ISSUES OF PLANNING IN DIOCLETIAN'S PALACE AT SPLIT:

IMPERIAL CULT AND THE LATE ANTIQUE PALACE

SARAH C. SPANGENBERG

ROGER B. ULRICH, Ph.D., ADVISOR
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

HANOVER, NH

MAY 2011

This thesis examines the plan and construction of Diocletian's residence at Split, where he retired after his abdication in 305 CE. I undertook this project intending to focus on Diocletian's inclusion of his own mausoleum inside the walls of his palace, which was unprecedented and copied in later late antique palaces such as those of Galerius in Thessaloniki (305-311 CE) and Maxentius in Rome (307-312 CE). The form of his mausoleum also influenced early Christian mausolea, such as that of Santa Costanza in Rome, which Constantine built for his daughter between 355 and 360 CE. It was with this focus that I traveled to Split and Thessaloniki in August 2010 with assistance from the Lester Reid '56 Academic Enrichment Fund and The Matthew Wiencke Research Fund. This trip was crucial to my understanding of the site at Split, as the majority of the images used in my description of the palace are my own photographs from the site.

My visits to both Diocletian's palace and Galerius' complex at Thessaloniki also raised the planning issues that eventually turned into the focus of my project. Though Galerius' palace has had only limited excavations, the importance of the axial approach to the rotunda along the causeway spanned by his triumphal arch remains evident. However, the incomplete excavations and largely Greek published material on Galerius' palace quickly proved to be limiting academically. But the importance of axiality in palace design was even clearer at Diocletian's residence at Split, which remains well preserved because of its incorporation into the historic city center even today. Though medieval and Renaissance structures have obscured much of the palace's original plan, the central core of the palace remains intact.

The incorporation of Diocletian's mausoleum and temple of Jupiter in the central area of his palace is unprecedented in imperial residence planning, which begged the question of what

models he might have used to create his palace plan. Much of the published literature focuses on the form of his mausoleum or the inclusion of a mausoleum as a typical feature of other late antique palaces, but little scholarship has been done on what might have influenced the design of Diocletian's palace itself. I began by trying to find comparable decorative molding styles, which might give insight into what structures may have inspired the architecture of the palace. I found very similar examples in late 2nd century CE buildings of south central Anatolia. In addition to this similarity in decoration, the use of the Syrian arch, which was incorporated into the central courtyard's porch facade at Split, in temple facades throughout this region pointed my research farther east. However, because decorative schemes varied throughout the palace, I proposed that Diocletian's focus had been on models for the large-scale organization of the palace rather than specific decorative styles; the similarity with the moldings from southern Asia Minor was likely due to the importation of workers from this area.

Several notable elements of the palace plan emerged as candidates for further research into their architectural pedigrees: the use of arcuated colonnades to divide the mausoleum and temple precincts, the orthogonal main streets, and the porch facade and Syrian arch of the central courtyard. The colonnaded street has long been associated with Syrian urban planning, which uses arterial colonnaded streets to link otherwise disparate elements. At Split, the colonnades divide the mausoleum and temple precincts. However, they also house entrances to these precincts through lintel doorways in the intercolumniations, so that the two structures are linked along the secondary cross-axis. This axial alignment is evocative of Egyptian tomb and temple complexes.

Secondly, the orthogonal palace plan is typical of Roman military fortifications, in which two orthogonal streets lead to a central administrative center, the *principia*. In the *principia* is

the so-called "Temple of the Standards" (*aedes principiorum*) that was associated with imperial cult. The presence of the Syrian arch in the porch facade at the end of the *cardo* at Split provides a solid parallel. The Syrian arch's typical use in temple facades meant that Diocletian may have been replacing the *aedes* of the Roman *castrum* with a porch facade meant to imitate a temple complex, such as the propylaea facade of the Sanctuary of Jupiter Heliopolis at Baalbek. Additionally, the presence of a protruding speaker's platform on the porch evoked the traditional usage of the rostrate temple facade for public appearances. Rather than having his central street culminate in a chamber dedicated to imperial cult, Diocletian made a space for himself to be honored in the flesh.

Limited literary sources prevent us from knowing how Diocletian's palace was or would have been received at the time of his abdication. However, the colonnades that divide the mausoleum and temple precincts seem to have been a late modification to the plan. At the junction of the colonnades and porch of the central courtyard, the drastically different cornice moldings of the two elements do not fit together continuously but rather collide awkwardly. This suggests that the colonnades might not have been original to the plan, and Diocletian added them in order to prevent the axiality of the mausoleum and temple from causing public disapproval. Moreover, the only prior use of arcuated colonnades in an imperial structure was in the Severan Forum at Lepcis Magna; this direct quotation may have been Diocletian's attempt to associate himself with Severus, the last soldier-emperor with a reign of substantial length. The inclusion of the arcuated colonnade seems to be an obvious architectural reference to another site, but the other models I discuss are more problematic. How would Diocletian (or his architects) have been exposed to them, and why would he choose to include them in his palace, supposedly a residence for his retirement? Again, the literary sources are limited, but Diocletian's repression

of revolts in Egypt and the recent subjugation of Palmyra in Syria by Aurelian suggest that

Diocletian may have sought to incorporate architectural models from recently subdued provinces

into his palace as a symbol of the strength of his imperial legacy.

I. <u>Introduction and Description (pp. 6-22)</u>

Diocletian's retirement palace in Split, Croatia stands today as the most well preserved Roman imperial palace and an exemplar of late antique architecture. Built for use after Diocletian's abdication in 305 CE, the palace allowed the aging emperor to make his exit from Roman political life and return to his native Dalmatian coast. Split's Latin name, *Spalatum*, is known from the record of a textile factory at the site in the later 4th century after Diocletian's death.[1] Unlike earlier imperial country villas such as Tiberius' retreats on Capri (early 1st century CE), Domitian's villa at Castel Gandolfo (late 1st century CE), and Hadrian's residence in Tivoli (early 2nd century CE) that were designed to be private escapes from political life, Diocletian's palace incorporated public spaces into its architecture to allow the former emperor to continue an administrative role even in retirement.[2] The relationship between secular and religious buildings makes the claim of imperial divinity. The axial alignment of the emperor's mausoleum, now converted to the Cathedral of St. Dominic, on the eastern side of the residence with the temple of Jupiter on the western side created a striking visual connection between the two figures they honored and made recognition of the imperial and the divine of equal importance in the public eye.[3] Also, the incorporation of typically eastern building materials and

---

[1] Wilkes argues that the name of Split is a Latinization of the original name for the site, *Aspalathos* (after a shrub that grows in the area), and does not derive from the Latin *palatium*, as is commonly thought (Wilkes (1993) 17); Belamarić notes the mention of the "*Procurator gynaecii Iovensis Dalmatiae-Aspalato*" at *Notitia Dignitatum Occidensis* xi.48 (Belamarić 176)

[2] Williams 193

[3] We know that a monumental tomb for Diocletian existed from Ammianus Marcellinus' account of the theft of the purple cloth from the tomb (*Roman History* XVI.8, trans. Yonge). The octagonal structure at Split is identified as such because of the subfloor crypt (*hypogeum*) and the upper level frieze on the interior, which depicts hunting scenes and portraits of Diocletian and his wife Prisca, alternatively identified as Tyche (Marasović (1995) 107 and McNally (1996) 22). The tetrastyle temple in the western precinct is identified as the Temple of Jupiter (mentioned in the 1567 writing of the Chancellor of the Split Commune, Antonio Proculiano (Marasović (1995)

architectural features such as the use of the arcuated lintel lend an eastern style to the palace.

However, combining them with typically Roman elements such as a central peristyle courtyard

(Figure 1.1: 9), Italic temple (Figure 1.1: 8), arterial streets based on the *castrum* (Figure 1.1: 2

and 3), and space for public presentation of the emperor (Figure 1.1: 11) makes the entire

complex a hybrid of east and west – a reflection of the expanse of the empire.

The palace at Split combines attributes of imperial palaces, country villas, and the Roman

castrum (Figure 1.2). Defensive walls defined the palace on the east, north, and west sides of the

palace's nearly rectangular form, which sat on a block 215 m long and 180 m wide (Figure 1.1).[4]

The site slopes south toward the sea, so the asymmetry of the walls may have resulted from

topographical necessity. From the perspective of an individual in the palace, the orthogonal

street planning masks the asymmetry in the perimeter walls and makes the palace feel perfectly

rectangular. The palace was divided into four sections by a colonnaded *cardo* (Figure 1.1: 2) and

decumanus (Figure 1.1: 3) that extended from monumental gates in the centers of the east, north,

and west perimeter walls and intersected at the center of the palace. The plan of the area north of

the *decumanus* has not been conclusively determined because full excavations have not been

undertaken in this section of the palace due to modern buildings in use in the area; the northern

blocks are usually restored with two peristyle gardens on the eastern and western sides and a row

of *tabernae* along the perimeter walls. Just south of the intersection of the two main streets, a

monumental peristyle (Figure 1.1: 9) marked the entrance to the residential area of the palace and

gave access to Diocletian's mausoleum on the eastern side and a smaller Temple of Jupiter and

---

106). On the interior, a cornice runs around three walls with modillions carved with sheaves of
thunderbolts; the thunderbolt decoration and the presence of the eagle on one of the lintel
modillions caused Wilkes to identify the structure as a Temple of Jupiter (Wilkes (1993) 47).
[4] Marasović 19; Wilkes measures the east and west walls at 215.5 m, the south wall at 181 m,
and the north wall at 175 m (Wilkes (1993) 27).

two additional rotundas on the western side.[5] Beyond the imperial apartments, the loggias of the

south side of the palace faced the Adriatic Sea. The south gate (Figure 1.1: 14), accessed from a

staircase in the peristyle that descended to the basement level, opened onto docks at sea level

(Figure 1.2).

Local limestone, largely from quarries on the nearby island of Brač (Brattia), was used in

large ashlars for most construction; imported marble was used for decorative purposes (Figure

1.3).[6] Builders also used local tufa in the basement levels, as can be seen today in the vaults of

the substructures of the imperial residence. Because the palace has been in continuous use since

Diocletian's time, much of the structural framework is remarkably well preserved, but medieval

and renaissance modifications have altered the interior quadrants (Figure 1.4). Though the

mausoleum, temple of Jupiter, and peristyle – the most obviously impressive and grandiose

elements of the palace – remain largely intact, the arterial network of streets that once gave

visitors access to those structures has been obstructed by buildings built after 305 CE. The

orthogonal plan of Diocletian's palace is no longer apparent.

However, the evident lack of a clear design for the palace as a whole today hides what

was a carefully planned residence built on a site with no preexisting structures. The structure

built before Diocletian's abdication in 305 appears to have been the conscious application of

urban planning principles to a private (or semi-private) palace. The palace combines traditional

Roman orthogonal planning with the imperial residential plan that had become typical of palaces

---

[5] Each side of the octagonal superstructure of the mausoleum is 7.6 m long, and the
superstructure rested on a 3.9 m high podium. On the west side the podium was extended 9 m
for the mausoleum porch (Wilkes (1993) 40). Temple of Jupiter sat on a 21 m x 9.3 m podium
that was 2.5 m high with cella walls 11.4 m long (Wilkes (1993) 45-46). The smaller size of the
Temple of Jupiter makes Diocletian's mausoleum seem even larger in comparison and suggests
that Diocletian placed an emphasis on his own mausoleum rather than on the temple to his patron
deity.
[6] Wilkes (1993) 18

in Rome. Diocletian borrowed large-scale forms from both the House of Augustus, which

combined the *domus* of the emperor with a temple to his patron deity, and the Domus Flavia and

Domus Augustana of Domitian, which provided private apartments as well as public areas where

the emperor could be presented as a semi-divine being.[7] Though the link with these residences

on the Palatine may seem irrelevant to an emperor who visited Rome only once, Kleiner argues

that Diocletian's adoption of Jupiter as a patron deity and commission of large-scale building

projects in Rome, such as his bath complex (298-306 CE), were part of a concerted effort to

place the Tetrarchy in the tradition of the Julio-Claudians and emperors of the high imperial

period.[8] However, instead of being buried in a multi-generational imperial mausoleum, such as

the Mausoleum of Augustus in Rome for the Julio-Claudians, Diocletian's mausoleum created a

temple-like space for the emperor as a deity even before death, when previously emperors were

worshipped after death in temples dedicated to their deified form.[9] Because the third century

lacked the imperial dynasties of the earlier empire, Diocletian had no predecessors to honor or

---

[7] House of Augustus, 27 BCE, Palatine Hill, Rome; Palace of Domitian (Domus Flavia and Domus Augustana), 92 CE, Palatine Hill, Rome.

[8] Kleiner cites Diocletian's adoption of Jupiter (and title of *Jovius*) and Maximian's adoption of Hercules (and title of *Herculius*) as a concerted effort to return the Roman state cult to prominence after the third century emphasis on eastern cults. Diocletian was the first emperor since the Severans to undertake major building projects in Rome, such as his bath complex. He also erected his *decennalia* monument near the triumphal arch of Septimius Severus in the Roman Forum. His arch over the Via Lata (no longer extant) incorporated reliefs taken from Claudian monuments, suggesting a direct connection to the Julio-Claudians as well. Relief material on Tetrarchic monuments such as the Arch of Galerius in Thessaloniki focused on recognizable imperial scenes such as *adventus*, *adlocutio*, *clementia*, and the victorious emperor in battle; this material echoed the reliefs from the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius as well the triumphal arches of Aurelius and Severus (Kleiner 426-427).

[9] Examples of such temples in Rome include the Temple of Divus Augustus (ca. 37 CE), the Claudianum (Temple of Deified Claudius, completed by Vespasian after 70 CE), the Temple of the Deified Vespasian (79-81 CE), the Temple of Deified Trajan (Hadrianic), the Hadrianeum (145 CE), the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina (begun in 141 CE), and the Temple of Deified Marcus Aurelius (unknown, built by Commodus). These are only examples from the city of Rome, and the temples to deified emperors were built throughout the empire (Ward-Perkins (1981)).

through whom to legitimize his reign. Therefore any cult activities happening in his mausoleum could not be veiled as honoring deceased members of the imperial family: they honored him only.

L'Orange argues that Diocletian went even further to assert imperial divinity with the subjection of the Temple of Jupiter to an axial relationship with his own mausoleum.[10] Though even Augustus subordinated his residence to the Temple of Apollo he built adjacent to it, Diocletian did not plan his residence so that the temple to his patron deity was the most prominent element. Instead the long approach from the northern palace gate culminated in a monumental entrance to the imperial apartments flanked on each side by the mausoleum and temple. The tetrastyle facade granted access to the residential sector; this porch facade was termed the "prothyron" by modern scholars.[11] Diocletian's palace breaks from the organic tradition of the House of Augustus and subjects its components, even a temple, to the inflexible "closed stereometric block of mathematic regularity."[12] He emphasizes the organization of the palace as a whole over the importance of individual structures. By placing the Temple of Jupiter opposite his mausoleum, it becomes a structure that merely balances the symmetry of the palace plan.

However, Diocletian may have sought to weaken his assertions of imperial divinity by a late modification to his palace plan. Though the peristyle (Figure 1.1: 9) divides the temple and mausoleum precincts, the junction between the lateral arcades of the peristyle and the entrance

---

[10] "Octavian, the first augustus, had already constructed in connection with his own *domus* a temple to his patron god, namely, the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine; however, he had subordinated his *domus* to the temple. In Diocletian's palace the relationship has changed; it is now the imperial suite which is superior, everything is regulated according to the emperor-axis, the symmetric order of the Dominate" (L'Orange 75-76).
[11] Brown 1972, McNally 1996, et al.
[12] L'Orange 70

facade of the imperial apartments (the "prothyron," Figure 1.1: 11) shows that the prothyron

facade was completed before the arcades and in a different decorative style. The peristyle

arcades abut against the pediment of the prothyron rather than joining it in one continuous unit,

giving the impression that the arcades were installed after the prothyron and perhaps even not

originally intended. Without them, the mausoleum and the temple of Jupiter would have been

united in a large, east-west oriented precinct – perhaps too directly connected in their axial

alignment with no barrier between them. A decision was made to divide the mausoleum and

temple using the arcades, which are themselves an unusual architectural feature at this time.

Only seen on a large-scale in two instances before the palace at Split, and only in the Severan

Forum at Lepcis Magna serving the same function as at Split where they delineate a courtyard,

the arcades at Split raise the question of Diocletian's architectural models for the palace.

As a soldier-emperor from Dalmatia who rose to power in the eastern provinces,

Diocletian may have heavily borrowed from eastern models to adapt the traditional Roman

palace form to his own uses and tastes. Tetrarchic military camps built before his palace at Split

show striking similarities to his plan for his retirement palace; granted, they fall into the long

tradition of the Roman *castrum*, but his adoption of local cult spaces for the *aedes principiorum*

suggests his intent to supplant the worship of local deities with his own imperial cult.

Conversely at Split, he uses an architectural form typically associated with sacred architecture,

the Syrian arch, for typically secular structures such as the entrance to his apartments. His

conflation of secular and sacred architecture is, again, associated with a long tradition of the

shifting boundary between the mortal and divine emperor. However, his palace can be described

as a physical reflection of his political and economic mindset: conservative with respect to the

influence of the military camp plan and traditional urban planning while pushing forward with its assertions of imperial divinity.

A comprehensive description of the palace is a necessary preliminary for its analysis in the context of possible architectural predecessors. Organized in a nearly rectangular block with fortified city walls, the palace is accessed from the exterior by three land gates on the north, east, and west sides and from the sea on the south side. Of the three land gates, the northern gate features the most elaborate facade and later earned the name of *Porta Aurea*, the "Golden Gate" (Figure 1.5 and labeled Figure 1.1: 1).[13] Limestone block courses 0.5 m high make up the north wall in which the gate resides, but the voussoirs of the arch and decorative elements of the gate are made of limestone from St. Elias, near Trogir, which has a creamier color than the light grey limestone of Brač.[14] Two octagonal towers, which no longer exist, flanked the gate in Diocletian's time; they extended 10 m outward from the walls and rose to a height of 14 m (Figure 1.6).[15] Set 15 m apart, they marked the west and east sides of the north gate. The gate's facade can be divided into lower and upper levels: the lower level consists of the entrance arch and two flanking semi-circular niches, and the upper level consists of a blind arcade with seven arches springing from directly above the columns. In the second and sixth openings of this arcade are two semicircular niches with half domes identical to the two directly below them. Directly above the entranceway beneath the fourth arch of the upper arcade is a rectilinear recessed niche.

---

[13] The north gate was originally called the *Porta Romae (*"Roman Gate"), but it took its later name by 1553 due to its ornate decoration (Wilkes (1993) 27).

[14] Wilkes (1993) 18

[15] The north, east, and west gates were each flanked by two octagonal towers, of which only minimal traces survive through incorporation into later buildings. However, excavations have confirmed their existence and dimensions (Wilkes (1993) 26).

The entryway arch is 7.58 m tall and has an opening 3.57 m wide.[16] The arch springs

from a height of 4.2 m and has a horizontal lintel that spans the springers, giving the impression

of a relieving arch above a horizontal lintel or a rectilinear doorframe set into an arch.[17] The

lintel is actually a flat arch, made of a series of voussoirs rather than a monolithic block. The

semicircular niches to the left and right of the opening are flanked by Corinthian pilasters and

topped by hemispherical domes. Directly above these niches and above the central arch are the

recessed niches of the blind arcade. Though the columns or pilasters that flanked these niches no

longer exist, the resulting "isolated corbels" of the arcade are striking.[18] Here, six carved

trapezoidal blocks that protrude from the wall just below the arcade would have supported

columns or piers, likely "en ressaut," that framed the three niches. The Corinthian pilasters of

the lower level suggest that these columns or piers would have had Corinthian capitals as well.

The lack of corbels beneath the first and last arches of the arcade suggests that they sprang from

engaged pilasters that did not need a protruding corbel for support.

In the arcade, there is a band of egg-and-dart molding above the columns with carved

plinths from which the arches spring. This band echoes the lintel within the entryway arch, as it

continues horizontally across the length of the arcade and marks the springing of the niche semi-

domes. Above the blind arcade runs a plain entablature, with the arches surmounted only by an

undecorated cornice. On top of the cornice are four plinths, with heights of .62 m, .75 m, .82 m,

and .61 m looking from left to right.[19] These may have supported statues of the four Tetrarchs,

and Niemann suggests that there may have been an additional base comparable in height to the

---

[16] Wilkes (1993) 33
[17] Brothers 184
[18] The term "isolated corbels" is a convention of A. J. Brothers (Brothers 183). These could also be described as projecting brackets for the column bases.
[19] Wilkes (1993) 34

.75 m base placed to the right of the central base. By his argument, a statue of Jupiter would have rested on the .82 m base in the center.[20]

After walking through the gate, a 9 m square courtyard made of the same ashlars as the palace walls serves as forecourt to the palace interior. On the southern wall, a similar arch gives access to the interior of the palace, although this second arch has no horizontal lintel inserted (Figure 1.7). Looking back toward the exterior of the palace, the upper level once had three arched windows centered over the arch; these windows were filled in with brick in the medieval period when the upper interior walkway of the gate was converted into a chapel (Figure 1.8). Staircases behind the octagonal towers would have given access to the walkway, which was used by guards keeping watch over the palace entrance.[21] However, the voussoirs of the original windows are still intact, and no decoration survives, if any existed. An unadorned cyma recta molding divides the lower level from the upper level with windows, and a plain cornice caps the original height of this wall. Later addition to the chapel has extended the height of the wall between 1 and 2 meters using irregular, small white stones.

