

# Još jedanput o Dioklecijanovom portretu

## Once more about Diocletian's portrait

Nenad Cambi  
Zoranićeva 4  
HR - 21000 Split  
nenad.cambj@gmail.com

UDK: 7.041.5:Dioklecijan,Gaj Aurelije Valerije "245/316"  
7.032(37):7.041:743Dioklecijan

Izvorni znanstveni članak / Original scientific paper  
Primljeno / Received: 21. 1. 2023.  
Prihvaćeno / Accepted: 31. 7. 2023.

Ova kratka studija još se jedanput navraća na Dioklecijanov portret, odnosno na to kako je izgledao njegov realni lik. Autor je o tome već pisao i utvrdio koji bi likovi na carevim zlatnicima mogli odgovarati njegovoj fizionomiji. Među inima je u tu skupinu uvrstio i izvanredni zlatni novac iz Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu. Naknadnim proučavanjem tog profila uočio je da potonji pokazuje neke staračke karakteristike kao što su opuštanje kože na vratu, podočnjaci, upali obrazi i dr. Riječ je o istom liku samo u nešto podmaklom životnom razdoblju. S obzirom da je prema autorima spomenuti novac kovan 286., dakle samo dvije godine nakon uspona na vlast, izgled se u tom razdoblju nije mogao mnogo izmijeniti. Zaključak bi bio: ili je ista ali mlađa fizionomija uljepšana (pomlađena) ili bi datacija zagrebačkog novca morala biti poznija.

**Ključne riječi:** *Dioklecijanov realni izgled.*

This brief study once more considers Diocletian's portrait, i.e., the question of his true appearance. The author has already written about this topic and ascertained which images on the emperor's gold coins may have corresponded to his actual appearance. The extraordinary gold coin from the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, among others, has been categorized in this group. A re-examination of this profile has ascertained that the latter exhibits certain features of ageing, such as loose neck skin, bags under the eyes, sunken cheeks, etc. This is the same person, only at a somewhat more advanced age. Given that the author asserts that this coin was minted in 286 AD, therefore two years after assuming power, his appearance in that period could not have been greatly altered. The conclusion would be that either the same or more youthful appearance was modified (de-aged) or the dating of the Zagreb coin should be set later.

**Key words:** *Diocletian's true appearance.*



U studiji o Dioklecijanovom portretu predložio sam da realistički portret na zlatnom novcu, izrađen u tradiciji plastičke druge polovice 3. st. doista predstavlja carev stvarni izgled.<sup>1</sup> Pretpostavio sam da je uzorak nastao na temelju njegovih službenih bista ili kipova o kojima, nažalost, znamo malo ili ništa. Taj portret na novcu nudi realno-fizionomijski izgled u profilnoj vizuri, a zastupljen je najčešće u nikomedijskim i antiohijskim kovnicama, bez obzira što se i u istim oficinama miješa s tipološki posve nereálnim i prekrupnim glavama koje zauzimaju čitavu slobodnu površinu aversa.<sup>2</sup> Razlike su posljedica stilskih promjena koje se događaju upravo u to doba.

Gornje razmišljanje oslanja se na Malalin opis Dioklecijanova lika koji glasi: „(...) ἦν δὲ μακρὸς λεπτός ξήροψις ὀλόπολιος τὴν κάραν καὶ τὸ γένειον λευκὸς τῷ σώματι γλαυκὸς παχύριος υπόκυρτος.“, a ovaj (Dioklecijan, op. N. C.) bijaše visok, malo pognut, nježan, mršava lica, njegova brada, brci i kosa bili su bijeli (valjda sijedi, op. N. C.). Njegova put bila je blijeda, oči plave, a nos velik. Malalini opisi drugih careva često nisu dovoljno vjerodostojni jer je u njih uvrštavao sve ono do čega bi došao bez temeljitije redakcije izvora. Dakako da te nedosljednosti nije lako uskladiti. Međutim, unatoč vremenskoj distanci između tetrarhijskog cara i biskupa povjesničara, ovakav opis sadrži konkretna i jasno realna obilježja lika, pa čak i boje, što ulijeva povjerenje za prosudbu o autentičnosti, za razliku od opisa Kara, jednog od Dioklecijanovih prethodnika. Na novcima realističke orijentacije Kar je ćelav na tjemenu, a Malala to ne spominje, nego se zadovoljava sa samo nekoliko uopćenih konstatacija (Malalas XII, 202-217.). Stoga se nameće zaključak da je Dioklecijanov opis preuzet iz nekog starijeg, ali vjerodostojnijeg izvora, od, recimo, Karovog.

