

JIRS

JOURNAL OF INTERCULTURAL
AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES

ISSN: 2147-0405

Number 2
ÇANAKKALE 2012

THE CONCEPT OF THE SOUL (NAFS) IN THE EARLY SUFISM ACCORDING TO AL-QUSHAYRĪ'S RĪSĀLA AL-QUSHAYRĪYA AND AL-HUJWĪRĪ'S KASHF AL-MAHJŪB

Yuri ISHIDA, M.A.*

E-mail: yuri14da@gmail.com

Citation/©: Ishida, Y., (2012). The Concept of the Soul (Nafs) in the Early Sufism according to Al-Qushayrī's *Risāla al-Qushayrīya* and al-Hujwīrī's *Kashf Al-Mahjūb*, *Journal of Intercultural and Religious Studies*. (2), 45-57.

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to clarify the relationship between the body and the soul in the early Sufism based on the concept of the soul of al-Qushayrī's *Risāla* and al-Hujwīrī's *Kashf al-mahjūb*. These two books are important for theorization of Sufism in the end of the eleventh century. Sufism introduces the concept of substance and attribute and then it is possible to explain why physical training works on the soul. Because the attribute of the soul is the passion that desires the sense and the sense is the attribute of the body, there is a logical conjuncture between the bodily action and the inner soul.

Keywords: Religion, Sufism, Nafs, al-Qushayri, al-Hujwiri

* Islamic philosophy major Ph. D. Student at Kyoto University, Japan.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to clarify the concept of the soul (*nafs*) in the early Sufism. Based on Sufi theory, it can be explained the relation between the suppression of the soul and physical training. In other words, the mind-body problem in Sufism in the late eleventh century is the subject of this paper.

Sufism has played a role of mysticism in Islam. It is said that Sufism has developed from the ascetic movement in Basra and Baghdad in the eighth century. Although the accepted notion about its beginning and process has not been established, we know its expansion by a number of theory books on Sufism in the tenth century. Many of the authors of these books were born in Khurāsān region or Transoxania region where are far away from Iraq (Karamustafa, 2007,83). According to Böwering (1980, 19-20), Sufi theory books can be divided into three categories: the Sufi treatise, the Sufi hagiography and the Sufi manual. The Sufi manual is a combination of the former two. Examples of the Sufi treatise are *Kitāb al-luma'* of al-Sarrāj (d. 988), *Kitāb al-ta'arruf* of al-Kalābādhi (d. 990?) and *Qūt al-qulūb* of al-Makkī (d. 996). The Sufi hagiographies are *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiya* of al-Sulamī (d. 1021) and *Ḥilya al-awliyā'* of Abū Nu'aim al-Iṣfahānī (d. 1038). The representatives of the Sufi manual are *al-Risāla al-Qushayriya* of al-Qushayrī (d. 1072) and *Kashf al-mahjūb* of al-Hujwīrī (d. 1072?). This paper will focus on both of two.

Al-Qushayrī is from Ustuwā (Qūchān, now on the border between Iran and Turkmenistan). He belongs to Shāfi'ī-Ash'arī group and he writes his books in Arabic. On the other hand, al-Hujwīrī's origin is Afghanistan in the present day. He belongs to Hanafī school and writes in Persian. There are these differences but Al-Qushayrī and al-Hujwīrī lives in the same period. To a comprehensive understanding of the concept of the soul in the last eleventh century, we need to see the description of the two. In addition, as we will see below in this paper, there are some compensations for the missing part of the sentences of one another. Based on the descriptions of both, this paper will analyze the concept of the soul in Sufism at the end of the eleventh century.

2. The Psychology in Early Sufism

This section aims to outline the position of the soul in Sufism. First, the soul is assumed to be separated from the body at the death in the Quran: angels demand dying prophet pretender's souls [Q 6: 93]. On the contrast, the Hadiths

says that angels pick up the spirit (*rūḥ*) when a man dies (Khan, 1997, 413). The soul and the spirit are interchangeable often and thus the general Muslims do not distinguish between them (Calverley, 1993, 151-162). However, Sufism has a clear distinction between the two because it assumes a hierarchical structure called “the subtles (*laṭā’if*)” in the psychology. Each of the soul and the spirit is the subtle (*laṭīf*) and layers of these subtles form a hierarchy. We would like to take a look at some Sufi psychologies according to Schimmel (1975, 187-193).

