

Imagination, Image of God and Wisdom of God: Theosophical Themes in Dooyeweerd's Philosophy

by

Dr. J. Glenn Friesen

© 2006

Introduction

The Dutch Christian philosopher Herman Dooyeweerd (1894-1977) is more relevant today than ever before. Postmodernism is questioning the validity of modernism's rationalistic and dualistic thought. It attempts to fully temporalize all of humanity's existence and concerns, and it rejects any role of the transcendent. And in its emphasis on our historical constructs of reality, postmodernism has relativized all values, leaving both our everyday praxis and our theoretical thought without any foundations. Postmodernism is acutely aware of this lack of foundations. A key postmodern theme has been the discovery of what many call a post-critical (or post-liberal) position concerning the possibility of a re-enchantment of life and of the cosmos, based, in part, on a hermeneutics of retrieval. But just what is it that postmodernism is seeking to retrieve? And how do we re-enchant our world after the devastation to the foundations caused by the hermeneutics of suspicion?

I believe that Dooyeweerd's philosophy, and in particular his ideas of imagination, help us to answer these questions. For Dooyeweerd, our acts of imagination do not only play a role in our aesthetic and artistic creations. Imagination is also fundamental to our act of perceiving the world, and to both our pre-theoretical and our theoretical knowledge. In our acts of imagination, we retrieve the wisdom of the past, a wisdom that reflects God's Wisdom or *Sophia*. This is therefore an answer to one problem posed by postmodernism. Our acts of imagination are also involved in our cultural formation of the world—when we realize and form that which has previously existed only as “figure” and not as reality. In our acts of imagination we find the figure, and in our cultural formation, we literally realize the figure, making the temporal world real in its fullest sense. Is this not the re-

enchantment of the world that postmodernism is seeking? Dooyeweerd himself speaks of a ‘spiritualizing-through’ [*doorgeestelijking*] of temporal reality, and of man’s purpose to illuminate from within [*doorlichten*] all of temporal reality so that the supratemporal fullness of meaning shines through it (see discussion below).

Like postmodern philosophers, Dooyeweerd also opposes the rationalism of modernism and its various dualisms. He rejects the modernist dualism between a material body and rational soul, and the rationalism at the basis of such a dualism. Dooyeweerd also rejects the irrationalism that results from inverting such a dualism in order to elevate the body (or feelings, or aesthetics) over rationality. And he vigorously opposes any other dualisms where one aspect of temporal creation is elevated over the other aspects. He rejects even the idea of substance, since it is an improper absolutization of the physical aspect of our experience.

Dooyeweerd’s understanding of perception is one of his most astounding ways of overcoming dualism. He rejects the empirical and phenomenological assumptions of a dualism between an independent observing subject and an independent object. Our experience is not of independent things, but of “individuality structures” that depend on man for their full realization and individuality. And the process of perception is a subject-object relation that occurs within the modal aspects of temporal reality, in a nondual act of perception.

But Dooyeweerd’s opposition to modernism and to dualism does not mean that Dooyeweerd is a postmodernist. For, in contrast to postmodernism, Dooyeweerd maintains the importance of the transcendent, especially of our supratemporal selfhood and of its relation to the temporal cosmos. And he maintains the importance of God’s law, both in its central supratemporal form of love and in its temporal diversity, a law that provides the foundation for our existence, experience and theoretical thought. Dooyeweerd’s law-Idea [*Wetsidee*], together with his Ideas of cosmic time and the supratemporal selfhood, form the basis of his philosophy. I will compare this law-Idea to the idea of God’s Wisdom or *Sophia*.

Dooyeweerd distinguishes God's eternity from the supratemporal *aevum* or created eternity.¹ And both eternity and *aevum* are distinguished from the cosmic time of our world. Our selfhood is supratemporal, but we are also "fitted into" temporal reality by our temporal body or what Dooyeweerd calls our 'mantle of functions' [*functiemantel*]. I will discuss this in more detail. But in making this distinction between selfhood and temporal mantle, Dooyeweerd is not introducing another dualism. Our selfhood is not one of our temporal functions. It is not, for example, merely our rational function. It is the supratemporal center, or heart, out of which all of our temporal functions proceed and are expressed.²

Dooyeweerd says that a proper understanding of our supratemporal selfhood is tied to proper knowledge of God (eternity) and of the temporal cosmos (cosmic time). We cannot understand God, self or cosmos except in an interrelated way.

Dooyeweerd's emphasis on our supratemporal selfhood is a kind of mysticism. It is not a mysticism of identity with God, or any kind of pantheistic mysticism. It is a nondual mysticism, emphasizing our total dependence on God. We are "from, through, and to" God as our Origin.³ (*NC* I, 9). Although the correspondence is not exact, I have compared this to panentheism.

Nor is Dooyeweerd's mysticism to be interpreted as a spiritualizing flight from the world. Although our world is fallen, broken, and in need of redemption, we should not seek to escape from it. Rather, our task is to assist in the working out of its redemption, for this is the purpose for which we were created. As we shall see, this emphasis fits with

¹ Herman Dooyeweerd: "Het tijdsprobleem en zijn antinomieën," *Philosophia Reformata* 1 (1936) 65-83, 4 (1939) 1-28, at 4-5. See Linked Glossary, entry for 'aevum,' online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Aevum.html>].

² See J. Glenn Friesen: "Monism, Dualism, Nondualism: A Problem with Vollenhoven's Problem-Historical Method," (2005), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Method.html>] ['Method'].

³ Herman Dooyeweerd: *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1997; Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1969; first published 1953), I, 9 ['NC']. This was a translation and revision of *De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee*, (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1935-36) ['*WdW*'].

theosophy's emphasis on discovering the structures within temporal reality instead of escaping from temporal reality.

Dooyeweerd criticizes modernism by (1) transcendent criticism from his own perspective (2) immanent criticism, showing modernism's internal inconsistencies and dualisms, even based on its own assumptions and (3) a transcendental critique based on the conditions that make possible any kind of theoretical thought.

But Dooyeweerd's transcendental critique depends on his view that every philosophy needs to account for itself in terms of three transcendental Ideas: the Ideas of (a) Origin, (b) totality, (c) and temporal coherence. From a Christian perspective, these three transcendental Ideas correspond to (a) God (as Origin), (b) selfhood (as supratemporal religious root, fallen and redeemed in Christ the New Root, in Whom we participate), and (c) cosmos (for Dooyeweerd, cosmos is only the temporal part of creation).

To the extent that postmodernism has given up seeking to answer these three transcendental questions, Dooyeweerd's transcendental critique of postmodernism will not be convincing. Many postmodernists deny not only any need to discuss an origin, but also deny any idea of totality, especially a supratemporal totality like Dooyeweerd's view of the selfhood. Indeed, much of postmodernism denies any identity of the selfhood at all, preferring to see it as a construct of many diverse and fragmented experiences. But perhaps some postmodernists will be willing to look at these issues again in the light of Dooyeweerd's views on imagination.

Dooyeweerd's transcendental critique should not be rejected merely because his requirement of providing these three transcendental Ideas makes his argument circular. Dooyeweerd's argument is circular, but it is not a circularity of mere concepts or theoretical presuppositions. Dooyeweerd makes a distinction between subjective presuppositions [*vooronderstellingen*] and "that which is presupposed" [*de vooronderstelde*]. Our Ideas, as "subjective presuppositions," point towards "what is presupposed"—that is, towards the ontical conditions which make our thinking possible at

all.⁴ Sometimes Dooyeweerd refers to what is presupposed, the ontical conditions, as ‘*vóór-onderstellingen*’⁵ Such playing with words, and the making of new technical terms by hyphenation, occurs frequently in Dooyeweerd, as it does in Heidegger. There is therefore a circularity in that our transcendental Ideas all point towards that which is presupposed in the sense of ontical conditions. Not only the three transcendental Ideas, but all of Dooyeweerd’s philosophical Ideas are interrelated—Ideas such as the supratemporal selfhood and religious root, the Idea of cosmic time, the nature of the modal aspects and the opening process, the subject-object relation, and the *Gegenstand*-relation. The meaning of one term involves the meaning of all the others. But this kind of circularity is a consequence of our Ideas pointing to their transcendental conditions in our supratemporal center—the conditions that alone make these Ideas possible. From out of that center, we then express ourselves theoretically in the temporal periphery, where our concepts and Ideas refer to modal aspects that display both sphere sovereignty and sphere universality. Dooyeweerd specifically refers to this kind of circularity in his 1946 *Encyclopedia*. The very idea of an encyclopedia involves this kind of learning in a circle.⁶

Although Dooyeweerd opposes modernism, he is not himself a postmodernist. I suggest that he is a pre-modernist, one who has returned to philosophical roots that pre-date modernism. A postmodernist will object that it is not possible to return to pre-modernism. Do we not have to first follow the hermeneutics of suspicion before we can attempt a retrieval of the past? But Dooyeweerd’s approach is different. His philosophy seeks to cut off such unfruitful and dead-end thinking at its root. We do not have to first agree with the ideas of the autonomy of thought, and of the temporalization of our

⁴ Herman Dooyeweerd: *Encyclopedia of the Science of Law* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002) [*‘Encyclopedia’*], 80-81. But these passages have not been translated properly. See J. Glenn Friesen: “Dooyeweerd’s *Encyclopedia of the Science of Law*: Problems with the Present Translation (2006), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Translation.pdf>].

⁵ See for example *WdW* I, 7 (*‘de vóór-onderstelde’*).

⁶ Herman Dooyeweerd: *Encyclopedia of Legal Science* (1946). Translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Encyclopedia.html>]. [*‘1946 Encyclopedia’*].

existence, in order to then reach the despairing realization that these are dead ends. For if those ideas are adopted, no positive retrieval will be possible. Our views of God, self and cosmos will remain dis-encharmed. But in criticizing modernism, Dooyeweerd has not evaded it. From out of his pre-modern roots, he has gone through modernism and beyond it, not adopting it, but criticizing it using its own tools of thought. He has anticipated the concerns and the problematics of postmodernism, but he has provided answers that are very different.

So my suggestion that Dooyeweerd is a pre-modernist should not be misunderstood. He is not a pre-modernist in the sense of Protestant fundamentalism. For fundamentalism, with its emphasis on rational propositional truth, is itself a form of modernism. Dooyeweerd criticizes those who seek to use the Bible as a textbook for philosophy.

Nor should Dooyeweerd's pre-modernism be understood as a return to the kind of Catholicism that regards philosophy as the handmaiden of theology. Dooyeweerd rejects all attempts by the Church to control theoretical thought. For Dooyeweerd, theology is itself a theoretical discipline that depends on philosophical assumptions. And not even philosophy is ultimate, since it, too is theoretical, and relies on the givenness of our pre-theoretical experience. Philosophy attempts to theoretically "give an account" of our pre-theoretical experience, but that experience always remains primary. Dooyeweerd's philosophy is experiential, but not in the subjectivistic sense of '*Erlebnis*,' but in a sense of a conscious '*Hineinleben*'—a conscious experience of the relation of our supratemporal selfhood to the temporal world (*NC II*, 474-475). Our supratemporal selfhood is at the root of all our experience; we discover it in what Dooyeweerd calls an act of 'religious self-reflection.'

So Dooyeweerd is not a modernist, nor a postmodernist, nor a Biblicist or fundamentalist, nor a philosopher whose thought is confined by a particular theology. Does Dooyeweerd's pre-modern philosophy fit into any tradition at all? Elsewhere, I have shown how Dooyeweerd's key ideas situate his philosophy within an existing tradition. This is the Wisdom tradition, or Christian theosophy, best exemplified in the philosophy

of Franz von Baader (1765-1841), who also criticized modernism, using terminology and arguments very similar to the ones that Dooyeweerd used a hundred years later⁷

I have made the connection between Dooyeweerd and Baader because Dooyeweerd's philosophy itself has driven me to explore the background of his ideas. It was in exploring the sources of Dooyeweerd's philosophy that I began reading Christian theosophy. It makes sense of Dooyeweerd's philosophy in a coherent way that respects the integrity and the importance of all of his key ideas.

So my comparison of Dooyeweerd and Christian theosophy is therefore not something that I have read into Dooyeweerd's philosophy. In fact, I was at first reluctant to even speak of theosophy, because the term is often associated with Madame Blavatsky's kind of occult theosophy. But that is not the only kind of theosophy.

Some have traced the Greek word '*theosophia*' to Ammonius Saccas, the teacher of Plotinus. But the term '*Sophia*' itself, in the sense of the Wisdom of God, can be traced to Scripture. The book of Proverbs personifies Wisdom (*chokmah* in Hebrew), and refers to Wisdom's role in creation:

The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth; by understanding hath he established the heavens (Prov. 3:19).

The Lord possessed me [Wisdom] in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. (Prov. 8:23-24).

The theme of Wisdom continues in later Jewish Scriptures. See, for example, the Book of Sirach, Chapter 24.⁸ And the theme is particularly important in the *Book of Wisdom*⁹, which describes the role of Wisdom in the creation the cosmos. It is worthwhile looking at some of these verses:

⁷ J. Glenn Friesen: "The Mystical Dooyeweerd: The Relation of his Thought to Franz von Baader," *Ars Disputandi* 3 (2003) [<http://www.arsdisputandi.org/publish/articles/000088/index.html>].

⁸ *Book of Sirach* (Ecclesiasticus), online at [<http://etext.virginia.edu/etcbin/toccer-new2?id=RsvSira.sgm&images=images/modeng&data=/texts/english/modeng/parsed&tag=public&part=25&division=div1>].

⁹ *Book of Wisdom*, online at [<http://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/apo/wis008.htm>].

7:7 Wherefore I prayed, and understanding was given me: I called upon God, and the spirit of wisdom came to me.

7:8 I preferred her before sceptres and thrones, and esteemed riches nothing in comparison of her.

7:9 Neither compared I unto her any precious stone, because all gold in respect of her is as a little sand, and silver shall be counted as clay before her.

7:10 I loved her above health and beauty, and chose to have her instead of light: for the light that cometh from her never goeth out.

7:17 For he hath given me certain knowledge of the things that are, namely, to know how the world was made, and the operation of the elements:

7:18 The beginning, ending, and midst of the times: the alterations of the turning of the sun, and the change of seasons:

7:19 The circuits of years, and the positions of stars:

7:20 The natures of living creatures, and the furies of wild beasts: the violence of winds, and the reasonings of men: the diversities of plants and the virtues of roots:

7:21 And all such things as are either secret or manifest, them I know.

7:22 For wisdom, which is the worker of all things, taught me: for in her is an understanding spirit holy, one only, manifold, subtil, lively, clear, undefiled, plain, not subject to hurt, loving the thing that is good quick, which cannot be letted, ready to do good,

7:23 Kind to man, steadfast, sure, free from care, having all power, overseeing all things, and going through all understanding, pure, and most subtil, spirits.

7:24 For wisdom is more moving than any motion: she passeth and goeth through all things by reason of her pureness.

7:25 For she is the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty: therefore can no defiled thing fall into her.

7:26 For she is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of his goodness.

7:27 And being but one, she can do all things: and remaining in herself, she maketh all things new: and in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God, and prophets.

8:1 Wisdom reacheth from one end to another mightily: and sweetly doth she order all things.

8:4 For she is privy to the mysteries of the knowledge of God, and a lover of his works.

9:9 And wisdom was with thee: which knoweth thy works, and was present when thou madest the world, and knew what was acceptable in thy sight, and right in thy commandments.

9:10 O send her out of thy holy heavens, and from the throne of thy glory, that being present she may labour with me, that I may know what is pleasing unto thee.

9:11 For she knoweth and understandeth all things, and she shall lead me soberly in my doings, and preserve me in her power.

10:1 She preserved the first formed father of the world, that was created alone, and brought him out of his fall,

10:2 And gave him power to rule all things.

In the New Testament, Matthew and Luke present Jesus as a teacher of Wisdom. And Paul speaks of Christ as “the power of God and the wisdom [*Sophia*] of God” (I Cor. 1:24).

The idea of Wisdom was certainly emphasized in the early centuries of the Church, and was at the center of many theological disputes. The Emperor Constantine (272-337 AD) dedicated the main church in Constantinople to Wisdom: he called it *Hagia Sophia*, or ‘Holy Wisdom.’ Augustine also refers to Wisdom. Garofalo’s painting of Augustine’s Vision, reproduced above, depicts the vision that Augustine describes in his *Confessions*. Augustine says that in this vision, he and his mother Monica reached out and briefly touched Wisdom. I discuss this in more detail in Appendix C, where I contrast Augustine’s vision with more metaphysical ways of describing supratemporal reality.

The idea of God’s Wisdom or *Sophia* has always remained important within Orthodoxy, but until recently, it has been downplayed in the Western church, or associated with Mary because of the feminine personification of Wisdom in the Scriptures. Recently, there has been a renewed interest in Wisdom, as some feminist theologians have sought to interpret Wisdom as a feminine being, or have even tried to interpret Wisdom in terms of Goddess imagery. In an article written for non-specialists, Fr. Leo D. Lefebure summarizes some of the historical developments in interpreting *Sophia*.¹⁰ But whereas Lefebure’s article is useful in showing some of the controversies surrounding *Sophia*, his article does not

¹⁰ Leo D. Lefebure: “The Wisdom of God: Sophia and Christian Theology,” *The Christian Century*, (Oct. 19, 1994), online at [<http://www.highbeam.com/library/docFree.asp?DOCID=1G1:15861175>].

emphasize the way that *Sophia* has been interpreted by Christian theosophy, and that's what is of interest in comparing Dooyeweerd's thought to the Wisdom tradition.

Christian theosophy emphasizes the role of Wisdom in the creation of the cosmos. But Wisdom is not regarded as a separate person, distinct from the Trinity. Instead, Wisdom is the mirror of God. Christian theosophy emphasizes *Wisdom 7:26*: "For she is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of his goodness." Antoine Faivre refers to Baader, who says that Wisdom is not a person, and does not have the power of working independently (*Selbstwirker*). Instead, Wisdom is the collaborator in creation, the organ of God. Wisdom is the *expression* of the Word, or what Boehme calls the '*Ausgesprochene*.' By His Wisdom, God *ex-presses* (*entäussert*) Himself in his "nature." *Sophia*, the mirror of God, itself has that nature for a mirror, and the original mirror *Sophia* is glorified in this original divine nature. This divine nature is related to desire, for will without a desire would be a will without a nature. Like Wisdom, this nature has no personality (*Selbstheit*) of its own.¹¹

This divine nature must not be confused with the nature of created reality. For although God's Wisdom dwells within the created cosmos, and is visible to us as His "glory" or *Schechina*, there are two self-manifestations of God: one is eternal or immanent (within the Trinity) and the other is temporal or emanant. Baader criticizes Hegel and Schelling for failing to distinguish between these two "natures"—a *naturata non creata creans* and a temporal *natura creata*. They have confused the non-creaturely process that exists in God with the processes that occur within creation as an image or copy (*Abbild*) of the divine process. In this way they have fallen into pantheism, confusing the Creator with the creature.¹² I believe that the same confusion is made by process theology today.

¹¹ Antoine Faivre: *Philosophie de la Nature: Physique sacrée et théosophie XVIII-XIX siècle* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1996) [*Phil. de la Nature*], 109-11. Faivre points out that it is not God Himself who is expressed in the divine Nature, but God's Wisdom, or Idea. And this is a much more personalized view of Idea than we find in Hegel.

¹² *Ibid.* 80-81, referring to *Werke IX*, 311. Man and cosmos are to dwell in the *Schechina*, like a child in the womb of his mother (*Ibid.*, p. 121, referring to *Werke II*, 43, 46 ; and *IV*, 371).

Faivre says that the relation of the Trinity to Wisdom is the “arithmosophic” notion of the quaternity. But quaternity is not to be understood as four distinct persons.¹³ The fourth is a passive element in relation to three active persons. Boehme calls the fourth element the ‘periphery,’ ‘body,’ or ‘dwelling’ of the Three (the Three are called the ‘Ternar’). And just as God expresses Himself in the divine nature, so man expresses himself in his body (*Phil. de la Nature*, 109). The relation in both is that of the center relating to its periphery. I will later discuss this idea of “expression” in more detail, and compare it to Dooyeweerd’s usage of the term.

Many works of Christian theosophy have not been translated into English. I have translated a few of Baader’s writings into English.¹⁴ And an anthology, mostly of other writers, has been compiled by Arthur Versluis.¹⁵ A very important book on the subject of Christian theosophy, particularly as it relates to the idea of imagination, is Antoine Faivre’s *Theosophy, Imagination, Tradition: Studies in Western Esotericism*.¹⁶

It is my view that Dooyeweerd’s philosophy represents a continuation and a renewal of this Christian theosophical tradition, which was transmitted to him from Orthodoxy through Baader and others. Dooyeweerd’s ideas on imagination are embedded in this Christian theosophical tradition. We shall see the importance of Wisdom as mirror and image, and of imagination or image-ination. Here is an overview of the ideas that we will look at:

¹³ Some confusion has arisen here because of the way that Jung’s quaternary mandalas have been interpreted, and the way that he regarded the Catholic Church’s Dogma of the Assumption of Mary (1950) in relation to the quaternity.

¹⁴ J. Glenn Friesen: “Studies Relating to Franz von Baader,” online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/baader/>].

¹⁵ Arthur Versluis: *Wisdom’s Book: The Sophia Anthology* (St. Paul, Minn.: Paragon House, 2000). See also Arthur Versluis: *Theosophia* (Hudson, NY: Lindisfarne Press, 1994) [‘Versluis’].

¹⁶ Antoine Faivre: *Theosophy, Imagination, Tradition: Studies in Western Esotericism* (Albany: State University of New York, 2000) [‘Faivre’].

In Part I of this work, I will explore Dooyeweerd's ideas on imagination in relation to Christian theosophy, particularly in its understanding of man's being created in the image of God, and of man's imaginative task as bearer of God's image.

In Part II, I will discuss the nature of imagination as an act, which like all acts, proceeds from out of our supratemporal selfhood and is then expressed temporally within our body or what Dooyeweerd calls our "mantle of functions." It is also expressed outwardly in the external world.

In Part III, I will discuss the role of imagination as it specifically relates to perception, both within its restricted form and within its opened form. Dooyeweerd rejects the copy theory of perception, and this is related to Dooyeweerd's rejection of the idea of substance. I discuss how this relates to Dooyeweerd's understanding of the subject-object relation, and how this differs from current reformational thought.

In Part IV, I will discuss what Dooyeweerd calls the "opening process," in which the anticipations in the modal aspects are opened, and by means of which the process of cultural forming takes place. I will examine what Dooyeweerd means when he says that the sensory image is "productive." This is related to Dooyeweerd's understanding of the historical aspect. I will also refer to reformational philosophers who have not understood the formative nature of the historical aspect, and who have therefore rejected the historical aspect.

In Part V, I will briefly discuss the role of imagination in aesthetics and creativity. Because Dooyeweerd's ideas regarding imagination have been misunderstood, his aesthetic theory has also been misunderstood.

Finally, in Part VI, I will look at how imagination relates to Dooyeweerd's understanding of theoretical thought, and to the intentional *Gegenstand*-relation on which theory is based. In the *Gegenstand*-relation, our supratemporal selfhood enters into the temporal functions of our own body or mantle of functions. Our body is the periphery of our central supratemporal selfhood. The modal aspects in which our body functions in time are split apart by our theoretical thought, and in this way, we discover the anticipations and "figures" that open up the modal aspects. We discover those figures by our intuitive vision. What is the connection between this inner image of the figure and the external

world? Between our imagination and the aspects in which the structures of the external world function? God's law, or Wisdom, gives the connection. And we are aware of the connection by means of our intuition, both pre-theoretical and theoretical.

I include several Appendices. Appendix A deals with the issue of whether Dooyeweerd's philosophy is Calvinistic, or whether we must regard its theosophical nature as conflicting with Calvinism.

Appendix B deals with Dooyeweerd's view of Animals. Dooyeweerd's view is certainly anthropocentric, but if it is true, then to avoid contrasting man and the animal world would be to evade the task for which we were created.

Appendix C looks at Henry Corbin's idea of the mesocosm, and compares and contrasts it with the views of imagination presented in this paper.

Appendix D is a compilation of some excerpts from Dooyeweerd's book *In the Twilight of Western Thought*,¹⁷ together with some footnotes showing the central importance for Dooyeweerd of the Idea of religious root, and how the Christian Ground-motive of creation, fall and redemption cannot be understood apart from this Idea.

Appendix E lists other references from the Bible, from Orthodox sources, as well as later Protestant sources, referring to man as root and to Christ as New Root.

May this discussion of Dooyeweerd's ideas of imagination lead to a better understanding of Dooyeweerd's philosophy, and to a better understanding of the relation between our knowledge of God, self and cosmos. And may it help us to re-enchant our experience of the world by orienting us again to God's Wisdom or *Sophia*, and in realizing the images and anticipatory figures that we discover and realize by means of our imagination, as image-bearers of God.

¹⁷ *In the Twilight of Western Thought. Studies in the Pretended Autonomy of Theoretical Thought*, (Nutley, N.J.: The Craig Press, 1968, first published 1961) ['*Twilight*'].

I. Imagination and Christian Theosophy

A. Dooyeweerd and Christian Theosophy

By ‘Christian theosophy,’ I mean the historical tradition exemplified in Jacob Boehme (1575-1624) and in Franz von Baader (1765-1841). Faivre says that it is clear that Boehme wrote more about *Sophia* than anyone else before him (*Phi. de la Nature*, 95). And Baader is known as Boehme’s best interpreter. Although Baader himself rarely uses the word ‘theosophy,’ (Faivre, 26), he frequently refers to Wisdom, and relates it to his Christian philosophy. Faivre says that Baader recalls that the etymology of the word ‘philosophy’ is itself religious, meaning the “love of Wisdom,” and that it therefore recognizes a Wisdom that is “already there,” of a Sage (*Weise*) or Guide (*Weisende*), to whom we must submit and by whom we must be instructed (*Phil. de la nature*, 101). Faivre mentions many more writers in the theosophical tradition, such as Friedrich Christian Oetinger (1702-1782), William Law (1686-1761), and Louis-Claude de Saint-Martin (1743-1803).

As we saw in the Introduction, the Wisdom tradition goes back to the Scriptures. It continues in the church fathers (both Latin and eastern Orthodox),¹⁸ in the Western mystics (like Meister Eckhart and Jacob Boehme), in Christian Hermeticism¹⁹ and in

¹⁸ Dooyeweerd acknowledges the influence of Augustine. Further research is required regarding the influence of other church fathers, such as Maximus the Confessor or Gregory of Nyssa. See Hans Urs von Balthasar: *Cosmic Liturgy: The Universe according to Maximus the Confessor* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2003, originally published in German, Freiburg, 1941). Von Balthasar himself relied on Baader to reject the nature/grace dualism within traditional Catholic philosophy.

¹⁹ See Anonymous [Valentin Tomberg]: *Meditations on the Tarot: A Journey into Christian Hermeticism* (New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher, 2002, first published 1985). There are many surprising parallels to Dooyeweerd’s ideas, which can be explained by Baader as a common source. Note the Afterword by Cardinal Hans Urs von Balthasar, who shows Baader’s influence on Tomberg. Faivre correctly criticizes some of Tomberg’s ideas, such as reincarnation, which do not fit within the Christian theosophical tradition, although they can be found in some of the church fathers like Origen (Faivre, 191-228).

Christian Kabbalah.²⁰ These traditions all intersect in Baader, who then influenced the neo-Calvinism of Abraham Kuyper,²¹ as well as German romanticism,²² and the Russian sophiological tradition.²³

Faivre distinguishes Judeo-Christian theosophy from other types of theosophy. In particular, he distinguishes it from the more Eastern type of theosophy as taught by Madame Blavatsky (Faivre, 4). Gershom Scholem makes a similar distinction. Scholem says that, in contrast to Blavatsky's ideas,

Theosophy postulates a kind of divine emanation whereby God, abandoning his self-contained repose, awakens to mysterious life; further, it maintains that the mysteries of creation reflect the pulsation of this divine life.²⁴

²⁰ Versluis refers to the introduction of Jewish Lurianic Kabbalism into Christian theosophy by Oetinger and Franz Josef Molitor, especially the doctrine of Adam Kadmon, the primordial *anthropos* who represents the whole of the cosmos...and how the redemption of human beings (through purification and celestial ascent) is also the redemption of nature." And he refers to the Kabbalistic idea of *tzim tzum*, where God creates a "space" inside himself to allow "room" for creation of the cosmos is also significant in that it "ultimately means that humankind and nature both exist *in* God, and reflect God (Versluis, 179). As an example of the apparent influence of Christian Kabbalah, see the references by both Kuyper and Dooyeweerd to sparks of God's wisdom, discussed below.

²¹ J. Glenn Friesen: "The Mystical Dooyeweerd Once Again: Kuyper's Use of Franz von Baader," *Ars Disputandi* 3 (2003) [<http://www.arsdisputandi.org/publish/articles/000130/index.html>] ['Kuyper and Baader']. In addition to his appreciative references to Baader, Kuyper refers to Oetinger's idea that "Leiblichkeit ist das Ende der Werke Gottes" ["embodiment is the goal of the works of God"]. Embodiment is the realization of imaginative images.

²² J. Glenn Friesen: "Dooyeweerd, Spann, and the Philosophy of Totality," *Philosophia Reformata* 70 (2005) 2-22, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Totality.html>]. ['Totality']. See also J. Glenn Friesen: "Individuality Structures and Enkapsis: Individuation from Totality in Dooyeweerd and German Idealism," (2005), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Enkapsis.html>]. ['Enkapsis'].

²³ Representatives of this tradition include Nicolai Berdyaev, Vladimir Solovyov (1853-1900), the Slavophile Fritz Lieb (1892-1970), Sergei Bulgakov, Pavel Florensky, V. Lossky. Although influenced by Baader, there are disagreements among these writers.

²⁴ Gershom G Scholem: *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1961), 206.

In my own work, I have distinguished between Blavatsky's theosophy and the Christian theosophy of Baader and Dooyeweerd.²⁵ Christian theosophy is a non-pantheistic and non-Gnostic²⁶ tradition, and it emphasizes the Wisdom of God, which is also referred to by the Church fathers as '*Sophia*.' God's Wisdom is reflected or imaged within creation. Faivre points out that, unlike a world-denying kind of mysticism, which seeks to flee the temporal world, theosophy concentrates on seeking God's wisdom within temporal reality, and learning its true structure.²⁷ But not all mysticisms are world-denying, and theosophy has itself been understood as a kind of mysticism.

Dooyeweerd was one of the founders of the philosophical journal, *Philosophia Reformata*. The journal was founded in 1936 as the organ of the Association for Calvinistic Philosophy, and Dooyeweerd was its first editor-in-chief. But several centuries before, there was another *Philosophia Reformata*. In 1622, Johann Daniel Mylius used the term as the title of a book published in Frankfurt, in reference to his Rosicrucian, Hermetic and alchemical philosophy.²⁸

²⁵ See J. Glenn Friesen: "Paul Brunton and Ramana Maharshi," (2005), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/abhishiktananda/Brunton.html>].

²⁶ Faivre refers to Origen:

Origen, contrary to the gnostic Valentinus, defended the dignity of the image which, according to him, was grounded in the perfection of the Son, who was himself the image of the invisible God; he thus set forth a voluntarist concept of the imagination (Faivre, 99).

See also Peter Koslowski: *Philosophien der Offenbarung. Antiker Gnostizismus, Franz von Baader, Schelling*, (Vienna: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2001). Koslowski shows how Baader's theosophy is neither pantheistic nor Gnostic, in contrast to the philosophers Hegel and Schelling, both of whom Baader influenced.

²⁷ Faivre says that the theosophist "prefers to sojourn, to travel, on Jacob's ladder, where the angels—the symbols, the mediations—are ascending and descending," rather than attempt to go beyond like the mystic. He quotes Madame de Staël's observation that theosophers attempt to penetrate the secrets of creation; mere mystics are content with their own hearts (Faivre, xxiii, 25). He says that Tauler's mysticism emphasized that a person wishing to realize mystical union had to reject '*bildnerinne*' or fantasy. Boehme and his disciples rehabilitated the importance of images (Faivre, 105).

²⁸ See the following websites for more information on this first *Philosophia Reformata*: [http://www.levity.com/alchemy/s_mylius.html]. See *Hervé Delboy*: "Philosophia

Did someone intentionally choose the name *Philosophia Reformata* to show the link between neo-Calvinist philosophy and these previous traditions? Was it just an unfortunate coincidence? Or is it an example of divine irony, a synchronistic bringing to light of neo-Calvinism's connections to these other currents of thought? Is it like the shadow side of our personality, which we repress and deny, only to have it express itself unconsciously?²⁹

Already in 1988, Michael Morbey drew attention to neo-Calvinism's connection to theosophy.³⁰ And he referred to van Moorsel's view that there was a Hermetic influence in Abraham Kuyper's neo-Calvinist idea of the regeneration of the heart:

We do not even dream of calling this too much abused neoCalvinistic divine, philosopher, journalist and statesman (1837-1920) a gnostic or semignostic, but this does not alter the fact that, here, the *τιμωρία-δυσάμεις* [*timoriai-dunameis*]-scheme is palpably present or rather: *has* to be present as a result of a *prima regeneratio* carried *à outrance*³¹

Many reformational philosophers will find it unimaginable that neo-Calvinism is in any way associated with non-Reformed ideas, especially Christian theosophy.³² This is

Reformata," online at [<http://hdelboy.club.fr/mylius.html>]. And coloured illustrations from Mylius's book are available from the Alchemy Bookshop at [http://www.alchemywebsite.com/bookshop/prints_series_mylius.html].

²⁹ Dooyeweerd acknowledged the unconscious and the insights of depth psychology. See discussion below. Dirk Vollenhoven expressed the fear that people would compare Dooyeweerd's work to that of C.G. Jung.

³⁰ Michael M. Morbey: "Kuyper, Dooyeweerd and the Reformational Vision: Theosophy Reformed," (1988, 1995), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/aevum/Theosophy.pdf>]

³¹ Gerald van Moorsel: *The Mysteries of Hermes Trismegistus: A Phenomenologic Study in the Process of Spiritualisation in the Corpus Hermeticum and Latin Asclepius* (Utrecht: Drukkerij en Zoon, 1955), 112-113, fn50.

³² For example, see D. F. M. Strauss's 2004 article attempting to disprove the connection between Dooyeweerd and Baader. Strauss mistranslates Baader to say the exact opposite of Baader's real meaning, and he ignores Kuyper's acknowledged appreciation of Baader. More importantly, in comparing Dooyeweerd and Baader, Strauss ignores Dooyeweerd's criticisms of Strauss's own philosophy, which rejects Dooyeweerd's key ideas where the most similarity with Baader can be found. See J. Glenn Friesen: "Dooyeweerd and Baader: A Response to D.F.M. Strauss," (2005), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Strauss.html>]. And J. Glenn Friesen:

because they have tended to regard neo-Calvinism as a more or less theologically pure movement that can be traced in a straight line from Augustine to Calvin to Kuyper to Dooyeweerd and his brother-in-law Dirk Vollenhoven. Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven are then regarded as the fathers of reformational philosophy, standing solidly in this unified tradition. Johan Stellingwerff's recent history of reformational philosophy follows this view. References are made to other philosophers, but reformational philosophy is regarded as heroically reacting against such other streams, developing its own ideas.³³ Except for Vollenhoven's influence, Dooyeweerd's philosophy is then viewed as a creative invention of his own, rather like Athena springing fully-formed from the head of Zeus. This viewpoint tends to ignore the non-Calvinistic historical influences that shaped Dooyeweerd's ideas. By proceeding in this non-historical way, reformational philosophy moves too quickly to an attempted systematization of ideas. It assumes that Dooyeweerd must fit into an existing pattern of thought, and in this way it fails to understand what Dooyeweerd really says.

A further problem in understanding Dooyeweerd has been that his philosophy has been interpreted in terms of Vollenhoven's philosophy. As I have shown, Vollenhoven rejected Dooyeweerd's key ideas. In order to understand Dooyeweerd, we therefore need to disentangle his philosophy from that of Vollenhoven.³⁴ This also applies to understanding Dooyeweerd's view of imagination. Vollenhoven thought that fantasy and

"Dooyeweerd versus Strauss: Objections to Immanence Philosophy within Reformational Thought," (2006), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Objections.html>]

³³ Johan Stellingwerff: *Geschiedenis van de Reformatorische Wijsbegeerte*, (Stichting voor Reformatorische Wijsbegeerte, 2006). This book is an example of the current religious dialectic of praising Dooyeweerd while simultaneously rejecting his key ideas. See my forthcoming review of the book in *Philosophia Reformata*.

³⁴ See J. Glenn Friesen: "Dooyeweerd versus Vollenhoven: The religious dialectic within reformational philosophy," *Philosophia Reformata* 70 (2005) 102-132, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Dialectic.html>]['Dialectic'].

imagination are useful only in forming a “working hypothesis in science.”³⁵ Dooyeweerd uses the idea of imagination in a much more encompassing and central way.

Does the association of Dooyeweerd’s philosophy with the tradition of Christian theosophy mean that Dooyeweerd’s philosophy is unoriginal? Dooyeweerd himself denied that his thought was original. In 1936, the theologian Valentijn Hepp, Dooyeweerd’s adversary at the Free University, published a series of brochures entitled *Dregeinde Deformatie* [Threatening Deformation]. Hepp accused Dooyeweerd of seeking too much originality. Hepp said that Dooyeweerd’s philosophy displayed an “illness of originality” [*oorspronkelijkheidsziekte*], and he accused Dooyeweerd of neglecting the historical continuity with “traditional reformed thought.” This resulted in a long investigation of both Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven by the Curators of the Free University. Dooyeweerd responded by showing the continuity of his philosophy with Kuyper’s ideas.³⁶ Dooyeweerd attached a long appendix of excerpts from Kuyper’s work to his Response to the Curators. And in his Foreword to Volume III of *De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee*, published in 1936 (after Hepp’s brochures), Dooyeweerd responded to this accusation of seeking too much originality [*oorspronkelijkheidszucht*]:

In its point of departure, the Philosophy of the Law-Idea is not at all “new,” but rather it builds on the *foundation of all ages*. What it fights against is the falling away from this fixed foundation, a falling away that appeals to the autonomy of thought, or depends on a completely misplaced appeal to the teaching of “common grace.”

So whoever reproaches this philosophy with “the desire for originality” does not know what he is talking about. Its characteristic is not a *desire for originality*, but a *desire for the Origin*, in the sense that it restlessly drives thought out above its supposed resting points, and points towards its true Origin in Jesus Christ.

³⁵ Vollenhoven’s rejection of the following ideas all prevent his appreciation of Dooyeweerd’s idea of imagination: (1) the supratemporal heart (2) creation in the image of God (3) individuality structures (4) the intra-modal subject-object relation (5) Dooyeweerd’s different understanding of modal aspects (6) the theoretical *Gegenstand*-relation (7) the immediacy of our central heart knowledge.

³⁶ See Dooyeweerd’s Second Response to Curators of the Free University, Oct 12, 1937, page 30. Translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Response2.html>] [‘Curators’].

If there is in fact any “originality” hiding in our philosophy, this is solely and exclusively by virtue of the new view that is the fruit of the unfolding of our thought before the Word of God, which discovers the true Archimedean point.

But it means the opposite of any revolutionary assault against the great law of historical continuity.[my translation]³⁷

And so we see that Dooyeweerd himself acknowledged the importance and the necessity of historical continuity. He emphasized that his thought is a return to the Origin, and that this return is the true nature of originality. And in *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, Dooyeweerd acknowledged that the content of his philosophy “is wedded to the historical development of philosophic and scientific thought with a thousand ties.” And he referred positively to a perennial philosophy:

Our transcendental ground-Idea itself requires the recognition of the “*philosophia perennis*” in this sense and rejects the proud illusion that any thinker whatever, could begin as it were with a clean slate and disassociate himself from the development of an age-old process of philosophical reflection. (NC I, 118, *WdW* I, 82).

Dooyeweerd’s concern about such a perennial philosophy was only that it not be used in an historicistic way to relativize the religious ground-motive [which is supratemporal] by

³⁷ *WdW* III, vii-viii, italics Dooyeweerd’s:

De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee is in haar uitgangspunt in ‘t geheel niet “nieuw”, doch bouwt op het *fundament aller Eeuwen*. Wat zij bestrijdt, is den afval van dit vaaste fundament met een beroep op de autonomie van het denken, of met een volkomen misplaatst beroep op de leer der “gemeene gratie”.

Wie haar daarin “oorspronkelijkheidszucht” verwijt, weet niet wat hij zegt. Niet *oorspronkelijkheids-*, maar *Oorsprongszucht* is haar eigen, in dien zin, dat zij het denken rusteloos uitdrijft boven gewaande rustpunten en het in Christus Jezus naar zijn waren Oorsprong heenwijst.

Wanneer in onze wijsbegeerte inderdaad “oorspronkelijkheid” schuilt, dan dankt zij die alleen en uitsluitend aan den nieuwen kijk, welke de vrucht is van ontsluiting van het denken voor het Woord Gods, dat het ware Archimedisch punt ontdekt.

Maar zij beteekent het tegendeel van een revolutionairen stormloop tegen de groote wet der historische continuïteit

This is part of the Foreword to Volume III of the *WdW*. It was never included in the English translation and revision of the *WdW*, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*.

confusing it with the *forms* given this ground-motive to it in historical relativity (*NC I*, 118).

Dooyeweerd gave this positive appreciation of perennial philosophy in 1935 (*WdW*, I, 82). Nine years later, Aldous Huxley later published his book *The Perennial Philosophy* (1944). Although Leibniz first popularized the term ‘perennial philosophy’, it is now used almost synonymously with Aldous Huxley's use of the term, which is that all religions teach the same truth in different ways. Dooyeweerd was certainly interested in dialogue with other religions.³⁸ But his emphasis on the centrality of Christ as the New Root of creation would not fit with most understandings of Huxley's type of perennialism.

So, although it is still useful to refer to the philosophy of Dooyeweerd in terms of the perennial philosophy, we need to distinguish Dooyeweerd's philosophy from certain understandings of what that means. For Dooyeweerd, every philosophy must be tested by his transcendental critique, which relies on the three transcendental Ideas of Origin, supratemporal religious root and temporal coherence. But the Idea of the supratemporal religious root is itself theosophical in nature, insofar as it relates to our creation in the image of God, the fall in religious root that brought with it the fall of temporal creation, and the redemption in the religious root by Christ as the New Root, who brings about the redemption of temporal reality, a redemption in which we participate.

The Idea of Christ as the New Root distinguishes Dooyeweerd's philosophy from those kinds of philosophy and theosophy that are not Christocentric. Dooyeweerd's Christocentrism also distinguishes his philosophy from most current reformational philosophy. For the Idea of Christ as the New Root depends on the Idea of the supratemporal religious root, and most current reformational philosophy rejects that Idea.³⁹

³⁸ See my notes regarding Dooyeweerd's Comparisons with Hinduism, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Notes/Hinducompare.html>].

³⁹ Hendrik Stoker says this explicitly, rejecting Dooyeweerd's “Christocentric” direction (*NC III*, 75). Dooyeweerd responds by rejecting Stoker's wish to ascribe autonomous being and value to the cosmos. “For it is this very autonomous being and value of the

And although there are many connections to be made to the Wisdom tradition of the church fathers, there are also variations in Dooyeweerd. For example, he does not accept Maximus's idea of a microcosm/macrocosm.⁴⁰ Thus, although Dooyeweerd's philosophy is situated within this tradition of Christian theosophy, Dooyeweerd continued to develop its ideas, and he related these ideas to the philosophy that was current in his day. I regard Dooyeweerd as the most important philosopher in the Christian theosophical tradition since Baader.

B. Some Themes of Christian Theosophy

Faivre lists some common themes in Christian theosophy:

1. Our interrelated knowledge of God, man and universe
2. The primacy of Biblical myths of foundation or origin
3. Man's direct access to superior worlds (Faivre, xvi, 7-8).

Let us examine these in more detail, noting how these themes also apply to Dooyeweerd's philosophy.

1. God, man and universe

a) Interrelated knowledge

Faivre refers to theosophy's "illuminated speculation" about the relation of God, man and universe. There is an interrelated triangle of relationships and correspondences. The correspondences are veiled, but are disclosed by our active imagination. Our imagination "deciphers the hieroglyphs of the world," (Faivre, xxi-xxii).

Dooyeweerd's philosophy fits with this theosophical pattern of correlating our knowledge of God, self and cosmos:

created world in itself which must be denied from the radical Biblical viewpoint of creation (*NC III*, 71). As I have shown in 'Mystical Dooyeweerd,' this idea of Christ as the New Root is also found in Baader, whose theosophy is also Christocentric.

⁴⁰ Dooyeweerd's reason for rejecting it was that the microcosm/macrocosm idea is too individualistic and personalistic (*NC II*, 593). But Dooyeweerd continued to believe that the temporal world has its existence only in the religious root, which is supraindividual.

The religious meaning of the created world binds the true knowledge of the cosmos to true self-knowledge, and the latter to the true knowledge of God. This view has been explained in an unsurpassable and pregnant way in the first chapter of the first book of Calvin's *Institutio*. It is the only purely Biblical view and the alpha and omega of any truly Christian epistemology. [...] We cannot truthfully know the cosmos outside of the true knowledge of God. But like all human experience in this earthly dispensation, our knowledge of God, although directed to the absolute Truth is also restricted and relativized *by* (but not at all *to*) our temporal cosmic existence (*NC II*, 560-61, italics Dooyeweerd's).

