

# The Byzantine Component of the Relic-ward of Constantinople

*John Wortley*

Many of our men, I may say, went to visit Constantinople, to gaze at its many splendid palaces and tall churches and view all the marvellous wealth of a city richer than any other since the beginning of time. As for the relics, these were beyond description, for there were as many at that time in Constantinople as in all the rest of the world.<sup>1</sup>

At the time in question (A.D. 1203) that city may well have housed even more relics than the phlegmatic Marshall of Champagne allows, for relics were then the greatest treasure of the richest city known to western man. For centuries its relics had been the wonder of the world, drawing people to reverence them from the four corners of Christendom. They provided the city which owned and cherished them with an attraction surpassing that of Jerusalem itself. It has been argued, not implausibly, that it was because of this sacred opulence that Geoffrey de Villehardouin and his companions came to be sitting over against (and visiting) the City of Constantine at the time of this Fourth Crusade, rather than fighting in the Holy Land. The relics (it is alleged), having as it were consecrated Byzantium as a New Jerusalem, deflected the Crusade in their direction like some gravitational force diverting an object travelling through space.<sup>2</sup>

As we now know, at the time of which Villehardouin wrote, both the city and her riches were doomed. Within a few months,

<sup>1</sup>Geoffrey de Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople* 192, transl. M. R. B. Shaw, *Joinville and Villehardouin: Chronicles of the Crusades* (Harmondsworth 1963) 76.

<sup>2</sup>A. Frolow, "La déviation de la 4<sup>e</sup> Croisade vers Constantinople: problème d'histoire et de doctrine," *RHR* 145 (1954) 168–187, 146 (1954) 67–89, 194–219, especially the last part.

on 12 April 1204, the city fell and in the wake of the subsequent sacking, together with many other treasures, many relics perished, while still more were dispersed, mainly throughout western Europe. Much is known of those that escaped the disaster, thanks to the monumental dossier composed by Riant, later expanded by de Mély and others.<sup>3</sup> Much more work remains to be done both on the dispersal of relics and on the relics which survived (or were invented) to grace the revived capital of the Palaeologan era; but the object of this enquiry is to look backwards, rather than forwards, from the sack of 1204. How (and, incidentally, why) did Constantinople acquire its amazing hoard of relics? How were they housed and what practices were associated with them?

These are not easy questions to answer, nor is it to be expected that they will be fully answered in the near future. Some relics appeared at the capital without any trace of how they came to be there; others mysteriously disappeared, or at least ceased to be mentioned. By 1204 Constantinople was already well on towards being a thousand years old. Throughout her nine centuries she had been acquiring relics, sometimes more, sometimes less. The present article is the first of a series of studies of the entire process of relic-acquisition, age by age (insofar as that is possible, given the far from complete nature of the extant sources) with the object of building up a coherent picture of how the Queen of Cities came into possession of so much pious treasure.

To begin at the beginning, Constantinople may have only been “opened for business” on 11 May 330, but this was not the beginning so far as relics are concerned. The first task must be to discover what (if any) relics Constantine’s new city inherited from old Byzantium. It would be a mistake to suppose that the

<sup>3</sup>Count Eduard Didier Riant, *Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae* I–II (Geneva 1877–78), III by Ferdinand de Mély, subtitled “La croix des premiers croisés; la sainte lance; la sainte couronne” (Paris 1904).

exiguity of this town had excused it from being the scene of shedding martyrs' blood during the persecutions of Christians; there is respectable evidence to the contrary. Tertullian asserts that Caecilius Capella waged a bitter campaign against the Christians of Byzantium in the early years of the third century; however none of his victims is named.<sup>4</sup> Epiphanius of Salamis has handed down, perhaps from Hippolytus, an account of one episode in that persecution in which a number of victims met their deaths, but only one person is mentioned by name, a certain Theodotus (who apostatised).<sup>5</sup> In his Oration against the Arians, delivered at Constantinople in November 380, just after Theodosius I had restored the use of their churches to the Catholics, Gregory of Nazianzus claimed that this advance should be attributed to the martyrs and to the restoration of their cult which had been too long neglected.<sup>6</sup> This would appear to be a reference to the indigenous martyrs of the city but, again, no names are mentioned.

However, with the appearance of the Hieronymian Martyrology, the names of some Byzantine martyrs are revealed:

8 May: *Constantinopoli Acacii militis et Maximi presbyteri*

10 May: *Constantinopoli Mucii ... Maximi*

18 May: *Constantinopoli Hesychii*

7 June: *in Byzantio Pauli*

15 June: *Constantinopoli Mucii*<sup>7</sup>

Delehaye opines that the name of Hesychius must be removed from this list as it appears to have been inserted by error. Paul I, sometime Bishop of Constantinople (337–339 and 341–342) was deposed and died in exile in 351, therefore he cannot be reckoned as one of the victims of the pre-Constantinian persecu-

<sup>4</sup>Tert. *Ad Scap.* 3, cited by Hippolyte Delehaye in "Saints de Thrace et de Mésie," *AnalBoll* 31 (1912) 161–300, to which valuable article I am indebted for the following remarks; cf. A. R. Birley, *GRBS* 32 (1991) 81–98.

<sup>5</sup>Epiph. *Adv.Haeres.* 54, cited by Delehaye.

<sup>6</sup>Greg. Naz. *Or.* 35.1 (PG 36.257), cited by Delehaye.

<sup>7</sup>Quoted in Hippolyte Delehaye, *Les Origines du culte des martyrs*<sup>2</sup> (Brussels 1933: hereafter "*Origines*") 233, from *AASS* Nov. II.1.

tions. This leaves only Acacius, Mucius/Mocios, and Maximus. Delehayé thought that Maximus (of whom nothing is known other than the name, and that only in this context) was probably to be identified with the second, leaving only two names: Acacius and Mocios (hereinafter, Mocius.) To these two tradition later added a group of martyrs believed to have died and to have been buried near Byzantium: Lucillianus, Paula, and the Four Youths. Also Bishop Metrophanes (306–4/5 June 314) who certainly died, and was probably buried, at Byzantium before it became Constantinople. His was not a martyr's death; nevertheless, he was later regarded as a saint.

Such is the totality of the inheritance of sacred relics which might have been directly bequeathed by the old city to the New Rome. To this must be added the names of martyrs who died elsewhere but whose relics were subsequently brought to Byzantium because they were believed to have some connection with that city. The outstanding examples are Eleutherius the Cubicularius, followed by Florus and Laurus the stone-masons. Finally, the names of martyrs brought to Byzantium for execution must not be overlooked.