Da je navedeni tip Dioklecijanova novca dosta realan, a to znači da je izrađen na temelju kiparskih uzora s takvim obilježjima, neka posluže i ova neznatno produbljena razmatranja koja nisu bila uključena u studiju o Dioklecijanovom portretu. Dakle, za proučavanje u obzir dolaze samo one glave na novcu koje posjeduju realističko-fizionomijske karakteristike, a koje imaju dodirne točke sa spomenutim Malalnim opisom. Zašto se izgled lika mijenja toliko da varira između onih koji su realni i onih koji nemaju takvih karakteristika nije lako odgovoriti, ali to je pitanje o kojemu ovdje neće biti riječi. Isto tako, riječi neće biti ni o onim glavama koje pokazuju miješane karakteristike drugih tetrarha, koje time pokazuju tobožnju međusobnu proklamiranu sličnost vladara i u vizualnom pogledu (*similitudo*). Neće biti ozbiljnije rasprave ni o onima koje su jako shematične i koje su pogubile vezu s realnošću jer su jedne i druge stoga neupotrebljive za neku temeljitiju analizu u smislu fizionomijske rekonstrukcije.

Svrha ovog rada je malo produbljena analiza realnog obli-

In my study on Diocletian's portrait, I proposed that the realistic portrayal on a gold coin, rendered in the tradition of sculpture in the latter half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, reflects the emperor's genuine appearance.<sup>1</sup> I assumed that it had been modelled after his official busts or statues, about which, unfortunately, we know little or nothing. This portrait on the coin offers a realistic physical countenance in profile, and it is most often present on Nicomedian and Antiochian coins, regardless of the fact that in the same officinae it was intermingled with typologically entirely unrealistic and out-sized heads that occupied the entire free surface of the obverse sides of coins.<sup>2</sup> The differences were the result of stylistic changes that occurred precisely during that period.

The above view rests on the description of Diocletian's image by Malalas, which reads: “(...) ἦν δὲ μακρὸς λεπτός ξήροψις ὀλόπολιος τὴν κάραν καὶ τὸ γένειον λευκὸς τῷ σώματι γλαυκὸς παχύριος υπόκυρτος,” i.e., “(...) and this one (Diocletian – *author's note*) was tall, slightly bent, with a gentle, thin face, his beard, moustache and hair were white (probably grey – *author's note*). His complexion was pale, his eyes blue, his nose large.” The descriptions Malalas wrote about other emperors are often not sufficiently credible, because he included anything he could find in them without carefully vetting the sources. To be sure, such inconsistencies are not easy to align. However, despite the chronological distance between the tetrarchic emperor and the historian bishop, such a description contains specific and clearly realistic facial features, and even colours, which raises confidence in an assessment of its authenticity, in contrast to the description of Carus, one of Diocletian's predecessors. On coins bearing realistic portraits, Carus is depicted with a balding pate, which Malalas failed to mention, rather he was satisfied with just a few generalized assertions (Malalas XII, 202-217). This imposes the conclusion that Diocletian's description was taken from some older, but credible source, than that of, say, Carus.

