Matthew I, Patriarch of Constantinople (1397 - 1410), his life, his patriarchal acts, his written works

Kapsalis, Athanasius G.

MATTHEW I, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE

(1397 - 1410),

HIS LIFE, HIS PATRIARCHAL ACTS, HIS WRITTEN WORKS

ATHANASIUS G. KAPSALIS

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS,

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM 1994

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This Thesis is a review of Patriarch Matthew I's life, his Patriarchal acts and his written works.

Patriarch Matthew I showed his inclination to the monastic life at a very early age. This love sculpted his character with humility, obedience and many other virtues.

After he became Patriarch he had to face various troubles, not only because of the financial ruin of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople but also because of his enemies: Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia.

During 1399-1403, Emperor Manuel II went to the West (Italy, France, England), escorted by fifty attendants, including Macarius of Ankara, Matthew I's enemy and someone very well informed about the Schism of the Western Church. From Emperor Manuel II's letters we can gather that he was well aware of Macarius' plans to depose Matthew I.

While Emperor Manuel II was away, Matthew of Medeia acted to depose Patriarch Matthew I from the Patriarchal throne, with the support of the ex-Emperor John VII (1390) who had now become Emperor-regent.

After Emperor Manuel II came back from his trip, he supported Matthew I, re-establishing him on the Patriarchal throne.

Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia, however, insisted on Matthew I's deposition, and repeatedly called for the convention of a number of Synods to prove his non-canonical election.

As can be seen, if Matthew I's two opponents succeeded in deposing him from the Patriarchal throne then a Schism may have arisen in the Eastern Church similar to that of the Western Church, since Matthew I was regarded by the majority as the legal Patriarch and his party would react against any newly-elected Patriarch.

With Matthew I's peaceful intentions and Manuel II's wisdom, the Church of Constantinople overcame the trouble and the Ecumenical Patriarchate retained its freedom to help what was left of the Byzantine Empire.

It must be pointed out that Matthew I acted to resolve many Ecclesiastical affairs, and left behind him two important written works:

I. His 'Hypotyposis' which gives advice to the Bishops and the Ecclesiastical Elders of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and

II. His 'Monastic Testament' in which Matthew I narrates his life and gives eighteen monastic regulations to the monks of the Charsianeites' monastery. As Matthew I states, these regulations had previously been issued in the 'Hypotyposis' of Patriarch Nil .

I would like to think that this work might prove useful to Scholars as well as general readers. Covering the wide field of Matthew I's life - using the primary sources of the Patriarchal records - it can lay claim to much originality.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Anselm Banduri, 'Imperium Orientale sive antiquitates Constantinopolitanae in quator partes distributae...'

= Anselmi Banduri, Domni Ragusini, Presbyteri ac Mon achi Benedictini e congregatione Melitensi, Imperium Orientale sive antiquitates Constantinopolitanae in quator partes distributae: quae ex variis scriptorum Graecorum operibus & praesertium inediti adornatae, Commentariis & Geographicis, Topographicis, alisque quam plurimis monumentorum ac nomismatum tabellis illustrantur & ad intelligentiam cum sacrae tum profanae historiae apprime conducunt, Opera et Studio, Tomus primus, Venice M.DCC.XXIX (1729).

BZ = Byzantinische Zeitschrift.

BF = Byzantinische Forschungen.

Byz = Byzantion.

BZ = Byzantinische Zeitschrift

Darrouzès, Regestes = Jean Darrouzès A.A., Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople, Vol.I: Les Actes des Patriarches, Fasc.VI: Les Regestes de 1377 a 1410, [Le Patriarcat Byzantin, ser.I], Paris 1979.

ΕΕΒΣ = Ἐπετηρίς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν.

ΕΚΦΣ = Ὁ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος.

EO = Echos d' Orient.

G.A. Rallis-M. Potlis, 'Σύνταγμα τῶν Θείων καί ἱερῶν κανόνων...'.

= George A. Rallis - M. Potlis, Σύνταγμα τῶν Θείων καί

ἱερῶν κανόνων τῶν τε ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων καί τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν καί τοπικῶν συνόδων καί τῶν κατά μέρος ἁγίων πατέρων, t.I-IV, Athens 1852-1859.

ΘΗΕ = Θρησκευτική καί Ἠθική Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία.

IEE = Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ἔθνους, t.I-IV, Athens 1980.

I.M. Konidares- K.A. Manaphes, 'Επιτελεύτιος βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...'.

= **I.M. Konidares- K.A. Manaphes,** Ἐπιτελεύτιος βούλησις καί διδασκαλία τοῦ παναγιωτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου πρός τούς ὑπ' αὐτόν μοναχούς, περιλαμβάνουσα μέν ἐξ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι τέλους τά κατ' αὐτόν, ἔχουσα δέ καί τινα ἔκθεσιν ἐν κεφαλαίοις διηρημένην τῶν ἐμπεριειλημμένων τῇ προγεγονυία ὑποτυπώσει παρά τοῦ καλογήρου αὐτοῦ τοῦ πανοσιωτάτου ἐν μοναχοῖς κυροῦ Μάρκου.

JÖBG = **Jahrbuch des Österreichischen Gesellaschaft.**

J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...'.

= **John W. Barker, Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship, New Brunswick - New Jersey 1969.**

M.M. = **Miklosich Franciscus et Müller Iosephus, Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani, M.CCC.XV - M.CCCC.II (1315-1402), e Codicibus Manu Scriptis Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis, sumptus praebentae Caesarea Scientiarum Academia, Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi Sacra et Profana, Volumen Secundum, ed. Carolus Gerold, Vindobonae M.DCCC.LXII (1862).**

OCP = **Orientalia Christiana Periodica.**

ODB	= The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, Vols.I-III, Oxford 1991.
PG	= J.P. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeco - latina.
REB	= Revue des Études Byzantines.
ZK	= Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to Dr. Carol Harrison for her help at various stages during the preparation of my M.A. Thesis. Dr. Harrison gave me valuable advice on particular points, suggesting many stylistic improvements and encouraged me until the completion of this Thesis.

I would like to thank the Student Schlolarships' Foundation of the Republic of Greece for their financial support with the fees for my studies and my living expences.

Finally I should like to say how much I owe to my Greek masters Vlassios Io. Phidas, Professor of General Church History in the University of Athens and Dimitrios B. Gonis, Professor of Slavic history in the University of Athens, who some years ago introduced me to the specific era of Church history during the XIV century.

NOTES ON PROPER NAMES

I would like to point out that Greek first names, when well known, are given their English form: thus Matthew, Manuel, John, Anthony, Constantine, Gabriel, Nathanael.

Latin forms are used when these seem more familiar: e.g. Macarius, Callistus, Athanasius, Euthymius, Alexius, Theognostus.

Less well-known first names, such as Dimitrios are left in their Greek form.

Some Slav and Russian names appear in their own form: Olgerd, Dmitri Donskoi.

The same guidelines have been applied to less familiar family names, such as Bryennios, while better known ones appear in Latin dress: e.g. Comnenus, Cerularius.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

A BRIEF HISTORICAL, POLITICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL DESCRIPTION OF BYZANTIUM DURING THE XIV CENTURY AND THE BEGINNING OF THE XV

In the Historical survey which follows we will have to limit ourselves simply to a description of the Ecclesiastical and political history of the era of the person we are studying.

The entire XIV century can be described as the 'century of the civil war', a fact which explains the decline in the political, social and economic situation. During the era of Matthew I the Turks, from distant Asia, had succeeded in creating an asphyxiating 'human collar' in the area surrounding Constantinople.

Insecurity was evident throughout the Byzantine Empire: from the beginning of the XIV century, Andronicus II (1282-1328) had asked the 'Catalan Company[1]' for help. Initially the Catalans wanted to help the Emperor, but by the time they settled in the towns which they liberated from the Turks, they were asking for large amounts of money in order to continue protecting them[2].

At the same time a great controversy between the Venetians

[1] The Catalan Company, was a company of mercenary troops, under the leadership of Roger de Flor.

[2] George Ostrogorsky, History of the Byzantine State, translated by Joan Hussey, Oxford 1956, p.440.

and the Genoese arose. The main reason was the c o m m e r c i a l expectations of each side. The problems which Byzantium faced during these conflicts were great and irresolvable [3].

And to these circumstances we must add two new civil wars: the first one was between Andronicus II (1282-1328) and Andronicus III (1328-1341) and was mainly caused by the ambitions of the latter to become the King of the Byzantine Empire. In 1328 Andronicus III, after many victories against his Grandfather, invaded Constantinople and was accepted enthusiastically[4] .

The second civil war was much longer than the first one. After the sudden death of Andronicus III there was no recognized succesor. John V was still a child. Hence John VI Cantacuzenus (1347-1354), who was the close advisor of Andronicus III (1328-1341), became regent - de jure. Although Patriarch John XIV Calecas (1282-1347) wanted the regency, the army stood by John VI Cantacuzenus, and proclaimed him as the new Emperor in October of 1341[5] .

In the West, the Papacy encountered many problems because of the Caesaropapism of the Frankish Emperors. Boniface VIII (1294-1303) reacted against Phillip the Beautiful (1268-1314), and later Clement V (1305-1314) was the first to come under the 'Babylonian

---

[3] Ageliki Laios, **Ἡ Βασιλεία τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου Β' (1282-1328)**, IEE, t.IX, Athens 1980, pp.146-147.

[4] Ibid., p.153.

[5] Ibid., pp.150-156.

captivity' - almost seventy years' captivity in which the Papacy did whatever was in accordance with the will of the Frankish Emperors[6]. The Popes were trying their best to satisfy them, and sometimes they were completely hostile to the Byzantine Emperor, as the excommunication of Andronicus II (1282-1328) shows[7].

Theological discussions between the Eastern and the Western Church continued during the XIV century. It was in the Autumn of the year 1333 - during the reign of the Emperor Andronicus III (1328-1342) - that the delegates of Pope John XXII [8] (1316-1334) arrived in Constantinople to participate in the unificatory discussions that were taking place there.

In 1339, Byzantine representatives were sent to Pope Benedict XII (1334-1342), for the same reason. In both of the above discussions the results were not very encouraging [9].

But during all this, the Eastern Church was enjoying the acme of its theology and its monasticism. The Hesychast controversies, which were raised in Byzantium by Gregory Palamas and Barlaam of Calabria, reinforced the theology of the Orthodox Church. There were

---

[6] (Archim.) Vasilios K. Stephanides , **Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι σήμερον**, Athens 1978[5], pp.509-512.

[7] Clement V (1305-1314) excommunicated Andronicus II (1282-1328) acting for Charles de Valois (1270-1325) who wanted to become the Byzantine Emperor. See George Ostrogorsky, op. cit., pp.440-441.

[8] He was in Avignon at that time.

[9] Vlasios Io. Phidas, **Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία ἀπό τῆς Εἰκονομαχίας μέχρι τῆς Ἁλώσεως (726-1453)**, t.II, Athens 1983, p.290.

many monks, mainly at the monasteries of Mount-Athos, using a method of monastic prayer and contemplation (Ἡσυχία), designed to achieve communion with God. It was a practice centered on the constant recitation of the short Jesus prayer: 'Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me'. The name of this practice was 'prayer of the heart'. Hesychasts used physical exercises in order to achieve concentration, but their methods were the tools and not the end. The spirituality of such contemplative monasticism can be traced back to the desert fathers of the IV century.

The monks unified this old tradition in 'Palamism', because the Monk Gregory Palamas came to be their spiritual leader, practicing himself and teaching them the 'prayer of the heart'.

The 'Anti-Palamites', who were under the guidance of Monk Barlaam from Calabria, claimed that the Hesychasts were doctrinally mistaken. After four Synods[10], the Anti-Palamites were condemned and the Palamites' definitions of the noetical prayer, 'Hesychasm', became an official doctrine of the Orthodox church[11].

Patriarch Matthew I (1397-1410) was born some years after the Hesychast controversies. As we will see, he was introduced to a monastery very early, under the spiritual guidance of the hermit Mark

[10] The first two in 1341, the third in 1347 and the fourth in 1351.

[11] (Archim.) Philaretos Vaphides, **Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία, Μέση Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία (700-1453),** t.II, Constantinople 1886, pp.246-251. Cf. Walter F. Adeney, The Greek and Eastern Churches, Edinburgh 1908, pp.288-289.

from Mount-Athos. This spiritual leader was a well-known practicioner of Hesychasm, which he may have taught to Matthew before he became Patriarch.

But what about the general situation in Constantinople? It was not promising for Byzantium. The Palaeologus' family was divided into two parties, each one trying to gain the throne of the Empire. Their behaviour damaged the church very badly since every change of Emperor meant a change of Patriarch, who silently supported the Emperor.

With a view to gaining the support of the Pope of Rome, Urban V (1362-1370), John V (1341-1391) Emperor of Constantinople, declared his conversion to the Roman-Catholic doctrine of 'filioque'[12].

John V also had serious difficulties because of his son Andronicus IV (1376-1379), who demanded the throne of Constantinople, imitating the behaviour of a contemporary Prince of the Turks, who opposed his father[13]. Both of them failed to succeed in a victory against their fathers.

After the failure of his revolution against his father, Andronicus IV was imprisoned, while his father named his second son

---

[12] Elizabeth Zachariades, **Ἡ ἐπέκταση τῶν Ὀθωμανῶν στήν Εὐρώπη ὡς τήν Ἅλωση τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1354-1453)**, IEE, t.IX, Athens 1980, p.188.

[13] He was the son of Murad I (1362-1389), Savdji, who also demanded the throne from his father. Murad I, might have sent his son as governor, to the Turkish territories of Thrace. The Turkish Prince, grasped the opportunity of meeting Andronicus IV (1376-1379), and both of them began the revolution against their fathers. Ibid., p.189.

Manuel II (1391-1425) as co-emperor.

In August of 1376, Andronicus IV escaped from the monastery where he had been imprisoned. Trying to take revenge, he imprisoned his father John V and his two brothers Manuel II and Theodore.

In this struggle for the Imperial crown, John V gained the throne, again with Turkish support (in July of 1379), in exchange for his promise to pay the Sultan tribute and to give him military aid[14]. According to the treaty of Turin, Andronicus IV was recognised as the successor of his father John V[15].

John V remained on the throne of Constantinople until the spring of 1390. In April of 1390, John VII [16] (1390) grasped the opportunity of becoming Emperor of Constantinople, signing an alliance with the Turkish Sultan Bayazid I (1389-1402).

But John VII (1390) did not succeed completely because his Empire lasted only for a few months. Manuel II besieged and occupied Constantinople (17 of September)[17]. He dislodged the usurper and gave the throne back to his father and himself.

---

[14] Ibid., pp.189-190.

[15] The Turks and the Venetians supported John V who besieged Galatas. The Genoese supported Andronicus IV. After the siege of Galatas, Andronicus IV was recognised as the succesor of his father John V (1381). This recognition was repeated in August of 1382 in the treaty of Turin. Ibid., p.190.

[16] He was Andronicus IV's (1376-1379) son.

[17] George Ostrogorsky, op. cit., pp.486-487.

The old Emperor John V was restored by his son Manuel II. All the civil wars against his son Andronicus IV had made him very tired and sick. He died in the same year on the 16th of February, 1391[18].

The new Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425) is a man of great importance to us not only as an Emperor but also as a historical person who trusted and supported Matthew as Patriarch of Constantinople (1397-1410).

Some years before Matthew became Patriarch, the jealousy between the Roman and the Frankish Cardinals caused great problems[19]. The result was the great Papal Schism, which arose with the election of Clement VII (1378-1394) in Avignon and lasted for about forty years (1378-1417)[20]. Shortly before that, Rome's Pope Urban VI (1378-1389) had tried to continue discussions with the Orthodox about the unity of the churches[21].

Meanwhile, many problems arose for the Venetians because of the Turkish sea-attacks. The resultant confusion brought the problem to the attention of the two Popes and the leaders of Europe. In 1394 King Sigismund of Hungary (1368-1437) and John of Nevers,

---

[18] Ibid., pp.487-488.

[19] Philip Hughes, A popular history of the Reformation, London 1957, p.50.

[20] (Archim.) Vasilios K. Stephanides, op. cit., pp.513-514.

[21] In September of 1384 Patriarch Nil (1380-1388), answers to Pope Urban VI (1378-1389) that the union of the Churches could only be achieved according to the canons. M.M., II, No 389, p.87[11-12]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2773.

advanced to the Danube after the proclamation of the two Popes (of Rome and of Avignon) for a new crusade. Due to the impetuosity of the French and the desertion of the Wallachians and Transylvanians the crusaders suffered a crushing defeat at Nicopolis of Aimos[22].

In July of 1397, Manuel II (1391-1425) sent his ambassadors to England and France, asking for military and economic support. Both of these countries seemed to be interested in the situation at Constantinople. Early in 1397, England sent the ambassador of Paris - Henry Godard - to Constantinople for eighteen months with the purpose of reporting on the events that were taking place there[23].

Acting in a similar way, the french King Charles VI (1368-1422) commanded Marshal Boucicaut to lead a small army to the support of the Byzantine Emperor, Manuel II. Boucicaut arrived in Constantinople in the late summer of 1399. But his forces did little in the way of recovering lost ground from the Turks. In the end of 1399, he thought of going back to France to demand a much larger army and financial support. Before his departure he persuaded Manuel II (1391-1425) that it was the right moment to travel with him all over Europe to awaken the conscience of the western leaders. As D.M.Nicol reports, it was Boucicaut who cajoled Manuel II's nephew John VII (1390) into a

[22] Jonathan Riley-Smith, The Atlas of the Crusades, London 1991, p.148.

[23] Donald M. Nicol, A Byzantine Emperor in England, Manuel II's visit to London in 1400-1401, in Byzantium: its ecclesiastical history and relations with the western world, Collected studies, X, [Variorum reprints], London 1972, p.206.

reconciliation with his uncle, in order to become Emperor-regent[24].

The existence of John VII as Emperor-regent caused many problems for Patriarch Matthew I (1397-1410), even if the Emperor Manuel II (1391-1425) made John VII responsible only for the defence of the town. This fact will be discussed in the first part of our thesis which is concerned with the life of Patriarch Matthew I.

In December of 1399 Emperor Manuel II left Constantinople accompanied by Marshal Boucicaut. He also took with him some priests to minister to his spiritual needs while he was in 'partibus schismaticorum' [25]. The Emperor's whole escort consisted of fifty people. They all arrived in Venice in the spring of 1400 and proceeded to Milan. At that time there were rumours that Manuel II had approached Pope Boniface IX (1389-1404) and that both of them had discussed the proclamation of a new crusade. At this point J.W. Barker believes that although this meeting seemed an unbelievable rumour, the Pope himself felt at that moment more inspired than ever to renew his call for a new crusade against the Turks[26].

After Milan, the Byzantine Emperor went to Paris where he

---

[24] Ibid., p.210.

[25] Ibid., p.210. Among those who were accompanying the Byzantine Emperor there was a Bishop called Macarius, Metropolitan of Ankara. Macarius learnt more about the Papal schism (1378-1417) in the West, and after his arrival in Constantinople he tried in every way to depose the Ecumenical Patriarch Matthew I (1397-1410).

[26] J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.172. See also Appendice XIX, Manuel's supposed visit to the Pope, p.510-512.

met King Charles VI - the well beloved - (1368-1422) and to London where he met King Henry IV (1399-1413) at Blackheath. The two Kings celebrated the feast of Christmas together in Eltham. The historian Robert Byron believes that Manuel stayed in England for one month [27] while D.M.Nicol insists on two months[28] .

During the absence of Manuel II in Europe, Matthew I was in trouble because of a party of Bishops who took the opportunity to excommunicate and then to condemn him. A year after the Turk Bayazid I was defeated by Timour (Ankara, July of 1402), the Byzantine Emperor went back to Constantinople (June of 1403) and found the Patriarchal throne empty.

Some months after his defeat at Ankara (1402), Bayazid I died leaving many unsolved problems, but most of all that of his successors. Two of the sons of Bayazid I, Suleiman (1402-1410) and Musa (1411-1413) were demanding, each one for himself, the leadership of the Turks.

In this military environment, Matthew I was restored by the Emperor and after some time by a synod. Manuel II needed, in any case, a spiritual leader who could unify all the citizens. He knew that he could not rely on an agreement that had been signed between him and Suleiman. Hence, from 1407 onwards, he sent the pro-Latin diplomat

[27] Robert Byron, The Byzantine Achievement, An Historical perspective A.D. 330-1453, London 1929, pp.264-265.

[28] Donald M. Nicol, op. cit., p.211.

Manuel Chrysoloras to the west, in order to renew contacts with Latin courts and to investigate chances of aid[29].

This introduction is a concise summary of the historical and ecclesiastical events of the XIV century and the beginning of the XV, concentrating on the most important and significant facts. We believe that this will provide a helpful overview in order to appreciate the era of Patriarch Matthew I.

[29] J.M. Hussey, The Orthodox church in the Byzantine Empire [Oxford History of the Christian Church], Oxford 1991, p.268.

PART A: THE LIFE OF PATRIARCH MATTHEW I,

(c. 1360 - 1410)

CHAPTER I: THE FIRST YEARS...

There are some Ecclesiastical figures who gradually become significant personalities, not only because of what they have offered to the Church but also because of their involvement in social and political activities.

One of these is undoubtedly Patriarch Matthew I (1397-1410). Although the written sources give us - indirectly - full details about him, not enough attention has been paid to his activities. In our opinion he was overshadowed by another great man of Constantinople who was contemporary with him, Emperor Manuel II (1391-1425).

Even so, Patriarch Matthew I was a gifted and talented Bishop. Patient and reasonable in many difficult cirumstances, he guided the Eastern church for thirteen years.

Externally, the enemies were the Turks, causing trouble for more than a century because of their imperialistic views. Apart from them, there were the Venetians and the Genoese who fought each other, for commercial rights in Byzantium. When one of them was friendly to the Byzantines, the other one was friendly with the Turks!

The internal enemies were the ambitious Bishops who

believed that they could succeed in deposing Matthew I from the Patriarchal throne.

Patriarch Matthew I was born in 1360, maybe earlier, during the second Patriarchate of Callistus I (1355-1363). The place of his birth and the first years of his childhood are unknown to us. From his early years, however, he felt an inclination to the monastic life. At the age of fifteen - when Patriarch Philotheos was restored (1364-1376) - he became a novice Monk at the Charsianeites' monastery[1]. Many parents encouraged their children to become monks at that time but the choice of a monastic life was Matthew's own, made at the age of twelve. Three years later his parents agreed to his request [2].

Byzantine education at that time was either handled by the church[3] or was private. We don't know what sort of education Matthew had before he became a monk, but in the church he would have had the comprehensive education of the time. Furthermore, according to the II canon of the VII Ecumenical Council, those who intended to become

[1] Alice-Mary Talbot, 'Matthew I', ODB, Vol.II, Oxford 1991, p.1316.

[2] H. Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I. (1397-1410)', BZ, 51, (1958), 295^{1} - 296^{18}. Vindob. Hist. gr. 55, ff.2^{r}-4^{r} : I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, **'Επιτελεύτιος βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...'**, ΕΕΒΣ, 45, (1981-82), 472^{34} - 474^{94}.

[3] It was the' Patriarchal school', organized in Constantinople in the XII century, by the Emperor Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118). He established three positions for the 'teachers' of the 'Gospel', of the 'Apostle', and of the 'Psalter'. They taught Theology to future clergy or monks. The 'Patriarchal school' or 'Patriarchal Academy', was located in 'Hagia Sophia'. The three teachers (DIDASKALOI), usually belonged to the corps of Deacons of Hagia Sophia. Alexander Kazhdan - Robert Browning, 'Patriarchal School', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1599.

Bishops had first of all to learn by heart the Psalms and then they were examined by a Metropolitan to establish whether they read the scripture in an Orthodox way[4].

A careful study in the third part of the thesis will enable us to see the level of his literary, and especially his theological, knowledge, because Matthew's education is evident in his actions and his work.

The connection of Matthew's name with the Charsianeites' monastery - which was one of the most distinguished in Constantinople - is a fact of great significance. At the time of the young Matthew, the spiritual life of the monastery was at its highest level. A co-emperor and a future Patriarch (Nil) who had served there before Matthew, are sufficient evidence of this. They had established the monastery as a powerful centre in Constantinople[5].

In the Charsianeites' monastery Matthew was put under the guidance of his spiritual father 'Mark the Athonite', one of the strictest Hesychast ascetics of the period - twenty five years after

---

[4] PG, 137, 287D.

[5] The Charsianeites' monastery was founded in Constantinople in the middle of the XIV century by John (his monastic name was Job) Charsianeites a supporter of John VI Cantacuzenus (1347-1354). The monastery, which was dedicated to the Virgin Mary, was well known as 'Nea Peribleptos' (Νέα Περίβλεπτος). The exact position of the monastery is unknown but it is supposed that it was near the walls which protected the town. John VI Cantacuzenus issued a 'Chrysobull' (= solemn document for granting privileges), favouring the monastery. After John VI Cantacuzenus retired (1355), he became a Monk at the same monastery (changing his name in Joashaph). Alice-Mary Talbot, 'Charsianeites Monastery', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.415.

the official end of the Hesychast controversies[6]. We can determine that Matthew I was taught the 'noetical prayer' of the Hesychasts, since the Abbot of Charsianeites', Mark, knew it. According to Patriarch Nil (1379-1388), the life of the ascetic Mark was close to the life of the Angels! No one in the church of Constantinople could ignore him [7]. Matthew was taught by Mark to be humble, to obey the monastic rules, and he distinguished himself in his obedience[8].

The successor of Abbot Mark at the Charsianeites' monastery was Nil Kerameus[9]. Nil became Matthew's spiritual father. Holding Matthew in high esteem he ordained him Deacon, and after a while, Priest[10].

There are no written sources concerning the place and the church that Matthew served as a Deacon and then as a Priest. But we might conjecture the following: some years after his ordination as a Priest, Matthew was elected Metropolitan of Chalcedon (1387). During

---

[6] Mark was the ex-Abbot of the 'Kosmidion' monastery, H. Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I. (1397-1410)', BZ, 51, (1958), 298^{17-28}: Vindob. Hist. gr. 55, f.7^{r} : I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, **'Επιτελεύτιος βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...', ΕΕΒΣ,** 45, (1981-82), 476^{183}-477^{194}.

[7] M.M., II, No 399, p.108^{23-25} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2829.

[8] M.M., II, No 399, pp.108^{25}-109^{1-3}. **'Πάρ' ἐκείνου καλῶς ἄρχεσθαι παιδευθείς, καί τούς τῆς ὑποταγῆς καί ὑπακοῆς νόμους ὡς εἴ τις τῶν ὀνομαστῶν ἐκμαθών, καί καλῶς ἀλειψάμενος πρός τούς τῆς ἀσκήσεως πόνους'** Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2829.

[9] His civil name was Neophytus Kerameus. His monastic name was Nil. Nil Kerameus, was the later Pariarch of Constantinople (1379-1388).

[10] M.M., II, No 399, p.109^{6-7}: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2829.

that period there was a rule which was imposed with very few exceptions: In accordance with this rule, all the Metropolitans and the Bishops of the Ecumenical throne of Constantinople were chosen from the clergy of 'H a g i a S o p h i a' [11]. Hence, we are sure that Matthew served in Constantinople.

It has been suggested that the Charsianeites' monastery was located near the walls which protected the Town[12]. We do not know the exact position of the monastery but what we do know is the position of two of the monastery's vineyards, one of which was located near the 'Golden gate' (**Χρυσία Πύλη**) and another in the position of 'Savron' (**Σαυρῶν**). There were also two buildings 'Metohia' (**Μετόχια**), the first near the district of 'Milion' (**Μίλιον**), and the second by the 'Beautiful gate' (**Ὡραία Πύλη**) which included another vineyard near the district of 'Kyparissia' (**Κυπαρίσσια**), in Psamathia[13]. In the light of this evidence H. Hunger supposes that the monastery was located in the southwest of the town near the Stoudites' monastery. In the 'Monastic testament[14]' of Patriarch Matthew I a vineyard is mentioned which - in

[11] Sophia =(**Σοφία**) in Greek is 'Wisdom'. The church which was the Cathedral of Constantinople, was dedicated to the Wisdom of God = Hagia Sophia.

[12] Alice-Mary Talbot, 'Charsianeites Monastery', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.415.

[13] H. Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I. (1397-1410)', BZ, 51, (1958), 298[1-15]; Vindob. Hist. gr. 55, f.6[v]; I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, '**Επιτελεύτιος βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...**', **ΕΕΒΣ**, 45, (1981-82), 476[167-181].

[14] A set of Regulations, prescribing the administrative organization and rules of behaviour of the Charsianeites' monastery. In other words it was one of the varieties of 'Typika', and not a 'will'.

his opinion - was near the monastery, located by the 'Beautiful gate' (**Ὡραία Πύλη**), near the 'Neorion gate' (**Πύλη τοῦ Νεωρίου**) and close to the 'Golden Horn' (**Χρυσοῦς κόλπος** or **Κεράτιος κόλπος**)[15].

To the best of our knowledge, Matthew's residence was this monastery and he remained there even after he became Patriarch. The church he was serving was probably the church of the monastery itself - the 'katholikon' (**τό Καθολικόν**)[16] - which was dedicated to the 'Assumption' of the Virgin Mary[17].

Additional evidence unquestionably demonstrates that Matthew served in Constantinople. It was not long before Matthew was elected as Metropolitan of Chalcedon, when Patriarch Nil, in his second 'Monastic testament', appointed Matthew as the Abbot who should succeed him[18]. This suggests that before his election Matthew served as a Priest in the Charsianeites' monastery.

---

[15] Herbert Hunger, 'Das Kloster **τοῦ Χαρσιάνίτου**', JÖBG, 7, (1958), 137.

[16] It is the central church of the monastery. The place where the monks gathered to receive the Holy-Communion.

[17] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes,'**Επιτελεύτιος βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...**', ΕΕΒΣ, 45, (1981-82), 507[1244-1254]; Vindob. Hist. gr.55, f.40[r].

[18] M.M., II, No 399, p.108[21-22] ; Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2829. Cf. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2832.

CHAPTER II: THE 'HANDING' OF THE CHARSIANEITES' MONASTERY, TO MATTHEW

As we have seen, Patriarch Nil declared his decision to give his place as Abbot of the Charsianeites' monastery to Matthew, through an official document[1]. Nil fulfilled his desire by means of a 'Monastic Testament', leaving the monastery to Matthew. It was a clear expression of Nil's feelings about Matthew - feelings which later on would be further demonstrated in Matthew's election as the Metropolitan of Chalcedon.

But the 'Monastic testament' itself raises many questions which must be addressed.

The Charsianeites' monastery was a spiritual centre, especially in Matthew´s time, and the name of a great figure - John VI Cantacuzenus - was related to it. It had the same name as the 'Thema' of the Charsianeites' located in Minor Asia[2]. In the Patriarchal acts of 1401, a doctor called Charsianeites appears, who came to Constantinople from Cappadocia[3]. We do not, however, think that he was the same person as the rich man called John Charsianeites who, fifty-four years before, decided to become a monk (named Job Charsianeites).

---

[1] M.M., II, No 399, p.109^{9-12} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2829.

[2] Herbert Hunger, 'Das Kloster **τοῦ Χαρσιανίτου**', JÖBG, 7, (1958), 136.

[3] M.M. II, No 633, pp.476-477. M.M., No 638, pp.485-486: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3195, 3200.

John Charsianeites bought a territory in the district of 'Palatitzia' and John VI Cantacuzenus issued a 'Chrysobull', supporting the foundation of monastery. The monastery which was built between 1347-1354, was dedicated to the Virgin-Mary and called 'Nea Peribleptos' (**Νέα Περίβλεπτος**), though most often it was commonly referred to as the Charsianeites' monastery[4].

As we saw before, when Matthew entered the monastery as a novice monk, the Abbot of the Charsianeites was 'Mark the Athonite'. Mark was the spiritual father of both Nil Kerameus and Matthew.

According to the 'Monastic testament' of Matthew I, Abbot Mark left the monastery in his own 'Hypotyposis[5] ' to Patriarch Nil[6]. Nil left it to Matthew, with a 'Monastic testament'. It is important to note that the monastery had been Mark's private property before it was left to Nil. In the same way it was Nil's private property, before it was left, in another official document, to Matthew[7].

The problem which arises is that, according to his

---

[4] Herbert Hunger, 'Das Kloster **τοῦ Χαρσιανίτου'**, JÖBG, 7, (1958), 136-137.

[5] As we have seen before, the word 'Typika', is a conventional term, designating a great variety of 'Monastic testaments' which beared such titles as 'diatheke', 'hypotyposis', 'thesmos' etc. See K.A. Manaphes, **Μοναστηριακά Τυπικά - Διαθήκαι, Ἀθηνᾶ, 7,** (1970), 33-60.

[6] Abbot Mark had expressed his decision to leave the Charsianeites' monastery to Nil (Neophytus Kerameus) H. Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I. (1387-1410)', BZ, 51, (1958), 296[33-39] : Vindob. Hist. gr. 55, f.4[v]: I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes '**Ἐπιτελεύτιος βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...**', ΕΕΒΣ, 45, (1981-82), 475[110-116].

[7] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2832, see Critique.

'Monastic testament', Patriarch Nil (end of 1387 - Jan. 1388) left the monastery personally to the M o n k = (Ιερομόναχος) Matthew, and not to the Metropolitan of Kyzikos, Matthew. But the document's date (end of 1387 - Jan. 1388) shows that, when it was presented as an official document, Matthew had already been ordained as Metropolitan of Kyzikos (November of 1387). Why is there this contradiction?

It is our opinion that Nil wrote his 'Monastic testament' while Matthew was still a Monk and that it can be proved by the 'Act of Kyzikos' - a Patriarchal act which is one of the main sources about Matthew's life. It contains a brief narrative, covering the period from when Matthew was first introduced into the Charsianeites' monastery, and gives a complete 'curriculum vitae' of Matthew's life when he became a Monk under the guidance of the Abbot Mark, his ordination first as a Deacon, then as a Priest, and then the fact that he was appointed spiritual father (of the Charsianeites' monastery). The continuity of the events is clear, because after a while it is mentioned that Matthew was elected to the Diocese of Chalcedon and then to Kyzikos.

The document itself shows that Matthew became Abbot of the monastery before he was elected Metropolitan of Chalcedon. According to the critical sources edited by Jean Darrouzès, Nil's second 'Monastic testament' is dated between the end of 1387 and the beginning of January of 1388. During this period, Matthew was already

Metropolitan of Kyzikos and 'President of Hellesponte and Bithynia'. Nil's decision had been expressed in writing before Matthew's election as Metropolitan of Chalcedon and of course before his election and ordination as Metropolitan of Kyzikos.

Nil possibly wanted to give his 'Monastic testament' an official character, presenting it as a Patriarchal act[8]. This is how, in our opinion, this contradiction can be solved. Hence, we do not believe that this 'Monastic testament' is related to the one written by Patriarch Nil three years before[9].

