

THEOLOGICAL VIEW ON THE ABSOLUTE

Ismail Bardhi

“Say: “He is Allah, [who is] One, Allah, the Eternal Refuge. He neither begets nor is born. Nor is there to Him any equivalent”.

(Qur’an, 112: 1-4)

Abstract

The issue of the Absolute in its content has always been not only a theological and philosophical challenge but a challenge for the culture and civilization as well. Theology, by its own profundity, has frequently attempted to accept it as a spotless issue between the naïve and the wisdom, not because has not comprehended it, but because theology has been sentient of the fact that it is impossible to make this issue tangible. Each time that philosophy, with the self-granted looseness, has tried to repudiate the issue of the Absolute, it has in fact acknowledged it. For as much as the philosophy has speculated with this issue that much has been plunged with torment in its own profundities, while rendering the thought through its language sometimes attractive even in ridiculous ways. Young philosophers in their ageing ceased being so enthusiastic in treating the issue of the Absolute – the Absolute exhausted the philosophy. This writing presents some theological reflections on the Absolute based on the signs that the Revelation has presented in the shape of the continuous guidance for the faithful.

Keywords: *The Absolute, Theological Reflections, Divine Revelation, Philosophical Inquiry, Transcendence*

Every movement presupposes a mandatory beginning which, on the other hand, in itself represents either only the end of passivity or a pursuit carried by ardent desire and permeated with the category of command in accordance

only with something that is eternal and absolute. Every beginning presupposes movement somewhere; movement, intention and ardent desire to go further.

The movement that we will begin here is of a comparative nature and we can certainly count on arriving at the end of a path, which is shaped by the finite and which necessarily flows into the finite; but the other path, which represents the highest possible or impossible arrival, the arrival into the absurd, is shaped by possibility, and everything that possibility shapes is shaped in accordance with infinity (an-Nasafi, 1993, pp. 9-19; M.M. Sharif, 1979, p. 17-22).

This movement of ours also necessarily considers the freedom (Jaspers, 1973, pp. 172-180), which we have, because the order, the duty and the need to go further, the necessity of freedom demands and claims, and we are free in spirit and by that intuitive freedom in thought we can dive a little deeper and go further from this rigid reality, whose characteristic is changeability, while whose official name is determined by the Revelation.

The entire Revelation is a permanent call, which removes any doubt and impossibility of reaching the end, namely the beginning of the essence – the Absolute. There are numerous verses in the Qur'an that speak about this, on which many works have been written, for example: Abu Al-Hasan Al-Ashari, *Bit polemike sa otpadnicima i inovatorima*, Sarajevo, 2000.

That very long and very distant path, to which all other relative paths lead us, in its final destination and in its meaning leads us to God and emphasizes only Him. "Everywhere I looked/ I saw clearly that it's you/ I found you where I sought you/ The great and true God" (Frashëri, 1986, pp. 192-197).

That path by which religion is meant has a unique feature, in fact it presupposes in its essence the esoteric weaving or consciousness through which infinity is presupposed. Following that path presupposes knowledge only up to that point, until that path is reached, and then man sets out on that path by another knowledge, by the consciousness of his soul, as a freedom which brings him closer to his God and takes him into the hidden depths where the heart and soul are silent, while reason and logic stop, fall, surrender and understand nothing more. Any kind of knowledge, which is based on objective purpose, must necessarily take into account religion as a special type of knowledge, which itself determines the boundaries of science, philosophy and art (Kahteran, 2002, pp. 5-36). Knowledge founded on reason only in

the domain of the real, the visible, directs the individual from that path, the path of religion, and the whole of human life must pass to reach that path. However, sometimes a person remains alone on the path of his whole life and, what is even more tragic, on the wrong and finite one (Ibn Tufejl, 1985, pp. 137-158).

To follow the path of religion means to be in the pure naturalness (*hanif*), the Nature of God, in which He has created the universe and man in it. Such a path is infinite and forms every individual who is on it, by the infinite. At the very foundation of that path is the principle of eternity and therefore he who arrives to religion (that path), to the naturalness and originality, which he has lost with his moral decline, he has certainly arrived closer to the pleasure of God. And can there be anything more than this?

