

The reliquarium of Constantine

The following information and questions are connected with the reliquarium (or reliquary) of Constantine the Great and a second item, a vase, with the remains of his mother Helena.

- 5 In a French article of 1873 (by H. d'Arbois de Jubainville) a report is described about a Greek orthodox bishop who visits the monastery of Clairvaux (Champagne) in 1744. See <https://www.delpher.nl/nl/boeken1/gview?identifieer=6WxfAAAACAAJ>. The name of the bishop is given as Nicodeme (Nicolas at his birth):
Le mercredi cinquième jour du mois d'août 1744, un évêque grec d'Arcadie (marquis dans l'île de Crête ou de Candie, moine de saint Basile, qui a reçu le nom de Nicodème en religion, et celui de Nicolas au baptême, banny par les Turcs hérétiques pour la foy et la cause de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ) considéra nos différentes reliques et reliquaires.
- 10 Then follows a description of the reliquary, in sufficient detail to recognise it if it should exist nowadays. A detail is that (some?) text (names) is in the Illyric alphabet [Glascolitic]. The name of the monastery on the West of Crete is (Moni) Arkadi or Arkadiu and is in these days also mentioned as devoted to Constantine:
« ΑΡΚΑΔΙ(ΟΝ) ΚΕΚΛΗΜΑΙ / ΝΑΟΝ ΗΛ ΕΧΩ / ΚΟΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥ ΑΝΑΚΤΟΣ / ΙΕΡΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΕΩΝ »
« *L'église porte le nom d'Arkadi et elle est consacrée à Saint Constantin* »
- 20 In literature, some facts of before 1866 - when there is a bitter fight with the Turks - on the monastery are given. There should be 1000 very old manuscripts (and other old items?) (writes Franz Wilhelm Sieber). Probably these items are lost or transferred to safe places in Western Europe, for example to Venice. When exactly is unknown, but before August 1744.
- 25 We also do not know when the remains of Constantine and Helena were transferred from Constantinopel to Candia/Crete. It is possible that this happened during the Fourth Crusade in circa 1204, but every other period is possible too. It seems to me that the remains has been in the monastery for centuries. Date: avant 1206. Apporté à cette date, par dom Hugues de Saint-Ghislain, ancien trésorier du palais de
- 30 Constantinople; c'était un don de l'empereur Henri Ier de Flandres. [See also Ghislain]
In any case, when Constantine dies in 337 his remains were transferred to Constantinopel, to the predecessor of the Church of the Holy Apostles. The remains of his mother Helena were undoubtedly reburied with those of her son. In the Vatican
- 35 Museum we can see two porphyry coffins, one belonged to a daughter of Constantine, and one to Helena. But the war-like images on this coffin belonged to a warrior, not to a mother. Combined with this knowledge we can suppose that Constantine's body was in the porphyry coffin, probably with the body of his beloved mother. When centuries later the situation in the town became bad, the remains of Constantine were put in a
- 40 reliquary box and those of Helena in a vase. So they could be shipped to a safer place, and Crete was a good destination, known to the Christians of the Eastern Roman Empire.
Why the banned bishop just visits the monastery of Clairvaux, can be explained because the surrounding churches of the monastery had been filled with many religious
- 45 items from Constantinopel. These were probably given to the churches in Champagne by Jean de Brienne, king of Jerusalem and emperor of Constantinopel.
I want to find further indications that the human remains of Constantine the Great and his mother were indeed present in Moni Arkadi, and then search backwards from 1744.
- 50 The first question is: can we find that bishop (or abbot) mentioned somewhere in the Archivio di Stato di Venezia?
Second: can we trace back the "contents" of Moni Arkadi? Is more known than Sieber mentions?
Third: can be determined when and which art objects were transferred from
- 55 Constantinopel to Crete, and in particular to Moni Arkadi?
Fourth: we know that the (new) monastery building was rebuilt in 1587 by Klimis Hortatsis. Are further details known about the interior of the church and the other buildings? About the church we find: *C'est une basilique à deux nefs, dont la nef septentrionale est consacrée à la Transfiguration du Christ et la nef méridionale à*
- 60 *Saint Constantin et Sainte Hélène*. This suggests that the reliquaries were present in 1587.
Fifth: Dès le XVIe siècle, le monastère fut un lieu de science et d'art, possédant une école et une bibliothèque riche de nombreux livres anciens. Maybe the reliquaries are mentioned somewhere, together with the old books.
- 65 Sixth, shifting to Constantinopel: can we find indications in the Turkish archives of movements of religious items from that capital to Crete or elsewhere in Western Europe? Fact is that many objects - now in museums - have their origin in Constantinopel.

Enclosed as Appendices: texts relating to the questions

Appendix 1a

March 10, 1873 Review of Learned Societies of France and Abroad p. 372 -
ARCHAEOLOGY SECTION. MEETING OF MARCH 10, 1873.

Mr. d'Arbois de Jubainville, a non-resident member, submitted copies of four documents relating to the treasury of Clairvaux Abbey, namely the inventory of the sacristy of Clairvaux in 1405, another from 1504, the 1743 appraisal of the jewels in the abbey's treasury, and the 1744 description of two Byzantine reliquaries from the same treasury, written, at the dictation of a Greek bishop, by Claude Guyton, a monk of Clairvaux. This communication was forwarded to Mr. de Montaiglon.

p. -381- Mr. de Montaiglon verbally proposed the printing, in the *Revue des Sociétés savantes*, of four documents relating to the Clairvaux treasure, copies of which had been sent by Mr. d'Arbois de Jubainville. These interesting documents should be preceded by the explanatory note provided by our colleague.

p. -490- CLAIRVAUX TREASURE. Communication from Mr. d'Arbois de Jubainville. A recent and unexpected event has brought to light in the Aube archives numerous and important documents whose existence was previously unknown. One of the most intriguing parts of these documents concerns the treasure of Clairvaux Abbey. It had probably already disappeared by the time Mr. Guignard, archivist of the Aube department, was writing his memoir on the relics of Saint Bernard and Saint Malachy. We have gathered here four documents:

1. The inventory of the sacristy of Clairvaux in 1405 (document A). Our copy was made from the original, which came from the Harmand collection, now in the archives of the Aube department.

2. The inventory of the sacristy of Clairvaux in 1504 (document B). Our copy was made from an 18th-century copy, also from the 18th century, which was in the possession of Mr. Guignard, who cites it in several passages of his memoir.

3. The appraisal of the jewels in the Clairvaux treasury in 1743 (document C).

4. The description of two Byzantine reliquaries from the same treasury, written in 1744 from the dictation of a Greek bishop by Claude Guyton, a monk of Clairvaux (document D). The last two documents were in their original form in the Harmand collection. Our copies of these two documents, like that of the first, are therefore made from the originals. We have added cross-references to these four documents, either in footnotes or parentheses. This kind of concordance was established using an inventory drawn up by Claude Guyton in 1741. This inventory, preserved in its original form in the Harmand collection, often takes the form of a dissertation and is, in our opinion, too long to be published. As for the description of the Byzantine reliquaries, we have inserted-after the copy of each inscription given by a Cistercian monk under the dictation of the Greek bishop-a transcription in cursive Greek characters.

p. -490- CLAIRVAUX TREASURE.

Communication from Mr. d'Arbois de Jubainville.

A recent and unexpected event has brought to light in the Aube archives numerous and important documents whose existence was previously unknown. One of the most intriguing parts of these documents concerns the treasure of Clairvaux Abbey. It had probably already disappeared by the time Mr. Guignard, archivist of the Aube department, was writing his memoir on the relics of Saint Bernard and Saint Malachy. We have gathered here four documents:

1. The inventory of the sacristy of Clairvaux in 1405 (document A). Our copy was made from the original, which came from the Harmand collection, now in the archives of the Aube department.

2. The inventory of the sacristy of Clairvaux in 1504 (document B). Our copy was made from an 18th-century copy, also from the 18th century, which was in the possession of Mr. Guignard, who cites it in several passages of his memoir.

3. The appraisal of the jewels in the Clairvaux treasury in 1743 (document C).

4. The description of two Byzantine reliquaries from the same treasury, written in 1744 from the dictation of a Greek bishop by Claude Guyton, a monk of Clairvaux (document D).

The last two documents were in their original form in the Harmand collection. Our copies of these two documents, like that of the first, are therefore made from the originals.

H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE.

Non-resident member of the Committee.

1845 and 1846. A new edition of this memoir appeared in 1855 in M. Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, vol. CLXXXV, col. 1661-1798.

[-492-][A 2] Vas sancte Helene, opere greco compositum (piece B, no. 4).

135 [-498-][B 4] Quarto loco est vas argentum, quod proude fecit sancta Helena, de
predicto thesauro sumptum et a domino Henrico imperatore per eundem Hugonem
Claramvallem missum, opere Greco mirabiliter et multum artificiose compositum, in
cujus parte anteriori, sub esmaldis de auro mirabiliter fabrefactis, honorifice
140 condita est portio Dominice crucis, in cruce ex auro mirabiliter fabrefacta, in qua
sunt quatuor lapides praxini et duo alii lapides in sex angulis sex esmaldis miro
opere decorati. In eadem parte anteriori continentur reliquie plures, scilicet de
ferro lancee Domini, de spinis corone Domini, et alie reliquie sub similibus esmaldis
in cellulis collocatae; in parte vero posteriori ejusdem vasis continentur reliquie
sancti Georgii et aliorum plurimorum sanctorum, in cellulis argenteis; et omnes
145 reliquie, que in hoc continental vase, litteris greekis exprimuntur. Sunt autem omnes
reliquie, que in hoc continental vase, quadraginta quator. Continentur etiam in hoc
vase reliquie sancti Minas, archiepiscopi et martyris 1.

1 This shrine, known in the 18th century as the Oratory of Constantine, was kept in the fourth cabinet. (See Exhibit C, No. 14.)

150 p. -503- PIECE C. 1743.
In the year one thousand seven hundred and forty-three, on Monday the twenty-sixth of
August, Mr. Jean-Baptiste Denis Lempereur, jeweler, and Mr. Marin, jeweler-goldsmith,
both residing in Paris, being in the Abbey of Clairvaux out of devotion to Saint
Bernard, its first abbot, to celebrate his feast day which falls on the twentieth of
155 the said month, they were asked to go to the reliquary treasury of the said church of
Clairvaux to give their opinion [-504-] on the names, qualities, and prices of the
precious stones that adorn it, and the following is recorded by copy. [...] [-505-]
14. In the reliquary of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, there is
nothing rich in precious stones or pearls, though they are all fine. The whole may be
160 worth one hundred and fifty pounds. The filigram enclosing the cross is gold (A 2, B
4, D 2). 150 pounds

[-506-] Signed: F. CLAUDE GUYTON, monk of Clairvaux.

ITEM D. 1744.

165 On Wednesday, the fifth day of August 1744, a Greek bishop of Arcadia (a marquis on
the island of Crete or Candia, a monk of Saint Basil, who received the name Nicodemus
in religion, and that of Nicholas at baptism, banished by the heretical Turks for the
faith and cause of Our Lord Jesus Christ) examined our various relics and
reliquaries. Here is how he explained the fourth table².

170 1. All the figures are of Greek origin. In the upper right square of the table is a
cross, with two figures standing on either side; an angel on each side above the
crossbeam. Above Christ's head is written in Greek: scabrosis (sic for stavrosis,
i.e., σταῦρωσις), meaning crucifixion. Above this is IHS XPS; beside the angel on the
right is Michael, beside the angel on the left is Gabriel. In the opposite square is
175 a cross, a Christ figure, two weeping figures, a third holding Jesus Christ by the
middle of his body to take him down from the cross, his right arm detached; on the
other side, a figure is bent low, with his head near the feet of Our Lord, holding a
handkerchief; a ladder resting by its upper end on the cross, with a man on it
detaching Jesus Christ's left arm from the cross. Above, on the right, is an angel: O
Archimichael; On the other side, an angel: O Gabriel; above the head of the crucifix:
180 hiapocaphilossis (sic for hi apocathilosis³, that is, ἡ ἀποκαθήλωσις), id est
incrucifixio (sic for excrucifixio or refixio): vir timoratus [-507-] Joseph de ligno
deponit intemeratum corpus tuum 1; above this inscription, IHS. XPS.
At the bottom of the table and squared to the right is a woman of her height, wearing
a closed crown on her head, behind it the crown of glory, on one side of her head
185 sancta (that is, ἁγία), on the other side Helena (that is, Ἑλένη). In the opposite
square is a man of his height, dressed in long robes, wearing a closed crown on his
head, behind which is the crown of glory, on his left arm like a maniple, on either
side of his head: O agios Constantinus megas (ὁ ἅγιος Κωνσταντῖνος μέγας), id est o
(sic) sanctus Constantinus magnus. The rest is distinguishable and legible without
190 being Greek.

