Journal of Philosophical Investigations
Print ISSN: 2251-7960 Online ISSN: 2423-4419
Homepage: https://philosophy.tabrizu.ac.ir

Commonalities of the Abrahamic Religions in the Worldview of Science: Metaphysical Presuppositions of Science

Maryam Shamsaei [1] | **Mahdi Golshani** [2]

[1] Corresponding Author, Associate Professor of Islamic Education Department, & Researcher of Quran, Hadith and Medicine Research Center, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran. Email: shamsaie2008@yahoo.com
[2] Distinguished Professor of Philosophy of Science and Physics Departments. Sharif University of Technology, Iran. Email: mehdigolshani@yahoo.com

Article Info

Article type:
Research Article

Article history:
Received 01 October 2023
Received in revised from 25 December 2023
Accepted 28 December 2023
Published online 29 January 2024

Keywords:
Abrahamic religions, science, worldview, metaphysical presuppositions

ABSTRACT

The Abrahamic religions include the three monotheistic religions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. All of these religions consider Abraham as their ancestor, and they consider science to be the knowledge of the universe and humanity, which are divine revelations. The framework of science in the Abrahamic religions uses three basic concepts: 1) monotheism (as a fundamental principle, a single and all-encompassing Divine vision) 2) the universe (as a divine creation) 3) science (as an all-encompassing knowledge about the world as the sign of God). The purpose of writing this paper is to find the common principles governing science among Abrahamic religions, using a descriptive-analytical method based on library sources. The results of this research is an intellectual attempt to draw on the commonalities between various Abrahamic religions in the areas of constructive dialogue in the field of globalization, based on revelatory and spiritual teachings, to achieve the unification of the world, which is one of the divine promises and is rooted in the natural foundations of humanity.

Cite this article: Shamsaei, M., & Golshani, M. (2024). Commonalities of the Abrahamic Religions in the Worldview of Science: Metaphysical Presuppositions of Science. *Journal of Philosophical Investigations*, 17(45), 300-316. https://doi.org/0.22034/JPIUT.2024.58674.3608

https://doi.org/0.22034/JPIUT.2024.58674.3608
Publisher: University of Tabriz.

Introduction

At first, empirical science was considered among the believers of Abrahamic religions, who believed in one God, the unity of the world, and religious values, and science was not an end for them, but a means to achieve spiritual goals. That is because for a religious person, life does not end with the physical world but continues in a metaphysical world. Metaphysics, in its broadest sense, seeks to answer questions related to the existence, nature, and mutual relationships of various types of beings, and generally examines the fundamental structure of the world.(Mansouri & Karbasizadeh,2021,25) When it comes to challenges put forth by the natural sciences, each of the three monotheistic religious traditions-Islam, Christianity and Judaism, -have something major at stake. As we shall see that unless we place scientific knowledge within a larger worldview, we will lose our understanding of what reality is if God is the one who created and sustains the world that science studies.

One of the important goals we seek in this article is to express the commonalities between Abrahamic religions in relation to science by using the revelation teachings written in the Holy books of these religions. The major concepts in science which are important in Abrahamic religions include: discussion of monotheism, which has been the basis of these religions; concept of nature, which refers to God's creation; and concept of science, which is the knowledge of this world .Therefore, to get the real knowledge of the world, one must know both the universe and humanity, because both are considered as Divine revelations. Furthermore, real science is not limited to the world of matter, because Abrahamic religions have considered a divine goal for the world within the framework of a moral system and have introduced humanity as the caliph (viceroy) of God on earth, responsible for its knowledge and development. In the following, we shall give a summary of the evolution of science and religion relation in Abrahamic religions.

The evolution of science and religion relation

From the eighth century, when Muslim scholars appeared as the first frontiers of science, their motivation was the interpretation of divine creation for human beings. By studying the books of the first-rate scientific personalities of the Islamic world, it can be seen that all of them have explicitly stated that their purpose in studying nature was to understand the works of divine creation, and there was no separation between their science and their religion, as they considered scientific work to be an act of worship. For example, if you look at the book of geography or the book of mining, or the book of astronomy of Abu Rihan al-Biruni, you find that he sought knowledge in order to know the divine revelations. In the pre-modern period, from the Middle Ages to the beginning of the Renaissance, thinking of scientific work as worship was prevalent among Western Christians. They also believed there was no separation between science and religion and that science is based on religious insights and metaphysical ideas appropriate to

religion. Thus, using Christian teachings do not lead to a kind of knowledge that conflicts with religion. Therefore, new science was formed in a theistic environment, and many prominent natural scientists were also religious scholars.

