

Ivan Josipović

Željko Rapanić, *Od carske palače do srednjovjekovne općine*

*Željko Rapanić, *Od carske palače do srednjovjekovne općine**

Ivan Josipović
HR, 23 000 Zadar
Odjel za povijest umjetnosti
Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV.2
ijosipov@unizd.hr

Ivan Josipović
Croatia, 23 000 Zadar
Art History Department
University of Zadar
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV.2
ijosipov@unizd.hr

Željko Rapanić, *Od carske palače do srednjovjekovne općine*,
Split, Književni krug, 2007. (Biblioteka Knjiga Mediterana; 50),
280 str., ISBN 978-953-163-299-7

Željko Rapanić, *Od carske palače do srednjovjekovne općine*,
Split, Književni krug, 2007. (Biblioteka Knjiga Mediterana; 50),
280 pp., ISBN 978-953-163-299-7

Krajem godine 2007. u izdanju splitskoga Književnog kruga izašla je nova knjiga Željka Rapanića, istaknutoga hrvatskog povjesničara umjetnosti, te bivšeg konzervatora, muzejskog radnika i sveučilišnog profesora, pod naslovom *Od carske palače do srednjovjekovne općine*. Knjiga je, uz kraći autorov predgovor, podijeljena na još šest opsegom neujednačenih poglavlja obogaćena i sa 17 crno-bijelih i 27 vrlo kvalitetnih ilustracija u boji, a priložena su joj i tri vrlo korisna kazala (naslovljena sljedećim nazivima: *Objašnjenje nekih zemljopisnih naziva i historiografskih pojmova*, *Kazalo starih autora i povijesnih osoba*, *Kazalo suvremenih autora*), te dosta opširan popis korištene literature. Naslov knjige koji sadrži dva značajna kulturno-povijesna termina - carsku palaču i srednjovjekovnu općinu (*komunu*) - u ovoj kombinaciji predstavlja i vremensku odrednicu koja bi svakom upućenijem čitatelju trebala biti dovoljan smjerokaz za prepoznavanje materije kojom se pisac pozabavio, a to je osnutak i razvoj grada Splita od kasne antike do razvijenoga srednjeg vijeka.

O tome se govori i u spomenutom predgovoru knjige gdje se naglašava kako je njezin cilj na jednome mjestu iznijeti niz poznatih, ali i ponešto novih znanstvenih spoznaja o poleogenezi Splita. Te su spoznaje prije svega vezane za cara Dioklecijana i njegovu Palaču kao i za nekadašnju salonitansku, poslije splitsku Crkvu, što Rapanić promatra u širem povijesnom i društvenom kontekstu svršetka antike i početka ranoga srednjeg vijeka. Tijek povijesnog razvitka grada prati se i dalje, duboko u srednji vijek, zaustavljajući se tek u stoljećima zrelog srednjovjekovlja, u kojima su se, kako sam pisac kaže, "već znatno oblikovali i splitska općina, kao zajednica građana - *comunitas Spaleti* - i grad, kao strukturna, urbana cjelina". Isto tako, naglašeno je kako ovo djelo nema pretenzija da bude deskriptivna povijest najvećega dalmatinskog grada (kakve su o njemu, kao i o najvećem broju ostalih hrvatskih gradova, odavno objavljene), već se ono bavi samo jednim, doduše vrlo značajnim i opsežnim, razdobljem njegova povijesnog razvitka, a sam prikaz tog razdoblja sastavljen je tek od niza povezanih povijesnih epizoda. U njima autor, ispreplećući značajnije događaje, ličnosti i spomenike iz prošlosti Splita, pokušava na suvremen način rasvijetliti povijesna zbivanja, pronaći i istaknuti njihovu problematiku te o njoj kompetentno raspravljati, i tako se, što je moguće više, približiti povijesnoj istini. Iako knjiga ne donosi puno novih i nepoznatih činjenica, što i sam pisac ističe, smisao njezina objavljivanja više je nego jasno istaknut: na tečan i širem čitateljstvu razumljiv (no nipošto manje znanstven) način, na jednome mjestu okupiti autorove spoznaje o povijesti, kulturi i umjetničkoj baštini grada Splita do kojih je došao predanim radom tijekom višegodišnje i uspješne karijere. S tim je spoznajama hrvatska znanstvena javnost najvećim dijelom bila upoznata preko njegovih stručnih i znanstvenih radova.

Predgovor najavljuje kako će cijeli tekst knjige biti popraćen čestim i iscrpnim bilješkama koje ne samo da upućuju na relevantnu domaću i svjetsku literaturu, te donose dodatna autorova pojašnjenja, već u slučaju povijesnih izvora na koje se on poziva, navode i nekoliko osnovnih podataka o njihovim tvorcima, kao i o povijesnim osobama koje spominju. Širem čitateljstvu to može itekako olakšati praćenje teksta. Bez duljenja, predgovor

In late 2007, publisher Književni krug from Split published a new book by Željko Rapanić, a prominent Croatian art historian and former conservator, museologist and professor, under the title *Od carske palače do srednjovjekovne općine* (From Imperial Palace to Mediaeval Commune). The book is, after the author's short preface, divided into six chapters of varying lengths, enriched with 17 black and white photographs and 27 high-quality colour illustrations, three very useful indices (they are: Explanation of Some Geographical Terms and Historiographic Concepts; Index of Old Authors and Historical Figures; and Index of Modern Authors) and a fairly extensive bibliography. The title of the book contains two significant cultural and historical terms: imperial palace and mediaeval commune. These elements constitute references which should be sufficient for any informed reader to recognising the material the writer covers: establishment and development of the city of Split from Late Antiquity to the High Middle Ages.

