

UNITED WISDOM

Meister Eckhart: detachment and the language of mystical experience

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-24-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Meister Eckhart: detachment and the language of mystical experience

> *“To become through grace what God is by nature.”*

Meister Eckhart, On Detachment, opening paragraph, Luke Dysinger’s English translation based on the edition identified there. Quotations here are editorial English renderings through the approved Russian version, translated by the article’s authors from the cited English text; they do not reproduce the published translator’s wording.

About this article

A medieval preacher’s phrase, cut from its page, easily becomes today’s advice: let everything go, abandon yourself, stop wanting. Open the page, however, and the Trinity, the Word’s birth, grace, intellect, and Creator–creature relations appear beside it. Remove these words and we obtain a familiar text. Is it still Eckhart’s?

We will examine a Christian thinker who sharpens philosophical and spiritual questions uncomfortably. What does detachment change in our relation to goodness? What do God’s birth in the soul and abandoning God for God mean? Why can refusing to appropriate an outcome accompany active living? Sermon genre, manuscript transmission, and particular translations matter. We will distinguish the extent of condemned propositions and the boundaries between theology, experience, and psychological description. Comparisons with Dionysius, Stoicism, and Indian texts preserve different aims. The practical section offers careful reading and examination of our claims, while retaining living feelings and responsibility.

I. A preacher with philosophical training

Eckhart lived around the turn of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, belonged to the Dominican order, taught, and preached. He wrote Latin and German. Scholastic questions, biblical interpretation, and Augustine’s and Dionysius’s inheritance meet in his thought. Choosing between “rational philosopher” and “mystic” impoverishes the subject. Amber Griffioen’s academic article relates his philosophy to these intellectual and religious activities. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

This circumstance changes how we read. A sermon addresses a listener, urges a different view of a familiar thought, and uses images and unexpected turns. A philosophical commentary may clarify concepts that preaching handles with considerable freedom. Different texts cannot all be required to use one style. Nor can an imaginative text be assumed free of

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

substantive assertions: an image can express a definite thought that still requires understanding and assessment.

Eckhart's soul and God do not merely name moods. They concern being, knowledge, creation, and participation in divine life. Replace God with "inner resource" and soul with "self-esteem," and another system emerges. Modern reinterpretation is possible, but should be named as such. Historical understanding begins by recognizing that authors may ask questions different from ours.

Precisely this distance makes reading fruitful. We encounter a thought that cannot immediately enter our familiar collection of advice. It asks us to examine not only one habit but the wish to possess goodness, knowledge, or a religious result. Hearing this question requires setting aside expectations of a quick exercise for a while. First understand what the thinker considers the aim of human life, and why he chooses expressions so sharp that they resist an easy, reassuring interpretation.

II. Texts with a history of transmission

Readers usually encounter Eckhart in translation and selection. Sermon order, titles, explanations, even numbering vary by edition. Distinguish the author, a medieval compiler, and a modern translator. Reliable references identify a text and edition; "Eckhart" beneath an attractive phrase does not establish provenance.

The Sermon on the Coming of the Lord in Stanford's Global Medieval Sourcebook provides an example. It derives from the medieval collection Paradisus anime intelligentis, whose compiler is unknown. Researchers note abridgment and alteration of some sermons. This witness to early reading and transmission needs attention to editorial history. Introduction to the sermon.

This does not render the entire inheritance unreliable. It rejects a simple picture: the author spoke, a stenographer recorded, and we received exact words. Manuscript culture involves a more complex journey. Knowing it keeps conclusions proportionate. One sermon can show how a particular tradition expressed the Word's birth without proving every proposition's final meaning across the corpus.

Translation adds a layer. Russian otreshennost may suggest coldness; English "detachment," emotional distance. German terms translated through release, relinquishment, and detachment work within theology. One translation preserves literal sharpness, another clarifies, another too quickly psychologizes. Difficult passages should be compared with context and commentary rather than entrusted to one successful phrase.

Read neighboring paragraphs. If freedom from images is followed by the Word and grace, that transition belongs to meaning. Removing the second changes the first. An excerpt starts

answering how to reduce tension when it originally concerned a human relation to God. A quotation's convenience cannot measure accuracy.

