YASIN
Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sosial Budaya

p-ISSN: 2808-2346
e-ISSN: 2808-1854

Terindeks: SINTA 5, Copernicus, Dimensions, Scilit, Lens, Crossref, Semantic, Garuda, Google, Base, etc.

https://doi.org/10.58578/yasin.v5i1.4902

APOPHATIC THEOLOGY IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF DECONSTRUCTIVE HERMENEUTICS

Angga Arifka
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
anggarifk@gmail.com

Article Info:

Submitted:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
Jan 3, 2025	Jan 18, 2025	Jan 30, 2025	Feb 4, 2025

Abstract

This article aims to explore apophatic theology in the light of deconstructive hermeneutics, wherein the two are complementary approaches to understanding divine transcendence and the limitations of human language. With a qualitative approach, this article reads apophatic theology employing the hermeneutical theory of Jacques Derrida. This article found that apophatic theology emphasizes the inability of language to fully describe the nature of the Ultimate Reality or God through the approach of negation. At the same time, deconstructive hermeneutics, rooted in Derrida's philosophy, focuses on the instability and limitations of meaning in language. This study has broad theoretical and practical significance. From a theoretical perspective, this study makes a new contribution to contemporary theological studies by showing how deconstructive hermeneutics can enrich the understanding of the methodology of apophatic theology. In particular, this study highlights how deconstruction helps reveal the creative dimension in the negation of apophatic theology, which is often seen as merely the elimination of meaning.

Keywords: Apophatic Theology; Deconstructive Hermeneutics; Divine Transcendence; Negation

Yasin Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

INTRODUCTION

In mysticism, or what in Islam is called *tasawwuf*, one seeks to attain absolute knowledge of Ultimate Reality. It is achieved by cleansing the soul, practicing contemplation, meditation, and the like (Schimmel, 2011). The Ultimate Reality that lies beyond the human world is presupposed to be grasped. Philosophers may claim that such embracing can occur through cogitation, activation of the intellect, and deep contemplation of the reality verses (*kawniyah*) (Badri, 2018).

The transcendent aspect of Ultimate Reality *an sich* is always a "thick fog" for human outreach that wants to break through it. The immanent aspect of Ultimate Reality, however, is always intimately accessible to those who approach it. These two dichotomies are not dualisms of polar extremes that compete with each other, let alone eliminate each other, but rather are gradations of Ultimate Reality. If Ultimate Reality is understood only in terms of its immanence, then crude anthropomorphism grows. Therefore, the transcendentality of Ultimate Reality draws out its immanence so as not to fall into the scientific abyss of anthropomorphism.

Is it possible, then, for this finite, profane human being—despite the sophistication of his intellectual reasoning and the experiential awesomeness of his mysticism—to explore the infinite, endless Reality of Ultimacy? The answer is always a perpetual loop between possible and impossible. At this point, this article analyzes the various "impossible" answers, that is, answers that show moments of silence. Such silence is explored in apophatic theology.

The intersection between apophatic theology and deconstructive hermeneutics remains an under-explored area in contemporary theological and philosophical research. While apophatic theology focuses on the ineffable God by negating definitive claims, deconstructive hermeneutics, rooted in the philosophy of Jacques Derrida, questions the instability and limitations of language, meaning, and interpretation. Both approaches share a critical awareness of the inadequacy of human constructs, but their potential dialog has yet to be fully developed. There is a significant research gap in examining how deconstructive hermeneutics can deepen one's understanding of the method of apophatic theology, particularly in uncovering how human language both explores and conceals the divine.

Research on this topic is important because it opens up new attempts to understand theological discourse in a postmodern context. Deconstructive hermeneutics challenges traditional metaphysical assumptions, offering tools to question how apophatic theology navigates the tension between language and the transcendent. By addressing this framework,

this analysis can explain that apophatic theology offers not only a denial of language but also a creative and transformative encounter with its limits.

Furthermore, exploring this intersection has practical implications for interfaith dialogue and contemporary spirituality. Both apophatic and deconstructive theologies emphasize humility and openness, qualities essential in managing a pluralistic landscape. Such investigations not only reinvigorate traditional theological approaches but also affirm the relevance of apophatic practices in fostering an ethic of respect and relationality in a world shaped by uncertainty and difference.

