

Vinka Marinković

Nekoliko novih figuralnih prikaza u Dioklecijanovoj palači

Vinka Marinković
Hrvatski restauratorski zavod
Porinova 2a
HR, 21000 Split
vmarinkovic@h-r-z.hr

UDK: 904 :728.8 (497.5 Split)
Izvorni znanstveni članak
Primljeno: 6. 3. 2013.
Prihvaćeno: 8. 7. 2013.

U radu se objavljuje fragment arhitektonskog elementa s figuralnim prikazom iz Muzeja grada Splita. Okolnosti nalaza i stilske značajke konzolu nesumnjivo vezuju uz izvornu arhitektonsku dekoraciju Dioklecijanove palače. Uspoređujući element s pojedinim reljefnim figuralnim motivima u Palači, autorica primjerke reljefa pripisuje jedinstvenoj radionici i prepoznaje unificirani, karakteristični stil obrade figuralnih prikaza u Dioklecijanovoj palači.

Ključne riječi: Dioklecijanova palača, skulptura, tetrarhija, Muzej grada Splita, Dioklecijanov mauzolej, Peristil

Several New Figural Portrayals in Diocletian's Palace

Vinka Marinković
Croatian Conservation Institute
Porinova 2a
CROATIA, 21000 Split
vmarinkovic@h-r-z.hr

UDC: 904 :728.8 (497.5 Split)
Original scientific paper
Received: 6 Mart 2013
Accepted: 8 July 2013

A fragment of an architectural element from the City Museum of Split is published herein. The circumstances surrounding its discovery and the stylistic features of the console are undoubtedly linked to the original architectural decoration of Diocletian's Palace. Comparing the element with individual relief figural motifs in the Palace, the author ascribes examples of the relief to a single workshop and recognizes the unified, typical style of rendering figural portrayals in Diocletian's Palace

Key words: Diocletian's Palace, sculpture, tetrarchy, City Museum of Split, Diocletian's Mausoleum, Peristyle

U Dioklecijanovoj palači u Splitu pronađeno je relativno malo cjelovitih djela i arheoloških artefakata koji svjedoče o izvornom dekoru (ukrasu) njezina ambijenta. Tijekom višegodišnjih sustavnih arheoloških istraživanja koja su se intenzivirala početkom 20. st., istraženi su i pobliže definirani arhitektonski sklopovi. U istraživanjima su pronađeni uglavnom sporadični primjerci izvorne arhitektonske dekoracije: samostalnih skulptura, fresko-slikarstva, mozaika i mramornih obloga. Posljednjih godina novije arheološke potvrde ne dopuštaju spektakularne pomake na tom polju, ali slučajni nalazi (poput ostataka *in situ* zidnog mozaika u jugozapadnom dijelu Palače¹) podsjećaju na činjenicu da Palača još uvijek nije dovoljno istražena. U obradi rezultata i postojećeg materijala pozornost znanstvenika i istraživača dosad je uglavnom bila usmjerena na iznimno dobro očuvane arhitektonske sklopove, njihovu funkciju i međuodnos. Reljefna plastika očuvana na arhitektonskim sklopovima detaljno je analizirana i kao takva poslužila je, u nedostatku posvetnih natpisa, pri određivanju njihove izvorne (prvotne) atribucije.

Izučavajući uređenje Palače, znanstvenici su izrazito malo pozornosti usmjerili na izvrsno očuvane podne mozaičke kompozicije,² a donedavno je i upotreba dekorativnog kamena korištenog u Palači relativno površno analitički i znanstveno obrađivana.³

O skulpturi se nešto više raspravljalo, no znanstvenici su kroz povijest uglavnom bili zaokupljeni spoznajom da u Palači gotovo da i nema sačuvane izvorne antičke samostalne skulpture. S obzirom na

Relatively few whole pieces and archaeological artefacts have been found in Diocletian's Palace in Split that testify to the original décor (ornamentation) of the ambient. During many years of systematic archaeological research which intensified at the onset of the twentieth century, archaeological complexes were examined and defined in some detail. Generally sporadic examples of original architectural decoration were found in this research: stand-alone sculptures, fresco paintings, mosaics and marble panelling. The more recent archaeological confirmations in recent years do not allow for any spectacular breakthroughs in this field, but chance finds (such as the *in situ* remains of a wall mosaic in the south-west section of the Palace)¹ recall the fact that the Palace has still not been sufficiently examined. The interest of scholars and researchers in the analysis of results and existing materials has thus far generally focused on well-preserved architectural units, and their function and interrelationships. Relief sculpture preserved on architectural units have been analyzed in great detail, and as such they have served in the determination of their original (initial) attribution in the absence of dedicatory inscriptions.

When studying the furnishings of the Palace, scholars have accorded remarkably little attention to the superbly preserved floor mosaic compositions,² and until recently even the use of decorative stones in the Palace has only been subject to superficial analytical and scholarly consideration.³

1 Perojević, Marasović, Marasović 2009, str. 70, bilj. 58.

2 Mozaici u Dioklecijanovoj palači slabo su znanstveno istraživani, premda su prema stupnju očuvanosti i površinom zaslužili veću pozornost. Premda se mozaicima Dioklecijanove palače u zadnjih pola stoljeća bavilo nekoliko domaćih i inozemnih autora, nitko njihovu problematiku vezanu uz funkciju i likovnu dekoraciju nije definirao do kraja. Čak je i vrijeme nastanka mozaika prema većini znanstvenika upitno. U novije se vrijeme sustavnom analizom likovnih ornamenata na mozaicima Palače bavio B. Matulić (Matulić 2003). Ponovnu reviziju mozaičkih podnica s prijedlogom nove datacije nedavno su načinili S. Perojević, K. Marasović i T. Marasović (Perojević *et al.* 2009, str. 58-65).

3 Pregled kamena korištenog u Palači donosi F. Bulić (Bulić 1908, str. 86-97). U novije vrijeme upotrebu dekorativnog kamena u Palači sustavno i analitički istražuju K. Marasović i D. Matetić-Poljak (Marasović, Matetić-Poljak 2010). Relativno nove i svježije spoznaje o upotrebi dekorativnog kamena Careva stana donose A. Penović i I. Tadinac-Šećer u izlaganju na znanstvenom skupu Hrvatskog arheološkog društva, Lošinj 2012.

1 Perojević, Marasović, Marasović 2009, p. 70, note 58.

2 Rather meagre scholarly research has been dedicated to the mosaics in Diocletian's Palace, although based on their state of preservation and surface area they merit much more attention. Although a few Croatian and foreign scholars have dealt with the mosaics in Diocletian's Palace in the past half-century, none have entirely defined the problems tied to their function and artistic decoration. For most scholars, even the time of their creation remains in question. In more recent years, a systematic analysis of the artistic ornaments on the Palace's mosaics has been conducted by B. Matulić (Matulić 2003). A revision of the mosaic floors with a proposal for new dating was done by S. Perojević, K. Marasović and T. Marasović (Perojević *et al.* 2009, pp. 58-65).

3 An overview of the stone used in the Palace was provided by F. Bulić (Bulić 1908, pp. 86-97). More recently, the use of decorative stone in the Palace was systematically and analytically researched by K. Marasović and D. Matetić-Poljak (Marasović, Matetić-Poljak 2010). Relatively new and fresh knowledge on the use of decorative stone in the Emperor's abode is provided by A. Penović and I. Tadinac-Šećer in a paper

nedostatak skulpture pojedini istraživači ističu mogućnost da skulptura kao ukras zbog brzine gradnje nikada i nije bila postavljena.⁴ Drugi su, pak, na temelju paralela i postojećih arhitektonskih elemenata (niše i baze), hipotetički rekonstruirali izgled Palače, smatrajući da je skulptura bila postavljena na svim važnijim arhitektonskim sklopovima (pogotovo ona koja je slijedila carsko-religijski program).⁵ Potonja teorija svakako je izglednija, posebice ako se uzmu u obzir konkretni arheološki nalazi, od kojih, nažalost, ni jedan nije sačuvan *in situ*. Iznimke koje potvrđuju prisutnost samostalne skulpture u Palači, uistinu su rijetke, ali dovoljno indikativne.

Od četiriju primjeraka dostupnih javnosti (redom kamene glave), tri primjerka veoma su loše očuvana,⁶ dok se četvrtome, koji je navodno iz Splita, još uvijek utvrđuje izvornost.⁷ Nekoliko primjeraka sporadičnih ostataka samostalne skulpture spominje se u

Sculpture has been given some more consideration, but throughout history scholars have generally been preoccupied with the fact that there is almost no original stand-alone Roman-era sculpture in the Palace. Given the absence of sculpture, individual researchers have stressed the possibility that statues were never installed as a form of ornamentation due to the haste of construction works.⁴ Others, however, have hypothetically reconstructed the Palace's appearance based on parallels and existing architectural elements (niches and pedestals), believing that sculptures were installed at all major architectural units (particularly those which followed the imperial religious program).⁵ The latter theory is certainly more likely, particularly if one takes into account specific archaeological finds, of which, unfortunately, not one has been preserved *in situ*. The exceptions that prove the presence of stand-alone sculptures in the Palace are truly rare, but sufficiently indicative.