Can a person be anything more than a genius in religion, or religion's warrior, as Abraham (peace be upon him) was?

To tread the path of religion and to remain on it until the end of one's life means to stand in the face of the whole world, all sciences, philosophy and art, and to remain strong, powerful, and able to say: "Who are you in reality?", just as Abraham (peace be upon him) was able to do this. To follow this path means to lead oneself through faith to the absolute state of consciousness and to know that you are in the face of the whole world and all the values in it, to be aware that you have accepted what is absurd to the world, and everything to you; to lose all that this world offers and again and in spite of it to gain all that stands in the face of this world and that shapes and exhausts it against its will (Qur'an, 6: 74-89).

Faith, therefore, with its ultimate goal, is absurd for this everyday life that consumes reason, it is pure naturalness for the heart and soul, for the logic of the highest world. The Quran presents the essential definition of faith, religion, in most cases in a language appropriate to reason, but we also have moments that are above every dimension, such as the case of the sacrifice of Ismail (peace be upon him) by his father, Ibrahim (peace be upon him). This is the purest, most "dangerous" dimension, which is even above the moral norm, not to mention other norms.

The Quran presents the essential definition of faith, religion, in most cases in a language appropriate to reason, but we also have moments that are above every dimension, such as the case of the sacrifice of Ismail (peace be upon him) by his father, Ibrahim (peace be upon him). This is the purest, most

“dangerous” dimension, which is even above the moral norm, not to mention other norms. Of course, it is surprising that what is at the foundation of this world and by which it is shaped, is at the same time also opposite of it, as an inconceivable phenomenon, a reality outside reason and outside logic, respectively the truth that cannot be known to the end due to impossibility and limitation or fear before that truth.

However, although the path of religion or faith in itself and in its essence is mysterious, efforts to discover it, to analyze and define it have also occurred at the level of science, philosophy and especially art. All of them are interested in the truth, but not all of them have departed with the truth, and therefore they have not been able to reach it, even though it seems to them that they have contemplated, thought of and realized even the most mysterious things. The first views, thoughts and inquiries of man have been directed towards metaphysics (Motahhari, 2003). Man, so small and moreover limited as he is, sought the Whole, something that is higher and more powerful, which also formed him and placed him where he is, until the appointed time. He wanted to grasp the irrational with *ratio*, to investigate and discover with logic that which degrades him and does not accept the logic of this world. Man tried to do this since he was in paradise and because of this inattentive, ardent, crazy desire for eternity and insurmountable fame, he lost that wonderful abode. Although this was an absurdity in the true sense of the word and still remains so, man tries to understand with reason that where human speech is lost and where language is confused, where everything is silent and in innocent amazement he asks himself secretly or openly: “What could be that which I do not know, while longing drives me to know and discover it”? (Karahasan, 2002).

Science, and by this I mean science as it should be and not as it is, explains this world by finding in it the laws and regularities by which it helps man in his right orientation, which, we must accept, also represents the essence of human living (Hegel, 1962, p. 431; Šušnjić, 1999, pp. 17-35). It therefore reveals all that is and that can symbolize its essence here and this is sufficient for the one who does not bother life in the way “invisible to ordinary human eyes”, to feel something deeper, that as an idea exists somewhere in an environment that does not accept the various changes of this world and that does not exhaust itself in its personal symbol, through which it reaches the category of space and time, the characteristic of which is of a relative or determined nature (Werner, 2003, pp. 685-692). Such science necessarily and primarily

presupposes the moral basis or simply morality as an all-valuable law, the highest value of which is God.

However, if we talk about today's science, let me not say that things are overturned here, but they are completely different. Today's science or scientificness is a real deformation of that genuine science mentioned above. First of all, it is no longer in the service of man, life, or itself, but is in the service of a goal whose official designation could be aimlessness, hopelessness, self-destruction (Spengler, 1991). It has started the movement towards that goal through extremely radical changes carried out during its journey. It has changed that moral basis as a source element in its own orientation during its involvement in the divine order and the discovery of that order that reigns in nature. Its basis is morals or morality without God, the highest value of which is the society composed of dispersed individuals loosely tied to the external repressive bond of law, while the ultimate goal of that morality is the interest that is realized through science guided by precisely determined and pre-programmed paths, which simultaneously follow various artificial policies and the same schizoid demagoguery.

