

DVA NATPISA OTKRIVENA U NEPOSREDNOJ BLIZINI DIOKLECIJANOVE PALAČE



TWO INSCRIPTIONS DISCOVERED IN THE IMMEDIATE VICINITY OF DIOCLETIAN'S PALACE

Nenad Cambi

Redovni član HAZU / Ordinary member of
Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences
Profesor emeritus Sveučilišta u Zadru / University
of Zadar professor emeritus
Zoranićeva 4
HR-21000 Split
nenad.cambi@xnet.hr

UDK/UDC:

003.071:728.81(497.583 Split) "652"

doi: 10.15291/misc.1355

Izvorni znanstveni rad / Original scientific paper

Primljeno / Received: 11. XII. 2016.

Abstract

Rad je posvećen dvama rimskim natpisima. Na prvom je zabilježen car Proba, jedan od Dioklecijanovih neposrednih prethodnika, a na drugom se s dobrim razlozima može pretpostaviti da su bila zabilježena imena Dioklecijana i Galerija. Oba natpisa su objavljena, ali im se nikad nije poklonila veća znanstvena pozornost. Na drugom natpisu sačuvane su samo tri riječi, ali to je ipak dovoljno da se smije pretpostaviti da je riječ o tetrarhijskim carevima. Na temelju analogija može se pretpostaviti da su na natpisu bila zabilježena imena Dioklecijana i Galerija

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: Dioklecijanova palača; natpis Proba; natpis Dioklecijana i Galerija

Abstract

This paper deals with two Roman inscriptions. The first one mentions the Emperor Probus, one of Diocletian's immediate predecessors, and the second one offers good reasons to assume that the names of Diocletian and Galerius were recorded on it. Both inscriptions were published but they never received adequate scholarly attention. Only three words are preserved from the second inscription, but still it is enough to assume that the tetrarchic emperors are mentioned on it. On the basis of analogies we can assume that the names of Diocletian and Galerius were recorded on the inscription.

KEYWORDS: Diocletian's Palace, inscription of Probus, inscription of Diocletian and Galerius

1. UVOD

Još je davno don Frane Bulić zažalio što je malo tragova Dioklecijanova života i djelatnosti na širem području Dalmacije, osim, dakako, groba i velebne palače.¹ Ta činjenica stoji i danas, ali ipak svako toliko pojave se neka nova svjedočanstva i neki drugi opipljivi arheološki tragovi koji unose više svjetla na doba i ambijent oko splitske carske palače. Ovaj rad posvećen je dvama natpisima. Na prvom je zabilježen car Probus, jedan od Dioklecijanovih neposrednih prethodnika, a na drugom se s dobrim razlozima može pretpostaviti da je bilo zabilježeno ime potonjega s njegovim cesarom, bez obzira na to što se nisu očuvala imena, ali nekoliko elementa na to ipak pokazuje. Iako su oba natpisa objavljena, prvome se nije nikad nije poklonila veća znanstvena pozornost.

2. NATPIS BR. 1 (SL. 1) (*CIL* 3, 8707)

Ovaj monumentalni natpis (dimenzije: vis. 1,11, šir. 0,41 [još je nekoliko centimetara ispod pločnika ulice], deblj. oko 0,20 m) posvećen je caru Probu i podignut je u nekoj (teško određivoj) prigodi, iako je precizno datiran. Uzidan je u kuću br. 10 na sjevernom dijelu Bosanske ulice u Splitu (nekadašnja ulica Cambj). Mjesto se nalazi u neposrednoj blizini zapadnog obrambenog zida Dioklecijanove palače (nešto južnije od ugaone sjeverozapadne kule). U stručnoj i znanstvenoj literaturi taj je natpis ostao gotovo nezapažen, premda je važan ne samo za Split i Dioklecijana nego i za povijest kasne antike. Razlog znanstvenom zanemarivanju nije činjenica što je natpisna ploča oštećena, ni to što je sada skrivena kontejnerom za otpatke, a često, što je nedostojno grada i spomenika, i brdom vreća raznog otpada iz okolnih lokala i kuća, jer je bio objavljen (*CIL* 3, 8707). Natpis glasi:

*[Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) M(arco) Aur(elio) Pro]//
bo p(io) f(elici) invicto Aug(usto) p(ontifici)
m(aximo) t(ribunicia) p(otestate) II cons(uli) p(atri)
p(atriciae) / procons(uli) / Aur(elius) Marcilianus v(ir)*

¹ F. BULIĆ 1927: 115, 178, 189–190; F. BULIĆ 1984: 200–201.

1. INTRODUCTION

A long time ago, Fr. Frano Bulić regretted the paucity of traces of Diocletian's life and activity in the wider region of Dalmatia, except for his grave and magnificent palace.¹ This fact is still valid, but every now and then some new testimonies and other archaeological evidence appear shedding more light on the period and environment of the imperial palace in Split. This paper deals with two inscriptions. The first one mentions the Emperor Probus, one of Diocletian's immediate predecessors, and the second one offers good reasons to assume that the latter was recorded with his caesar, regardless of the fact that their names were not preserved, but several elements support this thesis. Although both inscriptions were published, they never received adequate scholarly attention.

2. INSCRIPTION NO. 1 (FIG. 1) (*CIL* 3, 8707)

This monumental inscription (dimensions: height 1.11, width 0.41 [there are several more centimeters under the street pavement], thickness about 0.20 m) is dedicated to the Emperor Probus and set up on some occasion (that is hard to determine), but precisely dated. It is embedded in house no. 10 in the northern part of Bosanska Street in Split (former Cambj Street). The site is located in the immediate vicinity of the western defensive wall of Diocletian's Palace (more southerly from the north-western angle tower). In the professional and scholarly literature this inscription went almost unnoticed, although it is important not only for Split and Diocletian, but also for the history of Late Antiquity. The reason for this scholarly neglect was not the fact that the inscription slab was damaged, neither its present position behind a waste container, and often, to the disgrace of the city, behind a pile of junk from the surrounding premises and houses, as it was published (*CIL* 3, 8707). The inscription reads:

[Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) M(arco) Aur(elio) Pro]//

¹ F. BULIĆ 1927: 115, 178, 189–190; F. BULIĆ 1984: 200–201.



SLIKA 1. Natpis u čast cara Proba (Bosanska ulica 10, Split) (foto: N. Cambi)

FIGURE 1. Inscription honoring the Emperor Probus (Bosanska Street 10, Split) (photograph by N. Cambi)

*p(erfectissimus) pr/5aes(es) prov(inciae) Del(matiae) (sic!) / d(evotus) n(umini) m(aiestatique) eius.*²

Gornji dio natpisa s vladarevim imenom namjerno je izbrisan, što je nedvojbeno posljedica Probove *damnatio memoriae*.³ Od prvog retka nije ništa vidljivo, ali je u drugom srećom sačuvan posljednji slog careva nadimka -BO (*cognomen* u dativu), što, uz carsku titulaturu, omogućuje laku rekonstrukciju čitavog imena i nazivlja jer je samo jedan jedini među carevima imao takav završetak. Dativ jasno naznačuje da je natpis bio posvetnog karaktera. Šteta je što se ne može vidjeti pozadina natpisa

² “Imperatoru Cezaru Marku Aureliju Probu, pobožnom sretnom nepobjedivom Augustu, vrhovnom svećeniku, tribunske moći dvaput, konzulu, ocu domovine, prokonzulu, Aurelije Marcijan, savršeni muž, upravitelj provincije Dalmacije, posvećen njegovu božanskom dostojnstvu.” Ovaj je prijevod, naravno, nepotreban iole povijesno upućenijem čitatelju i nedajbože istraživaču.

³ D. KIENAST 1996²: 253 (s.v. Probus). Ovo je jedan od rijetkih Probovih natpisa na kojem se jasno zapaža namjerno brisanje njegova imena. Nameće se pri tomu pitanje koji je organ proveo senatsku odluku o *damnaciji*. Vjerojatno je to bilo djelo/nedjelo namjesnika provincije Dalmacije u razdoblju između Probove smrti i Dioklecijanova uspona na vlast (jesen 282. i 20. studenog 284). Diran je natpis, a ne spomenik, što znači da je potonji i dalje trajao.

