Constantinople before the Latin Conquest.
The New Rome on the Bosphorus, unlike the old Rome, had an almost insignificant martyrology of its own; but very soon the city was so abundantly endowed with holy relics brought from Rome, Jerusalem and other parts of the empire, that the pilgrim Silvia, near the end of the IV\textsuperscript{th} century, marveled at the multitude of churches and the great number of martyries.\textsuperscript{1}

One can see in Delehaye,\textsuperscript{2} without the frills of legend, a "noble emulation amongst the emperors and the notable personages to endow the capital with as many martyries as the most privileged cities possessed", continuing to the VI\textsuperscript{th} century. Not even in the following centuries, in spite of the iconoclastic tempest, did the passion for relics abate; a passion which sometimes reached a frenzy. Indeed, one notes the constant effort of Orthodox emperors to safeguard the city "protected by God" from the outrages of the infidels by concentrating there the most precious relics scattered throughout the empire's Asiatic provinces. It is enough to recall certain famous translations made under Heraclius, Leo the Wise, Constantine Porphyrogenitus and John Zemices, and the special feasts and commemorations they instituted.\textsuperscript{3}

So that near the end of the XII\textsuperscript{th} century, Constantinople without doubt was the most interesting of all the cities of the Orient in regard to the most venerated relics of Christ, of the Madonna; and it exerted a potent force of attraction on pilgrims who, impelled toward the East by religious faith, attached the highest importance to objects of cult and, astonished by the splendor of the rite and the luxuriant display of gold and gems, never tired of enumerating the holy relics and the sanctuaria, term which signifies a church or chapel, as well as the casket or reliquary in which relics were preserved.

It was natural, therefore, that many pious pilgrims coupled the itinerary of the Holy Land with that of Constantinople; for example, the monk Joseph of Canterbury, who, after having completed

---

This paper appeared in the Acts of the Roman Pontifical Academy of Archeology, xii, 1936, pp.133-156. A copy of the article is in the Wuenschel Collection of the Holy Shroud Guild, Esopus, New York. Prof. Mercati was a Corresponding Member of the Academy.
the visit to Jerusalem, "went to Constantinople. For he had heard that there was there an incomparable treasury of relics, to whose protection he desired to commend himself." However, his narrative is mutilated precisely where it begins to become more interesting, that is, at the moment of entering the chapel of relics.

If, on the one hand, Joseph of Canterbury (and also Matthew of Amalfi: "For the Constantinian city was consecrated by relics of a great many saints and protected by [saints'] bodies") fixes his attention on the relics and the bodies of the saints; on the other hand the so-called letter of Alexis Comnenus to Robert of Flanders calls attention to the inestimable treasures in order to instigate the intervention of the Latins:

*Melius est vos habeatis Constantinopolim quam pagani, quia in ea habentur pretiosissimae reliquiae Domini.... Soli thesauri ecclesiarum Constantinopolis habundant in auro, argentis, gemmis et lapidus pretiosis et pannis sericis et palliis que sufficere possint omnibus mundi ecclesiis, quos tamen, omnes thesauros inestimabilis thesaurus matris ecclesiae, sc. S. Sophiae...superat.*

[It is better that you should have Constantinople than the pagans because there are there the most precious relics of the Lord.... The treasures of the churches of Constantinople abound in gold, silver, gems and precious stones and silk cloths and pallia, that alone could suffice for all the churches of the world; but finally, the inestimable treasure of the mother of churches, Santa Sophia, surpasses them all.]

With the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1203 and 1204, a large part of these treasures and relics were dispersed in all the countries of the West. But the Latins did not carry away everything, because some of the relics were hidden by the Greeks. Stephen of Novgorod and other Russian pilgrims around 1350, as well as an inventory of Santa Sophia of 1396, enumerate a still rich and interesting collection of material. The inventory mentioned by Anna Comnena is lost; other Byzantine authors mention relics and reliquaries rarely and summarily. Therefore in order to reassemble to some extent the exact state of the holy riches found by the Latins, one must resort—not to the historians of the Crusades but instead to the accounts of travellers and pilgrims who visited Constantinople in the XIth and XIIth centuries.

