The Difficulty of Understanding the Meaning of Words in Sacred Texts by the Individual and the Dangers Induced in the Social Field

Abdellaoui Abdelkader*

Avicenna Virtual Campus Network, Paris, France

*Corresponding Author: Abdellaoui Abdelkader, Avicenna Virtual Campus Network, Paris, France.

Abstract

This article starts from the observation of contradiction between a religious conviction and its practice in social life. To try to understand this contradiction, he introduces the concepts of social influences, then the ability to interpret words and expressions in texts and in their socio-cultural, political and economic context. The notion of interpretation is not limited to words, but extends more generally to the ways of thinking and culture of the time when the text was written. The question is how would be written today what was written in a given historical period, in a given socio-cultural, political, economic, scientific knowledge context. The notion of appropriation of authority is also briefly reviewed to show how the individual (the believer in this case) transforms himself into a kind of defender of his belief and to this end states postulates or attitudes, instead of texts, on what should or should not be done. We wonder whether the cause is ignorance or unconsciousness or any desire to impose oneself.

Keywords: Conviction; Living Together; Interpretation

Introduction

The world is changing and at a very high speed. From more or less localized or extensive civilizational centers, we have entered the era of information and communication highways, social spaces for discussion or even questioning and contestation. Information is gradually beginning to escape the traditional centers of political, military, business or even religious power. But there are also the significant migrations that lead many people to live in societies that are culturally very different from those in which they were educated and lived their convictions. In society, which gradually believes that it is freeing itself from these powers, doubt is beginning to take hold, to fuse many questions, to appear a new breed of commentators, interpreters and preachers in all areas of social life; but the new interpreters are unfortunately not all in the "intellectual" bracket that should encourage them to ask the real societal and/or temporal questions; there are new interpreters-preachers who not only do not master knowledge (in any field whatsoever) but who, on the other hand, proclaim themselves the holder of the truth and have the right to disseminate it according to their own interpretation. Using modern and easy means of information and communication. The globalization of exchanges, relationships, means of "transport", financial networks and marketing calls into question, implicitly and slyly, the concepts of State, Nation, Community, the very belonging of the Individual to a "group", as an element of a Solidary Whole.

The advances of Science, beyond the "disturbances" induced by technological advances in societal paths, lead or will lead, sooner or later, questions of a new kind, on subjects yet old and supposedly known and mastered (because so considered obvious and simple to conceive); questions on the meaning of words, on concepts, on attitudes, on beliefs, on the roles of each one in Society, in the Community, in the Umma, one could say, in a particular way, for the Muslim. In addition, the reasons for believing evolve in the light of changes in knowledge in the different fields of knowledge and societal developments. Ghaleb Bencheikh notes: "Theology is the intelligibility of faith tested by time" [1,2]. How can faith be made intelligible today? Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd [3] states: "The tajdîd (renewal) school tries

---

The Difficulty of Understanding the Meaning of Words in Sacred Texts by the Individual and the Dangers Induced in the Social Field

55

to convince people that the Qur'an is not a book of science, history or political theory. It is in fact a book of ethical and spiritual guidance, whose stories have no other purpose than this. In other words, Quranic stories are literary works serving ethical, spiritual and religious purposes. It is therefore a fatal methodological mistake to pretend to read the accounts of the Qur'an as purely historical facts". Scientific and technological progress has led many thinkers to find in the Sacred Texts (Islam but also Christianity) passages whose interpretation could correspond to the fact that these texts contain elements of Knowledge and would justify their authenticity. The reflection we propose here leaves this question aside because it seems to us that faith is tested but not proven; the question of whether God exists or does not exist is beyond the scope of our present reflection.

The subjects are so numerous and varied that it is difficult to establish priorities, a classification or even a list that would lead to an unavoidable and unconscious subjectivity and, by the same token, to contribute to reinforcing polemics, misunderstandings and therefore, conflicts of all kinds.

