

The Role of Arabic Language, and Religion in the 21st Century

Issah Zubairu Achara^{[a],*}

^[a] Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, Kogi- Nigeria.
* Corresponding author.

Received 12 July 2024; accepted 26 September 2024
Published online 26 October 2024

Abstract

This paper shall look at Religion in the 21st century, Tylor defined religion simply as ‘belief in supernatural beings. Tylor caused him to distinguished between three varieties of Religious tradition animism (the belief that nature objects such as trees are rivers are ‘a live’ with spirits polytheism, the belief in a plurality of gods), and monotheism (belief in a single god, as held by Judaism, Christianity and Islam). The term ‘supernatural beings, being somewhat a wider variety of religious traditions, Tylor’s definition of religion can be labeled, ‘supernaturalist as well as ‘substantive’ since he claimed that the defining characteristic of religion is what lies beyond the physical world namely a supernatural realm. There are many good books that introduces the world’s religion as specific religious traditions. Yet students who are embarking on the study of religion are typically introduced to more abstract methodological issues, rather than the religions themselves. In the 21st century in the British context, developed in the new universities and teacher training colleges, involved creating departments to train teachers. This has developed since 1944 Education Act insisted upon religious education being an essential part of both primary and secondary curricula. In Britain, the increasing plurality and focus on promoting multicultural values has led to many Religious Education teachers taking their pupils to visit places of worship consequently, most teacher-training programmes in higher education, and Religious studies departments that have developed in colleges whose historical focus has been teacher, have provided field work activities on their degrees. Most departments of theology and religious

studies in Britain will probably have originated from the study of Christianity, introducing other discrete religion such as Islam, Hinduism or Buddhism and the social science, contributions to the study of religion. Religion, then, can be defined as a system of belief and practices by means of which group of peoples struggles with these ultimate problems of human life. It expresses their refusal to capitulate the death, to give up in face of frustration, to allow hostility to tear apart their human aspiration.

Key words: Animism; Polytheism religion; Supernatural; Varieties

Achara, I. Z. (2024). The Role of Arabic Language, and Religion in the 21st Century. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 29(2), 63-69. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/13640>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/13640>

1. INTRODUCTION

Historically, the study of religion has derived from a number of parallel lines of development of varying age with little horizontal age with little horizontal contact between them. The oldest and most venerable is the study of Christianity which, of course, has its roots in the western worlds historical heritage. The study of Christianity remains linked to the Christian church, in quest to understand Christianity’s key doctrines and to instruct the faithful in this context it has been joined by Biblical studies as it borrows from the disciplines of literary criticism, historiography and discoveries in archeology. So religion in the 21 century has been the most challenging in regard to theology’s main thrust of more fully understanding God’s presence in history, such attempts to enhance one’s understanding of the Christian faith have not always been welcomed mainly Christians continue to content that scholarship of the last two centuries continue has tended to undermine rather than strengthen faith.

So the development of the study of religion in the 21st century as an academic subject originally borrowed heavily from this methodological framework for the study of Christianity. The original study of other traditions or even comparative religion was often undertaken by Christian scholars anxious to demonstrate that their own tradition's truth-claims were paramount. They often adopted the methodologies used for the study of Christianity to explore other faith traditions, and division was made between the study of correct doctrine (theology), textual criticism (biblical studies), and History. In this 21st century the direction of knowledge has been essentially top downwards rather than from the bottom up, with a consequent emphasis on textual study and knowledge derived from a small group of Elite scholars and eminent churchmen.

2. ARABIC LANGUAGE

The Arabic language (al-luġah al-'arabiyyah), or simply Arabic ('arabī), is the largest member of the Semitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic language family (classification: South Central Semitic) and is closely related to Hebrew, Amharic and Aramaic. It is spoken throughout the Arab world and is widely studied and known throughout the Islamic world. Classical Arabic has been a literary language since at least the 6th century and is the liturgical language of Islam. Because of its liturgical role, Arabic has lent many words to other Islamic languages, akin to the role Latin has in Western European languages. During the Middle Ages Arabic was also a major vehicle of culture, especially in science, mathematics and philosophy, with the result that many European languages have also borrowed numerous words from it. The Arabic script is written from right to left.