METHODS

As a literature study, the method in this research is qualitative (Creswell, 2013). This method serves to describe the meaning found in textual sources. The approach used in this research is content analysis, which seeks to investigate, examine, and explain related topics comprehensively and systematically (Satori & Komariah, 2017). In addition, the theory used is deconstructive hermeneutics. This theory was initiated by the French philosopher Jacques Derrida. This hermeneutic theory serves to elaborate on the understanding of apophatic theology, outlining the limitations of human language in describing the Ultimate Reality.

RESULTS

Apophatic Theology: A Brief Understanding

Apophatic theology, also known as negative theology, is a form of theological reasoning and religious practice that seeks to approach Ultimate Reality through negation (via negative). The polar opposite of apophatic theology is cataphatic theology, or positive theology, which characterizes Ultimate Reality with affirmative and positive statements. In summary, the definition of apophatic theology is a theology that teaches that the existence of Ultimate Reality is vast and unreachable; no one can reach the essence of Ultimate Reality because Ultimate Reality will never manifest itself totally; and to know Ultimate Reality, one can only know through what is not Ultimate Reality (Bagus, 2005).

It is impossible to define apophatic theology, let alone try to summarize it succinctly. Denys Turner, a scholar of apophatic theology, prefers not to define it. According to him, apophatic theology does not need to be defined because it is more in line with its nature to negate. Meanwhile, Mary-Jane Rubenstein, more explicitly, states that apophatic theology can

only be expounded with apophatic/negative language. However, since apophatic theology is a discourse, it still requires identification to establish its conceptual boundaries definitively (Al-Fayyadl, 2012).

Apophatic theology does not deny making positive statements about Ultimate Reality as is done in apophatic theology. Still, apophatic theology shows that the impossibility of knowing Ultimate Reality thoroughly is also necessary. In other words, apophatic theology becomes an approach to understanding and describing God by emphasizing what cannot be said about God rather than what can be said. This theological method asserts that human language and concepts are inherently limited and incapable of fully comprehending the infinite and transcendent nature of God. The divine is beyond all categories, attributes, and descriptions, which are based on limited human experience. By making positive affirmations, apophatic theology seeks to avoid the dangers of idolatry and anthropomorphism–taking God as something finite or comprehensible.

Apophatic theology relies on the process of negation, which asserts that the characteristics of the created world do not bind God. For example, while God may be described as "good" or "wise," apophatic theology will argue that God's goodness or wisdom infinitely transcends human concepts of those terms. As a result, apophatic theology often uses paradoxes and metaphors to hint at the divine mystery, recognizing that even such attempts fail. This approach contrasts with apophatic theology, which uses positive affirmations about God, such as "God is love," and emphasizes God's immanence and relationship with the world.

The aim of apophatic theology is not to deny the existence of God but to cultivate a sense of humility and awe before the divine. By removing all inadequate human concepts, this theology invites believers into a deeper and contemplative encounter with God. Apophatic theology, therefore, serves as both a philosophical framework and a spiritual discipline, guiding the believer toward a deep recognition of God's transcendence. Apophatic theology is not a foreign method, as it is found in the expressions of mystics in various religions, such as Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism, Taoism, Buddhism, and Islam. Apophatic theology expresses religious diversity by means of the negation of Ultimate Reality (Lindahl, 2010).

Apophatic Theology in World Religions

In Christianity, the great mystic Augustine stated that Ultimate Reality is beyond human understanding because human understanding is very limited, and understanding of Ultimate Reality always uses analogies that only humans have experienced and known. Therefore, it is not possible to know the infinite Ultimate Reality (Parsons, 2013). However, the negativity of Ultimate Reality, according to Augustine, can still be reached by positivization by way of analogies. It is not yet as radical as what Dionysius Aeoropagit did.

The thought of Dionysius Aeoropagit gives a more concrete description of apophatic theology. For Dionysius, the experience of Ultimate Reality is incomprehensible, as it is mysterious and the Hidden One (Deus Absconditus). In order to approach Ultimate Reality, one must abandon all knowledge to enter the "space of no knowledge." This space is not naïve ignorance, but rather, it is the "post-knowing state of ignorance" (Al-Fayyyadl, 2012).

