (extremely weak), and Ibn al-Jawzī, who judged it as fabricated (*mawdhūʿ*), is a reasonable one based on concrete data. This is because the hadith has multiple chains of transmission, some of which are fabricated while others are extremely weak. As for the text (*matn*), the *hadith* can be considered fabricated (*mawdhūʿ*).

This contrast between Al-ʿIrāqī and Ibn al-Jawzī illustrates a clear methodological divergence. Al-ʿIrāqī distinguished between extreme weakness and deliberate invention, emphasizing caution in declaring fabrication, whereas Ibn al-Jawzī prioritized the protection of the Sunnah even at the risk of over-exclusion.

Second:

حَدِيثٌ «قَالَ لِي جَبْرِيلُ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ لَبَيْكَ الْإِسْلَامُ عَلَى مَوْتِ عُمَرَ»^{٢٦٤}

p. 138. ; Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad Sibṭ Ibn al-ʿAjāmī, *Al-Kashf al-Ḥathīth ʿammā Rumiya Bi-Waḍʿ al-Ḥadīth*, 1st ed., ed. Ṣubḥī al-Sāmarrāʿī (Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub, Maktabat al-Nahḍah al-ʿArabīyah, 1987). Vol. 1, p. 156. .

²⁶² Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Mawḍūʿāt*. Vol. 2, p. 190. .

²⁶³ Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān Al-ʿItidāl Fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Vol. 3, p. 337.

²⁶⁴ al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyāʾ ʿUlūm Al-Dīn*. Vol. 4, p. 474.

قال العراقي: أخرجه أبو بكر الأَجْرِيّ فِي كِتَابِ الشَّرِيعَةِ مِنْ حَدِيثِ أَبِي بِنِ كَعْبٍ بِسَنَدٍ ضَعِيفٍ جَدَا وَذَكَرَهُ ابْنُ
الْجَوْزِيِّ فِي الْمَوْضُوعَاتِ.²⁶⁵

The hadith, “Jibnāl ‘alayhi al-salām said to me: ‘I embraced Islām at the time of ‘Umar’s death.’”

Al-‘Irāqī said: It was narrated by Abū Bakr al-Ājūnī in al-Syanā‘ah from the hadith of Abay ibn Ka‘b with a very weak chain (ḍa‘īf jiddan), and it is also mentioned by Ibn al-Jawzī in al-Mawḍū‘āt.

قال الأَجْرِيّ: حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو بَكْرٍ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ الْوَاسِطِيُّ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ رِزْقِ اللَّهِ الْكَلَوْدَانِيُّ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا
حَبِيبُ بْنُ أَبِي حَبِيبٍ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ عَامِرِ الْأَسْلَمِيِّ، عَنِ ابْنِ شَهَابٍ، عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ الْمُسَيَّبِ، عَنْ أَبِي بِنِ
كَعْبٍ قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: «كَانَ جِبْرِيلُ يُدَاكِرُنِي أَمْرَ عُمَرَ: فَقُلْتُ: يَا جِبْرِيلُ، أَذْكَرُ لِي فَضَائِلَ عُمَرَ وَمَا لَهُ عِنْدَ
اللَّهِ؟ فَقَالَ لِي: لَوْ جَلَسْتَ مَعَكَ مِثْلَ مَا جَلَسَ نُوحٌ فِي قَوْمِهِ مَا بَلَغْتَ فَضَائِلَ عُمَرَ، وَلَيَبْنِكِنَّ الْإِسْلَامُ بَعْدَ مَوْتِكَ يَا
مُحَمَّدُ عَلَى مَوْتِ عُمَرَ بْنِ الْخَطَّابِ.

Al-Ājūnī said: “Abū Bakr ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Wāsiṭī taught us, saying: Muḥammad ibn Rizq Allāh al-Kalwazānī taught us, saying: Ḥabīb ibn Abī Ḥabīb taught us, saying: ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir al-Aslamī taught us, from Ibn Shihāb, from Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyib, from Ubayy ibn Ka‘b, who said: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: ‘Jibnāl frequently reminded me about ‘Umar. So I said: “O Jibnāl, mention to me the virtues of ‘Umar and his status with Allāh.” Jibnāl replied: “Even if I were to sit with you throughout your lifetime as long as Nūḥ remained among his people, I would still not be able to enumerate all the virtues of ‘Umar. Indeed, Islām will mourn the death of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb after your passing, O Muḥammad.”²⁶⁶

قال الطبراني: حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ دَاوُدَ الْمَكِّيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا حَبِيبٌ كَاتِبُ مَالِكٍ، ثنا ابْنُ أَبِي الزُّهْرِيِّ، عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ عَنْ سَعِيدِ
بِنِ الْمُسَيَّبِ، عَنْ أَبِي بِنِ كَعْبٍ، قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: «قَالَ لِي جِبْرِيلُ: لَيَبْنِكَ الْإِسْلَامُ عَلَى مَوْتِ عُمَرَ»

Al-Ṭabarānī said: “Aḥmad ibn Dāwūd al-Makkī narrated to us, saying: Ḥabīb, the scribe (kātib) of Mālik, narrated to us, saying: Ibn Akhī al-Zuhnī narrated to us, from al-Zuhnī, from Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyib, from Ubayy ibn Ka‘b, who said: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: ‘Jibnāl said to me: Islām should mourn the death of ‘Umar.”²⁶⁷

قال أبو نعيم الأصبهاني: حَدَّثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ بْنُ أَحْمَدَ، قَالَ: ثنا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ دَاوُدَ الْمَكِّيُّ، قَالَ: ثنا حَبِيبٌ كَاتِبُ مَالِكٍ قَالَ:
ثنا ابْنُ أَبِي الزُّهْرِيِّ، عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ، عَنْ سَعِيدِ بْنِ الْمُسَيَّبِ، عَنْ أَبِي بِنِ كَعْبٍ، قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: «قَالَ لِي جِبْرِيلُ:
لَيَبْنِكَ الْإِسْلَامُ عَلَى مَوْتِ عُمَرَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى عَنْهُ»

²⁶⁵ Al-‘Irāqī, *Al-Mughnī “an Ḥaml al-Asfār Fī al-Asfār, Fī Takhrij Mā Fī al-Iḥyā” Min al-Akhbār*, 1859.