Science no longer prepares or foresees a beautiful future for humanity, but the path it is taking foresees inevitable destruction. Firstly, it reduced man to a machine (Lametr) serving itself, then it replaced him with a machine in the full sense of the word, so that man became its slave, whom it once used and now does not need him even as a slave, becoming even superior to him, since it is less vulnerable. In the end, that machine destroys itself. That is, firstly, it deprived man of one component and that inevitable one – it left him Godless and prepared his inevitable destruction. Namely, it theoretically brought about that destruction by denying the soul and acknowledging only the body. Perhaps it would have accepted both his soul and his body when, through reason, man, who is in the absolute presence of God, could distance himself from the absolute and look at him somewhere “from the side” and thus form a permanent image of him. [For more, see: Izetbegoviq, 1993, pp. 91-95; Spengler, 1991, p. 14].

But what would have happened? First of all, this is almost absurd, and even to think about it and do it would have been more than tragic for man. When he manages to do this, man would become completely alienated, he would forget this reality and would certainly never return, or at least he would not have the desire to return; he would disappear without a trace, and if he finally reached some pre-image of God and thereby proved it, he would automat-

ically realize it and in this way would insert it into history, bring it into the process of the event, with which God would necessarily have to exhaust himself and in the end die because automatically from the moment of Him was proven, he would no longer be God. Thus, man with a dead God would lose everything, both freedom and the meaning of life, but he himself would also be lost. But, this is why God can never be proven. Such a thing could only happen if those crazy ideas of Sartre and Nietzsche (Kusić, 1980, p. 14 and 19; Jelkić, 2001, pp. 103-134) were true, because in them everything ends in nothingness, or at Nietzsche, God must necessarily die in order for man to become free, or rather to become a superman. “I teach you about the superman. Man is something that must be surpassed. What have you done to surpass him? The superman is the meaning of the earth.”

Every scientific truth is of a relative nature, while every newly discovered scientific truth is at the same time a personal loss of science and a degradation of that previous truth, which in the final sense can be reduced to a supposition. However, every such relative scientific truth no longer serves that positive knowledge acquired through empirical means, as a generally valid positive experience, but it serves certain groups of people or systems, so that there is no longer that aim for the conquest of man and his reformation and elevation to the level of “superman”, but the ultimate goal of all this is interest, which necessarily gives science the sign of bias, so that it is increasingly reduced to the handmaid of politics on the basis of which Godless morality is permeated with apodictic subjectivity. [For more, see: Šušnjić, 1999; Niče, 1962].

Now we inevitably come to a very important point, where the boundaries of science are reduced and where the plane of philosophy and art begins. Now we must put things on a comparative basis, because we have reached precisely the problematic that is thematically determined and in which the relationship where faith and philosophy stand opposite of each other is emphasized (Panenberg, 2003, pp. 15-27). This relationship is in fact the deepest and strongest bond that connects the various contradictions in the world, reconciles them and rises above them, making in the process the necessary synthesis, and thanks to this synthesis harmony is established in the world. This relationship or the middle path is that divine nature specified in the Qur’an and on which God created the world and man in it and made it the only right path that leads to Him, which is based on morality, the only source of which is Revelation, while the highest value is God.

That path can never be arrived at directly and at once, because man is located in the middle between two paths, and from that middle one reaches at one of the two mentioned paths by accepting different possibilities, which shape him by the path he has chosen during the process of his personal happening.

However, one thing is clear, that it is in human nature to strive to attain the highest, the most valuable, and the most lasting. This has been proven by the moral decline.

Since man is a synthesis, or rather, he was comprised by dualism, which demanded the indestructibility of synthesis, two paths, two possibilities were necessary to please human free will. Without such dualism, human history would also be impossible, while it was weaved at the moment when gender (sexuality) was defined as the second consequence of the moral fall with the first sin. Here we are specifically interested only in the starting point of man or his movement towards this distant goal that takes place through different possibilities. Here we will talk precisely about the two movements or the two departure points in the attempt to attain the truth.