Dionysius himself disliked the use of the term "God," as anthropomorphic connotations may have contaminated it. Even the word "God" itself is a misnomer, for "God" is "above God," a "mystery beyond being." "God" is not one of the many things that exist and is not at all the same as everything that exists as human experience. Even "God" does not have to be called a Trinity because "God" is neither a unity nor a trinity in the known sense. It is more appropriate to refer to "God" as "Nothing" (Armstrong, 2015).

Dionysius points out that any chosen expression about "God" will contain paradoxes. He refers to Ultimate Reality as "brilliant darkness," a paradoxical expression. Ultimate Reality can be both "light" and "darkness," as well as "neither". In addition to the paradoxical expression, Dionysius advocates negating anything about the Ultimate Reality and using negation in referring to Him. However, as it turns out, for Dionysius, negation itself is not sufficient. Negation must be transcended. If the expression is phatic or positive, "God is...", it is apophatically negated to "God is not..."; and according to Dionysius' logic-that is, the negation must be transcended-it becomes "God is not..." as well as "God is not...", the logic of which is operated simultaneously (Al-Fayyadl, 2012).

A somewhat later mystic was Meister Eckhart. He characterized "God" as *Deus* (Gott) and Deity (*Gottheit*). Deus is "God" who has manifested so that it can be understood, while Deity is that which cannot be understood by humans (Handayani, 2020). Deity (*Gottheit*) is the "Supreme God" that can only be expressed with negative terms, such as chaos, wildness, darkness, and nothingness. Eickhart calls "God" darkness not to indicate the absence of

light, but rather to express a presence that is brighter than can be comprehended (da Silva & Eddy Kristiyanto, 2020).

Eckhart asserts that the experience of "God" must begin by negating the self, that is, by emptying oneself of all actions and thoughts about "God". Actions and thoughts signify motion, while according to Eckhart, "God" is emptiness itself, when there is no more motion. Hence, in his prayers, he always affirmed in a way that he was praying for no one. He prays for something absent, namely "God" (Sabri, 2017).

In Judaism, the rabbis declare that "God" is utterly incomprehensible. Even Moses himself was unable to penetrate the divine mystery. Jews are even forbidden to pronounce the name "God" as it is too majestic for the human mind, thus making the expression of "God" inadequate; the holy Name is written YHWH (without vowels) and is not articulated in any scriptural recitation. The Jewish mystics tried to give an air of apophatism about "God" in their theology. They taught an esoteric-mystical discipline that was passed on to their disciples; they called it "Kabbalah," or the tradition passed on to them (Armstrong, 2015). The Kabbalists claim that there is no possible religious knowledge of "God" because, for them, there is no framework of knowledge to speak of Him. The Kabbalists have conceptualized this view by calling it "Ein-Sof," which means the Infinite. Kabbalism has other names similar to Ein-Sof, namely *mah she-ein ha-mahshavah masseget* (that which the mind cannot reach), *ha-or ha-mit'allem* (hidden light), and *seter ha-ta'alumahi* (veiled secret) (Huss, 2007).

The Kabbalists claim that no revelation can access the essence of the Ein-Sof. The Kabbalist tradition has the term "ayin," which means "nothingness". Therefore, they argue that Ein-Sof is nothingness (*ayin*), even complete nothingness (*ayin ha-gamur*), such that Ein-Sof cannot be thought of by humans and no concept or category encompasses it. The best way-though still inadequate to negate the statement about Ein-Sof itself: "He Who Is Not," because it cannot be called by anything and in any way (Sabri, 2017).

A Jewish philosopher, Maimonides, stated that humans are equally ignorant of "God". Here, Maimonides applies apophatic theology, according to which everyone does not know the nature of "God". Maimonides said, "You come nearer to an apprehension of Him, may He be exalted, with every increase in the negations regarding Him; and you come nearer that apprehension than he who does not negate with regard to Him that which, according to what has been demonstrated to you, ought to be negated" (Broadie, 2003). It shows that it is

through negation that one can know "God". In addition to negation, Maionides said that silence is an urgent religious language to approach God (Price, 2016).

