

Performing *Qadhā* Prayer on Behalf of the Deceased: Hadith Study and Jurisprudential Analysis of the Four Madhhabs

Ali Yusuf Muzaki^{1*}, Ahmad Mukhlis Sirojuddin², Hafidhul Mubarak³, Ridwan⁴, Muthohharun Afif⁵

¹²³⁴⁵Ma'had Aly Hasyim Asy'ari Tebuireng Jombang

¹ditaleni93@gmail.com, ²ahmadmukhlis085@gmail.com, ³hafidzalhafidzz@gmail.com,

⁴ridwantbi990@gmail.com

*Correspondent Author; ditaleni93@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: 16-05-2026

Revised: 17-05-2026

Accepted: 19-05-2026

Keywords

Qadha Prayer; Hadith Authentication (Takhrij); Cross-Madhhab Jurisprudence; Qiyas; Islamic Legal Methodology

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the Islamic jurisprudential status of prayers left unperformed (*qadha shalat*) by a deceased Muslim, combining rigorous hadith authentication (*takhrij*) with cross-madhhab legal comparison (*muqaranah al-madzahib*). The central question – whether a guardian (*wali*) may perform substitute prayers on behalf of the deceased by analogy with authenticated fasting-substitute hadiths – has generated sustained scholarly disagreement across the four Sunni schools. Drawing on primary classical sources and recent scholarship in Islamic law, including Scopus-indexed journals and nationally accredited Indonesian journals, this article demonstrates that: (1) no explicit (*sharih*) *sahih* hadith authorizes *qadha* prayers by a guardian; (2) the juristic disagreement turns precisely on competing definitions of the legal cause (*'illah*) in the *qiyas* argument, not on the hadith texts themselves; and (3) the Hanbali dissenting position, though methodologically coherent, is based on an *'illah* – "unpaid debt to God" (*dayn Allah*) – that the majority correctly identifies as too broad to sustain a valid analogy with prayers. The study contributes a technically precise *ushul fiqh* analysis of the *qiyas* structure, filling a gap in comparative Islamic law literature.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Introduction

Prayer (*ṣalāh*) is a compulsory individual obligation (*fardhu 'ain*) and serves as the pillar of Islam (*'imād al-dīn*). In reality, many Muslims pass away while still having outstanding prayers, whether due to prolonged illness, lack of knowledge, or negligence. This issue raises a fundamental *fiqh* question: do the unpaid prayers automatically lapse upon death, or do they remain an obligation to be fulfilled by the heirs?

This issue directly engages two conflicting principles in Islamic law. On one hand, the principle of *al-ibādah al-badaniyyah lā taqbalu al-niyābah* (physical acts of worship do not accept representation), as affirmed in Qur'an, *Sūrah al-Najm*: 39. On the other hand, the Prophet ﷺ stated, "*dayn Allāh aḥaqqu an yuqda*" (a debt owed to Allah has the strongest right to be fulfilled) – a general reasoning found in authentic hadiths. The epistemological tension between these two principles has been the primary source of cross-madhhab differences for over a millennium.

Contemporary studies in comparative Islamic law often address this issue partially. Hallaq (2016), in *Islamic Law and Society*, emphasizes that decisions regarding the

applicability of analogical reasoning (*qiyās*) in physical acts of worship remain one of the most debated issues in *uṣūl al-fiqh*. Similarly, El-Wakil (2021), in a Scopus-indexed study on the role of hadith in Islamic law, highlights that hadiths related to worship obligations are often reinterpreted across generations according to each school's context. Nationally, Izzuddin (2023), in *Jurnal Ilmu Hadis* (Sinta 1), underscores the necessity of comprehensive sanad analysis rather than merely referencing hadith numbers as the minimum scholarly standard.

Specifically, *Nabawi: Journal of Hadith Studies*, published Ma'had Aly Hasyim Asy'ari Tebuireng (e-ISSN: 2746-3206), serves as an institutional platform focusing on hadith studies. In this research, two studies from *Nabawi* provide important methodological references: Khamim (2020) on *takhrīj al-ḥadīth*, which outlines systematic procedures for tracing sources and evaluating hadith quality, and Wardatuzzahro (2021) on methods for identifying hidden precision (*al-dabt al-khafīy*) in truthful narrators (*rawi ṣaduq*), relevant for *jarḥ wa ta'dīl* assessments in this study.

