DIVINE OMNIPRESENCE AND INCORPOREALITY OF GOD

Ali YILDIRIM

Asst. Prof., Department of Islamic Studies, Faculty of Divinity

Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University

E-mail: ali.yildirim26@gop.edu.tr
Orcid Id: 0000-0003-1687-993X

Tanrı'nın Her Yerde Bulunması ve İlahi Cisimsizlik

ÖZ

İslam ve Hristiyan İlahiyat sahasında aşkın bir varlık olarak Tanrı'nın her yerde bulunmasının nasıl anlaşılması gerektiğine yönelik tartışmalar mevcuttur. Yaygın görüşe göre ilahi her yerde bulunma, Tanrı'nın dünyevi mahiyette bir bedene sahip olmaktan çok, O'nun bilgisi, gücü ve yaratmasıyla kısaca istidlali olarak her yerde bulunduğuna işaret eder. Yine ilahi cisimsizlik de O'nun diğer var olanlardan temel ontolojik farklılığına atfen anlaşılmalıdır. Bu çalışmada aynı zamanda bahse konu görüşler üzerinden Tanrı'yı cisimsel bir var oluştan tenzih eden aşkın mahiyeti ibadete layık olmak bakımından tutarlılığı ile bir arada değerlendirmeye tabi tutulmaktadır. Zira inanan için ibadete layık bir Tanrı'nın her yerde bulunması, O'nun yaratılmış maddi nesnelerdeki anlamıyla cisimsel olmamasını da gerektirir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Tanrı, Aşkınlık, Her Yerde Bulunma, Cisimsizlik, İbadete Layık.

Divine Omnipresence and Incorporeality of God

ABSTRACT

In the field of Islamic and Christian theology, there are debates on how to understand the omnipresence of God as a transcendent being. According to the common view, divine omnipresence indicates that God is omnipresent by His knowledge, power, and creation, rather than having a worldly body. Again, divine incorporeality must be understood in reference to His fundamental ontological difference from other beings. In this study, at the same time, the transcendent nature, which distinguishes God from a bodily existence, is evaluated together with its consistency in terms of being worthy of worship. For the believer, the omnipresence of a God worthy of worship also requires that he be incorporeal in the sense of created material objects.

Keywords: God, Transcendence, Omnipresence, Incorporeality, Worthy of Worship.

Introduction

People, try to understand and make it sense the presence in their environment. Similarly, the meaning of the actions which his attributes are the product of his experiences. He naturally defines what is like to see a thing or to hear a voice and how is it feels like from his experience. On the other hand the possibility of the positive science put forward to explain in a systematic way to understand people's experience. Therefore, Science continues ıts way to refer for almost all our definitions of life. The result which was put forward by the science, on the one hand, ıt gathers human experiences under common understandings and concepts, on the other hand, ıt imprisons the experience to reasonable limits of the science. However, science is not the only source for human being and for the people who believe the existence of god and his profits and his revelation is a vital importance. Furthermore, for some worshippers the revelation is the only source of information. Besides, in his concepts of revelation for the concept of beyond human experience in his revelation, ıt does not reveal a situation the necessity of denial of his knowledge. Then, when we analyze the concept which the god reveal about himself, he has a quality to reminiscent like human experiences, as a being at work all time (ar-Rahman 55/29) to fill the heavens and the earth itself (Jeremiah 23:24), to know, to see or to hear, but is not experience as a corporeal being, in that case, how could the god can be understood? The multiplicity of the expression like this in scriptures, brings the relationship of many attributes related to the subject. Although, scriptures make human experience with evocative concept reached, in the end, qualifications belong to marvelous and superior being which has signed to love. In addition to this, similar qualification which is being used for different kind of beings could be possible to carry different meanings. On a large scale, to communicate with the same concept that has taken from the scripture accordingly, for the understanding of the god's itself probably make it easier for the pople who wants to make a communication with the god. It seems that, human being communicate with the god through the concept that is familiar in the first stage. For instance, personal experiences of the meaning which means to see and hear to know and to will provides the first step for the information to understand the god.

The religious writings inform dozens of qualification about the god however, for the people who want to know the qualification belong to him causes some hardship. As a discussion subject of religious philosophy, the understanding the attribution of god, requires conceptual analysis his qualities and on this subject wide range of study has come to order the day. To determine of the edge of this study, in this essay, ıt will be focused on how should be understood the god who is defined as a disembodied and spiritual being which is in everywhere as an approach of common classical theism, and will be evaluated how the this subject effect human's relations with a god who is worthy for worship.

The thinkers who started off the idea of perfect being, beside the other features, are trying to understand the existence of god, uniqueness, to know everything, the eternity, his omnipotence and his simplicity. All the philosophers and the theologians didn't agree that all (or any of that) of these traits can simply deduced from the perfection. Actually, there has been some conflict about facility of these features. Some of the individual perfection, at the first glance, It seems consistent however,

when to be dealt with other qualification, It draws an attention some problems that can be barely understood. A more fundamental problem, although the idea of perfect being coincide, the fact that some perfection that doesn't know by the people always threatens inferences about the nature of god. (Webb, 2010:227). However; also this approach includes a peculiar problem. Then, to understand of the god's qualification is impossible. Therefore, it brings vicious circle with it which can render the attempts to know meaningless.

