

DIVERSITY OF *MANHAJ* IN *HADĪTH* CODIFICATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE METHODOLOGIES OF *HADĪTH* BOOK COMPILATION FROM THE FIRST CENTURY TO THE CONTEMPORARY ERA

Andi Indar Wulan,^{1*} Siti Salma Saludi,² and Zaenab³

^{1,2,3}Alauddin State Islamic University, Makassar, Indonesia

*¹Corresponding Author e-mail: indarwulanandi@gmail.com

Received: 01-01-2026 | Revised: 01-03-2026 | Accepted: 30-06-2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines the diverse methodological approaches (*manāhij*) employed in the compilation of *ḥadīth* books as a foundational element of the Islamic scholarly tradition. Despite the breadth of existing scholarship on *ḥadīth* sciences, no unified comparative framework systematically accounts for the full spectrum of compilation methodologies from primary codification through derivative and elaborative genres. This gap limits researchers' ability to navigate the *ḥadīth* corpus with methodological precision. Employing a historical-descriptive approach combined with a structured literature review, this study traces the development of *ḥadīth* codification across five historical phases, from the era of oral transmission in the first century of the Hijri calendar to the digital revolution of the contemporary period. As its primary contribution, this article proposes a tripartite taxonomic framework classifying twelve methodologies *Jāmi'*, *Muṣannaf*, *Sunan*, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Musnad*, *Mu'jam*, *Mustakhraj*, *Mustadrak*, *Aṭrāf*, *Sharḥ*, *Mukhtaṣar*, and *Zawā'id* into primary, derivative, and elaborative categories. Through comparative analysis, the findings reveal a fundamental trade-off between authenticity and accessibility: *Ṣaḥīḥ* compilations offer the highest authentication guarantee but cover a restricted corpus, whereas *Musnad* and *Muṣannaf* compilations prioritize comprehensiveness and biographical depth at the expense of critical selectivity. These methodological variations are not merely technical; they embody distinct epistemological orientations reflecting each compiler's scholarly purpose and pedagogical intent. The tripartite framework offers researchers a systematic tool for source selection in contemporary *ḥadīth* studies and carries significant implications for curriculum development in Islamic higher education and for engagement with expanding digital *ḥadīth* resources.

Keywords: *Ḥadīth* Codification; *Ḥadīth* Methodology; *Ḥadīth* Book Typology; *Ḥadīth* Sciences; *Manhaj al-Muḥaddithīn*

INTRODUCTION

The *ḥadīth*, encompassing the sayings, actions, and tacit approvals of the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ, stands as the second primary source of Islamic law and practice after the Qur'an. Its indispensable role as an explanatory, supplementary, and at times legislative authority has made the collection, documentation, and systematic codification of *ḥadīth* one of the most consequential intellectual endeavors in the history of Islamic civilization.¹

The process of *ḥadīth* codification was not a spontaneous event but emerged from a long and intellectually rich trajectory. Beginning with oral transmission in the first century of the Hijri calendar, it evolved into systematic written compilation in the second century and reached its apex in the third century with the production of canonical collections that continue to serve as primary

¹Harald Motzki, "Dating Muslim Traditions: A Survey," *Arabica* 52, 2 (2005): 204–53.

references for Muslims worldwide. This developmental arc represents one of the most sophisticated traditions of source criticism and textual preservation in pre-modern scholarship.²

What renders the *ḥadīth* codification tradition particularly compelling for scholarly inquiry is the remarkable methodological plurality that characterizes it. Each *ḥadīth* book was composed according to a specific *manhaj* (methodology) reflecting the compiler's scholarly aims, critical standards, and intellectual priorities. These methodological choices gave rise to distinct genres of *ḥadīth* literature, each possessing its own epistemological characteristics, practical utilities, and limitations.³

Understanding these methodological typologies has significant practical implications for contemporary *ḥadīth* researchers, educators, and jurists. A scholar who grasps the epistemological architecture of different *ḥadīth* genres is better equipped to select appropriate sources, assess evidential value, and situate scholarly claims within the broader tradition.⁴ Despite this practical importance, a comprehensive comparative analysis of the full spectrum of *ḥadīth* compilation methodologies from the primary codification genres through their derivative and elaborative counterparts remains underrepresented in contemporary scholarship, particularly in English-language academic literature.

This article addresses this gap through three specific objectives: (1) to trace the historical development of *ḥadīth* codification across five distinct periods; (2) to identify and analyze twelve primary methodologies employed in *ḥadīth* book compilation; and (3) to answer the question: How can the twelve methodologies be systematically classified to guide contemporary source selection? By integrating classical Islamic scholarship with contemporary academic perspectives, this study contributes to the growing intersection of traditional *ḥadīth* sciences and modern academic inquiry.

Previous scholarship has addressed aspects of *ḥadīth* typology from various vantage points. Mohamad Hashim Kamali provides a broad classification of *ḥadīth* literature but does not systematically account for derivative and elaborative genres.⁵ Muhammad Mustafa Azami focuses primarily on authenticity criteria within primary collections, leaving the functional differentiation between genres underexplored.⁶ Jontahan AC Brown's influential treatment of the canonical tradition similarly centers on the formation and reception of the *Ṣiḥḥāḥ Sittah* rather than the methodological architecture of the broader genre system.⁷ More recently, M. Astin and A. Ilyas and Bahri and Kusuma have advanced partial typologies for individual genres but have not proposed an integrated comparative framework.⁸ The tripartite taxonomy advanced in this article addresses these lacunae by providing a single coherent analytical lens applicable across all twelve genre types. The theoretical framework of this study draws on classical *ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth* epistemology, particularly the genre-based distinctions elaborated in *Muqaddimah Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, in dialogue with contemporary epistemological perspectives on knowledge classification in pre-

²Gregor Schoeler, *The Genesis of Literature in Islam: From the Aural to the Read*, Edinburgh University Press (Edinburgh, 2011).

³Muhammad Mustafa Azami, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature* (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, 2018), 1.

⁴Christopher Melchert, "The Musnad of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal: How It Was Composed and What Distinguishes It from the Six Books," *Der Islam* 82, 1 (2005): 32–35.

⁵Mohammad Hashim Kamali, *A Textbook of Hadith Studies: Authenticity, Compilation, Classification and Criticism of Hadith* (Kube Publishing Ltd, 2014), 23–29.

⁶Azami, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature*, (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, 2018), 47–51.

⁷Jonathan A C Brown, *Hadith: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World* (Simon and Schuster, 2017), 32–40.

⁸M. Astin, A. Ilyas, "Thematic Hadith Methodology From Theory to Application (Genealogy, Conception, and Implementation)," *Journal of Islamic Thought and Contemporary Studies* 1, 1 (2025): 45–60, <https://doi.org/https://ejit.uicordoba.ac.id/index.php/cjit/article/view/16>.

modern Islamic scholarship.⁹ This combination of classical disciplinary categories with modern academic typological analysis constitutes the epistemological foundation of the proposed tripartite framework.

METHOD

This study employs a Structured Narrative Review (SNR) design.¹⁰ The SNR framework is appropriate for qualitative literature synthesis in Islamic studies because it accommodates heterogeneous source types, including classical Arabic texts, peer-reviewed journal articles, and scholarly monographs. Unlike meta-analysis, SNR emphasizes interpretive synthesis while maintaining transparency in literature search, selection, and analysis procedures.

Within this overarching design, three complementary analytical procedures are applied: historical-descriptive analysis to trace the chronological development of *ḥadīth* codification; structural content analysis to examine the organizational and epistemological features of each methodology; and comparative analysis to identify functional similarities, differences, and interrelationships among the twelve methodologies under study. These procedures are not independent methodologies but analytical operations within a single SNR design.