It is a little surprising that whilst Byzantium appears to have witnessed the shedding of martyrs' blood, it cherished the memories and remains of so few indigenous martyrs. Perhaps in many cases the names of the victims had been lost, but this was certainly not universally the case. We learn (for instance) the names of two Byzantine martyrs, Proclus and Maximus, from the *Passion of Saints Florus and Laurus* (see below), yet there is no evidence whatsoever of a cult in *their* honour. The explanation may well be that relics of the great and famous came to the capital so soon that interest was diverted away from the indigenous martyrs—interest which, in other circumstances, would have led (as it did elsewhere) to the rehabilitation of the half-forgotten martyrs of Byzantium and the invention of their relics.

### Saint Acacius

Saint Acacius was no obscure saint, but a martyr of great popularity, honoured almost throughout the Christian world to some degree. His name is to be found in Greek, Latin, and oriental calendars but nowhere was he more honoured than at Constantinople, the city whose soil had been sanctified by his blood.<sup>8</sup> His popularity notwithstanding, Acacius' hagiographical dossier contains only a single item.<sup>9</sup> It is a *passio* which, although it contains episodes characteristic of the *passion épique* *pace* Delehaye, may still have originated at a date not too far removed from the time of his martyrdom, *sub Maximiano*.<sup>10</sup> In former times the Bollandists were even prepared to allow a Constantinian authorship for this document, but comparison with the hagiographic dossier of Saint Mocius has since revealed certain similarities which advise caution in this matter.<sup>11</sup>

According to the *passio*, Acacius was a Cappadocian by birth who rose to be a centurion in the Martesian cohort. After a series of cruel interrogations through which he steadfastly refused to deny his faith he was beheaded on 7 or 8 May in either 303 or 306.<sup>12</sup> The place of execution is vaguely described as "outside the [Severan] city" but the place of burial is given a name: Staurion. There he was buried by pious men.<sup>13</sup> Tradition adds that many of his comrades were put to death at the same time. Various lists of names exist, varying in number from 77 to 84, but these lists are almost exclusively found in western

<sup>8</sup>Delehaye, *Origines* 233–236.

<sup>9</sup>BHG 13; AASS Maii II 291–296; PG 115.217–240.

<sup>10</sup>Delehaye, *Les Passions des Martyrs et les genres littéraires*<sup>2</sup> (Brussels 1966) 204–205, 214.

<sup>11</sup>AASS Maii II 289D; Delehaye (*supra* n.4) 228–232.

<sup>12</sup>The date is discussed in AASS Maii II 295 note *k*.

<sup>13</sup>766E: καὶ συνέστειλαν ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκήδευσαν μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας ἐν τόπῳ ἐπικαλουμένῳ Σταυρίῳ.

sources for, in the west, these companions were commemorated together with Acacius as “martyrs of Byzantium” on 8 May.<sup>14</sup>

The cult of Saint Acacius must have been well established at the capital within half a century of the martyrdom for it is reliably reported that in 359 the Bishop Macedonius attempted to remove the casket (θήκη) of Constantine the Great out of the imperial mausoleum (Holy Apostles’)—which he claimed was in an unsafe condition—“to the church in which the body of the martyr Acacius lies.”<sup>15</sup> Now, which of the two known churches of Acacius was the one which housed his tomb: the small chapel at Karya or the large basilica at Heptascalon?<sup>16</sup> The former was certainly in existence at the beginning of the fifth century for it is mentioned by Socrates (*HE* 6.23) in connection with an event which he says took place shortly before the death of the Emperor Arcadius (1 May 408):

In Constantinople there is an apartment-block of largest size called Karya, for in the courtyard of the block there is a walnut-tree (καρύα) on which Saint Acacius is said to have been put to death by hanging. For this reason a small house of prayer has been built by the tree. Wishing to see this, the Emperor Arcadius went there, said his prayers, and departed. All the local inhabitants came flocking to see him ... until everybody, women and children included, was standing outside the chapel. And then the huge apartment block which surrounded the chapel suddenly collapsed. The cry that then went up gave way to wonder that the Emperor’s prayers delivered so great a company from destruction.

<sup>14</sup>291–292. Only the P MS. of *The Typicon of the Great Church* (ed. Juan Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Eglise* II, *OrChristAnal* 165–166 [Rome 1962–63]) adds “the companions” to a 2 June commemoration of Acacius the Martyr (I 303, note).

<sup>15</sup>εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν ἣ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ μάρτυρος Ἀκακίου ἀπόκειται, *Socr. HE* 2.38 (*PG* 67.329–332); εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν ἣ Ἀκακίου τοῦ μάρτυρός ἐστιν ὁ τάφος, *Soz. HE* 4.21 (ed. Bidez/Hansen 121.28–30).

<sup>16</sup>Jean Ebersolt, *Sanctuaires de Byzance: recherches sur les anciens trésors des églises de Constantinople* (Paris 1921) 76–77; R. Janin, *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique: Les églises et monastères*<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1969: hereafter “*Eglises*”) 13–15.

Obviously unaware of this passage, the redactor of the *Patria* has (quite uncharacteristically) dated the chapel in question much later, claiming that it was founded by a brother of Narses the Patrician in the reign of either Justin II or of Tiberius.<sup>17</sup> Assuming this was not a new foundation but a reconstruction of an existing establishment, the *Patria* supplies the earliest (and only) indication of where it was located, “at the imperial port.”<sup>18</sup> This, unfortunately, helps not at all for, as Janin comments, “l’identification des Portes Impériales est des plus difficiles.”<sup>19</sup> Janin nevertheless did not hesitate to locate the Karya chapel at Staurion in the Zeugma<sup>20</sup>—presumably on the assumption that it marked the place of the martyr’s burial, named Staurion in the *passio*. Yet he gives no text (nor can I find one) which links the names of Karya and Staurion.

Of the more famous and spacious basilica of Saint Acacius at Heptascalon there is no mention until it underwent a thorough restoration by Justinian I. Thus Procopius:

Who could pass over in silence the Church of Acacius? This had fallen into ruin and [Justinian] took it down and rebuilt it from its foundations so as to make it a building of marvellous size. It is carried on all sides by columns of astonishing whiteness and the floor is covered with similar stone, from which such a brilliant light is reflected that it gives the impression that the whole church is coated with snow (*Aed.* 1.4.25–26, transl. Dewing).

