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Amamagnæan Collection manuscript 194, 8° (dated 1387), an important geographical miscellany, contains on folios 11'-16' a famous itinerary from Iceland to the Holy Land, commonly known as the leiðarvísir.¹ It has generally been attributed to Abbot Nikulás of the Benedictine monastery in Munkaþverá, Iceland. He is reported to have returned from a journey in 1154, and to have died between 1158 and 1160. The journey probably took place between 1149 and 1154 (Simek 264-267) and lasted three years between 1151 and 1154, and it is likely that the leiðarvísir was written between 1154 and 1158/9.

The leiðarvísir contains the description of a pilgrimage through Europe to Jerusalem and is full of practical information about real places useful for a traveller. It indicates routes and alternative routes, distances, times and stopping places. It is also informative about churches and episcopal sees, as well as peoples and their dialects. Nikulás intersperses his geographical information with religious stories and fantastic elements drawn from Germanic heroic legends, such as Gnutahéðr, where Sigurðr killed Fáfnir (in the Nidda Valley region according to Magoun, 1943, 217), Gunnar’s snake-pit (placed in Lunigiana, Italy) and Thithrek’s Bath (between Viterbo and Sutri). In Nikulás’s text there is no clear distinction between real and fantastic places. The presence of these religious anecdotes and fantastic elements, which could not be part of an actual travel experience, is evidence that Nikulás collected and incorporated material he came across which fleshed out his itinerary and made it vivid.

Scholarly research since the fundamental work of Eric Werlauff has been devoted primarily to identifying the places mentioned in the leiðarvísir, and only secondarily to the recognition of possible written sources on which the work could be based -- and this mainly in connection with the references to Germanic legends (Magoun, 1943). This paper focuses on the Roman part of the itinerary, in order to demonstrate that written sources played a fundamental role in the way Nikulás describes the city. These sources, though not stricto sensu belonging to a literary genre, are part of the imaginary world of Nikulás, the part of his itinerary apparently based not on experience but on collected information. I will show that written sources on Rome serve as the foundation for his description of real places. It is not implausible, as has often been assumed, that Nikulás took notes during his journey to help his ‘good memory’; at the end of the leiðarvísir he is in fact called ‘minnigr’.² It is also not unlikely that Abbot Nikulás turned to written sources for some of his material, given the medieval intellectual and theological writing tradition of collecting
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¹ A fragment of the same itinerary is also included in MS AM 736 II, 4° (c. 1400).

² ‘Nikulás ábóta er þæði var vitur og viðfrægrur, minnigr og margfróður, ráðvis og réttorður.’ (Thorsson, p. 61) Further leiðarvísir quotations are from the Rome section: Thorsson, pp. 57-58.
information and often passages of text verbatim without any indication of their borrowed nature, but with the virtuous intention of producing an excellent text based on the best information and ideas available.

The section of the itinerary dedicated to Rome shifts stylistically from the earlier descriptions. It distinguishes itself in the leiðarrvísir for its length and wealth of detail used in depicting sacred and secular places. Particularly significant is the fact that in the description of Rome Nikulás repeatedly uses Latin. He does this, for example, to indicate the gate er heitir ante Portam Latinam, and when giving the dimensions of Saint Peter’s on the Vatican: Ecclesia Petri quadrigentorum et sexaginta longa ad sanctum altari sed lata ducentorum et triginta pedum. The use of Latin suggests the presence of written sources, which are relied on for their authority.

