

## MORALITY AND RELIGION

*Milos V. Arsic*<sup>1</sup>

*Summary:* It is often argued, especially in polemics, that morality makes no sense if it is not grounded in faith. However, the question is whether religious beliefs and customs shape moral behavior? Is religion necessary for morality? The intersection of morals and religion involves the relationship between religious views and morals. It is common for religions to have value frameworks that aim to guide adherents in determining between right and wrong. The aim of this theoretical research is the presentation, ie the analysis of morals and religion. The need to choose the mentioned subject of research is imposed by its importance, insufficient research and the necessity of re-examination in the modern epoch of the crisis of the value system. Defining the similarities and differences between morals and religion, as well as their interpretation, is fundamental for understanding their relationship. Many scientific studies have failed to break down "morality" and "religion" into theoretically grounded elements. It is believed that the categories of "morality" and "religion" must be separated, in order to get a complete picture of complex interaction as a roadmap for future research into the relationship between morality and religion. Essentially, traditional moral values are based on spiritual values. That is why it is necessary to accept the universality of both the moral and the religious in every person, not only historically but also in the context of modernity and anticipated human future.

Keywords: morality, religion, moral norms, religious dogmas

### INTRODUCTION

Morality and religion are current, complex and often controversial topics. The intersection of the two is an issue that has been seriously debated for a long time (Norenzayan, 2014). Whether morality requires religion or not is an ancient question that is still often asked today. Analysing the relationship between morality and religion, most contemporaries and researchers on this

---

<sup>1</sup> arsicmil1991@gmail.com PhD student, University of Kragujevac, Faculty of Law

topic, start from the famous Socrates' question posed in Platon's *Eutyphron*, whether the gods love goodness because it is good or goodness is good because the gods love it (Mandzaridis, 2011). Although he favoured the previous proposal, many others argued that morality is dictated by God and is truly unthinkable without God, the view that religion is a prerequisite for morality is widespread and deeply rooted (McKay & Whitehouse, 2015).

### THEORETICAL APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

For the analysis of the relationship between morality and religion, certain conceptual distinctions are needed. The term morality is more used for those values that one society accepts as universal principles. Morality should be conceptually understood as a set of unwritten social norms according to which people form their reasoning and direct their behaviour in relations with other people. Thus, moral norms are based on generally accepted moral values on the principle of opposition, good - evil, fair - unfair, true - untrue. Morality is a normative human practice (Nenadović, 2007). Religion, like morality, is a universal feature of man and a universal human practice since the appearance of *Homo sapiens*. Religion should be understood conceptually as the re-establishment of a lost connection in a broader sense, or the re-attachment to something that transcends or oversteps the boundary of experience (Nenadović, 2007).

Thorough research into the moral-religious relationship must seek to establish evolving cognitive systems that support the astonishing diversity of cultural concepts, norms, and behaviors that are (perhaps arbitrarily) labelled as "morals" and "religion". Despite the assertive claims of many contemporaries, it is believed that the relationship between morality and religion is not best explained. Among others, the reasons for this may be debates about religion and morality that have been disrupted by a set of interrelated conceptual gaps and confusion. Just as different areas can be described in any magnification, so the relationship between morality and religion can be explored in any granularity (McKay & Whitehouse, 2015; Radovanović, 2022).

Morality - like religion - encompasses a set of largely independent mechanisms that, although often linked by narratives, doctrines, poems, and other culturally distributed networks of ideas, represent the outcomes of quite different psychological processes and functions. Therefore, it is possible to treat "morality" and "religion" as monolithic entities and thus try to characterize their relationship, just as it is possible to study the influence of a certain theological doctrine on a very specific moral outcome.