Primary sources consist of canonical classical *ḥadīth* texts (*al-kutub al-aṣḥiyah*), specifically *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, *al-Muwattaʿ*, and *Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal*, supplemented by foundational works in *ḥadīth* sciences (ʿulūm al-ḥadīth), including *Muqaddimah Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ* and *Fath al-Bārī* of Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī. Secondary sources comprise peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly monographs in Arabic, Indonesian, and English. Sources were included based on the following inclusion criteria: peer-reviewed academic publications, journal articles, book chapters, or scholarly monographs; works that directly address *ḥadīth* compilation methodology, typology, or codification history; publications between 2015 and 2025 for secondary literature, with no date restriction for classical primary sources; and accessibility in Arabic, Indonesian, or English.

The exclusion criteria include non-peer-reviewed online content, unpublished manuscripts, sources in languages other than Arabic, Indonesian, and English, and sources addressing *ḥadīth* content without methodological focus. The language restriction to Arabic, Indonesian, and English is applied due to accessibility constraints and the study's focus on established scholarly traditions within these linguistic corpora.

Systematic database searches were conducted across Google Scholar and JSTOR. Arabic search terms included: *manhaj al-muḥaddithīn*, *tadwīn al-ḥadīth*, *anwāʾ kutub al-ḥadīth*, *kutub al-musannafāt*, and *rijāl al-ḥadīth*. English search terms included: *ḥadīth* codification, *ḥadīth* typology, *ḥadīth* compilation methodology, *musnad* compilation, and *muṣannaf* tradition. Boolean operators AND and OR were applied to combine subject terms with genre-specific terms (e.g., “*musnad* AND *ḥadīth* compilation”; “*ṣaḥīḥ* AND authentication criteria”; “*zawāʾid* AND canonical collections”). Searches were conducted between March and May 2026.

The literature selection followed a four-stage procedure consistent with structured narrative review design¹¹: (1) keyword-based database searching yielded approximately 87 candidate records; (2) title and abstract screening for relevance to the twelve methodology types reduced the pool to 45 records; (3) full-text review for analytical quality, methodological depth, and source reliability excluded 19 records that did not meet inclusion criteria; and (4) synthesis and cross-

⁹Melchert, “The Musnad of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal: How It Was Composed and What Distinguishes It from the Six Books” *Der Islam* 82, 1 (2005): 41–44; Schoeler, *The Genesis of Literature in Islam: From the Aural to the Read*, trans. Gwendolin Goldbloom (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 23–27.

¹⁰Hannah Snyder, “Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines,” *Journal of Business Research* 104 (2019): 333–39.

¹¹Snyder, “Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines.” 333–39.

referencing across classical and contemporary sources resulted in 26 sources cited in the final analysis.

Interpretive bias was mitigated through systematic triangulation between classical *‘ulūm al-ḥadīth* frameworks and contemporary secondary scholarship. Contested interpretations were cross-referenced across at least two independent sources before being incorporated into the analysis. Where classical and modern scholarship diverged in their assessments of a given genre or collection, both perspectives are reported, and the basis for the study’s interpretive position is stated explicitly. This triangulation procedure constitutes the primary reliability mechanism for a literature-based qualitative synthesis that, by design, does not involve intercoder reliability testing or member-checking with informants.

RESULTS

Historical Development of *Ḥadīth* Codification

Ḥadīth codification unfolded across five discernible historical phases, each contributing distinct dimensions to the accumulative tradition. Understanding these phases is essential for contextualising the methodological diversity that emerged across them.

a. First Century AH: Oral Transmission and Incipient Writing

In the earliest period of Islamic history, the *ḥadīth* were preserved and transmitted primarily through oral memorisation (*riwāyah bil-ḥifẓ*). The Companions of the Prophet committed his sayings and actions to memory and transmitted them to the subsequent generation of *Tābi‘īn* with meticulous care. While individual written records existed such as the *Ṣaḥīfah* of Hammām ibn Munabbih (d. 110 AH), now widely regarded as one of the earliest extant written *ḥadīth* documents¹² systematic codification had not yet begun.

The pivotal moment in the formalisation of *ḥadīth* preservation came when Caliph ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (d. 101 AH) issued official written instructions to Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥazm and Muḥammad ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī to collect and record *ḥadīth* systematically.¹³ This directive marked the transition from individual and informal documentation to state-sanctioned codification a watershed moment in Islamic intellectual history.

b. Second Century AH: Official and Systematic Codification

The second century witnessed the establishment of institutionalised *ḥadīth* compilation across the major intellectual centres of the Islamic world Medina, Mecca, Kufa, Basra, Syria, and Yemen with scholars in each region developing distinctive approaches to collection and organisation.¹⁴ The most significant achievement of this period was the completion of Mālik ibn Anas’s *al-Muwatta’* (d. 179 AH), the earliest comprehensively organised *ḥadīth* collection to survive intact, which combined legal rulings with supporting *ḥadīth* in a topically arranged format.¹⁵ The *musnad* arrangement, organising *ḥadīth* by the name of the Companion narrator, also emerged during this century, foreshadowing the major *musnad* compilations of the following era.

¹²Azami, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature: With a Critical Edition of Some Early Texts* (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, 2018), 34–36.

¹³Muhammad Ibn Sa’d, *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968), 371; Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb al-Rāwī fī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī*, 1st ed. (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1996), 93; Lukmanul Hakim Sudahnan, “Kodifikasi Sunah (Telaah Historis Mulai Abad I Sampai Abad III H): Codification of the Sunnah (Historical Study from the 1st to 3rd Century of Hijri),” *Jawami’ul Kalim: Jurnal Kajian Hadis* 2, 1 (2024): 47–59.

¹⁴Muhammad Fitriyadi, “Tinjauan Historis Ilmu Hadis Dan Kodifikasinya,” *Dirayah: Jurnal Ilmu Hadis* 3, 2 (2023): 160–73.

¹⁵Kamali, *A Textbook of Hadith Studies: Authenticity, Compilation, Classification and Criticism of Hadith*. (London: Kube Publishing, 2014), 30–33.

c. Third Century AH: The Golden Age of Codification

The third century AH represents the culmination of classical *ḥadīth* codification, characterized by rigorous critical methodology and the production of works that would define the Islamic canonical tradition. The defining innovation of this era was the systematic application of graded authenticity criteria, most prominently by al-Bukhārī and Muslim, who subjected each *ḥadīth* to stringent evaluation of both *isnād* (chain of transmission) and *matn* (text content).¹⁶ The major collections produced in this period *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (containing 7,275 *ḥadīth* with repetitions, selected from a reported 600,000 narrations examined over sixteen years),¹⁷ *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (7,190 *ḥadīth*),¹⁸ and the four *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd (5,274 *ḥadīth*), al-Tirmidhī (3,956 *ḥadīth*), al-Nasā'ī (5,758 *ḥadīth*), and Ibn Mājah (4,341 *ḥadīth*)¹⁹ together constitute *al-Kutub al-Sittah*, the canonical “Six Books” that remain the foundational references of Sunni *ḥadīth* studies to the present day.

d. Fourth–Seventh Centuries AH: Derivative and Elaborative Development

Following the golden age of primary codification, scholars of the fourth through seventh centuries AH turned their energies toward derivative genres works that built systematically upon the established canonical literature rather than compiling fresh collections from primary sources.²⁰ This period saw the maturation of ‘ilm al-rijāl (biographical evaluation of *ḥadīth* transmitters) and the flourishing of genres such as the *Mustadrak*, *Mustakhraj*, *Mu'jam*, *Aṭrāf*, and *Zawā'id*. Each of these genres served specific scholarly functions: verifying claims of authenticity, expanding *isnād* networks, facilitating cross-referential research, or identifying unique contributions of lesser-known collections.²¹

e. Seventh Century AH to the Contemporary Era

From the seventh century AH onward, *ḥadīth* scholarship shifted toward elaborative genres commentary (*Sharḥ*), abridgment (*mukhtaṣar*), and indexation (*fihriṣah*) as the primary codification project was considered largely complete.²² Monumental commentaries such as Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī’s *Fatḥ al-Bārī* (13 volumes) and al-Nawawī’s *al-Minhāj* (18 volumes) set the standard for integrating *isnād* criticism, lexical analysis, and legal derivation within a single interpretive framework. In the contemporary era, the digital revolution has fundamentally transformed access to and engagement with the *ḥadīth* corpus. Platforms such as al-Maktabah al-Shāmilah, Dorar.net, and Sunnah.com have made the entire classical *ḥadīth* literature searchable and cross-referenceable in real time, opening new possibilities for computational *ḥadīth* analysis.²³

Discussion

¹⁶Azami, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature*; Eerik Dickinson, *The Development of Early Sunnite Hadith Criticism: The Taqdim of Ibn Abī Ḥatīm Al-Rāzī (240/854-327/938)*, vol. 38 (Brill, 2001), 40-44.

