

# HERMENEUTIC DISCOURSE OF DEVINE WORD FROM TRADITIONAL TO CONTEMPORARY

**Metin IZETI**

*Faculty of Arts, University of Tetova  
Corresponding author e-mail: metin.izeti@unite.edu.mk*

---

## Abstract

Re-interpreting of entirety cultural results - from dreams to religion, through art and morality - changes culture by giving it the power of self-reflection. The false meaning of "text of society" is exposed by the overall implementation of the criticism on skepticism. The discussion between self-conscious thinkers, about the social construction of knowledge and the different meanings of its outcome, deals with the questions below: Are we able, in general, to know something and how we can know it, how we are treated as the subject of knowledge and who benefits from it, for which it is claimed, known in the best form. So, the conversation about what the text means and how it decides its meaning is inseparable from what meaning the reader wants the certain text to have. This article tries to polemize the issue of re-interpretation and re-reading of traditional Islamic religious texts in the mirror of contemporary discourse, the way the veil is lifted, and the meaning of the same.

*Keywords:* Re-interpretation, Qur'an, language turn, interpretive fertility.

---

## 1. Introduction

What we - despite the internal variety, even the contradictions - usually call postmodern thinking is based on Kant's assumptions: we cannot know things ourselves, the objects of knowledge in the recognition process adapt our ability to present. Ideas like "God," "freedom," and "truth" have only one regulatory function and cannot be reliable instances among subjects of experience. The extraordinary object-subject relationship, of the Hegelian type, proves them in the process of illusion, while the existential insistence on subjectivity is not enough. Jean-François Lyotard considers the postmodern era to be the era in which all "Excellent Confessions" (grand récits) (Lyotard, 1979, p. 23) or meta-narrative issues have lost the battle in credibility and suggestion, as well as hypotheses, already, are not related to reality, which also does not exist except as our construction, but has strategic value in the context of the appeared questions.

Re-interpreting of entirety cultural results - from dreams to religion, through art and morality - changes culture by giving it the power of self-reflection. The false meaning of "text of society" is exposed by the overall implementation of the criticism on scepticism. The discussion between self-conscious thinkers, about the social construction of knowledge and the different meanings of its outcome, deals with the questions below: Are we able, in general, to know something and how we can know it, how we are treated as the subject of knowledge and who benefits from it, for which it is claimed, known in it's the best form. So, the conversation about what the text means and how it decides its meaning is inseparable from what meaning the reader wants the certain text to have. In the footsteps of Saussure's principles for the arbitrariness of the sign of language and self-reference of the linguistic system- with which the "natural" connection between meaning and reference is interrupted, the protagonists of the "linguistic turn" (RORTY, 1967) claim that the limit of any research and search for truth can be the language or the discourse. Such theories have followed a new ordinance instead of consciousness, we should analyze linguistic communication, whereas instead of

individual subjects we must analyze the structures of intersubjectivity.

The traditional interpretation of texts of revelation and prophetic tradition, from which Muslims extract material for the way of their lives wishing to preserve the hermeneutics of religion, a long period has been limited by the methodology and actions of Muslim scholars. In the 19th and 20th centuries, the key to the search for historical truth, the under heaven of Muslim thought embraced the analytical-referential discourse of illuminism, but wanting to preserve a certain monopoly on the interpretation of divine texts with the ambivalence of human reason was treated in the way that their texts and criticism have often been isolated from context, the values and interests of the reader himself in culture, which opens with an acquaintance of various humanist disciplines, being dealt with such a lecture. They did not allow their critical and theoretical initial point to be discussed by placing the authority's argument on the authority of the argument, while their cultural context separated it from the overall cultural context. Consequently, with such an approach they abandoned the believers in a schizophrenic and naked situation in the middle of the road. So, on the one hand, the authority had collapsed, while on the other hand, the argument did not have the authority to turn into an acting paradigm (Aydin, 2021).