Of the four examples available to the public (all stone heads), three examples are very poorly preserved,⁶ while the authenticity of the fourth, which

4 Nikšić 2009, str. 129, bilj. 38; Piplović 1997, str. 20-21.

5 Kähler 1965, str. 106; Cambi 2002, str. 173-175; Wilkes 1993, str. 22, 23, sl. 3.

6 U prva dva primjerka očuvane tetrahijske skulpture u Palači spadaju dvije kamene glave uzidane u zid dvorišta palače Cambj, Ispod ure 3. O njima vidi: Cambi 1978; Cambi 1989, str. 15, 16; Cambi 2000, str. 82, T. 173; Cambi 2002, str. 175, sl. 273, 274; Cambi 2005, str. 182, sl. 275. Riječ je o iznimno vrijednim komadima samostalnih skulptura koje su sigurno krasile ambijent Dioklecijanove palače, a prema objavama N. Cambija, moguće da je desna glava portret jednog od tetraha (Maksimijan?). Glave su prvi put objavljene 1978. godine i već tada je upozoreno na njihov neprihvatljiv smještaj i oštećenja izazvana atmosferijama. Od tada, premda su prošla više od tri desetljeća, ništa nije poduzeto da se ta dva iznimno raritetna primjerka spase i konzerviraju. Hrvatski restauratorski zavod već treću godinu zaredom ulomke prijavljuje Ministarstvu kulture ne bi li se skulpture hitno demontirale i restaurirale, no ni ove godine (2013.) nisu odobrena sredstva za konzervaciju-restauraciju skulptura. Stručno gledano, najizglednije bi bilo da se glave demontiraju, restauriraju i primjereno izlože u jednom od splitskih muzeja. Ako se obavi restauracija *in situ*, poštujući i valorizirajući neospornu ambijentalnost prostora stvorenu ugradnjom skulptura, proces propadanja će se, s obzirom na uvjete smještaja, nastaviti brzo nakon restauratorskog zahvata. Konačnu odluku o demontaži skulptura ili o restauraciji *in situ*, ako se idućih godina odobre sredstva, donosi nadležni Konzervatorski odjel. Treća glava koja je pripisana izvornoj skulpturi Palače, danas je smještena u Etnografskom muzeju u Splitu, nedaleko od mjesta pronalaska, ali, nažalost, pronađena je s iznimnim oštećenjima; usp. Cambi 2005, str. 182, sl. 276.

7 Cambi 2011.

delivered at the seminar of the Croatian Archaeological Association in Lošinj, 2012.

4 Nikšić 2009, p. 129, note 38; Piplović 1997, pp. 20, 21.

5 Kähler 1965, p. 106; Cambi 2002, pp. 173-175; Wilkes 1993, pp. 22, 23, Fig. 3.

6 Two stone heads built into the wall of the palace courtyard belong to the first two examples of preserved tetrarchic-era sculpture in the Palace, Cambj, Ispod ure 3. On them see: Cambi 1978; Cambi 1989, pp. 15, 16; Cambi 2000, p. 82, P. 173; Cambi 2002, p. 175, Fig. 273, 274; Cambi 2005, p. 182, Fig. 275. These are exceptionally valuable pieces of stand-alone sculpture which certainly adorned the ambient of Diocletian's Palace, and according to N. Cambi it is possible that the right-hand head was a portrait of one of the tetrarchs (Maximianus?). The heads were first published in 1978, and already at the time it was pointed out that their location was inappropriate and that they had been damaged by weathering. Since then – and even though three decades had passed – nothing has been undertaken to save and preserve these exceptionally rare examples. The Croatian Conservation Institute has reported these fragments to the Ministry of Culture for three consecutive years, seeking the urgent removal and restoration of these sculptures, but even this year (2013) the funding for their conservation/restoration was not approved. From the technical standpoint, it would be best to remove the heads, restore them and properly display them in one of Split's museums. If the restoration is done *in situ*, respecting and appreciating the ambience of the space created by the installation of the sculptures, the process of deterioration will continue soon after restoration works are completed due to the



Sl. 1. Arhitektonski element iz Muzeja grada Splita, bočni pogled (foto: Zlatko Sunko)

Fig. 1. Architectural element from the Split City Museum, lateral view (photo: Zlatko Sunko)

znanstvenim člancima iz sredine 20. stoljeća, no danas su ti primjerci spremljeni u depoima splitskih muzeja, a njihova detaljna analiza i ponovna revizija (dokumentacija, interpretacija) tek, nadamo se, predstoji.⁸ Brojne egipatske skulpture sfingi i njihovi ostaci⁹ također programatski pripadaju Dioklecijanovoj palači, no one su postankom starije i sekundarno upotrijebljene. Neizravno puno govore o unutrašnjem uređenju Palače, te o samoj osobi Cara, ali izravno ne mogu pomoći u definiranju i određivanju umjetničkih i stilskih značajki kiparstva i umjetničke produkcije Dioklecijanove palače.

Zbog nedostatka izvorne skulpture Dioklecijanove palače smatram da je potrebno evidentirati svaki pojedini trag o mogućoj skulpturi i reljefima koji su krasili građevinske sklopove Palače. Naime, u nedostatku originalne skulpture, stilske značajke skulpturalne umjetnosti Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu moguće je odrediti prema figuralnim reljefima, kojih na očuvanim arhitektonskim sklopovima ima poprilično.

Slijedom navedenog, smatram da je iznimno bitno objaviti jedan, relativno malen kameni artefakt, pohranjen u Muzeju grada Splita, koji je do sada samo informativno publiciran u Muzejskom katalogu za posjetitelje.¹⁰

8 Mirnik 1989, str. 5; Mirnik 1977, str. 48, 49.

9 Dosad je ukupno popisano 12 sfingi i njihovih ulomaka; usp. o tome Selem 1997, str. 97-106; Tadinac 2001, str. 385.

10 Šarić 2003, str. 35.



Sl. 2. Arhitektonski element iz Muzeja grada Splita, prednji pogled (foto: Zlatko Sunko)

Fig. 2. Architectural element from the Split City Museum, frontal view (photo: Zlatko Sunko)

is allegedly from Split, has yet to be determined.⁷ Several examples of sporadic remains of stand-alone sculptures are mentioned in scholarly articles from the mid-twentieth century, but currently these examples are held in the storage rooms of Split's museums, and a thorough analysis and revision (documentation, interpretation) must yet – let us hope – be done.⁸ Numerous Egyptian sculptures of sphinxes and their remains⁹ also thematically belong to Diocletian's Palace, but they were actually made earlier and in secondary use. Indirectly, they say much about the interior furnishings of the Palace and the Emperor himself, but directly they cannot help in the determination of the artistic and stylistic features of the sculpture and artistic production in Diocletian's Palace.

Due to the absence of original sculpture in Diocletian's Palace, I believe it is necessary to record each individual trace of possible sculptures and relief

conditions at the location. The final decision on the removal of the sculptures or their restoration *in situ*, insofar as funds are approved in the coming years, will be made by the Conservation Department with jurisdiction. The third head ascribed to the Palace's original sculpture furnishings is currently held in the Ethnographic Museum in Split, not far from its discovery site, although it was, unfortunately, found exceptionally damaged; cf. Cambi 2005, p. 182, Fig. 276.

7 Cambi 2011.

8 Mirnik 1989, p. 5; Mirnik 1977, pp. 48, 49.

9 Thus far, a total of 12 sphinxes and their fragments have been recorded, on this cf. Selem 1997, pp. 97-106; Tadinac 2001, p. 385.



Sl. 3. Arhitektonski element iz Muzeja grada Splita, pogled odozdo (foto: Zlatko Sunko)

Fig. 3. Architectural element from the Split City Museum, view from bottom (photo Zlatko Sunko)

Riječ je o kamenom ulomku dimenzija 25 cm (v) x 26 cm (š) x 29 cm (d), koji je u izvornoj namjeni možda funkcionirao kao konzola, no zbog fragmentiranosti i nesigurnosti u njegovu izvornu funkciju nazvat ćemo ga arhitektonskim elementom (sl. 1, 2, 3). Nalazi se u stalnom postavu Zbirke kamenih spomenika Muzeja grada Splita, a vodi se pod inventarnim brojem MGS 4316.¹¹

Ulomak je izrađen od lokalnog kamena vapnenca te je izduženog piramidalnog oblika. Jedna od strana jako je mehanički oštećena (tako da nemamo podatak o njegovoj stvarnoj dužini), dok očuvana strana završava figuralnim ukrasom ljudskog lica (sl. 2). Donji dio ulomka obrađen je na način da je element, očito njezin ukrasni dio, nasjedao na drugi arhitektonski element, lako moguće od druge vrste kamena (sl. 3). Površina kamena nagrizena je djelovanjem atmosferilija, a na pojedinim zonama vidljiva su oštećenja karakteristična za aktivnost mikroorganizama, što upućuje na činjenicu da je skulptura dugo vremena bila na otvorenome. Unatoč oštećenjima, dobro se razaznaju tragovi klesarskog alata (zubače), posebno na reljefnom prikazu lica, koje je jako dobro sačuvano (sl. 2). Lice je izrazito kubičnog oblika i u potpunosti lišeno fizionomije. Detalji nisu pomno obrađeni, već su shematski naznačeni vještim potezima klesarskog dljeta. Unatoč nedovršenosti i shematskoj formi prikaza, riječ je o izrazito spretnom i kvalitetnom

images which adorned the architectural complexes of the Palace. For in the absence of original sculpture, the stylistic features of the sculptural art in Diocletian's Palace in Split may be ascertained on the basis of figural relief portrayals, of which there are a considerable number in the preserved architectural complexes.

In this vein, I believe it to be exceptionally important to publish a relatively small stone artefact that is stored in the City Museum of Split, which has thus far only been published in the museum's visitor catalogue for informative purposes.¹⁰

This is a stone fragment with dimensions of 25 cm (ht.) x 26 cm (wid.) x 29 cm (lng.), which was possibly originally used as a console, although due to its fragmentary nature and the uncertainty as to its original function, it will be referred to as an architectural element (Fig. 1, 2, 3). It is held in the permanent display of the Stone Monuments Collection in the City Museum of Split, and registered under inventory number MGS 4316.¹¹

The fragment is made of local limestone and has an oblong pyramidal shape. One side has sustained considerable mechanical damage (so that there is no information on its actual length), while the preserved side finishes in a figural ornament of a human face (Fig. 2). The lower part of the fragment was worked so that the element, obviously its decorative part, rested against another architectural element, very possibly made of a different type of stone (Fig. 3). The surface of the stone has been worn by the effects of weathering, and at individual points there are visible damages that are typical of the activity of microorganisms, which indicates that the sculpture has been outdoors for a considerable time. Despite the damage, the traces of masonry tools (tooth chisel) can be clearly seen, particularly on the relief image of the face, which has been very well preserved (Fig. 2). The face has a markedly cubic shape and is entirely devoid of physiognomy. The details were not carefully rendered, rather they were only schematically indicated by the adroit strokes of the sculptor's chisel. Despite its unfinished character and the schematic form of the image, this is nonetheless a remarkably deft and high-quality sculptor's work. The eyes are wide open and round, with folded eyelids, while the gaze without indicated pupils is oriented upward. The

10 Šarić 2003, p. 35.

