

## BETWEEN DOCTRINE AND REGULATION: LEGAL PLURALISM IN CONTEMPORARY SHARIAH ECONOMIC LAW

Nurul Huda<sup>1</sup>, Faisal Razak<sup>2</sup>, and John Smith<sup>3</sup><sup>1</sup> Universiti Utara, Malaysia<sup>2</sup> Universiti Malaya, Malaysia<sup>3</sup> Harvard University, United States

### Corresponding Author:

Nurul Huda,  
Universiti Utara.  
06010 Sintok Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia  
Email: nurulhuda@gmail.com

### Article Info

Received: August 18, 2025

Revised: November 20, 2025


Accepted: January 23, 2026

Online Version: February 25, 2026

### Abstract

Contemporary Shariah economic law operates within a pluralistic legal landscape shaped by the interaction between classical jurisprudence and modern regulatory frameworks. The expansion of Islamic finance across diverse jurisdictions has intensified tensions between doctrinal authority and institutional regulation, producing varying interpretations and governance practices. This study aims to examine how legal pluralism is constructed and managed within contemporary Shariah economic law, with particular attention to the relationship between doctrinal reasoning and regulatory structures. A qualitative normative–juridical research design is employed through systematic analysis of 92 legal documents, including fatwas, national regulations, and international standards across multiple jurisdictions. Analytical matrices and thematic coding are used to identify patterns of legal interaction, institutional integration, and interpretive divergence. The findings reveal that legal pluralism is a structural characteristic of Islamic financial governance, where integrated systems enhance coherence while decentralized arrangements increase fragmentation. Hybrid governance models demonstrate greater effectiveness in balancing doctrinal diversity with regulatory consistency. The study concludes that legal pluralism should be understood as a dynamic and productive condition rather than a problem to be eliminated, requiring governance frameworks that facilitate coordination between competing authorities while preserving epistemological diversity.

**Keywords:** Islamic Financial Governance, Legal Pluralism, Shariah Economic Law



© 2026 by the author(s)

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

Journal Homepage

<https://research.adra.ac.id/index.php/solj>ISSN: (P: [2988-5191](https://doi.org/10.70177/solj.v4i1.3586)) - (E: [2988-5205](https://doi.org/10.70177/solj.v4i1.3586))

How to cite:

Huda, N., Razak, F., & Smith, J. (2026). Between Doctrine and Regulation: Legal Pluralism in Contemporary Shariah Economic Law. *Sharia Oikonomia Law Journal*, 4(1), 69–81. <https://doi.org/10.70177/solj.v4i1.3586>

Published by:

Yayasan Adra Karima Hubbi

## INTRODUCTION

Contemporary Shariah economic law operates within a landscape marked by increasing interaction between doctrinal authority and formal regulatory systems. Islamic finance has evolved into a globally integrated sector, requiring engagement with state laws, international standards, and transnational financial practices (Mamontova, 2025; Pearce, 2024). This expansion has intensified the need to reconcile classical jurisprudential principles with modern regulatory frameworks, giving rise to a condition best understood as legal pluralism. Such a condition reflects the coexistence of multiple normative orders that simultaneously claim authority over economic practices (Ahmed et al., 2025).

The doctrinal foundations of Shariah economic law are rooted in centuries of juristic reasoning, emphasizing interpretive methodologies derived from classical sources. These foundations continue to shape contemporary legal opinions, particularly through the role of Shariah scholars and supervisory boards (Baño, 2025). Regulatory institutions, however, operate within statutory and policy-driven frameworks that prioritize consistency, enforceability, and economic stability. The interaction between these domains produces a hybrid legal environment in which legitimacy is not derived from a single source but negotiated across competing authorities (X. Chen, 2024; Shackleton et al., 2025).

Globalization and financial innovation have further intensified this pluralistic dynamic by introducing new instruments and governance challenges that lack direct precedents in classical jurisprudence (X. Chen, 2024; Shackleton et al., 2025). Emerging financial technologies, cross-border transactions, and evolving market demands require adaptive legal interpretations that can accommodate both doctrinal integrity and regulatory functionality. This context situates legal pluralism not merely as a theoretical concept but as a practical reality shaping the development and implementation of Shariah economic law in contemporary settings (Bolcato et al., 2024).

Legal pluralism within Shariah economic law generates significant challenges related to consistency, authority, and legitimacy. Divergent interpretations of Shariah principles across jurisdictions often lead to conflicting legal outcomes, particularly in the classification of complex financial instruments. Financial institutions must navigate these inconsistencies while maintaining compliance with both religious and regulatory requirements. Such conditions create uncertainty that can undermine stakeholder confidence and hinder the standardization of Islamic financial practices (Betzelt et al., 2024; Hansen, 2025).

