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Abstract
The paper represents the first attempt of interpretation and contextualization of Diana’s sanctuary in late antique Doclea, through re-examination of its particular architectural features, which have been documented by archaeologists through the past 131 years. We offer an integral picture of the temple and its temenos, thus once again confirming that the sanctuary was actually a part of large-scale imperial interventions into the urban fabric of the town — those of Emperor Gaius Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus. We substantiate the hypothesis that the temple was a creation of distinctive, highly innovative and original, Diocletian’s “architectural school” of planners, builders and stonemasons.
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Abstract
Rad predstavlja prvo nastojanje da se protumači i kontekstualizira Dijanino svetište u kasnoantičkoj Dokleji, te ponovno razmotre njegove specifične arhitektonske karakteristike, koje su arheolozi zabilježili tijekom proteklih 131 godinu. Ponuđena je cjevorita slika hrama i njegova posvećenog okruženja, čime se još jednom potvrduje da je uređenje svetišta bilo dio šireg carskog zahvata u urbano tkivo grada, poduzeto u doba Dioklecijana (Gaius Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus). Potvrđuje se pretpostavka da je hram bilo djelo osobite, inovativne i originalne Dioklecijanove „graditeljske radionice”.
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Introduction
Five Roman temples adorned ancient Doclea — a small southern Dalmatian town from the period of Principate, the centre of the area inhabited by the Illyrian tribus of Docleates, and one of the future urban centres of the province of Praevalitana. Although Doclea had never become the provincial capital, its main public buildings testify that the town surpassed Scodra in its importance. Most of its public buildings were, without doubt, of late antique provenance, and were erected by a distinct “architectural school”, the one that worked on Diocletian’s palace in Spalato. The relationship between the two, Spalato and Doclea, was already noticed by Piero Sticotti more than a hundred years ago, but has been re-examined and confirmed in one of our latest papers, in which we have also demonstrated direct imperial involvement into the reconstruction and re-erection of the town.¹ There we have concentrated on the town’s “forum” and “basilica”, and on this occasion we intend to turn our attention to a quite particular and very distinctive sacral building of late antique Doclea — the so-called “Diana’s temple” — actually the only temple that was not conceived and built according to the same principle as the other sacred buildings in the town.

Fortunately, Doclea attracted the attention of foreign researchers during the past 131 years, starting with Russian historian, slavist, ethnologist and geographer Pavel Apollonovič Rovinski, then Oxford researcher John Arthur Ruskin Munro, and Triestan archaeologist Piero Sticotti.² At the same time, it spurred the interest of Šime Ljubić and don Fran Bulić, who made some reports from the site (Bulić through Vid Petrović’s reports).³ During the time of SFR Yugoslavia, several exploration and revision campaigns were conducted, some of which were led by a distinguished scholar Dragoslav Srejović, and important reinterpretations were offered by Đuro Basler.⁴ Finally, Montenegrin Administration for the Protection of Cultural Monuments, Cetinje, conducted a series of excavations, collated the results, and clarified the stratigraphy of a number of Doclean edifices.⁵ Explorations of the site have intensified in the past two decades and resulted in many new insights, primarily due to systematic geophysical prospections, of which the most comprehensive is the one by Leonie Pett from 2007.⁶ A great milestone for the researchers of Doclea was also the doctoral dissertation by Tatjana M. Koprivica, who made an effort to summarize all the relevant information and conclusions until 2015.⁷ Soon followed

¹ Plan of the complex of “Diana’s Temple” in Doclea (after: Sticotti, 1913)

Tlocrt kompleksa „Dijaninog hrama” u Dokleji (prema: Sticotti, 1913.)
Italian-Montenegrin exploration campaigns, the project “The Future of the Past: Study and Enhancement of ancient Doclea, Montenegro” (2018), and a significant number of papers presented in 2019. So, once again, Doclea has become a “hot spot” for researchers, who have been introducing new technologies and collating significant quantity of new data, thus complementing a century old findings with new information. However, all these are still “raw” archaeological data, waiting to be contextualized and interpreted. So, a thorough examination of all the discoveries, both old and new, and their interpretation from art historical perspective, is of key importance for new insights into the history and development of the late antique town.