11 I would like to most sincerely thank Mrs. Elvira Šarić-Kostić, the director of the City Museum of Split, for her professionalism and her approval of an examination, reproduction and publication of museum materials (based on contract no. 304/12 of 23 May 2012).

11 Najiskrenije zahvaljujem gospođi Elviri Šarić-Kostić, ravnateljici Muzeja grada Splita, na profesionalnosti i odobrenju za uvid, izradu preslika i publiciranje muzejske građe (prema ugovoru 304/12 od 23. svibnja 2012.).

klesarskom radu. Oči su široko otvorene i okrugle, s podvučenim kapkom, a pogled bez naznačene zjenice usmjeren je visoko prema gore. Obrazi i brada također su okrugli i istaknuti, usne male i mesnate, a nos kratak i širok u korijenu. Okrupnjivanje formi daje licu dojam natečenosti. Čelo je nisko, ostatak glave djelomično je nedovršen, a kamen je jako pohaban, zbog djelovanja atmosferilija. S obzirom na odsutnost fizionomije nije moguće raspoznati je li riječ o ženskom ili muškom liku. Zanimljiv je jedan detalj, koji je jedva uočljiv, ali je pomno doraden, a to je vrpca koja se uvija i spušta niz lijevi obraz. Na suprotnoj strani takav detalj nije vidljiv. Kamena površina ispod brade glatko je obrađena, te je primjetno da umjetnik nije imao namjeru izraditi poprsje ili vrat, već je naglasak samo na licu.

S obzirom na navedene stilske značajke prikaza, koje nesumnjivo pripadaju tetrarhijskom razdoblju, a s obzirom na naglašenu ikoničnost i transcendentalnost izraza lica, ulomak bez sumnje možemo datirati u sam početak 4. stoljeća. Ta datacija i mjesto pronalaska fragment nesumnjivo definiraju kao dio izvorne arhitektonske dekorativne opreme Dioklecijanove palače. Naime, prema inventarnim knjigama Muzeja grada Splita,¹² ulomak je pronađen u peripteru Dioklecijanove palače, a Muzeju ga je godine 1992. darovao Zavod za zaštitu spomenika. Relativno šturi i neprecizni podaci iz inventarnih knjiga ne daju više informacija o kontekstu pronalaska, no peripter Dioklecijanove palače najizglednije možemo tumačiti kao ophod (peripter) Mauzoleja. S obzirom na mjesto pronalaska i prirodu artefakta, ulomak je mogao biti dio ograde koja se nalazila u ophodu Mauzoleja. Na crtežu idealne rekonstrukcije Dioklecijanova mauzoleja iz 1912. godine E. Hébrard između stupova trijema prikazuje metalnu ogradu.¹³ Moglo bi se pretpostaviti da je ta ograda bila kamena i da element pripada upravo navedenom dijelu. No prilikom nedavnog pregleda stupova trijema Mauzoleja na terenu utvrđeno je da nema tragova sidrenja ograde na tijelu stupova ni na njihovim bazama. Tragovi sidrenja ograde, međutim, postoje na stupovima istočne kolonade Peristila u neposrednoj blizini Mauzoleja. I na Adam-Clérisseau-ovu crtežu Peristila iz 1764. godine vidljivi su ostaci kamene ograde (trazene) između antičkih stupova.¹⁴ Nažalost, "konzola" iz MGS-a oblikom i orijentacijom figuralnog reljefa teško bi se uklopila u navedeni prostor.

cheeks and chin are round and prominent, the lips are small and fleshy, while the nose is short and wide at the base. The enlargement of the form makes the face appear swollen. The forehead is low, the remainder of the head is partially unfinished, and the stone is very worn due to weathering. Given the absence of physiognomy, it is impossible to tell whether this is a male or female portrait. An interesting detail, which is scarcely noticeable but very carefully rendered, is the ribbon which curls and descends down the left cheek. This detail is not visible on the opposite side. The stone surface below the chin was smoothly worked, and it can be seen that the artist did not intend to render a bust or neck, rather emphasis was solely placed on the face.

Given these stylistic features of the image, which are definitely typical of the tetrarchic era, and given the notably iconic and transcendental expression on the face, the fragment can unambiguously be dated to the very beginning of the fourth century. This dating and the discovery site unambiguously define the fragment as part of the original architectural decorative furnishings of Diocletian's Palace. For according to the inventory logs of the City Museum of Split,¹² the fragment was found in the peripter of Diocletian's Palace, and it was donated to the Museum in 1922 by the Heritage Preservation Department. The relatively terse and imprecise data from the inventory log do not provide any more information on the find context, but the peripter of Diocletian's Palace can be mostly likely interpreted as the gallery (peripter) of the Mausoleum. Given the artefact's find site and its very nature, the fragment may have been part of the fence in the Mausoleum's gallery. In a sketch of the ideal reconstruction of Diocletian's Palace done in 1912, E. Hébrard depicted a metal fence between the columns of the portico.¹³ It may be assumed that this fence was made of stone, and that the element belonged precisely to the aforementioned part. But during a recent examination of the portico columns of the Mausoleum in the field, it was ascertained that there are no traces of anchoring the fence to the body of the columns or their bases. Traces of fence anchoring, however, do exist on the columns of the Peristyle's eastern colonnade in the Mausoleum's immediate vicinity. The remains of a stone fence (transenna) between the Roman-era columns¹⁴ are also visible in Adam-Clérisseau's drawing of the Peristyle from 1764. Unfortunately, the "console" from the CMS would scarcely fit into this

12 U nastavku teksta za Muzej grada Splita rebit će se kratica MSG.

13 Hébrard, Zeiller 1912.

14 Adam 1764, str. 25, T. 20.

12 Hereinafter the abbreviation CMS will be used for the City Museum of Split.

13 Hébrard, Zeiller 1912.

14 Adam 1764, p. 25, P. 20.

Izravnu analogiju, međutim, možemo naći među arhitektonskim fragmentima pronađenima krajem 19. stoljeća pokraj Šipova u Bosni i Hercegovini.¹⁵ Među mnogobrojnim ulomcima grobne arhitekture (mauzoleja), šest je arhitektonskih ulomaka oblikom veoma slično kamenom ulomku iz MGS-a, koji ukazuje na istu uporabnu funkciju.¹⁶ Premda su šipovski ulomci polukružnoga i šesterostraničnog presjeka, u ostalim značajkama poklapaju se sa splitskima. Na svojoj prednjoj strani (licu) četiri ulomaka imaju dekorativni reljef sa tzv. *dječakim poprsjem*, dok su na preostalima prikazane animalne scene. Donja stranica im je, isto kao kod splitskog ulomka, udubljena i oblikovana za nalijeganje na drugi arhitektonski element.

Nakon pronalaska šest je ulomaka samo sumarno opisano i objavljeno te nisu uvršteni u hipotetičku rekonstrukciju mauzoleja u Šipovu.¹⁷ Šezdeset godina poslije Sergejevski se nanovo pozabavio rekonstrukcijom mauzoleja te je pritom šest ulomaka interpretirao kao poklopce urni.¹⁸ U kasnijim istraživanjima kanoantičke arhitekture Bosne i Hercegovine Đ. Basler ulomke ponovno povezuje s mauzolejom te ih tumači kao kamene krovne pokrivače mauzoleja.¹⁹ U crtežu rekonstrukcije jedan od šesterostraničnih fragmenta s *dječakim poprsjem* postavlja na mjesto glavnog akroterija, tj. kao rubnu kanalicu sljemena krova.²⁰ U najsvježijim istraživanjima D. Maršić ide korak dalje te ulomke prepoznaje kao imbrekse krovnih streha, odnosno jednu derivaciju antefiksa.²¹ U svjetlu posljednjih tumačenja možemo sagledati i ulomak iz MGS-a, te njegovo moguće izvorno mjesto pretpostaviti na jednoj od krovnih streha trijema Dioklecijanovog mauzoleja.²² Potrebno je naglasiti da se nekoliko elemenata prepoznavanja skupine ulomaka iz Šipova (osim oblika koji je bio prvotni impuls za analogiju)²³ poklapa sa splitskim fragmentom. Kao prvo, ulomci iz Šipova povezuju se s nadgrobnom arhitekturom

space in terms of the form and orientation of the figural relief.

A direct analogy, however, can be found among the architectural fragments found at the end of the nineteenth century next to Šipovo in Bosnia-Herzegovina.¹⁵ Among the numerous fragments of grave architecture (a mausoleum), six architectural fragments exhibit a form quite similar to the stone fragment from the CMS, which indicate the same function.¹⁶ Although the Šipovo fragments are semi-circular with hexagonal cross-section, in their other features they correspond to the one from Split. On its front side (face), four fragments have a decorative relief with a so-called boy's bust, while the remaining pieces bear animal scenes. Their lower sides are, as in the Split fragment, notched and formed so as to be set on another architectural element.

