

Characteristics of the Late Usul School Integrating the Methodologies of the Theologians and the Hanafis: Their Approaches to the Organization of Usul al-Fiqh Topics

YOUSEF AHMAD MOH'D BADAWI

Former Professor, Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah, Saudi Arabia

Email: badawe_yousef@hotmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9986-7662>

Abstract

This study examines the characteristics and methodological approaches of the **late integrative school** (*al-muta' akhkhirūn*) in *Usul al-Fiqh*, which emerged to reconcile the methodologies of the *Mutakallimun* and the Hanafi jurists. It aims to analyze the intellectual foundations of this school, identify its major strengths and limitations, and compare the organizational structures adopted in its principal works. The research employs analytical, historical, comparative, and inductive methods through an examination of six representative texts: *Badī' al-Ni'ām* by Ibn al-Sā'ātī, *Al-Tanqīh* by Qadr al-Sharī'ah, *Jam' al-Jawāmi'* by al-Subkī, *Fu'ūl al-Badā'i'* by al-Fanārī, *Al-Ta'wīl* by Ibn al-Humām, and *Musallam al-Thubūt* by Ibn 'Abd al-Shakūr. The findings reveal that, despite differences in the arrangement of *Usul* topics, these works share a common objective of integrating rational and textual evidence while linking legal principles with their practical juristic applications. The study further demonstrates that the integrative methodology significantly contributed to the maturation of Islamic legal theory by promoting comparative analysis, methodological coherence, and a balanced synthesis of the *Mutakallimun* and Hanafi traditions. However, it also identifies certain limitations, including excessive brevity, strong adherence to established legal schools, and the repetition of inherited juristic examples. The study concludes that the integrative school represents a pivotal stage in the historical development of *Usul al-Fiqh* and recommends further comparative research into the evolution and organization of *Usul* literature across different methodological traditions.

Keywords: *Usul al-Fiqh*; Integrative School; *Mutakallimun*; Hanafi Methodology; Islamic Legal Theory.

Introduction

The discipline of *Usul al-Fiqh* (Islamic legal theory) occupies a central position in the Islamic legal tradition because it provides the methodological framework through which jurists derive legal rulings from the primary sources of Islamic law, namely the Qur'an and the Sunnah. As the intellectual foundation of Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*), *Usul al-Fiqh* establishes the principles governing legal reasoning, textual interpretation, analogical deduction, and the reconciliation of apparently conflicting evidences. Without these methodological principles, the process of *ijtihad* (independent legal reasoning) would lack consistency, objectivity, and legal coherence. Following the era of the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ and the generations of the Companions and Successors, Islamic legal scholarship experienced remarkable intellectual growth. As juristic opinions expanded across different regions and schools of thought, scholars increasingly recognized the necessity of developing systematic principles capable of regulating legal interpretation and resolving disagreements among jurists. This intellectual need reached its first comprehensive expression through the pioneering work of Imam al-Shafi'i (d. 204 AH), whose *Al-Risalah* laid the foundations of *Usul al-Fiqh* as an independent discipline. Rather than

inventing new legal principles, al-Shafi'i systematically organized and articulated the methodological practices already employed by the early jurists, transforming dispersed juristic methods into a coherent and structured science.¹

After the formative period, *Usul al-Fiqh* developed into several methodological schools, each adopting distinctive approaches to legal theory, legal reasoning, and the organization of legal principles. Among the most influential were the School of the Theologians (*Tariqat al-Mutakallimun*) and the School of the Hanafis (*Tariqat al-Fuqaha*). Although both schools pursued the common objective of facilitating the accurate derivation of Islamic legal rulings, they differed considerably in their methodological orientations, evidentiary preferences, and modes of legal analysis. The methodology of the Theologians emphasized theoretical consistency, logical reasoning, and abstract legal principles independent of any particular legal school. Scholars belonging to this tradition sought to establish universal legal principles through rational argumentation and linguistic analysis before applying them to individual legal cases. Their works often incorporated discussions drawn from theology, logic, and philosophy, reflecting a highly analytical approach to Islamic legal theory. In contrast, the Hanafi methodology developed primarily through inductive analysis of substantive legal rulings established by Hanafi jurists. Rather than constructing legal theory independently of jurisprudence, Hanafi scholars formulated legal principles by examining established juristic rulings and extracting the underlying methodological rules governing those rulings. Consequently, many Hanafi legal principles were closely connected to practical jurisprudence and reflected the doctrinal preferences of the Hanafi school.²

Despite the significant contributions of both traditions, each methodology exhibited certain limitations. The theoretical orientation of the Theologians occasionally resulted in discussions that were excessively abstract or detached from practical legal application. Conversely, the Hanafi methodology was sometimes criticized for allowing juristic rulings to shape legal principles, thereby making the legal theory appear subordinate to the positive law of a particular school rather than functioning as an independent methodological discipline. Recognizing the respective strengths and weaknesses of these two traditions, a group of later *Usul* scholars developed an integrative methodology that sought to combine the analytical rigor of the Theologians with the practical legal orientation of the Hanafi jurists. This synthesis, commonly referred to as the Method of the Later Usul Scholars, represented a significant stage in the historical development of Islamic legal theory. Rather than merely combining two existing traditions, these scholars attempted to establish a more comprehensive methodology capable of integrating rational analysis, textual evidence, juristic application, and comparative legal reasoning within a single systematic framework. The emergence of this integrative methodology during the seventh century AH reflected broader intellectual developments within Islamic scholarship. By this period, legal schools had become firmly established, scholarly literature had expanded considerably, and comparative legal discussions had become increasingly sophisticated. Scholars sought not only to preserve the methodological achievements of earlier generations but also to reconcile divergent approaches and provide more comprehensive presentations of legal theory. This effort produced a series of influential works that integrated the principles of both traditions while introducing innovative methods for organizing *Usul al-Fiqh* topics.³

One of the distinguishing characteristics of the later scholars was their attention to the systematic arrangement of legal theory. They recognized that the organization of legal topics was not merely a matter of presentation but constituted an essential component of legal methodology itself. Earlier authorities such as Imam al-Juwayni and Imam al-Ghazali had already emphasized that the logical arrangement of legal discussions greatly facilitates understanding and enables students to perceive the interrelationship between different branches of legal theory. Building upon this insight, the later scholars developed increasingly sophisticated systems for organizing legal principles, evidences, linguistic discussions, legal rulings, analogical reasoning, and *ijtihad* into coherent intellectual structures. Although the integrative methodology occupies an important place in the history of *Usul al-Fiqh*, relatively little independent research has examined its defining characteristics and its distinctive

¹ Al-Āmidī, A. ibn M. (1402 AH). *Al-iḥkām fī uṣūl al-aḥkām* (2nd ed.). Al-Maktab al-Islāmī.

² Al-Aṣṣafahānī, M. ibn A. (1986). *Bayān al-mukhtaṣar: Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar Ibn al-Hājib* (Vols. 1–3). Dār al-Madani.