Viewed from the framework of Western experience, we can immediately conclude that there have been two departure points or two possibilities through which man should have begun his movement on the plane of knowing God, only to experience God and not to witness or show Him with any imagery. The first possibility is philosophy, while the other is religion or Revelation – Christianity (Panenberg, 2003, pp. 79-95; Brajičić, 1996, pp. 23-45).

Philosophy has departed and is still departing by the assumption in the form of the question: “what is that which is higher and how?” That is, it does not depart from the truth. Or perhaps it is a truth of hypothetical importance. With the assumption it was necessary to go further into the imagination of God himself, so that God in philosophy is imagined, remembered, realized and finally realized, with which he was necessarily introduced into the process of the happening, while the latter necessarily leads to the end. Thus, God in philosophy was exhausted and died, by which man again lost everything, while philosophical faith and the faith of philosophers continued to be founded on the assumption accompanied by the hope and ardent desire for the return of the “absent God”, who must prevent the destruction, which philosophy and science had already theoretically foreseen and felt. Jaspers later, in the field of existentialist philosophy, would save the honor of philosophy by not allowing

the possibility of witnessing God, “because the witnessed God no longer continues to be a God.” (Jaspers, 1973, pp. 151-162).

In Christianity, God did not experience a better fate. In other words, Christianity is founded on revelation and has departed with the truth, being the truth that God is and nothing more. That truth had to be attained, and in order to attain it, the spiritual leaders, instead of following it, they were not satisfied from the beginning with the truth that God is, but tried to go further from the truth, so that they transformed it into a supposition and asked questions like the philosophers: what is God like? Thus they also started imagining God, so that they finally made Him a sensible presence of this world, introduced Him into history by placing Him into the process of the happening, testing him with evil and allowing the possibility of his sacrifice for humanity after he had become a sensible presence, buried God; so that only “it” remained incarnated in the hearts of Christians as the eternal thought of His sacrifice that the human race might live. Christianity buried God much earlier than Nietzsche and Sartre, so that they could only put an end to “it” as the eternal idea of the murdered God, by overemphasizing the need for the superman, whose end is in nothingness or self-destruction, which will occur with the destruction of this world as a synthesis, which was prepared and promoted by the ugly separation of science on the one hand with all the philosophies of materialism and the philosophy of idealism and art with Christianity, on the other, which betrayed its own personal teaching, making an image for itself and comparing it with God, as well as the partialization of God or the totality into three categories of divinity (Bardhi, 2002, p. 85).

But they wanted to go further than the truth, replacing it with conjecture. They even tested God with evil. But can one go further than the truth? Can God be tested with evil? Can God be absent even for a moment, let alone be dead? Can something that is a whole in itself be divided, and can something irrational and infinite like God himself be imagined, even through the mediation of limited human instrumentality?

“After he took the morsel, Satan entered him. So Jesus said to him, ‘What you are going to do, do quickly.’ (John, 13, 27); “And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, ‘Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani?’ which means, ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’”

“Say: ‘O People of the Scripture, do not exceed limits in your religion beyond the truth and do not follow the inclinations of a people who had gone astray

before and misled many and have strayed from the soundness of the way”.
(Qur’an, 5:77)

“O People of the Scripture, do not commit excess in your religion or say about Allah except the truth. The Messiah, Jesus, the son of Mary, was but a messenger of Allah and His word which He directed to Mary and a soul [created at a command] from Him. So believe in Allah and His messengers. And do not say, “Three”; desist – it is better for you. Indeed, Allah is but one God. Exalted is He above having a son. To Him belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth. And sufficient is Allah as Disposer of affairs.” (Qur’an, 4:171)

What is characteristic of all philosophies, sciences, arts and all other knowledge of the world is that they always begin with the affirmative thesis and relay on positive knowledge. In the face of all this, surprisingly, stands Islam as that middle path, (Qur’an, 2: 143).the path of life or the highest level that has made the synthesis between the contradictions in the world and has conceived them, it is founded on the truth, which begins with denial. In denial lies the deepest and highest knowledge of God as the all-encompassing One who stands in front of the entire visible and invisible world, and since the knowledge of Allah Almighty is not based on any positive experience, the conclusion necessarily follows that God can never be imagined, only the idea of Him can exist, as the Qur’an also instructs.