Likewise, advances in understanding the relationship between morality and religion may require the fractionation of these vague concepts into more basic units (Mandzaridis, 2011). In that sense, it is appropriate to mention Saroglow's model of religious dimensions, whose basic characteristic is the categorization of morality as a key dimension of religion. He believes that religion not only deals with morality as an external correlate, but also includes morality as one of its basic dimensions (Saroglou, 2011). Yet religion, through published monotheistic religious teachings, is often positioned as a propagandist and surveyor of morality (Nenadović, 2007). Determining the identical archetypal source of morality and religion, through the historical-philosophical context of their mutual relationship, namely the intertwining of religious spiritual patterns and morals, as well as the analysis of similarities and differences between them, are the primary goals of the theoretical treatment.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The aim of the research

The goal of this theoretical research is to familiarize with the basic features of morality and religion, that is, the analysis of the relationship in which these two social categories are located.

Research tasks

In accordance with the set goal of the research, the following research tasks were formulated:

- With the first research task, we want to present the origin, development and interpretation of the connection between morality and religion
- With the second research task, we want to present the similarities and differences between morality and religion

The research was conducted using the descriptive method using the content analysis procedure. The methodological principle of the work is based on the principles of the review work. The following databases were searched for the preparation of the paper: Social Sciences Citation Index; Science Citation Index SCI; Religious&Theological Abstracts. Using keywords from the given field, relevant literature from the specified databases was searched.

The goal of our research was to contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between religion and morality, as well as to explain the causal relationships between all components of morality and religion, both in the theoretical sense and in the life of an individual. The results point to the following conclusions:

#### HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL REVIEW OF MORALITY AND RELIGION

Morality, almost certainly, developed at the same time as the appearance of *Homo sapiens*. It arises coinciding with the appearance of a rational, intelligent man enriched with the ability to conclude, judge, and predict as abstract thought categories.

The legality of the origin, development and adoption of morality implies for the individual the acceptance of the moral norm as a specific personal value in his mental totality. Before defining and accepting the moral norm, there had to be other norms in the socio-community, without the attributes of moral norms from the aspect of today's understanding. Certainly, these were the norms of the original community, then the customary (common) norms, religious norms, as the basis for the emergence of morality and the definition of moral norms and moral behavior. Later, a legal norm was created, which specifies sanctions in order for the community to avoid damage from the behavior of an individual contrary to what is prescribed. The development of moral norms must also be viewed historically. The needs of a smart man related to community life have changed dynamically. (Nenadović, 2007)

The development of moral norms certainly took place on the permanent need of man for the highest quality and most humane attitudes and forms of behavior in interpersonal relations. Accepted moral norms aimed to regulate interpersonal relationships, but also to define the essence and even the purpose of human life. The very goal of the moral norm is unique and it would be - to be a good man (Nenadović, 2007).

Whatever the source of morality is, God's commandments, or human reason, it is assumed that any healthy person can make a distinction between right and wrong, regardless of the law. Saying that no one who has spent his life among thieves, without knowing anyone else, can have the notion of virtue, Kant meant nothing but that the human spirit in these things is governed by examples, not doubting that human reason would, having an

example of virtue, know what was right and that the opposite was wrong (Kant, 2019).

Earlier, Socrates said that neither philosophy nor science is necessary for a man to know what he needs to do to be honest and good, as well as that everyone, of course, even the most ordinary man knows what his duty is to do. He believed that morality must be based on human nature and the good of human nature as such. Human nature is immutable and therefore moral and ethical values are immutable. Socrates' merit is that he understood the permanence of these values and strived to determine them by general definitions that could become the norms of human behavior. Therefore, we have the ability to acquire moral qualities, and then we have to perfect them through habit. Everything that is given to us by nature we bring (with us into the world) originally as different possibilities, which we later realize, Aristotel believes.

If man is a creature of God, of course he must be good at the same things that God "loves" and in that sense Thomas Aquinas emphasizes, relying on Socrates' opinion that God commands good because it is good (unlike Duns Scott who holds that good is good because God commands it), (Healy, 2021).