³ Amīr Bādshāh, M. A. (1350 AH). *Taysīr al-tahrīr 'alā Kitāb al-Tahrīr*. Maṭba'at Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī.

approaches to organizing legal theory. Existing scholarship has generally focused on either the School of the Theologians or the Hanafi School individually, while the methodological synthesis developed by the later scholars has received comparatively limited scholarly attention. Likewise, previous studies have rarely undertaken a comprehensive comparative analysis of the structural organization employed by the principal works representing this integrative tradition.⁴

Accordingly, this study seeks to examine the defining characteristics of the Method of the Later Usul Scholars by analyzing both its intellectual foundations and its approaches to organizing the major topics of *Usul al-Fiqh*. It investigates the historical emergence of this methodology, identifies its principal positive and negative characteristics, compares the organizational structures adopted by its leading representatives, and evaluates its contribution to the development of Islamic legal theory. By doing so, the study aims to provide a deeper understanding of one of the most influential methodological developments in the history of Islamic jurisprudence while highlighting its continuing significance for contemporary studies in *Usul al-Fiqh*.⁵

Despite the extensive body of scholarship devoted to *Usul al-Fiqh*, the integrative methodology developed by the later *Usul* scholars has received comparatively limited independent academic attention. Most existing studies have concentrated on either the methodological tradition of the Theologians (*Tariqat al-Mutakallimun*) or that of the Hanafi jurists (*Tariqat al-Fuqaha*), while relatively few have examined the intellectual characteristics of the later scholars who sought to reconcile these two influential traditions within a unified methodological framework. Consequently, significant aspects of this integrative school—including its defining characteristics, methodological innovations, and approaches to organizing *Usul al-Fiqh* topics—remain insufficiently explored. To the best of the author's knowledge, no comprehensive study has been devoted exclusively to analyzing both the defining characteristics of the integrative methodology of the later *Usul* scholars and their systematic approaches to structuring the subjects of Islamic legal theory. Existing research has generally examined isolated dimensions of this methodology or addressed it only incidentally within broader discussions of the historical development of *Usul al-Fiqh*. This gap provides the principal justification for the present study. Several previous scholarly works have addressed issues closely related to the present research. However, each focuses on a particular aspect of *Usul al-Fiqh* methodology rather than providing a comprehensive analysis of the later integrative school. The author's previous peer-reviewed studies constitute an important foundation for the present research. These include "The Usuli Characteristics of the School of the Theologians," published in the *Jordanian Journal of Islamic Studies* (Al al-Bayt University, 2009), which examined the methodological features of the *Mutakallimun* tradition. A second study, "The Usuli Characteristics of the Hanafi School," published in the same journal in 2012, analyzed the methodological principles governing Hanafi legal theory. The author also published "Methodologies of the Theologians in Organizing the Topics of Usul al-Fiqh" in the *Journal of Sharia and Islamic Studies* (Kuwait University, 2012), followed by "Methodologies of the Hanafi School in Organizing the Topics of Usul al-Fiqh," published in the *Journal of Islamic Studies and Academic Research* (Cairo University). Collectively, these studies investigated the two classical methodological traditions independently; however, they did not examine the later integrative methodology that sought to combine both traditions into a unified framework. Other relevant studies have likewise contributed valuable insights while leaving significant gaps. For example, Hisham Muhammad Al-Saeed's "The Arrangement of Usul al-Fiqh Topics and Their Interrelationships: An Analytical and Inductive Study" (2015) explored the structural organization of *Usul al-Fiqh* discussions and briefly addressed the methodology of the later scholars. Nevertheless, its primary focus remained descriptive, and it did not analyze the distinctive characteristics, intellectual foundations, or methodological advantages and disadvantages of the integrative school. Similarly, Hiba Muhammad Mansour's "Methodologies of Usul Scholars in Organizing and Discussing the Topics of Conflict and Preference: A Critical Applied Study" (2022) examined only the chapters dealing with legal conflict (*Ta'arud*) and preference (*Tarjih*). While the study provides an important contribution to understanding those specific topics, it does not extend its analysis to the broader organization of *Usul al-Fiqh*, including legal rulings, legal evidences, linguistic indications, legal

⁴ Mustafa, A., Ishaque, M., Raza, R., Samiullah, & Raza, M. I. (2025). When culture meets Fiqh: Examining the legal authority of 'Urf in contemporary engagement traditions. *Global Islamic Research Journal*, 1(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.65960/girj.1.1.2025.6>

⁵ Al-Taftāzānī, S. al-D. M. ibn 'U. (n.d.). *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥ 'alā al-Tawdīḥ li-Matn al-Tanqīḥ fī uṣūl al-fiqh*. Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.

Characteristics of the Late Usul School Integrating the Methodologies of the Theologians and the Hanafis: Their Approaches to the Organization of Usul al-Fiqh Topics

capacity, *ijtihad*, and *taqlid*. Consequently, it does not offer a comprehensive evaluation of the methodological structure adopted by the later scholars.

A review of the existing literature therefore demonstrates that previous scholarship has concentrated either on individual methodological schools or on particular subjects within *Usul al-Fiqh*. Comprehensive research examining the later integrative methodology as an independent school of legal theory remains scarce. More specifically, no previous study has systematically investigated its historical emergence, intellectual characteristics, methodological strengths and weaknesses, and approaches to organizing the principal subjects of *Usul al-Fiqh* in a single analytical framework.

The historical development of *Usul al-Fiqh* witnessed the emergence of several methodological schools, each seeking to establish a coherent framework for deriving Islamic legal rulings from the primary sources of Islamic law. Among these schools, the methodologies of the Theologians (*Tariqat al-Mutakallimun*) and the Hanafi jurists (*Tariqat al-Fuqaha'*) became the two most influential traditions. Although both made substantial contributions to Islamic legal theory, each developed distinctive methodological principles, organizational structures, and approaches to legal reasoning. As scholarly activity progressed, later *Usul* scholars attempted to bridge the methodological divide between these two traditions by developing an integrative approach that combined their respective strengths while minimizing their weaknesses. This synthesis produced a rich body of literature that significantly influenced the subsequent development of Islamic legal theory. Nevertheless, despite its historical importance, this integrative methodology has not received sufficient scholarly attention as an independent subject of research. Most existing studies have focused on either the theoretical foundations of the earlier schools or on selected topics within *Usul al-Fiqh*. Consequently, important questions remain unanswered regarding the historical emergence of the integrative methodology, its intellectual foundations, its defining characteristics, and its distinctive methods of organizing *Usul al-Fiqh* topics. Furthermore, no comprehensive comparative analysis has been undertaken to evaluate the organizational methodologies adopted by the principal works representing this school.

The absence of such a comprehensive investigation has created a significant gap in contemporary scholarship on Islamic legal theory. Addressing this gap requires a systematic study that examines both the methodological characteristics of the later scholars and the structural organization of their major *Usul* works.

