The Inhibiting Factors of Islamic Civilization Revival

Ilhamuddin
State Islamic University of North Sumatra (UINSU), Medan, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: Ilhamuddin

Abstract: Based on the library data, it was as well-known as a part of culmination of Islamic civilization for about 500 years, then it has regressed until now and it has not rised yet again. Among the theses for a reference so far that the decline and inhibting factors of the progress of Islamic civilization is theological case and the resistance to philosophy. Is it true that theological factors and resistance factors to philosophy are regarded as inhibiting factors of the revival of Islamic civilization? By using the fishbone method in this paper concluded that the main major that inhibits the revival of Islamic civilization is ignorance. This conclusion is found from the analysis of 14 possible root causes that are finally ruled out and only one is worthy of being root cause, that is an ignorance as the main factor. This conclusion both canceled the thesis which has become the most considered reference in the Islamic University in Indonesia that the decline and inhibition of the revival of Islamic civilization is a theologycal factor and resistance to philosophy.

Keywords: ignorance; revival; civilization

I. INTRODUCTION

In view of some Islamic reformers in Indonesia such as Harun Nasution in his book Islam Viewed from The Various Aspects and Nurcholis Madjid in his book Hasanah Intellectual Islam, this view is also probably followed by some of their students who study at the State Islamic University then, the decline of Islamic civilization relating to theological error and rejection of philosophy.

For Harun Nasution, the fatalist theology, namely *Jabariyah and Ash'ariyah* is the factor of the decline of Islam, including in Indonesia. While for Nurcholis Madjid, al-Gazali's criticism fot the philosophers in his book *Tahafut al-Falasifah* is a crucial mistake that resulted of Muslims to leave philosophy. Resistance to this philosophy is seen as an obstacle to the revival of Islamic civilization.

In historycal background of Muslims which have got a glory in the classical period, then it had a setback and destruction since the XIII century AD. Yet, in the phase of the decline and the destruction of the Muslims could resurrect through three major kingdoms, Ottoman in Turkey, Safawi in Persia and Mughal in India. These great kingdoms eventually fell down because of world wars I and II then the entry of European imprealism to the Islamic territories. Therefore, in the early twentieth century the Islamic territories were one by one being able to release from the colonialism, but the expectations for the revival of Islamic civilization until the twentieth century is now not succed to apply, where in the Muslim countries have great natural resources as well as human resources that can compete with other nations outside of Islam.

If observing historical issue for whole, it seems that the inhibiting factor of the revival of Islamic civilization is not only due to the theological and resistant factors to philosophy. Moreover, the current life-style of the society that are in hedonism no longer to achieve the theological and philosophycal life. The real life in contemporary context is more important than the speculative questions in philosophy and theology. Therefore, there must be a correction to the current academic references within the Islamic University in Indonesia that are contrasting to the efforts for resurrecting the Islamic civilization with theological and philosophical problems as described above.

This paper seeks to reveal the all possibilities for *root causes* which is possibility as a factor inhibiting the revival of Islamic civilization to be analyzed and established as *root cause*. This effort is expected to provide a comprehensive explanation of the main causes that are factors inhibiting the revival of Islamic civilization. Many factors potentially become factors inhibiting the revival of Islamic civilization, which is the factor of ignorance, poverty, natural disaster, social catastrophe, imperealism, terrorism, Islamophobia, politics, theology, resistance to philosophy, liberalism, pluralism, human rights violations and genocide. The main issue in this paper is why the theological factor and the resistant factor to philosophy is seen as a factor inhibiting the revival of Islamic civilization. What is the real root cause of inhibiting the revival of Islamic civilization?

II. METHODOLOGY

The discussion in this paper uses the *fishbone* method, which is filtering some possibilities to *possible root* cause and then analyzes what factors are the most dominant and can be determined as the main factor.