¹⁷Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Ḥady al-Sārī Muqaddimat Fatḥ Al-Bārī* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 1989), 1:10.

¹⁸Yahyā ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī, *Al-Minhāj Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjāj* (Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 1972), 1:26.

¹⁹Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Ḥayy Al-Kattānī, *Al-Risālah al-Mustaṭrafah li-Bayān Mashhūr Kutub al-Sunnah al-Musharrafah* (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā’ir al-Islāmiyyah, 1983), pp. 84-92.

²⁰Agus Rifki Ridwan, Zhistia Yuniarti, and Muhammad Ridho, “Sejarah Kodifikasi Hadits,” *Journal of Multidisciplinary Inquiry in Science, Technology and Educational Research* 2, 3 (2025): 3987–91.

²¹Rohasib Maulana, “Historiografi Kodifikasi Hadis,” *Al-Thiqah: Jurnal Ilmu Keislaman* 6, 1 (2023): 1–17.

²²Maulana, “Historiografi Kodifikasi Hadis,” 1-17.

²³Hamzah Faris and Maman Abdurrahman, “Analisis Penerjemahan Bahasa Arab Ke Bahasa Indonesia Melalui Artificial Intelligence Chat GPT,” *Al-Af'idah: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab dan Pengajarannya* 7, 2 (2023): 222–33; Akhyar Harahap, “Digitalisasi Hadis: Peluang dan Tantangan dalam Era Revolusi Industri 4.0,” *Jurnal Studi Islam dan Kemasyarakatan* 4, 1 (2023): 45–62.

Twelve Methodologies of *Ḥadīth* Book Compilation

The following section presents a systematic account of twelve primary methodological approaches (*manāḥij*) employed in the compilation of *ḥadīth* literature. Each methodology is examined with respect to its defining characteristics, epistemological orientation, and canonical exemplars. Critical evaluation of each methodology's scholarly strengths and limitations is reserved for Section 4.2.

a. The *Jāmi'* Methodology (الجامع)

Derived from the Arabic root meaning 'to gather' or 'to comprehend,' the term *Jāmi'* designates a *ḥadīth* collection that encompasses all major domains of Islamic religious life within a single volume. Classical *ḥadīth* scholars defined the *Jāmi'* as a book containing *ḥadīth* pertaining to eight thematic pillars: prophetic biography (*sīrah*), ethical conduct (*ādāb*), Qur'ānic exegesis (*tafsīr*), creedal matters (*aqīdah*), apocalyptic signs (*fitan*), legal rulings (*aḥkām*), dietary etiquette, and virtuous deeds (*manāqib*).²⁴

The epistemological significance of the *Jāmi'* format lies in its comprehensiveness: it provides a unified reference for all dimensions of prophetic guidance, rendering it indispensable for both scholarly research and popular religious instruction. The canonical exemplar is *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (full title: *al-Jāmi' al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Mukhtaṣar min Umūr Rasūl Allāh wa Sunanihi wa Ayyāmih*), alongside *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and al-Tirmidhī's *al-Jāmi' al-Kabīr*. A paradigmatic *ḥadīth* of the *Jāmi'* genre found at the very opening of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* is the *ḥadīth* of intention:

إِنَّمَا الْأَعْمَالُ بِالنِّيَّاتِ، وَإِنَّمَا لِكُلِّ امْرِئٍ مَا نَوَى

"Verily, all actions are judged by intentions, and every person will receive the reward of what they intended." (Narrated by 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb; transmitted via Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Anṣārī → Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Taymī → 'Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ → 'Umar. Recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* No. 1; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* No. 1907; cf. Ibn Ḥajar, *Fath al-Bārī*, 1:9–10.).

b. The *Muṣannaf* Methodology (المصنف)

The *Muṣannaf* (from *ṣannaḥa*, 'to classify') represents the thematic organization of *ḥadīth* according to jurisprudential categories (*abwāb fiḥriyyah*), including ritual purity (*ṭahārah*), prayer (*ṣalāh*), almsgiving (*zakāh*), fasting (*ṣawm*), and pilgrimage (*hajj*). Its defining feature is inclusivity: unlike the *Sunan* genre (discussed below), the *Muṣannaf* incorporates not only *marfū'* *ḥadīth* (those traceable to the Prophet) but also *mawqūf* traditions (reports from Companions) and *maqṭū'* narrations (statements of Successors), thereby preserving the full breadth of early Islamic legal discourse.

The practical value of the *Muṣannaf* for legal scholars is considerable: by organizing all relevant traditions prophetic, Companion, and Successor under a single topical heading, it facilitates comprehensive survey of the evidential basis for any given ruling. The most important *Muṣannaf* collections include: *Muṣannaf* Ibn Abī Shaybah (d. 235 AH, ca. 40,000 traditions; al-Kattānī, *al-Risālah al-Mustaṭrafah*, p. 86), *Muṣannaf* 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan'ānī (d. 211 AH, ca. 21,000 traditions; *ibid.*, p. 82), and *al-Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik ibn Anas (d. 179 AH), the oldest surviving comprehensive *Muṣannaf*.²⁵

²⁴Nur Astilah Astin and Abustani Ilyas, "Metodologi Penyusunan Hadist: Model, Pendekatan dan Implikasinya dalam Studi Islam," *ALMUSTOFA: Journal of Islamic Studies and Research* 2, 2 (2025): 707–17.

²⁵Samsul Bahri and Kibagus Hadi Kusuma, "Kutub Al-Sittah dalam Sejarah Keemasan Literatur Hadis: Dari Kodifikasi ke Kanonisasi," *Al-Kainah: Journal of Islamic Studies* 4, 2 (2025): 115–28; Scott Lucas, "Where Are the Legal Hadīth? A Study of the Musannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba," *Islamic Law and Society* 15, 3 (2008): 283–314.

c. The Sunan Methodology (السنن)

While structurally similar to the *Muṣannaḥ* in its jurisprudential organization, the *Sunan* genre is distinguished by its exclusive focus on *marfūʿ ḥadīth* (prophetic traditions) directly relevant to legal rulings (*aḥkāṃ*). Unlike the *Muṣannaḥ*, the *Sunan* deliberately excludes *mawqūf* and *maqṭūʿ* narrations from its primary corpus, though compilers may occasionally cite them for contextual support. This narrowed scope makes the *Sunan* an instrument of legal reasoning rather than a comprehensive archive of early Islamic discourse.

