1962

Can We Communicate Ultimate Reality?

David M. Newcomer

Recommended Citation

Can We Communicate Ultimate Reality ?

by

David M. Newcomer

Honors Paper
Illinois Wesleyan University
June 1, 1962

Preface

I would like to express my indebtedness to
the faculty of Illinois Wesleyan University for
presenting to me the opportunity to write an
honors paper.

The initial interest in the field of religious
language stems from lectures on "The Meaning of
Religious Language" which were presented by Professor
Paul Hessert. These lectures were given in the
Philosophy of Religion course offerfed in the spring
of 1961.

I would also like to thank Professor John
VanderWaal, chairman of the Philosophy Department
at Wesleyan, for his personal guidance and encouragement
during the preparation of this paper. Under his
direction the Buck Memorial Library is rapidly
attempting to compensate for its great deficiency
in source material pertaining to this subject.

Appreciation is also due to those certain
professors in various fields, who by their earnest
concern for knowledge and fine scholarship as
exhibited in their classroom, inspire many students
to plunge into an undertaking which from the inception
is beyond their grasp. The gratitude for these
individuals eludes an adequate expression.

OUTLINE

I. Preface

II. Introduction
    A. Man's concern for a directed existence
    B. Man is a social being, as a linguistic being
    C. Are our linguistics rooted in and do they
       communicate the intended reality?
    D. Proclamation of contemporary Zarathustra
    E. Three religious claims

II. Ontology
    A. Traditional function of philosophy
    B. Knowing participates in being- ontic relation
    C. Greek philosophy- search for
    D. Common nature to existence
    E. Relation of metaphysics to science
    F. Anti-metaphysical theologians
    G. Distinction between philosophy and theology

III. Contemporary Revolution in Philosophy
    A. Linguistic therapy
    B. Essential terms of semantics
    C. Sources of influence and main schools
    D. Preoccupation with meaning
    E. Logical positivists semantical approach
       to semantics
    F. Evaluation and appraisal

IV. A Functional Analysis of Religious Language
    A. The nature of faith
    B. Taking on of significance
    C. The introduction of mystery
    D. Various functions:
        1. Existential
        2. Ethical
        3. Belief
        4. "Quasi" factual
        5. Attitudinal
        6. "Directing attention"
        7. Convictional
        8. Impropriety
        9. Illumination through images

From the moment of conception, the organism designated by the Greek term "ἄνθρωπος" is involved in a process of growing into a complex and highly developed structure. The instant the egg and sperm unite, a zygote is formed and an individual is engaged in being or existence. Every being of necessity must respond to his existence. Man's response comprizes his life, and his life is what he experiences. Every man 'ought' to live in an awareness of his state of affairs - the human condition of an existing being. Indeed, from the inception of this paper, presuppositions are presented, but this should not appear unreasonable. The explicit assumption is that man's life or response to his existence concerns man's attempt to be an existentially authentic being. Man as a being engaged in existence is preoccupied with the meaning of existence, his existence.

Then man's ultimate response is to orientate himself to the cosmos. It is not adequate, according to Mircea Eliade, for man to simply say that he is in the world or "just here". That response is made only by an organism which vegetates, not an authentic being. Once again, the explicit and implicit assumption of this paper is that man, in full awareness of his state of being, necessarily seeks to orientate himself to the cosmos; this existential concern is for a directed existence, an authentic being.

As this distinct being evolves, he continually attempts to orientate himself in his existence in a meaningful manner. When anything becomes meaningful, man inevitably tries to communicate that which he understands as being the answer to authentic existence.

Simultaneously with the development of man's social relations, linguistic communication plays an increasingly important role. Language, as a means of communication, not only assists in the clarification of our own thoughts but serves as a means of communicating our ideas to others. We can therefore see that language is an integral part of social existence. Language is a priceless possession that must be employed with a conscious effort to use it properly. If our efforts to use language precisely deteriorate, our ability to communicate with meaning and clarity will greatly diminish. An essential "dialogue" will thereby be lost to the ages, and a significant part of our meaningful existence will also be sacrificed.

These thoughts introduce us immediately to the concern of this paper. We need to ask ourselves if our concepts catch hold of and convey the meanings we intend to communicate, i.e. are our linguistic apparatus rooted in the reality we seek to know, and do they communicate that reality

Ludwig Wittgenstein implies a similar, yet more emphatic consideration when he states, "In propositions there must be exactly as much distinguished (Gleich soviel zu unterscheiden) as in the state of affairs that it represents."[2] Language cannot be discussed without involving the facts to which they refer. Semantics and ontology are the main areas to be investigated. Another preliminary consideration is that the very nature of that which is known is indicated by the approach to and solution of these problems. This contemporary concern cannot and must not be glossed over lightly by anyone who would be and think as a philosopher or theologian in the realms of scholarship.

Due to the influence and questions being raised by the proponents of philosophical movements associated with linguistic analysis, the validity of theological statements is being questioned. Someone will attempt to answer these questions, and it would be preferable if there would be a feasible response from within the discipline being attacked. In a previous paper, I have tried to explain why language is the battleground of Twentieth Century philosophy. The purpose of this paper is to inquire into the cognitive implications of theological language, and within this undertaking

to recognize any change in the traditional function of philosophy.

It was a little over a half-century ago that Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) spoke his prophetic words through the character of Zarathustra. Zarathustra came down from the mountain "satiated with wisdom" and "descended into the lower world" in order that he might save mankind. Zarathustra's proclamation that God is dead is mild compared to the prophetic voices of the "doing" philosophers of today. Briefly, their Zarathustra would state that theological language is dead, traditional philosophy is dead, and philosophy is functional only as a linguistic theraphy. If the philosopher can clarify the different usages of language, man will be better able to understand what claims are being made by a certain language.

The claims made through religious language are the items that confront every individual and require a response from him. In general, all religious claims to fact incorporate and proclaim an understanding in a larger dimension than the standard spacio-temporal reference. The religious claim is that there is in every man a soul that is answerable to God. This realm irresistably confronts every authentically existing being. In addition to this most basic

consideration, there are the implicit claims to know-
ledge. All religious language involves an existential
knowledge about life or an individual's being. Secondly,
religious language entails a cognition of the cosmos as
an integrated whole. Lastly, religious language claims
a knowledge of the way life can be orientated to and
integrated with the cosmos. An example of the first
implication is St. Augustine's brief statement, "Our
heart cannot find rest until it has found Thee." (The
full ramifications of the existential knowledge confess-
ed in this statement can only be realized and under-
stood by a more thorough acquaintance with the main
tenets of Christianity.) A Taoists principle
illustrates the second claim to knowledge. Tao, the
cosmic energy, created the cosmos. Thereby, Tao
creates "the way to go" and the physical universe is
formed in a proper and distinct way or channel. The
third claim is clearly expressed by Buddha's teach-
ing of the Law of Karma. If an individual will
follow the "Middle Path", he may advance to a higher
existence in his next birth. Karma, the inevitable
judgement of sins which determines your next exist-
ence, is a principle of justice that deals with man's
relationship to the cosmos. In conclusion, religious
statements proclaim the knowledge of a reality above

this material realm. This higher reality has pervading results in the existence of every human being. The fulfillment of life or the meaning of one's life comes with the establishment of this relationship of life with the cosmos.[3]

These religious claims point to and attempt to express the being of a higher reality, a reality that is absolute and ultimate. This religious concern for the ultimate involves one's total response. Karl Barth expresses the belief that this subjective search is an encounter with the objective, ultimate reality. For Barth, this is the historical Jesus of Nazareth who is the Christ. Therefore, theological language is not simply subjective, whimsical postulations, but refers to a concrete reality to which an existential being passionately responds.

At this point our discussion is progressing toward statements dealing with reality or being. For the theologian this confrontation with the problem of reality entails ontological implications. Turning our attention in an ontological direction introduces us to a perennial problem of philosophy. Traditionally the problem of reality has been handled by philosophy under the title of metaphysics. Metaphysics has been broken into three categories; ontology, epistemology,

and axiology. The term "metaphysics" was coined by
the Romans to describe the type of writings that
followed Aristotle's book called <u>Physics</u>. Thus the
preposition μετά ("after") was prefixed to Physics
to designate any similar writings.

When Paul Tillich discusses this aspect of
philosophy he believes that it is less misleading to
speak of ontology than of metaphysics. Tillich suggests
that we "call philosophy that cognitive approach to
reality in which reality as such is the object. Reality
as such, or reality as a whole, is not the whole of
reality; it is the structure which makes reality a
whole and therefore, a potential object of knowledge.
Inquiring into the nature of reality as such means
inquiring into those structures, categories, and
concepts which are presupposed in the cognitive encounter
with every realm of reality."[4]

It is apparent for Tillich that the character of the
general structures that make experience possible involves
<u>the</u> philosophical question. Reference is here made to
Tillich because he most adequately explains that when
the religious statements express a claim to knowledge,
the statements are inextricably bound-up in <u>the</u>
ontological question. Since knowing is an act that
participates in being, i. e. an "ontic relation",

the analysis of the act of knowing must refer to an
interpretation of being. Understanding this issue,
we can readily see the friction between Tillich's
ideas and those of contemporary liguistic analysists to
abandon ontology. Tillich's answer is very clear. Any
answer to the relation of signs or logical operations to
reality involves a statement about the "structure of
being." Therefore, all statements as to cognitive
claims should express their fundamental ontological
assumptions. In conclusion, we should not look on
ontology as a subjective stab in the dark at "the
world behind the world." Theological statements are
directly concerned with an analysis of those structures
of being which we experience in our everyday, every
moment involvement with reality.[5]

In order to establish the idea of an absolute
structure more firmly in our minds, we need only
investigate the Milesian school's search for the φυσις-
that which is primary, fundamental, and persistent,
what is natural or given. The three Ionian
philosophers, Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes,
respectively believed water, απειρον (the boundless),
and air to be the principle of all things. These
philosophers initiated a tradition search for the
absolute, not the relative or secondary substances.

