



كُنُول

JOURNAL OF INDONESIAN ISLAMIC STUDIES

<https://ejournal.iainpalopo.ac.id/index.php/jiis/index>

The Methodology of Takhrij and Legal Inference on the Practice of Qunūt in the Fajr Prayer: A Comparative Study of Ibn Ḥajar and al-Zaylaʿī

Muhammad Ilham Al-Faiz Saputra^{1✉}, Muhammad Al Mighwar², Engkos Kosasih³, Irwan Abdurrohman⁴, Tajul Arifin⁵

¹⁻⁵Magister Ilmu Hadis, Pascasarjana UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia

Articles

Information

History:

Received: January

Approved: March

Publish: May

Keywords: *qunūt in the Fajr Prayer, hadith Takhrij, legal Inference, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, al-Zaylaʿī.*

Abstract

Qunut shubuh (the supplication recited in the dawn prayer) remains a debated issue in Islamic jurisprudence, and disagreement over its legal status stems from differences in how hadith scholars evaluate the traditions cited as evidence. This study aims to comparatively analyze the takhrij (*hadith verification*) methodology and legal reasoning (*istinbath al-hukm*) employed by Al-Zaylaʿī in *Naṣb al-Rāyah* and Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī in *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr* regarding hadiths on qunut shubuh, while identifying the epistemological patterns underlying their differences. This research is a qualitative library-based study, with the two takhrij works serving as primary data, analyzed through content analysis for the takhrij dimension and a comparative-analytical (*tahlili-muqaran*) approach for the legal-reasoning dimension. The findings show that both works engage in critical evaluation of the hadith chains related to qunut shubuh, yet display different epistemological styles in handling the results of that evaluation. Al-Zaylaʿī adopts a dialectical-cumulative approach, gathering arguments from conflicting authorities without rendering a firm personal verdict, which produces an open and context-dependent legal conclusion leaning toward understanding qunut shubuh within the context of qunut nazilah (situational supplication). Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī, by contrast, adopts an evaluative-declarative approach, explicitly and directly grading the reliability of each chain, which results in a legal conclusion structured hierarchically according to the strength of the transmission. This study concludes that the distinction between the two works lies not in the presence or absence of critical evaluation, but in the epistemological style of managing its outcomes suggesting that the ongoing legal disagreement over qunut shubuh can be understood as the consequence of two distinct yet equally valid epistemological paradigms within the tradition of Hadith Sciences.

✉ Email Correspondent:
ilhamalfaizz@gmail.com

Introduction

The practice of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer remains one of the juristic issues (*fiqhiyyah*) that continues to generate scholarly disagreement (*ikhtilāf*) among Muslims. This disagreement is particularly evident between schools of law that regard it as a *sunnah ab'āḍ* in the Fajr prayer and those that consider it a practice lacking sufficiently strong legal evidence for its establishment (Pranata, 2019). Such differences do not arise from a methodological vacuum; rather, they stem from divergent approaches adopted by scholars in evaluating and utilizing the hadiths related to the issue. In this context, the discipline of *takhrīj al-ḥadīth* occupies a central position, as the formulation of legal rulings (*istinbāt al-ḥukm*) concerning devotional practices is highly dependent upon the determination of the evidentiary status of the hadiths through the examination of transmission chains (*isnād*) and the assessment of their authenticity.

As a methodological instrument for tracing hadiths back to their original sources, *takhrīj al-ḥadīth* serves not only to identify chains of transmission but also, in many cases, to determine the evidentiary strength (*ḥujjiyyah*) of a hadith as a basis for legal reasoning. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, in his *Muqaddimah*, emphasized that hadith verification cannot be separated from the investigation of transmission chains and the identification of the original sources of narration (Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, 1984). Al-Suyūṭī, in *Tadrib al-Rāwī*, further elaborated this discussion by stressing the importance of hadith classification as an integral component of scholarly criticism, which ultimately serves as a foundation for legal inference (*istinbāt al-ḥukm*) (al-Suyūṭī, 2000). Accordingly, the methodologies of *takhrīj* and legal inference cannot be rigidly separated, since the evaluation of both the *isnād* and *matn* directly determines the extent to which a hadith may be employed as a valid legal proof.

Among the classical works of hadith *takhrīj* relevant to the issue of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer are *Naṣb al-Rāyah li Aḥādīth al-Hidāyah* by al-Zayla'ī (d. 762 AH) and *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr fī Takhrīj Aḥādīth al-Rāfi'ī al-Kabīr* by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852 AH). Both works were composed within the same tradition of juridical *takhrīj*, namely the tracing of hadiths employed as legal evidence in authoritative jurisprudential texts of their respective legal schools. Both authors critically evaluated the chains of transmission of the hadiths they examined; however, they demonstrated distinct epistemological orientations in responding to the outcomes of such evaluations. Al-Zayla'ī, who belonged to the Hanafi tradition, tended to adopt a dialectical and accumulative approach (al-Zayla'ī, 1997).

In contrast, Ibn Hajar al-Asqalanī, renowned for his authority in the field of *jarḥ wa ta'dīl*, employed an evaluative and declarative approach (Ibn Hajar al-Asqalanī, 1995). He consistently provided explicit judgments concerning the quality of transmission chains, including classifications such as *iḍṭirāb* (inconsistency), *ḥasan*, and *ṣaḥīḥ*. Furthermore, he actively corrected errors made by earlier scholars in attributing narrations to their sources. These differing epistemological styles directly influenced the manner in which each scholar derived legal conclusions. Consequently, examining these two works in relation to the issue of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer offers an opportunity to uncover two distinct orientations of legal inference: one producing legal conclusions that are relatively open and contextual, and another generating conclusions structured hierarchically according to the strength of the transmission chains.