Almost all of the representative edifices of late antique Doclea are unique in some of their aspects. However, in this paper we intend to concentrate on just one of them, and that is the so-called “Diana’s temple”, identified by a fragment of relief that adorned its pediment. Observed in a wider context, the temple is unique for a number of features. It ends with an exedra, what is an uncommon solution for Roman Dalmatia, and can be found in only one other example — the so-called “Temple of Dea Roma”, otherwise known as the “First Temple”, again in Doclea. Then, it is the only ancient Dalmatian temple surrounded by a temenos whose space was turned into a small garden-forest, the only temple whose temenos had spaces attached along one of its sides, and the only temple built against the back wall of the temenos, and not positioned in the centre, or at least near the centre of it. Finally, it is the only temple at the territory of Roman Dalmatia that was supposedly crowned with a “Syrian gable”. All of these features, otherwise non-existent in the area, make “Diana’s Temple” in Doclea even more interesting. Although Rovinski and Sticotti managed to gather substantial information about the temple and its precinct, and also gave it its name, they actually never endeavoured to piece the puzzle together and reconsider all of their findings, or even compare them with other public buildings in Doclea. Thus, a significant number of questions have remained unanswered. So, we will try to connect some of the pieces of “the puzzle” and to fill at least some of the still existing lacunae.

**“Diana’s Temple” — Defining Features of the Temple and its Temenos**

Let us start with a short description of the temple and its precinct, pointing to its peculiarities. Sticotti, although a man of few words, published a rather complete and comprehensive description of the site.
the precinct through a 3 m wide corridor, opening towards the *porticus* with its full width. The temple itself stood on a *podium* 1.5 m above its surroundings, and six steps led to it. It was rather small, and ended with an *exedra* protruding outside the limits of the precinct (fig. 1). Considering the front view of the building, Sticotti held that the temple’s *pronaos* had two Ionic columns flanking the door, and two pilasters on the sides, but this is, as we shall see, a very debatable hypothesis (fig. 3a). The temple was clad in white marble, both from the inside and the outside, the remains of which were found on the site. The exterior decoration included a highly elaborated and richly ornamented entablature, which is actually identical to that of the nearby "Temple of *Dea Roma*" in Doclea (after: Sticotti, 1913), the "Temple of *Diana*" in Doclea (after: Sticotti, 1913), and the "basilica" in Doclea (after: Sticotti, 1913). The *architrave* beams of Docelan temples were additionally decorated with a spiralling floral tendril, but the rest is the same, including the motif that Sticotti calls *Hängplatten* — strange elements beneath the protruding cornice, which look like something between consoles and *dentes*, but are actually neither of those. The inside of the temple was decorated quite imaginatively. The walls were covered by finely polished, 1 cm thin marble slabs, painted with various floral motifs. The *cella* was decorated with black floral motifs painted on white marble, while the *exedra* was decorated in the opposite manner — with white floral motives on black background. The two spaces together must have created a very special and unique effect, surely without parallel even beyond the borders of Dalmatia and Praevalitana. Finally, Sticotti noted yet another curiosity of this temple complex — the paving of the courtyard extended just a short distance in front of the temple, while the rest of the courtyard was never paved — so he assumed that the courtyard was planted with trees and bushes. After this brief description of the temple and its *te-menos*, we can conclude that they stand out in the corpus of Roman sacral architecture of the eastern...
Adratic for many reasons. Roman temples with exedrae do exist, but they are pretty rare even in Italy. However, they are almost a rule in Syria during the 2nd and 3rd century A.D., especially in the case of Baalshamin’s temples — in Palmyra, Kadesh, Musmeyeh, etc. (fig. 5). Exedrae appear on other temples as well, like those in Rahle, Quanawat-Seraglio, Slim and Es Sanamen (fig. 6); meaning that in that area they were quite common. During the 3rd century A.D. they will appear more frequently in Rome, as, for example, in the Temple of Sol Invictus.28 However, one would not expect such an arrangement in a relatively small provincial town like Doclea. Most of the above-mentioned buildings had a “Syrian gable” on the facade, which is also detectable from the wider central intercolumnium. However, it seems that Basler’s assumption that “Diana’s Temple” also had a “Syrian Gable” (fig. 3b) was wrong, because in that case there would be no space left for sculptural decoration on the tympanum.29

