HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies
ISSN: (Online) 2072-8050, (Print) 0259-9422

Hesychasm as a *locus theologicus*: The epistemology of experience in Gregory Palamas

Author:
Wojciech Słomski[1]

Affiliation:
[1]Vizja University, Warsaw, Poland

Corresponding author:
Wojciech Słomski,
slomski@autograf.pl

Dates:
Received: 22 Jan. 2026
Accepted: 05 Mar. 2026
Published: 30 Apr. 2026

How to cite this article:
Słomski, W., 2026, 'Hesychasm as a *locus theologicus*: The epistemology of experience in Gregory Palamas', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 82(1), a11277. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v82i1.11277

Copyright:
© 2026. The Author. Licensee: AOSIS.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Read online:
Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

This article argues that hesychasm, as articulated by Gregory Palamas, constitutes a genuine *locus theologicus* when 'experience' is construed within a disciplined epistemological and ecclesial framework. Against both rationalist reductions of theology to discursive inference and subjectivist appeals to immediate experience, Gregory Palamas develops a participatory epistemology in which knowledge of God is grounded in communion rather than representation. The study demonstrates that the essence–energies distinction functions not merely as a metaphysical thesis but as an epistemological grammar that renders real, non-exhaustive knowledge of God possible while preserving apophatic restraint. Through a close hermeneutical analysis of Palamas' Greek texts – situated within the broader patristic tradition and critically engaged with recent debates in theological epistemology – the article shows that Palamas' conception of experience is neither autonomous nor optional. It is ecclesially mediated, normed by ascetical discernment, and oriented towards deification.

Contribution: By reframing hesychasm as a *locus theologicus*, the current study contributes to contemporary discussions on religious experience, participatory realism and theological method. Thus, it proposes a model in which lived communion and doctrinal rigour prove mutually constitutive, not opposed.

Keywords: hesychasm; Gregory Palamas; locus theologicus; theological epistemology; religious experience; essence–energies distinction; participation; deification.

Introduction

Hesychasm [ἡσυχία, *hēsychia*, stillness] and its Palamite articulation remain a decisive test-case for any contemporary theology that wishes to take 'experience' seriously without collapsing into either romantic subjectivism or a rationalism that treats the knowledge of God as primarily inferential. In Gregory Palamas (1296–1359) the question is not merely whether mystical experience occurs but what kind of epistemic claim it can bear within the Church's dogmatic grammar: how an experience [ἐμπειρία, *empeiria*] may function as a *locus theologicus* without being absolutised into a private criterion of truth, and how apophatic restraint can coexist with a robust affirmation that God is genuinely known and participated [μεθεκτός, *methektos*] in the economy of salvation. Palamas's insistence that 'we know our God from his energies [ἐκ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν, *ek tōn energeiōn*], but we do not claim to approach his essence [οὐσία, *ousia*]' has become both a central Orthodox axiom and a continuing ecumenical provocation precisely because it binds together ontology and epistemology in a single theological claim about communion [koinōnia] (Bradshaw 2004; Pino 2023; Streza 2024). In this context, the term *locus theologicus* is used in its strict methodological sense: a 'place' or normative source within which theological claims can be responsibly grounded and tested. Classical accounts (from Cano onwards) distinguished several loci that carry decisive authority (e.g. scripture and tradition) from derivative loci (e.g. reason, history and experience) whose theological weight depends on their rule-governed integration into the Church's doctrinal grammar. In the present article, hesychasm is proposed as a *locus theologicus* not in competition with scripture or tradition, but as a disciplined mode in which the Church's faith becomes epistemically articulate through sanctified participation. Put differently, 'experience' functions here neither as private evidence nor as an autonomous criterion, but as ecclesially mediated participation that can yield genuine theological insight precisely because it is normed by the Church's continuity of worship, doctrine and sanctity.

The social and ecclesial value of revisiting Palamas' epistemology of experience is sharpened by at least three contemporary pressures. Firstly, global Christianity is marked by intensified appeals to 'experience' (spiritual, charismatic, therapeutic and contemplative) as a privileged access to truth, often in ways that bypass or weaken traditioned discernment; the result is

frequently polarisation between experiential immediacy and doctrinal normativity. Secondly, the academic study of religion has increasingly foregrounded embodiment, affect and practice – sometimes at the cost of treating theological truth-claims as secondary to descriptive phenomenology. Thirdly, within ecumenical dialogue, Palamas is repeatedly invoked (positively or negatively) as an emblem of an allegedly 'different' Eastern account of divine simplicity, divine presence and participation – matters that bear directly on how communities pray, preach and form persons. Recent debates about panentheism, divine simplicity, and the essence–energies distinction show that the Palamite problematic is not a medieval curiosity but a living doctrinal fault line with systematic consequences (Carey 2024; Dumsday 2021; Ladouceur 2024).

Despite a vast literature on Palamas, the specific question of how 'experience' functions epistemologically – what it is, how it is mediated, and how it is normed – often appears either presupposed (as 'mysticism') or reduced to a slogan ('essence–energies') without a sufficiently controlled account of its inferential and ecclesial logic. Classic 20th-century interpretations established enduring coordinates: Vladimir Lossky's (1957) apophatic synthesis and his insistence on the inseparability of theology and mysticism, and Meyendorff's historical-theological reconstruction of the hesychast controversy as a doctrinal defence of real communion with God (Meyendorff 1959, 1974). Yet the last decade has seen a methodological intensification: analytic and metaphysical engagements that test the coherence of the distinction (Bradshaw 2023; Dumsday 2021), renewed patristic contextualisations (Streza 2024), and systematic accounts that treat Palamas' entire corpus rather than selected loci (Pino 2023).

