A CRITIQUE OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PHILOSOPHICAL HERMENEUTICS IN CREATING RELIGIOUS SOLIDARITY BY A HERMENEUTICAL APPROACH TO THE TRANSCENDENTAL UNITY OF RELIGIONS

Javad Raghavi

Al-Mustafa International University, Mashhad, Iran
E-mail: jraghavi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Philosophical hermeneutics disregards the meaning of the text and the author's thesis and emphasizes the ontology of the process of understanding, and believes that this is the relationship of human with objects that creates the meaning. One of the results of the philosophical hermeneutics is denying the fixed interpretation of religious texts and dogmatic understanding of religions. Therefore, the denial of exclusivism and the confirmation of religious pluralism as a way of unification the followers of religions are known as a reflection of the philosophical hermeneutic successes. But the question is how much philosophic hermeneutics has succeeded in creating empathy among adherents of religions? Although religious pluralism is one of the outcomes of philosophical hermeneutic, but it seems that this attitude can by no means be a realistic way for developing sympathy between the followers of different religions. Because, according to the common sense of the believers, the religious texts show objective and historical truths that have been issued from a wise and conscious authority by the purpose of giving knowledge to the seekers of salvation While, philosophical hermeneutics, by ignoring these beliefs and defying these expectations, are trying to bring them closer together and this is not something that would satisfy the faithful and followers of the religions. This research, by criticizing the effectiveness of the philosophical hermeneutics in creating sympathy and bringing unity between believers, wants to defend the hermeneutics of religious as a way of understanding the transcendental unity of religions and believes that this approach implies religious pluralism appropriate to these multiculturalist societies today. The author believes that the attention to the transcendental unity of religions and the interior spirituality of the religious propositions is a suitable way to an empirical religious solidarity and, at the same time, provides a reasonable and wise evaluation along with the tolerance of the validity of religious doctrines.

INTRODUCTION

Philosophical hermeneutics abandoned common methods of interpreting and understanding a text and intended to interpret the existence and the process of human understanding instead of interpreting the text. It says that human understanding is fully influenced by its relationship with other things, so human understanding varies from one individual to the next, depending on their relationship with external realities. Therefore, looking for an agreed understanding and fixed interpretation for a religious text is meaningless. This methodology resulted in important consequence which inadvertently influenced other field.

According to philosophical hermeneutics, a text has no one absolute meaning, but basically hoping that a text has a single meaning is pointless. One of the results of this methodology is the absurdity of theological arguments regarding rightfulness of a specific religion. Although philosophical hermeneutics was not to create empathy among the adherents of religions, it aroused the considerable interest of those who were concerned for religious solidarity. One of those people is John Hick whom, the debates over understanding the rightfulness of all religions led to find a way for the proximity of religions and put an end to extensive philosophical and theological warfare on the truthfulness of religions.

He proposed the theory of religious pluralism according to which all religions hold the equal share of truth. Hick's theory of religious pluralism stands in contrast to the popular theories of exclusivism and inclusivism. Religious pluralism was applied by many scholars as an accepted way to resolve religious long-standing conflicts. This approach totally ignores truthfulness and falsity of religious propositions, and instead, emphasis on the essence of religions, that is the redemptive transition. Hick's arguments are obviously grounded on Kantian and new Kantian epistemological basis, which discredit epistemological value of religious propositions. Revelation and revealed propositions are regarded mere spiritual experiences in this view that anybody can experience in their personal trance or at a spiritual ceremony.

In fact, it is the tendency to discrediting theoretical debates and metaphysics, and considering traditional method of interpreting the text and hermeneutic as a defective way to understand Humanities; which finally lead to a kind of religious pluralism. But the question is that how much the plurality resulted from philosophical hermeneutics has succeeded in creating empathy among the adherents of religions? The paper is to show the deficiency of this approach to develop due sympathy between the followers of different religions and offers an alternative way that I call justifiability of belief in religious traditions. This attitude

could be clarified by the metaphor of "language-games" and the term "form of life" presented by Wittgenstein in his later period. The final part of the paper explores that how the followers of religious traditions' adherence to their religions could be justified in a sense that paves the way for peaceful dialogue to know each other and brings solidarity.