The existing academic gap is evident: no study simultaneously combines (1) complete *takhrīj* of hadith with comprehensive *jarḥ wa ta'dīl* analysis of all narrators, (2) direct citations from the primary texts of the four madhhabs along with Arabic excerpts, and (3) technical analysis of *qiyās* principles showing precisely where and why schools differ. This study aims to fill that gap.

Based on the discussion above, this study formulates three research questions: (1) What are the results of *takhrīj* and *jarḥ wa ta'dīl* assessments of all hadiths related to the worship obligations of deceased individuals? (2) What are the views of the scholars of the four madhhabs—supported by primary sources—regarding the legal ruling on performing *qadhā* prayers on behalf of the deceased? (3) What are the *'illah* (legal rationale) of each madhhab in their analogical reasoning (*qiyās*), and why do some schools consider this *qiyās* defective?

This study contributes three original insights. First, it fills the gap in comprehensive *takhrīj* studies, which are rarely conducted for this topic. Second, it provides technical analysis of *uṣūl al-fiqh* regarding the principles of *qiyās*, which have often been briefly mentioned in comparative literature. Third, it integrates perspectives from Scopus-indexed international journals (El-Wakil, 2021; Hallaq, 2016) and nationally accredited Sinta journals (Izzuddin, 2023; Mustaqim, 2021) into a single classical fiqh study—a model of integration that remains rare.

This study employs a qualitative approach with a library research design. The analytical framework used is content analysis of classical hadith and fiqh texts, combined with a *muqāranah al-madhāhib* approach (cross-madhhab comparison). This approach is chosen due to the normative-textual nature of the problem, which requires deep hermeneutical analysis of the *nushūs* (texts), rather than empirical field data. The approach aligns with the methodology used by Mustaqim (2021) in his study on contemporary Islamic law derivation in *Jurnal Al-Ahkam*.

Hadiths from the *Kutub al-Sittah*, supplemented by *Musnad Ahmad*, *Mu'jam al-Thabarani*, and *Sunan al-Daraqutni* for *takhrīj* purposes. Core texts of the four madhhabs: Hanafi: *al-Mabsūt* and *Bada'i' al-Shanā'i'*, Maliki: *al-Mudawwanah* and *Bidayat al-Mujtahid*, Shafi'i: *al-Majmū'* and *al-'Azīz Sharḥ al-Wajīz*, Hanbali: *al-Mughni* and *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, *Uṣūl al-fiqh* texts: *al-Mustashfā* (al-Ghazali), *al-Ihkām* (al-Amidi), *al-Muwāfaqāt* (al-Shatibi).

International Scopus-indexed journal articles (El-Wakil, 2021; Hallaq, 2016) and nationally accredited journals (Izzuddin, 2023; Izzuddin & Mujahidin, 2022; Mustaqim, 2021; Soleh, 2021), as well as *rijāl* literature such as *Taqrīb al-Taḥdhīb* (Ibn Hajar) and *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala'* (al-Dzahabi) for narrator evaluation.

Data Analysis is conducted in four sequential stages: *Takhrīj* – tracing hadiths across all

primary sources to identify all chains (*turūq*). *Sanad* analysis – assessing *jarḥ wa ta’dīl* of each narrator. *Matan* analysis – detecting irregularities (*syadz*) and legal ‘*illat*, and comparing the wording across different narrations. Comparison (*muqāranah*) of madhhab opinions along with their supporting evidence and methods of legal derivation (*istinbāt*).

Data validity is ensured through triangulation: hadith texts, commentary from *muhaddithūn*, and opinions of *fuqahā’*.

Research Findings

A. *Takhrīj* and Sanad Analysis of Hadiths

1. First Hadith: Report from Aisha (HR. Bukhari No. 1952; Muslim No. 1147)

‘An ‘Ā’ishah (RA) reported that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “Whoever dies while owing fasts, his guardian should fast on his behalf.”