Within the Indonesian academic context, studies on hadith *takhrīj* methodology have been conducted extensively, yet they reveal certain tendencies that warrant further

examination. Iskandar (2019) demonstrated that Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī’s criticism of transmission chains was characterized by meticulous evaluation of narrator credibility (Iskandar, 2019). Zulfikar (2020) emphasized the necessity of critically examining hadith authenticity and validity from the perspective of modern scholars (Zulfikar, 2020). Similarly, Siregar (2024) highlighted the importance of comparative approaches in understanding the contributions of contemporary hadith criticism methodologies (Siregar, 2024). While these studies provide an important foundation for understanding hadith criticism, they generally discuss *takhrīj* in broad terms and do not specifically address how differences in *takhrīj* methodology influence legal inference concerning particular juristic issues.

Studies on the legal status of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer have likewise been widely conducted, both through comparative jurisprudential analyses among legal schools and through hadith criticism of the narrations underpinning the practice. A recent study by Rohim and Arifin (2024), for instance, examined the validity of the evidences supporting the Shāfi‘ī position through the methodology of *jarḥ wa ta‘dīl* (Rohim, Abdul Arifin, 2024). Their findings concluded that the hadiths serving as evidence for *qunūt* in the Shāfi‘ī school fall within the category of acceptable (*maqbul*) hadiths and therefore qualify as legitimate legal proofs. Although this study reinforces the significance of transmission-chain criticism in determining the authority of hadiths related to *qunūt*, its analysis remains confined to a single legal school and does not comparatively investigate how two major *takhrīj* works with distinct epistemological orientations evaluate these hadiths side by side. To the best of the author’s knowledge, no previous study has explicitly and systematically compared the methodologies of *takhrīj* and legal inference employed by Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī and al-Zayla‘ī regarding the hadiths of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer.

Therefore, existing studies on *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer, whether comparative juristic analyses among legal schools or hadith critical examinations of its textual foundations, generally focus on the authority of the relevant hadiths independently or from the perspective of a single school. They rarely explore how two authoritative *takhrīj* works, namely *Naṣb al-Rāyah* and *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*, both evaluative in nature yet distinct in their epistemological approaches, treat the same body of hadith evidence and how such treatment affects the legal conclusions derived by their respective authors. This absence constitutes a significant research gap, particularly given that the issue of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer remains a practical juristic matter actively discussed within contemporary Muslim communities. Consequently, understanding the methodological roots of these differences carries both academic and practical significance.

This study seeks to address this gap by comparatively analyzing how al-Zayla‘ī in *Naṣb al-Rāyah* and Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī in *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr* conducted *takhrīj* of the hadiths related to *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer and how the outcomes of their analyses served as the basis for their respective legal inferences. The novelty of this study lies in narrowing the scope of comparison from a general examination of *takhrīj* methodologies to a thematic case study focused on a specific juristic issue, while simultaneously incorporating the dimension of legal inference that bridges hadith criticism and jurisprudential analysis. Furthermore, this study proposes a new conceptual understanding of the two works by arguing that their differences do not stem from the presence or absence of critical engagement with transmission chains, but rather from their distinct epistemological styles

in responding to the results of such evaluations. Accordingly, this research contributes not only to the development of hadith methodological studies but also to a deeper understanding of the epistemological foundations underlying the continuing legal disagreement over *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer within contemporary Muslim practice.

Based on the foregoing discussion, this study is guided by the primary question of how the methodology of *takhrīj* concerning the hadiths of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer was employed by al-Zayla'ī in *Naṣb al-Rāyah* and by Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī in *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*, and how these methodological differences influenced their respective processes of legal inference. Accordingly, the study aims to comparatively analyze the methodologies of *takhrīj* and legal inference employed by these two scholars in order to identify the epistemological patterns underlying the enduring juristic disagreement concerning *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer.

Method

This study employs a qualitative research design based on library research within the field of Hadith Studies, (Suhaldi, 2024) It focuses on a comparative analysis of the methodologies of *takhrīj al-ḥadīth* and legal inference (*istinbāṭ al-ḥukm*) concerning the hadiths related to *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer, as presented in two classical works of hadith *takhrīj*: *Naṣb al-Rāyah li Aḥādīth al-Hidāyah* by al-Zayla'ī and *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr fī Takhrīj Aḥādīth al-Rāfi'ī al-Kabīr* by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani. A library-based approach was selected because the object of the study consists of classical textual sources that require close reading, source tracing, and in-depth analysis of hadith texts, transmission chains, and legal inferences contained therein.

The data employed in this study consist of both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources are the two *takhrīj* works that constitute the main object of investigation, namely *Naṣb al-Rāyah* by al-Zayla'ī and *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr* by Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, particularly the sections addressing the hadiths concerning *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer. These works were selected because they represent authoritative references within distinct juristic traditions characterized by different madhhab orientations and methodological tendencies, thereby providing a suitable basis for examining differences in paradigms of *takhrīj* and legal inference. Secondary data were obtained from supporting literature, including classical works on *ʿulūm al-ḥadīth* and contemporary academic studies relevant to *takhrīj* methodology, hadith criticism, and legal reasoning regarding *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer. These sources serve to strengthen the analytical framework and situate the findings of this study within the broader scholarly discourse.

Data collection was conducted through documentation techniques. This process involved a careful examination of the relevant sections within both primary texts that contain narrations concerning *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer, the transmission chains cited therein, and the accompanying assessments of sanad quality and legal implications. The data collection process followed a thematic procedure by identifying all discussions related to *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer in both works and subsequently classifying the data according to the individual hadiths discussed. This procedure facilitated a systematic comparison between the two texts.

Second, a *tahlīlī-muqāran* (analytical-comparative) approach was employed to examine the dimension of legal inference. This analysis focused on how the results of

takhrīj and sanad evaluation conducted by each scholar served as the basis for legal reasoning in determining the legal status of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer. The resulting legal conclusions were then compared to identify points of convergence, points of divergence, and the underlying epistemological foundations that shaped these differences. Through this comparative framework, the study seeks to uncover the relationship between hadith evaluation and legal reasoning within the scholarly methodologies of the two authors. The integration of these two analytical approaches allows the study to move from a descriptive-methodological level, represented by the analysis of *takhrīj*, to an argumentative-comparative level, represented by the analysis of legal inference (*istinbāṭ al-ḥukm*). Consequently, the relationship between hadith authentication methodology and the resulting legal conclusions can be examined comprehensively and systematically without separating methodological analysis from jurisprudential implications (Pahrudin, 2021).