To address the research problem, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Who are the "Late Usul Scholars" (*al-Muta'akhkhirun*), and how is this methodological school defined within the history of *Usul al-Fiqh*?
2. What historical, intellectual, and scholarly circumstances contributed to the emergence of the integrative methodology that combines the approaches of the Theologians and the Hanafi jurists?
3. What are the principal positive characteristics of the methodology adopted by the later *Usul* scholars?
4. What methodological limitations and criticisms have been directed toward this school?
5. How did the leading scholars of this tradition organize the principal topics of *Usul al-Fiqh* in their major legal-theoretical works?
6. What similarities and differences exist among the organizational methodologies adopted in the principal works of the integrative school?
7. To what extent did this methodology contribute to the historical development of Islamic legal theory and influence later *Usul* scholarship?

This study aims to achieve the following objectives:

- To define the concept of the Method of the Later *Usul* Scholars and clarify its historical development.

- To identify the intellectual foundations upon which this integrative methodology was established.
- To analyze the methodological characteristics that distinguish this school from the earlier traditions of the Theologians and the Hanafi jurists.
- To evaluate both the strengths and weaknesses of this methodological approach.
- To examine the methods adopted by leading scholars in organizing the principal subjects of *Usul al-Fiqh*.
- To compare the organizational structures of the most influential classical works representing this school.
- To assess the contribution of this methodology to the development of Islamic legal theory and its continuing significance in contemporary *Usul al-Fiqh* studies.
- To enrich modern scholarship by providing a comprehensive analytical framework for understanding one of the most significant methodological developments in the history of Islamic jurisprudence.

Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative doctrinal research methodology based primarily on analytical, historical, comparative, and inductive approaches. Since the research investigates the evolution of legal-theoretical methodology rather than positive legal rules, it relies extensively on the analysis of classical *Usul al-Fiqh* literature and the comparative examination of major scholarly works.

The **historical method** is employed to trace the emergence and development of the integrative methodology within the broader history of Islamic legal theory. This approach enables the study to identify the intellectual circumstances that encouraged later scholars to combine the methodologies of the Theologians and the Hanafi jurists.

The **analytical method** is used to examine the methodological principles adopted by the later scholars, evaluate their approaches to legal reasoning, and assess their intellectual contributions to *Usul al-Fiqh*. Particular attention is given to the theoretical foundations underlying their organization of legal topics.

The **comparative method** forms the central methodological framework of the study. It facilitates systematic comparisons between the methodologies of the earlier schools and the integrative approach, as well as among the principal classical works representing the later tradition. Through comparative analysis, similarities, differences, methodological innovations, and distinctive structural features are identified and critically evaluated.

The **inductive method** is employed to examine a broad range of classical *Usul* texts in order to identify recurring methodological patterns and general characteristics. Rather than relying upon isolated examples, the study derives its conclusions from comprehensive examination of the major representative works of the integrative school.

Primary sources consist of the classical works of the leading scholars of the integrative methodology, including *Badi' al-Nizam*, *Al-Tanqih*, *Al-Tawdih*, *Jam' al-Jawami'*, *Fusul al-Bada'i'*, *Al-Tahrir*, and *Musallam al-Thubut*. These sources are supplemented by authoritative classical commentaries and contemporary academic studies addressing the historical development of *Usul al-Fiqh*.

The Method of the Late *Usul* Scholars: Nature, Merits, and Limitations

After the methodological traditions of the Theologians (*Tariqat al-Mutakallimun*) and the Hanafi jurists (*Tariqat al-Fuqaha*) had matured over several centuries, each developed into a well-established school of legal theory with its own methodological principles, intellectual orientation, and scholarly literature. Although both schools shared the common objective of regulating the derivation of Islamic legal rulings from the Qur'an and the Sunnah, they differed significantly in their approaches to legal reasoning, the formulation of legal principles, and the organization of *Usul al-Fiqh*. Each methodology possessed distinctive strengths while simultaneously exhibiting methodological shortcomings that attracted scholarly criticism. Against this intellectual background, a new methodological trend emerged among the later *Usul* scholars during the seventh century AH. Rather than maintaining the sharp distinction between the two traditions, these scholars sought to reconcile them by integrating their most valuable methodological features within a single coherent framework. Their objective was not merely to juxtapose two independent methodologies but to establish a comprehensive approach capable of combining theoretical rigor with practical legal application. This synthesis marked one of the most significant developments in the historical evolution of *Usul al-Fiqh*.⁶

The later scholars therefore adopted a methodology that preserved the theoretical precision and rational analysis characteristic of the School of the Theologians while simultaneously incorporating the practical orientation of the Hanafi jurists, who closely connected legal principles with substantive juristic rulings. In doing so, they attempted to overcome the deficiencies associated with each earlier methodology and to produce a more balanced and comprehensive science of Islamic legal theory. The literature produced according to this integrative methodology differs from the works of the earlier schools in both content and structure. These works generally begin by presenting abstract legal principles, carefully establishing their validity through rational argumentation, linguistic analysis, scriptural evidence, and juristic reasoning. Once these principles have been demonstrated, they are systematically applied to positive legal rulings (*furu' fihiyyah*), thereby illustrating the practical implications of legal theory within Islamic jurisprudence. Consequently, the relationship between legal theory and substantive law becomes considerably stronger than in the earlier methodological traditions. An examination of the classical literature reveals that the majority of scholars adopting this methodology belonged to the Hanafi school. Nevertheless, the approach was not exclusively Hanafi. Several distinguished scholars from other legal schools, particularly among the Shafi'is, recognized the value of this synthesis and incorporated it into their own writings on *Usul al-Fiqh*. Their participation demonstrates that the methodology gradually transcended strict school affiliation and became an important intellectual trend within Islamic legal theory.⁷

Despite its innovative character, the scholarly activity of this period remained largely centered on explaining, refining, and systematizing the foundational works of earlier authorities. Rather than introducing entirely new methodological principles, later scholars devoted considerable attention to commenting upon, clarifying, and reconciling previous *Usul* texts. Their contributions therefore consisted primarily of reorganizing existing material, resolving ambiguities, strengthening legal arguments, and improving methodological coherence instead of constructing a completely new theoretical framework. Historically, the emergence of this integrative methodology coincided with the seventh century AH, a period often described as the era of *taqlid* (juristic adherence to established schools). The growing influence of legal school affiliation and increasing doctrinal competition encouraged scholars to undertake comparative examinations of the methodological principles developed by different schools. While this intellectual climate was undoubtedly shaped by sectarian loyalty, it also stimulated more sophisticated comparative legal analysis. As a result, the integrative methodology contributed significantly to the critical evaluation of competing legal theories and facilitated more systematic

⁶ Al-'Atṭār, H. M. M. (n.d.). *Ḥāshiyat al-'Atṭār 'alā Sharḥ al-Jalāl al-Maḥallī 'alā Jam' al-Jawāmi'*. Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.

⁷ Al Azhari, F. U., Shah, S. H. M., Al Azhari, S. I., Rasool, F., Ahmed, R., Samad, A., & Rehman, A. (2025). The role of Islamic economic principles in family law: A study on inheritance and property rights within the context of child protection. *Global Islamic Research Journal*, 1(1), 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.65960/giri.1.1.2025.2>

comparisons between the approaches of the Theologians and the Hanafi jurists. Another distinguishing characteristic of this period was the concise style adopted by many of its authors. Classical manuals composed according to this methodology frequently summarized highly complex legal discussions in remarkably brief formulations. Although this style facilitated memorization and condensed an enormous body of legal theory into relatively short texts, it also produced works whose language often became highly technical and difficult for later readers to understand without detailed commentaries.⁸

The emergence of the integrative methodology was motivated by several important intellectual considerations.