After their discovery, the six fragments were only summarily described and published and they were not incorporated into any hypothetical reconstructions of the mausoleum in Šipovo.¹⁷ Sixty years later, Sergejevski once more dealt with the reconstruction of the mausoleum, and in the process he interpreted the six fragments as urn lids.¹⁸ In later research into Late Antique architecture in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Đ. Basler once more associated the fragments with the mausoleum, and he interpreted them as stone roof cover elements for the mausoleum.¹⁹ In the sketch of the reconstruction, one of the hexagonal fragments with the boy's bust was placed at the site of the main acroterion, i.e., as the peripheral channel of the roof eaves.²⁰ In the most recent research, D. Maršić went a step farther and saw these fragments as imbrices of the roof eaves, or a derivation of an antefix.²¹ The fragment from the CMS may also be viewed in light of the latest interpretations, and its possible original location may be assumed to have been on one of the roof eaves on the portico of Diocletian's mausoleum.²² It should be stressed that several elements for recognizing the group of fragments from Šipovo (besides the shape which was the initial impulse for the

15 Truhelka 1892.

16 O ulomcima: Maršić 2009, 39-44, 86, 87, T. 10, sl. 1-9.

17 Truhelka 1892, str. 319.

18 Sergejevski 1952, str. 43.

19 Basler 1985, str. 277; Basler 1972.

20 Basler 1985, str. 276, 277, T. 34, sl. 1.

21 Maršić 2009, str. 42, 43.

22 Sagleda li se ulomak u ovakvom kontekstu, ne čudi da je stražnja strana glave u potpunosti nedovršena, jer, prema svemu sudeći, ona nije ni bila za izlaganje, što je uostalom čest slučaj u oblikovanju kamene plastike Dioklecijanove palače.

23 Zahvaljujem mojem profesoru, mentoru i kolegi dr. sc. Draženu Maršiću, koji me je upozorio na moguću analogiju.

15 Truhelka 1892.

16 On the fragments, Maršić 2009, 39-44, 86, 87, P. 10, Fig. 1-9.

17 Truhelka 1892, p. 319.

18 Sergejevski 1952, p. 43.

19 Basler 1985, p. 277; Basler 1972.

20 Basler 1985, pp. 276, 277, P. 34, Fig. 1.

21 Maršić 2009, pp. 42, 43.

22 If the fragment is viewed in this context, it then comes as no surprise that the rear of the head was entirely unfinished, because by all indications it was not intended for display, which was in fact often the case in the formation of stone sculpture in Diocletian's Palace.

(ostatkom mauzoleja) s početka 4. st.²⁴ Potom, nekoliko autora ističe činjenicu da spomenici iz Šipova nose motive i forme različitih umjetničkih središta, pogotovo salonitanske radionice.²⁵ Nadalje, “imbrensi” (i šipovski i splitski) izrađeni su od lokalnoga i mekog materijala. Posljednje, ali jako bitno, dimenzije splitskog ulomka (izvorna širina i visina) i primjeraka iz Šipova podudaraju se gotovo u centimetar.²⁶

Istovjetne dimenzije, tehnika izrade i lagani materijal upućuje na činjenicu da su elementi zasigurno imali istu funkciju. Činjenica da ulomci pripadaju ostacima grobne arhitekture, njihova podudarnost u vremenskoj dataciji i poveznica sa salonitanskom radionicom ostavljaju otvorenom mogućnost da je mauzolej u Šipovu odjek splitskoga, a da su ovdje obrađeni “imbrensi” moguća tipološka značajka, a ne izolirana pojava.

Godina darivanja ulomka Muzeju (1992.) može biti indikativna za povezivanje s provedenim arheološkim istraživanjima u Dioklecijanovoj palači, što nam može pomoći u detaljnijem, odnosno točnijem kontekstu pronalaska. S obzirom da ulomak nije dokumentiran ni u jednome od arheoloških istraživanja tih godina ili prije,²⁷ može se pretpostaviti da je riječ o slučajnom nalazu prilikom čestih rutinskih građevinskih ili sanacijskih zahvata u blizini Mauzoleja. Poznata je činjenica da je godine 1991. postavljen gromobran uz Mauzolej, prilikom čega je raskopan njegov temenos. O radovima nažalost ne postoji pisana zabilješka, nego samo usmeni spomen. Međutim, intrigantna je i zavodljiva priča da je upravo u tom razdoblju, prilikom postavljanja gromobrana, pronađena kamena glava s tetrahijiskim stilskim obilježjima za koju se ni danas ne zna gdje je. Budući da je riječ samo o kuloarskim pričama bez pisane potvrde,

analogy)²³ correspond to the Split fragment. First, the fragments from Šipovo have been linked to the tomb architecture (mausoleum remains) from the fourth century.²⁴ Then several scholars stressed the fact that the monuments from Šipovo bear motifs and forms from different artistic centres, particularly the Salona workshops.²⁵ Furthermore, the “imbrices” (both from Šipovo and Split) were made of local and soft materials. Finally, but quite importantly, the dimensions of the Split fragment (original width and height) and the examples from Šipovo correspond almost to the centimetre.²⁶

Identical dimensions, rendering techniques and light materials point to the fact that these elements certainly had the same function. The fact that the fragments belong to the remains of tomb architecture, their correspondence in chronological dating and the link to a Salona workshop leave open the possibility that the mausoleum in Šipovo is an echo of its Split counterpart, and that the “imbrices” analyzed here are a possible typological feature rather than an isolated phenomenon.

The year in which the fragment was donated to the Museum (1992) may be indicative for its connection to research conducted in Diocletian's Palace, which may help in ascertaining a more thorough, or rather accurate, context for the find. Since the fragment was not documented in any archaeological research in those years or earlier,²⁷ it may be assumed that this was a chance find made during the frequent routine construction or renovation works near the Mausoleum. It is a well-known fact that in 1991 a lightning rod was installed in the Mausoleum, at which

24 Sergejevski 1952, str. 45; Cambi 1982, str. 104.

25 Sergejevski 1952, str. 56; Basler 1985, str. 277; Cambi 1982, str. 104 i d.

26 Fragmenti iz Šipova širine su od 26 do 28 cm, a visine 23 cm. Širina splitskog ulomka je 26 cm, a visina 25 cm. Dužina se nije razmatrala jer je splitski ulomak oštećen, te o tome nemamo stvaran podatak.

27 Pritom se ponajprije misli na sustavna arheološka istraživanja započeta 1992., a provedena u suradnji Muzeja Arheoloških spomenika u Splitu, Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu i Mediteranskog centra za graditeljsko naslijeđe. Ulomak nije moguće povezati s ovim istraživanjima, jer o njima postoji iscrpna dokumentacija te nije vjerojatno da bi ovako rijedak i vrijedan primjerak kamene plastike s tetrahijiskim obilježjima bio izostavljen prilikom objave nalaza.

23 I would like to thank my professor, mentor and colleague, Dražen Maršić, Ph.D., who pointed out this potential analogy.

24 Sergejevski 1952, p. 45; Cambi 1982, p. 104.

25 Sergejevski 1952, p. 56; Basler 1985, p. 277; Cambi 1982, p. 104 ff.

26 The fragments from Šipovo are 26 to 28 cm wide, while their height is 23 cm. The width of the Split fragment is 26 cm, and its height is 25 cm. Their length was not considered, because the Split fragment is damaged, and there are no actual data on this.

27 This primarily refers to the systematic archaeological research launched in 1992, and conducted in cooperation with the Museum of Archaeological Monuments in Split, the Archaeological Museum in Split and the Mediterranean Architectural Heritage Centre. The fragment cannot be linked to this research, because there is exhaustive documentation on the latter, and it is unlikely that such a rare and valuable example of stone sculpture with tetrarchic features would be omitted from the publications of finds.

nagađanje o kontekstu pronalaska, izvan okvira podataka iz inventarnih knjiga, ovdje bih zaustavila.²⁸

Figuralni prikaz na "konzoli", zbog potpunog nedostatka fizionomije, određenih obilježja (atributa) i djelomične nedovršenosti jako je teško atribuirati. Oslanjajući se na nekoliko detalja: moguću usku povezanost s Mauzolejom (s obzirom na mjesto pronalaska) te brižno obrađenu vrpcu koja se spušta uz lijevi obraz, moguće ga je povezati s motivom maske, odnosno maskeronom. Navedeni motiv već je uočen na kamenoj plastici Mauzoleja²⁹ i šire u Palači,³⁰ a kao ikonografski i apotropejski simbol odgovara funeralnom kontekstu zgrade.

Ono što je svakako najzanimljivije kod ovog malog primjerka skulpturalne plastike s tetrahijskim stilskim obilježjima, jest činjenica da skulptorska obrada, način rastvaranja površine i umjetnikovo percipiranje oblika iznimno nalikuju na obradu pojedinih primjeraka figuralnih kamenih reljefa u Dioklecijanovoj palači. Na kamenim konzolama, kasetiranim svodovima i arhitektonskim elementima unutar Palače općenito je zastupljen velik broj reljefa s antropomorfnim prikazima, a njihovom analizom moguće je pratiti sličnosti u obradi. Promotrimo li figuralni prikaz konzole i pojedinih biranih primjera uočiti ćemo sličnost u percipiranju oblika i obradi detalja koji odgovaraju poimanju tetrahijske umjetnosti, a, usudila bih se reći, i karakterističnom rukopisu jedinstvene radionice (možda čak i umjetnika).

Izrazitu sličnost u oblikovanju lica nailazimo na dobro očuvanim figuralnim prikazima koji su ukrašavali Mauzolej: prikazu Gorgone na kasetonu s trijema,³¹

time its temenos was excavated. No written notes on these works exist, rather only oral testimony. However, an intriguing and tantalizing story is that precisely during this time when the lighting rod was installed, a stone bust with tetrahic stylistic features was found – the whereabouts of which are not known to this day. Since this is only a rumour without written confirmation, I will refrain from any conjecture on the context of the find outside of the framework of the inventory logs.²⁸

The figural image on the "console", due to the complete lack of physiognomy, specific features (attributes) and partial incompleteness, is rather difficult to ascribe. Depending on several details, the possible narrow link to the Mausoleum (given the find site) and the carefully rendered ribbon that descends down the left cheek, it is possible that it may be a mask motif, or mascaron. This motif has already been noted in the stone plastic of the Mausoleum²⁹ and throughout the Palace,³⁰ and as an iconographic and apotropaic symbol, it corresponds to the funereal context of the building.