In the seventeenth century, some first-rate Western scholars such as Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Leibniz, Boyle, etc., considered the study of nature as the study of the works of divine creation and considered it as a kind of worship, a conclusion similar to that of the Islamic world. In short, the fathers of modern science also had a divine purpose in their scientific studies. Newton, with whom modern science began, was a first-rate believer who was also a monotheist and religiously concerned in his scientific studies. When Newton wrote his most important book, *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, he wrote a letter to Bishop Bentley in which he said:

> I wrote this book to draw my readers' attention to the divine revelations.

, and he also said:

> This most beautiful system of the sun, planets, and stars can only be the result of a wise and capable being exercising sovereignty. (Newton, 1848,503)

Leibniz, a contemporary of Newton, shared this view, saying,

> It is especially in science that we see the wonders of God ... His power, wisdom, and goodness ... that's why I've dedicated my life to the sciences that I loved." (Jaki, 1992, 428)

In the eighteenth century, religion became completely marginalized. Thus, e.g., Hume said:

> Look around the world. Think about everyone and every part of it. You will find that it is nothing but a big machine that splits into an infinitely smaller machine. (Hume, 1970, 22)

When empiricism shifted from Locke to Hume and then to Auguste Comte and Mach in the nineteenth century, everything changed and extremist position entered many areas of thought and targeted the legitimacy of religion and the revelation of sacred texts (Williams1995, 109-128). The positivists no longer attached any value to metaphysics and theology. In their view, only things of scientific value were those based on the senses. This idea gradually dominated the thinking of the scientists of that time. (Golshan, 2021,9)

At that time, science was considered a kind of religion: a religion in which reason was its God, and universities were its temples, and university professors were its priests. At this time, minds were directed toward hindering religion from advancing science. Among the theories that clashed with divine wisdom and intervention in the creation of the world in that century was Darwin's theory of "transformation of species," which called into question the validity of religious beliefs and the Bible (Barbour 1997,143). The thesis of the conflict of science and religion was

increasingly promoted with the writing of two books in the last quarter of the nineteenth century: one by J.W. Draper (1875) entitled "History of Conflict between Religion and Science"(Draper, 1875) and the other was by A.D. White (1895) entitled: "A History of the Conflict Between Science and Religion in Christianity." (White, 1895). These two books magnified the differences between Galileo and the church, as well as the differences between Darwin's companions and the church, and from that, they concluded a constant conflict between science and religion. This trend continued for the first half of the twentieth century. With the advent of the logical positivism throughout the first half of the 20th century, this problem was intensified so much that all metaphysics and its propositions were declared meaningless. During this period, some scholars said that there was no longer a question that positivistic science could not answer. We get all our answers from this science and have nothing to do with religion and God.

The two dominant currents of thought that played a major role at this time in the weakening of the role of religion were Freudianism and logical positivism. Freud said in this regard:

> So religion is a tempting neurological disease of humanity" (Pals, 1996, 73).

Freud considered religion to be the enemy of science and said:

> Of the three powers that may threaten the land of science (art, philosophy, and religion), religion alone is the most serious enemy. (Gay, 1987, 50)

But a few things forced some scientists to change their thinking. One was World Wars I and II, which left millions dead. It became evident that science alone does not prevent anything, including human rights abuses. It is noteworthy, however, that at this time some sought to discuss the interaction between science and religion. Thus, some theological liberals emphasized the empirical and rationalization of religion (Christianity) and the moral approach to science, using religious moral virtues. Whitehead offered a coherent metaphysics applicable to all aspects of truth, from God to nature (Barbour 1997,143-164). But, in the second half of the twentieth century, the weaknesses of secular science became more evident and the effects of religion on individual and social life became more apparent. Reductionism was shaken, and as the limitations of science became clear, its rebellion and pride diminished.

In the last few decades, we have witnessed the growing tendency of scientists and experts in experimental sciences towards philosophy, religion and spirituality. In addition, during the second half of the twentieth century, different schools of philosophy of science gradually emerged. These schools, despite their differences, had two things in common: humans do not face nature with an empty mind; in one's theorizing and scientific activity, one always inadvertently introduces metaphysical psychological, sociological, assumptions. Therefore, the situation has changed in the last three decades, and some of the great physicists have realized that physics needs metaphysics. Heisenberg, one of the leading physicists of the twentieth century, who had said in his 1925 article

that “we must put aside all invisible quantities”, in his later life changed his mind and said that we should be careful not to use bad philosophy and regretted that positivism still prevails." (Heisenberg, 1959, 5-55). The state of science today is such that the further it goes, the shorter the hand of experience becomes as it goes to smaller scales and higher energies and farther horizons, where the possibility of accessing vast information is small. Therefore, it has become easier for scientists to speak openly about God. There are several reasons for this phenomenon:

(a) It has been found that science without morality and spirituality has endangered human life, and the separation between science and religion and philosophy has created a gap between technical knowledge and the priorities for its application.