PASSING FROM TRADITIONAL HERMENEUTICS

Before the advent of philosophical hermeneutics among Christian theologians, the Holy Scripture used to be interpreted through a type of normative hermeneutics based upon some literal methods and principles of interpreting texts. Early in the 19th century, a Protestant Christian theologian, Schleiermacher, attempted to find a philosophical answer through hermeneutics for the fundamental philosophical question: what is the meaning of understanding? He was to find out that how the non-experimental premises of understanding texts could be obtained. Thus Schleiermacher's method to reach philosophical Enlightenments in the field of interpreting texts became famous as "philosophical hermeneutics".

Martin Heidegger Shifted the subject of hermeneutics from textual interpretation toward ontology by focusing on the existence of human being. He regarded previous philosopher's concerns as a distortion in philosophy. In the preface of his magnum opus Being and Time, he asserts that existential analysis of human existence (Dasein) is the way to reach the meaning of Being. Through the analyzing process of existential structure (Dasein), we can find the way to understand the meaning of Being. He calls that existential analysis the true philosophy, as well as phenomenology and hermeneutic. So from Heidegger's point of view, true philosophy, phenomenology, and hermeneutics are the same thing, which is performing existential analysis about (Dasein) to understand the meaning of being. (واعظی، 1379: 24)
Philosophical hermeneutics brings discredit on theological arguments regarding the rightfulness of religions. When Being interpretation takes the place of text interpretation, and the interior meaning of the text and the author's intended meaning is fully depended upon the Dasein's relationship with the immediate world in which one lives; then naturally trying to understand religious texts would be pointless.

Many new theories about language and meaning stemmed from philosophical hermeneutics. In this sense, "meaning" is not an external object or a mental form that is extracted from an external object, but it is a mean for talking about an external reality or the intended historical event. "Meaning", in both senses is a function of a certain language, and is depended on the vastness and historical dynamism of language.

Heidegger is criticized by his disciples on the grounds that his ideas are worthless. The word is that Heidegger never came back to his starting point from his philosophical inquiries and contemplative reflections, and never answered his primary questions. Heidegger, as Ricoeur says, went to ontology but could not come back to Humanities and interpret those epistemological concepts in the light of ontological concepts; and the philosophy that could not turn back to knowledge and be interpreted by knowledge and cognition, will lose its connection to sciences, will stay restricted to itself, and will not influence sciences.

Gadamer played a great role to develop hermeneutics in the way that resulted in religious pluralism. From Gadamer's point of view, every person is born in a cultural stream called "tradition", which forms his thoughts and understanding through the medium of language. The shaped understanding is in a constant interaction with this tradition, and "his tradition" becomes stable through this constant change. Gadamer views understanding as always linguistically mediated. Since both conversation and understanding involve coming to an agreement, so Gadamer argues that all understanding involves something like a common language, albeit a common language that is itself formed in the process of understanding itself. In this sense, all understanding is, according to Gadamer, interpretative, and, insofar as all interpretation involves the exchange between the familiar and the alien, so all interpretation is also translative. (Hans Georg Gadamer,2014:271)

PHILOSOPHICAL HERMENEUTICS AND RELIGIOUS PLURALISM

One of the logical results of philosophical hermeneutic is polysemy of texts and religion's potential for multiple understanding. Actually, religious texts' potential for multiple understanding is the result of their potential for multiple interpretations. In the traditional approach to texts, religious texts have specific meanings that are intended by the author and are achievable through understanding religious propositions. While in philosophical hermeneutics, abandoning the author's aim and intention opens the way for religious pluralism, and various understandings of religious texts make it possible to have the multiple understanding of a text that none of them is preferred to another, but all hold the same share of truth. As this multiplicity of understanding is not exclusive to a specific text, rather it is applied to all religions and religious texts, as well as religious customs and traditions; so it could be concluded that every religious tradition, in fact, is a general reading and understanding of religion that is in the same level of authenticity as other understanding.