The reference to our knowledge being relativized *by* but not at all *to* our temporal cosmic existence relates to the third criterion mentioned, our direct or immediate access to knowledge transcending the temporal (see discussion below).

Dooyeweerd refers to Calvin for support for the idea that our knowledge of God, self and cosmos is interrelated. The passage from the *Institutes* that he refers to is:

Our wisdom, in so far as it ought to be deemed true and solid Wisdom, consists almost entirely of two parts: the knowledge of God and of ourselves. But as these are connected together by many ties, it is not easy to determine which of the two precedes and gives birth to the other. For, in the first place, no man can survey himself without forthwith turning his thoughts towards the God in whom he lives and moves; because it is perfectly obvious, that the endowments which we possess cannot possibly be from ourselves; nay, that our very being is nothing else than subsistence in God alone (*Institutes* Chapter I)

The reference by Calvin to God in whom one “lives and moves” is an obvious reference to Paul's words in Acts 17:28. These words, and the statement that our subsistence is in God alone, may provide the basis for a nondualistic or panentheistic interpretation of Calvin, comparable to Dooyeweerd's use of the phrase “from, through, and to” our Origin (*NC I*, 9) (See my article ‘Method’). But Dooyeweerd's Idea of the selfhood is that of the supratemporal heart. Some theologians have argued that this Idea of the supratemporal heart is not found in Calvin,⁴¹ although Michael Morbey has argued that Calvin was originally much more theosophical and orthodox than the subsequent

⁴¹ Josef Bohatec, the Austrian scholar on Calvin, and a personal friend of Dooyeweerd, did not find the use of ‘*cor*’ or heart in Calvin in the sense of referring to our whole human existence. See Marcel Verburg: *Herman Dooyeweerd: Leven en werk van een Nederlands christen-wijsgeer* (Baarn: Ten Have, 1989) [‘Verburg’], 191, citing a letter to Dooyeweerd from Bohatec). But see Appendix A below, where other information suggests that Bohatec's opinion may have been wrong.

reformed Covenant theology.⁴² The reference to ‘Wisdom’ in the above quotation from Calvin would support Morbey’s argument. In Appendix A, I discuss these issues in more detail.

The point to be emphasized here is the way that Dooyeweerd interrelates our knowledge of God, self and cosmos. Dooyeweerd warns us that when we lose sight of the supratemporal we then also fail to view the temporal world properly, and our own self-consciousness is weakened:

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]⁴³

Thus, without proper knowledge of God, we do not have proper knowledge of self or cosmos.

We cannot even understand the modal aspects without relating them to the supratemporal religious root.⁴⁴ But when we do have the correct attitude, the light of eternity radiates perspectively through our world, illuminating even the most trivial things (*NC III*, 29). We then have an insight into the true nature of reality. We experience things and events

⁴² Michael M. Morbey: “Letter to K, May 11, 1982, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/aevum/Covenant.pdf>]. Morbey says that theosophic creation awareness, however, is not unique to Genevan Calvinism (Habakkuk 3:3-4; Romans 1:18-23). Morbey also refers to Appendix D, “Descensus in se” of Ford Lewis Battles: *Calculus Fidei: Some Ruminations on the Structure of the Theology of John Calvin* (Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1978; privately published, with appendices) [‘Battles’]. See also Appendix A below.

⁴³ Herman Dooyeweerd: “Het Tijdsprobleem in de Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee,” Part II, 1940 *Philosophia Reformata*, 209 [‘Tijdsprobleem’]:

Naarmate het transcendentie-besef van den mensch verzwakt, verzwakt ook zijn zelf-bewustzijn en zijn vermogen de perspectivische structuur van de tijd te ervaren

Translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Tijdsprobleem.html>].

⁴⁴ Herman Dooyeweerd: “De Kentheoretische Gegenstandsrelatie en de Logische Subject-Objectrelatie,” *Philosophia Reformata* 40 (1975) 83-101 [‘Gegenstandsrelatie’]. Translation online: [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Mainheadings/Kentheoretische.html>].

as they really are, pointing beyond themselves to the true religious centre of meaning and to the true Origin (*NC III*, 30).

This seeing things and events “as they really are” is not a knowledge of different worlds, but of this present created reality (both temporal and supratemporal). We don’t see different worlds, but we see this created reality differently. Baader refers to Meister Eckhart,

Meister Eckhart says that it is not that you contemplate different things eternally and temporally, or that there are different things that work in you or are worked by you, which you take or possess. Rather, they are the same things, which you now only see, take or possess differently. Just as you are not a different man when you are temporal than when you are eternal, but rather that you are the same man in a different way.[my translation]⁴⁵

Tomberg makes the same point. “Esotericism is not a system of extraordinary and unknown things; it is above all a manner of seeing ordinary and known things in a way that is little ordinary and known, to see their depth” (Faivre 196, citing Tomberg 614). ‘Esotericism’ here does not mean things that are deliberately kept secret from all but a select few. These things are secret only in the sense that they are unknown until we choose to see and to experience them. Dooyeweerd also says that his philosophy gives us a new view [*nieuwen kijk*] (*WdW III*, viii).

The interrelationship of God, self and cosmos is also evident from Dooyeweerd’s Christian Ground-motive of creation, fall, and redemption. He says that it is not enough to believe in creation, fall and redemption, for even the scribes and Pharisees believed in those doctrines. We entirely miss the true significance of these doctrines unless we

⁴⁵ Baader: *Die Weltalter: Lichtstrahlen aus Franz von Baader’s Werken*, ed. Franz Hoffmann (Erlangen, 1868) [*Weltalter*], 322:

Es sind nicht andere Dinge, sagt Meister Eckart, die du zeitlich und ewig schaust, in sie wirkst oder von ihnen gewirkt wirst, sie nimmst oder besitzest, sondern es sind dieselben Dinge, die du nur anders schaust, nimmst oder besitzest, so wie du kein anderer Mensch bist, wenn du zeitlich, ein anderer, wenn du ewig bist, wohl aber derselbe Mensch anders bist

See also *Ekst. Werke IV*, 3.26; *Inn. Sinn, Werke IV*, 95; *She v. Prev, Werke IV*, 143). Jung also liked to cite this passage from Eckhart. See C.G. Jung, “Introduction to Zen Buddhism,” *Psychology and the East*, (Princeton, 1978), p. 146, para. 891

understand them in their central (supratemporal, religious) and radical (root, ‘radix’) sense. Creation, fall and redemption are of the religious root, the religious center of human existence. Man was created as the religious root, and temporal creation has its center in man as the supratemporal religious root. The fall was of man as religious root, which is why the temporal world also fell with man. And redemption is in Christ, the New Root, in whom our selfhood now participates (See Appendix D). As we shall see, these Ideas have their beginning in the Bible, and are found in some of the Church fathers and later representatives of Christian theosophy.

What about the claim that theosophy engages in illuminated speculation about the interrelationship of God, man and cosmos? Doesn’t Dooyeweerd reject speculation? Dooyeweerd does reject metaphysical speculation, where we absolutize a part of the temporal world and then apply such an absolutization to speaking about God (*NC I*, 92). But if we take ‘speculation’ in the sense of ‘*specula*’ or mirror (as does Baader), then Dooyeweerd’s philosophy does engage in that kind of reflective knowledge, beginning with our religious self-reflection,⁴⁶ based on our creation in the image of God. Dooyeweerd devotes a great deal of attention to the present reality and experience of our supratemporal heart. Therefore, Dooyeweerd’s opposition to speculative philosophy must not be understood as a refusal to ever speak about reality that transcends time. On the contrary, we have a present experience of our supratemporal selfhood. To speak of our experience of our supratemporal selfhood is therefore not metaphysical speculation. Dooyeweerd says that there is a fundamental dichotomy between our supratemporal selfhood and our temporal mantle of functions, and that after death, they will be separated.⁴⁷ In another article, Dooyeweerd says “the body will disintegrate when its tie

⁴⁶ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘religious self-reflection,’ [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Self-reflection.html>].

⁴⁷ Dooyeweerd avoids speaking of what God may be like in Himself, or of the nature of the angelic existence in the *aevum*, or indeed of our own existence after death. But Dooyeweerd does say that after death, our supratemporal selfhood will be separated from our temporal body (mantle of functions):

There is in reality only one fundamental dichotomy [*principieele caesuur*], that between the whole temporal existence and its supratemporal religious root, a

to the soul is severed (in temporal death).”⁴⁸ But even this fundamental dichotomy must be understood not as a dualism, but in a nondual way. Dooyeweerd uses the new word ‘*twee (-een-)heid*’ or ‘two-unity’ to express this nonduality of supratemporal self and temporal body:

Just because of this, the Philosophy of the Law-Idea seeks the biblical dichotomy of soul and body not in the *temporal*, but in the nonduality of the supratemporal religious center or root (the “heart” or the “soul”) and the whole temporal mantle of functions (the “body”)] [my translation]⁴⁹

b) God creates and reveals by expression or imaging of His thoughts

For theosophy, imagination is the power of creation itself. In the words of Hanegraaff,

Diametrically opposed to common present-day notions of “reality versus (mere) imagination”, the (divine) imagination and its products *are* the very essence of reality.⁵⁰

For Baader, imagination is the realization of an idea or image; the concretization of this image is an in-magination, just as Adam is the image of God. All creation is an in-magination, an in-formation [*Imaginieren oder Einbilden*] (*Werke* I, 44-45; II, 20).

Faivre refers to this same idea in Boehme:

God manifests Himself by engendering, through His FIAT, the universe, which is a real image (*figürliches Gleichniss*) of the one that God has imagined, and

dichotomy that comes into effect in the temporal death of man (*Tijdsprobleem*, 216).

⁴⁸ “De leer van de mensch in de W.d.W.” *Corr. Bladen* 5 (1942), 134-143, translated as “The Theory of Man: Thirty-Two Propositions on anthropology” [‘32 Propositions’], 3.

⁴⁹ Herman Dooyeweerd: “Kuyper’s Wetenschapsleer,” *Philosophia Reformata* (1939), 204:

Juist daarom zoekt de W. d. W. de schriftuurlijke dichotomie van ziel en lichaam niet in het *tijdelijke* maar in de twee (-een)heid van het boven-tijdelijk religieuze centrum of den wortel (het “hart” of de “ziel”) en den geheelen tijdelijken functie-mantel (het “lichaam”)

⁵⁰ Hanegraaff, Wouter J (ed.): *Dictionary of Gnosis & Western Esotericism* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), II, 613 [‘Hanegraaff’]. Hanegraaff shows how this view of imagination, going back to Paracelsus, came to full development in Boehme, and later led to German Romanticism’s opposition to the Enlightenment’s “disenchanted” view of reality. Romanticism viewed nature as “the deeper spiritual being of the world, to which the soul has access by means of the imagination.”

which is eternal. God imagines *in* the Sophia; but “to imagine in” means that this imagination makes the subject participate in the quality of its object, and simultaneously changes this object according to the subject’s imagination. In expressing Himself, God incarnates in a universe situated between pure spirit and concrete reality, that is, in a mesocosm, hence an intermediary place, but at the same time the seat of the supreme creative imagination, where the Shi’ite theosophers placed what Henry Corbin called the *mundus imaginalis*, the imaginal world. In other words, to imagine is to reveal oneself, it is to create; to unite oneself with God means to transform oneself in Him. And just as He has created the world through His imagination, so we can find God through it and become capable of working wonders. *Magia* and *imagination* are two words that Boehme associated: everything that Man imagines (*sich ein-bildet*) he can make real.” “*Imaginatio macht Wesenheit*” –the imagination creates the essence. (Faivre, 106).

There are several important points to examine in this quotation:

- 1) the nature of the *mundus imaginalis*
- 2) the universe as a ‘figurative’ image
- 3) to imagine is to reveal oneself, to create
- 4) in imagination, the subject participates in and changes its object
- 5) to unite with God means to transform oneself
- 6) imagination makes real

I discuss most of these points in more detail later in this work. Here I will give a detailed analysis of 1) and 3), and only a brief summary of the remaining points.

1) the nature of the *mundus imaginalis*

How does Corbin’s idea of a mesocosm fit with Dooyeweerd’s ideas? There are some parallels, in that for Dooyeweerd, God’s Word acts directly on our supratemporal heart, and our heart is in the supratemporal *aevum*, which is intermediate, between God’s eternity and the temporality of the cosmos. So in some sense, this *aevum*, which Dooyeweerd describes as a “created eternity,” is a mesocosm.⁵¹ This does not mean that all law stands outside of the temporal cosmos.⁵²

⁵¹ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘*aevum*,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Aevum.html>].

⁵² Vollenhoven did view law as standing outside the cosmos, in his famous triad God–Law–Cosmos. Vollenhoven’s view tends towards a substance view of temporal reality, making the cosmos more independent of God than in Dooyeweerd’s philosophy. This is expressly the case in Hendrik Stoker’s philosophy or in Kent Zigterman’s re-

For Dooyeweerd, God's law is given as a central law in the intermediate and supratemporal *aevum*, and this central law is refracted by cosmic time, as *meaning-sides* of temporal created reality. The law has both a central religious unity and a temporal diversity (NC I, 99, 518). As we have seen, theosophists also speak of a refraction of God's Wisdom in time.

But Dooyeweerd's ideas differ from Corbin's idea of the mesocosm. The most important difference is that for Dooyeweerd, the imaginal world is not a realm of ideas that is divorced from the temporal world. Our imagination does not seek to escape created reality in order to speculatively explore God's Wisdom, but it explores God's Wisdom as it has been expressed in created reality, both in the *aevum* and within the temporal world. It is this incarnational emphasis that distinguishes Christian theosophy from the more rationalistic kinds of Logos speculation. See Appendix C for a more detailed discussion of this issue.

2) the universe as a 'figurative' image

In imagination, we seek the "figure" within the temporal world. A figure is an anticipation of what an individuality structure in the temporal world may become, but which is presently only a potential reality. In finding the figure within the temporal world, and in realizing it, we form history, and we fulfill the reality of temporal structures. I discuss this important idea of figure in more detail below in Part VI, "Imagination and theoretical thought."

3) to imagine is to reveal oneself, to create

In the theosophical tradition, God's Wisdom is God's way of understanding Himself.⁵³ This does not mean that God was required to create in order to understand Himself, for

working of Dooyeweerd's ideas of individuality structures. Both Stoker and Zigterman reintroduced the idea of substance (See my article 'Enkapsis').

⁵³ Faivre refers to the "architectonic self-contemplation of Sophia. It mirrors itself, reflects itself. It is a self-formation, the first magical representation that the Absolute has of itself" (Faivre 146).

there is a knowing relationship within the Trinity.⁵⁴ But God's Wisdom is also reflected, or imaged in creation. And this reflection within creation is the revelation of God.

Faivre explains how the reflected image is always on a lower ontical level than what is expressing itself in that image.

Thus God, Sophia, Man, and Nature are situated in relation to one another in a relationship of dependency and of freedom made possible through the nearly infinite possibilities of combinations that this Game of the four Mirrors allows. Every thing, every being, is created to be the image of what is superior to it. [...] Form, image, envelope are thus situated *below* what lives in them and manifests through them, that is, below the Spirit.⁵⁵

Dooyeweerd avoids speaking of what God may be like apart from how He has revealed Himself in creation. But Dooyeweerd does speak of God in relation to His creation, in terms of God's revelation and expression of himself. Dooyeweerd uses the terms 'revelation' and 'expression' synonymously. God's Word-revelation is central, and speaks to our supratemporal heart. But this unity of God's revelation, the "transcendent fullness of the meaning of this life" becomes cosmic when it is refracted through time (*NC II*, 561; *WdW II*, 493-495).

Dooyeweerd also uses the term 'revelation' [*openbaring*] to refer to the gradual disclosure of our temporal reality. For example, sphere universality is "revealed" in the deepening of the modal aspects (*WdW II*, 404, *NC II*, 470). Steen points out that Dooyeweerd's very idea of Divine revelation is this "expression" of God in the temporal cosmos:

Dooyeweerd uses the term '*openbaren*' when referring to the fact that the supra-temporal expresses itself in the temporal. The fullness of meaning, the totality

⁵⁴ C.G. Jung misreads Boehme and conflates the divine and the human levels of understanding. In this, Jung follows Schelling's and Hegel's interpretation of Boehme, and Baader says that their interpretations of Boehme lead to pantheism.

⁵⁵ Faivre, 147. But Faivre points out that this is not to be understood as occurring within the Trinity:

In the case of the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son (*homoousia*) there is not distinction between the image and its substrate, contrary to the status of the beings emanated from the divine Spirit or created by Him.

of meaning reveals itself in rich, temporal diversity. It manifests itself, expresses itself, but generally he uses the word ‘reveals.’⁵⁶

Dooyeweerd refers to both God’s self-revelation and to man’s revelation to himself:

The ground motive of the divine Word Revelation, that of creation, fall and redemption in Christ Jesus, radically excludes any dualism in either God’s self-revelation as Origin of all things, or in the revelation of man to himself (‘32 Propositions,’ 4).

Dooyeweerd says that God revealed himself both in the central creation of man in His image, and in the coherence of the temporal world. The temporal coherence is thus itself a revelation of God:

At the creation of the cosmos God revealed himself within his creation, both in its religious root (the “heart” of the human being) and in its temporal coherence of meaning, through creating humankind in his image and bringing the divine fullness of being to a meaningful creaturely expression within the entire creation (*Encyclopedia*, 176).

Expression is one of Dooyeweerd’s key ideas. Expression occurs from a higher ontical level to a lower level. Another word for the idea of expression is ‘production.’ When there is an expression from a higher ontological level to a lower one, something is produced in the lower level. The correlate of ‘expression’ is ‘refers back.’ That which has been expressed then refers back to the higher ontical level for its meaning. God *expresses* Himself in creation, and creation *refers back* to God for its meaning (NC I, 4). Indeed, created reality (both supratemporal and temporal), exists solely as *meaning*, and has no existence in itself:

Meaning is the *being* of all that has been *created* and the nature even of our selfhood (NC I, 4; also II, 30-31; *WdWI*, 6; also II, 27-28).

Temporal created reality (the cosmos) has even less reality than supratemporal created reality (the selfhood). Temporal reality has its existence only in man as its religious supratemporal root. That is why temporal reality fell with man, and why temporal reality must also be redeemed by man (see discussion below).

⁵⁶ Peter J. Steen: *The Structure of Herman Dooyeweerd’s Thought* (Toronto: Wedge, 1983), 55, ft. 20 [‘Steen’]. Steen finds this “a strange use of the idea of revelation.” But it corresponds to the meaning of ‘revelation’ in theosophy—the expression of a higher ontical level within a lower level.

Does this view of creation as *meaning* presuppose that creation is the result of God's thoughts? That is the opinion of Alvin Plantinga, who criticizes Dooyeweerd:

And if his [Dooyeweerd's] doctrine that meaning is the mode of being of created reality *does* imply that the relation between God and creation is like that between a thinker and the meanings he entertains, then at this point the accusation of a really significant departure from the Reformed and Christian tradition would be justified. For then created reality becomes constitutive of God's mind and thus of God.⁵⁷

Plantinga's last sentence is puzzling. If creation is an expression of God, then creation is constituted by God, but the converse is not necessarily true—creation is not necessarily constitutive of God. To say that it is constitutive of God makes the same mistake that Jung made, that God is dependent on His creation. Plantinga seems to assume that if creation is an expression of God, then the boundaries between God and creation are wiped out, and we are left with pantheism, where creation is divested of “distinctness and “over-againstness” with respect to God” (Plantinga, 15). But the Christian theosophical tradition is not pantheistic, although it may be panentheistic, or nondual (See my article ‘Method’).

Although I think that Plantinga's concern about pantheism is misplaced, I think that he is correct in raising the issue of whether Dooyeweerd's (and Kuyper's) neo-Calvinism is indeed Calvinistic (See Appendix A below). It is interesting that the Curators of the Free University raised similar questions. In his Response, Dooyeweerd affirmed Kuyper's view that creation is an expression of the thoughts of God. Referring to Kuyper's idea of a multiplicity and a distinction of law-spheres, Dooyeweerd quoted with approval from Kuyper's *Stone Lectures*:

What now does the Calvinist mean by his faith in the ordinances of God? Nothing less than the firmly rooted conviction that all life has first been in the thoughts of God, before it came to be realized in Creation. Hence all created life necessarily bears in itself a law for its existence, instituted by God Himself. There is no life outside us in Nature, without such divine ordinances, –ordinances which are called the laws of Nature—a term which we are willing to accept, provided we understand thereby, not laws originating from Nature, but

⁵⁷ Alvin Plantinga: “Dooyeweerd on Meaning and Being,” *The Reformed Journal* (Oct, 1958), 10-15 [‘Plantinga’].

laws imposed upon Nature. So, there are ordinances of God for the firmament above, and ordinances for the earth below, by means of which this world is maintained, and, as the Psalmist says, these ordinances are the servants of God. Consequently, there are ordinances of God for our bodies, for the blood that courses through our arteries and veins, and for our lungs as the organs of respiration. And even so are there ordinances of God, in logic, to regulate our thoughts; ordinances of God for our imagination, in the domain of aesthetics; and so, also, strict ordinances of God for the whole of human life in the domain of morals.⁵⁸ (emphasis Dooyeweerd's).

God's law for creation, which of course is fundamental to Dooyeweerd's Law-Idea [*Wetsidee*], is therefore based on the thoughts of God, which are then "realized" in creation.

In his early writings, Dooyeweerd's brother-in-law Vollenhoven also viewed God's law in terms of God's thoughts:

Every individual thing is defined in its being by God's idea for that kind of thing. A thing's individuality—its being this x—is rooted in the particular way in which God brought the general idea x to realization at some particular time and in some particular place... These divine ideas are thoughts in the mind of God. He knows each one of them completely; everything with its infinity of relations. Both as a general idea and particularized substance these thoughts of God hold as law for that which is created.⁵⁹

In one of his earliest works, Dooyeweerd stated that modal aspects are refractions of God's plan for the world:

The "full reality" as cosmic unity of subjectivity constructs itself in the organic coherence of the subject functions, just as all law-spheres are individually only refractions of God's world plan [my translation].⁶⁰

[.]

⁵⁸ Curators, 11, citing from Kuyper's *Lectures on Calvinism: The Stone Lectures of 1898*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 70; online at [http://www.kuyper.org/main/publish/books_essays/article_17.shtml].

⁵⁹ John Kok: *Vollenhoven: His Early Development* (Sioux Center: Dordt College Press, 1992), 16, 67-68.

⁶⁰ Herman Dooyeweerd: "Het juridisch causaliteitsprobleem in it licht der wetsidee," *Anti-revolutionaire Staatkunde* 2 (1928) 21-124, at 113 [*'Causaliteitsprobleem'*]:

De "volle realiteit" als kosmische subjectiviteitseenheid bouwt zich op in den organischen samenhang der subjectfuncties, gelijk alle wetskringen individueel slechts straalbrekingen zijn van Gods wereldplan.

If the refracted aspects of the temporal cosmos are refractions of God's world plan, does that amount to a pantheistic view of reality? Again, the answer is that it does not, although it does seem to imply panentheism or nondualism.⁶¹ From an Orthodox perspective, to regard the modal aspects as the Wisdom of God can be seen in terms of these aspects being the energies of God, but not his essence.⁶² Christos Yannaros has argued that the rejection of the essence/energies distinction was one of the causes of modernism's rationalism:

In the distinction of nature and energies Orthodox theology sees the very presupposition for a knowledge of God, as well as of man and of the world. If we reject this distinction and if we accept, with the Roman Catholics, the intellectual leap to the essence itself — an active divine essence — then the only possible relation of the world to God is the rational connection between cause and effect, a connection that leaves unexplained the ontological reality of the world, the formation of matter and its essential character.⁶³

⁶¹ Versluis refers to statements in the *Gospel of Thomas*:

...we read that the disciples asked Christ when the “new world” would come, and he replied, “What you look forward to has already come, but you do not recognize it.” Again, said Jesus, “It will not come by waiting for it. It will not be a matter of saying ‘Here is is’ or ‘There is is.’ Rather, the kingdom of the Father is spread out upon the earth, and men do not see it.” These statements refer to the omnipresent divine Reality in which the whole cosmos exists, and which it reflects (Versluis, 88).

⁶² See Michael Morbey's discussion of this difference between energies and essence. “Parallels to the Byzantine-Hesychast, Divine Essence/Energies Distinction,” (1979), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/aevum/Parallels.pdf>]. See also Kallistos Ware: “God Immanent yet Transcendent: the Divine Energies according to Saint Gregory Palamas” in *In Whom We Live and Move and Have Our Being: Pantheistic Reflections on God's Presence in a Scientific World*, eds. Philip Clayton and Arthur Peacocke, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 157-168. Baader also says that although through Christ we can again participate in the divine nature, this participation does not make us part of the divine nature itself (*Werke II*, 373).

⁶³ Christos Yannaros: “The Distinction between Essence-Energies and its importance for theology,” online at [<http://www.geocities.com/trvalentine/orthodox/yannaras.html>]. I am grateful to Bill Gordon for bringing this article to my attention. And see Versluis, who cites Friedrich Christoph Oetinger (1702-1782): “It is the most pestilent of ideas that nature can be envisioned as outside the presence of God.” Oetinger opposed the materialistic science developing in his day, which divorced man, God and nature (Versluis, 98-99).

The denial of the essence/energies distinction may have been an attempt to avoid pantheism, and to keep God and the created order at a safe distance from each other. But its consequence has been the denial of the possibility of any direct experience of God. But if we accept the essence/energies distinction, we can view the world not as a separate substance or a “what” but rather the “how” or the mode of being:

The whole cosmic reality, the innumerable variety of kinds of essences are not the *what* of objective observation and rational conception; they are not the abstract effect of a rationally conceived active cause, but the *how* of the “personal” harmony of “rational” qualities, “a musical harmony constituting a controlled and sublime hymn to the power which controls the universe.” [...] The beauty of creation is not the single-dimensional *logos* of a creative cause, but the revelation of the unified and at the same time triune *mode* of the divine energy which reflects the mystery of the singular and triune *mode* of existence of the divine life (*Ibid*).

We can compare this idea of the world as revelation and reflection to Boehme’s view that the universe is a mirror of *Sophia*, reflecting God’s Wisdom (Faivre, 138). Faivre says that the mirror of Wisdom is the eye of God, and that within it are enclosed in an ideal way all the energies, colours, marvels and essence, still undifferentiated but capable of being differentiated.⁶⁴ This undifferentiated Wisdom is refracted in the temporal cosmos, like light in a prism:

God cannot think without engendering his image, writes Louis Claude-St. Martin, who also insists on the reengendering of this image by Man. And Franz von Baader, the great heir and continuator of this current in the nineteenth century, speaking of the rays falling on a surface that are sent back in the form of colors, sees in this refraction an engendering. “All of nature is the prism of the divine ray of light,” he writes (Faivre, 160).

Here is another example of Baader’s view of the cosmos as a prism:

Physicists have a mechanical concept of the refraction of light. They suppose that a material ray falls on a plane and is then reflected back to give the image; however the reflection is much rather a generation. A ray of light that proceeds

⁶⁴ Faivre, *Phil. de la Nature*, 110-12, citing *Werke* III, 394. Within God, Wisdom is a unified will, with a fullness of unity. But in its relation with nature, there is a unity in diversity. *Werke* III, 86.

out comes back as a colour. So we can call the whole of nature the prism of the divine ray of light⁶⁵

The diversity of meaning, in the many colours refracted back, is already a semi-reality. But this semi-reality needs to be fulfilled and perfected (Faivre, 138, 145). Dooyeweerd also speaks of the necessity for temporal reality to be perfected or fulfilled.⁶⁶

Dooyeweerd says that temporal reality is a refraction of supratemporal totality by the prism cosmic time (*NC* I, 99; *WdW* I, 64). This has sometimes led to accusations of monism against Dooyeweerd, on the assumption that the idea of refraction means that all diversity can be reduced to a unity. But a theosophical understanding of refraction as “reengendering” helps to avoid such a monistic reduction. As an engendering or generation, the refraction is the beginning of the individuation of temporal creation, of it becoming real in its individuality. The prism image is thus not monistic, but a way of referring to individuation from out of Totality.

Dooyeweerd says that all of temporal reality is an unfolding and dis-closing from the undifferentiated root unity or totality. The “things” of this world are not independent substances, but rather individuations from out of totality (see my article ‘Totality’). We become ever more individual:

And within the temporal horizon man's self-consciousness does not from the outset have a static individuality. Rather it becomes more and more individual. This takes place in a process of development which is also historically determined (*NC* II, 594; *WdW* II, 529).

What Dooyeweerd calls the “deepening” or “opening process” of our experience continues this differentiation and unfolding process. And as we shall see in Part IV, ‘Imagination and History,’ this opening process is also dependent on our imagination.

⁶⁵ *Spec Dogmat, Werke* 8, 82:

[Einen] mechanischen Begriff haben die Physiker von der Lichtbrechung. Sie meinen, ein materieller Strahl falle auf die Ebene auf und werde zurückgeworfen und gebe so das Bild, vielmehr aber ist die Spiegelung eine Erzeugung. Wenn ein Lichtstrahl hingeht, so geht er als Farbe zurück. So kann man die ganze Natur das Prisma des Göttlichen Lichtstrahles nennen

⁶⁶ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘fulfillment,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Fulfillment.html>].

4) in imagination, the subject participates in and changes its object

I discuss this in more detail in Part IV, “Imagination and History” and in Part VI, “Imagination and Theoretical Thought.” Dooyeweerd speaks of a ‘spiritualizing-through’ of temporal reality. And both Baader and Dooyeweerd speak of the penetration of temporal reality by our supratemporal selfhood. For now it is sufficient to note that Dooyeweerd speaks of our entering into time, and assisting in the redemption of the world.

5) to unite with God means to transform oneself

It is not just external reality that is to be redeemed. Our own individuality must also to be fulfilled and perfected. See the discussion of redemption of temporal reality (below). We become more and more individual. And in the age to come, we will be fulfilled. In both Christian theosophy and in Dooyeweerd’s philosophy, union with God is never a matter of identity with God. I discuss this in more detail in my article ‘Method.’

6) imagination makes real

In theosophy, it is only when the image is embodied that it is truly real or actualized. Only then does it achieve “reality” in the theosophical sense (Faivre, 145 referring to Baader’s *Werke* 8, 93).

Dooyeweerd says that our sensory imagination “really exhibits a productive objectifying function” (*NC* III, 115; *WdW* III, 84). He also speaks of actualizing an image that until then was merely an intentional image in our fantasy:

This intentional object is nevertheless bound to the modal and plastic dimensions of the temporal horizon of experience and of reality. And just because it is bound to the transcendental horizon of experience, the fancied objective structure of a thing is a *potential* structure capable of being represented in a real thing. *And it is essential to the reality of the latter that it be a representation of the fancied thing-structure* (*NC* III, 116, italics Dooyeweerd’s; *WdW* III, 84).

In Part IV, “Imagination and History,” I discuss our productive imagination in more detail, as well as how we assist in making structures real by our realization or actualization of images.

c) Man is created in God's image

Boehme relates our imagination to our being created in the image of God. He says that man has a strong imaginative tendency to contemplate himself, what he is, since Scripture calls him an image of God.⁶⁷

The idea that man was created in the image of God is also crucial for understanding Dooyeweerd's ideas on imagination. Dooyeweerd says that we are the *expression* of God's image, and that we in turn *express* our selfhood in the coherence of our cosmic (temporal) functions (*WdW* I, 6; *NC* I, 4). As the image of God, we express ourselves in the temporal world, just as God expressed Himself in man as his image. Our ability to express ourselves in the temporal world includes our acts of imagination, which Dooyeweerd says proceed from out of our supratemporal selfhood (see Part II, "Imagination as an Act").

Sometimes a distinction is made between God's image and likeness. 'Image' is the contemplative aspect of God (or God in repose), whereas 'likeness' refers to God's creative aspects, which we also mirror when we express ourselves within temporal reality. Faivre says that 'image' is "the analogical structural relationship of the human being's core with God in repose" whereas 'likeness' is "the analogical functional relationship of the human being (understanding, imagination, and will) with God in action" (Faivre, 218).

Dooyeweerd distinguishes between our own state of repose and our action. He speaks of our experience of *enstasis*, which is a relation of resting or repose, where our supratemporal selfhood rests in its being "fitted into" temporal reality.⁶⁸ In contrast, our actions move out from this *enstatic* relation.⁶⁹ Dooyeweerd says that our acts of knowledge and imagination are contemplative, and relate to the lingual and aesthetic

⁶⁷ Jacob Boehme: *The Way to Christ*, tr. John Joseph Stoudt, (Harper, 1947), 41.

⁶⁸See Linked Glossary, entry for 'fitted into,' online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Fitted.html>].

⁶⁹ J. Glenn Friesen: "Enstasis, Ecstasis, Systasis, Dis-stasis and Ana-stasis: Dooyeweerd's Ideas of Dynamic Equilibrium and Deepening," (forthcoming) ['Enstasis']

aspects; our actions in the external world relate to other normative aspects, the moral, juridical, and faith aspects, and they involve our will.⁷⁰

Kuyper also emphasizes that man's nature is different from the rest of creation, and that this difference consists in being the image of God. Man has an "intimate bond and closer relation to his Creator":

This appears from the words *image* and *likeness*. In all His other creative acts the Lord speaks, and it is done; He commanded, and it stood fast. There is a thought in His counsel, a will to execute it, and an omnipotent act to realize it, but no more; beings are created wholly *outside* and *apart* from Him. But man's creation is totally different. Of course, there is a divine thought proceeding from the eternal counsel, and by omnipotent power this thought is realized; but that new creature is connected with the image of God.⁷¹

Kuyper notes that some theologians have distinguished between being created "after God's image" and "in God's image." These theologians use this distinction to deny that man's nature is itself the image of God. But Kuyper says that "after God's image" merely means that God's own image comes first:

Returning, after these preliminary remarks, to Gen.1:27, we notice the difference between (1) the divine image after which we are created, and (2) the image which consequently became visible in us. The image after which God made man is one, and that fixed in us quite another. The first is God's image after which we are created, the other the image created in us. To prevent confusion, the two must be kept distinct. The former existed before the latter, else how could God have created man after it? (*Ibid.*)

Because we are created in God's image, God feels Himself related, finds something of Himself in us:

That you have been created after God's Image, declares that by virtue of your creation, God feels Himself related to you; that He finds something of Himself

⁷⁰ *Encyclopedia*, 192. See discussion below in Part II, "Imagination as an Act," of the three directions of our acts from our of our supratemporal selfhood.

⁷¹ Abraham Kuyper: *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, (New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1900, online at [http://www.ccel.org/k/kuyper/holy_spirit/htm/TOC.htm], Vol. II, Chapter I, IV, "Image and Likeness." Kuyper rejects the view that we are created after, but not "in" God's image, and that the image is not found in man's nature of being, but outside of him. And Kuyper rejects the idea that image and likeness (which he uses synonymously) refer only to Christ.

in you, and because you are His own product, His own creature, His own handiwork, you are, and remain, an object of His Divine interest.⁷²

Note Kuyper's use of the idea that we are God's 'product' because we are created after God's image. He says that all true religion springs from the fact of our creation after God's Image, and that Christ's incarnation is related to God having expressed divine reality in our human form:

Moreover, you must understand that all this rests upon sober reality. It is not semblance, but actual fact, because God created you after His Image, so that with all the wide difference between God and man, divine reality is expressed in human form. And that, when the Word became Flesh, this Incarnation of the Son of God was immediately connected with your creation after God's Image (*Ibid.*, Chapter 5, "When He Turneth Himself Unto Prayer").

Note here the use of the word 'expressed' in relation to God's creation: God expressed divine reality in human form. Kuyper uses 'expression' and 'product' synonymously.

d) The temporal world is concentrated in man as the image of God

The meaning of 'image of God' is that we mirror God. But what does this mean? In what sense do we mirror God? For Dooyeweerd, our being created in the image of God is linked to man being created as the religious root of the entire temporal cosmos. Our supratemporal heart, as it participates in this religious root, is the "created image" of God as Origin:

The integral Origin of all things according to God's plan of creation has its created image in the heart of man participating in the religious community of mankind. The latter is the integral and radical unity of all the temporal functions and structures of reality, which ought to be directed in the human spirit toward the Absolute Origin, in the personal commitment of love and service of God and one's neighbour (*NC I*, 174; added to *WdW*).

and

God created humankind in God's own image. As God reveals himself as creator, as the absolute and integral origin of all things, so he concentrates all temporal functions and structures of human existence in a religious root-unity, in which all temporal life is supposed to be oriented to the service of God. This is

⁷² Abraham Kuyper: *To Be Near Unto God*, tr. John H. De Vries, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979, tr. 1925), Chapter 2, "The souls which I have made," online at [http://www.kuyper.org/main/publish/books_essays/printer_25.shtml].

the radical character of the scriptural motive of creation that penetrates to the religious root of what is created. It reveals humanity to itself, at the center of its entire existence (*Encyclopedia*, 58).

Dooyeweerd links our being created in the image of God with being “lord” of the temporal or earthly world:

But man is created after the image of God, as the lord of the “earthly” temporal world (*NC III*, 88; added to *WdW*).

So, just as our supratemporal selfhood finds its Origin in God, so the temporal world finds its root in our supratemporal selfhood. The mirroring is in the relation of center to periphery. There is an expression by the supratemporal central unity and a referring back by the temporal, earthly periphery.⁷³

Dooyeweerd relates the Idea of image of God to the fact that our temporal religious existence is focused in a religious unity:

He has expressed His image in man by concentrating its entire temporal existence in the radical religious unity of an ego in which the totality of meaning of the temporal cosmos was to be focused upon its Origin (*NC I*, 55; added to *WdW*).

Just as man has his meaning and existence only in God, our Origin,⁷⁴ the temporal world is concentrated in man as its religious root. And just as we have no existence in ourselves, but only in God (who has expressed us), so the temporal world has no existence except in humanity, its religious root (*NC I*, 100; *II*, 53; *WdW I*, 65; *II*, 51).

Baader also relates the Idea of religious root to the fact that we are the image of God (*Weltalter*, 184). We are the image of God in a very specific sense. Just as creation comes from out of God’s unity, so the temporal universe is concentrated in this selfhood. Our central, supratemporal selfhood is our true nature as the image of God. As such,

⁷³ See my discussion of center and periphery in “Dooyeweerd and Baader: A Response to D.F.M. Strauss,” (2005), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandoooyeweerd/Strauss.html>].

⁷⁴ Dooyeweerd says that man’s nature is not a substance. It is nothing in itself, but a “*stare extra se*,” having existence only in the Origin.

As long as the human person in its central kernel is conceived as a substance, it is impossible to understand the profound Biblical meaning of the creation of man after the image of God (*NC III*, 6.).

humans are truly the center of the material world (*Werke* XI, 78; also *Werke* V, 31; XI, 78; *Begründung* 48). Baader speaks of the “solar” position of Man; he is the center of creation, in a higher sense than the sun is to the temporal world (*Werke* V, 31 and *Begründung* 48).

2. Primacy of Biblical myths of foundation or origin

a) Double creation and double fall

Faivre says that theosophy emphasizes those aspects of biblical revelation that most theologians pass over in silence: Genesis, the vision of Ezekiel, the Apocalypse, Sophia, the angels, the primitive androgyne, the successive falls. By ‘successive falls,’ Faivre means the idea that there was a fall of Satan and his angels before man was created. God’s purpose in creating man was to repair this already created and fallen world, but man fell a second time.

Kuyper was aware of this idea of a double fall, and took no position with respect to the idea. But some of Kuyper’s ideas on aesthetics repeat ideas of Baader that depend on this notion of a double fall (See ‘Kuyper and Baader’).

Dooyeweerd holds that man was first created a supratemporal being, and then formed from the earth.⁷⁵ He says that there is a difference in principle between the *creation* in Genesis 1 and the *becoming* (forming from a pre-given material) in Genesis 2.⁷⁶

A sharp distinction must be made between the creation of man and his temporal becoming. For the creative act of God is not subject to time like the bodily becoming of man. The days of creation must be understood in terms of pistic time, not in terms of the physical time measure of the earth’s rotation. Unlike Gen. 1:27, Genesis 2:7 does not deal with the creation of man, but with the temporal process of becoming (‘32 Propositions,’ Proposition XXIX, p. 9).

Dooyeweerd also says that creation by God “in the beginning” was not a temporal event. God completed creation as a totality; this completed creation is worked out in time.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ See J. Glenn Friesen: “Dooyeweerd versus Vollenhoven: The religious dialectic within reformational philosophy,” *Philosophia Reformata* 70 (2005) 102-132, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Dialectic.html>][‘Dialectic’].

⁷⁶ Herman Dooyeweerd: “Na vijf en dertig jaren,” *Philosophia Reformata* 36 (1971) 7.

Thus, man was first created as a supratemporal being, and then “fitted into” [*ingesteld* or *ingevoegd*] temporal reality.⁷⁸

b) Man’s purpose

Theosophy says that man’s purpose was to send the image of God into nature. Or, as Faivre describes it, man is the mirror of *Sophia*, and man had the task of “imagination”:

Adam was to “imagine,” that is, project himself, into this divine reflection through the power of his active and creative imagination, the essential faculty handed down to the species that God had destined to repair a universe perturbed since the fall of the angels (Faivre, 139).

Dooyeweerd’s idea of a supratemporal creation and a temporal forming corresponds to theosophy’s idea that the temporal world had already fallen, and that the purpose of man being “fitted into” temporal reality was so that man could assist in the redemption of the world. Dooyeweerd says that humanity’s task “was to disclose the entire temporal creation in the service of God” (*Encyclopedia*, 47). This disclosing is of powers that God had enclosed within creation:

The powers and potential, which God had enclosed within creation, were to be disclosed by man in his service of love to God and neighbour.⁷⁹

The disclosing is an unfolding. For it is man’s task to unfold the powers, which God has enclosed in His creation.⁸⁰ Man’s task of disclosing the entire temporal creation is

⁷⁷ Herman Dooyeweerd: “Schepping en evolutie,” *Philosophia Reformata* 24 (1959) 114-116. ‘32 Propositions’ also refers to the creation of man as body and soul, which according to Scripture was fully completed [*volkomen voltooid*].

⁷⁸ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘fitted into,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Fitted.html>]. There is a play on the words ‘*stelt*’ and ‘*gesteld*,’ just as Baader makes a play on the words ‘*setzen*’ and ‘*gesetzt*.’ For Baader, ‘*Selbstsetzung*’ is autonomy, and being ‘*gesetzt*’ is being placed or sub-jected to God’s law [*Gesetz*]. And Dooyeweerd also refers to God’s law in this first instance of using ‘*ingesteld*.’

⁷⁹ Herman Dooyeweerd: *Roots of Western Culture*, (Toronto: Wedge, 1979) [‘*Roots*’], 30. *Roots* is a partial translation of *Vernieuwing en Bezinning*, (Zutphen: Van den Brink, 1959) [‘*Vernieuwing*’].

⁸⁰ *Vernieuwing*, 58: “...waarop de mens de krachten, door God in Zijn schepping besloten, gaat ontsluiten.”)

therefore related to our searching, imagining and re-expressing God's Wisdom, which he has "enclosed within creation." And, in an image reflecting Christian Kabbalah, Dooyeweerd refers to this as finding the sparks of God's wisdom in creation. He speaks of God's common grace that holds back the complete demonization of the world, so that we can still see everywhere "sparks of God's glory, goodness, truth, justice and beauty."⁸¹ *Roots* (p. 37) translates 'lichtvonken' as 'traces' which I think lessens the impact of what Dooyeweerd says. But *Roots* does translate 'vonken' as 'sparks' in the next reference:

Shown to his fallen creation as a still undivided totality, the revelation of God's common grace guards scriptural Christianity against sectarian pride which leads a Christian to flee from the world and reject without further ado whatever arises in western culture outside of the immediate influence of religion. Sparks of the original glory of God's creation shine in every phase of culture, to a greater or lesser degree, even if its development has occurred under the guidance of apostate spiritual powers (*Roots* 39).

What is remarkable here is that this common grace is given to creation as a still undivided totality. It must be remembered that for Dooyeweerd, creation, fall and redemption are all in this undivided religious root.

Elsewhere, Dooyeweerd refers to Kuyper's view that there are sparks of divine love in our heart:

But this we know, that if there is a spark of divine love glowing in our heart, it is certain that this spark can not be blown out, and only by the taking of breath in eternity can it break out into full flame.⁸²

Other references by Kuyper to divine sparks include:

We must return to that wondrous Word of God which as a mystery of mysteries lies still uncomprehended in the Church, seemingly dead as a stone, but a stone that strikes fire. Who has not seen its scintillating sparks? Where is the child of God whose heart has not been kindled by the fire of that Word? (*The Work of the Holy Spirit*, p. 6)

⁸¹ *Vernieuwing*, 36: "lichtvonken van Gods macht, goedheid, waarheid, gerechtigheid en schoonheid."

⁸² "Kuyper's Wetenschapsleer," 209, citing Kuyper *Enc* II, 112-3):

Maar dit weten we, dat, zoo zeker er een vonk van heilige liefde in ons hart glooit, deze vonk niet kan gebluscht worden, en eerst bij den ademtucht der eeuwigheid in vollen gloed kan ontbranden

and

First, that this work of re-creation is not performed in fallen man independently of his original creation; but that the Holy Spirit, who in regeneration kindles the spark of eternal life, has already kindled and sustained the spark of natural life. And, again, that the Holy Spirit, who imparts unto man born from above gifts necessary to sanctification and to his calling in the new sphere of life, has in the first creation endowed him with natural gifts and talents (*Ibid.*, 46).