Ja’far al-Šādiq (d. 765) assumes a tree stage: the soul, the heart (*qalb*) and the spirit. The intellect (*‘aql*) plays a role of barrier between the soul and the heart. Al-Baṣṭāmī (d. 874/877), al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī (d. 905-910), al-Junayd (d. 910) follow his thought. Al-Kharrāz (d. 899) replaced the intellect with the nature (*ṭab’*). However, al-Tirmidhī has another idea in his book, *Bayān al-farq bayn al-ṣadr wa al-qalb wa al-fu’ād wa al-lubb*. He thinks the heart itself has four concentric spheres: the breast (*ṣadr*), the heart, the inner-heart (*fu’ād*) and the kernel (*lubb*). The outermost is the breast and the innermost is the kernel (Heer, 2003, 1-81). The psychology of al-Nūrī (d. 907-8) also has this order. Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 966) is the theorist who introduces concentric circles’ structure but his order is the soul, the heart, the spirit and the secret (*sirr*) (1956-57, 399).

Other previous studies have revealed that al-Muḥāsibī (d. 857), the master of al-Junayd, thinks another order: the soul, the spirit and the secret (Izutsu, 2005). Al-Tustarī (d. 896) sometimes divides into two: the soul and the heart, but other times adds the nature to the soul and does the spirit and the intellect to the heart (Böwering, 2011, xxxviii-xlix).

These are the psychologies in early Sufism. We can find that there are differences in the number of the stages and the order. However, in most of all cases the soul is positioned in the lowest stage. In fact, the Sufis attributes the evil of human beings to the soul and proposed to improve the soul gradually by physical practices. The idea of gradual improvement would come from the Quran because it refers the three stages of the soul.¹ Moreover, the blaming people (*al-Malāmatīya*), they lives in the region of Kurāsān in this age, also seem that the confrontation with the soul is their mission.

Now, I would like to present the question of this paper. The soul is a major problem in the early Sufism as we see above. Then, why the Sufis think that the

¹ Evil-inciting self (*al-naḥs al-ammāra bi al-sū’*)[12: 53], blaming self (*al-naḥs al-lawwāma*)[75: 2], self at peace (*al-naḥs al-muṭma’inna*)[89: 27].

soul will be influenced by the physical training? According to the traditional Islam, the soul is regarded as a material thing. Macdonald clarifies that the early Sufism also regards the soul as a material because the spirit is a creature and it is not eternal (Macdonald, 1931, 307-351). Due to the fact, the soul is to be a material as well as the soul without any suspect. The descriptions of Al-Qushayrī's *Risāla* and al-Hujwīrī's *Kashf al-mahjūb* are basis of Macdonald's affirmation. Actually, Al-Qushayrī says that "the spirit and the soul are subtle substances residing in a certain form...." (Knysh, 2007, 109). However, "a creature and not eternal" means the materiality in the comparison with Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 1111) who harmonizes Sufism with Greek philosophy and thoughts the spirit is eternal because it is blown into the human being by God's breath. Furthermore, we have to consider the meaning of the material in Sufism with comparing to Islamic theology and our modern sense.

3. The meaning of the soul in Sufism

Based on the description of Al-Qushayrī's *Risāla* and al-Hujwīrī's *Kashf al-mahjūb*, this section will organize the concept of the soul in Sufism.² Al-Qushayrī and al-Hujwīrī point that the term of the spirit originally means its existence but Sufis use this term for human's bad nature and wrong action. Both of them agree there are two kinds of the soul. In the words of al-Qushayrī, "the deficiencies of one's character traits fall into two categories: first, those which one acquires by oneself – namely, one's acts of disobedience and one's sins; second, one's [inherent] base morals. They are blameworthy in and of themselves." (Al-Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 305; Knysh, 2007, 109) The examples of the second base morals are pride, anger, envy and such negative feelings.

² The basic text for Al-Qushayrī's *Risāla* is 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd & Maḥmūd b. al-Sharīf (eds.). (1995). *al-Risāla al-Qushayriya*, Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif. Knysh's English translation (Knysh. (tr.). *Al-Qushayrī's Epistle*) is used for citations in this paper but Gramlich's German translation (Gramlich, R. (tr.). (1989). *Das Sendschreiben al-Qušayrīs über das Sufitum*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Wiesbaden) and Sell's English translation (Sell, M. A. (tr.). (1996). *Early Islamic Mysticism: Sufi, Qur'an, Mi'raj, Poetic and Theological Writings*. New York: Paulist Press) are also consulted.