(b) The progress of science in our century has shown that scientific knowledge cannot be reduced to mechanical categories. The Nobel Prize winner in medicine (1962), Wilkins, in a speech in 1986, said:

> I disagree with molecular biologists when they say that molecular biology alone can explain life. This mechanical thinking, in my opinion, is simplistic (Singh ,1987,141)

Accordingly, it has been found that religion can create the right orientation for science with its rational and valuable tools. Thus, many scientists have realized the limitations of the experimental sciences in showing all the dimensions of nature. P. Kush, a Nobel Prize-winning physicist, says:

> Science cannot do many things. Assuming that science can provide technical answers to all questions, will lead to failure. (Jaki, 1992, 500)

In short, the evolution of the relationship between science and religion in the Islamic world and the Western world can be divided into several stages. In the early Islamic world, all scholars of natural and unnatural sciences had a divine motive in their research, and therefore for them, there was a close relationship between science and religion. The same was true in the middle ages in the Western world for a long time. But, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there was a change in epistemology that led to the rupture of the relationship between science and religion and the prevalence of anti-religion status. But again, in the second half of the twentieth century, with the development of various schools of philosophy of science, it became clear that in all fields of science, metaphysical assumptions have a major role and cannot be left out, and some of the scientists even paid attention to theology. For example, George Ellis (one of the leading contemporary cosmologists) says:

"Science needs an umbrella of theology"(Ellis, 1993).

Furthermore, even some physicists said that the general principles governing science is derivable from religion. Now, we show that the source of some general principles governing the

sciences is in the three Abrahamic religions, and this provides a common ground for their further collaborations.

Common general principles governing science among the Abrahamic religions

God is described as the "Creator and Sustainer" of the entire universe in the Holy Qur'an, and mentions that God has created everything in measure, each of which has a final cause or “telos”. According to the Holy Qur’an nothing is created futile, and there is a definite term to everything. Additionally, it distinguishes between the creatures design and their guidance:

"Praise be to your Lord, the Highest, Who made and shaped, decided and led" (87: 1-3)

However, in modern science, there is no concern about teleological considerations. We believe there are two reasons for ignoring teleological considerations on the part of scientists: heavy involvement with practical applications and mathematical manipulations; inappropriate metaphysics fundamental to theoretical scientific work. Physical sciences are divided into two categories: collection of empirical facts, and organization and interpretation of facts. On the one hand, collecting empirical facts is universal; namely, it is not important if they are collected by Russians or Japanese. On the other hand, the introducing concepts and theories, , religious convictions, metaphysical presuppositions, and psychological and sociological perspectives are of great importance. While believer assimilates and considers facts in a theistic context, non-believers interpret facts based on their atheistic disposition. Accordingly, there is a need for an intellectual practice before getting a theistic interpretation of the whole universe from scientific findings. Thus, there is a need for an appropriate metaphysical basis which allows supranatural realities in order to move from the bounded domain of nature towards the unbounded territory of the supernatural. There is no room for God or even teleological considerations within the philosophical framework that modern scientists try to express their work. In their sense of the term, ontology is reduced to matter while epistemology just allows sense data. However, empirical science yields only a limited cognition of God’s works, and the assumption of both a Transcendent Being and a telos for the universe is far from the territory of science. Yet, we accept indirect evidence that the universe has a teleological dimension and is dependent on a transcendent being. To discover this, a perceptive mind is needed. For instance, the problem of fine-tuning the basic constants of nature, leading to the formulation of the anthropic principle, has brings back the argument for the design and notion of purpose of creating the universe. Based on the anthropic principle, the force laws and the physical constants of nature are well- tuned; that is, in case of a slightly difference, carbon-based life was not possible. Also, multiple universes have explained the anthropic coincidences. In case of infinite number of universes, with different sets of basic constants, it is possible for the emergence of a universe to accommodate life. However, from the viewpoint of Muslims, Jews and

Christians, with a theistic view, interpret anthropic coincidences which is both more plausible and economical; thereby, no independent evidence exists for the presence of other universes.

