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I. Introduction

Most scholars mistakenly attribute the word ‘enstasis’ to Mircea Eliade (1907-1986), but Herman Dooyeweerd (1894-1977) used ‘enstasis’ as early as 1931 (Dooyeweerd 1931). He continued to use the term in the last article he wrote (Dooyeweerd 1975a). Despite the importance of the term in Dooyeweerd’s philosophy, little research has been done regarding its meaning by reformational scholars. Peter Steen mentions it, but confuses ‘enstasis’ with Dooyeweerd’s meaning of ‘ecstasis,’ being dissolved in the diversity of time (Steen 79).

Dooyeweerd does not acknowledge the sources for his use of ‘enstasis.’ But I have traced the term back to the theologian H.E.G. Paulus (1761-1851). Readers will be surprised to learn that Paulus used the term in a distinctly non-religious sense. But as a result of responses to Paulus by other philosophers and theologians, ‘enstasis’ has come to be a basic term for explaining religious experience.

This study is divided into two parts. The first part is a survey of the historical sources of ‘enstasis.’ I will begin with Eliade’s usage, since it is most familiar, but then look at earlier usages of the term, as well as its use by some other philosophers and theologians after Eliade.

The second part of this study will examine Dooyeweerd’s use of ‘enstasis’ in relation to these other sources. Dooyeweerd acknowledged that his philosophy was not original (WdW III, vii-viii; not in NC), and he placed his philosophy in relation to a perennial tradition (WdW I, 82; NC

¹ Cite this article as J. Glenn Friesen: “Enstasy, Ecstasy and Religious Self-Reflection: A history of Dooyeweerd’s Ideas of pre-theoretical experience,” at [http://www.members.shaw.ca/aevum/Enstasy.html].
I, 118). We must therefore carefully examine Dooyeweerd’s terminology and ideas, and compare them with other philosophers in order to understand his philosophy. The most important of these influences was Franz von Baader (1765-1841), whose works were again in vogue in Dooyeweerd’s time. There is no doubt that Baader influenced Dooyeweerd, whether directly or indirectly. Indirectly, this influence occurred through Abraham Kuyper (1837-1920), who expressly acknowledged Baader’s positive influence. Kuyper learned of Baader through Daniël Chantepie de la Saussaye (1818-1874) and J.H. Gunning, Jr. (1829-1905), two theologians who introduced Baader’s ideas to Reformed theology in the Netherlands. Many of Dooyeweerd’s ideas are obviously derived from his reading of these theologians (Friesen 2003b, 2011, Mietus 2006, 2009). Other indirect influences were through Dooyeweerd’s reading of Othmar Spann (Friesen 2005a) as well as Max Scheler and Wilhelm Wundt, who were all influenced by Baader. Dooyeweerd did not acknowledge a direct influence of Baader; however, marginal notes indicate a cross-reference to Baader (Friesen 2005a). Both Dooyeweerd’s idea of cosmic time and his philosophical anthropology were derived from Baader.

I will also compare Dooyeweerd’s use of ‘enstasis’ to other words that derive from the same Indo-European root ‘stā’ (meaning “to stand”, as in the Greek ‘ιστηµι’). These other words include ‘ekstasis’ (sometimes spelled ‘extasis’ or ‘ecstasis’), ‘systasis,’ ‘dis-stasis,’ ‘apo-stasis’ (apostasy) and ‘ana-stasis’ (resurrection). Dooyeweerd also refers to the experience of enstasis as a ‘Hineinleben,’ but not an ‘Erlebnis.’ He relates it to naive, pre-theoretical experience, and to our intuition. I will divide my study of Dooyeweerd’s use of the term under these headings:

A. Enstasy versus Ecstasy
B. Enstasy and religious self-reflection
C. Enstasy is a ‘Hineinleben’
D. Enstasy is related to intuition
E. Enstasy is naive experience
F. Enstasy is an experience of systasis, not of theoretical dis-stasis
I. The idea of Enstasis

A. Historical sources

1. Mircea Eliade (1907-1986)

The term ‘enstasis’ is usually (and incorrectly) attributed to Mircea Eliade, who used the word in his 1958 book *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom* (Eliade 1958, 76ff). Eliade’s first reference to the term appears to be in his 1948 book, *Techniques du Yoga*.

Lorsque la pensé devient définitivement immobile, lorsque l’oscillation même entre les modalités de la méditation ne trouble plus le citta…l’enstase de la vacuité totale, sans contenu sensorial et sans structure intellectuelle, état inconditionné (Eliade 1948, 106).

[When thought becomes absolutely immobile, when the oscillation itself between the modalities of meditation no long trouble the citta [mind]…the enstasis of total vacuity, without sensory content and without intellectual structure, an unconditioned state.] [my translation]

Eliade’s dissertation, published in various forms between 1932 and 1936, did not use the word ‘enstasis’ to describe the yogic experience. Instead, he used other categories, such as magical/mystical and abstract/concrete (Rennie, 1996). Dooyeweerd was already using the term ‘enstasis’ in 1931, which is prior to Eliade’s usage. And as we shall see, Catholic theologians like Olivier Lacombe also used the term before Eliade; it is likely that Eliade borrowed the term from these Catholic theologians, since they were also engaged in dialogue with Hinduism, and Eliade was aware of their work. And the theologian H.E.G. Paulus (1761-1851) used the term ‘enstasis’ as early as 1804. So it is certainly incorrect to say that Eliade coined the term.

But it is useful to look at Eliade’s usage. Eliade says the term ‘enstasis’ has several senses. As a kind of knowing, it grasps the object directly, without the help of categories or the imagination. As a yogic “state,” it makes possible the self-revelation of the Self (*purusha*). This “state” can be attained by concentrating on an object or an idea, in which case it is called “enstasis with support,” or “differentiated enstasis.” In the highest forms of such differentiated *enstasis*, the *yogin* experiences the happiness of eternal luminosity and consciousness of the Self, and realizes that he is other than his body. This leads to undifferentiated *enstasis*, which is without support—without any meditation or contemplation. But even this non-differentiated *enstasis* is not an
absolute emptiness:

It would be wrong to regard this mode of being of the Spirit as a simple “trance” in which consciousness was emptied of all content. Nondifferentiated enstasis is not “absolute emptiness.” The “state” and the “knowledge” simultaneously expressed by this term refer to a total absence of objects in consciousness, not to a consciousness absolutely empty. For, on the contrary, at such a moment consciousness is saturated with a direct and total intuition of being; it does not mean a state that is void of all content (Eliade, 1958, 193).

Eliade’s emphasizes that enstasis is not absolute emptiness, and that it is not a trance state. Thus, those scholars who compare Eliade’s idea of enstasis to nirvikalpa samadhi or to the Buddhist experiences of emptiness (shunyata) are incorrect. For Eliade, enstasis is a state that has content; I suggest that it is more similar to sahaja samadhi. A discussion of the difference between nirvikalpa and sahaja samadhi is beyond the scope of this article. But in general, sahaja samadhi refers to the experience of one who is liberated but still engaged in life (Friesen 2001 and 2006d).

Eliade contrasts enstasis, which is inward [it means “standing within”], with ecstasy [ecstasy or extasis, “standing outside of oneself”]. Ecstasy involves seeking magical powers by going outside of oneself. Ecstasy is the state that is experienced by shamans (Eliade 1958, 327, 338-340, 371). Such ecstasy is very different from yogic enstasy:

For—to repeat—Yoga cannot be classed among the countless varieties of primitive mysticism to which the term shamanism is commonly applied. Yoga is not a technique of ecstasy; on the contrary, it attempts to realize absolute concentration in order to attain enstasis (Eliade 1958, 361).

As we shall see, this distinction between enstasy and ecstasy has a long history, going back at least as far as 1804.
2. Early Greek usage of ‘enstasis’

‘Enstasis’ is a Greek word, so in applying it to yoga, Eliade was using a non-Sanskrit term. Early Greek thought used ‘enstasis’ to refer to an objection to a premise in a logical argument. It is finding an “instance” to counter the argument.\(^2\) See Aristotle: “enstasis d’ esti protasis protasei enantia” (Anal. prior. II, 28; II 26, 69a 37). This “stepping in” to an argument is not relevant to our purposes. What we are looking for is a use of the term ‘enstasis’ as a contrast to ecstasy.

The Greeks also used ‘enstasis’ to refer to a ‘way of life’ (enstasis biou). Diogenes Laertes said that some people classified cynicism not as a school but as an enstasis biou, or way of life (Dawson, 127). Hadot says, “Cynicism was not a philosophy in the proper sense of the word, but a state of life (enstasis). But all philosophy was to be a new way of life” (Hadot, 103-4). This use of ‘enstasis’ points to philosophy in an ethical way. Dooyeweerd does not use the term in this way, although he also emphasizes that our pre-theoretical experience is governed by our world-and life view.

3. H.E.G. Paulus (1761-1851)

The first reference that I have found contrasting ‘enstasis’ with ecstasy is by the rationalist theologian Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob Paulus. Paulus was professor of Oriental languages at Jena. He later became professor of exegetical theology, where he applied his Oriental studies to Christian theology, and sought naturalistic explanations for the miracles referred to in the Bible. Paulus knew Schiller, Goethe and Herder. In 1843, he angered Schelling by publishing a transcript of Schelling’s lectures on the philosophy of revelation without Schelling’s authorization.\(^3\)

---

\(^2\) The Latin is instantia or ‘instance.’ Arthur Schopenhauer, in The Art of Controversy, gives an example of the use of such an instance: “all ruminants are horned” is a proposition which may be upset by the single instance of the camel.

\(^3\) Friedrich Schelling: Paulus-Nachschrift (Die endlich offenbar gewordene positive Philosophie der Offenbarung oder Entstehungsgeschichte, wörtlicher Text, Beurtheilung und Berichtigung der von Schellingischen Entdeckungen über Philosophie überhaupt, Mythologie und Offenbarung des dogmatischen Christentums im Berliner Wintercursus von 1841–42.)
What is surprising is that Paulus used the term ‘enstasis’ not in any spiritual sense, but in order to attempt to explain spirituality away. In 1800, in his *Philologisch-Kritisch und Historischer Kommentar über das neue Testament*, Paulus contrasts *enstasis* and *ecstasis* (Paulus 1800, Vol. 1, 15). This occurs in a discussion about the vision of Zacharias recounted in Luke 1:11-22. Paulus refers to Zacharias’s vision as an enstasy (*Enstase*). Paulus explains this vision by an analogy to dreams. When we are asleep, a person “turns within himself.” We are then unconscious of our own actions, and we engage in dialogue with other inner persons. People often mistake this internal dialogue as the actions of spirits. But within ourselves we are multiple [verflieltigt], and our own thoughts can appear to us as the speech of different people. The dreamer receives questions and objections; he fears, hopes, doubts, etc. These events seem real as long as there is an interruption between our spirit (which makes judgments), and our sensation and fantasy. But we eventually learn to acknowledge that these *intuitions* are produced by ourselves and not due to any superhuman source. He continues

> Nach dieser Analogie (der Leser vergegenwärtige sich nur die sonderbaren über seine inner Thätigkeit in Träumen gemachten psychologischen Erfahrungen!) vermag nun wohl jeder auch sich einen Gemüthszustand vorzustellen, wo nach einer gewissen Anspannung und darauf folgenden Ermattung des grobköplerlichen, ein ähnliches Zurückziehen des Geistes von den äußern Würklichkeit abmäßt, und eine tiefe Richtung auf das inner Empfindungssystem auch im Zustand des Wachens möglich ist; einen Gemüthszustand, welchen man *Ekstase* (ein Versetzen außer sich) nennt und wohl eher eine *Enstase* (Versetzen in sich herein) hätte nennen sollen. Kommt hierauf jemand aus einem solchen In-sich-gekehrt-seyn in seinen gewöhnlichen Erfahrungskreis zurück, ohne einen solchen Übergang, welches den Unterschied des äußern und innern fühlbar macht; so würde ja wohl ein solcher, mit dem größten Theil der Menschen, das, was in der Ekstase innerlich in ihm vorgegangen war, als äußere Begebenheit, ohne nur an die Möglichkeit eines Irrthums zu denken (Paulus 1804, I, 74).

[By analogy (the reader need only bring to mind his strange inner capacity for psychological experiences made in dreams!), one may also conceive of a state of mind, where after a certain tension and consequent exhaustion of the gross body,

4 In Vol. 1, p. 15 of the first edition (1800), Paulus contrasts ‘Ekstase’ [“ein Versetzen ausser sich,” or “displacement outside of oneself”] with ‘Enstase’ [“Versetzen in sich herein,” or “displacement within oneself”]. This is found in the second edition (1804), Vol. I, p. 24. Unless otherwise noted, I will cite from the second edition of 1804.
there can in the state of wakefulness be a similar drawing back of the spirit from external reality, and a deep directedness to one’s inner sensory system. This is a state of mind which is often called ‘ecstasy’ [*Ekstase*], a displacement outside of oneself, but which should rather be called ‘enstasy’ [*Enstase*], a displacement within oneself. If someone returns to his ordinary sphere of experience from such a being turned within himself, without the kind of transition that makes perceptible the distinction between external and internal, then such a person, like the majority of humans, will continue to regard as an external event that which occurred in this inner *ekstasis*, which has and retains so many characteristics of an external result. And such a person will not think of the possibility that this was an error.] [my translation]

Note how Paulus contrasts ‘ecstasy’ (displacement outside of oneself) with ‘enstasy’ (displacement within oneself).

Paulus revised this passage in 1842. He retained the word ‘*Enstase,*’ but deleted some words and added others, also emphasizing others in italics. I think it is important to look at this change, too:

Nach dieser Analogie (der Leser vergegenwärtige sich nur die sonderbaren über seine inner Thätigkeit in Träumen gemachten psychologischen Erfahrungen!) vermag nun wohl jeder auch sich einen Gemüthszustand vorzustellen, wo ein ähnliches Zurückziehen des Geistes von den äußern Gegenständen, nach denen er sonst die Verhältnisse der äußern Wirklichkeit abmißt, und eine tiefe Richtung auf das inner Empfindungssystem auch im Zustand des Wachens möglich ist; einen Gemüthszustand, welchen man *Ekstase* (ein Versetzen außer sich) nennt und wohl eher *Enstase* (Versetzen in sich herein) nennen sollte. Kommt hierauf jemand aus einem solchen In-sich-gekehrt-seyn in seinen gewöhnlichen Erfahrungskreis zurück, ohne einen solchen Uebergang, wie zwischen dem träumenden und wachenden Thätigseyn das Erwachen ist; so wird ja wohl ein solcher, mit dem größten Theil der Menschen, das, was in der Ekstase innerlich in ihm vorgegangen war, aber so viele Kennzeichen eines äußern Erfolgs hat und behält, als äußere Begebenheit anzusehen fortfahren, ohne nur an die Möglichkeit eines Irrthums zu denken (Paulus 1842, I, 73-74).

[By analogy (the reader need only bring to mind his strange inner capacity for psychological experiences made in dreams!), one may also conceive of a state of mind, where there is a similar drawing back of the spirit from those external objects [*Gegenständen*] by which he would otherwise gauge his relation to external reality, to see that it is also possible in the state of being awake to have a deep directedness to one’s inner sensory system. This is a state of mind which is often called ‘ecstasy’ [*Ekstase*], a displacement outside of oneself, but which should rather be called ‘enstasy’ [*Enstase*], a displacement within oneself. If someone returns to his ordinary sphere of experience from such a being turned
within himself, without the kind of transition of awakening that occurs between
the activities of dreaming and waking, then such a person, like the majority of
humans, will continue to regard as an external event that which occurred in this
inner extasis, which has and retains so many characteristics of an external result.
And such a person will not think of the possibility that this was an error.] [my
translation]

Note that the revision deletes the idea of tension and exhaustion of the gross body. It adds that
the spirit is drawn back not from reality, but from objects by which the person would otherwise
gauge reality. And Paulus explains the transition that is missing as the ordinary transition
between dreaming and waking.

Paulus uses the term ‘enstasis’ in another work dealing with the life of Christ, Das Leben Jesu,
alas Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchistentums (Paulus 1828). In the section dealing
with “Jesus’s Ascension in the Heavenly Blessedness” he says,

Wo nämlich der menschliche Geist sich zur innigsten Betrachtung des
Vollkommenen oder Göttlichen, als dem Musterbilde im Wollen und Handeln, so
lebhaft und anschaulich erhebt, dass ihm diese Alles Uebrige beherrschende und
unterordnende Empfindung zunächst nicht als Etwas in und aus ihm selber
Entstehendes erscheint, pflegt sie vielmehr ihn wie Etwas anderswoher, aus der
höchsten Geisteshöhe, Gekommenes gleichsam zu überfallen und ihn seiner selbst
vergessen zu machen. Dieser Geisteszustand entsteht in dem Menschen, wenn er
durch irgend eine Art von Vollkommenheit, auch des Schönen, auch des Wahren,
wie des Guten und Heiligen, sich bis zu anschauender Betrachtung erhebt.

Am meisten aber wird er “begeistert” oder er würkt und empfindet am meisten in
sich selbst als ein reiner Geist, wenn seine Betrachtung und sein Wollen weg über
die Nebenrücksicht nur auf das heilige oder Willensvollkommene oder an sich
Rechte und Gute die beharrliche Richtung nimmt. Alsdann scheint er sich wie
ausser sich (extasiert) zu sein, während er gerade am meisten in sich (gleichsam in
einer Enstasis, statt Ekstasis) ist und in der reinen Tiefe des Geistes sich der
Möglichkeit bewusst wird, einzig und allein dem Wollen des Rechten, welches
der Wille der Gottheit sein muss, sich unbedingt zu ergeben. Daraus entsteht
alsdann eine Kraft aus der Höhe, die den Begeisterter mit Mut umkleidet, aber
mit jenem besonnenen, immer nach Ueberzeugung strebenden Mut, mit welchem
die Lehregesandten Jesu jetz bald überallhin ausgehen sollten. (Paulus 1828, 329)

[That is to say, where the human spirit, in its most inner contemplation of what is
perfect or divine, as its ideals for willing and acting, elevates itself in such a vivid
and graphic way so that this feeling, which dominates and subordinates
everything else, appears chiefly not as something arising in and from himself, but
much rather as something coming from elsewhere, from the highest spiritual
heights; at the same time it overcomes the one who receives this feeling, making him forget himself. This state of the spirit occurs in someone when he elevates himself to intuitive contemplation by some kind of perfection, such as the Beautiful, the True, or the Good.

But usually he is “inspired,” or he usually acts and feels in himself as a pure spirit when his contemplation and his will, without any distraction, directs itself only to what is holy or perfectly willed, or what is Just and Good in itself. He then appears to be outside of himself (in ecstasy), whereas he usually is just within himself (as though in an enstasis instead of ekstasis), and in the pure depth of his spirit he becomes aware of the possibility to give himself, individually and alone, to unconditionally desire justice, which must be the will of God. From this then arises a power from on High, which clothes the inspired one with courage. It is with this courage that the disciples of Jesus would soon go out everywhere.] [my translation]

Paulus therefore suggests that what appears to be an ecstasy is usually an enstastic state, entered into quite naturally as a result of inner contemplation. So Paulus thinks that Zacharias was dreaming while awake, and that in this way he mistakenly imagined the incense at the altar to be an angel.

An example of someone using ‘ecstasy’ for what Paulus calls ‘enstasy’ can be found in the writings of Heinrich Philipp Conrad Henke. In his Museum für Religionswissenschaft in ihrem ganzen Umfange (1806), Henke comments about the vision of the Apostle Paul recorded in Acts:


[Acts 9:17-18; 22:12-13. Yes, Paul was sunk in deep contemplation, which on anthropological grounds I understand proceeded to his well-known rapture and ecstasy. When one is confronted with someone in such a reverie, who is lost merely in contemplation of an object, and who has even lost consciousness of his individuality, and who has closed his senses to all external impressions, what is one to do? How is one to bring him to himself, to the consciousness of his personality, to consciousness of the outer world (which determine each other reciprocally)?] [my translation]
Henke says that one must shake the person out of his dream by calling him by name. This is what happened in Paul’s case; the first word of Ananias is “Saul adelphe” (Acts 22:13). And Paul saw again (aneblepe). “Er bekam das verlorene Gesicht wider” [He recovered his lost sight]. Henke does not use the word ‘enstasis’ to describe this inner absorption, but the idea is there. It is H.E.G. Paulus who first uses the word ‘enstasis.’ But Paulus is also emphatic that the vision produced is an error.

Paulus’s naturalistic explanation of miracles was continued by others in the nineteenth century, such as Robert Lewins, whose theory of hylozoism denied any mind/body dualism:

The Stoic and Christian Palingenesia, Pentecostal descent of the Paraclete, and all analogous raptures or Enstases of Saints and Martyrs “raising their longing eyes on high as though it were a bliss to die,” can be nothing else than this hyperneurotic condition of the supreme nerve centres, and therefore a natural physiological phenomenon. The ecstatic or enstatic rhapsody of the emancipated Baccalaureus in Part II. of Goethe’s Faust, translated by Miss Naden at page 173 of her Modern Apostle, and the quasi-divine vision of her Modern Apostle himself, on which she—through the medium of Ella—throws cold water, to say nothing of Calenturèe, Mirage of the Desert, and other cognate physiological states, are all instances of the same cerebro-cosmic exaltations, and Mount Tabor-like transfigurations (Lewins, 1890, 81).

4. Abbé Jean Hermann Janssens (1863-1853)

In 1818, Jean H. Janssens, a Belgian Catholic theologian, responded to Paulus’s ideas of enstasis and ekstasis. Janssens wrote his response in Latin, in his Hermeneutica sacra. Janssens summarizes Paulus’s views of the vision of Zacharias:

Zacharias diu desideraverat infantem Deo Messiaeque consecrandum. Suo tempore ad templi officia vocatus, incensoque Deo oblato Enstasi, (f) se tradit, desieriumque nanciscendi infantem ei recurrit. In hac Enstasi videt inter spissum ardentis incendi fumum ad dexteram altaris aliquid, quod ipsi caelestis species evadit (Janssens 1818, Vol. II, 149).

(f) “Enstasis ab εη = in et ιστηµι = sto.”

This footnote (f) by Janssens specifically explains the term ‘Enstasi,’ which is Greek and not

5 The word ‘enstatic’ appears to be by Lewins. Naden’s version of Faust does not use the word on page 173.
Latin: “Enstasis ab εν = in et τοστημι = sto.” Janssens thus translates the Greek roots to Latin. The meaning of those roots is “to stand within.” The fact that he gave this footnote indicates that Janssens believed that the word was rare or newly coined.

In 1928, Janssens’ *Hermeneutica Sacra* was translated into French by J.J. Pacaud. In his translation, Pacaud changed the word ‘enstasi’ to ‘extase.’ The translator also omitted the footnote of the Greek derivation of ‘enstasi’ (Janssens 1828, 167). And so in this way, the distinction between *enstasis* and *ekstasis* was obscured, at least for a while. But some of the terms that were used in this French translation would later be used for discussions of ‘*enstasis*.’ Pacaud translated the first passage I have cited from Janssens in this way:

Long-temps Zacharie avoit désiré un enfant qu’il se proposoit de consacrer à Dieu et au Messie. Son tour étant venu de se rendre au temple pour ses fonctions, après avoir offert de l’encens à Dieu, il tombe en extase, et ce désir d’avoir un fils, qui l’avoyt occupé tant d’années, se présente de nouveau à son esprit et à son coeur. Pendant son extase, et à travers la fumée épaisse de l’encense qui brûle, il voit à la droite de l’autel quelque chose qui prend à ses yeux le forme et l’apparence d’un être céleste (Janssens 1828, 167).

[Zacharias had long wished for a child, whom he proposed to consecrate to God and to the Messiah. When his turn came to serve his duties at the temple, having offered incense to God, he fell into an ecstasy [sic], and the desire to have a son, which had occupied him for so many years, presented itself anew to his spirit and his heart. During his ecstasy [sic], and through the dense smoke of the burning incense, he saw to the right of the altar something that to his eyes took the form and appearance of a celestial being.] [my translation]

Janssens used ‘*enstasis*’ twice more in his book of 1818. Again, the later French translation mistranslates the term as ‘*extase*.’ Janssens uses the word ‘*enstaseos*’ on p. 151 of the Latin text.

Here is the original Latin, with the French translation, and my translation of the French:

Visio Zacharieae per intuitionem animae *psychologice* explicari potest. Eaedem enim sunt operationes animae tempore *sommii* ac tempore *ecstaseos* seu potius *enstaseos*; nam tempore somnii anima modo secum ipsa loquitur, modo alios secum loquentes credit. Haec autem etiam fieri possunt extra somnum tempore enstaseos. Si somnia rarioa essent, et cum expergefacitone, sine sensibili discordantia cohaerent, illa vix a connectione aliarum rerum post ipsa contingentium discerneremus, immo potius connecteremus. In narratione autem visionis Zachariae nihil occurrit, quod ipsi differentiam internas cogitationes mentis inter ac operationes exteriores indicare potuisset.
Whereas Janssens used both ‘ecstatic’ [ecstaseos] and ‘enstatic’ [enstaseos],’ the French translation uses only ‘ecstasy’ [extase].

La vision de Zacharie peut s’expliquer psychologiquement par une intuition de l’âme. Il y a identité entre l’état de l’âme pendant un songe, et celui où elle est dans une extase: car, dans le songe, l’âme tantôt s’entretient avec elle-même, tantôt croit entendre les autres lui parler. La même chose peut arriver hors l’état de songe, et pendant un extase. Si les rêves étoient plus rares, et ci se qui s’y est passé pouvoit, au moment du réveil, se lier avec les choses réelles sans une incohérence sensible, à peine les distinguerions-nous des circonstances qui les suivent, ou plutôt nous n’en ferions qu’une série de fait non interrompus. Or, il n’y a dans la vision de Zacharie rien qui eût pu l’avertire d’une différence, d’un défaut de liaison entre les circonstances extérieures et ce qui s’étoit passé dans son esprit (Janssens 1828, 170).

[The vision of Zacharias can be explained psychologically as an intuition of the soul. There is an identity between the state of the soul during a dream and the state where it is in an ecstasy: for, in a dream, the soul sometimes talks to itself, and sometimes believes it speaks with others. The same thing can happen outside of the dream state during an ecstasy. If the dreams are more exceptional, it can happen that at the moment of waking, they are linked with real things without any noticeable incoherence that would allow us to distinguish the dream from the circumstances that follow; we may rather only notice a series of non interrupted facts.] [my translation]

And on p. 156 of the 1818 Latin text:

*D.G. Paulus* in argumento psychologico homines supponit non tales quales eos natura formavit sed quales ejus exagitat imaginatio illos sibi repraesentat. Profecto si homines in se collecti, su in enstasi, credent, se vedere et audire, quae nec vident nec audiant, nec hunc errorem postea animadvertent, collectio animi seu enstasis, cum somnio comparari poterit, sed tum homines vigiles somniabunt; quare *D.G. Paulus* multo expeditius fecisset, si breviter dixisset, Zachariam totam visionem somniassæ.

The 1928 French translation:

Paulus, dans son argument psychologique, ne suppose pas les hommes tel que la nature les a faits, mais tels que les lui présente son imagination échauffée. Assurément, si les hommes tout entiers absorbés en eux-mêmes, c’est-à-dire plongés dans une profonde extase, croient voir et entendre ce qu’ils ne voient ni n’entendent réellement, et qu’ensuite ils ne s’aperçoivent pas de l’erreur qui les a abusés, cette préoccupation de leur esprit ou cette extase pourra être comparée à un songe, et ces hommes auront rêvé tout éveillés; ainsi Paulus aurait eu plutôt
fait de dire tout uniment que cette vision n’avoit été qu’un rêve de Zacharie. (Janssens 1828, 175).

[In his psychological argument, Paulus does not consider humans as nature as made him, but rather as they have been presented to him by his over-heated imagination. Certainly, if humans are entirely absorbed within themselves, that is to say, plunged in a profound ecstasy \textit{sic} and who then believe that they see and hear that which they do not really see and hear, and if they thereafter do not perceive the error that has deceived them, this preoccupation of their spirit or this ecstasy \textit{sic} could be compared to a dream, and these people would be dreaming while awake; thus Paulus would rather simply say that this vision was nothing but a dream of Zacharias]. [my translation]

Even though the translator uses ‘ecstasy’ instead of ‘the original ‘enstasy,’ his descriptions of the state are frequently used in later literature: to plunge into a state of enstasy, the description of enstasy as an “intuition of the soul” or “being absorbed in oneself.”

5. Franz von Baader (1765-1841)

a) Ecstasy as central inner sensation

In the early 1800’s, Baader wrote several articles on the nature of ecstasy. Most of Volume 4 of his \textit{Collected Works} is devoted to this topic. Baader’s interest in ecstatic experience is not surprising, since two of Baader’s major influences, Jacob Boehme (1575-1624) and Louis-Claude de Saint Martin (1743-1803) had each experienced and written about their deep religious ecstasies. Baader had a profound influence on later writers on this topic, and so his ideas deserve an extended discussion.

