



Title	The Perfect Man in Islam : A Textual Analysis
Author(s)	Abu-Zaid, Nasr
Citation	大阪外国語大学学報. 1989, 77, p. 111-133
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/11094/81225">https://hdl.handle.net/11094/81225</a>
rights	
Note	

*The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

# The Perfect Man in Islam

——A Textual Analysis——

NASR ABU-ZAID

イスラームにおける「完全な人間」像

——テキスト分析——

ナスル・アブーザイド

本研究は、11世紀以来スーフィズムの中で形成された「完全な人間」という概念に対する、イスラームの基本的考え方を扱う。そのため、コーラン中の、最初の人間としてのアダムの肉体的精神的特徴に関する記述を、神とその対立者としてのサタンとの関係において分析する。その方法論はコーランのテキスト分析であり、次のコーラン注釈書が援用される：①タバリー（10世紀スンナ派）②ザマフシャリー（12世紀ムウタジラ派）③サイイド・クトゥブ（今世紀原理主義）。

第1節では主題と方法論を定義し、第2節ではアダム創造に関するコーランの叙述を分析し、スーフィズムの「人間」像の根拠を探る。第3節は、神が地上におく「代理人」と神がアダムに教えた「名前」の概念を検討した上で、それらに基きスーフィズムの「完全な人間」像が生まれる経緯を見る。第4節でアダムと天使の関係に触れた後、第5節は、イブリースによるアダム崇拜命令の拒否とアダムとイヴへの誘惑に見られる「悪」の概念を検討する。第6節は、アダムたちの行為の中に、悪との関係における疎外の概念を分析する。最後に、「完全な人間」像がイスラーム文化のみでなく、社会における人間の役割とその疎外を明らかにするという意味で、人間一般にも関係することを指摘して結論とする。（翻訳：高階美行）

## 1. Introduction

The doctrine of the Perfect Man represents a very unique aspect in the mystical system of Islam. Though Ibn 'Arabī was the first thinker to use the phrase "The Perfect Man" to signify such a doctrine, the general notion of man as the unique and the most respected creature of God prevailed all the fields of Islamic knowledge. This is due to the fact that the Qur'anic concept of man ascribes to him the central position in the whole universe. Man is addressed in the Qur'an: "Have ye not seen that God had subjected to you what is in the heavens and what is in the earth." (31, 19)<sup>1)</sup> Ibn 'Arabī's comment on this Qur'anic verse goes as follows: "God has so exalted man that He placed under his control all that is in the heavens and the earth from its highest to its lowest."<sup>2)</sup> It is easy then for Ibn 'Arabī to assume that: "all that is in the universe are summed up in the Perfect Man."<sup>3)</sup> The story of Adam in the Qur'ān represents infact the very basis of the later development in Islamic mysticism.

All the scholars who studied the doctrine of the Perfect Man, however, neglected this very obvious fact, and tried every effort to trace its origin as back early as to the Jewish and the Christian traditions. Some of them even denies any relation between the Qur'ān and the mystical doctrine of the Perfect Man claiming that: "such experience and beliefs were partly the cause and partly the consequence of speculation concerning the nature of God and man, speculation which drifted far away from koranic monotheism into Pantheism."<sup>4)</sup> Although Affi refers to the Qur'anic terms used in Ibn 'Arabī's language, following the Orientalists' approach he affirms the Jewish and Christian impact on Ibn 'Arabī's thought and terminologies<sup>5)</sup>. Other scholars are in favour of Plotinus as the source of Ibn 'Arabī's elaboration of the doctrine of the Reality of Muhammad (al-Ḥaqiqah Al-Muḥammadiyah) which is a basic element in the whole doctrine of the Perfect Man<sup>6)</sup>. A very new study devoted absolutely to the doctrine of the Perfect Man follows the same path; no consideration is given to the fact that the Qur'ān, the very basic text and the core of Islamic thought and culture, has its role in forming such doctrine. Instead, very great attention is paid to the Jewish and Christian traditions almost in every motif of the doctrine<sup>7)</sup>.

This proves how correct professor Massignon was, and how correct he still is, when he indicated long ago that, "many Europeans, failing to make sufficient use of the Qur'an, have studied Muslim thinkers only 'from outside' without entering into the heart of Islam itself."<sup>8)</sup> Since the Qur'ān holds a central position, "in the elaboration of any Muslim doctrine, even of the most seemingly heterodox one"<sup>9)</sup> a study which investigates the Qur'anic origin of the doctrine of the Perfect Man is needed. In a previous study about Ibn 'Arabī's hermeneutics of the Qur'ān, I have referred to the mutual interaction between the Qur'anic text and the development of Islamic thought and culture in general, especially that of Ibn 'Arabī, who has been always accused by both Muslim and non-Muslim scholars of

developing a mystical philosophical system which can hardly be related to Islam. In that study, most of these opinions about Ibn 'Arabī's system have been analysed from a hermeneutical perspective as different modes of textual interpretation. It is concluded there that if every scholar has his own cultural horizon from which Ibn 'Arabī's system is evaluated, and according to which he is judged, the best way to overcome such methodological deficiency is to adopt a dialectical approach to analyse the relationship between the text and Islamic thought and culture. In this approach the concept of the text itself, i.e., the Qur'anic text, should be widened to include all the interpretive traditions which have accumulated around the text and thus have become part of it<sup>10)</sup>.

The objective of this study, therefore, is to change the starting point of examining the doctrine of the Perfect Man. Instead of searching for the origin of its foundation far beyond Islamic thought and culture, it is more scientific to start from the Qur'ān itself, considering later developments as interpretive process through which the text is expanded reproducing its meaning and creating, within every mode of interpretation, new significance to its identity. It is also through such interpretive process that Islamic culture reaffirms its identity by absorbing and assimilating whatsoever 'other' cultural elements or ideas to its own scope and horizon.

In order to maintain this 'text-cultur interaction' presupposition of this approach, only the verses of the Qur'ān which deals mainly with the story of Adam, directly or indirectly, will be analysed. Three major commentaries of the Qur'ān are used for such analysis, each of which represents a specific historical stage in the history of Islamic culture on one hand, and stands for a specific school of thinking on the other hand. The first commentary is that of Al-Ṭabarī which is the first collection to contain all the early traditions accumulated around the Qur'ān from the very beginning to the third century of hijrah (tenth century A.D.) It represents in addition to that, the orthodoxial (Sunnī) way of thinking, which is still alive and prevailing uptill now<sup>11)</sup>. The second commentary is that of Al-Zamakhsharī which represents the Mutazilites' way of thinking and their approach of textual analysis. It also represents a second stage of the development of Islamic culture because it was composed about two centuries later than that of Al-Ṭabarī<sup>12)</sup>. The third one is that of Quṭb which stands for modern Islamic fundamentalism<sup>13)</sup>.

## 2. The Creation of Adam.

There are so many characteristics the Qur'ān provides concerning the creation of Adam which have been developed in the mystical system and have become the very foundation of the doctrine of the Perfect Man.