2.1 Literary and Modern Standard Arabic

The term "Arabic" may refer either to literary Arabic (fuṣḥā) or to the many localized varieties of Arabic commonly called "colloquial Arabic." Arabs consider literary Arabic as the standard language and tend to view everything else as mere dialects. Literary Arabic (al-luġatu'l-'arabiyyatu'l-fuṣḥā "the most eloquent Arabic language"), refers both to the language of present-day media across North Africa and the Middle East and to the language of the Qur'an. (The expression media here includes most television and radio, and practically all written matter, including all books, newspapers, magazines, documents of every kind, and reading primers for small children.) "Colloquial" or "dialectal" Arabic refers to the many national or regional varieties derived from Classical Arabic, spoken daily across North Africa and the Middle East, which constitute the everyday spoken language. These sometimes differ enough to be mutually incomprehensible. These dialects are not typically written, although a certain amount of literature (particularly plays and poetry) exists in many of them. They are often used to

varying degrees in informal spoken media, such as soap operas and talk shows. Literary Arabic or classical Arabic is the official language of all Arab countries and is the only form of Arabic taught in schools at all stages.

2.2 The influence of Arabic on other languages

In common with other European languages, many English words are derived from Arabic, often through other European languages, especially Spanish and Italian. Among them every-day vocabulary like "sugar" (sukkar), "cotton" (quṭn) or "magazine" (maḥāzin). More recognizable are words like "algebra", "alcohol", "alchemy", "alkali" and "zenith" (see list of English words of Arabic origin). The influence of Arabic has been most profound in those countries dominated by Islam or Islamic power. Arabic is a major source of vocabulary for languages as diverse as Berber, Kurdish, Persian, Swahili, Urdu, Hindi (especially the spoken variety), Turkish, Malay, and Indonesian, as well as other languages in countries where these languages are spoken. For example the Arabic word for book /kita:b/ is used in all the languages listed, apart from Malay and Indonesian (where it specifically means "religious book").

The terms borrowed range from religious terminology (like Berber tazallit "prayer" < salat), academic terms (like Uyghur mentiq "logic"), economic items (like English "sugar") to placeholders (like Spanish fulano "so and so") and everyday conjunctions (like Urdu lekin "but".) Most Berber varieties (such as Kabyle), along with Swahili, borrow some numbers from Arabic. Most religious terms used by Muslims around the world are direct borrowings from Arabic, such as salat 'prayer' and imam 'prayer leader'. In languages not directly in contact with the Arab world, Arabic loanwords are often mediated by other languages rather than being transferred directly from Arabic; for example, most Arabic loanwords in Urdu entered through Persian, and many older Arabic loanwords in Hausa were borrowed from Kanuri.

2.3 Arabic and Islam

The Qur'an is expressed in Arabic and traditionally Muslims deem it impossible to translate in a way that would adequately reflect its exact meaning—indeed, until recently, some schools of thought maintained that it should not be translated at all. A list of Islamic terms in Arabic covers those terms which are used by all Muslims, whatever their mother tongue. While Arabic is strongly associated with Islam (and is the language of salah, prayer), it is also spoken by Arab Christians, Mizrahi Jews, and smaller sects such as Iraqi Mandaeans. A majority of the world's Muslims do not speak Arabic, but only know some fixed phrases of the language, such as those used in Islamic prayer, without necessarily knowing their meaning. However, learning Arabic is an essential part of the curriculum for anyone attempting to become an Islamic religious scholar.

3. GRAMMAR

Arabic has three grammatical cases roughly corresponding to: nominative, genitive and accusative, and three numbers: singular, dual and plural. Arabic has two genders, expressed by pronominal, verbal and adjectival agreement. Numerals may agree with the same or different gender depending on the number's amount. As in many other Semitic languages, Arabic verb formation is based on a (usually) triconsonantal root, which is not a word in itself but contains the semantic core. The consonants k-t-b, for example, indicate 'write', q-r-' indicate 'read', 'k-l indicate 'eat' etc.; Words are formed by supplying the root with a vowel structure and with affixes. Traditionally, Arabic grammarians have used the root f-'l 'do' as a template to discuss word formation. The personal forms a verb can take correspond to the forms of the pronouns, except that in the 3rd person dual, gender is differentiated, yielding paradigms of 13 forms. Arabic has two verbal voices, active and passive. The passive voice is expressed by a change in vocalization and is normally not expressed in unvocalized writing.