Again in The Republic, Socrates, in his maieutic
fashion, wasn't simply for subjective opinions con-
cerning the meaning of "justice". Polemarchos' con-
ventional definition or Thracymarchos' radical sophist
definition of "justice" were insufficient; they weren't
founded in an absolute structure.

Granted that theology is necessarily confronted
with the ontological question, we need to consciously
ask whether Tillich explains it clearly by saying that
which confronts us ultimately must be being if we are
to be confronted by and concerned with this reality.
He also proposes that this being must be our ground of
being or the unconditional power of being. More
emphatically he states that this "being itself"
expresses itself in and through the structures of
being."[6] After having briefly stated Tillich's
ontological viewpoint, we will gain additional under-
standing by a further explanation of ontological
structures.

Everett W. Hall, in his article entitled
"Metaphysics", suggests that the present degradation
of metaphysics is a result of the prevailing emphasis
on action and doing something directly and immediately.
In reply, Hall states that metaphysics indirectly plays
a vital share in directing progress by "shaping views

as to what nature is and how it can and ought to be
controlled, by indicating the proper ends."[7] The
second criticism of metaphysics is illuminated by
explaining that Dewey's attempt to make thought the
instrument of activity is still based upon metaphysical
assumptions. The enterprise of metaphysics is also
attacked because of its high degree   Any
assumption on the part of specialists to the effect
that generality leads to unrealiability and thus to a
futile inquiry as to its truth, is in itself based
upon metaphysical foundations.

In our thinking, actions, and communication, all
people respond according to assumptions based upon
their experiences. Undergirding our intention to
communicate our existential situations to others,
there is the very basic assumption that there is an
objective, common nature to all cases of knowledge
and also to all existents.[8] We thus affirm by our
existence that we believe in a "common nature to
existence" in the entities which we suppose to exist
and that it is objective to our action and response;
and most important, it is objective to even our
language. Such universal constants the scholastics
referred to as "transcendentals." This reference did

not imply that such existents transcended all experience, but rather it was expressing the conviction that these existents were a constant factor in each and every experience. Mircea Eliade would add that this transcendental element is the sacred as contrasted with the profane. If we can once establish this point, we can then proceed to the problem of expressing the experience of existents in meaningful language or meaningful sentence structures. Hall believes that a meaningful statement referring to universal constants "excludes symbolic expressions in their referential aspect (though not as facts)."(9) Unfortunately he does not explain why only objective language as described by the logical positivists is acceptable. (Although we are still involved with the inception of this paper, this is the very point we shall be trying to clarify. Religious statements as symbolic statements are referring to an objective existent.)

Metaphysicians have traditionally made claims concerning the nature of knowledge and about what exists and what it is to exist. They are not primarily concerned with what part of things exist. At the same time the metaphysician can not and must not believe himself to be independent of scientific findings. In general metaphysicians must be able to modify their

stand, not their aims, and according to science, must
utilize science, and generalize from scientific
generalizations. It is the task of metaphysics to
establish by induction from scientific propositions,
propositions that do not occur explicitly in the
sciences as a result of assumptions with built-in
exclusiveness.

After having referred to the relationship between
metaphysics and science, it is essential to clearly
distinguish between the types of hypothesis with which
they respectively deal. Scientific hypothesis can be
varified because they state a relationship between
variables. If the variables have been identified we
may verify whether a predicted result actually takes
place ($Y = (f)X + K$). Metaphysical hypotheses refer
to constants; they refer to an existent condition of
being. Therefore, particular positive instances are
neither conclusive nor do they posit definite
verification. Yet the instances serve as illustrations
by clarifying through concrete examples and stimulating
imaginative insight which makes us aware of contra-
dictory illustrations. Particular instances aid in
sizing up an entire perceptual field.

Since the methodology of metaphysics must be
applied to unverifiable statements, there is often the

tendency to allow "anything to go". Actually meta-
physicians should try to constantly develop their
methodology so as to state what would constitute
approximate disverifications. In the final analysis
they must exercise critical inquiry and honest in-
sight. Though these two attitudes are the best method
possible, they remain highly unreliable. The meta-
physician must sincerely attempt to survey experience
from many various standpoints.

At times there have been strong reactions to meta-
physics among theologians. The two main anti-metaphysical
theologians should be viewed in the light of their Kantian
influence. It was Kant's epistemological dualism that
lead to a metaphysical agnosticism. It is also the
interweaving of Kantian dualism and agnosticism that has
infiltrated all German theology since Kant. Friedrich
Schleiermacher (1768-1834) in his discussion of religion
substituted the "feeling of absolute dependence" for
theology. The "father of modern theology" would not
allow the intellectual or ethical aspect of consciousness
to be stressed as being more supreme than the religious
consciousness. Following along in the footsteps of his
precusor, Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889) continues the
reaction against metaphysical theology by saying that
we know God only on the basis of value-judgments.

Religious judgments were valuational rather than
existential. God is not reached by speculation, nor
by "evidences" in nature, nor by any mystical experiences,
nor by a rational apriori or intimate feeling. They
rejected metaphysics as the manner in which to stress
objectivity.[10]

But again we are drawn back to the fact that there
still remains that perennial
religious ideas in which the faith is expressed. This
is the very reason that Paul Tillich insists that
theology and philosophy ultimately are drawn to the
same ontological question. We can not side-step the
issue - man is confronted with being. To this truth he
must respond.

Philosophy is not the concern for mere matters of
fact; rather it is the "best wisdom of the lover of
wisdom, with reference to ultimate value and ultimate
reality."[11] Such a philosophical-theological
approach underlines the fact that man with his total
being responds to what he considers unconditionally
important and his ultimate concern. He responds to
reality as a whole.

Tillich continues in his "Introduction" to
distinguish between theology and philosophy.
"Philosophy deals with the structure of being in

itself; theology deals with the meaning of being for us."(12) While being driven by a passion for object-ive truth, the philosopher intends to pursue an investigation of being and its structures by means of a detached objectivity. In quite an opposite manner, the theologian involves himself with and commits him-self to the existence which is his subject matter. Thus the first point of divergence is the cognitive attitude. Secondly, there is divergence concerning the difference in their sources. "The philosopher looks at the whole of reality to discover within it the structure of reality as a whole." He believes his cognative ability is such that he can understand the structures of being. He likewise assumes that the _logos_ of reality as a whole and the _logos_ working in him are identical. In other words, the logos permeates all or is common to all. No particular or special place reveals the structure of being. The cosmos is pure reason.(13)

The theologian does not have as his source of knowledge universal logos. The specific _logos_ that manifests itself in a particular historical event, that became flesh, is the theologian's source of knowledge. The logos is not manifest through common rationality but through the church. The difference in content is shown when the philosopher deals with the

categories of being in relation to the material which is
structured by them and when the theologian relates the
same categories and concepts to the quest for the "new
being". He speaks of the self-estrangement of the
subject, about the spiritual center of personal life,
and about community as a possible embodiment of the
"New Being".[14]

Having sufficiently examined the traditional
function of ontology and having discussed the traditional
ontological similarities and differences between the
philosopher and theologian, it is important to view the
previous considerations in the light of any beneficial
contemporary trends. It is my conviction that con-
temporary philosophy might help us in focusing-in on
the essence of this paper.

Our primary concern shall be the investigation of
a general statement made by R. Gregor Smith in the
General Introduction to the wonderful series of books
published by The Library of Philosophy and Theology.
The statement is as follows:

"Many things have contributed so to change the
picture of the work which theologians and philosophers
have to do that it seems to be not so much a modified
picture as an entirely new one. The strong blasts of
positive and empirical dogmatic theology blowing down

from Switzerland upon Europe and America, the immense
changes which have overtaken philosophy, especially in
Britain, so that the very ways of thinking seem to have
altered, and the changes which have taken place in the
world in which we all live - have continued to bring
about this revolution. We live in a post-liberal, post-
idealist, atomic age in theology. Philosophy and theology
alike are being compelled to face their traditional
problems in such a radical way that the question even
arises; are our traditional problems the real ones?"[15]

Willem F. Zuurdeeg has been as responsive to these
new influences and has tried to incorporate the advantages
of new movements and corresponding revolutions in his
book, An Analytical Philosophy of Religion. It is
Zuurdeeg's firm conviction that a break with the
traditional idealistic approach to the function of
philosophy is essential with the new insights brought
about by the Analytic Age. According to him, the
function of philosophy is to analyze languages. This
function appears most realistic because "it follows a
method which complies with what we can observe about
people."[16]   In our culture we are most aware that men
speak many languages (e.g. mathematics, empirical
science, moral , poetry, and various religious
languages.) Therefore we must not look upon philosophy

as a rational attempt to discover the true meaning of life, the real value of things or the intrinsic nature of the universe.

This movement has been called by various terms — Logical Positivism, Logical Empiricism, Logical Analysis, and Analytical Philosophy. While each term stands for a peculiar emphasis, this movement rebels against the accusation that it is a school. They consider themselves "doing philosophy." The entire group of men can be most easily referred to under the heading, analytical philosophy. William Hordern of Garrett Theological School in a recent lecture stressed the idea that very few pursuits have come to such quick maturity. Taking a que from August Comte's proposal that positivism is a higher evolutionary plateau that goes beyond mythology and philosophy, the philosophical analysists have emphasized the inability to make judgments, the abandonment of metaphysics (which results from language confusion), and necessity of not making value-judgements. In essence, the task of the philosopher is to make himself unnecessary. This does not involve a theory but activity. Philosophy is therapy of language. This is the honest conclusion to the question, "What is the purpose of philosophy?" The throne of philosophy has splintered into many chairs

of science. These chairs of science have splintered into many specialized footstools. This historical revolution has caused contemporary philosophy (maybe a passing fad) to propose the preceding function. (17)

Today the word "semantics" is being referred to by many people in many different fields. In most academic circles investigation of semantics has become a pre-occupation. The field of philosophy (specifically the logical positivist movement) has been its main entertainers. This trend is clearly reflected in such remarks as, "Our entire philosophy is a correction of our use of language."(18) In a similar tone Bertrand Russell has said that the function of philosophy is not to edify mankind, but to clarify meanings.

