Ridwan Arif[1]

'Abd Al-Ra'uf Al-Fansuri's Answer to Early Disputation of *Wahdat Al-Wujud of* 17ᵀᴴ Century Acheh

Abstrak: *Waḫdat al-wujūd* adalah salah satu doktrin kontroversi dalam tasawuf. Ia tidak saja menjadi perdebatan di Timur Tengah, tapi juga pernah memicu konflik dan tragedi di Nusantara, khususnya Aceh pada abad ke-17. Para penganut paham ini pernah dihukum kafir dan dihukum mati. 'Abd al-Ra'uf yang datang kemudian merasa bertanggung jawab menciptakan kembali kedamaian di Aceh, berupaya melakukan rekonsiliasi dengan menafsirkan ulang doktrin *waḫdat al-wujūd* sesuai akidah Islam (*syarī'ah*). Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif yaitu penelitian kepustakaan dengan meneliti sumber-sumber primer dan sekunder yang berkaitan dengan tema kajian. Hasil studi ini menemukan 'Abd al-Ra'uf berupaya membuktikan bahwa doktrin *waḫdat al-wujūd* tidak bertentangan dengan akidah Islam sebagaimana banyak disalah-pahami. *Waḫdat al-wujūd* bukan bermaksud Allah SWT identik dengan alam, tetapi hanya Allah yang memiliki wujud pada taraf substansi (hakikat) sedangkan alam, walaupun berwujud dalam dunia kasat mata, hakikatnya tiada memiliki wujud. Wujud alam disebut wujud *majazī*. Walaupun mempertahankan *waḫdat al-wujūd*, 'Abd al-Ra'uf mengkritik pemahaman menyimpang tentang *waḫdat al-wujūd* yaitu keyakinan yang mengatakan semua yang ada (alam semesta) adalah *dzāt* Allah. Upaya 'Abd al-Ra'uf dalam melakukan reinterpretasi doktrin ini sangat penting dan bernilai dalam upaya mengembalikan kedamaian dalam masyarakat Aceh.

Key words:

al-wujūd, waḫdat al-wujūd, universe, God

Introduction

Most of scholars and historians agree that there was important role of Sufism on Islamization of Malay-Indonesian archipelago. This is because most of Muslim scholars who spread Islam in this

region in the early period were Sufi. [2] Based on the contribution of Sufism on Islamization of people and culture in this area, Johns for example, concluded that Sufism was the aim factor on Islamization of Southeast Asia.[3] Among the early center of spreading Islam in Malay-Indonesian archipelago was Acheh in the north of Sumatera, beside Malacca in Malaysian Peninsular, Banten in West Java and Ternate in the Moluccas.[4]

As a center of spreading Islam in Malay world, Acheh has ever been played important role on Islamic development in Malay world. In this place, there had been the sultanate which has influenced in the Southeast Asia in 16th-17th century. At that time, Acheh had reached the top of progress as a center of trading between East and West as well as the center of the spread of Islam. During this two century, there had appeared four prominent Muslim scholars namely Hamzah Fansuri (d. 1607) , Shams al-Din al-Sumathra'i (d. 1630), Nur al-Din al-Raniri (d. 1658), and 'Abd al-Rauf al-Fansuri (1694). These scholars were well known as leading Muslim scholar not only in Acheh but in Malay world in general.

Islamization Malay-Indonesian archipelago by Sufi scholars caused Sufism spreads since the early period of Islamic development in this region. Sufism discourse and debating on Sufism doctrine had been appeared and discussed among Muslim scholars at that time. Among Sufism discourses which discussed in Acheh in 17th century was the doctrine of the unity of existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*). *Waḥdat al-wujūd* has been become a controversy doctrine and caused conflict and tragedy in the history of Acheh. This tragedy begin when Nūr al-Dīn al-Rānirī, who was then the *muftī* of the sultanate of Acheh, accused Hamzah's teaching of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* as deviated from Islamic creed. He issued a fatwa stated that the followers of the doctrine has been infidel (*kufr*). The followers have two choices, repent from their belief or they will be executed by the ruler. Many followers of Hamzah's teaching executed by the ruler and the books of Hamzah's burned in front of masjid Baiturahman, a grand mosque in Acheh.

The tragedy occurred at 'Abd al-Ra'uf's teenager age. After 'Abd al-Ra'uf return to Acheh, he feel responsible to settle down the issue by reconciling between two contradiction views by reinterpreting the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. This study is very important because: (1) the concept of *waḥdat al-wujūd* is one of the most important things to discuss because (i) it was closely related with the principle of divine unity (*tawḥīd*) which is the principle or basic to Islamic teaching. In this context, for those who supported and embraced the doctrine, they considered it as the highest level of expression of *tawḥīd*. Meanwhile for those who criticized the doctrine, they characterized the followers of this school as heretic (*zindiq*), heterodox (*mulḥīd)* or unbelief (*kufr)*. (ii) The influence of the concept of *waḥdat al-wujūd*

---

[2] Alwi Shihab, *Akar Tasawuf di Indonesia*, (Depok: Pustaka IIMAN, 2009), 21.

[3] Abdul Hadi WM, *Tasawuf yang Tertindas: Kajian Hermeneutik terhadap Karya-karya Hamzah Fansuri,* (Jakarta: Paramadina, 2001), 2.

[4] Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, *Raniri and the Wujudiyyah of 17th Century Acheh*, (Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch Royal Asiatic society, 1966), 4

very wide and it's spreading greatly in the history of Sufism development. It was spread evenly almost throughout the Muslim world including Malay world. Most of the prominent Malay scholars embraced this idea.[5] (2) 'Abd Ra'uf well known as prominent Muslim scholar in Malay world which was expert not in Sufism only but in various field of religious science, but there was very few attention from researcher and scholar concerning his works and thought.

Therefore, this study would be devoted on the concept of *waḥdat al-wujūd* according 'Abd al-Ra'uf as his respond to disputation between al-Raniri and followers of Hamzah Fansuri.