John Hick is one of those who got the most out of philosophical hermeneutics' statements to resolve interreligious conflicts. He dismisses both approaches of exclusivism and inclusivism as the sufficient ways to confront with the diversity of religions and proposes religious pluralism as the third way. Exclusivism confines the truth and salvation to a specific religion and asserts that only followers of a particular religion enjoy the salvation and perfection, and all other religious forms are wrong and deceptive which never lead to the liberation and salvation. According to inclusivism, however, the complete truth is contained only in one religion, but the liberation and salvation is not exclusive to that absolutely true religion, and the followers of other religions can receive God's general guidance provided that they accept the rules presented by that true religion even if they be uninformed of that religion. Hick's approach of religious pluralism stands in contrast to exclusivism and inclusivism and is regarded as a way out from the negative results of these two approaches in the present plural world.

John Hick defines religious pluralism as accepting that humans' transition from self- centeredness to God-centeredness is applied to all the main religious traditions in different ways. In other words, there is no only one way, but a diversity of ways to reach salvation. (*هیک، 1386: ص 17*) John Hick provides a philosophical base for religious pluralism that in short is as follows: most religions assume that the Ultimate Reality is infinite and beyond human perception, thought, and language, but the describable and experience able objects of worship are not Absolute and Ultimate in their essence, rather are Absolute and Ultimate in relationship to finite perceivers. This distinction is articulated in different forms that, in fact, indicate the distinction between Absolute Reality as it is and Absolute Reality as is perceived by a human.

Thus the presumption is that the Absolute Reality is one, but human understanding and perception of this Reality are diverse and plural, and different streams of religious experience represent the limited and varied consciousness of that one Absolute Reality, which is apprehended quite differently by human minds forming and formed by different cultural histories. This interpretation is in perfect accordance with the distinction that Immanuel Kant drew between the phenomena (the world as humanly experienced) and the noumenon (the world an sich, as it is in itself).

According to Kant's distinction, phenomenal world is the joint product of the world itself and the selecting, interpreting, and unifying activity of the perceiver. Hick confirms this distinction by mentioning that only some parts of the surrounding world are perceivable by our sensory equipment. Only some sounds and electromagnetic waves surrounding us are noticeable for us without special devices, and most of them remain unnoticed. Consequently, just as we perceive the world in a way that it appears to us, the same is true for religion. Humans experience the religious reality an sich (as it is in itself) and intelligible essence of one divine in different forms.

Different images of God are stemmed from different religious traditions. Even apparently direct and unmediated awareness of Absolute Reality is still the conscious experience of a human subject and as such is influenced by interpretative set of the cognizing mind. Therefore, the adherents of different religions and religious traditions are enjoying the same experience expressing in different languages; in addition, its outer aspect is influenced by the differences stemmed from the conceptual frameworks and meditational disciplines supplied by different religious traditions. John Hick, finally, considers it a possible attractive hypothesis and an alternative to total skepticism according which the great religious traditions of the world represent different human perceptions of and response to the same infinite divine Reality.(*هیک، 1381: صص 284 – 290*)

HICK'S RELIGIOUS PLURALISM AND THE ONE ESSENCE OF RELIGIONS

John Hick in his plural outlook insists on the unique essence of religions and the mythological type of religious language for transferring this concept to human minds, and says:

Properly understanding that religious language is representing our perception of Divine through mythical analogies, and that these analogies have human dimensions which are related to our cultural conditions; prepared the ground for the theory that various myths from great religious traditions of the world could be alternative and varied, even supplementing, ways to present divine Reality, not necessarily contradictory methods that oppose each other.(*هیک، 1386: ص38*)

Hick, by regarding the doctrines like incarnation as mythical, casts the transition from self-centeredness to God-centeredness as the essence of religion which is common to all religions. From his point of view, this salvational transition happens equally in all human religious traditions through a spiritual stream and morality. Salvation, in Judaism is conceptualized and experienced through pleasure and taking life responsibility in conformity with Pentateuch orders; in Islam, it is conceptualized and experienced through abandoning personal will to God's will and living in accordance with Divine revealed texts; in Hinduism, it is conceptualized and experienced through non-personal entity and discovering unity with the eternal reality of Brahman. (Hick,1981: 164)