Although he does not mention Paulus by name, Baader responds to his ideas about ecstasy. For example, in his 1828 article “Unterscheidung einer centralen Sensation von einer bloss peripherieschen und ecentrischen und Unabhängigkeit der ersteren von unseren materiellen Sinneswerkzeugen” [Distinction between central sensation and a merely peripheral and eccentric kind, and the independence of the first from our material sensory organs], Baader refers to the transition moments between sleeping and waking to which Paulus referred (\textit{Werke} 4, 135). There is a kind of seeing, hearing and feeling that comes from outside of us, but also a kind that proceeds from within outwards. We are aware of this inner sensation in dreams, or at the transition to sleep or awakening. This opposition between inner and outer sensation is overcome
only by completely falling asleep or by completely awakening. Yet even in our fully awakened moments, the inner sensation continues, just like the stars continue to shine during the day, but are overcome by the sun’s brightness. This inner sensation occurs in ecstatic states. These ecstasies or visions occur in all peoples and all times (p.136). They occur only when our soul [Gemüth] is grasped in a deeper and more inwardly way. They also occur in poets and artists who are truly visionaries. Ecstasies are not to be explained away as temporarily being carried away, but must be brought into relation with the continuity or total unity of our combined perceptions. These ecstasies allow us to come to the idea of a concentric or central kind of sensation. It would be wrong to call them subjective, since in inner sensation, there is both a subjective and an objective; the objective is unfolded [enfaltet]. Such inner sensations are as objective and real as our peripheral sensations coming from outside. In fact this inner sensation is deeper and wider, and encompasses our lower outer and narrower perception. Our outer senses are given as tools [Werkzeuge] partly to separate and to regulate, and partly to mute [dämpfen][6] our concentric sensation. These experiences are like what happens after earthly death, and therefore demand our attention and religious interest (Werke 3, 346 fn; 4, 137-139).

Whereas writers like Paulus tried to explain away the spiritual by these ideas of transitional moments between sleep and waking, Baader relied on these experiences, and other paranormal phenomena, in order to try to demonstrate the truths of spirituality. Baader also relied on the current wave of interest in somnambulism and hypnotism [“magnetism”, “Mesmerism”], which began with the experiments by Mesmer. Baader did not accept Mesmer’s materialist philosophy. On the contrary, he believed that the experiments proved the spiritual nature of ecstasy. Baader cites St. Martin:

C’est une chose bien singulière que le règne et l’action sensible de l’esprit ayant été prouvés par celui qui n’y croyoit pas. C’est Mesmer, l’incrédule Mesmer, cet homme qui n’est que matière, qui a ouvert la porte aux démonstrations sensible de l’esprit, et cela immédiatement après que le monde avoit été inondé pendant quarante ans par les déraisonnements philosphiques (Werke 4, 17).

[6] The idea of muting our inward experience was later echoed by Aldous Huxley’s idea that the brain is a reducing valve of a wider consciousness (Huxley 1972; 24, 144, 154).
[It is most remarkable that the reign and the sensory action of spirit have been proved by those who do not believe in them. It is Mesmer, incredible Mesmer, this man who is nothing but matter, who has opened the door to sensory demonstrations of spirit, and this occurring immediately after the world was flooded for forty years by philosophical un-reason.] [my translation]

We will look at somnambulism, clairvoyance and other such phenomena in more detail. But to understand how Baader viewed them in relation to ecstasy, we first have to look at Baader’s ideas of time and anthropology.

b) Time and anthropology

i) Baader’s idea of time

Baader distinguishes between the following “regions”: God’s eternity, the supratemporal [überzeitlich] heavens, the temporal earth, and the infratemporal [the region below time, the infernal realm of the demons]. God’s first creation was of the angels (finite spirits) in what is now the supratemporal region. Some angels chose to be centered in God. Other angels, like Lucifer, fell away from God, and are now in the region furthest removed from the center, the infratemporal region. And some angels have not yet chosen for or against God; for them, the region of time was created. Time is a suspension of eternity, and keeps the supratemporal region open for these beings (Baader: “Elementarbegriffe Über die Zeit”).

The supratemporal region has a past, present and future; the temporal has a past and a future but no present, and the infernal region has only a past.

ii) Baader’s philosophical anthropology

Baader did not accept any dualistic opposition between a rational mind and a physical body. For him, the relation is between our central heart (soul) and its peripheral nature. Every center has a nature in which that center expresses itself. Baader objected to any spirituality or supernaturalism that wants to abolish nature altogether. His ideas of inner sensation are opposed to those spiritualists who deny that spirits have sensation (Werke 4, 139). Even God has a nature in which He expresses Himself. But God’s nature must not be confused in a pantheistic way with His creation or with humanity’s expression in its own nature. But we are the image of God, and so
our expression in our nature mirrors the way that God expresses Himself in the Trinitarian perichoresis.\(^7\)

Baader speaks of man being a spirit, soul and body. We are created as soul, formed with a body, and God breathes our spirit into us. Spirit, soul and body are not to be understood as a trichotomy of three separate components of our being; we are all three at once. The relation is always of center and periphery: our soul is the center of our body, and our spirit is the center of our soul. Our soul is thus the mediator between spirit and nature. This is because man was created with the mission of mediating between God and creation, between heaven and earth, and to keep open the supratemporal region for the temporal world. Humanity was to help redeem the temporal world, as well as those angelic spirits who have not yet chosen for God.

Initially, man’s central heart (soul) and peripheral nature (body) were both in the spiritual (supratemporal) region. We were created in the heavens, and not in the universe. ‘Heaven’ here means the locality in which a being is completely fulfilled [‘Himmel = Localität, welche dem in demselben sich befindenden Wesen den Vollgenuss seines Seins gewährt’ (Werke 2, 511; 12, 354). Man’s spirit, breathed into him by God, was to be the basis for man becoming a son of God. But man did not fulfill this mission. Instead, man fell into the temporal region. His heavenly eye, which was to be open to the spirit of God, was closed, and instead, man opened his other eye to the spirit of this world. Originally created androgynous, Adam wanted to be like the animals. A second temptation led to a further fall, when Adam and Eve wanted to be like God, instead of being subjected in their region to the higher regions. Humanity thereby lost the power to become a son of God. Christ’s incarnation was necessary to accomplish the mission of redemption that man had failed. For, as Christ said, only he who came from Heaven can enter Heaven [Nur wer vom Himmel kam, kann in den Himmel kommen] (Werke 8, 175). By participating in Christ as the New Root, man is able to restore his spiritual center and to elevate his soul center, and again take his role in the redemption of the world. Man also again has the opportunity of divine sonship.

\(^7\) In this way, Baader distinguishes his theosophic views from those of Schelling and Hegel, whose pantheistic philosophy confused God’s expression with the expression of His creation in time.
When humanity fell into the temporal region, man’s nature was displaced or ‘versetz.’ Our peripheral bodily nature has been displaced or versetzt into the temporal region. Note that Baader uses the same term–being displaced–that Janssen used in his explanation of ecstasy and enstasy. Baader says our spirit, soul and body all fell into time. I believe this means that we act as if our soul is in time, forgetting our true nature. We are no longer centered in God’s spirit, but to the spirit of this world.

Baader says that at death, our temporal functions are withdrawn into the supratemporal center, awaiting the resurrection, when we will be given a new supratemporal nature. That seems to indicate that our heart center remains supratemporal. We now live in two regions: the supratemporal and the temporal. Or the fall of our soul into time could mean that a new temporal center was formed, much like Jung’s idea of a temporal ego that is distinguished from our supratemporal selfhood. In any event, Baader says that when we participate in Christ, we regain our true center, and that even in this life, a Christian will experience more and more of this elevation to his true being.

**c) Ekstasis as displacement to a different region**

Ekstasis is a temporary displacement to another region, either higher or lower than the fallen temporal world. See Baader’s article “Über den Begriff der Ekstasis (Verzücktheit) als Metastasis (Versetztheit)” [Concerning the idea of Ekstasis (being transported) as Metastasis (being displaced)] (Werke 4, 147 ff). In ekstasis, we are temporarily absent either spiritually or bodily. It is as if we are transposed (Hingerückt) to a different world (Werke 4, 155). In ecstasy, man’s spirit lives within (innewohnend) his earthly body, and yet he also freely lives through it (durchwohnend) in an unlimited way (Werke 2, 38).

Baader says that ecstasy can be used to understand primitive religion (Werke 3, 336). In ecstasy, we experience a partial unveiling (Lüftung) of the coffin-lid (Sargdeckel) or cocoon (Puppenhülle) of humans who are caught in time (zeitbefangen) (Werke 9, 112).

---

8 Except in the case of suicides and those who die a violent death, who are unable to completely withdraw into the heart center. These beings are called ‘Abgeschiedene,’ the spirits that haunt us, seeking atonement for their sins.
As a displacement to a different region, ecstasy is therefore a temporary anticipation of death’s separation of body, soul and spirit (Werke 4, 154, 276). But this separation in ecstasy is not absolute. It is a temporary weakening or dissolution of the spirit’s power over the body. It is a de-spiritualizing or dis-organising (Desorganisation) of the body or a dematerialization of the spirit (Werke 4, 276).

d) Confusion of ekstasis and “true stasis”

As a result of the fall, we are already displaced beings. We live partially within time instead of exclusively above time. Because of this fact, we sometimes confuse ideas of ecstasy (being displaced outside of ourself) with true stasis—a return to, or an anticipation of our true state. The withdrawal of the temporal peripheral nature into our supratemporal heart is incorrectly called an ekstasis, since we are not really standing outside of ourselves. Rather, we are returning to our true selves, our true stasis [wahre Stasis]. In returning to the supratemporal region, we are really returning to our original state, our original heart-life (Herzlebens), and not going outside of ourselves as the word ‘ek-stasis’ [standing outside] would imply:

Obschon man darum solche Zustände des menschlichen Lebens Extasen nennt, so sind selbe doch als Erinnerungen und Prophezeihungen der wahren Stasis desselben zu betrachten, somit als Anticipationen jener Integrirung und Sentrirung des Menschen, ohne welche, wie die Religion lehrt, die Integrirung der Schöpfung selber nicht zu Stande kommen kann (Werke 1, 412).

[Although one can refer to such situations in human life as ecstasies, they should rather be regarded as memories or prophecies of the true stasis of human life, as well as anticipations of the integration and centering of humans, without which, as religion teaches us, the integration of creation itself cannot come take place.] [my translation]

The feeling of displacement in ekstasis is therefore a temporary return to our true placement—

---

9 Baader seems to use ‘spirit’ in both a temporal as well as a central way. The withdrawal into the heart center at death seems to be require a central usage. At other times he seems to regard body, soul and spirit as temporal functions, none of which are the same as our heart center. See his treatise on extase of 1831; nature has 3 domains: mineral, plant and animal (Werke 4, 150); these three are matched in the human by body, soul and spirit, which correspond to the three senses, touching, hearing, and seeing (Werke 4, 153 and note 1). As St. John says, that which we have seen, heard, and touched with our hands (Werke 7, 245).

10 Imagination is another way of dematerialization (Werke 3, 300).
finding of our true heart center (*wahrhafte Mitte*), and our original mission as mediators between the heavenly and the earthly. This experience may be partial, and sometimes merely momentary. The experience cannot be explained immanently within one region alone, as merely a ‘duodram’ between a dualistically understood soul and body; ecstasy is an ontological move to our true center in another region. Those who seek to understand ecstasy in a purely immanent way (i.e. In a wholly temporal way) give themselves up to the present displacement of humanity in its present fallen state. For example, Baader criticizes Johann Ulrich Wirth, who incorrectly tried to understand all divine inspiration in terms of ecstatic-somnambulistic phenomena, which he then tried to understand in a purely immanent way (*Werke* 4, 321).\(^\text{11}\) Baader also rejected any psychologistic reduction of the experience. Ecstasy in the sense of true *stasis* is a real ontological move to another region. In later Catholic writers, we will see this same emphasis that *enstasis* is ontical reality.

**e) Displacement downward**

Since *ekstasis* is a displacement, there can be a displacement not only upwards towards our true state, but downwards to the temporal or the infratemporal state. Thus, not all *ekstasis* is desirable or good. Adam’s fall was itself an *ekstasis*, as he fell into the lower region of time.

This idea of the fall or displacement to a lower region as an *ekstase* is found in *Traité de la Réintégration des êtres* by Martine de Pasqually (d. 1774):

> A ce discours de l’esprit démoniaque, Adam resta comme dans l’inaction, et sentit naître en lui comme un trouble violent, d’où il tomba dans l’extase (de Pasqually, 124, cited by Nicole Jacques-Levevre).

> [To this speech of the demonic spirit, Adam remained as if inactive, and he felt being born within himself a violent disorder, from which he fell into ecstasy] [my translation]

De Pasqually is cited by Louis-Claude Saint-Martin (1743-1803), who strongly influenced Baader (Frank, 212). De Pasqually also refers to Adam’s initial mission, and to his spiritual body prior to the fall.

This moment of being displaced into another region is the basis for every temptation, whether that temptation [Versuchung] is to good or to evil (Werke 4, 276). Because of this possibility of a lower ecstasy, Baader warns about its ambiguous and dangerous nature, especially for any attempted contact with the infratemporal region. It is an anticipation of death, and involves sacrifice (Werke 4, 6). But there is also a good ekstasis, which is the anticipation of our true state, our true stasis. The regenerated person is one who is born again, and has been awakened again into this higher life; in such a person, this process of obtaining one’s true nature has already begun even in this earthly life (Werke 4, 6).

f) Introversion and extraversion

Baader used the terms ‘introversion’ and ‘extraversion’ long before C.G. Jung (he even spelled the terms the same way that Jung would spell them). Jung read Baader, and I believe that Jung’s work can be interpreted in terms of some of Baader’s ideas (Friesen 2008c).

Baader uses these terms in his article on the Eucharist (written in French):

Les sages réconnoissent cette matérialisation inférieure comme l’effet d’une translocation du principe divin ou de lumière par rapport à celui de la nature. C’est à dire, par une introversion du principe de la lumière et par une extraversion de celui de la nature, comme la clarification de la créature (laquelle proprement n’est que son accomplissement) se fait par l’Extraversion de la lumière, laquelle ne peut se réaliser que par l’introversion (ou le sacrifice) du principe naturel. Au reste il faut rémarquer, qu’un être actif comme l’homme n’ouvre son âme à un attirement qu’autant qu’il se laisse saisir par cette force attirante, c.à.d., qu’il se rende saisisable (passif) pour elle, ou pour ainsi dire, matière, dans laquelle le Principe attirant (le Père) puisse imprimer sa forme (son image). (“Sur l'Eucharistie,” Werke 7, 6n).

[The sages recognized this inferior materialization as the effect of a translocation of the divine or light principle with respect to the principle of nature. That is to say, by an introversion of the principle of light and by an extraversion of the principle of nature, just as the clarification of the creature (who is properly nothing but its accomplishment) is accomplished by the extraversion of light, which cannot realize itself except by introversion (or by sacrifice) of the natural principle. It must also be said that an active being such as man does not open his soul to an attraction except insofar as he allows himself to be seized by this attractive force, that is to say, that he allows himself to be captured (passive) by it,
or in other words, [to become] matter, in which the attracting Principle (the Father) may imprint his form (his image).] [my translation]

Baader here contrasts inferior materialization with clarification or superior materialization. The first occurs when the principle of light is introverted and the principle of matter is extraverted. The second occurs when the principle of light is extraverted and matter is introverted. To understand this, we need to see how he uses these terms in relation to center and periphery. As I understand this, introversion is human acceptance of a light that is given for us as our center; extraversion is our acting as the center for other creatures and the world around us. When we act as this center for the world, we are imaging God, from Whom we receive our light. And we can only be truly extravertive when we have been truly introvertive. In other words, these need to be in balance. Baader refers to proper and improper uses of extraversion and introversion (balance and imbalance). Improper extraversion is where we make the center temporal, instead of opening ourselves to the supratemporal center. This is an extraversion of nature, instead of the needed introversion of nature. Nature should seek its center in man as supratemporal. Not to do so is to seek the periphery at the expense of the center. Improper introversion is a flight from the periphery, seeking the center at the expense of the periphery (spiritualistic pietism).

There is a relation between introversion and enstasy in this sense of finding our center in a way that avoids spiritualistic world-flight. Extraversion should be understood as finding a center in another region: thus, nature should find its meaning in man, and man should find his meaning in God.

**g) Parannormal phenomena**

A full discussion of Baader’s ideas on paranormal phenomena is outside the scope of this article. But because he associates them with *ekstasis*, we need to look at them.

**i) Somnambulism and hypnosis**

Baader, like many of his contemporaries, was fascinated by the recently discovered phenomena of ‘magnetism’ or hypnotism, and phenomena such as sleepwalking. He related his ideas of *ekstasis* to these phenomena. He believed that such people temporarily withdraw their peripheral nature into their heart center, and that is why they have powers like clairvoyance. He also
compares it to what he calls ‘magnetic states.’ These magnetic states are those that Mesmer speaks of in reference to his mesmerism, or hypnosis of other people.

In hypnosis, another center controls our peripheral nature. But this is not a good ekstasis. The hypnotist or magnetizer often shares in the ekstasis of the person who is magnetized, and can often see what the magnetized person sees (Werke 15, 327, 334).

Baader was familiar with the writings of Emmanuel Swedenborg, who wrote a great deal about ecstasies, including his own experiences. According to Swedenborg, an individual in one region cannot experience another region except by means of (mediated by) an individual in that other region. An individual of a lower Region can only see within by rapport with a being in a higher or deeper one, just as an individual of a higher region can only reveal himself by an individual in a lower region, as his eye and his hand. Cf. Werke 4, 37 “Gott nichts thut, was Er nicht vorerst Seinen Erwählten (Propheren) zeigt” [God does nothing that he does not first show in his chosen ones (prophets)']. And a wholly spiritual being (angel) can only experience something in the temporal region by means of another individual in that region (Werke 4, 267).

Swedenborg thought that every somnambulist is magnetized by a Spirit. Baader seems to agree with that, except that he says not every spirit is that of a departed person or ‘Abgeschiedener’ (Werke 4, 205-6).

**ii) Clairvoyance**

In 1818, Baader published the revelations of a clairvoyant (Werke 4, 41ff). This was prior to Justinus Kerner’s 1829 publication of the experiences of The Seer of Prevorst, a book that later influenced C.G. Jung. Baader also wrote an article in response to these revelations of the Seer of Prevorst (Werke 4, 245ff).

Baader says that there is an inner seeing [Schauen] that is distinguished from mere outer seeing [Anschauen]. The inner is superior to the outer. Therefore we should call this inner seeing “first sight” instead of “second sight.” The material world is not the first world (Werke 4, 162). The mode of knowledge while in an ecstatic state is called ‘magical,’ which Baader links to the word ‘imagination.’ Susini says that by referring to these magnetic extases as “magical,” Baader intends to refer to what we can imagine, or, as Susini says, that which is “ideal” (Susini, II, 373).
For each region there is a bodily (Leibliche) seeing and a magical seeing (ausser dem Leibe, outside of the body) (Werke 4, 4). This magical wakefulness gives a broader deeper basis to consciousness (Werke 4, 20).

What is the nature of this magical vision? In regaining our true stasis, we do not see into another region. Rather, the experience involves seeing differently into the same temporal region in which we see bodily (Werke 4, 30). It is seeing this same temporal reality as a totality. Baader refers to a report by F. Meyer regarding a somnambulist:

Ich sehe, sagte sie zue dem Letztern, die ganze Geschichte der Menschheit wie ein Gemälde vor mir. Es sind darin Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft auf das Pünktlichste geordnet und zusammen gedrängt... (Werke 4, 22).

[She said to him [Meyer]: “I see the whole history of humanity like a painting before me. In it are the past, present and future, all ordered and compressed in the most precise way...”] [my translation]

Our magical (inner) and our bodily (outer) sensation normally coincide like concentric circles. But they are easily separated, much to the astonishment of the materialist who thinks outer sensation gives a firm foundation. Yet those who try to hold our inner and outer sensation apart often end up in madness. Ecstasy always involves the unlocking and elevation of this magical communication at the cost of our bodily communication. (Werke 4, 6-7).

Other writers used Baader’s idea of clairvoyance as the result of an “ecstatic” vision of totality. For example, Karl Phillipp Fisher said in 1850:

Dagegen hat es zu allen Zeiten Individuen gegeben, welche durch eine mächtige Sehnsucht nach einer substanziellen und wie die Mystiker selbst sagen centralen Intuition begeistert, ekstatische Zustände erlebten in welchen sie das innre Wesen und den lebendigen Prozess und Zusammenhang der Natur und der Geschichte des Geistes in einem Bewusstsein unter dem, dessen substanzielle einheit und Totalität sich im wachen Bewusstsein nur unvollkommen reflectirte. Daher sind alle Versuche contemplativer Hellseher: nach einander in objectiver Ordnung zu entwickeln, was sie in ihrer ekstatischen Totalanschauung in einem Seelenblicke concipirten, mehr oder weniger misslungen, so dass sie z. B. sogar J. Böhm im Bestreben die Einheit nicht zu verlieren im Kreise sich bewegen und im Versuche das Einzelne bestimmt hervorzuheben, den organischen Zusammenhang, dessen Moment es ist, übersehen. So sehr jedoch die Ekstase und ihr Ausdruck selbst in den Schriften J. Böhms: des Haupts somnabüler Contemplation gegen die objective Klarheit und Ordnung des normalen wachen Bewusstseins, und gegen

[In contrast, there have always existed certain individuals who, inspired by a powerful longing for a substantial, and (as the mystics themselves say), “central” intuition. [In this central intuition], they experience ecstatic circumstances in which the inner essence and living process and coherence of nature and the history of Spirit become inner to one consciousness; their substantial unity and totality is only imperfectly reflected in waking consciousness. That is why contemplative clairvoyants have more or less failed in all their attempts to develop and to set out in an objective order that which they conceive in one moment of their soul in their ecstatic total intuition. For example, even J. Böhme moves in circles in his endeavor not to lose unity. And in his attempt to clearly emphasize the particular, he overlooks the organic coherence of that of which it is a moment. But this is how ekstasis and its expression appear in J. Böhme’s writings: the superiority of somnambulistic contemplation as against the objective clarity and order of normal waking consciousness. It stands behind the evidence and necessity of scientific thought; that is the beautiful and deep witness of certain clairvoyant individuals regarding this substantial intuition, this inner beholding of being and life, which they experience in their ecstasy.] [my translation]

Fischer explicitly refers to Baader’s ideas of ekstasis, and the above-mentioned report to Meyer (p.88). He describes Boehme’s ecstatic experience of seeing sunlight glancing on pewter, which gave rise to the sense that in his heart, he could see into all created things at the same time in their innermost nature by virtue of their signatures or figures and colour [“also dass er vermittelst der Signaturen oder Figuren und Farben allen Geschöpfen gleichsam in das Herz und in die innerste Natur hineinsehen können”]. The emphasis is on a central beholding or intuition. It is a seeing from inside outwards [“von innen heraus”]. And he quotes Oetinger’s opinion that this central inner seeing should not lead us to despise the knowledge of thought. Logic allows us to distinguish and to divide or articulate [der Gliederung] that which we immediately perceived in our intuition. These ecstatic experiences are the presuppositions [Voraussetzungen] of a living development of science.
iii) Ghosts

Baader says that the ancients believed that in non-violent death, our life-powers \([Lebensgeistern]\) withdraw into the heart in order to leave the body. Something similar happens in \( ekstasis \): these life-spirits withdraw into the heart, and from there they are on the verge of leaving the body.

But in violent death, there is a temporary interception between the central Principle and its helping principles \([Hilfprincipien]\); these stay behind in the body, although the central principle has already left. These powers that are left behind are “ein Complex oder eine Mehrheit von Potenzen oder secundären Lebensprincipien” \[“a complex or a plurality of powers or other secondary life-principles”\].\(^{12}\) These split-off powers are what Paracelsus calls the ‘astral spirit,’ or what Boehme calls the ‘tincture body,’ or what the Seer of Prevorst calls the ‘\(Nervengeist\)’ [nerve spirit]. These split-off \([ losgewordenen]\) powers coming from the body can also displace themselves into the magnetizer’s body to be possessed by him. We should not force a return of these powers to the body of the somnambulist, since such forcing can lead to death \( (Werke 4, 250-51) \).

It is not just split off powers that Baader describes. The dead \([Abgeschiedene]\) sometimes make themselves known in order to confess \([beichten]\); they have no rest until everything is made known, especially where they have caused the death of someone else. Such confession is easier here than in Hades. They often show themselves as projections in other earthly living people, as a kind of “fixed idea.” These fixed ideas have objectivity in that these phantasies are not

\(^{12}\) There may be a connection here to Jung’s idea of “split-off” complexes, often caused by trauma, which seem to have the force of a separate personality:

We lack concrete proof that anything of us is preserved for eternity. At most we can say that there is some probability that something of our psyche continues beyond physical death. Whether what continues to exist is conscious of itself, we do not know either. If we feel the need to form some opinion on this question, we might possibly consider what has been learned from the phenomena of psychic dissociation. In most cases where a split-off complex manifests itself it does so in the form of a personality, as if the complex had a consciousness of itself. Thus the voices heard by the insane are personified. I dealt long ago with this phenomenon of personified complexes in my doctoral dissertation. We might, if we wish, adduce these complexes as evidence for a continuity of consciousness. (Jung 1963, 322).
possessed willingly; rather, such people are possessed by them (*Werke* 4, 248-9). There can be possession of body, soul or spirit. Such possession must not be confused with being fulfilled by a higher being (p. 245).

**iv) Exorcism**

Baader believed exorcism is necessary, since there is a continued relation of the dead [*Abgeschiedenen*] with the earthly living. We have the duty of praying for this community of the dead (*Werke* 4, 246).

**v) Other paranormal phenomena**

Clairvoyance is seeing at a distance. There is also action at a distance. Both depend on central sensation, whether this is central seeing or central acting. The center is present in the periphery inwardly as well as outwardly, above and under me, carrying and lifting up, just like God is at the same time over, in and outside of me (*Werke* 4, 246). Man was originally destined to act and see only in such a central way. In *ekstasis*, we are displaced to another region. Most *ekstasis* is a displacement of the soul. But it can also be a displacement of the body, where we are bodily absent [*leiblich abwesend*] This may sound strange, but Baader says it is a consequence of the fact that all material being is the product or expression of a non-material principle. The visible comes from the invisible.\(^{13}\) There is a seeing that is not-seen, a hearing that is not-heard, a touching that is un-touched and a moving that is immovable. By descending to a lower region, it becomes visible, audible, tangible, and moveable. By ascending, or by rapture (*extasis*), it is elevated to the Region of the Unseen. Bodily absence is a temporary suspension of such productivity or expression of the unseen. The material body can disappear in one place and

---

\(^{13}\) Baader cites Paul, that the visible world comes from the invisible. See Rom. 1: 20: “For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen”. Also 2 Cor. 4:18: ”While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.” Northrop Frye correctly comments:

So the Bible doesn’t think of the invisible world as a superior order. It thinks of it as that by means of which the world becomes visible: that is, the invisible world is the medium of the visible world (Frye, 2000).
appear in another, just like a salt crystal can disappear in a fluid without being destroyed. The body can even disappear in one place and appear in another; it is free in these circumstances, free from time. A movement through the Center is different from a movement from one peripheral point to another (Werke 4, 155-8, 162).

When a being ascends to the Unseen, it can then express itself again in the lower region. That is why spiritual beings [Geistwesen] do not appear in their entrance, but in their exit (reascensus), leaving their footsteps and sounds [Fusstritten und Klangfiguren] (Werke 4, 162).

6. Julius Langbehn (1851-1907)

A late nineteenth century reference to ‘enstasis’ is found in Julius Langbehn’s Rembrandt Als Erzieher (von einem Deutschen). Langbehn was an art historian. He is also known for the fact that he tried to cure Nietzsche. Langbehn’s work on Rembrandt was immensely popular, going through 39 editions. Dooyeweerd’s brother-in-law Dirk Vollenhoven was aware of Langbehn (Vollenhoven 2005), so it is likely that Dooyeweerd was, too. Langbehn was pro-German, and anti-Semitic. At p. 278, he says:


[One speaks of the stillness before the storm; but Wagner puts the storm before the stillness; his exaltation cannot be surpassed. After him, if music wants to progress at all, it will have to return to the highest innerness. Two centuries ago, Germans were filled with enthusiasm for “pure reason” and in the last century for “pure foolishness.” Hopefully in the present century they will become enthused]
for pure humanity. To be succinct: after ecstasy comes enstasy. The word ‘enstasy’ can best be translated into German by ‘innerness’; it is that characteristic which comes to its best and exceptional achievement in the folksong, and in the music of Bach, Glück, Mozart and Beethoven. It is the musical characteristic and possession of the German people. Before it, the most enthusiastic and brilliant externality, the most artful or sentimental passionateness will have to retreat; Wagner will have to retreat before his own maxim, that the Adagio “is the foundation of all musical tempos.”] [my translation]

The word ‘Innigkeit’ can also be translated as “intimacy of feeling,” but in this case, Langbehn opposes it to externality, so “innerness” must be what he means. And although ‘Zeitbestimmung’ can mean ‘chronology,’ in this case, it must mean “tempo,” since elsewhere Langbehn repeats that the Adagio is the most German tempo. But Langbehn does not give the source of the word ‘enstasy.’

Like Langbehn, Dooyeweerd relates enstasy to innerness. He says that in pre-theoretical intuition, the transcendent root of our personality thinks inwardly [in-denken] en-statically. Our naive thought is an in-denken, an inward thought, in enstasis. He contrasts the sensory aspect of the imagination with the sensory perception of the objectively perceptible ‘outer world’ (NC II, 372). We will discuss his ideas of pre-theoretical intuition later. But for now, it is sufficient to emphasize that he relates enstasy to “innerness.” And this innerness is related to our supratemporal selfhood. Our “inner human acts of experience” are “necessarily related to the ego as the transcendent centre of human existence.” Animals lack this center (NC II, 114).