III. DISCUSSION

In the world, there are many factors that can cause of advance or decline of a civilization. Therefore, in discussing the inhibiting factors of the revival of Islamic civilization, there are many factors considered as possibilities for being inhibiting factors. In general, there are two thing which is to be the inhibiting factors of the revival of Islamic civilization, internal and external. Internal is a factor derived from within Islam itself, as it is commonly to Muslims which are on ignorance and poverty issue. The internal situation contributes to the pattern of thinking, work ethic and spirituality possessed by Muslims. While external is a factor that comes from outside Islam. Undoubtfully, globalization era has made Islam a variable among many variables that involve the world's competition, which then impacted many political, social, economic and military issues. In this context the negative issues are often forced by those who are phobic towards Islam, ranging from the issue of radicalism which later shaping world opinion on the charge that Islam is likely to terrorism. In addition, the advance or decline of civilization is also closely related to resource factors ranging from natural resources (SDA) and that close phenomenon called natural phenomena such as volcanic disasters, landslides and tsunami. Then human resources (SDM) following social phenomena such as war, narcotics, corruption and disease outbreaks. Natural resource wealth is naturally obtained by humans, while human resources can be formed or engineered. Natural disasters and social disasters are closely related to human actions and behavior. The history of human civilization proves how the human can manipulate the civilization from primitive to modern.

Human resources (SDM) can be established through education, research and experience and then produce science and technology. The history records about 500 years of Muslims had been a leader for the civilization of the world, it, since the time of the Prophet Muhammad SAW was alive until the time of the Umayyad and Daula Abbasid Empire. This period is recorded as the golden age of Islamic civilization marked by the growth and development of science and technology.

While Mecca was under Raululloh Muhammad saw authority, Islam was only a religion, then when in Medina, Islam was not only a religion anymore but has become a government or a state. Thus Madinah became the center of government to the Caliphs of Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, Umar bin Khattab, Uthman ibn Affan and Ali bin Abi Talib. Next after the Umayyads came, the centre of Islamic government was moved to Damascus. When the power of the Umayyads in Damascus was captured by the Bani Abbas, then the center of Islamic rule was moved to Baghdad. That's how Baghdad for about 500 years became the center of government as well as the center of Islamic civilization.

In the first half of the XIII century AD, 1238 AD, when the area of the Daula Abbasid was a vast expanse of land that control of the various Abbasid territories weakened and Bagdad, then, fell into the hands of Hulagu Khan's Mongol army. The fall of Baghdad was also a proof of the decline and collapse of Islamic civilization. The fact shows that until the XXI century now Islamic civilization has not succeeded in reviving. As currently showing an evidence, the various Islamic regions have a wealth of natural resources, such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Egypt including Indonesia. On the one hand the wealth of natural resources is thus a true capital for the revival of Islamic civilization. But the reality is not so. Muslim countries with a wealth of natural resources are unable to do much for the revival of Islamic civilization. The wealth of SDA Saudi Arabia is only for themselves. Similarly, the wealth of natural resources in Indonesia as a majority Muslim nation in fact controlled by non-Muslims.

At the same time, the wealth of natural resources was once a real strong evidence for European imperialism to Muslim countries. In this context, the wealth of natural resources is due for main disaster. Natural resources (SDA) becomes a catastrophe when it becomes a contested target among the nations who desire to master it as happened to the Islamic regions since the collapse of the hegemony of Islamic power since the XIII century M. Various Islamic areas colonized. For example, Egypt was colonized by France and Britain, Indonesia was colonized by the Dutch and Malaysians colonized by the England.

Imperialism occured, as European imperialism against various Islamic regions was closely related to the strength or weakness of human resources owned by the Muslim community. When human resources in imperealist countries strengthened and human resources in Islamic countries weakened then there was colonialism. The weakness or strength of human resources in a society was in symbiosis relating to their own spirituality. It encouraged the existance of work ethics so that there was no important and strong creativity as maximum work ethic.