There are two main areas of science, in which empirical facts are used to prove/disprove God's existence. These are regarded as the problems of the creation of the universe and emergence of the human species.

Some scholars partly used the creation of the universe to prove the existence of God from a philosophical or scientific perspective. For instance, the problem of creation in time was proposed by the Big Bang model, first introduced in the late 1940's. The model became popular as soon as the microwave background radiation (CMBR) was discovered. However, unbelieving cosmologists tried to eliminate creation in time by applying different mechanisms. Furthermore, some scientists and philosophers suggested if we consider a temporal beginning for the universe, we cannot imply that it has a Creator. That is, the universe came into existence as a result of quantum fluctuations, without a definite cause. From our point of view, the beginning time for the creation of the universe (just like the interpretation of the Big Bang) or no such initial moment is not important since in both cases, the creation could be explained in a theistical manner. Muslim philosophers believe that creation is simply total dependence of everything upon God; namely, a temporal beginning for the universe is not necessarily implied. The creation of the universe has to do with ontological dependency on God, rather than a temporal beginning. By ontological dependency we mean that one needs to go beyond the universe in order to explain its existence. The most straightforward simplification for the existence of the universe has been provided by theism.

The creation of humans is another problem raised by the theory of evolution, introduced by Charles Darwin in (1859), but carries the day. The theory of evolution tries to clarify the evolution of species based on natural selection and the survival of the fittest. Serious efforts were made by the proponents of the Darwinian theory of evolution in order to use natural selection, a substitute for God. According to Richard Dawkins:

> The universe we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but blind, pitiless indifference.*(* Dawkins, 1995, 133)

However, we believe finding the mechanism of a phenomenon does not eliminate the assumption that it has an inventor. There is a need for explaining the gradual or sudden emergence of species. As a result, considering both theist and atheist evolutionists, atheist evolutionists ignore the fact that the belief in an evolutionary mechanism for species development does not necessarily negate the concept of Divine creation. Meanwhile, our ultimate questions may remain unanswered despite all attempts to clarify the universe in a self-originating manner, such as: Where do the physics rules come from? Why does the universe follow these rules? We must move beyond empirical science to simplify the entirety of human experience, which can be accomplished by

embedding science within a suitable metaphysical framework. It seems that there are many more cousinly connections between the three Abrahamic faiths than is usually assumed. Here, we focus on a few cases that share a common viewpoint. The following are some common views among the Abrahamic religions:

1. Belief in a Transcendent being and a telos to the created Universe

The three great divine religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam are called Abrahamic religions because of their affiliation with Abraham. Undoubtedly, one of the main reasons for the commonality between the contents of the Torah, the Bible, and the Holy Qur'an is that all of them are divine revelations. They have similar roots and came from the same source. No doctrine is more vital to theistic religions than the belief in one God and the creation of the world by Him. The followers of these religions worship the God of Abraham and consider Him the Creator of themselves and the world. They believe that it is fundamentally a grace of a Powerful, Merciful, and Unique Creator. In other words, this world is not born by itself but is the product of a transcendent Creator. In all the three scriptures God is the main creator of the world and everything. God's position concerning all creatures is defined by the major existential distinction between knowing Him as the Creator and knowing the creatures. Being Transcendent means that God is distinct from the world, and there is no part or force in Him (Barbour 1997). Here are the views of the Abrahamic religions in this regard:

It is said in the Old Testament that:

> The Lord's glory rises above the heavens and is above all nations! Who resembles the Ruler our God, Who is situated on high, who looks far down on the sky and the earth. (Psalm 113:4-6)
> and according to the New Testament Jesus said:
> Israel, listen: The Lord, who is one, is our God. With all of your heart, love the Lord your God. (Mark 12: 29-30)
> and it is said in the Qur'an:
> He is Allah, other than whom there is no deity, the Sovereign, the Pure, the Perfection, the Bestower of Faith, the Overseer, the Exalted in Might, the Transcendent, the Superior. Exalted is Allah above whatever they associate with Him. (59:23)

Islam calls all followers of religions to worship God and considers the "principle of monotheism" as one of the factors of convergence and common point of all Abrahamic religions:

> Say, 'O People of the Book! Come to a common word between us and you: that we will worship no one but Allah, that we will not ascribe any partner to Him,

> and that some of us will not take some others as lords besides Allah.' But if they turn away, say, 'Be witnesses that we have submitted [to Allah].(2: 64)

This verse clearly states that belief in God is a common belief of the followers of these three religions.