Through this approach, the study is expected to produce a systematic, in-depth, and textually grounded analysis based directly on evidence derived from the two primary sources. Ultimately, it aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how differences in *takhrīj* methodology contribute to differences in legal inference regarding the issue of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer.

Result

Findings on the Takhrīj of Hadiths Related to Qunūt in the Fajr Prayer in Naṣb al-Rāyah and Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr

In *Naṣb al-Rāyah*, authored by al-Zayla'i, three groups of narrations related to *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer were identified as the primary objects of *takhrīj*. The first group consists of narrations that negate the practice of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer as a regular ritual act. This group is represented by the narration of Ṭāriq b. Ashyam (Abū Mālik), who reported that he had never witnessed the practice of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer while praying behind the Prophet ﷺ, Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, or 'Alī, and described it as a *muḥdath* practice. The second group comprises a number of reports (*āthār*) from the Companions transmitted through the route of Ibn Abī Shaybah. These include reports attributed to Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, 'Alī, Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn Mas'ūd, Ibn 'Umar, and Ibn al-Zubayr. The contents of these reports vary: some indicate the absence of a regular practice of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer, while others describe the practice of 'Alī in the context of *qunūt al-nāzilah* rather than as a daily ritual. The third group consists of narrations that al-Zayla'ī himself refers to as *aḥādīth al-khuṣūm* (the narrations of the opposing side), represented primarily by the hadith of Anas b. Mālik concerning the Prophet's ﷺ continuous practice of *qunūt* until his death. This narration is traced through the chain 'Abd al-Razzāq–Abū Ja'far al-Rāzī–al-Rabī' b. Anas and received a wide range of evaluations, from *ṣaḥīḥ* according to al-Ḥākim to entirely *ḍa'īf* according to Ibn al-Jawzī.

In *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*, authored by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, three categories of data were identified, each reflecting a different emphasis. First, the narration recorded by Ibn Khuzaymah through the chain Sa'īd–Qatādah–Anas concerning the Prophet's ﷺ practice of *qunūt* only in the context of supplicating for the welfare or destruction of a particular group. Ibn Hajar notes that this narration contains *iḍṭirāb* (inconsistency) due to contradictions among the narrations transmitted from Anas himself, rendering it unsuitable as a strong legal proof. Second, the work contains corrective notes (*tanbīh*) regarding errors in source

attribution committed by several scholars, including al-Nawawī, who incorrectly attributed a narration on *qunūt* to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* or al-Ḥākim's *al-Mustadrak*, whereas its original source was a separate treatise on *qunūt* authored by al-Ḥākim. Third, Ibn Ḥajar records narrations concerning the practice of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer among the Rightly Guided Caliphs (*al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidūn*), transmitted through al-Bayhaqī. He explicitly provides sanad evaluations for these reports: the narration of al-ʿAwwām b. Ḥamzah concerning the practice of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān is classified as *ḥasan*, while the narration concerning the practice of ʿAlī transmitted through ʿAbd Allāh b. Maʿqil b. Muqarrin is classified as *ṣaḥīḥ*. Another narration from al-Aswad was also identified, indicating that ʿUmar performed *qunūt* only in the Fajr prayer and not in other obligatory prayers.

Overall, the findings indicate that both works discuss hadiths and reports related to *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer in considerable detail. However, they differ in the types of narrations emphasized, the manner in which transmission chains are presented, and the extent to which explicit evaluations accompany the narrations subjected to *takhrīj*.

Table 1. Summarizes The Key Differences in Takhrīj Methodology, Sanad Evaluation, and Legal Inference Between The Two Works Discussed Above

Aspect	Al-Zaylaʿī (<i>Naṣb al-Rāyah</i>)	Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (<i>Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr</i>)
Takhrīj style	Dialectical–cumulative: gathers arguments from conflicting authorities (e.g., Tirmidhi, al-Hakim, Ibn al-Jawzi) and juxtaposes them as "hadiths of the opposing party" (<i>aḥādīth al-khuṣūm</i>)	Evaluative–declarative: issues direct, explicit rulings on each narration; actively corrects other scholars' misattributions (<i>tanbīh</i>)
Sanad evaluation	Cites others' gradings without personally arbitrating between conflicting assessments; leaves the final verdict open to the reader	Personally grades each chain (<i>muḍṭarib</i> , <i>ḥasan</i> , <i>ṣaḥīḥ</i>) and states his own conclusion directly, without deferring to prior authorities
Legal inference (istinbāt)	Open and contextual; leans toward reading <i>qunūt</i> shubuh as <i>qunūt nāzilāh</i> (situational) rather than an absolute routine practice	Hierarchical and sanad-strength-based; narrations graded <i>muḍṭarib</i> are excluded as valid ḥujjah, while <i>ḥasan/ṣaḥīḥ</i> narrations form the basis for legal validity

Discussion

Al-Zaylaʿī's Methodology of Takhrīj on the Hadiths of Qunūt in the Fajr Prayer in Naṣb al-Rāyah

Al-Zaylaʿī's discussion of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer in *Naṣb al-Rāyah* demonstrates a methodological character that is more complex than the mere collection of transmission routes without evaluation. He structures his discussion in a dialectical manner by juxtaposing two opposing groups of narrations: reports that deny the continuity of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer as a regular practice and reports that support its continuity.

