

## THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY CHAPTERS IN THE COLLECTION OF *PHILOKALIA*: OBSERVATIONS ON A PECULIAR FEATURE

Andreas P. Zachariou

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Theology / Director of the Scientific Committee  
of Theology and Philosophy Institute; Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani University,  
E-mail: a.zachariou@sabauni.edu.ge, <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3499-4300>

The collection of *Philokalia*<sup>1</sup> includes six works of St Gregory Palamas: 1) *To the most reverend nun Xene*, 2) *the Decalogue of the*

---

<sup>1</sup> The collection, whose full title is *Φιλοκαλία τῶν ἱερῶν νηπητικῶν συνεραρισθεῖσα παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ θεοφόρων πατέρων ἡμῶν ἐν ἧ διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὴν πράξιν καὶ θεωρίαν ἡθικῆς φιλοσοφίας ὁ νοῦς καθάιρεται, φωτίζεται καὶ τελειοῦται*, is an anthology of texts by thirty-six Church fathers and ascetic authors. Covering a period of eleven centuries – from the 4<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> century – the texts address themes of asceticism and *theoria* in the contemplative life. The *Philokalia* was compiled by St Macarius of Corinth and St Nicodemus the Hagiorite and was first published in a large volume of 1,207 pages in 1782 in Venice (at the printing house of Anthony of Vortoli) at the expense of prince John Mavrocordatos of Moldavia. It was later republished in 1893 in Athens by P. Tzelatis, in two volumes (at the printing house of Paraskevas Leonis), and again by Al. and E. Papademetriou (from the publishing house Astir) in Athens between 1957 and 1963 in five volumes. The Astir edition has since been reprinted five times. The *Philokalia* has been also published in modern Greek: a) by the publishing house Τὸ περιβόλι τῆς Παναγίας in five volumes (1984-1988). The work was reprinted five times until the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, b) in the *ΕΠΕ* edition, alongside the original text. See Chrestou P. ([1994] introduction – text – translation – comments) *Γρηγορίου Παλαμᾶ ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα*, vol. 8, *ΕΠΕ* 121, Thessalonica, Τὸ Βυζάντιον, pp. 75-261, and c) by the Holy Monastery of the Dormition of Theotokos Mpoura, in ten volumes (2010-2020). In addition to the modern Greek versions, the *Philokalia* has been translated – either in its entirety or partially, with additions and omissions – into various languages: first into Slavonic, then into Russian, Romanian, English, French, and more recently, into other European languages. See more details in Palmer G.E.H. – Sherrard Ph. – Ware K. (1984), *Introduction*, in Id. (transl. from the Greek and edited) *The Philokalia. The complete text. Compiled by St Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St Makarios of Corinth*, vol. I, London – Boston, Faber and Faber, pp. 11-18. Dionysiatou Th. (1998), *Introduction*, in Galites G. A. (transl. in modern Greek) *Φιλοκαλία τῶν ἱερῶν νηπητικῶν*, vol. A', 5<sup>th</sup> edn, Thessalonica, Τὸ Περιβόλι τῆς Παναγίας, pp. 11-16. Conticello V. – Citterio E. (2002), "La Philocalie et ses versions", *CCTB* 2, Turnhout, Brepols, pp. 999-1021. *Introduction* (2010) in Holy Monastery of the Dormition of Theotokos Mpoura (ed.) *Φιλοκαλία τῶν ἱερῶν νηπητικῶν*, vol. A', Arkadia, pp. 30-35. Louth A. (2011), "Philokalia", in McGuckin A. J. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. II, Oxford, Wiley - Blackwell, pp. 445-447.

christian law, 3) *In defence of the holy hesychasts* (= *Triads* I, ii), 4) *On prayer and purity of heart*, 5) *On topics of natural and theological science, the moral and the ascetic life. One hundred and fifty Chapters*, and 6) the *Hagioretic Tome*<sup>2</sup>. Three of these works, *In defence of the holy hesychasts* (= *Triads* I, ii), the *Hagioretic Tome* and the *One hundred and fifty Chapters*, are directly linked to the hesychast controversy – that is to say, the theological dispute initially between Barlaam of Calabria and Palamas and later on between Gregory Akindynos and Palamas<sup>3</sup> – since they present an antirrhetic aim, while the

<sup>2</sup> See the works in Al. & E. Papademetriou (ed.) [1991], *Philokalia*, vol. 4, 5<sup>th</sup> edn, Athens, Astir, pp. 91-115; 116-122; 123-131; 132-133; 134-187; 188-193.

<sup>3</sup> For the hesychast controversy, see particularly: Meyendorff J. (1974) [1959], *A study of Gregory Palamas*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (transl. G. Lawrence), St. Vladimir's Seminary Press. Chrestou P. (1977), *Περί τὰ αἴτια τῆς ἡσυχαστικῆς ἐριδος*, in Id., *Θεολογικά μελετήματα*, 3. *Νηπτικά καὶ ἡσυχαστικά*, Thessalonica, ΠΙΠΜ, pp. 87-97. Patacs G. (1977), "Palamism before Palamas", *ECR*, vol. 9, no. 1-2, pp. 64-71. Sinkewicz R. (1980), "A new interpretation for the first episode in the controversy between Barlaam the Calabrian and Gregory Palamas", *JThS*, vol. 31, no 2, pp. 489-500. Chrestoforides B. (1993), *Οἱ ησυχαστικὲς ἐριδες κατὰ τον ΙΔ' αἰώνα*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, Thessalonica, Παρατηρητής. Mantzarides G. (1998), *Παλαμικά*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, Thessalonica, Πουρνάρᾱ. Id. (2020), "Hesychasm and theology", in Athanasopoulos C. (ed.) *Orthodox mysticism and asceticism: philosophy and theology in St Gregory Palamas' work*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 2-14. Torrance A. (2009), "Precedents for Palamas' essence - energies theology in the Cappadocian fathers", *VigChr*, vol. 63, pp. 47-70. On Barlaam the Calabrian, see specifically Schiró G. (1959), *Ὁ Βαρλαάμ καὶ ἡ φιλοσοφία εἰς τὴν Θεσσαλονικὴν κατὰ τὸν δέκατον τέταρτον αἰῶνα*, *Ἐταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν* 32, Thessalonica, Ἴδρυμα Μελετῶν Χερσονήσου τοῦ Αἴμου. Sinkewicz R. (1982), "The doctrine of the knowledge of God in the early writings of Barlaam the Calabrian", *Mediaeval Studies*, vol. 44, pp. 181-242. Fyrgos A. (2005), *Dalla controversia palamitica alla polemica esicastica (con un'edizione critica delle Epistole greche di Barlaam)*, Roma, Antonianum, pp. 161-191. On Gregory Akindynos, see Hero C. A. (1983), *Introduction. I. The life of Akindynos; Commentary*, in Id. (ed. and English transl.) Gregory Acindynos, *Epistles*, CFHB 21, Washington, Dumbarton Oaks, pp. ix-xxxiii; 309-439. See also, Zachariou P. A. (2018), *Ἡ θεολογικὴ γνωσιολογία τοῦ Γρηγορίου Ἀκινδύνου. Προσέγγιση στὴ διαμόρφωση καὶ τὴν ἀπόπειρα πατερικῆς κατοχύρωσης τῶν θεολογικῶν του ἀντιλήψεων*, Athens, Γρηγόρη, pp. 23-99. Id. (2024), "Theological notions in the controversy between St Gregory Palamas and Gregory Akindynos: Some observations", in Burri R. and Heyden K. (ed.) *The Role of Gregory Akindynos in the Hesychast Controversy, Eastern Church Identities*, vol. 17, Brill, pp. 101-120. Cf. the relevant works by J. Nadal, which, despite providing excellent details and historical evidence, are particularly biased in favor of