The basic text for al-Hujwīrī's *Kashf al-mahjūb* is Zhukovsky. (ed.). *Kashf al-mahjūb*. Nicholson's English translation (Nicholson, R. A. (tr.). (1936). *The Kashf al-Mahjūb: The Oldest Persian Treatise on Sūfism* (new ed.). London: Luzac) is used for citations in this paper but Rabbani's English translation with commentary (Maulana Wahid Bakhsh Rabbani. (tr. with commentary). (2001). *The Kashf al-Mahjūb: Unveiling the Veiled, the Earliest Persian Treatise on Sūfism*. Lahore: Al-Faisal) and Mortazavi's French translation (Mortazavi, D. (tr.). (1988). *Somme spirituelle: Kashf al-Mahjūb li-Arbāb al-Qulūb*. Paris: Sindbad) are also consulted.

The soul is regarded as the source of evil. Al-Qushayrī and al-Hujwīrī say that we could break the soul. Al-Qushayrī offers concrete methods to do it: "The best way to do this is to have recourse to the strictures of hunger, thirst, night vigil and other types of self-exertion that lead to the weakening of [the soul's] power." (Al-Qushayrī, *Risala*, 306; Knysh, 2007, 109) He thinks the physical training is valid of the soul. Al-Hujwīrī explains the reason why physical training as outer action works on the soul as inner evil character.

"These qualities can be removed by discipline (*riyāzat*): e.g., sins are removed by repentance. Sins belong to the class of external attributes, whereas the qualities above mentioned belong to the class of internal attributes. Similarly, discipline is an external act, and repentance is an internal attribute. A base quality that appears within is purged by excellent outward attributes, and one that appears without is purged by laudable inward attributes." (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 246; Nicholson, 1936, 196)

Al-Hujwīrī accepts that discipline as outer action works on the soul as inner evil character. Repentance as inner character can work on the sin as outer character. In other words, the interaction between outer and inner has been observed. It is confirmed that physical training is valid for the soul but we need more explanation about the relation between outer action and inner character. It could be said that they are not interested in the effect which is caused by actions on the mind in the modern sense. However, this paper tries to know how the Sufis think about the body-mind relationship in the end of the eleventh century. Al-Hujwīrī states that: "Now, every attribute needs an object whereby it subsists, and knowledge of that attribute, namely, the soul, is not attained save by knowledge of the whole body, which knowledge in turn demands an explanation of the qualities of human nature (*insāniyat*) and the mystery thereof..." (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 247; Nicholson, 1936, 197)

The next section will follow how the Sufis think about the human beings for comprehending the relationship between the body and the soul.

4. The definition of human beings in *Kashf al-maḥjūb*

In this section, we would like to see the details of the definition of human beings *Kashf al-maḥjūb* of al-Hujwīrī. Al-Hujwīrī introduces various positions concerning the term of "human beings." He accounts five groups: three groups from the people of the Qibra, namely Muslims, a Sufi pretenders' group, and a group from the people of the Sunna. Al-Hujwīrī approves the viewpoint of the last group. Since he does not give the exact names of these five groups, I named

them (i) Muslim Group A, (ii) Muslim Group B, (iii) Muslim group C, (iv) Sufi pretenders, and (v) Certain Sunnis for convenience to discover details.

(i) The Opinion of Muslim Group A

The first opinion to consider is as follows: “some Moslems assert that Man is nothing but spirit (*rūḥ*), of which this body is the cuirass and temple and residence, in order to preserve it from being injured by the natural humors (*ṭabāyi*), and of which the attributes are sensation and intelligence.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 248; Nicholson, 1936, 197) In short, a man is a spirit and his body is its fence.

