

## **IBNU TAIMIAH'S OPINION OF THE PRACTICE ZIKIR OF "ALLAH"**

**Abdi Syahril Harahap**

Islamic Edu Early Childhood Department, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia

Corresponding author: [abdisyahril@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id](mailto:abdisyahril@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id)

### **ABSTRACT**

This article discusses about the opinion of Ibnu Taimiah on the Sufi practice of Zikir (by said Allah) Isim Zat as a way of remembrance of Allah SWT Based on the dalil or evidence and arguments that held by him, he judges the practice as a bid'ah which is regarded as makruh. In addition, this article also presents answers on the views of Ibnu Taimiah based on the opinion of prominent Sufi figures in order to argue the validity of the practice of zikir Ismu zat (Allah).

**Keywords:** Ibnu Taimiah, Zikir Ismu Zat, Sufism

### **INTRODUCTION**

Ahmad bin `Abdul-Halim bin Taimiah Hurrani (D.728H.) Better known as Ibnu Taimiah is a scholar who has a critical view or opinion of the practice of remembrance Lafaz "Allah", is a form of remembrance by repeating the mention of lafzul Jalalah "Allah", is a practice that is disputed by some Islamic scholars. Although the problem or dispute about the practice is related to its practice according to the Shari'a, it has become an issue that persists until now, some even consider it to deviate from the teachings of Sufism, not prescribed in Islam, even deviating from what has been taught by the Prophet Muhammad. In connection with that, this article tries to discuss with an in-depth discussion of the opinion of Ibnu Taimiah, who is considered the only scholar who sharply and deeply criticizes the practice of zikir of "Lafaz Allah". To start this discussion, a historical review of the rejection of this practice will be presented to explain the debates and disputes that occur among the scholars.

### **Formulation to the Problem**

In the discussion of writing this paper, the author determines some of the formulations of the problem as stated below:

1. What is the effect of zikir on a person's heart?
2. Many people forbid zikir with the lafaz of Allah
3. There are also many scholars who allow zikir with the lafaz of Allah

### **Purpose of Writing**

The purpose of this writing has the following objectives:

1. In order to know the law of thought by using the word of God
2. How can one draw one closer to God.
3. Can know the opinion of Imam Ibn Tamiyah

### **Writing Benefit**

The benefits of this paper are expected to make a useful contribution both theoretically and practically, about the importance of thinking to Allah using the lafaz of Allah. This is because it is important to know the law of Shari'a to think with the lafaz of Allah and to know the correct law on this subject.

### **Theoretical Benefit**

For the author himself, it is hoped that by doing this writing, it can add insight into science in the field of spiritual power to fortify the human soul from the influence of zikir - zikir which violates the qur'an and hadith that is not exemplified by the Prophet Muhammad SAW.

### **Practical Benefit**

- a. The results of this paper are expected to increase the knowledge of writers in the spiritual field, especially in the field of Sufism, as well as provide knowledge to the public about the magnitude of the benefits of Sufism in society..
- b. Contribute the minds and knowledge of the previous scholars in solving problems related to Sufism matters that often occur in the lives of people in various countries.

### **METHODS**

As a review of the literature, the method used in this writing is more elective, namely a combination of qualitative and keritis analysis. This kind of research method is proposed with the intention of providing guidelines and directions in studying works that are philosophically charged and understand about the object under study. This research has the object of case studies as field research (field research), namely research that is directly carried out or on respondents.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **A Historical Review of the Rejection of the Practice of Zikir Lafaz "Allah"**

Throughout the author's reading of the practice of remembrance of Lafaz "Allah" or Isim zat, from the first century of hijrah to the sixth century of hijrah, problems and cases of rejection of this practice were seen as not being written, recorded and discussed in the works of Islamic scholars. In fact, most of them recommend the practice (Majmu'ah : TT). The issue of remembrance of isim substances appears in a note at the beginning of the seventh century of hijrah, namely at the time of Imam Haramain `Izzuddin bin `Abd al-Salam (D. 660H.), who was once asked about the remembrance of Isim Zat, is his position on par with the pronouncement of the remembrance of Subhanallah, Alhamdulillah, Allahu *Akbar* and like or something like that? He formulated this practice as something that is bid'ah which is not recorded and narrated that it was practiced by the Messenger of Allah or one of the companions, tabi'in or tabi'u tabi'in or better known as the Salaf. According to him, the recitation of remembrance should be prescribed in a complete and understandable verse structure. In addition, the nature of remembrance that is prescribed by the Shari'ah needs to be sourced and explained from the Qur'an and al-Sunnah or also the collection of remembrance of the Prophets (Mawahib : 1986).

Towards the eighth century of hijrah, Ibnu Taimiah reopened the issue and then debated it in his writings. In this case, he gave a fatwa for remembrance using the Lafaz "Allah" is not prescribed under any circumstances and there is no information from the Qur'an, hadith or any of the salaf scholars who follow that indicate whether the practice is circumscribed or must be practiced. What's more to classify it as zikir lafaz "Allah" is for people in a special rank (khawas) who have a closeness to Allah. On the other hand, he argues that those who say so, they are Dholalah or misguided people (Ibnu Tamiyah : 2010). In addition, according to him, this practice is a door to various forms of heresy, and opens the way for various despicable traits such as the state of followers of the sect.sect of zindik experts, expert on inspiration and ittihad (Itihad : 2000), or practiced by the heretical group, the wahdahtul embodiment group (ibnu tamiyah : 2010) or also a form of misguidance of later people who were very wrong (Ibnu Tamiyah : 2010).