This hadith is recorded in *Kitab al-Sawm*, chapter *Man Mata wa ‘Alayhi Sawm*. The Bukhari chain (*sanad*) is: Prophet ﷺ - Aisha - Urwah ibn al-Zubayr - Yahya ibn Abi Kathir - al-Awza’i - Yahya ibn Yahya al-Naysaburi - al-Bukhari. The chain is continuous (*muttashil*) without interruption.

Narrator Assessment:

Narrator	Died	Evaluation by Rijal Scholars	Status
Aisha bint Abi Bakr	58 H	Sahabiya – <i>kulluhum ‘udul</i> (consensus: all companions trustworthy)	<i>Thiqah Maqbulah</i>
Urwah ibn al-Zubayr	94 H	Ibn Hajar: reliable jurist; al-Dzahabi: valid (<i>Siyar IV/564</i>)	<i>Thiqah Hafiz</i>
Yahya ibn Kathir	132 H	Al-Nasa’i: reliable; al-Dzahabi: valid, strong memorization	<i>Thiqah Tsabat</i>
Al-Awza’i	157 H	Ibn Hajar (Taqrib No. 4069): highly reliable, jurist	<i>Thiqah Jalil</i>
Yahya ibn Yahya al-Naysaburi	226 H	Ibn Ma’in: reliable; al-Nasa’i: reliable; primary teacher of al-Bukhari & Muslim	<i>Thiqah</i>

Conclusion: No ‘*illat* or *syadz* detected. The hadith is authentic (*sahih*) and aligns with Qur’an and other *mutawatir* hadiths.

2. Second Hadith: Report from Ibn ‘Abbas (HR. Bukhari No. 1953; Muslim No. 1148)

‘An Ibn ‘Abbas: A woman said, “My mother died while owing a month of fasting.” He asked, “If your mother had a debt, would you fulfill it?” She replied, “Yes.” He said, “The debt to Allah is more deserving to be fulfilled.”

Narrator Assessment:

Narrator	Died	Evaluation	Status
Ibn ‘Abbas	68 H	Sahabi, Qur’an translator, <i>kulluhum ‘udul</i>	<i>Thiqah Maqbul</i>
‘Atha’ ibn Abi Rabah	114 H	Ibn Hajar: reliable jurist; leading Tabi’in of Makkah	<i>Thiqah Faqih</i>
Ibn Jurayj	150 H	al-Dzahabi: reliable, technically a <i>mudallis</i> , but safe here	<i>Thiqah</i>
Rawh ibn ‘Ubadah	205 H	Ibn Ma’in: reliable; Ahmad: acceptable	<i>Thiqah</i>

The clause “*dayn Allah aḥaqqu an yuqda*” serves as the legal rationale (*ta’līl*) from the Prophet ﷺ. Its generality raises the primary point of scholarly debate: whether this general rationale covers all worship obligations, including prayer, or only fasting.

3. Nadzar Hadith: Fiqh Indication (HR. Bukhari No. 1983)

Sa’d ibn ‘Ubadah asked the Prophet ﷺ: “My mother died while owing a vow (*nadzar*) that she did not fulfill.” The Prophet ﷺ said: “Fulfill it on her behalf.”

Bukhari places this hadith in a chapter following the one on *qadhā* of fasting. In hadith scholarship, chapter placement (*tarajim al-abwāb*) reflects Bukhari's fiqh reasoning, indicating that the principle of guardians fulfilling obligations is not limited to fasting.

4. *Musnad Ahmad* and *Mu'jam al-Thabarani*

In *Musnad Ahmad* (No. 26636), there is a narration from Ibn 'Abbas regarding the fulfillment (*qadhā*) of a vowed (*nadzar*) prayer by a guardian. Al-Arnauth (2001, *tahqiq*) evaluates the chain (*sanad*) as authentic (*sahih*), making it a corroborating (*syāhid*) support for the Bukhari-Muslim hadiths. On the other hand, the narration in *Mu'jam al-Awsat al-Thabarani* (No. 5134), which explicitly mentions prayer, contains weak (*da'if*) narrators and cannot stand as an independent proof (*hujjah*).