7. Max Scheler (1874-1928)

As we shall see, Dooyeweerd used Scheler’s idea of ‘ecstasy’ as a contrast to ‘enstasy.’ It is worth pointing out that for Scheler, ecstasy also means our pre-reflective knowing. Scheler describes such ecstatic knowledge, which is “prior to the emergence of consciousness or self-reflection”:

We will call this knowledge ecstatic [ekstatische] knowledge. It is found quite clearly in animals, primitive people, children, and, further, in certain pathological and other abnormal and supra-normal states (e.g. in recovering from the effects of a drug). I have said elsewhere that the animal never relates to its environment as to an object but only lives in it [es lebe nur “in sie hinein”]. Its conduct with respect to the external world depends upon whether the latter satisfies its
instinctive drives or denies them satisfaction. The animal experiences the surrounding world as resistances of various types. Hence, it is absolutely necessary to contest the principle in Descartes, Franz Brentano, et al. that every mental function and act is accompanied by an immediate knowledge of it. An even more highly contestable principle is that a relation to the self is an essential condition of all processes of knowledge. It is difficult to reproduce purely ecstatic knowledge in mature, civilized men, whether in memory, reverie, perception, thought, or empathetic identification with things, animals or men; nevertheless, there is no doubt that in every perception and presentation of things and events we think that we grasp the things-themselves, not mere “images” of them or representatives of some sort.

Knowledge first becomes conscious knowledge \([\text{Bewusstsein}]\), that is, comes out of its original ecstatic form of simply “having” things, in which there is no knowledge of the having or of that through which and in which it is had, when the act of being thrown back on the self (probably only possible for men) comes into play (Scheler 1973, 294).

This pre-reflective state of ecstasis is not so much knowledge of, but rather a having of, a kind of participation. Mohanty interprets Scheler in this way:

In this sense, knowing is an ontological relation: one entity, the knowing mind, partakes (\(\text{teilhaben}\)) in the other, the thing. This participation, at first prereflective, is \(\text{Wissen}\); subsequently it is reflective knowing, i.e., \(\text{Erkennen}\). In the most general sense, then, knowing is taking part in being, taking part literally (thus presupposing, as Scheler tells us, the ontological relation of whole and part), the known becoming a part of the knower. This relation is neither spatial nor temporal nor causal.….What happens, according to Scheler is that a \(\text{Sosein}\) that is not intentional becomes one that is intentional. In spite of this change, there is strict identity. The prereflective knowing is also called by Scheler ‘ecstatic.’” (Mohanty, 15).

The idea of a prereflective knowledge is also very important for Dooyeweerd. But Dooyeweerd describes this prereflective knowledge, or “naive experience” in terms of \(\text{enstasis}\), not \(\text{ekstasis}\). He restricts \(\text{ekstasis}\) to the animal world. \(\text{Enstasis}\) is our entering into temporal reality, something that animals cannot do. There is a further distinction from Scheler. From the above quotations, it is evident that Scheler viewed \(\text{ekstasis}\) as a “living in” reality, a \(\text{Hineinleben}\). As we shall see, Dooyeweerd also uses that term, but relates it to ‘\(\text{enstasis}\).’

Like Scheler, Dooyeweerd also speaks of our “participation” \([\text{teilhaben}, \text{deelhebben}]\) (Friesen 2009, Theses 39, 79 and references). But Dooyeweerd always uses ‘participation’ in relation to
our sharing in a higher supratemporal and eternal reality, Christ, the New Root. Dooyeweerd
does not use ‘participation’ in the sense of sharing in temporal reality. Dooyeweerd is aware of
those writers like Levy-Bruhl who speak of ‘participation mystique’ in the temporal world, but
he rejects that as a primitive view of reality (NC I, 329 fn).


Several Roman Catholic theologians used the term ‘enstasis’ prior to Eliade. Although these
examples are subsequent to Dooyeweerd’s 1931 usage, they are nevertheless of interest in how
the idea has been used in comparing certain Christian mysticism to yogic meditation. They are
also of interest because of the link of these Catholic theologians to Baader’s Christian theosophy.

In his 1936 student work on Origen, Von Balthasar says

…cette extase de son etre est en meme temps une marche vers le centre de lui-même, vers sa source. L’image est un miroir, le ghw=qi seauton se realise dans la contemplation du Christ. C’est là qu’Origène découvre l’immense espace intérieur, le “cor spatiosum”… (von Balthasar 1936, 522)

[…this extasis of his being is at the same time a march towards the centre of himself, towards the source. The image is a mirror; the γνῶθι σεαυτόν [know thyself] realizes itself in the contemplation of Christ. It is there that Origen discovers the immense interior space, the “cor spatiosum” [spacious heart]] [my translation]

By 1937, Von Balthasar refers to this inner life as ‘enstasis’:

…der Entrückung (Ek-stase) ergänzt durch ein wachsende des Insichstehen (En-stase). “Das inner Leben der Dinge nimmt relativ auf das äußere in dem Verhältnis zu, in welchem ihr besonders Leben dem Centro sich einbildet oder diesem gleich wird; daher der Mensch der ganz in Centrum steht…”

[…the rapture (Ek-stase) is completed by a growing standing within one’s self (En-stase). “The inner life of things increases relative to the external to the extent that the Center is imagined in its special life or becomes identical to it; for that reason, man, who stands completely in the Center, is the most perfect”] [my translation]

The idea that ekstasis leads to enstasis echoes Baader’s idea that what appears to be ekstasis is
really an anticipation of true stasis and of our true nature. Indeed, Von Balthasar expressly refers
to Baader in this book (pp. 624-25). Von Balthasar and his teachers P. de Lubac and Erich
Przywara were all influenced by Baader (Friesen 2008a).
Von Balthasar continued to write about *enstasis* in 1947:


[The existence of rapture (*ek-stase*) completes itself by an increased standing within oneself (*en-stase*). “The inner life of things receives the outer to the extent that its particular life images the Center or becomes identical to it…”] [my translation]

Later in the same work, he refers to Goethe’s idea that everything finite is ‘ecstatic’ in the sense of the ‘empor’ of finite being, its ‘upwards- and onwards-ness’. It is in ecstasy before the wonder of being that being attains transparency to eyes that themselves have become the media of spirit-of the person—in the fullest sense. Paradoxically, self-possession (‘enstasy’, being most fully ‘in’ oneself) comes about through ecstasy (stepping ‘out’ of the self) (p. 407).

In his work on aesthetics, *The Glory of the Lord*, Von Balthasar mentions Baader several times. He also contrasts *ekstasis* and *enstasis*:

But this act is the extrication of the spirit alienated from God from its sensual nature, and its restoration to its full and bright transparency in God. Thus, what is involved here is not an *ekstasis* to a Thou, but an *enstasis* to the God present within the spirit, by transcending all sensual and spiritual forms which are found in the memory or which are conjured up by the demon (Von Balthasar 1982 I, 267)

This usage of *enstasis*, of transcending all sensual and spiritual forms, seems to be an attempt to have a pure spirituality apart from one’s nature. Von Balthasar refers to the Church Father Pontius Evagrius (A.D. 345-399) as recommending this kind of negation of the sensual (p. 267). As we will see, Dooyeweerd, like Baader, denies the possibility of a pure spirituality.

We should note that Von Balthasar warns against both ecstasy (“the expansion of the soul to the dimensions of divinity”) and enstasy (“the indwelling of the godhead in the soul to the point of absorption”). He says, “Both forms lie close to the point of tilting over into atheism or at least radical scepticism” (p. 229).

But Von Balthasar presents a more positive view of enstasy and ecstasy in his discussion of Goethe, who sees everything finite as ecstatic in the sense that “it seeks to be more than itself.”
This is the “empor” of finite being, its “upwards- and onwards-ness. Aidan Nichols writes,

It is in ecstasy before the wonder of being that being attains transparency to eyes that themselves have become the media of spirit–of the person–in the fullest sense. Paradoxically, self-possession (‘enstasy’, being most fully ‘in’ oneself) comes about through ecstasy (stepping ‘out’ of the self)” (Nichols, 101).

This vision of the world is obtained by a respectful looking at the world, a “Hingabe.”

Dooyeweerd, too, speaks of the “restlessness” of all created being, finding its meaning in the transcendent. Dooyeweerd does not call this an ‘ekstasis.’ But he does speak of existence as ek-sisterre. Dooyeweerd refers to our tendency towards an Origin as the ex-sistent character of our heart. In the state of apostasy we attempt an autonomous exsistere. We need to be ‘pulled out of’ (ex-trahere) this state by God in order to regain our true ex-sistent position (NC, I, 58, 59).

And the idea of Hingabe has some relation to Dooyeweerd’s idea of Hineinleben, discussed later.

9. Olivier Lacombe (1904-2001)

In support of his views on yogic concentration, Eliade refers (Eliade 1958, 383) to Olivier Lacombe’s 1937 article “Sur le Yoga indien” (Lacombe, 1937). The French priest Henri Le Saux (Abhishiktananda) (1920-1973) read Lacombe’s article before going to India in 1948 (Friesen 2001, 82-3). Although Lacombe does not use the word ‘enstasis’ in his 1937 article, he certainly expresses the idea of yogic concentration as being an inward movement, the “grasping of the soul by itself,” in the depth of its substance, a movement from extraversion to introversion. Lacombe describes this yogic concentration as a kind of dis-incarnation, the isolation of the spirit in its native and original purity. Lacombe considers it to be a kind of “natural” mysticism as opposed to Christianity’s supernatural mysticism. The following year, Lacombe wrote another article in the same journal, discussing the Hindu sage Ramana Maharshi as an example of this natural mysticism of enstasis (Lacombe, 1938). Lacombe believed that Ramana’s realization resulted from his fear of death when he was 16 years old. This fear plunged him into the interior dimension. I have discussed Ramana’s experience elsewhere in more detail; it is not nearly as simple as Lacombe described it (Friesen 2006d).

In 1951, Lacombe published “La mystique naturelle dans l’Inde” in the Revue Thomiste (Lacombe 1951). In a letter to Abhishiktananda dated November 1953, Jules Monchanin refers
to this article and its idea of “l’enstase de l’acte de connaître dans l’acte d’exister” [the enstasis of the act of knowing within the act of existing]. The following year, Louis Gardet, a scholar of Islam, wrote another article in the Revue Thomiste referring to ‘enstasis’ (Gardet, 1954). In 1981, Olivier Lacombe and Louis Gardet published L'Expérience du Soi, Étude de mystique comparée, where they repeat this view of the meaning of ‘enstasis’:

…une expérience supra-sensible centrée sur l’exister du soi, en son dépouillement, non d’une intuition métaphysique contemplant les richesses intelligibles de l’essence de l’âme, ni d’une investigation curieuse parmi les phénomènes de l’intimité psychologique. Il s’agit, si je puis me permettre cette expression, d’une enstase de l’acte de connaître dans l’acte d’exister. Il suffit, en effet, que l’expérience de soi s’appréhende en profondeur comme expérience de l’être que je suis, pour que le niveau empirique soit transcendé et que nous ayons affaire à une expérience au moins virtuellement métaphysique et non à un simple ‘vécu’ de conscience.

[a supra-sensible experience centered on the existence of the self, in its voluntary deprivation, not of a metaphysical intuition contemplating the intelligible riches of the essence of the soul, nor of a strange investigation among private psychological phenomena. It concerns, if I may use the expression, an enstasis of the act of knowing in the act of existence. It is in fact sufficient that the experience of the self apprehends itself in its depth as the experience of the being who I am in order for the empirical level to be transcended; we have do with an experience that is at least virtually metaphysical and not a simple state of consciousness.] [my translation]


Lacombe’s 1937 distinction between “natural” and “supernatural” mysticism was adopted by Jacques Maritain, who wrote an article the next year in the same journal Études Carmélitaines; he recommended that Catholics should study the experience of the Self, where all religious implications are absent (Maritain, 1938). But Maritain’s distinction between natural and supernatural is dualistic, as Von Balthasar and De Lubac learned from reading Baader (Friesen 2008a).

Jules Monchanin, the Catholic priest who later founded the Christian ashram in India with Abhishiktananda, and who met Ramana Maharshi, used the word ‘enstasis’ in a letter dated June 29, 1941 (a few years after Lacombe’s article):

Ma recherché et ma méditation (entrelacées) sont de plus en plus centrées sur l’unity trinitaire–l’unité du coesse créé (devenir)–l’unité des ces deux unites dans le Verbe incarné et l’Esprit envoyé. Contemplation de la circumincension et métaphysique synontique se fondent et c’est une exigence d’extase substantielle (si loin de moi, hélas! Je me sense parfois si perdu…). L’enstase pure (yoga) se transsubstantie dans l’Esprit en pure extase, participation, elle, aux Hypostases; et c’est la même conversion que celle de la douleur du Vendredi Saint en ja joie pascale (Monchanin 1974, 163).

[My research and my meditation (intertwined) are more and more centered on the Trinitarian unity, the unity of the created co-esse (that is to say, of becoming), and the unity of those two unities in the incarnate Word and the Spirit sent upon us. Contemplation of the circumincension and synontic metaphysics fuse together, and it is a demand (a requirement) of substantial ecstasy (so far from me, alas: I sometimes feel myself so lost). The pure enstasis (yoga) is transsubstantiated in the Spirit into pure ecstasy, ecstasy being participation in the Hypostases; and it is the same conversion as that of the sorrow of Good Friday into Easter joy.]\(^\text{14}\)

We have earlier seen the use of the term ‘substantial extasis’ in Fischer. As an example of “substantial extasis,” Monchanin refers to the experience of St. John of the Cross, which was towards God. He rejects Heidegger’s idea of a merely worldly ekstasis of the “ex-sistant,” for Heidegger’s idea remains wholly within the temporal horizon (Monchanin 1974, 177).

Monchanin used the term ‘enstasis’ again in 1945, where he says that yoga’s movement of enstasis is the intellectual and spiritual propadeutic to the “dark night of the soul” (Monchanin 1974, 239). Monchanin also mentions the fourth century Pontius Evagrius as searching for God “à travers l’image qui reside au plus secret de l’âme” [by means of the image that resides in the most secret place of the soul] (Monchanin 1974, written in 1945). This is interesting, since Von Balthasar also mentions Evagrius as anticipating the idea of enstasis, although I have not yet found any direct reference to the word in Evagrius.

\(^{14}\) I have in general followed the translation in Jules Monchanin (1895-1957) as Seen from East and West: Lyon-Fleurie (ISPCK, 2001).
Monchanin cites Lacombe’s 1951 article in 1953, where he says that by “l’enstase de l’acte de connaître dans l’acte d’exister” Lacombe means “to know one’s own existence” [connaître sa proper existence (Monchanin 1974, 263 fn 19). He refers to Eliade having given to yoga a “dimension immémoriable” but he does not link Eliade to the idea of enstasy.

12. Valentin Tomberg (1900-1973)

Valentin Tomberg was a Russian Christian mystic, initially attracted to Rudolf Steiner’s anthroposophy but who converted to Roman Catholicism. In *Meditations on the Tarot*, Tomberg makes many references to *enstasis* (Tomberg 1985). He wrote *Meditations* in 1960, but it was published posthumously in French in 1984. The book is not about divination, but uses Tarot images in a way similar to the way that Jung refers to archetypes. The Catholic theologian Hans Urs von Balthasar wrote the Afterword to this book, and he says that Tomberg writes in the tradition of Franz von Baader. Von Balthasar says that the power of Tomberg’s spiritual vision is in his “ineluctable certainty that at the depths of existence there is an interrelationship between all things by way of analogy” (Tomberg 661, 663).

Tomberg refers to Plotinus, for whom ecstasy meant complete union with God. And he discusses similar ideas in yoga. But Christian yoga does not aspire to unity, but to the *unity of two*. He distinguishes this “unity of two” both from monism and from dualism (p. 31). This is similar to the meaning of ‘*advaita*’ [nondualism] in some types of Hinduism as meaning “not-two.” (Friesen 2001).

And Tomberg distinguishes *enstasy* from ecstasy. *Enstasy* is “the conscious experience of the initial microcosmic state—the experience of the primordial layer at the root of the human being or microcosm. It is

…a conscious descent into the depths of the human being…experience of the depths at the foundation within oneself. Here one becomes more and more *profound* until one awakens within oneself to the primordial layer—or the “image and likeness of God”—which is the aim of enstasy. (129)

Ecstasy is the conscious experience of the *initial macrocosmic state*. It is a rapture, a going out of oneself, whereby the macrocosmic layers, the “spheres” or heavens, reveal themselves to consciousness, as in the Apostle Paul’s experience as recorded in 2 Cor. 12:2-4, where Paul
describes being caught up in the third heaven. Enstasy is of depth, and ecstasy is of height. But both lead to the same truth:

Ecstasy to the heights beyond oneself and enstasy into the depths within oneself lead to knowledge of the same fundamental truth. Christian esotericism unites these two methods…Thus, the apostle John, author of the Gospel of the Word-made-flesh, was at the same time he who listened to the heart of the Master. He had the twofold experience–macrocosmic and microcosmic–of the Cosmic Word and the Sacred Heart, of which the litany says, “Cor Jesu, rex et centrum omnium cordium” (Heart of Jesus, king and centre of all hearts”). It is thanks to this twofold experience that the Gospel which he wrote is at one and the same time so cosmic and so humanly intimate–of such heights and depths simultaneously. (130).

And he gives another interesting contrast:

…ecstasy is the going out of the soul from the domain of the powers of discursive reason, memory and imagination–sometimes followed by the body. Both Peter and St. Teresa passed in their rapture through the stages “You are”; “I draw near to You”; “It is not I, but you who lives and acts in me.” It is therefore the attraction of the divine You, resulting in union with him, which constitutes the essence of their psycho-somatic ecstasy, whilst Jesus Christ walked on the water not by virtue of ecstasy–not by going out of his Humanity–but rather by virtue of enstasy, i.e. centering in himself, which is the active virtue of the formula “I am; do not be afraid.” The Humanity of Jesus Christ walking on the water did not lead to a You attracting and supporting it, but rather to the divine I of the Son of the eternal Father present in itself. (311)

Christian initiation is the unity of our inner heart and this cosmic experience. The apostle John had this ”twofold experience–macrocosmic and microcosmic–of the Cosmic Word and the Sacred Heart.” And here is another contrast of enstasy and ecstasy:

The first is a conscious descent into the depths of the human being to the initial layer. Its method is enstasy, i.e. experience of the depths at the foundation within oneself. Here one becomes more and more profound until one awakens within oneself to the primordial layer–or the “image and likeness of God”–which is the aim of enstasy. (Tomberg, 129)

This “initial layer” is described as the root of all that is human in human nature or its “beginning” (Tomberg 129). Dooyeweerd also describes the supratemporal heart as the root not only of ourselves but of the entire temporal world, as redeemed in Christ, the new Root. And that idea of the heart as both inner reality and root of the cosmos is found in Tomberg.
13. C.J. Jung

We have already looked at how Jung’s ideas of introversion and extraversion, and his idea of split-off complexes seem to be derived from to Baader. There is an interesting discussion of *ekstasis* by C.G. Jung in a letter to W.Y. Evans-Wentz of Feb. 9, 1939. Jung says,

I quite agree with him [Mr. Sturdy] that there are states of intensified consciousness which deserve the name “super-consciousness.” No matter how far that “super-consciousness” reaches, I'm unable to imagine a condition where it would be completely all-embracing, i.e., where there would not be something unconscious left over. Even in his ekstasis, Paul assures us that an “I” has seen. Acts 26:13. Now if his [Paul's] ego had been completely dissolved and abolished, he never could have said “I have seen,” he might have said “God has seen,” or rather he would not have been able to tell us even about the fact that something had been seen at all. So no matter how far an ekstasis goes or how far consciousness can be extended, there is still the continuity of the apperceiving ego which is essential to all forms of consciousness. (p. 261)

Thus, according to Jung, our supratemporal selfhood can never become totally detached from our temporal ego. Jung therefore disputes the possibility of a Buddhist experience of nothingness or “*Shunyata.*”


R.C. Zaehner distinguished between introverted mysticism, which is directed inwards, and extraverted mysticism, which is directed towards the senses (Zaehner 1960, 62). He does not trace the history of these terms. As we have seen, they were already used by Baader, even before Jung made them central to his psychology.

Zaehner says that the extravertive mystic perceives the universal life of the world, while the introvertive “reaches up to the realization of a universal consciousness of mind.” (1973, 131-2) The extraverted mysticism is a kind of nature mysticism (p. 70), similar to Wordsworth's views in his poem “Tintern Abbey.” There is a sense of communion or “at-one-ment” with nature (Zaehner 1973, 35, 81). Zaehner relates introverted and extraverted to enstatic and ecstatic religion.

…by ‘enstasy’ I understand that type of ‘introverted’ mystical experience in which there is experience of nothing except an unchanging, purely static oneness. It is the exact reverse of ecstasy which means to get outside oneself and which is often
characterized by a breaking down of the barriers between the individual subject and the universe around him (Zaehner 1973b, 143).

But monism is not the only kind of enstatic religion. There is also Christian theism, “in which the soul feels itself to be united with God by love.” (1973, 29). For Zaehner, that is the highest kind of mysticism.


In his 1960 book *Mysticism and Philosophy*, W.T. Stace also distinguishes between introverted and extraverted mysticism. There is an introverted realization of the unity of one’s own soul. The experience of the introverted mystic is undifferentiated. The experience of the extrovertive is differentiated, at least spatially. But the mystic sees through the space-time world, to the unity that is not differentiated (Stace 1960, 273). For Stace, introverted mysticism is higher than the extraverted kind of mysticism.

As we have seen, these terms go back to Baader, who used them long before Jung. However, Stace spells ‘extrovertive’ with an ‘o’ and not an ‘a.’

B. Herman Dooyeweerd (1894-1977)

A. Enstasy versus Ecstasy

1. Scheler’s idea of ekstasis

Like many of the other authors we have surveyed, Dooyeweerd contrasts enstasy and ecstasy. But he describes the difference using Scheler’s idea of ‘ecstasy’ (an idea that Scheler in turn obtained from Baader).

Dooyeweerd says that it is only humans that have the ability to enter enstatically into temporal reality. Other creatures have no self-consciousness and are ekstatically absorbed in time:

Kosmisch en kosmologisch zelfbewustzijn kan in den kosmos alleen de mensch bezitten, wijl alleen ’s menschen kosmische structuur in een individueelen, den tijd transcendeerenden religieuzen wortel, in een zelf-heid is gegrond en alleen die zelf-heid zich door de tijds-intuitie in den kosmos kan in-denken en theoretisch diens modale zin-zijden kan uiteen- en te-zamen vatten. Tegenover het *ex-statisch* opgaan in den kosmos der geen zelfbewustzijn bezittende schepselen staat het *en-
It is only man who can have cosmic and cosmological self-consciousness because only man’s cosmic temporal structure is founded in an individual religious root transcending time, viz. his selfhood. Only his selfhood is able to enter into the temporal cosmos by means of his intuition of time and to set apart and combine the modal aspects in theoretical thought. In contrast with those creatures that have no self-consciousness and are *ex-statically* absorbed by their temporal existence, man’s selfhood is able to *enter enstatically* into the coherence of cosmic time (*NC II*, 480).

Dooyeweerd’s point that creatures that have no self-consciousness are *ek-statically* absorbed in the temporal cosmos is confirmed elsewhere. Such other creatures are “entirely lost in time.” Dooyeweerd refers to the subjective undergoing of sense-impressions in animals. He contrasts this to man's conscious experience. Since the human selfhood transcends cosmic time, not a single aspect of temporal reality can transcend the self-consciousness operative in all human experience (*NC II*, 539).

It is only because humans have a supratemporal concentration point that we are in a position to “gain a veritable notion of time” (*NC I*, 32).

Dooyeweerd therefore contrasts *enstasis* and *ex-stasis*. Because But this usage of ‘*ex-stasis*’ does not mean going beyond oneself to a higher region. Instead, it is related to Baader’s idea of an incorrect kind of *ekstasis* of being limited by the temporal (see above).

In the *New Critique*, Dooyeweerd does not give any reference for his use of the word ‘ex-statically’ to refer to the temporal world's lack of a supratemporal center. But it is clear that he obtained this idea from Max Scheler’s 1928 work, *Man’s Place in Nature*. In his 1961 article, “De Taak ener Wijsgerige Anthropologie,” Dooyeweerd explicitly acknowledges this work for the idea temporal beings are *exstatically* absorbed by their temporal existence. Why did he not acknowledge Scheler when he first used this idea in 1935 in the *WdW*? Dooyeweerd did not always document or acknowledge the sources that he used; he footnoted and referenced only those sources that he wants to acknowledge. Today this would be called plagiarism. But we must remember that Dooyeweerd’s works were essentially self-published. Dooyeweerd’s major work, *De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee*, was subsidized by the Kuyper Foundation, but there was no
outside editor. Furthermore, Dooyeweerd had to be very cautious because of the extreme hostility of theologians at the Free University to ideas that did not fit with their theology (Stellingwerff 1987; Friesen 2006c; Friesen 2011).

Scheler contrasts temporal beings to man, who is a spiritual being who is open to a “world.” Scheler says at p. 47 of the German edition,

Ein solches “geistiges” Wesen ist nicht mehr trieb- und umweltgebunden, sondern “umweltfrei” und, wie wir es nennen wollen, weltoffen. Ein solches Wesen hat “Welt.” Es vermag die ursprünglich auch ihm gegebenen “Widerstands'- und Reaktionszentren seiner Umwelt, in die das Tier ekstatisch aufgeht, zu “Gegenständen” zu erfassen, ohne die Beschränkung, die diese Gegenstandswelt oder ihre Gegebenheit durch das vitale Triebsystem und die ihm vorgelagerten Sinnensfunktionen und Sinnesorgane erfährt.

[The spiritual being, then, is no longer subject to its drives and its environment. Instead, it is “free from the environment” or, as we shall say, “open to the world.” Such a being has a “world.” Moreover, such a being is capable of transforming the primary centers of resistance and reaction into “objects.” The animal remains immersed in them “ecstatically.’ Such a being is capable of grasping the qualities of objects without the restriction imposed upon this thing-world by the system of vital drives and the mediating functions and organs of the sensory apparatus.] (English translation, Man’s Place in Time, p. 37).

Man is a spiritual being, and has a world. This is similar to the idea of experiencing the cosmos as “our own” (see discussion below).

Robert Sweeney comments on Scheler’s ideas:

Thus, in Man’s Place in Nature, Scheler speculates on man’s situation in the cosmos by analyzing the stages of psychophysical life in plant, animal and man. Whereas the plant’s activity is dominated by Gefühlsdrang, vital impulse that is blind, passive, and exclusively “ecstatic,” the animal’s behavior is instinctive in the sense of being ordered to meeting needs, of following bodily rhythms, and of serving the species, as well as of screening sense-data, so that it is active in relation to its environment (Sweeney, 108).

For Scheler, ‘ecstatic’ means the inability to report back to a center (English translation, 11, 39, 43). Plants are totally outwardly directed, and lack even the animals’s primitive reporting back to a center. And this inability to report to a center is what Dooyeweerd means by ‘ex-stasis.’ He says that temporal reality lacks the spiritual or religious root that is at man’s center. Because
other beings do not have this religious root, they do not have cosmic and cosmological consciousness:

> It is only man who can have cosmic and cosmological self-consciousness because only man’s cosmic temporal structure is founded in an individual religious root transcending time, viz. his selfhood (NC II, 480).

and

> De anorganische stoffen, het planten- en dierenrijk, hebben geen zelfstandige geestelijke of religieuze wortel. Hun tijdelijk bestaan wordt eerst volledig in en door de mens (Dooyeweerd 1959, 30).

[The inorganic materials, the plant and animal realms, have no independent spiritual or religious root. Their temporal existence first becomes complete [fulfilled] in and through man] [my translation]

and

> In contrast to mankind, neither the inorganic elements nor the kingdoms of plants and animals have a spiritual or religious root. It is man who makes their temporal existence complete. To think of their existence apart from man, one would need to eliminate all the logical, cultural, economic, aesthetic, and other properties that relate them to man. With respect to inorganic elements and plants, one would even need to eliminate their capability of being seen (Dooyeweerd 1979, 30).

Temporal reality relies on humanity as its root. And Dooyeweerd follows Baader’s idea that temporal reality does not even have any reality apart from its root in humanity, in which it is concentrated. That is why the temporal world is fallen with man:

> Our temporal world, in its temporal diversity and coherence of meaning, is in the order of God's creation bound to the religious root of mankind. Apart from this root it has no meaning and so no reality. Hence the apostasy in the heart, in the religious root of the temporal world signified the apostasy of the entire temporal creation, which was concentrated in mankind (NC I, 100).

So if ‘ecstatic’ means not to have a center, then ‘enstatic’ means man’s ability to relate the temporal peripheral world, as well as man’s own temporal functions and experiences to his supratemporal center (see the discussion of “cosmic consciousness” below).

To be sure, Dooyeweerd criticizes Scheler's view of the center. He says that Scheler’s view of Spirit [Geist] is an absolutization of the theoretical Gegenstand-relation, because Scheler
understood our selfhood in a logical sense (NC I, 52). In contrast, Dooyeweerd uses Baader’s idea of our selfhood being the center of all of our functions, including our logical function.

Heidegger also speaks of ek-stasis. Heidegger, too, speaks of the difference between animal and human, and of how the animal is “poor in world.” But Heidegger does not have a view of our selfhood as supratemporal, and so the distinction from animals cannot be found there. Dooyeweerd is critical of Heidegger’s views. Dooyeweerd says that his own use of the word existential is not to be understood in the humanist-existential sense. He says that existentialism remains entangled in the diversity of meaning of the terms ego and selfhood; it loses sight of religious root (radix) of human existence. He points to Heidegger as an example of this attempt to find the selfhood in time:

If Heidegger had had real insight into cosmic time, he would not have sought the selfhood’s transcendence in the inner experience of the ex-sistere, in the historical time-aspect with its anticipatory future (NC II, 531).

Heidegger sought the transcendence within time itself, in our movement towards death (NC II, 24). Existentialism sees existence only in its antithesis to the “given nature of reality” (for Heidegger, Dasein as the ontological manner of being against the given world of the Vorhandenen) (NC I, 112). Vorhandenes rest on a failure to appreciate the dynamic character of reality; ex-sistence of all created things as meaning, with no rest in themselves.