In the mid-twelfth century, there were several medieval texts which described the city of Rome and which could be used by both the travelling pilgrim and the sedentary scholar far from Rome.\(^3\) In recent years an exemplary and thorough study on medieval pilgrim guides has been carried out by Nine Miedema. I will concentrate on those texts which were distinguished by their wide circulation and importance in the tradition of this genre and which, directly or through their textual traditions, were available in Nikulás’s day. By ‘traditions’, I mean that some of these texts appear in various forms, as new versions developed over time. One of the oldest texts is about Rome’s churches and is commonly known by the name Stationes ecclesiarum urbis Romae. The form of the text is a list in which, for every day of the year, a station (i.e., a church) is indicated where the principal mass for the day was to be celebrated. The oldest manuscript dates back to the eighth century (Miedema, 1996, 15). Another famous manuscript is the Mirabilia urbis Romae, whose first known version’s terminus ante quem is 1143, several years before Nikulás’s journey is believed to have taken place. It was part of the Liber politicus by Benedictus, Canon of St Peter’s.\(^4\) It consists of lists and descriptions of monuments and sites, many belonging to ancient Rome. The Ordo romanus is another text attributed to Benedictus, closely related to the Stationes ecclesiarum and often belonging to the manuscript tradition of the Mirabilia. The text which was most commonly used from the late twelfth century through the Renaissance is the Indulgentiae ecclesiarum urbis Romae.\(^5\) It reached wide circulation in the fourteenth century and its oldest manuscript, BL MS Cotton Faustina B.VII (late twelfth century), comes just after the supposed date of Nikulás’s trip, but it is based on traditions which began earlier. The Indulgentiae appear in many versions. The common feature of these texts is that they are accounts of the churches of Rome and the indulgences that could be obtained in each, although they differ in the number of churches and their description.\(^6\) For the Indulgentiae we do not have a uniform tradition but a multiform corpus of texts. In reviewing the Indulgentiae which could be part of the tradition informing the leiðarrvísir, I have taken into account the five published editions of the Latin versions of the Indulgentiae, based on fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts (Huelsen, 137-156; Hulbert; Schimmelpfennig; VZ, IV,

\(^3\) On the older Roman itineraries and catalogues, see Testini, pp. 25-32.

\(^4\) For the contentious issue of the Mirabilia’s dating, see Miedema (1996), pp. 2-11.

\(^5\) Miedema (1996, pp. 24-95) offers a comprehensive catalogue of the Latin manuscripts containing the Mirabilia, Stationes and Indulgentiae.

\(^6\) On the Indulgentiae’s textual history, see Miedema (2003), esp. pp. 18-23.
78-88; and Weißhanner), as well as manuscripts Cotton Faustina B.VII and Vatican Library, Vat. Lat. 687 (fourteenth-fifteenth centuries). Many manuscripts contain several of these sources on Rome, sometimes copied by one hand, as is already the case in Faustina B.VII, which includes the Indulgentiae immediately after a shortened version of the Mirabilia and before a list of the Stationes ecclesiaram. My aim in reviewing these various sources on Rome and in comparing the leðarvisir to them has been to determine whether written precedents could have been relied on in drafting the Rome section, serving to provide particular detail and phrasing. I do not believe that we can say for certain which works Nikulás was reading, but the evidence does suggest that he had access to sources in the traditions I have described which offered the specifics he supplied in the leðarvisir.7

To begin with, Nikulás opens his description of Rome in the manner of the Mirabilia, giving the dimensions of the city. He indicates, however, its length and breadth, not the measure of its perimeter with the number of towers in the walls, which is how the Mirabilia begins. Nikulás tells us: Svo er sagt að Roma sé fjórar millur á lengd en tvær á breidd. The Mirabilia starts with the following words:

Murus citivatis Romae habet turres .CCCLXI, turres castella .XLVIII, propugnacula .V.LDCCC., portas .XII. sine Transtiberim, posterulas .V. In circuitu vero eius sunt miliaria .XXII, excepto Transtiberim et civitas Leoniana.