In the Farabi's reason concept pays some attention to be understood of the god's qualification. According to him, he is the cause of the creation. His creation is to ensure the continuity of the existence of something whose existence is not himself (Fârâbi, 2017:119). Such divine qualities that precede the existence of everything that exists about God, is made it necessary to explain some points in the relationship between the universe and the god. According to him, the existence of things is from him and he has no intention of things. However, existence did not emerge from Him in a natural way without His knowledge and consent. Since He knows the himself and He is the principle of the order of goodness in this ideal being, things emerged from Him. Now then, this information which belongs to him is a reason to exist known things. His knowledge of things are not a knowledge to depend time. (Fârâbi, 2017:119). Farabi's first reason concept is one that includes all objects and concepts Thus, the divine will, which is the cause of everything, is also the first principle to which the judgment is attributed to everything. As the source of all judgment, the ruling of the first principle is valid which emanates from the divine will. The substantiality and success of this argument is related to God's attributes as well as being the first cause. At this point, a misconception is almost revealed which people fall into. The conceptual expression of seeing, hearing or being anywhere as an innate ability for human beings gain meaning. It is naturally defined within its own limitations. However, when the concepts in question are used with reference to God as a supreme being, there can be characteristics that exceed human experience and whose boundaries cannot even be predicted. The first cause imagination of Al-Farabi, pays an attention to the fact that definitions that are the product of human experience ultimately remain only within the conceptual framework of God's knowledge. As it is known, the description is expressed with the term of boundary and according to this it is possible to define something by drawing its boundaries and that can only be possible if it is bigger than the thing in all aspects which determines their limits like knowledge, power of subject. Briefly, while human knowledge makes a description, ıt can provide an accurate definition to the extent that it covers the nature of the thing to be defined.

In this circumstances, ıt seems hard for man as a created being to emerge with a description about his creator. Therefore, people instead of making a definition about god, try to recognize and characterize the god with the adjectives that correspond to their own experiences and the clues that god gives about himself in the holy texts. The God gives some knowledge about himself and his essence for his servant and this knowledge includes some situations which it seems to cause some arguments. As an example; the perfection of the God creates difficulties about understanding some of this other characteristic. The God's presence as a marvelous and unsubstantial being, philosophers and theologians have presented some opinions on how it should be understood that it occupies a single place or is ubiquitous at the same time. Another point that makes ubiquity a controversial issue has to do with the nature of human knowledge. The essence of real knowledge for people is mainly determined in proportion to its conformity with tangible, material qualities and its own limits. The existence of a thing is revealed by seeing it with the eyes of the World like a person standing in front of us, hearing its voice or touching it. In fact, this situation expresses a limited persuasion of man's

continuously recurring experiences of existence. Exactly like a person who has to admit the existence of objects outside the lower or upper brink of vision or hearing, People may not have an idea about the essence of a being whose qualifications cannot grasp as a perfect being. This delusion drags people to second delusion. The idea of only being in one place, which emerges with a concrete definition of being in a place, it makes it difficult to imagine that God is in many places or everywhere. Correlatively, the person who experiences the difficulty of being busy with many things at certain time. The person finds it difficult to conceive the God taking care of the affairs of all creatures at once. Therefore, the restrictive effect of Daily human experiences on the concepts which we use can bring some fallacies in the analysis of God's qualities as a divine and perfect being. After all, especially in Christian and Islamic thought, Different theories have been put forward in understanding ubiquity, and opinions have been put forward on how this adjective can be interpreted.

1. Omnipresence

In Islamic thought, this issue has been dealt with mainly in the context of God's attributes. In Islam, it is stated that it is necessary to believe one of His essential attributes, and that He is unlike any other existence in the existence of Allah. Because primarily, the first step of becoming faithful like other monotheistic religion is acceptance of the God's existence. The first step of understanding his existence is to accept that he doesn't look like any other created beings and to absolve him from characteristic possessed by all other created beings. There is a wide literature about explanation of God's attributes in Islam. We encounter with the term of' 'equalization'' in terms of expressing the presence of God in a certain place which is considered as one of the characteristic dealing with the relationship of God's essence with the world in Islamic sources. In the dictionary this terms, means to settle down, to verge, to ascend, to dominate, to sit on the throne. (Yavuz, 2001:402). Yavuz collected the views on "equalization" in Islamic thought under several titles, one of them was defined as Allah's absolute dominance over the universe. In here, equalization is considered as a concept that expresses divine power, will and sovereignty. (Yavuz, 2001:403). Especially, this approach was defended by many Islamic scholars, particularly, Mutezili, Maturidi, Ashariyya and Shia theologians. At this point, the opinions of Muhyiddin İbn'ül-Arabî (1165-1240) are importantwho gave more detailed information.