The historic-artistic value of these reports and descriptions varies considerably. We could mention briefly:

1 – *Reliquiae Constantinopolitanæ*: "These are the relics that are shown in Constantinople in the chapel of the emperor." Short travel note of a pilgrim, probably English, who, returning from the Holy Land, visited the imperial city around 1150. Compared with other texts published by Riant, this meager list seems rather long and detailed.

2 – Even less is found in the *Catalogus reliquiarum Constantinopolitanarum* of the Irish monk Nicholas Thingeyrense (c. 1157):

---

4 However, his narrative is mutilated precisely where it begins to become more interesting, that is, at the moment of entering the chapel of relics.

5 *Melius est vos habeatis Constantinopolim quam pagani, quia in ea habentur pretiosissimae reliquiae Domini.... Soli thesauri ecclesiarum Constantinopolis habundant in auro, argentis, gemmis et lapidus pretiosis et pannis sericis et palliis que sufficere possint omnibus mundi ecclesiis, quos tamen, omnes thesauros inestimabilis thesaurus matris ecclesiae, sc. S. Sophiae...superat.*

6 With the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1203 and 1204, a large part of these treasures and relics were dispersed in all the countries of the West. But the Latins did not carry away everything, because some of the relics were hidden by the Greeks. Stephen of Novgorod and other Russian pilgrims around 1350, as well as an inventory of Santa Sophia of 1396, enumerate a still rich and interesting collection of material. The inventory mentioned by Anna Comnena is lost; other Byzantine authors mention relics and reliquaries rarely and summarily. Therefore in order to reassemble to some extent the exact state of the holy riches found by the Latins, one must resort—not to the historians of the Crusades but instead to the accounts of travellers and pilgrims who visited Constantinople in the XIth and XIIth centuries.

7 The historic-artistic value of these reports and descriptions varies considerably. We could mention briefly:

8 1 – *Reliquiae Constantinopolitanæ*: "These are the relics that are shown in Constantinople in the chapel of the emperor." Short travel note of a pilgrim, probably English, who, returning from the Holy Land, visited the imperial city around 1150. Compared with other texts published by Riant, this meager list seems rather long and detailed.

9 2 – Even less is found in the *Catalogus reliquiarum Constantinopolitanarum* of the Irish monk Nicholas Thingeyrense (c. 1157):
In Constantinopoli est ecclesia que vocatur Hagia Sophia, in hac ecclesia sunt Crux Domini, cet. In Constantinopoli, in palatiis antiquis sunt littere quas Dominus scripsit propriis manibus.... Hic requiescunt quoque Jacobus frater Domini.... In Constantinopoli sunt panni in quibus Christus involutos est...et multa alia sanctuaria."

[In Constantinople is a church called Santa Sophia; in this church are the Cross of the Lord, etc. In Constantinople, in the old palace, are the letters that the Lord wrote with his own hand.... Here lies also James the brother of the Lord.... In Constantinople are the cloths in which Christ was wrapped...and many other relics.]

3 – In the Vatican Latin Codex Reginense 712, a valuable collection of texts relative to the Crusades, along with the Descriptio sanctuarii ecclesiae Lateranensis and De S. Mariae Maioris ecclesia in Urbe nonnulla, there is, on folio 91, a very short chapter containing the inventory of the Boucoleon chapel:

Constantinopolitan sanctuarii in palatio imperiali descriptio: Hoc est sanctuarium quod in capella imperiali Constantinopoli (sic) ad presens (c. 1190) continetur. Virga videlicet que in Rethina, quindecima mansione Israel, in manu tenentis Aaron fronduit, floruit et amigadala (sic) peperit: amigdalina enim erat. Pars summa vitalis ligni: arundo, cet.

[These are the relics conserved at present (c. 1190) in the chapel of imperial Constantinople. Namely, the rod which in Rithmah, fifteenth encampment of Israel (see Num. 33:18), flowered in the hand of Aaron, flowered and put forth almonds. For it was almonds. Top part of the wood of life: reed, etc.]