At the same time, recent scholarship has highlighted how Palamas' account of divine knowledge cannot be isolated from: (1) his anti-Barlaamite polemic concerning the limits of discursive reasoning, (2) his theological account of illumination and the uncreated light, and (3) his ecclesial criteria of discernment. Studies explicitly addressing 'knowledge of God' and method show both promise and remaining gap. Wojciech Micał's systematic mapping of Palamas' modes of knowing underscores that the 'vision of Taboric light' is called 'knowledge' only καταχρηστικῶς [*katachrēstikōs*, improperly], precisely to protect the apophatic reserve whilst affirming real participation (Micał 2021). Zhukovskyy's (2019) analysis of Palamas' 'triangle' (apophatic, cataphatic, antinomy) demonstrates that epistemology in Palamas is structurally antinomic rather than simply negative or positive.

Yet two problems persist in the current state of research:

- Conceptual underdetermination of 'experience': Even when 'experience' is invoked, it often remains unclear whether it denotes: (1) ascetical-psychological states, (2) sacramental-ecclesial participation, (3) a noetic illumination [νοῦς, *nous*] reconfigured by grace, or (4) an eschatological foretaste [πρόγευσις, *progeusis*] of deification. Without disambiguation, the term becomes rhetorically powerful but analytically weak.
- Insufficient integration of sources, practices and epistemic norms: The epistemology of experience is sometimes extracted from Palamas' polemical passages without sustained attention to how his claims are anchored in the ascetical tradition (Philokalia) and in the Church's criteria of discernment, or how they function within his broader dogmatic commitments (Trinity, Christology and soteriology).

This article emanates from the thesis that Palamas' epistemology of experience is best construed as an ecclesially governed, participatory realism: (1) realism, because the object known is truly God-in-energies (not a created sign or subjective projection); (2) participatory, because knowledge is inseparable from communion and transformation [θέωσις, *theōsis*]; (3) ecclesially governed, because the evidential force of experience is normed by traditioned discernment, not by private immediacy. The heart of the framework is thus the Palamite claim that the uncreated energies are neither mere effects nor a secondary 'thing', but God's real self-manifestation and self-giving, by which the created intellect is healed and enabled to 'know' in a mode proportionate to communion (Bradshaw 2004; Pino 2023).

In the Triads, Palamas repeatedly distinguishes discursive theology from the knowledge given in purified prayer, yet he refuses to grant 'experience' the status of an autonomous tribunal over doctrine. Precisely here, the epistemological question becomes sharp: what warrants the transition from ascetical practice to a theological claim about divine uncreatedness? The Palamite answer is not psychological but ontological and ecclesial: the 'light' is uncreated because it is the mode of God's real presence, confessed within the Church's continuity of sanctity and teaching (Meyendorff 1959; Palamas 1983). In contemporary debates, this is exactly the point at which critiques of divine simplicity or worries about panentheism arise, and where defences must clarify what 'participation' entails and what it does not entail (Carey 2024; Streza 2024).

The aim of this study is to provide a historically grounded and systematically precise account of hesychasm as a locus theologicus by analysing Palamas' epistemology of experience in its ontological, noetic and ecclesial dimensions.

The objectives are:

- to clarify the semantic field of 'experience' [ἐμπειρία, *empeiria*], 'knowledge' [γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις, *gnōsis* and *epignōsis*] and 'participation' [μέθεξις and μετοχή, *methexis* and *metochē*] in Palamas, distinguishing ascetical, noetic and ecclesial senses;
- to show how the essence–energies distinction functions as an epistemic claim (not only a metaphysical thesis), enabling a non-competitive relation between apophaticism and real knowledge of God;

- to test the coherence of Palamas' experiential epistemology against key modern debates (divine simplicity, panentheism, falsifiability and criteria of discernment), drawing on recent analytic and systematic discussions;
- to propose a disciplined way in which 'experience' may operate as a *locus theologicus*: neither as private evidence nor as a mere illustration, but as ecclesially normed participation that yields theological insight.

The present study adopts a multi-layered methodological approach, intentionally situated at the intersection of historical theology, theological epistemology and hermeneutics of sources. The primary methodological axis is a close hermeneutical reading of Palamas' Greek texts, with particular attention to semantic fields, argumentative strategies and polemical contexts. This includes a philological analysis of key terms such as *energeia*, *ousia*, *nous*, *gnōsis*, *empeiria*, *methexis* and the related vocabulary of illumination and participation, as attested in the Triads, the One Hundred and Fifty Chapters, and the anti-Barlaamite dialogues (Palamas 1983, 1988, 1999).

This textual analysis is combined with patristic exegesis in the strict sense: Palamas is read not in isolation, but within the living continuum of Greek patristic theology, especially the Cappadocian Fathers, Maximus the Confessor, and Dionysius the Areopagite, whose conceptual grammar decisively shapes his understanding of divine transcendence and participation (Bradshaw 2004; Russell 2019; Torrance 2009). The study, therefore, resists both a purely historical reconstruction and a purely systematic abstraction, opting instead for what may be termed a historically disciplined systematic reading.