Hinduism also developed an apophatic understanding of Ultimate Reality. Although Hindu mythology contains a bewildering 330 million gods, they are all manifestations of the One, Brahman, as the Ultimate Reality (Kuswanjono, 2006). Hinduism's philosopher Shankara stated that no quality, quantity, or modality can bind Brahman. The Ultimate Reality overcomes everything and is second to none. Therefore, Brahman cannot be reached by anyone's thoughts (Meister, 2014).

Shankara understood that any attempt to describe the Ultimate Reality is a futile endeavor. The attempt to describe Him is only to limit Him, whereas Ultimate Reality is limitless. So, in this case, the form of negation is the best explanation so as not to be trapped in limiting Him. Shankara provides an understanding of the negation of Brahman in a way that Brahman is not nature (*Nirguna*), formless (*Nirkara*), and unlimited (*Niruphadi*), so anything cannot reach it. It is in accordance with what the Upanishads say, which states that Brahman is *neti neti*, not-this and not-that (Siswadi & Murtiningsih, 2023).

In Taoism, there are Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu who are exponents of exploring apophatic theology. Ultimate Reality, for them, is understood to be beyond any verbal description. Lao-Tzu does not explain why Ultimate Reality cannot be fathomed and described. He states that the Tao is "nameless," "formless," "unimaged," "unseen," "unheard," and so on. As a result, the Way (*Tao*) is nonexistent (*wu wu*) or Nothing (*wu*). Chuang-tzu's argument, on the other hand, is that Ultimate Reality in its absoluteness is a "negation-of-negation-of-negation"; that is, the negation of Ultimate Reality as Nothing, which, again, is the negation of Existence (Izutsu, 2016).

Conceptually, one can start with "There is Entity." When that is negated, it is "there is Non-Entity." If one continues the negation again, "there is no Non-Entity"; then negated again, it becomes "there is no [so-called] Non-Entity." According to Chuang-tzu, this concept of "No-there-[None-Non-Existence]" or "None-Existence-Nothing" represents the ultimate logical stage that can be reached through the negation of the opposition of Form and Non-Estance. However, as imagined, the concept has succeeded in performing "negation-of-negation-of-negation," but is it an understanding that can reach the Ultimate Reality in its entirety? The answer is "no." According to Chuang-tzu, the concept must be surpassed by logical reasoning because if one stops at the level of conceptualization, then

one will be trapped in a mere abstruse concept and prove to fail to understand Ultimate Reality as it really is (Izutsu, 2016).

In Buddhism, although the religion is non-theistic and does not systematize theology, its apophatism can be traced. Historically, apophatism in Buddhism emerged approximately 100 years BCE with the writing of the *Prajna Paramita* literature in India (Prakash Guda & Avadhanam, 2016). *Prajna* literally means wisdom. What is important about this "wisdom" for Buddhism is that it is unspeakable, formless, and empty. *Prajna* came to be identified with *sunyata*, which means "emptiness," understood as the pinnacle of wisdom (Al-Fayyadl, 2012).

Shunyata is understood to have no substitute, to be unborn, to have no form, and to have no duality. It is neither created nor destroyed. *Shunyata* is seen as empty because there is nothing to cling to and exist: No basic qualities can be formulated for it, which is why voidness is called nonsubstantial. Nonsubstantiality overcomes both negation and affirmation. It is the negation of negation (Yong, 2012). Words or terms that express duality, such as existence and non-existence, pure and unclean, good and bad, cannot be affixed as the true sense, included in other religious beliefs (Hassan, 2019).

In Islam, Ibn 'Arabi is a reliable exponent in this regard. Although Ibn 'Arabi's ideas are often understood as wahdat al-wujud, which consequently posit human knowledge of the immanently manifested Ultimate Reality (*tashbih*), Ibn 'Arabi invites people to understand that the Ultimate Reality is incomprehensible (Chittick, 2005). Ultimate Reality, in its absoluteness, transcends all qualifications and relations that humans can conceptualize. In fact, in Ibn 'Arabi's philosophical terminology, the word "Allah" cannot refer to the Ultimate Reality in His absoluteness but rather only to the determination of the *tajalli* of God (Alsamaani, 2017).

