

ESOTERIC PSYCHOLOGY III

THEN TAKE MY HEART



Kristian Riis-Søndergaard, BA in the History of Ideas and Social Science

Fredericia, 7/2/2026

Epistemic Front Journal

Words: 3917

Index

Author's preface

What is love? – Plato and Plotinus on Agape and Eros

The primacy of love, dialectics of the heart, and origins

Pneuma, spirit, and the beauty of the heart

The truth and law of the heart

Aufheben – The collective nature of love, and the psychic aether

Appendix 1: Translation of Tove Ditlevsen's Danish poem "So Take My Heart" (1942)

Appendix 2: Lyrics to Nico and the Velvet Underground's "I'll Be Your Mirror" (1967)

Abstract

This essay is a continuation of our series on esoteric psychology.

The basic proposition of this essay is that the Heart (metaphor for love/poetics/imagination) is essential to the true man – without the heart, we will vanish into existential oblivion.

So our argument is a direct confrontation with modern-day, materialist science that sees nothing but synapses, mirror-neurons, and chemical flux, when contemplating the idea of love.

Rather, we seek to the ancient sages, the Vedas, Socrates, Plato, and Plotinus, for clues as to the nature and reality of love – those sages upheld a poetic notion of the truth of love, spirit, and soul – this is the tradition, we seek to present to modern readers.

Modern medicinal psychology has done immense damage to the self-perception of man, as to his/her divine origins, and in this essay, we seek to once again bring true awareness as to the inherent origins of man in the Immortal Heart.

Let this essay be a testimony as to the immensity of the soul, and to the divine nature of love, as the cause and primacy of creation.

Author's preface

What is the nature and reality of love?

In this essay, we continue our line of thought from the two previous essay on the topic of esoteric psychology (Riis-Søndergaard, 2025a; 2025b) to explore the nature of the psyche, as we are all embarked on this mystical-poetic journey of love and war of the soul in temporal, incarnated existence – in Maya.

We start by outlining the perspective of Plato and Plotinus on the concept of love, two ancient thinkers, who made valuable contributions as proto-psychologists as to the nature of creation, spirit, and soul.

Those are our philosophical standards for understanding the nature of love, and by that token, the true nature of man, which has been darkened by modern-day materialist, empiricist science.

We present a mystical-poetic notion of man, and man as an inherently erotic being, created as a divine, dialectical union of man and woman.

In the final equation, man is set to reach for the stars, and return to origins, *Aufheben*, as has always been the promise of the Hyperborean sages.

During the time, we dwell on the perspectives of two continental thinkers, Hegel and Kierkegaard, as to the nature of love, and we intermix these considerations with poetic lyrics from modern culture, as the poetic man is crucial for our understanding of the nature and reality of love.

We hope this continuation of our series on esoteric psychology will inspire our readers to further their contemplations as to the true nature of man, love, origins, and destiny.

Thank you for reading the *Epistemic Front Journal* and for tuning in to *The Hyperborean Dispatch*.

What is love? – Plato and Plotinus on Agape and Eros

Plato's *Symposium* (385 BC) is a classical study of the nature of love. Let's start this essay by gaining an overview of the arguments in Plato's study:

Speaker	Core View of Eros
Phaedrus	The eldest God, and a motivator for virtue, shame, and courage.
Pausanias	A distinction between base (physical) and noble (soul-focused) love.
Eryximachus	A cosmic force of balance and harmony.
Aristophanes	A search for wholeness and our "soulmate".
Agathon	The most beautiful, young, and good force.
Socrates	A "ladder" of desire that leads to wisdom and true beauty.
Alcibiades	An overwhelming, irrational passion/obsession.

Table 1: Summary of perspectives on the nature of love in Plato's *Symposium*.

Now, the true nature of love is probably in-between or in a combination of these 7 perspectives – in the Vedic tradition, it is said that there are “a thousand words for love”.

The later Neo-Platonist, Plotinus (270), was especially inspired by the perspective of Socrates. Let's now get an overview of the perspective of Plotinus on love – Plotinus operated with 3 categories:

Type	Definition	Function	Goal
Immanent Eros	Lower, material passion and desire.	Initial search for the higher divine. First stage on the “ladder of love”.	To move beyond the sensual, rather than being caught in the sensory world.
Transcendent Eros	Higher, philosophical love, ascent to the intelligible world (Nous).	Purified passion, soul's journey towards its origins.	To achieve <i>unio mystica</i> (mystical union) with the One.
Transcendental Agape	The One's goodness and perfection that initiate the soul's journey home.	Descending or radiating love that the soul may aspire to.	Pure perfection, emanates existence, which allows the soul to return to origin.