Within the first group, al-Zaylaʿī cites the narration of Ṭāriq b. Ashyam (Abū Mālik), who stated that he had never observed *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer while praying behind the Prophet ﷺ or the Rightly Guided Caliphs, and even described it as a *muḥḍath* (newly

introduced practice)(al-Zayla'ī, 1997). In presenting this narration, al-Zayla'ī does not merely identify its source. Rather, he includes al-Tirmidhī's assessment that the hadith is *ḥasan ṣaḥīḥ* and summarizes the evaluations of several prominent hadith critics, including Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Ibn Ma'īn, al-'Ijlī, Abū Ḥātim, al-Nasā'ī, and Ibn Ḥibbān, all of whom consistently regarded Abū Mālik as a trustworthy narrator (*thiqah*):

أَخْبَرَنَا أَبُو سَعْدٍ الْمَالِينِيُّ ، أَنبَأَ أَبُو أَحْمَدَ بْنُ عَدِيٍّ الْحَافِظُ ، ثَنَا الشَّافِعِيُّ ، ثَنَا بُنْدَاؤُ ، ثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ سَعِيدٍ ،
 ثَنَا الْعَوَّامُ بْنُ حَمْرَةَ ، قَالَ : سَأَلْتُ أَبَا عَثْمَانَ عَنِ الْقُنُوتِ فِي الصُّبْحِ ، قَالَ : بَعْدَ الرَّكُوعِ . قُلْتُ : عَمَّنْ ؟
 قَالَ : عَنْ أَبِي بَكْرٍ ، وَعُمَرَ ، وَعُثْمَانَ - رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ - . هَذَا إِسْنَادٌ حَسَنٌ ، وَيَحْيَى بْنُ سَعِيدٍ لَا يُحَدِّثُ
 إِلَّا عَنِ الثِّقَاتِ عِنْدَهُ

Abū Sa'd al-Mālinī narrated to us, from Abū Aḥmad Ibn 'Adī al-Ḥāfiẓ, from al-Shāfi'ī, from Bundār, from Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd, from al-'Awwām b. Ḥamzah, who said: "I asked Abū 'Uthmān about qunūt in the Fajr prayer, and he replied, 'After bowing (rukū').' I then asked, 'From whom was this practice transmitted?' He answered, 'From Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān—may Allah be pleased with them.'" Al-Bayhaqī commented: "This chain of transmission (isnād) is ḥasan, and Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd only narrated from individuals whom he regarded as trustworthy." (Hadis Baihaqī: 3159) (Al-Bayhaqī, 2003; Al-Darqutni, 2004; Ibn Abi Shaybah, 2015)

The significance of this narration lies in the fact that Ṭāriq b. Ashyam's testimony spans five successive generations of leadership—the Prophet ﷺ, Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, and 'Alī—all of whom, according to his account, did not perform qunūt in the Fajr prayer on a regular basis. Based on this observation, he concluded that the practice was a muḥdath innovation. The strength of the narration therefore rests on the consistency of this testimony across multiple generations. Nevertheless, al-Zayla'ī also records al-Bayhaqī's methodological objection that a narrator's lack of knowledge concerning a particular practice does not automatically constitute proof that the practice was never performed by those whom he followed.

This methodological counterargument illustrates that al-Zayla'ī does not position himself as the final arbiter of the debate but rather as a compiler of competing arguments advanced by different authorities. A similar pattern can be observed in his treatment of the reports (*āthār*) of the Companions. Al-Zayla'ī cites narrations transmitted by Ibn Abi Shaybah indicating that Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān did not perform *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer, as well as reports concerning 'Alī which suggest that his practice of *qunūt* occurred within the context of *qunūt al-nāzilah*—supplication during times of calamity—rather than as a regular ritual act (al-Zayla'ī, 1997). Likewise, a report from Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī traces the historical and political origins of *qunūt* practices among the people of Kūfah and Syria, associating them with the *qunūt al-nāzilah* performed respectively by 'Alī and Mu'āwiyah during periods of political conflict. As for the narration attributed to Ibn 'Abbās that explicitly describes *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer as an innovation (*bid'ah*), al-Zayla'ī notes that al-Bayhaqī regarded the report as weak (*ḍa'īf*).

The second group consists of narrations that al-Zayla‘ī explicitly designates as *aḥādīth al-khuṣūm* (“the narrations of the opposing side”), a designation that itself reflects his methodological awareness of conflicting evidences requiring reconciliation. The principal narration in this category is the hadith of Anas b. Mālik stating that the Prophet ﷺ continued to perform *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer until his death (al-Zayla‘ī, 1997). This narration is transmitted through the chain of ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Abū Ja‘far al-Rāzī, and al-Rabī‘ b. Anas. In discussing this hadith, al-Zayla‘ī presents a lengthy series of arguments. These include al-Ḥākim’s judgment that the hadith is *ṣaḥīḥ* and transmitted by trustworthy narrators, the defense offered by the author of *al-Tanqīḥ*, who considered it the strongest narration among the reports concerning *qunūt*, and attempts to reconcile the text by interpreting the term *qunūt* as referring either to *qunūt al-nāzilah* or simply to the prolongation of prayer, given the diverse lexical meanings of the root *qanata* in the Qur’an and hadith literature.

At the same time, al-Zayla‘ī also includes the severe criticism of Ibn al-Jawzī, who rejected the narration entirely and classified it as weak. In support of this assessment, Ibn al-Jawzī cited the opinions of several hadith critics who regarded Abū Ja‘far al-Rāzī as prone to error and known for transmitting *munkar* reports. Significantly, al-Zayla‘ī concludes this discussion by presenting an additional balancing narration from another transmission route indicating that Anas b. Mālik himself, according to the testimony of one of his students, did not practice *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer. A distinctive feature of Al-Zayla‘i’s methodology is that he does not deliver a final personal verdict at the end of this debate. Babonazarov (2023) corroborates this, noting that Al-Zayla‘i did not explicitly state his own methodological principles in the introduction to *Naṣb al-Rāyah*, so his methodological character must be inferred from the pattern of how material is presented throughout the work—a trait consistent with the dialectical-cumulative style identified in this study (Babonazarov, 2023).