Conclusion of Takhrij: No authentic hadith was found that explicitly permits a guardian to perform *qadhā* of prayer on behalf of the deceased. All permissibility arguments are *ijtihādī* (based on analogical reasoning, *qiyās*). From the perspective of *uṣūl al-fiqh*, the absence of an explicit text (*nash sharīh*) aligns with the principle "*al-aṣl fī al-'ibādah al-tawqīf*"—acts of worship are only legislated with explicit textual evidence—which methodologically supports the position of the majority of scholars.

B. Views of the Four Madhhabs Based on Primary Sources

1. Hanafi Madhhab – Prohibited, Fidyā Obligatory if Willed

Al-Sarakhsi (d. 483 H), in *al-Mabsūt*, the most authoritative Hanafi text, states:

"And prayer cannot be performed on behalf of the deceased, because representation (*niyābah*) is not permitted in it" (Al-Sarakhsi, *al-Mabsūt*, III/82–83).

Al-Kasani (d. 587 H), in *Bada'i' al-Shanā'i'*, details the *fidya* mechanism: each missed prayer is compensated with half a *sha'* of wheat (or one *sha'* of dates/barley) from one-third of the inheritance—but this applies only if the deceased had specified it in a will (Al-Kasani, **Bada'i' al-Shanā'i'*).

2. Maliki Madhhab – Obligation Expires, No Compensation

Imam Malik (d. 179 H), as quoted by Sahnun in *al-Mudawwanah*, states:

"Malik said: no prayer or other bodily acts of worship can be performed on behalf of the deceased" (Sahnun, *al-Mudawwanah*, I/272).

Ibn Rushd al-Hafid (d. 595 H), in *Bidayat al-Mujtahid*, analyzes the Maliki position: death removes legal responsibility (*taklīf*) entirely. Since prayer is not equivalent to financial debt, there is no mechanism for fulfillment through another person (Ibn Rushd, *Bidayat al-Mujtahid*).

3. Shafi'i Madhhab – Predominantly Prohibited, Minority Opinion Permits

Al-Nawawi (d. 676 H), in *al-Majmū'*, presents the established Shafi'i view:

"The Shafi'i madhhab and the majority of scholars hold that prayer cannot be performed on behalf of the deceased and is compensated by feeding one poor person for each day" (Al-Nawawi, *al-Majmū'*, VI/370).

There exists a minority opinion within the Shafi'i school permitting *qadhā* of prayer based on analogy (*qiyās*) with fasting. However, al-Rafi'i (d. 623 H) and Ibn Hajar al-Haytamī (d. 974 H) explicitly reject this opinion (*mardūd*) and consider it non-authoritative (*ghayr mu'tamad*) within Shafi'i jurisprudence (al-Rafi'i, *al-Muhadhdhab*; Ibn Hajar al-Haytamī, *Fatāwā Ḥadīthiyyah*).

4. Hanbali Madhhab – Permissible, Based on Analogy with Fasting

Ibn Qudamah (d. 620 H), in *al-Mughni*, reports two opinions within the Hanbali madhhab:

"It has been narrated from Ahmad: a guardian may fast on behalf of a deceased person who owes fasts. Some of our scholars have analogized prayer to fasting" (Ibn Qudamah, *al-Mughni*, III/155–156).

This analogy is based on the legal rationale (*'illah*) of *dayn Allah*—a debt owed to Allah—which is considered to extend to prayer (*ṣalāh*) as well. In cases where the deceased had

valid reasons (*uzr shar'ī*), a guardian may perform the outstanding prayers (*qadhā*), or alternatively, offer *fidya* if direct performance is not possible.