A Re-examination of the Temple’s Dedication

Sticotti concluded that the temple was dedicated to goddess Diana because of a fragment of tympanum relief depicting her (fig. 7a). However, the piece was confiscated by Italian occupation forces in 1943 and taken to Rome, and nothing is known about it since, so the old photograph is all we have today.30 According to the shape of the fragment it does seem that it belonged to the temple tympanum, namely to its left (southern) side. Although only the head and the torso of a figure were preserved, Diana was clearly recognizable — with her volute-like coiffure, dress folded across the breast and tightened above the waist, and a quiver on her back. We can almost imagine the rest of the composition, because her stance strikingly resembles the figure of Diana from the Vatican Museum (1 c. A.D, fig. 7b). Her head is turned to her left and her left shoulder is slightly raised. It is quite certain that “Doclean Diana” belonged to the same type of representation of the goddess. We can imagine her with a dog beside her right leg, and her right hand reaching towards the arrow in the quiver, while casually holding the bow in her left hand. However, the question remains about the rest of the composition on the tympanum, because her figure must have occupied just a small portion slightly left from the centre. Actually, her position seems to indicate that there must have been another figure on the opposite side. Except for the temple’s sculpture, a number of other details confirm that the temple was dedicated to Diana. First of all, there are indications that the courtyard of the temple was planted with trees and must...
have looked like a miniature emulation of her sacred grove on Lake Nemi. If this was the case, then the garden was planted with various trees, but certainly there were oaks (quercus), preferred by mistletoe (viscum), the plant highly esteemed for its use in medicine, and symbolically potent in Diana’s cult at Nemi.21 The same symbolism obviously extended in the interior of the temple, as it can be concluded from the already mentioned fragments of black and white floral decoration (fig. 8). At first sight, the painted motifs look like some unusual leaves and strange looking “buds”, but a closer inspection reveals stylised leaves of quercus cerris and viscum — plants of Diana’s sacred groves (fig. 9).22 We can imagine that the whole complex was very impressive. Entering the temenos must have been an overwhelming experience, as if reaching into some other dimension of existence; trees, plants, as well as the whole decoration of the temple aroused admiration, especially because of the fact that they were positioned in the centre of the town.

However, a few confusing finds were strangely put aside by Sticotti and the following researchers. First should be mentioned four large fragments of limestone slabs with reliefs, found in 1892 beneath the staircase of the temple.23 Two of them put together (3 m long, 58 cm high, 14 cm thick) showed an image of a colossal dolphin (head and tail were broken off). Two other slabs of corresponding dimensions were also decorated with figures of dolphins, on both sides (fig. 10). Sticotti assumed that they belonged to the parapet of the staircase of the temple.24 However, the appearance of dolphins, especially of such colossal dimensions, in Diana’s sacred precinct is quite strange, as there has never been any connection between these aquatic mammals to the goddess. The second thing that seems rather strange is the already mentioned positioning of Diana’s figure on the tympanum. It was not in the centre, but slightly to the left, so it seems that Diana had a counterpart on the right side; it must have been Apollo. Apollo Delphinios was venerated from deep antiquity as protector of seafarers and sailors at sea, as well as the killer of the female partner of Delphian Python.25 This female dragon was called Delphusa, and thus, through Homeric Hymn to Apollo, in the 6st c. B.C., he acquired the appellative Delphinios.26 Festivities in his honour were held on winter solstice in Delphi. He was still venerated as Delphinius in the 2nd century A.D., as Arrian’s Cynegetica shows, but by then he was, as Arrian explains, venerated yearly along with his twin sister Diana, in form of Diana Agratera (“The Wild One”), as well as with Hermes, Pan and Nymphs. However,

7 Sculptures of goddess Diana; (a) fragment from Doclea (after: Sticotti, 1913), (b) sculpture from the Vatican Museum, 1st c. A.D.

