I, Philip Kiernan, hereby submit this as part of the requirements for the degree of:

Master of Arts

in:

Classics

It is entitled:

Imperial Representation under Diocletian and the Tetrarchy

A.D. 284-305.

Approved by:

Charles Brian Rose
Barbara Burrell
IMPERIAL REPRESENTATION
UNDER DIOCLETIAN AND THE TETRARCHY
(A.D. 284-305)

A thesis submitted to the

Division of Research and Advanced Studies
of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Classics
of the College of Arts and Sciences

2003

by Philip Kiernan

B.A., The University of Western Ontario, 2001

Committee Chair: Professor C. Brian Rose
ABSTRACT

The emperor Diocletian (A.D 284-305) established an entirely new system of governing the Roman world, which is known today as the “Tetrarchy.” Diocletian’s system saw four men, two Augusti and two Caesars, sharing control of the Roman Empire and basing themselves in different geographical locations. As such, the Tetrarchs were able to deal with threats to the Empire’s borders much more efficiently than one emperor. In order to contrast the Tetrarchs from the civil wars and usurpations of the fifty years that had preceded them, a new system of imperial representation was developed. This thesis examines surviving examples of Tetrarchic imperial representation. This includes coins and medals of the Tetrarchs, porphyry statue groups, a monument of five columns in the Forum Romanum (the Fünfsäulendenkmal), the Arch of Galerius in Thessalonike, wall paintings at Luxor, and the so-called Arcus Novus in Rome. On all of these monuments, the Tetrarchs are consistently shown as four equal emperors, but a single ruling unit. The new portraiture, costume and attributes of the Tetrarchs are thought to be intended to show the Tetrarchs as identical and equal. This concept, termed similitudo, was used to underscore the ideal of Tetrarchic harmony (concordia). Jupiter and Hercules find a special place in Tetrarchic representation as the patrons of the two Tetrarchic houses. The use of other personifications and divinities in Tetrarchic representation showed the divine prerogative, legitimacy and the universality of the Tetrarchic system. It is argued that Tetrarchic art and monuments do not represent a decline in Roman art as was once commonly thought. Instead, it seems that the Tetrarchy marks the beginning of a move towards more symbolic representation. The overall effect of these changes was to represent the Tetrarchs as a cohesive and powerful ruling unit.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The Tetrarchic system was a unique experiment in governing the Roman Empire: instead of one ruler, four men controlled the Roman world. Although the Tetrarchy crumbled and the Empire fell into civil war after Diocletian’s retirement, the system lasted a full twenty years. Given the mass of barbarian invasions and other problems that plagued the empire when Diocletian began his reign, these twenty years were an impressive feat.¹

This new form of government, with four rulers equally dividing control of the Roman empire, required a new way of thinking on all levels of Roman society. In addition to the numerous administrative changes initiated by Diocletian, a new form of imperial representation was developed. This can be seen in the monuments of the Tetrarchic period, and also in the surviving Latin panegyrics.² The new system of imperial representation addressed the problem of showing the four emperors as a single cohesive ruling unit. It was essential that they not be confused with the squabbling mass of usurpers and warlords who had ruled for the past fifty years. The purpose of this thesis is to examine surviving examples of Tetrarchic representation, and to investigate the new ideology that stood behind them.

After an historical introduction, the central chapters of this thesis begin with an examination of selected problems in Tetrarchic coinage. As coins are easily datable, and bear inscriptions, they provide a very reliable source of evidence. The thesis then turns to the famous porphyry statues of the Tetrarchs. Then it moves to a monument with five columns that was erected in the Roman

---

¹ A narrative history of the Tetrarchy is given in the second chapter where the first footnote gives a full list of modern historical scholarship about the Tetrarchy.
² The panegyrics have recently been published in English translation with a useful introduction and commentary by Nixon and Rodgers 1996.
Forum in 303. This is followed by a discussion of our most prolific source of Tetrarchic relief sculpture: the Arch of Galerius in Thessalonike. Finally, the fragmentary wall paintings in Luxor, and the highly problematic Arcus Novus, are considered.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to assemble a full list of inscribed statue bases of the Tetrarchy. Such a task would be difficult due to both the volume of Tetrarchic inscriptions and the problem of the similarity of Tetrarchic names. Similar problems are encountered with Tetrarchic coinage. Marble busts that have been attributed to various Tetrarchs have also been excluded from this study. Not one of these busts has a reliable find spot or inscription, and, the style of Tetrarchic portraiture did not encourage individualized features.

The examination of the chosen monuments reveals much about Tetrarchic imperial representation. In both portraiture and iconography, the Tetrarchs are consistently represented as identical. Only a few attributes allow Augusti to be distinguished from Caesars. This characteristic of Tetrarchic art, referred to in literature as the Tetrarchic similitudo, served to show the concordia of the Tetrarchs. Other iconographic innovations, include the use of the pileus pannonicus, a pill box shaped hat, and the nimbus. Three different types of Tetrarchic scenes are identified: purely ideological, ceremonial, and battle scenes. Some of these scenes

---

3 Galerius’ official name was C. Galerius Valerius Maximianus, and Maximian’s was Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maximianus. Thus without the first part of the name, which one rarely finds in inscriptions, the two cannot always be distinguished. A partial list of Tetrarchic inscriptions, in Greece and Asia Minor, has been produced by Vermeule 1968, 287-338.

4 The marble busts have already been treated in great detail elsewhere. See L’Orange 1984; Bergemann 1977; Calza 1972; von Meischner 1986.
find precedent in earlier Roman art. The use of these scenes, and in one instance the recycling of older sculpture as spolia, served to connect the Tetrarchs to past periods of stability.\(^5\)

It is further argued that Tetrarchic art and monuments in no way represent a decline in Roman art as was once commonly argued.\(^6\) Instead, it seems that the Tetrarchy marks the beginning of an intentional move towards more symbolic representation. It will be shown that representations of the Tetrarchs alongside gods and personifications were meant to show their divine prerogative and universal power. These figures were also used to relate the Tetrarchs directly or metaphorically to their divine patrons, Jupiter and Hercules. The overall effect of these changes was to represent the Tetrarchs as a cohesive and powerful ruling unit.

---

\(^5\) This idea forms part of the central thesis of Elsner 1998. It is also discussed in his article on the later Arch of Constantine. (Elsner 2000).