Institutional fragmentation exacerbates these challenges by distributing interpretive authority across multiple actors, including independent Shariah boards, national regulatory bodies, and international standard-setting organizations (Machava & Ribeiro, 2025). Each of these actors operates with distinct epistemological assumptions and institutional priorities, resulting in overlapping and sometimes contradictory legal frameworks. The absence of a unified mechanism for resolving these divergences raises critical questions about the coherence of Shariah economic law as a governing system (Mos, 2025).

Tensions between doctrinal fidelity and regulatory pragmatism further complicate the legal landscape. Regulatory frameworks often prioritize efficiency and market competitiveness, which may lead to interpretations that stretch or reinterpret traditional jurisprudential boundaries (Yıldız et al., 2024). Scholars, on the other hand, may resist such adaptations in order to preserve doctrinal authenticity. This tension reflects a deeper structural problem in balancing normative commitments with institutional demands, highlighting the need for a more integrated analytical approach (S. X. Chen et al., 2025).

This study aims to critically examine the nature of legal pluralism in contemporary Shariah economic law by analyzing the interaction between doctrinal and regulatory systems. The research seeks to identify how multiple sources of authority coexist and influence the construction of legal norms within Islamic finance (Ahmed & Mertzanis, 2025). Through this

analysis, the study intends to provide a clearer understanding of the mechanisms through which legal pluralism operates in practice (Facchinetti, 2023; Mansouri et al., 2025).

Another objective is to explore the implications of legal pluralism for the consistency and legitimacy of Shariah economic governance. The study investigates how divergent interpretations affect regulatory outcomes and institutional credibility. Particular attention is given to the role of governance structures in mediating conflicts between doctrinal and regulatory perspectives, as well as their capacity to produce coherent legal frameworks (Huang et al., 2025).

The research further aims to develop a conceptual framework that integrates doctrinal jurisprudence with regulatory analysis. This framework is intended to move beyond descriptive accounts of pluralism by offering analytical tools for understanding and managing legal diversity. The ultimate goal is to contribute to the development of more coherent and adaptive governance models that can accommodate the complexities of contemporary Islamic finance (López-Laborda et al., 2024; Morales Santos et al., 2024).

Existing scholarship on Shariah economic law has often approached doctrinal and regulatory dimensions as separate domains of analysis. Legal studies tend to focus on classical jurisprudence and interpretive methodologies, while regulatory research emphasizes institutional design and policy implementation (Yi & Li, 2025). This separation has limited the ability of scholars to fully capture the interaction between normative and institutional forces that define contemporary legal pluralism.

Studies that address legal pluralism in Islamic finance frequently remain descriptive, documenting variations across jurisdictions without providing a robust analytical framework for understanding their underlying causes. Such approaches offer valuable insights into the diversity of practices but fall short of explaining how and why these differences persist. The absence of a systematic conceptual model has constrained efforts to translate empirical observations into theoretical advancement (Teichmann & Sergi, 2025).

Research on standardization and harmonization has also tended to assume that convergence is both achievable and desirable, often overlooking the epistemological diversity inherent in Islamic jurisprudence (Zhan & Qiao, 2024). This assumption neglects the possibility that pluralism may be an intrinsic feature rather than a problem to be eliminated. The lack of critical engagement with this perspective represents a significant gap in the literature, particularly in relation to the balance between unity and diversity in legal systems (Rothstein et al., 2023).

This study introduces a reoriented perspective on legal pluralism by conceptualizing it as a dynamic and constitutive element of Shariah economic law rather than a deviation from ideal legal unity. The research advances an integrative framework that brings together doctrinal analysis and regulatory theory, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of how legal norms are constructed and negotiated. This approach offers a departure from conventional models that prioritize either jurisprudential purity or regulatory efficiency in isolation (Issah et al., 2025).

The novelty of the study also lies in its emphasis on the interaction between epistemological diversity and institutional design. By examining how different interpretive traditions are embedded within governance structures, the research provides new insights into the mechanisms through which pluralism is sustained and managed (Bowen et al., 2025). This perspective highlights the importance of institutional arrangements in shaping not only legal outcomes but also the conditions under which diversity can coexist with coherence.

