

Harmonizing *Syarī'ah* and *Ḥaqīqah*: Taimiyyan Epistemological Resonances in Hamka's Reconstruction of *Tasawuf Modern*

Hamdan Maghribi^{1*}, Alfina Hidayah²

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Mas Said Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Internasional Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

*Correspondence: ✉ Hamdan.maghribi@staff.uinsaid.ac.id

<https://doi.org/10.51214/biis.v5i1.1814>

ABSTRACT

Studies of Hamka's Sufism routinely list Ibn Taimiyyah among his influences, yet the relationship has been asserted rather than demonstrated. This article examines how, and on what evidentiary basis, Taimiyyan concerns shape Hamka's reconstruction of *tasawuf*. It reads Hamka's *Tasawuf Modern* (1939), *Perkembangan Tasawuf dari Abad ke Abad* (1952), later republished with his 1958 inaugural lecture as *Tasawuf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, and *Teguran Suci dan Jujur* (1958) alongside Ibn Taimiyyah's *al-'Ubūdiyyah*, *al-Furqān*, *Qā'idah Jalīlah* and *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah's *Madārij al-Sālikīn*, *Zād al-Ma'ād* and *al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib*. Using thematic coding and a four-level evidentiary scale adapted from Quentin Skinner's criteria for influence, the study finds that Hamka refers explicitly to Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim, names *Madārij al-Sālikīn*, *al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib* and *Ighāthat al-Lahfān*, and uses *Zād al-Ma'ād* against spiritual quietism. Convergence appears in four domains: the critique of *wujūdiyyah*, the volitional reading of *fanā'*, the critique of mediated spiritual authority, and the conceptions of *zuhd* and *tawakkul*. Explicit reference supports the criterion of sainthood and the anti-quietist argument; the other convergences are mediated receptions, structural affinities, or parallel developments shaped by the Minangkabau *Kaum Muda*, *al-Manār* reformism, and al-Ghazālī's ethics, which remains the architecture of *Tasawuf Modern*. The article argues that Hamka rearticulated a Taimiyyan epistemology of spiritual validation, in which *syarī'ah* is the criterion of *ḥaqīqah*, largely through Ibn al-Qayyim. It offers a graded model for studying Ibn Taimiyyah's reception in Southeast Asia and complicates the binary between Salafi reformism and Sufism.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: 10-02-2026

Revised: 11-10-2026

Accepted: 13-10-2026

Keywords:

Hamka;
Ibn Taimiyyah;
Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah;
Intellectual Reception;
Neo-Sufism;
Tasawuf Modern.

© 2026 Hamdan Maghribi, Alfina Hidayah



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

A. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between Islamic reformism and Sufism in modern Indonesia has often been framed as a binary. Reformism is associated with scriptural purification, rational religiosity, and the critique of popular devotion, whereas Sufism is associated with interior spirituality, devotional practice, and the authority of the Sufi orders.¹ The intellectual project of Haji Abdul Malik Karim Amrullah, better known as Hamka (1908–1981), does not fit this binary. Hamka was a Muhammadiyah leader, a Qur'anic exegete, a novelist, and a public moralist, and he was also the most widely read Indonesian writer on *tasawuf* in the twentieth

¹ Julia Day Howell, "Sufism and the Indonesian Islamic Revival," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 60, no. 3 (2001): 701–29, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2700107>; Elizabeth Sirriyeh, *Sufis and Anti-Sufis: The Defence, Rethinking and Rejection of Sufism in the Modern World* (London: Routledge, 2014), <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315027388>.

century. He did not reject Sufism. He rebuilt it as an ethical and socially engaged spirituality that could be practiced by Muslims who belonged to no Sufi order.²

Hamka's position was formed in the reformist milieu of Minangkabau. His father, Haji Abdul Karim Amrullah (Haji Rasul), was one of the leading figures of the *Kaum Muda*, whose disputes with the *Kaum Tua* concerned religious authority, ritual practice, the Sufi orders, and the call to return to the Qur'an and Sunnah.³ Hamka's major statements on *tasawuf* emerged from this setting. *Tasawuf Modern* first appeared as a series in the Medan weekly *Pedoman Masyarakat* and was published as a book in 1939.⁴ *Perkembangan Tasawuf dari Abad ke Abad*, dated Jakarta, March 1952, offered a history of Sufism from the Prophet to the eighth Islamic century.⁵ It was later republished together with Hamka's 1958 inaugural lecture as professor of *tasawuf* at the State Islamic College (PTAIN) in Yogyakarta under the title *Tasawuf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*.⁶ In the same year, Hamka wrote *Teguran Suci dan Jujur terhadap Mufti Johor*, a polemical defense of the *Kaum Muda* that sets out, more bluntly than his Sufi treatises, what he rejected in contemporary devotional practice.⁷

Scholarship on Hamka's Sufism has developed along four lines. The first reads Hamka through the ethical Sufism of al-Ghazālī, emphasizing happiness (*bahagia*), moral discipline, and the purification of the soul.⁸ The second places him within Islamic modernism and Neo-Sufism. Khairudin Aljunied has shown how Hamka reoriented Sufism toward the ethical and social concerns of a modernizing Malay world,⁹ and Fathor Rahim and Hasnan Bachtiar have read his thought as an instance of Neo-Sufism.¹⁰ The category itself, however, is contested. Fazlur Rahman coined "neo-Sufism" for a reformed, *syari'ah*-oriented and activist Sufism that he associated with the legacy of Ibn Taimiyyah;¹¹ R. S. O'Fahey and Bernd Radtke argued that the label had hardened into a cliché without adequate textual support,¹² and John Voll later defended a more limited use of it.¹³ The third line approaches Hamka through the language of

² Khairudin Aljunied, "Reorienting Sufism: Hamka and Islamic Mysticism in the Malay World," *Indonesia*, no. 101 (2016): 67–84, <https://doi.org/10.5728/indonesia.101.0067>; Khairudin Aljunied, *Hamka and Islam: Cosmopolitan Reform in the Malay World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2018), <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501724589>; James R. Rush, *Hamka's Great Story: A Master Writer's Vision of Islam for Modern Indonesia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2016), <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.36075907>.

³ Deliar Noer, *The Modernist Muslim Movement in Indonesia, 1900–1942* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1973), 31–56 [Google](#); Sudar, "Ibn Taymiyyah's Theological Influence on Indonesian Muslim Revivalists" (master's thesis, International Islamic University Malaysia, 2014), 27. [Google](#)

⁴ Julia Day Howell, "Indonesia's Salafist Sufis," *Modern Asian Studies* 44, no. 5 (2010): 1045–46, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X09990278>; Hamka, *Tasawuf Modern* (Jakarta: Yayasan Nurul Islam, 1981), front matter (printing history). [Google](#)

⁵ Hamka, *Perkembangan Tasawuf dari Abad ke Abad* (Jakarta: Pustaka Keluarga, 1952). [Google](#)

⁶ Hamka, *Tasawuf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya* (Jakarta: Yayasan Nurul Islam, 1978), publisher's preface. [Google](#)

⁷ Hamka, *Teguran Suci & Jujur terhadap Mufti Johor* (Jakarta: Pustaka Panjimas, 1958), v. [Google](#)

⁸ Muhammed Nur Kaplan and Arif Afandi Zarkasyi, "Purification of Sufism According to Hamka," *Kalimah: Jurnal Studi Agama dan Pemikiran Islam* 22, no. 2 (2024): 141–66, <https://doi.org/10.21111/klm.v22i2.12909>; Fahrudin F. Fahru, "Melacak Kedalaman Tasawuf Modern Hamka di Tengah Arus Modernitas," *Jurnal Penelitian Keislaman* 16, no. 2 (2020): 129–42, <https://doi.org/10.20414/jpk.v16i2.2327>; Hamdan Maghribi, Alfina Hidayah, and Muhammad Wahyudi, "Spiritualitas untuk Modernitas: Analisis Komparatif Tasawuf Hamka dan Hermeneutika Etis Fazlur Rahman," *Spiritualita* 9, no. 2 (2025): 92–109, <https://doi.org/10.30762/spiritualita.v9i2.3286>.

⁹ Aljunied, "Reorienting Sufism"; Aljunied, *Hamka and Islam*. <https://doi.org/10.7591/cornell/9781501724565.001.0001>

¹⁰ Fathor Rahim and Hasnan Bachtiar, "Hamka's Neo-Sufism in the Context Modern Society," *Journal of Social Studies* 19, no. 1 (2023): 1–14, <https://doi.org/10.21831/jss.v19i1.57513>.