Theologically, the spirituality is formed from the pattern of thinking and belief. The most prominent theological discussion on this issue in Islam involves two major groups, the traditionalists (*ahl al-Hadith*) and the rational (*ahl al-Ra'y*). In understanding the various things in traditional groups tend to be textual and give a large portion of the *nash* while the rational group tends to be contextual and give a large portion to the ratio in

understanding the various problems. *Mu'tazila* and *Qadariyah* can be positioned as rationalism. *Ash'ariyah* and *Jabariyah* can be positioned as traditionalism. Al-Qadi 'Abd al-Jabbar, for example, from the *Mu'tazila*, holds that human beings created their own deed so they are worthy to have some (reward) or punishment (punishment / torture). If God creates human deeds then man is not worthy of reward (reward) and punishment (punishment). Furthermore, if all human actions are based on God's provisions, it can lead to the notion that Allah bless a kafir as kafir, this idea for the *Mutazilah* is considered vulnerable to undermine the Muslim beliefs. Similarly, showing an evidence that God created human deeds, then the consequence is that human creativity is not an act for man. In this context, there is no proof for mandatory *wajib, haram, makruh, mubah and mandub*. In addition, *Mu'tazilah* thought that obligation is regarded as a good one when there are cans and probabilities to do so. Besides, how Allah, the mighty and the glorious, will reckon His servants in the Hereafter if their deeds of human are Allah's creation. Furthermore, how Allah gives reward and punishment (goodness and torture) if humans instead create their own actions that will be rewarded and punished.

Relating to the explanation above, it seems that in the matter of one's creativity, three possibilities exist: *First*, perhaps all human actions are God's creations, the consequence is that there is no deed for man. Therefore, human beings receive no praise, reproach, reward or punishment. *Second*, it may be both God and man do, so praise and censure apply. *Third*, human deeds may be human creations. Therefore man will get praise, reproach, reward and punishment. The *Mu'tazila* accepted only the third alternative as a consequence of their doctrine of human freedom. Similarly to the view above, *Mu'tazila* argued that human are essentially those who created his deeds, as indicated in the Qur'an (Surah al-Ankabut, 29:17; Surah al-Mukminun, 23: 14 ; QS.al-Maidah, 5: 110). All of the verses refer to the full role of man in his deeds. Therefore, human actions, according to which can be understood logically from the verses of the Qur'an above, are human creations. The use of the term *Khalq* in the verses above, strongly supports the Mu'tazilah's view, that man created his deeds because in general the term *Khalq* is related to the issue of creation. As God says in holy Qur'an about the creation of this universe in many verses, He also uses the term *Khalq* (QS.al-An'am, 6: 73) so it is quite argumentative if the Mu'tazila call man 'the creator of his own deeds'.

As far as the explanation that understanding as mentioned previously is not up to the position of human beings equal with God. Mu'tazilah do not attempt to equal humans with God in creation because it is contradictory to the doctrine of *al-tauhid* of theirs. After all, too many empirical facts that make man not in the same position with God, including in the matter of the creation of deeds. Apparently, in general terms *Khalq* is used by God to show its full role in an action, such as acts of God when creating nature. Thus the relation of the *Khalq* term in the verse that describes the human act as mentioned above, is the way of God to indicate the full role of man in his deeds.

In Islamic theology of creativity or human action is divided into two, those are *idtiroriyah* (reflective and instinctive) and *ikhtiyariyah*. Reflective behavior is not a much-debated part of the discourse of Islamic theology because it is beyond human control of their desire or motive or consciousness. Therefore, reflective action occurs outside the normal considerations, namely natural so it is difficult to research, to observe, to experiment to be a scientific study material. In a reflective action man is in a condition which has no freedom of choice so that it cannot be responsible for.

Therefore, *ikhtiyariyah* acts alone can be used as Islamic theological discourse because it is related to desire and power normally within the limits of human consciousness. More prevalent, the actions of *ikhtiyariyah* originated from the activity of the heart that appeared an abstract movement in the form of feeling, desire, will or motivation.

Many terms can be used to refer the power to, such as *istitha'ah, quwwah, qudrah* and *harakah*. All these terms can be connected to power. The debate which arises later is when the power comes to a person, whether before or simultaneously and when the deed takes place. The determination of *istitha'ah* is related to human independency in doing something. If the word *istitha'ah* existed before the act then the essential consequence of human deeds is one hundred percent to the responsibility of humans because it is done independently (free). But if it is said that *istitha'ah* coincides with deeds then the consequences of human actions is not one hundred percent of human responsibility, because in this context humans lose his freedom, so that human beings do for whole because of his unwillingness so it is likely to the action of *idthiroriyah* or reflective.