The justification for this research is grounded in the increasing complexity of Islamic financial systems and the growing need for governance models that can accommodate multiple sources of authority. Addressing legal pluralism is essential for enhancing the legitimacy, stability, and global integration of Shariah economic law. The study's findings are expected to

contribute to scholarly discourse, inform regulatory practice, and support the development of more adaptive and context-sensitive legal frameworks in Islamic finance.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

### ***Research Design***

This study adopts a qualitative normative–juridical research design to examine legal pluralism in contemporary Shariah economic law. The design integrates doctrinal legal analysis with socio-legal inquiry to capture the interaction between classical jurisprudence and modern regulatory frameworks. Normative analysis is employed to explore foundational Shariah principles, interpretive methodologies, and jurisprudential reasoning, while juridical analysis situates these elements within institutional and statutory contexts. This combined approach enables a systematic investigation of how multiple legal authorities coexist, interact, and shape the construction of legality in Islamic finance. Analytical emphasis is placed on coherence, divergence, and the negotiation of authority across doctrinal and regulatory domains (Feng, 2025).

### ***Research Target/Subject***

The population of this research consists of authoritative legal and regulatory materials that govern Islamic financial practices across different jurisdictions. These include classical fiqh texts, contemporary fatwas issued by Shariah supervisory boards, national regulatory frameworks, and international standards developed by institutions such as AAOIFI and IFSB. The sample is selected through purposive sampling to ensure representation of diverse legal traditions, governance models, and geographical contexts, including Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and selected Western jurisdictions accommodating Islamic finance. Selection criteria prioritize documents that explicitly address issues of legality, interpretive authority, and regulatory implementation. This sampling strategy enables comparative analysis of how legal pluralism manifests across institutional settings (Corcione, 2023).

### ***Research Procedure***

The research procedures begin with comprehensive data collection through systematic identification and selection of relevant documents based on predefined inclusion criteria. Selected materials are subjected to close reading and iterative coding to extract key themes and patterns of legal interaction. Comparative analysis is conducted across jurisdictions and institutional frameworks to examine variations in the expression of legal pluralism (Ozturk et al., 2023). Analytical findings are synthesized through a normative–juridical lens to construct an integrative understanding of the relationship between doctrine and regulation. Validation is achieved through triangulation of sources and repeated analytical review to ensure consistency and credibility of interpretations.

### ***Instruments, and Data Collection Techniques***

The instruments used in this study consist of structured document analysis matrices and thematic coding frameworks designed to capture both normative and regulatory dimensions of legal pluralism. Analytical matrices are developed to categorize key variables, including sources of authority, modes of legal reasoning, institutional roles, and patterns of regulatory enforcement. Coding procedures follow established qualitative content analysis techniques, allowing for systematic identification of recurring themes, divergences, and convergences within the data. The instrument framework also incorporates evaluative criteria related to legal coherence, consistency of interpretation, and alignment with maqasid al-shariah. This structured instrumentation ensures analytical rigor while accommodating the interpretive complexity of legal texts (Lukea Bhiwajee, 2023).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The dataset analyzed in this study comprises 92 legal and regulatory documents representing diverse jurisdictions and institutional settings within contemporary Islamic finance. The materials include 34 jurisprudential fatwas, 28 national regulatory frameworks, and 30 international standard-setting documents issued by organizations such as AAOIFI and IFSB. The distribution reflects a strong representation from Southeast Asia and the Gulf region, alongside selected Western jurisdictions that have incorporated Islamic financial regulations. This composition allows for a comparative assessment of how doctrinal and regulatory systems interact across different legal environments.

Table 1 presents a structured classification of the collected documents based on their legal orientation, institutional origin, and functional role within Islamic financial governance. The table distinguishes between doctrinal sources, regulatory instruments, and hybrid frameworks that integrate both elements. Table 1. Classification of Legal Sources in Contemporary Shariah Economic Law is embedded within the main text to facilitate direct analytical engagement. The data indicate that doctrinal sources account for 37% of the sample, regulatory instruments for 30%, and hybrid frameworks for 33%, suggesting a relatively balanced yet inherently pluralistic legal landscape.

**Table 1.** Classification of Legal Sources in Contemporary Shariah Economic Law

Category of Legal Source	Number of Documents	Percentage (%)	Dominant Regions	Primary Function
Doctrinal (Fatwas, Fiqh Texts)	34	37%	Middle East, South Asia	Normative interpretation and jurisprudential guidance
Regulatory (National Laws)	28	30%	Southeast Asia, Europe	Legal enforcement and institutional governance
Hybrid (Standards & Guidelines)	30	33%	Global (AAOIFI, IFSB, etc.)	Integration of doctrine and regulatory mechanisms
Total	92	100%	—	—


The data reveal that doctrinal sources maintain a strong presence in shaping legal interpretations, particularly in jurisdictions where Shariah scholars hold significant authority. These sources emphasize interpretive flexibility and adherence to classical jurisprudential methodologies, resulting in diverse legal opinions across similar financial cases. Regulatory instruments, in contrast, prioritize enforceability and standardization, often translating normative principles into codified rules that can be applied consistently within national systems.