2. Belief in human being's free-will

Human beings' orientation and their choice of values is given to them in the context of creation. Humans must discover them and seek the right destination, as they have the will and authority to walk this path. We examine the views of Abrahamic religions concerning this matter.

In Judaism, human's authority is expressed as follows:

> See, I'm giving you a blessing and a curse today—a blessing if you follow the commands I'm giving you from the LORD, your God.… (Deuteronomy 11:26,27)
>
> The Lord directs the man's steps, whereas the man's mind plans his route. Proverbs 16:9 (Old Testament)
>
> In Christianity, human freewill is recognized. Thus, we have in the New Testament:
>
> Brethern, you were called to freedom; just don't transform your opportunity into a chance for the tissue, however through adoration serve each other. (Galatians 5:13)

In Islam, there is a belief in the free will of human beings as well, mentioned in the following verses of the Holy Qur'an:

> That is because Allah never changes a blessing that He has bestowed on a people unless they change what is in their own souls, and Allah is all-hearing, all-knowing. (8:53)
>
> Indeed We have guided him to the way,be he grateful or ungrateful (76:3)
>
> Whoever accepts guidance, it is only for his own good; and whoever goes astray, it is only for his own loss. No bearer of burden will bear the burden of another, nor do We punish until We have sent a messenger. (17:15)

Thus, all Abrahamic religions have acknowledged the role of human will and agency because the knowledge and wisdom of God require that human beings be free on the path of evolution, otherwise, a forced evolution is not evolution. It is also believed that God set humans free to the extent that they can even oppose God and not accept His salvation.

Ian Barbour believes that a human is not an involuntary motivational-response mechanism. Rather, he is a self-organizing system, with at least a certain autonomy and spontaneity. In addition,

human choices are influenced by moral and intellectual-rational ideals. Man, as a wise thinker, reacts to abstract concepts and imagines ideal possibilities. He has an independent talent for imagination and foresight and can think of two alternative goals and new ways to achieve them (Barbour 1997, 347-8). Thus, humans, due to this freedom, can try to learn and acquire knowledge.

3. A Common Concern for Truth

All divine religions believe in transcendent truth, as God has invited humans to acquire knowledge and develop it in proper ways. Then, their legitimate and wise use is right and according to the will of God. The theology of the Abrahamic religions is based on several presuppositions in the field of science and religion, including the originality of truth and the necessity of its discovery.

According to the Bible:

> You will also learn the truth, which will liberate you... (John 8:32)
> Nothing brings me more joy than hearing that my children are living the truth... (John,1:4)
> But the one who lives the truth enters the Light so that his deeds can be shown to have been done in God's sight... (John 3:21)

and according to the Qur'an:

> Confound not truth with falsehood, nor knowingly conceal the truth. **(Qur'an 2:42)**
> This is the Day when the truthful will benefit from their truthfulness**. (Quran, 5:119)**
> O ye who believe! Be careful of your duty to Allah and be with the truthful. **(Qur'an 9:119)**

The Abrahamic religions are based on a principle in which the element of truth is very prominent and so people are advised to seek the truth in all of their actions, including the study of nature. These truths can be scientific, philosophical, mystical and revelatory, and so on. Therefore, we can conclude that the seeking of truths is a religious act because God has called us to discover and understand the truthful facts. Thus, seeking truthful science is a religious act and pleasing to God.

The implication of a conception of the natural world as Divine creation is that our increasing knowledge of the natural world through scientific inquiry increases our understanding of the Divine creative creation. Therefore, any knowledge we get from the natural world should not be a threat to our knowledge of God or gratitude to Him; besides, it should increase our understanding of God.

4. Belief in the Exercise of Reason

Religion and reason have played a significant role in human progress and development because the power of reason is limited, and it makes mistakes. Therefore, religions that have been brought to mankind by divine prophets are able to awaken and guide the human intellect in discovering the secrets of the world. In this regard, Morteza Motahhari (an Iranian contemporary philosopher) says:

"Our message is that if the prophets had not come and led the world, this intellect would have remained at the same level as a child and humans would not have reached this level ... They were the prophets who came and tore the chains from the human intellect and gave him character. " (Motahari, 2006,364)

Therefore, the origin of religion is beyond and superior to reason, and for this reason, religion is in many cases the guide of reason. This shows the dependence of reason on religion in some ways. Hence, with reason alone, one cannot reach his true evolution, but one can reach true evolution in the shadow of religion and its teachings, using the tools of reason. The idea of the supremacy of reason over religion and the incompatibility of the two, and finally the rebellion of reason against religion, was formed from the Renaissance with the growth of science in the West. But, it must be acknowledged that if in our time some Christians declare that faith has nothing to do with reason, it is due to the distortion of Christianity. The original Christ never said that, and the separation of faith from reason is a distortion of Christianity, and no prophet has said that. (Motahari ,1987, 89)

In the age of modernity in the West, there was a shift from absolute faith to maximum and extreme rationalism. Science became at the service of human's material inclinations, and science and reason were deprived of their sacred status because human's intellect and science were only at the service of humanity's material well-being.