Waḥdat al-Wujūd

Actually, the doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd* has been become controversy teaching in the Muslim world since long time ago. This doctrine goes back to a great Arab mystic-philosopher of Spain of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Ibn 'Arabi (1165-1240).[6]

Even though *waḥdat al-wujūd* attributed to Ibn 'Arabi, but according to William Chittick, essentially this doctrine has been developed in the history of Sufism since long time ago before Ibn 'Arabi. Among the Sufi scholars who considered propounded *waḥdat al-wujūd* before Ibn 'Arabi were Ma'rūf al-Kharkī (d. 815), Abū al-'Abbās Qassāb, (d. 10th C), Mansūr al-Hallāj (d. 922), 'Abd Allāh al-Anshāri (d. 1089), 'Ali Utsmān al-Hujwirī (d. 11th C) Abū Hāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 1111), Ahmād al-Ghazālī (d. 1123), 'Ain al-Qudat al-Hamādānī and so on. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Rūmi (d. 1273) actually also propounded *waḥdat al-wujūd* teaching, even though his name rarely attributed to the doctrine.[7]

Furthermore, Chittick argued, attribution of *waḥdat al-wujūd* to Ibn 'Arabi caused due Ibn Taymiyah's critism to this doctrine. Ibn Taymiyah attributed *waḥdat al-wujūd* which is pantheistic and deviate to Ibn 'Arabi. Ibn Taymiyah views *waḥdat al-wujūd* was like pantheism or monism in Western tradition. After publishing of the works of Ibn Taymiyah, the Accusation of heretic (*zindīq*) and infidel (*kufr*) to followers of *waḥdat al-wujūd* become more widely.[8] According to Ibrahim Madkur, Ibn Taymiyah was the strongest scholar who criticized Ibn 'Arabi's thought. Therefore, at

---

[5] Zakaria Stapa & Mohamed Asin Dolah (ed.) *Islam: Akidah dan Kerohanian*, (Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 2001), 115.

[6] His complete name is Muhammad ibn 'Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn 'Abdullah al-Hatimi. He was given the title of Muḥy al-Dīn and Syaikh al-Akbar. He was born in Murcia, Spain in 1165. After studied in Seville, he moves to Tunis in 1194, and embraces Sufism there. He goes to Makkah in 1202 and leaves Damaskus in 1240. As a prominent scholar, especially in Sufism, he has been written many books. His works reached more than two hundred titles. The famous one was *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah*, beside *Fushūsh al-Hikam* which was, according to him, originally received from the Prophet (pbuh) in a dream when he was in Damaskus on 626. See Toshihiko Izutsu, *The Concept and Reality of Existence*, (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, 2007), 4.

[7] Abdul Hadi WM, *Tasawuf yang Tertindas*, 160

[8] Abdul Hadi WM, *Tasawuf yang Tertindas*, 160.

least Ibn Taymiyah has been merit to popularize the term of *waḫdat al-wujūd* to Muslim world although with the negative aim.[9]

Nevertheless, Ibn 'Arabi never propounded the term of *waḫdat al-wujūd*. This term introduced by interpreters and students of Ibn 'Arabi such as Sadr al-Dīn al-Qunawī (d. 1274), Mu'ayyid al-Dīn al-Jandī (d.1291), Sa'id al-Dīn al-Farghanī (d. 1301), Ibn Sab'īn (d. 1300), Sa'ād al-Dīn al-Hammuyā (1252), Ahwad al-Dīn al-Balyanī(d. 1288), 'Azīz al-Dīn al-Nasafī (d. before 1300), 'Abd Razzāq al-Qāsanī (d. 1330) and so on. Through interpretation of those followers of Ibn 'Arabi, Ibn Taymiyah judged that the *waḫdat al-wujūd* was a deviate teaching especially the interpretation which propounded by Ibn Sab'īn.[10]

On explanation of *waḫdat al-wujūd*, Ibn 'Arabi said, in reality (*ḫaqīqah*), there is one existence (*wujūd*) namely the existence of Allah (*wujūd Allāh*). Actually the existence of creation (*makhlūq*) was the existence of Creator (*Khāliq*). Absolutely there was no difference among them. If someone thought that there is difference between existence of Allah and existence of creation, it is because one saw them from the sense point of view and reason which has limited ability to reach the Reality,[11] As Ibn 'Arabi tell us:

Glory to Allah who created everything and He is the essence (*'ayn*) of everything.[12]

According to Ibn 'Arabi, absolutely, the existence of creature was the existence of Allah and Allah was reality of universe. There is no difference between the eternal existence (*wujūd al-qādim*) which called by Creator (*Khāliq*) and the new existence (*wujūd al-hādits*) which called by creature (*makhlūq*). There is no difference between worshiper (*'ābid*) and worshiped (*ma'būd*). The differentiation merely on the form and range of One Reality.

It is expressed by Ibn 'Arabi through his poetry:

Servant is God and God is servant

By my feeling, who is burdened (*mukallaf*)?

If you say servant whereas He is (on reality) God

Or you said God, then who is governed?[13]

---

[9] Ibrāhīm Madkūr, "Waḥdat al-wujūd bayn Ibn ʿArabī wa Asbīnūzā", in *Al-Tidzkārī: Muḫyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī fī al-Dzikrā al-Mi'awiyyah al-Tsāminah li Mīlādih*, (al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Kātib al-'Arabī, 1969), 367-380; Zakaria Stapa, *Tokoh Sufi dan Penyelewengan Akidah*. (Kuala Lumpur: Berita Publishing Sdn. Bhd.1998), 132.

[10] Abd Hadi, *Tasawuf yang Tertindas*, 160.

[11] Abū al-Wafā' al-Ghanīmī al-Taftazanī, *Al-Madkhal ilā al-Tashawwūf al-Islāmī*, (Al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Tsaqāfah, 1976), 247; HAMKA, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, (Jakarta: Pustaka Panjimas, 1994), 140.

[12] Abū al-Wafā' al-Ghanīmī al-Taftazani, *Al-Madkhal ilā al-Tashawwūf al-Islāmī*, 245; Ibn 'Arabi, *al-Futūḫāt al-Makkiyyah*, (Al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Kātib al-ʿArabī,1293 H), 604.

[13] HAMKA, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 141; Ibn 'Arabi, Fushūsh al-Ḥikam, in Abū al-ʿUlā ʿAfīfī, *Fushūsh al-Ḥikam wa al-Ta'līqāt ʿalayh*, (Beyrūt: Dār al-Fikr, nd), 92.