Today, the original width of the ancient *cardo* has been partially obstructed by medieval and renaissance construction (Figure 1.4).[22] The general axiality of the palace is preserved, and the modern street *Dioklecijanova* still connects the northern gate to the peristyle and follows the ancient *cardo*, albeit not along a wide, colonnaded street as shown on the ancient plan (Figure 1.1: 2). According to restorations, the *cardo* was at a minimum 9 m wide, since it extended southward from the north gate's courtyard, with additional width from covered porticoes on

---

[20] Wilkes (1993) 34 after G. Niemann, *Der Palast Diokletians in Spalato*. Vienna, 1910, p. 24
[21] Wilkes (1993) 33
[22] This street is also equivalent to the north-south *via praetoria* of the Roman *castrum*. Similarly, the *decumanus* is equivalent to the east-west *via principalis* (Wilkes (1993) 38).

either side.[23] Immediately after the gate's courtyard, the *cardo* opened onto a perimeter street

that followed the perimeter wall from the north gate to the eastern and western gates. This

internal perimeter in the northern half is seen in the modern streets of *Neopotova* in the east,

Majstora Jurja in the north, and *Rodrigina* in the west. Though each of the northern quadrants

occupied 60 m by 45 m rectangles and centered on peristyle courtyards with surrounding rooms

in antiquity, these courtyards no longer exist; the northern half of the palace was almost

completely converted to medieval and renaissance residences.[24] The planned view lines of

Diocletian's palace have thus been lost.

   Walking down the ancient *cardo*, the colonnades to the left and right would have

obscured views into the rooms and courtyards adjoining the porticoes. The first significant open

view would have been at the crossing of the *cardo* and *decumanus* at the center of the palace; not

simply an open view, the intersection of these two streets marked the first time a visitor would

have access to areas of the palace not bound by an arterial street and perimeter wall. Similar to

the *cardo*, the *decumanus* was the only east-west street that crossed the entirety of the palace and

linked the eastern and western gates (Figure 1.9). Today, the arches from which the *decumanus*

porticoes would have begun are visible: a stone archway stands attached to the eastern arcade of

the peristyle, and a similar arch is built into the wall that now fills the western arcade (Figures

1.10 and 1.11). South of the intersection of the *cardo* and *decumanus*, a rectangular open

courtyard, the so-called peristyle, creates a link between the public and private sections of the

palace and gives access to the mausoleum and temple precincts. G. Niemannn's 1910

---

[23] In addition to columns and architrave blocks now lying along the north exterior wall of the
mausoleum precinct (i.e. the southern wall of the *decumanus*), evidence for covered porticoes
along the arterial streets comes from the preservation of the beginning of the colonnade on the
north pier of the west gate (Wilkes (1993) 35).
[24] Wilkes (1993) 40

reconstruction of the core of the palace provides a helpful model for what this area would have looked like in Diocletian's time (Figure 1.12).

The peristyle is a paved courtyard that is 27 m long and 13.5 m wide oriented lengthwise along the north-south axis (Figure 1.13).[25] Three shallow steps at the north end lead down to the level of the courtyard, about 1 m lower than the street level of the *cardo* and *decumanus*. Bordering the east and west sides of the courtyard are two arcades with seven arches that spring directly from the Corinthian capitals, echoing the arcade of the northern gate (Figure 1.14). Today, the eastern arcade remains freestanding, and the western arcade has been incorporated into the walls of later buildings (Figure 1.15).[26] In Diocletian's time, 2.4 m high *transennae* walls were placed in the intercolumniations, and lintel doorways on axis with the mausoleum and temple entrances gave access to these structures from the peristyle.[27] The four southernmost columns on both sides are unfluted monoliths of pink granite, followed by two grey marble columns; both arcades end with engaged composite capital pilasters on the walls that join the peristyle with the portico of the *decumanus* (Figure 1.16). The archivolts of the arcades are undecorated and defined only by a beveled edge. The arcades are framed above by an undecorated architrave and frieze level with a cornice level of dentils, modillions decorated with fleurons, a recessed band of chevrons, and palmette cyma recta. However, the sharpness and cleanliness of the stone of these arcades indicate a better state of preservation when compared to the facade of the entrance to the imperial apartments.

---

[25] Wilkes (1993) 41

[26] In the southwest corner is a Romanesque palace originally dating to the 15th century CE, which has been rebuilt several times. Along the western side is a Romanesque (13th century) building that once belonged to the Grisogono and Cipci families (Marasović (1995) 103).

[27] Wilkes (1993) 46

The most striking feature of the peristyle is the monumental prothyron that marks the

entrance into the residential sector of the palace (Figure 1.17).[28] Two flights of seven steps flank

a central entrance into the substructures below the residential sector. These steps lead up to the

platform of the pedimental porch, which is supported by four monolithic pink granite columns

with Corinthian capitals that match the orders of the flanking arcades. In the left and right

intercolumniations today are two doorways topped with roofs and arched *aediculae*, but these are

later additions.[29] The central archway is also a later addition, and the original entrance to the

private apartments would have been through a doorway with a horizontal lintel. Original to the

facade, however, is the so-called "Syrian arch" that spans the central intercolumniation (Figure

1.18).[30] The prothyron has no decorative molding at the architrave or frieze levels, and the sima

is decorated with dentils, palmettes, and modillions adorned with rosettes. If there were any

additional reliefs or inscriptions originally on the prothyron, they have not survived; though it

appears structurally sound, the stone of the prothyron is worn, crumbling in places, and

blackened by pollution.

 Immediately to the east of the peristyle lies the octagonal structure identified as the

mausoleum of Diocletian, whose interior will be dealt with in Chapter II. Oriented

perpendicularly to the peristyle and accessible from it, the mausoleum survives today as the

Cathedral of St. Duje and has undergone major alterations since the early 4th century CE. Today,

an apsed chancel has been built into the easternmost face, and a bell tower (campanile), built in

the 13th century CE and restored in the late 19th century, obscures the original entrance to the

---

[28] The term "prothyron" has been attributed to the porch at the south end of the peristyle by
McNally, Brothers, et al.
[29] The inscriptions on the door lintels, which reference the Christian God and the church, prove
their later date.
[30] For discussion of the "Syrian arch" and its use here, see Chapter V.

mausoleum and has replaced the mausoleum porch. Despite the changes, the church's entrance

is through a doorway in the same location as the original door to the mausoleum and aligns with

the third intercolumniation from the south end of the eastern arcade. Excavations have revealed

that a 2.8 m wide flight of sixteen steps once led up to a tetrastyle dipteral porch.[31] Fragments of

porphyry found in this area suggest that the porch columns were made of porphyry, fitting for an

imperial tomb of this period.[32] The porch pediment may have had an arcuated lintel like the

prothyron, but scholars do not agree on this reconstruction.[33]

The mausoleum sits in a rectangular enclosure 32 m wide and 39 m deep bounded by an

ashlar precinct wall on the north side (Figure 1.19) and higher brick and stone wall on the south

side (Figure 1.20). Until the 19th century a portion of the south wall still reached a height of 6.36

m, suggesting that the height of the wall in Diocletian's time would have largely obscured the

structure from the north and south views.[34] Because the site slopes down southwards toward the

sea, the southern side of the precinct is lower than the north side, and has been excavated to

reveal the entrance to the crypt in the podium foundation (Figure 1.21). Also, the greater length

and height of the south precinct wall exposes alternating rectilinear and semicircular niches that

may have accommodated statuary (Figure 1.20). The sides of the octagon are each 7.6 m in

length and rest on a 3.7 m high podium of limestone orthostates (Figure 1.22).[35] This podium

extends outwards 3.5 m from the octagon's exterior to form a platform for an external portico

with broad intercolumniations.[36] Though largely restored, original portions of the podium

---

[31] When the belltower was constructed, traces of two rows of four columns were evident (Wilkes (1993) 48).

[32] Johnson (2009) 68

[33] For discussion of the possible reconstruction of the mausoleum porch, see p. 80.

[34] Johnson (2009) 59

[35] Wilkes (1993) 46

[36] Johnson (2009) 60

reveal, from the bottom, bead-and-reel, egg-and-dart, plain fascia, bead, and stylized leaf

moldings in the podium cornice (Figure 1.23).

Along each face of the octagon, four columns of varying types of marble and granite are

spaced equally along the edge of the podium and support an entablature that mirrors the form and

dimensions of the octagonal base. Since the corner columns are shared between the eight sides

and the four additional porch columns are lost, the original structure would have had twenty-four

columns; those that survive have Corinthian capitals. The entablature above has a beveled ledge

on which the coffered slabs of stone that make up the ceiling of the covered portico rest, with

their other ends supported by a parallel beveled molding on the exterior walls of the octagonal

superstructure. Four of these slabs remain *in situ*, but the decoration of the damaged undersides

of the coffers is indiscernible (Figure 1.24). Even beam holes spaced in a row about .5 m apart

on each octagon face about 1 m above the height of the architrave indicate the beams used for the

pitched portico roof (Figure 1.25). The exterior of the octagonal superstructure is plain, and no

external decoration or inscriptions, if there were any in antiquity, survive today. Its walls are

made of limestone ashlars laid in courses with no additional mortar used. The superstructure is

topped by a shallowly pitched octagonal roof sheathed with ceramic tiles (not original), with a

simply decorated cornice level of stylized leaves above a dentil course (Figure 1.26).[37]

Opposite the mausoleum to the west of the peristyle lies the Temple of Jupiter, which was

converted into a baptistery for the church.[38] Like the mausoleum, it stands in its own rectangular

precinct 32 m wide and 44 m deep.[39] Ashlars similar to those of the mausoleum rest on a 2.5m

---

[37] For discussion of the domed interior ceiling, see p. 25
[38] For discussion of this building's identification, *supra* n. 3.
[39] Wilkes (1993) 52

high podium that has dimensions of 21 m by 9.3 m.[40] The temple is oriented eastward towards

the peristyle, so the entry street to the temple stretches from the third bay of the peristyle arcade

to a flight of front steps leading up to the porch (Figure 1.27). However, the difference in the

shape, texture, and wear of the stones of the staircase and podium suggest that the current

staircase is a later restoration of the original approach (Figure 1.28). Later construction has also

intruded upon the porch of the temple, so the original tetrastyle facade is lost.[41] Two engaged

pilasters in the *antae* extend about 1.5 m from the cella walls onto the porch, but none of the

freestanding columns are extant (Figure 1.29). There is a half-size column on the porch, but it is

associated with later construction rather than with the ancient temple. The pilasters have

Corinthian capitals, suggesting the columns would have been Corinthian as well.

The temple's porch pediment no longer survives, but the rear pediment is nearly perfectly

preserved. On the porch pediment, sharp edges and lighter colored stone of some of the

architrave blocks suggest modern restoration, and the *antae* have a band of worn egg-and-dart

molding missing from the central porch wall. Though the 2.5 m x 6 m doorway may have been

restored in later times also, the range and style of the decorative moldings suggest that it dates

from the time of the building's use as a temple. In addition to several Roman floral designs and

moldings is a series of figures on the decorative modillions of the lintel.[42] On the far right, an

image of an eagle links the figures with the building's association with Jupiter, suggesting that

the doorframe is original at least in its design (Figure 1.30).

---

[40] Note that the temple's podium was 1.4 m shorter than the octagonal podium of the mausoleum. They were presumably situated on sites of the same slope (as the site of the entire palace sloped down to the sea), so it is reasonable to assume that the temple sat closer to the ancient street level than did the mausoleum.
[41] None of the original porch columns survive, but both Wilkes and Marasović identify it as tetrastyle (Wilkes (1993) 52 and Marasović (1995) 110).
[42] Wilkes (1993) 52: two Tritons, Helios, Hercules, Apollo, an eagle, a human face, and two winged victories

The 11.4 m long cella walls reveal no decoration but are well preserved, and the southwest corner has an engaged pilaster like those of the *antae* (Figure 1.31). The northwest corner of the temple is built into a later house, but the rear pediment is essentially intact. The pedimental cornice shows a similar style to the doorframe, again suggesting that the doorframe dates to the building's original construction. Dentil, egg-and-dart, and stylized acanthus leaves make up the bulk of the frieze, with the modillions decorated with acanthus leaves rather than discernable figures and fleurons in the recesses between them (Figure 1.32). In the center of the pediment is a large wreath, evoking imagery of the Roman triumph (Figure 1.33). On the interior of the temple, the 7.27 m x 5.68 m cella is spanned by a coffered barrel vaulted ceiling, which has sixty four coffers decorated with fleurons and masks (Figure 1.34).[43] Between the vault and the cella walls runs a Corinthian cornice, whose modillions are decorated with thunderbolts, linking the structure with Jupiter through the use of his attributes in decoration.[44]

South of these precincts and the peristyle lies the sector of the palace that has been identified as the residential wing and was presumably used for the emperor's private apartments, halls, and baths. A centrally-planned room known as the vestibule lies immediately to the south of the prothyron and marks the transition from public to private (Figure 1.35 and Figure 1.1: 12). Constructed of alternating brick and stone-and-mortar courses rather than ashlars, it measures 12 m in diameter, and its domed ceiling once reached a height of 17 m. The current oculus in the dome is not considered original, and at the time of its construction the only sources of light were the two arched windows that pierce the east and west sides of the dome.[45] Four semicircular niches at ground level in the southeast, southwest, northeast, and northwest "corners" of the

---

[43] Wilkes (1993) 53
[44] Wilkes (1993) 54
[45] Wilkes (1993) 56

vestibule may have held statuary. Though the vestibule is the only upper level room of the

residential sector south of the prothyron still extant, the architecture of the upper rooms of the

residential wing can be restored to some degree by examining the palace substructures, made of

ashlar tufa piers and superimposed brick vaulting, that once supported the upper walls (Figure

1.36).

II. <u>Decorative Links with Asia Minor and Split as a Late Antique Palace (pp. 23-35)</u>

The materials and techniques used in the construction of the palace reveal much about the administration of the project. Not only were the structures that Diocletian built significant for his assertions of imperial authority and divinity, but these forms also allow us to set the palace in a larger context of prolific building that characterized the Tetrarchic Roman provinces. The prevalence of ashlar masonry and the limited use of the drill in architectural decoration link its construction most with contemporary sites in Asia Minor.[46] Local limestone, rather than marble was used for the ashlars, despite the presumably large imperial budget for the project and Split's coastal location that would have made importing marble relatively easy. As J.B. Ward-Perkins detailed in his monograph on the Dalmatian marble trade, the majority of imported building materials came from Greece and Egypt, but these were limited to column shafts and capitals, veneers, and pavement tiles.[47] However, his survey of marbles used in the palace showed that in addition to Egyptian granites and porphyry and Proconnesian marbles such as *rosso antico* and green porphyry, stone varieties from Asia Minor such as *africano* and *porta santa* marbles were also used. The use of stones from Asia Minor in addition to typical Greek marbles and Egyptian granites link the palace to the eastern tradition, if we assume that Diocletian could have imported stone from any part of the Roman world.

However, the extensive use of limestone and the high level of decorative detail applied to the entablature moldings suggest a familiarity and expertise in working with the material. Similar work in Salona supports the assumption that local workers were responsible for the majority of the project.[48] Foreign workers may have accompanied stone shipments to Split and

---

[46] McNally (1996) 22
[47] Ward-Perkins (1992) 116
[48] McNally (1996) 22

stayed to work on the project, but the scale and speed with which the project proceeded indicate a large, likely local, workforce. However, differences in carving quality can be seen throughout the structure, such as in the frieze on the interior of the mausoleum and the door of the temple of Jupiter, shown in Figures 2.1 and 2.2. Both structures serve ceremonial, if not also religious, functions, yet the level of detail and quality of execution varies greatly. The mausoleum's frieze is carved almost entirely in the round and is divided into panels featuring *putti* holding garlands and wreaths. The figures are crude and out of scale, yet the cornice level is intricately carved (Figure 2.3). In addition to discrepancies in decorative quality in the mausoleum itself, the rich detail of the Temple of Jupiter doorframe, one of the most extensive examples of drill work in the entire project, shows an even higher degree of decorative quality. Considering only the lintel itself, dentil and egg-and-dart courses divide the elaborate doorframe from a cornice level with modillions decorated with figures in relief (Figure 2.4). The highest course echoes the stylized palmettes carving of the peristyle cornice (Figure 2.5) but refigures it in a more intricate version. Unlike the scroll-like elements of the peristyle cornice, the palmettes on the Temple of Jupiter cornice are carved in a way that suggests the uneven edges of actual leaves. The discrepancy may result from the eye level position of the temple lintel versus the elevation of the mausoleum frieze or the use of plaster to render the surface detail for the latter, especially for the portraits of Diocletian and Prisca/Tyche. The use of drill on the Temple of Jupiter doorframe allowed relatively small designs to be readily discernable, unlike the frieze of the mausoleum interior, which relies on the elements' large size to be legible. The difference in technique suggests that different groups of workers were responsible for the decoration in different areas of the palace, and these teams may have come from different geographic areas.

The high quality of local stone and the availability of local labor may have contributed to Diocletian's decision to use limestone ashlars for the majority of the palace, but there are two notable instances of brickwork. The first is the pitched brick vaulting of the mausoleum dome, a technique already prevalent in Asia Minor, such as in the barrel-vaults of the basilica in Aspendos (late 3rd century CE, Figure 2.6), and later replicated in the dome of the Rotunda of Galerius in Thessaloniki (305-306 CE, Figure 2.7).[49] The dome at Split spans the 13.35 m diameter of the mausoleum and rises 1.25 m above the upper cornice. The bricks are arranged in small offset arcs in a fish scale-like pattern up to the top of the dome, which is finished with concentric rings of brick (Figure 2.9). The bricks are of low quality and locally made, stamped with brickstamps reading, "DALMATI."[50] Though made with local brick, the mausoleum dome was likely constructed by an imported labor force since the mausoleum dome is the only brick vaulted structure in the palace and surrounding area. Local laborers would probably not have been skilled in the technique; the tradition of brick vaulting in the east such as at Aspendos suggests that brick workers may have been brought in from Asia Minor for the project.[51] Another eastern technique is present in the palace in the vestibule behind the prothyron. Here, irregular local stones are set in mortar with alternating courses of brick approximately 0.3 m wide in a technique called *opus listatum*.[52] The domes of the four semicircular niches are

---

[49] Ward-Perkins (1981) 276: pitched brick vaults are created by laying bricks side by side at a slight tilt in order to span a curved space unlike corbelled vaults, which use cantilevered bricks, or true vaults, which do not tilt or "pitch" the bricks and require extensive centering. Pitched brick vaulting placed mud bricks edge-to-edge at an angle so that each ring of brick could be "glued" to the preceding ring with mortar (Oleson 274, Figure 2.8).

[50] Wilkes (1993) 50

[51] Brickwork is notably seen in the Serapeum at Pergamon and the Baths at Ephesus, among many other sites

[52] *Opus listatum* is alternatively identified simply as *opus mixtum* by Adam; he cites an example from a late wall from Pompeii (62-79 CE) made up of *opus incertum* with brick courses and quoining, as at Split (Adam (1994) 141).

covered using the pitched brick vaulting technique (Figure 2.10). Though the mixed use of

materials is at first surprising, *opus listatum* is prevalent in Asia Minor as well, such as in the city

walls of Nicaea in Bithynia (Figure 2.11).[53] Built between 258 and 269 CE, the Nicaea example

shows that this technique was in use in Asia Minor in the period leading up to the construction of

the palace, if not in contemporary projects. The importation of brick workers for the project as

well as limited numbers of stone workers accompanying marble imports could have led to the

variation in the construction and decorative techniques employed throughout the structure.[54]

Stylistic links with Asia Minor are also seen in the decorations themselves. Great

variation in the cornice molding of the peristyle arcade and prothyron pediment necessitates an

awkward junction where the two meet, but the southwest corner where the two cornice blocks

join shows the two predominant molding styles of this portion of the palace (Figures 2.12 and

2.13). On the left, the prothyron modillions are carved with drilled acanthus leaves that extend

downwards away from the modillion block; on the right, the carving has been simplified into

relatively flat, simple four petal fleurons.[55] Around and between the modillions, a chevron

pattern runs continuously. The horizontal sima is decorated with tongue-and-groove; on the

pediment, there is a vine and rosette cavetto topped by a palmette cyma recta. The palmettes

themselves are grooved and have ridged edges. On the peristyle, the intermediate rosette and

vine course of the pediment is omitted, leaving only the palmette. However, here the grooved

---

[53] Ward-Perkins (1981) 278

[54] Brickwork in the palace was limited to vaulted and domed spaces and additionally the walls of the vestibule; using cut stone in these instances would have been more difficult to accomplish. However, the inclusion of the dome, vault, and curved niche – which necessitated its own specialized labor force – shows the deliberate inclusion of these features into the palace. Brick vaulting, which gained popularity throughout the imperial period and especially in the late empire, continued to be prevalent through the later Byzantine period.

[55] The acanthus leaves prothyron modillions are most similar to those of the Temple of Jupiter pedimental moldings, cf. Figure 1.32

palmettes similar to the prothyron course alternate with simplified and less realistic palmettes.[56]

This variation can be seen more clearly in the cornice of the mausoleum roof (Figure 2.14),

although this has none of the realistically carved leaves of the prothyron and peristyle colonnade.