²⁶⁶ “تراث”

²⁶⁷ “تراث”

*Abū Nu‘aym al-Aṣḥabānī said: “Sulaimān ibn Aḥmad narrated to us, saying: Aḥmad ibn Dāwūd al-Makkī narrated to us, saying: Ḥabīb, the scribe (kātib) of Mālik, narrated to us, saying: Ibn Akhī al-Zuhī narrated to us, from al-Zuhī, from Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyib, from Ubayy ibn Ka‘b, who said: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: ‘Jibnī said to me: Islām should mourn the death of ‘Umar — raḍiya Allāhu ta‘ālā ‘anhu.”*²⁶⁸

This hadith is a narration of Ubay ibn Ka‘b and is recorded by Abū Bakr al-Ājūrī in *al-Syaṅ‘ah*, al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, and Abū Nu‘aym in *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā’*. In its chain of transmission, there is Ḥabīb ibn Abī Ḥubayb, a scribe of Imam Mālik, who was judged as a liar by the majority of scholars, including Abū Dāwūd, Ibn ‘Adī, and Abū Ḥātim,²⁶⁹ Aḥmad and Ibn Mā‘īn, on the other hand, judged him as extremely weak (*ḍa‘īf jiddan*). Furthermore, in the chain reported by Ibn al-Jawzī in *al-Mawḍū‘āt*, there is a narrator named ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir al-Aslamī, who was judged extremely weak (*ḍa‘īf jiddan*) by Ibn Mā‘īn and Ibn al-Madīnī. Ibn Ḥibbān even stated that he had distorted both the text (*matn*) and the chain (*sanad*).²⁷⁰

This case shows how differently both scholars approached weak reports. Al-‘Irāqī saw the hadith’s problem as lying mainly in its extremely weak transmitters but found no proof of fabrication, so he stopped at calling it *ḍa‘īf jiddan*. Ibn al-Jawzī, however, viewed the same flaws—along with the report’s exaggerated tone—as signs of invention and placed it among the *mawḍū‘āt*. In the end, their disagreement reflects two ways of protecting the Sunnah: al-‘Irāqī by carefully separating degrees of weakness, and Ibn al-Jawzī by cutting off anything that looked suspicious.

Third:

حَدِيثُ نَافِعٍ: أَنَّ ابْنَ عَمْرِو بْنِ كَانَ مَرِيضًا فَاشْتَرَى سَمَكَةً طَرِيَةً فَالْتَمَسَتْ لَهُ بِالْمَدِينَةِ فَلَمْ تُوْجَدْ، ثُمَّ وَجَدَتْ بَعْدَ كَذَا وَكَذَا، فَاشْتَرَيْتَ لَهُ بِدَرَاهِمٍ وَنَصْفِ فَشَوِيْتِ وَحَمَلْتِ اِلَيْهِ عَلَى رَغِيْفٍ فَقَامَ سَائِلًا عَلَى الْبَابِ فَقَالَ لِلْغُلَامِ: لِفِيهَا بَرِغِيْفِيهَا وَادْفَعِيهَا اِلَيْهِ، فَقَالَ لَهُ الْغُلَامُ: اَصْلَحَكَ اللهُ قَدْ اَشْتَرَيْتَهَا مِنْدُ كَذَا وَكَذَا فَلَمْ نَجِدْهَا فَلَمَّا وَجَدْتَهَا اَشْتَرَيْتَهَا بِدَرَاهِمٍ وَنَصْفِ، فَنَحْنُ نُعْطِيهِ ثَمَنَهَا، فَقَالَ: لِفِيهَا وَادْفَعِيهَا اِلَيْهِ، ثُمَّ قَالَ الْغُلَامُ لِلسَّائِلِ: هَلْ لَكَ اَنْ تَأْخُذَ دَرَاهِمًا وَتَتْرِكِيهَا؟ قَالَ: نَعَمْ فَاَعْطَاهُ دَرَاهِمًا وَاَخَذَهَا وَاتَى بِهَا فَوَضَعَهَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ وَقَالَ: قَدْ اَعْطَيْتَهُ دَرَاهِمًا وَاَخَذْتَهَا مِنْهُ، فَقَالَ:

²⁶⁸ ”تراث“،

²⁶⁹ Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān Al-I‘tidāl Fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Vol. 1, p. 452.

²⁷⁰ Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān Al-I‘tidāl Fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Vol. 2, p. 448.

لَهَا وَادْفَعَهَا إِلَيْهِ وَلَا تَأْخُذْ مِنْهُ الدِّرْهَمَ، فَإِنِّي سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ﷺ يَقُولُ «أَيُّمَا امْرِئٍ اشْتَهَى شَهْوَةً فَرَدَّ شَهْوَتَهُ وَأَثَرَ بِهَا عَلَى نَفْسِهِ غُفِرَ لَهُ»²⁷¹
قال العراقي: أخرجه أبو الشيخ ابن حبان في كتاب الثَّوَابِ بِإِسْنَادِ ضَعِيفٍ جَدَا وَرَوَاهُ ابْنُ الْجَوْزِيِّ فِي الْمَوْضُوعَاتِ.²⁷²

The hadith from Nāfi': that Ibn 'Umar once fell ill and greatly desired to eat fresh fish. Fish was sought for him in Madīnah, but none was found. After some time, a fish was finally obtained and purchased for him at the price of one and a half dirhams. The fish was then grilled and brought to him along with a piece of bread. Suddenly, a beggar appeared at the door, and Ibn 'Umar said to his servant: "Wrap the fish with the bread and give it to him." The servant said to him: "May Allāh improve your condition; you have long desired it, but we could not find any. When we finally obtained it, we bought it for one and a half dirhams. Shall we just give him the price instead?" Ibn 'Umar replied: "Wrap it and give it to him." Then the servant said to the beggar: "Would you accept just one dirham and leave it (the fish)?" The beggar replied: "Yes." The servant gave him one dirham, and the beggar returned the fish. The servant then placed it before Ibn 'Umar and said: "I have given him one dirham and taken it from him." Ibn 'Umar said: "Wrap it and give it to him, and do not take the dirham from him. Indeed, I heard the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ say: 'Whoever has a desire for something, yet restrains it and prioritizes others over himself, Allāh will forgive him.'"