\(^6\) Berenson (1954) was the champion of this belief, but certainly not the originator of the idea of a late antique decline. It is described in such terms as early as 1519, when Raphael wrote a report on Antiquities for Pope Leo X; see Elsner 2000, 149.
2. THE HISTORY OF THE FIRST TETRARCHY, 284-305

Introduction

The history of the Roman empire in the late third and early fourth centuries is by no means straightforward, as demonstrated by the fact that a third edition of volume 12 of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, which covers A.D. 193-324, has yet to be produced. The most frequently used work for the period is Williams’ *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery*. This book, supplemented by Barnes’ *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, forms the basis of this chapter. The extant contemporary sources for the period include the Latin panegyrics, speeches delivered in praise of various Tetrarchs on different occasions between 289 and 313, Lactantius’ book *De Mortibus Persecutorum* (On the Deaths of the Persecutors), written in 313 or 314, as well as later fourth century historians such as Eutropius and Aurelius Victor. This chapter focuses on the major political events and military campaigns of the Tetrarchy, which influenced the Tetrarchic coins and monuments, and to a large extent ignores the important social reforms that occurred during that period. To incorporate both topics adequately would involve writing an entire book, and the purpose of this work is to study the imperial imagery of the Tetrarchy. The chapter begins with a narrative account moving from the ascension of Diocletian to his abdication in 305, and concludes with a discussion of the Tetrarchic system and its possible dynastic implications.

*Narrative Account, A. D. 284 - 305*

---

7 The principal modern works for the period are Barnes 1982; Carrié 1999; Corcoran 1996; Kolb 1987; Kuhoff 2001; Seston 1946; Williams 1985.

8 For a full discussion of the sources for the period see Kuhoff 2001, 9-12. The editions, translations and commentaries on these works used here are those of Nixon and Rodgers 1995 (Panegyrici Latini); Creed 1984 (Lactantius); Bird 1993 (Eutropius) and Bird 1994 (Aurelius Victor).
When Diocletian seized power in 284, the empire was in a bad state. It had suffered numerous usurpations and civil wars, repeated barbarian incursions along the Rhine and Danube, and as attacks by the Persians from across the Euphrates. Massive inflation plagued the economy, the coinage was debased and the plague was rampant as the depopulation and abandonment of the countryside caused famines. The emperors of this period tended to spend their entire careers fighting both barbarians on the frontier and their own generals who had been hailed as rival Augusti by their troops.

Diocletian was one of a series of soldier emperors who had climbed their way to the top after long military careers. Most of these tough pragmatic emperors, including Claudius Gothicus, Aurelian, and Probus, all came from the Danube region, where much military action was fought in the third century. In this period nobility was considered greatly subordinate to military competence as an imperial trait. As such, these newcomers were despised by the Roman senate and aristocracy, but, as provincials often did, they considered themselves to be Romans, and in many ways held more traditional Roman values than their aristocratic detractors.

Diocletian, originally named Diocles, was said to have been born of humble parents in Illyricum and rose through the ranks of the army under Aurelian and Probus. It is possible that he once held the position Dux Moesiae. He participated in Probus’ reduction of the barbarian invasions

---

9 For discussions of the third century’s social, political and economic problems see Williams 1985, 19-21; Carrié 1999, 133-144; Drinkwater 1987, 19-23; Watson 1999, 1-20.
11 Williams 1985, 28-29.
13 Williams 1985, 26. For service under Probus see SHA, Probus, 22.3. and Pan. Lat. 11.3. Barnes 1982, 31 comments that there is no reliable evidence for Diocletian’s career prior to 284
in Gaul and his trans-Rhine expeditions.\textsuperscript{14} When the armies of the Danube declared Carus as their emperor, Probus was quickly deserted and slain by his troops.\textsuperscript{15} Yet Diocletian still seemed to enjoy a high rank and obtained the position of commander of the household cavalry of Carus. In 283 he was even honoured with a second consulship.\textsuperscript{16}

After settling the Danube frontier, Carus took advantage of an internal Sassanian dispute to invade Persia. After defeating a Persian army, Carus took Ctesiphon and Seleucia with only a short struggle.\textsuperscript{17} But before Carus could employ this victory to his advantage, he died mysteriously. According to one account his tent was struck by lightning, and according to another he was the victim of illness, but it is by no means unlikely that he was murdered.\textsuperscript{18} His son and Caesar, Numerian, was proclaimed Augustus, and the army began the March back to Roman territory. When Numerian was discovered dead in his litter, the praetorian prefect, Aper, was promptly executed for the crime. On the 20\textsuperscript{th} of November, 284, in the vicinity of Nicomedia, a council of officers appointed Diocles as the new Augustus.\textsuperscript{19}

After his appointment as Augustus, Diocles adopted the name Gaius Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus.\textsuperscript{20} Carinus, the elder son of Carus, had been left in control in Rome during the Persian campaign, and he was now recognized as the legitimate Augustus there. The governor of Dalmatia, Constantius, was a fellow soldier of Diocletian, and declared his loyalty to him. To complicate matters, a praetorian prefect in Pannonia, Sabinus Julianus, independently revolted.

\textsuperscript{14} Williams 1985, 30.
\textsuperscript{15} Marcus Aurelius (\textit{RE} 77, 4.2455-2457, Henze) Carus.
\textsuperscript{16} Williams 1985, 32-33; Kuhoff 2001, 17-19. His title under Carus is recorded in the \textit{SHA} \textit{Vita Cari} as \textit{domesticus regens}.
\textsuperscript{17} Williams 1985, 33; \textit{SHA} Carus, Carinus and Numerian 7.1 and 8.1-9; Oros. 7.24.4.
\textsuperscript{18} Aur. Vict. \textit{Caes.} 38 (lightning); \textit{SHA} Carus, Carinus and Numerian, VIII (illness).
\textsuperscript{19} Williams 1985, 34-36. Lactant. \textit{De Mort. Pers.} 17.1
against Carinus. Carinus defeated Julianus near Verona in winter of 284 and met the main forces of Diocletian in the spring of 285 at Viminacium. Though Carinus’ forces greatly outnumbered those of Diocletian, and the battle saw Diocletian on the verge of defeat, Carinus was suddenly assassinated by one of his officers, whose wife he had seduced. Unwilling to continue the battle without a leader, Carinus’ troops capitulated to Diocletian.

Though now unchallenged internally, Diocletian was immediately and simultaneously faced with major external problems. The Sarmatians were causing problems on the Danube, and fresh incursions of Franks and Alamanni were crossing the Rhine. The Sarmatians were originally an Iranian tribe that had expanded into the territory of the Scythians over a 300 year period. In the third century A.D., pressure from Germanic tribes was forcing them toward the Hungarian plain and into Roman territory. The Alamanni were a conglomeration of various southern German tribes, sometimes including the Iuthungi, who had occupied the abandoned Agri Decumates around 260. The Franks (Franci) were a more recent conglomeration of Germanic tribes from the north of Germany who would eventually overrun Gaul, and who gave their name to France. In the third and fourth centuries A.D., the Franks were both troublesome raiders by land and sea and also sometimes mercenaries of the Romans.