"The importance to the philosopher of the study of semantics may be realized when it is pointed out that there could be no philosophy without words, and that philosophy consists of the meanings of words."(19) William Hoerber continues with a word of warning. We must proceed with discriminative caution as we approach various linguistic developments. Even though these people are preoccupied with meaningfulness, they too are sometimes vague in their terminology. We will encounter different uses of the words 'semantics',

'language', and 'meaning'. If we are to really understand and think with these men, we must know what each is referring to when he speaks of "verification" et cetera. We must look for the assumptions and inevitable outcome of their proposals. "The apprehending and study of semantical distinctions, relations and principles is preparation of the ground upon which a scientific foundation of philosophy may be built more easily, and more securely. It is a primary part of a scientific method in philosophy."(20)

"He is a boy;" and "It is raining outside;" and "My disposition for doing what was right prevented me from robbing the bank", are all basic statements representing quite different types of grammatical structures. The first one is meaningful and is necessarily true by the established definition of its words. The second statement may be meaningful. Its meaningfulness depends upon verification, which we find to be possible. The third statement leads us into some difficulty. How are we to verify this feeling? If we cannot verify it, should we continue discussing it? It is evident that we have come up against a a typical semantical problem. Can we retain this meaningless statement and use our language justly? This is the context of our topic. Those philosophers who

deal exclusively with linguistic problems 'feel' that
a more detailed analysis of our linguistic systems will
lead to answers having factual validity and being able
to be verified. Thereby, it is the greatest hope that
the emotional pitfalls of the ordinary uncritical use
of linguistics may be overcome. We cannot stand by and
allow language to lose its cognitive claims.

Rudolf Carnap wrote a fine introduction to
semantics. His purpose in writing the book is, in
addition to a purely formal analysis of language,
that we are in dire need of "an analysis of the signify-
ing function of language, in other words, a theory of
meaning and interpretation."(21) Another very
important consideration which Carnap is willing to
express, and most others will not spell out in their
writings, is that this development of semantics will
ultimately construct a theory of truth and a theory of
logical deduction. We must always keep in mind these
purposes and their far-reaching implications.

Semiotic is the theory of signs and language.
This theory is divided into three areas, these areas
stress different types of relationships. Pragmatics
(or interpretics) is the term referring to the relation-
ship between words and user. Syntax is the relationship
between words and other words. Semantics is the relation-

-ship between the words and objects they designate.

Semantics is our main field of interest in this section.

R. Carnap also subdivides the Semantical division
of Semiotics. Descriptive semantics is a title given to
"the description and analysis of the semantical features,
either"of some particular historically given language,..
or of all historically given languages in general."[22]
Then descriptive semantics is primarily the description
of facts or is in general an empirical science. A
semantical system is the result of building a set of
semantical rules. "The construction and analysis of
semantical systems is called pure semantics."[23] Thus,
in contradistinction to the former, pure semantics is
analytical and does not pertain to factual content.

In Chapter B, Carnap introduces us to a few more
essential terms. In the above discussion we recognized
that a semantical system involves a designated set of
rules. It is evident that by designating a certain set
of rules by which our language must abide, we in-
augurate a semantical system that establishes a
truth-condition for every sentence employing descriptive
semantics. Carnap says that the rules are a sufficient
and necessary condition for the truth of an object.
In other words, a system of language is made understand-
able by the rules, because to understand the assertion

by the sentence is to know under what conditions it would be true. This is the necessary ground work in understanding some of the main statements referred to by other books on the subject. Thus Carnap has adequately expressed that rules determine the meaning or sense of a sentence.

Another significant point made by Carnap is that truth and falsity are designated by this term. The truth-condition previously discussed is a preliminary step toward the truth-value of a sentence.

Carnap sums up his brief introduction by stating, "a semantical system may be constructed in this way: first a classification of the signs is given, then the rules of formation are laid down, then rules of designation, and finally rules of truth."[24] The logical outcome is a prescription for truth and such a prescription culminates in a "Correspondence" theory of truth. Thus we should realize that a great deal is at stake.

A few words in the way of summation are probably necessary at this point. Bertrand Russell, when discussing Ludwig Wittgenstein says that he views the development of semantical systems much as we would a chess game. If we are to play the game, there are certain rules which we must observe and

only certain moves that we are able to make.
"Wittengenstein (Tractatus 4.024, 4.46) has
emphasized the point of view that the truth-conditions
of a sentence constitute its meaning, and that under-
standing consists in knowing these conditions."[25]

It would be almost impossible and a great short-
coming of this paper, not to sight some of the sources,
schools, and men who have made outstanding contributions
to linguistic movement. Logical positivism has been the
leading proponent of many linguistic doctrines. In
general, this movement is opposed to the religious
philosophy of Protestant New-Orthodoxy. "Its aim is
to get away from metaphysical value judgments and to
purify knowledge from all axiological and religious
elements."[26] The sources of logical positivism are
rooted deeply in philosophy and science. A study of
British empiricism of the Eighteenth Century is a
fine introduction to their beliefs. Following the
positivistic influence of Comte they state that the
sum total of knowledge is provided by science. They
inherited the empiricist idea (Locke, Berkeley, and Hume)
that only assertions about empirical facts admit of
verification. Jumping ahead in our discussion, but
relevant to this point, is Hume's belief that the
impossibility of metaphysics is due to the inability

of verifying its problems.

The Vienna Circle founded by Moritz Schlick is
probably the outstanding group in the historical
of philosophy's preoccupation with linguistics.
Mach preceded Schlick and made one outstanding con-
tribution to the school. His procedure used in defining
terms employed in mechanics was that meaning is in the
method. When the domineering and ruthless Nazi regime
came into being, the Vienna group broke up. Schlick,
its founder , was stabbed by one of his students. Carnap
went to the University of Chicago and continued teaching
and writing. Waissmann went to teach at Oxford. Neurath,
who sied in England in 1945, was to become the first
editor of the Monographs which were published just before the
outbreak of the war and which later became the basis of the
International Encyclopedia of Unified Sciences. Later we
see the entrance of the mathematicians, Whitehead and
Russell, and the pragmatists, Peirce, James, and Dewey.
This transplantation of logical empiricism was greatly
aided by Alfred Jules Ayer's book, Language, Truth
and Logic , published in 1936. (Reference to this book
will be made later.)

It is interesting to note that R. Carnap in his
Introduction to Semantics states that the systematic
development of semantics stems from the Warsaw school

of logicians. This group's contributions have been in
the fields of contemporary logic and logical foundations
of mathematics. Kraft's book, <u>The Vienna Circle</u>, is the
only other book that draws specific attention to this
group. S. Lesniewski's lectures dealt with semantical
concepts, e.g. concept of truth and the semantical
antinomes. T. Kotarbinski made a detailed analysis of
certain semantical and related pragmatical concepts.
Alfred Tarski who was the main influence behind Carnap's
book laid the foundation of a systematic construction
on the basis of the preceding analysis. Because the
works of the Polish school were not translated until
after 1936, they have not been given the credit they
deserve.

Another great influence upon the philosophy of
analysis in England has been the Cambridge School.
Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951) is undoubtedly the
paramount figure in this school and possibly the
entire historical development of semantics. Due to
the existence of the Nazi regime, Ludwig went to
Cambridge where he was appointed professor in 1939
as a result of G. E. Moore's retirement. The
<u>Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus</u> (1921) was the only
book published during his life time. In 1958 his
'Preliminary Studies for the "Philosophical

Investigations" ', <u>The Blue and Brown Books</u> was
published. Ludwig dictated the "Blue Book" to his class
at Cambridge during the 1933-34 term and had a few
copies stenciled. The "Brown Book" was presented in
the same manner during 1934-35 at which time he had
only two students. That year he had only three copies
made. These two one-year lecture notes were circulated
bound in a blue wrapper and brown wrapper respectively,
and thereby they acquired their names.

In the early portions of the "Blue Book"
Wittgenstein believes that the puzzles we try to solve
arise from an attitude toward language. "The man who
is philosophically puzzled sees a law in the way a
word is used, and, trying to apply this law consist-
ently comes up against . . . . paradoxical results."(27)
Before this discussion he does not see mataphysics
connected with language, but rather an attempt to ask
and answer questions in a scientific manner.

In his first publication (Tractatus) he developed
the view that all truths of logic are tautologies.
Tautologies are simply analytical statements. Their
contradictory is a self-contradiction. They are
necessarily true. In the following years, his interest
changed from logic to logical analysis.

Earlier we referred to Ludwig when speaking of

his concept of "language games" with their rules and restrictions. Later he rejected what had been said in his first book concerning statements being divided into ultimate constituents - logical atomism. One of his major statements was that the meaning of a word is acquired through and in its use. According to him, we must learn the 'grammar' or 'logic' of a word. "The raising of metaphysical problems would then be the result of a defective grasp of the grammar of words. For once the rules are properly understood, there survives no temptation to ask such questions. Linguistic therapy has cured us from the desire."(28)

With an understanding of the problems, the basic terms, main sources of influence, and prominent proponents, we are required to center our attention on the preoccupation with meaning. It is quite evident that all linguistic developments should be investigated with the recognition that it did not come about in a vacuum, and a conscious effort should be made to recognize the influences of the logical, mathematical, and scientific developments of the nineteenth and twentieth conturies.

In any semantical analysis it is necessary to presuppose the stipulated relation between the sign and the signified. Specific meaning is given to a sign

when we precisely designate what the above relation
is to be. If any stipulation is to be made, both
the sign and the signified must be identifiable. If
we use the word "tree" we must be able to indicate
what the word is and indicate what the signified
object (tree) is. This process is usually carried on
by definition, but definitions don't proceed on ad
infinitum. We, sooner or later, arrive at primitive
concepts (undefinable words) where we simply point
to the immediately present.