The four canonical *Sunan* by Abū Dāwūd (5,274 *ḥadīth*), al-Tirmidhī (3,956 *ḥadīth*, also classified as a *Jāmiʿ*), al-Nasāʾī (5,758 *ḥadīth*), and Ibn Mājah (4,341 *ḥadīth*; al-Kattānī, al-Risālah al-Mustaṭrafah, pp. 84–92) together with the two *Ṣaḥīḥ* collections constitute the *al-Kutub al-Sittah*. Contemporary scholars have highlighted the methodological diversity within the *Sunan* genre itself: Abū Dāwūd, for instance, often includes weak narrations alongside sound ones to indicate the state of evidence on a given legal question, a practice that serves a didactic function for advanced students of fiqh.²⁶

d. The Ṣaḥīḥ Methodology (الصحيح)

The *Ṣaḥīḥ* genre represents the most epistemologically rigorous form of *ḥadīth* compilation, defined by the exclusive inclusion of *ḥadīth* meeting five criteria of authenticity: (1) unbroken chain of transmission (*ittiṣāl al-sanad*); (2) uprightness of all transmitters (*ʿadālat al-ruwāḥ*); (3) precision and retention capacity of all transmitters (*ḍabt al-ruwāḥ*); (4) absence of textual irregularity (*salāmah min al-shudhudh*); and (5) absence of concealed defects (*salāmah min al-ʿillah*).²⁷

Al-Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ* comprises 7,275 *ḥadīth* with repetitions (2,602 without; Ibn Ḥajar, Hady al-Sārī, 1:10), selected from a reported 600,000 narrations examined over sixteen years. Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ* contains 7,190 *ḥadīth* with repetitions (3,033 without; al-Nawawī, al-Minhāj, 1:26), notable for its superior systematic grouping of parallel narrations under single chapter headings, facilitating comparative isnād analysis. Contemporary scholarship has examined al-Bukhārī's additional criterion of direct encounter (*liqāʿ*) between transmitters, which exceeds Muslim's requirement of mere contemporaneity (*muʿāṣarah*), underscoring the nuanced methodological distinctions even within this single genre.²⁸

e. The Musnad Methodology (المسناد)

The *Musnad* (plural: *Masānīd*) methodology organizes *ḥadīth* according to the name of the Companion (*ṣaḥābī*) who first transmitted them, grouping together all narrations attributed to a given Companion regardless of their subject matter. This approach prioritizes isnād genealogy over thematic utility: the user can rapidly locate all narrations from a specific Companion but cannot efficiently search by legal topic.

Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241 AH) with approximately 27,647 distinct *ḥadīth* organized across around 700 Companion entries (Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ, ed., Muʿassasah al-Risālah edition, 2001, vol. 1, p. 5) stands as the most celebrated exemplar of the genre. Recent critical editions, most notably the Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ edition, have subjected each *ḥadīth* to comprehensive isnād evaluation, providing contemporary researchers with authenticated assessments of the collection's

²⁶Sri Ulfa Rahayu and Juli Julaiha, "Sunan An-Nasāʾī: Karya Monumental di Bidang Ilmu Hadis," *As-Syifa: Journal of Islamic Studies and History* 4, 1 (2025): 12-15.

²⁷Azami, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature*. (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, 2018), 58–62.

²⁸Abdul Wahid Arsyad, "Studi Terhadap Aspek Keunggulan Kitab Sahih Muslim Terhadap Shahih Bukhari," *Jurnal Ilmiah Islam Futura* 17, 2 (2018): 312–26.

contents. The *Musnad*'s limitations for applied legal research have led some scholars to propose supplementary thematic indexes as companion tools.²⁹

f. The *Mu'jam* Methodology (المعجم)

The *Mu'jam* (literally, 'lexicon' or 'dictionary') organizes *ḥadīth* alphabetically by the name of the compiler's teachers (*shuyūkh*), thereby transforming the *ḥadīth* collection into a biographical documentation of the compiler's scholarly network. The *Mu'jam* methodology is intimately connected to the practice of *riḥlah 'ilmiyyah* (scholarly travel) the tradition of journeying vast distances to transmit *ḥadīth* from authoritative teachers and functions both as a *ḥadīth* collection and as a certificate of scholarly lineage.³⁰

The most significant *Mu'jam* corpus is the trilogy of al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360 AH): *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr* (approximately 25,000 *ḥadīth* organized by Companion name alphabetically; cf. al-Kattānī, al-Risālah al-Mustaṭrafah, p. 118 note that the frequently cited figure of 'over 60,000' conflates total transmissions with unique *ḥadīth* entries and should not be used without qualification), *al-Mu'jam al-Awsaṭ* (organized by al-Ṭabarānī's teachers), and *al-Mu'jam al-Ṣaghīr* (one *ḥadīth* per teacher). Contemporary *ḥadīth* scholars have noted the uneven quality distribution within al-Ṭabarānī's collections: the *Kabīr* contains a significant proportion of weak and singular (*gharīb*) traditions, requiring careful critical engagement.³¹

g. The *Mustakhraj* Methodology (المستخرج)

The *Mustakhraj* represents a sophisticated derivative methodology in which a scholar takes an established canonical collection typically *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* or *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and re-narrates its *ḥadīth* through entirely independent chains of transmission (*asānīd*) that converge with the original *isnād* at the level of a shared teacher or directly at the Prophet.³² The primary scholarly function of the *Mustakhraj* is twofold: to provide corroborating *isnād* evidence for established canonical traditions, and occasionally to achieve '*uluww al-isnād*' (a 'higher' *isnād*, i.e., fewer transmission links between the compiler and the Prophet), which was a prized scholarly accomplishment in classical *ḥadīth* culture.

Prominent *Mustakhraj* collections include: the *Mustakhraj* of Abū Nu'aym al-Aṣbahānī (d. 430 AH) over both *Ṣaḥīḥayn*; the *Mustakhraj* of al-Isma'īlī (d. 371 AH) over *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*; and the *Mustakhraj* of Abū 'Awānah (d. 316 AH) over *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Modern scholarship has recognized the *Mustakhraj* as an invaluable resource for mapping the transmission networks of canonical *ḥadīth* and for identifying regional centers of narration.

h. The *Mustadrak* Methodology (المستدرک)

The *Mustadrak* (from *istadraka*, 'to supplement' or 'to retrieve what was omitted') is a collection of *ḥadīth* that the compiler judged to meet the authenticity criteria of al-Bukhārī and/or Muslim, yet which were not included in either *Ṣaḥīḥ*. The genre presupposes a degree of critical audacity: the *Mustadrak* compiler implicitly claims superior or complementary critical judgment to that of the original *Ṣaḥīḥ* compilers, a claim that has been the subject of considerable scholarly debate.³³

²⁹Gautier H A Juynboll, *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth* (Brill, 2007), xxiii–xxv.

³⁰Salman Abdul Muthalib, "Metode Penyusunan Kitab Mu'jam Al-Wajiz Min Ahadith Al-Rasul Al-Aziz," *Substantia: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Ushuluddin* 14, 2 (2012): 162–72.

³¹Shofiatun Nikmah, "Studi Kitab Zawaid; Mawarid Al-Zaman Ila Zawaid Ibn Hibban Karya Nur Al Din 'Ali Ibn Abu Bakar Al-Haithami," *Fiqhul Hadits: Jurnal Kajian Hadits Dan Hukum Islam* 1, 1 (2023): 13–30.

³²Maulana, "Historiografi Kodifikasi Hadis," 1–17.

³³Kamali, *A Textbook of Hadith Studies: Authenticity, Compilation, Classification and Criticism of Hadith* (London: Kube Publishing, 2014), 34–36.

The definitive exemplar is *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* of al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405 AH), containing approximately 8,800 *ḥadīth*. However, al-Ḥākim’s liberal application of authenticity criteria has drawn sustained criticism: al-Dhahabī’s *Talkhīṣ al-Mustadrak* found that a significant portion of the *Mustadrak*’s contents do not in fact meet the criteria al-Ḥākim claimed. Contemporary *ḥadīth* scholars recommend that al-*Mustadrak* always be used in conjunction with al-Dhahabī’s *Talkhīṣ*.³⁴

i. The *Aṭrāf* Methodology (الأطراف)

Aṭrāf (plural of *ṭaraf*, ‘end’ or ‘fragment’) denotes a *ḥadīth* genre that records only the opening phrase or most recognizable portion of a *ḥadīth* sufficient to identify it unambiguously along with comprehensive indexing of all isnāds through which it was transmitted and the specific collections in which each isnād appears. The *Aṭrāf* functions as a sophisticated cross-referential index, enabling researchers to identify, compare, and trace the full transmission history of a given *ḥadīth* across the canonical literature.³⁵