But Science and Technology, currently eminently external factors, are not the only ones to produce "disturbances" in the social process. The evolution of material conditions (enrichment or impoverishment) will also generate new needs and demands (more comfort, more consumption not always healthy, more envy, more rivalries). The increasingly important financialization of the economy and trade influences, for its part and to a certain extent, the evolution of social relations: we talk to each other much less (or more at all), we see each other even more rarely, we think more about ourselves, we want to have everything faster, we lose the patience to observe, to observe, to listen to each other, to understand each other.

In developing societies and among minorities on the margins of technologically advanced societies, changes are so profound and rapid that they produce shocks whose consequences are not always immediate; these shocks often lead to shortcuts in interpretations, to positions taken, to the adoption of attitudes in violent opposition to lifestyles, traditions, beliefs, rules of living well; the most dangerous is the fact that these new attitudes lead to actions that the perpetrators try to justify by an attachment to a current of political, racial, religious or any other protest and that others, those who suffer or those who observe do not understand, so much these acts (and their consequences) seem odious and disoriented from "norms". These shortcuts also lead to situations of malaise, malaise, misunderstanding and perhaps rejection, all ingredients entering the recipe for the preparation, perhaps involuntary and above all "unconscious", of a social time bomb with effects, to say the least disastrous, on future generations if nothing is done now to understand its mechanisms and begin to defuse them.

On the other hand, technologically advanced societies, where the contrast between rich and poor is increasingly felt, are confronted with other types of malaise and ill-life that are expressed in acts that are as incomprehensible as they are unacceptable; these acts are sometimes so violent that they lead to situations of generalized insecurity and therefore to draconian measures, but above all to unfortunate associations and amalgams, sometimes maintained by the media and recovered by groups. We thus associate incivility and emigration of all kinds (but especially recent), violence and terrorism and religion (especially Islam) and fanaticism or radicalism, knowing that radicalism has existed and still exists in other currents, in other beliefs and is not specific to Islam. The Believer and practitioner (especially the Muslim but not only) who lives in these regions must thus constantly justify himself and show that he is in no way associated with acts considered here as "barbaric", which they are in reality for any Society, for any Culture and for any Religion. Here too a work of reflection, beyond the necessary normal security actions, must be carried out so that the symbols of "living together" have their true meaning in the general popular consciousness. But it is essential to make a correct reading; just as an example; verse 189 of Sura 2 "el bakara" states "verbatim": [fight for the glory of God, those who fight you but do not provoke; God does not like provocateurs]; it seems to me, however, that the question of combat must be studied and explained in the linguistic senses, certainly, but also temporal, social...

It is with this objective in mind that we consider it useful to begin a global, profound and long-term reflection on: i) the Society's understanding of technological and scientific changes, ii) the Society's relationship to the Sacred Texts iii) If this does not include the

The Difficulty of Understanding the Meaning of Words in Sacred Texts by the Individual and the Dangers Induced in the Social Field

56

historical-exegetic analysis of the texts and their interpretation in the light of advances in all fields of knowledge, it should probably be added or clarified; and (iv) on the reactions of individuals, families, groups and communities to these diverse and multiple transformations.

The present reflection does not aim to answer the many difficult questions mentioned above; the objective here is much more modest; it simply consists in highlighting that me-knowledge, as opposed to Knowledge (in the very general sense of the term), than the insufficiency of general culture (I will say in-culture), as opposed to Art and Culture, that the insufficiency (or disappearance) of framing under the pretext of Freedom leads, inevitably, to Misunderstanding, to shortcuts of all kinds, to abuses of all kinds, to the justifications of the most reprehensible and unbearable attitudes, in a word to the rejection of one by the Other. Another objective is to propose, very modestly, another approach, another way to spread in Society (or rather societies) this simple idea that a new look at the other passes first through the questioning of The self, that each one understands himself in his convictions, in his belief (or even his non-belief), in his religion in order to find, and to adopt the attitude of living serenely one's life in the group.