Therefore, different, and perhaps apparently contradictory, religious teachings are like the surface of religion that is proposed in symbolic and mythological language, and should not be regarded as true or false propositions, like scientific propositions, and the token of confliction between religions. Hick, insisting on the essence and main aim of religion, disapproves of any religious ranking. Form Hick's view, the religious experiences, that lay the base for religions, have no logical framework to evaluate and rank them, like scientific propositions, from the cognitional aspect. (*هیک، 1386، ص 142 – 146*)

FAILURE OF PHILOSOPHICAL HERMENEUTICS IN CREATING UNITY AND CONVERGENCE BETWEEN THE FOLLOWERS OF RELIGIONS

We can see the result of philosophical hermeneutic in solving the contact between followers of religions in the theory of pluralism of Hick. In spite of the fact that Hick was so sincere to provide a solution for creating unity and convergence between the followers of religions, his pluralistic view was not practical and effective. In the following some of the factors for this failure will be mentioned.

Firstly, the theoretical basis if this thesis is not acceptable. Philosophical hermeneutic and pluralistic view of Hick is based on Immanuel Kant epistemology which doubts in the Judgments of pure Reason and consequently considers religious propositions nonsense. Hick believed that religious traditions is reflecting the variety of human beings and their nature which is manifested in different aspects such as wisdom, language, society and so on (Hick, 1381, 274).

In this view, there is some kind of reduction about the value of religious propositions which makes them non-epistemic. As a result, the religious propositions will be merely some kind of spiritual experiences for the believers, in this view; these propositions are emotional and non-epistemic. We do not need to evaluate them and their values are the same and just the context is different. In other words,

the philosophical hermeneutic which is the basis of Hick's pluralistic views bases his epistemology on doubt. While when we consider our daily experiences and presumptions, we will find that the default is that they have epistemological value. As William Alston believes that when all of the wise people in their daily lives confide on their presumptions and their feelings, there is no reason for us to prefer doubts over epistemology and the experience, both sensational and spiritual, are valid unless it is disproved by later evidences, otherwise we will fall into a kind of skepticism. Every epistemic action which is supported by the society must be accepted as a true justified belief unless there was enough evidence for disproving it (Alston 1383, 147). The first understanding of believes from religious propositions and considering them epistemic and their confidence in spiritual experiences is rational unless we have some strong evidences for disproving.

The next problem in Hick's theory is that it is not compatible with the mentality of the believers of religions. Religious pluralism will be as a factor in convergence between religions if it is coordinate with the facts of the ground. Having such a pluralistic view, may be digestible by some philosophers of religion and help them to get rid of some theological dilemmas or disproving some theological exclusivism but by no means is compatible by the believers' consumptions. In other words, the majority of the believers maintain that their religious propositions are descended by the God for their guidance and think that their religion is superior to other religions. Believers in every religion usually have gathered enough evidence to convince themselves that their religion is the real one (Although these evidences have no logical or philosophical value), otherwise there will be no motivation for sticking to religious customs. Just only, a few would buy the religious chores just for enjoying from those religious traditions. So, almost all believes think that their religion is the best and others are false, hence the Hick pluralistic views is not compatible with what believers maintain on the street.

John Hick knows himself that his view is not compatible with the Abrahamic religions such as Islam. He says:" in Islam, there is this strong belief that the Muhammad (pbh) is the last prophet and the God has sent the last religion by the Quran to them and this religion is the last and the best religion. So, A Muslim feels affinity with the Abrahamic religions and according to some interpretations he can extend the concept of Islam to include all God believers such as Hindus, Buddhism, Confucius, Taoism, Judaism and Christianity. But a Muslim always has this feeling that qur'anic revelation is much better than others and the Quran is the last words of God and all of the people must obey it, and such a belief is not acceptable by a pluralistic viewpoint." (Hick, 1985: 48-49). definitely, having such a view about is not limited to the Islam and Muslims, every devoted religious believer has such a view about his favorite religion. Every devoted believer is worshipping a particular religion since he knows that his religion is superior to the others. So, he believes that other religions are wrong and if they have the appropriate chance, they will choose his religion. So, we think that this kind of incompatibility between the believers and pluralistic ideology is enough to prove that this view is not a suitable solution for convergence between the religions.