If Creator and creation are one existence, why did they look two entities? According to Ibn 'Arabi, this is because one did not see them from one point of view, or they are two side of one Reality.[14]

From Ibn 'Arabi's point of view, although in the external world there are various kind of creation but it has no reality (*ḥaqīqah*). In reality there was only one i.e. the Absolute Reality (Allah) as Reality and truly Reality. Anything else whatever it is could not be said as exists in truly meaning. If there was one existence i. e. existence of Allah in reality, the question might be appeared is what is the ontology status of creation? (*khalq*)? Is it identical with God or it has no existence at all? Whereas in fact, this universe was exists empirically. In order to answer this question, Ibn 'Arabi said, this universe was Allah and was not Allah at once. In his term, this creation was "He" and "not Him" *(huw lā huw)*. Creation called as "He" because they were manifestation (*tajalliyāt*) of Allah's attributes.[15]

Even though the doctrine of *waḫdat al-wujūd* has been become controversy but it has many follower in Muslim world. The influence of this teaching very wide and it's spreading greatly in the history of Sufism development. It was spread evenly almost throughout the Muslim world including Malay world. Most of leading Muslim scholars in this region embraced this idea.[16] In the Malay world, the doctrin of *wahdat al-wujūd* was also known as the concept of the seven degree *(marātib al-sab'ah)* or *wujūdiyyah*. In 17th century, this teaching has been caused disputation between Hamzah Fansuri and Nur al-Din al-Raniri[17] The former was well known as early Sufi figure who spread the doctrin of *waḫdat al-wujūd*. After his death, his teaching continued by his student Shams al-Din al-Sumathra'i. On the era of both of scholar, either Hamzah Fansuri or Shams al-Din al-Sumathra'i, there is no challenge to this doctrine either from scholars or Muslim community. Even, Shams al-Din al-Sumathra'i, inducted as *Qadhī Mālik al-'Adil* (a sort of Ministry of Religious Affairs) in the sultanate of Acheh. After the Shams al-Din's death, occurred a disputation on the doctrine of *waḫdat al-wujūd* which led to a great tragedy in Acheh history.

Wujudiyyah Conflict in Acheh

Disputation on the doctrine of *waḫdat al-wujūd* and the conflict caused by the disputation occured in the era of Sultan Iskandar Tsāni (1637-1641). The controversy fueled by a Sufi scholar who is a master of Rifā'iyyah order namely Nur al-Din al-Raniri (d.1666).[18] He came from Randir, Gujarat, India

---

[14] Muhammad Mustafa Hilmi, *al-Ḥayāh al-Rūḥiyyah fī al-Islām*, (Mishr: al-Hay'ah al-Mishriyyah al-ʿĀmmah li al-Kitāb, 1984), 182.

[15] Ibn 'Arabi, *Al-Futūḫāt al-Makkiyyah*, II, 160; A. Khudori Soleh, *Wacana Baru Filsafat Islam*. (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar), 148.

[16] Stapa, *Islam Akidah,* , 115.

[17] Ahmad Daudi, *Allah dan Manusia dalam Konsepsi Sheikh Nur al-Din al-Raniri*, (Jakarta: CV Rajawali, 1983); Oman Fathurahman, *Tanbih al-Mashi: Menyoal Wahdat al-Wujud*, (Bandung: Mizan,1999).

[18] His complete name is Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Hasanji ibn Muḥammad Ḫāmid al-Rānirī. Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, *Raniri and the Wujudiyyah*, 12.

and arrived in Acheh on 1637.[19] Al-Raniri regarded the doctrine of *wujūdiyyah* (*waḥdat al-wujūd*) which spread by Hamzah Fansuri and Shams al-Din al-Sumathra'i has been deviated from true Islamic teaching. As an orthodox scholar who emphasized on *syarī'ah*, al-Raniri issued a *fatwā* that *wujūdiyyah* teaching was deviated from Islamic creed, so that those who embraced such a doctrine, they have been judged as heretic (*zindiq*), or infidel (*kufr*) and if they did not repent, they must be executed.[20]

The *fatwā* of al-Raniri supported by the ruler sulthān, Sulthān Iskandar Tsani. Hence, the followers of *wujūdiyyah* forced to release their believed and got violence action from apparatus of government. Beside that Hamzah Fansuri's works burned in front of Masjid Bayt al-Rahman, because it was considered as the source of deviation.[21]

Despite the doctrine *waḥdat al-wujūd* goes back to Ibn 'Arabi, but al-Raniri did not criticized Ibn 'Arabi. It proved that al-Raniri himself also embraced *waḥdat al-wujūd*. On criticism Hamzah Fansuri, al-Raniri distinguished w*aḥdat al-wujūd* teaching into two categories i. e. *wujūdiyyah al-ḥaqq* and *wujūdiyyah mulḥid*. The *wujūdiyyah al-ḥaqq* which means by al-Raniri was the true understanding of *waḥdat al-wujūd* and *wujūdiyyah mulḥid* was the false understanding of *waḥdat al-wujūd*. In the case of Hamzah Fansuri's teaching, al-Raniri categorized it to *wujūdiyyah mulḥid*.

According to syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, the points of refutation of al-Raniri to Hamzah's teaching and ideas could be summarized to:[22]

a) That Hamzah's ideas regarding God, the world, man and the relationship between them are identical with those of the philosopher, the zoroastrians, the metempsychosists, the Brahmins.

b) That Hamzah's belief is pantheistic in the sense that God's essence is completely immanent in the world; that God permeates everything that is seen.

c) That, like the philosophers, Hamzah believes that God is simple being.

d) That Hamzah, like the *Qadariyyah* and the *Mu'tazilah*, believes the Qur'an to be created.

e) That, like the philosophers, Hamzah believes in the eternity of the world.

In these points, al-Raniri accused Hamzah Fansuri's theacing as pantheistic i.e that God's essence completely immanence in universe. Al-Raniri cited Hamzah's thought in one of his work, *al-Muntahi*. In this book, on interpretation prophetic tradition, *man 'arafa nafsahu fa qad 'arafa rabbahu*, (who knows himself, knows his God), Hamzah said:

---

[19] Ahmad Daudi, *Allah dan Manusia*, 38.

[20] Fathurrahman, *Tanbih Al-Masyi*, 7.

[21] Ahmad Daudi, *Allah dan Manusia*, 41; Abdul Hadi WM, *Hamzah Fansuri: Risalah Tasawuf dan Puisi-Puisinya*, (Bandung: Mizan: 1995), 13.

[22] Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, *The Mysticism of Hamzah Fansuri*, (Kuala Lumpur: University Malaya, 1970), 31.

> *…erti mengenal dirinya dan mengenal Tuhannya: ya'ni diri kuntu kanzan makhfiyyan [itu] dirinya, dan semesta sekalian dalam [ilmu] Allah. (Tamthil) seperti biji dan puhun; puhunnya dalam sebiji itu, sungguhpun tiada kelihatan, tetapi hukumnya ada dalam biji itu."*[23]

Regarding this statement, al-Raniri comments:

> *"maka nyatalah daripada perkataan wujudiyyah itu bahwa serwa semesta 'alam sekalian ada lengkap berwujud di dalam Ḥaq Ta'ala. Maka keluarlah 'alam daripada-Nya seperti pohon kayu keluar daripada biji. Maka iktikad demikian itu kufur"*.[24]

In other of his work, al-Raniri said:

> *"Sekali-kali tiada seperti kata wujūdiyyah yang mulḫid, katanya: bahwasanya adalah segala makhluqat itu berwujud di dalam kandungan zat Ḥaq Ta'ala. Maka tatkala dilahirkan-Nya akan dia, maka jadilah Ia di dalamnya dan bersatulah ia dengannya, dan sekarang Ia di dalam kandungan wujud segala makhluqat."*[25]

From this commentary, it can be seen that al-Raniri accused Hamzah's teaching as *kufr* based on Hamzah's concept, in understanding of al-Raniri, that universe indeed was the essence of God and radiate from his essence, like the appearance of tree from a seed. No doubt that there were many statement of Hamzah Fansuri that emphasized immanence of God despite he also argued the transcendence of God in other place.