2. The same Greek bishop who saw the reliquary of Constantine the Great ². One
notices there, on one face at the top and between the two door panels, the bust-
length figure of Constantine the Great, who has a closed crown on his head; in his
right hand he holds a long cross; On one side of the head are effigies (i.e., εἰκόν),
195 on the other Constant (Κωνσταντῖ). On the first part of the right-hand panel, Jesus

Christ is detached and taken down from the cross, and one reads in Greek: hiapocaphilosis (ἡ ἀποκαθήλωσις), id est vir timoratus Joseph, etc., ut supra. On the second, below, is the Transfiguration of Our Lord; one reads: metamorphosis tou Xpou (μεταμόρφωσις του Χριστου). On the third, below, is the Dormition and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin; we read hichimissis tis panogies (ἡ κοίμησις της παναγίας), id est assumptio de Sanctissima 3. On the first part of the other leaf is the ascension of Our Lord; we read: hianalipsis (ἡ ἀνάληψις), id est ascencio. On the second, above, is the apparition to the doubting apostle; one reads: ipsilaphissis (ἡ ψηλάφησις), id est apparatio sancto Thome 4. On the third, above, is the resurrection of Our Lord; one reads: hianastasis (ἡ ἀνάστασις), id est resurrectio. Inside the said reliquary, at the top of the right-hand door, is St. Michael (ὁ Μιχαήλ). Above, one reads: O Evangelismos (ὁ εὐαγγελισμός), id est annuntiatio. Below are illyric characters. Below, genicis (γένεσις), id is nativitas Xpisti. At the top and to the right of the bottom of the reliquary, we read: O phios prodromos (ὁ ἅγιος πρόδρομος) 5, id est divus Johannes Baptista (or rather sanctus praecursor); and opposite, in the said bottom of the reliquary, we read: mitir theou (μήτηρ θεοῦ), id est mater Dei. The two flaps, which are below in the interior of said reliquary, are full of [-508-] enamel figures with characters that are said to be illyric. At the top of the other upper door, one reads: hypapanti (ἡ ἀπάντησις), seu occurus Simeonis ad Xpistum 1. Below this are Illyric characters, according to the said Greek bishop. Below that, one reads yvapticis (ἡ βάπτισις), id est baptismus Xpisti. In the middle of the two inner doors, above the crucifix, one reads stabrousis (σταῦρωσις), id est crucifixio. The rest, which is below the inner doors, is not easy to read, because the pieces, for the most part, are placed indirectly in view.

For certified copy: H D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE,
Non-resident Member of the Committee.

2 Side D. Item A, No. 8; Item B, No. 8; pi

Item C no. 9. This reliquary came from the monk Artand, who received it from Louis, Count of Blois, according to the 1741 inventory.

3 Ph for th as below.

1 This phrase, borrowed from the breviary, is a commentary by the monk of Clairvaux, and not a legend inscribed on the monument.

2 Item A, no. 2; item B, no. 4; item C, no. 1.

3 The literal meaning is dormitio.

4 The literal meaning is tactus. It is the verb ψηλαφάω that is used by Saint Luke, XXIV; cf. John, XX, 27.

5 Ph here represents the aspiration sound of the Greek γάμμα.

1 Saint Luke, II, V. 25 ff.

Appendix 1b INTERPRETATION OF THE KNOWN RELIQUARY OF CONSTANTINE

(Treasury, no. 60). Note by Dom Guyton.

September 11, 2017 Result: The Clairvaux Treasure from the 12th to the 18th Century: 1. The same Greek bishop (cf. Appendix XII) who saw the reliquary of Constantine the Great.

On one side (front, exterior doors), at the top and between the two door panels, is the bust-length figure of Constantine the Great, wearing a closed crown; in his right hand he holds a long cross; on one side of his head are the inscriptions "Effigies" (i.e., ΕΙΚΩΝ), and on the other, "Constantine" (ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤ). On the first part of the right-hand panel, Jesus Christ is taken down from the cross, and the Greek text reads: Hiapocaphilosis (Η ΑΠΟΚΑΘΗΛΩΣΙΣ), id est vir timoratus Joseph, etc., ut supra; on the second part, below, is the Dormition and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, and the text reads: Hichimissis tis panogies (Η ΚΟΙΜΗΣΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΝΑΓΙΑΣ), id est assumptio de Sanctissima. On the first part of the other panel is the Ascension of Our Lord; the text reads: Hianalipsis (Η ΑΝΑΛΗΨΙΣ), id est ascencio; On the second, it is the apparition to the doubting apostle, we read: Ipsilaphissis (Η ΨΗΛΑΦΗΣΙΣ), id est apparitio sancto Thome (or rather tactus). On the third, above, is the resurrection of Our Lord, we read: Hianastassis (Η ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΙΣ), id est resurrectio. Inside the said reliquary, at the top of the right-hand door, O Michael (ΜΙΧΑΗΛ). Below, we read: O Evangelismos (Ο ΕΥ'ΑΓΓΕΛΙΣΜΟΣ), id est annuntiatio. Below that are illyric characters. Below, Genicis (ΓΕΝΕΚΙΣ), id is nativitas Xpisti. At the top and to the right of the bottom of the reliquary, we read: O phios prodromos (Ο ΘΕΙΟΣ ΠΡΟΔΡΟΜΟΣ), id est divus Johannes Baptista (or rather divus praecursor); and opposite, in the said bottom of the reliquary, we read: Mitir Theou (ΜΗΤΗΡ ΘΕΟΥ), id est Mater Dei.

260 The two battans, which are below in the interior of said reliquary, are full of enamel figures with characters that are said to be illyric. At the top of the other upper door panel, one reads: Hypapanti (H APANTHCIC), seu occursus Simeonis ad Xpistum. Below this are Illyric characters, according to the said Greek bishop. Below that, one reads Yvapticis (H BAPTICIC), id est baptismus Xpisti. In the middle of the two inner doors, above the crucifix, one reads Stabrousis (STAYYPQCICIC), id est crucifixio. The rest, which is below the inner doors, is not easy to read, because

265 the pieces, for the most part, are placed indirectly in view, (Aube Archives, copy. This piece was previously printed by M. d'Arbois de Jubainville in the Revue des Sociétés savantes des départements, 5th Series, vol. V, p. 507.)

2. Sheet for the other exterior and rear face of the reliquary of Emperor Constantine. In the middle of the two doors at the top, a figure of a prince; around it is written: O Constantios (O KQNCTANTIOC). On the first door on the right, there is a Descent from the Cross, known in Greek as: Apocloelosis (APOKAΘHQCIC, the act of unnailing); below, a Transfiguration expressed by the letters IC XC H METAMOPNCIC; below, the Deposition of Our Lord into the Sepulchre expressed by the letters IC XC H KOIMECIC, Jesus Christ lying down, the Virgin Mary surrounded by thirteen apostles,

275 angels, and an apostle holding a censer. At the top of the other door is the Ascension, expressed by the words H ANELEPIC; below it is depicted St. Thomas touching the side of the North with the inscription H ΨHΛAΦHCIC, id est tactio; then below that, the Resurrection, expressed by the words H ANACTACIC, id est resurrectio. (We left it at this point on May 20, 1742.)

280 The images of the Coronation, which have been described, follow (Trésor, no. 60, p. 41). Above the first figure, to the right outside the door of the first gate of the said reliquary, is written Nicephoros (NIKEΦOPOC); below this figure is another with the inscription, above, Agios Theodotos (AGIOC ΘEOΔOTOC). On the other door leaf, to the left outside, above the large figure near the opening, is written Menas (MHNAC);

285 below it, another figure with the inscription Polieuctes (ΠΟΛΙΕΥΚΤΗC). Inside the door leaf, to the right, is written above a figure Agios Eustakios (ΑΓΙΟC ΕΥCΤΑΧΙΟC); and on the figure below, Agios Alexandros (ΑΓΙΟC ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC). Inside the door leaf on the left: a figure with the inscription Hiagapea (H AΓAΠIA). Four small figures follow on the small inner door, to the right and above. The first at the top is titled Agios Babulas (ΑΓΙΟC ΒΑΒΥΛΑC); below Agios Heliodoros (ΑΓΙΟC ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟC); below repeat of the previous one; below E agia Barbara (H AΓIA BAPBAPA). Opposite these four figures, on the small interior door to the left and above, are four figures. Above the first Agios Dionusios (ΑΓΙΟC ΔΙΟΝΥCΙΟC); above the second Agios Anthimos (ΑΓΙΟC ΑΝΘΙΜΟC); above the third Agios Abdenomakos; above the fourth Agios

295 Gregorotheolo[go]s (ΑΓΙΟC ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟC ΘΕΟΛΟΓΟC). On the small door, inside the second right-hand leaf below, is, above the first figure, Agios Leontios (ΑΓΙΟC ΛΕΟΝΤΙΟC); above the second, Agios Akimaunos; above the third, Agios Pantalemon (ΠΑΝΤΑΛΕΗΜΩΝ); and above the fourth, Agios Kuros (ΑΓΙΟC ΚΥΡΟC).

300 On the small door, inside the second left-hand leaf, and below, are four figures: on the first is written Agios Athanasios (ΑΓΙΟC ΑΘΑΝΑCΙΟC); on the second, Agios Autonomos (ΑΓΙΟC ΑΥΤΟΝΟΜΟC); on the third, Agios Longinos (ΑΓΙΟC ΛΟΓΓΙΝΟC); and on the fourth, Agia Aglae (H AΓIA AΓΓAIA). Next and opposite, on the same leaf inside, on the first Agios Demetrios (ΑΓΙΟC ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟC); below Agios Mercurios (ΑΓΙΟC ΜΕΡΚΥΡΙΟC).

305 Small bottom cap. Above the first figure Agios Iô (ΑΓΙΟC ΙΩΑΝΝΗC) sanctus Johannes; above the second Agios Eugenios (ΑΓΙΟC ΕΥΓΕΝΙΟC); above the third Agios Eustrathios (ΑΓΙΟC ΕΥCΤΡΑΘΙΟC); above the fourth Agios Orestes (ΑΓΙΟC ΟΡΕCΤΗC). The first coin on the back panel, which is the largest, bears the inscription: Tou agiou Gregoriou Nusses... (ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΥ ΝΥCΧΗC)... (Treasury, no. 60, p. 43.)

310 Note in Dom Guyton's handwriting. Regarding the reliquary known as that of Saint Helena, also called that of Constantine, or the portable altar of Constantine the Great, we should recall that Nicephorus (Book VII, Chapter 6) and Sozomen (Book I, Chapter 8), in their Ecclesiastical History, attest that the great Emperor Constantine never undertook a military expedition without having a portable altar on

315 which to celebrate the divine sacrifice for himself and his people: in quo Deum landare, orareque, ac mysteriis participare possent.

The monks of the abbey of Saint Sauveur, outside the city of Liège, have two portable altars. One of porphyry, only a foot or so long and half a foot wide, decorated with a gilded bronze border on which we read these words: Anno Dominice Incarnationis

320 M.L.XI, indict. XIV, IV idus augusti, dedicatum est hoc altare in honore Domini nostri J.-C. et sancte Crucis et B. M. semper virginis et S. Johannis Bapt. and Omn. Apostolor., et martyrum Laurentii, Pancratii, Georgii et XI mil. Virgin. and Omn. SS. cooperante Lamberto II hujus loci abbate. Memoria dni Hillini, prepositi, et majorum

ejus. Around this altar the twelve apostles are represented in ivory.

- 325 The other altar is made of a green stone only two inches long and three inches wide. The rest is covered with a bronze plate, on which is engraved this inscription: Anno ab Incarnatione Domini M.C.XXX.VII, indict. V, consecratum est hoc altare in honore S. et I. Trinitatis et sce Crucis et sancte Marie Virginis et sci Laurentii, mart., et Omn. SS. a domino Rodulpho, episcopo Leodiensium, XV kal. marcii.
- 330 Hic datur ipse Jesus animarum potus et esus
Hec tibi sit cara, cui caro fit, crucis ara.

This altar is adorned with several precious stones. At the four corners are depicted the four Evangelists; and above it is an ivory crucifix, attached to the cross with four nails.

- 335 In the city of Paderborn, in the cathedral church, there is an ancient portable altar, on which Mass was said for sick canons. It is a silver chest filled with holy relics, in the center of which is a precious stone. It is taken to the canons when they are ill, and they themselves bring it back to the church when they are cured. [On portable altars (altaria gestatoria, viatica, itineraria, portatilia), see the special treatise by Gattico, De altari portatili. – Catalani, Commentar. in Pontific. Roman., Part II, Title V, de altar. portatili. consecratione. Philip, Count of Flanders, gave two portable altars to Clairvaux (Appendix XIX).] Among the objects from the treasury of Saint-Urbain of Troyes deposited in the collegiate church of Saint-Etienne in 1277 was a portable altar (Archiv. Aube, Saint-Urbain, cart. 1).
- 340

- 345 Appendix 1c

2. Reliquary of Saint Helena/Oratory of Constantine

Relics: Forty-four relics, including fragments of the spearhead ("half a nail, from which the spearhead was nailed"), thorns from the Crown of Thorns, and wood from the True Cross. The relics of saints are identified by inscriptions and bust or full-length portraits of the corresponding saints.