Muhyiddin İbn'ül-Arabî considers equalization with divine names in connection and defends that Allah's ascencion is related with the name of "merciful". According to him, "The fact that Allah did not characterize the name of merciful with anything, and that He did not make the ninth heaven associated with any of the attributes (Ibnu'l-Arabi, 2006:128) shows the extent of the ninth heaven in the realm, which means the scope of mercy. In another evaluation, Arabi, who uses the expression "all of the creatures except Allah" (Ibnu'l-Arabi, 2006:243) for the ninth heaven, wants to explain that equalization encompasses all creatures.

Moreover, Arabi, who says that all beings are His property (Ibnu'l-Arabi 2006:243), defines beings as ninth heaven and expresses the principle of unity in abundance and abundance in unity in a different perspective. (Akkaya, 2015:389). Again, in another place, Muhyiddin İbn'ül-Arabî says that the ninth heaven equivalence to the human body in the comparison of man and the world. (Ibnü'l-Arabi, 2006:120)".

In a study (Türkben, 2018a: 1330) in which the adjectives he attributed to God, based on Ebheri's book Hidayetü'l Hikme, were discussed, a similar discussion was mentioned on the issue of the necessity of existence and determination being the same as essence. Accordingly, God's existence of

an external reality is either in terms of being a necessary being or due to a reality outside himself. When the first option is valid, the obligatory entity must be none other than the determinant. If the necessary being is not determined because of itself, but because of someone else, it means that it has a cause and owes its existence to someone else. This contradicts the notion of necessary existence. Because, if the presence in the external world, that is, determination, is accepted as something added to the necessary existence, this will bring up an existence-nature debate about God.

In Christian thought, the discussions on comprehension omnipresence mostly took place around the views of the Christian saints Augustine, Anselmus and Thomas Aquinas. Saint Aurelius Augustine (354-430) presents a principle in the Letters, which suggests that the divine being can be understood by analogy with the existence of the soul. According to him, no object can be completely everywhere, because it absolutely consists of innumerable parts where it is; however no matter how big or small it ultimately takes up a certain amount of space, this is an attribute of tangible assets. The nature of the soul is very different, and this very different nature is the nature of God, the creator of body and soul. Augustine draws attention to two more points: First, God "knows how to be everywhere without being limited to any one place." (Augustine, 1953: L.137). Unlike material objects that are parts of the space it occupies, it is found with true completeness wherever it is. As a Second, God is not in any of the places (in the sense of being surrounded) or limited by the boundaries of those places. Therefore, for Augustine it is clear that God's presence anywhere is not in the way material objects are. Augustine states that God's light, power, and erudition reach everywhere (Augustine, 1953: L.187/7) And God is not in earthly entity but the god says that penetrates everything. It says, The God effectuates the creative essence of everything in the world."

At the same time, Edward R. Wierenga (b.1947) widens on these views and states that God has not dispersed to space, so half of God's need not be in one half of the world and the other half in the other. So totally The God is in alone heaven also totally in the earth and exists totally simultaneously in heaven and on earth; it is nowhere closed, it is totally itself everywhere (Wierenga, 2005).

Saint Anselmus (1033-1109) in chapter 20 of the Monologue, It handles the subject with the two forms of existence of being in a place literally, namely being in a place and being present in a place. According to him, if, in the first way, it surrounds X, contains and limits the scope of X, then X has a situation. Ordinary physical objects are encircled by their regions in space. At the same time, God as a supreme being cannot be found anywhere, for she does not accept any space subject to time and space. Anselmus, on the other hand, states that God is present everywhere and in time with complete simultaneity. However, it does not do explanation in more detail about this second opinion.

We can say that it was Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) who dilated the explanation by adding some details to this point. He speaks of God existent in space in a different way than normal objects exist. However, Thomas Aquinas emphasizes that more God's presence can be understood in relation to God's power, knowledge, and existence. Thomas Aquinas says: "The God is in all things by God's power, for all things are subject to God's power: The God is in everything with God's presence in everything, because everything depends on God's and is before God's eyes: The God is fundamentally in everything because God exists as the cause of their existence" explains it by saying. (Aquinas, 1945:I.1.8) Thomas Aquinas, compares the spatial quantitative bond of a physical object to the place in which it is located and the power relation of an massless being to the place of its occupancy. According to him, the entity of an massless thing can be associated with its power in something else, just as the entity of a corporeal thing can be associated with its spatial dimensions with respect to

something else. In this case, if there is no body that an infinite spatial quantity can have, it must be everywhere. Therefore, if there is an massless being with infinite power, it must be everywhere (Aquinas, 1975:III.68.3) it reaches to result. According to Thomas Aquinas, if God is intrinsically present in things, "He exists as the cause of their existence," by virtue of an effect of his power. That is, The God exists as the creator and life-giver. This way of designing God's existence with reference to His knowledge and power, it assumes that the jurisdiction "is present" attributable to God is similar to the attribution of physical objects, the expression is neither univocal nor synonymous. Furthermore, the meaning of "existence", or better of "being somewhere," is that when attributed to God it can be explained by reference to any perception of God's. For example, like knowing the existence of a physical object in any place by ordinary perception, God's presence in any place can be known with a special perception, after all, God can control things; He knows what is going on with them and is the reason for their existence (Wierenga, 2010:259). Thomas Aquinas speaks of "being open to God's eyes" (Aquinas, 1945:I.1.8). Although it is claimed here that God sees or perceives what is there in order to have knowledge about things, in fact, Thomas Aquinas does not believe that God acquired his knowledge in this way. Because according to him, God does not acquire knowledge about the world by causative means. Rather, "Because His existence includes the similarity of things other than Himself, He sees things in himself, not in them." (Aquinas, 1945:I.14.5).

