

UNITED WISDOM

Apophatic theology: what it means to speak through negation

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W36 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Apophatic theology: what it means to speak through negation

> *“Trinity beyond all, beyond divinity and goodness.”*

Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Mystical Theology, I.1, the opening fragment of a prayerful address, translated into English by John Parker. The quotation here is an editorial English translation through the approved Russian version, rendered by the article’s authors from that English text; it is not presented as Parker’s published wording.

About this article

“If nothing precise can be said about God, why do you keep speaking about him?” The question arises naturally when a religious text first calls God good, wise, and living, then withdraws even those words. Thought seems to destroy its own foundation. Yet “this does not exist” and “my description does not exhaust this” are different claims.

Christian apophatic theology examines the limits of human concepts in speech about God. We will consider it alongside cataphatic, or affirmative, speech, through Pseudo-Dionysius’s Mystical Theology and Thomas Aquinas’s account of divine names. Why does denying life not mean death, and why is incomprehensibility not unbelief? What remains after abandoning an exhaustive definition? The article distinguishes prayerful silence, missing information, and a human demand that questions cease. Comparisons will show both a shared caution about language and different objects of negation. The practical application is modest: refine our formulations while retaining the ability to name what is known and answer for our actions.

I. What negative theology negates

Apophatic negation does not necessarily deny the existence of the one being discussed. It may deny the suitability of a particular manner of description. Saying that God has no bodily form differs from saying that God does not exist. Saying that God is not good in the same sense as a particular human action concerns a word’s meaning and how it is applied.

The term derives from a Greek word associated with negation. Its partner is cataphatic theology, the affirmative mode of theological speech. God is named good, wise, creating, loving; inquiry then asks what in these names corresponds to God and what belongs to the human manner of thinking. Negation does not arise in a vacuum. It works with speech already present.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A less difficult example makes the distinction visible. Someone who says, “A friend is not a function to me,” does not deny that the friend helps. They refuse to define the entire person through usefulness. This analogy shows the structure of a limitation but proves nothing about God. Theology asks a question on another scale: can a finite mind encompass the source of being itself?

Sometimes negation concerns an imperfection: God does not change through fatigue or error. Sometimes it concerns an entire category: God cannot be included in a class of objects to which a property is attributed in the same way. Merely accumulating “not” is therefore insufficient. We need to understand which habit of thought each negation seeks to correct.

Otherwise apophatic language becomes a vocabulary of obscurity. Any inconvenient objection can be declared inapplicable because its subject is “above all categories.” But substantive apophatic work must specify a boundary more precisely, rather than simply leave the conversation. Without that work, negation ceases to discipline thought and becomes protection against testing our formulations.

II. Dionysius: prayer before the withdrawal of words

Mystical Theology begins with an address to the Trinity and instruction to Timothy. This matters to the movement of the entire work. Negative language operates within Christian prayer; it does not arise as an independent proof that religion is impossible. In the first chapter the author distinguishes affirmations and negations, warning that they should not be understood as simple opposites. Mystical Theology, chapter I.

The author is conventionally called Pseudo-Dionysius: modern scholarship places the corpus in the late fifth or early sixth century, rather than attributing it to the disciple of the apostle Paul in the New Testament account. His thought combines a Christian context with late Neoplatonism. This historical distinction allows a more precise reading, without reducing the work to either a secret apostolic transcript or renamed pagan philosophy. SEP historical and philosophical overview.

The prayerful opening and radical negations stand beside each other in Dionysius. A modern reader may find this contradictory: why address someone about whom you refuse to speak? The author, however, distinguishes a relation to God from possession of an exhaustive concept of God. Addressing someone does not require having already enclosed the addressee within a definition.

Another model of understanding becomes visible. We usually assume that knowledge grows as a description acquires more features. The apophatic path asks whether, at some point, the opposite happens: the features create an appearance of possessing what they cannot exhaust. Moving forward then includes relinquishing earlier confidence.

This does not mean the author rejects Scripture, church life, or theological reasoning. His corpus includes works on divine names and hierarchies. A short treatise on silence cannot be extracted from that setting and turned into permission to consider any private feeling the highest religious authority. Apophatic speech has a context that restrains arbitrariness.

III. Why “not living” does not mean “dead”

The hardest aspect of apophatic language is its refusal to choose between familiar opposites. The fifth chapter of Mystical Theology negates not only sensory features but concepts of mind, knowledge, light, and life. Yet the author does not propose assigning God to the opposite category. The movement goes beyond the pair itself. Chapters IV–V.