Social influences

In his preface to the book by G. Paicheler (1984), S Miscovici states that "the phenomena of influence are at the heart of all relations between individuals and from the individual to the group of which they are a part". And these phenomena are, in reality, present everywhere in both space and time. When two people meet, it is rare that one of them does not seek to influence the other, consciously or not. But this phenomenon of influence is also found in the relationship of the group to the individual, the group seeking to maintain its cohesion, harmony, and even its existence. In all cultures, for example, regardless of their age, we find these phenomena of influence that modify and shape the attitudes and behaviors of individuals in such a flexible way that little or no attention is paid to them; a fashion phenomenon for example on a style of clothing to wear, a type of attitude to hold, a way of behaving will be followed almost unconsciously thanks to the methods of influence designed for this purpose and directed towards a target population, but also thanks to the "group" ripple effect. The Company, for its part, constitutes a protective mold inducing, in the more or less long term, uniformity; it generates, as Moreno [4] puts it so well, cultural preserves, some of which strive to free themselves, [alone or with the help of experts], to regain the extent of the natural potentialities faded in the individual. To this end, we can cite here the work of social psychologists that use group methods [fashionable group therapy methods] intended to "bring the individual to take the measure of social constraints and to free himself from them" [5].

We can then ask ourselves the question, very banal of the rest, of how some societies manage to build their protective mold and how, on the contrary, others fail. Giving a complete answer to this complex question goes far beyond the scope of this article; we shall confine ourselves to indicating a few points which are useful for the present work. The educational system, in its broadest sense, including the work of the family itself a product of this system, is, of course, the first element of this whole of preservation of the social edifice.

The "Culture System", with its thinkers, its artists, its militants constitutes a significant element in the construction and protection of social identity, in the transmission of tradition, in the elaboration of new models of Societies. There is also the media system in all its forms that contributes to the manufacture of models, "molds" and "norms" of attitudes or behaviors. Religions also play a discreet but not negligible role in the protection, even the manufacture, of the "Social Mold".

In organized and technologically advanced societies all these systems try to make a place for themselves, to build an audience, more or less important, without brutal opposition, that is to say by acting as "Systems" admitted, recognized, respectful of global "norms" and rejecting, by the same token, violence in all its forms. In developing societies (or within groups or communities resulting from these societies but located in environments of organized societies), the situation is quite different. The education system does not always manage to decide between "modernity" and traditionality; the cultural system, still impoverished by decades of acculturation and external domination on the one hand and by an unfinished maturation on the other, struggles to propose a societal model harmoniously combining tradition, openness and modernity; the media, whatever they have, often have no internal or local "model" to highlight and

The Difficulty of Understanding the Meaning of Words in Sacred Texts by the Individual and the Dangers Induced in the Social Field

57

on which to base their approaches; the religious system, recognizing a single religion and positing the postulate that every citizen is automatically convinced and practicing, fails to organize itself effectively because, switching between the concept of "state religion" (and not society) and the principle of individuality (personal responsibility) of faith, it leaves the field open to everyone to seize the right to defend the religious fact according to his means, its impregnation (or its adherence) to the various currents of thought, his conviction and his own interpretation of the texts. The Lambda citizen thus believes himself invested with powers and missions that he often has neither the competence nor even the right to perform; this leads, one suspects, to all the abuses and all the acts, at least reprehensible, in the behaviors here or elsewhere. Would there not then be the need to set up a system of regulation within the structures of religions that establishes the work of intellectual reflection, debate, questioning, questioning and questioning and thus making it possible to counteract the unfounded appropriations by unqualified individuals of "knowledge" and the practices that result from it? There is certainly el Azhar (Cairo School) which is normally a regulatory institution! In reality it would take several "schools" to avoid the appropriation of the "Truth"; but it would also take another system, "awakening" society to remove it from its torpor, passivity and unconditional follow-up! And this system would first and foremost go through education.

The meaning of words

In all cultures, words evolve and will evolve in their meaning and use over time. In reality, the lexicon of any language is linked to human activity and is constantly renewed by the formation of new words, by the evolution of the meaning of existing words or by borrowing from other languages. The evolution of the meaning of words is often conditioned by the needs of communication. Let's take an example in the French language to illustrate: the word chômer meant "not to work during periods of great heat"; it has a completely different meaning at present; another example: "The bourgeois designates in feudal times the inhabitant of the village, as opposed, on the one hand, to the villain, the inhabitant of the villa of the master and worker of the land, and on the other hand, to this master himself, the lord"; in the epoch of French revolution the word bourgeoisie referred to a progressive social class and had a positive value. The term bourgeois now has a completely different meaning.