¹¹ Fazlur Rahman, *Islam*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979). [Google](#)

¹² R. S. O'Fahey and Bernd Radtke, "Neo-Sufism Reconsidered," *Der Islam* 70, no. 1 (1993): 52–87. <https://doi.org/10.1515/islam.1993.70.1.52>

¹³ John O. Voll, "Neo-Sufism: Reconsidered Again," *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 42, nos. 2–3 (2008): 314–30, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00083968.2008.10751385>.

the *salaf*. Julia Day Howell has described Hamka's *tasawuf* as a form of "Salafist Sufism" that grounds Sufi practice in the example of the Prophet and the pious ancestors,¹⁴ while Sudar has traced Ibn Taimiyyah's theological influence on Indonesian Muslim revivalists, including the Minangkabau reformers around Haji Rasul.¹⁵ The fourth line concerns Ibn Taimiyyah himself. A substantial body of research has dismantled the image of Ibn Taimiyyah as simply anti-Sufi, showing that his criticism targeted monistic metaphysics, antinomian claims, and saintly elitism rather than Sufism as such.¹⁶

These literatures have rarely been brought together. Studies of Hamka mention Ibn Taimiyyah as one influence among many, alongside al-Ghazālī, Muḥammad 'Abduh, Rasyīd Riḍā, and the Minangkabau reformers, but the relationship has been asserted rather than demonstrated. Howell's analysis attends to Hamka's rhetorical appeal to the *salaf*, not to the specific Taimiyyan and Qayyimian texts he knew; Sudar's study concerns theology rather than *tasawuf*; and research on Ibn Taimiyyah's Sufism has not followed its reception into the Malay-Indonesian world. No study has compared particular passages in Hamka with particular passages in Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah on the same concepts, and none has asked what kind of evidence supports each claimed connection. As a result, the role of Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah as an intermediary between Ibn Taimiyyah and Hamka has also gone unnoticed.

This article addresses that gap. It argues that Hamka's reconstruction of *tasawuf* selectively rearticulates a Taimiyyan epistemology of spiritual validation, in which *syarī'ah* is the criterion by which claims to *ḥaqīqah* are tested, and that this epistemology reached Hamka largely in the redaction of Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah and through the reformist networks of his father's generation. The term "resonance" is used to designate conceptual affinity whose historical channel can be specified only in part. Where Hamka names Ibn Taimiyyah or Ibn al-Qayyim, the article speaks of reference; where a documented intermediary exists, it speaks of mediation; and where neither is available, it speaks of structural affinity or parallel development. The analysis also shows that this Taimiyyan strand operates within a framework that remains predominantly Ghazalian.

The central question is: to what extent, and through which channels, do Ibn Taimiyyah's concerns about the validation of spiritual experience resonate in Hamka's reconstruction of *tasawuf*? Four subsidiary questions follow. *First*, how does Hamka's critique of *wujūdiyyah* compare with Ibn Taimiyyah's critique of *ittiḥād*? *Second*, how does Hamka reinterpret *fanā'* and the discipline of the will, and how does this relate to the Taimiyyan typology of *fanā'*? *Third*, how does Hamka's critique of mediated spiritual authority relate to Ibn Taimiyyah's doctrine of *walāyah* and *tawassul* and to Minangkabau reformist polemics? *Fourth*, how do Hamka's conceptions of *zuhd* and *tawakkul* converge with or diverge from Taimiyyan-Qayyimian definitions?

¹⁴ Howell, "Indonesia's Salafist Sufis," 1031–33. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X09990278>

¹⁵ Sudar, "Ibn Taymiyyah's Theological Influence." [Google](#)

¹⁶ George Makdisi, "Ibn Taimīya: A Šūfi of the Qādiriya Order," *American Journal of Arabic Studies* 1 (1973): 118–29 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003278832-8>; Thomas Michel, "Ibn Taymiyya's *Sharḥ* on the *Futūḥ al-Ghayb* of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī," *Hamdard Islamicus* 4, no. 2 (1981): 3–12 [Google](#); Diego R. Sarrió Cucarella, "Spiritual Anti-Elitism: Ibn Taymiyya's Doctrine of Sainthood (*Walāyah*)," *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 22, no. 3 (2011): 275–91 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09596410.2011.568812>; Arjan Post, *The Journeys of a Taymiyyan Sufi: Sufism through the Eyes of 'Imād al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Wāsiṭī* (Leiden: Brill, 2020) <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004377554>; Kamal Gasimov, "Muslim Saints Contested: Ibn Taymiyya's Critique of al-Qushayrī's *Risāla*," *Journal of Islamic Studies* (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/etac045>; Naser Dumairieh, "Could Sufism Have Been a Means of Spreading Ibn Taymiyya's Thought in the Ottoman Empire?," *The Muslim World* 112, no. 4 (2022): 422–35, <https://doi.org/10.1111/muwo.12447>; Mehdi Berriah and Arjan Post, eds., *Ibn Taymiyya's Thought: Corpus, Reception, and Legacy* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2026) <https://doi.org/10.11116/9789461667045>; Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-'Arifī, *Ibn Taimiyyah wa al-Šūfiyyah: Istiqrā' li Mi'at Mujallad min Kutub Syaikh al-Islām* (Riyadh: Dār Ibn al-Jauzī, 2023) [Google](#); Hamdan Maghribi, *Tasawuf Salafi: Rekonstruksi Tasawuf Ibn Taimiyyah* (Malang: Madani, 2024). [Google](#)

The article makes three contributions. It establishes, on the basis of Hamka's own texts, the extent and the limits of his engagement with Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim. It contributes to the study of Ibn Taimiyyah's modern reception by showing how Taimiyyan ideas were rearticulated in an Indonesian Sufi register rather than only in anti-Sufi polemics. It offers a graded model of evidence that can be applied to other claims of Taimiyyan influence in Southeast Asia, thereby giving the Neo-Sufism debate a more precise textual basis.

B. METHODS

This study is a qualitative, text-based inquiry in intellectual history. It combines the reconstruction of concepts within Hamka's writings with an analysis of their reception from earlier traditions. The first task asks what Hamka means by terms such as *fanā'*, *iradah*, *zuhud*, and *tawakal*. The second asks whether and how those meanings are related to Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim. For the second task, the study follows Quentin Skinner's warning against the "mythology" of influence. Skinner argued that a claim that writer A influenced writer B requires, at minimum, that B is known to have read A, that B could not have found the doctrine in another writer, and that B could not plausibly have arrived at it independently.¹⁷ Following Mark Bevir, tradition is understood as a set of inherited beliefs that each recipient modifies rather than reproduces.¹⁸ Doctrinal similarity is therefore treated as data that must be explained, not as evidence of influence.

The primary sources were selected according to three criteria: relevance to Sufism, spiritual authority, and ethical discipline; centrality to the concepts examined; and evidentiary value, meaning that a text either names Ibn Taimiyyah or Ibn al-Qayyim or formulates a concept in a way that can be compared with their writings. The resulting corpus is set out in Table 1. Earlier editions were preferred because they most closely reflect the period of composition. *We consulted Tafsir al-Azhar and Perkembangan Kebatinan di Indonesia for context but did not include them in the coded corpus*, since their engagement with Sufism is dispersed across exegetical and historical material.

Table 1. Corpus of Primary Sources

Work	Composition / first edition	Edition used	Function in the analysis
Hamka, <i>Tasawuf Modern</i>	Serialized 1937–38; book 1939	Jakarta: Yayasan Nurul Islam, 1981	Ethical program of <i>tasawuf</i> ; <i>iradah</i> , desire, <i>zuhud</i> , <i>qana'ah</i> , <i>tawakal</i> ; explicit references to Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim
Hamka, <i>Perkembangan Tasawuf dari Abad ke Abad</i>	1952	Jakarta: Pustaka Keluarga, 1952	History of Sufism; <i>fanā'</i> , <i>wujūdiyyah</i> , sainthood
Hamka, <i>Tasawuf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya</i>	1952 text with 1958 PTAIN lecture	Jakarta: Yayasan Nurul Islam, 1978	As above, with the section "Pembaharuan Ibnu Taimiyah" and the program of "returning <i>tasawuf</i> to its source"
Hamka, <i>Teguran Suci dan Jujur terhadap Mufti Johor</i>	August 1958	Malaysian reprint	Critique of <i>wasilah</i> , <i>rabitah</i> , grave devotion, and absolute obedience to the <i>syaiikh</i> ; channels of transmission

¹⁷ Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 26, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2504188>.

¹⁸ Mark Bevir, *The Logic of the History of Ideas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). [Google](#)

Work	Composition / first edition	Edition used	Function in the analysis
Ibn Taimiyyah, <i>al-'Ubūdiyyah</i> ; <i>al-Furqān bayna Awliyā' al-Raḥmān wa Awliyā' al-Syaitān</i> ; <i>Qā'idah Jalilah fi al-Tawassul wa al-Wasilah</i> ; <i>Majmū' al-Fatāwā</i>	7th–8th/13th–14th c.	See references	Typology of <i>fanā'</i> ; freedom of the heart; criterion of <i>walāyah</i> ; <i>tawassul</i> ; <i>asbāb</i>
Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, <i>Madārij al-Sālikīn</i> ; <i>Zād al-Ma'ād</i> ; <i>al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib</i>	8th/14th c.	See references	<i>Zuhd</i> ; the four degrees of <i>jihād</i> ; transmission of Ibn Taimiyyah's sayings

Secondary sources were used to contextualize and test the interpretations: studies of Hamka, Minangkabau reformism, and Indonesian modernism; studies of Ibn Taimiyyah's and Ibn al-Qayyim's Sufism; and the literature on Neo-Sufism. They also serve to identify alternative sources for each doctrine, which is the condition Skinner's second criterion requires.

The analysis proceeded in four stages. The first stage was close reading of the Hamka corpus. It included a systematic search for every mention of Ibn Taimiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim, and their works, including older spellings such as "Taimijah" and "Qajjim", together with the immediate context of each mention. The second stage was hybrid thematic coding. Deductive codes were derived from the research questions; inductive codes were added where Hamka's texts raised themes that the initial scheme did not capture, such as the psychology of the will and the sociology of national decline. Table 2 lists the codes and separates Hamka's own vocabulary from the analytical categories introduced in this article. The third stage was comparative conceptual analysis. We compared coded passages with Taimiyyan and Qayyimian passages at the level of argumentative structure rather than shared words, and we recorded divergences alongside convergences. The fourth stage assigned each convergence an evidentiary level according to the criteria in Table 3.