- 350 Reliquary: "Vase of Saint Helena," "Shield or Oratory of Constantine."
Date: before 1206. Brought there at that time by Dom Hugues de Saint-Ghislain, former treasurer of the palace from Constantinople; it was a gift from Emperor Henry I of Flander
- 355 Dimensions: H.=1 foot (0.32 m); W.=9 inches (0.24 m); Thickness = 2 inches, 9 lines (0.07 m)
Attestations: mentioned in the inventories of 1405, 1504, 1640, 1741, 1771 and in documents from 1517, 1743, and 1744.

See https://archive.org/stream/letresordeclairv00lalo/letresordeclairv00lalo_djvu.txt
360 https://www.persee.fr/doc/bec_0373-6237_1902_num_63_1_448120#
https://www.persee.fr/doc/ccmed_0007-9731_2003_num_46_184_2865
https://www.persee.fr/doc/bulmo_0007-473x_1973_num_131_2_5229
CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF TEXTS AND DOCUMENTS PUBLISHED IN VOLUMES 123 TO 147 OF THE LIBRARY OF THE SCHOOL OF CHARTES

- 365 Appendix 2

May 1, 2017 Story of Μονή Αρκαδίου/Moní Arkadhíou

« ΑΡΚΑΔΙ(ΟΝ) ΚΕΚΛΗΜΑΙ / ΝΑΟΝ ΗΛ ΕΧΩ / ΚΟΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥ ΑΝΑΚΤΟΣ / ΙΣΑΠΟΣΤΟΥΛΟΥ »

"The church is named after Arkadi and is dedicated to Saint Constantine."

- 370 The Arkadi Monastery (Greek: Μονή Αρκαδίου/Moní Arkadhíou) is an Orthodox monastery located on a fertile plateau 23 km southeast of Rethymnon, on the island of Crete (Greece).

The current church dates from the 16th century and shows the influence of the Renaissance, as the island was under Venetian rule at that time. This influence is visible in the architecture, which blends Romanesque and Baroque elements. This two-aisled church was destroyed by the Turks in 1866 and has since been rebuilt. From the 16th century onwards, the monastery was a center of learning and art, boasting a school and a library rich in ancient books. Surrounded by thick, high walls and situated on a difficult-to-access plateau, the monastery was a veritable fortress. Arkadi was an active center and one of the strongholds of resistance against the Ottoman occupation, which contributed to its renown. During the Cretan Revolt of 1866, 943 Greeks found refuge there: resistance fighters, and a majority of women and children. After three days of fighting, and on the orders of the monastery's abbot, Gabriel, the Cretans detonated the gunpowder barrels, preferring to sacrifice themselves rather than surrender. All but about a hundred died in the assault. Some 1,500 Turks and Egyptians also perished in the battle. The monastery is now a national shrine in honor of the Cretan resistance. November 8th is now a day of commemorative celebrations in Arkadi and Rethymno. The explosion did not end the

375

380

385

Cretan uprising, but it did draw Europe's attention to this people fighting for their independence.

390 The Arkadi Monastery is located in the Rethymno prefecture, about 25 km southeast of Rethymno. The monastery occupies a roughly rectangular plateau, approximately 6.5 km on each side, situated on the northwest slope of Mount Psiloritis, at an altitude of about 500 meters. The Arkadi region is fertile, with numerous vineyards, olive groves, and forests of pine, oak, and cypress trees. The plateau on which Arkadi sits is surrounded by hills that overlook it. The western edge of the plateau ends abruptly, giving way to a gorge. These gorges begin at a place called Tabakaria (tanneries) and end in the Stavromenos region on the coast, east of Rethymnon. The Arkadi Gorge boasts a rich diversity of endemic wild plants and flowers.

400 The area where the monastery is located has been inhabited since antiquity. The presence of Mount Psiloritis, a sacred mountain chosen, according to legend, as the site where Zeus was raised, encouraged human settlement. Thus, five km to the northeast, the city of Eleftherna reached its peak during the time of Homer and the Classical and Roman periods, but its influence was felt throughout the Early Christian and Byzantine eras.

405 The nearest village to the monastery is Amnatos, about three km to the north. The villages surrounding Arkadi are rich in Byzantine remains, attesting to the region's prosperity. Thus, the Moni Arseniou monastery, a few kilometers north of Arkadi, is also among the great monasteries of Crete.

410 The monastery is shaped like an almost rectangular parallelogram, covering a total area of 5,200 square meters. The enclosure resembles a fortress, extending 78.50 meters to the north, 73.50 meters to the south, 71.80 meters to the east, and 67 meters to the west.

415 The exact date of the monastery's founding is not known with certainty. According to tradition, the monastery's foundations were laid either by the Byzantine emperor Heraclius or by the emperor Arcadius as early as the 5th century. According to this second version, the monastery takes its name from the emperor. The presence of numerous monasteries in Crete bearing the name of the monk who founded the building is very common. This hypothesis, therefore, now prevails: that a monk named Arkadios founded the building.

420 According to Joseph Pitton de Tournefort, the monastery is built on the site of an ancient city, Arcadia, whose legend was believed that after its destruction, all the springs and fountains in the surrounding area would not flow again until after the founding of a new city. However, as early as 1837, Robert Pashley demonstrated the impossibility of the monastery having been built on the ruins of any city. This is the version that prevails today.

425 The oldest evidence of the monastery's existence dates back to the 14th century. In 1951, Professor K.D. Kalokyris published a 14th-century inscription that supports the hypothesis that a monastery dedicated to Saint Constantine existed at that time. This inscription reads:

430 "The church is called Arkadi and is dedicated to Saint Constantine."

It must have been located on the pediment of a church older than the one we see today, or perhaps above the monastery's entrance gate.

435 It is a two-aisled basilica, the northern aisle dedicated to the Transfiguration of Christ and the southern aisle to Saint Constantine and Saint Helena. It stands in the center and slightly south of the monastery. According to the inscription engraved on the bell tower's facade, the church was founded in 1587 by Klimis Hortatsis. The building's architecture is marked by a strong Renaissance influence, which is explained by the fact that the church's foundation dates back to the time when Crete was a colony of the Republic of Venice.

440 In the lower part of the church's facade, built of regular square blocks of masonry, the main element consists of four pairs of columns with Corinthian capitals. Although their capitals show classical influence, the columns themselves, set on high bases, are Gothic in origin. Between each pair of columns is a semicircular arch. The two arches at the ends of the façade each contain a door and a circular opening, adorned with palmettes around the perimeter. The central arch of the façade contains only a decorative portico.

450 In the upper part of the façade, above the columns, a series of moldings and elliptical openings, also decorated with palmettes, can be seen. At the center of this upper section stands the bell tower, and at each end are Gothic-inspired obelisks. Comparisons of the monastery's façade with the works of the Italian architects Sebastiano Serlio and Andrea Palladio suggest that the church's architect was likely inspired by them.

455 In 1645, the church was first damaged by looters who destroyed the altar. When the monastery was captured by the Turks in 1866, it was burned, and the altar and icons were completely destroyed. Only a cross, two wooden angels, and a fragment of the

Resurrection of Christ were saved from the flames. The church's apses were also destroyed.

The current iconostasis, made of cypress wood, was erected in 1902. From 1924 to 1927, at the initiative of Metropolitan Timotheos Veneris, consolidation and restoration work was undertaken on the apses and the bell tower. The interior flagstones were then replaced in 1933.

Towards the end of the 16th century, a period of intense cultural and artistic creation on the island, the monastery underwent restorations and transformations. The owners were Klimis and Vissarion Hortatsis, likely from the Hortatsis family of Rethymnon, whose name is associated with the Cretan Renaissance, including Georgios Hortatsis, author of *Erophile*. The abbot of the monastery at that time was Klimis Hortatsis. In 1573, he transformed the monastery into a cenobitic monastery. Thus, the building's facade would date from 1586. The two-aisled church, as it can be seen today, dates from this period. An inscription at the base of the bell tower dates it back to 1587, when Klimis Hortatsis was the abbot of the monastery. This inscription reads:

"ΑΦ ΚΑΜΧΤΖ ΠΖ"

or: "15 Klimis Hortatsis 87".

The construction of this church is said to have lasted twenty-five years, and it can therefore be assumed that the foundation stone was laid in 1562. Abbot Klimis Hortatsis, who initiated this work, probably died shortly after its completion and does not appear to have lived until the inauguration of the new church. Research has uncovered a letter from the Patriarch of Alexandria, Meletios Pigas, stating that the inauguration ceremony was to be entrusted to Klimis' successor, Abbot Mitrofanis Tsyrigos. While the letter is undated, it can be placed between 1590, the year Meletios Pigas was ordained patriarch, and 1596, when Abbot Nicephorus succeeded Tsyrigos.

During the tenure of the first three abbots, and until the beginning of the 17th century, Arkadi Monastery experienced significant growth, both economically and culturally. The monastery became a major center for copying manuscripts, most of which were produced by the Archbishop of Niccolò.

These manuscripts were lost during the building's destruction by the Ottomans in 1866, but some are now in libraries abroad. The monastery was expanded with the construction of stables in 1610 and the refectory in 1670.

In 1645, the Ottoman conquest of the island began. By the spring of 1648, they had taken control of most of the island, with the exception of Candia (Heraklion), Gramvousa, Spinalonga, and Souda, which remained under Venetian rule.

After the capture of Rethymno in 1648, the Ottomans gradually occupied the hinterland and looted the monastery. The monks and Abbot Simeon Halkiopoulos then sought refuge at the Vrontisi Monastery. They were allowed to return after swearing allegiance to Hussein Pasha. The latter also granted them the right to ring the bell. Arkadi Monastery then became the Çanlı Manastir (Monastery where the bell is rung in Turkish). A firman authorized destroyed monasteries to be rebuilt according to their original plans, without additions or changes. Arkadi took advantage of this firman but seems to have overstepped its bounds by adding new buildings.

During the Ottoman period, the monastery continued to prosper, as evidenced by the writings of Joseph Pitton de Tournefort. According to the traveler, the monastery was the most beautiful and wealthiest in Crete. He counted 100 monks living in the monastery and another 200 living in the surrounding countryside. The monastery's territory extended north to the Cretan Sea, west to Rethymno, and south to the summit of Mount Ida. These lands allowed the monastery to live off the land. Thus, Tournefort speaks of "400 measures of oil" produced each year, a figure that could be double if the monastery didn't let its fruit go to waste due to a lack of manpower.

Tournefort also praises the monastery's cellar, which contains at least 200 barrels, the best of which bear the name of the abbot who blesses them each year with a prayer specifically prepared for this purpose. The wine made at Arkadi is apparently renowned. This wine, called Malvasia, named after a village near Heraklion, and for which Crete was famous during the Venetian era, also came from the monastery's vineyards. Franz Wilhelm Sieber, during his visit to the monastery, also mentions the abbot's cellar and the production of wine from excellent grapes grown at high altitude, but specifies that Malvasia production was no longer in use. Instead, the monastery was then producing corn.

At the beginning of the 19th century, the monastery seems to have experienced a decline. Sieber, who stopped there nearly a century after Tournefort and Pococke, did not offer such a glowing description as his predecessors. According to the German, the monastery housed only eight priests and twelve monks. Fieldwork continued to be carried out regularly, but the monastery was said to be in debt. He mentions the abbot who, to settle his debts, often had to travel to Rethymnon.