A. The first of these characteristics is the formation of his body. According to the Qur'ān, Adam's body is made of clay (Ṭīn). In some verses of the Qur'ān, the substance of Adam's body is merely clay; in other verses, there are some specifications to what kind of clay<sup>14</sup>. In one verse, it is clay like potter's (ṣaḷṣālin kal fakḥkhār)<sup>15</sup>. In another it is potter's clay of black mud altered (Ṣaḷṣālin Min Hama'in Masnūn.)<sup>16</sup> In a third verse it is described as plastic clay (Ṭīn Lazib.)<sup>17</sup> Al-Ṭabarī explains such variations as different conditions of one basic substance. It is dust moulded with water to make clay. Then the clay is heated, or simply left to be altered. The potter is made of heated clay, so part of the clay from which Adam's body was fashioned should be of heated clay. He concludeds that Adam's body was made of the different kinds of clay mentioned in the Qur'ān. According to al-Ṭabarī, the linguistic root of the name 'Adam' means the outward level or the surface. The first human being was called so because his body was made of the outer surface of the earth (Adīm). Different samples of soil were taken from different parts of the surface of the earth, mixed together, and from the mixture the body of Adam was formed. In order to sustain such an explanation, al-Ṭabarī provides a prophetic tradition (Ḥadīth), which explains also, by the same notion, why Adam's children, have different skin-colours, and have different ways of acting and thinking<sup>18</sup>. When al-Ṭabarī comes to the verse, "we created them of plastic clay", he explains that Adam's body was made of the Four Natural Elements, i.e., Water, Fire, Air and Dust<sup>19</sup>.

It seems likely that such verses in the Qur'ān, with these old traditions al-Ṭabarī quotes of the early Muslim thinkers which explains them, have paved the way to later development in Islamic culture. If it was the Pythagorean thought only, *Ikhwān al-Ṣāfā*, in the fourth century of hijrah (11th century A.D) could not have introduced the motif of Microcosm-Macrocosm to Islamic philosophy<sup>20</sup>. As the Four Elements of Nature constitute the substance of the physical world, they also constitute the substance of Adam's body. It is, therefore, that Adam's body is compared to the physical world. if these Four Elements to be found separately in the physical things, they are gathered in the human body. And still the human body, especially that of Adam, has more privilege than the physical things.

B. This brings the second characteristic of the creation of Adam. All the physical things are created by the command-word of God, i.e., be (KUN), and things are. Adam's body, however, was created by God's own two hands directly. It is mentioned when 'Iblīs refused to fall prostrate before Adam, disobeying God's order, then God said, "O, 'Iblīs, what hindered you from falling prostrate before which I created with both My hands?"<sup>21</sup>

The expression "both My hands" evoked, beside other verses in the Qur'ān, controversial debates between different Islamic groups about God's nature. According to the Sunnī school, the literal meaning is accepted without bearing any resemblance between God and man. The hands of God are not by

any means like the physical hands we know, they are rather specific attributes of God. Al-Ṭabarī, representing the Sunnī school, maintains the literal interpretation by quoting the opinion of one of the companions of the Prophet, Ibn ‘umar, who says: “God created by his own hand only four things, i.e., the Throne (Al ‘Arsh), ‘Adan’s (garden), the Pen and Adam. Then He created every thing else by the command-word ‘be’ (Kun)”.<sup>22)</sup>

The Mutazilites would argue for a metaphorical interpretation to the “hands” in order to maintain God’s differentiation from man and sustain His Unity and Oneness. The expression “both My hands” means then: “with My power” since power is mainly practiced by hands<sup>23)</sup>. Later Sunnī commentators argue against such a metaphorical interpretation. They differentiate between the singular form and the dual form in the usage of the word hand (Yad). If it is possible to be used metaphorically in the singular form to mean “Power”, it has never been used in the dual form to signify such meaning. Moreover, the Qur’anic verse considered here has the structure in which the word is preceded by the preposition “BA,”, which makes it like the sentence: I wrote by the pen (Katabtu bi al-qalam). Since this sentence conveys that the pen IS THE TOOL used in writing, so does the Qur’anic verse convey the meaning that God has created Adam by his own hands. The metaphorical interpretation is by no means applicable to such structure<sup>24)</sup>.

C. As for Adam’s soul, it represents the most unique characteristic of all his creation. Adam has the privilege of being breathed into his body directly by God<sup>25)</sup>. Other creatures have the spirit of God invested into them indirectly, through Adam’s spirit so to speak. The Qur’ān, contrary to the Christian doctrine, makes it very clear that Jesus is like Adam in God’s Eyes, “he was created of dust, and then He said to him: be, and he is.”<sup>26)</sup> Later Sūfī thinker Al-Jīlī explains that the Christians, not understanding the exact meaning of the breathing of God’s spirit into the body of Mary through the Angel, have committed the mistake of worshipping Jesus<sup>27)</sup>.

The significance of God’s breathing of His spirit into Adam’s body lies in the fact that Adam, and accordingly all human beings, have the Divine energy. Therefore, Adam does not only represent the physical world by his body as we explained in a previous paragraph, but he also represents by his soul the Divine energy of God. It is not so difficult for the Sūfīs to conclude that Adam has two aspects, each of which represents one side of reality. He is compound of both divinity and universality. This understanding surely is the very basis of the “Perfect Man” doctrine. But this is not to deny the impact of other cultural elements on Islamic thought. Al-Ḥallāj, who was the first to present this dual nature of Adam, was surely influenced by the duality of Nasūt and Lahūt in Christian tradition<sup>28)</sup>. This influence would not have happened if the Qur’ān did not help evoking the notion of Adam’s double nature.

### 3. The Vicgerent

A. When God first announced to the Angels that He is about to place a vicegerent on earth they did not seem to understand what was meant by that Divine decree. The word “vicegerent” (**Khalifah**), without any annexation (*‘Idafah*) seemed to be obscure to them as it did to the early commentators of the Qur’ān<sup>29</sup>). Since the Arabic root of the word signifies ‘to succeed’ or ‘to come after’, the question is: after whom God was going to place this **khalifah**? Was he to succeed other creatures of God who inhabited earth long time before, but they caused harm and blood-shed on it? Some of the early commentators support such an understanding. They depend on the context of the Qur’anic verse in which the Angels say: Whilst Thou place therein one who will do harm therein and will shed blood, while we, we glorify Thy, praise and sanctify Thee.” This Answer, say some of the early Muslim thinkers, means that earth was inhabited before the creation of Adam, and thus Adam would be the **khalifah** of those who inhabited it<sup>30</sup>). This answer of the Angels by which they praise themselves, in comparison to Adam, will be discussed later in view of the mystical interpretation.

Another answer to the question: whom Adam will succeed on earth, is that the word **khalifah** refers not only to the first man, Adam, but it refers also to all of his children who will succeed each other on earth. It seems that this understanding tries to avoid adding any external information to the text, as it also tries not to suppose any structural omission (*Ḥaḍf*) in the text as the previous explanation does.

The third interpretation, however, provides that Adam would be the **khalifah** of God himself. Al-Ṭabarī is in favour of such understanding. It means, according to a tradition he relates to both the prophet’s companions Ibn Masūd and Ibn ‘Abbās, that Adam will carry out God’s control over His (other) creatures on earth<sup>31</sup>). Al-Zamakhsharī provides the first and the last interpretations adding that Adam is the **Khalifah** of God because he is also a prophet<sup>32</sup>). The difference between the Mutazilites and the Sunnī concerning Adam’s nature and his position in comparison to the Angels will be discussed later.

