
What is my distinction between constitutivist and representativist understandings of religion if not another way (I should hope, a more adequate way) of making Kant's distinction between religious understandings that, in one way or another, reverse the proper priority between the natural/universal and the historical/particular (in the case of constitutivist understandings) and understandings that uphold this proper priority by consistently treating the historical/particular as but a means of the natural/universal (in the case of representativist understandings)?

Broadly speaking, I should say that Kant's distinction between noumenal and phenomenal, supersensible and sensible, is a way of making the distinction between "the order of constitution" and "the order of manifestation [or representation]" (Boff).

10 June 2000