A further methodological layer consists of systematic-theological analysis. Here, the Palamite account of experience is examined as an epistemological claim: what kind of knowledge is involved, what warrants its truth-claim, and how it avoids reduction either to psychological interiority or to speculative metaphysics. This requires engagement with contemporary debates in philosophical and analytic theology concerning divine simplicity, panentheism, and the metaphysics of participation, wherein Palamas is increasingly invoked as a constructive interlocutor rather than merely a confessional authority (Butner 2016; Carey 2024; Dumsday 2021).

Finally, the current study employs a hermeneutics of ecclesial discernment. 'Experience' is analysed not as an isolated datum but as a phenomenon embedded in liturgical, ascetical and sacramental practices, and normed by the Church's tradition of sanctity and teaching. This perspective draws on recent work in Orthodox theological methodology, which emphasises the inseparability of doctrine, worship and spiritual practice (Drimbe 2023; Ladouceur 2024). The methodological assumption is that Palamas' epistemology cannot be adequately understood apart from this ecclesial horizon.

Several delimitations are necessary. Firstly, the article does not aim to provide a comprehensive historical account of the 14th-century hesychast controversy; this has been extensively treated elsewhere (Meyendorff 1959; Russell 2019). Secondly, though the study engages contemporary philosophical theology, it does not attempt a full analytic defence of the essence–energies distinction against all objections; rather, it focuses on its epistemological function within Palamas' theology. Thirdly, comparative references to Western mystical traditions are limited to what is necessary for conceptual clarification; the primary concern remains the internal coherence of Palamas' own theological logic.

At the same time, the study explicitly avoids treating hesychasm as a marginal or 'esoteric' phenomenon. Instead, it is approached as a paradigmatic expression of how theology itself arises from, and remains accountable to, lived communion with God. This is precisely what justifies treating hesychasm as a *locus theologicus* in the strict sense.

The first section, *Experience and knowledge in Gregory Palamas: Semantic and conceptual clarifications*, reconstructs the semantic and conceptual field of 'experience' and 'knowledge' in Palamas' writings, distinguishing ascetical, noetic and ecclesial dimensions, and thus clarifying the relation between apophatic reserve and positive cognition.

The second section, *The essence-energies distinction as an epistemological claim*, analyses the essence–energies distinction as an epistemological claim. It argues that this distinction is not merely metaphysical, but functions to articulate how real knowledge of God is possible without compromising divine transcendence.

The third section, *Gregory Palamas and contemporary theological epistemology*, situates Palamas' epistemology within contemporary theological debates, engaging recent literature on divine simplicity, panentheism, and participatory realism, and testing the explanatory power of the Palamite model in these contexts.

The final section, *Hesychasm as a locus theologicus and its methodological implications*, proposes a constructive account of hesychasm as a *locus theologicus*, outlining criteria by which 'experience' may legitimately function within theological reasoning, without collapsing into subjectivism or being reduced to illustrative rhetoric.

By integrating close textual analysis, patristic contextualisation, and systematic-theological reflection, this study makes three contributions to current scholarship. Firstly, it offers a conceptually precise account of 'experience' in Palamas' conception that avoids both romanticisation and reductionism. Secondly, it reframes the essence–energies distinction as a fundamentally epistemological claim, thereby clarifying its ongoing relevance beyond intra-Orthodox

debates. Thirdly, it proposes a disciplined model for the use of experience as a theological source, one that may contribute to broader discussions in theological epistemology and the hermeneutics of religious experience.

Experience and knowledge in Gregory Palamas: Semantic and conceptual clarifications

Any attempt to construe hesychasm as a *locus theologicus* must begin with a clarification of what Gregory Palamas means by 'experience' [ἐμπειρία, *empeiria*] and 'knowledge' [γνῶσις, *gnōsis*]. Modern theological discourse often employs a category of 'religious experience' as a quasi-universal explanatory term, though such usage risks anachronism when applied to Palamas' 14th-century theological grammar (Lossky 1957:9–14; Russell 2019:63–71). In Palamas, experience is neither a neutral datum of consciousness nor a merely psychological state, but a mode of participation in divine life articulated within an explicitly ontological and ecclesial framework (Bradshaw 2004; Meyendorff 1974).

Empeiria, *gnōsis*, and *nous*

The term empeiria appears in Palamas primarily within the anti-Barlaamite polemic, where it functions as a counter category to Barlaam's restriction of theological knowledge to demonstrative reasoning and conceptual inference [ἀπόδειξις, *apodeixis*; ἐπιστήμη, *epistēmē*] (Palamas 1983:Triads I.3.4–6). Against this epistemic rationalism, Palamas insists that there exists a form of knowing that exceeds discursive reasoning without abolishing it. This knowing arises not from abstraction but from purified participation [μετοχή, *metochē*] in divine activity [ἐνέργεια, *energeia*] (Palamas 1983:I.3.23).

Crucially, Palamas does not oppose experience to knowledge as irrational to rational. Rather, experience constitutes a specific mode of knowledge grounded in the transformation of the knowing subject. This distinction presupposes the patristic differentiation between discursive reasoning [διάνοια, *dianoia*] and the intellect [νοῦς, *nous*], already articulated by Maximus the Confessor and appropriated by Palamas in an explicitly soteriological key (Maximus Confessor, Ambigua 7; cf. Torrance 2009:49–53). Knowledge of God occurs insofar as the nous is healed and illumined by grace, not insofar as it constructs adequate concepts.