*bo p(io) f(elici) invicito Aug(usto) p(ontifici) m(aximo) t(ribunicia) p(otestate) II cons(uli) p(atri) p(atriciae) / procons(uli) / Aur(elius) Marcilianus v(ir) p(erfectissimus) pr/5aes(es) prov(inciae) Del(matiae) (sic!) / d(evotus) n(umini) m(aiestatique) eius.*²

The upper part of the inscription with the emperor’s name was erased intentionally which is doubtlessly a consequence of Probus’ *damnatio memoriae*.³ Nothing is visible of the first line, but fortunately the last syllable of the emperor’s nickname -BO (*cognomen* in the dative case) was preserved in the second line enabling, alongside imperial titlature, easy reconstruction of the entire name and titles because only one emperor had such an ending. The dative case clearly designates that it was a dedicatory inscription. Unfortunately, the back of the inscription cannot be seen, and it might have facilitated interpretation of the function.⁴

It is clear that the inscription was dedicated to the Roman Emperor Probus, one of Diocletian’s immediate predecessors who reigned from July 276 to autumn 282. However, the inscription is dated precisely to the year 277, the second year of Probus’ reign, as clearly shown by his second *tribunicia potestas*. The inscription was public, marking some imposing monument dedicated to the mentioned emperor, meaning that the inscription predates the beginning of the building of Diocletian’s Palace for over fifteen years which is indicative in itself, although many other remains from antiquity were located in the center of Split.⁵ It is important

² “To the emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Probus, pious fortunate invincible Augustus, pontifex maximus, in the second year of his tribunician power, consul, father of the country, proconsul, Aurelius Marcianus, most perfect man, governor of the province of Dalmatia, devoted to his divine spirit and majesty.” It goes without saying that this translation is redundant to any reader with some knowledge of history or, God forbid, to a researcher.

³ D. KIENAST 1996²: 253 (s.v. Probus). This is one of the rare inscriptions of Probus with clear intentional erasing of his name. The question is, which administrative body carried out the Senate’s decision on *damnatio*. Probably it was a deed/misdeed of the governor of the province of Dalmatia in the period between the death of Probus and Diocletian’s rise to the throne (autumn 282 and November 20, 284). The intervention was made only on the inscription, and not on the monument, meaning that the latter continued to last.

⁴ The reason is that the inscription is embedded in the house wall. Through the hole in the wall we can discern a slab about 20 cm thick, but this is only an estimate.

⁵ We do not know when Diocletian started to build his palace as neither archaeology nor historical sources offer any information. Political logic implies that the decision on building may



SLIKA 2. Blokovi pri temeljima kuće Bosanska 10 u Splitu (foto: N. Cambi)

FIGURE 2. Blocks at the house foundations in Bosanska Street 10 in Split (photograph by N. Cambi)

koja bi omogućila lakšu interpretaciju funkcije.⁴

Jasno je, dakle, da je natpis posvećen rimskom caru Probu, jednom od neposrednih Dioklecijanovih prethodnika koji vlada od srpnja 276. do jeseni 282. Međutim, natpis se precizno datira u godinu 277., u drugu godinu Probova vladanja, što jasno pokazuje njegova druga tribunicia potestas. Natpis je bio javnog karaktera koji je obilježavao neki monumentalni spomenik posvećen spomenutom caru, a to znači da natpis prethodi nešto više od petnaest godina početku izgradnje Dioklecijanove palače što je samo po sebi indikativno, iako u središtu Splita postoje i drugi brojni ostatci iz antičkog doba.⁵ Važno je naglasiti da ti prežitci, kao

to mention that these remnants and most other monuments were not brought from Salona, but they were found when the houses were built and embedded in them.⁶ The inscription was set up by the governor of the province of Dalmatia (*Delmatiae* sic!) Aurelius Marcianus who emphasized that

have been issued soon after the tetrarchy was introduced as a system of power inheritance in the year 293. That was when the idea of abdication was born and the problem of “providing for” augusti after the end of their office. Not only Diocletian chose the location of his residence, but also Maximian, whose residence is still looked for in Lucania or Campania. See Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 26.7. On this dilemma see note 150 in Cambi’s 2005 edition of Lactantius.

⁶ Mostly they were not brought from Salona except for monuments incorporated in the Romanesque belfry of the Cathedral of Split and those in private collections such as Papalić’s. Fortunately, in most cases they were embedded rather than destroyed. The finders expressed their respect for heritage and high aesthetic feeling. Finds from antiquity were often embedded in modest field laborers’ houses, at least in Dalmatia. Otherwise, most monuments would have been lost. About embedded monuments, see a number of works: N. CAMBI 1987; N. CAMBI 1990; N. CAMBI 1997; N. CAMBI 2007.

⁷ This form clearly points to the genesis of the province’s name from the ethnic group of the *Delmatae*. When the governor addresses his province in such a way, it is indicative of what the actual name of the Province was.

⁴ Tomu je razlog što je natpis ugrađen u zid kuće. Kroz rupu u zidu nazire se da se radi o ploči debljine oko 20 cm, ali to je samo procjena.

⁵ Kad je Dioklecijan počeo graditi svoju palaču, nije poznato jer o tome ni arheologija ni povijesni izvori ne nude ništa. Po političkoj logici odluka o gradnji mogla je biti donesena ubrzo nakon uvođenja tetrarhije kao sustava nasljeđivanja vlasti 293. godine. S time se, naime, rodila ideja o abdikaciji i problem „zbrinjavanja“ augusta nakon silaska s vlasti. Nije samo Dioklecijan odabrao lokaciju svoje rezidencije nego i Maksimijan, u mjestu za kojim se još traga u Lukaniji ili Kampaniji. V. Lactantius, *De mort. pers.*



SLIKA 3. Konzola s akantovom viticom pri temeljima kuće Bosanska ulica 10 u Splitu (foto N. Cambi)
 FIGURE 3. Console with an acanthus tendril at the house foundations in Bosanska Street 10 (photograph by N. Cambi)

i najveći broj drugih spomenika, nisu doneseni iz Salone, nego su otkriveni prilikom gradnje kuća i jednostavno u njih uzidani.⁶ Natpis je postavio namjesnik provincije Dalmacije (*Delmatiae sic!*) *Aurelius Marcianus* koji standardnom formulom naglašava da je odan carskom božanskom dostojanstvu. Namjesnik (*praeses provinciae*) je pripadao viteškom staležu, na što upozorava izraz *vir perfectissimus*. U svakom slučaju, zavjestitelj spomenika je namjesnik rimske provincije Dalmacije s punim ovlastima. Te, 277. godine car Prob nalazio se u

26, 7. O dilemi v. na istom mjestu bilj. 150.

⁶ Osim spomenika koji su bili uzidani u romanički zvonik Splitske Katedrale i onih u privatnim zbirnama poput Papalićeve, najčešće nisu prenošeni iz Salone. Oni su nalaženi prigodom kopanja temelja zgrada, dogradnja, popravaka i sl. Srećom često nisu uništavani, nego su uzidavani. Nalaznici su tim činom izražavali svoje poštovanje prema baštini i iskazivali visoki estetski osjećaj. Antički su nalazi, barem u Dalmaciji, dosta uzidavani i u skromne težačke kuće. Da nije bilo ugrađivanja, najveći broj spomenika bio bi nestao. O ugrađenim spomenicima v. u nizu radova: N. CAMBI 1987; N. CAMBI 1990; N. CAMBI 1997; N. CAMBI 2007.

⁷ Ovakav oblik jasno ukazuje na genezu imena provincije od naroda *Delmatae*. Kad tako svoju provinciju naslovljava sam namjesnik, tada je to doista znakovito.

he was devoted to his divine spirit and majesty by the standard formula. The governor (*praeses provinciae*) belonged to the equestrian rank as indicated by the expression *vir perfectissimus*. In any case the monument was ordered by the fully authorized governor of the Roman province of Dalmatia. In the year 277 the Emperor Probus was in Pannonia because of the war with the Sarmatians and German tribes whom he conquered attaining thereby a significant military reputation. Having all this in mind, the governor probably erected a sign of victory to commemorate these events though it is not explicitly mentioned. This is supported by the fact that big dressed stone blocks (Fig. 2) were embedded in the wall in the immediate vicinity of the inscription as well as a large console with acanthus tendrils (Fig. 3) with the following dimensions: length 0.28 m, height 0.18 m. Monumental blocks were part of some construction (from the immediate vicinity), and the console probably belonged to its cornice. Such consoles were a typical element of any more demanding example of Roman architecture. Of course there had to be several



SLIKA 4. Ploča friza tropeja (najvjerovatnije cara Proba) nađena pri iskopu u podrumima kuće Capogrosso u Splitu), sada u Arheološkom muzeju u Splitu (foto N. Cambi)

FIGURE 4. Slab of the tropaeum frieze (most probably of the Emperor Probus's tropaeum) unearthed in the basement of the Capogrosso house in Split, presently in the Archaeological Museum in Split (photograph by N. Cambi)

Panoniji zbog rata sa Sarmatima i Germanima koje pobjeđuje i stječe znatan vojnički ugled. S obzirom na tu činjenicu, namjesnik po svoj prilici podiže pobjedničko obilježje u spomen na te događaje, premda to izriječkom ne navodi. U prilog tome govori i činjenica što su u neposrednoj blizini natpisa (u istom zidu) ugrađeni također veliki obrađeni kameni blokovi (Sl. 2) te jedna konzola s akantovim viticama (Sl. 3) sljedećih dimenzija: duž. 0,28, vis. 0,18 m. Monumentalni blokovi su dijelovi neke konstrukcije (iz neposredne blizine ugradbe), a konzola je po svoj prilici pripadala njezinu vijencu. Takve su konzole tipični element svake iole ambicioznije rimske arhitekture. Dakako da je moralo biti više takvih konzola. Sve je činilo jedan jedinstveni arhitektonski kompleks znatnih dimenzija.