Finally, a group known as the Bagaudae had risen in Gaul. The nature of the Bagaudae is not entirely clear. The word is of Celtic origin and has been given a variety of meanings, including

---

21 Williams 1985, 38. It is not clear from the sources whether there were two usurpers named Marcus Aurelius Sabinus Julianus, (PLRE 474, no. 24, Aur. Vict. Caes. 29.10), and Sabinus Julianus, (PLRE 480 no. 38, Aur. Vict. Epit. 38.6), or merely one whose name was confused. This latter explanation seems the most likely.
“rebels”, “fighters” and “Lords of the Land.”

They may have been an organized conglomeration of bandits who had been plaguing the region for some time, or, perhaps more likely, a collection of peasants who had risen under local aristocracy to defend their land against the German raiders. The Bagaudae were led by two men named Aelianus and Amandus. A few examples of coins of the latter are known, on which he receives the title Augustus. It was probably fear of a usurper that caused the Bagaudae to be perceived as a threat by Diocletian.

Both of these problems would require a large army, and appointing a delegate to command such a force risked creating another usurper. Recognizing this, Diocletian provided a unique solution. At Milan, shortly after the battle of Viminacium in the summer of 285, he appointed Maximian to the rank of Caesar and sent him to deal with the Bagaudae and Germans in Gaul. Maximian, like Diocletian, came from humble Illyrian stock and had risen through the ranks of the army. He was a comrade of Diocletian and had probably served with him during Carus’ Persian campaign. He took the name Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maximianus and the title filius Augusti. The ancient sources generally depict him as loyal to Diocletian and a brilliant general, but a lesser strategist and politician.

The Bagaudae were easily dealt with. They lacked order and soon fell or dispersed at the sight of Maximian’s troops. The issue was settled by the end of 285 or early 286. As part of his

---

26 For full references to the etymological discussions see Kuhoff, 2001, 36 footnote 70.
29 Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maximianus (RE 1, 28.2486-2515, Ensslin); RIC V.2, p. 579 and 595.
30 Barnes 1982, 32-33. On his promotion, Pan. Lat. 11.5.6.
31 Barnes 1982, 4.
32 Williams 1985, 44. For instance, Lactant. De Mort. Pers. 8.2 and Pan. Lat. 10.7.6-7 which describes Maximian as the active Hercules, and Diocletian as the powerful Jupiter who causes things to tremble by a mere nod.
campaign for a more stable Gaul, Maximian had appointed Carausius as the commander of the channel fleet, based in Dover and Boulogne, to deal with raids on the Gallic and British coast by Frankish pirates. But while Maximian was engaged with the German tribes on the Rhine, reports reached him that Carausius had himself been engaged in piracy.³⁴ Orders were sent for the execution of Carausius who, in response, had himself proclaimed Augustus. He then proceeded to establish a secessionist empire from the mouth of the Rhine to Brittany, with a stronghold in Boulogne, and in all of Britain. Carausius was supported by two legions in Britain, the II Augusta and XX Valeria Victrix and part of the XXX Ulpia Victrix in Boulogne.³⁵ Carausius secured the services of Frankish mercenaries, but the chief source of his strength was the channel fleet, the classis Britannica. Not only was Maximianus occupied with the Germans, he also lacked a fleet with which to invade Britain. The Rhine fleet, usually stationed near Cologne, had been destroyed by the Germans some years earlier.³⁶

Either in response to the usurpation of Carausius, or as a pre-planned reward for the suppression of the Bagaudae, Diocletian raised Maximian to the rank of Augustus on 1 April 286.³⁷ In official propaganda the two now enjoyed a fraternal relationship rather than that of father and son, and were clearly considered as equals.³⁸ Sometime around 286, the two took on the names Jovius and Herculius, and their coinage began to compare them to these gods.³⁹ This close association with divinities was not entirely new, as Aurelian had made efforts to connect himself

³⁴ Williams 1985, 46; Casey 1994, 52; Barnes 1982, 10-11.
³⁵ Kuhoff 2001, 70.
³⁷ Barnes 1982, 4; Chron. min. 1.229.
³⁸ Williams 1985, 49.
³⁹ Rodgers and Nixon 1994, 48-50; Kolb 1987, 63-66. See chap. 2.3.
with Sol Invictus some years earlier.\textsuperscript{40} While the exact theology and interpretation of the new titles is open to debate, the idea was almost certainly an attempt to create legitimacy of the regime through the concept of divine patronage. The choice of these traditional deities probably reflects the very conservative attitude of the Illyrian generals from whose ranks both Diocletian and Maximian came.\textsuperscript{41}

Forced to leave Carausius for the moment, Maximian turned his attention to the Rhine and established his headquarters at Mainz. He was unable to take on all of the German tribes in Roman territory simultaneously, so he employed a scorched earth campaign of destroying the crops of a number of tribes west of the Rhine. He then left them to starve while he dealt with other fronts. His first campaign was against the Heruli and Chaibones in 286. He defeated these two tribes in a single battle in which (we are told by the panegyricist Mamertinus) he himself fought in person:

\begin{quotation}
For what need of a multitude when you yourself took part in the fray, when you yourself did battle in each spot and over the whole of the battlefield, and you yourself ran to counter the foe everywhere, both where he resisted, and where he gave way and fled, and deceived equally your adversaries and your own troops, since neither did the barbarians suppose you to be one man nor were your soldiers able to follow you, I don’t mean in a band as your escort, but even with their eyes. Indeed you were born over the whole field of battle in the fashion of a great river, swollen with winter rain and snow, which is wont to flow wherever the plain extends.
\end{quotation}

\textit{Panegyrici Latini} 10.5.3. (Nixon’s translation)

Maximian then turned to the Alamanni. He first chased them out of the \textit{Agri Decumates}, which they had held since 260, and then crossed the Rhine into Germany itself. Much territory east of

\textsuperscript{40} Watson 1999, 188-196.  
\textsuperscript{41} Williams 1985, 58.
the Rhine was taken and large numbers of Germans were slaughtered. Ever since the defeat of Varus’ legions under Augustus, trans-Rhine campaigns were seen as miraculous achievements by the Romans. Mamertinus puts voice to this wonder and claims that the empire no longer needs the Rhine to protect it: “Let the Rhine dry up, and with its gentle current scarcely move the smooth pebbles in its transparent shallows; there is no fear from that quarter: all that I see beyond the Rhine is Roman!” Roman Gauls once again farmed the Agri Decumates, and members of the Frisian and Salian Franks, the Chamuvi and other lesser Germanic tribes were settled in Lower Germania. These were given the status of Laeti, who had very few rights; they seem to have been bound to the land they worked, and were required to provide military service. In general, Roman policy seems to have been to establish buffer zones of friendly barbarians between themselves and more hostile groups. For instance, a treaty was struck with the Frankish king Gennoubaudes who became a friend and ally of Rome. The trans-Rhine campaign and the restoration of the German frontier is celebrated by a medallion of 288. (See chap. 3.9)

In 287 Diocletian was in Syria, where he again strengthened the frontier against the Persians. He was at last available to take advantages of Carus’ victories in 284 and establish a treaty with the Sassanian leader Vahram. The latter agreed to abandon his claims to Mesopotamia and Armenia and to recognize the Roman client king Tiridates III as the rightful ruler of Armenia. In 288 Diocletian met with Maximian in Mainz, and proceeded to conduct a campaign against the Germans in Raetia. He then followed this with a campaign against the Sarmatians in Dacia
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43 Pan. Lat. 10.7.7 (Nixon’s translation).
45 Williams 1985, 51; Kuhoff 2001, 86; Pan. Lat. 10.10.4
46 Williams 1985, 52; Kuhoff 2001, 178.
At this time he also re-organized and strengthened the system of Danube defences to an extent otherwise unknown in the third century. A short campaign was also fought by Diocletian against the belligerent Saracen tribes in Syria in 290.