Certainly the most interesting aspect of this small example of sculpture with tetrahic stylistic features is the fact that the sculptural rendering, the method employed to render the surface and the artist's perception of the shape greatly resemble individual examples of figural stone relief works in Diocletian's Palace. In general, there is a high number of relief sculptures with anthropomorphic portrayals on the stone consoles, cellular vaults and architectural elements inside the Palace, and similarities in their rendering can be discerned by analysis. If the figural image on the

28 Pri uklanjanju stare biskupske palače pokraj Dioklecijanova mauzoleja, a i ranije, nađeni su kameni ulomci vijenca, kasetiranih ploča i ostalih profiliranih i iskićenih dijelova koji su pripadali kamenom stropu periptera, trijemu ulica i ostalim zgradama Palače. Nakon pronalaska kameni su ulomci radi očuvanja ponovno zakopani u blizini Mauzoleja te ponovno otkopani u arheološkim istraživanjima u razdoblju od 1968. do 1974. Moguće je da je i ulomak konzole u tim kampanjama bio zakopan, ali ne i ponovno pronađen. Usp. o tome Mirnik 1977, str. 51; McNally 1994, str. 109.

29 Motiv maske pojavljuje se na kamenoj plastici portala Mauzoleja te na konzolama trijema Mauzoleja južne strane. Na ostacima kamenih kaseti s trijema Mauzoleja u nekoliko se navrata pojavljuju tragične teatarske maske. Motiv maske na nadgrobnim spomenicima česta je pojava, vidi: Maršić 2007.

30 Figuralni prikazi s motivom maski i maskerona zabilježeni su na konzolama Protirona i istočne kolonade Peristila te na kasetiranome svodu malog prostilnog hrama.

31 Mirnik 1977, str. 51, sl. 8; Cambi 2005, str. 173, sl. 253.

28 During the removal of the old bishop's palace next to Diocletian's Mausoleum, and even earlier, stone fragments of a cornice, coffered tiles and other articulated and ornate components which belonged to the peripter's stone ceiling, street portico and other buildings in the Palace were found. After their discovery, these fragments were once more buried near the Mausoleum in order to preserve them, and once more excavated in archaeological research from 1968 to 1974. It is possible that the console fragment was also buried in these campaigns, but not found again. On this, cf. Mirnik 1977, pp. 51; McNally 1994, p. 109.

29 The mask motif appears on the stone sculpture of the Mausoleum's portal and on the consoles of the portico at the Mausoleum's south side. Tragic theatrical masks appear several times on the remains of stone panels from the Mausoleum portico. The mask motif appears frequently on gravestones, see: Maršić 2007.

30 Figural portrayals with the motifs of masks and mascarons have been recorded on the consoles of the Prothyrum and the eastern colonnade of the Peristyle and on the cellular vault of the small prostyle temple.

prikazu muške teatarske maske na glavnom portalu³² i na portretima na unutrašnjem frizu.³³ Dok je unutrašnji friz u Mauzoleju poprilično površno izveden, a likovi erota nespretni i nedovršeni, portreti cara Dioklecijana i žene mu Priske nešto su kvalitetnije izrade. Usporedimo li Dioklecijanov portret s figuralnim prikazom ulomka iz MGS-a, unatoč tome što je riječ o hijerarhijski različitim likovima, primijetit ćemo iznenađujuću sličnost, koja bez sumnje odgovara karakterističnom rukopisu jedinstvene radionice. U oba slučaja zamjetna je izrazita natečenost³⁴ i kubičnost lica, okrupnjivanje oblika (nosa, očiju, usnica i obraza), izbjegavanje detalja i izostavljanje fizionomskih obilježja. Svaki element promatran zasebno na licu ova dva lika gotovo je isti i shematski izveden. No unatoč očitij rutinskoj (šablonskoj) izvedbi, lica nisu isprazna i bezizražajna, naprotiv, oba prikaza sadrže stanovitu transcendentalnost i ikoničnost. To je postignuto oblikovanjem očiju, čiji je pogled (bez naznačenih zjenica) usmjeren visoko prema gore, iznad točke promatrača. Ovakva ikonična vizija ljudske glave trasirana je u tetrarhijskom razdoblju, a svoj vrhunac doživljava u konstantinovskom razdoblju, što je logična posljedica stilskeg razvitka.³⁵ Upravo naglašena ikoničnost prikaza na licu s izrazito tetrarhijskim obilježjima (od kojih bih ponajprije istaknula kubičnost) poblizje datira oba reljefa u prvo desetljeće 4. stoljeća, što se vremenski poklapa s krajem izgradnje Palače i Dioklecijanovom abdikacijom. Na temelju nekih ikonografskih elemenata na likovima Mauzoleja N. Cambi smatra da su radovi u Palači mogli trajati i u drugom desetljeću 4. stoljeća.³⁶ Ta činjenica ne bi bila u koliziji sa stilskim značajkama navedenih reljefa, no teško je povjerovati da radovi traju i nakon useljenja, a potom i smrti cara Dioklecijana.

S obzirom na izraženu transcendentalnost prikaza ovdje se postavlja pitanje je li nedovršenost oblika (zamijećena u gotovo svim reljefnim prikazima unutar Palače) samo posljedica brzine kojom se Palača gradila i dovršavala. Moguće je da je nedovršenost formi,

console and select individual examples are examined, a similarity becomes apparent in the perception of form and the rendering of details which corresponds to the perception of tetrarchic art, and – I daresay – also the characteristic “handwriting” of a single workshop (and perhaps even an individual artist).

A remarkable similarity in the formation of the face can be found on the well-preserved figural portrayals which adorned the Mausoleum: the image of a Gorgon on the panel from the portico,³¹ the image of a male theatrical masque on the main portal³² and on the portraits on an internal frieze.³³ While the internal frieze in the Mausoleum was rather superficially rendered, and the images of Erotes are clumsy and unfinished, the portraits of Emperor Diocletian and his wife Prisca display a somewhat higher quality of craftsmanship. If Diocletian’s portrait is compared to the figural image on the fragment from the CMS, despite the fact that these are hierarchically different personages, a striking similarity can be seen that doubtlessly corresponds to the typical style of a single workshop. In both cases a marked tumescence³⁴ and cubical form on the face, the largeness of shapes (nose, eyes, lips and cheeks), the avoidance of details and the absence of physiognomic features are notable. Each element considered separately on the faces of these two images are rendered almost identically and schematically. But despite the routine (patterned) rendering, the faces are not empty and expressionless; on the contrary, both portrayals reflect a certain transcendentalism and iconicity. This was achieved through the formation of the eyes, for their gaze (without pupils indicated) is oriented upward, above the observer’s line of sight. This iconic vision of the human head was put forth in the tetrarchic era, and it experienced its peak in the Constantinian period, which is a logical consequence of stylistic development.³⁵ It is precisely

32 L’Orange 1931, str. 35, sl. 7.

33 Cambi 2000, str. 402, T. 172, sl. 128, 129.

34 Upravo je natečenost Careva lica na tom prikazu, te na pojedinim prikazima na novčićima, natjerala pojedine istraživače da povjeruju kako je Dioklecijan patio od vodene bolesti. *Chronicon Paschale* (629) čak upozorava da je Car umro od hidropizije, što bi eventualno moglo odgovarati crtama njegova carskog portreta u Mauzoleju. Usporedbom do sada navedenih primjera vidljivo je da je natečeno lice značajka antičke umjetnosti u Palači, a ne znak bolesti. To je dokazano jednostavnim usporedbom figuralnih motiva unutar Palače.

35 Cambi 2000, str. 77.

36 Cambi 2002, str. 180.

31 Mirnik 1977, p. 51, Fig. 8; Cambi 2005, p. 173, Fig. 253.

32 L’Orange 1931, p. 35, Fig. 7.

33 Cambi 2000, p. 402, P. 172, Fig. 128, 129.

34 It is precisely the tumescence of the Emperor’s face in this portrayal, and on individual images on coins, that has led individual researchers to believe that Diocletian suffered from fluid retention. In the *Chronicon Paschale* (629), it even states that the Emperor died from oedema, which could possibly explain the contours of the imperial portrait in the Mausoleum. If the examples mentioned thus far are compared, it is apparent that the swollen face is a feature of the Roman-era art in the Palace, rather than a sign of illness. This has been proven by a simple comparison of figural motifs inside the Palace.

35 Cambi 2000, p. 77.



Sl. 4. Konzola s motivom maske fantastičnog bića čovjek-bik, Protiron Peristila Dioklecijanove palače (Foto: N. Vasić, Arhiv Hrvatskog restauratorskog zavoda)

Fig. 4. Console with motif of mask featuring a fantastic creature, man-bull, Prothyrum of the Peristyle in Diocletian's Palace (photo: N. Vasić, Archives of the Croatian Conservation Institute)

uz navedeni tehnički problem (nedostatak vremena), i posljedica duhovnog stanja društva te umjetnikovog gotovo ekspresionističkog odgovora na to. Kako bilo, na osnovi stilskih značajka i gotovo napadne sličnosti fizionomije, možemo biti gotovo sigurni da je ista ruka ili barem ista skupina majstora izradila ulomak iz MGS-a i portret cara Dioklecijana na unutrašnjem frizu Mauzoleja.

Figuralni prikazi sa sličnim stilskim i likovnim značajkama nedavno su zamijećeni i na Peristilu. Kamene konzole s reljefnim prikazima glava u jugoistočnom kutu zabata Protirona bile su djelomično zamijećene i prije,³⁷ no nikada nisu detaljno analizirane. Tijekom opsežnih, sustavnih i dugogodišnjih konzervatorsko-restauratorskih zahvata na Peristilu (2003.-2013.) bilo je moguće iz blizine promotriti i dokumentirati sve klesarske motive. Ustanovljeno je niz novih detalja, koji su Peristil izbacili iz domene puke dekorativnosti. Dok je na jednoj od konzola istočne kolonade zamijećena teatarska maska ista kao i u jugozapadnom kutu zabata Protirona, u jugoistočnom kutu Protirona zamijećeno je čak pet konzola s antropomorfnim prikazom u nizu (sl. 4-8). Prve dvije konzole (gledano sa zapada) prikazuju fantastična bića s bikovsko-

the striking iconicity of these portrayals in the faces with notable tetrarchic features (of which I would first and foremost stress the cubical quality) that roughly dates both relief images to the first decade of the fourth century, which fits chronologically with the close of construction of the Palace and Diocletian's abdication. Based on certain iconographic elements on the images in the Mausoleum, N. Cambi believes that works in the Palace may have continued into the second decade of the fourth century.³⁶ This fact would not counter the stylistic features of these relief images, but it is difficult to believe that the works endured even after its residents moved in, and then after the death of Emperor Diocletian.