Skulpture boginje Dijane; (a) ulomak iz Dokleje (prema: Sticotti, 1913,), (b) skulptura iz Vatikanskog muzeja, 1. st. n. c.
the main deity of the festival was Diana Agrótera, to whom hunters would have donated money through the year as a kind of pledge for each wild animal they would hunt down, leaving it in a coffer on her altar. At the day of the festival, they would offer a sacrifice in form of a sheep, goat or calf, took back their money from the coffer, and then the feast ensued. There are many examples of Diana being worshiped along with her brother Apollo, and their joint cult is well attested in North Africa, Greece and Italy. At the agora in Aigion there was a temple dedicated to Diana and Apollo, as well as in Tanagra or Kirrha (port of Delphi). In Rome, they had a joint temple on the southern side of Campus Martius, and, what is most important, Diana was also venerated at Augustus’ temple of Apollo Palatinus. Festivities in their honour continued all throughout the 3rd century, as is best attested by a fragmentary poem written at the end of the century by Marcus Aurelius Olympos Nemesisianus. So, taken all into consideration, it seems that Doclean temple was not exactly “Diana’s temple”, but the temple dedicated to the twins — Apollo and Diana. If we let loose our imagination, we could complement the figure of Diana on the tympanum with the figure of Apollo, so we also get an explanation of her positioning aside
from the central axis. The above-mentioned depictions of dolphins can also be explained in this context. In our opinion, they were once part of the large parapet surrounding the altar that stood in front of the temple. The purpose of the appended rooms on the northern side of the temenos now also becomes clear. In fact, the festival in honour of Diana Agrotera and Apollo was usually concluded with a collective feast of hunters. The feast could not have been held inside the sacred grounds of temenos, so the most appropriate place would be in the adjoining halls, just like the ones we have in Doclea. Thus, as all pieces of the puzzle have come into their place, we may also propose a new name for this Doclean temple — "Temple of Diana Agrotera and Apollo Delphinius".

Another important argument could be added in favour of such dual dedication of Doclean temple. Both of these deities were titular deities of Emperor Augustus, who erected temples to both of them in Rome — one on the Palatine, and the other, in sight, on the opposite Aventine hill. What most scholars tend to forget is that, through his religious reforms, Emperor Augustus established a theological baseline for all future emperors, who were expected to uphold it; the Emperor seen as Sun-giver, comitatus of Apollo and Diana, Saturn reborn, bringer of the speculum aureum. Thus, the cult of both deities was deeply embedded into the image of an emperor, who might also have chosen to introduce some other deities in his imperial cult, but had to preserve the baseline. As we have argued that Diocletian was the re-founder and re-builder of his home town of Doclea, his choice to erect such a temple should not come as a surprise. After all, the so-called “First Temple” in Doclea, obviously an imperial building, was most probably also dedicated to the state cult of Dea Roma.

That this complex was indeed an imperial investment is confirmed by every detail: the entablatures were unmistakably produced by the so-called “Diocletian’s architectural school”, and the whole temenos and temple were based on a novel concept of putting together and mixing diverse existing architectural elements and ideas — the school’s “trade-mark” already recognized by Sticotti, who argued that the same masons worked on the imperial palace in Spalato.

**Final Remarks**

The “Temple of Diana Agrotera and Apollo Delphinius” is undoubtedly a unique structure in the geographical context of Roman Dalmatia. The only possible comparison could be the Dianion on the Marjan hill on the Peninsula of Spalato, but due to lack of archaeological data from the site, no concrete conclusions can be drawn. We know of its importance, and we can assume that it had some kind of relation to the imperial residence in Spalato. It cannot be excluded that...
Diana’s sanctuary on Marjan, confirmed by archaeological remains around and beneath the church of St. George on the promontory, was also surrounded by a sacred grove. However, the temple, the temenos and the adjoining structures in Doclea are a unique concept, just like the Doclean “forum”. The temenos with an ambulatory porticus, a miniaturised sacred grove in the courtyard, symmetrical entrances on the lateral sides leading straight to the porticus, and the temple positioned against the back wall of the temenos with a protruding exedra etc. — all of these elements were put together in such an inventive and innovative way that one must be amazed to find something like that in a smallish town like Doclea; however, we should not forget the fact that on the “forum” of the same town, there was an Imperial Kaisarion.