Coming back to the situation in which the "linguistic turn" had still not overtaken the human sciences, at this point is not possible. Nevertheless, this principle should and must be considered as an alternative during the religious discourse. Radical disbelief of meta-narratives should not be understood as a constructive subversion of institutional values, but as a positive driver to consider the heterogeneity and variability of human existence, even as criticism of ideological misuses of meta-narrative. Unfortunately, the "first naivety" of transparency and objectivity towards religious symbolism is lost for the postmodern man a long time ago, but the "second naivety" of faith based on the traces of the holiness in divine revelation is possible. Moreover, the "re-readings" of the revelation text also reveal new layers of totally non-derivable meaning of sacred texts, whether the Qur'an or hadith, and this re-reading, perhaps it is not possible to be accepted as naïve religious, but it is possible to be understood again and re-interpreted (Riceur, 2005, p. 36).

The idea of Islam at this post-critical time is possible with the return to the holy text, first to its symbolic potential, whereas the theological dimension should be comprehended by accepting the hermeneutic turn.

Hermeneutics of concept renewal despite skepticism

The concept of skepticism doubts not only meaning but also the consciousness which produces it. It begins with the suspicion that there is a world that must be believed and from which an invitation should be expected, consequently which can be considered a place of reforming the intent in appearance, reflection, or revelation. With the revelation, in this case, we mean, the final reference of meaning, consequently something to do with the search for understanding and meaning.

The school of skepticism was opened by three thinkers who seemingly opposed each other: Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud. All three have in common the objection of the phenomenology of holiness as well as the methods of demystification. They understand the symbol as a de-simulation of the real, while the sense of guilt, which dominates the unconscious, in the case of the Westerner, they see as the fruit of the repressive action of cultural norms.

Consequently, they deal with devastating criticism to demolish something they call "false consciousness". They oriented the sharp side of their criticism against religion, which they consider be "false consciousness", par excellence. They were skeptical concerning the meaning of religious language, whereas religion was imagined as the coded version of the afterlife. Marx, for example, analyzed religion in the context of his illusory character of the transcendent kingdom which serves as the false comfort of dehumanized people, of young slaves of capital in the period of capital. Nietzsche sees weakness (modesty, silence, prudence) as a particular characteristic of a religion that is considered a moral value, but with it, human beings are reduced to tame creatures, and consequently, this hinders the explosion of the human being's potential. Religion, according to him, relies on the existence of objective truth, but it is illusory. Freud separates the "real" from

the "imagined" and with it exposes religion as a "place" where people seek refuge trying to find retribution for their suppressed instincts. All three authors, each in their way, have explored the ways of overcoming the syndrome of foreignness-dominion-humiliation, whose language in the past - it is fact - has been the language of religion. By articulation of our consciousness in religious languages, we, indeed, as Lewos S. Mudge says, "We have emptied our human substance and moved it to an absolute illusion", consequently to idolatry (MUDGE, 1980, pp. 5).

The new spectrum of commentary, open to radical suspicion, is intertwined with the problem of imagining, which already is no problem of recognizing subjective imagining that has objective validity, as it was with Kant, but is the humiliation of the entire epistemological system regarding the truth and errors of the consciousness matter which comprehends, and which in itself is "false". The three thinkers above based on their suspicion take the cartesian suspicion. However, although Descartes involves scepticism in everything we can think of, he doubts at all the possibility of thought itself, consequently, in the confrontation of meaning and awareness of the meaning. But, starting with Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud we're also doubting the latter. In a way, the alliance between thought and reality has been overthrown. The deciphering of the three demystifications of meaning represents the radical opposition of the phenomenology of sacral and hermeneutics which is condensed as a summary and renewal of meaning, more justly, as "memory for being".