O kakvom se karakteru građevine radi po svoj prilici upozorava u blizini natpisa slučajno otkriveni i gotovo neoštećeni segment friza s prikazom rimskog oružja i vojne opreme (Sl. 4), što upućuje na vjerovatni zaključak da su friz, blokovi i natpis dio istog spomeničkog ansambla. Dimenzije velike

such consoles. It all made a unique and rather large architectural complex.

The character of the building can be discerned from the accidentally found and almost intact segment of a frieze depicting Roman arms and military equipment (Fig. 4), pointing to the probable conclusion that the frieze, blocks and inscription belonged to the same monument assemblage. Dimensions of the big slab: length 1.41 m, height 0.81, thickness 0.32 m. Military equipment and weapons are a definite iconographic mark that a triumphal monument was erected somewhere nearby, located outside the western defensive wall of Diocletian's Palace, non-existent at the time. Information about the find-spot of the frieze depicting arms was discovered by A. Duplančić in the archives of the Archaeological Museum in Split. The information was found in the correspondence of the director Mihovil Abramić with the Capogrosso family, revealing that a frieze segment was dug out in the basement of their house in 1924. After two-decades of negotiations this important

ploče su: duž. 1,41 m, vis. 0,81, deblj. 0,32 m. Bojna oprema i oružje nepobitni su ikonografski znak da je negdje u blizini bio podignut trijumfalni spomenik koji se nalazio izvan tada još nepostojećeg zapadnog obrambenog zida Dioklecijanove palače. Podatak o mjestu nalaza friza oružja otkrio je A. Duplančić u pismohrani Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu. Podatak je ponudila korespondencija ravnatelja Mihovila Abramića s obitelji Capogrosso iz koje proizlazi da je segment friza iskopan u podrumu njihove kuće 1924. godine. Nakon pregovora koji su trajali dva desetljeća taj važan reljef pribavljen je za Arheološki muzej u Splitu, gdje je i danas izložen (jugoistočno krilo lapidarija). Do Duplančićeva otkrića nije se znalo podrijetlo reljefa jer na njemu nije bilo inventarnog broja.⁸ S obzirom na to da su natpis i ploča s frizom oružja nađeni u međusobnoj blizini, opravdano ih je povezati u jednu cjelinu: trijumfalni spomenik u čast cara Proba. U sastavu takvog komemorativnog spomenika bila je obično carska statua te natpis, friz oružja i neki drugi vojni znakovi i naoružanje. Svi ti razmjerno brojni nalazi upozoravaju na jedan poseban odnos tadašnjeg naselja (*Spalatum*) s carem i namjesnikom rimske provincije Dalmacije Aurelijem Marcijanom. Kakav je bio odnos Probova spomenika i Dioklecijanove palače, teško odgonetnuti, ali u svakom slučaju znakovita je podudarnost što je u neposrednoj blizini poslije Dioklecijan podigao palaču u koju je uselio nakon abdikacije (1. svibnja godine 305.). Pri gradnji palače očito je bio respektiran Probov spomenik. Razlog tomu po svojoj prilici leži u činjenici što je Prob, čini se, načinio ključni korak u Dioklecijanovoj vojničkoj karijeri. Nekoliko je bitnih momenata u odnosima te dvojice vladara. Ranije veze ova dva vladara potekla iz iliričkih krajeva potvrđuju se u panonskom središtu, Probovu rodnom gradu Sirmiju. Po svojoj prilici Prob je upravo te 277. godine imenovao Dioklecijana zapovjednikom Mezije (*dux Moesiae*), što je nedvojbeno vojnička, a ne civilna funkcija (Ivan Zonara 12.31). Koliko se dugo Dioklecijan zadr-

relief was acquired by the Archaeological Museum in Split where it is still exhibited (south-eastern wing of the collection of stone monuments). The provenance of the relief was unknown prior to Duplančić's discovery as there was no inventory number on it.⁸ Since the inscription and the slab with frieze were found close to each other, it is reasonable to join them into a triumphal monument dedicated to the Emperor Probus. This kind of commemorative monument usually comprised an imperial statue, inscription, frieze depicting arms and some other military signs and weaponry. All these relatively abundant finds point to a special relationship between the settlement (*Spalatum*) and the emperor and governor of the Roman province of Dalmatia, Aurelius Marcianus. It is difficult to determine what the relation was between Probus' monument and Diocletian's Palace, but it is indicative that it was found in the immediate vicinity of the palace that Diocletian subsequently built to retire in it after his abdication (May 1, 305). Probus' monument was evidently respected in the process of palace building. The reason seems to be the fact that Probus might have made a crucial move in Diocletian's military career. There are several important moments in relations between these two rulers. Earlier connections of these two emperors originating from the Illyrican region are confirmed in the Pannonian center and Probus' hometown Sirmium. Most likely it was exactly in 277 that Probus appointed Diocletian as the commander of Moesia (*dux Moesiae*), which was definitely a military, not civilian function (Joannes Zonaras 12.31). It is not known how long Diocletian stayed in the Danubian region of Illyricum, if he possibly accompanied Probus in his later military operations or he remained in Moesia. It seems likely that he stayed in Illyricum. After the end of Probus' reign, Diocletian (still Diocles back then) was in the service of the new Emperor Carus. We do not know if he was immediately appointed as the commander of Carus' bodyguard (*protectores*

⁸ O reljefu s prikazom oružja raspravljao sam višekratno ne znajući za mjesto nalaza; v. N. CAMBI 2010; N. CAMBI 2013. Rezultate svojih arhivskih istraživanja objavio je A. Duplančić (A. DUPLANČIĆ 2015: 9–21 i Sl. 3). Probov natpis nađen je u zidu kuće upisane pod br. 2171, a reljef na br. 2251, na udaljenosti od oko 50 m zračne linije.

⁸ I have repeatedly discussed the relief with arms depiction not knowing the find-spot; see. N. CAMBI 2010; N. CAMBI 2013. A. Duplančić published the results of his archival research (A. DUPLANČIĆ 2015: 9–21 and fig. 3). Probus' inscription was found in the wall of the house recorded under no. 2171, and the relief under no. 2251, at the air distance of about 50 m.

žao u podunavskim krajevima Ilirika, nije poznato. Nije poznato ni je li možda Dioklecijan pratio Proba u njegovim kasnijim vojnama ili je i nadalje ostao u Meziji. Čini se vjerojatnijim da je ostao u Iliriku. Padom Proba Dioklecijan (tada još Dioklo) stupio je u službu novog cara Kara. Ne zna se je li odmah bio imenovan zapovjednikom Karove tjelesne straže (*protectores domestici*), ali dobro je poznato da je u tom svojstvu služio Karovu sinu i suvladaru Numerijanu. Iste 283. godine postao je i *consul suffectus*.⁹ Na tu je dužnost Dioklecijan imenovan nakon Probove smrti, tako da to nije posljedica intervencije potonjega. Uskoro pod Probom nasljednicima Karom i sinom mu Numerijanom Dioklecijan odlazi u vojnu na Parte. Tada su se događaji počeli odvijati njemu u korist. Naime, veoma brzo poslije ubojstva Numerijana iskoristio je prigodu, kaznio Arija Apera, navodnog počinitelja nedjela, i postao imperator voljom vojske i drugih zapovjednika na zasjedanju u Nikomediji.¹⁰

Prob je rođen u Sirmiju 19. kolovoza 232. godine.¹¹ Njegovo podrijetlo je, kao i mnogih drugih vojničkih vladara, iz nižih društvenih slojeva. Kognomen Probova oca bio je *Maximus*¹² ili *Delmatius*.¹³ No, nije isključeno da su oba nadimka ispravna jer su mogla paralelno egzistirati i međusobno se dopunjavati. Prvi nadimak odražavao je tjelesnu

domestici), but it is known that he served in that position to Carus' son and co-ruler Numerian. In the same year (283) he also became *consul suffectus*.⁹ He was appointed to this office after Probus' death so that this was not a consequence of the latter's intervention. Soon Diocletian left to war with the Parthians under Probus' successors Carus and his son Numerian. That was when things started to develop in a good direction for him. Soon after Numerian's murder he used the opportunity, punished Arrius Aper, an alleged murderer, and became an emperor in accordance with the claims of the army and other commanders at the assembly in Nicomedia.¹⁰

Probus was born in Sirmium on August 19, 232.¹¹ He came from a lower-class background, as did many other soldier emperors. The cognomen of Probus' father was either *Maximus*¹² or *Delmatius*.¹³ It is also possible both nicknames are correct as they could coexist and supplement each other. The first cognomen reflects physical grandeur and strength, while the other might indicate that Probus' father was Dalmatian by origin, which is possible, considering his son's birth in Pannonia. His father also had a successful mili-

⁹ *Consul suffectus* najviši je državni dužnosnik koji je zamjenjivao eponimnog konzula prije kraja službe potonjeg.