Scheler also views man’s being as beyond time. He says,

Man alone—in so far as he is a person—is able to go beyond himself as an organism and to transform, from a center beyond the spatiotemporal world, everything (himself included) into an object of knowledge. Thus man as a spiritual being is a being that surpasses himself in the world. As such he is also capable of irony and humor which always indicate the transcendence of actual existence (Dasein). The center, however, from which man performs the acts by means of which he objectifies body, psyche and world in its spatial and temporal abundance cannot itself be part of this world. It cannot be located in space or in time: it can only be located in the highest Ground of Being itself (Man’s Place in Time, 46-47).

Scheler cites Kant with approval as having raised “spirit” above “psyche.” But Scheler was also influenced by Baader’s philosophy (Susini, I, 6). Like Dooyeweerd and Scheler, Baader says that humans have a supratemporal center, but animals do not. Man was breathed out by God, or emanated, in distinction to the world that was created (Baader: Zeit 40). Humans have a
supratemporal center, but animals do not. Because of this, an animal does not perceive time like we do; this also means that animals do not become bored (Baader: Elementarbegriffe 553; Zeit 27 ft.7). Animals are not displaced (versetztes) beings. Humans are displaced, because although they have a supratemporal center, they also function in time. We share with animals what Baader calls ‘purely outer seeing.’ But animals do not share with us the inner seeing related to our central being (Baader: Zeit 56).

2. Enstasis is not an experience of pure consciousness

Many writers suppose that ‘enstasis’ means a kind of pure consciousness—a consciousness that is separated from all external sensation, and even separated from the body. Some view it in terms of the trance state of nirvikalpa samadhi, where there are no longer any distinctions of subject and object or any distinctions whatsoever. As we have seen, although Eliade is somewhat ambiguous here, he does state in his later works that enstasis is not a state without content.

The idea of pure consciousness usually means that some part of our consciousness is “impure” and needs to be eliminated. Frequently, pure consciousness is seen as an overcoming of the logical side of our experience. According to this view, pure consciousness is a level of consciousness where there are no logical distinctions, and no longer any distinction between subject and object. Apart from their questionable use of the terms ‘subject’ and ‘object’, these advocates of pure consciousness frequently advocate a state of trance in which there is no consciousness of anything at all. K.C. Forman correctly points out that this kind of loss of consciousness may achieve the overcoming of a subject-object distinction, but in a tautological way. If there is no consciousness of anything at all, then of course there is no distinction between ‘subject’ and ‘object.’ Forman says that this is the least interesting in this view of consciousness (Forman 1990).

Dooyeweerd also rejects any idea of a “pure consciousness.” Enstasis is not an inward consciousness that is separated from all external reality.

And Dooyeweerd does not use ‘enstasy’ in the sense of a static consciousness that is no longer related to any temporal duration and that is completely unmoving. The contrast between change and rest is sometimes discussed as the relation between the dynamic and the static. For the word
‘static’ derives from the word ‘stasis,’ and change has been regarded as related to kinêsis. Stasis is one of the basic categories in Plato’s philosophy. Plato refers to both sensible and intelligible categories. Among the intelligible categories are Being (on), identity (tauton), otherness (heteron), change (kinēsis) and continuance or rest (stasis) (Soph 254, C, D). Plotinus also distinguishes between sensible and intelligible categories, listing the same intelligible categories, including stasis. Plotinus also speaks of the intelligible as Spirit in rest, unity and continuance.

Now this meaning of ‘stasis’ as rest or continuance does correspond in some sense to Dooyeweerd’s usage. For he speaks of naïve experience as both enstatic and as being “at rest”:

> In the resting pre-theoretical intuition we have an enstatic conscious ‘Erleben’ of the full temporal reality as it presents itself in the typical structures of individuality and their relations. This conscious ‘Erleben’ or ‘Hineinleben’ into reality primarily unfolds itself in the integral experience of temporal reality to which any kind of theoretical meaning-synthesis is still alien (NC II, 474; II, 409).

Elsewhere, Dooyeweerd says that naïve experience is inert (traag) (Dooyeweerd 1931, 102). Naïve syn-systatic thought depends inertly on its connection to psychical sensations (NC II, 474). And yet Dooyeweerd’s meaning of rest is not a static rest in the sense of unchanging being. He opposed any viewpoint that seeks a static reality. He dismisses that as a metaphysical-Greek idea of supra-temporality. Not even the eternity of God should be regarded in that way (NC I, 31 ft.; not in WdW). According to Baader, even God expresses Himself in His nature. Dooyeweerd’s denial that God’s eternity is static seems to suggest a similar dynamic relation, where the center always expresses itself in its periphery or nature. Thus, the rest of our naïve experience is one that is dynamic.

I understand this in terms of Baader’s view of “true stasis,” which is a moving in its rest, and a resting in its movement. Baader says that our mistaken view of eternity is caused by our abstraction, which views rest (Ruhe) as static and lifeless (Elementarbegriffe 535). Eternity should instead be seen as always resting in its movement and always moving in its Rest, as always new and always the same. There is a dynamism even within God, in the generation of the persons of the Trinity. God is eternal Life, eternal Being and eternal Becoming at the same time, an eternally proceeding Process (Baader: Schriften I, 149; Weltalter 139)

And Dooyeweerd does not view enstasis as a separation from the body. For Dooyeweerd,
enstasis is the relation of our supratemporal selfhood to temporal reality. As we have seen, he emphasizes that our selfhood enters into temporal reality. And our body is the temporal expression of our selfhood. Pietism and spiritualistic types of mysticism aim for a separation from the body, but Dooyeweerd rejects any disembodied spirituality.

From our naïve state of rest, we move out in our theory. We then return to the rest of naïve experience, to enstasis, but it is a deepened naive experience. There is therefore a continuous spiraling movement in Dooyeweerd between the equilibrium of naïve experience and the deepening of it by theoretical experience. We can understand this further when we look at Dooyeweerd’s view of enstasis and religious self-reflection, and of his view of enstasis as cosmic consciousness. I will look at both of these issues separately.

Nor did Dooyeweerd accept any dualistic anthropology of mind and body. For Dooyeweerd, our central selfhood, or heart-center is not purely rational, but rather the supratemporal center of all our temporal functions, including our rationality. This idea of our selfhood expressing itself within temporal nature can be found in Baader’s philosophical anthropology of a supratemporal heart center expressing itself within a temporal periphery. This is not at all the same as a dualism of soul and body, since a dualism is always the elevation of one temporal function over the others. The best evidence is that Dooyeweerd obtained this anthropology of the heart from J.H. Gunning, Jr. And from Daniël Chantepie de la Saussaye, who introduced Baader’s Christian theosophy to Reformed theology (Friesen 2011).

As we have seen, some modern Catholic theologians like Olivier Lacombe, Jacques Maritain and Jules Monchanin used the term ‘enstasis,’ referring to it as a kind of ‘natural’ mysticism. But the idea of a supratemporal center expressing itself in a temporal periphery should not be regarded in terms of a distinction between supernatural and natural. For as Baader emphasizes, there is never a nature without a center, and every center must have a nature in which to express itself. Other Catholic theologians Henri de Lubac, Erich Przywara, and Hans Urs von Balthasar learned of this dualistic problem from Baader (Friesen 2008a), and tried to reject this dualism.
3. Enstasis is an entering into temporal reality

As we have seen, Dooyeweerd says that it is only humans who can enter enstatically into the temporal cosmos. For Dooyeweerd, *enstasis* involves our supratemporal selfhood (our I-ness) *entering* into temporal reality:

In pre-theoretical thought, my I-ness enters enstatically by means of its naïve intuition into the cosmic temporal coherence of experience. Only humans can do this. Other beings are ex-statically absorbed by their temporal existence (*WdW* II, 415; *NC* II, 479-80).

For Dooyeweerd, our selfhood or I-ness is supratemporal. Dooyeweerd refers to the temporal coherence of experience as a ‘*systasis*.’ So enstasy involves the relation of our supratemporal selfhood to the *systasis* of temporal reality. I will discuss *systasis* in more detail below. For the moment it is sufficient to emphasize that *enstasis* is the entry into the temporal *systasis*.

Dooyeweerd speaks of the relation of our supratemporal selfhood to the temporal *systasis* in several ways. First, Dooyeweerd refers to our being “fitted into” [*ingesteld*] temporal reality (*WdW* II, 401). We are simultaneously supratemporal beings as well as beings who have been “fitted into” temporal reality. It is only because we both transcend time and are fitted into it that we can perform the theoretical act of synthesis of meaning (Dooyeweerd 1931, 103). The temporal reality into which we are fitted is a fallen reality. We enter into temporal reality, in order to help redeem it and to fulfill it (Friesen 2009, Theses 75 and 77 and references).

Note Dooyeweerd’s emphasis on the entering of our selfhood into the “cosmic temporal coherence of experience.” For Dooyeweerd, ‘cosmic’ always refers to the temporal world, and does not include our selfhood, which is beyond time. We could have no true sense of time unless we did not go above time in the deepest part of our being. (Dooyeweerd 1940, 181). Cosmic time is not the only kind of time; it is distinct from the *aevum*, the created eternity in which our supratemporal heart is situated. And both cosmic time and the *aevum* are distinct from God’s eternity. These distinctions of cosmic time, the supratemporal and the eternal have their roots in Baader’s distinctions between time, the supratemporal, and the eternal.

Note also that it is our naïve intuition that allows our selfhood to enter into the temporal. We will discuss intuition in more detail later.
4. Ecstasy

Dooyeweerd uses ‘enstasis’ in a positive sense. But he is generally critical of the term ‘ecstasy’ or ‘ex-stasis.’ In his early student writings he refers to ecstasy in relation to Wagner’s music. And in his student article on Frederik van Eeden, he refers to the ecstasy of Dionysian rites. He also speaks of the “high peaks of contemplation and ecstasy” in Plotinus:

In ecstasy, having died to the impurity of the sensory world, reason beholds itself in complete unconsciousness. For deep in the soul is seated our intuition on the golden tripod [19], and by the welling up of the waves of incense from out of the dark Urgrund [Original Ground] of the heart, her eye is enlightened and she sees the Godhead in herself, and in the beholding [aanschouwing] of that vision, she sinks into great blessedness. (Dooyeweerd 1915a; my translation)

In the same article, he says that the teaching of ecstasy “bewitched even Augustine.” And Dooyeweerd finds a “contradiction” in Frederik van Eeden’s works between the idea of ecstasy and that of “the inner light of intuition.” He does not refer to this inner intuition as ‘enstasy,’ and yet is it not the same contrast as that between an outward ekstasis and an inward enstasis?

Dooyeweerd corresponded with Van Eeden. In a letter of November 14, 1914, Dooyeweerd asked van Eeden what he meant by “zien met de meest mogelijke helderheid, die iemand vergen kan” [“to see with the most clarity possible that one can obtain”]. This letter was written after publication of van Eeden's book *Paul's ontwaken* (Amsterdam, 1913). Van Eeden's son Paul had died in that year. In this “seeing,” van Eeden said he had come to a fixed certainty about eternal matters. Dooyeweerd writes,


[It seems to me that it is not possible that you can have referred here to “empirical sensory perception.” Is what occurred to you perhaps that immediate feeling that is often called ‘intuition’ and, to use Schopenhauer’s words, is seated in the inwardly turned side of consciousness?] [my translation]

And yet, even if Dooyeweerd does not use the word ‘ecstasy’ in a positive sense, he does use a similar idea. In one of his first student articles, he asks
How is it, that the whole world around us can seem so empty, like the lead-grey clouds hanging low or the plaintive noise of rain trickling down on disconsolate grey towns, as a weeping melancholy comes over us and we see nothing but ghostly shadows of an unreal world, and hear nothing in our ears but monotone sounds from far away?

How is it that the world, which has been created by the Father, can seem so lamentably empty to the Christian? Is it not because we do not see things in the way that regenerated persons must see them, everything under that single category of their goal? (Dooyeweerd 1915b; my translation).

The world is experienced as empty unless we see it in terms of its (transcendent) goal. He repeats this idea in his mature work:

Every Christian knows the emptiness of an experience of the temporal world which seems to be shut up in itself. He knows the impersonal attitude of a “Man” in the routine of common life and the dread of nothingness, the meaninglessness, if he tries to find himself again in a so-called existential isolation. He is acquainted with all this from personal experience, though he does not understand the philosophical analysis of this state of spiritual uprooting in Humanistic existentialism. But the Christian whose heart is opened to the Divine Word-revelation knows that in this apostate experiential attitude he does not experience temporal things and events as they really are, i.e. as meaning pointing beyond and above itself to the true religious centre of meaning and to the true Origin (NC III, 30)

When we do see things as “pointing beyond and above themselves”–to a transcendent center, then the light of eternity illuminates our temporal world.

In the Biblical attitude of naïve experience the transcendent, religious dimension of its horizon is opened. The light of eternity radiates perspectively through all the temporal dimensions of this horizon and even illuminates seemingly trivial things and events in our sinful world (NC III, 29)

Baader speaks of a similar experience that he calls the ‘Silberblick’ [Silver Vision]. In this experience, there is a reintegration of feeling and knowledge in self-transcendence; it is an unreflective reaching out (übergreifenden), an anticipation that manifests itself as a transient Silberblick (Baader: Werke 4,114). It is achieved when our intuition (Anschauen) moves in an anticipatory direction (Baader: Zeit 58, fn14; Fermenta I, 23). We then can see with a “double light”–from out of the Center but also into the periphery. There is a coherence of inner and outer seeing. Ecstasy is an anticipation of this integrity:
In this way, Dooyeweerd’s experience of the radiant illumination of the temporal is similar to Baader’s idea of ecstasy as true *stasis*, an anticipation of our true state. It is anticipation of our resurrection, or *ana-stasis* (*WdW* I, 80). ‘Anastasis’ means resurrection, ‘to stand again.’ In contrast to an apostate choice of Archimedean point, we can make the proper choice. This is resurrection, new life. It is what Dooyeweerd means by “standing in the truth” (*Friesen* 2008d). Resurrection is already a present (albeit partial) reality for those who stand in the truth. Our central being then stands in the truth. At death, our temporal body dies, but our central selfhood continues. The body will need to be resurrected, but it will be a new, spiritual body.

It should also be mentioned that Dooyeweerd believed in an ultimate beatific vision (*NC* II, 298). Baader refers to this in relation to what Paul says about knowing in part (1 Cor. 13:12)

Wenn Paulus sagt, daß wir im irdischen Zeitleben und Leiben Alles nur im Stückwerk sehen (empfinden), daß wir aber im ewigen Leben und Leiben Alles in der Totalität sehen (empfinden) werden, so wie wir jetzt gesehen sind, …(Baader 1847, III, 265).

If true *stasis* (*en-stasis*) is the right relation of the supratemporal to the temporal, apostasy (*apo-stasis*) is the wrong relation. Apostasy is the heart's choice of direction away from God. It is also the direction away from true knowledge of the cosmos. *Apo-stasis* or apostasy is a standing “away from”; it uses the same root ‘*sta*’ as in *en-stasis*, *dis-stasis*, *ek-stasis* and *ana-stasis*.

Apostasy is the seeking of our human personality and its Origin within the temporal:

It is human personality that operates in cognition; it is not one or more of its abstracted modal functions. In its religious root this personality transcends its temporal acts and modal functions. This holds good no matter whether the cosmological self-consciousness, in the cognitive activity, is directed in Christ to
the true Origin of all things, to the sovereign Creator and Heavenly Father, or, in sinful apostasy, seeks itself and the Origin in the temporal (NC II, 473).

Apostasy is also called the ‘immanence standpoint’ by Dooyeweerd. By ‘immanence,’ he means the incorrect seeking of meaning within (or immanent to) temporal reality itself.

Apostasy is a standing away from the truth instead of a standing in the truth. It is trying to stand by oneself, to be self-sufficient, and apart from our meaning towards God. This use of ‘apostasy’ is found in a very early article by Dooyeweerd. He says,

> If what exists has a fixed [*vaststaande*] meaning, that is only because of the Divine giving of meaning. Nothing exists in itself. Nothing exists “Apo-state” or separate from the Divine giving of meaning, everything exists in and through the Divine *noesis* (Dooyeweerd 1923b).

Spiritual death is the falling away, the apostasy of this centre or root (*radix*) of existence. This is spiritual death because it is the apostasy from the absolute source of Life. So the fall was also radical (NC I, 175).

Apostasy involves the absolutization of merely temporal reality. Such absolutization is only possible because of the law of concentration of temporal reality in the religious center of human existence:

> That is also why human existence, in its religious center, is subject to a law of religious concentration, which has not been abrogated by the fall. All the power of the devil is based on this law of concentration in human existence, because without this law idolatry would be impossible. Sin is a privation, a lie, a nothingness, but the power of sin is something positive, which is dependent on the created goodness of reality (Dooyeweerd 1966, cited by Steen, 74 fn 46).

In the apostate attitude, one does not experience temporal things and events as they really are (NC III, 30). This implies that when the naïve experience is opened up to the transcendent, we *do* experience things as they really are. The true nature of things and events is as meaning, pointing beyond above themselves to the true religious centre of meaning and to the true Origin. When the transcendent religious dimension is shut out, there are “mythological aberrations” in naïve experience. Thus, if we restrict ourselves to the temporal, we do not experience things as they really are. Dooyeweerd warns us that when we lose sight of the supratemporal we fail to even view the temporal properly, and our own self-consciousness is weakened.
Naarmate het transcendentebesef van den mensch verzwakt, verzwakt ook zijn zelf-bewustzijn en zijn vermogen de perspectivische structuur van de tijd te ervaren (Dooyeweerd 1940, 209).

[To the degree that man's understanding of the transcendent is weakened, so also is weakened his self-consciousness and his ability to experience the perspectival structure of time]. [my translation]

This indicates that Dooyeweerd does not believe that we all experience the world the same way prior to our theorizing.

5. Enstasy and the paranormal

Dooyeweerd does not discuss paranormal phenomena. Yet he shares with Baader all the ideas used by Baader in support. These include the idea that our body is an expression of our supratemporal selfhood, and that our selfhood is in the heavens in contrast to “earthly” temporal reality (Friesen 2009, Theses 7, 54, 56 and references). Dooyeweerd adopts the distinction between supratemporal central/temporal peripheral. He emphasizes the importance of imagination. Dooyeweerd also rejects any pietistic spiritualizing that seeks to repudiate nature. And he shares the idea that our supratemporal selfhood survives death (Friesen 2009, Thesis 73 and references), and that temporal reality seeks its root and existence in this supratemporal selfhood (Friesen 2009, Thesis 66 and references). Dooyeweerd also refers to our sonship (NC I, 61). And he also refers to our cosmic consciousness (see below). Knowledge of God is linked to knowledge of self.