Finally, we might mention that Jean Darrouzès thinks that Nil remained Abbot of the Charsianeites' monastery, even after he gave its leadership to Matthew. But given the fact that Nil did not hold the Patriarchal throne for very long after his second 'Monastic testament', and Jean Darrouzès does not give any written evidence, we incline to disagree with him[10].

---

[8] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2832, see Critique.

[9] M.M., II, No 364, pp.61-64 ; Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2769.

[10] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2832, see Date.

CHAPTER III: MATTHEW'S ELECTION AS METROPOLITAN OF CHALCEDON

According to the 'Act of Kyzikos' Matthew became the spiritual father (Abbot) of the Charsianeites' monastery, before Nil elected him as Metropolitan of Chalcedon[1]. Nil's Patriarchate lasted for eight years (1380-1388). A Patriarchal act of 1383 (24 of August), proves that Matthew, as a monk, did his best in his contributions to the Patriarchal synod[2].

Nil held Matthew in high esteem and proposed his name as Bishop in the synod. Matthew was elected Metropolitan of Chalcedon, some days before the beginning of November 1387 [3] and was given the honorary title of 'President[4] ', but he was never ordained as Metropolitan of this town [5].

In the 'Act of Kyzikos' it is mentioned that Chalcedon had

---

[1] M.M., II, No 399, p.108^{21-22} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2829 .

[2] M.M., II, No 361, pp.53^{32}-54^{2} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2756.

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2809.

[4] 'President' (=Πρόεδρος): It was a title used for the superior of an Ecclesiastical province. Hence, Matthew could be the administrator or director of this see, but not its effective titular (assistant Bishop), as no enthronement or installation was involved. In the XIV century the incorporation of such sees was provisional, ceasing once a new Bishop was elected. S. Salaville, " Le titre ecclesiastique de 'proedros' dans les documents byzantins", EO, 29, (1930), 416-436.

[5] ' Εψηφισμένος '.

been completely destroyed by the Turks[6] : hence the elected Metropolitan for Chalcedon had no more than a little flock.

The property of the Diocese would no longer exist and the offering of the few, but faithful people, would not be enough. As Nil says, a number of Chalcedonians suggested that they did not need a Bishop[7]. The ordinary offering - called 'Kanonika[8]' (κανονικά) - which were levied annually on all laity in the Diocese for the Metropolitan's maintenance, were not enough.

But the financial ruin of the Diocese was not the only trouble. The privileges of the Metropolitans of Chalcedon had been increased in the past. The number of benefits that had been given to their Diocese by the Emperors set them apart from the Metropolitans of other Dioceses. Thus, Patriarch Philotheus (1364-1376) decided in a synod not to ordain any Metropolitan of Chalcedon in the future[9].

Strictly speaking, Matthew could never occupy this throne. When Patriarch Nil describes the relation between 'Matthew' and

---

[6] M.M., II, No 399, p.109^{24-26} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol. I, Fasc. VI, No 2829 .

[7] M.M., II, No 399, p.109^{26-27} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc. VI, No 2829 .

[8] E. Herman, 'Das bischöfliche Algabenwesen im Patriarchat von Konstantinopel vom XI. bis zur mitte des XIX Jahrhunderts', OCP, 5, (1939), 434-513.

[9] The fact was that he wanted to stop the disorder and confusion that had arisen as a result of the privileges which had lately been given to the Metropolitan of Chalcedon. Unfortunately the Patriarchal document is lost. The evidence is given to us by the Patriarch Anthony IV (1389-1390,1391-1397) who succeeded Nil (1380-1388) and tried to solve the problem. M.M., II, No 406, p.132^{10-16} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2853 .

'Chalcedon', he mentions a spiritual 'engagement' and not a spiritual 'marriage' [10].

Added to these circumstances was a 'temporal obstacle[11]' - a reference to the Turkish invasions - to Matthew proceeding from election to ordination[12].

We are sure that Patriarch Nil (1380-1388) was aware of both of these obstacles. We do not, however, think that he intended to to revise the synodical decision of Patriarch Philotheus (1364-1376) and ordain Matthew as Metropolitan of Chalcedon[13]. Nil gave the 'Presidency' of Chalcedon to Matthew as a privilege, concurrently with a future Metropolitan see.

There are no narrative sources to prove Matthew's participation in the 'Endemousa'[14] after his election, even though the participation of someone 'elected' for a Metropolitan see[15] was usual in

---

[10] M.M., II, No 399, p.109$^{20-21}$.

[11] 'καιρικόν ἐμπόδιον', M.M., II, No 399, p.109^{27}.

[12] M.M., II, No 399, p.109$^{24-27}$.

[13] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2640.

[14] This was a synod in which the activity of the Patriarchate of Constantinople was decided. Its administrative and judical functions included canonical discipline with dogmatic and liturgical issues. The 'Endemousa' was convened and presided over by the Patriarch. It consisted of the 'Endemountes' - the Metropolitans or the Bishops who were visiting Constantinople or those who were residing in or near the Capital. Its institution stretches back to the IV century. V. Stephanides, 'Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Synoden des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel', ZK, 55, (1936), 127-157. During Matthew's era, its membership had been increased because of the Turkish invasions. Ibid., pp.138-141.

[15] 'Epsiphismenos' (= Ἐψηφισμένος).

that era [16].

But the absence of Matthew's name from the Patriarchal acts is justifiable. The time between his election as Metropolitan of Chalcedon (before November of 1387) and his election and ordination as Metropolitan of Kyzikos was not long (November of 1387). That is why there is no mention anywhere in the Patriarchal acts of his participation in the 'Endemousa' synod[17].

Considering the aforementioned facts we are sure that Matthew was never ordained as Metropolitan of Chalcedon. As Patriarch Nil said in the 'Act of Kyzikos', the Divine Economy had decided that Matthew deserved a much more 'perfect' future[18].

---

[16] He also had the right to vote as this had happened with another contemporary person, Joseph, the 'elected' for Sozopolis. M.M., II, No 404, p.129^{25-26}, **'Ο Ὑποψήφιος Σωζοπόλεως Ἰωσήφ'**, (February of 1389).

[17] The mention of the name Matthew (May of 1384) in the Patriarchal acts is simply in a synodical act referring to the Metropolitan of Myra, whose name was Matthew. Matthew of Myra is mentioned as elected on January of 1383. See M.M., II, No 360, p.48^{6}. Cf. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2749. In August of 1383, he appears to be a member of the 'Endemousa' synod which condemned Constantine Kabasilas. Cf. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2756. In May of 1384 the Patriarch Nil decided that Matthew of Myra could go to his Diocese. See Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2767. But Matthew of Myra was not the same person as Matthew of Chalcedon who was elected before November of 1387. See Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2809.

[18] M.M., II, No 399, p.109^{23-24}. ' **Ἄλλως ἡ πρόνοια τά κατ' αὐτόν ὠκονόμει, πρός ὑψηλοτέρας ἀναβάσεις αὐτόν ἀνάγων, ὡς ἔοικε** '.

CHAPTER IV: THE ORDINATION OF MATTHEW AS METROPOLITAN OF KYZIKOS AND THE 'PRESIDENCY' OF CHALCEDON

Shortly after his election as Metropolitan of Chalcedon, Matthew was elected and ordained as Metropolitan of Kyzikos (November 1387)[1] . At first, Matthew did not accept his election, but at Patriarch Nil's insistence he submitted to the decision of the synod[2] .

Henceforth Matthew of Kyzikos could promote Readers, Sub-Deacons and Deacons and ordain Presbyters and Bishops in his Metropolitanate. He was given the Patriarchal rights over two shrines located in 'Yrtakion' (**Ὑρτάκιον**[3]): that of ' Lady Mary the Achiropoiitos[4] ' and of ' St.George[5] ' with some cells, and a building for his residence[6] .

Patriarch Nil (1380-1388) did not intend to ordain a new Metropolitan of Chalcedon, for reasons that have been mentioned earlier. Thus, Matthew was also given, in addition, the Diocese of Chalcedon together with the administration of its churches and its

---

[1] Kyzikos (today Balkiz) is a town on the south coast of Marmara on the way to Minor Asia. In 1303-4, the Headquarters of the Catalans was based in the town. The Turkish Sultan Orhan (1326-1362) took the town from the Byzantines after 1335. Kyzikos was the Metropolitan Bishopric of Hellespont. Clive F.W. Foss, 'Kyzikos', ODB, Vol.II, Oxford 1991, pp.1164-1165.

[2] M.M., II, No 399, p.109[21]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2829 .

[3] 'Artaki' = (**Ἀρτάκη**).

[4] '**Παναγία ἡ Ἀχειροποίητος**'.

[5] '**Ἅγιος Γεώργιος**'.

[6] M.M., II, No 399, p.110[6-24]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2829 .

ecclesiastical property. In addition to these he was given the church of 'St. Eufemia' located in Constantinople [7]. It was a monastic property - 'Metohion' (μετόχιον) - belonging to the Diocese of Chalcedon[8].

Kyzikos was the Metropolitan Bishopric of Hellesponte[9] and Matthew was also established as the Patriarchal 'Exarch of Hellesponte and Bithynia'[10]. Thus, he was obliged to protect the Patriarchal rights, [11] and both the clergy and the laity of Matthew's Dioceses had to obey their new Metropolitan [12].

In April 1389 - two years after Matthew's ordination as Metropolitan of Kyzikos - the Patriarchal synod decided, in agreement with the Emperor John VII[13], on the cancellation of the benefits that had hitherto been given to the Metropolitans of Chalcedon[14].

---

[7] M.I.Gedeon reports that there was more than one temple dedicated to 'St. Eufemia', and located in Constantinople. M.I. Gedeon, **Πατριαρχικοί πίνακες**, Constantinople 1890, pp.446-447.

[8] M.M., II, No 399, p.110^{24-31}.

[9] Clive F.W. Foss, op. cit., p.1165.

[10] M.M., II, No 399, pp.109^{35} - 110^{1}: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2829.

[11] M.M., II, No 399, pp.110^{31-35} - 111^{1-5}.

[12] M.M., II, No399, p.111^{7-8}. ' **Εἴτε ἐν τῇ θεοδοξάστῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλει, εἴτε ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτοῦ, εἴτε ἀλλαχοῦ ἀποδημήση** ' and furthermore ' **αἰδῶ καί ὑποταγήν καί εὐπείθειαν καί ὑποτάσσεσθαι αὐτῷ** '.

[13] The Emperor was the usurper of the throne, John VII (April - 17th of September) who, after three months, supported the restoration of the ex-Patriarch Macarius (30th of July - end of September 1390). The Emperor is characterised by the Patriarch Anthony IV as the 'Teacher of Peace and Order'. Early on the same month, John VII subscribed an alliance with the Turkish Sultan Bayazid I (1389-1402). M.M., II, No 406, p.132^{32} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2853.

[14] M.M., II, No 406, p.132^{10-16} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2853.

The privileges were probably originally given by the Emperor John V, and the Patriarchs before Anthony IV did not want to cancel them.

The one exception was the decision of the Patriarch Philotheus, who prohibited any future ordination of a Bishop for the Diocese of Chalcedon[15]. But Philotheus did not try to cancel the privileges. The title was preserved up to Anthony IV's Patriarchate as a commemoration which would prevent any territorial changes in the Dioceses around Chalcedon[16]. The Patriarchal synod wanted to abolish the privileges and found favour for their request with the new Emperor John VII (1390)[17].

At the same time John VII intended to depose Anthony IV from the Patriarchal throne. He favoured the ex-Patriarch Macarius (1376-1379) who had been supported in the past by his father Andronicus IV (1376-1379). The increased privileges of the Metropolitan of Chalcedon and the problems that had been caused in the past prohibited the election of a new one. The cancellation of these privileges would open the way to the ordination of a new Metropolitan of Chalcedon and - as a result - his participation in the 'Endemousa'.

---

[15] M.M., II, No 406, p.132^{10-16} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2853.

[16] M.M., II, No 406, p.132^{16-17} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2853.

[17] M.M., II, No 406, p.132^{22-35} - 133^{1-3} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2853.

Thus John VII could succeed in his plan[18].

After a few days the Patriarchal synod elected and ordained Gabriel as the Metropolitan of Chalcedon, a Bishop who first participated in the Patriarchal synod in April of 1389[19]. The title of 'president' of Chalcedon was automatically withdrawn from Matthew of Kyzikos.

Until then, Patriarch Anthony IV (Jan. 1389 - Jul. 1390) and most of the Metropolitans were favoured by the old Emperor John V[20]. It was unfortunate that in 1390 John V was briefly deposed by John VII, who agreed with the cancellation of the privileges that John V had given to Chalcedon.

Hence, it is not a coincidence that in July, Anthony IV was deposed by a faction of Metropolitans[21] during John VII's reign. And, of course, the restoration of the ex-Patriarch Macarius at the end of July in 1390 is far from being a coincidence.

Even so, Matthew of Kyzikos continued thinking and acting Ecclesiastically. He was opposed to the faction that deposed the

---

[18] His plan was the Patriarchal deposition, a fact, that would help him to secure the Imperial throne for himself.

[19] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2854, cf. No 2853, in Diplomatique.

[20] John V (1341-1390, 1391), was Andronicus IV's (1376-1379) brother. John VII (1390), was Andronicus IV's son. It is clear that the deposition and the restoration of the Patriarchs varied according to the deposition and the restoration of the Emperors.

[21] Macarius of Ankara was among them.

Patriarch, Anthony IV. As Macarius of Ankara reports, Anthony IV's supporters did not accept the ex-Patriarch Macarius before he was first examined by the synod[22].

[22] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.38^{v}: 'τόν Πατριάρχην Μακάριον οὐκ ἐθέλησαν παραδέξασθαι συνοδικῶς πρό ἐξετάσεως τῶν κατ' ἐκείνου'.

CHAPTER V: THE PARTICIPATION OF MATTHEW OF KYZIKOS IN THE 'ENDEMOUSA' SYNOD (NOV. 1387 - OCT.1397)

Matthew of Kyzikos took part in the assemblies of the 'Endemousa' synod for ten years. After Patriarch Nil's death, the Patriarchal throne remained vacant. Hence, the 'Endemousa' synod was not convened in 1388 and this is the reason for Matthew's absence from the Patriarchal acts of that year.

We believe that at that time Matthew was serving in all the three places he administered: Kyzikos, Chalcedon[1], and the Charsianeites' monastery. Kyzikos was next to Constantinople, located on the south-east coast of Hellesponte. Matthew could easily serve there from time to time, leaving his permanent residence - the Charsianeites' monastery - temporarily.

Patriarch Nil's successor was Anthony IV. Anthony IV's first Patriarchate lasted for a year and a half (Jan. 1389 - Jul.1390). During this Patriarchate, Matthew of Kyzikos took part in the 'Endemousa'

[1] Whenever the outskirts of Constantinople were free.

synod in February, March, April, July and September of 1389[2].

In July 1390 Anthony IV was deposed and the ex-Patriarch Macarius re-occupied the Patriarchal throne for a short period (30 Jul. - end of Sept. 1390). During Macarius' Patriarchate Matthew's name is mentioned in the Patriarchal records in July and August of 1390[3].

After Macarius' death Anthony IV gained the Patriarchal throne again. His second Patriarchate lasted for six years (Jan. 1390 - May 1397). Matthew's name appears again in the Patriarchal records in February 1392[4] and then in March, June, September, October and December of 1393[5].

In 1394, Matthew of Kyzikos took part in the Patriarchal

---

[2] Twice in February, M.M., II, Nos 404, 403, p.129[8-9], p.115[4]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 2847, 2848. Once in March, M.M.,II, No 402, p.115[4]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2851. Twice in April, M.M., II, No 406, p.133[6-7]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 2853, 2854. Twice in July, M.M., II, Nos 409, 411, p.135[26], 138[4]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 2861, 2863. Once in September, Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2867.

[3] Once in July, Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2878. Three times in August, M.M., II, Nos 417, 419, 418, p.144[18], p.149[31], 147[4]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 2879, 2880, 2881.

[4] M.M., II, No 435, p.167[29]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2921.

[5] In March, M.M., II, No 435, p.169[26-27]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2921. In June, Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2922. Twice in September, M.M., II, Nos 440, 441, p.174[13], 175[31]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 2927, 2928. Once in October, M.M., II, No 444, p.178[11]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2934. Once in December, M.M., II, No 451, p.198[30-31]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2939.

synod in January, March, May, June, July, September and December[6]. During that time, the looting of the suburbs of Constantinople by the Turks was a common occurence. The frequency of Matthew's participation in the 'Endemousa' synod leads us to assume that he resided in the Charsianeites' monastery because of the Turkish siege.

In 1395 he took part in the Patriarchal synod in May, in spring summer (sine anno), in August, and in October[7].

In 1396 he took part in the Patriarchal synod in spring - summer (sine anno) and in November[8].

In 1397 he took part in the 'Endemousa' synod in January,

---

[6] Once in January, M.M., II, No 454, p.202[9] : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2944. Once in February, M.M., II, No 461, p.208[4]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2949. Once in March, M.M., II, No 457, p.204[12-13]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2953. Once in May, Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2959. Once in June, M.M., II, No 468, p.215[18]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2965. Once in July, M.M., II, No 471, p.222[7]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2967. Once in September, M.M., II, No 465, p.213[11]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2969. Once in December, M.M., II, No 478, p.232[2]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2976.

[7] Once in May, M.M., II, No 490, p.246[16-17]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2998. Once in spring summer (sine anno), Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3025. Twice in August, M.M., II, Nos 493, 493 (ii), p.250[2], 252[8-9]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3004, 3006. Twice between August - October, M.M., II, Nos 493 (iii), 493 (v), p.253[10], 255[18]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3007, 3009.

[8] Once in spring - summer (sine anno), Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3025. Once in November, M.M., II, No 505, p.270[3]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3028.

and in March - April [9].

After Anthony IV's death, Callistus II Xanthopoulos succeeded him (May 1397). During Callistus II's Patriarchate (May-September 1397), Matthew took part in the 'Endemousa' synod in May - July and in October [10]. After Callistus II's retirement (July 1397) Matthew of Kyzikos became 'protothronos[11]' holding the Patriarch's place in the presidency of the 'Endemousa' synod.

Many years later Macarius of Ankara accused Matthew of never having been to Kyzikos[12]. We think this accusation is false, and have shown that Matthew had the opportunity to go both to his Diocese and to Constantinople: Kyzikos and Chalcedon were next to Constantinople. During Matthew's Metropolitanate in Kyzikos, four Patriarchs succeeded each other within five Patriarchates[13]. Matthew's absence from Kyzikos could have easily been noticed by them and if Matthew's behaviour as Metropolitan was not deemed proper, they could

---

[9] Three times in January, M.M., II, Nos 508, 509, 511, p.272[20], 273, 275: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3034, 3035, 3037. Three times in March - April, M.M., II, Nos 513, 517, 518, p.276[12], 285[16-17], 287[5]: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3042, 3043, 3044.

[10] Twice in May - July, Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3053, 3054. Once in October Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3058.

[11] 'πρωτόθρονος'.

[12] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.9[r]: Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 166[22-23].

[13] Nil Kerameus (March\April 1380 - 1[st] Feb. 1388). Anthony IV (Jan. 1389 - Jul. 1390). Macarius (30 Jul. - end of September 1390). Anthony IV (John 1390 - May 1397). Callistus II Xanthopoulos (May - September 1397).

have punished him.

CHAPTER VI: MATTHEW AS CALLISTUS II'S SUCCESSOR

Callistus II succeeded Anthony IV (1389-1390,1391-1397) in the last days of the month of May, in 1397. Callistus II, according to tradition, had to prove his Orthodox faith seven times before he became Patriarch. During that period – some years after the Hesychast controversies - this custom was a 'sine qua non' for the enthronement of the Patriarch[1].

According to Banduri, Callistus II's Patriarchate lasted for three months[2] . But there are also two sources which disagree with Banduri about the duration of Callistus II's Patriarchate. They both agree upon a five months' Patriarchate [3] . In addition to these, there is a special study comparing the Patriarchal Acts of the era which definitely accepts the five months' Patriarchate[4] .

Callistus II was sick and after the first three months of his

---

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3052, see Pieces annexes and critique. Cf. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No.3223.

[2] Banduri Anselmi, 'Imperium Orientale sive antiquitates Constantinopolitanae in quatuor partes distributae ...', t.I, Venice M.DCC.XXIX (1729), pp.687-688, (pagina II : 989).

[3] Parisinus 1783, f.98, cf. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3052, Date. The first Patriarchal Acts of Matthew are dated in October of 1397. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3059....3062.

[4] Peter Wirth, 'Zur frage nach dem beginne des Patriarchats Matthaios I von Konstantinopel', Byzantion, 37, 1967 (1968), 417-418.

Patriarchate he retired to a cell at the Xanthopoulos' monastery[5].

The last Patriarchal act of Callistus II is dated in July. After that month (the third of his Patriarchate) Callistus II's name is not mentioned anywhere in the Patriarchal acts[6].

Three months later (October 1397), Matthew appeared as 'protothronos' (first among equal Metropolitans), answering synodically to the Emperor Manuel II. Before that (October), Callistus II had died and Matthew of Kyzikos was acting as president of the Patriarchal synod, representing the missing Patriarch.

In addition to the scarcity of material covering the duration of Callistus II's Patriarchate and, above all, the exact date when Matthew I succeeded Callistus II, there is another question about the events of his succession. This arises not because of the absence of the sources, but because of the existence of two contradictory pieces of information that we have.

M.I.Gedeon, the Patriarch's biographer, informs us that Matthew I succeeded Callistus II after his r e s i g n a t i o n, without giving us any more details about the circumstances[7].

At the same time, Matthew I states that he succeeded

---

[5] The contradiction between the three and five months' Patriarchate might be obvious, if Banduri's sources were based on Callistus II's Patriarchate before his retirement. But there is no excuse for this, because even if he was retired, he continued to be the Patriarch of Constantinople.

[6] M.M., II, No 520, p.295[6-7] : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3056.

[7] M.I.Gedeon, **Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες**, Constantinople 1886, p.457-458.

Callistus II after his death. As he reports, Callistus II did not hold the Patriarchate long before his death. The widowed church (of Constantinople), asked for a spiritual Bridegroom, and as he concludes, the synod voted and the Emperor [Manuel II (1391-1425)] proposed him (Matthew I). We think that Matthew's statement carries a lot of weight, as it could easily be contradicted if events had not happened exactly as he stated[8].

In the light of this contradictory evidence, we think that both come close to the truth: M.I.Gedeon is a highly respected scholar who presents us with the information he has been able to discover but we must not forget that the commentators - who seemm to be M.I.Gedeon's main source - were presenting their own opinions, especially when there was some confusion as to the facts.

On the other hand, Matthew I was the new Patriarch who succeeded Callistus II and had no obvious reasons for wishing to hide the fact of Callistus II's retirement, especially in September of 1407,

---

[8] ' Μεταξύ δέ τῆς τοιαύτης τῶν πραγμάτων φθοράς ὁ μέν πατριάρχης κύριος Ἀντώνιος μεταλλάττει τόν βίον. εὐθύς (sic) [Εὐθύς] δέ μετ' ἐκείνον πατριάρχης χειροτονείται ὁ κύριος Κάλλιστος, ὃς καί μικρόν ἐπιβιούς πρός τήν ἐκείθεν καί αὐτός διαβαίνει μακαριότητα. Τῆς τοίνυν ἐκκλησίας χηρευούσης καί νυμφίον ἐπιζητούσης πνευματικόν ψήφῳ τε πάσης τῆς συνόδου καί προβλήσει τοῦ Θειοτάτου βασιλέως ἡ μετριότης ἡμῶν κρίμασιν, οἷς οἶδε Θεός, τήν ταύτης ἐμπιστεύεται προστασίαν ' H.Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I', BZ, 51, (1958), 299^{43-45}: Vindob. Hist. gr. 55, f.9^{r} : I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, ' Ἐπιτελεύτιος βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...', ΕΕΒΣ, 45, (1981-82), 478^{245-52}. The same text, including some orthographical faults, appears in C. Oudin, Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiae antiquis, t.III, Lipsiae MDCCXXII, (1722), col. 2210.

ten years after Callistus II's death[9]. Almost everybody in the Patriarchal environment would know what was true and what was false.

But what were the reasons that impelled Callistus II to resign?

Studying the evidence of the patriarchal acts of the five months' Patriarchate of Callistus II, it is clear that the Patriarch did not take part himself in the last few assemblies[10]. Callistus II does not seem to have had enemies, rather, the main reason for his resignation was that he was sick. In a Patriarchal letter which mentions the name of Patriarch Callistus II, we see that he had retired some time before his death in the Xanthopoulos' monastery[11].

Callistus II died more or less at the same time as his resignation. Matthew I, feeling that the 'just - resigned shortly before his death' Patriarch was still the Patriarch in the conscience of the church, avoids using the word 'retirement'. The word itself would cast a shadow on Callistus II's

---

[9] H. Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I', BZ, 51, (1958), 299^{43-45}: Vindob. Hist. gr. 55, $f.9^{r}$: I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, 'Ἐπιτελεύτιος Βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...', ΕΕΒΣ, 45, (1981-82), $478^{245-252}$: C. Oudin, op. cit., col. 2210.

[10] The last time that Patriarch Callistus II presided in the Patriarchal synod, was in July of 1397 (third month of his Patriarchate), at the confession of the Monk Joashaph. M.M., II, No 520, $p.295^{6-7}$: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3056.

[11] M.M., II, No 629, $p.470^{26-8}$: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3191.

memory - which is why he talks about Callistus II's death.

As we saw before, during the final assemblies of Callistus II's Patriarchate (1397), Callistus II was represented by Matthew of Kyzikos[12]. At that time, Matthew held first rank after the Patriarch and was the first among equal Metropolitans who made up the Patriarchal synod (protothronos)[13].

After Callistus II's death, a new Patriarch had to be ordained. Who should he be?

[12] After July (1397), we may see the Patriarchal synod meeting in October (1397) under Matthew's presidence. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3058.

[13] 'πρωτόθρονος'.

CHAPTER VII: THE ELECTION AND THE ENTHRONEMENT OF PATRIARCH MATTHEW I (1397-1410)

One of the two leaders of Byzantine Society was the Patriarch. He and the Emperor were involved in all the institutions of Byzantium and in each other's authority.

The relation between the two authorities had its background first of all in Holy scripture[1]. The idea was perpetuated by the Theocentric leadership of Constantine the Great (306-323)[2] and Justinian law, in which relations between the Emperor and the Patriarch are described[3].

The same kind of relation between the two authorities was established by the 'Epanagoge[4] ' of Patriarch Photius (867, 868, 877-886)[5]. Hence, the ascension of the Patriarch to the throne was related closely to the will of the Emperor. The Emperor actively participated in

---

[1] Romans XIII:1-7. 'Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established....if honour then honour'.

[2] During the IV century he bound together the ideas of Religious and Political History in the church.

[3] According to the VI and the CIX 'Neara' (corpus of law, composed in 535) of Justinian I the Great (527-565), the two authorities, the Patriarchal and the Imperial, are God-given. Vlassios Io. Phidas, Βυζάντιο, Βίος - Θεσμοί - Κοινωνία - Τέχνη, Athens 1985, p.113

[4] 'Epanagoge' (= **Επαναγωγή**) : return to the point. A law book of the Emperors Basil I, Leo VI and Alexander, consisted of 40 chapters. Patriarch Photius composed this book among others in 886. He wrote the preface and the two titles important for us (2 and 3), on the Emperor and the Patriarch. See J. Scharf, 'Photios und die Epanagoge', BZ, 49, (1956), 385-400.

[5] Unlike to the above mentioned (Neares) of Justinian I the Great, the comparison in 'Epanagoge' is personally among the Patriarch and the Emperor.

the election of the new Patriarch.

A short list consisting of three persons elected from those who were taking part in the Patriarchal synod was presented to him. The decision was his own, because the elected Patriarch would have to collaborate with the Emperor, both as Religious and Spiritual leader of Byzantium[6]. The Emperor of that period was a wise man, Manuel II (1391-1425). He was a leader with sagacity, within the difficult circumstances of Byzantium. Manuel II thought Matthew the best person to become Patriarch and help him to resurrect the Byzantine Empire. He was absolutely sure about Matthew's personality and did not pay any attention when some time before he refused him - as 'protothronos[7]' of the Patriarchal synod - an annual memorial service that he had tried to impose after his mother's death[8].

After Callistus II's death, the Patriarchal synod - 'Endemousa' - was convened for the election of the new Patriarch,

[6] J. Morinus, Commentarius de sacris ecclesiae ordinationibus, Antverpiae M.DC.LXXXXV (1695), p. 158 A.

[7] He presided at the 'Endemousa' synod representing Patriarch Callistus II who had retired.

[8] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3058, see critique 2. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.38^{r}. Manuel II's mother was Helen Cantacuzenus. She died on November of 1396. Callistus II had retired to the Xanthopoulos' monastery and died in that month. Matthew of Kyzikos was the first among equal Metropolitans and he had the responsibility for the decisions of the Patriarchal synod, representing its President - the Patriarch Callistus II. Furthermore Matthew of Kyzikos, answering the Emperor, reminded him that his position as a Political leader didn't allow him to demand such things from the Patriarchal synod. Matthew's answer demonstrates that during that period the relation between the two authorities - Church and State - was healthy. Each one of the two authorities could be expressed in freedom.

possibly in the same month (October 1397). The synodical tomes of 1405 and 1409 give us further information about the participants of the synod. There are also some letters of the Emperor Manuel II, referring to the case, and in addition to these, two other texts, with an apologetical character, which unfortunately can only be used as indirect sources. These manuscripts are: Parisinus graecus no 1378 and Parisinus graecus no 1379, containing in two versions the 'Catholic-treatise' - a text written by Macarius of Ankara[9]. In many of the events described by Macarius there appears a kind of change and confusion, even in the logical connection between them. The critical edition of the Patriarchal acts edited by Jean Darrouzès gives evidence for the distortion of the truth.

These distortions are obvious since the 'Catholic - treatise' was written during an era of controversies between Matthew I and Macarius of Ankara[10]. The text is full of allusions concerning the regularity of the proceedings for the election of Matthew as Patriarch.

The 'Endemousa' synod that convened for the election of the new Patriarch consisted of seven Metropolitans, including Matthew of Kyzikos. They were the Metropolitans of Monemvasia, of Melitini, of Corinth, of Patras, of Severine and of Ankara.

[9] He was one of the greatest enemies of Matthew of Kyzikos. His text called 'Catholic treatise' describes from his own point of view the facts the same before and after Matthew's enthronement as the Patriarh of Constantinople.

[10] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3059, Critique 1.

Constantinople was under siege by the Ottoman Bayazid I. Nobody was able to enter the town and all of the participants of the Patriarchal synod were 'Endemountes[11] '.

The Emperor was represented in the 'Endemousa' by the 'Great Chartophylax[12] ' John Holobolos who was also responsible for the proceedings concerning the election. Furthermore, he acted as the mediator between the Emperor and the Patriarchal synod.

In the previous chapters we referred to the humility of Matthew of Kyzikos. It was one of his main virtues, the most visible one, acting as the manifestation of his ascetic character, a character which made his presence unobserved. The same happened in the 'Endemousa' synod: three meetings had been held and there was no result for the election. Until then, Matthew's presence hadn't been noticed. Macarius of Ankara tells us that the Metropolitan of Kama proposed Matthew of Medeia, who was absent, but that his suggestion was not accepted. We must emphasize that Matthew of Medeia didn't participate in the 'Endemousa', because of the presence of Macarius of Ankara in the same synod. When the synod invited him, he refused to participate, answering that he regarded Macarius of Ankara as

[11] The Metropolitans who were visiting or residing in or near Constantinople, participating in the 'Endemousa' synod.

[12] The title of 'Great Chartophylax' (=Μέγας Χαρτοφύλαξ) belonged to an Ecclesiastical official of Constantinople and the provinces, usually a Deacon. He had archival and notarial duties that by the time grew in extent and significance with the growth of the synodical transactions. R.J. Macrides, 'Chartophylax', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, pp.415-416.

'akoinonitos[13] ' and condemned[14] .

At that moment, the 'Great Chartophylax' John Holobolos proposed Matthew of Kyzikos. The question arose of his ordination as a Metropolitan. He was elected as Metropolitan of Chalcedon without being ordained, and after a while, he was elected and ordained as Metropolitan of Kyzikos, accepting 'in benevolence' the Diocese of Chalcedon.

Until then, Matthew himself was 'Endemon', participating in the Patriarchal synod and going from time to time to Kyzikos and to Chalcedon. This, of course, happened only when the Turks were not so close to Constantinople.

The Patriarchal synod was divided into two parties. The first party believed that Matthew had been Bishop twice, regardless of the fact that Matthew was only elected for Chalcedon without being ordained. It was all one to them. They considered that if the majority of the synod was going to elect him as the Patriarch of Constantinople, he should have to be enthroned for a third time.

The second party believed that he had been enthroned once as a Bishop (Metropolitan of Kyzikos). But if the majority of the

[13] 'Akoinonitos' - **(Ακοινώνητος)** = He, who has no communion with the others. The most vivid expression of the communion - 'Koinonia' - among the Bishops, is the Divine Liturgy. A further expression of this is the synod itself. In the case of the two Metropolitans, Matthew of Medeia seems to have refused to participate in the same Liturgy with Macarius of Ankara, and furthermore in the synod.

[14] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128$^{36-42}$.

synod was going to elect him as the Patriarch of Constantinople, he would have to be enthroned for a second time. In this case there was no problem because they were thinking of the similar case of St. Gregory of Nazianzus.

But what if Matthew had never served in a Diocese? St. Gregory of Nazianzus had never been in his Diocese either. And according to Macarius' testimony (which may not, however, carry much weight), Matthew had never been to the Diocese of Kyzikos[15].

During these controversies Matthew left the synod which was to decide about him, but before he went away, he asked the synod to exclude Macarius of Ankara from the Metropolitans that would vote [16]. We must underline that everybody knew about the controversy between Matthew of Kyzikos and Macarius of Ankara. This explains the fact that nobody refused Macarius' exemption from the Patriarchal votes, since he was one of his most well-known enemies. If someone had reacted against Matthew's request, we think that Macarius would have dedicated a whole chapter to the fact! All members of the synod were convinced of his ill-feeling for Matthew [17]. As the synodical tome of 1409 bears witness, it was Macarius of Ankara who first accused

---

[15] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.64^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 154$^{30-31}$.

[16] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.9^{r} : Laurent , Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 166$^{22-23}$.

[17] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.64^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 154^{30}, 154^{40}.

Matthew of Kyzikos as 'Trisepiscopos'[18] .

Hence, there were only five Metropolitans left: the Metropolitans of Monemvasia, of Melitini, of Corinth, of Patras and of Severine. The 'Great Chartophylax', who was representing the Emperor himself, asked all the participants of the synod for additional information, as he wanted to know if Matthew had hitherto occupied one or two Dioceses.

The Metropolitan Athanasius of Severine, testified - taking oath - that when the Patriarchal synod elected Matthew as Metropolitan of Kyzikos, he was believed never to have occupied the throne of the Diocese of Chalcedon. The 'Great Chartophylax' also testified to this and both of them gave evidence about their presence during that Patriarchal synod, saying that Matthew was 'Monepiscopos'[19] and not 'Disepiscopos'[20].