4. RELIGION IN 21ST CENTURY

Everywhere you look, religions—and religious controversies—are shaping our world. A powerful source of beliefs, moral claims, and cultural practices, religions profoundly influence our contemporary world. For some, religion is held up as the key solution to various social ills such as poverty and racial tension. For others, religion is a major part of the problem. Religion generates critiques of inequality and capitalism while others invoke it to celebrate the free market and individual wealth. And, religious concerns shape views on policy issues as diverse as same-sex marriage, climate change, and government-sponsored healthcare. From challenges to evolution to debates on stem-cell research, religions juxtapose faith and modern science. Religions likewise factor prominently in various military conflicts around the globe and in the long-running debates over the proper relationship between religion and the state.

Religions now focus on how religions, both as belief systems and socio-cultural systems, are interwoven in today's challenges. How are religions, themselves, changing in response to contemporary events and developments? How can the academic study of religions help us assess and make sense of religion's role in 21st century societies? This course is particularly recommended for students who intend to pursue majors or minors in American studies, anthropology, business, communication, criminal justice, economics, education, environmental policy or science, health sciences, history, Middle Eastern studies, philosophy, political science, religion, and sociology.

'Science has long challenged religious belief, but the corresponding role of religion to prune science of idolatry and false absolutes is rarely discussed. This volume addresses that imbalance and its contributors seek to usher in a new era of mutually constructive dialogue.' Robert E. Ulanowicz, University of Maryland's Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, USA 'Religion in the 21st century is a phenomenon that cannot be taken for granted, and is undergoing transformations that present us with new challenges both from a scholarly and societal perspective. The nuanced and multifaceted way in which these features are analyzed in this book should be welcomed by all who are interested and concerned with the role of religion on the contemporary scene. The combination of accessible scholarship and challenging positions makes this a book for everyone who is interested in religion in the secularized parts of the world. The volume contributes to an understanding of how it is not, after all, a contradiction to be both fully modern and religious.' Jan-Olav Henriksen, Norwegian School of Theology, Oslo, Norway 'This is an enlightening selection of essays... in this context it afford the reader a broad, and frequently thought-provoking, account of some of the challenges not only facing religion but also those from religion to aspects of secularism. The essays in Part II provide useful case-studies on how religion currently operates and may proceed to operate in the 21st century considering the tensions posed by these sets of challenges.' Ecclesiastical Law Journal 'Christoffersen et al have collected together a range of papers which amply demonstrates the merits of interdisciplinary exchange. And the inclusion of chapters by leading academic lawyers such as Silvio Ferrari shows how lawyers have much to give and much to gain from such interdisciplinary dialogue. I would heartily recommend this collection to law and religion specialists who wanted to dip their toes into non-legal scholarship. ... Religion in the 21st Century: Challenges and Transformations provides a valuable insight as to the place of religion currently. It deserves to be much-read and to provoke much thought and discussion.' Law and Justice.

4.1 Why Religion will Dominate the 21st Century

Religious disaffiliation may be growing in America, but the rest of the world is a different story. One of the most common assumptions is that religiosity is linked to economic and technological underdevelopment. As a society gets more technologically and economically advanced, the thinking goes, religiosity naturally fades away and is replaced by a more secular worldview. Under this view, the 21st century will be the century in which secularization spreads even further as the rest of the world catches up. But when you look at the actual trends of religiosity across the world, what becomes apparent is actually the opposite: The 20th century was probably the high point of secularization, while the 21st century will

likely be dominated by religion. The famous line by the French intellectual and politician André Malraux — “The 21st century will be religious or it will not be” — is on track to be vindicated.