Furthermore, Dooyeweerd is in the meditative/mystical tradition of Abraham Kuyper (Friesen 2011). In the video taken at his 80th birthday, Dooyeweerd says that as a student he was not very interested in reading Kuyper, but when he started work at the Kuyper Foundation in 1922, he was obliged to do so (Dooyeweerd 1975b). He picked up Kuyper’s Pinkstermeditatie [Pentecost meditation] (Kuyper 1888a), and could not put it down. He also mentions Kuyper’s Stone Lectures, and its idea about that central point where our life is undivided. Dooyeweerd says that this is a very different Kuyper than in his theological and scholastic work. In the Pentecost meditation, Kuyper says that we cannot understand Christ’s ascension using our human reason [vleeschelijk verstand]:

```
But God has broken down the wall, and from that opening in the wall, divine light has fallen, allowing us to see things on earth in a very different way, and very different things in the heaven above. God’s majesty and power breaks into this life (Kuyper 1888, 8-9, my translation)

Doomweerd later said that when our heart center participates in Christ, the light of God’s eternity breaks through, illuminating our present world so that we see it differently (NC III, 29).

As a student, Dooyeweerd referred to the same idea (Dooyeweerd 1915b).

Kuyper speaks more directly about the paranormal. In his aesthetics, he refers to Baader’s idea of both the eternal moments and the infernal moments (Friesen 2003b). Kuyper says that after man’s fall, the earth sank below the level that it originally had. A part of the beauty of the earth was taken away. Thereafter, the unsightly, the ugly and even the demonic and the horrible began to reveal themselves as powers, both in their spiritual as well as material existence. Kuyper differentiates between mere ugliness and the truly horrible:

Where there is only the retreat [moving backwards] of former beauty, we have the beginning of ugliness. But as soon as an antithetical principle begins to work actively, there arises the sporadic anticipation of the hellish and the horrible; this really finds its own true region in the things that are under the earth, in the [katachthonia]… (Kuyper 1888b, 12, 64 fn32).

This is similar to what Baader says of the infernal eye:

In der Ekstase als Antizipation jener Integrität blickt darum (wenn shon nur momentan) das himmlische Auge als Silberblick durch das bloß äußere Sehen, oder es blickt das infernal Auge durch. Shakespeare nennt diese Momente bedeutend: “Eternal moments.” (Baader: Zeit 58, fn 14).

[In ecstasy as anticipation this integrity is seen by the heavenly eye (if only momentarily) through the purely outer seeing, or it is seen through the infernal eye. Shakespeare calls these moments “Eternal moments.”]

And in his Pro Rege, Kuyper says that the miracles of Christ should be seen not as demonstrations of Christ’s divinity, but as examples of his true humanity, which we can emulate:

He [Christ] made the remarkable promise to the disciples that whoever believed in Him would do even greater works than His (John 14:12) […] While on earth, He neither ruled as the Son of God nor did He display the majesty of His divinity, but He appeared among us as a human being, as one of us, and He did not reveal any power other than that potentially available to all humanity (Kuyper 1911, tr. John H. Boer, p. 7).
If that is so, then what is often regarded as ‘paranormal’ should be regarded as our true normality. This was also Baader’s view. Baader links the prophecies in Scripture to our ability to transcend time. They are anticipations of what is beyond time.

Obschon man darum solche Zustände des menschlichen Lebens Extasen nennt, so sind selbe doch als Erinnerungen und Prophezeihungen der wahren Stasis desselben zu betrachten, somit als Anticipationen jener Integriirung und Sentrirung des Menschen, ohne welche, wie die Religion lehrt, die Integriirung der Schöpfung selber nicht zu Stande kommen kann (Werke 1, 412).

[Although one can refer to such situations in human life as ecstasies, they should rather be regarded as memories or prophecies of the true stasis of human life, as well as anticipations of the integration and centering of humans, without which, as religion teaches us, the integration of creation itself cannot come take place.] [my translation]

Baader’s idea of anticipation is helpful in understanding what Dooyeweerd’s means when he distinguishes between retrocipations, that look back in time, and anticipations, which look forward to the fulfillment beyond time. The Christian opening process therefore has an eschatological element.

Only in its eschatological expectation of the ultimate full revelation of the Kingdom of God can Christian belief rise above this broken state without losing its relation to the sinful cosmos. For the same reason the Idea of the universality of each of the aspects within its own sphere cannot be conceived in a purely eschatological sense; it should also be related to our sinful cosmos (NC II, 337).

We anticipate the fullness that is already present beyond time in the supratemporal center. And this anticipation is an anticipation of resurrection, of ana-stasis.

B. Enstasy and religious self-reflection

Although Dooyeweerd does not accept the idea of enstasy as a pure consciousness that is separated from temporal reality, he does emphasize an inward contemplative direction. He calls this “religious self-reflection.” Self-reflection is experiential. Dooyeweerd’s philosophy is based on experience (Friesen 2009, Thesis 1 and references).

Religious self-reflection is an inward movement. Dooyeweerd emphasizes the inwardness or innerness of our experience. There are “inner human acts of experience” that are ‘necessarily
related to the ego as the transcendent centre of human existence.” Animals lack this center (NC II, 114). Inner and outer are related to the distinction between central and peripheral. The heart is central and inner and what is temporal is outer and on the periphery (WdW I, v-vii). Dooyeweerd refers to the human soul or heart as ‘the inner man’ ['de inwendige mensch'] (Dooyeweerd 1939). In pre-theoretical intuition the transcendent root of our personality thinks inwardly [indenken] en-statically. Our naïve thought is an in-denken, an inward thought, in enstasis:


In the composure of my pre-theoretical intuition I have an immediate enstatic experience of temporal reality as my own in my thought. In pre-theoretical thought our I-ness enters enstastically by means of its naïve intuition into the cosmic temporal coherence of experience. And thus we have conscious experience of the modal diversity of meaning but without distinct knowledge of the modal aspects. In contrast with theoretical self-consciousness we can speak here of a pre-theoretical cosmic self-consciousness (NC II, 478-79).

So religious self-reflection is related to ‘cosmic consciousness.’ Knowledge of self is related to knowledge of cosmos. Self-reflection is a way that we know the relation between our supratemporal selfhood and its expression within temporal reality. Just as God expresses Himself in man as his image, so our supratemporal selfhood expresses itself in temporal reality (Friesen 2009, Thesis 65 and references). In self-reflection, we know the modal functions as “our own.” (NC II, 474). We know ourselves as “fitted” within temporal reality, but simultaneously transcending it. We will look at these terms ‘cosmic consciousness,’ ‘our own’ and ‘fitted’ in more detail, as well as the idea of pre-theoretical intuition. For now, note that they are connected by Dooyeweerd to the idea of enstasis.

From where did Dooyeweerd obtain this idea of religious self-reflection? One source may be Husserl, who says

Die ekstatisch-religiöse Hingegebenheit is zugleich radikalste Selbstbesinnung (Husserl, 1929, 115).
[Ecstatic-religious surrender is at the same time the most radical self-consciousness]

Note however that Husserl refers to self-reflection as ‘ecstatic’ whereas Dooyeweerd uses the term ‘enstatic.’

Another likely source of the idea of religious self-reflection is Frederik van Eeden, who emphasized the importance of such inward beholding of the self [zelfschouw]. As discussed, Dooyeweerd corresponded with Van Eeden regarding the meaning of ‘intuition’ (Friesen 2011).

Dooyeweerd says that most philosophers dogmatically reject this idea of “religious self-reflection.” These philosophers want to save at all costs their starting point that assumes a self-sufficient reason. In other words, they start with immanence philosophy, which denies a supratemporal center, a center that would relativize their reason (WdW I, v-vii; inadequately translated in NC). All theoretical pushing away of the human selfhood from this central position in experience rests on a lack of philosophic self-reflection (WdW II, 494; NC II, 562). A truly critical epistemology depends on self-reflection on the cosmonomic Idea from which the thinker starts (NC II, 491). Ideas give an account of our relation to the eternal Origin (God), the supratemporal Totality (selfhood), and the temporal coherence (cosmos).

Can philosophy—which ought to be guided by the Idea of the totality of meaning—then ever be possible without critical self reflection? Evidently not. A philosophy which does not lead to this reflection must from the outset fail to be directed to the totality of meaning of our cosmos. γνῶθι σεαυτόν, “know thyself”, must indeed be written above the portals of philosophy. But in this very demand for critical self-reflection lies the great problem. To be sure, the ego is actually active in its philosophical thought, but it necessarily transcends the philosophical concept. For, as shall appear, the self is the concentration-point of all my cosmic functions. It is a subjective totality which can neither he resolved into philosophical thought, nor into some other function, nor into a coherence of functions. Rather it lies at the basis of all the latter as their presupposition (NC I, 5)

Note that by ‘critical’ self-reflection, Dooyeweerd means self-reflection that accounts for the existence of our supratemporal selfhood. To be critical is to be engaged in theory, in an attempt to give an account of our pre-theoretical knowledge [rekenschap geven; WdW I, 4). We give a theoretical account of our experience by theoretical Ideas, which point to and approximate the
ontical conditions that are required to make such theoretical thought even possible. These ontical conditions include our supratemporal selfhood, the center of all our functions (Friesen 2009, Thesis 2 and references).

But no special science, nor an encyclopaedic sociology, can answer the question, what man himself is in the unity of his selfhood.

Human I-ness functions, to be sure, in all modal aspects of reality. But it is, nevertheless, a central and radical unity, which as such transcends all temporal aspects. The way of critical self-reflection is, consequently, the only one that can lead to the discovery of the true starting-point of theoretical thought (NC I, 51).

Dooyeweerd says that our self-knowledge itself exceeds the limits of theoretical thought and is rooted in our “heart” (NC I, 55). Our experience is rooted in religious self-consciousness (NC II, 560, where he makes clear that ‘religious’ refers to the transcendent horizon of the selfhood). Such self-reflection is the only way leading to the discovery of the true starting-point of theoretical thought. He also says that there was “great promise” in Kant's search for a starting point for his theoretical philosophy which would be raised above the special synthetic points of view.

For it is indubitable that our theoretical thought, so long as it is fixed on the different aspects of reality, is dissipated in a theoretical diversity. Only in the way of knowledge of itself can human consciousness concentrate on a central point where all the aspects of our consciousness converge in a radical unity. The ancient Greek philosophers knew this very well. Socrates already laid it down that self knowledge is the key to all philosophy. But here arises a new problem, which we may formulate thus:

(4) How is self-knowledge possible, and of what nature is this knowledge?

Kant did not wish to abandon the theoretical point of departure (Dooyeweerd 1947, 48).

Baader says that we have self-consciousness only by participating in God’s original self-consciousness [the divine Urselbstbewußtseins]; we know ourselves insofar as we know God (Werke V 95f; II 207f). And Dooyeweerd emphasizes our need to participate in Christ, the New Root of creation. Only as we do so can we truly understand our self.

But religious self-reflection is different from critical self-reflection. Critical self-reflection is a
theoretical giving an account of what we know by religious self-reflection. And self-reflection is not at all the same as reflexive thought (Friesen 2008b)

We obtain knowledge of God by divine revelation. But Dooyeweerd does not view revelation in terms of propositional exegesis of Scripture (Friesen 2009, Thesis 42 and references). Revelation is not theoretical in nature. Revelation primarily has a religious enstatic character.

Deze kennis uit openbaring draagt primair een religieus-enstatisch karakter, ze rust primair evenmin in een zin-synthesis als het kosmisch zelfbewustzijn (WdW II, 494)

This knowledge in the full sense of the word contains the religious principle and foundation of all true knowledge, and primarily has a religious enstatic character. It no more rests primarily on a theoretical meaning-synthesis than does the cosmic self-consciousness (NC II, 562).

Religious self-reflection is dependent on the working in us of God's Word:

…als het gaat om de waarachtige gods- en zelfkennis, dan moeten we zeggen: er is geen theologie ter wereld en geen wijsbegeerte ter wereld, die de mens dat bij kan brengen. Dat is de onmiddellijke vrucht van de centrale werking van Gods Woord zelf in de gemeenschap van de Heilige Geest, in het hart, de radix, de worteleenheid van het menslijk bestaan (Dooyeweerd 1964).

[And concerning true knowledge of self and of God, we must then say: there is no theology in the world and no philosophy in the world that can bring us to this kind of knowledge. It is the immediate fruit of the central working of God's Word itself in the community of the Holy Spirit, in the heart, the radix, the root unity of our human existence.] [my translation]

Provided that we do not interpret self-reflection as pure consciousness, or nirvikalpa samadhi, we may compare it to some kinds of inner meditation, such as the sahaja samadhi emphasized by Ramana Maharshi (Friesen 2001, 2006d). A central difference is of course Dooyeweerd’s insistence that true enstasis is centered on Christ as the New Root. But both Dooyeweerd and Ramana Maharshi emphasize the importance of our central heart experience. Such experiential religious self-reflection goes beyond theoretical Ideas (NC II, 4). It is religious because it involves the center of our existence, the supratemporal heart, and our heart in turn is dependent on and refers to our Origin, God. Dooyeweerd emphasizes that self-knowledge is linked to knowledge of God and to knowledge of the cosmos. We do not have knowledge of self without knowledge of God. And neither do we have proper knowledge of the cosmos.
True knowledge of the cosmos is bound to true self-knowledge, which is bound to true knowledge of God (NC II, 560).

This is shown in the biblical revelation of our creation concerning our creation in the image of God. Our self-knowledge is a central knowledge. Self-knowledge exceeds theoretical knowledge and is rooted in the heart or the religious centre of our existence (NC I, 55). The “earthly” cosmos is transcended by Man in his full selfhood where he partakes in the transcendent root (NC II, 593). Even if it is not disconnected from the outer and temporal, religious self-reflection involves an awareness of the inner and supratemporal.

We will now look at the terms ‘cosmic consciousness,’ ‘our own,’ ‘center and periphery’ and ‘fitted’ that Dooyeweerd associates with enstatic experience.

1. Cosmic consciousness

Dooyeweerd links our pre-theoretical consciousness with “cosmic consciousness” (NC II, 479).

It is only man who can have cosmic and cosmological self-consciousness because only man’s cosmic temporal structure is founded in an individual religious root transcending time, viz. his selfhood (NC II, 480)

Note the distinction between cosmic and cosmological consciousness. Cosmic consciousness is pre-theoretical. Cosmological consciousness, which distinguishes the aspects of our consciousness, is theoretical. But our theoretical consciousness is based on our pre-theoretical cosmic consciousness (WdW II, 415).

The term ‘cosmic consciousness’ is often used to describe mystical ecstatic experience. An early example is given by Richard Maurice Bucke in his book Cosmic Consciousness (Bucke, 1901, 1923).

Bucke was a Canadian doctor. In the spring of 1872 he had been reading some poetry by Whitman, with some friends in London. He left the friends after midnight in a calm mood, and took a long drive in his carriage. While riding, he had an experience of what he called illumination, or cosmic consciousness. It was described in the Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada:

All at once, without warning of any kind, he found himself wrapped around, as it were, by a flame-colored cloud. For an instant he thought of fire—some sudden
conflagration in the great city. The next (instant) he knew that the light was within himself.

Directly after there came upon him a sense of exultation, of immense joyousness, accompanied or immediately followed by an intellectual illumination quite impossible to describe. Into his brain streamed one momentary lightning-flash of the Brahmic Splendor which ever since lightened his life. Upon his heart fell one drop of the Brahmic bliss, leaving thenceforward for always an aftertaste of Heaven. Among other things he did not come to believe, he saw and knew that the Cosmos is not dead matter but a living Presence, that the soul of man is immortal, that the universe is so built and ordered that without any peradventure all things work together for the good of each and all, that the foundation principle of the world is what we call love and that the happiness of every one is in the long run absolutely certain. (Bucke, 10).

The experience that Bucke reports is visionary and ecstatic. It uses Hindu terminology, relating the experience to Brahman. It is intensely experiential. Bucke says that cosmic consciousness carries with it the conviction of immortality. It is not that we shall have eternal life in the future but that it is possessed and experienced already.

Does Bucke's ecstatic and visionary experience of cosmic consciousness fit with Dooyeweerd's use of the term? Can we regard cosmic consciousness as an “illumination?” Dooyeweerd does speak of our opened naïve experience as an “illumination” of our temporal world:

In the Biblical attitude of naïve experience the transcendent, religious dimension of its horizon is opened. The light of eternity radiates perspectively through all the temporal dimensions of this horizon and even illuminates seemingly trivial things and events in our sinful world (NC III, 29).

Bucke's experience was frequently referred to by later philosophers of mysticism. William James refers to Bucke in his Varieties of Religious Experience (p. 398). We know that Dooyeweerd had read William James as early as 1915, he refers to James in his student article about van Eeden (Dooyeweerd 1915a). Dooyeweerd was still reading James in 1940 when he wrote about James's idea of the "specious present” (Dooyeweerd 1936-39).

Three years after Bucke’s book, Wilhelm Wundt (whom Dooyeweerd also read) refers to the idea of cosmic consciousness in his Principles of Physiological Psychology:

We may say, then, that the mechanistic explanation of the movements of the lower animals is not the outcome of impartial and unprejudiced observation. But the
rival theory, which ascribes mind and consciousness to the plant-world, is in no better case. Fechner, the chief representative of this theory, himself expressly declares that he derived it from considerations of general philosophy: he further attributes consciousness to the earth and the other heavenly bodies, making this cosmic consciousness the whole, of which the individual forms of consciousness in plant and animal are parts. (Wundt, I, 33)

Wundt's reference is to Gustav Fechner's *Zend-avesta oder über die Dinge des Himmels und des Jenseits*. Dooyeweerd makes express reference to that book, so we know he read it (*WdW* III, 554fn; *NC* III, 631 ft). But Dooyeweerd certainly rejected Fechner's *hylozoism*, which regards every movement, even the fall of a stone, as a part of a living organism.

In van Eeden's *Johannes Viator*, which has the subtitle “The book of love,” van Eeden writes of Johannes who tries to become conscious of cosmic love which holds all of creation in existence and also holds it together, and which will bring redemption to the contrariety in the world. In this book, van Eeden puts forward a worldview in which self and the world are brought together in a cosmic coherence (van Eeden, 1895). And there are other similarities Dooyeweerd and Frederik van Eeden (Friesen 2011).

Dooyeweerd may have obtained the phrase ‘cosmic consciousness’ from Joseph Maréchal. In his “On the Feeling of Presence in Mystics and Non-Mystics” he refers to cosmic consciousness. (Maréchal, 1924). We know that Dooyeweerd was familiar with Maréchal, since he owned a copy of the second French edition of that book (1938). Whether he was aware of the earlier edition is uncertain.

Dooyeweerd may also have obtained the phrase ‘cosmic consciousness’ from Eduard von Hartmann's *Philosophy of the Unconscious* [Philosophie des Unbewussten] (1869). It is clear that he read this, too (*NC* II, 315). This book was written well before Bucke's use of the term. Hartmann there expresses Schopenhauer's philosophy (itself derived from the Upanishads and Buddhism); von Hartmann refers to a cosmic consciousness that underlies individual consciousness. In most people this cosmic consciousness is unconscious.

... jetzt aber handelt es sich um Erweiterung des egoistischen zu einem kosmischen Bewusstsein und Streben, zu dem Bewusstsein, dass das Individuum wie die Nation nichts als ein Rad oder eine Feder in dem grossen Weltgetriebe sind und keine Aufgabe haben, als als solche ihre Schuldigkeit zu thun, um den
process des Ganzen, auf den es allein ankommt, zu fördern…(Von Hartmann 1869, 608).

[..we are now concerned with the enlargement of egoic consciousness to a cosmic consciousness and striving, to being conscious that both the individual and the nation are no more than a wheel or a spring in the great machinery of the world, and have no other task than to do their duty to further the process of the whole, on which alone it depends…] [my translation]

Von Hartmann writes this in the context of his view of history as proceeding from an individualistic view of responsibility to the Roman tribal view to one that goes beyond egotism. Dooyeweerd’s exposition of the history of law makes some similar distinctions. What is interesting in the present circumstance is the idea of cosmic consciousness pointing to a whole. But Dooyeweerd did not regard the cosmos in mechanistic terms.

And whereas Bucke tended to regard cosmic consciousness as a kind of pure consciousness of our selfhood, Dooyeweerd uses the term to relate the temporal cosmos to our supratemporal selfhood. Our selfhood is supratemporal. But for Dooyeweerd, the cosmos is always temporal. The illumination that we experience is an illumination of the world, in that we see its deeper unity:

Slechts het (…) kosmisch zelfbewustzijn kan de diepere eenheid van alle zin-zijden der werkelijken vatten, doch slecht daarom, wijl het zelve alle, in de kosmische tijdorde vervlochten, zinfuncties in den transcendenten wortel der zelfheid te boven gaat (WdW I, 399)

Only the cosmic self-consciousness (to be examined later in the discussion of the problem of knowledge) can grasp the deeper unity of all aspects of reality, because in the transcendent root of the selfhood it transcends all its modal functions, which are interwoven in the cosmic order of time (NC I, 431).

And so for Dooyeweerd, ‘cosmic consciousness’ includes the experience of cosmic unity. A similar idea is found in Baader, where the central intuitive beholding is not a view of a different region, but a view of the same region in a different way.

…ein Individuum, welches in irgend einer Region aus der Peripherie ins Centrum tritt, nothwendig nun allen einzelnen Peripheriepuncten allgegenwärtig (d.i. als Geist oder als eine unbegreifliche, unfassliche, unsperrbare und unaufhaltbare höhere Natur) sich bezeugen wird, so wie selbes die ganze Peripherie nun mit einem Blicke (Alles in Einem) übersieht (Werke 4, 23-4)
Dooyeweerd says that cosmic self-consciousness does not rest in a theoretical meaning-synthesis \((WdW\ II, 494)\). Theoretical consciousness, which distinguishes the aspects of our experience for the first time, is called ‘cosmological consciousness.’

Dooyeweerd's 'cosmic consciousness' should not be interpreted as a nirvikalpa samadhi, where there is no awareness of subject or object. It may perhaps be similar to sahaja samadhi, although further research needs to be done on this point (Friesen 2001; 2006d).

2. Experiencing temporal reality as “our own”

*Enstasis* is related to experiencing temporal reality as “our own.” In naïve experience, we have an immediate enstatic experience of temporal reality as our own:

In de *rustende vóór-theoretische intuitie beleeft* ik denkende de tijdelijke werkelijkheid als mij eigen. In haar *denkt* de transcendentere wortel onzer persoonlijkheid zich enstatisch in in den kosmisch-tijdelijken samenhang der werkelijkheid en *beleeft* wetende de zin-verscheidenheid, maar zonder gearticuleerde kennis der zin-modaliteiten. Wij kunnen in tegenstelling tot het theoretisch zelf-bewustzijn hier von een *vóór-theoretisch kosmisch zelfbewustzijn spreken* \((WdW\ II, 414)\).

In the composure of my pre-theoretical intuition I have an immediate enstatic experience of temporal reality as my own in my thought. In pre-theoretical thought our I-ness enters enstatically by means of its naïve intuition into the cosmic temporal coherence of experience. And thus we have conscious experience of the modal diversity of meaning but without distinct knowledge of the modal aspects. In contrast with theoretical self-consciousness we can speak here of a pre-theoretical cosmic self-consciousness \((NC\ II, 478-79)\).

Thus, the awareness of temporal reality and of temporal functions as “our own” is also cosmic consciousness. Dooyeweerd emphasizes that cosmic temporal reality is “our own” and not “alien” or foreign \([vreemd, Fremd]\) to us. The problem of foreignness does not arise unless we accept Dooyeweerd’s starting point that our selfhood is beyond time, or supratemporal. The issue is then how our supratemporal selfhood relates to temporal reality, including our own body.
In our cosmic consciousness, we relate temporal reality to the structure of the human selfhood as such:

In the transcendent religious subjective a priori of the cosmic self-consciousness the whole of human cognition is directed either to the absolute Truth, or to the spirit of falsehood. In this cosmic self-consciousness we are aware of temporal cosmic reality being related to the structure of the human selfhood qua talis (NC II, 562).

Because temporal reality is necessarily related to the selfhood, Dooyeweerd denies the existence of things in themselves [Dinge an sich]. In fact, he denies that temporal reality has any existence apart from its rootedness in man as its supratemporal center (Friesen 2009, Thesis 66 and references; Friesen 2006b). A full exploration of this important idea is beyond the scope of this article.

Dooyeweerd says that even the identification of a sensation such as a sweet taste would be impossible without this intuition:

How could I really be aware of a sweet taste, if I could not relate this sensory impression to myself, by means of my intuition entering into the cosmic stream of time? (NC II, 478; Cf. WdW II, 413).

What does he mean? In the text, he is responding to the ideas of Johannes Immanuel Volkelt, who said, “When I am immediately certain of the sensation of sweetness, this is not an intuitive certainty” (Volkelt 1918, cited in NC II, 477). Volkelt regarded sensation in an empiricistic way, abstracting from our sensory-psychical aspect of experience. Volkelt says that when we experience something sweet, we do not have certainty of things in their essence, but only of my emotions [Affection] (Volkelt 1873, 90). This is the empiricistic distinction between primary and secondary qualities, a distinction that Dooyeweerd also rejects (Friesen 2009, Thesis 23 and references).

In contrast to Volkelt, Dooyeweerd asserts:

Experience is related to the human I-ness. It is fundamentally different form the animal awareness of sensations (NC II, 477).

Again, there is a distinction here between animals that do not have a supratemporal center, and humans that do. And for that (enstatic) relation between selfhood and temporal reality we need
intuition. Volkelt held that intuition is what goes beyond experience, but for Dooyeweerd, intuition is what relates our experience to our selfhood. And again, this selfhood is supratemporal:


[In a nutshell, the whole inner antinomy of so-called critical epistemology is based on this merely functionalistic view of self consciousness. Self-consciousness necessarily has at the same time both a time-transcending and a time-immanent character. The deeper identity that is experienced in the selfhood is trans-functional. It is knowing oneself as one and the same in and above all cosmic-temporal meaning functions, and knowing one’s temporal meaning functions as one’s own.] [my translation]

These temporal meaning functions which we know as “our own” include our function of thought. Our central supratemporal selfhood relativizes even our thought; it is not autonomous (WdW I, v-vii). If we improperly regard our thought as autonomous, we then have the problem of relating that which is not thought to thought. The non-rational aspects of reality are then “foreign to thought.” This problem occupied Dooyeweerd’s brother-in-law Vollenhoven, as he wrestled with the idea of what is foreign to thought [het denkvreemde] (Tol 2010; Friesen 2011).

Dooyeweerd followed his former teacher Jan Woltjer, who said that we ourselves stand in close connection with the world, and we can learn it because our own selfhood is not foreign [vreemd] to it:

Wij staan door geheel het organisme van ons kenvermogen, door onze zenuwen en hersenen en alle krachten die daarin werken, met die wereld in het nauste verband, zoodat we haar niet alleen door de dingen buiten ons, maar door ons eigen lichaam, dat we, krachtens ons zelfbewustzijn, niet als iets dat ons vreemd is kunnen beschouwen, leeren kennen (Woltjer 1896, 33).

[By means of the whole organism of our faculty of knowing, by our nerves and brain and all powers that work therein, we stand in the closest connection to the world, so that we do not only know it through the things outside of us but by
means of our own body, which we learn to know, and as a result of our self-consciousness, cannot regard as something that is foreign to us.] (my translation)

Dooyeweerd affirms the same position: that which is a-logical is not foreign to me:

De mogelijkheid der zin-synthesis is slechts op te klaren vanuit de door ons vroeger summier aangegeven opvatting i.z. de structuur van het zelfbewustzijn. Het zelfbewustzijn transcendeert den kosmischen tijd, inzooverre de individuele zelfheid deel heeft aan den religieuzen wortel van het menschengeslacht, van welks zinvolheid alle tijdelijke zin-functies (zoowel natuur- als geestesfuncties) slechts tijdelijke zinbrekingen zijn. Het is immanent aan den kosmischen tijd, in zoovere onze bewustzijnssfuncties in de kosmische tijdsorde zijn ingevlochten. De a-logische zinfuncties zijn niet vreemd aan het zelfbesuwtzijn. Ze zijn alle gezamenlijk eigen aan onze zelfheid. Alleen daarom kunnen wij ze in hare zin-wetmatigheid leeren kennen (Dooyeweerd 1931, 103).

[The possibility of the synthesis of meaning can only be explained on the basis of our previously given summary view concerning the structure of self-consciousness. Self-consciousness transcends cosmic time insofar as the individual selfhood participates in the religious root of the human race, of which all temporal meaning functions (both natural as well as spiritual functions) are merely temporal refractions of meaning. [Self-consciousness] is immanent to cosmic time insofar as our functions of consciousness are interwoven in cosmic time. The a-logical meaning functions are not foreign to self-consciousness. They are all together the selfhood’s own. Only because of this can we come to know them in their lawful regularity.] [my translation]

So to see temporal reality as “our own” is to relate it by means of our intuition to our supratemporal selfhood.

From where did Dooyeweerd obtain this idea of making things “our own”? One source may be Husserl, who says in the *Cartesian Meditations*, “Moreover, this life is continually there for me.” (Husserl, 1960, First Meditation, 19).

A more likely source is be Frederik van Eeden, who says in his poem *Het Lied van Schijn en Wezen*,

Geen ding bestaat, zoo niet het Ik ‘t beleeft,
zich voelend, denkend, teegenwoordig weetend,
schoon het al schijnbaar door ‘t on-eig’ne zweeft
en zoekt een weg, herinn’rend, tastend, meetend
in wat een onbekende waereld schijnt.
*Oneigen wordt tot eigen, want gekeetend*
Nothing exists except as it is lived by Self, as feeling, thinking, knowing in the present, although the seeming real is in not-I suspended, and seeks a way, in memory, taste and measure in what seems to be a world unknown. Not-mine becomes my own, for all of Being is attached to consciousness of self, in the forever resting present (however we refine this thought), and all the sense of "not-I" disappears.

3. Center and periphery

For Dooyeweerd, enstasis is the relation of our central heart to the peripheral cosmos, including our temporal body. We experience temporal reality as “our own.” The movement inwards of religious self-reflection is towards this center. It is only in that center that we have a view of totality (Friesen 2005a). We have seen how for Baader, true stasis is a relation to our true center. Baader also speaks of a view of totality from that center. And we have seen how Scheler, influenced by Baader, says that (in contrast to humans), temporal reality is ‘ecstatic’ because of its inability to report back to a center.

The distinction between our central supratemporal heart and its peripheral functions is emphasized by Dooyeweerd in the opening pages of his major work, De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee (1935). Dooyeweerd begins with a discussion of the importance of this central significance of the heart. Kant’s Copernican revolution was not central or radical (from ‘radix’), but only a revolution in the periphery, because rationality is only a peripheral function that finds its center in the heart. In contrast, a truly radical and revolutionary philosophy begins with the central supratemporal heart, which relativizes everything temporal, including our rationality.
That is why Dooyeweerd can criticize the “autonomy of thought.” Thought is not autonomous, but is only one temporal function of our supratemporal center (WdW I, v-vii, poorly translated in NC I, v-vii; see Friesen 2011).

In one of his last lectures before his retirement, Dooyeweerd again emphasized the importance of the distinction between central and peripheral (Dooyeweerd 2007; lecture given in 1964).

4. That we are “fitted into” cosmic time

Dooyeweerd relates cosmic self-consciousness to our being ‘fitted’ into temporal reality. This idea of being ‘fitted’ is related to Baader’s idea of being ‘placed’ in time. This placement is actually a displacement because of the fall, whereby man fell into time. Dooyeweerd, too speaks of a fall into time (Friesen 2009, Thesis 76 and references). Baader says that this placement is a being set [gesetzt] by God’s Law [Gesetz]. Dooyeweerd makes a similar play on words for his idea of our being fitted into the temporal cosmos. See his February, 1923 address, “Advies over Roomsch-katholieke en Anti-revolutionaire Staatkunde.” As far as I can tell, this is his first use of the word ‘gesteld’ which is translated “fitted into.”

Al het bestaande ligt gebonden aan zijn objectieven zin, die zijn wezen uitmaakt. Het schouwen is gebonden aan zijn gezichtsvelden, het denken aan zijn kategorieën. In deze binding van schouwen en denken ligt hun objectieven zin. Waar nu het bewustzijn niets meer autonoom stelt, maar alles heeft ontvangen, in alles gesteld is, als objectieven zin, nu de wet der heteronomie onbeperkt in al het bestaande gaat heersen, ook in het zingevend bewustzijn, komt de vraag naar den wetgever, den ordenaar, den Schepper van zelf naar boven. (Dooyeweerd 1923b).