If the aforementioned issue of Diocletian's coin bears a realistic image and this would mean that it was based on sculptural models with those features, then let it serve to back these negligibly more extensive considerations which were not incorporated into the study on Diocletian's portrait. Thus, only those images on coins that possess realistic physical features and have points in common with the aforementioned description by Malalas can be taken into consideration for study. Why the figure's appearance changes so much that it varies from those that are realistic to those that lack those qualities has no simple answer, but this is a question that will not be examined herein. By the same token, those portraits which exhibit the intermingled features of the other tetrarchs, there-

1 Cambi 2017, str. 49-63, sl. 53.

2 RIC VI. 1967, 554, 11; L'Orange 1984, T. 64.

1 Cambi 2017, pp. 49-63, Fig. 53.

2 RIC VI. 1967, 554, 11; L'Orange 1984, Pl. 64.

ka careve glave. Naime, one glave koje posjeduju izrazite podudarnosti pokazuju neke međusobne srodnosti, a njihove razlike ipak nisu bitnog fizionomijskog karaktera. Sve one koje nose realna obilježja kristalno jasno pokazuju da se odnose na istu osobu. No, bez obzira na identičnost osobe, kao i na njihovu kronologiju, uspoređujući malo povećane slike takvih zlatnika, uočavaju se i neke razlike koje treba objasniti. Najljepši i najkvalitetniji primjerci antiohijskih kovnica pokazuju čovjeka zrele dobi, ali još uvijek dovoljno mladog, bez bora, nategnute epiderme, punih usana, podužeg i lagano zakrivljenog nosa, dosta otvorenih očiju bez podočnjaka; starijih crta još nema. Ako je to doista prikaz dalmatinskog cara, tada bi to bio njegov izgled sa samog početka vladavine, u doba njegove pune vitalne zrelosti, moglo bi se čak kazati i muškaračke ljepote. To je bilo doba kad je vladar intenzivno radio na učvršćenju svoje vlasti, na oporavku i obnovi poljuljane i uzdrmane moći Rimskog Carstva. Poznato je da se domogao vlasti pri kraju 284. godine na sjednici vojnog vrha u Nikomediji, na povratku s istočne vojne i nakon nasilne smrti prethodnika mu Numerijana. Kad je i gdje rođen nije pouzdano utvrđeno. Podrijetlom je *Dalmata*, a preciznija lokacija je po svoj prilici *Docleja*, tada u rimskoj provinciji *Dalmaciji*.<sup>3</sup> Obično se drži da je rođen između 245. i 250. godine, što bi značilo da je u doba uspona na vlast imao četrdesetak godina.<sup>4</sup> Ako je glava na tom zlatniku malo i uljepšana, ona bi približno odgovarala godinama kad je došao do vlasti (sl. 1). Bez obzira na kronologiju novca, model je vjerojatno izrađen upravo u vrijeme malo nakon uspješnog uspona na tron, a u tradiciji portretistike druge polovice 3. st. Po svojoj prilici kip (predložak) nije bio izrađen povodom nekog važnog događaja, kao što je to često bio slučaj,<sup>5</sup> već je izabran za matricu jer je bio najrealniji.

Međutim, kada se taj „mladahn“ lik usporedi s onim koji se također javlja na nekim novcima antiohijske kovnice (jedan od najljepših je zlatnik iz Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu), tada se jasno može utvrditi da jedan i drugi prikazuju istu osobu, što pokazuju uistinu slični fizionomijski detalji (sl. 2). Taj ga novac ipak predstavlja kao već prilično ostarjelog čovjeka.<sup>6</sup> Zapažaju se, naime, promjene koje se mogu protumačiti protokom godina tijekom ljudskog života. Koje su to promjene? Prije svega, oko očiju se zapažaju jaki podočnjaci te su oči zbog toga smanjene. Labionazalne bore su dublje, lice je mršavije, jagodične kosti istaknutije, dok se na čelu zapažaju dva jako plastično naznačena nabora. Posebno važan detalj su dvije višće kožne ovjese koje se nedvojbeno ukazuju na zagrebačkom primjerku. Osim navedenih razlika, sve je ostalo identično i nema nikakve dvojbe da oba lika prikazuju istog čovjeka samo