We like to say that the Arabic language is rich, that is to say that for a given notion can exist many synonyms, which do not always have exactly the same meaning and which introduce, for a given period, variations in the direction according to social, cultural, geographical contexts. Ibn Khalamayh [6] indicates that the Arabs have 500 names for the lion and 200 names for the serpent. Some linguists agree that these are exactly the same names; it seems, however, that the strongest view is that there are nuances from one word to another and that two terms do not refer to exactly the same thing. According to Mr. Gloton, the Qur'an used about 5000 terms that correspond to 1726 different roots. This richness of the language will induce the great difficulty in grasping the meaning of words. Thus, M. Gloton [7] writes in his approach to the Qur'an through grammar and lexicon: "Like the great Muslim commentators of the Qur'an, we assume that the Founding Text is revealed by Allah to His Prophet Muhammad: even in detail, everything in this Text is necessary, and therefore nothing can be removed from it, including binding particles that contribute to the internal and constantly repetitive nuanced organization of sequences and ideas". To this end, Mohamed Arkoun notes that this question is burning and must be taken care of after careful checks and research; in any case it cannot yet appear in a text that would appear as the first of its kind in a local Algerian magazine; but I fully agree in the context of a text for an "international" oversight. According to Mr. Arkoum [8], the text of the Qur'an underwent many changes, as a result of struggles, during the first decades, to arrive at the "orthodox" text and an "official" spelling. What then does it mean "nothing can be removed?". It would seem that many primitive passages were "removed" during this history. All this leads us to note that the richer a language is (and this is the case of the Arabic language), the more difficult it is to display a meaning to a term, an expression and that it is necessary to have appropriate tools (in the first place knowledge) to decide the meaning of words in a text.

Moreover, on evolving in time (or space), the word sometimes retains part of the original meaning; the derived meanings are thus lost or forgotten. The most current example is the word "jihad", completely diverted from its general original meaning of struggle and struggle

The Difficulty of Understanding the Meaning of Words in Sacred Texts by the Individual and the Dangers Induced in the Social Field

58

(especially on oneself against all possible temptations to distance oneself from the faith), and which has become, in popular acceptance, synonymous with armed "combat" against the "disbeliever".

This leads us to emphasize, once again, the danger in the fact that the one who does not possess "Knowledge" appropriates the ability to interpret, for himself and especially for others, the meaning of the words in the Sacred Texts.

Ability to interpret sacred texts

Religion seems to be a universal phenomenon. All societies have tried to appeal to religion to explain the presence of man on earth; but science is also another way to try to answer this crucial question. The three most common religions are Islam, Christianity and Judaism; they have commonalities but also differences. We can point out that we sometimes find the same stories there, such as: the creation of the world in six days, the flood or the story of Adam and Eve.

There are three major religions in the world that have only one God: Judaism, Christianity and Islam. These religions did not appear at the same time in human history. They have things in common and also differences.

The formation of the first law schools in Islam (madhâhib) dates back to the period between the VIIIth and X centuries; since intense legal discussions oppose those who favor strict membership of historical schools and others who call for a permanent return to scriptural sources. This is not peculiar to Islam and prompts us to consider that the problem of interpretation of the Texts is so complex that it cannot be a matter for everyone.

The reading of texts must be associated with very precise conditions and above all with very precise abilities. Prophet Muhammad was to send a judge to Yemen; just as he was about to leave, the Prophet asked him, "What will you judge by? According to god's book, he replied. What if you can't find anything there? According to the tradition of the Prophet of God. What if you can't find anything there? Then I will put all my energy into making my own judgment". What this anecdote should teach us is the fact of the knowledge, as complete as possible of the Texts, of the ability to read and understand them, finally of the competence and the willingness to go further in the effort of reflection before making a judgment on the other.