There is no mention of a martyr’s tomb here, but Procopius is only interested in buildings. It is possible that the relics remained or were replaced below ground, as in the case of the relics of the Apostles Andrew, Timothy, and Luke when the same emperor reconstructed their church (1.4.22).

Like many other Constantinopolitan churches, the Basilica of

<sup>17</sup>*Patria* 116 (*Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. T. Preger III 253–254) and elsewhere. See Janin, *Eglises* 13 n.6.

<sup>18</sup>ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ πόρτῃ, *Patria* p.53, note on line 19.

<sup>19</sup>Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1964) 291.

<sup>20</sup>Janin (*supra* n.19) 290 and *Eglises* 13.

Acacius had the reputation of being a Constantinian foundation. Holy Apostles' may be the only shrine which has a ghost of a claim to this reputation; but, in the case of Saint Acacius', the claim is so persistent that it probably ought not to be lightly dismissed. If nothing else, it means that the shrine was believed to be of great antiquity;<sup>21</sup> but of *how* great antiquity? The answer to this question may well depend on the answer to another one: How long had this church housed the relics of its eponymous saint?

That it *did* eventually house them there is no doubt. Thus Anthony of Novgorod at the end of the twelfth century: "Dans l'église de saint Akacius, qu'a fondé l'empereur Constantin"—clearly the Heptascalon church—"se trouvent ses reliques."<sup>22</sup> They appear to have been there already by the tenth century, or even earlier, depending on what dates one accepts for the *Life of Saint Andrew the Fool*,<sup>23</sup> for this contains an episode in which the Saint's disciple is sent to pray at the church in question, at Heptascalon. The text speaks precisely of drawing near to the martyr's casket (θήκη), not tomb (τάφος), thus suggesting that the relics were not only there, but accessible.<sup>24</sup>

The liturgical evidence (not much older than the tenth century) also points in the same direction. The *Typicon of the Great Church* appoints a number of observances in honour of the martyr at Heptascalon but makes no mention of Karya. So far as the synaxaria are concerned, Karya might not even have

<sup>21</sup>*Patria* 1.49 (p.140), 3.1 (p.214), 3.18 (p.219)—this last also mentions the restoration by Justinian I.

<sup>22</sup>Anthony of Novgorod (transl. Marcelle Ehrhard, "Le Livre du Pèlerin d'Antoine de Novgorod," *Romania* 58 [1932]) 62.

<sup>23</sup>See John Wortley, "A Note on the Date of the *Vita Sancti Andreae Sali*" (which is much disputed), *Byzantion* 39 (1969) 204–208; see also *ODByz* I 93.

<sup>24</sup>Cc.197–202 (*PG* 111.841–848). There is an interesting detail here: Euphrosyne (the disciple) arrives at the church "at the seventh hour" and finds it locked. It is not opened until the signal for Vespers is sounded.

existed.<sup>25</sup> Now, whilst the holding of a synaxis in a certain place is no guarantee of the presence of relics in that place, it is almost unknown for the location of relics *not* to be the site of a synaxis. Hence, insofar as silence can ever indicate anything, the silence of the synaxaria concerning Karya demonstrates that the relics were not there. Maybe the famous walnut tree had died and, deprived of its *raison d'être*, the Karya chapel had passed into oblivion by the tenth century.

It used to be believed that the church at Heptascalon already existed in 359 and that it was to this church that Bishop Macedonius attempted to remove the θήκη of the Great Constantine in that year. Dagron, however, urges the case for Karya, pointing out the proximity of Staurion (which he accepted as the location of Karya) to the imperial mausoleum and arguing that the visit of Arcadius implies the presence of the martyr's relics there.<sup>26</sup> This is a persuasive argument in some respects, implying a by no means unlikely series of events. Arcadius' visit having demonstrated the inadequacy and danger of the Karya chapel, a more commodious shrine would have been erected to house the relics. This might well have been at the instigation of Arcadius' daughter, the Blessed Pulcheria, a lady whose propensity for the building of churches and translation of relics is well known. The references above to an accessible casket seem to indicate that an exhumation had taken place (although this could equally well have been at the time of one of the major restorations of Justinian I and Basil I). It should however be noted that Socrates identifies the place to which Macedonius

<sup>25</sup>The *Typicon* appoints a synaxis to commemorate the saint's ἄθλισις on 8 May (I 284.19–20) and on 21 July (346.22–23, H only), both at Heptascalon. Similar synaxes at no specific location are mentioned on 2 June (302.19–20) and 28 July (352.14). As 7/8 May was also the encaenia of the Heptascalon church (*Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. H. Delehaye [Brussels 1902, *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum novembris*, hereafter *Synax CP*] 661.27) 21 July could possibly have commemorated the Basilian restoration (and the exhumation of the relics?). The absence of this entry in P suggests an element of novelty here in the early tenth century.

<sup>26</sup>Gilbert Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale* (Paris 1974) 394.

tried to remove Constantine's θήκη as "the church in which the body of the martyr *lies*," and Sozomen: "the church in which *is* the grave of Acacius the martyr." The use of the present tense by both writers is significant. Both were writing in the 440s, at which time, although Pulcheria's influence at court was somewhat eclipsed (albeit temporarily), any building for which she might have been responsible, especially any to remedy a defect already detected in 408, would have been long completed. The ecclesiastical historians are unlikely to be mistaken; their testimony implies that wherever the relics of Acacius lay in 359, they were in the same place in the 440s and that, it would seem, was not Karya, but Heptascalon.

There are other considerations, not the least of which is the unlikelihood of a bishop attempting to move the relics of so great an emperor into what appears to have been little better than a lean-to shack set in the midst of lower-class dwellings. Nor does Socrates even imply that it was relics which drew Arcadius to Karya; he came out of curiosity, "either to tell or to hear some new thing," so to speak. It was the walnut tree for which Karya was famous and this appears still to have been something of a novelty. Nor does Socrates describe the chapel at Karya as ἐκκλησία, the term which he uses in connection with the abortive translation of 359, still less as μαρτύριον.

