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On the reverse of the Ortiz cross, besides three archangels and St. Niketas the Goth, there is depicted, most likely, St. Paul of Kaiouma, the little known martyr from Constantinople. The very local importance of the cult and the exceptional rarity of the representations of this martyr afford a firm basis for the assumption that the cross was created for some Constantinopolitan monastery, probably for the monastery of Kaiouma, where the cult of St. Paul was for a long time centered. The cross was made in the eleventh century, presumably before the beginning of the era of the Komnenoi.

In a paper, presented at the Third Yugoslav Byzantine studies conference (Kruševac, May 2000) nearly five years ago, we tried to identify two saints, whose images decorate the reverse of the Byzantine processional cross from the George Ortiz Collection, Geneva. It was then mentioned that the precise identification of the said images was a necessary precondition for the full interpretation of the iconographic program of the “Ortiz cross”. Apart from that, it was stressed that establishing the identity of the two saints could have an important bearing on dating the cross and defining the place of its origin. The following text examines this possibility and there will also be discussed the meaning of the decoration on the cross. Before that, we shall present some basic data about this interesting work of Byzantine applied art, which is dated to the end of the eleventh century or to the twelfth century.

The Ortiz cross (which is said to have been found in Eskişehir, Turkey) is made of thin silver sheets mounted on an iron armature. It is 25.4 cm in height, 14.65 cm wide, and weighs 330 grams. Since the cross was used in processions, it had a bronze tang, which is now broken. On the front side of the cross, all the decoration (medallions and the ornamental patterns) is worked in repoussé and gilded (Fig. 1). The names of the represented figures are written in letters formed by punched dots. In the central medallion is Christ [I(σηρούς) (Χριστοῦ)]. He holds the Gospel book in His left hand while blessing with His right. In the roundels which decorate the horizontal arms are the Virgin [Μητρόπα Θεοτόκου] and St. John Prodromos [ὁ ἡγιασμένος Ὀρθοδόξος Θεοτόκου], who are shown turning toward Christ in an attitude of prayer. In the vertical arms, two archangels are depicted also in medallions, Michael [Μητρόπα Θεοτόκου] above, and Gabriel [Γαβριήλ] below. Both wear the patrician chlamys, fastened with a fibula at the right shoulder. In their right hands they hold scepters. With his left hand Michael is making a gesture of adoration, while Gabriel is holding an orb in his left.

The decoration on the other side of the cross, which is worked in niello and silver gilt, consists of two standing figures and three medallions with busts (Fig. 2). At the center is another representation of the archangel Michael [ὁ ἀρχισκύλος Μητρόπα Θεοτόκου], this time as a standing figure with outspread wings. He is wearing the divestures and loros. In his right hand he holds a scepter, and in his left, an orb. In the horizontal arms are busts of the archangels Uriel (left) and Raphael (right), who also carry scepters. In his left hand, Uriel [ὑπομονή] holds a sphere, and Raphael [ὑπομονή] with his left is making a gesture of adoration. Both are wearing patrician vestments. In the upper arm is a standing figure in military attire with a spear and a sword. The figure is identified by an inscription as St. Paul [ὁ ἀγίος Παύλου παύλος]. The iconographic analysis showed that this was most probably St. Paul of Kaiouma, a martyr of Constantinople. The said is depicted as a middle aged man with thick, black hair and a short beard. The bottom arm of the cross is decorated with the bust of a young person, identified by an inscription as St. Niketas [ὁ ἀγίος Νικήτας Νικήτας]. This, undoubtedly, is St. Niketas the Goth, whose feast is celebrated on September 15. The saint is clothed in a tunic and mantle, which is tied at the right shoulder. He holds a small cross in his right hand.

According to its form and function, the cross from the collection of George Ortiz falls within the category of liturgical processional crosses. This kind of cross is used primarily during the litai, liturgical processions organized for important feasts and other occasions prescribed in the typika. At...
least one liturgical cross is needed in every church for use in religious offices, and many churches and monasteries owned several. For example, four processional crosses are mentioned in the inventory of the Constantinopolitan monastery of Christ Panoktirmon, founded by Michael Attaleiates, the famous historian of the eleventh century.7

Even by the Early Byzantine period, liturgical crosses had become objects of artistic achievement. The techniques and the iconography of their decoration changed during the centuries, but from the beginning, and especially after the Iconoclasm, there was a phenomenon who played an important role — liturgical crosses very often came to churches and monasteries as votive gifts offered by prominent individuals.8 Throughout the Middle Byzantine period, this phenomenon had a strong influence on the iconographic program of silver crosses, in particular. Their front sides usually were decorated with the Deesis, extended with the figures of the archangels Michael and Gabriel (Fig. 3 and 4).8 Such a program can be easily explained, if one takes into consideration the soteriological and eschatological connotations of the cross itself as much as the essential meaning of the Deesis.10

---

7 P. Gutier, La distasie de Michel Attaleiates, REB 39 (1981) 89. For other examples cf. Cotsounis, Cossae, 23.
8 Cf., for example, M. Mandell aroma, Silver from Early Byzantium, The Kaiser Kronen and Related Treasures, Baltimore 1986, 87–249 (no. 7 and 76); Cotsounis, Cossae, 29, 32.
9 Cotsounis, Cossae, 46–47, 62, figs. 3a, 12a, 14a, 20a, 21a (the author supposes that the reverse of silver liturgical crosses with the composition of the Deesis were produced by silversmiths in series, and that the donor could only choose how the niello reverse would be decorated. In this way the reverse decoration reflected the personal piety of the donor). Cf. also Bouras, Cross, 24–25; Sandir, Bronze crosses, 125, Glory of Byzantium, 59–65 (no. 23–26). For the early appearance of the images of the archangels on liturgical crosses, cf. C. Mango, Art of the Byzantine Empire, 212–143; Sources and Documents, Englewood Cliffs 1972, 144–145; E. Cruzsank Dokk, Three Early Byzantine Silver Crosses, DOP 41 (1987) 165.177, Fig. 1; L. S. B. Mac Coul, The Coptic Inscriptions on the Votive Cross of the Monastery of Stomatos, CA 44 (1996) 13–15, Figs. 1–2.
The obverse of the Ortzi cross is decorated in full accord with the described iconographic concept. What is more, the “eschatological” part of the program is here expanded to the horizontal arms of the reverse, adorned with the busts of the archangels, Uriel and Raphael. This formula also has analogies among processional crosses of the eleventh century. The images of the four primary archangels are found on the silver cross of Bishop Leo in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (Fig. 5). The idea of the program supplement can be found even in early Christian literature. Old apocryphal sources and the writings of some Church Fathers state that Uriel and Raphael, along with Michael and Gabriel, have important roles in the Last Judgment. Because of this, the joint depiction of the four archangels most usually conveys an eschatological meaning.

The three remaining images on the back of the Ortzi cross, the archangel Michael, St. Paul the soldier, and St. Niketas the Goth, do not appear in this combination in any other object of medieval art. They form the unique part of the program and, accordingly, deserve detailed investigation. However, before this research, we shall once again focus attention on the figure of St. Paul because, in the meantime, it has emerged that there are some more details, which are relevant for its correct identification. Among other things, a text was recently published, dealing with an earlier, unknown presentation of St. Paul of Kariouma.

The name “Paul” is found frequently in medieval hagiology, but the identification is made easier because the figure, designated as “ο ἀγίος Παύλου” is portrayed in armor and in his hands he holds a spear and a sword. As is known, in the Byzantine iconography of saints, military dress and weapons appeared almost exclusively in portraying martyr-soldiers, i.e., martyrs who were, according to hagiographic sources, in military service. If the archangels are not taken into account, exceptions to this rule are extremely rare. Consequently, in our research we can exclude St. Paul the Apostle, as monks (SS. Paul the Theban, Paul the Simple, Paul of Xeropotamou, etc.).

Fig. 3. Silver processional cross, the obverse. Musée de Cluny, Paris, 11th c.

Fig. 4. Silver processional cross, the obverse. Musée d'art et d'histoire, Geneva, 11th c.
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1. Glory of Byzantium, 62–64 (H. C. Barnes). Cfr. also the bronze cross from Kassandra, Greece: H. Buschhausen, Ein byzantinisches Bronzekreuz in Kassandra, JBG XVI (1967) 281 ff, Fig. 1; Sandin, bronze crosses, 330–335 (no. 49), Pls. LV–LV.


5. In Byzantine art, the famous apostle was always presented in a chiton and himation with the physiognomy of an older balding man with a...
Fig. 5. Silver processional cross, the reverse. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 11th c.

Fig. 6. Mielo di Jacopo, Altarpiece with Christ and Saints, a detail: St. Paul the apostle, Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence, 1271

Paul of Mt. Lathros, Paul the Acolyte, Paul the Physician, Paul the Stoudites, Paul the Sinaite, etc.) and bishops (SS. Paul of Fleunus, Paul of Neocaesarea, Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople, Paul of Korinthos, Paul of Antiochae, Paul of Nikan, etc.) who carry his name. Besides this, there is another advant-

high forehead, an elongated face, an aquiline nose, and a dark, pointed beard of medium length; he usually held a codex or folded scroll in his hand. Cf., for example, E. von Dobuschütz, Der Apostel Paulus. II. Seine Stellung in der Kunst, Halle 1928, 12–20, Figs. 22–32; A. M. Vitt, L'ar-

petto fisico di S. Paolo, La Civitá cattolica 91 (1940) 416–423; K. Weitzmann, The St. Peter Icon of Dumbarton Oaks, Washington 1985, 33. It is worth noting that in the art of the Medieval West, beginning in the second half of the 12th c., St. Paul was often portrayed with a sword in his hand (Fig. 6), but this weapon appears as an iconographic attribute which alludes to the way in which the apostle suffered martyrdom, cf. von Dobuschütz, Paulus, 22 ff, Figg. 34–38; L. Réau, Iconographie de l'art chré-


36 The possibility must also be excluded of those- and hieromartyrion who were named Paul (St. Paul the homiomyrtion, who suffered on Cyprus, St. Paul the Confessor, the archbishop of Constantinople, etc.) since they are also normally shown in the vestments of monks, priests or bishops. For lists of santi monks, bishops, patriarchs, homomartyrion and hieromartyrion named Paul see, for example, Archibiskop Sorgii (Spascikii), Pojed tecnstelevov Fossoh, Vladimir 19029 (prz. Moscow 1997), t. III, 612, 646 (q.v. Pavel); Synaxarium CP, 1149 (q.v. Paulus); S. Eustathides, Ayiologikon tis Orthodoxou Evkathetis, Athens 1935, 378–382 (q.v. Paulos); VHГ I:
tageous circumstance for our inquiry. Only three of the dozen martyrs named Paul could be associated with military service. One is St. Paul of Rome, who was beheaded with his brother John in the time of Julian the Apostate. The other is St. Paul, a soldier from Mesopotamia who suffered martyrdom in the middle of the third century in Athens, with SS. Dionysius and Christina. The third is St. Paul of Caiouma, who was martyred in Constantinople during the Iconoclasm, sometime between 711 and 775 A.D. The rest of the martyrs named Paul either were not soldiers or their professions are not mentioned in hagiographic sources. Beside this, all of them were victims of so-called collective martyrdom, so it is very unlikely that their


17 Because of the Greek inscriptions on the cross and the place where it was found, here only Byzantine hagiographic sources are taken into account.