In a remarkable passage, Kuyper relates the idea of creation to the reflected image of God. God sees His glory reflected in creation, in a firmament of sparks of love, and all of creation points to God's glory:

And to now allow this to be done is the goal of God's creation. He wanted to have a *Name*. He wanted to let his glimmer proceed from Him. He wanted to see crystal before Him (or a glass sea, just like John saw on the Throne), from whose scintillating lines his own virtues would be reflected back to Him. Even Love; He wanted to multiply love in a thousand hearts and in this way react back on themselves.

The having of a Name, of a glittering of his Majesty, of a radiance of his glances, of a revelation of his virtues, of a firmament full of sparks of love around him, that is that the Holy Scriptures call '*the glory of God*.'

Everything thus concerns the *glory* of God. And the whole creation points to it⁸³

Now it is true that Calvin also refers to sparks of God. Calvin said that sparks (*scintillae*) of the knowledge of God are kindled everywhere in general revelation and that an

⁸³ Abraham Kuyper: *E Voto Dordaceno: Toelichting op den Heidelbergischen Catechismus*, I, 93, Online at [<http://www.neocalvinisme.nl/ak/ev/akev0903.html>].:

En dit nu te doen komen is het doel der Schepping Gods. Hij wilde *een Naam* hebben. Hij wilde zijn schijnsel laten uitgaan. Hij wilde kristal voor zich zien (of een glazen zee, gelijk Johannes het aan den Troon zag) uit welks fonkelende lijnen zijn eigen deugden Hem tegenschitteren zouden. Zelf de Liefde, wilde Hij die liefde in duizend harten vermenigvuldigen en alzo doen terugwerken op zich zelve.

Dat hebben van een Naam, van een schittering zijner Majesteit, van een uitstraling zijner glansen, van een openbaring zijner deugden, van een firmament vol vonken van liefde om zich heen, dát is het wat de Heilige Schrift noemt: *de heerlijkheid Gods*.

Op die *heerlijkheid* Gods is dus alles aangelegd. Daarop doelt heel de Schepping.

awareness of divinity (*sensus divinitatus*) has been implanted in everyone.⁸⁴ We may ask whether Kuyper's statement goes beyond Calvin in its theosophical vision of creation as the mirror of God. But Calvin himself refers to God "clothing himself with the image of the world for our contemplation:

For God -- by other means invisible -- (as we have already said) clothes himself, so to speak, with the image of the world in which he would present himself to our contemplation. They who will not deign to behold him thus magnificently arrayed in the incomparable vesture of the heavens and the earth, afterwards suffer the just punishment of their proud contempt in their own ravings. Therefore, as soon as the name of God sounds in our ears, or the thought of him occurs to our minds, let us also clothe him with this most beautiful ornament; finally, let the world become our school if we desire rightly to know God.⁸⁵

Dooyeweerd refers to the slumbering powers that need to be developed in all of the law-spheres.⁸⁶ The same article speaks of this work in terms of sacrifice:

The kernel of the Calvinistic life- and worldview is that all law-spheres should work together as an unbroken unity towards God's unfathomable world plan and to His glory, with the most extreme development of our energy in each area of life from out of our Christian belief, so that our personal life may be an acceptable daily sacrifice to God.⁸⁷

This dis-closing or unfolding of the anticipatory aspects in creation, required obtaining power over the forces of nature:

⁸⁴ John Calvin: *Institutes* Vol. I, Book I, c. 4, s. 1). It is cited by Kuyper in his *Lectures on Calvinism*, 46. Are these ways of viewing the world in conflict with Calvinism? Not necessarily. Michael Morbey has referred to Battles work on Calvin. Battles says that Calvin read the Bible and the book of nature in the Orthodox manner of reading an icon (Battles, 112-113).

⁸⁵ John Calvin: *Commentary on Genesis*, From "The Author's Epistle Dedicatory" [To Henry, Duke of Vendome] online at [http://www.ccel.org/c/calvin/comment3/comm_vol01/htm/v.htm]. For a more detailed discussion, see Appendix A.

⁸⁶ Herman Dooyeweerd: "Leugen en Waarheid over het Calvinisme," *Nederland en Oranje* (July/1925) [in Folder "Miscellaneous Articles," 1923-1939, archives, ICS).

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*:

Maar alle wetssferen gezamenlijk naar Gods ondoorgrondelijk wereldplan als een ongebroken eenheid samenwerkend tot de eere Gods en op ieder terrain des levens een uiterste energieontplooiing vanuit het Christelijk, dat het persoonlijk leven stelt tot een dagelijksche Gode welbehagelijke offerande—ziedaar de kern der Calvinistische leven-en wereld beschouwing.

At the creation, the obtaining of power over the forces of nature was already imposed upon humanity as a normative historical task (*Encyclopedia*, 152).

Dooyeweerd also relates man's creation in the image of God, as religious root, to man's task in creation. Man's task was to assist in the perfecting of the temporal world, which does not have any religious root in itself and therefore needs to be perfected in man:

The inorganic materials, the plant and animal realms, have no independent spiritual or religious root. Their temporal existence first becomes complete [perfected] in and through man.⁸⁸

Approximating the fullness of meaning involves opening up the anticipatory analogies within the law-spheres. As we shall see, this involves finding the 'figure' within temporal reality in order to bring temporal reality to perfection.⁸⁹ We do this by anticipating the fullness of meaning. This anticipation is a bringing experience to an inner unity, an illumination from within:

Yet we can only first do this by illuminating from within [*doorlichten*] the givenness of naïve experience, that is, the individual thing-experience, by means of meaning-synthetic, philosophic thought, which distinguishes the meaning-sides of naïve reality in an articulated way (1946 *Encyclopedia*, 28).

and

Man's task was to lead the unfolding process in the temporal cosmos in such a harmonious way, that in each law-sphere, the supratemporal religious fullness of meaning of human existence would completely shine through [*doorlichte*], and that in each meaning-side of reality, the fullness of meaning in its own meaning-tone would be completely reflected (1946 *Encyclopedia*, 35).

To speak of "completely reflecting" the fullness of meaning implies that this fullness is something reflected or imaged within creation. And that is a theosophical idea.

⁸⁸ *Vernieuwing*, 30:

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

⁸⁹ See Linked Glossary, entry for 'fullness,' at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Fulfillment.html>].

c) Fall of man, and the fall of temporal reality in man

But man did not fulfill the task entrusted to him. Satan convinced man to be not the image of God but a god for himself. As Baader says, man wanted to be not the image of God, but his own image (*Schriften*, 545). Or, as Faivre expresses it, “the original fall was nothing more than a perversion of desire by the imagination” (Faivre, 100). Boehme says that man idolatrously loved self-fabricated images in the heart in place of God (*The Way to Christ*, 42).

And because the temporal world was concentrated in humanity as the image of God, it fell with man (*WdW* I, 65). The *NC* translates this passage in this way:

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).

The idea that the whole temporal world fell with man is repeated elsewhere in Dooyeweerd's work:

Because of humankind's fall into sin the entire temporal world has been cursed. The other creatures, which are included with humanity in the same temporal order of the world, do not themselves have a religious root to their existence. Humanity's task was to disclose the entire temporal creation in the service of God (*Encyclopedia*, 47).

The theosophical traditions emphasize the fall of temporal reality in man. Faivre says, “all theosophers establish that Man corrupts the entire world through his sin.” (Faivre 58).

d) Redemption of temporal reality

After the Fall, the universe is only a “distorted reflection of its archetypal and original mirror” (Faivre, 139). Faivre says that nature, the mirror creation, is now in exile and groaning in pain (referring to Rom 8:19-22), and that it seeks to reascend to *Sophia*.

Faivre calls this the element of ‘transmutation’ in theosophy. Not only we ourselves are transformed, but so is temporal reality. There is a transmutation of both the experimenter and of nature (Faivre, xxii).

Man himself is changed, because although created in the image of God, this image had not yet been fixed (*fixiert*); man still had to acquire life and corporeity (*Leb- und Leibhaftwerden*) by inner birth (*Eingeburt*) (Faivre, 147). According to Boehme, by contemplating, imagining, the Glory of the Lord, we are ourselves transformed:

And on the human level, I am also a mirror into which God looks and through which the shadowy realm simultaneously covets me. I can then respond to the look, to the imagination, of God, or to that of the powers of shadow. By contemplating—by imagining—the Glory of the Lord who is looking at us—imagining us—we are transformed in Him (cited by Faivre, 119).

For Dooyeweerd, regeneration is of both man, and of the cosmos that finds its completion in man. The regeneration of both is related to Calvin's idea of the religious seed implanted by God in the human heart (*NC* II, 311; *WdW* II, 239). Dooyeweerd cites Kuyper in support:

Just as the whole creation culminates in man, its glorification can only first find its fulfillment in man, who was created as God's image; this is not because of man (who seeks), but because God Himself created in the human heart alone the only truly religious expression in the *semen religionis* [religious seed]. God himself *makes* man religious through the *sensus divinitatis* [the sense of the Divine], which He lets play on the strings of his heart.⁹⁰

Complete redemption of the temporal world, in the sense of its glorification and fulfillment, can therefore only take place through man, who was created in the image of God, and in whom the whole creation culminates. Whether by our theory or in our other acts, by which we form temporal reality, we are assisting in the completion of the redemption of the fallen world.⁹¹

⁹⁰ *Kuyper's Wetenschapsleer* 211, citing Kuyper's *Lectures on Calvinism*:

Maar gelijk heel de schepping culmineert in den mensch, kan ook de verheerlijking haar voleinding eerst vinden in den mensch, die naar Gods beeld geschapen is; niet omdat de mensch, die zoekt, maar omdat God zelf de eenig wezenlijke religieuze expressie door het *semen religionis*, alleen in het hart des menschen inschiep. God zelf *maakt* den mensch religieus door den *sensus divinitatis*, die Hij spelen laat op de snaren van zijn hart.

⁹¹ Saint-Martin says that Christ restores to humanity the proper relation between man and nature. Versluis summarizes:

Christ, who is the pillar between hevaen and earth, is the means by which humankind is able to “bind and loose” on earth and in heaven. That is, Christ is

Dooyeweerd says that the fall corrupted our nature as religious root, and that a New Root was required, who is Christ. This is the reason for the incarnation. Redemption, just like creation and fall, also takes place in the religious root. And in order for us to fulfill our task of perfecting the world, we now need to participate in Christ, the New Root.

This is also found in Baader. For Baader, God's central action occurs above time; this is the central action of the Word.⁹² Baader says that the Word produces rays [*Strahlen*] within temporal reality. The original human task was to return those rays into their unity.

This central action of the Word is linked with man's original work:

The original temporal work of primal Man was to gradually unite within its being all rays of this central action (of the Word), and therefore to let the Word become human in itself. A becoming human which, as we know, God Himself undertook, after man neglected his duty.⁹³

Baader says that our ability to imagine was impaired in the fall. If imagination is related to image in God, it must be remembered that this imagination was impaired by the Fall. Jesus Christ gives us again the power to imagine in God

Christ has given us again the ability to become Children of God, i.e. he gave us the ability to freely imagine in God, to create a new will, to generate a new willed form.⁹⁴

the means by which the terrible catastrophes and evil let loose by the primordial angelic Fall are reversed. This function of repairing directly manifests the proper human relation to nature—for human beings in their primordial state are Christlike, manifesting heaven on earth (Versluis, 101).

⁹² This view of God's Word as acting in a Central way is familiar in Dooyeweerd. "In the Word-revelation God addresses the human race in its religious root, and man has only to listen faithfully" (*NC II*, 307).

⁹³ *Zeit*, 39 ft. 20; *Werke II*, 89:

Das ursprüngliche zeitliche Werk des Urmenschen war, all Strahlen dieser zentralen Aktion (des Wortes) nach und nach in seinem Wesen zu vereinigen und also das Wort in sich Mensch werden zu lassen. Ein Menschwerdung, welche, wie man weiß, Gott selbst übernahm, nachdem der Mensch sie vernachlässigte.

⁹⁴ *Werke VIII*, 156:

Christus hat uns wieder das Vermögen gegeben, Kinder Gottes zu werden, d. h. er gab uns das Vermögen, in Gott frei zu imaginieren, einen neuen Willen zu schöpfen, eine neue Willensgestalt zu erzeugen.

There may be a parallel to Dooyeweerd's statement that the image of God was "wiped out" in the fall (*NC* I, 4 fn2; *WdW* I, 6 fn1). The true image of God is Christ, the New Root, in Whom we now participate.

Faivre says that in discussing the redemption of the world, Baader adds ideas that are not found in Boehme. According to Baader, God created the temporal world in order to stop the negative process begun by the fall of Satan, and that the redemption of the world, God's Sabbath rest, could not be completed without the direct entry of the eternal Mediator, in the Son of God, in His creaturely copy man (*creatürliches Abbild*). And it was Baader's view that the incarnation, the Word becoming man, would have been necessary even if Adam had not sinned, but would have taken place another way (*Phil. de la Nature*, 80-81).

See Appendix A for references in Calvin to man as root and to Christ as New Root. See Appendix D for Dooyeweerd's references in *Twilight* to the importance of these ideas. And see Appendix E for other references from the Bible, from Orthodox sources, as well as later Protestant sources.

3. Direct access to superior worlds

According to theosophy, our creative imagination allows us access to the divine world (Faivre, 3). This allows (a) the exploration of all levels or dimensions of reality [dimensions] (b) the co-penetration of divine and human and (c) the spirit to fix itself in a body of light, experiencing second birth.

Both Kuyper and Dooyeweerd emphasize the immediacy of our relationship with God, and both speak of this in terms of our immediate experience in our supratemporal heart, and the revelation of the Word to our heart.

This immediacy of the supratemporal has sometimes been misunderstood by reformational philosophy. It is not that we are purely temporal beings who then need an intermediate realm in order to have knowledge of God. Rather, man was first created in the intermediate realm—the supratemporal, or what Dooyeweerd calls the 'aevum' (created eternity). It is our supratemporality that allows us to experience the temporal

world, and even our own temporal functions as “our own.”⁹⁵ Our immediate experience of supratemporality also allows us to mediate the temporal world and lift it to a higher level. Mediation is always that which lifts a lower realm to a higher one.⁹⁶ And it is because of our supratemporality that we can enter into the *Gegenstand*-relation, and to form ideas that transcend our temporal function of thought:

Therefore by maintaining the *Gegenstand*-relation, the theoretical Idea relates the theoretical concept to the conditions of all theoretical thought, but itself remains theoretical in nature, thus within the bounds of philosophic thought (*Encyclopedia*, 80-81, re-translated by myself)

Dooyeweerd says that in self-reflection, the truth of the fullness of meaning in our inner concentration point is “immediately evident” (*NC* I, 15; *WdW* I, 19). But Dooyeweerd does not have an individualistic view of revelation:

Scheler’s “Idea of God” is only “realizable” by an individual revelation. This Idea remains a merely intentional, theoretical hypostasis for any one who has not received this individual, most personal revelation. From this hypostasis the possibility of a *real experience* of the macrocosm can never be understood (*NC* II, 593, italics Dooyeweerd’s; *WdW* II, 528).

Thus our self-reflection does not lead us to individualistic experience or revelation. The revelation is in the heart, which is supratemporal and supra-individual.

Kuyper also emphasizes the immediacy of our knowledge of God, and he specifically relates this immediate knowledge to our being in the image of God. He says,

In the Babe of Bethlehem God Himself makes approach to us in our human nature, in order in our language, through our world of thought and with the help of our imagination, to make Himself felt in our human heart according to its capacity (*To Be Near Unto God*).

And Kuyper relates our being created in the image of God to our being able to perceive things of God by the “eye in the soul”:

⁹⁵ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘own,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Own.html>].

⁹⁶ This is also misunderstood by those reformational philosophers who, following postmodernism, speak of a mediation downwards. For example, they speak of all our knowledge being mediated by temporal reality. That is not Dooyeweerd’s view.

This eye in the soul is not a separate thing. It is rather the sum-total of all the powers in the soul, which enable it to become aware of, to perceive, to discover and to enjoy. This spiritual sight is a feeling, a perceiving, with all the powers that slumber in the soul. It is a waking up of the entire human nature that is within us, which, created after the Image of God, goes back to that original Image, clearly perceives the relation between the Image and the original, between the original and the impression, imprints it upon its own sense of self, and so knows God with an inward knowledge (*To Be Near Unto God*)

To perceive the relation between the Image and the original is the kind of correspondence emphasized by theosophy.

There are other parallels with Dooyeweerd, who emphasizes that the horizon of human experience has many levels, including the religious or supratemporal level, the temporal level, the modal level, and the plastic level of individuality structures.⁹⁷ For Dooyeweerd, the correspondence between these levels is by way of the higher level expressing the lower, and the lower referring back for its meaning to the higher level. Dooyeweerd starts from above, from God as Origin and man as supratemporal totality. He does not start from below, with an idea of substance, and that is why he rejects the idea of an analogy of being. For Dooyeweerd, only God has Being; created reality is merely meaning (See ‘Totality’).

We have already referred to point (b), the penetration of God’s eternity into the temporal. For example, the way that God’s eternal radiance breaks through and illuminates temporal reality. Does the temporal also penetrate the eternal? We might go into the Orthodox Idea of *theosis*, and what that means for us as “sons of God.”⁹⁸ But such a discussion is beyond the scope of this work.

⁹⁷ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘levels,’ at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Levels.html>].

⁹⁸ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘sonship,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Sonship.html>]

And the third point—regeneration of the heart—is certainly something that Dooyeweerd (and Kuyper⁹⁹) emphasize. I have already referred to van Moorsel’s view that this idea is related to Christian Hermeticism.

II. Imagination is an Act

A. Our supratemporal selfhood

As we have seen, for Dooyeweerd, our creation in the image of God is related to the nature of our supratemporal selfhood. We were first created as supratemporal and then we were “fitted into” (*ingesteld*) temporal reality. The way that we were fitted into temporal reality was by means of our body or mantle of functions.

But our supratemporal selfhood is a present reality. It is not just something that we strive for, or that we hope to attain only after death. In this life, we exist as both supratemporal and as temporal beings. Dooyeweerd makes this clear in many places.¹⁰⁰ Here is one such reference:

According to my modest opinion, and in the light of the whole Scriptural revelation concerning human nature it is just this possession of a supratemporal root of life, with the simultaneous subjectedness to time of all its earthly expressions, that together belong to the essence [*wezen*] of man, to the “image of God” in him—by means of which he not only relatively but radically to go out above all temporal things. And that is how I also understand Ecclesiastes 3:11 (emphasis Dooyeweerd’s) (Curators, 34).

Note that in our selfhood we really and radically transcend time.¹⁰¹ But although we transcend time in our selfhood, within the temporal coherence, we are universally-bound-to-time (*NC I*, 24; added to *WdW*).

⁹⁹ See Michael M. Morbey: “Kuyper, Dooyeweerd and the Reformational Vision: Theosophy Reformed,” (1988, 1995), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/aevum/Theosophy.pdf>].

¹⁰⁰ See J. Glenn Friesen: “Dooyeweerd versus Strauss: Objections to Immanence Philosophy within Reformational Thought (2006), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Objections.html>]

¹⁰¹ Dooyeweerd specifically rejects Vollenhoven’s idea of a fully temporal and merely pre-functional selfhood (*NC I*, 31, fn1).

Dooyeweerd is fond of quoting the Biblical verse “out of the heart are the issues of life.” By “issues of life,” he means the functions of temporal life, which issue within time from out of our supratemporal heart. Dooyeweerd refers to the heart as the source of these functions:

Scripture also calls it the “inward man” or the “heart” of man, “out of which proceed the issues of life” and “in which eternity is laid.” It is, as Kuyper expresses in his *Stone Lectures*, “that point in our consciousness in which our life is still undivided and lies comprehended in its unity...”¹⁰²

Dooyeweerd says that our body is the total temporal form of existence, whereas our spirit (soul) is the total and integral root-unity of our human existence (Curators, 34).

Dooyeweerd opposes both an absolutization of the temporal, and a spiritualistic flight away from the temporal.¹⁰³ Dooyeweerd calls the relation between our supratemporal selfhood and its temporal body a relation of ‘enstasis.’ (See ‘Enstasis’).

Dooyeweerd says that the “key of knowledge” is the Christian Ground-motive of creation, fall and redemption, but only when that Ground-motive is understood in its central and radical sense, in relation to man as the supratemporal religious root of temporal reality. Man was created as the religious root, and temporal creation has its center in man as the supratemporal religious root. The fall was of man as religious root, which is why the temporal world fell with man. And redemption is in Christ, the New Root, in whom our selfhood now participates (See Appendix D). The idea of the supratemporal selfhood as the religious root is also the key to understanding Dooyeweerd’s ideas of the nature of our actions of knowing, imagining and willing.

¹⁰² Het Tijdsprobleem in de Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee [The Problem of Time in the Philosophy of the Law-Idea], *Philosophia Reformata* 5 (1940) 160-192, 193-234, at 181 [‘Tijdsprobleem’]. Translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Tijdsprobleem.html>].

Dooyeweerd quotes the same passage from Kuyper in his 1939 article ‘*Kuyper’s Wetenschapsleer*,’ at 211.

¹⁰³ *Encyclopedia*, 62:

...a no less dangerous mystical direction which, along with a denial of creation, identifies “nature” and “sin” and desires to escape “nature” in a mystical experience of grace.

Without the experience of our selfhood as the religious root, we do not experience the world as it really is—as *meaning* (NC III, 30; *WdW* III, 12).

We can compare this seeing reality “as it really is” to what is said in the book *Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain*.¹⁰⁴ We think that we know what a face looks like and so when we draw a portrait, we set the eyes in the top of the head, as children do when they draw. But when we really observe, we see that the eyes are at the equator, the middle of our head. Our previous conceptions of what the world looks like get in the way of our perception. Similarly, when we read what Dooyeweerd says about the Christian Ground-motive of creation, fall and redemption, we tend to skip over the passages, thinking, “I know that already from Sunday school, so I don’t have to read it.” But Dooyeweerd’s point in *Twilight* is that this theological knowledge is not enough, and to the extent that it ignores the supratemporal religious root, it is wrong (See Appendix D). In order to understand Dooyeweerd, we need to set aside what we think we already know about his work, the meaning of the Bible, and the meaning of creation, fall and redemption.

B. Our acts proceed from out of our supratemporal selfhood

Dooyeweerd says that all of our acts proceed from out of our supratemporal selfhood. Imagination is an act. And, like all of our acts, imagination proceeds from out of this supratemporal selfhood. The following quotation is worth examining in detail:

Acts are inner activities of human beings by means of which, under normative points of view (for instance, logical, aesthetic, cultural, jural, ethical or pistical), they orient themselves intentionally (that is, intending or meaning) towards situations in reality or in their world of imagination, and make these their own by relating them to the “I” (as the individual religious center of the person’s existence).

These acts always proceed from the supra-temporal (and thus integral) center of human nature, which the Bible in a pregnant religious sense calls the “heart,” the “soul,” or the “spirit,” of the person. But it can only express itself within the human body as an enkaptic structural whole, more specifically, within its typical act-structure. The inner nature of acts resides in their intentional or meaning character. They only come to realization in the external world via a human

¹⁰⁴ Betty Edwards: *Drawing on the Right side of the Brain*, (New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher, 1999, originally published 1979). Of course, I am not suggesting that a mystical new view can be reduced to a change in physical brain states.

action. Action brings to realization the intention of the act in which the three fundamental orientations of the act-life (knowing, imagining, and willing), within the motivated process of taking decisions, are intertwined and decision is translated into action.

There is no action without act; but not every act comes to realization in an action. So it is possible for a scientific act of knowing or an esthetic act of imagining to remain entirely inwardly-directed.¹⁰⁵

There is a great deal of information that needs to be unpacked from this long quotation.

Let's enumerate some of the points made:

1. Acts proceed from out of our supratemporal and integral center, our heart.
2. Acts are expressed within the [temporal] act structure of the human body, which is an enkaptic structural whole.
3. Acts are inner activities.
4. Acts are realized in actions in the external world. Not all acts are realized.
5. There are three fundamental orientations of acts: knowing, imagining and willing.
6. Acts orient themselves under normative points of view.
7. Acts orient themselves intentionally towards situations in reality or in the world of our imagination.
8. In either case (reality or imagination), we need to make these situations "our own."

Now let's look at these points in detail.

1. Acts proceed from out of our supratemporal and integral center, our heart.

All acts, including our acts of thinking and of imagining, proceed from out of our supratemporal selfhood (*NC III*, 88; added to *WdW*). Because our acts proceed from out of our supratemporal heart, our supratemporal heart is the central realm of "occurrence"

¹⁰⁵ *Encyclopedia*, 223. Dooyeweerd says very much the same elsewhere. For example,

Our acts come out of our supratemporal soul or spirit, but they function within the enkaptic structural whole of the body, by which man, under the guidance of normative viewpoints, intentionally [*bedoelend*] directs himself to states of affairs in reality or in our imagination, and then makes these states of affairs innerly his own [*innerlijk eigen maakt*] by relating them to his selfhood [*ikheid*]. The human act life reveals itself in the three basic directions of knowing, imagining and willing. (*Reformatie en Scholastiek in de Wijsbegeerte*, Vol. I, 137, my translation.).

An almost identical passage occurs in *Grenzen van het theoretisch denken* (Baarn: Ambo, 1986) [*Grenzen*], 74. And see '32 Propositions,' 4.

(*NC I*, 32; added to *WdW*). But these acts are expressed temporally, within the functions of our temporal body, and within the temporal world. As already discussed, these functions are the issues of life, which proceed from out of our heart.

Because our actions proceed from out of the heart, we cannot form a theoretical conception of the heart:

The heart cannot be grasped by psychological analysis, for all theoretical analysis presupposes our heart, in the sense of our selfhood, which is active as thinking and analyzing ('Curators,' 26).

But we should not think of the acts as occurring in either the supratemporal selfhood alone or in the temporal body alone. The origination and the expression are one act:

All human acts have their origin in the soul as the spiritual center of man's existence. With respect to their temporal structure, however, they can only take place in the human body. It would be incorrect, therefore, to say that the soul or spirit thinks, imagines or wills, just as it would be incorrect to say that the body thinks, imagines or wills. The whole man as an integral unity of soul and body performs these acts. Outside of the body no acts are possible. In other words, acts should be thought of as neither purely spiritual, nor as purely bodily ('32 Propositions,' Proposition XX, p. 6).

2. Acts are expressed within our temporal human body, which is an enkaptic structural whole.

All our acts [*verrichtingen*] come forth out of the soul (or spirit), but they function within the enkaptically structured whole of the human body ('32 Propositions,' Proposition VIII, p. 4].

Our acts function in our temporal body, or what Dooyeweerd calls our "mantle of functions" (*functiemantel*). This mantle of functions is a structural whole made up of four separate enkaptically intertwined individuality structures: the inorganic, the organic, the biotic and the act-structure.¹⁰⁶ Unlike temporal individuality structures, man as a whole cannot be qualified by any temporal functions:

Man is not qualified as a "rational-moral being," but only by his kingly position as the personal religious creaturely centre of the whole earthly cosmos. In him the rational-moral functions also find their concentration and through him the

¹⁰⁶ See my article 'Enkapsis.' Also see "32 Propositions." and *NC III*, 88.

entire temporal world is included both in apostasy and in salvation (*NC III*, 783; *WdW III*, 628).

So, although our acts come forth from our supratemporal center, they are expressed within our temporal mantle of functions. The human body is the free plastic instrument of the I-ness, as the spiritual centre of human existence (*NC III*, 88; added to *WdW*). As already discussed, we can temporally express our supratemporal selfhood because we are made in the image of God, who has expressed Himself in man as His image. And just as man finds his meaning in God, so the temporal world finds its meaning and existence within man as its supratemporal religious root.

Just as Dooyeweerd uses the word ‘revelation’ as synonymous with God’s expression of Himself, so he also refers to man’s temporal expression of himself as ‘revelation.’ He uses the same Dutch word ‘*openbaring*’ for God’s revelation and for man’s revelation in time. He refers to our heart as “the root and centre of our temporal life-revelations” and he refers to “the temporal revelations of the heart in the distinguished life-spheres.” (Curators, 26, emphasis Dooyeweerd’s). He mentions again “the whole Scriptural view of the heart as the religious root and centre of all temporal revelations of life” (Curators, 27)

3. Acts are inner activities

In the long quotation being analyzed, Dooyeweerd says that imagination, like all of our acts, is an inner activity. And he says that the “inner” is the realm of the “intentional,” the realm of “meaning.”¹⁰⁷ The “outer world” is the world in which the act is realized in an action.

Why has Dooyeweerd placed ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ in quotation marks? It is because what is ‘inner’ has two senses:

(a) First, there is our central inner and supratemporal selfhood, from which all of our temporal acts proceed.

¹⁰⁷ See “32 Propositions” regarding ‘innerness’ (*innerlijkheid*).

(b) But these acts, which proceed from our supratemporal center, function in the enaptically-structured whole of the human body, our mantle of functions. Our temporal body is also ‘inner’ in contrast to what is outside of our body. But this is a secondary level of ‘innerness’; it is a temporal distinction of inner and outer.

4. Acts are realized in actions in the external world. Not all acts are realized.

An *act* of imagination that takes place only in reference to our body’s temporal functions of consciousness is an act that is not realized. It becomes an *action* only when it is realized in the external world. It is the performance (activity) that actualizes (realizes) the intention of the act (‘32 Propositions,’ 4). Thus, a purely intentional act still needs to be actualized or realized in temporal reality. When we realize our productive imagination, we make the product of our imagination real. (See below for an extended discussion of ‘productive’ and of ‘making real’).

5. There are three fundamental orientations of acts: knowing, imagining and willing.

There are three different intentional directions to our acts: knowing, willing, and imagining (*NC III*, 88). But these temporal directions must be distinguished from the central (religious and supratemporal) act of self-consciousness:

It is not in his imagination, his will or his actions that man concentrates within himself the whole temporal creation, including his bodily nature. Rather, such concentration is achieved in self-consciousness, through self knowledge—an act of knowledge in which man concentrates himself upon himself. [my translation].¹⁰⁸

A very similar idea is found in Kuyper, who also refers to knowing, willing and imagining as powers of the soul, but distinguishes this from “the pondering soul in its totality”:

¹⁰⁸ Herman Dooyeweerd: “Het tijdsprobleem en zijn antinomieën,” *Philosophia Reformata* 1 (1936) 65-83, 4 (1939), 1-28 [‘*Antinomieën*’], 1:

Niet in het zich verbeelden, het willen of het handelen concentreert de mens heel de tijdelijke schepping inclusief zijn lichamelijke in zichzelf en zo heel deze werkelijkheid op God, maar in het zelf bewustzijn, door de zelfkennis, een kenacte waarin de mens zich op zichzelf concentreert.

The reason for this is, that the finding of God is not effected by any one power of the soul, but by the whole soul itself. It is not our knowledge, it is not our will, it is not our imagination or our thought, that grasps God and possesses Him; but it is the knowing, the willing, the pondering soul in its totality, in its inner unity and soundness, in its inner reality. Ray by ray enters in, but each ray is caught up in the one focus of the awakening life of the soul; and this action is called faith (*To Be Near Unto God*).

For Dooyeweerd, these three directions of acts are not to be understood as separate faculties of our selfhood. Rather, they are all intertwined and interconnected in one act-structure (*Encyclopedia*, 223). This act-structure is a temporal structure. It is the most encompassing of the four enkaptic structures that make up our physical body.

The three directions of acts have very different emphases. Knowing and imagining both have a *contemplative* orientation. And they are associated with the lingual and aesthetic modal aspects. The direction of our will is *practical* in orientation, and it is associated with the jural, moral and faith aspects (*Encyclopedia*, 192).¹⁰⁹ Our practical will depends on the other two directions of acts, for no act of the will is possible without knowledge and imagination (*Grenzen*, 77). This has implications for theoretical thought. Theoretical thought is an act of the will; it therefore depends on pre-theoretical knowledge and imagination, as well as on a distinct theoretical use of the imagination in the *Gegenstand*-relation (see below).

All acts, whether inward or outward, are expressed in all aspects (*NC II*, 112; added to *WdW*). For Dooyeweerd, our act of knowing, like all acts, occurs in all aspects. This is very different from the traditional conception of knowing based on a merely rational soul.

Whenever we know or will, this concrete action concerns not only an abstract “soul” (as a supposed substantial complex of rational-moral functions), but much rather our whole temporal existence in its enkaptically interwoven individuality structures, although we always *proceed from out of* the selfhood as centre of our existence (*Tijdsprobleem*, 223-224, italics Dooyeweerd’s).

¹⁰⁹ The inner act also has its lingual aspect. We think in judgments that we speak inwardly (*Grenzen*, 78 fn).

Unlike the idea of a merely rational soul, our act of thinking is not to be identified with merely the logical aspect.¹¹⁰

Imagination is another of the three directions that our acts may take. And just as the act of thinking is not to be identified with merely the logical aspect, so the act of imagination should not be identified with merely the psychical aspect of feeling. It takes place in all aspects, including the psychical.

Perception, representation, and remembrance are acts, not modalities (*NC* II, 372; *WdW* II, 308). As an act, perception functions in all aspects (*NC* II, 112; added to *WdW*). How do these acts fit with the three directions of knowing, imagining and willing? I believe that perception and remembrance are acts of knowing. Representation is certainly an act of the imagination. And yet, as we shall see, imagination is also involved in perception and remembrance, for they also involve the forming of images. We should recall here that Dooyeweerd says that all three directions of our acts work together.

6. Acts orient themselves under normative points of view.

As discussed, knowing and imagining both have a contemplative orientation. And they are associated with the lingual and aesthetic modal aspects. The direction of the will is practical in orientation, and it is associated with the jural, moral and faith aspects. All of these aspects are normative aspects. For Dooyeweerd, the logical aspect, and all the aspects succeeding it, are normative aspects. Sometimes he refers to these normative aspects as ‘spiritual’ aspects, in distinction to the ‘natural’ aspects (the pre-logical).¹¹¹ This is important, because as we shall see later, Dooyeweerd speaks of the imaginative

¹¹⁰ Dooyeweerd repeats this idea elsewhere: “No act of will (volition) is possible apart from acts of knowing and imagining” (*Encyclopedia*, 225). Like Dooyeweerd, Baader says that imagination and will are required before we can act (as deed). Sinful acts proceed along the same sequence:

Therefore, guard your imagination, for you can more easily win out over sin there (*Werke* 8, 102; see also *Werke* 13,68).

¹¹¹ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘spiritualistic’ at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Spiritualistic.html>].

opening up process of reality as a ‘spiritualizing-through’ [*door-geestelijking*] of temporal reality.

7. Acts orient themselves intentionally towards situations in reality or in the world of our imagination.

For Dooyeweerd, ‘intentionality’ may refer to either what is external to our temporal body, or to what is within the functions of our body. When used to refer to what is external to us, Dooyeweerd does not use the word ‘intentional’ in a phenomenological sense, where there is a directedness to supposedly independent things in the outer world.

When acts are “purely intentional,” they are directed inwardly. That is, they are directed to our functions within our temporal body, without reference to what is happening outside. In the case of theory, our own temporal functions of consciousness are analyzed in the *Gegenstand*-relation (See below). When they are directed outwardly, our acts become actions.

Dooyeweerd illustrates the difference between inner and outer intentionality by the example of riding in a train through a summer landscape. Looking out the window, we receive psychical impressions. We can direct our spiritual [inward] view to something else, such as a memory. The *meaning* of the outer world then escapes our eye, but the psychological beholding [*aanchouwing*] of it remains present (Verburg, 55). Meaning is always related to an inner intentionality.

8. In either case (inner or outer directedness), we need to make the temporal functions of our acts “our own.”

When we make an act “our own,” we relate that temporal act, which participates in all modal aspects, to our supratemporal selfhood, which transcends or goes beyond all temporal aspects. It is our intuition that makes us aware of our temporal functions as “our own.” Even the identification of a sensation such as a sweet taste would be impossible without 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; *WdW* II, 413).

Similarly, the modal aspects are not foreign to us, but are our own “cosmically” (*WdW* II, 409; *NC* II, 474). And in theoretical thought, we need to make the theoretical *Gegenstand* our own (*NC* II, 475). The role of intuition in theoretical thought is discussed in more detail in Part VI below.

III. Imagination and Perception

“We ever must believe a lie/When we see with, not through, the eye.”¹¹²

A. Perception in Naïve experience

1. Naïve (pre-theoretical) experience versus theoretical experience

Dooyeweerd distinguishes between our naïve or pre-theoretical experience, and our theoretical experience. If we do not acknowledge the supratemporal selfhood, the distinction between pre-theoretical and theoretical experience becomes blurred when (See ‘*Gegenstandsrelatie*’).

In our naïve experience, the horizon of individuality structures plays the dominant role (*WdW* II, 488; *NC* II, 557). Naïve experience grasps reality in its plastic structure (*NC* III, 36; *WdW* III, 15).¹¹³ The individuality structure of which we become aware expresses

¹¹² Malcolm Muggeridge, paraphrasing William Blake’s “Auguries of Innocence.” Malcolm Muggeridge, *A Third Testament*, (Toronto: Little, Brown & Co, 1976) [‘Muggeridge’] online at [www.brudershof.co.uk/e-books/downloads/ThirdTestament.pdf]. The actual quotation from Blake reads:

We are led to believe a lie
 When we see with not thro' the eye,
 Which was born in a night to perish in a night,
 When the soul slept in beams of light.
 God appears, and God is light,
 To those poor souls who dwell in night;
 But does a human form display
 To those who dwell in realms of day.

¹¹³ By ‘plastic,’ Dooyeweerd means that new individuality structures can be formed. The idea of formation is linked to the historical aspect, discussed in Part IV below.

itself in the sensory image without being itself of a sensory character.¹¹⁴ This determines the things and events experienced in the naïve attitude. Note that this does not mean that naïve experience is of the individual thing and that theory investigates the universal properties.

2. Naïve experience is not the same as a copy theory of reality

Dooyeweerd says that naïve experience is not the same as naïve realism. Naïve realism is a “copy theory of reality” (*NC* I, 43; Cf *WdW* III, 14 ‘*Abbildtheorie*’). What does he mean by this? And how does his own view of naïve (or pre-theoretical) experience differ from this copy theory?

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.¹¹⁵ The *datum* is given, and not constructed by us. Nor is this givenness something that is abstracted by us from the continuity of all the aspects of our experience in time. And Dooyeweerd says that that is what the copy theory does: it reduces our full experience to an abstraction of the sensory aspect from the full continuity of our experience. Thus, a copy theory of reality is not the same as naïve experience, but rather a theory about experience. True naïve experience comes before all theories.

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). As we shall see, Dooyeweerd has his own *Abbild*-relation or copy relation in imagination, but it is distinguished from the copy theory of perception.

¹¹⁴ A structural whole is made up of one or more enkaptic interlacements of individuality structures. A structural whole functions in or expresses itself in the aspect. In fact, every aspect is an expression of the structural whole (*NC* III, 116 fn2).

¹¹⁵ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘given,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Given.html>].

3. Perception is not of objects completely external to us

Dooyeweerd says that he rejects a view of images, if by image is meant a reproduction of the external world apart from us.

According to this view, naive 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 naive experience. Naive 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 knowledge¹¹⁶ (my emphasis).

So one of Dooyeweerd’s objections to the copy theory is that it assumes it is copying an external world that is separate from man. He says that there is no such thing as a natural reality in itself. As already discussed, for Dooyeweerd, the temporal world has no existence in itself, but only in man. Any view of perception that regards the world as totally independent is therefore to be rejected.

According to the copy theory (*Abbildtheorie*), which Dooyeweerd rejects, our perception furnishes us with an exact image of an external object in reality; perceiving is like taking a photo of something *external to us*.

Dooyeweerd says that we are actively involved in our perception of the world. Our imagination plays a role in perception. And he refers to our sensory imagination as “productive.” We will come back to what he means by ‘productive.’ For the moment, it is sufficient to note that for Dooyeweerd, perception is not of things that are totally external to us. Rather, temporal reality has its existence and reality only in 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 (*NC I*, 100; *WdW I*, 65).^{116A}

¹¹⁶ Herman Dooyeweerd: “Introduction to a Transcendental Criticism of Philosophic Thought,” *Evangelical Quarterly* 19 (1947), 42-51. [‘Ev.Qu.’].

^{116A} See also Linked Glossary, entry for ‘existence,’ at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Existence.html>]

4. Rejection of phenomenology

Since perception is not to be understood as perception of objects that are external to us, we must also distinguish Dooyeweerd's ideas of perception from those of phenomenology, which seeks to perceive and understand the object external to us. Dooyeweerd says that phenomenology is one of the most dangerous philosophies for Christians (*WdW* II, 422; *NC* II, 487).

Some of the ways that Dooyeweerd's philosophy is different from phenomenology are:

a) The view of things and events as 'phenomena' reflects a view that these things and events exist in themselves, apart from us—phenomenology seeks the *eidōs* as a "*Sache an sich*." But once we realize the self-insufficiency of all meaning, we realize that the phenomenological attitude is contrary to the truth (*WdW* II, 421-424; *NC* II, 485-89). For temporal things do not exist except in their supratemporal root. The idea of the supratemporal root is not found in Husserl. It is a theosophical idea.

b) Dooyeweerd does not accept phenomenology's view of consciousness. He says that phenomenology is still based on an abstraction. It lacks true self-consciousness. In seeking a "pure essence", the "phenomenological reduction" lacks a radical transcendental self-reflection (*WdW* II, 424; *NC* II, 489). For Dooyeweerd, true self-consciousness is related to our supratemporal selfhood.

c) Dooyeweerd's use of the word 'intentional' must also be distinguished from Husserl's idea of intentionality. Dooyeweerd does not mean it in Husserl's sense of "directed towards the object," because Dooyeweerd does not share the same view of objects. For Dooyeweerd, there is no mere phenomenon for which we must find the essence. If we try to search for the essence of a thing, the aspects are torn apart into *noumenon* and *phenomenon* (*WdW* I, 68).

d) Dooyeweerd's use of the term 'aspect' must also not be understood in terms of phenomenology's perspectivalism, which claims that we view a reality that exists apart from us from different angles or perspectives. Dooyeweerd's perspectivalism is not one

of different angles, but of different levels or dimensions of an experiential horizon.¹¹⁷ And although Dooyeweerd does speak of aspects as modes of intuition (*'schouwingswijzen'*), that is different from perceptual perspectives in phenomenology's sense.¹¹⁸

e) Dooyeweerd has a different view of "actuality." The "actuality" referred to by phenomenology is the kernel of each subject function (*WdW* I, 78; *NC* I, 101). This is something that needs to be explored further, and is outside the scope of this article. I believe it has to do with Dooyeweerd's view that the kernel of each function is central and supratemporal (See *'EvQu'* and my article 'Enkapsis').

f) Dooyeweerd's use of the word *'epoché'* to explain the theoretical attitude of thought is carefully distinguished from Husserl's usage. He does not use *'epoché'* in the sense of the "bracketing" of our assumptions, but in the sense of a "refraining" from the coherence of cosmic time, an abstraction from full temporal reality.¹¹⁹

5. Rejection of a functional analysis of perception

A functionalist analysis of perception is one that regards perception as a function between two independent entities. But in its view of entities, functionalism denies the individuality structures of our temporal experience, and views them as substances. Functionalism views an individuality structure as a

...*Ding an sich* [Thing in itself] separate from any possible perception of it by humans. Such a view can only lead to the traditional dichotomistic conception of human nature as a composition of a material body and an immortal rational soul (*NC*, I, 44; added to *WdW*).

Dooyeweerd rejects a functional analysis of perception, because it distorts our naïve experience. This distortion is caused because functionalism bypasses the problem of a

¹¹⁷ See Linked Glossary, entry for 'levels,' at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Levels.html>].

¹¹⁸ See discussion below regarding intuitive vision [*schouwen*]. And see Linked Glossary, entry for 'aspects,' at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/aspects.html>].

¹¹⁹ See Linked Glossary, entry for *'epoché'*, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Epoche.html>].

thing-structure. By abstract simplification, functionalism theoretically demolishes what is given in the pre-theoretical experiential attitude (*NC* III, 106; *WdW* III, 73). So functionalism does not have a proper view of things as individuality structures.

Dooyeweerd does say that these individuality structures have functions. But these functions are within the modal aspects. Our subjective act of perception also functions within the modal aspects. Dooyeweerd thus distinguishes between modal aspects and functions.¹²⁰ We cannot regard the psychological aspect as itself a function. Our acts function within the psychological aspect, and that aspect is distinct from the function:

...perception, representation, remembrance, volition etc. are concrete human 'acts', which as such cannot be enclosed in a modal aspect of reality, but have only a *modal function* within the psychological law-sphere (*NC* II, 372; *WdW* II, 308).

Similarly, the individuality structure of what is perceived functions in the psychological aspect. Objective perceptual images are formed that have an implicit object-structure within the aspect. We will analyze this in our discussion of the subject-object relation within the modal aspects, which is very different from a functional relation between independent entities. For now, the point to understand is that to analyze these object-structures in an aspect, we need to analyze the individuality structure that functions in that aspect:

These dependent, implicit object-structures may show all kinds of individual complications in the psychological aspect. They cannot be analysed by means of the modal concept of function. Only by analysing the individual thing-structure in which they occur can their nature become theoretically clear to us (*NC* II, 376; *WdW* II, 313).

So Dooyeweerd's view of perception can only be understood in terms of individuality structures. Even to regard perception as a function of the eye is to understand the eye in terms of substance. This is confirmed when Dooyeweerd refers to the image on the retina

¹²⁰ He maintained this distinction right up to the last article that he wrote. See '*Gegenstandsrelatie*.'

as a sensory image on another sensory image. The retina of our eye, on which a sensory image is formed, is itself an individual objective perceptual image!¹²¹ (see below).