Table 2. Coding Scheme: Hamka's Vocabulary and Analytical Categories

Analytical code (researcher's category)	Hamka's own vocabulary indexed	Taimiyyan-Qayyimian comparator
<i>Syari'ah</i> as criterion of spiritual experience	<i>syari'at</i> , <i>hakikat</i> , <i>hidup kerohanian</i> , "kata mereka" (reported Sufi claims)	Subordination of <i>kashf</i> and <i>ḥāl</i> to Qur'an and Sunnah
Critique of monistic metaphysics	<i>Wihdatul Wujud</i> , <i>Wihdatusy Syuhud</i> , <i>Hulul</i> , <i>Ittihad</i> , Neo-Platonisme	Critique of the <i>ittiḥādiyyah</i>
<i>Fanā' al-irādah</i> (ethical-volitional <i>fanā'</i>)	<i>iradah</i> , <i>hawa nafsu</i> , <i>merdeka</i> , <i>diperhamba hawa</i>	First type of <i>fanā'</i> in <i>al-'Ubūdiyyah</i> ; "freedom of the heart"
Decentralisation of spiritual authority	<i>wasilah</i> , <i>wasithah</i> , <i>rabithah</i> , <i>guru</i> , <i>syekh</i> , <i>wali</i> , <i>keramat</i>	<i>Walāyah</i> as faith and piety; limits of <i>tawassul</i>
Active <i>zuhd</i>	<i>zuhud</i> , <i>qana'ah</i> , <i>harta</i> , <i>kemajuan</i>	<i>Zuhd</i> as leaving what does not benefit in the hereafter
Causality and agency	<i>tawakal</i> , <i>ikhtiar</i> , <i>sunnatullah</i> , <i>takdir</i>	Ibn Taimiyyah's maxim on <i>asbāb</i>
Anti-quietism	<i>jihad</i> , <i>kemunduran</i> , "Kebijaksanaan Timur"	Ibn al-Qayyim's four degrees of <i>jihād</i>

Table 3. Evidentiary Levels for Claimed Connections

Level	Criterion	Permitted claim
-------	-----------	-----------------

Level	Criterion	Permitted claim
1. Explicit reference	Hamka names Ibn Taimiyyah or Ibn al-Qayyim, or reproduces an identifiable passage, in connection with the concept under discussion	Reception or appropriation
2. Mediated reference	A documented intermediary (Haji Rasul, the <i>Kaum Muda</i> , <i>al-Manār</i>) transmits the Taimiyyan or Qayyimian position to Hamka's milieu	Mediated reception
3. Structural affinity	Two or more argumentative components correspond, but no channel can be documented	Resonance
4. Parallel development	The similarity can be explained by a source common to both, such as the Qur'an, Hadith, al-Junayd, al-Ghazālī, or a Companion's saying	No claim of Taimiyyan influence

On this basis, the key terms are used consistently. "Influence" and "reception" are reserved for level 1. "Mediated reception" applies to level 2. "Resonance" refers to level 3. "Appropriation" designates cases at levels 1 or 2 in which Hamka adapts a concept to a new Indonesian context. "Genealogy" refers to the wider process by which a cluster of ideas is transmitted and transformed through these channels.

The study has three limitations. The Hamka editions used are early printings, and their pagination differs from later reprints. The analysis does not claim that every element of Hamka's *tasawuf* is Taimiyyan, nor that every Taimiyyan resonance is a product of transmission. And the archival question of which Taimiyyan and Qayyimian books circulated in Haji Rasul's circle can be answered here only from Hamka's own testimony.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are presented in five parts. The first establishes the textual record: where Hamka names Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim, and through which channels their works reached him. The next four parts examine the four conceptual domains identified in the research questions. Each proceeds from Hamka's text to the Taimiyyan or Qayyimian comparator, records points of convergence and divergence, identifies the mediating channels, and concludes by assigning an evidentiary level. A synthesis table at the end relates the four domains to the article's central claim that *syari'ah* functions in Hamka, as in Ibn Taimiyyah, as the criterion by which *ḥaqīqah* is validated.

1. The Textual Record: Explicit References and Channels of Transmission

Hamka's writings on *tasawuf* refer to Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim more directly than the secondary literature has recognized. The most important reference occurs in *Perkembangan Tasauf dari Abad ke Abad* and is retained unchanged in *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*. Discussing the Prophetic tradition about those who love one another for God's sake and who will stand on pulpits of light, followed by Q. Yūnus 10:62 on the friends of God, Hamka observes that the Sufis took this text as the foundation of their way of life. He then adds that "several Sunni scholars who did not entirely approve of the paths taken by the Sufis, such as Ibn Taimiyyah and his disciple Ibn Qayyim, as well as al-Harawī," composed works in the same spirit, "among them *Ighāthat al-Lahfān*, *al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib*, *Madārij al-Sālikīn* and others."¹⁹

¹⁹ Hamka, *Perkembangan Tasauf*, 38 [Google](#); Hamka, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 42: "Kaum Shufi baik sangka, bahwa merekalah yang dituju oleh Hadits ini dan ayat yang dibacakan Nabi itu adalah dasar hidup mereka. Beberapa orang Ulama Ahli Sunnah, yang tidak sama sekali menyetujui jalan-jalan yang ditempuh oleh kaum Shufi, sebagai Ibnu Taimiyah dan muridnya Ibnu Qayyim, demikian juga Al-Harawī, dan beberapa Ulama lain telah mengarangkan buku-buku yang sejalan dengan ini. Diantaranya ialah 'Iqasatul Lahfaan', 'Al-

Three features of this passage matter. First, Hamka knows Ibn al-Qayyim's *Madārij al-Sālikīn*, the work in which the Taimiyyan reconstruction of the Sufi path is most fully systematized.²⁰ Second, he groups al-Harawī, the Ḥanbalī Sufi whose *Manāzil al-Sā'irīn* is the base text of the *Madārij*, with Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim. He thus identifies, in effect, the Ḥanbalī line of Sunni Sufism that George Makdisi later reconstructed.²¹ Third, Hamka presents these scholars as critics of Sufi methods who nonetheless wrote works on the spiritual life grounded in Qur'an and Sunnah. This is precisely the position that recent scholarship attributes to Ibn Taimiyyah, and Hamka formulated it in 1952.

The structure of *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya* confirms that this was not an isolated remark. Hamka's preface frames the book as a history of Sufism reaching "the freezing of thought caused by the decline of the Muslims in the seventh and eighth centuries of the Hijrah."²² In the book's closing chapters, a section entitled "Pembaharuan Ibnu Taimiyah" (Ibn Taimiyyah's Renewal) is followed by a section on the Wahhābiyyah and Sanūsiyyah, after which comes the 1958 lecture on "Mengembalikan Tasauf ke Pangkalnya" (returning *tasawuf* to its source).²³ In Hamka's historical narrative, then, Ibn Taimiyyah stands at the point where decline gives way to renewal and where renewal opens onto Hamka's own program for Indonesia.

Tasauf Moderen adds three further references. In discussing faith, Hamka adopts the view of "some scholars, among them Ibn Taimiyyah," that every believer (*mu'min*) is a Muslim but not every Muslim is a believer.²⁴ In the chapter on misery (*celaka*), he quotes Ibn Taimiyyah's sayings from prison: "What can my enemies do to me? My paradise and my garden are in my breast ... If I am put in prison, that is my retreat (*khalwat*) ... The prisoner is the one whose heart is imprisoned from his Lord; the captive is the one captured by his desire."²⁵ These sayings are transmitted by Ibn al-Qayyim in *al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib*,²⁶ one of the three titles Hamka names in 1952. And in the chapter "Tangga Bahagia" (the ladder of happiness), Hamka summarises Ibn al-Qayyim's *Zād al-Ma'ād* on the four degrees of *jihād* in order to refute what he calls the quietist "wisdom of the East."²⁷ This last reference is analyzed in part 5 below.

These references point to a channel that Hamka himself documents. In *Teguran Suci dan Jujur*, he recalls that in 1911 Haji Rasul published *al-Fawā'id al-Āliyah*, a treatise rejecting the pronounced *niyyah* before the prayer, and that opponents were incensed because "the textual

Wabil Ush-Shaib', 'Madarij us Salikin' dan lain-lain." The phrase "tidak sama sekali menyetujui" can be read as "did not approve at all" or "did not entirely approve." The inclusion of al-Harawī, himself a Sufi master, supports the second reading. [Google](#)

²⁰ Ovamir Anjum, "Sufism without Mysticism? Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah's Objectives in *Madārij al-Sālikīn*," *Oriente Moderno* 90, no. 1 (2010): 161–88 <https://doi.org/10.1163/22138617-09001009>; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, *Ranks of the Divine Seekers: A Parallel English-Arabic Text*, trans. Ovamir Anjum (Leiden: Brill, 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004413412>

²¹ George Makdisi, "The Hanbali School and Sufism," *Humaniora Islamica* 2 (1974): 61–72; Makdisi, "Ibn Taimiyya." <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112312827-003>

²² Hamka, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 12. [Google](#)

²³ Hamka, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 221, 225, 228. [Google](#)

²⁴ Hamka, *Tasauf Moderen*, 54–55. [Google](#)