However, even in the most rationalized form, the obligatory character of good for man lies in the commandment of God. It follows that in religion, but not in morality, sin is primarily understood as disobedience. Nowhere in the strictly religious tradition can one find an unequivocal and truly radical answer, as Kant gave to Socrates' interpretation, that actions will not be considered binding because they are commanded by God, but will be respected as divine because man has an inner obligation to them. Only where such emancipation from religious precepts has been achieved, where people are, according to Kant, the judges of revelation themselves, can one speak of a philosophy of morality. Also, Kant, who in his theoretical philosophy tried so hard to leave the door open for religion, even after showing that man could have no knowledge of such things, was just as careful to close any passage that could, in his practical or moral philosophy, lead back to religion (Kant, 2019).

In the written works of Thomas Aquinas, it can be seen that morality was a part and area of philosophy that dealt with human actions to the extent in which he was a citizen. He was both a faithful disciple of Aristotle and a faithful Christian, he constantly had to come to the point where he differed from his teacher, and that distinction is nowhere more conspicuous than where he says that every mistake or sin is violence against the laws that God's mind prescribed by nature (Healy, 2021). Of course, Aristotle also

knew about God, who is imperishable and immortal for him. He also thought that the greatest virtue of man, precisely because he is mortal, consists in living as close as possible to the vicinity of God. However, there are no regulations, no commandments that could then be obeyed or disobeyed. Everything was still based on the "good life", the best life for a man, and sometimes it was left to him to find it and judge about it.

In the late classical period-antique, after the fall of Polis, various philosophical schools, especially Stoics and Epicureans, not only developed a kind of philosophy of morality, they tended, at least in their late Roman version, to transform all philosophy into moral teaching. But the search for a good life has remained the same: how to achieve maximum happiness here on earth. In Aristotle's writings, one cannot find a commandment that is ultimately beyond argument, as it can be found in every religious teaching. Even Thomas Aquinas, the greatest rationalizer of Christianity, admits that the ultimate reason why special precepts are correct and why special commandments must be obeyed lies in their divine origin (Akvinski, 1973).

Morality deals with the individual in her individuality. The criterion of right and wrong, in the final analysis, does not depend on habits and customs or laws, whether of divine or human origin, but on how a person determines himself (Kant, 2016). Just as God is by no means the creator of the fact that a triangle has three angles, so even God, cannot be the creator of moral laws. In this clearly defined sense, the philosophy of morality ceased to exist after antiquity, all the way to Kant.

The great thinkers, Freud, Marx and Nietzsche, brought ideas that were unthinkable until then and dared to present them to humanity in a very direct way. With the disappearance of faith in God, the higher authority that watches over the world and the moral principles that went hand in hand with faith and that have kept society together for more than 2,000 years have disappeared. With his proclamation, Nietzsche liberates the world from God, and divine principles and morals, and from that moment man must fight alone and fight for his own values and new general morals. The loss of faith inevitably leads to a vacuum of meaning in the human mind, but also in the very root of human existence (Niče, 1991).

When we talk about Nietzsche's critique of morality, his critique of Christianity is most often mentioned. An important part of his critical philosophy is certainly focused on the ethical values of Christianity, however, Nietzsche finds the basis of that morality in resentment, in the envy and will of the weak to restrain the strong. For Nietzsche, this is no longer just a historical statement, the problem is that such a morality is still

ruling today. This is what constitutes conventional morality today, and what is generally called morality today. Nietzsche believed that turning to "heaven" and not to life itself, represents a renunciation of the present, earthly life and the direction of his path and morality towards a fictitious life after death. Nietzsche also dealt with this position in *The Twilight of Idols*, where he claimed that the whole field of morality and religion is based on imaginary causes, as well as that Morality and religion completely belong to the psychology of delusion. However, Nietzsche believed that certain moral values, i.e virtues, could affirm life and strength. Such moral values contribute to a person's progress on the path to becoming a higher type of person, i.e. "Superman." (Niče, 1980).