18 For more detailed facts concerning the three martyrs v. infra.

19 St. Paul who suffered with St. Lukullianos and four other martyrs in Byzantium (the feast day — June 3) died as a child, cf. H. Delachaye, Saints de Thrace et de Méiste, AB 31 (1913) 187–192; B. Latyrev, Menologii

anonymi byzantini saeculi X quae superant, St. Petersburg 1911–1912, t. II, 7–12; F. Halkin, Les deux pentas iconiaux du martyre Loclitien, AB 84 (1966) 8–18, 19–28; St Paul of Iamnia (February 16) who was martyred with the presbyter Parmephos and six other martyrs in Kaiserburg, Palestine, was an augustin in the church community of that city, cf. Eusébe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres VIII–X et Les martyrs en Palestine, ed. G. Barety, Paris 1958, 153–157; Latyrev, op. cit., I, 3–10. St. Paul who was martyred with his sister Juliana and three other martyrs (March 4 and August 17), are said to have been citizen of Palmyra. There he studied the "Holy Scriptures" and read them to the people, cf. Latyrev, op. cit., I, 179–184; R. Truschenz – R. Kjoerum, Drei griechische Texte zum Codex Supraallenui, I. Das Martyrium von Paulus und Julianus, Zeitschrift für slawische Philologie 11 (1934) 2–19; F. Halkin, Paul et Julienne martyres à Poilamès de Phénicie, Vetera Christianorum 20 (1963) 95–110. The Christian faith was also proclaimed by St. Paul (May 28) who died in Rome with St. Krates and St. Dioscorides, cf. Acta sanctorum, Mai, VI, 738–739; PG 117, 480; Synaxarium CP, 714; Συναξαριστὴρ τῶν δεδεκα μεν τοῦ εκκλησίαν κυῖα τῶν εὐαγγελισµῶν τῶν Μαρτυρίων διακόνων τῆς Μνήμης Εὐαγγελίσµον, red. Nicodemos η Ευαγγελίσμον, Athens 1868, t. II, 172. One martyr named St. Paul is mentioned as a disciple of St. Ktistos the doctor (March 10), who was the leader of a group of six martyrs who died in Corinth during the reign of emperors Decius and Valerian, cf. Latyrev, op. cit., I, 216–218. There is no biographical data about St. Paul who was martyred in Damascus with members of his family, St. Tata and St. Subianamos (September 23), but the text of akolouthia honoring these martyrs does not contain hymnographic topos characteristic for akolouthia of martyr-soldiers, cf. A. Dmitrievskii, Opisanie Ilirskikhskih rukopisnykh, khranitelis'ch Ribes v bibliotekeh pravo-

slavnego Ivostica, Kiev 1895–1917, t. I, 9, 284–285; I. Mateus, Le Typicon de la Grande Eglise, Roma 1962, t. I, 44; Synaxarium CP, 774; Συναξαριστὴρ, I, 66; V. Jagić, Manasta septembris octobris novembri ad fidem vetustissimorum codicum, St. Petersburg, 1886, 0192–0194, 0198–0202, 543–544. The least is known about St. Paul the Egyptian who was killed in Palestine (July 16 and February 10), with his sister Valentina and Theos or Emma (cf. Basile de Césarée, Histoire, 145–147; PG 117, 544; Synaxarium CP, 455–456, 822; Dmitrievskii, op. cit., I, 92; Mateus, op. cit., I, 346; Συναξαριστὴρ, II, 266, 450; Sergii, Mesiteschronion, III, 65), and about St. Paul (October 21) whose name is among the 60 pilgrims killed by Arabs in Jerusalem in 723 AD (for sources concerning these martyrs cf. BHG II, 101, 185).

37 Cf. the previous note.
In the Byzantine world, co-martyrs were commemorated together, not only liturgically and in hymnography but also in the field of iconography. Deviations from this practice did not occur except in cases when, in *martyrta*, *akolouthia*, and in the rubrics of *synaxaria*, *menologia* and calendars, specific martyrs were more emphasized than their "socii" or when the "socii" were not named at all.

In considering the three martyrs who could be connected with military service, we will pay attention first to St. Paul of Rome. Hagiographic sources testify that he and his brother John were high court officials in the service of Constantina, the daughter of the emperor, Constantine the Great. Nevertheless, in certain medieval depictions they are portrayed in armor and with weapons because in one redaction of their *pastio* it is said that they participated in the victorious campaign which Gallican, the emperor’s army commander, led against the Scythians. However, it must be immediately stated that the cult of the brothers from Rome never had a meaningful following in Byzantium. There are at least three reasons for this assertion. The mention of these

---


is it known when the cult of St. Peter of Lampskos and his company became strong in Constantinople. It is clear that the cult already existed in the ninth century since, at that time, Joseph the Hymnographer, the skewophylax of the Constantinopolitan Great Church, wrote a canon in which the five martyrs are praised, and the typikon of the church prescribed their annual commemoration. Also, in later times, the commemoration of SS. Peter, Dionysios, Christina, Andrew, and Paul was regularly held in Byzantine churches. This is shown in the liturgical calendars (in typika, lectionaries, praxapostoloi etc.) and menaia. However, it appears that the remembrance of these martyrs did not develop into a strong cult anywhere, not even in Lampskos or Athens, where it would most logically be expected.

One of the firm arguments for such assertion is the very small number of their surviving representations in me-

Fig. 12. SS. Peter of Lampskos, Dionysios, Paul, Andrew and Christina, a Russian monologion icon, Rome, Pinacoteca Vaticana (after J. S. Assemani, Kalendarium ecclesiasticum..., VI), a detail, 17th c.

saints in the liturgical calendars of the Byzantine Church is extremely rare. The Greek text of their vita was translated from a Latin original for use by the Greek colony in Rome. Depictions of St. Paul and St. John are not found in the art of Byzantium. On the other hand, the images of St. Paul found in the West cannot be linked with the figure of the holy warrior on the Ortiz cross since they represent the saint as a beardless youth (Fig. 10–11). Furthermore, St. Paul is, like other martyrs who were not commemorated alone, regularly presented together with his companion martyrs — St. John (Fig. 11).

St. Paul of Mesopotamia also belongs to the category of martyrs who were victims of collective martyrdom. Already in the time of the creation of the earliest martyrologia, he is mentioned only as a member of the company of martyrs led by St. Peter of Lampskos. The other two members of the company were SS. Andrew and Dionysios. According to the text of the Latin passio, which is considered authentic, all these martyrs suffered in Lampskos during the reign of the emperor Decius and the proconsul Opitimus (or Optimus).

The Greek synaxaria of the tenth and eleventh centuries also state that St. Peter of Lampskos led the group but the remaining details of the story differ. The persecutor was there given as Delkos (or Deckos), the archon of the city of Abydos, near Lampskos. The archon first had Peter tortured to death because he refused to offer sacrifices to the idols. After this, Delkos went to Athens together with his soldiers, including Paul and Andrew from Mesopotamia. In Athens, Paul and Andrew were posted as the guards of the prison where a certain Diomysios and the sixteen year old virgin, Christina, were already imprisoned, for professing their faith. Hearing the testimony of the young girl, the two soldiers became Christians themselves. Because of this, all of them were executed. Diomysios, Andrew, and Paul were stoned to death, and Christina was beheaded.

The reason for the differences between the Latin passio and the Greek synaxarion notices is not known, nor


In fact, only one such calendar — the kanonarion in a 10th-c. evangelion from Sinaï — is known to us, cf. Dmitrievskii, Opisaniye, I, 218, n. 1; Sergii, Mestashtevi, II, 192, 234. It is possible, however, that this kanonarion was used in the Greek churches of southern Italy and Sicily, cf. Sergii, op. cit., I, 145–150.


For these depictions cf. F. W. Deichmann, Ravenna, Hauptstadt des spätantiken Abendlandes III: Frühchristliche Bauten und Musikalien von Ravenna, Wiesbaden 1958, PI 121; G. Kahil, Saints in Italian Art: Iconography of the Saints in Central and South Italian Schools of Painting, Firenze 1965, 653–657, Fig. 741; De Sancta, Giovanni e Paolo, 1047; E. Kitzinger, i mosaici del periodo normannico in Sicilia, I–VI, Palermo 1992–2000, I, Fig. 75; IV, Fig. 196; G. Bertelli, La storia di S. Biagio a Castellammare di Stabia (Napoli), CA 44 (1996) 67–88, Fig. 31.