The first objective was to reinforce Hanafi legal theory by employing the rational and analytical methods developed by the School of the Theologians. Scholars sought to demonstrate that Hanafi *Usul* principles were not merely products of juristic practice but could also withstand rigorous rational scrutiny and systematic theoretical analysis. This objective is clearly articulated by ʿAbd al-Shariʿah (d. 747 AH), who explains that his purpose in composing *Al-Tanqih* was to refine the principles of al-Bazdawi, clarify their meanings, organize them according to rational principles, and incorporate the most valuable discussions from al-Razi's *Al-Mahsul* and Ibn al-Hajib's *Mukhtasar*. His project therefore represented an effort to combine the analytical sophistication of the Theologians with the practical jurisprudential foundations of the Hanafi tradition. The second objective was to establish direct dialogue between the methodological discussions of the Theologians and those of the Hanafi jurists. For example, the Theologians traditionally organized discussions of legal rulings according to four principal elements: the Lawgiver (*al-Hakim*), the legal ruling (*al-Hukm*), the legal subject (*al-Mahkum bih*), and the legal addressee (*al-Mahkum 'alayh*). Hanafi scholars, however, generally addressed these same issues within separate discussions devoted to commands, obligations, legal capacity, and related subjects without adopting this systematic classification.⁹

Similarly, discussions concerning impossible obligations (*taklif bi-ma la yutaq*), the legal responsibility of non-Muslims for subsidiary religious obligations, and legal capacity (*ahliyyah*) were treated differently by the two schools. The later scholars sought to integrate these diverse organizational frameworks into a unified methodological system capable of accommodating both traditions without sacrificing their distinctive analytical contributions. Through this synthesis, they produced a more comprehensive structure for *Usul al-Fiqh* that combined theoretical organization with practical legal analysis and significantly influenced subsequent generations of Islamic legal theorists.¹⁰

Merits of the Method of the Late *Usul* Scholars

The emergence of the integrative methodology developed by the later *Usul* scholars represents one of the most significant milestones in the historical evolution of Islamic legal theory. Rather than introducing an entirely new school of legal thought, this methodology sought to reconcile the methodological strengths of the two dominant traditions—the School of the Theologians (*Tariqat al-Mutakallimun*) and the Hanafi School (*Tariqat al-Fuqaha'*)—within a unified analytical framework. Consequently, it produced a more balanced approach that combined theoretical precision with practical legal application, thereby enriching both the content and methodology of *Usul al-Fiqh*. One of the principal merits of this methodology is its successful integration of the strongest features of both earlier schools. The late *Usul* scholars adopted the analytical rigor, logical coherence, and theoretical sophistication characteristic of the Theologians while simultaneously incorporating the practical orientation of the Hanafi jurists, who consistently linked legal principles to substantive juristic rulings.

⁸ Hasanah, L. N., Faisal, M. S., Ahmed, Z., & Hasyim, M. Y. A. (2025). Religious diversity and the digital economy: Legal-academic pathways to harmonize Sharia and international law. *International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.8>

⁹ Mashdurohatur, A. (2026). *Digital marketplaces and consumer protection: A comparative socio-legal analysis of e-commerce regulation in Islamic and Western legal systems*. *International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.2.1.2026.11>

¹⁰ Zubair, A. A., Salman, K., & Zakariyyah, A. O. (2026). Existing legal and regulatory framework for sovereign Sukuk in Nigeria. *Global Islamic Research Journal*, 2(1), 36–73. <https://doi.org/10.65960/giri.2.1.2026.8>

This synthesis enabled scholars to benefit from the complementary strengths of both traditions while minimizing many of their respective shortcomings. Instead of presenting legal theory as either purely abstract or exclusively practice-oriented, the integrative methodology established a more comprehensive framework that harmonized theoretical and applied dimensions of Islamic legal reasoning.¹¹

Another major contribution lies in its simultaneous emphasis on legal evidence (*adilla*) and juristic application (*furu' fiqhiyyah*). Earlier works produced by the School of the Theologians generally concentrated on establishing and defending legal principles through rational argumentation, linguistic analysis, and scriptural interpretation, often without extensive discussion of their practical legal implications. Conversely, Hanafi jurists frequently derived legal principles inductively from established juristic rulings, giving greater attention to practical applications than to abstract theoretical justification. The later scholars successfully combined these two approaches by first demonstrating the validity of legal principles through textual and rational evidence and then illustrating their practical significance through carefully selected juristic examples. This dual methodology significantly strengthened the relationship between legal theory and positive Islamic law. The integrative school also made an important contribution by consolidating the vast intellectual heritage of earlier *Usul* scholarship. Rather than limiting themselves to the literature of a single methodological tradition, later scholars systematically drew upon the major works of both the Theologians and the Hanafi jurists. They extracted the most valuable discussions, compared competing opinions, reconciled methodological differences where possible, and incorporated these materials into comprehensive legal-theoretical manuals. This process not only preserved the scholarly achievements of previous generations but also facilitated comparative legal analysis and enhanced the accessibility of earlier intellectual contributions.¹²

Another distinguishing characteristic of this methodology is its remarkable ability to summarize complex legal discussions in concise formulations. Many classical manuals composed according to this tradition condensed extensive debates spanning numerous earlier works into relatively brief yet systematic presentations. Although such brevity occasionally created difficulties for later readers, it also reflected a high degree of scholarly precision and intellectual discipline. The concise style adopted by these scholars enabled students and jurists to acquire an overview of the major principles of *Usul al-Fiqh* without consulting numerous independent sources.

The books produced according to this methodology also constitute valuable models of comparative Islamic legal theory. Their authors regularly present competing opinions from different methodological schools, analyze the evidence supporting each position, and explain the reasoning underlying their preferred conclusions. Although many of these scholars remained committed to their own legal schools—particularly the Hanafi school—their works nevertheless demonstrate an advanced level of comparative analysis that significantly enriched the discipline of *Usul al-Fiqh*. Consequently, these texts may be regarded as some of the earliest systematic examples of comparative legal methodology within the Islamic intellectual tradition. Perhaps the greatest intellectual achievement of the integrative methodology lies in its successful combination of rational and transmitted evidence. The later *Usul* scholars did not perceive reason and revelation as competing sources of legal knowledge but rather as complementary instruments for understanding the objectives and principles of Islamic law. Accordingly, they employed rational analysis to clarify linguistic meanings, establish legal principles, evaluate juristic arguments, and resolve methodological disputes, while simultaneously grounding these discussions in the authoritative texts of the Qur'an and the Sunnah. This balanced interaction between reason (*'aql*) and revelation (*naql*) produced a richer and more sophisticated theory of legal interpretation. Furthermore, the methodology strengthened the practical relevance of *Usul al-Fiqh* by consistently connecting theoretical discussions with substantive jurisprudence. Rather than treating legal principles as abstract philosophical concepts, the later scholars demonstrated how these

¹¹ Al-Zarkashī, B. al-D. M. ibn 'A. (1998). *Tashnīf al-masāmi' bi-Jam' al-Jawāmi'* (S. 'A. 'Azīz & 'A. Rabī, Eds.). Maktabat Qurṭubah lil-Baḥth al-'Ilmī wa lḥyā' al-Turāth.