Starting from the eighth century and after, the absurdity of the necessity of this practice was heralded into an issue of the times until now. For example, the presence of Ibn al-Qayyim (D.751H.) later reaffirmed Ibnu Taimiah's views on this issue (al – Qayyim : 1994). Among the Islamic figures who opposed the practice of zikir Ismu Zat after Ibnu Qayyim were al-Khatib al-Sharbini (D.977H.) (al-Sharbini : 1975), who have refused the practice from being

carried out on the grounds of saying Allah is muftada '(subject) which requires khabar (predicate) based on language aspect (Al – Munawi : 2000).

Taking another example, al-San`ani (D.1182H.) due to the same issue criticizing the practice regarding characterizing its practitioners as soldiers of the devil, cursed by Allah and being the biggest donkey in this world besides being tricked by the devil. In this modern era, the Fatwa Council of Lajnah al-Da'imah li al-Buhuth al-'Ilmiyyah wa al-Ifta' in Saudi Arabia has announced a fatwa, including answering questions related to Islamic views on the practice of zikir Ism al-Zat in the Tarekat of Naqsyabandiyah Order. The fatwa states that zikir Ismu zat as is usually practiced by tarekat experts is an heretical practice, in fact it is an evil because it is not based on the arguments of the Qur'an and al-Sunnah. .

According to the author's response, Ibn Taymiyyah was the first character to develop a heretical view of the practice of Ismu Zat ziikr, so that it became a follow-up to later generations who also characterized it as a case of heresy. This response can be proven, if the fact that `Izzu Din even preceded Ibnu Taimiah in converting the practice of zikir, but his fatwa has been re-examined by the scholars' afterwards<sup>1</sup> and found `Izzuddin himself has made a statement that the zikir of Ismu zat a mubah and specifically for practitioners of zikir at the rank of al-Munta*i*, that is, someone who has come to know and closed to God.

Referring to these two contradictory views, it is understood that `Izzuddin has passed two levels of scientific discipline, namely the discipline of fiqh and the discipline of Sufism. When he was involved and was in the era of the discipline of fiqh before accompanying his contemporaries Sufis, he considered the practice of zikir Ismu Zat is not required by Syarak, instead it is heresy. His attitude towards the practice then changed when he began to accompany and study with Sufi sheikhs, and accepted the bay`ah of the Sufism practice from them, as he is reported to have received bay`ah from Sheikh Shihabuddin al-Suhrawardi and received spiritual guidance along with Sufi etiquette from Sheik Abu Hasan al-Shaziili (Al – Subki : 1964).

In this case, al-Sha`rani ever recorded the attitude of `Izzuddin before doing charity with the Sufism order, among others he had reported the charges of `Izzuddin who said: "Everyone claims that there is one way to convey it to Allah other than the way that we have highlighted, indeed he has committed a lie against Allah". This fact exposed his inconsistent attitude towards the existence of the Sufism order at that time. However, after studying with Abual-Hasan al-shadhili, he stated that all this time: "We have wasted our life in the hijab" (Al Shabni : 2000).

Differences in attitudes and views on the same issue have become a habit that applies to some scholars'. This situation occurs depending on several factors, including the factor of association and assistance with experts in a field of science as happened to `Izzuddin. Among them refer to something that is measured and assessed from different perceptions. Taking the same example, `Izzuddin is reported to have attributed Ibnu `Arabia is a zindik. However, when one of his students asked who was Qutb at that time, his answer was Ibnu `Arabi. In this case, `Izzuddin issue two contradictory facts against an individual who must be accounted for. Each of these facts is certainly based on different dimensions because it involves two contradictory views, namely disbelief and faith which cannot be applied simultaneously to an individual at the same time.

When asked why he held such a view, he replied: "So that I can maintain the Zahir Syarak". The answer clearly shows the attitude of `Izzuddin against Ibnu `Arabia is a believer knows Allah at a high level. Only Ibnu `Arabi He is considered a zindik if he refers to several facts

in his work which in Zahir Syarak is a prodigy if it is not interpreted to the true meaning. In order to maintain the integrity of Zahir Syarak, this attitude is emphasized to prevent people from reading such works. This is because, people who do not understand the real will of the author, may fall into the valley of disbelief due to the misguided element resulting from a misunderstanding of their reality.

Therefore, `Izzuddin should not be considered as the first figure to develop an heretical understanding of the practice of zikir Ismu Zat, as the response to Ibnu Taimiah. In fact, independent records reaffirm this response because as far as the author's research, there has not been a single record or work proving whether Ibnu Taimiah has retracted the fatwa issued by him regarding the issue of ziki Ismu Zat or issue another fact that justifies the practice as happened to `Izzuddin. This at least shows his consistent attitude in related issues, in fact supports the author's response to it.