(VZ, III, 17)8

After this introduction, Nikulás describes the most important churches, stating that there are five bishop’s thrones, i.e. five patriarchal churches: Par eru fimm biskupsstólær. The patriarchal churches until the fourteenth century were in fact still five and not seven, as they would become with the reclassification of the ancient churches of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme and San Sebastiano.9 The Indulgentiae preserved in manuscript Faustina B.VII begin on folio 16a with the rubric: Indulgentiae indulte a romanis pontificibus ad stationes que sunt in urbe romana. There follows (ff. 16a-16b) a list of the main churches of Rome with indications of the indulgences to be obtained in each.10 After this, we find an enumeration of the patriarchal churches:


7 Miedema (2001, p. 22), in discussing the non-German and Dutch versions of the Indulgentiae, asserts in fact that the leðarvisir reworks the Indulgentiae.
8 Francis Magoun (1940, p. 281) suggests that the ‘ii’ of the text could be a scribal error for ‘iii’, which would also better correspond to the approximately circular shape of the city.
10 That Cotton Faustina B.VII was intended for pilgrims is confirmed by the following observations about the different degrees of indulgences according to travellers’ countries of origin: ‘Quid indulgentias recipiant viciniores et quid remotiores. Peregrini visitantes limina apostolorum Petri et Pauli si sunt Angli vel Scotti vel hibernienses habent indulgentiam trium annorum, Francigene, Yspani, Teutonici trium annorum, Lumbardi, Tuscani, Apulei vnius anni’, MS Cotton Faustina B.VII, f. 17a. See also Miedema (2003), p. 21.
The sequence given by Nikulás differs from this. He begins with St John Lateran, observing that no one inferior to a lýðbiskup can celebrate a mass there: *Einn er að Jóns kirkju baptista. Þar skal engi messu syngja yfir háaltari, sá er miður sé vigdóur en lýðbiskup.* Magoun (1940, 281) observes that lýðbiskup (suffragan bishop) may be a misinterpretation of *cardinalis episcopus.* This suggests the use of a written source, which the author may have partially misunderstood. We find a similar passage in the *Descriptio Lateranensis Ecclesiae.* This description, written by John the Deacon during the papacy of Alexander III (1159-1181), was based on earlier texts (the first dated shortly after 1073) and enriched with his own updates (VZ, III, 319-325), and it constituted a source for the parts of the *Indulgentiae* about St John Lateran: *Super hoc etiam sacrosanctum altarium, super quod missam non celebrat nisi papa vel cardinalis episcopus ...* (VZ, III, 338)

Nikulás goes on to indicate that in St John Lateran there is the papal throne: *Þar er þáfastól.* *Páfastól* is a translation of the Latin *cathedra pontificalis,* of which we find an example in John Deacon:

In hac itaque sacrosancta Lateranensi basilica Salvatori Ihesu Christo Deo dicata, quae caput est mundi, quae patriarchalis est et imperialis, sedis est apostolicae cathedrae pontificalis. (VZ, III, 336)

There follows in the *leíðarvisir* a list of the relics to be found in St John Lateran:

þar er hlið Krísta og klaði Maríu og mikill hlutur beína Jóhanness baptista. Þar er umskurður Krísta og mjólk úr bjóðstí Maríu, af þornfjörd Krísta og af kryttl hans og margir aðrir helgir dómar varðar í eimu gullkeri mjólu.

This list of relics -- which includes the blood of Christ, a garment of Mary, bones of St John the Baptist, the prepuce of Christ, milk from the breast of Mary, a large part of Christ's crown of thorns and his coat -- is present in many branches of the tradition of text describing St John Lateran and the chapel of San Lorenzo in Palatio, the *Sancta Sanctorum.* In John the Deacon's *Descriptio Lateranensis Ecclesiae* the following relics are located in St John's: *tunica inconsutilis, Purpureum vestimentum eiusdem Salvatoris et Redemptoris, de sanguine et aqua lateris Domini ampullae duae, circuncisio Domini, de sanguine sancti Ioannis Baptiste, et de pulvere et cinere combusti corporis eiusdem praecursoris Christi.* (VZ, III, 337) In the text immediately preceding these items is a quote from Paul, Hebrews, IX, 2-4, where we have an *urna aurea habens manna, quod habuit secundum tabernaculum quod dicit sancta sanctorum.* While the quote is explicit in John the Deacon (*Unde Paulus dicit Apostulus,* it merges without citation into the text in the *Indulgentiae*:

Item in cadem ecclesia est quaedam camera, quae dicitur sacraria. Ibi est altare beati Ioannis baptista .... Et ibi est archa testamenti, in qua sunt due tabule

---

12 See also Werlauff, p. 45.
13 Significantly, in the German tradition of the *Indulgentiae* the basilica is often called *des habtes stule.* (Miedema, 2001, p. 163)
14 On the throne situated in the hemicycle of the tribune was a twelfth-century tetrasich: *Haec est papalis sedes et pontificalis/praesidet et xpi de ivre vicarivs isti/et qvia ivre datvr sedes romana vocatrv/ nec debet vere nisi solvs papa sede/et qvia svblimis alii svbdvntur in imis.* (Armillini, p. 124)
15 *Sancta Sanctorum* was also the name given to the wooden 'ark' of Leo III (795-816), a reliquary which had this name inscribed on it, and it became the name of the oratory of San Lorenzo. (Lauer, 1906, p. 26; Armellini, pp. 144-149)
testamenti, et virga Moysi, virga Aaron, ornamenta Aaron, ura aurea plena manna, candelabrum aureum ... (Schimmelpfennig, 651)\textsuperscript{16}

The ‘gullker’ (golden vessel) of the leíðarvisir may have derived either from the archa testamenti (Ark of the Covenant), which St Paul says was covered in gold, or from the ura aurea habens manna; if the latter is the source, there was possibly a misunderstanding of magna for manna which generated the adjective miklu. John the Deacon also says that ossa duo sancti Iohannis Baptistae are in this chapel. (VZ, III, 357) Similar lists are found in versions of the Indulgentiae, for instance in the Schimmelpfennig edition, which is close to Vat. Lat. 687:

Item in predicta ecclesia sunt duo ampulle de sanguine et aqua, que fluxerunt de latere Christi, et sudarium et purpureum vestimentum et lintheum, quo pedes discipolorum suorum territis in cena, de V panibus ortaecis, quibus saciati fuerunt VM hominum, de carne preputii, que domino nostro fuit abscissa in circuncisione eius, velum beate Marie virginis, caput Zachariae, de erinibus et sanguine beati Iohannis baptiste ... (Schimmelpfennig, 651)

Magoun (1940, 281-282) compared Nikulás’s list with some verses in Huelsen’s edition of the Indulgentiae. These verses were actually also the text of a mosaic inscription (of the second half of the twelfth century) by the door of the sacristy at the Lateran, and they also included the milk from Mary’s breast: *lac quod sacris suxisti Christi* *momillos*.\textsuperscript{18} I could not find in the sources I reviewed any reference to the ‘thorns of Christ’s crown’ kept in St John’s, only to *novem spine de corona Christi* kept in Santa Croce in Gerusalemme. (Hulbert, 408)

After St John’s the leíðarvisir mentions the second bishop’s throne, which is in Santa Maria Maggiore, where the pope celebrated mass on Christmas and Easter: *Annar biskupsstoll er að Mariukirkju. Þar skal þá fið messu sýngja jóladag og þáskadag. This liturgical information coincides with the tradition of the Stationes ecclesiariwm, where it is reported that the principal mass was to be celebrated in natalem domini ad Sanctam Mariam, and In Dominico Sancto ad Sanctam Mariam. (Rusch, 109 and 110) The *Ordo romanus* includes a thorough description of the rituals to be followed by the pope and his court. For Christmas, it says: *In adventu Domini ...*

---

\textsuperscript{16} See also *Graphia aureae urbis*, VZ, III, pp. 83-84.