Concerning the significance of using reason, it is said in the Bible:

> And as was Paul's custom, he went to them and discussed the Scriptures with them for three Sabbaths. (Acts 17:2)
> Jesus, however, reacted to their thoughts by responding, "Why are you reasoning in your hearts? (LUKE 5: 22)

And according to the Holy Qur'an:

> Indeed, in the creation of the heavens and the earth and the alternation of night and day …are study signs for people who apply reason "(1:164)
> **"Say: Bring your proof if you are truthful." (2:111)**
> "Thus does Allah make clear to you His verses that you might use reason." (2: 242)

5. Belief in the study of nature, God's handiwork, as an act of worship.

The Holy books of the three monotheistic religions have recommended the study of nature, God's handiwork, for example, it is said in the Bible:

> God's glory and his creation are both visible in the sky above. (Psalm 19)
> They speak day in and day out; They demonstrate their knowledge day after day. (Psalm 19:2)
> Since the world was created, God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clear to see and comprehend from what has been made, leaving no room for human error.(Romans 1:20)

And we have in the Qur'an:

> Say travel over the earth and then observe how He has originated the creation. (29/20)
> Say: observe what is in the heavens and the earth. (10/9)

all the eminent believing scholars in the Islamic civilization era, in the Middle Ages, at the dawn of modern science, and in our time have considered the study of God's handiwork as a kind of religious worship.

The understanding of Muslim scholars from the Qur'an was that they should study nature to become familiar with God's handiworks in nature, and various sciences were considered to be different pages of the book of nature. They also considered scientific research as a kind of religious worship. For example, during the Islamic civilization era al-Biruni (an eminent Muslim scientist) said:

> To learn from God's wisdom in the creation and to argue with the Creator from the creation, sight is necessary... (Biruni, 1335 H.Q,5)

In his Introduction to the History of Science, George Sarton mentions that to understand the reason for the glorification of knowledge in the Islamic world, one has to consider the axial role of the Qur'an. (Sarton ,1927, 5)

We hear the same thing from Leibnitz at the dawn of modern science:

> It is especially in sciences...that we see the wonders of God, wisdom and goodness...; that is why, since my youth, I have given myself to the sciences that I loved. (Jaki, 1992,428)

and from Boyle:

> [Science is a religious task], the disclosure of the admirable workmanship which God displayed in the universe. (Barbour ,1966, 37)

In our time, Charles Townes (a Nobel laureate in physics) saw scientific research as a religious experience:

> Although I consider our exploration of the universe to be a part of my religious experience, I do not myself distinguish between science and religion. (Singh, 1987, 141)

and so was Arthur Schawlow (another Nobel laureate in physics):

> However, religion provides an excellent background for science. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows his handiwork," reads Psalm 19. As a result, scientific research is a form of worship because it reveals more of God's creation's wonders. (Cosmos, 1992, 106)

6. Belief in the incompleteness of empirical science

The Holy books explicitly mention that our knowledge is incomplete. For example, it is said in the Bible:

"Our *knowledge* is *incomplete* and our *ability to speak what God has revealed is* incomplete" (Corinthians 13:9)

And we have in the Qur'an:

> Immaculate is He Who has created all the kinds of what the earth grows and of themselves and what they do not know (36:36)

and

> … and you have not been given of knowledge except a little. (17:85)

During the first half of the nineteenth century, the school of positivism, which restricts science to the findings of human senses, was established by Auguste Comte. This mentality was fortified by physicist Earnest Mach during the second half of that century and became dominant in the first half of the twentieth century. Positivism left no room for religion or philosophy. But during the second half of this century several schools in the philosophy of science were developed which showed that positivistic science is neglecting some very important things:

- It cannot answer some of humanity's fundamental questions, like "where am I coming from? or "why empirical knowledge is reliable?".

- It cannot justify moral values.