We thus see the necessity of verification if only
by pointing. This brings us to the belief that the
meaning of the sign is in its verification. For the
statement "It is raining outside." to have any mean-
ing we will in the process of analysis discover the
means of verification. Alfred Jules Ayer, in his book
Language, Truth, and Logic does not think a relevant
experience is sufficient for verification and neither
are observational statements. He carries the necessity
of verification to the extreme of requiring an ex-
perimental statement. He is willing to say that state-
ments according to some semantical systems are meaning-
ful which are neither analytic nor empirically verifiable.
For him the only real meaning and meaningful statement
in the sense of true or false is the literal meaning as

distinguished from the factual meaning or empirical
hypothesis. Unless a statement meets this meaning
of the 'verification of meaning', it would not be
capable of being understood in a scientific hypothesis
or common-sense statements.

Kraft, as he views the semantical developments
of the Vienna school, doesn't believe their idea of
verification necessitates actual verification. They
are speaking more of a 'verification in principle'.
This possibility of verification can be either by
logical

Meaningless statements are empty in regards to being
scientifically verifiable, but are in no way non-
sensical. Even though such statements are not non-
sensical, he discusses them very little. Our only
conclusion is that they are of little significance.

He points out that we must be careful if we say
that only assertions about empirical facts admit of
verification. In essence, only statements we prove
through experience are meaningful because they alone,
can be verified. Therefore, mathematical and logical
statements are meaningless, even if they are state-
ments concerning the logic of science.

In summarizing the verificational analysis,
Fredrick Ferré says that we should set rules for

language if we are to use it as an instrument for a communication of fact. But he says, and we should remember, that we will get out of a language what we put into it. Within the dichotomy of analytic statements of truth-conditions (no experience necessary) and fact-asserting synthetic statements (which are not meaningful because they are extra linguistic and must be tested against some form of relevant truth e.g. sense experience), all logically important meaningfulness is included.

For a fuller understanding of the topic let us further investigate the meaning of a relevant truth. Our sense-experience verification is not conclusive. The corollary to this statement is that verification is greater or lesser probable but not necessary. It stands to reason that if we can through verification prove the positive denial of the negative we also have a meaningful statement. Thus verification can also be arrived at by falsifiability.[29]

If we attempt to verify anything beyond analytic or synthetic statements, we are once again in danger. At this level truth-conditions are not met and any statements are devoid of literal significance. If they are stated, they are parasitical because they fail to abide by the rules. These statements operate

on an "emotive capital" because they do not allow for
translation into statements about possible experience.

Ferré presents an excellent summary in three
basic statements. a) Philosophy is not empirically
uninformative. Wittgenstein says, "Philosophy is not
a natural science." The sphere for philosophy is
"logical meaningfulness." He became convinced that
philosophy should rid itself of a priori notions re-
garding an ideal language and of the relation of
language to fact and concern itself only with language
as such, within its actual use. b.) Linguistic
significance is the primary subject matter of
philosophy. Analysis is essential because grammatic-
ally perfect sentences may conceal logical unmeaning .
c.) The function of philosophy is to engage in analysis
of meaningful language.

According to Ayer, all philosophers that have been
considered to be great have simply been misunderstood
analysists. For example, Socrates was most interested
in establishing the meaning (e.i. identifying specific-
ally what we mean) of terms. In the Republic,
Socrates wants man to ask himself what he really means
by the word "justice." Do we really know the meaning
of terms? If we don't stipulate a meaning of what
value are they? There are no per se philosophical

problems. Philosophy is a method of making statements
clear, it is involved with solving puzzles, not reveal-
ing truth.(30)

It is important that we recognize the ramifications
of such proposals and the blow that is given to meta-
physics. The movement of logical positivism seems to be
one more of the many movements which developed within
the realm of philosophy; and when this off-shoot became
independent, it took away a portion of its mother. The
question remains, "Will the mother which has given
birth to many offspring be resolved through the in-
dependent division of her branches?"

Wittgenstein has said that metaphysics so long as
they exist have a defective grasp of the 'grammar' of
words. Ayer says that metaphysics cannot reveal to us
knowledge of a transcendent reality. We can only verify
that which the senses can experience and not the super-
experience.

M. Schlick wrote an essay entitled "Turning Point
in Philosophy". (Die Wendi Der Philosophie" opened the
first number of Volume I of Erkenntniss (1930-31).) In
his anti-metaphysical essay, principle assumptions are
set forth. "The clue to their nature is to be found
in the fact that every cognition is an expression or
representation. That is, it expresses a fact which is

cognized in it." "So all knowledge is such only by
virtue of its form. It is through its form that it
represents the fact known." The signs not becoming
the determiner of reality and any ideas concerning
epistemology are thrown to the wind. "The form it-
self cannot be represented."[31] "Everything is
knowable which can be expressed . . . There are
consequently no questions which are in principle
insoluble." Meaningless sequence of words are such
because "they' "transgress the profound inner rules" of
logical syntax discovered by new analysis."[32] (The
inner quotes are my own. It seems this is purely
emotional language.)

Schlick continues by saying there can be no meta-
physics "not because we aren't capable of the task but
because there is no task. Then it will no longer be
necessary to speak of "philosophical problems" for one
will speak philosophically concerning all problems.."[33]

Ferré has a very interesting chapter dealing with
the elimination of theological metaphysics. The almost
impossible problem to be solved is for the theological
language to maintain a factual content and at the same
time have a supernatural reference. The radical division
in language between the observable and unobservable is
not permissable.

To say that God is necessary is to say something logically impossible; a synthetical term such as God united with an analytical term is logically incompatable. It is similar to speaking of a round square or a beginning not preceded by something. This theological misuse of language is emotive. Since these statements are unfalsibiable, they are nonsense. (Recall that a previous man said that a meaningless statement is not non-sensical. And according to what Schlick said above, this idea is nonsense and thus doesn't exist.)

A revelant parable told originally by Professor John Wisdom explains how two men came to a group of flowers in the jungle. One man said there was a gardener, and the other disagreed. After no gardener showed up in a few days, and they had built an electric fence around the area and no screams were heard, and no blood hounds tracked anyone down, the original believer said the gardener was invisible. The other friend replied asking how the elusive gardener differs from an imaginary gardener or even from no gardener at all.[34]

In passing it is worth noting that we should not give

which is essential. An example of his restatement is that instead of saying "God exists", we should say

"some people have had and all may have experiences called 'meeting God'".(35)

· There are four main ideas that we may obtain from R. Carnap's essay "The Elimination of Metaphysics...." Any psychological association of some image or feeling with a word is not a sufficient or valid way of acquiring meaning. There is no critera for an application and nothing is asserted. Simply putting these emotional words in new context does not help in becoming meaningful. Secondly, Carnap believes the mythological use of 'God' is meaningful but the metaphysical use is meaningless because it transcends experience. The theological use of the word oscillates between the former two and its disadvantage is that it is judged by the empirical science. Thridly, under the topic the "Meaninglessness of All Metaphysics", he deals with the faults centering around the verb "to be." The first fault is the ambiguity between its use as a copula prefixed to a predicate and its use as designating existence. The second fault lies in the meaning of its use as "existence".(36) Since Kant we have known that "existence" is not a property (God is). It can only be applied to a predicate (e.g. Descartes' "cogito ergo sum".) First, we cannot say that "I exist". An existential statement does not have the form " a

exists" but rather "there exists a." The second fault
is the transition from "I think" to "I exist". Not
"I am B" to "I am" but rather "I am B" to "B exists".
(G. E. Moore is supposed to have written an influential
essay dealing with the faults of the verb "to be".)

Up to this time there have only been slight
indications of personal disagreement or rather obvious
inadequacies of certain ideas. At present we must
appraise and evaluate some essential doctrines.

Almost all men that have been mentioned as proponets
of "the method of verification provides the meaning"
(the most general way of expressing the over-all trend)
say that the function of philosophy is not the represent-
ation of facts. As Carnap says, metaphysical speculation
merely expresses a volitional attitude toward life. He
believes the context of metaphysical speculation is not
theoretical and therefore does not describe the state
of affairs.

Personally, this seems to be one of the major
shortcomings. An attitude, which I believe metaphysics
to be, may well be non-theoretical in the sense that
this language does not refer to plain, unadulterated
objective facts. BUT we cannot go a step further
(which their assumption seems to do) and deny that
these life-feelings don't indicate and point to a

reality as factual (possible a better term would be "quasi-factual") as any other and aren't meaningful to our existence. A 'reality' as prescribed by their assumptions definitely short changes reality. They only deal with a segment of reality which they "feel" confident to handle. According to Ferrè, any victory that narrows down what is fact is too cheap to be convincing. Susanne K. Langer would also agree that they have arbitrarily created their own "little grammar bound island."

When anyone sets up arbitrary rules by which we arrive at meaning, they are setting up a priori conditions for truth and exclude anything else. They seem to be saying if you cannot play our rules then you cannot play. This is an escape from some real issues and a denial of what could possibly be reality. The movement starts out in an attempt to clarify language and discard unverifiable language games and winds up creating their own isolated game in a vacuum. Man determines the meaning of sign-combinations. Meaning becomes relative to a certain language composed of a semantical system. Wittgenstein himself recognized some of these things when he said "My statements are meaningless" and nothing is easier than to expose and question as a meaningless pseudo-problem.[37]

The verification principle is misunderstood if
it is used as a criterion for judging the meaningfulness
of all language. The principle itself should be assert-
ing a fact, but when the principle is used to test it-
self we find it devoid of meaning because there is no
sense experience for the task. For on their very
premises the statements must be judged meaningless.
Ferré also shows its narrowness in dealing with
theological language and paradoxes which may both be
"philosophically useful or cognitively illuminating."
In essence it becomes a criterion of empiricality, not
of meaningfulness.(38)

In summation, the using of the verification
principle has possibly saved metaphysics and theological
discourse from becoming non-cognitive through lack of
a technical use of language. 'It is primarily valuable
as an antidote, but poisonous as an exclusive diet.'
As a principle it surely fails to appreciate the wide
variety of linguistic uses. Carried to its logical
extreme it distorts our use of language rather than
clarifies. After thinking through this section we
should realize that there is a necessity for meta-
physics and an urgent need to be concerned with
semantics. Language is the only means of communicating
factual experiences. We cannot abandon language or

get away with misusing it. It is necessary for living
a full life. We must make a conscious effort to do
language justice. An investigation of meaningfulness
must always be at the fore-front of philosophical
investigations.