Given the exceptional transcendentalism of the portrayal, the question arises as to whether the incompleteness of the form (noted in almost all relief portrayals inside the Palace) is only the result of the speed with which the Palace was constructed and finished. It is possible that this incompleteness, coupled with aforementioned technical difficulty (a lack of time), also reflected the spiritual mood of society at the time and the artist's virtually expressionist response thereto. Whatever the matter, based on the stylistic features and the almost blatant similarity of the physiognomy, it is nearly certain that the same hand, or at a minimum the same group of craftsmen, made the fragment from the CMS and the portrait of Emperor Diocletian on the Mausoleum's internal frieze.

Figural portrayals with similar stylistic and artistic features were recently also noted in the Peristyle. Stone consoles with relief images of heads in the south-east corner of the Prothyrum's pediment were partially noticed even earlier,³⁷ but they have never been analyzed in detail. During extensive, systematic conservation works in the Peristyle over the course of many years (2003-2013), it was possible to observe and document all sculptural motifs. A series of new details were ascertained, which moved the Peristyle outside of the domain of simple decorativeness. While a theatrical mask identical to the one in the south-west corner of the Prothyrum's pediment was observed on one of the consoles of the eastern colonnade, in the south-east corner of the Prothyrum five consoles with anthropomorphic images in a row (Fig. 4-8) were noted. The first two consoles (viewed from the west) show fantastic creatures with both bovine and human features (Fig. 4, 5).³⁸ Next in the series

36 Cambi 2002, p. 180.

37 Verzar-Bass 2009, p. 164, Fig. 2, note 5.

38 This motif inside the Palace has already been noted at several places: on the consoles of the northern gate and the consoles on the south side of the Mausoleum's

37 Verzar-Bass 2009, str. 164, sl. 2, bilj. 5.



Sl. 5. Konzola s motivom maske fantastičnog bića čovjek-bik, protiron Peristila Dioklecijanove palače (foto: N. Vasić, Arhiv Hrvatskog restauratorskog zavoda)

Fig. 5. Console with motif of mask featuring a fantastic creature, man-bull, Prothyrum of the Peristyle in Diocletian's Palace (photo: N. Vasić, Archives of the Croatian Conservation Institute)

ljudskim značajkama (sl. 4, 5).³⁸ U nizu slijedi prikaz bradatog muškarca (sl. 6) i jako oštećena konzola s prikazom golobradog muškarca (sl. 7). Ti prikazi nisu



Sl. 6. Konzola s motivom muške maske, protiron Peristila Dioklecijanove palače (foto: N. Vasić, Arhiv Hrvatskog restauratorskog zavoda)

Fig. 6. Console with motif of male mask, Prothyrum of the Peristyle in Diocletian's Palace (photo: N. Vasić, Archives of the Croatian Conservation Institute)

is an image of bearded man (Fig. 6) and a very damaged console with an image of a beardless man (Fig. 7). These portrayals are not theatrical masks, although the grotesque position of the man's mouth would seem

38 Ovaj je motiv unutar Palače već zamijećen na nekoliko mjesta: na konzolama sjevernih vrata i konzolama s južne strane ophoda Mauzoleja. Glave s fantastičnim prikazima na Peristilu teatarske su maske, iste kao i one na ophodu Mauzoleja, dok su one na sjevernim vratima mnogo impozantnijih dimenzija i pomnije izrade. One nisu prikaz maski, već bića. Prikazi bića čovjeka bika na peristilskim konzolama, premda dolaze u paru, izvedbom se jako razlikuju. Naime, na protomi sa slike br. 4 vidljive su šiljaste i prema gore zaokrenute uši, a rogovi su ravno usmjereni i nalaze se na stražnjem dijelu glave. Prikaz sa slike br. 5, iako na prvi pogled isti, u detaljima je značajno različit. Uši su zaobljene, mesnate i blago spuštene prema dolje, dok rogovi izrastaju iz prednjeg dijela glave te su zavijeni prema gore i prema unutra. Ovakva razlika u detaljima nagovještava mogućnost da je riječ o dvama potpuno različitim motivima. Štoviše, usporedi li se prikaz sa sl. br. 5 s motivom s južne strane ophoda Mauzoleja, može se zaključiti da navedeni motivi imaju više bikovskih negoli ljudskih značajki, što upućuje i na mogući prikaz Minotaura (?). Kako bilo, riječ je o intrigantnom pitanju koje tek treba potanje ispitati i pokušati razriješiti. S obzirom da u atribuciju nismo sigurni, u nastavku teksta za navedene prikaze rabiće se već uvriježen, opisni i nipošto pogrešan naziv - fantastična bića s ljudsko-bikovskim značajkama.

gallery. The heads with fantastic portrayals on the Peristyle are theatrical masks, the same as those in the Mausoleum's gallery, while those on the northern gate have much more imposing dimensions and were much more carefully rendered. They are not portrayals of masks, but rather beings. Images of a man-bull on the Peristyle's consoles, although paired, differ greatly in rendering. Namely, on the protome from illustration no. 4, pointed and upright ears are visible, while the horns are straight and positioned at the rear part of the head. The image from Fig. 5, although the same at first glance, differ considerably in details. The ears are rounded, fleshy and slightly lowered, while the horns grow from the front of the head and are turned upward and inward. This difference in details indicates the possibility that these are two entirely different motifs. Moreover, if one compares the image from Fig. 5 with the motif from the southern side of the Mausoleum's gallery, one may conclude that these motifs have more of a bull's features rather than a human's, which indicates the possibility of a Minotaur (?). Whatever the matter, this is an intriguing question which has yet to be comprehensively examined and resolved. Since the attribution is uncertain, in the remainder of the text these portrayals shall be referred to by the already accepted, descriptive and by no means erroneous term: fantastic creature with human-bovine features.



Sl. 7. Konzola s motivom maske, protiron Peristila Dioklecijanove palače (foto: J. Kliska, Arhiv Hrvatskoga restauratorskog zavoda)

Fig. 7. Console with a mask motif, Prothyrum of the Peristyle in Diocletian's Palace (photo: J. Kliska, Archives of the Croatian Conservation Institute)

teatarske maske, premda bi groteskni položaj muškarčevih usta upućivao na to (sl. 6). Peta konzola, gotovo u samome kutu zabata, najbolje je očuvana i vješto klesarski obrađena, a prema ikonografskom motivu možda i najzanimljivija. Riječ je o prikazu bradatog muškarca, bujne kose, strogo podijeljene na sredini čela, s jasno naznačenim roščićima na vrhu glave (sl. 8). Ovaj prikaz ne treba miješati s motivom fantastičnog bića (čovjek-bik) koji se nalazi u istom nizu. Pogledamo li pažljivo, zamijetit ćemo da bujni uvojci na čelu nisu uvojci, već prednja strana rogova. Promatrajući prikaz iz te perspektive (na taj način), roščići postaju svinuti ovnujski rogovi (ponešto stilizirani i nespretni, svijaju se put gore), te u tom kontekstu prikaz bez sumnje možemo atribuirati kao lik Jupitera Amona. Spomen o štovanju kultova egipatskog i "orijentalnog" podrijetla, odnosno njihovih grčko-rimskih recepcija, u Palači nije novost, a na osnovi figuralnih prikaza ovna, bika i carskoga genija s obližnjih kaseti Mauzoleja već se pretpostavilo postojanje carske (državne) propagande u liku Jupitera Amona.³⁹ Konzola s antropomorfnim prikazom Jupitera Amona dokaz je egzistiranja tog vida carske propagande u Palači, što s obzirom na koncept ukrasa Palače i Dioklecijanovu sklonost "egiptofiliji" nije nimalo neobično.

Nazočnost prikaza Jupitera Amona na javnim građevinama i spomenicima Ilirika je česta, sastavni je dio carske propagande, te je izravno vezana uz kontekst svijeta mrtvih, dionizijski ciklus, more i vodu te ratničke trijumfe.⁴⁰ Premda su sve navedene poveznice s kontekstom Palače prihvatljive, kult Amona



Sl. 8. Konzola s prikazom Jupitera Amona, protiron Peristila Dioklecijanove palače (foto: J. Kliska, Arhiv Hrvatskoga restauratorskog zavoda)

Fig. 8. Console bearing image of Jupiter Ammon, Prothyrum of the Peristyle in Diocletian's Palace (photo: J. Kliska, Archives of the Croatian Conservation Institute)

to indicate this (Fig. 6). The fifth console, almost at the very corner of the pediment, is the best preserved and skilfully rendered, and based on its iconographic motif it is perhaps the most interesting. It is a portrayal of a bearded man with thick hair, rigidly parted at the middle of the forehead, with clearly indicated small horns at the top of the head (Fig. 8). This image should not be confused with the fantastic creature motif (man-bull) found in the same series. Upon closer examination, it can be noticed that the thick curls on the forehead are not curls of hair, but rather the front side of the horns. Viewing the image from this perspective (in this manner), the small horns become curved ram's horns (somewhat stylized and clumsy, curving upward), and in this context the portrayal can doubtlessly be attributed to the image of Jupiter Ammon. Mention of reverence for cults of Egyptian and "Oriental" origin, i.e., their Graeco-Roman reception, in the Palace is not new, and based on the figural portrayals of rams, bulls and the imperial genius from the nearby panels in the Mausoleum, the existence of imperial (state) propaganda in the personage of Jupiter Ammon had already been assumed.³⁹ The console with an anthropomorphic image of Jupiter Ammon is proof of the existence of this aspect of imperial propaganda in the Palace, with given the concept of