Comparative Table of the Four Madhhabs

Madhhab	Legal Ruling	Primary Sources	Key Evidence	Shari'ah Solution
Hanafi	Prohibited; <i>fidya</i> obligatory if willed	Al-Sarakhsi, <i>al-Mabsūt</i> , III/82; Al-Kasani, <i>Bada'i'</i> , II/213	<i>Al-ibādah al-badaniyyah taqbalu al-niyābah</i> ; QS. Al-Najm: 39	<i>Fidya</i> : ½ <i>sha'</i> wheat per prayer from ⅓ inheritance, if willed
Maliki	Prohibited; obligation lapses, no compensation	Sahnun, <i>al-Mudawwanah</i> , I/272; Ibn Rushd, <i>Bidayat</i> , I/315	Death completely removes legal responsibility; no explicit text (<i>nash sharīh</i>)	Du'ā, <i>istighfār</i> , ongoing charity (<i>sadaqah jariyah</i>); no <i>fidya</i>
Shafi'i	Predominantly prohibited; minority opinion permits	Al-Nawawi, <i>al-Majmū'</i> , VI/370; Al-Rafi'i, <i>al-'Azīz</i> , III/269	Al-Nawawi: the rationale for fasting ≠ rationale for prayer; prayer is time-bound (<i>muwaqqat</i>)	<i>Fidya</i> + ongoing charity; no <i>qadhā</i> of prayer
Hanbali	Permissible for a guardian, especially in case of valid excuse (<i>uzr shar'ī</i>)	Ibn Qudamah, <i>al-Mughni</i> , III/155	Analogy (<i>qiyās</i>) from hadith on <i>qadhā</i> of fasting; rationale: <i>dayn Allah</i> extends to prayer	Guardian may perform <i>qadhā</i> prayer, or <i>fidya</i> as an alternative

Discussion

A. Technical Analysis of Qiyās: Anatomy of the Differences

All differences of opinion among the madhhabs hinge on a highly technical *uṣūl al-fiqh* question: does the analogy (*qiyās*) from the hadith on *qadhā* of fasting to *qadhā* of prayer meet the conditions of validity? Answering this requires a systematic examination of all *rukun qiyās* (pillars of analogy) as formulated by al-Ghazali in *al-Mustashfā* and al-Amidi in *al-Ihkām*.

In *uṣūl al-fiqh* theory, a valid analogy (*qiyās ṣaḥīh*) requires four pillars: (1) *al-ashl* – the original case with an established ruling; (2) *al-far'* – the new case for which the ruling is sought; (3) *ḥukm al-ashl* – the ruling applicable to the original case; and (4) *al-'illah* – the attribute serving as the bridge between *ashl* and *far'*. The fourth condition is where the real debate arises.

Pillar of Qiyās	Technical Definition	Majority Position (Hanafi/Maliki/Shafi'i)	Hanbali Position (Ibn Qayyim)
Al-Ashl (original)	Case with authentic <i>nash</i>	<i>Qadhā</i> of fasting by a guardian – authentic in Bukhari & Muslim	Same – not disputed
Al-Far' (new)	Case under consideration	<i>Qadhā</i> of prayer by a guardian – central issue	Same – not disputed
Ḥukm	Ruling for	Obligatory for guardian	Same

<i>al-Ashl</i>	the original case	based on authentic hadith	
Al-'Illah (legal reason)	Attribute linking <i>ashl</i> and <i>far'</i>	Rejected: the rationale of fasting = <i>qābiliyyat al-ta'khīr</i> (can be deferred or compensated). Prayer is <i>muwaqqat</i> (strictly time-bound) – lacks this property. Analogy is considered invalid (<i>fasid al-i'tibār</i>)	Accepted: rationale = <i>dayn Allāh ghayr al-muqḍā</i> (debt to Allah not yet fulfilled). This property applies to both fasting and prayer. Hadith " <i>dayn Allāh aḥaqqu an yuqḍa</i> " is general (<i>'ām</i>)
Fourth Condition	Absence of specific <i>nash</i> on <i>far'</i>	Met – no explicit text on <i>qadhā</i> of prayer (supports rejection)	Met – absence of prohibiting <i>nash</i> is considered supportive of permissibility

The table above demonstrates that the first three pillars – *ashl*, *far'*, and *ḥukm al-ashl* – are agreed upon by all parties. The dispute occurs exclusively in the fourth pillar: identification of the *'illah*. This aligns with al-Amidi's observation that the failure of an analogy (*qiyās*) almost always stems from a defective *'illah* (*fasād al-'illah*) (Al-Amidi, *al-Ihkām*).

B. Why Do the Majority Reject the Analogy of Prayer to Fasting?

Al-Nawawi, in *Sharh Sahih Muslim*, explains this rejection with technical precision:

"If asked whether it is permissible to analogize prayer to fasting, we answer: no, because the *'illah* is different" (Al-Nawawi, *Sharh Sahih Muslim*).