He can only be experienced individually. Only in religion the individual can reach the farthest and attain the highest value (Qur’an, 2: 255).

Therefore, only in religion does truth exist, and the movement towards religion must necessarily be occupied with truth, while in philosophy only assumption remains, which in its ultimate meaning can never be translated into truth. Hence in philosophy there is never truth, and everyone in the realm of philosophy can have their say and be right. Philosophy has not even limited itself absolutely (Brajčić, 1988, pp. 69-75).

In religion, the truth about the Absolute remains and is always established as an inconceivable and indivisible whole, while in philosophy, only the notion or some perceptions of it remain. Though Hegel, as the highest philosophical spirit born among European philosophers, tried to encompass all of human history with his thought and extend his thought to all levels of human thought and knowledge, he nonetheless accepted the wisdom that prevails in the world (What is real is wise, what is wise is real) and the universal or absolute spirit, which he tried to perceive and touch through paths that lead

nowhere. His religion was the religion of philosophers, which would rather think and conceive everything with reason, while his love is a love of deep thought, which permeates all spheres of the soul, but never reaches the highest, because between it and thought lies the insurmountable sphere of silence, which only religion understands, while other sciences before it are silent in the innocent wonder that stands before that paradox as a permanent goal and ardent desire, which wants to detach itself from itself and lose itself in that for which it has only the truth, but which it has not benefited from in its spiritual determination attached to human naturalness (Hegel, 1995, pp. 13-21).

“The only thought that philosophy brings with it is the simple thought of the mind, that the mind rules the world, or rather that even in world history the happening has been mental.

... So, from the very exploring of the world history it will follow that the happening in it has been mental, that it has been a mental, obligatory flow of that soul, of the soul whose nature is always one, but which in the world’s being explains it in its nature.

... In nothing that is to be scientific the mind dares not sleep, so it must use thinking. Whoever sees the world from the mental aspect, he also sees it mentally, the two being in mutual determination.” (Hegel, 1951, pp. 27-29).

In his detailed discussions on the Absolute, Hegel established three relations to it or three paths by which one reaches unto Him, the Absolute. These three paths or possibilities are at the same time the three highest manifestations of the spirit. Philosophy is the highest manifestation of the spirit, where the Absolute is reduced to a pure notion, then religion, which brings the prefiguration of that Absolute and finally art, as a high manifestation of the spirit of the third degree, where the problem of the Absolute is reduced to intuition.

However, in religion there could be an imagining of God if we speak exclusively of the Christian religion or of any other religion where God is presented in the world in some visible form, which is one hundred percent subject to the laws of the circle and the categories of space and time. However, when it comes to Islam, then we would not be able to agree with Hegel, because in Islam there is only the truth about God, what God is, but not the image that would reduce God to simple concretization and construction, from which the conclusion necessarily follows that the impossibility of seeing God through the limited apparatus of the eye turns any representation of Him into absurdity (Hafizović, 1996, pp. 29-44; al-Ashari, 2000, pp. 32-37 Brajičić, 1988, pp. 69-75).

In Hegel's philosophy, the Absolute was and remains only a notion about the essence of which nothing has been said. In fact, he established what the Revelation had established much earlier: that the Absolute exists. Simply, in his philosophy there is only the notion of the Absolute, which neither shows nor offers anything more, because from the notion, from the abstract, no existence arises or flows, as Kant said, which was strongly supported by Kierkegaard, who called this the only honest opinion about the existing.