Taken as a whole, al-Zayla‘ī’s methodology of *takhrīj* regarding the hadiths of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer may be characterized as dialectical and accumulative. He actively gathers and juxtaposes arguments from different hadith authorities representing opposing viewpoints, together with their respective evaluations of transmission chains, yet generally refrains from issuing a definitive personal judgment. At many points of contention, the final conclusion remains open and is effectively entrusted to the reader’s assessment of the competing arguments. This characteristic differs from the common portrayal of al-Zayla‘ī as a merely documentary compiler who avoids critical engagement. In the case of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer, he demonstrates a high degree of critical awareness; however, this critical engagement is expressed through the accumulation and presentation of scholarly debate rather than through the issuance of a single, explicit verdict.

Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī’s Takhrīj Methodology in Evaluating the Hadiths of Qunūt in the Fajr Prayer in Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr

In contrast to al-Zayla‘ī’s dialectical-accumulative approach, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī’s discussion in *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr* demonstrates a more decisive tendency in adopting evaluative positions toward the hadiths of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer that he subjects to *takhrīj*. This tendency is particularly evident in his treatment of the narration recorded by Ibn Khuzaymah through the route of Sa‘īd–Qatādah–Anas concerning the Prophet ﷺ, who

did not perform *qunūt* except when supplicating for the welfare or destruction of a particular group. After citing this narration, Ibn Ḥajar immediately presents his own evaluative conclusion: that the narrations transmitted from Anas b. Mālik concerning *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer are inconsistent and affected by *idṭirāb* (contradictory transmission), rendering them insufficiently reliable as definitive legal evidence (*hujjah*) (Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, 1998). This assessment is articulated directly by Ibn Ḥajar himself rather than being merely attributed to earlier authorities, a characteristic that is consistent with his recognized status as an authority in the field of *jarḥ wa ta'dīl*.

Ibn Ḥajar's evaluative precision is also reflected in his attention to the accuracy of source attribution (*tanbīh*). This evaluative precision is also evident in his attention to the accuracy of narration attribution (*tanbīh*). A similar trait is found in Wadi and Al-Qura'ishy's (2024) study of Ibn Hajar's methodology in *Fath al-Bari*, which shows his consistent tendency to explicitly state the strength or weakness of narrations across his other works, not only in *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr* (Wadi, H. T. K., & Al-Qura'ishy, 2024). He explicitly corrects errors made by several scholars, including al-Nawawī, who incorrectly attributed a narration concerning *qunūt* to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* or al-Ḥākim's *al-Mustadrak*, whereas the narration actually appears in a separate treatise on *qunūt* authored by al-Ḥākim (Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, 1998). Such corrections demonstrate that Ibn Ḥajar's orientation in *takhrīj* extends beyond tracing sources to include the critical verification of attribution errors committed by earlier scholars, representing a methodological dimension that surpasses mere documentation.

In his discussion of narrations concerning *qunūt* among the Rightly Guided Caliphs (*al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidūn*), Ibn Ḥajar again demonstrates a tendency to provide explicit and direct evaluations of transmission chains. The narration of al-'Awwām b. Ḥamzah concerning the practice of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān is classified as *ḥasan*, while the narration concerning the practice of 'Alī transmitted through 'Abd Allāh b. Ma'qil b. Muqarrin is classified as *ṣaḥīḥ* (Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, 1998).

أَخْبَرَنَا قُتَيْبَةُ ، عَنْ خَلْفٍ وَهُوَ ابْنُ خَلِيفَةَ ، عَنْ أَبِي مَالِكٍ الْأَشْجَعِيِّ ، عَنْ أَبِيهِ قَالَ: صَلَّيْتُ خَلْفَ رَسُولِ
اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ، فَلَمْ يَفْعَلْ وَصَلَّيْتُ خَلْفَ أَبِي بَكْرٍ فَلَمْ يَفْعَلْ ، وَصَلَّيْتُ خَلْفَ عُمَرَ فَلَمْ يَفْعَلْ
، وَصَلَّيْتُ خَلْفَ عُثْمَانَ فَلَمْ يَفْعَلْ ، وَصَلَّيْتُ خَلْفَ عَلِيٍّ فَلَمْ يَفْعَلْ ، ثُمَّ قَالَ: يَا بُنَيَّ إِنَّهَا بَدْعَةٌ .

One of the narrations cited in this discussion is transmitted from Abū Mālik al-Ashja'ī, from his father, who said: "I prayed behind the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and he did not perform qunūt. Then I prayed behind Abū Bakr, and he did not perform qunūt; I prayed behind 'Umar, and he did not perform qunūt; I prayed behind 'Uthmān, and he did not perform qunūt; and I prayed behind 'Alī, and he did not perform qunūt. Then he said: 'My son, this is an innovation (bid'ah).'" (Hadis An-Nasa'i: 1079) (Al-Maqdisi, 2001; Al-Nasa'i, 1986, 2001; Al-Tirmidzi, 1998; Ibn Hibban, 1993; Ibn Majah, 2009)

The *ḥasan* classification assigned by Ibn Ḥajar to this narration is not without basis. He explicitly notes that Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd, one of the transmitters associated with the chain, was known to narrate only from individuals whom he considered trustworthy (*thiqah*). Although brief, this observation is significant because it demonstrates Ibn Ḥajar's careful attention to the scholarly reputation of individual transmitters rather than relying solely on general judgments regarding the hadith as a whole. Interestingly, the substance of this narration stands in contrast to the narration of Ṭāriq b. Ashyam discussed by al-Zaylaʿī. While the narration of Ṭāriq indicates the absence of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer among the Rightly Guided Caliphs, the narration of al-ʿAwwām b. Ḥamzah affirms the practice of *qunūt* after *rukūʿ* by the first three caliphs. Such textual contradictions illustrate why legal inference concerning *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer cannot be based on a single narration in isolation but must take into account the broader network of interconnected reports.

