

On my analysis (following W.A. Christian), *religious* faith, properly so-called, rests on (1) the basic supposition that life is somehow ultimately meaningful together with the basic question and open commitment that this supposition makes possible; and (2) some suggestion for answering this question together with a basic proposal answering it. It lies in the nature of the case that, so far as religious faith is concerned, it affirms all of this and questions none of it, although any *theology* of the religious faith, in the proper sense of critical reflection on its distinctive validity claims, allows for, and may involve, questioning all of it.

This is not the case, however, with *philosophical* faith, even though it is, in important ways, like religious faith. Although philosophy likewise necessarily supposes that life is somehow ultimately meaningful, philosophy also involves, or allows for, questioning whether even its own most basic supposition, etc. is valid, to say nothing of questioning any suggestion or basic proposal for answering the question it makes possible. This means that if the faith one holds is a properly philosophical, as distinct from a properly religious, faith, one's holding it involves, or allows for, one's having questioned everything about it. In this respect, philosophy is less like religion and more like theology, which also involves, or allows for, questioning everything about the religious faith whose validity claims it has the task of critically validating.

With this reflection, I continue to pursue the question why religion and philosophy, notwithstanding their striking similarities, are different.

26 December 2003