In ordinary speech, denying life suggests death or lifelessness. This works for objects that can be living or nonliving in the sense accessible to us. Dionysius does not treat God as one more object in that series. The negation therefore means that our manner of attributing life does not encompass God. It does not mean that God lacks life.

The difference between transcendence and privation is substantial. Privation is the absence of something that might have been present. Transcendence in apophatic thought means that the subject cannot be placed within the same scale. Readers may reject this metaphysics, but understanding the text first requires recognizing the claim being made.

The same distinction gives rise to luminous darkness, an image that sounds like a poetic riddle. In the first chapter Dionysius invokes Moses ascending into divine darkness: progress in understanding does not finish God within a clear image. Darkness marks a limit of comprehension, not an evil force or a lack of intelligence. Chapter I, §3, and chapter II.

This cannot be turned into an empirical account of a brain state. The theological word “darkness” does not measure neural activity, and “going beyond” does not automatically identify a psychological technique. The text discusses the human relation to God through philosophy, Scripture, and prayerful language.

The most honest encounter with a paradox does not rush to agreement or ridicule. It first reconstructs the question being answered. Here the question is not whether life can exist without life. It is how far the human concept of life is suitable for describing its divine source.

IV. Affirmative names remain necessary

If every name is limited, can God be called good in a way that still means something? A call for silence alone does not resolve this. Religious life contains prayers, doctrinal claims, and moral distinctions. These cannot survive if words lose all determinacy.

In the Summa Theologiae, Thomas Aquinas examines the application of divine names. He rejects both an entirely identical meaning of names in God and creatures and a complete disconnection between meanings. The analogical mode matters: names are related through the creature's relation to its source but do not exhaust that source. Summa Theologiae, I, question 13, article 5.

To feel the problem, compare three possibilities. In the first, "God is wise" means literally what "this person is wise" means, only to a greater degree. In the second, "wise" applied to God means something completely alien to human wisdom; its use then becomes puzzling. The third preserves a connection while limiting identity. It allows speech to continue without declaring it exhaustive.

The third possibility is not a simple compromise between two extremes. Saying that meanings partly coincide and partly differ is insufficient. We must explain the relation through which the connection is maintained. In Aquinas's argument considered here, it is the creature's relation to its source. Analogical speech therefore does not mean freely choosing an attractive metaphor: the connection between names must be grounded within the theological argument. Remove that foundation and only a promise remains that one word somehow fits two different subjects. Greater emotional persuasiveness cannot replace the explanation either. A name may move the reader deeply, but the strength of the response does not establish the relation that makes its theological use meaningful.

It helps to distinguish transferring a word from enlarging a property. In a hypothetical discussion, one participant proposes imagining divine wisdom as a human ability intensified without limit. Another notices that enlargement preserves the earlier model: a being gathers information, corrects errors, and gradually understands more. How well does that manner of description fit the one they call God? Adding "infinitely" or "perfectly" does not settle the question. They first need to understand which features of human wisdom belong to its limited manner of realization. This example calls for testing not the magnitude of the attributed property but the way it is conceived.

The reverse movement is insufficient too: excluding recognizable features does not automatically complete the task. If the refined word no longer allows any distinction, readers may ask whether a claim remains at all. This is precisely why an affirmative name remains a necessary partner to negation. It retains the question of content, while negation examines excess in the way that content is presented.

Such work leaves room for substantive disagreement. One reader may accept the theological foundation of analogy; another may consider it unproven. But the dispute now concerns a specific foundation and a specific manner of speech. It need not become a choice between a literal portrait of God and the complete meaninglessness of all divine names.

This reasoning cannot simply be called a softened version of Dionysius. Their questions and methods differ. Aquinas constructs an argument about predication, or the attribution of properties. Dionysius also examines the movement of negations in prayerful theology. Comparing them remains useful: it shows that linguistic limits can lead not only to silence but to more carefully constructed speech.

Readers can distinguish two claims: “my formulation is meaningful” and “my formulation exhausts its subject.” There is space between them. We can speak reliably about some aspects of a person without believing we have understood them completely. Theology poses a harder question, but the logical discipline of this difference remains recognizable.