In the preface author stresses that his aim is to present, in a single book, a series of already known data together with the results of newer research concerning the poleogenesis of Split and the former Church of Salona, later the Church of Split. Rapanić observes all of this within the broader historical and social context of the end of the Ancient World and the onset of the Early Middle Ages. The course of the city's historical development is also followed further into the Middle Ages, stopping only in the centuries of the High Middle Ages in which, as the writer says, "both the commune of Split as a community of its citizens – *comunitas Spaleti* – and the city, as a structural, urban unit had already been considerably formed". The author also emphasizes that this work has no pretensions to be a descriptive history of the largest Dalmatian city (such histories of Split, as well as most other Croatian cities, had already been published long ago), for it only deals with one still very significant and extensive period of its historical development. His consideration of this period encompasses a series of connected historical episodes. In them, Rapanić interweaves some of the more significant events, figures and monuments of Split's past and thus attempts to shed light on historical events in a contemporary manner, uncovering and highlighting certain unresolved questions and capably discussing them, thereby approaching the historical truth to the greatest possible degree. Although the book does not feature many new or previously unknown facts – something the author is eager to emphasize – the purpose of its publication is more than clearly stressed: to consolidate in one place the author's findings about the history, culture and heritage of the city of Split, acquired with great dedication over his long and productive career, in a manner fluent and comprehensible to a broader reading public (but no less scholarly). For the most part, Croatia's scholarly public became familiar with these findings by means of his professional and scientific works.

The preface specifies that the text will be accompanied by frequent and detailed annotations. These not only direct readers to the relevant domestic and foreign bibliography and contain the author's additional explanations; in the case of the historical sources to which he refers, they also point to some basic facts

je vrlo informativan te dosta precizno nagovještava čitatelju što predstoji na stranicama koje slijede.

Prvo poglavlje knjige naslovljeno je zgodnom parafrazom početnih riječi Evanđelja po Ivanu - *Na početku bijaše Palača*, čime se i na simboličkoj razini nagovještava budući nastanak grada u okviru nekadašnjega carskog zdanja. Rapanić, nadalje, čitatelja vrlo zanimljivo uvodi u opću povijesnu problematiku nastanka gradova, ističući da neki od njih, primjerice Rim, nisu imali tu sreću, kao što ju je imao Split, da se njihov nastanak može bar približno odrediti, već su historičari u pokušaju razjašnjavanja njihove poleogeneze oduvijek bili prisiljeni razdvajati isprepletenost mita i povijesne zbilje. Nalazeći razloge formiranja gradova u povijesnim okolnostima, prirodnim pogodnostima i zemljopisnim zadanostima, te činjenice primjenjuje i na konkretnom slučaju, tj. na primjeru današnjeg šireg splitskog područja. Tako se naširoko elaboriraju spoznaje o Saloni - nekadašnjem glavnom gradu rimske provincije Dalmacije - te se utvrđuje njezin odnos s bližom okolicom i njezinim manjim naseljima. Korištenjem tzv. *Tabule Peutingeriane* kao povijesnog izvora iz vremena prije gradnje Palače (radi se o rimskom zemljovidu koji je precrtan u 4. ili 5. stoljeću, ali koji je nastao prema izvornoj verziji iz početka 1. stoljeća poslije Krista) na užem području današnjeg Splita prepoznaju se i jasno razlikuju dva toponima: *Spalatum* - naziv za naselje pod Marjanom koje je već postojalo prije gradnje Dioklecijanove rezidencije, i *Spalato* - koji na karti označava tek mjesto raskrižja putova između *Spalatum*, *Epetiona* (Stobreča) i *Salone* (Solina). Ovdje bi trebalo istaknuti i tek jednu manju zamjerku! Naime, u nastavku istog poglavlja (str. 27) opet se spominje isto raskrižje (*Spalato*), koje je u ovom slučaju očito pogrešno nazvano *Spalatum*, ali se iz daljnjeg konteksta može razaznati da je riječ ili o autorovu previdu, ili pak o tiskarskoj pogrešci, jer se potonji pojam kasnije opet koristi kao naziv za naselje na području današnje uže jezgre grada Splita.

