

DECONSTRUCTIVE ANALYSIS OF SUFISTIC THOUGHT IN TEJO AND KAMBA'S *TUHAN MAHA ASIK*

Nurhasanah¹, Evan Afri², Zulfan Sahri³
STKIP Kusumanegara, Jakarta, Indonesia
Politeknik Ganesha, Medan, Indonesia
Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

nurhasanah@stkipkusumanegara.ac.id

Received: 29/11/2022

Accepted: 12/12/2022

Publication: 14/12/2022

Abstract

The study is mainly aimed at exploring the sufistic phenomenon presented in Tejo and Kamba's book *Tuhan Maha Asik* by applying deconstructive analysis. Besides, this study also finds out the hidden philosophical meaning revealed in the opposite expression in the book as recommended by Derrida. In this context, deconstruction is concerned not with the discovery of 'truth' or of distilling correct conclusions, but rather with the process of questioning itself. It is a process characterized by uncertainty and indeterminacy. It is interesting to explore and reveal the internal logic of ideas and meaning. Tejo and Kamba succeeded in using paradox as a weapon to reveal the truth of thinking from two opposite points on the book. Two contrasting ideas are used to produce an in-depth truth. The characteristics or style of deconstruction in works of Sufism discussed specifically from what written on book. From the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that many statements in the book *Tuhan Maha Asik* describe the phenomenon of God. This characterizes that this book presents many events that are sufistic in nature. The quotations displayed prove that this understanding must continue to be evaluated in order to create depth and self-awareness of God's existence.

Keywords— approach, deconstruction, phenomenon, sufism, truth

Introduction

Sufism can also be explained from the perspective of the three basic religious attitudes mentioned in the Qur'an. These are the attitudes of Islam, Iman and Ihsan. There is a Hadith of the Prophet (S.A.W) which describes the three attitudes separately as components of Din (religion), while several other traditions in the Kitab-Ul-Iman of Sahih Bukhari discuss Islam and Iman as distinct attitudes varying in religious significance. These are also mentioned as having various degrees of intensity and varieties in themselves. The attitude of Islam, which has given its name to the Islamic religion, means Submission to the Will of Allah. This is the minimum qualification for being a Muslim. Technically, it implies an acceptance, even if only formal, of the teachings contained in the Qur'an and the Traditions of the Prophet (S.A.W). Iman is a more advanced stage in the field of religion than Islam. It designates a further penetration into the heart of religion and a firm faith in its teachings. Ihsan, the third quality, is the highest stage of spiritual advancement. At this stage the devotee has such a realization of the religious truths which amounts almost to their direct vision. This quality of Ihsan, which was later termed as Mushahidah (Direct seeing) by the Sufis, is described in the Tradition by the Prophet (S.A.W).

Sufism (Arabic: *tassawuf*) is generally understood to be the inner, mystical dimension of Islam. A practitioner of Sufism is generally known as a Sufi. Understanding in the perspective of Sufism refers to the perfect self-understanding enchainning the understanding of the Divinity. The Sufis believe that it is the unique human right and privilege to be able to find

the way towards the understanding reality of the Divinity. Sufism has been defined in various ways (Wulan, 2011). According to Hamka, Sufism (*tassawuf*) is spiritual purification from thing and nature to ease the way to God (Hamka, 1952). Abul Qasim Qusairy, a famous Sufi of the eastern world says that tassawuf is the application of Al-Qur'an and prophet's Sunnah consequently to restrain lust, to avoid bid'ah action and not to lighten act of devotion (Sjukur, 1978).

Today, most Muslims and non-Muslims believe that Sufism is outside the sphere of Islam. Schimmel in Manzoor (2016) is quite right while proposing that for Sufis, the paradox is the most legitimate form of guiding the seeker toward the goal. The divine love is the topmost station for which Sufis strive throughout their life. The urge for the Beloved and the hardships of love are the essence of Sufi experience (Manzoor, 2016).

There are as many definitions of Sufi and Sufism as many eminent Sufi masters had practiced as well as experienced it. It is really hard to bring all those multiple viewpoints in this short paper. As (Chittick, 2000) Chittick mentions in the preface of his book on Sufism, the Sufi tradition is immensely so broad and diverse that to provide a conclusive verdict about it, would be an impossible endeavor but it presents subtle emerging themes such as remembrance of God, the path of love, to serve humanity, beatitudes of God, the paradox of veil, etc.