¹⁰ Eutrop. IX, 20, 1: *Is prima militum concione iuravit, Numerianum nullo suo dolo interfectum, et cum iuxta eum Aper, qui Numeriano insidias fecerat, constitisset, in conspectu exercitus manu Diocletiani percussus est.* (Prijevod: "On je na prvoj vojničkoj skupštini prisegnuo da Numerijan nije ubijen nikakvom njegovom prijearom, a kako je pored njega stajao Aper, koji je skovao zavjeru protiv Numerijana, Dioklecijan ga je naočigled vojske probio vlastitom rukom.")

¹¹ Ovaj datum potvrđuju dva izvora pa je više nego vjerojatan: *Chronicon Paschale* 506, Malalas, .302. O Probu osim na spomenutom mjestu v. kod D. Kienasta (D. KIENAST 1996²); v. i H. BRANDT 1997; A. JOVANOVIĆ 2006: 87–99.

¹² *HA XXVIII, III, 2.* Mnogi autori, pa i jedan recenzent ovoga rada, upozoravaju na nevjerođostnost podataka iz toga izvora. Nema dvojbe da kao i kod svakog drugog i s ovim izvorom valja biti oprezan, ali moje je mišljenje suprotno od prevladavajućeg mišljenja istraživača. Naime, imena i neki drugi podatci biografskog karaktera nisu izmišljeni ili lažirani. Zašto bi bili? Probov život spada među dijelove spisa iz doba ne dugo poslije njegove smrti. Što bi uopće značilo ime, zar bi ga pisac Probove biografije izmišljao, a sasvim se dobro uklapa u mogućnost podrijetla Probova oca iz Dalmacije? Naprotiv, povjesničari poput Tacita, Svetonija ili Laktancija su tendenciozni jer opisuju događaje sa svoje društvene i političke platforme. O *HA* usp. A.R. BIRLEY 1997: 127–147. Birley se višekratno bavio tim spisom.

¹³ *Epitome de Caesaribus* 36, 2.

⁹ *Consul suffectus* was the highest state official who replaced the eponymous consul before the end of his office.

¹⁰ Eutrop. IX.20.1: *Is prima militum concione iuravit, Numerianum nullo suo dolo interfectum, et cum iuxta eum Aper, qui Numeriano insidias fecerat, constitisset, in conspectu exercitus manu Diocletiani percussus est.* (Translation: "Diocletian, in the first assembly of the army that was held, took an oath that Numerian was not killed by any treachery on his part; and while Aper, who had laid the plot for Numerian's life, was standing by, he was killed, in the sight of the army, with a sword by the hand of Diocletian.")

¹¹ This date was confirmed by two sources making it more than likely: *Chronicon Paschale* 506, Malalas, .302. About Probus except in the mentioned place see D. Kienast (D. KIENAST 1996²); see also H. BRANDT 1997; A. JOVANOVIĆ 2006: 87–99.

¹² *HA XXVIII, III.2.* Many authors, including one reviewer of this paper, believe that some of the information from this source is unreliable. One definitely needs to be cautious regarding all sources, but my opinion differs from the prevailing attitude of researchers. Namely the names, and some other biographical data were not invented or falsified. Why would they be? Probus' life belongs to segments of the script from the period not long after his death. What would the name mean, why would Probus' biographer invent it? It fits well to the possible origin of Probus' father from Dalmatia. On the contrary, historians like Tacitus, Suetonius or Lactantius are tendentious as they describe events from their social and political platform. About *HA* cf. A.R. BIRLEY 1997: 127–147. Birley dealt with this work on several occasions.

¹³ *Epitome de Caesaribus* 36.2.

veličinu i snagu, dok bi drugi upućivao na to da je Probov otac podrijetlom bio Dalmatinac, što nije isključeno, bez obzira na sinovljevo panonsko rođenje. I otac je imao uspješnu vojničku karijeru, a umro je u Egiptu.¹⁴ Ove podatke iz spisa *Historia Augusta* neki povjesničari drže upitnima, ali u njima nema baš ništa što bi se protivilo rimskim običajima ili protuslovlilo drugim izvorima. Valerijan i Galijen iznimno su cijenili Probove vojničke i organizacijske sposobnosti. Oba vladara hvale ga u svojim pismima. U predcarskoj karijeri Prob je pod Aurelijanom ratovao u Africi i Egiptu i protiv Palmirenaca, a u doba zemljaka mu Aurelijana i Klaudija Gotika kao veoma mlad dobio je titulu *tribunus militum* i zapovjedništvo jedne elitne legije. Carem je postao u svojoj 44. godini kad su ga vojnici javno isklicali, što je potvrdio Rimski Senat. Proslavio se u ratovima protiv Germana, Izauraca u Maloj Aziji, Blemijaca u Egiptu i dr. Vodio je i niz ratova i u Europi. Suzbio je i nekoliko pobuna. Bio je sedam puta konzul, a dobio je i počasne nazive *Gothicus*, *Gothicus maximus*, *Germanicus maximus*, *Parthicus (Persicus) maximus*.¹⁵ *Historia Augusta* još bilježi zanimljiv podatak da mu je među inima učenik bio i Dioklecijan, kao i suvladar potonjega u svojstvu cezara, Konstancije I.¹⁶ Stoga bi logično bilo da su ova dva kasnija vladara zahvaljujući Probovu mentorstvu dobili visoke funkcije u provincijama: Dioklecijan je imenovan zapovjednikom (*dux Moesiae*), a Konstancije, kasniji Maksimijanov cesar, namjesnikom (*praeses provinciae Dalmatiae*).¹⁷ Prob je u Rimu proslavio trijumf nad nekoliko naroda krajem 281. godine.¹⁸

S obzirom na to da nije znao za poraz, Prob je nesumnjivo bio jedan od najuspješnijih rimskih vladara koji je ratovanje shvaćao kao obranu stečenog područja, smirivanje nemira i čuvanje poretka. Identičan cilj kasnije je imao i Dioklecijan koji nije

tary career, and he died in Egypt.¹⁴ In the opinion of some historians, the information from the *Historia Augusta* is disputable, but there is nothing contrary to Roman customs in it or contradicting other sources. Valerianus and Galien held Probus' military and organizational skills in high esteem. Both rulers praise him in their letters. In his pre-imperial career Probus fought under Aurelian in Africa, Egypt and against the Palmyreans, and in the time of his countrymen, Aurelian and Claudius Gothicus, he was given the title *tribunus militum* and was a commander of an elite legion. At the age of 44 he was hailed emperor by the army and confirmed by the Roman Senate. He gained reputation in wars against the Germanic tribes, Isaurians in Asia Minor, Blemians in Egypt etc. He led a number of wars in Europe and crushed several rebellions. He was a consul seven times, and he was also given the honorary titles of *Gothicus*, *Gothicus maximus*, *Germanicus maximus*, *Parthicus (Persicus) maximus*.¹⁵ The *Historia Augusta* records another interesting detail, that Diocletian was one of his disciples, as well as his co-ruler, Constantius I.¹⁶ Therefore it would be logical if these two future rulers obtained high functions in the provinces owing to Probus' mentorship: Diocletian was appointed as a commander (*dux Moesiae*), and Constantius, later Maximianus' Caesar, became a governor (*praeses provinciae Dalmatiae*).¹⁷ Probus celebrated his triumph over several nations by the end of 281.¹⁸

As he was never defeated in battle, Probus was undoubtedly one of the most successful Roman rulers. He had a defensive approach to warfare, defending conquered territories, subduing upheavals and preserving order. Later on Diocletian had an identical aim as he would not let the Roman Empire be parcelled out, but he conquered little

¹⁴ HA XXVIII, III, 2.

¹⁵ D. KIENAST 1996²: 254.

¹⁶ HA XXVIII, XXII, 3.

¹⁷ A. JAGENTEUFEL 1958: 107; J. J. WILKES 1969: 422. Aurelija Marcijana iz splitskog natpisa naslijedio je M. Aurelius Tiberianus još za Probova života. Na njegovo je mjesto došao pak Konstancije. Za Konstancijevo namjesnikovanje iznimno je važan natpis CIL 3, 8708 koji je po mnogima upitan, ali izdavači CIL-a nisu dvojili u autentičnu tradiciju izvornog teksta, jednako kao ni F. Bulić.

¹⁸ D. KIENAST 1996²: 253.

¹⁴ HA XXVIII, III, 2.

¹⁵ D. KIENAST 1996²: 254.

¹⁶ HA XXVIII, XXII, 3.

¹⁷ A. JAGENTEUFEL 1958: 107; J. J. WILKES 1969: 422. Aurelius Marcianus from the inscription from Split was succeeded by M. Aurelius Tiberianus while Probus was still alive. His place was taken by Constantius. His governorship is illustrated by an inscription (CIL 3, 8708) the authenticity of which is questionable in the opinion of some, but CIL publishers had no doubt of the authentic tradition of the original text, and neither did F. Bulić.