First, let’s dispense with the notion that there is some necessary causal link between economic and technological advancement and secularization. One need only look at South Korea, which was one of the poorest countries on the planet at the end of World War II, and is now one of the richest and most technologically advanced — indeed, on some metrics, more advanced than Western Europe or the U.S. At the same time that South Korea experienced this astonishing growth, Christianity in the country grew from less than 1 percent of the population to about 30 percent today. What about the rest of the world? Is it secularizing? To the contrary, religion is becoming one of the most important forces shaping the fate of most countries in the world. Look at the former Communist bloc countries. They went from being officially atheist to experiencing a strong religious revival. It’s impossible to mention Poland without mentioning the cultural importance of Catholicism there. Religion is also a common theme in any discussion of Russia, where the Orthodox Church has stepped in to provide a sense of Russian identity and become — for better or worse, given its alliance with the Putin regime — a key force shaping the country’s culture. If you know one thing about religion and Latin America, it’s that the entire continent has been historically dominated by the Catholic Church. If you know two things, it’s that Catholicism is being strongly challenged by other forms of Christianity, particularly Evangelical and Pentecostal. That’s a change in religion’s favor: the kind of anticlerical secularism that featured so prominently in the continent mere decades ago isn’t Catholicism’s main antagonist anymore. In Latin America, the fight is between varieties of religion.

In the Middle East and the broader Arab world, the same phenomenon prevails: The most dominant cultural-religious trend of the 1950s was anti-colonial, socialist, secular pan-Arabism. That led mostly to autocracies presiding over corrupt governments, which resulted in a backlash that took the form of political Islam, which was the strongest vehicle for resistance to the jackboot of tyranny. This religious revival is much broader than terrorism — most varieties of Islam that are growing are not extremist, even if they are robust and vociferous. We don’t know what the Middle East will look in the future, but one thing is clear: It will certainly not be European-style secularism. Not long ago, a few hundred thousand Muslims made the yearly hajj pilgrimage to Mecca; today, the number is more than 2.5 million. Wherever you look, religion is mutating, thriving, growing. Southeast Asia is as fiercely religious as ever. Same with India. Africa — this century’s next superpower — is the most religious continent on the planet. In America, disaffiliation is

changing the face of American religion, but at the same time, higher proportions of people today than in the 1950s declare believing in God, or having had a religious experience, or praying frequently. And even in Western Europe, that bulwark of secularization, the main debate over national identity is inseparably linked to the question of the growth of Islam there (from both conversions and immigration). Indeed, Europe may be sowing the seeds of a Catholic revival.

4.1.1 Why does this matter?

It matters because theology has consequences. The post-Enlightenment secular worldview tends to treat religion as nothing more than a private hobby. It rejects out of hand the notion that people’s spiritual beliefs matter in a broader context. When evolution tells us we’re just genes trying to spread, when economists tell us all we do is maximize our self-interest, when psychologists tell us we just want to get laid — we become convinced that humans act on nothing but narrow material desires. But that’s just not true. As a matter of fact, human beings are spiritual beings first, with a natural orientation toward transcendent realities. More prosaically, to state the obvious, human beings make decisions partly based on how we understand our self-interest, yes, but also based on our worldviews, on our vision of what is true and good and beautiful. Religion has been the most intense worldview-shaping phenomenon in history, and it will continue to be the most important worldview-shaping phenomenon of the 21st century. Ignore this reality at your peril.

4.2 SCIENCE AND RELIGION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

A Speech delivered at Philadelphia by invitation of the John Templeton Foundation, 2000. As we enter a new century likely to be dominated by sweeping scientific and technological developments, the need for spiritual guidance will be stronger than ever. Science alone cannot adequately cater for our spiritual needs, but any religion that refuses to embrace scientific discovery is unlikely to survive to the 22nd century. Religion faces extraordinary challenges in the 21st century. Dazzling advances in science and technology have transformed our world view and produced dramatic changes in lifestyle and material wellbeing. But this enormous progress has left religion behind. Few theologians have kept up with the revolutionary developments at the forefront of astronomy, physics, molecular biology or genetics. Churches and other religious institutions seem ill-equipped to deal with the brave new world of big bang cosmology, quantum reality, genetic engineering and nanotechnology. As a result, many people see religion on the defensive against the onslaught of scientific progress. They think of science as undermining or displacing religion.

Historically, it is true that major scientific discoveries, such as Darwin’s theory of evolution, have proved

profoundly unsettling in some religious quarters. And three hundred years of materialistic and reductionistic scientific thought has fostered the impression that scientists are cold, hard, soulless individuals who try to reduce the splendour of nature to sterile mathematical formulas.

However, this view of two implacably opposed belief systems constantly at loggerheads is seriously misleading. For those religious thinkers prepared to engage the scientific agenda in a constructive spirit, the coming decades will be a time of excitement and renewal. Science need not be the enemy of religion. Indeed, far from threatening mankind's spiritual wellbeing, science is increasingly seen as positively inspirational. As scientists unlock more and more secrets of nature, so they reveal a universe of stunning beauty and ingenuity, a grand cosmic scheme truly worthy of our awe and celebration.