²⁵ Hamka, *Tasauf Moderen*, chap. XI, 234–43: "Kata Ibnu Taimiyah: 'Bahwasanya di dunia ini ada suatu syurga. Barangsiapa yang belum pernah menempuhnya, tidaklah dia akan menempuh syurga yang di akhirat.' Katanya pula: 'Apakah yang akan dilakukan oleh musuh-musuhku kepadaku? Syurga dan jannahku ada dalam dadaku ... Jika engkau dimasukkan orang ke penjara, adalah itu khalwatku. Kalau aku diusir dari negeriku, adalah ganti aku bertamasya ... Aku bukan terpenjara, sebab orang yang terpenjara ialah yang dipenjarakan hatinya di tengah perjalanan mencari Tuhannya.'" [Google](#)

²⁶ Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, *al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib min al-Kalim al-Ṭayyib*: ما يصنع المحبوس من حبس قلبه؛ أعدائي بي؟ أنا جنتي وبستاني في صدري، أين رحمت فهي معي لا تفارقي، إن حبسي خلوة، وقتلي شهادة، وإخراجي من بلدي سياحة [Google](#)

²⁷ Hamka, *Tasauf Moderen*, chap. X, 212–33. [Google](#)

evidence was taken from the book *Zād al-Ma'ād* by Ibn Qayyim, who belonged to the Ḥanbalī school,” going so far as to accuse Haji Rasul of being a Wahhābī.²⁸ In the same text Hamka notes that the books of Ibn Taimiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, al-Ṣan‘ānī, and al-Syaukānī had become available for purchase and order in the region, and that this explained the spread of reformist opinions.²⁹ Ibn al-Qayyim was thus present in Hamka’s household as a source of legal argument a generation before he became a source of Hamka’s Sufism. The wider network through which these texts travelled, from the Meccan circle of Aḥmad Khaṭīb al-Minangkabawī to the *Kaum Muda* and from Cairo through *al-Manār*, has been documented by historians of Indonesian reform.³⁰

The record also sets limits. In *Tasauf Moderen*, al-Ghazālī is named at least thirteen times and his division of happiness structures the opening chapter, while Ibn al-Qayyim is invoked in two passages and Ibn Taimiyyah in two. Western thinkers such as Aristotle, Tolstoy, and Bertrand Russell are quoted at length.³¹ The Taimiyyan strand in Hamka is real, but it runs through a book whose overall architecture is Ghazalian and whose interlocutors include modern Western philosophers. The four domains examined below should be read against this proportion.

2. *Wujūdiyyah*: Monistic Metaphysics as a Foreign Accretion

Hamka’s treatment of monistic Sufism is historical rather than polemical. He reports that the Sufis grounded their belief that the cosmos is a “Universal Unity” (*Wahdat ul Wujud*) or a “Unity of Witnessing” (*Wihdat usy Syuhud*), and that God manifests Himself in all His creatures, on verses such as Q. al-Baqarah 2:115.³² He then surveys the theses of Western scholars on Indian, Buddhist, Christian, and Neoplatonic origins of Sufism and concludes that a cluster of technical terms entered Sufism through contact with Greek thought. After listing *ittiḥād*, the First Intellect, the Muhammadan Reality, *wiḥdat al-wujūd*, *wiḥdat al-syuhūd*, *ḥulūl* and related concepts, he writes that “all of these are fragments of speculative opinion that arose after contact with Greek philosophy, above all Neo-Platonism.”³³ Hamka does not deny that Sufism has Qur’anic roots; on the contrary, the book defends those roots and cites Ibn Khaldūn’s account of Sufism as an Islamic science derived from the practice of the *salaf*.³⁴ What he denies is that monistic doctrine belongs to that root.

This genealogical judgment corresponds to the structure of Ibn Taimiyyah’s critique of the *ittiḥādiyyah*. Ibn Taimiyyah held that the doctrine that the existence of the Creator is identical with the existence of creatures derived from the philosophers and from the esoteric

²⁸ Hamka, *Teguran Suci & Jujur*, 45–56: “Kemudian ada yang marah kerana nas keterangan itu diambilnya pula pada kitab Zaadul Ma’ad karangan Ibnu Qayyim yang bermazhab Hambali dan ada pula yang lebih marah lalu memaki-maki ... mengatakan al-Haji Abdul Karim Amrullah (Haji Rasul) telah keluar dari mazhab! Bahkan ada yang gelap mata lalu menuduh Muktazilah dan Wahabi!” [Google](#)

²⁹ Hamka, *Teguran Suci & Jujur*, 45–56: “Kitab-kitab Ibnu Taimiyah, kitab Ibnu Qayyim, kitab Muhammad bin Abdul Wahab, kitab Amir Shan’ani, kitab al-Imam Syaukani dapat dibeli, dapat dipesan.” [Google](#)

³⁰ Noer, *Modernist Muslim Movement* [Google](#); Azyumardi Azra, *The Origins of Islamic Reformism in Southeast Asia: Networks of Malay-Indonesian and Middle Eastern ‘Ulamā’ in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2004) <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004488199>; Malcolm H. Kerr, *Islamic Reform: The Political and Legal Theories of Muḥammad ‘Abduh and Rashīd Riḍā* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966) [Google](#); Ahmad N. Amir, Abdi O. Shuriye, and Jamal I. Daoud, “Muhammad Abduh’s Influence in Southeast Asia,” *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 13 (2013): 124–38, <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.13.mae.10004>; Sudar, “Ibn Taymiyyah’s Theological Influence,” 27. [Google](#)

³¹ Hamka, *Tasauf Moderen*, chap. I, 22–49. The counts are based on a word search of a complete digital transcription of the work, checked against the 1981 edition. [Google](#)

³² Hamka, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 37–38. [Google](#)

³³ Hamka, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 50: “Ittiḥad, Kasrat, Al-‘Aqlul Awwal, Al-Haqiqatul Muhammadiyah, Wihdatul Wujud, Wihdatusy Syuhud, Al-Hulul, dan lain-lain, yang semuanya itu adalah pecah-pecahan pendapat fikiran sesudah berhubungan dengan Filsafat Yunani, terutama Neo Platonisme.” [Google](#)

³⁴ Hamka, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 70. [Google](#)

speculation of later Sufis, not from the early masters, and he distinguished degrees within the monistic school, treating Ibn 'Arabī as closer to Islam than al-Tilimsānī.³⁵ In *al-'Ubūdiyyah* he classifies the doctrine that "there is no existence other than God's" as a false *fanā'* belonging to those who fell into *ḥulūl* and *ittiḥād*, from which, he insists, the recognized Sufi masters dissociated themselves.³⁶ Hamka and Ibn Taimiyyah thus share two components of argument: monistic doctrine is treated as an accretion foreign to the Qur'anic root of the spiritual life, and the early Sufi tradition is defended against its later metaphysical elaboration.

The divergences are equally clear. Ibn Taimiyyah's critique is a theological and philosophical refutation conducted in the categories of *kalām* and *falsafah*; Hamka's is a historicist argument conducted with the tools of comparative religion, drawing on Massignon, Goldziher, Browne, and O'Leary, and addressed to readers interested in "Kebatinan Indonesia."³⁷ Hamka also had a local precedent closer at hand than Ibn Taimiyyah. The seventeenth-century controversy in Aceh, in which Nūr al-Dīn al-Rānīrī condemned the *wujūdiyyah* of Ḥamzah Fanṣūrī and Syamsuddin al-Sumatrani, had already established the critique of monism as a Malay theological tradition.³⁸ Under Skinner's second criterion, therefore, the Acehnese precedent and the general Sunni critique of *ḥulūl* are alternative sources for Hamka's position.

The convergence in this domain is a structural affinity (level 3). The passages examined here do not link Hamka's judgment on *wujūdiyyah* to Ibn Taimiyyah by name. The evidentiary question turns on Hamka's section on "Pembaharuan Ibnu Taimiyah," where the explicit link, if it exists, would be made. For the central argument, the significance of this domain lies less in its source than in its function: by classifying monism as a philosophical accretion, Hamka clears the ground for a *tasawuf* whose content is ethical and whose criterion is scriptural.

3. *Fanā'* and the Discipline of the Will

Hamka describes ontological *fanā'* without endorsing it. In *Perkembangan Tasawuf*, he explains that the Prophetic tradition of *taqarrub* ("My servant draws near to Me ...") gave rise among the Sufis to taste and longing "so that there arose *fanā'*, meaning the disappearance of the servant into God, of the lover into the beloved, of the creature into the Real. When this is attained, *so they say*, the human being reaches a spiritual rank of very high value: the unity of the Worshipped with the worshipper."³⁹ The interjection "kata mereka" (so they say) marks the claim as reported speech. The next page introduces Ibn Taimiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim, and al-Harawī as Sunni authors of an alternative spiritual literature.

Tasawuf Moderen, Hamka's program for the practicing Muslim, does not use *fanā'* in a positive sense at all. Its key term is *iradah*, the will. "What mediates between reason and happiness," Hamka writes, "is *iradah*, the will! ... The greater the will, the nearer happiness;

³⁵ Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Ibn Taimiyyah, *Majmū' Fatāwā Syaikh al-Islām Aḥmad ibn Taimiyyah*, ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Qāsim and Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Qāsim (Riyadh: Maṭābi' al-Riyāḍ, 2004) [Google](#); Alexander D. Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi in the Later Islamic Tradition: The Making of a Polemical Image in Medieval Islam* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 87–111 [Google](#); Gasimov, "Muslim Saints Contested." <https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/etac045>

³⁶ Ibn Taimiyyah, *al-'Ubūdiyyah* [Google](#), in Ibn Taimiyyah, *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* [Google](#).