Al-'Irāqī said: This hadith is narrated by Abū al-Shaykh Ibn Ḥibbān in al-Thawāb with a very weak chain (ḍa'īf jiddan), and it is also narrated by Ibn al-Jawzī in al-Mawḍū'āt.

قال ابن حبان: وقد روى عمرو بن خالد، عن حبيب بن أبي ثابت، عن نافع، عن ابن عمر، قال: قال رسول الله ﷺ: «أَيُّمَا مُسْلِمٍ اشْتَهَى شَهْوَةً فَرَدَّ شَهْوَتَهُ وَأَثَرَ عَلَى نَفْسِهِ غُفِرَ لَهُ»

Ibn Ḥibbān said: 'Amr ibn Khālid narrated from Ḥabīb ibn Abī Thābit, from Nāfi', from Ibn 'Umar, who said: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: "Every Muslim who has a desire for something, yet restrains it and gives preference to others over himself, his sins will be forgiven."²⁷³

قال ابن الجوزي: أنبأنا مُحَمَّدُ بن عبد الملك بن خَيْرُونِ أَنبَأَنَا عَبْدُ الصَّمَدِ بن المأمون أَنبَأَنَا الدَّارِقُطَنِي حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو ذَرِّ أَحْمَدُ بنُ مُحَمَّدِ الوَاسِطِي حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بنُ حَرْبٍ حَدَّثَنَا الْحَسَنُ ابنُ مُوسَى الْأَشْيَبِيِّ حَدَّثَنَا سَعِيدُ بنُ زَيْدٍ عَنْ عَمْرُو بنِ خَالِدٍ عَنْ حَبِيبِ بنِ أَبِي ثَابِتٍ عَنْ نَافِعِ عَنْ ابْنِ عُمَرَ «أَنَّهُ اشْتَرَى سَمَكَةً طَرِيَةً بِدِرْهَمٍ وَنَصْفِ، فَأَتَاهُ سَائِلٌ فَتَصَدَّقَ بِهَا عَلَيْهِ، وَقَالَ: سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ﷺ يَقُولُ: أَيُّمَا امْرِئٍ اشْتَهَى شَهْوَةً فَرَدَّ شَهْوَتَهُ وَأَثَرَهُ عَلَى نَفْسِهِ غُفِرَ لَهُ».

Ibn al-Jawzī said: Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Malik ibn Khayrūn narrated to us, saying: 'Abd al-Ṣamad ibn al-Ma'mūn narrated to us, saying: al-Daraqutnī narrated to us,

²⁷¹ al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm Al-Dīn*. Vol. 3, p. 92.

²⁷² Al-'Irāqī, *Al-Mughnī "an Ḥaml al-Asfār Fī al-Asfār, Fī Takhrij Mā Fī al-Iḥyā'" Min al-Akḥbār*, 978.

²⁷³ "تراث".

saying: *Abū Dharr, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Wāsiṭī, narrated to us, saying: ‘Alī ibn Ḥarb narrated to us, saying: al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Ashyab narrated to us, saying: Sa’īd ibn Zayd narrated from ‘Amr ibn Khālīd from Ḥabīb ibn Abī Thābit, from Nāfi’, from Ibn ‘Umar, that: “He purchased a fresh fish for one and a half dirhams. A beggar came to him, so he gave it to him in charity, and he said: ‘I heard the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ say: Whoever desires something, restrains his desire, and gives preference to others over himself, his sins will be forgiven.’”*²⁷⁴

قال ابن الجوزي: أنبأنا علي بن عبيد الله قال أنبأنا علي بن أحمد البندار قال حدثنا عبد الله بن محمد العكبري قال حدثنا أبو بكر محمد بن الحسين قال حدثنا محمد بن عبد الحميد الواسطي قال حدثنا محمد بن رزق الله قال حدثنا حبيب بن أبي ثابت قال حدثنا عبد الله بن عامر الأسلمي عن ابن شهاب عن سعيد بن المسيب عن أبي ابن كعب قال قال رسول الله ﷺ: «كان جبريل يذاكرني أمر عمر، فقلت: يا جبريل اذكر لي فضائل عمر وما له عند الله، فقال: لو جلست معك مثل ما جلس نوح في قومه ما بلغت فضائل عمر وليبكين الإسلام بعد موتك يا محمد على عمر.»

*Ibn al-Jawzī said: Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Khayrūn reported to us, saying: ‘Abd al-Ṣamad ibn al-Ma’mūn reported to us, saying: al-Dāraqutnī reported to us, saying: Abū Dharr Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Wāsiṭī narrated to us, saying: ‘Alī ibn Ḥarb narrated to us, saying: al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Ashyab narrated to us, saying: Sa’īd ibn Zayd narrated to us, from ‘Amr ibn Khālīd, from Ḥabīb ibn Abī Thābit, from Nāfi’, from Ibn ‘Umar: “Indeed, he purchased a fresh fish for one and a half dirhams. Then a beggar came to him, so he gave it to him in charity. He then said: I heard the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ say: Whoever desires something, yet restrains his desire and gives preference to others over himself, his sins will be forgiven.”*²⁷⁵

This hadith is a narration of Ibn ‘Umar, recorded by Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Dhu‘afā’* and by Ibn al-Jawzī. In its chain of transmission, there is a narrator named ‘Amr ibn Khālīd al-Wāsiṭī, who was judged a liar by the majority of scholars, including Wakī, Ibn ‘Adī, Aḥmad, Ibn Mā’in, al-Darqūthnī,²⁷⁶ Ibn Ḥibbān, and Ibn al-Jawzī.²⁷⁷ As for al-Nasā’ī and al-‘Irāqī, they judged him as extremely weak (*ḍa‘īf jiddan*). Even though al-‘Irāqī identified serious weaknesses in the chain and chose to classify the report as *ḍa‘īf jiddan*, the stronger view (*al-rājiḥ*) appears to follow Ibn al-Jawzī’s assessment that the ḥadīth is *mawḍū‘* (fabricated).