This kind of solution is defending from the believers against their will.

TOWARD FINDING A SOLUTION FOR CONVERGENCE BETWEEN BELIEVERS

Criticism on philosophical hermeneutics and John hick's religious pluralism does not mean that we ignore the value of Hick's dream about finding a solution for convergence between the believers. Certainly, Hick's effort is so valuable especially in a world that religious differences have become a pretext for creating animosity. So, we will try to follow this dream from another path.

In this part of the essay, it is tried to show that, although a particular religion can be true, the salvation and justifiability is not limited to a particular religion. The majority of the religious followers, obeying a particular religious tradition, are justified and we shouldn't undermine this obeying.

In our view, three facts in parallel with each other can create a kind of convergence between the believers. These three facts are the following: considering the transcendental unity of religions, considering the justifiability of religious beliefs in their local religious traditions and the last but not the least respecting other religions in their social and cultural context. Regarding these facts will cause peaceful coexistence between believers from different traditions and on the other hand will prepare a suitable condition for dialogue between religious scholars.

1. Transcendental unity of religions and justifiability of religious beliefs

John Hick has talked about the unified essence of religions and that is one's evolution from "arrogance" to "considering the God". So the essence of all religions is that human in this process will change from self-centric to God-centric. We must pay attention to another aspect of unity between the religions and that is the transcendental unity between the religions. This means that all Divinely religions have a common root, the God's will for guidance of people and for doing so He has sent so many prophets with miracles. This fact is depicted in the word of Imam Ali, the first successor of holy prophet Muhammad in Shia tradition of Islam:

"Then, He sent the prophets among the people. The prophets came after another and asked people to fulfill the convention that they made in the first day and remember His blessings, the prophets wanted to arouse the reason and wisdom of people, and they came to show to people the signs of His power (Nahjal al-Balaghe/ speech 1). Transcendental unity of religions can converge the religious traditions. According to this view, all Divinely religions have the same root and carry the same message that depending on the time and the place different religions are descended into earth. Also, the goal of all religions is not but to release the suffrage of humans and lead them to eternal salvation. So religions in the starting point are the same and this diversity is as a result of being descend in different traditions. There are different interpretations about transcendental unity of religions. Some believe that it means all of the present religions and traditions are true and that they have equal value, but some maintain that it does not mean they are the same and in order to

understand the reality of religions, we must consider some factors such as trustworthy of propositions, its authenticity, and its expiration. We must know that the trustworthiness is different from salvation and they may have different elements.

By Divinely religions we men that there must be some signs that show that these religions are descended from the Heavens. In Islam there is a mainstream belief maintain that there are many prophets that help us with the idea of diversity in religions. According to some Islamic quotations, God has sent 124000 prophets for guidance of human beings. So, if God has sent so many prophets, there will be this possibility that present religions are originated from their instructions.

There have been two different paradigms among the Muslims about transcendental unity of religions. The first one belongs to Gnostics (theosophist) which emphasize on the inner aspect of the religion and do not pay much attention to the form of the religion. From the perspective of the most Gnostics, the differences between the religions are in the form and the essence is the same. Care must be taken that when the Gnostics put emphasis on the inner aspect or what they call "truth", it does not mean that they ignore the form or "rules". The majority of the Muslim Gnostics believe in Islamic rules and their motto is that "there will be no Sufi path (Tarighah) without Sharia ". it means that for reaching to the essence of the religion we must walk through the Sharia, because " the core and the crust are related to each other and they cannot act separately" (۲۵۶ :۱۳۹۶ ،هیک). Furthermore, Muslim Gnostics maintain that although all of the religions originated from the same light and in the Quran the bible and Torah is called light, but we must know that this light is about the original books which were free from any distortion.