Table 2: Plotinus' three categories of love in the *Enneads*.

In Plotinus' creation mysteries, Plotinus as a proto-psychologist, the One is origin, and the intellect (Nous) is descended from the One, in the One's attempt to know itself, but the intellect is imperfect in that it cannot distinguish itself from the One, it does not know that it is not the One, wherefore the soul (Psyche) is created as yet another emanation – so the reality of existence is sort of a “misperception”. Therefore the “longing of the soul” to return home in “the wound of the experience of Beauty” – the soul being a wound/misperception, according to Plotinus, and the One being pure Beauty.

This tale of creation aligns well with the more ancient Vedic tradition on the concept of Maya, and the “dream of Vishnu” – temporal existence is a divine, mystical-poetic dream.

According to Hyperborean metaphysics, we need to wake up from the “dream of Maya”, and return home, return to origins, but for us *this means war*, a mystical war of the Immortal Heart, absolute truth.

The primacy of love, dialectics of the heart, and origins

According to Hyperborean metaphysics, while the cause of creation is Agape, the divine love of the Aryan race-father and -mother, we should speculate more on the problem of evil, for can we deny that there is indeed evil in the world?

Given the outline we have made of the Vedas, Socrates, Plato and Plotinus, the nature and reality of the Heart is obvious and given, but how do we explain the nature of evil and war?

What went wrong in the misperception of Nous, when the Psyche was created, since obviously, evil came into being as well? What is the onto-psychological explanation of the existence of Maya, which for us is a mystical, phenomenological, epistemic war against evil – the Devas vs. the Asuras?

While the privation theory of evil is true, there is more than that to the nature of evil – an ontological difference, which makes evil *a negation* of good, not merely a privation. So it's a categorical difference, and the consequence of that distinction is that evil must die – death came into being (“tarrying with the negative” (Hegel, 1807)) – for evil/death does not belong in the One, which is immortal, whereas evil is temporal, like incarnation is only temporal (in Sanskrit, Samsara).

We will not dwell more on the problem of evil in this text, as this essay is about the nature of love, but you can see our recent essay (Riis-Søndergaard, 2026a), and stay tuned for our forthcoming essay on Hyperborean metaphysics (Riis-Søndergaard, forthcoming).

Rather, we wish to dwell on the primordial nature of love.

Continuing in the line of thought of the Danish philosopher, K.E. Løgstrup (1956), love is a “sovereign life-expression”, or in Heidegger’s (1927) terms, an “existential” – that is, it is metaphysically fundamental and inherent to Being.

But contrary to Løgstrup, who sees love and trust as non-reciprocal expressions, which only in part is true, we wish to emphasize exactly the reciprocal, dialectical nature of love.

Let’s sketch out how we define the metaphysical nature of love:

1. Divine origin.
2. Cause of creation – Primacy.
3. Essential to Being – “Pure Being”, in Heidegger’s terms.
4. Transcendental reality.
5. Reciprocal – The divine, dialectical, mystical-poetic truth of the man-woman relationship.
6. Immortal – That is, unconditional.
7. Based on the Truth and Law of the Heart – That is, respect, appreciation, faithfulness and trust.
8. Moral obligation – That is, in Heidegger’s terms, “authenticity”.
9. Ethical demand – That is, according to Løgstrup, a “sovereign life-expression”.
10. Destiny of the Good – “Return to origins” (Plato, 4th BC; Plotinus, 270; Rosario, 1985).

List 1: The metaphysical, divine nature of love, according to Hyperborean metaphysics.

The key point to take away from this definition is the “divine, dialectical, mystical-poetic truth of the man-woman relationship” – this is our origins, whereto we will return, and therefore, in temporal incarnation, along the way, faithfulness and trust become crucial.

Pneuma, spirit, and the beauty of the heart

When we in the title of this essay say “take my heart”, we don’t mean to give our hearts away, or that someone who doesn’t deserve it should have our hearts, but for our lover to take our heart for “what it is”, take us “as we are” (as immortal beings) – we say that our lover should know that we love them for what they are – and what *we* are, innately and reciprocally. The phrase is taken from the Danish poet T. Ditlevsen’s poem, “So Take My Heart” (1942), which we will bring a translation of in the appendices.

This is love as unconditional, a sovereign life-expression, an existentielle – the inner truth of the Heart.