¹² Satyo, B. K., & Prasetyo, B. A. Y. (2026). *Artificial intelligence and the future of human rights: Legal accountability for algorithmic decision-making in democratic societies*. *International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 54–74.
<https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.2.1.2026.12>

principles operated within actual legal cases and judicial reasoning. This close relationship between legal theory and legal practice enhanced the educational value of *Usul al-Fiqh*, enabling students to appreciate the practical consequences of methodological debates for the development of Islamic jurisprudence.¹³

Finally, the integrative methodology contributed significantly to the intellectual maturity of Islamic legal theory by promoting comprehensive and systematic scholarship. Its representative works reveal a high degree of methodological organization, conceptual precision, and analytical balance. By combining the theoretical achievements of the Theologians with the practical insights of the Hanafi jurists, the later scholars produced a coherent methodological framework that influenced subsequent generations of legal theorists and remained a central reference point in the study of *Usul al-Fiqh*. Their efforts not only preserved the accumulated heritage of earlier scholarship but also provided an enduring model for integrating legal theory, jurisprudential application, rational inquiry, and textual interpretation within a unified discipline.

Limitations of the Method of the Late *Usul* Scholars

Despite its considerable scholarly achievements, the methodology of the later *Usul* scholars was not free from criticism. Numerous classical and contemporary scholars have identified several methodological limitations that affected both the content and presentation of works produced according to this approach. While these criticisms do not diminish the historical importance of the integrative methodology, they provide a more balanced understanding of its contribution to the development of Islamic legal theory. One of the most frequently cited criticisms concerns the inclusion of discussions that have little practical relevance to legal reasoning. Influenced by the methodological tradition of the Theologians, many later scholars devoted substantial attention to theological, logical, and philosophical debates that were only indirectly related to the practical objectives of *Usul al-Fiqh*. Some of these discussions addressed highly speculative issues that produced no significant legal consequences, thereby increasing the complexity of the discipline without providing corresponding practical benefits. A second limitation is the repetitive nature of many of the illustrative examples employed throughout the literature. Rather than developing new legal examples reflecting changing social realities, later scholars frequently reproduced the same classical illustrations inherited from earlier authorities. As a result, many works became heavily dependent upon traditional juristic examples, limiting their capacity to demonstrate the continuing applicability of legal theory to emerging legal questions.¹⁴

Closely related to this issue is the limited engagement with newly arising legal problems. Most authors confined their practical discussions to established rulings transmitted from the classical legal schools instead of applying *Usul al-Fiqh* principles to contemporary legal developments. Consequently, although the theoretical framework remained highly sophisticated, its practical application often appeared restricted to inherited jurisprudential discussions rather than extending to the evolving needs of Islamic societies. Another significant criticism concerns the strong influence of legal school affiliation. Although the integrative methodology promoted comparative analysis, many of its authors ultimately defended the methodological preferences of their respective legal schools. Their discussions frequently culminated in affirming the superiority of the Hanafi position while critically evaluating opposing opinions. This tendency occasionally reduced the objectivity of comparative legal analysis and reflected the broader intellectual climate of the period, in which adherence to established schools of law was particularly strong. The highly condensed literary style adopted by many later scholars also generated considerable difficulties for students and readers. In their pursuit of brevity, authors often expressed complex methodological discussions through exceptionally concise formulations that required extensive commentary for proper understanding. Many classical manuals consequently became inaccessible

¹³ Al-Ziriklī, K. al-D. (1995). *Al-a'lām: Qāmūs tarājīm li-ashhar al-rijāl wa al-nisā' min al-'Arab wa al-musta'ribīn wa al-mustashriqīn* (11th ed.). Dār al-'Ilm lil-Malāyīn.

¹⁴ Siswanto, M. A., & Ahmad, T. (2026). Climate justice in Islamic legal thought: Harmonizing environmental law, human rights, and sustainable development in OIC countries. *International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 20–41.
<https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.2.1.2026.14>

without detailed explanatory works, creating an additional layer of scholarly literature devoted primarily to interpretation rather than original methodological development.¹⁵

Indeed, the complexity of these texts gave rise to an extensive tradition of commentaries (*shuruh*), glosses (*hawashi*), and super-commentaries. While these works played a vital role in preserving the intellectual heritage of *Usul al-Fiqh*, they also illustrate the inherent difficulty of many integrative texts. Scholars frequently devoted their efforts to explaining obscure terminology, resolving ambiguous expressions, and clarifying compressed arguments rather than advancing new methodological theories. This phenomenon reflects both the intellectual richness and the pedagogical challenges of the integrative tradition. Several classical scholars criticized the extreme brevity of works such as *Al-Tahrir*, *Jam' al-Jawami'*, and *Musallam al-Thubut*, arguing that their compressed language sometimes obscured rather than clarified legal principles. According to these critics, excessive condensation transformed highly sophisticated legal discussions into texts that were difficult even for advanced students to understand without expert guidance. Consequently, although these works became authoritative references within *Usul al-Fiqh*, they also imposed substantial barriers to learning. Finally, although many representatives of the integrative methodology remained strongly committed to their respective legal schools, some prominent scholars demonstrated remarkable intellectual independence. Figures such as **Shihab al-Din al-Qarafi** and **Abu Ishaq al-Shatibi** transcended narrow school affiliation by emphasizing the higher objectives (*maqasid*) of Islamic law and prioritizing evidence over sectarian preference. Their contributions illustrate that the integrative methodology was not inherently bound to legal partisanship and that it possessed the intellectual flexibility to accommodate broader and more objective approaches to Islamic legal theory. Their works represent some of the most mature expressions of methodological synthesis within the classical tradition and continue to influence contemporary scholarship on *Usul al-Fiqh*.¹⁶