Some of the treasures of other churches, particularly St. Sophia and the Holy Apostles, are registered on one single page. The presence of this inventory in the Reginense Codex from the abbey of Mont-Saint-Quentin in France is due to the fact that, through the generosity of Hugh of Beaumetz, this abbey received a share of the spoils from Constantinople. The state of mind of the new possessors of the "holy spoils" (exuviae sacrae) and of those who were despoiled is well-expressed on the label fixed to the little chest of relics belonging to the Cistercian Abbey of Rosieres (Jura):¹¹

De civitate Grecie que dicitur urbs regia
Sumpte sunt hec reliquie nec non sanctuaria
Dolet Constantinopolis tanto nudata pretio,
Sed iste locus nobilis gaudet de tanto premio.

[From the city of Greece which is called the royal city/ These relics, as well as reliquaries, were taken./ Constantinople bewails, denuded of such treasure/ But this place rejoices to have such noble prize.]
there around 1200. It is precisely this date, so close to the Fourth Crusade, which renders the information especially interesting; it seems almost as if a mysterious presentiment had moved the Russian prelate to compile the inventory of the religious riches of the imperial city on the very eve of their dispersion.  

A similar presentiment seems to have induced a Western pilgrim to describe "reliquaries and relics of the saints in great haste", in a short draft that, by itself, constitutes the material of the Latin Ottobonian Codex 837, chartaceous folio 23, 16cm x 11cm. It is a correct and regular script of the XVI\textsuperscript{th} century, but so corroded by ink that the whole text had to be reinforced with tissue paper, making reading more difficult. Fortunately, we later discovered the original Codex Ottobon. Latin 169, parchment, folio 67, in two columns 25cm x 18cm, written by diverse hands of the XII-XIII\textsuperscript{th} centuries. The description we publish is on ff. 62\textsuperscript{v}-97\textsuperscript{r}: \textit{Hic sunt scripta omnia sanctuaria que sunt in magnio palatio}....

The codex is of English origin, as are several others of the Ottobonian source studied by Bannister\textsuperscript{14} where n.169 is placed among those which "seem to be of undoubted English script." The English provenance is also confirmed by some hexameters added in an empty space of the second column of f. 59, by the same hand that wrote the description of Constantinople:

\begin{verbatim}
Quem sibi subractum tua nutrix Cantia luget
Temporis excursu non parvo, Stephane, vati
Pande tuo regis Ricardi martia gesta cet.
\end{verbatim}

[Your nurse Kent mourns very much that which was taken from her at the time of the excursion of your King Richard, Stephen, announcing warlike deeds to the poet.]

The author describes "churches and monasteries and relics and bodies of the saints which are without number in the royal city." He refers to himself as "wretch and sinner"; who he was is not known. He was probably an ecclesiastic or a religious, who wrote for his own edification and for the "fratres karissimi", dearest brothers, to whom every once in awhile he addresses the phrase to keep their attention alert.

The English traveler made his voyage to Constantinople certainly some decades before the Latin conquest of 1204, since he names the letter of Christ to Abgar, which disappeared in the sack of the imperial palace in 1185.\textsuperscript{15} But one could also surmise that while translating the Greek texts into Latin, he followed them without checking them with what he himself had seen. However,

*These lines seem to be a snatch from some epic poem. If we knew the context, we could probably determine their meaning. The translation given could refer to Richard's ruination of Kent (which in his time included not only Canterbury but also London) by taxation to finance his crusade to the Holy Land. Ed.*
one element for more precisely determining the date of this perioegesis could be deduced from an attentive examination of the hexameters, to see if some relationship could be established between their author and the pilgrim who compiled the description. The reference to Richard the Lionheart takes us back to the last decades of the XII\textsuperscript{th} century; also the naming of Stephen, said to be \textit{fidus Et comes expertus bello et pace fuisti}, [you were a faithful companion, expert in war and in peace] might help.