conceptions refuted in them are common positions of the theology of Barlaam and Akindynos.

In particular, the work *In defense of the holy hesychasts*, consisting of nine treatises and composed between 1338 and early 1341, rebuts Barlaam's polemic against the hesychasts and their prayer practices<sup>4</sup>. The *Hagioretic Tome* was written in late 1340, before the Council of June 1341, to highlight and refute certain theological views of Barlaam that had caused disagreement and conflict with the hesychasts<sup>5</sup>. The author, namely Palamas, in his third *Epistle* to Akindynos, notes that the *Tome* was aimed at what Barlaam wrote against "those who hold the correct faith" ("τῶν ὀρθοδόξων")<sup>6</sup>. What Palamas contends is extremely interesting: he identifies the monks with the correct faith and, by extension, with the Church itself. While Barlaam did not directly oppose the Church's faith – at least overtly – he expressed his opposition to the hesychasts and their prayer practices. Nevertheless, Palamas viewed the insult to the monastic way of life as equivalent to a direct polemic against the Church as a whole. In his first *Antirrhetic* against Akindynos, written after the *Hagioretic Tome*, he explicitly supports this view: "(The Synodal Tome of 1341), after stating that "what was said and written in a blasphemous and malicious manner against

---

Akindynos. See Nadal J. (1995), *Introduction*, in Id. (ed.) *Gregorii Acindyni Opera. Refutationes duae operis Gregorii Palamae, cui titulus Dialogus inter Orthodoxum et Barlaamitam* [Antirrhetics I-IV and Dialogue of the impious Palamas with an orthodox], CCSG 31, Turnhout, Brepols, pp. xiii-lxvii. Id. (2002), *Gregorio Akindinos. I. Biografia*, in Id., (ed.) *Report to Kalekas, CCTB 2*, Turnhout, Brepols, pp. 189-223. Id. (1990-1991), "Gregorio Akindinos, ¿Eslavo o Bizantino?", *RSDN*, vol. 27, pp. 259-265. Id. (2006), *La résistance d'Akindynos à Grégoire Palamas. Enquête historique, avec traduction et commentaire de quatre traités édités récemment*, vol. 2. *Commentaire historique*, Leuven, Peeters, pp. 28-103.

<sup>4</sup> Chrestou P. (1998), "Υπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχασόντων. Εἰσαγωγή", in ΠΣ 1 (2<sup>nd</sup> edn), pp. 315-354.

<sup>5</sup> Chrestou P. (1994), *Πραγματεῖαι ὁμολογιακαί. Εἰσαγωγή*, in ΠΣ 2 (2<sup>nd</sup> edn), pp. 551-553. Dentakis B. (1975), "Ἐπιτὰ συμβολικὰ κείμενα περὶ ἡσυχασμοῦ", *ΕΕΘΣΠΑ* vol. 22, pp. 719-722. Chrestoforides B. (1993), *Οἱ ἡσυχαστικὲς ἐριδεῖς*, p. 43.

<sup>6</sup> Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to Akindynos* 3, 19, ΠΣ 1, p. 310, 13-15.

the monks", added, "rather, against the Church itself". Does this not imply that the monks are, in fact, synonymous with the Church? ... and does this not also suggest that Barlaam's accusations against them are, in effect, accusations against the Church?"<sup>7</sup>.

The *Hagiorctic Tome* does not refer or imply Akindynos and his theological conceptions, since at that time he had not yet expressed them publicly. After all, not even the name of Barlaam is mentioned. Nevertheless, most of the positions refuted in the *Hagiorctic Tome* as untraditional and heretical, are at the same time basic parameters of Akindynos' theological gnoseology, expressed after the Council of July 1341 during his controversy with Palamas<sup>8</sup>.

The *One hundred and fifty Chapters*, however, which were written about a decade after the *Hagiorctic Tome*, around 1349-1350, after the condemnation (1347) and death (c.1348) of Akindynos<sup>9</sup>, provide

---

<sup>7</sup> See Gregory Palamas, *Antirrh.* 1, 10, 55, ΠΣ 3, p. 78, 14-19. For the passage of the *Tome of 1341*, see Miklosich F. – Müller I. (ed. [1860]), *Τόμος 1341*, in *Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi, Sacra et Profana*, vol. I, Vindobonae: C. Gerold, p. 216: "εἴ τις ἕτερός τι τῶν ὑπ' ἐκείνου (= τοῦ Βαρλαάμ) βλασφημῶς καὶ κακοδόξως κατὰ τῶν μοναχῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας αὐτῆς λαληθέντων ἢ συγγραφέντων, φανεῖη πάλιν τῶν μοναχῶν κατηγορῶν, ἢ ὄλως τούτων ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις καθαρπόμενος τῆ αὐτῆ καταδίκη παρὰ τῆς ἡμῶν μετριότητος καθυποβαλλόμενος...". For the English translation, see Russell N. (transl. with an introduction and notes) [2020], *Gregory Palamas. The Hesychast Controversy and the debate with Islam. Documents relating to Gregory Palamas, Translated Texts for Byzantinists*, vol. 8, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, p. 230: "if anybody else is found in the future accusing the monks of anything drawn from what has been blasphemously and erroneously uttered or written by Barlaam against the monks, or rather against the Church itself, or is found attacking them at all in similar terms, let him be subject to the same judgement that has been given by our humility...". On the *Tome of 1341*, see especially Chrestoforides B. (1993), *Οἱ ησυχαστικὲς ἐριδές*, pp. 47-65. Lialiou D. (1998), *Γρηγοριανὰ Β' καὶ Σύμμικτα* [ΦΘΒ 36], Thessalonica, Πουρναρά, pp. 409-438.