III. Detachment: ceasing to make everything one's own

On Detachment seeks the virtue joining humans most closely to God. The opening distinguishes becoming through grace from what God is by nature. The author then gives detachment priority and describes freedom from claiming to be this or that. This theological question does not define emotional numbness. Opening and discussion of humility.

We can ask our own question: what does claiming "mine" do to a relation with goodness? I help someone and consider their gratitude my property. I study a difficult text and claim an exclusive right to speak. I pray and expect a guaranteed inner result. Action joins a demand for self-confirmation. These are modern illustrations, not reconstructed scenes from Eckhart's life.

Release from that demand need not abandon action. Helping, studying, and praying can continue with a revised relation to results. One stops using goodness exclusively to strengthen a self-image. Yet absence of desire does not always mean virtue. Unwillingness to act has different causes; outward resemblance to relinquished claims does not establish detachment.

Nonappropriation also differs from abandoning responsibility. Not owning another's gratitude does not cancel a promise. Not proving spiritual uniqueness does not remove the need to correct mistakes. Possessive claims and accountability are different matters. A modern application erasing this distinction makes historical thought an excuse for inactivity.

Outward restraint cannot alone measure detachment. Calm speech can accompany insistence that everything follow one's plan. Strong feelings can coexist with no attempt to subordinate others. A relation's content matters more than the image of an unruffled mystic. Appropriation runs deeper than appearing quiet.

IV. God's birth in the soul: the image's subject

The Sermon on the Coming of the Lord connects Christian life with God's birth in the soul and the soul's birth in God. It distinguishes an inner word from a spoken one and addresses intellect as this birth's place. The argument concerns the Word, grace, and eternity, rather than a new independent divine substance appearing inside someone. Sermon on the Coming of the Lord.

Birth expresses closeness beyond external observation. Learning about God from texts differs from describing participation in divine life. Closeness alone does not establish identity in every respect. Who is born, in what sense, what is the soul, and how does grace act? Without these questions, the image becomes decoration or a claim that ordinary humans are God by nature.

The reference to intellect should not be taken as the modern instruction to “understand everything in your head.” In this philosophical language, the question concerns a capacity to receive truth and the relation between an inward word and speech already expressed. This differs from accumulating information or performing a rapid analysis. We may know many facts about an author while remaining insensitive to the question he poses. The intellectual dimension of contemplation does not abolish the labor of understanding; it changes that labor’s direction.

Eternity requires similar care. Going beyond time does not justify forgetting an appointment or denying past events. The discussion concerns divinity and humanity, not abolishing calendars. Everyday application might reveal how expected results hold us. That limited analogy does not reproduce the whole medieval theory of time and eternity.

Let the image work without assigning too much to it. It raises participation and inward understanding without proving a neurophysiological state or universal religious experience. Similar language of closeness and unity does not settle each tradition’s account of reality. This sermon also contains very sharp formulas identifying soul and God. Grace restores context without resolving every philosophical or doctrinal difficulty. Do not automatically soften every formula into unquestionable likeness: assessment requires neighboring argument, textual edition, and controversy’s history.

V. A paradox: abandoning God for God

True Hearing, in Claud Field’s older translation, explains abandoning God for God through relinquishing expected benefits, not God’s disappearance. Self-love also connects with love for others. This context changes a phrase that alone might sound like abandoning Christianity. Sermon IV.

Distinguish whom we address from what we expect. Seeking God may coexist with seeking guaranteed consolation, vindication, or special experience. Relinquishing the latter need not abandon the former. The same word in a paradox’s two parts may concern different aspects of a relation. Without clarifying this, the paradox becomes nonsense or provocation.

Historical accuracy nevertheless need not neutralize every sharp edge. Some formulas genuinely trouble theological explanation; hence continuing research and discussion. He did not necessarily always express ordinary thoughts unusually. Unusual expression can change the question and reach a disputed boundary. Careful reading recognizes this instead of rushing to defense or accusation.