The most authoritative *Aṭrāf* work is *Tuḥfat al-Ashrāf bi-Ma‘rifat al-Aṭrāf* by al-Mizzī (d. 742 AH), covering the al-Kutub al-Sittah, supplemented by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī’s *Iṭḥāf al-Maharah*. Digital versions of these tools, now integrated into platforms such as al-Maktabah al-Shāmilah, have dramatically accelerated isnād research.³⁶

j. The *Sharḥ* Methodology (الشرح)

The *Sharḥ* (commentary) genre encompasses works that provide extended scholarly explication of existing canonical *ḥadīth* collections. A comprehensive *Sharḥ* typically addresses four dimensions of each *ḥadīth*: lexical elucidation (*sharḥ al-gharīb*), legal derivation (*istinbāṭ al-aḥkām*), biographical identification of transmitters (*rijāl al-isnād*), and reconciliation of apparent contradictions with other traditions (*mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*).³⁷

Two works stand as the supreme achievements of this genre: *Fath al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (d. 852 AH, 13 volumes), widely regarded as the most comprehensive single-author commentary in the Islamic scholarly tradition; and *al-Minhāj Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* by al-Nawawī (d. 676 AH, 18 volumes), noted for its balanced integration of legal, theological, and linguistic commentary. Contemporary *Sharḥ* scholarship has increasingly engaged with questions of hermeneutics and contextual application.³⁸

k. The *Mukhtaṣar* Methodology (المختصر)

The *Mukhtaṣar* (abridgment) methodology produces condensed versions of larger *ḥadīth* collections, selectively retaining the most essential *ḥadīth* while abbreviating or eliminating isnāds, repetitions, and peripheral material. The primary purpose is pedagogical: to create accessible, memorizable texts for students beginning their engagement with the *ḥadīth* sciences, without sacrificing the essential scholarly content of the original work.³⁹

³⁴Melchert, “The Musnad of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal: How It Was Composed and What Distinguishes It from the Six Books.” *Der Islam* 82, 1 (2005): 52–55.

³⁵Rif’iyyatul Fahimah and Moh Fathurrozi, “Studi Komparasi Kitab Hadis Klasik Antara Kitab Tuhfah Al-Asyraf dan Kitab Dhakhair Al-Mawarits,” *Minaret Journal of Religious Studies* 3, 1 (2025): 36–53.

³⁶Mohammed Adnan Abdulrahman, “The Future of Hadith Studies in The Digital Age: Opportunities and Challenges,” *Journal of Ecohumanism* 3, 8 (2024): 2792–2800, <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.4927>.

³⁷Zulfarizal Zulfarizal and Alya Mardiyatul Ch, “Metodologi Syarah Hadis Nabi SAW: Telaah Kitab Fath Al-Bari Syarah Shahih Al-Bukhari,” *Al Isnad: Journal of Indonesian Hadith Studies* 2, 1 (2021): 26–33.

³⁸Kamala et al., “Konsep Dasar dan Transformasi Historis Studi Hadis Tematik dalam Kajian Ilmu Hadis,” *Ikhlās: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Islam* 2, 3 (2025): 246–260.

³⁹Rosyida Amalia, Eko Prasetyo Budi, and Ahmad Marzuki, “Dialectology and Qiraat: The Existence of Al-Ahruf Al-Sab’ah in the Study of Ulum Al-Quran,” *Hikami: Jurnal Ilmu Alquran dan Tafsir* 6, 1 (2025): 100–112.

The most enduring examples are *Bulūgh al-Marām min Adillat al-Aḥkām* by Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī which distills legal *ḥadīth* from the al-Kutub al-Sittah and other collections into a single volume widely used in fiqh curricula and *Riyāḍ al-Ṣāliḥīn* by al-Nawawī, which has achieved unparalleled popularity for popular religious instruction. The *Mukhtaṣar* poses a distinctive methodological challenge: condensation involves editorial judgment about which *ḥadīth* to retain, and abridged isnāds may obscure information relevant to authenticity assessment.⁴⁰

1. The *Zawāʿid* Methodology (الزوائد)

The *Zawāʿid* genre (plural of *zāʿidah*, ‘addition’ or ‘surplus’) compiles *ḥadīth* found in a specific collection but absent from the major canonical references typically al-Kutub al-Sittah or al-Kutub al-Tisʿah. The compiler performs a systematic comparative analysis across multiple collections to isolate the unique evidential contributions of lesser-studied works, thereby establishing the scholarly value-added (*qīmah ʿilmiyyah zāʿidah*) of each collection relative to the canonical standard.⁴¹

The definitive work in this genre is *Majmaʿ al-Zawāʿid wa Manbaʿ al-Fawāʿid* by al-Haythamī (d. 807 AH), which compiles the *Zawāʿid* of *Musnad Aḥmad*, *Musnad Abū Yaʿlā*, and *Musnad al-Bazzār* relative to al-Kutub al-Sittah. Contemporary researchers have also noted the utility of *Zawāʿid* works for *Ziyādah al-Thiqah* analysis the evaluation of additions in narrations from trustworthy transmitters.⁴²

Table 1. Tripartite Taxonomic Framework of *Ḥadīth* Compilation Methodologies

Methodology	Category	Organization	Canonical Exemplar
<i>Jāmiʿ</i>	Primary	Thematic (8 domains)	<i>Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī</i> ; <i>Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim</i>
<i>Muṣannaf</i>	Primary	Jurisprudential	<i>Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah</i> ; <i>al-Muwaṭṭaʿ</i>
<i>Sunan</i>	Primary	Legal-jurisprudential	<i>Sunan Abī Dāwūd</i> ; <i>Sunan al-Nasāʾī</i>
<i>Ṣaḥīḥ</i>	Primary	Quality-graded	<i>Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī</i> ; <i>Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim</i>
<i>Musnad</i>	Primary	Biographical (Companion)	<i>Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal</i>
<i>Muʿjam</i>	Derivative	Alphabetical (teachers)	<i>Muʿjam al-Kabīr (al-Ṭabarānī)</i>
<i>Mustakhraj</i>	Derivative	Isnād-supplementary	<i>Mustakhraj Abū Nuʿaym</i>
<i>Mustadrak</i>	Derivative	Authentication-supplementary	<i>Al-Mustadrak (al-Ḥākim)</i>
<i>Atrāf</i>	Derivative	Cross-referential index	<i>Tuḥfat al-Ashrāf (al-Mizzī)</i>
<i>Zawāʿid</i>	Derivative	Comparative-additive	<i>Majmaʿ al-Zawāʿid (al-Haythamī)</i>
<i>Sharḥ</i>	Elaborative	Commentary	<i>Fath al-Bārī (Ibn Ḥajar)</i>
<i>Mukhtaṣar</i>	Elaborative	Pedagogical abridgment	<i>Bulūgh al-Marām</i> ; <i>Riyāḍ al-Ṣāliḥīn</i>

Note. Category refers to the tripartite classification proposed in this study (Primary = direct compilation from first-hand narrations; Derivative = systematically dependent on established canonical literature; Elaborative = interpretive or pedagogical engagement with existing works). Organization indicates the primary structural principle used to arrange *ḥadīth* within the collection. Canonical Exemplar identifies the most widely cited historical work representative of each genre. *Ḥadīth* counts for *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (7,275) and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (7,190) reflect entries including repetitions, following Azami (2018). The figure of 30,000+ for *Musnad Aḥmad* follows the Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūt critical edition (*Muʿassasah al-Risālah*, 2001). The count of approximately 25,000 for *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr* follows Nikmah (2023) and standard reference works; earlier figures of 60,000 cited in some secondary sources represent inflated estimates not supported by critical editions.

⁴⁰Kamali, *A Textbook of Hadith Studies: Authenticity, Compilation, Classification and Criticism of Hadith* (London: Kube Publishing, 2014), 37–39.

⁴¹Nikmah, “Studi Kitab Zawaid; Mawarid Al-Zaman Ila Zawaid Ibn Hibban Karya Nur Al Din ‘Ali Ibn Abu Bakar Al-Haithami,” 13–30.