The best example of similar decoration is found in the moldings of the Upper Agora of

Sagalassos, dating to the second half of the second century. Vandeput, in a study of Roman

architectural decoration in Asia Minor, provides images of the moldings found in Sagalassos,

among other sites. Sagalassos was a city of the Tetrarchic province of Pisidia, organized by

Diocletian in 308-311 CE. Pisidia lies directly north of the province of Pamphylia, in which

Aspendos is located; Aspendos has already been cited as a possible source for brick vaulting

techniques.[57] On the Nymphaion of Sagalassos (150-200 CE) is a hybrid of the two cornice

decorative bands seen in the peristyle (Figure 2.15). Again, a dentil course runs below a row of

modillions. The deeply carved grooves of the acanthus leaves of the modillions and detail of the

fleurons and leaves in the intervening spaces is very similar to the modillion detail of the

prothyron. Around the top edge of the modillions runs an egg-and-dart course rather than the

chevron pattern; this may speak to a higher level of craftsmanship in Sagalassos or the

apparently larger space between the modillions on the Nymphaion cornice. The modillions of

the peristyle cornices are much more closely spaced, and the decoration therefore appears much

more cramped. The egg-and-dart may have been simplified to a chevron pattern for

considerations of space. On the pediment of the Temple of Jupiter, the modillions are also

bordered with the egg-and-dart molding, showing that at least some craftsmen in the palace had

the skill required (Figures 1.32, 2.16). Above the modillions on the Sagalassos cornice fragment

is a plain band followed by a bead-and-reel course. The palmette course above closely resembles

[56] Vandeput 30
[57] Vandeput 212

the palmettes of the prothyron pediment in style, showing grooved leaves with distinct edges (Figure 2.12). In both instances, the palmette fronds are bound at the base from which they curve by a "band", represented by a thin rectangle. As we can see on the colonnade cornice, the palmettes alternate between having the band at the bottom and being upside down, with the band at the top of the course. The Sagalassos fragment replaces the intermediate rosette and vine course of the prothyron pediment with the plain fascia. Despite this difference, the composition of dentils, modillions decorated with acanthus leaves or fleurons, an intermediate fascia (decorated or not), and a final course of alternating palmettes is found only at Sagalassos from the samples of Vandeput's study.[58]

However, McNally cautions that the connection in decorative styles with Asia Minor, and specifically Pisidia, may not have been purposeful.[59] Labor for the palace may not have been organized in the traditional mode of self-contained workshops brought from a single area; while the stylistic link with Sagalassos is strong, indicating that workers may have been imported from this area, they may have been left to carve to a certain degree as they saw fit. The replication of styles from sites in Asia Minor likely reflects a familiarity on the part of the workers with those styles rather than a dedicated effort on the part of Diocletian's architects to connect the palace with those sites stylistically. A workshop of craftsmen trained by their fathers or other elder masters through apprenticeships was closely linked with its local community. Increasingly in the third and fourth centuries, workers traveled in small groups or as individuals and formed more

---

[58] Vandeput provides images of decorative elements from Aizanoi, Ankyra, Pisidian Antioch, Aphrodisias, Attaleia, Ephesus, Hierapolis, Iasos, Kremna (Cremna), Kibyra, Labraunda, Miletus, Mylasa, Myrina, Nysa, Olba Diocaesarea, Pergamon, Perge, Sardis, Side, and Smyrna
[59] McNally (1996) 38

temporary labor coalitions.[60] Diocletian spent significant amounts of time in residence in

Nicomedia, Syrian Antioch, and Egypt and undertook ambitious building in these cities. Though

no record of the administration of the palace at Antioch exists, Lactantius's note, however

exaggerated, on Diocletian's building projects in Nicomedia shows that Diocletian's

requirements likely exceeded the capacity of the local labor force.[61] Similarly, the other

Tetrarchs were engaged in great building projects in cities not traditionally known for prolific

building.[62] Therefore the importation of workers for individual projects became more common

and with it mixed styles of execution.

McNally cites the analysis of the masons' marks, sixty-one of which are dated to the

original construction phases of the palace.[63] The variety in the marks suggests that workmen

came to the project as individuals or in small groups, rather than as large workshops. She

concludes that the work force was a combination of laborers from Pamphylia, because of the link

with the brick vaulting in Aspendos, as well as local, due to similarities in style to monuments in

---

[60] This allowed them to better deal with shortages of manpower or, alternatively, shortages of building projects in their local areas (McNally (1996) 38).

[61] "To this there were added a certain endless passion for building, and on that account, endless exactions from the provinces for furnishing wages to labourers and artificers, and supplying carriages and whatever else was requisite to the works which he projected. Here public halls, there a circus, here a mint, and there a workhouse for making implements of war; in one place a habitation for his empress, and in another for his daughter. Presently great part of the city was quitted, and all men removed with their wives and children, as from a town taken by enemies; and when those buildings were completed, to the destruction of whole provinces, he said, "They are not right, let them be done on another plan." Then they were to be pulled down, or altered, to undergo perhaps a future demolition. By such folly was he continually endeavouring to equal Nicomedia with the city Rome in magnificence." (Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum* 7, trans. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers)

[62] Such projects were undertaken in the Tetrarchic capitals of Milan, Sirmium, Trier, and Nicomedia, as well as at the residences of Diocletian at Split and Antioch and of Galerius at Thessaloniki and Romuliana (Gamzigrad).

[63] Rismondo, Tajma. "Klesarski znakovi na zidovim Dioklecijanove palace u Splitu." *Salona Christiana*, ed. Emilio Marin. Split: 1994, pp. 197-212

neighboring Salona.[64] The Salonian craftsmen were likely to have been employed for their

experience with carving the local limestone for sarcophagi, while the Pamphylians brought skills

in brickwork and as well as in limestone carving. Because the mausoleum's dome and vestibule

niches are the only instances of brickwork as a covering material for vaulted spaces, it seems

unlikely that workers would have been brought in solely for that purpose. Groups from

Pamphylia may have included some dedicated brick workers or those familiar with both stone-

carving and brickwork. Because of the variation in the workers' backgrounds, variation in the

quality of decorative execution was inevitable. Diocletian may have set a more skilled group of

craftsmen to work on the decoration of the temple of Jupiter in order to increase its importance in

the complex; at the same time, the more traditional decoration of the temple may point to his

desire to decorate that building in a more conservative fashion. The peristyle, which was already

an architectural experiment in and of itself, may have received its unusual decorative treatment

because of the freedom granted to the craftsmen working on this structure.[65]

That being said, parallels on a larger scale (i.e. similarities in architectural rather than

decorative features) may be interpreted as intentional references to other monuments as models,

or at least as sources of strong influence. Stylistically, McNally makes a connection between the

arcades of the peristyle courtyard and the arcade of the 3rd century stadium gate at Miletus in

Caria, the province directly west of Pamphylia and Pisidia (Figure 2.17).[66] There, seven arches

once sprung from eight columns rather than the six seen in the Split colonnades; two of the

arches spring from entablature blocks spanning the second and sixth bays. The other five arches

spring from entablature blocks inserted between the column capital and arch that do not span the

---

[64] McNally (1996) 39
[65] For a description of the peristyle, see pp. 16-17
[66] McNally (1996) 36

intercolumniations, as is "famously" done in the Mausoleum of Constanza ca. 350 CE, which is

considered a precursor to the use of impost blocks often seen in later Byzantine architecture.[67]

The zone above the arcade of the Milesian gate lacks a frieze or a superimposed attic, giving the

peristyle colonnades at Split a more "top-heavy" feeling, as the arches there are essentially set

into a wall topped by an entablature rather than being a part of the entablature themselves

(Figures 1.14-16). This prompts Ward-Perkins' interpretation of the arcade at Split as not a

sequence of arches but an "arched variant of the flat architrave" with another complete

entablature above them.[68] Before its appearance at Split, this form is present only at the Severan

Forum at Lepcis Magna, so the peristyle arcade may be representative of Diocletian's desire to

make an architectural connection with that site.[69]

The incorporation of the Syrian arch into the facade of the prothyron (Figure 1.17) and its

essential repetition in the form of the arcade suggests the existence of a model for its use at Split.

Pohl provides a catalog of Roman Imperial temples in Asia Minor that includes three Pisidian

temples using the Syrian arch in their pedimental facades.[70] A tetrastyle Augustan temple in

Lagon (Figure 2.18) and a hexastyle temple in Termessos (Figure 2.19) dated to the mid 2nd

century CE demonstrate the use of the arcuated lintel in imperial period temples in the province.

More closely related in terms of architectural similarity is the late 2nd century CE temple at

Cremna (Figure 2.20), whose Syrian arch exhibits the bent-architrave construction Ward-Perkins

uses to describe the arches of the peristyle colonnades at Split.[71] On the Milesian gate,

intermediate blocks above the column capitals act as an interrupted horizontal architrave with

---

[67] Such as in the apse of the Basilica of San Vitale, Ravenna, 547 CE.
[68] Ward-Perkins (1948) 71
[69] For a discussion of the arcade at Lepcis Magna, see pp. 86-89
[70] Pohl 262-263, 286-287
[71] *Supra* n. 68

subsidiary Syrian arch above; similarly the temples at Lagon and Termessos have a horizontal entablature that is interrupted at the central intercolumniation with an arched inset above. These renderings try to maintain the traditional horizontal entablature without radical reorganization of the traditional facade; structurally, they could use a horizontal architrave across all intercolumniations, and the "arcuated lintel" would become merely a cut-out, like a relieving arch, in the pediments of the temples or at the frieze level of the gate. At Cremna, the entablature runs in one continuous band across the complete facade: the central bay has become an integrated component.

Stylistically, the decoration at Cremna is very similar to that of the pediment of the prothyron at Split, with a similar dentil band and modillions with fleurons on the underside of the cornice and alternating upright and pendant palmettes on the raking sima (Figure 2.21). A cornice block from the Propylon at Cremna (mid to late 2nd century CE) shows a decorative scheme that is most similar to that of the prothyron at Split (Figure 2.22).[72] Like the fragment from Sagalassos, the block from Cremna has more intricate decoration, with ancillary egg-and-dart and bead-and-reel moldings rather than plain fasciae or chevron patterns. However, the fleuron motifs on the underside of the modillions of the Split prothyron and the Cremna propylon cornice are nearly identical. The similarity in distinctive cornice decoration at Cremna and Sagalassos again suggests that workers at Split were familiar with the decorative styles at both of these sites. Cremna and Sagalassos are approximately 28 km apart in Pisidia, which gives the similarity in decoration at the two sites a sense of regional style. It is this regional style that employed by the workers at Split, strongly suggesting that at least some labor groups were brought in from this region (Figure 2.23).

---

[72] Büyükkolanci and Vandeput 214

Unfortunately, no remains of Diocletian's palace at Antioch-on-the-Orontes (Syrian Antioch) exist for comparison between Diocletian's two imperial residences; presumably, if the decoration and construction techniques had been similar, some of the laborers for the Split residence would have already worked on the residence at Antioch as well. However, Libanius' description of the palace provides an insight into the plan of the palace, based on the orthogonal *castrum* plan as the palace at Split was.[73] Diocletian sponsored many building projects in Antioch, as he stayed there in 290 CE as well as between 299 and 302 CE after suppressing a revolt in the Egyptian provinces. His return to Antioch in 299 CE is known from the occurrence of a meeting with Galerius in Nisibis, north of Antioch, in order to negotiate peace with the defeated Persian King Narses.[74] Libanius describes the plan of the palace at Antioch:

> …The new city stands on the island which the division of the river formed… The form of this new city is round. It lies in the level part of the plain, the whole of it in an exact plan, and an unbroken wall surrounds it like a crown. From four arches which are joined to each other in the form of a rectangle, four pairs of stoas proceed as from an *omphalos*, stretched out toward each quarter of the heaven, as in a statue of the four-handed Apollo. Three of these pairs, running as far as the wall, are joined to its circuit, while the fourth is shorter but is the more beautiful just in proportion as it is shorter, since it runs toward the palace which begins hard by and serves as an approach to it. This palace occupies so much of the island that it constitutes a fourth part of the whole. It reaches to the middle of the island, which we have called an *omphalos*, and extends to the outer branch of the river, so that where the wall has columns instead of battlements, there is a view worthy of the emperor, with the river flowing below and the suburbs feasting the eyes on all sides… it is far superior to many, nowhere surpassed in point of beauty, and in size surpassing all others, divided into so many chambers and stoas and halls that even those who are well accustomed to it become lost as they go from door to door.[75]

---

[73] Downey (1959) 674-675
[74] Corcoran 233
[75] Libanius, *Oration* XI.203-207 (trans. G. Downey, 1959)

From this, the image of an orthogonal city within a curvilinear enclosure emerges, but little can be said about the palace itself.

C.R. Morey produced a restored plan of the city, originally published in 1936 in his article on the excavations, which has been widely accepted by scholars (Figure 2.24).[76] The four arches with stoas extending to the walls may describe a central tetrapylon with streets, presumably colonnaded, extending toward the circuit wall that runs around the perimeter of the island. However, Libanius says that the fourth stoa serves as an approach to the palace and extends to the riverfront beyond the palace on the north end of the site, ending in a facade similar to that of the south wall of the palace at Split. This would have divided the palace along the north-south axis, but Libanius does not describe any major east-west artery (*decumanus*) like that visible in Morey's reconstruction within the palace itself. The two "stoas" extending from the "*omphalos*" can be interpreted as colonnaded arterial streets, but their intersection is located outside the palace; the fourth "*stoa*" approaches the entrance to the palace proper, of which Libanius gives no description other than its grandeur and size. An alternate restoration portrays this ambiguity by marking the palace without any claim for what the plan of the palace proper may have been (Figure 2.25). As Downey points out, the palace at Antioch is often considered a model for Diocletian's later palace at Split. However, even if the Antioch palace was built around a *castrum* plan, it is just as likely that the form would have been so prevalent that Diocletian would have chosen the plan by default rather than for deliberate association of the two structures.[77] Additionally, Libanius describes the Antioch palace as a residence within a round,

---

[76] The plan (Downey (1959) 674) was drafted by the Chairman of the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch and its Vicinity, C. R. Morey. It is based on excavations done at the site and provides an alternative to the literary source of Libanius, *Oration* XI; excavations began in the 1930's (Downey (1959) 653-54).
[77] Downey (1953) 112

presumably meaning irregularly shaped, fortified urban precinct; it also has a hippodrome located east of the residential block, of which there is no evidence at Split. By applying the Antioch palace model to the Split residence, the "palace" is reduced to the emperor's apartments south of the peristyle. The northern section becomes the exterior grounds for the palace, with the *cardo* and *decumanus* acting as roads that approach the palace rather than run through it. At Split, the entire complex is a self contained unit with no associated structures around it, unlike the hippodrome we see at Antioch and other late antique imperial residences such as Maxentius' on the Via Appia in Rome, built between 307 and 312 CE (Figure 2.26).

Frazer, in his study of the Maxentian villa, provides schematic overviews of many late antique imperial residences and argues for a connection between imperial residences and circuses, beginning with the proximity of the Palatine and the Circus Maximus (Figure 2.27).[78] In this comparison, Split is the only palace that is a self-contained unit, as all evidence points to a lack of structures external to the palace. Frazer, considering the "palace" as only the imperial apartments in the southernmost portion of the Split complex, identifies the prothyron as the primary facade of the palace rather than merely as a divider between the public and private zones of the palace. If we accept Frazer's reduction of the palace to only the zone south of the *decumanus*, then in essence Diocletian replaces the once requisite hippodrome with his mausoleum and a temple to his patron deity. The association of palace and mausoleum is echoed by Maxentius at his villa and by Galerius with his palace and rotunda (305-311 CE). Directly across from the mausoleum is the Temple of Jupiter as the other structure associated with the palace. Rather than a hippodrome, Diocletian provides his guests only with spaces in which to honor his patron deity and imperial cult.

---

[78] Frazer figs. 4-12

III. Models from the Provinces: Syrian Urban Planning and Egyptian Tomb-Temple Complexes (pp. 36-50)

Already, the scope of Diocletian's building projects at Antioch and Nicomedia has suggested that Diocletian would have been experienced in the administration of large-scale construction projects by the time of his palace's construction at Split. The similarities between the decorative moldings of Split and sites in south central Anatolia suggest that labor may have been imported to Split from this area. Given Pamphylia and Pisidia's location between Nicomedia and Antioch, perhaps workers from these regions had also been involved with the construction of Diocletian's other residences (Figure 3.1). Pleased with the results, Diocletian may have employed them again for his palace at Split (this, however, is only speculation). With regards to the organization of the palace plan, Diocletian was likely used his eastern palaces as models but also looked elsewhere for inspiration. The unusual inclusion of both a temple to his patron deity and his mausoleum near the entrance to the imperial apartments points to some other influence than merely his other imperial residences.

The inclusion of the Syrian arch in the prothyron facade makes Syria a likely candidate for architectural source material; Diocletian may have sought to emphasize the importance of Syria, a crucial province for Roman security on the eastern frontier by making allusions to its architectural forms. Syria owed its prosperity to its position as a gateway for trade between Mesopotamia, India, and China and the western provinces. Successful in profitable industries such as glass-making, silk-weaving, and purple-dying as well as the agricultural production of corn, wine, and oil, Syria was economically vital to the empire.[79] Additionally its place at the eastern frontier ensured frequent visits from emperors; as discussed, Diocletian spent considerable time there and built a palace around 290 CE on an island formed by the branching

[79] Bosanquet 101

of the River Orontes.[80] This building project shows the attention Diocletian paid to the city, not

only as a place of convenient residence, but as capital of the lucrative province of Syria Coele,

created by Septimius Severus in 194 CE.[81] Indicative of its importance, the governor of Syria

Coele was the senior officer of the eastern frontier at least until the reign of Gallienus (d. 268

CE).[82] J. Gilliam has studied the evidence for governors of the region between the reigns of

Severus and Diocletian. Of those whose names or *cursus* (political career) are known, four

governors of Syria had previously held the office in Cappadocia, Germania Inferior, Moesia

Inferior, or Dacia; three had previously governed Arabia.[83] Even amidst the turmoil of the third

century, the political backgrounds of Syrian governors differed little from those of governors

under the Antonines.[84] Three from the mid-third century, the political low point of the imperial

period, came from families that had been of the senatorial class for at least two generations. The

competent leadership of the province, even in times of political turmoil, demonstrates its

widespread recognition as a key to the security of the empire. It is not surprising, therefore, that

Diocletian would bolster the stability of his own regime by asserting the province's importance

to an even greater degree.

In addition to the Syrian arch, perhaps the most obvious Syrian form is the well-

documented Syrian urban plan, which uses arterial colonnaded streets to link otherwise disparate

structures. While Roman orthogonal urban planning positioned structures along city blocks

defined by major and minor cross-streets as part of a unified building plan, Syrian arterial streets

typically connected structures that had been built over a many years and otherwise had no

---

[80] Bosanquet 102
[81] Gilliam 225
[82] Gilliam 226
[83] Gilliam 227
[84] Gilliam 228

geographical relation to each other. MacDonald terms these streets, "urban armatures," and explains the function of their colonnades as a way to link elements longitudinally as well as laterally.[85] Disparate structures line the streets laterally, but the equal spacing of columns – serving as entryways to these different buildings – equalizes and standardizes the otherwise inconsistent structures to each side of the armature. Because armatures develop over time and out of necessity rather than from concentrated architectural planning, the columnar screen serves to unify and standardize the city plan. As MacDonald says, "Planning is applied all at once; armatures are the products of the passage of time, of a process energized not by the work of a corps of professionals but by the imperial synthesis."[86] Emphasizing the lateral as much as the longitudinal, colonnaded streets link elements that lack relationships with each other and have developed over time, forcing them into the Roman provincial mold.

From Libanius' description of Antioch and excavations at Palmyra, Gerasa, and other Syrian cities, Robert Bosanquet long ago created the archetype of what he termed the "Syrian type" town plan.[87] Firstly, the width of the streets is increased due to foot traffic to shops and buildings lining the street as well as through traffic. The function of the colonnaded street as one that provides gathering places is implied by Libanius' term of "*stoai*" to describe the arterial streets of Antioch. The colonnaded street is perhaps the most obvious unifying element of the "Syrian type" town, as such streets are present in the Syrian sites of Gerasa, Palmyra, Philippopolis, Bostra, Apamea, Damascus, and Samaria; the practice spread to Egypt at

---

[85] MacDonald (1965) 25
[86] MacDonald (1965) 25
[87] Bosanquet 103

Alexandria and Antinoe as well as to the southeast region of Asia Minor, on the Syrian border, and at Nicomedia, Ephesus, and Constantinople farther to the west and north.[88]

Because the colonnaded streets functioned as overflow spaces for commercial activity, the second feature of the "Syrian town" is the loss of importance of the central marketplace (*agora*).[89] In typical Hellenistic towns, narrow streets opened onto marketplace areas; in the "Syrian town" model, the streets subsume the function of the open marketplace. Public places are still included in town planning, however, as some colonnaded streets are expanded into central "piazzas," like the oval courtyards at Gerasa and Palmyra. Rather than replicating the rectangular courtyards of temple precincts, like that of the Temple of Bel at Palmyra, oftentimes the secular courtyards that served as transitional spaces between roads were oval. In addition to transitional courtyards, tetrapylon arches marked important intersections, such as that of the *decumanus* and *cardo*. The monumental marking of these transitions showed their importrance in Syrian town planning, as these arches limited pedestrians' choice when changing directions so that they would continue along one of the designated streets only. Additionally, minor temples, baths, and other public buildings placed along the arterial street as well as monumental

---

[88] An excellent example of a typical "Syrian town" is the site of Gerasa. Lying in Jordan along the ancient highway from Damascus to Philadelphia, ancient Gerasa (Jerash) sits on a tributary of the River Jabbok (Figure 3.2).[88] Its city walls, built of rusticated ashlars, are 10.5 m thick and enclose an area of 170 acres. On the western side of the stream are the colonnaded central street (*decumanus*), public buildings, and two temples placed on hills. The main street runs from the north gate toward the temple on the southern hill, so the Temple of Bel would have been visible to travelers for the majority of their passage along the thoroughfare. This temple, dedicated in 162 CE, stood 15 meters above the oval forum. The Temple of Artemis, dedicated in 150 CE, stood on the higher of the two hills and was enclosed by a courtyard with a portico of 260 columns. The idea of architecture directing and defining the paths of visitors is especially evident at Gerasa; for example, the Temple of Artemis is approached from the central street only along a 4.8 m wide stairway that stretched 77.7 m from the street to the propylaea of the temple courtyard (Figure 3.3).
[89] Bosanquet 103

nymphaea served as gathering places.[90] Perhaps the most significant theme of Syrian town

planning for the late antique palace, however, is the architectural "closing of vistas".[91] In the

approach to the Temple of Artemis at Palmyra, a visitor who turned off the arterial street would

find himself essentially stuck on a path leading up various flights of stairs to the temple complex,

essentially closing off the rest of the city to anyone visiting the temple. Similarly, the

unobstructed view along an arterial street constantly reinforced the linear aspect of the city

planning; armatures typically ran from gate to gate. The colonnades not only linked otherwise

disparate lateral elements but also standardized the view to either side as a visitor progressed

along the longitudinal axis. Placing the focus on the uniformity of the flanking colonnades, the

colonnaded street emphasized the axiality of the Syrian urban plan.