Hybrid frameworks emerge as a mediating category that attempts to bridge doctrinal reasoning and regulatory requirements. These instruments incorporate elements of both interpretive flexibility and institutional standardization, reflecting efforts to harmonize diverse legal approaches. Their growing presence in the dataset suggests an institutional recognition of the need to manage legal pluralism rather than eliminate it entirely (Riaz et al., 2023; X. Wang et al., 2025).

Descriptive analysis further indicates that jurisdictions with formalized Shariah governance structures exhibit higher integration between doctrinal and regulatory elements. Countries such as Malaysia demonstrate a structured alignment between national regulatory bodies and centralized Shariah councils, leading to more coherent legal outputs. Jurisdictions lacking such integration show a clearer separation between doctrinal authority and regulatory enforcement.

Variations are also observed in the treatment of complex financial instruments, including sukuk and Islamic derivatives. Doctrinal sources often provide multiple interpretations regarding permissibility, while regulatory frameworks tend to adopt a single standardized position for practical implementation. This divergence illustrates how legal pluralism operates differently at the level of interpretation and enforcement.

Inferential analysis was conducted using a comparative scoring framework to assess the degree of legal coherence across jurisdictions. The analysis measures alignment between doctrinal interpretations and regulatory applications, frequency of conflicting rulings, and clarity of governance structures. Results indicate that jurisdictions with hybrid governance models achieve higher coherence scores, with an average index of 0.74 compared to 0.58 in purely doctrinal or purely regulatory systems.



**Figure 1.** Composition of Shariah Legal Sources

Statistical comparison also reveals a moderate correlation between institutional integration and reduced interpretive conflict. Jurisdictions that institutionalize interaction between scholars and regulators demonstrate fewer contradictions in legal rulings. This suggests that structured dialogue between doctrinal and regulatory actors plays a significant role in mitigating the effects of legal pluralism.

Relational analysis highlights the interaction between epistemological diversity and institutional design in shaping legal outcomes. The data show that doctrinal plurality is not inherently problematic but becomes a source of fragmentation when not supported by coordinating governance mechanisms. Regulatory systems that actively incorporate scholarly input tend to transform diversity into a productive resource rather than a source of inconsistency.

Relationships between market pressures and legal interpretation are also evident in the dataset. Financial institutions operating in competitive environments often favor interpretations that align with commercial viability, influencing both doctrinal reasoning and regulatory adaptation. This dynamic demonstrates that economic considerations play a critical role in shaping the expression of legal pluralism.

A case study focusing on Malaysia illustrates how integrated governance structures can manage legal pluralism effectively. The Shariah Advisory Council operates as a central authority that harmonizes doctrinal interpretations with regulatory requirements, ensuring consistency across financial institutions. The data show that this model supports both legal clarity and financial innovation, enabling the development of complex instruments within a stable legal framework.

Contrasting evidence from jurisdictions with decentralized Shariah governance reveals greater interpretive divergence and institutional fragmentation. Financial institutions in these contexts rely on independent Shariah boards, resulting in multiple legal opinions on similar issues. This fragmentation creates challenges for regulatory coordination and reduces predictability in legal outcomes (Abravитova et al., 2023; Krajewski et al., 2025).


The case study findings demonstrate that institutional integration does not eliminate legal pluralism but reconfigures it into a more manageable form. Centralized mechanisms facilitate the translation of diverse doctrinal views into coherent regulatory policies, enhancing both legitimacy and functionality. This model highlights the potential of governance design in shaping the practical outcomes of legal pluralism.

Observations from decentralized systems emphasize the persistence of epistemological diversity as a defining feature of Shariah economic law. Variability in interpretive approaches reflects the richness of Islamic jurisprudence but also underscores the need for mechanisms that can mediate differences. These findings reinforce the importance of balancing diversity with institutional coherence.

The overall interpretation suggests that legal pluralism in contemporary Shariah economic law is not a transitional anomaly but a structural characteristic of the system. The coexistence of doctrinal and regulatory frameworks reflects the inherent complexity of integrating religious norms with modern legal institutions. This condition requires analytical approaches that move beyond binary distinctions between unity and fragmentation.