We cannot hazard the identity of the author of the travel account. However, if we remember that Geraldus Cambrense knew Greek and had made a pilgrimage to Constantinople, our thoughts would dwell on him as a possibility.\textsuperscript{16}

In any case, the anonymous author comes from the ambience of Cambrense and Radulfus of Dicetus [dean of London] whose Latin version of some chapters from the narration of the construction of S. Sophia are conserved in \textit{Abbre\v{r}iationes Chronicorum}. This version of the original Greek is reproduced better than in some other codices.\textsuperscript{17}

The anonymous author's description constitutes a valuable parallel with Anthony of Novgorod's \textit{Liber pellegrini}, with which it has several analogues and even common sections, due partly to the fact that the two pilgrims knew the Greek language and the Greek texts dealing with the churches and thaumaturgic relics of Byzantium. Both authors insert the story of the prodigies performed by this or that image or relic; however, the English pilgrim is much more complete than the Russian in that he systematically introduces as many as five miracle stories translated from Greek sources, among them a very extensive account of the image of Chalcopratia.

Both contain precious personal and independent observations, a rare treasury for historians and geographers of Byzantium. Finally, it is to be noticed that the English author gives such a clear sequence of his itinerary that it can be followed step by step on the map of Constantinople. His declaration, then is exact: \textit{omnia secundum ordinem scripsi}, I wrote everything in order.

Toward the end he became less precise and more summary, as did Anthony of Novgorod also; partly because in some sections of the city the treasures were minor, but especially because he was working in haste (he had to leave?). Because of this haste he gave very few details about the Blacherna complex. He himself acknowledges the lacunae in his description: \textit{non scripsi omnes sanctos, sed nominatos sanctos}, I did not write about all the saints, only the famous ones; and he recognizes his incapacity to describe all the countless things he saw in the imperial city.

In both the anonymous Englishman and in Anthony of Novgorod, inaccuracies appear in names of places and persons, but these can easily be corrected with the aid of the sources. Some
constantinople
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errors can also be attributed to the copyists, who in other places make corrections. Now a word is skipped, now a word is transposed and repeated.

But since for us the description has primarily a historical and archeological interest, we have limited ourselves to reproducing the manuscript exactly, without a critical apparatus.

One might ask how it happens that such a valuable text could have remained unknown up to now [1936]. The main reason is to be found in the poor quality of the hand-written inventory, *Index codicum Bibliothecae Ottobonianaec*. Under "Constantinople" it says only "See Sanctuaries", and on page 569, *Sanctuariis Civitatis Constantinopolitanae liber e greco in latinum conversus* gives only the Codex 837, that is, the copy. The original, however, is registered on page 531: *Reliquiarum enumeratio quae servabantur in ecclesias et monasteriis Urbis Cosmopilitanae* (sic), *ubi sunt scripta omnia sanctuaria*. N. 169 p.62 tergum.

Another reason for the oblivion is that in Codex 837, the description is given per se, while in Codex 169 it is relegated to the end and confused among the two miracles of the Beirut image and the scanty description of Jerusalem (*Modo descriptio Ierusalem talis est*), which the copyist omitted.

But precisely for these two miracles, and even more, for those that are inserted in the description, one must emphasize the importance of our codex for the history of the translations from Greek in the XIIth century and for the transmission to the West of legends of the lives of the saints. Thus, the article by E. Galtier is notably complemented, both for documenting the Byzantine origin of certain legends and for establishing other means of diffusion in Latin and Romance literature, apart from southern Italy [Magna Grecia]. But this examination is outside the limits that we have set, which do not permit a minute comparison of the Byzantine sources. These are extremely intricate, especially those referring to miracles.

A short preface introduces the description.
Hic sunt scripta omnia sanctuaria que sunt in magno palatio sancti et magni Constantini et reliquie et corpora sanctorum que sunt posita in sacris et sanctis ecclesiis et monasteriis que sunt in Constantinopolitana urbe, non enim omnes sanctos sed diversos sanctos descripsi. Quis enim potest enumerare sanctas reliquias sanctorum et corpora que sunt in regali urbe? Ego autem descripsi sanctuaria et reliquias sanctorum cum magna festinatione. Omnia enim secundum ordinem scripsi.

