Conclusion:

It is clear from this study that the book *al-muwāqif wa-l-mukhāṭabāt* surpasses every standard and principle of its age, in fact, it even surpasses them for several centuries after the 10th century.  Even though it remained in obscurity for an extended period of time, it formed a basis for Sufism in the 13th century, which is embodied by ibn ʿArabī's adoption of al-Niffarī’s thought. It is worth noting that ibn ʿArabī addresses al-Niffarī as if he were present throughout the preceding period, and this allows us to conclude that the culture of al-Niffarī’s age was not mature enough for the reception of this kind of thought, due to its engagement with affirming the *sharīʿa*, and how it made the *sharīʿa* a foundational bedrock for any spiritual or philosophical discourse.

Al-Niffarī’s lack of affiliation with any Sufi order and his inclination to the absolute in his writing made his text a “non-affiliated” text, and this is a reason for the lack of opposition against him, or the lack of any charge of infidelity and blasphemy against him, as has happened to many Sufis.  Thus the book, *al-muwāqif wa-l-mukhāṭabāt* with regards to the dominant ideas, was a dangerous breach for both jurisprudence and the Qur’ān, and this means that the foundation of the text did not permit even the possibility of refutation. As for its two conditions, namely lacking adoption and lacking refutation, in my opinion, the cause of these two is the novelty of the text with respect to its content and style. There is no doubt that the novelty comes from how the text completely sprung from the absolute, and how it urged al-Niffarī on because of his sincerity to this reality, and from his adhering to a new style of writing that accords with the essence of the absolute, so at the end of the matter, the text is composed at the moment of his meeting the Real.

In what follows I will present the conclusions of this study:

1. We arrived at the conclusion in the first section that the book *al-muwāqif wa-l-mukhāṭabāt* formulates a new enterprise. Thus, its difference from al-Niffarī’s other manuscripts leads us to two possibilities: either al-Niffarī created a compilation of his thoughts in this book, or other people, from among al-Niffarī’s descendants, took part in compiling this book. For both of these options, we have before us a discourse whose goals comes from the predominant culture of the time.
2. In the second chapter we addressed the crisis of Sufism in the tenth century, which is represented by the suffering of the Sufis by juridical authority, considering the conflict between Sufi thought and the *sunna* and scripture (*al-kitāb*). This is what led to the emergence of a stream of compromise in Sufism, and the establishment of Sufi thought as a way of life for the individual within the social framework so that Sufism could become a part of Muslim life and a system of the *sharīʿa*.

At the beginning of the tenth century, Sufi texts were restricted to compiling the Sufi heritage and basing them upon the *sharīʿa,* as well as asserting that the Qur’ān and Hadith are the sources of Sufism. In opposition to this, with his book *al-muwāqif wa-l-mukhāṭabā*, al-Niffarī sought to defend upright Sufism in order to announce that real Sufism is that which surpasses the *sharīʿa,* and with this, al-Niffarī alone formed a different stream, one that opposes concealment by jurisprudence, as every Sufi had done since the latter part of the ninth century.

1. In the third chapter we reached the conclusion that the standing (al-*waqfa*) for al-Niffarī is a summation of all the Sufi stations (*maqāmāt*), and it is the station (al-*maqām*) which he originated, being influenced by the Sufis of the 9th century. The novelty of al-Niffarī’s thought concerning the standing (*al-waqfa*) is quite manifest, in that it is a moment where the *wāqif* is separated from being, and this is actualized by absolute detachment from all that is other [than God], with this detachment the attributes disappear, opposites become the same, and the vision becomes actualized for the *wāqif*.  The absolute, from which the speech (*al-khiṭāb*) emerges in the standing (*al-waqfa*) is in itself unattainable and ever-fleeing, and every time the *wāqif* comes closer, it becomes more distant, and every time he withdraws from it, it becomes more distant. With this al-Niffarī establishes a new philosophical understanding for the absolute, and he applied it to the experience of the *wāqif* since it is a journey without a path, and without a path, no trace remains, as such the standing (al-*waqfa*) obliterates the trace of his self, and it causes the *wāqif* to be perpetually in movement in the region of the impossible, despite his proximity to the absolute.
2. The depth of al-Niffarī’s thought in relation to his contemporaries becomes clear to us in the fourth section, as well as his pioneering role as the initiator of deconstruction in his treatment of Sufism and religion. From the side of Sufism, al-Niffarī creates a philosophy of the experience of arriving at the Real. He surpasses the traditional ecstatic sayings of the Sufis with this conception, and from his spiritual experience, there arises an ontological experience that has no relationship to the essential identity of humanity.  Moreover, al-Niffarī is the first one to address the Qur’ān in a deconstructive manner. Before everything, he concedes its sacrality, though he clearly announces how the standing (*waqfa*) surpasses scripture (*al-kitāb*). He distinguishes the difference between the people of the book “*ahl al-kitāb*” and “*ahl al-waqfa*”. Thus scripture is the instrument of the believer for reaching heaven, though the *wāqif* surpasses paradise, and he is in a standing (*waqfa*) that is not in heaven and not in hell. Considering that the standing (*waqfa*) cancels the intermediaries between God and the *wāqif*, and it goes beyond the Qur’ān and its meanings, it is for that reason al-Niffarī deconstructs the foundation of those who relied upon intellect (*ʿaql*) and transmission (*naql*) for the understanding of the Quranic text, and he presents a new understanding of the Quranic text that proceeds from the states of the *wāqif*, and he obliterates what is written in the Qur’ānic text throughout his deconstructive reading.
3. In the fifth section we reach the conclusion that the novelty of al-Niffarī’s thought manifests in the language of the *al-muwāqif wa-l-mukhāṭabāt,* since he takes it up as a topic that he devotes himself to similarly to his devotion to the meaning of his spiritual experience. He does not treat language as an instrument or something that carries the content; rather, it is the content itself, and it is for this reason that al-Niffarī is the first thinker about writing in the Arabic culture. At the same time, it is possible to consider al-Niffarī the first Sufi to treat the inability of language to describe the experience of arriving at the ultimate. In the vision the letter drops, and as such, language descends because of its inability to describe what cannot be described, and the difference is that al-Niffarī deconstructs writing by way of writing. Here language shines forth in a new style that opposes the traditional metaphor in exchange for a metaphor of meaning, and this is what manifests in the union of linguistic opposites, like the result of conceptual equalization throughout the strategy of negating the negation which al-Niffarī relied upon.

In summary, it is possible to consider this an introductory study to the philosophy of al-Niffarī, and an advancement for the understanding of Sufism with regards to the position of the book *al-muwāqif wa-l-mukhāṭabāt* in the first part of the tenth century, as well as its difference from the other Sufi texts which took different courses, if we compare it with the Sufism of the ninth century.

In the next stage, namely my doctoral research, I will expand upon the chapters of this study, and add new sections that address the semiotic dimension of the text *al-muwāqif wa-l-mukhāṭabāt*, as well as the aesthetics of this text, especially the poetics of the text which arises from the dialectical relationship between content and language.

As such, I will expand upon my research concerning al-Niffarī’s deconstructive method and its comparison with modern deconstruction, especially the philosophy of Jacques Derrida. This will start with the discursive core of al-Niffarī since the traditional ways, due to its writing style, are not capable of arriving at the meaning of the experience of communication with the absolute, since there is perpetual difference and delay, and this is what deconstruction offers.