

*K. Waaijman*

---

# MYSTICAL PERSPECTIVES IN INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE

## ABSTRACT

This article discusses the distinction that is being made between the unknowability of God, the source of all that is, and Jesus of Nazareth, the body language of God, from the viewpoint of spirituality with Paul's address at the Areopagus in Athens (Acts 17:16-32) as point of departure. This speech virtually represents the oldest Christian interfaith meeting in which there is a dialogue between religious Athenians and Paul. The article reflects, first of all, on Paul's reaction to the questions and challenges of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers in his audience that relates to this distinction. A second part will investigate the mystical unity of the unknowable God and his body language in Christ. In a third part some mystical perspectives on this distinction in Islam will be analysed.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In *The New SCM Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, recently edited by Philip Sheldrake, the *Images of God* have their own entry. The opening sentence of this lemma reads:

Christianity lives between the recognition, shared with the other Abrahamic traditions and beyond, of the profound unknowability of God, the infinite, inexhaustible source of all that is, and its defining belief in Jesus of Nazareth as *the* expressed image (Col. 1:15) and uttered Word of God (John 1:18), God's own body language as it were (Murray 2005:325).

In this sentence a distinction is articulated which is important from the viewpoint of interfaith dialogue. It distinguishes between the unknowability of God, the source of all that is, and Jesus of Nazareth, the body language of God. The author correctly remarks that the Abrahamic traditions share the first element of this distinction. In Judaism there is the *'Ein Sof*, the Unknown and Unknowable God. Christians believe in one God who created the universe of being. The same is valid for Islam which confesses to the one all encompassing God. The second element, however, is also to some extent held in common. A Christian believes in Christ as God's own body language just as Jews believe in the *Tora* as *the* self expression of God and the Islam believes in Mohammed and the Koran as God's message.

*Prof. Kees Waaijman, Titus Brandsma Institute for Spirituality, Nijmegen, and Research Fellow, Department of New Testament, Faculty of Theology, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.*

Even without complete insight in this distinction between God and his privileged mediation, its importance for interfaith dialogue is immediately evident. The more one emphasises and isolates the first part of the paradox — God is the unknowable, all encompassing source — the more a dialogue is unnecessary, for all images, expressions and words of God are relative and in a sense mutually exchangeable. The more one emphasises and isolates the second part of the distinction — Jesus, the Tora, Mohammed and the Koran are *the* body language of God — the more a dialogue is impossible.

This article will consider this issue from the viewpoint of spirituality. This will be done, firstly, with Paul's address at the Areopagus in Athens (Acts 17:16-32) as point of departure. This speech, virtually representing the oldest Christian interfaith meeting, contains a dialogue between religious Athenians and Paul and raises the issue how Paul reacted to the questions and challenges of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers. The second part of this article will investigate the mystical unity of the unknowable God and his body language in Christ in order to reflect on the relationship between Christ and the unknown God in Christian mysticism. In the third part some aspects of the mystical perspective in Islam will be analysed.

## 2. THE UNKNOWN GOD — PAUL AT THE AREOPAGUS

One of the oldest Christian interfaith dialogues is the discussion of Greek philosophers with Paul at the Areopagus, the Hill of Ares where the Counsel of Athens met in the Royal Colonnade (*Stoa Basileios*). Luke reports this meeting in a well-designed narrative (Acts 17:22-31).

In this narrative, Paul firstly, does not talk about the Athenians, but addresses them directly with the remark, "You, Athenians, I see that in every respect you are very religious" (v. 22). During his visit to Athens, Paul observed the religiosity of the Greeks and found that they are "in every respect very religious." Paul grounds his statement on personal observation and research. "For as I walked around looking carefully at your shrines, I even discovered an altar inscribed *To the Unknown God*" (v. 23). He carefully noted the abundant presence of shrines and altars expressing the names and images of the divine reality. But what impressed him was an altar at the margins of this abundant religiosity dedicated to the Unknown God. Several aspects of the name "The Unknown God" are noteworthy (cf. also Van der Horst 1994:186). Some of these aspects are relative: This God is known by some people, but not known by others; in the past the name of this God was unknown, because he had not yet revealed himself, and so on. Some aspects seem to be more essential: We are not able to know this God; only God's works can be known, not his essence; he is only expressible in negations; only mystical transformation mediates knowledge of him. All these relative and essential aspects may be implied in the enigmatic name of the Unknown God.