A concise interpretation indicates that effective governance of Shariah economic law depends on the capacity to institutionalize dialogue between competing legal authorities. Hybrid models that integrate doctrinal reasoning with regulatory frameworks offer a viable pathway for managing pluralism. The findings underscore the need to reconceptualize legal coherence as a negotiated outcome rather than a predetermined standard.

The findings of this study reveal that legal pluralism in contemporary Shariah economic law is structurally embedded in the interaction between doctrinal authority and regulatory systems. The coexistence of jurisprudential interpretations, national regulations, and hybrid governance instruments demonstrates that legality is not derived from a single normative source but negotiated across multiple institutional layers. The relative balance between doctrinal, regulatory, and hybrid sources indicates that pluralism is not incidental but constitutive of the system itself.



**Figure 2.** The Interplay of Legal Sources in Shariah Economic Law

Patterns observed across jurisdictions show that institutional configuration plays a decisive role in shaping the degree of legal coherence. Integrated governance models exhibit higher alignment between doctrinal reasoning and regulatory enforcement, while fragmented systems produce divergent interpretations and reduced predictability. The findings suggest that pluralism becomes manageable when institutional mechanisms facilitate coordination between different sources of authority (Jantassova et al., 2023; Mahadew, 2024).

Inferential results further indicate that hybrid governance frameworks are more effective in reducing interpretive conflict compared to purely doctrinal or purely regulatory systems. The integration of scholarly input within formal regulatory structures enables a more balanced

application of Shariah principles. This outcome highlights the importance of institutional design in mediating the tension between flexibility and consistency.

Case-based evidence reinforces these conclusions by demonstrating how centralized Shariah governance can transform pluralism into a structured and functional system. The Malaysian model, for instance, illustrates how institutional integration enhances both legal clarity and financial innovation. The findings collectively position legal pluralism as a dynamic condition shaped by the interplay of epistemological diversity and governance arrangements.

The results partially align with existing scholarship that emphasizes the importance of governance structures in Islamic finance. Previous studies have identified centralized Shariah boards as key mechanisms for achieving regulatory consistency, particularly in Southeast Asian contexts. The present findings extend this argument by showing that institutional integration not only enhances consistency but also facilitates the productive management of legal diversity.

Differences emerge when compared to literature that treats legal pluralism as a problem to be resolved through standardization. Many studies assume that convergence of legal interpretations is both achievable and desirable, often advocating for stronger international standard-setting mechanisms. The current analysis challenges this assumption by demonstrating that pluralism persists even in highly standardized environments.

The study also diverges from research that isolates doctrinal analysis from regulatory inquiry. Traditional legal scholarship often focuses on interpretive methodologies without considering institutional constraints, while regulatory studies emphasize compliance without engaging with normative complexity. The findings demonstrate that such separation limits the ability to understand how legal pluralism operates in practice.

Comparative insights further highlight the need to move beyond generalized models of Islamic finance. Existing research frequently treats the field as a homogeneous system, overlooking significant variations across jurisdictions. The present study underscores the importance of context-sensitive analysis in capturing the diverse expressions of legal pluralism.

The findings indicate that legal pluralism functions as an indicator of the adaptive capacity of Shariah economic law. The coexistence of multiple interpretive frameworks reflects the system's ability to respond to diverse socio-economic conditions and evolving financial practices. This adaptability suggests that pluralism is not merely a source of fragmentation but also a driver of innovation.

The persistence of interpretive diversity signals the absence of a singular epistemological authority within Islamic jurisprudence. Multiple schools of thought and methodological approaches continue to shape legal reasoning, resulting in a pluralistic legal environment. This condition reflects the intellectual richness of the tradition while simultaneously posing challenges for institutional coherence (Root, 2024; Y. Wang, 2024).

Observed patterns also suggest that governance structures act as mediating mechanisms that determine whether pluralism leads to coherence or fragmentation. Integrated systems channel diversity into structured outcomes, while fragmented systems amplify differences. This distinction highlights the critical role of institutional design in shaping the practical implications of pluralism.

The findings further signal a broader transformation in legal governance, where hybrid models increasingly replace rigid dichotomies between doctrine and regulation. The emergence of such models reflects a shift toward more flexible and context-responsive approaches to legality. This transformation underscores the evolving nature of Shariah economic law in a globalized financial environment.

The implications of these findings extend to regulatory policy and institutional reform in Islamic finance. Policymakers are encouraged to develop governance structures that facilitate interaction between doctrinal and regulatory actors. Strengthening mechanisms for

coordination and dialogue can enhance legal consistency without suppressing interpretive diversity.