The Greek synaxaria also, differ among themselves in some details. For example, in many recensions of the Synaxarion of Constantinople it is said that Paul and Andrew were originally from Mesopotamia (cf. Synaxarion CP, 691–693; Συναξαριστήριον, II, 155). The same information is found earlier in the Typikon of the Great Church (Dimitrievskii, Opisaniye, I, 73), but in the Menologion of Basil II and in later recensions it is not found (PG 117, 460; Belgrade, Archives of the Serbian Academy of Science and Art, MS. no. 33, fol. 205). It is interesting, furthermore, that most Greek synaxaria did not explicitly state where St. Peter of Lampskos was killed. Yet, according to the Typikon of the Great Church, he was also put to death in Athens (Dimitrievskii, op. cit., I, 73).

Cf. Dmitrievskii, Opisaniye, I, 455; Συναξαριστήριον, II, 155; Sergii, Mestashtevi, II, 148.

For the dating of the typikon of the Great Church to the end of the 9th c., cf. Mateos, Typikon, I, p. X–XVII. According to this typikon, the commemoration of the five martyrs was held on May 15 (Dimitrievskii, Opisaniye, I, 73; Mateos, op. cit., I, 292), but in later sources their feast day is usually given as May 18 (cf. Sergii, Mestashtevi, II, 144, 148; Synaxarion CP, 691–693).

Cf. PG 117, 460; Dimitrievskii, Opisaniye, I, 73, 455, 858, III, 99; Συναξαριστήριον, II, 155; Synaxarion CP, 691–693; Nikodim’s Sabatic typikon (the first Serbian translation of the Sabatic typikon, created in 1318–1319 under the auspices of archbishop Nikodim), fol. 107b, Sergii, Mestashtevi, II, 144, 148.

Not one known church in Lampskos or Athens was dedicated to these saints, cf. B. Janin, Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins. Bithynie, Hellas Ponte, Latmos, Galatia, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique, Paris 1975, 206, 298–340; Catalogue of Byzantine Steats at Dunbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art, ed. J. Nesbitt and N. Okimondow, Washington 1991–1996, t. 2, 49–53, t. 3, 100–101. In truth, in Athens and in the surrounding area two inscriptions were found in which a St. Andrew and SS. Paul and Andrew were mentioned, but these could relate to the spots of these names, cf. J. S. Croghan — A. F. Ruebisch, Early Christian Epitapha from Athens, Hesperia 16 (1947) 29, pl. III/19; Janin, op. cit., 302–303, 331.
Fig. 13. St. Onuphrios, fresco, Thessalonike, the church of St. Nicholas Orphanos, ca. 1320

dieval art. We have nothing at our disposal other than a few late depictions painted in illuminated calendars. What is important for our research, is that in these scenes St. Paul is not painted at all or else he can not be reliably distinguished from St. Peter, St. Dionysius, or St. Andrew (Fig. 12). Therefore we must rely on the *Hermeneia* of Dionysius of Founra, which also provides an iconographic formula only for a calendar depiction of the five martyrs from Athens: “St. Dionysius and St. Peter (old men) and those with them, young men with incipient beards, are buried under stones and die. And St. Christina above them (is dying) by the sword....” The “young men with incipient beards” are, without doubt, SS. Andrew and Paul, the Mesopotamian soldiers. If St. Paul was painted in a similar manner in the Middle Ages then he is not the soldier on the Ortix cross. Besides, the previously stated data concerning the isolated portrayal of martyrs, who suffered together with others, further reduces the possibility of identifying the soldier depicted on the cross as St. Paul of Mesopotamia. That is to say, this martyr does not satisfy any of the “criteria” for being portrayed alone.

Neither was the cult of St. Paul of Kaisouma (the Younger) widely developed in Byzantium. There is no record of this saint in the *synaxaria* and his name appears in liturgical calendars sporadically, mostly in the eleventh century. The brief text about the martyrdom of St. Paul (BHG 1471) may be found only in the so-called Imperial Monodion — a specific collection of the vitae of the saints, which seems to have


36 For the said “criteria” cf. supra. Normally, only St. Peter of Lampskos or he and St. Dionysius were named in the rubrics of synaxaria, and in the calendars. Cf., for example, PG 117, 460; Dmitrievski, *Opisanie*, I, 455, 358, III, 49; M. Arrazu, *Le typicon du Monastère du Saint-Saveur à Messine*, Roma 1969, 132. The other three members of the eunuchs (SS. Paul, Andrew, and Christos) were mentioned only in the texts of the synaxaria notices and the abouloula.


been written in Constantinople during the time of the emperor Michael IV Paphlagon (1034–1041). The text represents a shortened version of the more detailed *martýrion* of St. Paul (BHIG 1471b) written in the mid-tenth century at the earliest. This full-length *martýrion* was also rarely copied and today is preserved in a single thirteenth-century manuscript (*Codex Patavinius 187*). Yet, there are several reasons, beginning with the Constantinopolitan origin of the cult and the fact that St. Paul of Kaiouma had no companion martyrs, which make him the most interesting for our study.

Both *martýrion* of St. Paul give very meager facts about his life, stating only that he was a wealthy man who was born and educated in Constantinople. The focus is on the description of the saint’s martyrdom, i.e. on his conflict with the emperor Constantine V Kopronymos (741–775) concerning the veneration of icons, his imprisonment, judgment and torture. At the end, the texts relate that after various forms of torture, Paul was tied by his hands and feet and dragged around the central Constantinopolitan agora, where he died of the blows to his head from its stones. The emperor’s people continued to drag the dead body of the martyr “ad partes Asparis”. There they threw the body to the dogs, but it was saved and secretly buried, “in loco sequestro”. One hundred and twenty two years later, five decades after the triumph of Orthodoxy and the reinstatement of the cult of icons, Patriarch Antony II Kaulias (893–901) was instructed by an angel in a dream to look for the saint’s relics in the monastery of Kaiouma, “ad partes Asparis” (*τοις Ἀσπαρωσ μέσιν*). Having found the grave of the martyr and his incorrupt body, the patriarch ceremoniously transferred the relics from the grave to the church of the Mother of God, also at the Kaiouma monastery. According to the texts of the *martýrion*, the relics demonstrated healing powers in the monastery.

It is not altogether clear what happened later to the relics of St. Paul of Kaiouma. At one point, probably between 1081 and 1087, they were given to the Constantinopolitan monastery of Christ Pantepoptes and from there they were transferred to Venice in 1222. In Venice, the relics were deposited in the Benedictine monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore, after which the martyr of Constantinople became known in the West. His full-length *martýrion* was later translated word for word into Latin, and between 1369 and 1372 the Venetian Pietro de Natili, bishop of Equilino (Jesolo), composed a epitome on St. Paul of Kaiouma and included it in his *Catalogus sanctorum*. For our theme, this brief *vita* is particularly interesting.

---


43 Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Aeliae*, IV, 251; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Patrologia*, 56, 61. Churches and monasteries only very rarely gave away their precious relics, and in this regard their rights were protected by sacred decrees. Therefore, the removal of the relics of St. Paul from the Kaiouma monastery could be explained only by the special prominence and influence of Anna Dalassene, the founder of the monastery of Christ Pantepoptes. Having in mind the role of relics in the consecration of any newly built church, it is logical to think that the mother of emperor Alexios I Komnenos obtained the relics for her foundation at the time of the building of the monastery (between 1081 and 1087). For the prominence and authority of Anna Dalassene, see B. Skoulagias, *Les personnages byzantins de l’Alexiad de... Analyse prosopographique et synthèse*, Louvain 1980, 20–24. Concerning the monastery of Christ Pantepoptes and its history, see Janin, *La géographie*, 527–529; A.-M. Talbot, *Pantopote monastere*, OBO 3, 1574.

44 The relics of St. Paul of Kaiouma were transferred to Venice by Paolo Venier. He was the first Benedictine superior of the monastery of Christ Pantepoptes at the time of Latin rule in Constantinople, and later the abbot of the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore, cf. *Acta sanctorum*, July II, 634–635, 638–641; Janin, *La géographie*, 528.


46 Petrus de Natalibus, *Catalogus sanctorum et gestorum corum ex diversis voluminibus collocatis*, Vicenza 1493, liber V, cap. LXIX. For the translation of relics to Venice and their further deposition in the monastery of Christ Pantepoptes, cf. *Acta sanctorum*, July II, 634–635, 639–641; Janin, *La géographie*, 528; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Patrologia*, 56, 61. Churches and monasteries only very rarely gave away their precious relics, and in this regard their rights were protected by sacred decrees. Therefore, the removal of the relics of St. Paul from the Kaiouma monastery could be explained only by the special prominence and influence of Anna Dalassene, the founder of the monastery of Christ Pantepoptes. Having in mind the role of relics in the consecration of any newly built church, it is logical to think that the mother of emperor Alexios I Komnenos obtained the relics for her foundation at the time of the building of the monastery (between 1081 and 1087). For the prominence and authority of Anna Dalassene, see B. Skoulagias, *Les personnages byzantins de l’Alexiad de... Analyse prosopographique et synthèse*, Louvain 1980, 20–24. Concerning the monastery of Christ Pantepoptes and its history, see Janin, *La géographie*, 527–529; A.-M. Talbot, *Pantopote monastere*, OBO 3, 1574.


48 Petrus de Natalibus, *Catalogus sanctorum et gestorum corum ex diversis voluminibus collocatis*, Vicenza 1493, liber V, cap. LXIX. For...
Fig. 16. St. Paul of Kaisuuma (a detail of Fig. 2)

Fig. 17. St. Theodore the Stratelates, The Menologion of Basil II, Vatic. gr. 1613, fol. 383, ca. 985

The King, ἐκλήτης Χριστοῦ, τὸν Χριστόν στρατιώτης, κολάς στρατιώτης (the good soldier), St. Demetrius as ὁ ἄγιος στρατιώτης (the true soldier), ἡλίτης Χριστοῦ, γενναῖος ἡλίτης; St. Theodore Stratelates as στρατιώτης ἄγιος, στρατιώτης δύνατος (the mighty commander), στρατιώτης τοῦ οὐρανοῦ βασιλέας (the general of heavenly King), στρατιώτης Χριστοῦ; St. Theodore Tiron as πρῶταις ἀξίωσε (the invincible fighter), ἀντίπαλος ἡλίτης (the newly enlisted hoplite), καμπής ἡλίτης (the strong hoplite), δόξας στρατιώτης (the skilled soldier); St. Prokopios as στρατιώτης ἄγιος, στρατιώτης ἄγιος, ἡλίτης τοῦ Λόγου (the hoplite of the Word), ἀρκαίως ἡλίτης (the honest soldier); St. Mercurios as στρατιώτης ἀξίωσε.