Thus far we have tried to explain the ontological
question as presented by traditional philosophy and
have sought an understanding of the contemporary fad in
philosophy to analyze the language which attempts to
communicate this reality. In the final section we will
be primarily concerned with a functional analysis of
religious language. This approach seems to be only
natural after realizing the built-in shortcomings in
the premises of the earlier analytical philosophers and
the insight into our problem given through Wittgenstein's
proposal that the only remaining approach is to concern
ourselves with the actual use of language, not an ideal
language and its relation to fact.

Probably the best transitional idea is that espoused
by Willem Zuurdeeg as he draws attention to the differen-
tiating factors between mere propositional statements and
statements made by a person.[39] To ask the meaning of
propositions is only relevant to mathematics and science.
To ask the meaning of what a person states is relevant
to religious language. The latter idea reveals that

the language situation involves a human situation. As
Zuurdeeg continues in his book, this emphasis exposes
us to the man-who-speaks. Man speaks with convictions.
In fact, man is his convictions. Emphasizing his idea
with more vehemence, Zuurdeeg calls the language of
mathematics and science "artificial" language. I take
this to mean, it is artificial because it does not take
man into consideration. We cannot perform a logical
analysis of a person. Simultaneously and interwoven
with the language situation is a human situation. A
definite shortcoming of any analysis is the omission
of this significant fact.

Often in the historical development of philosophy
and theology we encounter attempts to explain the
epistemological basis of faith. But it seems evident
that such ideas concerning the dynamics of faith are
only convincing for those who already have made
theistic commitments. An example of this would be the
Voluntarist's belief that faith creates the fact.
According to voluntarist, man cannot wait for a proof
concerning his faith. It is similar to an understanding
that a girl's love depends upon the boy's love that is
offered simultaneously. Another manner in which his
idea may be expressed is that we cannot wait to plant a
seed until we have proof that a plant will grow from

the seed. It appears as though the relationship between
the seed and the flower is conscientiously known, even
if this knowledge is the result of accidental findings,
before a person ultimately commits himself to the act of
planting. It is as if theism were already true. Like-
wise any attempt to base faith on the moral order of the
universe (e.g. Butler's Conscience, Kant's Moral Law, or
Ross' Duty) seems to be convincing only for those who
already profess theistic inclinations. Again there
seems to be no logical inference from the illative
sense (i.e. "to divine the significance of a large field
of evidence", or "appreciating the drift of miscellaneous
mass of evidence")[40] to the knowledge that God exists.
These attitudes seem to be the result and not the cause.

John Hick's development of the nature of faith
provides certain insights for our present point of con-
cern. His basic thesis deals with the manner of
cognition by which the religious man gains an awareness
of God. Another of his main endeavors is to see how
religious cognition is related to other cognitions. In
the inception he states that there is an epistemological
pattern employed for all knowing. He stresses the fact
that the theistic belief will be peculiar, but this is
only natural when we consider that through it
cognization of a unique object is known. The word

"significance" instead of "form" or "meaning" is the key word. The latter words have been used in so many various philosophies that too much time would be required to clarify their meaning and draw out the distinctions necessary for the continuation of the presentation.

The basic characteristic of human experience is the taking on of "significance". It is this fundamental and all persuasive characteristic that permits the conscious experiencing of outer reality; the possession of significance is that which enables us to inhabit and come to terms with our environment.

Significance makes an essential reference to action. "Consciousness of a particular kind of environmental significance involves a judgment, implicit or explicit, as to the appropriateness of a particular kind, or range of kinds, of action in relation to that environment."(41) To refer to anything as having objective significance is to reveal its relational aspect since the physical structure functions in relation to human interests. In a Kantian fashion, John Hick says that the correlative mental activity by which the various significances are apprehended involves our interpretation. In addition this interpretative action takes place in relation to types of existence or orders of significance, those

being natural, human, and divine. After having mention-
ed objective-significance Hicks says that it is character-
istic for man to live also in a dimension of personality
and responsibility. This human significance necessarily
follows the realization of the objective significance.
To establish the significance of one, it is necessary to
recognize and deal with the other; the moral only follows
after recognizing the natural significance.

"Has this epistemological paradigm - of one order of
significance super-imposed upon and mediated through an-
other - any further implications? . . . As ethical
significance interpenetrates natural significance, so
religious significance interpenetrates both ethical and
natural. The divine is the highest and ultimate order
of significance, mediating neither of the others and yet
being mediated through both of them."[42]

This "interpretative leap" comes only after one
focuses upon experience as a whole. It involves a
recognition of situational-significance. It is not a
reasoned conclusion or an unreasoned hunch. "It is,
putatively, an apprehension of the divine presence
within the believer's human experience. It is not an
inference to a general truth, but a "divine-human
encounter", a mediated meeting with the living God."[43]
While this is essentially an epistemological paradigm,

it carries over or is incorporated in and through a
way of living. This is the essence of a total being
involved with total existence. And after having come
to live in terms of this interpretation, we neither
require nor can we possibly conceive of a validation
process for this cognitive claim. (A discussion of the
inability to test these claims, the possibility of
their mere psychological existence as opposed to
existential existence will be covered later.)

Another unique point is brought to our attention
by Hick:

> "There is in cognition of every kind an unresolved
> mystery. The knower-known relationship is in
> the last analysis <u>sui generis</u>: the mystery of
> cognition persists at the end of every inquiry -
> though the persistence does not prevent us
> from cogni ng.[44]

For a moment let us continue discussing the element of
mystery and view its role in contemporary science and
philosophy. Certain suppositions of the contemporary
trends in science and philosophy are that we must
demand clarity in our thinking and that all thinking
is problem solving. Accordingly mystery originates
from a lack of knowledge which science will attempt to
overcome and secondly from unclear thinking which

philosophy will eliminate. Contemporary disciplines
have as their common goal the elimination of
mystery.(45)

Professor Hessert points out that a riddle
constitutes a pseudo-problem or involves a confusion
of terms. A puzzle contains the elements for a solution
and merely requires being put in the correct order. A
problem is a situation to which the answer is not given;
but with proper plans being established, we may arrive
at an answer. He emphasizes that a mystery is still
distinct from the three preceding situations. A mystery
is unique in that the more you go into it, the more
mystery is encountered. Also the more mystery we
experience the greater respect we have for its pro-
fundity. In addition, the mystery sheds light on
other situations, rather than itself.(46)

The sin quo non of mystery is the attitude of
wonder. For the Greeks who looked at nature as an
eternal principle underlying the sensible world and
at science as an intellectual contemplation of the
divine object, mystery was never dispelled but always
more fully revealed. In modern science, wonder is trans-
ferred to man, and he compels nature to answer his
questions. Also mathematical language
contain no degrees of depth or profundity for modern

science. If we accept Eucledian geometry as our
geometrical yardstick and all explanation within the
scheme, all more complex or wider application follow
necessarily. Diametrically opposed to modern science is
the concept of revealed truth which offers multiple
levels of depth. The former involves systems of know-
ledge that are eternal truths, as opposed to the claims
of revealed truth that are eternally true. The basic
attitudes have changed from contemplation of the self-
revealing of nature to human mastery through experiment-
ation.

The mystery referred to by the Holy Bible was not
the different elements of man but the difference in man
as a whole and God, not what is rational and empirical
but what is within man's power and what can be revealed
only by God. Mystery is therefore an integral part of
religion and religious language. It is very possible
that contemporary emphases have made us blind to an
integral part of what we are attempting to investigate.
We need to seriously consider the fact that maybe we
have lost a perspective of existence that is most basic
to our cognition of the real depth dimension of reality-
the reality that presents us as a total being who needs
to be orientated to the objective cosmos. Undoubtedly
such a perspective gives us a keener insight into the

transcendental reality referred to by religious
language.

Frederick Ferré in <u>Language, Logic and God</u> presents
a brief analysis of the various functional uses of
religious language. His supposition is that a functional
analysis is directed toward understanding the genuine use
of religious language instead of being directed specif-
ically at the manner in which it is misused. In the
chapter entitled "Familiar Functions of Theological
Discourse", a discussion is presented that deals with
four different functions of theological languages.
According to Ferré the existential language functions as
a means of recognizing that all men have certain features
in common. To merely drop the "existential situation"
referred to with this simple statement and then state
that the "central factor" of this situation is the fact
that every individual is "one-who-must-die" is certainly
a misleading summary. Certainly existential language
seems to refer to understandings that are quite common;
but its significant function, as a quest, not an
seems to be the personal experience that is encountered
in the midst of the quest. It is the possibility of
authenticity originating from the existential tension.
This reality is the significant reference; and it is
through the experience of this existential situation

that man encounters a serious and honest quest for the
meaning of his existence. It is not the mere objective
fact that I must die, but rather the new dimension of
personal life that unfolds for the first time through
such an experience. Ferré's additional reference to
claims concerning "after life" seems to reveal still
further his lack of understanding concerning this
function of theological language. In his summary he is
correct in saying that this language does not need to be
theistic. But it seems that this language evolves from
a more preliminary situation that can lead to a more
thorough understanding of the function of religious
language. This is its main attribute, and this is what
Ferré is unable to recognize.

A second familiar function of theological discourse
concerns ethical commitment. Professor Braithwarte
believes the essential function is the statement of moral
assertions. Biblical stories are the best example of
ethical assertions. These stories are rooted in an
agapeistic concern for the individual's relationship to
the world and other individuals. Commitment to the
agapeistic interpretation requires putting the essential
meaning conveyed through these stories into action and
secondly responding with one's emotions, feeling, et cetera.

A. C. Ewing emphasizes that for emotions to respond over a long period of time requires an objective reality. As pointed out before in discussing the essential role of mystery, Ewing does not view commitment to ethical standards as an intellectual conversion. Instead, ethics involves commitment of the whole being to an objective reality. Hare attempts to show that the unique function of theological languages is founded in something more basic. The ethical function to which Ewing refers rises out of something more basic. The unique expression from which behavior arises is a "belief-content". Again, these explanations as to the function of theological statements are signigicant, but their superficiality does not bring us closer to any concrete reality. They aren't one of the unique or most revealing functions.

R. M. Hare says that religious statements really function as a means of expressing quasi-factual beliefs. The word "quasi" (kwā′sī) used in this context means "as if, in a sense or degree", or 'seemingly' factual". As an example of that to which he is referring, Hare sights the conversion of Paul while on the road to Damascus. Paul did not decide to stop persecuting the Jews simply because he thought he ought not act in this manner. Paul's behavior changed as result of understanding a

matter of fact during his encounter with Jesus the
Christ. His behavior was a natural by-product that
sprouted from an experiential encounter with quasi-
fact. Hare's discussion of function seems to be more
informative because he stresses the fact that this type
of language refers to a unique and distinctive reality-
what we believe is primary to our outlook upon life.
R. M. Hare makes a corollary statement dealing with the
relevance of attitude. He believes that attitudes
shape our interpretation of facts. Attitudes may be in
disagreement, but facts may not. It seems evident that
life is organized around attitudes and that "ordinary"
facts are the result of active discrimination on our
part. "Faith does not supply what is missing in
knowledge. It helps us to obtain knowledge, not as a
method, but as an attitude in which learning is made
possible."(47) This quotation from Professor Hessert's
book states explicitly the vital necessity and role
played by attitude. But the necessary point to grasp
is that attitude and method are not synonymous in this
case. Attitude is not _the_ way to truth but is rather
an understanding that is the context in which we learn.

But the question arises whether attitude is
necessarily logically prior to any facts. If this were
so, as Hare states, man's outlook would never change.

It seems that the attitude would be innate or acquired
possibly through teaching or at least before any facts
affected the attitude. The facts must grasp you, not you
grasp them. Hare views the attitude as making the facts
and transcending the facts. Hessert is pointing out that
the attitude is not the method. Hare puts faith in
Kantian terms when he says that it is an ultimate
category of thought and what we recognize as fact is
relative to the ultimate category. Ultimate categories
imply method of knowing fact, fact relative to category.
This way no fact can be disproven. But as Hessert points
out, fact is connected with knowledge and knowledge can
expose false faith. Therefore, Hare has recognized the
necessity of attitude but has incorrectly associated it
with the method of acquiring fact. Again the functional
analysis has brought to our attention some shortcomings
of different views, but also it has exposed new insights.

John Wisdom, who was referred to in section two of
this paper, sees the function of theological language
as something more than attitudinal. As was pointed out
before, the existence of the gardener in his illustrat-
ion, could not be verified. Although we cannot verify
our beliefs, as also the two men in the illustration
could not, we can continue our discussion by "directing
our attention" to the patterns in the "facts". Pointing

up features in the facts is the method by which the men
continued their talk.   Therefore, Wisdom believes
theological language functions only as an attention-
directing device.While this undoubtedly may be a
function of theological language, this cannot be the
most unique function. It seems very inadequate in the
light of the enormous cognitive claim that is at stake.
It does not do justice to the claim being made. While
this function may have real purpose, and will be referred
to later as a part of a larger discussion dealing with
Ian Ramsey, we must still attempt to analyze some
significant functions that are more fundamental.

Willem Zuurdeeg is quite interested in bringing the
analytical approach into a correct perspective by show-
ing that language must necessarily take the human
situation into account. As stated earlier, the human
situation is intrinsically included in the language
situation. With this understanding in mind, we should
not view religious language as indicative language. It
is much more correct to refer to it as convictional
language that is deeply rooted in the personality.
Convictional language is also that which involves all
of reality and not merely scientific facts. In addi-
tion Zuurdeeg points out another important consideration
by distinguishing between the language of systematic

theology and convictional language. The language of
systematic theology as opposed to convictional language
is something we manipulate, not something that grasps us.

In all honesty Zuurdeeg concludes by saying that
convictional language expresses that which is real for
a certain individual. He rebels against metaphysics as
all analysists do; and therefore, he rejects any trans-
subjective or transcendental objectivity which this
language attempts to express. He fails to go beyond the
situation which is _real_ _for_ _them._ In true existential
fashion (Zuurdeeg includes existentialism because it
most adequately emphasizes the analysis of the human
situation which in turn is an integral part of the
language situation) he sees reality as relative to humans.
For this reason language must also be relative. This
rules out metaphysics or any reference to fundamental
realities. To merely state that something is real for
them reveals a function but this function doesn't include
a claim to a reality that is ultimate and to which all
men must respond with their whole being. This type of
language seems to function in an exclusive manner. It
draws attention to man, not to the community and an
objective cosmos which are the claims of religious
language.

Alasdair Mac Intyre draws attention to the function

of myth. By myth man expresses his view of real being.
The essential reality which we cannot justify but to
which the myths refer requires our commitment to an
authority. Theism does not rest upon firm epistemo-
logical foundations. The most significant point for
the theist "is commitment to belief in these myths as
more than useful or inspiring stories."[48] What makes
one religion differ from another is the authoritative
criteria accepted by and for this self-commitment. This
ultimate criteria is the only means of justifying one's
commitment. Mac Intyre emphasizes that because it is an
ultimate criterion it is not possible according to the
very definition to be justified; it is its own criterion.
In brief, religion lacks any means of justification.

Although there is a history of apologetics which
is integral to the history of theistic thought, this
does not seem to refute Mac Intyre's proposal that it
is not valid. Just because there is a definite tradition
of historical apologetics that has attempted to justify
itself before objective criteria of reason and evidence
does not mean Mac Intyre is wrong. Apologetics may
come up with some significant ramifications full of
many insights but this can not be the main or unique
function of theological language. It is not the most
basic method of pointing out the essential element of

commitment. Apologetics most often assumes commitment.
(In addition we might question Ferré's idea that we
must convert our language, not instead of argument,
but for the sake of meaningful argument. Meaningful
argument seems to imply a possible justification
through reason and evidence. This is precisely what
Mac Intyre is trying to show is impossible.)

Ian T. Ramsey in Religious Language draws our
attention to the importance of the logical oddness of
theological language. The main thesis of his book is
that the services performed by an analysis directed from
the perspective of logical empiricism shall be very
beneficial to philosophy and theology. The empirical
placing of theological phrases will not only be the
grounds of a new cooperation, but a new venture altogeth-
er. His two main questions are, "What is a religious
situation?" and "What kind of empirical anchorage have
theological words?"

Ramsey believes the foundation of the religious
situation is discernment. Discernment involves a break-
through. He illustrates this state of affairs by dis-
tinguishing between types of knowing. When we know
facts about a person (wissen) we have what Bertrand
Russell termed "knowledge of description." In addition
to this type of knowing, there is the knowing that

involves personal association and trust (kennen).
Through this association, and knowing this person through
your being known by him in the same sense, there is a
sudden disclosure. The individual that you previous-
ly knew only through the channel of facts becomes a
'person'. Ramsey refers to this disclosure as a "break-
ing of the ice". This disclosure does not add any facts
to the many facts already known. The fundamental
difference comes through the "encounter which brings no
new facts but rather a 'person' into focus." This
personal encounter is not psychological in so far as
they would reduce religion to what would be called a
subjective experience.

"Let us emphasize, without any possibility of mis-
understanding, that all these situations, all these
characteristically different situations, when they
occur, have an objective reference and are, as all
situations, subject-object in structure. When sit-
uations "come alive", or the "ice breaks", there is
objective depth in these situations along with and
alongside any subjective changes."(49)

In addition to an odd discernment, there is a
response of total commitment which is the second part of
a religious situation. When we try illustrating the
different types of commitment such as mathematical

commi

that all of our examples refer not to what religious

commitment actually is but only what it is like. It

is only what logically corresponds to religious

language. For example, we know a man who is "wrapped

up" in sailing. His commitment to sailing causes

his everyday language to be colored by it. This

commitment carries over into all he says and does.

When committing ourselves to a lover, we organize

the whole of our life around another being. It causes

a personal revolution. This is where personal

commitment goes beyond the mathematical options which

involve no heart searching.

"So we see religious commitment as a _total_

commitment to the _whole_ universe; something in relation

to which argument has only a very odd function, its

purpose being to tell such a tale as evokes the insight,

the 'discernment' from which the commitment follows as

a response."(50)

In addition, our religious commitment is bound up

in key words whose logic resembles the logic of words

used in describing personal and mathematical commitment.

It has "key-words suited to the whole job of living—

'apex' words."(51) While it may resemble other logical

uses of linguistics, it is objective language that has
been given very special qualifications. It is objective
language that reveals "logical impropriety". We qualify
religious language to stress that its reference is in
part beyond the language in which it is clothed. "The
same is true about "God"; and the central problem of
theology is how we use, how to qualify, observational
language so as to be suitable currency for what in part
exceeds it - the situations in which theology is found-
ed."(52) Then the function of theological language is
to evoke discernment and commitment through the use of
objective words that exhibit logical peculiarities but
refer to a religious situation with objective reality.
It is a currency for discernment.

One of the many examples of logical impropriety is
the topographical oddness. This involves inverting
commas, hyphens, or capital letters to otherwise
straightforward words. Examples of this would be
'authentic' or 'being-in-a-situation'. Another
oddness is gained by using words "technically" in a
sense that it is never defined at one point but is used
with frequency so that it is defined in its use or it
gains "meaning in use". An example of this would be
the word "existential".(53)

Ian Crombie in Faith and Logic stresses the idea

that theological language functions as an establishment
of a "reference range". Thus it functions "by eliminat-
ing all improper objects of reference (like finite things
or empirical events) from theistic discussions and by
suggesting the realms of non-theological discourse
(ethical, historical, cosmological, and so on) to which
theological speech is somehow relevant."[54] We then
see that the logical "oddness" of theological speech
functions in a semantical fashion. This language does
take on significance because of its reference. Parables
become more significant and through them we find the
real meaning of words in a real theological context. In
the context of the parable they have their appropriate
"reference range" and most adequately function as
theological language. Crombie believes that all
language about God must be some way used in a parabolic
setting. But the parable is not that with which we stop.
For the Christian the parable points to reality beyond
itself. The truth to which the parables witness does not
correspond literally to that which is referred to in the
parable. It is the trust of the Christian that as a
reliable parable we are not misled as to its real
significance and actual reality. Crombie goes a step
beyond Mac Intyre's logic of sheer witness. He does not
simply say that this is a reliable parable or image

because the believer is impelled to believe it.

Instead Crombie concludes by developing the idea
that through our constant attempt to use images, light
is cast by the images and provides us with a better
understanding of the reality to which the image refers.
The idea that "logical images are capable of <u>illuminating</u>
one's understanding of the world," gives a new and vital
significance to theological language. The idea that
"illimination" is as significant as "impulsion" provides
a new justification and makes a further investigation of
images or analogies relevant.

The main purpose of this section has been directed
toward a functional analysis of theological language.
Unfortunately the analysis has brought to our attention
many different functions the language may serve but has
still not disclosed any conclusive discernment of a
reality to which this language is referring. Though
the language may serve various functions we still do
not know if the language
experiential reality that claims a response of our
entire personality.

Susanne Langer, in her book, <u>Philosophy in a New
Key</u>, attempts to make an honest analysis of the types,
qualities, or different levels of linguistic communicat-
ions. Her main emphasis is the demarcation made between

discursive and presentational language.

According to Professor Langer, language is related
- to reality by means of the "law of projection". To
some people only discursive language, that which is
language put in peculiar order, can be spoken. There is
expression in a different sense which refers to feelings,
emotion, and desires. This language does not represent,
but expresses. This "genuine type of semantics" goes
beyond and fills in the gaps of discursive language
which is not the only articulate form of symbolism.[55]
Her main assumption is "wherever symbol operates, there
is meaning."[56] It is important to notice that
"presentational semantics" (Does "semantics" here mean
the same thing it does for the logical positivists?)
is not conceived through language; but after having been
experienced, it is preserved in an attitude and gains
expression through interplay with other aspects of
experience. The most highly developed form of
connotational semantics is music.

But there still remains a certain vagueness con-
cerning the ability of language to communicate the
religious reality. When employing language to
communicate a reality, we most always sense a direct
awareness or participation in the reality. But with
religious language, as we analyze it, we feel once

removed from the reality; and therefore, a vague or hazy communication is sensed by almost every one. Then we begin to question whether the language is actually communicating any reality at all. If there is a reality, its meaning and significance seem to have transcended the analysis. The primary question seems to be, "How can we communicate through language a transcendental subject?"

John A. Hutchinson in his article, "The Religious Use of Language" expresses the thought that religion condensed to its very essence involves symbols for the ultimate meaning of human existence. This reality which is then communicated in a symbolic manner is independent of the mind, but the mind can only find expression and fulfillment in the symbols. Hutchinson states that religious statements are anological and metaphorical. Analogy is the only means of communicating the reality of the transcendental object. As Professor Paul Hessert pointed out i. a   , u...., an anology is an identity of relation and not of essence. The bravery of a boy is not that of a man, but there may be a relation between their bravery. Religious language is poetical or imaginative. Such religious images are differentiated from concepts by their immediacy. After explaining this point in more

detail, he defines a religious experience as being hit by such images and responding to them. His third and fourth point are that this language must express ultimate meaning, that which is independent of and gives meaning to all other concerns, and that it is referring to a unique object that can be indicated but not defined. It is a holy language. In summary, he believes that religious language has an emotive meaning that is taken existentially.

Now that we have been exposed to the area of symbolism, let us pursue the interest further. "In man's search for what it means to be and to stay human, he returns perennially to symbols for the expression of ultimate meaning."(57) This statement is made in the Editor's Preface to the September 1955 issue of The Christian Scholar. And it is more that an ample introduction to Paul Tillich's thoughts is his article, "Religious Symbols and Our Knowledge of God".

Tillich begins by recognizing that the logical positivists have helped make us aware that we have no clearing house for communication. He also assumes and explicitly states that levels of reality exist and these levels are different. Each level demands a different language and approach. Tillich approaches

and interprets religious language as being essentially
symbolic.

A sign indicates the existence of something be-
yond itself. It is one aspect of a larger whole (e.g.
smoke is one aspect of the fire), and our real concern
is with the "pointed to" reality. A symbol is also
employed to represent some reality although it is not
a proxy for that reality. Both the sign and the symbol
point to something beyond themselves but signs do not
participate in the meaning and power of that to which
it is referring as symbols do.

"Every symbol opens up a level of reality for
which non-symbolic speaking is inadequate."[58] The
symbol is then a representation that opens up a level
of reality otherwise hidden and unable to be grasped
in any other manner. For Tillich, the opening-up
process involves the opening up of reality in deeper
levels and the opening-up of the inner man in special
levels. It opens up reality and the soul. Thus the
symbol brings us to a new dimension of life. A sign
such as the stop light is invented and can be replaced
by a different light, but a symbol has a special
function. Each symbol serves for one specific function -
it cannot be replaced. Symbols are the result of a
situation; they are born out of a group that

acknowledges in a word, a flag or any specific symbol
a part of their being. When the inner situation or
conviction dies, the symbol dies. A symbol is born
and dies but is not invented. The question he seems to
beg is, "By what criterion will we judge between symbols
if they represent an ultimate reality"? If the symbol
dies it is because the situation dies. Are there any
abiding or ultimate symbols and can the religious
situation die?

Religious symbols open up "the depth dimension of
reality itself, the dimension of reality which is the
ground of every other dimension and every other depth,
and which therefore, is not one level beside the others
but is the fundamental level, the level below all other
levels, the level of being itself, or the ultimate
power of being."[59] These symbols open the experience
of the dimension of this depth in the human soul. Symbols
are born and die according to the changed relationship
with the ultimate ground of being - God. The Ground of
Being transcends any symbol. If a symbol should be
taken as unconditional it is demonic.

There are two fundamental levels in all religious
symbols (i.e. the transcendent level and the immanent
level). The most basic symbol on the transcendental
level would be the Ground of Being - God. But can we

say that his is only the unconditional ground of being?
The awareness of the reality is not symbolic, but in our
relationship we must symbolize - and the relationship is
experienced only as we encounter him with the wholeness
of our being which is a person, a being. That element
which is infinite and unconditional, yet transcendental,
and that which is adequate to knowing him through a
person relationship are the two essential elements
that always must be foremost in our transcendental
symbols. The attributes and the acts of God are also
included under transcendental sumbols. The second level,
the immanent level, involves the level of the divine
in time and space. Under this section Tillich discusses
the incarnation, sacraments, and sign-symbols.

Tillich concludes his article with his ideas con-
cerning the truth of religious symbols. Symbols are
independent of any empirical criticism. A symbol is
alive as long as the situation out of which it was born
still has significance. "Their truth is their adequacy
to the religious situation in which they are created, and
their inadequacy to another situation is their un-
truth."(60) Again his conclusion leads to relativism unless
he intended his reference to "situation" to imply ultimate
situation. Even if this is what he intended, it would
seem to be reasoning circulus in probando. The absolute

statement concerning the truth is that no symbol is
ultimate. No symbol can take the place of the ultimate
without becoming demonic. No matter what the symbol
might be, it is conditional and must deny the idolatrous
tendency within itself. The criterion for any Christian
symbol is its clarity in representing or being a concept,
but not the thing in itself.

I am sure that we would agree with Thomas Aquinas
and Paul Tillich that God can never be an object of the
mind. In my estimation most of our language is construct-
ed as a result of objects we experience being able to
become objects of the mind and thereby becoming concept-
ualized. It is conceivable that anological language
which does not refer to the essence of two objects but
rather a relation that exists between the objects might
be the only way of overcoming this barrier of communicat-
ion through religious language. It seems that most
communication involves conceptual language and not a
perceptual language. We are able to form a concept of
a tree; and because other humans have experienced a
tree and it is possible to have a tree as an object
of the mind, we are able to linguistically communicate
in a dialogue the reality of the tree. Such things as
love and attitude seem to be excluded from the categories
of those things which are or can be the object of our

mind. Therefore, unless it is possible through analogy, they seem to also be excluded from the possibility of being communicated by language as we know it today. Even if we are able to use anological language to communicate a reality between those who have already experienced the reality, the question still remains, "How are we to communicate this reality by anological language or communicate it in any manner to those who have not experienced such an encounter?"

Geddes Mac Gregor in his article "The Nature of Religious Utterance" brings to the surface the idea that the failure of theological communications is not necessarily failure in the use of language (assuming language is capable of expressing all realities). It is more often a symptom of confused standpoints. By the word "standpoint" he means the presuppositions and types of questions to which they give rise and the outlook on things which result.[61] Professor H. A. Hodges in his book Language, Standpoints, and Attitudes believes that each standpoint has a language; and when the languages are confused, it is merely a symptom of confused standpoints. He forsees that philosophy will become a standpoint analysis, not a linguistic analysis. Such a philosophy will require an understanding of the standpoint it considers, a certain

sense of a dramatic study, a dialectical approach, a
normative structure so as to allow a judgment between
standpoints and will provide an existential judgment.
But again I feel that we must point out that an exist-
ential choice must be made. The question still remains,
"How does one make the choice?" It seems we make a
choice by being grasped or confronted by a reality. And
the Christian problem involves the ability to communicate
the reality to others. The central problem with which
we started still remains - "Can we use language to
communicate ultimate reality?" Some people would reply
that all the Christian can do is trust that their words
will be a witness to the reality and thereby give the
reality an opportunity to reveal itself. Or some will
agree with Mac Gregor that theological statements only
have meaning as they are put in liturgical form or
some imperative form.

In this paper a study has been made of traditional
ontology, contemporary philosophy, types of verifications,
and types of analyses. It has involved a preoccupation
with semantics and religious reality. No matter what
ideas might have seemed to be the answer at one time,
we cannot escape the conclusion that the intended
semantic reference of theological discourse is to an
ontological reality. This has been and seems to be the

main conviction of Christians.