The affirmative and negative paths can therefore be considered a mutual check. Affirmative speech prevents negation from dissolving its subject into indeterminacy. Negation prevents affirmative speech from turning concepts into an enclosed portrait of God. The tension remains because neither side has the right to eliminate the other with a convenient slogan.

V. Apophatic theology, agnosticism, and atheism

Apophatic theology is not equivalent to agnosticism. Agnostic positions concern the possibility or sufficiency of knowledge about God’s existence and nature; their forms differ. Christian apophatic theology usually already operates within faith, examining the limits of comprehending the one addressed. Using the same word, “unknowable,” does not create the same position.

Nor is it equivalent to atheism. Denying that God is an object among objects cannot automatically be translated into denying God. Christian texts may affirm both the possibility of knowledge about God and the impossibility of exhaustive comprehension. The Catholic catechism places knowledge of God alongside the requirement to purify language of limited human representations. Catechism, §§39–43.

Nevertheless, this distinction should not protect every religious formulation. Someone may ask what content remains after all the qualifications, and which grounds support the existence of this particular God. Apophatic theology alone does not replace a full answer to those questions. It establishes conditions of language; proof and faith require separate consideration.

For example, “God is above good and evil” can, without context, mean several incompatible things. In one case, the speaker limits the application of human categories. In another, they permit moral indifference. In a third, they justify a religious leader’s arbitrary actions. The phrase’s outward similarity does not make its meaning and consequences identical.

Precision also helps a nonbelieving reader. Substantive criticism must address what a teaching actually claims. If all negative theology is read in advance as timid atheism, the dispute misses its subject. If every objection is declared evidence of insufficient spiritual experience, discussion becomes impossible too.

We can recognize the intellectual force of a question about language without accepting its religious answer. Such reading need end neither in conversion nor in a refutation of faith. Sometimes a sufficient result is to see exactly where initial assumptions differ. Disagreement becomes clearer, and therefore more respectful and serious.

VI. Silence preceded by work

Apophatic silence is not equivalent to an absence of thought. In the texts discussed, it follows complex work with words, images, and distinctions. Simply falling silent for a few minutes and declaring the resulting quiet a theological achievement cannot reproduce it.

There are different kinds of silence. Someone remains silent because they do not know a fact; because they fear the consequences; because they respect another's grief; because words cannot be found; or because they consider any words inadequate here. These cases look similar but have different grounds. A spiritual interpretation of one does not automatically apply to the others.

Consider a hypothetical example: a friend speaks of a loss, and the listener responds with a general formula about God's incomprehensible will. Perhaps they intend humility. For the friend, however, the phrase may close the possibility of speaking about pain. The issue is not whether the theological claim is true within its tradition, but what work it performs in this conversation.

Sometimes a more precise silence means refusing to explain another's loss while remaining present and ready to help. This is a modern ethical application of linguistic limitation, not an interpretation claiming that Dionysius wrote a guide to supporting grief. It rests on the distinction between acknowledging a limit and withdrawing from a relationship.

Silence also cannot be demanded where facts are needed. In discussions of harm, a broken agreement, or an abuse of power, incomprehensibility does not answer what happened. Religious mystery does not make the amount of a debt or the content of a promise mysterious. Sometimes mature respect for linguistic limits requires naming the known very concretely.

Silence becomes substantive when it preserves the possibility of hearing. If it prevents someone from describing what happened or examining an authority's actions, it serves another function. Apophatic vocabulary alone does not guarantee that this function is good.

VII. The mystery of God and the mystery of someone else’s decision

Another distinction is needed to prevent negative theology from justifying any uncertainty. God’s incomprehensibility and missing information about a human act belong to different orders. A theologian claims that no finite definition exhausts God. When a manager conceals a dismissal’s reason or a religious guide refuses to explain a demand, the circumstances can in principle be clarified. Their unknown character does not become sacred because the speaker uses “mystery.”

This also distinguishes two kinds of humility. One acknowledges that I cannot turn God into an object possessed through a successful formula. Another is sometimes proposed as an obligation: I have no right to understand events or ask questions. No necessary transition connects them. Limited human knowledge also applies to the person demanding trust. Their confidence does not become infinite beside my limitations. On the contrary, a shared limit can ground mutual patience and a more honest conversation.

A useful boundary of application emerges. Where a fact must be established, negative theology does not replace inquiry. Where a rule of shared life is needed, it does not replace discussion. Its own field is the relation between our concepts and the one Christian thought names God. We may take a discipline of cautious speech from that field, but the transfer remains our action and responsibility. It does not automatically become Dionysius’s teaching.