As it is understood, it is a a matter of debate in both Islamic and Christian thought, it is about whether God's presence or presence in a place is to be evaluated in a real sense (fundamental location) or inferential / relational (derivative location). According to this, the actual positioning of the being in a place means its positioning according to itself, that is, the positioning of the being according to its relations with the space. Here, the qualities about the location of the entity come to the fore and these qualities cause the being located there to be given its own qualities. On the other hand, in inferential finding, the positional facts of other existences with which the existence is related, It is the understanding of the existence in question through various effects and relations that it carries with other existence. (Inman, 2017:169) Therefore, being in a real sense means that the being is in a place with its own existence; inferential presence, on the other hand, refers to the existence of the being in a place through some relations. In the West, actual presence (occupation view) and potential presence also interpreted as (dependence view) (Zawadi 2019) In these two approaches, the view that God is truly omnipresent is tried to be explained by Hud Hudson (b.1964) in four different ways. Hudson takes advantage of contemporary disputes on the metaphysics of material objects and their relationship to space-time and identifies several possible "existence" relationships about God (Hudson 2009:209): every part of Him being in one place (pertention); His existence in every object or his integration with them (intention); His all-encompassing (spanning) and His omnipresence or multiple-location.

The view that the pieces in the first option spread to the whole universe. He argues that God spreads out into space like an object, with different parts occupying different sub-regions. The subsuming and multiplicity in options 3 and 4 do not acknowledge that God exists as a single entity in all regions. At this point, only the integration model in option 2 asserts that God is fully present in all regions without compromising his indivisibility (Zawadi, 2019:1). Thus Hudson refuses the analogical way of understanding God's omnipresence, but the reason is that he thinks there is a true way that God is omnipresent. In fact, according to Hudson, anything that occupies any place in space is a material thing. Therefore, Hudson is close to accepting that God is omnipresent as a material object, as a result

of this thought of omnipresence. In a similar way, there are those who advocate true existence approaches.

For instance, when Henry More (1614-1687) tried to explain omnipresence with the identicalness of God and space, pointed out that ubiquity is a necessary consequence (More, 1995). Isac Newton (1643-1727), on the other hand, did not go so far as to describe space as identical with God however he was of the view that the existence of space is inextricably linked to the existence of a God who must exist forever and ever. So much so that this God exists regardless of time and space. It exists forever and everywhere. As the creator and master of all things, the God can never be in a particular place, as God is always present in every part of space. The necessity of its existence necessitates its absolute ubiquitous (Newton, 1934:545). Despite Newton's explanation, although it is not possible to find many supporters of this model in contemporary analytical philosophical theology, for those who truly advocate omnipresence, this characteristic is a separate, non-inferential characteristic of God and thus cannot be reduced to omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, or any of His other characteristic (Inman, 2017: 172).

The associational or potential approach refers to the inferential acceptance of ubiquity and according to this model, God manifests his presence in all regions by his power and knowledge that interacts in some way with all other regions. His presence here is not as an unchanging being of one's essence, it must be understood as an entity that includes factors such as acting on things in certain regions and being noticed by things.

This reductionist approach sees omnipresence not as a matchless quality in itself, but as a power, a quality that is the interaction of omniscience and omnipotence. Once more, this approach considers omnipresence not solely as an feature expressing God's relationship to places, at the same time emphasises the importance of seeing the ability to relate to and personally deal with all people in these places as an affirming qualification (Zawadi, 2019:2; Inman, 2017:170).

Charles Hartshorne (1897-2000) states that "God's relation to the world must, if at all possible, certainly be thought of analogically, with relations determined by human experience." According to him, instead of comparison omnipresence to where ordinary objects are in space, he must try to understand by assuming that God's connection to the world is similar to the human mind's connection to his form. Hartshorne thinks that people can know some things directly by intuition and others by inference only. According to him, intuition is infallible: it involves knowledge of one's own thoughts and feelings, as well as the alterations taking place in one's own body. Because this kind of literal is the highest form of knowledge, it is the kind of knowledge that God has. Moreover, in this case, as far as God is concerned, The God has immediate knowledge of the entire cosmos. Hartshorne makes similar claims about power. According to him, human beings have only direct or potential power over their own will and movements of their own body. However since potential power is the highest form of power, it is the type of power fit for God. Accordingly, God has potential power over every part of the universe. Therefore, God is omnipresent as God has instant knowledge and strength throughout the entire universe. However, Hartshorne makes one more surprising addition. It is, by definition, by stating that a mind that knows and controls momentarily is the form of any part of the world, it concludes that the world is the form of God (Hartshorne, 1941).