This conclusion is supported by the presence of transmitters accused of deliberate alteration and by thematic inconsistencies that align more closely with the criteria Ibn al-Jawzī employed in identifying fabricated reports. This difference shows how the two scholars approached hadith evaluation. Al-‘Irāqī tends to be more cautious, preferring to call a hadith

²⁷⁴ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Mawḍū‘āt*. Vol. 3, p. 138.

²⁷⁵ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Mawḍū‘āt*. Vol. 3, p. 138.

²⁷⁶ Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān Al-Itidāl Fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Vol. 3, p. 257.

²⁷⁷ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Mawḍū‘āt*. Vol. 3, p. 138.

ḍa‘īf jiddan rather than rush to declare it mawḍū‘, unless the evidence of fabrication is clear. Ibn al-Jawzī, on the other hand, is quicker to label a hadith mawḍū‘, driven by his strong desire to protect the authenticity of the Sunnah.

Fourth:

حَدِيث أَنَس «مَنْ حَمَلَ طَرْفَةً مِنَ السُّوقِ إِلَى عِيَالِهِ فَكَأَنَّمَا حَمَلَ إِلَيْهِمْ صَدَقَةً»²⁷⁸
قال العراقي: أخرجه الخرائطي بسند ضعيف جدا، وأخرجه ابن عدي في الكامل. وقال ابن الجوزي: حديث مؤضوع.²⁷⁹

The ḥadīth of Anas states: “Whoever brings something (even a small item) from the marketplace for his family, it is as if he has brought charity to them.”
Al-‘Irāqī said: This ḥadīth was narrated by al-Kharā‘īṭī with a very weak (ḍa‘īf jiddan) chain of transmission, and it was also narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in al-Kāmil. Ibn al-Jawzī deemed it a mawḍū‘ (fabricated) ḥadīth.

قال ابن حبان: سمعت محمد بن محمود، يقول: سمعت الدارمي، يقول: قلت ليحيى بن معين: حماد بن عمرو النصيبي؟ قال: ليس بشيء. قال أبو حاتم: وهو الذي روى عن عبد الله بن ضرار بن عمرو، عن أبيه، عن يزيد الرقاشي، عن أنس بن مالك، قال: قال رسول الله ﷺ: «مَنْ حَمَلَ طَرْفَةً مِنَ السُّوقِ إِلَى وَلَدٍ كَانَ كَحَامِلِ صَدَقٍ حَتَّى يَضَعَهَا فِيهِمْ، وَلِيَبْدَأَ بِالْإِنَاثِ قَبْلَ الذُّكُورِ، فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ رَقٌّ لِلْإِنَاثِ، وَمَنْ رَقَّ لِأُنثَى كَانَ كَمَنْ بَكَى مِنْ خَشْيَةِ اللَّهِ ﷻ، وَمَنْ بَكَى مِنْ خَشْيَةِ اللَّهِ ﷻ غُفِرَ لَهُ، وَمَنْ فَرَّحَ أَنْتَى فَرَّحَهُ اللَّهُ يَوْمَ الْحَزَنِ».

Ibn Hibbān said: “I heard Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd say: I heard al-Dārimī say: I asked Yaḥyā ibn Ma‘īn about Ḥammād ibn ‘Amr al-Naṣībī. He replied: ‘He is nothing (i.e., of no value/rejected).’ Abū Ḥātim said: He is the one who narrates from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ḍirār ibn ‘Amr, from his father, from Yazīd al-Raqāshī, from Anas ibn Mālik, who said: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: ‘Whoever brings something from the marketplace for his family, it is like the one who brings charity until he places it before them. Let him begin with the daughters before the sons, for indeed Allāh shows gentleness toward daughters. Whoever shows gentleness toward a daughter, it is as though he wept out of fear of Allāh. And whoever weeps out of fear of Allāh, his sins will be forgiven. And whoever brings joy to a daughter, Allāh will bring joy to him on the Day of Grief (the Day of Resurrection).’”

قال ابن عدي: حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ بُلَيْلٍ التستري، حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ شَيْبِيبٍ، حَدَّثَنَا حَمَادُ بْنُ عَمْرٍو النَّصِيبِيُّ، حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ ضَرَّارٍ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ ضَرَّارِ بْنِ عَمْرٍو عَنْ يَزِيدَ بْنِ أَبَانَ، عَنْ أَنَسٍ، قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: مَنْ حَمَلَ طَرْفَةً مِنَ السُّوقِ إِلَى وَلَدِهِ كَانَ لِلْحَامِلِ صَدَقَةً وَأَبْدَأُوا بِالْإِنَاثِ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ رَقٌّ لِلْإِنَاثِ، وَمَنْ رَقَّ لِأُنثَى فَكَأَنَّمَا بَكَى مِنْ خَشْيَةِ اللَّهِ ﷻ، وَمَنْ بَكَى مِنْ خَشْيَةِ اللَّهِ ﷻ غُفِرَ لَهُ، وَمَنْ فَرَّحَ أَنْتَى فَرَّحَهُ اللَّهُ يَوْمَ الْحَزَنِ.

²⁷⁸ al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm Al-Dīn*. Vol. 2, p. 53.

²⁷⁹ Al-‘Irāqī, *Al-Mughnī “an Ḥaml al-Asfār Fī al-Asfār, Fī Takhrij Mā Fī al-Iḥyā’” Min al-Akhbār*, 493.