When talking about the Essence (*Dhat*), Ibn 'Arabi states that the *Dhat* of Ultimate Reality cannot be equated with anything else (Al-Fayyadl, 2012). In this sense, nothing can be said about "God" except by way of negation (*salb*). Essence is the Ultimate Reality as He is in Himself, in unchallenged absoluteness. Incomparability logically and ontologically precedes similarity. That is the main issue that can be said about "God" (Kars, 2019).

Ultimate Reality per se is the mystery of mysteries or the "Absolute Mystery" (*al-Ghayb al-Mutlaq*). Ultimate Reality in this sense is called *ankar al-nakirat*, i.e. "the most indeterminate of all the indeterminate." Because it is so indeterminate and undetermined, it cannot be known at all: "the least known of all the unknowns." That is the Reality of Being, Being *qua* Being, the knowledge of which must be negated (Izutsu, 2016).

Thus, Ibn 'Arabi often warns that whatever is expressed in terms of the Ultimate Reality will always contain restrictions (*tahdid*). The *Dhat* or Essence of Ultimate Reality is *munazzah*, both free and completely different from nature, and thus unknowable (Chamankhah, 2019). It has consequences for His unreachability and implies the impossibility of approaching Him with any designation since every designation presupposes the positive in itself, while He is impossible to approach with the positive, so logically, "He" is negative.

DISCUSSION

Apophatic Theology in the Perspective of Deconstructive Hermeneutics

Jalal al-Din Rumi once said, "Truth is like a mirror broken into pieces. Then everyone picks up each piece and claims: this is the Truth." In this case, "truth" is certainly different from "Truth". The former is only an interpretive study of the latter (Afifah, 2019). The study of interpretation is a "possible area," while the Truth is an "impossibility". The realm of possibility in interpretation applies according to capability and readiness so that it produces truth, which is the creation of human cognitive and intuitive operationalization of it. However, Truth is never created because human reason cannot create it, let alone manipulate it.

Derrida's deconstruction affirms that an interpretation is a snippet—picked and missed—of a reality that can never be fully grasped. As a radical hermeneutic, deconstruction celebrates differentiation and enjoys difference. Although deconstruction also operates as interpretation, it cannot pretend to totalize meaning, let alone have the arrogance to monopolize meaning (Al-Fayyadl, 2005). Deconstructive reading realizes that there is something missing and unreachable, whether it is diversity, absurdity, strangeness, aporia, irony, or paradox. It makes one enter a moment of silence, as in apophatic theology. In contrast to cataphatic theology, it is always chatty about the existence of Ultimate Reality.

Cataphatic theology or positive theology, as a hermeneutical act, is still naive in the hope that the use of univocal, equivocal, or analogous language can embrace the existence and essence of Ultimate Reality, which is in the realm of the impossible. In fact, it shows *contradictio in terminis*, the impossible is forced to be positioned as possible. The impossible remains in its absolute and unchallenged impossibility. At the same time "possibility" is the tracing of its traces, which show its absent presence, so that it is no longer itself *per se*.

What can be said about the impossibility that envelops the body of the impossible? For the impossible is the Other and will always be other than the Other. With deconstructive

reading, truth becomes the impossible and always will be. The impossibility of embracing the total is an indicator that the "body" always evades and leaves only traces. From the traces, one can only trace the traces without being able to embrace them.

Apophatic theology is a moment of *differ(a)nce*, that is, in addition to emphasizing difference, it is also a strategy of constant postponement of the Ultimate Reality by way of negation (Hardiman, 2025). Positive theology will certainly affix terms that imply that Ultimate Reality can be fully and correctly understood. Apophatic theology, therefore, works the other way around, negating Ultimate Reality to suspend the finality of understanding. For deconstructionists, the finality of understanding is abhorrent because it captures and imprisons truth in a static state. It clearly demonstrates epistemological hubris by claiming to have reached the culmination of understanding the truth.

However, apophatic theology cannot forbid that affirmative statements can be knocked on the door of Ultimate Reality. Still, apophatic theology asserts that the door will not be opened, and Ultimate Reality will not reveal itself or even peek through the window. As Lao-Tzu said, "The 'name' which can be designated by the word 'name' is not the real Name." (Izutsu, 2016). Therefore, cataphatic theologians need to realize that they cannot guess to describe the Ultimate Reality that hides in the "dark house".