What is important to mention here is that Hegel placed the Absolute in history and claimed that that absolute spirit is realized on three different planes, or three different categories, but at the same time the highest of the spirit: philosophy, religion and art. These are only three planes on which the absolute spirit is realized whether in type, intuition, prefiguration or pure notion as the highest abstract thought, which has almost no connection with reality or existence, as Kierkegaard says this in rebelling against Hegel's philosophy, that any existence that could be derived from that abstract thought would be only a partial representation of a general wisdom that rules the world, as Hegel states, while the individual himself in history is a prey to that wisdom, which is quite cunning, as well as a daily loser in it, who consciously or unconsciously enters and submits to the laws of that wisdom. Individual existence is impossible according to Hegel, or at least it does not represent a reality for itself, and any individual who closes himself within the circle of his own consciousness and assumes his own subjective values as general historical values, which that wisdom has created in the world, in history, is a state of the "beautiful soul", which deceives itself with subjective illusions and necessarily dissipates and disappears like smoke in the air. [For more, see: Brajičić, pp. 93-95].

This kind of thought caused reactions among existentialist philosophers, especially Kierkegaard, who speaks of the failure of that highly abstract thought that loses all connection with reality and any existence, and especially the theory of wisdom, which does not at all correspond to the existing order of things in nature. He rises against all those abstract generalities in which any subjective existence is lost, and even rebels against the institutional church, which assumes that generality, considering that God must be removed from the altar and placed in human hearts, to become the subjective God of all.

In his philosophizing, Hegel usurped the entire human history from certain peoples and did not allow them to participate in it, treating them only as fuel, which serves that history or that great historical machine that must

always plunder other peoples who have that history, such as: the Chinese, the ancient Egyptians, the Persians, the Indians and of course the Europeans. However, he certainly forgot the fact that history began with the first couple on Earth, when the gender was determined, only according to which history is possible. Humanity inherited from that couple everything that the first man had, while it was complete and in its very beginning represented both the individual and the entire human race.

“...The Easterners do not yet know that the soul or man as such is free in itself. Since they do not know this, they are not free. They know that only one is free, but precisely for that reason such freedom is a sinacote, savagery, the darkness of lust, or perhaps even its softness, which itself is only a natural case or sinacote. – Therefore that one is only a tyrant and not a free man. The Greeks were the first in whom the consciousness of freedom was awakened, and therefore they were free; but they, like the Romans, knew that only some are free, not man as such. Neither Plato nor Aristotle knew this. Therefore the Greeks had not only slaves, to whom the life and essence of their beautiful freedom was tied, but their freedom itself was partly only accidental, a transient and limited world, and partly at the same time also the harsh slavery of that human, humane one. – The Germanic nations were those which in Christianity reached the awareness that man as man is free, that the freedom of the soul constitutes his special nature.” (Hegel, 1951, p. 35).

In Christianity, man is not completely free, in fact he does not possess freedom for himself, especially when it comes to the Absolute. God is the highest freedom in religion, which is also claimed in philosophy, and since man contains in himself that pronounced divine element, he should necessarily turn directly to God and himself on the basis of his relative freedom given by God to benefit from divine love and pleasure. Man and God are in a direct relationship and there are no obstacles between them when it comes to turning to God and turning from Him. The very institution of the clergy in Christianity eliminated that possibility and deprived the broad masses of freedom in that area.

Today's Western man is confronted every day with the machine that not only limited his freedom, but also eliminated and cast him out as God's slave. On the other hand, the Eastern man at every step encounters only God, who is mentioned every day as the highest value, as the highest freedom according to which not only the Eastern man, but also the believer (*mu'min*) in general

is free and gains his freedom every day. The Western man reduces everything to *ratio* and is daily limited and hindered by the rigid geometry and relative human norms, which are established by European morality, while the Eastern man freely extends his thought into the boundless spaces of God's order, experiencing them deeply.

In Islam, man has been free since genesis and in his freedom he has created his own history, both that which is ranked in the plane of world history and that most true history, which does not go further than the space of spiritual being (Hafizović, 1996, 14-16; Neville (ed.), 2001, p. 140).

Islam truthfully presents the Absolute as the only and most prominent reality that stands before this world, and at the same time it permeates and emphasizes it with its omnipotence, but it never places it in the process of the happening nor refracts it through its own personal prisms of the soul, as happens in philosophy, to some extent in art and in Christianity.