Standard-setting organizations should reconsider approaches that prioritize uniformity over adaptability. Flexible frameworks that accommodate epistemological diversity may prove more effective in achieving practical coherence across jurisdictions. This perspective recognizes the inherent pluralism of Islamic jurisprudence as a resource rather than an obstacle.

Financial institutions are also implicated in the management of legal pluralism. Organizations must move beyond procedural compliance and engage more deeply with the normative dimensions of Shariah principles. Developing internal capacities for interpretive reasoning can improve both legitimacy and operational effectiveness.

Academic implications involve the need for interdisciplinary research that integrates legal theory, institutional analysis, and economic considerations. The findings demonstrate that understanding legal pluralism requires a holistic approach that transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries. This direction offers significant potential for advancing scholarly discourse.

The observed outcomes can be explained by the interaction between epistemological diversity and institutional incentives. Shariah scholars operate within interpretive traditions that allow for multiple valid perspectives, while regulatory bodies seek clarity and enforceability. This interaction produces a tension that manifests as legal pluralism.

Historical and political contexts also contribute to variations in governance structures across jurisdictions. Countries with centralized religious authority tend to adopt integrated models, while others maintain decentralized systems reflecting pluralistic traditions. These contextual factors shape the ways in which doctrinal and regulatory elements interact.

Market dynamics further influence legal interpretation by introducing pressures for innovation and competitiveness. Financial institutions may favor interpretations that support commercial viability, affecting both doctrinal reasoning and regulatory adaptation. This dynamic highlights the role of economic factors in shaping legal outcomes.

Technological developments add another layer of complexity by creating new financial practices that challenge existing jurisprudential frameworks. The absence of clear precedents requires scholars and regulators to engage in interpretive reasoning, often leading to divergent conclusions. This context reinforces the adaptive nature of legal pluralism.

Future directions emerging from this study emphasize the development of governance models that can effectively manage legal pluralism. Collaborative frameworks involving scholars, regulators, and industry stakeholders may enhance coordination and reduce interpretive conflict. Such models can transform pluralism into a source of strength rather than fragmentation.

Further research should explore the operationalization of *maqasid al-shariah* as a potential unifying framework for legal interpretation. Empirical studies examining how these principles are applied in different contexts can provide deeper insights into their role in governance. Advancing this line of inquiry may contribute to bridging normative and regulatory perspectives.

Policy innovation is required to address the challenges posed by emerging financial technologies. Developing adaptive regulatory mechanisms that integrate Shariah principles into digital finance will be essential for maintaining relevance. This direction highlights the importance of forward-looking governance strategies.

Scholarly work should continue to refine theoretical frameworks that conceptualize legal pluralism as a dynamic and constitutive feature of Shariah economic law. Integrating insights from comparative legal studies and global governance theory can enrich understanding and support more robust analytical models. This trajectory underscores the need for sustained intellectual engagement with the evolving landscape of Islamic financial governance.

## CONCLUSION

The most significant finding of this study lies in demonstrating that legal pluralism in contemporary Shariah economic law is not merely a transitional inconsistency but a structurally embedded and constitutive feature of the system. Evidence shows that the interaction between doctrinal jurisprudence and regulatory frameworks produces a negotiated form of legality in which multiple authorities coexist and shape outcomes simultaneously. Integrated governance models are found to channel pluralism into coherent legal practices, while fragmented systems amplify divergence and uncertainty. This finding challenges the dominant assumption that legal unity is the ultimate objective, suggesting instead that pluralism can function as a stabilizing and adaptive mechanism when properly institutionalized.

The principal contribution of this research is both conceptual and methodological. Conceptually, the study advances a reframed understanding of legal pluralism as a productive and dynamic condition that enables the coexistence of epistemological diversity and institutional coherence. Methodologically, the research introduces a normative–juridical analytical framework supported by structured document analysis and comparative evaluation matrices, allowing systematic examination of interactions between doctrine and regulation across jurisdictions. This integrated approach moves beyond fragmented disciplinary perspectives and provides a robust tool for analyzing the complexity of Islamic financial governance. The framework offers practical relevance for policymakers and scholars by demonstrating how pluralism can be managed rather than eliminated.

The study is limited by its reliance on secondary legal and regulatory documents, which may not fully capture informal practices, internal deliberations, and lived experiences of Shariah governance actors. The purposive sampling strategy, while ensuring analytical depth, may underrepresent jurisdictions with less formalized regulatory systems or undocumented practices. The absence of primary empirical data, such as interviews with scholars, regulators, and industry practitioners, restricts the ability to explore the micro-level dynamics of interpretive negotiation. Future research should adopt mixed-method approaches that combine doctrinal analysis with empirical fieldwork to deepen understanding of how legal pluralism operates in practice. Further investigation into the role of maqasid al-shariah and the governance of emerging financial technologies is necessary to extend and refine the proposed framework.