In 289, Maximian took advantage of the stabilised Rhine frontier to deal with Carausius. Although it seems his forces managed to fight their way to the shore, his newly built fleet was either destroyed by the classis Britannica of Carausius or lost in a storm. This resulted in three more years of peace for Carausius’ secessionist empire. Carausius’ coinage gives the impression that he held some sort of official position during this period. As well as coins with his own obverse bust and legends, Carausius’ mints struck obverses of Diocletian and Maximian, as well as one coin with the conjugate busts of all three and the legend CARAVSIVS ET FRATRES SVI. But the propaganda was all one way: no coinage of Carausius was ever minted in the central empire, and he was never recognized in the headings of official documents.

The five years of solid campaigning that marked the beginning of Diocletian and Maximian’s reigns were followed by years of peace in 291 and 292. In the winter of 290/1, Maximian and Diocletian travelled together through the Alps and stopped at Milan; here they held a conference and an elaborate celebration of their joint rule. But Carausius still held Britain, and it was doubtful that Maximian could leave the Rhine frontier in peace for long enough to deal with him.
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47 Williams 1985, 52; Pan. Lat. 10.9.1
48 Williams 1985, 51; An extended discussion of Diocletian’s system of defence is to be found in Williams 1985, chapter 7.
49 Williams 1985, 63; Barnes 1982, 51; Pan. Lat. 11.5.4.
50 Williams 1985, 56.
51 Williams 1985, 56; Casey 1994, 52-53. Reverse types include PAX AVGG (RIC V.2, Carausius, 1), VICTORIA AVGG (RIC V.2, Carausius, 28) PROVID AVGG (RIC V.2. Carausius, 371).
52 RIC V.2, Carausius 1.
53 Williams 1985, 57.
54 Pan. Lat. 11.8.1.
Once again Diocletian provided a novel solution and created a new and short lived form of governance in the Roman world. On 1 March 293, Diocletian appointed Galerius as his Caesar and Maximian appointed Constantius as his. The diarchy evolved into a Tetrarchy. The alliance of the four emperors was strengthened by the marriage of Diocletian’s daughter Valeria to Galerius and Maximian’s daughter Theodora to Constantius. Both the new Caesars took the name Valerius to become C. Galerius Valerius Maximianus and M. Flavius Valerius Constantius.  

Around 272 Constantius’ first wife, Helena, had born him a son named Constantine who would drastically re-shape the Roman world after his father’s death. Both Lactantius and other later Christian writers portray Galerius as an evil persecutor and Constantius as the heroic father of the Christian emperor. Aurelius Victor says that Constantius ruled Gaul across the Alps; Maximian, Italy and Africa; Galerius, the Danube and Greece; and Diocletian, Asia, Egypt and the Orient. New regional capitals were established at Trier, Milan, Salonica and Nicomedia. But it should be stressed that these geographical limits were by no means fixed, and various Tetrarchs frequently operated in regions that were not their own according to Victor’s classification.

Constantius set about dealing with Carausius at once. He began by laying siege to the city of Boulogne, the principal mainland stronghold and port of Carausius. After he had constructed impressive siege works that included a blockade of the port, the soldiers within capitulated. The surrounding territory was quickly taken. Only Carausius’ Frankish allies at the mouth of the
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56 Barnes 1982, 30; Flavius Valerius Constantinus (RE 2, 7.1013-1040, Cohn).


Rhine remained loyal.59 With the defeat of these in a campaign in Batavia, Constantius began the construction of a fleet for the invasion of Britain. Shortly after losing his mainland territory, Carausius himself was assassinated and replaced by his finance minister Allectus.60 The construction of the new fleet took until the end of 296. During this time Constantius settled more defeated Germans in the recently depopulated regions of Gaul and visited Italy.61

By 296 the fleet was ready, and Constantius launched a two pronged attack on Britain. His prefect Julius Asclepiodatus led a large fleet from the mouth of the Seine towards the south coast, and Constantius himself led a smaller diversionary fleet from Bolougne towards Dover.62 This ploy, aided by a fog covering the channel, allowed Asclepiodatus’ fleet to cross over unmolested and land near Southampton. Before marching on London, he is reported to have burned his ships as a dedication to Mars.63 Allectus rushed from London to meet Asclepiodatus and was killed in the ensuing rout of his army.64 Constantius landed near London just in time to meet and destroy the fleeing remains of Allectus’ army. We are told in a panegyric to him how he slaughtered the Frankish mercenaries of Allectus in front of the walls of London before they could sack it.65 The triumphal entry of Constantius into London and the success of the British campaign is celebrated by the famous Arras Medallion (see chap. 3.10)

While Constantius was in the process of restoring the Western empire, Galerius was busy in the East. With the ascension of a new warlike Sassanian ruler named Narses, Diocletian’s treaty of
287 was threatened. In 296, Narses had invaded Armenia, deposed Tiridates, and threatened Roman Syria. Galerius rushed to meet the Persian army near Carrhae and was soundly defeated.\textsuperscript{66} Early in 297, soon after Galerius’ defeat, the Egyptians perceived a new census as a prelude to even further taxation, and revolted. They proclaimed one Lucius Domitius Domitianus as Augustus. Another character, Achilleus, also seems to have held a measure of power, although some historians see him as simply a second Augustus who took control after Domitianus was killed in the siege of Alexandria.\textsuperscript{67} It is quite likely that the Egyptians expected help from Persia and may even have been encouraged by the Persians to revolt. There were many Manicheans in Egypt and the Persian sympathies of their religion resulted in its persecution by Diocletian after the revolt.\textsuperscript{68}