'Abd al-Ra'uf's Reinterpretation of Waḫdat al-Wujūd

If we accept Rinkes' assumption which estimates 'Abd al-Ra'uf's departure to the Middle East in 1642 C.E., it can be assumed that the conflict of *wujūdiyyah* in Acheh occurred before 'Abd al-Ra'uf's departure to Arabia. Hence, it is most probably 'Abd al-Ra'uf witnessed such a conflict and knew precisely the disputation since it was the great disputation that had involved political authority.[26] Even though the polemics had passed and al-Raniri had returned to his native land, it seemed the root of the problem had been not settled yet. As far as *wujūdiyyah* is concerned, the conflict caused chaos and disharmony in Acheh society. As a native scholar, certainly 'Abd al-Ra'uf felt responsible for the reestablishment of harmony in Acheh and wanted to solve the problem. As the doctrine of *waḫdat al-wujūd* was the source of disputation, 'Abd al-Ra'uf attempted to clarify this doctrine based on his knowledge. The concern of 'Abd al-Ra'uf about this matter is evidenced through his writings in his works, especially *Tanbīh al-Māshī* and *Daqā'iq al-Ḥurūf*.

---

[23] Hamzah Fansuri, "al-Muntahi", in Al-Attas, *The Mysticism of Hamzah Fansuri*, 330.

[24] Al-Raniri, "Tibyan", in al-Attas, *The Mysticism of Hamzah Fansuri*, 479.

[25] Ahmad Daudi, *Allah dan Manusia*, 224.

[26] Fathurahman, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 27.

Although 'Abd al-Ra'uf discussed *waḥdat al-wujūd* in his works, he did not mention any name or sect to whom he addressed his thought. With regard to the previous and current intellectual discourses of Acheh, Fathurahman[27] for instance, assumes that the thought of ᶜAbd al-Ra'ūf on the doctrine was a response to the disputation of *wujūdiyyah*.

The discussion of 'Abd al-Ra'uf on *waḥdat al-wujūd* is visible in his works, especially *Tanbīh al-Māshī*. In the work, 'Abd al-Ra'uf's elucidation of *waḥdat al-wujūd* can be seen while he dealt with the issue of ontology, i.e., the ontological status of the world as well as its ontology relationship to God. Concerning the ontological status of the world, 'Abd al-Ra'uf held the belief of theologians who distinguished the being into the necessary being (*wājib al-wujūd*) and possible being (*mumkin al-wujūd*). The necessary being is the being of God, whereas possible being is the being of the world as 'Abd al-Ra'uf states, "The reality of the world is existence that is bound up by the nature of possibility (*sifat al-mumkināt*). That is why it is called as something other than God."[28] Regarding the ontological relationship between the world and God, 'Abd al-Ra'uf employed the allegory of shadow as he says:

> If it is linked to God, the world is like shadow. It is not other reality beside the known realities of God in the eternal (*al-azal*) times, and then acquired its existence. Therefore, according to this view, mankind is His shadow, or shadow to His shadow.[29]

'Abd al-Ra'uf quoted Ibn 'Arabi who said:

> In the respect of fundamental reality, our archetypes are shadow of God Almighty, no other.[30]

'Abd al-Ra'uf quoted ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān bin Aḥmad al-Jāmī, thus:

> …such potentiality covers the outward archetypes (*al-a'yān al-khārijiyyah*) and the permanent archetypes (*al-a'yān al-tsābitah*). This is because our *al-a'yān tsābitah* is shadow of the essence (*dzāt*) of God that mixed with His action and our *al-a'yān khārijiyyah* is shadow to the *al-a'yān tsābitah*, therefore shadow of the shadow is shadow through mediator.[31]

ᶜAbd al-Ra'ūf elucidated that the shadow has no existence other than the existence of its owner. Hence, the existence of the shadow depends on the existence of the owner. Because the existence of shadow is determined by another, thus, the other is the true reality, i.e., God. Thus, in reality, there is one being, i.e., the being of God.[32] 'Abd al-Ra'uf says that all of the above in his elucidation concerning the ontology status of the world is meant by the term *waḥdat al-wujūd*.[33] Through this belief, 'Abd al-Ra'uf

---

[27] Fathurahman, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 36.

[28] 'Abd al-Ra'uf bin 'Ali al-Fansuri, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī al-Mansūb ilā Tharīq al-Qushāshī*, Manuscript, MS A101, (Jakarta: Perpustakaan Nasional), 1.

[29] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 1-2. Translation is mine.

[30] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 2. Translation is mine.

[31] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 2. Translation is mine.

[32] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 2.

[33] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 3.

says, we would know that the world belongs (*milk*) to Allah Almighty, and through His existence, the world come exist. 'Abd al-Ra'uf cited a Prophet's tradition:

Our existence is merely causes by Him, and belonged to Him.[34]

Although 'Abd al-Ra'uf accepted the doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd*, nevertheless he rejected the identification of the world and God. He stated that, the world is not truly the essence (*dzāt*) of God Almighty. In order to maintain his standpoint, 'Abd al-Ra'uf propounded some arguments. Among the Qur'ānic verses quoted by 'Abd al-Ra'uf:[35]

… The Creator of all things …[36]

According to 'Abd al-Ra'uf, if it is assumed that the world is the essence of Allah, it is impossible for the Creator to create His own-essence. Furthermore, according to 'Abd al-Ra'uf, Allah Almighty says to His Apostle (PBUH):

… Say: God is the Creator of all things …[37]

Allah Almighty, 'Abd al-Ra'uf argued, does not say "Say: God is the Creator of His own-essence".

God also says:

But God has created you and your handiwork.[38]

'Abd al-Ra'uf maintained that God does not say, "Allah is the Creator of His own-essence". Likewise God says:

Praise be to God, the cherisher and sustainer of the worlds;[39]

God does not say, "Praise be to God, who created His own essence.