<sup>8</sup> See Zachariou P. A. (2018), *Ἡ θεολογικὴ γνωσιολογία τοῦ Γρηγορίου Ἀκινδύνου*, pp. 92-99. Id. (2024), "The 'mysteries of the contemplatives' in the theological conception of St Gregory Palamas and Gregory Akindynos", in id. (ed.) *St Gregory Palamas and Hesychasm. Past and contemporary challenges and perspectives*, Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference (Holy Metropolis of Trimithountos, 1-3 July 2022), *Θεολογικὲς Παρεμβάσεις*, vol. 7, Holy Metropolis of Trimythous, Idalio, Cyprus, pp. 178-187.

<sup>9</sup> Chrestou P. (ed. [1992]), *Κεφάλαια ἑκατὸν πενήτηκοντα φυσικὰ καὶ θεολογικά, ἠθικά*

a clearer view of the theological positions of Barlaam and Akindynos. The period up to their composition includes the so-called second phase of the hesychast controversy – which is defined as the period from the aftermath of the Council of 1341 until the Council of 1347. During this period Akindynos, because of the upheaval caused by the civil war, exploited the political ambitions of patriarch of Constantinople John Kalekas and, by manipulating him theologically, vigorously presented himself in the limelight as Barlaam's successor, to the controversy with Palamas<sup>10</sup>. He then expressed his theological views, first verbally and then, around the autumn of 1342, in writing, while Palamas responded to Akindynos' divergent perceptions with his own antirrhetic works<sup>11</sup>. In these Palamite writings – many passages of which

---

*τε και πρακτικα και καθαρικα της Βαρλααμιδος λυμης.*), Εισαγωγή, in ΠΣ 5, pp. 28-30. Sinkewicz R. (1988), *The Later Chapters of the Capita 150. B. The date of the Capita 150*, in Id., *Saint Gregory Palamas. The one hundred and fifty Chapters* (A critical edition, translation and study), *Studies and Texts* 83, Toronto, Pontifical institute of mediaeval studies, pp. 49-54.

<sup>10</sup> See Polemis Io. (ed. [2012]), *Γεωργίου Πελαγονίας, Κατὰ τοῦ Παλαμά*, in *Theologica varia inedita saeculi XIV. Georgius Pelagonius, Adversus Palamam. Anonymus, Adversus Cantacuzenum. Prochorus Cydones, De lumine Thaborico*, CCSG 76, Turnhout, Brepols, p. 26, 22-26. See also Zachariou P. A. (2018), *Η θεολογική γνωσολογία τοῦ Γρηγορίου Ἀκινδύνου*, pp. 38-39.

<sup>11</sup> See Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to Philotheos*, 13, ΠΣ 2, pp. 530, 30 – 531, 11. Id., *Refutation of Kalekas' Epistle*, 41, ΠΣ 2, p. 618, 25-28. Joseph Kalothetos, *Κατὰ τῶν αὐτῶν Ἀκινδύνου καὶ Βαρλαάμ τῶν κακοδόξων*, 4; 14, in Tsames D. (ed. [1980]), *Ἰωσήφ Καλοθέτου Συγγράμματα [ΘΒΣ 1]*, Thessalonica, Κέντρο Βυζαντινῶν Ἑρευνῶν, pp. 113, 60-62; 120, 290-291. Kallistos of Constantinople, *Διδασκαλία δογματικὴ κατὰ τῶν Βαρλααμιτῶν*, 1, in Paidas C. (ed. [2012]), "Editio princeps of an unedited dogmatic discourse against the Barlaamites by the patriarch of Constantinople Kallistos I", *BZ*, vol. 105, no. 1, p. 123, 10-17. Cf. Papamichael Gr. (1911), *Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Παλαμάς*, pp. 111-113. Tsames D. (1973), *Εισαγωγή. 2. Χρόνος συγγραφῆς τοῦ Λόγου κατὰ Βαρλαάμ καὶ Ἀκινδύνου*, in Id. (ed.) *Δαβιδ Δισύππου, Λόγος κατὰ Βαρλαάμ καὶ Ἀκινδύνου πρὸς Νικόλαον Καβάσιαν*, ΒΚΜ 10, Thessalonica, Κέντρο Βυζαντινῶν Ἑρευνῶν, pp. 24-26. Hero C. A. (1983), *Introduction. I. The life of Akindynos*, in Id. (ed. and English transl.) Gregory Akindynos, *Epistles*, CFHB 21, p. xxii. Chrestou P. (1994), *Εισαγωγικά*, in ΠΣ 2, pp. 19-42. Id. (1970), *Εισαγωγή. Ἡ δραστηριότης τοῦ Γρηγορίου Ἀκινδύνου*, in ΠΣ 3, pp. 10-17. B. Chrestoforides (1993), *Οἱ ησυχαστικὲς ἐριδες*, pp. 67-79. Treadgold W. (1997), *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, pp. 764-771. Koumpe M. (1998), "Η ησυχαστικὴ ἐρίδα καὶ η

were actually used in the composition of the *Chapters*<sup>12</sup>– the concept of a God indivisible in essence and energy is seen as the theology first expressed by Barlaam and then continued and supported by Akindynos. It is precisely this shared theological thought of Barlaam and Akindynos that is refuted in the *Chapters*, referred to as “*Barlaamite’s infection*” (“*Βαρλααμίτιδα λύμη*”)<sup>13</sup>.

Nevertheless, the inclusion of these three Palamite works –*In defense of the holy hesychasts*, the *Hagioretic Tome*, and the *One hundred and fifty Chapters*– in the *Philokalia* collection lacks any indication or reference to the reasons behind their original composition and use. Furthermore, the third work, the *One hundred and fifty Chapters*<sup>14</sup>, differs in two distinct ways from its critical editions by R. Sinkewicz and P. Chrestou<sup>15</sup>.

---

εμπλοκή της στις πολιτικές εξελίξεις στη διάρκεια του δευτέρου εμφυλίου πολέμου (1341-1347)”, *Βυζαντινά*, vol. 19, pp. 253-267. Venning T. (ed. [2006]), *A Chronology of the Byzantine Empire*, Great Britain, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 658-663.