Quṭb affirms that Adam is God’s **khalifah** on earth. This conveys to him the great position God ascribes to Adam, and accordingly, to all human beings. The Islamic system, provided by the Qur’ān, gives such high value to the human creature which has been so suffering different kinds of humiliation in other, non-Islamic, systems, whether economical, social, political or philosophical. According to Quṭb, both the two major systems of the present world, i.e., Capitalism and Socialism, have undervalued the human being; the former system has turned him down to be only a small part of the machinery life while the later has sacrificed him absolutely to the welfare of the state or the party<sup>33</sup>). Quṭb has never been in favour of any Sūfī interpretation of Islam, his argument of the high position

man enjoys in Islamic system has, however, the touch of the Sūfī doctrine of the Perfect Man, who represents the Image of God as long as he carries out God's order on earth, and as long as he fulfils his role as *khalīfah*. Even the distinction the Sūfī claims between the Perfect Man and the so-called the animal man is taken by Quṭb as will be referred later.

B. When the Angels praised themselves in comparison to Adam, ignoring his real nature, God informed them of their ignorance. He then taught Adam all the Names. The Qur'anic text does not indicate here also what names, or the names of whom, Adam was taught. The non-existence of any annexation (*iḍāfah*) raises multiplicity of understanding similar to that of the word '*khalīfah*'.

Al-Ṭabarī leaves it open so that it could mean that God has taught Adam the names of the Angels and that of his successors, namely his children, and also the names of things. This is not to contradict the understanding that God has taught him the names of all things. The non-contradiction is based, in al-Ṭabarī's view, on the fact that the pronoun which refers to the "Names" in the text is plural masculine, 'them' (*hum*), not singular feminine, 'its' (*hā*). While the plural masculine pronoun may signify rational and irrational names, the singular feminine refers only to the irrational<sup>34</sup>.

Al-Zamakhsharī suggests that the structure of the text supposes a word-omission which he identifies as: the names (of the named, *al-musammayāt*). This word is omitted because of the necessary relationship that exists between the name and the named although, according to the Mutazilites' view, they are not identical<sup>35</sup>. Because the Ash'arites hold that both the name and the named are identical, Ibn al-Munīr attacks al-Zamakhsharī for such interpretation. He maintains that the Qur'anic verse does not mean that God has only informed Adam of the names of things, but it rather signifies the whole process of teaching him the reality of things. Had it only meant the names of things, as al-Zamakhsharī says, God would have taught him the names of things about which he knows nothing. Having known the name without knowing its referent is having only a hollow sound which signifies nothing. We can express Ibn al-Munīr's view in a more modern way by saying that the process of naming is nothing more than the cognitive act of the mind towards grasping the reality of things. Therefore, the teaching of the names to Adam by God is nothing than providing him by the necessary knowledge about the reality of things<sup>36</sup>.

Similar view is expressed by Quṭb, who does not need to indulge in any sort of irrelevant discussion which might take him far away of the Shadows of the Qur'ān. The verse means, in his view, that God has provided Adam, and all mankind accordingly, of the capacity to capture the reality of things by the capability, he has provided to them also, of naming and communicating<sup>37</sup>. This capacity is what differentiates man from animal, and more than that, it is the capacity by which man can develop himself as a cultural being.



C. The Sūfī interpretation of the ‘Names’ leads us directly to the foundation of the doctrine of the Perfect Man. As was referred before, the structure of the Qur’anic text, which has the two key words, i.e., *khalīfah* and *al-’Asmā’*, without any annexation, has left it always open to speculation from time to time, and from group to group. It was the Sūfī interpretation which gave a specific meaning to the ‘names’ to be God’s Names. The teaching process, accordingly, was meant to be the investing of the Divine Names to Adam. Thus, the *Khilāfah* of Adam to God gained a very special mystical meaning<sup>38)</sup>. Even the two hands of God, discussed before, are interpreted by Ibn ‘Arabi as follows:

“God joined His two hands for (creating) Adam. This He did solely by way of conferring upon him a great honor. And this is why He said to ‘Iblīs; what hinders thee from falling prostrate before that which I created with both My hands? The (joining of His two hands) symbolizes nothing other than the fact that Adam joins in him two ‘forms’: the form of the world and the form of the absolute. These two are the hands of God”<sup>39)</sup>.

The two hands of God, thus explained, are nothing but the two aspects of Adam explained in the second chapter. As his body represents Nature and his soul represents the Divine energy, it is then that man in virtue of his essence, is the cosmic Thought assuming flesh and connecting Absolute Being with the world of Nature. The human being gains his supremacy over anything else in the universe because he is the only creature that shows all the Attributes of God. “While every appearance shows some attributes of reality, man is the microcosm in which all attributes are united, and in him alone does the Absolute become conscious of itself in all its diverse aspects.”<sup>40)</sup>

Again Ibn ‘Arabi puts it in a very clear way: you must have understood by now the real nature of Adam, i.e., his outward form, as well as the real nature of his spirit (*rūḥ*), i.e., his inward form. Adam is the absolute (in view of his inward form) and a creature (in view of his outward form). You know also the real nature of his (ontological) rank which, being a synthesis, makes him entitled to be the Vicegerent (of God.)<sup>41)</sup>

Vicegerent also has gained a specific mystical meaning. It means in the Sūfī interpretation two things, the first of them is to preserve the existence of the world by his very existence in it. That is to say that Adam, the Perfect Man, is the spirit of the universe. The second meaning ascribed to ‘Vicegerent’ is that man, the Perfect Man, is the governor of the world. Every thing from the highest to the lowest is under his control. Thus he represents God in both ways: in holding the existence of every thing and in governing the world. Again Ibn ‘Arabi puts it boldly:

God in this way has made Man the Spirit (rūh) of the universe and made every thing, high and low, subservient to him because of the perfection of his (inner) form<sup>42</sup>.

#### 4. Adam And the Angels

Since Adam, and accordingly man, is the vicegerent of God, in the above explained sense, it is likely that he is the only being to know God perfectly. Because all God's Names and Attributes are invested to him, while every other being represents only one or some of them, man is able to know God in His Absoluteness. Contemplating on his own attributes, he can reach the exact and the perfect knowledge of God. This explains why the Angels could not understand the reality of Adam, whom God announced to them to place on earth as a **khalifah**.

A. The Angels praised themselves in comparison to what they conceived of Adam's reality. But what they conceived of him is in fact nothing more than of what they conceived of their own reality. This imperfection of the Angel's knowledge is due to the fact that they reflect only one aspect of reality, i.e., the transcendental aspect, which makes them only glorify and praise God. What they conceived of Adam, as compared to their own reality, is the causing of harm and the shedding of blood on earth. Had they been invested with other names of God they would have understood Adam's reality. When God asked the Angels to inform him of the Names He taught Adam, their answer was: "Be glorified, we have no knowledge saving that Thou hast taught us"<sup>43</sup>. When Adam informed them of the names, which they did not know, God ordered them to fall prostrate before Adam. All of them fell prostrate except 'Iblis. What significance was concluded from such order? And what does it mean to obey God as the Angels did, or to disobey Him, as 'Iblis did?

It is conceived by the Sunni school that the order of God for the Angels to fall prostrate before Adam is meant to indicate the honourship invested to Adam. The obedience of the Angels to God's order is by no means an act of worshipping Adam<sup>44</sup>. It seems that the Mutazilites are not in favour of the notion that Adam has supremacy over the Angels. This is due to the fact that they emphasize, in a very rigid way, the idea of God's transcendence. In this aspect, the Angels represent to the Mutazilites the perfect knowledge of God. Because of the Angels' constant obedience to God, they also represent for the Mutazilites the ideal act required by God from all of his creatures, including man<sup>45</sup>.