In the theory of deconstruction, a thought that seeks to dismantle the understandings of the general public which has been believed to be hereditary, in the context of purifying meaning, by releasing thoughts that bind a word or object (Herianti., 2018). In accordance with this theory, the writers of the book *Tuhan Maha Asik* appeared to deconstruct people's habit to consider that what are taught by religion is not received literally. People should think it deeply or even think deconstructively to get the truth and the true lesson of a teaching. This study is to explore the sufistic thought presented in the book by applying deconstructive analysis. Besides, this study is to find out the hidden philosophical meaning revealed in the opposite expression in the book as it is recommended by Derrida. (Reynold, 2004)

Literature Review

Deconstruction

The word deconstruction is taken from the French verb *deconstuire*, connoting to undo the improvement of or the development of, to take to pieces. Gnanasekaran explains that deconstruction is a system that incorporates all other related necessities of building radially and tenaciously, and/ or contains both obliteration and improvement in itself giving space for the illumination that there is no destruction without advancement and the other way around (Gnanasekaran, 2015) Deconstruction was first coined by the philosopher, Jacques Derrida. Deconstruction is a theory of literary analysis that opposes the assumption of structuralism. The objective deconstruction is to discern the relationship between text and meaning. Then, the deconstruction aims to show the inappropriateness of logic or rhetoric between explicitly mentioned and implicitly hidden text. Deconstruction is a philosophy applied to literary criticism, as well as to criticism of the other arts, which began to gain popularity in the 1980s. Deconstruction is an approach, which rigorously pursues the meaning of a text to the point of exposing the supposed contradictions and internal oppositions upon which it is founded - showing that those foundations are irreducibly complex, unstable, or impossible.

Further, Derrida shows that a text can be read as saying quite different from what it appears to be saying and that it may be read as carrying of significance or as saying many different things which are fundamental at variance with, contradictory to and subversive of what may be seen by criticism as a single, stable 'meaning'. Thus, a text may betray itself. Texts create only a semblance of stable meaning. Where a text may appear to offer the reader options (either/or), in fact, it offers not such choice (both/and), and remains ultimately uncommitted, leaving the reader with no sense of closure (2006: 111). The kind of options which text offers will often be in the form of apparent binary oppositions which the text seems to distinguish. However, Derrida insists that deconstruction is not a method, but an activity of reading. Moreover, deconstruction has tended to employ discernable techniques. Deconstructive analyses look for what is deemphasized, overlooked, or suppressed in a particular way of thinking or in a

particular set of legal doctrines.

In the literary works, deconstruction is used to find the contrasted matters found in the text themselves. The meaning is even shown in the contrary with the precious existing meaning. Derrida coined the term *differance*, which forms the basis of the deconstruction theory. It means both a difference and an act of deferring, which together help us understand the meaning. We understand the meaning of words in contrast to the meaning of other words. For example, happiness is understood as an emotion that is not sadness. This takes care of the difference aspect of difference. Derrida also argues that the meaning of any word is understood through a continuous process of deferring. He says that in order to understand the definition or meaning of one word, we rely on the meanings of other words that define it. This constant process of competing interpretations and eternal deferring is a testament to the fact that meaning is not fixed (Kalive, 2017)

In this context, deconstruction is concerned not with the discovery of ‘truth’ or of distilling correct conclusions, but rather with the process of questioning itself. It is a process characterized by uncertainty and indeterminacy. For this reason, Derrida explains, deconstruction is not a ‘method’, and it cannot be transformed into one (Turner, 2016). Finally, deconstruction is not an act or an operation. Rather, it is something that happens, something that takes place. It takes place everywhere. It does not require deliberation or consciousness, but rather its potential exists within our structures of meaning. It is interested in exploring and revealing the internal logic of ideas and meaning. It is concerned with opening up these structures and revealing the way in which our understanding of foundational concepts is constructed. This is internal to meaning itself and not dependent on external factors. What this suggests is that the possibility of deconstruction exists within the structure of meaning itself, within the structure of difference, and is not something to be found and applied from the outside. It is primarily concerned with understanding ideas, not with their application.