These evaluations are presented directly and decisively throughout Ibn Ḥajar's discussion rather than merely being quoted from earlier authorities. He also records a narration from al-Aswad indicating that ʿUmar, in his regular practice, performed *qunūt* only in the Fajr prayer and not in other obligatory prayers. This report further reinforces the notion that *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer occupied a distinctive position in comparison to *qunūt* practices associated with other prayers.

Taken as a whole, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's methodology of *takhrīj* regarding the hadiths of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer may be characterized as evaluative-declarative. He consistently goes beyond tracing the sources of narrations by providing explicit judgments regarding transmission chains—whether in the form of *iḍṭirāb*, *ḥasan*, or *ṣaḥīḥ* classifications—and by actively correcting attribution errors found in the works of earlier scholars. Consequently, Ibn Ḥajar's position within scholarly debates tends to crystallize more readily into definitive conclusions than the approach adopted by al-Zaylaʿī, whose discussions more often leave interpretive space open for the reader.

The Implications of Divergent Takhrīj Methodologies for Legal Inference on Qunūt in the Fajr Prayer

The methodological differences between al-Zaylaʿī and Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, as outlined above, have direct implications for the manner in which legal conclusions (*istinbāt al-ḥukm*) concerning *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer are derived, whether by the authors themselves or by readers who rely on their respective works.

In al-Zaylaʿī's approach, the dialectical-accumulative nature of his *takhrīj* methodology results in a form of legal inference that is relatively open and contextual. Because al-Zaylaʿī presents arguments from both sides of the debate in a balanced manner—including attempts to reconcile the meaning of the term *qunūt*, which possesses a broad lexical range—the legal conclusion that emerges from his work tends to suggest that, if the supporting narrations are accepted, *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer is more appropriately understood within the framework of *qunūt al-nāzilah* (situational supplication associated with specific circumstances) rather than as a universally prescribed and routine practice in every Fajr prayer. The inclusion of narrations concerning the historical and political roots of *qunūt* practices in Kūfah and Syria further reinforces this tendency, as these reports indicate that the practice during the era of the Companions was closely connected to particular circumstances rather than to a fixed daily ritual. Consequently, the

legal inference associated with al-Zaylaʿī's methodology tends toward a more cautious and contextualized position (*tawaqquf* with a contextual inclination), avoiding categorical judgments that *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer is either absolutely prescribed or absolutely rejected.

By contrast, Ibn Ḥajar's evaluative-declarative approach produces a form of legal inference that is structured hierarchically according to the strength of the transmission chains. Because Ibn Ḥajar consistently assigns explicit evaluations to the narrations he discusses, the legal conclusions derived from his work depend directly upon the relative strength of those narrations. Reports classified as affected by *idṭirāb*, such as the narration transmitted by Ibn Khuzaymah through Anas, cannot serve as decisive evidence for rejecting *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer. Conversely, narrations concerning the practice of *qunūt* among the Rightly Guided Caliphs that are classified as *ḥasan* or *ṣaḥīḥ* provide a stronger evidentiary basis for affirming the legitimacy of the practice in particular contexts. This approach renders the resulting legal inference more methodologically verifiable, as each legal conclusion can be traced back to an explicit evaluation of the transmission chain, reflecting Ibn Ḥajar's broader scholarly profile as an authority in *jarḥ wa ta'dīl*, a characteristic also evident in his other works.

This comparison reveals that the difference between the two works does not lie in the presence or absence of critical evaluation of the hadiths concerning *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer, since both scholars engage in critical assessment. Rather, the distinction lies in their epistemological approaches to the outcomes of that evaluation. Al-Zaylaʿī positions himself as a compiler of scholarly debate who preserves interpretive space for the reader, resulting in a mode of legal inference that is contextual and often relies upon reconciliation between competing evidences. Ibn Ḥajar, by contrast, positions himself as an active evaluator who issues direct judgments on the quality of transmission chains, resulting in a mode of legal inference that is hierarchical and dependent upon the relative strength of the narrations.

Ultimately, these two epistemological styles reflect two distinct yet equally legitimate orientations within the tradition of Hadith Studies: one that prioritizes the breadth of scholarly dialectic and interpretive openness, and another that emphasizes decisiveness through explicit evaluation based on the strength of the available evidence. This pattern aligns with Rozikin's (2026) contention that the epistemic reliability of a hadith—rather than its popularity or frequency of citation—must serve as the primary basis for legal inference, and with Maihula and Abdulkadir's (2022) observation that sanad and matan criticism function as inseparable components in determining a hadith's evidentiary value (Maihula, J. S., & Abdulkadir, 2022; Rozikin, 2026).

The Relevance of the Findings to Contemporary Fiqh Discourse on Qunūt in the Fajr Prayer in the Indonesian Muslim Context

The findings concerning the two epistemological styles of *takhrīj*—the dialectical-accumulative approach of al-Zaylaʿī and the evaluative-declarative approach of Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī—are not only relevant from a historical and textual perspective but also possess considerable explanatory power for understanding the continuing differences in the practice of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer among Indonesian Muslims. The divergence between those who regularly perform *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer and those who do not may

be understood as a practical manifestation of two distinct approaches to legal inference whose methodological foundations have been identified in this study. A study by Nofitayanti and Supriadi (2025), which examined differences in ritual practices among Islamic organizations in Indonesia, found that *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer remains one of the prominent points of disagreement, rooted in differing methodologies of legal reasoning (*istinbāt*), (Nofitayanti, Supriadi, 2025) This finding is consistent with the pattern identified in the present study.