Listening to their declarations, the Metropolitan of Corinth reacted by asserting that Matthew was 'Disepiscopos'. But no one paid any attention to his opinion. Matthew's name was added as the third one after that of the Metropolitan of Monemvasia and of the Archimandrite

[18] 'Trisepiscopos' (=**Τρισεπίσκοπος**): He had been elected and enthroned as Bishop thrice. Parisinus gr. 1378, f.13^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), p.153$^{9-14}$.

[19] 'Monepiscopos' (**=Μονεπίσκοπος**): He had been elected and enthroned as Bishop once.

[20] 'Disepiscopos' (**=Δισεπίσκοπος**): He had been elected and enthroned as Bishop twice. Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.29^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), p.129$^{65-67}$.

of the Stoudites' monastery, Euthymius [21]. The three names constituted the 'Triprosopon[22] ', from which the Emperor would select one as the new Patriarch.

Some years later, Macarius of Ankara asserted that all the Metropolitans of the Éndemousa' synod had thought that Matthew was 'Disepiscopos'. Narrating the events, he says that he himself, together with the Metropolitan of Monemvasia, and the Metropolitan of Corinth, had presented themselves in front of the Emperor, Manuel II, telling him that Matthew's name had been hastily added to the 'Triprosopon'. Together, they had tried to explain to him their views concerning Matthew´s 'disepiscopate' [23]. Their main purpose was to prove to the Emperor that the composer of the 'Triprosopon' (John Holobolos) was to blame for this.

According to Macarius - who appears to be fair since he is blaming others! - the two Metropolitans pretended in front of the Emperor that they favoured Matthew's election as the new Patriarch, but that they were objecting on canonical grounds to the behaviour of the 'Great Chartophylax'.

In the midst of these events the Archimandrite of the

---

[21] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.13^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 153^{15} -154^{21}. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1379, f. 86^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, 1972, 136^{20}.

[22] 'Triprosopon' (=**Τριπρόσωπον**): A short catalogue consisted of three names.

[23] But Macarius of Ankara was excluded from the votes concerning the composition of the 'Triprosopon'. When the Metropolitan of Patras changed his mind, Macarius still had no right to vote! He is possibly lying.

Stoudites' monastery, Euthymius, resigned for reasons that are unclear. The great friendship between the Emperor Manuel II and the Abbot of the Stoudites' monastery cannot be ignored, but in spite of this, Euthymius, possibly recognising Matthew's superiority, stood down with his resignation[24]. Manuel II demanded from the electors their agreement concerning Matthew's 'Monepiscopate'. When he saw that it was impossible, he invited them to vote. At first, a decision seemed unattainable as they still remained divided into two parties. But suddenly, the Metropolitan of Patras separated himself, saying that in his opinion Matthew, was neither 'Monepiscopos', nor 'Disepiscopos' !

Macarius of Ankara, together with the Metropolitan of Corinth, supported Matthew's 'Disepiscopate'[25].

On the other hand the Metropolitans of Melitini and of Severine supported Matthew's 'Monepiscopate'.

Finally, Matthew of Kyzikos was elected as the new Patriarch by the Emperor, who chose him by casting lots between him and the Metropolitan of Monemvasia. At the same time Manuel II issued a 'Chrysobull' confirming the Imperial act. Macarius of Ankara would say some years later that: 'the unexpected lot fell to the non-canonical

---

[24] Manuel II was sending letters to him while he was in Paris. See translation in English by: J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II ...', pp.184[10] - 185[18].

[25] Parisinus gr. 1379, ff.64[r] - f.64[v] : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 154[30], 155[56].

Metropolitan'[26].

According to tradition, after the Emperor had elected the new Patriarch, the Imperial Elders would question the one elected, asking him if he intended to accept the throne of Constantinople. After Matthew accepted, the ceremony of the 'Promotion' would take place in the 'Triklinon[27]' **(Τρίκλινον)** of the Palace. The first among the Imperial Elders would take the Patriarch by the hand and bring him to the Emperor. The Emperor, according to custom, would give the crozier to the Patriarch, promoting him 'Archbishop of Constantinople-new Rome and Ecumenical Patriarch'. Then the Patriarch, riding on a white horse, would go to Hagia Sophia for the ceremony of his enthronement[28].

It was only a few years after the Hesychast controversies and all the Patriarchs, before their assumption of the throne, were thoroughly examined about their Orthodoxy. This was closely related to the practice of the primitive church, especially concerning the selection of those who were going to be ordained as Bishops.

In Matthew I's case, the 'examiners' were seven monks, who are mentioned in a later letter that Matthew I sent to the Monk Ignatius[29].

---

[26] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.64^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 155^{57}. **(Ἔπεσε γάρ ὁ ἀκανόνιστος κλῆρος ἐπί τόν ἀκανόνιστον ἐπίσκοπον).**

[27] Triklinon (= in Roman antiquities Triclinium). A set of three couches arranged round a four-sided dining table. It was itself a dining room, but also a room of honour.

[28] J. Morinus, op. cit., pp.158-160.

[29] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3223.

Matthew I's Patriarchal life was a tempestuous one: his enemies were waiting to seize the opportunity of opposing him to secure his deposition.

CHAPTER VIII: MACARIUS OF ANKARA AND HIS PREVIOUS RELATIONS WITH MATTHEW I

As is clearly stated in the apology of the ex-Patriarch Manuel II Calecas presented to the Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus, Macarius of Ankara was a native of Thessaly[1]. As Calecas observes, Macarius was one of the greatest supporters of 'Palamism'[2] . Calecas accuses Macarius in one of his letters to Manuel II[3] , describing him as the leader of an angry party, in which violence was practised[4] .

There is otherwise not much information about him. Even in the 'Catholic - treatise', Macarius tries to record every step of Matthew's life, but says little about himself.

Macarius was a defender of traditional discipline, with a special knowledge of the church's canon law. At the time of his appearance in Constantinople he was caught in a trap which had been set beforehand, by some Metropolitans. Their purpose was the deposition of Patriarch Anthony IV (Jan. 1389 - Jul. 1390). When the Emperor began investigations, Macarius was found to be in touch with

---

[1] R.J. Loenertz, Correspondance de Manuel Calecas, [Studi e Testi, No 152], Rome 1950, p.315[244].

[2] The alternative name of the Hesychasts.

[3] **'Οὐκ ἄρα πάλαι πότ' ἔχρην τέρας τι καππαδόκειον ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐσχατιῶν ἐπί λύμῃ τῶν πραγμάτων ὡρμήσθαι, ἀλλά καί νῦν ἡμίν ἐκ τῶν τῆς Θετταλίας ἐσχάτων ὥσπερ ἄλλο τι φανέν ἐκ τοῦ πελάγους κακόν αὐτό τούτο συμβήναι, συγχέαι μέν τά πράγματα, τούτο μόνον μάλιστα δυνάμενον, τἄλλα δέ μηδενός ἄξιον ὥσπερ ἐκείνο'.** Ibid., p.315[242-246].

[4] Ibid., p.315[209-216].

that party, participating in their activities. All the Metropolitans were powerful, and when they were asked by the Emperor they pretended that they did not know anything about the case[5] .

Anthony IV was deposed, but only for a while. When he was restored, the Monk Macarius was among the first to be accused. He was called up to be judged by a synodical court of justice, under the presidency of the Patriarch himself (spring - summer 1396)[6].

The synod asked Macarius many questions about his activities and finally Macarius betrayed Matthew of Medeia as the real culprit behind the events.

When Matthew of Medeia was called, he presented evidence which proved himself innocent! The Jury decided that both of them should be judged again, together. They eventually found that Macarius was guilty of faction and plotting[7].

The final decision was taken by the same court of justice, which exceptionally consisted not only of 'Endemountes' but also Imperial representatives (Elders).

Matthew of Kyzikos was against the participation of the civil judges, thinking that it was not canonical. At this point we can

---

[5] Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 9-11. Cf. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3025, see literature. J. Darrouzès, corrects Vitalien Laurent's text p.11, line 3. He reads 'Matthieu de Cyzique', instead of 'Matthieu de Médía'.

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3025.

[7] Vaticanus gr. 1858, ff.28^{r} - 28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 127$^{18-27}$.

see another illustration of Matthew's virtues. He knew very well the difficult and inconstant character of Macarius. He could well imagine that the final decision would condemn him; needless of the danger, he supported his future enemy. Not only he did express his opposition to the participation of the Imperial representatives, Skaranos and Iagupis, but he expelled them as well.

As Macarius says, Matthew of Kyzikos influenced the synod to vote against their participation since it was not included in the canon-law of the church. But Matthew was more courageous than that: He visited Emperor Manuel II himself, in order to present his opposition.

We must underline that all this happened even though Matthew of Kyzikos did not belong to the party which favoured Macarius[8]!

Macarius of Ankara reports that Patriarch Anthony IV had come to a secret agreement with the Emperor before all these events. Anthony IV had asked for a written opinion from all the Metropolitans who made up the Patriarchal synod[9] . Among those who gave their opinion was the Metropolitan of Zechiae and Matrahon, Joseph. Joseph, like Matthew of Kyzikos, was against the presence of the Imperial representatives in the jurisdiction of Ecclesiastical affairs. But it seems that the Patriarch, who had a different opinon, became angry

---

[8] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.69^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 152$^{1-25}$: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3025. See Mention.

[9] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3025. See B. - Version de Macaire.

with him, telling him that it was his fault[10].

As we have seen before, there was a close relation between the Emperor John VII (1390) and Patriarch Macarius (30 Jul. - Jan. 1391), who succeeded Patriarch Anthony IV, after his first patriarchate (1389-1390). This relation was expressed in the creation of a party which also supported Macarius of Ankara and which was perhaps responsible for trying to depose Patriarch Anthony IV.

We can see that Matthew of Kyzikos was not ill intentioned: he was thinking Ecclesiastically, trying to avoid any kind of interference by secular power in the church. He wanted the jurisdiction to be fair.

On the other hand, Macarius was an ambitious man. Trying to obtain his ordination as a Metropolitan, he was among those who plotted against the Patriarch Anthony IV.

Meanwhile, Manuel II, who was a wise man, noticed the alliance made by John VII, which would be dangerous for the church and the state. He wanted to be sure of the result of the condemnatory decision, which would be an example for every future movement organized by John VII (1390). The ex-Emperor John VII, seven years after his deposition (1397), was still powerful[11].

---

[10] ' εὗρον βάρος παρά τοῦ Παναγιωτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου, τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου, καί τῆς θείας καί ἱερᾶς συνόδου, ὡς παρά τήν ἐκκλησιαστικήν συνήθειαν πράξας, διό καί ἐδεήθην καί παρεκάλεσα καί ἔτυχον συγγνώμης' M.M., II, No 504, p.269[9-13] ; Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3027.

[11] Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 12.

Finally the Imperial Elders who participated in the Patriarchal synod condemned Macarius. Matthew of Kyzikos and the elected Metropolitan of Lacedemonia voted against Macarius too.

The Metropolitan of Zechiae and Matrahon, Joseph, was 'Endemon'. A little before his departure to his Diocese, he said that he did not think that Macarius was a rebel and for this reason he was against his condemnation[12] . The Metropolitans of Nikomedeia and of Corinth also thought Macarius' innocent [13], but both of them belonged to the party of John VII, favouring Macarius for their own reasons.

According to the synodical tome of 1409, the Patriarch selected Matthew to compose the condemnation of Macarius: "a long detailed text[14].

After Anthony IV's patriarchate, Callistus II Xanthopoulos succeeded him for only five months. Macarius of Ankara was successful in seizing the opportunity to reverse the condemnation. The 'Acquittal letter' - dated between May and July of 1397[15] - abolished the condemnation of spring - summer 1396.

---

[12] M.M., II, No 504, p.269$^{1-5}$: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3027. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1378, f.69^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 152$^{8-10}$.

[13] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.69^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 152$^{8-10}$.

[14] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 127^{2} - 128^{29}.

[15] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3053. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1378, f.69^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 152$^{18-23}$. Cf. Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128$^{30-32}$.

After the decision of the synod, Matthew behaved to Macarius as if nothing had really happened. He celebrated with him in many liturgies[16] until Macarius' election and ordination as the Metropolitan of Ankara[17]. Matthew of Kyzikos was against the election and ordination of Macarius: he knew about his character and he didn't vote for him[18] - but nevertheless he accepted him.

We believe that John VII was behind the acquittal, the election and the ordination of Macarius of Ankara. The fact that all these things happened in such a short time, and that there was no presentation of the case to the Imperial Elders who would re-examine it, leads us to think that someone really powerful was behind Macarius.

Another relevant fact is that the Patriarch Callistus II Xanthopoulos himself was sick and very old. In addition to this he favoured John VII's party. As we mentioned before, he remained active on the Patriarchal throne for only three months[19]. It was a great opportunity for the party of John VII to support Macarius...

---

[16] Vaticanus gr.1858, f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128$^{32-34}$.

[17] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3054.

[18] Vaticanus gr.1858, f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128^{36}.

[19] Between May - July. During August - September he retired.

CHAPTER IX: THE 'SECRET ALLIANCE', AND MANUEL II'S DEPARTURE FOR THE WEST

After Macarius of Ankara accused Matthew of Medeia of being the culprit behind the faction against Patriarch Anthony IV, their relations were severed, even though they belonged to the same party (of John VII). The same hostility that had been manifested at the end of the 'Endemousa' synod which condemned Macarius divided them[1].

Matthew of Medeia, especially, did not even want to see his slanderer. When, after a while, Macarius of Ankara was acquitted[2] - possibly with John VII's help[3] - he was the elected and ordained as the Metropolitan of Ankara[4] - Matthew of Medeia refrained from participating in the Patriarchal synod.

He did not want to participate even when he was invited for the election of the new Patriarch. Instead of accepting the invitation, he sent a letter, explaining the reason for his absence - namely - the

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3025.

[2] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3053. Cf. Vaticanus gr.1858, f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128$^{30-32}$. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1378, f.69^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 152$^{1-25}$.

[3] It was an old tradition for John VII to play his games through Ecclesiastical affairs. Why shouldn't he do it now? For the previous participation of John VII in the Patriarchal elections see J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.74.

[4] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3054. Cf. Vaticanus gr.1858, f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128$^{32-36}$.

presence of Macarius of Ankara. In this way Matthew of Medeia publically took up a position against Macarius[5].

Matthew of Medeia held the Patriarch himself to be ultimately responsible for the acquittal, election and ordination of Macarius. Unable to accept that one could ask to be excused and the excuse to be granted (as Macarius did), he started to think of a way to oppose Matthew I. He felt that, after all, the Patriarch had ignored everything that had happened in the past - especially when agreeing to concelebrate with Macarius[6] . Matthew of Medeia refused to take part in the 'Endemousa' synod and the Patriarch - a peace-maker - was disturbed by this fact[7] . The Metropolitan of Medeia had isolated himself into a corner, far removed from contemporary events. He had realized this himself earlier on, from the events that took place during the election of the new Patriarch[8] . He thought there was no one who would support him in his fight against Macarius of Ankara[9] . But why

---

[5] Vaticanus gr. 1858,f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128$^{36-42}$.

[6] Vaticanus gr. 1858,f.29^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128$^{50-51}$.

[7] Vaticanus gr. 1858,f.28^{v} - f.29^{r} : Laurent, LeTrisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128$^{42-47}$.

[8] Matthew of Medeia had been proposed by the Metropolitan of Kama as the new Patriarch, but he was not there and he had no supporters.

[9] It is our personal belief that Manuel II who knew that Macarius of Ankara was favoured by John VII, did not try to prohibit his acquittal, election and ordination. It would have been easy for him (because of Callistus II Xanthopoulos' health problems), but he avoided doing it. He wanted to reconcile himself with John VII, confronting the Turkish danger. We will see further on the position of both of them. Hence, Macarius being until then (May of 1397) a condemned monk, he suddenly became Metropolitan of Ankara (September of 1397).

would they? Did he expect a second condemnation of Macarius?

Another event made the whole situation worse for Matthew I - the appearance of a new enemy: Jacob Holobolos.

During a Patriarchal concelebration in which many Bishops were participating, the Metropolitan of Herakleia came forward at the right hand side of the Altar[10] , and proceeded to announce something from the liturgy - 'a petition'. Among the Bishops was the new-ordained Metropolitan of Gothia, Jacob Holobolos[11] .

Jacob Holobolos had been ordained as a Bishop between June and October of 1399. When he was ordained, he took - as an honorary title - the rank of the Metropolitan of Ephesos[12] . Jacob Holobolos expected that he would be the one who proceeds for the 'petition'. Instead, the Metropolitan of Herakleia had acted against the custom of the church, and most of all against the honorary order established for the Metropolitans of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Jacob Holobolos remembered the honour and the glory of his previous position, as 'Great Chartophylax'. He couldn't bear this shame and he expected the Patriarch to do him justice before the Metropolitan of Herakleia.

But despite Jacob's expectations, Matthew I did not pay any

[10] He had to do so as 'Tritoprotos' = (He was mentioned as the third among the Metropolitans of the first rank).

[11] His civil name was John. He was the 'Great Chartophylax' until May of 1399. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3074. See critique.

[12] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3074.

attention to this event.

Jacob Holobolos became angry and from then on he tried to find opportunities to blame the Patriarch[13].

Macarius of Ankara had his own serious reasons to be angry with the Patriarch and joined the above named Bishops (Matthew of Medeia and Jacob of Gothia) against Matthew I. They all knew that they would have John VII's support and their reconciliation was not only sudden but also compulsory. Excusing each other for their previous controversies, they were waiting for the right moment to act against the Patriarch. And they would not wait for long.

Two years after Matthew became Patriarch, Emperor Manuel II decided to go to Western Europe to ask for military and financial support. Among his companions (50 persons), he selected some Bishops and Priests, who would service the mission.

There is definite evidence concerning the participation of

[13] At this point we have to mention a serious mistake that the copyist of the Synodical tome of 1409 did, replacing the word 'Gothia' (Γοτθίας) with 'Medeia' (Μηδείας). Hence, Vitalien Laurent, based on the synodical tome of 1409, thought that Matthew of Medeia was in Jacob Holobolos' position holding the rank of Ephesos. Thus, he narrates the same event as if it had happened between Matthew of Medeia and the Metropolitan of Herakleia. Some years after Vitalien Laurent's article, Jean Darrouzès found out that the synodical tome of 1409 is referred to another person, the Metropolitan of Gothia, Jacob Holobolos. Matthew of Medeia was the successor of Michael of Medeia who until 1387 was signing as the Metropolitan of Amasia and 'President' of Medeia. He also held the rank of the Metropolitan of Ephesos, being the first among equal Metropolitans who participated in the 'Endemousa' synod.. V. Laurent, reading (Μηδείας), thought that Matthew of Medeia demanded the title that his predecessor, Michael, had. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3074. See Mention. Cf. Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.29^{r}: Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 128$^{51-53}$.

Priests and Bishops in the Byzantine mission. Thomas Walsingham reports : 'At this time (1400), the Emperor of Constantinople, accompanied by several Greeks, came to England to ask for help against the Turks. The King met him with a noble retinue at Blackheath on the Feast of St. Thomas the Apostle, properly receiving him as a hero, and led him to London. There, for many days, he entertained him in glorious fashion, defraying all the expense of his hospitality and lavishing gifts upon him. The King spent the Christmas of that year at his palace at Eltham; and with him was the Emperor of Constantinople with his Greek bishops' [14] . The appearance of the clergy who were following the Byzantine Emperor drew everybody's attention[15] .

Before and after their visit to England, the Byzantine mission had a long stay in France. Macarius of Ankara, who was among the Bishops, grasped the opportunity to 'investigate' the major Ecclesiastical event of the era (the Papal Schism 1378-1417) and to conceive some new ideas for acting against Matthew I.

Macarius was chosen to be among those who accompanied

---

[14] Thomas Walsingham, Annales Ricardi Secundi et Henrici Quarti, pp.334-335; Quondam Monachi S. Albani, Historia Anglicana, p.247; Ypodigma Neustriae, pp.391-392. On the relationship between these three chronicles and their authorship by Thomas Walsingham, see C.L. Kingsford, English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth century, Oxford 1913, pp.12-21.

[15] '...No razor touched head or beard of his chaplains. These Greeks were most devout in their church services, which were joined in as well by soldiers as by priests, for they chanted them without distinction in their native tongue'. See Chronicon Adae de Usk, A.D. 1377-1421, edited with a translation and notes by Sir E.M. Thompson, London 1904^2, p.57 (Latin text), p.220 (English translation).

the Emperor possibly because he was an expert in canon-law, and the presence of such expertise would have been very useful.

Vitalien Laurent reports that the Emperor needed to have with him people who would participate in the discussions opening the way to the union. It was a great opportunity for the Orthodox to be in a climate different from their own. He also thinks that Manuel II wanted to have expert observers for the faith and the customs of the Roman-Catholic church[16].

We think that Manuel II's main purpose was the extermination of a new faction that might have arisen if Macarius of Ankara had remained in Constantinople. He was well aware of Macarius' background.

Matthew of Medeia and Jacob of Gothia remained back in Constantinople developing their own secret plans...

[16] Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 14-15. We disagree with V. Laurent as regards the unificatory character of Macarius' participation. To the best of our knowledge, the latter could be useful to the mission only as a defender of the Orthodox faith with no unificational perspectives. Besides, Manuel II's behaviour was the same. J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', pp. 192-193.

CHAPTER X: THE FALSE ACCUSATION OF MATTHEW I AS COLLABORATOR WITH THE TURKS

It was only half a year after Manuel II's departure for the West (March - April 1401), that the Patriarchal enemies who were residing in Constantinople as 'Endemountes' took the opportunity to attack Matthew I. Their first attack was a calumny about a non-existing collaboration between Matthew I and the Turks, accusing him of betrayal.

Since 1397, John VII, the Emperor-regent, had stopped collaborating with the Turks. In spite of this, Bayazid I thought he could rely on him. It seems that the Turkish Sultan hadn't understood the true reason for Manuel II's departure from Constantinople and ignored the reconciliation between Manuel II and John VII. Thus, he sent a message to John VII from Andrianople ordering : 'If I have indeed put the Basileus Manuel out of the city, not for your sake have I done this, but for mine. And if, then, you wish to be our friend, withdraw from thence and I will give you a province, whatever one you may wish. But if you do not, with God and his great Prophet as my witness, I will spare no one, but all will I utterly destroy'[1].

John VII replied to him saying: ' Withdraw, report to your lord: we are in poverty and there is no great power whereunto we may

[1] Ducae, Historia Turcobyzantina, (1341-1462), ex recensione, Basilii Grecu, Bucharest 1958, p.89, ll.11-15 : The translation is taken by J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.205.

flee, except to God Who aids the powerless and Who overpowers the powerful. So if you wish anything, do it'[2] !

John VII was waiting for Manuel II's arrival, but the latter's absence continued, and the aid that the Venetians had promised had not come. Timur had appeared with his army in the East[3] , attacking the Turks, but in spite of his presence, Bayazid I continued to siege Constantinople for six years (1400)[4]. His army was exhausted.

Constantinople was suffering too. Many of its citizens escaped from its walls and surrendered to the Turks [5] . Escaping from the town and joining Bayazid I was a common phenomenon at that time[6].

The Turkish ambassadors had failed in their mission to John VII. Bayazid I thought of approaching the Patriarch, Matthew I. He sent some new ambassadors, who were Byzantines, because they could get in and out of the town unobserved. They promised the Patriarch that they would spare his life in exchange for surrendering Constantinople[7].

Matthew I refused but the ambassadors were insistent and

---

[2] Ducae, op. cit., p.89, ll.17-20 : The translation is taken by J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.206.

[3] He was the leader of the Mongols.

[4] The six years' siege by Bayazid I, can be proved through the same siege that Patriarch Antonios IV mentions in his letter to the Great duc Basil in autumn of 1394. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2931: M.M., II, No 447, pp.188-192. Cf. J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', pp.105-109.

[5] Ducae, op. cit., p.91, ll.23-28 .

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189. See Critique.

[7] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189 : M.M., II, No 626, p.466 $^{1-6}$. Cf. English translation by J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.210 $^{7-12}$.

visited him twice again. Matthew I not only refused to collaborate with them but also condemned them by excommunication, behaving as a defender of the town and not as a common traitor[8] . As the Patriarch reports, after they had failed, they returned back to the Turks[9].

But some people who knew about this approach, tried to accuse Matthew I by saying that he was really collaborating with the Turks. According to Matthew I's 'monastic testament', the above mentioned slanderers were Matthew of Medeia and Jacob of Gothia[10] . It seems that they spread the news, thinking of it as the only way to succeed in deposing Matthew I. Of course, the Patriarch was not a traitor and rejected the accusations[11] .

The only source which attests the charges against the Patriarch is his public answer [12] . Matthew I's learning is obvious

---

[8] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189 : M.M., II, No 626, p.466 $^{1-17}$. Cf. English translation by J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.210 $^{7-27}$.

[9] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189. See critique: M.M., II, No 626, p.466 $^{3-9}$. Cf. English translation by J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.210 $^{7-15}$.

[10] The Patriarch himself says in his testament that those who were acting to succeed in his deposition, were the same ones who had acted before, disturbing and promoting the revelation against the church - and furthermore against Matthew. H. Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I, (1397-1410)', BZ, 51, (1958), 300 $^{13-14}$: Vindob. Hist. gr. 55, f.9^{v}.

[11] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189 : M.M., II, No 626, p.465 $^{11-30}$. Cf. English translation by J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.209 $^{18-41}$.

[12] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189. See Date.

through this document. Its form is similar to a 'pittakion[13] ' or a 'homily', and we think that it is in fact the latter. The text indicates its object, which was to be published. It was doubtless read out in the churches of Constantinople as a Patriarchal message[14].

Matthew I's purpose was not only to defend himself from the false accusations but also to make the whole situation clear in Constantinople. Moral problems and corruption had arisen because of the siege. People who had previously been inclined to wrong doing became worse than ever.

Furthermore, Matthew I's slanderers had not only put the Patriarch himself in danger, but also the church of Constantinople. Otherwise, the people of Constantinople would not have believed the rumours which were disturbing the internal peace of the town[15]. After the Patriarch narrates all these facts, he accuses directly, but anonymously, all those who tried to slander him in public. He knew very well who was plotting against him, and in spite of their attacks he had become braver. Nobody could really blame him, since he was thinking of Jesus who said: ' Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for

---

[13] '**πιττάκιον**', is a letter of credit.

[14] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189. See Diplomatique.

[15] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189 : M.M., II, No 626, pp.463-464. Cf. English translation by J.W. Barker 'Manuel II...', pp.208-209[6].

my sake "[16]. Remembering this, Matthew I encouraged himself when difficulties arose.

At the same time, he was trying to achieve the union of the citizens of Constantinople within the church[17] . Being sure that all these accusations against him were just calumnies, he condemned anonymously, by excommunication, all of those who made the charges, calling them to repentance[18] . A little before, the Patriarch banished himself from the communion of Christ in the age to come if he had any connection with Bayazid I, or with the traitors of the town[19] .

Matthew I reacted by distancing himself from all these machinations, but the above mentioned event made him more careful in dealing with future attacks from his enemies.

While Manuel II was in the West, John VII could not restrain himself from acting against the Patriarch. Together with the 'Secret alliance', he worked to depose Matthew I and ordain a new Patriarch. Then, the way would open for his plan.

---

[16] Matthew V:11 : M.M.,II, No 626, p.465^{19-20}.

[17] Corinthians XII:27 : M.M.,II, No 626, pp.465^{26} - 466^{3}.

[18] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189 : M.M., II, No 626, pp.466^{26} - 467^{10}. Cf. English translation by J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', pp.210^{37} - 211^{14}.

[19] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189 : M.M., II, No 626, p.466^{12-17}. Cf. English translation by J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.210^{18-27}.

CHAPTER XI: THE DEPOSITION OF PATRIARCH MATTHEW I

Manuel II's absence was exploited by the enemies of Matthew I, who continued their fight against him.

John VII did not intend to protect Matthew I from his enemies, since he was silently one of them. As Patriarch Matthew I said, it seemed at first that John VII did not pay any attention to Ecclesiastical affairs, but gave the impression that he had a neutral attitude to the Patriarch. But after a while, being influenced by all the members of the aforementioned 'secret alliance', he decided to depose him[1] . The abusive slanderers took advantage of that particular moment to agitate the church, and to accuse Matthew I[2].

Two of the three members of the 'secret alliance' (Matthew of Medeia and Jacob of Gothia) were properly prepared. They were disappointed because of their previous failure. One of their most important members - Macarius of Ankara - was missing, accompanying the Emperor in the West. They needed new supporters to succeed and they found them in two Bishops: Theognostus of Kyzikos and Athanasius of Severine.

Theognostus of Kyzikos, who was Matthew I's successor,

---

[1] Vindob. Hist. gr. 55, f.9^{v} : H. Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I, (1397-1410)' , B. Z., 51, (1958), p.300$^{16-17}$.

[2] Vindob. Hist. gr. 55, f.9^{v} - 10^{r} : H. Hunger, op. cit., p.300$^{17-24}$.

resided in Constantinople as 'Endemon'. He had been ordained at a very young age[3]. His previous residence was the Charsianeites' monastery.

H. Hunger believes that Matthew I liked organizing everything not only in his territory but also in the Dioceses of the Patriarchal throne[4]. His desire to solve every problem that arose in the Dioceses may have made him irritating to the Metropolitans[5]. For example, V. Laurent believes that Matthew I had tried to put Theognostus' Diocese in order and that Theognostus could not tolerate it[6].

Athanasius of Severine was the ex-Metropolitan of Pergi and Attalia[7]. Between May and June of 1389, he accepted the title of Hongrovalachia - better known as Severine - and was transferred there [8]. Did the transfer offend him and did he therefore decide to attack the Patriarch? We do not know. We are not sure about the real reasons that made Athanasius of Severine change his behaviour towards Matthew I. At that time he was 'Endemon' in Constantinople too.

All the above mentioned Metropolitans formed a new group[9],

---

[3] M.M., II, No 529 II, p.312[1-2] : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3078.

[4] H. Hunger, op. cit., p.290.

[5] Oudot I., Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani, Acta selecta, I, Vatican 1941, pp.134[1-2],136[3].

[6] Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 36.

[7] M.M., II, No 404, p.129[12-13] : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2847.

[8] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2859, See Critique 1, 2.

[9] Maintaining the constitution of the first 'secret alliance': Macarius of Ankara, Matthew of Medeia and Jacob Holobolos (in collaboration with John VII).

allied with John VII in acting against the Patriarch, and searching for new reasons to accuse him.

After Matthew I's self-defensive homily (March - April 1401), which denied the accusations against him, the spirits of the Constantinopolitans calmed down. But this was not the only reason.

Earlier in January of 1401, John VII had been away from Constantinople, trying to sign an agreement with Bayazid I. The results of this agreement were evident in the summer of 1401 when the Turks paused in their siege of Constantinople for a short period[10] .

Apart from these negotiations, there was another embassy, consisting of Metropolitan Jacob of Gothia (6 of August 1401) and an Imperial representative, in order to discuss, or negotiate, peace with the Turks in Brusa[11] .

Matthew of Medeia, who had completely reconciled himself with the Patriarch (November 1401) [12], by participating in the 'Endemousa'[13] , grasped the opportunity of Manuel II's absence in the West and composed a catalogue of accusations against Matthew I. Three other Bishops joined him: The Metropolitans Jacob of Gothia,

---

[10] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189, see Critique.

[11] F. Dölger, Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565-1453, 5, Regesten von 1341-1453, (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit, A: Regesten, I) Munich 1965, No 3196. Cf. J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.212.

[12] M.M., II, No 677, pp.551-556 : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3239.

[13] M.M., II, No 643, p. 491^{24}, 489^{2}, 519^{19} : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3206, 3207, 3221.

Athanasius of Severine and Theognostus of Kyzikos[14] . All of them persuaded John VII that Matthew I had to be deposed.

An illegal and non-canonical synod which was held by only four Metropolitans, accused Matthew I of not paying proper attention to the Charsianeites' monastery of which he was Abbot, and of overlooking corrupt practices within it. (As we have seen the Charsianeites' monastery was Patriarch Matthew I's ordinary residence).

The accusation of corruption had moral implications. Many of Matthew I's monks in the Charsianeites' monastery were young and he was finally found guilty of immorality. The charges were obscure, but Macarius of Ankara, in his 'Catholic treatise', later accused Matthew I of allowing the monastery to degenerate into a place of ill-repute[15] .

The Patriarch was deposed from the Patriarchal throne, but without being condemned. He remained Bishop until he dismissed all the young monks from the Charsianeites' monastery, and replaced them with older ones[16]. By the end of the synod, John VII - signing -

---

[14] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f. 29^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 129$^{70-74}$.

[15] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.28^{r}. **'καί τήν ...Θείαν μονήν τοῦ Χαρσιανείτου ὡς ὀπωροφυλάκιον κατέστησε..'.**

[16] We learn about the verdict of the synod through the 'Catholic-treatise' of Macarius of Ankara. The synod decided about Matthew I that: **' Τήν δέ ἰδικήν αὐτῷ ἱερωσύνην οὕτω λέγομεν ἔχειν αὐτόν, εἴπερ τό κελλίον αὐτοῦ διακαθαρῇ τῆς πονηρᾶς φήμης καί τοῦ πορνοβοσκεῖν ἀποστῇ καί τούς νέους ἐξελάσας ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ διά μοναχῶν γερόντων καί εὐλαβῶν ἐξυπηρετούμενος φαίνοιτο '.** Parisinus gr. 1379, f.11^{r}, 61^{r}: Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 118.

confirmed Matthew I's deposition.

The synod was both illegal and non-canonical, because Matthew I had not been invited to the synod to defend himself before his accusers. Furthermore, it seems that there was no evidence as to what was actually happening in the Charsianeites' monastery. Only one of the four Metropolitans could testify to it, Theognostus of Kyzikos, who after being ordained[17] went to his Diocese and had recently returned to Constantinople.

As for the irregularity of the synod we have to say the following: according to the XV canon of the synod of Antioch, in the case of a Bishop[18] being accused of serious Ecclesiastical offences, he must be judged by all the Bishops who belong to his territory[19] . This canon was reinforced by the decisions of the synod of Constantinople in 394, which solved the disagreement between the two Bishops Agapios

[17] And it happened when he was still very young. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3078 : M.M.,II, No 529 II, p.312[1], '**πάνυ νέος**'.

[18] It is mentioned in the old Metropolitan system according to which the local church is governed by the synod of the one Metropolitan and his Bishops.

[19] A. S. Alivisatos, **Οἱ ἱεροὶ κανόνες καὶ οἱ Ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ Νόμοι**, Athens 1949[2], p.177.

and Vagadios, both claiming the Diocese of Bostron in Arabia[20].

Generally speaking, in the Autocephalos churches, it is possible for an Archbishop to be judged by three Bishops. But in the case of Matthew I, he was 'Archbishop of Constantinople - New Rome and Ecumenical Patriarch'. He was Archbishop but also Patriarch. More than four Metropolites were therefore needed to judge him, and according to the XII canon of Carthagen the minimum number is 'twelve', plus the Patriarch who must be invited to defend himself[21]. Matthew I was not invited and this is another fact proving that the synod was illegal.