³⁷ Hamka, *Tasawuf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 12, 46–50. [Google](#)

³⁸ Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, *Raniri and the Wujudīyyah of 17th Century Aceh* (Singapore: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1966) [Google](#); Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, *The Mysticism of Ḥamzah Fanṣūrī* (Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1970) [Google](#); Oman Fathurahman, *Iṭḥāf al-Dhakī: Tafsir Wahdatul Wujud bagi Muslim Nusantara* (Bandung: Mizan, 2012) [Google](#); Azra, *Origins of Islamic Reformism*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004488199>

³⁹ Hamka, *Tasawuf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 41: "sehingga terdapatlah fana, artinya lenyap hamba ke dalam Tuhan, lenyap pencinta ke dalam yang dicintai, lenyap makhluk ke dalam Haq (yang Benar). Bila telah tercapai ini, –kata mereka– sampailah Insan ke dalam martabat Rohani yang sangat tinggi nilainya. Kesatuan Ma'bud dengan 'Abid." Emphasis added. [Google](#)

the weaker the will, the further happiness.”⁴⁰ The will is in turn the site of the struggle with desire (*hawa nafs*). Hamka distinguishes three kinds of people: those whom desire has enslaved and made into their god; those who fight desire with alternating victory and defeat, whom he calls *mujahid*; and those who have mastered it, so that “he rules desire, not desire him ... he is king, he is sovereign, he is free (*merdeka*), not enslaved by desire.”⁴¹

Ibn Taimiyyah’s typology of *fanā’* provides the comparator. In *al-‘Ubūdiyyah* he distinguishes three kinds. The first, which belongs to the prophets and the perfected friends of God, is “*fanā’* from willing anything other than God,” such that the servant loves, worships, relies on, and seeks none but Him; “whether or not it is called *fanā’*, this meaning is the beginning and the end of Islam, the inward and the outward of religion.” The second, *fanā’* from witnessing anything other than God, is a deficient state that befalls some wayfarers and that the greatest Companions never experienced. The third, *fanā’* from the existence of anything other than God, is the doctrine of *ḥulūl* and *ittiḥād*.⁴² In the same treatise, Ibn Taimiyyah defines freedom and servitude as states of the heart: “freedom is the freedom of the heart, and servitude is the servitude of the heart.”⁴³ Ibn al-Qayyim reproduces and systematizes the same distinctions in *Madārij al-Sālikīn*.⁴⁴

The convergence is substantial. Both thinkers relocate the meaning of spiritual self-transcendence from ontology to volition, and both define freedom as release from enslavement to desire. Hamka’s own citation of Ibn Taimiyyah’s prison saying, that “the captive is the one captured by his desire,” uses exactly this logic, which shows that Hamka encountered it in a Taimiyyan formulation. In this article, *fanā’ al-irādah* is accordingly used as an analytical label derived from Ibn Taimiyyah’s first type of *fanā’*. Hamka does not use the term in the texts examined.

There is also a divergence. Ibn Taimiyyah’s *fanā’ al-irādah* purifies the will by redirecting its object: the servant ceases to will anything but God. Hamka’s *iradah* strengthens the will as a psychological force. He illustrates it with modern medicine, the power of suggestion, and the authority of leaders, and he draws on Abū Bakr al-Rāzī and Ibn Sīnā as physicians rather than on Sufi or Ḥanbalī authorities.⁴⁵ The Taimiyyan element is the orientation of the will toward God and away from desire; the modern element is the valorization of the will’s strength as a condition of agency. Ibn Taimiyyah’s typology also has a parallel in the “sober” Sufism of al-Junayd, which Hamka knew and which Ibn Taimiyyah himself praised.⁴⁶

The convergence in this domain is a structural affinity (level 3), supported at one point by explicit reference (level 1): Hamka’s reproduction of Ibn Taimiyyah’s saying on the captive of desire. For the central argument, this domain shows how the validation of spiritual

⁴⁰ Hamka, *Tasauf Moderen*, chap. I, 22–49: “Adapun yang menjadi perantaraan antara akal dengan bahagia, ialah iradah, kemauan! ... Bertambah besar iradah, bertambah dekat bahagia. Bertambah lembik iradah, bertambah jauh bahagia.” [Google](#)

⁴¹ Hamka, *Tasauf Moderen*, chap. III, 99–115: “Orang yang dapat mengalahkan hawanya, sehingga ia yang memerintah hawa, bukan hawa yang memerintahnya ... dia yang raja, dia yang kuasa, dia merdeka, tidak terpengaruh, tidak diperhamba hawa.” [Google](#)

⁴² Ibn Taimiyyah, *al-‘Ubūdiyyah*, vol 10: فأما النوع الأول فهو الفناء عن إرادة ما سوى الله، بحيث لا يحب إلا الله، ولا يعبد إلا إياه، ولا وهذا المعنى إن سمي فناء أو لم يسم فهو أول الإسلام وآخره، وباطن الدين وظاهره . يتوكل إلا عليه، ولا يطلب غيره ... See also Hikmet Yaman, “Ḥanbalīte Criticism of Sufism: Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), a Ḥanbalīte Ascetic (Zāhid),” *Ekev Akademi Dergisi* 14, no. 43 (2010): 37. [Google](#)

⁴³ Ibn Taimiyyah, *al-‘Ubūdiyyah*: فالحرية حرية القلب، والعبودية عبودية القلب، كما أن الغنى غنى النفس [Google](#)

⁴⁴ Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, *Madārij al-Sālikīn fī Manāzil al-Sā’irīn*, ed. Muḥammad Ajmal al-Isḥāhī (Mecca: Dār ‘Ālam al-Fawā’id, 2019), manzilat al-fanā’ [Google](#); Anjum, “Sufism without Mysticism?” <https://doi.org/10.1163/22138617-09001009>

⁴⁵ Hamka, *Tasauf Moderen*, chap. I, 22–49. [Google](#)

⁴⁶ Hamka, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 12 [Google](#); Ibn Taimiyyah, *al-‘Ubūdiyyah*

experience shifts from the intensity of a state to the direction of the will, which can be judged by *syari'ah* and by its ethical fruits.

4. Spiritual Authority: *Walāyah*, *Wasilah*, and the Teacher

Hamka's treatment of sainthood is the domain in which the Taimiyyan connection is most explicit. The passage examined in part 1 places Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim precisely at the point where Hamka discusses the Prophetic tradition on the friends of God and Q. Yūnus 10:62. The Sufis, he writes, assumed in good faith that the text referred to them; Ibn Taimiyyah and his school wrote an alternative literature on the same foundation.⁴⁷ Ibn Taimiyyah's *al-Furqān* opens from the same verse and draws from it a criterion that removes sainthood from the possession of any group. The friends of God are "those who believe and are mindful of God," and every believer's *walāyah* is proportional to his faith and piety.⁴⁸ Diego Sarrio has described this doctrine as a "spiritual anti-elitism" that relocates sainthood from esoteric rank, lineage, or miraculous power to the realization of faith.⁴⁹

Hamka draws the practical consequences most sharply in *Teguran Suci dan Jujur*. Against the annual gatherings at the tombs of saints, where pilgrims asked the dead for intercession, and against a Sammāniyyah teaching in Palembang that instructed disciples in danger to call out "Ya Saman," he states the principle of unmediated servanthood: God sends guidance to His servants through the Prophet, and the Prophet through Gabriel, "but from the servant himself to God it is direct, each one for himself ... There is no *wasilah*, no *wasithah*, no *rabithah*."⁵⁰ The polemic does not, however, end in excommunication. Although he regarded these practices as contrary to the foundations of faith, Hamka writes, "we do not at once point at such a person and say 'you are an unbeliever'"; those who practice them remain "our people," misled by the "merchants of the grave," whom the reformers have a duty to teach.⁵¹

Hamka's view of the teacher follows the same distinction between pedagogical and salvific authority. The position of the teacher, he writes, equals that of one's parents and demands respect, "but if the teacher errs in his path, then as a sign of our respect we correct him." What Hamka rejects is the teaching of "some teachers of *suluk* and *tarekat*" who require the disciple to obey his *syaikh* "as if he were a corpse laid out before the one who washes it."⁵² The qualifier "setengah" (some) matters. Hamka's target is a specific model of absolute obedience, not the *ṭarīqah* as an institution. In Weberian terms, he rejects a charismatic authority that places the person of the master beyond scriptural accountability, while retaining the teacher's role as an educator subject to correction.⁵³

⁴⁷ Hamka, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 41–42. [Google](#)

⁴⁸ Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Ibn Taimiyyah, *al-Furqān bayna Awliyā' al-Raḥmān wa Awliyā' al-Syaiṭān* (Damascus: Maktabah Dār al-Bayān, 1985): وإذا كان أولياء الله هم المؤمنون المتقين، فيحسب إيمان العبد وتقواه تكون ولايته لله تعالى. [Google](#)

⁴⁹ Sarrió, "Spiritual Anti-Elitism," 275–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09596410.2011.568812>

⁵⁰ Hamka, *Teguran Suci & Jujur*, 59–62: "Kami percaya bahawa Tuhan menyampaikan petunjuk kepada hamba-Nya dengan perantaraan Rasulullah (s.a.w.) dan disampaikan kepada baginda dengan perantaraan Jibril. Tetapi daripada hamba itu sendiri kepada Tuhan ialah langsung sendiri-sendiri ... Tidak ada wasilah, tidak ada wasithah, tidak ada rabithah." [Google](#)

⁵¹ Hamka, *Teguran Suci & Jujur*, 59–62: "tidaklah dengan serta merta kami menunjuk muka orang itu 'engkau kafir' ... Mereka kami pandang kaum kami juga meskipun mereka telah sesat atau disesatkan oleh tijarah al-kubur." [Google](#)

⁵² Hamka, *Teguran Suci & Jujur*, 65–66: "Kedudukan guru sama dengan kedudukan ibu bapa wajib dihormati dan dimuliakan. Tetapi kalau guru itu silap jalannya, maka sebagai tanda bahawa kami hormat, ialah kami tegur ... Maka berbeza pendapat kami dengan pendirian dan ajaran setengah guru-guru suluk dan tarikat yang mewajibkan murid taat kepada syeikhnya seakan-akan dia seperti mayat yang terbujur di hadapan orang yang akan memandikan." Emphasis added in the translation. [Google](#)

⁵³ Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 241–45. [Google](#)

Ibn Taimiyyah's *Qā'idah Jalīlah* provides a close comparator. It distinguishes legitimate *tawassul*, by faith, righteous deeds, and the Prophet's prayer during his lifetime, from petitioning the dead, and it denies that any created being can stand between the servant and God in worship.⁵⁴ The convergence covers three components: the criterion of *walāyah* as faith and piety, the rejection of intercessory invocation of the dead, and the subordination of the master's authority to revelation.