Naselje *Spalatum* spominje se detaljnije i u nastavku, pa se, ponajprije na temelju epigrafskih izvora, pretpostavlja kako je najvjerojatnije osnovano u vrijeme prijelaza dviju era, što bi onda bio još jedan dokaz o neprekinutoj naseljenosti tog prostora (iako se arheološki nalazi koji potvrđuju tu odavna poznatu činjenicu, u novije vrijeme, u našoj znanosti često prikazuju kao novo otkriće ili čak kao svojevrsna senzacija). Budući da se dio tog naselja, prema Rapaniću, gotovo sigurno nalazio na terenu na kojem je poslije sagrađena Dioklecijanova palača, ono je očito tom prilikom bilo dijelom, ako ne i čitavo, porušeno. O tome svjedoče i ostaci zidova ispod mauzoleja Palače, koji ne odgovaraju kasnijem postavljanju temeljnih zidova careve buduće grobnice te najvjerojatnije potječu od neke građevine iz doba prije Dioklecijana. Autor se nadalje ukratko dotiče i svih važnijih događaja koji su obilježili povijest širega splitskog područja na prijelazu iz antike u srednji vijek, a poseban naglasak stavlja na burne godine slavensko-avarskih provala s kraja 6. i početka 7. stoljeća, opravdano smatrajući kako su okolnosti "propasti" Salone od presudne važnosti za cjelokupni kontekst nastanka novoga grada u susjednoj joj Palači, prema tome i za čitavu problematiku o kojoj je riječ u njegovu radu.

about their authors as well as the historical figures they mention. This makes following the text much easier for the broader reading public. The preface is thus very informative and provides a fairly precise indication as to what readers may expect in the pages that follow.

The title of the first chapter is an apposite paraphrase of the initial lines of the Gospel of St. John - "In the Beginning There Was the Palace", which on the symbolic level also heralds the future beginnings of the city inside the former imperial building. Rapanić further introduces the reader to some general historical problems, e.g. the establishment of cities, in a very engaging manner. He emphasizes that some cities, such as Rome for example, do not have the good fortune of Split, in that their establishment cannot even be approximately determined, so historians attempting to clarify their poleogenesis have always been forced to sift through the myths interwoven with historical reality. In recapitulating the reasons for the formation of cities under given historical circumstances, favourable natural conditions and geographical features, these facts are also applied in the specific case of the wider present-day area of Split. So everything known about Salona, the former capital of the Roman province of Dalmatia, is elaborated at great length as well as its relationship with the surrounding area and its smaller settlements. The so-called *Tabula Peutingeriana*, a historical source that predates construction of the Palace (it is a Roman map drafted in the fourth or fifth centuries AD, although drawn from the original version dating to the first century AD) clearly acknowledges and distinguishes two toponyms in the narrower area of present-day Split: *Spalatum* - the name of a settlement at the foot of Marjan Hill which had already existed prior to construction of Diocletian's Palace; and *Spalato* - which only marks the intersection of roads leading to *Spalatum*, *Epetion* (Stobreč) and *Salona* (Solin). Only a minor objection should be pointed out here. Namely, in the continuation of the same chapter (p. 27) the same intersection (*Spalato*) is mentioned again, in this case evidently incorrectly called *Spalatum*, but based on its context this can be understood as either the author's mistake or a printing error, because the latter notion is used again as the name of the settlement in the area of the present-day narrower core of the city of Split.

The settlement of *Spalatum* is mentioned in greater detail thereafter. Primarily on the basis of epigraphic sources, the author assumes that the settlement was most likely established at roughly the beginning of the Common Era, providing further evidence of the continuous presence of a human population in this area (although archaeological finds which confirm this long-known fact have in recent years been presented in scholarly circles as new discoveries or even as sensations in and of themselves). Since, according to Rapanić, a part of this settlement was almost certainly on the terrain on which Diocletian's Palace was later built, it was evidently partially or even entirely demolished for that purpose. The remains of the walls under the mausoleum of the Palace which do not correspond to the later foundations of the emperor's future mausoleum demonstrate this, and they most likely belonged to a building from the period preceding Diocletian. The author

Nakon prvog poglavlja Rapanić je uglavnom opširnije i detaljnije razradio svoja dotad iznesena stajališta i razmišljanja. Tako se može reći da drugo, treće i četvrto poglavlje u tematskom smislu ne donose ništa novo, ali zato se u njima na vrlo temeljit način pretresa i raspravlja o već zadanoj problematici, tj. o svrsi, nastanku i novoj funkciji careva zdanja nakon doseljavanja novih stanovnika u nju. Kombinirajući povijesne izvore sa stajalištima arheološke, povijesne i povijesnoumjetničke znanosti (starije i suvremene), kao i svojih osobnih zapažanja, spoznaja i metoda istraživanja, autor dolazi do interesantnih zaključaka, koji su svojevrsni *summa summarum* svega do sada poznatoga, a da pritom njegov raspravni diskurs potiče na daljnje promišljanje i interes za navedenu temu i njenu problematiku.