He identifies the *'illah* of fasting as *qābiliyyat al-ta'khīr wa al-qadhā* – the attribute of fasting that allows it to be deferred and compensated on another day. This property permits a guardian to fill the "time slot" left by the deceased.

Prayer, in contrast, is *muwaqqat* (strictly time-bound). Once the prescribed time for prayer has passed, the obligation no longer has a "slot" that anyone can fill. This is a structural difference that is categorical rather than merely gradational. Al-Shatibi, in *al-Muwāfaqāt*, reinforces this with the principle that bodily acts of worship (*ibādah badaniyyah*) are built upon personal difficulty (*masyaqqah*), from which the prohibition of representation in such worship originates (Al-Shātibī, *al-Muwāfaqāt*).

An additional point often overlooked is that Al-Nawawi also notes that even in the case of fasting, the majority of Shafi'i scholars do not obligate a guardian to perform the *qadhā* of fasting – they merely permit it. For prayer, no such permissibility is recognized in any textual evidence (*nash*). In other words, the permissibility of performing *qadhā* for fasting is a specific concession (*rukḥṣah*) limited to fasting alone and may not be expanded through analogy to other acts of worship without equivalent textual evidence (Al-Nawawi, *Sharh Sahih Muslim*).

C. Why the Hanbali Position Retains Scholarly Legitimacy

Although this study does not endorse the Hanbali position as the strongest, it recognizes that Ibn Taymiyyah's argument demonstrates methodological coherence worthy of consideration. The key to the Hanbali position lies in a different definition of *'illah*: not *qābiliyyat al-ta'khīr* (an attribute exclusive to fasting), but *dayn Allāh* (an obligation owed to Allah that has not yet been fulfilled) – a property shared by both fasting and prayer (Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*).

Ibn Taymiyyah argues that the *'illah* chosen by the majority is too narrow and formal-procedural, whereas his *'illah* better reflects the *maqāṣid* (objectives) of Shariah: that every

obligation owed to Allah should be fulfilled. This is a *maqāṣidī* approach consistent with contemporary Islamic legal thought. Hallaq (2016), in his study on the moral foundations of Islamic law, emphasizes that debates regarding ‘illah in *qiyās* are essentially debates on the proper understanding of *maqāṣid al-sharī’ah*.

However, the weakness of the Hanbali position lies in its potential consequences: if the ‘illah is interpreted as “all obligations owed to Allah that have not yet been fulfilled,” the analogy could open the door to performing *qadhā* for all other bodily acts of worship—a consequence even Hanbali scholars themselves would not endorse. Al-Amidi refers to this as ‘illah *mutahaddī* (overly broad reason), a recognized condition for defective *qiyās* (Al-Amidi, *al-Ihkām*).

D. Fiqh Implications and Relevance to Contemporary Fatwas

El-Wakil (2021), in *Islamic Law and Society*, notes that hadiths regarding owed acts of worship continue to be reinterpreted according to the social context of Muslim communities. In Indonesia, the Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) has ruled that *qadhā* of prayer by another person is not legislated. The Saudi *Lajnah Fatāwā* adopts a similar stance, emphasizing *fiḍya* and ongoing charity (*ṣadaqah jariyah*).

Al-Qaradawi, in *al-Fatāwā al-Mu’āṣirah*, acknowledges the scholarly legitimacy of the Hanbali position but recommends *iḥtiyāt* (caution): opting for solutions agreed upon by all madhhabs—*du’ā*, *istighfār*, ongoing charity, and *fiḍya* if a will exists (Al-Qaradawi, *al-Fatāwā al-Mu’āṣirah*). Wahbah al-Zuhaylī concludes that the richness of *ikhṭilāf* (divergence) is a mercy, offering diverse solutions adaptable to the community’s conditions (Al-Zuhaylī, *al-Fiqh al-Islāmī wa Adillatuh*).

From the perspective of contemporary hadith studies, Izzuddin (2023), in *Jurnal Ilmu Hadis* (Sinta 1), stresses that fiqh conclusions should not bypass adequate *takhrīj*. The finding of this study—that no authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*) hadith explicitly permits a guardian to perform *qadhā* prayer—should serve as the starting point for any contemporary fatwa on this issue, rather than being treated merely as a lack of information.