The divergences concern register and channel. Ibn Taimiyyah argues as a jurist and theologian. Hamka argues as a reformist publicist, in the idiom of the *Kaum Muda* against the *Kaum Tua*, and he associates absolute obedience with a state religious bureaucracy of "officials who wear turbans and robes" and hold letters of appointment.⁵⁵ His immediate source for the critique of *rābiṭah* was, moreover, Minangkabau. Aḥmad Khaṭīb al-Minangkabawī's attack on the Naqsybandiyyah practice of *rābiṭah* in the first decade of the twentieth century had set the terms of the dispute in which Haji Rasul and his students took part.⁵⁶

This domain therefore rests on explicit reference (level 1) for the criterion of *walāyah*, since Hamka himself links the Qur'anic definition of the friends of God to Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim. The critique of *wasilah*, *rabitah*, and absolute obedience is a mediated reception (level 2), transmitted through the *Kaum Muda*. For the central argument, this is where the epistemology of validation becomes institutional: the measure of spiritual authority is not initiation, lineage, or charisma but conformity to revelation, which every believer can in principle verify.

5. *Zuhd*, *Tawakkul*, and the Critique of Quietism

Hamka did not invent socially engaged Sufism. Sufi figures and networks had long been active in education, commerce, political counsel, and anti-colonial resistance, including in the Malay world.⁵⁷ Hamka's contribution was to give this strand a programmatic form for urban Muslims outside the orders. Already in 1952 he describes the spiritual life as the primary lens through which a Muslim views "every complicated matter in this transient world, from politics, economics, social affairs, household matters, business and work to the smallest questions," so that Islam becomes "the unity of life's purpose on a spiritual foundation."⁵⁸

Tasauf Modern turns this conviction against a particular understanding of *zuhd*. Religious leaders, Hamka complains, taught "lessons of *zuhud*, hatred of the world, although they themselves still lived in the world," and nations that received such teaching fell until they

⁵⁴ Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Ibn Taimiyyah, *Kitāb fī al-Wasīlah al-Masyhūr bi Qā'idah Jalīlah fī al-Tawassul wa al-Wasīlah*, ed. Ḥamad ibn Aḥmad al-'Aṣṣlānī (Kuwait: Dār Ilāl al-Dauliyyah, 2021) [Google](#); Muhammad Umar Memon, *Ibn Taimiyya's Struggle against Popular Religion: With an Annotated Translation of His Kitāb Iqtidā' aṣ-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm Mukhālafat Aṣḥāb al-Jahīm* (The Hague: Mouton, 1976). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111662381>

⁵⁵ Hamka, *Teguran Suci & Jujur*, 65–66. [Google](#)

⁵⁶ Martin van Bruinessen, *Tarekat Naqsyabandiyah di Indonesia: Survei Historis, Geografis, dan Sosiologis* (Bandung: Mizan, 1992) [Google](#); Noer, *Modernist Muslim Movement*, 31–56 [Google](#); Sudar, "Ibn Taymiyyah's Theological Influence," 27. [Google](#)

⁵⁷ Nile Green, *Sufism: A Global History* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012); Khairudin Aljunied, "Sufi Warriorism in Muslim Southeast Asia," *Sociology Lens* 37, no. 4 (2024): 502–16, <https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12474>; Azra, *Origins of Islamic Reformism*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004488199>

⁵⁸ Hamka, *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*, 20: "Alhasil hidup kerohanian itulah yang menjadi pokok pertama bagi orang Muslim di dalam memandang segala soal yang berliku-liku dan berbelit-belit dalam kehidupan dunia fana ini. Sejak dari urusan politik, ekonomi, sosial, urusan rumah-tangga, usaha dan amal sampai kepada soal-soal yang sekecil-kecilnya sekalipun, sehingga Islam itu dalam keyakinan seorang Muslim adalah kesatuan tujuan hidup dengan dasar kerohanian." [Google](#)

were “weak and oppressed in the world, not moving forward but sliding back.”⁵⁹ His positive definition is psychological rather than material. “The ascetic is not one who dislikes keeping wealth or seeking it, or who rejects wealth altogether. *Zuhud* is to be willing to be poor and willing to be rich, ... willing to be a millionaire, provided that wealth does not make one forget God or neglect one’s duty.”⁶⁰ The ascetic, he adds, “is the one who is not influenced by wealth, even if the whole content of this world were his.”⁶¹

Ibn Taimiyyah defined *zuhd* in comparable terms. Ibn al-Qayyim reports him as saying that “*zuhd* is abandoning what does not benefit in the hereafter, and scrupulousness is abandoning what one fears will harm in the hereafter.”⁶² Both definitions locate *zuhd* in the relation between the heart and its objects rather than in poverty. Hamka, however, attributes his definition not to Ibn Taimiyyah but to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, whose saying that the foundation of *zuhd* is “not to rejoice too much at gain nor despair at loss” he quotes.⁶³ Since both men drew on a common stock of early ascetic sayings, the convergence on the definition of *zuhd* is a parallel development (level 4).

The treatment of *tawakkul* shows a closer structural correspondence. Hamka insists that reliance on God does not exclude precaution. To lock the door, close the henhouse, and tether the camel is to be “a true *mutawakkil*, in theory and in practice”; one acknowledges “that the key has no power at all, it is only an effort (*ikhtiar*),” but “we may not flee to destiny while our effort is still incomplete.”⁶⁴ Ibn Taimiyyah’s maxim on causality has the same three parts: “turning to causes is *syirk* in *tawḥīd*; denying that causes are causes is a deficiency of reason; and abandoning causes altogether is a defect in the *syari’ah*.”⁶⁵ Hamka’s key corresponds to the first part, his warning against fleeing to destiny to the third, and his appeal to *sunnatullah* to the second. Both thinkers also invoke the Prophetic instruction to tether the camel, which is a shared source. The correspondence is therefore a structural affinity (level 3).

The anti-quietist argument rests on explicit reference. In the chapter “Tangga Bahagia,” Hamka quotes Bertrand Russell’s critique of an “Eastern wisdom” that withdraws from struggle. He replies that this describes Hindu or Buddhist teaching rather than Islam, and he proves it by summarising Ibn al-Qayyim’s *Zād al-Ma’ād*: “*jihād* has four degrees: *jihād* against the self, against Satan, against the unbelievers, and against the hypocrites,” of which the first two are individual obligations.⁶⁶ His conclusion is a diagnosis of the Muslim present: “It is the

⁵⁹ Hamka, *Tasauif Moderen*, chap. II, 50–98: “Mereka adakan pelajaran-pelajaran zuhud, membenci dunia, padahal mereka masih hidup dalam dunia ... Banyak bangsa-bangsa yang dapat pelajaran agama seperti itu hingga jatuhlah derajat mereka ..., lemah dan tertindas di dunia, tidak maju ke muka, tetapi surut ke belakang.”

⁶⁰ Hamka, *Tasauif Moderen*, chap. V, 157–79: “orang yang zuhud bukanlah yang tidak suka menyimpan harta, atau tak suka mencari harta, dan menolak harta sama sekali. Zuhud ialah yang sudi miskin, sudi kaya, sudi tidak beruang sesen pun, sudi jadi jutawan, tetapi harta itu tidak menyebabkan ia melupakan Tuhan, atau lalai dari kewajiban.”