Tko je bio Dioklecijan, kad je rođen i kako je izgledao, kakvim je životom živio nakon napuštanja carskog prijestolja, kako je doživljavao propast svojih glavnih projekata - tetrahijskog sustava i društvenih reformi, te konačno kako se na njega mogla odraziti činjenica da je kršćanstvo, koje je on gorljivo progonio, nakon njegove abdikacije (a još za njegova života) postalo priznata i s drugim vjerama ravnopravna državna religija; tek su neke teme za koje autor nudi odgovore ili (ako to nije moguće) o njima bar intenzivno promišlja. Sve navedeno, naime, usko je povezano s idejom, svrhom i samom gradnjom Palače, te njezinom sudbinom nakon Dioklecijanove smrti, tako da je širi kontekst razmatranja njezine problematike ustvari neizbježan. Zbog toga se i naglašava važnost carskog ceremonijala za arhitektonski dizajn Palače, ideja tetrahijskog ustrojstva iščitava se iz arhitektonske i skulptorske koncepcije svih, a posebno sjevernih, tzv. Zlatnih vrata, a govori se i o višeznačnoj ulozi carskog zdanja. Tako se navodi da je ono bilo i carska palača, i luksuzna rezidencija, i dvorac-ljetnikovac ili vila, te u konačnici i carev mauzolej. U tom kontekstu autor, iz nekoliko opravdanih i argumentiranih razloga, nije sklon prihvatiti najnoviju teoriju Joška Belamarića koji u sjeverni dio Palače, u vrijeme Dioklecijana, smješta i djelovanje tkaonice (*gineceja*) - postrojenja za izradu vunjenih tkanina za vojsku. Naime, pretpostavka koja se temelji na promišljanju da bi istovremeno u Palači, kao sustanari, mogli živjeti i car i proizvođači sukna, Rapaniću je ipak presmiona, tako da je njezinu opovrgavanje posvetio dosta velik prostor, što i ne treba čuditi ako se imaju na umu sva mišljenja i teorije za koje se on na prethodnim stranicama zalagao.

Međutim, na samom kraju drugog poglavlja izneseno je i nekoliko, najblaže rečeno, problematičnih zaključaka, koji nisu u suglasnosti s povijesnim činjenicama koje su nam odavno poznate i povijesnim izvorima potvrđene. Naime, govoreći o okolnostima Dioklecijanove smrti, odnosu prema mrtvom caru te stanju u državi i u samoj Palači nakon nje, dolazi se do zaključka kako je poslije legalizacije kršćanske vjere 313. godine, dakle u doba cara Konstantina Velikog, započelo razdoblje tzv. kršćanske represije. S njim je navodno došlo i do kršćanskog obračuna s Dioklecijanom još za njegova života, a posebice nakon njegove smrti, kada je, tobože, ubrzo nakon nje, bio oskrvnut i njegov sarkofag, a carevo tijelo izbačeno iz Mauzoleja. Kao glavni dokaz ovoj teoriji navedeno je uništavanje Dioklecijanovih i Maksimijanovih

further briefly touches upon all major events that marked the history of the broader area of Split at the transition from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, and he accords particular emphasis to the turbulent years of Slav and Avar invasions in the late sixth and early seventh centuries. Rapanić rightfully considers the circumstances surrounding Salona's "fall" of crucial importance to the entire context of the establishment of the new city in the neighbouring Palace, and consequently to all of the matters he covers in his work.

After the first chapter, Rapanić mainly elaborates his previously presented views, ideas and reflections much more extensively and in greater detail. It can be said of the second, third and fourth chapters that they do not bring any new themes, although questions raised earlier concerning the purpose, establishment and new functions of the emperor's residence after its settlement by new inhabitants are very thoroughly discussed. Combining historical sources with the results of archaeological, historical and art-history research (both older and contemporary), as well as his personal observations, findings and research methods, the author draws some very fascinating conclusions. They represent the *summa summarum* of all facts so far known, while his presentation encourages further consideration and interest in this subject and the problems surrounding it.

Who Diocletian was, when he was born and what he looked like, what his life was like after his abdication, how he endured the failure of his major project (the tetrarchy and social reform) and, finally, and how the fact that Christianity, which he had so ardently persecuted, was recognized and made equal to other state religions, affected him after his abdication (during his lifetime): these are just some of the questions answered or (inasmuch as they cannot be answered) scrutinized by the author. Rapanić links the above considerations to the idea, purpose and construction of the Palace itself and its fate after Diocletian's death, so that the broader context of considering this problem is almost inevitable. The importance of imperial ceremonials to the architectural design of the Palace is therefore emphasized, and the idea of the tetrarchic structure is interpreted from the architectural and sculptural conception of the gates – the northern, so-called Golden Gate in particular. The multi-faceted role of the imperial building is also discussed, for it was an imperial palace, a luxury residence, a castle serving as summer residence or villa, and finally the emperor's mausoleum. In this context, Rapanić cites several justified and well-argued reasons for hesitating to accept the latest theory by Joško Belamarić, who specifies the northern part of the Palace during Diocletian's time as the location of a plant for weaving woollen fabrics for the military (*Gynaeceum*). Rapanić deems it too bold to presume that both the emperor and the cloth weavers could have lived in the Palace as fellow tenants at the same time. He therefore devoted considerable space to refuting this theory, which should not be given all of the opinions and theories he advocated in the previous pages.