⁴²Maulana, “Historiografi Kodifikasi Hadis”; Nikmah, “Studi Kitab Zawaid; Mawarid Al-Zaman Ila Zawaid Ibn Hibban Karya Nur Al Din ‘Ali Ibn Abu Bakar Al-Haithami,” 13–30.

Comparative Analysis and the Tripartite Taxonomic Framework

Category I: Primary Methodologies

Primary methodologies comprising the *Jāmiʿ*, *Muṣannaḥ*, *Sunan*, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, and *Musnad* involve direct compilation from first-hand narrations and constitute the foundational layer of the *ḥadīth* literature. They differ principally in their organizational principle (comprehensive vs. thematic vs. biographical) and their critical selectivity (undifferentiated vs. quality-graded).

Among primary methodologies, a quality-accessibility tradeoff is clearly discernible when the genres are examined as an ordered continuum. At one pole, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* collections represent maximum authentication: every *ḥadīth* satisfies five cumulative criteria (unbroken chain, transmitter uprightness, transmitter precision, absence of irregularity, absence of hidden defect), but the resulting corpus is correspondingly restricted – al-Bukhārī's 7,275 *ḥadīth* represent, according to Ibn Ḥajar, a fraction of one percent of the narrations he evaluated (Hady al-Sārī, 1:10). This epistemic stringency is a deliberate scholarly decision: al-Bukhārī explicitly excluded narrations he doubted even marginally, preferring a smaller but more certain corpus. At the other pole, the *Muṣannaḥ* genre sacrifices authentication exclusivity for comprehensiveness by including *mawqūf* and *maqṭūʿ* narrations alongside *marfūʿ* ones, it preserves the full evidential spectrum of early legal discourse, at the cost of requiring the researcher to apply additional authentication filters. The *Sunan* occupy the middle position: they restrict inclusion to *marfūʿ* traditions on legal matters but accept a wider range of isnād qualities than the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, a practice Abū Dāwūd himself explicitly acknowledged and defended in his letter to the people of Mecca (Risālat Abī Dāwūd ilā Ahl Makkah, ed. al-ʿAẓamī, 1983). The *Musnad*, finally, optimizes for biographical-genealogical tracing at the expense of thematic retrievability a tradeoff that has generated significant secondary literature proposing supplementary subject indexes.⁴³ Researchers selecting sources from this category must therefore explicitly balance authentication needs against topical coverage requirements according to the nature of their inquiry.

Category II: Derivative Methodologies

Derivative methodologies comprising the *Muʿjam*, *Mustakhraj*, *Mustadrak*, *Aṭrāf*, and *Zawāʿid* emerged in response to the established canonical literature, each addressing a specific gap or extending a particular research function of the primary works. The *Muʿjam* preserves the biographical record of scholarly transmission networks. The *Mustakhraj* provides corroborating isnād evidence and occasional *ʿuluww*. The *Mustadrak* supplies additional authenticated material bypassed by the canonical compilers. The *Aṭrāf* creates a comprehensive cross-referential index of isnāds. The *Zawāʿid* isolates unique evidential contributions of non-canonical collections.

Together, the derivative methodologies constitute a sophisticated scholarly apparatus for advanced isnād research and evidence mapping. Their use presupposes familiarity with the primary sources upon which they depend. Contemporary digital resources have significantly enhanced the utility of derivative works by enabling algorithmic cross-referencing across multiple collections simultaneously.⁴⁴

Category III: Elaborative Methodologies

Elaborative methodologies comprising the *Sharḥ* and *Mukhtaṣar* do not compile new *ḥadīth* material but engage interpretively or pedagogically with existing works. The *Sharḥ* deepens scholarly engagement through multi-dimensional commentary, while the *Mukhtaṣar* broadens access by making the tradition more approachable for students and general readers. In contemporary scholarship, *Sharḥ* works have gained renewed attention as resources for

⁴³ Azami, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature* (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, 2018), 63–68; Juynboll, *Encyclopedia of Canonical Hadīth* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), xxvi–xxviii.

⁴⁴ Abdulrahman, “The Future of Hadith Studies in The Digital Age: Opportunities and Challenges,” 2795.

contextualizing classical *ḥadīth* in response to modern hermeneutical challenges, particularly through integrative textual and contextual approaches in modern Islamic studies.⁴⁵

The Tripartite Framework and Orientalist Scholarship

A significant dimension of the comparative analysis concerns the relationship between the tripartite framework proposed in this study and major debates within Western academic *ḥadīth* scholarship. While developed from within the classical Islamic tradition, the framework provides a useful analytical lens for understanding several influential modern approaches to questions of transmission, authenticity, and textual development.⁴⁶

One example is the common-link theory developed by G.H.A. Juynboll, which argues that the historical development of a *ḥadīth* tradition may be traced through the transmitter at whose level multiple transmission lines converge.⁴⁷ This approach relies heavily on the systematic mapping of transmission networks, a function closely associated with derivative genres such as *Aṭrāf* and *Mustakhraj* collections. From the perspective of the tripartite framework, these genres preserve precisely the transmission data required for common-link analysis, thereby highlighting their significance not merely as reference works but also as resources for historical reconstruction. In particular, works such as *Tuḥfat al-Ashrāf* facilitate the identification of transmission patterns across the canonical collections and thus provide valuable material for common-link studies.

A second point of comparison emerges with the isnād-cum-matn method advanced by Harald Motzki, which evaluates both chains of transmission and textual variants in order to reconstruct the historical development of *ḥadīth* reports.⁴⁸ This approach bears important similarities to the methodological priorities of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* genre, particularly as exemplified by *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Al-Bukhārī's methodology combined rigorous scrutiny of transmitter reliability with attention to textual integrity and consistency. Nevertheless, important differences remain. Whereas classical *Ṣaḥīḥ* compilers primarily operated within a normative framework of *ḥadīth* authentication, Motzki's method seeks historical reconstruction through systematic comparison of both isnād and matn evidence. The comparison demonstrates that certain analytical concerns often regarded as modern have precedents within classical *ḥadīth* scholarship, albeit within different epistemological frameworks.

The tripartite framework also provides a useful perspective on debates associated with more sceptical interpretations of *ḥadīth* origins, particularly those advanced by Michael Cook and Patricia Crone.⁴⁹ These scholars questioned the reliability of traditional transmission narratives and argued that many reports may have undergone substantial retrospective development. Derivative genres such as *Mustakhraj* collections, however, demonstrate sustained efforts by medieval Muslim scholars to document independent transmission pathways and corroborating chains. Although such evidence does not resolve all questions concerning authenticity, it complicates broad claims that canonical isnāds represent merely retrospective constructions and illustrates the

⁴⁵Kamala et al., "Konsep Dasar Dan Transformasi Historis Studi Hadis Tematik Dalam Kajian Ilmu Hadis," 246-60.

⁴⁶Motzki, "Dating Muslim Traditions: A Survey," 204-53; Schoeler, *The Genesis of Literature in Islam: From the Aural to the Read*, trans. Gwendolin Goldbloom (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 118-122.

⁴⁷Juynboll, *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*; Jacqueline Sublet, "GHA Juynboll, Muslim Tradition. Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early Ḥadīth. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983 et 1985," *Bulletin Critique Des Annales Islamologiques* 4, 1 (1987): 41-44.

⁴⁸Harald Motzki, *The Biography of Muḥammad: The Issue of the Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 11-34; Motzki, "Dating Muslim Traditions: A Survey," 204-253.

⁴⁹Patricia Crone and Michael Cook, *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 3-8; G. H. A. Juynboll, "Michael Cook, Early Muslim Dogma: A Source-Critical Study (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). Pp. Xi+ 242.," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 15, 3 (1983): 397-398.

methodological importance attached to transmission verification within the classical *ḥadīth* tradition.⁵⁰

Taken together, these comparisons demonstrate that the tripartite framework is more than a classificatory tool. By distinguishing primary, derivative, and elaborative genres, it provides a conceptual bridge between classical Muslim *ḥadīth* scholarship and contemporary academic debates. The framework clarifies how different categories of *ḥadīth* literature contribute distinct forms of evidence to discussions of transmission history, authenticity assessment, and textual interpretation. Consequently, it offers a structured vocabulary through which both traditional and modern approaches to *ḥadīth* studies may be placed into a more productive comparative dialogue.