39 Babić 2003, str. 723.

40 Budischovsky 1973, str. 213, 214.

39 Babić 2003, p. 723.

podrazumijeva i identifikaciju Amona i Jupitera, što se nadalje uklapa u koncept rimskog državnog, ali i religijskog simbolizma ostvarenog u Palači.⁴¹ Decentrirani (postranični) položaj konzole u ovome slučaju možda zbunjuje, upravo kao i položaj simbola Jupitera (orla) na malom hramu⁴² i možebitnog Carevog genija na jednoj od kasetiranih ploča sa sjeverne strane trijema Mauzoleja.⁴³ No s obzirom da prikaz Jupitera Amona dolazi u kombinaciji s parom fantastičnih bića (čovjek-bik), atribucija nije upitna. Naime, bez obzira što simbolika fantastičnih bića (čovjek-bik) nije još uvijek u potpunosti definirana i razriješena,⁴⁴ povlaštenu (središnji) položaj motiva na sjevernim vratima Palače određuje njihovu hijerarhiju i važnost u ikonografskoj simbolici. U tom kontekstu zasigurno i preostale dvije figuralne konzole, koje zbog stupnja oštećenja materijala i nedostatka obilježja nisu atribuirane, poprimaju posve drugu dimenziju i ikonografsku težinu (sl. 6, 7).⁴⁵ Na figuralnim prikazima konzola Peristila opetuju se stilske značajke uočene na kamenim elementima Mauzoleja (ulomak iz MGS-a, portret Dioklecijana): nisko čelo, širok nos, debele usnice, naglašene oči s podvučenim kapkom, izraženi obrazi. Te likovne značajke naziru se (premda nedovoljno, s obzirom na oštećenja) i na veoma oštećenim

decoration in the Palace and Diocletian's affinity for "Egyptophilia" is not in the least unusual.

The presence of depictions of Jupiter Ammon on the public buildings and monuments of Illyricum was frequent, an integral component of imperial propaganda, and directly tied to the context of the netherworld, the Dionysian cycle, the sea and water and military triumphs.⁴⁰ Although all of these links to the context of the Palace are acceptable, the cult of Ammon also implies the identification of Ammon with Jupiter, which furthermore fits into the concept of Roman state and also religious symbolism created in the Palace.⁴¹ The decentred (ancillary) position of the consoles in this case may be confusing, just like the position of Jupiter (the eagle) in the small temple⁴² and the possible imperial genius on one of the coffered tiles from the northern side of the Mausoleum's portico.⁴³ But since the image of Jupiter Ammon appears in combination with a pair of fantastic creatures (man-bulls), the attribution cannot be called into question. Namely, regardless of the fact that the symbolism of the fantastic creatures (man-bulls) has not been entirely defined and resolved,⁴⁴ the privileged (central) position of the motifs on the northern gate of the Palace indicates their hierarchy and importance in iconographic symbolism. In this context, the remaining two figural consoles, which have not been attributed due to the degree of damage to the material and the absence of features, certainly acquire an entirely different dimension and iconographic portent (Fig. 6, 7).⁴⁵ The stylistic features observed on the stone

41 U kontekstu egipatskih kulturnih tradicija treba tumačiti i ostale prikaze maski na figuraciji Palače. Osim naravno što su one čest funeralni simbol, služile su i u kultne svrhe. Naime, u kultovima egipatskog podrijetla i u rimsko doba navlače se maske bogova u liturgijama s naglašenom teatarskom dimenzijom. Očito je u Palači došlo do prožimanja funeralnih motiva i onih koji su se koristili za liturgije (za što je Peristil bio idealan prostor), a to se prožimanje odrazilo i na kamenoj plastici.

42 Cambi 1999; Cambi 2002, str. 177.

43 Babić 2003, str. 722.

44 O značenju fantastičnih bića s ljudsko-bikovskim značajkama usp. L'Orange 1931, str. 42; Verzár-Bass 2009.

45 Konzola na slici br. 6 zbog nedostataka obilježja uopće nije atribuirana, dok se na konzoli prikazanoj na slici br. 7 ipak zamjećuju specifična ikonografska obilježja. Naime, ispod kose vidljive su šiljaste i uvis podignute uši koje sugeriraju prikaz Satira. S obzirom da je lik golobrad, može se pretpostaviti da je riječ o prikazu mladog Satira (?). Nadalje, ovdje bih se osvrnula i na druge dekorativne motive zamijećene na Peristilu Dioklecijanove palače. Na konzolama je niz dekorativnih prikaza, kojima nije posvećena dostatna pozornost. Osim motiva lopoča, teatarskih maski, bršljana, košara, lovorovih vijenaca i dr., zamijećen je i niz nerazjašnjenih motiva. Mislim da ti motivi zbog skrivene simbolike zaslužuju podrobniju analizu. O dekorativnim arhitektonskim ornamentima više u: S. McNally 1996.

40 Budischovsky 1973, pp. 213, 214.

41 The remaining masks in the Palace's figuration should also be interpreted in the context of Egyptian cult traditions. Besides the fact that they frequently served as funerary symbols, they also had a cult purpose. For in cults of Egyptian origin even in the Roman era, masks of the gods were donned in liturgical services with a notable theatrical dimension. It is obvious that an intermingling between funerary motifs and those used in liturgies occurred in the Palace (for which the Peristyle was an ideal space), and this intermingling was reflected in the stone sculpture.

42 Cambi 1999; Cambi 2002, p. 177.

43 Babić 2003, p. 722.

44 On the significance of fantastic creatures with human-bovine features, cf. L'Orange 1931, p. 42; Verzár-Bass 2009.

45 The console on Fig. 6 has not been attributed at all due to the lack of features, while the console shown on Fig. 7 does have some notable specific iconographic features. Pointed and upright ears are visible under the hair, which suggests an image of a satyr. Since the image is beardless, it may be assumed to be an image of a young satyr (?). Furthermore, here I would also like to

tetrarhijskim glavama uzidanima u zid dvorišta palače Cambj. Slični skulptorski pristup tek se djelomično pojavljuje na ostalim arhitektonskim elementima u Palači.

Moguće je pretpostaviti da je dio umjetnika klesara zaposlenih na uređenju Dioklecijanove palače, prije gradnje, za vrijeme gradnje i poslije gradnje Palače, djelovao i u obližnjoj Saloni. Analizom tetrarhijskih portreta i ulomaka kamene plastike pronađenih na području nekadašnje Salone, međutim, ne nailazimo na umjetničke značajke slične onima u Palači. U Saloni (i njezinoj okolini) evidentirano je nekoliko lijepih i izrazito kvalitetnih tetrarhijskih portreta,⁴⁶ koji se oslanjaju na starije antičke tradicije, a čije se likovne značajke ne podudaraju (osim općenitih tetrarhijskih) s onima zamijećenima na reljefima Dioklecijanove palače. Stilske tetrarhijske nijanse zamijećene u Palači u Saloni ne opetuju se čak ni na istovjetnim motivima Dioklecijanove rezidencije. Tako primjerice herme s likovima tetrarha i fantastičnog bića čovjek-bik iz Salone⁴⁷ (danas pohranjene u Arheološkome muzeju u Splitu) imaju potpuno drugačija fizionomska obilježja od onih na reljefima sjevernih vrata, Dioklecijanovog mauzoleja i Peristila u Splitu. Čak ni na portretima koji svjedoče o produkciji lokalnih radionica u Saloni,⁴⁸ ne možemo naći dodirnih točaka.

Slične fizionomijske specifičnosti poput onih na pojedinim reljefima u Palači (kubične forme glave, gojaznost obraza, široki nos i debele usnice), međutim, susrećemo na licima likova salonitanskog sarkofaga Dobrog pastira pronađenog na Manastirinama (AMS, D-15) datiranog u drugo desetljeće 4. stoljeća (310.-315. g.). Stilske pojedinosti, među ostalim, naveli su H. Kählera na zaključak da su sarkofag izradili kipari angažirani u Dioklecijanovoj palači, koji su se nakon radova u Palači zadržali u Saloni te potom krenuli u Rim, gdje su navodno dobili posao na

elements of the Mausoleum (fragment from the CMS, Diocletian's portrait) are constantly repeated on the figural portrayals from the consoles in the Peristyle: a low forehead, a wide nose, thick lips, prominent eyes with folded lids, and protruding cheeks. These artistic features can also be discerned (although insufficiently, given the damage) on the very damaged tetrarchic heads built into the wall of the Cambj palace courtyard. A similar sculptor's approach only partially appears on the remaining architectural elements in the Palace.

It is possible to assume that some of the stone-cutter artists employed in the furnishing of Diocletian's Palace also operated in nearby Salona before, during and after construction of the Palace. An analysis of the tetrarchic portraits and fragments of stone sculpture found in the territory of the former Salona has not, however, turned up any artistic features similar to those in the Palace. Several attractive and exceptionally high-quality tetrarchic portraits⁴⁶ were recorded in Salona (and its vicinity), but these were rooted in older Roman-era traditions, and their artistic features do not correspond (except the generally tetrarchic) with those noticed on the relief portrayals in Diocletian's Palace. The stylistic tetrarchic nuances noted in the Palace do not reappear in Salona, even in identical motifs in Diocletian's residence. Thus, for example, the hermae with images of the tetrarchs and fantastic creatures (man-bulls) from Salona⁴⁷ (today stored in the Archaeological Museum in Split) have an entirely different physiognomy of features than those on the relief portrayals on the northern gate, Diocletian's Mausoleum and the Peristyle in Split. Even in the

46 Neki od tih primjera su: glava muškarca pronađena pokraj salonitanskog amfiteatra, danas uzidana u kuću Jurić u Vranjicu, usp. o tome: N. Cambi 2000, str. 79, T. 167; fragmentirana mramorna ženska glava pohranjena u Arheološkome muzeju u Splitu (inv. br. C 225), usp. o tome N. Cambi 2000, str. 79, T. 168; fragmentirana mramorna ženska glava pohranjena u Arheološkome muzeju u Splitu (inv. br. C 226), usp. o tome N. Cambi 2000, str. 79, T. 169.