Paul secondly proclaims this Unknown God: “What therefore you unknowingly worship, I proclaim to you” (v. 23). This proclamation begins with the remark that this Unknown God is the Creator: “... the God who made the world and everything in it, the Lord of heaven and earth,” this Creator God “does not dwell in sanctuaries, made by human hands” (v. 24). The universal God<sup>1</sup> cannot be served by human hands, for he himself is the One “who gives to everyone life and breath and everything” (v. 25). As universal God he created the human race from one flesh, spreading them over the earth in particular places and ordering them in fixed times (v. 26). All these creative activities seem to be the reason why the creatures seek this God. The very reason for their creation seems to be “so that people might seek God, even perhaps grope for him and find him, though indeed he is not far from any of us” (v. 27). In a surprising paradox the Unknown God — receiving an altar at the margins of the abundant religiosity — is proclaimed by Paul to be in the centre: the God who has created humanity from one flesh, living its life in fixed places and times *in order* to seek God! All these people are searching their Creator, the Unknown God! And even greater is the paradox that this Unknown God “is not far from any of us.” This is an understatement, for, as Paul says, “In him we live and move and have our being” (v. 28), followed by a saying of Epimenides of Knossos (6<sup>th</sup> century BCE), a poet of Cilicia: “For we too are his offspring” (v. 28). Our being is born from the Unknown God. Precisely this immediacy is — in my opinion — the most important reason for the impossibility to know him. We can not objectify the indwelling presence of the Creator. He is unknowable by essence, because in him we live and move and are. There is no distance. Our very being is immediately unified (not identified) with his being. This is the unknowability of our Creator. We flow from God. This is the very reason why every objectivation of this Unknown God will fail, as Paul remarks, “Since therefore we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the divinity is like an image fashioned from gold, silver or stone by human art and imagination” (v. 29). Since we *are* the immediate creation of the Unknown God, we cannot realise the distance needed for representation, understanding and imagination (v. 30). We *are* the offspring of God the Creator. We are his body language. In Paul’s proclamation he thus brings in the centre what is marginalised in Athens. He does not tell something new or something particular. On the contrary, he proclaims what is hidden at the background of all the shrines: the Unknown God, known by all people as their unknowable Creator. We are seeking him, groping for him and finding him — because he is the One in whom we live, move and are. He is the most forgotten Mystery, because he is unknowable by essence. But this precisely is for Paul — at the margins of shrines — the meeting place between the religiosity of the Greeks and the Christians. Here is the place where the interfaith dialogue can begin.

---

1 Cf. Welzen (2005:24-31) for this notion.

In a third step Paul offers his hearers a new perspective on the end time: “God had overlooked the times of not-knowing,” says Paul, but now he demands, that all people everywhere repent, because he has established a day on which he will “judge the world with justice” through a man he has appointed, and he has provided confirmation for all “by raising him from the dead” (vv. 30-31). At this moment Paul proclaims his particular message about Christ as the man God appointed to judge on the day he himself established. Paul asks a shift of perspective regarding the unknown God. God has overlooked the times of not-knowing, belonging to the perspective of creation. Now the end time is coming, the time for conversion, the time for the Messiah, the day of judgment. This is the new perspective Paul presents to his hearers: the time of redemption, the end time, God’s time beyond time. This does not mean that from now on the unknowability of God will end. On the contrary, the darkness of the death of the Messiah will plunge us in an even deeper darkness, the darkness of the cross. But precisely this darkness is the point where the Unknown God grasps his Messiah, and draws him into his life, and raises him from the death. The Unknown God, at the margins of the shrines and the altars, appears to be not only the all-encompassing Creator but also the compassionate Redeemer — revealing his redemption at the margins of life in the death of his Messiah. The Unknown God reveals his silent presence in the absolute liminality of Christ’s death. This is the second place where Paul invites us to complete our interfaith dialogue: the Unknowable God beyond death.