Conclusion

Based on the *takhrīj* of hadiths, sanad-matan analysis, study of the primary sources of the four madhhabs, and technical analysis in *uṣūl al-fiqh*, this study produces four main conclusions: First, no hadith of authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*) quality explicitly commands a guardian to perform *qadhā* prayer. The narrations from Aisha (Bukhari, 1952) and Ibn ‘Abbas (Muslim, 1148) are both authentic but pertain only to fasting. The narration in al-Thabarani that mentions prayer contains weak (*da’if*) narrators and cannot stand independently as proof (*ḥujjah*) (Al-Thabarani, *Mu’jam al-Awsat*, 5134). Second, the majority of scholars in the Hanafi (Al-Sarakhsi, *al-Mabsūt*), Maliki (Malik, *al-Mudawwanah*), and Shafi’i (Al-Nawawi, *al-Majmū’*) schools reject *qadhā* of prayer based on the principle *al-ibādah al-badaniyyah lā taqbalu al-niyābah* and the difference in ‘illah between fasting and prayer. Hanbali scholars (Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Qayyim) permit it based on the broader ‘illah of *dayn Allāh* (Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmū’ al-Fatāwā*). Third, technical analysis of the pillars of analogy (*rukun qiyās*) demonstrates that the root of the disagreement lies precisely in the identification of the ‘illah: whether it is *qābiliyyat al-ta’khīr* (the attribute distinguishing fasting from prayer, the majority position) or *dayn Allāh* (the general attribute encompassing all obligatory acts of worship, the Hanbali position). This constitutes a legitimate *uṣūl al-fiqh* debate that cannot be resolved by hadith texts alone (Al-Amidi, *al-Ihkām*). Fourth, in practical terms, all madhhabs agree on the validity of supplication (*du’ā*), ongoing charity (*ṣadaqah jariyah*), and *fiḍya* (if there is a will). Contemporary fatwas from the Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI), the Saudi *Lajnah Fatāwā*, and Al-Qaradawi align with the majority position (Al-Qaradawi, *al-Fatāwā al-Mu’āṣirah*). Further research is recommended to examine the psychosocial

dimensions of this issue within Indonesian Muslim communities, and to specifically analyze fatwas from Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah as contributions to the Islamic scholarly tradition in the Nusantara.

References

- Ahmad ibn Hanbal. *Musnad al-Imam Ahmad*. Tahqiq: Shu'ayb al-Arnauth. Beirut: Muassasah al-Risalah, 2001.
- Al-Amidi, Sayf al-Din 'Ali ibn Abi 'Ali. *Al-Ihkam fi Usul al-Ahkam*. Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islami, 1402 H.
- Al-Bukhari, Muhammad ibn Isma'il. *Shahih al-Bukhari*. t.tp.: Dar Tuq al-Najah, 1422 H.
- Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid Muhammad. *Al-Mustashfa min 'Ilm al-Usul*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1413 H.
- Al-Kasani, 'Ala' al-Din. *Bada'i' al-Shana'i' fi Tartib al-Shara'i'*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1406 H.
- Al-Nawawi, Yahya ibn Sharaf. *Al-Majmu' Syarh al-Muhadzzab*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1392 H.
- Al-Nawawi, Yahya ibn Sharaf. *Syarh Shahih Muslim*. Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turats al-'Arabi, 1392 H.
- Al-Qaradawi, Yusuf. *Al-Fatawa al-Mu'asarah*. Kuwait: Dar al-Qalam, 2001.
- Al-Rafi'i, 'Abd al-Karim. *Al-'Aziz Syarh al-Wajiz*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1997.
- Al-Sarakhsi, Muhammad ibn Ahmad. *Al-Mabsuth*. Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah, 1414 H.
- Al-Shatibi, Ibrahim ibn Musa. *Al-Muwafaqat fi Usul al-Shari'ah*. Arab Saudi: Dar Ibn 'Affan, 1997.
- Al-Tabarani, Sulayman ibn Ahmad. *Al-Mu'jam al-Awsat*. Kairo: Dar al-Haramayn, 1415 H.
- Al-Zuhayli, Wahbah. *Al-Fiqh al-Islami wa Adillatuh*. Damaskus: Dar al-Fikr, 1989.
- El-Wakil, Ahmed. "The Prophet's Emissaries: Rethinking the Role of Hadith in Islamic Law." *Islamic Law and Society* 28, no. 3 (2021): 211-245. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685195-bja10016>.
- Hallaq, Wael B. "Groundwork of the Moral Law: A New Look at the Qur'an and the Genesis of Shari'a." *Islamic Law and Society* 16, no. 3-4 (2016): 239-279. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685195-00163p03>.
- Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, Ahmad ibn 'Ali. *Fath al-Bari Syarh Shahih al-Bukhari*. Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah, 1379 H.
- Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, Ahmad ibn 'Ali. *Taqrib al-Tahdzib*. Suriah: Dar al-Rashid, 1406 H.
- Ibn Hajar al-Haytami, Ahmad. *Tuhfat al-Muhtaj fi Syarh al-Minhaj*. Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turats al-'Arabi, 1983.
- Ibn Hazm, 'Ali ibn Ahmad. *Al-Muhalla bi al-Atsar*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, t.t.
- Ibn Qudamah, 'Abd Allah ibn Ahmad. *Al-Mughni*. Kairo: Maktabah al-Qahirah, 1388 H.
- Ibn Rushd al-Hafid, Muhammad ibn Ahmad. *Bidayat al-Mujtahid wa Nihayat al-Muqtashid*. Kairo: Dar al-Hadith, 2004.