***Al-Tanqīḥ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* by Ḥadr al-Sharīʿ ah (d. 747 AH)**

Al-Tanqīḥ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh is one of the most influential works representing the integrative methodology of the later *Usul* scholars. Its author, Ḥadr al-Sharīʿ ah ʿ Ubayd Allāh ibn Masʿūd al-Maḥbūbī, sought to develop a systematic framework that combined the methodological strengths of the Hanafi and *Mutakallimun* traditions. In the introduction, he describes his work as a uniquely organized treatise distinguished by methodological precision and scholarly refinement. He further explains that the purpose of writing *Al-Tanqīḥ* was to refine and reorganize al-Bazdawī's *Usul*, while incorporating the analytical discussions of al-Rāzī's *Al-Maḥḥal* and Ibn al-ʿAjīb's *Mukhtaḥar*. Consequently, *Al-Tanqīḥ* was built upon these three principal sources, representing one of the earliest systematic attempts to synthesize the Hanafi and theological approaches within a single legal-theoretical framework. The scholarly significance of *Al-Tanqīḥ* is reflected in the extensive attention it received from later jurists. Al-Taftāzānī (d. 793 AH) composed his celebrated commentary *Al-Talwīḥ ilā Kashf al-aqāʾiq al-Tanqīḥ*, which itself generated numerous glosses and super-commentaries, while Ibn Kamāl Pasha (d. 940 AH) further contributed through his work *Tanqīḥ al-Tanqīḥ*. These commentaries not only clarified the concise language of the original text but also reinforced its position as a foundational reference in later *Usul al-Fiqh* scholarship. Ḥadr al-Sharīʿ ah introduced an innovative organizational structure by dividing the book into an introduction and two principal sections devoted respectively to legal evidences and legal rulings. The first section examines the primary sources of Islamic law—including the Qurʾan, the Sunnah, consensus (*ijmāʿ*), and analogical reasoning (*qiyās*)—while also discussing subsidiary evidences, legal conflict (*taʿāruf*), preference (*tarjīḥ*), and *ijtihād*. The second section focuses on legal rulings, the legal act, the legal subject, and legal capacity (*ahliyyah*).

¹⁵ Zahra, R., Qasim, M., Ali, M., Asef, J., & Ali, B. (2025). Addressing mental health stigma and digital harassment in Pakistan and Indonesia: Insights from Islamic principles and AI-driven cybersecurity law. *Global Islamic Research Journal*, 1(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.65960/girj.1.1.2025.1>

¹⁶ Ibn al-Sāʾātī, M. al-D. A. ibn ʿA. (1985). *Badīʿ al-nizām (Nihāyat al-wuṣūl ilā ʿilm al-uṣūl)* (S. ibn Ghurayr al-Sulamī, Ed.).

This arrangement reflects a logical progression from legal sources to their application and demonstrates the author's systematic approach to legal theory.¹⁷

***Jam' al-Jawāmi'* by Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 771 AH)**

Jam' al-Jawāmi' is among the most celebrated works in *Usul al-Fiqh* and represents one of the finest examples of the later integrative methodology. Composed by Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, the work synthesizes both *Usul al-Fiqh* and *Usul al-Dīn*, drawing upon nearly one hundred earlier sources. Al-Subkī states that he sought to compile the essential discussions contained in his earlier commentaries while adding numerous original observations, thereby producing a concise yet comprehensive manual of Islamic legal theory. Its scholarly importance is demonstrated by the remarkable number of commentaries, abridgements, versifications, and glosses produced by later scholars, making it one of the most influential *Usul* texts in the Islamic intellectual tradition. The book is systematically organized into introductory discussions followed by seven major sections covering the Qur'an, the Sunnah, consensus, analogical reasoning, disputed legal evidences, legal conflict and preference, and finally *ijtihād* and *taqlīd*. Al-Subkī largely follows the organizational model of al-Bayḥāwī's *Minhāj al-Wuḥūd* while expanding the work to include discussions on theology and selected aspects of Sufism. The sequence adopted by the author reflects a logical hierarchy in which the Qur'an precedes the Sunnah as its primary foundation, followed by consensus and analogy as derivative sources, before moving to disputed evidences and methodological questions concerning legal reasoning.¹⁸

Methodologically, *Jam' al-Jawāmi'* is distinguished by its concise yet comprehensive presentation. Al-Subkī organizes legal topics according to a logical framework, frequently attributes opinions to their respective authorities, and employs evaluative expressions such as "the sound view," "the preferred opinion," and "the strongest position" when assessing competing arguments. The work also integrates legal theory with practical jurisprudence through the application of legal principles to juristic cases, while incorporating selected discussions from theology and logic. Despite its brevity, the book maintains remarkable thematic breadth and presents a balanced synthesis of the methodological traditions of the *Mutakallimun* and the jurists without engaging in the extensive debates characteristic of many earlier integrative works.

***Fuḥūl al-Badā' i' fī Tartīb al-Sharā' i'* by Muḥammad ibn Ḥamzah al-Fanārī (d. 834 AH)**

Fuḥūl al-Badā' i' is one of the major works of the integrative school of *Usul al-Fiqh*. Al-Fanārī sought to combine the principal Hanafi and *Mutakallimun* sources into a single systematic framework, drawing upon works such as *Usul al-Bazdawī*, *Usul al-Sarakhsī*, *Tanqīḥ al-Uḥūd*, *Al-Maḥḥūd*, *Mukhtaḥar Ibn al-Ḥājib*, and *Minhāj al-Bayḥāwī*. The book is distinguished by its careful organization, innovative classification of topics, and comparative treatment of legal theory. It is divided into an introduction, preliminary discussions, legal evidences, legal conflict and preference, and concludes with *ijtihād*, *taqlīd*, and *fatwā*. Methodologically, al-Fanārī follows the approach of the *Mutakallimun*, frequently compares Hanafi and Shafi'i opinions, and consistently illustrates legal principles through juristic applications. Despite its systematic arrangement, some scholars criticize the placement of *taqlīd* among the disputed evidences rather than within the discussion of *ijtihād*.¹⁹

***Al-Taḥrīr* by Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Humām (d. 861 AH)**

¹⁷ Al-Suyūṭī, J. al-D. 'A. ibn A. (1967). *Ḥusn al-muḥāḍarah fī tārikh Miṣr wa al-Qāhirah* (M. A. Ibrāhīm, Ed.; Vol. 1). Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyyah.

¹⁸ Azam, M., Alwreikat, N. M., Alsyouf, B., Al Fandi, A. S. A. A., & Pharaon, R. A. K. M. (2026). *Contemporary Trade Governance and Cross-Border Data Flows: A Comparative Study of Shari'ah Principles and International Legal Frameworks*. MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review, 5(1), 686–721. <https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v5i1.13387>

¹⁹ Al Azhari, F. U., Shah, S. H. M., Al Azhari, S. I., Rasool, F., Ahmed, R., Samad, A., & Rehman, A. (2025). The role of Islamic economic principles in family law: A study on inheritance and property rights within the context of child protection. *Global Islamic Research Journal*, 1(1), 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.65960/giri.1.1.2025.2>

Al-Taḥṣīl is regarded as one of the most authoritative Hanafi works on *Usul al-Fiqh* and a landmark of the integrative methodology. Ibn al-Humām composed the work to clarify the terminology and methodologies of both the Hanafi jurists and the *Mutakallimun*, thereby providing a comprehensive comparative manual. The book is organized into introductory discussions, linguistic principles, legal rulings, legal evidences, and concludes with *ijtihād*, *taqlīd*, and *iftāʾ*. Its methodology is characterized by comparative analysis, frequent citation of different legal schools, careful definition of technical terminology, extensive use of Qur'anic and Prophetic evidence, and reasoned preference (*tarjīḥ*) among competing opinions. Ibn al-Humām also discusses objections and counterarguments in a dialectical style, demonstrating the strong influence of the theological method while maintaining close links with Hanafi jurisprudence. Owing to its concise style and analytical depth, *Al-Taḥṣīl* became one of the foundational references in later *Usul al-Fiqh* scholarship and inspired numerous commentaries, most notably *Taysīr al-Taḥṣīl* and *Al-Taqrīr wa al-Taḥṣīl*.²⁰