48. Petrus de Natalibus, Catalogus, Liber V, cap. LXIX.
49. For the most important sources which were used by Pietro de Natali, see Colinielli, Pietro de Natalibus, 1979.
50. Cf. Papaeliopoulos-Photopoulos, Αγιολογικά, 65–69 (the akolouthia is preserved in a single 16th-c. manuscript, Codex Parisiense 738; the name of the poet Gregory who wrote the canon to saint is revealed in an acrostic).
51. Papaeliopoulos-Photopoulos, Αγιολογικά, 86, 87, 89, 91 (after the Cod. Pum. 738).
52. In the verses of the akolouthia, only the most characteristic details from the vitae are usually mentioned. For instance, in the akolouthia of St. Tryphonos, it is said that he was a goatherd, St. Mamantos is said to have fed on the milk of a mountain roe, and St. Souzonos is mentioned as a "shepherd", cf. Meissell (protaufragmata... Αγιολογικά), ed. Bechler-Janemans, op. cit., Athens 1959–1973, t. II, 5–11; t. IX, 14–21, 47–52.
53. Μανου, I–XII, passim.
With regard to the authenticity of Pietro de Natali’s statement about St. Paul of Kauouma being a “dux militiae imperialis” it seems reasonable to mention one other interesting detail. The feast day of the Constantinopolitan martyr is celebrated on the same day (June 8) as that of St. Theodore Stratelates, one of the most renowned holy warriors. It is possible that this is not a mere coincidence. We are referring to a hagiological phenomenon that can be followed in the Eastern Christian world from the Middle Byzantine period. At the time when a new saint’s cult was formed, it often occurred that the sanctified and canonized person was introduced into the liturgical calendar on the same date as some well-known saint, who had accomplished similar feats of faith. For example, St. Peter of Athos, the ninth-century hermit, who did not see another person during the five decades of his eremitic life on Mt. Athos, was given the feast day of June 12, the same day of the famous St. Onuphrios, who accomplished the same anchoritic endevour during the fourth century in Egypt. St. Loukas the Stylic (d. ca. 979), who spent more than forty years standing on the pillar of Eutropious in Chalcedon, was placed in the calendar beside his famous predecessor, St. Daniel the Stylist (December 11), the Southern Slavic hermit St. Gavril of Lesnovo (the eleventh century) is associated with St. Paul the Theban (January 15), St. Michael Choniates, the archbishop of Athens (d. ca. 1222) with St. Andrew, the archbishop of Crete (July 4), the singer and composer, St. John Koukouzeles (d. ca. 1340) with St. Romanos the Melode (October 1), etc. The first example is particularly interesting for our theme since it demonstrates that in some instances concurrence was established between the newly canonized saints and their archetypes not only in the date of their feasts and details of their vitae, but also in their iconography (Fig. 13–15). With this in mind, one should not overlook the fact that there is an obvious similarity between the portrait of St. Paul the soldier on the Oriz cross (Fig. 16) and the depictions of St. Theodore the Stratelates (Fig. 17–18).

While indicating that St. Paul of Kauouma could be represented as a military saint, the cited evidence is also sig-

---


56 Μεγαλούλας, XII, 222–230.

57 Μεγαλούλας, XIII, 131–140.


60 Μεγαλούλας, I–XII, passim.

61 Until the middle of the tenth century, the most famous stratelates saint was still commemorated only on June 8, cf. Doudarevski, Описане, I, 48, 79; Матрос, Типосы, I, 228, 310.


63 Cf. Sereg, Mesiatsas, II, 15, 199–200, 305, 381 (with reference to medieval church calendars and other relevant hagiographical sources).

64 Cf. Leskén ο χριστιανικός ίσωνοστασίως, VIII, 84–88, 177 (G. Kastor); L. Hadraman-Misguich, Κορινθία, Βρυξελλές 1975, 263–264; A. Tsiourkou, Ο Χριστιανικός Ισωνυστικός του Αγίου Νικάδου Ορθρού στη Βενετολική, Θεσσαλονίκη 1986, 204–205, Fig. 105. Cf. also Ισωνυστικός, 237–238.

65 For the iconography of St. Theodore the Stratelates cf. Markoví, Military Saints, 594–597, 621.
significant for the identification of St. Paul, depicted as a soldier on the Oriz cross. It was pointed out above that most other saints named Paul could not be taken into consideration, at all. We have also seen that identifying the soldier in question as St. Paul of Rome or St. Paul from Mesopotamia would create insurmountable difficulties. In fact, St. Paul of Kaiouma is the sole incontestable option. For these reasons, one could draw the following conclusion: the military saint depicted on the cross is most likely the martyr from Constantinople.

Unfortunately, our identification of the soldier depicted on the Oriz cross cannot be confirmed with iconographic material, since we do not know of any other preserved depiction of St. Paul of Kaiouma. It must be stated, however, that written sources do prove that representations of the saint did exist. One of them decorated the staurotheca of the monk Timothy, a valuable work of Byzantine art, which was taken from Constantinople to the West after 1204. The staurotheca, having the form of a box with a sliding lid, was kept in the Benedictine abbey of Mont-Saint-Quentin until the end of the eighteenth century, but then disappeared during the French Revolution. Fortunately, drawings and descriptions have survived which, among other things, show that a depiction of St. Paul of Kaiouma was on the reliquary. His portrait was part of the rich adornment of the box’s sides which were decorated with nineteen busts of saints, separated by ornamental fields. Sixteen of those nineteen saints are known to us by name. But, some cannot be positively identified since only three saints’ names were accompanied with epitaphs which define the portrayed person. Besides this, three busts were already missing in the seventeenth century when the description and drawings of the reliquary were made, so the complete reconstruction of the iconographic program is not possible. It is clear, nevertheless, that the greater number of depictions represented monks (SS. Antony, Euthymios, Sabas, three sabaites — Xenophon, Arcadios and John, Euphrasim of Syria, Arsenios, Ormophios, John Kallitakes, and possibly Anastasius, Sinaites or Persians), but there were also busts of archpriests (SS. Andrew of Crete, Methodios of Constantinople, and probably Clement of Rome and Athanasius of Alexandria). Among the figures cited in the description of the reliquary, only St. Paul of Kaiouma was a martyr (not taking into account the hosio- and hieromartyrs). This special program, unusual also in terms of the internal composition of the aforesaid categories of saints, leads to the supposition that the staurotheca of the monk Timothy, like the decoration of many other reliquaries, was based on its contents. In other words, it can be proposed that the monk Timothy, i.e., the monastery in which he lived, besides a fragment of the True Cross, had in its possession at least one relic of each saint depicted on the sides of the staurotheca. This suggestion has its best argument in the bust of St. Paul of Kaiouma. Otherwise, it would be hard to explain why this very rarely depicted martyr

64 Judging by published material, the image of St. Paul of Kaiouma does not appear in illustrated liturgical calendars, psalters, and synaxaria. It is thought that he or a St. Maximin were depicted as the illustration for June 8 in fol. 310v of a 11th-century Greek lectionary with synaxaria (Vaticana gr. 1156), see Mijović, Menolog, 195. However, the figure referred to by Mijović illustrated June 3 and depicts the holy martyr Loukianion, an old man with gray hair and a beard.

65 It is believed that count Hugues de Beaumont, cousin of Baldwin I, the Latin emperor of Constantinople, brought the staurotheca to France in 1207 on his return from the Crusade. The reliquary was first recorded by Ch. De Cange (Dissertations, on Réflexions sur l’Histoire de Saint Louis..., XXXVI, Paris 1668, 314–315) and for a long time this was the only source for the reconstruction of its appearance, e.g., for example, A. Prolow, La relique de la Vraie Croix. Recherches sur le développement d’un culte, Paris 1961, 397–399, no. 473. However, recently J. Durand, on the basis of other sources from the 17th e. more precisely defined the form and decoration of the reliquary, identifying most of the figures including the portrait of St. Paul of Kaiouma, cf. Durand, Le reliquaire byzantin, 51–69, Figs. 1–5. Mr. Durand kindly called our attention to the staurotheca and his study concerning it, for which we are very grateful.

66 The absence of epitaphs create greater problems only for the identification of SS. Anastasios, Clement, and Athanasius. Keeping in mind the Constantinopolitan origin of the reliquary and the fact that seven of the identified saints in some way were connected to the capital city (SS. John Kallitakes, Paul of Kaimona, Methodios of Constantinople, Andrew of Crete, Xenophon, Arcadios, and John), it should be reasonable to consider as alternate solutions St. Anastasios patriarch of Constantinople (February 10), St. Clement the poet, hegumenos of the Studioulion monastery (April 30 and May 27) and St. Athanasios of Psellopotamia (February 22). Additionally, the possibility must not be excluded that two famous saints with corresponding names — Athanasios of Atlas and Clement, the bishop of Anchyre, or even Methodios, the bishop of Patara (June 20), were represented. For a slightly different identification of the saint portrayed on the sides of Timothy’s reliquary see Durand, Reliquaire, 63, 64.