A paradox cannot prove anything whatsoever. Permission to harm requires a separate argument; literary force supplies none. If a phrase orders someone to abandon an opinion,

clarify the speaker’s authority and which opinion is meant. Quoting a profound text does not transfer its spiritual depth to the speaker.

Pause over paradoxes. Which meanings collide? Which familiar relation is reconsidered? What remains after negation? If the answer is only “understand nothing,” perhaps we closed inquiry too soon. Unusual speech may require greater precision, not abolish understanding. Eckhart’s theological vocabulary belongs to that demand.

VI. Contemplation and action: freedom from a bargain

Detachment is often imagined as peace followed by withdrawal from ordinary life. Griffioen instead shows inward release’s connection with virtuous action. Her discussion of Mary and Martha stresses activity unhindered by inward attachment. Busyness is not automatically inferior to contemplation. SEP, §9.3.

Ask about action without a concealed bargain. We sometimes do what is needed while counting respect, proof of kindness, or improvements to self-image. Removing this calculation does not destroy meaning. Care may matter because of another’s need, rather than future testimony to our exceptional nature.

This does not abandon planning. Cooking requires timing; arranging a trip requires a route; promises require sequences of action. Practical means and ends remain necessary. A separate question asks whether another becomes a means to confirm my worth. Distinguishing levels preserves rational action without spiritual trading.

Hidden bargains also differ from open agreements. Suppose help with a trip was agreed on condition that another pays specified expenses. Reminding them need not demand reverence for one’s kindness; without payment, participation may be impossible. Conversely, someone stating no conditions may later demand recognition as payment: everyone must now agree because they helped. An apparently selfless gesture becomes expanded power.

This neither decides for Eckhart nor measures others’ spiritual maturity. It clarifies our application’s limit: nonappropriation does not hide actual participation conditions. Time, expenses, and limits can be discussed without claiming superiority. Praise can be relinquished while a clear agreement remains binding. Freedom from inward calculation must not become endless giving without permission to name what is available. Examine a demand’s content instead of judging it solely because someone expects something.

Nonappropriation of results does not abandon assessment of consequences. If help proved useless, understand and change it. If a promise failed, acknowledge the fact. “I expected no reward” establishes neither quality nor exemption from accountability. Motives and consequences connect without replacing each other.

Nor is every pleasure in activity a vice. Enthusiastic reading or joyful conversation need not obstruct simply because pleasurable. Attachment becomes a question where one cannot see reality beyond a demand. The modern analogy helps notice this without delivering a final verdict on spiritual maturity.

VII. Condemned propositions: precision instead of legend

Proceedings began during Eckhart's life; John XXII's In agro dominico appeared on March 27, 1329, after his death. Seventeen propositions were condemned as heretical; eleven as rash and suspect of heresy, with a correct sense possible through further explanation for the latter. The groups received different judgments. Eckhart was not personally declared a heretic. The bull reported his retraction of the erroneous sense of the relevant statements, an important qualification. Evan King's study quoting the document.

Hold both sides. Condemnation was a real ecclesiastical act affecting reception and circulation, not removable through "he was simply misunderstood." Yet condemned extracted propositions do not give every text, sermon, or later interpretation identical status. The document's scope differs from the inheritance's extent.

Retraction requires similar care. It does not establish that Eckhart dismissed all his work or abandoned Christianity. Ask about particular formulas' meanings and correction's limits. Theological history often treats one expression as a literal assertion, part of an argument, and a phrase understood differently by listeners.

Public speech raises a contemporary question. If a complex formula admits dangerous readings, is intention sufficient? How do precision, expressiveness, and responsibility for understanding relate? This history supplies no universal answer. It shows real consequences of distinguishing thought, formulation, and reception. Study that distinction instead of assigning one side truth and the other persecution beforehand.

We can read with interest without declaring every formula indisputable; consider condemnation without reducing the thinker to proceedings. Accuracy leaves room for argument and theological judgment. It demands neither a misunderstood genius's cult nor refusal to open an author seriously disputed.

VIII. Why detachment is not a diagnosis

"Distance" today can mean relational reserve, exhaustion, concentration, or indifference. "Dissociation" belongs to a different descriptive language from medieval soul, virtue, and grace. Similar words establish no identity. Theology is not medical description; readers' experiences do not automatically confirm theological interpretations.