The discussion of this matter has been somewhat confused by the location of Karya at Staurion in the Zeugma, a location which may not have much to be said for it. The *passio* of Acacius mentions two spots hallowed by the martyrdom: an unspecified place of execution "outside the city" and a place of burial identified as Staurion. Now *staurion* is not really a proper name; it means crossroads, hence it can apply to many locations.<sup>27</sup> It is possible that the church at Heptascalon (a name

<sup>27</sup>Janin (*supra* n.19) 430. See *BHG Nov. Auct.* (Brussels 1984) item 13, for alternative reading of Stathmos for Staurion in the *passio*.

which does not appear in the sources until the tenth century)<sup>28</sup> originated as a μαρτύριον over the place of burial, “at a cross-roads” which, by 359, had become, if not a Constantinian, a Constantian enlargement of the primitive chapel.

On the other hand, if Karya was indeed located at the place later known as Staurion, in the Zeugma, it is not difficult to see how this might have come about. Popular devotion had no doubt been at work to bring the walnut tree at Karya into prominence.<sup>29</sup> Is it not possible that with the same disregard for “the facts of the matter” (as they appear in the *passio*) it had shown in mistaking the method of the saint’s execution, popular devotion also misappropriated the burial-place? This is to suggest that the rise to fame of Karya may have conferred upon its locale the name of Staurion, rather than vice-versa. It is also to imply that the saint’s relics never were, nor were ever thought to be, anywhere else but at Heptascalon. In other words, the church at Heptascalon may have a valid claim (possibly a unique claim) to derive from a martyrdom at Byzantium.

#### Saint Mocius

The Church (later, the Monastery) of Saint Mocius the Martyr is to be counted amongst the most distinguished religious monuments of the Capital and its eponymous saint amongst the city’s most efficacious patrons.<sup>30</sup> Such was the importance of his shrine that it was visited by the court twice a year, once on the Sunday after Easter and again on the Wednesday of the

<sup>28</sup>The references in the *Typicon* could be earlier but the first dateable reference to Heptascalon is in *Vita Basilii imp.*, Theophanes Cont. p.324, where Constantine VII speaks of his grandfather’s restoration of Saint Acacius’ shrine which was threatening ruin.

<sup>29</sup>The establishment of the cult of a saint in connection with a tree is not unknown elsewhere and may well have pagan antecedents. See A. Grabar, *Martyrium: recherches sur le culte des reliques et l’art chrétien antique* (Paris 1946) I 71 n.8.

<sup>30</sup>Ebersolt (*supra* n.16) 74–75; Janin, *Eglises* 354–358; A. Kazhdan, “Mokios,” *ODB* Byz II 1389–1390.

fourth week of Easter, although this second visit was at least temporarily discontinued after the unfortunate attempt to assassinate Leo VI in 903 whilst he was in the church.<sup>31</sup>

According to the extant documents<sup>32</sup> Mocius was born at Amphipolis where he became a priest of Dionysus.<sup>33</sup> Converted to Christianity he fought against idolatry and refused to perform the accustomed sacrifices to the gods, seeking to win over his fellow citizens to the new faith. Laodicius the proconsul caused him to undergo a series of bitter torments, but failing to produce the desired recantation, he despatched him to the prefect at Heracleia who in turn transferred him to Byzantium where he was put to the sword in the reign of Diocletian. The corpse was taken and buried “in the place in which it now lies, one mile from Byzantium, where many cures are effected.”<sup>34</sup> As Janin points out, the putative location of Saint Mocius’ Church is much more than a mile from the Severan wall, much less than a mile from the Constantinian (*Eglises* 358). This may indicate that the *passio* dates from a time when people were no longer aware of the exiguity of old Byzantium, but then the *passio* and its related documents inspire very little confidence. At no point do they breath the atmosphere of *acta sincera* which can sometimes be detected in the *Passio Sancti Acacii*. On the contrary, most of the familiar characteristics of the *passion épique* are to be

<sup>31</sup>*Caerim.* 1.64 (*PG* 112.556A). According to the Panegyric of Michael the Monk (see below) this visit took place on Easter day, not the Sunday following (*AnalBoll* 31 [1912] 187). *Caerim.* 1.17 (pp.324–329), Theophanes Cont. pp. 365.3–366.9, Scylitzes 181.23–25.

<sup>32</sup>The dossier consists of a basic *passio* (*BHG* 1298, probably later than sixth cent.) from which all the other items derive: two variants of that text (*BHG* 1298b, c), a panegyric based on the *passio* by Michael the Monk (1298h) and a tenth-cent. re-working of the *passio* along Metaphrastic lines (1298d). With the exception of the last, all these documents were edited and commented on at length by Delehay (*supra* n.4) 161–300. The last text was edited with commentary by Halkin in *AnalBoll* 83 (1965) 10–22.

<sup>33</sup>Delehay raised the possibility that Mocius may originally have been a certain Maximus, a priest who accompanied Saint Acacius in his martyrdom; see *Origines* 234.

<sup>34</sup>*Supra* n.4: 175–176.

found there,<sup>35</sup> to the extent that Delehayé despaired of ever abstracting anything of value from them:

C'est du sanctuaire, situé à un mille de Byzance que le culte de saint Mocius est rayonné au dehors, et cette donnée de la légende est, comme il arrive d'ordinaire, la seule qui paraisse mériter considération.<sup>36</sup>

The cult certainly did spread far and wide,<sup>37</sup> but how old was that sanctuary, the first perceptible symptom of the cult, from which it spread, and which (presumably) housed the saint's relics (for Delehayé held it to be axiomatic that "les honneurs rendus aux martyrs furent, à l'origine, rigoureusement concentrés autour de leur tombeau")?<sup>38</sup> Constantine is named as founder of the shrine in a number of sources, some of them probably older than those in which such claims are commonplace, such as Theophanes Confessor, depending no doubt on a yet older source.<sup>39</sup> Those who are prepared to accept Eusebius' statement that Constantine provided his new city with "*martyria* on the largest and most sumptuous scale" (*V.Const.* 2.40) would advance Saint Mocius' as the first candidate for the title of Constantinian foundation. "Assurément, le culte de saint Môkios est ancien" wrote Dagron. "On peut croire que son *martyrion* est l'un de ceux que, selon Eusèbe, Constantine construisit *extra muros*; mais encore une fois c'est sans doute Justinien qui, en le rebâtissant, l'introduit dans l'histoire monumentale de Constan-

<sup>35</sup>See Delehayé (*supra* n.10) ch. 3. Halkin (*supra* n.32: 9) very much doubted whether any of the Mocius documents could be any earlier than the reign of Justinian I.

<sup>36</sup>*Supra* n.4: 225.

<sup>37</sup>Delehayé, *Origines, passim*, cf. the index *s.v.* "Mocius."