47 H. P. L'Orange 1931, T. 1. 2; N. Cambi 2000, T. 174, 175.

48 Ovdje je riječ o glavama izrađenima od domaćeg kamena vapnenca, a redom su danas u sekundarnoj upotrebi: glave uzidane u kuću Benzon (Vranjic), usp. o tome Cambi 2000, str. 83, sl. 133, 134, T. 176, i glave uzidane u pročelje Buličeva *Tusculuma* u Saloni.

refer to the other decorative motifs noticed in the Peristyle of Diocletian's Palace. The consoles have a series of decorative images which have not received adequate attention. Besides motifs of water lilies, theatrical masks, ivy, baskets, laurel wreaths, etc., a series of unclear motifs have also been noted. I believe that these motifs, due to their hidden symbolism, merit more thorough analysis. For more on decorative architectural ornaments, see: S. McNally 1996.

46 Some of these examples are: the head of a man found next to the Salona amphitheatre, today built into the Jurić house in Vranjic, on this cf. N. Cambi 2000, p. 79, P. 167; a fragmented marble woman's head stored in the Archaeological Museum in Split (inv. no. C 225), on this cf. N. Cambi 2000, p. 79, P. 168; a fragmented marble woman's head stored in the Archaeological Museum in Split (inv. no. C 226), on this cf. N. Cambi 2000, p. 79, P. 169.

47 H. P. L'Orange 1931, P. 1. 2; N. Cambi 2000, P. 174, 175.

Konstantinovu slavlolu.⁴⁹ Put klesara umjetnika iz Dioklecijanove palače teško je rekonstruirati, pogotovo zato što se njihov kiparski izričaj pod utjecajem mode naglo mijenjao, no izoliranu podudarnost stilskih značajka figuralnih reljefa u Palači i na likovima sarkofaga Dobrog pastira ne treba zanemariti.

portraits that testify to production of local workshops in Salona,⁴⁸ no points in common can be found.

However, similar physiognomic specifics such as those on individual relief portrayals in the Palace (cubically shaped heads, fleshy cheeks, a wide nose and thick lips), can be seen in the faces on the figures of the Salona sarcophagus of the Good Shepherd found in Manastirine (AMS, D-15) dated to the second decade of the fourth century (310-315). The stylistic details, among other things, led H. Kähler to conclude that the sarcophagus was made by sculptors engaged in Diocletian's Palace, who after works in the Palace remained in Salona and then moved on to Rome, where they were employed to work on Constantine's triumphal arch.⁴⁹ The path of the stone-cutter artists from Diocletian's Palace is difficult to reconstruct, especially since their sculptural expression changed suddenly under the influence of current fashion, but the isolated correspondence between the features of the figural relief images in the Palace and on the figures on the sarcophagus of the Good Shepherd should not be overlooked.

49 Kähler 1964, str. 173; Cambi 2000, str. 86; Cambi 1994.

48 This is a case of heads made of local limestone, all now in secondary use: the heads built into the wall of the Benzon house (Vranjic), on this cf. Cambi 2000, p. 83, Fig. 133, 134, P. 176, and the heads built into the façade of Bulić's *Tusculum* in Salona.

49 Kähler 1964, p. 173; Cambi 2000, p. 86; Cambi 1994.

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam 1764 R. Adam, *The Ruins of the Emperor Diocletian at Spalato in Dalmatia*, London 1764. (pretisak izdanja Split 1996.)
- Babić 2003 I. Babić, *Egipatski utjecaji u Dioklecijanovoj palači*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku 96, Split 2003, 719-744.
- Basler 1972 Đ. Basler, *Arhitektura kasnoantičkog doba u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo 1972.
- Basler 1985 Đ. Basler, *Das "Mausoleum" von Šipovo bei Jajce und das Problem seiner Wiederherstellung*, in: *Lebendige Altertumswissenschaft. Festgabe für Hermann Vetters*, Wien 1985, 276-278.
- Budischovsky 1973 M. C. Budischovsky, *Jupiter-Ammon et Méduse dans les forums du Nord de l'Adriatique*, Aquileia Nostra XLIV, Aquileia 1973, 201-220.
- Bulić 1908 F. Bulić, *Materiale e provenienza della pietra, delle colonne, nonche delle sfingi del Palazzo di Diocleziano a Spalato*, Bullettino di archeologia e storia Dalmata 31, Split 1908, 86-110.
- Cambi 1978 N. Cambi, *Dvije glave iz tetarhijskog doba iz Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu*, Kulturna baština 7-8, Split 1978, 17-27.
- Cambi 1982 N. Cambi, *Sarkofag iz Šipova*, Godišnjak ANU BiH 20 Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja, Sarajevo 1982, 91-109.
- Cambi 1989 N. Cambi, *Pristup razmatranju skulpturalnog programa Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu*, Kulturna baština 19, Split 1989, 12-22.
- Cambi 1994 N. Cambi, *Sarkofag Dobrog pastira i njegova grupa*, Split 1994.
- Cambi 1999 N. Cambi, *Posveta prostilnog hrama u Dioklecijanovoj palači*, Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru 36 (24), Zadar 1999, 79-88.
- Cambi 2000 N. Cambi, *Imago animi, Antički portret u Hrvatskoj*, Split 2000.
- Cambi 2002 N. Cambi, *Antika*, Zagreb 2002.
- Cambi 2005 N. Cambi, *Kiparstvo rimske Dalmacije*, Split 2005.
- Cambi 2011 N. Cambi, *Glava Sokrata iz zbirke Brangwyn u Arheološkome muzeju u Splitu*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku 104, Split 2011, 209-226.
- Fisković 1950 C. Fisković, *Prilog proučavanju i zaštiti Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu*, JAZU 275, Zagreb 1950.
- Hébrard, Zeiller 1912 E. Hébrard, J. Zeiller, *Le palais de Diocletien*, Paris 1912.
- Kähler 1964 H. Kähler, *Datierung der Sarkophaags von Manastirine im Archäologischen Museum von Split*, Münster 1964.
- Kähler 1965 H. Kahler, *Split i Piazza Armerina: rezidencije dvaju careva tetrarha*, Urbs 4 (1961-1962), Split 1965, 97-109.
- L'Orange 1931 H. P. L'Orange, *Bildnisse der Tetrarchen*, Acta Archaeologica 2, Copenhagen 1931, 29-52.
- Marasović, Matetić-Poljak 2010 K. Marasović, D. Matetić-Poljak, *Upotreba dekorativnog kamena u Dioklecijanovoj palači u Splitu*, Histria antiqua 19, Zagreb 2010, 89-100.
- Matulić 2005 B. Matulić, *Mozaički nalazi u perimetru Dioklecijanove palače*, Kulturna baština 32, Split 2005, 227-246.
- Maršić 2007 D. Maršić, *Bilješke uz dva liburnska cipusa Aserijatske skupine*, Asseria 5, Zadar 2007, 197-226.
- Maršić 2009 D. Maršić, *Ugradbeni i građevni portretni reljefi u Istriji i Dalmaciji*, Zadar 2009.
- Mirnik 1977 I. Mirnik, *On some Architectural Fragments from Diocletians Palace at Split*, Archaeologica Jugoslavica XVIII, Beograd 1977, 1-72.
- Mirnik 1989 I. Mirnik, *Roman architectural fragments*, in: *Diocletian's palace American-Yugoslav joint excavations volume six*, S. McNally, I. Dvoržak Schrunck (eds.), Minneapolis 1989, 1-57.
- McNally 1994 S. McNally, *Joint American-Croatian excavations in Split (1965-1974)*, Antiquite tardive 2, Turnhout 1994, 107-121.

- McNally 1996 S. McNally, *The Architectural ornament of Diocletians Palace at Split*, Oxford 1996.
- Nikšić 2009 G. Nikšić, *Dioklecijanova palača - od projekta do izvedbe*, in: *Dioklecijan, tetrarhija i Dioklecijanova palača o 1700. obljetnici postojanja*, N. Cambi, J. Belamarić, T. Marasović (eds.), Split 2009, 117-134.
- Perojević, Marasović, Marasović 2009 S. Perojević, K. Marasović, T. Marasović, *Istraživanja Dioklecijanove palače od 1985. do 2005. godine*, in: *Dioklecijan, tetrarhija i Dioklecijanova palača o 1700. obljetnici postojanja*, N. Cambi, J. Belamarić, T. Marasović (eds.), Split 2009, 51-94.
- Piplović 1997 S. Piplović, *Obilježja i paradoksi Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu*, *Kulturna baština* 20/28-29, Split 1997, 5-24.
- Selem 1997 P. Selem, *Izidin trag*, Split 1997.
- Sergejevski 1952 D. Sergejevski, *Kasnoantički spomenici iz Šipova*, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* 7, Sarajevo 1952, 41-57.
- Šarić 2003 E. Šarić, *Dioklecijanova palača*, in: *Vodič Muzeja grada Splita*, E. Šarić (ed.), Split 2003.
- Tadinac 2011 I. Tadinac, *Sfinge iz Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu*, *Kulturna baština* 37, Split 2011, 371-400.
- Truhelka 1892 Ć. Truhelka, *Arheološko ispitivanje jajačkog grada i najbliže okoline*, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* 4, Sarajevo 1982, 315-320.
- Verzár-Bass 2009 M. Verzár-Bass, *Reflessioni sulle mensole figurate del palazzo di Diocleziano a Spalato, con particolare atenzione alla figura di Acheloos*, in: *Dioklecijan, tetrarhija i Dioklecijanova palača o 1700. obljetnici postojanja*, N. Cambi, J. Belamarić, T. Marasović (eds.), Split 2009, 163-181.
- Wilkes 1993 J. J. Wilkes, *Diocletian's palace Split: residence of a retired roman emperor*, Sheffield 1993.