by demonstrating the proclaimed alleged mutually similarity between the rulers even in the visual sense (*similitudo*) will similarly not be considered herein. There will also be no serious discussion of those that are rather vague and which have lost their link to reality, because both are therefore unusable for any more thorough analysis in the sense of physical reconstruction.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a slightly deeper analysis of the actual contours of the emperor's face and head. Namely, those portraits that have notable congruencies exhibit certain mutual similarities, and their differences do not pertain to the essential physical character. All of those that bear realistic features quite clearly show that they depict the same individual. However, regardless of the identical nature of the persons as well as their chronology, when comparing enlarged pictures of such gold coins, certain differences may be observed which should be explained. The loveliest and highest-quality examples from the Antiochian mint show a man in advanced years, but still sufficiently young, with uncreased, smooth skin, full lips, a long and slightly bent nose, rather wide open eyes with no bags below them, and still lacking elderly contours. If this is truly a depiction of the Dalmatian emperor, then that would have been his appearance at the very beginning of his reign, at the time of his full vital maturity and, one could even say, masculine beauty. This was the period when the ruler was engaged in intense efforts to reinforce his authority and secure the recovery and restoration of the Roman Empire's disrupted and shaken might. It is known that he attained power at the end of 284 AD at a council of the top military leadership in Nicomedia upon his return from an eastern campaign and after the violent death of his predecessor Numerian. When he was born has not been reliably determined. He was a *Dalmata* by origin, and the location of his place of birth was likely *Doclea*, then in the Roman province of *Dalmatia*.<sup>3</sup> It is generally maintained that he was born between 245 and 250 AD, which means that he would have been roughly forty years of age at the time when he ascended to the throne.<sup>4</sup> Even if the image on that gold coin had been touched up, it would correspond to the age at which he assumed authority (Fig. 1). Regardless of the coin's chronology, the model was probably made at the time just after his ascent to power, in the portraiture tradition of the latter half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. The statue (model) was likely not made for some important event, which was often the case otherwise,<sup>5</sup> rather it was selected as a model because it was the most realistic.

However, when this “youthful” figure is compared to

3 Cambi 2016, str. 27-30.

4 Kienast 1996<sup>2</sup>, str. 266.

5 Takvi značajni događaji su uspon na tron, proslava jubileja vladanja (*decennalia*, *vicennalia* i sl.), pobjeda, rođenja djece i sl.

6 Cambi 2017, str. 51, sl. 48 i 49.

3 Cambi 2016, pp. 27-30.

4 Kienast 1996<sup>2</sup>, p. 266.

5 Such major events were ascent to the throne, celebrations of jubilees of rule (*decennalia*, *vicennalia*, etc.), military triumphs, births of children, etc.



Slika 1.  
Novac Dioklecijana,  
antiohijska kovnica

Figure 1  
Diocletian's coin,  
an Antiochian mint



Slika 2.  
Zlatnik Dioklecijana u  
Arheološkom muzeju u  
Zagrebu

Figure 2  
Diocletian's coin at the  
Archaeological Museum in  
Zagreb

u različitim životnim razdobljima. Reklo bi se da između tih dvaju prikaza leži približno više od desetljetnog vremenskog odmaka. Budući da je kosa prikazana na jednak način, očito je da se nije prorijedila, a čak je i oblik frizure isti. U dvadesetak godina osnovne karakteristike ostale se iste, a znaci starenja registrirani su na profilu. Kako prikaz nije u „boji“, nema sjedina koje navodi Malala, a ne vide se ni plave oči, kao ni blijeđa put. Ova zapažanja upozoravala bi da je matrica nastala po realnom predlošku. Novci bi, po svoj prilici, pripadali dvama carevim likovima izrađenim na početku i pri kraju careve vladavine. Prvi lik odgovarao bi čovjeku od četrdesetak godina, a drugi čovjeku u kasnim pedesetim godina. Za Carstvo je to razdoblje velikih napora i tenzija, što je neminovno moralo ostaviti znatnog traga na licu vladara koji je uložio golem napor da održi stabilnost rimske države i vlasti u okvirima izvorne rimske tradicije.