<sup>38</sup>*Supra* n.4: 161; but the thought is variously expressed *passim* in Delehayé's writings.

<sup>39</sup>Theophanes I 23.31 de Boor. One MS. attributes the same assertion to Hesychius of Miletus (sixth cent.); this could be an interpolation, but the opening lines of *PSChr* are explicit: Preger, *Patria* III 19–20.

tinople et accrédite l'idée—vraie ou fausse, nous ne pouvons plus juger—d'une origine constantinienne."<sup>40</sup>

There is however an interesting connection between the cult of this martyr and the founding of Constantinople: they share a common feast day. 11 May is both the death-day of the saint and the birthday of the city.<sup>41</sup> If this is anything other than pure coincidence, it would suggest that the cult of Saint Mocius was already flourishing before 329; that Constantine was sufficiently aware of this and of its potential value to him that he made use of it, even though it centred on a shrine outside his new city; and that he might well therefore have honoured that cult with a new and larger (or enlarged) building. Eusebius does add that the alleged new *martyria* were constructed not only within the city, but also in the surrounding area. There is no evidence to confirm that the cult was flourishing prior to 329, but then the above is not the only possible sequence of events, congenial though it might have appeared to later apologists. It is possible that some intelligent churchman timed an *inventio* of Mocius' relics to coincide with the city's birthday and, by doing so, gained that martyr lasting fame. If Christian and pagan elements were really more equally matched in first-generation Constantinople than Eusebius would have the reader believe, such an *inventio* would not have been an unwise move on the part of the Christians in the struggle for the upper hand.

Whatever the origins of the shrine might have been, the first clear references to it come remarkably early. It is named by Sozomen as the burial-place of one of the Long Brothers, Dioscorus, in 402.<sup>42</sup> As there is never any question of another

<sup>40</sup>Dagron (*supra* n.26) 395.

<sup>41</sup>*Typicon* I 286.12, 290.4. Rather surprisingly, no ancient writer appears to have commented on this coincidence except for the compiler of the Latin *passio*, *BHL* 6023. See Halkin's comments (*supra* n.32) 5 and n.5; see also *Synax CP* 673.23–676.10.

<sup>42</sup>ἑτάφη ἐν τῇ Μωκίου τοῦ μάρτυρος ἐπωνύμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, Soz. *HE* 8.17 (Bidier/Hansen 372.11).

church with this dedication, it may reasonably be assumed that this can be identified with “the place in which [the body of the saint] now lies, one mile from Byzantium, where many cures are effected” mentioned in the *passio*. Yet, notwithstanding the many mentions of this shrine in subsequent centuries, it is a very long time before one encounters any further statement that it housed the body. Procopius speaks only of its magnitude (“to which all other shrines yield in size,” *Aed.* 1.4.27). Constantine Porphyrogenitus provides useful information concerning the form of the building.<sup>43</sup> The ceremonies on 11 May took place mainly at the Great Church and in the Forum of Constantine, but also included a synaxis at Saint Mocius’, “in his own most holy *martyrion* itself,” which almost certainly means a relic-containing shrine within the church<sup>44</sup>—but still there is no specific mention of relics.

For that one has to wait until the twelfth century, and even then to rely on foreign visitors. Anon. Mercati breaks the silence, and then only in an aside to his main object of interest, Saint Samson:

*in illis partibus est monasterium monachorum, magnum valde, sancti Mocii et sancti Samsonis. sanctus Mocius erat presbiter et martir, Romanus genere. sanctus autem Samson et ipse fuit presbiter et medicus. iacent autem hi duo sup̄tus altare ipsius aecclesiae in monumentis.*<sup>45</sup>

Anthony of Novgorod (*ca* 1200) confirms this statement without adding anything to it (p.60): “Plus loin se trouve le monastère de Saint-Nocius [*sic*] avec une grande église sous le chœur de laquelle reposent saint Nocius et saint Samson.”

<sup>43</sup>*Caer.* 1.17 (PG 112.324–329).

<sup>44</sup>τελείται δὲ ἡ αὐτοῦ σύναξις ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίῳ, *Typicon* I 286.12–290.4, quotation of last line.

<sup>45</sup>Anon. Mercati ch.52 (= S. G. Mercati, “Santuari e reliquie Constantino-politane secundo il codice Ottoboniano Latino 169 prima della Conquista latina (1204),” *RendPontAcc* 12 [1936] 133–156, also in *Collectanea Byzantina* II 464–489).

From these two passages it would appear that the name of Saint Mocius had been somewhat eclipsed by that of his alleged relative, Samson; also that Saint Mocius' relics had never been exhumed. If, as certain sources claim, Saint Mocius' church stood on the site of a pagan temple (*Patria* pp.19–20), it is difficult to accept that this would have been his place of burial. We have to conclude that the origin of the relics remains something of a mystery.

#### Saint Eleutherius

There appear to have been several Saints Eleutherius, of which one, "the Cubicularius," a eunuch, was martyred at Tarsia (Bithynia) *sub Maximiano*, 4 August.<sup>46</sup> This distinguished minister of Maximian was executed when it was learnt that he had secretly converted to Christianity and his retreat on the River Sangarius was discovered. Yet, his great age and Byzantine origins notwithstanding, this Eleutherius appears not to have entered the Use of Constantinople until the tenth century, for the *Typicon* makes no mention of him. Even when he makes his appearance in the synaxaria there is no mention of any shrine in his honour. His Byzantine origins are insisted upon in the longer entry in the tenth-century *Menologion* edited by Latyshev<sup>47</sup> but comparison with the older *acta* on which its statements are based shows that the story has grown somewhat with the telling. The *acta* say nothing of the saint having been a eunuch, nor is it certain where he was born and raised: "He was a Byzantine from what is now the great City of Constantine, or a child of one of the eastern provinces."<sup>48</sup> Later writers express

<sup>46</sup> *BHG* 572e; *Synax CP* 866.38–868.9.

<sup>47</sup> Basil Latyshev, ed., *Menologii anonymi Byzantini saeculi x quae supersunt* (Saint Petersburg 1902) II 245–247 (*BHG* 572e), presents a summary of the *acta* (*BHG* 572), written in an elevated style: ἡμεδαπὸς ὁ Ἐλευθέριος καὶ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου καὶ οὗτος γέννημα, θρέμμα καὶ παιδεύμα, 245.20–21.

