

1. The *material object* of both a religion and a metaphysics is the same: the ultimate reality of human existence, i.e., self, others, and the whole.

2. But whereas the *formal object* of a religion is this ultimate reality *in its meaning for us*, for how we are each to understand ourselves and lead our lives in relation to self, others, and the whole, the *formal object* of a metaphysics is this ultimate reality *in its structure in itself*.

3. The conditions necessary respectively to the constitution of a religion and a metaphysics are also different. Whereas the constitution of a metaphysics requires nothing more than human existence simply as such, and so the original *presentation* of ultimate reality through the experience and understanding of each and every human being, the constitution of a religion requires, in addition, some human being(s) qualified in a special way—namely, through the experience and understanding of a special/decisive *re-presentation* of ultimate reality in its meaning for us.

4. This means that the formal object of a religion, as distinct from that of a metaphysics, is duplex, in that it has an existential-*historical* aspect as well as an existential-*transcendental* aspect. The first aspect is related to the second as the explicit is related to the implicit, or as ultimate reality as specially/decisively *re-presented* is related to ultimate reality as originally *presented*.

5. So it is that the constitution of a religion, as distinct from that of a metaphysics, involves not only one correlation but *two*: not only the correlation between its subject side and its (formal) object side, but also the correlation already involved in its (formal) object side itself between its two aspects: its existential-transcendental aspect and its existential-historical aspect—or, in Christoph Boff's terms, its "order of constitution" and its "order of manifestation."