قال الشيخ: وهذا الحديث لعل إنكاره من حماد بن عمرو النصيبي لا من عبد الله بن ضرار لأن حماد بن عمرو قد عدده السلف فيمن يضع الحديث.

Ibn 'Adī said: "Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Bulayl al-Tustanī narrated to us, he said: Yaḥyā ibn Muḥammad ibn Shabīb narrated to us, he said: Ḥammād ibn 'Amr al-Naṣībī narrated to us, he said: 'Abd Allāh ibn Ḍirār narrated to us, from his father Ḍirār ibn 'Amr, from Yazīd ibn Abān, from Anas, who said: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: 'Whoever brings something from the marketplace for his family, then for the one who brings it, it is (counted) as charity. Begin (by giving) to the daughters, for indeed Allāh shows gentleness toward daughters. Whoever shows gentleness to a daughter, it is as though he wept out of fear of Allāh. And whoever weeps out of fear of Allāh, then Allāh will forgive him. And whoever brings joy to a daughter, Allāh will bring joy to him on the Day of Grief (the Day of Resurrection).'

Al-Shaykh said: This ḥadīth seems to derive its denouncement (munkar) from Ḥammād ibn 'Amr al-Naṣībī, not from 'Abd Allāh ibn Ḍirār, for indeed Ḥammād ibn 'Amr was deemed by the Salaf to be a fabricator of ḥadīth.²⁸⁰

قال الخرائطي: حَدَّثَنَا سَعْدَانُ بْنُ يَزِيدَ الْبُرَّارُ، حَدَّثَنَا صَاحِبٌ لَنَا يُقَالُ لَهُ عَبِيدُ اللَّهِ، عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ ضِرَارٍ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ، عَنْ أَبَانَ بْنِ أَبِي عَيَّاشٍ، عَنْ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكٍ، قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: «مَنْ حَمَلَ طَرْفَةً مِنَ السُّوقِ إِلَى عِيَالِهِ فَكَأَنَّمَا حَمَلَ إِلَيْهِمْ صَدَقَةً، حَتَّى يَضَعَهَا فِيهِمْ، وَلْيُبْدَأْ بِالْإِنَاثِ قَبْلَ الذُّكُورِ؛ فَإِنَّهُ مَنْ فَحَّحَ أَنْثَى فَكَأَنَّمَا بَكَى مِنْ خَشْيَةِ اللَّهِ، وَمَنْ بَكَى مِنْ خَشْيَةِ اللَّهِ؛ حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ بَدَنَهُ عَلَى النَّارِ».

Al-Kharā'itī said: Sa'dān ibn Yazīd al-Bazzār narrated to us; he said: one of our companions, whose name was 'Ubayd Allāh, narrated to us, from 'Abd Allāh ibn Ḍirār, from his father, from Abān ibn Abī 'Ayyāsh, from Anas ibn Mālik, who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: "Whoever brings something from the marketplace for his family, it is as though he has brought them charity until he places it before them. And let him begin with the daughters before the sons. Indeed, whoever brings joy to a daughter, it is as though he weeps out of fear of Allah. And whoever weeps out of fear of Allah, Allah will forbid his body from the Fire."²⁸¹

قال ابن الجوزي: أَنبَأَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْمَلِكِ أَنبَأَنَا ابْنُ مَسْعَدَةَ أَنبَأَنَا حَمْرَةُ بْنُ يُوْسُفَ أَنبَأَنَا ابْنُ عَدِيٍّ حَدَّثَنَا أَحْمَدُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ بُلْبُلٍ حَدَّثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ شَيْبٍ حَدَّثَنَا حَمَّادُ بْنُ عَمْرٍو النَّصِيْبِي حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ ضِرَارِ بْنِ عَمْرٍو عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنْ يَزِيدَ الرَّقَاشِيِّ عَنْ أَنَسِ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: «مَنْ حَمَلَ طَرْفَةً مِنَ السُّوقِ إِلَى وَلَدِهِ كَانَ

²⁸⁰ "تراث،"

²⁸¹ "تراث،"

كحامل صدقة، وابدؤا بالاناث فإن الله عزوجل رَقَّ لِلْإِنَاثِ، وَمَنْ رَقَّ لِأُنْتَى كَانَ كَمَنْ بَكَى مِنْ حَشِيَّةِ اللَّهِ عزوجل،
وَمَنْ بَكَى مِنْ حَشِيَّةِ اللَّهِ غَفَرَ لَهُ، وَمَنْ فَرَحَ أَنْتَى فَرَحَهُ اللَّهُ عزوجل يَوْمَ الْحُزْنِ».

Ibn al-Jawzī said: Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik informed us, he said: Ibn Mas‘adah informed us, he said: Ḥamzah ibn Yūsuf informed us, he said: Ibn ‘Adī informed us, he said: Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Bulbul narrated to us, he said: Yaḥyā ibn Muḥammad ibn Shabīb narrated to us, he said: Ḥammād ibn ‘Amr al-Naṣībī narrated to us, he said: ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ḍirār ibn ‘Amr narrated to us, from his father, from Yazīd al-Raqāshī, from Anas, who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “Whoever brings something from the marketplace for his child, it is as though he has brought charity. And begin (giving) with the daughters before the sons, for indeed Allah has tenderness towards daughters. Whoever shows gentleness towards a daughter, it is as though he weeps out of fear of Allah. And whoever weeps out of fear of Allah, Allah will forgive him. And whoever brings joy to a daughter, Allah will bring him joy on the Day of Distress (the Day of Resurrection).”²⁸²

This ḥadīth is narrated from Anas ibn Mālik and was transmitted by Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Du‘afā’*, Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil*, al-Kharā‘iṭhī in *Makārim al-Akhḫāq*, and Ibn al-Jawzī in *al-Mawḍū‘āt*. This ḥadīth is deemed fabricated (*mawḍū‘*) because in its chain of transmission appears Ḥammād ibn ‘Amr al-Naṣībī. Some scholars considered him a liar, such as Ibn Ḥibbān, al-Jūzajānī,²⁸³ and Ibn al-Jawzī. This hadith again shows the same pattern. Al-‘Irāqī pointed out major weaknesses in the chain but didn’t see clear proof of fabrication. He preferred to record it as ḍa‘īf jiddan and move on. Ibn al-Jawzī, though, lived in a time when moral stories and “virtue” narrations were often invented for preaching, so he took a firmer line and called it *mawḍū‘*.