Recent scholarship has emphasised this participatory structure of Palamite gnōsis. Micał demonstrates that Palamas consistently qualifies 'knowledge of God' as knowledge *kata methexin* rather than *kata ousian*, thereby excluding any epistemic access to the divine essence while affirming real cognitive participation in God's life (Micał 2021:254–259). Knowledge, therefore, is inseparable from communion [*koinōnia*] and transformation [*theōsis*]. A basic terminological clarification is required at this point. When Palamas (drawing on earlier patristic usage) contrasts knowing God *kata methexin* [κατὰ μέθεξιν, *kata methexin*, according to participation] with knowing God *kata ousian* [κατ᾽ οὐσίαν, *kat᾽ ousian*, according to essence], he is not introducing two competing objects of knowledge but two fundamentally different modes of relation. Knowledge *kata ousian* would imply comprehension of what God is in himself – an epistemic access Palamas explicitly denies to every creature. Knowledge *kata methexin*, by contrast, designates real participation in God's self-giving presence: God is known as communicable [μεθεκτός, *methektos*] in his operations, without becoming comprehensible in his essence. Therefore, the doctrine of the uncreated energies is epistemologically decisive. The energies are not created 'effects' that merely point to God, nor a secondary entity between God and the world; they are God's own uncreated activity and self-manifestation ad extra, by which the *nous* is illumined, and the person is drawn into communion. On this basis, experiential knowledge is neither a psychological report nor an inferential conclusion, but a participation-grounded cognition whose content is regulated by apophatic reserve.

Apophaticism and epistemic realism

A persistent misunderstanding in the reception of Palamas concerns the relation between apophatic theology and epistemic realism. Apophaticism is often assumed to entail epistemic agnosticism. Palamas explicitly rejects this inference. For him, the incomprehensibility of the divine essence safeguards transcendence but does not delimit divine self-manifestation (Lossky 1957:38–44; Meyendorff 1959:172–176).

The essence–energies distinction functions as an epistemological grammar rather than a speculative metaphysical construct. As Bradshaw (2004) has shown, the energies are not created intermediaries nor merely divine effects, but God himself as present and active ad extra. Consequently, knowledge of the energies constitutes genuine knowledge of God, though non-exhaustive and participatory.

Recent analytic engagements have clarified the coherence of this epistemic claim. Dumsday (2021:6–9) argues that the Palamite account avoids contradiction precisely by rejecting the assumption that all knowledge must be exhaustive or conceptually comprehensive. Similarly, Streza (2024:4–6) situates Palamas within a broader patristic account of divine immutability, arguing that epistemic change occurs in the knower rather than in God.

Ecclesial mediation of experience

Palamas consistently resists any absolutisation of individual experience as a self-authenticating criterion of truth. Experience acquires theological authority only within the Church's continuity of sanctity, doctrine and ascetical praxis. This explains Palamas' repeated appeal to the saints as

empirical witnesses – not in the modern testimonial sense but as bearers of a shared ecclesial experience (Palamas 1988:chs. 36–38; Meyendorff 1959:210–214).

The ecclesiological logic presupposed here is not merely institutional but sacramental and pneumatic. 'Church' for Palamas is the concrete historical body in which apostolic faith is lived, confessed, celebrated and transmitted – so that truth is received not as private illumination but as communion. Consequently, discernment [διάκρισις, *diakrisis*] is not reduced to individual introspection; it is a tested ecclesial practice of distinguishing true illumination from deception by correlating: (1) ascetical purification and humility, (2) doctrinal coherence with the Church's dogmatic teaching, and (3) reception within the tradition of sanctity (the 'consensus' of the saints as embodied witnesses). In this framework, an experience gains theological relevance insofar as it remains integrated into liturgical–ascetical life and recognised as consonant with the Church's confession. This is precisely what prevents hesychast 'experience' from functioning as an uncontrolled epistemic tribunal, while still allowing it to operate as a source of theological insight within the Church's normative horizon.

Recent methodological discussions in Orthodox theology have underscored this point 'precisely' as decisive. Drimbe (2023:7–10) argues that Orthodox theology loses its epistemic integrity when it separates doctrine from lived sanctity and ecclesial discernment. From this perspective, Palamas' epistemology emerges not as a medieval curiosity, but as a paradigmatic model of theological knowing.

Experience and epistemic control

A standard objection to experiential epistemologies concerns their alleged lack of falsifiability. Palamas' response, though not formalised in modern epistemological terms, is nonetheless rigorous. Experience is subject to discernment [διάκρισις, *diakrisis*], tested by ascetical purification, doctrinal coherence and ecclesial reception (Palamas 1983:I). False experiences are not excluded in principle; their possibility is precisely what necessitates ascetical and ecclesial criteria.

Contemporary theological discussions recognise the relevance of this model. Carey (2024:3–5) has argued that Palamas offers a framework in which divine presence can be affirmed without collapsing into experiential immediacy or metaphysical indeterminacy. Experience, thus understood, functions neither as incorrigible evidence nor as dispensable illustration.

Interim synthesis

The foregoing analysis yields three provisional conclusions. Firstly, experience in Palamas is a theologically thick concept, inseparable from participation, transformation, and ecclesial discernment. Secondly, the essence–energies distinction functions as an epistemological condition of possibility for real knowledge of God without compromising apophatic restraint. Thirdly, hesychasm, so construed, is not a marginal spiritual phenomenon but a structured mode of theological knowing and thus legitimately functions as a locus theologicus.