Having argued with the help of several Qur'ānic verses, 'Abd al-Ra'uf strengthened his argument by the fact that God has ordained mankind to perform *syari'ah* obligations. Through logic approach, he argued, if the world [in which mankind is part of the world] is truly the essence of God, certainly He would not burden mankind with religious obligations such as prayer, fasting and so on, since they are the Essence of God.[40]

Another argument evidences the non-identical point between the world and that of God propounded by 'Abd al-Ra'uf; that is the argument of "will". According to 'Abd al-Ra'uf, Mankind,when they wanted to create something, then they says "be!", but it had not become, certainly they knew that they were not the essence of God. If it were so, certainly the thing would have existed immediately because Allah Almighty says

---

[34] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 2. The narrator of the *ḥadīts* is not to be found. Translation is mine.

[35] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 2.

[36] Al-Qur'ān, al-An'ām (6): 102. Translated by 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, see 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, *The Holy Qur'an*, 171.

[37] Al-Qur'ān, al-Ra'd (13): 16. Translated by 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, see 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, *The Holy Qur'an*, 295.

[38] Al-Qur'ān, al-Shāffāt (37): 96. Translated by 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, see 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, *The Holy Qur'an*, 547.

[39] Al-Qur'ān, al-Baqarah (2): 1. Translated by 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, see 'Abdullah Yusuf 'Ali, *The Holy Qur'an*, 19.

[40] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 2.

"Verily when He intends a thing, His command is, "be" and it is!"[41] The non-existent of such a thing after that saying is the evidence that his will is different form God's will. This is the evidence that mankind and the world are not identical to the Truth Most Exalted absolutely.[42] 'Abd al-Ra'uf also quoted a *ḥadīts qudsī*:

> [O] Son of Ādam (mankind), you will [something] and I will [something], there would not be except what I will. If you submit to me in what I will, I would grant you what you will, but if you oppose what I will, I will complicate what you will, so that there will not be except what I will.[43]

It is understood from the phrase "you will and I will", 'Abd al-Ra'uf argued, that the servant is different from God; from the words "there would not be except what I will" that the will of a servant would not come true except while such a "will" is in appropriate to the "will" of God; and from the phrase "If you submit to me in what I will, I would grant you what you will" that while a servant is very obedient to God, certainly God obeys him, i.e., God will approve all that the servant asks.[44]

'Abd al-Ra'uf advised to never turn to those who argue upon the absolute union between men and God based on the Prophet's tradition: "Who knows his self, indeed he knows his Lord". In their ignorance, 'Abd al-Ra'uf explained, those people interpret such *ḥadīts* saying that the human being is truly the essence of Allah Almighty. This understanding, in 'Abd al-Ra'uf's view, is false since it indicates the misunderstanding on knowing Allah Almighty. By quoting Abū Ḥasan al-Shādzilī, 'Abd al-Ra'uf stated that the true meaning of the *ḥadīts* is one who knows himself as a poor man, certainly knows his Lord as the Most Rich; one who knows himself as weak, certainly knows his Lord as Almighty; one who knows himself as disabled, he knows his Lord as Omnipotent; and one who knows himself as despicable, he knows his Lord as Most Exalted.[45] The meaning is drawn by 'Abd al-Ra'uf through his poem thus:

> *Jika tuan menuntut ilmu*
> *Ketahui dahulu keadaanmu*
> *Man 'arafa nafsahu kenal dirimu*
> *Fa-qad 'arafa rabbahu kenal tuhanmu*
>
> *Kenal dirimu muḥdath semata*
> *Kenal Tuhanmu qadim dzāt-Nya*
> *Tiada bersamaan itu keduanya*
> *Tiada semisal seumpama-Nya.*

---

[41] Al-Qur'ān, Yā Sīn (36): 82. Translated by 'Abdullah Yūsuf 'Alī, see 'Abdullah Yūsuf 'Alī, *The Holy Qur'ān*, 541.

[42] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 2.

[43] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 2; *Idem*, "Daqā'iq al-Ḥurūf", in Johns, A.H., "Dakā'ik al-Hurūf by 'Abd al-Ra'ūf of Singkel," Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London: the Royal Asiatic Society, 1955, 140.

[44] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqā'iq al-Ḥurūf", 140.

[45] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqā'iq al-Ḥurūf", 98.

If you are seeking knowledge
First know your state
Whoever knows himself [means] knowing yourself
Indeed he knows his Lord [means] to knowing your Lord

Know yourself [that it is] absolutely *muḥdats*
Knowing your Lord [that] His essence is eternal
There is no similar between the two
There is no one like unto Him.[46]

'Abd al-Ra'uf claimed that the meaning of such *ḥadīts* must be linked to the disability of mankind to know their nature comprehensively. He cited the words of Allah Almighty: "Say [O Muhammad] the spirit by command of my Lord".[47] This Qur'ānic verse reminds that mankind would not know the very fundamental of their nature, i.e., the spirit (*al-rūḥ*). While they are not able to know their fundamental reality which is the closest and part of the creatures at whole, they are also unable to know the reality of their Creator, which is no associating to Him, perfectly. In addition, they would not able to know the reality of His Revelation as well as His attributes and actions.[48] To draw such incapacity, 'Abd al-Ra'uf quotes saying of a poet:

You do not know yourself and do not know who you are absolutely; do not know the process of your presence as well as the attributes you possess, because you are not able to reach it.[49]

Therefore, according to 'Abd al-Ra'uf, there is no way for mankind to attain the gnosis (*ma'rifah*) of God except through knowing that he is weak; and to rise the bewilderment (*al-ḥayrah*).[50] 'Abd al-Ra'uf stated, *ḥayrah* is the paramount gnosis of God, i.e., the praised *ḥayrah*; the *ḥayrah* of those

---

[46] Braginsky, V. I., *Yang Indah Berfaedah dan Kamal: Sejarah Sastera Melayu dalam Abad 7-19*, (Jakarta: INIS, 1998), 494. Translation is mine.

[47] Al-Qur'ān, al-Isrā' (17): 85.

[48] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 4-5.

[49] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 5. Translation is mine.