⁶¹ Hamka, *Tasauif Moderen*, chap. VI, 180–89: “Orang yang zahid ialah orang yang tidak dipengaruhi harta; walaupun seluruh isi dunia ini dia yang punya.” [Google](#)

⁶² Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, *Madārij al-Sālikīn*, manzilat al-zuhd: سمعت شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية قدس الله روحه يقول: الزهد ترك ما لا ينفع في الآخرة، والورع ترك ما تخاف ضرره في الآخرة [Google](#)

⁶³ Hamka, *Tasauif Moderen*, chap. VI, 180–89: “Kata Saidina Ali, dasar zuhud itu hanyalah satu, yaitu: ‘Jangan terlalu gembira beroleh untung, jangan cemas beroleh rugi.’” [Google](#)

⁶⁴ Hamka, *Tasauif Moderen*, chap. VII, 190–91: “Tetapi tidaklah boleh kita terus saja lari kepada takdir, kalau ikhtiar belum sempurna ... ketika pintu dikuncikan, kita akui bahwa tidak ada kekuasaan apa-apa pada kunci itu, dia hanya semata-mata ikhtiar.” [Google](#)

⁶⁵ Ibn Taimiyyah, *Majmū’ al-Fatāwā*, 8:169: الالتفات إلى الأسباب شرك في التوحيد، ومحو الأسباب أن تكون أسبابا نقص في العقل، والإعراض عن الأسباب بالكلية قدح في الشرع [Google](#)

⁶⁶ Hamka, *Tasauif Moderen*, chap. X, 212–33: “Jihad itu ada empat tingkatan: Jihad kepada diri (nafs), jihad kepada syaitan, jihad kepada kuffar dan jihad kepada munaafiqin.” [Google](#); Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, *Zād al-Ma’ād fī Hady Khayr al-‘Ibād*, ed. Syu’aib al-Arna’ūṭ and ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Arna’ūṭ (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risālah, n.d.), 3:9–11: فالجهاد أربع مراتب: جهاد النفس، وجهاد الشيطان، وجهاد الكفار، وجهاد المنافقين [Google](#)

death of the feeling of *jihād* that has caused the Muslims to decline so badly in this age.”⁶⁷ Here Ibn al-Qayyim supplies the framework through which Hamka integrates the inner struggle against desire (part 3) with outward social engagement. *Jihād al-naḥs* is not a retreat from the world but the first degree of a continuum that extends into public life.

The divergences in this domain are those of a modern synthesis. Hamka places Ibn al-Qayyim beside Russell, Amīn al-Riḥānī, and Mayy Ziyādah, and he frames decline in terms of national progress (*kemajuan*), a category alien to Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim. The domain thus combines three levels of evidence: explicit reference for the anti-quietist framework (level 1), structural affinity for *tawakkul* (level 3), and parallel development for the definition of *zuhd* (level 4). For the central argument, this domain shows the outward consequence of the Taimiyyan criterion. A spirituality validated by *syarī'ah* and by its ethical fruits must issue in action, and passivity is itself a sign that the inner discipline has failed.

6. Synthesis

Table 4 summarises the findings. Read together, the four domains show a consistent pattern. Hamka adopts from the Taimiyyan-Qayyimian tradition not a set of doctrines but a criterion: spiritual experience, authority, and practice are valid insofar as they conform to revelation and bear ethical fruit. He applies this criterion to metaphysics by classifying monism as a philosophical accretion, to the self by redirecting *fanā'* into the discipline of the will, to authority by measuring sainthood by faith and piety, and to social life by rejecting quietism. The strength of the evidence varies across domains, and it is strongest where Ibn al-Qayyim is the intermediary.

Table 4. Synthesis of Convergences, Divergences, and Evidentiary Levels

Domain	Hamka	Ibn Taimiyyah / Ibn al-Qayyim	Convergence	Divergence	Channel	Level
<i>Wujūdiyyah</i>	<i>Tasauḥ: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya</i> , 37–38, 50	Critique of the <i>ittiḥādiyyah</i> ; third type of <i>fanā'</i> in <i>al-'Ubūdiyyah</i>	Monism as foreign accretion; defence of early Sufism	Historicist and comparative rather than theological refutation	Acehnese precedent (al-Rānīrī); Sunni <i>kalām</i>	3
<i>Fanā'</i> and the will	<i>Perkembangan Tasauḥ</i> , 41; <i>Tasauḥ Modern</i> , chaps. I, III	First type of <i>fanā'</i> ; “freedom of the heart”	Volitional rather than ontological self-transcendence; freedom from desire	Will strengthened (psychological) rather than purified (theocentric)	Ibn Taimiyyah’s prison saying via <i>al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib</i>	3 (partly 1)

⁶⁷ Hamka, *Tasauḥ Modern*, chap. X, 212–33: “Sesungguhnya kematian perasaan jihad inilah yang telah menyebabkan kaum Muslimin sangat mundur pada dewasa ini.” [Google](#)

Domain	Hamka	Ibn Taimiyyah / Ibn al-Qayyim	Convergence	Divergence	Channel	Level
<i>Walāyah</i> and authority	<i>Perkembangan Tasauf</i> , 38/42; <i>Teguran Suci</i>	<i>al-Furqān</i> ; <i>Qā'idah Jalīlah</i>	Sainthood as faith and piety; no intermediary in worship; master accountable to revelation	Reformist-publicist register; critique of religious bureaucracy	Haji Rasul; Aḥmad Khaṭīb; <i>Kaum Muda</i>	1 (criterion); 2 (anti-mediation)
<i>Zuhd</i> , <i>tawakkul</i> , <i>jihād</i>	<i>Tasauf Modern</i> , chaps. II, V–VII, X	Definition of <i>zuhd</i> ; maxim on <i>asbāb</i> ; four degrees of <i>jihād</i>	Detachment of the heart; causality and agency; anti-quietism	National progress; Western interlocutors	Ibn al-Qayyim, <i>Zād al-Ma'ād</i> (known in Haji Rasul's circle since 1911)	1 (<i>jihād</i>); 3 (<i>tawakkul</i>); 4 (<i>zuhd</i>)

The pattern also clarifies the relation between the Taimiyyan and Ghazalian elements. Al-Ghazālī supplies the architecture of *Tasauf Modern*: happiness as the goal, the division of goods, and the psychology of the virtues. Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim provide a criterion for testing that architecture against revelation, along with specific arguments at points where the Ghazalian legacy was vulnerable to reformist criticism: monism, sainthood, mediation, and passivity. Hamka's *tasawuf modern* is therefore neither a Ghazalian system with a Salafi veneer nor a Taimiyyan system in Ghazalian dress. It is a synthesis in which the Taimiyyan-Qayyimian criterion governs a Ghazalian ethical psychology.

D. CONCLUSION

This article asked to what extent, and through which channels, Ibn Taimiyyah's concerns about the validation of spiritual experience resonate in Hamka's reconstruction of *tasawuf*. The answer is that Hamka adopted a Taimiyyan criterion rather than a Taimiyyan system, and that he received it chiefly through Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah and the reformist milieu of his father. Hamka names Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim, lists *Madārij al-Sālikīn*, *al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib*, and *Ighāthat al-Lahfān*, quotes Ibn Taimiyyah's prison sayings as transmitted in *al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib*, uses *Zād al-Ma'ād* against quietism, and places Ibn Taimiyyah's "renewal" at the turning point of his history of Sufism. The four subsidiary questions yield graded answers. Hamka's classification of *wujūdiyyah* as a Neoplatonic accretion is structurally parallel to Ibn Taimiyyah's critique of the *ittiḥādiyyah*, but it has a closer local precedent in al-Rānīrī and remains a level-3 affinity. His relocation of *fanā'* from ontology to the will corresponds to Ibn Taimiyyah's first type of *fanā'*, with one explicit point of contact, while his valorisation of the will's strength is modern. His criterion of sainthood is explicitly linked to Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim, and his critique of *wasilah*, *rabitah*, and absolute obedience reached him through the *Kaum Muda*. His anti-quietism rests explicitly on Ibn al-Qayyim; his doctrine of *tawakkul* is structurally Taimiyyan; and his definition of *zuhd* draws on a common ascetic inheritance. The study makes three contributions. It replaces the general assertion of Taimiyyan influence on Hamka with a documented and graded account. It identifies Ibn al-Qayyim as the principal intermediary through which Ibn Taimiyyah's Sufi thought entered Malay-Indonesian reformist *tasawuf*, a finding that refines the Neo-Sufism debate by showing what Rahman's category can and cannot claim in a specific case. It shows that in Hamka, a

reformist commitment to *syari'ah* and a Sufi concern for the purification of the heart are integrated through a shared criterion of validation, which complicates the binary between Salafi reformism and Sufism. Two limitations define the agenda for further research. The first is textual. Hamka's section on "Pembaharuan Ibnu Taimiyah" and the 1958 lecture require a close reading of their own, as does the treatment of sainthood, *tawassul*, and the Sufi orders in *Tafsir al-Azhar*. The second is historical. Hamka's testimony about the books available to Haji Rasul's generation needs to be tested against library inventories, printing records, and the circulation of *al-Manār* in Minangkabau, so that the channels of Taimiyyan and Qayyimian reception in Southeast Asia can be documented beyond the testimony of a single author.

E. DECLARATIONS

1. Author Contribution

Hamdan Maghribi: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, formal analysis, writing (original draft and review and editing), validation, and data curation. **Alfina Hidayah:** Supervision, conceptualization, validation, and writing; review and editing. All authors made substantive intellectual contributions to the study, critically reviewed the manuscript, and approved the final version for publication. All authors agree to be accountable for the accuracy and integrity of the published work.

2. Funding Statement

This research received no external funding. The study was conducted using the authors' existing academic and institutional resources.

3. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no competing financial or non-financial interests relevant to this study.

4. Declaration of AI Use

The authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI) as a supporting tool for language refinement, academic writing, manuscript organization, and preliminary identification of relevant literature. All AI-assisted material was critically reviewed and revised by the authors, and references were independently verified against their original sources. The selection and analysis of primary and secondary sources, interpretation of scholarly arguments, and formulation of conclusions remained under the authors' intellectual responsibility. AI-generated content was not treated as an independent source of scholarly evidence. The authors assume full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and academic integrity of the final manuscript.