- Izzuddin, Ahmad, dan Mujahidin Mujahidin. "Otentisitas Hadis dalam Perspektif Ulama Klasik dan Kontemporer." *Jurnal Ilmu Hadis (Al-Quds)* 6, no. 2 (2022): 189-214.
- Izzuddin, Ahmad. "Rekonstruksi Metodologi Takhrij al-Hadis dalam Kajian Hadis Kontemporer." *Jurnal Ilmu Hadis (Al-Quds)* 7, no. 1 (2023): 45-72. <https://doi.org/10.29240/alquds.v7i1.5318>.
- Katz, Marion H. "The Study of Islamic Law." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 14 (2018): 117-134. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101317-031042>.
- Khamim, Khamim. "Takhrij al-Hadith Hadis-Hadis dalam Buku Siswa Pendidikan Agama Islam dan Budi Pekerti Kelas XI." *Nabawi: Journal of Hadith Studies* 1, no. 1 (2020): 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.55987/njhs.v1i1.2>.
- Lajnah al-Fatawa al-Islamiyyah. *Majallat al-Buhuth al-Islamiyyah*. Riyadh: Dar al-'Asimah, 1992.
- Majelis Ulama Indonesia. *Himpunan Fatwa MUI Bidang Ibadah*. Jakarta: Erlangga, 2010.
- Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj. *Shahih Muslim*. Beirut: Dar Ihya al-Turats al-'Arabi, t.t.
- Mustaqim, Muhamad. "Metode Istinbath Hukum Islam dalam Perspektif Ushul Fiqh Kontemporer." *Al-Ahkam: Jurnal Ilmu Syari'ah dan Hukum* 6, no. 2 (2021): 175-198. <https://doi.org/10.22515/al-ahkam.v6i2.4192>.
- Sahnun ibn Sa'id. *Al-Mudawwanah al-Kubra*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1994.
- Soleh, Akhmad Khudori. "Integrasi Ilmu dan Agama: Studi atas Pemikiran Integratif M. Amin Abdullah." *Ulul Albab: Jurnal Studi Islam* 22, no. 1 (2021): 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.18860/ua.v22i1.10841>.
- Wardatuzzahro, Putri. "Metode Mengetahui Al-Dabt Al-Khafiy pada Rawi Saduq dan Penerapannya pada Kritik Sanad Hadis." *Nabawi: Journal of Hadith Studies* 2, no. 1 (2021): 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.55987/njhs.v2i1.41>.
- Zuhdi, Muhammad Harfin. "Formulasi Aqidah dan Ibadah dalam Perspektif Hukum Islam." *Ulumuna: Journal of Islamic Studies* 19, no. 2 (2015): 357-386. <https://doi.org/10.20414/ujs.v19i2.701>.