<sup>12</sup> See more in Chrestou P. (ed. [1992]), *Κεφάλαια ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα*, Εἰσαγωγή, in *ΠΣ* 5, pp. 11-30. Pino T. (2024), “A *summa* of palamite theology? The place of the *One hundred and fifty Chapters* in the writings of St Gregory Palamas”, in Zachariou P. A. (ed.) *St Gregory Palamas and Hesychasm*, pp. 393-408.

<sup>13</sup> For more details on this subject, see Zachariou P. A. (2022), “The Relation of Gregory Akindynos to Barlaam the Calabrian”, in Pino A. T. and Mitrea M. (ed.) *Hesychasm: Theology and Praxis from Late Byzantium to Modernity*, *Studia Universitatis Babeş Bolyai Theologia Orthodoxa*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 255-267.

<sup>14</sup> . See *Κεφάλαια φυσικά, θεολογικά, ἠθικά τε καὶ πρακτικά, ΠΝ’* (1782) in *Φιλοκαλία τῶν ἱερῶν νηπτικῶν*, pp. 964-1009. Tzelatis P. (ed.), *Philokalia*, vol. 2, pp. 307-342. Papademetriou Al. & E. (ed. [1991]), *Philokalia*, vol. 4, pp. 134-187. The edition of the *Chapters* by J.-P. Migne in *PG* 150, 1121-1225, is a reprint of the *Philokalia* text (Venice, 1782). A similar text – differentiated and based on the *Philokalia* edition – is also published in modern Greek translations. See Galites G. A. ([1997] transl. in modern Greek) *Φιλοκαλία τῶν ἱερῶν νηπτικῶν*, vol. 4, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, Thessalonica, Τὸ Περιβόλι τῆς Παναγίας, pp. 292-351. Holy Monastery of the Dormition of Theotokos Mroua (ed. [2017]) *Φιλοκαλία τῶν ἱερῶν νηπτικῶν*, vol. 8, Arkadia, pp. 383-564. An exception is the translation in *ΕΠΕ*, which is based on the text of the *Chapters* published in *ΠΣ* 5. See Chrestou P. ([1994] introduction - text - translation - comments) *Γρηγορίου Παλαμᾶ ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα*, vol. 8, *ΕΠΕ* 121, pp. 74-260.

<sup>15</sup> See Sinkewicz R. (1988), *Saint Gregory Palamas*, pp. 82-256. Chrestou P. (ed. [1992]) *Κεφάλαια ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα φυσικά καὶ θεολογικά, ἠθικά τε καὶ πρακτικά καὶ καθαρικά τῆς Βαρλααμίτιδος λύμης*, in *ΠΣ* 5, pp. 37-119. Sinkewicz’s edition

The first distinction concerns the title of the *Chapters*. The *Philokalia* limits itself to simply stating the number of *Chapters* and noting their genre and themes, which are to be discussed. However, the critical text provides a more extensive title, clarifying that the *Chapters* possess a polemical character aimed at confronting and refuting a particular heretical teaching, that of Barlaamism, which is regarded as especially harmful to the true faith. By describing it as an “infection” (“*λύμη*”), the *Chapters* imply precisely this – that it has a pernicious character:

**Table 1.**

<i>Philokalia</i>	R. Sinkewicz / P. Chrestou
<i>On topics of natural and theological science, the moral and the ascetic life. One hundred and fifty Chapters</i> <sup>16</sup>	<i>One hundred and fifty Chapters on topics of natural and theological science, the moral and the ascetic life, and purificative of Barlaamite’s infection</i> <sup>17</sup>

Another difference is found in the second half of the work, from *chapter* 65 to *chapter* 150. In this section, any reference to the names Barlaam and Akindynos, as well as the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists*, is absent. Instead, as is clearly shown in the Table below, other words or circumlocutions are used<sup>18</sup>:

---

was used for the English translation of the *Chapters*. However, the title of the *Chapters* was translated according to the Astir edition, which also served as the basis for the English translation of the entire *Philokalia* collection. See Palmer G.E.H. – Sherrard Ph. – Ware K. ([1984-1995] transl. from the Greek and edited) *The Philokalia. The complete text. Compiled by St Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St Makarios of Corinth*, vol. I-IV, London – Boston, Faber and Faber. See particularly vol. I, p. 11 and vol. IV, pp. 290 and 346-417.

<sup>16</sup> See *Philokalia*, vol. 4, Athens, Astir, p. 134.

<sup>17</sup> Sinkewicz R. (1988), *Saint Gregory Palamas*, pp. 82-83. Chrestou P. (ed. [1992]) *Κεφάλαια Ἐκατὸν πενήκοντα φυσικὰ καὶ θεολογικά, ἠθικά τε καὶ πρακτικά καὶ καθαρτικά τῆς Βαρλααμίτιδος λύμης*, in ΠΣ 5, p. 37.

<sup>18</sup> In the English translation – specifically in the right column of the Table – the

**Table 2.**

	<i>Philokalia</i>	R. Sinkewicz / P. Chrestou
<i>Chapter</i>		
65	<i>“those who hold the opposite opinions”</i>	<i>“those who hold the opinions of Barlaam and Akindynos”</i>
70	<i>“those who hold the opinions of heretics” “we thoroughly refuted these people in our Antirrhetics, written against them”</i>	<i>“those who hold the opinions of Barlaam and Akindynos” “this opinion we have refuted exhaustively in our Antirrhetic against Akindynos”</i>
72	<i>“those who eagerly hold and vindicate the opinions of heretics”</i>	<i>“those who eagerly hold and vindicate the opinions of Barlaam and Akindynos”</i>
73	<i>“those who champion the opposite conception”</i>	<i>“those who champion the conceptions of Akindynos”</i>
75	<i>“even though those who hold the opposite view disagree”</i>	<i>“even though Barlaam and Akindynos disagree”</i>
81	<i>“those who hold the opposite view” “when those who oppose (these views)... hear”</i>	<i>“The Akindynists” “when Barlaam and Akindynos ... hear”</i>
82	<i>“the madness of heretics”</i>	<i>“the madness of Barlaam and Akindynos”</i>

works of Palmer G.E.H. – Sherrard Ph. – Ware K. (1995) *The Philokalia. The complete text*, vol. IV, pp. 346-417 and Sinkewicz R. (1988), *Saint Gregory Palamas*, pp. 83-257, have been taken into account.