Nor does a historical text prescribe therapy through ceasing to feel. Eckhart discusses detachment in relation to God. Hearing people, noticing needs, and answering for acts remain concrete tasks. An exercise targeting emotional insensitivity needs assessment on its own grounds. A medieval name makes it no proven help.

The reverse substitution calls all mystical speech concealed disorder. It deprives authors of actually thinking about God and turns philosophy’s history into unsupported judgments about inner conditions. Texts, genres, and circumstances permit substantive investigation, not confident retrospective diagnosis.

Personal application remains possible within proportion. Notice expected gratitude or help’s relation to control. These questions do not reproduce Eckhart’s mystical experience or measure another’s spirituality. A modest conclusion improves precision without removing significance.

No unusual state is required for attentive reading. Ordinary wakefulness, questions, disagreement, and discovery suffice. Historical thought does not demand proof of suitability through experienced emptiness. Its difficulty primarily concerns concepts and relations we are unaccustomed to holding together.

Distinguish experience, interpretation, and a claim about the world. Someone may report unusual clarity or deep quiet, interpret it religiously, then say it proves reality’s structure. These steps differ. Respectful listening does not oblige acceptance of every conclusion; critical discussion does not license declaring the report invented.

Historical texts provide no ready scale for this. We read formed speech addressed to listeners, not direct access to consciousness. Expressiveness measures no experience’s strength; philosophical complexity establishes no autobiographical accuracy. Word meanings, argument, and grounds remain available for inquiry. This work need not pretend to read another’s inner state.

IX. Release that preserves relationship

Eckhart becomes no clearer as a ready instructor in calm or an author of unacceptable extremes. His texts join philosophy, Christian confession, and sharp preaching. Detachment, the Word’s birth, and nonappropriation require these connections. Their power questions what someone makes their final foundation.

Condemnation’s history recalls precision: proposition, intended meaning, reception, and personal status differ. Modern application requires equal care: theology is not diagnosis, reflection does not automatically recreate medieval experience, and relinquished claims do not exempt action. These distinctions bring readers closer without sacrificing autonomy.

A useful question is more modest than a promise of complete inner liberation: am I able to see goodness, another person, or truth without immediately demanding that they confirm my exceptional nature? This question can remain alongside ordinary obligations and living feelings, rather than replacing either of them. It gives no ready answer on Eckhart's behalf. It helps begin an attentive conversation with his thought and understand where the historical text ends and our own responsibility begins.

What this means in practice

Begin with one short passage and keep several neighboring paragraphs with it. Mark the words God, Word, soul, grace, and intellect. Then ask what would be lost if they were replaced by more familiar psychological terms. This examination helps locate the boundary between understanding the author and offering your own reinterpretation. Both activities may be useful, provided one is not presented as the other.

If a phrase about detachment attracts you, examine its object. What exactly is to be relinquished: care for another person, the wish to control their response, an expected spiritual reward, or a particular image of God? These possibilities produce entirely different consequences. Until the object has been specified, "let everything go" remains too general an expression to guide an actual life and its particular relationships.

Consider one action of your own without trying to judge your entire personality. Suppose you offered help. What help was actually requested? What conditions do you expect in return? If gratitude never arrives, will your view of the other person's need change? The answers need not be corrected immediately. First notice the distinction between a real circumstance and your own demand upon it. This is a limited exercise in reflection, rather than a promise of a mystical result.

Afterward, return to responsibility. What did you promise, and what can you fulfill? Which consequences should be checked? Do you need to ask the person whether the offered help suits them? Returning to these questions does not cancel nonappropriation. It guards against the false inference that examining an inward relation allows us to neglect an outward task. Reading and action may instead clarify one another.

When encountering a paradox, do not hurry to make it a rule. Restate at least two possible meanings in ordinary language, then check which the context supports. Where certainty is absent, preserve an open question. Not every difficult formula needs to be applied today. Sometimes the most accurate result of reading is understanding which thought still needs further study before we know what it asserts.