In this regard it is insightful to consider Paul’s rhetorical strategy. Firstly, Paul brings us to the margins of the abundant and expressive religiosity, to the Unknown and Unknowable God, to the Creator of all that is. Secondly, Paul brings us to the margins of this Unknown God, the death of his Son, the Messiah, who lost himself, in the darkness of God dying on a cross, completely annihilated – but grasped by God in the moment of nothingness. Paul in his first Letter to the Corinthians calls this nothingness “the foolishness of the cross” (1 Cor. 1:18) which is identical with “the foolishness of God” (1 Cor. 1:25). This foolishness, this nothingness regarding our knowledge, is the place where Christians are called to be. Paul writes:

Just consider your own call, brothers. Not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth. But God chose what was foolish in the world to shame the wise. God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong. God chose what is low and despised in the world, things that are nothing, to reduce to nothing things that are something (1 Cor. 1:26-28).

### 3. TRANSFORMED IN GOD WITHOUT FORM — THROUGH CHRIST

Central in Christian spirituality is the conformity to Christ. But this process of conformity is not the end. The end is the transformation in God without form — through Christ. As Bonaventura says in his *Itinerarium in Deum*, by the interiorisation of Christ's life, the original image of God in humanity rises to the surface and a person achieves union with God who is above all creatures and surpasses all knowledge.<sup>2</sup> Suso (1966:174) remarks: "A resigned person must be stripped of his creaturely form, formed in Christ, and transformed by the Deity." All spiritual forms, including Christ as a form, initiate people into God without form. This is also the vision of John of the Cross. All spiritual forms point at the transformation in God. This transformation goes through a deep and painful process of annihilation, through the nothingness of the cross. This process of annihilation touches all levels of our being, both the so called natural forms and the supernatural forms (cf. *The ascent of Mount Carmel* II,12,3). Regarding the natural forms John of the Cross observes:

Transformation in God makes the soul so consonant with the simplicity and purity of God in which there is no form or imaginative figure, that it leaves her clean, pure and empty of all forms and figures (*Spiritual canticle* B, 26,17; cf. also *The ascent of Mount Carmel* II,8,5).

Not only the natural form language of our apprehensions and imaginations, but also the supernatural forms will be transformed in the Unformed; the soul must "also darken and blind itself in the part of its nature that bears relation to God and spiritual things" (*The ascent of Mount Carmel* II,4,2). Forms — as the shrines and the altars for the Athenians — are necessary for beginners to ignite their soul in love via apprehension, imagination and understanding. One must go through them, not remain stuck in them.

God cannot be grasped in any supernatural image (*The ascent of Mount Carmel* III,12,1) or spiritual communication (*ibidem*, III,14,1). All our faculties have to be emptied, our intellect, our will and our memory. Especially our memory, our well organised archive, filled with all we have lived through, precious forms shaping our future, has to be emptied. Precisely our self-organised past has to be given up at the moment of transformation in God. As John of the Cross remarks:

God has no form or image comprehensible to the memory. Therefore the memory is without form, figure or fantasy when united to God. (...) The annihilation of the memory in regard to all forms is an absolute requirement for union with God: the memory must empty and divest itself of all communications and forms. (...) Union with God cannot be wrought

---

2 Cf. Bonaventura (1996:159).

without a complete separation of the memory from all forms that are not God (*ibidem*, III,2,4).

This process of emptying, annihilation and absolute poverty will elicit fear and disorientation — even foolishness. But gradually to the degree that God informs our memory with his unforeseen presence, a person will feel secure.

There should not be any fear because the memory is void of forms and figures. Since God is formless and figureless, the memory walks safely when empty of form and figure, and it draws closer to God. (*Living flame of love*, III,52).

God who is without form — the Unformed, and for that reason the Unknown and Unknowable — waits till the soul loses all her forms and determinations. He waits till the soul is empty, prepared to receive God's presence unconditionally. God waits till he can communicate himself unconditionally to the pure heart.