This explains why Al-Zamakhshari insists on the idea that the Angels fell prostrate before Adam as an obedience to God's order only. They obeyed the order although they are the dearest and the most close creatures to God. He illustrates his interpretation by comparing God to a king who ordered his minister, i.e., the Angels, to visit one of his low-rank subjects, i.e., Adam. This comparison provokes

Ibn al-Munīr's anger. He proceeds to say that Al-zamakḥsharī have missed the whole meaning of the text; it is meant to indicate Adam's superiority. He quotes a Ḥadīth in which it is mentioned that, in the day-after, people will approach Adam begging him to ask God to dismiss them from such a hard situation (to be). They will encourage him by enumerating the special characteristics given to him and invested into him by God. They will say: "You are Adam, the father of man kind, whom God has created by both His own hands, before whom God ordered the Angels to fall prostrate, and for whom God has the Garden of Adan as his residence"<sup>46</sup>).

B. The Sūfī understanding of Adam's superiority over the Angels, and over all other creatures of God, is due to his being the perfect manifestation of both Divinity and the universe. The whole creation, according to Ibn 'Arabī, is a rational structure from the lowest mineral to the highest type of man (the Perfect Man), who stands supreme on account of his unique and unparalleled nature. "No one", Ibnul 'Arabī says, knows the dignity of man and his place in the universe except those who know how to contemplate God perfectly. He is the only creature in whose power lies the possibility of knowing God absolutely. Infact it is through him that God knows Himself, for he is the manifested consciousness of God. Other things know as much of the nature of God as they do of themselves, for the phenomenal objects are nothing but his attribute. Their knowledge is imperfect and incomplete compared with that of man who sums up in himself God's attributes. Even the Angels' knowledge of God is imperfect. They know God as a transcendent reality which has no relation to the phenomenal world. Man alone knows both as the Real (Haqq) and the phenomenal (Khalq), for man himself (The Perfect Man) is the real and the phenomenal."<sup>47</sup>

Gathering all the features discussed so far; concerning the formation of his body by God's own both hands from the Four Elements of Natur, the breathing from God's spirit into his body, and the teaching to him all the Names, Adam is not only superior to the Angels but he is also superior to all the phenomenal beings. His soul is infact the power which prevails all the universe since it is the manifestation of the Divine energy. Because all the Names of God are invested into him, he is the only creature who has the capacity of the perfect knowledge of both God and the universe. Adam is then the khalifah of God because he mediates between God and the universe on both the ontological and the epistemological levels. This mediation is the main feature of the Perfect Man, "who as a microcosmos of a higher order reflects not only the powers of nature but also the divine powers, as in a mirror.",<sup>48</sup>

C. Having all that tradition in front of his eyes, it is easy to Quṭb, who disagrees with the Sūfī doctrines, and who occasionally attacks the theologians for being so far of the true meaning of the Qur'ān, to reflect on the idea of Adam's superiority. "Although this creature, i.e., Adam or man" says

Qutb, “might cause harm and shed blood on earth, some secrets (of God) are invested to him forming his superiority. First of all, the secret of knowledge is revealed to him, secondly, he has the free-will secret which enables him to choose his way. Unlike the Angels, who only obey God according to their inner nature, i.e., without any choice from their part, man has the two options. If he obeys God according to his free will he is perfect, otherwise he is worse than an animal. By this very secret of both knowing and acting freely, man is superior, and thus is honoured by the order of God to make the Angels fall prostrate before Adam<sup>49</sup>). Why then did not 'Iblīs obey God's order? This question leads to the problem of evil which will be dealt with soon.

## 5. Man And Evil.

It is here also that the structure of the text leaves it open to many and different speculations concerning the reality of 'Iblīs. In some verses it is said that all the Angels had fallen prostrate (before Adam) except 'Iblīs<sup>50</sup>). These verses make it possible that 'Iblīs was one of the Angels by the linguistic exclusive particle ('illā) in the grammatical structure of perfect positive exclusion, (al-'istithnā' al-tām al-mūjab). One verse, however, makes it clear that 'Iblīs was one of the Jinn; “he rebelled against his Lord's command.”<sup>51</sup>)

A. It seems that the early Muslim thinkers have realized the problem and have occupied themselves to solve it. According to some accounts mentioned in al-Ṭabarī, 'Iblīs is one of a specific group of the Angels. This group is called al-Jinn, and they are created of essential fire (nār al-samūm). This group of Angels are not the Jinn, genies, who are mentioned in the Qur'ān to be created of “smokeless fire” (mārijin min nār)<sup>52</sup>). This differentiation between two kinds of creature, carrying the same name in the Qur'ān, i.e., Al-Jānn in the plural, does not seem to be accepted. However, a whole myth is created to make it reconcile with the Qur'ān. According to this myth, 'Iblīs was an angel whose name was al-Ḥārth; he was one of the paradise' gate-keepers. He led his group of Angels, according to God's order, to attack the genies who inhabited earth before Adam, and to whom, Adam, according to this account, is the *khalīfah*. Gaining victory against them, he and his group of Angels, called Jinn, caused them, the genies, to retreat to the islands of the seas and to the tops of the mountains. This is the reason why 'Iblīs became so proud of himself, and such proudness had led him to disobey his Lord<sup>53</sup>).

Another account, al-Ṭabarī relates to the prophet's companion Ibn 'Abbās, mentions that 'Iblīs' name was 'Azazīl; he was one of the most active angels in terms of worshipping God and glorifying him. He was also one of the most gifted by knowledge. This caused him to be overweening and thus committed his act of disobedience<sup>54</sup>).

Quṭb, on account of the text itself, denies that 'Iblīs was one of the Angels. He refers to the different nature of both 'Iblīs and the Angels. As the Angels are mentioned in the Qur'ān not to disobey any of God's commands and obey whatever order they receive from Him, 'Iblīs, who disobeyed God's order, could never have been one of the Angels. It happened, according to Quṭb, by accident that 'Iblīs was among the Angels when they were ordered to prostrate before Adam. The structure of the text is explained as the exclusion of 'Iblīs from the Angels is "exception not related to the main term" ('istithna' munqati'). Quṭb also quotes the Qur'anic verse which indicates that 'Iblīs was one of the Jinn<sup>55</sup>). Quṭb's interpretation raises the question: was it an accident, a mere accident, that 'Iblīs was among the Angels? If the answer is 'yes', would it be concluded that evil in the universe is accidental? Surely Quṭb would not agree on such conclusion, although the question is very important. Accepting the view that 'Iblīs was one of the Angels, the question is: how could an Angel, who is supposed by his inner nature to obey God, be so rebellious against his Lord?

B. 'Iblīs' act of disobedience is considered by all Muslims to be the first act, and supposedly the origin, of evil in the universe<sup>56</sup>). The Sunnī school, which holds the doctrine of predestination, understands that this very act of disobedience is nothing but the fulfillment of God's plan. Had 'Iblīs not committed this act of disobedience, Adam would not have been sent to earth, and would not have fulfilled the purpose of his creation, i.e., to be God's *khālīfah* on earth. It was also God's plan to make the distinction between good, as represented by the Angels, and evil, as represented by 'Iblīs.

From another perspective, it could be said that the act of disobedience by 'Iblīs has activated the force of evil in the universe, the force which was previously latent. Both good and evil, as the Sūfīs hold, are latent in God's Names which are invested to Adam. They both are latent in the reality of Adam. The first act of 'Iblīs has activated the force of evil, thus has distinguished good from evil. This understanding could be supported by the very fact that God's order for the Angels to fall prostrate before Adam is 'one' in itself. This order, however, has generated two opposite, and simultaneous, actions, i.e., obedience and disobedience. The unity of the order has thus been transformed into duality.