On the other hand, the historical view of religion indicates that religiosity and religious belief must have distinguished our ancient ancestor. *Homo sapiens* is universal and *homo religious*. "Religion is first and foremost a universal human phenomenon," said Carl Gustav Jung (Schaer, 1951). All the sciences that deal with the study of man, uniquely conclude that religious belief is as old as man himself. Religious normative practice in prehistory, as well as today, is a problematic area of cognitive comprehension, so the logical explanation is not worth much due to numerous paradoxical practical evidence. The fact is that religion, through dogma, enables quality psychological functioning for every believer. Traditionally, religiousness is a synthesis of religious consciousness and religious behaviour and association. Every believing person has evidence that his, by all accounts, magical rites have effectiveness in real life reflection. Therefore, it is not possible to talk about the confirmation or denial of religious actions, but the quality must be assessed through the visible self-confidence of a religious person. Belief is often devoid of logic, but the value of belief is rationally confirmed and therefore not meaningless (Dourley, 2004).

Historically, religion has been polytheistic since the first magical and animistic beliefs millennia ago. Polytheistic mythological religious beliefs on all continents were characterized by paying religious reverence to the gods in the Parthenon (temples), and these gods had characterologies full of evil and immorality. The man of that time did not have established moral norms. The deities were therefore intensely anthropomorphized and essentially naturalistic in the depiction, which corresponded to the image and circumstances of the man of that time. Around 1800 BC one of the most prominent figures in the history of religion was born - Patriarch Abraham. His time is considered to mark the beginning of the transition from polytheism to monotheism. He is considered by both Jews and Christians

and Muslims to be their "ancestor" (Holloway, 2017). This is followed by the perfection of the human community and relations in it and the emergence of monotheistic teaching (faith in one single and omnipotent god), above all Judaism, then Christianity and Islam. In the monotheistic religions in question, God has common qualities: supreme command, supreme and beyond human supervision of morals and moral practice, and according to the quality of an individual's behavior, he rewards or punishes him, but also the community and the human race as a whole.

Religious monotheistic teaching is revealed through a prophet or religious leader as God's will and as God's command, and has the power of unquestioning obedience and obedience (Holloway, 2017). God Yahweh is omnipotent and timid and has a hitherto unknown characteristic of a deity because he is the supreme judge and the supreme moral authority. Moses declares that God is omnipresent, omnipotent, and knows and measures what man thinks he is doing, not just what he has done. In this way, he lucidly installs high-level cunningness with his tribesmen with far-reaching influence to this day. Before God, intentional and not only committed crimes have the same weight and are identically inadmissible, punishable and unforgivable. By this representation of the almighty god Yahweh, he "outwitted" all those who are inclined to disobey earthly, human laws. Earthly laws in the human community can be easily circumvented by cunningness, and their jurisdiction can be avoided because the law is not omniscient. The tort must first be established by means of evidence, namely witnesses, to impose a court sentence. It is clear that people can easily testify falsely, and the universal human trait is the unreliability of remembering an event seen or experienced. Moses therefore appoints an ubiquitous and omniscient God who watches over the behavior and thoughts of every human being. The Lord Yahweh cannot be deceived, and his punishment is extremely severe for transgression and is intended for all people of the tribe of Moses. By revealing the God Yahweh Moses established legal and moral regulations of a religious nature (Aslan, 2017).

There were also written laws of legal quality (for example, the Code of Hammurabi, which Moses did not know about). However, Hammurabi had a state unlike the Jews in the time of Moses. Moses acts insightfully because he knows the people of his time well, so he correctly anticipated the modern psychiatric thesis about punishment, guilt and the Super Ego. He was the first to introduce the notion of oath in corroborating evidence and ensuring objective testimony, counting on the fear of the individual from God's terrible punishment, because God also has knowledge about human thoughts, and they must not be deceitful either. Even today, it is common



for a witness to swear in court that he will speak the truth by putting his hand on the Bible (Holloway, 2017).