\textsuperscript{17} Vat. Lat. 687 (ff. 129'-130') reads: ‘Item in eadem ecclesia sunt duo ampulle de sanguine et aqua que fluxerunt de latere Christi [et] sudarium [et] purpureum vestimentum et lintheum cum quo Christus extersit pedes discipolorum suorum in cena de quinque panibus ortaecis [ordeatecis] de quibus saciati fuerunt quinque milia hominum, de carne preputii quae fuit domino nostro Ihesu Christo abscissa in circuncisione, velum beate marie, caput Zacharic, de crinibus et sanguine sancti Iohannis baptiste ...’ This early list of relics is already partly present in Vat. Lat. 636, f. 73’ (13\textsuperscript{th} century); interestingly, the list in this manuscript is followed by an early thirteenth-century version of the *Mirabilia*; it also appears in the *Graphia aureae urbis* (VZ, III, pp. 83-84).

\textsuperscript{18} Gissar, p. 76: ‘... iste reliquie sunt ad sancta sanctorum rome/iste locus celebris nostris sic verat in horis/vt popovlo veteri sancte domus interioris/cirvmcisa caro christi sandalia clara/ac viget hic precissio cara/de velo matris domini cariaca capillis/et lac quod sacris svxisti christe mamillis/hic panis cene sacer est hvmersqve mathei/vestis batiste cvm mento bartholomei/hic (sanc);e evfemie capvd agnetisqve beate/hic petri pavliqve capvd pars de cruce sancta/hiis sociata manent carissima pignora qaanta.’ See also Werlauft, p. 45, n. 95 and Lauer (1911), pp. 294-295.
stacio ad Sanctam Mariam Maiorem .... In vigilia Nativitatis Domini ... stacio ad Sanctam Mariam Maiorem .... Ad vesperum et ad vigilias debet ibi manere pontifex per totam noctem .... Et ad Presepium debet cantare missam. (VZ, III, 210-211) For Easter, it tells us: In die sanctae Resurrectionis ... stacio est ad Sanctam Mariam Maiorem ... (VZ, III, 216)

Nikulás provides us with analogous information for the next church: Saints Stephen and Lawrence, i.e. San Lorenzo Fuori le Mura, where the pope is to sing mass on the octave of Christmas and on the feast of these saints: Þridji er að kirkju Stephani et Laurenti. Þar skal þáfl messu syngja hinn dita dag þóla og háðir þeirra sjálfr. The two Latin genitives in the Icelandic text hint strongly that a Latin text served as a model. In the Ordo romanus we find corresponding information about the pope’s stations: Ista dominica Septuagesimae stacio ad Sanctum laurentium foris muros .... In Festivitate sancti Stephani ... pontifex ... vadit ad Sanctum Stephani ubi est stacio .... (VZ, III, 214)19 For the feast of St Lawrence, it says: In festivitate sancti Laurentii dominus pontifex in basilica eius in agro Verano ... facit vesperum. (VZ, III, 221)

Sant’Agnes, the next church in the leirávistra, is not a biskupsstíði, but according to Nikulás is the most beautiful ‘in all the city’ and built by Constance, daughter of ‘King’ Constantine: ‘
En austur þaðan tvær milur er Agnesakirkja. Hún er dýrlægust í allri borginni. Hana lét gera Konstantía dóttr Konstantins konungs er hún tók fyrrí trú en hann og bað hún leyfis að láta gera Agnesakirkju en konungur leyfði henni utan borgar að ráði Silvestri páfa.’

Nikulás is referring here not to the church built by Pope Honorius I but to the large, stadium-shaped basilica next to it which today is in ruins. In the Indulgentiae editions that I compared, although the church is mentioned (Huelsen, 145; Schimmelpfennig, 657; and Weißthanner, 63), I did not find references to this legend of Constance. We do find it, however, in several hagiographic and historical accounts. For example, in the Life of St Sylvester written by Anastasius Bibliothecarius in the late ninth century, it is reported that:

Eodem tempore fecit [Constantine] basilicam Sanctae Martyris Agnetis ex rogatu Constantiae filiae suae, et baptisterium in eodem loco, ubi et baptizata est soror ejus Constantia cum filia Augusta a Silvestro Episcopo.’ (PL, CXXXVII, 1521)