In contrast to a functionalistic view of an independent subject viewing an independent object by a psychological function, Dooyeweerd's view of individuality structures and of the subject-object relation in the act of perception gives a much more interdependent relation of perception. There is not a dualism between subject and object, but a reciprocal back and forth relation of images in the subject-object relation. This will become clear as we continue, but it is a view of perception that is very different from the current understanding in reformational philosophy.¹²² Dooyeweerd specifically says that in our naïve experience (which includes our perception), there is no dualism between knower and known:

In its logical side, naïve experience remains wholly *fitted into* [*in-gesteld*] temporal reality; it knows no dualism between knowing and what is known; it understands both the logical and the post-logical functions of things—in what I later describe as the *structural subject-object relation*—essentially as elements [*bestanddeelen*] of full reality as it is given to us (*Tijdsprobleem*, 163)

This is all very different from the “common sense” views of philosophers like John Searle. Searle seeks to defend the following propositions:

- 1) There is a real world ‘out there’ which exists totally independently of us and of our experiences, thoughts and language about it, and which is thus totally indifferent to us.
- 2) That we have access to that world only (exclusively) through our senses
- 3) That words like *rabbit* or *tree* have clear meanings only because they ‘correspond’ to real objects in the world

¹²¹ See discussion below. And Cf. David Loy's discussion of the eye in his account of nondual perception. David Loy: *Nonduality* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1988), 90-95.

¹²² Since Vollenhoven denies the intra-modal subject-object relation, and since he denies the idea of individuality structures, his view of perception is a functionalistic relation between different entities. See ‘Dialectic.’

4) That our statements are typically true or false only on the basis of whether or not they objectively correspond to ‘the facts that are in the world’ independently of ‘us’,¹²³

All of these propositions conflict with Dooyeweerd’s philosophy and view of perception. The strangeness of Dooyeweerd’s ideas of perception in relation to these common-sense views is why Dooyeweerd did not accept the suggestion that he translate his idea of naïve experience into English as ‘common sense.’¹²⁴ And those philosophers who have made comparisons of Dooyeweerd to common-sense philosophers like Thomas Reid (1710-1796) have not understood what Dooyeweerd means by the “givenness” of the data of naïve experience in all the modal aspects, nor his view of individuality structures and the subject-object relation, nor his underlying view of cosmic time. 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.”¹²⁵

¹²³ John Searle, *Mind, Language and Society: Philosophy in the Real World* (New York: Basic Books, 1998).

¹²⁴ Letter dated October 4, 1946 from Intervarsity to Dooyeweerd regarding the translation of his work:

And the phrase “naïve realism” would cause raising of eyebrows here if what you mean is simply “commonsense.” (Dooyeweerd archives, Amsterdam, *Lade* I, 3).

¹²⁵ Dooyeweerd mentions William James and Thomas Reid in this quotation:

That the “specious present” is really a *current time of feeling*, or a *time of sensory awareness*, and not something that can be brought back to *memory* as Reid thought in his *Essays on the Intellectual Powers*, is forcefully brought to light by Wildon Carr in a conference of the Aristotelian Society held in 1915/16, and mentioned by Gunn. He gave there a critical analysis of our awareness in the seeing of a shooting star. In this he remarks,

The line is *sensed*, not memorized. The whole series is *within* the moment of experience, and is therefore a present sensation.

Bergson has also placed all emphasis on this in his opposition of the “duration of feeling” and the mathematical concept of time. In a similar sense W. James and Gunn, *op. cit.* p. 394 and others. (*Tijdsprobleem*, 170, fn15).

The reference to Gunn is to J. Alexander Gunn: *The Problem of Time: an Historical & Critical Study* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1929). Dooyeweerd specifically cites Gunn in his article on the *aevum*.

Nor is naïve experience the same as our routine experience (*NC* III, 145; *WdW* III, 118). 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 opened 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.¹²⁶

Baader also specifically rejects the views of common sense philosophy (*Philosophische Schriften* II, 178).

6. Perception is much more than sense impressions

Dooyeweerd rejects the empiricistic view that our perception is based on sensory impressions, and he rejects the naïve realist view of sensation (*NC* III, 22; added to *WdW*).

For Dooyeweerd, our perception is based on all the aspects; the sensory-psychical aspect of experience has no experiential sense apart from the inter-modal coherence of meaning (*NC* II, 477; Cf *WdW* II, 413). Empiricism tries to reduce perception to only one aspect:

One should never try to resolve the biotic subject-object relation in its original modal meaning into sensory impressions, as is done by psychological empiricism (*NC* II, 374-75; *WdW* II, 311).

The copy theory of perception gives too much weight to our sensory impressions. Dooyeweerd says that the sensory plays very little role in naïve experience. Sensory perception is not preponderant:

It is doubtless true that in the naïve attitude we accept objective sensory qualities. But we experience them in the concrete context of our plastic horizon. We do not identify them with our subjective sensory impressions; we are always willing to complete or to correct a superficial perception by a more exact observation of the objective sensible image of a thing or an event, if it draws our special attention and if we are not in an emotional condition impeding a quiet verification of our subjective sensations. *But the sensory aspect of perceiving does not at all play that preponderant role in naïve experience which the current*

¹²⁶ We may find some similarity here to the Hindu idea that reality goes beyond the names and the forms [*namarupa*] that we use to describe it.

epistemological opinion ascribes to it (NC III, 38, italics Dooyeweerd's; added to WdW).

What does it mean that our naïve experience is an experience of all aspects? In naive experience, we certainly experience objective sensory qualities. But we experience these objective qualities in the concrete context of our plastic horizon. We don't identify individuality structures with our subjective sensory impressions (NC III, 38). For example, we immediately notice that the tree is qualified by the biotic aspect. The objective sensory total image of a tree is qualified by the biotic aspect (NC III, 104; WdW III, 72). The tree expresses itself within the psychical object side of reality in the sensorily perceptible image familiar to us:

The actual subject-functions of our linden are objectified in its object-functions in such a way that the latter betray the structural architecture of the whole, in the typical groupage of its aspects. In its sensorily perceptible image, for example, the qualifying function, as such, delineates itself in an objective modal analogy, which hereby acquires a dominant position in the total image. In naïve experience this immediately distinguishes the objective sensory image of a living tree from that of a dead thing though doubt may arise with respect to trees affected by disease (NC III 105; Cf. WdW III, 72).

Similarly, our perceptual image of an animal qualified by leading psychical function. We could not know this merely on the empiricist view of sense impressions.

Dooyeweerd specifically rejects the empiricistic distinction between primary and secondary qualities. He discusses how modern science relies on the distinction to show that secondary qualities (sensory qualities such as colours, tones, temperatures, pressures, etc.) are merely subjective, and that the primary qualities are the supposed objective states of affairs investigated by science. Dooyeweerd points out that this distinction could not hold even within modern science:

Theodor Haering correctly points out that modern physics not only eliminates the secondary qualities of matter, but the so-called primary qualities as well. (NC III, 37; WdW III, 18).

This is because modern science restricted itself to a mathematical formulation of the physical functions. But Dooyeweerd says that these abstract mathematical formulae cannot exhaust the objective contents of human experience, and so the distinction between primary and secondary qualities cannot account for our experience. Rather, the so-called secondary qualities are object functions within the individuality structure itself,

in relation to possible subjective functions which the things do not possess (*NC I*, 42; added to *WdW*).

His rejection of the idea of a thing in itself [*Ding an sich*] is related to the view of man as the temporal root:

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 (*Roots* 30).

Well, what about the theory of perception based on our reception of light waves? Dooyeweerd also rejects that commonly held view.

...but it makes no sense to suppose that electro-magnetic waves of a certain wave-length are sensorily perceptible, if they lack an objective sensory aspect (*NC III*, 37; added to *WdW*).

and

It makes no sense to assume that the impression of sensory colours is caused by light-waves *in their abstract physical aspect*. If light-waves are taken as real events in an empirical sense, they must have an objective sensory modality, and then cause and effect are to be conceived in the *sensory* subject-object relation (*NC III*, 40; added to *WdW*).

Dooyeweerd's point here is that light waves are not just an aspect of our experience. They are events, and like all events, they function in all aspects. In order for these light waves to affect us biotically, these light waves must also function in the biotical aspect:

Indeed, biotical stimuli exercised on the nerves of the sense-organs can no more be caused by the external events concerned, if the latter lack an objective biotical aspect. And biotical stimuli, as such, cannot cause sensory psychical impressions, if the term 'biotical' is taken in a non-psychical sense (*NC III*, 40; added to *WdW*).

Baader also rejects an empiricist view of perception. He 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).

7. Perception is not explained merely by inner and outer

We have already seen that Dooyeweerd views acts as inner, and actions as acts that have been realized in what is external to us. Our imagination is therefore related to our innerness.

But this inner and outer distinction does not help to explain perception. He says that psychology commonly distinguishes between sensory perception of the “outer world” dependent on “observation in space,” and our “inner” subjective experience of feelings, which do not give us a spatial picture of objective phenomena (*NC II*, 371; *WdW II*, 307). But Dooyeweerd rejects this distinction. The words ‘outer’ and ‘inner’ have a spatial meaning and are confusing if you try to contrast spatial perception with the use of the word ‘inner.’ For *both* our ‘inner’ and our ‘outer’ world have a sensory aspect. Dooyeweerd contrasts the sensory aspect of the imagination with the sensory perception of the objectively perceptible ‘outer world’ (*NC II*, 372; *WdW II*, 308).

Our sensory perception of space is not just a passive impression of something external to us. There is also an “inner” perception of space in which we are active:

The objective sensory picture of space cannot exist without its structural relation to our active subjective feeling of extension in its subjection to the universally valid laws of spatial sensory perception (*NC II*, 373; *WdW II*, 310).

So both our ‘inner’ and our ‘outer’ world also have a spatial aspect. Without the subjective feeling of extension we could not perceive any objective sensory image of space.

Baader says the same—all spatial perceptions are also within me (as represented). Therefore the subject is not just inner, and the object is not just outer (*Philosophische Schriften I*, 43).

Dooyeweerd says that the terms ‘outer world’ and ‘inner sense’ [*Sinn*] cannot teach us anything with regard to a cosmological analysis of the psychical subject-object relation (*NC II*, 372; *WdW II*, 308). The issue should really be regarded as follows:

What aspects of reality can be objectified within the psychical law-sphere in the sensory image to which subjective sensory perception is related? (*NC II*, 372; *WdW II*, 308, italics Dooyeweerd’s).

There is therefore a sensory image in which aspects are objectified (in the subject-object relation), and a subjective sensory perception related to those objectified aspects in the objective image. To understand this, we need to look at (a) Dooyeweerd's idea of the subject-object relation, (b) the objectified sensory image, and (c) the subjective sensory perception. This last item—subjective sensory perception—exists in both a restricted and an opened form.

B. The Subject-Object relation

For Dooyeweerd, what is important in naïve experience is the subject-object relation. This relation provides the basis for the integral character of naïve experience. For our naïve concept formation is directed towards things and concrete events (*NC I*, 41-42; added to *WdW*). And the subject-object relation maintains our experience of the identity of a thing, even though that thing itself may undergo change (*NC III*, 3; *WdW III*, 1).

For Dooyeweerd, the subject-object relation occurs *within* the modal aspects. The entire subject-object relation depends on Dooyeweerd's view that the aspects are given in a temporal order of before and after. We objectify an earlier modality within a later modality. Objective functions and qualities are unreflectingly ascribed to things and natural events in modal aspects where they cannot appear as subjects (*NC I*, 42; added to *WdW*).¹²⁷

This objectivity is not the same as universally valid law-conformity (*NC II*, 370; *WdW II*, 306). In an individuality structure, the subject and object within the same law-sphere are *both individual*. They are not universals. But the subject and object have different individualities. Thus, the relation between an individual subject and an individual object cannot be reduced to a general or typical law.¹²⁸

¹²⁷ Vollenhoven denies this intra-modal subject-object relation. For Vollenhoven, the subject-object relation is only between things or entities, and not within an aspect (See 'Dialectic').

¹²⁸ Again, this must be contrasted with Vollenhoven. In viewing the subject-object relation between different entities of things, Vollenhoven reduces this relation to general laws between those things.

Although the subject-object relation cannot be explained by universals, the individuality of the modal object is “indifferent” to the subjects that it is related to:

An individual modal object is an object to any subject whatsoever which in the same modal aspect has the same typical relation to it (*NC II*, 371; *WdW II*, 307)

The only exceptions to this indifference are when (a) the object is the result of the formative activity of an individual subject or (b) when the individual subject has acquired the exclusive use of the object (*NC II*, 371; added to *WdW*).

To illustrate the subject-object relation, Dooyeweerd chooses the example of the subject-object relation within the modal aspect of feeling, which manifests itself in our sensory perception (*NC II*, 371; ; *WdW II*, 310II, 307). This example is helpful, since it directly relates to Dooyeweerd’s view of imagination. We will therefore look at this example in detail, to examine the subject-object relation as it occurs in our act of perception.

C. The Objective Sensory Image

Our act of perception relies on an objectification within the psychical aspect. The earlier aspects of number, space, movement, energy and organic life are objectified in the psychical modality:

The subjective modal functions of number, space, movement, energy, and organic life can be psychically objectified in the (objective) space of sensory perception, because in the modal aspect of feeling we find the retrocipations (analogies) of these modal functions of reality (*NC II*, 373-74; *WdW II*, 310)

This does not mean that original meaning of number, space, movement, energy and organic life are themselves sensory perceptible. But there are objective analogies of them that refer back to these original modal functions (*NC II*, 373 fn4; added to *WdW*).

This objective image is what Dooyeweerd calls the original image—the *oer-beeld*, translated as *Urbild*.¹²⁹ This *Urbild* is the objective sensory image that is formed in the psychical aspect. This objective sensory image refers back to the actual pre-psychical subject functions that have been objectified in it (*NC II*, 375; *WdW II*, 311).

¹²⁹ *NC III*, 113, referring to *NC II*, 375. Note that the Dutch word ‘*oer-beeld*’ is not translated to English, but to German! Dooyeweerd’s philosophy is Germanic, and this must not be forgotten when we examine his ideas of perception.

One of the pre-psychical subject functions that is objectified in the psychical aspect is the spatial aspect:

...the objective sensory space of feeling is a modal *retroicipation* of the original modus of extension. As such it forms the necessary *basis* within the modal structure of the psychical aspect for the sensory image of motion as an analogy that comes later in the modal arrangement. This in its turn is an (objective) modal retroicipation of the *original meaning* of motion (*NC II*, 168; *WdW II*, 111).

A sensory three-dimensional space is required for us to perceive images of motion (the aspect that succeeds the spatial aspect in the order of time):

Consequently sensory three-dimensional space is indeed the *a priori* modal condition of all sensory perceptions of the objective images of motion (*NC II*, 169; *WdW II*, 112).

There are two issues that complicate our understanding of the objective sensory image. The first is that this original image, or *Urbild*, may contain not only previous subject functions of an individuality structure, but it may also include prior subject-object relations that have been objectified. Dooyeweerd gives the example of perceiving a mother bird feeding her young. The objective sensory image includes the biotic subject-object relation of such feeding (*NC II*, 374; *WdW II*, 311).

The second complication is that the individuality structure that we are perceiving itself may contain other representations. For example, there may be drawings or designs on a piece of paper or cloth that we are perceiving. In that case, the original objective perceptual image of these designs must be sharply distinguished from its representation [*afbeelding*] (*NC II*, 375; *WdW II*, 312). If these designs are aesthetically qualified, then there is an enkaptic relationship of the representation within the objective image of the paper or cloth (see discussion of aesthetics below).

D. The subjective sensory image

The subjective sensory image is the correlate of the objective perceptual image of the *Urbild*. But the subjective sensory image exists both in a restricted form, which is a copy of the *Urbild*, and in an opened form, in which we perceive the anticipatory aspects in which the individuality structure that we are viewing may potentially function.

1. The Restrictive Sensory Image

a) Shared with animals

Our subjective sensory imagination forms a subjective sensory image in the psychical aspect. This is what Dooyeweerd also calls the restrictive sensory image.

The sensory function of imagination in this restrictive sense is also to be found in the psychical life of the higher organized animals (*NC III*, 115; added to *WdW*). Animals can have these sensory images or objectifications because they are temporal individuality structures qualified by the psychical mode. They therefore have a subject function in the psychical aspect. But animals cannot intentionally “act” in Dooyeweerd's sense, since they have no supratemporal center. They are ex-statically absorbed in time (*NC II*, 479-80; *WdW II*, 414-15). And our conscious experience of the psychical aspect is different from what animals experience:

This conscious experience is a quite different thing from the subjective undergoing of sense-impressions found in animals (*NC II*, 539; Cf. *WdW II*, 471).

Animals lack the inner human acts of experience; humans relate to the ego as the transcendent centre of human existence (*NC II*, 114; added to *WdW*).

Experience is related to the human I-ness. It is fundamentally different from the animal awareness of sensations (*NC II*, 477; added to *WdW*).

This last citation is in the context of making sensory impressions our own (e.g. sweetness), something that we have already discussed in the context of the supratemporal selfhood.

The three directions of our acts—knowing, imagining and willing—are all directed temporally. And they all have a relation to this subjective sensory image. Dooyeweerd refers to this as the sensory [outer] correlation to all three directions of our acts. There is a sensory knowing, a sensory representation and a sensory striving and desiring [*zinnelijk kennen, zinnelijk verbeelden and zinnelijk streven en begeren*] (*Grenzen*, 77). He repeats this elsewhere, and again indicates that this is something that we share with animals. The three orientations of our act life

... are founded in three orientations of intentional experiencing in the psychically qualified structure of the body, which we already encounter in the animal, namely, sensory knowing, sensory imagining, and sensory striving and desiring. These are not acts as such, because they are not related to a “self” and because the intentional experiencing here is not subject to the leading of normative points of view. Nevertheless, even the animal has a sensory knowledge of its environment; it possesses a sensory life of imagination...(*Encyclopedia*, 226).

In itself, this objectification in a sensory image is not an act, because even animals form sensory images. And acts are necessarily related to a selfhood, which animals do not have: (*Grenzen*, 77).

This restricted sensory objectification is not at an act, but is only implicit:

And in the objective sensory image to which subjective sensory perception is related, the objectifications... are implicit (*NC* II, 374; *WdW* II, 310).¹³⁰

Baader also refers to a kind of perception that we share with animals. Baader calls it ‘purely outer seeing.’ Animals do not share with us the inner seeing related to our central being (*Zeit* 56).¹³¹ He contrasts outer seeing with inner seeing, which seeks the Totality of the aspects, which he calls “elements and factors” (*Werke* 4, 98ff).

For a further discussion of Dooyeweerd’s view of animals, see Appendix B.

b) Restrictive sensory image as *Abbild*

Dooyeweerd speaks of this sensory image as a sensory representation (*NC* II, 375; *WdW* II, 312). This sensory image, as a representation, is a copy or *Abbild*. The restricted sensory image is “a merely *natural* “*Abbild-relation*” (such as is implied in the inverted

¹³⁰ Cf. Baader: outward seeing is possessed by humans in common with animals and which seems to belong to the mechanical part of our knowing. It is the kind of knowing that the French call ‘exact’: a knowing that, as is said, comes and goes to a man without his will, and for which coming and going he is really not responsible (*Zwieapalt*).

¹³¹ Insofar as Man is temporal, the three domains of mineral, plant and animal are matched in Man’s temporal being by body, soul and spirit, which correspond to the three outer senses, touching, hearing, and seeing (*Werke* IV, 153 and note 1). Baader refers to St. John who says, ‘that which we have seen, heard, and touched with our hands’ (*Werke* VII, 245). Our inner sense corresponds to our supratemporal center.

image of a thing on the retina of the eye)” (*NC* III, 114; *WdW* II, 82). We optically perceive this inverted image:

It is optically perceived only on the condition that in its physico-biotic substratum the stimuli of the incoming rays of light, on the extreme ends of the optic nerves, are transmitted to the brain. The sensory perceptible object-structure of the inverted copy on the retina is obviously a different one from that of the original objective perceptual image (*NC* II, 375; *WdW* II, 312-313)

The image that we optically perceive is different from the *Urbild*, the original objective perceptual image. So how does Dooyeweerd’s view of perception differ from that of the copy theory that he rejects? First, the original image or *Urbild* is not something that exists as substance independently of us, but is the objectification in the psychical aspect of an individuality structure functioning in all modal aspects. Therefore the *Urbild*, of which the subjective representation is a copy, is itself more than just the psychical aspect. It is a result of the subject-object relation in the aspects, something that occurs implicitly.

Second, the sensory copy, the *Abbild* of the *Urbild*, can be opened up. It is a dynamic image, and not a static “snapshot” of something existing “out there.”

Dooyeweerd says that the *Urbild* exists before the subjective copy or *Abbild*. Therefore the *Urbild* itself cannot be a representation of an image. Natural reality is not *depicted* in the sensory impressions (*NC* II, 581; *WdW* II, 516). The *Urbild* is the original image. The *Abbild* is its copy.

For a sensory representation (copy) pre-supposes a sensory *original image*, and as such the pre-psychical aspects of reality cannot occur. A representation, as such, is not originally objective; it is merely the optic copy of an individual perceptual image within another individual objective perceptual image, and always bound up with the latter in an optical-tactile way. Thus the objective perceptual image of a human being, an animal or a tree, has its inverted optic representation or copy on the retina of the eye (*NC* II, 375; *WdW* II, 312)

and

A sensory copy is unilaterally dependent on the original objective perceptual image whose optic copy it is, and also on the other objective perceptual image in which it is objectified: it has an *implicit* and an *indirect* object-structure. (*NC* II, 376; *WdW* II, 313)

Both of these quotations are remarkable in pointing out that the optic copy on our retina is itself an image within another individual objective perceptual image. Our retina is

itself an individual objective perceptual image! We have images within images, mirrors within mirrors. The other thing to notice is that a representation is not “originally” objective. A representation is a copy of that which is objective (in Dooyeweerd’s sense of objectification within the subject-object relation).

The restricted sensory image is a *projected* image of the *Urbild*. The optic objective picture of space on the retina is dependent on the impressions made by light. It is “a projective and limited spatial picture. Touch and movement are needed to make this image three dimensional” (*NC II*, 373; *WdW II*, 309). Dooyeweerd concludes from this that our sensory perception of space does not consist of merely passive impressions, as the copy theory claims.

c) Restrictive sensory image is only retrocipatory

This restrictive sensory image is of individuality structures in their *natural*, non-normative functioning in the aspects:

...in the retrocipatory direction of sensory perception the objective analogies of the pre-psychical functions of a thing or even are *given in a natural way* in objective sensory space, independent of any axiological moment in human sensory perception (*NC II*, 377; added to *WdW*).

When Dooyeweerd speaks of the restrictive sensory image as being merely natural, he is referring to the natural aspects of our experience, with their subject-object relations, as opposed to the normative (logical and post-logical aspects). The normative aspects are found in the opened sensory image (see below).

Since this restricted image refers only to the natural aspects, it refers by retrocipation to the earlier aspects, and to subject-object relations in those aspects:

Now it appears that the possibility of objectification in the modal aspect of feeling is primarily bound to the retrocipatory structure of this modal aspect (*NC II*, 373, *WdW II*, 310; Dooyeweerd’s italics)

and

The original objective sensory image always refers back to actual pre-psychical subject (respectively subject-object) functions objectified in the original sensory perceptual image. This is their essential characteristic (*NC II*, 375; *WdW II*, 311).

The restricted sensory image as such does not include even the logical aspect. In the modal sensory impression as such there is no logical identity (*NC* II, 450; *WdW* II, 381).

The post-psychical subject-functions and subject-object relations cannot be objectified in an objective sensory perceptual image (*NC* II, 376; *WdW* II, 310). In other words, we cannot form a perceptual image of the normative aspects.

2. The Opened Sensory Image

The opening process opens up the aspects of our experience, disclosing the anticipatory moments in the aspects. Sometimes Dooyeweerd refers to the opening process as an ‘unveiling.’ In other places he speaks of an ‘unfolding’ or a ‘disclosing.’ This implies that the full experience already exists in an enclosed or enfolded state.¹³²

The sensory image is also opened up. This opening does not have to be by a theoretical experience,¹³³ although theory also opens up the aspects in a different way (see below)

It will be recalled that Dooyeweerd says that in our acts, under the leadership of normative points of view, we direct our self intentionally to states of affairs either in reality or in the world of our imagination. One such normative leading is when the sensory image is objectified in the logical aspect. Representations are required in order to logically compare one sensory image to another. This is the objectification of the psychical in the logical. The (objective) sensory image is in turn objectified by the logical aspect. Before we can make logical distinctions, there must be a sensory image.¹³⁴

¹³² The fullness of meaning is supratemporal. That is why our Ideas need to transcend the temporal.

¹³³ *NC* II, 191; *WdW* II, 137: The opening of the historical sphere is not founded in the logical. And science depends on deepened manifestation of human power in the opening-process of history.

¹³⁴ Cf. Frederik van Eeden: In order to understand, in order to compare, we need an image [representation]. In the image we are mirroring. Frederik van Eeden: *De Redekunstige Grondslag van Verstandhouding* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1975, first published 1897), 46 #37. See also Hanegraaff II, 607: The soul does not think without images, a view that goes back to Aristotle’s *De Anima* III, 7, 431 a 16.

In the *WdW*, Dooyeweerd said that only retrocipations are expressed in the sensory object-function of the rosebush. But he corrects this view, acknowledging that what he said before comes into conflict with sphere universality. Dooyeweerd's corrected view is that there must therefore be potential anticipations in the restrictive sensory image that can be disclosed. Until they are opened, these anticipations are merely potential. For example, there is an anticipation of the logical aspect that can be opened up in our concept formation.

The objective logical characteristics of the rosebush definitely express themselves by anticipation in the sensory perceptual image. If this were not the case, then in naive, nontheoretical thought, which still remains rigidly bound to sensory representation, we could not logically distinguish a plant from a stone (*Encyclopedia*, 189).

But this naive concept formation, although it opens up the logical aspect in the sensory image, is entirely bound to the sensory image. It differs from our theoretical concepts formation (see below).

So the sensory image includes the logical aspect as an anticipation, but this is realized only after our naïve experience has been opened up. This is because our opened experience goes beyond the restricted sensory image, which we share with animals. Animals don't experience the logical aspect. Dooyeweerd says that the animal mode of awareness of things cannot be called experience since it lacks any relation to a selfhood (*NC III*, 58; *WdW III*, 38). Animals lack the inner human acts of experience that are necessarily related to the ego as the transcendent centre of human existence. They lack subject-functions within the logical and post-logical modal law spheres. Within these spheres, animals can have only object functions (*NC II*, 114; added to *WdW*).

Human sensory perception differs from animal perception in that it includes post-psychical anticipations like the logical. It also includes the later normative anticipations, such as the cultural, linguistic (symbolic), juridical and aesthetic anticipations (*Encyclopedia*, 190). But these anticipations are not accessible in the restrictive sensory image, but only in the opened image:

The objective analogies [retroicipations] are simply and directly given in the objective-sensory perceptual image. Within certain limits they are even accessible to the subjective sensory perception of the animal. A spatial form, movement, or life process, in the macro-world, objectifies itself as a matter of course in the sensory perceptual image. Those with normal vision, and who use their eyes, cannot help but see it, at least, if there is enough light. That holds as a matter of course in nature.

In the case of the objective anticipations, however, the situation is altogether different. These relate to normative aspects of reality. They belong to the opened, or deepened objective perceptual image, and are only accessible to an opened, subjective feeling-function of consciousness (*Encyclopedia*, 192-93).

An example of the unfolding process is given by our perception of a tree's internal unfolding process (*NC III*, 59; *WdW III*, 40). The tree does not exist totally separate from us, but exists "for us"; it therefore has object functions in the post-biotic modalities. In the psychic modality, it is a sensorily perceptible image. In the logical modality, the object of a possible concept; in the historical modality, the object of possible culture; in the linguistic modality, the object of symbolical signification. In the social modality, it has a social object function (parks); in the economic modality, it is the object of economic valuation; in the aesthetic modality, it is the object of aesthetic appreciation; in the juridical modality, it is legal object; in the ethical modality, it is the object of our love or hate; in the faith modality, it is the object of our belief-that it has been created by God, or merely a product of nature, or inhabited by a demon or good spirit.

See the discussion of the opening process in Part IV, "Imagination and the historical opening process."

E. Dreams, Phantasms, Hallucinations

As part of an act of knowing, a true perception is distinguished from a false perception. The subjective sensory image must correspond with the objective image. If it does not correspond, then it is a false perception, like a hallucination, fantasy or dream (*NC II*, 374-75; *WdW II*, 312;). For example, Dooyeweerd says that we may mistake a tree for a man (See "Advies"). This is similar to the usual problem posed by Hindu *advaitic* thought, of mistaking a rope for a snake.

Furthermore, the dream image and hallucination lack a sense of identity on the part of the subject (*NC II*, 375; *WdW II*, 312). The subject experiencing the dream or hallucination does not experience the image as his “own.”¹³⁵

F. The Unconscious

We should also discuss the relation of imagination to our unconscious. In productive imagination, we consciously will the formation of imaginative images. But sometimes, images erupt in visions from our unconscious, in an event that we have not willed.

Dooyeweerd refers to our unconscious and to depth psychology. He says that there are two layers of the act-life, as shown by depth psychology (Freud and his school). There is an unconscious underlayer and a conscious layer above [*bovenlaag*]. But the unconscious substratum of the act life is hierarchically subordinated to the conscious superstratum. If that structure is broken up, as in schizophrenia, there are symptoms of a pathological split.

The unconscious act-life breaks its hierarchical subordination to the conscious act-life, so that the patient is no longer capable of relating his disintegrated act-life to his I or selfhood (‘32 Propositions,’ Proposition XXI, p. 7).

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 (*Grenzen*, 83). These are all ideas that are very similar to Jung's view of the unconscious.

Let us look at his example of an unconscious process in remembering a name. He says that consciousness is not limited to the psychical and the later aspects:

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

¹³⁵ Contrast our normal experience of a sense of identity of inner and outer, given by our intuition (discussed below).

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 (*Grenzen*, 81).¹³⁶

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 a different level of reality that we have to attain; our consciousness is a given [*gegeben*] that we then analyze (*WdW* II, 405; Cf. *NC* II, 472). We just have to see reality differently. We have already looked at Baader’s reference to Eckhart’s views in that regard.

Elsewhere Dooyeweerd says that the personality ideal of the humanistic Nature/Freedom Ground-motive “received a death blow” from the findings of depth psychology (*NC* I, 214; added to *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 fn; added to *WdW*.)

¹³⁶ *Grenzen*, 81:

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 act-leven zijn eigenlijke continuïteit dankt aan het onbewuste.

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 calls the ‘personal unconscious.’

Dooyeweerd gives a more collective view of the unconscious 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).

But even that kind of collective knowledge was conscious at one time. The deeper meaning of unconscious is that which has yet to be unfolded in time.

In another passage, it is evident that the unconscious is not just repressed personal memories, but that it can include the post-psychical aspects. He says that the discovery of the so-called unconscious dealt another blow to the traditional dichotomistic conception of human existence:

For it became apparent that the relation between the pre-psychical, the psychical and the post-psychical functions of human life is even closer in the sphere of the unconscious than it is in the conscious superstratum. (‘32 Propositions,’ Proposition XXV, p. 7).

If that is so, then the unconscious also includes anticipations of aspects of experience that have not yet been opened.

Dooyeweerd rejects the idea that centers of the human act-life cannot be localized in the cerebral cortex, since when those areas are disturbed,

...neighbouring parts of the associative brains can take over their function. There is no actual “center of ideas” or “moral center” in the frontal lobes of the cerebrum. In contrast, the sense and motor aspects of sensory awareness can be localized. (‘32 Propositions,’ Propositions XIX, p. 6).

From that quotation, it appears that Dooyeweerd is prepared to see the brain as the center of motor and sensory awareness, but not of an opened sensory awareness.

Dooyeweerd seems to have an idea corresponding to Jung's Idea of individuation. We become more and more individual as we bring more of the unconscious to consciousness. We experience our individuality in the various structures of temporal societal relationships. We become ever more individual:

And within the temporal horizon man's self-consciousness does not from the outset have a static individuality. Rather it becomes more and more individual. This takes place in a process of development which is also historically determined (*NC II*, 594).

The original Dutch is even stronger:

En binnen den tijdhorizon wint het zelfbewustzijn eerst in een (ook historisch bepaald) ontwikkelingsproces aan individualiteit (*WdW II*, 529).

[And within the horizon of time, self-consciousness first attains to individuality within a development process (that is also historically determined)]

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,

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 translation in *Roots*, 12 obscures the meaning.¹³⁷

Baader also had an idea of the unconscious (and even of the shadow) long before Jung.

Baader refers to the shadow and the unconscious in the same passage.

The conscious being cannot exist save for the unconscious; light cannot exist except by the shadows; we do not serve the flame well if we remove the black carbon, or the plant if we take out its subterranean roots (*Werke I*, 66)

Baader says that the supernaturalists see the coherence between Nature and spirit (*Geist*) as contingent. They want to separate the will from its unconscious drives (*Begründung*,

¹³⁷ *Vernieuwing*, 11:

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

34). Baader is using ‘spirit’ here in the sense of the undifferentiated supratemporal center. Spirit is conscious and nature is unconscious. Thus, the unconscious is in that part of temporal reality that remains undisclosed. It is temporal nature that is still separated from the Center.

In a very interesting commentary, Sauer says that for Baader, the movement from the self to the theoretical *Gegenstand* breaks the homogeneous but unconscious unity in which the subject finds himself; it is an emancipation from the Quasi-Totality of the factual, unquestioned and unconscious; instead, the *Gegenstand* is ordered in a conceptual world [*Begriffswelt*]. Separated nature is mute and dark [*stumm und finster*] and lacks fulfillment and grounding (*Zeit* p. 40 ff 21). Sauer also emphasizes that in making the *Gegenstand*, we are becoming more conscious of the Other, the Not-I. But this other is our other.¹³⁸

Now this is somewhat similar to what Dooyeweerd says about naive experience being unconscious as to the aspects in their differentiation, and about theoretical thought explicitly distinguishing the modal aspects. We become more aware of what is not ourselves, making the *Gegenstand* “our own.” And this is a deepening of our naïve experience. Dooyeweerd says that our philosophy can no longer fall back [*terugvallen*] into the bare [*blooten*] naive attitude (*WdW* I, 60; Cf *NC* II, 482). That would be a return to naive experience without deepening.

More research is needed on these important issues.

G. Productive Imagination

Because the world does not exist apart from man, our perception is not of something that is totally external. Perception involves our sensory imagination, which is “productive” in its perception of the world. Dooyeweerd says that sensory imagination “really exhibits a productive objectifying function” (*NC* III, 115; *WdW* III, 84). What does he mean?

¹³⁸ Hanjo Sauer: *Ferment der Vermittlung: Zum Theologiebegriff bei Franz von Baader* (Göttingen: Vanderhoek & Ruprecht, 1977) [‘Sauer’].

Some theosophical theories are magical in the sense that they believe that we can actually manifest external things by imagining them. A favourite example is to point to Jacob's effect on the sheep that he tended. The white sheep, by looking at the coloured bark that Jacob placed before their eyes, were able to conceive speckled and spotted lambs (Gen. 30:31-42). People like Paracelsus put forward this magical view (Faivre, 102). Other theosophists regarded imagination as the Archimedean Point. Ritter wrote to Novalis' brother: "The point claimed by Archimedes has been found. *We will make the Earth really move*" (Faivre, 116).¹³⁹

But I don't believe that productive imagination for Dooyeweerd includes the restrictive image, since that would imply that all of temporal reality is a product of our formative imagination.¹⁴⁰ I believe that the statement that sensory imagination "really exhibits a productive objectifying function" must be interpreted in the sense of bringing to reality those aspects that had previously been closed. It is the opening up of the restrictive sensory image. And in doing that, we are actualizing what was merely potential.

If productive imagination applied to the restrictive sensory image, then animals would have productive imagination, too, and that does not seem to be Dooyeweerd's view, since he says that the objective sensory image is not due to an act, but occurs implicitly.

We can obtain some help by looking at Baader's view of perception. We have already referred to Baader's idea that the temporal world is a prism that reflects back the divine ray, but in a reengendered way. The passage by Faivre contains views on perception that are relevant to our discussion. It continues:

All of nature is the prism of the divine ray of light," he [Baader] writes. There is, he also reminds us, a solar substance in water which calls for and attracts the rays of the Sun. The Sun then projects its own image in the water (*ein-bilden*), which then allows the water to send this image back to the Sun while reengendering it (Faivre, 160).

¹³⁹ It is interesting that most discussion of Dooyeweerd's use of 'Archimedean Point' refers to its fixed nature. But since Dooyeweerd also says that all acts come from out of the supratemporal selfhood, the dynamic consequence of what proceeds from this Archimedean point should also be taken into account.

¹⁴⁰ Some theosophical systems go that far. I don't think that Dooyeweerd does.

Faivre discusses Baader's view of perception, particularly as these are set out in Baader's article *Towards a Theory of the Image*.¹⁴¹ Faivre says that Baader was interested in theories of light and optics. For Baader,

...the sense of sight presupposes both the existence of a passive mirror in the eye, and a function that is active, formative, and completing. Similarly, he differentiates two sorts of imagination, one active, the other reactive.

Baader rejects any view of knowledge as a reproduction of things in themselves (*Dingen an sich*). So Baader, too, rejects ideas of perception of things existing independently of us as things in themselves. To hold to such a *Reproduktionstheorie* would be to remain bound to the standpoint of our outer senses (*der äußeren Sinne*) (Sauer, 39). Baader's idea of the outer senses corresponds to Dooyeweerd's idea of the restricted sensory image, which has not been opened up for its anticipatory and especially its normative aspects.

For Baader, true knowledge involves fixing something in an image, and giving form.¹⁴² Both the producer of the image and that which is produced play both an active and a passive role. The image mediates between us as the producer, and what is produced (*Werke* 8, 101).¹⁴³ There is a complex relation of knower and known; Baader relates it to the Biblical view of knowledge, connecting knowledge and sexual generation. Our perception involves imagination. But something in the object perceived also draws us to it. What we are drawn to is also found within us, and in what we imagine.

Baader gives the example of A wanting to produce the image of B.

¹⁴¹ Faivre 143-149, referring to "Zum Lehre vom Bilde," in *Vorlesungen über speculative Dogmatik* (*Werke* 8, 93-106).

¹⁴² Erkennen meint ein Darstellen, ein Ins-Bild-fassen, Gestalt-Geben. "Ins-Bild-fassen" is active, spontaneous, productive.

¹⁴³ In the same way we have consciousness of ourselves only by intermediary of a thought engendered in us (an interior objectivation of ourselves or a reproduction of ourselves), and this image-thought serves as mediator for our consciousness of ourselves and of our activity directed outside, the activity realizing or accomplishing this image-thought (*Werke* 7, 35)

1. First, there is a ray from B. B has implanted a seed in A. I understand this in terms of Dooyeweerd's idea of objective image, *Urbild*. Both Baader and Dooyeweerd speak of this *Urbild* being 'projected' to us. We find a similar view of projection in Kuyper.¹⁴⁴
2. The projection awakens a return ray in A. I understand this in terms of Dooyeweerd's idea of restrictive subjective sensory image, or *Abbild*.
3. The return ray can also be the moment of A's desire for B. In his imagination, A obtains a power to generate a will to B. This is the spiritual image (*Geistbild*). Imagination generates this image as an *Idea formatrix* (*Werke* 2, 260). I understand this

¹⁴⁴ Abraham Kuyper: *The Work of the Holy Spirit* (New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1900, Vol. II, Chapter I, IV, "Image and Likeness.", "Image and Likeness," online at [http://www.ccel.org/k/kuyper/holy_spirit/htm/TOC.htm]:

According to the universal significance of the word, a person's image is such a concentration of his essential features as to make it the very impress of his being. Whether it be in pencil, painting, or by photography, a symbol, an idea, or statue, it is always the concentration of the essential features of man or thing. An *idea* is an image which concentrates those features upon the field of the *mind*; a statue in marble or bronze, etc., but regardless of form or manner of expression, the essential image is such a concentration of the several features of the object that it represents the object to the mind. This fixed and definite significance of an image must not be lost sight of. The image maybe imperfect, yet as long as the object is recognized in it, even tho the memory must supply the possible lack, it remains an image.

And this leads to an important observation: The fact that we can recognize a person from a fragmentary picture proves the existence of a *soul-picture* of that person, *i.e.*, an image photographed through the eye upon the soul. This image, occupying the imagination, enables us mentally to see him even in his absence and without his picture.

How is such image obtained? We do not make it, but the person himself, who while we look at him draws it upon the retina, thus putting it into our soul. In photography it is not the artist, nor his apparatus, but the features of our own countenance which as by witchery draw our image upon the negative plate. In the same manner the person receiving our image is passive, while we putting it into his soul are active. Hence in deepest sense, each of us carries his own image in or upon his face, and puts it into the human soul or upon the artists' plate. This image consists of features which, *concentrated*, form that peculiar expression which shows one's individuality. A man forms his own shadow upon a wall after his own image and likeness. As often as we cause the impress of our being to appear externally, we make it after our own image and likeness.

in terms of Dooyeweerd's idea of opened image. There has been a formation of an image, but until it is actualized, it has no historical significance.

4. A gives the implanted seed back to B; then the Will of A is in B. We can say that the will of A is formed (*gebildet*) in B. Baader refers to this as the willed form, the essential image (*Willensgestaltung, wesenhaftes Bild*). I understand this in terms of the actualization of the act of imagining in an action.

5. When the formation is completed, it returns to A, and forms the body of the image, and the image is completed. The image has corporeality, or *Leiblichkeit*. This is the living form, the corporeal image (*leibhafte Gestaltung, leibliches Bild*). We find a reference to the corporeal image in Kuyper. Kuyper refers to the idea of Friedrich Christoph Oetinger (1702-1782), that "Leiblichkeit ist das Ende der Werke Gottes" ["embodiment is the goal of the works of God"]¹⁴⁵

H. Intentionality

In our productive imagination, we form a purely intentional object. It has no relation, except an intentional one, to the concrete object-side of temporal reality (*NC II*, 387). Dooyeweerd makes it clear that he is using 'intentional' in the sense used by the scholastics:

In our productive fantasy we are thus indeed confronted with an *intentional* object, in the sense explained in the modal analysis of the subject-object relation in context with the scholastic logical conception of the *objectum intentionale* (*NC III*, 115-116, referring to *II*, 387ff; *WdW III*, 83 referring to *II*, 306).

The intentional character of our acts is their inner nature. Acts only come to realization in the external world via a human action. Actions bring to realization the intention of the act in which the three fundamental orientations of the act-life (knowing, imagining, and willing), within the motivated process of taking decisions, are intertwined and decision is translated into action (*Encyclopedia*, 223). But even the formation of this intentional object is productive. The imaginative act is productive in itself. Thus, an artist's

¹⁴⁵ See my article 'Kuyper and Baader.' Faivre says that Oetinger owes his theory of *Leibwerdung* or embodiment to Boehme (*Phil. de la Nature*, 76).

aesthetic fantasy is a real productive act, even if it is not actualized or realized in an external individuality structure.

This productive view of imagination is very different from David Hume's. Hume saw imagination as "the faculty that enables us to picture something not actually given in our sensory impressions." Thus, Hume saw imagination as restricted to psychical laws of association (*NC* II, 515; *WdW* II, 444).

The productive nature of our imagination, which is involved in this opening up process, is in a sense a construction of an opened reality. But it is not a constructivism that is based on our logical thought. That would absolutize the logical aspect. We can see this difference when we contrast Dooyeweerd's (and Baader's) view of imagination with that of Kant.

Productive imagination is not the same as Kant's idea of the imposition of forms of intuition on a presumed sensory manifold. For one thing, Dooyeweerd disagrees with an empiricistic view of a sensory manifold. And on the other hand, Dooyeweerd does not regard the opening up process as the imposition of logical forms. He sees Kant's view of the transcendental imagination as based on logic. For Kant "even the unconscious imagination can execute the synthesis only by means of the logical function of the understanding" (*NC* II, 497; *WdW* II, 430).

I. Reproductive Imagination (Memory)

Remembering and representation are also acts (*NC* II, 372; *WdW* II, 308). In memory, a past sensory representation is recalled. In the images of our memory, the actual reference to reality is therefore only of a *reproductive* nature (*NC* II, 375; *WdW* II, 312). Memory merely reproduces that which has already been produced as a sensory image.

Insofar as our concepts refer to the retrocipatory aspects of our experience, our memory is needed. Imagination is used in the representations that we remember and incorporate in these concepts.

Baader distinguishes sterile imagination from the creative imagination (*schöpferische Einbildung*), which is really productive as much inside the subject as outside it. Active

imagination involves active desire. A reactive imagination is mere nostalgia, *Sehnen* and *Sucht* (Faivre 117).

IV. Imagination and the historical opening process

A. Imagination and the opening process

For Dooyeweerd, the opening process involves the “positivizing of principles.” In this positivization, the opening of the normative meaning-moments takes place (*NC* II 336; *WdW* II, 266). These principles are given only potentially and must be actualized (*NC* I, 105; added to *WdW*). These principles that are positivized are the normative aspects that until then have been only potentially within the individuality structures.

Refer again to the quotation analyzed previously:

Acts are inner activities of human beings by means of which, under normative points of view (for instance, logical, aesthetic, cultural, jural, ethical or pistical), they orient themselves intentionally (that is, intending or meaning) towards situations in reality or in their world of imagination, and make these their own by relating them to the “I” (as the individual religious center of the person’s existence) (*Encyclopedia*, 223).