The following section will examine in detail how the essence–energies distinction operates as an epistemological claim and why it remains indispensable for contemporary theological epistemology.

The essence–energies distinction as an epistemological claim

The distinction between divine essence [οὐσία, *ousia*] and divine energies [ἐνέργειαι, *energeiai*] constitutes the conceptual core of Palamas' theological epistemology. Although frequently treated as a metaphysical or ontological thesis, its primary function in the hesychast controversy is epistemological: It articulates how genuine knowledge of God is possible without compromising divine transcendence. Palamas introduces the distinction not as an abstract speculation but as a theological response to a concrete epistemic problem – namely, the status of experiential knowledge claimed by the hesychast tradition (Meyendorff 1959:185–192; Palamas 1983:I.3.16–18).

The epistemic problem in the Barlaamite controversy

Barlaam of Calabria's critique of hesychasm rests on a restrictive epistemology. Knowledge of God, in his view, is limited to what can be known through conceptual reasoning and demonstrative argumentation; any claim to immediate experience of God must therefore refer either to created symbols or to psychological states (Meyendorff 1959:121–129). On this basis, Barlaam interprets the Taboric light as a created phenomenon and regards hesychast prayer as epistemically irrelevant to theology.

Palamas identifies the epistemological presupposition underlying this critique: the assumption that knowledge must be either discursive or illusory. Against this dichotomy, he argues that there exists a mode of knowing grounded in participation rather than representation (Palamas 1983:I.3.23–24). The essence–energies distinction is introduced precisely to articulate this third possibility. Without it, Palamas contends, one must choose between agnosticism (if God is absolutely unknowable) and rationalism (if God is known only through concepts), both of which undermine the Church's lived experience of communion with God (Lossky 1957:69–74).

Energies as the epistemic condition of participation

Palamas consistently insists that the divine energies are neither created effects nor intermediary entities. They are God himself as communicable, God in the mode of self-giving and presence (Bradshaw 2004:101–104; Palamas 1988:ch. 75). From an epistemological perspective, this claim

is decisive: it grounds the possibility of knowing God without implying comprehension of the divine essence.

Knowledge of God through the energies is therefore real but non-exhaustive. It is real because its object is truly God; it is non-exhaustive because it does not penetrate the divine essence. This asymmetry allows Palamas to affirm both epistemic realism and apophatic reserve. As Russell (2019:143–147) observes, Palamite epistemology refuses the assumption that knowledge must be exhaustive in order to be genuine.

Recent systematic theology has sharpened this insight. Pino (2023:88–95) argues that the essence–energies distinction functions as a grammar of divine naming, regulating how predicates may be truly affirmed of God without collapsing into either equivocity or univocity. From this perspective, epistemology and language are inseparable: how God is known determines how God may be spoken of.

Epistemology and deification

The epistemic function of the essence–energies distinction cannot be separated from Palamas' doctrine of deification [θέωσις, *theōsis*]. Knowledge of God is not an external act of cognition but a transformative participation in divine life. Palamas explicitly links knowing and becoming: one knows God insofar as one participates in God's energies, and this participation effects ontological transformation (Meyendorff 1974:135–138; Palamas 1983:II.3.9).

This participatory epistemology challenges modern subject–object models of knowledge. As Micał (2021:262–265) notes, Palamas' account destabilises the assumption that cognition is primarily representational; instead, it is relational and performative. Knowledge is verified not by correspondence alone but by conformity to divine life, a claim that remains controversial but philosophically coherent within Palamas' theological framework.

Contemporary discussions of participatory realism have found this aspect of Palamite thought increasingly compelling. Butner (2016:33–37) argues that Palamas offers a model in which participation does not dilute divine transcendence but intensifies it, precisely because it preserves the asymmetry between God and the creature. Epistemologically, this means that knowledge is always asymmetrical: true, transformative, yet never comprehensive.

Epistemic objections and contemporary debates

Modern critiques of Palamas often focus on the alleged incompatibility of the essence–energies distinction with divine simplicity. From an epistemological standpoint, however, this objection frequently presupposes a univocal notion of simplicity that Palamas does not share. As Carey (2024:4–7) observes, Palamas' theology presupposes a patristic account of simplicity that is compatible with real distinctions on the level of divine manifestation without implying composition in God.

Analytic theology has recently entered this debate with greater precision. Dumsday (2021:9–12) argues that the epistemic work done by the distinction is obscured when it is treated exclusively as a metaphysical thesis; once its epistemological role is foregrounded, many standard objections lose their force. Similarly, Torrance's (2009:55–60) patristic analysis demonstrates that precedents for this mode of reasoning are already present in the Cappadocians, particularly in their account of divine operations.

Interim synthesis

The essence–energies distinction emerges as a carefully calibrated epistemological claim. It secures the possibility of real knowledge of God without collapsing transcendence into immanence or experience into subjectivism. By grounding knowledge in participation rather than representation, Palamas articulates a model of theological knowing that is simultaneously apophatic, realist and ecclesially normed.

This analysis confirms that hesychasm, insofar as it presupposes and enacts this epistemological grammar, functions legitimately as a *locus theologicus*. The remaining task is to assess how this model can be brought into critical dialogue with contemporary theological epistemology without either diluting its specificity or insulating it from critique.

The next section will therefore examine the relevance and limits of Palamas' experiential epistemology in current debates concerning religious experience, divine presence and theological method.