Fifth:

حَدِيثُ عَائِشَةَ «مَا جَبَلَ اللَّهُ وَلِيَا لَهُ إِلَّا عَلَى السَّخَاءِ وَحَسَنِ الْخَلْقِ»²⁸⁴
قال العراقي: أخرجه الدَّارَقُطَنِيُّ فِي الْمُسْتَجَادِ دُونَ قَوْلِهِ «وَحَسَنِ الْخَلْقِ» بِسَنَدٍ ضَعِيفٍ وَمِنْ طَرِيقِهِ ابْنُ الْجَوْزِيِّ فِي الْمَوْضُوعَاتِ وَذَكَرَهُ بِهِ الزِّيَادَةُ ابْنُ عَدِيٍّ مِنْ رِوَايَةِ بَقِيَّةَ عَنْ يُوْسُفَ بْنِ أَبِي السَّفَرِ عَنِ الْأَوْزَاعِيِّ عَنِ الرَّهْزِيِّ عَنِ عُرْوَةَ عَنِ عَائِشَةَ، وَيُوسُفَ ضَعِيفٌ جَدًّا.²⁸⁵

The ḥadīth of ‘Ā’ishah: “Allah does not appoint a walī (friend and ally) for Himself except that he possesses generosity and good character.”

Al-‘Irāqī said: This ḥadīth was transmitted by al-Dāraquṭnī in al-Mustajād without the additional wording “and good character” with a weak isnād. Through this same transmission, Ibn al-Jawzī also narrated it in al-Mawḍū‘āt. As for the version with the additional wording, it was cited by Ibn ‘Adī from the narration of Baqiyyah, from

²⁸² Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Mawḍū‘āt*. Vol. 2, p. 276.

²⁸³ Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān Al-‘Itidāl Fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Vol. 1, p. 598.

²⁸⁴ al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm Al-Dīn*. Vol. 3, p. 244.

²⁸⁵ Al-‘Irāqī, *Al-Mughnī “an Ḥaml al-Asfār Fī al-Asfār, Fī Takhrij Mā Fī al-Iḥyā’” Min al-Akhbār*, 1148.

Yūsuf ibn Abī al-Safar, from al-Awzā'ī, from al-Zuhnī, from 'Urwah, from 'Ā'ishah. However, Yūsuf has been judged to be very weak (da'if jiddan).

قال ابن الجوزي: أَنبَأَنَا ابْنُ خَيْرُونَ أَنبَأَنَا الْجَوْهَرِيُّ عَنِ الدَّارِقُطِيِّ قَالَ رَوَى أَبُو عَمَّارٍ عَنْ بَقِيَّةَ عَنْ أَبِي الْقَيْصِ يُونُسَ بْنِ السَّفَرِ عَنِ الْأَوْزَاعِيِّ عَنِ الرَّهْرِيِّ عَنْ عُرْوَةَ عَنْ عَائِشَةَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ ﷺ قَالَ: «مَا جَبَلَ وَلِيُّ اللَّهِ إِلَّا عَلَى السَّخَاءِ وَحُسْنِ الْخُلُقِ».

Ibn al-Jawzī said: Ibn Khayrūn informed us, al-Jawhānī informed us, from al-Dāraqūṭnī, who said: Abū 'Ammār narrated from Baqiyyah, from Abū al-Fayḍ Yūsuf ibn al-Safar, from al-Awzā'ī, from al-Zuhnī, from 'Urwah, from 'Ā'ishah, from the Prophet ﷺ, who said: "No walī of Allah is ever created except that he is generous and possesses noble character."²⁸⁶

قال ابن عساكر: محمد بن عمر أبو عبد الله الحمصي الأنماطي حدث بدمشق عن الحسين بن خالوية النحوي روى عنه عبد العزيز الكتاني أخبرنا أبو محمد بن الأكفاني ثنا أبو محمد الكتاني أنبأنا أبو عبد الله محمد بن عمر الحمصي الأنماطي قراءة عليه ثنا أبو عبد الله الحسين بن خالوية ثنا أبو عبد الله بن المطبقي ثنا محمد بن عزيز بن سليمان بن سلمان ثنا يوسف بن السفر عن الأوزاعي عن الزهري عن عروة عن عائشة قالت قال رسول الله ﷺ ما جبل ولي لله إلا على السخاء وحسن الخلق.

Ibn 'Asākir said: Muḥammad ibn 'Umar Abū 'Abdillāh al-Ḥimṣī al-Anmāṭī narrated in Damascus from al-Ḥusayn ibn Khālawayh al-Naḥwī. From him, 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Kattānī narrated. Abū Muḥammad ibn al-Akfānī informed us, he said: Abū Muḥammad al-Kattānī narrated to us, he said: Abū 'Abdillāh Muḥammad ibn 'Umar al-Ḥimṣī al-Anmāṭī narrated to us by way of reading before him, he said: Abū 'Abdillāh al-Ḥusayn ibn Khālawayh narrated to us, he said: Abū 'Abdillāh ibn al-Muṭbaqī narrated to us, he said: Muḥammad ibn 'Azīz ibn Sulaimān ibn Salmān narrated to us, he said: Yūsuf ibn al-Safar from al-Awzā'ī narrated to us, from al-Zuhnī, from 'Urwah, from 'Ā'ishah, who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: "No walī of Allah is ever created except that he is generous and possesses noble character."²⁸⁷

Apart from the narrations mentioned by al-'Irāqī, this ḥadīth was also transmitted by Ibn 'Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq*. Within this ḥadīth there is a transmitter named Yūsuf ibn Abī Safar, who was deemed a liar by al-Dāraqūṭnī, al-Bayhaqī, and Ibn al-Jawzī. However, some scholars considered him extremely weak, such as al-Bukhārī,²⁸⁸ al-Nasā'ī, Abū Zur'ah, and al-'Irāqī. What is more correct (*al-rājiḥ*) is that Yūsuf was indeed a liar and that his ḥadīth is

²⁸⁶ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Al-Mawḍū'āt*. Vol. 2, p. 179.