67 Here we are referring only to the decorative programs of the sides of the box. The other parts of the staurotheca carried themes which could be considered normal (cf., for example, Prolow, Relique, no. 662), including the Crucifixion, the Deposition, Holy Women at the Sepulchre, the Anastasias, St. Constantine and St. Helena, the archangels Michael and Gabriel, the apostles Peter and Paul, the prophets Zechariah and Samuel, cf. Durand, Reliquaire, 57–59. For reliquaries with the representations of saints whose selection is in direct connection with contents of a reliquary cf. Prolow, op. cit., nos. 173, 233, 272, 464, 467, 504, 591, 790, 880.

would have been inserted in the iconographic program of the reliquary. 70

Unfortunately, in the description of the staurotheke of the monk Timothy, there is no data concerning the depiction of St. Paul except that written beside his name was the epithet Ο ΚΑΙΟΥΜΑ. 71 By analogy with other comparable objects of minor arts, which include representations of martyrs, it is most reasonable to assume that the saint was portrayed in accordance with the general method of depicting martyrs — in a tunic and cloak, holding a cross in his hand, or possibly as a martyr-soldier, in armor and with weapons. 72

The other two known depictions of St. Paul of K aiou ma were created in the West, at the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore in Venice. One of these, an icon painted around 1320, is recorded at the beginning of the fourteenth century by Fortunato Olmo, a former novice at the famous Benedictine monastery. 73 The central part of the painting contained the figure of the Virgin. Painted on the right side were SS. George, Stephen, and Cosmas, while on the left were SS. Benedict, Paul “the martyr” and Dumnian. Philip, the abbot of the monastery and the donor of the icon, was portrayed in prosyntesis before the Virgin. What is particularly interesting is that St. Paul was represented with the attribute of a duke (cum ducali cornu). 74 Another representation, also an icon, depicted the martyrdom of St. Paul of K aiou ma. 75

As we have already said, the identification of the figure of the military saint named Paul on the Ortix cross is important since this figure could be very useful in determining the origin of the cross. There are good reasons for such an opinion. During the Middle Byzantine era, a part or the entire decoration of the reverse side of liturgical processional crosses most often expressed the relationship of the cross with the specific sacred place. This was achieved by introducing a representation of the patron saint of the church or monastery, for which the cross was destined, into the decorative program. 76 A few examples will be sufficient to demonstrate this particular practice.

On the silver cross from the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos, whose katholikon is dedicated to the Mother of God, the center of the reverse is occupied by the figure of the Virgin, who also is shown on the obverse in the Deesis. 77 On the lower arm of the reverse of the “Zaccaria cross” from the Duomo in Genoa, which caesar Bardas presented to the church of St. John the Theologian at Ephesus, the patron of the famous cathedral is depicted. 78 At the center of the reverse side of the cross from the Cleveland Museum of Art, which was ordered by the hieromonk Nicholas for the monastery of St. Sabbas the Sanctified, is the image of the patron of the monastery, St. Sabbas (Fig. 20). 79 The scene of the Annunciation is painted on the reverse of the cross from Matshkharvishi, Georgia, which was ordered for some unidentified monastery of the Mother of God, Θεοτόκος του Μαστού (Fig. 19). In addition, in the bottom arm of the obverse, the figure of the Virgin with the Child on the throne is especially emphasized, even though Mary is also shown on the same side of the cross, in the Deesis. 80

---

70 Cf. Durand, Reliquiae, 64, where it is suggested that the representation of St. Paul was placed in the decorative program of the reliquary because “the remains of the martyr were kept in the monastery of monk Timothes”. If the hypothesis is correct, the conclusion would follow that the staurotheke was made for the monastery of K aiou ma, i.e., for its Church of the Mother of God, or for the monastery of Christ Pantepoptes (cf. supra), depending on the time of its fashioning. Unfortunately, there is not sufficient information for the dating of the staurotheke. It is clear only that it was made before 1204. According to Durand, one conscientiously made copy of the founder’s inscription shows that the reliquary could not have been created before the 11th c., cf. ibid., 58–59, Fig. 3.

71 Durand, Reliquiae, 64.

72 Durand (op. cit., 64–65) implies that St. Paul of K aiou ma was depicted on the reliquary as a monk, but it seems that the suggestion is not very likely. In most hagiographic sources, St. Paul is characterized as “δύσις μεταλομορφών Πάσχος ο Νέος ο θαυματουργός” or “τούτος ο μάρτυρος” (cf. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Νεολήτες, IV, 247; Papadopoulos-Papoutsiou, Αγιολογικά, 53 ff, 70, 83; Athens, National library, cod. 10464, fol. 14v), in agreement with the facts of his martyrdom. Also the saint’s skholia shows that he fell within the categories of martyr, specifically martyrs-soldiers (cf. supra). Neither in this text there is any indication that St. Paul was ever a monk, not even the absence of hymnographic tropa which usually appear in skholia hailing honoring monks. Truthfully, in the 11th c. Cod. Marc. gr. I, 47 (fol. 283v) the saint is mentioned as “δύσις κοιλομορφής Πάσχος του Καιούμα”, cf. M. I. Gedeon, Βυζαντινοί κορύφολογοι, Constantinople 1899, 44, 112; Papadopoulos-Papoutsiou, Αγιολογικά, 54. However, the absence of the epithet “μαρτυρ” demonstrates that the scribe of the Marcian codex did not have a clear idea of this St. Paul. What is more, a note from the same manuscript shows that he confused the martyr of K aiou ma with St. Paul the Confessor, the patriarch of Constantinople, martyred in the 4th century. The patriarch’s main feast day is celebrated on November 6, but in earlier martirologia the date of the translation of his relics to Constantinople is June 7, which may be the source of the confusion (the feast day of St. Paul of K aiou ma is June 8), cf. Papadopoulos-Papoutsiou, Αγιολογικά, 53–54. Apart from this St. Paul, Paul of K aiou ma was confused with several other saints of the same name, primarily with St. Paul the Confessor, bishop of Plousias (March 7), and St. Hosiosmartyr Paul (March 17) who suffered martyrdom on Cyprus, also under Constantine V Kopronymos, see Acta sanctorum, July II, 631–632; Papadopoulos-Papoutsiou, Αγιολογικά, 54–55.


74 Acta sanctorum, July II, 632. From long ago, the painting has not been in its original location and we do not know if it is even preserved. After the suppression of the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore in 1806 most of the art work from its collection was dispersed and the brotherhood went to the Benedictine abbey of Santa Giustina in Padua and Santa Maria di Preglia, cf. G. Damerini, L’isola e il cenobio di San Giorgio Maggiore, Venezia 1965, 92.

75 Acta sanctorum, July II, 642. There is no trace of this image as well. We are indebted for this information to Mr. Silvano De Tuoni, the curator of the photo library of the Istituto di Storia dell’Arte, Fondazione Giorgio Cini (Isola di San Giorgio Maggiore), Venice.


77 Acta sanctorum, July II, 642. The cross is ascribed to emperor Nikephoros II Phokas (963–969), who played a very important role in the founding of the Lavra, cf. Grabar, Préceaux croix, 91–99.

78 Most likely this concerns Bardas Phokas who carried the title of caesar at the time of the rule of his son Nikephoros II Phokas. The cross was restored by Isaac, the metropolitan of Ephesus (1262–1283), cf. S. G. Mercati, Collectanea byzantina, Roma 1970, t. II, 520–533; Bournas, Cross, 25; Cotsoris, Crosses, 29–32, figs. 12a–12b.

79 Concerning the cross from Cleveland, which is dated to the second or third quarter of the 11th c., see Cotsoris, Crosses, 61, 68–75. Cf. also Mango, La croce, 43, Figs. 7–8; Glory of Byzantium, 60–62, no. 24 (H. C. Evans).

80 The cross, whose commissioners were Kosmas, the hegoumenos of the monastery, and hieromonk John, is most often dated to the 12th c., cf. L. Khussivadan, Vizantiyisli krest iz Matshkharvishi, Zagora 15 (1984) 24–40; Cotsoris, Crosses, 16–17, 62, figs. 5a–5b. It is not known when or from where the cross was taken to Georgia, nor has the monastery of the Mother of God “του Μαστού”, for which the cross was created, been identified. In this context it would be useful to mention that there was at some point in Thessalonica a monastery Theokostos tou Matestou, a tetravangelion was written for the monastery in 1185 at the expense of the monk kyri Gerasimos “the son of the keter”. The manuscript also mentions kyri Hilarios, the kathigoumenos of the monastery, and monk Gregory Mikacostoum, another “son of the keter” who died in 1188, see P. N. Papa-georgiou, Περί χειρογράφων Ευαγγέλου Θεσσαλονίκης, BZ 6 (1897), 538–546. On the basis of these facts, R. Janin (Janin, Les églises, 396) reasoned that the monastery was founded around the middle of the 12th century. If this opinion is correct, it would be difficult to connect the Matshkharvishi cross with the monastery of Theokostos tou Matestou. Judging by its style, the cross was made at the beginning of the 12th c. 45
It is also worth mentioning three silver processional crosses, whose decoration most probably correlate with the site to which they belonged. The first cross is located in the Musée d’art et d’histoire, Geneva. Based on the fact that the iconographic program on the reverse is entirely devoted to the prophet Elijah, it is reasonable to assume that the cross was intended for some church or monastery dedicated to the prophet. The second cross is kept today in the Musée de Cluny, Paris. It is believed that this cross, ordered by the monk Kosmas, was intended for some holy place dedicated to the Mother of God. The standing figure of the Virgin Hodegetria decorates the center of the reverse, while the arms contain three scenes from Mary’s life. The Virgin is also depicted in the Crucifixion in the upper arm of the reverse and as a part of the Deesis on the obverse. The third cross of this group is housed in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. It is the aforementioned liturgical cross of Bishop Leo. The center of its reverse is decorated with the bust of St. Thaleleia, the physician, who was martyred at Cilicia. He does not appear in the ranks of the most honored anargyroi and his depictions in medieval art are fairly rare. Because of this, his appearance in the decorative program of the cross of Bishop Leo deserves special attention. The bishop probably had specific reasons for revering the healing powers of St. Thaleleia and therefore donated the cross with the image of the holy physician to one of the churches that were dedicated to him or possibly to a church which held some of his relics. St. Thaleleia also could have been the patron saint of the cathedral church of Bishop Leo or, even, the protector of the city where the seat of his bishopric was located since the Byzantine seals of the archpriests usually show this type of patron saint. It is much less likely that the said holy physician was the patron saint of the bishop and for this reason appears on the cross given as a votive gift. The pa-
tron saint of a monk normally was the saint, whose name he had taken when receiving the tonsure.87

If part of the iconographic program of the reverse of the Ortiz cross was intended to reveal the specific holy place for which the cross was created, as is the case with the mentioned processional crosses, then it is almost certain that the figure of the military saint named Paul belongs to this part of the program. Whoever this St. Paul was — Paul of Kaiouma, Paul the Roman or Paul from Mesopotamia — it is very difficult to find another explanation for the introduction of this figure into the very condensed decoration of the cross.