The suppression of the Egyptian revolt was undertaken by Diocletian himself, and ended with a long siege of Alexandria which lasted into the Spring of 298. The result of the revolt was a re-organisation of the Egyptian economy, including the completion of the census, the end of independent Egyptian coinage, and a re-division of the Egyptian provinces.\textsuperscript{69} At the end of the campaign, Diocletian undertook another campaign against the Blemmyes in southern Egypt and strengthened the frontier by stationing more troops around Thebes (perhaps including the new fort at Luxor, see chap. 7), and by settling the more friendly Nobades between Roman Egypt and the territory of the Blemmyes.\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{66} Williams 1985, 80; Eutr. 9.24. For a collection of all the sources, in translation, relating to Galerius’ Persian campaign, see Dodgeon and Lieu 1991, 125-135.
\textsuperscript{67} Williams 1985, 81; Kuhoff 2001, 193.
\textsuperscript{68} Williams 1985, 83; Kuhoff 2001, 188.
\textsuperscript{69} On the end of the Egyptian coinage see Harl 1996, 156.
\textsuperscript{70} Williams 1985, 83; Kuhoff 2001, 197-199.
In 297 Galerius went to the Danube and collected a new army, one that included Gothic and Sarmatian mercenaries, for dealing with Narses. Narses does not seem to have advanced very far to take advantage of his success in 296; perhaps he was delayed by the renewed Syrian defences. Galerius’ second Persian campaign in 298 was as successful as his first was disastrous. Invading Persia via Armenia with the aid of Tiridates, Galerius managed to ambush the main Persian army in mountainous terrain.\footnote{Williams 1985, 84; Seston 1946, 168.} The Persian army was utterly defeated and the Persian treasury and royal harem were both captured. Marching into Iran, Galerius took both Nisibis and the Persian capital, Ctesiphon.\footnote{Williams 1985, 84; Aur. Vict. \textit{Caes.} 39.33-36; Eutr. 9.25.}

In early 299 Diocletian met with Galerius at Nisibis and the two settled a treaty with Persian ambassadors. The terms included the return of the royal harem and a large payment of restitution to the Romans by Narses. This was certainly one of the most important victories of the Romans over the Persians, and Roman territory was slightly increased eastward. Tiridates, now restored to his throne, married daughter to a male of the Sassanian royal family. The resulting peace lasted for forty years.\footnote{Williams 1985, 86; Seston 1946, 171.}

In Mauretania, the Berbers had been raiding the Roman north as early as 288 and had been put down initially by the governor Aurelius Litua. In 296 these troubles were beginning again.\footnote{Warmington 1954, 8; Seston 1946, 114-127; Williams 1985, 75.} In early 297 Maximian moved towards Africa via Spain, where he defeated a group of Franks.\footnote{Seston 1946, 117; Williams 1985, 75.} The Franks had penetrated deeply into Roman territory during the third century, and the fact that
some of them were still to be found in Spain is by no means surprising. The subsequent campaign in Mauretania against the troublesome Berber tribes was a success, and Maximian entered Carthage in triumph on 10 March 298. This was followed by his triumphal entry into Rome in 299.

While the most impressive victories of the 290’s were certainly those in Britain, Persia and Egypt, a variety of minor campaigns had been fought by the two senior Augusti. These included those campaigns of Diocletian against the Blemmyes in Egypt as well as his campaigns against Saracen tribes on the Syrian frontier prior to the Persian campaign. In 293 and 294 Diocletian had campaigned again on the Danube against the Sarmatians and re-established Roman defences through the construction of a series of forts known as the *ripa Sarmatica*. We also know of an instance in 289 when Constantius was taken by surprise, besieged by Germans at Langres, and successfully fought his way out.

The victory titles of Galerius indicate that a series of campaigns against the Carpi and Marrommani took place on the Danube frontier between 299 and 306, but the exact chronology is disputed. Similarly, Constantius fought on the Rhine between 300 and 303, and in the winter of 304, he repelled an invasion of Germans who had crossed the frozen Rhine river. The following year, he went to Britain to campaign against the Picts. Allectus had removed troops from the Northern borders to defend against Constantius’ invasion some seven years earlier, and
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76 Barnes 1982, 59; The details of this are unclear, see Kuhoff 2001, 201 for a discussion of Maximian’s actions in Spain.
78 Williams 1985, 76.
79 Eutropius 9.23; Williams 1985, 94. For the date, Bird 1993, 148.
80 Barnes 1982, 63, n. 78 and, 257 (table 7).
81 Barnes 1982, 56; Pan. Lat. 6.6.4.
the Picts had taken advantage of this reduction of the defences.\footnote{Williams 1985, 74; Casey 1994, 151 and 171.} In any event, these campaigns cannot have been more than the regular stabilising actions, or the repulsions of small raids, rather than major victories.

In short, the period between the accession of Diocletian in 284 and his retirement in 305 was marked by incessant warfare against external foes. The Rhine and Danube regions required almost continuous campaigning against the Sarmatii, Franks and Alamanni in order to maintain a stable frontier. All of the Tetrarchs campaigned on at least one of these frontiers. Apart from regular victories in these regions, the most important campaigns were the trans-Rhine expedition of Maximian (287), the invasion of Britain by Constantius (297), the suppression of the revolt in Egypt by Diocletian (297) and, of course, the victory of Galerius over Nares (298). Maximian’s campaigns against the Berbers in Mauretania, like those of Diocletian against the Blemmyes in Egypt, should probably be seen as analogous to the stabilising actions on the Rhine and Danube.

In addition to the various campaigns described above, there were numerous social and administrative reforms undertaken by Diocletian and the Tetrarchs. Even though the Tetrarchs were almost always on the move, they nonetheless conducted the usual legal business of the empire. In 286 Diocletian began to produce a finer\footnote{Harl 1996, 149. The existence of this second edict, which had previously only been conjectured by numismatists, was confirmed by the discovery of an amendment to the fragments of the Edict of Maximum Prices found at Aphrodisias. For a discussion, see Erim, Crawford and Reynolds 1971.} aureus (60 to the Roman pound), and this move was followed up in 292 by a full scale reform of the coinage, the details of which are not fully understood.\footnote{At any rate, Diocletian’s new bronze coin, probably called a ‘nummus’, was a}
vast improvement in quality on the debased radiates of the third century.\textsuperscript{84} Still, inflation continued to be a major problem, and an attempt was made to curb it early in 301 with the famous edict of maximum prices. This was followed almost immediately by an edict doubling the value of the coinage.\textsuperscript{85} Diocletian also standardized the very governance of the empire in the provinces and regularized the system of tax collection.\textsuperscript{86} After dividing the current Roman provinces into smaller units, Diocletian created larger units known as \textit{dioceses} and put each in the control of a new official known as a \textit{vicarius}.\textsuperscript{87}

On 20 November 303, Diocletian and Maximian both arrived in Rome to celebrate their \textit{vicennalia} and the \textit{decennalia} of the two Caesars.\textsuperscript{88} The festivities are depicted in part on the bases of the five columned monument, known to scholars as the Fünfsäulendenkmal, erected in the Roman forum to celebrate the event.\textsuperscript{89} Lactantius tells us that Diocletian wearied of the events in Rome and the lavisciousness of the Roman people, and left early for Nicomedia. Enroute he became seriously ill and remained so, almost incapacitated, and at one point falling into a death-like coma, until 305.\textsuperscript{90}