But we have seen in the above the fact that Mr. Everyone can seize the right to interpret, for oneself sometimes to "adapt" religious practice to one's own constraints of time, organization, finances but also for others by calling himself "defender" of the religion "threatened" and going so far as to tell you, in a brazen and brutal way, without respect for your age, or for what you carry as knowledge or as wise men: "Sir, your prayer is null (not accepted) [batla]". He has thus monopolized the Authority to pronounce a sentence that only the Creator can take; and he is also persuaded to react with respect and good for religion, but also for yourself since he pushes you to correct "your mistake". The first question that arises then is why this gentleman reacted in this way. And two diametrically opposed answers are offered to us: i) abort his limited culture or education that does not allow him to put the form in his remarks and in the way of addressing Others; he may never have learned to use "gentle" ways, a "respectful" vocabulary, a "proper" approach with Others; this can, possibly, to be excused and corrected; ii) then his ignorance and ignorance of the very religion he claims to defend; ignorance of the existence of "schools" and thinkers who have worked hard to try to interpret dark parts of the sacred texts (dark here means complex for the common mortal); to simplify the meaning for believers and practitioners, they use shortcuts; ignorance of the very fact of the existence of several schools, therefore obviously of several possible interpretations that can complement each other or be in complete divergence; ignorance of the fact that each of these interpretations can have its place, in a given context of time; ignorance also the fact that social groups have chosen to follow this or that school but that I, a humble believer, have no capacity to say that those who have chosen another are in error; ignorance of the fact that God's commandments forbid us, in all places and at all times, violence with Others; ignorance finally that no one can claim to hold the Truth, God's supreme capacity.

The Difficulty of Understanding the Meaning of Words in Sacred Texts by the Individual and the Dangers Induced in the Social Field

59

It seems useful to quote here an excerpt from ibn Rochd's decisive treatise on religion and philosophy (Quoted by El Kenz., *et al*. 1985 [9]); Ibn Roch (Averroes) had been for Greco-Arab speculative thought, like the bouquet of a brilliant fireworks display [10]. These excerpts read: "If the divine law presents an external meaning and an inner meaning, it is because of the diversity that exists in the naturalness of men and the difference of their innate dispositions in relation to assent, and if it presents (expressions taken in) external sense contradict each other, it is in order to warn men of a deep science to have to reconcile them through interpretation". To insist on the innumerable possibilities of interpretation, Ibn Rochd adds: "What proves that unanimous agreement cannot be found in speculative matters, in a certain way, as it can be in practical matters, is that it is not possible to note unanimous agreement on any question, at any time unless that time is in our minds narrowly delimited, that we do not know all the scholars (I intend to know them individually and to know their number); that the doctrine of each of them on this question has not been transmitted to us by a repeated tradition; and that apart from all this we know positively that the scholars of that time agreed to (admit) that there is nothing external and internal in the Divine Law, that science, in every question, must not be celebrated to anyone, and that for (all) men, the method (leading) to the knowledge of the Religious Law is unique". We can clearly see here both the possibility of the multitude of interpretations and also the importance of the possession of the indispensable tools (knowledge, knowledge, sustained work) to access understanding at first and dissemination after understanding; in other words, not everyone can, under any circumstances, to set himself up as an interpreter; the first reason is that he does not possess the tools of understanding; the Society must integrate this important fact.