Of course, in the quest for an answer to the question as to where the Ortiz cross originated, one should consider all three possible identities of the soldier named St. Paul. However, one need not strictly abide by the methodological rules in this case because it was established earlier that the possibility of the holy warrior on the reverse of the Ortiz cross being a representation of St. Paul of Rome or St. Paul from Mesopotamia was very remote. In any case, the cult of those two martyrs was not linked to any specific centre, therefore, it is impossible to conclude anything about the origin of the Ortiz cross even if St. Paul the Roman or St. Paul from Mesopotamia were represented on its reverse. In contrast, the cult of St. Paul of Kaiouma, in Byzantium, was confined to Constantinople and the only known Byzantine portrait of this martyr was produced in the capital city. It means that, if the identification of the figure of the soldier on the Ortiz cross with the martyr of Kaiouma is correct, the cross was made for some Constantinopolitan church or monastery.

If we seek a more precise answer, the first place to consider would be the old monastery of Kaiouma. There, the relics of St. Paul were found and they rested for a long time in the monastery church dedicated to the Mother of God. The legend "οσ εγενομένος τον Παύλον" is also indicative. Such a legend, containing only the saint’s name, could have been inscribed beside the image of the martyr from Kaiouma, only in the middle where he was easily recognisable and without the epithet O KAIOYMAC.89 In addition, there were good reasons for offering a gift such as the Ortiz cross to this monastery. The oldest martyrion of St. Paul, which was written in the tenth century, mentions the monastery of Kaiouma as the place where the martyr’s intact body gave health to all who prayed to him for help.90 It is less likely that the Ortiz cross was intended for the monastery of Christ Panteoptes in Constantinople, where his remains rested for a time before the Fourth Crusade. The moderate level of technical execution of the cross and its artistic workmanship is not in conformity with the renown of the famous monastery and its founder Anna Dalassene, the emperor’s mother. Additionally, the monastery of Panteoptes was not founded earlier than 1081, and by this date the Ortiz cross probably had already been made.91 For now, a third option does not exist. Surviving sources do not mention any other center for the cult of St. Paul of Kaiouma in Constantinople. However, one cannot totally exclude the possibility that this martyr was particularly venerated at some other place of worship in the capital city.

With respect to the causality between the depiction of the military saint named Paul and the origin of the Ortiz cross, one could find that additional caution must be maintained since it may be that the martyr from Constantinople was the patron saint of the donor of the cross and consequently, his image was placed on the cross. As is known, a personal marker of the donor can be seen in the decoration of some processional crosses, being expressed by the depiction of especially venerated, holy persons.

The special devotion of the donor is particularly well expressed in the decoration of the processional cross from Adrianople, now in the Benaki museum, Athens. The cross was given to some church for the redemption of the sins of the "servant of God" Sisinnios and the presbyter John. Besides the Deesis with the associated busts of the archangels, the front side of this cross is decorated with several small discs, two of which contain the images of St. Sisinnios and St. John Chrysostom — saints who are namesakes of the cross' commissioners. The center of the reverse is decorated with the bust of St. John Prodromos.92 Another interesting example is offered by the already cited cross of the hieromonk Nicholas, which was intended for the monastery of St. Sabbas the Sanctified. Next to the image of St. Sabbas, several other holy monks from the Christian East are also portrayed on the reverse of the cross (SS. Anthony, Euthymios, Arsenios, Abramios, Ephraim the Syrian, Hilarion, Anastasios of Sinai, and John Climacus).93 Their ascetic endeavors could serve as models for every monk, including the hieromonk Nicholas himself. Finally, one should remember that Bishop Leo decorated his liturgical cross, which is housed in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, with busts of two distinguished archpriests — St. John Chrysostom and St. Nicholas (Fig. 5).94

Returning to the depiction of St. Paul of Kaiouma, we again point out the fact that the cult of this saint had a very local importance and that his name is not even mentioned in most liturgical calendars, synaxaria, menologia, and menaia. There is no proof that the saint had an important place in the sphere of personal piety. Even if the donor of the Ortiz cross was a monk, who was named Paul, it would be very bold to propose that St. Paul of Kaiouma was his patron saint. As has been stated, monks usually chose their patron saint based on the name they were given upon receiving the tonsure, but the fact must be kept in mind that in the Christian hagiologion there were many other saints by the name of Paul, whose cults were incomparably stronger and more widespread. It is sufficient to mention once more the apostle Paul and the holy monks such as Paul the Theban, Paul of Mt. Luthros, Paul of Xeropotamou, and Paul the Simple.

87 The custom of monks of choosing their namesakes as patron saints can be most definitively observed in iconographic material, cf., for example, B. Todíc, Le patriarache Jouankije — Kotor des fresques à l’église des Saints-apôtres de Poc, Zbornik za likovne umetnosti 16 (1980) 92–93 (in Serbian with a French summary); I. M. Djerđević, Predstava Sveta Savea Jerusalimskog u studeničkoj Bogorodičinoj crkvi, Bogorodilje 31/1 (1987) 172 ff.
88 Bearing in mind the hagiographic sources and canons of Byzantine iconographic language, any other possibility of identification is excluded, cf. supra.
89 Generally speaking, the omission of the epithet can be seen as strange. However, one should be mindful that every saint named Paul, except St. Paul the Apostle, is marked in Byzantine art with an appropriate epithet so as to distinguish him from his numerous namesakes. In our case the rule may have been disregarded because of the lack of space for a long inscription, and the fact that the material the cross was made of was unsuitable for writing may have played a certain part.
90 Papeljopolov–Philotopouli, Αγιολογίακ, 81–82. An anonymous Latin author recorded that miraculous healings occurred at other places where the saint’s relics rested — first in the monastery of Christ Panteoptes and later in Venice, beginning at the moment when their citizens ceremonially received the precious relics, cf. Acta sanctorum, July II, 639, 641.
91 Concerning the monastery of Christ Panteoptes cf. n. 44 supra. On the dating of the Ortiz cross cf. infra.
92 Bousaras, Crosses, 21–28, fig. 1–4, 19, 21–22 (one of the donors of the cross was identified as patriarch Sisinnios who lived at the end of the 10th c.).
93 Cf. n. 79 supra.
94 Cf. n. 83 supra.
There is more justification for the opinion that the special devotion of the donor of the Ortz cross is expressed by the standing figure of the archangel Michael. He is the only figure who appears twice in the decoration of the cross — on the center of the reverse and on the obverse (Fig. 1–2).

It is not necessary to justify the assertion that the archangel Michael was especially venerated in the whole Christian world, particularly in Byzantium. His image appears in many mosaics, frescoes, icons, miniatures, seals, and works of applied arts. Also, many churches were dedicated to the leader of the heavenly hosts, and his name was widespread at all levels of Byzantine society. Monks, as well as church and state dignitaries and even rulers venerated him as their patron.

This naturally does not mean that the archangel Michael could have received this preeminent place on the Ortz cross only in the event that the person ordering the cross venerated him as his personal protector. In the religious consciousness of the Byzantines, the archangel performed various roles. He was honored as an intercessor of the human race before God, the psychopompos, but most of all, he was thought of as a healer and a warrior. However, his eschatological functions could be neglected in this context since, as it has already been shown, in the decoration of the Ortz cross and of related processional crosses, these are expressed on the front side in the context of the Deesis composition. Michael’s warrior role is of no importance in explaining his appearance on the reverse of the Ortz cross since he is shown without a soldier’s equipment. On the other hand, the cult of the archangel Michael as a healer was most developed in Byzantium during the fifth and sixth centuries, while in later times that aspect of the cult was much weaker because of its stronger militarisation. Nevertheless, the reputation of the so-called Michaelianos, the sanctuary-hospitals in which faith in the healing powers of Michael emerged most robustly, was very strong also in the Middle Byzantine era. In the middle of the ninth century, great numbers of pilgrims traveled to the Constantinople church of the archangel Michael ἐν τοῖς Ἐβασελίου being drawn by the miraculous icon of the archangel which had healing powers. The famous sanctuary at Choni with its healing spring in front of the church functioned as an important center for the archangel’s cult until 1189, when it was burned. The aforesaid Michaelians, as well as other churches dedicated to the archangel Michael, most assuredly received various votive gifts from people, who invoked the heavenly archistrategos for aid in healing. There must have been among them processional crosses, so there is a basis for the suggestion that the Ortz cross, with the figure of the archangel in the center of the reverse, was made as the donor’s ex-voto for some place of worship dedicated to Michael. Yet, this assumption is hard to accept in the light of the proposed interpretation that the image of St. Paul of Kauojama connects the Ortz cross with one of the centers of his Constantinople-limited cult. The two hypotheses would be brought into harmony only in the event that there existed in the capital a place of worship where the archangel Michael and St. Paul were both particularly venerated. This is not impossible, especially if we remember three things. First, the cult of the heavenly archistrategos was extremely strong in Constantinople. Second, there were some sanctuaries, where Michael was not the primary patron saint but where he also was particularly celebrated. Third, parekklesia probably existed in the monasteries of Kauojama and Christ the Pantopoeus. Nevertheless, if one considers all the available facts, it seems that the previously offered explanations for the figures of the archangel Michael and St. Paul of Kauojama on the Ortz cross are more acceptable.