Relating to the debate above, Mu'tazilah takes a pro-stance towards the independence of human deeds. This understanding brings the Mu'tazilah to the notion that it is the man who created his deeds. If God created man's deeds then there is no point He sent His Messenger and sent down revelation because man is not in an arbitrary in following His instructions. Therefore, for Mu'tazila, it cannot be accepted that the man who created his deeds. In human doing, there are disbelief, lies and tyranny. If the God who created human deeds leads to the notion that the bad deeds are the doing of God for those who do something, they are attributed to themselves. Therefore, for the Mu'tazila it is very risky to say that Allah created human deeds.

Besides, according to the Mu'tazila it cannot be said that Allah created the deeds of His servant and He then tortures them because among the actions of His servant is immoral. To inflict a deed on the non-perpetrator is an act of wrongdoing. It is a bad thing so it is not worth relying on God. Therefore, human actions are not God's creation. Abd al-Jabbar said, 'God does not want to do injustice as mentioned in the verse (not your God is persecuting His servants QS.Fushshilat, 41:46); (verily Allah does not persecute a person even as much as zarrah.QS al-Nisa ', 4:40); (and your Lord does not persecute a single man) QS al-Kahf, 18: 49)'. Starting from these verses, the Mu'tazila insisted that men created their deeds and God did not intervene in them.

The *Ash'ariah* followers reject the Mu'tazila view above, for according to al-Ash'ari such a view contradicts to the Qur'anic verse (Surah Hud, 11: 107). This opinion is a consequence of the general view of Ash'ariah who cling to the concept of God's absolute will and power.

For Asy'ariyyah, human has no choice in determining his deeds because of all that man does based on God's provisions. God is the creator of human actions. According to them, in essence of the doing will not happen unless it is created by who created it. Therefore, there must be one who creates genuine disbelief and faith. Allah made the disbelief a bad thing and Allah made it good. It is God who creates human actions, good or bad. If it were not He who created it, then the *kafir* would call the *kafir* is good as he wished. Abu Hasan al-Ash'ari called the human act as *al-kasb*. There is no *fa'il* for *kasb* except Allah. Similarly there is no *Khaliq* except Allah. According to him no one could create essentially except God. The act of necessity of the *fa'il* for essential. Therefore, according to him, *kasb* must be from *muktasib* which gave *kasb* intrinsically. Therefore, in his view good deeds such as *belief* and evil such as *kufr*, actually God created them. Definition of the belief man, according to him, is that man has faith with *qudrah hadith*, that is a new power or created power, it does not mean that man exactly creates a faith, but God. It is also about lie to. The one who lies as a *kasib* is not the creator of the true lie. In similar, al-Ash'ari used the example of the movement *idthiroriyah* to show that God, indeed, the one who created human deeds. The act of *idthiroriyah* for him is an indisputable fact and carries the nature of human is indeed *majbur* (forced) or no choice in his deeds.

In contrast to al-Ash'ari, the second character among the Ash'ariyah, al-Baqillani divides human creativity into two kinds, those are the deeds that occur based on human choice and deeds that occur because humans are forced to do so. Example based on empirical facts that under normal circumstances man is able to stand, sit, and speak with his own desires. But humans are not able to move when paralyzed or limited movement when they are sick. Standing on this fact, al-Baqillani acknowledges the existence of a man's intervention in his deeds. Therefore, it comes to an understanding that man has freedom in determining what he wants. However, it seems that human freedom in his view is not as great as the Mu'tazila's thought. This is viewed from his view that man is only capable of doing with the *qudrah* created by God. In fact, one can only do something at a time, but he is probably not be able to do the same at another time. Besides, according to him, man cannot do anything before *iktisab* (the deed happens), but they are only able to do in circumstance of *iktisab*, that is when the deed happens because human is not given by Allah the *qudrah* before. In this context al-Baqillani viewed that power existed to deeds. This is why liberalism in al-Baqilani's thought is not as much Mu'tazila's. In a proof, although al-Baqillani's thought is closely to the Mu'tazila, but in the context of human deeds he has not been far away in thought with his senior Abu Hasan al-Ash'ari.