Derrida’s deconstruction is also founded in the opinion that people usually express their thoughts in terms of binary oppositions, with the claim that each term of a binary opposition always affects the other (Sikirivwa, 2020) and this arises from the theory of language according to which the meaning of a term is determined by its position within the linguistic system, and not by any fixed property of “meaning” that is indissociably bound to it. A meaning is an effect produced by the interrelationships among the terms of a language. Consequently, neither concept in an opposition of contrast has an identity that is entirely independent of its opposite (Armstrong, 2004). Barbara Johnson (Abrams, 2009) states, “Deconstruction is not synonymous with destruction. The deconstruction of text does not proceed by random doubt or arbitrary subversion, but by the careful teasing out of warring forces of signification within the text itself. If anything is destroyed in a deconstructive reading, it is not the text, but the claim to unequivocal domination of one mode of signifying over another.”

Jonathon Culler in Saleh and (Hashemi, 2013) also states that deconstructing a discourse is to show or reveal:

how it undermines the philosophy it asserts, or the hierarchical oppositions on which it relies, by identifying in the text the rhetorical operations that produces the supposed ground of argument, the key concept or premise.

In terms of deconstructive reading and interpreting a literary work, deconstruction identifies paradoxical situation in a text, on one hand, and systematically dismantles them, on the other. Deconstruction is not to neutralize the deadlock of meaning. On the other hand, it is to guide a double meaning. This is the play role of binary opposition (Patel, 2012). The difference between one discourse and another lies merely in the manner in which one inhabits the interior of a conceptuality doomed to decay, or already submitted to decay, argues Derrida. We must strive to re-establish the unity of tool and idea, whether inside that conceptuality or even without it, before the originality of the one and the other is revealed, and without allowing this profound union to give rise to confusion (Derrida, 1998).

Deconstruction can be used to better comprehend the relationship between text and meaning, institution and nature, dichotomies, and the hierarchies that language creates. It is a type of literary and philosophical analysis that is based on the writings of post-structuralist

philosopher Jacques Derrida. His work suggests that meaning does not remain static but rather evolves and alters over time and space (Turner, 2016) (Khakzand, 2022)

Deconstruction has at least two aspects: literary and philosophical. The literary aspect concerns the textual interpretation, where invention is essential to finding hidden alternative meanings in the text. The philosophical aspect concerns the main target of deconstruction: the “metaphysics of presence,” or simply metaphysics. Starting from Heideggerian point of view, Derrida argues that metaphysics affects the whole of philosophy from Plato onwards. Metaphysics creates dualistic oppositions and installs a hierarchy that unfortunately privileges one term of each dichotomy /presence before absence, speech before writing, and so on (Reynold, 2004). In *Grammatology*, Derrida stated that deconstruction concerns about the unseen rather than the obvious one. It is just like in the previous quotation. A deconstructive reading must always aim at a certain relationship, unperceived by the writer, between what he commands and what he does not command of patterns of language that he uses. It attempts to make the not-seen accessible to sight.

Binary Opposition

The establishing of one center of unity automatically means that another is decenter, Derrida concludes that Western metaphysics is based on a system of binary oppositions. “For each center, there exists an opposing center” (God vs humankind for instance). In addition, Western metaphysics holds that in each of these binary operations or two opposing centers, one concept is superior and defines itself by its opposite or inferior center. For example, we know light because we know dark. The creating of these hierarchal is the basis of Western metaphysics to which Derrida objects (Bressler, 1999). After realizing the concept of center, Derrida in (Putra, 2012) concludes that in every center there is and opposite center. The relation in this concept is complex since the one is superior to another, and also their meaning depends on each other.

Research Method

This study discusses the idiosyncrasy of Sufistic Deconstruction in the book *Tuhan Maha Asik* by Sujiwo Tejo and MN. Kamba. This study reviews the characteristics of the analysis using a deconstructive approach that leads to the phenomena of Sufism that appear in the work of *Tuhan Maha Asik*. In this book, it is described how the author illustrates the story in the book using the binary opposition technique. The texts in this book are examined to find contradictory points but contain contradictory meanings. The truth shown in these points leads to unity to God. This concept is often found in the mindset of Sufism. Therefore, this study focuses on the characteristics or style of deconstruction in works of Sufism.