In the opening process, we disclose these principles and powers, which God enclosed within creation:

The powers and potential which God had enclosed within creation were to be disclosed by man in his service of love to God and neighbour (*Roots* 30).

The unfolding of the anticipatory spheres is part of our anticipation in the fulfillment of all things:

The “unfolding of the anticipatory spheres,” as an active “in-spiration” [lit. “spiritualizing-through”] of the law-spheres, is a religious theme in the Calvinistic life and worldview, a theme that reaches its highest tension through the immeasurable power of the all-ruling idea of predestination, taken in its universal meaning. Religious meaning must penetrate everywhere, in all law-spheres, and it must “complete” the meaning of the law-idea, although in this sinful dispensation this ideal is never fulfilled, except through Christ!¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ ‘*Causaliteitsprobleem*,’ 61:

De “ontsluiting der anticipatiesferen,” als actieve “door-geestelijking” van de wetskringen, is een religieus thema in de Calvinistische levens- en

We have already looked at the opening of the logical aspect in the sensory image. The remaining aspects can also be opened up within the sensory image. The post-lingual aspects require sensory symbolism in order to be objectified in the subject-object relation (*NC II*, 379; added to *WdW*). This is something that animals cannot do, because a genuine symbol has a cultural and logical foundation:

A genuine symbol, in contradistinction to a natural animal means of expression, always has a cultural and logical foundation. (*NC II*, 381; added to *WdW*).

The normative aspects that are opened in the sensory image are also cultural anticipations:

Everything that is given in nature has a potential object-function in the cultural aspect. But it cannot become a cultural thing proper without undergoing a transformation realized by human cultural activity according to a free project (*NC II*, 378; added to *WdW*).

But these cultural anticipations are only given to someone whose anticipatory perception in which the normative or axiological moments have been disclosed. Thus, this cultural opening up remains hidden from animals:

Cultural things cannot be sensorily perceived without cultural feeling, anticipating the cultural pact of human experience and being directed by it...an anticipation of cultural norms in the implicit valuation of feeling. To animal perception, which is rigidly bound to natural vital needs, they must remain hidden (*NC II*, 378.)

B. The historical aspect

The opening process therefore opens up the normative aspects. The historical mode is the mode that is the foundation for this opening up of the normative aspects. Dooyeweerd describes the historical aspect as the “nodal point” for normative deepening of meaning (*NC II*, 190; *WdW II*, 137). In the historical mode, past, present and future meet (*NC II*, 192-193; added to *WdW*). Why does Dooyeweerd say that? Because the past is the retrocipatory direction. It is our pre-theoretical, enstatic resting in repose. The

wereldbeschouwing, een thema, dat zijn hoogste spanning verkrijgt door de onmetelijke kracht der in universeelen zin genomen allesbeheerschende praedestinatiegedachte. Overal, in alle wetskringen moet de religieuze zin doordringen en den zin der wetsgedachte “voleindigen,” al wordt in deze zondige bedeeing dit ideaal nimmer vervuld, tenzij dan door Christus!

future is the normative, what temporal reality may be and will become in the fullness of time. All deepening of our experience is of an anticipatory character. The present is where we act, from out of our supratemporal center, but expressing our will temporally by forming temporal reality so that the potential normative aspects can be expressed. The historical aspect is needed for this temporal expression of forming.

The historical aspect of our experience is the aspect of free forming. This forming, one of the aspects of all acts, can be either inward or outward. But unless the act of forming is realized in the outer world, it has no historical significance. Our acts, when expressed as actions in the temporal world, form the plastic¹⁴⁷ nature of the horizon of individuality structures. This forming is the basis of history.

Reformational philosophers have frequently misunderstood the historical modality.¹⁴⁸ It is not the same as history in the sense of a series of events. Events, like acts, function in all aspects, and not just the historical. History, in the sense of that which occurs must be distinguished from the historical modality of our experience, which is the aspect of forming.¹⁴⁹ Dooyeweerd emphasizes this:

The [supratemporal] central sphere of human existence [...] is the central sphere of *occurrence*, for that *which occurs* cannot be distinguished too sharply from the *historical aspect* of cosmic time, which is only one of its temporal *modalities of meaning* (NC I, 32; added to *WdW*, italics Dooyeweerd's).

The historical modality is therefore not an event. The historical aspect is that mode of our experience by which we give form to ourselves and to our world. And not all events are qualified by the historical aspect. The fact that I breathed yesterday is not history.

¹⁴⁷ i.e. capable of being formed. It is interesting that Baader refers to plastic (*Plastik*) as an intermediary between the spiritual imagination and that which is formed. Imagination is the creative and plastic faculty of forming images. See Faivre, *Phil. de la nature*, 99 and 105, citing *Werke* IX, 181, X, 11, XII, 483. More research is need on the relation between Dooyeweerd's references to the plastic dimension of our experience and our imagination. There is no doubt, however, that the plastic dimension is culturally formed as a result of our use of our imagination.

¹⁴⁸ Vollenhoven denied that there was a historical modality (See 'Dialectic'). So did C.T. McIntyre: "Dooyeweerd's Philosophy of History," in: C.T. McIntire (ed.), *The Legacy of Herman Dooyeweerd* (University Press of America, 1985) [*Legacy*]

¹⁴⁹ This would seem to have a bearing on McIntire's desire to see history as trans-modal.

Merely natural aspects of this event are not within scope of history (*NC* II, 193; *WdW* II, 140).

The historical aspect determines the “how” of all phenomena of historical becoming (*Encyclopedia* 140). This “how” is mastery, control, a free productive forming in accordance with an imagined pattern:

Mastery or control, in its original modal sense, elevates itself above what is given and actualized after a fixed pattern apart from human planning. It presupposes a given material whose possibilities are disclosed in a way exceeding the patterns given and realized by nature, and actualized after a free project of form-giving with endless possibilities of variation (*NC* II, 197; Cf. *WdW* II, 143).

Forming in the historical modality is a “free project of form-giving.” Man’s free forming is based on reflection and productive fantasy (*NC* II, 198; added to *WdW*). In other words, it is based on *imagination*.

Thus, the historical aspect is a forming that depends on our productive imagination. We form in accordance with a pattern that we have imagined, as opposed to the forming by nature according to instinctual and automatic patterns. Dooyeweerd contrasts man’s freedom of formation with the animal, who lacks the free control of the material of its construction, for example in a bird’s building of a nest.

C. Cultural forming as power

The central or nuclear meaning of the historical aspect is that of free formative power (*macht*). Why does Dooyeweerd use the word ‘*macht*’ or ‘power’ with respect to the historical aspect? This has puzzled some commentators. But it fits very well with the theosophical tradition. Baader relates the words ‘imagine’ and ‘magic’ to the German words *Macht* (power); *machen* (to make), *ich mag* (I may); *ich vermag* (I have the power to do). Magic is the force of creation (*Werke* 10, 31 fn; Susini 212, 213).

Faivre says our forming is in accordance with an image. Our knowledge, which relies on imagination, is information, or in-form-ation. In Claudel’s language, the formation of an object is ‘information.’ This forming of the object allows us to name it.

Baader also uses the terms imagination and information synonymously (Faivre, 120). The superior descends to the inferior and forms its foundation or support (*Werke* I, 44). It

is a taking possession of the known object. There is a circumscribing (*Umgreifen*) of the object, a forming, fashioning or modeling of it (*bilden, gestalten*), just like an invisible vase imposing form on a liquid (*Werke I, 42-45*).

D. Enkapsis

We culturally form the world when we transform what is given in nature.

Everything that is given in nature has a potential object-function in the cultural aspect. But it cannot become a cultural thing proper without undergoing a transformation realized by human cultural activity according to a free project (*NC II, 378; added to WdW*)

When realized in a culturally formed individuality structure, the cultural anticipations are realized. The cultural anticipations no longer exist merely potentially. Dooyeweerd sometimes calls the structure that is formed a ‘cultural thing’ (*NC III, 109; Cf. WdW III, 77*), or an ‘objective spiritual thing’ (1946 *Encyclopedia*). But this forming is not just the opening up of the anticipations in an existing structure. It is the creation of a new individuality structure that is then enkaptically interwoven with the first structure.

These things involve an enkaptic interlacement of the physically qualified thing (like a no longer living tree) with a historically founded intentional object, like a chair, which has a specific cultural use:

This state of affairs re-emphasizes the fact that the inner structures of the materials remain clearly distinct from the internal structure of the chair as an individual whole (*NC III, 133; Cf. WdW III, 103*)

There may be intervening individuality structures, such as semi-formed technical products. For instance, a tree may first be formed into planks.

If we do not understand *enkapsis*, then we cannot understand Dooyeweerd’s idea of individuality structures. For an individuality structure is qualified by its highest subject function. Without the idea of *enkapsis*, we mistakenly start talking about cultural objects being qualified by their object function.¹⁵⁰ For a more detailed discussion, see my article ‘Enkapsis.’

¹⁵⁰ As I have pointed out, this mistake occurs in the present Glossary to the *Encyclopedia*.

Sometimes, Dooyeweerd calls such a new individuality structure a “cultural thing” (*NC* II, 378; added to *WdW*). But it is evident from the rest of his work that this cultural thing is a new individuality structure that has been produced, and which is then enkaptically interwoven with the first individuality structure.

E. Cultural forming as realization

We have discussed Dooyeweerd’s idea of productive imagination. He gives a further example of this when he discusses the “productive objectifying function” in the cultural unfolding process (*NC* III, 115; *WdW* III, 84). We create another individuality structure that is enkaptically interwoven with the first.

In theosophy, it is only when the image is embodied that it is truly real or actualized. Only then does it achieve “reality” in the theosophical sense [Faivre, 145 referring to Baader’s *Werke* 8, 93]. I believe that this is what Dooyeweerd means when he says that the temporal world has no reality except in 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 (*NC* I, 100; *WdW* I, 65).

I believe that this is also what Baader means when he associates *magia* and *imagination*. “*Imaginatio macht Wesenheit*” –everything that man imagines (*sich ein-bildet*), he can make real (Faivre, 106). I understand Baader to mean that we use our imagination to discover the real potentialities or anticipations that lie in temporal things ready to be unfolded. In naive experience we see only the retrocipatory, in theory we also find anticipations. And this is done by our imagination. We actualize and make real temporal reality by perfecting it, by opening up the anticipatory aspects and realizing them historically.

We open up the anticipatory aspects by imagining the figure within temporal reality. When we find the figure, we are not inventing or constructing the modal relations we investigate, but we are dis-covering them. And when we apply the figure, and make it actual in an action, we are positivizing it.

Positivizing is related to Baader’s idea of active knowledge, or *erkennen*. Susini compares *erkennen* to Claudel's idea of ‘*connaissance*’ or ‘*co-naissance*.’ It is a giving

birth to something, a constructive knowledge. But this constructive knowledge should not be confused with constructivism in today's sense of the word. For Baader, *erkennen* is not a matter of inventing new principles, but of discovering them. It is a finding [*finden*], and not an absolutely original discovery [*erfinden*]. The knowledge that we find derives from a source that 'dominates' and founds this knowledge.¹⁵¹

Faivre comments on how the goal of this intentional relation is not to create original images, but to find the correspondences between our inner world and the outer reality.

While phenomenological analyses have accustomed us to speaking of the imagination in terms of intention, in the case of Paracelsus, Boehme, Baader, or, closer to us, Frohschammer, we are not dealing with an intentionality of the subject which would be seeking first to abstract itself from the world, to turn its spirit away from the universe of the senses (*abducere mentem a sensibus*) and then to create original images inside itself. What is to be seen is rather a desire to "correspond" concretely to, and in, the fullness of the world, of humanity, and of things, in a network of living and intersubjective relationships, whence the incarnationist aspect of this tradition that encompasses so many texts, including those that have been discussed (Faivre 125).

This incarnational emphasis is also found in Dooyeweerd, who rejected Brentano's view of intentionality as a purely spiritual matter divorced from our body. Dooyeweerd thus agrees with the theosophical tradition in not fleeing into an empty spirituality that is separated from temporal life, but rather seeking the incarnational structure within temporal life. But Dooyeweerd applies this to our present life only (as supratemporal beings with a temporal body); what will happen in the next life is hidden to us (*NC II*, 561, *WdW II*, 493).

It is not only individuality structures in the external world that need to be made real. In creation, we transform nature and so reveal and transform ourselves. Baader says that each self-revelation of Spirit only occurs through a transformation of nature (*Werke* 4, 367; Sauer 37). In the highest sense, we, as the image of God, also need to be made real. For Baader, imagination in the highest sense is "man's entering into (elevation) into the

¹⁵¹ *Weltalter* 261. See Eugène Susini: *Franz von Baader et le romantisme mystique* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1942), I, 432 ['Susini'].

image (*imago*) of God.”¹⁵² Just as the temporal world is made real by entering into our productive imagination, so we are made real by fully entering into God’s image of us.

Baader also says that the law needs to be fulfilled in the finite being. Man has the power to fulfill the laws for creatures (*Elementarbegriffe*, 553). This response needs the cooperation of the finite being (*Zeit* 32, 33). Man must organize and re-create the world; the laws are in the world but must be actualized. This is done by our perception (*vernehmen, wahrnehmen*) of the invisible laws that govern the earthly world. Nature is a book from which we decipher the divine characters or hieroglyphs in order to perceive the voice of God (*Werke* XI, 29, 149).

F. Van Riessen’s mistaken view of technical forming

Dooyeweerd’s idea of historical forming must also be distinguished from the idea of technique introduced by Hendrik van Riessen and his student Egbert Schuurman.¹⁵³ Dooyeweerd disagreed with van Riessen’s view of technique and technology, as is shown by a 1961 letter from van Riessen to Dooyeweerd.¹⁵⁴ Dooyeweerd had reviewed a draft article by van Riessen. Dooyeweerd criticized van Riessen’s views regarding technology, but van Riessen rejected Dooyeweerd’s criticism, and published his article anyway.¹⁵⁵

More research is required for this important issue. In particular, it would be important to obtain a copy of van Riessen’s draft article with Dooyeweerd’s suggested corrections on it. But let us look at some of the differences between van Riessen and Dooyeweerd:

¹⁵² “...die Sicheinführung (Erhebung) des Menschen in das Bild (*imago*) Gottes (*Werke* 13, 217)

¹⁵³ Egbert Schuurman’s dissertation was entitled *Techniek en Toekomst. Confrontatie met wijsgerige beschouwingen* (dissertatie, 1972) [Technique and the Future: Confrontation between philosophical concerns]

¹⁵⁴ Letter dated 6-3-1961 from Hendrik van Riessen to Herman Dooyeweerd (Dooyeweerd Archives, *Lade* I, 2).

¹⁵⁵ Hendrik van Riessen, “De Structuur der Techniek,” *Philosophia Reformata* 26 (1961) 114-130 [*‘Structuur’*].

1. For Dooyeweerd, technology is applied natural science. Van Riessen responds in his letter that there is a technology, and that technology is applied.
2. It is evident that Dooyeweerd replaced van Riessen's references to 'facts' with the word 'events.' Van Riessen says,

Dat neem ik niet over. Reeds in myn dissertatie heb ik de onderscheiding dingen en feiten ingevoerd en daarby omdat het om techniek gaat aan "factum" boven het meer algemene gebeuren de voorkeur gegeven. Aan deze onderscheiding, die zich overal voordoet en dan wel als "ding en gebeurtenis" beschreven kan worden, heb ik al lang geleden wat meer aandacht willen geven, omdat zy my zeer belangryk lyk, maar de tyd ontbrak tot nu toe.

[I don't accept that. Already in my dissertation I introduced the distinction between things and facts. It did that because it concerns technique, and for that we must give the preference to "factum" over the more general [term] 'event.' For a long time I have wanted to devote more attention to this distinction, which presents itself everywhere. The distinction can be described as "thing and event." This has seemed very important to me, but I did not have the time until now.]

There are serious disagreements evident here that need to be investigated further. Dooyeweerd seems to have questioned van Riessen's very conception of the nature of facts. I suggest it has to do with van Riessen's rejection of Dooyeweerd's idea of individuality structures, his consequent rejection of the idea of enkapsis, and his view of aspects as properties of things.

3. In proposing the technical as an aspect, van Riessen (and Schuurman) seem to have incorrectly identified the historical aspect with technical acts (which function in all aspects). For Dooyeweerd, the historical aspect is different from events that participate in all the aspects. We can see in the 1961 letter that Dooyeweerd's view is that technique is an event (not an aspect, and not a fact). Acts and events function in all aspects. Dooyeweerd says that technical industry is an act:

Technical industry, as a historical phenomenon, is itself ruled by *principles* which, as such, refer to subjective formative activity (*NC* II, 258; *WdW* II, 190).

And on the same page

[Technical industry] always means a historical expansion of formative power both in subjective and in objective directions. [...] Progress in technical industry is impossible without the basis of historical power over persons, manifesting itself in the general acceptance of new technical ideas: the deepened

technical principles must find sufficient support in a cultural community and cultural area.

4. Actually, for Dooyeweerd, technology involves a series of acts:

a) There is the act of productive fantasy. Although van Riessen refers to productive fantasy (*Struktuur*, 126), he does not use it in Dooyeweerd's sense, which involves Dooyeweerd's view of intentionality and *enkapsis*. Since van Riessen rejected both individuality structures and *enkapsis*, and had only an outwardly-directed view of intentionality (as in phenomenology), he cannot share Dooyeweerd's ideas. For Dooyeweerd, the fantasy is only productive when the productive fantasy becomes enkaptically interwoven with another individuality structure.

b) There are three more acts. *NC III*, 148 (*WdW III*, 121) lists them (I summarize):

- i. The objectification of the intentional object in the structure of a real object
- ii. The subjective unfolding or opening in human experience of the closed objective thing-structure
- iii. The actualization of the objective thing-structure by human activity, which uses the thing according to its objective and opened qualifying function.

5. Dooyeweerd sees the kernel moment of the historical sphere as free formative power. It is true that Dooyeweerd also uses the word '*techne*' to refer to the positivized form of such formative control (*NC II*, 257; *WdW II*, 189). But there is a distinction. We can exercise technical formative control which nevertheless does not have historical force:

An individual discovery or invention that has no historical consequences because it is not generally accepted, and consequently lacks the character of a formative factor in human society, cannot form history (*NC II*, 259; *WdW II*, 191).

The formation of history is therefore different from an individual discovery or invention. Furthermore, as discussed below, for Dooyeweerd, technique is an act, not a modal aspect.

6. Technique is certainly not just finding new uses for a statically existing thing. Dooyeweerd emphasizes that things are dynamic.

For the reality of a thing is indeed dynamic; it is a continuous realization in the transcendental temporal direction (*NC III*, 109; *WdW III*, 76)

7. Dooyeweerd also warns about excessive expansion of technical activity.

And it can hardly be denied that an excessive expansion of the power of technical industry implies serious dangers for mankind. (*NC* II, 258; added to *WdW*).

and

...we find an excessive increase of the formative power on the part of the cultural sphere of modern natural science, at the expense of the formative power of the other cultural spheres (*NC* II, 362; *WdW* II, 296).

8. A review of van Riessen's article shows other differences that need to be explored, such as: (1) van Riessen's distinction between science as unfolding of the order of creation laws, and technique as the unfolding of creation according to its subject-side (2) his rejection of technique as a division of labour between God and man (for Dooyeweerd, man assists God in recovering sparks of God's goodness). (3) his distinction between technical things and facts (4) his view of science as the way of abstraction, always seeking a more universal formulation of the problem and a more universal application of the solution this is of course in contrast to Dooyeweerd's *Gegenstand*-relation (5) his corresponding view of individuation (6) his view of the three characteristics of all things—uniqueness, coherence and mutability (7) his view of technique as overcoming a resistance in the natural aspects. That is not Dooyeweerd's view of resistance, which is related to the *Gegenstand* relation and the splitting apart of reality, (8) his view of laws for technical things or facts (as opposed to Dooyeweerd's view of law as one side of an individuality structure).

In his recent history of the reformational movement, Stellingwerff has sharply criticized both van Riessen and Schuurman for their “stagnated” philosophy.” Stellingwerff correctly says that van Riessen spoke of entities and not aspects, and that he saw reality as only individual, and the law as universal. Stellingwerff says that van Riessen had too little historical and philosophical depth, he did not distinguish his views enough from current philosophy, and he improperly sought a compromise between Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven—he had “the voice of Dooyeweerd, but the spirit of Vollenhoven” (Stellingwerff 133, 136-138, 158).

V. Imagination and Aesthetic Creation

For Dooyeweerd, aesthetic creation involves forming a merely *intentional* visionary object. This merely intentional object can then be actualized in an aesthetic work, although it need not be.

Productive aesthetic fantasy is founded in our sensory imagination—the sensory image in its restrictive form, which is shared by animals (*NC* III, 115; added to *WdW*). But it is in the opened structures of this type all subjective types of aesthetical projects are founded.

...it is exclusively characterized by the internal psychical fact that the sensory function of imagination produces its phantasms in merely *intentional* objectivity, entirely apart from the sensory objectivity of real things. In the opened structure of this modal type all subjective types of aesthetical projects are founded. (*NC* II, 425-26; *WdW* II, 356).

This implies that an animal, who has only the restrictive sensory image, cannot be aesthetic.

For Dooyeweerd, aesthetic projects rely on the opened up or disclosed aspects of reality. In an aesthetic act, our imagination forms a representation or “fantasy” [*fantasie*]. Dooyeweerd gives the example of the sculpture of Hermes by Praxiteles:

In the aesthetically qualified conception of Praxiteles, the productive imagination has *projected* the sensory image of his Hermes as a merely *intentional* visionary object (*NC* III, 115; Cf. *WdW* III, 85).

By ‘merely intentional,’ Dooyeweerd means that the image is internal, inner, with no relation to what is external. This merely intentional image is projected externally when Praxiteles realizes the internal image in the external marble.

As discussed, Dooyeweerd does not have a copy theory of perception. He also does not have a copy theory of art. He says that for Praxiteles, the proper sensory *Urbild* for his Hermes is not the sensory form of the living model. It is related to the ideal harmonious sensory shape evoked in the productive fantasy of the artist by the contemplation of his living model. Praxiteles had a productive vision of two living deified human bodies (*NC* III, 117; Cf. *WdW* III, 86).

The opened sensory image evoked in the artist’s productive fantasy may then be actualized. But it need not be actualized:

There is no action without act; but not every act comes to realization in an action. So it is possible for a scientific act of knowing or an esthetic act of imagining to remain entirely inwardly-directed.¹⁵⁶

This actualization may be by the performance of the work in an actual event. Or it may occur by the representation of the aesthetic project in an artistic work, by which it achieves somewhat more permanence. For example, a musical work may be represented symbolically in a written score. Or an aesthetic image may be represented in a painting or a sculpture.

When the aesthetic project is actualized in an artistic work, a new individuality structure is created. Events such as a musical performance have an individuality structure, too, and function in all aspects. But in the case of a score, or a painting, or a sculpture, there is an enkaptic interlacement of the aesthetic individuality structure in a new individuality structure that also includes the structure of the medium in which the representation is made (the paper, the canvas, the marble). In a marble statue, there are two structures *enkaptically* interwoven: the physical marble, and the aesthetic work (*NC* III, 123; *WdW* III, 92).

The aesthetic individuality structure, which is enkaptically interlaced with the other individuality structures, is founded in the historical law sphere, which is modally qualified by free formative control (*NC* III, 120; *WdW* III, 89). The aesthetic structure that is enkaptically intertwined is not the same as the original structure evoked in the artist's fantasy. It is a representation of that merely intentional object.¹⁵⁷ The marble statue is the "objective plastic *representation* of an aesthetically qualified intentional fantasy-object, which itself appeared to be typically founded in a sensory fantasm" (*NC* III, 120; *WdW* III, 89).

The person viewing the work of art must not regard it as a copy of external reality. It is not a copy of reality, but a copy of the productive fantasy of the artist, which was evoked

¹⁵⁶ *Encyclopedia*, 223. Faivre refers to this as "intransitive action," which is exercised on the body of the imagining subject only (Faivre, 99).

¹⁵⁷ The aesthetic object-function is only the aesthetic representation [copy]. It is not an objectification of the aesthetic subject-function as such

by reality. The viewer therefore needs to view the work of art in an aesthetic way, and not as a copy of external reality. Aesthetic appreciation is therefore reproductive (*NC* III, 114; *WdW* III, 82). In the case of Praxiteles' sculpture of Hermes, the artist's productive aesthetic fantasy deepens and discloses the anatomic structure of living bodies (*NC* III, 117; *WdW* III, 85).

It is true that a natural thing may also be beautiful. But such beauty is not necessarily related to the individual productive fantasy of the perceiving subject, and does not have an inner aesthetically qualified structure (*NC* III, 114; *WdW* III, 82).

Cultural things cannot be sensorily perceived without cultural feeling, anticipating the cultural aspect of human experience. They remain hidden to animal perception (*NC* II, 378; added to *WdW*).

I discuss the aesthetic process of formation in more detail elsewhere.¹⁵⁸

VI. Imagination and theoretical thought

In this final part, we will look at how imagination relates to Dooyeweerd's understanding of theoretical thought, and to the intentional *Gegenstand*-relation on which theory is based.

A. Theoretical opening of the sensory aspect

The opening process does not always involve theoretical thought. Naïve experience can include a limited opening of aspects. But naïve experience does this in relations to structures of individuality. It is still bound to the sensory aspect.

The anticipatory spheres of the sensory aspect are also opened by theoretical thought:

...we theoretically open the sensory aspect of the full temporal reality by means of its modal *deepening of meaning* (*NC* II, 582; *WdW* II, 517).

As discussed, in naïve experience, we have anticipations of the logical in the sensory aspect, since we can distinguish things. The anticipation of the logical in the sensory aspect is opened up. But the anticipation that is opened is only an anticipation of the

¹⁵⁸ See J. Glenn Friesen: "Dooyeweerd's Philosophy of Aesthetics: A Response to Zuidervaart's Critique," (forthcoming)

logical aspect in its own closed or restrictive form. In pre-theoretical thought, the logical aspect is only actualized in its retrocipatory or closed structure (*NC* I, 29; II, 120; both added to *WdW*).

In order for the logical aspect to be fully opened, we require theoretical thought. What does this mean? It means that without theory, our logical analysis is restricted to distinguishing concrete things and their relations. We are bound to the sensorily founded characteristics of these things:

Enstatlcal (pre-theoretical) logical analysis is restrictively bound to sensory perception and can only analytically distinguish concrete things and their relations according to sensorily founded characteristics (*NC* II, 470; *WdW* II, 404).

Being bound to sensory perception in relation to individuality structures is what makes the pre-theoretical experience naïve! (*NC* III, 31; *WdW* III, 13).

In contrast to naïve thought, which is bound to these psychical factors in directing our attention, theoretical thought is “free” in being able to direct itself to modal states of affairs (*NC* II, 483, fn1; *WdW* II, 418 fn1).

B. *Gegenstand*

We have seen that Dooyeweerd distinguishes the three temporal directions of acts from the central religious act of self-knowledge. And we have observed a similar idea is in Kuyper, who also refers to knowing, willing and imagining as powers of the soul, but distinguishes this from “the pondering soul in its totality.” This kind of meditative self-reflection is not of a theoretical nature.

But there is a temporal counterpart to this self-knowledge. And this is the theoretical *Gegenstand*-relation (the “over-against” relation). The *Gegenstand*-relation is the entering of our supratemporal selfhood into its own 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 (1946 *Encyclopedia*, 12).

Our supratemporal selfhood thus enters into its temporal functions, the functions in which it expresses itself. The *WdW* speaks of a “turning within,” [*tot mij zelve in te keeren*] (*WdW* I, 8-9).

The ‘*Gegenstand*,’ which is set over against the analytical function of meaning in the synthesis of meaning, is the product of a willed reduction [*afrekking*] from out of the full temporal reality (*WdW* II, 402). For Dooyeweerd, the *Gegenstand*-relation therefore involves a willed movement of the selfhood into the temporal. Since all acts of the will depend on the imagination, we can readily see the importance of the imagination for theoretical thought.

This movement of our selfhood into its temporal functions of consciousness is also described as a ‘penetration’ of temporal reality. The supra-theoretical knowledge of the heart must “penetrate the temporal sphere of our consciousness” (*NC* I, 55; added to *WdW*). Dooyeweerd contrasts this penetration with pre-theoretical thought.

Naïve, non-theoretical analysis does not penetrate behind the objective outward appearance, and cannot embrace the functional laws of the modal spheres in an inter-modal synthesis of meaning (*NC* II, 470; *WdW* II, 404).

But what does Dooyeweerd mean by ‘penetrate’? I find Baader very helpful in understanding Dooyeweerd here. Baader says that just as God is able to be immanent in temporal reality, so we are to penetrate temporal beings and structures.

Dooyeweerd says that the *Gegenstand*-relation involves the entry of our supratemporal selfhood into its temporal functions of consciousness. Does that mean that our selfhood becomes temporal? Baader says that the penetration to the temporal does not involve a mixture of identities—he refers to Boehme’s saying that Spirit can penetrate nature just as light penetrates fire (*Fermenta* IV, 14). There are different ways of penetrating the animal, plant and mineral realms (*Fermenta* I, 13; note m). Baader says that all understanding or knowledge is a penetration [*Durchdringung*] of an intuition, and that in our penetration of the temporal object, we understand its structure:

All understanding or knowledge is a penetration of an intuition. To determine an intuition means to make a model of it. The concept of “intuition” makes the sensory mediation of all knowledge clear; similarly, understanding is defined as the power to make the “intuition” into a model, i.e. to understand its structure.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁹ *Werke* 12, 84:

Alles Begreifen oder Erkennen ist ein Durchdringen einer Anschauung. Eine Anschauung bestimmen, heisst sie zum Modell machen. Der Begriff der

After entering into the temporal functions of our own consciousness, we intentionally split apart the modal aspects in which our consciousness functions. This splitting apart of the aspects involves setting them against our temporal function of thought. We analyze the aspects; they become the *Gegenstand* of our analysis. The *Gegenstand* that is set over-against our temporal logical function is merely intentional and not ontical (*NC I*, 39; added to *WdW*). By this, Dooyeweerd means that the *Gegenstand* is purely an inner image, a “figure” that we behold by our intuitive vision (*schouwen*). When we behold or intuit such a figure, we see the anticipations that may be opened up within the modal structure. The figure is merely a potential reality that then needs to be realized within the temporal world.

To understand this, we need to examine separately the ideas of theoretical intentionality, the meaning of ‘figure,’ the meaning of intuitive vision (*schouwen*) and the nature of realization.

C. Theoretical intentionality

We have already discussed naïve intentional objects, such as aesthetic projects. But such objects must not be identified with the intentional *Gegenstand* of our theoretical thought. So there is another kind of intentionality, one that we experience in theory. This intentional relation is one that abstracts from the continuity of cosmic time, in order to epistemologically split apart the aspects.

Intentional objectivity involves our imagination (*NC II*, 425; *WdW II*, 356). Dooyeweerd’s view of intentionality is that it is a purely inner act. It is not directed to external objects. Thus, as we have seen, Dooyeweerd’s idea of intentionality differs from that of Husserl, who said that we must look to the objects themselves. Dooyeweerd

“Anschauung” macht die sinnliche Vermittlung aller Erkenntnis deutlich; gleichzeitig wird das Begreifen als das Vermögen bestimmt, die “Anschauung” zum Model zu machen, d.h. ihre Struktur zu erfassen

refers to the idea in Scholasticism of a purely intentional logical object. As such, it is no part of reality; it is only the intentional content of thought (*NC* II, 388; *WdW* II, 319).¹⁶⁰

For Dooyeweerd, the intentional abstraction from time cannot be done by our logical function of consciousness itself:

This synthetic abstraction, this sub-traction, cannot be brought about by our logical function of consciousness itself. For as a subjective meaning-side of temporal reality, the logical function is itself within time.

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 (1946 *Encyclopedia*, 12).

Dooyeweerd's rejection of a logical basis for theoretical abstraction must therefore be distinguished from current reformational epistemology (See '*Gegenstandsrelatie*').

J.A.L. Taljaard has investigated the idea of intentionality in Brentano and Durandus de St. Porçain. Taljaard says that intentionality assumes a mind-immanent object, and he correlates it with the idea of *nous* in Greek thought. Taljaard finds this idea of intentionality in Dooyeweerd. But Dooyeweerd expressly rejects the idea that intentionality is a matter of the mind. Taljaard also sees Dooyeweerd's idea of relating the whole temporal cosmos to the heart as the religious root in terms of seeking the *ratio* of things. That is not Dooyeweerd's view. Nor is Taljaard correct that the act-structure is a duplicate of the heart, "the *Ratio* enlarged to include time." Taljaard's reasoning here seems to be that the heart is transcendent to time, and no scientific knowledge of the heart is possible. Taljaard calls the act-structure a "transcendental duplicate of the heart," and he says that scientific knowledge about the act structure *is* possible (pp. 182-183). Taljaard's argument fails to understand the whole idea of the expression within time of our supratemporal heart, and how the act-structure is the temporal expression of this supratemporal heart (See *Grenzen*).

Dooyeweerd specifically opposes Brentano's view of intentionality as an inner directedness that is divorced from temporal reality altogether:

¹⁶⁰ Although Dooyeweerd accepts this "important scholastic theory about the intentional logical object" he rejects the way that it was joined to the debate about universals in realism and nominalism (*NC* II, 388; *WdW* II, 319).

The view of the act as one that is in principle independent of the material body, a pure spiritual act of the ‘soul,’ is clearly something that derives from the absolutization of the theoretical *Gegenstand*-relation, which we [earlier] have analyzed. The whole modern act psychology, grounded by Fr. Brentano, describes the act as “a spiritual experience of the Selfhood intentionally directed to a *Gegenstand* for its content.”¹⁶¹

Although our theoretical intentionality is not related to individuality structures, it is directed to the temporal functions of our body. Dooyeweerd says that our acts are never independent of our body (although they proceed from out of our supratemporal selfhood, they are expressed within the temporal body).

Faivre points out a similar incarnational emphasis for intentionality in theosophy:

While phenomenological analyses have accustomed us to speaking of the imagination in terms of intention, in the case of Paracelsus, Boehme, Baader, or, closer to us, Frohschammer, we are not dealing with an intentionality of the subject which would be seeking first to abstract itself from the world, to turn its spirit away from the universe of the senses (*abducere mentem a sensibus*) and then to create original images inside itself. What is to be seen is rather a desire to “correspond” concretely to, and in, the fullness of the world, of humanity, and of things, in a network of living and intersubjective relationships, whence the incarnationist aspect of this tradition that encompasses so many texts, including those that have been discussed (Faivre 125).

D. Figure

1. Finding the figure within created reality

We have seen that for Dooyeweerd, the intentional *Gegenstand*-relation involves the entry of our supratemporal selfhood into its temporal functions. The *Gegenstand* of theoretical thought is purely intentional, and not ontical (*NC I*, 39; added to *WdW*). We examine the modal aspects as if they were split apart, when in fact they are not, and we

¹⁶¹ My translation of *Grenzen*, 75:

De opvatting van de acte als een in beginsel van het stoffelijk lichaam onafhankelijke, puur geestelijke verrichting van de ‘ziel’ is duidelijk voortgekomen uit de verzelfstanding van de theoretische *Gegenstands*relatie, die wij [eerder] hebben geanalyseerd. Men beschreef de act nl. al ‘in haar inhoud intentioneel op een *Gegenstand* betrokken geestlijke beleving van het Ik’ (zo de hele moderne act-psychologie, gegrondvest door Fr. Brentano)

then in our imagination, form Ideas in which we make a synthesis of meaning with our supratemporal selfhood, making the *Gegenstand* “our own.”

The *Gegenstand*-relation, which is merely intentional, and not ontical, is nevertheless related to finding structures within the temporal world, including those anticipatory structures, which have not yet been realized. These potential anticipatory structures are the “figure” within the temporal world. They have not yet achieved a meaning whole. This figure is found in our intentional act of turning inwards and having our selfhood enter its temporal functions of consciousness.

But how is it possible for us to find the figure within temporal reality if the *Gegenstand*-relation is not ontical? Why does my merely intentional *Gegenstand* help to find the structure of external reality? Are we not merely creating fantasies within ourselves with which we then use to attempt to construct temporal reality?

By ‘figure,’ Dooyeweerd certainly does not mean a mere metaphor or “figure of speech.” A figure is a potential reality that needs to be discovered and actualized in the opening up process. Nor is a figure merely a subjective fantasy with only a contingent connection to the outside world:

This intentional object is nevertheless bound to the modal and plastic dimensions of the temporal horizon of experience and of reality. And just because it is bound to the transcendental horizon of experience, the fancied objective structure of a thing is a *potential* structure capable of being represented in a real thing. *And it is essential to the reality of the latter that it be a representation of the fancied thing-structure* (NC III 116; *WdW* III, 84; italics Dooyeweerd’s).

There is a correspondence between the epistemological *Gegenstand*, which is internal and merely intentional, and the aspects in the external world that need to be unfolded. Our theoretical Ideas, based on our own temporal functions (into which our supratemporal selfhood has entered), are not fantasy, but correspond to the real image or figure. And the real figure is given by God’s Wisdom, or Law. That is why what we explore in the theoretical *Gegenstand*-relation as exists in the external world. It is God’s law that provides the correspondence. We are able to find that figure in the *Gegenstand*-relation, since our functions of consciousness are themselves temporal.

The intentional object is bound to our temporal horizon of experience. And it is because of so being bound that this “fancied” structure, a structure that is merely intentional, can be represented in a real thing.

Note the use of ‘represented’ here. Just like the artist’s internal aesthetic structure can be represented externally, so our internal fancied structure can be represented in a thing.

And the last sentence of the above quotation is really most remarkable: “*And it is essential to the reality of the latter that it be a representation of the fancied thing-structure.*” For the external thing, or individuality structure to be real, it must be a representation of what we have fancied internally! What does Dooyeweerd mean, that the reality of the individuality structure depends for its reality on its corresponding to our fancied thing-structure? Let’s look at this idea of realization in more detail.

2. Realization, actualization

In theosophy, it is only when the image is embodied that it is truly real or actualized. Only then does it achieve “reality” in the theosophical sense [Faivre, 145 referring to Baader’s *Werke* 8, 93]. I believe that this is what Dooyeweerd means when he says that the temporal world has no reality except in 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 (*NC* I, 100; *WdW* I, 65).

I believe that this is also what Baader means when he associates *magia* and *imagination*. “Imaginatio macht Wesenheit” –everything that man imagines (*sich ein-bildet*), he can make real (Faivre, 106). I understand Baader to mean that we use our imagination to discover the real potentialities or anticipations that lie in temporal things ready to be unfolded. In naive experience we see only the retrocipatory, in theory we also find anticipations. And this is done by our imagination. We actualize and make real temporal reality by perfecting it, by opening up the anticipatory aspects and realizing them historically.

So when we find the figure, we are not inventing or constructing the modal relations we investigate, but we are dis-covering them. And when we apply the figure, and make it actual in an action, we are positivizing it.

3. Biblical references to ‘figure’

Although Dooyeweerd’s philosophy is not based on propositions from the Bible, it does accord with the Biblical view.¹⁶² The idea of a ‘figure’ within created reality, one that needs to be perfected and completed, is found in the following references.

Romans 5:14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the **figure** of him that was to come.

Hebrews 9:9 Which [was] a **figure** for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; _

Hebrews 9:24 For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, [which are] the **figures** of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us:

Hebrews 11:19 Accounting that God [was] able to raise [him] up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a **figure**.

There has always been a kind of Biblical interpretation that speaks of types and figures that foreshadow a future that we can only anticipate, and which is perfected in Christ. This anticipation is done by the “foretelling” of the prophets, who look into the future to say what can and will be.

The theosophical view of imagination carries this view of figure into more than a technique for interpreting the Bible. This kind of anticipatory foreseeing of the future is the way that our temporal reality is opened up to its fullness of being. All cultural unfolding itself involves such anticipatory foreseeing.

4. Kuyper’s references to ‘figure’

Kuyper also uses ‘figure’ in this sense of that which is not quite real:

The Scriptural expressions, “one plant with Him” and “branches of the Vine,” which must be taken in their fullest significance, are metaphors entirely different from those which we use. We are confined to metaphors which express our meaning by analogy; but they can not be fully applied nor express the being of the thing; hence the so-called third term of the comparison. But the figures used by the Holy Spirit express a real conformity, a unity of thought divinely

¹⁶² See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘Biblicism,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Biblicism.html>].

expressed in the spiritual and visible world. Hence Jesus could say: I am the true Vine, that is, every other vine is but a figure. The true, the real Vine am I, and I alone.¹⁶³

What is remarkable here is that Kuyper emphasizes the conformity, the “unity of thought divinely expressed in the spiritual and visible world.” There is a correspondence between the supratemporal spiritual world and the temporal visible world. And it is this same correspondence between what we imagine in the *Gegenstand* and the law-spheres in which the individuality structures function.

5. Boehme’s references to ‘figure’

For Boehme, the entire visible world is only a figure of the inner world:

The whole external visible world with all its essence is a sign or figure of the inner spiritual world; all what is in the inner, and how it is in effect, also indeed has its character externally.¹⁶⁴

6. Baader’s references to ‘figure’

For Baader, our imagination involves finding the figure in temporal reality. Temporal reality is temporary, and needs to be raised up to a higher level. It has a figure that can be raised to true Being (Sauer 39). The work of imagination is related to our inner sense. Whereas our outer senses only look to the passing being of things, our inner sense looks to the enduring figure in things (*Werke* 7, 131).

But this figure must not itself be objectified or made into a hypostatized and isolated *Gegenstand*:

¹⁶³ Kuyper: *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 322.

¹⁶⁴ “Jakob Boehme's Sämmtliche Werke,” ed. K. W. Schieber,” [“Jacob Boehme's Collected Works edited by K. W. Schieber”] (Leipzig, 1831-1846), Vol. IV, “De signatura Rerum”, p. 346, cited by N. A. Berdyaev: *Studies Concerning Jacob Boehme*, online at [http://www.berdyaev.com/berdiaev/berd_lib/1930_349.html#9]:

Die ganze äussere sichtbare Welt mit all ihrem Wesen ist eine Bezeichnung oder Figur der inneren geistlichen Welt; alles was im Inneren ist, und wie es in der Wirkung ist, also hat auch seinen Charakter äusserlich.

...welche indes eben nur durch seine Form (Bild) sich ausspricht, welche (natürlich als Funktion und nicht etwa als erstarrt gedacht) sohin die Vermittlung zwischen jenem Inneren und ausseren leistet (*Werke* 2,223).

[which however expresses itself only through its form (*Bild*), which must be thought of as a function and not as something solid [substantial], allowing the mediation between the inner and the outer.]

Dooyeweerd also warns against hypostatizing the *Gegenstand*. Such absolutizing is the source of the various –isms of thought (NC, I, 46). It is also interesting that Baader here says that our thought is directed to *functions*. This is also what Dooyeweerd says of the *Gegenstand*-Relation. In the *Gegenstand*-relation, our supratemporal selfhood enters into its functions. These functions are of course within the temporal modal aspects.

Like Dooyeweerd, Baader also says that the images of our thought are not ontical. For Baader, this work of imagination is not real. Baader says that what is imagined is “magical.” Imagination must not be seen as something “merely subjective” in contrast to an objective world outside of our imagination. For the temporal world is in itself “magical.” This is a play on words ‘magic’ and ‘imagine.’ But as we have seen, this may be related to the nuclear meaning of power (*macht*) in the historical aspect.

Baader uses the word ‘magic’ in the sense of St. Martin’s “apparent” (*Werke* II, 51-52; Susini 369). Everything in cosmic time, the Appearance-Time (*Schein-Zeit*), is merely apparent. These merely apparent things are all that which is still potentiality and has not arrived at its end, and has not yet achieved concrete existence.¹⁶⁵

For Baader, a figure is that which has not yet achieved its true being, but which possesses only an “*Idea formatrix*” (*Werke* 5, 83, note 1; also 2, 260). A figure is of something that is not quite seen, like when we are aware of the sun before it is actually appears over the horizon, or after it descends from the horizon (*Werke* 8, 94).

For Baader, the temporal world as *Inexistenz* inheres in, dwells in, or subsists in our own existence. As existent beings, it is our mission to descend to the temporal world and to raise it up to its true existence. When we do that, the temporal world is eternally revealed

¹⁶⁵ To say that they are apparent does not mean they are illusory. they are merely not yet fully real. See also Linked Glossary, entry for ‘maya,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Maya.html>].

to eternal creatures, such as the angels (*Fermenta* VI, 17). Baader relies here on Boehme, who says that the world was in eternal Wisdom as a figure invisible to intelligent creatures. The world reaches its true end only by man (*Fermenta* VI, 15).

7. Some examples of figures in Dooyeweerd

Here are some examples of figures that Dooyeweerd says that we find:

a) The figure of the legal object

This is the economic analogy according to the law-side (normative side) of the juridical aspect. On the subject-side, this analogy reveals itself in subjective law and the figure of the legal object. The legal object is nothing more than the juridical objectification of an economic valuation (from which it follows for example that the free air cannot be a legal object) (See *Tijdsprobleem*).

b) legal figure

There are numerous references to legal figures in the *Encyclopedia*, but they have not been consistently translated.¹⁶⁶

c) good faith and equity

The Ideas of "good faith" and "equity" are anticipatory meaning figures not found in a primitive system of law (*NC* II, 141; *WdW* II, 94).