Of course, one should not overlook the appearance of St. Niketas the Goth in the decorative program of the cross. However, it is important to keep in mind that there are many other medieval crosses, processional or pectoral, containing the image of the martyr from the land of the Goths. Among them, the previously mentioned Matkaivtaris cross is closest to the Ortz cross with regard to the type and location of

---

97 Rohland, Erzengel Michael, 50–144; Gabélis, Cycles, 21–29, 135.
99 Gabélis, Cycles, 24–27, 29, 108–109, 135; Peers, Representing Angels, 142ff, 154ff, 178ff. The belief in the healing power of the archangel was also held in the Palaiologan era. This is clearly seen in the wall paintings of the church of the archangel Michael in Leonozo, painted some time between 1342 and 1347. Two paintings of Michael as a miraculous healer occupy important places in the decorative program of the church, see Gabélis, Manuelis-Leonozo, figs. 35–36.

---

102 Cf. Glory of Byzantium, 67 (H. C. Evans), where it is supposed that the Ortz cross was made for some site dedicated to the archangel Michael or to St. Niketas of Medikion.
103 R. Janin lists over 30 monasteries, churches and parekklesia dedicated to the archangel Michael in Constantinople and in the surrounding area, cf. R. Janin, Les sanctuaires byzantins de saint Michel (Constantinople et banlieue), EO 33 (1934) 28–52; idem, La géographie, 349–363.
104 Unfortunately, the sources describe almost nothing concerning the dedication of churches in the monastery of Kauojama nor Christ Panteopes. As for Kauojama, it is only known that the monastery church which housed the relics of St. Paul was dedicated to the Mother of God (cf. supra). Moager information is also available about the foundation of Anna Dalassene even though the katholikon of the monastery is preserved, cf. Th. F. Mathews, The Byzantine churches of Istanbul: a photographic survey, University Park 1976, 59–70. It could be mentioned that one monastic seal from the 11th c. is decorated with the bust of the Virgin "Blachernitissa", cf. Laurent, Corpus, V/3, 212–213 (no. 1906).
105 Besides other problems, it would be difficult to find an analogy for a processional cross which in its decoration had a dual iconographic connection to the place for which it was intended. At this time we could cite only the so-called "cross of Michael Keroularios" from the Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Collection, decorated with two scenes from the cycle of the archangel Michael and one scene from the life of St. Constantine (Cotonion, Crosses, 81–83, no. 5). According to the opinion of Cyril Mango (La croix, 46–47), he stated with considerable reservation, the cross "probably belonged to some monastery in Asia Minor, say a monastery of the archangel Michael, which had a chapel dedicated to St. Constantine".
the image. St. Niketas is represented as a bust and is found on the bottom arm of the reverse (Fig. 19). However, the cross preserved in Georgia has the Crucifixion in the intersection of the reverse, instead of the figure of the archangel Michael. The commissioner and the craftsman of a bronze processionary cross in the Byzantine Museum, Athens (no. 248), also intended to create an iconographical program with the Crucifixion and the bust of St. Niketas on the reverse of the cross. Unfortunately, this work, which was begun either somewhat earlier or at the same time as the Matskharvishi cross, was not completed. The arms on the reverse are only partly decorated, this being limited to the names of the saints.

There are also the Byzantine crosses with the depiction of St. Niketas as an orant. For example, we will cite two eleventh-century examples made of bronze. The first one, a liturgical cross, originating from Asia Minor or Palestine, is kept in the Dr Christian Schmidt Collection, Munich. The second example, a pectoral cross, was found at Strumica and now is located in the National Museum of Belgrade. In both cases, the figure of the martyr-orans is engraved, meaning that it is totally schematic in design and has no modeling.

Pectoral crosses with the image of St. Niketas were common in medieval Russia. What is characteristic for these crosses is that instead of a standing figure or a bust of the saint, the scene of Niketas’ victory over the devil appears. This was a very popular image in Russia together with the apocryphal saint’s martyrion which inspired it. Similar to the cited Byzantine crosses, the depiction of St. Niketas is usually placed under the Crucifixion, but there are a number of preserved examples where it occupies the central area of the cross. In these cases, the Crucifixion is frequently left out, while the arms of the cross are filled with images of saints.

The explanation for the frequent depiction of St. Niketas on various types of crosses, most often with the Crucifixion, probably could be found in liturgical books. Old typika and menaia prescribed that on September 15, the Exaltation of the Cross and the popular martyr from the land of the Goths should be celebrated jointly. In fact, it is the first day of the prolongation (μετεπορίστη) of the Feast of the Exaltation. Then, the stichera and canons honoring the Holy Cross and those honoring St. Niketas follow one another. This connection between the two feasts in the iconography of the crosses is most clearly demonstrated on the Matskharvishi cross, where St. Niketas is shown immediately above the scene of the Exaltation of the Cross (Η ΥΨΟΙΣΙΩ), including the figures of SS. Constantine and Helena with the instru-

106 Khukhivadze, Matskharvishi, T. 2, 9, 13. Sufficiently firm arguments for a more precise dating of this cross have not yet been found. Based on stylistic analysis it is dated in the beginning of 12th c. (cf. our n. 80 supra), while the iconographic characteristics allow the supposition that the cross was made a few decades earlier. St. Niketas the Goth is most often portrayed as a beardless youth during the 11th c., while his military deeds are common already in the beginning of era of Konneno (cf. Marković, Representations, 503–507; cf. also infra). The representation of St. Theodore with a hand in which no epibath (Strateletes or Tereos) is written would be rather unusual in Byzantine art of 12th c., cf. Marković, Military Saints, 596–597.

107 The medallion with the name of St. Niketas is located above the Crucifixion which is placed at the center, cf. Sandin, Bronze crosses, 335–343, no. 50.


109 The reverse of the cross is decorated with the figure of the archangel Michael, cf. G. Marjanović-Vujović, Crosses, 6th–12th C., from the Collection of National Museum, Belgrade 1987, 47, 62, no. 44.

110 Allusion to the joint liturgical celebration of the True Cross and St. Niketas was expressed with equal clarity in other artistic media. The central part of a Russian icon at the Hermitage is occupied by the Holy Cross, while beneath it there are four scenes from the martyrion of St. Niketas. On a Byzantine cameo in the Vatican, dated to the twelfth century, the front side is decorated with the figure of the Virgin and St. Niketas, while on the back is the image of the Holy Cross. As far as the appearance of Niketas’ victory over the devil on Russian crosses is concerned, researchers usually have understood this scene as a symbolic image of Christ’s victory over Satan, i.e., a sign of His victory on the Cross of Golgotha. According to the opinion of Natalia Teteriatnikov, in establishing the relationship between St. Niketas, Christ, and the Cross as the symbol of victory, a decisive role was played by Niketas’ name (νατάλα — victor). Describing a characteristic peculiar of Christ, the name was the reason why some attributes and roles of the Savior were ascribed to the Gothic martyr, especially His attribute as the victor over Hades and death.

Surely, for a complete interpretation of Niketas’ images on pectoral and liturgical crosses it would be necessary to perform a wider analysis than we can perform on this occasion. Nevertheless, what has been presented thus far demonstrates clearly that such images were very common in the Middle Ages. Accordingly, most often, there is no need to search for a special donor’s devotion toward St. Niketas the Goth in cases where the saint is included in the decorative program of a cross. It is appropriate to recall here the Matskharvishi cross, once again. On the one hand, the persons who commissioned the cross are known (hegoumenos Kosmas and hieromonkh John), as is the monastery for which it was created (Theotokos του Μακρου). On the other hand, the liturgical connection between the feasts of the Holy Cross and St. Niketas is expressed in the iconography of the cross in a very obvious manner.

111 The variation of the Greek name Nikitas is Nikita, as given in the inscription on the cross in the Church of St. Nikitas, Novgorod. The Latin name Nikita is added to the Greek name in the inscription on the large cross in the Church of St. Niketas at Bykovo outside Moscow.

112 The problem of the identity of the scene of St. Niketas’ victory over the devil is treated in depth by A. M. Znamenskaya (Znamenskaya, St. Nikitas, 1–115).


114 Among other things, one should examine whether Byzantine crosses in any form expressed the belief in St. Niketas as the victor against Satan (on this belief in Byzantium cf. Marković, Representations, 508). If so, the decoration of the reverse of the Ortix cross may have had one more meaning, given that the Archangel Michael was seen as deserving the greatest credit for the downfall of Satan (see note 98 supra).
**Fig. 21. Fragment of a silver processional cross, the obverse, The Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Collection, Washington, 11th c.**

**Dating of the cross**

The time when the Ortiz cross was created still cannot be determined precisely. However, iconographic analysis helps take a step in that direction as well, especially if we accept the hypothesis that the military saint named Paul, who is represented on the cross, is St. Paul of Kaisuana.\(^{119}\) The cult of this saint displayed its greatest strength within a relatively short period of time culminating in the eleventh century. His akolouthia was written at that time, and the old martyrion was reworked and inserted in the Imperial Menologion (1034–1041). Most liturgical calendars, where the commemoration of St. Paul of Kaisuana was prescribed, dated from the same time. Finally, probably somewhere between 1081 and 1087, the relics of the saint were transferred to the monastery of Christ Panteleimon, the newly founded endowment of the powerful Anna Dalassene. The date of this transfer could be more important for the chronology of the Ortiz cross if the previously presented supposition were accepted, that the cross was created at the time when the monastery of Kaisuana was still the only center of St. Paul’s cult.