Richard Swinburne (b.1934), first of all, it turns to the concept of "basic action". For example, raising someone's arm is often an act of its own, whereas raising the same arm with the arm of another is not "an action in itself". According to Swinburne, God can directly move any part of the universe or

anything in the universe. As a matter of fact The God can have knowledge of any part of the world without making any inferences. In this way, Swinburne that the omnipresence of doctrine. He draws conclusion that God controls everything directly, without intermediaries, and can know without any information coming to his through any causal chain (Swinburne, 1977: 104-7). At this juncture, however, it should be noted that Taliaferro objects to Hartshorne and Swinburne's statements of God's action by stating that "the world will not function as God's form in the same way that physical forms function like ours" (Taliaferro, 1994:277). The subject of being everywhere, There is another objection to the views of Hartshorne and Swinburne, who conclude that the world is the form of God. According to Wainwright, by this inference, it is understood that God knows what happens in only occupied regions of space and can directly control events there. So if there's just something physical there, that thing then becomes part of God's form and God has epistemic access to that area. However, in case if there isn't any physical object there, it is unimaginable for God to exist there, as there will be no place for God to control. This situation causes to an incoherent result with ubiquity When as, the existence of the object should not be expected to contribute to God's qualifications (Wainwright, 1987).

Wainwright puts forth his view of God's omnipresence on the fundamental of Thomas Aquinas' inferential approach and defends that God is thus omnipresent in the world, just as our souls are present in our bodies (Wainwright, 2010:53).Whereas, according to him, it is difficult to say that we are as a human being, aware of everything that goes on in our bodies. Everything that happens out there beyond our control, except that we can only perform certain movements, is still a mystery to us (Wainwright, 2010:54).He also says that God has different intensities in different souls, implies that it is determined by people's relationships with God.

This last analysis of Wainwright seems to overlap with the verses in the Qur'an, which are frequently encountered in Islamic mysticism, and which provide important clues about how the presence of God anywhere should be understood. Verses in the Qur'an that The God states that He is very close to His servants (el-Bakara 2/186; Sebe' 34/50; Kâf 50/16; Vâkıa 56/85) and also there are verses (el-Mutaffifîn 83/21, 28) that talk about his servants who are close to The God. It is also stated in different verses that these people are those who pray (Hud 11/61) and spend in the way of God (at-Tawbah 9/99). While the names of angels and some prophets are adverted (Âl-i Imran 3/45; en-Nisâ 4/172; Sâd 38/25, 40), it is adverted that they are close to God. Lastly, it is seen that comfort, good sustenance and paradise are promised to those who are close to God among those who pass away (Vâkıa 56/88, 89).

There is a significant issue revealed by these verses. God, who created human, has not leave him alone, he is closer to him than his jugular vein (Kâf 50/16) however at the same time, it is understood that the situation of God's presence anywhere is also related to the actions of his servants and the willpower of God. The God responds to His servants who goes towards to him. The God is always with them, in their soul or in them.

Or The God stands with them, maybe he backs up to them. On the other hand, God may be distant to those who do not establish good relations with him in terms of faith. Even, a different level of relationship in a negative sense occurs with those who deny to God or associate partners with them. In this respect, it is possible to identify a new aspect of the discussions about the existence of God.

From past to nowadays, particularly to until monotheistic religions, Believers have always located God somewhere or through some entities. Objects revealed by pagan communities, the belief in the

Sky God that existed in the Ancient Turks, Mount Olympus, believed to be the place where the gods lived in ancient Greece, Again, the old Kaaba structure, where the pagan Arabs placed their idols, is an indicator of all this positioning approach and need. However, the eternal and perpetual together with the monotheistic religions, whose existence is different from everything else in creation, faith in the existence of a God who is unlike anything created and who is superior to all created beings in all aspects, It also revealed that it is not possible for him to be located anywhere or in any way, like other ordinary beings. In what respect, then, should the discussion of His positioning be made?

It is seen that one of the most emphasized subjects in the Qur'an is faith in the entity and oneness of The God. The Qur'an, which also gives information about his nature, emphasizes that those who believe in God and do good deeds will be rewarded, and those who do not believe in him will be punished. There are stories that repeat this warning in many suras, and it is mentioned that God is always with those who believe in him. Accordingly, His positioning should be taken in a metaphorical sense, the entity of which we cannot know beyond a physical discussion. This does not mean that He is in no way physical or has no earthly existence. Such knowledge is difficult to obtain by human as a created being about his creator and it is a secondary knowledge in terms of its contribution to the meaning in the life of the person who believes in his existence.

Faith in the existence of The God is a very powerful and inclusive basic motivation for believers. This belief, combined with the existence of the other world, also nourishes the sense of immortality in people and the life of this world becomes a life that gains meaning only when it is lived in accordance with God's commandments. God's commandments reveal Him as an entity worthy of worship. At this juncture, the nature of an entity worthy of worship is important for the believer. He can only be worthy of worship as a transcendent entity that transcends human and the world he lives in. Because of that, His transcendent nature, along with his many attributes, requires making incorporeal intelligible as an alternative perspective in understanding omnipresence.