This is the inherent trust we must put forward in our love, lest our devotion turns into “the hermeneutics of suspicion”, as Horkheimer & Adorno (1944) wrote about – as Elvis Presley (1969) sang: “We can’t go on together... With suspicious minds”. Trust is basic for true love. Love is a solemn oath that you will always honor and respect the Other “in prosperity and adversity”.

The Danish philosopher, S. Kierkegaard, in his book, *Works of Love* (1847), talks in passion about “the edifying nature of love” to give the beloved Other “hope, courage, and strength” to reach for God/origins, rather than mere objectified, sensual obsession. Like the ancient sages, he talks about a higher, divine love (Agape), as opposed to physical attraction (Eros), and friendship (Philia).

Let’s compare these types of love, according to Kierkegaard:

Feature	Agape (Neighbor Love/Christian Love)	Eros (Erotic/Romantic Love)	Philia (Friendship)
Source	Spiritual/Theocentric (From God)	Natural/Psychological (Passion/Desire)	Natural/Social (Affection/Mutual Interest)
Object	The Neighbor (Everyone, un-discriminating)	The Beloved (Specific, chosen individual)	The Friend (Specific, chosen individual)
Nature	Self-sacrificing, giving, unconditional	Acquisitive, passionate, needy	Mutual affection, shared values/virtue
Condition	Loves without preference (loves the person despite their traits)	Conditional on the beloved's qualities/attractiveness	Conditional on mutual admiration or similarity
Stability	Eternal/Stable (Duty-based)	Fragile (Dependent on emotion/attraction)	Fragile (Can end if shared interests change)
Focus	"To will to exist" on behalf of another	Possessive; desires to be everything to the other	"Brotherly" love/camaraderie

Table 3: Comparison of Kierkegaard’s three types of love in *Works of Love*.

But in all actually, these three notions are intertwined, for in the Pneuma (which in Greek means both spirit and face/countenance), spirit is expressed in the soul, and in that meeting of the two beautiful lovers we find our origins in spirit, so according to the Hyperboreans, we cannot have Agape without also Eros and Philia – the three notions are all interconnected and necessary – this is remembrance, Anamnesis (Plato 4th BC; 385b BC), of origins. There is no neighborly love without being a beloved friend first – this is where we seem to debark from Kierkegaard, and other Christian thinkers.

In the daring eyes, in the loving, slick smile, we see who we truly are – two lovers of primordial times.

In the Hyperborean Circle (HC), we have a saying that goes: “A glimpse, a hope...” – this is the glimpse and hope of origins, of remembrance, of authentic Being, of Beauty – the Immortal Heart of the Siddha. This is a higher, transcendental synchronicity, a shared alignment with the Immortal Heart.

The truth and law of the heart

Hegel, in his conceptualization of love, moves from his earlier writings (1798), defining love as a mystical union, conjoining individuals and subjective states into a higher reality, to a more skeptical, rational perspective on the law of the heart (1807), as something to be institutionally overcome or planned for (1820).

Was Hegel disappointed with raw love?

While having had an early illegitimate child in 1807, the year his phenomenology was published, he was married in 1811, and apparently lived happily ever after in what he termed a proper, “ethical, institutional marriage”.

Usually, we don’t dwell on the personal tales of authors, but when it comes to the question of love, the personal story is interesting.

Like Kierkegaard, who gave up his raw love for Regine Olsen to dedicate himself to the “duty of the higher love of God” – here, the personal tale, and the philosophical writings, do indeed correlate.

The truth is probably in-between (as usual).

Both Hegel and Kierkegaard say that “subjective love”, in Hegel’s terms, the “law of the heart”, is only half the story, but that we must align with a higher sense of order, for Hegel, the objective order of state and society, and for Kierkegaard, the divine order of God.

For the Hyperboreans, love is raw, and it is due to this raw love that we have any (divine) order – it’s not an outright “either/or” (Kierkegaard, 1843). Love is not raw in the physical/sensual sense, but as a matter of spirit being true to the divine, inherent, mystical-poetic, dialectic relationship of man and woman – divine love, immanent, transcendent, and transcendental, is the cause and *fabric* of cosmos (order/Harmonia) – in that sense, raw and essential.

True love is beyond modern, institutional society – modern society may not even acknowledge, respect, or care for divine, transcendental, ethereal love, as we learn from Huxley’s *Brave New World* (1932) and Orwell’s *1984* (1948) – rather, today, it seems like divine, ethereal love is being technologically suppressed in the “technetronic era” (Brzezinski, 1970), the “control society” (Deleuze, 1992).