The unnamable is impossible, and it is impossible to conceptualize it. Positively, cataphatic theology is desperate to name it and conceptualize it. In fact, conceptualizing the unnameable through language interpreted by sensory experience and reason is very limited and irrelevant to the enigmatic Reality of the Ultimate. This has the consequence that the labeling in whatever form it is embedded becomes incongruent and is forced to fall into a constant slippage, which paradoxically deconstructs the positive labeling.

Ibn 'Arabi once uttered the aphorism, "Whoever claims to know that Allah is the Creator, without being confused, is the proof of his ignorance." Religious people think that by believing, they can know the full extent of what they call "God". In fact, there is an enigmatic mystery there that cannot be revealed. Hence, Derrida said: "I know nothing, I can only believe (*je ne sais pas, il faut croire*)." This ignorance is a proposition in apophatic theology, so the elasticity of knowledge can only be understood in the operationalization of negativity (Ryadi, 2023).

Apophatic theology is a deconstructive reading of the Ultimate Reality. Difference suggests that what is positively preached will always be missed and singular meanings lost. It is because the continuous delay (*differance*) is a passion to wade into the wilderness of the

unexplored mystery (*Ghayb al-Mutlaq*), the impossible. One of the ways of such delay is through negation, i.e. affixing "the impossible" to the Ultimately Impossible Reality. Although one perceives the Ultimate Reality as "God", "God" *das Ding an sich* remains an enigma in *optima forma*.

In closing, the author will try to see the implications of apophatic theology for perennial philosophy (Lings & Minnaar, 2007). The author would like to place the position of apophatic theology at a balancing point: between approving and criticizing. Perennial philosophy is an idea that proclaims the transcendental unity of religions at the esoteric level. Apophatic theology agrees with that. With apophatics, the Ultimate Reality, at the level of "substance," cannot be segmented and institutionalized by certain theological dogmas, such as the typical expression of the theosophical movement, "There is no religion higher than Truth."(Gardner, 2017).

However, apophatic theology wants to go further. Ultimate Reality remains in the realm of the impossible. Suppose the transcendental unity of religions is understood to be because Ultimate Reality pervades and underlies all forms of religious teachings. In that case, that suggests a politicization of Ultimate Reality that is in the realm of the impossible-not to mention that there is a fundamental relationship between "God," nature, and human beings. In perennial philosophy, metaphysical speculations by way of an excessively positive description of Ultimate Reality are a futile distraction (Livings, 2006).

CONCLUSION

Ultimate Reality is the impossible and the other, which is never present and captured by human reason and perception. One way to understand it is by constant negation and postponing a single, random, and ambiguous *telos*. Deconstruction operates by realizing that the Ultimate Reality is a difference, which is never resolved and cannot be resolved by deconstruction itself. It is left floating with the strategy of playing in the paradox of negativity without deciding on certainty.

REFERENCES

Afifah, P. A. S. (2019). *Analisis Semiotik Pesan Dakwah Islam dalam Tari Sufi Pondok Rumi*. UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.

Al-Fayyadl, M. (2005). *Derrida*. LKiS.

Al-Fayyadl, M. (2012). *Teologi Negatif Ibn Arabi: Kritik Metafisika Ketuhanan*. LKiS.

Alsamaani, N. A. M. (2017). *An Analytic Philosophical Approach to Ibn Arabi's Conception of Ultimate Reality*. University of Birmingham.

Armstrong, K. (2015). *Sejarah Tuhan: Kisah Pencarian Tuhan yang Dilakukan oleh Orang-orang Yahudi, Kristen, dan Islam Selama 3.000 Tahun*. Mizan.

Badri, M. (2018). *Contemplation: An Islamic Psychospiritual Study (New Edition)*. IIIT.

Bagus, L. (2005). *Kamus Filsafat*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Broadie, A. (2003). Maimonides. In *History of Islamic Philosophy*. Routledge.