Just as Moses and Muhammad will set the paradigm of religious and political activity of the Jewish, i.e the Arab / Arab peoples, so on the other hand within Christianity, especially Aurelius Augustine, will distill Christ's gentle teaching from the Sermon on the Mount into a sharp practical theology that will go into the area of politics, history and morals, giving Christian heavenly metaphysics the foundation of concrete "earthly" political institutions. Augustine's ingenious Christian-intoned philosophy of history "lowers" Christ's gentle heavenly doctrine into the mundane contingencies of history, shaping the idea of ecclesiastical not only religious but also its political legitimacy, which will be valid throughout the Middle Ages, until the dawn of the Modern Age (Cvetićanin, 2017). Metaphorically speaking, Augustine, just like Moses and Muhammad, ingeniously solves the question of moral norms, lowering "heavenly legislation" to earth, confirming that the first habitat of morality is, in fact, religion. Stoicism flourished throughout the Roman and Greek worlds until the 3rd century AD, and among its supporters was Emperor Marcus Aurelius. However, Stoicism declined after Christianity became the state religion in the 4th century AD. They claimed that the world is ruled by logos (worldly mind, destiny) and that is why everything is determined. "The primary aspect of Stoicism involves improving the ethical and moral well-being of the individual: 'Virtue consists in a will that is in harmony with nature. Stoicism was promoted as a way of life in harmony with nature, which is not proven by words, but by deeds. The Stoic school was banned in 529 by the ruler Justinian I on the grounds that it originated from paganism and was not in accordance with Christianity (Valdez, 2014).

After the Stoic philosophers, especially the late Stoics represented by Seneca and Marcus Aurelius, whose thoughts will be incorporated into emerging Christian philosophy and worldview, Aurelius Augustine became the next bearer of the idea of a social mechanics modeled on eternal "celestial mechanics" which in Augustine, unlike Seneca and Marcus Aurelius, was conceived in an explicit Christian key (Sharpe, 2014).

Religion in modern society, on the principle of light and shadow, acquires historical and political legitimacy to an entity that is historically fresh, such as the Christian Church as an institutional order in relation to the dilapidated Roman Empire, which was replaced by that church, representing from that moment "the real Rome".

One of the important questions of theology in the middle ages was the question of knowing God. In Thomas Aquinas, it is defined as the

knowledge of the necessary existence of God and is superior to philosophy as knowledge that refers to the final existence of created things. Thus scholasticism set itself the task of explaining but also proving the existence of God. The first in this was Anselm of Canterbury, who presented the so-called ontological proof of God's existence. In the spirit of Plato, and in accordance with his teaching on the realism of universals, Anselm claims that God is perfect and necessarily exists, because it is impossible that something is perfect and that he lacks something and therefore existence, that is, that he lacks the predicate of existence. It follows from this that the idea of God as absolute perfection is necessarily the idea of an existing being, so Anselm concludes that no one can simultaneously have the concept of God and deny his existence (Kenterberijski, 1991).

The most important theologian of Latin scholasticism, Thomas Aquinas, in his collection *Summa Theologiae*, built an almost encyclopedic system of Christian philosophy and theology, using Aristotle's philosophy as a basis. He rejects ontological proof (a priori - before experience, from opinion itself) and instead believes that God can be proved only a posteriori - from experience, because the human power of knowledge is not so perfect that we can learn its essence from the existence of God.

Eastern, Byzantine theology, in addition to the influence it had from Latin scholasticism, in contrast to Western rationalism created a movement called hesychasm (Gr. Hesychia - inner and spiritual peace, silence, which is achieved in ascetic, monk isolation from the world and devotion and prayer), (Podskalski, 2010). It is a mystical practice of prayer that should stand in opposition to the logical and syllogistic method in building theology. Thus, in Byzantium, a conflict flared up between rational theology and the logical path to God on the one hand and mystical hesychasm on the other. The winner in the 14th century was Gregory of Palamas, who was one of the greatest opponents of Aristotle's rationalism in the doctrine of God. The most important representatives of Arab scholasticism were not clerics but mostly doctors, the most famous of whom were Avicenna and Averoes. They not only interpreted the Arabic holy book of the Qur'an, but also dealt extensively with the interpretation and translation of Aristotle's works. Augustine, as one of the Latin Fathers of the Church, was not as meditative as the Eastern Church Fathers Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa or John Chrysostom, but he had an infallible "historical instinct" for what time has come and for what time has passed, fully aware of the dialectic of history, giving it Christian teleology and using it to accelerate Christian teaching, and especially for arguments that will give the Church secular authority. This will complete the work of