But love reigns supreme – “Let there be faith, hope, and love, but greatest of these is love”, as it is said in *1. Corinthians* (13:13).

In that same text, it is also said (13:12): “For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known” – is this not a promise of future revelation, as to the true nature of man, and is this not the promise that we will meet our counterpart of creation, so that we may know the “even” – the Other, the (beloved) One – face to face (in Pneuma) – in the dialectics of the heart, so that we may know the true cause and nature of creation, namely the mystical union of man and woman, the equal counterparts of creation?

As in the Vedic tradition of the romantic love of Shiva-Shakti, and Krishna-Radha, devotion (Bhakti) in love is crucial, and the only real path towards transcendence and spiritual liberation. The romance is unconditional and eternal – it is a soul-bond made of spirit – of the Immortal Heart.

“I surrender myself, into the arms of a beautiful stranger”, as it is sung by the Danish band, Saybia (2004) – the enigma of the two lovers will never be “solved”, but is a continuing, unfolding, never-ending tale of “the triumph of the heart” of getting to know each other, and thereby ourselves, as we are equal counterparts of mystical-poetic creation – the primacy and dialectics of the heart.

Aufheben – The collective nature of love, and the psychic aether

This essay builds on the two previous essays on the topic of esoteric psychology (Riis-Søndergaard, 2025a; 2025b). In the first of those essays, we especially described the collective nature of the psyche of the Hyperboreans, while we in the second essay made the plea to elevate the “poetic man” to rank on par with the rational man, countering the Platonic/Cartesian relegation of the heart (poetics/imagination) to shadow existence.

We wish to continue this line of thought by stating that:

1. The true nature of the psyche (soul) is a “collective consciousness” – how otherwise do we belong in and descend from origins, the One?
2. Temporal existence, history, is a process of individuation (descent/forgetfulness/diaspora), and collectivization (ascent/anamnesis/return).
3. Aufheben (ecstasy/transcendence/ascension) is destiny – The absolution of temporality, and the return to origins – the eternal life, which is the transcendental equation.

List 2: The crux of incarnation explained.

This is the hope.

But it does not mean that all of mankind will return home – return/restoration is “conditional”.

So we have a tension between the propositions of “unconditional love” and “conditional restoration”.

To solve this problem, we will state that unconditional love is reciprocal and dialectical, so that if a being doesn’t believe in or respect this higher love, one will disregard the pact, the covenant, and as a consequence be cast aside in the Book of Life (Book of Revelation) – this is a necessary and ultimate consequence of transgression against the Immortal Heart – absolute truth – a break of trust, trust, which we have proved is crucial in temporal incarnation. This break of trust is the cause of evil in the world – “the Lie”, which Dostoevsky (1877) said was the first evil.

Of course, the problem of evil, the Theodicy, and the topic of restoration are intriguing questions, so we will deal with these questions in later texts.

Now, if we read the Theosophy of Blavatsky (1877; 1889), it is stated that “all belong in the One”, “cosmos is unity”, “the soul will dissolve into spirit upon return”, etc., but this is only half the story, for we have proven that evil is not mere privation, but negation, that is, an ontological transgression against the Immortal Heart – a limit must be set, and is evil not death, that is, not immortal?

This line of thought must be continued, for how could we ever accept ontological alien evil in the Immortal Heart (the divine love of heavens)? We cannot – evil is transgressive, and irredeemable.

Good people will innately be by the heart, even in times of ignorance or weakness.

So on that point, we disagree with the Theosophy of Blavatsky.

But nevertheless, Aufheben is real, and will commence in these the latter days.

In the HC, we are day-by-day building the “New Ethereal Atlantis” – the “psychic aether” (in Sanskrit Akasha, and in Greek Aither) is alive, what Blavatsky called the 5th element (Riis-Søndergaard, 2025c).

The science of the aether (and in general, our spiritual energies, which we explore in many of our essays) must be reawakened, for us to reach our true, inherent spiritual potential and liberation.

Together, we will bring true transcendental illumination unto the world, and defeat the grave darkness.

Appendix 1: Translation of Tove Ditlevsen's Danish poem "So Take My Heart" (1942)¹

So take my heart in your hands
but take it carefully and take it gently
the red heart - now it's yours.

It beats so quiet, it beats so softly
it has loved and suffered
now it's still - now it's yours.

And it can get hurt and it may sink
and it can forget and forget often,
but never forget, that it is yours.

It was so strong and so proud, my heart
it slept, and dreamed of desire and fun
Now it can be crushed - but only by you.