- 525 Sieber describes the building's library, boasting over 1,000 volumes, including religious texts as well as works by Pindar, Petrarch, Virgil, Dante, Homer, Strabo, Thucydides, and Diodorus. But the traveler emphasizes the sorry state of these books, judging that he had "never seen such damaged books," and he is unable to distinguish the works of Aristophanes from those of Euripides.
- 530 In 1822, a group of Turkish soldiers led by a man named Getimalis seized and looted Arkadi. The inhabitants of Amari managed to devise a plan to retake the monastery and exterminated Getimalis and his men.
- 535 Another version recounts that a man named Anthony Melidonos, a Sphakiote living in Asia Minor, returned to the island at the head of Greek volunteers from Asia Minor to support the Cretan effort during the Greek War of Independence. With a force of 700 men, he set out to cross the island from west to east. Learning of the monastery's looting, he went there. He arrived at night and, climbing onto the rooftops, poured flammable materials into the building and set it ablaze. He then attacked Getimalis, who was drinking, grabbed him, and threw him to the ground outside the room. He was about to kill him when Getimalis swore he was ready to convert to Christianity. The
- 540 baptism took place immediately, and the new convert was released.
- 545 Although this event must have dealt a blow to the monastery's development, Turkish and Greek documents mention the monastery's ability to provide food for the local inhabitants and to shelter fugitives pursued by the Turkish authorities. The monastery offered classes to the local Christian population. From 1833 to 1840, it was able to contribute 700 Turkish piastres to the region's schools.
- 550 Although Crete rose up against the Ottoman occupiers during the Greek War of Independence, the London Protocol of 1830 did not allow the island to become part of the new Greek state.
- 555 On March 30, 1856, the Treaty of Paris compelled the Sultan to implement the Hatti-Houmayoun, that is, civil and religious equality between Christians and Muslims. The Ottoman authorities in Crete, however, were reluctant. Faced with the large number of Muslim conversions (mostly former Christians who had converted to Islam and were therefore considered relapsed), the Empire attempted to curtail freedom of conscience. The imposition of new taxes and a curfew further fueled discontent. In April 1858, 5,000 Cretans gathered in Butsounaria. Finally, an imperial decree of July 7, 1858, guaranteed them privileges in religious, judicial, and fiscal matters. The 1866 revolt seized upon the opening created by the Hatti-Houmayoun.
- 560 A second cause of the 1866 uprising was Ismail Pasha's intervention in an internal dispute concerning the organization of Cretan monasteries. Since 1862, various laymen had been advocating that the monasteries' assets be placed under the control of the council of elders, with the aim of establishing schools, but they met with opposition from the bishops. Ismail Pasha intervened in this internal Christian dispute by appointing those responsible for debating the issue, annulling the election of "undesirable" members, and arresting and imprisoning the members of the committee
- 565 tasked with traveling to Constantinople to discuss the matter with the Patriarch. This intervention provoked violent reactions among the Christian population of Crete. In the spring of 1866, meetings were held in various villages. On May 14, an assembly was held at the Aghia Kyriaki Monastery in Boutsounaria, near Chania, and drafted a petition which it sent to the Sultan as well as to the consuls of the major powers present in Chania. During the first gatherings of revolutionary committees in the spring of 1866, representatives were elected by province. The representative for the Rethymno region was the abbot of Arkadi, Gabriel Marinakis.
- 570 Upon hearing of these appointments, Ismail Pasha sent a message to the abbot through the Bishop of Rethymno, Kallinikos Nikoletakis. The letter demanded that the abbot dissolve the Arkadi revolutionary assembly or face the destruction of the monastery by Ottoman troops. In July 1866, Ismail sent his army to capture the insurgents, but the committee members fled before the Ottomans arrived. The Turks left after destroying the icons and sacred objects found in the monastery.
- 575 In September, Ismail Pasha sent the abbot a new threat of destroying the monastery if the congregation did not surrender. The decision was made to establish a defense system for the monastery. On September 24, Panos Koronaios arrived in Crete and landed in Bali. He went to Arkadi, where he was appointed commander-in-chief of the revolt for the Rethymnon region. A career soldier, Koronaios believed the monastery was not meant to be a stronghold. However, the abbot and the monks held the opposite
- 580 view. Koronaios eventually yielded to the abbot's opinion. Nevertheless, Koronaios advised destroying the stable so that the building could not be used by the Turks, a request that was also ignored. After appointing a certain Ioannis Dimakopoulos as commander of the monastery's garrison, Koronaios departed. Upon his departure, many local inhabitants, particularly women and children, sought refuge at the monastery,
- 585 some bringing their valuables with them in the hope of protecting them from the
- 590

Turks. Thus, by November 7, 1866, the monastery sheltered 964 people: 325 men, 259 of whom were armed, and the remainder women and children.

Appendix 3

Nicholas Mesarites, Ekphrasis on the Church of the Holy Apostles

595 THE MAUSOLEUM OF CONSTANTINE AND THE TOMBS OF THE EMPERORS

XXXIX. But let us, if you please, go off to this church which lies toward the east, so that we may look at the things in it, in order to admire and describe them - this church whose founder our discourse has already declared to be Constantius.

600 2. This whole church is domical and circular, and because of the rather extensive area of the plan, I suppose, it is divided up on all sides by numerous stoaed angles, for it was built for the reception of his father's body and of his own and of the bodies of those who should rule after them.

3. To the east, then, and in first place the body of Constantine, who first ruled the Christian Empire, is laid to rest within this purple-hued sarcophagus as though on
605 some purple-blooming royal couch - he who was, after the twelve disciples, the thirteenth herald of the orthodox faith, and likewise the founder of this imperial city.

4. The sarcophagus has a four-sided shape, somewhat oblong but not with equal sides. The tradition is that Helen, his mother and his fellow-worker for the orthodox faith,
610 is buried with her son.

5. The tomb toward the south is that of the famous Constantius, the founder of the Church. This too is of porphyry color but not in all respects similar to the tomb of his father, just as he who lies within it was not in all ways similar to his father, but was inferior to his father, and followed behind him, in piety and in mental
615 endowment.

6. The tomb toward the north and opposite this, and similar to those which have been mentioned, holds the body of Theodosius the Great like an inexhaustible treasure of noble deeds.

7. The one toward the east, closest to this one, is that of Pulcheria. She is the honored and celebrated founder of the monastery of the Hodegon; see how she, a virgin herself, holds in her hands the likeness of the all holy Virgin.

8. This tomb holds the dust of him who was an emperor among wise men and a wise man among emperors [=Leo VI, "the Wise", 886-912]. This is the tomb of the Empress
625 Theophano [d. 893], the worthy and venerable, whose memory is everlasting, whose husband was the Wise Emperor, the truly wise Empress, who lived a praiseworthy life; "for the first wisdom is a praiseworthy life" as the holy writings say.

9. This is the tomb of Constantine, the first emperor born in the purple, whose name is great in righteous judgment...

10. This is the tomb of Basil [I, 867-86] the Macedonian, who by most divine
630 providence was raised from a lowly walk of life to the eminence of the imperial position - he who, they say, removed a quantity of the decoration from the church of the heralds of God and transferred it to the sacred house which he himself built in the name of the chief marshal of the powers on high, the church whose title is the Nea.

11. This is the tomb of Nikephoros [I, 863-9] Phokas a most brave and warlike and prudent man, who lost his life by treachery. The tomb in the inner part of the Church contains Constantine [VIII, 1025-8], born to the purple, the brother of the great emperor who is known as [Basil II, 976-1025] the Bulgar-slayer.

12. This is the Constantine who built this Church in the form in which it is now to
640 be seen, as various people have told.

THE MAUSOLEUM OF JUSTINIAN AND THE TOMBS OF THE EMPERORS

XL. Let us go on a little, if it seems good to you, o spectator, to another building, which is called a heroon, and is named by some a place of mourning because there are
645 buried in it the emperors, who are, one might say, heroes.

2. You see another building with five stoas like that pool at the Sheep Gate of Solomon; for here too there lies a great multitude of those who have lost their vigor because of the weakness to which every man is subject through sin.

3. But these men too will spring up at the coming of the angel, when he sounds the trumpet to all the world at the second coming of the Lord, and they will stand before
650 the impartial judge of all, the Savior Christ.

4. This tomb at the east is that of Justinian [I, 527-65], whose name is great and celebrated for just judgment and observance of the law, who is the founder of the great shrine of the Wisdom of the Word of God. His name will be celebrated from generation to generation as the doer of the most mighty deeds, as the supreme ruler,
655 who cast down great princes who had subjected the whole world to the power of their might.

5. The tomb close to this and toward the north is that of Justin [II, 565-78], the

grandson of Justinian, a man celebrated for his justice and greatly renowned for his piety, who also built what was lacking in the great shrine of the Wisdom of the Word of God, and completed it and resettled the dome, which had fallen, and skilfully raised it.

660 6. The tomb toward the south is that of his consort Sophia, a devout and seemly woman, really wise and truly fearing the Lord; for the beginning and end of wisdom is the fear of the Lord, as the holy writing says."

665 7. This is the tomb of Heraclius [610-41] whose fame is wide and resounding in Persia and the lands about it. He performed many labors, surpassing, as one might say, those labors of Heracles; and before performing these he put off his imperial robe and as he set out on his campaign, put on black-hued boots, and then returned when he had turned them red, dyeing them in the blood of the barbarians.

670 8. This green sarcophagus is that of Theophilus [829-42], who belched forth the venom of impiety against the holy images and poured it over those who venerated them.

9. Whether, indeed, as the story is, he was saved by the remarkable assistance and zeal of the orthodox Theodora, his wife, through the restoration and veneration once more, at her behest, of the holy and divine images, I myself cannot say certainly;

675 but let him speak who was tattooed by him - and is known to this day as the Graptos - on account of his veneration of the august images - he who is himself inscribed in the Book of Life.

10. This tomb of Sardian stone belongs to Theodora [wife of Justinian I] the prudent empress, whose work this celebrated and admired church of the heralds of God is. And concerning the others, why should we care, since their memories are buried with them in their tombs?

680

See: Constantinople, recueil d'études, d'archéologie et d'histoire. Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople
mpedani@unive.it [Maria Pia Pedani]
 685 antonio.fabris@gmail.com [Toni Fabris]
r.m.speelman@uu.nl [Raniero Speelman]
info@arkadimonastery.gr

The "Cross of Constantine", which, like and at the same time

as the previous one, ended up in the treasury of St. Peter's Church in Rome, is placed in a triptych, which measures 10 by 7.5 cm when the doors are closed. For this description, the data are also taken from those of Dr. Hoogewerff and from Flament's above-mentioned article, in which a (deviating) drawing of it from the H. S. van Gulpen is shown on plate III.

690 The cross is placed against a flat background; this almost equal-armed cross probably consists of particles of the Holy Cross; it is surrounded by a "border in cassette enamel; with a pattern of red, white and blue". In each corner of the arms there is a large pearl; outside the end of the arms a disk of enamel: "white letters on blue, within a red border". The inscriptions read:

695

OPA TI / KAI NO / N ΘAY /
 MA - KAI Z / ENHN/ XAPI / N- XPYC / ON ME/ NEZω -
 XPIC / TON EN / ΔECKO / πEI.

700

Above the upper inscription are two pearls and a light purple agate. On the lower left, on the flat background, the figure 1) of the emperor is placed in relief and next to it, like poles, (O K) ωNCT / ANT.

705 On the door on the right, in relief, the golden figures of Mary, MP ΘY; next to it that of O ΠANTEΛEHΩN; below that of O TIMΩN. On the wing on the left, according to the notes of Dr. Hoogewerff, there are the raised figures of O ΔEMHTRHOC and below O MATΘAIOC; next to it above IC and XC, and below O BAPNABAC. The left door cannot be opened completely, because the awkwardly placed cloud of the modern pedestal is in the way. When the doors are closed, the upper and lower edges of pearls with a purple agate in the middle, a purple agate on the left and right remain visible; the outside of the doors is decorated with stones, namely: a green one on the top left, a purple-red one in the middle and a purple one below; on the right: two purple ones, and a green one below; in the heart a pale purple stone. Some of the pearls have been renewed.

710

715 The busy back of the cabinet, provided with scale and leaf ornamentation, is of chased gold and contains an equal-armed cross in the middle and six medallions within a pearl border; four of them are next to the arms and two in the upper corners; the latter bear the monograms IC and XC. The other four are covered by a rosette, according to fig. 531, the bottom one by a seal.

720 According to van Gulpen's drawing, (the back of) the jewel contained the following inscriptions, which were also noted down by Dr. Hoogewerff:

O KAI / TETey / KEN EK

ΠΡΟΘ / ΥΜΟΥ / ΚΑΡΙ / ΑC ΙΩΑΝ / ΝΗC Α / ΥΤΡΩ / CΙΝ

ΑΙΤΩ / Ν CΦΑ / ΑΜΑΤ / ΩΝ.

725

730

We now know the maker from the inscription, because the inscription means that a certain Joannes, in order to obtain forgiveness of his sins, cheerfully made (this cross). This inscription cannot be seen in the fig. with Lipinsky's article and the author only mentions the previous one. He ends his article with: "We are inclined to assume the fifth or sixth century as the date. And presumably the shrine belonged to Justinian and not to Constantine, whose taste was less refined".

See <https://www.delpher.nl/nl/boeken/view?identificator=MMKB06:000008521:00117>

X. The cross of Constantine in the treasury of St. Peter in Rome.

735

In the church treasury of the Chapter of St. Peter in Rome there is a very precious relic of the Holy Cross, although of small dimensions in the form of a pectoral cross, but of a barbaric splendor and excessive wealth. This cross is said to be the pectoral cross of Emperor Constantine.