1. In primis quidem sunt in magno palatio in templo sancte Marie Dei genitricis hec sanctuaria et sacre reliquie: Sanctum manutergium, in quo est vultus Christi inpinctus quod misit Christus Ihesus ad Abagarum regem Edesse civitatis et cum vidisset sanctum vulturn Christi Abagarus rex statim effectus est sanus ab infirmitate sua. semper enim erat in lecto iacens. Et epistola quam scripsit Christus sua manu et misit ad predictum Abgarum. Scripsit autem Christus ad eum sic: "Beatus Abgare et civitas tua que vocatur Edessa. Beatus es quia non vidisti me et credidisti in me" et reliqua. Ipsa epistula est in palatio et sanctum manutergium. Ipsum autem Abgarum baptizavit sanctus Apostolus Taddeus post ascensionem Domini.

Pelvis ubi lavit Christus pedes discipulorum, linteum quo erat precinctus Dominus. Spinea corona, clavis, flagellum, arundo, spongia, lignum Domini, clavis, lancea, sanguis, vestimentum, cinctura, calciamenta, linteamen et sudarium sepulturae eius. Petra quam posuerunt sub caput Domini. Vestimentum sancte Marie genitricis Dei, velamen eius, de cinctura eius, calciamenta eius, et alia diversa sanctuaria Christi et matris eius.


Plena sunt armaria et scrinia de reliquis sanctorum. Magnum palatium enim magnos et gloriosos thesauros habet intus de sanctuaris et reliquis.

2. In templo Michaelis Archangeli ibi est virga Moysi et de melote Helie prophete. Est ibi de vinea Noe ex qua bibit vinum. De
Here are written all the chapels which are in the Great Palace of the saint and great Constantine and relics and bodies of the saints that are deposited in holy and saint churches and monasteries in the city of Constantinople; however, not all the saints but various saints are described. Who indeed could enumerate the holy relics of the saints and bodies that are in the imperial city? In fact, I described chapels and relics of the saints with great haste. However, I wrote everything according to order.

1 — First then in the Great Palace, in the temple of St. Mary Mother of God there are these chapels and holy relics: Holy towel, on which the face of Christ is painted which Christ Jesus sent to Abgar king of the city of Edessa and when King Abgar saw the holy face of Christ he was immediately made whole from his infirmity, for he had been from a long time lying in bed. And the letter which Christ wrote with his hand and sent to the above-named Abgar. For Christ wrote to him thus: "Blessed Abgar and your city which is called Edessa. Blessed are you because you did not see me and believed in me", and so forth. This very letter is in the palace and [so is] the holy towel. St. Taddeus Apostle baptized this Abgar after the Ascension of the Lord. Basin in which Christ washed the feet of the disciples, the towel with which the Lord was girded. Thorn of the crown, nail, flagellum, reed, sponge, the wood of the Lord, nail, lance, blood, clothing, belt, sandals. linen and sudarium of his burial. The stone which they placed under the head of the Lord. Garment of St. Mary Mother of God, her veil, her girdle, her sandals, and various other relics of Christ and his Mother. The rod of Moses. The mantle of St. Elijah the prophet. The head, all complete, of St. Paul the apostle, his chains. The arm of St. Andrew apostle. Hand of St. Stephen protomartyr. Skull of St. Thomas apostle and his finger which he put in the side of the Lord. Head of St. Luke evangelist. Relics of other apostles, i.e., the Twelve. Relics of St. Blaise bishop and martyr. Relics of Sts. Cosma and Damian martyrs. Relics of St. Peter of Alexandria patriarch and martyr. Femur of St. Gregory Nazianzen archbishop. Relics of St. Pantaleon martyr. Relics of St. Demetrius martyr. Head of St. Gregory bishop of Great Armenia and martyr. Relics of Sts. patriarchs Abram, Isaac and Jacob and their heads and relics of various prophets. Relics of many saints without number, as well as of holy virgins.