This manifestation of good and evil is strikingly parallel to that of God's Name. According to Ibn 'Arabī, God's Names and Attributes were latent in His Essence. In the first act of divine manifestation, i.e., the most glorified one, the Names were revealed in the form of Adam's Reality. That is to say the unity of the Essence and the names had transformed into duality<sup>75</sup>). Adam, although 'one' in his essential reality, has also the duality of good and evil. The manifestation of good by the obedience of the Angels, and of evil, by the disobedience of 'Iblīs, is only a manifestation of the inner reality of Adam. Ibn 'Arabī also puts it explicitly that the Angels are some of the powers of the universe<sup>58</sup>). Since the universe reflects the Divine Names analytically while Adam reflects them synthetically, it is likely that

the Angels, including 'Iblīs, are some of the outward aspects of Adam.

'Iblīs' disobedience was then infact an act of obedience to his inner nature on one hand and to God's plan on the other. Al-zamakhsharī provides a very important point when he says that 'Iblīs' disobedience was refusal not to prostrate before any one but God<sup>59</sup>). This remark is another expression of the Sūfī's interpretation that 'Iblīs has obeyed, by his act of disobedience, God's eternal command not to worship any one save Him. It seems that Jīlī quotes both al-Ṭabarī and al-zamakhsharī, or reconciles them, when he says:

"The name of 'Iblīs was 'Azazīl: he had worshipped God for thousands of years before the creation of the world, and God had forbidden him to worship anything else. Therefore when God created Adam and commanded the Angels to bow down before him, 'Iblīs refused, for he did not know that to worship by God's command is equivalent to worship God."<sup>60</sup>

Unlike al-Ṭabarī, who drives the name 'Iblīs from the root "ablās" which means to be removed from the right path, Jīlī drives it from 'talbīs' which means doubt and confusion. According to this theory 'Iblīs was confused, or to say it in different way, God's command caused 'Iblīs to be confused. Jīlī goes on saying:

"Instead of justifying his disobedience or repenting of it, like Adam did, and asking God to forgive him, he silently acknowledged that God wills and acts in conformity with the eternal and unchangeable principles of His nature. 'Iblīs was banished from the Divine presence and a curse was laid upon him until the Day of Judgment, (Qur. 15, 35), i.e., for a finite time."<sup>61</sup>

Disobedience, then, is in reality some sort of obedience because sin is not evil except insofar as we judge it to be forbidden by God. It is, from the aspect of reality, obedience to the inner nature of the creature who commits it. It can be easily said with Ibn 'Arabī and Jīlī: "all God's creatures worship him in accordance with his will, and every form of worship expresses some aspects of His nature. Infidelity and sin are affects of the Divine activity and contribute to the Divine perfection. Satan himself glorifies God, inasmuch as his disobedience is subordinate to the eternal will."<sup>62</sup>

Since evil and good are two different aspects of one unified reality, say it God or Adam (the Perfect Man), 'Iblīs and the Angels would be the outer manifestations of Adam's inner nature. 'Iblīs's enmity to Adam, as expressed in many places in the Qur'ān, seems to be as if the inner evil of Adam has rebelled against his inner goodness<sup>63</sup>. Since God promised 'Iblīs to be saved of death until the Day of Judgment, the evil force of Adam has been activated. Therefore, the struggle between good and evil starts.

C. By such activation, God's plan starts its first step to be fulfilled. Adam has been resided in God's garden, 'Iblīs has been banished from the Divine presence, and God has created a companion to Adam in order not to be alone. They were permitted to eat of all the trees and fruits of the garden except of one tree<sup>64</sup>). 'Iblīs again caused them to disobey God's command, and they all were exiled from heaven to the earth.

Here, the act of disobedience was committed by Adam and Eve themselves. Unlike the first act of disobedience, committed by 'Iblīs, which is a disobedience to God's command to do (prostrate), the human disobedience is to God's command not to do (eat from a specific tree). In other words, 'Iblīs disobeyed God's 'amr (order) while Adam disobeyed His nahy (prohibition). As for why God has made such prohibition, a question which does not seem to worry al-Ṭabarī or al-Zamakhsharī, Quṭb says: "This (prohibition of eating from a specific tree) symbolizes the inevitable prohibition necessary for life on earth"<sup>65</sup>). In other words, man had to experience deprivation in heaven in order to be able to tolerate it in his life on earth. According to Quṭb, the whole experience of living in heaven, before being sent to earth, is intended to teach Adam and Eve to get prepared to their life on earth. It is the first lesson they had to learn in order to carry out God's vicegerence on earth. It was all planned eternally. It symbolizes the everlasting human experience (the struggle between evil and good)<sup>66</sup>).

As the significance of Adam's act of disobedience will be discussed later, it suffices here to reflect on what provokes evil to fight against good. Is it a matter of pre-designed plan of God, or does it have to do with social order and organization? As for life on heaven and the first experience of man, it may be said that all has been designed eternally. Since good and evil are two different aspects of human reality, evil is provoked according to some external, social so to speak, conditions; so is good. The first human disobedience might also be understood as a result of social struggle between Adam and 'Iblīs. This is true if the idea that: Adam, Eve and 'Iblīs have formed the first community is accepted.

The second manifestation of the struggle between good and evil is remarkably related in the Qur'ān to social conflict. It is in the story of Adam's two children Abil and Cain<sup>67</sup>). It is obvious from the text that both of them have made an offer to God, who accepted one and refused the other. If we take into account the explanation given by al-Ṭabarī, it is not so difficult to conclude that it is the human desire to have and to deprive others, even one's brother, from having<sup>68</sup>). Since evil is the product of social conflict, it causes man's alienation in society, alienation of himself, of his fellow-men and of his Lord. The first act of disobedience caused 'Iblīs to be alienated from his Lord, so did the first act of disobedience to Adam. It alienated him from both his Lord and Nature.

## 6. Evil and Alienation of Man

A. Man is as closed to God as the reflection of a thing in a mirror. He reflects in himself all God's Names and Attributes. This is referred to in the Qur'ān by the first covenant God gave to Adam and all his children while they were only seeds in his rein. Or at least this is what the Sūfīs have understood from the verse: "God brought forth from the children of Adam, from their reins, their seeds, and made them testify of themselves, saying, am I not your Lord? They said: Yea, verily, we testify"<sup>69</sup>). Beyond the debate between the Sunnī and the Matāzilites concerning the literal and the metaphorical meaning of the scene<sup>70</sup>, the Sūfīs maintain that this covenant is nothing but the investing of the Names and Attributes of God, i.e., the creation of Adam on God's image according to a well known tradition in which the fallen back pronoun (al-ḡamīr al-'ā'id) is related to God, not to Adam as the Sunni interpretation maintains<sup>71</sup>).

Quṭb, in a modern language, though carries the influence of both the Sūfīs and the Sunnīs, says that this verse represents the inmate real nature (al-ḡīrah) of man which testifies and acknowledges the existence of God and of His Lordship and Oneness. It is this inmate nature that leads man to live in accordnace with God's commands unless some external circumstances cause him to be deviated of his nature<sup>72</sup>).