The second group is the Muslim philosophers; they look for the truth at monolithic religions, they believe that there is a truth at the heart of all divinely religions which at the course of history according to the different audience and capacity of the people is provided to the people. The foremost Muslim philosopher who believes that all divine religions have one root is Abu Nasr Farabi. He believed that difference in religions is in forms and all of them are the ways toward salvation. However, the Muslim philosophers just like the Muslim gnostics, believe in Sharia and maintain that Islam is the last religion which is free from any distortion. Hence, those believing in transcendental unity of religions although they do not accept the trustworthy of all religions, they deny the fundamental difference. Considering the original unity of heavenly religions and the following points will help us toward an affinity and dialogue between the believers of different kinds of religions.

2. Justifiability of religious beliefs in local religious traditions

There is a distinction between "subject S's being justified in believing that P" and the "activity of justifying". It is possible to differentiate between rationality of a belief and the justifiability of its acceptance. What we are discussing is justifiability of the acceptance of a particular belief and not justifiability and rationality of its propositions. We can explain this concept by some of Wittgenstein's term. In his second period of his life, after he changed his view about

picture theory of language, Wittgenstein maintained that "language is a tool and the concepts are instruments" (Wittgenstein 1380: 569). According to the metaphor of the language games for understanding the meaning of a word we must consider its usage in a language. Just like for understanding the meaning of a chess piece, we must know the rules of the chess game otherwise we will not understand the meaning of the pieces separately. Also according to the Wittgenstein's Forms of life theory, the words and the statements finds their meaning when they are used in human lives. For example, the believer and the atheist have chosen two kinds of life and since their life style is different, their words have their own meaning and without the life style, the words and sentences have no meanings. Critiquing this theory, it is said that Wittgenstein has exaggerated in his theory, the same as his previous theory, because the life style does not determine totally the meaning of the words. However, no doubt that understanding the life style of people and knowing them closely will help us to understand their beliefs properly and helps us to discover why they have chosen a particular belief. When a Muslim from outside of the Christians' life style is thinking about the "Son of God" he will be surprised and will wonder how it is possible to believe in the son of God. But when he acculturated and lived in Christion society, and became familiar with some evidences for this kind of belief in the Christian form of life, he will find that this idea can be justifiable for Christians although still he believes that his religion is the best.

We should pay attention that society and environment are the main factors of choosing a religious tradition among the public: the public, generally, do not follow a religion by reason and ration. Always, at the beginning there is some non-epistemic factors for choosing a religion. It is better that the humans choose their religion by reason but in practice most people choose their religion by their feelings rather than by reason. For reaching to a stage that we choose our religions according to our reason, we need to practice and discipline ourselves. It is normal that at the beginning do not have this characteristic. Now, we are discussing about the mass public, not the philosophers and religious scholars. Normally, it is the environment that determines our religion. For example, if we born in middle east, most probable we will become a Muslim and if in East Asia a Buddhist and if we born in Europe we will be a Christian. Why are the most people in eastern parts of the word Buddhist and western Asia Muslim and Europeans are Christians? Doubtlessly, the surroundings and society has played an important role in choosing their religion. Can we say that these people neglect in choosing their religions? Of course not; since if we were at their shoes, we would do the same.

3. Respecting the understanding of others

Knowledge and morality are the bases of inter religious dialog. It does not mean that we should necessarily abandon the idea of right religion and be a religious pluralist, but it means that we must believe that the others are equal with us in understanding. So, the role of respecting the understanding of others is the base of solidarity with other believers.

There are some religions which are not true but if someone sincerely looked for the truth and the society and

environment have led him to another path, this person will be included in the grace of almighty God and will be saved. Following a valid religion might not be possible for all of the people but if one has looked for the truth and has not achieved it as long as deliberately has not denied the truth will gain salvation. So salvation is not limited just in apparently following the right religion and what is important is trying to find the right and most complete religion and acting according rationality and ethical duty. In the holy Quran it is mentioned that lessening the prophets and following the rationality are the factors of being safe; "They will say, 'Had we listened or exercised our reason we would not have been among inmates of the Blaze."(Quran, 67: 10)

Having such a viewpoint might help us to converge between the followers of different religions and can make the way for mutual understanding and dialogue. We should respect other religions as much as our religions.