Results and Discussion

Bringing into Limelight of the Paradoxes through Analysis of Binaries

The use of the paradox in *Tuhan Maha Asik* is quite dominant. In almost all chapters, paradox becomes a tool to enhance the dialectic in this book. Tejo and Kamba succeeded in using paradox as a weapon to reveal the truth of thinking from two opposite points. This reflects that this book can be categorized as sufi discourse. This book presents sufistic thought by using paradox as used by the other sufi poet. It is based on some previous researched on sufi discourse (Manzoor, 2016). Two contrasting ideas are used to produce an in-depth truth. The truth can be studied logically. This is what makes this book truly characterize the features of Sufism literature. The poet's reliability in using paradox proves a fairly strong understanding of Sufism. Paradox used to represent the phenomenon of life, social, culture. The paradoxes can be examined from two opposing perspectives. However, this paradox contains truth which is a source of inspiration for knowledge towards unity with God. And that is called unity with God.

The paradox found in the book *Tuhan Maha Asik* aims to open the mindset of Godhead. All hanging truths are about God. Like the opposite context used in paradox, Tejo and Kamba

also use the binary features analysis. Two opposing concepts are used to represent the oneness of the Godhead. This can be seen in some of the quotes below:

What is thought to be God's will may be your (human) will (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(19).

The above quote implies that humans are incapable of understanding God's will. It is said that God's power is absolute. Nothing can happen without His will. It is impossible indeed to estimate the activity of God. This implies that humans cannot do anything without God's permission or will. Then how can there be an assumption of human will if indeed everything is according to God's will. Of course this is contradictory. However, Tejo and Kamba explain from the quote above that they believe that everything including our will is God's will too. The problem is not whose will. It is difficult to determine whether it is God's will or our will because there is no mechanism to determine this. However, the most important thing is to carry out the roles and functions as well as possible. That is the true will that God wills. This is also explained in the quote below:

..., choosing to believe everything, including our will is God's will anyway, can be an alternative choice of attitude. (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(20).

Tejo and Kamba emphasized that choosing to believe that everything is God's will is the best choice. That separating His will from ours is not the essence of unity. The emphasis on selection is on the confident attitude that all will is on the basis of His will to be the most appropriate thing. From this it is emphasized that our choice for good is God's choice.

Furthermore, in this book there are things that contradict the two statements above. If our will is God's will. This will be a complicated problem if it is connected with the role of crime. This is illustrated in the quote below:

In the context of unity and oneness, there is actually no evil but imperfect goodness. (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(20).

Here, the author provides two opposing interpretations. However, these two problems can be seen simultaneously. The first interpretation is that criminals carry out their roles according to God's scenario. However, from human interpretation that crime is very inconsistent with conscience and common sense. Humans can choose to do the best. So, humans can ensure that the choice for goodness is God's choice. This is because God is love and in love it is not so important your will or mine, because you have experienced unity. Lovers understand each other's desires, so there is no need to pursue their own desires. This is the truth contained in the paradox of the will of God and servants as stated in the following quote

No matter what the suffering, it is still a pleasure when the process is towards eternal unity and oneness (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(23).

Furthermore, in this book it is described that the paradox of life that we experience is like a play. Tejo and Kamba explain that understanding life is essentially a play that can provide a broad way of interpreting all events as plays in human life. This understanding also realizes wisdom in responding to various phenomena of diversity in life. Based on this understanding, it can be concluded that humans are essentially acting. Man carries out his play according to God's scenario. Therefore, humans do their behavior for various interests in their lives, including protecting themselves. Even pretend play is also a way for humans to protect themselves. Looks contradictory indeed when to protect ourselves we have to pretend. But the truth is seen when we understand the nature of life as a series of plays that can be seen as pretense.

...That pretending is also a way for humans to protect themselves (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(55).

However, in pretending to be a human play, actually it is the seriousness in carrying out the play of life. Like an artist who plays well in a soap opera. If we see the truth, that it is just a pretense. However, the artist plays the scenario with seriousness which makes his acting very good and natural. So that the artist is considered successful in carrying out his pretense. This is illustrated in the following paradox.