At Split, the colonnaded *cardo* and *decumanus* lead from the north, east, and west gates

to the peristyle courtyard in a fashion typical of Roman urban planning. However, at the

peristyle forward progress is abruptly slowed, and the columnar screens of the peristyle

colonnades allowed sightlines to suddenly open along the east-west axes. Though the prothyron

facade would have been striking and would have focused attention at the south end of the

peristyle along the longitudinal axis, the choice of colonnades rather than precinct walls for the

divisions between the peristyle and adjacent precincts allowed the cross-axis between the temple

and mausoleum to become immediately evident. The Sanctuary of Jupiter Heliopolitanus at

Baalbek accomplishes a similar task, slowing forward progress in order to allow visitors to

properly approach the temple, by shifting the orientation of its spaces to the lateral cross-axis as

well (Figure 3.4).

---

[90] Bosanquet 105
[91] Bosanquet 103

Baalbek, also known as Heliopolis, is located on the eastern slopes of the Bekaa valley of Lebanon and depended on a spring between the Litani and Orontes Rivers.[92] The principal remains at Baalbek are those of the great sanctuary originally dedicated to the Syrian god Hadad, the god of lightning and thunder. When the area came under Roman control in the Augustan period, Hadad was retained and incorporated into the Roman pantheon as Jupiter Heliopolitanus, along with Atargatis as Venus and Adonis as Mercury. Today, the ruins of the sanctuary remain on their platform of giant stones making up the acropolis of Baalbek.[93] Within this platform, vaulted spaces may have been used for storage; on it, the Antonine temple (138-161 CE) dedicated to Jupiter Heliopolitanus was constructed, and the other structures in the sanctuary were added later. A large stairway approached the main entrance (Figure 3.5) n the east side, whose Syrian arch over the entrance is evocative of the Syrian arch of Split's prothyron. This monumental porch opened onto a hexagonal courtyard 55 m wide oriented with its acute angles at the north and south. It was part of a series of additions to the Antonine temple: the propylaea was constructed by Septimius Severus and Caracalla (193-217 CE), the courtyard by Philip the Arab (244-249 CE). The hexagonal court opened onto a rectangular court on the west side measuring 102 m by 107 m, the walls of which were ornamented with niches and small chambers decorated with sculpted moldings. In the center of this courtyard, a rectangular space is delineated by walls 1 m high decorated with reliefs of children holding garlands and other pastoral imagery. At the western exit of the rectangular courtyard stands the gigantic, hexastyle Corinthian Temple of Jupiter on its trilithon podium. The peripteral temple is 88 m long and 49 m wide, and including the height of the podium, stands 36.5 m tall. South of the Jupiter complex are the Temple of Bacchus and the circular Corinthian Temple of Venus (both Antonine as well);

---

[92] Watkins 130
[93] Watkins 131

the Temple of Venus is remarkable for its concave niches topped with concave entablatures in the shape of semi-circles.[94]

The Sanctuary of Jupiter uses sheer monumentalism to impress upon visitors the religious importance of the sanctuary. However, the plan shows the simultaneous longitudinal progress and expansion of lateral space seen in the colonnaded streets model. The elements of the sanctuary are organized in a clear progression from east to west, inviting visitors to move forward to approach the temple. Simultaneously, each element examined in isolation expands space laterally on a parallel series of a north-south axes. The main staircase leads up to a porch with chambers at the north and south end. The dominant axis established by the only two points of the hexagon visible on the exterior wall extends from north to south, orthogonal to the pedestrian east-west axis. Though the architect tried to establish east-west axiality by widening the central intercolumniations of the east and west entrances, likely this was overwhelmed by the enclosing feeling of the centrally-planned courtyard and its orthogonal principal axis.[95]

Donald Brown goes so far as to call the hexagonal court a "disruptive and centrifugal influence" rather than conducive to the flow from the propylaea to the temple.[96] Brown does attribute great importance to the choice of using a hexagonal form for the courtyard; like the arcuated colonnade in the early 4th century, the hexagon is an extremely rare form in monumental architecture. In plan, aside from at Baalbek it is used only for the Trajanic harbor at Ostia, with which Brown rightfully finds no connection. Because of its construction under a Syrian emperor, he looks to Syrian roots for the choice of plan. The cult of Jupiter Heliopolitanus had astrological associations, with cult statues showing him draped in a garment

---

[94] Watkins 132-133
[95] Brown (1939) 287
[96] Brown (1939) 285

decorated with reliefs of the seven planetary divinities.[97] A possible source for the hexagonal

courtyard is the ceiling of the north adyton of the Temple of Bel at Palmyra, which shows the

seven planetary divinities arranged in and around a hexagon. In the center is a depiction of Bel,

with the other six placed along the sides of the hexagon, and around this central relief is a circle

of constellations. The hexagonal motif is repeated at Baalbek, where the ceiling of the Temple

of Bacchus is decorated with hexagons in a repeating geometric pattern. However, Brown

argues that the association of the hexagon and the worship of Bel is monumentalized in the

hexagonal court of the Sanctuary of Jupiter. Following the arrangement at Palmyra, the Sun

would be given the eastern side, Venus as the evening star the west, and Bel Jupiter the center.[98]

This possible significance is reinforced by the use of the 30 columns in the colonnade of the

hexagonal courtyard, as there were 30 days in a solar month used in the religion of a solar

divinity such as at Baalbek.[99]

    According to Brown, the architects at Baalbek used an apparently secular architectural

form with specific, yet subtle religious connotations to make the transition from secular areas of

the site along the colonnaded street to the temple sanctuary. Though eastern temple complexes,

such as that of Bel at Palmyra, typically situate temples within a quadriporticus, the hexagonal

courtyard at Baalbek is equally similar to the colonnaded courtyards that join streets in eastern

town planning or the peristyles of domestic architecture. The secular peristyle courtyard takes

on religious significance due to its position behind the propylaea of the sanctuary as well as the

modification to its form; it halts the longitudinal progress of visitor and prepares them to

approach the temple.

---

[97] Brown (1939) 286
[98] Brown (1939) 287
[99] Brown (1939) 288

Similarly, the peristyle at Split, a secular form, takes on sacred connotations with the addition of the Syrian arch in the tetrastyle prothyron facade, and its colonnades essentially serve as the fourth sides of the temple and mausoleum precincts. The opposition of the mausoleum and temple along the palace's cross-axis immediately evokes an association between the two buildings and therefore the individuals for whom they were built: Diocletian and Jupiter. Since Diocletian had already adopted the name "*Jovius*," the fact that he would try to solidify this association architecturally is not surprising. The porch of the mausoleum, located at the top of a frontal staircase, had a tetrastyle facade of porphyry columns and a pediment that may had had a Syrian arch like the prothyron – creating the image of a second temple. Though the circular plan of the mausoleum on the interior of the octagon fit in the standard type of the centrally-planned late antique imperial mausoleum, the porch would have exhibited the features of a classical temple facade. Additionally, the large scale of the mausoleum in comparison to the small temple opposite it would have given the peristyle the feeling of a temple precinct with major and minor temples. The "major temple" as Diocletian's mausoleum is an instance of Diocletian pushing the boundaries of assertions of imperial divinity; as a monument for his own tomb after his apotheosis, his use of temple architecture is fitting. Temples to deified emperors were common throughout the empire, such as the Temples of Divus Julius, of Deified Augustus, and of Vespasian and Titus in Rome and the Temple of Deified Hadrian at Ephesus. However, these were built by the successors of the deified emperors both to honor the past emperor and reaffirm their own current relation to a god. Diocletian's construction of the mausoleum during his own life as a temple to his future deified self was not an accepted practice.

Diocletian may have followed another model for the organization of this section of the palace: the pyramid and temple complexes of the Egyptian Old Kingdom. The axial positioning

of temple and tomb, at Split positioned along the cross-axis and divide by columnar screens, is reminiscent of these pharaonic funerary complexes. His importation of Egyptian materials for the peristyle area is notable, as he used Egyptian red granite for the columns of the prothyron and for eight of the twelve peristyle colonnades. Fragments of porphyry in the area of the mausoleum porch suggest that at least some of the columns of the facade of the mausoleum were made of the stone, and of the extant columns of the mausoleum, two are of Egyptian grey granite from Mons Claudianus and five are of Egyptian red granite.[100] Belamarić, according to the drawings of Richard Adam, notes the presence of twelve sphinxes in and around the peristyle of the palace, including one on each of the antae projecting into the peristyle from each side of the prothyron.[101] Due to the artistic license that Adam sometimes took, this number is likely exaggerated; Wilkes records four sphinxes originally placed by the Mausoleum entrance as tomb guardians facing west. Today, one carved from basalt measuring 2.46 m long, .65 m wide, and 1 m high sits on the eastern anta wall of the peristyle, where its human arms hold an offering vessel.[102] The inscription on the shields of the warriors engraved around the plinth names Palestinian cities, and this inscription was likely added by the conqueror of those cities, Ramesses II (1279-1212 BCE). This area is currently under reconstruction, but a photo from 2004 shows this sphinx where it rests facing north (Figure 3.6). Another sphinx has been moved to the porch of the Temple of the Jupiter where it stands today, with its head broken off (Figure 3.7). The use of the sphinx may not only cite the "Avenue of the Sphinxes" connecting the Temple of Khonsu at Karnak with the temple complex at Luxor, but also the royal pyramid and temple complexes of the Old Kingdom.

---

[100] Ward-Perkins (1992) 117
[101] Belamarić 173
[102] Wilkes (1993) 1a9

The inclusion of this Egyptian material strengthens the association of the peristyle area with a possible Egyptian model. Diocletian's time spent in Egypt suppressing the Theban rebellion may have exposed him to the royal funerary complexes that combined a pyramid and temples associated with the cult of the deceased pharaoh. Certainly, Diocletian undertook building projects in Egypt out of military necessity, such as the fort of El-Deir, south of Luxor, and a fortress in old Cairo.[103] However, in addition to strictly military construction, Diocletian extended the imperial cult into the province through his extensive adaptation of the temple complex at Luxor for his *castrum*.[104] There may have been influences in the reverse direction as well, with Diocletian incorporating Egyptian pharaonic worship into the Roman imperial cult tradition through the adoption of the tomb-temple complex.

The pyramid developed as a monument royal tomb surrounded by a rectangular precinct in the third dynasty.[105] One relevant example is the funerary complex of Djoser (Zoser) at Saqqara dating to the Third Dynasty in the 27th century BCE (Figure 3.8). Within the main precinct are two large courtyards north and south of the central step pyramid each housing an altar, for the pyramid tomb and for the south tomb, respectively. A thoroughfare is created within the precinct by the causeway connecting the east gate of the monumental entrance hall and the vestibule at its west side. Freestanding chapels in the eastern portion of the precinct featured deep niches in the walls in which a statue of a god or the pharaoh was likely placed; Diocletian echoes these niches with the alternating rectilinear and curvilinear niches of the wall surrounding the mausoleum and temple precincts at Split. To the north of the pyramid lies the funerary temple of Djoser, which was divided into the inner cult area with two chapels and a more open

---

[103] Morkot 87 and Sheehan 96
[104] For a discussion of the Diocletianic complex at Luxor, see pp. 60-65
[105] Stadelmann 1

area Stadelmann terms the "Verehrungstempel" with two open courtyards and areas for slaughter.[106] The Djoser complex at Saqqara is the earliest completely excavated example of a unified pyramid-temple complex surrounded by precinct walls. The smaller tombs of officials that surrounded the pharaonic pyramid tomb has been suggested to represent the centralization of the Egyptian state and was intended to display the extreme wealth, power, and patronage of the pharaoh over the state and its population.[107]

This model was developed in the Fourth Dynasty and converted to an east-west oriented sequence of a valley temple, causeway, mortuary temple, and pyramid; examples of this organization are seen at the site of Meidum and at the pyramids of Khufu, Khafre, and Menkaure at Giza, dating to the Fourth Dynasty in the 26th century BCE (Figure 3.9). Between the Third and Fourth Dynasties lies a marked increase in the linear organization of these buildings compared to the scattering of buildings in the precinct of Djoser; the tomb-temple complexes at Giza demonstrate the intentional axiality of these complexes (Figures 3.10 and 3.11). Undoubtedly the mortuary temple served as a place to worship and perform sacrifices for the body of the dead pharaoh; even after apotheosis, Egyptian theology dictated that the physical body of the dead still needed to be honored.[108] In these complexes the mortuary temples featured false doors that represented a connection between the temple and pyramid through which the pharaoh could enter the temple to be honored and cared for. The "closed" plan of early mortuary temples (Figure 3.12), as Roth terms the convoluted sequences of rooms that were linked by vestibules and hallways that impeded progress, compared to the extreme linearity of the New Kingdom mortuary temples is also notable; the linearity of the entire complex that developed in

---

[106] Stadelmann 2
[107] Roth 33
[108] Stadelmann 6

the Fourth Dynasty eventually transformed the plans of individual mortuary temples as well (Figure 3.13).[109] However, in function, they served the same purpose: to house activity associated with honoring the deceased and deified pharaoh. If the Roman mausoleum combines the functions of the monumental tomb and a place for activity associated with the imperial cult, the pyramid-mortuary temple complex separates these two spaces. However, when viewed as a unit they stand opposite the valley temple as a much larger structure on axis with a strongly associated but lesser temple.

With regard to the "royal mortuary suites" of the New Kingdom, Barbara Lesko rejects Uvo Holscher's argument that the later mortuary temples lost their original function of providing a space to perform mortuary services for the dead and became purely temples in which to honor the deified pharaoh.[110] She uses the example of Medinet Habu, the mortuary temple of Ramesses III in Thebes, ancient Luxor (Figure 3.14).[111] Constructed soon after he began his reign in 1182 BCE, it is essentially an enlarged copy of the Ramesseum, the 13th century BCE mortuary temple of Ramesses II (Figure 3.15).[112] Both feature an axial plan with a hypostyle hall and three cult rooms dedicated to the pharaoh, Ammon, and Re.[113] This juxtaposition of cult rooms to the deified pharoah and to the chief gods of the Theban pantheon makes these temples spaces in which the pharaoh and these gods are allied or even conflated. Lesko refers to reliefs in rooms 26 and 27 that depict food offerings as evidence that traditional mortuary activity continued to be practiced in these later temples, even if the plan had changed drastically from its

---

[109] Roth 45, 47-48
[110] Lesko cites Uvo Holscher, *The Excavation of Medinet Habu III and IV: The Mortuary Temple of Ramses III, Parts I and II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941 and 195I (Lesko 455)
[111] Lesko 454
[112] Dodson and Ikram 2479
[113] Dodson and Ikram 248

original 3rd Dynasty form.[114] However, the majority of the reliefs in the Ramesside temples depict either activities of the gods or the pharaoh interacting with the gods, strongly associating them with the activities involved in the cult of the deified pharaoh.[115] Lesko identifies room 14 on the south side of the hypostyle hall as a chapel likely devoted to the worship of the deified Ramesses II and the ancestral king Ramesses III.[116] Though the later mortuary temple took on a greater role in the worship of the pharaonic cult, it likely would have been removed had the conservative ideas of proper care for the royal dead not persisted.

Though the rooms associated with pharaonic cult are not located on axis with the entrance of the temple, Medinet Habu not surprisingly exhibits the same linear development seen in the Luxor Temple. The model for Medinet Habu, the Ramesseum, and the Luxor Temple were both constructed by Ramesses II with similar plans. Because Medinet Habu as well as the Ramesseum were associated with Ammon and Re as well as the deified pharaoh, their plans feature three rooms past the hypostyle hall; at the converted Temple of Luxor, only one room beyond the hypostyle hall is used.[117] However, the idea of a linear progression through the larger structure to the main cult rooms is present at both. Thus in the royal funerary monuments at Luxor, Diocletian would have found not only a model for the arrangement of his version of a tomb-temple complex, his octagonal mausoleum and the Temple of Jupiter, but also for the arrangement of his palace from the north gate to the residential block. He takes the "macro" design of the pyramid and valley temple arrangement and places it within the walls of his palace, while taking the "micro" design of the layout of the New Kingdom mortuary temple and using it for the large-scale organization of his palace from the Golden Gate to the prothyron. The

---

[114] Lesko 455
[115] Dodson and Ikram 249
[116] Lesko 458
[117] For a discussion of the conversion of the Luxor temple to a *castrum,* see pp. 60-65

presence of the Diocletianic fort in the same city proves that he spent time here while repressing the Egyptian rebellion. His organization of the peristyle area of his palace at Split as well as the inclusion of Egyptian material here strongly suggests that he was influenced by Egyptian architecture.

IV. Supplanting Local Cult Spaces: Imperial Cult and Military Fortifications at Palmyra and Luxor (pp. 51-65)

The adoption of these architectural forms from Syria and Egypt requires that Diocletian and his architects would have been directly exposed to them, or they would be well known enough that they would be widely recognized without traveling to these provinces. Because the palace was completed by Diocletian's abdication in 305 CE and a project of this scale would have taken multiple years to complete, Diocletian's travels through 295-300 CE were likely the most influential if Diocletian did rely on foreign models for his palace at Split. Corcoran has undertaken a comprehensive look at Diocletian's travels over the course of his rise from his command in Carus' army to his abdication.[118] Diocletian served as commander of emperor Carus' *protectores* (imperial guard) during his Mesopotamian campaign of 282 and 283 CE.[119] After Carus' death, his son Numerian became emperor but died of supposed infection, after which Diocletian's army proclaimed him emperor on November 20, 284 CE. Carinus, Carus' older brother, seized power in Italy, and the two armies clashed at the River Margus near Viminacium in modern Serbia. After Carinus' assassination by one of his officers, Diocletian took undisputed control, elevating Maximian as a co-emperor in 285. Leaving Maximian to handle affairs in the west, Diocletian undertook a series of campaigns in the eastern and African provinces over the next two decades. Battling the Sarmatians along the Danube in the fall of 285, he spent the winter in Nicomedia, and Lactantius notes Diocletian's haste in building a residence there: in order to maintain the hurried pace of construction at his Nicomedian residence, Diocletian resorted to "limitless scouring of the provinces to raise workers."[120] This documented importation of labor at Nicomedia shows Diocletian's willingness to import a labor force in order

---

[118] Corcoran 228-254
[119] Corcoran 229
[120] McNally quotes Lactantius' *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, Ch. 7

to keep up with the demands of a building project. If the construction of the Split residence

raised the same demands, Diocletian would likely have imported labor for that project as well.

In the spring of 286, he stayed at Tiberias and Paneas (Banias) en route from Syria to

Palestine along the eastern Mediterranean coast.[121] After dedicating a market in Tyre in honor of

Maximian Herculius in 287, he returned west in 288 and invaded Germany from the province of

Raetia. Wintering in Sirmium for his Danubian campaigns of 289, he returned to Milan for a

conference with Maximian in the winter of 290-291, where he created the first Tetrarchy and

gave himself the post of Sirmium to address the Danubian frontier.[122] Before meeting Galerius

at Nisibis to make peace terms with the conquered Persian King Narses, Diocletian put down the

Egyptian revolt in 298.[123] This revolt, led by the usurper Domitius Domitianus, involved a siege

of Alexandria in 298, after which Diocletian traveled south to Elephantine to negotiate the

southern border of the province. Here, he withdrew from Hiera Sykaminos and established the

frontier at Aswan, building a fortress on the island of Philae.[124] Having reestablished order in

Egypt, he traveled to Antioch in 299, stopping in Nisibis en route, and stayed in Antioch until

301. Presumably, it was during this time that he completed his palace in Antioch described by

Libanius. After wintering in Alexandria in 301-302, he returned to Nicomedia in 302.

In addition to incorporating eastern architectural forms in his palaces, Diocletian adopted

several foreign court practices as well. Corcoran notes that Diocletian had visitors bow prostrate

before him and kiss the hem of his imperial robe, a practice called *proskynesis* and adopted from

Persian court tradition.[125] Diocletian also introduced the presence of eunuch chamberlains; both

---

[121] Corcoran 231
[122] Corcoran 233
[123] Corcoran 234
[124] Morkot 83
[125] Corcoran 236

were likely adopted after the capture of the court of King Narses, whose peace treaty Diocletian

negotiated with Galerius at Nisibis in 299. Eutropius describes Diocletian's court practices:

> "He was the first that introduced to the Roman empire a ceremony suited
> rather to the royal usages than to Roman liberty, giving orders that he
> should be adored, whereas all emperors before him were only saluted. He
> put ornaments of precious stones on his dress and shoes, when the
> imperial distinction had previously been only the purple robe, the rest of
> the habit being the same as that of other men."[126]

Ammianus Marcellinus also documents Diocletian's adoption of the *proskynesis*, saying,

"Diocletian was the first who introduced the custom of offering reverence to the emperor after

this foreign manner and royal pretension; whereas all former princes, as we read, had been

saluted like judges."[127] Diocletian's separation of the emperor from the civilian population by

means of special clothing and adoption of *proskynesis* transformed the recognition of the

emperor from a mortal to a semi-divine figure. Apotheosis after death was standard imperial cult

practice beginning with the deification of Julius Caesar, but recognition of the emperor as divine

before death was unorthodox and had been disastrous when previously attempted by Domitian

and Commodus among others.