Separately, attend to a quotation's source. Identifying a sermon, translator, and edition is more useful than an attractive card carrying a surname. If provenance is unknown, do not circulate

the phrase as securely established. Be especially careful with sayings inviting someone to abandon feelings, will, or responsibility. Losing context here changes not only a phrase's meaning but the possible way in which someone acts upon it.

Key quotation

> *"So that God may be born in the soul."*

Meister Eckhart, Sermon on the Coming of the Lord, opening paragraphs on Scripture's and creation's purpose, English translation by the Global Medieval Sourcebook team. Editorial English rendering through the authors' approved Russian translation. This short statement of purpose promises no new natural deity inside someone; manuscript transmission and later sharp formulas require independent reading.

Connections across traditions

These analytical comparisons identify a shared question and a boundary between answers; they do not themselves establish historical influence.

Question	Positions and sources	Actual similarity	Boundary of comparison
Relinquishment and theology	Eckhart, True Hearing, IV and Dionysius, I.1–2	Negative movement remains within address to God.	Relinquishing expected benefits and limiting categories have different immediate objects; neither instructs us to stop believing.
Participation and nature	Eckhart, On Detachment, opening and Athanasius, 54.3	Strong language of participation requires distinct modes of relation.	Eckhart's sermons and treatise do not merely repeat Athanasius; resemblance does not make every disputed formula indisputable.
Detachment and one's action	Eckhart on action: SEP §9.3 and Epictetus, §1	Reduced claims on external results can preserve action.	Divine birth and Stoic judgment belong to different teachings; an Eckhart overview is no primary Epictetus text.

Question	Positions and sources	Actual similarity	Boundary of comparison
Action without appropriated fruit	Eckhart, True Hearing, IV and Gita, II.47–48; III.4–9	Refusing goodness as private advantage need not end activity.	Expected religious benefits and karma yoga's fruits differ, as do duty's and liberation's contexts.
Images and definitions' limits	Eckhart, detachment and Brihadaranyaka, II.3.6	Our comparison notices how attachment to an image may hinder understanding.	Nonappropriation and negative instruction concerning Brahman are different arguments; neither natural identity nor historical dependence follows.

Sources

1. Amber L. Griffioen. Meister Eckhart—Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Academic article, 2023; historical context and section 9 on mystagogy and action.

2. Meister Eckhart. Sermon on the Coming of the Lord—Global Medieval Sourcebook. Middle High German text, modern English translation, and introduction to transmission in Paradisus anime intelligentis.

3. Meister Eckhart. On Detachment. German text after Josef Quint; Luke Dysinger's English translation using older translations.

4. Meister Eckhart. Sermons, translated by Claud Field, 1909. Sermon IV, True Hearing, used; outdated preface judgments are not accepted as historical grounds.

5. Evan King. Unum necessarium: Meister Eckhart, the Ground and Theology in the Vernacular. Dionysius XXXV, 2017, 173–196; historical introduction and In agro dominico excerpts.

• Pseudo-Dionysius. Mystical Theology, I.1–2, translated by John Parker: Christian context of apophatic speech.

• Athanasius of Alexandria. On the Incarnation of the Word, §§1–4 and 54.3, older NPNF translation: incarnation and deification, distinguishing Christ's event and human participation.

• Epictetus. Enchiridion, §§1, 5, translated by Elizabeth Carter: one's action and judgment versus external circumstances, without equating Stoic and Christian aims.

• Bhagavad Gita, chapters II–III, translated by Edwin Arnold, The Song Celestial, 1900 edition: nonappropriation of fruit, II.47–48 and III.4–9; comparing detachment without equating karma yoga and Eckhart's teaching.

• Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, II.3.1–6, translated by F. Max Müller, SBE XV: negative instruction within Brahman discourse, not identity with Christianity.

Tags

Meister Eckhart, detachment, Abgeschiedenheit, Christian mysticism, Dominicans, scholasticism, theology, philosophy, sermon, manuscript transmission, translation, Word, God's birth in the soul, grace, nature, intellect, eternity, paradox, nonappropriation, contemplation, action, Mary and Martha, In agro dominico, condemned propositions, John XXII, experience, interpretation, responsibility, Stoicism, karma yoga

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.