This ‘baptistery’ is clearly the mausoleum Constance built next to the basilica. In his De ratione temporum, Bede, writing about Constantine, says: Item basilicam sanctae martyris Agnetis ex rogatu filiae suae, et baptisterium in eodem loco, ubi et baptizata est soror ejus Constantia cum filia Augusta (PL, XC, 556). It is thus not unlikely that here Nikulás has again used a written source, not necessarily a description of Rome, to enrich his depiction of Sant’Agnes.20

After Sant’Agnes, the text works in the Porta Latina and the church of San Giovanni a Porta Latina: Þaðan eru fjórar milur í borgina austan í hlíð það er heitir ante Portam Latinam. Þar er kirkja Jóhannes postula. Once again Nikulás clearly shows the use of a Latin model and another possible misunderstanding: ante portam latinam should instead be part of the name of the church which is usually mentioned

19 See also Werlauff, p. 45, nn. 96-97.
20 See also Acta sanctorum, Feb., III, p. 70; Hrotsvit von Gandersheim, Historia Passionis Sanctae Agnetis Virginis et Martyris, PL CXXXVII, col. 1121.
with this full name in the *Indulgentiae*, including the earliest version (Faustina B.VII, f. 16); cf. Weißthanner, 63, Huelsen, 148). Nikulás’s description also strays from geographical fact. San Giovanni a Porta Latina is said in the *leidavísir* to be a short distance from the ‘hall’ (or ‘palace’) of Diocletian: *till hallar þetrar er átti Diókletianus konungur*. Kaalund (1908, 76) and Magoun (1940, 283) point out that Nikulás probably confused the Baths of Diocletian with those of Caracalla, which are closer to the church. It is worth noting that, while the Baths of Caracalla are not mentioned in the *Mirabilia*, the *Thermae Diocletianae* are. Also interesting is the fact that the term ‘palace’ (palatium) is used later in the *Mirabilia* to refer again to the Baths of Diocletian (and for many other large buildings in this work).

After the ‘Hall of King Diocletian’, there is the ‘Mariúkirjía’, identified by Magoun (1940, 283) as Santa Maria in Domnica. This church is commonly mentioned in the *Indulgentiae* (e.g., Faustina B.VII, f. 16 and Schimmelpfennig, 656-657), but Nikulás may simply have picked from the list a name familiar to him. The same could possibly have happened with the next church we come to, Santi Giovanni e Paolo. Nikulás describes these saints as two court officers of Constance (daughter of Constantine): *Pá er kirkja Johannis et Pauli martirum. Peir voru hirómenn Konstantiu*. A similar definition belonged to the hagiographic tradition. We find it for instance in Bede’s *MartYROLOGIUM: ROMAE Joannis et Pauli fratum, quorum primus praepositus, secundus primicerius fuit Constantiae virginis, fillae Constantini* (PL, XCIV, 956).

After Santi Giovanni e Paolo, the church of All Saints, i.e. the Pantheon, is mentioned. It is large, beautiful and open on top like the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem: *Pa er Allraheilagrakirjak, mikil og dyrgleg og er opin ofan sem Pulrokirkja i Jerusalem*. Even though, as Magoun (1940, 283) points out, there is no church in Rome of this name, we should bear in mind that in the *Mirabilia* the name is explained in connection with the Christianization of the temple:

> [Agrippa] Rediens Romam fecit hoc templum, et dedicari fecit ad honorem Cibeleos, matris deorum, et Neptuni, dei marini, et omnium daemoniorum, et posuit huic templu nomen Pantheon. ... Venit Bonifacius Papa tempore Focae Imperatoris christianoi. Videbant illum templum ita mirabili dedicatur ad honorem Cibeleos, matris deorum, ante quod multoens a daemonibus christianis percutiebantur, rogavit papa imperatorem ut condonaret ei hoc templum; ut sicut in calendis novembris dedicatum fuit ad honorem Cibeleos, matris deorum, sic illud dedicaret in calendis novembris ad honorem beatæ Marie semper virginis, quae est mater omnium sanctorum, (VZ, III, 35)