Radical scepticism on the one hand, through the despairing criticism, removes the "mask", while on the other hand, through the creation of a new art of commentary, frees up the space for new. In Descartes, scepticism overpowers the matter through the clarity of consciousness; In Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche scepticism overpowers the awareness with the clarification (exegesis) of meaning. Seeking for the meaning already does not mean immersing consciousness in the direction of meaning but means deciphering expressions. The new link between hidden and visible has already become a fundamental category: if consciousness is not how it appears, then a new link between visible and hidden must be established, in this way an indirect discipline for meaning that cannot be reduced to direct awareness of meaning. All three thinkers of scepticism have tried to identify their "conscious methods of deciphering" with the "unconscious code of ciphering", and they attributed it to the desire for power (Nietzsche), social being (Marx), and unconscious psychism (Freud).

The details of Marxian, Niche, and Freudian thinking, mainly, are revised in the field of economics, anthropology, and psychology, but based on their fundamental convergences they have become an integral part of our culture. Hermeneutics of skepticism - as the possibility of the art of interpretation and not as a simple tool of constructive criticism - in reality, does not discredit religion, but frees the horizon for "authentic concept on the world". In the process of exploiting methods of interpretation for political use, many thinkers in the imagination of resistance were helpless as Heidegger was in the hermeneutics of existential meaning, Foucault in processing the structure of the genealogy of the subject, and Derrda in a radical denial of logocentrism. A further step in criticism is also the approach of the one who interprets with criticism. Bipolar-focused criticism is the "real" criticism in the face of "false" criticism. Just as the hermeneutics of skepticism belongs to the space of doubt, so does the "hermeneutics of the concept renewal" belongs to the space of religion. Not any religion and religious understanding, but only that religion which has crossed the threshold of criticism: "It is this reasonable religion, as it comments and through commentary requires "second naivety (purity)". For that one, phenomenology is a means of hearing, summary, and renewal of meaning (concept). Therefore, to believe to be understood, to understand to believe, consequently this is the "hermeneutic circle" of faith and understanding, and this is the principle of the hermeneutics of the renewal of the concept. Intelligent most critical religion moves from deliberate analyses of religious symbolism - as privileged deep understanding and revelations of aporia reflection that cannot be resolved with simple speculation - and continues in the direction of turning this analysis into a hearing. First, the rich

lecture of symbols that precedes reflection, which educates and feeds it, must be heard, while then, through the clarification of symbols, further comments should be made. So, this system should be followed and by no means the opposite. The initial point of reflection this way must be symbolic thinking. The symbol is a gift of language, a gift that requires thought, while thought precedes the "fullness of the language". The first movement of religion is the belief in the possibility of discovery through words (Quran) (IZETI, 2012, pp. 12).

Within the framework of the analysis for clarification and meaning it would be necessary for the phenomenology of holiness, as phenomenology which deals with the "veracity" of symbols, to understand it as a means of "discovering meanings". The symbol is "expression, for which it can be said that sometimes appears and sometimes hides". But the appearance and concealing of the following do not mean that it always displays and hides what must be said, but sometimes it is concealing for an environment of holiness, and the appears in another time or space environment. The veracity of symbols is the fulfilment of the will for meaning. When I say the truth, I don't mean the absolute meaning of the word or abstract, but the multiple desire for the fullness of meaning, which is often expressed because of linguistic wealth (IZETI, Problem estetike u Islamskoj tradiciji, 2010). This wealth is the nature of the symbol itself, which is very present in the qur'anic lecture, it presents on the one hand the holiness that is bound to the original, literary, emotional meaning, and therefore presents the rigidity of the symbol; On the other hand, it expresses the symbolic significance of the time and space that also rests in the concept of the holiness.

The fact that links meaning to sense link me, too. Consequently, the gravitation of the symbol draws in a second meaning and relates it to that what is said. With this, the symbol contributes to that what is foretold. This can also be called the existentialist connection of our being to the Absolute Being (Vuslat). The symbol sends the invitation because of credibility in the language, as the language is pregnant with symbols and is not only a language-tool that people use for communication but also language that is directed at and speaks to people. Engagement with the fulfilled language - the language that is revealed in the thought movement that addresses me and makes me a guest subject - suspends phenomenological neutrality. Whereas accepting such reflection, at the same time, is also the way of intellectual honesty; of transparency towards the new, the word, and the current thought, acknowledging the power derived from it. The constitution of the renewal hermeneutics of meaning is a re-legitimizing of the process of trust.