To reinforce his assertion of imperial divinity in the architecture of the palace, Diocletian

would have looked to adapt an architectural form that had worship of the imperial cult as an

accepted element: the *castrum*. The Roman military fort typically had at its center a well-

guarded cult room, the *aedes principiorum*, in which the standards were held; usually a *genius* of

the emperor and altar were kept here as well.[128] The presence of this imperial cult room in the

typical *castrum* meant that the association between the *castrum* and assertions of imperial

divinity (if not of the emperor himself, of his divine predecessors) was well established. The

---

[126] Eutropius 9.26, trans. J.S. Watson
[127] Ammianus Marcellinus XV.5.18, trans. C.D. Yonge
[128] Keppie 143

Tetrarchic military fortifications in the East and Egypt exhibit the traditional orthogonal plan of the Roman *castrum*, with two north-south and east-west arteries meeting in the center of the structure. Respectively the *cardo* and *decumanus* of Roman urban planning correspond with these central roads, and Wilkes uses their military terms, *via praetoria* and *via principalis*, respectively, when describing the palace at Split.[129] In the *castrum*, the military headquarters (*principia*) is set up at the intersection of these roads, and the *aedes principiorum* next to the *principia*. A Tetrarchic example survives at Palmyra, of which Gawlikowski provides a plan of the *principia* (Figure 4.1). A plan of the site as a whole shows that though the Diocletianic camp is organized around a dominant east-west axis (i.e. the apse of the *aedes principiorum*, the central room of the *principia*, is on the far west), the fort uses the typical axial construction (Figures 4.2 and 4.3). However, the *principia* is set up as almost an external structure to the main fort – atypical for the *castrum* plan.[130]

Gawlikowski has written the most extensive report on the site of the Diocletianic camp in Palmyra, which he admits needed further excavation at the time of his publication in 1976.[131] Though Byzantine and post-Byzantine construction obscures some of the site, the core intersection of the *via praetoria* and *via principalis*, as well as the *aedes*, have been excavated (Figure 4.4). The *via praetoria*, the longitudinal artery of the camp that runs west-northwest to

---

[129] Wilkes (1993) 38

[130] Cavaglieri describes the *castrum* as such: "The *castrum*, as well as the fixed establishment into which the *castrum* was often transformed, needs military protection. A wall is built all around it with easily protected gates. These are placed, of course, in the direction of the *cardo* and of the *decumanus*; thus the traffic into the city and from the city to the outside is conveyed to these main arteries; usually, also, the *cardo* or the *decumanus* are on the axis of the main country road in the location" (29). He notes the presences of the *praetorium* at the center of the *castrum*, typically the first structure east of the intersection of the arterial streets (*via principalis* and *via praetoria*) such as Caesar's camp at Sabis (Gaul, 57 BCE) or the 3rd century camp at Novaesium near Trier, Germany (Cavaglieri plate X).

[131] Gawlikowski (1976) 153-163

east-southeast, joins the Palmyrene avenue at an oblique angle. The columns at either side of

this intersection have been dated to the 2nd century CE. However, Gawlikowski is certain that

the main structure of the fort is Tetrarchic: an inscription found in the *aedes*, which Gawlikowski

terms the "Temple of the Standards," dates to between 293 and 303 CE, making the fort

contemporaneous with or slightly earlier than Diocletian's palace at Split. The inscription reads,

"*castra condiderunt*" (they built a camp). Ambiguously, this could also refer to the circuit walls

around the hillside where the camp is built; however, Richmond argues that those date to

Aurelian's siege of 272 CE and were constructed to preclude the use of the hill west of the fort in

future attacks on the city.[132]

Before Gawlikowski and Richmond, D. Schlumberger had found columns dated to the

first half of the first century in the unexcavated area north of the excavated portions of the

transverse *via principalis*.[133] Likely they came from a preexisting Temple of Jupiter located in

that area that had fallen into disuse or had been otherwise destroyed. Other finds support the

suggestion that the area formerly served as a sanctuary. Inscriptions were found related to the

cult of Allat, a Nabataean goddess worshipped in Syria. Allat was a fertility and warrior goddess

as well as the female protector of cities and the evening star; she is consequently associated with

Minerva and Venus.[134] She is worshipped in a triad with Rahim and Sams (Shamash), a sun

---

[132] Richmond 48

[133] Schlumberger 79-97

[134] The chief sanctuary to Allat was in the city of Ta'if. Representations of her found at Hatra, Palmyra, and Dura Europos depict her clad in military attire with a helmet, shield, spear, and an aegis with a gorgon (Ismail 177). In southern regions of Syria, Venus as the evening star was equated with the female goddess Ishtar, but in middle and upper Syria, she was equated with Allat (Offord 198).

deity, and is one of the principal deities of the Nabataeans.[135] An altar to this goddess dating to 115 CE was reused for building material in the camp. Also north of the *via principalis*, a column drum larger than those associated with the presumed Temple of Jupiter was found without context; on it a Greek inscription to Helios dates to 272 CE, so this drum was likely associated with the Aurelianic walls. Other altars to Aglibol and Malakbel were found throughout the site, although only one was found *in situ* covered over by the courtyard of the *aedes*, and it dates to 234 CE. These structures provide a critical *terminus post quem* of 234 CE for the *aedes*, a date that agrees with Gawlikowski's proposed date range of 293 to 303 CE.

To summarize, the objects found in the excavation that date to before the construction of the camp are associated with a variety of deities, making a reconstruction of a sanctuary to a specific deity difficult. Undoubtedly, however, Palmyrenes would have strongly associated this area west of the city center with religious activities. The early and mid-3rd century CE dates of some of the objects show that the area likely served one or more cults up until the time of the fort's construction at the century's close. By building the fort, which served as the headquarters of the Tetrarchy for the area, over this sanctuary area of Palmyrene gods, Diocletian substituted his imperial cult for that of the indigenous deities. The column drum inscription to Helios and the altar to Malakbel, a Palmyrene sun deity, suggest the association of the area with worship of the sun; the altar to Allat indirectly suggests the worship of Sams by association. When Palmyra submitted as an occupied Roman town in the second half of the 3rd century, the structure representing the authority of Rome, the fort, was built on the ground of the former sanctuary. Diocletian's personal identification with Jupiter did not make for a perfect continuation of the

---

[135] Local variations of the principal deities of this triad were worshipped throughout Syria; in Palmyra they were known as Sams, Allat, and Rahim. The three solar deities were Sams (Shamash), Aglibol (Iarhibol), and Malakbel (Seyrig 349).

worship of Helios, but Diocletian nevertheless ultimately supplanted the gods of Palmyra in this location.

Thus through topography, the camp has connotations of religious significance. In addition, the camp demonstrates a link to the typical late antique palace, especially in the context of Frazer's categorization.[136] A visitor to the camp proceeds axially towards the *aedes*, the "Temple of the Standards." Though a monumental tetrapylon marks the crossing of these roads, typical of this type of intersection, undoubtedly the focus of the plan is on the *aedes* at the far west. Like the late antique palaces – with Split as the notable exception – the camp has two arterial streets that transverse an enclosed, rectangular area with the *aedes* and courtyard placed on the west end, taking the place of the residential area of the late antique palace. Rather than placing the *aedes* in the open area created by their intersection, as was typical of the Roman camp, here Diocletian seems to have added it as an external component to the camp. The palace at Split can be divided into the public section, bounded at the south by the *decumanus*, and the true "palace" section, to which the peristyle and associated precincts serve as a forecourt. Similarly, at Palmyra the camp can be divided into the true "camp" in the traditional sense and the imperial cult precinct as a separate element in the west.

Ernest Will goes so far as to say that the structure identified as a camp is in fact a palace: "Le prétendu 'Camp de Diocletien' ne mérite en aucune maniére ce nom… Le Camp est en realité un palais...."[137] The attribution of the inscription, "*castra condiderunt*," to this structure has led to the misidentification of the building as purely a camp. The full inscription reads as follows:

---

[136] Frazer 385-392
[137] Will 388

"The repairers of their world and propagators of the human race, our lords Diocletianus and Maximianus, the most unconquered *Imperatores*, and Constantius and Maximianus (i.e. Galerius), the most notable *Caesares*, have successfully founded the camp, under the care of Sossianus Hierocles, a most perfect man, governor of the province, devoted to their *numen* and their *maiestas*."[138]

It likely served as the headquarters of the Tetrarchy in the area and served as a deterrent to

attacks from the hills west of Palmyra, and the area demarcated by the *via praetoria* and *via*

principalis may have served in the traditional fashion as a camp. However, Will argues that the

actual *aedes* was located at the intersection of the arterial streets and the complex to the west that

has been termed the "Temple of the Standards" is in fact an imperial palace complex.[139] The

apsidal room that Gawlikowski identifies as the *aedes* Will identifies as an imperial audience

hall. Will argues that residential areas of the camp would have been constructed out of local

mud brick and that the stone masonry of the so-called "Temple of the Standards" points to

imperial usage.[140] If the structure actually served as an imperial administrative building, if not

an imperial residence, the so-called camp would have fit well into the model of late antique

palaces established by Frazer.

Even if the camp did in fact serve a military purpose, Will also makes the distinction

between the private section, whether it be the *aedes* or an audience hall, and the public

"quadrilatère."[141] The ambiguity in the interpretation of the plan of the private section

demonstrates the lack of absolute separation of the religious and secular in the late antique

period. Like a standard Italic temple, the "Temple of the Standards" features a frontal staircase

---

[138] Millar (1993) 182

[139] Will 389

[140] He also offers the alternative that the actual Roman camp was built in the overtaken "palace of the princes of Palmyra," the former residence of King Odaenathus and Queen Zenobia, and it is to this structure that the inscription refers. This structure has not been excavated and is thus not on the site plan.

[141] Will 389

and tetrastyle facade; though we have no reconstructions of the building, these elements would likely have given building's facade the impression of a temple. Between the two pilasters behind the four columns, space expands laterally as it does in the propylaea of the Sanctuary of Jupiter at Baalbek.[142] This detracts from the temple-like feeling of the structure, which one would expect to continue longitudinally into the cella. The lateral expansion is also a functional necessity in order to give access to the five main rooms of the structure. Again, the apsed central hall conflates the religious and secular traditions: though the apse had long been used in temple cellas, it also by this time had become a fixture in imperial audience halls, such as the Aula Regia of Domitian on the Palatine in Rome.[143]

If Will's argument that the room served as the audience hall of a palace, it is a secular room essentially provided with a temple facade. By plan, its parallel at Split is the prothyron that divides the imperial apartments from the public sections of the palace. Here, too, Diocletian gives a secular transitional monument a religious connotation. Already the arcuated lintel used in isolation evokes connotations of divinity in late antiquity. While its use in arcades and gates can be reduced to experiments in stylistic innovation, instances of a single, central arcuated lintel can be categorically attributed to temple facades or representations of imperial divinity, with the exception of the single gates of 8th-6th century BCE Syria.[144] If Will proves incorrect and this section of the Palmyrene camp did in fact serve as an *aedes*, the religious connotations of the prothyron at Split are further strengthened. Taking the *aedes* as a shrine to imperial cult, Wilkes suggests that Diocletian replaces it with the pedimental facade of his prothyron at Split.[145]

---

[142] For a discussion of this sanctuary, see pp. 41-43
[143] The Domus Flavia, the public section of Domitian's Palace, was completed ca. 92 CE (MacDonald (1965) 48).
[144] Brown (1942) 390-391
[145] Wilkes (1993) 38

Where in the typical fort there would have been a statue of the emperor to be honored in this space, Diocletian creates a place where he can present himself to be honored in the flesh.

Another model for the practice of imperial cult in a military setting presents itself in the Temple of Ammon at Luxor, which was completed by Ramesses II in the 12th century BCE.[146] In the late third century CE the temple was enclosed by circuitry walls and converted into the core of a Roman *castrum* (Figure 4.5). Because the temple complex was preexisting, it had to be converted to suit the needs of Diocletian's administration; only the area north of the camp's center has been excavated, but this allows for an understanding of how the temple and approaching courtyards were converted to serve for their new purpose as a Tetrarchic *aedes*. In the northwest corner at the intersection of two streets are four bases (marked with the letters A-D on the plan Figure 4.5). The four bases supported four columns, which marked the intersection of the *via praetoria* and *via principalis*; the pre-existing structure at the site made a perfectly orthogonal plan impossible, so the intersection is slightly west of the axial line with the temple.[147] The inscriptions on the column bases indicate that they were dedicated to the Tetrarchs Diocletian, Maximian, Galerius, and Constantius Chlorus and date to 300 CE.[148] Likely each column held a statue of its respective Tetrarch, similar to the statues atop the plinths of the Golden Gate at Split.[149] A colonnaded street leads from this intersection to the western gate of the courtyard of Ramses II. Moving from this courtyard along the central axis of the temple complex (the cardinal northeast-southwest axis), a portico, labeled M on the plan, connects the courtyard of Ramses II with the courtyard of Amenophis III. Another colonnaded

---

[146] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 227
[147] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 228
[148] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner cites P. Lacau. "Inscriptions latines du temple de Luxor." *Annales du Service des Antiquites de l'Egypte*. 34 (1934) 32 (Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 228)
[149] See p. 12 and figure 1.5

street connects with the east side of this courtyard and features another set of four columns bases, labeled I-L; the inscriptions indicate these were dedicated to the Augusti Licinius and Galerius and their Caesars Constantine and Maximinus and date to November 308 CE. Apparently these bases supported smaller columns that copied the earlier northwestern group (A-D).[150] The location and inscriptions of this earlier group (A-D) suggest that the temple complex was incorporated into the camp around 300 CE, likely after the construction of the camp at Palmyra and immediately following Diocletian's repression of the revolt in Egypt in 299.

A hypostyle hall serves as a transitional space between the courtyard of Amenophis III and an apsed hall on axis to the southwest (Figure 4.6). The parallel with Split's colonnaded peristyle is tempting, but given the fact that this complex was converted to a camp rather than purposefully created, the hypostyle hall is more accurately a remnant of the structure's previous use as the Temple of Ammon.[151] However, the eight columns along the central axis of the hall were joined by walls pierced with central openings that likely functioned as doorways. This solidification of a columnar screen emphasizes the axial approach toward the apsed hall and also echoes the insertion of the marble latticework *transennae* between the columns at Split as noted by Wilkes.[152] The apsed hall is not original and was altered during the Diocletianic construction of the *castrum*; the rear wall closed off the opening that had previously led to the southern chambers of the temple and the cult chamber of Ammon. This doorway was completely blocked by a masonry wall during the conversion of the camp, and an apse nearly 1.5 m deep was built into this wall. The original eight columns that supported a flat roof were removed, a new raised pavement level was laid, and a frontal staircase was added for access to the chamber from the

---

[150] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner cites Lacau 25 (Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 228)
[151] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 230
[152] Wilkes (1993) 46

hypostyle hall. Like at Palmyra, the small apse lies on axis with the central entrance to a rectangular chamber oriented orthogonally to its approach (Figure 4.7). The importance of the apse is highlighted by two columns, similar to those marking the entrance to the apsed hall at Palmyra. However, the space of the chamber expands to either side as the approach abruptly ends at the focal apse. Though the apse is clearly the focus of the room, the width of the chamber is arresting, especially given the long axial approach through the two courtyards.

The two columns flanking the apse are made of syenite, a stone similar to Egyptian red granite, which is used in the columns of the prothyron at Split.[153] The two columns found *in situ* stand about 0.5 m away from the rear wall and span a width of 2.8 m; as marked on the plan, two additional columns stood in front, but these were found lying on the ground west of the temple.[154] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner suggests that these four columns supported a *ciborium*, a canopy supported by columns, here likely a domed canopy with either a gabled or domed roof. In addition to the raised floor, frontal staircase, apsed hall, and proposed ciborium, during the Diocletianic construction the Pharaonic reliefs were covered with two layers plaster that carried frescoes. Though the Roman frescoes have been removed to reveal the reliefs, the scholar J. G. Wilkinson created a series of watercolors of the frescoes in the mid-19th century that were later published by Monneret de Villard (Figure 4.8).[155] According to the sketches, the walls were divided into three levels: the lowest consisted of painted plaster imitating *opus sectile*, the middle section depicted figural scenes, and the upper level is largely unknown, as only small ornamental portions were preserved at Wilkinson's time. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner argues on the bases of these

---

[153] Red, yellow, gold, and brown were colors associated with the sun in ancient Egypt, so stones in these shades, such as syenite or red granite, were understood to have solar connotations (Robins 24).
[154] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 231
[155] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner cites U. Monneret de Villard. "The Temple of the Imperial Cult at Luxor." *Archaeologia*. 95 (1953) 85-105 (Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 232)

sketches that the middle section portrayed a Diocletianic *adventus* scene celebrating the

suppression of the Egyptian revolt in 297; she argues for an *adventus* rather than a triumph as

civil wars and revolts were not considered to merit the award of a triumph.[156]

However, the decorative program of the frescoes is of less concern than the fact that the

architectural model of the Palmyrene *castrum* was repeated at Luxor. Monneret de Villard

suggests that the apsed room at Luxor was in fact the *aedes principiorum* of the camp, or as he

calls it, "The *sacellum* of the legionary insignia, the sanctuary for the *genius castrorum* and for

sacrifice to the emperor."[157] Though the apse is commonly found in the *aedes*, the suggested

ciborium is unusual, and he suggests that a cult statue of the emperor would have been placed

beneath it, given the decorative program of the frescoes. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner argues that a

throne for the emperor would have been placed under the *ciborium*, making the apsed hall an

imperial audience hall.[158] Supporting this idea is Wilkinson's detailed watercolor of the niche,

which depicts two Tetrarchs, permanently giving them a presence in the apse and essentially

beneath the *ciborium*; the figure on the right is identified as Diocletian because of the orb and

scepter he holds in his left and right hands respectively (Figure 4.9).[159] The interchangeability of

the *genius* of the emperor and the throne for a live presentation of the emperor makes the apsed

hall both secular and religious. The ambiguity in the architectural model for the imperial

audience hall and the *aedes principiorum* is similar again to the camp at Palmyra. This

commonality in secular and religious architecture makes the use of these apsed halls in the *castra*

nearly impossible to identify surely today, but even in the 4th century the ambiguity would have

seemed purposeful.

---

[156] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 241
[157] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner cites M. de Villard 99 (Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 249)
[158] For coins depicting Roman emperors under ciboria, see Yegul 22
[159] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 244

The conversion of the Temple of Ammon, the Egyptian equivalent of Zeus and Jupiter, into an imperial audience hall would have fit well with Diocletian's adoption of Jupiter as his patron.[160] Moreover, the Luxor temple likely served as a cult place not only for Zeus Ammon but also for the Egyptian royal cult, the worship of the pharaoh's *ka*.[161] An inscription on an architrave block in the courtyard of Amenhotep III reads, "[Amenhotep III was] one who made monuments in Luxor for the one who bore him."[162] This reminder of Amenhotep's link with the divine through his ancestry reminds all visitors of the pharaoh's rightful possession of the *ka* – when Ammon was honored, so would be the pharaoh's deified predecessors.[163] A cult statue of the deified Ramesses II in his courtyard is the equivalent of a Roman *genius*; it is a physical representation of the king as an embodiment of the *ka*.[164] Even before the complex's conversion to an *aedes principiorum* for the Roman ruler cult, the temple combined the worship of the local deity and ruler. Like at Palmyra, where Diocletian supplanted the local deities by placing his administrative-military center over a preexisting sanctuary, here Diocletian converts a structure previously dedicated to both the primary god of the Egyptian pantheon as well as the ruler cult. The connection was surely purposeful. With the hypostyle hall converted to the function of a colonnaded corridor with the addition of walls between the columns, the long approach to a frontal staircase, raised platform, and a presentation of the emperor in the apse – either in life or

---

[160] Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 249

[161] Bell quotes R. T. Rundle Clark's description of the concept: "The kingship of Egypt, like all forms of property, consisted of a duality – it was based on a relationship between the living and the dead. The king exercised the supreme power in the world. He was the intermediary whereby the divine energies of the universe were made available for men. This power he derived from his ancestors, in particular from his father who for this reason was considered as himself divine. The deceased father in his tomb was the source of the power, called by the Egyptians the *Ka*…" Bell cites R. T. Rundle Clark. *Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt.* London: Thames & Hudson, 1959, p. 107 (Bell 256).

[162] Bell 254

[163] Bell 257

[164] Bell 259

in absentia in the form of a *genius* and the fresco paintings – the temple at Luxor was transformed into a temple to the Roman imperial cult.