However, at the very end of the second chapter there are some, to say the least, questionable conclusions which do not jibe with known historical facts, as confirmed in historical sources. When he discusses the circumstances surrounding Diocletian's death,

kipova već u početku Konstantinove vladavine. S druge je strane sasvim oprečna povijesna pripovijest Amijana Marcelina, koja govori o okolnostima smrtne presude za kradljivaca Danusa koji je sredinom 4. stoljeća oskvrnuo Dioklecijanov grob ukraivši skupocjeni purpurni prekrivač s careva sarkofaga, proglašena nevjerodostojnom, pa čak i anakronom za vrijeme o kojem govori, a sve zbog toga što ona stoji u suprotnosti s iznesenim autorovim mišljenjem. Ipak, Marcelinova je pripovijest zasigurno puno bliža povijesnoj istini od Rapanićeva promišljanja! Naime, spominjati nekakvu kršćansku represiju u godinama neposredno nakon Milanskog edikta, ne čini nam se dovoljno utemeljenim. Tim je Konstantinovima i Licinijevim reskriptom kršćanstvo iz pragmatičnih razloga postalo tek ravnopravna i s drugim vjerama izjednačena religija u rimskoj državi, te se barem do propisâ cara Teodozija s kraja 4. stoljeća (kojima je kršćanstvo postala službena i jedina religija u Carstvu) nikakva kršćanska represija nije ni mogla dogoditi, a pogotovo se nije mogla manifestirati u Mauzoleju i na grobu jednog od najvećih rimskih careva, i to u zdanju koje je i nakon njegove smrti ostalo u državnom vlasništvu, te povremeno bilo boravište nekih careva i drugih državnih velikodostojnika. Kada je, pak, razbijen Dioklecijanov sarkofag i kada je njegovo tijelo izbačeno iz mauzoleja Palače, teško je i pretpostaviti, a kamoli pouzdanije utvrditi, ali se to zasigurno nije dogodilo, kako Rapanić kaže, *“ne mnogo poslije careve smrti”*, jer se o nečem takvom, sve do pred kraj 4. stoljeća, a još pogotovo na carskom posjedu, nije moglo ni pomišljati, pa bi se navedeni događaj, s nužnim oprezom, eventualno mogao datirati negdje u 5. stoljeće. Nadalje, uništavanje Dioklecijanovih i Maksimijanovih kipova u Konstantinovo doba ne može biti dokaz kršćanskog obračuna s gorljivim apologetima poganstva i nekadašnjim žestokim protivnicima tada tek legalizirane vjere, već ga treba promatrati isključivo u kontekstu Konstantinova obračuna s tetrahijem sustavom koji su ta dvojica careva osmislila, provodila te konačno i simbolizirala, a koji je Konstantin, nakon višegodišnjih ratova protiv svojih suvladara i konkurenata, na kraju ipak uspio dokinuti, te opet ustoličiti sustav vlasti samo jednog vladara.

Zanimljivo je i Rapanićevo viđenje “propasti” Salone i početka grada u Palači, budući da je toj temi posvetio znatan prostor u svom radu. On je, naime, nakon kritičke reinterpretacije povijesnih izvora, prije svega Konstantina Porfirogeneta i Tome Arhidakona, donio svoje viđenje tog događaja, o kojem je naša historiografija uglavnom pisala kao o osvajanju i rušenju Salone od strane pristiglih “barbara”, tj. *“nepreglednih masa Slavena i Avara”*, te mu je u većini slučajeva nastojala utvrditi točan datum. Rapanić, naprotiv, izbjegava i govoriti o “propasti” Salone (ili tu riječ stavlja u navodnike), a godinu njezina navodna pada i rušenja i ne spominje, već tu problematiku objašnjava dužim procesom degradacije grada u prvoj polovini 7. stoljeća i postupnim preseljenjem njegovih sveukupnih urbanih, tj. civilnih i crkvenih funkcija u Dioklecijanovu palaču, u kojoj su se onda ostvarili svi preduvjeti za formiranje budućega grada. Tako je careva palača, iz više razumljivih razloga koje je pisac naveo, postala novi grad, a *“jedan veliki i u administrativnom i vjerskom pogledu važan grad, bio je napušten”*. Iako većina iznesenih stajališta djeluje prilično

attitudes on the deceased emperor and the situation in the state and the Palace itself after his death, Rapanić concludes that after legalization of Christian religion in 313 AD, thus during the era of Constantine the Great, a period of so-called “Christian repression” began. This allegedly brought with it the Christian retribution against Diocletian already during his lifetime and particularly after his death when, soon afterward, his sepulchre was allegedly defiled and the emperor’s body was ejected from the Mausoleum. As the crucial evidence for this theory, Rapanić mentions the demolition of the sculptures of Diocletian and Maximian already at the beginning of Constantine’s reign. On the other hand, he declares the historical narrative by Ammianus Marcellinus unreliable or even anachronistic for the time it covers. What Ammianus Marcellinus wrote completely contradicts Rapanić’s view: he talks about the circumstances surrounding the death penalty for the thief Danus, who defiled Diocletian’s tomb in the mid-fourth century AD by stealing a valuable purple shroud from his sepulchre. Whatever the case may be, the account by Marcellinus is certainly much closer to the historical truth of Rapanić’s assertions! Speaking of Christian repression in the years immediately following the Edict of Milan does not seem well-founded. This Edict, issued by Constantine and Licinius, only made Christianity equal to other religions in the Roman state for pragmatic reasons, and at least until the declarations of Emperor Theodosius at the end of the fourth century AD (which made Christianity the official and sole religion in the Empire), no Christian repression could have occurred, much less manifest itself in the Mausoleum and on the sepulchre of one of the greatest Roman emperors, particularly not in a building which remained state property after Diocletian’s death and which occasionally served as a temporary residence for certain emperors and other high state dignitaries. It is difficult to even speculate, much less state with any certainty, as to when Diocletian’s sepulchre was demolished and when his body was removed from the mausoleum in the Palace, but this certainly did not occur, as Rapanić says, *“soon after the emperor’s death”*. No one could even think of doing something like this until the end of the fourth century, especially not on imperial property, and the aforementioned event could, with the necessary caution, possibly be dated somewhere in the fifth century. Furthermore, the demolition of the statues of Diocletian and Maximian during Constantine’s reign cannot be evidence of Christian retribution against the ardent apologists of paganism and the formerly violent opponents of a newly-legalized religion. It should only be considered strictly within the context of Constantine’s struggle with the tetrarchy, which had been designed, implemented and finally symbolized by the two emperors, and which Constantine, after long wars against his co-rulers and rivals, finally managed to abolish and thus establish a system of the governance with only a single ruler.