Acknowledging incomprehensibility does not require considering all representations equally successful. An image of God that justifies cruelty can be criticized on moral and theological grounds. A conclusion contradicting its source text can be shown to do so. An inexhaustible subject is not the same as an absence of criteria for discussing it. A sea horizon cannot be grasped by hand, but not every coastal map is therefore accurate. Apophatic theology leaves room to correct human speech precisely because that speech does not possess its subject finally.

A logical clarification is also necessary. In ordinary reasoning, “not living” denies a property of an object to which that property is applicable. When an apophatic author negates both sensory and intelligible definitions, they question the adequacy of the system through which properties are applied. We cannot immediately conclude that they license contradictory assertions about any object. Criticizing a concept’s boundaries does not directly lead to abandoning consistent reasoning.

Compare the expression “a long wait.” Length is measured in space, but the word works differently here. We need not declare the phrase meaningless; we clarify how the transfer works. Theological analogy is more complex, yet this ordinary example shows why modes of

use must be distinguished. Precision does not always mean applying one vocabulary literally to everything about which we can speak.

This does not give every obscure expression meaning. An author must still show why a definition is withdrawn and which question remains. Readers should ask about this. If every question meets another negation without distinguishing subjects, an argument may never emerge. Apophatic theology investigates the limit of speech; its name cannot guarantee in advance the success of every mysterious-looking text.

VIII. Incomprehensibility does not abolish moral distinction

The limits of human words do not make every act equally permissible. Moving from “I do not exhaust God through a concept” to “I cannot distinguish violence from care” changes the subject. Apophatic theology does not supply the required grounds for that move.

This boundary matters especially with someone who declares themselves a conduit of truth unavailable to everyone else. If every demand to explain an action receives “this is beyond your understanding,” incomprehensibility becomes a tool of power. Readers should distinguish a theological claim about God from a human claim to exemption from accountability.

A priest, teacher, or author remains a person whose actions can be examined. Their ideas may be profound and some words difficult. This does not remove the need for consent, clear boundaries, and the possibility of ending participation. Even the most radical language of spiritual self-renunciation does not establish another person’s right to control your life without consent.

The modern analogy itself also has a limit. Apophatic theology helps criticize overconfident descriptions, but a principle of modesty alone does not create a complete ethical system. Discussing justice requires affirmative grounds: dignity, obligations, harm, care, rights. If only distrust of every concept remains, nothing is left with which to defend someone.

In a hypothetical example, someone explains their cruelty by saying that “ordinary morality is too small for the higher path.” We can acknowledge that philosophical accounts of morality are more complex than everyday slogans. Nevertheless, actual cruelty requires explanation and an end to harm, rather than certification of the speaker’s spiritual rank. An act’s consequences do not disappear because the vocabulary is complex.

Respect for what cannot be comprehended can accompany definite responsibility for what can. There is no contradiction. Rather, recognizing the limits of one’s knowledge should restrain imposing unverified absolute decisions on others.

IX. Words that do not take possession of their subject

Apophatic theology asks a difficult question: can we speak meaningfully without believing that our speech gives us possession of its subject? Christian answers include Scripture, prayer, negation, analogy, and silence. They do not reduce to a single universal formula.

Dionysius does not abolish God through a sequence of negations. Aquinas does not turn divine names into ordinary properties of an enormous being. Their differing approaches preserve the tension between the necessity of speech and its limited adequacy. Understanding this work requires holding both sides together.

For today’s reader, the value may be a small but significant change of habit. Say less when a grand phrase lays claim to another’s fate. Speak more precisely when obscurity conceals known harm. Allow that what matters to a person is not exhausted by their current description, while retaining an explainable choice.

Not all ignorance is sacred. Not all silence is profound. But not all precision requires a finished portrait of everything that exists. Sometimes a good formulation knows its measure. Apophatic theology invites serious inquiry into that measure—within Christian faith and, through careful modern comparison, within our responsibility for words.

What this means in practice

A modern reader can apply an apophatic distinction to their language while preserving the difference between this exercise and Christian prayer. The aim is not to achieve a mystical state, but to reduce inadvertent exaggeration in our formulations.