The exact date on which the illegal synod deposed Matthew I from the Patriarchal throne is unknown to us. The material covering the period is scarce but the Patriarchal records are still signed by the

[20] During the discussions the Patriarch of Alexandria, Theophilos, said that all the Bishops of the Metropolitan territory ought to be present in the synod for its decisions to be correct: **' εἰ μέντοι γε περί τῶν μελλόντων διασκοπεῖη τις τῶν ὀφειλόντων καθαιρεῖσθαι, φαίνεταί μοι μή μόνον τρεῖς παρεῖναι προσήκειν, ἀλλ' , εἰ δυνατόν, τούς πάντας ἐπαρχεώτας, ἵνα τῇ τῶν πολλῶν ψήφῳ ἀκριβεστέρα ἡ κατάκρισις τοῦ ἀξίου τῆς καθαιρέσεως δεικνύηται παρόντος καί κρινομένου'.** An answer similar to this was given by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Nektarios: **' μή χρῆναι πρός τό ἑξῆς, μηδέ παρά τριῶν, μήτοι γε παρά δύο, τόν ὑπεύθυνον δοκιμαζόμενον καθαιρεῖσθαι· ἀλλά γάρ πλείονος συνόδου ψήφῳ καί τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας, καθώς καί οἱ ἀποστολικοί κανόνες διωρίσαντο'.** Both of these opinions were acceptable to the synod which was presided over by Patriarch of Antioch, Flabianos, and from then on they became canons of the church. A.S. Alivisatos, op. cit., p.303-305.

[21] **' Φῆλιξ ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν· Ἀναφέρω κατά τά ὁρισθέντα ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν συνόδων, ἵνα, ἐάν τις ἐπίσκοπος (ὅπερ ἀπείη) ἔν τινι ἐγκλήματι περιπέσῃ καί γένηται πολλή ἀνάγκη τοῦ μή δύνασθαι πολλούς συνελθεῖν, διά τό μή ἀπομεῖναι αὐτόν ἐν τῷ ἐγκλήματι, ἀπό δώδεκα ἐπισκόπων ἀκουσθῆ, καί ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἀπό ἕξ ἐπισκόπων καί τοῦ ἰδίου, καί ὁ διάκονος ἀπό τριῶν'.** See A.S. Alivisatos, op. cit., p.236.

same Patriarch (Matthew I) until January of 1402[22]. After January, there is evidence that two Patriarchal acts were registered, the first one dated - approximately - before the summer of 1402[23] and the second one, in July[24]. Between January and July, no other Patriarchal act is registered.

Meanwhile, we must recall that John VII had sent a letter to the King of England, Henry IV, on the 1st of June 1402, telling him that Constantinople, under siege by the Turks, was in extreme danger of being occupied. John VII's letter was written according to Manuel II's precise instructions[25]. It was fortunate for Constantinople that Bayazid I, one month or more after John VII's letter, moved a great part of his army to Ankara because of the Mongols. According to J.W. Barker, historians generally believe that John VII made an agreement with Bayazid I to give him Constantinople only if he ended his conflict with Timur. After Bayazid I's defeat in Ankara (28th of July in 1402), the siege of Constantinople was interrupted because of the Turkish civil war[26].

---

[22] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3257 : H. Hunger, 'Zu den restlichen Inedita des Konstantinopler Patriarchalregister im Cod. Vindob. hist.gr. 48', REB, 24, (1966), 66-68 (no 7).

[23] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3258. See Mention, Critique.

[24] M.M., II, No 648, pp.495-496 : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3259 :

[25] Royal and Historical Letters During the Reign of Henry IV, ed. F.C.Hingeston, I, London 1860, doc. 42, pp.103-103. The text has been reproduced by J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', App. XVII, pp.500-501, with an English translation at pp.213-214.

[26] J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', pp.215-217.

Jean Darrouzès thinks that it was at this particular moment - after the 28th of July - that the four Metropolitans entered the town and convened the first synod which condemned Matthew I[27] . On the contrary, Macarius of Ankara reports, that during Matthew I's first deposition, no Bishop could enter or leave the town because of the Turkish siege[28] . Apart from that, if the members of the 'secret alliance' convened the synod soon after this date, why did they not wait for the Metropolitans who would enter the town as 'Endemountes' to complete the legal number of twelve?

Since Macarius of Ankara reports that nobody could enter or get out of the town, the synod was not held until after the 28th of July (1402).

On the other hand, V. Laurent thinks that when the rumour of his collaboration with the Turks arose, Matthew I was deposed by the Emperor-regent John VII[29] . But this happened in the spring of 1401[30] , and Matthew I was still signing the Patriarchal records until June of 1402[31] .

Since the participants of the first synod were only four, and the town was under siege, we are absolutely certain that the synod

---

[27] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3260. See Date.

[28] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.33^{v}.

[29] Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 37.

[30] M.M., II, No 626, pp.463-467 : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3189.

[31] M.M., II, No 648, pp.495-496 : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3259.

was convened before the battle of Ankara (28th of July).

John VII sent his letter to Henry IV on the 1st of July, explaining to him that the town was still under siege. But the critical sources prove that Matthew I was still on the throne in July[32]. Accepting that - at least - on the first day of July Matthew I was still on the Patriarchal throne and Bayazid I needed fifteen days to prepare and recall his army to Ankara interrupting the siege of Constantinople, we may conclude that the first illegal synod that deposed the Patriarch was convened during the first fifteen days of July.

[32] M.M., II, No 648, pp.495-496 : Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3259. G.T. Dennis, ignores the fact that Matthew I is still Patriarch in July, because he relies only on M.M.. Thus he thinks that Matthew I remained on the Patriarchal throne until January. See his article 'The Deposition and Restoration of Patriarch Matthew I, 1402-1403', BF, 2, (1967), 101.

CHAPTER XII: THE SECOND SYNOD ABOUT MATTHEW I'S DEPOSITION

Shortly after the illegal synod took place, the four Metropolitans realized the need to be (more than) twelve or at least twelve, a number which was the canonical one for the convening of such a synod.

They were all well aware that after Manuel II's return from the West he would ask for explanations about Matthew I's case. Thus their action had to become 'canonical', unlike the first illegal synod.

After Matthew I was deposed, they confined him to the Charsianeites' monastery. Meanwhile the siege of Constantinople had been interrupted. Hence, the four Metropolitans were able to meet with the newly arrived Metropolitans (Endemountes) and share their views with them. It was not difficult for them to succeed, because the new 'Endemountes', entering into Constantinople, learnt about John VII, his alliance and their plan. Troubles such as their residence and their food could be overcame only if they agreed to collaborate with them in the second synod.

The second synod was convened two months after the battle of Ankara (28th of July in 1402), but before Manuel II's arrival in June of 1403[1]. The original document of the decisions of this synod is lost.

There is a report given by Macarius of Ankara which confirms that a second synod condemned Matthew I, acting in a comple-

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3261. See Date.

mentary way to the first one. The synod consisted of fourteen Metropolitans, who agreed unanimously with the decisions of the previous one[2]. The number of participants was the canonical one - more than twelve.

Unfortunately, the synod was canonical only as regards the number of its participants. Matthew I was not invited - for a second time - to defend himself[3]. The participants of the synod gathered in the Pantokrator's monastery, with the agreement of the Emperor-regent John VII. A 'brief chronicle' reports that the temporary leader of the 'secret alliance'[4], and obviously the one who guided Matthew of Medeia to compose the catalogue of the accusations, was Jacob Holobolos, the Metropolitan of Gothia[5]. Since Jacob was the accuser, we think that Matthew I was accused a second time of immorality (and not of the later accusation of 'trisepiscopos')[6].

---

[2] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.34^{r} ' **καί β΄ σύνοδος ἐπισκόπων ιδ΄ πάντων ὁμοφωνησάντων, καί τό διά τόν καιρόν ἴσως ὑστέρημα τῆς α΄ συνόδου ἀνεπλήρωσεν ἡ β΄ σύνοδος'.**

[3] According to the XII canon of the synod of Carthage, the Bishop (=Archbishop in the case of Matthew) has to be 'heard' by twelve Bishops.

[4] In the absence of Macarius of Ankara.

[5] P. Schreiner, Die Byzantinischen Kleinkroniken, Vol.I, Einleitung und Texte, Wien 1975, p.114, (§ 13).

[6] It was Macarius of Ankara who made this accusation in Italy (Genoa - Ragusa), between January - April. [Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3261] . Cf. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.57^{r} ' **Ἐγώ μέν ἐν Ἰταλία διάγων ἔγραψα κατά τοῦ πατριαρχεύοντος** ' : 'While I was in Italy I wrote against the Patriarch'. The correspondence of the Byzantines with Italy where the Emperor and his companions were residing, gave Macarius of Ankara the opportunity of learning the main events taking place in Constantinople. Willing to support the purpose of the 'secret alliance' which seemed to fail for a second time, he reiterated the accusation of 'Trisepiscopos'.

The accusers had no real evidence or proof. The second synod condemned Matthew I, reinforcing the decisions of the first one, and decided on his deposition from the Patriarchal throne and the loss of his Patriarchal dignity in general[7].

Matthew I, after being deposed and restricted to the Charsianeites' monastery, endured the difficulties hoping that Manuel II would be able to help him. John VII had deposed Matthew I in the name of the secular power. Manuel II would restore him in the name of the same power.

According to Church canon-law, the restoration of a Patriarch is not a matter for secular power to decide. But since the previous two illegal synods were not regarded as real synods[8], the deposition of Patriarch Matthew I was finally an act enforced by secular power against Church canon-law.

---

[7] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.11^{r} **πατριάρχην ὑπό δύο σηνόδων** (sic) **'συνόδων' τοπικών ἐκβληθέντα τοῦ τε θρόνου καί τῆς τιμῆς...'.**

[8] The synodical tome of 1403\4 confirms that Matthew I's opponents took advantage of Manuel II's absence deposing the Patriarch. The tome itself is not mentioning a synod. We are sure that the compiler of the tome of 1403\4, regarded Matthew I's opponents as if they held an illegal meeting and not a real synod. Another very serious point is, that accidentally Macarius of Ankara repeats exactly the same phrases of the synodical tome in his 'Catholic treatise', without a synod to be mentioned. (V. Laurent has reconstituted the text with the exact sentences that Macarius of Ankara uses in his 'Catholic treatise'). Parisinus gr. 1379, f.10^{v}, 30^{r}, 60^{v}-61^{r}, 140^{r-v}: Parisinus gr. 1378, f.39^{v}: Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 121$^{10-13}$: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3267, Extraits cités par Macaire d' Ancyre, 1-3.

CHAPTER XIII: THE 'THIRD SYNOD'

When the Emperor Manuel II returned from Europe, he found the church of Constantinople disturbed and divided.

At first he tried to bring about the restoration of the Patriarch by peaceful means. Thus he called together all the Metropolitans who had opposed Matthew I, and advised them to reconcile themselves with him, accepting his Patriarchal dignity[1].

The Metropolitans refused, replying that they would decide after a synodical examination[2]. The Emperor became very angry listening to their reply, and told them: 'If anyone regards him as patriarch, he regards me as Emperor, and whoever doesn't regard him as Patriarch doesn't regard me as Emperor'[3].

Manuel II was always ready to protect the Patriarch. According to Macarius of Ankara, the Emperor issued a decree 'horismos[4]' (Ὁρισμός) proclaiming the convening of a third synod under

---

[1] Parisinus gr. 1379, f. 10^{v}. ' ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἐπανελθών ἠδύνατο μέν αὐτίκα τοῦτον εἰς τόν ἴδιον ἀποκαταστῆσαι θρόνον..., οὐκ ἐποίησε δέ τοῦτο εὐθύς πρίν ἄν ἀπόπειραν ποιήσηται τῶν ἀρχιερέων ὡς ἄν καί αὐτούς εἰρηνεύση καί διαλλάξη μετά τοῦ πατριάρχου, καί ὅπως ἑως μέν λόγους ἤκουεν ὑποθέσεως παρ' αὐτῶν...'.

[2] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.18 ^{r}, ' καί γοῦν ὥσπερ ἐπανελθών ἀπό τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἐπεί ὥρισε πρός τούς ἀρχιερεῖς ἵνα ὑπάγωσιν αὐτόν ἀνεξετάστως εἰς τό πατριαρχεῖον, οἱ δέ ἀπεκρίθησαν γενέσθαι τοῦτο εἰ δεήσοι μετά τήν κανονικήν ἐξέτασιν ...'.

[3] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.18 ^{r},' εἴ τις ἔχει αὐτόν πατριάρχην ἔχει καί ἐμέ βασιλέα, καί ὅστις οὐκ ἔχει αὐτόν πατριάρχην οὐδέ ἐμέ ἔχει βασιλέα '.

[4] The 'Horismos' is a kind of prostagma like the 'Pittakion'. Both of these synonymous terms, are designating an administrative order.

the presidency of the Metropolitan of Gothia, Jacob Holobolos. The synod took place in the Psichaitissa (Ψυχαΐτισσα) monastery where the cell of Matthew of Medeia was located. The participants were the Metropolitans of Gothia, of Herakeia, of Kyzikos, of Brousa, of Nicaea, of Thessalonica, of Monemvasia by procuration, of Andrianople, of Severine (Hongrovalachia), of Bidyne, of Philippopoli by procuration, of Medeia, of Ganos, of Derkos, of Kama, of Ankara and the Bishops of Rhedestos and Panion. Altogether, there were eighteen, including the two procurators.

We do not agree with G.T. Dennis, who claims that Macarius of Ankara forgot to add his name to the participants[5]. After Macarius mentions all the participants he comments: 'you may add me, (the Metropolitan) of Ankara, among those Metropolitans who agreed, and none of us really disagreed[6]. He referred to his title (of Metropolitan of Ankara) and not to his name: Macarius.

The 'third synod' ratified the decisions of the previous two, which deposed Matthew I. Furthermore, its participants condemned, excommunicated and anathematized Matthew I, issuing a synodical

[5] G.T. Dennis, 'The Deposition and restoration of Patriarch Matthew I, 1402-1403', BF, 2, (1967), 104.

[6] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.73^{r}, ' **Πρόσθες κἀμέ τόν Ἀγκύρας καί ἐπί τούτοις συναποφαίνοντα, μηδενός κἄν διαφωνήσαντος** ' : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 119$^{5-6}$.

tome which was sent to the Emperor Manuel II[7].

For the first time they firmly combined the moral charges against the Patriarch with the old one of 'Trisepiscopos'.

Macarius of Ankara had prepared himself against the Patriarch while he was in the West, where he had composed much written material. He was one of Matthew I's greatest enemies and the one who could remember that during his election as Patriarch, Matthew had stated that he was 'Disepiscopos' and that if he was really 'Trisepiscopos' the synod could condemn, excommunicate and anathematize him[8]. Macarius of Ankara remembered Matthew I's saying and accused him of being 'Trisepiscopos'. The Metropolitan of Ankara suggested that it was Matthew I who had given the verdict himself!

For the moment it seemed that Matthew I had two accusations to fight against: the one of immorality and the other of 'Trisepiscopos'.

According to the XXV canon of the Apostles, every Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon accused of prostitution - (as in Matthew I's case) - or false evidence, or robbery, must be condemned, but not

---

[7] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.34^{r}, ' **ἐκάθηρε καί ἀφώρισε καί ἀναθεμάτισεν αὐτόν ἐγγράφως, καί τόν συνοδικόν ἐκεῖνον τόμον στείλασα ἐνεχείρισε τῷ ἁγίῳ βασιλεῖ** ' : Parisinus gr. 1379, f.73^{r}.

[8] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.73^{r}.

excommunicated [9]. Nahum in the Old Testament says on this: 'affliction shall not rise up the second time'[10] . It is a quotation which, transposed, became the source for three church canons[11] .

The same opinion is expressed by St. Basil the Great in his canons (III, XXXII, LI).

In the III canon, he proposes condemnation for the Deacon who has fallen in prostitution after he has been ordained. After that he will not belong to the clergy but to the laity. But, as a secular person, he must not be excommunicated. St. Basil the Great vindicates his opinion by referring to the same quotation for Nahum 1:9.

St. Basil mentions the fact that the first punishment for both the clergy and the laity should be only one 'step down': from clergy to laity and from laity to excommunication. The difference is, however, that a person from the laity can repent after excommunication and be accepted back into the laity and restored to the position he had before, while a clergyman lost his clerical dignity once and for all. This penalty is sufficient for him and he must not be excommunicated, unless he commits a second sin. In St. Basil's opinion, the main purpose of the punishment is not the annihilation of the sinner, but his

[9] ' Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος ἐπί πορνεία, ἢ ἐπιορκία, ἢ κλοπῆ ἀλούς, καθαιρείσθω, καί μή ἀφοριζέσθω· λέγει γάρ ἡ γραφή· Οὐκ ἐκδικήσεις δίς ἐπί τό αὐτό. Ὡσαύτως καί οἱ λοιποί κληρικοί '. See G.A. Rallis - M. Potlis, 'Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καί ἱερῶν κανόνων...', t.II, Athens 1852, pp.32-33. Cf. PG, 137, 160.

[10] Nahum I:9, ' Οὐκ ἐκδικήσει (ὁ Κύριος) δίς ἐπί τό αὐτό ἐν θλίψει '.

[11] The III, XXXII, and LI, of St. Basil the Great. P.I. Boumis, Οἱ κανόνες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας περί τοῦ Κανόνος τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς, Ἔμμεσοι μαρτυρίαι, Vol.II, Athens 1991, p.43.

repentance[12] .

The (XXXII and LI) canons of St. Basil the Great agree with the previous two[13].

In Matthew I's case the canons of the church were 'officially' ignored by the 'third synod' which was prejudiced and maintained the decisions of the previous two synods. Moreover, the Patriarch did not participate in this synod either. But was it a real synod or not?

We think that Manuel II may have given his permission (horismos) to the Metropolitans to gather for a meeting, in order to decide upon their reconciliation with the Patriarch, but not for a real synod.

Otherwise, Matthew I should have been present as the President of the synod and would also have been able to defend himself. Furthermore, a real synod should have followed all the canonical regulations, because of the Emperor's presence in the town. But this did not happen.

The Metropolitans gave Manuel II the decisions of the 'third

---

[12] ' Ἀμφότερα τοίνυν εἰδέναι ἡμᾶς δεῖ, καί τά τῆς ἀκριβείας, καί τά τῆς συνηθείας· ἔπεσθαι δέ ἐπί τῶν μή καταδεξαμένων τήν ἀκρότητα τῷ παραδοθέντι τύπῳ '. See G.A. Rallis - M. Potlis, 'Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καί ἱερῶν κανόνων...', t.IV, Athens 1854, pp.99-101.

[13] 'Οἱ τήν πρός θάνατον ἁμαρτίαν ἁμαρτάνοντες κληρικοί, τοῦ βαθμοῦ μέν κατάγονται, τῆς κοινωνίας δέ τῶν λαϊκῶν οὐκ ἐξείργονται. Οὐ γάρ ἐκδικήσεις δίς ἐπί τό αὐτό ', (XXXII), Ibid., pp.173-175. ' Τό κατά τούς κληρικούς, ἀδιορίστως οἱ κανόνες ἐξέθεντο, κελεύσαντες μίαν ἐπί τοῖς παραπεσοῦσιν ὁρίζεσθαι τιμωρίαν, τήν ἔκπτωσιν τῆς ὑπηρεσίας, εἴτε ἐν βαθμῷ τυγχάνοιεν, εἴτε καί ἀχειροθετήτῳ ὑπηρεσία προσκαρτεροῖεν ', (LI), Ibid., pp.206-207.

synod' in writing and Manuel II called the Patriarch to show him the document with the new accusation of 'Trisepiscopos'.

The Patriarch, knowing that the synods which had deposed him had not been canonically held, tried to persuade the Emperor to convene a new one, in which he could be justified before his enemies.

Macarius claims that immediately after reading the decisions of the 'third synod', Manuel II called the Patriarch to read them. Then, on the same day (14th of June) he restored Matthew I, to the surprise of all the Metropolitans[14].

But when did the 'third synod' actually take place? If we recall that Manuel II arrived from the West on the 9th of June, we think that the date when the 'third synod' was convened can be approximated[15].

If we suppose that the 9th of June was both the day of Manuel II's arrival and the date on which he was informed in detail

---

[14] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.34^{r}, ' **ὃν δή τόμον καί αὐτός ὁ πατριαρχεύων εἶδε καί ἀνέγνω. ὁ δέ ὑπόσυρεν τήν εὐθυδικίαν τοῦ ἁγίου βασιλέως πρό ἐξετάσεως τῶν κατ' αὐτοῦ ὑπό μείζονος συνόδου** '. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.35^{v}, ' **ὃν [τόμον] καί αὐτός ἰδών ἀναγνούς τε εἰς οὐδέν ἡγήσατο· τῇ γάρ αὐτῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπέβη τῆς ἐκκλησίας** '. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.74^{r}, ' **αὐτός δέ ἐπέβη τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῇ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνός ιδ΄** '.

[15] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.74^{r} ' **ἐπειδήπερ ὁ μέν ἅγιος βασιλεύς ἐπανῆκεν ἀπό τῆς Ἰταλίας μεθ' οὗ καί αὐτός ἔγωγε ἐπανῆλθον Ἰουνίῳ θ΄ ...** '. : Parisinus gr. 1378, f.28^{v}.

about the deposition of Matthew I[16] then the Emperor could not contact the Metropolitans to advise them to reconcile themselves with the Patriarch before the next day (10th of June). The messengers needed at least one day to inform the eighteen Metropolitans about the 'horismos' that the Emperor issued, and gather them all (11th of June). Hence, the third synod may have taken place on any day between the 12th and the 14th of June, and we know for sure that the restoration was effected on the 14th of June.

Therefore, if the 'third synod' took place before the 14th of June, then Manuel II would have had time to consider his decision about the restoration of Matthew I as Patriarch. This makes us think that Macarius of Ankara is again exaggerating - as so often in the 'Catholic treatise' - when he claims that all the events mentioned above happened at the same time, on the 14th of June.

But what about the political member of the secret alliance? Was John VII really interested in deposing his uncle from the Imperial throne? After Manuel II's arrival everyone seemed to expect it. But according to J.W.Barker, John VII, after three and a half years governing Constantinople, was quite content, if not eager, to pass his responsibi-

[16] We use the word 'in detail', because the Emperor being in the West knew about the events which were taking place in the church.

lities back to Manuel II[17].

Thus, the remaining members of the secret alliance had lost - officially - their political support.

[17] J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.239.

CHAPTER XIV: THE SYNODICAL RESTORATION OF PATRIARCH MATTHEW I

Matthew I's accusers were still free, organizing themselves against him. They were Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia with their close friends, Jacob of Gothia, Athanasius of Severine and Theognostus of Kyzikos.

Macarius of Ankara was completing his 'Catholic treatise' a work he had begun composing when he was still in Italy[1] . The pamphlet he presented during the third synod was a part of this uncompleted work. Macarius of Ankara could not believe that after all the accusations made against him, Matthew I was still the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Matthew I persuaded the Emperor to convene a new synod which would justify him and punish his slanderers. All the Emperor wanted was peace to be established in Constantinople. The Byzantine Empire of that time was a small community of people - the Constantinopolitans'. Manuel II, considering that the Patriarchal enemies were still dangerous for the internal peace of Constantinople, convened a synod and presided over it himself. According to the critical edition of the Patriarchal acts, the synod was convened in the Palace[2]

---

[1] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.57^{r}, ' **Ἐγώ μέν ἐν Ἰταλία διάγων ἔγραψα τά κατά τοῦ πατριαρχεύοντος**' . Cf. Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 21.

[2] ' **οὕτω κἄν τῇ εἰς τό παλάτιον συνόδῳ αὐτός ἦν καί ὁ κρινόμενος καί ὁ κρίνων** '. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.18^{r}.

(December of 1403[3]).

V. Laurent seems to be convinced that Manuel II and Matthew I needed at least six months to convert the Metropolitans and at the same time ordain some new ones, but he has no evidence to prove this.

We do not agree with him because there is no Patriarchal act in which an ordination is confirmed. On the other hand it is Macarius of Ankara who gives evidence for a transference[4] and an ordination[5] . This is the unique source of reference, even for Jean Darrouzès[6] .

If there were more than one transference and one ordination we are sure that Macarius would mention it. If there is something we can 'accuse' Matthew I of, it is the similarity of the transference and

---

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3267, See Date. There is a controversy about the exact date on which Matthew I was re-established. G.T. Dennis thinks that the synod was convened in June, because in the Parisinus gr. 1379, f.74^{r}, it is mentioned that one of the Metropolitans who was participating in the synod celebrated the Divine Liturgy together with the Patriarch on the 2nd of July, in the presence of the Emperor. See G.T. Dennis, 'The Deposition and restoration of the Patriarch Matthew I, 1402-1403', BF, 2, (1967), 106. On the contrary, Jean Darrouzès, based on Vitalien Laurent (Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 120), thinks that the synod was convened in December. But - as he reports - he cannot find the quotation that Laurent refers to as a proof of what he says (Parisinus gr. 1379, f.86^{r}). We think that Jean Darrouzès is right because this sentence: ' **ἐπί πολλαῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ χειμῶνος σφοδροτάτου** ', is located two folios before (Parisinus gr. 1379, f.85^{r}), and not in the f.86^{r}.

[4] Matthew of Rhedestos was transfered to the Diocese of Selymbria. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3263. See Mention.

[5] It is the ordination of the Metropolitan of Sougdaia, who had previously been elected for the Diocese of Drama. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3265.

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3263, 3265.

the ordination with his own case.

The synod that took place in December 1403 condemned the activities of the Metropolitans as non - canonical, while emphasizing that they had taken advantage of Manuel II's departure to the West.

When it was Macarius' turn to defend himself, he said that according to the XVII canon of the synod of Antioch, and to St. Basil the Great (he mentioned some of his canons generally), the transference of Bishops is not canonical.

But it seems that Macarius of Ankara was not properly prepared for this 'battle' and some of the thirty-three Metropolitans present proved to him that the canons he was mentioning, confirmed by the XIV canon of the Apostles, actually permitted transferences. They also pointed out that in addition to these canons transferences of Bishops are canonical after they have been synodically decided[7].

Meanwhile, during his six months residence in Constantinople, Macarius of Ankara had circulated some pamphlets as part of his 'Catholic treatise', accusing the Patriarch[8]. Many Imperial

---

[7] '...τάς μεταθέσεις οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἀπαγορεύουσι οἱ θεῖοι κανόνες, ἀλλά καί προτρέπουσιν αὐτάς γίνεσθαι γνώμῃ συνοδικῇ'. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.40^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 121$^{30-32}$. According to the XIV canon of the Apostles, ' Ἐπίσκοπον μή ἐξεῖναι, καταλείψαντα τήν ἑαυτοῦ παροικίαν, ἑτέρα ἐπιπηδᾶν, κἄν ὑπό πλειόνων ἀναγκάζηται, εἰ μή τις εὔλογος αἰτία ἤ, τοῦτο βιαζομένη αὐτόν ποιεῖν, ὡς πλέον τι κέρδος δυναμένου αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἐκεῖσε λόγω εὐσεβείας συμβάλλεσθαι· καί τοῦτο δέ οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλά κρίσει πολλῶν ἐπισκόπων καί παρακλήσει μεγίστῃ'. PG, 137, 64 B.

[8] We must not forget that even the 'Catholic treatise' consisted of many different units and chapters.

Elders, who were present at the synod, confirmed that it was Macarius' work, since they had received it from Macarius himself. Macarius' position was very difficult, but he managed to escape saying that he was not the composer of the pamphlets since they did not bear his signature.

Suddenly, to the surprise of the participants, Macarius read some notes that he had kept from the past[9], accusing Patriarch Matthew I of being 'Trisepiscopos'. The Imperial Elders demanded from Macarius proofs of what he had said. They told him that according to St. Gregory the Theologian, ordination is the perfection of election. They also explained to him that Matthew had been elected but never ordained to Chalcedon. Hence he was 'Disepiscopos' rather than 'Trisepiscopos', as Macarius claimed. All of the Elders were confident of this fact, and assured Macarius that if Matthew I was 'Trisepiscopos', the sea and the sky would be disturbed[10]!

By the end of the synod, a synodical tome was issued. Its composer was the Metropolitan of Serres, Matthew, who had the first rank in the Patriarchal synod, bearing the honorary title of Ephesos[11].

Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia accepted the

---

[9] Since Matthew was elected as Patriarch.

[10] **'Ψάμμος τοίνυν πρότερον ἂν μετρηθείη καὶ σπαρείη θάλαττα καὶ τοξευθεῖεν νεφέλαι καὶ τι τῶν ἀδυνάτων κατορθωθείη ἢ τοῦτο δεχθείη, ὡς ὁ παναγιώτατος ἡμῶν δεσπότης ὁ οἰκουμενικός πατριάρχης τρισεπίσκοπος ἐστιν'**. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.19^{v}, 32^{v}, 39^{r}, 42^{v}, 107^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 122$^{48-51}$.

[11] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.32^{v}, 108^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 122$^{68-69}$.

decisions, signed the synodical tome[12] and celebrated the Divine Liturgy together with the Patriarch[13].

Jacob of Gothia, repenting of his previous behaviour, asked the Patriarch to forgive him[14]. Theognostus of Kyzikos did likewise, and reconciled himself, with the Patriarch[15]. The Emperor issued a 'Chrysobull' sealing the decisions of the synod in the hope that the case had come to an end[16].

As regards the Imperial presence at the synod, we need to note that this had happened many times before by Emperors wishing to establish order.

Unfortunately for the church of Constantinople, Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia changed their minds the moment after they had signed. They had pretended to agree with the synod, without really believing it themselves.

---

[12] That Matthew I was not 'Trisepiscopos' and his transference was in accordance with the church canons.

[13] It is mentioned in the synodical tome of 1409 : Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.30^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 129$^{92-95}$.

[14] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 123$^{8-9}$.

[15] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.28^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 123$^{9-10}$.

[16] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.30^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 129$^{92-97}$.

CHAPTER XV: THE REACTION OF MACARIUS OF ANKARA AND MATTHEW OF MEDEIA

Some days after the synod of December 1403 - as Macarius describes - Matthew of Medeia celebrated the Divine Liturgy only once with the Patriarch. Then, he decided to retire for a while, without participating either in the Divine Liturgy or in Ecclesiastical events[1]. But ten folios earlier, in the same manuscript, Macarius mentions the 'pittakion' addressed to him by Manuel II, in which the Emperor confirms that the Patriarch was still in communion with Matthew of Medeia [2]. Macarius of Ankara, on the other hand, celebrated with Matthew I two or three times, showing him that he accepted his Patriarchal dignity[3], but then continued writing against him in his 'Catholic treatise'.

By the end of the synod of December 1403, Macarius had written as many copies as he could, slandering Matthew I with the old accusations. Henceforth, being well aware that the canons he had used

---

[1] ' **ὁ μέν Μηδείας ἅπαξ συλλειτουργήσας αὐτῷ ἀπέστη τῆς εἰς τό ἑξῆς κοινωνίας αὐτοῦ** '. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.50^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 156$^{2-3}$.

[2] ' **ἀλλά τοῦ πατριάρχου κοινωνοῦντος ἀεί τῷ Μηδείας, σοί δέ μή θέλοντος κοινωνεῖν** '. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.40^{v}: Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 116$^{11-12}$. The 'pittakion' is written a few months before the later synod of September 1405.

[3] ' **κἀγώ δέ δίς ἤ τρίς συλλειτουργήσας αὐτῷ ἤμην ἡσυχάζων** '. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.50^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 156$^{3-4}$. Did Macarius lie before, showing that he had an immitator of his own behaviour?

in the past were not capable of deposing Matthew I, he developed a new accusation. Insisting on the 'fact' that the three 'synods' which deposed Matthew I were canonical, he rejected as non-canonical both the synod of December 1403 and the involvement of the Emperor which reinstated Matthew I. He was now accusing the Patriarch of having being reinstated with the aid of secular power, contrary to the Church's canon law[4].

Trying to 'clarify' events, Macarius tells us that a little after the synod of December 1403, the Emperor sent him to the Peloponnese. Only there did he find the synodical tome, with the decisions of the synod, and read it[5] - expecting us to believe that he ignored the contents of an official document he had already signed[6]!

After he returned to Constantinople, he came into contact with Matthew of Medeia and both of them discussed their plans against the Patriarch. At first, they wanted to cause a controversy between the Emperor, the members of the synod, and the Metropolitan Matthew of Serres[7].

They sent a letter to the Emperor, assuring him that they

---

[4] According to the XXX canon of the Apostles, ' **Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, κοσμικοῖς ἄρχουσι χρησάμενος, δι' αὐτῶν ἐγκρατὴς Ἐκκλησίας γένηται, καθαιρείσθω καί ἀφοριζέσθω, καί οἱ κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ ἅπαντες** '. PG, 137, 93B. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.137^{v} : Parisinus gr. 1378, ff. 35^{v}-36^{r}.

[5] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.50^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 156$^{5-7}$.

[6] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.30^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 129^{94}.

[7] He presided in the 'Endemousa' of December 1403.

regarded anyone who dared to say that the Emperor, or the Imperial Elders, or the Church, are heretics as anathema, and saying that they believed there were one or two persons who had brought about heresy in the Church (Patriarch Matthew I and the Metropolitan Matthew of Serres as the composer of the synodical tome of December 1403). Therefore, they were suggesting that Matthew I's case should be re - examined [8].

A second letter was sent to the 'Endemousa' synod which stated that the unique source of the priesthood was God and not secular power and that the synod of December 1403, which confirmed Matthew I's re-establishment with the aid of secular power had made a decision in the same manner as 'the Latins' [9]. (They were referring to the Papal Schism and the involvement with secular matters which had caused it).

A third letter was sent to the Metropolitan Matthew of Serres. They asked him to act so that the canonical mistakes made by the synod of December of 1403 should be corrected[10].

Macarius narrates that after a while, he went to the Peloponnese for a second time. We do not know the exact reasons for

---

[8] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.19^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB , 30, (1972), 147^{1} - 148^{15}.

[9] 'The Latins' was a common word for the Byzantines of this era describing the Western Church. Parisinus gr. 1378, ff.24^{v} - 25^{r}, 51^{v} - 52^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 149^{1} - 150^{24}.

[10] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.55^{r}, 87^{v} : Parisinus gr. 1378, f.24^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 150^{1} - 151^{15}.

his second trip, since he does not mention that he was sent by the Emperor[11]. Our view is that his second trip was a very suspicious one, because John VII had been established as governor of Thessalonica and the Byzantine Empire had been divided into two parts[12]. Thus it was easy for Macarius to approach John VII on his way to the Peloponnese (if he had not done so during his first trip). Knowing very well that John VII had supported him in the past as a member of the 'secret alliance', he could ask for his help again.

While Macarius was in the West, he learnt about the main events that led to the Papal Schism. For three and a half years, he became accustomed to living amidst division.