Gregory Palamas and contemporary theological epistemology

The contemporary relevance of Palamas' epistemology of experience becomes particularly visible when set in dialogue with current debates in theological epistemology, philosophy of religion, and systematic theology. Over the past decade, renewed interest in participation, embodiment, and religious experience has exposed the limits of purely propositional or inferential models of theological knowledge. At the same time, appeals to 'experience' have often lacked sufficient epistemic control, oscillating between phenomenological description and subjective immediacy. Palamas' thought offers a distinctive alternative: an account of experience that is ontologically grounded, epistemically constrained and ecclesially mediated.

Experience beyond propositionalism and subjectivism

Much contemporary theological epistemology has been shaped by the tension between propositionalist accounts of belief and more experiential or practice-oriented models. Although analytic theology has refined the logic of doctrinal claims, it has also faced criticism for marginalising the lived

and transformative dimensions of faith (Plantinga 2000). Conversely, phenomenological and post-liberal approaches have sometimes elevated experience or practice in ways that weaken truth-claims or doctrinal normativity.

Recent discussions of religious experience illustrate this ambivalence. Biernot and Lombaard (2017:3–6) argue that experience remains indispensable for theology but must be critically situated within tradition and communal practice in order to avoid reductionism. Palamas anticipates this concern by refusing to treat experience as an autonomous source of knowledge. Instead, experience is epistemically significant only insofar as it participates in divine life and is recognised within the Church's discernment.

From this perspective, Palamas' model avoids both extremes. It resists propositional reductionism by affirming that knowledge of God exceeds conceptual articulation, yet it also resists subjectivism by insisting that experience is neither self-authenticating nor privately authoritative (Palamas 1983:I.2.7). Contemporary theologians concerned with the epistemology of practice have increasingly recognised the need for such a mediating position.

Participatory realism and recent systematic debates

One of the most significant points of convergence between Palamas and contemporary theology lies in the renewed interest in participatory realism. Recent systematic and analytic work has questioned whether classical theism can adequately account for real divine presence without compromising transcendence. Palamas' participatory epistemology offers a framework in which presence and transcendence are not competitive.

Bradshaw's (2023:41–47) recent work has emphasised that the epistemic force of participation lies precisely in its asymmetry: God is genuinely present and known, yet never comprehended. This insight has been taken up in contemporary debates on divine action and presence, where Palamas is increasingly cited as a constructive interlocutor rather than a confessional exception.

Dumsday's (2021:10–14) engagement with critics of Palamism demonstrates that many objections presuppose an epistemic model foreign to Palamas' thought – namely, the assumption that genuine knowledge must be exhaustive or univocal. Once this assumption is abandoned, the Palamite account emerges as both coherent and explanatorily powerful. Knowledge is real because it is participatory; it is limited because participation does not erase ontological asymmetry.

Divine simplicity, panentheism, and epistemic clarity

A particularly contentious area of contemporary debate concerns the relation between Palamas' theology and divine simplicity. Critics often argue that the essence–energies distinction introduces composition into God, thereby undermining classical theism. Recent scholarship, however, has increasingly reframed this issue in epistemological rather than purely metaphysical terms.

Carey (2024:5–8) has argued that Palamas' theology is best understood as offering an epistemic account of how God is known rather than a revisionist ontology of God's inner life. On this reading, the distinction safeguards the knowability of God without implying metaphysical division. Streza's (2024:6–9) analysis of divine immutability further supports this interpretation by showing that Palamas locates change exclusively in the creature's mode of participation, not in God.

Parallel discussions in the context of panentheism reveal a similar dynamic. Ladouceur (2024:2–5) notes that contemporary Orthodox theology increasingly employs participatory language to articulate God's presence in the world while resisting metaphysical collapse into immanence. Palamas' epistemology provides a conceptual grammar for such claims by distinguishing between God's essence and the modes of divine presence accessible to creatures.

Experience, embodiment and ascetical practice

Another point of resonance with contemporary theology concerns embodiment and practice. Recent theological and phenomenological studies have highlighted the embodied character of religious knowledge, emphasising that cognition is shaped by practice, habitus and formation (Turcan 2025:3–6). Palamas' account of experience is intrinsically embodied: hesychast prayer involves the body, breath and affect, yet without reducing knowledge to physiology or technique.

This integration of embodiment and transcendence challenges both spiritualist and reductionist accounts of experience. Palamas neither dismisses bodily practice nor equates it with epistemic sufficiency. Instead, bodily discipline functions as a condition for noetic illumination, not as its cause (Palamas 1983:II.2.9–12). Contemporary discussions of embodied cognition in theology can thus find in Palamas a pre-modern but sophisticated account of how bodily practice and epistemic transformation are related.

Interim synthesis

The dialogue between Palamas and contemporary theological epistemology reveals both continuity and challenge. Palamas offers a model in which experience is epistemically meaningful without becoming epistemically sovereign; participation grounds knowledge without erasing transcendence; and ecclesial discernment provides criteria without suppressing lived encounter.

This section has shown that Palamas' epistemology is not only historically significant but systematically relevant. It engages current debates on religious experience, participatory

realism, divine simplicity, and embodiment with conceptual resources that remain underutilised. The final task, therefore, is to articulate how hesychasm, so understood, may function constructively as a locus theologicus within contemporary theological method.

The concluding section will synthesise these findings and propose criteria for the disciplined use of experience as a theological source.