Al-Hujwīrī contends, “This view is false because a body from which the anima (*jān*)³ has departed is still called ‘a human being’ (*insān*); if the anima is joined with it, it is ‘a live human being,’ and if the anima is gone, it is ‘a dead human being.’ Moreover, an anima is located in the bodies of animals, yet they are not called ‘human beings.’” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 248; Nicholson, 1936, 197) We can call a human body “a human being” whether he is alive or not. However, we cannot call an animal body “a human being” even if it has a spirit. This is because “If the spirit (*rūḥ*) were the cause of human nature, it would follow that the principle of human nature must exist in every creature possessed of an anima (*jān-dārī*)” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 248; Nicholson, 1936, 197-198) From the perspective of al-Hujwīrī, the presence of the spirit or the anima is not itself a criterion for being a human being.

(ii) The Opinion of Muslim Group B

The second opinion is that “others, again, have stated that the term ‘human nature’ is applicable to the spirit and the body together, and that is no longer applies when one is separated from the other.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 248; Nicholson, 1936, 198) This means that we can only call a man “a human being” when he has a spirit and body; we cannot call a dead man’s body “a human being,” in contrast to former opinions.

A parable of colours has been used to explain this concept and it explains that “when two colours, black and white, are combined on a horse, it is called

³ The original translation of Nicholson uses the word, “the soul (*jān*)”; however, I replaced all such references with “the anima.” It appears that *rūḥ* and *jān* are interchangeable in al-Hujwīrī’s writing.

‘piebald’ (*ablaq*) , whereas the same colours, apart from each other, are called ‘black’ and ‘white.’” (Al-Hujwārī. *Kashf al-mahjū*, 248; Nicholson, 1936, 198) A horse that has white hair is called “a white horse,” and a horse that has black hair is called “a black horse,” but a horse that has white and black hair is called “a piebald horse.” Similarly, a man who has a spirit only is called “the spirit,” and a man who has a body only is called “the body,” but a man who has a spirit and body is called “a human being.”

Al-Hujwārī objects to this opinion from the Moslem doctrine and says, “This too is false, in accordance with God’s word: ‘*Did there not come over Man a space of time during which he was not a thing worthy of mention?*’ [76: 1]: in this verse Man’s clay, without anima—for the anima had not yet been joined to his body—is called ‘Man.’” (Al-Hujwārī. *Kashf al-mahjū*, 248; Nicholson, 1936, 198) God shaped the human body from clay and then blew the spirit into it [15: 29; 32:9; 38: 72], after that, the human is alive. Consistently, al-Hujwārī contends that we can call human body “a human being” whether or not it has a spirit or anima.

(iii) The Opinion of Muslim Group C

The third opinion is that “others aver that ‘Man’ is an atom, centred in the heart, which is the principle of all human attributes.” (Al-Hujwārī. *Kashf al-mahjū*, 248; Nicholson, 1936, 198). According to proponents of this argument, the heart determines human nature.

Al-Hujwārī rejects this opinion, too, saying, “This also is absurd, for if anyone is killed and his heart is taken out of his body he does not lose the name of ‘human being.’” (Al-Hujwārī. *Kashf al-mahjū*, 248-249; Nicholson, 1936, 198) He claims that one physical organ, such as the heart, can never define the entire human being. We cannot call a part of the human body “a human being,” even if it is important for life support. Here again, al-Hujwārī’s criteria for “a human being” extend to those “dead or alive.”

(iv) The Opinion of Sufi Pretenders

The fourth opinion is from Sufi pretenders: “They declare that ‘Man’ is not that which eats and drinks and suffers decay, but a Divine mystery, of which this body is the vesture, situated in the interfusion of the natural humours (*imtizāj-i ṭab*) and in the union (*ittiḥād*) of body and spirit.” (Al-Hujwārī. *Kashf al-mahjū*,

249; Nicholson, 1936, 198) In brief, only God can create a human being through His secret knowledge.

Al-Hujwīrī also opposes this opinion, saying, “the name of ‘human being’ belongs to sane men and mad, and to infidels and immoral and ignorant persons, in whom there is no such ‘mystery’ and who suffer decay and eat and drink.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 249; Nicholson, 1936, 198) Al-Hujwīrī says that Divine mystery is appropriate for wise people. He continues, and says, “and that there is not anything called ‘Man’ in the body, either while it exists or after it has ceased to exist.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 249; Nicholson, 1936, 198) Here again, his two basic conceptions of human nature have not changed; (1) we can call a human body “a human being” whether it is living or dead; however, (2) there is no physical organ that itself determines “a human being.” The latter is emphasized by the following, which states, “God Almighty has given the name of ‘Man’ to the sum of the substances⁴ which he compounded in us, excluding those things which are not to be found in some human beings.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 249; Nicholson, 1936, 198) After citing the Koran,⁵ al-Hujwīrī concludes, “this particular form, with all its ingredients and with all the changes which it undergoes, is ‘Man.’” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 249; Nicholson, 1936, 198-199)