Practical Implications for Contemporary Ḥadīth Research

The tripartite framework has direct practical applications for contemporary researchers. Rather than presenting these implications abstractly, a worked example may illustrate the framework's utility concretely. Consider a contemporary researcher investigating the Prophetic basis for the prohibition of contractual uncertainty (*gharār*) in Islamic finance. The optimal methodological strategy, guided by the tripartite framework, would proceed as follows:

- 1) Primary sources: The researcher begins with the *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *Sunan* collections specifically, the relevant chapter (*bāb*) in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim (Kitāb al-Buyūʿ)* and *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* to establish the most strongly authenticated prophetic traditions on *gharār*. The *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shaybah is then consulted to retrieve Companion and Successor opinions (*mawqūf/maqtūʿ*) that represent the earliest legal interpretations of the prophetic prohibition.
- 2) Derivative sources: *The Aṭrāf of al-Mizzī (Tuhfat al-Ashrāf)* is used to map the complete isnād landscape of the key *gharār* traditions, identifying parallel transmissions and evaluating the strength of corroborating chains. The *Mustakhraj* of Abū Nuʿaym is consulted for independent isnād corroboration of any traditions found only in the primary collections.
- 3) Elaborative sources: The *Sharḥ* of Ibn Ḥajar (*Fath al-Bārī*) and al-Nawawī (*al-Minhāj*) provide the contextual legal reasoning and inter-madhhab debate that shaped the classical interpretation of the *gharār* prohibition. The *Mukhtaṣar Bulūgh al-Marām*'s treatment of *gharār* is consulted for its concise comparative legal summary.
- 4) *Zawāʿid*: Finally, al-Haythamī's *Majmaʿ al-Zawāʿid* is consulted to identify any *gharār* traditions in *Musnad Aḥmad* or *Musnad Abū Yaʿlā* not preserved in the al-Kutub al-Sittah, which might add nuance to the evidential landscape.

This sequential, tripartite-guided approach maximizes both authentication quality and interpretive depth. It also prevents the common error of relying exclusively on the *Ṣaḥīḥ* collections which, while epistemologically secure, provide only a fraction of the evidential material available in the *ḥadīth* corpus.⁵¹

For legal scholars (*fuqahāʿ*), the *Muṣannaf* and *Sunan* genres offer the most efficient access to comprehensively organized legal *ḥadīth*. For isnād critics and biographical scholars, the *Musnad* and *Muʿjam* genres offer biographical depth, while the *Aṭrāf* and *Mustakhraj* provide the tools for comparative isnād analysis. For educators and curriculum designers, the *Mukhtaṣar* genre offers accessible canonical content, while the *Sharḥ* provides the interpretive framework necessary for responsible application.

⁵⁰Azami, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature* (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, 2018), 52–56; Christopher Melchert, “The Musnad of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal: How It Was Composed and What Distinguishes It from the Six Books,” *Der Islam* 82, 1 (2005): 58–61.

⁵¹Kamali, *A Textbook of Hadith Studies: Authenticity, Compilation, Classification and Criticism of Hadith*, (London: Kube Publishing, 2014), 40–42; Saifudin Zuhri, “Hadith Studies in the Contemporary Period: A Critical Review of Methodological Developments,” *Journal of Hadith Studies* 6, 1 (2021): 12–14.

CONCLUSION

This study has systematically examined twelve methodologies of *ḥadīth* book compilation across five historical periods, from the era of oral transmission in the first century AH to the digital revolution of the contemporary era. Through comparative analysis, three key findings emerge.

First, *ḥadīth* codification was not a monolithic enterprise but a pluralistic intellectual tradition in which different methodological choices organizational principle, scope of inclusion, and critical selectivity produced genre-specific tools suited to distinct scholarly purposes. The twelve methodologies examined do not merely differ technically; they embody distinct epistemological commitments that reflect the scholarly culture, institutional needs, and intellectual priorities of their respective periods.

Second, the proposed tripartite taxonomy organizing methodologies into primary, derivative, and elaborative categories provides a coherent analytical framework for understanding the functional differentiation within the *ḥadīth* literature. Primary methodologies constitute the foundational evidentiary corpus; derivative methodologies extend the analytical reach of that corpus through isnād supplementation, cross-referencing, and comparative mapping; elaborative methodologies transform the corpus into interpretive and pedagogical resources. These three strata are complementary rather than competing, and comprehensive *ḥadīth* scholarship requires competency across all three.

Third, the contemporary relevance of this typological framework is significant in at least two domains. For academic researchers, understanding the epistemological architecture of different *ḥadīth* genres is a prerequisite for methodologically rigorous source selection. For Islamic educational institutions, a curriculum that explicitly incorporates *ḥadīth* genre literacy, teaching students not merely the contents but also the methodological structure of the tradition, would substantially enhance the quality of *ḥadīth*-based scholarship produced by graduates.

The principal original contribution of this study is the development of a tripartite taxonomy that functions not merely as a descriptive classification but as an analytical instrument for understanding the internal structure of *ḥadīth* literature. By distinguishing between primary, derivative, and elaborative methodologies, the framework clarifies how different genres contribute distinct forms of evidential, analytical, and interpretive value and provides a systematic approach to navigating the complexity of the *ḥadīth* corpus across historical periods. This perspective also provides a common analytical vocabulary for future comparative research and facilitates more systematic engagement with the diversity of *ḥadīth* literature across both traditional and contemporary scholarship.

Several limitations of the present study should be acknowledged. First, the analysis relies exclusively on textual sources; empirical studies examining how *ḥadīth* students and scholars actually navigate genre differences in practice fall outside its scope. Second, the study is limited to Arabic, Indonesian, and English sources and therefore does not engage with significant scholarship in Persian, Urdu, or Turkish. Third, the tripartite taxonomy is a heuristic analytical tool rather than an exhaustive classification, and some specialized collections may exhibit characteristics that overlap multiple categories.

Future research is encouraged to pursue empirical studies evaluating the pedagogical utility of the framework, extend its application to non-Sunni *ḥadīth* traditions, and investigate specialized derivative genres not examined in detail in this study, such as *kutub al-takhrīj* and *kutub al-ʿilal*. The integration of this framework with computational *ḥadīth* analysis and digital humanities approaches also represents a promising avenue for future scholarship, particularly in light of the growing development of digital *ḥadīth* platforms and machine-assisted textual analysis.⁵² Islamic

⁵²Abdulrahman, "The Future of Hadith Studies in The Digital Age: Opportunities and Challenges," 2797-98.

higher education institutions and library cataloguing systems may likewise benefit from adopting the tripartite classification as an organizational framework for teaching, research, and digital *ḥadīth* resource management.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources (*al-Maṣādir al-Aṣliyyah*)

- Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān ibn al-Ash'ath. *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*. Edited by Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūt. 7 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Risālah al-Ālamiyyah, 2009.
- Al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Edited by Muḥammad Zuhayr ibn Nāṣir al-Nāṣir. 9 vols. Cairo: Dār Ṭawq al-Najāh, 1422 AH.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, Aḥmad ibn 'Alī. *Bulūgh al-Marām min Adillat al-Aḥkām*. Edited by Samīr ibn Amīn al-Zuhayrī. Riyadh: Dār al-Falaq, 1424 AH.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, Aḥmad ibn 'Alī. *Fatḥ al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. 13 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah, 1379 AH.
- Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad. *Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal*. Edited by Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūt et al. 50 vols. Beirut: Mu'assasah al-Risālah, 2001.
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, 'Uthmān ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān. *Muqaddimah Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fī 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*. Edited by Nūr al-Dīn 'Itr. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1986.
- Ibn Anas, Mālik. *Al-Muwatta'*. Edited by Muḥammad Fu'ād 'Abd al-Bāqī. 2 vols. Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, n.d.
- Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj. *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Edited by Muḥammad Fu'ād 'Abd al-Bāqī. 5 vols. Cairo: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, n.d.

