

The purpose of this study is to investigate how different Islamic schools of thought interpret and derive basic principles in Islamic jurisprudence. It is believed that the Muslims set the principles of Islamic jurisprudence soon after the demise of the Prophet (s.a.w.w) of Islam. This branch of knowledge is actually a superb fusion of reasoning and imitation. It is the study of the arguments through which Islamic Sharia is interpreted and Islamic legislation is achieved. Most often, the debates involve doctrinal arguments, and all the existing Islamic schools of thought agree on the basic principles through which certain laws are derived from those debates.

All the Islamic schools of thought agree that Qur'an is the final authority, and it is the Qur'an that provides the initial argument whenever some issue arises. Thus the Qur'an is the first and foremost source to provide an answer to any issue. However, the Hambli scholars ascribe authority to the Qura'an and the Sunnah, without making a clear distinction in order or rank between the two.

The Sunnah is the second source for deriving doctrinal principles. All Islamic schools of thought agree that the Sunnah is an important and basic source for deriving the Sharia principles. The Sharia can be divided into two kinds: the first deals with the steady and gradual reporting which, according to every school of thought, adds to argumentative knowledge, and hence stands for authority in Islamic jurisprudence. The second kind involves personal reporting which depends on personal character for determining its truth-value. However, every school of thought takes it as authority once its truth-value is verified. For Hanfi school of thought, certain other conditions besides personal character are required in order to accept the personal reporting.

The third most important source for deriving principles in Islamic jurisprudence is the community consensus. Every school of thought accepts the authority of the general consensus. Although most of the schools of thought agree on the authority of absolute consensus, the *Malkis* also take community consensus as an authority, i.e., if the community in Madina arrive at a consensus on some issue, it would be accepted as the authority. On the other hand, according to the *Ja'fri* school of thought, every consensus has attained authority with a *ma'soom's* opinion in its favor.

For the majority *Ummah*, reasoning is also regarded as authority for the derivation of the Sharia principles. According to Imam Ibne Hazam, logical reasoning is possible, but it is not recognized by the Sharia. On the other hand, the *Ja'fri* school of thought accepts the authority of both the *mansoosul-illat* reasoning and the *awaliyat* reasoning.

As for the authority of *istashab*, all the Muslim states accept and set it as a precedence to implement the state laws. The *Hanfis* believe that only an accepted right can be explored and verified through *istashab*, and not a new one. All these are the basic principles that serve as authority in the Islamic jurisprudence. Every Islamic school of thought employs them for the interpretation and implementation of the Sharia