2. Divine Incorporeality

There are some anthropomorphic references about the God in Quran, Bible and Old Testament. It is mentioned about the God's hands, arms, eyes and head. For sure, theologians and philosophers who belong to this tradition, defends that such language should be read as hıgh metaphorical references to an incorporeal reality. The aim of this and similar expressions which is in religious text, is to explain supreme attributes of God's personality in a tone that people can understand. Otherwise, if the abstract meanings were given in a different way that does not suit human feelings, perhaps humanity would not be able to recognize God's attributes at all. (Kasar, 1997:225). However, this situation seems to provide some evidence that such arguments are necessary and thus belief in the incarnation of God is not completely destroyed. In recent years, Grace M. Jantzen (1948-2006) who is a Canadian philosopher enhanced a theology in which the material world is the body of God (Jantzen, 1984). According to his idea, God's omnipresence in the universe should be interpreted as His power and creation. The omnipresence of God is equal. The fact that God was created metaphysically by the universe, and the universe also became God's omniscient, omnipotent, and conscious. According to him; in a sense, the god is more than the material word which is taken as a collection of the world, yet is not an existing independently, intangible thing or entity. Conversely, unless the god embodied and settle to somewhere in the universe, it cannot be claimed that he exists in the universe. (Jantzen, 1978:518). The theory of Jantzen claims that having an advantage of eliminating the radical difference between the God and the Universe is one of the central problems of traditional

incorporealism. In the meantime, as long as he accepts that the God has only immaterial qualities and actions. It is not clear whether completely abolishes a radical inequality between God and Universe (Taliaferro, 2010: 297).

David L. Paulsen (1936-2020), who wants to prove his argument as "If something is God, then it is incorporeal" with logical inferences, emphasizes the meaninglessness of worshiping something that is limited to anything thinkable. According to him, all kind of limited qualification is defective in superiority (Paulsen, 1989:76-77). To the religion, evidence of God's omnipresence, is his loving awareness of all that is new, his constant attentiveness, his ability to fulfill his purposes and promises (in human history and in our individual lives). For that reason, it is understood that omnipresence is vitally related to God's knowledge and his might and ıf he is omnipotent, he must be omnipresent. (Paulsen, 1989:81). Paulsen thinks there is also a way to understand Jantzen's partially closed view above. Because Jantzen also draws attention to the limitation of our conceptual structure, which can perceive only three spatial dimensions, and hypothesizes that God can express his "existence" all over the universe, gain a seat or occupying a place in dimensions outside of our ordinary experiences (Paulsen, 1989:81-82).

Georg Gasser (b.1979) assumes that to be in everywhere is not only God's presence manifested in his omnipresent knowledge and power but also sometimes miraculously acting. (Gasser, 2019:43). According to him the God is in the place where he acts and due to effection of everything naturally he is present in everything. At this point, the God's immanence rests not on a God who literally contains the cosmos, or on a true intermingling of God and cosmos, but on a God who moves throughout the cosmos and at all times. (Gasser, 2019:60). Therefore, it is necessary to be prepared to understand His omnipresence as different from the way ordinary beings are omnipresent. His existence may express an existence in a miraculous manner which human nature cannot understand at the first glance or never.

Musa Bin Meymun (1138-1204) uses a series of arguments to prove God's incorporeality. First, Musa Bin Meymun who applied to the principles used by Aristotle to define concepts subject to natural laws such as body and shape, afterwards tried to justify his claims according to examples from the Torah. Initially, Musa Bin Meymun stated that to have a body prevents" to be in more than one place at the same time" demonstrates that it is not possible to have it with the verse of (Repetition of law 4:39)" "Today your Lord is God both on the earth below and in the celestial" In the second place, to have a body in the shape of mind, requires that have an obvious limited shape however, the verse of " The day which he called you, you didn't see any image belongs to him"(Repetition of law 4:15)" It shows that it is a proof which it has no shape that points to any frame. Musa Bin Meymun presents the third proof of incorporeality, without reference to any philosophical basis, just from the religious writing based on the verse of "To whom will you compare me to be my partner or measure up to me (Isaiah 40:25)" and says that If he had a body, he would be like other beings (Wolfson, 1965:116-17). Since God is a transcendent and completely different being, he cannot be expected to establish a personal relationship with us. Meymun, who also points out that he cannot be defined because there is no genus, species and distinction, argues that he can only be known as his inferential (Türkben, 2018b: 34-35). Nicolaus Cusanus (1401-1464), who also emphasizes the transcendence of God, thinks that we are faced with a complete paradox when it comes to knowing Him. According to him, on the one hand, his existence encompasses the entire universe, on the other hand, he is not a being that can be the subject of the experience of creatures. Because if a concept is to be mentioned, it will be necessary to talk about a similarity between the perceiver and the grasped. Cusanus, who applies to a negative

theology, claims that God can only be thought by moving away from individual determinations (Cusa, 1985:45).

Harm Goris (b. 1960) first of all, thinks that we cannot have a clear understanding of God's spatial existence, and he thinks that He is neither surrounded by any space nor a body like creatures. For example, the existence in anywhere of him, doesn't exclude an asset which can be exist in the same place. He is not affected where he is located (conditions) and he is not become only as limited to a particular body or to a particular time as we understand it. Despite everything, this exonerating approach of course, does not distract him to be existing conversely, ıt shows profoundness and immanence of his asset. As a supplier of giving his own essence to every one of the object and every individual, he is the one who is the closest to every existing. (Goris, 2009:51-52). Goris who points to the importance of the scriptures as a reference source for understanding the God, He quotes the following from the Psalms: Where can I go from your Spirit? Where can I flee from your presence? If I go up to the heavens, you are there; if I make my bed in the depths, if you are there, If I rise on the wings of the dawn, if I settle on the far side of the sea, even there your hand will guide me, your right hand will hold me fast. (Psalm 139:7-10)."