The sanctuary of Diana and Apollo was conceived and composed as a unified whole, as a kind of Gesamtkunstwerk — from its layout, construction, vegetal decoration, sculptural and painted decoration, and highly potent symbolism — in order to impress and overwhelm the visitor. The whole structure was carefully planned, so the visitor was led through the complex, and at the same time confronted with various vistas constantly keeping him in suspense. First, he entered the richly forested courtyard, with a temple completely screened by the woods. Then he passed through the porticus towards the temple, whose whiteness gleamed in the sun. Going further, he had to approach the altar, which stood inside the enclosure and was surrounded by a parapet decorated with colossal dolphins. If he raised his eyes on the day of the festival he could see right through the door of the temple, monumentally framed by an ornamented gable with depictions of Diana and Apollo, and Corinthian columns of the pronaoi. Most probably, the visitor could also catch a glimpse of the cult sculptures of Diana and Apollo in the exedra, accentuated by wall paintings with black and white floral motives; an allusion to wilderness, but at the same time, to prosperity, wealth, and well-being that Apollo provided. Delicacy of execution of the painted ornamentation pointed much more to the latter. At first sight the whole arrangement of the complex might seem to follow Vitruvian concept of the temple and its precinct; however, by closer inspection, the alterations of the prescribed plan become more than obvious, and one becomes aware that he is confronted with something completely original — a complex full of deliberately playful distortions and rearrangements of existing architectural motives, borrowed from Roman and Syrian architecture.

At the end of our last paper, on Doclean “forum” complex, we have raised the question of the scope of Diocletian’s interventions in Doclea. He was called the founder of the city of Diocleia by Constantine Porpyrogenitus, and not without a reason, because his interventions were all-encompassing. To these interventions we can now add the “Temple of Diana Agrotera and Apollo Delphinius”, so it seems that the recognized scope of his interventions is growing. We, indeed, may assume that Porpyrogenitus was right, and conclude that it was Diocles, later known as Emperor Gaius Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus, the most notable of all Diocletes, who rearranged and re-erected almost the whole town of Doclea. Emperors before him embellished various provincial centres; Septimius Severus, for example, embellished his Leptis Magna. However, it seems that none of the Roman emperors built a new town in the place of the old one, as Diocletian did. It is quite surprising that no one except Đuro Basler put an effort to reconstruct this edifice, or any other of the sacral complexes of late antique Doclea. The results of archaeological explorations, physical or geophysical, are abundant, but architectural reconstructions from the documented remains, their contextualisation and interpretation, are clearly lacking. If Basler had enough information for such an attempt in 1963, we certainly do have much more information today, but Doclean edifices have not yet been examined in the context of general developments of Roman late antique architecture. This paper, thus, presents an attempt to shed some new light on one of its monuments, important not only for understanding the Roman architecture in the region, but Roman architecture from the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 4th century in general. Croatian art history should have a special interest in Doclean monuments, as Diocletian’s palace in Spalato, a complex of global importance, is part of our cultural heritage. Paying more attention to Diocletian’s colossal undertakings in our immediate vicinity contributes not only to better understanding of particular architectural accomplishments, but also the emperor himself, and his drive for reforms, concerning not only the administration of the Empire, but the imperial architecture and related iconography of architecture as well.
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5 They provided basic information about stratigraphy, and demonstrated that the outlines of the town’s center, one explored by Rovinski and Sticotti, actually represented one of the final stages in its development, and should be dated between the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 4th century, according to Ivan Stevović. We have proposed a more accurate dating to the reign of Emperor Diocletian, after a comparative study of public edifices of Doclea and confirmed Diocletian’s buildings, namely the one on the peninsula of Spalato. See Ivan Stevović, Praevais. The Making of the Cultural Space of the Late Antique Province, The Archaeological Society of Montenegro, Special Editions, Book 1 (2014), 64.