V. <u>The Syrian Arch and Diocletian's Adoption of the Rostrate Temple Facade (pp.66-78)</u>

The symbolic replacement of the *aedes principiorum* with the prothyron meant that Diocletian created a place for public self-presentation; the Syrian arch of the prothyron would have been commonly understood to mark the divinity of the figure below it. The form of the "Syrian lintel," "Syrian arch," or "Syrian pediment" has been dated as far back as the mid-9th century BCE for its usage in city gates in Northern Syria; Donald Brown defines it as a "freely upswung" architrave that curves to form an arch over the central intercolumniation of a columnar facade without interruption, calling it an arcuated lintel.[165] These terms all describe the same architectural form, though the "Syrian lintel" and "Syrian arch" refer specifically to the arcuated lintel, and "Syrian pediment" refers to the whole pedimental construction using this type of architrave. The earliest example Brown notes is a depiction of an arcuated lintel over a city gate on one of the sixteen original bronze relief bands from the doors of the palace of Shalmaneser, which are dated to 858-824 BCE and called the Balawat Gates (Figure 5.1). The reliefs of the doors depict a fortified city; on the city walls, a horizontal molding forms an arch over the barrel vaulted entrance to the city before continuing on horizontally on either other side of the doorway. This technique is replicated in the 2nd century CE west city gate at Bosrah (Syria, Figure 5.2). The earliest examples of the form only appear on city gates; after falling out of use in the 6th century BCE, the form reemerges in a sacred context for the first time in the 1st century BCE at the Syrian town of Si', where it appears on the gateway to the temple precinct of the Temple of Dushara (33-9 BCE) (Figure 5.3).[166] Here, the lintel is not formed by a molding on a solid wall that forms an arch over a barrel vaulted opening; instead it is inserted into the horizontal architrave of a classical temple, creating an opening in the pediment. The propylaea of the

---

[165] Brown 389
[166] Brown 391

Sanctuary of Jupiter Heliopolitanus at Baalbek, dating to the reign of Caracalla (198-217 CE) and completed by Philip (244-249 CE) follows this model, as shown in Wiegand's reconstruction of its facade (Figure 5.4).

Though still used in the context of transitional spaces as it originally was on the city gate, its use in the propylaea of temple sanctuaries gave the arcuated lintel its first associations with sacred architecture. What Brown calls a hybrid form of the arcuated lintel, the construction used in the Milesian stadium gate where an arch is superimposed upon a flat architrave, appears in the temples at Termessos and Lagon, while the temple at Cremna uses the true form.[167] Their use in temples throughout Asia Minor shows the pervasiveness of the arcuated lintel, which spreads even to the province of Transalpine Gaul where it appears on the Triumphal Arch of Orange, possibly dated to 27 CE under reconstruction by Tiberius.[168] The sides of the arch show four columns spanned by an architrave and with an arcuated lintel over the central intercolumniation topped by a pediment, the arcuated lintel's first appearance on a Roman monument (Figure 5.5).[169] Between the columns are depictions of *spolia*, suggesting that the pedimental facade depicted is that of a monumentalized *aedes principiorum*, or "Temple of the Standards" that stood in the center of the Roman *castrum*.

In addition to its use in the pediments of temples and other sacred gateways, the form is used in relief and other pictorial forms to mark the glorification or divinity of the figure depicted below the arch. The presentation of the enthroned emperor below the Syrian arch occurs on the

---

[167] For discussion of the stadium gate at Miletus and the temples at Termessos, Lagon, and Cremna, see pp. 30-32.
[168] Curtis 42: The dating of this arch is controversial: holes exist on the north side of the arch that likely held bronze letters of an inscription to Tiberius that read, "*August. f. divi Iuli nepoti August.*" However, the letters would have covered the decoration of the architrave and may have been attached in a later period than the construction of the arch itself, making the arch Augustan.
[169] Yegul 22

silver *missorium* of Theodosius I, made in 388 to commemorate his decennalia (Figure 5.6).[170]

On it, a tetrastyle pedimental facade frames the seated, haloed emperor, above whom a Syrian

arch spans the central intercolumniation.[171] Below the depiction of the emperor, in the exergue,

is the depiction of the allegorical figure of the Earth (Tellus), perhaps symbolizing that the

structure above her is situated in a realm above the earth, i.e. the heavens. Placing a figure in the

heavenly realm beneath an architectural form associated with sacred structures strongly suggests

the divinity of that figure, here, the emperor. Here, the Christian emperor depicts himself in the

role of ruler of the heavens, which is unusual. The central placement of Theodosius and his large

size relative to the scale of the rest of the relief strengthen this suggestion. Though this disk

dates to later in the fourth century after the completion of the palace, the idea of an emperor

made divine below a Syrian arch likely would have been understood in the early fourth century.

The sword of Tiberius, which Brown mentions but does not include in his analysis, dated to 15

CE presents the same imagery in separate registers on the gilded scabbard (Figure 5.7).[172] On

the upper register is a scene of Tiberius in military dress presenting the statue of a winged

victory to a seated Augustus, dressed as Jupiter and surrounded by the figures of Victory and

Mars Ultor (Figure 5.8). Likely commissioned for a high-ranking military officer, the decorative

program of the sword is careful to maintain Tiberius' mortality: in the middle band of relief, an

eagle is depicted below a tetrastyle structure with a Syrian arch and pediment, linking this relief

with the upper relief through the appearance of one of Jupiter's attributes (Figure 5.9). In the

lowest section of the scabbard is a figure in a tunic carrying a double-axe, perhaps a depiction of

the recipient of this sword. Though Tiberius is careful not to assert his own divinity overtly

---

[170] From the collections of the Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid.
[171] Brown 395
[172] Mainz, Germany, now in the British Museum (see British Museum Collections Online)

through the iconography of the sword, the association of Jupiter, the eagle, and the Syrian arch

provides a link between the form's use in sacred architecture and its ability to connote divinity

when used in relief.

Because of its associations with religious architecture, the Syrian arch used in the

peristyle porch at Split "establishes the correct *mise-en-scène* in which the god-emperor might

choose to emerge."[173] The presence of the Syrian arch in the porch facade of the peristyle not

only brings the religious associations typically attributed to the form but also links it to other

buildings using a similar facade construction. Already, the construction techniques of the

Pisidian temples using the feature helped to provide information about possible sources of labor

for the palace. Another temple in Asia Minor, the so-called "Temple of Hadrian" on Curetes

Street in Ephesos, also features a tetrastyle facade with a Syrian pediment (Figure 5.10). Some

scholars contest the identification of this building as the Temple of Hadrian described in an

inscription from an architrave block found on Curetes Street, which stated that the building was

dedicated by Ti. Claudius Piso Diophantus, "The high-priest of the two temples in Ephesos, in

whose tenure was consecrated the temple of the divine Hadrian, who first asked (for it) from the

divine Hadrian and succeeded."[174] The Syrian arch of the tetrastyle temple on Curetes street

would likely have been a significant identifying feature, but a bronze coin issued by Elagabalus

between 218 and 222 CE commemorating the award of the city's fourth *neokoros* depicts four

Ephesian temples on the reverse, all of which have flat architraves (Figure 5.11).[175] The two

upper temples are tetrastyle and the two lower are distyle: given the identification of the cult

---

[173] Yegul 23

[174] Bowie 137, Jones 151

[175] *Neokoros* means "temple-warden," referring to the emperor's granting that a temple to the imperial cult be built the city; Head 91: BMC *Ionia* No. 304, pl. XIV 6: Obv.: AUTKMAUP AUP ANTΩN EINOC CEB, Bust of Elagabalus, laureate, r., wearing a cuirass and *paludamentum.*

statue of Artemis in the temple on the upper left and that temple's octastyle facade in reality, these depictions are likely inaccurate. Though the omission of the Syrian arch is surprising, it is possible that the temple of Hadrian's facade was modified for ease of carving on the coin die, as the Temple of Artemis' was.[176]

However, in addition to the evidence of the architrave's inscription, a Hadrianic gate located at the intersection of Curetes Street and the Marble Street has been reconstructed with a Syrian pediment over four columns on the upper level (Figure 5.12).[177] Based on the inscription of Diophantus and the use of the tetrastyle Syrian pediment on the upper level of the gate of Hadrian on the same street, it seems likely that the tetrastyle structure on Curetes Street is in fact the Hadrianeion. Combined with the expansion of the imperial cult before his death, Hadrian adopted the title of *Olympios* in 128 CE in a fashion similar to Diocletian's adoption of the title "*Jovius*" in 285 CE. Also responsible for the completion of the sanctuary of Zeus Olympios in Athens in 131-132 CE, Hadrian, like Diocletian, promoted an association between himself and

---

[176] Though numismatic depictions of Syrian arches are uncommon, there are several examples from the late second and third centuries CE:
- Bronze coin of Commodus (ANS 1944.100.47703), Aphrodisias, 180-192 CE, reverse depicts Aphrodite beneath the Syrian arch of a tetrastyle temple;
- Bronze coin of Septimius Severus (ANS 1971.230.34), Apollonia (Caria), 193-211 CE, reverse depicts three female figures within tetrastyle temple with Syrian arch;
- Bronze coin of Septimius Severus (ANS 1951.64.36), Metropolis (Ionia), 193-211 CE, reverse depicts Ares beneath the Syrian arch of a tetrastyle temple;
- Bronze coin of Caracalla (ANS 1971.279.56), Philadelphia (Lydia), 211-217 CE, reverse depicts Helios beneath the Syrian arch of a tetrastyle temple;
- Bronze coin of Philip II (ANS 1953.171.1461), Zeugma (Syria), 244-249 CE, reverse depicts a tetrastyle temple with Syrian arch on the reverse;
- Sestertius of Trajan Decius, (ANS 1944.100.59353), Antioch, 249-251 CE, reverse depicts Tyche beneath the Syrian arch of a tetrastyle temple;
- Aureus of Galerius (ANS 1967.153.39), Trier, 295-305 CE, reverse depicts Mars beneath a Syrian arch.

All coins are found in the online collections of the American Numismatic Society: http://numismatics.org/search/ (April 17th, 2011).
[177] Thür taf. 3s

the supreme god during his reign. William Metcalf argues that Hadrian's issue of *cistophori*

depicting Zeus Olympios (Olympius) of Ephesus combined with the worship of Hadrian in the

city provides datable evidence for Hadrian's assertions of his own divinity before his death.[178] In

addition to dedication of temples to the divine Hadrian in Ephesus, Kyzikos, and Smyrna, of

which those cities were named "*neokoroi*" (temple-wardens), if the identification of the

Hadrianeion on Curetes Street is accurate, the Syrian pediment of this structure combines the

lintel's traditional use on temples with the imperial cult and the idea of the divine emperor. A

project at the site conducted by the Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut, ongoing through

December 31st, 2011, notes that in front of the columns are four rectangular statue bases

dedicated to Diocletian, Constantius Chlorus, and Galerius, and the father of Theodosius I; the

last base was replaced in the mid-4th century and was likely originally dedicated to Maximian

(see Figure 5.10).[179] This, too, points to the building's significance for the imperial cult and

supports its identification as the Temple of Hadrian. The choice to erect dedicated statue bases

to the emperors approximately 175 years after the temple's construction, if it is Hadrianic, shows

that the temple continued to play an integral role in the worship of the current emperor at

Ephesus rather than only the worship of the deified Hadrian after his death. Its later identification

with the Tetrarchy because of the dedication of the statue bases in front of it validates its

importance as an imperial cult site and provides a useful link between the imperial cult in the

Tetrarchic period and the use of the Syrian arch. By using the Syrian arch in new construction

projects, such as the palace at Split, as well as reaffirming the ties between the Temple of

---

[178] Burrell 31, Metcalf 66 and 59: Obv.: HADRIANVS AVG COS III PP, Head of Hadrian, bare, r. Rev.: IOVIS OLYMPIVS [EPHESI] [sic] around border. Jupiter sits enthroned on the left, holding a vertical scepter in his raised left hand and a small cult statue of Artemis of Ephesus in his right hand
[179] http://www.oeai.at/index.php/temple-of-hadrian.html (Mar. 10, 2011)

Hadrian at Ephesus and the ongoing worship of the Tetrarchic imperial cult, Diocletian begins to make an association between this architectural feature and the divine status of the Tetrarchs.

At his palace at Split, Diocletian combines the Syrian arch, an architectural form with eastern roots, with the more conservative form of the Roman Capitolium in the porch at the south end of his peristyle. In the context of Frazer's definition of the late antique palace, the formal entrance to the palace at Split would have been through the doorway of the prothyron, not through the Golden Gate in the north wall of the larger structure.[180] Borrowing the Syrian arch from the sacred architecture of the East would have immediately evoked the expectation of a transition to a religious space, like at the Sanctuary of Jupiter at Baalbek; instead, Diocletian uses it to bridge the public areas and his private palace to the south, which both ought to be purely secular spaces. He strengthened this impression of a temple entrance by setting the Syrian lintel above a rectangular doorway in the central intercolumniation of the tetrastyle facade (Figure 5.13). [181] Given the rectangular plinth above the apex of the pediment that may have held a statue, possibly a *quadriga*, one might expect that there would have been statuary niches between the left and right intercolumniations, but renaissance chapels have obscured the original porch wall since before Adam's set of drawings of 1764. [182] The post-and-lintel doorway of the entrance to the vestibule would have appeared similar to the traditional doorway for a temple cella. This entrance was echoed in the rectangular doorways set into the third intercolumniations, when counting from the southern end of the peristyle, of the arcades that gave access to the Mausoleum and Temple of Jupiter precincts.

---

[180] For a discussion of Frazer's late antique palace types, see p. 35
[181] Wilkes (1993) 39
[182] Wilkes (1993) 37

The palace apartments would have been approached through the central doorway of the prothyron, which was accessed by two flights of stairs the match the widths of the left and right intercolumniations. The rise in level via steps is similar to the frontal staircase of a temple podium, such as that in the interior of the Antonine Temple of Bacchus at Baalbek, Lebanon, in the ancient province of Syria (Figure 5.14).[183] In this temple, the sanctity of the cult rooms is emphasized by the difference in floor level, forcing a conscious ascent to access the sacred inner rooms. At Split, not only does the prothyron retain this temple-like arrangement of levels, with the approaching peristyle set about a meter lower than the level of the porch, but it would have allowed Diocletian to present himself to the public from a literal higher level. Like the rostrate temples that provided platforms for speakers to address the public as well as accomodating cult activities, the prothyron presents the facade of a temple while providing a space for Diocletian to address the public from a raised platform befitting a mortal leader and certainly a divine one. According to Wilkes' reconstruction, projecting walls level with the height of the porch floor in line with the central columns supported a platform fronted by a stonework *transenna*, and it was on this platform beneath the Syrian arch that would have Diocletian would have made public appearances.[184] Below this, a staircase would have descended to the basement level beneath a barrel vaulted opening and that gave access to the dock outside the South Gate.[185] Though it seems unlikely that this opening would have been uncovered beneath an otherwise meticulously decorated and planned facade, it was a structural necessity in order for the South Gate to be functional. Aside from this modification and the addition of the Syrian arch, the prothyron essentially replicates the standard Roman tetrastyle temple facade.

---

[183] For further discussion of the Baalbek sanctuary complex, see pp. 41-43
[184] Wilkes (1993) 39
[185] Wilkes (1993) 37

The hypothetical inclusion of the *quadriga* on the plinth above the pediment would have situated the prothyron in the tradition of placing a *quadriga* above temple facades begun by the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline in Rome; Ward-Perkins mentions that when it was rebuilt by Vespasian in 75 CE the *quadriga* above the pediment was also replaced.[186] The *quadriga* had clear associations with the Roman triumph and was therefore placed above triumphal arches throughout the imperial period, and its prominent role in the triumph is significant. During the triumphal procession, the emperor rode in the *quadriga* while being crowned with a wreath and temporarily made divine; this transformation is symbolically made permanent by the creation of a statue of that emperor in the *quadriga*.[187] Not only would the *quadriga* immediately evoke the idea of the victorious and temporarily divine emperor, but it was also used on temples to the deified emperor as a visual sign of that emperor's divinity. One important example is the Temple of Divus Augustus in Rome, completed by Caligula ca. 37 CE.[188] A sestertius issued by Caligula in 39 and 40 CE commemorates his completion of the temple: on the obverse, a velate Pietas sits holding a patera, and on the reverse a veiled and togate Caligula stands in front of a hexastyle temple topped with a *quadriga*.[189] This temple has been identified as the Temple of Divus Augustus by the inscription, "DIVO AUG SC" (Figure 5.15). The figure in the *quadriga*, representing Augustus, is depicted with a nimbus around his

---

[186] Ward-Perkins (1981) 63; Livy describes this *quadriga* in his *History of Rome* 10.23: "…The wooden thresholds of the Capitol were replaced by bronze, silver vessels were made for the three tables in the shrine of Jupiter, and a statue of the god himself, seated in a four-horsed chariot, was set up on the roof."

[187] The association between the divinity of the emperor and his placement in a *quadriga* had roots in the early and high imperial periods. For example, in the center of the Forum of Augustus (Rome, 2 BCE) before the Temple of Mars Ultor, a statue of Augustus in a *quadriga* was erected bearing the title "*pater patriae*" (Favro 72). On the Arch of Titus (Roman Forum, ca. 82 CE after Titus' death), Titus is depicted in a relief on the north pier being pulled by a *quadriga* and also on the intrados on the back of an eagle, symbolic of his apotheosis (Curtis 48).

[188] Ward-Perkins (1981) 46

[189] Mar. 11, 2011. http://numismatics.org/collection/1967.153.113

head, which strengthens the assertion of the divinity of the figure. If Diocletian had placed a *quadriga* above the prothyron pediment of his palace, he would have simultaneously linked it with monuments of imperial triumph and deified emperors, as well as the original Capitolium.

The presence of the platform in front of the central intercolumniation also links the prothyron with the tradition of the "*templum rostratum,*" which had *rostra* from which political leaders could address the public.[190] Implemented on the Temple of Venus Genetrix (dedicated by Julius Caesar in 46 BCE) and the Temple of Divus Julius (dedicated by Augustus in 29 BCE) in Rome with true *rostra* decorated with ship's beaks, the form evolved to include consecrated buildings of any kind that had a central speakers' platform built into the porch (Figure 5.16). An example, which combines this type with the Capitolium type, is the hexastyle Capitolium in the forum of Pompeii, built between 150 and 120 BCE at the north end of the forum (Figure 5.17).[191] After Sulla's capture of Pompeii in 89 BCE, the Capitolium was rebuilt on its original podium 3 m high (Figure 5.18).[192] At an unknown date, its conventional frontal staircase was modified, and a rostra was placed in the center, flanked by a flight of stairs on each side, as depicted on the relief from the House of L. Caecilius Jucundus that shows the Capitolium (with rostra and flanking stairs) shaking in the earthquake of 62 CE (Figure 5.19). However, before this modification, the frontal staircase was split into three flights: the outer two ascended to the level of the podium, while the central flight descended into the *fauissae*, the barrel-vaulted chambers built in the podium that may have functioned like the treasury chambers of the Temple of Saturn in Rome (Figure 5.20).[193]

---

[190] Ulrich 9
[191] Berry 192
[192] Ulrich 236
[193] Richardson (1988) 140

The Sullan modification built over this split entrance with a unified frontal staircase and expanded the facade to hexastyle rather than the original tetrastyle; the *fauissae* could be accessed from an opening carved into the east side of the podium.[194] At some point between Sulla's reconstruction and the earthquake of 62 CE, likely under Augustus or a later Julio-Claudian due to the use of brick-faced concrete, a platform was inserted into the frontal staircase halfway to the podium: at and below the level of the platform, two staircases flank the platform, and above it they merge with the central flight of stairs behind the platform.[195] The relief of the House of L. Caecilius Jucundus also shows a small altar or other small honorary monument placed at the center of the rostra, likely as a replacement for an altar at forum level that was removed in order to make room for the rostra.[196] The final form of the Capitolium at Pompeii is typical of early to mid-imperial rostrate temples even outside the Italian peninsula. The Antonine Capitolium at Sabratha in North Africa, which has two frontal staircases flanking each side of a central platform, likely replaced an earlier Augustan structure of the same type based on the fragmentary inscription found on two blocks at the site that reads, "*[Caesa]RI[s filius]*," and "*XII TRIB[(unicia) pot(estate)*" as well as Augustan pottery in the area and evidence of walls in the podium that indicated an earlier construction phase.[197] Because the temple has three separate cult chambers, three post-and-lintel doorways are placed in the intercolumniations of the facade, providing a similar model for the doorway and (possible) niche construction of the Split prothyron (Figure 5.21).

Another North African site, Gigthis, has a hexastyle *templum rostratum* dated to the reign of Hadrian that was likely not dedicated to the emperor or imperial family, but statues of the

---

[194] Ulrich 236
[195] Ulrich 240, 238
[196] Ulrich 239
[197] Ulrich 269

deified Nerva and Trajan as well as dedicatory statues of Hadrian and his successors, made during their reigns, were found around the temple podium.[198] Like the Capitolium of Pompeii, and for that matter the prothyron at Split if it were to be a temple facade as it appears rather than a gateway, the temple at Gigthis is situated at one end of a colonnaded precinct that it visually dominates. Likely dedicated to the Alexandrian Zeus-Serapis because of evidence from relief sculpture and a carved head found next to the temple, the temple at Gigthis is yet another example of the *templum rostratum* being used for worship of Jupiter or a local variation once the model was expanded beyond the original Roman temples.[199] This temple introduces the idea of colonnades springing from the facade of the temple itself, as the lateral arcades of the Split peristyle seem to spring directly from the Diocletian's prothyron. Vestigial exterior walls extend forward half the length of the temple from the back wall, after which point three columns on each side beginning behind the level of the cella entrance span the distance from the wall to the facade (Figure 5.22). The colonnades of the temple precinct running parallel to the temple almost act as a continuation of the lateral colonnades located on the podium.[200]

The model of the *templum rostratum* not only presents a space for public presentation of officals to the public but also, in its adoption in Capitolia outside Rome, becomes associated with the worship of Jupiter or a local variation of Jupiter. The presence of the rostra sets up the expectation for public appearance of political figures and provides the ability to maintain the guise of "democratic" meetings even in the imperial period. Diocletian's adoption of this form for his prothyron created a rostra on which to present himself to the public. He may have fronted the platform with a *transenna* in order to provide some protection since the space below the

---

[198] Ulrich 278
[199] Ulrich 281
[200] Ulrich 279

rostra opened to the staircase below; usually these speakers' platforms were themselves on a solid podium rather than a kind of floating shelf above an opening and therefore needed no balustrade. Or, the *transenna* may have been a way to further distinguish himself architecturally from his audience. By combining an architectural form associated with public address with the Syrian lintel, strongly associated with sacred architecture and the depiction of divine figures, Diocletian sets up the expectation in his public that he will appear to them in this same way: divine. Despite the appearance of the prothyron, it actually serves as only a gateway from the public to the private portions of the palace: ironically Diocletian returns the Syrian lintel to its original use as the signifier of gateway. However, that traditional symbolism would not have been as immediately evocative to Diocletian's fourth century audience; undoubtedly, Diocletian expected to address the public and wished to do so in an architectural framework that implied divinity.