[All that exists is bound to its objective meaning, which gives it its essence. Intuition is bound to its fields of view and thought is bound to its categories. In this relation of intuition and thinking lies their objective meaning. If now our consciousness no longer autonomously sets its own meaning, but rather has received everything, has been set or placed in everything, as objective meaning, and if now the law of heteronomy can rule unhindered in all that exists, even in the consciousness that gives meaning, the question then arises as to the lawgiver, the one who orders, the Creator]. [my translation]

There is a play on the words ‘stelt’ and ‘gesteld,’ just as Baader makes a play on the words

---

15 Kuypers specifically praised Baader for his opposition to the autonomy of thought (Friesen 2003b; 2011).
‘setzen’ and ‘gesetzt.’ Selbstsetzung is autonomy, and being ‘gesetzt’ is being placed or subjected to God's law [Gesetz].

The idea of being fitted is therefore related to our being at the same time both supratemporal beings as well as beings who are placed, fitted within time (Friesen 2009, Thesis 76 and references).

In 1931, Dooyeweerd uses the word ‘ingesteld’ in this way. Our pre-theoretical experience is of being fitted into temporal reality, and this experience is one of enstasis, as opposed to theoretical synthesis of meaning:

> De naïve, vóór-theoretische ervaring is en-statisch, niet synthetisch in de volle tijdelijke werkelijkheid met al hare in de kosmische tijdsorde samengevlochten zinzijden, zoowel natuurlijke als geestelijke, ingesteld en komt intuïtief in verzet tegen iedere poging van het verabsoluuteerd synthetisch denken, om haar een of meer zin-zijden harer werkelijkheid te ontrooven. (Dooyeweerd 1931, 87)

[It is not in a synthetic but an enstatic way that naïve, pre-theoretical experience is fitted into full temporal reality with all of its meaning-sides (both natural and spiritual) that are interwoven in the cosmic order of time. And this naïve, pre-theoretical experience intuitively opposes every attempt of absolutized synthetic thought to rob it of one or more of its meaning-sides.]

Dooyeweerd contrasts our merely being fitted into temporal reality in our pre-theoretical or naïve experience with the deliberate “setting over-against” of theoretical thought. Dooyeweerd here plays on the meaning of the words:

> In het zin-synthetisch denken bevrijdt de verdiepte analytische bewustzijnsfunctie zich van een bloot ingesteld zijn in de volle tijdelijke werkelijkheid: het stelt zich de ter kennis opgegeven a-logische zin functies tegenover, het wordt “gegenständlich.” (Dooyeweerd 1931, 102).

[In meaning-synthetic thought, the deepened analytic function of consciousness frees itself from being merely fitted into full temporal reality; it sets itself over against the a-logical meaning-functions that are given to be known, it becomes “gegenständlich.”] [my translation]

There are a couple of instances of the word ‘gesteld’ in the WdW. Dooyeweerd criticizes Rickert's view that thought can autonomously set its own limits (door het denken gesteld) (WdW I, 36). There are several instances of the word ‘ingesteld’ in WdW II, 401-08). But Dooyeweerd generally changes to the word ‘gevoegd.’
Het is een wereldsamenhang, dien de mensch wel in zijn zelfheid transcendeert, naar waarbinnen hij met alle schepselen, die met hem in denzelfden wereldsamenhang gevoegd zijn, in universele gebondenheid aan den tijd verkeert (WdW I, 36)

[It is a temporal coherence. Man transcends it in his selfhood, it is true,—but within this coherence he exists in a status of being-universally-bound-to-time. Man is bound to time together with all creatures that are fitted with him in the same temporal order] (as translated in NC I, 24).

In *Encyclopedia of Legal Science* (1946), Dooyeweerd says,

Now what is unique to naïve experience is that it does not set the functions of consciousness over against a reality that is foreign to it (the *Gegenstand* of knowledge, as it is called by the Germans). Rather, with the functions of consciousness (the psychical and logical), our naïve experience is naïvely fitted into [in-gesteld] full temporal reality. That is to say, it understands the psychical, logical and the later spiritual functions as an organic part of and in full temporal reality.

Naïve experience is therefore fitted into the full temporal reality with all its meaning-sides (law-spheres), but without an articulated knowledge of the law-spheres (Dooyeweerd 1946, 9; my translation).

**C. Enstatic Experience is a Hineinleben**

1. Dooyeweerd’s use of ‘Hineinleben’

Dooyeweerd refers to our pre-theoretical experience as a ‘Hineinleben’ or “living within.”

The word ‘*Hineinleben*’ does not appear in Dooyeweerd’s original Dutch text of the WdW:

In de rustende, vóór-theoretische intuitie hebben wij een *enstatisch wetend beleven* of *in-leven* in de volle tijdelijke werkelijkheid, gelijk ze zich geeft in de individualiteits-structuur van dingen en hun betrekkingen. Dit wetend in-leven komt primair in de volle tijdelijke werkelijkheidservaring tot ontplooiing waaraan iedere theoretische zin-synthesis nog vreemd is, een werkelijkheidservaring, die op geen enkele wijzje naar de functionalistische gezichtspunten der immanentiefilosofie (bv. als bloot zinnelijk-functioneel of als een synthetisch-logische ordening van zinnelijke indrukken) theoretisch mag worden misduid. Aan dit *wetend in-leven*, dat geenszins *los* is van de analytische denkfunctie ontbreekt nog het theoretisch *in-zicht* in de zin-modaliteiten onzer ervaring…

[WdW II, 410].

In the *New Critique*, this was translated as follows:
In the resting pre-theoretical intuition we have an enstatic conscious ‘Erleben’ of the full temporal reality as it presents itself in the typical structures of individuality and their relations. This conscious ‘Erleben’ or ‘Hineinleben’ into reality primarily unfolds itself in the integral experience of temporal reality to which any kind of theoretical meaning-synthesis is still alien. This integral experience of reality must not in any way be misinterpreted theoretically in accordance with the functionalistic view-points of immanence-philosophy (e.g. as something of a purely sensory psychical nature, or as a synthetical logical arrangement of sensory impressions). The conscious enstatic ‘Hineinleben’ as an entering into reality, although by no means detached from the analytical function of thought, lacks theoretical insight into the modal aspects of our experience. (NC II, 474).

Note that the English translation uses more German words than the Dutch original! It uses ‘Erleben’ and Hineinleben.’ The use of ‘conscious Erleben’ to translate ‘wetend beleven of in-leven’ is odd in several ways:

a) It mistranslates ‘wetend’ as ‘conscious’ instead of ‘knowing.’ Dooyeweerd certainly believes that enstasis is conscious. This is a similarity to Eliade, who also insists on enstasis being conscious. But is clear from the context that ‘knowing’ is the intended meaning, since he contrasts two Dutch words for knowing: weten and kennen. A more accurate translation would be ‘knowing lived experience.’ ‘Beleven’ means “live to see,” or an obsolete usage is “to witness.”

It is not the same as the German term ‘Erlebnis.’ Dooyeweerd says that this ‘wetende beleving’ is the foundational layer in time for all ‘kennen.’ This contrast of types of knowing is lost in the English translation: “Conscious ‘Erleben’ is the temporal basic layer of all cognition” (WdW II, 410; NC II, 475). But Dooyeweerd’s contrast is not between conscious and unconscious, but between an intuitive pre-theoretical knowledge and a theoretical knowledge. This is made clear on the following page, where it is said that we must intuitively know (geweten worden) about the analytical law-conformity of thought if we are to have theoretical analysis (WdW II, 411, NC II, 475). This distinction between intuitive knowledge (‘weten’) and theoretical ‘kennen’ is found in

16 It should be noted that Dooyeweerd was so unhappy with the translation of Volume II of the WdW by H. de Jongste that he himself translated Volume III. De Jongste had taken over the translation when Dooyeweerd was dissatisfied with that of William S. Young for Volume I.

17 In his 2010 dissertation on Vollenhoven, Anthony Tol translated ‘beleven’ as “current experience,” but I don’t think that this distinguishes it sufficiently from ‘Erlebnis.’
Frederik van Eeden, whom Dooyeweerd read as a student (Dooyeweerd 1915a; Friesen 2011). Van Eeden says that the highest knowledge is a ‘weten,’ instead of ‘kennis.’ It is the ‘veritas sicuti se habet’ of Thomas a Kempis, the incomprehensible understanding, the ‘Visio sine Comprehension,’ the Mysterium Magnum of Boehme, the kennen in opposition to wissen of Von Helmholtz (van Tricht, 84). This deepest knowledge is an inner knowledge related to the Self. The source of deepest knowledge is ‘Zelfschouw’ – the intuitive knowledge of Self. A similar distinction between intuitive and theoretical knowledge is found in Baader. We will discuss intuition and religious self-reflection in more detail below.

b) The use of the German word ‘Erleben’ is confusing in the English translation. While ‘Erlebnis’ was a well-known term in phenomenology, Dooyeweerd specifically criticized the use of that term, particularly in its common usage when it is restricted to feelings or sensation. Dooyeweerd certainly does not intend to refer to empirical experience, in the meaning of sense impressions. This prevailing use of ‘Erlebnis’ fails to recognize that our true ego is transcendent to all of our modal functions (NC II, 111-115). Even in the quotation above regarding ‘Hineinleben,’ Dooyeweerd makes it clear that the experience he is talking about is not to be interpreted functionalistically. To use the word ‘Erleben’ in the translation brings back the confusion that Dooyeweerd is trying to clear up.

c) The translation fails to pick up on Dooyeweerd’s deliberate hyphenation of ‘in-leven’ by translating it with the German ‘Erleben.’ Such “in-living” is more related to empathy than it is to the idea of Erlebnis.

d) The English “translation” also adds the term ‘Hineinleben’ as another translation of the Dutch ‘in-leven.’ It is hard to believe that the translator would have included this word without Dooyeweerd’s knowledge. If that is so, from whom did Dooyeweerd get this term ‘Hineinleben’ and what else can we know about its meaning? The fact that the translation uses German words gives us a hint that we should look for German sources for the idea. In looking at the history of this idea, we will be most helped if we can find instances where several of these terms are used

---

18 A similar view was expressed by Valentijn Hepp of the Curators of the Free University. He tried translating Dooyeweerd’s terms in the WdW into German in order to understand them better. (Friesen 2006c)
together. We know that Dooyeweerd read Nietzsche as early as his student days (Dooyeweerd 1914). And Dooyeweerd was clearly influenced by Goethe, whose *Faust* he cites. Dooyeweerd studied Husserl. And he was influenced by Baader, through his reading of J.H. Gunning, Jr. and Chantepie de la Saussaye (Friesen 2011). It is helpful to look at the way other writers have used the term ‘*Hineinleben*.’

2. Aesthetic uses of ‘Hineinleben’

Joseph Kürschner, who edited Goethe’s works in 1882, refers to Goethe’s “*Hineinleben in seinen Helden*” or “immersing himself in his heroes.”

Goethe used the term ‘*hineinleben*’ in *Die Leiden des Jungen Werthers* [*The Sorrows of Young Werther*] where he says that the happiest people are like children who are immersed in their day:

…daß diejenigen die Glücklichsten sind, die gleich den Kindern in den Tag hineinleben, ihre Puppen herumschleppen, aus und anziehen, und mit großem Respekt in die Schublade umherschleichen, wo Mama das Zuckerbrot hinein geschlossen hat...

Most translations of this work do not bring out this idea of ‘*Hineinleben*.’ For example, Martin Swales translates it as “live from day to day”:

I gladly concede, because I know what you would answer, that those people are the happiest who, like children, live from day to day, who drag their dolls after them, who dress and undress them and who with great respect slink around the drawer in which Mummy keeps the sweets…”

In his commentary on this work by Goethe, Heinemann contrasts this “naïve joy” of children at Christmas with Werther’s thoughts of death (Heinemann, 1895).

Another nineteenth century work on aesthetics also links *Hineinleben* with what is naïve. In 1857, Johannes Andreas Romberg wrote about the artist Dürer’s drawing of the Holy Family:

…so ist es bei Dürer das naïv *Hineinleben* in die Umständlichkeit, das bei mancher äusserlichen Unwahrscheinlichkeit uns dennoch eine poetische Ueberzeugung von dem Leben der heil. Familie beibringt;

[and so in Dürer, the naïve living immersion within often externally improbable circumstances, which nevertheless brings with it a poetic conviction of the life of the Holy Family] (Romberg, III,137). [my translation]

Dooyeweerd also links ‘*Hineinleben*’ with what is naïve. We will discuss the idea of naïve
experience in more detail below.

In 1844, Heinrich Theodor Rötscher used the word ‘Hineinleben’ for the idea of an actress immersing herself in the character she plays (Rötscher, 272).

In his *Encyclopedia of Classical Philology* (1871), Nietzsche used ‘Hineinleben’ in relation to philology and the study of the classics. ‘Hineinleben’ means “immersion in the past.” “Hineinleben is the goal.” Such immersion involves an aesthetic intuition (Porter 175, 180).

Eduard von Hartmann speaks of Hineinleben in relation to the aesthetic realm [Gebiet]. There is an inner intuitive lived experience [Sich-Hineinleben] in which we obtained for the first a concrete knowledge of the essence of what is empirically given, in all its almost inexhaustible details. The artistic consciousness is opposed to mere conscious perception (Von Hartmann 1876, 412). Von Hartmann refers to the work of Max Schasler, who says:

> Denn wir haben oft genug unsre Ueberzeugung dahin ausgesprochen, daß nur durch das innige Sich-Hineinleben in den ganzen Detailreichthum des stofflichen Gebiets—und ein solches Sich-Hineinleben führt nothwendig zur Intuivität (selbst nach aller Reflexion)—sodann aber durch die Erhebung dieses intuitiven Erfassens, durch die Reflexion, zum spekulativen Bewusstsein des Wesens eine wahrhaft konkrete Erkenntniss, ein substantielles Denken möglich sei (Schasler, 1132).

[For we have stated our conviction often enough, that it is only through inner lived experience in the whole richly detailed material realm–and such a lived experience leads necessarily to intuition (and in fact to all reflexion)–and then by the elevation of this intuitive comprehension, by means of reflexion, that we attain to the speculative consciousness of the essence of a truly concrete knowledge, an essential way of thinking becomes possible.] [my translation]

Dooyeweerd cites Eduard von Hartmann’s *Das religiöse Bewusstsein der Menscheit* (second ed. 1888, first published 1882) at NC II, 315. Although that book does not mention ‘Hineinleben,’ it does show that Dooyeweerd was familiar with von Hartmann. Other references to Eduard von Hartmann can be found in my study on the history of reformational philosophy (Friesen 2011).

It should be noted that Von Hartmann was influenced by Baader. Von Hartmann in turn influenced Russian theatre, and his views of the unconscious influenced the Stanislavky method of acting (Whyman 2008). That influence would also seem to be related to the idea of immersing oneself in the role, and in having empathy with the character’s predicament.
3. Edmund Husserl’s use of ‘Hineinleben’

In 1925, Husserl stated:

Die Welt, in die wir bewußt hineinleben, ist uns ja nicht bewußt als eine Phantasie, als wie Nixen und Zentauren, sondern wie diese Dinge um uns, als seien, als wirklich. Aber es ist auch zu beachten: Im Wechsel des Bewusstseins von ihnen geht hindurch das Bewusstsein vom Selben (Husserl 1925, 402).

[The world that we consciously live within in is not conscious to us as a fantasy, in the sense of nymphs and centaurs, but rather in the sense of how these things are around as, as existing, as real. But we also need to note that the interchange of consciousness of these [things] goes through the consciousness of one’s self.]

The entire lecture is interesting, in that Husserl says that this consciousness takes many different forms or modes of appearing [Erscheinungsweise]. And note that Husserl uses the term ‘conscious’ instead of ‘knowing.’

He uses the term again a few years later:

…die stetige Bezogenheit des Ich auf sein jeweiliges Erfahrungsfeld als Feld möglicher Affektionen, vermögener Thematik heraus (zu) stellen oder, was dasselbe, die Grundtatsache dass waches Leben ein actives Leben ist, aber als das vorweg immer schon Hineinleben in ein Erfahrungsfeld, in eine Seinsphäre, in vager Allgemeinheit gesprochen, in eine “Welt” ist, und zunächst eine sich bewusstseinsmässig selbst darstellende (Husserl 2002, 216).

[…]to be able to thematically set out the constant directedness of the Self to its present experiential field as a field of possible emotional stages, or what is the same thing, the basic fact that conscious life is an active life, but that it always from the very beginning involves living within a field of experience, in a sphere of being, or we can say with vaguer generality, in a “world,” and above all, one which like our consciousness is self-exhibiting.]

And even later, Husserl writes of the Selfhood, which, as center, lives life:

Aber das Ich ist “Subjekt” des Bewusstseins. Subjekt ist dabei nur ein anderes Wort für die Zentrierung, die alles Leben als Ich-Leben, und somit lebend etwas zu erleben, etwas bewusst zu haben, hat.

(2) Wie ist das Ich Zentrum dieses “erlebenden” Lebens, wie ist es erlebend? Es ist von dem, dessen das Bewusstsein bewusst ist, affiziert, folgt der Affektion, oder ist etwa von einem Affizierenden hingezogen, festgehalten und genommen...Und nicht nur das, das Ich erlebt und lebt als waches Ich aktiv, lebt in einen Erlebnishorizont, in einen Horizont des Erlebten, <des> Für-es-Seienden,
hinein, und dieses Hineinleben, dieses In-wacher-Aktivität-Sein ist besonders geartet (Husserl, 2006, 35).

[But that Self is “subject” of consciousness. ‘Subject’ is there just another word for centering, which experiences all of life as a life for Self and therefore although living, it lives to see and be conscious of something.

(2) How is this central Self of this life that lives to see, how is it able to live to see? It is affected by that of which its consciousness is conscious, and is a result of these affects, or is attracted by something that affects it...And not only that the Self lives to see and lives actively as a conscious Self, and lives within a horizon of experience, a horizon of that which is experienced, of that which is being-for-itself, and this living within, this being in-conscious-activity is grounded in a distinct way.] [my translation]

At p. 89 in the same work Husserl says

Wir und unsere Umwelt, wir als tranzendental Subjectivität und als weltkonstituierende, in der wir uns menschlich objektivierend und in der Welt finden, in die Welt als Personen hineinleben und Selbsterhaltung üben.

[We and the world around us, we as transcendental subjectivity and as world-constituting, in which we objectify ourselves as humans and find ourselves in the world, living as persons within the world and excercising self-preservation.]

We need to also note Husserl’s linking of the natural naïve attitude with ‘Hineinleben.’ This is important, since Dooyeweerd also links the naïve attitude with enstasis, which in turn is linked with Hineinleben. In Husserl’s Vienna lecture, “Die Philosophie in der Krisis der europäischen Menschheit” (May 10, 1935) he says,

Das natürliche Leben charaktisiert sich nun als naïv geradehin in die Welt Hineinleben, in die Welt, die als universaler Horizont immerfort in gewisser Weise bewußt da ist, aber dabei nicht thematisch ist. Thematisch ist, worauf man gerichtet ist. Waches Leben ist immer auf dies oder jenes Gerichtetsein, gerichtet darauf als auf Zweck oder Mittel, als Relevantes oder Irrelevantes, auf Interessantes oder Gleichgültiges, auf Privates oder Öffentliches, auf das alltäglich Erforderliche oder auf ein einbrechendes Neues. Das alles liegt im Welthorizont, es bedarf aber besonderer Motive, damit der in solchem Weltleben Begriffene sich umstellt und dazu kommt, sie selbst irgendwie zum Thema zu machen, für sie ein bleibendes Interesse zu fassen (Cited by Strasser 1991, 28).

[Natural life is characterized by naïvely and directly living immersed within the world, the world which as the universal horizon is always consciously there in a certain way, but which is not thematic. Thematic means that to which man is
directed. Conscious life is always directed to this or that, directed towards it as goal or as means, as something relevant or irrelevant, as interesting or as that to which we are indifferent, as private or public, as requisite for everyday life or the breaking into consciousness of something entirely new. All of this is found in our world horizon, but particular motives are required so that what is grasped in our life in the world can be transformed, and so that it can be somehow thematically formed, in order to give this a lasting interest.] [my translation]

And in his 1929 Paris Lectures, Husserl says


The Paris Lectures were expanded revised by Husserl and published in 1931 as the Cartesian Meditations. Here is the slightly revised version of the above passage, in Dorion Cairns’ English translation:

Anything belonging to the world, any spatiotemporal being, exists for me—that is to say, is accepted by me—in that I experience it, because I perceive it, remember it, think of it somehow, judge about it, value it, desire it, or the like Descartes, as we know, indicated all that by the name cogito. The world is for me absolutely nothing else but the world existing for and accepted by me in such a conscious cogito. It gets its whole sense, universal and specific, and its acceptance as existing, exclusively from such cogitationes. In these my whole world-life goes on, including my scientifically inquiring and grounding life. By my living, by my experiencing, thinking, valuing, and acting, I can enter no world other than the one that gets its sense and acceptance or status [Sinn und Geltung] in and from me, myself (Husserl, 1960, 21).

This translation translates ‘Hineinleben’ as merely ‘living.’ But it does relate the world to the Self, which is essential to Dooyeweerd’s meaning. And it does speak of “entering” that world. There are therefore many connections between Dooyeweerd’s and Husserl’s use of ‘Hineinleben.’ Of most importance is the relation of the selfhood and world, in which the selfhood is immersed. And this world in which we are immersed is on that finds its meaning concentrated in our own selfhood. But Dooyeweerd did not share Husserl’s idea of intentionality
or directedness. For Dooyeweerd, ‘intentional’ is contrasted with what is ontical. Dooyeweerd also disagreed with phenomenology’s characterization of the Selfhood and its idea of what is given to our consciousness. And Dooyeweerd believed that our own Selfhood was also not self-sufficient, but depended for its meaning on God as Origin. For more differences from phenomenology, see Friesen 2006b.

4. Max Scheler’s use of ‘Hineinleben’

We have already seen that Scheler used the term ‘hineinleben.’ But unlike Scheler, who related the term to ekstasis, Dooyeweerd relates it to the terms ‘enstatic,’ ‘knowing,’ ‘resting’ ‘intuitive’ and ‘conscious.’ The similarity with Scheler is that Dooyeweerd also uses the term to mean a pre-reflective, or pre-theoretical knowledge. Dooyeweerd’s use of the term ‘Hineinleben’ has associations of aesthetic intuitionism, an appreciation of naïve experience, and the idea of empathy with and an immersion within temporal reality. As enstasis, it is a relation of the selfhood to temporal reality.

We have also seen that for Scheler, ‘hineinleben’ means a knowledge by participation in the world. Again, there is some similarity in Dooyeweerd. The selfhood, which for Dooyeweerd is supratemporal, dwells within or immerses itself in the lower region of temporal reality. This meaning of ‘hineinleben’ is anticipated by Baader’s idea of einwohnen, or dwelling within another reality. This idea of dwelling within an entity in a lower region is the converse of a being in a lower region participating in a being of a higher region. Thus, insofar as we dwell within temporal reality, that temporal reality participates in our selfhood. In this way, we help temporal reality fulfill its true nature, which has no existence in itself, and requires humanity’s help for its redemption (Friesen 2009, Thesis 75 and references). This same idea is repeated on a higher level. Our supratemporal selfhood also has no existence in itself, but exists as meaning, pointing to its Origin. Insofar as we participate in Christ, Christ also dwells within us, and we are elevated to our true nature, and brought into “the relationship of sonship with the Father” (NC I, 61).

5. Rudolf Steiner’s use of ‘Hineinleben’

In 1927, Rudolf Steiner used the term ‘Hineinleben’ to refer to “Das Sich-Hineinleben in Geberde und Form” [immersing one’s self in gestures and form] (Steiner 1927, xxii). And Steiner
often uses the term to indicate how we should immerse ourselves in the eternal world, in which we must learn to dwell. We may contrast this with Dooyeweerd, who usually uses the term the other way: our supratemporal selfhood learning to dwell in temporal reality and accepting it as its own. But the idea of immersing oneself in reality (whether supratemporal or temporal) is common to both men. In his doctoral dissertation of 1892, *Wahreit und Wissenschaft*, Steiner refers to Eduard von Hartmann’s ideas as the most important of his day. In his conclusion, Steiner says:


[Our discussion has shown that the innermost core of the world comes to expression in our knowledge. The harmony of laws ruling throughout the universe shines forth in human cognition. It is part of man's task to bring into the sphere of apparent reality the fundamental laws of the universe which, although they rule all existence, would never come to existence as such. The very nature of knowledge is that the world-foundation, which is not to be found as such in objective reality, is present in it. Our knowledge—pictorially expressed—is a gradual, living penetration into the world's foundation.] (as translated in *Truth and Knowledge*).

‘Hineinleben’ is here translated as a “living penetration” into the world’s (spiritual) foundation.

But note that for Steiner, this *Hineinleben* is theoretical, whereas for Dooyeweerd it is pre-theoretical. Steiner refers to science as “Hineinleben in die Natur” (Steiner 1986). Steiner says that when we arrive at our Higher Self, there is a “Hineinleben in alle Wesen” [living within all beings] when we have a universal net of sympathy with all beings, empathy with all beings (Steiner 1987 GA 55, 205).

Steiner also refers to our immersing oneself in the world, as when he refers to Goethe’s use of the idea in *Faust*: 
Goethe wants to set such a knowledge in motion that will allow that which is within his soul to really immerse itself in the living *Dasein* of the world, not just in order to know the *Dasein* of the world, but to be able to co-experience it. Goethe himself strives for such a knowledge and to obtain such an attitude with respect to the phenomena of the world, and he embodies this dramatically in his *Faust*. And Goethe had formed in himself the conviction that man can not only obtain a knowledge that describes a world found outside of him, but that he can set in motion a representation of the world within himself that co-experience the stream of the *Dasein* of the world. But this is only possible when one undertakes what Kant describes as an adventure of understanding: to draw upwards the deepest powers of the soul, which are able to know more than the mere senses and more than reason that is limited to the senses...[Faust] wants to move outwards with his soul, and to unite it with that which lives within nature. He reached that state, and after his world wandering he was reborn in that which animated Goethe and what he experienced, which we may call the highest and most beautiful flowering of German spiritual life.] [my translation]

6. Paul Ricoeur’s use of ‘Hineinleben’

Ricoeur uses ‘*Hineinleben*’ as meaning “to sink into and lose itself in lived and living experience.”

Reflection does not sever the *cogito* from the *cogitatum*, but it does sever the meant world from the world existing absolutely. Reflection frees the world as intended from a certain opaque power of absolute existence which impregnates
experience at the same time that it devours me, its witness. But in ceasing to sink into and to lose itself (hineinerfahren, hineinleben) in lived and living experience, the ego splits itself correlatively: an “uninterested” impartial spectator wrenches itself away from “interest in life.” At this point the triumph of phenomenological “seeing” over vital and everyday “doing” is complete (Ricoeur 1967, 94).

As already discussed, Dooyeweerd agrees that theory is intentional, although he gives it a different meaning. But he does not agree that this intentional way of seeing is superior to the pre-theoretical. Nevertheless, this idea of sinking into life is helpful in understanding ‘Hineinleben,’ provided that we do not posit some kind of functionalistic ego, but rather recognize the ego as transcendent to all modal functions.

7. Hans-Georg Gadamer’s use of ‘Hineinleben’

Hans-Georg Gadamer refers to Husserl’s idea of Hineinleben:

...die Welt, in die wir in der natürlichen Einstellung hineinleben, die uns nicht als solche je gegenständlich wird, sondern die den vorgegebenen Boden aller Erfahrung darstellt. Dieser Welthorizont bleibt auch in aller Wissenschaft vor ausgesetzt und ist daher ursprünglicher als sie” (Gadamer GW I, 251; cited in Hammermeister).

[...the world, in which we have our lived experience, does not as such become gegenständlich to us, but rather sets out the previously given basis of all experience. This world horizon also remains presupposed in all our science, and is therefore more basic than science]

That is certainly in line with Dooyeweerd’s view of pre-theoretical experience: that it is not gegenständlich, since it is only in theory that we have a Gegenstand-relation. We will discuss this in more detail later. And for Dooyeweerd, as for Husserl, naïve experience is always presupposed by science and is more basic than science.

8. Enstasis is conscious lived experience [bewust beleven] or known lived experience [wetend beleven]

We have seen how the original Dutch text uses the term ‘wetend beleven’ and that it is this term that is translated by ‘Hineinleben.’ From where did Dooyeweerd get this idea of ‘wetend beleven,’ or ‘knowing lived experience’?

The Spinoza scholar J.D. Bierens de Haan was praised by Dooyeweerd (Dooyeweerd 1986, 150),
so it is certain he read him. Bierens de Haan refers to mystical religion as ‘een weten beleven’:

Mystische religie is een beleevend weten van het in-God-zijn der wereld; de in eigen bewustzijn beleefde wetenschap, dat de wereld in God is opgeheven (Cited, van der Bend, 29).

[Mystical religion is an experiential knowing of the Being-of-God-in-the-world, the science known in one’s own consciousness that the world is elevated in God]

The whole content of Spirit is a ‘weten en beleven’ of Idea (p. 63). There is a progression from a rational concept of being to a spiritual experience of being.

Bierens de Haan reviewed Frederik van Eeden’s book Het Lied van Schijn en Wezen, a book that Dooyeweerd also refers to. Bierens de Haan says that for van Eeden, the life of the spirit is not opposed to nature. De Haan calls this van Eeden’s ‘monism’ and comments, making reference to various verses of van Eeden’s poem:

Dit monisme bevat niet slechts de ontkening van absolute tegengestelden, maar ontkent ook het bestaan van scheidingen, zoodat ieder en wij zelven deel zijn van een grooter geheel; de ziel is zich bewust in den Kosmos te leven (II, 10) en het leven is een dienen van regels (I, 1) die getuigen van een hooger Macht en Meester (II 11) (Bierens de Haan, 1917).

[This monism does not just consist in the denial of absolute contraries, but also denies the existence of separations, so that everything and we ourselves are part of a greater whole; the soul is conscious of itself living in the cosmos (II, 10) and life is a service of rules (I, 1) that bear witness to a higher Power and Master (II, 11).]

[my translation]

While Dooyeweerd was opposed to monism, he agreed with de Haan’s idea of the soul (in the sense of central heart) being conscious of itself living in the cosmos. This is Dooyeweerd’s use of the idea of cosmic consciousness that we have already discussed.

Another possible source for Dooyeweerd’s use of the term is Hans Driesch. In his Ordnungslehre, a book with which Dooyeweerd was familiar, Driesch says,

Bewußt erleben oder kurz: Erleben heißt wissen, was man erlebt, was Ich erlebe; es kann auch heißen, daß ich als »selbstbewußter« um das Wissen von meinem Erleben weiß (Driesch 1912, 14).
‘To consciously experience,’ or in short, ‘to experience,’ means to know what one experiences, what I experience; it can also mean that I as one who is self-conscious, know about the knowledge of my experience…] [my translation]

However, note that Driesch is using the term ‘erleben’ and not ‘beleben.’ And his use of the term is more that of reflexive self-knowledge than it is about immersing oneself in one’s experience.

The theologian J.H. Gunning, Jr., who together with Chantepie de la Saussaye introduced Baader’s Christian theosophy to Dutch Reformed theology, also speaks of the unity of the spiritual and the natural. He refers to conscious living in the natural world, and links it to conscious living in the spiritual world. Okke Norel, in an article that Dooyeweerd must have been aware of (Friesen 2011), cites Gunning in relation to Scotus Erigena:

des menschen geloof, zijn bewust wonen in de zedelijke, geestelijke wereld, is één met zijn wetenschap, zijn bewust wonen in de natuurlijke wereld (Norel 1920, 72).

[Human faith, his conscious living in the moral, spiritual world, is one with his science, his conscious living in the natural world] [my translation].

This is closer to Dooyeweerd’s meaning, of being conscious of living in both the central religious world as well as in the temporal world. However, it is again not a precise match, because Gunning links this kind of knowing to science, which for Dooyeweerd is not *enstasis* but *diss-tasis* (see below).

**D. Enstasis is Intuitive Knowledge**

Dooyeweerd says that it is our intuition that accomplishes the enstactical entry of our I-ness into the cosmic temporal coherence of experience:

Only humans can enter enstatically into time by means of their intuition. Other creatures are ‘entirely lost in time’ (*NC* I, 32).

Our naïve intuition allows our supratemporal selfhood to “own” temporal reality, to acknowledge temporal reality as belonging to ourselves.

Dooyeweerd was familiar with other philosophers’ ideas about intuition, such as Henri Bergson, who believed that our intuition is a subjective psychical function that reveals the metaphysical essence of reality in an immediate way by sympathetically penetrating into the “*durée,*” the creative psychical stream of time (*WdW* I, 264); Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, who distinguished
our original consciousness of immediate knowledge from our reflecting and discursive consciousness (WdW I, 439) and Immanuel Volkelt, who saw intuition as being certain of that which transcends experience (WdW II, 411). A full comparison is beyond the scope of this article.

Dooyeweerd’s own use of ‘intuition’ follows that of Frederik van Eeden, who spoke of intuition as an immediate beholding [schouwen] of reality. The idea of beholding [Schauen] is also found in Baader, and was adopted by J.H. Gunning Jr. And Chantepie de la Saussaye (Friesen 2011).

For Dooyeweerd, intuition is the “temporal bottom layer” [tijdelijke dieptelaag] (WdW II, 408). It is a cosmic intuition of time [kosmische tijds-intuitie]. By this, Dooyeweerd means that in intuition we grasp the temporal coherence of meaning and relate it to ourselves. The coherence cannot be defined, since in intuition, we grasp the temporal coherence immediately in a way that goes beyond the boundaries of all theoretical thought.

De continue zin-samenhang in de tijdelijke zin-breking wordt in haar achter alle theoretische begripsgrenzen onmiddellijk gevat. De intuïtie is kosmische tijds-intuitie (WdW II, 408).