The essence of the soul is freedom, which Hegel himself acknowledged. However, the soul is not and should not necessarily be free just because it has to move towards itself in order to reach its state of consciousness. If the soul had come into being with freedom itself before it had gained its consciousness, then it would have necessarily come into being through that movement of its own and would have necessarily lost its freedom. For everything that moves by coming into being does not have full awareness of itself nor does it have full freedom, because it is set in motion and process, and in that process different possibilities are formed. And everything that forms a possibility of any kind necessarily carries within itself the anxiety of the possibility of the appearance of two different states in which it can find itself. On the other hand, anxiety is a sign of the possibility of the loss of freedom. The Absolute can neither resemble nor have anxiety, because it has complete self-awareness, it is always in itself and in itself it is eternal and transcends every reality, which it penetrates with its knowledge to the point where the atom emerges (springs) from the formula of life [For more, see: Hafizović, 1996].

We mentioned already that in religion the soul that man carries within himself is a divine element by which man is free. In fact, through it man reaches freedom, while that soul itself promotes the realization of the purpose of man's extension in this world, where it necessarily flows. In religion man is free and by God and only by Him he reflects all the signs of the universal character, which then in themselves testify to the Absolute, which in itself is the

source of the entire universe. Hence, that which is free in itself, by itself and for itself, which has its own reason for existence in itself or which is reason in itself, is necessarily as such only One and Absolute, whether this is a pure notion in philosophy, an intuition in art or an vision of its kind in religion. This can only be God, by whom all possible states of freedom in every individual resemble and by whom all human history resembles the entire universe extended between the categories of space and time.

Through the very freedom of the soul which he tried to examine in the realm of philosophy, Hegel only to some extent reached the *n o t i o n* of the Absolute, although he did not express this concretely or formulated it clearly. This can be seen from the context in his *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, when he speaks of the soul, the essence or being of which is freedom. He does not seek any opposition outside itself in order to prove its freedom and consciousness, although opposition can and does exist outside it in the visible [For more, see: Hegel, 1962, p. 32].

“The nature of the soul can be known by its opposition. Just as weight is the substance of matter, so we must say that the substance, the essence of the soul, is freedom. It is believable to everyone that the soul, among other virtues, has freedom too; but philosophy teaches us that all the virtues of the soul exist only with freedom, that all virtues are only means to freedom, that all virtues only seek and produce freedom; this is the knowledge of speculative philosophy, that freedom is the only truth of the soul. Matter is heavy insofar as it aims towards a center: it is essentially composed, exists extended, it seeks its unity and aims to interrupt itself, it seeks its opposition. If it had reached this, then it would no longer be matter, but would be destroyed; it aims towards ideality, because in unity it is ideal. The soul, on the contrary, is that which must have the center in itself, it has no unity outside itself, but it has found it; it is in itself and at itself. Matter has its substance outside itself; the soul is that which is itself in itself. This is freedom, because if I am dependent, then I am in relation to something else, which I am not; I cannot be without the outside; I am free if I am in myself. This “being in itself” of the soul is self-consciousness.” (Hegel, 1962, p. 34).

Considering that we have not yet exhausted this issue to the end, nor do we intend to exhaust it, because this is ultimately impossible when talking about something that according to the Qur’an is designated as *gayb*. However, for

the human thought, although futile according to some, it is not a sin if a person ponders and thinks about this issue (Hafizović, 1996, p. 215).

Here lies precisely that very emphasized paradox, which stood in the face of all possible sciences, philosophies and arts, the paradox that only that Absolute, which is turned towards the whole world of the visible and the invisible as its source, which does not accept the logic of this world to which reason is accustomed, transcends the categories of space and time. This is what only religion understands as infinite possibility, which necessarily shapes by the infinite, because its source is in Revelation.

This is what is always and forever, the totality that does not tolerate any fragmentation and does not allow itself to be imagined by all the possible finitenesses of this world through different paths, which would open up the extraordinary possibility of pantheism and the undoubted warning of destruction, when everything would necessarily end in Nothingness. This is what is placed with its essence in front of this world and the entire realized positive experience of humanity, at the basis of which is the assumption of the affirmative nature, while the essence, meaning, affirmation and truth of which is best expressed in the negative acceptance of the undoubted truth established by Revelation.