83	<i>“those who say the divine energy is not distinct from the divine substance”</i>	<i>“those who like Barlaam and Akindynos say the divine energy is not distinct from the divine substance”</i>
88	<i>“those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“the Barlaamites”</i>
93	<i>“the nonsensical slander of those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“the nonsensical slander of Akindynos”</i>
96	<i>“according to the absurdities of those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“according to the absurdities of Akindynos”</i>
97	<i>“according to the perception of those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“according to the perception of Akindynos”</i>
108	<i>“the fallacy of those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“the fallacy of Barlaam and Akindynos”</i>
109	<i>“those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“the followers of Akindynos”</i>
117	<i>“those who hold the adversary’s opinions”</i>	<i>“those who hold the opinions of Barlaam”</i>
121	<i>“the followers of those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“the followers of Barlaam and Akindynos”</i>
124	<i>“the sophistries of those who hold the opposite view”</i>  <i>“the followers of those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“the sophistries of the Barlaamites”</i>  <i>“the followers of Barlaam and Akindynos”</i>

125	<i>“for those who contend that”</i>	<i>“for the Akindynists who hold the opinion that”</i>
126	<i>“those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“the Akindynists”</i>
130	<i>“Those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“The Akindynists”</i>
131	<i>“those who hold the opinions of the adversaries”</i>	<i>“those who hold the opinions of Barlaam and Akindynos”</i>
134	<i>“those who hold the opinions of the adversaries”</i>	<i>“those who hold the opinions of Barlaam and Akindynos”</i>
137	<i>“those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“The Akindynists”</i>
138	<i>“those who hold the conceptions of the adversaries”</i>	<i>“those who hold the conceptions of Akindynos”</i>
139	<i>“with the heretical fallacy”</i>	<i>“with Akindynos’s fallacy”</i>
140	<i>“according to the absurdities of those who hold the opposite view”</i>	<i>“according to the absurdities of Akindynos”</i>
141	<i>“The advocates of heretical impiety”</i>	<i>“The advocates of Akindynos’ impiety”</i>
142	<i>“even if those who hold the opposite views should be displeased”</i>	<i>“even if Akindynos should be displeased”</i>
147	<i>“the prattling heretics say”</i>	<i>“the Akindynists say”</i>
148	<i>“the heretics, who hold the wrong opinions”</i>	<i>“the Akindynists”</i>

149	“the heretics” “leaders of the heresy”	“the Akindynists” “Barlaam and Akindynos”
150	“the heretics”	“the Akindynists”

What might be the reason for this twofold distinction? First, it may result from editorial intervention by the compilers of the *Philokalia*. The variations in the *Chapters* might reflect choices made by St Macarius of Corinth and St Nicodemus the Hagiorite, who may have adjusted the text with a specific aim, possibly a pastoral one<sup>19</sup>. This may have involved deliberately omitting the names of Barlaam and Akindynos to prevent readers from delving into their ideas and teachings<sup>20</sup>. This, of course, could have been possible, given that Barlaam and Akindynos, as well as those who embraced and continued their doctrines, were condemned as heretics<sup>21</sup>. Nevertheless, if that had been the case, the compilers of *Philokalia* would have also omitted any reference to Eunomius, Sabellius, *Eunomians* and *Massalians*.

<sup>19</sup> See Russell N. (2019), *Gregory Palamas and the Making of Palamism in the Modern Age*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 6, note 20: “In keeping with Nikodemos’ aim of spiritual edification, however, all references to Barlaam and Akindynos were excised”.

<sup>20</sup> See Chrestou P. (ed. [1992]), *Κεφάλαια ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα, Τὸ κείμενον*, in ΠΣ 5, pp. 33-34.

<sup>21</sup> *Synodal Tome of 1351*, § 51: “We, the entire divine and holy synod gathered by the grace of Christ... do justly subject the notorious Barlaam and Akindynos, as men who treated vital matters of right belief recklessly and in no way repented while they were still alive, to excommunication from Christ. Those who have now been found to be, and have been synodically convicted of being, of like mind with them, and simply as many as belong to their company, we hold to be expelled from the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ, unless they repent, and we subject them to excommunication from Christ, and hold all who knowingly communicate with them as out of communion, and we strip them from any priestly functions that they have”. See Russell N. (transl. with an introduction and notes) [2020], *Gregory Palamas*, p. 372. See the Greek text in Karmiris Io. (1960), *Τὰ δογματικά καὶ συμβολικά μνημεῖα τῆς ὀρθοδόξου καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, vol. I, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, Athens, p. 404.

These names and terms, however, not only appear in ten *chapters* but are mentioned in nine of them alongside the names of Barlaam and Akindynos, as well as the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists* – or, in the *Philokalia*, with phrases used in place of these names and terms. The close placement of these names reflects the polemical character of the *Chapters*, with direct references to the views of Barlaam and Akindynos – which are considered heretical – in order to refute and reject them. In this way, the argument supporting the hypothesis of a pastoral intent by Macarius and Nicodemus is thus overturned, or at the very least, weakened<sup>22</sup>. See for instance:

*“Is the substance of God, then, perceived in created things? Certainly not! This is the sort of thing you find in the madness of heretics [= of Barlaam and Akindynos] and in the madness of Eunomius before them” (chapter 82)<sup>23</sup>,*

*“But go through for me the writings against Eunomius by Basil the Great and by his brother who held fraternal opinions, for there you will find the followers of those who hold the opposite view [= of Barlaam and Akindynos] clearly in accord with Eunomius and you will have ample refutations against them” (chapter 124)<sup>24</sup>,*

*“The Eunomians hold that anything said of God is substance... In imitation of the Eunomians, those who hold the opposite view [= the Akindynists] hold that everything said of God is substance” (chapter 126)<sup>25</sup>.*

Furthermore, the compilers of the *Philokalia* may have had an additional purpose behind their alleged intervention. According to P. Chrestou, they were likely aiming to avoid a potential refusal by the

---

<sup>22</sup> See the *chapters* 82, 83, 109, 120, 124, 125, 126, 137, 142, 150.

<sup>23</sup> See *Philokalia*, vol. 4, Athens, Astir, p. 164. For the English transl. cf. Sinkewicz R. (1988), *Saint Gregory Palamas*, p. 179.

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*, p. 178. English transl.: *ibid*, p. 229.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 178-179. English transl.: *ibid*, pp. 229-231.

Venetian authorities to print their work. It is well known that in order for a book to be approved for printing, its content had to be in conformity with the principles and faith accepted and expressed by the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, a book, which would in any way speak not only against Barlaam, who after his departure from Constantinople in the summer of 1341, adhered to Roman Catholicism, and even appointed by the Pope bishop of Gerace, but also against Akindynos, who was considered to have defended the Orthodox faith against the “heretic” Palamas, definitely would not have been approved for printing<sup>26</sup>. This conjecture may be correct, as the *Philokalia* indeed received permission and authorization certifying that the book contained nothing contradicting the teachings of the “Roman Catholic Faith” (“Santa Fede Cattolica”) and allowing its printing<sup>27</sup>. This authorization is noted on the cover of the first edition of the *Philokalia* (Venice, 1792) with the phrase “*Con licenza de superiori, e privilegio*” and is also printed on page 1207.