Thus, figures are found in the opening up of anticipatory spheres. A figure is a result of theoretical thought, and relates to theory's intentionality. We find the figure in the

¹⁶⁶ See J. Glenn Friesen: "Dooyeweerd's *Encyclopedia of the Science of Law*: Problems with the Present Translation (2006), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Translation.pdf>]. Some of these errors are (references to page and line number): 13:9 'rechtsfiguur' is translated as 'legal configuration.' Similarly at 18:14 and 95:9. Elsewhere it is translated as 'legal pattern' or 'juristic notion' (18:12). Sometimes it is correctly translated as 'legal figure' (15:16, 19:35) and sometimes as 'jural figure' (15:29). 88:16 translates it as 'pattern.' And 99: 19 translates it as 'legal patterns.' Finally, 102:11 translates 'rechtsfiguren' as 'legal phenomena.' Because of this inconsistent translation, the English-speaking reader has no way of understanding the significance of 'figure' for Dooyeweerd's *Encyclopedia*.

Gegenstand-relation, when we turn inwards to examine the functions of our own temporal consciousness. This intentionality involves our imagination, to find the figure in things. The figure remains merely intentional and inward until it is acted on.

d) logical *prius* and *posterius*

Dooyeweerd says that the logical *prius* and *posterius* are “real figures of time” (*Tijdsprobleem*, 194 fn28).

E. Intuitive Vision (*schouwen/Schauen*)

1. Meaning of ‘*schouwen*’

In a 1923 article Dooyeweerd says that the primary function of our consciousness is our intuitive vision (*schouwen*).¹⁶⁷ Dooyeweerd uses this old Dutch word in many other works, too.

Wolters comments on Dooyeweerd’s use of ‘*schouwen*.’ Wolters sees parallels with Husserl’s idea of intuition of essences (*Wesenschau*).¹⁶⁸ But Dooyeweerd does not follow Husserl’s phenomenology. His use of ‘*schouwen*’ stems from a much older usage in mysticism and theosophy.

I have variously translated ‘*schouwen*’ as ‘intuition,’ ‘intuitive vision,’ or ‘beholding.’ Van Dale’s dictionary says that the word ‘*schouwen*’ means a kind of spiritual perception [*een waarneming in de geest*].¹⁶⁹ A ‘*schouwer*’ is a prophet, someone who sees into the future. See Isaiah 30:10:

Ziener: Ziet niet; schouwer: Schouwt ons niet, wat recht is; spreekt tot ons zachte dingen, schouwt ons bedriegerijen.

And the KJV version is

¹⁶⁷ Herman Dooyeweerd: “Het Advies over Rooms-katholieke en Anti-revolutionnaire Staatkunde,” (February, 1923, cited in Verburg, 47-61), at 53, from pages 38-39 of the article [‘*Advies*’]

¹⁶⁸ Al Wolters: “The Intellectual Milieu of Herman Dooyeweerd,” in C.T. McIntire (ed.), *The Legacy of Herman Dooyeweerd* (University Press of America, 1985) [‘Wolters’], 14.

¹⁶⁹ See [<http://www.vandale.nl/opzoeken/woordenboek/?zoekwoord=schouwen>].

Which say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits.

The connotation of prophecy, beholding the future, is also a very accurate meaning for Dooyeweerd's use, since in our turn inwards into the functions of our own consciousness, we are opening up the modal aspects of reality by examining the modal anticipations. And anticipations point forward in time in the temporal order of the aspects.

2. Intuition mediates between inner and outer

We have discussed the importance of the correspondence between our inner, purely intentional *Gegenstand*-relation and the aspects in the external world. The correspondence between our inner and outer world is given to us by God's Law or Wisdom. But we recognize the correspondence between our inner and outer world by our intuition.

Dooyeweerd distinguishes between pre-theoretical and theoretical and theoretical intuition. He criticizes those who fail to recognize the difference (See '*Gegenstandsrelatie*').

a) Our pre-theoretical intuition relates our supratemporal selfhood to its expression in its temporal functions. In naive experience, our intuition shows us that our temporal functions are "our own." We have an immediate enstatic experience of temporal reality as our own (*NC* II, 479; *WdW* II, 414). Even the identification of a sensation such as a sweet taste would be impossible without this intuition (*NC* II, 478; *WdW* II, 413). This awareness of the temporal functions as "our own" is what Dooyeweerd calls 'cosmic consciousness' (*NC* II, 479; *WdW* II, 414).

This intuition is the temporal bottom layer [*tijdelijke dieptelaag*] of the analytical aspect, and it keeps our analytical function of thought "fitted into" [*ingesteld*] within cosmic time. And it is through this bottom layer that our thought (an act from out of our supratemporal selfhood) is in contact with all of our other modal functions in time:

It [intuition] is that temporal bottom layer of the latter [the analytical modus] by means of which our analytical function of thought is embedded [*ingesteld*] in cosmic time itself. Through this bottom layer our thought is in continuous temporal contact with all the other modal functions which our selfhood can

claim in time as its own. This temporal bottom layer of actual analysis is our intuition (*NC* II, 473; *WdW* II, 408).

b) Our *theoretical* intuition mediates between the *Gegenstand* that we have theoretically isolated and our supratemporal selfhood (*NC* II, 479; *WdW* II, 414).

In theoretical thought, the *Gegenstand*-relation is the entry of our supratemporal selfhood into its temporal functions. Our intuition of time allows us to “enter into the temporal cosmos” and to set apart and combine the modal aspects in theoretical thought. This is because our intuition is an intuition of time (*NC* II, 480; *WdW* II, 415).

In theoretical thought, we epistemologically split apart the modal aspects. We create a *Gegenstand* which is not ontical, but merely intentional. Theoretical intuition moves to and fro between this intentional *Gegenstand*, and our real act of thought, which has been deepened in the opening process:

My intuition moves to and fro between my deepened analysis and its “*Gegenstand*” to bring them into actual contact in the inter-modal synthesis of meaning. In this process I become conscious of my theoretical freedom of thought. The actual synthesis of meaning accomplished in it can never be explained by means of the isolated functions of consciousness. Theoretical intuition is operative in deepened analysis itself, and only by its intermediary is theoretical thought able to analyse the “*Gegenstand*” in the intermodal synthesis of meaning. In this intuition 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, 478-79; *WdW* II, 413).

The last sentence indicates that the meaning-synthesis, which is accomplished in theoretical thought, is related to our supratemporal selfhood, in which we experience the coincidence of the temporal aspects (*NC* I, 106; *WdW* I, 71). The Dutch uses the term ‘*elkander dekken*,’ which means “are congruent with each other.” This coincidence or congruence is not a logical identity, but fullness.¹⁷⁰

The original Dutch refers to our “beholding intuition that moves to and fro” (*de heen- en weder schouwende intuïtie*). Thus, it uses both ‘*schouwen*’ and ‘*intuïtie*.’ The English translation does not adequately convey the visionary nature of intuition.

¹⁷⁰ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘coincidence,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Coincidence.html>].

If in naïve experience we have a cosmic consciousness that our temporal functions are own, in theoretical thought, we have a cosmological consciousness (*NC* II, 480; *WdW* II, 415), where there is an identity between our theoretical in-sight and the aspects of reality:

In het vóór-theoretisch zelfbewustzijn blijft naar de kosmische wetsorde het theoretische gefundeerd. Aan alle theoretisch denken over de zin-zijden der werkelijkheid en aan alle *schouwend in-zicht* ligt een *be-lewing in identiteit* ten grondslag, welke in het theoretisch-schouwend in-zicht slechts *verdiept*, maar nimmer *opgeheven* kan worden (*WdW* II, 415).

The *NC* translation (*NC* II, 480) does not make this clear, so I will re-translate:

In accordance with the cosmic law order, our theoretical self-consciousness remains founded in this pre-theoretical self-consciousness. There is a foundational experience in identity that is *lived experientially* [*be-lewing in identiteit*] between all theoretical thought about the meaning-sides of reality and all *intuitive in-sight*. This identity can only be *deepened* in the theoretical-intuitive in-sight, but never *sublated* or *cancelled* [*opgeheven*].

The identity is the correspondence between our intuitive in-sight¹⁷¹ and our theoretical thought about the meaning-sides of reality. In naïve experience, we have a cosmic consciousness of the identity of our selfhood with its functions. In theoretical thought we have a cosmological consciousness of the identity of the *Gegenstand* with the meaning-sides of reality. In both cases, we have an experience of the identity of inner and outer.

3. Correspondence between inner and outer

Although our imagination proceeds from out of our supratemporal selfhood, it is expressed temporally within our body or mantle of functions. It is also expressed outwardly in the external world. What is the connection between this inner and outer? Between our imagination and the aspects of the world? The connection is given by God's law, or Wisdom. We know God's law both in its central sense in our supratemporal selfhood, and within our body, in a differentiated sense. This differentiated sense corresponds to the outer world.

We should not regard this correspondence between inner and outer as some kind of psychic parallelism. For Dooyeweerd's idea of the supratemporal heart is more than the

¹⁷¹ See Linked Glossary, entry for 'inner,' at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Inner.html>].

psychical aspect. The correspondence is due to the fact that our body, as a mantle of temporal functions, is the expression of our supratemporal selfhood, and that the aspects of temporal reality are also expressions from out of the supratemporal. These aspects are the same, and correspond to each other. In both cases, the aspects are expressions, images of something above them. They are expressions of the Wisdom of God, or God's law in its central sense. This central law is refracted into the various modal laws by time. The law has both a central religious unity and a temporal diversity (*NC I*, 99; added to *WdW*). The law has both a religious fullness and a temporal diversity of meaning (*NC I*, 518; *WdW I*, 486).

The idea of correspondence between inner and outer worlds is a prominent theme in theosophy. The same form of the lion is both created in nature and also projected in man's imagination. There is in nature itself a kind of creative imagination, reflecting God's Sophia (Faivre, 118).¹⁷²

Sometimes, the correspondence between inner and outer is explained in terms of man being a microcosm of the macrocosm (Faivre, 173). Dooyeweerd rejects the idea of microcosm and macrocosm. His reasons for rejecting it are interesting: it is because the idea is too individualistic and personalistic (*NC II*, 593; *WdW II*, 527-28).¹⁷³

¹⁷² Versluis discusses how this correspondence of image and original is related to the Hermetic idea from the *Emerald Tablet*: "as above, so below."

In other words, there is a correspondence between spiritual truth and what we see in the natural world. One sees this in the many parables of the New Testament, which use natural images to reveal the most transcendent of spiritual truths about the human condition (Versluis, 96).

¹⁷³ Versluis also says that the mystical unity between humanity, nature and God is not completely expressed by the idea of man as microcosm. Versluis cites Valentin Weigel for a more adequate expression of the relation:

O my creator and God, through thy light I know how wonderful I am created: Out of the world am I created, and I am in the world, and the world is in me. I am also created out of you, and remain in you, and you in me...I am your child and son...and all that is in the greater world is also spiritually in me; thus am I and it one (Versluis, 97, referring to a citation of Weigel in F.W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert: *Deutsche Mystik Zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969), 177-178).

But Dooyeweerd does maintain the important idea of a correspondence between inner and outer, between our internal imagined *Gegenstand* and the external aspects in which individuality structures function. For Dooyeweerd (and for Kuyper and Baader), the correspondence between inner and outer is given by God's Law, or Wisdom. And within our own consciousness, it is our intuition, or intuitive vision (*schouwen*), which allows us to see this correspondence.

4. Aspects as modes of intuitive vision [schouwingswijzen]

In Dooyeweerd's 1923 article 'Advies,' he describes the modalities as modes of intuition [*schouwingswijzen*]. He says,

We behold intuitively in definite forms, each of which itself has a definite meaning. Number, space, time, reality, etc. are all forms of intuitive vision as the primary functions of consciousness. We cannot think about a system of numbers without having first brought to consciousness what is meant by number as such. For this we must first intuitively behold the meaning of number, and this [primary] giving of meaning differs from all giving of meaning to concrete numbers (like one, two, three, etc.) in that it is the absolute condition for this concrete giving of meaning. I cannot bring to consciousness the existence of a concrete number 4 unless I first obtain conscious insight the meaning of number as such, in distinction for example of an actual meaning (such as "the apple tree in this garden."). On the other hand, I cannot intuitively behold any physical reality without space, time and matter.

All these forms of intuitive vision, without which the concrete giving of meaning would be impossible, must therefore in themselves (as objective meaning) stand in an essential relation with the intuitively beheld meaning itself.

We call these forms of intuition the *modalities of giving meaning*. They belong to the immanent being of the giving of meaning itself, to the objective meaning of the giving of meaning.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁴ 'Advies,' 38-39, cited in Verburg, 53:

Wij schouwen in bepaalde vormen, die ieder op zichzelf een bepaalden zin hebben. Getal, ruimte, tijd, werkelijkheid, enz. zijn alle gelijkelijk vormen van de *schouwen* als primaire bewustzijnsfunctie. Wij kunnen niet over een getallensysteem denken vóór wij ons eerst tot bewustzijn hebben gebracht wat het getal als zoodanig beduidt. Daartoe moeten wij eerst den zin van het getal schouwen en deze zingeving verschilt in zooverre van all zingevingen aan concrete getallen (als een, twee, drie, enz.), dat zij absolute voorwaard is voor deze concrete zingevingen. Ik kan mij het wezen van een concreet getal 4 niet tot bewustzijn brengen, vóór ik eerst bewust heb ingezien wat dat getal als

Our intuitive vision in the sense of ‘*schouwen*’ is a conscious in-sight, a seeing within our own temporal functions that corresponds with the external meaning of concrete structures. Or as Dooyeweerd says elsewhere in the same article, they are subjective forms of giving meaning, and they must correspond to outer meaning:

Something in the world of perceived meaning must correspond to modalities which are primary forms of the intuiting consciousness [*schouwend bewustzijn*]. What corresponds to the modality must be something other than the concrete nature of the meaningful reality itself. The analogue to the modality is the essential relation of the area in the world of the perceived meaning, or in short, area category. The modality is subjectively a form of giving meaning and objectively it is a form of the essential relation of the area within the world of perceived meaning; in contrast, a concept is a form of thought.¹⁷⁵

When we examine the aspects within our own temporal functions, in the *Gegenstand*-relation, we are giving meaning to the corresponding areas of the external world. Dooyeweerd thus distinguishes between the aspect's subjective nature as a form of our subjective intuition, and its objective nature as an area category. Dooyeweerd later refers to area categories as ‘law-spheres.’¹⁷⁶ So the modalities are subjective giving of

zoodanig beduidt, in onderscheiding b.v. van een werkelijken zin (als “de appelboom in dezen tuin”). Anderzijds kan ik geen enkele physische werkelijkheid schouwen zonder ruimte, tijd en materie.

Al deze vormen van het schouwen, zonder welke concrete zingeving onmogelijk ware, moeten op zich zelf (als objectieven zin) daarom in wezensverband staan met den geschouwd zinnelike zelf.

Wij noemen deze schouwingsvormen de *modaliteiten der zingeving*. Zij behooren tot het immanent wezen der zingeving zelve, behoren tot den objectieven zin der zingeving

¹⁷⁵ ‘*Advies*,’ cited in Verburg:

Aan de modaliteit als primaire vorm van het schouwend bewustzijn moet dus iets anders beantwoorden in de wereld van den geschouwd zinnelike, dan de concrete geaardheid van de zinvolle wezens zelve; dit analogon noemen wij het wezensverband van het gebied in the wereld van den geschouwd zinnelike, of kortweg, gebiedskategorie. De modaliteit is dus iets totaal anders dan het begrip. De modaliteit is subjectief vorm van de zingeving, objectief een vorm van het wezensverband van het gebied binnen de wereld van den geschouwd zinnelike; het begrip daarentegen is vorm van het denken.

¹⁷⁶ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘aspects,’ at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/aspects.html>].

meaning—that is, the giving of meaning from within our supratemporal subjectivity. The law-spheres are within “objective” meaning reality.

The last sentence of the quotation distinguishes between the modalities and our concepts. Dooyeweerd distinguishes in this article between intuition and thinking. Intuition [*schouwen*] is bound to the modalities. Thinking is bound to its categories. Modalities are restricted then to intuition; concepts are the form of thought (Verburg 54). But the correspondence between thinking and intuition gives rise to the issue of God, the giver of the law that makes this correspondence possible:

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.¹⁷⁷

The passage is important, since Dooyeweerd here contrasts how this view of God’s law, which binds our thinking and intuition, is different from a view of autonomy. In autonomy, man sets his own law. But here, man has been fitted into [*ingesteld*], set into objective meaning.

The passage also suggests that the law-Idea is required in order to explain the correspondence between inner and outer. We do not autonomously set our own meaning, but we are set or placed, fitted within everything.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid*, cited by Verburg, 60:

Al het bestaande ligt gebonden aan zijn objectieven zin, die zijn wezen uitmaakt. Het schouwen is gebonden aan zijn gezichtsvelden, het denken aan zijn categorieën. Het schouwen is gebonden aan zijn gezichtsvelden, het denken aan zijn categorieën. 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 det heteronomie* onbeperkt in al het bestaande gaat heerschen, ook in het zingen beswutzijn, komt de vraag naar den wetgever, den ordenaar.

The other point to mention is that this early article emphasizes that the modalities are not properties of things. This is a distinction that Dooyeweerd maintained right up to his last article in 1975 (*'Gegenstandsrelatie'*).

5. Boehme's use of 'Schauen'

As a student, Dooyeweerd was familiar with the work of A.H. de Hartog, who published in the journal *Opbouw*, to which both Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven also contributed. Vollenhoven was the editor of the journal, under one of his pseudonyms. One of the books reviewed in that journal was de Hartog's book on Boehme.¹⁷⁸ De Hartog refers to Boehme as the "*schauwende denker*," the "intuitive thinker." And in his introduction, he refers to how Boehme obtained a view of eternity by his intuitive beholding [*schauwen*] of light in a pewter plate, which gave him at once a wonderful, inner clarity by which he was able to intuitively see into [*doorschauwen*] the deepest and final principles of all things.

6. Baader's use of 'Schauen'

Baader also says that our thought is directed to the structure of things, a structure that we know intuitively:

All understanding or knowledge is a penetration of an intuitive perception. To determine such a perception means to make a model of it. The concept of perception makes evident the sensory mediation of all knowledge; similarly, understanding is defined as the power to make the perception into a model, i.e. to understand its structure.¹⁷⁹

Baader uses the word '*Schauen*' for this intuitive knowledge:

¹⁷⁸ A.H. de Hartog: *Uren met Jacob Boehme* (edited selections) (Baarn: Hollandia-Drukkerij, 1915). De Hartog quotes extensively from Julius Hamberger: *Die Lehre des deutschen Philosophen Jakob Boehme*. Hamberger was a commentator on Baader, and de Hartog also mentions Baader in connection with Boehme.

¹⁷⁹ *Werke* 12,84:

Alles Begreifen oder Erkennen ist ein Durchdringen einer Anschauung. Eine Anschauung bestimmen, heisst sie zum Modell machen. Der Begriff der Anschauung macht die sinnliche Vermittlung aller Erkenntnis deutlich; gleichzeitig wird das Begreifen als das Vermögen bestimmt, die Anschauung zum Modell zu machen, d.h. ihre Struktur zu erfassen.

There is an inner seeing, which is not mediated by the outer senses, and an inner action (*ad extra* works) that corresponds to this inner seeing. And these works are also not mediated by outer action.¹⁸⁰

Our “inner sense” reaches for the Totality of all elements and factors of our intuitive vision (*Anschauung*), whereas outer seeing just gives us a composite of these elements and factors (*Werke* 4,100). From our initial intuition (*Schauen*) we move outwards in our theoretical abstraction; but we must return to this *Schauen*. Otherwise, our thinking becomes an enemy; it then destroys and deadens our Spirit. The mistake in theory is not in the antithesis involved in thought, but in failing to return to a synthesis.

Like van Eeden and Dooyeweerd after him, Baader also emphasizes both thought and intuition. In a variant of Kant, Baader says,

Intuition without thought would be blind; thought without intuition would be meaningless.¹⁸¹

Thus for Baader, it is our inward intuition that gives meaning. And we have seen this same idea in Dooyeweerd. The giving of meaning, *zin-geving*, is based on our inward intuition.

For Baader, our intuition is a knowledge relating to the supratemporal center. And it involves a prophetic looking into the future, anticipating the future. He says that prophets see into the future; they show us that the future is already here. Others represent the past and show us (remember) that the past is still there (*Werke* 4, 117 fn). Baader prefaces his article *Zeit* by a quotation from St. Martin that man’s true state is the prophetic state. What the prophets see is “yet unborn in time”:

In a similar sense, but one intended to refer to a higher order of things, the Scriptures say that God does nothing that He has not previously (*auparavant*) shown to his disciples [*Vertrauten, confidens*] or prophets [A reference to Amos 3:7]. They really form the true youth of the society of every era, insofar as that

¹⁸⁰ *Werke* 4,98f:

Es gibt ein inneres Schauen, welches nicht durch die äußeren Sinne vermittelt ist, und ein diesem inneren Schauen entsprechendes inneres Tun (Wirken *ad extra*), welches ebensowenig durch das äußere Tun vermittelt ist.

¹⁸¹ *Werke* I, 19:

Schauen ohne Denken blind; Denken ohne Schauen sinnlos wäre.

which is still temporally unborn [and which the prophets see] yet unborn in time are still younger than the youngest already temporally born (*Elementarbegriffe*).

And Baader says that our knowledge comes through communication and entering into perfect and finished intuition and knowledge that exists above us.

Our knowledge does not come from ourselves, as the rationalists believe, but through communication (not being part of) and entering into a relation with a complete and perfect intuition [*Schauen*] and knowledge [*Wissen*] that stands *a priori* above us. (*Zwiespalt* 60)

Baader also links our intuition with God's Wisdom or *Sophia*. It is Wisdom (*Sophia*) that is intuitive (*anschauende*) (*Begründung*, 133).

Baader says that there are times that our anticipation manifests itself as a transient *Silberblick*, an eternal moment in time (*Werke* 4,114). This is when our intuition (*Anschauen*) moves in the anticipatory direction (*Zeit* p. 58, ft. 14; *Fermenta* I, 23). We can then 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. Similarly, Dooyeweerd speaks of times when

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).

7. van Eeden's use of 'schouwen'

Frederik van Eeden was deeply influenced by Boehme, and some of the same themes are evident in his writing, including this emphasis on intuitive vision. In his student article on Frederik van Eeden, Dooyeweerd compares intuition to the dream state. Dooyeweerd refers to "the intuitive dream-life of our second 'I.'" And he says that there are two basic structural needs; intuitive and reasoning.¹⁸²

Dooyeweerd also corresponded with Van Eeden. In a letter of November 14, 1914, Dooyeweerd asked what van Eeden meant by "zien met de meest mogelijke helderheid, die iemand vergen kan" ["to see with the most clarity possible that one can obtain"].

¹⁸² Herman Dooyeweerd: "Neo-Mysticism and Frederik van Eeden," (Almanak van het studenten corps van de Vrije Universiteit, 1915), translated and online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Mainheadings/Neo-mystiek.html>].

This letter was after van Eeden's book *Paul's ontwaken*.¹⁸³ 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 her 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?¹⁸⁴

Van Eeden's idea of intuition is related to lucid seeing [*heldere zien*]. This kind of seeing is given to everyone, in his innermost. And it is the source of all knowledge.

The way is shown by intuition and understanding, beholding and distinguishing.¹⁸⁵

Intuition, source of all true wisdom, itself sees the direction. Understanding helps by distinguishing. And both are involved in inner self-examination [*zelfschouw*].

Van Eeden's amazing poem, *Het Lied van Schijn en Wezen*¹⁸⁶ was written over a long period of time, and it contains a record of van Eeden's movement from an initial monistic viewpoint to his conversion to Christianity late in his life. There are many beautiful passages in the poem, but the following expresses the relation of this inner self-examination to the unfolding of God's law:

No living being is completely bare
of this your greatest gift. For in the faintness
of the dawn, alone and still, cells of young shoots

are built by her from air and water
wondrous flowers and the promised wood;

¹⁸³ Frederik Van Eeden: *Paul's Ontwaken* (Amsterdam, 1913).

¹⁸⁴ Letter dated Nov. 14, 1914 from Dooyeweerd to Frederik van Eeden:

Ik voel, dat u hier onmogelijk het "empirisch zintuigelijk waarnemen" kunt hebben bedoeld. Is het misschien bij u dat onmiddelijk gevoel geweest, dat men met den naam ‘intuïtie’ pleegt aan te duiden en dat om met Schopenhauer te spreken, in de naar binnen gekeerde zijde van het bewustzijn zetelt?

¹⁸⁵ Cited by H.W. van Tricht: *Frederik van Eeden: Denker en Strijder* (Amsterdam: Lankamp & Brinkman, 1934), 72:

Intuïtie èn verstand wijzen daarbij, schouwend en scheidend, de weg

¹⁸⁶ Frederik van Eeden: *Het Lied van Schijn en Wezen*, ed. H. W. van Tricht, Zwolle, W.E.J. Tjeenk, 1954, originally published 1892-1922).

she also wakes us up to introspection deep

and to unfolding of God's law, that holds
the glory with its steadfast beams,
built in the empty heavens by His hand [My translation].¹⁸⁷

F. Theoretical synthesis and Ideas

In the theoretical attitude, we distinguish and split apart the modal aspects. It therefore gives a more complete opening process. This theoretical splitting apart is not ontical (*NC I*, 39; added to *WdW*).

The modal aspects which have been (epistemologically but not ontically) split apart must be brought back into relation with our supratemporal selfhood. We must make the theoretical Gegenstand “our own.” This is done by theoretical synthesis, aided by our theoretical intuition and by our imagination.

Synthetical thought is done by our Ideas, as opposed to our concepts. Concepts are retrocipatory, but Ideas reach forward in anticipation. Our imagination is needed to anticipate moments in the aspects of our temporal experience that have not yet been opened or unfolded. Imagination is needed for the Ideas by which we anticipate. Dooyeweerd gives an example in imaginary numbers, which anticipate movement through the intermediary of spatial dimensionality and magnitude (*NC II*, 171; *WdW II*, 114).

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, *Lied I*, XII, 58:

Geen levend wezen bleef er gansch ontbloot
dier grootste gaaf. Zij is ‘t, die doet in flauwe
daging de celletjes in jong loot,

vereend en stil, uit lucht en water bouwen
hun wondre bloemen en ‘t belooverd hout,
maar zij ook wekt den mensch tot diep zelf-schouwen

en tot ontvouwen van Gods wet, die houdt
de pracht te samen met standvastig glanzen,
door Zijn hand in der heemlen leeg gebouwd.

It is only because we both transcend time and are immanently fitted into temporal reality that we can perform the theoretical act of synthesis of meaning:

The possibility of meaning-synthesis can only be explained on the basis of what we previously said in a more summary manner 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, from whose fullness of meaning all temporal meaning-functions (both natural as well as spiritual functions) are only temporal refractions. Self-consciousness is immanent within cosmic time, insofar as our functions of consciousness are interwoven within the cosmic order of time. The a-logical meaning functions are not foreign to our self-consciousness. They are all together owned by our selfhood. It is only because of this that we can learn to know them in their meaningful conformity to law. [my translation]¹⁸⁸]

Dooyeweerd also states this in the *Encyclopedia*. It is only because of our supratemporal selfhood that we can form Ideas of the transcendental supratemporal conditions that make all thought possible, while nevertheless remaining bound to philosophy.

Therefore by maintaining the Gegenstand-relation, the theoretical Idea relates the theoretical concept to the conditions of all theoretical thought, but itself remains theoretical in nature, thus within the bounds of philosophic thought. It is just in this that its transcendental character resides. For in theoretical thought, the transcendental is everything that, by means of the inner (immanent) structure of theoretical way of thought, first makes possible theoretical thought itself; the transcendental is everything that stands at the basis of every theoretical conceptual distinction as its theoretical presupposition (*Encyclopedia*, 80-81, re-translated by myself)

The importance of imagination for the theoretical synthesis appears in Dooyeweerd's discussion of Heidegger's interpretation of Kant. He refers to Kant's idea of the synthesis

¹⁸⁸ Herman Dooyeweerd: *De Crisis der Humanistische Staatsleer, in het licht eener Calvinistische kosmologie en kennistheorie* (Amsterdam: Ten Have, 1931), 103:

De mogelijkheid der zin-synthese 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 individueele zelfheid deel heeft aan den religieuzen wortel van het menschengeslacht, van welks zinvolheid alle tijdelijke zin-functies (zoowel natuur- als geestesfuncties) slechts tijdelijke zinsbrekingen zijn). Het is immanent aan den kosmischen tijd, in zooverre onze bewustzijnsfuncties in de kosmische tijdsorde zijn ingevlochten. De a-logische zinfuncties zijn niet vreemd aan het zelfbesuwzijn. Ze zijn alle gezamenlijk eigen aan onze zelfheid. Alleen daarom kunnen wij ze in hare zin-wetmatigheid leeren kennen

of imagination as "indeed a dark point in Kant's argument" (*NC II*, 497; added to *WdW*). Kant's "figurative synthesis," refers to the transcendental synthesis of the imagination in contradistinction to the merely logical synthesis (*NC II*, 514; *WdW II*, 444). Dooyeweerd seems concerned that Kant's doctrine of the imagination might, as Heidegger suggests, provide a basis for Kant's view of theoretical synthesis. For Heidegger, Kant's transcendental imagination is the formative medium of the two stems of knowledge—intuition and thought (*NC II*, 525; *WdW II*, 455). After a lengthy discussion, Dooyeweerd concludes that imagination for Kant is still a logical act. It therefore cannot provide the basis for synthesis.

G. Realization and the Re-Enchantment of the World

If our imagination seeks to mirror the Wisdom of God, reading the hieroglyphics of His Wisdom in our own temporal mantle of functions, which correspond to the aspects in the external world, both those that have been realized and those that are still merely potential, does this not lead to a static view of science? What is the role of our creativity?

The question is important, but in my view it betrays a substantialized view of the world. It presupposes that temporal reality is made of fixed substances responding to a fixed law that we then discover. Indeed, I think that the question more accurately reflects the prevailing views in reformational philosophy, and it is why students often find such reformational philosophy so boring. Vollenhoven's idea of God-law-cosmos, where the cosmos responds to a law outside the cosmos, and where aspects are properties of things that are separate from that law, seems to lead to just such a deadening viewpoint. This leads to a rigid idea of things, with a subject-object relation restricted to functionalistic relations between things or entities.

But Dooyeweerd's philosophy, when understood in terms of the Wisdom tradition, results in a much more dynamic and creative view of reality. It overcomes a dualistic subject-object relation in favour of a nondual view of perception, imagination, knowing and action. The aspects are not properties of things, but modes of our intuitive vision, which correspond to law-spheres of structures that are still in the process of being individualized. In our imagination, we look forward in time, anticipating what may be. We play creatively with the aspects, making and forming temporal reality.

To say that discovering and applying God's Wisdom leads to a static view of reality is itself a failure of imagination in viewing God, self and cosmos. If the structure of our world, in its modal aspects and structures, reflects the Wisdom of God, then we must have creativity, for is not God creative in His Wisdom? I suppose it might be said that our creativity is limited to what God has already thought in His Wisdom. The only possible reply to this is, "But are you not then seeking to become greater than God? Where is your sense of dependence on Him?"

The fact that God's Wisdom is the temporal law-side of reality brings a dynamic relation to individuality structures. This dynamic does not exist when things are seen as merely responding to a law completely external to them. And to say that finding God's law limits creativity is rather like saying complaining that the musical notes in our scales, which also have law-structures, somehow limit our creativity. The history of music, and particularly the improvisation of jazz show that the creative possibilities are endless. As Dooyeweerd says, our forming is "a free project of form-giving with endless possibilities of variation" (*NC II*, 198; added to *WdW*). Dooyeweerd's modal scale is not a boring representation of what modernistic science is doing, but a Wisdom tradition. It is like a *Glass Bead Game* that is contemplative as well as magical in the sense of actually forming temporal reality and making it real.

The idea of making temporal creation become real is something like the meaning of those stories that children love so much of inanimate objects becoming real, like the wooden puppet Pinocchio who becomes real, or the Velveteen Rabbit, who becomes real because the boy (properly opening up the normative aspects inherent in the toy), loves the rabbit.

As Baader says, our understanding is an act of creativity and this is also an act of love.¹⁸⁹ In our creativity, we produce finite beings in their completed state. This producing love requires a denial of self; but there is an answer to this love by the reaffirmation of the producing being (*Zeit* 34 ft. 14). Fulfillment of the existence of a created thing can only

¹⁸⁹ See Ramón J. Betanzos: *Franz von Baader's Philosophy of Love*, ed. Martin M. Herman (Passagen Verlag, 1998). Love is both a gift (Gabe) and a task (Aufgabe). See Faivre, *Phil. de la Nature*, 126.

be done through the reciprocal sacrifice of Creator and the created. But Baader says that this power of creation can also be misused; this misuse of power is the original sin.

Dooyeweerd specifically rejects a rigid view of reality and of our imagination. We do not look for a fixed essence of independently existing things. An example of a totally fixed view of reality is that of Parmenides (Eleatic philosophy), who declared all becoming and change to be a sensory phenomenon that does not correspond to true Being. For Parmenides, the real origin of this Being is theoretical thought: “for thinking and being is one and the same.” Dooyeweerd says that Parmenides' idea of Being identifies theoretical thought with its product (*NC* III, 5; Cf. *WdW* III, 3). Dooyeweerd's own view (like Baader's), opposes a fixed or hypostatized figure:

In theoretical laying bare of modal meaning, we do not grasp a rigid *eidōs*, an absolute essential structure, a *Sache an sich* (*NC* II 485; *WdW* II, 421).

But if we are searching for the figure in reality, is that not searching for a fixed *eidōs*? I believe that the answer to this question is found in another significant passage, where Dooyeweerd says that all of our Ideas are inadequate. We move from anticipatory sphere to anticipatory sphere until our thought finds rest in its religious root, and we realize the inadequacy of all our Ideas:

In the *Idea* of a meaning-modus, philosophical reflection oriented to our cosmomic Idea passes through a process of successive meaning-coherences in the transcendental direction of time. The internal unrest of meaning drives it on from anticipatory sphere to anticipatory sphere, and so from one anticipatory connection to another. At last we arrive at the transcendental terminal sphere of our cosmos and reflect on the insufficiency of the modal Idea. We then direct our glance to the transcendent meaning-totality and the Origin, in which at last our thought finds rest *in its religious root* (*NC* II, 284; *WdW* II, 214).

As I interpret this, all of our Ideas are only partial, pointing to a fulfillment that we strive for but can never fully attain. It is like the orthodox idea of *epektasis*.¹⁹⁰ Our theory is thus itself an act of worship, ending in apophatic wonder, opening up more and more of temporal reality, but with always more that can be discovered.

¹⁹⁰ See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘epektasis,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Epektasis.html>].

VII. Conclusion

Dooyeweerd's ideas on imagination emphasize the importance of seeing and intuitively imaging God, self and cosmos in a different way. In Dooyeweerd's words, when our heart is opened to the transcendent reality, we see things as they really are. The transcendent light of eternity then shines through, illuminating even the trivial in our lives. Our theory itself becomes an act of worship, where we ascend from sphere to sphere, until we are left in apophatic wonder. But along the way, we help to redeem the sparks of God within his creation. For if temporal reality fell because of humanity, it is only through redeemed humanity that the world will be redeemed.

Our imagination is an act that proceeds from out of our supratemporal selfhood. It is expressed within time, both within the temporal functions of our body or mantle of functions, and in the world outside of our body. We are simultaneously supratemporal and temporal beings. There is therefore a need to relate our supratemporal selfhood to our temporal functions. This relation between inner and outer is given by our intuition, both (pre-theoretical and theoretical).

Imagination is an inner, intentional act, in which we form images. Our imagination is more than just fantasy, disconnected to reality. Rather, in imagination, we seek the "figure" within temporal reality. This is an anticipation of what reality may become, but which is presently only a potential reality. In finding the figure within reality, and in realizing it, we form history and fulfill the reality of temporal structures.

These ideas fit within the tradition of Christian theosophy, which emphasizes the relation of our acts of imagination to our being created in the image of God, and the act of imaging in a "figure" what God has expressed within his creation. We intuit this figure in an anticipatory, prophetic way, looking forward into time to see what may and should be. When we do this, we open up the anticipatory aspects in the temporal world, we form the temporal world historically and culturally, and we assist in the process of the completion of the redemption of the world.

In order to find the figure within reality, there has to be a correspondence between the inner images and the outer world. God's law gives this correspondence, since both our physical mantle of functions and external reality function in the same modal aspects.

Because of this correspondence, we can find the figure by our intuition, which is an intuitive beholding (*schouwen*). The modal aspects are modes of this intuition. And the temporal world, including our temporal body, functions in those modal aspects. And we are made aware of the connection between inner and outer by means of our intuition, both pre-theoretical and theoretical. The modal aspects are modes of our intuition. Both our temporal mantle of functions and the temporal world function in the same aspects. This is why we are able to find the “figure” within temporal reality by the purely inner *Gegenstand*-relation. It corresponds to what is external to us.

Our pre-theoretical intuition makes our temporal functions “our own” by relating them to our selfhood. And our theoretical intuition makes the intentional (purely inner) *Gegenstand* our own by relating it to our selfhood.

In his views on perception, Dooyeweerd distinguishes between the original objective image, and the subjective sensory copy of that image in a restricted form. This restricted form is opened up by our cultural forming and imagining. It is opened up in a different way in our theoretical thought when, by the intentional *Gegenstand*-relation, we examine the functions of our own internal temporal functions of consciousness to find the figures within the temporal aspects.

Dooyeweerd’s idea of the *Gegenstand*-relation is understood when we see it as an intentional imaging of the wisdom of God within temporal reality. And in particular, it is an imaging within that part of temporal reality that is our own mantle of functions. The aspects in that mantle, and the aspects in the world external to our physical body, correspond to each other, because they function in the modal aspects, which are expressions of God’s law. It is our intuition that helps us to see this correspondence. Our intuitive vision (*schouwen*) is our primary mode of consciousness, and by this we see the figure within temporal reality.

In order to understand Dooyeweerd’s ideas of imagination, we need to read him carefully, putting aside previous interpretations that derive from Vollenhoven’s philosophy. We also need to read Dooyeweerd without assuming that he must fit into a

particular kind of reformed theology.¹⁹¹ It is an open question whether the neo-Calvinism of Dooyeweerd and Kuyper is compatible with Calvinism. There may be connections with the Calvin's own more theosophical outlook, in contrast to later covenantal theology. But even if there is agreement with such original Calvinism, it is likely that Dooyeweerd and Kuyper obtained their central idea of the religious root and supratemporal heart from non-reformed sources.

The theosophical or Wisdom tradition helps us to understand what Dooyeweerd means by his complicated (and Germanic) terminology. Once we make this connection, many passages that were once obscure are immediately clarified, even though the meaning is often one that appears most strange in terms of current reformational thought.

Some readers, who have not previously seen the connections of Dooyeweerd's philosophy of imagination to Christian theosophy, may now decide to reject his philosophy. They may turn to Vollenhoven's distinctly non-imaginative and indeed logicistic and modernistic philosophy.¹⁹² Or they may turn to an explicit theological philosophy such as that of Cornelius van Til. Or they may denounce Dooyeweerd's philosophy as theo-ontological, and turn to postmodernism. Although I think that all of those responses are wrong, they are better than purporting to follow Dooyeweerd while simultaneously contradicting his key ideas.

But there will be other readers who will be pleasantly surprised, and who will turn to Dooyeweerd to read him again for themselves. They will see connections in his ideas

¹⁹¹ An example of theological considerations getting in the way of reading Dooyeweerd is the article by D.F. M. Strauss, "The Central Religious Community of Mankind in the Philosophy of the Cosmogenic Idea," *Philosophia Reformata* 37 (1972), 58-67. Strauss cannot see how redemption is in the religious root, for that would undercut the traditional reformed ideas of a portion of humanity being redeemed. I do not find a double predestination in Dooyeweerd, but rather Dooyeweerd's emphasis that nothing of God's creation can be lost (*NC* III, 524-525). Nothing in our apostate world can get lost in Christ (*NC* II, 34; I, 101). There is a sense in which redemption has already occurred in the religious root and is only being worked out in time (*NC* II, 33). Dooyeweerd's ideas are closer to the orthodox idea of *apokatastasis*.

¹⁹² Those are Dooyeweerd's own judgments on Vollenhoven's philosophy, as incorporated in current reformational philosophy, particularly that of D. F. M. Strauss. See Dooyeweerd's last article, 'Gegenstandsrelatie.'

that have previously gone unnoticed, and they will be able to appreciate Dooyeweerd in relation to an existing philosophical tradition. And they will view with wonder the truly radical nature Dooyeweerd's philosophy. Theosophy explains Dooyeweerd's mysticism in a way that is linked to the temporal world and not a spiritualistic fleeing from the world. It also helps us to relate Dooyeweerd's philosophy to Orthodox ideas, and it may encourage a review of Calvin's ideas in terms of such Orthodoxy.

In my view, Dooyeweerd has recapitulated the Wisdom tradition, in a comprehensive way not seen since Baader. And Dooyeweerd has expanded this tradition in his own original way. I hope I have encouraged others to read his work again. For what is at issue is the nature of Christian philosophy itself, and a true view of the nature of God, self and cosmos.

Appendix A: Is Dooyeweerd's Philosophy Calvinistic?

Dooyeweerd initially referred to his philosophy as 'Calvinistic.' But in later years he rejected this label, wanting to take a more ecumenical approach. In a 1956 article he said that he did not want his philosophy to be associated with a theological system that gave to Calvin an authority that a human should not deserve. He said that the term 'Calvinism,' already "dangerous in itself," can lead to a label for a definite group or sect (Verburg 344).

Dooyeweerd's opposition to the term 'Calvinistic' also appears in the *New Critique*:

Therefore, I regret the fact that the philosophical association, which was formed in Holland [after the appearance of the Dutch edition of this work], chose the name "The Association for Calvinistic Philosophy." But I will give due allowance for the fact that I, myself, in an earlier stage of my development, called my philosophy "Calvinistic" (*NC I*, 524 ft. 1).

Dooyeweerd tried to change the name of the Calvinistic Association for Philosophy [Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte]. He was unsuccessful in that attempt. On January 2, 1964, Dooyeweerd gave an address to that Association. The subject of the gathering was "Center and Circumference of the Philosophy of the Law-Idea in a changed world" ["Centrum en omtrek van de Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee in een veranderende wereld"]. Dooyeweerd emphasized the importance of ecumenism, and pointed out, "The term 'Calvinistic' is not Biblical." (Verburg, 292). He said,

You may have your own convictions in this area, but I am convinced that at this time we need to bring forward in an increasingly strong way the Biblical-ecumenical motive of our actions and our thoughts, and that we must no longer be an obstacle to those persons who, although they are attracted to our ideas, yet say, "Yes, but we could never do that, we could not come within the narrow circle of those Calvinists; that is not possible." [Verburg 381, my translation].

But how closely connected with Calvinism is Dooyeweerd's philosophy? I have already referred to Bohatec's view that Dooyeweerd's key idea of the religious root is not found in Calvin. But Bohatec's opinion appears to be incorrect. Sheng-Hong Tan has referred to the following quotation from Calvin which appears to support the view of Christ as the New Root:

By these words he reminds us how efficacious is that knowledge which he mentions, even because by it we are united to Christ; and become one with God;

for it has a living root, fixed in the heart, by which it comes that God lives in us and we in him. As he says, without a copulative, that: we are *in him that is true, in his Son*, he seems to express the manner of our union with God, as though he had said, that we are in God through Christ”.¹⁹³

The quotation is remarkable because it combines ideas of living root, the heart, and participation in God through Christ.

Now it might be objected that this quotation from Calvin only applies to redemption and not to creation and fall. But other passages from Calvin seem to also support man’s creation as the root and man’s fall carrying with it the fall of temporal reality.

With respect to the first issue, creation of man as root of temporal reality, Calvin even refers to man as a microcosm:

Truly there are many things in this corrupted nature which may induce contempt; but if you rightly weigh all circumstances, man is, among other creatures a certain preeminent specimen of Divine wisdom, justice, and goodness, so that he is deservedly called by the ancients *mikri kosmon*, “a world in miniature.”¹⁹⁴

From his commentary on Chapter 2 of Genesis, it seems that Calvin does not distinguish between image and likeness. But it is interesting that he was aware of Augustine’s views relating this to different faculties of the soul. And although Calvin disagrees with Augustine, he nevertheless admits that being created in the image of God does have to do with at least a division between body and soul:

In our image, etc. Interpreters do not agree concerning the meaning of these words. The greater part, and nearly all, conceive that the word *image* is to be distinguished from likeness. And the common distinction is, that image exists in the substance, *likeness* in the accidents of anything. They who would define the subject briefly, say that in the image are contained those endowments which God has conferred on human nature at large, while they expound likeness to mean gratuitous gifts. But Augustine, beyond all others, speculates with excessive refinement, for the purpose of fabricating a Trinity in man. For in laying hold of the three faculties of the soul enumerated by Aristotle, the intellect, the memory, and the will, he afterwards out of one Trinity derives many. If any reader, having leisure, wishes to enjoy such speculations, let him

¹⁹³ John Calvin: *Commentary on the First Epistle of John*.