From the first two letters to the Emperor and to the synod, it is clear that the two Metropolitans were criticising the activities of the Byzantine secular power by comparing it to that of the Western political leaders. They attempted to scare both the Patriarch and the Emperor by threatening them with a similar schism. There were still a large number of Bishops who were not completely convinced of Matthew I's Patriarchal dignity.

Macarius had given copies of his 'Catholic treatise' to every person he regarded as influential. His purpose was to undermine his readers' confidence in Matthew I. He had become so insistent about

---

[11] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.50^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 157[10].

[12] It happened before the beginning of November 1403. See J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', pp.243-244.

repeating the same charges against the Patriarch, that both manuscripts saved from his 'Catholic treatise' are full of recapitulations, repetitions and - as we have previously seen - contradictions.

It was in the spring of 1405 that Macarius came back from the Peloponnese (via Thessalonica?), and Manuel II advised him to concelebrate with the Patriarch in the Divine Liturgy[13].

Contrary to the Emperor's expectations, Macarius spread rumours that Manuel II impelled him to be in 'communion' with the Patriarch.

When Manuel II learnt of this, he became very angry and sent a 'pittakion' to Macarius explaining that no-one was impelling him to be reconciled to Matthew I[14].

The Emperor was really quite afraid of the eighteen Metropolitans who had participated in the 'third synod'. The majority he regarded as malcontents. He was also worried because they had confirmed the decisions of the previous two synods even though they knew that the Emperor himself favoured Matthew I, who had been canonically elected and enthroned. He may have started to suspect that they were encouraged in their activities by a person with secular

---

[13] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.40^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 116$^{2-3}$.

[14] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.34^{r} : Parisinus gr. 1379, f.136^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 117$^{15-21}$.

power (John VII). All the above mentioned Metropolitans were able to (elect and) ordain a new Patriarch. Manuel II was seriously concerned and wrote in the same 'pittakion' that if Macarius continued to act as agitator and to encourage a party of Metropolitans against the Patriarch, he was putting the peace of the Orthodox Church in danger[15]. Furthermore, a Schism similar to that of the Western Church might be caused[16].

In the same 'pittakion' Manuel II mentioned that the Patriarch was in communion with Matthew of Medeia and he expected the same behaviour from Macarius. As the Emperor reports - it was the Patriarch who had asked him to invite Macarius after he had realized that the Metropolitan of Ankara did not pay attention to his

---

[15] '**...μή πρός ὀχλήσεις χωρῆσαι καί ταραχάς, μήποτε ἀπό τούτου τό ἀντίθετον μέρος πρός χειροτονίαν χωρήση πατριάρχου...**' . G.T. Dennis, 'Official Documents of Manuel II Palaeologus', Byz, 31, (1971), 53^{3-5} (no19). It seems that G.T. Dennis' translation in English is incorrect. As he says ' ...not to cause trouble and not to oppose the consecration of the Patriarch [i.e. claim that he was unlawfully elected] '. Ibid., p.52^{4-6} (no 19). Translating correctly we could say: ' Don't proceed to uproar and (public) disorder, because the opponents (of Matthew I) might proceed to the enthronement of another Patriarch '. According to G.T. Dennis' translation we must accept that Patriarch Matthew I was unlawfully elected for the Patriarchal throne and the opponents (Macarius' party) were against his enthronement which would take place after a while.

[16] '**...καί σύγχυσις καί σχίσμα γένηται τῇ ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ καί ταὐτόν τι πάθομεν καί ἡμεῖς ὅ καί ἐν τῇ τῶν Λατίνων ἐκκλησία συνέβη** '. G.T. Dennis, 'Official Documents of Manuel II Palaeologus', Byz, 31, (1971), 53^{5-7} (no 19) : ' This will lead to confusion and schim in the Church and we will suffer the same thing as has happened in the Church of the Latins '. English translation, Ibid., op. cit., p.52^{6-9} (no 19) : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 116^{5-6}. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1379, ff.40^{v} - 41^{r}.

invitations[17] . The 'pittakion' addressed to Macarius of Ankara therefore had an admonitory character.

Macarius was convinced that no-one (in Constantinople) was paying any attention to what he had to say and decided to go to Mount Athos (located near Thessalonica) to join a monastery (spring 1405)[18] but Matthew I, exerting Patriarchal rights, did not give him his permission to go[19] and conveyed his decision to Macarius by the 'Skeuophylax'[20], just as the Metropolitan of Ankara was going to get on the boat to Thessalonica[21] . The 'Skeuophylax' also told him that Matthew I expected him to present himself to the synod which would examine his pamphlets[22] .

Patriarch Matthew I has hitherto appeared as a reasonable and peace-loving Bishop. What made him forbid Macarius to leave the town? Under the circumstances, it would seem better if Macarius had indeed gone to Mount Athos. At least he would have been away from Constantinople and conflict in the Patriarchal environment could have

---

[17] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.40^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 116^{9} - 117^{14}.

[18] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.50^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 156^{1} - 157^{14}.

[19] On that time, the spiritual affairs of Mount Athos, were responsibility of the Ecumenical Patriarch.

[20] 'Skeuophylax', **'Σκευοφύλαξ'** (= the keeper of the vessels). A cleric who was appointed to look after the sacred valuables and liturgical vessels of a church. In this case he may have been from 'Hagia Sophia'. Paul Magdalino - Alice Mary Talbot, 'Skeuophylax', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, pp.1909-1910.

[21] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.50^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 157$^{15-22}$.

[22] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.50^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 157$^{25-26}$.

come to an end[23] .

Matthew of Medeia would no longer have someone to follow. Neither would Athanasius of Severine, who had not cooperated with them since December 1403. Macarius' absence from Constantinople, could have put everything in order. Then why did Matthew I forbid him to leave? We can only suppose that the Patriarch and the Emperor shared suspicions about Macarius' secret plans. They suspected that instead of going to Mount Athos, he would go to Thessalonica, and stay there.

It is noteworthy that John VII had the support of his father in-law Fransesco II Gattilusio, governor of Lesbos. Before November of 1403, they had together sent a flottila, to try to seize Thessalonica by force, or at least, to make a demonstration of force there. Manuel II was not yet sure of John VII's intentions. This was why he sent Demetrius-Lascaris Leontaris (whom he trusted) to Thessalonica, as his liaison man and overseer. Historically, John VII did not cause any more trouble after that. Did this happen because he did not have the opportunity? What might have happened if Macarius had joined John VII, the newly-installed 'Basileus of all the Thessaly[24] '? Only Macarius and John VII would know.

Macarius, trying to escape, begged the Emperor to persuade the Patriarch to give him his permission to leave, but he failed. The

---

[23] We are referring to the Metropolitans who were still against Matthew I.

[24] J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', pp.242-245. **' Βασιλεύς άπάσης Θετταλίας '.**

Emperor was of the same opinion as the Patriarch. Macarius requested an audience from the Emperor and gave him the 'Catholic treatise' to examine [25].

The Emperor did not want to read the book, so Macarius pressed him, sending it to the Archimandrite of the Stoudites' monastery, Euthymius[26]. Euthymius decided that it was a text composed by Bishops[27] and suggested it was not for him to venture into this area[28].

The patient Patriarch realised that everything could be arranged following a synodical decision and he prepared the climate for this.

---

[25] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.50^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 157$^{29-35}$. It was a corpus of his pamphlets.

[26] He was among the three names of the 'Triprosopon' when Matthew I was elected. A little before the elections he had resigned. Euthymius was Manuel II's friend. Manuel II kept this friendship corresponding with him while he was in he West. J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', pp. 184-185.

[27] Euthymius may have concluded this because of the repetitions and recapitulations of Macarius' text. In the midst of his confusion he may have decided that it had been composed by more than one Bishop.

[28] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.50^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 157$^{36-48}$.

CHAPTER XVI: THE CONDEMNATION OF MACARIUS OF ANKARA AND MATTHEW OF MEDEIA

It was in the summer of 1405 that four Patriarchal messengers appeared in Macarius' cell. They were the Metropolitans of Barna[1] and Maronia, accompanied by the 'Great Sakellarios[2] ' and the 'Teacher of the Psalter[3] '. They invited Macarius to present himself to the synod, for the examination of his book[4] .

Macarius thought he could find a way to leave Constantinople, so he tried to gain time. The excuse he gave was that he had a pain in his leg and was unable to attend the synod. As for the book he had composed, he assured the messengers that it concerned the life of some Saints!

The messengers gave him one month's time-limit, but when

---

[1] Possibly Gabriel of Barna. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2847.

[2] Possibly Michael Aoionares. See Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3240. 'Sakellion' **(=Σακέλλιον)** or 'Sakelle' **(=Σακέλλη)** was originally a treasury of the Great church of Constantinople, analogous to the 'Imperial Sakellion'. After the 1090s, the officials 'Sakellarioi' **(=Σακελλάριοι)** of the 'Patriarchal Sakellion' became responsible for religious foundations under Patriarchal jurisdiction. The 'Great Sakellarios' took care of the monasteries. Paul Magdalino, 'Sakellion', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1830 (§ 2-3).

[3] Possibly Katakalon. See H. Hunger, Johannes Chortasmenos, (ca.1370-ca. 1436\37), Wien 1969, pp.73-74,155. Teaching activity in Byzantium was closely linked with participation in the State or in the Ecclesiastical administration. The 'Teachers' of the Patriarchal school - 'Didaskaloi' **(=Διδάσκαλοι)** - often became provincial Bishops. Alexander Kazhdan - Robert Browning, 'Teacher', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.2019.

[4] Macarius' book was a collection of pamphlets that he had unified in a corpus. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3270.

they explained to the Patriarch and the synod what had happened they realised that Macarius of Ankara was lying and only trying to gain time. He could easily escape during the one month's time-limit, and thereby avoid presenting himself to the synod, and the synod would not be able to judge him in his absence. Matthew I realised this and on the next day sent another five messengers to Macarius: the Metropolitans of Kyzikos[5] and of Zechiae[6] , accompanied by the 'Great Sakellarios', the 'Great Chartophylax' and the 'Teacher of the Psalter'[7] . They informed Macarius that it was their second message to him and on the next day, a third invitation would take place, exactly as the church canons commanded. The 'Teacher of the Psalter', presented him, in writing, with the reasons for which the synod was going to be convened. Despite the fact that Macarius did not read them, he understood from the messenger's words that he would be excommunicated through a Patriarchal act unless he gave his book to them[8] . But to the best of our knowledge,

---

[5] As we have seen in the previous chapter, Theognostos of Kyzikos reconciled himself with Patriarch Matthew I. Cf. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3265, Critique 2.

[6] He participated in the synod that condemned Macarius (when he was still monk in 1396), supporting his innocence. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3027: M.M., II, No 504, p.269.

[7] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3271.

[8] We disagree with Jean Darrouzès, who suggests that the synodical invitation included the threat of the excommunication. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3271. Macarius says that his synodical excommunication (and not the threat) was included in the Patriarchal act. Macarius of Ankara understood it from the 'Teacher of the Psalter's' words without reading the message. ' **πρός τοῖς ὑπ' ἐκείνων εἰρημένοις, περιεῖχε καί συνοδικόν ἀφορισμόν** '. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.51^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 158^{72}. It is obvious that he was trying to persuade his readers of the 'unfair justice' that the synod intended to mete out.

neither the Patriarch nor the synod intended to do that before a canonical examination. At the very end the messengers demanded Macarius' book to commit it to the flames at Milion (Μίλιον).

Macarius did not agree but rather sent two monks (Moses and David) to the Emperor, with a pamphlet explaining everything about the contents of his book. The Emperor, who was afraid of a schism, ordered Macarius to send his book to him while he recuperated, and this Macarius did[9].

Matthew I did not really want to condemn Macarius. Peaceful and conciliatory in character, he sent the 'Great Sakellarios' and the 'Teacher of the Psalter' another two times to Macarius, asking him to repent of his behaviour. But rejecting the Pariarchal proposals Macarius contacted Matthew of Medeia, and both of them prepared themselves for the canonical hearing in the synod. There, they could speak in their own defence[10].

After Macarius had 'recuperated', the Emperor gave him an audience and urged him again to repent of what he had written. Macarius refused, as he had always done[11].

---

[9] Parisinus gr. 1379, ff.50^{v} - 51^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 157^{36} - 158^{90}. Cf. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.54^{r}, 94^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 123$^{18-20}$. As Macarius reports a little before, the second messengers succeeded in stealing one of his books. Parsinus gr. 1379, f.51^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 158$^{81-82}$.

[10] Parisinus gr. 1379, f. 51^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepicopat, REB, 30, (1972), 158^{90} - 159^{96}.

[11] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.51^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 159$^{96-100}$.

Then, Manuel II signed two 'horismous' (Ὁρισμούς). The first one he sent to the Patriarch. In it he stated that ' the Metropolitan of Ankara has said that I have been sending you his pamphlets[12], which you know is not true. I have retained them in the hopes that he would reform. But, since he had told me previously, and has repeated in writing, that I should send them to you[13] , I am now doing so, together with his book, which he entrusted to me until he should come to his senses, as I counselled him. But he has not done so. Since he has asked that we ourselves get out of this, and that the matter be carried to an examination, I permit this to take place. I now request you and the holy synod to see to his reformation and not to appear to act out of anger[14] '.

A second 'horismos' was sent to Macarius of Ankara. The latter, after contacting Matthew of Medeia, insisted on asking Manuel II to convene a new synod. He was sure that by the end of the synodical procedure he would defeat the Patriarch and succeed in his condemnation.

---

[12] Macarius of Ankara used to bombard the Emperor with pamphlets accusing the Patriarch. Thus the Emperor had received more than the one that the two monks (Moses and David) had given to him. Parisinus gr. 1379, f. 52^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 114^{1-4} : See translation in G.T. Dennis, 'Official Documents of Manuel II Palaeologus', Byz, 31, (1971), 54 (no21). Cf. Parisinus gr. 1379, f.54^{r} ,94^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 123^{20-21}.

[13] We may see that even on his last visit to the Emperor, Macarius gave him another pamphlet.

[14] Parisinus gr. 1379, f. 52^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 114^{1-15} : Translated by G.T. Dennis in 'Official Documents of Manuel II Palaeologus', Byz, 31, (1971), 54-55.

Manuel II informed Macarius in writing that the time had come for him to prove he was right. But if the synod decided the opposite of what he expected, it was he himself who would be condemned[15].

In August of 1405, a new synod was convened in the monastery of Mangana[16]. When Macarius arrived, the Bishops asked him whether or not he was prepared to reconcile himself with the Patriarch Matthew I. Macarius asked for time to think about it, and the issue was postponed.

A second synod was convened in the same monastery - complementary to the first one - and Macarius asked what did the synod suggest he should do?

The Bishops advised him again to reconcile himself with Matthew I.

Macarius replied that it might happen after the canonical examination of the matters raised in his book ('Trisepiscopos' etc.).

The Metropolitan of Serres considered Macarius' demand unacceptable. He also informed him that the Patriarch was asking for a 'written promise', stating that Macarius would never speak or write

---

[15] Parisinus gr. 1378, f. 60^{r} : Parisinus gr. 1379, 52^{r-v}: Laurent, Le Triepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 115^{1-13}.

[16] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3272.

anything else against him[17].

Instead of a 'written promise', the synod would also accept Macarius' repentance in front of all its participants[18]. It was all the same to them to read or to hear Macarius saying that the synod examined and disapproved his book and the accusations against the Patriarch, and that he agreed with its decisions[19].

The synod did not want to proceed to the canonical examination of Macarius' book because he would have to be condemned for every page of it. Macarius replied that since his book had not been examined, they could not disapprove it and neither could he. Then he went away[20].

Shortly after the synod had been interrupted, its participants decided to send the 'Teacher of the Apostles[21]' to invite Macarius once more. The Metropolitan of Ankara paid no attention to his message, which seemed to have a private rather than an official character.

---

[17] It is clear that the Patriarch Matthew I did not preside over the synod. It was the Metropolitan Matthew of Serres who did so.

[18] Parisinus gr. 1379, ff.51^{v} - 52^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 159$^{102-115}$.

[19] '**Ἐπεὶ ἐξετάσασα ταῦτα ἡ σύνοδος ἀπεδοκίμασεν αὐτά, ἔχω κἀγὼ ταῦτα ὡς διέκρινεν ἡ σύνοδος**'. Parisinus gr. 1379, f. 52^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 159$^{115-116}$.

[20] Parisinus gr. 1379, f. 52^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 159$^{116-119}$.

[21] He was Teacher [=Didaskalos, (**Διδάσκαλος**)] of the Acts of the Apostles, of the Epistles of Paul the Apostle and of the General Epistle of James.

After that, the synod sent him a third canonical message - in addition to the previous two - inviting him to present himself again to the synod[22] . The messengers were the Metropolitans of Mesembria and of Sofia (or Sardiki, or Triaditza), accompanied by the 'Great Sakellarios' and the 'Great Chartophylax'. Macarius did not reply at all to their invitation.

Meanwhile, Matthew of Medeia, who wanted to support Macarius, asked the synod to invite him as well.

The synod replied that he had not objected to the Patriarch until then. On the other hand, they reminded him that a few years before he was Macarius' enemy. Thus, they suggested him that if he wanted to add anything concerning the case, he should have to wait for his turn, after Macarius' synodical examination[23] .

Matthew of Medeia became angry and abused the participants of the synod in public. The 'Endemountes' decided that the two Metropolitans must be invited together. Despite Matthew's abuses, the synod had arranged for them to sit according to rank[24] .

---

[22] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3273.

[23] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.53^{r-v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 124$^{26-33}$: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3274.

[24] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.57^{r} : Parisinus gr. 1379, f.53^{v} : 131^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 124$^{33-44}$.

The synod elected new messengers from its participants[25]. They were the Metropolitans Matthew of Serres[26], Eustathius of Berroia[27], Athanasius of Hongrovalachia, accompanied by the 'Great Sakellarios[28]', the 'Great Skeuophylax[29]', and the 'Great Chartophylax[30]'. They went first to Matthew of Medeia's cell, where they found Macarius of Ankara. They tried to be friendly with them, but the two Metropolitans were not willing to do the same. Matthew of Medeia - shouting - rejected both the decisions of the synod of 1403 and the Imperial 'Chrysobull', telling the messengers that he did not regard Matthew I as the Patriarch. Matthew of Medeia concluded that he and Macarius would never go to attend the synod.

When Macarius was asked whether or not he agreed with Matthew's declarations he replied positively, adding that both of them had hastily signed the synodical tome of December 1403[31].

Finally, the long-awaited synod was convened in September

---

25 Parisinus gr. 1379, f.53^{v} : 131^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 124$^{39-48}$: Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3275.

26 He had the rank of Caesarea (that is to say he was among the first among equal Metropolitans).

27 H. Hunger, Johannes Chortasmenos, (ca. 1370 - ca. 1436\37), Wien, 1969, pp.77, 160.

28 He was Michael Aoionares. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3275.

29 He was John Syropoulos. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3275.

30 He was Michael Valsamon. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3275.

31 Parisinus gr. 1379, ff.53^{v} - 54^{r}, 94^{v} - 95^{r}, and not as V. Laurent states 94^{r} - 95^{r} in Laurent, Le Trisepiscopate, REB, 30, (1972), 123. : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 124^{49} - 125^{69}.

of 1405[32] . According to church canon-law, the two Metropolitans would be judged by default[33], but there was also their official attestation in front of the above named synodical messengers[34] . Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia were deprived of their Priesthood[35]. The first charge was that they had gone back on their signed agreement (to the synodical tome of December 1403) by making accusations against Matthew I[36] .

Secondly, they had rejected both the synodical tome and the Imperial 'Chrysobull'.

The synod considered that their first deed was an attack against the holy dogmas of the church while the second was an attack

---

[32] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3276.

[33] The LXXIV canon of the Apostles' states: ' **Ἐπίσκοπον κατηγορηθέντα ἐπί τινι παρά ἀξιοπίστων ἀνθρώπων· κἄν μέν ἀναγκαῖον ὑπό τῶν ἐπισκόπων· κἄν μέν ἀπαντήση καί ὁμολογήση, ἤ ἐλεγχθείη, ὁρίζεσθαι τό ἐπιτίμιον. Ἐάν δέ καλούμενος μή ὑπακούση, καλείσθω καί δεύτερον, ἀποστελλομένων ἐπ' αὐτόν δύο ἐπισκόπων. Ἐάν δέ καλούμενος μή ὑπακούση, καλείσθω καί τρίτον δύο πάλιν ἐπισκόπων ἀποστελλομένων πρός αὐτόν. Ἐάν δέ καί οὕτως καταφρονήσας μή ἀπαντήση, ἡ σύνοδος ἀποφαινέσθω κατ' αὐτοῦ τά δοκοῦντα, ὅπως μή δόξη κερδαίνειν φυγοδικῶν** '. PG, 137, 48C. Cf. Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.30^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 130$^{127-129}$.

[34] Parisinus gr. 1378, ff.53^{v} - 54^{r} : Parisinus gr. 1379, ff.59^{v} - 60^{r} , 95^{r}, 143^{v}: Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 125$^{70-82}$.

[35] The 'replacement', is a practical explanation of the deposition. It is not double punishment. Parisinus gr. 1378, f.54^{r} : Parisinus gr. 1379, f.60^{r}, 95^{r}, 143^{v}: Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 125$^{82-83}$.

[36] **' φησί γάρ ὁ νόμος· Ὁ τῇ ἰδία ὑπογραφῇ ἐναντιούμενος καθαιρείσθω '.** Parisinus gr. 1378, f.54^{r} : Parisinus gr. 1379, f.60^{r}, 143^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 125$^{84-85}$.

against the Emperor[37] . The synod anathematized the contents of Macarius' books[38] and everyone who agreed with them[39] .

After the synod sent the decisions to Macarius and Matthew both of them had to take off the symbols of their Archpriesthood: their Crosses[40] and the Enkolpia[41], and send them to the synod. In addition to this, they signed the document containing the decisions of the synod[42] .

---

[37] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.54^{r} : Parisinus gr. 1379, f.60^{r}, 143^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 125$^{87-90}$.

[38] The synod anathematized the whole corpus of his pamphlets (=books).

[39] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.54^{r}, 25^{r-v} : Parisinus gr. 1379, f.60^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 125$^{90-94}$.

[40] The Crosses are worn around the neck of Bishops.

[41] Objects with christian imagery, or containing (the old ones) a sacred relic or inscription. They are worn around the neck of the Bishop, together with the Cross. Sheila D. Campbell - Anthony Culter, 'Enkolpion', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.700.

[42] Parisinus gr. 1379, f.60^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 125$^{98-106}$.

CHAPTER XVII: THE CONTINUATION OF MATTHEW I'S TROUBLES, BECAUSE OF THE TWO EX-BISHOPS THEIR EXCOMMUNICATION

After the synodical condemnation of his enemies, Matthew I tried to solve the many Ecclesiastical questions that had arisen, organizing the church of Constantinople. Two years later he issued a 'Monastic testament' for the Charsianeites' monastery (September 1407) advising his monks of the way to spiritual perfection[1].

But his opponents were not still convinced that he was the canonical Patriarch. The two Metropolitans, Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia, affected by their deposition, wanted to take revenge. The main sources concerning their reaction after the synod of September 1405, are Macarius' 'Catholic treatise', and the later synodical tome of 1409, in cod. Vaticanus gr. 1858.

For the first three years after their synodical condemnation (1405-1408), the two Metropolitans seemed to withdraw from public activity. But secretly, they continued to send letters full of slander to powerful people - especially the Imperial Elders - who were disturbed by what they read[2]. The Patriarch was now accused not only of being 'Trisepiscopos', but also of being a Bishop-usurper, tyrant, patrician,

---

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3283.

[2] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.31^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 131$^{132-137}$.

and was compared with Simon the Magician and Judas Iscariot[3].

Macarius of Ankara, together with Matthew of Medeia, wanted to lodge an appeal with the Emperor demanding another synod to judge the Patriarch and re-examine the reasons for their condemnation (September 1405). But Manuel II was away in Selymbria (possibly in 1406). The two Metropolitans also looked out for newly-arrived 'Endemountes' who had not taken part in the synod that condemned them. In 1406 there was only one[4].

After some new Metropolitans had entered the town Macarius of Ankara sent his first letters to the Emperor and the Patriarch demanding that a new synod be convened[5]. Neither Manuel II nor Matthew I paid attention to his demands and all he succeeded in doing was to make Manuel II feel upset, after reading the slanders against the Patriarch.

The two ex-Metropolitans[6] did not regard the synod which had already condemned them as an appeal to a higher court. Hence, what they really demanded was a 'second' re-examination of their case[7].

During 1406-1407, Manuel II wrote Macarius four letters

---

[3] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.31^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepisopat, REB, 30, (1972), 131$^{138-152}$.

[4] Dorotheus, Metropolitan of Athens.

[5] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.64^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 161$^{52-62}$.

[6] We refer to them as 'ex - Metropolitans', because after they had been deposed, they belonged to the laity.

[7] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.18^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 160$^{1-27}$.

trying to make him think sensibly. The Imperial letters that are saved in the cod. Vaticanus Barberinus graecus 219, ff.89-90^{v} reveal Macarius' character, some of them pointing out his evil ways.

The first one says: ' Many men today have turned to slander, impelled perhaps by fear, although some blame fortune and look upon their evil ways as respectable. What you are now doing is madness. Therefore, either cease your wickedness or, at least, show some shame so that we[8] may hope for your reformation' [9].

Since the Emperor did not pay attention to Macarius' demands, the latter sent him another letter accusing the Patriarch and asking that his letter be read before an audience - possibly the Imperial Elders. To this Manuel II replied that: ' You are not the honorable man you claim to be but a contemptible one. Although preeminent in insolent jesting, you still felt it terrible if you did not also direct your attack against us[10]. You attempt to show that we are rivals in a contest of slander. Moreover, you regard the present wretched time as a god-given opportunity and you spare nobody at all;

---

[8] Both the Emperor and the Patriarch.

[9] Translated by G.T. Dennis, 'Four Unknown Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus', Byz, 36, (1966), p.37 (no 63). We disagree with G.T. Dennis in the translation of the title of these four letters located in Vat. Barberinus gr. 219. The title is ' **Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολαί ἐξ ὑποθέσεως εἰρημέναι** ' and he translates it as 'Hypothetical letters' instead of ' Letters of (Manuel II), issued because of a hypothesis (a case). It seems that he has misunderstood the translation of '**Ὑπόθεσις**' (Hypothesis) with 'Hypothetical'. Ibid., p.36.

[10] Manuel II and the Patriarch.

you rejoice and enrich yourself in this period of general decline. You do not realize that you too are implicated in these grievous circumstances, and this leads others to grieve for you. You glory in your good fortune at a time when better men are tried by evil fortune[11] . Most shameless of all, however, is your effort to ascribe your own evil ways to us[12] . While I should not condescend to reply to your nonsense, still, something must be said to bring you to your senses. But your impudence has now brought you to this point: some grieved, some laughed, but everyone jeered when your letter was read. As you desired, many were present, and you received an appropriate reward [13] '.

The third letter must have been written at the beginning of 1409 after Manuel II came back from the Peloponnese and Thessalonica. John VII was already dead and Manuel II writes to Macarius: ' Why do you continue to act so shamelessly in trying to ascribe what you are doing to others? Perhaps you actually believe in your superior skill, but you will never convince anyone else, since your reputation has already been ruined by your own deeds. Everyone knows that your chief interest lies in trying to goad us[14] . You profit from the misfortunes of others,

---

[11] Manuel II is possibly thinking of Theodore I Palaeologus (1374-1407). Theodore I was the Despot of Morea and his final illness had apparently been a long one. The Emperor was very distressed. We think that this letter was sent to Macarius in 1407 - a little before Theodore I Palaeologus' death.

[12] Macarius in fact ascribes his own evil ways to others since he was (still?) favoured by John VII.

[13] Translated by G.T. Dennis, op. cit., p.37 (no 64).

[14] The Emperor and the Patriarch.

and the present state of affairs only assists in making you worse. Do as you will, then, and perhaps some will praise you, but we, ever mindful of your position, shall still hope you will come to your senses, and if you ever return here we shall gladly see you' [15].

Looking carefully at the conclusion of Manuel II's third letter to Macarius of Ankara, we may see that Macarius was out of Constantinople. There were three possible 'places' where he could be. Trebizond, the Peloponnese, and Thessalonica. But we do not think that Macarius went to Trebizond because neither his 'Catholic treatise' nor our sources mention his relation with that 'small Byzantine Empire'. Nor do we think, however, that he went either to the Peloponnese or to Thessalonica because the Emperor had already been there and would have met him (summer 1408 - end of 1408). We think that the word 'returning' bears a general meaning, referring to the reformation of Macarius.

When the Emperor returned from his trip, Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia were not only slandering the Patriarch with their accusations, but were also accusing the whole church of being heretical[16]. But since the church of Constantinople was regarded by the two ex-Metropolitans as heretical and they could express their opinion in public, what was there to stop them from founding their own party

[15] Translated by G.T. Dennis, op. cit., p.37 (no 65).

[16] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.32^{r-v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 132^{186} - 133^{216}.

and separating themselves from the Ecumenical Patriarchate?

It was at the end of 1408, when Macarius of Ankara, holding in his hands an icon of the crucifixion and the synodical tome of September 1405, presented himself to the Emperor. Weeping, Macarius told him that both he and Matthew of Medeia had been condemned contrary to the Church's canon-law[17].

At the same time the Patriarch accepted Matthew of Medeia in audience, in the presence of the 'Exokatakoiloi[18]'. Matthew of Medeia objected to Macarius' and his own condemnation, and the Patriarch replied that it was a matter that had been examined by the Patriarchal synod and not by him alone.

What Matthew of Medeia ultimately managed to do was simply to cause a disturbance, since he abused the members of the Patriarchal synod, calling them a Jewish congress[19]!

After all this, the Emperor decided to convene a synod warning the two Metropolitans that the synod would only discuss the matter of the heresy and not that of 'Trisepiscopos'.

---

[17] Parisinus gr. 1378, ff.18^{r} - 18^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 160$^{27-32}$.

[18] 'Exokatakoiloi' (='Εξωκατάκοιλοι) : they were the 'Great Oikonomos', the 'Great Sakellarios', the 'Great Skeuophylax', the 'Great Chartophylax', and 'the head of the Sakellion'. They were the Ecclesiastical Elders who judged various kinds of Ecclesiastical affairs in collaboration with the Patriarch, who was the President of this primitive court. They were seated on both sides of the Patriarchal throne.

[19] Parisinus gr. 1378, f.18^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 160^{33} - 161^{51}.

The Imperial decision was first announced to Macarius in the fourth letter of Manuel II. The Emperor mentions that he had been persuaded by certain friends of Macarius' to read his letters. It seems that the Metropolitan of Ankara still had the support of a number of powerful Imperial Elders[20].

Manuel II wrote to Macarius saying: 'Since my earlier attempts to bring you to your senses seem to have been useless, I am now sending this fourth letter with a severe warning. Certain of your friends, have been inducing me to do this very thing for some time, even though I was quite unwilling. But now that you have come and indicated the same sort of thing which they had requested, and it was clear that you had only become worse, I am now taking proper action and am finished with the matter' [21].

The synod was convened in August 1409, but the Patriarch did not take part in it. It consisted of fourteen Metropolitans [22] and

[20] Were they the former supporters of John VII that had remained in Constantinople? J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', p.241.

[21] Translated by G.T. Dennis, op. cit., pp.37-38 (no 66).

[22] They were the Metropolitans of Serres, of Herakleia, of Berroia holding the rank of the Metropolitan of Ankara, of Kyzikos, of Athens, of Russia, of Lacedemonia, of Medeia, of Derkon, of Selymbria, of Ganou, of Bethlehem, of Athyra, and of Rhedestos. Vaticanus gr. 1858, ff.32^{v} - 33^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), $133^{217-236}$.

twenty Imperial Elders[23] under the presidency of the Emperor[24].

They sent the synodical invitation to the two ex-Metropolitans and the synod began[25].

During the synod, Macarius and Matthew lied and stated that they had Manuel II's promise for the discussion of the 'Trisepiscopos'. They also said that they regarded the invitation of the synod as the result of their appeal to a higher court.

The synod rejected their demands, answering that everything about the case of 'Trisepiscopos' had been decided in the synodical tome of 1405 confirmed by the Imperial 'Chrysobull'. The reason of their present meeting was their accusation of heresy in the church, and that of Matthew I's re-establishment by the secular power.

After many disputations with the two Metropolitans, the synod decided that both of their accusations, against the Emperor and

---

[23] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.35^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 136$^{323-328}$.

[24] They had been invited three times and they proceeded to the synod only on the third invitation. Vaticanus gr. 1858, ff.33^{r-v} - 34^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 134^{245} - 135^{296} : Parisinus gr. 1378, ff.67^{r} - 68^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 162^{30} - 165^{129}. Before the synod began, the two ex-Metropolitans asked for the Metropolitans of Serres and of Berroia to be excluded, because they thought they favoured Matthew I. Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.34^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 135$^{297-307}$: Parisinus gr. 1378, f.68^{v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 165$^{141-157}$.

[25] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.35^{r-v} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 136^{345} - 137^{368}.

the Patriarch, were false. According to the LXXXIV[26] , and the LV [27] canon of the Apostles, everyone who abuses the King, the Bishop or the Elders: A) if he is a clergyman, must be deposed. B) if he belongs to the laity, must be excommunicated.

The synod also considered the XXIX [28] , and XXXIII [29] canon of the Apostles which both condemn those who give bribes in order to buy their Priesthood (like Simon the Magician) and furthermore those who use the secular power for their establishment. The participants of the synod knew that a Political power had, in the past, supported Matthew of Medeia and especially Macarius of Ankara.

The 'Endemountes' decided that they must both be imprisoned in a monastery, or be exiled to an island. In this way, any

---

[26] ' **Ὅστις ὑβρίσει βασιλέα ἢ ἄρχοντα παρά τό δίκαιον, τιμωρίαν τιννύτω· καί εἰ μέν· κληρικός, καθαιρείσθω· εἰ δέ λαϊκός, ἀφοριζέσθω·** ' PG, 137, 209C. Cf. Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.41^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 143$^{612-613}$.

[27] ' **Εἴ τις κληρικός ὑβρίσει τόν ἐπίσκοπον, καθαιρείσθω. Ἄρχοντα γάρ τοῦ λαοῦ σου οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς·** ' PG, 137, 149, B. Cf. Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.41^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 143$^{614-616}$.

[28] ' **Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος διά χρημάτων τῆς ἀξίας ταύτης ἐγκρατής γένηται, ἤ πρεσβύτερος ἤ διάκονος, καθαιρείσθω καί αὐτός καί ὁ χειροτονήσας, καί ἐκκοπτέσθω τῆς κοινωνίας παντάπασιν, ὡς Σίμων ὁ Μάγος ὑπ' ἐμοῦ Πέτρου** ' PG, 137, 93A. Cf. Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.41^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 143$^{617-619}$.

[29] ' **Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, κοσμικοῖς ἀρχουσι χρησάμενος, δι' αὐτῶν ἐγκρατής Ἐκκλησίας γένηται, καθαιρείσθω καί ἀφοριζέσθω καί οἱ κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ πάντες** ' PG, 137, 93B. Cf. Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.41^{r} : Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 143$^{620-622}$.

circulation of their opinions would be avoided[30] . The synodical tome that was issued describes in full detail the deeds of Matthew I's enemies and his peaceful reaction.

As for the punishment, we must add that from September 1405, Macarius and Matthew were laicized. From 1409 they were excommunicated. The Patriarch did not participate in the synod. All of the Metropolitans had been persuaded that he was the canonical Patriarch.

The co-existence of Matthew I's Patriarchate and Manuel II's reign at this particular juncture safe-guarded the church of Constantinople from serious danger. The unity of the Orthodox church had been achieved due to their collaboration. Nine years later a similar unity would be achieved in the Western church with the council of Constance that ended the Great Papal Schism.

[30] Vaticanus gr. 1858, f.41^{v}: Laurent, Le Trisepiscopat, REB, 30, (1972), 144$^{638-643}$.

CHAPTER XVIII : MATTHEW I'S DEATH

After the synod of August 1409, Matthew I remained on the Patriarchal throne for only one year.

Unlike the detailed sources we have about Matthew I's life, those mentioning the exact date of his death are insufficient.

The last Patriarchal letter of Matthew I was sent to the Roukouniotes' monastery on the island of Symi. After that there is no evidence that he was still on the Patriarchal throne[1] . This final letter of Matthew I's Patriarchate is not dated, but the previous one which was sent to Pope Gregory XII, is dated in the summer of 1410 (before the 10th of August[2]).

If we rely on Anselm Banduri, whose sources prove that Matthew I remained on the Patriarchal throne for thirteen years, we may conclude that the earliest that Matthew I could have died is August, 1410[3].

Matthew I's successor - Euthymius, was established on the

---

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3286.

[2] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3285.

[3] ' **ΜΑΤΘΑΙΟΣ ἔτη ιγ'** . Matthaeus annis tredecim. Callisto fatis functo sub finem anni Christi 1396. anno (sic) - 'Anno' frequenti in ejus locum substituitur Matthaeus. Hic cum sedisset annis tredecim obiit anno Christi 1410. Vide quae de illo habent Scriptores illius aevi '. Banduri Anselmi, 'Imperium Orientale sive antiquitates Constantinopolitanae in quatuor partes distributae...', t.I, Venice M.DCC.XXIX (1729), p.688, (pagina II: 989).

Patriarchal throne in the same year that the Patriarch died[4] . After Matthew I's death, the synod needed at least a month to elect and ordain the new Patriarch. The latest that Matthew I could have died is, then, in November of 1410.

Matthew I must have died between August - November of 1410 at the age of approximately fifty.

The events of his Patriarchate had been a great trial. All these, in combination with the enemies we are now well-acquainted with, sent him to death earlier than expected.

In PART B, where his Ecclesiastical concerns will be examined, we will be able to comment on his social work and the action he took both as Archbishop of Constantinople - New Rome, and as Ecumenical Patriarch.

[4] ' **ΕΥΤΥΜΙΟΣ** (sic) - '**ΕΥΘΥΜΙΟΣ**' **ἔτη 5, μήν. 5,** Euthymius annis quinque, mensibus quinque. Euthymius successit Matthaeo anno Christi 1410 '. Banduri Anselmi, 'Imperium Orientale sive antiquitates Constantinopolitanae in quatuor partes distributae...', t.I, Venice M.DCC.XXIX (1729), p.688, (pagina II: 989).

PART B: THE PATRIARCHAL ACTS OF MATTHEW I

CHAPTER I: A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO MATTHEW I'S PATRIARCHAL ACTS

In the chapters that follow, we will consider Matthew I's acts, not only as Archbishop of Constantinople-New Rome, but also as Ecumenical Patriarch.

Hence, in many instances it will be impossible for us to distinguish the Patriarchal from the Diocesan character of his activities.

Matthew I's concerns fall into three groups: Ecclesiastical affairs, the affairs of the Monasteries, and the private affairs of the citizens of Constantinople.

We will begin our study by referring to Ecclesiastical affairs described in the Patriarchal records.

CHAPTER II : MATTHEW I'S ACTION IN ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS

CHAPTER II.1: HIS INTEREST IN THE FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF HAGIA SOPHIA

Shortly after Mathew I became Patriarch (October 1397), he took great pains concerning the financial problems that the local church of Constantinople had to face. The church of Hagia Sophia above all, needed financial support[1].

Hagia Sophia was the liturgical centre of Constantinople. Administratively the church was joined to three other churches, namely St. Irene, The Theotokos of the Chalkoprateia, and St. Theodore of Sphorakios. All four churches were served by the same clergy[2].

Matthew I acted to resolve the problem, and in co-operation with the Ecclesiastical Elders, registered the exact amount of Hagia Sophia's treasure[3].

Matthew I realised that financial trouble was present in

---

[1] The church of Hagia Sophia was the third one with the same name, built at the same place. The first church was built in the location 'Milion' (=**Μίλιον**) by Constantius II (337-361) in 360. The church was burned down by the supporters of St. John Chrysostom in 404. It was rebuilt by Theodosius II (408-450), being completed in 415. The church was destroyed by the fire of the 'NIKA' revolt against Justinian I in 532. The third church was completed by the same Emperor in 537, under the direction of the Architects Anthemios of Tralles and Isidoros of Miletos. Cyril Mango, 'Hagia Sophia in Constantinople', ODB, Vol.II, Oxford 1991, pp.892-895.

[2] A. M. Schneider, 'Die vorjustinianische Sophienkirche', BZ, 36, (1936), 77-80.

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3062 : M.M., II, No 686, pp.566-569[22]. The Patriarchal act had been dated incorrectly by M.M.

many of the other churches of Constantinople. The periodic sieging of Constantinople by the Turks had caused the economic weakness which was symptomatic of the whole town.

During March-April of 1401, Matthew I sent the monk Luke, of the Mangana monastery, to many of the Dioceses of the Ecumenical throne for fundraising campaigns. Luke was charged with contacting the Metropolitans, and collecting financial support. Matthew I reports that more money was needed for the feeding of the clergy that served in Constantinople, and olive oil for the churches' lamps.

Luke always carried with him a letter of recommendation issued by Matthew I, so that the Metropolitans might be convinced of his mission. It seems that Matthew I issued many similar letters for each mission Luke undertook [4].

By September of 1401 all the Dioceses of the Ecumenical throne had contributed to the Patriarchal invitation. The financial support was helpful, resolving the immediate needs of the church.

---

[4] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3191 : M.M., II, No 629, pp.469-470[23]. The same as above, this Patriarchal act had been dated incorrectly by M.M.

CHAPTER II.2: THE ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS OF RUSSIA AND PATRIARCH MATTHEW I'S AID

When Matthew I was established on the Patriarchal throne, the leader of the church of Russia was the Metropolitan of Kiev, Cyprian.

Cyprian had been a Bulgarian Monk trained on Mount Athos. He went to Constantinople at the beginning of Philotheus' second Patriarchate (1364-1376) and made his first appearance in Russia as Patriarchal correspondent of the same Patriarch (1373 - 1374). He was charged with the mission of reconciling the Great Prince of Moscow, Dmitri Donskoi and the Metropolitan of Kiev Alexius, with some minor Russian Sovereigns [1]. Despite the fact that Alexius had been ordained as Metropolitan of Kiev, he went to Moscow (1365)[2]. For this reason, the Sovereign of Kiev, Olgerd, demanded Patriarch Philotheus to ordain a new Metropolitan of Kiev[3].

For many years, the trouble was unresolved until Patriarch Anthony IV (1391-1397) elected Cyprian as Metropolitan of Lithuania,

---

[1] During that time, the powerful Sovereign (Great Prince) of Moscow Dmitri Donskoi (1363 - 1389) wanted to unify the mosaic of minor Russian Sovereignties under his leadership and the Metropolitan Alexius, as the spiritual leader of whole Russia, supported, if not created this idea. A controversial party consisted of the Kievian Sovereign Olgerd (1345 - 1377) and the Sovereigns of Tver and Smolensk, who did not share the same views as Dmitri Donskoi. Anthony - Emilios Tahiaos, ΕΕΑΠΘ, 6, '**Ἡ εἰς Ρωσίαν ἀποστολὴ τοῦ Κυπριανοῦ**', (1961), 181-195.

[2] Ibid., 183.

[3] Ibid., 191.

who would also service the Metropolitan see of Kiev[4]. Cyprian would be Alexius' successor - as happened after the latter's death when a new Patriarchal act was issued (February 1389)[5].

Three months later the Great Prince Dmitri Donskoi died (May 1389) and some months after this his son and successor Basil accepted Cyprian in Moscow (1390).

In July 1393, Patriarch Anthony IV and Manuel II sent to Russia two Byzantine correspondents - Michael, Archbishop of Bethlehem and the Imperial Elder, Alexius Aaron - whose mission was to observe ecclesiastical affairs in Russia[6].

Matthew I, participating in the 'Endemousa' synod as Metropolitan of Kyzikos (since November 1387), was well aware of ecclesiastical affairs in Russia. The bright idea of Dmitri Donskoi to establish Moscow as the 'third Rome', overcoming Constantinople, was a challenge for his son Basil[7].

---

[4] Alexius still bore the title of Metropolitan of Kiev. The ordination of a new Metropolitan of Kiev would cause more trouble than there was already. Furthermore, the candidates for Metropolitans of Russia were chosen by the Patriarch from among the Priests of Hagia Sophia. In this way Patriarchal rights concerning the Metropolitanates were secured.

[5] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2847: M.M.,II, No 404, pp.116-129.

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2924: M.M. II, No 438, pp.171-172.

[7] In 1393 Basil Donskoi forbade the mention of the Byzantine Emperor's name in Russian churches and declared to Cyprian: 'We have a church but no Emperor'. Patriarch Anthony IV sent a letter to him in an advisory spirit, trying to persuade him that the Byzantine Emperor was the only true Emperor and as such the rightful overlord of Christendom. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2931: M.M.,II, No 447, pp.188-192. Cf. George Ostrogorsky, History of the Byzantine State, translated by Joan Hussey, Oxford 1956, pp.254-255.

During the winter of 1393-1394 Constantinople was sieged by the Turks and Manuel II asked for financial support from Russia.

At this crucial moment Cyprian, who was in Lithuania visiting the Sovereign Vitovt, organized a whip-round and collected 20.000 roubles[8]. Then the Metropolitan of Kiev sent a mission to Byzantium under the leadership of the monk Herodion Osljabjata[9] who brought with him a considerable sum of money as financial help. The Russian monk was accompanied by the Archbishop of Bethlehem, Michael, and they all arrived in Constantinople - possibly - in the autumn of 1398 when Matthew I was already Patriarch[10].

Matthew I was not surprised because he expected the financial support[11]. He thanked the members of the Russian mission and supplied them with some liturgical presents addressed to the Metropolitan of Kiev. Among these presents was a Byzantine icon of the Saviour[12].

---

[8] Anthony - Emilios Tahiaos, ΕΕΑΠΘ, 6, **' Ἡ εἰς Ρωσίαν ἀποστολή τοῦ Κυπριανοῦ ', (1961),** 238.

[9] He was one of the most beloved monks of St. Sergius. Ibid., 238.

[10] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3070, 1, 2.

[11] In the conflict between Moscow and Constantinople for the commemoration of the Byzantine Emperor's name in the Russian churches, Cyprian had taken the Byzantine side supporting the commemoration. Patriarch Matthew I was properly informed by the Byzantine correspondents about Cyprian's action which favoured the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Around 1397, the Metropolitan of Kiev wrote a letter to the clergy of Pskov stating explicitly that the Emperor's name was commemorated liturgically in the churches of Moscow. Dimitri Obolensky, Six Byzantine Portraits, Oxford 1988, p.197.

[12] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3070, Date 2.

According to three Russian chronicles, the monk Herodion and the Russian mission left Constantinople during the same year (1398) or in the spring - summer of 1399, bearing with them four letters[13].

In the same period, Constantinople was again in a very difficult position, facing financial ruin. Aid, whether in money or in kind, from its Orthodox neighbourhood was a necessity. This time it was Matthew I who asked Cyprian for aid. The above mentioned chronicles attest that a new mission consisting of Byzantine commissioners was sent to Russia, but there is a scarcity of written material. Hence, a question arises as to whether Matthew I's correspondents accompanied the monk Herodion and his companions on their return to Moscow or whether they departed a little after them[14].

The Archbishop of Bethlehem took with him a letter from Matthew I addressed to Cyprian (January - March 1400)[15]. In March 1400, Patriarch Matthew I sent a second letter to Cyprian and urged him, as a 'Byzantine-loving[16]' man, to start another fundraising campaign; Matthew I mentioned the happier circumstance of the reconciliation between Manuel II and John VII, and wrote that it was

[13] PSRL, Sofijskajia (6905), VI, 130; Voskresenskaja (6906), VIII, 71; Nikonofskaja (6906), XI, 168; Saint-Petersburg - Leningrad 1846-1925.

[14] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3070, Date 1,2.

[15] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3101.

[16] M.M.,II, No 556, p.361[1]. **(ὡς φιλορρώμαιος ἄνθρωπος)**

meritorious for Cyprian to contribute money for the defence of Constantinople rather than to build churches, to give alms to the poor, or to redeem prisoners. As he reports, Constantinople had been until then the pride, the support, the sanctification, and the glory of Christians throughout the whole world[17].

There are no written sources mentioning 'Byzantine loving' Cyprian's contribution, but it is almost certain that he sent support as before. Cyprian's Metropolitanate lasted for six more years. He died in his country estate at Goleznitzev, near Moscow, on the 16th of September 1406[18].

After Cyprian's death the Metropolitan throne of Kiev remained vacant for three years. Matthew I had to elect the best Bishop from among the Priests of Hagia Sophia. In September of 1408, he elected Photius from Monemvasia[19]. Photius has been characterized as one of the strictest ascetes of the 'Amorrian territory[20]', distinguished for his knowledge of Philosophy and Theology[21].

The Emperor Manuel II was interested in the political and

---

[17] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3112: M.M., II, No 556, pp.359-361.

[18] Dimitri Obolensky, op. cit., p.199.

[19] It is the south of Peloponnese

[20] Θ. Βαλλιάνου, **Ἱστορία τῆς Ρωσικῆς Ἐκκλησίας,** Athens **1851,** p.82.

[21] **' ὢν ἔμπειρος τῆς τε ἔξω σοφίας καί τῆς περί τά θεῖα, τόν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς τήν Ρωσίαν δαψιλῶς ἐκήρυξε '. Μελετίου [Μήτρου], μητροπολίτου Ἀθηνῶν, Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία, Γ',** Wien αψπδ' (1784), p.245.

Ecclesiastical affairs of Russia and, together with the Patriarch, obtained information from a reliable source: the Archbishop of Bethlehem[22]. They knew that the Tartars, under the leadership of Edigeos, had invaded Russia, capturing the Eastern borders of the country and Ancient Kiev[23]. It is also of note that the Emperor, exceptionally, presided over the synod that elected Photius[24].

Despite his ordination, Photius remained in Constantinople until the autumn of 1409 participating in the synod of August 1409 that excommunicated the ex-Metropolitans Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia[25]. Photius arrived in Kiev at Easter (22 April of 1410)[26] and then went to Moscow. He had to face a tremendous situation: the Dioceses were in complete disarray because a major part of the Ecclesiastical property had been robbed and another part was occupied by the Bojars. The Bojars were supported by the Great Prince Basil Donskoi and they had been a constant threat to the clergy.

Matthew I, conscious of the disorder of the Russian church, decided after careful consideration to elect and ordain Photius as Metropolitan of Kiev.

Despite the opposition, Photius succeded in puting in order

---

[22] Archbishop Michael of Bethlehem.

[23] Θ. Βαλλιάνου, op. cit., p.82.

[24] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3282, Critique, 3.

[25] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3284, p.503[10-11].

[26] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3282, Date.

most of the Ecclesiastical affairs of his Diocese. Reorganizing his Metropolitanate, he protected its Ecclesiastical property and defended the clergy.

Photius was unlucky to be ordained Metropolitan of Kiev during a period of war. He was a monk who had lived in Constantinople, far away from similar events. John Constantinides reports that Matthew I ordained an administratively inexperienced monk[27].

But the results showed that Matthew I's selection was one of the best he could have made. In spite of the various kinds of danger, Photius managed to guide the church of Russia for a long time, following the steps of his predecessor Cyprian.

[27] John Chr. Constantinides, ΘΗΕ, 8, (1966), c.833.

CHAPTER II.3: MATTHEW I'S ADVISORY LETTER TO THE GOVERNOR OF AINOS

Ainos (today Enez) is a city in Thrace near the mouth of the river Hebros. Early in 1384 the people of Ainos invited a member of the family of Gattilusio to be its ruler[1]. For reasons that are unclear, Ainos had had no Metropolitan since 1395[2].

In January of 1400 Patriarch Matthew I wrote to the governor of Ainos, Nicolaus Gattilusio[3], asking for his permission to ordain a new Metropolitan for Ainos[4] . The Priests of the town had inclined to evil deeds and as Matthew I reports, they were undisciplined, drinking in wineshops and abusing the laity. There was an immediate need of a Bishop who would put the Diocese in order.

In the same letter Patriarch Matthew I reminds Nicolaus Gattilusio that he had already written him three other letters with the same request without receiving any answer.

---

[1] Timothy E. Gregory, 'Ainos', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, pp.41-42.

[2] Until the beginning of 1395, the Metropolitan of Ainos was Mark. It seems that he disagreed with Nicolaus Gattilusio (who was Roman-Catholic), because in February of 1395 Mark demanded from Matthew I the Diocese of Philippi which the Metropolitan of Serres had earlier dismissed. The Patriarchal records report that the Metropolitan of Ainos held the 'Presidency' of Drama - possibly residing there - and he was also given in addition the Diocese of Philippi. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fassc.VI, No 2981: M.M., II, No 480, p.234.

[3] Nicolaus Gattilusio was Francesco's uncle. Francesco Gattilusio was the governor of Lesbos and John VII's father-in-law. J.W. Barker, 'Manuel II...', pp.462-466. Cf. W. Miller, 'The Gattilusij of Lesbos', BZ, 22, (1913), 446-447.

[4] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3095: M.M., II, No 540, pp.338-339.

Knowing that John VII was related to Nicolaus Gattilusio, Matthew I tried to exploit the fact, and resolve this inconvenience. He therefore chose the particular moment when John VII was installed on the Imperial throne. Matthew I was almost sure that Nocolaus Gattilusio would not refuse the ordination of a new Metropolitan. Despite the favourable timing of the Patriarch's request, we are not sure of the result, since there is no relevant evidence in the Patriarchal records.

CHAPTER II.4: THE ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIR OF TREBIZOND

The Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 led the Byzantines to find other centres of activity and independence. Three new Byzantine Empires arose at Trebizond, Nicaea, and Thessalonica. Alexius Comnenus was the founder of the Empire of Trebizond.

The newly established Empire took great pains to survive among dangerous enemies similar to those of Constantinople. Until Matthew I's Patriarchate, it was the Ecumenical Patriarch, in cooperation with the Endemousa synod, who would decide the election and ordination of the new Metropolitan of Trebizond. In other words, the Diocese of Trebizond belonged to the Ecumenical throne of Constantinople.

During Matthew I's Patriarchate, the Emperor of Trebizond was Manuel III Comnenus. Manuel III's reign coincided with the invasion of Timour into Asia Minor. About 1400 Bayazid I had conquered Samsun, making the frontiers of Turkey meet with those of Trebizond at Ünië[1].

As Manuel III Comnenus reports in his letter to Matthew I (before the spring of 1400), there were serious dangers on the sea frontiers of the Empire and no one could come close to the coast of Trebizond secure of Turkish naval attacks. The Metropolitan of Trebizond was also responsible for the opposite coast of Alania, but he

[1] William Miller, Trebizond, The Last Greek Empire, London 1926, p.71.

could not go there, because of the Turks. Thus, the Emperor of Trebizond asked Matthew I for the foundation of a new Diocese in Alania[2].

The Patriarch of Constantinople sent him a letter (spring of 1400) mentioning that he agreed with the foundation of the new Diocese, and describing the means of examining, electing, and ordaining the new Metropolitan. All the canonical regulations would have to be followed, as the custom of the church of Constantinople prescribed.

Matthew I sent also sent a Patriarchal Exarch - monk Nathanael - with instructions about the canonical procedure for the establishment of the new Metropolitan of Alania[3].

Unfortunately Manuel III Comnenus did not follow the Patriarchal instructions for the election and ordination. It seems that the Emperor of Trebizond had his own plans for Alania. Wishing to control the territory of Alania, he wanted to nominate a person he favoured, in the hope that this person would support the commercial and other vital interests he had there. He knew that the Metropolitan as the spiritual leader would be influential in controlling the political leaders in their decisions. He ignored monk Nathanael and eventually persuaded the Metropolitan of Trebizond to further his plans by offering him money for the ordination of the person he favoured as the new

[2] The Alans are distinguished into two groups. The mountain Alans and the steppe Alans. The former lived in the Northern Caucasus between the Terek, Bolso, Zelencuk and Argun rivers. The second group is found between the Don and Volga. Omeljan Pritsak, 'Alans', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, pp.51-52.

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3121. Cf. M.M.,II, No 636, p.483[12,14].

Metropolitan. From the Patriarchal point of view the promotion of the new Metropolitan was an act of simony.

Patriarch Matthew I, who had learnt from his Exarch that the person promoted as Metropolitan of Alania had paid for his ordination, expressed his disagreement to the Emperor of Trebizond.

The Emperor of Trebizond, trying to cajole Matthew I, sent him - with monk Gedeon[4] - five 'Somia'[5]. The Patriarch gave the money back to Gedeon accusing him of being a member of the simoniac wing[6]. Shortly after that, he wrote a letter to the Metropolitan of Trebizond, Anthony, rebuking him for his 'cooperation' with the Emperor and castigating his position at the election and ordination of the new 'Metropolitan' (March-April 1401). He also accused him of simony and of being disobedient to the Patriarchal throne. Matthew I stated that he would not regard the new 'Metropolitan' as a real Bishop before the synodical examination of this matter by the Endemousa synod[7].

It was not long after the Metropolitan of Trebizond received the Patriarchal letter that he died. Then, Manuel III asked the Patriarch for the ordination of a new Metropolitan of Trebizond, sending him relevant letters with monk Nathanael[8]. This time, the Emperor favoured

---

[4] He was the Abbot of the monks that served in 'Hagia Sophia'.

[5] They were the local coins of Trebizond.

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3198: M.M.,II, No 636, p.484[13-15].

[7] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3198: M.M.,II, No 636, p.484[8-12].

[8] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3236: M.M.,II, No 636, p.542[5].

the ordination of a monk named Simon. Trying to persuade the Patriarch, he wrote that he would never demand any kind of 'favour' in the future[9].

The Patriarch brought the case to the Endemousa synod, which invited monk Simon to Constantinople in spring time (after March), for a synodical examination. After that they would decide about his election and ordination. Matthew I also asked Emperor Manuel III to promise in writing that he would never ask for a similar favour in the future[10].

But the Emperor of Trebizond did not give up his interest in the 'Metropolitan' of Alania whom he still favoured and - as Matthew I reports - he sent the Patriarch eight 'Somia' for the establishment of the new Bishop.

Matthew I replied that it was a great surprise for him to receive eight 'Somia' - after the first five sent to him with monk Gedeon - for the ordination of the new Metropolitan of Alania. The Patriarch assured Manuel III that, in spite of Constantinople's financial ruin, he would never accept the money, even if it were eight thousand 'Somia'[11]!

Matthew I wanted to secure Patriarchal rights over these

---

[9] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fsac.VI, No 3236: M.M.,II, No 636, p.542[11-12].

[10] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fsac.VI, No 3236: M.M.,II, No 636, p.542[19-27].

[11] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fsac.VI, No 3236: M.M.,II, No 636, p.542[27-33].

two distant Dioceses in electing and ordaining their Bishops. Ready to resolve the trouble, he invited the 'Metropolitan' of Alania to the Patriarchal synod of Constantinople for the examination of his case. He was supposed to take part together with monk Simon.

The Patriarchal records show us that Simon was presented to the synod of Constantinople (before July 1402) and after a while was elected and ordained, occupying the Metropolitan throne of Trebizond[12]. In contrast there are no written sources referring to the promoted Metropolitan of Alania's presence. The latter, realizing the difficult position he was because of the accusation of simony, did not participate in the synod.

Matthew I was well aware that the interference of the secular power could cause serious damage, not only for the Patriarchate but also for the Dioceses of Trebizond and of Alania. Hence, he reacted as quickly as possible, avoiding the creation of new dangerous Ecclesiastical affairs.

[12] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3258, Critique 1. Cf. No 3236, Critique 1.

CHAPTER II.5: MATTHEW I'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS OF THE DIOCESE OF SOUGDAIA AND PHOULLOI

Shortly before the beginning of Matthew I's Patriarchate on the 22nd of March in 1397, Patriarch Anthony IV had ordained Theophylact, not only as Metropolitan of Attaleia[1], but also as the 'President' of Side[2]. Anthony IV's purpose was to unify the two Dioceses into one, because during the last days of his Patriarchate, the Diocese of Side had no Bishop. Therefore, he gave Theophylact the title of the honorary Exarch of Pamphylia[3].

Unfortunately the Elders of Attaleia treated Theophylact with unexpected irreverence, commiting atrocities against him. Patriarch Matthew I took action against this and in agreement with Emperor John VII gave Theophylact the Diocese of Sougdaia and

[1] Earlier on, Attaleia had been given to the Metropolitan of Myra and Anthony IV informed him in writing that henceforth Theophylact would be the new Metropolitan of Attaleia. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3043: M.M.,II, No 517, pp.285-286.

[2] It was a city of Pamphylia. Sources of the XI century describe Side as abandoned. Clive F. W. Foss, 'Side', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1892.

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3042: M.M.,II, No 513, pp.276-277. Pamphylia is in the coastal plain of southern Asia Minor, ca. 100 Km. long, surrounded by an arc of the Taurus mountains. This town supported several large cities like Attaleia, Side, and Syllaion. Constantine I made Pamphylia a separate province with Perge as its capital. Clive F. W. Foss, 'Pamphylia', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1568.

Phoulloi[4] . Sougdaia was a city and port of great importance. The city had recently become populous because of its port, but until then it was an autocephalous Archbishopric. Matthew I, with the population explosion in mind, proclaimed Sougdaia a Diocese, having incorporated the town of Phoulloi.

The new Diocese came to be the permanent residence of Theophylact who thereby changed his Diocesan residence. In this way Matthew I managed to protect the Metropolitan from the menace of the Elders of Attaleia.

[4] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3132: M.M.,II, No 574, pp.389-390. Sougdaia (Suroz), is a city and port in Eastern Crimaea, between Alouston and Kaffa. Clive Foss F.W., 'Sougdaia', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1931. Phoulloi was a city in the same area, the location of which is disputed. Identifications have been suggested with Solkhat and Tepsen both in Eastern Crimaea or Cufut-Kale and Kyz-Kermen near Bakhchisarai. It was probably located on the trans-crimaean route, approximately halfway between Cherson and Cimmerian Bosporos. Omeljan Pritsak, 'Phoulloi', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1670.

CHAPTER II.6: THEOPHANIS OF HERAKLEIA AND THE EXARCHATE OF THRACE, MACEDONIA, AND THE BLACK SEA

Theophanis of Herakleia[1] made his debut at the Patriarchal synod in October - November 1399[2], but we do not know the exact date of his ordination.

Between October and December 1399, he took part in the Patriarchal synod twice[3].

In a Patriarchal 'pittakion' of January 1400 addressed to him, he is mentioned as 'President' and Patriarchal Exarch of Thrace and Macedonia[4] . As we have seen, the title of the 'President' is an honorary title - with no duties imposed on its bearer.

Eleven months later, Patriarch Matthew I realized that there were no Bishops at all, either in the Dioceses of Thrace and Eastern Macedonia or in the Black Sea. During this time it was especially difficult for the Patriarch to find proper Bishops for each of these Dioceses.

---

[1] Three cities with this name figure prominently in Byzantine history. Herakleia in Thrace, in Kappadokia and in Pontike. The Herakleia we are mentioning is that of Thrace. It was a city on the North shore of Marmara, at the junction of the Via Egnatia ad the main Balkan road to Naissus. In 1832 together with Rhedestos and some other Thracian towns, Herakleia was given over to Andronicus IV. Timothy E. Gregory, 'Herakleia in Thrace', ODB, Vol.II, Oxford 1991, p.915.

[2] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3077, see Date: M.M.,II, No 529, I, p.312.

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3078, 3088: M.M.,II, No 529 II, p.312, (-).

[4] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3093: M.M.,II, No 538, p.333. As regards Macedonia, Matthew I mentions the Eastern Macedonia (Diocese of Philippi). See Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3177, Critique.

During the XIV century, the Bulgarians periodically invaded the Byzantine towns on the coast of the Black-Sea (Euxeinos Pontos). The same happened while Matthew I was Patriarch. The Byzantine Orthodox inhabitants were supposed to be under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Tyrnovo but although the Tsars and the Patriarch of Tyrnovo had tried to encourage the Byzantine Metropolitans - especially those of Black-Sea - to participate in the Patriarchal synod of Tyrnovo, they had no success[5].

Because of this, whenever one of the Orthodox Metropolitans died, the Tsars did not permit the ordination of new ones by the Patriarch of Constantinople. Thus, these towns had no Bishops. Matthew I needed a neutral person that would secure the Patriarchal rights in Thrace, Macedonia, and the Black-Sea: a Bishop with no permanent Metropolitan See, an Exarch.

Hence, the Endemousa synod decided to give to Theophanis the administrative rights of these three Dioceses[6], proclaiming him an active Patriarchal Exarch. Then, Patriarch Matthew I wrote to Theophanis of Herakleia informing him about his new duties[7].

Once again Matthew I had succeeded in unifying a great num-

[5] Dimitrios Gonis, ' **Τό Τύρνοβο καί οί παραθαλάσσιες Μητροπόλεις καί Ἀρχιεπισκοπές (Βάρνας, Μεσημβρίας, Σωζοπόλεως καί Ἀγχιάλου) κατά τόν ΙΔ΄ αἰώνα, Ἀξίες καί πολιτισμός, Ἀφιέρωμα στόν καθηγητή Εὐάγγελο Θεοδώρου,** Athens 1991, pp.309-328.

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3177: M.M.,II, No 616, I, pp.449-451.

[7] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3178: M.M.,II, No 616,II, pp.451-452.

ber of small towns across Thrace, Macedonia, and the western coast of the Black-Sea, defending the Patriarchal rights over them.

CHAPTER II.7: THE MISSION OF JOSEPH BRYENNIOS TO CRETE AND CYPRUS

Joseph Bryennios was born in 1350 and died before 1438. During Matthew I's Pariarchate he was a monk and a fervent supporter of the Palamites.

Since 1191 the Venetians had occupied Cyprus, prohibiting the ordination and the inauguration of Orthodox Bishops. After that most of the island was handed out as feudal grants and the Catholic hierarchy appropriated all the larger sees, relegating the Orthodox clergy to villages and distant areas. In fact, 'during those years Cyprus was, after Palestine, the most important western outpost in the East, the staging ground for whatever crusader aspirations still remained'[1].

Another problem that Matthew I had to face, was that the Orthodox clergy in Crete - limited to 130 members in 1363 - had been under the jurisdiction of the Latin Archbishop of the island[2].

In 1381 Patriarch Nil (1380-1388) established the Metropolitan of Patras as Patriarchal Exarch of Crete[3], but it was clear that an Orthodox Metropolitan could not offer his services successfully - especially from remote Patras - for reorganising the Orthodox church among the Roman-Catholics.

---

[1] Timothy E. Gregory, 'Cyprus', ODB, Vol. I, Oxford 1991, pp.567-569.

[2] Nancy Patterson Sevcenko, 'Crete', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.546.

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 2715: M.M.,II, after the No 342, p.25[4-5].

The Patriarchal records show us that Joseph's mission was closely related with the Exarchate of the Metropolitan of Patras in Crete[4]. He may have acted as his ally or representative. Patriarch Nil thought of Joseph Bryennios as the proper person for this mission because he was well aware that it would be easier for a monk, rather than for a Bishop, to succeed in this mission. This explains the title of the Patriarchal Exarch of Crete - which Joseph took after the Metropolitan of Patras[5].

Joseph Bryennios preached many homilies among the Cretans re-introducing them to the Orthodox faith, and wrote a book largely consisting of homilies, named 'Kefalea Eptakis Epta'.

During his residence in Crete, many Priests used to ask him for his theological opinion on various matters of faith. There were also some Byzantines, who had become Roman-Catholics, like Maximus Chrysobergis, Dimitrios Skaranos and someone called Phokas, whom Joseph Bryennios discussed with, and answered their questions.

Joseph Bryennios not only discussed dogmatic affairs with the Roman-Catholics, but also moral affairs between the Orthodox. Immorality was evident everywhere where the clergy had no Bishops to guide them. Joseph - as Patriarchal Exarch - gave frequent report of his activity to Matthew I and the Endemousa synod.

Patriarch Matthew I, on receiving Joseph's reports, was very

[4] Nicolaus H. Ioannides, Ο Ιωσήφ Βρυέννιος, Βίος - έργο - Διδασκαλία, Athens 1985, p.74.

[5] R.J. Loenertz, Correspondance de Manuel Calécas, [Studi e Testi, No 152], Rome 1950, p.99.

worried about the clergy of Crete and wrote an advisory letter encouraging them to monastic ideas and Orthodox spirituality[6]. Many of them had introduced women into the monasteries, with the excuse that the latter served them. He advised them with examples taken from the monastic life of the Abbot Pimen, John Climacus, Arsenius and other monks[7] mentioning some canons referred to similar cases[8]. The monks who ignored the Patriarchal letter continued to live with women in the monastery - many of them were Priests serving the churches near their monasteries.

Hence, the Endemousa deprived many of them of their Priesthood, forbidding the Orthodox of Crete to come into contact with, or be in communion with them. The aforementioned Priests, insisting on their misguided opinions, continued serving in their churches, threatening the Patriarchal synod with the threat that they would join the Roman-Catholics of the island. (They did not miss the opportunity of accusing Joseph Bryennios of being an inquisitor).

When the rebellious Priests realized that their accusation was in vain, they denounced Bryennios to the Latin authorities as unpatriotic. He was imprisoned, and after a while, expelled from the

---

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3196: M.M, No 634, pp.477-481.

[7] M.M., No 634, pp.478^{21} - 480^{1}.

[8] The XLVII canon of the VI Ecumenical council (PG 137, 213D-214A), and the XX canon of the VII Ecumenical council (PG 137, 325C-326A).

island of Crete[9].

When Joseph Bryennios came back to Constantinople in 1401[10] or 1402[11], he went to the Stoudites' monastery, where he resided until 1406[12]. During those years he taught at the Patriarchal school of Constantinople and possibly at the school of the Stoudites' monastery[13].

Since 1192, the Venetians - who were Roman-Catholics - had occupied Cyprus. The Cypriots wanted to belong to the Ecumenical Patriarchate and asked for their unification with it. In the autumn 1405 three Bishops from Cyprus sent their messenger, monk Theodoulos, to Matthew I informing him that they intended to submit the Orthodox Church of Cyprus to the dignity of the Ecumenical Patriarchate[14]. Matthew I replied positively to them and brought the case to the 'Endemousa' synod[15].

Theodoulos returned to Cyprus with a letter from the

---

[9] Nicolaus H. Ioannides, Ο Ιωσήφ Βρυέννιος, Βίος - έργο - Διδασκαλία, Athens 1985, p.74-77.

[10] N.B. Tomadakis, Μελετήματα περί Ιωσήφ Βρυεννίου, ΕΕΒΣ, 29, (1959), 125-128.

[11] R.J. Loenertz, Pour la chronologie des oeuvres de Joseph Bryennios, REB, 7, (1949), 13. Cf. The same scholar, one year after the publication of his opinion, suggested that Joseph Bryennios arrived in Consantinople between 1402-1403. See R.J. Loenertz, Correspondance de Manuel Calécas, [Studi e Testi, No 152], Roma 1950, pp.98-99.

[12] Alice-Mary Talbot, 'Bryennios, Joseph', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.330.

[13] Nicolaus H. Ioannides, Ο Ιωσήφ Βρυέννιος, Βίος - έργο - Διδασκαλία, Athens 1985, p.78-79.

[14] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3277.

[15] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3277.

'Endemousa' synod and another from Matthew I. The 'Endemousa' synod had been advised by Matthew I to accept an invitation that may lead to a future unification.[16].

Matthew I sent a letter to the three Cypriot Metropolitans, mentioning them in it as concelebrants[17]. He assumed that if the Cypriots continued being in communion with the Pope, then the unification could not come about. The same would happen if the Cypriots intended to be in communion with the Latin Bishops of Cyprus[18].

The Patriarch, the 'Endemousa' synod, the Emperor and the Senators decided to send Joseph Bryennios, escorted by Antony (the Abbot of the Kosmidion monastery), and the Deacon Constantine Timotheus. Joseph would be the commander of the expedition to Cyprus and the observer of the Ecumenical throne[19].

After his mission to Crete, Bryennios was experienced in teaching and organizing the Orthodox people in Latin territories.

The 'Endemousa' synod decided to give certain instructions to its expeditors about their activity in Cyprus, instructions that were based on the II canon of Antioch[20].

What the Cypriots really hoped for was a fake unification.

---

16 Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3278.

17 Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3279.

18 Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3280.

19 Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3281.

20 PG 137, 431B-C.

They wanted to restore their communion with the Ecumenical Patriarchate but also to continue to follow Papal directions.

The Patriarchal expedition arrived on the 28th of June and on the 28th of July 1406, Joseph convened a local synod which would discuss the possibility of future unification. The participants were the Bishops of Famacusta and of Nicosia, while the latter also represented the Bishop of Paphos. The Bishop of Limassol disagreed with the procedure of the possible unification and did not participate in the synod.

During the synod Joseph Bryennios mentioned that until then, the Cypriots had been subject to the Church of Rome, accepting the Papal holiness and paying tribute to the Latin Bishop of Nicosia.

The Bishops replied that the oath they usually took in front of the Latin Bishops included the phrase 'de salvo ordine meo' and 'de salvo credo meo' which secured the independence of their ordination and their Orthodox faith[21] . They also mentioned that their submission and the oaths were external signs. In spite of this, the people of Cyprus were faithful to the Orthodox church.

At this point the minutes of the synod are interrupted and

[21] Jean Darrouzès, 'Textes synodaux chypriotes', REB, 37, (1979), 13. ' **σωζομένης τῆς τάξεώς μου** ', ' **σωζομένης τῆς πίστεώς μου** '.

we know nothing about the continuation of the discussions[22]. There is only a later letter of Joseph Bryennios to his friend John Syrianos, in which he mentions that he had rejected the proposals of the Cypriots and returned to Constantinople[23].

Joseph Bryennios did not publish the decisions of the synod in writing until 1412 when Patriarch Euthymius (Matthew I's successor) received a new message from the Cypriots asking once again for unification with the Ecumenical Patriarchate[24].

---

[22] A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, **Ἀνέκδοτα κείμενα περί Κύπρου καί Θεσσαλονίκης, Ἰωσήφ Βρυεννίου, πρακτικά συνόδου ἐν Κύπρῳ, ΕΚΦΣ,** appendix of the XVII tome, Constantinople 1886, pp.49-51.

[23] N.B. Tomadakis, **Ὁ Ἰωσήφ Βρυέννιος καί ἡ Κρήτη κατά τό 1400,** Athens 1947, p.136.

[24] Joseph Bryennios, **Τά Εὑρεθέντα τόμος Β',** edited by Eugenius Boulgaris, Leipzig 1784, pp.1-25.

CHAPTER II.8: MATTHEW I'S INTEREST IN VARIOUS ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS

There are many more Ecclesiastical affairs which Matthew I was interested to resolve. Most of them are not of sufficient interest to be discussed in a separate unit and we will only review them here.

Such affairs are: the ordination, the guidance, and the transference of many Metropolitans together with the establishment of new Ecclesiastical Elders[1]. We also see evidence of Patriarchal interest in the morality of the clergy in general[2].

Among major Ecclesiastical affairs we might single out Matthew I's correspondence with the Pope of Rome, Gregory XII (1406-1415)[3]. Gregory XII had tried to persuade Patriarch Matthew I that the unification of the churches could be achieved.

But Matthew I had already been informed about Latin action in Crete and Cyprus. The resultant confusion did not allow him to

---

[1] Jean Darrouzès' study is based on various documents and not only on M.M.. This is why in the footnotes that follow we will first mention Darrouzès and secondarily M.M.. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos3060, 3074, 3077, 3078, 3079, 3088, 3093, 3105, 3134, 3175, 3206, 3235, 3244, 3240, 3258, 3263, 3265, 3269: M.M.,II, Nos 529i, 529ii, 529iii, 532, 538, 548, 645, 672, 681.

[2] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3068, 3075, 3082, 3106, 3117, 3135, 3138, 3132, 3154, 3156, 3158, 3162, 3163, 3182, 3188,3191, 3199, 3203, 3207, 3225, 3228, 3239, 3243, 3245, 3253, 3254, 3259: M.M.,II, Nos 533, 551, 561, 576, 579, 583, 594, 596, 598, 602, 603, 621, 625, 629, 636, 641, 643, 665, 668, 677, 627, 682, 687, 648.

[3] In August 1410, Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3285.

accept the Papal proposals and initiate discussions. Rather, the sources give evidence that he sent an ambiguous reply. After that, during Matthew I's Patriarchate, there was no progress in these discussions.

It must also be pointed out that the sources bear witness only to Matthew I's reply to the letters of the canonically elected Pope Gregory (1406-1410). He ignored the Antipope Alexander V (1409-1410), refusing to acknowledge the Schism of the Western Church.

Emperor Manuel II shared the same views as Matthew I about the Ecclesiastical affairs of the Western Church. The Byzantine Emperor from 1407 onwards had sent the pro-Latin diplomat Manuel Chrysoloras to the West, in order to renew contacts with the Latin courts and Pope Gregory XII (1406-1415)[4].

Although both Patriarch and Emperor were Orthodox and the great Schism of 1054 between the Eastern and Western Church had taken place, they were concerned about the internal schism in the Western Church.

Another type of Ecclesiastical affair about which there is evidence is that concerning the Orthodox confession of many ex-Roman-Catholics that returned to the Orthodox faith[5]. These confessions were documents, that had been written and signed by the confessors in front

[4] J.M. Hussey, The Orthodox church in the Byzantine Empire [Oxford History of the Christian Church], Oxford 1991, p.268. Cf. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3285, Date.

[5] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3081, 3083, 3103, 3110, 3176, 3180, 3204, 3205, 3268: M.M.,II, Nos 531, 521, 545, 546, 615, 618, 642, 644, 694.

of the Patriarch.

Finally, we must mention a Patriarchal letter to the Metropolitan of Herakleia (and Patriarchal Exarch of Thrace and Macedonia), referring to the meaning of the 'Antimension'[6] . The 'Antimension' (Antimension from Lat. mensa 'table') is a portable altar made of cloth which contains a small pocket for relics and has to be consecrated. It is to be used only when a consecrated altar-table is not available, or if the consecration is in doubt[7] . Every 'Antimension' must have been previously consecrated by the Patriarch or a Metropolitan.

In January 1400, the Metropolitan of Herakleia was in trouble because of the existence of many Patriarchal and Metropolitan 'Amtimensia'[8] in the hands of Priests who were under his jurisdiction.

Matthew I states clearly that the 'Antimension' is to be used only when a Priest is accompanying the Emperor[9] or when the Bishops, who bore the title of the Patriarchal Exarch, had to celebrate the Divine Liturgy but there was no altar.

Matthew I reports that he knew many Priests who put the 'Antimension' on the altar for its beauty only. He also knew that some

---

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3097: M.M.,II, No 542.

[7] The term 'Antimension' = **(Ἀντιμήνσιον)** is first found in an encomion of St. Markianos of Syracuse (VIII c.) where the 'Antimension' is identified as 'mustike trapeza'. Anna Gonosova, 'Antimension', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.112.

[8] 'Antimensia'= **(Ἀντιμήνσια)** is the Greek plural for 'Antimension'.

[9] The latest example was that of Manuel II's departure to the West. The Priest that escorted him, carried with them 'Antimensia'.

others usually put the 'Antimension' on the altars of churches where other Priests ordinarily served. The result was 'competition' among the Priests, since those who had got the 'Antimension' regarded themselves as superiors. Matthew I assumes that the Metropolitan of Herakleia was responsible for collecting the 'Antimensia' from the Priests who did not really need them. In this way the trouble could come to an end[10].

[10] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3097: M.M., II, No 542, 340[14-27].

CHAPTER III: MATTHEW I'S ACTION IN MONASTIC AFFAIRS

CHAPTER III.1: THE MONASTIC AFFAIR OF MONK NATHANAEL AND HIS EXARCHATE OVER THE PATRIARCHAL MONASTERIES OF THESSALONICA

As we have seen, after April 1389 the new Metropolitan of Chalcedon was Gabriel[1], who had occupied his Metropolitan see favoured by John VII. We came across his name when we mentioned the loss of Chalcedon's benevolence by Matthew (then Metropolitan of Kyzikos).

The Metropolitan of Chalcedon remained in his Diocese for eight years, until the moment he demanded the Diocese of Thessalonica. Thus, he became an opponent of monk Nathanael, who belonged to the Patriarchal clergy and wanted to occupy the same throne.

In 1388 Patriarch Nil Kerameus (1380-1388) had supplied Nathanael with a Patriarchal letter mentioning officially that he belonged to the Patriarchal clergy[2].

Shortly after that (1391) Patriarch Anthony IV (1391-1397) sent Nathanael to Thessalonica as Patriarchal Exarch[3].

During the first three months of Callistus II's Patriarchate (May - July 1397) Gabriel - who was favoured by John VII - was transferred to Thessalonica as its new Metropolitan. But to the latter's

---

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I , Fasc.VI, No 2854, cf. No 2853, Diplomatique.

[2] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I , Fasc.VI, No 2839.

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I , Fasc.VI, No 2897.

surprise the same Patriarch confirmed that the monk Nathanael should remain in the Thessalonica - Diocese of the recently transferred Metropolitan, Gabriel [4]. Henceforth Nathanael would be the defender of the Patriarchal rights, foundations, and monasteries of the Ecumenical throne in Thessalonica.

An internal controversy concerning the administration of Patriarchal property in Thessalonica thus arose between the Metropolitan Gabriel and monk Nathanael. Matthew I was aware of the underlying controversy between the two ex-competitors and tried to defend the peace of the local church from their conflict[5].

In January 1400 Matthew I wrote to the Metropolitan of Thessalonica advising him to seek reconciliation with monk Nathanael and not to show his disagreement with him in public. He also mentioned that it was only the Patriarch himself, with the contribution of the Patriarchal synod, who could judge Nathanael if he was mistaken[6]. The aforementioned monk belonged to the Patriarchal clergy and nobody else could judge or criticise his behaviour. In the end Matthew I demanded that Gabriel should send him, in writing, all his accusations

[4] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3055.

[5] In the beginning of 1397 Anthony IV wrote to monk Nathanael who resided in Thessalonica, informing him that he had been advised by the Elders of the town to ordain him as the new Metropolitan. Anthony IV seems to be sure about Nathanael's intervention in these letters since some powerful Elders of Thessalonica supported him. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3041.

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3094: M.M.,II, No 539, p.337[7-9].

against Nathanael, without bitterness and hatred[7]. He ordered him not to interfere anymore with Patriarchal affairs challenging the Patriarchal Exarch of Thessalonica[8].

Both Gabriel and Nathanael openly disliked each other: Nathanael, representing the Patriarch, did not invite Gabriel to the celebrations and the feasts that took place in the Patriarchal monasteries and their shrines in the town. He was the Abbot of Kyr-Maximos monastery and the monks supported him[9]. In those years the monastery was among the most distinguished in Thessalonica.

Similarly, Gabriel did not pay attention to the existence of monk Nathanael in town[10] and after a while he condemned Nathanael by excommunication. Thus Matthew I's letter not only defended his rights over the Patriarchal monasteries but also accused Gabriel of ignoring Patriarchal dignity[11].

In October 1400 Matthew I sent a new letter to Gabriel that had a reconciliatory character. His informers had told him that during January - October 1400 Gabriel had condemned and excommunicated Nathanael. The Metropolitan of Thessalonica regarded the monks of Kyr-

---

[7] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3094: M.M.,II, No 539, p.337$^{1-2}$.

[8] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3094: M.M., II, No 539, pp.337^{33} - 338^{2}.

[9] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3165: M.M., II, No 605, p.434$^{1-21}$.

[10] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3094: M.M., II, No 539, p.338$^{3-9}$.

[11] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3094: M.M., II, No 539, p.335$^{1-3}$.

Maximos monastery as agitators who supported the activity of their Abbot Nathanael. Because of that Gabriel had also condemned and excommunicated all the monks residing in it.

It was clear that the Metropolitan of Thessalonica had acted without respecting the Patriarchal rights over Nathanael's judgement, regardless of the fact that he was one of the Metropolitans of the Ecumenical throne. As Matthew I reports, during recent years there had been no similar event of disobedience. Gabriel's conduct had set a bad example to all the Metropolitans[12].

Between January - October 1400, Gabriel (who was well aware that the Emperor-regent John VII supported him) condemned and excommunicated Nathanael another two times. Contrary to the canon-laws we have already mentioned[13], he had taken revenge not only twice but thrice for the same reason[14].

Matthew I cancelled the condemnation and excommunication of his Exarch Nathanael and the monks of Kyr-Maximos, inviting Gabriel to a future synodical examination in Constantinople[15].

---

[12] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3165: M.M.,II, No 605, pp.434^{21} - 435^{4}.

[13] It is the XXV canon of the Apostles (G.A. Rallis - M. Potlis, **'Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καί ἱερῶν κανόνων...'**, II, Athens 1852, pp.32-33), and the III, XXXII, and LI canons of St. Basil the Great (G.A. Rallis - M. Potlis, **'Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καί ἱερῶν κανόνων...'**, t.IV, Athens 1854, pp.99-101, 173-175, 206-207. We have already referred to the relation of these canons to Nahum 1:9 : 'What do ye imagine against the Lord? he will make an utter end: affliction shall not rise up the second time'.

[14] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3165: M.M.,II, No 605, p.435$^{5-20}$.

[15] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3165: M.M.,II, No 605, p.435$^{20-29}$.

During Gabriel and Nathanael's conflict many letters - abusing Nathanael - had been circulated in the town of Thessalonica under Gabriel's silent fostering. We are almost sure that Matthew I suspected the Metropolitan of Thessalonica as the compiler, or at least the supporter, of these letters, since he charged him to prohibit any future circulation of such letters and promised to punish the accusers[16].

One of Gabriel's favourite accusations against Nathanael was that the latter worked as a salt-miner.

Matthew I responded to Gabriel's accusation that the previous Metropolitans of Thessalonica - Dorotheus and Isidorus - knew very well that Nathanael had inherited this work from his parents and none of them had found anything wrong with that[17]. Matthew I concludes in his letter that: if Nathanael worked as a trader, then Gabriel would be right. Of course it was only the Patriarch who could decide Nathanael's punishment. But if Nathanael just used to work as a salt-miner without buying and selling the salt (keeping it for the monastery), then he was innocent[18]. Gabriel paid no attention to the Patriarch's advice and in July 1401 Matthew I sent a new letter to him

[16] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3165: M.M.,II, No 605, p.436$^{1-20}$.

[17] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3165: M.M.,II, No 605, p.436$^{30-35}$.

[18] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3165: M.M.,II, No 605, p.437$^{1-6}$.

making it clear that he errored in refusing to comply with the Patriarchal rules.

Gabriel did not respond in writing to Matthew I. Instead, he sent a messenger - Mark Sagoudinos - to Constantinople, informing the Patriarch that neither had he condemned nor had he excommunicated and anathematized Nathanael and that he had - just - suspended him[19]. As for the monks of Kyr-Maximos monastery, Gabriel regarded them as separatists.

In the end Matthew I answered Gabriel, saying that he had ignored his wish, taking revenge against the Patriarchal Exarch. The Patriarch brought the case to the Endemousa synod which decided that Gabriel ought to be in communion with Nathanael. In addition to this, the Endemousa permitted Nathanael to serve in whichever church it was necessary in Thessalonica, and Gabriel was obliged to concelebrate with him in the Divine liturgy[20].

As regards the monks of Kyr-Maximos monastery, Matthew I replied to Gabriel that he was mistaken in regarding them as separatists because they had never been heretics[21].

We must mention that in spite of Matthew I's answer, it took a lot of time for Gabriel to abandon his egotistical behaviour. There were to be

---

[19] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3220: M.M.,II, No 659, p.515[1-12].

[20] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3220: M.M.,II, No 659, p.516[19-34].

[21] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3220: M.M.,II, No 659, p.517[1-16].

yet more monastic affairs that brought him into renewed controversy with the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

CHAPTER III.2: THE MONASTIC AFFAIRS OF THE AKAPNIOU, THE PRODROMOS AND ST. ATHANASIUS MONASTERIES

The Metropolitan of Thessalonica did not stop challenging Patriarch Matthew I with new trouble. There was an estate of the Akapniou monastery[1] in the location 'Vollada' **(Βολλάδα)** which the Endemousa synod had decided belonged to the Akapniou monastery and not to the Metropolitan of Thessalonica. The synodical decision had been announced eight years before to the Metropolitan Isidorus (Gabriel's predecessor) and after him to Gabriel. Gabriel once again had not paid attention to Matthew I's letter, keeping the estate of Vollada for his Diocese[2].

But this was not the only challenge of the Metropolitan of Thessalonica against the local Patriarchal monasteries. There was also the complaint of the monks from the ex-Prodromos monastery about a vineyard of theirs that Gabriel had occupied and unified with the Diocesan vineyards[3]. The small estate was necessary for the feeding of

---

[1] The Akapniou monastery was located in Thesalonica on the acropolis. It had been possibly established by St. Photius of Thessaly in the early XI century. Alice-Mary Talbot, 'Akapniou Monastery', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, pp.43-44.

[2] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3221: M.M., II, No 660, p.518[1-31].

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3221: M.M., II, No 660, pp.519[1]-520[22]. The Prodromos monastery had been closed down by the secular power and its monks went to the Kyr - Maximos monastery. Then Gabriel grasped the opportunity to keep for his Diocese the vineyard of the monastery.

the monks and the existence of the monastery.

In the midst of the new troubles, Matthew I tried to defuse the dangerous crisis between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Diocese of Thessalonica. Hence, he proclaimed Archimandrite Ignatius as the new Patriarchal Exarch of Thessalonica[4] , and not forgetting the great pains he had taken to reconcile Nathanael with Metropolitan Gabriel, in his letter to Gabriel, Matthew I asked him to be in communion with Nathanael[5] .

Another monastic affair that Matthew I tried to resolve was that of St. Athanasius monastery. The Abbot of the Pantokrator monastery, Theodotus, wanted the Abbacy and the property of St. Athanasius monastery for himself. Supported by the secular power, he managed to become its Abbot and shut the monastery down. After that he destroyed all the monastic cells and then he sold the church of St. Athanasius to a foreigner - of different faith - together with a great building that was left. In addition to these, he kept for himself some other estates of the monastery.

In the midst of this disorder, the monks of St. Athanasius monastery joined the Exazinos monastery and Patriarch Matthew I

---

[4] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3223: M.M., II, No 662, p.524$^{1-21}$. Darrouzès did not notice that the Archimandrite Ignatius became the new Patriarchal Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarchate for Thessalonica. Thus, he thinks that he only became Patriarchal Exarch of 'first' and 'second' Thessaly. Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3223.

[5] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3224: M.M., II, No 663, p.525$^{1-15}$.

asked Gabriel to persuade Theodotus to give the monastic property that was left to the Exazinos monastery[6]. It is noteworthy that Matthew I once again used some of the church's canons in order to prove the legitimacy of his demand to 'the always controversial' Gabriel[7].

[6] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3222: M.M., II, No 661, pp.520[1] - 521[10].

[7] The XXIV canon of the IV Ecumenical council (PG 137, 16C-17A), the XLIX canon of the VI Ecumenical council (PG 137, 217B-C), and the XIII canon of the VII Ecumenical council (PG 137, 313B-C).

CHAPTER III.3: MATTHEW I'S ACTION CONCERNING MINOR MONASTIC AFFAIRS

As we have seen, Patriarch Matthew I had been the Abbot of the Charsianeites' monastery of Constantinople, and was very experienced in monastic affairs. It was easy for him to decide not only concerning the future of many monasteries that belonged under his Patriarchal jurisdiction, but also concerning the administration of their property.

Matthew I - a monk himself - was the specialist who could advise the monks in various spiritual affairs, organizing the monasteries according to the monastic ideal.

But Matthew I was also interested in the external relations of the monasteries. A great part of monastic property had been robbed or given to the local feudals or the Political Elders that the Emperors favoured in the past. The Patriarchal records show us that Matthew I tried to overcome the secular power, in order to secure the monastic property which was necessary for the feeding of the monks. As we may see, there were a large number of similar monastic cases[1].

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3067, 3073, 3087, 3090, 3107, 3108, 3111, 3116, 3124, 3131, 3144, 3145, 3149, 3159, 3160, 3161, 3169, 3170, 3171, 3183, 3190, 3211, 3213, 3214, 3215, 3216, 3218, 3231, 3246, 3257, 3264, 3266, 3286: M.M., II, Nos 528, 654, 534, 552, 553, 555, 560, 567, 573, 585, 586, 622, 664, 599, 600, 601, 609, 610, 611, 628, 650, 652, 653, 654, 655, 657, 670, 683.

CHAPTER IV: MATTHEW I'S SOCIAL WORK IN CONSTANTINOPLE

By the end of the XIV century, all that was left of the Byzantine Empire was Constantinople. The entire commercial, economic, and political life of the Empire had been concentrated in this town.

The Turkish siege and economic disorder had brought corruption in Constantinople. Many refugees that had come from distant Asia Minor looking for a better future were dissapointed. The increase in population meant also that the Courts had many more cases to judge.

Patriarchal interference in the judgement of people was not something unusual for Constantinople. The Patriarch had his own authority in resolving both major and minor affairs, therefore, most of the notarial deeds were signed before the Patriarch, whose dignity would guarantee the legality of these contracts[1].

Many contracts of endowment that took place before marriage, were usually signed by the Patriarch[2].

The Patriarch did his best to resolve the troubles that arose

---

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3064, 3069, 3071, 3072, 3080, 3084, 3085, 3089, 3096, 3102, 3114, 3118, 3119, 3125, 3129, 3130, 3136, 3139, 3157, 3164, 3174, 3179, 3181, 3184, 3185, 3187, 3192, 3208, 3212, 3217, 3232, 3238, 3242, 3252: M.M., II, Nos 530, 523, 524, 536, 541, 543ii, 558, 562, 563, 568, 571, 572, 577, 580, 597, 604, 614, 617, 619, 623, 620, 635, 630, 646, 651, 656, 675, 676, 680.

[2] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3126, 3140, 3256: M.M., II, Nos 569, 581.

with inheritances[3], while in some other circumstances he confirmed with his signature the value of general purpose contracts[4].

[3] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3061, 3063, 3065, 3067, 3076, 3086, 3092, 3100, 3104, 3109, 3113, 3115, 3120, 3122, 3123, 3127, 3128, 3133, 3137, 3143, 3146, 3147, 3148, 3151, 3152, 3153, 3155, 3166, 3167, 3168, 3172, 3173, 3193, 3194, 3195, 3197, 3200, 3201, 3202, 3210, 3233, 3234, 3237, 3240, 3241, 3247, 3248, 3249, 3251, 3255: M.M., II, Nos 549, 550, 528, 526, 537, 544, 547, 554, 557, 559, 564, 565, 566, 570, 575, 578, 583, 587, 588, 589, 591, 592, 593, 595, 606, 607, 608, 612, 613, 631, 632, 638, 635, 638, 639, 640, 649, 666, 671, 674, 678, 679, 684, 685.

[4] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, Nos 3091, 3098, 3099, 3103, 3141, 3150, 3186, 3219, 3230: M.M., II, Nos 535, 543, 525, 545, 582, 590, 624, 658, 669.

PART C: PATRIARCH MATTHEW I' S WRITTEN WORKS

CHAPTER I: THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE 'HYPOTYPOSIS' AND THE 'MONASTIC TESTAMENT'

In the first chapters on Patriarch Matthew I's life we referred to his two written works: the 'Hypotyposis' and the 'Monastic Testament'.

Although sometimes in Byzantine literature the terms 'Hypotyposis' and 'Monastic Testament' are considered similar, they usually have a different use and meaning. Hence, Matthew I's 'Hypotyposis' must be distinguished from his later 'Monastic testament'.

Matthew I's 'Hypotyposis' concerns the administrative organization and rules of behaviour of every Bishop in his Diocese. Through this text, we can see the theological knowledge of the Patriarch, together with his particular interest in order in the Church.

Matthew I's 'Monastic Testament', however, is a text which refers to the coenobitic monastery of the Charsianeites', and describes its liturgical observances (Liturgical Typikon). It should be noted that the term 'Typikon' has become a conventional term, designating a variety of 'Monastic Testaments', bearing such titles as 'Diatheke',

'Hypotyposis', 'Thesmos', 'Diataxis', 'Hypomnema' or 'Typikon'[1] . The term 'Hypotyposis' in reference to the 'Monastic Testament', is therefore to be distinguished from the same term used for Matthew I's regulations concerning Ecclesiastical administration[2] .

The existence of the same term in two different contexts[3] is simply a coincidence. What is of note is that Matthew I's 'Monastic testament' is based on the 'Hypotyposis' of the monk Mark, the 'Athonian', which is one of the types of 'Monastic Testaments'.

[1] 'Διαθήκη', 'Θεσμός', 'Διάταξις', 'Υπόμνημα', 'Τυπικόν'.

[2] C. Galatariotou, " 'Byzantine Ktetorika Typika', A Comparative Study ', REB, 45, (1987), 77-138.

[3] As a set of administrative regulations or as a 'Monastic Testament'.

CHAPTER II: THE 'HYPOTYPOSIS' OF PATRIARCH MATTHEW I

As we have already seen, Matthew I's 'Hypotyposis' refers to the Ecclesiastical administration of the Patriarchate and other minor Dioceses. It was written one year after Matthew I was established on the Patriarchal throne (1398)[1].

In the introduction, Matthew I describes vividly the harmony of the Celestial Hierarchy - the Angels - exactly as St. Dionysius the Areopagite does[2]. The Patriarch appears to be one of the most distinguished Byzantine Patristic Scholars of his time. Comparing the Celestial to the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy - as St. Dionysius does[3] - he explains that the Celestial 'Hierarchy' is a sacred order assimilated (as far as possible) to the likeness of God. It is Divine illumination that imparts its own proper light to each of these sacred orders, according to their worthiness.

Matthew I explains metaphorically that the relation of the Celestial Hierarchy is similar to the administrative relation of the Patriarch with the Metropolitans and the Ecclesiastical Elders[4]. He also cites Paul's saying: 'Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called'[5].

---

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3066.

[2] PG 3, 1-152D.

[3] PG 3, 153-282D.

[4] Oudot I., Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani Acta Selecta, I, Vatican 1941, p.134:1.

[5] I Corinthians VII:20.

It is obvious that Matthew I is concerned not only with the present but also with the future of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and is well aware of his own responsibilities as Patriarch. As he reports, as Patriarch of Constantinople, he had, from the first, noticed the disorder of the Patriarchal clergy. His predecessors had also been aware of it but no other Patriarch had tried to put them in order.

Then, Matthew I illustrates St. Dionysius' Theology by means of examples, mentioning that the Celestial Hierarchy is a kind of symbol adapted to our condition, which needs material things for our Divine elevation from these, to spiritual reality. An example of such material things is the church order[6] . In this way Matthew I links his plans for church order with the description of St. Dionysius.

Furthermore, Matthew I describes in great detail how a Bishop has to defend the faith and the rights of the local church against any secular interference, citing various sayings from the New Testament [7] . We might observe that from here on he becomes more practical than theoretical. He has an analytical way of thinking and apart from the Bishops' duties, he mentions those of the Ecclesiastical Elders' ('Exokatakoiloi').

The 'Exokatakoiloi' were the six principal officials of the

[6] Oudot I., op. cit., pp.134:2-136:3.

[7] Ibid., pp.136:4-142:9. Cf. Romans X:2., II Timothy II. Matthew X:8, I Timothy V:20, II Timothy IV:2:24. I Corinthians IX:13, I Timothy VI: 8, I Corinthians IX:11-14. Matthew X:10.

Patriarch[8]. They consisted of the 'Great Oikonomos' [9], the 'Great Sakellarios'[10], the 'Great Skeuophylax'[11], the 'Great Chartophylax'[12], the 'Head of the Sakellion'[13] and the 'Protekdikos'[14]. The functions of many of them had been established since the XI century.

Some of the 'Exokatakoiloi' were Priests or Deacons, while some others belonged to the laity. As Matthew I states, all of the Ecclesiastical Elders are obliged to present themselves at the Patriarchate every day, seated beside the Patriarch, because they had voting rights in adjudicating minor affairs[15].

The 'Endemousa' synod was not convened every day and the 'Endemountes' Bishops did not present themselves when there were no clergymen to judge. This is why the 'Exokatakoiloi' had the voting right.

During these trials, the Imperial Elders could only express their opinion, as Imperial representatives, but it was the Patriarch who

---

[8] In the late Byzantine period (XIV century) their number had been shrunk.

[9] **'Μέγας Οἰκονόμος'.**

[10] **'Μέγας Σακελλάριος'.**

[11] **'Μέγας Σκευοφύλαξ'.**

[12] **'Μέγας Χαρτοφύλαξ'.**

[13] **"Η ἀρχή τοῦ Σακελλίου'.**

[14] **'Πρωτέκδικος'.**

[15] We have already seen that the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople - New Rome, had the jurisdiction to judge almost every kind of case. It was a privilege that had been given to him by the Emperors. A specific study on this would be very useful for the Church Historians.

finally judged the case [16].

Matthew I also takes the opportunity to mention some regulations concerning the daily presence of two groups of assistants who helped the synodical procedure. They were the 'Notars' who kept minutes, or wrote the notarial deeds, and the 'Episcopians' who were responsible for inviting those who had been accused to the synod, acting as Patriarchal messengers. If the persons they invited were unable to attend the synod, they listened carefully to their testimony and reported it to the 'Endemousa' and to the Patriarch[17].

Then, Matthew I draws his readers' attention to the duties of the 'Exokatakoiloi', for they occupied high administrative positions.

The number of Ecclesiastical Elders (six, five or less) - depended on the state of the Byzantine Empire. Matthew I's 'Hypotyposis' is of great importance to today's Scholars, not only because it gives evidence of his literary ability, but also because it is a written source which attests that the number of 'Exokatakoiloi' was on the wane by the end of the XIV century. Matthew I states clearly in his 'Hypotyposis' that at least from 1398, the duties of one of them -

[16] Oudot I., op. cit., pp.142:11-144:12. Matthew I also refers to the Imperial Elders, mentioning that they could only express their opinion. In this way he is able free his judgement from the control of the Emperor.

[17] Oudot I., op. cit., pp.144:13-146:14.

the 'Great Oikonomos' - had been cancelled[18] . The 'Great Oikonomos' held the first rank among the 'Exokatakoiloi', but Matthew I pays no attention to his office. But how can the absence of the 'Great Oikonomos' be explained?

We think that the obscurity surrounding his existence can easily be explained if we look back to the middle of the XI century. Until then, the 'Great Oikonomos' reported first to the Emperor and then to the Patriarch. Patriarch Michael I Cerularius (1043-1059) managed to release the 'Great Oikonomos' from Imperial supervision, persuading the Emperor Isaakius I Comnenus (1057-1059) to decide that in future, it would be the Patriarch of Constantinople who would appoint the 'Great Oikonomos'.

In addition to this, there is another event, in the time of Matthew I's Patriarchate, which should be considered. In October 1397, a little before Matthew I wrote his 'Hypotyposis', he registered the exact value of Hagia Sophia's treasure (sacred vessels etc.) with the help of the Ecclesiastical Elders. The 'Great Oikonomos' is completely ignored in the Patriarchal records, although he had held first rank until

[18] The office of the 'Oikonomos' had been established since the V century, by the XXVI canon of the IV Ecumenical council (PG 137, 143B-C), ' **ὥστε μή ἁμάρτυρον εἶναι τήν οἰκονομίαν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καί ἐκ τούτου σκορπίζεσθαι τά αὐτῆς πράγματα καί λοιδορίαν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ προστρίβεσθαι'.** Every Diocese had its own 'Oikonomos'. The 'Oikonomos' of the Cathedral of Constantinople (Hagia Sophia), was called the 'Great Oikonomos'.

then[19]. The appointment of the 'Great Oikonomos' was up to the Patriarch. We think that due to the general financial ruin of the church of Constantinople the Patriarchal treasury was poor and the 'Great Oikonomos' was not necessary anymore.

Hence, Matthew I refers first to the 'Great Sakellarios' whose functions had been changed over the centuries. In the XI century, the Patriarchal 'Sakellarios' was responsible for the cathedral treasury, registering and executing the Patriarchal acts. As time went by, he displaced the 'Great Skeuophylax', bearing the second rank among the 'Exokatakoiloi'[20]. During Matthew I's Patriarchate (1397-1410), the 'Great Sakellarios' supervised the monasteries of Constantinople, entrusting monastic houses to the care of lay patrons. He was also responsible for introducing and advising novice monks, being their spiritual leader and where necessary, bringing them to trial before the Patriarch in cases of disobedience[21].

