_A Level Philosophy & Ethics

Red	Amber	Green

2.4 Religious Language: 2.4A Inherent problems of religious language

1. I can explain the limitations of language for traditional conceptions of God such as infinite and timeless.			
2. I can explain the challenge to sacred texts and religious pronouncements as unintelligible.			
3. I can explain the challenge that religious language is not a common shared base and experience.			
4. I can explain the difference between cognitive and non-cognitive language.			
5. I can evaluate solutions by religious philosophers to inherent problems of religious language			
6. I can evaluate the exclusive context of religious belief for an understanding of religious language.			

2.4 Religious Language: 2.4B Religious language as cognitive but meaningless

1. I can explain the key features of Logical Positivism and the significance of being able to verify or falsify propositions			
2. I can outline AJ Ayer's argument that God-talk is evidently nonsense as a criticism of theism, atheism and agnosticism.			
3. I can explain A Flew's Invisible Gardner analogy to show the problem that nothing can counter the belief.			
4. I can explain the criticisms of verification: self-refuting, historical events, scientific statements, eschatological verification.			
5. I can explain criticisms of falsification: Hare's Blik, Basil Mitchell's partisan and the stranger, Swinburne's toys in the cupboard.			
6. I can evaluate the persuasiveness of arguments asserting either meaningfulness or meaninglessness of religious language.			

2.4 Religious Language: 2.4C Religious language as non-cognitive and analogical

1. I can explain Thomas Aquinas view of religious language as analogy; Proportion and attribution			
2. I can explain Ian Ramsey's view of religious language: qualifier and disclosure			
3. I can discuss how far analogies can give meaningful insights into religious language with reference to Aquinas and Ramsey			
4. I can evaluate how far Logical Positivism should be accepted as a valid criterion for meaning in the use of language.			
5. I can evaluate to what extent the challenges of Logical Positivism provide convincing arguments to non-believers.			

6. I can evaluate whether non-cognitive interpretations are valid responses to the challenges of meaning of Religious Language			

2.4 Religious Language: 2.4D Religious langauge as non-cognitive and symbolic

1. I can explain John Randall's view of religious language as symbolic - functions of symbolic, with examples			
2. I can explain Paul Tillich's view of religious language as symbolic - Ultimate concern, with examples			
3. I can explain how symbolic language provides a deeper and more meaningful understanding of beliefs and concepts.			
4. I can explain challenges against symbolic language as meaningful or giving the right understanding.			
6. I can evaluate how far Randall and Tillich provide a suitable counter-challenge to Logical Positivism			
5. I can evaluate whether symbolic language has adequate meaning as a form of language			

2.4 Religious Language: 2.4E Religious language as non-cognitive and Mythical

1. I can explain the function of mythical language to communicate values and insights.			
2. I can give examples of religious myths: creation myths, myths of good v/s evil, heroic myths			
3. I can explain how myths help overcome fear of the unknown and effectively transmit religious, social and ethical values.			
4. I can explain challenges: competing myths, changes to meaning, myths as social constructs, demythologisation & scientific worldview.			
5. I can evaluate whether mythological language is able to offer a solution to the problem of religious language.			
6. I can discuss different religious attitudes to religious mythology and demythologisation of sacred writings.			

2.4 Religious Language: 2.4F Religious language as language game

1. I can explain Witgenstein's concept of Language games as meaningful to those who participate in the same language game.			
2. I can explain support for Language Game theory: non-cognitive use of language, coherence theory, & expresses belief.			
3. I can explain challenges to Language Games: religious claims lack verification & meaning, and problem of defining'God'.			
4. I know 3 or 4 useful quotes from Wittgenstein to help explain his Language Game theory.			
5. I can analyse and evaluate to what extent Language Games helps us resolve the problems of religious language.			
6. I can analyse and evaluate whether the strengths of Language Games outweigh the weaknesses.			

Date:

Student Reflection:
Teacher Comment: