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Personal Learning Checklist

**Student Name:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject Name:**  **AQA Philosophy** | **Unit Name:**  **Philosophy of Religion** |
| *Minimum Target Grade:* | *Aspirational Target Grade:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Knowledge/Specification** | **Not Yet** | **Not Sure** | **Yes** | **To address this before the exam I will:-** |
| **THEME 1 – THE CONCEPT OF GOD** | | | | |
| **Key Concepts:**  Omniscient  Omnipotent  Supremely good  Timeless (eternal)  Within time (everlasting |  |  |  |  |
| **1.1 God as omniscient, omnipotent, supremely good, and either timeless (eternal) or within time (everlasting) and the meaning(s) of these divine attributes.** |  |  |  |  |
| Issues with claiming that God has these attributes, either singly or in combination, including:   * The paradox of the stone * The Euthyphro dilemma * The compatibility, or otherwise, of the existence of an omniscient God and free human beings. |  |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge/Specification** | **Not Yet** | **Not Sure** | **Yes** | **To address this before the exam I will:-** |
| **THEME 2 – ARGUMENTS RELATING TO THE EXISTENCE OF GOD** | | | | |
| **Key Concepts:**  Ontological arguments  Cosmological arguments  Design arguments  Problem of Evil |  |  |  |  |
| **2.1 Ontological arguments, including those formulated by:**   1. Anselm 2. Argument in *Proslogion* 2 3. Argument in *Proslogion* 3 4. Descartes 5. Argument in *Meditations* V 6. Leibniz 7. Extension of Descartes’ argument 8. Malcolm 9. Update of Anselm’s ontological argument from Proslogion 3 10. Plantinga. 11. Using possible worlds in an ontological argument – in *God, Freedom and Evil* |  |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge/Specification** | **Not Yet** | **Not Sure** | **Yes** | **To address this before the exam I will:-** |
| * Issues with the Ontological Argument, including those raised by:  1. Gaunilo   ‘On Behalf of the Fool’ – the Perfect Island objection.   1. Hume   *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* – Reason alone cannot demonstrate the existence of things   1. Kant   *Critique of Pure Reason* – God’s existence can be denied without contradiction. And existence is not a predicate. |  |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge/Specification** | **Not Yet** | **Not Sure** | **Yes** | **To address this before the exam I will:-** |
| **2.2 The arguments from design: arguments from purpose and regularity, including those formulated by:**   1. Paley 2. *Natural Theology*’*s* Argument from analogy 3. Swinburne. 4. *The Existence of God’s* Argument from regularities of succession  * Issues with the Argument from Design, including those raised by:  1. Paley (himself)   Paley’s anticipations of problems with the analogy   1. Hume   *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*:   * + Weakness of the analogy   + Argument from Effect to Cause   + Alternative explanations for apparent design   + A perfect God cannot be inferred from an imperfect creation |  |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge/Specification** | **Not Yet** | **Not Sure** | **Yes** | **To address this before the exam I will:-** |
| **2.3 The cosmological arguments: causal and contingency arguments, including those formulated by:**   1. Aquinas’ Five Ways (first three) 2. *Summa Theologicae*’*s*    1. Argument from motion    2. Argument from efficient causes    3. Argument from contingency and necessity 3. Descartes 4. *Meditations* 3 – Descartes’ Causal Principle. 5. The Kalam argument. 6. Al-Ghazali’s argument that everything has a cause so the universe has a cause  * Issues, including those raised by:  1. Hume   *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion and an Enquiry Concerning Human understanding*   * The link between cause and effect can be questioned. * The universe does not need an explanation. * The argument contradicts itself. |  |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge/Specification** | **Not Yet** | **Not Sure** | **Yes** | **To address this before the exam I will:-** |
| 1. Russell.   *1948 Radio Debate with Copleston*   * Only propositions can be necessary * Fallacy of composition * There might be some events that do not need a cause * The universe is a brute fact |  |  |  |  |
| **The problem of evil: how to reconcile God’s omnipotence, omniscience and supreme goodness with the existence of physical/moral evil.**   1. The logical problem of evil from J.R Mackie’s *Miracle of Theism* 2. The evidential problem of evil from William Rowe   Responses to the Problem of Evil and responses arising from those responses, including:   1. The Free Will Defence (Plantinga’s *God, Freedom and Evil*) 2. Soul-making (Hick’s *Evil and the God of Love*) |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Knowledge/Specification** | **Not Yet** | **Not Sure** | **Yes** | **To address this before the exam I will:-** |
| **THEME 3 – RELIGIOUS LANGUAGE** | | | | |
| **Key Concepts:**  Logical positivism  Verification  Falsification  Bliks  Eschatological verification |  |  |  |  |
| **3.1 Logical positivism: verification principle and verification/falsification (Ayer) – cognitivist accounts of religious language**   1. Logical Positivism and Verificationism from the Vienna Circle and A.J.Ayer’s *Language, Truth and Logic*  * Issues with Logical Positivism and Verificationism  1. Religious statements are verifiable eschatologically (Hick) 2. Flew’s Falsification Principle and the University Debate:    1. Flew on Wisdom’s Gods – religious statements are not falsifiable    2. Hare’ s Bliks – Non-cognitivism: religious statements express viewpoints about the world    3. Mitchell’s Parable of the Partisan |  |  |  |  |
| **Knowledge/Specification** | **Not Yet** | **Not Sure** | **Yes** | **To address this before the exam I will:-** |
| **3.2 Non-cognitivist accounts of religious language**   1. Wittgenstein (*Philosophical Investigations) –* Religious language as a form of life in a language game. 2. Braithwaite’s view that religious statements express commitments 3. Crombie’s view that religious language is not meaningless (against the critics) |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REVISION**  **Use the information on this checklist to make revision cards and notes** |

**Grade tracking:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Grade* | *Date* | *Grade* | *Date* | *Grade* | *Date* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Grade* | *Date* | *Grade* | *Date* | *Grade* | *Date* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Note: You should discuss this checklist regularly with your subject teacher/mentor*