But it must be noted that even in acting there is seriousness (Tejo & Kamba, 2020) (59).

The play played by humans in this life scenario describes our busy lives as God's servants. All creatures do their business in silence. This is illustrated in a statement in one

chapter of this book.

They are busy with their own silence (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(173).

Humans are busy with role that must be played. Become a teacher, poet, researcher, scavenger and others. Animals, plants and even inanimate objects are busy with their sunnatullah or natural roles. Animals and plants are busy with their life cycle. Inanimate objects are busy with their obedience. All human beings are by nature very busy with their adherence to life's scenarios. Even though the assumption of busyness is the number of plays or activities, the busyness implies obedience. And obedience is assumed to be silence. Compliance can be symbolized by not protesting. That is the silence of God's creatures in their preoccupation with the play being played. This is what is implied in the quote above.

Furthermore, the plays that are played are based on the verses obtained, whether written or not. Tejo and Kamba illustrate through the following quotes

So, written and unwritten verses are the same, huh? If you play around, it can make you feel bad. But it also can't make you bad (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(181).

From the above quote, there are two things that are simultaneously contradictory. Written and unwritten verses can be misinterpreted if played around, but they can also be true even if played around. The meaning contained in written and unwritten verses can be interpreted seriously or not. Seriously here the meaning is the meaning of the verses through a verification approach outside the context of reason which sometimes requires verification through messengers. However, the meaning of these verses can be through the beat of conscience in the depths of the soul which also gives instructions or inspiration about various interpretations. So it is explained in this book that the discoveries of new theories or the meaning of God's verses that can provide benefits and guidelines for mankind do not always have to come from messengers that require serious verification. Messengers do not always have to be called apostles or prophets because messengers are not limited to humans but also non-human beings. This is the truth contained in the paradox of God's verses illustrated in the above quote.

Deconstructive Opposition to Rational Thought

As explained in the concept of Deconstruction, in *Tuhan Maha Asik* there are many expressions that characterize Sufistic thought. In the sufistic expressions, it can be seen that the author uses two opposite points in one expression but contains mutually supporting meanings. Even this expression contains a philosophical meaning which certainly defies the logic of thinking in general. Seen in the following quote:

..., closeness to God is not determined by formal rituals such as being busy reading alhamdulillah and the like (just an example) as an expression of gratitude for natural phenomena (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(101).

In general, it is recognized that worship is a formal ritual performed by adherents of religions. These activities are only as a habit or obligation. The essence of these worship activities is not sincerely attached to the hearts of worshipers. In fact, worship aims to draw closer to God. When worship is just a mere formality, then the closeness will not be felt. The above quote emphasizes that closeness to God is formed with a sense that is not born only in rituality, but the presence of this sense of worship is very necessary to build closeness to God. Furthermore, there is a quote in the book *Tuhan Maha Asik* which shows the contradiction with the logic of human thinking in general. This contradiction undermines the understanding that prayer is a way for humans to get closer to God. However, in the quotation below, this understanding is undermined

..., God also on the other hand understands the attitude of the servant who does not pray because he is afraid of being distant from God, because when he prays he feels that he is facing God, even though he wants to be one (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(135).

The above quotation deconstructs that prayer can actually build distance with God. In this quote, the author illustrates that prayer is generally imagined as facing God, not as one. This is what causes the worshipers to distance themselves from God. Prayer should be one with God.

This quote invites you to build a mindset that worship or prayer builds a sense of unity with God, not imagining you are dealing with God. In addition, this quote undermines the common understanding that prayer is not just a ritual of getting closer. However, prayer is a process of oneness with God. This means that prayer makes the doer possess divine qualities, so that prayer makes humans better. There are two opposing points in the quote below. Obedient words that can tarnish loyalty. Rationally, obedience is a form of loyalty. However, these two points are juxtaposed in the following quote

Pride because of religious devotion is an affair that tarnishes loyalty and intimacy with God (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(141)

The general understanding is that religious obedience shows loyalty to God. However, the quotation above shows that obedience sometimes leads to arrogance. When obedience is prioritized without awareness and humility, this obedience becomes hidden arrogance. When obedience is accompanied by arrogance, that obedience tarnishes loyalty and even intimacy with God. Obedience is no longer pure loyalty. This quote seems to break the rational thinking of religious people. Actually, this quote sends the message that sincere obedience is the awareness that we just want to obey without expecting anything. This obedience is a form of loyalty to God. This is at the same time destructive to the understanding or mindset of religious observance.