## **2. Fertile interpretations**

Are these two hermeneutics, the hermeneutics of skeptics and the hermeneutics of religion, so very different that they both cannot be considered together? And if they can then how? Both are legitimate, each in its field. However, it is not enough that we should only let each one in their way do the work, but they must be articulated with each other so that their complementary functions are observed: on the one hand, the language must be cleansed from unnecessary extensions, from idols and sharpened to its original marrow, while on the other hand, we should deal with the dynamics of the original thought period so that we can re-say it, re-read what was called once, say what is said when meaning is re-presented and when it is complete. The complementary of the two hermeneutics, skepticism, and faith, can be shaped concerning the conscious and the unconscious. Since after Freud no longer we can talk about consciousness as we have spoken before it, a new concept of consciousness must be found and again to address the link between consciousness and manifestations by recalling the sacred. If consciousness is the space in which the two interpretations of the symbol meet, to restore their polarity, there is a need for consciousness to be approached in double mode. The first principle, which enlivens the analytical action of demystifying, is the desire to challenge the priority of consciousness. Because of the primacy of consciousness, as a problem of the "consciousness illusion", we can understand the methodological decision to move from the description of consciousness within the topography of the psychic apparatus, displaced by the appropriation and narcissism of this illusion, as

psychoanalysis does. However, the philosophy is called to renew the problem of the existence of consciousness. Leaving the approach that gives priority to consciousness does not suspend it but renews its meaning in radical ways. The dialect of consciousness and unconscious, progress and remiss, precisely shapes the meaning of consciousness. Consequently, the meaning of consciousness as the modus of existence should be revealed again, which the unconscious considers to be something else and to which it reopens through symbols. To achieve the congregation and conciliation consequences of the symbol we must interrupt the hermeneutic circle of confronted interpretations and reshape it into a tenon. The tenon where the consciousness is connected embraces the fact to be better understood the connection between man and the existence of other beings if the indication of symbolic thought is allowed. The tenon in this case turns into a mission: that way to prove and defend himself with meaning. As a counter value, the mission transforms the tenon by investing in the meaning of the symbolic world, and because of this investment follows the counter value of reflexive power in a coherent lecture. The problem of symbolic size is the problem of the language unit and the connection with its multilayer functions in the kingdom of lecture. The language wants to say something else from what it says and for this reason, rotates without interruption in the space of double meaning. In the conventional and established linguistic sign, a double dualism is reflected. But the symbol has no such dualism. The language foreshadows the signs that have the first reflected meaning, the literal meaning, and thus takes a different meaning. While the dualism of the symbol is for a higher degree: its dualism is added and it is placed on the meaning of the double matter, in the form of "the connection between sense and meaning".

Precisely for this, the comment is the meaning of the dual meaning where different ways of commenting are met (Kalin, 2021, pp. 51).

After Freud, consciousness cannot be placed in the horizontal line, in the instant line, or the direct line. It is no longer a source, but a duty task to become as aware as possible. Consciousness is not the first reality we may know, but the last, so it should be headed toward consciousness and not be started from it. The human, to approach the real being himself, is not enough to discover the discrepancy of consciousness that is within him, not even the power of desire that puts him into existence. He must also discover that "awareness", as the mastering of the meaning for personal existence, is not his property, but is the property of meaning. The subject reaches himself with the acceptance of unconscious self-archaeology and with the desire to get out of himself by heading towards transcends, which in reality reveals its signs through the symbols of holiness. Self-archaeology can only manifest itself in the light of teleology, giving meaning to it. Neither theology (kalam) nor the clarification of the texts of the Qur'an and hadith can be suspended from the discussion. In the clarifications (tafsir/exegesis) we encounter a constant clash of interpretations of the text as well as theological constructions of its meanings. Consequently, the matter is for the distinction between the hermeneutic reading of the text of the Qur'an, as the symbolic language has in mind, and theological reading within the prism of speculative concepts. Perhaps the best example of discussion between alternatives, hermeneutic and speculative approaches to religious truths, is the very concept of God. It is absorbed into conceptual space so that it can be interpreted within the philosophical and theological terms for Absolut. Consequently, the concept of God, from the meaning aspect, belongs to ontotheology.