For the dating of the Ortiz cross, two facts revealed in researching the development of the iconography of St. Niketas the Goth also can be of use. First, it must be mentioned that images of the martyr portraying him as a beardless youth most commonly originate in the eleventh century.\(^{120}\) After this time, such an image is extremely rare and instead the other iconographic type of St. Niketas dominates (his depiction as a mature man with a beard and a moustache).\(^{121}\) The other iconographic fact relevant for the chronology is connected with representations of St. Niketas as a warrior. These representations were quite rare until the end of the third quarter of the eleventh century. The oldest example positively dated — the seal of Niketas, the megas oikonomos of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople — was created only at the beginning of the era of the Komnenoi.\(^{122}\) From that time on, representations of St. Niketas as a warrior were common and, at the time of the Palaiologoi, he was considered a member of the “squad” of military saints, who were painted very often on the walls of Eastern Christian churches.\(^{123}\) All this is still not enough to conclude for certain that the Ortiz cross, where St. Niketas is portrayed without armor or weapons, was made before the formation of the new type of the iconography of the saint. Depictions of St. Niketas in a tunic and cloak, with the martyr’s cross in his hand, appear later as well, from the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries, when the warrior type of representation prevailed in the iconography of the saint.\(^{124}\)

However, if the facts obtained in the study of the cult of St. Paul of Kaisuana are simultaneously borne in mind, it could be assumed that the cross from the collection of George Ortiz was made before 1081.

\(^{119}\) As it is still impossible to definitively confirm this identification, one should approach all the conclusions based on this with some reservation. Nevertheless, one should stress once again that the identification of military saint depicted on the Ortiz cross with St. Paul Kaisuana is the only acceptable solution. All other alternatives are equally controllable, cf. supra.

\(^{120}\) Cf. supra.

\(^{121}\) For the 12th and 13th centuries cf., for example, Kitzing, Mosaici, I, Fig. 71; Restle, Kleinasien, Fig. 191; M. Chatzidikai — I. Melpita, Kýnagorai, Athens 1997, 115–116, figs. 5, 7; N. B. D ANDALEZI, Βυζαντινής πατριαρχίας της Μέσας Μισού, Athens 1995, 94, 337; D. KOCO — P. MULIKOV-CIPEK, Manastir, Skopje 1958, Pl. 28; M. BORBOUTAKIS, Main Trends of Thirteenth Century Well-Painting in Crete, in: Drewnowski ed. 1989, 123–130; A. DRAKOS, Νέα Ανακαίνιση τού Μεγάλου Άνω Πεδίου της Κρήτης, Athens 1992, 181, 237; F. PAPANIKOLAOU, Βυζαντινές χριστιανικές εικόνες του δεκατέσσαρου αιώνα, Athens 1998, 181, 237; E. STEPANOVA, New Seals from Sakha, in: Studia in Byzantine Symbology, L 6, ed. N. Oikonomides, Washington 1999, 35–58, no. 22. On the other hand, a reliquary from San Marco, Venice, suggests that at the time of its creation (the end of the 10th or beginning of the 11th c.) the warrior type of the iconography of St. Niketas still was not formulated. On the other side, the reliquary is placed the bust of SS. George, Theodore Taras, Demetrios, Prokopios, Eustathios Phlakidas and Niketas. The first five martyrs are represented with armor and weapons, while only St. Niketas has no military saint attribute. He is clothed in a tunic and a cloak, and holds a cross in his right hand, cf. Il tasaro di San Marco: Il Tasaro e il Museo, dir. H. K. HABERLAND, Firenze 1971, 34–35; T. XXVII (A. FROLOV, Glory of Byzantium, 79, no. 37 (C. A. ANDERSON)).

\(^{122}\) SS. George, Demetrios, two Theodorus, Eustathios Phlakidas, Merkurios, Prokopios, Nectar and Artemios are to be considered as other members of that decuria, cf. Markovii, Military Saints, 591–594, 607.

\(^{123}\) Cf., for example, Kitzing, Mosaici I, Fig. 71; C. Grodzenov, Oихлдшко збю иллюстративни XIV век, Belgrad 1980, Fig. 19; J. Frolov, Die Kirche des Heiligen Andreas an der Treba, Wien 1987, Fig. 68; Bresevea, Afoninska kniga, 235, no. 76.
As is plainly evident, dating the Ortiz cross based on iconographic analysis cannot offer a narrower chronological scope than the first eight decades of the eleventh century as a solution with a solid foundation. Therefore, it would be advisable to attempt to improve this relatively broad chronology by a detailed analysis of style. As such an analysis demands a separate study, here we shall confine ourselves to the conclusions which come from a few summary comparisons of the Ortiz cross with related art works. Apart from the previously mentioned liturgical crosses in Paris, Geneva, Cleveland, and New York, included in this group is the fragment of a cross in the Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Collection, which is decorated on the horizontal arms of the obverse with standing figures of Christ, the Virgin, and St. John the Fore-runner in the Deesis composition (Fig. 21).125

By its form, technical execution, type of ornamental decoration and treatment of the figures, the Ortiz cross is closest to the cross of the monk Kosmas from the Cluny Museum. In addition, the two crosses share the unusual abbreviation marks in the form of stars, which were used in the inscriptions (Fig. 3).126 Such marks also appear on the Geneva cross with the cycle of the prophet Elias (Fig. 4). However, it is distinguished from the Ortiz cross by its cruder treatment of the figures and by the abundance of orthographic mistakes.127

Unfortunately, neither of these crosses can be dated with sufficient precision. Based mainly on stylistic elements, the cross of the monk Kosmas is assigned to the end of the eleventh or to the twelfth century,128 and the Geneva cross to the last quarter of the eleventh century.129 As for the three other crosses, the fragment from Dumbarton Oaks and the cross of Bishop Leo from New York are dated to the first half of the eleventh century, while the Cleveland cross of the hieromonk Nicholas to the second or third quarter of the same century.130

In closing, we will repeat some of the conclusions gained in the iconographic analysis of the cross from the collection of George Ortiz. First, on the reverse of the cross, besides three archangels and St. Niketas the Goth, there is depicted, most likely, St. Paul of Kaouma, the little known martyr from Constantinople. Second, the very local importance of the cult and the exceptional rarity of the representations of this martyr afford a firm basis for the assumption that the cross was created for some Constantinopolitan monastery, probably for the monastery of Kaouma, where the cult of St. Paul was for a long time centered. Third, the cross was made in the eleventh century, presumably before the beginning of the era of the Komnenoi.

If our conclusions concerning the connection of the Ortiz cross to Constantinople are accurate, it would be the only artistic object of its kind, whose origins could be traced more reliably to the Constantinopolitan workshops. In literature there have been attempts to connect some procession crosses with the artisans of the capital city (for example, the Benaki’s Adrianople cross, the Matschkarishvili cross, “the cross of Michael Keroularios” and the fragmentary cross with the Deesis in Dumbarton Oaks), but the arguments have generally been based on the high degree of workmanship of the crosses.131 The Ortiz cross, which does not display the highest level of technical and artistic skill, would demonstrate that the criteria, upon which certain objects are connected with Constantinople as the principal artistic center of Byzantium, should not be overly stringent.

---

125 Cotonos, Crosses, 76–78, no. 3, fig. 27.
126 For this cross cf. literature cited in n. 82 supra. Concerning the unusual abbreviation marks cf. Caillet, La croix, 209, fig. 3, 7.
127 Cf. literature cited in n. 81 supra. To be truthful, it should be stated that the Ortiz cross is also rich in the orthographic mistakes, especially its reverse. On this side of the cross all inscriptions are written erroneously: “ο ωρη(δηγιης) Μηχη(ηπη)

128 “ο ωρη(δηγιης) Μηχη(ηπη)

129 “ο ωρη(δηγιης) Μηχη(ηπη)

130 Cf. the literature cited in note 82 supra. H. C. Evans (Glory of Byzantium, 64) assigns the cross to the “late 11th – early 12th century”.

131 For the cross from the Geneva cf. Lazovic, Commentaires et catalogue, 12. A. Bank (Trotz croix, 104) and J. A. Cotonos (Crosses, 49) dated the Geneva cross more generally, to the 11th century.

130 For the dating of the Cleveland cross and fragment from Dumbarton Oaks cf. Cotonos, Crosses, 71, 78; for the cross of bishop Leo cf. Glory of Byzantium, 62 (H. C. Evans).

131 For opinions supporting a connection of the cited Middle Byzantine procession crosses with Constantinople cf. Bourn, Cross, 27–28; Bank, Trotz croix, 97; Khvastshvili, Matschkarishvili, 40; Cotonos, Crosses, 83. On the other hand, it should be pointed out that Cyril Mango attributed the Matschkarishvili cross and “the cross of Michael Keroularios”, together with the crosses in Cleveland, Cluny Museum and the Geneva “Elias’ cross”, to the “monastic provincial milieu”, cf. Mango, La croix, 43.
Белешке о византијском литијском крсту из Збирке Џорџа Ортиза

Миодраг Марковић

На реверсу византијског литијског крста из Збирке Џорџа Ортиза, поред три арханђела и светог Никите Гota, представљен је и свети Павле Кајумски, мало познати муčеник из Цариграда, чији је култ имао средиште у престоничком манастиру Кајуми. Локални значај култа и изузетна реткост представа тог муčеника упућују на претпоставку да је повећани крст рађен за потребе неког цариградског манастира. Највише је разлога да се помиња управо на манастир Кајуму. Судећи по важном месту које је у декорацији „Ортизовог крста“ приказан арханђел Михаило, рекло би се да је предводник небеских сила био патрон поручника крста. Не сме се, међутим, искључити ни могућност да је „Ортизов крст“ био намењен неком престоничком светилишту у којем су били посебно поштован и арханђел Михаило и свети Павле Кајумски. Иконографске и стилске особености крста воде ка закључку да је он настао у XI веку, вероватно пре почетка епохе Комнина.

Уколико су закључци о повезаности „Ортизовог крста“ са Цариградом тачни, то би било једно уметничко дело у својој врсті чији би се настанак поузданје могло приписати престоничким радионицама. У литератури је било посматрања да се и неки други прописани крстови тог типа доведу у везу с цариградским мајсторима, али се аргументација углавном сводила на истичење високог степени уметничке обраде и указивање на ортографску исправност појединих натписа на крстовима. „Ортизов крст“, који не улази у ред врхунских уметничких дела, показује да критеријуми на основу којих се поједини споменици повезују са Цариградом, као главним уметничким средиштем Византије, не смеју бити престроги.