¹⁹⁴ John Calvin: *Commentary on Genesis*.

read the tenth and fourteenth books on the Trinity, also the eleventh book of the "City of God." I acknowledge, indeed, that there is something in man which refers to the Fathers and the Son, and the Spirit: and I have no difficulty in admitting the above distinction of the faculties of the soul: although the simpler division into two parts, which is more used in Scripture, is better adapted to the sound doctrine of piety; but a definition of the image of God ought to rest on a firmer basis than such subtleties. As for myself, before I define the image of God, I would deny that it differs from his likeness. For when Moses afterwards repeats the same things he passes over the *likeness*, and contents himself with mentioning the image. (*Ibid.*)

The exposition of Chrysostom is not more correct, who refers to the dominion which was given to man in order that he might, in a certain sense, act as God's vicegerent in the government of the world. This truly is some portion, though very small, of the image of God.

The idea of viceregent in the government of the world is not nearly as strong as the idea of microcosm, which Calvin does seem to have accepted, and which corresponds more nearly to Dooyeweerd's idea of man as the religious root of temporal reality. Support for this seems to be found in other sayings of Calvin, where he speaks of Christ as the New Root.

In the *Institutes*, Calvin says that in the fall, pride penetrated to man's "inmost heart."¹⁹⁵ And Calvin refers to the Holy Spirit, who makes Christ's benefits available to us, as the "root of heavenly life in us":

2. But in order to have a clearer view of this most important subjects we must remember that Christ came provided with the Holy Spirit after a peculiar manner, namely, that he might separate us from the world, and unite us in the hope of an eternal inheritance. Hence the Spirit is called the Spirit of sanctification, because he quickens and cherishes us, not merely by the general

¹⁹⁵ John Calvin, *Institutes*, Book 2, Chapter 1: Through the fall and revolt of Adam, the whole human race made accursed and degenerate. Of original sin. Section 9. *Exposition of the former part of the definition, viz., that hereditary depravity extends to all the faculties of the soul.*

I have said, therefore, that all the parts of the soul were possessed by sin, ever since Adam revolted from the fountain of righteousness. For not only did the inferior appetites entice him, but abominable impiety seized upon the very citadel of the mind, and pride penetrated to his inmost heart, (Rom. 7: 12; 4.15.10 - 12)

energy which is seen in the human race, as well as other animals, but because he is *the seed and root of heavenly life in us*.¹⁹⁶ (my emphasis)

And:

Again when he declares, “Every plant which my heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up,” (Matth. 15:13,) he intimates conversely that those who have their root in God can never be deprived of their salvation.¹⁹⁷

And in his Commentary on First John, Calvin mentions again that true knowledge has a “living root, fixed in the heart”:

By these words he reminds us how efficacious is that knowledge which he mentions, even because by it we are united to Christ; and become one with God; for it has a living root, fixed in the heart, by which it comes that God lives in us and we in him. As he says, without a copulative, that: we are *in him that is true, in his Son*, he seems to express the manner of our union with God, as though he had said, that we are in God through Christ.¹⁹⁸

These quotations from Calvin do seem to support some understanding of the heart in a central sense. Why then was Dooyeweerd’s philosophy challenged as being contrary to Calvin? I have already referred to the theologian Valentijn Hepp, who in 1936, Hepp published a series of brochures entitled *Dreigende Deformatie* [Threatening Deformation]. This caused a long investigation of both Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven by the theological faculty at the Free University. The investigation did not end until after World War II; the controversy was not really resolved. It ended because there was a change of staff on the theological faculty. Verburg says that the controversy with Schilder also acted as a lightning rod to deflect some of Hepp's criticism (Verburg 203).

Hepp said that Dooyeweerd was challenging the traditional Calvinistic doctrines of the place of theology, the dualism of body and soul, and the idea of substance as set out in some Reformed Confessions. He thought that Dooyeweerd’s Idea of the tendency towards the Origin would stand in the way of truly progressive theology. He thought that the new philosophy was bringing back anthropomorphisms that the church had rejected

¹⁹⁶ John Calvin: *Institutes*, Book III, Chapter 1, 2, p. 538. The Benefits of Christ made available to us by the secret operation of the Holy Spirit.

¹⁹⁷ John Calvin: *Institutes*, Chapter 24. Election confirmed by the calling of God.

¹⁹⁸ John Calvin, *Commentary on the First Epistle of John*.

as heresy, and that there was a wrong understanding of the mediating of creation. Hepp opposed the law-Idea, the way the boundary with God was interpreted, the Idea of the subject, and he also opposed Dooyeweerd's understanding of the image of God. Hepp said that whenever Dooyeweerd opposed traditional Calvinistic thoughts, he did not say so openly, but blamed immanence philosophy. Hepp especially opposed the Idea of the supratemporal heart, which he called the “heart-theory,” and which he said was completely untenable (Verburg 204-218).

In his Second Response to the Curators, Dooyeweerd referred to Kuyper for support of the continuity of his thought with Calvinism. He attached a long appendix, with citations from Kuyper's work that agreed with his own philosophy. It is unlikely that Dooyeweerd was familiar with the quotations I have cited from Calvin, since he does not attach them to his Response, and they would have been powerful support for his views. But Dooyeweerd sensed that Kuyper was following in a truer Calvinistic tradition than Hepp and his other accusers.

But Dooyeweerd did not even accept all of Kuyper's views. He criticized remnants of scholasticism in Kuyper.¹⁹⁹ And In 1971, Dooyeweerd said that there were only a few works by Kuyper that he really appreciated: Kuyper's *Lectures on Calvinism* (Stone Lectures), Kuyper's address on sphere sovereignty,²⁰⁰ and works by Kuyper relating to “contemplation of life and of a meditative nature” [*van levenbeschouwelijke en meditatieve aard*].²⁰¹

¹⁹⁹ In Dooyeweerd's 1939 article “Kuyper's Wetenschapsleer.” Although Dooyeweerd criticized some of Kuyper's ideas in this article, he did not criticize Kuyper's mystical ideas. On the contrary, Dooyeweerd continued to emphasize the importance of Kuyper's rediscovery of the importance of the supratemporal heart (See pages 208-211 of that article).

²⁰⁰ The reference is to Abraham Kuyper, *Souvereiniteit in eigen kring*, 3e druk (Kampen, 1930). This was his lecture given at the opening of the Free University.

²⁰¹ Herman Dooyeweerd, “Na vijf en dertig jaren,” *Philosophia Reformata* 36 (1971), 1-10, at 6. Works of a meditative nature must include Kuyper's *To Be Near Unto God*, written late in his life.

It seems to me that Dooyeweerd was most interested in those works by Kuyper that show non-reformed influences. Dooyeweerd himself distinguishes between neo-Calvinism and the historical Calvin. In a very early article, Dooyeweerd says that he is not following the historical Calvin so much as the Calvinism that had since been worked out in Kuyper's neo-Calvinism.²⁰² Verburg includes the comment that it was not for nothing that Kuyper named his life and world view "neo-Calvinism" (Verburg 230).

Vollenhoven rejected those ideas of Kuyper that Dooyeweerd most admired. Vollenhoven rejected the idea of the supratemporal heart, the immediate knowledge of our heart, the supratemporal regeneration of the heart, and the divine seed implanted in man. Vollenhoven criticizes this last idea as an example of Gnosticism.²⁰³ The idea is not Gnostic. As Koslowski has shown, the Christian theosophy of Baader is very different from Gnosticism. And Dooyeweerd specifically affirms Kuyper's reference to the divine seed implanted within us.²⁰⁴

It seems to me that Hepp's criticisms of Dooyeweerd may have more validity than has been admitted, at least with respect to how Calvin was generally interpreted at the time. Dooyeweerd's statement that he was not attacking theology, but only showing its philosophical foundations (Verburg 221), is hardly an appropriate response. For that kind of philosophical criticism must lead to a radical revisioning of theology, especially since Dooyeweerd gives philosophy a priority over theology. And with respect to his denial of "substance," he said that the Dutch Reformed Confessions did not include the idea, and that he was not bound by non-Dutch Confessions like the *Westminster Confession* (which does speak about substance).

We may be critical of Dooyeweerd for not being more forthright in his criticism of traditional reformed theology, and for not being more forthcoming about the

²⁰² Herman Dooyeweerd: "De staatkundige tegenstelling tusschen Christelijk-Historische en Antirevolutionaire partij," February, 1923; cited by Verburg, 63).

²⁰³ See references in Stellingwerff, 64, 65, 90.

²⁰⁴ Herman Dooyeweerd, "Kuyper's Wetenschapsleer," *Philosophia Reformata* 4 (1939), 193-232, at 211.

philosophical sources behind his philosophy.²⁰⁵ But Dooyeweerd was facing a most difficult situation. Whether his philosophy is genuinely Calvinistic is open to debate, but I am grateful that he was able to continue to publish his philosophy.²⁰⁶ I personally prefer Dooyeweerd's philosophy to the type of Calvinism that Hepp wanted to defend.

But it is also possible that Dooyeweerd and those parts of Kuyper that he accepted are more authentically Calvinistic than this later covenant theology. Morbey has argued that Calvin was initially more theosophical, and that it primarily the later covenant theology that is at variance with Dooyeweerd. I believe that Morbey is correct when he says those who follow the infralapsarian position of Covenant theology have misinterpreted Dooyeweerd. Morbey says that Steen's critique was influenced by such Covenant theology in the works of Meredith Kline.²⁰⁷ Steen specifically praises Kline's covenant theology and says that it is "a striking confirmation of the work of Vollenhoven and Dooyeweerd as philosophers" (Steen 297, ft. 28). But Steen's conclusion is inconsistent, because he also criticizes Dooyeweerd's supralapsarianism (Steen 41, 205-206, 225, 227, 331-332). Unlike Dooyeweerd, who does not want to drive a wedge between creation and redemption, Kline says that creation and not redemption is primary (Steen, 328). It is only by rejecting Dooyeweerd's idea of the supratemporal religious root that Steen can try to force Dooyeweerd's thought into Kline's infralapsarian mold.²⁰⁸ For Dooyeweerd emphasizes that redemption is in this religious root. Morbey cites E. David Willis, who says that Calvin "speaks of Christ as the Mediator before the Incarnation even prior to

²⁰⁵ As an aside, it is interesting that Hepp found some passages of Dooyeweerd so difficult that he tried translating them from Dutch into German in order to better understand them (Verburg, 215). It is also interesting that one of his accusations was that the Association for Calvinistic Philosophy was a secret society.

²⁰⁶ See Linked Glossary, entry for 'Calvinistic,' online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Calvinistic.html>].

²⁰⁷ Michael M. Morbey, Letter to K. dated May, 1982, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/aevum/Covenant.pdf>].

²⁰⁸ Note: Despite these objections to Kline's infralapsarianism and covenant theology, other parts of Kline's work may support the view of the cosmos as an image of God's Wisdom. Gregory Baus has referred me to Kline's book, *Images of the Spirit* (Wifp & Stock, 1999). as putting forward the idea that the entire cosmos is *Imago Dei*, and that the Spirit of God is the Archetype of all creation.

and apart from the Fall.”²⁰⁹ Morbey says that it is in relation to this ‘*extra calvinisticum*’ that Dooyeweerd's philosophy may be authentically Calvinistic. But this is a Calvinism that has affinities to orthodox theology, and is very different from later Covenant Reformed theology. For the ‘*extra calvinisticum*’ represents the relation between religious root and temporal reality. And this is also reflected in our own selfhood, as we participate in Christ, the New Root. In Christ, and in our true selfhood, there is a double mystical movement of knowledge between the supratemporal and the temporal.

Morbey says that Calvin emphasized this double mystical movement, or the *duplex cognitio Dei*. There is one act of knowing, that can be analyzed in a twofold fashion. Battles discusses the presence of this mystical double movement or circle in Calvin's religious experience and thinking. Morbey comments:

Calvin's theological methodology is that of successive approximations to the truth as means between extremes. Every notion of Calvin is defined in a field of tension, a true middle between false extremes. The use of more than one image; generates conflicting statements. The calculus is that the key to the infinite is the infinitesima. The way down is the way up. The least is the greatest. The Word of God is dynamic; not just “definition.”²¹⁰

Morbey sees these ideas as reflecting an orthodox view of God, humanity, and creation. But he says that this contemplative structure in Dooyeweerd's thought, which depends on the double movement between the supratemporal and the temporal, was opposed by Vollenhoven:

Vollenhoven sought to excise from the heart of Dooyeweerdean philosophy the very transcendental contemplative structure which I would consider most Orthodox and most akin to Hesychasm, and to replace it by the thoroughly “Western,” legal categories of Dutch Covenantal Theology.²¹¹

Morbey's emphasis on the Orthodox and elements within Calvin's theology is also supported by Sheng-Hong Tan, who says,

²⁰⁹ E. David Willis: *Calvin's Catholic Christology: The Function of the So-called Extra Calvinisticum in Calvin's Theology*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966), pp. 56-57.

²¹⁰ Michael M. Morbey: “Letter to H., August 28, 1989 (unpublished).”

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.”

However, if Calvin does affirm something like a patristic notion of *theosis*, it cannot be said that he flatly rejects the notion of *unio mystica* as imitation, or that it does not have ontological significance. Hence, he charges Osiander in failing to account for “the bond of this unity [our union with Christ],” which makes our oneness with Christ not one which “Christ’s essence is mixed with our own” but an energetic union through “the secret power of his Spirit.” Hence, to be “partakers of the divine nature” means a participation not of “essence but quality”; thus, it is not substantial, but nonetheless, it is still ontological as participation in the nature involves a sharing in the properties of the essence. (Sheng-Hong Tan, *op. cit.*).

In the main part of this work I have already referred to Calvin’s remarkable statement that God clothes himself with the image of the world for our contemplation. It is worth citing this more fully, to show that Calvin insists on the importance of our knowing God in His works, and not in His essence. Calvin refers to “the ancient and perpetual tradition of the Fathers.” I have emphasized certain parts of the citations in bold type:

The intention of Moses in beginning his Book with the creation of the world, is, **to render God, as it were, visible to us in his works.** But here presumptuous men rise up, and scoffingly inquire, whence was this revealed to Moses? They therefore suppose him to be speaking fabulously of things unknown, because he was neither a spectator of the events he records, nor had learned the truth of them by reading. Such is their reasoning; but their dishonesty is easily exposed.[...]

Therefore, we ought not to doubt that The Creation of the World, as here described **was already known through the ancient and perpetual tradition of the Fathers.** Yet, since nothing is more easy than that the truth of God should be so corrupted by men, that, in a long succession of time, it should, as it were, degenerate from itself, it pleased the Lord to commit the history to writing, for the purpose of preserving its purity. Moses, therefore, has established the credibility of that doctrine which is contained in his writings, and which, by the carelessness of men, might otherwise have been lost.

I now return to the design of Moses, or rather of the Holy Spirit, who has spoken by his mouth. We know God, who is himself invisible, only through his works. Therefore, the Apostle elegantly styles the worlds, *ta[<] mhJ ek fainome[>]nwn blepo[>]mena*, as if one should say, “the manifestation of things not apparent,” (Hebrews 11:3.) **This is the reason why the Lord, that he may invite us to the knowledge of himself, places the fabric of heaven and earth before our eyes, rendering himself, in a certain manner, manifest in them. For his eternal power and Godhead (as Paul says) are there exhibited,** (Romans 1:20.) And that declaration of David is most true, that the heavens, though without a tongue, are yet eloquent heralds of the glory of God, and that this most beautiful order of nature silently proclaims his admirable wisdom, (Psalm 19:1.) This is the more diligently to be observed, because so few pursue the right

method of knowing God, while the greater part adhere to the creatures without any consideration of the Creator himself. For men are commonly subject to these two extremes; namely, that some, forgetful of God, apply the whole force of their mind to the consideration of nature; and others, overlooking the *works* of God, aspire with a foolish and insane curiosity to inquire into his *Essence*. Both labor in vain. To be so occupied in the investigation of the secrets of nature, as never to turn the eyes to its Author, is a most perverted study; and to enjoy everything in nature without acknowledging the Author of the benefit, is the basest ingratitude. Therefore, they who assume to be philosophers without Religion, and who, by speculating, so act as to remove God and all sense of piety far from them, will one day feel the force of the expression of Paul, related by Luke, that God has never left himself *without witness*, (Acts 14:17.) For they shall not be permitted to escape with impunity because they have been deaf and insensible to testimonies so illustrious. And, in truth, it is the part of culpable ignorance, never to see God, who everywhere gives signs of his presence. But if mockers now escape by their cavils, hereafter their terrible destruction will bear witness that they were ignorant of God, only because they were willingly and maliciously blinded. **As for those who proudly soar above the world to seek God in his unveiled essence**, it is impossible but that at length they should entangle themselves in a multitude of absurd figments. **For God -- by other means invisible -- (as we have already said) clothes himself, so to speak, with the image of the world in which he would present himself to our contemplation. They who will not deign to behold him thus magnificently arrayed in the incomparable vesture of the heavens and the earth, afterwards suffer the just punishment of their proud contempt in their own ravings. Therefore, as soon as the name of God sounds in our ears, or the thought of him occurs to our minds, let us also clothe him with this most beautiful ornament; finally, let the world become our school if we desire rightly to know God.**²¹² (my emphasis).

and

And he not only declares generally that God is the architect of the world, but through the whole chain of the history he shows how admirable is His power, His wisdom, His goodness, and especially His tender solicitude for the human race. Besides, **since the eternal Word of God is the lively and express image of Himself**, he recalls us to this point. And thus, the assertion of the Apostle is verified, that through no other means than faith can it be understood that the worlds were made by the word of God, ([Hebrews 11:3](#).) For faith properly proceeds from this, that we being taught by the ministry of Moses, do not now wander in foolish and trifling speculations, but **contemplate the true and only God in his genuine image.** (*Ibid.*)

²¹² John Calvin, Commentary on Genesis, From “The Author’s Epistle Dedicatory” [To Henry, Duke of Vendome] online at [http://www.ccel.org/c/calvin/comment3/comm_vol01/htm/v.htm].

Calvin's emphasis here to contemplate God not in His essence (which is vain speculation), but in his genuine image, shows what I believe is a theosophical or Wisdom influence going back to the Fathers. He continues in the same document with other ideas that echo the importance of contemplating God in His image:

Nothing shall we find, I say, **above or below**, which can raise us up to God, until Christ shall have instructed us in his own school. Yet this cannot be done, unless we, **having emerged out of the lowest depths, are borne up above all heavens, in the chariot of his cross, that there by faith we may apprehend those things which the eye has never seen, the ear never heard, and which far surpass our hearts and minds.**[...] For the earth, with its supply of fruits for our daily nourishment, is not there set before us; but Christ offers himself to us unto life eternal. Nor does heaven, by the shining of the sun and stars, enlighten our bodily eyes, but the same **Christ, the Light of the World and the Sun of Righteousness, shines into our souls**; neither does the air stretch out its empty space for us to breathe in, but the Spirit of God himself quickens us and causes us to live. **There, in short, the invisible kingdom of Christ fills all things, and his spiritual grace is diffused through all. Yet this does not prevent us from applying our senses to the consideration of heaven and earth, that we may thence seek confirmation in the true knowledge of God. For Christ is that image in which God presents to our view, not only his heart, but also his hands and his feet. I give the name of his heart to that secret love with which he embraces us in Christ: by his hands and feet I understand those works of his which are displayed before our eyes.** As soon as ever we depart from Christ, there is nothing, be it ever so gross or insignificant in itself, respecting which we are not necessarily deceived.

and

After the world had been created, man was placed in it as in a theater, that he, beholding above him and beneath the wonderful works of God, might reverently adore their Author.

The reference to being borne in “the chariot of his cross” is an unusual mixture of Jewish *Merkabah* speculation about the idea of the Chariot and Christian ideas of the cross, a kind of Christian Kabbalah. I can understand Calvin's statement only in the sense that Christ shines directly into our souls, above all heavens, surpassing our hearts and minds. The invisible kingdom of Christ seems to me to be what Dooyeweerd means by the supratemporal spiritual community, participating in Christ. We have confirmation of this direct and immediate knowledge when we apply our senses to the consideration of heaven and earth. The heart is “the secret love with which He [God] embraces us in

Christ.” And the hands and feet are the works displayed before our eyes—in other words, temporal reality.

In his *Institutes*, Calvin also refers to the illumination in our hearts:

Besides this there is a special call which, for the most part, God bestows on believers only, when by the internal illumination of the Spirit he causes the word preached to take deep root in their hearts.²¹³

And Calvin refers again to this knowledge of the heart in his commentary on Galatians and Ephesians:

Which surpasseth knowledge. A similar expression occurs in another Epistle: “the peace of God, which surpasseth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus.” (Philip. iv. 7.) No man can approach to God without being raised above himself and above the world. On this ground the sophists refuse to admit that we can know with certainty that we enjoy the grace of God; for they measure faith by the perception of the bodily senses. But Paul justly contends that this wisdom exceeds all knowledge; for, if the faculties of man could reach it, the prayer of Paul that God would bestow it must have been unnecessary. Let us remember, therefore, that the certainty of faith is knowledge, but is acquired by the teaching of the Holy Spirit, not by the acuteness of our own intellect. If the reader desire a more full discussion of this subject, he may consult the “*Institutes of the Christian Religion.*”²¹⁴

See also Calvin’s commentary on Hebrews 11:1:

What would become of us if we did not take our stand on hope, and if our heart did not hasten beyond this world through the midst of the darkness upon the path illumined by the word and Spirit of God?²¹⁵

These quotations present a very different view of Calvin than the one that we normally associate with Calvinism. I hope that reformational philosophers will not only read Dooyeweerd again, but that they will also read Calvin again.

In reading Dooyeweerd, we need to give a high interpretation of his philosophy, working from the assumption that Dooyeweerd was a conscientious philosopher who used his words carefully to express what he intended to say. We must attempt to understand what

²¹³ John Calvin: *Institutes* 3:24:8

²¹⁴ John Calvin: Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and the Ephesians (1548), online at [<http://oll.libertyfund.org/Home3/HTML.php?recordID=0036>].

²¹⁵ John Calvin: Hebrews,

Dooyeweerd says even if this meaning does not correspond with the way that he has usually been interpreted (via Vollenhoven), and even if this meaning does not correspond to traditional reformed theology. In this way, ideas that have previously seemed obscure in Dooyeweerd will become clear.

I also hope that readers will reconsider the roles of theology and philosophy, and reflect on the ways that theology carries with it a philosophical view of reality. That was Dooyeweerd's view. And that in turn may allow a reconsideration of the history of Calvinism, of Calvin's own ideas as distinct from later covenantal theology, and the relation of Calvinism to neo-Calvinism.

Appendix B: Dooyeweerd's view of Animals

Some readers will regard Dooyeweerd's views arrogant and anthropocentric insofar as they distinguish man from the animal world. The ideas are anthropocentric, and they are based on Dooyeweerd's view that the temporal world has no existence except in man, redeemed in Christ, and that the temporal world is redeemed only through man. But is it arrogant only if this view of the religious root is false. If Dooyeweerd is right, then it would be arrogance against God for us to refuse to fulfill our role as restored root of temporal reality. This would be an apo-stasy, a standing away from our true position as "lord" of the "earthly cosmos" (NC III, 88).

Obviously, there is a Biblical reference here, to Genesis 1:28, where man was given "dominion" over every living thing. But Dooyeweerd says that he does not use the Bible as a philosophical textbook, and we must look elsewhere for his philosophy. I believe that the basis is experiential: our own experience of our supratemporal selfhood. But in philosophy we give an account of such an experience. One of the philosophical sources that Dooyeweerd used in this giving account is Max Scheler, a philosopher who was also influenced by Baader during the explosion of interest in Baader in the 1920's. Let us look at Scheler's influence.

Dooyeweerd says that only man has the ability to *enstatically* enter into time, because only man has a supratemporal selfhood. Animals are *ex-statically* absorbed by their temporal existence (*WdW* II, 415; *NC* II, 479-80). 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 from his later writings that Dooyeweerd obtained this idea from Scheler. For in his 1961 article, "De Taak ener Wijsgerige Anthropologie," Dooyeweerd explicitly refers to Scheler in support of temporal beings being exstatically absorbed by their temporal existence.²¹⁶ Scheler says that, in contrast to animals, man's spiritual being is open to a "world":

²¹⁶ Herman Dooyeweerd: "De Taak ener Wijsgerige Anthropologie," 26 *Philosophia Reformata* (1961) 35-58, at 48, referring to Scheler, 47 (German edition).

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, p. 37]²¹⁷

I discuss these issues in more detail elsewhere.²¹⁸

Dooyeweerd’s failure to note Scheler as the source for his statement in 1935 about animals being ex-statically absorbed in time is evidence that Dooyeweerd did not always document his sources. This is of importance in the present discussion of theosophy, for it is my view that Dooyeweerd did not document many of the sources that he obtained from those sources, either. It is evident from the investigations by the Curators of the Free University that Dooyeweerd was not forthcoming about the sources of his philosophy, and that he merely tried to show continuity with Kuyper. And as we know, Kuyper was himself influenced by Baader’s theosophy.

But coming back to the issue of animals, this view of man as lord of creation, as the one who has dominion over the temporal world must not be used to justify exploitation of animals or the earth’s resources. Many Christians emphasize that man’s domination of the world is to be understood in terms of stewardship. That is true, but the domination goes even further. We are to act as the center for the temporal world, including animals, in the way that God is our center. It is part of the way that we image God. And the

²¹⁷ Max Scheler: *Man’s Place in Nature* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1962, originally published as *Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos*, 1928).

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 Triebssystem und die ihm vorgelagerten Sinnensfunktionen und Sinnesorgane erfährt

²¹⁸ J. Glenn Friesen: “Enstasis, Ecstasis, Systasis, Dis-stasis and Ana-stasis: Dooyeweerd’s Ideas of Dynamic Equilibrium and Deepening,” (forthcoming) [‘Enstasis’]

temporal world reaches its fulfillment only in man (as redeemed in Christ, the New Root). So Dooyeweerd's views go well beyond mere caring for and being stewards of natural resources. There is an ontological emphasis on achieving true reality for the world, and not merely a moral emphasis on doing the right thing for our planet.

Dooyeweerd's view that animals do not have a selfhood does not mean that animals cannot feel pain. Animals are qualified by the psychical modality, and there is no reason that they would not feel pain. Thus, we must question views expressed by C.S. Lewis.²¹⁹

If the temporal world has no existence except in its supratemporal root, this also means that the supratemporal can reveal itself to the animal world. Revelation for Dooyeweerd is always the expression of a higher ontological realm in a lower realm. So it is possible that the Biblical story of Balaam's ass is true—that the ass saw the angel of the Lord (Numbers 22:23). Presumably, asses do not always see this, so this was an exceptional revelation. Such a vision would not make the ass (or animals in general), individuality structures with a supratemporal center. They may still be entirely caught in cosmic time.

The revelation of a higher realm in a lower also occurs in our interactions with animals. This may explain some of the experiments done with animals to show their apparent logical and symbolic activity. If animals, after training by humans, do achieve some ability to function in aspects like the logical and symbolic, this may be evidence that these animals are using man (their trainer) as their center, in order to achieve these things. Dooyeweerd seems to specifically acknowledge such a conditioned animal response:

There may even be proofs of "intellect" in the psychical reaction upon new situations resting upon a deliberate presentiment of causal and teleological reaction (not upon rational analysis). But an animal's subjective psychical feeling remains in a closed state with regard to the meaning of the normative law-spheres. It is not susceptible of anticipation in the axiological sense of the world; it is not capable of a deepening of meaning under the direction of normative functions of consciousness (*NC II*, 184).

²¹⁹ C.S. Lewis: *The Problem of Pain* (New York: Macmillan, 1944).

Dooyeweerd says that because animals do not participate as subjects in the normative aspects, their perception is different from ours. They do not see the total underlying individuality structures of the world:

A dog choosing a beautiful easy chair as a resting-place, certainly perceives a sensory form associated with the satisfaction of his sensory desire for rest. But a dog does not really perceive the sensory form of a “chair.” His power of perception is limited to the sensory psychical function. An animal cannot relate the *perceived form* to its total *underlying structure*. [...] With man it is quite different. Even without engaging in a theoretical analysis, he is able to experience such things as tables and chairs, as individual totalities, in accordance with their typical structural meaning. The only condition is the historical opening of his experiential horizon by a proper cultural education. [...] The introduction of furniture and the cultivation of its habitual societal use are dependent on a historical disclosure of human society (NC III, 136-137).

If it could ever be shown that animals participate like humans in the normative spheres, without a relation to man as their supratemporal center, then that would be a serious challenge to Dooyeweerd’s philosophy. But it is unclear how such an experiment would be set up, without presuppositions influencing the design. An empiricist will respond that such concerns make it impossible to ever falsify Dooyeweerd’s idea of the superiority of man. Perhaps that is true, and is an indication of the religious conditions that govern all science. More research is needed.

The distinction between man’s supratemporal selfhood and animals who are caught in time does not necessarily require the rejection of evolution. Dooyeweerd was not a creationist. He regarded both creationism and evolutionism as attempts to explain man’s creation in temporal terms. But for Dooyeweerd, our creation was a supratemporal event, completed in the religious root, and completed as it is worked out and expressed within cosmic time. (See my article ‘Dialectic’).

The important thing for me is that humans should attempt to open up the normative aspects in the temporal world, including that of animals, from a perspective that expressly acknowledges man’s supratemporal transcendence. For man to act that he is on the same level as the animal world would be for man to abdicate from the position that God has given him. And the longer that man persists in such a view, the less likely he is to experience the full perspectival nature of our experience, including the transcendent supratemporal (see footnote 43 above).

Appendix C: Corbin's Idea of the Mesocosm and the *Mundus Imaginalis*

As discussed in the main body of this article, Henry Corbin (1903-1978) puts forward the idea of a mesocosm. Versluis points out that ,although Corbin wrote about Islamic esotericism, he arrived at these studies through the visionary mysticism of Boehme, Oetinger, Pordage and Baader. Thus, some writers have called Corbin a “Protestant theologian.” (Versluis, 165). Corbin draws parallels between the ideas of Ibn Arabî and Pordage, especially in their use of the symbols “eye, heart and breath.” The eye of the heart reveals the spiritual world, which is alive with the “outflowing breath” of God. Versluis comments on this parallelism regarding a “path of spiritual vision”:

...this parallelism demonstrates clearly that one need not abandon the Christian tradition as being devoid of the profound spiritual vision and praxis found in Islamic esotericism and in Asian religions (Versluis, 171).

But does Corbin's idea of a mesocosm really correspond to Dooyeweerd's idea of an intermediate *aevum*? There are some similarities, but also some important differences.

Corbin used the term '*mundus imaginal*' or 'imaginal world' because he wanted to differentiate his view of imagination from that of the merely fantastic and unreal. In his view, the imaginal is the realm of the truly real. To that extent, there is a correspondence with Dooyeweerd.

The main problem is Corbin's association of the imaginal world with a trichotomy of intellect, soul and body. For Corbin, intellect concerns the relation to God's eternity and ideas, soul refers to the imaginal world, and the body refers to the temporal world.

Dooyeweerd denies any such trichotomy, and says that the only division is between our supratemporal selfhood and its temporal mantle of functions.²²⁰ Dooyeweerd specifically disagrees with any view that would make our highest center an intellectual one in the sense of rational thought. He views that as an absolutization of the rational. So whereas he can speak of creation as being a realization of the thoughts of God, he is not using this in the sense of a rationalistic understanding of thoughts of God, nor in the sense of a

²²⁰ This seems similar to Calvin's acceptance of only a twofold division, and not Augustine's threefold division. See Appendix A.

rationalistic *Logos* doctrine.²²¹ He makes this clear in ‘*Kuyper’s Wetenschapsleer.*’ This does not mean that Dooyeweerd does not have a *Logos* doctrine of his own, but for him, *Logos* is the realm of meaning, and not just the rational.²²²

Furthermore, Corbin’s view of the mesocosm tends to isolate this imaginal world from the temporal world. Corbin says that the imaginal world is less material than the temporal world and more material than the intellectual world. Again, this is contrary to Dooyeweerd. It is also contrary to the emphasis by Christian theosophy on an incarnational reality, and of discovering structure within the temporal world.

And so unlike Corbin’s wonderful stories of those who leave the earthly realm behind to travel to the 8th heaven, Dooyeweerd concentrates on our discovery of God’s Wisdom as it is reflected in our temporal world, particularly as it is expressed in our own functions of consciousness. In this life, our experience of the fullness of the supratemporal is restricted to the way it is refracted through time.²²³ But this refraction is something that makes our temporal life spectacular:

²²¹ See Christos Yannaros, who rejects a single-dimensional view of *Logos* as relating only to rational essences.

²²² In his “Advies over Rooms-katholieke en Anti-revolutionaire Staatkunde” (February, 1923, cited by Verburg 48-61), Dooyeweerd has 10 pages entitled “Kosmos en *Logos*.” He says that the cosmos is the whole ordered world of creation; *logos* is the realm of meaning. We can only speak about the cosmos when we have looked at the area of *logos*. The *logos* is cosmic in character and precedes all knowledge. It therefore seems that *logos*, as meaning, is wider than the cosmos, which is temporally ordered meaning. In this very early article, Dooyeweerd says

...*logos* is fitted into the cosmic order in an essential relation [*wezensverband*] that we do not and cannot know because our consciousness is walled up [*ingemuurd*] in the *logos* and can never look out above the *logos* to its cosmic coherence. We know only the essential relation within *logos*. Within the *logos* are the giving of meaning (*noesis*) to objects having meaning (*noema*) and the meaning itself (*noumenon*) as the law-like fixed meaning that precedes each individual giving of meaning.

²²³ That is also what Calvin seems to mean when he rejects speculation. Yet it should not be forgotten that Calvin, too, emphasizes the direct knowledge given by the Holy Spirit to our heart. See Appendix A.

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).

But Dooyeweerd specifically says he does not speculate on what may occur after death. For after death, we are separated from our temporal functions.

Furthermore, Dooyeweerd says that our present knowledge is not restricted to our temporal functions of consciousness. We are limited *by* but not *to* these temporal functions:

But 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. *NC II*, 561)

In addition to this spectacular refracted experience of the eternal, we also have, even before death, a supratemporal experience of our selfhood, which we know by religious self-reflection. And Dooyeweerd in several places refers to our supratemporal experience. For example, he refers to our experience of the ‘identity’ of the temporal modal functions:

In this intuition 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*, 478-79).

For in the supratemporal root, the meaning of all temporal functions coincides.

And without our supratemporal selfhood, we would not be able to form Ideas of the ontical conditions that transcend the temporal, and that make possible any kind of thought whatsoever.²²⁴ In fact, all of our experience depends on our transcendent unity of self-consciousness:

All human experience both in the pre-theoretical and in the theoretical attitudes, is rooted in the structure of the transcendent unity of self-consciousness. The latter partakes in the religious root of the creation directed to God, or, in the case of apostasy, directed away from God. This religious horizon is the transcendent horizon of the selfhood, and encompasses the *cosmic temporal horizon* in which we experience the insoluble coherence and the modal and typical refraction of meaning. The *temporal horizon encompasses and determines the modal horizon*

²²⁴ *Encyclopedia* 80-81, discussed above.

both in its theoretical (analytical and synthetical) distinction and in its pre-theoretical systasis.

The temporal horizon encompasses and determines also the plastic horizon of the structures of individuality, which in its turn implies the modal horizon. (NC II, 560).

On the same page, Dooyeweerd says that true knowledge of the cosmos is bound to true self-knowledge, and the latter to the true knowledge of God.

This view has been explained in an unsurpassable and pregnant way in the first chapter of the first book of Calvin's *Institutio*. It is the only purely Biblical view and the alpha and omega of any truly Christian epistemology. Theoretical truth, limited and relativized by the temporal horizon, is in every respect dependent on the full super-temporal Truth....

So although Dooyeweerd is similar to Calvin (and to Christian theosophy), in emphasizing that our imagination and theory are to be centered on God's Wisdom as it is reflected and refracted in time, we must not deny the pre-theoretical and immediate knowledge of the supratemporal heart, which places us in a more immediate relation to God's Wisdom. For it is in our supratemporal heart that we are addressed by God's Word and Holy Spirit.

How do we reconcile Dooyeweerd's emphasis on this supratemporal knowledge, and his insistence on restricting our theoretical knowledge to the way that God's Wisdom has been refracted within time? I think that the following quotation is helpful:

Every spiritualistic view which wasn't to separate self-knowledge and the knowledge of God from all that is temporal, runs counter to the Divine order of the creation....In this horizon we become aware of the transcendent fulness of the meaning of this life only in the light of the Divine revelation refracted through the prism of time. (NC II, 561).

In other words, what Dooyeweerd is objecting to is a purported knowledge of the supratemporal that is separated from the temporal. The knowledge that we have in our hearts, or the unity and coincidence of the aspects, is not separate from the temporal world. It is the root, which is unfolded temporally. We have knowledge of both. And so we can also have knowledge of God's Word as it speaks to us in the central sense, as well as God's Word as it is refracted and revealed within time. Dooyeweerd only objects to a spiritualizing flight away from the world. And this emphasis on the incarnational reality of Wisdom is what is common to Dooyeweerd, Calvin and Christian theosophy.

So how does this relate to Garofalo's painting of Augustine's Vision, which I reproduced in the Introduction to this article? Was the vision by Augustine (and his mother Monica) a vision of a world that is totally separate from our world? Was it a vision of something totally unrelated to their temporal bodies? I don't think so. The fact that they both had the vision together says something about its relatedness to incarnational reality. They retained their separate identities, but had a common vision. This was not a case of losing one's selfhood in some kind of acosmic trance. The painting depicts more of a mirroring of different levels of reality. There is no doubt that the realm in the clouds depicts the supratemporal, the realm of angels and of the Madonna and Holy Child. What is the Wisdom that Augustine and Monica are writing down? Let's look at what Augustine says about in the *Confessions*, Book IX, Chapter X.²²⁵ He says that he and his mother Monica were looking out the window of a house. They could see the garden in the courtyard, and they were talking together "very pleasantly." I think that this is itself important. The vision was not due to any special ascetic practice, but occurred during the course of a conversation. There were no special preparations for the vision; they were talking about eternal things, and then suddenly saw reality from a different point of view. Augustine says that they were "forgetting those things which are past, and reaching forward toward those things which are future." The reference is to Phil 3:13. In fact, much of what Augustine writes about the experience incorporates Scriptural references. Using Dooyeweerd's terms, I interpret this "reaching forward toward those things which are future" as an anticipation, in contrast to mere retrocitations and memories. Augustine says,

We were in the present--and in the presence of Truth (which thou art)--discussing together what is the nature of the eternal life of the saints: which eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither has entered into the heart of man [1 Cor. 2:9]. We opened wide the mouth of our heart, thirsting for those supernal streams of thy fountain, "the fountain of life" which is with thee²²⁶ that we might

²²⁵ Augustine: *Confessions*, Book IX, Chapter X. Online at [<http://www.ccel.org/pager.cgi?&file=a/augustine/confessions/confessions-bod.html&from=12.6&up=a/augustine/confessions/confessions.html>].

²²⁶ Augustine's reference is to Psalm 36:9. The verse makes reference not only to the fountain of life, but to a vision of light:

be sprinkled with its waters according to our capacity and might in some measure weigh the truth of so profound a mystery.

24. And when our conversation had brought us to the point where the very highest of physical sense and the most intense illumination of physical light seemed, in comparison with the sweetness of that life to come, not worthy of comparison, nor even of mention, we lifted ourselves with a more ardent love toward the Selfsame, and we gradually passed through all the levels of bodily objects, and even through the heaven itself, where the sun and moon and stars shine on the earth. Indeed, we soared higher yet by an inner musing, speaking and marveling at thy works.

The “soaring higher” is by an “inner musing.” And they were still speaking and marveling at God’s works. But as evident from the continuation, this is all still within their “minds.” They then sought to climb beyond their minds to the Wisdom by whom all things are made:

And we came at last to our own minds and went beyond them, that we might climb as high as that region of unfailing plenty where thou feedest Israel forever with the food of truth, where life is that Wisdom by whom all things are made, both which have been and which are to be. Wisdom is not made, but is as she has been and forever shall be; for "to have been" and "to be hereafter" do not apply to her, but only "to be," because she is eternal and "to have been" and "to be hereafter" are not eternal.

And while we were thus speaking and straining after her, we just barely touched her with the whole effort of our hearts. Then with a sigh, leaving the first fruits of the Spirit bound to that ecstasy, we returned to the sounds of our own tongue, where the spoken word had both beginning and end. But what is like to thy Word, our Lord, who remaineth in himself without becoming old, and “makes all things new.”

The last reference is to Wisdom. See Wisdom 7:27:

And being but one, she [Wisdom] can do all things: and remaining in herself the same, she makes all things new.”

Augustine says that he and Monica “just barely touched” Wisdom. They experienced the “first fruits” of ecstasy, but then returned to the temporal world of speech, with a beginning and end. They contrast this temporal speech with the God’s Word, “which remaineth in himself without becoming old.”

For with thee is the fountain of life; in thy light shall we see light.

25. What we said went something like this: "If to any man the tumult of the flesh were silenced; and the phantoms of earth and waters and air were silenced; and the poles were silent as well; indeed, if the very soul grew silent to herself, and went beyond herself by not thinking of herself; if fancies and imaginary revelations were silenced; if every tongue and every sign and every transient thing--for actually if any man could hear them, all these would say, "We did not create ourselves, but were created by Him who abides forever"--and if, having uttered this, they too should be silent, having stirred our ears to hear him who created them; and if then he alone spoke, not through them but by himself, that we might hear his word, not in fleshly tongue or angelic voice, nor sound of thunder, nor the obscurity of a parable, but might hear him--him for whose sake we love these things--if we could hear him without these, as we two now strained ourselves to do, we then with rapid thought might touch on that Eternal Wisdom which abides over all. And if this could be sustained, and other visions of a far different kind be taken away, and this one should so ravish and absorb and envelop its beholder in these inward joys that his life might be eternally like that one moment of knowledge which we now sighed after--would not *this* be the reality of the saying, "Enter into the joy of thy Lord" [Matt. 25:21]. But when shall such a thing be? Shall it not be" when we all shall rise again," and shall it not be that "all things will be changed" [1 Cor. 15:51].

The vision seems to have to relate to going out of time into a more fulfilled kind of time. Whatever else may have been included here, it must have included the experience of the center out of which we act, the experience of the fullness of meaning, where the meaning of the separate temporal modal aspects coincide. Dooyeweerd says that in self-reflection, the truth of the fullness of meaning in our inner concentration point is "immediately evident" (*NC I*, 15). Augustine and Monica touched this supratemporal Wisdom and returned; there was a movement back to earth. They did not journey to other worlds and then describe the strangeness of that world, like Swedenborg's descriptions of his visions. This kind of mysticism is different. It is not metaphysical speculation of a rationalistic kind. Augustine and Monica saw the centrality of the Word, speaking to us not in temporal terms but (to use Dooyeweerd's terms) to our supratemporal heart. And they returned to the temporal.

And it is this movement back and forth that is shown by Blake in his painting of Jacob's Ladder. The reference is to Genesis 28:12, the angels ascending and descending. There is both an ascent and a descent, a way up and a way down. Or, if we use Dooyeweerd's words, a transcendental direction and a foundational direction, the anticipatory and the retrocipatory, the relation to the center and to the temporal periphery.

C.G. Jung reports a very interesting vision of a ladder by Edward Maitland, who reflected on ideas and reached their source. The vision also had to do with the distinction between a central and a peripheral consciousness. Maitland says that he “resolved to retain my hold on my outer and circumferential consciousness, no matter how far towards my inner and central consciousness I might go.” Maitland reported,

Once well started on my quest, I found myself traversing a succession of spheres or belts...the impression produced being that of mounting a vast ladder stretching from the circumference towards the centre of a system, which was at once my own system, the solar system, the universal system, the three systems being at once diverse and identical.²²⁷

And just as Dooyeweerd speaks of a coincidence of the meaning of the modal aspects, Maitland refers to a convergence of his rays of consciousness, and says that when he focused the convergent rays of consciousness into a unity, “a glory of unspeakable whiteness and brightness,” “the unindividuate individuate, God as the Lord...”

Jung interprets experiences like these in Biblical terms, as participating in Christ. He quotes St. Paul: “Yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.” And “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” There is a pneumatic body that is put on like a garment (*Ibid*, para. 77).

For Dooyeweerd, the relation to our supratemporal selfhood is not a fleeing from temporal reality, but a back and forth relation. We have seen that Dooyeweerd speaks of our beholding intuition as moving “to and fro,” connecting our experience of the correspondence of the intentional *Gegenstand* with the real act of thought of our supratemporal selfhood:

My intuition moves to and fro between my deepened analysis and its “Gegenstand” to bring them into actual contact in the inter-modal synthesis of meaning. In this process I become conscious of my theoretical freedom of thought. The actual synthesis of meaning accomplished in it can never be explained by means of the isolated functions of consciousness. Theoretical intuition is operative in deepened analysis itself, and only by its intermediary is theoretical thought able to analyse the “Gegenstand” in the intermodal synthesis of meaning. In this intuition I implicitly relate the intermodal meaning-synthesis

²²⁷ See See C.G. Jung, “Commentary on “The Secret of the Golden Flower,” *Psychology and the East*, (Princeton, 1978), p. 28, para. 40.

to the transcendent identity of the modal functions I experience in the religious root of my existence (NC II, 478-79).

Our intuition relates the theoretical intermodal meaning-synthesis to the transcendent identity of the modal functions experienced in our religious root. The experience of this supratemporal convergence or identity is not to be interpreted as God Himself. But it is an experience of our selfhood as the image of God. And here we can see a relation to Jung, who says that all that psychology can speak of is the ‘God-Image.’²²⁸

For Dooyeweerd (and for Jung), there is a movement to and fro, from our supratemporal central to the temporal peripheral. This is not an escape from the temporal world. So this seems to be quite different from Corbin’s descriptions of visions of the imaginal world. Corbin’s descriptions are not of a to and fro, but of a separation from the material temporal world into another world.