The predicted concordance between science and religion will not come without significant religious progress, however. To appreciate the fascinating synergies that are emerging in the science/religion field demands a level of theological sophistication far above that which characterizes the simplistic wrangling of much public science-religion debate. For their part, if scientists were better educated in matters of religion and spirituality, they would be less inclined to dismiss them as anachronisms.

To illustrate what I mean, I shall take two examples from the scientific frontier that are often presented as threatening to religion, and argue that the reverse is actually the case. The first is the big bang theory of the birth of the universe, the second is the origin of life. My central point will be this. Neither of these events needs a miracle to explain it. Both happened, I believe, through natural physical processes, billions of years ago. But far from supporting a purposeless cosmos and a bleak atheism, as many have concluded, these scientific advances do just the opposite.

Let me start with the origin of the universe. Remember the furore when Stephen Hawking said, more or less, that God wasn't necessary to explain the big bang? I always took this remark of Stephen's to be a light-hearted jibe rather than a serious statement of theology. Hawking was in fact stating little more than St. Augustine, who had already concluded in the fifth century that, "the world was made with time and not in time." Augustine was anxious to demolish the naïve image of God as a sort of miracle-working superbeing emersed in the stream of time, waiting an eternity before whimsically making the universe at some arbitrary moment, and then sitting back to watch the action. If time itself forms part of creation, reasoned Augustine, then this embarrassing pre-creation eternity would not exist. He therefore placed God outside of time altogether, and interpreted "creation from nothing" to include the creation of time. Today, when most Christian theologians talk about "creation," they

don't mean the universe popping into being from nothing, but the holding-in-being of space, time, matter and the laws of nature at all times. In this more sophisticated interpretation of creation, God is regarded not so much a cosmic magician, or pyrotechnic engineer, but as the rational ground in which all physical existence is timelessly rooted.

Remarkably, Albert Einstein came to more or less the same conclusion, 1,500 years later. His theory of relativity makes it clear that time is inseparable from space and matter, and that all are part of the physical universe, subject to laws of nature. Personally, I find the idea of a god trapped in time and subordinated to its laws theologically very unsatisfactory. In Einstein's theory, the entire universe can originate from literally nothing in a big bang. There is no time before the big bang: time itself comes into being with space and matter. Moreover, there are known physical principles that permit the spontaneous appearance of time and space from nothing, without the need for a supernatural act to make the big bang go bang. So Hawking was merely sniping at a concept of God that was in any case abandoned long ago by scholarly theologians. Let me start with the origin of the universe. Remember the furore when Stephen Hawking said, more or less, that god wasn't necessary to explain the big bang? I always took this remark of Stephen's to be a light-hearted jibe rather than a serious statement of theology. Hawking was in fact stating little more than St. Augustine, who had already concluded in the fifth century that, "the world was made with time and not in time." Augustine was anxious to demolish the naïve image of god as a sort of miracle-working super being emersed in the stream of time, waiting an eternity before whimsically making the universe at some arbitrary moment, and then sitting back to watch the action. If time itself forms part of creation, reasoned Augustine, then this embarrassing pre-creation eternity would not exist. He therefore placed god outside of time altogether, and interpreted "creation from nothing" to include the creation of time. Today, when most Christian theologians talk about "creation," they don't mean the universe popping into being from nothing, but the holding-in-being of space, time, matter and the laws of nature at all times. In this more sophisticated interpretation of creation, god is regarded not so much a cosmic magician, or pyrotechnic engineer, but as the rational ground in which all physical existence is timelessly rooted.

Remarkably, Albert Einstein came to more or less the same conclusion, 1,500 years later. his theory of relativity makes it clear that time is inseparable from space and matter, and that all are part of the physical universe, subject to laws of nature. personally, i find the idea of a god trapped in time and subordinated to its laws theologically very unsatisfactory. in einstein's theory, the entire universe can originate from literally nothing in a

big bang. there is no time before the big bang: time itself comes into being with space and matter. moreover, there are known physical principles that permit the spontaneous appearance of time and space from nothing, without the need for a supernatural act to make the big bang go bang. so hawking was merely sniping at a concept of god that was in any case abandoned long ago by scholarly theologians.