[50] *Hayrah* means bewilderment, perplexity or wonderment. According to Amatullah Armstrong, *ḥayrah* indicates a moment of utter perplexity, when the mind ceases to function, unable as it is to resolve or find an answer to a particular spiritual impasse. At such a blessed time, for it is by the grace of Allah that such *ḥayrah* was reached, the disciple must attempt not to panic or give-up. Out of this knot of bewilderment a spiritual reality is given the opportunity to unravel and reveal itself in shattering clarity. The ultimate bewilderment is that possessed by the knowers and lovers of Allah. They are utterly bewildered because they have found Allah and in finding Allah they know that He is unknowable yet in each moment they are opened to a fresh and new knowledge of Allah. "So, Glory be to Allah who is known only through the fact that he is not known", see Amatullah Armstrong, *Sufi Terminology (al-Qamus al-Sufi) the Mystical Language of Islam*, (Kuala Lumpur: A.S. Noordeen, 1416/1995), 69-70.

who belong to vision of heart, who know the process of God's manifestation.[51]

'Abd al-Ra'uf did not refute any claim stating the absolute unity between everything and of God, but it merely occurred in the eternal (*al-azal*) times since at that time there was no existence except God's existence as he explained:

> If you found someone who says that the world and everything is the essence of Truth Most Exalted, know that it is not true except with regard of the eternal (*al-azal*). One can say everything is the essence based on God's being, not based on its fundamental reality (*ḥaqīqah*). Because, in the *al-azal* time, there is no existence except God's existence; and the possible things (the world) has nothing except the possibility of being.[52]

However, we may not say, everything is God except "in Him", i.e., in *aḥadiyyah* in the respect of smelting (encompassing) and no distinction in it to other than God. So never say, "Everything in the beginning is the essence of God Most Exalted, then it changes becoming other possible thing. It is a kind of erroneous understanding."[53]

'Abd al-Ra'uf quoted al-Kūrānī who said, "In the *al-azal* times, there is no existent except Allah Almighty and everything is hidden in His knowledge. It is not an existence that is distinguished from the existence of God. Therefore, it appears through the essence of God's existence and exists by the existence of God in the eternal times. This is meant by the oneness of being (*al-'ainiyyah*) of the *al-azal* times because everything being within the necessary existence (God) then it becomes the possible being (*mumkin al-wujūd*). However, in ᶜAbd al-Ra'ūf's view, the reality would not be change and mixed with others.[54] This is meant by Ibn ᶜArabī's poem:

> We were lofty letters unspoken,
> Attached to our abode in the mountain peak
> I was you within him and we all were you, and you were he
> Everything is in 'he is he', ask of those who arrived. [55]

'Abd al-Ra'uf commented on the above Ibn 'Arabī's poem. According to him, the sentence "We were lofty letters unspoken" means we were in the *al-azal* times as the hidden realities that remain in God's

---

[51] In the respect of *ḥayrah*, 'Abd al-Ra'uf states, "Whoever knows that God is Most Great to be known, indeed he had known Him. Hence, ᶜAbd al-Ra'ūf says, there is a narration states that it is merely God knows himself. The Prophet Muhammad (pbuh), according to 'Abd al-Ra'uf, had ever been asked the confusion when he says in his pray, "O my Lord, increase me on confuse upon Thee, i.e., the confusion on Thy never-ended manifestation (*tajallī*) and the change of your essence in Thy states (*syu'un*) and attributes, see 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 6.

[52] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 3-4.

[53] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 3-4.

[54] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 3-4.

[55] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqā'iq al-Ḥurūf", 61. Translation is mine.

knowledge; we were neither created nor attached to the saying of creation, i.e., *'kun'* (be). "We were attached to all of our states" means each creature is attached to its characteristic, its law as well as its image. This is because, according to 'Abd al-Ra'uf, every single existence had quiddity (*al-māhiyyah*), state, degree and law since the *al-azal* times. "And it was in the mountain peak" means the first manifestation (*al-taᶜayyūn al-awwāl*) that is also called as the state of unity (*waḥdah*) among the Sufis.[56] "I was you within Him, and we all were you, and you were He" means in the respect there is no difference between one to another. However, in 'Abd al-Ra'uf's view, everything remains in its personality, as he said "But 'I' remain 'I', and 'you' still 'you'. 'Abd al-Ra'uf made an analogy, it is like a speck of water that has fallen into the sea. Since we cannot distinguish it from the sea, we say that such water is the sea and the sea is the water, but the sea remains the sea likewise the water, it will not change. If we are not aware of specks of water, it is due to our wonder by seeing the sea; and at the time we may say, all of them are the sea.[57]

The result is that we are all in the *al-ta'ayyūn al-awwāl*, i.e., the presence of the general (*ijmāl*) knowledge so called the hidden realities (*al-ḥaqā'iq al-ghaybiyyah*) or the states of the essence (*al-syu'un al-dzātiyyah*), there is no difference between one to another in the respect of its generality (*ijmāl*). The *syu'un* is in the presence of the second manifestation (*al-taᶜayyūn al-tsānī*) that is the presence of a particular knowledge (*al-ᶜilm al-tafshīlī*) that is called permanent archetypes (*al-a'yān al-tsābitah*). In this state, one has been distinguished from another, i.e., the earth, the heavens, animals, human beings, jinn, angels and so forth, for each by its particular fashion and character. Hence, in contrast to the first state (*al-ta'ayyūn al-awwāl*), in this state, it can be said, "I was you and we all were you and you are He" because they are in their particular state that has been determined for each of them.[58]

In order to understand this matter, 'Abd al-Ra'uf made an analogy. He stated that it is like our knowledge within the heart. While it remains in its generality (*al-ijmāl*) and annihilates within our heart; and we do not view except ourselves of the moment, at the time we can say it is our essence (*al-'ayn*) in this perspective. Nevertheless, while it appeared through speaking or writing on the board, for instance, certainly we can say it as our essence. Likewise the letters, while they are hidden in the ink, they are the essence of the ink; while they are in the end of a pen, they are

---

[56] 'Abd al-Ra'uf quotes the author of *Tuḥfah al-Mursalah*, namely al-Burhānpūrī, stating that the first degree of Divinity is *aḥadiyyah* which is also called as *huwiyyah* that is means the essence of God in the respect of its invisible (*ghayb*). This degree was also known as the degree of *al-lā ta'ayyun*. The second degree is *waḥdah* which is also called as the degree of the first manifestation (*al-taᶜayyūn al-awwāl*) or the reality of Muḥammad (*al-ḥaqīqah al-Muḥammadiyyah*). The third is *wāḥidiyyah* which is also called as the second manifestation (*taᶜayyūn tsānī*) or the reality of mankind (*al-ḥaqīqah al-insāniyyah*), see 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqā'iq al-Ḥurūf", 60.

[57] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqa'iq al-Ḥurūf", 62.