Objections to experiential epistemology and Palamas' replies

A disciplined construal of hesychasm as a *locus theologicus* must acknowledge and answer at least three standard objections. Firstly, experiential epistemologies are often criticised as epistemically 'unfalsifiable' because subjective reports appear immune to correction. Palamas' framework, however, is structurally anti-immediatist: experience is corrigible and requires discernment [διάκρισις, *diakrisis*] through ascetical testing, doctrinal coherence and ecclesial reception (Palamas 1983:I.2.7). The possibility of deception is not denied; it is precisely why the hesychast tradition insists on purification, humility, and obedience to the Church.

Secondly, critics argue that the essence–energies distinction threatens divine simplicity by introducing composition in God. Yet this objection typically presupposes that any real distinction implies partition. Palamas' claim is epistemologically oriented: it distinguishes the incomprehensible divine essence from the truly communicable divine presence, in order to secure real knowledge of God without collapsing transcendence into conceptual possession. The distinction marks asymmetry between God's inner incomprehensibility and God's uncreated self-giving, rather than positing 'parts' in God.

Thirdly, some worry that participatory language tends towards panentheistic collapse, blurring the Creator–creature distinction. Palamas' account moves in the opposite direction: participation is precisely what preserves asymmetry because the creature participates in God's energies without crossing the boundary into divine essence. Deification [θέωσις, *theōsis*] is therefore not ontological absorption but communion by grace, which deepens rather than dissolves the distinction between God and creation.

These replies do not remove all controversies, but they show that Palamas, experiential epistemology is neither naïvely subjectivist nor methodologically uncontrolled. It operates with explicit criteria, limits and ecclesial norms – conditions under which 'experience' can function as a theological source without becoming sovereign.

Conclusion

Hesychasm as a *locus theologicus* and its methodological implications

The present study argues that hesychasm, as articulated by Gregory Palamas, may be legitimately construed as a *locus theologicus*, provided that 'experience' is understood within a disciplined epistemological and ecclesial framework. Against both rationalist reductions of theology to discursive inference and subjectivist appeals to unmediated immediacy, Palamas offers a participatory model of theological knowledge in which experience is neither autonomous nor dispensable. It is, rather, a mode of knowing grounded in communion, regulated by apophatic restraint and normed by ecclesial discernment.

Three principal conclusions follow:

Firstly, the Palamite account of experience is irreducibly epistemological. Experience (empeiria) is not an auxiliary illustration appended to doctrinal claims, but a constitutive dimension of how theological knowledge is possible. The essence–energies distinction functions here as a grammar of knowledge: it articulates how God may be truly known without being comprehended. Knowledge of God is real because its object is God-in-energies; it is non-exhaustive because the divine essence remains transcendent. This asymmetry secures epistemic realism without collapsing into either rationalism or agnosticism (Bradshaw 2004; Pino 2023).

Secondly, Palamas' epistemology is intrinsically participatory and transformative. Knowledge is inseparable from deification; one knows God insofar as one participates in God's life. This challenges modern subject–object models of cognition by locating verification not primarily in representational accuracy but in conformity to divine life. Such a claim does not dissolve truth into praxis; rather, it insists that theological truth is apprehended through a transformed mode of being. Recent systematic and analytic engagements confirm that this participatory realism remains philosophically coherent and theologically fruitful when knowledge is not presupposed to be exhaustive or univocal (Butner 2016; Dumsday 2021).

Thirdly, experience functions theologically only within an ecclesial horizon. Palamas' refusal to absolutise individual experience is decisive for treating hesychasm as a locus theologicus rather than as a private mystical datum. Experience is subject to discernment, tested by ascetical purification, doctrinal coherence and communal recognition. This ecclesial mediation provides the epistemic control that contemporary discussions of religious experience often lack, whilst preserving the indispensability of lived encounter (Drimbe 2023; Streza 2024).

These conclusions yield the following methodological implications for contemporary theology:

- Experience as a controlled theological source: Hesychasm demonstrates that experience can function as a theological source without becoming a sovereign criterion. As a *locus theologicus*, experience must be articulated within a conceptual grammar (here, the essence–energies distinction), subjected to discernment, and integrated

with scripture and tradition. This provides a model for incorporating experience into theological reasoning without capitulating to subjectivism.

- Epistemology prior to metaphysical polemic: Many modern critiques of Palamas focus on metaphysical concerns (especially divine simplicity), yet the present analysis suggests that the primary stakes are epistemological. When the essence–energies distinction is interpreted as an account of how God is known rather than as a speculative anatomy of the divine life, several standard objections lose their force (Carey 2024; Dumsday 2021). Methodologically, this recommends prioritising epistemic function before metaphysical adjudication.
- Integration of practice and doctrine: Palamas' theology resists the separation of doctrinal formulation from ascetical and liturgical practice. Knowledge of God is neither produced by technique nor abstracted from embodied discipline. For contemporary theological method, this implies that serious engagement with practice need not weaken doctrinal rigour; on the contrary, it may clarify the conditions under which doctrine is intelligible and true.
- Ecumenical and systematic relevance: Finally, construing hesychasm as a *locus theologicus* opens constructive avenues for ecumenical and systematic dialogue. Rather than treating Palamas as a confessional anomaly, his epistemology can be engaged as a resource for broader debates on religious experience, participatory realism and theological method. The Palamite synthesis shows that apophatic theology and robust knowledge of God are not mutually exclusive but mutually conditioning.