²⁸⁷ "تراث"

²⁸⁸ Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī, *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, 1st ed., ed. Muḥammad ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Muḥammad al-Dabbāsī and Markaz Shadhā lil-Buḥūth under the supervision of Maḥmūd ibn 'Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Naḥḥāl (Riyadh: Al-Nāshir al-Mutamayyiz lil-Ṭibā'ah wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī', 2019).

mawḍūʿ (fabricated). This is because of the explicit criticism (*jarḥ mufassar*) of Ibn ʿAdī, who stated that he transmitted false reports, and this assessment was further corroborated. In this study, *tarjīḥ* (preponderance) is determined based on two criteria: first, the specificity and explicitness of *jarḥ mufassar* (detailed criticism); and second, the corroboration of that judgment by multiple authoritative critics from early generations.

According to these principles, the assessment that Yūsuf was a liar and that his reports are *mawḍūʿ* (fabricated) is more convincing, since Ibn ʿAdī’s statement that he “transmitted false reports” is explicit and corroborated by later authorities. In this last example, both scholars kept to their familiar tendencies. Al-ʿIrāqī noted that the chain was extremely weak but avoided calling it a fabrication, keeping his consistent distinction between “weak” and “false.” Ibn al-Jawzī, true to his reforming spirit, had no hesitation in classifying it as *mawḍūʿ*.

D. CONCLUSION

Five ḥadīths were classified as *ḍaʿīf jiddan* by al-ʿIrāqī and as *mawḍūʿ* by Ibn al-Jawzī. Al-ʿIrāqī tended to be more cautious, preferring to label reports as *ḍaʿīf jiddan* rather than fabricated, while Ibn al-Jawzī adopted a stricter stance, often declaring similar reports *mawḍūʿ* when transmission flaws were severe. This difference reflects their distinct priorities: al-ʿIrāqī focused on assessing transmitters and *isnād* reliability, whereas Ibn al-Jawzī emphasized protecting the ḥadīth corpus from dubious material. After careful comparison, the stronger view (*al-rājih*) holds that the ḥadīth on the virtue of bread is *ḍaʿīf jiddan*, while four others on the virtues of ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, restraining desire, bringing goods from the market, and generosity are *mawḍūʿ*. Both scholars made lasting contributions to ḥadīth criticism: al-ʿIrāqī with his precision and extensive *takhrīj* works, and Ibn al-Jawzī with his prolific authorship and rigorous critique.

E. REFERENCES

- Adlini, Miza Nina, Anisya Hanifa Dinda, Sarah Yulinda, Octavia Chotimah, and Sauda Julia Merliyana. “Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Studi Pustaka.” *Jurnal Edumaspul* 6, no. 1 (2022): 974–80.
- Al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl. *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*. 1st ed. Edited by Muḥammad ibn Šāliḥ ibn Muḥammad al-Dabbāsī and Markaz Shadhā lil-Buḥūth under the supervision of

-
- Maḥmūd ibn ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Naḥḥāl. Riyadh: Al-Nāshir al-Mutamayyiz lil-Ṭibā‘ah wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘, 2019.
- Al-Dhahabī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad. *Mīzān al-Itidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. 1st ed. Edited by ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī. Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah lil-Ṭibā‘ah wa al-Nashr, 1963.
- Al-‘Irāqī, ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn al-Ḥusayn. *Al-Mughnī “an Ḥaml al-Asfār Fī al-Asfār, Fī Takhrij mā fī al-Iḥyā” min al-Akḥbār*. 1st ed. Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2005.
- Altammami, Shatha Hamad. “Artificial Intelligence for Understanding the Hadith.” PhD Thesis, University of Leeds, 2023.
- Anwar, Pajar, and Sri Minarti. “Metodologi Ulumul Hadits.” *Fatih: Journal of Contemporary Research* 2, no. 2 (2025): 612–22. <https://doi.org/10.61253/7ytxq209>.
- Aziz, Hafiz Fahad, and Mr Ghulam Qasim. “Exploring the Interplay between Hadith and Islamic Theology: Foundations, Impacts, and Interpretations.” *Journal of Religion and Society* 3, no. 02 (2025): 846–59.
- Azungah, Theophilus. “Qualitative Research: Deductive and Inductive Approaches to Data Analysis.” *Qualitative Research Journal* 18, no. 4 (November 2018): 383–400. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-D-18-00035>.
- Fikri, Shofil, Fiimaratus Sholihah, Jasminta Murawah Hayyu, Alqodhi Adlantama, and Muhammad Hanan Ali. “Memahami Makna dari Hadis dan Ilmu Hadis menurut Pandangan Muhadditsin dan Ushuliyin.” *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 1, no. 4 (2024): 12–12.
- Ghazālī, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-. *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm Al-Dīn*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, n.d.
- Gufran-ul-Haque, Muhammad. “Ḥadīth of Self-Knowing between Sufis and Ḥadīth Scholars.” *ISLAMIC INSIGHT* 7, no. 2 (2024).
- Hafidz, Abdul. “Kritik Ulama Hadits: Ilmu Jarh wa Ta’dil sebagai Upaya dalam Menjaga Orisinalitas Hadits.” *International Conference on Islamic Studies* 1, no. 1 (2020): 152–62.
- Hasanah, Ananda Nurul. “Penerapan Syarat Kesahihan Hadis pada Skripsi Mahasiswa Prodi Ilmu Hadis UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta Tahun 2024.” B.S. thesis, Fakultas Ushuluddin UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, n.d.
- https://Yaqeeninstitute.Org.My/Read/Paper/Authenticating-Hadith-and-the-History-of-Hadith-Criticism?Utm_source=chatgpt.Com#fint22.
- Ibn al-Jawzī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Alī. *al-Du‘afā’ wa al-Matrūkūn*. 1st ed. Edited by ‘Abd Allāh al-Qāḍī. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1986.