[The continuous meaning-coherence in the temporal refraction of meaning is immediately grasped by it [intuition] behind all theoretical conceptual limits. Intuition is thus a cosmic intuition of time] (NC II, 473).

As an aside, it is interesting that in 1950 (thus after Dooyeweerd’s work), Nicolaï Hartmann also refers to our intuition as an inner beholding [innere Schau], and that both our inner and outer world are in the same “Real time, “ [Realzeit] which comprises cosmic time and historical time, lived time and conscious time. Hartmann says that consciousness has the form of a temporal stream, and is in various layers [Tiefenlagen] (Hartmann 1950, 148, 384).

Elsewhere, Dooyeweerd speaks of our pre-theoretical conscious ‘Erleben’ as the temporal basic layer of all cognition [experience] (NC II, 475). So there does not seem to be a difference between pre-theoretical intuition and conscious ‘Erleben.’

Wilhelm Wundt had also distinguished between immediate and mediate knowledge, and between a “beholding” intuitive [anschauliche] knowledge and a conceptual knowledge (Wundt 1889, 152). But for Wundt, this intuition was only with respect to the subject; as soon as we refer to the
object in representations [Vorstellungen], we are engaged in theory, since the represented object has ceased to be the real object (p. 153). In contrast, Dooyeweerd held that our subject-object relation is entirely pre-theoretical. The distinctions we make in theory are not between subject and object, but between our thought and its Gegenstand (see below).

In our pre-theoretical intuitive enstasis, we are engaged in full temporal reality. We have not abstracted from out of that temporal continuity. Our experience is a mere thinking-oneself [indenken] into reality, a concrete experience of things and their relations (WdW II, 401). And our naïve concept of a thing remains “inertly fitted” into this full temporal meaning systasis of naïve experience (WdW II, 404). In this pre-theoretical enstasis, we are not able to distinguish the various modes of our consciousness:

It is not the given ontical systasis of the modal aspects of our experiential that prevents our pre-theoretical intuition from acquiring insight into their structure. It is much rather the enstatic character of pre-theoretical experience, still wholly set within concrete reality, that prevents pre-theoretical intuition from acquiring this insight. It is only in the theoretical attitude of thought and experience, in which we receive in our analytic view of the modal aspects that have been analytically split apart and set over against each other, that intuition can lead to an epistemological insight into their modal structure (Dooyeweerd 1995, 94).

It is possible to make logical distinctions in pre-theoretical experience. But these distinctions are limited to distinguishing concrete things. Enstatic logical analysis (in pre-theoretical thought) is “restrictively bound to sensory perception and can only analytically distinguish concrete things and their relations according to sensorily founded characteristics” (NC II, 470)

E. Enstasis is naïve experience

1. Positive sense of the word ‘naïve’:

Dooyeweerd refers to our enstatic pre-theoretical experience as ‘naïve experience.’

In the transcendental critique, I have explained this as due to the fact that in the naïve attitude, our acts of thought and experience still remain wholly enstatistically placed within the concrete, individual reality of things and events, and that our concept formation here still rests inertly upon our sensory representation. (Dooyeweerd 1995, 92, my translation)
We often use the word ‘naïve’ in a derogatory way. “Oh, you are just being naïve!” The word generally refers to someone who is not sufficiently aware or reflective. And ever since Descartes’ demand for “clear and distinct” ideas, we suspect ordinary consciousness as containing prejudices and idols of the mind that need to be rooted out by means of theoretical thought.

But Dooyeweerd uses ‘naïve experience’ in a positive way. It is the basis for all our experience, including our theoretical thought. Where did Dooyeweerd obtain this positive view of ‘naïve’?

**a) References in Aesthetics**

The first positive use of ‘naïve’ is probably to be found in German works on poetry and aesthetics. What is naïve proceeds naturally from within, as Schiller states in his “Über naïve und sentimentalische Dichtung.” Schiller says that what is naïve looks at the natural or objective, whereas what is sentimental looks at what is subjectively felt [Gemütlichen] (Krug, V, 64). The naïve genius stands in a dependence on experience that the sentimental poet does not know (Schiller, Collected Works, Vol. 18, 305).

Eberhard derives the term ‘naïve’ from the French word ‘naïf’ and from the Latin ‘natives’ meaning “innate and natural.” Goethe says that the naïve is what is purely natural as long as it is morally suitable. “Das rein Natürliche, insofern es sittlich-gefällig ist, nennen wir naïv.” Naïve is being true and open-hearted (Eberhard, 114, s. 184, citing Goethe Spr. i. Pr. 696 a). Goethe says that the purely natural, when it harmonises with our moral sentiments, is called naïve (Goethe 1883, 202).

In 1859, Heinrich Ritter spoke of naïve art, which knows of no split with nature (Ritter, 571).

In 1882, Joseph Kürschner, the editor of Goethe, referred to naïve objects as the domain of art that seeks to give a moral expression of what is natural [Naive Gegenstände sind also das Gebiet der Kunst, die ein sittlicher Ausdruck des Natürlichen sein soll] (Kürschner, 505).

Friedrich Theodor Vischer referred to naïve art as the immediate connection between poetry and music, as the “art before art” (Vischer, IV, 839).

**b) References in Psychology**
We have seen how Wilhelm Wundt regarded intuition as a “beholding,” and that such beholding is prior to our representations of objects. Similarly, Wilhelm Wundt distinguished between naïve and reflective knowledge:

Alles Erkennen beginnt nothwendig mit der naïven Form der Erkenntniss, welche einen Unterschied zwischen Vorstellung und Object noch nicht kennt; alles Erkennen geht aber ebenso nothwendig zu der reflectirenden Form der Erkenntniss über, welche das Object der Vorstellung als ein von dieser selbst verschiedenes ihr gegenüberstellt. Eine Rückkehr zur ursprünglichen Stufe ist unmöglich (Wundt 1889, 92).

[All knowing necessarily begins with the naïve form of knowing, which does not yet know a distinction between representation and object; however, all knowing nevertheless necessarily proceeds to the reflective form of knowing, which distinguishes the object from the representation and sets it over against it as a reflective form of knowledge. A return to the original stage is impossible.]

Wundt was certainly aware of Baader’s work (Wundt 1880, I, 568; 1906, 372). Although Baader also distinguished between pre-theoretical and theoretical experience, he did not use the word ‘naïve’ in a positive sense.

Dooyeweerd’s idea of theoretical knowledge does require an imaginative representation of reality, and Dooyeweerd distinguishes this “intentional” representation from the ontical reality that is represented (Friesen 2006b). Yet Dooyeweerd says that we return to naïve experience once we cease our theoretical activity. But this return is to a “deepened” naïve experience (see below).

In 1887, August Johannes Dorner distinguished between immediate naïve consciousness and science (Dorner, 46).

Alfred Wolfenstein gives a very positive view of naïve experience:


Naïveté is not the kind of ‘experience’ [Erlebnis] that is talked about everywhere today. These experiences are in the foreground and are sought. They want to be justified and answered. What is naïve presents itself—appears—is there—unsought,
unannounced, surprising-refuting, exalting, wonderful for the humble discoverer.
It stands behind all the contents of life…[my translation]

Husserl spoke of the naïve previously given beheld world [“der naiv vorgegebenen anschaulichen Welt”] (Husserl 1922-1937, 2276). In the same lectures, he speaks of naïve living within, and naïve experience [naïve dahinleben, naiv erfahrend] (p. 270).

2. Enstatic experience is naïve and not theoretical

Dooyeweerd contrasts naïve experience with the theoretical attitude of experience (NC I, 3). Dooyeweerd considers most philosophy to be insufficiently critical of its own presuppositions. That is why Dooyeweerd gave a transcendental critique of theoretical thought. Like Baader before him, Dooyeweerd turned Kant’s transcendental method against Kant himself. Dooyeweerd follows Baader in critiquing Kant’s assumption of the autonomy of thought. What Kant thought was a Copernican revolution was only “a revolution in the periphery,” as opposed to Dooyeweerd’s view of the central and supratemporal selfhood, which relativizes all of our temporal functions, including our rational thought. Our rationality is not autonomous, but only one mode of consciousness of our central selfhood (WdW I, v-vii). I discuss this in more detail elsewhere (Friesen 2011).

We find a similar contrast between naïve and critical in Rudolf Steiner.

While naïve realism begins by assuming that the content of experience, as we perceive it, is an objective reality without examining if this is so, the standpoint just characterized sets out from the equally uncritical conviction that thinking can be used to arrive at scientifically valid conclusions. In contrast to naïve realism, this view could be called naïve rationalism. To justify this term, a brief comment on the concept of “naïve” is necessary here. A. Döring [107] tries to define this concept in his essay, Ueber den Begriff des naïven Realismus (Concerning the Concept of naïve Realism). He says:

“The concept ‘naïve’ designates the zero point in the scale of reflection about one's own relation to what one is doing. A naïve content may well be correct, for although it is unreflecting and therefore simply non-critical or uncritical, this lack of reflection and criticism excludes the objective assurance of truth, and includes the possibility and danger of error, yet by no means necessitates them. One can be equally naïve in one's life of feeling and will, as in the life of representing and thinking in the widest sense; furthermore, one may express this inner life in a naïve manner rather than repressing and modifying it through consideration and
reflection. To be naïve means not to be influenced, or at least not consciously
influenced by tradition, education or rules; it means to be, in all spheres of life,
what the root of the word: ‘nativus’ implies. i.e., unconscious, impulsive,
instinctive, daimonic.”

Starting from this, we will endeavor to define “naïve” still more precisely. In all
our activities, two things must be taken into account: the activity itself, and our
knowledge of its laws. We may be completely absorbed in the activity without
worrying about its laws. The artist is in this position when he does not reflect
about the laws according to which he creates, but applies them, using feeling and
sensitivity. We may call him “naïve.” It is possible, however, to observe oneself,
and enquire into the laws inherent in one's own activity, thus abandoning the naïve
consciousness just described through knowing exactly the scope of and
justification for what one does. This I shall call critical. I believe this definition
comes nearest to the meaning of this concept as it has been used in philosophy,
with greater or lesser clarity, ever since Kant. Critical reflection then is the
opposite of the naïve approach. A critical attitude is one that comes to grips with
the laws of its own activity in order to discover their reliability and limits.
Epistemology can only be a critical science. For its object is an essentially
subjective activity of man: cognition, and it wishes to demonstrate the laws
inherent in cognition. Thus everything “naïve” must be excluded from this
science. Its strength must lie in doing precisely what many thinkers, inclined more
toward the practical doing of things, pride themselves that they have never done,
namely, “think about thinking” (Steiner 1892, “Epistemology since Kant”).

There are some similarities with Dooyeweerd. I am not saying that Dooyeweerd relied on
Steiner. I am only pointing out how naïve experience was a matter of interest to others prior to
Dooyeweerd’s time. Dooyeweerd also distinguishes naïve experience, which refers to what is
“ontical” from epistemology, which is theoretical and merely “intentional” (see discussion
below). But Dooyeweerd disagreed that naïve experience is unconscious (see discussion below).

Some authors we have discussed use ‘naïve’ in the sense that it is prior to all concepts. But
Dooyeweerd says that we can have pre-theoretical (naïve) concepts. The subject-object relation
is itself a relation of naïve experience. But our naïve concepts are limited to viewing things
(individuality structures) or events and their relations (NC I, 41). As long as we conceive things
in concrete structures without theoretical reflection, our attitude towards them is naïve (NC III,
31).

Dooyeweerd contrasts the theoretical attitude of the special sciences with “a bare enstasis” (“de
zich bloot in de werkelijkheid instellende denkhouding der naïeve ervaring” (WdW I, 49).
Elsewhere, Dooyeweerd speaks about a bare [bloot] "falling back" into the naïve attitude naïve experience which accepts things as given in their indivisible unity of creation without an explicated distinguishing of their aspects (WdW I, 60). When the epoché of theoretical thought is cancelled, we fall back into the enstatic intuitive attitude of naïve experience (NC II, 482).

3. Not naïve realism

Dooyeweerd expressly distinguishes his idea of naïve experience from the view that was called ‘naïve realism.’ Naïve realism assumes that objects exist independently of us, as things-in-themselves [Dinge an sich].

Dooyeweerd says that naïve realism mistakenly assumes that our experience of things-in-themselves is a copy or mirror of what exists outside of us. Dooyeweerd refers to Natorp’s view that the basic error of naïve realism is the view things are given in our representations as a mirroring of objects that occurs by means of perception [“daß die Dinge auf dem Wege der Wahrnehmung als einer Art Abspeigelung der Gegenstände in unserer Vorstellung gegeben sind”] (Dooyeweerd 1931, 85 fn2).

Dooyeweerd rejects the naïve realist view of sensation (NC III, 22). So does Baader, who says that objects are not to be seen as the source of sensory impressions working upon a separate thinker (Weltalter 48, 364). Our sensations are not the source and cause of our thinking function (Werke V, 53). As Sauer says, there are for Baader no positivistic facts that are not already involved in the universal process of sensation, knowing and understanding (Sauer 21).

Although Dooyeweerd emphasizes that our naïve experience is of things and their relations, it is not an experience of thing-hood in the sense of singular and individual objects! Dooyeweerd objects to the view that our pre-theoretical experience is of separate entities. Such a view was held by Scheler, who said, “There is nothing more certain than the fact that all the objects given in natural observation, are given as singular and individual objects.” Dooyeweerd responds:

It is of great methodological importance to point out that by limiting my theoretical attention to this concrete natural thing, I am actually engaged in a theoretical abstraction. In veritable naïve experience, things are not experienced as completely separate entities. This point is ignored or rather denied by Scheler. It must be emphasized, however, if we are to understand the plastic horizon of
reality, and if we are to avoid a naturalistic and atomistic interpretation of the latter (NC III, 54).

Dooyeweerd says that in the copy theory of reality, the real *datum* of naïve experience is reduced to a theoretical abstraction of objective sense-impressions (NC III, 22; added to WdW). This real *datum* that is reduced is the givenness of our experience in all modal aspects.

As an example of the copy theory, Dooyeweerd points to Windelband, who assumed that the representing mind is placed in a surrounding world, and that the world must in some way repeat itself in this mind (NC III, 35; WdW III, 15).

According to this view, naïve experience would imagine that human consciousness was placed like a photographic apparatus opposite a reality, as it were, *independent of that consciousness*. This “reality in itself” would be reproduced faithfully and completely in consciousness. That is a very erroneous conception of naïve experience. Naïve experience is not a theory of reality. Rather it takes reality as it is given. It is itself a datum, or rather the supreme datum for every theory of reality and of knowledge (Dooyeweerd 1947, my emphasis).

Dooyeweerd has his own *Abbild*-relation or copy relation in imagination, but it is distinguished from the copy theory of perception. Dooyeweerd says that we are actively involved in our perception of the world. Our imagination plays a role in perception. And, like Baader, he refers to our sensory imagination as “productive” (Friesen 2006b).

4. **Not a reversion to the imagined Eden of childhood**

Some authors regard the naïve in terms of childhood. We have looked at Goethe’s *Sorrows of the Young Werther*. Karl Heinemann comments how Goethe’s *Sorrows of the Young Werther* contrasts the naïve joy of children at Christmas to Werther’s thoughts of death (Heinemann, I, 237). We have also seen this in Wilhelm Wundt, who regarded naïve experience as the childlike point of view. This view was repeated by others. In 1921, Von Ogden Vogt said,

> We live in an analytical and psychological age, and are no longer able to enjoy a wholly naïve experience (Vogt, 41).

He proposed a modern cultus, and said that some objected to this: “We think we are not sufficiently naïve, that we are too introspective and unchildlike to share the pageantry of a great celebration.” (p. 77)
But Dooyeweerd did not regard the naïve as a reversion to childhood. We should not confuse naïve experience with the beginning experiences of a child. That would be a Romanticism, which Dooyeweerd rejects. Our naïve experience is itself something that is learned. Dooyeweerd says that the child's life is not only pre-theoretical, but it is pre-experiential. Infants have not yet learned the practical function of things and events in social life.

It is, therefore, a fundamental error to seek the pure pattern of this experience [naïve experience] in infants who have not yet learned the practical function of things and events in social life (NC III, 32).

This infantile attitude is animistic; it displays a provisional inability to conceive subject-object relations. By this I understand Dooyeweerd to be saying that the child cannot distinguish between the realms of mineral, plant, animal and human, since that is how he characterizes animism elsewhere. Dooyeweerd says that there must be sufficient development of the typical act-structure of human existence and a practical acquaintance with the things of common life. Our naïve experience is learned socially; it is informed by social praxis (NC III, 33-34). I am not aware of any discussion on these points by those who want to start their analysis of theory with our naïve experience of the “individual thing.” In fact, I am not aware of any discussion of these distinctions between pre-experiential, pre-theoretical, and theoretical.

The passage says that our act-structure must be formed and the practical function of things and events must be learned. These are temporal events and structures. We must learn how to live in the temporal world, to make it our own. It seems that by development of an act-structure, Dooyeweerd may be referring to the development of a temporal ego [with its own temporal enkaptic structure]. We would then have a distinction between temporal ego and supratemporal selfhood, as in Jung’s psychology. In a recent article, Gerrit Glas says that more needs to be said about the I/Self relationship (Glas 2010). I hope that further research will be done on this important issue.

Dooyeweerd also says that naïve experience is not the same as our routine experience (NC III, 145). Dooyeweerd says that the routine view of modern daily life is not naïve experience, because modern daily life is content with names. What does he mean by this? Our naïve experience certainly includes a linguistic aspect. But if we stop at names, we have not
experienced reality in its full inter-relatedness. And in our modern routine, by applying labels to what we experience, we miss fully experiencing our reality. We may find some similarity here to the Hindu idea that reality goes beyond the names and the forms \textit{[namarupa]} that we use to describe it. I believe that Dooyeweerd's rejection of the routine must also imply his rejection of the common sense Philosophy of Thomas Reid and others. Dooyeweerd was aware of Reid, but criticizes his work for not understanding our sense of awareness of time, in what William James calls the ‘specious present.’ The experience of seeing the line of shooting star is sensed in the present moment, and not brought back to memory as Reid suggests (Dooyeweerd 1940, 170 fn15). Baader specifically rejected a common sense (Philosophische Schriften II 178).

5. Not unconscious

Dooyeweerd also rejected the idea that our naïve experience is unconscious. He emphasizes that it is a knowing and conscious lived experience \textit{[wetend en bewust beleven]}.

That does not mean that Dooyeweerd has no views on the unconscious. He also refers to the unconscious and to depth psychology. In Grenzen van het theoretisch denken Dooyeweerd refers to two layers of the act-life, as shown by depth psychology (Freud and his school). He says that there is an unconscious underlayer and a conscious layer above \textit{[bovenlaag]}. He says that the act-structure is the temporal expression of the selfhood. If the unconscious is one layer of our act-life, then the unconscious is something that is also expressed in the temporal. It is the undisclosed, as yet unopened part of our temporal reality.

As an example of unconscious knowledge he refers to our remembering a name. He says that consciousness is not limited to the psychical and the later aspects:

\textit{Het bewustzijn is niet, zoals men vroeger meende, beperkt tot het psychische aspect en de na-psychische aspecten van het menselijke bestaan, waarbij men alle voor-psychische aspecten tot het onbewuste rekende. Bewust-zijn en onbewust-zijn zijn veeleer twee openbaringswijzen van een en dezelfde werkelijkheid, die in alle aspecten zonder onderscheid fungeren. Het menselijk bewustzijn omvat, juist omdat het geconcentreerd is in een zelfbewustzijn, alle aspecten van de werkelijkheid; anders zou de vraag hoe deze aspecten in het menselijke bewustzijn zouden kunnen komen, onoplosbaar zijn. Maar ook het onbewuste fungeert in alle aspecten zonder onderscheid. Zo is vastgesteld, dat het menselijk
[Consciousness is not, as was earlier supposed, limited to the psychical and post-psychical aspects of human existence, by which all pre-psychical aspects were considered as the unconscious. Being conscious and being unconscious are rather two modes of revelation of one and the same reality, which functions in all aspects without distinction. Human consciousness comprehends all aspects of reality, just because it is concentrated in a self-consciousness. Otherwise the question of how these aspects could come to human consciousness would not arise, and would be insoluble. But also the unconscious functions in all aspects without distinction. So it is established that the human life of acts owes its continuity to the unconscious]. [my translation]

To say that the conscious and the unconscious are two modes of revelation of one and the same reality suggests that "cosmic consciousness" is not unconscious; nor is it on a different level of reality that we have to attain; cosmic reality is given \(\text{gegeven}\) (\(WdW\) II, 405). We just have to see the cosmos differently.

Dooyeweerd says that the unconscious functions in all aspects. It is that part of temporal reality that is still undisclosed, unopened. He gives examples of the workings of the unconscious: remembering a name, past impressions and post-hypnotic suggestion. In normal circumstances our unconscious is subordinated to consciousness; there is a harmonic working together of the different modal functions and a central relation to the I-ness. But in some cases the unconscious breaks through into consciousness (p. 83). These are all ideas that are very similar to Jung's view of the unconscious.

Elsewhere Dooyeweerd says that the personality ideal of the Nature/Freedom Ground-Motive "received a death blow" from the findings of depth psychology (\(NC\) I, 214; not in \(WdW\)). In another passage he refers to the "subconscious" in relation to the unopened psychical aspect:

I have argued that the act-structure of inner human experience is founded in a lower structure qualified by feeling-drives in which the psychical aspect has not yet opened its anticipatory spheres. In the so called 'enkaptic structural whole' of the human body this animal structure is bound by the higher act-structure of human experience. Nevertheless, it is continually present as a sub-conscious under-layer of the latter and it can freely manifest itself in certain limiting
situations (Grenzsituationen) in which the controlling function of the higher act-life has become inactive. Depth-psychology has laid this bare (NC II, 114 ft.)

This is a more restricted view of the unconscious than what he says in Grenzen. Perhaps this is why he calls it the sub-conscious. In relating it to the individual animal structure, this seems more like what Jung would describe as the “personal unconscious.”

A more collective view of the unconscious is given by Dooyeweerd in respect to cognition:

My individual cognitive activity, both in a theoretical and in a pre-theoretical sense, is borne by an immensely more comprehensive and specialized subjective knowledge on the part of human society. This knowledge has been acquired by the successive generations of mankind. It is in the possession of human society and is not equal to the sum of actual knowledge of all individuals together in the present and the past. Nor does it cancel all personal individuality and genius in cognitive activity. The theoretical knowledge of mankind has for the greater part been objectified in a structure that makes it independent of the momentary actual individual insight of individual human beings (NC II, 594; Cf. WdW II, 529).

The development of our consciousness is a rediscovery “in abysmal depths” of our true selfhood and of God, brought about by the working of God's Spirit. Dooyeweerd says,

Slechts Gods Geest kan ons de radicale zin van de Woord-openbaring onthullen, die ons in afgrondelijke diepten tegelijk de waarachtige God en ons zelven ontdekt. Gods Woord leert ons wanneer het in reddende zin werkt. En waar het in reddende zin werkt, brengt het onafwendbaar de radicale omwentelling in de wortel van ons afgevallen bestaan (Dooyeweerd 1959, 11)

[Only God's Spirit can disclose to us the radical meaning of the Word revelation, which in abysmal depths discloses to us simultaneously the true God and our selves. God's Word teaches us whenever it works in a redemptive sense. And where it works in this redemptive sense, it inevitably brings the radical revolution in the root of our existence which had fallen away from God.] (my translation; the 1979 translation in Roots of Western Culture, 12 obscures the meaning).

6. Not Vorhandenes

Pre-theoretical experience is not an experience of reality as Vorhandenes in Heidegger’s sense of the term. I have discussed this in more detail in my response to Lambert Zuidervaart’s incorrect comparison of Dooyeweerd and Heidegger (Friesen 2008d).
7. Not functionalistic

Naïve experience is not to be understood as a functionalistic approach to experience.


[In a nutshell, the whole inner antinomy of so-called critical epistemology is based on this merely functionalistic view of self consciousness. Self-consciousness necessarily has at the same time both a time-transcending and a time-immanent character. The deeper identity that is experienced in the selfhood is trans-functional. It is knowing oneself as one and the same in and above all cosmic-temporal meaning functions, and knowing one’s temporal meaning functions as one’s own.] [my translation]

Dooyeweerd says that if the critical and positivistic epistemology were correct that our experience were limited to our cosmic functions, or rather to an abstractum from out of our temporal complex of cosmic functions, then we could not truly know God, nor our self, nor the cosmos (WdW II, 494).

F. Enstasis is an experience of systasis, not of dis-stasis

Dooyeweerd distinguishes the term ‘enstasis’ from ‘systasis.’ Systasis is the coherence and continuity of temporal experience. When we enstatically enter temporal reality, we experience this systasis or continuity. This occurs in pre-theoretical experience (NC I, 468; NC II, 4). Our pre-theoretical experience is directed towards full reality. This experience is systatic, integral, and has factual immediacy. It grasps reality in its plastic structure (NC III 36).

Theory is the abstraction from this full systasis of meaning (NC II, 431). It is the abstraction not of qualities or properties, but abreaction from the continuity of cosmic time (Friesen 2009, Thesis 19 and references). The real datum is the systatic coherence of meaning, not what has been theoretically isolated or abstracted (NC II, 433). Theory breaks apart the continuity of systasis into a dis-stasis. This setting apart is merely intentional, not ontical. In theoretical synthesis, what has been set apart is related back to the unity of our selfhood. Naïve experience
and thought relates our selfhood to the continuity of cosmic time, the \textit{systasis}. But in theoretical thought, we suspend the continuity of time by what Dooyeweerd calls \textit{epoché} (he does not mean Husserl’s sense of the term). And abstract from the continuity of time is not at all the same as abstraction of properties from things. Dooyeweerd rejects that kind of abstraction (Friesen 2010a).

In this suspension of the continuity of time, the systasis of temporal reality is split up into the various modal aspects, which are distinguished for the first time. But this splitting up is not an ontical reality, but only an intentional one.

We will look in more detail at the meaning of both ‘\textit{systasis}’ and ‘\textit{dis-stasis}.’

1. The meaning of ‘\textit{systasis}’

Like ‘\textit{enstasis},’ ‘\textit{systasis}’ comes from the root meaning “to stand.” So ‘\textit{systasis}’ means “to stand together.” It is used in a political sense to mean “a political union, confederation, or league.” It was used to refer to political unions. In Aristotle’s “Poetics”, the \textit{polis} is a structure or compound (\textit{systasis}). Aristotle also used the term ‘\textit{systasis}’ to refer to combinations of the incidents in the story, the tragedy: \textit{ton pragmaton systasis}. Hannah Arendt comments:

Aristotle holds that the whole universe “is single and eternal, having no beginning and no end of its whole existence, containing and embracing in itself infinite time.” The cosmos itself is equated with holding together all its possible variations (systasis versus the diatheseis). Since these variations occur in bodies (somata), they are limited and therefore changeable. However the whole is prior to its parts and can survive their coming and going that is, their changeability. Aristotle writes, “Prior to Becoming there was always this keeping-together which preceded it and of which we cannot say that it changed, since it never came into being” (Arrendt, 63).

Some of the Church Fathers seem to have used the term ‘\textit{systasis}’ to refer to the world. For example, Dysinger quotes the third century Bartholemeus Angelicus’ On the Properties of Things:

\textit{The world is the natural sustasis that comprises the different and varied bodies of the logikoi, for the knowledge of God} (See Dysinger, citing Bartholemeus Angelicus, III, 36)
A variant reading is

The world is the sustasis of the natures that have been constituted of different bodies and contain different logikoi, for the growth in the knowledge of God.]

In 1605, Francis Bacon used the term in relation to science:

There be also other diversities of methods vulgar and received: as that of resolution or analysis, of constitution or systasis, of concealment or cryptic, &c., which I do allow well of, though I have stood upon those which are least handled and observed. All which I have remembered to this purpose, because I would erect and constitute one general inquiry (which seems to me deficient) touching the wisdom of tradition (Bacon, 174).

In 1852, Sir Thomas Browne used ‘systasis’ in relation to Plato’s view of the soul:

And this also with application unto the soul of man, which hath a double aspect, one right, whereby it beholdeth the body, and objects without; --another circular and reciprocal, whereby it beholdeth itself: The circle declaring the motion of the indivisible soul, simple, according to the divinity of its nature, and returning into itself; the right lines respecting the motion pertaining unto sense and vegetation; and the central decussion, the wondrous connection of the several faculties conjointly in one substance. And so conjoined the unity and duality of the soul, and made out the three substances so much considered by him; that is, the indivisible or divine, the divisible or corporeal, and that third, which was the systasis or harmony of those two, in the mystical decussion (Browne, II, 553).

The use of the word ‘systasis’ in the sense of an integral whole is sometimes attributed to Jean Gebser (1905-1973), who used it to mean “the conjoining or fitting together of parts into integrality” in his book The Ever Present Origin (1985, first published in German as Ursprung und Gegenwart in 1949). Pat Arneson describes Gebser's view of systasis: “Systasis circumscribes all aspects of time which cannot be the object of categorical systematization.” (Arneson, 1993). And yet Dooyeweerd used the word ‘systasis’ more than thirty years before Gebser, in a somewhat similar sense.

Dooyeweerd himself translated Volume III of the WdW. In a footnote (NC III, 36 ft. 1), he says that ‘systasis’ is an obsolete word, but he does not indicate from where he obtained it. He defines it as "the factual immediacy of our internal experience of reality." And it relates to our naïve, enstatic experience of temporal coherence:
…maar het heeft systatisch en en-statichs weet van den zin-samenhang in de
realiteit, zoodat het negatief tegen iedere aftrekking van bepaalde zinfuncties van
die volle zin-volle tijdelijke werkelijkeheid reageert. [Dooyeweerd 1931, 87).

[But [naive pre-theoretical experience] has a systatic and enstatic knowledge of
the coherence of meaning in reality, so that we react negatively to any abstraction
of certain meaning functions from the full meaning-full temporal reality] [my
translation]

But if the word ‘systasis’ was obsolete when Dooyeweerd used it, where was it first used?
Dooyeweerd was familiar with Rudolf Eisler’s Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe, since
Dooyeweerd refers to it at NC I, 150. Eisler refers to Aristotle’s idea of the world as a systasis:
“Nach ARISTOTELES ist die Welt hé tou holou systasis (De coel. I 10, 280 a 21)” (Eisler).

We can get some help from the writings of Dooyeweerd’s brother in law, Dirk Vollenhoven.
Vollenhoven says that ‘systasis’ was used by the Church fathers, particularly Appolinarus:

And his chief concern is to maintain this sovereignty of the higher in every man.
[...] In the doctrine concerning the Saviour, the problem for him is stated thus:
“Can these two sovereign wills work together in the one Mediator?” Coming to
this he seeks refuge in a negative answer: the human sovereign fell out to make
room for the divine Logos, which in turn together with the remaining part of the
systase (that is, after the human sovereign had fallen out of the human “systase”) formed that which he had already called “one physis.” Vollenhoven 1931, 149).

Vollenhoven used the word ‘systasis’ to refer to things, and even to the selfhood (Friesen 2011,
107 fn91). Instead of referring to individuals, Vollenhoven first spoke of ‘systasis’ and later of
‘cosmic unity’ [kosmische eenheid].

In plaats van individu sprak Vollenhoven eerst liever van ‘systasis’ en later van
‘kosmische eenheid’, terwijl P. Verburg er het woord ‘entiteit’ voor invoerde. Het
begrip ‘syn’ in systasis en synthesis duidt op een verbinding. ‘Stasis’ betekent
daarbij een gegeven, en ‘thesis’ een door mensen gemaakte verbinding. In
sytstasis gaat het om een gegeven vertical verbinding van wetskringen tot een
eenheid. Een systasis met een intra- en interfunctionele samenhang noemde