Yet, although this hypothesis seems plausible, it may not be true, as it is not confirmed – and may even be disproved – by the content of the *Chapters* themselves. The omission of the names Barlaam and Akindynos, as well as the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists*, and their replacement with other words or definitions (see Table 2), did not result in any real and essential change in the *Chapters*. The *Chapters* remained antirrhetic and polemical against the theological notion which asserts that in God essence and energy are inseparable – altogether indivisible. The same, of course, applies to the other two writings of Palamas found in the *Philokalia*, namely *In defense of the holy hesychasts (Triads I, ii)* and the *Hagioretic Tome*, which

<sup>26</sup> See Chrestou P. (ed. [1992]), *Κεφάλαια ἑκατὸν πενήτηκοντα, Τὸ κείμενον*, in ΠΣ 5, pp. 33-34.

<sup>27</sup> See Kitromilides M. P. (2000), “Philokalias’ first journey”, *Ἐνθύμησις Νικολάου Μ. Παναγιωτάκη*, Crete, University publications of Crete, p. 342.

– as mentioned above – reflect the theological perspective opposing Barlaam and Akindynos. Moreover, in the preface to all six Palamite writings and in the upper margins of their pages, Palamas is referred to as a saint and father of the Church: “*Our father among the saints Gregory of Thessalonica*” (“*Ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις πατὴρ ἡμῶν Γρηγόριος Ὁ Θεσσαλονίκης*”)<sup>28</sup>. But the theology distinguishing between God’s *ousia* (essence) and *energeia* (energy), along with the veneration of Palamas as a saint, though consistent with the Orthodox (Eastern) perspective, stands in stark contrast to the Roman Catholic Church’s official stance (at least at that time) on his person and teachings<sup>29</sup>.

It can be assumed, however, that the approval was granted without anyone delving too deeply into the content of the book. In other words, it could be considered or speculated that the manuscript of *Philokalia* submitted for review and approval received favorable treatment from the person responsible in that area. At that time, the person in charge was the Cephalonian Agaprios Loverdos, a priest and a scholar, who was a censor – reviewer in the service of the Venetian Republic<sup>30</sup>. Perhaps Loverdos was asked – and he consented – to

---

<sup>28</sup> See *Φιλοκαλία τῶν ἱερῶν νηπτικῶν* (Venice 1782), pp. 927-1009.

<sup>29</sup> See for example, Allatius L. (1648), *De Ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione*, Coloniae Agrippinae, J. Kalcovium, col. 803-824. Richardus Fr. (1658), *Τάργα τῆς πίστεως τῆς Ρωμαϊκῆς Ἐκκλησίας εἰς τὴν διαφέντευσιν τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας. Μέρος δεύτερον*, Paris, pp. 254-280. Petavius D. (1865), *Dogmata Theologica*, tom. I, Paris, pp. 156-172. Cf. Papamichael Gr. (1911), Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης. Ἡθικο - πατρολογικὴ συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν ἡσυχαστικῶν ἐρίδων τοῦ ἰδ’ αἰῶνος, Petroupoli – Alexandria, pp. 144-153. Kalliakmanes B. (2000), “Ἡ διδασκαλία καὶ οἱ περιπέτειες τῶν κειμένων τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου Παλαμᾶ κατὰ τὴν περίοδο τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας”, *Proceedings of International Scientific Conferences of Athens and Limassol - Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς στὴν ἱστορία καὶ τὸ παρόν*, Athens, 13-15 November 1998 and Limassol, 5-7 November 1999, Holy Mountain, Monastery of Vatopedi, pp. 379-389. Giagkazoglou St. (2001), *Κοινωνία θεώσεως. Ἡ σύνθεση Χριστολογίας καὶ Πνευματολογίας στὸ ἔργο τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ*, Athens, Δόμος, pp. 18-22.

<sup>30</sup> See Kitromilides M. P. (2000), “Philokalias’ first journey”, p. 342. For Agaprios Loverdos, see Kitromilides M. P. (1998), “The identity of a book. European power politics and ideological movements in Agaprios Loverdos’s, *Ἱστορία τῶν δύο ἐτῶν* (Venice, 1791)”, *Θησαυρίσματα*, vol. 28, pp. 433-449.

give a favourable opinion regarding the suitability of the manuscript and its compatibility with the Catholic Church. Thus, the omission (or non-inclusion) of the names of Barlaam and Akindynos, without any alteration to the content of the text, would have been sufficient for approval, on the grounds that no one would have checked or noticed the content of the *Philokalia*, since the book was intended for the East. Following this assumption – that the approval was given as a favor – a certain difficulty arises. The printed *Philokalia*, even before reaching monastic circles in the East, was first received in the West, where it was deposited in the library of the University of Padua shortly after its publication. This suggests not only that the *Philokalia* gained a Western readership, albeit within academia, but also that its content would have become known more broadly<sup>31</sup>!

It seems, therefore, that both of these assumptions – a) that the compilers of the *Philokalia* altered the text of the *Chapters* by removing the names Barlaam and Akindynos, along with the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists*, either for a specific pastoral aim or to secure approval for printing, and b) that Loverdos did not examine the *Philokalia* manuscript, thus facilitating its approval – raise more questions than they answer: Why would Macarius and Nicodemus want to remove the names Barlaam and Akindynos, as well as the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists*, from the source (or sources) they used to compile the *Philokalia*? Why are the names Barlaam and Akindynos and the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists* absent from the *Chapters*, while names and terms like Eunomius, Sabellius, *Eunomians* and *Massalians* remain? How could omitting (or deleting) the names Barlaam and Akindynos, along with the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists* – without making any other changes to the text – support the pastoral aims of the *Philokalia*'s compilers, or serve as sufficient proof of the book's compatibility with the "Roman Catholic Faith", thereby

<sup>31</sup> Id. (2000), "Philokalias' first journey", p. 346.

securing approval for printing from the Venetian authorities?<sup>32</sup> Why would Loverdos seek to facilitate the manuscript's approval, and why did the deposit of the *Philokalia* – and apparently its reading – at the University of Padua library provoke no reaction?<sup>33</sup>