Rapanić’s views on the “fall” of Salona and the beginnings of the city inside the Palace are also interesting, since he accorded considerable space to them in his work. After a critical reinterpretation of the historical sources, namely Constantine Porphyrogenitus and Thomas the Archdeacon, he presents his

uvjerljivo, stječe se dojam kako se ipak malo prečesto sumnja u vjerodostojnost povijesnih izvora, što uostalom u ovom radu i nije iznimka, te se onda olako odbacuju i negiraju neki događaji o kojima ti izvori govore, a bez spominjanja činjenica koje bi im eventualno išle u prilog, i tako dovele u pitanje ili čak osporile piščev stav. Međutim, iste činjenice navode se i koriste u daljnjoj raspravi, u nekom drugom kontekstu ili analizama.

Posebno je mjesto u knjizi posvećeno sudbini nekadašnje salonitanske Crkve te njezinom međuodnosu s kasnijom splitskom, koja je nakon formiranja Splita kao srednjovjekovnoga grada postala baštinik i nasljednik njezine ugledne i bogate tradicije. Rapanić se ovdje opet pozabavio kompliciranom problematikom interpretacije povijesnih vrela, tj. detaljnim komentiranjem i višestranim verificiranjem svakog podatka koji donose, i ovom prilikom uvelike sumnjajući u njihovu punu vjerodostojnost. Nadalje je iznio podosta uglavnom poznatih podataka, kao i svojih zaključaka vezanih za njih, s time da je posebno naglašavao one činjenice koje su mu se u kulturno-povijesnom kontekstu učinile vrlo važnima, a koje naša historiografija do sada nije pretjerano isticala.

Posljednja dva poglavlja knjige, pod naslovima *Palača postaje grad* i *Spaletina nobilissima et valida urbs*, bave se već poviješću Splita i prilikama nakon što je postao urbano naselje u punom smislu te riječi. Tako se na početku petoga poglavlja nastoji utvrditi kako je nastalo ime novoutemeljenoga srednjovjekovnoga grada (*Spalatum* i *Spalato* sada se koriste kao istoznačnice!), te se pretresaju moguće okolnosti i problemi s kojima su se novopridošli Salonitanci morali suočiti neposredno nakon useljenja u Palaču. Izneseno je stajalište, utemeljeno na djelu Tome Arhiđakona, koji govori kako su Salonitanci u Palaču najvjerojatnije došli pod vodstvom svoga prvaka, tzv. Velikog Severa. U tom se kontekstu i razglaba o odnosu svjetovne i crkvene vlasti u gradu, kao i o unutarnjim lokacijama koje su te važne institucije odabrale za svoja sjedišta. Dalje se raspravlja o vremenu obnove splitske biskupije i ostalih dalmatinskih biskupija sredinom 8. stoljeća, te se, kombinacijom nekoliko pisanih i epigrafičkih izvora, uvjerljivo rekonstruira povijest splitske Crkve sve do trenutka kada je ona uzdignuta u rang nadbiskupije i metropolije, što se najvjerojatnije dogodilo u prvoj polovici 10. stoljeća, u doba nadbiskupa Ivana Tordakatova (Tvrčkova?). Važno je, međutim, naglasiti kako se do danas sačuvao (uz još dva stilski bliska) i njegov sarkofag koji zbog svog značajnog natpisa predstavlja prvorazredni povijesni izvor.

Upravo je 10. stoljeće vrijeme kada je *Spalatum* bio dobro organiziran i u civilnom i u vjerskom pogledu, te je počeo prerastati u pravi srednjovjekovni grad. U to se doba otprilike može smjestiti i početak njegova izlaženja iz okvira Dioklecijanova perimetra, što se prvenstveno manifestiralo u širenju prema zapadu, pa će se tako grad do pred kraj 13. stoljeća površinom udvostručiti. Rast njegovih prostornih gabarita podrazumijevao je i gradnju novih obrambenih zidova oko novog dijela grada izvan Palače, što Rapanić detaljno opisuje i raščlanjuje po fazama gradnje, a da pritom nije propustio naglasiti i razvijanje novih glavnih pravaca kretanja u gradu i stvaranje novoga gradskog