According to al-Baqillani the *qudrah* of human is not fixed which is due to the human ability only exist in deeds being. According to him if man has had the ability before the occurrence of deed, then at the time, it no longer needs the help of God. According to him, such an impossible. His thought gives an illustration of the dynamics among Ash'ariyah, because if al-Ash'ari strictly protects the notion that man's deeds are God's creations, al-Baqillani's focus is not only on deeds but slightly on power so that there is space freedom in it. Human freedom in this context according to him is on the use of that power itself. Thus power is divided into two parts, namely *kulliyah* and *juziyah*. The *kulliyah* is the creation area and is the prerogative right of Allah, while the *juziyah* is the area of utilization or use. In this area of use involves the human freedom to use power so that later there will be accountability in the world and in the hereafter. In this world, the wrongdoers cannot escape from the responsibility before the law by simply saying the act is God's creation. Then in the hereafter all people must be responsible for, cannot be separated simply by saying it is the act of God's creation. All deeds will be reckoned according to the God's revelation in the Qur'an (Surah al-Zalzalah, 99: 7-8).

Furthermore al-Baqillani explains that human power is not fixed because if it balances because of 2 reasons, it is firstly because of himself or because of the cause. If it balances because of the individual, he should always be there at the same time or at different times. He thought it was impossible. Furthermore, if it balances because of a cause it must be something physical or material. That's also not true.

This view seems to indicate that al-Baqillani disagreed with an opinion which saw power as the cause of the deed, in his view, the cause of the deed was due to the creation of God. In this case, al-Baqillani is still on the understanding that God is the one who created the deed. But as has been mentioned previously there is a new one in his view. He is not exactly like al-Ash'ari who sealed human freedom so it is likely to adopt Jabariyah fatalism. In the opinion of al-Baqillani slightly state a bit freedom on the aspect of the use of power or power

created by God. From that view comes the argument that God is fair if he punishes his sinful servant even though the act is his creation. Human responsibility takes place on the use not on the creation, it means that man is sinful because of wrong doing in using the power created by God.

The view above can also be illustrated in the use of other potentials created by God, such as the use of ratios, feelings and senses even though Allah created all in man, but man is responsible for his doing. It is not only mistaken in using the function, but also in absence and omission or omission by not using or evoking the five senses created by God in good path is fatal, bringing a person into hell and his status more erroneously than the animal, as implied in the Qur'anic verse (QS. al-A'raf, 7: 179).

Relating to the previous description and verse, the commitment to use the ratio, feeling and senses in goodness is severely demanded in order to maintain the dignity given by God to human as mentioned in the Qur'an (Surat al-Isra ': 17 : 70). Ratio, feeling and senses are part of the so-called human virtue of God's other creations so that a strong commitment is needed to enable them to function properly in order to maintain maximally for human dignity. The *taklif* issue in Islamic theology deals with the discussion of power. Talking about capable or incapable for someone which hold taklif based on his power. Because the power in many views is different, *taklif* is also perceived differently by Mutakallimin. For those who have a thought likely to Mu'tazilah tend to see all the *taklif* can be done. But for those who argue like Jabriyyah and Ash'ariyah certainly tend to see *taklif* as something that cannot be done. So the question is whether all the *taklif* can be done or something that cannot be done.

In view of al-Baqillani, Allah gives power to do to people who are previously nothing. Therefore, power exists deeds acts. As the rings move along with hand gestures. Water came out at the same time as the entry of stone into the glass. Someone feels ill with the disease. To reinforce this opinion, al-Baqillani puts forward the verse (Sura-Baqarah, 2: 286); and (QS, al-Thalaq, 65: 7). According to al-Baqillani, the above verses indicate that there is no power before deeds. This opinion is reinforced by the verse (QS, al-Baqarah, 2: 184). This verse in his opinion clearly shows the absence of power / ability before the action.