7 Tatjana M. Koprićeva, Arhitektura kasnoantičke Duklje. Mogućnost rekonstrukcije (The Architecture of Late Antique Doclea. Possibilities of Reconstruction), doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade (2015).


9 It should be mentioned that this dedication of the temple, based on the remains of sculptural decoration, is debatable. J. A. R. Munro wrote: “A torso of a figure, considerably less than life size, clad in a toga and bearing a cornucopia in his left hand, was found near the temple. It is the only piece of sculpture in the round, except a small fragment of a foot, discovered on the site. On the terrace at the new palace near Podgorica is the central slab of the pediment, with the head of Minerva or Roma in relief, now much defaced. If the toga is the genius of an emperor, or a deified emperor, and belongs to the temple, we may regard it as dedicated to Roma.” However, Basler contested such a dedication, and if we may add, rightly so. Studying modular relations of the temple, Basler came to conclusion that the mentioned fragments could neither have been the central decoration of the pediment, nor a part of the temple. See Munro et als., The Roman Town of Doclea, 22; Basler, “Problem rekonstrukcije”, 141.

10 The closest parallel would be the positioning of the “Small Temple” or “Jupiter’s Temple” in Diocletian’s palace in Spalato, although the situation is not the same and the form of the two temples is different.

11 Sticotti, Die Römische Stadt Doclea, 85–98.

12 Sticotti, Die Römische Stadt Doclea, 89.

13 By reversing the orientation of the entrances from the main street, the builders clearly disregarded Vitruvus’ prescriptions. He recommended that temples should be erected with the best possible view of the city in mind, or be aligned with streets and rivers to impress the passer-by, thus enhancing the impression of their auctortas. In this case, such an orientation would be pointless because as it will be explained, the temple was screened by an obviously densely forested courtyard. At the same time, the forested courtyard was one of the main reasons why the temple was “pushed back” to the western part of the town. It was imperative to make space for a forested garden for symbolic reasons. See Marcus Vitruvius Pollio, De Architectura, Book IV, trans. Morris Hickey Morgan (Harvard University Press, 1914): 5; Ulrike Egelhaaf-Gaiser, “Roman Cult Sites: A Pragmatic Approach”, A Companion to Roman Religion, ed. Jörg Rüpke (Blackwell Publishing, 2007): 205–221 (209).

14 This is one of the main points in which Basler and Sticotti do not agree.

15 Sticotti, Die Römische Stadt Doclea, 95.

16 He called them Hängplatten because they look as if they are suspended from the cornice and have no structural purpose.

17 Sticotti, Die Römische Stadt Doclea, 88–89. This assumption must be correct, as the courtyard was obviously irrigated by a canal running through the northern part of the porticus. So, we can assume that the courtyard was thickly forested, thus creating an illusion of a “real” forest in the middle of the town. No paved pathways were identified in the courtyard, so it seems that the visitor could have either walked around the courtyard or walked through the trees.

18 Either on Elagabalus’ Temple of Sol which was built at the intersection of Via triumphalis and Via sacra, opposite the temple of Venus and Roma, or on Aurelian’s Temple of Sol Invictus built on Campus Agrippae after crushing the revolt of Zenobia in Palmyra. It is a known fact that in 274 A.D. Aurelian had not yet become a standard. Meanwhile, by the time of Commodus, it became a standard in Syria, as for example on Tychoon in Es–Sanamen. As Gross explained, in Syria it was not just the exedra that mattered, but also the vista towards the cult sculpture. That is why the middle intercolumnium on the facade was wider — to create an unimpeded view towards the sculpture through the wide door of a temple. The sculpture was monumentally framed with an exedra and semi–dome, corresponding to the arched “Syrian gable” at the front of the edifice. It was quite a different aesthetic concept than the one previously found in Rome and in Italy. The aesthetic that Aurelian brought to Rome by re–using parts

20 Koprića, Arhitektura kasnoantičke Duljke, 134.


22 Here is what Virgil said about the mistletoe and oak in book VI of his Aeneid and about the impression they made: “Quale solet silvis brumali frigore viscum / Fronde virere nova, quod met his eye on the dark of the ilex;” (Aeneid 6.225–226). However, there is no clear evidence of the exact positioning of the columns on the façade of “Diana’s temple”, and it is unquestionable that the tympanum had sculptural decoration.