There is a point that must be noted, if we use from the capacity of convergence between religions, it might lead us to choosing the true path. If we respect to other religions, we can have this chance to talk about the validity of a particular religion. At the next stage, we can enter the faith and disbelief exam, it means that only after sincere dialogue, the truth will emerge. This does not mean that we fall into the abyss of skepticism and meaningfulness of religious propositions and so on. It is understanding and rational faith that determines whether God exists or not and that which religion is the last most complete prescription for human being. At the end as a Muslim, I would like to mention a tradition from Imam Al Reza, (as) the eight infallible imam of Shia Muslim who says: "The rationality of a Muslim cannot be complete unless when there be ten attributes in him. Goodness is excepted from him, the other are safe from badness of him, considering other's goodness too much and considering his own goodness nothing, does not get tired from been asked to answer the requests, nor is he tired of seeking knowledge in his total fife , poverty in God is more love full for him from richness, humiliation in God is more love full to him than the splendor of his enemy, and being unknown is more pleasant to him than fame, and then said: "the tenth" and the who knows what is "the tenth" someone asked him: What is the tenth? He told: "To consider the others better than himself and whenever he sees a person he says to himself: he is better and more righteous than me.

Any person may be influence by the environment and society in which he is born and grew up and accordingly choses a specific religion that can be called his geographical religion. Justifiability of following such a religion is about its early stages and not practicing a religion during the lifetime. Everybody during his life may have this chance to compare and contrast between his or her religious beliefs with others, knowing the advantages and disadvantages of his favorite religion. The conditions may be different some may have this chance sooner than the others. It is at this stage that we can divide the believers in two categories of deliberate defaulter and undeliberate defaulter. The roots of this kind if categorizing refer to some theological arguments about salvation and some qur'anic verses. When accepting a type of religion and rejecting other religions has some motives just like egotism, fanaticism, bigotry, and blind fully following our ancestors, we will be guilty for choosing this type of

religion. A wise man should pass the stage of geographical religion by performing his epistemological duty toward choosing right religion. But in many cases, choosing a religion is not according to these factors. They just might not be in our situation and if they had our situation, they would choose the same. Nowadays, since there are so many doubts in philosophical schools, we cannot say someone is faulty for choosing his religion unless when he disregards his epistemological duty in his beliefs. We can say someone ignored in choosing the right religion just when he had this chance to compare two or more religions and chose the best but he did not. This case is the real infidelity and this kind of infidelity is blamed severely in the holy Quran, and it says about the Ferro and his followers while they denied the truth deliberately; "They impugned them though they were convinced in their hearts because of their cruelty and their arrogant" (Quran, 27:14).

What happens inside us is real and voluntary and the faith is valuable when it is epistemic. In the holy Quran, there are so many verses that refer that we must not force people in choosing their religion, e.g. in the 2:257 we have: " There shall be no compulsion in [acceptance of] the religion. The right course has become clear from the wrong. So whoever disbelieves in Taghut (Tyranny) and believes in Allah has grasped the most trustworthy handhold with no break in it. And Allah is Hearing and Knowing. ".

The meaning of growth in the above verse is right and the meaning of the sin is interpreted to distortion from the true path. The writer of the Al-Mizan commentary (who is a great interpreter of the holy Quran) maintains that this verse is not informing from a natural reality but it is giving a new order. It means that we shouldn't force someone to accept a certain belief or deprive them if accepting a certain religion. If someone chooses the true path, God will save him and if someone select the wrong path will be misled.

We can conclude that based on this verse and similar verses, atheism is forbidden from ethical point of view only when someone discover the truth but reject it deliberately. In other words, the literal meaning of atheism is to cover and when someone try to cover the truth he is responsible for it. At the opposite, the meaning of the faith is to voluntarily choose a belief system which we understand it clearly. So, if someone during his lifetime did not discover the truth and looked for it but did not achieve it, he is not guilty and had not this chance to be a believer.