Naturally, a Jew, Christian or Muslim believes that God is one and only, that he is always and everywhere, and the religious texts give him the clearest information on this subject However, there are some differences in the styles used in the sacred texts. In Judaism the God is eternal and immortal just like the other monotheistic religions. (Psalm 90:2). The omniscient (Psalm 139:1-3), The omnipotent (Jeremiah 32-27), creator of everything (Book of Genesis 1:1-5) totally different from created (Isaiah 55:8-9) but he is very close to the people (Psalm 139:7-10). However, this understanding which is believed the love is an asset, leaves its place to an anthropomorphic attitude with the addition of many human elements. Just like a human being, God walks around the garden, cannot see what is hidden (Genesis 3/8-9) and wrestles with a human (Genesis 32:28).

On the other hand, In Christian thought, this time the God, who is eternal and omnipotent, is described with a different imagination. Briefly, Jesus is the incarnation of God's remark (Matthew 3:16-17; Matthew 28:19). For that reason, Christians call Jesus the son of the God. According to this, Christians think that God created a unique and sincere relationship with Jesus, and that his eternal and uncreated message is present in Jesus (Kar, 2014:429). Although there are opinions that it is claimed that the vision of God serves to help the concentration of worshipers (Opeloye, 2003:483), there cannot be any corporeal vision of God as a being worthy of worship. It is stated in the Qur'an that such a tendency stems from the fact that people follow their thoughts and souls even though they have no knowledge (an-Nacm 53/23).In many verses, especially in the verses of surah Al-Fatiha, Ihlas, it is emphasized that Allah is the only being worthy of worship and obedience as supreme, holy, absolute and transcendent God. Sometimes worshipping assets other than Allah is criticized sarcastically (Meriem 19/42; el-Enbiyâ 21/51-65).

When it is considered the simplicity of God, it is inconceivable that some part of his should be here and some part of him should be somewhere else. It has no sense for a God to be in a place, due to settle in a place means to be surrounded by that place. Therefore a place cannot be attributed to God who is a being transcend the universe and there is a fundamental ontological difference between the transcendent God and the universe. Wherever he is found, God is a supernatural and transcendent being; it is not possible to describe God with possible references to the universe. (Aktürk, 2016:959). For the believer, the omnipresence of God worthy of worship requires that he is incorporeal in the

sense of created material objects. Answering the prayers of the believer, protecting him from all kinds of evilness, granting him goodness, fulfilling his wishes for his relatives far away, forgiving the past, preserving and watching over the future generations, all these prayers being answered makes him a God worthy of worship. The hope for the realization of all these seems possible only if He is an incorporeal God who is not registered with time and space. At least, Human experience, supposes that it is only through such imagination that relationships with God can be regulated. On the other hand, in a way human as a secular, has a desire to survive and this desire necessarily puts him concern of seeking some kind of interest in his relationship. While such a concern is reasonable for the believer at first, as the sincerity and level of internalization of this relationship increases, it is hoped that the relationship of interest will lead to an unrequited love and gets a state where ''God is pleased with man and man is pleased with God (Al-Beyyine 98/8)''. Therefore the God who is worthy for worship to believer should be superior being that is suitable to turn himself, to pray, to defect and ask for forgiveness. His love, compassion and grace are a hope of salvation in the other world for the believer.

Conclusion

The omnipresence and incorporeality of God are among the basic approaches of the divine understandings of the monotheistic religions in particular. Even though some description in the religious texts include anthropomorphic elements, this subject mostly states a kind of analogy. Most philosophers and theologians have resorted to evaluating omnipresence with His knowledge, power and will. However, it seems that some theologians are inclined to leave the door open by expressing that this can be a nature that people cannot know. The reasons which is mooted and the arguments which is proved mainly stated that as a result of God's other supreme attributes, it is necessary for him to be everywhere and this can only be possible if he is incorpereal. Although there are various comments of God's incorporeality, it can be said that the general evaluation is that he has a spiritual/moral nature. In the last section, where we evaluate God's omnipresence and incorporeality in terms of being worthy of worship, It was tried to reveal how important these qualities are for the believer. As a transcendent being for man, God has qualities that transcend human experience in all aspects.

All kinds of actual conceptions of God, such as knowing, seeing and hearing, are transcendent for man. Therefore, his actions, states and motion should not be limited in the worldly sense. Being solid requires a kind of limitation in this sense. The most vivid example of this, presents in person's own nature and life. For that reason, human being believes that the God, as a transcendent being, should be distant from all kinds of limitations and restrictions. The conception of an immaterial God as not bound by time and being omnipresent, in short, as an omnipresent being, is also suitable for human experience.