Musallam al-Thubūt by Muḥibb Allāh Ibn ʿ Abd al-Shakūr al-Bihārī (d. 1119 AH)

Musallam al-Thubūt is one of the most prominent later works representing the integrative methodology in *Usul al-Fiqh*. Composed by Muḥibb Allāh al-Bihārī, the book combines the approaches of the Hanafi jurists and the *Mutakallimun*, although it predominantly reflects the Hanafi tradition. The author states that his objective was to produce a comprehensive treatise integrating legal theory with jurisprudential application while incorporating both Hanafi and Shafi'i methodologies. Due to its scholarly significance, the work attracted numerous commentaries, the most famous being *Fawāṭiḥ al-Raḥamūt* by ʿ Abd al-ʿ Alī al-Laknawī. The book is organized into an introduction, three preliminary discussions, four principal sections on the legal evidences (the Qur'an, Sunnah, consensus, and analogy), and a concluding section on *ijtihād* and *taqlīd*. Its arrangement closely follows Ibn al-Humām's *Al-Taḥṣīl*, with some modifications, particularly in the placement of discussions on legal rulings and linguistic principles. Methodologically, al-Bihārī begins by defining technical terms, presents the opinions of various legal schools alongside those of leading jurists such as al-Ghazālī and al-Rāzī, cites Qur'anic and Prophetic evidence, and supports theoretical discussions with juristic applications. His work is especially distinguished by its comparative analysis of Hanafi and non-Hanafi opinions while consistently relating legal principles to their practical implications in Islamic jurisprudence.²¹

Comparative Analysis of the Organizational Methodologies of the Major Works of the Integrative School

A comparative examination of the principal works representing the integrative (*late Usul*) school reveals a common methodological framework despite variations in organization and presentation. These works generally revolve around eight core themes: introductory discussions, legal rulings, legal evidences, linguistic principles and textual indications, abrogation (*naskh*), conflict and preference (*taʿāruf wa al-tarjīḥ*), *ijtihād* and *taqlīd*, and legal capacity (*ahliyyah*). Their differences primarily concern the sequence in which these topics are presented rather than their substantive content. Regarding **introductory discussions**, Ibn al-Sāʿātī and al-Fanārī include theological, legal, and linguistic preliminaries, whereas Ḥadr al-Sharīʿah limits the introduction largely to the definition and scope of *Usul al-Fiqh*. Ibn al-Humām incorporates logical preliminaries, while Ibn ʿ Abd al-Shakūr also discusses legal rulings in the introductory section. Al-Subkī, by contrast, focuses primarily on defining *Usul al-Fiqh* and legal rulings without extensive linguistic preliminaries. With respect to **legal rulings** (*al-aḥkām al-sharʿiyyah*), the authors differ considerably in placement. Ibn al-Humām allocates an independent chapter to legal rulings before discussing the legal evidences, whereas Ḥadr al-Sharīʿah postpones this discussion until after the evidentiary chapters. Al-Fanārī, al-Subkī, and Ibn ʿ Abd al-Shakūr include legal rulings within their introductory sections, reflecting the influence of the *Mutakallimun* methodology.

²⁰ Azam, M., Hamdoun, A. A.-M., Harahsheh, E. A. A. M., Mashdurohatun, A., & Sidauruk, H. P. (2025). *Religious Diversity in the Digital Economy: Interfaith Legal Pathways to Harmonize Sharia, Christian Ethics, and International Law*. *Contemporary Issues on Interfaith Law and Society*, 4(2), 207–264. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ciils.v4i2.33011>

²¹ Azam, M., Mashdurohatun, A., Firmansyah, A. N., Saktiawan, M. D., & Jaya, K. O. P. (2025). *Harmonizing Contemporary International Commercial Law with Sharia-Based National Legal Systems: A Comparative Study of Pakistan, Turkey, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Saudi Arabia*. *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review*, 4(2), 1074–1096. <https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v4i2.11334>

Concerning **legal evidences**, all authors examine the Qur'an, the Sunnah, consensus (*ijmā'*), and analogy (*qiyās*), but their arrangement varies. Qadr al-Sharī'ah begins immediately with the legal evidences after the introduction, while Ibn al-Humām and Ibn 'Abd al-Shakūr postpone them until after discussions of legal rulings and linguistic principles. Al-Subkī and al-Fanārī place linguistic discussions between the Qur'an and the Sunnah, whereas Ibn al-Sā'ātī treats textual indications as a common feature shared by the principal evidences.²²

The treatment of **linguistic principles and textual indications** likewise reflects different methodological preferences. Ibn al-Humām and Ibn 'Abd al-Shakūr discuss them within the linguistic preliminaries, while Qadr al-Sharī'ah, al-Subkī, and al-Fanārī examine them immediately after the Qur'an. Ibn al-Sā'ātī places them after discussing the principal legal evidences, considering them common to both the Qur'an and the Sunnah. Regarding **abrogation** (*naskh*), all six authors discuss it in close connection with the chapters on textual interpretation and legal indications, although its precise location differs. Some classify it as a form of legal clarification (*bayān*), while others present it as an independent topic immediately following the discussion of clarification. The placement of **conflict and preference** (*ta'ārūf wa al-tarjīf*) also varies considerably. Ibn al-Sā'ātī discusses it at the conclusion of his work, whereas Qadr al-Sharī'ah, al-Subkī, and al-Fanārī place it after the disputed evidences and before *ijtihād*. In contrast, Ibn al-Humām and Ibn 'Abd al-Shakūr attach it to the discussion of the Sunnah, following the Hanafi tradition. Almost all authors conclude their works with **ijtihād and taqlīd**, highlighting the practical culmination of legal theory. The principal exception is Ibn al-Sā'ātī, who discusses *ijtihād* before the chapter on conflict and preference. Finally, **legal capacity** (*ahliyyah*) illustrates one of the clearest differences between the two methodological traditions. Ibn al-Sā'ātī, al-Fanārī, and Qadr al-Sharī'ah devote specific discussions to legal capacity and its impediments, reflecting the influence of the Hanafi school. Conversely, al-Subkī, Ibn al-Humām, and Ibn 'Abd al-Shakūr omit an independent treatment of this subject, following the methodological preference of the *Mutakallimun*. Overall, the comparison demonstrates that the later *Usul* scholars succeeded in creating a unified methodological tradition that integrated the theoretical precision of the *Mutakallimun* with the practical orientation of the Hanafi jurists. Although they differed in the arrangement of individual topics, they shared the common objective of presenting *Usul al-Fiqh* in a systematic, comparative, and coherent manner, thereby establishing the mature form of the integrative school.²³

Conclusion

This study examined the characteristics and methodological approaches of the **late integrative school** (*al-muta'akhkhirūn*), which sought to reconcile the methodologies of the *Mutakallimun* and the Hanafi jurists in the study of *Usul al-Fiqh*. Through an analytical and comparative examination of the principal works of Ibn al-Sā'ātī, Qadr al-Sharī'ah, al-Subkī, al-Fanārī, Ibn al-Humām, and Ibn 'Abd al-Shakūr, the research demonstrates that, despite differences in the organization and sequence of *Usul* topics, these scholars shared a common objective: integrating theoretical precision with practical juristic application within a unified methodological framework.

