

Title: Conversations

Subtitle: Critical Structural Method

Second Subtitle: Critical Structural Method

Author: wizanda

Date: 1744036143

URL: https://www.wizanda.com/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=30

There are a couple of analytical methods that people use to assess religion.

The Historical Critical Method means they try to understand what the author intended, the historical setting, and to use as much information connected to that to build a picture of what was intended.

The Historical Grammatical Method tries to use the history surrounding the text to reach a conclusion of what the author meant based on the language used within the text. This method can believe the texts are inspired by God, and so allows for interpretation.

I personally find both methods why religious people are all arguing, as they are based on assessments of everything available to us.

I've always used my own method, which when asked I've called the Critical Structural Method. The reason for the naming is it does exactly that, it deals with all structuring of the text. The author might not have read it, to properly analyse if the authors statements are based on ideas, we have to also know that data.

So for example: Biblical ideas had previous religions before, where Zoroastrianism is a thousand years older than Moses, and they discuss a child found in a basket. Foundling, as they will create a great movement.

The wise men that came to Christ birth came from the East in the Bible, frankincense, and myrrh, based on Zoroastrian prophecy, where they were born under a great star.

To properly deal with what the Bible was implying, we have to deal with the context before it, not assume like with the Historical Critical Method, that the author knew about what they knew, and limiting the data to something that neglects what was known from.

The problem with the Historical Grammatical Method is it can assume that the texts are based on base material when some of them were forged by the religious institutions, and contradicting base material.

If they'd Critically dealt with what are the primary precepts, then they'd find the answers should be within the later material.

This is where we have to build 'Precept upon Precept' (Isaiah 28:10+13) to reach a conclusion of what the texts mean, not only what the author intended, yet the context.

as we don't know if the author within prophetic texts foresaw everything they were merely given something to write down.

Part of using the Critical Structural Method is that any equation shown w like Algebra, where a sum can be reversed to check our workings.

Where if we believe that a structuring shows a prophetic utterance was f all the criteria match in all jurisdictions, and if not, why not, no part of so it is more based on logic, where everything has to add up.