Hence, since these speculations cannot convincingly explain how and why the *Chapters* exhibit this particular peculiarity, it may be necessary to consider another assumption. Macarius of Corinth and Nicodemus the Hagiorite neither mention how exactly they worked on the compilation of *Philokalia*, nor do they refer to the sources they used, i.e. whether they took into account particular manuscripts or possibly even anthologies, which were already in use in monastic circles, inside and outside of the Mount Athos<sup>34</sup>. Although it is presumed

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the opinion of K. Ware, who, while referring to the permission from the Venetian authorities, does not associate it with the absence of the names Barlaam and Akindynos. He believes that the Palamite character of the *Chapters* did not pose an obstacle to the granting of permission, which was given because the *Philokalia* collection does not contradict "Roman Catholic Faith". See Ware K. (2012), "St. Nikodimos and the Philokalia", in Brock Bingaman – Bradley Nassif (ed.) *The Philokalia. A Classic Text of Orthodox Spirituality*, Oxford – New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 28-29: "Yet, although there is nothing specifically Western or Roman Catholic in the *Philokalia*, there is also nothing specifically anti-Western or anti-Catholic. In the *Pedalion* Nikodimos wrote in polemical terms against the Church of Rome, but throughout the *Philokalia* he refrains from doing so. Not without reason, the Roman Catholic censors from the University of Padua, in the *licenza* or authorization that appeared at the end of the 1782 edition of the *Philokalia*, were willing to certify that the book contains nothing *contro la Santa Fede Cattolica*, "contrary to the Holy Catholic Faith." A contemporary Roman Catholic reader may surely agree with this estimate, unless he or she happens to be a determined anti-Palamite (which fortunately most Roman Catholics today are not)".

<sup>33</sup> The *Philokalia* can still be found today in the University library of Padua. See Kitromilides M. P. (2000), "Philokalias' first journey", pp. 346-347.

<sup>34</sup> See Tachiaos Ant. - Aem. (1964), *Ὁ Παΐσιος Βελιτακόφσκι (1722-1794) καὶ ἡ ἀσκητικοφιλολογικὴ σχολή του*, Thessalonica, pp. 109-111. Ware K. (2012), "St. Nikodimos and the Philokalia", pp. 19-25. Savvatos Chr. (2006), "Ἡ συλλογὴ «Φιλοκαλία» καὶ ἡ συμβολὴ τοῦ Ὁσίου Μακαρίου Νοταρᾶ στὴ συγκρότησή της", *Proceedings of the Conference, Ὁ Ἅγιος Μακάριος (Νοταρᾶς). Γενάρης τοῦ Φιλοκαλισμοῦ - Μητροπολίτης Κορίνθου καὶ ὁ περίγυρός του*, Korinthos, 9-12 May 2005, Athens, pp. 146-147; 154-155.



by some that specific manuscripts were taken into account<sup>35</sup>, still the history of the compilation and the identity of the sources of the corpus of *Philokalia* is rather vague and unclear. Nevertheless, this ambiguity surrounding the sources of the work could provide a framework for explaining the distinctiveness of the *Chapters*. Specifically, given the unknown nature of these sources, one could hypothesize that this characteristic of the *Chapters* did not emerge at a later stage but is, instead, inherent to the original sources used in the *Philokalia*.

In fact, this hypothesis could be substantiated by considering an interesting feature present in three *chapters*, which appears in both the *Philokalia* version and the critical edition. In *chapters* 73, 80, and 109, the term “ἀντικείμενοι” (= those who oppose) appears; however, it is not used as a substitute for the names of Barlaam, Akindynos, or their like-minded followers, the *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists*. Instead, it appears alongside these names – or the expressions substituting for these names – and is used to denote those generally opposed to Palamas’s theology, who are, in any case, none other than Barlaam, Akindynos, and their followers. In *chapter* 73, the “ἀντικείμενοι” are those who, by promoting and supporting Akindynos’s theological perspective, essentially oppose the saints, meaning the Church fathers: “τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀντικείμενοι”. In *chapter* 80, the “ἀντικείμενοι” are those who oppose Palamas, to whom he responds with refutations grounded in the Holy Spirit-inspired experience of the fathers. In *chapter* 109, the “ἀντικείμενοι” in opposition to Palamas: “ἡμῖν ἀντικειμένους”, are

---

<sup>35</sup> See Meyendorff J. (1959), *Introduction a l'étude de Grégoire Palamas*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, pp. 336-338. Sinkewicz R. (1988), *The Text*, in Id., *Saint Gregory Palamas*, pp. 56-69. Chrestou P. (ed. [1992]), *Κεφάλαια ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα*, Τὸ κείμενον, in ΠΣ 5, pp. 31-36. Savvatos Chr. (2006), “Ἡ συλλογὴ «Φιλοκαλία»”, pp. 147-154. Chrysopodaritissa - Nezeron Monastery (ed.) [2021], *Ἁγίου Νικοδήμου τοῦ Ἀγιορείτου, Πρόλογος εἰς τὰ συγγράμματα τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ*, Athens, Tinos, pp. 98-119. Paschalides A. S. (2021), “Ἡ συλλογὴ τῆς Φιλοκαλίας καὶ τὸ ἀγιορειτικὸ περιβάλλον τῆς. Συμβολὴ στὴν ἔρευνα τῆς χειρόγραφης παράδοσής τῆς”, *Κληρονομία*, vol. 39, pp. 68-87.

those who support the notion that the essence of God can be participated in. The following Table lists *chapters* 73, 80, and 109, with the term “ἀντικείμενοι” underlined:

**Table 3.**

	<i>Philokalia</i>	R. Sinkewicz / P. Chrestou
	<i>Chapter</i>	
73	“Clearly <u>opposed to the saints</u> (τοῖς ἁγίοις <u>ἀντικείμενοι</u> ), those who champion the opposite conception argue that...” <sup>36</sup>	“Clearly <u>opposed to the saints</u> (τοῖς ἁγίοις <u>ἀντικείμενοι</u> ), those who champion the conceptions of Akindynos argue that...” <sup>37</sup>
80	“Thus, we should not have recourse to ourselves to say anything about God, but rather we should direct ourselves to those who speak of the things of the Spirit in the Spirit, even <u>when those who oppose us</u> (οἱ <u>ἀντικείμενοι</u> ) require a word of us” <sup>38</sup>	The same text

<sup>36</sup> *Philokalia*, vol. 4, Athens, Astir, p. 160

<sup>37</sup> My translation. Cf. Palmer G.E.H. – Sherrard Ph. – Ware K. (1995) *The Philokalia. The complete text*, vol. IV, p. 379. See the Greek text in Sinkewicz R. (1988), *Saint Gregory Palamas*, p. 168, 1-2 and in Chrestou P. (ed. [1992]), *Κεφάλαια ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα*, in ΠΣ 5, p. 76, 26-27.