Chamankhah, L. (2019). *The Conceptualization of Guardianship in Iranian Intellectual History (1800–1989): Reading Ibn ʿArabī's Theory of Wilāya in the Shīʿa World*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Chittick, W. C. (2005). *Ibn 'Arabi: Heir to the Prophets*. Thomson Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research Design Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed*. Pustaka Pelajar.

da Silva, E. S., & Eddy Kristiyanto, A. (2020). Meister Eckhart: Pandangan Teologisnya. *Jurnal Teologi*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24071/jt.v9i01.1874

Gardner, E. L. (2017). There Is No Religion Higher Than Truth. *Filosofia Esoterica*. https://www.filosofiaesoterica.com/there-is-no-religion-higher-than-truth/

Handayani, W. T. (2020). Merawat Pengalaman Mistik dalam Liturgi: Memanfaatkan Olah Batin Lepas Bebas dalam Penyusunan Liturgi. *Kenosis: Jurnal Kajian Teologi*, *8*(1). https://e-journal.iaknambon.ac.id/index.php/KNS/article/view/330

Hardiman, F. B. (2025). *Seni Memahami: Hermeneutik dari Schleiermacher sampai Derrida*. Kanisius.

Hassan, A. A. (2019). The Concept of Evil And Its Truth in View of Philosophical Buildings And The Words Of Reason. *Opción: Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*, *19*. https://produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/opcion/article/view/31556

Huss, B. (2007). The New Age of Kabbalah: Contemporary Kabbalah, the New Age and Postmodern Spirituality. *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/14725880701423014

Izutsu, T. (2016). *Sufism and Taoism: A Comparative Study of Key Philosophical Concept*s. University of California Press.

Kars, A. (2019). *Unsaying God: Negative Theology in Medieval Islam*. Oxford University Press.

Kuswanjono, A. (2006). *Ketuhanan dalam Telaah Filsafat Perennial: Refleksi Plurarisme Agama di Indonesia*. Badan Penerbitan Filsafat Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM).

Lindahl, J. R. (2010). *Paths to luminosity: A Comparative Study of Ascetic and Contemplative Practices in Select Tibetan Buddhist and Greek Christian Traditions*. University of California.

Lings, M., & Minnaar, C. (Eds.). (2007). *The Underlying Religion: An Introduction to the Perennial Philosophy*. World Wisdom.

Livings, E. A. R. (2006). *Open Silence: An Application of the Perennial Philosophy to Literary Creation*. Victoria University of Technology.

Meister, C. (2014). Concepts of God/Ultimate Reality. In *Philosophy of Religion: Palgrave Philosophy Today*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137314758_3

Parsons, W. B. (2013). *Freud and Augustine in Dialogue: Psychoanalysis, Mysticism, and the Culture*

of Modern Spirituality. University of Virginia Press.

Prakash Guda, S., & Avadhanam, S. (2016). Future Global Leaders may be Empowered with Ancient Indian Wisdom. *ICMLG2016-4th International Conference on Management, Leadership, and Governance*.

Price, J. G. (2016). *Approaching an Unknowable God: The Practical and Contemplative Role of Maimonides' Negative Theology in Aquinas and Eckhart*. University of Memphis.

Ryadi, A. (2023). Faith and God, according to Jacques Derrida. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, *22*(65). http://thenewjsri.ro/index.php/njsri/article/view/248

Sabri, M. (2017). *Mengurai Kesenyapan Bahasa Mistik: Dari Filsafat Analitik ke Epistemologi Hudhuri*. Kencana.

Satori, D., & Komariah, A. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Alfabeta.

Schimmel, A. (2011). *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*. The University of North Carolina Press.

Siswadi, G. A., & Murtiningsih, R. S. (2023). Metafisika dalam Pandangan Advaita Vedānta dan DvaitaVedānta: Diskursus Monistik Śańkarācārya dan Dualistik Madhvācārya. *Sophia Dharma: Jurnal Filsafat, Agama Hindu, Dan Masyarakat*, *6*(2). https://www.e-journal.iahn-gdepudja.ac.id/index.php/SD/article/view/1329

Yong, A. (2012). Shunyata: The Nature of the World in Mahayana Traditions. In *The Cosmic Breath*. Brill. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004230491_007