Furthermore, al-Baqillani said that his opinion which mentions a power for one act does not show that man are forced by his deeds. On his view, the definition of 'forced' is someone burdened with something he does not like, not because he cannot afford it. Then, again, he jumped slightly from his senior view, al-Ash'ari who tends to adopt *Jabariyah* fatalism. Although in al-Baqillani's view the power and the deeds come along with, so that power becomes impermanent and its consequences are *taklif mala yuthaq* but *taklif mala yuthaq* according to al-Baqillani contextually no longer falls on forced deeds because deeds in his view are not related to disability but are related to dislike. Thus, in spite of the fact that it is a heavy or incapable *taklif*, it is no problem for he likes. In other words incapacity is not a problem, which is problematic if someone does not like the decision. Therefore, the punishment of Allah against a person who does not implement *taklif* not on the basis of disability but on the basis of unwillingness or dislike of the person to carry it out.

According to al-Baqillani, *taklif mala yuthaq* exists as God commands to His servant to do justice even though God says that man cannot do justice. The verse of Qur'an in al-Maidah, 5: 8 is the command to do justice, while the verse of QS.al-Nisa ', 4: 129 is God's acknowledgment that man cannot do justice. This verse is used by al-Baqillani to support his opinion that the *taklif mala yuthaq* exists and not something bad because it comes from God, the bad is coming from man that is dislike of *taklif*.

In response to the Mu'tazilah's opinion about deeds is not God's creation but the creation of man himself so that there is no *taklif mala yuthaq*, al-Baqillani commented that God is the creator of all human actions because He is in charge of what they do. According to him, Allah says in QS.al-Shaffat, 37: 96 shows that God created man and his deeds. There is no creator other than Allah, as implied in the verse of Qur'an, Fathir, 35: 3; and QS.al-Qashash, 28: 72. In addition, al-Baqillani argues that the view which calls man as the creator of his own deeds contradicts to the Qur'anic verse QS.al-Ra'd, 13:16).

Furthermore, according to al-Baqillani, human deeds are called acts of God because man has been given the power by God to do many things, then God do not abandon the deeds because it happens because of Him, not because of man. If He leaves it, it will not happen then.

Furthermore al-Baqillani said that Allah created man's deeds and it was He who created man's desire to do everything. Thus, in one thing, both desire and ability, there is only one creator, that is God. All of Allah's creation is good and the best (*al-sholah wa al-ashlah*), in this last context all theologycal idealism agree including *Mu'tazila and Ash'ariyya.*

The facts show that Islamic theology is colored by debating in thought which is hard to solve. But in fact, it is actually that theological dialogues is the most positive communication at that time among Muslims especially among the scholars. If sometimes it seems hard but from such a dialogue also appeared the development of the dynamics of thinking in Islam. Through theological dialogue the passion of science can be preserved in continuity even today, Islamic theology can be seen as the main Islamic thought.

Based on the above description it is known that there are several factors that could potentially be viewed as possible root cause of the inhibiting of the revival of Islamic civilization, as can be analyzed in the following table 1.

TABLE I
THE INHIBITING FACTORS OF ISLAMIC CIVILIZATION REVIVAL

No	Possible Root Cause	Root Cause
1	Ignorance	Y
2	Poverty	N
3	Natural disasters	N
4	Social Disasters	N
5	Imprealism	N
6	Terrorism	N
7	Islamophobia	N
8	Political	N
9	Theology	N
10	Resistance to Philosophy	N
11	Liberalism	N
12	Pluralism	N
13	Violation of Human Rights	N
14	Genocide	N

From the fourteen possible root causes in the table above it seems that only one can be the *root cause*, is "ignorance". Thus in conclusion that the main inhibiting factor the revival of Islamic civilization is "ignorance". If the main factor can be solved, other factors will also be able to be solved then. Therefore, all thesis, called theology and resistance to philosophy is the main cause of the decline of Islam, ruins. Also in theology of Asy'ariyah, as well as Jabariyyah and al-Gazali's rejection of philosophy cannot be used as the cause of decline, moreover it becomes main cause of of the inhibition of the revival of Islamic civilization.

IV. CONCLUSION

The view that has been putting the theological factor and resistance to philosophy as an inhibition to the progress and revival of Islamic civilization, so it tends to blame Ash'ariyah and al-Gazali is rejected because although there are many inhibiting factors of the revival of Islamic civilization, the main factor of it is only one, ignorance. If the problem of ignorance can be eliminated from the Islamic community, other factors also can be eliminated. Thus, the thesis of Islamic reformers such as Harun Nasution in his book *Islam Ditinjau dari Berbagai Aspeknya* and Nurcholis Madjid in his book *Hasanah Intelektual Islam*, moreover it has been possibly followed by some of their students who studied at the State Islamic University, such as UIN, IAIN and STAIN that the decline of Islamic civilization is related to the misunderstanding of theology, especially because Indonesian Muslims follow the theology of Ash'ariyah and Jabariyah and the rejection of philosophy by al-Gazali must be revised again because if these factors can be used as one factor not as a major factor so that it is too much exaggerated.