<sup>48</sup> *AASS Aug. I* 320–327, *BHG* 572, ed. Peter Bosch: εἰπεῖν δὲ [δεῖ] πάντως ὅτι Βυζαντίδος τῆς νῦν Κωνσταντίνου μεγαλοπόλεως, ἢ μάλλον τῶν ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν τέκνον (323D).

no such reserve and confidently assert his Byzantine origins which, presumably, accounted for such popularity as the saint enjoyed.

According to the *acta*, the martyr's remains were interred in the same secret underground chapel in which he had been inducted into the Christian faith. A church arose over the spot and the relics came to be regarded as the Palladium of the nearby city of Tarsia on the River Sangarius, east of Nicomedia. There appears to be no record of their translation to the capital, though one can well understand that this might have been called for with the growing insistence on the saint as a native of Byzantium, and might even have become a necessity in the eleventh century to protect them from hostile incursions. It should be added that in a period such as the tenth century (prior to the fall of Basil Lecapenus) when so many powerful eunuchs held sway at Byzantium, often as παρακοιμώμενος, the government might have looked with unwonted favour on the rising cult of a sainted eunuch-cubicularius.

The presence of relics of a saint of the same name in the capital is signalled surprisingly early; this in an early seventh-century story about a certain Charsianus who, allegedly during the patriarchate of Gennadius I (458–471), was attached as reader to a shrine of Saint Eleutherius, the relics of whom were located in the apse of the shrine.<sup>49</sup> The existence of this shrine is well attested; it was the scene of a synaxis twice a year, 15 December and 20 or 21 July.<sup>50</sup> However, from the entries in the synaxaria at these dates two data emerge: that this is *not* Eleutherius the Cubicularius, but a Roman of the same name, martyred in the time of Hadrian; and that the Roman saint's shrine was located near the Xerolophus. This last point is of some importance because *ca* 1200 Anthony of Novgorod (p.62)

<sup>49</sup> *Pratum Spirituale* 145 (PG 87.3009A); see Janin, *Eglises* 110.

<sup>50</sup> *Typicon* I 132, 346; *Synax CP* 310.13–14, 832.48–49.

speaks of relics of a Saint Eleutherius at a different location: “Derrière Ispigas sont les reliques et le sang de Saint Eleuthère.” That these were *not* the relics of the Roman Eleutherius is fairly clear: the Xerolophus and Ispigas were roughly at the southern and northern ends of the Constantinian wall respectively, hence the likelihood of confusion is very small. Could the relics Anthony saw have been those of the Cubicularius? There is no corroborative evidence and, given that there were at least five saints bearing the name Eleutherius, it would be hazardous even to make a guess. We may never know whether Constantinople ever housed the relics of its native son (?) who rose to be the eunuch-minister of Maximian.

#### Saints Florus and Laurus

Although they are virtually unknown elsewhere, the martyrs Florus and Laurus came to enjoy a particular devotion at Constantinople. It is nowhere stated that they were natives of Byzantium nor that they were put to death there, but they are claimed to have been (at least for a time) resident in the city.<sup>51</sup> It was there that they learned their craft as stone-masons from two men, Proclus and Maximus, who subsequently earned their place on the list of Byzantine martyrs, although nothing is known of them from any other source. On the death of these masters (during the reign of Hadrian) our saints (who were twins) migrated from Byzantium, presumably to escape persecution, to Dardania in Illyricum, to the city of Ulpiana. There they were commissioned by a certain Licinius to build a pagan temple. Some of the funds he provided for the work they distributed to the poor. When the temple was completed, the brothers came with a band of poor men and tore out all the pagan idols and decoration. These were replaced with the cross while the

<sup>51</sup> τὰς ἐν Βυζαντίῳ καταλιπόντες διατριβάς (AASS Aug. III 523A) is the only statement in the published *passio* (BHG 664) connecting them with the city of Byzas; it is echoed in the synaxaria.

building was sanctified by prayer as a Christian church. As punishment for these misdeeds the poor men were flung into a furnace by Licinius while the twins, refusing to deny their faith, were buried alive in a deep well. In a later age, when persecution had abated, there was an invention of the relics and subsequent translation to the capital.<sup>52</sup> It is difficult to say when this translation took place (other than prior to the tenth century, date of the earliest mention) but take place it certainly did. The existence of a Μονὴ τῶν Φλώρου, first attested in 695,<sup>53</sup> provides no evidence of a cult of the twin martyrs for the name of Laurus is never associated with this institution. The form of the title rather suggests (by analogy with the names of other monasteries) that it refers to a benefactor and/or founder rather than to a titular saint. A possible candidate for his role is the Saint Florus who lived in the later sixth century and who withdrew from public life to embark on a monastic career on one of his estates in Anaplus.<sup>54</sup> Here might be discerned the origin of the Μονὴ τῶν Φλώρου.

The earliest indication of a cult of the twin martyrs at Constantinople is to be found in a source of *ca* 900 which prescribes a synaxis in their honour on 18 August, to be observed “in their holy μαρτύριον which is near the Church of Saint Philip the

<sup>52</sup>The text from which this information is taken and upon which all the entries in the synaxaria appear to be based is a *passio*, *BHG* 664, which the Bollandists considered to be the only extant document known in the eighteenth century concerning the twin martyrs worthy of publication (*AASS* Aug. III 522–524, also in Latyshev, *Menologion* II 292–295). It betrays no hint of Constantinopolitan authorship and is, in fact, attributed to the pen of a Calabrian monk. A particularly sensational but historically worthless account of the invention survives but remains unpublished. This and other extravagant narratives (*BHG* 660, 661–663) are described in *AASS* Aug. III 521–522. The first of these would probably provide some additional information about the translation to the capital, the event which may have inspired its author. Two of the extant manuscripts date from the tenth century: *Paris.gr.* 548 and *Paris.gr. suppl.* 241.

<sup>53</sup>Janin, *Eglises* 495–496.

<sup>54</sup>*Synax CP* 324.1–18. This Florus later became Bishop of Amisos, where he presumably died and was buried.