---

21 VZ, III, p. 20.
Reference in the *Indulgentiae* to the dome’s opening is usual: *Habet in medio centri in cacumine apertura rotundam magnum, nec habet aliam fenestram.* (VZ, IV, 82)

Next on the itinerary, the church of San Paolo is to the west, outside the city: *Vestur frā borginni er Pālskirkje. Frā er munkiði og borg utan er gengur ír Róma. Frā er stāður sá er heitir Catacumbas.* The observation that San Paolo is frā borginn is probably taken from the Latin name *extra muros*. Once again, in the *Indulgentiae* tradition we find significant similarities; there is a reference to a Cistercian monastery: *... est ibi etiam monasterium antiquum monachorum nigrorum et bene devotum et pulcherrimum claustrum et mirifice operatum ...* (VZ, IV, 86) The expression stāður sá er heitir Catacumbas is clearly a translation from the common Latin formula *in loco qui dicitur catacumbas.*

After San Paolo, Nikulás observes that all parts of the city described hitherto are *fyrr utan Tifur;* this expression is formed from the Latin *Transstiberim* (beyond the Tiber), which also appears in the beginning of the *Mirabilia*. Nikulás then gives the ancient name of the river: *Hín hét forðum Albana.* The correct Latin name is Albuía; the erroneous form present in the *leiðarvisir* could easily be due to a misreading by the fourteenth-century scribe rather than by Nikulás himself.

After this topographical summing up Nikulás says that ‘on this side of the river’ there is Castel Sant’Angelo, which he calls *Kreskentiukastali,* using the medieval name *Castellum* (or *Castrum*) *Crescentii,* after the powerful Roman family Crescenti, who owned (and fortified) the Mausoleum of Hadrian until the mid-twelfth century. Nikulás also mentions here a *Kauphús Péturs postula, harðla mikil og langt.* Magoun (1940, 286) believes that this ‘Bazaar of Peter the Apostle’ is the long portico that connected Castel Sant’Angelo to St Peter’s and had shops. In fact, Krautheimer tells us that, in the entire area stretching from the basilica to the bridge over the Tiber, ‘were the important traffic lanes and a major shopping centre for visitors and pilgrims.’ (Krautheimer, 266)

After the *kauphús,* Nikulás tells us, comes the large and splendid church of St Peter: *Pá er hín göfgu Péturskirkja, harðla mikil og dyrlag.* Nikulás adds that in St Peter’s, there is full absolutio of all ‘troubles’ for men from all over the world: *Pá er lausn öll of vanðredi manna of allan heim.* This a clear reference to the indulgences obtained for pilgrimage there and to remission of all sins (*remissio omnium peccatorum*), which the *Indulgentiae* usually attribute not to St Peter’s but to St John Lateran or to Santa Croce in Gerusalemme. Nikulás then adds that one must enter St

---


26 For *albula,* see Magoun (1940), p. 285 and Kaalund (1913), p. 77.

27 This denomination is present in the *Mirabilia,* VZ, III, p. 23, together with that of *castellum Adriani,* pp. 45-46. Cf. Magister Gregorius, VZ, III, pp. 145 and 163.

28 Krautheimer gives us the flavour of the zone: ‘Along the streets and on the square were the booths of the vendors of religious souvenirs, the painters of icons and ex-voto goldsmiths, and rosary makers; the cobblers, cloth merchants, and sellers of purses; and the small merchants of *generi alimentari* ...’ (p. 266)