External pressure towards religious experience and language, then criticism of metaphysics by Kant have influenced the ontotheology destruction and appearance of Marks meta-criticism, Nietzschean nihilism, psychoanalysis, and social sciences, and because of this theology, today faces anti-ontological concepts. In addition, we cannot say that the situation has radically changed. Even further theology necessarily must comment own principles in the function of the problematics which are not its own, but which are imposed on it from abroad. The theology of the extreme abstraction of God (tanzih mutlak) presents a similar formal structure as well as ancient ontotheology, therefore, at the same time, it is determined by philosophy and culture.

Whereas the task of theology is to coordinate the experience that treats the text of the Qur'an with general human experience, it continues to remain in the so-called neoliberal situation and is forced in its own space also to relate external connection to philosophy. This polarity is not only imposed from the outside but is also derived from the very nature of religious experience and lecture which requires conceptual articulation. Consequently, due to symbolic language, the internal text dynamics of the Qur'an and Hadith, constantly call for re-interpretation and actualization of principles.

In the era of the "hermeneutics of the skepticism", the pressure is present not only between these two sources (philosophy and religion) but also in the interior of the self-understanding of Islamic religious experience and the discourse which faces the radically confronted interpretations. To better understand this kind of hermeneutics of religious skepticism there is no need to adopt its arguments, but we must be aware of the paradox which leads it, and again we must return to the potential of experience and essential religious lecture. The point is, we must escape at the same time from claims of scientific recognition and the reduction of the arbitrariness of thought, to cut a long story short, the conviction and criticism should agree with each other. The critical structure makes obedience more prudent, while reasonable conviction brings criticism down to the limits of what cannot be clarified to the end, and which is built on our concept of preconception of the world. We approach the text with a pre-commitment; We hear the invitation, but not in the same way as the authors and listeners/readers of previous generations have heard, while the text of the revelation, precisely because of this pre-commitment and spatial and time circumstances, does not stand in the same way before our consciousness as it stood before their consciousness. This pre-commitment is a kind of "first naivety", but in our time when people no longer have consciousness as they had in ancient cultures, we have no opportunity for accepting the symbol and myth straight as a construction of the world. Our "first naivety" is that we constantly hear the invitation that the text of revelation sends us, but we are not able to derive its authentic message from the reality of our culture or within the dogmatic and religious framework in which we are living now, in contemporary. Exactly from here derives the importance of critical clarification of the text, but not to destroy the purity and naivety of religion, but to reopen the way towards it. The Hermeneutics of the Quran is trying to release the text of revelation from cultural stereotypes, from the subjectivism of interpretations, and it will require that we listen carefully to what the text of revelation testifies, starting from the "first naivety" of the acceptance of religion by the authority of the Prophet, and continuing through criticism towards "second naivety", second innocence, which will derive from the testimony of revelation in reason and heart (Gormez, 2015).

Presuming that skepticism is not the last word, text, context, doubt, belief, persuasion, and reasoning must be at a constant circuit pressure. The new articulation of religion needs to pass through the filter of the "hermeneutics of the skepticism " and no way to pass around it. The dialectic of interpretation contains the searching for "productive collision". Divergences between interpretations can be exceeded by creating a practical method of interpretation that will consider all aspects of hermeneutics.