Another covenant between God and man is expressed in the Qur'ān as follows:

We offered the trust onto the heavens and the earth and the mountains, but they shrank from bearing it and were afraid of it—And man assumed it. Lo! He hath proven a tyrant and a fool. So Allah punisheth hypocritical men and women, and idolatrous men and women. But Allah pardonth believing men and women and Allah is ever Forgiving, Merciful<sup>73</sup>).

The 'trust' is interpreted mainly as the free choice man has in his action as apposed to other beings or creatures who act according to their inmate nature. Other creatures do not have free choice in acting, but they are forced to act the way the do. Man alone has this privilege of free will. This interpretation is held by almost all Muslim thinkers and schools although they have different opinions concerning the nature of man's free will<sup>74</sup>). The trust is then the obedience of God which is based on free choice, of which all the creatures were afraid, and man alone accepted it. It is a responsibility man took on his shoulder unaware of his double nature which exposes him to both obedience and disobedience. Al-Ṭabarī says in some of his accounts that Adam accepted the trust, but it took him only from noon to sunset in paradise and he then committed his act of disobedience<sup>75</sup>). That is why man is described as tyrant and fool.



According to the Sūfī interpretation, the 'trust' is the Divine Names and Attributes, which include the free- will Attribute and the Name al-Murīd. Man is tyrant to himself; he is unjust to his own soul in letting it suffer degradation (from the things of the world), and he is ignorant (fool) of his real worth, because he is unaware of that with which he has been entrusted, i.e., God's Names and Attributes<sup>76)</sup>. The description of man as tyrant and fool is applicable to the animal man not to the Perfect Man. Although both of them reflect, in reality, the trust, God's Names, only the Perfect Man realizes this fact and act accordingly<sup>77)</sup>. By such realization and knowledge man can maintain his perfection and can, thus, carry on the trust God entrusted into him.

Quṭb is not so far, as he supposes, from the Sūfī interpretation as he holds the idea that man, despite his small size in comparison to other creatures, has carried the trust of God to obey him on account of his free will. If he accomplishes this task he is really God's vicegerent; if not he is worse than an animal, because other creatures obey God instinctively<sup>78)</sup>. It is then the fulfillment of God's trust that makes man as close to God as a thing reflected in a mirror, otherwise he will be alienated from his Lord. But how could man fulfil such a task while he is apt to both evil and good, obedience and disobedience?

B. The answer for such a question needs some reflections on the Qur'ān, reflections which go beyond the limits of traditional Islamic thought. It is through history that man develops awareness of himself and of his reality. Man makes his own history through two dimensions. The first one is labour which differentiates between him and animal in terms of relation to nature. The second dimension is the social existence of man which determines his consciousness and knowledge<sup>79)</sup>.

Adam, as God's vicegerent on earth, went through several preparing stages before he was sent down to earth to start his mission or, in other words, to start the history of mankind. As God banished 'Iblīs from His presence, he got God's permission to try to alienate Adam and his children from the presence of God. The first experience of Adam was that of the paradise. The prohibition of eating from a specific tree might have provoked Adam and Eve to know the reason of such prohibition. Since Adam and Eve is designed by God to act according to their free will, it is likely that their action should be based on knowledge. From these two aspects of Adam, free-will and the capability to know, i.e., the trust and the capability of naming, 'Iblīs could convince him and his wife of trying the tree prohibited to them. Although Adam and Eve were promised to have in paradise their essential needs, i.e., food and shelter, they did not have the chance to exercise their own free will<sup>80)</sup>.

The existence of Adam and Eve in God's Garden could then symbolize two facts, the unity with God and the unity with Nature. The disobedience of Adam on the other hand, could symbolize their eagerness to know and to practice their freedom. It was this eagerness that 'Iblīs addressed when he

said to them: Your Lord forbade you from this tree only lest ye should become kings or become of the immortal<sup>87)</sup>. The word “Malikayn” (two Kings) could be read “Malakayn” meaning two angels, and the two pronunciations are accepted. Immortality then was the stake by which ‘Iblis could drive both Adam and Eve out of paradise. It should be meaningful to say that both Adam and Eve were seeking for something beyond their existence in paradise. They were seeking their freedom, power and immortality, things which can be fulfilled only in the process of history.

It is of significance that the moment they disobeyed God and ate of the forbidden tree they became stripped of whatever covered their shame (saw’ah): “Their shame was manifest to them and they began to hide (by heaping) on themselves some of the leaves of the Garden”<sup>82)</sup>. This manifestation of the sham and the act of hiding symbolize their alienation from nature and from themselves. The order to leave paradise to earth maintains the symbolic interpretation. Now man has become alienated from God. Although this process of alienation is introduced in the Quran as punishment to the disobedience of Adam and Eve, it should not be forgotten that, without this alienation, man would not have carried out his role as God’s vicegerent, and God’s plan could not have been fulfilled.

The Sūfī interpretation of Adam’s disobedience comes across some of the symbolic significance referred to. Since the trust offered to the heavens and the earth, of which they were afraid, and which man accepted, is to act freely, the first human disobedience committed by Adam is in reality an act of obedience. It is an obedience to the real inner nature of Adam, by which he fulfilled the very goal of his creation. “The fall of man”, according to the Sūfīs, “is the necessary consequence of his Divine nature. Adam ate the forbidden fruit because his soul manifests certain aspects of deity, vis., Lordship (rubūbiyya), for it is not the nature of Lordship to submit to a prohibition. The soul knew that, if it ate the fruit, it would inevitably descend into the material world and would suffer misery, but on the other hand, it was aware of the blessedness of its inherent sovereignty. Thus it became perplex, and its perplexity (iltibās) brought about its fall”<sup>83)</sup>.

It is then the strong need of the soul to act freely according to its real inherent nature. It is the basic need, the lack of which may turn the human being into an animal. If other basic needs are shared with man by animals, it is freedom which makes man superior to Nature itself. It is the only thing that man shares with God. It is said that: “freedom is so much the essence of man that even its opponents realize it...No man fights freedom, he fights at most the freedom of others. Every kind of freedom has therefore always existed, only at one time as a special privilege, another time as a universal right”<sup>84)</sup>.

C. If this very act of freedom, “Which is the capacity to say “NO”, opened man’s eyes that he saw himself as stranger in the world, beset by conflicts with Nature, it also opened the first chapter of man’s history<sup>85)</sup>. The second act of disobedience, however, opened another chapter of man’s history.

This chapter is opened by man's alienation from his fellow-brother. It is not accidental that, in the verses which narrate the story of Adam's two children, the realization of the shame is mentioned also. The only difference is that the shame mentioned here is the shame of his brother "saw'ata **akhi**", while in Adam's story the shame was of their own body. While Adam and Eve tried to hide their own shame by the tree leaves, the killer of his brother needed some animal to teach him how to bury his body. The Qur'anic expression is very important to be quoted:

The (selfish) soul of the other led him to the murder of his brother: he murdered him, and became (himself) one of the lost ones. Then God sent a raven who scratched the ground, to show him how to hide the shame of his brother. "Woe is me" said he "Was I not even able to be as this raven, so to hide the shame of my brother?" Then he became full of regret"<sup>86</sup>).