Zaključak bi bio da, unatoč svim mogućim stilskim i ideološkim promjenama, realistički pogled na čovjeka nije posve izostao i da je tinjao u umjetničkim radionicama i u vrijeme znatnih umjetničkih promjena u smjeru fizionomijske transcendencije. Nisu se, naime, radili samo aulički kipovi, nego i smiješne figure bez imalo realizma, kao što je bila tzv. Vatikanska skupina iz Vatikanske biblioteke.<sup>7</sup> Ti realistički likovi na novcu nastajali su na temelju, nažalost, nedostajućih predložaka, tako da kronologija kovanja nema neku važniju ulogu kod prvog uzorka, a neki mogući uzorak mogao je bilo kada poslužiti za matricu novca.

Što se pak drugog, „ostarjelog“ tipa vladareva portreta tiče, kronologija je znatno važnija i pomalo zbunjujuća jer stariji

those that also appear on certain coins from the Antiochian mint (one of the finest examples is the gold coin from the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb), then one may clearly state that both depict the same person, which is indicated by certain truly similar physical details (Fig. 2). This coin nonetheless presents him as an already rather aged man.<sup>6</sup> Changes that may be interpreted by the passage of years during a human life may be noted. Which changes? Above all, prominent bags under the eyes can be seen, so that the eyes themselves are smaller as a result. The labionasal folds are deeper, the face is thinner, the cheek bones are more prominent, while two very sculpturally rendered creases can be seen on the forehead. A particularly important detail consists of the two sagging jowls which are undoubtedly indicated on the Zagreb example. Besides these differences, everything else is identical and there can be no doubt that both images depict the same man at different points in his life. One could estimate that roughly more than a decade had passed between these two depictions. Since the hair is portrayed in the same way, it apparent that it had not thinned, and it is even styled in the same manner. Over approximately twenty years, the basic features have remained the same, while signs of ageing have been registered in the profile. Since the portrayal is not in “colour”, the observer cannot see any greying as asserted by Malalas, nor the blue eyes or pale complexion. These observations indicate that the matrix was made on the basis of a realistic model. The coins likely feature two images of the emperor made at the beginning and then near the end of his reign. The first figure would correspond to a man of roughly forty years of age, and the second

7 L' Orange 1984, str. 99, T. 5a, b.

6 Cambi 2017, p. 51, Fig. 48 and 49.

izraz nije mogao nastati prije mlađeg. Zagrebački novac autori približno datiraju u doba kada Dioklecijan ima pedesetak godina (oko 286.), no čini se da bi to teško odgovaralo stanju njegove fizionomije. Za razrješenje enigme stoga ostaju dvije mogućnosti.<sup>8</sup> Prva bi bila da je mladi, kizičko-antiohijski tip, unatoč težnji za realnošću, ipak bio dotjeran, tako da su izostavljene staračke pojedinosti, dok se na drugom primjerku to nije dogodilo. Druga mogućnost bila bi da je drugi tip, koji nam prikazuje zagrebački zlatnik, doista odgovarao realnim godinama života i da je nastao petnaestak godina kasnije od prvog. Teško se odlučiti za neku od te dvije mogućnosti jer nisam dovoljno upućen u kronologiju Dioklecijanova novca. Ono što se smije kazati je da ova dva fizionomijska tipa prikazuju istog čovjeka na nešto različit način, pri čemu na „zagrebačkom“ prevladavaju starije crte lica u odnosu na prvi primjerak.

Jedan od onih momenata koji se događao veoma brzo nakon raspada tetrahije je temeljito odstranjivanje javnih tetrahijskih spomenika zbog čega su skulpturalni uzorci za matrice nažalost nestali, a izgledi da se nekima ipak uđe u trag tek su mali ili nikakvi. U slučaju ranijih vladara (sve do ranog 3. st.) taj se korelacijski odnos može utvrditi. Na tetrahijskim novcima teško je otkrivati karakteristike realnog obličja, ali se težnja prema sličnosti zapaža i ponekad ipak dade otkriti. Karikaturalnost je ipak, i lošim primjerima, uspješno polučivala propagandnu poruku. U tetrahijsko doba potreba za brzom dostavom novca vojsci i njezinoj logistici odigrala je ulogu u estetskoj destrukciji kovničkih matrica.