VI. <u>Modifying Site Plans: Split's Connection with Lepcis Magna (pp. 79-89)</u>

Thus far, Diocletian appears to have made creating an architectural framework for public self-representation the fundamental goal of his Split palace's design. The deliberate combination of the Syrian arch and the *templum rostratum* facade for his prothyron created a platform on which he could appear as the retired emperor made divine before death. The alignment of his mausoleum and temple of Jupiter on the palace's cross-axis and the longitudinal approach toward his presentation platform at the prothyron of the peristyle meant that the palace at its core declared his divinity. Consequently, Diocletian did not concern himself with creating a uniform decorative program for the palace; the large-scale plan was of greater importance. Diocletian's conversion of local cult centers at Palmyra and Luxor, both in recently subjugated provinces, in centers of imperial cult provides an architectural typology for what a Tetrarchic cult space might look like. The preservation of the long axial approach to the *aedes* at Palmyra and Luxor show his adaptation of the Roman *castrum* plan, whose orthogonality makes this type of approach possible. If at Split we wish to present the prothyron as another one of these presentation spaces for the semi-divine emperor, this long approach must be preserved. The peristyle's lateral arcades separate the precincts of the mausoleum and the temple of Jupiter, while simultaneously the *transennae* walls that fill the lower portions of the intercolumniations of the arcades serve to continue the longitudinal line of the *cardo* all the way to the base of the steps leading up to the prothyron platform. The peristyle arcades play the role of both monumental facades for the mausoleum and temple precincts, granting entry to those spaces, as well as directing traffic and attention forward to the prothyron facade.

Though Diocletian focused on models for the palace plan, the discrepancy between the apparent planned layout of the palace and the qualitative variance in workmanship and

decorative styles is notable. Already the decoration of the Temple of Jupiter and the peristyle have been discussed.[201] Even where the decoration of the peristyle cornice imitates that of the prothyron cornice, there are marked differences between the two. The junction of the two mismatched cornices shows that the two elements were decorated at different rates, by different labor groups, or that more attention was paid to the cornice of the prothyron. Similarly, the elaborate decoration of the temple may indicate Diocletian's desire to honor his divine counterpart as he sought to align himself with Jupiter as his patron deity through direct numismatic references and the adoption of his title *Jovius*.[202] Additionally, by erecting his own mausoleum with a tetrastyle, pedimental facade directly across from the temple, he was already promoting assertions of his own divinity and attendant funerary cult. Because only porphyry fragments in the area of the mausoleum, perhaps from the porch columns, give any indication of the decoration of the porch, the nature and quality of the decoration on that element's cornice is unknown.[203] If the decoration of the temple was meant to separate it from the peristyle and place it in a category deserving of greater reverence (as a temple deserves), Diocletian may have done the same for his own mausoleum. The employment of a Syrian arch for the porch, on which scholars do not all agree but suggest because a conventional pediment could partially obscure the semicircular window on the west face of the mausoleum, would strengthen the sacred connotations of the mausoleum facade (Figure 6.1).[204] If the mausoleum employed a Syrian arch in its pediment like the prothyron, the similarity in the two facades would certainly strengthen the link between them. If the prothyron served as a backdrop for public addresses by the

---

[201] See figure 2.12 and pp. 26-27
[202] See figure 2.4
[203] Johnson (2009) 68
[204] As the only light source for the mausoleum's interior, this window would need to be clear of obstructions, but, as the reconstruction with the traditional pediment shows, this may have been possible in either scenario.

emperor while he remained alive, the architectural parallel between the two would have evoked the image of a cult statue beneath a pedimental facade, as would presumably soon exist in his mausoleum.

Unlike the speculated intricacy of the decoration of the mausoleum's facade, the cornice of the mausoleum's attached portico shows similar execution to the decoration of the peristyle colonnades, with the undersides of the modillions decorated with simplistic fleurons, the intervening chevron course, and similarly rendered palmettes (Figure 6.2). The execution of a dentil band is simpler than tongue-and-groove or egg-and-dart moldings, which involve a greater number of carved lines per linear meter. Additionally, the three unadorned fasciae below the dentils and the four-petal fleurons, rather than acanthus leaves which necessitate a greater number of incisions to depict, show that this cornice is less elaborately decorated than that of the temple of Jupiter or prothyron facade. The styles of palmette and modillion fleurons are nearly identical to those of the peristyle arcade and suggest that the same group of workers were responsible for these two elements, especially when compared to the porch of the Temple of Jupiter. The inclusion of additional elements on the modillions could suggest freedom for artistic experimentation; however, this seems unlikely given that the building was Diocletian's own mausoleum and especially because of the intricacy of the interior decoration. Slightly varying the modillion decoration distinguishes the mausoleum and even links it with the Temple of Jupiter, whose lintel modillions are decorated with an eagle, figures, and masks similar to those of the mausoleum portico.

Nevertheless the portico's decoration is certainly more similar to that of the peristyle's colonnade. If the portico's decoration was replicated in the entablature of the mausoleum's facade, a proposed stratification of the decoration of the core of the palace based on the level of

intricacy and attributed importance could be: 1) Temple of Jupiter 2) prothyron pediment 3) mausoleum 4) colonnades of peristyle 5) entablatures of the street colonnades. This separation of the Temple of Jupiter and mausoleum in the hierarchy of decoration weakens the association between the two structures and buffers Diocletian from too directly aligning himself with the god. This presumed caution likely led to the decision to insert the colonnades of the peristyle into the larger east-west precinct in order to separate the structures into separate precincts to either side of the central courtyard. The awkward junction between the colonnades and prothyron pediment offers the possibility that the colonnades were added as an alteration to the original plan or later addition (Figure 2.12). Presumably, if the peristyle had been planned from the outset as a self-contained unit, its cornice would have run continuously and without any noticeable change in ornament from the colonnade entablature to that of the prothyron.

This leads to the question of whether the final plan of the peristyle and associated precincts reflects the original conception of the project or a modified version conditioned by structural necessity, haste, or some other circumstance that may have arisen during the actual construction process. The awkwardness of the junction between the peristyle cornice and the prothyron pediment seems to be the result of poor planning, or could mark the insertion of colonnade at a later date.[205] Had Diocletian intended to create a mausoleum-temple complex similar to that of the Egyptian funerary complexes, the preferred layout of the peristyle area would have been east-west rather than north-south (Figure 6.3).[206] Diocletian had the luxury of building his palace on a completely clear site, rather than adapting or adding his residence to a

---

[205] Alternatively, Diocletian may have simply put his most adept team of stone masons to work on the "centerpiece" of the palace, the prothyron facade. If he had access to a limited cadre of artisans, he may have focused their efforts on the prothyron and left the less skilled workers to decorate the subordinate elements of the palace, such as the colonnades.
[206] For a discussion of Egyptian funerary complexes, see pp. 46-50

preexisting structure. Therefore, any major modifications to the original plan of the palace could have been resolved before construction began, rather than clumsily inserted as this one appears to be.

We can use the Severan monuments of Lepcis Magna to see more clearly how builders resolved old and new construction. The Severan forum-basilica complex provides an example of how traditional Roman forms could be fit together by means of unorthodox junctions in order to suit the demands of the site. From the outset, the architect of the Severan complex had to modify the exteriors of the structures in order to fit their rectangular footprints into non-rectangular spaces. At Split, the site could be planned with no preexisting limitations, but the apparent late modification of the peristyle colonnade suggests that the architects responsible for the Split complex had to address design issues midway through the project, forcing them into a situation similar to that confronted earlier at Lepcis Magna. In addition to the model for large-scale planning the site can provide, the Severan forum at Lepcis provides the only other example of the use of a large-scale arcuated colonnade in a courtyard preceding its use at Split. The rarity of this form before the fourth century is highly suggestive of a direct connection between the two sites; whether Diocletian or his architects had personally visited the site is only open to speculation, but the replication of the form at Split seems more than coincidental. The intermediate architrave blocks used in the entablature of the Miletus stadium gate are omitted from the Severan arcade, and these blocks are similarly not used in the Split arcade.

Ward-Perkins argues that a single architect was likely responsible for the colonnaded street and forum-basilica complex that date to the Severan period (Figure 6.4).[207] At Lepcis Magna, Septimius Severus did not have the luxury of building his complex on a site with no

---

[207] Ward-Perkins (1948) 61

preexisting structures as all indications show that Diocletian had at Split; therefore it can serve as a model for how architects accommodated new structures within a preexisting layout. The architect responsible showed ingenuity in fitting the basilica and forum into the pre-existing site by creating an axis with the colonnaded street that met the axis of earlier monuments, the street by the Hadrianic baths, in an exedra (Figure 6.4). He bridged this transition with arches to distinguish between the directed, confined space of the colonnaded streets and the open space of the exedra. As seen in the colonnaded streets of eastern cities such as Gerasa or Timgad and the arterial streets of the palace at Split, colonnaded streets controlled the flow of traffic through the city or palace by giving no choice to the visitor – once in the street, one could continue onwards or stop in one of the shops. But this choice to stop only delayed the inevitable decision that is made by the architect of the city or palace rather than the visitor: the only two points of exit are the "beginning" and "end" of the street. The exedra, on the other hand, left the choice of direction up to the individual within the open space before being funneled into another colonnaded street. Consequently, these streets could control the flow of traffic through a site by making a visitor approach buildings the way they are intended to be approached: if an architect wanted the exterior of a space to make a certain impression or an individual to enter a structure through a particular entrance, situating structures along a colonnaded street rather than in an open courtyard allowed this approach to be mandated.

At Lepcis Magna, what appears at first glance to be haphazard is actually carefully laid out, and it shows an intermediate phase between the asymmetrical layout of Hellenistic or even early imperial complexes and the ordered late antique complexes studied by Frazer. As discussed in Chapter II, the organization of the main north-south thoroughfare at Split can be

interpreted as a long, colonnaded approach to the residential palace entrance of the prothyron.[208] In that case, the inclusion of the colonnades and parapet walls of the peristyle continues to direct foot traffic to that monumental facade by restricting lateral movement. Without them, an east-west oriented courtyard would emerge with three focal points rather than one – the mausoleum and Temple of Jupiter in the east and west as well as the monumental prothyron on the south. The expansion of the colonnades befits the large scale of the monuments in this section of the palace and creates the sense of a distinct courtyard, but in reality the colonnades continue the north-south axiality of the *via praetoria* and create two courtyard precincts for the mausoleum and temple to either side.

If the colonnades were a late addition to the plan at Split, a similar problem of reconciling old and new structures had presented itself earlier at the Severan Forum. A bend in the pre-existing street running along the northwest side of the forum and basilica made the axes of the complex lie obliquely rather than parallel with the new colonnaded street to the east. Inserting a wedge of *tabernae* of decreasing sizes (moving southward) along the long southeastern wall of the forum created a new set of axes that allows the forum and basilica to conform to the bend in the existing road while appearing to lie parallel to the new colonnaded street (Figure 6.5).[209] On a smaller scale, spaces in the longitudinal walls of the basilica allowed freer access to the exterior on the east and to the forum on the west. These gaps were created by the antae of the rectangular chambers on either side of the apse at each end of the basilica, as these projecting antae do not join with the longitudinal walls. Romanelli argues that there was a change of design during construction in order to allow for easier access between the forum and basilica.[210] The

---

[208] Frazer figs. 4-12
[209] Ward-Perkins (1948) 61
[210] Ward-Perkins (1948) 63 after Romanelli, *Leptis Magna,* Rome: 1925, p. 103

doors off of the lateral aisles give access to the forum on the south side and to a monumental passageway that links the colonnaded street with the older quarter northwest of the complex on the north side.[211]

Several architectural features of Lepcis Magna serve to illustrate the parallels between the Severan construction there and Diocletian's residence at Split. The traditional flat architrave in the colonnade of the Severan Forum is replaced by the arcuated colonnade seen at Split, termed by Ward-Perkins, "an arched variant of the flat architrave."[212] Previously used in domestic architecture at Pompeii and on a larger scale at Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli (early 2nd century CE) and the gate at Miletus (pp. 29-31, Figure 2.16), the arcuated colonnade at Lepcis Magna serves the same purpose as it does at Split. At Lepcis Magna the arcuated colonnade morphs from an isolated curiosity into a deliberate and repetitive decorative choice on a large-scale; a similar decision was made at Split, where the arcuated colonnade is structurally unnecessary but the dominant feature. Though the prothyron's Syrian pediment and tetrastyle facade does have overt religious connotations, the colonnade's essentially repeated usage of the arcuated lintel as a decorative feature can be linked to these other secular examples. The arcuated colonnade was chosen either for purely aesthetic purposes or may have suggested an architectural connection between the Split peristyle and the Severan Forum. From an aesthetic perspective, the bays of the colonnade draw the eye upward and allow greater visibility between the intercolumniations compared to that allowed by a flat architrave placed above columns of the same height. The columns act as the limiting factor of the height of the colonnade, as they are cut offsite and imported to the site: they are placed on a raised platform that defines the peristyle, and the height of the entire colonnade is increased by the wall and complete entablature above the arches. In

---

[211] Ward-Perkins (1948) 64
[212] Ward-Perkins (1948) 71

the House of Fortuna Annonaria at Ostia, built ca. 150 CE with modifications in the 4th century, is an arcaded columnar screen with two marble pilasters supporting three brick arches that spring from brick piers in the dividing wall between the peristyle and the triclinium (Figure 6.6).[213] Given that the blind arcade in the fountain of the House of Cupid and Psyche at Ostia dates to ca. 300 CE, this columnar screen may be a 4th century modification (Figure 6.7). Like at Hadrian's villa, where the arcuated lintel seems to be used for the sake of novelty in his unusual Canopus and dining room complex, these two instances may be the result of the wealthy house owners' desires to impress guests with unusual architecture or to seem fashionable. However, arches of the columnar screen in the House of Fortuna Annonaria again draw the eye upward and may have imparted a sense of airiness to the triclinium, especially given the peristyle garden on the other side: the arcade would have allowed guests to better see into the garden from the dining room. Similarly at Split the arcade bays allow greater visibility between the precincts to the east and west of the peristyle, and they make the Syrian lintel of the prothyron seem less unexpected. The combination of Greek trabeated style based on verticals and horizontals with what are essentially repeated Syrian lintels gives a context for the choice of the Syrian lintel for the prothyron.

Opus listatum is used in the construction of both sites, in the walls of the forum behind the colonnade at Lepcis Magna and in the vestibule walls at Split (Figure 6.8). Though this method of construction is not uncommon, its occurrence at both sites helps to strengthen the connection made between the sites because of the arcades. Additionally, the colonnade of the western apse of the Severan basilica, though using a flat architrave (Figure 6.9), appears to use a

---

[213] The prevalence of brick at the site of Ostia due to shortage of marble may account for the use of brick rather than marble or other stone for the arches and walls in the House of Fortuna Annonaria and the House of Cupid and Psyche (RBU 2011).

double entablature similar to that of the gate at Miletus (Figure 2.16). Complete entablature blocks the width of a column capital that are tied to the rear wall support lion-head blocks, on top of which rests a flat architrave with cornice. Like the arcuated colonnades of the Split peristyle, the frieze level has basically been omitted and the narrow cornice rests on an elongated, plain architrave. The forum boasts a similar construction where the columns between the doorways of the shops have capital-width architrave blocks with a projecting cornice level that presumably supported another flat architrave (Figure 6.10). This effect is subtler than that of the basilica apse, where the elevation of columns on isolated, cylindrical bases and the double entablature greatly increases the apparent height of the colonnade. This emphasis on the large scale of the architecture also makes the lack of elaborate decoration on the individual elements less noticeable. Unlike at Split, the quality and elaborateness of decoration are relatively consistent amongst the Severan additions, especially between the forum, basilica, and the *quadrifrons* arch. The consistency of decoration of these buildings likely reflects a desire to unify the Severan secular contributions across the site.

The use of the intermediate architrave blocks in the colonnade of the forum shops and the apse of the basilica in the Severan buildings shows that the omission of these blocks in the arcade was purposeful. The stadium gate at Miletus provides the most likely model for the colonnade at Lepcis Magna; similar to the relation of the colonnades of Lepcis Magna and Split based on the rarity of the form in the 3rd century CE, the gate at Miletus provides the only example of the arcuated colonnade on a large scale before Lepcis Magna. The Milesian gate uses these flat architrave blocks as springer blocks for the bays of the arcade, but that is not replicated in the Lepcis arcade. Instead, the Lepcis arcade features a true "arched variant" rather than superimposing arches above a flat architrave; it bends the architrave into a series of arches

without the addition of an extra section onto the entablature (Figure 6.11). The arches spring directly from the column capitals but are not joined visually to each other by sharing a springing point; though one springer block serves adjacent arches, the molding that distinguishes the arch from the spandrels is carved so that each arch appears structurally isolated from the adjacent arches. At Split, this is modified so that the arches share a springer block and also appear to be joined. The springer block is carved with a protruding ridge in the shape of a "V" that is shared by adjacent arches, making the arcade seem like one continuous unit rather than a series of discrete arches (Figure 6.12).

The fluidity of the arcade at Split refines the form introduced in the Severan Forum. The omission of the intermediate architrave blocks in the Severan Forum is retained at Split; like at Lepcis Magna, where the intermediate blocks are seen in other colonnades but dropped from the arcade, the columns on the interior of Diocletian's mausoleum use this double architrave construction to support the cornices that divided the upper from the lower section and the dome from the upper section (Figure 6.13). Again, the use of the intermediate blocks in other structures in the palace marks a significant decision to construct the arcade without them. Rather than using a traditional flat architrave and superimposing the arches above it, as at Miletus, Diocletian purposefully rejects the post-and-lintel colonnade tradition and follows the Severan arcade model from Lepcis Magna. This construction links his peristyle both with the Forum of Septimius Severus, a soldier-emperor with whom he may have sought an association, and with the traditions of the Eastern provinces by creating what is essentially a sequence of Syrian arches.

VII. <u>Conclusion (pp. 90-95)</u>

Throughout the third century, soldier-emperors took control of the principate as a result of their military excellence; once in power, they failed as leaders. Diocletian, himself a soldier-emperor from the province of Dalmatia, demonstrated considerable political savvy; though his Tetrarchic governmental system crumbled after his retirement, he reestablished considerable stability to the empire and reigned for twenty years. To reinforce his legitimacy, he may have turned to the model of the last soldier-emperor whose reign had been of substantial length – Septimius Severus. In addition to possible references to the Severan buildings at Lepcis Magna, such as the monumental arcuated colonnade of the Severan Forum, Diocletian may have sought to emphasize the importance of Syria, the birthplace of Severus' wife Julia Domna and a crucial province for Roman security on the eastern frontier, using architectural models from that province as well. Both of these provinces had been recently subjugated, yet Diocletian chose these provinces to draw inspiration from for the plan of his palace.[214]

Analyzing the plan of the palace at Split raises the question of mechanisms of transferal for these architectural connections: decorative styles could be shared between regions by the importation of labor, but the organization of large-scale plans required either exposure to the models in question or that the forms being imitated was widely known. Diocletian would have seen the alignment of Egyptian pharaonic tombs and temples during his time in Egypt. Additionally, the *castra* at Palmyra and Luxor were Diocletian's own building projects; that he would replicate them at Split is entirely within the realm of possibility. Though visitors to the palace might not recognize it as a descendant of these sites, the orthogonal street plan and core of buildings at its center would be immediately recognizable as typical of Roman urban planning

---

[214] Diocletian put down a revolt in Egypt in 297 CE, and Aurelian subjugated Palmyra in 273 CE.

based on the *castrum*. Moreover, linking the palace to the military tradition would be unsurprising given Diocletian's rise to power in the field. The emulation of the *castrum* plan in the late antique palace plan, as exemplified at Split, reflects a greater recognition of the mechanisms for imperial power transfer in the 3rd century CE. For the past century, the principate had not been inherited but rather seized by victorious generals. Though Diocletian sought to change that by creating the system of the Tetrarchy, which had its own mechanism for power transfer built into it, he recognized the roots of his own power and overtly referenced them in his palace design. He created an imperial system that planned for the peaceful abdication and appointment of emperors, but his retirement residence declared the source of power that gave him the imperial throne from which that system came. Diocletian's palace allowed him to simultaneously present himself in the role of the emperor beneath the prothyron facade and as general in his *castrum*.

From the Golden Gate to the prothryon, the north-south movement along the *via praetoria* is broken by its intersection with the *via principalis* in the center of the palace. Though the arcuated colonnade in one sense is an expansion and continuation of the *via praetoria* and divides the mausoleum and temple precincts from the peristyle, it acts as a permeable barrier unlike a solid wall. The 2.4 m high *transennae* between the columns blocked the free flow of traffic between the three areas and channeled the approach to either the mausoleum or temple along the axis between them. The addition of the *transennae* would have created a stronger division than the colonnade alone, and that was likely an intentional effect: since the *transenna* is a feature typically reserved for the upper stories of residential architecture (an example is in the House of the Samnite in Herculaneum), its use in the colonnades is purposed and unusual (Figure 7.1). The junction of the colonnades and prothyron shows that the

colonnades were likely modified or added in the late construction phases of the Diocletianic

plan, and the *transennae* may have been added even after the colonnades in order to strengthen

the division between the three areas. The peristyle is further distinguished by its sunken ground

level and set of shallow steps around the perimeter; a similar technique is used to distinguish the

open space of the courtyard from the porticoes in the courtyard of the Temple of Jupiter at

Baalbek (Figure 7.2).