29 For instance in Vat. Lat. 687: ‘Item dixit papa Bonifatius quod qui devote veniret ad horandum in die consecrationis salvatoris qui visibiliter apparuit amni populo Romano
Peter’s from the east, that under the altar, in the middle of the church, is St Peter’s sarcophagus, and that in this area he was held in prison: *og skal austan ganga í Péturskirkju, og altari í miðri kirkju. Þar er Pétursrök undir altara og þar var hann í myrkvastofa.* Peter and Paul were actually incarcerated in the Mamertine Prison by the ancient Forum, where the church of San Pietro in Carceri stands. References to the altar and to St Peter’s sarcophagus are common in the *Indulgentiae corpus:* *Primo est ibi altare maius in capite ecclesia, in quo nullus audet celebrare nisi Summus Pontifex. Et subus altari est corpus sancti Petri, vel maior pars et beati Pauli, consocii sui.* (VZ, IV, 79-80). The dimensions of the church, as mentioned above, are given in Latin: *Ecclesia Petri quadrirgentorum et sexaginta pedum a foribus longa ad sanctum altari sed lata ducentorum et triginta.* The measurements are roughly correct and, although an exact match cannot be found in the sources, a similar formula appears in the *Indulgentiae:* *Item tenet in longitudine dicta ecclesia, a cathedra sancti Petri usque ad portale, palmos DCXV; in latitudine CCCXXX.* (VZ, IV, 80). Nikulás adds further that near the altar was the place where St Peter had been crucified: *og því nær stóð kross Péturs þá er hann þinndur sem nú er háaltari, information of common knowledge, but which we also read in the *Indulgentiae:* in eodem loco constructa, ubi sanctus Petrus apostolus fuit crucifixus pedes desuper ...* (Schimmelpfennig, 649) Nikulás also tells us that under the altar there are half the bones of Sts Peter and Paul, while the other half is in the church of St Paul: *Í þeim eru hálf bein Petri et Pauli gudis postula og hálf hvorteggi eru í Pálskirkju. A very similar formulation of this tradition is traceable in the *Indulgentiae.* In Hulbert’s edition (p. 407) we have: *Item medietas corporum Petri et Pauli requiescit ad sanctum Petrum, reliqua vero medietas ad sanctum Paulum,* while Huelsen’s edition gives more detail:


I could not find an exact reference in the Latin sources to the ‘twenty-five bones of those disciples of Christ who followed Peter to Rome’ which, immediately after, are said to be concealed under the altar. Nikulás concludes the description of the church interior by mentioning that there are the altars and tombs of Popes Sylvester I and Gregory the Great: *Í Péturskirkju er altari Silvestri pape þar sem hann hvílír. Gregoriustaltari er í Péturskirkju þar sem hann hvílír.* We know that Pope Sylvester’s altar was in an oratory, and we have an explicit indication of Pope Gregory’s altar and his sepulchre in the *Indulgentiae:* *Et V altaria sunt in dicta ecclesia privilegiata ... altare beati Gregorii pape iuxta sepulchrum eius ...* (Schimmelpfennig, 649-650)

After the last note on the interior of the basilica, Nikulás gives us the position of the obelisk ‘of St Peter’, saying that it is outside to the west, *Péturs nál er hjá úti fyrir vestan.* The word used in this passage for obelisk, *nál,* appears to be a translation of the medieval Latin *agulia,* originally meaning ‘needle’, a form which appears in the *Mirabilia:* *iuxta quod est memoria Caesaris, id est agulia, ubi splendide cinis eius in suo sarcophago requiescit ...* (VZ, III, 43)

*haberet remissionem omnium peccatorum suorum ...* See also Hulbert, pp. 406 and 408; Schimmelpfennig, p. 650; and Weißthanner, pp. 60-61.
From this analysis of the Roman itinerary of Nikulás, we can conclude that material from written sources contributed to the Roman section of the leidavísur. The use of Latin and particular Icelandic terms interpreting Latin, as well as correspondences between the leidavísur and sources on Rome, strongly suggest a reliance on these texts, even though it cannot be said for certain which ones Nikulás may have used. I have cited a variety of sources on Rome in my analysis; some of them, in fact, already appear together in manuscripts in the second half of the twelfth century, sometimes copied by a single hand. This means that Abbot Nikulás could conceivably have drawn from several sources, even with relatively few books to hand, with the purpose of composing a rich and accurate account of the city of Rome.
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