### **Ibnu Taimiah's Opinion And Criticism of The Practice Of Zikir Ismu Zat**

In this case, Ibnu Taimiah is of the view that there is not a single text of the Qur'an and authentic Hadith that recommends remembrance of Allah SWT which clearly and specifically mentions the practice of zikir Ismu Zat. For example, it is not recommended in the Qur'an or Hadith to literally order remembrance such as: "Remember Allah by mentioning Allah..Allah.. or the best remembrance that is done is the remembrance of Allah.. Allah.. Allah." Or at least the practice of the scholars of the Salaf that may be followed. On the other hand, all forms of remembrance that are prescribed by Allah in various acts of worship such as prayer, call to prayer, hajj, celebrations and so on are referred to in one complete verse structure and are perfect in meaning from a grammatical point of view, and are not just called by a single incomplete name. like Allah..Allah or Hu.Hu.

In Arabic and Malay, a complete verse structure is intended to include at least one subject and one predicate, that is, the combination of the two results in a complete meaning understood by the listener, unlike the verse structure which depends on its meaning causing the listener to wonder about it. Ibn Taymiyyah has made an analogy to the practitioner of dhikr al-Isim al-Dhat whose position is like a Bilal chanting the call to prayer saying "Ashhadu anna Muhammadan Rasulallah" by lining up on the words "Rasul". At that time, an Arab heard the call to prayer and asked: "What did Bilal say? He only mentions the subject, where does the predicate go (which complements the conversation?)" (Ibnu Taimiyah : 1999). In elaborating on this issue, Ibnu Taimiah has carried out an analysis of the Qur'an and Hadith from the aspect of recitation of remembrance which is recommended to prove his view is in line with the statements of the two sources. The verses that he presented are as the words of Allah Ta'ala:

سبح اسم ربك الأعلى

*Glorify and purify the name of your most high God (from all the qualities of deficiency).*

And the word of Allah SWT:

فسبح باسم ربك العظيم

*Therefore - (O negligent) - glorify by praising the name of your Lord, the Most Great (as gratitude for His favors).*

And His words again:

واذكر اسم ربك و تتبلا اليه تتبلا

*And call (with your tongue and heart) the name of your Lord (continuously day and night), and heap (your deeds of worship) to Him with a full focus.*

According to Ibnu Taimiah, the directive to mention the name of God in these verses and the like need to be applied in complete verse structure like someone said "Bismillah (in the name of Allah), or *Subhana Rabbiya al-A`la* (Glory to my Lord Most High), *Subhana Rabbiya al-`Azim* (Glory to my Lord the Most Great) and the like. In addition, he also uses Hadith to prove the truth of his views such as the words The Messenger of Allah meant: "The best of four things are:

سبحان الله , والحمد لله , ولا اله الا الله والله أكبر

As well as the words of His Majesty which means: "The best remembrance is لا له لا الله". He added, the descriptions of the Qur'an and Hadith are in line with the use of Arabic. This is because the concept of al-kalimah in Arabic grammar, which is also applied in al- The Qur'an and the Hadith are composed of one complete verse structure. Thus, it is evident that the zikir of Allah which is prescribed from the sources of the Qur'an and al-Sunnah should be in a complete verse arrangement.

According to Ibnu Taimiah again, the importance of mentioning remembrance in a complete verse structure is because if something remembrance is said without it, such as repeating the words of Allah..Allah or Hu..Hu.. it will not be able to trigger *ma`rifah* (knowing Allah) that is useful and things (nature) of faith that can be used by its practitioners. According to him again, based on logical evidence, *Ismu Zat* is lafaz solely has nothing to do with the aspect of making someone a believer or disbeliever, getting *hidayat* or going astray, knowledgeable or ignorant, in addition to the lafaz it also doesn't explain anything the meaning of directives and prohibitions. The position is the same as someone mentioning one of the names of the prophets such as Harun..Harun.., or the name of the pharaoh, so that if one mentions one of the names of idols such as al-Lat..al-Lat... Moreover, according to he,

Based on this principle, Ibn Taymiyyah is of the view that someone who mentions the name "Allah", "Allah" even though there are a million times, or a disbeliever repeats Allah's words..Allah all his life until the end of his life, (Ibnu Tamiyah : 1999) he will not be a believer, nor will he be entitled to a reward from Allah nor enter His paradise.

In fact, according to al-San`ani, the repetition of the name of Allah in practice is considered as humiliating Allah SWT. The parable is the same as a prominent figure named Zayd who is mentioned by name, "Zayd..Zayd" repeatedly by a group of people around him. The act was considered an insult and ridicule against him. In addition, he is of the view that there are also among the disbelievers among mankind who only mention the lafaz "Allah" It's just whether they agree to the existence and oneness of Allah or vice versa. Therefore, according to al-San'ani, Syarak has determined that the prescribed remembrance must be revealed in at least one complete verse structure, which is understood by both the performer and the listener. This kind of remembrance will allow a person to receive rewards, be able to know and approach God, in addition to feeling love and fear of Him and being able to reach various levels of perfect faith.

However, one problem arises regarding the discussion above, namely the possibility of feeling love and raising Allah or for example as an impression rather than mentioning or hearing the pronunciation of *Ismu Zat*. In this regard, Ibnu Taimiah made a comment that matters of faith which consist of love, fear of Allah and so on are indeed prescribed, but it does not mean that mentioning the word "Allah" is merely one thing that is circumscribed. According to him, when one word is expressed, the perpetrator or the listener has shocked



the state of a light heart. However, according to him, such a state of the heart may also be shocked when hearing about unlawful or makruh matters. He took the example of an individual Muslim when he heard someone berating or committing shirk against Allah, his heart would rebel, feel very hate and angry with the perpetrator, then arouse a sense of love for God and a feeling of wanting to defend his religion. This matter of faith was termed by the Prophet Muhammad as Sarih al-Iman, which is an answer to the absurdity proposed by some of the Companions about the feeling of hatred for reciting the words of kufr which the devil is wary of in their hearts (Muslim : 1977).