In way of conclusion, let us think for a moment about the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:1-7:29) or the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:9-15). In either one of these statements Jesus was using language to communicate ultimate reality. And Christians today repeat and pray them in order that the reality might be communicated to the men of this generation. Let us take both of these statements and view them in the light of this entire paper. We might conclude that these statements have an ontological reference. Undoubtedly those who have never experienced such a reality would attempt a verification of the referents. Others would analyze the various functions or attempt to find logical coherence in the statements. Some would say that these statements serve as an emotive or ethical function. Others would say they serve a responsive, or imperative function or would make analytical games out of these serious endeavors to communicate reality. Still others would be driven back to a standpoint-analysis which appears to offer a better solution than any other isolated method.

In all fairness I think we would admit that these statements of Jesus and other religious statements do provide a basis of communication for Christians today. But keeping in mind that the good news of gospel is

for those who have not experienced such a reality
(the lost sheep), we need to question whether language
was Jesus' most effective way of communicating this
real

Most basically we need to ask whether it was the
language that opened up new levels of reality for those
who heard Jesus speak or whether it was possibly
communicated more effectively in some other manner.
According to the gospels, Jesus' most effective communi-
cation was his authority, and his authority was what
he started and increased. In other words, Jesus' real
communication was by what he did, not his language.

In conclusion, two main ideas have evolved
through this paper. Different types of reality are
opened up through different types of language -- the
various functions of theological language as we have
found them. The other idea is that language is in-
adequate and certainly not the most effective manner
of communicating ultimate reality. What a man is and
does is more able to communicate the ultimate reality
of the human situation.

Today, we are in search of a more intellectual
understanding and communication of the ultimate
reality. The reason for introducing the gospel in
the concluding thoughts was because the Christian who

makes religious statements, whether he be theologian, minister, or an everyday man, must justify his communication according to his one model - Jesus the Christ. This is the one criterion of his ontology and its manner of communication.

The problem is still with us and I am certain always will be in future generation. "Can we communicate ultimate reality?" Is it possible that a new understanding of what language is, how it functions, and what it is capable of communicating will allow mankind to communicate ultimate reality? Or is language inadequate and we must seek a more effective manner of communicating ultimate reality? Or might real communication of ultimate reality only become a reality after both alternatives are simultaneously developed to their utmost? It seems plausable that the real solution to our problem rests with a better understanding and proper use of language and a more thorough investigation of non-linguistic means of communication! Only the energetic and vitally concerned will provide contemporary theology and philosophy with guiding insights.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Editor's Preface, The Christian Scholar
        Vol. XXXVIII No.3 September,1955 pp.171-172

2. Ludwig Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus
        4.04

3. Notes taken from a lecture presented by Paul Hessert
        in Philosophy of Religion

4. Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology. Vol. I, p.18

5. Ibid. pp.18-20

6. Ibid. p.21

7. E.W. Hall, "Metaphysics", Living Schools of Philosophy
        edited by D.D. Jones   p.131

8. Ibid. p.145

9. Ibid. p.152

10. D.C. Macintosh, "Theology and Metaphysics", Living
        Schools of Philosophy, edited by D.D. Jones
        pp. 181-189

11. Ibid. p.181

12. Paul Tillich, op. cit. p.12

13. Ibid. p.23

14. Ibid. p.24

15. "General Introduction" as printed in New Essays
        in Philosophical Theology, edited by
        Flew and Macintyre

16. Willem Zuurdeeg, An Analyitical Philosophy of
        Religion, p.13

17. Notes taken from a lecture by William Hordern in
        the Meaning and Purpose of Theological Language.

18. Willem Zuurdeeg, op. cit. p.18 (Within his sentence,
        Zuurdeeg quotes Lichenberger.)

19. William Hoerber, A Scientific Foundation of Philosophy
        p.3

20. _Idem._

21. Rudolf Carnap, _Introduction to Semantics_, p.3

22. _Ibid._ p.12

23. _Idem._

24. _Ibid._ p.28

25. Bertrand Russell, _The Wisdom of the West_, p.157

26. Federick Mayer, _A History of Modern Philosophy_, p.574

27. Ludwig Wittgenstein, _The Blue and Brown Book_, p.27

28. Bertrand Russell, _op. cit._, p.157

29. Frederick Ferré, _Language, Logic, and God_, pp. 8-18

30. A.F. Ayer, _Language Truth and Logic_, p.26

31. A.F. Ayer, _Logical Positivism_, p.56

32. _Ibid._ p.59

33. _Idem._

34. Frederick Ferré, _op. cit._, p.32

35. _Ibid._, p.39 (Within this passage, Ferré is quoting
        from Cox.)

36. A.F. Ayer, _Logical Positivism_, pp.73-74

37. Victor Kraft, _The Vienna Circle_, p.39

38. Frederick Ferré, _op. cit._, p.54

39. Willem Zuurdeeg, "The Implications of Analyitical
        Philosophy for Theology", _The Journal of Bible
        and Religion_, July, 1961, p.208

40. John Hick, _Faith and Knowledge_, p.95

41. _Ibid._ p.113

42. _Ibid._ p.127

43. _Ibid._ p.129

44. _Ibid._ p.132

45. Michael B. Foster, _Mystery_ _and_ _Philosophy_, This
    paragraph is a summary of Chapter I.

46. Notes taken from a lecture presented by Paul
    Hessert in Philosophy of Religion.

47. Paul Hessert, _Introduction_ _to_ _Christianity_, p.29

48. Frederick Ferré, _op._ _cit._, p.141

49. Ian T. Ramsey, _Religious_ _Language_, pp.27-28

50. _Ibid._ p.37

51. _Idem._

52. _Ibid._ p.38

53. _Ibid._ p.40

54. Frederick Ferré. _op._ _cit._, p.143

55. Susanne Langer, _Philosophy_ _in_ _a_ _New_ _Key_, p.81

56. _Ibid._ p.90

57. The Editor's Preface to _The_ _Christian_ _Scholar_
    September,1955, p.172

58. Paul Tillich, "Religious Symbols and Our Knowledge
    of God", _The_ _Christian_ _Scholar_, September,1955,
    p.191

59. _Ibid._ p.192

60. _Ibid._ p.196

61. Geddes MacGregor, "The Nature of Religious Utterance",
    The _Christian_ _Scholar_, September,1955, pp.178-179

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ayer, Alfred Jules. Language, Truth and Logic.
  New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1950

Ayer, Alfred Jules. Logical Positivism.
  Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959

Carnap, Rudolf. Introduction to Semantics.
  Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942

Ferré, Frederick. Language, Logic and God.
  New York: Harper Brothers, Publishers, 1961

Flew, Anthony and Macintyre, Alasdair. New
  Essays in Philosophical Theology. London:
  SCM Press, 1955

Foster, Michael B. Mystery and Philosophy.
  London: SCM Press, 1957

Hessert, Paul. Introduction to Christianity.
  Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:Prentice-Hall, 1958

Hick, John. Fai _ d _ Knowledge.
  Ithica, New York: Cornel University Press,1957

Hodges, H.A. Language, Standpoints, and Attitudes.
  London: Oxford University Press, 1953

Kraft, Victor. The Vienna Circle "The Origin of
  Neo-Positivism".New York:Philosophical
  Library, 1953

Langer, Susanne. Philosophy in a New Key.
  New York: Mentor Books, The New American
  Library, 1959

Martin, C.B. Religious Belief.
  Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1959

Mascall, E.I. Words and Images.
  New York: Ronald Press, 1957

Mitchell, Basil (ed.). Faith and Logic.
  London: George Allen and Unwin, 1957

Ramsey, I.T. Religious Language.
  London: SCM Press, 1957

Tillich, Paul. Systematic Theology, Vol. I.
   Chicago: Universtiy Press, 1951

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. The Blue and Brown Books.
   New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958

Ziff, Paul. Semantical Analysis.
   Ithica, New York: Cornell Universtiy Press, 1960

Zuurdeeg, Willem F. An Analytical Philosophy
   of Religion. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958

                    ARTICLES

Editor's Preface,The."The Relevance of Contemporary
   Analytical Philosophy for the Community of
   Christian Scholars". The Christian Scholar. Fall 1960

Hall, Everett, "Metaphysics"Living Schools of
   Philosophy, ed. D.D. Runes.Ames, Iowa: Littlefield,
   Adams & Co. 1958

Hutchinson, John. "The Religious Use of Language,"
   The Christian Scholar. September, 1955

Kennick, W.E. "Language of Religion", Philosophical
   Review. January, 1960

Klemke, E.D. "Are Religious Statements Meaningful?"
   Journal of Religion. January, 1960

MacGregor, Geddes. "The Nature of Religious Utterance"
   The Chriatian Scholar. September, 1955

Mackintosh, D.C. "Theology and Metaphysics" Living
   Schools of Philosophy. ed. D.D. Runes, 1958

Osborn, Robert. "Contemporary Criticism of Christian
   Language" The Journal of Bible and Religion.
   January 1962

Tillich, Paul. "Religious Symbols and Our Knowledge
   of God," The Christian Scholar. September 1955

Zuurdeeg, Willem. "The Implications of Analytical
   Philosophy for Theology"The Journal of Bible
   and Religion. July 1961

Zuurdeeg, Willem. "The Nature of Theological Language"
    Journal of Religion. January 1960

GENERAL REFERENCE BOOKS

Hoerber, William. A Scientific Foundation of Philosophy.
    Los Angeles: W.H. Hoerber, 1952

Mayer, Frederick. A History of Modern Philosophy.
    New York: American Book Co. , 1951

Russell, Bertrand. Wisdom of the West.
    Garden City New York: Doubleday & Co.,Inc., 1959

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Christian Scholar, The.   Fall 1960

Ferre, Frederick. Language, Logic and God.
    New York: Mentor Books,The New American Library, 1961

Zuurdeeg, Willem. An Analytical Philosophy of Religion.
    New York: Abingdon Press, 1958