[58] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqa'iq al-Ḥurūf", 62-63.

the essence of such end of pen and; when it is written in the board, it is different from ink and pen. It is also like the twigs, branches and all of the leaves. While all of them are contained in the seeds, in respect of that all manifestations are disappeared within it, so all of them can be called as the essence of the seeds in this perspective. Nevertheless, while each of them appears with its characteristic, they differ from the seeds. Hence, never think that previously all of them are the essence of the seeds then changes to others. All of them (the seeds, twigs, branches and leaves) remained in themself though the three (twigs, branches and leaves) do not appear from the seeds.[59]

'Abd al-Ra'uf advised to never mix the inward law and the outward law. He quoted the Sufis saying, "The perfect man is one who give the right to those who have it and give the superiority to those belonging to it, i.e., they do not mix the different matters like the presence of knowledge (*al-'ilm*) to the presence of creation (*al-takwīn*) because what is true in the former, is not valid in the latter".[60]

It is clear that, in 'Abd al-Ra'uf's view, the absolute union between the world and that of God (*al-'ainiyyah*) is not true except before its appearance in the external world, i.e., the *al-azal* times. This is because everything is within the knowledge of God as primordial potentialities that are so called *al-a'yān al-tsābitah*. Such potentialities are general and universal in which every kind of creature is united in its generality like human beings are united in their kind of humanity. Based on this, Shāh Wālī Allāh al-Dihlawī, for instance, called *al-a'yān al-tsābitah* as universal self (*al-nafs al-kullī*).[61] However, in the stage of *al-a'yān al-tsābitah* everything has not been created yet, but still is the object of God's knowledge which remains in His knowledge. Nevertheless, in the view of 'Abd al-Ra'uf, after the creation of everything which is indicated by their appearance to the external world, the union between God and that of everything is not valid since the external world as well as the internal world have their law. The law of the internal is vague and nothingness (*al-'adam*), whereas the law of external is the visible law (existence). 'Abd al-Ra'uf advised his disciple to understand this matter well, because making an error in this issue, 'Abd al-Ra'uf says, is very dangerous. Those who err in this matter would become unguided and led to unguided.[62]

Although 'Abd al-Ra'uf did not reject the cosmological concept of Ibn 'Arabī in which the world is manifestation (*majlā*) to the names and attributes of God, he maintained that the world and God are not identical. In this term, 'Abd al-Ra'uf employed the analogy of the mirror thus:

---

[59] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqa'iq al-H̲urūf", 66.
[60] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqa'iq al-H̲urūf", 65.
[61] Wan Mohd Azam bin Mohd Amin, "Tasawuf Falsafi (Philosophical Sufism) Shāh Wālī Allāh al-Dihlawī," in Abdul Salam Muhammad Shukri (ed.), *Dimensi Pemikiran Shāh Wālī Allāh al-Dihlawī dan Pengaruhnya di Malaysia*, (Gombak: Research Centre International Islamic University Malaysia, 1st edition, 2007), 50.
[62] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 7.

Dan adalah al-Ḥaqq Ta'ālā itu cermin bagi orang yang 'ārif, maka dilihatnya dalamnya segala tafshīl hal dirinya; dan ia pun cermin bagi Tuhannya, maka Tuhannya melihat dalamnya diri-Nya dan segala asma'-Nya dan segala sifat-Nya dengan sakira-kira penerimaannya, tiada dengan sakira-kira Tuhannya karena Tuhannya itu tiada baginya hingga pada pihak dzāt-nya. Maka sebab itulah berubah-ubah tajallī Tuhannya dalamnya sebab berubah-ubah penerimannnya dan segala halnya seperti umpama berubah-ubah rupa dalam cermin itu, sebab berubah-ubah penerimaan cermin jua.

The Truth Most Exalted was the mirror to the gnostic, so he saw within it all of the particular things of himself; and he was also the mirror to his Lord, so the Lord saw within it Himself gathering His names and attributes in accordance to his acceptance, not in accordance to his Lord because there is limitation to God in respect of His essence. That is why the manifestations of God change within it by the change of its acceptance and all of its states like the change the image in the mirror, because it changes the acceptance of the mirror.[63]

'Abd al-Ra'uf stated that the different state of the image in the mirror is due to the different state of the mirror. Sometimes, the image is small because the mirror is small; it is long because the length of the mirror; it moves because the mirror moves; it is inverted when the mirror is being in the top or bottom sides; sometimes the right side of an image is opposite the right side of one who faces to the mirror when the mirror was multiplied, and sometimes the right side of the one opposite to the right side of the image, while the mirror is in front of him. All of such states, 'Abd al-Ra'uf explained, refer to the image that is seen in the mirror, never is it the self of one who faces the mirror and also it is other than him because he remains as he was, not change; what merely changes is his appearance in the mirror because of the change in the mirror's acceptance. This is, 'Abd al-Ra'uf said, the analogy of the non-identical (*tiada tasybih*) to the manifestations (*al-tajaliyyāt*) of God the Most High to his servants. It is diverged because of the divergence of His servants in their states.[64] Thus, it can be understood that, in 'Abd al-Ra'uf's view, God differs with His manifestations (creatures). On the viewpoint of essence, 'Abd al-Ra'uf asserted, the existence is one, i.e., the essence of God, meanwhile in respect of God's manifestation, the existence is many, i.e., God and the world as His manifestations.

The above elucidation demonstrates how 'Abd al-Ra'uf masterly understood the nature of *waḥdat al-wujūd* as taught by Ibn 'Arabī, i.e., the reality of God differs from His manifestations.[65] According to Zakaria Stapa, Ibn 'Arabī's viewpoint, that views everything that exists is one,

---

[63] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqā'iq al-Ḥurūf", 139. Translation is mine.
[64] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, "Daqā'iq al-Ḥurūf", 139.
[65] Stapa, *Islam Akidah*, 125. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, Three Muslim Sages, (Pakistan: Suhail Academy Lahore, 1988), 106-07.

does not contain any element of identical. The non-identical between God and creatures in Ibn 'Arabī's view, Stapa argues, is visible in *Fushūsh al-Ḥikam* stating that the world, including mankind, basically, differs with God because it is only God who belongs to existence, whereas creatures are in need of God to earn the existence and continuity of their existence.[66] *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, in Ibn 'Arabī's teaching, according to Stapa, refers to the fact that there is no existence in the grade of fundamental reality except God. In other words, there is one existence in the level of real existence, i.e., God. Everything other than God does not exist in itself; it merely exists as long as it manifests the existence of God. Therefore, the world has no existence except loan existence, or the existence derived from God.[67]

The above elucidation shows how 'Abd al-Ra'uf emphasized on the non-identical between the world and that of God or the transcendence of God upon His creatures. In the end of his elucidation on this issue, he stressed this thesis:

> Understand this affirmation, and never mix something, because to mix matters is among the attitude of those who do not know Allah Almighty. Say and believe that the servant remains a servant despite he goes ascending, and God remains God although He descends. The ultimate reality would not change, i.e., the reality of a servant would not become the reality of God and contrary, despite in eternal times.[68]