However, Ibnu Taimiah is of the opinion that this Hadith does not mean that Syara' should suggest someone to have or practice misgivings that contribute to the hatred of kufr. Or also, a sin that can cause a sense of repentance to the perpetrator, does not mean that the sin was ordered by Syarak. This view is reaffirmed by the words of Allah SWT:

*They are also the ones who were told by the people (the news bearers) to them: "That the people (unbelievers) have gathered an army to fight you, so you must attack them."MThen the news added to their faith and said: "Allah is sufficient for (helping) us, and He is the best of administrators (whom it is up to Him for all our affairs)".*

The verse above describes the increase in the faith of the companions of the Prophet Muhammad which resulted in an impression of the enemy's claim against them. However, initiating an enemy's claim against the believer is not something that is prohibited in Islam. In a case like this, Ibnu Taimiah establishes a method to distinguish a matter whether it is prohibited or vice versa, namely a cause that needs to be seen, whether the cause acts as a source of goodness or not. If it is a source of goodness such as various pious practices and al-Kalimat al-Tayyibah (the collection of remembrance is prescribed), that matter is definitely characterized as a bearer of goodness, mercy and reward, then it is prohibited. The strength of belief and faith that exists in a believer will increase with his presence. On the contrary, If a thing acts as the cause of an action that is not prescribed, for example an unlawful, makruh and obligatory act by a jinn or a human, or the cause is a natural disaster that is destined by Allah to befall one of His servants, if these various matters are exposed to a believer, he will spark the awareness of faith and confidence that is already in him, then add the believer's faith regarding it. Even so, the related cause is not at all loved, praised or required to do so because it is not considered a source of goodness. or also the cause is in the form of a natural disaster that is destined by Allah to befall a servant of His which when various matters are exposed to a believer, he will spark the awareness of faith and confidence that is already in him, then add to the faith of the believer regarding it. Even so, the related cause is not at all loved, praised or required to do so because it is not considered a source of goodness. or also the cause is in the form of a natural disaster that is destined by Allah to befall a servant of His which when various matters are exposed to a believer, he will spark the awareness of faith and confidence that is already there in him, then add to the believer's faith regarding it. Even so, the related cause is not at all loved, praised or required to do so because it is not considered a source of goodness.

According to Ibnu Taimiah's research, it is possible that the practitioner of zikir Ismu zat .have followed the actions of a previous sheikh as reported to apply to al-Shibli (D. 334H.). When asked why he said "Allah..Allah", he replied because I was afraid to die in a state between the nafs and ithbat, which is to die in a state of not having time to say the sentence *La ilaha illa allah* perfectly, on the contrary died in a state only had time to say *La* or *La IllaHa* or *Lallaha Illa* just fine.

According to Ibnu Taimiah, this view should not be reasonable to rely on to require practice regarding the situation experienced by al-Shibli is the result of the power of faith that has

taken control of his soul so that he is in a state beyond control to even mention such an expression. In Ibnu Taimiah's opinion again, al-Shibl's actions This can be considered as a misconduct that should not be followed, even though Allah has forgiven him because of the nature of his truth and the persistence of his faith, apart from his uncontrolled condition. Ibnu Taimiah justifies that the situation experienced by al-Shibli probably caused him to go crazy and had to be hospitalized with his beard shaved off.

According to Ibnu Taimiah again, Zikir Ismu Zat may encourage someone who practices it towards understanding hulul and ittihad because when practicing it, a person will go through a stage of understanding that the existence of oneself and the existence of Allah is only one. Therefore, this case violates the Islamic creed. According to him again, if judged from the Syara' aspect, someone who says *La ilaha illa allah* a moment later he dies before he finishes reciting the noble sentence, then the situation does not harm the dead. This is because all the deeds and deeds of each convert are dependent on the intentions of each based on the Hadith of the Messenger of Allah, even given to the dead what he intended.

Referring to several other Hadith sources, it is narrated that the Messenger of Allah himself had mentally convinced His Majesty's brothers, Abu Talib with *La ilaha illa allah* (Ibnu Hanbl : 1975) and also the Hadith which suggests "Who is the end of the conversation *La ilaha illa allah, then he will go to heaven*". (Al : Tammi ; 1993) Half of the narrations also say: "Whoever dies believing in *La ilaha illa allah, will enter heaven*" and there are several other narrations that state the advantages of mentioning that sentence.

In this case, the thing that Ibnu Taimiah wants to highlight is the remembrance of the Prophet recommended by *La ilaha illa allah* and not zikir Ismu Zat and this shows that remembrance is not a practice recommended by Syara. In addition, the hadiths stated above also do not indicate that if a person dies and does not have time to even recite this noble sentence, then his death is not perfect or does not enter heaven. In fact, the combination of various Hadith narrations above explains; someone who is nazak in a state of belief in the meaning of *La ilaha illa Allah*, if he ends his life with the noble sentence, whether he has time to complete the reading or vice versa, he is still included in the Hadith promise, that is, he will be admitted to heaven.