It suffices here to indicate that in both stories specific vocabularies are stressed, i.e., the verb "to hide" (yuwārī) and the noun "shame" (saw'ah). In the story of Adam, the verb means simply to hide, while it means here "to bury". The noun means there, i.e., in Adam's story, part of the body, namely the genital organs, while it means here the whole dead body. If the disobedience of Adam has opened his eye, as mentioned before, to realize his strangeness from Nature, the very act of killing with its consequence of realizing the shame of the brother, has opened man's eye to his alienation from his fellow brother. If the leaves of the tree could hide the shame in the first story, all the leaves of all the trees of the world, as al Ṭabarī says, could not hide such crime of man. Unable to hide his brother's shame, the killer had to learn from an animal so to be full of regret and sorrow. It is of great significance that such grief, sorrow, and regret, will be the signs of those who, instead of trying to eliminate their alienation by following God's revelation, sustain it by committing disobedience to God's commands.

Islam, unlike Christianity, does not have any doctrine of the First Sin. God wanted Adam to start human history free of sin, and thus be responsible of whatever action he will commit. Qur'ān puts it clearly that the struggle between good and evil has started, and God puts forth to people the Divine Law, those who follow good will overcome their alienation and will be reunited with God, Nature, and with their fellow men, but those who will follow evil will not be only alienated but will be absolutely lost. God said:

Fell down, one of you is enemy to the other...but verily there cometh unto you from Me a guidance, and who followeth My guidance, there shall no fear come upon them neither shall they grieve. But they who disbelieve, and deny our revelations are rightful people of the fire. They will abide therein<sup>87</sup>).

The freedom of fear and grievness is the reward in this word for those who follow God's revelation. This symbolizes man's recognition of his position in the universe. In the Sūfī terminology, man realises his perfection and becomes the Perfect Man. Those who do not follow God's words and guidance are compared in the Qur'ān to animals, "His (i.e., the disbeliever) similitude is that of a dog: if you attack him, he lolls out his tongue or if you leave him alone, he (still) lolls out his tongue. That is the similitude of those who reject Our Signs"<sup>88)</sup>

The alienation of those who disbelieve in God and who reject his revelation is expressed in the Qur'ān in a very unique way. If that who follows God's way "will not go astray nor come to grief", that who turns away from God "will be in a narrow life, and I shall bring him blind in the assembly of the Day of resurrection"<sup>89)</sup>. The free of fear-life of the believer, as compared to the life of fear and grief of the disbeliever, is expressed as:

"Those whom God willth to guide, he openeth their hearts to Islam, those whom He willth to leave straying, He maketh their hearts close and constricted as if they had to climb up to the skies: Thus doth God (heap) the penalty on those who refuse to believe"<sup>90)</sup>

"If any one assigns partener to God, he is as if he had fallen from the heaven and been snatched up by birds, or the winds had swooped and thrown him into a far-distant place."<sup>91)</sup>

D. Human alienation could not be expressed in a better artistic literary language than that of the Qur'ān. To disbelieve in God means, in the Qur'anic text, to worship other thing or creature than God. Worshipping idols is the most expreseion of the alienation of man in society. "The essence of what the prophets call 'idolatry' is not that man worships many gods instead of only one. It is that the idols are the work of man's own hands, they are things, and man bows down and worships things, worships that which he has created himself. In doing so he transforms himself into a thing. he transfers to the things of his creation the attributes of his own life, and instead of experiencing himself as the creating person, he is in touch with himself only by the worship of the idol. He has become estranged from his own life forces, from the wealth of his own potentialities, and is in touch with himself only in indirect way of submission to life frozen in the idol."<sup>92)</sup>

The kind of empty life in which man is in touch with himself through worshipping the idol is remarkably expressed in the Quran:

"Many are the jinns and men we have made for Hell. They have hearts wherewith they understand not, eyes wherewith they see not, and ears wherewith they hear not. They are like cattle-

may more misguided: For they are heedless (of warning)"<sup>93</sup>

The worshipping of idols is only a symbol which refers to whatsoever forces lead man to alienation. Since man's knowledge has developed to the extent that it is hard for him to worship an idol, it is important to be emphasized that modern life in different social systems has created to man so different types of idols. "Idolatry changes its object, it is by no means to be found only in those forms in which the idol has a so-called religious meaning. Idolatry is always the worship of something into which man has put his own creative powers, and to which he now submits, instead of experiencing himself in his creative act"<sup>94</sup>.

If Islam's very objective in the past was to fight against idolatry of various kinds and shapes, it should be the very objective of modern Islam to keep fighting against modern types of idolatry which alienate man from Nature, his fellowmen, and from God Himself. Since Islam did not fight only against idolatry as an individual way of acting and believing, but also fought against all forms of economical and social systems which maintained man's alienation, it is likely that modern Islam should create the social environment in which man can return back to his position in the universe and act as the vicegerent of God on earth. It is the task of modern Islam to create the Perfect Man in the world not as an individual, as the Sūfī doctrine suggests, but as the ideal social actor on earth.

## 7. Conclusion.

Islam, unlike Christianity, has set man free of his first sin. Adam was sent down to earth after he has received the words of God: "Then Adam received from his Lord words, and He relented toward him. He is the Relenting, the Merciful"<sup>95</sup>. These words of revelation Adam received from God was the first communication between God and man in man's history on earth. God used to send his prophets to lead the people back to the right path whenever it was necessary. Every time, there was a renewal of God's words. Islam is considered the last communication God has addressed to man through his prophet Muhammad. This means that man has been responsible for himself in a rather different way than that of the first time when Adam was sent down to earth.

Islam then represents a second phase of human history, the phase in which man has gained his complete freedom by God. That explains the emphasis the Qur'ān puts on free thinking. Man is persuaded in the Qur'ān to use 'reason' to understand God's words and to carry out his mission on earth. If the Sūfīs hold the doctrine of the saint "Walī", who has the capacity to reinterpret God's words, the Sunnī also has the doctrine of the innovator who comes every century to explain God's words according to the new circumstances. This means that the notion of social development and historical

changes is explicit in both the original text of Islam and different Islamic schools of thought.

This can easily open the way to reinterpret the whole story of Adam in order to investigate possible significance to modern life and society. This we have tried here concerning the doctrine of the Perfect Man, but a lot of efforts has to be done in order to find out what Islam can present to the modern situation not only for the societies in which the majority of population confess Islam but for all the societies of the world as well.