- Every science is based on some supra-scientific (metaphysical) principles, which are not derivable from that science. Furthermore, for a certain number of experiments, it is possible to make several theories that explain those experiments but involve some different metaphysical principles. Some of these theories could be ruled out by further experiments.

The results of these findings are as follows:

(a) Our knowledge of nature is never complete. As Feynman (a Nobel laureate in physics) put it:

"We have concluded that it is of the utmost importance to acknowledge our ignorance and allow for doubt if we are to advance. Scientific knowledge is a collection of statements with varying degrees of certainty, some of which are most improbable, others that are almost certain, and none that are absolutely certain." (Feynman, 1999,146)

(b) In the light of aforementioned points some eminent scientists and philosophers said that we must have a comprehensive cove over science that takes care of humanities fundamental questions, can justify moral values, and can provide basic metaphysical principles for making scientific theories. This cove can come from philosophy or religion. But some of the eminent physicists of our time have mentioned that the answer to our deepest questions can come only from religion. For example, Arthur Schawlow (a Nobel laureate in physics) says:

> When I look at the wonders of life and the universe, I think it's important to ask why rather than just how. Religious responses are the only viable options; I recognize the universe's and my own existence's need for God. *(Barbour, 1990, 105)*

And in the words of John Barrow (an eminent British physicist):

> The concept of a lawful universe, with order that can be understood and relied upon, emerged largely out of religious beliefs about the nature of God. This is the origin of many of the deepest and most intriguing questions we have about the nature of the universe. (*Barrow, 2006, 16)*

Conclusion

This paper is an attempt to draw on the commonalities between the three Abrahamic religions through constructive dialogue in the age of globalization, and is based on revelatory and spiritual teachings of the Holy books. The framework of science in the Abrahamic religions uses three basic concepts: 1) monotheism (as a fundamental principle, a single and all-encompassing Divine vision) 2) the universe (as a divine creation) 3) science (as an all-encompassing knowledge about the world as the sign of God). These religions say that the universe and humans are both divine revelations and humans must understand that the knowledge called science is a knowledge that should be governed by a monotheistic worldview - a framework in which God is the universe's creator and sustainer,, does not limit the world of existence to the world of matter and has a moral system. In the Abrahamic religions (AS), humanity has been introduced as the caliph (viceroy) of God on earth and responsible for its development. Hence, in Islamic traditions, science, along with

faith, has been introduced as a means of development and worship. However, it should be noted that science can be destructive while it is knowledge and awareness. But when it is accompanied by faith, it has a constructive role. Therefore, the tools of science should be used in the light of the monotheistic worldview. Religion can be effective in two ways: one is in the formation of science and the other is in the direction of application and use of science. Science, as an empirical knowledge, is not religious or nonreligious, and whether or not it is religious is related to an aspect outside the context of science *per se*. Accordingly, considering that in the Abrahamic religions, humanity has been introduced as the caliph of God and responsible for the development of the Earth. A science that grows within the framework of a theistic worldview, must be used to meet the material and spiritual needs of human beings. But there is no guarantee that a science developed in the light of a secular worldview will not be destructive; as we have witnessed many of these destructions during the last century and in our time.

According to divine religions, the foundations and frameworks of real science are based on a monotheistic worldview. The framework that views God as the universe`s creator and preserver and does not confine existence to the realm of matter. This indicates that religious science places a strong emphasis on situating all relevant questions within a religious metaphysical framework; specifically, a metaphysics that derives from religious philosophy and is consistent with the contents of the holy books. In fact, the physical sciences consist of two parts. The first part contains a set of facts. But, when we come to the second part, which is the introduction of concepts and theorizing, using metaphysical assumptions, religious beliefs, and psychological and sociological prejudices play an important role. The believer looks at the facts and integrates them into a theistic framework, while the non-believer interprets them based on his atheistic inclinations. This can be accomplished by incorporating science into a suitable metaphysical framework, which may be rooted in religion and, consequently, falls under a religious worldview, where science and religion share a common metaphysical foundation, and the purpose of religious and revelatory knowledge is to reveal divine works and attributes to humans. On the other hand, religious vision is also effective in the practical applications of science. Therefore, science is under the effect of religious metaphysical presuppositions.

References

Aquinas, T. (2000). *'The Five Ways', in Introduction to Philosophy: Classical and Contemporary Readings*, edited by L. P. Pojman, Wadsworth.

Barbour, I. (1996). *Issues in Science and religion*, Prentice- Hall, Inc.

Barbour, I. (1990). *Religion in an Age of Science*, SCM Press.

Barbour, I. (1997). *Religion and Science*, Gifford Lectures Series.