Some other voices of the Christian mystical tradition provide a deeper insight in the mystical “nothing.”

Dionysios the Areopagite is sometimes described as one of the Athenians who listened to Paul on the Areopagus and who was initiated by him in the mystical “nothing.” He was, however, a Syriac author from the sixth century. In his *Mystical theology* he gives his disciple Timothy advice for his mystical journey, particularly regarding the faculty of our intellect. Ascending higher on the mystical mount Sinai, Timothy should leave behind “everything perceptible and understandable” (Pseudo-Dionysius 1987:135). Only when he has separated himself from his being a knowing subject and from all things knowable, he can “unknowingly” strive upward toward the union with the One who is “beyond all being and knowledge” (Pseudo-Dionysius 1987:137). Unknowingness is to be freed from the structure of knowledge as such. Therefore, when Moses the mystic makes the decisive transition, he breaks free of them:<sup>3</sup>

... away from what he sees and what is seen, and plunges into the truly mysterious darkness of unknowing. Here, renouncing all that the mind may conceive, wrapped entirely in the intangible and the invisible, he belongs completely to him who is beyond everything. Here being neither oneself nor someone else, one is supremely united by a completely unknowing inactivity of all knowledge, and knows beyond the mind by knowing nothing (Pseudo-Dionysius 1987:137).

Knowing (“being seen and seeing”) has been rendered as knowing nothing and precisely this knowing nothing is a way of being beyond everything, completely “unified” — not “identified”! — with the unknown God.

---

3 That is the conceptual heights of the holiest places of God.

Bernard of Clairvaux is particularly interested in the faculty of the will. His experience is making oneself conform (*sese conformare*) to the Creator. It is making a transition (*transire*), by which the soul is made divine (*deificari* ; Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Diligendo Deo* 10, 28):

Just as a little drop of water mixed with a lot of wine seems entirely to lose its own identity, while it takes on the taste of wine or its color; just as iron, heated and glowing, looks very much like fire, having divested itself of its original and characteristic appearance; and just as air flooded with the light of the sun is transformed into the same splendor of light so that it appears not so much lighted up as to be light itself; so it will inevitably happen that in saints every human affection will then, in some ineffable manner, melt away from self and be entirely transfused into the will of God (Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Diligendo Deo* 10, 28).

One finds a very strong awareness of the radical nothingness as the place of the birth into God in the writings of Meister Eckhart. For him only when a person lets go of all forms, the natural as well as the supernatural, the transformation in God can take place.

For a truly perfect man should be accustomed to be dead in himself, stripped of himself in God, and so conformed to God's will that his whole happiness consists in not knowing himself or anything but God alone, to will nothing nor to know anything, but God's will and to wish to know God as God knows me, as St. Paul says. God knows everything that he knows and loves (Meister Eckhart 1958:117-118).

To come to this birth into God, a person has to become aware of her nothingness. As Eckhart remarks:

In themselves creatures are a pure nothing. I do not just say that they are insignificant or are only a little something: they are a pure nothing. Whatever has no being is nothing. Creatures have no being in themselves because their being consists in God's presence (Meister Eckhart 1958:69-70).

The same experience has been expressed by Ruusbroec, a Flemish mystic, deeply influenced by Eckhart. He says:

Our immersion in the transformation of God remains eternal, unceasing, once we have gone out of ourselves and possess God in immersion of loving. For if we possess God in immersion of loving, that is: lost to ourselves, God is our own and we are his own and we sink away from ourselves for ever, without return (Ruusbroec, *Opera Omnia* 10,152.).

We sink away from ourselves in his eternal life and

we receive the transformation in God in the wholeness of ourselves. And so we feel completely enfolded in God. (...) Through the transformation we receive from God, we feel swallowed in the fathomless abyss of our eternal bliss where we can never again find a distinction between ourselves and God. (...) Yet at the very moment we want to test and examine what it is we are feeling, we fall back into reason and then we find distinction and otherness between ourselves and God (Ruusbroec, *Opera Omnia* 10, 158-60).