CONCLUSION

Unfortunately many people regard this scientific account of the cosmic birth as trickery. They suspect scientists are merely covering their ignorance with technical obfuscation, lest they leave a loophole for God. This mistaken conclusion has been made by many commentators, including the leading British journalist Bernard Levin. In a hard-hitting column in the London Times that began with the memorable words, "Well, poor old God..." Levin slammed the great American physicist John Archibald Wheeler for pointing out, quite correctly, that the question "What happened before the big bang?" is simply meaningless in the context of the general theory of relativity. It is a meaningless question when time itself began with the big bang. As Stephen Hawking puts it, it's rather like asking what lies north of the North Pole? The answer is "nothing," not because there is some mysterious Land of Nothing there, but because there is no such place as "north of the North Pole." In the same way, there is no such time as "before the big bang." The big bang theory describes how the universe originates from nothing - nothing at all, not even space and time - entirely in accordance with the laws of physics. Augustine would have understood perfectly. The big bang theory is, of course, a mathematical model. There is a vast amount of observational support for the basic idea of an abrupt, explosive origin for the cosmos about 15 billion years ago, and I don't think the basic scenario is in doubt. But the actual originating event itself is far beyond any foreseeable observation. In the laboratory it is possible to recreate the conditions that prevailed about a trillionth of a second after the big bang, but the sort of physics we need to explain the origin of space and time occurred well before that, at energies trillions of times greater. So the explanation for the natural origin of the universe using quantum cosmology is a highly speculative piece of mathematical theory. It may turn out to be totally wide of the mark. But that doesn't matter! The key point is that we can envisage how the universe might have come into being from nothing, without violating any physical laws. A special supernatural act isn't needed to start the universe off. The second caveat is that the big bang model I have been discussing may be altogether too simple. It could be that there were many bangs, and that what we call "the universe" is actually just one bubble of spacetime amid

a vast assemblage of universes - a multiverse if you like. But I don't want to tax your patience too much, so I shall sidestep these elaborations and move on to the second of my chosen topics - the origin of life. Darwin famously explained how life on Earth has gradually evolved from primitive microbes to the rich diversity of the biosphere that we see today. However, he left open the question of how the first living thing came into existence. And it remains deeply problematic. How did lifeless chemicals transform themselves spontaneously into the first living thing? Nobody knows. There are plenty of theories, but they all have serious shortcomings. It's a genuine mystery. Now there are those who seize on this bafflement to declare that God created the first living organism by a miracle. But this is to fall for the old god-of-the-gaps trap - invoking God to explain a puzzling phenomenon. The idea that God is like an absentee landlord who shows up from time to time to give the world a prod, moving atoms about in competition with the forces of nature, I find both scientifically and theologically repugnant. It is also a tactically foolhardy proposition, because science has a habit of solving mysteries sooner rather than later. However, that is hardly the end of the story. Physical processes come in two varieties - lawful and random. Traditionally, scientists assumed that the origin of life was a chemical fluke of stupendous improbability, a quirk of fate unique in the entire cosmos. If so, then we are alone in an otherwise sterile universe, and the existence of life on Earth, in all its exuberant glory, is just a meaningless accident. On the other hand a growing number of scientists suspect that life is written into the fundamental laws of the universe, so that it is almost bound to arise wherever earthlike conditions prevail. If they are right - if life is part of the basic fabric of reality - then we human beings are living representations of a breathtakingly ingenious cosmic scheme, a set of laws that is able to coax life from nonlife and mind from unthinking matter. How much more impressive is such a magnificent set of physical principles - which bear all the hallmarks of design - than the sporadic intervention of a Deity who simply conjures these marvels into existence. Life and mind will be revealed as part of the grand cosmic scheme, embedded in the nature of things at the deepest level of reality. Our own existence will be seen as linked to this deep level in an intimate and purposeful way. Instead of us playing a trivial role as incidental cosmic extras, with life on Earth an insignificant accident in a pointless universe, our place in the cosmos will be far more inspiring. True, it wouldn't return us to the centre of the universe or to the pinnacle of creation - our place is far more humble - but nor will it relegate us to the status of mere moving mounds of atoms. In my view, the discovery that life and mind have emerged as part of the natural outworking of the laws of the universe will be strong evidence for a deeper purpose in physical existence. Since it is easy