CONCLUSION

Philosophical Hermeneutic in its verity is a branch of Hermeneutics that contracts traditional method of interpretation of the texts and resists interpretation in terms of scientific method. It maintains that the text and author is not important but rather emphasis should be on the ontological processes of human understanding. Philosophical hermeneutic express that we must emphasis on the quality of understanding and its process because the meaning will emerge when human and the objects interconnect. Rejecting the traditional methodology of understanding will lead to a kind of chaos in interpreting a text and will lead to religious pluralism and pluralism is considered as a way out for the religious struggles about trustworthiness of religions. But it seems that this methodology will eradicate the foundations of

religious epistemology and by no means can provide a solution for convergence of religions. Because this pluralistic view will undermine the theoretical bases of religions and the believers do not support this kind of solution for convergence between the religions. Generally, the believers maintain that religious their texts are the true one and is descended from the God to lead us toward salvation, while hermeneutic philosophy as religious pluralism undermine these foundations and disappoint the believers, as if the hermeneutic philosophy and pluralism school is going to say that "do not struggle over these religious texts because there is no truth behind it and it is not epistemic ". it is obvious that such a solution cannot bring real convergence between religions but will lead to a kind of divergence from religion and spirituality. In this essay, we conclude that Hermeneutic philosophy cannot create convergence between religions but the writer believes that hermeneutic by considering meaning, text structure and the author is a good tool for transcendental unity of religions. The writer believes that most if the believers in choosing their religion are not totally free and the social environment is an important factor. And as Wittgenstein said the variety of religions and their life style is justifying their religion. In this variety and vastness of religious sects and divisions, only those are guilty in choosing their religion that have rejected the truth after discovering it. Transcendental unity of religions and the spirituality behind the religious propositions can help us to find the truth and respect to other religions. The above mentioned points can lead us to find a solution for mutual understanding between religions and help us to tolerate other religions.

REFERENCES

Persian sources:

مجموعه مترجمان. تهران: هرمس.

تهرانی ،مهدی هادوی ، (1385ش) مبانی کلامی اجتهاد، تهران، خانه خرد

جان هیک، (1381ش) فلسفه دین، ترجمه بهزاد سالکی، تهران، انتشارات بین المللی الهدی، چاپ سوم

جان هیک، (1386ش) مباحث پلورالیسم دینی، ترجمه عبدالرحیم گواهی، تهران، نشر علم، چاپ اول

رقوی، جواد، (1386ش) دیدگاه معرفت شناختی ویتگنشتاین، مجله تخصصی الهیات و حقوق، تابستان، شماره 24

کردستانی، سوران، (1381ش)اسلام از تاویل گرایی تا هرمنوتیک ، سوران کردستانی، دستا نی،
http://www.sorankurdistani.com/hermenotic.html,

مایکل پترسون و دیگران، (1379) عقل و اعتقاد دینی، ترجمه احمد نراقی، ابراهیم سلطانی ، تهران، طرح نو

مجلسی، محمد باقر، (1403ق) بحار الأنوار، بیروت، دار احیاء التراث العربی.

واعظی، احمد ، (1379ش) اقتراح هرمنوتیک، قبسات، پاییز، شماره 17

ویتگنشتاین، لودویک،(1380ش) پژوهشهای فلسفی، ترجمه فریدون فاطمی، تهران، نشر مرکز

یزدانی ، عباس، جهان مهر، مهدی، (1392ش) مقایسه دیدگاه تکثرگرایی دینی هیک با دیدگاه انحصار گرایی پلانتینگا، الهیات تطبیقی، سال چهارم، پاییز و زمستان، شماره دهم

English sources:

Hans Georg Gadamer, (2014) Truth and Method, Translation revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, London.

John Hick and Brian Hebblethwaite. (1981). Christianity and Other Religions.

John Hick, (1980) God Has Many Names, Macmillan, landon.

John Hick, (1985), Problem of Religious Pluralism, New York, St. Martin's Press.

William p. Alston, "Religious Experience" in Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, London & NewYork, Volume 8.