¹⁸ D. KIENAST 1996²: 253.

dopuštao komadanje Rimskog Carstva, ali je osvajao malo i ništa. Probovi napori bili su, naravno nerealno, usmjereni na dobrobit ljudi. Tako bi se jedino mogle shvatiti njegove izjave koje također prenosi *Historia Augusta* o moći Rimskog Carstva i od kakve bi koristi za ljudski rod bilo kad ne bi bilo vojske i ratova.¹⁹ Pokušaj da vojsku iskoristi za civilne radove (isušivanje močvare kod Sirmija i odvođenje vode kanalom do Save) platio je Prob glavom. Naime, nezadovoljni vojnici smatrali su da je car počeo provoditi svoje pacifističke nakane.²⁰ Vojnicima je uvijek bilo mnogo milije ratovati i, dakako, pljačkati, nego stvarati plodno zemljište. Ubijen je, dakle, u svojem rodnom kraju vladar koji je ostavio vidnog traga u samo šest godina koliko je vladao. Nakon Probova ubojstva Senat je javno obznanio *damnatio memoriae* prema kojoj se brisala uspomena na njega, što bijaše sramotno i nepravedno. Zbog toga je i na splitskom natpisu izbrisan prvi redak, srećom ne i BO u drugom retku. Damnacija je vjerojatno prouzročila i činjenicu što je malo Probvih natpisa uopće sačuvano.²¹ U čitavoj rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji, osim ovoga natpisa, poznat je još samo jedan, a taj potječe iz Vitaljine koja se nalazi južnije od Epidaura (Cavtat).²²

Međutim, Proba i Dioklecijana, osim gore navedenih događaja i spomenika, povezuje još jedan velikodušan potez potonjega koji je od Senata ishodio odluku da poništi *damnatio* čime je omogućio da ovaj bude pobožanstvljen uz pripadajući naslov *Divus Probus*. Posthumna rehabilitacija bila je važna jer nije bilo svejedno kakva se slika careva vladanja prenosi sljedećim naraštajima. Naime, damnaciju, odnosno konsekraciju redovno su bilježili pisci – brevijaristi (epitomisti) kao važan kurikularni podatak. Probov grob bio je pod humkom na nekoj sirmijskoj nekropoli (nepoznata lokacija).

¹⁹ *HA* XXVIII, XX, 1-6; XXII, 1-4. I ovaj podatak *HA* za mnoge je problematičan, ali i on nije u neskladu s Probvim idejama. Takvu Probovu sklonost potvrđuje i Eutropije IX, 17, čime podatak postaje znatno vjerodostojniji.

²⁰ *HA* XXVIII, XXII, 1-4.

²¹ *ILS* donosi samo 4 njegovih natpisa: *ILS* 594-597 (vol. 1, 1894., 136-137).

²² Taj natpis je objavljen u *CIL* 3, 6433 i glasi: *Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) / M(arco) Aur(elio) / Probo / p(io) f(elici) invic(to)*. I ovaj je natpis počasnog karaktera. Po svoj prilici riječ je o posveti neke privatne osobe.

or nothing. Probus' efforts were directed at the benefit of people, rather unrealistically. That is the only way to interpret his statements recorded in the *Historia Augusta* about the power of the Roman Empire which would be useless for humanity without an army and wars.¹⁹ An attempt to use the army for civil works (draining the swamp near Sirmium and channeling the water to the Sava River) was fatal for Probus as dissatisfied soldiers believed that the emperor started to implement his pacifistic intentions.²⁰ Soldiers always preferred warfare and plunder to making fertile soil. He was killed in his homeland as an emperor who managed to leave any trace in only six years of his reign. After Probus' murder the Senate publicly declared *damnatio memoriae* erasing his memory which was disgraceful and unfair. Therefore, the first line was erased on the inscription from Split, but fortunately not BO in the second line. Only a few of Probus' inscriptions were preserved, probably owing to the *damnatio memoriae*.²¹ In the entire Roman province of Dalmatia there is only one more inscription from Vitaljina, somewhat more southerly from Epidaurus (Cavtat).²²

However, another generous gesture associates Probus and Diocletian as the latter managed to make the Senate abolish the *damnatio* enabling in that way Probus' deification and the accompanying title *Divus Probus*. Posthumous rehabilitation was important in terms of the image of an emperor's reign in the eyes of future generations. Namely, *damnatio* or *consecratio* were regularly recorded by writers – breviarists (epitomisers) as an important biographical fact. Probus' grave was under a mound at some Sirmian necropolis (unknown location). Allegedly he was buried by his sister Claudia.²³

¹⁹ *HA* XXVIII, XX.1-6; XXII.1-4. This information from *HA* is problematic for many researchers, but it does not contradict Probus' ideas. Probus' tendency for this is confirmed by Eutrop. IX.17, making the information more trustworthy.

²⁰ *HA* XXVIII, XXII.1-4.

²¹ *ILS* includes only 4 of his inscriptions: *ILS* 594-597 (vol. 1, 1894, 136-137).

²² This inscription was published in *CIL* 3, 6433 and reads: *Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) / M(arco) Aur(elio) / Probo / p(io) f(elici) invic(to)*. This is also a dedicatory inscription. Most likely it is a dedication of some private person.

²³ *HA* XXVIII III.4. This information is held unreliable by some researchers, but they usually do not reveal reasons why. It is unusual that his sister's name is Claudia, since according to

Navodno ga je pokopala sestra *Claudia*.²³

Splitskim trijumfalnim spomenikom najvjerojatnije se komemorirala Probova pobjeda nad Gotima ili Germanima na Dunavu iz godine 277., koja je očito imala odraza i u Dalmaciji pa je bila obilježena javnim spomenikom. Kad je počela izgradnja Dioklecijanove palače, Probov spomenik nije porušen, nego je dugo koegzistirao i vjerojatno nestao nakon nekoliko stoljeća sa širenjem Splita izvan Dioklecijanove palače (prema zapadu).²⁴ Je li možda Prob već došao u posjed terena na kojem je nastala Dioklecijanova palača, nije naravno poznato, ali nije ni nemoguće. Naime, carski posjedi nakon vlasnikove smrti završavali su u državnom vlasništvu, osobito ako car nije imao izravnih potomaka kao što je doista bio slučaj s Probom. Ako je imovinski razvoj tekao na takav način, tada je do posjeda legitimno došao Dioklecijan te ga iskoristio za gradnju svoje rezidencije. To bi možda bio najlogičniji odgovor na pitanje kako je Dioklecijan dobio lokaciju i zašto je u susjedstvu svoje palače zadržao i Probov trijumfalni spomenik. Dioklecijan je očito iskazivao dužno štovanje jednom od svojih izravnih prethodnika kojemu je dugovao čak i vojno obrazovanje.²⁵

3. NATPIS BR. 2 (SL. 5) (*CIL* 3, 14687)

Drugi natpis dugo je služio kao lavor u vrtu samostana sv. Dominika koji se nalazio južno od crkve, u neposrednoj blizini istočnog ulaza u Dioklecijanovu palaču. Godine 1897. objavio ga je F.

The triumphal monument from Split was most probably set up to commemorate Probus' victory over the Goths or Germanic tribes on the Danube from the year 277, which evidently resounded in Dalmatia as it was marked with a public monument. When the building of Diocletian's Palace started, Probus' monument was not torn down but they coexisted for a while. It disappeared probably after several centuries when Split spread outside Diocletian's Palace (westwards).²⁴ We do not know if Probus was in possession of the terrain where Diocletian's Palace was built, but it is possible. Namely, imperial estates became state property after the owner's death, particularly if the emperor had no direct descendants as was the case with Probus. If the situation developed in such a way, then Diocletian acquired the estate legitimately and used it to build his residence. This might be the most logical answer to how Diocletian had got the location and why he kept Probus' triumphal monument in the vicinity of his palace. Diocletian evidently expressed due respect to one of his direct predecessors whom he owed even his military education.²⁵

3. INSCRIPTION NO. 2 (FIG. 5) (*CIL* 3, 14687)

The second inscription was used for a long time as a washbowl in the garden of the Monastery of St. Dominic, in the immediate vicinity of the eastern entrance to Diocletian's Palace. It was published in 1897 by F. Bulić.²⁶ Its number in *CIL* 3 is 14687. In the publication of Salonitan Christian inscriptions

²³ *HA* XXVIII III, 4. U ovaj podatak neki istraživači sumnjaju. Obično ne navode razloge sumnji. Neobično je što se sestra zove *Claudia* jer bi po rimskim pravilima obiteljskog prezimanja imena morala nositi isti *nomen* kao i brat joj (*Aurelia*). Međutim, moguće je ona caru bila polusestra (različiti otac) i onda ništa ne bi bilo neobično.