Those who regard *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer as a regular practice generally rely on the hadith of Anas b. Mālik concerning the Prophet's ﷺ continued performance of *qunūt* until his death as their primary evidence. In doing so, they often emphasize al-Ḥākim's authentication of the narration while giving less weight to Ibn al-Jawzī's criticism regarding the reliability of Abū Ja'far al-Rāzī. This pattern of argumentation corresponds closely to al-Zayla'ī's dialectical-accumulative approach, in which the narration is presented as one of the strongest reports among the *aḥādīth al-khuṣūm* ("the narrations of the opposing side"), accompanied by the defense of the author of *al-Tanqīh*, who regarded it as the strongest among the narrations concerning *qunūt*. Conversely, those who reject *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer as a regular practice tend to rely on the narration of Tāriq b. Ashyam, which indicates the absence of such a practice among the Rightly Guided Caliphs, and regard the narration of Anas concerning continuous *qunūt* as weak. This position is broadly consistent with the criticism advanced by Ibn al-Jawzī and cited by al-Zayla'ī, although al-Zayla'ī himself refrains from explicitly determining which of the competing narrations is stronger.

A different pattern emerges in Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī's methodology, which provides explicit and hierarchical evaluations of transmission chains. Narrations concerning the practice of the Rightly Guided Caliphs are classified as *ḥasan* or *ṣaḥīḥ*, whereas narrations affected by *iḍṭirāb*, such as the narration transmitted through Anas and cited by Ibn Khuzaymah, are explicitly deemed unsuitable as decisive legal evidence. When applied consistently within contemporary fiqh discourse, this evaluative-declarative approach tends to produce a more moderate legal conclusion: *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer may be regarded as a practice supported by valid evidence based on the reported practice of the Rightly Guided Caliphs, yet it cannot be considered an absolute or universally binding obligation. This is particularly evident in light of reports indicating variations in practice among the Companions themselves, such as the narration suggesting that 'Umar performed *qunūt* only in the Fajr prayer. Similarly, Pranata's (2019) comparative study of *qunūt* practices in the Mālikī and Shāfi'ī schools demonstrates that differences in ritual practice—whether concerning the timing of *qunūt* before or after *rukū'* or the manner of recitation—also originate from differences in legal inference employed by the respective schools, (Pranata, 2019) This further supports the conclusion that diversity in *qunūt* practices is rooted in legitimate methodological diversity within the Islamic legal tradition.

From the perspective of *uṣūl al-fiqh*, such differences of opinion (*ikhtilāf*) possess a well-established theoretical foundation. Sadari and Desya (2021) explain that, according to Imam al-Shāfi'ī, *ikhtilāf* should not be regarded as a weakness but rather as a natural consequence of differing methods of *ijtihād*, and is therefore viewed as a source of mercy within the Islamic intellectual tradition. (Sadari, S & Desya, 2021)

Accordingly, this study demonstrates that the continuing debate over the practice of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer is not merely a disagreement lacking methodological foundations.

Rather, its roots can be traced to two established epistemological traditions of *takhrīj* that have existed since the classical period. Understanding these epistemological foundations carries important practical significance, as it encourages a more moderate approach to contemporary differences regarding *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer. Such differences should be understood as the consequence of distinct yet methodologically grounded forms of scholarly reasoning, each supported by a legitimate intellectual foundation, rather than as sectarian disputes or disagreements devoid of scholarly basis.

Conclusion

This study concludes that both al-Zaylaʿī in *Naṣb al-Rāyah* and Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī in *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr* engage in critical evaluation of the hadiths concerning *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer. Consequently, the common assumption that al-Zaylaʿī's approach is merely documentary and devoid of critical evaluation requires reconsideration. The fundamental difference between the two works does not lie in the presence or absence of critical engagement, but rather in their epistemological approaches to the outcomes of that evaluation. Al-Zaylaʿī adopts a dialectical-accumulative approach, gathering and juxtaposing arguments from various hadith authorities representing opposing viewpoints, together with sanad evaluations cited from earlier critics, while leaving the debate open without issuing a definitive personal verdict. In contrast, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī employs an evaluative-declarative approach, consistently providing explicit and direct assessments of transmission chains and actively correcting errors in source attribution found in the works of earlier scholars.

These differing epistemological approaches have direct implications for the character of the legal inferences that may be derived from each work. Al-Zaylaʿī's approach produces a form of legal reasoning that is relatively open and contextual, tending to understand *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer—provided that its supporting narrations are accepted—as a practice more appropriately interpreted within the framework of *qunūt al-nāzilah* rather than as an absolute and routine ritual observance. This interpretation is consistent with the historical and political origins of *qunūt* practices during the era of the Companions. By contrast, Ibn Ḥajar's approach generates a form of legal inference structured hierarchically according to the strength of the transmission chains. Narrations affected by *iḍṭirāb* cannot serve as decisive evidence for rejecting the practice altogether, whereas narrations classified as *ḥasan* and *ṣaḥīḥ* provide a stronger and methodologically verifiable evidentiary basis for affirming the legitimacy of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer within particular contexts.

The findings of this study demonstrate that the continuing juristic disagreement regarding the legal status of *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer has identifiable epistemological roots that can be traced to differing methodological approaches among hadith scholars in managing the results of sanad criticism. On the one hand is an orientation that prioritizes the breadth of scholarly dialectic and interpretive openness; on the other is an orientation that emphasizes decisiveness through hierarchical evaluation based on the strength of the available evidence. Both orientations are firmly grounded in the tradition of rigorous hadith criticism. Therefore, the legal differences that emerge from them should not be understood merely as competing claims of authority, but rather as the logical consequence of two distinct yet equally legitimate epistemological paradigms within the discipline of Hadith Studies.

This study is limited by its reliance on two primary *takhrīj* works and therefore does not encompass perspectives found in other *takhrīj* compilations or jurisprudential commentaries that also discuss *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer. Future research is encouraged to broaden the comparative scope by incorporating *takhrīj* works from other legal schools or by examining how the dialectical-accumulative and evaluative-declarative epistemological styles identified in this study manifest themselves in other juristic issues beyond *qunūt* in the Fajr prayer. Such investigations would enable a broader assessment of the applicability and explanatory value of the patterns identified in the present study.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to all individuals and institutions that contributed to the completion of this research. Special appreciation is extended to the lecturer of the *‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* course and to colleagues in the Graduate Program of Hadith Studies at UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung for their valuable insights, constructive feedback, and academic discussions throughout the research process. The author also acknowledges the administrators of Shamela.ws for providing digital access to classical Islamic sources that served as the primary data for this study.