The illness contracted by Diocletian after leaving Rome lasted all throughout 304 and nearly brought Diocletian to his death.\textsuperscript{91} According to Lactantius, it was Diocletian’s illness that prompted his retirement, but the fact that he had been building his retirement palace at Split

\textsuperscript{84} Harl 1996, 148-157.
\textsuperscript{85} Harl 1996, 152-154.
\textsuperscript{86} Williams 1985, 103-105.
\textsuperscript{87} Williams 1985, 105. For a complete list see Williams 1985, 221-223 (appendix I) and for a description of the seventh century manuscript from which these come, known as the Verona List, and the problems associated with it see Barnes 1982, 201-225.
\textsuperscript{88} Kuhoff 2001, 235.; Pan. Lat. 6.8.7.
\textsuperscript{89} See chap. 5.
\textsuperscript{90} Lactant., De Mort. Pers. 17.
\textsuperscript{91} Williams 1985, 189; Lactant. De Mort. Pers., 17.
since at least 290 seems to suggest that it had been planned much earlier.\textsuperscript{92} He summoned Galerius to him in Nicomedia, and two new Caesars, Severus and Maximinus, were nominated by Galerius to fill his own place and that of Constantius.\textsuperscript{93} This was done in a ceremony outside Nicomedia that is described in detail by Lactantius.\textsuperscript{94} Diocletian announced his retirement and the elevation of Galerius and Constantius to the rank of Augusti. Maximian in Milan also retired, although with much more reluctance. Thus the Tetrarchic system could theoretically continue, but within a year the second Tetrarchy would collapse completely. Maxentius, the son of Maximian, would be declared Augustus in Rome, and Constantine would be proclaimed Caesar in Britain. Maximian himself would come out of retirement and vainly attempt to depose both his own son and, later, Constantine. The civil wars that had racked the third century would be renewed in a fury until 324 when Constantine emerged from the bickering Tetrarchs as the supreme emperor. But the history and archaeology of the Tetrarchy in decline is beyond the scope of this paper, which will limit itself to the end of the first Tetrarchy in 305.

\textit{The Tetrarchic System and Dynastic Implications}

The Tetrarchic system of government has been considered in two ways by modern historians. Some scholars see the Tetrarchy as something planned and concrete with set ideas and values.\textsuperscript{95} Others see it as a natural development that was the result of Diocletian’s response to certain events.\textsuperscript{96} From the historical narrative above it should be fairly clear that the Tetrarchy

\textsuperscript{92} Williams 1985, 191.
\textsuperscript{93} Flavius Valerius Severus (\textit{RE} 15, 2.4.2002-2003, Seeck) and Gaius Galerius Valerius Maximinus Daia, (\textit{RE} s.v. Daia, 8.1986-1989, Seeck).
\textsuperscript{94} Lactant. \textit{De Mort. Pers.} 18.
\textsuperscript{95} Thus Kolb 1987 and Williams 1985.
\textsuperscript{96} The idea that the Tetrarchy was purely the result of a group of responses to political crises is championed most by Seston (1946) as well as Rousselle (1976.) For a discussion in English see Nixon and Rodgers 1995, 44-47.
developed as a result of current events as much as it was planned. In fact, the very notion of a Tetrarchic system is the product of modern scholarship, and the Tetrarchy in its full form lasted only fifteen years.\(^\text{97}\) The second Tetrarchy was a failure, and the last vestiges of the entire system were abandoned by 312. Undoubtedly the retirement of Diocletian had much to do with this.\(^\text{98}\) The truth about the nature of the Tetrarchy is probably somewhere between the two viewpoints.

There are, however, distinct and recognizable elements of a Tetrarchic system that ought to be discussed here. First, the very idea of four emperors, two Augusti and two Caesars, is undeniably unique. It cannot be denied that there were some elements of this system of government, whether planned or developed, that contributed to its success. To cement the relationship between the four power sharing individuals, a system of both divine and earthly relationships was conceived. Diocletian and Maximian became the representatives of Jupiter and Hercules. Libations and sacrifices were made to the *genii* of the emperors and all the legitimacy of the Tetrarchs stemmed from this divine prerogative rather than any fictional hereditary claim.\(^\text{99}\) The practice not only conveyed the divine authority of the Tetrarchs, but also the idea that heavenly concord was repeated on earth.\(^\text{100}\) The marriage of Diocletian’s daughter Valeria to Galerius, and the marriage of Maximian’s daughter Theodora to Constantius, further cemented the worldly relationships of the Tetrarchs.\(^\text{101}\) In official texts, the two Caesars were brothers, with the Augusti their fathers and uncles.\(^\text{102}\) The *concordia* of the Tetrarchs was praised not only by their coin
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\(^{97}\) König 1986.  
\(^{98}\) Williams 1985, 195-198.  
\(^{100}\) Kolb 2000, 33.  
\(^{101}\) Barnes 1982, 31 and 33.  
\(^{102}\) Kolb 2000, 28; Sutherland 1967, 9.
types but also by later Roman historians. Overall, it cannot be denied that until 305 the Tetrarchy functioned remarkably smoothly, and was more adept at dealing with the problems of usurpation and civil war that had plagued other third century emperors.

Tetrarchic *concordia* was further reinforced by the concept of the *similitudo* of the Tetrarchs. The Tetrarchs celebrated each others’ triumphs, common *dies imperii* and votive anniversaries. The victories earned by one Tetrarch resulted in triumphal titulature for all four. The coinage of Carthage that celebrates Maximian’s *adventus* in 298 was struck with the obverses of all four Tetrarchs who, of course, were not all present. In imperial representation, as shall be seen in the central chapters of this thesis, the Tetrarchs are always represented in the same manner. A new style of portraiture and dress was even adopted in which no attributes of individual Tetrarchs are to be found. Thus the concord of the Tetrarchs was emphasized by the fact that each Tetrarch was both physically and ideologically the same as his colleagues.