Vollenhoven een ding (Stellingwerff 1992, 78).

[At first, Vollenhoven spoke of ‘systasis instead of ‘individual’ and later he spoke
of ‘cosmic unity.’ P. Verburg introduced the word ‘entity’ for this. The idea ‘syn’
in ‘systasis’ and ‘synthesis’ refers to a relation. ‘Stasis’ refers to a given relation
and ‘thesis’ to a man-made relation. Systasis concerns a given vertical relation of
law-spheres to a unity. Vollenhoven called a systasis with both an intra- and inter-
functional coherence a ‘thing’] [my translation].
Stellingwerff cites Vollenhoven from a 1928 note:

’N Getal is dus niet een ding: het voldoet niet aan den eisch een systase te zijn. Daarentegen kan een cirkel wel een ding zijn. Ten eerste is een cirkel een systase.

[A number is therefore not a thing: it does not satisfy the requirement of being a systasis. In contrast, a circle can certainly be a thing. First, a circle is a systasis]

[my translation]

But Dooyeweerd never refers to a thing as a ‘systasis.’ For that he developed the term ‘individuality structure.’ And Dooyeweerd certainly did not refer to the selfhood as a systasis. For Dooyeweerd, the systasis of temporal reality is not the same as enstasis. He emphasizes that our selfhood is supratemporal, and is not found in the cosmic temporal meaning-systasis (WdW II, 400; NC II, 467).

In a 1921 article, Vollenhoven said that one should take systasis into account when it comes to synthesis; a connection concluded in the subjective realm must somehow correspond to a systasis in the objective realm. And in 1930, he said

When I also want to give account of this two-sided connection, I call this with a number of reciprocally retrocipating and anticipating functions a ‘systasis.’ Every this that has a right to the name ‘subject unit’ also has a right to the name ‘systasis.’ But with ‘systasis’ such a this is denoted more in its concreteness, namely with its retrocipatory and anticipatory connections, than it is with the first term (Vollenhoven 1930, 36-37).

One of Dooyeweerd's first references to ‘systasis’ is in his 1928 article “Het juridisch causaliteitsprobleem in 't licht der Wetsidee” (Excerpts in Verburg 115). He says that our knowledge depends on analysis and synthesis; it is no “resting systasis.” Systasis is therefore related to rest and not movement.

In De Crisis der Humanistische Staatsleer, Dooyeweerd refers to the systasis of meaning functions. It is “an organic, unbreakable coherence of meaning.” He asks how synthesis relates to systasis. He also says that the synthesis of meaning is founded in the systasis of meaning, and not the other way around (pp. 102-103, cited Verburg 143). He says there that systasis is related to our naïve, pre-theoretical experience (Dooyeweerd 1931).

In “De Theorie van de Bronnen van het Stellig Recht in het licht der Wetsidee” (1932) he says,
Alle zin-zijden der tijdelijke werkelijkheid (ook de logische) zijn nu een zin-breking in den tijd van de boventijdelijke creatuurlijke religieuze zin-volheid naar wets-en subjectszijde. In het licht dezer wetsidee, die den wortel aller zin-zijden der werkelijkheid inderdaad boven den tijd zoekt moeten deze zin-zijden wezenlijk als wetskringen worden erkend, die naar hun functioneelen grondzin soeverein in eigen kring, door de kosmische tijdsorde in zin-systase zijn verbonden en juist daardoor in hun functioneelen zinsverband met alle andere wetskringen is gewaarborgd.

[All meaning-sides of temporal reality (including the logical) are a refraction of meaning in time from the supratemporal creaturely religious fullness of meaning into law-side and subject side. In the light of this law-Idea, which seeks the root of all meaning-sides of reality above time, these meaning-sides must really be acknowledged as law-spheres, which, sovereign in their own sphere according to their functional ground-meaning, are bound together in the cosmic order of time in a systasis of meaning, and through this their functional relation of meaning with all other law-spheres is guaranteed]. [my translation]

The systasis is the temporal coherence into which we have been “fitted.”

In his last article (1975a), Dooyeweerd says:

In the Prolegomena of the transcendental critique of the theoretical attitude of thought and experience, I have remarked that in the subject-object relations of naïve attitude of thought and experience, empirical reality is understood as it gives itself, that is to say in the continuous systatic coherence and relatedness of its modal aspects within cosmic time (Dooyeweerd 1975a, 91)

and

The ontical systasis of the modal functions of an individual entity does not at all guarantee a pre-theoretic conceptual insight into the modal structures of the different aspects, as Strauss thinks. To the contrary, it conceals them to the [pre-theoretical] analytical view that is still enstatically bound to concrete entities (Dooyeweerd 1975a, 92).

and

And we have already seen that the ontical systasis in which the modal aspects are implicitly given in the pre-theoretical experience does not at all effect an implicit conceptual knowledge of them; on the contrary, the discontinuity of the modal meaning of these aspects is concealed [verhult] in the pre-theoretical manner of making analytical distinctions (Dooyeweerd 1975, 98).

Thus, Dooyeweerd continued to emphasize the importance of the ideas of enstasis and systasis right up to the end of his life. In this last article, he mentions how our pre-theoretical experience
is still enstatically bound to concrete entities. The enstatic character of pre-theoretical experience means that we are wholly set within concrete reality. This is in contrast to the theoretical Gegenstand-relation, where our supratemporal selfhood enters into its temporal functions, and where the systatic coherence of temporal reality is split apart into a dis-stasis.

2. Theoretical dis-stasis

In naïve experience, we experience the systasis of temporal reality. We experience the continuity of cosmic time (NC II, 4). We do not distinguish the aspects of our experience, but rather experience concrete things and their relations (WdW I, 46, 60).

But in theory, the continuity of time is broken up into a discontinuity. Instead of there being a given fittedness or “instelling” within cosmic time, there is a setting apart, an “uiteen-stelling.” Instead of cosmic consciousness, we have “cosmological consciousness”—that is, we become aware of the modal aspects:

In the transcendental temporal direction of theoretical intuition, our selfhood becomes cosmologically conscious of itself in the temporal coherence and diversity of all its modal functions (NC II, 473, italics Dooyeweerd's).

Having become aware of the different modal aspects, we then make the aspects “cosmically our own” (NC II, 474). Again, we have the idea of experiencing something as “our own.” But this time, it is in relation to the theoretically distinguished aspects, and not to the coherent experience of temporal reality in an unarticulated way. And yet Dooyeweerd says that this making the aspects “our own” is not itself theoretical

But theoretical insight, originating from antithetical disjunctive thought, and reading the disclosed and opened modal aspect as its “Gegenstand” cannot itself reveal this modality to us as our own. The true datum is never that which has been merely theoretically read. Only as the disclosure, opening, and theoretical deepening of the real datum in pre-theoretical conscious ‘Erleben’, is theoretical insight [in-zicht] possible (NC II, 475).

Thus, the making of the modal aspects as our own is the result of a deepened naïve experience. Naïve experience is deepened by our theoretical knowledge. Deepening is related to Dooyeweerd’s distinction between concept and Idea, which is in turn related to the distinction to
the anticipations and analogies [retrocipations] in the law-spheres:

Van den generalen zin van iederen wetskring kunnen wij zoo in het later te bespreken zin-synthetisch denken een begrip en een idee winnen. Het begrip vat de zinstructuur in “restrictieve functie,” d.w.z. alleen den nog niet verdiepten, nog niet ontsloten zin, den systatiscnen samenhang van zijn kern en zijn analogieën. De idee daarentegen vat de zin-structuur in “expansieve” of “verdiepte functie,” in de ontsluiting zijner “anticipatiesferen” (Dooyeweerd 1931, 95-96).

[Through what we shall later call meaning-synthetic thought, we can obtain a concept and an idea from the general meaning of each law-sphere. The concept grasps the meaning-structure in its “restrictive function,” i.e. only in its not yet deepened, not yet disclosed meaning. This is in the systatic coherence of the kernel and its analogies. In contrast, the Idea grasps the meaning structure in its “expansive” or “deepened function,” in the disclosing of its anticipatory spheres.] [my translation]

Concepts thus are retrocipatory. They relate to things and individuality structures (Friesen 2009, Thesis 85 and references). Ideas deepen the meaning structure by disclosing the anticipatory spheres. These anticipations point forward to the supratemporal fulfillment of meaning.

As long as we conceive things in concrete structures without theoretical reflection, our attitude towards them is naïve (NC III, 31). Dooyeweerd contrasts the special sciences with “a bare enstasis” [“de zich bloot in de werkelijkheid instellende denkhouding der naieve ervaring”] (WdW I, 49). Elsewhere, Dooyeweerd speaks about a bare [bloot] "falling back" into the naïve attitude, the experience that accepts things as given in their indivisible unity of creation without an explicated distinguishing of their aspects (WdW I, 60). That would be a return to naïve experience without deepening.

When the epoché of theoretical thought is cancelled, we fall back into the enstatic intuitive attitude of naïve experience (NC II, 482). By “falling back” he also means that we return to the foundational direction:

Theoretical intuition, actualized in synthetical thought, is no more detached from pre-theoretical intuition, operative in enstatic thought, than the transcendental direction in the cosmic order of time is detached from the foundational direction. In the inter-modal synthesis and analytical disjunction of the modal aspects of experience our theoretical intuition is actualized in synthetical thought as insight. It can only be understood as a deepening of pre-theoretical intuition, to which it
must always refer in the foundational direction of time (NC II, 479; Cf. WdW II, 414)

Thus, there is a return to enstasis. There is first a movement in the transcendental direction in theory and then we fall back into the foundational direction. But the return is a deepened naïve experience. There is a kind of spiraling back and forth, an ever-deepening. A good phrase to describe this is Abhishiktananda's phrase, “Ascent to the depths of the heart” (Le Saux, 1986).

Theory is dis-continuous; it abstracts from the continuity of cosmic time (WdW I, 72; II, 402-403). Dis-stasis results in dis-continuity. Dis-stasis is the “analytical dissociation of our experience in its different modal aspects” (Dooyeweerd 1968, 126). It is in theory that we distinguish the modal aspects. This is the gain or “deepening” achieved by theoretical thought. Dooyeweerd also says this in the 1946 edition of the Encyclopedia of Legal Science:

> The gain of scientific thought as compared to naïve experience is that it obtains for us an articulated knowledge of the particular law-spheres, and of their particular conformity to law (wetmatigheid) (p. 9).

Theory is the abstraction from the full systasis of meaning (NC II, 431). In this abstraction, there is a dis-stasis, a setting apart of the modal aspects. But that splitting apart is only epistemological and not ontical. The real datum is the systatic coherence of meaning, not what has been theoretically isolated or abstracted (NC II, 433).

For Dooyeweerd, enstasis is the pre-theoretical way that our selfhood relates to and enters into the temporal. We have seen how enstasis is a cosmic consciousness, the relation of our supratemporal selfhood to the temporal systasis. But there is another way that we enter into the temporal, and that is by theoretical thought, by means of the Gegenstand-relation. For as Dooyeweerd emphasizes, the Gegenstand-relation is the entry of our supratemporal selfhood into its temporal functions:

> The meaning synthesis of scientific thought is first made possible when our self-consciousness, which as our selfhood is elevated above time, enters into its temporal meaning functions (Dooyeweerd 1946).

Since there is a difference between pre-theoretical and theoretical experience, our theoretical entering of our selfhood into cosmic time must be different than our naïve or pre-theoretical
entry into time.

a) The Gegenstand-Relation

I have written about the Gegenstand-relation in more detail elsewhere (Friesen 2009). And in my first article on Dooyeweerd (Friesen 2003a), I compared the views of theory and the Gegenstand-relation of Dooyeweerd and Baader. Susini says that for Baader, our theory requires a movement outwards, and this requires an act of imagination, which is a movement from enstasis to ek-stasis (Susini I, 378, 379). This is a temporary movement into the temporal, a voluntary descent that is done for the sake of helping to redeem the temporal (Cf. Gunning’s idea of “self-sacrifice” in science; Friesen 2011, 182-83). Dooyeweerd also sees theory as moving from out of our resting enstasis, and he also links theory to imagination; that is why the theoretical setting apart is not ontical, but merely intentional (Friesen 2006b). And Dooyeweerd also emphasizes that we cannot stay in this theoretical attitude of dis-stasis, but must return by means of synthesis to the unity of our selfhood. Dooyeweerd also emphasizes that we participate in the redemption of the world (Friesen 2009, Thesis 75 and references). But he does not refer to the theoretical Gegenstand-relation as an ecstasis. Baader’s philosophy is therefore helpful in showing how Dooyeweerd’s ideas of theory fit together with these other ideas.

Dooyeweerd emphasizes that in the theoretical Gegenstand-relation, we set our act of knowing over-against the Gegenstand that we are investigating. This ‘setting over-against’ [tegenoverstellen] has been improperly translated as ‘opposed to,’ which gives it an incorrect logical connotation.

From whom did Dooyeweerd get this idea of theoretical thought as a setting over-against? Woltjer emphasizes that our knowing consciousness stands within the world. And we set our whole knowing being, our selfhood, over against the world:

Wij stellen echter ook geheel ons kennend wezen, ons *ik* met inbegrip onzer gewaarwordingsvoorstellingen en begrippen als subject tegenover de wereld buiten ons als object. Waar we zoó de tegenstelling nemen, kan de idee het subjectieve, het reëele het objectieve genoemd worden (Woltjer 1896, 45)

[We really set our whole knowing being, our *self* including our perceived representations and concepts as subject over-against the world outside of us as
object. If we act in such an over-against way, the idea can be called subjective, and the real may be called objective.]

In support of this idea, Woltjer refers to Heinrich Rickert’s *Die Grenzen der naturowissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung* (Freiburg 1896, 168ff). Rickert sees the whole man, both body and soul as the subject. Dooyeweerd was also familiar with Rickert’s work. But Dooyeweerd said it was only our act of knowing, and not our entire Selfhood that is set over-against the *Gegenstand*. Our deepened analytical function of consciousness frees itself from being merely fitted into temporal reality, and sets itself over against the other functions:

Het is niets dan de anticipeerende (daarom steeds door den zin der historische ontwikkeling geleide) verdieping, de zin-ontplooing van het naieve syn-systatisch denken, dat zelve nog traag hangt aan zijn zinsverband met de psychische zinnelijkheid. De zin-synthesis is in de zin-systasis gefundeeerd, niet omgekeerd! In het zin-synthetisch denken bevrijdt de verdiepte analytische bewustzijnsfunctie zich van een bloot ingesteld zijn in de volle tijdelijke werkelijkheid: het stelt zich de ter kennis gegeven a-logische zin-functies tegenover, het wordt “gegenständlich.” Dit tegenovergestelde, dit probleem der kennis, kan niet de kosmische realiteit zelve zijn. Want onze analytische denkfunctie is zelve systatisch in de realiteit gevlochten en blijft zulks ook in haar verdiepte, theoretische werkzamheid (Dooyeweerd 1931, 102).

[It is nothing other than the anticipatory (therefore always led by the meaning of historical development) deepening, the unfolding of meaning of naïve syn-systatic thought, which itself still remains inert in its meaning relation with psychical sensation. Meaning synthesis is founded in the meaning-systasis, and not the other way around! In meaning-synthetical thought, the analytical function of consciousness frees itself from being merely fitted into full temporal reality: it sets itself over against the a-logical meaning functions that are given for knowledge; it becomes “gegenständlich.” What it is set over-against, this problem for knowledge cannot be cosmic reality itself. For our analytical function of thought it itself systatically interwoven in this reality and remains so even in its deepened, theoretical activity.] [My translation]

Scheler also speaks of setting our consciousness over-against the world. He again contrasts this human ability with animals that live in momentary ekstasis, caught by various instinctual drives.

Erst der Mensch stellt sich und sein “Selbstbewusstsein” der Welt gegenüber; in ihm erst scheiden sich gegenständliche Umwelt und das Ich-Selbst (Scheler 1976, 99).
Dooyeweerd emphasizes that it is not just the analytical function that is set over-against what is to be known, but our entire act of knowing (Dooyeweerd 1975a). And he also says that even the logical aspect itself can be investigated as a Gegenstand of this act of thought. Dooyeweerd says that that Kant and his followers opposed the logical function to the other modal aspects of the integral act of thought.

The only, but fundamental, mistake in their argument was the identification of the real act with a purely psychical temporal event, which in its turn could become a ‘Gegenstand’ of the ultimate transcendental-logical ‘cogito’ (NC I, 50).

Kant’s mistake was trying to find the starting point for synthesis in the antithetical relation itself (NC I, 54). In other words, Kant took the theoretical antithesis as fundamental or ontical. Kant did not take into account the synthesis with the supratemporal self of that which has been set apart in theory. The selfhood must also be the starting point for theory.

Dooyeweerd emphasizes that the Gegenstand-relation does not result in an ontical distinction, but only an “intentional” one. In his last article, Dooyeweerd emphasizes how reformational philosophy has failed to distinguish between the ontical nature of systasis and the merely intentional nature of theoretical dis-stasis and subsequent synthesis (Dooyeweerd 1975a).

A similar view was expressed by the psychologist Egon Brunswik in 1934:

... der Intentionalität steht in engem Zusammenhang mit der Grundauflösung, daß das intentionale Verhältnis zum Gegenstand ein symbolisches sei, das als nicht ontisch-reale …(Brunswik 1934)

[...Intentionality stands in closest relation with the basic view that the intentional relation to the Gegenstand is a symbolical one and not an ontic-real one…]  

I have elsewhere discussed Dooyeweerd’s meaning of ‘intentionality” and how it is not to be understood in Husserl’s sense of the term (Friesen 2003a).

In contrast to theoretical thought, our naïve thought does not set itself over-against any “opposite” and does not perform any inter-modal theoretical synthesis. It is operative in the full temporal reality in enstasis (WdW II, 401; NC II, 468). Theoretical thought, in its “deepening” of
naïve experience, distinguishes the modal aspects for the first time. And it also finds the analogies (anticipations and retrocipations) among those modal aspects.

We are able to find analogies within the temporal world because there is a correspondence between the higher realm of our selfhood and the lower realm of the temporal cosmos. There are analogies between the modes of our consciousness and the modes in which temporal reality functions. Within our central selfhood, all modes of consciousness coincide in a radical unity. In cosmic time, these modes are split up into various modes. Each mode has sphere sovereignty, which is related to its kernel meaning within the central selfhood. But each mode also has sphere universality in that it has analogies in time to all of the other modes.

That is why the Gegenstand-relation of theory works, where we set our act of knowing over against that part of temporal reality that we are investigating. Our act of knowing is qualified by the analytical mode, but as an act, it participates in all of the modes of consciousness. Due to sphere universality, our act of knowing contains within itself analogies of all of the modes; theory opens up these other modes in our act of knowing itself. Then by setting that act of knowing over against temporal reality, we discover these analogies within temporal reality itself. This opens up or deepens our naïve experience of temporal reality.

Many writers have rejected Dooyeweerd’s Gegenstand-relation, and have replaced it with a view of abstraction of the universal from the particular. In my view, this removes the heart from Dooyeweerd’s view of theory, and trivializes it with a view of theory that is indistinguishable from many other philosophers. It results in a “flatland” and totally temporalized view of humanity (Friesen 2010a).

b) Enstasis is not synthesis

Dooyeweerd opposes enstasis to synthesis.

De naïve, vóór-theoretische ervaring is en-statisch, niet synthetisch in de volle tijdelijke werkelijkheid met al hare in de kosmische tijdsorde samengevlochten zinzijden, zoowel natuururlijke als geestelijke, ingesteld en komt intuitief in verzet tegen iedere poging van het verabsoluteerd synthetisch denken, om haar

19 Dooyeweerd himself uses ‘higher’ and ‘lower.’ And because the lower is the expression or revelation of the higher, the distinction does not entail a dualism.
een of meer zin-zijden harer werkelijkheid te ontrooven (Dooyeweerd 1931, 87).

[Naïve, pre-theoretical experience is fitted enstatically, not synthetically in the experience of full temporal reality with all its meaning sides woven together in the cosmic order of time, both the natural as well as the spiritual sides. And it intuitively resists every effort of absolutized synthetic thought to try to rob it of one or more meaning-sides of its reality]

Dooyeweerd repeats elsewhere this idea that naïve experience, as conscious Hineinleben, is different from the meaning-synthesis of theoretical thought:

This conscious ‘Erleben’ or ‘Hineinleben’ into reality primarily unfolds itself in the integral experience of temporal reality to which any kind of theoretical meaning-synthesis is still alien (NC II, 474; Cf. WdW II, 409).

Theoretical synthesis presupposes the previous enstatic-systatic thought:

Synthetical thought pre-supposes enstatic-systatic thought, with which it should never come into conflict (NC III, 46).

Synthesis of meaning is accomplished by our theoretical intuition, which provides the link between our theoretical dis-stasis and the enstatic (and ontical) relation of our selfhood. Theoretical intuition is actualized in synthetical thought (NC II, 479). In other words, our epistemological distinctions must not be seen as corresponding to ontical distinctions, and we must return to the equilibrium of our naïve, enstatic experience if we are to avoid absolutization.

Synthesis is a relation of the intermodal synthesis to the transcendent identity of the modal functions that we experience in our selfhood: “I implicitly relate the intermodal meaning-synthesis to the transcendent identity of the modal functions I experience in the religious root of my existence” (NC II, 479). This implicit relation is made explicit by the transcendental Idea (of Origin, Totality and coherence). Only by Ideas does our selfhood become cosmologically conscious of itself in its intuitive reflection (NC II, 479).

III. Conclusion

An examination of Dooyeweerd’s use of ‘enstasis’ and related words and ideas helps us to place his philosophy within an existing philosophical tradition that includes Max Scheler, Franz von Baader, and further back, some Church Fathers. This tradition emphasizes the importance of spiritual experience more than a rationalistic preoccupation with propositional beliefs. The
history of these ideas illuminates not only Dooyeweerd’s views of theoretical and pre-theoretical experience, but it also helps us in understanding current studies of religious experience in general.

Contrary to the opinion of most scholars of religious studies today, the term ‘enstasis’ was not coined by Mircea Eliade. The term ‘enstasis’ goes back at least to the work of H.E.G. Paulus (1761-1851). Paulus contrasted enstasis with ekstasis, and this contrast continued in almost all subsequent discussion. But Paulus used ‘enstasis’ in a restrictive way that attempted to rationally explain religious experience. Subsequent Catholic writers such as Abbé Jean Hermann challenged this idea, but continued to use the term ‘enstasis.’ Franz von Baader wrote extensively on ecstasy or ekstasis, contrasting it with ‘true stasis.’ In the 1920’s and 30’s, there was a revival of interest in Baader. There was also an exploration of yogic states by Catholic writers like Olivier Lacombe, Jacques Maritain and Jules Monchanin. They revived some of the early meanings of ‘enstasis.’ Eliade was aware of some of these Catholic sources, and it is likely that he relied on them in formulating his own ideas. Other scholars like W.T. Stace and R.C. Zaehner used ‘enstasis’ in relation to Jung’s ideas of introversion. But they seem unaware that Jung’s ideas of introversion and extraversion derive from Baader, and involve issues of how our selfhood relates to temporal reality. Indeed, the influence of Baader cannot be overestimated. Baader influenced not only Dooyeweerd, but many of the other philosophers and theologians that we have discussed. In varying degrees, Baader influenced Goethe, Schelling, J.H. Gunning, Jr., Daniël Chantepie de la Saussaye, Abraham Kuyper, Eduard von Hartmann, Wilhelm Wundt, A.H. De Hartog, Max Scheler, C.G. Jung, Hans Urs von Balthasar, Valentin Tomberg and Mircea Eliade. And insofar as Baader preserved and made known the writings of Meister Eckhart and Jakob Boehme, he influenced many more philosophers and theologians, including Kierkegaard, Frederik van Eeden and Paul Tillich, to name only a few.

This does not mean that these authors all used these terms in the same way. But almost all of them (at least after H.E.G. Paulus) used the term ‘enstasis’ in a way that assumes a distinction between our outward temporal reality and the inward reality of the Self.

Dooyeweerd sees enstasis as the relation between our supratemporal selfhood and the temporal world. Our selfhood has a world that it can enter, and in which it expresses itself, must as God
expresses Himself in His creation. *Enstasis* is the immediacy of our internal experience of temporal reality. It is the experience of temporal reality as “our own,” and this experience of temporal reality in its temporal coherence is a “cosmic consciousness.” Following Scheler, Dooyeweerd contrasts our selfhood’s ability to enter into temporal cosmic reality animals who are ex-statically lost in time; they have no supratemporal selfhood, and hence do not enter into a world.

Dooyeweerd does not use ‘enstasy’ in the sense of a pure consciousness that is unrelated to the temporal world. Nor does he say that enstasy is beyond logical distinctions; he allows for a naïve form of concepts, although these are restricted to observing individuality structures (things) and their relations. Thus, Dooyeweerd’s use of ‘enstasis’ differs form those who see enstasis as a totally inward movement unrelated to the temporal. And yet Dooyeweerd does mention the importance of the inward movement, of innerness, of “in-sight” and of religious self-reflection, the experience of totality in which all aspects of our consciousness coincide in a radical unity. And Dooyeweerd appreciated the “meditative” works of Kuyper, which emphasize our central heart.

Dooyeweerd also distinguished between enstasy and ecstasy. Dooyeweerd says that sometimes the radiance of eternity penetrates our temporal world. He does not call this ‘ecstasy,’ but it is similar to Baader’s idea of the ‘Silberblick,’ in which we for a time recover our true stasis, or “*wahre Stasis*.” Baader emphasizes that in this fallen world, we are already displaced, standing “outside of” our true nature. Thus, many of our temporal experiences, although they sometimes seem to be ecstasies, are memories and retrocipations of our original state, or anticipations of our future true state. Dooyeweerd, too refers to the anticipatory and the retrocipatory, the foundational and transcendental directions of our experience.

Unlike Baader, Dooyeweerd does not relate *ekstasis* and true *stasis* to the paranormal. But all the elements relied on by Baader are present in Dooyeweerd’s thought. These include the idea that our body is an expression of our supratemporal selfhood, and that our selfhood is in the heavens, in contrast to “earthly” temporal reality. And he shares the idea that temporal reality seeks its root and existence in this supratemporal selfhood. Dooyeweerd adopts the distinction between supratemporal central and peripheral, which is related to the distinction between supratemporal
and temporal. He emphasizes the importance of imagination, which is linked to our being created in the image of God. And he shares the idea that our supratemporal selfhood survives death, and that our selfhood gives us a central intuitive beholding [Schauen, schouwen]; sometimes the light of eternity breaks through and illuminates everything temporal. Dooyeweerd also rejects any pietistic spiritualizing that seeks to repudiate nature. As we participate in Christ we attain divine sonship. Dooyeweerd also appreciated the meditative works of Kuyper, and Kuyper held that the miracles of Christ are examples of what redeemed humanity can do. What is often considered paranormal is really the true normal.

For Dooyeweerd, enstasis is related to systasis, the idea of a systematic coherence found in our temporal reality. Contemporary religious studies is wrong in supposing that Jean Gebser coined the term ‘systasis.’ Systasis is not a system that we impose on reality, but one that is given to us prior to theory. For Dooyeweerd, the word ‘systasis’ refers to the coherence of the temporal aspects of consciousness. Our selfhood is not a systasis, but goes beyond temporal reality and its systasis. Enstasis is the relation of our selfhood to that systasis.

Enstasis is also related to the idea of naïve experience. While ‘naïve’ is often used in a negative way, it was used positively by a certain aesthetic and romantic appreciation of what is childlike. This romanticism opposed a rationalistic atomization of our experience. Instead, what it sought was wholeness and totality.

Dooyeweerd did not believe that everyone shares the same pre-theoretical experience. Without the proper religious ground-motive, we do not see temporal reality correctly. True enstatic experience must be achieved, although not in a theoretical way. For Eliade, it is achieved by meditation. For Dooyeweerd, it involves religious self-reflection, and a conscious lived experience. Such self-reflection is not a matter of beliefs or theoretical presuppositions. But improper beliefs and presuppositions can get in the way of, or impair our correct relation with temporal reality. In particular, the belief that we are totally temporal beings will result in our inability to have a true experience of reality, whether of our self, of the world, or of God.

A review of the history of these terms, as well as of the related ideas of ‘Hineinleben,’ religious self-reflection, cosmic consciousness, and intuition helps us to understand the nature of
experience that is prior to all theorizing about that experience. Of course, our discussion of these terms and ideas is itself theoretical, but it “points to” and attempts to “give an account of” a state of consciousness that we already know, a state that is pre-theoretical, a state that is foundational for all subsequent theoretical thought. For Dooyeweerd, true Christian philosophy i “gives an account of” the relation between our supratemporal selfhood and its temporal expression in our body, our mantle of functions ['functiemantel'].

For Dooyeweerd, enstasis therefore relates to our pre-theoretical experience, and is contrasted with theoretical thought. Naïve thought does not set its logical function over-against any “opposite” and does not perform any inter-modal theoretical synthesis. It is operative in full temporal reality in enstasis (WdW II, 401; NC II, 468). Theoretical experience involves dis-stasis. Dis-stasis is the suspension (epoché) of the temporal coherence of systasis, a refraining from the fullness of the selfhood. It occurs in the theoretical Gegenstand-relation, where the act of thought of our supratemporal selfhood is set over-against [gegenüber or tegenover] our temporal functions. In this dis-stasis, the modal aspects of consciousness are split apart. This splitting apart is merely epistemological and not ontical. In theory, we move out of the resting enstasy of naïve experience. Unlike Baader, Dooyeweerd does not use the word ‘ec-stasis’ to characterize this movement out of enstasy, but the idea is there as a movement out of rest.

Following the theoretical dis-stasis, we need to return to the state of enstasis by means of our intuition, which relates our theoretical thought back to our supratemporal selfhood. If we do not do that, then we absolutize temporal reality. The dualistic belief between body and soul arises because of the mistaken belief that our moving from out of our selfhood corresponds to a real separation. We fall into apostasy or apo-stasis, the standing away from our center. Through redemption in Christ, we are enabled to stand again, ana-stasis, in relation to our supratemporal center, both as a present resurrection experience, and as a future anastasis [resurrection] after death when we leave behind our present temporal mantle of functions. Dooyeweerd implies that we will in the afterlife continue to express ourselves, but within a fulfilled body. He considers any further discussion of what that afterlife is like to be speculative. But it is not speculative to discuss our present supratemporal selfhood, and its enstatic relation to the temporal systasis of individuality structures.
Why has so little attention been paid to the history of the idea of *enstasis* and its related ideas? I believe this is because these ideas necessarily involve Dooyeweerd’s idea of our supratemporal selfhood, which most reformational philosophers have rejected. The relation of ‘*enstasis*’ to the idea of the supratemporal selfhood also explains why the idea of *enstasis* does not seem to appear in Dooyeweerd’s writings until after he introduced the idea of ‘cosmic time,’ and of how our supratemporal selfhood transcends cosmic time.

Dooyeweerd’s use of ‘*enstasis*’ cannot be understood if we do not acknowledge the supratemporality of our selfhood, which involves entering into temporal reality. Humans are the only beings with a supratemporal center, and that is why humans are the only beings capable of this enstatic entry into temporal reality; other creatures are “ex-statically lost in time.” In religious self-reflection, we recognize that we are both temporal and supratemporal beings. We are “fitted into” the temporal world along with other temporal creatures, and we experience the continuity of cosmic time and have a “cosmic consciousness.”

While theological disagreements can explain reformational philosophy’s reluctance to explore the meaning of ‘*enstasis*,’ it is harder to explain why religious studies in general has not bothered to research the history of the term, but has mistakenly attributed it to Mircea Eliade. Perhaps the Roman Catholic origins of the idea are uncomfortable for scholars preferring to find meaning in non-Western religions. In this respect, Jung was certainly correct in his view that our own Western tradition has everything within it that is required for our individuation, and for our relation to supratemporal totality. Comparisons to other traditions may still be useful to compare or contrast our own experience. But the experience of enstasy can be found within western traditions, including the Christian theosophical tradition in Boehme, Baader, Kuyper’s neo-Calvinism and Dooyeweerd.
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