740

It found its first describer in Dr. BOCK, who published a work of large dimensions in 1864: *Die kleinodiën des hl. röm. Reichs Deutscher Nation*". Bock assumed that this cross was used at the liturgical coronation of the German emperors in the Middle Ages. This remains an assumption, which however became a reason for Bock to describe the cross of Constantine in detail on fol. 115-117. Figure 28 of Table XX in the work in question gives a coloured drawing of the relic. On fol. 116 an uncoloured image of the back is included.

745

In 1893 the pectoral cross of Constantine was described by DE WAAL in his article "Die antiken Reliquiare der Peterskirche". A photographic image of the piece is given in Table XVIII. 167) The visit of the Russian Grand Duke Sergius had given rise to the creation of that study. In 1894 DE WAAL published a dissertation on the same subject, in which the cross of Constantine was treated in the same way. 168)

750

Better informed about the possibility that this jewel had been used at the imperial coronations in Rome, Dr. BOCK described in 1896 the cross of Constantine again in "Die Byzantinischen Zellschmelze der Sammlung Svenigorodskoi". 169) A final describer found this cross in ANGELO LEPINSKY, who in July 1933 in the *Illustratione Vaticana*, an article wrote: "Old goldsmithing in the church treasury of St. Peter". The Dutch edition 170) gave the text of this article with some improvements, for the iconographic description of less importance. 171) Three very good photo reproductions illustrate the article by Lepinsky.

760

When in 1913 the great Staurotheca was photographed for the Dutch Historical Institute in Rome with special permission of the Pope, three photographs were also taken of the smaller cross, which we reproduce here as fig. 16, 17 and 18. In May 1936 we were able to admire this pectoral cross from close by. The reliquary, also called "encolpium Constantini magni", consists of two parts: the actual pectoral cross, and the cabinet in which the cross is kept suspended as a relic. This cabinet can be opened as a triptych with two hinged doors. It is made entirely of gold, according to Bock and Lepinsky. De Waal wrongly thought it was made of gilded silver. When closed, the small shrine measures 12 cm high and 8 cm wide. The edge at the top and bottom is set with a row of pearls and pearls, placed on the wing doors, form a third row. Each row consists of ten pearls with a large gemstone at the corners and in the middle. The pearls are of unequal size and irregular shape. On the doors at the height of the hinges, another gemstone is placed in the four corners. The front shows thirteen gemstones and thirty pearls in its entirety. The pearls are attached by means of a gold thread. Two of them, in the bottom row, are split. The four surfaces of the doors are bare, but bear the traces of a lost decoration. Probably gold plates with relief decorations were attached to it, as we will see on the inside.

775

780

785

On top of the edge is a wide gold ring with a large opening, so that the box could be worn around the neck with a chain or cord passed through it. This need not be surprising, since it is known with what stiff splendor of robes and jewelry the Basileus used to be hung. Lepinsky says that a large ruby was set on the gold pendant in 1929, as can be seen in his photo. 172) The photo with the article by De Waal from 1893 also showed a stone, of a different shape, most resembling a gemstone placed in a gold setting. 173) This ornament is no longer there. According to the photo from 1913, the gemstone had already disappeared by then. 174) The drawing by Dr. Bock in 1864 showed nothing at that location. We must therefore assume that between the years 1864 (actually 1862, since Bock had the drawings made in that year for his work published in 1864) and 1893 a stone was placed on the support ring that had disappeared in 1913 and was replaced in 1933 by another stone, which according to Lepinsky was placed there in 1929, but had disappeared again in 1936!

790 In 1864 the pearls were still intact according to the drawing by Dr. Bock, and there is no mention of damaged pearls in his description either. The photo by De Waal 175) shows that in the lowest row of pearls the seventh (counted from left to right, calling left what is left to the observer) is split (1893). The same can be seen in the photo of 1913, 176) while in the photo of 1933, by Lepinsky, 177) the third pearl is also split. Lepinsky 178) generally notes that the pearls are in poor condition, 795 and believes that there used to be more rows of pearls. We could also see the poor condition of the pearls. In the bottom row, the middle pearls on the left and the second pearl on the right are split.

In the previous century, the box was placed on a silver cloud decorated with two floating angels, a similar inappropriate decoration, as people thought they had to 800 apply to the large Byzantine double cross. 179) Dr. Bock (1864) says nothing about a pedestal. In 1893, however, it was there, since the photo by De Waal 180) shows the pins with which it can be fixed to the silver cloud.

On the back of the cabinet the gold is worked out in relief in such a way that one is justified in assuming that the undecorated sections of the fronts could certainly not 805 have been without their decoration originally. The back is scaled in its entirety. 181) In the middle a cross, richly worked out. The other decorations are: four medallions with a flower pattern at the ends of the cross arms. The medallion at the bottom is not visible in fig. 17 because of a seal hanging on a cord. 182) When 810 taking the photo for Lepinsky's article the seal was lifted, so that a similar medallion is visible there. At the bottom there are two more garlands, while in the upper corners two more medallions have been applied. The latter bear the letters $\overline{\text{IC}}$ and $\overline{\text{XC}}$ respectively, the well-known hierogram letters for IHCOX XPICTOC, Jesus Christ s. 183)

This magnificent piece only shows itself in its full richness when the two wing doors 815 are opened and the actual pectoral cross becomes visible. The side doors are covered on the inside with gold plates, each decorated with four very artfully crafted saint figures in standing position in relief. On the left door we see at the top right the image of Christ in long robe with the closed book in his left hand. To the left of the nimbus, in which there is a cross, are the letters IC. 820 On the right, of course, there was XP, the abbreviation for Jesus Christ, which we constantly encounter in Byzantine art and also saw on the back of this "encolpium". However, the letters XP have disappeared due to the application of a precious stone in that place on the outside. According to Dr. Bock, this was already the case in 1864. The photo by De Waal (fig. 18) shows that by then, in 1893, that stone had 825 disappeared. In 1913, see fig. 17, that stone was put back in its place or replaced by another, as we also found.

Next to the Savior we see a saintly figure, pointing with his left hand in the direction of Christ. The inscription on either side of the nimbus is: O $\Delta\text{HMH//TPHOC}$. O the abbreviation of o $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is written together. This is also always the case with 830 the other figures. Also the last two letters are written together: C Dr. Bock incorrectly read $\Delta\text{HMHTPHOC}$.

Under the figure of Christ is a statue with folded hands and the inscription O BAPNA//BAC. Next to it an apostle figure with a book in his left hand and the inscription O MAT// ΘAIOC . Dr. Bock could, due to a bending of the edge here, only 835 decipher O ... ΘAIOC . However, the name is now clearly legible in its entirety. On the right door we see at the top left as a pendant to Christ, the figure of the Mother of God. Of the usual inscription M-P ΘY only ΘY can be seen. The first part has disappeared due to the setting of a stone on the outside, exactly as we saw on the left door with the letters XP. Next to the Mother of God stands with a raised 840 hand O $\Pi\text{ANTE//}\Delta\text{EHM}\Omega\text{N}$. Below the figure of Mary we see a saint with the inscription: O TIMO ΘEC and to the right of that an eighth saint representing O TIM ΩN . Dr. Bock mistakenly gives TIMON.

The images are all eight with a regular round nimbus, a double drawn circle, only the 845 nimbus of Christ is provided with a cross. The figures of Christ and the Mother of God are depicted standing on a square pedestal. The other six do not have that. In the cabinet the actual pectoral cross hangs, loose, on the gold ring. The cord with seal on the back prevents it from being taken out. A large square gemstone is set on the ring. The back against which the cross hangs is divided into four planes by the cross. In the lower left corner we see a gold plate applied in this plane, on 850 which in relief in the same style as the eight other figures on the wing doors, but somewhat smaller, a crowned saint figure, with the inscription O K ΩNCTANT . Dr. Bock read KONCTANT here.

These four corner planes initially presented us with a problem as a result of 855 inaccurate descriptions by the various authors. The image of Constantine raises the suspicion that the three other corners also had their plates with images. The photo of De Waal (fig. 19) clearly showed the figure decoration of the back in the boxes above and next to Constantine, while the fourth box showed a blank plate. The photo

of 1913 (fig. 18), on the other hand, showed three blank plates in addition to the corner of Constantine. The solution turned out to be very simple. These corner-filling plates can be rotated, so that the photo of De Waal was taken with two of the four corner panels in the open position.

The Holy Cross wood is closed in a golden cross and covered with rock crystal. The horizontal bar is in one piece. The upper part of the vertical bar is very rotten. This golden cross is - according to Dr. Bock much later - enclosed by a second cross, on which a chain decoration in white enamel is applied, which extends drop-shaped at the corners of the four bars, also in white enamel. At the ends of the beams are medallions with text in Greek letters. Between the beams of the cross and on either side of the support ring are 6 large pearls attached by means of gold wire. The whole is surrounded by a gold rim. In 1893, see fig. 19, one of the large pearls was missing, namely the one between the left arm and the upper arm of the cross. This has now (1936) been replaced.

The medallions are in blue transparent enamel, while the letters are in white, opaque with red punctuation. The text is in Greek capitals, on each medallion four lines, except on the right one, which only has three lines.

OPATI

KAINO

N ΘAY

MA

KAIE

XPYC

ΕNHN

ONME

XAPI ΝΕΞΩ

XPIC

TONEN

ΔΕCKO

ΠΕΙ

ον μεν έξω

Χριστον εν δε σκόπει.

The meaning is:

"Behold, what a new wonderful work,

what a rare grace,

outside you see gold,

but inside Christ."

Since the pectoral cross could actually be worn, Dr. Bock assumes that these medallions will also bear an inscription on the back. Because of the sealing, he had not been able to check this in 1862. Later he learned that the inscription on the back was in one of the works of Cardinal Mai. Since he does not mention it, we must assume that he did not find it with Mai himself. De Waal does not say a word about the back, nor does Lepinsky.

Only the inner gold cross is known by Dr. Bock a great age. The tradition that this encolpium was worn by Constantine the Great could only concern this cross. The jewel as a whole is of a more recent date. De Waal dates it from the IXth to the XIth century. Dr. Bock in this well the most competent, places the production at the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century.

In his work on enamelling among the Byzantines he dates it even further to the beginning of the twelfth century. 184)

According to Dr. Bock, the second line has a metrical irregularity, while the first is a regular Alexandrian. That is why he calls the verses of "little correct form" and considers the cross much younger than the fourth century. His special knowledge of the Byzantine enamelling enables him to assume the beginning of the twelfth century, which dating we will adhere to.

We have already referred to the fact that Dr. Bock was mistaken when he thought that the encolpium of Constantine had possibly served in the coronation of the German emperors in the Middle Ages in Rome. In Maastricht, Dr. Bock learned from the pastor of Our Lady [O.L. Vrouw] that this precious piece came from Maastricht. 185) When he describes this encolpium again in 1896, he explicitly states this. The Waal knows nothing of the origin. Lepinsky, however, does, as we have already mentioned above. The documents from the previous century prove the correctness of the claim of the pastor of O. L. Vrouw against [to] Dr. Bock.

In the document, 186) in which Gregory XVI donated the double cross to St. Peter on January 18, 1838, there is explicit mention of two crosses "binas cruces". He describes the small as

"alteram prout in traditis Nobis Literarum monumentis dicitur, a Constantino Magno in proeliis obeundis gestari solitam".