Author's note on the poem: This poem exemplifies, how love is vulnerable, why we state that love is in nature *reciprocal* – faithfulness and trust are crucial, if we ever seek to return to origins, along this temporal way of conflict, strife, and war. The poem could, in the context of the 2nd WW, also be seen as a metaphor for the history of the Danish nation, as having “loved and suffered”, and the burden of German oppression during that period of time, as also is a common reading of another Danish poet's, Kaj Munk, “The Blue Anemone” (1943).

1 Danish title is “Så Tag Mit Hjerte”. English translation from <https://forgottenselves-blog.tumblr.com/post/19669882179/tove-ditlevisen>. This poem has also been accompanied by music in the form of the Danish composer Michael Bojesen's melody (2007) to the text – a beautiful song. See the music video of DR's PigeKor at <https://www.facebook.com/drpikekoret/videos/s%C3%A5-tag-mit-hjerte/1266247670421492/>.

Appendix 2: Lyrics to Nico and the Velvet Underground “I’ll Be Your Mirror” (1967)

I'll be your mirror
 Reflect what you are, in case you don't know
 I'll be the wind, the rain, and the sunset
 The light on your door to show that you're home

When you think the night has seen your mind
 That inside you're twisted and unkind
 Let me stand to show that you are blind
 Please, put down your hands
 'Cause I see you

I find it hard to believe you don't know
 The beauty you are
 But if you don't, let me be your eyes
 A hand to your darkness so you won't be afraid

When you think the night has seen your mind
 That inside you're twisted and unkind
 Let me stand to show that you are blind
 Please, put down your hands
 'Cause I see you

I'll be your mirror (reflect what you are)
 I'll be your mirror (reflect what you are)
 I'll be your mirror (reflect what you are)
 I'll be your mirror (reflect what you are)
 I'll be your mirror (reflect what you are)

Author’s note on the lyrics: A great song on how we are cast into this world to remember who we truly are. Only in the meeting with the Other, can we find home, for when we don’t remember, our love will remember for us – this is the dialectical nature of love. In trust, we will learn who we are, as counterparts of creation.

References

- ‘1. Corinthians’ in *The New Testament*
- ‘Book of Revelation’ in *The New Testament*
- Blavatsky, H.P., *Isis Unveiled: A Master-Key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science and Theology*, 1877
- Blavatsky, H.P., *The Key to Theosophy*, 1889
- Brzezinski, Z., *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, 1970
- Deleuze, G., ‘Postscript on the Societies of Control’, 1992
- Ditlevsen, T., ‘Så Tag Mit Hjerte [So Take My Heart]’ in *Lille Verden [Little World]*, 1942
- Dostoevsky, F., *The Dream of a Ridiculous Man*, 1877
- Hegel, G.W.F., ‘Fragment on Love’, 1798
- Hegel, G.W.F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, 1807
- Hegel, G.W.F., *Philosophy of Right*, 1820
- Heidegger, M., *Being and Time*, 1927
- Horkheimer & Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, 1944
- Huxley, A., *Brave New World*, 1932
- Kierkegaard, K., *Enten-Eller [Either/Or]*, 1843
- Kierkegaard, S., *Kærlighedens Gerninger [Works of Love]*, 1847
- Løgstrup, K.E., *Den Etiske Fordring [The Ethical Demand]*, 1956
- Munk, K., ‘Den Blå Anemone [The Blue Anemone]’ in *Den Skæbne Ej Til Os [That Fate Not For Us]*, 1943
- Orwell, G., *1984*, 1948
- Plato, *Phaedo*, 4th BC
- Plato, *Symposium*, 385a BC
- Plato, *Meno*, 385b BC
- Plotinus, *Enneads*, 270
- Presley, E., ‘Suspicious Minds’ on *From Memphis to Vegas/From Vegas to Memphis*, 1969
- Reed, L., ‘I’ll Be Your Mirror’ on *The Velvet Underground & Nico*, 1967
- Riis-Søndergaard, K., ‘Esoteric Psychology’, 2025a
- Riis-Søndergaard, K., ‘Esoteric Psychology II – A Plea for the Heart’, 2025b
- Riis-Søndergaard, K., ‘The Psychic Aether’, 2025c
- Riis-Søndergaard, K., ‘Götterdämmerung – Twilight of the Astral War’, 2026a
- Riis-Søndergaard, K., ‘Fundamentals of Hyperborean Metaphysics’, forthcoming
- Rosario, N., *Fundamentals of Hyperborean Wisdom*, 1985

Saybia, 'I Surrender' on *These Are the Days*, 2004