S druge strane, štovanje tetrahijskih vladara živjelo je i u primitivnom obliku (sl. 3-5),<sup>9</sup> tipičan primjer čega je herma iz okolice Jelse na Hvaru na kojoj su dvije glave povezane na zatiljku. One su tipična bezvremena, rustična „kreacija“ folklornog karaktera. Međutim, tip herme je antički te nestaje tijekom kasne antike. Treba pretpostaviti da je postojala još jedna koja je prikazivala cijelu tetrahijsku cjelinu, ali se nije očuvala. Nije to bio slučaj primitivnih kreacija samo u doba tetrahije nego i mnogo ranije. Obični ljudi nisu se stidjeli svojih „kreacija“ koje su bile gotovo pa nakazne, ali su odražavale privrženost rimskoj državi i aktualnim carevima.<sup>10</sup> Nije se poštovao

to man in his late fifties. This was a period of great turmoil and tension in the Empire, which inevitably had to have taken a considerable toll on the face of the ruler who invested enormous efforts to retain the Roman state's stability and authority within the framework of genuine Roman tradition.

The conclusion would be that, despite all potential stylistic and ideological changes, the realistic view of the man was not entirely absent and it was nurtured in artistic workshops even in times of significant artistic changes in the direction of physical transcendence. Namely, not only aulic statues were made, for comical figures without a trace of realism were also produced, such as the so-called Vatican Group from the Vatican Library.<sup>7</sup> These realistic images on coins were created on the basis of, unfortunately, missing models, so that the chronology of their minting plays no major role for the first sample, but there may have been some sample that served as the matrix for the coin.

As to the other, “aged” type of the ruler's portrait, the chronology is considerably more important and somewhat puzzling, because the older physical appearance could not have appeared before the younger. Scholars have approximately dated the Zagreb coin to the period when Diocletian was roughly fifty years of age (ca. 286 AD), but it would appear that this could hardly correspond to the state of his actual physical appearance. Two possibilities thus remain to solve this enigma.<sup>8</sup> The first would be that the younger, Cyzico-Antiochian type, despite an aspiration to realism, was nonetheless retouched, so that any details indicating advanced age were left out, while this did not happen in the second example. The other possibility is that the second type, which is depicted on the Zagreb gold coin, truly corresponded to the emperor's actual age and was made roughly fifteen years after the first one. It is difficult to make a choice between these two options, because I am not well-versed in the chronology of Diocletian's coins. What may be said is that these two physical types depict the same man in a somewhat different manner, wherein older facial contours prevail on the “Zagreb” type, in contrast to the first example.

One of the events that occurred rather quickly after the collapse of the tetrarchy was the removal of public tetrarchic monuments, which is why the sculptural models on matrices were, unfortunately, lost, and the prospects of tracking any of them down are meagre to non-existent. In the case of earlier rulers (until the early 3<sup>rd</sup> century), this correlation may be ascertained. It is difficult to detect the traits of realistic features on tetrarchic coins, but the aspiration to similarity may be observed and sometimes reveals itself. Caricatural portray-

8 Dukat, Mirnik 1989, str. 77-90. Autori smatraju da je novac kovan oko 286. godine. Za ostarjeli izgled bilo bi ponešto rano.