The unformed soul ends up in modelessness.

In the darkness he is enveloped and falls into modelessness as one who wanders about lost. In the bareness, he loses perception and distinction of all things and is transformed and permeated by simple brightness. In the nothingness, he fails in all his activity, for he is overcome by the activity of the fathomless love of God (Ruusbroec, *Opera Omnia* 3, 526).

The last Christian mystic I wish to quote is Johann Tauler, a German mystic in the same mood as Meister Eckhart. John Tauler articulates his insight in this way:

Those who succeed in attaining a thorough knowledge of their own nothingness will have found the nearest, shortest, straightest, and most certain way to the highest and most profound truth we can find on earth. To take that road, no one is too old or too weak, nor too educated or too young, too poor or too rich. That way is called: "I am nothing"! O what an unspeakable life is concealed in that "I am nothing!" Unfortunately, no one wants to take that road, no matter where you look. May God forgive me for saying it! Truly we are, and want to be, and always wanted to be something, to be somebody in the eyes of others. People are so possessed and shackled by that drive that no one wants to relinquish himself. It is easier for a person to do ten other things than to relinquish himself just once (Tauler 1961).

#### 4. THE NON-EXISTENCE AS OUR REAL BEING

Christian mystics show that moments of annihilation and radical detachment are preferential opportunities for God to reveal his unpredictable presence. God's breaking-through in the breaking of the human form, including the Christian form, is the most suitable place for interfaith dialogue. It is the place where people have lost their pre-established patterns of faith. They are the desert of nothingness, the desert of love. Some voices of the Islamic tradition, speaking from their experience of the mystical nothingness, witness to this.

Several Sura's of the Koran, with graphic metaphors and figures of speech, try to open the awareness of the reader that the only One who really is, is God. Everything outside him is perishable, dedicated to the nothingness of time.

Three Sura's are relevant here. "Whatever is with you is temporary, but whatever is with God is permanent" (Sura 16/96). "Everything is perishable except his face" (Sura 28/88). "Truly, we belong to God, are returning to him" (Sura 2/156; Cf. Chittick 1987:379.). In line with these Sura's in the Koran, Islam mystics define the end goal of the spiritual journey as a detachment from every existence outside God. They call it un-becoming or non-existence (*fana*). The mystic is transformed in God, a process of un-becoming. This is the resurrection: being completed in God. The mystic does not belong to any "state" attributed to him from outside. For that reason Rumi, one of the greatest Islamic mystics, can say:

There is no dervish in the world; and if there be, that dervish is really non-existent. He exists relative to the survival of his essence but his attributes are extinguished in the attributes of God. Like the flame of a candle in the presence of the sun, he is really non-existent, though he exists in terms of the form (Rumi, *Mathnawi* 3, 3669. We are following Rumi 1995).

In reality the dervish, that is the perfectly detached, the completely selfless one, has vanished in God's existence as the light of a candle vanishes in the light of the sun. To illustrate this truth Rumi uses the splendid image of the horse which leaves its hoof print in the dust:

My ego passed away for the sake of his Ego. My ego passed away, he alone remains. I roll like dust under his horse's feet. The individual soul became dust: the only trace of it is the print of his feet upon its dust. Become dust at his feet for the sake of that footprint and be as the diadem on the head of an Emperor (Rumi, *Mathnawi* 2, 1170; Rumi 1995:178).

Rolling like dust under the horse's feet, that is un-becoming, the mystical nothingness. Nothing but the hoofprint of the horse's feet upon the dust. "Become dust at his feet for the sake of that footprint."

Another beautiful image of the mystical nothingness is the fly plunged in the honey, a parable of the same mystic Rumi.

When a fly is plunged in honey, all the members of its body are reduced to the same condition, and it does not move. Similarly the term "unbecoming in God" is applied to one who has no conscious existence or initiative or movement. Any action that proceeds from him is not his own. If he is still struggling in the honey, or if he cries out: "Oh, I am drowning," he is not said to be in the state of unbecoming. This is what is signified by the words "I am God". People imagine that this is a presumptuous claim, whereas it is really a presumptuous claim to say "I am the slave of God." The man who says "I am the slave of God" affirms two existences, his own and God's. But he who says "I am God" has made himself unbecoming and has given himself up and says "I am God," i.e. "I am nothing". He is all. There is no being but God's (Rumi, *Fihî, ma fihî*, 49; Rumi 1995:184).