If we bear these differences in mind, we can find some other interesting observations in Corbin’s view of the mesocosm. One is with respect to his view of the meaning of ‘*in* the mesocosm.’ Does not the word ‘*in*’ have a temporal meaning, related to the spatial? How can we refer to something being in the supratemporal, which is beyond the spatial? Or, in Dooyeweerd’s terminology, how can we speak of something occurring within the supratemporal heart? Isn’t that giving temporal meaning to the supratemporal? Are we not treating the heart like a temporal location? I like Corbin’s explanation—that when we enter into the supratemporal mesocosm, all of the temporal functions are contained within it. It is the supratemporal that gives meaning to the very expression ‘*in*.’

And there is another beautiful passage in Corbin of the ‘where’ of supratemporality:

...this world is at the boundary where there is an inversion of the relation of interiority expressed by the preposition *in* or *within*, “in the interior of.” Spiritual bodies or spiritual entities are no longer *in* a world, not even *in* their

²²⁸ Jung emphasizes that his statements about the Self refer only to the manifestation of the God-image and of the God-concept in the human psyche:

At all events, the soul must contain in itself the faculty of relationship to God, i.e., a correspondence, otherwise a connection could never come about. *This correspondence is, in psychological terms, the archetype of the God-image.*”(C.G. Jung: “Psychology and Alchemy,” *Collected Works* 12, para 11).

world, in the way that a material body is in its place, or is contained in another body. It is their world that is *in* them. [...]

For henceforth, it is the *where*, the place, that resides in the soul; it is the corporeal substance that resides in the spiritual substance; it is the soul that encloses and bears the body. This is why it is not possible to say *where* the spiritual place is situated; it is not situated, it is, rather, that which situates, it is *situative*. Its *ubi* is *ubique*.²²⁹

Corbin explains that this is Utopia, *ou-topia*, literally No-where, a “place outside of place.”

And I like Corbin’s explanation of diversity within the supratemporal mesocosm. This is an issue that has troubled commentators of Dooyeweerd. Are there many supratemporal hearts? Dooyeweerd seems to acknowledge the continuance of individuality in the supratemporal (see *Kuyper’s Wetenschapsleer*). What does it mean for individual supratemporal hearts to participate in Christ, the New Root? How does supratemporal individuality fit with the Idea of supratemporal Totality?

Corbin’s explanation relies on the last three *Enneads* by Plotinus (who influenced both western and Islamic Arabic thinkers). He explains that each spiritual entity is

...in the totality of the sphere of its Heaven; each subsists, certainly independently of the other, but all are simultaneous and each is within every other one. It would be completely false to picture that other world as an undifferentiated, informal heaven. There is multiplicity, of course, but the relations of spiritual space differ from the relations of space understood *under* the starry Heaven, as much as the fact of being *in* a body differs from the fact of being “in the totality of its Heaven.” That is why it can be said that “behind this world there is a Sky, an Earth, an ocean, animals, plants, and celestial men; but every being there is celestial; the spiritual entities there correspond to the human beings there, but no earthly thing is there (*Ibid.*, 13).

And Corbin speaks of visions of the archetype images, in both their pre-existent state and in their fulfilled state, represented as eastern and western regions of the beyond:

...When the term refers to the world of the eighth climate, it relates to the *eastern* region of the eighth climate, the city of Jabalqa, where these images subsist, preexistent to and ordered before the sensory world. But on the other

²²⁹ Henry Corbin: *Swedenborg and Esoteric Islam*, tr. Leonard Fox (West Chester, Pennsylvania: Swedenborg Foundation, 1995) [‘Corbin’], 12, 14.

hand, the term also relates to the *western* region, the city of Jabarsa, as being the world or interworld in which are found the Spirits after their presence in the natural terrestrial world, and as a world in which subsist the forms of all works accomplished, the forms of our thoughts and our desires, or our presentiments and our behavior (*Ibid*, p. 10).

However interesting such statements may be, for Dooyeweerd they are speculation, since they deal with what our life after death will be like, when we are separated from our mantle of functions. He seems to be content with the belief that it will be a fulfillment of our present existence. And it seems to me that such fulfillment will include the fulfillment that we have helped to achieve by completing the reality of the temporal world.

Appendix D: Excerpts from *Twilight of Western Thought* (Nutley: Craig Press, 1968).

The following excerpts from *Twilight* have been compiled because in my experience, many readers of that book skip over what Dooyeweerd says. They think that they know what is meant by “creation, fall and redemption,” and that they therefore do not have to read about it. But Dooyeweerd’s emphasis is that the Christian Ground-motive of creation, fall and redemption must be understood in its radical and integral sense. It is not enough to merely believe in creation, fall and redemption. By ‘radical and integral,’ Dooyeweerd means that creation, fall and redemption must all be understood in relation to the supratemporal religious root, originally man’s selfhood or heart, and later redeemed in Christ, the New Root.

Another reason for this compilation is that the page numbering is inconsistent across the various editions of *Twilight*, and so some readers were not looking at the correct passages. My citations are from the 1968 edition. There are variations in the text of other versions, and Paul Otto’s 2005 article in *Philosophia Reformata*²³⁰ shows that the recent Mellen edition of *Twilight* is unreliable.

The excerpts also distinguish between theoretical and theological knowledge, which is temporal, and the knowledge of our heart, which is supratemporal. The entire book *Twilight* is devoted to this topic, and this collection of excerpts demonstrates just how carefully Dooyeweerd’s work must be read.

I have added some footnotes, emphasizing certain points.

As Dooyeweerd says, the radical nature of these ideas, including the idea of the supratemporal heart and root can be understood only when God opens our heart. So when you read these excerpts, put aside your ideas of what you think you learned about these ideas. Don’t assume that you know what Dooyeweerd means. Don’t skip over words on the assumption that you already know their meaning from Sunday School.

²³⁰ Paul Otto: “In the Twilight of Dooyeweerd’s Corpus. The Publishing History of *In the Twilight of Western Thought* and the Future of Dooyeweerd Studies,” *Philosophia Reformata* 70 (2005), 23-40.

Read these excerpts meditatively, and in prayer.

* * * * *

page 7:

This whole diversity of modal aspects of our experience makes sense only within the order of time. It refers to a supra-temporal, central unity and fulness of meaning in our experiential world which is refracted in the order of time...the central unity of the human selfhood.²³¹

page 29:

My selfhood is nothing without that of yours, and that of our fellow-men. In other words there exists a central communal relation between the individual centers of experience, lying at the foundation also of any temporal communal relation in theoretical thought.²³²

page 30:

...central religious relation between the human ego and God, in whose image man was created.²³³

page 42:

...the human ego, as the religious concentration-point of our integral existence, as the central seat of the *imago Dei*...²³⁴

page 115:

...fatal step of confusing theoretical Christian theology with the true knowledge of God and true self-knowledge.²³⁵

page 121:

²³¹ Supratemporal, central, fulness and selfhood are all related. The central is always supratemporal. Cf. *NC I*, v (first page of Foreword): "I came to understand the central significance of the "heart", repeatedly proclaimed by Holy Scripture to be the religious root of human existence."

²³² The central communal relation is different from any temporal communal relation. The central relation is the invisible Church.

²³³ Central religious. For Dooyeweerd, the religious is always central and supratemporal. Note the relation between this centrality and being created in the image of God.

²³⁴ Religious concentration point. Again, 'religious' is supratemporal, related to the concentration point, as central seat of image of God.

²³⁵ Theology is not the same as self-knowledge.

[Theoretical thought] ...is always related to the I, the human self; and this ego, as the center and radical unity of our whole existence and experience, is of a religious nature. Therefore real self-knowledge is dependent on the knowledge of God, since the ego is the central seat of the *imago Dei*.²³⁶

pages 123-124:

For it is not only the individual temporal existence of man which is centered in a radical unity. Much rather, it is our whole temporal world, the “earth” as it is called in the initial words of the book of Genesis, which, according to the order of creation, finds its center in the religious root of mankind, i.e., in the spiritual community of the hearts of men in their central communion with God, the Creator. This is the radical and integral sense of creation, according to the Word of God.²³⁷

pages 124-125:

...the fullness of meaning of his [man's] existence was only to reflect the divine image of his Creator. This also determines the radical and central sense of the fall into sin.²³⁸

This apostasy concerns the root, the religious center of human existence....This apostasy implied the apostasy of the whole temporal world which was concentrated in man's ego. Therefore the earth was cursed, because it had no religious root of its own, but was related to the religious root or center of human existence.²³⁹

²³⁶ Theoretical thought has to still relate to the human self. Again, the self is the center and radical unity of our whole existence and experience, and is of a religious nature [supratemporal].

²³⁷ Not just our temporal functions are concentrated in this radical unity or concentration point. But rather the whole earth, the whole temporal world is concentrated in this radical unity. It is centered in the religious root. After the fall and redemption, this is the spiritual community of the hearts of men, participating in Christ, the New root. See below regarding ‘heart.’

This concentration in the religious root is the radical and integral sense of creation. Note how ‘radical’ relates to ‘root’ or ‘*radix*.’

Note the use of the word ‘in’: “in the religious root of mankind,” “in the spiritual community of the hearts.”

²³⁸ The fullness of meaning is related to man as the image of God. Thus, the concentration of temporal reality in man was part of man’s being created in the image of God. This is expressly affirmed below.

²³⁹ Man as the religious root is also required for the Idea of the radical and central sense of the fall. There was an apostasy of the whole world, concentrated in man’s ego. [Note: The apostasy was not in Christ at that time, nor in a spiritual community, but in the

For the same reason²⁴⁰ the redemption by Jesus Christ and the communion of the Holy Spirit, which makes us into members of His body, has a central and radical sense. In Christ mankind and the whole temporal world have received a new religious root²⁴¹ in which the *imago Dei* is revealed in the fullness of its meaning.

Thus the central²⁴² theme of the Holy Scriptures, namely, that of creation, fall into sin, and redemption by Jesus Christ in the communion of the Holy Spirit, has a radical unity of meaning, which is related to the central unity of our human existence²⁴³....So long as this central meaning of the Word-revelation is at issue...In this sense the central motive of the Holy Scripture is the common supra-scientific starting point of a really biblical theology and of a really Christian philosophy. It is the key of knowledge²⁴⁴ of which Jesus spoke in his discussion with the Scribes and lawyers.

page 136:

And it is only within the temporal diversity of experiential aspects that the divine revelation can become an object of theological thought.²⁴⁵

page 145:

From this it may appear that there must be a difference in principle between creation, fall and redemption in their central sense as the key to knowledge,²⁴⁶ and in their sense as articles of faith,²⁴⁷ which may be made into the object of

undifferentiated root ego or selfhood]. And this ego is then called the religious root or center of human existence

²⁴⁰ For the same reason, the Idea of religious root is also required to understand redemption.

²⁴¹ Christ as New Root. See also Appendix E for other references.

²⁴² The “central theme” is literally that. It is related to the center.

²⁴³ The radical unity of this theme (creation, fall, redemption) has a radical unity of meaning related to the central unity of our human existence. That central unity is our selfhood. And that selfhood is supratemporal.

²⁴⁴ It is in this sense (i.e. this radical sense) that creation, fall and redemption is the key of knowledge.

²⁴⁵ Theory concerns only what is temporally revealed, and not the Word as it speaks to our heart. In ‘Curators,’ Dooyeweerd even says that creation fall and redemption are not the subjects of theology.

²⁴⁶ The Christian Ground-motive is the key of knowledge only in this central sense.

²⁴⁷ Articles of faith are not central. They are temporal expressions. That is why Dooyeweerd says that he is not bound by confessions of faith if they contain wrong philosophy that denies the supratemporal selfhood (See ‘Curators’)

theological thought. The Jewish Scribes and lawyers had a perfect theological knowledge of the books of the Old Testament. They wished, doubtless, to hold to the creation, the fall, and the promise of the coming Messiah as articles of the orthodox Jewish faith which are also articles of the Christian faith.²⁴⁸ Nevertheless, Jesus said to them: “Woe unto you, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge!”

This key of knowledge in its radical and integral sense cannot be made into a theological problem.²⁴⁹

page 146:

In other words, the true knowledge of God in Jesus Christ and true self-knowledge are neither of a dogmatic-theological, nor of a philosophical nature, but have an absolutely central religious²⁵⁰ significance. This knowledge is a question of spiritual life or death.²⁵¹

page 148:

...theology in its scientific sense is bound to philosophical fundamentals which are in turn dependent on the central religious motive of theoretical thought.²⁵²

page 150:

...theologians...did not realize the fundamental difference between the divine creative deeds and the genetical process occurring within the created temporal order as a result of God's work of creation²⁵³....But as a truth of faith God has revealed these creative deeds in the faith-aspect²⁵⁴ of this temporal order which points beyond itself to what is supra-temporal.

page 186:

²⁴⁸ Perfect theological knowledge of creation, fall and redemption is not enough.

²⁴⁹ The reference to perfect theological knowledge of creation, fall and redemption must therefore be ironic, since we cannot have theoretical knowledge of these deeds.

²⁵⁰ Central religious refers to the supratemporal religious root. The selfhood and now Christ as the New Root in Whom we participate.

²⁵¹ This implies that any philosophy or theology that denies the supratemporal selfhood, religious root is spiritually dead.

²⁵² Theology as a theoretical discipline is based on philosophy.

²⁵³ Rejection of creationism. See also ‘32 Propositions.’ And see Linked Glossary, entry for ‘creation,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Creation.html>].

²⁵⁴ The aspect of faith is temporal. Revelation in the faith aspect is of something that exceeds the temporal.

But in this entire image of man [the opposing Greek view of man] there was no room for the real, i.e., the religious center of our existence which in the Holy Scripture is called our *heart*,²⁵⁵ the spiritual root of all the temporal manifestations of our life. It [the Greek view] was constructed apart from the central²⁵⁶ theme of the Word-revelation, that of creation, fall into sin, and redemption by Jesus Christ in the communion of the Holy Spirit. And it is this very core²⁵⁷ of the divine Revelation which alone reveals the true center of human life.²⁵⁸ It is the only key²⁵⁹ to true self-knowledge in its dependency on the true knowledge of God. It is also the only judge both of all theological and philosophical views of man.²⁶⁰ As such, this central theme of the Word-revelation cannot be dependent on theological interpretations and conceptions, which are fallible human work, bound to the temporal order of our existence and experience.²⁶¹ Its radical sense²⁶² can only be explained by the Holy Spirit, who opens our *hearts*,²⁶³ so that our belief is no longer a mere acceptance of the articles of the Christian faith, but a living belief,²⁶⁴ instrumental to the central operation of God's Word in the heart,²⁶⁵ namely, the religious center of our lives. And this operation does not occur in an individualistic way but in the ecumenical communion of the Holy Spirit who unites all the members of the true Catholic Church in its spiritual sense²⁶⁶ ...

page 187:

I am afraid that many Christians have only a theological knowledge of creation, fall into sin and redemption by Jesus Christ, and, that this central theme of the Word-Revelation has not yet become the central motive-power of their lives.²⁶⁷

²⁵⁵ The heart is the real religious center of our existence.

²⁵⁶ Central=supratemporal religious, in the root

²⁵⁷ Core=center.

²⁵⁸ True center of human life.

²⁵⁹ Again the word 'key,' related to self-knowledge and knowledge of God.

²⁶⁰ The key of knowledge is also the criterion for theology and philosophy.

²⁶¹ Theological and theoretical knowledge are temporal.

²⁶² Radical=root, central, religious.

²⁶³ We can only understand this truth about the central radical religious root of our hearts when the Holy Spirit opens our heart.

²⁶⁴ Living belief requires a knowledge of and relation to the supratemporal religious root, the awareness of true self-knowledge.

²⁶⁵ Note again "in the heart."

²⁶⁶ The spiritual sense is the supratemporal community of hearts.

²⁶⁷ The central theme must become the central motive power.

page 189:

Just as²⁶⁸ God is the absolute Origin of all that exists outside of Himself, so He created man as a being, in whom the entire diversity of aspects and faculties of the temporal world is concentrated within the religious center²⁶⁹ of his existence, which we call our I, and which the Holy Scripture calls our *heart*, in a pregnant, religious sense. As the central seat²⁷⁰ of the image of God, the human selfhood was endowed with the innate religious impulse to concentrate his whole temporal life and the whole temporal world upon the service of love to God.²⁷¹ And since the love God implies the love for His image in man...[the two commandments of love are related]²⁷²

page 191:

...the history of dogmatic theology proves that it is possible to give an apparently orthodox²⁷³ theoretical explanation of the articles of faith pertaining to the threefold central theme of the Holy Scripture, without any awareness of the central and radical significance of the latter for the view of human nature and of the temporal world.²⁷⁴

²⁶⁸ This “just as” is most important. It relates our being created as image of God to the way God is the Origin of all that exists outside of Himself. Man reflects this in that temporal reality is concentrated in him.

²⁶⁹ Note: “withih the religious center.”

²⁷⁰ Central seat. Supratemporal seat of the image.

²⁷¹ Temporal life and the temporal world is concentrated in man, and so man has the innate impulse to in turn concentrate that to the service of love to God.

²⁷² We love fellow human beings because they reflect the image of God. I call this the “*tat tvam asi*” view of ethics. “That art thou.” We love others because they reflect the same image that is in us. See Linked Glossary, entry for ‘*tat tvam asi*,’ online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Definitions/Tattvamas.html>].

²⁷³ Without the radical sense of religious root, theology is only apparently orthodox.

²⁷⁴ The Ground-motive of creation, fall and redemption has a central and radical significance for the view of human nature and of the temporal world. Why? Because this Ground-motive depends on a view of human nature as the central supratemporal religious root, and of the temporal world as concentrated therein.

Appendix E: Other References to man as root and Christ as New Root

Dooyeweerd emphasizes that the Christian Ground-Motive must be all be interpreted as in relation to the supratemporal religious root. Man was created as the religious root of the temporal world. In man's fall, the whole temporal cosmos also fell. Redemption of man and cosmos is in Christ, the New Root, in Whom we now participate.

In Appendix A, I have shown that Calvin shared at least some of these ideas of the religious root. In the main article, I have also made reference to Christian theosophical sources. which emphasize this idea of religious root. But Christian theosophy is only repeating what is revealed in the Biblical revelation, and in Orthodox theology. Even after the reformation, the Idea of Christ as the New Root is found in theologians and preachers other than Calvin. So although it is a Christian theosophical Idea, the Idea of religious root in relation to creation, fall and redemption is also in accord with a very broad and ancient Wisdom tradition that has continued to exert its revivifying force to later generations.

Here is a collection of some relevant sources. More could be added. I have emphasized some words by marking them in bold type.

I. Biblical Sources

2 Kings 19:30 And the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall yet again **take root downward, and bear fruit upward.**

Proverbs 12:3 A man shall not be established by wickedness: but **the root of the righteous shall not be moved.**

Proverbs 12:12 The wicked desireth the net of evil [men]: but **the root of the righteous yieldeth [fruit].**

Isaiah 11:1 And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and **a Branch shall grow out of his roots:**

Isaiah 11:10 And in that day there shall **be a root of Jesse**, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious.

Isaiah 37:31 And the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall again **take root downward, and bear fruit upward:**

Isaiah 53:2 For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and **as a root out of a dry ground:** he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, [there is] no beauty that we should desire him.

Matthew 3:10 **And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees:** therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

Matthew 13:6 And when the sun was up, they were scorched; and **because they had no root**, they withered away.

Matthew 13:21 **Yet hath he not root in himself**, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended.

Mark 4:17 **And have no root in themselves**, and so endure but for a time: afterward, when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, immediately they are offended.

Mark 11:20 And in the morning, as they passed by, they saw the fig tree **dried up from the roots**.

Luke 3:9 And now also the **axe is laid unto the root** of the trees: every tree therefore which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

Luke 8:13 They on the rock [are they], which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and **these have no root**, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away.

Rom 11:16 For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: **and if the root be holy, so are the branches**.

Rom 11:17 And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and **with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree**;

Rom 11:18 Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, **thou bearest not the root, but the root thee**.

Rom 11:26 And so all Israel shall be saved...

Romans 15:12 And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a **root of Jesse**, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.

Ephesians 3:17 That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, **being rooted and grounded in love**

Colossians 2:7 **Rooted and built up in him**, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.

Revelation 5:5 And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the **Root of David**, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.

Revelation 22:16 I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am **the root and the offspring of David**, [and] the bright and morning star.

II. Orthodox Sources

St. Gregory of Palamas, Archbishop of Thessalonica, says in his sermon “On the Entry of the Mother of God into the Temple”:

If Adam had been sufficiently strong to keep the divine commandment, then he would have shown himself the vanquisher of his enemy, and withstood his deathly attack. But since he voluntarily gave in to sin, he was defeated and was made a sinner. **Since he is the root of our race, he has produced us as death-bearing shoots.** So, it was necessary for us, if he were to fight back against his defeat and to claim victory, to rid himself of the death-bearing venomous poison in his soul and body, and to absorb life, eternal and indestructible life.

It was necessary for us to have a new root for our race, a new Adam, not just one Who would be sinless and invincible, but one Who also would be able to forgive sins and set free from punishment those subject to it. And not only would He have life in Himself, but also the capacity to restore to life, so that He could grant to those who cleave to Him and are related to Him by race both life and the forgiveness of their sins, restoring to life not only those who came after Him, but also those who already had died before Him. Therefore, St. Paul, that great trumpet of the Holy Spirit, exclaims, “the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit” (*1 Cor. 15:45*).²⁷⁵

Panayiotis Christou, in his article “Partakers of God,” states:

The human acquisition, through its integration with the Word, was transformed and deified as the first fruit of the race. **Thus a new root was created, capable of imparting life even to its offshoots.** The transformation of Christ’s human acquisition is natural, on the level of the hypostasis, and the change which was effected in man by the renewal is also natural. **Yet, man’s connection to that root is not natural, as was the connection to the old root of Adam; it is gnostic. The connection to the new root is secured by each person’s voluntary participation in the renewal, as Gregory Palamas declared.** And this is what I earlier characterized as a common venture by God and man.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁵ St. Gregory of Palamas: “On the Entry of the Mother of God into the Temple,” online at [<http://www.oca.org/FSsermons-details.asp?SID=4&ID=3>]. See also St. Gregory of Palamas, *Homilies*, Homily 5. Homily 5: On the Meeting of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ, in Christopher Veniamin, *The Homilies of Saint Gregory Palamas*, (South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 2002), vol. I, p. 52.

²⁷⁶ Panayiotis Christou: “Partakers of God,” (Brookline, Mass.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1984), online at [http://www.myriobiblos.gr/texts/english/christou_partakers_forw.html].

George Mantzaridis says,

The sacraments of the Church make it possible for man to enter freely and personally into communion with the divinizing grace which the Logos of God bestowed upon human nature in assuming it. Through the sacraments corrupt man, sprung **from the corrupt root of Adam, is united with the new root, that is, with Christ, and partakes of incorruptibility and divine life.** The uncreated and imperishable grace of God dwelling in man renders him, too, imperishable, eternal, and unoriginate. These bold terms, used to describe the man who through God's grace is regenerate, are not met with for the first time in Palamas; Maximus the Confessor had already used the same words to characterize the man who is alive in Christ and who is guided by His grace. They do not, of course, alter the basic distinction between man and God as created and Creator, but they express the truth of the genuine regeneration as experienced by the man who enters into communion with divinizing grace, which makes him a god in every respect 'save in identity of essence.' (Palamas quoting Maximus)....The direct relationship between the sacramental and the moral life of the believer is obvious. If man continues in sin, says Palamas, baptism and the rest of the sacraments of the Church will do him no good at all.²⁷⁷

III. Confessions of Faith²⁷⁸

The Belgic Confession of Faith Article XV:

We believe that through the disobedience of Adam original sin is extended to all mankind; which is a corruption of the whole nature and a hereditary disease, wherewith even infants in their mother's womb are infected, and which produces in man all sorts of sin, **being in him as a root thereof**, and therefore is so vile and abominable in the sight of God that it is sufficient to condemn all mankind.

Westminster Confession of Faith (Presbyterian)

Our first parents, being seduced by the subtlety and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin, God was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to his own glory. By this sin they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of the soul and body. **They being the root of all mankind**, the guilt of this sin was imputed and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to

²⁷⁷ George Mantzaridis, *The Deification of Man*, (St. Vladimir's), Chapter 2: "The Sacramental and Ecclesiological Nature of Deification," 42-43.

²⁷⁸ Online at [<http://www.bible.ca/cal-T-creeds.htm>].

all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." (Par. 6.033).

IV. Some Protestant theologians and preachers

A. Charles Hodge

8. The Effects of Adam's Sin upon his Posterity. "That the sin of Adam injured not himself only but also all descending from him by ordinary generation, is part of the faith of the whole Christian world." [...] As to the ground of these evils, we are taught that 'the covenant being made with Adam not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression.' Or, as is expressed in the Confession, '**Our first parents, being the root of all mankind**, the guilt of their sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature were conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation.'

²⁷⁹

B. Charles Spurgeon

The root is Christ, and his people are the branches that are called to bear fruit. (Rom. 11, John 15:16.) Christ said that if his followers want to serve him, they must do the same. However, our call is not to a literal death as was Christ's.²⁸⁰

and

I will just put another question. If thou hast been born again, there is another matter by which to try thee. Not only is thy inward self altered, and thy outward self too, but **the very root and principle of thy life must become totally new.** When we are in sin we live to self, but when we are renewed we live to God. While we are unregenerate, our principle is to seek our own pleasure, our own advancement; but that man is not truly born again who does not live with a far different aim from this. Change a man's principles, and you change his feelings, you change his actions. Now, grace changes the principles of man. **It lays the axe at the root of the tree. It does not saw away at some big limb it does not try to alter the sap; but it gives a new root, and plants us in fresh soil.** The man's inmost self, the deep rocks of his principles upon which the topsoil of his actions rest, the soul of his manhood is thoroughly changed, and he is a new creature in Christ.²⁸¹

²⁷⁹ Charles Hodge: *Systematic Theology*, Vol. II, Part II-Anthropology, excerpt online at [<http://www.bible.ca/cal-T-creeds.htm>].

²⁸⁰ Charles Spurgeon, Sermons, online at [<http://www.spurgeon.org/sermons/0329.htm>].

²⁸¹ Charles Spurgeon: Sermon 291, Dec 25, 1859, online at [<http://www.spurgeon.org/sermons/0291.htm>].

C. J.C. Philpot (1802-1869) (Baptist Preacher)

Now, viewing this love of the world as a disease, if we could find some mysterious remedy which **would cure that propensity at the very root**; if there were, say, some holy balm brought us by an angel from heaven, like the oil which, according to the Romish legend, was brought to anoint the kings of France, and we could drop, drop, drop it into the seat of all this worldly love and purge it out, cleanse, and remove it; and if, by the dropping in of this mysterious yet blessed oil, there could be communicated another love of a purer kind, of holier nature, which was fixed upon God Himself, and the things of God, how by this mysterious yet blessed remedy the disease would be removed, and how the love of the world would at once be purged out by **the entrance of a better love, which would, so to speak, reach down to, and wither it, and put another in its place, as a new root.**²⁸²

D. Charles Wesley

As many as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have been baptized into his death — In baptism we, through faith, **are ingrafted into Christ; and we draw new spiritual life from this new root**, through his Spirit, who fashions us like unto him, and particularly with regard to his death and resurrection.²⁸³

²⁸² J.C. Philpot, Sermon July 19, 1868, online at [\[http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/Lake/8890/grace/loveoftheworld.html\]](http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/Lake/8890/grace/loveoftheworld.html).

²⁸³ Charles Wesley, Commentary on Rom 6:3, online at [\[http://www.christnotes.org/commentary.php?b=45&c=6&com=wes\]](http://www.christnotes.org/commentary.php?b=45&c=6&com=wes).

Bibliography

- Anonymous [Valentin Tomberg]: *Meditations on the Tarot: A Journey into Christian Hermeticism* (New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher, 2002, first published 1985) ['Tomberg']
- Augustine: *Confessions*, online at [<http://www.ccel.org/a/augustine/confessions/confessions.html>].
- Baader, Franz von: *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Franz Hoffmann, (Leipzig, 1851-1860) ['*Werke*'].
- Baader, Franz von: *Fermenta Cognitionis*, tr. Eugène Susini (Paris: Albin Michel, 1985; originally published 1822) ['*Fermenta*'].
- Baader, Franz von: *Über die Begründung der Ethik durch die Physik und andere Schriften* (Stuttgart: Verlag Freies Geistesleben, 1969) ['*Begründung*']
- Baader, Franz von: *Die Weltalter: Lichtstrahlen aus Franz von Baader's Werken*, ed. Franz Hoffmann (Erlangen, 1868) ['*Weltalter*'].
- Baader, Franz von: *Philosophische Schriften und Aussätze von Franz Baader* (Münster, 1831) ['*Schriften*'].
- Baader, Franz von: "Concerning the conflict of religious faith and knowledge as the spiritual root of the decline of religious and political society in our time as in every time" (1833) [Über den Zwiespalt des Religiösen Glaubens und Wissens als die geistige Wurzel des Verfalls der religiösen und politischen Societät in unserer wie in jeder Zeit], translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/baader/Zwiespalt.html>].
- Baader, Franz von: "Concerning the Concept of Time" [Über den Begriff der Zeit] (1818), translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/baader/Zeit.html>] ['*Zeit*'].
- Baader, Franz von: "Elementary concepts concerning Time: As Introduction to the Philosophy of Society and History" [Elementarbegriffe über die Zeit: als Einleitung zur Philosophie der Sozietät und Geschichte] (1831, *Schriften zur Gesellschafts-philosophie*, ed. J. Sauter (Jena: Fischer, 1925). [], translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/baader/Elementar.html>] ['*Elementarbegriffe*']
- Battles, Ford Lewis: *Calculus Fidei: Some Ruminations on the Structure of the Theology of John Calvin* (Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1978; privately published, with appendices). Especially Appendix D: "Descensus in se." ['Battles'].
- Berdyaev, N.A. : "Studies Concerning Jacob Boehme," online at [http://www.berdyaev.com/berdiaev/berd_lib/1930_349.html#9]

- Betanzos, Ramón J.: *Franz von Baader's Philosophy of Love*, ed. Martin M. Herman (Passagen Verlag, 1998).
- Boehme, Jacob: *The Way to Christ*, tr. John Joseph Stoudt, (Harper, 1947).
- Boehme, Jakob: *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. K. W. Schieber, (Leipzig, 1831-1846).
- Book of Sirach* (Ecclesiasticus), online at [<http://etext.virginia.edu/etcbin/toccer-new2?id=RsvSira.sgm&images=images/modeng&data=/texts/english/modeng/parsed&tag=public&part=25&division=div1>].
- Book of Wisdom*, online at [<http://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/apo/wis008.htm>].
- Calvin, John: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill. Translated and indexed by Ford L. Battles. The Library of Christian Classics, ed. John Baillie et al., vol. XX. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- Calvin, John: *The Comprehensive John Calvin Collection*. CD-ROM (Albany, Oregon: AGES Software, 1998).
- Calvin, John: *Commentary on Genesis*, From "The Author's Epistle Dedicatory" [To Henry, Duke of Vendome] online at [http://www.ccel.org/c/calvin/comment3/comm_vol01/htm/v.htm].
- Calvin, John: *Commentary on the First Epistle of John*, CD-ROM (Albany, Oregon: AGES Software, 1998).
- Corbin, Henry: *Swedenborg and Esoteric Islam*, tr. Leonard Fox (West Chester, Pennsylvania: Swedenborg Foundation, 1995).
- de Hartog, A.H.: : *Uren met Jacob Boehme* (edited selections) (Baarn: Hollandia-Drukkerij, 1915).
- Delboy, Hervé: "Philosophia Reformata," online at [<http://hdelboy.club.fr/mylius.html>].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: "Neo-Mysticism and Frederik van Eeden," (Almanak van het studenten corps van de Vrije Universiteit, 1915), translated and online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Mainheadings/Neo-mystiek.html>].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: "Het Advies over Rooms-katholieke en Anti-revolutionnaire Staatkunde (February, 1923, cited in Verburg, 47-61) ['Advies']
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: "De staatkundige tegenstelling tusschen Christelijk-Historische en Antirevolutionaire partij," February, 1923; cited by Verburg, 63
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: "Leugen en Waarheid over het Calvinisme," *Nederland en Oranje* (July, 1925) [in Folder Miscellaneous Articles, 1923-1939, archives, ICS].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: "Het juridisch causaliteitsprobleem in it licht der wetsidee," *Anti-revolutionnaire Staatkunde* 2 (1928) 21-124 ['Causaliteitsprobleem'].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: *De Crisis der Humanistische Staatsleer, in het licht eener Calvinistische kosmologie en kennistheorie* (Amsterdam: Ten Have, 1931).
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: *De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee*, (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1935) ['WdW'].

- Dooyeweerd, Herman: Second Response to the Curators, Oct 12, 1937; translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Response2.html>] [‘Curators’].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: “Het tijdsprobleem en zijn antinomieën,” *Philosophia Reformata* 1 (1936) 65-83, 4 (1939), 1-28 [‘Antinomieën’].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: “Kuyper’s Wetenschapsleer,” *Philosophia Reformata* (1939).
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: “Het Tijdsprobleem in de Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee” [The Problem of Time in the Philosophy of the Law-Idea]. *Philosophia Reformata* 5 (1940) 160-192, 193-234 [‘Tijdsprobleem’]. Translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Tijdsprobleem.html>].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: “De leer van de mensch in de W.d.W.” *Corr. Bladen* V (1942), 134-143. This has been translated as “The Theory of Man: Thirty-Two Propositions on anthropology” [‘32 Propositions’].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: *Encyclopedia of Legal Science* (1946). Translation online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Encyclopedia.html>]. [‘1946 Encyclopedia’].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: “Introduction to a Transcendental Criticism of Philosophic Thought,” *Evangelical Quarterly* 19 (1947), 42-51. [‘Ev.Qu.’].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1997; Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1969; first published 1953) [‘NC’].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: *In the Twilight of Western Thought. Studies in the Pretended Autonomy of Theoretical Thought*, (Nutley, N.J.: The Craig Press, 1968, first published 1961), 124 [‘Twilight’].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: “De Taak ener Wijsgerige Anthropologie,” 26 *Philosophia Reformata* (1961), 35-58.
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: “Na vijf en dertig jaren,” *Philosophia Reformata* 36 (1971), 1-10.
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: *Vernieuwing en Bezinning*, (Zutphen: Van den Brink, 1959) [‘Vernieuwing’], partially translated as *Roots of Western Culture*, (Toronto: Wedge, 1979) [‘Roots’].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: “De Kentheoretische Gegenstandsrelatie en de Logische Subject-Objectrelatie,” *Philosophia Reformata* 40 (1975) 83-101. [‘Gegenstandsrelatie’] Translation and discussion online: [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Mainheadings/Kentheoretische.html>].
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: *Grenzen van het theoretisch denken* (Baarn: Ambo, 1986) [‘Grenzen’]
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: *Reformation and Scholasticism (Reformatie en Scholastiek in de Wijsbegeerete, Vol. I.*
- Dooyeweerd, Herman: *Encyclopedia of the Science of Law* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002) [‘Encyclopedia’]

- Edwards, Betty: *Drawing on the Right side of the Brain*, (New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher, 1999, originally published 1979).
- Faivre, Antoine: *Philosophie de la Nature: Physique sacrée et théosophie XVIII-XIX siècle* (Paris: albin Michel, 1996) [*Phil. de la Nature*']
- Faivre, Antoine: *Access to Western Esotericism* (Albany: State University of New York, 1994).
- Faivre, Antoine: *Theosophy, Imagination, Tradition: Studies in Western Esotericism* (Albany: State University of New York, 2000) [*Faivre*'].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "The Mystical Dooyeweerd: The Relation of his Thought to Franz von Baader," *Ars Disputandi* 3 (2003) [<http://www.arsdisputandi.org/publish/articles/000088/index.html>] [*'Mystical Dooyeweerd'*].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "The Mystical Dooyeweerd Once Again: Kuyper's Use of Franz von Baader," *Ars Disputandi* 3 (2003) [<http://www.arsdisputandi.org/publish/articles/000130/index.html>] [*'Kuyper and Baader'*].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "De sleutel der kennis: Herman Dooyeweerd en Franz von Baader," *Beweging* 68, Nr. 3 (2004).
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Monism, Dualism, Nondualism: A Problem with Vollenhoven's Problem-Historical Method," (2005), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Method.html>] [*'Method'*].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Paul Brunton and Ramana Maharshi," (2005), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/abhishiktananda/Brunton.html>].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Dooyeweerd's *Encyclopedia of the Science of Law*: Problems with the Present Translation," (2006), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Translation.pdf>].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Dooyeweerd and Baader: A Response to D.F.M. Strauss," (2005), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Strauss.html>].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Dooyeweerd, Spann, and the Philosophy of Totality," *Philosophia Reformata* 70 (2005), 1-22, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Totality.html>][*'Totality'*].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Dooyeweerd versus Vollenhoven: The religious dialectic within reformational philosophy," *Philosophia Reformata* 70 (2005) 102-132, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Dialectic.html>][*'Dialectic'*].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Individuality Structures and Enkapsis: Individuation from Totality in Dooyeweerd and German Idealism," (2005), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Enkapsis.html>].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Dooyeweerd versus Strauss: Objections to Immanence Philosophy within Reformational Thought," (2006), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/hermandooyeweerd/Objections.html>].
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Studies Relating to Herman Dooyeweerd: Linked Glossary." Online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Mainheadings/Glossary.html>]. See

- especially the entries for: abstraction, *aevum*, aspects, Biblicism, coincidence, epektasis, fitted into, fulfillment, given, inner, levels, maya, own, religious self-reflection, sonship, spiritualistic, Word
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Notes Regarding Dooyeweerd's Comparisons with Hinduism," online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Notes/Hinducompare.html>].
- Friesen J. Glenn: "Enstasis, Ecstasis, Systasis, Dis-stasis and Ana-stasis: Dooyeweerd's Ideas of Dynamic Equilibrium and Deepening," (forthcoming) ['Enstasis']
- Friesen, J. Glenn: "Dooyeweerd's Philosophy of Aesthetics: A Response to Zuidervaart's Critique," (forthcoming)
- Gunn, J. Alexander: *The Problem of Time: an Historical & Critical Study* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1929).
- Hanegraaff, Wouter J (ed.): *Dictionary of Gnosis & Western Esotericism* (Leiden: Brill, 2005) ['Hanegraaff']
- Jung, C.G., "Introduction to Zen Buddhism," *Psychology and the East*, (Princeton, 1978).
- Jung, C.G.: "Psychology and Alchemy," *Collected Works* 12 (Princeton University Press).
- Kline, Meredith G.: *Images of the Spirit* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 1980).
- Kok, John: *Vollenhoven: His Early Development* (Sioux Center: Dordt College Press, 1992),
- Koslowski, Peter: *Philosophien der Offenbarung. Antiker Gnostizismus, Franz von Baader, Schelling*, (Vienna: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2001).
- Kuyper, Abraham: *Souvereiniteit in eigen kring*, 3e druk (Kampen, 1930).
- Kuyper, Abraham: *Lectures on Calvinism: The Stone Lectures of 1898*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), Online version at [http://www.kuyper.org/main/publish/books_essays/article_17.shtml].
- Kuyper, Abraham: *The Work of the Holy Spirit* (New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1900, online at [http://www.ccel.org/k/kuyper/holy_spirit/htm/TOC.htm].
- Kuyper, Abraham: Abraham Kuyper: *E Voto Dordaceno: Toelichting op den Heidelbergischen Catechismus*, online at [<http://www.neocalvinisme.nl/ak/ev/akev0903.html>].
- Kuyper, Abraham: *To Be Near Unto God*, tr. John H. De Vries., (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979, tr. 1925), online at [http://www.kuyper.org/main/publish/books_essays/printer_25.shtml].
- Lefebure, Fr. Leo D.: "The Wisdom of God: Sophia and Christian Theology," *The Christian Century*, (Oct. 19, 1994), online at [<http://www.highbeam.com/library/docFree.asp?DOCID=1G1:15861175>].
- Lewis, C.S.: *The Problem of Pain* (New York: Macmillan, 1944).
- Loy, David: *Nonduality* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1988).

- McIntire, C.T. 'Dooyeweerd's Philosophy of History,' in: C.T. McIntire (ed.), *The Legacy of Herman Dooyeweerd* (University Press of America, 1985). ['Mcintyre'].
- Morbey, Michael M.: "Kuyper, Dooyeweerd and the Reformational Vision: Theosophy Reformed," (1988, 1995), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/aevum/Theosophy.pdf>]
- Morbey, Michael M.: "Parallels to the Byzantine-Hesychast, Divine Essence/Energies Distinction," (1979), online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/aevum/Parallels.pdf>].
- Morbey, Michael M.: "Letter to K, May 11, 1982, online at [<http://www.members.shaw.ca/aevum/Covenant.pdf>].
- Morbey, Michael M.: "Letter to H, August 28, 1989 (unpublished).
- Muggeridge, Malcolm: *A Third Testament*, (Toronto: Little, Brown & Co, 1976), online at [www.bruderhof.co.uk/e-books/downloads/ThirdTestament.pdf].
- Otto, Paul: "In the Twilight of Dooyeweerd's Corpus. The Publishing History of *In the Twilight of Western Thought* and the Future of Dooyeweerd Studies," *Philosophia Reformata* 70 (2005), 23-40.
- Plantinga, Alvin: "Dooyeweerd on Meaning and Being," *The Reformed Journal* (Oct, 1958), 10-15 ['Plantinga'].
- Sauer, Hanjo: *Ferment der Vermittlung: Zum Theologiebegriff bei Franz von Baader* (Göttingen: Vanderhoek & Ruprecht, 1977).
- Scheler, Max: *Man's Place in Nature* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1962, originally published as *Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos*, 1928).
- Scholem, Gershom G.: *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1961).
- Schuurman, Egbert: *Techniek en Toekomst. Confrontatie met wijsgerige beschouwingen* [Technique and the Future: Confrontation between philosophical concerns] (dissertation, 1972)
- Searle, John: *Mind, Language and Society: Philosophy in the Real World* (New York: Basic Books, 1998).
- Steen, Peter J.: *The Structure of Herman Dooyeweerd's Thought* (Toronto: Wedge, 1983), ['Steen'].
- Stellingwerff, Johan: *Geschiedenis van de Reformatorische Wijsbegeerte*, (Stichting voor Reformatorische Wijsbegeerte, 2006).
- Strauss, D. F. M.: "The Central Religious Community of Mankind in the Philosophy of the Cosmonomic Idea," *Philosophia Reformata* 37 (1972), 58-67.
- Susini, Eugène: *Franz von Baader et le romantisme mystique* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1942), I, 432 ['Susini'].
- Taljaard, J.A.L.: *Polished Lenses* (Potchefstroom: Pro Rege Press, 1976) ['Taljaard'].

- Tan, Sheng-Kong: "Calvin's Doctrine of Our Union with Christ," 5 *Quodlibet Journal* (2003), online at [<http://www.quodlibet.net/tan-union.shtml>].
- van Eeden, Frederik: *De Redekunstige Grondslag van Verstandhouding* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1975, first published 1897).
- van Eeden, Frederik: *Het Lied van Schijn en Wezen*, ed. H. W. van Tricht, Zwolle, W.E.J. Tjeenk, 1954, originally published 1892-1922).
- van Eeden, Frederik: *Paul's Ontwaken* (Amsterdam, 1913).
- van Moorsel, Gerald: *The Mysteries of Hermes Trismegistus: A Phenomenologic Study in the Process of Spiritualisation in the Corpus Hermeticum and Latin Asclepius* (Utrecht: Drukkerij en Zoon, 1955).
- van Riessen, Hendrik: Letter dated 6-3-1961 from Hendrik van Riessen to Herman Dooyeweerd (Dooyeweerd Archives, *Lade I*, 2).
- van Riessen, Hendrik: "De Structuur der Techniek," *Philosophia Reformata* 26 (1961) 114-130.
- van Tricht, H.W.: *Frederik van Eeden: Denker en Strijder* (Amsterdam: Lankamp & Brinkman, 1934), 72.
- Verburg, Marcel: *Herman Dooyeweerd: Leven en werk van een Nederlands christen-wijsgeer* (Baarn: Ten Have, 1989) ['Verburg'].
- Versluis, Arthur: *Theosophia* (Hudson, NY: Lindisfarne Press, 1994) ['Versluis'].
- Versluis, Arthur: *Wisdom's Book: The Sophia Anthology* (St. Paul, Minn.: Paragon House, 2000).
- von Balthasar, Hans Urs: *Cosmic Liturgy: The Universe according to Maximus the Confessor* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2003, originally published in German, Freiburg, 1941).
- Ware, Kallistos: "God Immanent yet Transcendent: the Divine Energies according to Saint Gregory Palamas" in *In Whom We Live and Move and Have Our Being: Panentheistic Reflections on God's Presence in a Scientific World*, eds. Philip Clayton and Arthur Peacocke, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 157-168.
- Willis, E. David: *Calvin's Catholic Christology: The Function of the So-called Extra Calvinisticum in Calvin's Theology*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966).
- Wolters, Al: "The Intellectual Milieu of Herman Dooyeweerd," in: C.T. McIntire (ed.), *The Legacy of Herman Dooyeweerd* (University Press of America, 1985) ['Wolters'].
- Yannaros, Christos: "The Distinction between Essence-Energies and its importance for theology," online at [<http://www.geocities.com/trvalentine/orthodox/yannaras.html>].

Revised Jul 15/06