own view of the event. In historiography, this subject is treated primarily as the conquest and devastation of Salona by newly arrived "barbarians", i.e. "large masses of Slavs and Avars". In most cases historians even attempted to determine the precise date. Rapanić, on the contrary, avoids even talking about the "fall" of Salona (or he places the word in quotation marks), nor does he even mention the year of its alleged collapse and destruction. He presents the problem of the "fall" as a long-term process of the city's degradation in the first half of the seventh century and the gradual relocation of its urban, i.e. civil and ecclesiastical, functions into Diocletian's Palace, in which all preconditions for the formation of the future city were consequently met. So the Palace, for several understandable reasons which the writer already covered, became a new city, while "a large and administratively and religiously important city was abandoned". Although most of his views seem to be quite convincing, one is given the impression that Rapanić too frequently suspects the credibility of the historical sources. This is, in fact, not an exception in his work, because certain events mentioned in the sources are too readily discounted and denied without mentioning the facts which could possibly back the accounts contained in these historical sources and thus cast doubt on or even contest the author's assertions. However, these same facts are then cited and used in different contexts or analyses for further discussion.

A special place in the book is accorded to the fate of the former Church of Salona and its relationship to the subsequent Church of Split which, after the formation of Split as a mediaeval city, became the inheritor and heir to its respected and rich tradition. Once more Rapanić deals with the complicated problem of the interpretation of historical sources, i.e. detailed commentary on and comprehensive verification of each piece of information they contain, and, on this occasion, casting considerable doubt on their full authenticity. Furthermore, he presents a number of largely known facts as well as his conclusions about them, emphasizing those facts which he deems vital within the cultural and historical context and which were not specifically emphasized in Croatian historiography up to this point.

The last two chapters of the book, "The Palace Becomes a City" and "*Spalatina nobilissima et valida urbs*", deal with the history of Split and the circumstances therein after it had become an urban settlement in the full sense of the word. So at the beginning of the fifth chapter, he attempts to determine the origin of the name of the newly founded mediaeval city (*Spalatum* and *Spalato* are now synonyms!) and the possible circumstances and problems the newcomers from Salona had to face immediately after having settled in the Palace. This stance is based on the chronicle of Thomas the Archdeacon, which speaks of the inhabitants of Salona who most probably came into the Palace under their leader, known as Severus the Great.

In this context, the relationship between the secular and ecclesiastical authorities in the city is also analyzed, as well as the locations inside it in which these major institutions chose to reside. He further discusses the restoration of the diocese of Split and the other Dalmatian dioceses in the mid-eighth century. Combining

središta - Trga sv. Lovre (današnjeg Narodnog trga). Taj se javni gradski prostor formirao ispred zapadnih vrata Dioklecijanove palače (tzv. Željeznih vrata) te se na njega preselila i svjetovna gradska uprava, dok je prvobitna urbana jezgra - Peristil - ostala samo centar crkvene vlasti, čime se Split oblikovao kao grad bicentrično organizirana prostora. Njegovo je tadašnje širenje prouzročilo i zamah prije svega graditeljskih zahvata koji se i danas mogu iščitati s profanih i sakralnih objekata što nose romaničke i gotičke stilske karakteristike. Time se ujedno, kako Rapanić kaže, oblikovao i *lik* grada oko kojeg su se onda mogli isplesti uobičajeni mitovi i legende čime su srednjovjekovni građani u vlastitu kolektivnu memoriju nastojali ugraditi svijest o slavnom podrijetlu svoga grada.

Iako je Split (kao i ostali dalmatinski gradovi) u stoljećima razvijenog srednjovjekovlja proživljavao razdoblja sukobljavanja interesa više političkih subjekata u borbi za vlast nad njim, činjenica je da je krajem 12. i početkom 13. stoljeća grad doživio velik gospodarski napredak koji ga je vodio prema stvaranju samostalne općine - *civitas Spaleti*. Naime, nove okolnosti u kojima je došlo do razvoja trgovine i obrta zbog kojih su se sklapali ugovori o suradnji s drugim sredinama u susjedstvu, ali i u udaljenim krajevima, zahtijevale su efikasnije ustrojstvo gradske vlasti od dotadašnje, a ona se u pravnom pogledu prije svega očitovala u načinu upravljanja gradskom zajednicom. Novi je način rukovođenja gradom zahtijevao načelnika koji će njime upravljati na opću korist svih građana, a to je mogao biti jedino čovjek koji će taj posao obavljati profesionalno, kao plaćeni činovnik. Time je Split svršetkom tridesetih godina 13. stoljeća postao *komuna* - zajednica građana u kojoj se sve radi u suglasju i za opće dobro, a gdje se upravna vlast predaje u ruke njezinih činovnika, a ne više, kao do tada, u ruke knezova, nametnutih uglavnom iz hrvatskih velikaških krugova koji su gospodarili prostorom u širem gradskom zaleđu.