Sufistic Thought in *Tuhan Maha Asik*

By applying deconstructive analysis on this study, a philosophic idea is found in the book. It is revealed as sufistic thought. At the same time, the existence of the idea proves that this study applies deconstructive analysis. Besides, the object of the study is a sufi discourse. It is in line with what Culler explains. According to Jonathan Culler (Patel, 2012), the indispensable step to deconstruct a discourse is to show or reveal “how it undermines the philosophy it asserts, or the hierarchical oppositions on which it relies, by identifying in the text the rhetorical operations that produces the supposed ground of argument, the key concept or premise”. Based on this opinion, this study found that the book reveals sufistic thought as the philosophical aspect. The sufistic thought presented in the book is transition of life.

Life has a transitional nature. Life is moving. Not static. This transitional nature applies to God's creatures. The transition process is in accordance with God's provisions. That is called sunatullah. This concept of life transition leads to relativity in life. That the value of something in this life is relative. The Sufis view the value of life as mere relative. Therefore life is moving. Life goes through transitions. This concept is also used by Tejo and Kamba in the book *Tuhan Maha Asik*. At the end of each chapter, it always ends with a conclusion that leads to a transitional view from one point of view to another. Two contradictory things initiated at the beginning of the story until the middle of the chapter will end with a conclusion that implies a transitional view. This view is to gain wisdom or new knowledge. Knowledge that is sometimes transcendent becomes a new light for human life in particular. Let's take a look at some of the following quotes that represent the transitional nature of life.

Value is not in the gold or clay, but in its meaning (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(22).

In the quote above, Tejo and Kamba explain that humans who find their identity and gain self-enlightenment see the difference between gold and clay as something that is only relative. Seeing something valuable can be something ordinary or even worthless according to the purpose and meaning of looking at it. Disease will be viewed in two different ways. A wise person will consider his illness as a form of God's love for him. He was prejudiced against the pain that was given to him. He considered the pain as his way to purifying the heart. However, kufr people will consider sickness as a disaster or punishment. He always blames something outside himself. In fact, he blamed God for the pain. Various perspectives can appear on a living phenomenon. Therefore, views or perspectives are relative or changeable. This is also seen in

Besides God. Everyone has the potential to change (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(39).

Next, views and interpretations of His verses are also relative. Human perception of

God's signs or messages is also always changing. Nothing is absolute. Because the only thing that is absolute is the Supreme Being. He is the Absolute. Therefore, there are so many interpretations that arise about human perception of a phenomenon. In fact, the perception of God himself is also different.

Other than that, everything is relative. Including the perception of Him and the interpretation of His verses and sign (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(50).

Tejo and Kamba say in the book *Tuhan Maha Asik* that God does not question the perception of Him as he is or not, and whether the interpretation of His verses is in accordance with His will or not. What is important is how to take lessons from existing perceptions and interpretations. Wisdom is wisdom and wisdom. The perception of God and the interpretation of His verses must lead to wisdom and discernment. This means that the meaning of the interpretation can influence the formation of wise and wise attitudes and behavior. This is actually the essence conveyed in Sufi literary works. *Tuhan Maha Asik* book emphasizes the conclusion of seeking wisdom in whatever is seen in life. In addition, this book also emphasizes that humans have nothing and are entitled to nothing. Everything happens according to God's will. This is in line with the Sufi view of life.

Basically, humans are nothing and have no right to own anything, except with the permission of God (Tejo & Kamba, 2020) (141).

The quote implies that humans should not be arrogant. In fact, Tejo and Kamba explain that boasting about religious devotion is an affair that tarnishes loyalty and intimacy with God. Lovers of God absolutely do not feel that there is a meaningful role for themselves or for others, except that anything and any prophecies that are born from them are solely God's arrangements as well. That's how God, through His lovers teaches humility because peace lives not by pride but by humility. That's the true life of life. There are always lessons we can learn through or without messengers. This is illustrated in the quote below.