In his final commentary, Ibnu Taimiah has emphasized that all news about the practice of zikir Ismu Zat reported than individuals such as AbuYazid, al-Nuri, al-Shiblii and for example, their situation when they say the lafaz needs to be considered as someone who is in a state of being out of control and not doing it with effort. Their spiritual and personal things have proven this. In fact, the sheikhs who have stages of spiritual maturity, faith and piety that are more firm and perfect than these individuals have been found to never make dhikr but use the form of remembrance contained in the complete verse structure.

However, according to Ibnu Taimiah again, someone who calls Ismu Zat in an atmosphere beyond the control capacity, the act should not be punished as makruh. His reason is that faith is the result of the practice of remembrance that fills the soul of the perpetrator so that sometimes it is difficult for someone to recite the sentence of remembrance perfectly, what is easier for him is to just say Ism al-Dhatsolely. However, to anyone who is allowed to do remembrance using the form of remembrance in the complete verse structure, but has dhikr with dhikr Ism al-Dhat, then the law of the practice of remembrance is bid'ah, that is makruh.

### **Reviews and Comments on Ibnu Taimiah's Views**

The overall view of Ibn Taimiah regarding the practice of zikir Ismu Zat it can be concluded that he has dealt with this issue by basing his views and arguments based on the Qur'an and Hadith, as well as presenting some logical arguments to support his views. The

analysis was carried out by him through the two authoritative sources to prove that the remembrance of Syara's recommendation should be in a complete verse structure, producing a perfect meaning and not a single word that does not bring up an idea of meaning that can be understood. In addition, he tries to prove that all the arguments of the Qur'an and Hadith that have been put forward do not show that the practice of zikir is Ismu Zat that. This proof prompted him to fatwa the practice of zikir Ismu Zat is a matter of bid'ah and the law of practicing it is makruh.

However, a matter that attracts attention is Ibnu Taimiah in proving the necessity of practicing zikir Ismu Zat have equated the pronunciation of Allah which is pronounced singly with other lafaz-lafaz which is also pronounced singly such as lafaz fir'aun, idols of al-Lat, Musa etc. This situation shows as if someone who mentions the word *Allah..Allah* repeatedly is the same as saying the sentence al-Lat..*al-Lat*, as long as it is not in a complete verse arrangement. In this case, his view can be answered based on several things:

First, each utterance shows a meaning that is understood separately known as *ifadah ifradiyyah* as a complete verse which also shows an idea of meaning that can be understood structurally and it is known as *ifadah Tarkibiyyah* (Alwi : 1992). These two forms carry meanings that can be understood from different scopes. A word, even though it is not in the complete verse structure, does not mean that the pronunciation does not show its own meaning that can be understood. In this context, the pronunciation of *Allahis* in category *ifadah ifradiyyah*, which is a word that shows the meaning of the substance of Allah SWT which is *Wujud Haqiqi*, includes all the meanings of the nature of Uluhiyyah, Rububiyyah and all the qualities of praise. In this case, Abu Hanifah, who is the founder of the Hanafi school, once stated that the pronunciation of Allah's name itself supports the meaning of Ta'zim (majesty) to Allah. In connection with that, according to him, someone who starts the prayer is sufficient to carry out Takbirat al-Ihram by saying Allah alone and the prayer is valid (Al Kasani : 1982). When lafaz al-Lat also shows the name of the idol worshiped by the polytheists who were created to associate partners with Allah. If so, the word Allah's name is a noble pronunciation that includes a very deep meaning compared to the word al-Lat, which is an insulting word when referring to the meaning of the idols created by the polytheists. Therefore, someone who repeats the words of Allah..Allah singly, even though from the aspect of the structure of the verse it is incomplete for the listener to understand, but it will surely impress the heart of the person who does a good faith thing as a result of understanding and imagining the meaning of the noble lafaz. . On the other hand, someone who mentions al-Lat.. al-Lat in the same way, the meaning of lafaz regarding at least will tread in the heart of the perpetrator without realizing it will give a negative impression on him.

Second, the pronunciation of *Allah..Allah* referred to by someone with a specific intention and not by accident. Therefore, a believer who makes remembrance calls Allah should not be equated with the words of someone who is not Muslim. Ibnu Taimiah's view that someone who repeats the word *Allah* a million times will not make him a believer, it is acceptable if the 'someone' that is meant is an infidel who wants to embrace Islam. So it is not sufficient for him to recite *Allah* only because it is not understood as proof of his Islamic confession. However, the point of discussion here is that a Muslim believer makes remembrance of Allah SWT. Therefore, this fact is not appropriate to be addressed to these Muslims.

Third, Ibnu Taimiah is seen as proficient in the subtleties of Arabic grammar when dealing with issues like this. In his expansion, he related the issue of zikir Ismu zat, his writing imagines as if there is no space at all in the Arabic grammar rules justifying the use of the word *Allah* referred to outside of the complete paragraph structure. While referring to the well-known Arabic grammar rules used, a single lafaz may become a complete verse if it is



assumed (*taqdir*) there are other words whose pronunciation is removed (*al-mahdhuf*) which complements the meaning of the relevant single lafaz. A lot of *taqdir* can be matched to lafaz *Allah* coincides with the rules of the Arabic language. Among them, such as "Allah depend on Him in all my movements"; "Allah Nur of the heavens and the earth" or Allah with meaning *Ya Allah* and others.