²⁴ Zanimljivo je da se na splitskim gradskim zidinama iz XV. st. s vanjske strane pojavljuju ploče s reljefima visoko inspiriranima rimskom vojničkom opremom. W. Radt, istraživač Pergamona, bio je uvjeren da su to rimske spolije, slične onima iz heroona Diodora Paspura u Pergamonu, zbog čega je i došao u Split. Mislim da sam ga u razgovoru ipak razuvjerio. Međutim, tada nisam znao za reljef s oružjem i vojnom opremom tek kojih stotinu metara južnije od gradskih zidina. O pergamonskoj ploči usp. W. RADT 1999: 248–254, sl. 200, d.

²⁵ D. KIENAST 1996²: 253.

Roman naming conventions she should have the same *nomen* as her brother (Aurelia). However, it is possible that she was the emperor's half-sister (different fathers).

²⁴ It is interesting that slabs with reliefs inspired by Roman military gear appear on the outer side of the city walls of Split from the 15th century. W. Radt, a researcher from Pergamon, was convinced that these were Roman spolia, similar to the ones from heroona of Diodorus Paspurus in Pergamon, which is why he came to Split. I believe that I have succeeded in proving him wrong in our conversation. However, at the time I did not know about the relief with weapons and military equipment only some hundred meters to the south of the city walls. On the slab from Pergamon cf. W. RADT 1999: 248–254, fig. 200, ff.

²⁵ D. KIENAST 1996²: 253.

²⁶ F. BULIĆ 1897: 178, br. A 2375.



SLIKA 5. Natpis tetrarhijskih careva (Dioklecijana i Galerija) nađen u vrtu Dominikanskog samostana u Splitu, sada u Arheološkom muzeju u Splitu (foto: T. Seser)

FIGURE 5. Inscription of the tetrachic emperors (Diocletian and Galerius) found in the garden of the Dominican Monastery in Split, presently in the Archaeological Museum in Split (photograph by T. Seser)

Bulić.²⁶ U *CIL*-u 3 nosi br. 14687. U publikaciji o salonitanskim kršćanskim natpisima dobio je značajnu pozornost i prostor.²⁷ Riječ je o fragmentu goleme kamene grede dimenzija: vis. 0,38, duž. 1,08, deblj. 0,38 m, koja je kasnije, u teško određivo doba, bila izdubljena kao recipijent za vodu. Fragment je darovao Arheološkom muzeju tadašnji samostanski prior i od tada nosi inv. br. A 2375. Kao i u slučaju natpisa br. 1, po svoj prilici treba pretpostaviti da je fragment nađen negdje u blizini i potom prerađen u gore navedenu svrhu. Riječ je o golemoj kamenoj gredi nekog monumentalnog zdanja s natpisom od kojeg su fragmentarno sačuvana samo dva retka, ali nedvojbeno ih je bilo više jer se tragovi piljenja kamena vide, pa je čak i gornji dio nekih slova djelomično oštećen. Slova prvog retka visoka su 15, a drugog 11 cm, što svjedoči o većoj važnosti prvog u odnosu na drugi. Veličine upućuju na značenje natpisa i monumentalnost grede.

Na prednjoj strani bio je natpis, složen u dva retka koji su međusobno odvojeni linijom vodiljom za klesanje (ordinacija).

it was given considerable attention and space.²⁷ It is a fragment of a huge stone beam with the following dimensions: height 0.38, length 1.08, thickness 0.38 m. It was hollowed out as a water receptacle, in a period that is difficult to determine. The fragment was donated to the Archaeological Museum by the monastery prior and it was given inv. no. A 2375. As in the case of inscription no. 1 we should assume that it was found somewhere in the vicinity and then reworked for the mentioned purpose. It is a huge stone beam of some monumental aedifice with an inscription of which only two lines are partially preserved, but there were definitely more lines as traces of sawing the stone are visible, and even upper parts of some letters are partially damaged. Letters from the first line are 15 cm high and 11 cm in the second testifying to the greater importance of the first line in relation to the second. The size is indicative of the importance of the inscription and beam monumentality.

The inscription is on the front side, arranged in two lines divided by a guide line for carving (ordinatio).

²⁶ F. BULIĆ 1897: 178, br. A 2375.

²⁷ *Salona IV*, br. 11, str. 157–158. Malo poslije E. MARIN 2016: 1181, uvrštava ovaj fragment među konstantinske natpise.

²⁷ *Salona IV*, no. 11, pp. 157–158. Shortly after: E. MARIN 2016: 1181, includes this fragment among the Constantinian inscriptions.

Natpis glasi:

.....] FORTISSIMI CAE[s (aris).....
.....] DEDICANTE[.....]

Jasno je da ispred i iza očuvanih riječi nedostaje mnogo teksta. Nije moguće dokučiti koliko je ukupno bilo redaka, ali po svoj prilici ne više od tri. Iako su preostale samo tri nepotpune riječi, ipak je sasvim jasno da se natpis odnosi na rimske careve. Slova CAE upućuju na carsku pripadnost osoba kojima se posvećuje natpis. Atribut *fortissimus* također je svojstven carevima u doba kasne antike, iako se pojavljuje ipak i nešto ranije, kao na primjer na jednom Hadrijanovu natpisu (Lambesis u današnjem Alžiru), a češći postaje od doba Karakale.²⁸ Druga riječ u prvom retku nije u cijelosti očuvana, ali očito je da se odnosi na nekog ili neke nasljednike vladajućeg augusta. Cezara kao suvladara rimskih careva (augusta) bilo je još u doba Antonina Pija (Marko Aurelije i Lucije Ver). Zbog toga autori kataloške jedinice u *Salona IV* (br. 11, 158) ostavljaju široku mogućnost datacije od Septimija Severa do Julijana Apostate. Međutim, u doba Septimija Severa (Karakala i Geta), oni se nikada nisu označavali kao *fortissimi caesares*. Naprotiv, od tetrahije naziv *caesar*, što je veoma značajno, označuje mlađe vladare koji vladaju i koji se pripravljaju da postanu augusti nakon abdikacije ili smrti njihovih starijih kolega. Tada naslov *caesar* za mlađeg vladara postaje uobičajen tek u doba prve tetrahije kad se oni karakteriziraju kao *nobilissimi et fortissimi*.²⁹ Potonjim se cezarskim apelativima označuju dvije poželjne kvalitete: plemenitost (karaktera) i hrabrost. Stoga, ovaj se fragmentirani natpis s pravom smije dovesti u vezu s tetrahijom, iako nedostaju carska imena i druge naznake.

Na natpisu je označeno i tko posvećuje spomenik s ablativnom *dedicante*. Poslije te riječi moralo je slijediti ime zavjetodavca. Ovakav način dedikacije svojstven je upravo za predtetrahijsko i tetrahijsko doba.³⁰ Međutim, nije lako povezati ova dva retka i tri riječi u suvislu cjelinu. Autori spomenute kataloške jedinice u *Salona IV* pokušavaju sintagmom: pro salute.....] *fortissimi cae[saris]*. To

The inscription reads:

.....] FORTISSIMI CAE[s (aris).....
.....] DEDICANTE[.....]

It is clear that a big piece of text is missing before and after the preserved words. It is impossible to determine the exact number of lines, but most likely not more than three. Although only three incomplete words were left, it is clear that the inscription refers to the Roman emperors. Letters CAE point to an imperial attribution of the persons that the inscription is dedicated to. The attribute *fortissimus* is also characteristic of the emperors in Late Antiquity, although it appears somewhat earlier, for instance on one of Hadrian's inscriptions (Lambesis in present-day Algeria), and it became more frequent in the period of Caracalla.²⁸ The second word in the first line was not fully preserved, but it evidently refers to a successor or successors to the ruling augustus. There were caesars as co-rulers of the Roman emperors (augusti) back in the period of Antoninus Pius (Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus). Therefore the authors of the catalogue unit in *Salona IV* (no. 11, 158) offer broad dating from Septimius Severus to Julian the Apostate. However, in the time of Septimius Severus (Caracalla and Geta), they were never designated as *fortissimi caesares*. On the contrary, it is important to notice that from the period of the tetrarchy, term *caesar* marks younger rulers in power who prepare to become augusti after the abdication or death of their older colleagues. The title *caesar* for a younger ruler becomes common only in the period of the first tetrarchy when they were characterized as *nobilissimi et fortissimi*.²⁹ Latter caesarean appellatives are used to denote two desirable characteristics: nobility (of character) and courage. Therefore, this fragmented inscription can rightfully be associated with the tetrarchy, although imperial names and other indications are missing.

The ablativ form *dedicante* denotes who dedicates the inscription. The name of the dedicator had to follow after this word. This type of dedication was characteristic of the pre-tetrachic and tetrachic

²⁸ V. *Salona IV*, 158.

²⁹ *ILS* 619 (Maksimijan); *ILS* 633, *ILS* 653 (Galerije); *ILS* 635 (Konstancije I. i Galerije).

³⁰ V. *ILS* I, 631, 632, odnosno 593.

²⁸ See *Salona IV*, 158.