Choose one significant claim: about someone close, about your failure, or about what makes life worthwhile. Write it in ordinary words. Then ask what is known and what is assumed. “They never respected me” may contain facts about several acts and an unsupported conclusion about the whole person. Refinement need not excuse the acts. It helps separate an event from a total portrait.

Next, name the formulation’s limit. “These actions were humiliating; I do not know everything they thought.” This does not cancel the first claim; it limits the second. Sometimes the revision clarifies the decision: a boundary can be set without claiming complete knowledge of another’s inner life.

Reading a religious text suggests a different sequence. First find the affirmative claim. Then establish what exactly the author negates. Finally, check whether the text returns to prayer, action, or a specific teaching. A paradox then ceases to be an isolated attractive phrase and becomes a movement of thought.

If you already participate in Christian life, this work can take place within your tradition, discussing difficult passages with a competent interlocutor. The article does not establish one prayer practice for different denominations. If you do not share the faith, understanding the argument's logic is enough, without imitating religious experience.

The final check concerns the new formulation's consequences. Did caution help name what is known more clearly? Did it allow another's clarification to be heard? Or did it become a convenient reason to decide nothing? Limiting a claim to omniscience can help. Limiting the right to act for one's safety is an entirely different result. They must not be confused.

Key quotation

> *"It is neither darkness nor light."*

Pseudo-Dionysius, Mystical Theology, V, John Parker's translation. Editorial English translation through the approved Russian rendering by the article's authors, not a reproduction of Parker's published wording. Both familiar definitions are negated. The point is to limit how these properties are attributed, rather than choose darkness instead of light.

Connections across traditions

These are our analytical comparisons. They show a shared question and a boundary between answers; by themselves, they do not establish historical influence.

Question	Positions and sources	Actual similarity	Boundary of comparison
Negation and naming	Dionysius, I.1–2 and Aquinas, I q13 a5	Both examine meaningful speech about God without an exhaustive definition.	Dionysius also considers prayerful ascent; Aquinas's argument about analogy is not merely a shortened account of that path.
Conceptual limits and actual speech	Dionysius, IV–V and Catechism, §§39–43	Acknowledging limits accompanies continued theological speech.	The catechetical text provides a Catholic framework; it does not automatically explain every radical formula in Dionysius.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Question	Positions and sources	Actual similarity	Boundary of comparison
Negative instruction	Dionysius, V and Brihadaranyaka, II.3.6	Negation can limit an affirmative image; a negative movement need not mean the subject's absence.	Brahman and the Christian Trinity belong to different teachings. One passage does not represent every Vedanta school; influence is not established here.
God is not a bodily object	Dionysius, IV and Shneur Zalman, Tanya, chapter 7	A bodily picture may distort a claim about God.	Nonliteral tzimtzum in this Hasidic text and apophatic ascent have different tasks and conceptual structures.
What exactly is limited	Dionysius, I.2 and Epictetus, §§1, 5	Our comparison distinguishes subject, judgment, and excessive human claims.	Stoic control of one's judgment is not negative theology and does not prove God's incomprehensibility.

Sources

• Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. Mystical Theology, chapter I, §§1–2, translated by John Parker: prayerful opening and the relation of affirmations to negations.

• The same work. Chapter I, §3; chapter II: Moses, divine darkness, and the movement of negation.

• The same work. Chapters IV–V: negation of sensory and intelligible definitions.

• Kevin Corrigan and L. Michael Harrington. Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: historical context, the corpus, and the distinction between negation and privation.

• Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologiae, I, q.13, especially a.5: analogical application of divine names.

• Catechism of the Catholic Church. §§39–43, How Can We Speak about God?: limited yet meaningful language about God.

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

• Shneur Zalman of Liadi. Tanya, Shaar Hayichud Vehaemunah, chapter 7, with Chabad commentary: a nonliteral understanding of tzimtzum and the impossibility of attributing bodily movement to God.

• Epictetus. Enchiridion, §§1, 5, translated by Elizabeth Carter: one's action and judgment distinguished from external circumstances (§§1, 5); comparing grounds of responsibility without equating Stoic and Christian goals.

Tags

apophatic theology, apophasis, cataphatic theology, negation, theology, Christianity, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Mystical Theology, Thomas Aquinas, divine names, analogy, Trinity, prayer, silence, divine darkness, incomprehensibility, privation, transcendence, agnosticism, atheism, language, concept, limits of knowledge, Scripture, Neoplatonism, Brahman, tzimtzum, comparative philosophy, responsibility, precision of speech

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.