REFERENCES

[1]   Abu Hasan al-Hasan Ali ibn Ismail al-Asy'ari, *al-Ibanah an Ushul al-Diyanah,* Dar al-Kitab al-'Arabi, Beirut, 1985.
[2]   --------, *al-Luma' fi Radd 'ala Ahl al-Ziyag wa al-Bida',* Mathba'ah Munir, Mesir, 1955.
[3]   Abd al-Aziz Muhammad Saliman, *al-Kawasif al-Jaliyat 'an ma'ani al-Washithiyyah,* al-Mamlakah al-'Arabiyyah al-Su'udiyyah, Riyad, 1982.
[4]   Abu Daud, *Sunan Abu Daud,* juz 4, Dar al-Hadits, Kairo, 1988.
[5]   Abu Isa Muhammad ibn Isa ibn al-Saurat al-Tirmizi, *Sunan al-Tirmizi,* jilid 5, Dar al-Fikr, Beirut, 1988.
[6]   Ahmad Amin, *Duha al-Islam,* jilid 1, Dar al-Kutub al-Arabi, Kairo, tt.
[7]   Ahmad ibn Naval, *Musnad Ahmad ibn Naval,* jilid 3, al-Maktab al-Islami, Beirut, 1978.
[8]   Ali ibn Muhammad al-Jurjani, *Kitab al-Ta'rifat al-Haramain,* tp., Singapura, tt.
[9]   Al-Amidi, *al-Ihkam fi Ushul al-Ahkam,* jilid 1, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah, Beirut, 1985.
[10]   Al-Amin al-Haj Muhammad Ahmad, *Syarh Muqaddimah Ibn Abi Zaid al-Qairani,* Maktabah Dar al-Mathbu'ah al-Haditsah, Jeddah, 1991.
[11]   Harun Nasution, *Teologi Islam,* Aliran-Aliran Sejarah: *An*lisa *Perbandingan,* UI-Press, Jakarta, 1986.
[12]   Imam al-Bukhari, *Shahih al-Bukhari,* jilid 2, Dar al-Fikri, Istambul, 1981.
[13]   Imam al-Haramain al-Juwaini, *Kitab al-Irsyad 'ala Qawathi' al-'Adillat fi Ushul al-I'tiqad,* Maktabah al-Sa'adah, Mesir, 1950.
[14]   Nurcholis Madjid, *Hasanah Intelektual Islam,* Bulan Bintang, Jakarta, 1984.
[15]   Philip K Hitti, *History of The Arabs*, The MacMillan Press, LTD, London, 1974
[16]   Al-Qadhi 'Abd al-Jabbar, *Syarh al-Ushul al-Khamsah,* Maktabah Wahbah, kairo, 1960.

[17]   --------, *al-Mughni fi Abwab al-Tauhid.* jilid XV, Dar al-Mishriyah, Kairo, 1965.
[18]   Al-Qadhi Abu Ya'la, *Masil al-Iman*, Dar al-'Azimah, Riyadh, 1410 H.
[19]   Al-Qadhi al-Baqillani, *Kitab Tamhid al-Awail wa Talkhis al-Dalail,* Muassasat al-Kutub al-Tsaqafiyah, Beirut, 1987.
[20]   Saif al-Din al-Amidi, *Gayat al-Maram fi 'Ilm al-Kalam,* lajnah Ihya al-Turats al-Islamiyah, Mesir, Mesir, 1971.
[21]   Al-Syahrastani, *al-Milal wa al-Nihal,* I, Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, Beirut, 1992.
[22]   Zuhdi Jar Allah, *al-Mu'tazilah,* al-Ahliyah al- Nasyr wa al-Tauzi', Beirut, 1974.