In this connection, perhaps, the discoveries of new theories that provide guidance to humanity and are of wider benefit also through the messenger route, although the person concerned does not have to be called an apostle or prophet (Tejo & Kamba, 2020)(184).

Obviously, in this book it is explained that God always bestows guidelines for human life. Humans who always experience life transitions from time to time do not do it alone. However, God always gives instructions through signs. These signs are called the verses of God. These signs can be conveyed through messengers. Or what is often called a prophet or apostle. However, these signs do not have to go through a messenger or someone from humanity. Messengers are not limited only to the selection of a human being, but also to creatures other than humans. We see that ants are just small animals that don't have a big influence on life. But, from him we learn how the nature of togetherness and mutual cooperation is built. From small things we can learn big things. Conversely, things that we think are big actually only have a small impact. That life is always in transition. And this can all be illustrated in the book *Tuhan Maha Asik*.

Conclusion

From the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that many statements in the book *Tuhan Maha Asik* describe the phenomenon of God. This characterizes that this book presents many events that are sufistic in nature. These phenomena are presented by presenting contradictory things or binary opposition. These two contradictory things are intended to represent a philosophical meaning. This is called a paradox. This is the specialty or uniqueness of this book. Paradoxes that seem deconstructive provide a deep understanding of Godhead. In addition, in this book, there are many statements that are destructive, but in fact these statements are very constructive, inviting people to think in terms of what has been understood so far. Rigid understandings lead to irrational mindsets. The quotations displayed above prove that this understanding must continue to be evaluated in order to create depth and self-awareness of God's existence. It can be concluded that this book can be said to present Sufistic phenomena in a deconstructive style.

References

- Abrams, M. &. (2009). *A Glossary of Literary Terms (9th ed)*. Boston : Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Armstrong, J. &. (2004, March). *Safe System : Construction, Destruction, and Deconstruction (Technical Report Series)*. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/196e/ae1675c3f3cee7cf7e0dc3003dcb66be8c32.pdf>.
- Bressler, C. (1999). *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to theory and practice (2nd ed)* . New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Chittick, W. (2000). *Sufism; A Beginner's guide*. Oxford: One World.
- Derrida, J. (1998). *Writing and Difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gnanasekaran, R. (2015). An Introduction to Derrida Deconstruction and Post-Structuralism. *International Journal of English Literature and Culture*, 211-214.
- Hamka. (1952). *Perkembangan Tasawuf dari Abad ke Abad*. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- Herianti. (2018). Sufistic of the Social Transformation Era (Deconstruction of Jalaluddin Rakhmat's Thought). *Journal of Islam and Science*, 46-52.
- Hashemi, M. &. (2013). Deconstruction, Ontology and Literature. *International Researchers*, 23- 31.
- Kalive, P. (2017). *Jacque Derrida's Deconstruction Theory*. Retrieved from <https://www.sociologygroup.com/deconstruction-theory/>.
- Khakzand, M. &. (2022). Deconstruction as a Technique for Divergent. *Journal of Design Thinking*, 263-276.
- Manzoor, A. (2016). Deconstructive Phenomenological Analysis of Sufi Discourse. *Linguistic and Literature Review*, 17-29.
- Patel, P. (2012). The Deconstructive Process: The Theoretical Speculations and the Fate of Reading Beyond Formalism. *The Criterion : An International Journal in English*, 1-11.
- Putra, R. (2012). *A Deconstruction on the binary opposition of the male and female characters in Susan glasspel's trifles (Undergraduate Thesis)*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University.
- Reynold, J. d. (2004). <https://iep.utm.edu/derrida/#H5>. Retrieved from Internet encyclopedia of philosophy.
- Sikirivwa, M. (2020). Deconstruction Theory and It's Background. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 44-72.
- Sjukur, A. (1978). *Ilmu Tasawuf*. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu.
- Tejo, S., & Kamba, M. (2020). *Tuhan Maha Asik*. Tangerang: Imania.
- Turner, C. (2016). *Jacques Derrida: Deconstruction. Critical Legal Thinking*. Retrieved from <https://criticallegalthinking.com/2016/05/27/jacques-derrida/>.
- Wulan. (2011). Sufistic Allegory in the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam. *Julisa*, 119-135.