Finally, the present study has constructive implications beyond Eastern theology. For non-Eastern theological traditions that either distrust 'experience' as epistemically unstable or, conversely, treat experience as self-validating, Palamas offers a mediating model: experience can be acknowledged as cognitively significant while remaining rule-governed, corrigible, and communally normed. Methodologically, this suggests that theological epistemology need not choose between propositional rigour and lived communion; instead, doctrinal claims and spiritual practice may be mutually conditioning when the criteria of discernment are made explicit. In ecumenical terms, the Palamite grammar clarifies how strong apophaticism can coexist with real knowledge of God, thereby reframing debates on divine presence and participation not as 'mystical exceptionalism' but as a disciplined account of how faith becomes epistemically articulate within the Church.

In sum, hesychasm, as interpreted through Palamas' epistemology of experience, provides a disciplined model for the theological use of experience – one that is ontologically grounded, epistemically constrained and ecclesially governed. As such, it warrants recognition not merely as a spiritual tradition or historical episode, but as a genuine *locus theologicus* with enduring methodological significance for contemporary theology.

Acknowledgements

Competing interests

The author declares that no financial or personal relationships inappropriately influenced the writing of this article.

CRediT authorship contribution

Wojciech Słomski: Conceptualisation, Formal analysis, Methodology. The author confirms that this work is entirely their own, has reviewed the article, approved the final version for submission and publication, and takes full responsibility for the integrity of its findings.

Funding information

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and are the product of professional research. They do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated institution, funder, agency, or that of the publisher. The author is responsible for this article's results, findings, and content.

References

Biernot, D. & Lombaard, C., 2017, 'Religious experience in the current theological discussion and in the church pew', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 73(3), a4347. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v73i3.4347

Bradshaw, D., 2004, *Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and the division of Christendom*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bradshaw, D., 2023, *Divine energies and divine action: Exploring the essence–energies distinction*, IOTA Publications, St. Paul, MN.

Butner, D.G., 2016, 'Communion with God: An energetic defense of Gregory Palamas', *Modern Theology* 32(1), 20–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/moth.12222

Carey, J., 2024, 'On Orthodox Panentheism', *Religious Studies* 60(2), 269–275. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034412523000355

Drimbe, A., 2023, 'Where scripture and tradition first meet: How the field of Orthodox theology is being shaped in Romania', *Religions* 14(10), 1323. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14101323

Dumsday, T., 2021, 'Is Palamism a form of classical theism, theistic personalism, panentheism, or what? Some conceptual clarification for analytic philosophers', *Philosophy of Religion: Analytic Researches* 5(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.21146/2587-683X-2021-5-2-27-40

Gregory P., 1983, *The Triads*, J. Meyendorff, (ed.), N. Gendle, trans. Paulist Press, New York.

Ladouceur, P., 2024, 'World-affirming theologies in modern Orthodox Christianity', *Religions* 15(10), 1174. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15101174

Lossky, V., 1957, *The mystical theology of the Eastern Church*, James Clarke, London.

Maximus Confessor, 2014, *On difficult passages in the Church Fathers: The Ambigua*, transl. N. Constas, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Meyendorff, J., 1959, *Grégoire Palamas: Défense des saints hésychastes* [Gregory Palamas: Defense of the Hesychast Saints], Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Louvain.

Meyendorff, J., 1974, *St Gregory Palamas and orthodox spirituality*, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY.

Micał, W., 2021, 'Knowledge of God in St Gregory Palamas', *Studia Religiologica* 54(3), 249–268. https://doi.org/10.4467/20844077SR.21.016.16553

Palamas, G., 1983, *The Triads*, transl. N. Gendle, J. Meyendorff (ed.), Paulist Press, New York, NY.

Palamas, G., 1988, *The one hundred and fifty chapters (Capita physica, theologica, moralia et practica): A critical edition, translation, and study*, (ed.), transl. R.E. Sinkewicz, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto.

Palamas, G., 1999, *Dialogue between an Orthodox and a Barlaamite*, transl. R. Ferwerda, Global Publications, Binghamton, NY.

Palmer, G.E.H., Sherrard, P. & Ware, K. (trans.), 1979–1995, *The Philokalia: The complete text*, vol. IV, Faber & Faber, London.

Pino, T., 2023, *Essence and energies: Being and naming God in St Gregory Palamas*, Routledge, London.

Plantinga, A., 2000, *Warranted Christian belief*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Russell, N., 2019, *Gregory Palamas and the making of Palamism in the modern age*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Streza, C., 2024, 'Understanding God's (im)mutability and (im)passibility: A Greek patristic point of view', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 80(2), a9854. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v80i2.9854

Torrance, A., 2009, 'Precedents for Palamas' essence–energies theology in the Cappadocian Fathers', *Vigiliae Christianae* 63(1), 47–74. https://doi.org/10.1163/157007208X287661

Turcan, N., 2025, 'From finitude to transfiguration: A theo-phenomenological inquiry into embodiment, ascetic practice, and grace', *Religions* 16(6), 739. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16060739

Zhukovskyi, V., 2019, 'Bohoslov'ia enerhii Hryhoriia Palamy: holovni aspekty i znachennia [The theology of Gregory Palamas' energies: Main aspects and significance]', *Naukovi zapysky UKU. Seriia: Bohoslov'ia* 6(12), 163–205.