9 Cambi 2017, str. 87, sl. 98-100.

10 Jedan opis donosi jednu takvu sliku kod Marka Kornelija Fronta (*Epistulae ad Marcum Caesarem* 4, 12, 4): *scis, ut in omnibus argentariis mensulis perguleis taberneis protecteis vestilibus fenestris usquequaque, ubique imagines vestrae sint volgo propositae, male illae quidem pictae pleraeque et crassa, lutea immo Minervae fictae scalptaeque: cum interrim numquam tua imago tam dissimilis ad oculos meos in itinere accidit, ut non ex ore mea excusserit jactum osculei et savium* (znaš li (Cezaru Marko, op. N. C.) da su na stolovima kod svih mjenjača novca, u svim radnjama i tabernama, pod nadstrešnicama trijemova, na stolovima i prozorima te posvuda drugdje javno izloženi tvoji portreti, ponajčešće loše oslikani, kao i gadna od gline oblikovana Minerva; kad se, međutim, putom pred mojim očima ukaže tvoj toliko razli-

7 L'Orange 1984, p. 99, Pl. 5a, b.

8 Dukat, Mirnik 1989, pp. 77-90. Scholars believe that the coin was minted in ca. 286 AD. This would have been somewhat early for an elderly appearance.



Slika 3, 4, 5.  
Herma Dešković, Jelsa



Figure 3, 4, 5  
Dešković's herma, Jelsa

izgled vladara, iako se to u ambicioznijim pokušajima ipak radilo. Takav je respektabilan primjer u tondu na tzv. Malom slavlolu u Solunu gdje se lik Galerija, surovog i gojaznog vladara, fizionomijski lako raspoznaje i ne može pomiješati s nekim drugim (sl. 6).<sup>11</sup> Naprotiv, na novcu su tetrarsi u mnogočemu izjednačavani jedni s drugima, pa čak i s Dioklecijanom s kojim fizionomijski očito nisu imali nikakve veze. Mnogo pažnje nije se čak pridavalo ni liku Dioklecijana u njegovom mauzoleju u Splitu (sl. 7).<sup>12</sup> Stilske tendencije okrupnjavanja i pogrubljivanja izraza našle su svoje mjesto i nitko za to nije mario. Kriteriji umjetničke vrijednosti očito su se poremetili. Uostalom, to nije službena nego sepulkralna slika koja je imala manje važnu ulogu u svojoj službenoj poruci. Dioklecijanov reljef je tim izrazitije pojednostavnjen jer je smješten u frizu visoko pod kupolom građevine.

als, even poor examples, nonetheless successfully conveyed a propagandistic message. The need for rapid delivery of money to the army and its logistics during the tetrarchy played a role in the aesthetic destruction of minting matrices.

On the other hand, reverence for the tetrarchy's rulers lived in primitive form (Fig. 3-5),<sup>9</sup> of which a typical example is the herma from the vicinity of Jelsa on the island of Hvar, on which two heads are connected at the occiput. They are typically timeless, rustic "creations" with a folkloric character. However, the herma type was a feature of Classical Antiquity that disappeared during Late Antiquity. One may presume that there was another one that portrayed the entire tetrarchy, but it has not been preserved. This was not solely the case of primitive creations in the tetrarchic era but also much earlier. Ordinary people were not ashamed of their "creations," which were virtually grotesque, but they reflected the affinity for the Roman state and the current emperors.<sup>10</sup> The ruler's appear-

čit lik, moja usta ne mogu odoljeti, a da ti ne pošalju cjelov). Frontonova slika vrlo je realan odraz stanja među primitivnim svijetom i grožnja intelektualca nad činjenicom, ali je u isto doba i primitivno dodvoravanje caru. On ne govori o susretu s carem na cesti ili u javnosti nego o njegovim likovima različitog karaktera u raznim ambijentima.

11 Stefanidou Tveriou 1995, T. 1, 3, 5.

12 Cambi 2017, str. 72, sl. 64. Golema je literatura napisana o ovom portretu.

9 Cambi 2017, p. 87, Fig. 98-100.

10 Marcus Cornelius Fronto provided a description for such a picture (Epistulae ad Marcum Caesarem 4, 12, 4): "scis, ut in omnibus argentariis mensulis perguleis taberneis protecteis vestibibus fenestris usquequaque, ubique imagines vestrae sint volgo propositae, male illae quidem pictae pleraeque et crassa, lutea immo Minervae fictae scalpatae: cum interim numquam tua imago tam dissimilis ad oculos meos