What the mystic discovers at the end of his journey, at the extreme of unbecoming, is in fact the reality of our creation. We as creatures are nothing but the body language of God. Thus Rumi remarks, "We and our existence are non-being. You are the Absolute who appears in the form of mortality. What moves is your gift. Our whole being is your creation" (Rumi, *Fihi, ma fihi*, 107; Rumi 1995:184). He, who descends into the non-being he is, realises the absolutely gratuitous creational transition he at every moment experiences from the side of God: "You revealed the beauty of Being in non-being, after you had permitted a non-being to become infatuated with You" (Rumi, *Fihi, ma fihi*, 107; Rumi 1995:184).

The mystic who goes the way to the extreme of unbecoming arrives at the true depth of his creation. He fulfils the word of the Koran which says: "You will be reverted back to what you were when he made you in the beginning" (Sura 7/29). Eschatology is present in the origin. This fundamental insight is voiced by Rumi as follows:

I died as mineral and became a plant,  
 I died as plant and rose to animal.  
 I died as animal and I was human being.  
 Why should I fear?  
 When was I less by dying?  
 Yet once more I shall die as human being to soar  
 With angels blest; but even from angelhood  
 I must pass on: all except God doth perish.  
 When I have sacrificed my angel-soul,  
 I shall become what no mind e'er conceived.  
 O let me unbecome! For unbecoming  
 Proclaims in organ tones: "To him we shall return!" (Rumi, *Mathnawi* 3,  
 3901; cited in Schimmel 1975:321-322.)

Rumi describes the entire journey from mineral to unbecoming, from inanimate matter to "return" (the *eschaton*). This journey is a process of dying and rising again. Not a single state is final, not even that of angels. The final state is the unbecoming (*fana*), unbecoming from evolution, history and biography. Then the soul has returned to the eternal One who created it.

In the end, the soul is annihilated and passed away in the unbecoming. This is its creation, this is its destiny. As the Sufi mystic Al-Junayd observes: "He annihilated me in generating me. (...) I cannot designate him because he leaves no sign" (quoted in Lanzetta 2001:77). We ourselves are the trace of his generation. Our very being is the trace of his footprint. Our nothingness reveals his mystery.

Being here we are in reality nowhere, because we lose all our referential points. Precisely this nowhere, however, is our divine place. As Rumi remarks:

My place is the Placeless, my trace is the Traceless; 'Tis neither body nor soul, for I belong to the soul of the Beloved. I have put duality away. I have seen that the two worlds are one; One I seek, One I know, One I see, One I call. He is the first, He is the last, He is the outward, He is the inward (Rumi 1998:125).

Unbecoming in God is the place of our real being. Although this is a dark night, it gives us a deep insight in the unity of all religious traditions, as Rumi says: "The lamps are different, but the light is one: it comes from Beyond. If you keep looking at the lamp, you are lost" (Rumi 1998:125). All forms invite us to relinquish them, falling past them into God's unfathomableness. This is the place where a radical openness for other religious traditions can grow. Ibn Arabi remarks, "My heart has become a receptacle for every form, a pasture for gazelles and a cloister for Christian monks" (Chittick 1987:388). At the resurrection, Ibn Arabi continues, God will appear in a multitude of forms, but his creatures will deny him until he appears in a form that corresponds to their own belief, that is, to their own identifications. It is only the perfect human who has interiorised all the divine names in equilibrium, who will recognise God in whatever form he displays.

He who delimits God denies him in everything other than his own delimitation, acknowledging him only when he reveals himself within that delimitation. But he who frees him from all delimitation never denies him, acknowledging him in every form in which he appears (Ibn Arabi, cited Chittick 1987:388-389).