Both modern and ancient historians have seen Diocletian’s reforms as a move towards an eastern style monarchy. Evidence for this is found both in the new style of imperial dress, with elaborately decorated clothing, and also in the introduction of new court ceremonies. These included the introduction of the ceremony of *proskynesis* or *adoratio* mentioned by Eutropius
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103 For instance, *RIC* VI, Rome 47, Ticinum 25-26, Aquileia 2 and so on. Examples of ancient historical praise include Victor 39; Oros. 7.26.5-7 and Julian. *Caesares* 315, where the emperor compares the Tetrarchy to a dance group.
104 Kolb 2000, 32.
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108 Kolb 2000, 33; L’Orange 1984, 3-6.
and Lactantius.\textsuperscript{110} This ceremony has been compared both to Persian \textit{proskynisis} before kings as well as a Hellenistic gesture employed in the adoration of images of the gods.\textsuperscript{111} In Tetrarchic art, as shall be seen, the emperor is often seen enthroned and separated from the soldiers and senators with whom he once mingled. In daily court ceremony, the emperor became increasingly lofty and separated from his subjects.\textsuperscript{112} The new ceremony of adoring the emperor in the visiting hall of his palace is described as early as 291 in the panegyric to Maximian:

\begin{quote}
What a spectacle your piety created, when those who were going to adore your sacred features were admitted to the palace in Milan you both were gazed upon and your twin deity suddenly confused the ceremony of a single veneration. Yet this private veneration, as if in the inner shrine, stunned the mind only of those whose public rank gave them access to you.
\end{quote}

\textit{Panegyrici Latini} 11.11.1-3 (Rodger’s translation)

Based on three textual references, some scholars have argued that Diocletian’s Tetrarchic system was intended to run on hereditary principals.\textsuperscript{113} They cite a passage in Lactantius where Diocletian, having been forced into retirement by Galerius, states that it should not be necessary to contact Maximian and Constantius regarding the appointment of new Caesars because their sons, Constantine and Maxentius, are the obvious candidates.\textsuperscript{114} On top of this, in the panegyrics of 289 and 297, the orators praise the sons of the Maximian and Constantius respectively and even imply that they shall succeed their fathers.\textsuperscript{115} The idea of a hereditary principle in the Tetrarchy has been opposed both by Seston and more recently by Kolb.\textsuperscript{116} They argued that the panegyric references to Maxentius and the sons of Constantius are merely rhetorical gestures that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{110}] Eutr. 26, Lactant. \textit{De Mort. Pers.} 18.9 describing how Maxentius refuses to pay either Galerius or Maximian \textit{adoratio}.
\item[\textsuperscript{111}] Williams 1985, 111-112; Kolb 2000, 38.
\item[\textsuperscript{112}] Williams 1985, 112-114.
\item[\textsuperscript{113}] The principal of these are: Seeck 1897, 34; Rousselle 1976, 457-461; Barnes 1981, 9 and 25-27.
\item[\textsuperscript{114}] Lactant. \textit{De Mort. Pers.}, 18.8.
\item[\textsuperscript{116}] Seston 1944, 255; Kolb 1987, 139-143.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
do not conform to the Tetrarchic formula. The first of the references in the panegyrics is also dated four years before the establishment of the full Tetrarchy.\footnote{Kolb 1987, 143.} Moreover, the praise of the two panegyrics for the sons of Maximian and Constantius is far less grand than the praise that was directed to the sons of Constantine and Theodosius in later panegyrics.\footnote{Kolb, 1987, 141; \textit{Pan. Lat.} 7.6.1-1, and 7.2.2-5.} The fact that neither Maxentius nor Candidianus, the son of Galerius, received coins, monuments, or imperial titles should be clear evidence that they were not guaranteed a place in the Tetrarchic system.\footnote{Kolb, 1987, 141. Except the possible inclusion of Candidianus on the \textit{decennalia} base of the Fünfsäulendenkmal. (See chap. 5.1).} Some of the central concepts of the Tetrarchy, such as residences outside of Rome and a monarchical style of government, would become fixed institutions of the late Roman and then Byzantine periods.\footnote{Williams 1985, 205-206.}

Whatever ideals the Tetrarchy did have were certainly displayed in the manner in which the four Tetrarchs are represented. In some ways, concepts such as \textit{concordia} and \textit{similitudo} of the Tetrarchs are better understood through contemporary coins and monuments than through the historical sources. Unlike written sources, these objects are transmitted to us directly from the period of the Tetrarchy, and thus are free from errors of transmission as well as the bias of ancient authors. That does not mean that imperial representation under the Tetrarchy was unbiased, in fact it was far from it. But we can be fairly sure that what Tetrarchic representations do show are what the Tetrarchs wanted to be seen, or at least were designed to fit with their policies of imperial representation. The following chapters explore individual monuments and discuss what they can tell us about Tetrarchic ideology.
3. COINS AND MEDALS OF THE TETRARCHY

A full account of the coinage and medals of the Tetrarchs with a discussion of their reverse messages and propaganda value would be a book in itself. By carefully evaluating the reverse imagery of all Tetrarchic coins, both before and after the reform of 294, such a book would be able to detect shifts in the mode of imperial representation on Tetrarchic coinage and relate them to political events.\textsuperscript{121} A short description of both coins and medals is necessary here, and I have chosen only those coins and medals whose imagery relates to the monuments under consideration or that reflect important components of Tetrarchic ideology. Unless otherwise noted, all of the coins illustrated in this chapter are one to one reproductions.

Most medals and gold coins of the late Roman empire were probably produced for specific and irregular distributions of payments to the troops. These cash handouts, \textit{donativa} or \textit{sportulae}, were intended as supplements to the meagre military wages, and were probably what kept the troops loyal. Such payments were always made on the successions of new emperors, but also on the occasion of triumphs, \textit{adventus} and imperial anniversaries. A contemporary panel on the Arch of Constantine shows the emperor sitting on a platform distributing coins to the people. Because of their specific function, the reverse imagery of gold coins and medallions is often very specific and can be related to specific historical events. As such, these coins and medals are usually datable to within one or two years.

\textsuperscript{121} Sutherland, 1967, 1-2 outlines the argument for a date of 294 rather than 296 as had once been thought. The reform was followed by a revaluation of the currency in 301 that is evidenced by an inscription from Aphrodisias. See Erim, Reynolds and Crawford 1971. The most important and comprehensive catalogue of Tetrarchic coins is Sutherland’s \textit{RIC VI}, (1967) that covers 294-313. Percy Webb’s \textit{RIC V.2} (1933), which covers the pre-reform coinages of Diocletian and Maximian, is still useful but is currently being revised by Catherine King, one of the curators of the Heberden Coin Room in the Ashmolean.
The regular coinage of the empire was a different matter. After Diocletian’s reform of the coinage in 294, good quality gold *aurei* and silver *argentii* were issued alongside large silver washed bronze coins known as *nummi* and small bronze fractions. Unlike the special medallic issues, the regular coinage was far more generic. While the gold coins often did refer to historical events, sometimes through allegory, the silver and silver-washed bronze coins tended to carry generalised scenes of Tetrarchic ideology and glorification. Although speaking of the post Tetrarchic coinage, Patrick Bruun accurately described late antique coinage as a whole by comparing it to music played on a keyboard: “Composing the tune of the coinage as a whole would be almost like playing on a keyboard and carefully selecting the pitch of the individual chords to achieve harmony with the constant humming of the bass.”122 The bass is the abundant mass of bronze coinage with its few repetitive reverse types, while the more varied and historical gold and silver coins are the chords played against it.