## NOTES

- 1) Cf. Qur'ān, 14, 34; 16, 12, 14; 29, 61.
- 2) *Fusūs al Hikam*, p. 402, From Affifi A., *The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyid Din Ibnul-Arabi*, Cambridge University Press, 1939, pp. 83–84.
- 3) Affifi, p. 84.
- 4) Nicholson, R. A., *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, Cambridge University press, 1978, p. 79.
- 5) *The Mystical Philosophy*, pp. 60, 90.
- 6) Cf. Izutsu, Toshihiko, *Sufism and Taoism, A Comparative Study of Key Concepts*, Iwanami Shoten Publishers, Tokyo, 1983, p. 238.
- 7) Takeshita, Masataka, *Ibn Arabi's Theory of The Perfect Man and Its Place in The History of Islamic Thought*, *Studia Culturae Islamicae* 32, Institute for the study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo Univ. of Foreign Studies, 1987.
- 8) Massignon, Loius, *The Passion of al-Hallaj, Mystical and Martyr Of Islam*, trans. by Herbert Mason, Princeton University Press, 1982, vol. 3, p. 3.
- 9) *Ibid*, p. 4.
- 10) *Falsafat al-Ta'wīl, Dirāsah fī Ta'wīl al-Qur'ān 'ind Myhyi al-Dīn Ibn 'Arabī*, Dar al-Tanwir, Beirut, 1983, pp. 13–16, 20–32, 37–43.
- 11) *Jāmi' al-Bayān 'an Ta'wīl Ay al-Qur'ān*, by: Abu-Ja'far Muhammad Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, Sharikat Maktabat wa Matb'at Mustafā al-Babī al-Ḥalabī and his sons, Egypt, 2ed ed., 1954.
- 12) *Jār Allāh Maḥmūd Ibn 'Umar al-Zamakhsharī, Al-Kashshāf 'an Ḥaqa' iq Ghwāmiḍ al-Tanzīl wa 'Uyūn al-Aqāwīl fī Wujūh al-Ta'wīl*, Dar al-Kitāb al 'Arabī, Beirut.
- 13) Sayyid Quṭb, *Fī Zīlāl al-Qur'ān*, Dar Ihya' al-Turāth al'Arabī, Beirut, 3ed ed..
- 14) Qur., 32, 7; 38, 71.
- 15) Qur. 55, 14.
- 16) Qur., 15, 26.
- 17) Qur., 37, 77.
- 18) *Al-Ṭabarī*, 1, p. 214.
- 19) *Ibid*, 23, p. 42.
- 20) Cf. Ibn 'Arabī's Theory of the Perfect Man, pp. 74–75.
- 21) Qur., 38, 75.
- 22) *Al-Ṭabarī*, 23, p. 185.
- 23) *Al-Zamakhsharī*, 3, p. 106.
- 24) Ibn al-Qayyim (Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyah), *Al-Ṣawa'iq al-Murasalah 'alā al-Jahmiyyah wa al Mu'attilah*, sum. by Muhammad Ibn al-Mūsili, ed. Zakariyya 'Ali Yūsif, Al-'Imām Press, Egypt, 1380(H.), pp. 12–13.

- 25) Qur., 15, 29; 32, 9; 38, 72.
- 26) Qur., 3, 59.
- 27) Nicholson, p. 140.
- 28) Affifi, p. 79. See also, Nicholson, p. 80, and Masignon, vol. 2. p. 102.
- 29) The verse is: "Wa'id qāla Rabbuka lil-Malā'kati 'Inni Ja'ilun fil-'Arḍi khalifah" Qur., 2, 30.
- 30) Al-Ṭabarī, 1, pp. 199–200.
- 31) Al-Ṭabarī, 1, p. 209.
- 32) Al-Zamakhsharī, 1, p. 124.
- 33) Quṭb, 1, pp. 72–73.
- 34) Al-Ṭabarī, 1, p. 216–217.
- 35) Al-Zamakhsharī, 1, pp. 125–126. And Al-Ash'arī, Abū al-Ḥasan, Maqālāt al Islamiyyin wa 'Ikhtilāf al-Musallin, ed. by Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abd-el-Hamid, Al-Nahḍah book, Egypt, 1970, 2, p. 205.
- 36) Ibn al-Munīr, Ahmad Ibn Muhammad, Al Intiṣāf fīmā Taḍammanahu al-Kashāf min al-I'tizāl, on the margine of Al-Zamakhsharī, 1, p. 125–126.
- 37) Quṭb, 1, p. 67.
- 38) See Affifi, p. 78.
- 39) Fusūs, from: Izutsu, p. 231.
- 40) Nicholson, p. 84.
- 41) Fusūs, from Izutsu, pp. 228–229.
- 42) Fusus, from Izutsu, p. 226.
- 43) Qur., 2, 35.
- 44) Al-Ṭabarī, 1, pp. 228–229.
- 45) This is not to conclude by any mean that the Mutazilites hold any idea of man's inferiority to the Angles. It is man's free will, which they affirm, that makes him entitled to disobedience. The act of this disobedience is the reason behind such non-superiority notion of man over the Angels.
- 46) Al-Zamakhsharī, 4, p. 106. For Ibn al-Munīr, see the margin of pp. 106–107.
- 47) Affifi, p. 86.
- 48) Nicholson, p. 82. For more analysis to the mirror- metaphor, see Izutsu, pp. 220–223.
- 49) Qutb, 1, p. 68.
- 50) Qur., 2, 34; 7, 11; 15, 30–31; 17, 61; 20, 116; 38, 72–73.
- 51) Qur., 18, 50. The Arabic is: Kān min al-Jinn fa fasaqa 'an'amri rabbih. The conjuncture "fa'" could be a mere conjuncture, simply means "and", but it could also mean "so", a meaning which may be problematic in a different way concerning the nature of the jinn.
- 52) The two verses of the Qur'ān referred to are 15, 27; 55, 15 respectively. They both refere to the same category, the genies, in comparison to man.
- 53) Al-Ṭabarī, 1, p. 207.
- 54) Ibid, 1, p. 224.
- 55) Quṭb, 1, p. 68.
- 56) Al-Shahristanī, Al-Millal wa al-Niḥal, on the margin of Ibn-Ḥazm's Alfiṣal, Maktabat al-Salām al-'Ālamiyyah, Cairo, 1, pp. 15–21.
- 57) See, Falsafat al-Ta'wīl, pp. 182–193.
- 58) Fusūs, pp. 48–49.
- 59) Al-Zamakhsharī, 4, p. 106.
- 60) From Nicholson, p. 120.
- 61) Ibid, pp. 120–121.

- 62) Ibid, p. 131.
- 63) Qur., 7, 12-18; 15, 32-44; 17, 62-65; 38, 75-82.
- 64) Qur., 2, 35; 7, 19.
- 65) Quṭb, 1, 69.
- 66) Quṭb, 7, p. 70.
- 67) Qur., 5, 32-34.
- 68) al-Ṭabarī, 6, 186-199. See also al-Zamakhsharī, 1, p. 624.
- 69) Qur., 7, 172.
- 70) Al-Ṭabarī, 9, pp. 111-118. And al-Zamakhsharī, 2, pp. 176-177.
- 71) See Massignon, 3, pp. 105-107, And Takeshita, pp. 15-17.
- 72) Quṭb, 9, p. 105.
- 73) Qur., 33, 72-73.
- 74) Al-Ṭabarī, 22, pp. 53-54. See al-Zamakhsharī, 2, pp. 564-565.
- 75) Al-Ṭabarī, 22, p. 54.
- 76) Nicholson, p. 107.
- 77) Affifi, p. 69, 81.
- 78) Quṭb, 22, pp. 49-50.
- 79) See Fromm, Erich, Marx's Concept of Man, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co. New York, 33ed ed., 1985, pp. 15-17.
- 80) It is mentioned: "You have not to suffer hunger nor nakedness, and not to suffer thirst nor to be exposed to sun's heat." Qur., 20, 118-119. This means all the basic needs beside sex which was guaranteed by the fact that they were male and female. The purpose mentioned in the Qur'an for creating a female companion to Adam maintains this fact," that he might take rest in her." Qur., 7, 189.
- 81) Qur., 7, 20.
- 82) Qur., 7, 23; 20, 121.
- 83) Nicholson, pp. 119-120.
- 84) Dunayevskaya, R., Marxism and Freedom, New York, 1958, p. 19.
- 85) See Fromm, p. 64.
- 86) Qur., 5, 33-34.
- 87) Qur., 2, 36, 38-39; 7, 24.
- 88) Qur., 7, 176.
- 89) Qur., 20, 23.
- 90) Qur., 6, 125.
- 91) Qur., 22, 31.
- 92) Fromm, p. 44.
- 93) Qur., 7, 179.
- 94) Fromm, p. 45.
- 95) Qur., 20, 102.