Apostle."<sup>55</sup> There is no mention of relics here, but no importance whatsoever can be set on the silence of the *Typicon* so far as relics are concerned: it rarely makes any mention of them even where they are well known to have been located. The earliest dateable mention of a translation of relics to the capital is in the later tenth century *Menologion* which contains against 18 August a brief précis of the martyrs' *passio*. There is an additional statement to the effect that both the invention referred to at the end of the *passio* ("when the persecution came to an end") and the translation to the capital took place in the reign of Constantine the Great, at which time the relics "were deposited in the place where they still lie" (unspecified).<sup>56</sup> So late a testimony to a Constantinian translation inspires very little confidence and, curiously, is not encountered elsewhere in the synaxaria. Where this entry does have value is in demonstrating that there *were* relics of the twin saints in the capital at the time of writing. From the entry in the *Typicon* mentioned above, it might be inferred that by "the place where they still lie" the writer of the *Menologion* was referring to the *martyrion* of Florus and Laurus near Saint Philip's church. While the fuller entry found in the later synaxaria specifies no date for the translation, it does add two useful data: first, that when the relics were found, they were "placed in rich caskets which poured forth a torrent of healings."<sup>57</sup> This is probably to be read as a description of the disposition and the properties of the relics as they were known to the writer, rather than as an historical statement. Then: at some time (the synaxaria indicate) a second translation took place. A synaxis in the μαρτύριον at Saint Philip's Church continued to be observed on 18 August, but on the same day an identical celebration was held at the great monastery of the Pantocrator (founded by John II Comnenus, 1113–1143) "because

<sup>55</sup>*Typicon* I 376.17–20; Janin, *Eglises* 496–497.

<sup>56</sup>*Menologion of Basil Porphyrogenitus*, PG 117.589c.

<sup>57</sup>*Synax CP* 907.6–908.20.

their relics have been transferred there."<sup>58</sup> This second translation can be dated more accurately. It may not have preceded the visit of Anthony of Novgorod *ca* 1200 for he reports the bodies of the twin saints near the Gate of Saint Romanus (Top Kapı), in the western part of the city, a most likely location for the Church of Saint Philip.<sup>59</sup> The Pantocrator lies at least two kilometres distant from this site. In 1350 Stephen of Novgorod saw the *heads* of Saints Florus and Laurus at the Pantocrator<sup>60</sup> which may have prompted Janin to suppose that the second translation took place after 1261. However the possibility cannot be overlooked of the relics having been divided, or rather, decapitated. It is curious that Anthony of Novgorod speaks only of the bodies (which is not his usual way of referring to relics) while Stephen of Novgorod and subsequent visitors to the Pantocrator only mention heads. Perhaps John II added to all his other benefactions to the Pantocrator a share (*viz.*, the heads) of two of the more popular saints of the city; in which case, as Janin observes elsewhere (*Eglises* 501), "ce transfert eut lieu sans doute au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle."

#### Saint Lucillian and companions

There were six martyrs revered at Constantinople who were neither natives nor residents of Byzantium but prisoners brought there to suffer capital punishment. These were: the aged former pagan priest Lucillian, the youths Claudius, Hypatius, Paul, and Dionysius, together with Paula the Virgin,<sup>61</sup> all of whom share a common feast in the Use of Constantinople on 3 June.

<sup>58</sup>διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖσε μετατεθῆναι τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν λείψανα, *Synax CP* 908.18–20

<sup>59</sup>Anthony of Novgorod p.60; Janin, *Eglises* 493–494.

<sup>60</sup>George P. Majeska, *Russian Travellers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Washington 1984) 43. Subsequent viewings are noted on 153, 163, 187; comment on 293.

<sup>61</sup>See Conrad Janning's comments in *AASS Jun. I* 274–276, also Delehaye's (*supra* n.4) 233–235 and *BHG* 998y–999c.

Lucillian met the youths, already incarcerated for their faith, when he was gaoled for his apostasy by Silvanus the Governor of Nicomedia. When these five proved obdurate in their new-found faith they were sent for execution (the young men by the sword, the elder by crucifixion) to “a desert place near Byzantium.”<sup>62</sup> Some time later Paula was sent to be executed on the same spot, she having drawn the Governor’s attention to herself and to her faith by her diligent ministrations to the other five during the time of their imprisonment at Nicomedia. All these martyrs are said to have been buried where they fell.<sup>63</sup>

There is evidence of a burgeoning cult of Lucillian and his companions at Constantinople by the middle of the tenth century. One of the two principal manuscripts of the *Typicon of the Great Church* (**H**, dated *ca* 950) mentions a μαρτύριον in their honour “near the Church of Michael the Archangel in the Oxeia” where a synaxis was held in their name each 3 June.<sup>64</sup> The entry passed *verbatim* into the synaxaria (728.12–15) but at an indeterminate date a further entry was added in honour of these saints, stipulating a commemoration of them on 19 January “in the house of the Patriarch Anastasius in the Oxeia” (405.2–3). This does not necessarily mean that there were two separate shrines of the martyrs in the Oxeia, rather that the one was increasing in popularity. Janin suggests that the later entry might be the shrine’s [re-?]dedication festival. He also suggests that it might have been in some way connected with a hospice erected by the Patriarch Anastasius (729–752).

The location of this shrine is not incompatible with what is reported of the site of the martyrs’ executions: a steep valley roughly five hundred metres outside the Severan wall. This prompts the question of whether the shrine was believed to

<sup>62</sup>Latyshev, *Menologion* II 7–12 (BHG 999c), ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ τοῦ Βυζαντίου, p.10.3.

<sup>63</sup>*Menologion* II 7–12; the synaxaria appear to have used the same source.

<sup>64</sup>*Typicon* I 302.23–25; Janin, *Eglises* 311–312.

mark their place of burial. If so, there would appear to have been an exhumation for the *passio* published by Latyshev clearly implies that the relics were accessible. It also concludes with a prayer including the following words: “Now you [martyrs] are habitants of the heavens, receiving the fruits of your labours while, here on earth, you provide a source of miracles to the sick who merely touch the relics of you martyrs.”<sup>65</sup> One assumes that it would be in the μαρτύριον that these relics were to be found, but this is not confirmed until ca 1150, by a western visitor: *iuxta illud monasterium [Μονὴ τὰ Ναρσοῦ, definitely in the Oxeia]*<sup>66</sup> *est aecclesia sancti Luciliani martyris et in ipsa iacet ipse et socii ejus.*<sup>67</sup>

It is possible that this shrine of the six martyrs later suffered some disaster such as a fire, but the evidence is ambivalent and difficult to date. It occurs in an *encomium* of the martyrs by a certain Photius who, towards the end of his peroration, prays the martyrs to “look down upon those who venerate the dust of your relics.”<sup>68</sup> But the style is highly oratorical, which means that “dust” in this context may be no more than a figure of speech. However, this is certainly not the way men usually spoke of the holy relics, the very fact that they had not, like others’ remains, gone from “dust to dust” being held as a demonstration of their sanctity. On the other hand there are plenty of examples of dust and ashes taken from martyrs’ shrines later

<sup>65</sup>καὶ νῦν οἰκοῦντες τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τῶν πόνων τὰ γέρα λαμβάνοντες καὶ θαυμάτων πηγὴν ἐν γῆ τοῖς νοσοῦσι μόνη προσάψει τῶν μαρτυρικῶν ὑμῶν λειψάνων παρέχοντες, *Menologion* II 12.5–8.