23 Sticotti, Die Römische Stadt Doclea, 92–94.

24 It is quite hard to comprehend how Sticotti imagined that “parapet”, as he does not give clear explanations.


30 Tin Turković, “Diocletian’s “Imperial Court” in Doclea”.

31 The issue of dedication of that temple has already been dealt with in this paper.

32 Sticotti, Die Römische Stadt Doclea, 92–94.


34 The type of columns used on the temple was never specified, as no capitals were found on the site. However, if we consider that the entablature of the temple was almost identical to the entablatures of other monumental buildings in Doclea, and that most of them rested on Corinthian capitals, it seems reasonable to assume that this temple was no exception. In that respect, Basler’s reconstruction is more convincing than Sticotti’s. See fig. 3.

35 “Doclea gets its name from the city in this country that the emperor Diocletian founded, but now it is a deserted city, though still called Doclea.” See Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio, ed. GY. Moravcsik, Dumberton Oaks Texts I (1967), cap. 35.10.

36 As well as the “First Temple”, about whose dedication we cannot be certain.
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Ponovno promišljanje
tv. „Dijaninog hrama“ u antičkoj Dokleji

Antička Dokleja istražvana je tijekom posljednjih 131 godinu, čak i opsežnije od mno-
ghih drugih antičkih gradova na istočnoj obali Jadran. Istraživači su se redali od 1890.
godine pa sve do danas, no, osim rijetkih, većina ih je tek prikupljala arheološke po-
datke, ne upuštajući se u interpretacije pojedinih monumentalnih zdanja antičkog i
kasnoantičkog grada. Tek su se rijetki istraživači poput Piera Sticottija, Đure Baslera
ili Dragoslava Srejovića upustili u interpretaciju ili reinterpretaciju izgleda pojedinih
gradevina. U proteklih se dva desetljeća interes za Dokleju dodatno povećao kroz su-
radnju crnogorskih i talijanskih arheologa. Međutim, iako su arheološke kampanje
od 2007. godine iznijele na vidjelo iznimnu količinu novih podataka i saznanja o sa-
moj Dokleji, izostala je temeljita povijesno-umjetnička obrada prikupljenih podataka.
U ovom je radu pozornost posvećena tek jednom od reprezentativnih i jedinstvenih
doklejskih spomenika s kraja 3. ili samog početka 4. stoljeća — tv. „Dijaninom hra-
mu“ — koji je krasio samo središte antičkoga grada. Sabiru se sve dokumentirane spo-
znaje o ovom svetišnom sklopu te nudi njegova cjelovita rekonstrukcija, a na temelju
analize njegovih tlocrtnih karakteristika i specifičnog arhitektonskog izričaja pove-
zuje ga se s gradnjom ostalih monumentalnih gradevina kasnoantičke Dokleje, koja
je nesumnjivo bila pregrađena u posve novi grad od strane najznamenitijeg od svih
Dokleata (odnosno, kasnoantičkim jezikom, Diokleta) — cara Dioklecijana. Analiza
je upotpunjena komparacijama koje uistinu potvrđuju da su na konceptu i izgrad-
njovog svetišnog sklopa radili isti majstori koji su radili i na carevoj palači u Splitu.
Sklop se tumači kao vrlo inovativno i originalno rješenje, konceptualno doradeno
u svakom pogledu. U obzir se uzimaju i ulomci skulpture koji gotovo stoljeće i pol
nisu dobili adekvatnu interpretaciju, a koji upućuju i na vrlo izglednu dvojnu posve-
tu hrama. Naime, suđeći po dekorativnom motiviči na parapetnim ogradama oltara