Fourth, the equation made by Ibnu Taimiah, if it is assumed to be true, he only relies on the grammatical laws of conversation according to linguists only. It is not appropriate to be associated with the Sharia law to convert this practice because it refers to the noble words of Allah which supports the meaning of the majesty and perfection of Allah SWT

Referring to the method used by Ibnu Taimiah to distinguish a cause as a source of goodness or not, it can also be answered with other accusations. Even though in his view the act of repeating Allah's words is a matter of *makruh*, it does not mean that Allah's words themselves cannot be a source of goodness, mercy or rewards. On the other hand, Allah's word is the best of names and indeed He is the source of all grace and goodness. From another angle, Ibnu Taimiah's response to the matter of faith as a sense of the prescribed faith, is actually the result of a person's appreciation in the next remembrance of Allah rather than repeating the title of the noble lafaz. In fact, it is more than just a matter of awakening the sensitive conscience as is alleged.

In addition, Ibnu Taimiah is also seen as having equalized the position of "hearing the pronunciation of Allah" by "hearing insults and shirk against Allah" because by hearing these two things it is thought that it can raise the awareness of the hearts of those who hear. In this case, there is no denying that conscientiousness may result from the two causes, but such an attitude is an outrageous attitude that should not be equated. Logically, although something like shirk to Allah may play a role in raising awareness of faith in one's heart, it is *munasabah* that is decided as "the cause that is the cause of goodness and mercy" because the act of shirk itself is discouraged and hated by Islam based on several verses of the Qur'an and Hadith. In contrast to the position of lafaz Allah when heard, in addition to being the originator of conscience, it should also be characterized as a source of goodness and mercy because the suggestions and demands of remembrance of Allah are touched upon in the Qur'an and Hadith. In fact, there is no prohibition against mentioning the name of Allah singly and repeatedly as discussed.

Ibnu Taimiah's view which presents Syarak's view on issues related to the reality of al-Shibli can be agreed. However, due to the fact of al-Shibli, a different dimension from that understood by Ibnu Taimiah may be suggested. The fact of al-Shibli in the last issue is not seen as denying the Syarak law as understood by Ibnu Taimiah himself. The implied meaning to be expressed in the reality of al-Shibli is the extreme shame (*al-haya'*) to Allah if he (al-Shibli) meets his Beloved (Allah) in a state of reciting the word *nafi* against Him. This situation applies when the matter of faith fills a person's heart so that there is no room in his heart, even for a moment, a path meaning partner for Allah that needs to be denied, apart from the sense of being, His perfection and majesty alone. Therefore, the remembrance person who is in such a state will only mention Allah..Allah. So, this is one of the perfections of the meaning of shame (*al-haya'*) to Allah which is bestowed upon the servant whom He wills.

Thus, the fact that al-Shibli has displayed a peak of perfection in faith is not a situation that shows him in a state of out-of-control as alleged. In addition, individuals recognized by Ibnu Taimiah himself such as al-Junaid are reported to have justified the practice based on his facts. (Hamid Ibrahim : 1970) and his pledge to the actions of al-Nuri and al-Shibli (Al – Kalabadhi 2001). Al-Junaid's confession, which is corroborated by Abu Hanifah's view that

both of them are scholars of the salaf (al-salaf al-salih) at the same time rejects Ibnu Taimiah's accusation that the salaf denied this practice.

A little review of the accusation that the practice of zikir Ismu Zat may plunge a person into the valley of the understanding of Hulul and Ittihad. In essence, the practice is not a contributing factor to this understanding. Fitnah that many Sufis fall into the understanding of Hulul and Ittihad as an impression of various practices of heresy that are not permitted, has prompted Ibnu Taimiah to connect the practice of zikir Ismu Zat with this understanding. His accusation is that the practice of khalwah (seclusion to worship) carried out by the Sufis in addition to chanting Allah..Allah continuously so that it is able to empty the memory of other things and the focus of the heart becomes one may invite the presence of Satan who sneaks into the heart, However, it is an unfair and inappropriate matter according to academic assessment if the tohmahan is made into a general view of the Sufis.

Naturally, such problems need to be researched in the discipline of Sufi discipline according to the perspective of the Sufis themselves. Taking the example of al-Ghazali who is considered by Ibnu Taimiah as a strong supporter of this method of practicing heresy,he didn't mean to focus and empty memory of everything as indicted. On the other hand, the focus of the heart is meant only to Allah alone, in addition to rejecting any form of interference from all the five senses and the path of the heart other than Allah. More importantly than that, all related practice activities should be under the care and supervision of a teacher who has the character to guide them (Al – Gazhali : 1986). If it is assumed that Ibnu Taimiah's accusations were really valid in his time, then of course the practice that was carried out was considered to have strayed from the actual practice according to the Sufism scholars themselves. Therefore, this case should not be used as a general measure in making punishments for the Sufis, instead criticism should focus on the mistakes of the perpetrators in particular because they have deviated from the actual practice methods recommended by them.