In the official act of receipt 187) signed by Gregory XVI on 30 July 1838 it is

925 called:
 "item minorem particulam ligni Sanctissimae Crucis minori pariter cruci isertam..."
 "... Minorem vero Crucem existimatam semper fuisse eam, quam Imperator Constantinus Magnus in proeliis super pectus gestabat."
 In the official document of transfer, which was drawn up in Maastricht on 27 May 1837
 930 188) and signed by Lysens, Van der Vrecken, and the two witnesses Ackx and Deppen, chaplains of St. Matthias and St. Servaas, the smaller cross is mentioned not spoken. Also in the piece 189) of "hac Maii" 1837 the smaller cross is not spoken about. And it is precisely these two pieces that Van der Vrecken presented to the Pope as proof that he had received the crosses from Lysens to give to the Pope.
 935 From this we can strictly conclude that Lysens nowhere testifies to having given this small cross to Van der Vrecken.
 Van der Vrecken writes on 14 July 1838 190) that he handed over the cross to Gregory XVI on 9 July 1837. Here again, only the large double cross is mentioned. The plural form is somewhat misleading, because it distinguishes 1° the considerable part of the
 940 cross wood of O. L. Jesus Christ and 2° the golden cross in which it is set. 191) Also in the piece of "hac Maii" 1837 this is described in this way. 192) Finally, we have the piece of April 1, 1837, in which Van der Vrecken declares to have received the large cross of Lysens "in depositum". Here too nothing is said about the small cross. So there is no mention of the so-called cross of Constantine in any of the
 945 documents exchanged between Lysens and Van der Vrecken.
 Van der Vrecken did hand this cross to the Pope. Where did this cross come from? The communication in the papal act of receipt (appendix 9)
 "Ex tradito porro Nobis Instrumento authentico a praedicto Paulo van der Vrecken S. Sedis Notario confecto constat praedictas cruces S. huic Sedi dono in perpetuum dari
 950 a R. D. R. Lysens.." is therefore an untruth concerning the small cross. There is no evidence that Van der Vrecken received this cross from Lysens. One would even be inclined to say that he did not receive from Lysens. Why would Lysens, who did not hesitate to give up the large double cross and had this act recorded by witnesses, conceal the fact that he had also given away the smaller cross? There are three
 955 answers to this:
 - Either Lysens knew nothing about the small cross and is completely innocent of the disappearance of this piece from Maastricht;
 - or: Lysens had nothing to do with this cross of Constantijn, because it had not belonged to O. L. Vrouwekapittel.
 960 After all, Lysens gave away the large double cross because he believed that as a former canon [oud-kanunnik] he was entitled to dispose of this property of the former chapter of O. L. Vrouw. One could conclude from this that this cross was the property of another church in Maastricht;
 - or: the smaller cross was considered to be of much less importance in comparison
 965 with the large cross. And this seems to us the most probable. In the relic lists it is always in second place. When we compare the literature we see that much more is written about the large cross than about the small one, although most authors do mention the smaller one. Dr. Hoogewerff is even surprised that the smaller cross attracts so little attention, while in his opinion it is more valuable in every
 970 respect. As far as the material and art historical value is concerned certainly, while the tradition that it belonged to Constantine the Great increases its value, but as a relic of the Holy Cross wood it is far behind the double cross of Romanos with the small particles.

XI. The cross of Constantine in Maastricht.

975 When in 1861 the deed of 1 April 1837 of Van der Vrecken, 193) and the deed of receipt of Gregory XVI 194) were found at the rectory of St. Matthias and handed over to chaplain Russel of Our Lady, one reads from these documents that Lysens had given the large Byzantine cross and the so-called cross of Constantine to Van der Vrecken and that he had handed them over to the Pope on behalf of the former canon [thus:
 980 oud-kanunnik]. As a result, they requested the Pope in 1861 to be allowed to receive these two relics, which had belonged to Our Lady. 195) In fact, this request was premature as far as the small cross was concerned, since it is clear from the documents that Van der Vrecken had given up a so-called cross of Constantine, but not that this cross had belonged to Our Lady's Church.
 985 Moreover, it was obvious that the church council of Our Lady did not doubt that the small cross was also theirs.
 According to the story of Van Gulpen 196), the so-called cross of Constantine had disappeared at the same time as the large double cross. No wonder that Van Heylerhoff 197) and Al. Schaepkens 198) wrote about the disappeared crosses in 1847 and 1853
 990 respectively, identifying the donated cross of Constantine, as the church council of Our Lady 199) and Russel 200) later did, with the cross that used to be present in

Our Lady's church treasure.

Yet there is some reason for doubt. Flament does not assume that the cross in Rome is the same one that used to be in Our Lady's church. We must therefore go into this matter in more detail.

We have a total of four Relic Lists of the old chapter [kapittel], but none of these are complete, as we do have an official and complete Relic List of St. Servaas in the "Catalogus Reliquiarum Sacrarum S. Servatii... Renovatus sub finem Anni 1677". 201) The Relic Lists of Our Lady's Church all have a more uncertain character.

We have:

I. "Ritus servandus in ostensione SS. Reliquiarum in Camera earundem insignis Ecclesiae Beatae Mariae Virginis Trajectensis".

This piece was published by Bock and Willemsen. 202) The relics are listed according to the four cabinets in which they are displayed. Often it is not stated whether the Relic is in a holder. Cabinet no. 4 contains the Holy Cross wood donated by Philippus secundus:

"In 4to Armario

"Notabilis pars Lignee sanctae Crucis Salvatoris nostri nobis transmissae a Philippo 2do Constantinopolitani et Grecorum Imperatore".

There is no mention of a pectoral cross of Constantine. We only know this "ritus servandus" from a 17th century copy. 203) Since we also see several pieces not mentioned here, which we do find in the other relic lists, this inventory of the cabinets must be considered incomplete.

II. Bock and Willemsen also publish another list of relics, 204) namely

"Specificatio SS. Reliquiarum Collegialis ecclesiae B. M. V. quae abhinc viginti annis propter temporis calamitatem in obscuris latuerunt, et nunc, religionis aurora ritulante, ecclesiae Parochiali S. Nicolai traditae sunt. May 1, 1817".

Here twenty-nine no's are listed in total. However, the Relic Treasure had already been disintegrated. Two days in advance (April 28) the canons asked for information about the two Byzantine crosses that had disappeared. 205)

To these well-known lists we have added two that have not yet been published, namely "Specificatio SS. Reliquiarum Collegialis ecclesiae B. M. V. quae abhinc viginti annis propter temporis calamitatem in obscuris latuerunt, et nunc, religionis aurora ritulante, ecclesiae Parochiali S. Nicolai traditae sunt. 1 May 1817".

Here a total of twenty-nine no's are listed. However, the Relic Treasure was already dismantled at that time. Two days beforehand (28 April) the canons asked for information about the two Byzantine crosses that had disappeared. 205)

To these well-known lists we have added two that have not yet been published, namely

III. "Emuneratio praecipuarum Reliquiarum hujus Ecclesiae", which can be found in the "Stipale Privilegiorum" of 1767. 206) Here only 21 no's are listed, according to the inscription only the most important ones. We find as no. 2:

"2. S. Crucis minor pars ab Imperatore Constantino gestari solita, gemmis pretiosis adornata et capsula argentea deaurata inclusa".

IV. Finally, we have a list of ornaments and relics of the O. L. Vrouwekerk,

which was drawn up in 1580, when these were hidden for safety in the house of the provost Arnold de Meroda. 207) Among the relics is mentioned "Pars crucis Sanctae parva tabulis argenteis deauratis inserta". This of course refers to the same cross that is mentioned in III of Constantine. In both III and IV it is in second place, directly behind the large Byzantine double cross.

As fig. 8 (p. ...) we have given a fragment of the 16th century copper engraving, a relic plate of Our Lady.

In the lower right corner we see an image of the cross with the caption:

"Een + D Den Keyser Consta op syn Borst placht t Drage' als he sTrijde tegenden heydenen."

To these direct data from the archives of the old collegiate church we can add Gretserus (1616), Miraeus (1622), d'Outreman (1648) and Rayssius (1628), who, where they discuss the large double cross, also speak of the pectoral cross of Emperor Constantine. 208)

Their data can be traced back to what Gretserus tells. Gretserus has also paid considerable attention to the small cross. We will quote Gretserus extensively when we discuss how this cross came to Maastricht.

The pectoral cross of Constantine was used during the ceremonies of Holy Week. After the Holy Service, the officiant, carrying this cross, and the deacon and subdeacon, each carrying a crystal reliquary containing a Holy Thorn, 209) went to the baptismal chapel, where the three relics were immersed in the newly consecrated water.

The former canon Van Gulpen also drew this cross after its disappearance during the

French Revolution in the often mentioned "Liber continens statuta". A photo reproduction of this drawing is given as fig. 20. Unfortunately, the drawing by Van Gulpen is not accompanied by a description. When we now compare the drawing by Van Gulpen with the cross in Rome, several differences immediately catch the eye. First of all, the cabinet by Van Gulpen is crowned by a segment-shaped tympanum, while in Rome the shrine is simply flat on top with a ring on it. On the side doors an oval is also drawn where the statues of saints can be seen in Rome. The captions, however, are literally the same, without a single deviation. Even the circumscriptions O and C° have been copied. The precious stones and the double row of pearls are not indicated, nor are the pearls on the cross itself. The drop-shaped extensions of white enamel are, with the difference that in Van Gulpen's case they are also drawn in the corners between the arms, where the cross in Rome has pearls. The medallions show a different text, while the relief of Constantine is completely missing. The text reads:

'OKAI
TETEY
KENEK

ΠΡΟΘ ΙΩΑΝ
ΥΜΟΥ ΝΗΧΑ
ΚΑΡΔΙ ΥΤΡΩ
ΑC CIN

ΑΙΤΩ
ΝCΦΑ
ΛΜΑΤ
ΩΝ

In plain Greek letters:

ο και τετευκεν εκ προθυμον καρδιας
Ιωαννης λητρωσιν αιτων σφαλματων.

The translation of this is:

"Which (this) has made, with a ready heart, Joannes, requesting forgiveness of his sins".

The drawing by Van Gulpen was taken over by Martinus van Heylerhoff in his manuscript, and Arnaud Schaepkens 210) also writing about this cross in 1846 had nothing else in mind than this drawing. His description is taken entirely from this drawing. He says that the triptych is crowned by a "tympanum", and that there is no decoration with drop-shaped pearls to be seen on the cross itself. The side doors each have four oval stones set in gold, where the names of saints standing next to each other.

Before asking the question whether the differences in the drawing in the "liber continens statuta" are of much importance, one could ask: Was there another cross of Constantine in Maastricht? After all, it is certain that the cross was brought from Maastricht by Van der Vrecken. The answer to this question is affirmative. Before the French Revolution, a so-called cross of Constantine also appeared in the treasure of St. Servaas. In the already mentioned "Catalogus Reliquiarum" of St. Servatius from 1677 211) we find as no: "118. Asservatur praeterea in hoc Sacratio caput integrum S. Servatii, huius ecclesiae ac totius civitatis Patroni (qui de cognatione fuit Christi Domini secundum carnem) ultimi Tungrensis ac primi Traiectensis episcopi, in statua argentea deaurata, geminis ornata et parvula cruce aurea, quae internal habet de Ligno crucis Dominicae et diversorum Sanctorum sacris Reliquiis, external vero habet quatuor magnus uniones cum multis lapillis pretiosis; hanc Imperator Constantinus gestavit dum contra infideles progredederetur". 212)

The bust of St. Servatius seems to have been decorated with a small cross, which probably hung around the neck of the bust.

In 1672, the "Sacer Thesaurus Servatianus expositus per Litanias.." etc. by Andreas Bowens was printed in Liège. This cross is also mentioned here on page 50. 213) "Per Crucem et Passionem tuam. De Cruce Christi partes insignes. Item crucicula, quam Constantinus Imperator ex collo suspensam ferre solebat, quando cum paganis praeliabatur. Item crux ex puro et puto auro cum Cricifixo eburneo..." 214)

These are the only data we have about a so-called cross of Constantine in the St. Servatius church. There is therefore reason to investigate whether the cross of Rome is indeed that of Our Lady, since otherwise St. Servaas could claim ownership. However, are the deviations from Van Gulpen's drawing of much importance? Van Gulpen drew from memory in 1817 when the precious pieces had already disappeared and he had not seen them for twenty years. As for the large staurotheca, we see him placing the medallions on the wrong side. It can come as no surprise that his drawing of the encolpium Constantini Magni is also inaccurate. It is understandable that he places oval figures where there are relief statues, since he would not have dared to draw