Constantine the Great and lay the foundations of the so-called Christian statehood (Djurić, 2015). Modern religious teachings contribute to the humanization of the human community because they are based on highly humanistic principles. Religion as a universal property of man, with the development of civilization, leads to the pursuit of humanistic and democratic relations in the community. Freedom of religion is an absolute right of every individual and is not subject to any restrictions. That is why God, by his grace, left nature and man a certain independence, that is, movement according to the laws of cause and effect. Natural scientific knowledge is in fact only a possibility that only through religious supplementation, that is, by the grace of God, becomes the real truth.

Today, in the age of global neoliberal capitalism, moral norms are threatened by the system and way of life, and religious communities, including churches, in their practice, to a large extent stumble, even become factors in the reproduction of such a reality. It seems that what we call today "transition" essentially existed several thousand years ago, but it was not called that.

#### SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MORALITY AND RELIGION

"There are many religions, but there is only one morality." Faulkner

Religious norms as regulatory norms or commandments are most directly related to moral norms, but they also differ from them. One of the classics of German philosophy, Ludwig Feuerbach, is most significant for his teachings on the essence of religion. He believed that the need for religious illusions basically arose from the feeling of inferiority and fear of man before nature, and especially before such an obvious and inevitable fact as death. The rationalist view recognizes in man the need for illusory self-deception and illusory faith. However, man has a need for religiosity depending on his own psychic personality structure, as Freud acknowledged. According to Kant, the basic function of religion is the ethical function. He does not explain the basis of morality on religion, but proves the need for it if it serves morality. Kant believes that the idea of God is important, because it supports man's faith and hope in the possibility of achieving the highest desired good in life through the synthesis of morality and happiness. The fact is that a person can ascend spiritually if he believes in something eternal, divine and sublime. However, this sublime feeling should not become dogma and fanaticism, because it is the most

difficult form of blindness of the human spirit, human actions and human mind (Barrett, 2007).

There are significant differences but also great similarities between religious / denominational and moral norms. They can be found in the range from semantic to essential similarities and differences. For example, the term holiness is a form and expression for a religious norm. Holiness is a supernatural divine attribute. The divine evokes feelings of admiration and love, but also the fear of divine omnipotence and sublimity. When talking about a moral norm, the term good is used. Sanctions for violating moral norms are, among other things, a matter of conscience. Man takes moral norms as the measure of all things and values (Barrett & Lanman, 2008).

When it comes to the holy commandments, they are obligatory and unconditional according to religious teaching. Absolute obedience to the divine is an essential requirement of faith and every religion. In contrast, moral norms are not unconditional. Man freely chooses and accepts moral norms and harmonizes his behavior according to them.

In the circumstances in which there is a violation of religious norms, a person feels a sense of sin towards God, that is, towards holiness. The knowledge of a transgression about faith or God is a very difficult negative emotional experience, accompanied by a kind of horror before the omnipotence of the saint and possible severe evil supernatural consequences for the offender. When one violates moral norms, one creates a feeling of shame due to the violation of personal dignity. The care of conscience is the most severe sanction for a man who has sinned against morals (Marek & Walulik, 2021).

The application of religious norms is related to a special institution, namely the Church. The church strictly takes care that the believers adhere to religious norms and in case of violations, it undertakes strict earthly sanctions. In this regard, religious norms are much more effective than moral ones. Some communities have or have had a clear tendency, especially medieval and Christian ones, to turn religious norms into moral ones for the sake of easier control of the individual. Today, some Islamist state communities do that. Moral norms are not related to any institution or organization; they are acquired and adopted by growing up and forming a person under social influence (family, schooling, and community), (Barrett, 2007).