The term wihdah al-Manifest carries the meaning of the unity of the form of God and creatures as understood by Ibnu Taimiah is an understanding that has also been agreed as misguided by the Sufism scholars. If you trace back the various facts of Sufism figures such as al-Junaid, al-Sulami, al-Qushayri, al-Ghazali and others, no one in their circle is found to have such understanding or acceptance of such an understanding. On the contrary, they are the pioneers who oppose these misconceptions through their works.their work. Therefore, it would be a mistake to associate understanding *upstream* and ittihad or wihdah al-Manifest as a symbol of the heresy of the tarekat and Sufism. In fact, the accusations leveled against the Sufi scholars and Sufis, as presented by Ibnu Taimiah, have indirectly accused many parties of being kufr, which excluded them from the Islamic religious ties. This is because the scientific disciplines of Sufism and the tarekat have never acknowledged the truth of this understanding in any Sufism practice carried out by its practitioners.

## CONCLUSION

Ibnu Taimiah is a figure who is seen as making the most analysis and criticism of the fairness of the practice of zikir Ismu aZat according to Syarak. Ibnu Taimiah's criticism of him is based on his special understanding of the Qur'an and Hadith and not based on arguments.*sarugh*(real) than both who forbid or hate the practice. Therefore, he was found not to have presented various arguments accepted by Sufism experts to be analyzed thoroughly when making a decision to reject the practice in question. The cause of the criticism is seen to be focused on two main aspects, namely, there is no source of evidence from the Qur'an, Hadith and Salaf scholars to rely on; and second is the position of lafaz zikir regarding not being in a complete verse structure. Referring to the second aspect, they were found not to have explored aspects of the Arabic language extensively to be

discussed in related issues as if it did not open up space to require the practice of *Ismu Zat* according to *Syarak*. The attitude that was highlighted by him in the issue of error seemed not to have mercy on the other views that were put forward. This attitude can be understood through the style of language used against the practitioners by labeling them as "a heretical group", "the error of later people", "very wrong", "the heretical munkar", "the sect of *zindik* and illegitimate people". *had*", "the *wihdah al-Manifest* group", "the devil's army is cursed by Allah", and so on. In dealing with the problem of mistakes, rejection of a view should not be associated with accusations of *fasiq*, *bid'ah* or *kufr* against someone because each party has a basis for their views. As long as the *hujah-hujah* is legal within the scope of the final method of law-making among Islamic scholars, then this view is a matter of *ijtihad* that needs to be respected.

## REFERENCES

- Abi Luay, Walid bin Mahmud bin Hasan (tt), *al-Mafahim al-Muthla fi Zilal Sharh Asma' Allah Ta'ala al-Husna*, ttp: tp.
- Al-`Alawi, Ahmad bin Mustafa (1992), *al-Qawl al-Mu`tamad fi Mashru`iyyah al-Dhikr bi al-`Ism al-Mufrad*, Morocco: al-Matba`ah al-`Alawiyyah bi Mustaghanam.
- Al-Bajuri, Ibrahim (tt), *Sharh Jawharat al-Tawhid*, ttp: tp.
- Al-Bayhaqi, Ahmad bin al-Husayn bin `Ali bin Musa Abu Bakr (1994), *Sunan al-Bayhaqi al-Kubra, `Ata, Muhammad `Abd al-Qadir (tahqiq)*, Mecca: Maktabah Dar al-Baz.
- Al-Bukhari (1987), *Sahih al-Bukhari, Vol. 6, Bugha, Mustafa Adib (tahqiq)*, Beirut: Dar al-Kathir.
- Al-Dawsari, Husayn bin Ahmad (tt), *al-Rahmah al-Habitah fi al-Dhikr Ism al-al-Dhat wa al-Rabitah*, ttp: tp.
- Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid Muhammad bin Muhammad (1986), *Ihya' `Ulum al-Din, Vol. 3*, Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid Muhammad bin Muhammad (1988M./1409H.), *Majmu`ah Rasa'il al-Imam al-Ghazali, Kimiya' al-Sa`adah, Vol. 5*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid Muhammad bin Muhammad (tt), *al-Maqсад al-Asna fi Sharh Ma`ani Asma' Allah al-Husna, al-Khusht, Muhammad `Uthman (tahqiq)*, Kaherah: Maktabah al-Qur'an .
- Ibn `Abidin, Muhammad Amin bin `Umar(2000), *Hashiyah Radd al-Muhtar `ala al-Durr al-Mukhtar: Sharh Tanwir al-Absar, Vol. 1*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.
- Ibn `Ashur, Muhammad al-Tahir (tt), *Tafsir al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir, Vol. 1*, Tunis: Dar al-Tunisiyyah li al-Nasr.
- Ibn `Ata'Allah al-Sakandari, Abu al-Fadl Taj al-Din Ahmad bin Muhammad bin `Abd al-Karim (tt), *Lata'if al-Minan, c. 2*. Kaherah: Dar al-Ma`arif.
- Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, Muhammad bin Abi Bakr Ayyub al-Zar`i Abu `Abd Allah (1994), *Tariq al-Hijratayn wa Bab al-Sa`adatayn, Abu `Umar, `Umar bin Mahmud (tahqiq)*, Dammam: Dar Ibn al-Qayyim.