Kao svojevrsan simbol nove gradske uprave autor je logično istaknuo prvoga splitskog profesionalnog upravitelja (načelnika), kojeg su građani Splita doveli čak iz Ancone, a čije je ime bilo Gargan de Arscindis. O njemu nadalje govori da je vrlo uspješno ustrojio komunalnu upravu "*na način talijanskih gradova*", postavivši gradsku birokraciju (suce, rizničare i glasnike), a dokaz valjana funkcioniranja gradske uprave nalazi se u pisanju Tome Arhiđakona (tada povijesnog suvremenika), koji svjedoči kako je Opće gradsko vijeće (*universale consilium*) načelniku Garganu, očito zbog dobro obavljena posla, produžilo mandat te ujedno i povećalo plaću. Isti je čovjek zaslužan i za objavljivanje prvoga splitskog gradskog statuta - tzv. Garganova *Kapitularija* - iz sredine 13. stoljeća, iako prvi statut grada Splita koji se do danas sačuvao potječe tek iz 1312. godine. Nakon svega navedenog posve je jasno zašto je Rapanić baš vremenom upravljanja načelnika Gargana odlučio zaključiti svoju knjigu, smatrajući da je to jedno od najznačajnijih i najplodonosnijih razdoblja u bogatoj povijesti Splita, kad se taj grad najviše približio uzvišenom načelu tzv. *civitas felix* - sretnoga grada.

Rapanićev pogled na razvitak srednjovjekovnog Splita svojevrsna je sinteza njegovih dugogodišnjih proučavanja

several written and epigraphic sources, Rapanić convincingly reconstructs the history of the Church of Split up to the point when it was elevated to the rank of archdiocese and metropolis, which most likely occurred in the first half of the tenth century, at the time of Archbishop John Tordacatus (Tvrtkov?). It is, however, important to point out that his sarcophagus (together with two others of similar style) has been preserved to the present day and represents a first-class historical source.

The tenth century is in fact taken as the time when Spalato was well-organized in civil and religious terms and began growing into a genuine mediaeval city. This period can possibly be seen as the time when it first began to grow out of Diocletian's perimeter, and this was primarily reflected in its westward expansion, so that the city doubled its area by the end of the thirteenth century. The expansion of its limits meant the construction of new protective walls around the new developments outside of the Palace, which Rapanić describes in detail and analyzes based on the stages of their construction. He does not neglect mentioning the development of the new main streets in the city as well as the formation of the new city centre: St. Lawrence's Square (present-day *Narodni trg* – National or People's Square). This public space in the town was formed in front of the western gate of Diocletian's Palace (the so-called Iron Gate) and the secular municipal authorities moved there. At the same time the original urban nucleus, the Peristyle, remained the seat of only ecclesiastical authority, so Split was formed as a city with dual centres. Its expansion at that time provided an impetus for architectural activity which can be seen, even today, on the lay and sacral buildings bearing the features of the Romanesque and Gothic styles. This, as Rapanić says, created the city's *personality*, around which the usual myths and legends could be woven, which the mediaeval citizens employed to incorporate an awareness of their city's illustrious origins into their collective memory.

Although Split (like other Dalmatian towns) endured periods during the High Middle Ages when several political factions confronted each other in an attempt to exert their control over it, the city nonetheless achieved great economic progress in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, which led to the formation of an independent commune: *civitas Spaleti*. The new circumstances brought about the growth of trade and crafts and the conclusion of agreements on co-operation with other cities in both neighbouring and more distant regions. This required more efficient organization of communal authority than what had existed up to that point, and, in legal terms, it was, above all, reflected in the governance of the urban community. The new method of governance required a mayor who would administer the city for the common good of all citizens and it could be only a person who would do so professionally, as a salaried civil servant. So in the late 1330s, Split became a commune: a community of citizens, in which all activities are conducted in harmony to the benefit of all citizens. Authority was then placed into the hands of its officials (civil servants), no longer to be held by princes largely imposed by the Croatian magnates who held the lands in the city's broader hinterland.

raspravljane problematike, obogaćena zanimljivim osobnim teorijama i viđenjima pojedinih problema. Pisana je jednostavnim, nadasve razumljivim stilom i na suvremen način, a obogaćena je i svježim idejama, što je promovira u nezaobilazno štivo za svakoga čiji je interes usmjeren k spoznavanju nastanka i razvoja srednjovjekovnih gradskih središta na istočnoj obali Jadrana.

As a symbol of the new urban authority, the author logically emphasized the first professional mayor (podestà), who was brought by the citizens of Split all the way from Ancona, and whose name was Gargan de Arcindis. He is later mentioned as the person who organized the communal authority very successfully "in the manner of Italian cities", appointing the city's bureaucracy (judges, treasurers and heralds). Proof of the proper functioning of the city's government can be found in the work of Thomas the Archdeacon (a contemporary), who testified that the city's Grand Council (*universale consilium*) prolonged Mayor Gargan's term in office and increased his salary, evidently as acknowledgement of a job well done. Gargan is also credited with publishing of the first statute of the city of Split, the so-called *Capitulary* of Gargan, in the mid-thirteenth century, although the first preserved statute of the city of Split dates to 1312. Given these latter aspects, it is quite clear why Rapanić decided to conclude his book with Mayor Gargan's era, considering that it was one of the most important and productive periods in Split's very rich history, in which that city approached the sublime principle of the so-called *civitas felix* – the happy city.

Rapanić's view of the development of the mediaeval city of Split represents a synthesis of his many years of study of all of the topics mentioned above, which is enriched by his interesting personal views and theories thereof. The prose-style is simple, clear and contemporary. It is enriched with new ideas, making it essential reading for anybody interested in understanding the establishment and development of mediaeval cities in the Eastern Adriatic seaboard.

Translated by Matilda Vuletić