Slika 6.  
Tondo s glavom Galerija u  
Malom slavoluku u Solunu

Figure 6  
Tondo with Galerius's  
portrait on the Arch of  
Galerius in Thessaloniki

ance was not respected, even though this was done in more ambitious attempts. A respectable example thereof is in the tondo on the Arch of Galerius in Thessaloniki, in which the

---

*in itinere accidit, ut non ex ore mea excusserit jactum osculei et savi-um* "(...) You [Marcus Caesar – *author's note*] know how in all money-changer's bureaus, booths, bookstalls, eaves, porches, windows, anywhere and everywhere there are likenesses of you exposed to view, badly enough painted most of them to be sure, and modelled or carved in a plain, not to say sorry, style of art, like some poorly formed Minerva made of clay, yet at the same time your likeness, however much a caricature, never when I go out meets my eyes without making me part my lips for a smile and dream of you"). Fronto's description is a rather realistic reflection of the situation among the 'primitive masses' and the distaste of intellectuals over that fact, but at the same time is itself an instance of 'primitive' adoration of the emperor. He was not speaking of an encounter with the emperor in the street or in public but rather about his portrayals of varying character in different settings.



Slika 7.  
Tondo s poprsjem Dioklecijana u Mauzoleju Dioklecijanove palače  
u Splitu

Figure 7  
Tondo with the bust of Diocletian in the Mausoleum of  
Diocletian's Palace in Split

image of Galerius, a coarse and corpulent ruler, is easily recognized and cannot be mistaken for any of the others (Fig. 6).<sup>11</sup> By contrast, the tetrarchs are in many ways equated on coins, even with Diocletian, with whom they obviously had nothing in common. Not much attention has been accorded to the image of Diocletian in his mausoleum in Split (Fig. 7).<sup>12</sup> The stylistic tendencies of enlarging and coarsening portrayals found their place and nobody was concerned with this. The criteria of artistic value had obviously been disrupted. This was, after all, not an official but rather sepulchral image which had a lesser role in its formal message. Diocletian's relief is thereby even more notably simplified because it is situated in a frieze high above under the building's dome.

It bears emphasis that when examining numismatic materials, greater attention must in fact be accorded to a portrait or some other depiction (deity or personification), and not only to the legend and obverse. A coin is an exceptional iconographic source for research into Classical and other art.

---

<sup>11</sup> Stefanidou Tveriou 1995, Pl. 1, 3, 5.

<sup>12</sup> Cambi 2017, p. 72, Fig. 64. There is an enormous body of literature on this portrait.

## Literatura / Bibliography

### Cambi 2016

N. Cambi, *Dioklecijan, vir prudens, moratus callide et subtilis ili inventor scelerum et machinator omnium malorum. Povijesne kontroverze i današnje dileme*, Split 2016.

### Cambi 2017

N. Cambi, *Dioklecijanov lik između realnosti i transcencencije. Artistički, ikonografski i sociološki aspekti*, Split 2017.

### Dukat, Mirnik 1989

Z. Dukat, I. Mirnik, *Nekoliko značajnih kovova I. Tetrarhije*, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, br. 3. ser., 22, Zagreb 1989, 77-90.

### Kienast 1996<sup>2</sup>

D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1996<sup>2</sup>.

### L' Orange 1984

H. P. L' Orange, *Das spätantike Herrscherbild von Diokletian bis zu den Konstantin-Söhnen 284 - 361 n. Chr. Mit einem Nachtrag von Max Wegner. Die Bildnisse der Frauen und des Julian*, Berlin 1984.

### RIC VI. 1967

*Roman Imperial Coinage: The Diocletian Reform - Maximinus II (294 - 313)*, C. H. V. Sutherland (ed.), London 1967.

### Stefanidou Tveriou 1995

Th. Stefanidou Tveriou, *ΤΟ ΜΚΡΟ ΤΟΞΟ ΤΟΥ ΓΑΛΕΡΙΟΥ ΣΤΗ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ*, Athinai 1995.