The study further shows that the integrative school made a significant contribution to the development of Islamic legal theory by combining rational and textual evidence, strengthening the relationship between legal principles and juristic branches, and promoting comparative analysis among the major legal schools. At the same time, the research identifies certain limitations, including excessive brevity, adherence to established legal schools, and the inclusion of discussions with limited practical significance. Nevertheless, these shortcomings do not diminish the school's enduring scholarly value or its profound influence on subsequent *Usul al-Fiqh* literature.

Overall, the findings confirm that the integrative methodology represents a mature stage in the historical evolution of *Usul al-Fiqh*, successfully synthesizing the strengths of both the *Mutakallimun* and

²² Al-Ṭūfī, N. al-D. S. ibn 'A. (1990). *Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar al-Rawḍah* ('A. al-Turkī, Ed.; 1st ed.). Mu'assasat al-Risālah.

²³ Azam, M., Masyhar, A., Purnawarman, P., Suryati, N., & Setyarini, S. (2026). *The Protection Policies on Predatory Digital Credit Traps Students: Lessons from Indonesia*. Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System, 6(1). Scopus Q1. <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v6i1.862>

Hanafi traditions. The study recommends further comparative research on the organization of *Usul al-Fiqh* across different methodological schools and encourages renewed scholarly engagement with classical *Usul* literature to enhance contemporary studies in Islamic legal theory.

References

- Al Azhari, F. U., Shah, S. H. M., Al Azhari, S. I., Rasool, F., Ahmed, R., Samad, A., & Rehman, A. (2025). The role of Islamic economic principles in family law: A study on inheritance and property rights within the context of child protection. *Global Islamic Research Journal*, 1(1), 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.65960/girj.1.1.2025.2>
- Al-Āmidī, A. ibn M. (1402 AH). *Al-Ikām fī uṣūl al-akām* (2nd ed.). Al-Maktab al-Islāmī.
- Al-Afahānī, M. ibn A. ibn A. (1986). *Bayān al-mukhtaṣar: Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar Ibn al-ʿAjīb* (Vols. 1–3). Dār al-Madani.
- Al-ʿAṭṭār, M. M. (n.d.). *ʿĀshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār alā Sharḥ al-Jalāl al-Maʿallī ʿalā Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ*. Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah.
- Al-Suyūṭī, J. al-D. ʿA. ibn A. (1967). *ʿUsn al-muḥāṣarah fī tārikh Miṣr wa al-Qāhirah* (M. A. Ibrāhīm, Ed., Vol. 1). Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyyah.
- Al-Taftāzānī, S. al-D. M. ibn ʿU. (n.d.). *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥ ʿalā al-Tawḥīd li-Matn al-Tanqīḥ fī uṣūl al-fiqh*. Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah.
- Al-ʿUfī, N. al-D. S. ibn ʿA. (1990). *Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar al-Rawḥah* (A. al-Turkī, Ed., 1st ed.). Muʾassasat al-Risālah.
- Al-Zarkashī, B. al-D. M. ibn ʿA. (1998). *Tashnīf al-masāmiʿ bi-Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ* (S. ʿA. ʿAzīz & ʿA. Rabīʿ, Eds.). Maktabat Qurṭubah lil-Baḥth al-ʿIlmī wa Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth.
- Al-Zirikī, K. al-D. (1995). *Al-Aʿlām: Qāmūs tarājīm li-ashhar al-rijāl wa al-nisāʾ min al-ʿArab wa al-mustaʿribīn wa al-mustashriqīn* (11th ed.). Dār al-ʿIlm lil-Malāyīn.
- Amīr Bādshāh, M. A. (1350 AH). *Taysīr al-taḥrīr ʿalā Kitāb al-Taḥrīr*. Maṭbaʿat Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-ḥalabī.
- Azam, M., Alwreikat, N. M., Alsyuf, B., Al Fandi, A. S. A. A., & Pharaon, R. A. K. M. (2026). Contemporary trade governance and cross-border data flows: A comparative study of Shariʿah principles and international legal frameworks. *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review*, 5(1), 686–721. <https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v5i1.13387>
- Azam, M., Hamdoun, A. A.-M., Harahsheh, E. A. A. M., Mashdurohatun, A., & Sidauruk, H. P. (2025). Religious diversity in the digital economy: Interfaith legal pathways to harmonize Sharia, Christian ethics, and international law. *Contemporary Issues on Interfaith Law and Society*, 4(2), 207–264. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ciils.v4i2.33011>
- Azam, M., Mashdurohatun, A., Firmansyah, A. N., Saktiawan, M. D., & Jaya, K. O. P. (2025). Harmonizing contemporary international commercial law with Sharia-based national legal systems: A comparative study of Pakistan, Turkey, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Saudi Arabia. *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review*, 4(2), 1074–1096. <https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v4i2.11334>

Azam, M., Masyhar, A., Purnawarman, P., Suryati, N., & Setyarini, S. (2026). The protection policies on predatory digital credit traps students: Lessons from Indonesia. *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v6i1.862>

Hasanah, L. N., Faisal, M. S., Ahmed, Z., & Hasyim, M. Y. A. (2025). Religious diversity and the digital economy: Legal-academic pathways to harmonize Sharia and international law. *International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.1.1.2025.8>

Ibn al-Sā'ātī, M. al-D. A. ibn 'A. (1985). *Badī' al-niām (Nihāyat al-wu'ūl ilā 'ilm al-u'ūl)* (S. ibn Ghurayr al-Sulamī, Ed.).

Mashdurohatun, A. (2026). Digital marketplaces and consumer protection: A comparative socio-legal analysis of e-commerce regulation in Islamic and Western legal systems. *International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.2.1.2026.11>

Mustafa, A., Ishaque, M., Raza, R., Samiullah, & Raza, M. I. (2025). When culture meets fiqh: Examining the legal authority of 'Urf in contemporary engagement traditions. *Global Islamic Research Journal*, 1(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.65960/girj.1.1.2025.6>

Satyo, B. K., & Prasetyo, B. A. Y. (2026). Artificial intelligence and the future of human rights: Legal accountability for algorithmic decision-making in democratic societies. *International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 54–74. <https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.2.1.2026.12>

Siswanto, M. A., & Ahmad, T. (2026). Climate justice in Islamic legal thought: Harmonizing environmental law, human rights, and sustainable development in OIC countries. *International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 20–41. <https://doi.org/10.65960/ijlss.2.1.2026.14>

Zahra, R., Qasim, M., Ali, M., Asef, J., & Ali, B. (2025). Addressing mental health stigma and digital harassment in Pakistan and Indonesia: Insights from Islamic principles and AI-driven cybersecurity law. *Global Islamic Research Journal*, 1(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.65960/girj.1.1.2025.1>