

Responder → audience of responder.

## SECTION C

1. 'dear of a love  
January'

Write your answer in the space provided.

4 Evaluate the claim that religious language is meaningless.

In your response to this question, you must include how developments in Philosophy of Religion have been influenced by **one** of the following:

- Religion and Ethics
- New Testament Studies
- Study of a Religion.

Anslem.  
Bram.  
19:1  
logism  
pos.  
Kupper.  
etc.  
Wittgenstein  
& Raskin  
Lang.  
(30)

I take on the position that religious language is utterly meaningless. This is because propositions such as 'God exists' are unverifiable. A verifiable statement is a statement which the conclusion must be true. Though, we cannot know for sure that 'God exists' if we cannot verify it. This is A.J. Ayer's argument that what is unverifiable is ultimately meaningless. Although, Hick disagrees. Hick proposes the idea that we can know that God exists eventually, after we die. Therefore, such statements are not meaningless. However, we do not know if there is in fact an afterlife, so that statement continues to be meaningless. Furthermore, we could argue that a statement such as 'God is love, therefore he loves us' is utterly meaningless too. This is

HA059049274



P 7 5 7 3 0 A 0 1 5 2 4

Because the attribute of love given to God in this case, may not be the same 'love' we know of. There is a saying that "God works in mysterious ways" which suggests that God does not think like us. If our 'love' and God's 'love' is different, the language used to describe him is meaningless as it is above our comprehension. There is no way to verify God's 'love'. Critics would then

switch the argument to fit their narrative by arguing that in reality, God's love is different from ours but he still loves us as we are. Though religious statements continue getting ~~swayed~~ changed to fit a certain narrative (God is omniscient), then the proposition would result in 'death of a thousand paradoxes', wherein the proposition would end up becoming meaningless. The more the statement is changed many times, the more meaningless it becomes, then it cannot be used in any way.

Religious language is also used to ~~describe~~ argue for the existence of God.  
~~to the ontological argument.~~



~~Anscombe's Argument of imagining the greatest possible being and that everything that can be imagined must be real is refuted by Kant, who argues that it is not possible to give God the attribute of existence. This is much similar to now~~

In conclusion, religious <sup>statements</sup> language can suffer the claim of a thousand fallacies with regard to meaningfulness. However, it could be argued that due to bias, what is meaningless to a non-religious person, is meaningful to a religious person, therefore, meaning is <sup>ultimately</sup> subjective.