(v) The Opinion of Certain Sunnis

The last opinion to address is that belongs to certain Sunnis, which posits “Man is a living creature whose form has these characteristics, and that death does not deprive him of his name, and that he is endowed with a definite physiognomy (*ṣūrat-i ma’ḥūd*) and a distinct organ (*ālat-i mawsūm*) both externally and internally.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 249; Nicholson, 1936, 199)

This time al-Hujwīrī does not refute the stance, but it is difficult to guess his mindset from these analogies: “By ‘a definite physiognomy’ they mean that he has either good or ill health, and by ‘a distinct organ’ that he is either mad or

⁴ The original Persian text says, “jumle mā-yi-hā.” There are two different interpretations for this: “the sum of us” and “the sum of things.”

⁵ “And We have created Man of the choicest clay, then We placed him as a drop of sperm in a safe lodging, then We made the sperm into a clot, then We made the clot a lump of flesh, then We made in the lump of flesh bones, then We clothed the bones with flesh, then We caused it to grow into another creation, so blessed be Allah, the Best of creators” (Kor. xxiii, 12- 14).

sane.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 249; Nicholson, 1936, 199) As mentioned earlier, al-Hujwīrī calls a human body “a human being,” regardless of whether it is living or dead. These sentences indicate that, externally, a human body has a particular apparent shape and specific organs. On the other hand, the internal meaning of these sentences, as al-Hujwīrī explains, is that we can call a man “a human being” whether he is healthy and intelligent or not.

Hitherto, this paper discussed the five opinions concerning the “human being” that were introduced by al-Hujwīrī. There is a range of conditions that apply when we use the term “human being.” However, al-Hujwīrī’s standard is simple. He contends that “a human being” refers to the entire human body and, even after death, the human body is called “a human being.” Finally he clarifies the Sufi opinion as follows:

“You must know, then, that in the opinion of mystics the most perfect composition of Man includes three elements, viz. spirit, soul, and body.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 249-250; Nicholson, 1936, 199)

For this reason, he objected giving the name “human being” to merely the spirit or a part of the body. Besides, he affirmed “that each of these has an attribute which subsists therein, the attribute of spirit being intelligence, of soul, passion, and of body, sensation.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 250; Nicholson, 1936, 199) These three attributes are functions of fundamental human activities. Since the human body is a place wherein attributes dwell, it qualifies being called “a human being,” whether it is living or not. Concerning the relationship between the body and the soul, it is clarified that both of them are the substances which have their attributes.

Discussion of the concept of “a human being” leads to a cosmology. Al-Hujwīrī states, “Man is a type of the whole universe. The universe is the name of the two worlds, and in Man there is a vestige of both.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 250; Nicholson, 1936, 199) The two worlds include the present world and the hereafter. “For he is composed of phlegm, blood, bile and melancholy, which four humours correspond to the four elements of this world, viz. water, earth, air, and fire,” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-maḥjū*, 250; Nicholson, 1936, 199)⁶ he continues. Based on the science of the time, al-Hujwīrī posits that the world consists of four elements and finds these in the human body as well.

⁶ Zhukovsky thinks that counterpart of phlegm is air and that of bile is water.

However, he describes the next world as a realm where “his spirit, his soul,⁷ and his body correspond to Paradise, Hell, and the place of Resurrection. Paradise is the effect of God’s satisfaction and Hell is the result of His anger.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-mahjū*, 250; Nicholson, 1936, 199) This implies that three human components—the spirit, soul, and body—belong to the afterlife. However, we have seen that a human being is endowed with these components during life. Should we assume that these three do not consist of the four elements of the world? According to the Koran, the spirit comes from God and it is easy to discern that the spirit was not made in this world. However, a problem exists when it comes to the body, which God created using the earth. Is a human being a bridge between the physical and spiritual world? If so, then what does this mean for the soul? Is it a mixture of the two worlds?

Al-Hujwīrī further explains, “In short, the believer’s spirit calls him to Paradise, of which it is a type in his world, and his lower soul calls him to Hell, of which it is a type in this world. Therefore it behoves those who seek God never to relax their resistance to the lower soul, in order that thereby they may reinforce the spirit and the intelligence, which are the home of Divine mystery.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-mahjū*, 250; Nicholson, 1936, 199-200)

This conflict between the spirit and soul is also found elsewhere: “Both the lower soul and the spirit are subtle things (*laṭā’if*) existing in the body, just as devils and angels and Paradise and Hell exist in the universe; but the one is the seat of good, while the other is the seat of evil.” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-mahjū*, 245; Nicholson, 1936, 196)

From the above, we can conclude that the spirit is the symbol of virtue and the soul that of evil. Ultimately, we see that the body itself exists neutrally. It serves as the battlefield for good and evil.

5. The substance and the attribute

The section four has examined the concept of human nature on the basis of the discussion in al-Hujwīrī’s *Unveiling the Veiled*. Al-Hujwīrī consistently claims that the name “human being” properly applies to the whole body. He strongly opposes the idea that the human being may be represented by only part of the body and he never distinguishes between whether a body is alive or dead. Islam teaches that dead bodies revive, as the condition of death: therefore, al-Hujwīrī sees a human being as a whole that continues to exist even in the afterlife. It

⁷ Nicholson’s original translation is “his soul (*jān*), his lower soul (*nafs*).”

would be useless if we regained only a physical heart. Al-Qushayrī also says that: “resurrection will happen to this whole, and so will reward and punishment.” (Al-Qushayrī. *Risāla*. 308; Knysh, 2007, 110) The spirit (or the soul) which is apart when he dies will return the time of resurrection. A human being is the whole combination of the body, the soul, and the spirit.

Instead, al-Hujwīrī is interested in the human body and its elements in this discussion. He has even said that he excludes health and wisdom when he bestows the name “human being” on some one. It is possible to say that his perspective is drawn from his view of the body. The body itself does not have any value. What bring it values are the spirit and soul. Al-Qushayrī agrees for this position and says: “however, the soul may also mean a subtle substance placed in the [human] body, which is the repository of blameworthy character traits in the same way as the spirit is a subtle substance placed in the [human] body, which is the repository of praiseworthy character traits. All these elements are subjugated to one another and their sum total constitutes a human being.” (Al-Qushayrī. *Risāla*. 306; Knysh, 2007, 109) A human being has a certain form which is deferent from animals’ form and this form qualifies the name of “human.” His morals and talents are not demanded. A human being has three substances: the body, the soul, and the spirit. The soul is the evil attribute and the spirit is good attribute.

As we see above, al-Hujwīrī says that the attribute of the body is the sense. There is no difference with al-Qushayrī in this point. From the description in *Risāla*, “this is also the case with vision being the repository of seeing, the ear being the repository of hearing, the nose being the repository of smelling, and the mouth being the repository of tasting. The entity that hears, sees, smells, or tastes constitutes a whole, which is a human being.” (Al-Qushayrī. *Risāla*. 306-307; Knysh, 2007, 109) That is to say, physical organs in the body have the senses as its attribute. However, the subject that controls these senses is not a part of the body but a whole human being.

The attribute of the soul is the passion according to al-Hujwīrī. He explains: “The most manifest attribute of the lower soul is lust (*shahwat*). Lust is a thing that is dispersed in different parts of the human body, and is served by the sense. Man is bound to guard all his members from it, and he shall be questioned concerning the acts of each. The lust of the eye is sight, that of the ear is hearing, that of the nose is smell, that of the tongue is speech, that of the palate is taste, that of the body (*jasad*) is touch, and that of the mind is thought (*andishīdan*).” (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-mahjū*, 263; Nicholson, 1936, 208-209) At first glance, the soul’s attribute matches the body’s attribute. However, the

soul's attribute is not the sense but the passion to desire the senses. The passion is the evil character that could be vanished by outer action and is blameworthy character that dwells in the soul. To quit desire the senses is the goal of physical training as al-Hujwīrī's account: "When you have obtained knowledge of it [the soul] you recognize that it can be mastered by discipline, but that its essence and substance do not perish." (Al-Hujwīrī. *Kashf al-mahjūb*, 260; Nicholson, 1936, 206).