References

- Al-Bayhaqi, A. bin al-H. (2003). *Al-Sunan al-Kabir* (2nd ed.). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Darqutni, A. bin U. (2004). *Sunan al-Darqutni* (2nd ed.). Muassasah al-Risalah.
- Al-Maqdisi, D. al-D. (2001). *Al-Ahadith al-Mukhtara*. Dar Khidr.
- Al-Nasa’i, A. bin S. (1986). *Al-Sunan al-Sughra / Al-Mujtaba*. Maktab al-Matbu’at al-Islamiyyah.
- Al-Nasa’i, A. bin S. (2001). *Al-Sunan al-Kubra*. Muassasah al-Risalah.
- al-Suyūṭī, J. al-D. ‘Abd al-R. ibn A. B. (2000). *Tadrib al-Rāwī fī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawawī* (pp. 176–180). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Tirmidzi, M. bin I. (1998). *Jami’ al-Tirmidzi*. Dar al-Gharb al-Islami.
- al-Zayla’ī, J. al-D. ‘Abd A. ibn Y. (1997). *Naṣb al-rāyah li-aḥādīth al-Hidāyah*. Mu’assasat al-Rayyān.
- al-Zayla’ī, J. al-D. ‘Abd A. ibn Y. (1997). Bab Sholat Witr. In Syaikh Muhammad Awwamah (Ed.), *Naṣb al-Rāyah li-aḥādīth al-Hidāyah* (p. 131/2). Mu’assasat al-Rayyān.
- Babonazarov, D. T. (2023). The method used by Jamal al-Din al-Zayla’i in writing Nasb al-Rayah. *EPRA International Journal of Social Science Research*, 8(8). <https://eprajournals.com/IJSR/article/11112>
- Ibn Abi Shaybah, A. bin M. (2015). *Al-Musannaf fil Ahadith wal Atsar* (5th ed.). Dar Kunuz Ishbilya.
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. (1984). *Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fī ‘ulūm al-ḥadīth* (Muṣṭafā Dīb al-Bughā (ed.)). Maktabat al-Fārābī.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, A. ibn ‘Alī. (1995). *Talkhīṣ al-ḥabīr fī takhrīj aḥādīth al-Rāfi’ī al-kabīr*. Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, A. ibn ‘Alī. (1998). Bab Shifat Sholat. In *Talkhīṣ al-ḥabīr fī takhrīj aḥādīth al-Rāfi’ī al-kabīr* (p. 600/1). Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyyah.
- Ibn Hibban, M. (1993). *Sahih Ibn Hibban*. Muassasah al-Risalah.

- Ibn Majah, M. bin Y. (2009). *Sunan Ibn Majah*. Dar al-Risalah al-Alamiyyah.
- Iskandar, A. (2019). Metodologi Kritik Sanad Al-Hafidz Ibnu Hajar Al-Asqalany. *Jurnal Studi Hadis Nusantara*, 1(2), 1–12.
- Maihula, J. S., & Abdulkadir, M. M. (2022). In-depth analysis on the methodology of sanad and matan criticisms: The perspective of hadith scholars. *IAR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(1), 55–60. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.47310/iarjhss.2022.v03i01.008>
- Nofitayanti, Supriadi, U. (2025). Analisis Amaliyah Ibadah Nahdlatul Ulama dan Muhammadiyah dalam Membangun Ukhuwah Islamiyyah. *Hadara: Journal of Da'wah and Islamic Civilization*, 1(1), 30–50. <https://doi.org/10.61630/hrjdic.v1i1.6>
- Pahrudin, A. (2021). *Studi Pemikiran Hadis Abu Rayyah dalam Kitab Adwa 'ala al-Sunnah al-Muhammadiyah*. Penerbit A-Empat.
- Pranata, B. Y. (2019). *Pelaksanaan membaca doa Qunut di dalam shalat Subuh menurut Madzhab Maliki dan Syafi'i*. UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung.
- Rohim, Abdul Arifin, T. (2024). Implikasi Jarh wa al-Ta'dil terhadap Keautentikan Hadits (Studi Validitas Dalil Qunut Subuh Madzhab Al-Syafi'i). *Asian Journal of Islamic Studies and Da'wah*, 2(4), 337–353.
- Rozikin, M. R. (2026). al-Farā'id is half of knowledge: A critical hadith analysis and its juridical implications in Islamic inheritance discourse. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2598289>
- Sadari, S & Desya, M. M. (2021). Konsep Ikhtilaf dalam Perspektif Imam Syafi'i: Studi Islam Menyoal Perbedaan Sebagai Rahmat. *MISYKAT: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Al-Quran Hadist Syari'ah Dan Tarbiyah*, 6(2), 99–116.
- Siregar, I. R. (2024). Nuruddin 'Itr's Hadith Manhaj: A Significant Contribution to The Development of Hadith Studies (Manhaj Hadis Nuruddin 'Itr: Kontribusi Signifikan terhadap Perkembangan Studi Hadis). *Jurnal Studi Hadis Nusantara*, 6(2), 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.24235/jshn.v6i2.18636>
- Suhaldi. (2024). *Sejarah Metodologi Ilmu Tafsir Al-Qur'an (Teori, Aplikasi, dan Model Penafsiran)*. Bintang Pustaka Madani.
- Wadi, H. T. K., & Al-Qura'ishy, S. J. (2024). The methodology of Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani (d. 852 AH) in explaining the narratives of Fath al-Bari: The Book of the Virtues of the Companions as an example. *Journal of Jurisprudence Faculty*, 2(46), 185–212. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36324/fqhj.v2i46.17068>
- Zulfikar, E. (2020). Otentisitas dan Validitas Hadis dalam Perspektif Ulama Modern. *Jurnal Studi Hadis Nusantara*, 2(2), 194. <https://doi.org/10.24235/jshn.v2i2.7652>