References

Akkaya, Veysel. 2015. "Muhyiddin İbnü'l-Arabî'de Arş Tasavvuru ve İstivâ Meselesi". The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies 33:379-92.

Aktürk, Eyüp. 2016. "Tanrı-Mekân İlişkisi: Her Yerde Bulunma ve Aşkınlık Sorunu". Şarkiyat İlmi Araştırmalar Dergisi 8(2):942-61.

Aquinas, Thomas. 1945. "Summa Theologica". Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas. ed. A. Pegis. New York: Random House.

Aquinas, Thomas. 1975. Summa Contra Gentiles. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Augustine, Aurelius. 1953. "Letter 137 (to Volusian) and Letter 187 (to Dardanus). 'On the Presence of God'" ed. I. Ç. W. Parsons. Saint Augustine Letters Vols. III.

Fârâbi, Ebû Nasr Muhammed. 2017. "Uyûnü'l Mesâil". İslam Filozoflarından Felsefe Metinleri. ed. M. Kaya. İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları.

Gasser, Georg. 2019. "God's Omnipresence in the World: On Possible Meanings of 'En' in Panentheism". International Journal for Philosophy of Religion / 85:43-62.

Goris, Harm. 2009. "Divine Omnipresence in Thomas Aquinas". Ss. 37-58 içinde Divine Transcendence and Immanence in the Work of Thomas Aquinas. Leuven: Peeters.

Hartshorne, Charles. 1941. Man's Vision of God and the Logic of Theism. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Hudson, Hud. 2009. "Omnipresence". The Oxford Handbook of Philosophical Theology. ed. T. P. Flint ve M. C. Rea. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

İbnü'l-Arabî, Muhyiddin. 2006. Fütûhât-ı Mekkiyye. çev. Ekrem Demirli. İstanbul: Litera Yayıncılık.

Inman, Ross D. 2017. "Omnipresence and the Location of the Immaterial". Oxford Studies in Philosophy of Religion / 8:168-206.

Jantzen, Grace M. 1978. "On Worshipping an Embodied God". Canadian Journal of Philosophy 8(3):511-19.

Jantzen, Grace M. 1984. God's World, God's Body. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Kar, Sait. 2014. "Bütün Dinler Aynı Hakikate Mi Götürür? Tanrı Anlayışları Bağlamında Bir Değerlendirme". Atatürk Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi/41". 419-36.

Kasar, Veysel. 1997. "Kur'an'da Müteşabihat'tan İstivâ Kavramı". Harran Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi (i/3):201-27.

More, Henry. 1995. Manual of Metaphysics. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Newton, Isac. 1934. Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy. University of California Press.

Nicholas of Cusa. 1985.On Learned Ignorance. (Ed. by Paul Wilbert). Minnesota.

Opeloye, Muibi O. 2003. "Tanrı'nın Birliği ve Üçlü-Birlik; Kitâb-ı Mukaddes ve Kur'ân-ı Kerîm'deki Görüşlerin Analitik Bir Değerlendirmesi". çev. Alparslan Yalduz. Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 12(2):473-85.

Paulsen, David. 1989. "Must God Be Incorporeal?" Faith and Philosophy 6(1):76-87.

Stroumsa, Gedaliahu. 1983. "The Incorporeality of God, Context and Implications of Origen's Position". Religion / 13:345-58.

Swinburne, Richard. 1977. The Coherence of Theism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taliaferro, Charles. 1994. Consciousness and the Mind of God. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taliaferro, Charles. 2010. "Incorporeality". A Companion to the Philosophy of Religion. ed. C. Taliaferro, P. Draper, ve P. L. Quinn. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Türkben, Yaşar. 2018/a. "Esirüddin Ebheri'ye Göre Tanrının Sıfatları". Bolvadin Araştırmaları 1. Ed. Mustafa Güler ve Cantürk Kayahan. Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi.

Türkben, Yaşar. 2018/b. İlahi Gizlilik. Ankara: Elis yayınları.

Wainwright, William J. 1987. "God's Body". The Concept of God. ed. T. Morris. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wainwright, William J. 2010. "Omnipotence, Omniscience and Omnipresence". Ss. 46-65 içinde The Cambridge Companion to Christian Philosophical Theology, ed. C. Taliaferro ve C. V. Meister. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Webb, Mark Owen. 2010. "Perfect Being Theology". A Companion to the Philosophy of Religion. ed. C. Taliaferro, P. Draper, ve P. L. Quinn. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Wierenga, Edward. 2005. "Omnipresence". Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

Wierenga, Edward. 2010. "Omnipresence". A Companion to the Philosophy of Religion. ed. C. Taliaferro, P. Draper, ve P. L. Quinn. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Wolfson, Harry A. 1965. "Maimonides on the Unity and Incorporeality of God". The Jewish Quarterly Review 56(2):112-36.

Yavuz, Yusuf Şevki. 2001. "İstivâ". Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. İstanbul: TDV Yayınları.

Zawadi, Bassam. 2019. "Does Divine Omnipresence Conflict with Divine Incorporeality". Academia.edu. 15.09.2019, https://www.academia.edu /3716971/Does_Divine_Omnipresence_Conflict_with_Divine_Incorporeality.