

The general methodology for analyzing metaphysical subjects

Omar Abur-Robb

www.omr-mhmd.yolasite.com

omar.robb@yahoo.com

Oct 2022

This material has been taken from the “Proposed solutions for the three puzzles of the early Christian history” (#54.01). We preferred to put this material in a single article in order to be used as a reference.

I am a Muslim and I truly acknowledge my Islamic metaphysical beliefs. However, I do have two clear approaches when analyzing a metaphysical subject:

- The metaphysical analysis of the texts in the scripture (Quran and Hadith) related to the subject.
- The scientific analysis of this subject.

Now ... the gap between the two approaches can be very valuable as it might draw the attention to some different meanings in the text in the first approach, or it might draw the attention to some hidden areas in the second approach.

By the definition of “Scientific Method”, no metaphysical input is allowed to enter the “scientific research”. However, the “scientific conclusions” can be used as inputs in the “metaphysical analysis”. For example, if there are many legitimate interpretations to a metaphysical text, then the scientific conclusion can support one interpretation over the other.

Now ... there are some gaps between the two approaches that are acceptable to us. For example, if there is a clear-expressed miracle in the approved metaphysical text then this will be an accepted gap between the metaphysics and science. However, if the miracle is not clearly expressed or there are some illogical issues then the gap needs to be resolved.

Therefore, the only accepted gaps between the metaphysics and science are those that have clear expressed information. All other gaps need to be resolved.

For example, parting the sea for Moses is clearly expressed in the text, and this is an accepted gap between the metaphysics and science. The reason for this acceptance is that if God existed then “parting the sea” could happen, but the question would be “did it really happen?”. This is the reason that we need a clear-expressed information in the text. But the way that Moses managed to protect himself from the Pharaoh is not clearly expressed, therefore we cannot just invent a miracle for that, and we need to find a logical explanation.

Also, there are some gaps between the metaphysics and science that are due to insufficient information. Some of them might never be resolved, as the metaphysical texts

aren't in details and the science doesn't have all the data. But if the gap between them is shrinking overtime then this would be sufficient.

So, in a nutshell, creating a pure scientific model for the metaphysical event is necessary (even if it wasn't acceptable) as it can act like a gap gauge to warn us if we went too far in our metaphysical conclusions.

Furthermore, creating pure scientific models for the metaphysical events can be a good starting point for discussion between different theological parties.

Now ... History cannot be put into testing and experimentation; therefore, it cannot be analyzed scientifically. But we can use "Science" as a filter for historical records: If a historical record contradicts with the scientific laws of nature then we can reject this record for the analysis of the second approach (which we have discussed at the start of this article).

I would like here to stress that I am not content with the academic definition of "History". "History" is an ancient word that existed before academia started. Metaphysical understandings have been part of the recorded history of almost every civilization. I don't think it is really right for the Academics in the 20/21th century to take the word "History" from the standard dictionary and redefine it according to their views.

However, this matter can be resolved by adding one word: "Scientific History". So, history should include all data related to an event (Metaphysical or none-Metaphysical), while "Scientific History" is a special branch of history that only deals with none-Metaphysical data.

Now "Scientific History" might be a meaningless combination of words, so let us define it. "Scientific History" is a special branch of history in which we only select records that don't contradict with the scientific laws of nature. Then these selected records will be under robust historical analysis to determine their level of accuracy.

In this regard, the body of knowledge that historians refer to as "The Historical Jesus" should actually be "The Scientific Historical Jesus", which means: the history of Jesus based only on records that does not contradict with the scientific laws of nature.

I do acknowledge that adding words in names is a bit problematic. However, this subject is sensitive to many religious people as many of them regard the metaphysics as an integral part of the history of Jesus. Therefore, clarity is more important here than the number of words in the name.

So, my methodology for analyzing a metaphysical event in history can be summarized as follows:

- Conduct the metaphysical analysis based on the approved metaphysical text related to the event in question.
- Conduct the scientific historical analysis of this event.
- Identify the gaps between the previous two analyses and analyze them to form the overall metaphysical conclusion (as based on the discussion above).

Therefore, there need to be an effort to create a pure scientific historical model for the event in question in order to be used in this methodology.