<sup>66</sup>Janin, *Eglises* 360.

<sup>67</sup>Anon. *Mercati* ch.30.

<sup>68</sup>AASS Jun. I 267–279, τὴν τε κόνιν τῶν σῶν πολυάθλων λειψάνων κατασπαζομένους (279A). These are the words of Photius τοῦ μακαριωτάτου σκευοφύλακος τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ λογοθέτου. Unfortunately we have nothing to add to Janning’s comment: “de auctore nihil nobis aliunde innotuit” (269E), although we can infer with him that it was at Holy Apostles’ Constantinople that this Photius was Sacristan. There is no question of this being the Photius who became patriarch, as he was a layman prior to his elevation: Theophanes Cont. p.194, Scylitzes p.106.36–37, Zonaras, *Epitome* 16.4.35.

being venerated and used as though these were the relics themselves. Maybe this is such a case.

#### Bishop Metrophanes

Metrophanes, the fourth Bishop of Byzantium (306–314, 315–325 or 327),<sup>69</sup> was certainly no martyr, hence not a candidate for saintly honours until many years after his death. As the bishop of the subsequently imperial city at the time when the Christian religion was legalised, his grave would probably be carefully marked and, in due course, become a point of considerable interest. It is clear from the synaxaria that this had happened already by the tenth century for by then there was an annual synaxis in his honour on 4 June, a celebration of no small importance:

Commemoration of our father among the saints Metrophanes, archbishop [*sic*] of Constantinople [*sic*] ... his synaxis is held in the most holy Great Church and in his venerable house which is near to [πλησίον] the holy martyr Acacius in the Heptascalon, where his honourable and holy relics lie. The procession advances from the Great Church to the Forum [of Constantine] and, after the accustomed prayers, proceeds to the celebration of the aforementioned synaxis.<sup>70</sup>

The location of Metrophanes' tomb indicates that he wished (or others wished him) to be buried *ad sanctos*, for it is surely no coincidence that he lay in close proximity (πλησίον) to the least suspect of the Byzantine martyrs—further evidence of an early cult of Saint Acacius. That “venerable house” in which he lay is variously claimed to have been a Constantinian foundation.<sup>71</sup> This is a common-place so frequently encountered that it would

<sup>69</sup> Although many Byzantine sources extend the episcopate of Metrophanes to include the Council of Nicaea in 325 many scholars have taken 314 as the year of his death. A strong case for the later date is made by F. Winkelmann, “Die Bischöfe Metrophanes und Alexandros von Byzanz,” *BZ* 59 (1966) 44–71.

<sup>70</sup> *Typicon* I 304.1–7, *Synax CP* 730.2–4.

<sup>71</sup> E.g. *Patria* 3.115 (p.253), 3.210 (p.281). See also Janin, *Eglises* 336 and n.6.

hardly be worth mentioning were there not a dissenting voice in a rather unlikely source, one which rather down-grades the origin of the structure. The oldest extant *vita* of Metrophanes says nothing of his burial-place<sup>72</sup> and neither does Photius' summary of that document (*Bibl. cod.* 256). There is however a tenth-century synoptic *vita* according to which Metrophanes was laid to rest "in the oratory which he had raised up himself."<sup>73</sup> It is precisely because this statement, running counter to the prevailing belief in a Constantinian foundation, occurs in so conventional a document that it inspires some confidence. With the wisdom of hindsight we know that, even if Constantine I ever did build a funerary chapel for a martyr at Byzantium (and it is by no means proven that he did) it would be considerably more than a century before an emperor, or anybody else for that matter, would even consider doing such an honour to a mere bishop. Why then should Metrophanes have presumed to build a chapel for himself? The text does not say that he did. It says he was responsible for the building, but nothing about for whom or what it was built. Might it not be that what Metrophanes was responsible for building at Heptascalon was in fact a μαρτύριον, possibly the first μαρτύριον (subsequently enlarged) over the tomb of Saint Acacius and in his honour? Here is the testimony of Anthony of Novgorod *ca* 1200 (p.62):

Dans l'église de Saint-Akacius martyr, qu'a fondée l'empereur Constantin, se trouvent ses reliques; derrière le chœur de cette église il y a le tombeau de Saint Mitrophane, premier patriarche de Tsargrad [Constantinople]; là sont son étole et sa tête; quant à son corps, l'empereur païen Kopronime, après avoir fait battre de verges, le fit brûler.

"Derrière le chœur" suggests two contingent structures, a church

<sup>72</sup> Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια 4 (1884) 287–291, 296–300, 305–310, and 324–326 (*BHG* 1279).

<sup>73</sup> καθ' ὃν αὐτὸς οὗτος ἀνήγειρεν εὐκτήριον οἶκον, Latyshev, *Menologion* II 12–15, p.15.6–7 (*BHG* 1278y).

and an oratory. It is a small step from there to see them as a larger and a smaller (older) structure with the saint's relics which both honoured (Acacius') located between them, much as one altar can serve two churches in western usage. What more natural than for Metrophanes to be buried in an oratory he had raised up for Constantinople's distinguished martyr?

Anthony's allegation that Constantine V despoiled the bishop's relics cannot be taken too seriously since the *Typicon* as cited above leaves no doubt that the relics were still there in the tenth century. A more likely explanation is that exhumation and partition took place at a later date, or how else could the stole have been visible?

Such is the tally of relics held at Constantinople which had a connection with the old Byzantium. It would be misleading to treat them corporately as the *noyau primitif* of the relic-collection because several of them only came to light at a later age. In truth, the present writer would be very surprised indeed if at the moment of its inauguration, 11 May 330, Constantinople was aware that it possessed any relics whatsoever other than those of Acacius the Martyr.

*June, 2001*

Dept. of History  
University of Manitoba  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
Canada R3T 5V5  
Wortley@cc.umanitoba.ca