The cupboards and the caskets are full of relics of the saints. The Great Palace has in it great and glorious treasures of caskets and relics.

2 — In the church of Michael Archangel there is the rod of Moses and the mantle of Elijah prophet. There is there the vine of Noah.
illo ligno unde fecerunt crucem. Mensa Habrahe in qua invitatit et suscipit angelos. ipsa mensa est ornata auro et argento et lapidibus pretiosis. Templum autem sancti Archangeli totum est deauratum et pavimentum eius pulchrum nimis.

from which he drank wine. From this wood they made the cross. The table of Abraham to which he invited and received the angels. This table is decorated, with gold and silver and precious stones. But the church of the Saint Archangel is all gilded and the pavement is very beautiful.

3 — In St. Sophia, the great church that Justinian the great and most pious emperor constructed, are the cloths with which Christ was bound at his nativity and the bands and linens. Gold which the Magi offered Christ. Gold alabaster [jar] in which the chrism is blessed for baptism, the wood of the Lord and parts of all the relics which are in the Great Palace. Blood of Christ. Blood and milk of St. Pantaleonis martyr. These are in the splendid vial of crystal covered with gold and they are, even up to this day, both fluid in the vial where the milk is on top and the blood below; and when it is the feast of St. Pantaleonis martyr they change places with each other. This year the blood rises upward and the milk goes below and they remain separated. Likewise in another year the milk rises above and the blood goes below and thus are they always exchanged on his feast, and this is an exceedingly great miracle. His skull and relics. Stole of St. Gregory Neocesariensis archbishop and his pastoral staff. Head of St. Anastasio confessor and martyr. Bench of St. John at which he always sat and wrote. The measure of the length of the body of Christ which was measured by faithful men in Jerusalem and Emperor Justinian made a cross according to the length of Christ* and decorated it with silver and gold and precious stones and gilded it. And he stood it beside the door of the sacristy where are all the sacred vessels and treasures of the great church, as well as all the above-named relics. To the right of the temple altar, outside [the sanctuary] along the wall is the door of the Lord's tomb and the keys and lock and seals with which the Jews sealed the sepulcher of the Lord. But inside, along the wall, are the reliquaries of the passion of the Lord and holy relics of various saints. But in front of the sanctuary is situated the door, and the seals, of the Lord's tomb and over it is a gilded silver panel the same measure as the door; and in every place there is Our Lord Jesus Christ crucified with Holy Mary Mother of God and St. John the Evangelist. Over the silver panel they have placed a sculpted marble panel with windows and thus they close the holy place. Also in this place they display the wood of the Lord and the blood

---

*I translate longitundinis literally, not, as other commentators have done, by "height" or "stature". It could be significant that the word used here is longitudo, length; which is a horizontal measure, as of something lying down. The text does, not say procerus, which refers to a person's stature, height or tallness: Tacitus writes habitu procerus and Suetonius procerae staturae. The so-called Letter of Lentulus (variously attributed to the XIth, XIVth and XVth centuries) has “In statura corporis propagatus.” Ed.
...Domini et adoratur ab omnibus fidelibus. Similiter et IIII dies ante exaltationem sancte crucis. Iuxta ipsius loci parietem est imago Christi et Dei nostri. Fecit autem Deus magnum miraculum per illam.
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of the Lord for four days* in the middle of Lent and it is worshipped by all the faithful. The same is done also four days before the Exaltation of the Holy Cross. Near the wall of this place is the Image of Christ our God. God also performed great miracles by it.

This concludes the document on the chapels and relics of Constantinople, as published by Prof. Mercati. His article continues with the Latin texts of the five miracle stories, narrated in extenso, and the very brief (about four paragraphs) description of Jerusalem, *Modo descriptio Ierusalem talis est*.

---

*Arculf (A.D. 700) gives three days: Holy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday. Ed.*