²⁹ *ILS* 619 (Maximian); *ILS* 633, *ILS* 653 (Galerius); *ILS* 635 (Constantius I and Galerius).

bi značilo da se natpis odnosio na jednog augusta i jednog cezara. Da se natpis odnosio na četveročlanu vladarsku cjelinu, tada bi genitiv bio u množini. Stoga bi koncepcija natpisa prema paradigmi natpisâ ILS 631 i 632 mogla izgledati: [*Templum I(ovi) O(ptimi) M(aximi) conservatori d. n. imp. C. Val. Diocletiani*³¹ *invicti et semper fel. Aug. et C. Galerii Valerii Maximiani*³²] *fortissimi cae[saris] / dedicante*[..... Poslije te riječi slijedilo bi ime onoga koji posvećuje hram ili neku drugu građevinu u ablativu.³³ Dakle, očito je da u posveti nisu spomenuta sva četvorica careva. Natpis je iza IOM mogao imati i dodatak *pro salute*, ali ne nužno.³⁴ Restitucija imena dvaju vladara predložena je po teritorijalnoj logici. Naime, splitski teritoriji, zapravo Salona, pripadali su Dioklecijanovu i Galerijevu dijelu Rimskog Carstva. Da sami carevi pak podižu takav spomenik, ne bilo riječi *dedicante*. U njihovo ime to je načinio netko drugi, najvjerojatnije namjesnik provincije Dalmacije (*praeses provinciae Dalmatiae*) koji je bi bio zavjetodavac i financijer. U carskim natpisima uz *dedicante*³⁵ javlja se katkada i riječ *curante*.³⁶ Razlika je što u slučaju dedikacije spomenik zavješćuje i financira zavjetodavac, dok se riječ *curante* odnosi na onoga koji skrbi o izvršenju, ali funkcija ne podrazumijeva i plaćanje troškova. Radilo bi se, dakle, o dvije vrste funkcija pri izradi spomenika. Takvu interpretaciju tih funkcija potvrđuje jedan natpis iz Italike (rimska provincija Betika u Španjolskoj), gdje se javljaju i *dedicante* i *curante* u vidu dviju različitih osoba.³⁷

Ovaj skromni ostatak spomenika ipak je moguće dobro definirati i datirati. Ono što je posebno važno u svezi s ovim natpisom jest to što je on

period.³⁰ However it is not easy to make a coherent whole out of these two lines and three words. The authors of the mentioned catalogue unit in *Salona IV* tried to do it with a syntagm *pro salute*.....] *fortissimi cae[saris]*. This would imply that the inscription referred to one augustus and one caesar. If the inscription referred to a four-member ruling unit, then the genitive plural would be used. Therefore, the inscription concept in accordance with the paradigm of inscriptions ILS 631 and 632 might be: [*Templum I(ovi) O(ptimi) M(aximi) conservatori d. n. imp. C. Val. Diocletiani*³¹ *invicti et semper fel. Aug. et C. Galerii Valerii Maximiani*³²] *fortissimi cae[saris] / dedicante*[..... The name (in the ablative case) of the person who dedicates the temple or some other building would follow after that word.³³ It is evident that not all four emperors were mentioned in the dedication. The inscription might have had *pro salute* formula after IOM but not necessarily.³⁴ A reading of the two emperors' names was proposed in accordance with territorial logic. Namely, the territory of Split, actually Salona, belonged to Diocletian's and Galerius' portion of the Roman Empire. The word *dedicante* would be missing if the emperors themselves erected such a monument. Someone else did that on their behalf, most probably the governor of the province of Dalmatia (*praeses provinciae Dalmatiae*) who was a dedicator and financier. In the imperial inscriptions the word *dedicante*³⁵ sometimes accompanies the word *curante*.³⁶ The difference is that in the case of dedication the dedicator dedicates and finances the monument, while the word *curante* refers to the one taking care of execution, but the function does

³¹ Dioklecijan je upotrebljavao dva prenomena: Gaius i Marcus; usp. D. KIENAST 1996²: 267 koji navodi oba prenomena.

³² Ime Galerija ovdje je doneseno prema D. KIENAST 1996²: 283.

³³ Masivnost arhitrava (sačuvani dio je samo oko polovice), veličina slova i karakter upućuju na monumentalno zdanje.

³⁴ ILS 609 kao na primjer [*pro salute*] *impp. Ff. dd.nn Carini e[t Numeriani divi Cari]genitoris eorum tem[plum a fundamentis]constituit dedicante [M. Aurelio] Decimo*

³⁵ Iz tetrarhije nije očuvan ni jedan primjer, ali jest iz neposredno ranijeg doba (ILS 593), kad se taj termin javlja na spomeniku u čast cara Florijana koji je vladao samo 88 dana (izabran 276. i ubijen iste godine) ili ILS 609. Međutim, često je kao posveta, *dedicavit* ili *dicavit*, što je više ili manje isto, bezbrojno puta potvrđen u tetrarhijsko doba.

³⁶ ILS 626, 631, 632, 633 itd.

³⁷ V. natpis u čast cara Florijana ILS 593.

³⁰ See ILS I, 631, 632, i.e. 593.

³¹ Diocletian used two praenomina, Gaius and Marcus; cf. D. KIENAST 1996²: 267 who mentions both praenomina.

³² Galerius' name is given here after D. KIENAST 1996²: 283.

³³ The massive size of the architrave (only half has been preserved), size of letters and character point to a monumental object.

³⁴ ILS 609 for example [*pro salute*] *impp. Ff. dd.nn Carini e[t Numeriani divi Cari]genitoris eorum tem[plum a fundamentis]constituit dedicante [M. Aurelio] Decimo*

³⁵ Not a single example was preserved from the tetrarchy, but there is one example from an earlier period (ILS 593), when this term appears on the monument honoring the Emperor Florian who ruled for only 88 days (elected in 276 and murdered the same year) or ILS 609. However, it often appears as a dedication, *dedicavit* or *dicavit*, more or less the same, frequently confirmed in the tetrarchic period.

³⁶ ILS 626, 631, 632, 633 etc.

nađen uz samu Dioklecijanovu palaču. Postavlja se pitanje je li spomenik na tom mjestu bio podignut prije podizanja palače, za vrijeme gradnje ili pak poslije završetka. Nema nikakve dvojbe da je natpis nastao između 293. i 305. godine. Naime, imenovanje cezara dogodilo se 293. (Konstancije 1. ožujka, a Galerije početkom lipnja iste godine). To je donja granica jer se u natpisu spominju cezari kojih prethodno nema (Dioklecijan i stariji Maksimijan su augusti). Do nove promjene je došlo 1. svibnja 305. abdikacijom prethodnih augusta imenovanjem novih augusta i cezara istom svečanom prigodom. To je vrijeme kad se gradi palača, pa bi se smjelo kazati da je natpis nastao upravo u doba gradnje. Lokacija spomenika bila bi dakle izvan palače, vjerojatno na mjestu koje je kasnije zauzela crkva sv. Dominika. Nažalost, istraživanja južno od samostana (novo proširenje) nije u tome pogledu dala rezultata.³⁸ Po svoj prilici spomenik je ostao u funkciji i poslije završetka radova i useljavanja Dioklecijana u svoju rezidenciju, a lokacija je po svoj prilici izabrana nakon početka gradnje. Riječ je, dakle, po svoj prilici o jednom poganskom hramu u neposrednoj blizini Dioklecijanove palače.

Natpis br. 2 donosi i jednu važnu specifičnost. Naime, unutar jedinog slova O zapauža se da je tu bio urezan monogramatski križ (križ s grčkim slovom P na vrhu vertikalne haste). Taj dodatak je neka vrst skrivene kristijanizacije natpisa, udaranje svojevrsnog kršćanskog biljega na poganski sadržaj. Kako se natpis nalazi na teškoj i monumentalnoj gredi, spomenuti kršćanski simbol morao je biti uklesan prije nego što je podignut na potrebnu visinu ili je pak ugreben dok se montirao, a klesari još mogli koristiti drvenu armaturu. Urezivanje je pokazatelj da su klesari bili kršćani, ali ne otvoreni jer je simbol vjere skriven pa djeluje više kao podvala poganskom kultu. Takav kriptokršćanski karakter je i dokaz da je zahvat bio iz doba prve tetrarhije, svakako prije Galerijeva edikta iz godine 311. kojim su eskulpirani kršćani jer bi u protivnom protest bio besmislen.