I think the pure idea of Islam to come back to its essence, needs to deconstruct itself (in the sense of Derrida). With the deconstruction of the religious idea, on the one hand, I aim the analysis of the Islamic idea from the position that claims to have the ability to achieve, while on the other hand, only the transfer, i.e., Islamic cultural transformations in the environment where it is still possible the access to resources that simultaneously push and cover it. I want to say this:

The idea of Islam should be released from thoughts that have used the authority of religion and have not acted according to the methods of revelation, as well as should line the abyss around itself where are established the first alternatives of theism and atheism. Talking about the hermeneutic approach to theology is problematic, because hermeneutics as the interpretive reading of Quran texts, is as old as theology itself, even perhaps even older. Theology, according to genesis is linguistic, its subject is charismatic, while its method is mainly hermeneutic. However, what changes is the theology's relation - as a speculative reflection

of the Qur'an's order and the creation of concepts in which it is reflected as a system of paradigms and hermeneutics- as an analysis of fundamental principles for reading the text of revelation. The history of theology is an organic entity in which moments have relative independence and are clarified in reciprocity. In science, when there is no possibility of proving the specific number of issues given, the paradigm must be changed in revolutionary form; Therefore, from axiomatic meaning, it is switched to the empirical and historical concept, which in essence defines experimentation. Because in theology there is no substitution of one paradigm with another, perhaps in theology the paradigm should be better to be understood as the "structured horizon" and as such there would be different models in function to the intelligence of religion. Consequently, we can say that the hermeneutic approach can be considered a new model within the framework of theological thought. A model in which representation would be replaced by commentary (interpretation), and then on the one hand we would have to take care of the traps of conceptualist idols, while on the other hand, of the boundaries of interpretation that cannot absorb the divine puzzle until the end, as He knows how to appear even in secret.

### **3. Meta-interpretation as hermeneutics in itself**

Returning to the traditional path within the solid epistemological frameworks, from now on is no longer possible. The postmodern man, because he lives in the world of lunatic symbols and is exhausted of original contents, in some way has lost his sense of symbolic language. Our contemporary culture is based on technical language; in other words, the language is now more precise, more manipulative, and consequently even more adequate for formalization and content discharging. This situation makes the language more in transparent to deep symbolic work as well as fills it with a second meaning. With the language depleting from symbols as in the case of manipulation with symbols, we simply lost the sense of sanctity, that is, the key support towards the texts of our tradition and culture as well as our archeology. The scientific ideal, in the beginning, served to progress, while now, it has become an obstacle to progress.

Jürgen Habermas states that the return to the interest hierarchy has produced one-dimensional persons, while this is an ideological phenomenon that serves for every social agent to be obliged, completely, to submit to the functioning of the industrial system. But such a turn is not necessary, because the issue is constantly re-opened in the framework of research with the re-evaluation of the sacred universe. Traces of the sacral are now rather reduced, and scientific-technological ideology creates a nihilistic cultural configuration. The scientific illusion and the withdrawal of the sacral, together belong to the oblivion of our roots and thus contribute to the expansion of the "desert" without the basic orientation in which we are living. The re-evaluation of the sacral is based on the overestimation of the value and invites us to re-analyze the crashes of the sacral in our culture by turning to symbolism and not by using speculative thought. The presentation of the dual symbolic meaning does not always mean covering up what is meant to be said, but sometimes it can also be a reflection and revelation of the sacral. The space of the symbol is the space of the double meaning in which the compound meanings, at the same time, intertwine and display the direct meaning, placing from time-to-time man to the essential reality as a revelation of the sacral which itself appears and hides and as such invites to be commented. The first fact is that the symbol is related to the literal meaning, while the second is that it is related to the symbolism, and this makes the symbol oppose the technical sign which means nothing other than what it looks like. This sign as such can be emptied, formalized, and become a mere subject of speculation. Whereas only the symbol has the power to give what is saying.