## 5. CONCLUSION

In her inaugural lecture, September 2005, Celia Kourie (2005) has given insight in mysticism as a way of unknowing or nothingness (no-thing-ness). In the introduction of her lecture she pointed at the relevance of this way of unknowing regarding

the oppression that is felt by the narrowness and rigidity of religious dogmatism, particularly where only one view of the Divine is given. Claims of privileged truth, and the realisation that revelatory structures cannot contain the fullness of Reality, has led to an increasing interest in eastern philosophies with the importance given to meditation and silence, greater inter-religious dialogue, and the understanding that mysticism is a phenomenon that cuts across all religious and denominational boundaries (Kourie 2005:1).

This is true, mysticism as a way of unknowing, which is present in all religious traditions, may be the meeting place for interfaith dialogue — beyond the narrowness and rigidity of religious dogmatism, beyond the dangerous claims of privileged truth.

I wholeheartedly share the conclusion of her exploration of the mystical nothingness on behalf of the interfaith dialogue:

Mysticism as a “way of unknowing” as seen in the apophatic wisdom traditions of east and west leads to the silence of *nothingness* which is the root of sound, and intensifies, rather than attenuates authentic communication. It is therefore, the “place” where true dialogue and the meeting of diverse religious traditions, in an atmosphere of “reciprocal transparency,” can occur. Such a creative rapprochement will facilitate and open dialogue in which the different mystical traditions can acknowledge their complementarity and articulate plurality. As such, dogmatic rigidity and colonial intellectualism will be replaced by a deep humility in the face of the infinite mystery and “unknowingness” of the Ultimate (Kourie 2005:8).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

BONAVENTURA, S.

1996. *Itinerarium mentis in Deum. De weg die de geest naar God voert*. J. van Winden (transl. and ed.). Assen: Van Gorcum.

CHITTICK, W.

1987. Eschatology. In: *Islamic spirituality foundations*. London: Routledge.

LANZETTA, B.J.

2001. *The other side of nothingness. Towards a theology of radical openness*. Albany: State University of New York.

KOURIE, C.

2005. *Mysticism: A way of unknowing*. Inaugural lecture read at the University of South Africa, Pretoria.

MEISTER ECKHARDT.

1958. *Treatises and sermons*. J.M. Clark & J.V. Skinner (eds.). New York: Octagon.

1958. *Omne datum optimum*. In: J. Quint (Hrsg.), *Die deutschen und lateinischen Werke*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

MURRAY, P.

2005. *Images of God*. In: P. Sheldrake (ed.), *The New SCM Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*. London: SCM.

- PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS  
1987. *The complete works*. C. Luibheid (trans.). New York-Mahwah: Paulist.
- RUMI, J.  
1995. *Poet and mystic (1207-1273)*. R.A. Nicholson (ed.). Oxford: One World.  
1998. *Selected poems from the Divan – I Shams – I Tabriz*. R. Nicholson (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- RUUSBROEC, J.  
1988. *The sparkling stone. Opera Omnia*. CCCM 103. J. Alaerts (ed.). Turnhout: Brepols.
- SCHIMMEL, A.  
1975. *Mystical dimensions of Islam*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- TAULER, J.  
1961. *Predigten 77*. G. Hoffman (ed.). Freiburg: Herder.
- SUSO, H.  
1966. *Das Leben des seligen Heinrich Seuse*. G. Hoffman (Hrsg.). *Deutsche mystische Schriften*. Düsseldorf: Patmos.
- VAN DER HORST, P.  
1994. The altar of the “Unknown God” in Athens (Acts 17:23) and the cults of “unknown gods” in the Graeco-Roman World. In: P. van der Horst, *Hellenism – Judaism – Christianity. Essays on their interaction*. Kampen: Kok.
- WELZEN, H.  
2005. De geboorte van een universele spiritualiteit. *Speling* 57(3):24-31.

<i>Keywords</i>	<i>Trefwoorde</i>
Spirituality	Spiritualiteit
Interreligious dialogue	Intergodsdienstige gesprek
Nothingness	Niksheid
Mysticism	Mistiek