- Ibn Hanbal, Ahmad (1975), al-Musnad, Vol. 18, Shakir, Ahmad Muhammad (tahqiq), Kaherah: Dar al-Ma`arif.
- Ibn Taymiyyah, Taqi al-Din Ahmad bin `Abd Halim (1999), al-`Ubudiyyah, al-`Alami Khalid `Abd al-Latif (tahqiq), Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-`Arabi.
- Ibn Taymiyyah, Taqi al-Din Ahmad bin `Abd Halim (tt), al-Radd `ala al-Mantiqiyyin. Beirut: Dar al-Ma`rifah.
- Ibn Taymiyyah, Taqi al-Din Ahmad bin `Abd Halim (tt), Majmu` al-Fatawa, Vol. 10. ttp:tp. `Isa, `Abd al-Qadir (2001), Haqa'iq `an al-Tasawwuf, Syria: Dar al-`Irfan.
- Jumu`ah, `Ali (tt), al-Bayan lima Yushghil al-Adhhan, Kaherah: al-Maqtam li al-Nasr wa al-Tawzi`.
- Al-Jurjani, Abu al-Hasan `Ali bin Muhammad bin `Ali al-Husayni (2000), al-Ta`rifat, Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Kalabadhi, Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Ishaq (2001), al-Ta`arruf li Madhhab Ahl al-Tasawwuf, Shams al-Din, Ahmad (tahqiq), Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Kasani al-Hanafi, `Ala' al-Din Abu Bakr bin Mas`ud (1982), Bada'i` al-Sana'i` fi Tartib al-Shara'i`, Vol. 2, Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-`Arabi.
- Lajnah al-Da'imah li al-Buhuth al-`Ilmiyyah wa al-Ifta' (tt), Fatawa al-Lajnah al-Da'imah-al-Majmu` al-Ula, Vol. 2, al-Duwaysh, Ahmad bin `Abd al-Razzaq (tahqiq), ttp:tp.
- AlMunawi, `Abd al-Ra'uf bin Taj al-`Arifin bin `Ali (tt), al-Kawakib al-Durriyyah fi Tarajim al-Sadah al-Sufiyyah, Vol. 4, Himadan, `Abd Hamid Salih (tahqiq), Kdirection:al-Maktabah al-Azhariyyahli al-Turath.
- Muslim bin al-Hajjaj Abu al-Husayn al-Naysaburi (tt), Sahih Muslim, Vol. 1, `Abd al-Baqi, Muhammad Fu'ad (tahqiq), Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-`Arabi.
- Al-Naysaburi, Muhammad bin `Abdullah Abu `Abdullah al-Hakim (1990), al-Mustadrak `ala al-Sahihayn, Vol.1, `Ata, Mustafa `Abd al-Qadir (tahqiq), Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Qurtubi, Abu `Abd Allah Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Abi Bakr bin Farh (1372H.), al-Jami` li Ahkam al-Qur'an. vol. 1, Kaherah: Dar al-Sha`b.
- Al-Ra`ini, Abu `Abd Allah Muhammad bin muhammad bin `Abd al-Rahman al-Maghribial-Hatab(1995), *Mawahib al-Jalil fi Sharh Mukhtasar al-Shaykh al-Khalil*, Vol. 8.Beirut:Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah.
- Al-Razi, Fakhr al-Din Muhammad bin `Umar al-Khatib (1990M./1411H.), al-Tafsir al-Kabir aw Mafatih al-Ghayb, Vol.1. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah.
- Rushdi bin Ramli (2005), The Authentic and Targeted Among the Experts of the Order and the Sufis, According to Imam Ahmad Ibn Taymiyyah, One Academic Research, Kuala Lumpur: Prospekta Printers Sdn. Bhd..
- Sakhr, Hamid Ibrahim Ahmad (1970), Nur al-Tahqiq fi Sihhah A`mal al-Tariq, Kaherah: Matba`ah Dar al-Ta'lif.

Al-San`ani, Muhammad bin Isma`il `Amir (tt), *Tathir al-I`tiqad min `Adran al-Ilhad*, ttp: tp.

Al-Sha`rani, Abu al-Mawahib `Abd al-Wahhab bin Ahmad bin `Ali (1997), *al-Yawaqit wa al-Jawahir fi Bayan `Aqa'id al-Akabar*, Vol. 1. Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-`Arabi.

Al-Sha`rani, Abu al-Mawahib `Abd al-Wahhab bin Ahmad bin `Ali (1999), *al-Minan al-Kubra aw Lata'if al-Minan al-Kubra wa al-Ahklaq fi Wujub al-Tahadduth bi Ni`mah Allah `ala al-Itlaq*, al-Badri, Salim Mustafa (tahqiq), Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah.

Al-Subki, Taj al-Din Abu Nasr `Abd al-Wahhab bin `Ali bin `Abd al-Kafi (1964-1976), *Tabaqat al-Shafi`iyyah al-Kubra*, Vol. 8. Kaherah: `Isa al-Babi al-Halabi.

Al-Tamimi, Muhammad Ibn Hibban bin Ahmad Abu Hatim (1993), *Sahih Ibn Hibban*, Vol. 7, al-`Arna'ut, Shu`ayb (tahqiq), Beirut: Mu'assasah al-Risalah.

AlTantawi, `AliAhmad `Abd al-AI (2000), *Bida` al-Sufiyyah wa al-karamat wa al-Mawalids*, Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-`Ilmiyyah.