By observing and analysing religion, it can be concluded that it provides a complete view of the world, a picture of the world as a whole, because religion seeks to regulate the entire life of people. When a religious person

accepts a given faith, it almost completely affects his morals and the moral essence of his personality. Every religion seeks to impose to all believers a special morality, absolutely obligatory and unconditional – it imposes it as an expression of God's will. Thus, religion is superior to all other principles of its believers and requires unconditional respect and behavior according to those norms (Barrett & Lanman, 2008)(Barrett, & Lanman, 2008). In accordance with that, it can be concluded that the formation of moral norms in a given social community is significantly influenced by religion.

However, the content of religious norms may partly coincide with the content of moral norms. The differences are obvious because each religion has its own norms that in the modern community differ significantly from the norms of other religions, but also from the moral norms of that community. The creation of morals according to the principles of religions has had numerous negative consequences in the history of civilizations.

Religiously based morality is in danger of violating some humanistic principles because there is a supernatural, unreachable and incomprehensible God at the top of its axiological scale (Bloom, 2012).

However, modern religious teachings contribute to the humanization of the human community because they are based on highly humanistic principles, rejecting retaliation against other people because God's commandments impose love with heart and soul for other people and neighbours. Neighbours and people are hostile to an individual or a society. It has been shown throughout history, as is often claimed, especially in polemics, that morality makes no sense if it is not based on faith.

## CONCLUSION

The intersection of morals and religion involves the relationship between religious views and morals. It is common for religions to have value frameworks in terms of personal behavior that aim to guide adherents in determining between right and wrong.

Morality can also be said to represent a system of rules on the basis of which human behavior is determined, directed and evaluated. Essentially, traditional moral values are based on spiritual values. But like any theoretical question, the question of the relationship between morality and religion has its historical and problematic dimension. That is why it is necessary to accept the universality of both the moral and the religious in every human being, not only historically but also in the context of modernity and the anticipated human future. In the scientific sphere,

progress is often hampered by a series of prevailing conceptual limitations and gaps.

Research on morality and religion is advancing rapidly. Advances in understanding the relationship between religion and morality may require a comprehensive explanation of the causal relationship between all components of morality and religion and give it a constructive meaning.

Perhaps some future research on this topic, using the existing facts, will be able to set higher standards in the conceptual precision of determining the relationship between morality and religion, both in the theoretical sense and in the life of an individual, which is certainly a feature of a serious approach to each, and primarily in this area science.

## REFERENCES

- Akvinski, T. (1973). *O biću i suštini*. Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod.
- Aslan, R. (2017). *God: A Human History*. Random House.
- Barrett, J. L. (2007). Cognitive Science of Religion: What Is It and Why Is It? *Religion Compass*, 1(6), 768–786. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8171.2007.00042.x>
- Barrett, J. L., & Lanman, J. A. (2008). The science of religious beliefs. *Religion*, 38(2), 109–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.religion.2008.01.007>
- Bloom, P. (2012). Religion, Morality, Evolution. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63(1), 179–199. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100334>
- Cvetičanin, N. (2017). Religija i politika na istom izvoristu; arhetipski državnici i propovednici staroga doba kao spoj religije i (političke) veštine državnštva. In M. Blagojević (Ed.), *Religija u savremenom društvu* (pp. 33–44). Institut društvenih nauka. [http://iriss.idn.org.rs/134/1/NCveticanin\\_Religija\\_u\\_savremenom\\_drustvu.pdf](http://iriss.idn.org.rs/134/1/NCveticanin_Religija_u_savremenom_drustvu.pdf)
- Djurić, D. (2015). *Večnost sveta u antici i ranom srednjem veku*. Srpsko filozofsko društvo.
- Dourley, J. P. (2004). Jung, mysticism and the double quaternity: Jung and the psychic origin of religious and mystical experience. *Harvest: International Journal for Jungian Studies*, 50(1), 47–74.
- Healy, N. M. (2021). *Thomas Aquinas: Theologian of the Christian Life* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315264806>
- Holloway, R. (2017). *A little History of religion*. Yale University Press.
- Kant, I. (2016). *Zasnivanje metafizike morala*. Dereta.