The goal of this reflection was not to offer any profound thought, which in itself would contribute something new to the space of human knowledge, nor was it the intention to degrade anyone's thought or authority (especially Hegel's), or to present the entire misery, or even the splendor and breadth of any erudite wealth, but it was simply just a personal and verbal reflection, not out of the desire to retire from this harsh reality, but to enter it as deeply as possible and to know it intimately, out of the desire and true need to follow the Qur'anic imperatives on this issue and out of the need to find some solutions for oneself, in order to achieve personal ataraxy.

Here I tried only to initiate certain thoughts, to develop interest in others, and this again not from the desire to plunge into the very deep and secret depths of thought, but from the interest in the truth in front which man stops, or from the fear of it, because of our ignorance or immaturity to attain it. This was only an attempt to search for the truth or find the truth for those who drown in a way invisible to the human eye. It is the search for the truth for those who I consider to be mine enough, so I could communicate it to them.

References

- [1]. al-Ashari, H. *Bit polemike sa otpadnicima i inovatorima*, translated into Bosnian by Adnan Silajdžić, el-Kalem, Sarajevo, 2000.
- [2]. an-Nasafi, *Tabsiratu'l Adille fi Usuli-d-Din*, prepared in Turkish by Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Atay, DIBY, Ankara, 1993.
- [3]. Bardhi, I. "Islamskiot humanizam – osnova za medjureligiski dijalog", in *Filozofija*, vol. 1, no. 2, Skopje, 2002.
- [4]. Brajičić, R. *Opravdanje čistoga uma*, Zagreb, 1988.
- [5]. Brajičić, R. *Filozofski eksperimenti*, Zagreb, 1996.
- [6]. Frashëri, N. *Lulet e Verësë*, Vepra 1, Prishtina, 1986.
- [7]. Hafizović, R. *O načelima islamske vjere*, Zenica, 1996.
- [8]. Hegel, G. F. *Filozofija povijesti*, Zagreb, 1951.
- [9]. Hegel, G. F. *Fenomenologija duha*, "Kultura", Zagreb, 1955.
- [10]. Hegel, G. F. *Istorija Filozofije*, III, Beograd, 1962.
- [11]. Hegel, G. F. *Filozofija religije*, Vrnjacka Banja, 1995.
- [12]. Ibn Tufejl, *Živi sin budnoga*, Logos, Sarajevo, 1985.
- [13]. Izetbegović, A. *Islami mes Lindjes e Perëndimit*, Logos-A, Skopje, 1993.
- [14]. Jaspers, K. *Filozofija egzistencije*, Beograd 1973.
- [15]. Jelkić, V. *Nietzsche: povratak vlastitosti*, Zagreb, 2001.
- [16]. Kahteran, N. *Perenijalna filozofija (Sophia Perennis)*, el-Kalem, Sarajevo, 2002.
- [17]. Karahasan, D. *O jeziku i strahu*, Izdanja Antibarbarus, Zagreb 2002.
- [18]. Kusić, A. *Filozofski pristupi Bogu*, Split, 1980.
- [19]. Sharif, M. M. "Filozofska učenja Kur'ana", in "Takvim", Sarajevë, 1979.
- [20]. Motahhari, M. *O jedinstvi Božijoj*, Ibn Sina, Sarajevë, 2003.
- [21]. Neville, R. (ed.), *Religious Truth*, New York, 2001.
- [22]. Niče, F. *Tako je govorio Zaratustra*, Zagreb, 1962.
- [23]. Panenberg, V. *Teologija i filozofija*, Beograd, 2003.
- [24]. Spengler, O. *Čovjek i tehnika*, LAUS, Split, 1991.
- [25]. Šušnjić, D. *Metodologija*, Beograd, 1999.
- [26]. Werner, M.H. "Rizik i racionalnost", in *Filozofska istraživanja*, vol. 23, fasc. 3, Zagreb, 2003.