5. Additional Information

Not applicable.

REFERENCES

- Aljunied, Khairudin. *Hamka and Islam: Cosmopolitan Reform in the Malay World*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2018.
<https://doi.org/10.7591/cornell/9781501724565.001.0001>
- Aljunied, Khairudin. "Reorienting Sufism: Hamka and Islamic Mysticism in the Malay World." *Indonesia*, no. 101 (2016): 67–84. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ind.2016.0012>
- Aljunied, Khairudin. "Sufi Warriorism in Muslim Southeast Asia." *Sociology Lens* 37, no. 4 (2024): 502–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12474>
- Amir, Ahmad N., Abdi O. Shuriye, and Jamal I. Daoud. "Muhammad Abduh's Influence in Southeast Asia." *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 13 (2013): 124–38. [Google](#)

- Anjum, Ovamir. "Sufism without Mysticism? Ibn Qayyim al-Ğawziyyah's Objectives in *Madāriğ al-Sālikīn*." *Oriente Moderno* 90, no. 1 (2010): 161–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/22138617-09001009>
- al-'Arīfī, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān. *Ibn Taimiyyah wa al-Şūfiyyah: Istiqrā' li Mi'at Mujallad min Kutub Syaikh al-Islām*. Riyadh: Dār Ibn al-Jauzī, 2023. [Google](#)
- al-Attas, Syed Muhammad Naquib. *Raniri and the Wujudiyyah of 17th Century Aceh*. Singapore: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1966. [Google](#)
- al-Attas, Syed Muhammad Naquib. *The Mysticism of Ḥamzah Fanşūrī*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1970. [Google](#)
- Azra, Azyumardi. *The Origins of Islamic Reformism in Southeast Asia: Networks of Malay-Indonesian and Middle Eastern 'Ulamā' in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004488199>
- Berriah, Mehdi, and Arjan Post, eds. *Ibn Taymiyya's Thought: Corpus, Reception, and Legacy*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.11116/9789461667045>.
- Bevir, Mark. *The Logic of the History of Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. [Google](#)
- Bruinessen, Martin van. *Tarekat Naqsyabandiyah di Indonesia: Survei Historis, Geografis, dan Sosiologis*. Bandung: Mizan, 1992. [Google](#)
- Dumairieh, Naser. "Could Sufism Have Been a Means of Spreading Ibn Taymiyya's Thought in the Ottoman Empire?" *The Muslim World* 112, no. 4 (2022): 422–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/muwo.12447>
- Fahru, Fahrudin F. "Melacak Kedalaman Tasawuf Modern Hamka di Tengah Arus Modernitas." *Jurnal Penelitian Keislaman* 16, no. 2 (2020): 129–42.
<https://doi.org/10.20414/jpk.v16i2.2327>
- Fathurahman, Oman. *Itḥāf al-Dhakī: Tafsir Wahdatul Wujud bagi Muslim Nusantara*. Bandung: Mizan, 2012. [Google](#)
- Gasimov, Kamal. "Muslim Saints Contested: Ibn Taymiyya's Critique of al-Qushayrī's *Risāla*." *Journal of Islamic Studies* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/etac045>
- Green, Nile. *Sufism: A Global History*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. [Google](#)
- Hamka. *Perkembangan Tasauf dari Abad ke Abad*. Jakarta: Pustaka Keluarga, 1952. [Google](#)
- Hamka. *Tasauf Moderen*. Jakarta: Yayasan Nurul Islam, 1981. First published 1939. [Google](#)
- Hamka. *Tasauf: Perkembangan dan Pemurniannya*. Jakarta: Yayasan Nurul Islam, 1978. [Google](#)
- Hamka. *Teguran Suci & Jujur terhadap Mufti Johor*. 1958. Reprint, Jakarta: Pustaka Panjimas, 1958. [Google](#)
- Howell, Julia Day. "Indonesia's Salafist Sufis." *Modern Asian Studies* 44, no. 5 (2010): 1029–51.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X09990278>
- Howell, Julia Day. "Sufism and the Indonesian Islamic Revival." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 60, no. 3 (2001): 701–29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2700107>
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr. *Al-Wābil al-Şayyib min al-Kalim al-Ṭayyib*. [Google](#)
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr. *Madārij al-Sālikīn fī Manāzil al-Sā'irīn*. Edited by Muḥammad Ajmal al-Işlāḥī. Mecca: Dār 'Ālam al-Fawā'id, 2019. [Google](#)
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr. *Zād al-Ma'ād fī Hady Khayr al-'Ibād*. Edited by Syu'aib al-Arna'ūt and 'Abd al-Qādir al-Arna'ūt. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, n.d. [Google](#)
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah. *Ranks of the Divine Seekers: A Parallel English-Arabic Text*. Translated by Ovamir Anjum. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004413412>
- Ibn Taimiyyah, Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm. *Al-Furqān bayna Awliyā' al-Raḥmān wa Awliyā' al-Syaiṭān*. Damascus: Maktabah Dār al-Bayān, 1985. [Google](#)

- Ibn Taimiyyah, Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm. *Kitāb fī al-Wasīlah al-Masyhūr bi Qā'idah Jalīlah fī al-Tawassul wa al-Wasīlah*. Edited by Ḥamad ibn Aḥmad al-'Aṣḥānī. Kuwait: Dār Ḳāf al-Dauliyyah, 2021. [Google](#)
- Ibn Taimiyyah, Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm. *Majmū' Fatāwā Syaikh al-Islām Aḥmad ibn Taimiyyah*. Edited by 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Qāsim and Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Qāsim. Riyadh: Maṭābi' al-Riyāḍ, 2004. [Google](#)
- Kaplan, Muhammed Nur, and Arif Afandi Zarkasyi. "Purification of Sufism According to Hamka." *Kalimah: Jurnal Studi Agama dan Pemikiran Islam* 22, no. 2 (2024): 141–66. <https://doi.org/10.21111/klm.v22i2.12909>
- Kerr, Malcolm H. *Islamic Reform: The Political and Legal Theories of Muḥammad 'Abduh and Rashīd Riḍā*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966. [Google](#)
- Knysh, Alexander D. *Ibn 'Arabi in the Later Islamic Tradition: The Making of a Polemical Image in Medieval Islam*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999. [Google](#)
- Maghribi, Hamdan, Alfina Hidayah, and Muhammad Wahyudi. "Spiritualitas untuk Modernitas: Analisis Komparatif Tasawuf Hamka dan Hermeneutika Etis Fazlur Rahman." *Spiritualita* 9, no. 2 (2025): 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.30762/spiritualita.v9i2.3286>
- Maghribi, Hamdan. *Tasawuf Salafi: Rekonstruksi Tasawuf Ibn Taimiyyah*. Malang: Madani, 2024. [Google](#)
- Makdisi, George. "Ibn Taimīya: A Ṣūfī of the Qādiriya Order." *American Journal of Arabic Studies* 1 (1973): 118–29. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003278832-8>
- Makdisi, George. "The Hanbali School and Sufism." *Humaniora Islamica* 2 (1974): 61–72. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112312827-003>
- Memon, Muhammad Umar. *Ibn Taimīya's Struggle against Popular Religion: With an Annotated Translation of His Kitāb Iqtidā' aṣ-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm Mukhālafat Aṣḥāb al-Jahīm*. The Hague: Mouton, 1976. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111662381>
- Michel, Thomas. "Ibn Taymiyya's *Sharḥ* on the *Futūḥ al-Ghayb* of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī." *Hamdard Islamicus* 4, no. 2 (1981): 3–12. [Google](#)
- Noer, Deliar. *The Modernist Muslim Movement in Indonesia, 1900–1942*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1973. [Google](#)
- O'Fahey, R. S., and Bernd Radtke. "Neo-Sufism Reconsidered." *Der Islam* 70, no. 1 (1993): 52–87. <https://doi.org/10.1515/islam.1993.70.1.52>
- Post, Arjan. *The Journeys of a Taymiyyan Sufi: Sufism through the Eyes of 'Imād al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Wāsiṭī*. Leiden: Brill, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004377554>
- Rahim, Fathor, and Hasnan Bachtiar. "Hamka's Neo-Sufism in the Context Modern Society." *Journal of Social Studies* 19, no. 1 (2023): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jss.v19i1.57513>
- Rahman, Fazlur. *Islam*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979. [Google](#)
- Rush, James R. *Hamka's Great Story: A Master Writer's Vision of Islam for Modern Indonesia*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.36075907>
- Sarrió Cucarella, Diego R. "Spiritual Anti-Elitism: Ibn Taymiyya's Doctrine of Sainthood (*Walāya*)." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 22, no. 3 (2011): 275–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09596410.2011.568812>
- Sirriyeh, Elizabeth. *Sufis and Anti-Sufis: The Defence, Rethinking and Rejection of Sufism in the Modern World*. London: Routledge, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315027388>
- Skinner, Quentin. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas." *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3–53. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2504188>
- Sudar. "Ibn Taymiyyah's Theological Influence on Indonesian Muslim Revivalists." Master's thesis, International Islamic University Malaysia, 2014. [Google](#)
- Voll, John O. "Neo-Sufism: Reconsidered Again." *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 42, nos. 2–3 (2008): 314–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00083968.2008.10751385>

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978. [Google](#)
Yaman, Hikmet. "Ḥanbalīte Criticism of Sufism: Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), a Ḥanbalīte Ascetic (Zāhid)." *Ekev Akademi Dergisi* 14, no. 43 (2010). [Google](#)