However, the intercolumniations above the *transennae* would have allowed for sightlines

between the three areas and therefore associations between them that are not possible today.

These sightlines, kept open above the *transennae*, were likely what caused Diocletian to insert

the colonnades in the first place; without the colonnades, the mausoleum and temple would have

been situated together in one east-west precinct just as in the pharaonic complexes in Egypt. The

addition of the *transennae* in the intercolumniations would have helped to distinguish the three

courtyards as separate, but their short height relative to the colonnades meant that they would not

have completely divided the larger east-west precinct. Though the peristyle colonnades

continued the colonnades of the street right up to the prothyron, the peristyle and associated

precincts define a distinct area oriented along the orthogonal axis. This expansion of lateral

space pervades early 4th century architecture, such as at the Basilica Nova built by Maxentius

and Constantine in Rome between 306 and 313 CE. This is an example of a structure that can be

oriented along either cardinal axis: under Maxentius' original plan, the apse was located at the

end of the principal east-west axis along the 80 m nave (Figure 7.3).[215] However, Constantine

modified the building and created an apse in the center of the north wall of the structure, moving

the entrance to the center of the south wall and shifting the principal axis to the 65 m north-south

---

[215] Claridge 114

central aisle.[216] The walls between the pillars and exterior walls created the side aisles for the north-south orientation, but the large barrel vaulted openings in them created the side aisles for the east-west orientation.

The manipulation of architecture to suit the desired orientation for a complex as a whole occurs in the peristyle precinct of Split as well. In addition to the axial orientation of the mausoleum and temple, the individual arcuations of the east and west colonnades create minor axes that cross the peristyle rather than run parallel along it. Also, alternating rectilinear and curvilinear niches were built into the precinct walls that surrounded both the mausoleum and the Temple of Jupiter, unifying the three precincts into one large courtyard similar to that of the camp at Palmyra (Figure 7.4). Both the temple and mausoleum precincts were accessed through lintel doorways placed in the third intercolumniations from the south end of the peristyle; these entrances prevented free access to the precincts and demanded frontal approaches of the mausoleum and temple along the east-west axis. Visitors would have been familiar with this expansion of lateral spaces off of a primary longitudinal axis because of the influence of Eastern models on late Roman architecture, so the ambivalent orientation of the peristyle would have been recognized.

This emphasis on lateral space reflects the fundamental differences in planning between Syrian cities and Roman urban plans based on the *castrum*. In Syrian towns, the central colonnaded street served almost as a forecourt to the structures positioned laterally along it, accessed either directly from the street or from lesser side streets. In a city that has developed over time, the thoroughfare linked buildings and precincts that are otherwise unrelated. Usually extending from gate to gate, the "urban armature" had no destination and relied on courtyards to

---

[216] Richardson (1992) 52

make transitions between directed motion and an "arrival" at a particular structure.[217] At Split,

Diocletian played off this idea of the colonnaded street: southwards from the Golden Gate, small

tabernae and courtyards extended to either side of the street. Rather than terminating at a city

gate, not possible here because of the palace's position on the coast, the *via praetoria* terminates

at the prothyron of the peristyle. This terminus would have been arresting to a first-time visitor

to the palace; the Syrian arch of the prothyron and unusual arcuated flanking it colonnades would

only have added to the factor of surprise built into the palace core. Despite its appearance, the

via praetoria is less a thoroughfare and more a direct pathway to the peristyle. In effect, the

colonnaded street acts as a forecourt to the peristyle just as the hexagonal court at Baalbek serves

as a forecourt to the Temple of Jupiter precinct.

Additionally, idea of replacing the *aedes* in the Roman *castrum*, such as the Diocletianic

fort at Palmyra, with the prothyron facade at Split is also a compelling statement for replacing

imperial cult practices with the presentation of the live emperor. Supposedly, he built this

residence at Split for his retirement, as described by Aurelius Victor (perhaps sardonically):

> "Diocletian actually relinquished the imperial fasces of his own
> accord at Nicomedia and grew old on his private estates. It was he
> who, when solicited by Herculius [Maximian] and Galerius for the
> purpose of resuming control, responded in this way, as though
> avoiding some kind of plague: "If you could see at Salonae the
> cabbages raised by our hands, you surely would never judge that a
> temptation."[218]

By Victor's account, Diocletian was satisfied with retired life and entirely uninterested in

rejoining the imperial sphere. However, the architecture of the palace shows that even if he did

not intend to return to power, he certainly intended to continue living in the public eye. He built

---

[217] MacDonald (1965) 25, see p. 38
[218] Aurelius Victor 39.5-6, trans. T. Bancich; Victor is referencing Maximian's request for
Diocletian to return to the imperial seat in 308 CE (Corcoran 251).

his mausoleum during his life to ensure the practice of imperial cult even after his retirement. Moreover, the organization of his palace makes the prothyron, discussed as a platform for public presentation, the focal point of the entire structure.

How this would have been received remains unclear, as the majority of the literary sources that discuss Diocletian are Christian historians documenting his persecution of the Christians. However, Eutropius speaks highly of the retired emperor as a retired citizen:

> "Diocletian lived to an old age in a private station, at a villa which is not far from Salonae, in honourable retirement, exercising extraordinary philosophy, inasmuch as he alone of all men, since the foundation of the Roman empire, voluntarily returned from so high a dignity to the condition of private life, and to an equality with the other citizens. That happened to him, therefore, which had happened to no one since men were created, that, though he died in a private condition, he was enrolled among the gods.[219]

In Eutropius' view, Diocletian died in 312 CE after seven years of retirement and was deified after death as a private citizen.[220] However, the plan of his residence at Split shows a carefully crafted plan to maintain his own imperial divinity even after retirement. His palace acted as a monument to his divinity after his death, but it would have served the same function even while he remained alive.

---

[219] Eutropius 9.28, trans. J.S. Watson

[220] Diocletian died on December 3rd of either 311 or 312 CE, between the deaths of Galerius in May 311 and Maximinus in 313 CE. Corcoran argues for his year of death as 312 on the basis that he was likely alive at the time of Maxentius' overthrow in October 312; Diocletian was the only one of the original Tetrarchs not to appear on Maxentius' coinage that featured the deified Tetrarchs (Corcoran 251).

Bibliography (pp. 96-100)

Adam, Robert. *Ruins of the Palace of the Emperor Diocletian at Spalatro in Dalmatia.* ed. Marco Navarra. Cannitello, Italy: Biblioteca del Cenide, 2001

Adam, Robert. *Classical Architecture: A Comprehensive Handbook to the Tradition of Classical Style.* New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1990

Adam, Jean-Pierre. *Roman Building: Materials and Techniques.* trans. Anthony Mathews. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994

American Numismatic Society. *American Numismatic Society Collections Database.* 2009. Mar. 17 – Apr. 24, 2011. http://www.numismatics.org/Collections/CollectionDatabase.

Ammianus Marcellinus. *Roman History.* trans. C. D. Yonge. London: Bohn, 1862. Jan. 18, 2011. http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/index.htm#Ammianus_Marcellinus

Arheoloski Muzej u Splitu. *Guide to the Archaeological Museum at Split.* Split: Archaeological Museum at Split, 1973

Aurelius Victor. *Epitome de Caesaribus.* trans. Thomas Bancich. Buffalo, NY: Canisius College, 2009. May 18, 2011. http://www.roman-emperors.org/epitome.htm

Bandinelli, Bianchi. *Rome: The Late Empire. Roman Art AD 200-400.* Trans. Peter Green. New York: George Braziller, 1971

Belamarić, J. "The Date of Foundation and Original Function of Diocletian's Palace at Split." *Hortus Artium Medievalium*: *Journal of the International Research Center for Late Antiquity and Middle Ages* 9 (2003) 173-185

Bell, Lanny. "Luxor Temple and the Cult of the Royal Ka." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 44:4 (Oct., 1985) 251-294

Berry, Joanne. *The Complete Pompeii.* Thames & Hudson Inc.: New York, 2007

Bosanquet, R. C. "Greek and Roman Towns: II. Town Planning in Syria." *The Town Planning Review* 6:2 (Oct., 1915) 101-113

Bowie, E. L. "The 'Temple of Hadrian' at Ephesos." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 8 (1971) 137-141

Brothers, A.J. "Diocletian's Palace at Split." *Greece & Rome.* 19:2 (Oct. 1972) 175-186

Brown, Donald F. "The Hexagonal Court at Baalbek." *American Journal of Archaeology* 43:2 (April – June, 1939) 285-288

Brown, Donald F. "The Arcuated Lintel and Its Symbolic Interpretation in Late Antique Art." *American Journal Archaeology.* 46:3 (Jul. – Sept. 1942) 389-399

Bulić, Frane and Karaman, Ljubo. *Kaiser Diokletians Palast in Split.* Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1929

Bulić, Frane. *L'imperatore Diocleziano.* Spalato: Narodna Tiskara, 1916

Burrell, Barbara. "Temples of Hadrian, not Zeus." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 2002-2003 43:1 (2002-2003) 31-50

Büyükkolanci, Mustafa and L. Vandeput. "Das grosse Propylon in Kremna in Pisidien." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Abt. Istambul)* 49 (1999) 213-248, pl. 19-26

Bužančić, Radoslav. *Diocletian's Palace.* Književni krug: Split, 2009

Cavaglieri, Giorgio. "Outline for a History of City Planning. From Prehistory to the Fall of the Roman Empire: IV. Etruscan and Roman." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians.* 8:3-4 (Jul. – Dec., 1949) 27-42

Claridge, Amanda. *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide*. Oxford University Press: New York, NY 1998. pp. 115-116

Corcoran, Simon. "Diocletian." *Lives of the Caesars*. Ed. Anthony Barrett. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008, pp. 228-254

Curcić, Slobodan. "Late Antique Palaces: The Meaning of Urban Context." *Ars Orientalis*. 23 (1993): 67-90

Curtis, C. Densmore. "Roman Monumental Arches." *Supplementary Papers of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome*. 2 (1908) 26-83

Dodson, Aidan and Salima Ikram. *The Tomb in Ancient Egypt: Royal and Private Sepulchres from the Early Dynastic Period to the Romans*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2008

Downey, Glanville. "Libanius' Oration in Praise of Antioch (*Oration* XI)." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 103:5 (Oct. 1959) 652-686

Downey, Glanville. "The Palace of Diocletian at Antioch." *Les Annales Archéologiques de Syrie* 3:1-2 (1953) 106-16

Duval, N. "Le 'Palais' de Dioclétien à Spalato à la lumiére des récentes découvertes," *Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaries de France*. 1961

Eusebius. *Life of Constantine* I.14. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999

Eutropius. *Abridgement of Roman History*. trans. John S. Watson. London: Bohn, 1853. Feb. 21, 2011. http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/eutropius/index.html

Favro, Diane. "'Pater urbis': Augustus as City Father of Rome." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 51:1 (Mar., 1992) 61-84

Frazer, Alfred. "The Iconography of the Emperor Maxentius' Buildings in Via Appia." *The Art Bulletin* 48.3-4 (Sept. – Dec. 1996): 385-392

Gawlikowski, Michel. "Le Camp de Dioclétien: Bilan Préliminaire." *Palmyre: Bilan et Perspectives, Colloque de Strasbourg (18-20 Octobre 1973)*. Strasbourg: Universite des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, 1976. pp. 153-163

Gawlikowski, Michel. "Les défenses de Palmyre." *Syria* 51:3-4 (1974) 231-242

Gawlikowski, Michel. "Les *Principia* de Dioclétien à Palmyre Projet en Réalisation." *Le Dessin d'Architecture dans les Sociétés Antiques: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 26-28 Janvier 1984*. Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg: Strasbourg, 1985, pp. 283-289

Gilliam, J. F. "The Governors of Syria Coele from Severus to Diocletian." *The American Journal of Philology* 79:3 (1958) 225-242

Ismail, Wathiq. "The Worship of Allat at Hatra." *Sumer* 32 (1976) 177-179

Johnson, Mark Joseph. "Late antique imperial mausolea*.*" Ph. D. diss., Princeton University, 1986

Johnson, Mark Joseph. *The Roman Imperial Mausoleum in Late Antiquity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009

Jones, C. P. "The Olympeion and the Hadrianeion at Ephesos." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 13 (1993) 149-152

Head, Barclay V. *Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum: Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Ionia*. ed. Reginald S. Poole. Bologna: Arnaldo Forni, 1964

Horne, Thomas H. *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, Volume I*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1835, p. 91

Kähler, Heinz. *Die Villa des Maxentius bei Piazza Armerina*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1973

Kähler, Heinz. *The Art of Rome and her Empire*. trans. J. R. Foster. New York: Crown
        Publishers, 1963

Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Ioli. "The Imperial Chamber at Luxor." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 29
        (1975) 225-251

Keppie, Lawrence. *Legions and Veterans: Roman Army Papers 1971-2000*. Stuttgart: Franz
        Steiner Verlag, 2000

Khouri, Rami. *Jerash: A Frontier City of the Roman East.* New York: Longman, 1986

Kleiner, Diana. *Roman Sculpture.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992

L'Orange, H.P. *Art Forms and Civic Life in the Late Roman Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
        University Press, 1965

Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*. Trans. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. New York:
        Christian Literature Company, 1886-1900. Feb. 17, 2011.
        http://people.ucalgary.ca/~vandersp/Courses/texts/lactant/lactpers.html

Leadbetter, Bill. *Galerius and the Will of Diocletian*. New York: Routledge, 2009

Lehner, Mark. *The Complete Pyramids.* New York: Thames and Hudson, 1997

Lepre, J. P. *The Egyptian Pyramids: A Comprehensive, Illustrated Reference.* Jefferson, NC:
        McFarland & Co., Inc., 1990

Lesko, Barbara. "Royal Mortuary Suites of the Egyptian New Kingdom." *American Journal of
        Archaeology* 73:4 (Oct., 1969) 453-458

MacCormack, Sabine G. *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiqity.* Berkeley: University of California
        Press, 1981

MacDonald, William. *Architecture of the Roman Empire, vol. I.* New Haven, CT: Yale
        University Press, 1965

MacDonald, William. *Architecture of the Roman Empire, vol. II.* New Haven, CT: Yale
        University Press, 1966

MacMullen, Ramsay. *Roman Government's Response to Crisis: AD 235-337.* New Haven, CT:
        Yale University Press, 1976

Magner, Thomas F. "Aspalathos, Spalatum, Split." *Classics and the Classical Tradition.* Ed. E.
        N. Borza and R. W. Carrubba. New York: University Park, 1973

Makaronas, C. J. *The Arch of Galerius at Thessaloniki*. Thessaloniki: Insititute for Balkan
        Studies, 1970

Marasović, Tomislav. *Diocletian's Palace: Split, Croatia.* Zagreb: Dominovic and Buvina, 1995

McNally, Sheila. "The Frieze of the Mausoleum at Split." *Studies Presented to George M. A.
        Hanfmann*. Mainz: 1971, pp. 101-12

McNally, Sheila. *The Architectural Ornament of Diocletian's Palace at Split.* Oxford: Tempus
        Reparatum, 1996

Metcalf, William. "Hadrian, IOVIS OLYMPIVS." *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, 27:1 (1974) 59-
        66

Millar, Fergus. *The Emperor in the Roman World: 31 BC – AD 337.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell
        University Press, 1992

Millar, Fergus. *The Roman Near East: 31 BC – AD 337*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
        Press, 1993

Mitchell, Stephen. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor, Vol. I.* New York: Oxford
        University Press, 1993

Mitchell, Stephen. *Cremna in Pisidia: An Ancient City in Peace and War.* Oakville, CT: David
        Brown Book Co., 1995

Morkot, Robert. "The Darb el-Arbain, the Kharga Oasis and its forts, and other desert routes." *Archaeological Research in Roman Egypt: the proceedings of the seventeenth Classical Colloquium of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum, held on 1-4 December, 1993.* ed. Donald Bailey. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1996, pp. 82-94

Offord, Joseph. "The Deity of the Crescent Venus in Ancient Western Asia." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (Apr., 1915) 197-293

Oleson, John P., ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Engineering and Technology in the Classical World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008

Pazaras, Theocharis. *The Rotunda of Saint George in Thessaloniki*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Ballkan Studies, 1985

Pohl, Daniela. *Kaiserzeitliche Tempel in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berucksichtigung der hellenistischen Vorläufer*. Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt, 2002

Pond Rothman, Margaret. "The Thematic Organization of the Panel Reliefs on the Arch of Galerius." *American Journal of Archaeology* 81:4 (Autumn 1977) 427-454

Reddé, Michel. "Réflexions critiques sur les chapelles militaires (*aedes principiorum*)." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 17 (2004) 442-462

Rees, Roger. "Images and Image: A Re-Examination of Tetrarchic Iconography." *Greece & Rome.* 40:2 (Oct. 1993) 181-200

Rees, Roger. *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd., 2004.

Richardson, L. *New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 1992, pp. 51-52

Richardson, L. *Pompeii: An Architectural History*. Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 1988, pp. 138-145

Richmond, I. A. "Palmyra under the Aegis of Rome." *Journal of Roman Studies* 53:1-2 (1963) 43-54

Robert, Adam. *Ruins of the Palace of the Emperor Diocletian*. Cannitello: Biblioteca del Cenide, 2001

Robertson, D. S. *A Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959

Robins, Gay. *The Art of Ancient Egypt.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997

Roth, Ann Macy. "Social Change in the Fourth Dynasty: The Spatial Organization of Pyramids, Tombs, and Cemeteries." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 30 (1993) 33-55

Schlumberger, D. "Le prétendu Camp de Dioclétien à Palmyre." *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 38:3 (1962) 79-97

Seyrig, Henri. "Antiquités syriennes: 95. Le culte du Soleil en Syrie à l'époque romaine." *Syria* 48:3/4 (1971) 337-373

Sheehan, Peter. "The Roman Fortress of Babylon in Old Cairo." *Archaeological Research in Roman Egypt: the proceedings of the seventeenth Classical Colloquium of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum, held on 1-4 December, 1993.* ed. Donald Bailey. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1996, pp. 95-97

Stadelmann, Rainer. "The Development of the Pyramid Temple in the Fourth Dynasty." *The Temple in Ancient Egypt: New Discoveries and Recent Research.* ed. Stephen Quirke. London: British Museum Press, 1997, pp. 1-16

Stafford-Deitsch, Jeremy. *The Monuments of Ancient Egypt*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana
    University Press, 2001. *AJA* 73:4 (Oct., 1969) 453-458

Taylor, Lily Ross. "Tiberius' Refusals of Divine Honors." *Transactions and Proceedings of the
    American Philological Association* 60 (1929) 87-101

Taylor, Lily Ross. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown, CT: American Philological
    Association, 1931

Taylor, Lily Ross. "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime." *Transactions and
    Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 51 (1920) 116-133

Thür, Hilke. *Forschungen in Ephesos XI, 1: Das Hadrianstor in Ephesos*. Vienna:
    Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1989

Ulrich, Roger. *The Roman Orator and the Sacred Stage: The Roman "Templum Rostratum."
    Collection Latomus Vol. 222*. Brussels: Latomus, 1994

Vandeput, Lutgarde. *The Architectural Decoration in Roman Asia Minor: Sagalassos: a case
    study*. Leuven, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 1997

Van Sickle, C.E. "Conservative and Philosophical Influence in the Reign of Diocletian."
    Classical Philology. 27.1 (Jan. 1932) 51-58

Vickers, Michael. "Observations on the Octagon at Thessaloniki." *The Journal of Roman
    Studies* 63 (1973) 111-120

Ward-Perkins, J. B. "Dalmatia and the Marble Trade." *Marble in Antiquity. Collected Papers of
    J.B. Ward-Perkins*. Dodge, Hazel and Bryan Ward-Perkins, ed. London: Archaeological
    Monographs of the British School at Rome, 1992, pp. 115-121

Ward-Perkins, J. B. "Imperial Mausolea and Their Possible Influence on Early Christian
    Central-Plan Buildings." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*. 25:4 (Dec.
    1966) 297-299

Ward-Perkins, J. B. *Roman Imperial Architecture*. New York: Penguin Books, 1981

Ward-Perkins, J. B. "Severan Art and Architecture at Lepcis Magna." *The Journal of Roman
    Studies* 38:1-2 (1948) 59-80

Watkins, Ruth Nagle. "Baalbek, Ancient Heliopolis, City of the Sun." *Art Journal* 24:2 (Winter
    1964-65) 130-133

Wiegand, Theodor, ed. *Baalbek: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen in den
    Jahren 1898 bis 1905, Erster Band, Tafeln*. Berlin: Gruyter & Co., 1921

Wiegand, Theodor, ed. *Milet: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem
    Jahren 1899, Band II, Heft I: Das Stadion*. Berlin: Gruyter & Co., 1921

Wilkes, J. J. *Dalmatia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969

Wilkes, J. J. *Diocletian's Palace, Split: Residence of Retired Roman Emperor*. Oxford: Oxford
    University Committee for Archaeology, 1993

Will, Ernest. "Les fouilles polonaises et la 'Camp de Dioclétien' à Palmyre." *Syria* 40:3-4
    (1963) 385-393

Williams, Stephen. *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery*. New York: Methuen, Inc., 1985

Yegul, Fikret. "A Study in Architectural Iconography: Kaisersaal and the Imperial Cult." *The
    Art Bulletin* 64:1 (March 1982) 7-31

Zaknić, Ivan. "Split at the Critical Point: Diocletian's Palace, Excavation vs. Conservation."
    Journal of Architectural Education 36.3 (Spring 1983) 20-26

Zawadzki, Tadeusz. "La résidence de Dioclétien à Spalatum. Sa dénomition dans l'Antiquité."
    Museum Helveticum 44:3 (1987) 223-30