to imagine other universes and other sets of physical laws that would prohibit life, the fact that our universe is so ingeniously bio-friendly would surely be a fact of the utmost significance. I hope you see the drift of my thinking. Invoking a miracle to explain life is exactly what is not needed to see evidence of divine purpose in the universe. So I conclude my remarks on a positive note. As we enter a new century likely to be dominated by sweeping scientific and technological developments, the need for spiritual guidance will be stronger than ever. Science alone cannot adequately cater for our spiritual needs, but any religion that refuses to embrace scientific discovery is unlikely to survive to the 22nd century.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Freedom of Religion, everybody has freedom to practice any religion that likes.
- All Christian supposes to be going to the church always, to enable him to practice his/her religion accordingly.
- Also, Muslim supposed to be going to the mosque always so that he can worship his God accordingly.
- Muslims and Christian they are not allowed to remain at home without going to the mosque or church.
- Christians and Muslims they are expected to the carrying, their children to the mosque and church, to enable their children to know about their religion.
- Nobody should stop their families to be going to the mosques and church.
- All religion should be practice accordingly so that we close to our God, and increase in faith.
- We should not see Arabic Language as a Religion, is a language, which each one of us can learn.
- All religion should be practice, as commotion in Religion, and all religion activities should be properly organized, in order to encourage other people to accept our Religion.
- Christian should learn Arabic language, because is not religion, is a language.

REFERENCES

- Alper, M. (2001). *The God part of the Brain: A scientific interpretation of Human spirituality and God*. New York: Rogue Press.
- Arberry, V. (2002). *Muslim saints and mystics: Translations of Alter, Farid al-Din*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Anttonen, V. (2002). "Identifying the generative mechanisms of religion." In P. Pyysiräinen & V. Anttonen (Eds.), *Cognitive science of Religion London Curriculum*.
- Ayer, A. J. (1946). *Language, truth and logic* (2nd ed.). London: Gollancz.
- Beckgord, J. (1975). *The Trumpet of prophecy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Berger, P. (1969). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Bowie, F. C. (2000). *The Anthropology of Religion*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chow, R. (1993). *Writing Diaspora*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Connolly, P. (Ed.). (2001). *Introduction to approaches to the study of religion* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.
- Daquille, E., & Newberry, A. (1999). *The Mystical mind: Probing the Biology of Religious Experience*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Flew, A., & MacIntyre, A. (1955). *New essays in philosophical theology*. London: SCM.
- Flood, G. (1999). *Beyond phenomenology: Rethinking the study of religion*. London: Cassell.
- Freud, S. (1907). "Obsessive actions and religious practices." In S. Freud: *Collected papers* (Vol. 2, pp. 25-35). London: Hogarth.
- Huxley, A. (1969). *The perennial philosophy*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- James, W. (1902). *The varieties of religious experience*. London: Longman, Green.
- Joseph, R., et al. (2003). *Neurotheology: Brain science, spirituality, religious experience*. California University Press.
- Jung, C. G., & Von Franz, M. (1964). *Man and his symbols*. London: Aldous.
- Katz, S. (1978). *Language, epistemology, and mysticism*. London: Sheldon Press.
- Lawson, T., & Mccauley, R. (1990). *Rethinking religion: Connecting cognition and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lofland, J. (1966). *Doomsday cult: A study of conversion, proselytization, and maintenance of faith*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lyon, D. (1999). *Postmodernity*. Minnesota University Press.
- Liotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mackie, J. L. (1985). *Selected papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Moody, R. R. (1978/2001). *Life after life: The investigation of a phenomenon—survival of bodily death*. London: Rider.
- Otto, R. (1985). *The idea of the holy* (Trans. J. Harvey). New York: Galaxy Books.
- Plato. (1966). *The Republic* (Trans. H. D. P. Lee). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Smart, C. (1992). *Modern conditions, postmodern controversies*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Stark, R., & Rainbridge, W. (1985). *The future of religion*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stevenson, I. (1974). *Twenty cases suggestive of reincarnation* (2nd ed.). Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Troelsch, R. (1931). *The social teaching of the Christian churches* (Vol. 2, Trans. Olive Wyong). New York: Macmillan.