Contemporary semiotics would have considered such a definition of symbolism as very general because they do not understand the symbol as a special kind of sign, but as a special way of using the sign, consequently interpretation. Each sign and text can be read in symbolic form. But the articulation of thoughts that is initiated with symbols, that is, the thoughts that are present in the kingdom of symbols is a matter which must be understood and interpreted. The text aims at the being, now no longer as the modality of being, but

as the modality of existence. Symbols in some ways are prophecies of consciousness. Symbolic language rooted in meaning is addressed to the one who uses it, who becomes the invited subject. The concern about symbols represents the new desire to exist of the invited subject. The expectation of the new word, the new actuality of the word is the implicit idea of any phenomenology of symbols, which at first emphasizes the subject, then highlights the symbols, and finally accepts the power that flows from the source word.

The re-acquisition of symbolic language, consequently the establishment of the meanings of words through the interpretation of the text and the human world, means that the human experience, for the second time is given the narrative opportunity for self-understanding. In this case, we should not feel sorry for the ruined illusions about the language, but we should hope for the possibility of its re-creation.

The deconstruction of the subject's illusion is a negative aspect of what we, conditionally, can name as imagination to assimilate the text of revelation and the constitutive prophetic tradition. Demystifying hermeneutics confronts us with the resistance of the discipline of necessity (with which Spinoza introduced us), but at the same time erases our imagination through which we can experience the words as a revelation. Instead of approaching the phenomenon of imagination through reception, consequently, to the relation of perception and photography, we should closely associate it with semantic innovation, that is, the collective setting, the group of two different words that produce new meanings. The productive power of the imagination, first, is the power of the word and not of the image. The image is not separated from language, it is created only through language and not through perception. Images are expressed in time or before they are viewed and as such cannot be constituted as false material of perception (as empiricists say), nor as modification or denial of perception (as phenomenologists say). Imagination is free to play with possibilities, independent of the world of perception or action. Exactly in this situation of disengagement in relationship with the world, we can try new ideas, new values, and new ways of being in the world (Jahjai, 34).

Whereas the semantics of the imagination has referential application. The neutralizing function of the imagination concerning the world is a negative condition for the liberation of the second-degree referential power which has to do with our deep ontological belonging to the world of existence. The subject, which is a problem, as it understands itself as a possibility of itself and everything problematizes and realizes itself with radicalism which transcends the Cartesian dualism of the wounded cogito. With interpretation-reading and listening, then also with translation and writing the subject through the nodes of intersubjectivity, necessarily, opens the secret of the otherness of being. The decentralized subject obtains a new feeling for the other one. As a result of the "desert of criticism", he can again be invited and transformed into an integrated ego who will be able to responsibly create his own and common history.

The hermeneutics of revelation proposes new ways for self-interpretation, precisely, through terms of otherness, while then calling on the others to reintegrate into the horizon of meaning. On the one hand clarification, that is explanation, sheds a faint light within this horizon until it meets the stranger, on the other (though it is often ignored); on the other hand, it remains in doubt concerning the postmodern cult of the unspoken. Pre-understanding and comprehension are always obliged to be in a dialogue. In the context of the new hermeneutic model, in addition to all, which cannot be expressed, one must insist on saying something about what cannot be expressed, that is, to think what cannot be thought, to confess what cannot be confessed, but at the same time being careful not to jump over the boundaries that surround the world of "higher answers". Here we do not need to go back to the meta-closed narratives of the total. The hermeneutic challenge is about placing suspension bridges between us and others or the other. This, not in the way of totalitarian reduction, consequently to ontology or logocentrism, but through a dialectical movement that does not ignore the symptoms of indecision, and stands in permanent aporia (Izeti, Qasje religioze religijonit, 2012).