<sup>38</sup> *Chapter* 80 does not mention the names Barlaam and Akindynos, nor the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists*; therefore, the *Philokalia* version does not include the corresponding phrases that would replace them. For this reason, the *chapter* it is identical in both the *Philokalia* and its critical edition. See *Philokalia*, vol. 4, Athens, Astir, p. 163. Sinkewicz R. (1988), *Saint Gregory Palamas*, p. 177. Sinkewicz

- 
- 109      *“Therefore, if indeed according to those who oppose us (ῥῆμῖν ἀντικειμένους) the substance of God is an object of participation for all even in these respects, it will turn out to be no longer trihypostatic but multi-hypostatic. Who among those nurtured on the divine doctrines does not know that this is the nonsense of the Messalians? According to the Messalians those who have attained the height of virtue have achieved participation in the substance of God, but those who hold the opposite view in their zeal to surpass this blasphemy say that not only those among men who have excelled in virtue but also all beings in general participate in the substance of God on the very foolish pretext that this is present everywhere”<sup>39</sup>*
- “Therefore, if indeed according to those who oppose us (ῥῆμῖν ἀντικειμένους) the substance of God is an object of participation for all even in these respects, it will turn out to be no longer trihypostatic but multi-hypostatic. Who among those nurtured on the divine doctrines does not know that this is the nonsense of the Messalians? According to the Messalians those who have attained the height of virtue have achieved participation in the substance of God, but the followers of Akindynos in their zeal to surpass this blasphemy say that not only those among men who have excelled in virtue but also all beings in general participate in the substance of God on the very foolish pretext that this is present everywhere”<sup>40</sup>*
- 

translate the term “ἀντικείμενοι” as “our adversaries”. I chose to translate it as: “those who oppose us”.

<sup>39</sup> See *Philokalia*, vol. 4, Athens, Astir, pp. 171-172.

<sup>40</sup> For the English transl. cf. Sinkewicz R. (1988), *Saint Gregory Palamas*, p. 207. The phrase “ῥῆμῖν ἀντικειμένους”, rendered by Sinkewicz as “our opponents”, is translated by me as “those who oppose us”.

Since the word “ἀντικείμενοι” is used in this way in these three *chapters* – and “ἀντικείμενοι” appears to be one of the terms replacing the names of Barlaam and Akindynos, as well as the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists* – why not consider these instances, if not as proof, then at least as an indication of the type of source or sources used for the *Chapters* in the *Philokalia*? In other words, why should it be taken for granted that the names were removed from the *Chapters*, simply disregarded, or replaced with other words? Why couldn't something else be the case – namely, that the sources used by Nicodemus and Macarius, specifically the manuscripts or anthologies they consulted in compiling the *Philokalia* – and later sent to Venice for printing – , may not have included any references to Barlaam, Akindynos, *Barlaamites*, or *Akindynists*? For reasons we cannot currently speculate on, these sources may have contained only the terms listed in Table 2 from the outset.

\* \* \*

The absence of any reference to the names Barlaam and Akindynos or the terms *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists* within the *Chapters* in the *Philokalia* collection is particularly puzzling. This omission is especially notable given that the *Chapters* in this collection do not differ in polemical content from the standard critical editions of R. Sinkewicz and P. Chrestou. Thus, the distinctive character of the *Chapters* presents a significant challenge. To address this issue, three hypotheses are presented in this article. The first two hypotheses – the possible interventions by Macarius of Corinth and Nicodemus the Hagiorite, who may have modified the original text to serve specific aims, and Agapios Loverdos's favorable disposition to facilitate approval for printing – seem unable to provide a satisfactory and convincing solu-

tion. The third hypothesis, however, is proposed as a more probable and plausible explanation for the peculiar character of the *Chapters*. Although it cannot be considered a definitive solution, it is offered here as a useful framework for analyzing the structure and form of the *Chapters* and as a foundation for relevant academic discussion.

### Abbreviations

<i>BKM</i>	<i>Βυζαντινά Κείμενα και Μελέται</i> , Thessalonica 1970-
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i> , Munich, Leipzig 1892-
<i>CCSG</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca</i> , Turnhout 1977-
<i>CCTB</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum – La Théologie Byzantine</i> , Turnhout 2002-
<i>CFHB</i>	<i>Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae</i> , Berlin 1967-
<i>ECR</i>	<i>Eastern Churches Review</i> , Oxford 1966-1978
<i>ΕΕΘΣΠΑ</i>	Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Πανεπιστημίου Ἀθηνῶν, Athens 1924-
<i>ΕΠΕ</i>	Ἑλληνας Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, Thessalonica, “Gregorios Palamas”, 1972-
<i>ΘΒΣ</i>	Θεσσαλονικεῖς Βυζαντινοὶ Συγγραφεῖς, Thessalonica 1980-
<i>JThS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> , Oxford & London 1899-
<i>PG</i>	J.-P. Migne (ed.), <i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca</i> , Paris 1857-1866
<i>ΠΙΠΜ</i>	Πατριαρχικὸν Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν
<i>RSBN</i>	<i>Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici</i> , Rome 1964-
<i>ΠΣ</i>	Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Συγγράμματα, vol. 1-6, Thessalonica, Kyromanos, 1962-2015
<i>VigChr</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i> , Amsterdam 1947-
<i>ΦΘΒ</i>	Φιλοσοφικὴ καὶ Θεολογικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, Thessalonica 1985-

## **THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY CHAPTERS IN THE COLLECTION OF *PHILOKALIA*: OBSERVATIONS ON A PECULIAR FEATURE**

**Andreas P. Zachariou**

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Theology / Director of the Scientific Committee of Theology and Philosophy Institute; Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani University, E-mail: a.zachariou@sabauni.edu.ge, <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3499-4300>

The work of St Gregory Palamas, *One hundred and fifty Chapters*, as included in the collection of the *Philokalia*, presents an interesting peculiarity in its second section when compared to the critical editions by R. Sinkewicz and P. Chrestou. Although the *Philokalia* version of the *Chapters* aligns with these critical editions in terms of content – where the theological positions of Barlaam the Calabrian and Gregory Akindynos are criticized and refuted as contrary to the patristic tradition – there is a notable absence of any explicit reference to the names Barlaam and Akindynos and to the epithets *Barlaamites* and *Akindynists*.

This peculiar feature and its possible reasons will be briefly discussed in the present article.

*Keywords: St Gregory Palamas, Gregory Akindynos, Barlaam the Calabrian, Barlaamites, Akindynists, Philokalia, One hundred and fifty Chapters.*