Prvi natpis i spomenik na koji se odnosi pouzdano nije bio predviđen u originalnom planu, dok je drugi to mogao biti.

not imply paying the costs. These were two kinds of functions in the monument production. Such an interpretation of these functions is confirmed by an inscription from Italica (Roman province of Baetica in Spain) where *dedicante* and *curante* appear in relation to two different persons.³⁷

Nevertheless, this modest remnant of the monument can be well defined and dated. It is particularly important that this inscription was found next to Diocletian's Palace. The question is if the monument was erected at this position prior to the building of the palace, during its building or after its completion. There is no doubt that it was made between 293 and 305, as the inscription mentions caesars, which appeared only in 293 (Constantius on March 1, and Galerius at the beginning of June in the same year, while Diocletian and Maximian were the augusti) so this is the lower chronological border. A new change happened on May 1, 305, when previous augusti abdicated and new augusti and caesars were appointed on the same solemn occasion. This is the period when the palace was built so we could say that the inscription was made exactly in the period of building. The location of the monument would be outside the palace, probably at the position later occupied by the Church of St. Dominic. Unfortunately, excavations south of the monastery (new extension) offered no results in that regard.³⁸ Most likely the monument remained in function even after the works were finished and Diocletian moved into his residence. The location was most likely chosen after the beginning of building. In all likelihood, it was a pagan temple in the immediate vicinity of Diocletian's Palace.

Inscription no. 2 offers another important detail. In one letter, O, we can notice an incised monogrammatic cross (cross with the Greek letter P on the top of vertical arm). This addition is a kind of hidden Christianization of the inscription, giving a Christian mark to the pagan content. Since this inscription is on a heavy and monumental beam, the mentioned Christian symbol must have been carved prior to lifting, or it was scratched while being installed, and the stone carvers still could use

³⁸ Istraživanja je provodio Muzej grada Splita pod vodstvom Helge Zglav Martinac.

³⁷ See the inscription honoring the Emperor Florian, *ILS* 593.

³⁸ The research was carried out by the Split City Museum lead by Helga Zglav Martinac.

Ova dva natpisa su, dakle, iznimno važna za bolje poznavanje neposredne preddioklecijanske i dioklecijanske faze razvitka splitskog poluotoka. Očito je da Dioklecijan svoju palaču nije gradio na praznom terenu. Po svemu navedenom u ovom radu Dioklecijan je u posjed došao kao baštinik carskog dobra koje je, barem od Proba, ali vjerojatno i od ranije, imalo takav status.³⁹ Dioklecijan nije bio uzurpator, nego legitimni vlasnik zemljišta na kojemu je mogao rušiti i graditi kako je htio.

wooden armature. Carving signifies that the stone carvers were Christians, but latent, as the symbol of faith was hidden seeming more like a prank on a pagan cult. Such crypto-Christian character is a testimony that the procedure dates from the time of the first tetrarchy, definitely before the Edict of Galerius from the year 311 when Christianity was legalized, or otherwise the protest would be meaningless.

The first inscription and the monument it refers to were definitely not anticipated in the original plan, while the second inscription might have been.

These two inscriptions are exceptionally important for a better understanding of the immediate pre-Diocletian and Diocletian phase of development of the peninsula of Split. It is evident that Diocletian did not build his palace on an empty field. All that has been mentioned in this work indicates that Diocletian acquired the property as a successor of an imperial estate which had such status at least from Probus' time, if not earlier.³⁹ Diocletian was not a usurper but a legitimate owner of the land where he could build or demolish as he wished.

³⁹ Nema dvojbe da je splitsko područje imalo poseban vlasnički status. Prikupio sam dosta veliku dokumentaciju o carskim natpisima i spomenicima koji nisu iz Salone, nego s lica mjesta. Međutim, o tome ovdje ne može biti riječi jer izlazi iz teme ovoga rada.

³⁹ There is no doubt that the Split region had a special proprietary status. I have collected a number of documents about imperial inscriptions and monuments not from Salona but from the area in question. However, this cannot be elaborated here and now as it is not related to the topic of this paper.

BIBLIOGRAFIJA /
BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Popis izdanja literarnih izvora /
List of literary sources*

Chronicon Paschale

Chronicon Paschale, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia graeca*, vol. 92.

Epitome de Caesaribus

J. A. Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus. Untersuchungen zur heidnischen Geschichtsschreibung des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Munich: C. H. Beck, 1974.

Eutrop.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctorum Antiquissimorum Tomus II: Eutropi Breviarum ab Urbe Condita, ed. H. Droysen, Berlin, 1879.

H.A.

Scriptores Historiae Augustae I-II, ed. E. Hohl, Leipzig, 1965.

Historia Augusta, preveo D. Nečas Hraste, Zagreb: Antibarbarus, 1994.

Lactantius, *De mort. pers.*

Laktancije, O smrtima progonitelja, ur. N. Cambi, Split, 2005.

Malalas

Ioannis Malalae Chronographia, recensuit Ioannes Thurn, Berolini et Novi Erboraci: Walter de Gruyter, 2000.

Popis literature / Literature

A. R. BIRLEY, 1997 – Anthony R. Birley, *The Historia Augusta and pagan historiography, Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Berlin, 1997, 127–149.

H. BRANDT, 1997 – Hartwin Brandt, *Probus 276-282, Die römischen Kaiser. 55 historische Portraits von Caesar bis Iustinian*, ed. M. Clauss, München, 1997., 252–258.

F. BULIĆ, 1897 – Frane Bulić, *Iscrizioni inedite, Bullettino di archeologia e storia Dalmatia*, 20,

Split, 1897, 178.

F. BULIĆ, 1927 – Frane Bulić, *Palača cara Dioklecijana u Splitu*, Split, 1927.

F. BULIĆ, 1984 – Car Dioklecijan. Njegovo ime, njegova domovina i mjesto, gdje se rodio; kada, gdje i kako je umro, *Izabrani spisi*, ed. N. Cambi, Split, 1984, 199–289.

N. CAMBI, 1987 – Nenad Cambi, Studije o antičkim spomenicima u zgradama u Splitu i okolici (II). Reljef u južnom zidu crkve Sv. Duha, *Kulturna baština*, 17, 1987, 7–18.

N. CAMBI, 1990 – Nenad Cambi, Studije o antičkim spomenicima uzidanim u kuće Splita i okolice (III). Fragment nadgrobnog spomenika na Šperunu, *Kulturna baština*, 20, Split, 1990, 57–68.

N. CAMBI, 1997 – Nenad Cambi, Studije o spomenicima uzidanim u kuće Splita i okolice (IV). Reljef Ivana Evanđelista u crkvi sv. Jere na Marjanu, *Kulturna baština*, 28-29, Split, 1997, 25–36.

N. CAMBI, 2007 – Nenad Cambi, Antička spolia na Lučcu. Spomenici ugrađeni u kuće Splita, *Arheološki radovi i rasprave*, 15, Zagreb, 2007, 15–39.

N. CAMBI, 2010 – Nenad Cambi, *Rimski vojni tropeji u Dalmaciji*, *Adrias*, 17, Split, 2010, 125–150.

N. CAMBI, 2013 – Nenad Cambi, Roman military tropaea from Dalmatia, *Radovi XVII ROMEC-a: Rimski vojni oprema u pogrebnom kontekstu*, Zagreb, 2013, 9–21.

N. CAMBI 2014 – Nenad Cambi, Maurilius (Ill-yricum Sacrum I, 414) = Marcus Aurelius Iulius v(ir) c(larissimus) praeses provinciae Dalmatiae (CIL III 8569), *Splitska hagiografska baština: povijest, legenda, tekst. Zbornik radova s međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa održanog u Splitu od 26. do 27. rujna 2011.*, eds. J. Belamarić – B. Lučin – M. Trogrlić – J. Vrandečić, Split, 2014, 185–193.

A. DUPLANČIĆ, 2015 – Arsen Duplančić, Bilješka o rimskom reljefu s vojnom opremom iz Splita, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku*, 108, Split, 2015, 281–293.

ILS – Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae I, ed. H. Dessau, Berlin, 1894.

A. JAGENTEUFEL, 1958 – Adolf Jagenteufel,

- Die Statthalter der römischen Provinz Dalmatia von Augustus bis Diokletian*, Beč, 1958.
- A. JOVANOVIĆ, 2006 – Aleksandar Jovanović, *Tlo Srbije – zavičaj rimskih careva*, Beograd, 2006.
- D. KIENAST, 1996² – Dietmar Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, 2., durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage, Darmstadt, 1996.
- E. MARIN, 2016 – Emilio Marin, L'épigraphie de Salone au temps de Constantin et de ses successeurs (313-363): l'épigraphie chrétienne, u: *Acta XVI Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae. Romae (22-28.9.2013). Costantino e i Costantinidi. L'innovazione costantiniana, le sue radici e i suoi sviluppi*, vol. I [Studi di antichità cristiana LXVI], ed. O. Brandt, G. Castiglia, Città del Vaticano, 2016, 1179–1196.
- W. RADT, 1999 – Wolfgang Radt, *Pergamon, Geschichte und Bauten einer antiken Metropole*, Darmstadt, 1999.
- Salona IV – Salone IV. Inscriptions de Salone Chrétienne IV^e-VII^e siècles. Recherches archéologiques franco croates à Salone*, eds. N. Gauthier – E. Marin – F. Prévot, Rome – Split, 2010.
- J. J. WILKES, 1969 – John J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia*, London, 1969.