The hermeneutic approach, concerning the understanding of the connection between the ego and the other, facilitates the fulfilment of self-criticism with the necessary critique of the other and vice versa. Consequently, the hermeneutics of scepticism acts as a simultaneous translator on both battlefields. Without this double critique which reveals the illusory categories of the one and the other, it is impossible to speak of the real relations between man and man, the man with himself and man with everything else. Without the analysis of the dialectic of the similar and the other one, the culture becomes a space of crime and compassion, consequently in the dichotomy of "justice" and "love", which then attempt to master them with the "logic of the crowd", with a logic which frames the interaction of identity and otherness. In the absence of the identification dialectic and alienation, that is, without the meaning of ego as the other, the dogma destroys the reflection of divine compassion. To cut the story short, violence takes the place of the enigma. The intelligent belief necessarily involves the hermeneutics of demystification. Religion is the symbolic space where the function of reviewing gives birth to the function of matter, destroying idols, and religious images, just as the illusion of metaphysics gives birth to the terms of the supreme being, to the first substance, to the absolute thought. This, in some way, is the revival of revision as an item, meaning, the downfall of the sign in extraordinary and super cultural matters. Even the sin of idolatry itself is in the concept where things are worshiped instead of God, that is, the worshipping of reflections instead of their content.

#### **4. Conclusion**

In general, religion and belief, if we had discussed it through the prism of intelligent hermeneutics, means the acceptance of the Absolute Person, certain concepts, rules, and provisions which are enabled through the space of the sacred in the journey to God, belief in God's commitment for humanity and most importantly the ultimate obedience to divine assistance. The word "iman" in Islamic terminology means belief in God, but also the belief that God is "with us". The concept of religion and belief, in this case, must be interconnected with self-understanding before the text of the Qur'an. From this position religion can be defined as "the highest concern", that is, the acceptance of the only necessary issue from which I orient myself and choose my priorities. But the "highest concern" will remain dumb if we do not include the power of the word, consequently, the interpretation of the signs and symbols, which have educated and addressed this concern over the centuries. Absolute metaphysical dependence will be weak and unspoken as a feeling if there is no answer to the proposition of "new creation", which opens new possibilities of being and action. Unconditional belief would be empty if it would not be based on a new interpretation of the events and symbols spoken of in the Qur'an and Hadith.

So, these principles of revelation are events of liberation and inclusion of the deep ego and thus bring themselves closer to the Creator. This is the common relation between the text of revelation and its appropriation by man and the believer. Hermeneutics is also of high importance in self-understanding in the face of the text of revelation. We must bear in mind that there is a great difference between the critique of religion and self-understanding, that is, revival, consolation in the broad bosom of the divine word. This kind of hermeneutics facilitates the deconstruction of prejudices that prevent the divine text from becoming the world itself. This kind of being is a love of the world and the universe, a love that is both a consolation and a reward.

## References

- [1]. Aydin, M. (2021). Filozofia e Fesë. Shkup: Logos-A.
- [2]. Gormez, M. (2015). Metodologjia hermeneutike e hadithit dhe sunnetit, Çështja e metodologjisë në të kuptuarit dhe interpretuarit e hadithit dhe Traditës Pejgamberike. (A. Pajaziti, Përkth.) Shkup: Logos-a.
- [3]. Izeti, M. (2010). Problem estetike u Islamskoj tradiciji. Islamska Misao, 45-56.
- [4]. Izeti, M. (2012). Qasje religjioze religjionit. Shkup: Logos-a.
- [5]. Jahjai, Abaz (2021), Muiyika si mjet i ndërtimit të realitetit në shembullin e teoricienëve mysliman, Shkup, Logos-a.
- [6]. Kalin, I. (2021). Veli dhe Kuptimi. (R. Hoxha, Përkth.) Shkup: Logos-a.
- [7]. Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). La condition postmoderne. Paris: Édition de Minuit .
- [8]. Mudge, L. (1980). Essays on Biblical Interpretation. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- [9]. Riceur, P. (2005). O tumaçenju. Ogled o Freudu. (L. Lovrinçeviç, Përkth.) ZAgreb: Ceres.
- [10]. Rorty, R. (1967). The Linguistic Turn. Chikago: University of Chicago Press.