SAŽETAK

Ponovno promišljanje
tv. „Dijaninog hrama“ u antičkoj Dokleji

Antička Dokleja istražvana je tijekom posljednjih 131 godinu, čak i opsežnije od mno-
ghih drugih antičkih gradova na istočnoj obali Jadran. Istraživači su se redali od 1890.
godine pa sve do danas, no, osim rijetkih, većina ih je tek prikupljala arheološke po-
datke, ne upuštajući se u interpretacije pojedinih monumentalnih zdanja antičkog i
kasnoantičkog grada. Tek su se rijetki istraživači poput Piera Sticottija, Đure Baslera
ili Dragoslava Srejovića upustili u interpretaciju ili reinterpretaciju izgleda pojedinih
gradevina. U proteklih se dva desetljeća se dva desetljeća interes za Dokleju dodatno povećao kroz su-
radnju crnogorskih i talijanskih arheologa. Međutim, iako su arheološke kampanje
od 2007. godine iznijele na vidjelo iznimnu količinu novih podataka i saznanja o sa-
moj Dokleji, izostala je temeljita povijesno-umjetnička obrada prikupljenih podataka.
U ovom je radu pozornost posvećena tek jednom od reprezentativnih i jedinstvenih
doklejskih spomenika s kraja 3. ili samog početka 4. stoljeća — tv. „Dijaninom hra-
mu“ — koji je krasio samo središte antičkoga grada. Sabiru se sve dokumentirane spo-
znaje o ovom svetišnom sklopu te nudi njegova cjelovita rekonstrukcija, a na temelju
analize njegovih tlocrtnih karakteristika i specifičnog arhitektonskog izričaja pove-
zuje ga se s gradnjom ostalih monumentalnih gradevina kasnoantičke Dokleje, koja
je nesumnjivo bila pregrađena u posve novi grad od strane najznamenitijeg od svih
Dokleata (odnosno, kasnoantičkim jezikom, Diokleta) — cara Dioklecijana. Analiza
je upotpunjena komparacijama koje uistinu potvrđuju da su na konceptu i izgrad-
njovog svetišnog sklopa radili isti majstori koji su radili i na carevoj palači u Splitu.
Sklop se tumači kao vrlo inovativno i originalno rješenje, konceptualno doradeno
u svakom pogledu. U obzir se uzimaju i ulomci skulpture koji gotovo stoljeće i pol
nisu dobili adekvatnu interpretaciju, a koji upućuju i na vrlo izglednu dvojnu posve-
tu hrama. Naime, suđeći po dekorativnom motiviči na parapetnim ogradama oltara
te skulpturalnoj dekoraciji zabata i unutarnjoj dekoraciji hrama, može se zaključiti
dati je bio posvećen ne samo Dijani, nego i njezinom božanskom blizancu Apolonu.

Decoracija hrama, tlocrtni oblik i uređenje svetišta sugeriraju da se radilo o svetištu
Dijane Agrote i Apolona Definijskog.

Po dovršetku vizualne rekonstrukcije hrama moguće je konstatirati da se oblikovno
i konceptualno radi o jedinstvenom građevinskom sklopu na istočnoj obali Jadran,
ali i jedinstvenom rješenju na širim prostirima provincije. Ornamentacija je po mnogočemu jedinstvena i gotovo neusporediva s bilo kojim od poznatih sklopoa posvečenih Dijani i Apolonu, čak i ako u obzir uzmenu sačuvana zdanja na Apeninskom
poluotoku. Utoliko, rad za cilj ima biti tek poticaj za interpretaciju ostalih imperi-
jalnih gradnji u Dioklecijanovoj Dokleji, ostvarenih od straneособite „arhitektonsko-
škole”, kako bi je nazvao Sticotti, koja je imala snažnu inkluziju prema originalnom
i ingenioznom, pomalo zaigranom, čak „manirističkom” arhitektonskom izričaju.
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