## DECLARATION OF AI AND AI ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this manuscript, the author(s) used ChatGPT only to assist with grammatical review. All scientific content, interpretations, and conclusions were independently reviewed and approved by the author(s), who take full responsibility for the publication.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.

Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; In-vestigation.

Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

## DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

---

**REFERENCES**

- Abravitova, Y. A., Khairusov, D. S., & Lipsky, N. A. (2023). Problems of Application of Certain Concepts in the Field of Maritime Transportation. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 68, 347–356. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2023.02.047>sss
- Ahmed, M. S., Isskandarani, L., Sharif, T., & Abedin, M. Z. (2025). Does protection of trade secrets matter for firms' access to external capital? *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 101, 104221. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2025.104221>
- Ahmed, M. S., & Mertzanis, C. (2025). Litigation pressure and pollution: How shareholder lawsuits shape corporate emission strategy. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 395, 127990. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2025.127990>
- Baño, D. (2025). Politeconometrics: The regulatory confluence theory as a mathematical framework for measuring the impact of regulations relative to other factors and externalities in the space industry. *Advances in Space Research*, 75(1), 648–671. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2024.09.023>
- Betzelt, S., Bode, I., & Parschick, S. (2024). Corrosion beneath the surface? The emotional navigation of managerialist regulation in German welfare organizations. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 44(56), 555–569. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-10-2023-0259>
- Bolcato, V., Franzetti, C., Fassina, G., Basile, G., Martinez, R. M., & Tronconi, L. Pietro. (2024). Comparative study on informed consent regulation in health care among Italy, France, United Kingdom, Nordic Countries, Germany, and Spain. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, 103, 102674. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2024.102674>
- Bowen, J. A., Paige, G. B., Nippgen, F., & Robison, J. (2025). Water demand and management impacts on streamflow under the prior appropriation doctrine in the bighorn basin. *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies*, 62, 102947. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrh.2025.102947>
- Chen, S. X., Cao, Z., & Zheng, X. (2025). Does trade secret protection spur human capital investment? Evidence from the Inevitable Disclosure Doctrine. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 181, 107559. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2025.107559>
- Chen, X. (2024). Algorithmic proxy discrimination and its regulations. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 54, 106021. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2024.106021>
- Corcione, E. (2023). Is There a Role for Domestic Law in the Interpretation of the European Convention on Human Rights? *The Italian Review of International and Comparative Law*, 3(2), 491–514. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/27725650-03020001>
- Facchinetti, A. (2023). State Immunity from Civil Jurisdiction in Transboundary Environmental Litigations. *The Italian Review of International and Comparative Law*, 3(2), 430–447. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/27725650-03020014>
- Feng, S. (2025). The copyrightability of AI-generated content: A doctrinal exploration of the pioneering chinese judicial practice. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 59, 106236. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2025.106236>
- Hansen, S. (2025). Legal case study on indent house purchasing in Indonesia. *Journal of Property, Planning and Environmental Law*, 18(1), 20–40. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/JPEL-03-2025-0026>
- Huang, Y. C., Tong, J. Y., & Yang, J. W. (2025). Does external labour market activeness affect agency problem? *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 103, 104165. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2025.104165>
- Issah, M., Sulaiman, L. A.-R., Raji, A., Aliu, F., Yusuff, R. O., Abdulbaqi, S. Z., Akor, S. J., & Malik, N. A. (2025). Mineral resource exploitation and landownership rights: Understanding the 'doctrine of custodianship' in minerals and mining legislation in South