Conclusion

The above discussion resulted, even though 'Abd al-Ra'uf accepted and maintained the doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd*, he rejected the misunderstanding or misconception on this teaching i.e., the identification of the world and that of God. As we have seen that since the beginning of his discussion on ontology, although 'Abd al-Ra'uf affirmed that creatures are the manifestations (shadow) of God, he maintained the transcendence of Allah upon its creatures. The serious concern of 'Abd al-Ra'uf on this matter is evidenced by the fact that he also discussed this issue in other works like *Daqā'iq al-Ḥurūf*. 'Abd al-Ra'uf's rejection of the identification of the world and God shows his endeavor to dispel the misconception and misunderstanding on *waḥdat al-wujūd* which is against orthodoxy. The orthodox interpretation of 'Abd al-Ra'uf on *waḥdat al-wujūd* evidenced his strong commitment to reconcile Sufism and Islamic orthodoxy. 'Abd al-Ra'uf accepted the cosmology concept of Ibn 'Arabī that explains the creation process of the world through God's manifestation (*tajalliyyāt*) of His Names and Attributes that implies the external entities (*al-a'yān al-khārijiyyah*) are the manifestations of God, nevertheless 'Abd al-Ra'uf maintained that the

---

[66] Stapa, *Islam Akidah*, 130; Ibn 'Arabī, *Fushūsh al-Ḥikam*, tashdīr wa ta'liqāt Abū al-'Ulā 'Afīfī, 2 volumes, (Beyrut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Arabī), vol. 1, 67.
[67] Stapa, *Islam Akidah*, 129-30.
[68] 'Abd al-Ra'uf, *Tanbīh al-Māsyī*, 4.

world remains different from God like the shadow in the mirror, even in *al-azal* times (while the creatures remain in their possibility i.e., in the state of *al-a'yān al-tsābitah*), i.e., while the world remains in the knowledge of God.

It can be concluded that, 'Abd al-Ra'uf had attempted to reconcile Sufism and Islamic orthodoxy by giving an appropriate interpretation with orthodoxy. According to him, it is the true nature of *waḥdat al-wujūd*. Even though 'Abd al-Ra'uf criticized the misconception or misunderstanding of *waḥdat al-wujūd*, i.e., the identical of the world and that of God, he did not judge those who hold such an understanding as infidels. As has been seen above, his exposition is very clear and it is interesting to note that his elucidation was constantly supported by Qur'ānic verses and Prophetic tradition (*ḥadīth*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Al-Qur'an al-Karim

Armstrong, Amatullah. (1416/1995). *Sufi Terminology (al-Qamus al-Sufi) the Mystical Language of Islam*. Kuala Lumpur: A.S. Noordeen.

al-Attas, Syed Muhammad Naquib, 1966. *Raniri and the Wujudiyyah of 17th Century Acheh*, Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch Royal Asiatic Society.

_____. 1970. *The Mysticism of Hamzah Fansuri*. Kuala Lumpur: University Malaya.

Daudi, Ahmad. 1983. *Allah & Manusia dalam Konsepsi Sheikh Nuruddin al-Raniri*, (Jakarta: CV Rajawali)

Fathurahman, Oman. 1999. *Tanbih al-Mashi :Menyoal Wahdat al-Wujūd*. Bandung: Mizan.

Hadi, Abdul WM. 1995. *Hamzah Fansuri: Risalah Tasawuf dan Puisi-Puisinya.* Bandung: Mizan.

_____. 2001. *Tasawuf yang Tertindas: Kajian Hermeneutik terhadap Karya-Karya Hamzah Fansuri.* Jakarta: Paramadina.

HAMKA. 1994. *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya.* Jakarta: Pustaka Panjimas.

Hilmī, Muhammad Mustafā. 1984. *Al-Hayāh al-Rūhiyyah fī al-Islām.* Misr: al-Hay'ah al-Misriyyah al-'Āmmah li al-Kitāb.

Ibn ʿArabī, Muhammad ibn ʿAlī. 1293 H. *Al-Futūḫāt al-Makkiyyah*. Al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Kātib al-ʿArabī.

_____. (No date). "Fushūsh al-Ḥikam", in Abū al-ʿUlā ʿAfīfī. *Fushūsh al-Ḥikam wa al-Taʾlīqāt ʿalayh*. Beyrūt: Dār al-Fikr.

Izutsu, Toshihiko. 2007. *The Concept and Reality of Existence*. Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust.

Madkūr, Ibrāhīm. 1969. "Wahdat al-Wujūd bayn Ibn ʿArabī wa Asbīnūzā", in *al-Kitāb al-Tidhkārī: Muhyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī fī al-Dhikrā al-Miʾawiyyah al-Thāminah li Mīlādih (1165-1240 M.)*. (Al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Kātib al-ʿArabī).

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. (1988). *Three Muslim Sages*. Pakistan: Suhail Academy Lahore.

Noer, Kauthar Azhari. 1995. *Ibn ʿArabī: Wahdat al-Wujūd dalam Perdebatan*. Jakarta: Paramadina.

Shihab, Alwi. 2009. *Akar Tasawuf di Indonesia*. Depok: pustaka IIMAN.

ʿAbd al-Raʾuf. *Tanbīh al-Māshi al-Mansūb ilā Tarīq al-Qushāshi*. (Manuscript). A. 101, 113. Jakarta: Perpustakaan Nasional.

_____. *ʿUmdah al-Muhtajīn ilā Sulūk Maslak al-Mufarridīn*. (Manuscript). W. 41. Jakarta: Perpustakaan Nasional.

Soleh, A. Khudori. 2003. *Wacana Baru Filsafat Islam*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Stapa, Zakaria & M. Asin Dollah. 1998. *Islam: Akidah dan Kerohanian*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

_____. 1998. *Tokoh sufi dan Penyelewengan Akidah*. (Kuala Lumpur: Berita Publishing Sdn. Bhd)

Al-Taftāzānī, Abū al-Wafāʾ al-Ghanīmī. 1976. *Al-Madkhal ilā al-Tasawwuf al-Islāmī*. Al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Thaqāfah.

Wan Mohd. Azam bin Mohd. Amin. "Tasawuf Falsafi (Philosophical Sufism) Shāh Wālī Allāh al-Dihlawī," in Abdul Salam Muhamad Shukri (ed.). (2007). *Dimensi Pemikiran Shāh Wālī Allāh al-Dihlawī dan Pengaruhnya di Malaysia*. Gombak: Research Centre, International Islamic University Malaysia, 1st edition.