Barrow, J. D. (2006). The Great Basilica of Nature, in *Science & Theology News*. 6(8), 16-19.

Biruni, A. R. (1956). *Al-Jamahir fi Ma'refah Al-Javahir*, Matbaa' Jameiyah Daerah Al-Maa'rif Al-Osmaniyah, (in Arabic)

Dawkins, R. (1995). *River Out of Eden: A Darwinian View of Life*, Basic Books.

Draper, J. W. (1875). *History of Conflict between Religion and Science*, Cambridge University Press.

Earle E. C. (1994). *Christianity Through The Centuries*, Zondervan.

Ellis, G. (1993). *Before the Beginning: Cosmology Explained*, Boyars Bowerdean.

Feynman, R. (1999). *The Pleasure of Finding Things Out*, Persus Books.

Gay, P. (1987). *Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism and the Making of Psycho Analysis*, Yale University Press.

Golshani, M. (2021). Reviving Physicists' Attention to Philosophy in Recent Decades, *Journal of Philosophical Investigations*, 15(37), 5-19. (in Persian) DOI:10.22034/jpiut.2022.46918.2898

Golshani, M. (2000). *Science, Religion, and Spirituality on the Threshold of the 21st Century*, Institute of Humanities and Cultural Studies. (in Persian)

Heisenberg, W. (1959). *Planc's Quantum Theory and The Philosophical Problems of Atomic Physics, in Science, Men, Methods, Goals*, edited by B. Brody and N. Capaldi, Benjamin.

Heisenberg, W. (2017). *Der Teil und das Ganze*, in Najafizadeh.org (eds) *Beyond The Borders: Series in Philosophy and History of Science*, Vol. 2. Najafizadeh.org. (in Persian)

Hume, D. (1970). *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, ed. & commentary by N. Pick, Bobbs-Merril.

Jaki. S. (1992). *'The Relevance of Physics*, Scottish Academic Press.

Lightman, A., & Brawer, R. (1990). *Origins: The Lives and Worlds of Modern Cosmologists*, Harvard University Press.

MacGrath, A. E. (2006). *Christianity: An Introduction*', Blackwell Publishing.

Makarem Shirazi, N. (1995).*Tafsir Nomoneh*, vol. 16. Dar al-Kitab al-Islamiyah. (in Persian)

Mansouri, A., & Karbasizadeh, A. E. (2021). The Importance and Role of Metaphysics for Science, *Journal of Philosophical Investigations*, 15(37), 20-41. (in Persian). DOI: 10.22034/jpiut.2021.47867.2960

Margenau, H., & Abraham, R. (eds.) (1992). *Cosmos, Bios, Theos: Scientists Reflect on Science, God, and the Origins of the Universe, Life, and Homo Sapiens*, Open Court Publications.

Motahari, M. (1987). *Siri in the prophetic life*, Vol. 2. Sadra. (in Persian)

Motahari, M. (2006). *Collection of Works*, Vol. 4. Sadra. (in Persian)

Motahari, M. (2014). *The Perfect Man*, Sadra. (in Persian)

Naghizadeh, M. (2005). *The place of nature and environment in Iranian culture and cities*, Islamic Azad University Press. (in Persian)

Naghizadeh, M. (2009). *Fundamentals of Religious Art in Islamic Culture*. Vol. 1, Office of Publishing and Islamic Culture. (in Persian)

Nasr, S. H. (2014). *Religion and the order of Nature*, Ney Publications. (in Persian)

Newton, I. (1848). *Newton's principle: The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, Translated by A. Motte. & D. Adee, Book III.

Pals, D. L. S. (1996). *Theories of Religion*, Oxford University Press.

Pannenberg, W. (19981). *The Science and Theology in the Twentieth Century*, University of Notre Dame Press.

Peters, T. & Iqbal, M., & No'man ul-Haq. (2002). *Science and Religion from Conflict to Compromise, (God, Life, and the Cosmos, Christian and Islamic Perspective)*, Routledge.

Sarton, G. (1927). *Introduction to the History of Science*, Vol. 1, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Singh. T. D., Gomatam. R. (eds.) (1986). *Synthesis of Science and Religion*, The Bhakti Vedanta Institue.

White, A. D. (1896). *A History of the Warfare of Science and Theology in Christendom, D.* Appleton and Company.

Williams, B. (1995). Rationalism, translated by MohammadTaghi Sobhani, *Naghd (Critique) and Nazar (Opinion)*, 2(15), 109-128. DOI: 10.22081/JPT.1995.22899