- those figures. That Arn. Schaepkens mistook these for stones, each bearing a saint's name, is very strange. Worse still, there is nothing to be seen of the relief statue of Constantine in Van Gulpen's drawing. The failure to indicate the two rows of pearls can be explained. Even someone who has only just seen the relic will not be able to answer when asked whether these two rows of pearls are on or above and below the doors. The fact that these pearls are on the outside of the cabinet suggests that they are not visible when the doors are open. Finally, Van Gulpen places a segment-shaped head on the cabinet. Fortunately, we still have the image on the copper plate, which allows us to correct Van Gulpen almost completely. We see here - see fig. 8 - that the cabinet is flat with a support ring, through which even a ribbon has been drawn. 215) Despite the small dimensions, the eight statues of saints are clearly visible. Pearls have been applied along the four sides, although this is not entirely correct either, but it does compensate for the lack of pearls in Van Gulpen's work. The cross is very faithfully reproduced in its actual form as it can be seen in the box on the engraving. The fact that the representation of Constantine and the medallions are missing here is due to the smallness of the image.
- If we add to this that the literary sources explicitly speak of a cross hanging in a gilded silver box, then the identification of the cross in Rome as that of O. L. Vrouwekerk does not require any new evidence.
- How, however, to reconcile the different texts?
- The cross of St. Servaas is not considered. According to the description, it had no medallions and was not in a box or capsule. Before 1672, nothing was ever heard of it. A pectoral cross of Constantine - genuine or not - would certainly have occupied a more prominent place in the treasure of St. Servaas than was the case, now that it served as an ornament on the bust of St. Servaas. It would certainly have attracted the attention of writers as it did in Our Lady's Church, and it would have been the center of a special devotion.
- It would certainly have attracted the attention of writers and have as was the case in O. L. Vrouwekerk, and it would have been the centre of a special devotion. However, it is so little regarded that in the great official "Catalogus Reliquiarum" it was not even indicated as a separate number, but placed on an equal footing with the precious stones that adorn the bust of St. Servaas.
- We are undoubtedly dealing here with an ordinary cross, such as are so many in the treasuries of churches, originating from prelates, or votive offerings, sometimes also found in graves. 216) In the "Catalogus Reliquiarum" of 1677 of St. Servaas we find, besides the cross with the ivory Christ on no. 17, several other crosses; 217)
15. In monili argenteo rotundo. ... est crux argentea. ...
16. Sunt deinde tres tafellae nigrae. ... continentes tres cruces de Ligno S. Crucis.
84. Duae cruces in auratae habent de cruce Domini.
- Nos. 78 and 80 also mention crosses. 218)
- In addition to the ones discussed here, the Church of Our Lady had several others. The list of 1580 mentions two gold and one silver cross. 219)
- The pectoral cross of Constantine in the treasury of St. Servaas fell from the sky so suddenly that we can hardly believe it. We must seek the explanation in the often-mentioned jealousy of the chapters, which led to a certain parallelism. Even in the construction history of both churches these elements of not wanting to be inferior to each other can be detected.
- The canons of St. Servatius displayed their relics from the dwarf gallery of the chancel, those of Our Lady had a separate gate broken in order to be able to do it in the same way and place. We have already mentioned the fierce battle for the display of the relics. 220) Joint city processions were almost impossible as a result of the disagreement about priority. As a result of this jealousy, this parallelism can also be observed in the relic treasures. We have already seen that the large Byzantine double cross was copied by St. Servatius. In addition to the two Byzantine objects discussed here, the church of Our Lady possessed a third, a capsula with Madonna, which tradition has it was painted by St. Luke. No. 15 of the Catalogue of 1677 from St. Servatius states that the crux argentea, which was found in the grave of St. Servatius, was made by St. Luke himself. This is completely consistent with the fact that St. Servaas also had to have a pectoral cross from Constantine. The Byzantine objects that Our Lady acquired from the second crusade, while we hear of no acquisitions in St. Servaas, have aroused the jealousy of this chapter in a special way.
- There are two possible explanations for the different text 221) of the medallions in Rome and on the Van Gulpen drawing: either Van Gulpen filled in a text that he got from an incorrect literary source on the drawing, or the cross has a back where the medallions give a different text. The latter is undoubtedly the case. In Maastricht, the side would have hung in front, on which the text reads:

ο και τετευκεν εκ 222)

while in Rome the other side is now visible, where one reads:

ορα τι καινον θαυμα 223)

- 1195 Dr. Bock wrote already in 1864 that the cross probably also has a back, where the medallions show a different text. He later learned that this text had been published by Cardinal Mai in one of his works. 224) The fact that Dr. Bock does not publish that text from Mai is probably because he could not discover it there. We have not succeeded in doing so either. In the chapter bibliography 225) we
- 1200 mentioned the only book by Mai in which that text could reasonably be found, namely a part of his "Scriptorum Veterum Collectio", in which inscriptions of the most diverse nature are collected. 226) In this part we found the text of the large double cross taken from Apianus and Gretserus. 227) Mai wrote this part in 1831 and it was not until 1837 that the two crosses arrived in Rome.
- 1205 Dr. Bock's statement about the text on the back is based on a mere conjecture. When he has the opportunity to confirm this rumour, in 1872 228) and in 1896 229) he no longer speaks at all about the back of the cross. De Waal and Lepinsky also described the pectoral cross as if it had no back. A cord holds the cross at the back and is sealed there. This seal can be seen in our fig. 17, as well as in fig. 18 the cord
- 1210 itself on the inside diagonally above the lower medallion. The seal is of Cardinal Merry del Val. In 1913 Dr. Hoogewerff, then secretary of the Dutch Historical Institute in Rome, made notes on the occasion that the two Maastricht crosses could be photographed. We have explained above under what circumstances this happened. 230) In the personal
- 1215 notes of Dr. Hoogewerff, of which Dr. Kalf kindly granted us access, both inscriptions are given. We would have the solution of the case here, if it had not become apparent to us that Dr. Hoogewerff had only seen one inscription. On that occasion, a total of seven photographs were taken, all seven of which we had a look at. 231) No photograph was taken of the back. This would certainly have been the
- 1220 case, if the possibility had existed. Just as for Dr. Bock in 1862, the seal was not broken in 1913. When Dr. Hoogewerff now gives a text of the back, he did not have this from his own observations. The fact that he accompanies the text of the inscription with a metrical translation in Latin strengthens the suspicion that this was not recorded from the jewel itself, but was drawn from a literary source. This
- 1225 source must have been directly or indirectly the ms. [manuscript?] Van Gulpen in Maastricht. Now, do the verses themselves not answer the question whether they can stand on one and the same cross?
- Since we are no longer dealing with classical verse here, it will be difficult to draw a conclusion from the rhythm. As for the form of the letters, we dare not draw a
- 1230 certain conclusion either, since we have to compare the original with the drawing. In both cases, the round sigma C and the W are not capitalized, but the other letters cannot be compared.
- The content of the verses offers more certainty:
- 1235 "See what a wonderful thing, what a rare grace, of gold from outside, but within you see Christ. Which has been made, with humble mind, John, praying for forgiveness of his sins".
- As for the meaning, the verses fit together well, is relatively easier to explain than demonstratively. Although the latter is not impossible, one would expect it to be, while also as a stop word instead of or also indicates something that
- 1240 continues. The Greek inscriptions on crosses that we know usually first give a praise of the Holy Cross Wood and in the second part the information about who had it made. This is the case with the patriarchal double cross of Maastricht, which in four verses has the profound thought about the Holy Cross Wood, instrument of Christ's death bringing life for us, and in the last four verses names John as the one who decorated it with gold and precious stones.
- 1245 The same dual character has the inscription of the Byzantine double cross of Monte Cassino, which reads according to D. Mauro Inguanez' translation:
- "The wood, which conquered the death, which was caused by the wood" and then:
- 1250 "Romanos has worthily decorated with gold, because this gold is an ornament of Christ himself". 232)
- The cross of Limburg on the Lahn also in the same way. 233) First:
- "God stretched out his hands on the wood, pouring out the powers of life through it". Then follows the statement that Constantinos and Romanos, the emperors, decorated it beautifully.
- 1255 These parallels, although they are ordinary crosses and not pectoral crosses - we are not aware of a second Byzantine pectoral cross from that time - give us the conviction that we can consider this writing as a whole. Added to the data of the describers, we assume that the cross in Rome is one and the same as that of the Church of Our Lady in Maastricht.

1260 **XII. The oldest history of the pectoral cross.**

Tradition has it that our cross was the pectoral cross of Emperor Constantine the Great. Dr. Kalf in the eleventh annual report of the National Commission for Monument Care 234) doubts this and claims that it is certainly not older than the sixth century. In the Provisional List of Dutch Monuments of History and Art, 235) it is therefore noted as being from the 6th-7th century. Angelo Lepinsky 236) assumes the fifth or sixth century, 237) and believes that it did not belong to Constantine, whose taste was less refined, but to Justinian (527-565). There is, however, a great difference in style between the encolpium Constantini magni and, for example, the cross of Justin (518-527), the predecessor of Justinian. This cross, which also belongs to the church treasure of St. Peter in Rome, is of a more elegant form and shows, especially in its medallions and floral figures, a more even workmanship, from which the skill of the classics is still evident. 238)

De Waal 239) however, following Dr. Bock 240) reckons it to the 11th to 12th century and we consider the dating of Dr. Bock in his Byzantinischen Zellenschmelzen, 241) where he places this piece in the beginning of the 12th century on the basis of his knowledge of enamel. The possibility that the cross was worn by Constantine is not ruled out by this, as we shall see. The cross names a certain Joannes as its maker, without further indication of who this Joannes is. Mart. van Heylerhoff 242) and Flament 243) see this Joannes as the maker of the jewel, the goldsmith. We know of no examples of the aurifaber in Byzantine art putting his name on his work in such a conspicuous manner. This seems unlikely, especially on a small pectoral cross like ours. On the other hand, there are several crosses on which emperors, Romanos 244) or Konstantinos 245) or a high-ranking person like Basilius dec, that is the chairman of the senate 246) are mentioned as those who decorated the Holy Cross wood. Why not assume here as the most obvious thing, that Joannes was one of the emperors of that name. This was probably considered impossible because no emperor of that name appears among the first successors of Constantine. Since the encolpium as a whole is dated much later, this John will be: either John I Timisces (969-976), the successor of Nicephorus Phocas, or John II Comnenos, the successor of Alexios Comnenos. We consider this John, who reigned from 1118-1143, to be the one who had this encolpium made. In Byzantium, relics were a matter of state, which primarily concerned the emperor. There are many imperial decrees concerning relics to prove this. We saw Emperor Romanos I open the imperial treasuries and give away a large piece of the Holy Cross wood to the monks of the monastery of Xeropotamu. 247) Alexios even arbitrarily disposed of the relics that were kept in the churches of Constantinople. 248) The dating of our cross by Dr. Bock in the first half of the twelfth century - which dating was done completely independently of the inscription with the name Joannes, since Dr. Bock did not know it - points with a fair degree of certainty to Johannes II as the maker of the cross.

In the description of the pectoral cross we have already mentioned 249) on which Dr. Bock bases his dating, mainly the enamel cloisonné. This agrees with the general view that the use of enamel only occurs sporadically in the 6th century, but only becomes general in the 9th century. 250)

Dr. Bock's dating is partial. She does not rule out that parts of this jewel are of older date and this seems very likely to us. The first impression is that this cross was only hung in the golden shrine afterwards. Initially with the intention to take it out of the gold case when it had to be worn, later - as is evident from the carrying ring on the case itself - it was worn in its entirety. This corresponds to the rigidity of the ceremonial and the stiff pomp at the Byzantine court, which increased as the power of the basileus decreased and his territory shrank. If we see Emperor John II decorating the cross at the beginning of the twelfth century, as is evident from the enamel inscriptions, then the question remains as to what this decoration consisted of. We assume that he had special reasons to hang this cross in such a box that was extremely valuable even for Byzantium. And then the tradition that we are dealing here with.

Incidentally, we do not have to regard it as something special that in those days the real pectoral cross of Constantine was still preserved. Niketas testifies that in the days of Andronikos Comnenos the crown of Constantine was still preserved. It hung above the altar in the Aya Sophia. It so happens that the Greek sources mention the pectoral cross of Constantine precisely in connection with Emperor John II. In a treaty of John II, concluded in the year 1138 with the emir of Schaizar, the emir returns a cross decorated with precious stones, which had been taken from Romanos Diogenes when he had been defeated in the battle of Mantzikert (1071) and had fallen into captivity. 251)

The hypothesis becomes very tempting here: Byzantium of course still possessed a pectoral cross of Emperor Constantine. The emperors used to wear this pectoral cross when they went up against the pagans. Romanos Diogenes falls into captivity in the