Matthew I also refers to the 'Great Skeuophylax' as being responsible for the renewal of the sacred vessels, for the singers of the cathedral and for order in general. In the early XI century the 'Great Skeuophylax' lost the rank he had held next to the 'Great Oikonomos',

---

[19] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3066.

[20] Alexander Kazhdan - Paul Magdalino, 'Sakellarios', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, pp.1828-1829.

[21] Oudot I., op. cit., p.148:15. Cf. Vlassios Io. Phidas, **Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία ἀπό τῆς Εἰκονομαχίας μέχρι τῆς Ἁλώσεως (726-1453)**, t.II, Athens 1983, pp.151-152.

because he was demoted to third place in favour of the 'Sakellarios'[22].

The Patriarch then mentions the duties of the 'Great Chartophylax', who presented to the Patriarch those who intended to be ordained Priests. Apart from this function, we have seen that a year before Matthew I wrote his 'Hypotyposis' (1397), during the Patriarchal elections, the 'Great Chartophylax' had acted as the mediator between the Patriarch and the Emperor. Matthew I mentions that the 'Great Chartophylax' is not entitled to have an active role in the ordinations of Bishops. It seems that he has in mind the case of Jean Holobolos, who tried to interfere in the Patriarchal elections[23].

During Matthew I's Patriarchate, the 'Great Chartophylax' supervised the 'Ecclesiarches', the 'Kanonarches', the 'Prosmonarioi' and the 'Exquitors', who assisted him in his duties[24].

As Matthew I reports, the 'Great Chartophylax' was also responsible for supervising the procedure of marriage. According to the custom of Constantinople, every engagement had to be consecrated by the church. But if a Priest's blessing had not consecrated the engagement, then the engagement was illegal. The Patriarch states that this custom had become civil-law three centuries earlier, established by the Emperor Alexius I Comnenus[25].

---

[22] Paul Magdalino - Alice-Mary Talbot, 'Skeuophylax', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, pp.1909-1910.

[23] Ibid., p.150:18.

[24] Oudot I., op. cit., p.150:18.

[25] Ibid., pp.152:19-20.

At this point, Matthew I mentions the early marriage of the couples. The couple had official permission to get married if the boy was over the age of fourteen and the girl over twelve. Let us remember that the Turkish siege had caused the concentration of the population inside the city. This is a simple example of Matthew I's active role as an advisor of the Constantinopolitans on every aspect of their life[26].

Another Ecclesiastical Elder was the 'Great Sakellion' who was responsible for various religious foundations - especially for public churches[27]. His office was established in the X century.

It seems that during Matthew I's time his duties were increased. He not only supervised the behaviour of the Priests outside the church, but also inspected them inside it, giving instructions whenever they were liturgically mistaken. He also took care of some of the Ecclesiastical shrines that belonged to the churches[28].

Finally, Patriarch Matthew I mentions the 'Protekdikos', who was given sixth rank among the 'Exokatakoiloi'. He was the defender of those who sought asylum in Hagia Sophia. Many slaves, or people suspected justly or unjustly of murder, went to Hagia Sophia, where they would find the 'Protekdikos'. He usually listened to, and judged them, and then, accordingly set the penitent sinner 'Epitimia'[29].

---

[26] Ibid., pp.152:21-156:27.

[27] Ibid., p.156:28.

[28] Alexander Kazhdan - Paul Magdalino, 'Sakellion', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1830.

[29] ('Επιτίμια) = Spiritual punishments that the confessors impose upon the penitent sinners.

Another of his duties was the supervision of the conversion of slave-refugees to the Orthodox church, and of their baptism.

Apart from 'Protekdikos' (the leader of the 'Ekdikoi'[30]) there were many more 'Ekdikoi' in other churches of the Empire, who had been charged with the same mission[31] .

Matthew I concludes his 'Hypotyposis', by encouraging the 'Exokatakoiloi' to their duties with citations from the New Testament[32] .

[30] 'Ekdikoi'= (Ἔκδικοι), is the Greek plural for the single 'Ekdikos'.

[31] Oudot I., op. cit., p.158:29.

[32] John VII:24, XIV:15, I Corinthians VIII:12.

CHAPTER III: THE 'MONASTIC TESTAMENT' OF PATRIARCH MATTHEW I

Some time before his death, Patriarch Matthew I left behind him another written work: the 'Monastic Testament'. We have already mentioned that Matthew I's 'Monastic Testament' is a kind of 'Typikon' and at this point it would be useful to give a clear description of what a 'Typikon' is.

In the XVII century, Leo Allatius made a distinction between the 'Liturgic Typika' (those giving instructions about the order of the hymns in the Divine Liturgy which are well-known), and the non-Liturgic 'Typika'[1].

The non-Liturgic 'Typika' are sets of regulations prescribing administrative organization and behaviour in a monastery.

Through the years, the term 'Typikon', became a conventional term designating a wide variety of foundation charters and monastic testaments, which bear the title: 'Diatheke', 'Hypotyposis', 'Thesmos', 'Diataxis', 'Hypomnema'[2]. The 'Typika' also contain rules about the election of the 'Hegoumenos'[3], about enclosure, diet, novitiates, clothing, discipline, and commemorative services for

---

[1] L. Allatius, De libris et rebus ecclesiasticis Graecorum, Dissertatio I, Paris 1645, pp.5-6.

[2] 'Διαθήκη', 'Υποτύπωσις', 'Θεσμός', 'Διάταξις', 'Υπόμνημα'.

[3] 'Ηγούμενος'.

the benefactors of the monastery[4]. And if a conclusion can be drawn, there is no difference between the 'Ktetorika Typika' and the 'Monastic Testaments'[5].

Matthew I's 'Monastic Testament' can be divided into two parts. The first one narrates his life from childhood until the age he wrote his 'Testament', while the second one is based on the primitive 'hypotyposis' of his spiritual father - the Monk Mark[6].

In the introduction to the first part, Matthew I composes a hymn on the monastic life which is the only - easy - way leading to Paradise. All of the monks, despite their origin or their previous financial status are equal, trying their best for the salvation of their soul[7].

It is noteworthy that Matthew I narrates his life from childhood and his first thoughts of becoming a monk. He felt an inclination to the monastic life early on, at the age of twelve. Living with his parents, he asked for their permission to join the monastery.

---

[4] C. Galatariotou, " 'Byzantine Ktetorika typika', A Comparative Study ", REB, 45, (1987), 77-138. Cf. K.A. Manaphes, **'Μοναστηριακά Τυπικά - Διαθήκαι'**, **Ἀθηνᾶ, 7,** (1970), 33-60. Cf. I. M. Konidares, **Νομική Θεώρηση τῶν Μοναστηριακῶν Τυπικῶν,** Athens 1984, pp.29-35.

[5] I.M. Konidares, Νομική Θεώρηση των Μοναστηριακών Τυπικών, Athens 1984, pp.34-35.

[6] H. Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I (1397-1410)', BZ, 51, (1958), 294 : I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, **' Επιτελεύτιος Βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...',** ΕΕΒΣ, 45, (1981-82), 472 : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, f.1^{r}. As for the 'Hypotyposis' of Mark the 'Athonite', we have already explained that sometimes the alternative name of a 'Typikon' is the 'Hypotyposis'.

[7] H. Hunger, op. cit., 294$^{1-27}$: I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 472$^{7-33}$: Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.1^{r}-2^{v}.

They let him think about it for the next three years and after that - at the age of fifteen - they inclined to his will and introduced him to the monastic life under the guidance of the Abbot Mark the 'Athonite' - one of the most famous spiritual fathers of that period[8].

'Mark the Athonite's' successor - at the Charsianeites' monastery - was Patriarch Nil Kerameus who encouraged Matthew as a novice monk. Matthew I reports that his acquaintance with Nil was of great significance to him, it bolstered his faith and enabled him to become an experienced monk[9].

At this point, Matthew I narrates the background of the Charsianeites' monastery and its foundation. He refers to the monk Job Charsianeites, who had been a famous and rich doctor, who bought the estate of Amparos, making the old houses into cells and decorating a church that existed there before.

In addition to this property, John VI Cantacuzenus gave Job Charsianeites the village of Palatitzia (**Παλατίτζια**), issuing 'Chrysobull' for it. He also offerred the monastery a vineyard, located near the 'Golden gate' (**Χρυσία Πύλη**), another in the location of 'Savron' (**Σαυρῶν**),

---

[8] H. Hunger, op. cit., 295^{1}-296^{6} ; I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 472^{34}- 474^{82} ; Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.2^{r}-3^{v}.

[9] H. Hunger, op. cit., 296^{33}-297^{13} ; I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., $475^{110-134}$; Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.4^{v}-5^{r}.

and two buildings 'Metohia' (**Μετόχια**). The first was near the district of 'Milion' (**Μίλιον**) and the second by the 'Beautiful gate' (**Ὡραία Πύλη**) which included another vineyard near the district of 'Kyparissia' (**Κυπαρίσσια**), in Psamathia[10].

After that - as Matthew I states - Job Charsianeites met with monk Mark, the 'Athonite', who had been the Abbot of the Kosmidion monastery, and persuaded him to accept the Abbacy of the Charsianeites' monastery.

Unfortunately, when John V (1341-1391) succeeded John VI Cantacuzenus (1347-1354), he took back the village of Palatitzia, giving it as a gift to the Stoudites' monastery.

After John VI Cantacuzenus retired, he joined the Charsianeites' monastery, submitting himself to the guidance of monk Mark the 'Athonite'. Matthew I mentions the fact of Mark's death and after a while Patriach Nil's, who had been the Abbot of the same monastery.

Two Patriarchs [Anthony IV (Jan. 1389 - Jul. 1390, Jan. 1390 - May 1397) and Callistus II (1397)] succeeded Nil on the Patriarchal throne[11]. After Callistus II's short Patriarchate Matthew I

---

[10] H. Hunger, op. cit., 297[14]-298[15] : I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 475[135]-476[181] : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.5[r]-6[v].

[11] As we have seen from the previous chapters, it is obvious that Matthew I does not regard Macarius' last Patriarchate (30 Jul. - end Sept. 1390) as a legal one, because he had been supported by John VII (1390) in order to occupy the Patriarchal throne.

became Patriarch[12].

Patriarch Matthew I tries to relate everything that had happened during his Patriarchate, mentioning the false accusations against him, and his controversy with the Emperor-regent John V, during Emperor Manuel II's trip to the west. As he explains, when Manuel II came back from his trip, he favoured the Charsianeites' monastery, supplying it with new estates. Hence, he thought that since all the material aspects of the monastic property had been arranged, he ought to give instructions to his monks, to enable them to accomplish their main purpose, the salvation of their souls[13].

Matthew I then cites eighteen monastic regulations based on Nil's 'Hypotyposis'[14].

In his introduction, Nil shows his respect to the Fathers of the Church, who are the pattern for the faithful people - and especially for the monks'. He draws his monks' attention to theoretical instructions of general Theological interest referring in particular to the Divine economy. But the practical internal relations of the monks in

---

[12] H. Hunger, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I (1397-1410)', BZ, 51, (1958), 298^{16}-300^{5} : I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, '**Ἐπιτελεύτιος Βούλησις καί διδασκαλία...**', **ΕΕΒΣ**, 45, (1981-82), 476^{182}-478^{257} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.6^{v}-9^{r}.

[13] H. Hunger, op. cit., 300^{6}-302^{15} : I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 480^{302}-481^{355} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.10^{v}-12^{r}.

[14] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 481 : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, f.12^{r}.

the Charsianeites' monastery also interest him[15].

Matthew I continues his 'hypotyposis' adding eighteen chapters of monastic regulations, some of them first given by his spiritual father, Mark the 'Athonite'. These regulations deal with:

I. A general summary of the obligations of the Abbot to his monks - especially those in the novitiate[16].

II. The prohibition of women, female animals and young boys under the age of sixteen in the monastery[17].

III. The prohibition of anybody in the monastery to eat in secret[18].

IV. The prohibition of the Abbot to eat separate meals with such important persons as the Elders, in the absence of the monks[19].

V. The prohibition of entering the monastery to all those who had evil thought and 'habits'[20].

VI. The obligation on the part of all the monks to confess their sins and evil deeds to the confessors of the monastery and not to

---

[15] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 481^{356}-496^{881} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.12^{r}-29^{r}.

[16] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 496^{900}-497^{919} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.29^{v}-30^{r}.

[17] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., $497^{920-929}$: Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.30^{r-v}.

[18] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 497^{930}-498^{960} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.30^{v}-31^{v}.

[19] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 498^{961}-499^{973} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, f.31^{v}.

[20] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., $499^{974-983}$: Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.31^{v}-32^{r}.

any other Priest outside the monastery[21].

VII. The prohibition of monks criticizing each other[22].

VIII. The monastery's annual obligation to offer the exact amount of tax to the state[23].

IX. Every monk's responsibility for himself, and the avoidance to defend any of his brothers for any reason[24].

X. The monks' daily obligation to listen to a short reading from the 'Ascetics' of St. Basil the Great during their meals[25].

XI. The prohibition of keeping any personal belongings in their cells without the permission of their Abbot[26].

XII. The monks and the Abbot should be in communion with he Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople[27].

XIII. The communion of the monks with each other must be

---

[21] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 499^{984}-500^{1033} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.32^{r}-33^{v}.

[22] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 501^{1034}-502^{1078} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.33^{v}-35^{r}.

[23] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 502^{1079}-503^{1136} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.35^{r}-36^{v}.

[24] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 504^{1037}-505^{1077} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.36^{v}-38^{r}.

[25] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., $505^{1078-1199}$: Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.38^{r-v}.

[26] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., $506^{1200-1208}$: Vindob Hist. gr. 55, f.38^{v}.

[27] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., $506^{1208-1230}$: Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.39^{r-v}.

expressed in the Divine Liturgy and the memorial services for monks who had died[28].

XIV. Every year the monks of the monastery should celebrate the feast of the 'Assumption' of the Virgin Mary. It seems that the 'Katholikon' of the monastery was dedicated to the Virgin Mary[29].

XV. The obligation to hold an annual memorial service for the two previous Abbots - Nil and Mark[30].

XVI. The prohibition of the monks to criticize the Abbot of the monastery[31].

XVII. The monks' obligation to celebrate the Divine Liturgy on a daily basis[32].

XVIII. The aforementioned regulations of the 'Monastic Testament' had to be followed not only by the monks but also by the future Emperors and the Patriarchs. Matthew I obviously desires the monastery's continued existence free from outer, secular conflicts. The estates that belonged to the monastery were enough to provide food for

---

[28] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 507[1231-1243] : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, f.39^{v}.

[29] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 507[1244-1254] : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, f.40^{r}.

[30] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 508[1255-1264] : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, f.40^{r-v}.

[31] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 508[1265-1272] : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, f.40^{v}.

[32] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 508[1273]-509[1302] : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.40^{v}-41^{v}.

the monks. Nobody was allowed to diminish the monastic property, or change the regulations that the monastic life had been based on until then[34].

Matthew I concludes that just as the monk Mark gave the Abbacy of the monastery to Nil and then the latter to Matthew I, it was his turn to nominate a new person who would succeed him at the monastery. He does not mention his successor's name, perhaps because he had not yet decided on the exact person. This is why an empty space is left instead of his successor's name. Matthew I presumably intended to add it later[35].

---

[34] I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 509^{1303}-510^{1350} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.41^{v}-43^{r}.

[35] H. Hunger, op. cit., 302^{16}-303^{19} ; I.M. Konidares - K.A. Manaphes, op. cit., 509^{1303}-510^{1350} : Vindob Hist. gr. 55, ff.41^{v}-43^{r}.

CONCLUSION - GENERAL SUMMARY

Matthew I's reign as Patriarch shows him to be one of the most notable people of his time. We have already mentioned that for a long time he was overshadowed by the greatest person of his age, Emperor Manuel II, but this fact does not diminish Matthew I's own greatness. His deeds show him to be a man of exceptional intelligence, exemplary life and strict asceticism.

Matthew I came to be the defender, both of the Orthodox church, and the Byzantine Empire, from internal and external enemies. This is why he became a vital symbol of unification not only for the Orthodox Church but also for the Constantinopolitans that had left - almost fifty years before the Turkish occupation.

As defender of the Orthodox Church he refused to countenance anything that threatened his Patriarchal dignity. As defender of the Byzantine Empire, he rejected the demands of the Turkish mission (which rather unexpectedly consisted of Byzantines) for the surrender of the town. During this period, Matthew I and some of his predecessors were vigorous in asserting Constantinople's supremacy everywhere in the Christian world. Matthew I confidently asserted his authority everywhere. His correspondence with the Western Church on the question of unity made him well-known from

East to West[1]. In addition to this, his various concerns about the unity and the organization of the Orthodox Church in Russia, Hongrovalachia, Bulgaria, Alania, Peloponnese, Crete, Cyprus and the Aegean islands, made him well-known from North to South.

Matthew I had a Patriarchate filled with wide-ranging activities, which fell wholly in the reign of Emperor Manuel II[2] and the Emperor's support of Matthew I was of great significance.

Macarius of Ankara, on the other hand, found a ruthless ally in the Bishop Matthew of Medeia. Both of them regarded Matthew I's ordination as invalid and a great battle began.

John VII's interference as the Emperor's-regent was an even greater storm, bringing him into collision with Matthew I.

Manuel II's reaction shows him to be an Emperor-defender of the Church, concerned to guide and instruct, watchful for the appearance of any kind of heresy. Even the possibility of a promotion of a second Patriarch of Constantinople was heresy to him. We think that it was Matthew I's Ecclesiological thought which persuaded Manuel II to think in the same way.

With Manuel II's aid, Matthew I succeeded in getting the leaders of the 'Secret alliance' expelled from the church, and rooting

---

[1] Darrouzès, Regestes, Vol.I, Fasc.VI, No 3285. We refer to Matthew I's correspondence with the Pope Gregory XII (1406-1415). We must point out that Matthew I addressed letters only to the real Pope and not to the Antipope Alexander (1409-1410), contributing in a way to the internal unity of the Western Church. This is a vivid example of Matthew I's intentions to avoid and fight against both the existing and the possible future Schism.

[2] With the exception of John VII who became Emperor-regent for two and a half years (December 1399 - June 1403).

out the faction. It was Matthew I's kindness and humility which placed him in the high position he held among the Patriarchs of Constantinople.

It is not only our personal belief that Matthew I would have been generous if Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia had shown a change of heart. We have seen that Matthew I had left the door open to the members of the 'Secret alliance' to return to communion, provided they accepted him as Patriarch.

The question of Matthew I's Patriarchal authority was one of the earliest matters of dispute for the members of the 'Secret alliance'. This is hardly surprising, since opponents would invariably question the legitimacy of the authority of the existing Patriarch. Matthew I, however, was a peacemaker, and through peaceful manners tried his best for the unity of the Church.

However, the allies did not accept his defence of himself and imprisoned him, to repent in the Charsianeites' monastery.

Of course, there were some Bishops who had taken part in the synods that condemned and deposed Matthew I, but they were pardoned after pleading that they had done so under Macarius' influence. As for Macarius of Ankara and Matthew of Medeia, they were condemned, deposed, and anathematized because of their deeds and both of them took off their 'Enkolpia'.

During Matthew I's Patriarchate, Constantinople saw a phenomenal growth in population and activities. The Orthodox were concentrated in Constantinople because of the Turkish invasions on the

outskirts of the town, and the increase in Patriarchal activities in many aspects of the life of the citizens was obvious to all.

As for Matthew I's concern for external aid, he had a special relationship with the Orthodox of Russia, taking in hand the provision of food and other necessities for the starving population. He had the same success in forging links with the Alans, where he resolved serious Ecclesiastical obstacles.

Apart from the aforementioned, he demonstrated his interest in the spiritual life of the Church, bringing order to it, and issuing a detailed code for the election and conduct of the Ecclesiastical Elders. The renewal of the Church, the relief of social distress, the training of priests and the unity in the town, were his major concerns.

As we have seen, later Scholars such as H. Hunger, I.M. Konidares, K.A. Manaphes and V. Laurent, singled out Matthew I among the other Patriarchs of the late XIV century for his higher education. He was a voluminous writer, practical rather than theoretical and both his 'Hypotyposis' and his 'Monastic Testament', shows him to be an unoriginal but effective summarizer of St. Paul's teaching. But as we have seen, Matthew I's reputation rests more on his work as a Churchman, than on his multifaceted learning, especially in the field of Theology.

Let us remember that he was a strict, ascetic man, born to die in the Church, for the Church. Being such a man, he raised the

prestige of his office in an age of eclipse and various Ecclesiatical troubles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

ADAM OF USK. Chronicon Adae de Usk, A.D. 1377-1421, edited with a translation and notes by Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, K.C.B., London 1904[2].

BALSAMONIS THEODORI, Patriarchae Theopolis Magnae Antiochiae, Τά εὑρισκόμενα πάντα, in PG, 137, 1-508.

BRYENNIOS JOSEPH, Τά Εὑρεθέντα, t.2, edited by Eugenius Boulgaris, Leipzig 1784.

DARROUZES JEAN A.A., Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople, Vol.I: Les Actes des Patriarches, Fasc.VI: Les Regestes de 1377 a 1410, [Le Patriarcat Byzantin, ser.I], Paris 1979.

DARROUZES JEAN, 'Textes synodaux chypriotes', REB, 37, (1979), 5-122.

DENNIS GEORGE T., S.J., 'Four Unknown Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus', Byz, 36, (1966), 35-40.

DIONYSIUS PSEUDOAREOPAGITES, Περί τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Ἱεραρχίας, in PG, 3, 153-282D.

DIONYSIUS PSEUDOAREOPAGITES, Περί τῆς Οὐρανίας Ἱεραρχίας, in PG, 3, 1-152D.

DÖLGER FRANCIS, Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565-1453, V, Regesten von 1341-1453, [Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit, A:Regesten,I], Munich 1965.

DUCAE, Historia Turcobyzantina, (1341-1462), ex recensione Basilii Grecu, published by 'Academiae Reipublicae Popularis Romanicae', Bucharest 1958.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

HUNGER HERBERT, 'Das Testament des Patriarchen Matthaios I. (1397-1410)', BZ, 51, (1958), 288-309.

HUNGER HERBERT, Johannes Chortasmenos, (ca.1370-ca. 1436\37), Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften. Einleitung, Regesten, Prosopographie, Text, [Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, Band VII, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften], Wien 1969.

HUNGER HERBERT, 'Zu den restlichen Inedita des Konstantinopler Patriarchalregisters im Cod. Vindob. Histor. Gr. 48', REB, 24, (1966), 58-68.

KINGSFORD CHARLES LETHBRIDGE, M.A., St. John's College, English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century, with an Appendix of Chronicles and Historical pieces hitherto for the most part unprinted, Oxford 1913.

KONIDARES I.M.- MANAPHES K.A., ' Ἐπιτελεύτιος βούλησις καί διδασκαλία τοῦ παναγιωτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου πρός τούς ὑπ' αὐτόν μοναχούς, περιλαμβάνουσα μέν ἐξ ἀρχῆς μέχρι τέλους τά κατ' αὐτόν, ἔχουσα δέ καί τινα ἔκθεσιν ἐν κεφαλαίοις διηρημένην τῶν ἐμπεριειλημμένων τῇ προγεγονυία ὑποτυπώσει παρά τοῦ καλογήρου αὐτοῦ τοῦ πανοσιωτάτου ἐν μοναχοῖς κυροῦ Μάρκου', ΕΕΒΣ, 45, (1981-82), 472-515.

LOENERTZ RAYMOND J., O.P., Correspondance de Manuel Calecas, [Studi e Testi, No 152], Rome 1950.

MIKLOSICH FRANCISCUS ET MÜLLER IOSEPHUS, Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani, M.CCC.XV - M.CCCC.II (1315-1402), e Codicibus Manu Scriptis Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis, sumptus praebentae Caesarea Scientiarum Academia, Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi Sacra et Profana, Volumen Secundum. ed. Carolus Gerold, Vindobonae M.DCCC.LXII (1862).

MACARIUS, Metropolitan of Ankara, 'Καθολική πραγματεία'. in Parisinus

London 1864.

WIRTH PETER, 'Zur frage nach dem beginne des Patriarchats Matthaios' I, von Konstantinopel', Byz, 37, 1967 (1968), 417-418.

YPODIGMA NEUSTRIAE, A THOMA WALSINGHAM, Quondam Monacho Monasterii S. Albani, Conscriptum, Chronica Monasterii S. Albani, edited by Henry Thomas Riley, M.A., Cambridge & Oxford, and of the inner Temple, Barrister-at-law, London 1876.

B. MODERN STUDIES AND MONOGRAPHS

ADENEY WALTER F., The Greek and Eastern Churches, [ser. International Theological Library], Edinburgh 1908.

ALIVISATOS AMILKAS S., Οἱ ἱεροὶ κανόνες καὶ οἱ Ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ Νόμοι, Athens 1949^2.

ALLATIUS LEO, De libri et rebus ecclesiasticis Graecorum, Dissertatio I, Paris 1945.

BANDURI ANSELMI (Domni) Ragusini, Presbyteri ac Monachi Benedictini e Congregatione Melitensi, Imperium Orientale sive antiquitates Constantinopolitanae in quatuor partes distributae: quae ex Variis scriptorum Graecorum Operibus & praesertim ineditis adornatae, Commentariis, & Geographicis, Topographicis, alisque quam plurimis monumentorum ac nomismatum tabellis illustratur, & ad intelligentiam cum sacrae tum profanae historiae apprime conducunt, Opera et Studio, Tomus Primus, Venice M.DCC.XXIX (1729).

BARKER JOHN W., Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship, New Brunswick - New Jersey 1969.

BOUMIS PANAGIOTIS I., Οἱ κανόνες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας περὶ τοῦ Κανόνος τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς, Ἔμμεσοι μαρτυρίαι, Vol.II, Athens 1991.

BROWNING ROBERT, 'Patriarchal School', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1599.

BROWNING ROBERT, 'Teacher', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.2019.

BYRON ROBERT, The Byzantine Achievement, An Historical perspective A.D. 330-1453, London 1929.

CAMPBELL SHEILA D., 'Enkolpion', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.700.

CONSTANTINIDES J. CHR., 'Ματθαῖος Α΄ Πατριάρχης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως

(1397-1410)', ΘΗΕ, 8, (1966).

CULTER ANTHONY, 'Enkolpion', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.700.

DENNIS G.T., S.J., 'Official Documents of Manuel II Palaeologus', Byz, 31, (1971), 45-58.

DENNIS GEORGE T., S.J., 'The Deposition and Restoration of Patriarch Matthew I, 1402-1403', BF, 2, (1967), 100-106.

FOSS CLIVE F.W., 'Kyzikos' ,ODB, Vol.II, Oxford 1991, pp.1164-1165.

FOSS CLIVE F.W., 'Pamphylia', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1568.

FOSS CLIVE F.W., 'Phrygia', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, pp.1671-1672.

FOSS CLIVE F.W., 'Side', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1892.

FOSS CLIVE F.W., 'Sougdaia', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1931.

GALATARIOTOU C., " 'Byzantine Ktetorika Typika', A Comparative Study ", REB, 45, (1987), 77-138.

GEDEON MANUEL I., Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες, Ειδήσεις Ἱστορικαί Βιογραφικαί περί τῶν Πατριαρχῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀπό Ἀνδρέου τοῦ Πρωτοκλήτου μέχρις Ἰωακείμ Γ' τοῦ ἀπό Θεσσαλονίκης (36-1884), Constantinople 1890.

GONIS DIMITRIOS, Το Τύρνοβο καί οἱ παραθαλάσσιες Μητροπόλεις καί Ἀρχιεπισκοπές (Βάρνας, Μεσημβρίας, Σωζοπόλεως καί Ἀγχιάλου) κατά τόν ΙΔ' αἰώνα, Ἀξίες καί πολιτισμός, Ἀφιέρωμα στόν καθηγητή Εὐάγγελο Θεοδώρου, Athens 1991, pp.309-328.

GONOSOVA ANNA, 'Amtimension', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.112.

GREGORY TIMOTHY E., 'Aimos', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, pp.41-42.

GREGORY TIMOTHY E., 'Cyprus', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, pp.567-569.

GREGORY TIMOTHY E., 'Herakleia in Thrace', ODB, Vol.II, Oxford 1991, pp.915.

HERMAN E., 'Das bischöfliche Algabenwesen im Patriarchat von Konstantinopel vom XI bis zur mitte des XIX Jahrhunderts', OCP, 5, (1939), 434-513.

HUGHES PHILIP, A popular history of the Reformation, London 1957.

HUNGER HERBERT, 'Das Kloster τοῦ Χαρσιανίτου', JÖBG, 7, (1958), 136-139.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

HUSSEY J.M., The Orthodox church in the Byzantine Empire, [Oxford History of the Christian Church], Oxford 1991[2].

IOANNIDES H. NICOLAUS, Ὁ Ἰωσήφ Βρυέννιος, Βίος - ἔργο - διδασκαλία, Athens 1985.

KAZHDAN ALEXANDER, 'Patriarchal School', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1599.

KAZHDAN ALEXANDER, 'Sakellarios', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, pp.1828-1829.

KAZHDAN ALEXANDER, 'Sakellion', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, pp.1829-1830.

KAZHDAN ALEXANDER, 'Teacher', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.2019.

KONIDARES I.M., Νομική θεώρηση των Μοναστηριακών Τυπικών, Athens 1984.

LAIOS AGELIKI, Ἡ Βασιλεία τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου Β' (1282-1328), IEE, t.IX, Athens 1980, pp.137-183.

LAURENT VITALIEN, Le Trisépiscopat du Patriarche Matthieu I[er] (1397-1410), Un grand procès canonique à Byzance au début du XV[e] siècle, REB, 30, (1972), 5-166.

LOENERTZ RAYMOND J., O.P., 'Pour la chronologie des oeuvres de Joseph Bryennios', REB, 7, (1949), 12-32.

MACRIDES R.J., 'Chartophylax', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, pp.415-416.

MAGDALINO PAUL, 'Sakellarios', ODB, Vol III, Oxford 1991, pp.1828-1829.

MAGDALINO PAUL, 'Sakellion', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, p.1830 (§2-3).

MAGDALINO PAUL, 'Skeuophylax', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, pp.1909-1910.

MANAPHES K.A., 'Μοναστηριακά Τυπικά - Διαθήκαι', Μελέτη Φιλολογική, ["Αθηνᾶ", Σύγγραμμα περιοδικόν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας, Σειρά Διατριβῶν καί μελετημάτων, t.7], Athens 1970.

MANGO CYRIL, 'Hagia Sophia in Constantinople', ODB, Vol.II, Oxford 1991, pp.892-895.

MELETIUS [MITROU], Metropolitan of Athens, "Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία', ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς εἰς ἁπλοελληνικήν πλουτισθεῖσα παρά Γ. Βενδότη, t.III,

Wien αψπδ' (1784).

MILLER W., 'The Gattilusij of Lesbos (1355-1462)', BZ, 22, (1913), 406-447.

MORINUS J., Commentarius de sacris ecclesiae ordinationibus, Antverpiae M.DC.LXXXXV (1695).

NICOL M. DONALD, A Byzantine Emperor in England, Manuel II's visit to London in 1400-1401, in Byzantium: its ecclesiastical history and relations with the western world, Collected studies, X, [Variorum reprints], London 1972, pp.204-225.

OBOLENSKY DIMITRI, Six Byzantine Portraits, Oxford 1988.

OSTROGORSKY GEORGE, History of the Byzantine State, translated by Joan Hussey, Oxford 1956.

OUDIN C., Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiae antiquis, t.III, Lipsiae M.DCC.XXII (1722).

PATTERSON-SEVCENKO NANCY, 'Crete', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.546.

PAPADAKIS ARISTEIDES, 'Endemousa Synodos', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.697.

PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS A., Ἀνέκδοτα κείμενα περί Κύπρου καί Θεσσαλονίκης, Ἰωσήφ Βρυεννίου, πρακτικά συνόδου ἐν Κύπρῳ, ΕΚΦΣ, appendix of the XVII tome, Constantinople 1886, pp.48-51.

PHIDAS VLASSIOS IO., Βυζάντιο, Βίος - Θεσμοί - Κοινωνία - Τέχνη, Athens 1985.

PHIDAS VLASSIOS IO., Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία, ἀπό τῆς Εἰκονομαχίας μέχρι τῆς Ἁλώσεως (726-1453), t.II, Athens 1983.

PRITSAK OMELJAN, 'Alans', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, pp.51-52.

RALLIS GEORGE A. - POTLIS M., Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καί ἱερῶν κανόνων τῶν τε ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων καί τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν καί τοπικῶν συνόδων καί τῶν κατά μέρος ἁγίων πατέρων, t.I-VI, Athens 1852-1859.

RILEY - SMITH JONATHAN, The Atlas of the Crusades, London 1991.

SALAVILLE S., "Le titre ecclesiastique de 'proedros' dans les documents

byzantins", EO, 29, (1930), 419-436.

SCHARF J., 'Photios und die Epanagoge', BZ, 49, (1956), 385-400.

SCHNEIDER A.M., 'Die vorjustinianische Sophienkirche', BZ, 36, (1936), 77-80.

SCHREINER P., Die Byzantinischen Kleinkroniken, Vols. I-III, Einleitung und Texte, Wien 1975.

STEPHANIDES K. VASILIOS, 'Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Synoden des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel', ZK, 55, (1936), 127-157.

STEPHANIDES K. VASILIOS, (Archimandrite), 'Εκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι σήμερον, Athens 1978[5].

TAHIAOS ANTHONY - EMILIOS, "Η εἰς Ρωσίαν ἀποστολή τοῦ Κυπριανοῦ', ΕΕΑΠΘ, 6, (1961), 180-241.

TALBOT ALICE - MARY, 'Akapniou Monastery', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, pp.43-44.

TALBOT ALICE - MARY, 'Bryennios, Joseph', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.330.

TALBOT ALICE - MARY, 'Charsianeites Monastery', ODB, Vol.I, Oxford 1991, p.415.

TALBOT ALICE - MARY, 'Matthew I', ODB, Vol.II, Oxford 1991, p.1316.

TALBOT ALICE - MARY, 'Skeuophylax', ODB, Vol.III, Oxford 1991, pp.1909-1910.

TOMADAKIS N.B., 'Μελετήματα περί Ἰωσήφ Βρυεννίου', ΕΕΒΣ, 29, (1959), 125-128.

TOMADAKIS N.B., Ὁ Ἰωσήφ Βρυέννιος καί ἡ Κρήτη κατά τό 1400, Μελέτη Ἱστορική καί Φιλολογική, Athens 1947.

VALLIANOS THEODORE, "Ἱστορία τῆς Ρωσικῆς Ἐκκλησίας', Athens 1851.

VAPHIDES PHILARETOS (Archimandrite), 'Εκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία, Μέση Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία (700-1453), t.II, Constantinople 1886.

ZAHARIADES ELIZABETH, Ἡ ἐπέκταση τῶν Ὀθωμανῶν στήν Εὐρώπη ὡς τήν Ἅλωση τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1354-1453). ΙΕΕ. t.IX, Athens 1980, pp.184-213.