-
- . *al-Mawḍū'āt*. 1st ed. Edited by 'Abd al-Rahmān Muḥammad 'Uthmān. Al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah: Muḥammad 'Abd al-Muḥsin, Ṣāhib al-Maktabah al-Salafiyah, 1966.
- Ibn Muhammad Yusoff, Muhammad Fawwaz. "Ibn Ḥibbān Al-Bustī's (d. 354/965) Contribution to the Science of Ḥadīth Transmission." PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow, 2017.
- Imron, Ali. "Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Jarh wa Ta'dil." *Mukaddimah: Jurnal Studi Islam* 2, no. 2 (2017): 287–302. <https://doi.org/10.14421/mjsi.22.1371>.
- Karagözoğlu, Mustafa Macit. "Contested Avenues in Post-Classical Sunni Ḥadīth Criticism: A Reading through the Lens of al-Mughnī 'an al-Ḥifẓ wa-l-Kitāb." *Journal of Islamic Studies* 29, no. 2 (2018): 149–80. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13020092>.
- Kurdian, Nur Kholis Bin, Abd A'la, and Muhammad Syarifudin. "Kritik Israr Ahmad Khan Terhadap Hadis-Hadis Kitab al-Qadar dari Kitab Sahih al-Bukhari." *Al-Majaalis: Jurnal Dirasat Islamiyah* 12, no. 1 (2024): 121–40. <https://doi.org/10.37397/al-majaalis.v12i1.678>.
- Mohajan, Haradhan Kumar. "Qualitative Research Methodology in Social Sciences and Related Subjects." *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People* 7, no. 1 (2018): 23–48.
- Muhid, Muhid. "Ilmu Kritik Hadis (al-Jarh wa al-Ta'dil) dalam Lintasan Sejarah." *Dar El-Ilmi: Jurnal Studi Keagamaan, Pendidikan Dan Humaniora* 6, no. 2 (2019): 338–62. <https://doi.org/10.52166/dar%20el-ilm.v6i2.1742>.
- Nawaz, Muhammad. "Understanding Tadrīs: A Key Concept in the Science of Ḥadīth Criticism." *Al-Marjān (المرجان)* 2, no. 3 (2024): 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.1234/6mvsqw31>.
- Nurrohman, Muhamad Ridwan. "Metodologi Tajrih Ibn al-Jauzi dalam Kitab ad-Dhu'afā wal-Matrūkīn (Bedah Kasus Riwayat Aflah Ibn Sa'id dalam Kitab al-Maudhū'ât)." *Al-Majaalis: Jurnal Dirasat Islamiyah* 4, no. 2 (2017): 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.37397/almajaalis.v4i2.66>.
- Qudsy, Saifuddin Zuhri, Irwan Abdullah, Hasse Jubba, Zaenuddin Hudi Prasojo, and Egi Tanadi Taufik. "The Making of Living Ḥadīth: A New Direction of Ḥadīth Studies in Indonesia." *Culture and Religion* 23, no. 4 (2023): 353–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14755610.2024.2336461>.
- Rajani, Kumail. *Making Sense of Ismaili Traditions: The Modes and Meanings of the Transmission of Ḥadīth in the Works of al-Qāḍī al-Nu'mān (d. 363/974)*. University of Exeter, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14755610.2024.2336461>.
- Ramle, Muhamad Rozaimi, and Miftachul Huda. "Between Text and Context: Understanding Ḥadīth through Asbab al Wurud." *Religions* 13, no. 2 (2022): 92. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13020092>.

-
- Rohman, A'an Mujibur. "Kritik Ibn al-Jauzi terhadap Hadis dalam Kitab Ihya Ulum ad-Din dan Pembelaan Abu al-Fadl al-Iraqi." *Jalsah: The Journal of Al-Quran and As-Sunnah Studies* 1, no. 1 (2021): 62–75.
- Taufik, Alwi, Juli Handoko, and Ihsan Mustofa. "Ilmu Hadits sebagai Pilar Keaslian Ajaran Islam: Kajian Kritik Sanad dan Matan." *Molang: Journal Islamic Education* 3, no. 1 (2025): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.32806/tb6bp948>.
- Tohardi, Dr Ahmad. *Pengantar Metodologi Penelitian Sosial + Plus*. Tanjungpura University Press, 2019.
- Tujang, Bisri. "al-Nasikh wa al-Mansukh (Deskripsi Metode Interpretasi Hadis Kontradiktif)." *Al-Majaalis: Jurnal Dirasat Islamiyah* 2, no. 2 (2015): 69–98. <https://doi.org/10.37397/almajaalis.v2i2.28>.
- Utama, I. Gusti Bagus Rai, Ni Made Eka Mahadewi, and Ni Putu Dyah Krismawintari. *Metodologi Penelitian Bidang Manajemen dan Pariwisata (dilengkapi Studi Kasus Penelitian dan Pembahasannya)*. Deepublish, 2023.
- Widodo, Heru, and Fahmi Irfanudin. "al Jarh wa at-Ta'dil in Researching Sanad Hadits." *Journal of Hadith Studies* 3, no. 1 (2020): 23–33.
- Wijaya, Dina Sakinah, and Nurul Fitri Habibah. "Periwayatan Hadis Nabi (Tahammul wal Ada'), Ilmu Jarh wa Ta'dil dan Ilmu Nasikh Mansukh dalam Hadis." *El-Sunnah: Jurnal Kajian Hadis Dan Integrasi Ilmu* 5, no. 1 (2024): 23–32.
- Zubaidillah, Muh Haris. *Ilmu Jarh Wa Ta'dil*. OSF, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/y8wt6>.