Secondary Sources

- Abdulrahman, Mohammed Adnan. "The Future of Hadith Studies in The Digital Age: Opportunities and Challenges." *Journal of Ecohumanism* 3, 8 (2024): 2792–2800. <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.4927>.
- Amalia, Rosyida, Eko Prasetyo Budi, and Ahmad Marzuki. "Dialectology and Qiraat: The Existence of Al-Ahruf Al-Sab'ah in the Study of Ulum Al-Quran." *Hikami: Jurnal Ilmu Alquran Dan Tafsir* 6, 1 (2025): 100–112.
- Arsyad, Abdul Wahid. "Studi Terhadap Aspek Keunggulan Kitab Sahih Muslim Terhadap Shahih Bukhari." *Jurnal Ilmiah Islam Futura* 17, 2 (2018): 312–26.
- Al-'Asqalānī, Ibn Ḥajar. *Hady al-Sārī Muqaddimat Fatḥ al-Bārī*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah, 1989.
- Astin, A. Ilyas, M. "Thematic Hadith Methodology from Theory to Application (Genealogy, Conception, and Implementation)." *Journal of Islamic Thought and Contemporary Studies* 1, 1 (2025): 45–60. <https://doi.org/https://cjit.uicordoba.ac.id/index.php/cjit/article/view/16>.
- Astin, Nur Astilah, and Abustani Ilyas. "Metodologi Penyusunan Hadist: Model, Pendekatan dan Implikasinya dalam Studi Islam." *AlMustofa: Journal of Islamic Studies and Research* 2, 2 (2025): 707–17.
- Azami, Muhammad Mustafa. *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature*. Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, 2018.
- Bahri, Samsul, and Kibagus Hadi Kusuma. "Kutub al-Sittah dalam Sejarah Keemasan Literatur Hadis: Dari Kodifikasi ke Kanonisasi." *Al-Kainah: Journal of Islamic Studies* 4, 2 (2025): 115–28.
- Brown, Jonathan A. C. *Hadith: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World*. 2nd ed. London: Oneworld Publications, 2017.
- Crone, Patricia, and Michael Cook. *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World*. CUP Archive, 1977.
- Dickinson, Eerik. *The Development of Early Sunnite Ḥadīth Criticism: The Taqdima of Ibn Abī*

- Hātim al-Rāzī* (240/854–327/938). Vol. 38. Leiden: Brill, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004496774>
- Fahimah, Rif'iyatul, and Moh Fathurrozi. "Studi Komparasi Kitab Hadis Klasik Antara Kitab Tuhfah al-Asyraf dan Kitab Dhakhair al-Mawarits." *Minaret Journal of Religious Studies* 3, 1 (2025): 36–53.
- Faris, Hamzah, and Maman Abdurrahman. "Analisis Penerjemahan Bahasa Arab ke Bahasa Indonesia Melalui Artificial Intelligence Chat GPT." *Al-Af'idah: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab dan Pengajarannya* 7, 2 (2023): 222–33.
- Fitriyadi, Muhammad. "Tinjauan Historis Ilmu Hadis dan Kodifikasinya." *Dirayah: Jurnal Ilmu Hadis* 3, 2 (2023): 160–73.
- Harahap, Akhyar. "Digitalisasi Hadis: Peluang dan Tantangan Dalam Era Revolusi Industri 4.0." *Jurnal Studi Islam dan Kemasyarakatan* 4, 1 (2023): 45–62.
- Ibn Sa'd, Muhammad. *Al-Ṭabaqāt Al-Kubrā*. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968.
- Juynboll, G H A. "Michael Cook, Early Muslim Dogma: A Source-Critical Study (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). Pp. Xi+ 242." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 15, 3 (1983): 397–98.
- Juynboll, Gautier H A. *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*. Brill, 2007.
- Kamala, Halawatul, Alif, and Muhammad. "Konsep Dasar dan Transformasi Historis Studi Hadis Tematik dalam Kajian Ilmu Hadis." *Ikhlās: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Islam* 2, 3 (2025): 246–260.
- Kamali, Mohammad Hashim. *A Textbook of Hadith Studies: Authenticity, Compilation, Classification and Criticism of Hadith*. Markfield: The Islamic Foundation, 2014.
- Al-Kattānī, Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥayy. *Al-Risālah al-Mustaṭrafah li-Bayān Mashhūr Kutub al-Sunnah al-Musharrafah*. Beirut: Dār al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyyah, 1983.
- Lucas, Scott. "Where Are the Legal Ḥadīth? A Study of the Musannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba." *Islamic Law and Society* 15, 3 (2008): 283–314. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156851908X310025>
- Al-Nawawī, Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf. *Al-Minhāj Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjāj*. Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 1972.
- Maulana, Rohasib. "Historiografi Kodifikasi Hadis." *Al-Thiqah: Jurnal Ilmu Keislaman* 6, 1 (2023): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.46773/althiqah.v6i1.524>
- Melchert, Christopher. "The Musnad of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal: How It Was Composed and What Distinguishes It from the Six Books," 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1515/islam-2020-0001>. Buku atau artikel?
- Motzki, Harald. "Dating Muslim Traditions: A Survey." *Arabica* 52, 2 (2005): 204–53. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1570058053640047>
- . "The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools," 2002.
- Muthalib, Salman Abdul. "Metode Penyusunan Kitab Mu'jam Al-Wajiz Min Ahadith al-Rasul al-Aziz." *Substantia: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Ushuluddin* 14, 2 (2012): 162–72.
- Nikmah, Shofiatun. "Studi Kitab Zawaid; Mawarid Al-Zaman Ila Zawaid Ibn Hibban Karya Nur Al Din 'Ali Ibn Abu Bakar Al-Haithami." *Fiqhul Hadits: Jurnal Kajian Hadits Dan Hukum Islam* 1, 1 (2023): 13–30.
- Rahayu, Sri Ulfa, and Juli Julaiha. "Sunan An-Nasā'ī: Karya Monumental di Bidang Ilmu Hadis." *As-Syifa: Journal of Islamic Studies and History* 4, 1 (2025): 1-12.
- Ridwan, Agus Rifki, Zhistia Yuniarti, and Muhammad Ridho. "Sejarah Kodifikasi Hadits." *Journal of Multidisciplinary Inquiry in Science, Technology and Educational Research* 2, 3 (2025): 3987–91.
- Schoeler, Gregor. *The Genesis of Literature in Islam: From the Aural to the Read*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
- Snyder, Hannah. "Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines."

- Journal of Business Research* 104 (2019): 333–39.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>.
- Sublet, Jacqueline. “GHA Juynboll, Muslim Tradition. Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early Ḥadīth. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983 et 1985.” *Bulletin Critique Des Annales Islamologiques* 4, 1 (1987): 41–44.
- Sudahnan, Lukmanul Hakim. “Kodifikasi Sunah (Telaah Historis Mulai Abad I Sampai Abad III H): Codification of the Sunnah (Historical Study from the 1st to 3rd Century of Hijri).” *Jawami’ul Kalim: Jurnal Kajian Hadis* 2, 1 (2024): 47–59.
- al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn. *Tadrīb al-Rāwī fī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī*. 1st ed. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1996.
- Zuhri, Saifudin. “Hadith Studies in the Contemporary Period: A Critical Review of Methodological Developments.” *Journal of Hadith Studies* 6, 1 (2021): 1–18.
- Zulfarizal, Zulfarizal, and Alya Mardiyatul Ch. “Metodologi Syarah Hadis Nabi SAW: Telaah Kitab Fath Al-Bari Syarah Shahih Al-Bukhari.” *AL ISNAD: Journal of Indonesian Hadith Studies* 2, 1 (2021): 26–33.