

Unit - 4

Page No. : _____

Date : _____

1. "Religious language is non-cognitive." Justify the statement following Alick.

Ans: Non-Cognitivism claims that religious language does not express beliefs, but some other, non-cognitive mental state. And so religious claims do not try to describe the world and cannot be true or false. They express an attitude toward the world, a way of understanding or relating to the world. Alick argues that religious language is non-cognitive. This is to say that religious language is not to be taken literally as true or false.

Alick holds that the real is ultimately transcategorical, or mysterious, he points that all religious language, or language about the real, is mythological rather than literal, such mythological language is language that is not literally true but nevertheless tends to evoke an appropriate dispositional attitude towards the real. His application of this mythological language to Christology is perhaps the most well known and controversial, but Alick also proposes similar applications to theological doctrines of each of the various religions, and indeed, to his own Theodicy.

Alick's non-cognitive religion is based on the notion that the world is religiously ambiguous, such that it can be experienced either, religiously

or non-religious for or as religious in first instance at that the ambiguity interpreted drawing non-cognitive

highly or into new of consequences -cal not widely is

2. What is Explain correct

Ans: The primary language of religious sentences is the religious is the taken

to state or God problem then might

or non-religiously, with no compelling proofs for or against any one religious or non-religious interpretation of the world. Hick first introduced the notion of religious ambiguity in faith and knowledge, though at that time he applied it solely to the ambiguity between Theistic and Atheistic interpretations of the world rather than drawing and its fuller implications for non-cognitive religions.

But because Hick was such a highly original thinker, whose work fits into neither the established Orthodoxies of Conservative Christianity nor of Philosophical naturalism, his work has been both widely influential and widely criticized.

2. What is the speciality of religious language? Explain the doctrine of analogy in this connection.

Ans: The principle aim of research on religious language is to give an account of the meaning of religious sentences and utterance. Religious sentences are generally taken to be have a religious subject matter, a religious utterance is the production in speech or writing of a taken religious sentence.

The term religious language refers to statements or claims made about God or Gods. There is a typical philosophical problem of religious language. If God is infinite, then words used to describe finite creatures might not adequately describe God.

Without adequate solution to the

problem of religious language, human speech about God is called into question. Without the ability to speak about God and to understand the meaning of what is spoken, the religious language ideally serves several functions. It gives meaning and purpose to life, social unity and stability, serves as an agent of social control, promotes psychological and physical well being, and may motivate people to work for positive social change.

The problem of religious language considers whether it is possible to talk about God meaningfully if the traditional conceptions of God as being incorporeal, infinite, and timeless, are accepted. Because these traditional conceptions of God make it difficult to describe God, religious language has the potential to be meaningless. Theories of religious language other attempt to demonstrate that such language is meaningless, an attempt to show how religious language can still be meaningful.

Analogical language argues that the when terms are used to describe God and his attributes, those terms are used analogically. Thus, when the predicate 'good' is applied to God, it doesn't pick out a property that God has owing to divine simplicity. God does not have properties.

We may say that because

kinds and both lay eggs and deduce that they are both birds, but we are entirely wrong on our conclusion, from his writing we can deduce from ways to make judgements on analogies:

- (i) The strength of the analogy relies on how many similarities there are in the two things being composed.
- (ii) Similarity only exists in identical relatives and properties.
- (iii) Good analogies are based on underlying common causes or same general principle.
- (iv) Good analogies do not need to assume acquaintance with the underlying generalization. There should be obvious links.

Thus, according to we can talk about God meaningfully, in positive terms by analogy. An analogy is an attempt to explain the meaning of something which is difficult to explain the meaning of something which is difficult to understand by using a comparison with something familiar and easier to understand. So, it's wrong to say we are completely the same as God, but it's also wrong to say we are completely different. The middle finds is to say we are like God - Analogous to God.