Appropriation of authority

All Religions, all Beliefs defend, in a common way, a universal principle of social organization based on an expression that has become fashionable: "living well together". "Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal from one's neighbor, thou shalt not lie" are all texts of application of this simple principle of maintaining social cohesion, from which they derive and which they strengthen. This principle is also accepted as the basis of social organization by those who do not believe in any religion. As we have seen before, and as Ibn Rochd points out, The Word of God is often complex and sometimes seems ambiguous to the common man who does not have sufficient knowledge to understand it; we had asked, several times during discussions with people of all ages and social status, if he knew Pasteur; each time, the response shocked us: "If he had fulfilled the promise of faith in the One God, he would have gone to heaven because of what he did for humanity"; we could not help but say to our interlocutor: "Are you God to make this decision?". Here again, two questions arise: i) is this person aware of the seriousness of the answer he has given? (ii) does it understand the very meaning of its response? Since the person in question here has not been to school, we could put this down to ignorance first, then to the influence of this or that religious current training the faithful to typical attitudes. But when the person in question is an academic, and therefore supposed to think for himself and forge convictions, then we can only cry because we feel dispossessed of any tool before the importance of the impact of certain discourses on Society, of the pressure exerted in turn by society on the Individual in general and on the faithful in a particular way. This impact tends to make the Individual a docile "follower", defending his religion (or should say his school, his madhab) with the means at his disposal, that is to say none and therefore defending it badly. Here we see all the ridiculousness, and the gravity, of a situation with such harmful and dangerous consequences for all.

Personal belief and social behaviour

In many Societies (even secular societies) religion, when it is unique or when it becomes the majority at the appearance of other convictions in society, constitutes a component of History, Tradition, or Culture itself; it can thus constitute a factor in the construction of social cohesion, in affirming belonging to the same origins and identity. This becomes different in the case of several religions in society.

Sometimes, conservative (or ultra-conservative) currents do not hesitate to highlight their belonging, sometimes going to denounce, or even reject by considering them simply as " foreigners", people of another conviction, another religion. This is also the risk of all multiconvictional society.

The Difficulty of Understanding the Meaning of Words in Sacred Texts by the Individual and the Dangers Induced in the Social Field

60

In territories where religion is "declared" state religion (in my opinion we should rather say religion of society, or of society, or even official) or simply considered as "normal or historical religion" the individual, or rather the citizen (more precisely the one who bears the nationality relative to the territory in question), is considered from the outset as belonging to this religion, that is, with a high probability of being a believer and practitioner. The majority of the territory's inhabitants are therefore in fact; a minority of people, living on the territory as "foreigners", are not concerned by this postulate but must nevertheless refrain from provocations such as ostensibly eating on a day of Ramadan, or wearing the veil in the street.

The difficulty of understanding the meaning of words in sacred texts by the individual and the dangers induced in the social field

Religious conviction is, and should be, in our view, a profoundly individual matter; it represents a proper "state of mind" that is lived entirely, that is fully tested but that does not need to prove itself for others, or in front of others. Of course, there are times when we meet with other practitioners in a communion of prayer (at the mosque, at the church), in other circumstances also such as funeral ceremonies for example. Article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights states:

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes the freedom to change religion or belief, as well as the freedom to manifest his religion or belief individually or collectively, in public or in private, through worship, teaching, practice and observance.

2. The freedom to manifest one's religion or belief may not be subject to restrictions other than those which, provided for by law, constitute measures necessary in a democratic society for public security, the protection of public order, health or morals, or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

Religious conviction is thus individual but should be lived in harmony with the social framework in which one lives; and I put in this term "social framework" the meaning of territory with its widest possible acceptance including both society (association of individuals) and the geographical space where this society lives. Mr. Arkoum [11] highlights three levels of meaning and functioning of religions: religion-force, religion-form and individual religion. This implies, in the first place, the protection and respect of these two inseparable elements. This respect is unfortunately flouted by the individual who also claims to be a believer and is practicing in the "common" religion. A few simple examples allow us to clarify these words: i) first example: we are in a taxi; from the car in front of us, someone has just thrown away a small empty bottle; we cannot help but make a remark that seems to shock the taxi driver; we are in a territory with a state religion and the one who threw away the bottle is supposed to be a practitioner, or at least a believer; Does he realize, beyond all civic, moral or other considerations, that he is in contradiction with his belief since he generates a danger for others and a pollution of the geographical space in which he lives? But maybe he's not even aware of it! ii) second example: we have noticed, during our travels, a habit that tends to spread and which consists in appropriating the urban space in front of one's building, one's property; the action begins by planting a few trees or shrubs, the idea (laudable at first glance) to promote the green space; the action continues by planting a grid "to protect this space", an idea that is also commendable; it ends with the construction of a solid wall and the appropriation of the space thus delimited, which becomes in full view of everyone a private space. Is the person who performed this act aware that he has stolen nothing more or less than a property that does not belong to him, regardless of who it previously belonged to? Is she aware that this is in contradiction with her religious conviction? iii) third example: a fruit and vegetable merchant puts you in front of the best fruits to attract you and serves you what is in front of him, so hidden for you and obviously of very poor quality; Is this merchant aware of the manifest sin and of this contradiction with one of the first precepts of any religion: "thou shalt not steal". These few examples, far from being the only friends that could be multiplied infinitely, are enough to note the flagrant contradiction between the conviction displayed and the real behavior of everyone and every day. The fact is even more serious when one realizes that people who engage in such behaviors do not understand the contradiction in which they live because they always try to justify it with one argument or another.

The Difficulty of Understanding the Meaning of Words in Sacred Texts by the Individual and the Dangers Induced in the Social Field

61

Some food for thought

Many thinkers, philosophers, exegetes, specialists in the law of religions have worked on these questions and have tried to decipher these contradictions, especially for developing societies where technological advances have arrived too quickly shaking up habits and beliefs. Our problem is that these discourses, quite commendable and deserving, do not seem to us to reach those social masses where the use of the Internet has replaced reflection and reading (or culture), where the media broadcast what works the most, that is to say sensational series and highlight the stars of fashion and show this rather than the thinker or the researcher. Unfortunately, these discourses only reach the minority of intellectuals and academics. They will have an impact, certainly, but in the very long term.

By Way of Conclusion

In this article we have tried to draw attention to the contradiction between religious conviction, eminently individual, and application (or practice) in everyday life that involves the inescapable relationships with the other who is thus in the first place of social order.

The lines of thought seem to us to be quite original in that they are: it seems to us, totally obscured by the educational systems that do not manage to position themselves in a clear way between secularism and protectionism, between tradition and modernity.

We showed that in many Societies (even secular societies) religion, when it is unique or when it becomes the majority at the appearance of other convictions in society, constitutes a component of History, Tradition, or Culture itself; it can thus constitute a factor in the construction of social cohesion, in affirming belonging to the same origins and identity. This becomes different in the case of several religions in society.

Unfortunately, the discourses only reach the minority of intellectuals and academics. They will have an impact, certainly, but in the very long term.

We also underlined that the individual can monopolize the power to interpret, even to make a decision in place of God by deciding for example that our prayer is not acceptable.

Certainly, we have not given an answer to all such complex questions; but we have sketched out the main problems connected with the meaning of the words in the Revealed Texts.

Thanks

Bibliography

1. Bencheikh Ghaleb. "Pour une refondation de la pensée théologique islamique". *Confluences Méditerranée* 95.4 (2015): 153-163.

2. Bencheikh Ghaleb. "The Dilemma of the Literary Approach to the Qur'an (Part 2)".

3. Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd. "The Dilemma of the Literary Approach to the Qur'an (Part 2)".

4. Moreni JL. Who shall survive? A new approach in the problem of human relations. Washington DC: Nervous and mental disease Publishing Company (1934).

The Difficulty of Understanding the Meaning of Words in Sacred Texts by the Individual and the Dangers Induced in the Social Field

62

5. Paicheler G. "Psycology of social influences: coercing, convincing, persuading". Delachaux and Niestlé, publishers; Neuchätel - Paris (1985).

6. Ibn Khälawayh H. al hujja fi quirät al-sab; edition. Abde al Salim Makram; Beirut (1971).

7. Gloton M. An Approach to the Qur'an through Grammar and Lexicon, Albouraq Edition, Beirut (2002).

8. Arkoun Mohammed. La Pensée Arabe; puf (1975).

9. El Kenz A and Lotfi H. "Master Thinkers; Entreprise nationale du Livre, Algiers" (1985).

10. Gauthier L. Ibn Rochd (Averroès), Paris (1948).

11. Benzine Rachid. "The New Thinkers of Islam". Albin Michel (2004).