

Conference  
Colloque

# Salvation in religions a comparative approach

Le Salut dans les religions  
une approche comparée

*Abstracts*  
Résumés

Université  
de Strasbourg

Sciences  
des Religions et Théologies  
à Strasbourg  
GIS



■ **Alī ASGARI YAZDI (Téhéran)**

**Comparative study on the doctrine of salvation in Islam and Christianity**

The reason and origin of human tendency to religion is their innate and inherent need to salvation. The issue of salvation is one of the most important concerns of the Abrahamic religion, Islam and Christianity. The issue of salvation from the view of Islam is the salvation of all the spiritual and physical suffering of the post-death world. Its agents are "faith", "good deed", "repentance" and "intercession" and its barriers are "sin", "disbelief", "shirk" and "hypocrisy". From the point of view of Islam, although God is salvific and Savior, but The human being accepts divine salvation through his deeds.

But in Christianity, salvation means liberation from the original sin and its consequences through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Belief in the salvation that Jesus Christ brought to mankind is the foundation of Christianity. Hence, human beings are captives of sin and death, and they are not capable of salvation or cannot save themselves. But God, with his direct presence in the body of Jesus, and with his sacrifice, pays the price of sin for mankind and saves him from captivity. In this paper, we review the most important issues of the doctrine of salvation - based on the Holy Qur'an and the Bible.

■ **Ahad Faramarz GHARAMALEKI (Téhéran)**

**The Place of Freedom in the Salvation of Religions: an Islamic Concept of Salvation**

Today, liberal political philosophers and their proponents consider the emphasis on freedom in policy and interpretation of justice as not entering into religious disputes and traditional moral challenges. In this approach, the religious concept of salvation is considered as the altar of individual liberty. Salvation is bound by the obligation of solidarity and is based on the priority of the good over justice. These two are incompatible with the liberal interpretation of freedom, and the analysis of this incompatibility is the problem of this research. We first need to analyze the concept of salvation. Although all religions emphasize salvation, which is at least considered to be a family similarity between religions, it cannot be said that the followers of all religions have the same meaning of salvation. It is always said that in religion, salvation is the saving of the soul from sin and its consequences. But a general conceptualization of that is also possible: the redemption from a horrible, disastrous and painful situation into a very promising state. In the Islamic concept, the transition from the error and the seduction to the prosperity/salvation has been mentioned. There are five important elements in the conception of salvation: (a) an individual or group [God, Prophet or Religious Organizations] leads, (b) an individual, group, or all human beings (c) with a project (d) from an unfavorable status to (e) a favorable situation. In Islam, the status quo and the desirable status include all aspects of human life, and the transition is the concept is of degrees, in a way that the transition from bad to good and the transition from good to excellent can also be considered as a salvation concept. In the Islamic sense of salvation, the audience of religion (humans) does not have only the duty of acceptance of the salvation, rather they are also obligated to participate actively in the salvation of themselves and others. What kind of obligation is that i.e. the duty of participating actively in the salvation of myself

and others? Is it the Kantian natural and universal duty that does not need consent or a particular obligation based on consent? This problem cannot be answered without easing another problem: is the goal of salvation to bring justice? In other words, which of the good and justice is prior in the religious project of salvation? Although the salvation of religions is a teleological concept, we cannot consider the religious concept of salvation as the Aristotelian teleological concept of the perfection of soul i.e. the progression from potentiality to actuality. But upon on the Islamic principles, salvation is the liberation from inner and outer evil and the going towards bliss and good. Accordingly, the good is prior over the right, and this seems to be incompatible with a liberal interpretation of freedom. This problem could be raised in another way: does the salvation of religions eliminate the human in the Absolute Good temple? Is the salvation of religions incompatible with human essence, which is constituted of freedom and other human rights?

Salvation in the Islamic sense is based on covenant. Islam regards its salvation only as an invitation to the human himself, and when a wise man accepts that, it would be a consensus rather than a coercion. A person born in a Muslim family is required in two ways to salvation and make solvation. This person has the right to examine the Islamic invitation to salvation, and the decision based on the investigation is respected. So the requirement is based on an agreement. It may be asked: what kind of right is it, while it is conditioned to the rational investigation? We will answer this question in the second part of the requirement in this case. It may be said: the person born in the Muslim family, and therefore the Muslim community, is a storytelling being as McIntyre's concept of narrative person. On this basis, there is a third type of requirement that is not a natural and general obligation in the Kantian sense, nor an explicit or implied agreement in the liberal sense of the word, but an obligation of solidarity. This answer is not correct, since it reduces the concept of salvation in Islam to a specific duty, while in Islam, this is a general duty of human as a human. The obligation of salvation and making salvation is based on the natural right: the adherence of what release human from destruction and annihilation. If we ask Kant: why it should be a natural and natural duty? He will say because we are human beings as rational beings. The salvation of religions in the general sense, which is liberation from what humanity is consisted of, is justified by the universal and natural obligation, even in the Kantian sense. If we consider good as what the humanity of human is based on that, the challenge of the priority of the good over the right would also be solved. Of course, this solution brings a greater challenge: what is human and what does humanity mean? Whatever the answer, it could not be a physicalistic interpretation of human. The contemporary philosophical tradition has put forth a kind of exclusive Middle between physicalism and dualism and idealism. This delusive stalemate paves the way for reductionism in anthropology.

■ **Yves LEHMANN (Strasbourg)**

**Eschatology and soteriology in Virgil's Aeneid.**

*La descente d'Enée aux Enfers - véritable centre de gravité de l'Énéide, et qui reprend le motif homérique de la Nékyia - acquiert une profondeur et surtout une signification cosmique totalement étrangères à la scène de nécromancie qui clôt, au chant XI de l'Odyssée, l'épisode de Circé. Le parallélisme ainsi établi avec la tradition homérique offre l'occasion à Virgile de se référer à des conceptions philosophiques et religieuses que Varron venait de répandre dans les milieux intellectuels de Rome, et que l'auteur du "Songe de Scipion", Cicéron, n'avait pas ignorées : une théorie générale de la*