- defeat of Mantzikert in 1071, where he is forced to enter into an extremely humiliating peace, which is to last fifty years. In 1138 another emperor stands against the Muslims and he receives the imperial pectoral cross back in negotiations. Will he not have the jewel, which had been in the hands of the Turks for so long, embellished and decorated?!
- This supposed course of events overcomes the difficulty of the different dating of the cited art historians. Even Lepinsky's objection that Constantine's taste was not so refined disappears.
- But despite all probability, this hypothesis will only gain a firm basis if the description of the cross from 1138 would correspond with the Maastricht pectoral cross of Constantine. And precisely this correspondence will remain unprovable because we also assume that John II immediately had the necessary embellishments applied, which will certainly make the cross unrecognizable.
- What reports do we now have concerning that peace treaty of the year 1138? Nicetas relates as follows: 252)
20. Having thus taken from the besieged splendid gifts, both those of wood, more precious than all (kinds of wood), as well as horses with strong necks and of good breed, and silken woven cloths interwoven with gold, and a table worth seeing, but before all this *having taken in his hands a cross, a brilliant object and regaling the sight, with a luminous stone inserted, on which the knust naturally revealed an inscription relating to the triumphant beauty of the divine image and the artless delicacy of the eyes, he raised the siege, taking the road to Antioch.*
- This description of the cross then surrendered supports our hypothesis to a very small extent. The luminous stone may perhaps still be understood as the rock crystal cross that covers the cross wood, but it is more likely that an extra-large and brilliant gemstone is meant here. The fact that there was already an inscription on it does not correspond with our starting point, that the inscription of our cross dates from the time of John II himself. The above description can hardly be understood otherwise than that a figurative representation appears on it.
- In a second writer, John Kinnamos, we read about the same event: 253)
7. Because (the emperor) noticed that the attacks were always in vain, he entered into a peace treaty, after having received the embassy; great treasures were now brought to him, *a cross was also brought, an extraordinary treasure and a worthy gift for emperors.*
10. *There was a luminous stone of considerable size; because it had been cut according to the shape of the cross, it had lost a little of its natural surface during the cutting.* The envoy told the emperor that Constantine had had it made and that it had somehow fallen into the hands of the Saracens. After receiving these (treasures), ... etc.
- Although Kinnamos mentions Constantine, and it could all fit together quite nicely, we can hardly draw the positive conclusion that the cross of Mantzikert and of 1138 is the same one that Emperor John had decorated to obtain forgiveness for his sins, and that came to Maastricht during the plundering of Constantinople. On the other hand, there is no reason to reject the tradition that this would be the pectoral cross of Constantine as completely impossible.
- The priest from Maastricht, who brought this jewel to Maastricht as pious booty, together with the large double cross of Emperor Romanos, did indeed make a good grab and showed expertise. No wonder! After all, he had been in Byzantium for quite some time, as Reinerus Monachus tells us! The question of how the cross came to Maastricht must be examined in more detail.
- The treasury of the Basilica of Our Lady still possesses a precious silver cabinet with Madonna, executed in enamel, also of Byzantine origin. 254) Tradition has it that this gem came to Maastricht at the same time as the two art treasures discussed here. Reinerus Monachus' reliable statement teaches us that this happened in the days of the fourth crusade. 255)
- Among the numerous clerics who responded to the invitation of Baldwin of Constantinople and were enriched by him, is the unnamed Maastricht priest who came to Maastricht in 1206 with the large cross and donated it "cum aliis pretiosis reliquiis" to the Church of Our Lady. Reinerus also tells us that this cleric had already been in Constantinople for seven years and had been looking for a favourable opportunity for a long time. He was not among the swarm of priests who arrived later, and this explains why he managed to get hold of the most precious pieces.
- Earlier 256) we have already become acquainted with a cleric who, in the same way, only intent on pious booty, managed to get hold of quite a few relics during the plundering of Constantinople, namely Martinus Lintzius, the abbot of Pairis, about whose adventures Guntherus Monachus informs us extensively. 257) Guntherus also relates that Philip of Swabia received a large number of relics as a gift from Martinus Lintzius. Gretserus deduced from this that Philip, distributing his

treasures, gave Maastricht the three precious Byzantine pieces. Guntherus here calls the gift to Philip a "laudabilem partem", but since he immediately afterwards describes a "tabula" of inestimable value, we are more inclined to assume that Philip received only this "tabula", for which he in turn confirmed the abbey of Pairis in possession of the other relics. If on that occasion a large piece such as the Byzantine double cross had been forgiven, this would certainly have been mentioned by Guntherus. Gretserus, who had only seen the image of the so-called cross of Constantine on the Relic Plate, 258) sees this cross in the "tabula", which Philips received as a gift and which Guntherus describes in detail. 259)

Now that we, in contrast to Gretserus, have an accurate description and image at our disposal, the major differences are immediately apparent. The "tabula" of the abbot of Pairis, to name just one thing, is not a cross and does not contain a cross either.

So, as far as the small cross is concerned, there is not the slightest connection between the valuables of the Pairis Abbey and the Byzantine objects from the church treasure of Our Lady. A priest from Maastricht brought these rare pieces to his home town and placed the church of Our Lady in the ranks of Western European churches, where priceless treasures would have been safely preserved for centuries, saved from the advancing Turks.

The advancing French Republicans caused the precious pieces to travel through Europe again six centuries later and find a new place of preservation in Rome.

July 9, 1962 **Spring of Christian art**

MAASTRICHT, July 9 - In the context of the Maastricht Heiligdomsvaart, Cardinal Alfrink opened an exhibition of early Christian and early medieval art in the Bonnefantenmuseum on Saturday evening. Numerically, the exhibition is not very extensive, according to Cardinal Alfrink, but this does not detract from its value, because the works exhibited here give a good picture of the natural relationship between faith and culture.

The chairman of the working committee, Father Clodoald van Meijel O.F.M. welcomed the cardinal and all other ecclesiastical and secular authorities and spoke words of thanks to the many domestic and foreign museums that donated works for this exhibition. According to him, the willingness of the Vatican Museums to lend twelve precious works of art to Maastricht deserves special mention. Among these works of art is one of the two treasures that ended up in Rome from Maastricht, namely the Byzantine double cross and the pectoral cross of Constantine the Great. Almost 125 years ago, one of the last canons of the chapter of the Church of Our Lady, the then pastor of the St. Mathijs parish M. R. Lijsens, transferred both treasures to Pope Gregory XVI through the mediation of the diplomat Paul van der Vrecken. This transfer was accompanied by a little too much goodwill. Amid great hilarity among those present, Father Clodoald noted that the current residents of Maastricht cannot share the position of Canon Lijsens. Father Clodoald had to complete the necessary formalities in Rome before he could receive the cross of Constantine. An extensive committee of prelates was involved and a notarial deed of 27 folios. The sealed treasure - insured for half a million guilders - had to be opened by order of Rome in the presence of the bishop of Roermond. He authorized the dean of Maastricht, Mgr. P. J. M. Jenneskens, to do so. A notarial deed of the receipt of the cross has been drawn up, which has now been sent to Rome.

The exhibition features valuable works of art from the pagan prehistory, from the early Christian period, the Frankish, Merovingian and Carolingian eras, as well as from the early Middle Ages. Prof. J. J. M. Timmers, director of the Bonnefantenmuseum, therefore gave this exhibition, which will remain open until 30 September, the title "Spring of Christian Art". The designer has paid special attention to the period between the year 384, when St. Servatius, the first bishop of Maastricht, died and the year 1200, when the most precious reliquary of Maastricht, the emergency chest, was made.

Eindhoven, August 20, 2018

Dear Madam, Sir,

In 1913, a certain Dr. Hoogewerff, the secretary of the Dutch Historical Institute in Rome, made notes on the occasion that the two Maastricht crosses could be photographed.

These two Byzantine crosses were donated to the Vatican from Maastricht in 1837. One of them (a small cross that was kept in a golden box) most likely belonged to Constantine the Great and was therefore much older. They were photographed in 1913 when Hoogewerff was present. Better photos are not known, although I have written to the various Vatican museums and libraries about this, but at the moment it is not clear where the box with the cross is located and whether there are modern photos of it.

Is there a report or something like that at your institute of this meeting in the Vatican?

1465 Dear Mr. Theelen,
We have forwarded your request to Dr. Arno Witte, Head of Art History. Perhaps he can help you further after his return from vacation (27 August).
Kind regards,
Agnieszka Irena Konkol
1470 Secretary Office
Royal Netherlands Institute Rome
Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome
Reale Istituto Neerlandese di Roma
Via Omero 10-12, 00197 Rome
1475 Tel. (0039)063269621 www.knir.it

Dear Mr. Theelen,
I received your email forwarded from our secretariat, of course with the question whether I could answer it. As for the archive material of our institute, most of it (but especially the institutional matters) ended up in the National Archives because
1480 the then NIR was part of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and/or Foreign Affairs. What is in it about Hoogewerff mainly concerns his directorship. As far as I know, hardly anything of Hoogewerff was left behind in Rome, but I can check that the day after tomorrow when I am back in the office. In any case, the chance that we have that material seems quite small, I fear.
1485 You will hear from me whether we have anything in Rome!
Kind regards,
Arnold Witte
Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome
Dr. Arnold Witte
1490 Head of Art History
E a.witte@knir.it
M (+39) 334-3304153
W <http://knir.academia.edu/ArnoldWitte>

August 23, 2018 Dear Paul Theelen,
1495 now back at my desk in the Roman I checked here how things are with the archive documents of Hoogewerff and where they ended up. As I already wrote, the administrative archive is mainly in the National Archives but as I suspected, a part also ended up at the RKD (Rijksbureau Kunsthistorische Documentatie) in The Hague, a personal archive. I quote from an internal document about the KNIR archive:
1500 "During the processing of the NIR archive in 2000-2001, several other collections or work archives were also arranged. The estate of the former director G.J. Hoogewerff was transferred to the Netherlands Institute for Art History in The Hague". This archive is also listed on the RKD website: see
1505 https://rkd.nl/nl/explore/collections/record?filters%5Bidentificatie.verantw_afdeling%5D%5B0%5D=Archivalia+%26+Excerpten&filters%5Binhoudelijke_beschr.trefw.period%5D%5B0%5D=20ste+eeuw%2C+eerste+helft&filters%5Binhoudelijke_beschr.trefw.pers%5D%5B0%5D=Hoogewerff%2C+Godefridus+Johannes&query=&start=0
I hope that more material can be found there, including Hoogewerff's notes. In any case, there is an inventory that gives some idea of what is in it. As for research
1510 into those crosses, I think they are indeed in the library, where many diplomatic gifts to the popes ended up - and they were usually not inventoried, and so they are untraceable. I would contact them, hoping they have some idea. As for further research into them, that seems very interesting to me, but unfortunately I don't have any spare quarters, and I know from experience that this takes days of work, in the
1515 form of talking to all kinds of people who might know something. And I can do that, but then you will receive an invoice from our director...
Kind regards
Arnold Witte

Eindhoven, August 22, 2018
1520 Dear Mr. Witte,
Many thanks for your answer regarding my question about your institute. I don't expect you to be able to find anything substantial, but perhaps you have contacts here and there, which I can never have. So this is what it is about: in 1837, Canon van der Vrecken of the Church of Our Lady in Maastricht completely legally donated
1525 two Byzantine crosses to the Pope (personally, I think). They were then donated to the Vatican Institute and are also recorded as such, because they have been published regularly, the most important study being the dissertation by Charles Thewissen from

1530 1939. It contains a wealth of information about the works of art in the treasury of that church and of the competing St. Servaas Church. It is now mainly about a small cross (about 8x6 cm I estimate) that was kept in a golden box. This small cross - of which a few black and white photos exist - is said to have been the pectoral cross of Constantine the Great, in the sense that the wooden splinter of the Holy Cross that his mother had dug up in Jerusalem around 328 was contained in a holder in the shape of a cross, which was later given an extra covering, the cross that we can still see in the photos. There are no photos from 1939 because they were apparently not allowed to be taken, and photos from 1913 had to be used. Images of the back of the cross are not known at all, because the seal (of a bell jar?) was not allowed to be broken. Dr. Hoogewerff from your institute seems to have been there in 1913.

1535 I contacted the Vatican Museum, but they do not know the two crosses and is referred to two other institutions, which have not (yet) responded substantively. Apparently these crosses (together or separately) have been swallowed up in the abundance of works of art in the Vatican. The day before yesterday, Monday, I received a response from Inventario Generale, which does not know it and refers to Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana and the treasury of St. Peter's, see below.

1540 In the past, several attempts have been made to get the crosses back, but the Vatican has refused to give them up again.

1545 Could you - in a few lost quarters of an hour - do some research into the crosses, in particular that of Constantine the Great?

Picture of the "Encolpium Constantini Magni" available?

1550 Eindhoven, 19 August 2018
Dear madam, sir,
Since 1837 (otherwise said since 1795, the French invasion in the Netherlands) the Vatican possesses the Encolpium Constantini Magni. It came from the Treasury of the Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk in Maastricht. In a small golden box a small cross is contained, of which it is said that it belonged to Constantine the Great.

1555 I am gathering (on paper or as a computer file of course) all items that belonged to Constantine, and it came as a surprise that this cross existed at our days, and that it was part of a church treasury in my country.

1560 It has been described by different persons, as Beck and Willemsen and in 1939 appeared a thesis on both Byzantine crosses in your possession. The title of the thesis is TWO BYZANTINE HOLY CROSS RELICS. The author M.A.F.Ch. Thewissen had studied the crosses but did not make photographs himself, and he used older pictures of Lepinsky and De Waal. The author claims that there does not exist a picture of the back of the cross, but the front can be seen in his book as picture 18, in black-and-white and very grainy, because it was made in 1913. Do you have high-resolution photographs of the Encolpium Constantini Magni? If so, I would like to receive a digital file. When used in an article I of course shall mention the source of the picture.

1565

1570 Dear Mr. Theleen, thank you for your kind message. Unfortunately, the artifact you are interested in is not part of the Vatican Museums' collections. However, since other Vatican institutions possess collections of art and archaeology, it might be possible that the Encolpion is among the Vatican Library collections (bav@vatlib.it or in the Treasury of the St. Peter's Basilica (amministrazione@capitolosp.va). I wish you all the best for your research and remain

1575 Yours very truly Alessandra Uncini Registrar of Collections, Vatican Museums
ig.musei@scv.va