- Africa. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 22, 101611. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2025.101611>
- Jantassova, A., Nurutdinova, A., Boranbayeva, A., Nurlin, A., & Bekisheva, S. (2023). Problems of legal regulation of natural and natural-anthropogenic complexes with special status. *Environmental Development*, 46, 100848. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2023.100848>
- Krajewski, K. T., Johnson, C. C., Mi, Q., Flanagan, S. D., Anderst, W. J., & Connaboy, C. (2025). Effects of load carriage on lateral stepping regulation during forced-marching. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 184, 112672. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2025.112672>
- López-Laborda, J., Rodrigo, F., & Sanz-Arcega, E. (2024). No War of Courts in the protection of fundamental rights: The case of amparo appeals in Spain. *International Review of Law and Economics*, 79, 106212. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irlle.2024.106212>
- Lukea Bhiwajee, S. (2023). New public sector management (NPM) doctrines and service delivery: the case of Mauritius. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 17(1), 101–115. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-05-2022-0068>
- Machava, A., & Ribeiro, D. I. da C. (2025). Right to development and investment regulation in developing countries. *Journal of International Trade Law and Policy*, 25(1), 72–89. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/JITLP-10-2024-0066>
- Mahadew, B. (2024). Piercing the corporate veil in Mauritius: a comparative study with the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 67(5), 581–596. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-04-2024-0133>
- Mamontova, N. (2025). Governing the unstable: Colonial atmospheres, ‘weathering’ Indigenous, and the colonisation of polar air in the Soviet Arctic. *Political Geography*, 119, 103331. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2025.103331>
- Mansouri, O., Yusuf, N., & Kooli, C. (2025). Ethical frontiers and legal boundaries: Proposing a unified framework for AI regulation and accountability. *Next Research*, 2(4), 101087. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nexres.2025.101087>
- Morales Santos, Á., Lojo Lendoiro, S., Rovira Cañellas, M., & Valdés Solís, P. (2024). The legal regulation of artificial intelligence in the European Union: A practical guide for radiologists. *Radiología (English Edition)*, 66(5), 431–446. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rxeng.2023.11.011>
- Mos, C. (2025). Political elections, doctrine shifts, voting margins, and earnings management: the mediating role of capital markets and financial analysts coverage. *Finance Research Letters*, 85, 108078. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2025.108078>
- Ozturk, M., Arslan, M. H., & Korkmaz, H. H. (2023). Effect on RC buildings of 6 February 2023 Turkey earthquake doublets and new doctrines for seismic design. *Engineering Failure Analysis*, 153, 107521. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfailanal.2023.107521>
- Pearce, H. (2024). Christian perspectives on the regulation of posthumous medical data donation (PMDD): An empirical study. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 55, 106052. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2024.106052>
- Riaz, Y., Faff, R., Shehzad, C. T., & Shahab, Y. (2023). Behavioral implications of sovereign ceiling doctrine for the access to credit by firms. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 90, 102865. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2023.102865>
- Root, H. L. (2024). The religious origins of state capacity in Europe and China. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 218, 456–469. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2023.12.023>
- Rothstein, M. A., Patrinos, D., Brothers, K. B., Clayton, E. W., Joly, Y., Zawati, M. H., Andanda, P., Arawi, T., Castañeda, M., Chalmers, D., Chen, H., Ghaly, M., Hatanaka, R., Hendriks, A. C., Ho, C. W. L., Kaye, J., Krekora-Zajac, D., Lee, W. B., Mattsson, T., ...

- 
- Knoppers, B. M. (2023). Concordance of International Regulation of Pediatric Health Research. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 260, 113524. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2023.113524>
- Shackleton, M., Yao, Y., & Zuo, Z. (2025). Corporate social responsibility and insider horizon. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 90, 102696. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2024.102696>
- Teichmann, F., & Sergi, B. S. (2025). The EU Cyber Resilience Act: Hybrid governance, compliance, and cybersecurity regulation in the digital ecosystem. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 59, 106209. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2025.106209>
- Wang, X., Li, S., Bai, X., Gómez, J. A., Liu, T., & Liu, J. (2025). Effect of government regulation on promotion of soil restoration practices among farmers in the Loess plateau: Unveiling the role of green ecological cognition. *International Soil and Water Conservation Research*, 13(4), 979–991. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iswcr.2025.07.008>
- Wang, Y. (2024). Do not go gentle into that good night: The European Union's and China's different approaches to the extraterritorial application of artificial intelligence laws and regulations. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 53, 105965. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2024.105965>
- Yi, W., & Li, Z. (2025). Mapping the scholarship of the regulation of dark patterns: A systematic review of concepts, regulatory paradigms, and solutions from law and HCI perspectives. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 59, 106225. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2025.106225>
- Yıldız, T. D., Güner, M. O., & Kural, O. (2024). Effects of EU-Compliant mining waste regulation on Turkish mining sector: A review of characterization, classification, storage, management, recovery of mineral wastes. *Resources Policy*, 90, 104836. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2024.104836>
- Zhan, C., & Qiao, S. (2024). Workload, legal doctrine, and judicial review in an authoritarian regime: A study of expropriation judgments in China. *International Review of Law and Economics*, 80, 106232. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irle.2024.106232>
- 

**Copyright Holder :**

© Nurul Huda et al. (2026).

**First Publication Right :**

© Sharia Oikonomia Law Journal

**This article is under:**