- Kant, I. (2019). *Kritika praktičkog uma*. Dosije studio.
- Kenterberijski, A. (1991). *Proslogion*. Moderna.
- Mandzaridis, G. (2011). *Hrišćanska etika*. Kalenić.
- Marek, Z., & Walulik, A. (2021). What Morality and Religion have in Common with Health? Pedagogy of Religion in the Formation of Moral Competence. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 60(5), 3130–3142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-021-01279-6>
- McKay, R., & Whitehouse, H. (2015). Religion and morality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(2), 447–473. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038455>
- Nenadović, M. M. (2007). *Medicinska etika* (Vol. 2). Medicinski fakultet.
- Niče, F. (1980). *S one strane dobra i zla: Uvod u jednu filozofiju budućnosti*. Grafos.
- Niče, F. (1991). *Volja za moć*. Dereta.
- Norenzayan, A. (2014). Does religion make people moral? *Behaviour*, 151(2–3), 365–384. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1568539X-00003139>
- Podskalski, G. (2010). *Teologija i filozofija u Vizantiji: Spor oko teološke metodike u duhovnoj istoriji pozne Vizantije (XIV/XV), njegove sistematske osnove i istorijski razvoj*. Pravoslavni bogoslovski fakultet.
- Radovanović, S. Ž. (2022). Hajdeger—Formiranje moderne estetike i umetnost kao pojava kulture. *Sinteze - Časopis Za Pedagoške Nauke , Književnost i Kulturu*, 22, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5937/sinteze11-41959>
- Saroglou, V. (2011). Believing, Bonding, Behaving, and Belonging: The Big Four Religious Dimensions and Cultural Variation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42(8), 1320–1340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111412267>
- Schaer, H. (1951). *Religion and the cure of souls in Jung's psychology*. Routledge.
- Sharpe, M. (2014). Stoic virtue ethics. In *The Handbook of Virtue Ethics* (pp. 28–41). Routledge.
- Valdez, J. (2014). Stoic Philosophy: Its Origins and Influence. *Journal of Social Philosophy Research*, 2(4), 56–68. <https://doi.org/10.12966/jspr.11.01.2014>

*Miloš V. Arsić<sup>1</sup>*

*Sažetak:* Neretko se, posebno u polemikama, tvrdi da moral nema smisla ako nije utemeljen na veri. Međutim, postavlja se pitanje da li verska uverenja i običaji oblikuju moralno ponašanje? Da li je religija neophodna za moral? Ukrštanje morala i religije uključuje odnos između verskih pogleda i morala. Uobičajeno je da religije imaju vrednosne okvire koji imaju za cilj da usmeravaju pristalice u određivanju između ispravnog i pogrešnog. Cilj ove predmetne teorijske obrade, je upoznavanje sa osnovnim obeležjima morala i religije, odnosno analiza odnosa u kojem se ove dve društvene kategorije nalaze. predstavljanje, odnosno analiza morala i religije. Potrebu za izborom navedenog predmeta obrade nameću njegov značaj, nedovoljna istraženost i neophodnost preispitivanja u savremenoj epohi krize sistema vrednosti. Definisanje sličnosti i razlika između morala i religije, kao i njihovo tumačenje, od suštinskog je značaja za razumevanje njihovog odnosa. Mnoge naučne studije nisu uspele da razlože „moral“ i „religiju“ na teorijski utemeljene elemente. Smatra se da kategorije „moral“ i „religija“ moraju biti razdvojene, kako bi se dobila kompletna slika složene interakcije kao mapa puta za buduća istraživanja odnosa morala i religije. U suštini tradicionalne moralne vrednosti su zasnovane na duhovnim vrednostima. Zato je neophodno prihvatiti univerzalnost i moralnog i religioznog u svakom čoveku, ne samo istorijski već i u kontekstu savremenosti i anticipirane ljudske budućnosti.

*Cljučne reči:* moral, religija, moralne norme, religijske dogme

Primljen: 13.03.2024.

Prihvaćen: 25.04.2024.



---

<sup>1</sup> [arsicmil1991@gmail.com](mailto:arsicmil1991@gmail.com) doktorand, Univerzitet u Kragujevcu, Pravni fakultet