From above, we can conclude that action of the body, its attribute is the sense that is the target of the soul's passion, is needed to control the passion. This is the relationship between the body and the soul.

Conclusion

This paper clarified the concept of the soul based on the descriptions of al-Qushayrī's *Risāla* and al-Hujwīrī's *Kashf al-mahjūb*. First, Sufis have the unique usage of the term of the soul. Second, the target of Sufi physical training is not the body but the soul. Third, the body and the soul are substances and each of them has an attribute. The attribute of the body is the sense and the attribute of the soul is the passion to desire the sense. Sufi physical training aims to clear the passion because the source of the evil is the soul's attribute and the soul itself is necessity as a component of the human beings.

We have been a closer look at the discussion of the definition of human beings in al-Hujwīrī's *Kashf al-mahjūb*. Al-Hujwīrī thinks the special form of human is the criteria of the definition and the body and the soul are not opposite nor belong to entirely different category. He emphasizes a sum of the body and the soul (we may add the spirit to them) is the human beings. The body and the subtles are substances and a substance has its attribute. The attribute of the soul is the passion that desires the attribute of the body. From this relation, Sufi practice must use the body that is the location of the sense to eliminate the soul. Fasting and the recollection of God (*zikr*) is unique Sufi practice. Fasting can control the passion to desire taste because fasting restricts the sense of tasting by physical action. Similarly, the recollection of God is valid for control the passion to require speaking because the tongue is engaged in repeat the words for praising God. Here we can find the relationship between the body action and the soul. Introducing the theory of jurisprudence and theology enables Sufism to logically explain their discipline.

References

- 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd & Maḥmūd b. al-Sharīf (eds.). (1995). *al-Risāla al-Qushayrīya*, Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif.
- Böwering, G. (1980). *The Mystical Vision of Existence in Classical Islam: the Qur'ānic Hermeneutics of the Ṣūfī Sahl At-Tustarī (d. 283/896)*, Berlin & New York: Walter De Gruyter.
- Calverley, E. E. (1993). Nafs. *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed., Vol. 7). Leiden: E. J. Brill
- Gramlich, R. (tr.). (1989). *Das Sendschreiben al-Quṣayrīs über das Sufitum*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Wiesbaden)
- Heer, N. (introduction and translation). (2003). *Three Early Sufi Texts*, Louisville: Fons Vitae.
- Izustu, T. (2005). *Islaam Sisoushi (The History of Islamic Thought)* (2nd ed.). Tokyo: Chuo Koron Shinshya.
- Karamustafa, A. T. (2007). *Sufism: The Formative Period*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Keeler, A., & Keeler, A. (tr.), (2011). *Tafsīr al-Tustarī: Great Commentaries on the Holy Qur'ān*. Louisville: Fons Vitae.
- Knysh, A. D. (tr.). (2007). *Al-Qushayrī's Epistle on Sufism: Al-Risala al-Qushayriyya fi 'Ilm al-Tasawwuf*. Reading: Garnet Publishing.
- Macdonald, D. B. (1931). The Development of the Idea of Spirit in Islam. *Acta Orientalia*, 9, 307-351.
- Maulana Wahid Bakhsh Rabbani. (tr. with commentary). (2001). *The Kashf al-Mahjūb: Unveiling the Veiled, the Earliest Persian Treatise on Ṣūfism*. Lahore: Al-Faisal
- Mortazavi, D. (tr.). (1988). *Somme spirituelle: Kashf al-Mahjūb li-Arbāb al-Qulūb*. Paris: Sindbad.
- Muhammad Muhsin Khan, (1997). *The Translation of the Meaning of Sahīh Al-Bukhārī: Arabic-English*, Riyadh: Dar-us Salam, Vol. 4.
- Nicholson, R. A. (tr.). (1936). *The Kashf al-Mahjūb: The Oldest Persian Treatise on Ṣūfism* (new ed.). London: Luzac
- Schimmel, A. (1975). *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Sell, M. A. (tr.). (1996). *Early Islamic Mysticism: Sufi, Qur'an, Mi'raj, Poetic and Theological Writings*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Smith, J. I. (1979). The Understanding of Nafs and Rūḥ in Contemporary Muslim Considerations of the Nature of Sleep and Death. *The Muslim World*, 69 (3), 151-162.