*Numismatic Portraiture of the Tetrarchy*

Coins are also our best source for identified busts of the Tetrarchs. Yet it is also here that the total *similitudo* of the Tetrarchs becomes apparent. The pre-reform coins of Diocletian and Maximian, such as nos. 4 and 5, clearly fall into the tradition of portraiture on the coinage of the soldier emperors.123 The emperor’s shoulders are included in these portraits, and often his armour. His brows are furrowed and he has a strong chin and short military beard. This sort of

---

122 Bruun 1966, 46.
123 L’Orange 1984, 15.
portraiture was clearly intended to emphasize the toughness of the emperor, and his concern for the well-being of the state, rather than his personal facial characteristics.  

A new style of Tetrarchic bust appears after the reform of the coinage in 294. The armoured bust of the emperor is abandoned, and a larger head, beginning at the neck, fills the space. The new bust is more cubic, with strong right angles, a squared haircut, short hair and military beard, and large almond eyes. See for instance the obverses of nos. 1, 2 and 3. This is also the same type of portraiture found on the porphyry sculptures of the Tetrarchs in the Vatican and Venice (see chapters 4.1 and 4.2). It should be noted that the new portrait bust was not a totally new creation. The loss of individual characteristics was already a trait of the soldier-emperor type portraits. L’Orange even identified an intermediary stage, occurring shortly after the reform, where the use of longer necks and skinnier heads clearly indicates the remaining influence of the soldier emperor type of portrait.  

L’Orange has argued that the capital cities of individual Tetrarchs, as well as those mint cities under their control, would have have produced more iconographically valuable portraits of their respective rulers. But he also admits that the bust from the coin of one Tetrarch can always be switched with the bust on the coin of another. Indeed, in the style of new portraiture, no Tetrarch is ever noticably different from another. It is puzzling that L’Orange, and others, have

---

125 Sutherland 1967, 109; L’Orange 1984, 16.  
126 Delbrueck 1940, 100 and 158-9; Kleiner 1991, 400.  
127 L’Orange 1984, 16.  
128 L’Orange 1984, 14.
persisted in their attempts to find the individuality in Tetrarchic portraits.\textsuperscript{129} Whatever variation exists is purely accidental, or the result of the artistic taste of the individual die engravers.

Two techniques of representing multiple busts on one coin gained popularity under the Tetrarchy. One was the use of conjugate (overlapping) busts of either two Tetrarchs or of a Tetrarch and his special divinity. The other was the use of two busts facing each other (e.g. nos. 4 and 6). These two techniques were not new to Roman numismatic art: both found precedents in the Republican period.\textsuperscript{130} More recently, a medallion of Philip the Arab used both techniques to show the emperor and his family.\textsuperscript{131} Under the Tetrarchy, conjugate and facing busts were used more frequently than ever, and even under Constantine the techniques would remain popular. The most striking example is the large gold multiple of 313 that shows Constantine conjugate with Sol.\textsuperscript{132}

\textit{The Arras Hoard}

Undoubtedly the most important source of the spectacular Tetrarchic gold medallions is the Arras Hoard. It was found on September 21, 1922 in Beaureins, a suburb of Arras, in the North of France by workers digging on a construction site. The hoard, contained in a pot, consisted of about 400 gold and silver coins, numerous gold medallions and pieces of jewellery. Unfortunately, much of it was stolen by the workers who discovered it. Some coins and medallions are known to have been sold to a dealer in Ghent, Belgium, who eventually decided

\textsuperscript{129} L’Orange 1984, 14. Calza (1972) and Delbrueck (1932) make similar attempts.
\textsuperscript{130} Conjugate busts: \textit{RRC} 346/3, 403/1, 455/2a, 463/1a, 515/1. Facing busts: \textit{RRC} 511/1, and 534/2.
\textsuperscript{131} Kent 1973, pl. 126 no. 457.
\textsuperscript{132} \textit{RIC} VII, Ticinum, 111; Kent 1973, pl. 159, no. 629.
they were fakes and melted them down. A long hunt for the lost coins ensued in which such famous academics as Arthur Evans and Jocelyn Toynbee participated. Various dealers and museums, including the American Numismatic Society, vied for possession of the coins over a twenty year period. A catalogue of all of the coins known to have come from the hoard was published in 1977 by Bastien and Metzger. These two scholars concluded that the hoard represented the collection of various *donativa* received by a high ranking soldier in a career that lasted between 285 and 310. The hoard itself was probably deposited no earlier and probably not long after 315.

*Description of Select Coins*

It is not possible here to explore every single issue produced by the Tetrarchs, or even give an adequate outline. The following section describes first the regular coinage of the Tetrarchs in bronze, silver and gold, and then looks at some of the medallic issues.

**REGULAR COINAGE**

1. *The bronze nummi*

![Image of nummi](image)

*Fig. 1. Two *nummi* of Galerius. Left: The Genius of the Roman People c. 296, RIC VI Aquileia 24b, ANS 1984.146.1679. Right: Sacra Moneta, c. 300, RIC VI Aquileia 30b, ANS 1984.146.1686. (Author)*

---

134 Bastien and Metzger 1977, 211-213.
By far the two most common reverse types of the new *nummi* of the first Tetrarchy were those that bore the legends GENIO POPULI ROMANI and SACRA MONETA. In fact, almost no other types were used on the bronze coins of the first Tetrarchy. The Genius of the Roman people had not appeared on coins since the reign of Septimius Severus, and harkened back to an older, traditional ideal.\(^{135}\) It has been suggested that the genius type conveyed the idea of the legitimacy and unity of the Tetrarchs. The very uniformity of the new bronze coinage, limited almost exclusively to these two types, was strikingly different from the vast variety of reverse types employed on the debased *antoniniani* of the third century, and must have given an impression of renewed stability. Furthermore, the genius type is also employed later on the coinage of Maximian to legitimize his return to the purple after retirement. The coinage of Maxentius, who never seems to have made any attempt at legitimizing his place in the Tetrarchy, does not employ the Genius type.\(^{136}\) It is interesting to note that the obvious switch from the Genius of the Roman People to the Genius of the Augusti and Caesars does not begin on the bronze coins until after the end of the first Tetrarchy. This suggests that the Tetrarchic notion of an imperial genius was not developed until the Tetrarchy was fully in place.

2. Silver Coinage

![Image](image)

*Fig. 2. Argenteus of Diocletian, rev.: Tetrarchs sacrificing at tripod with legend VICTORIA SARMATICI, c. 294, RIC VI, Rome, 14a, ANS 52.102.20. (Author)*

---

\(^{135}\) Callu 1960, 16.

\(^{136}\) Sutherland 1967, 110-111.
The new pure silver coins of the Tetrarchy refer more to military types. The most commonly minted type is that shown here. The four Tetrarchs stand around a tripod in front of a city wall pouring a libation over a flaming tripod. The scene is clearly an echo of the same scene on the arch of Galerius (6.17). There are three basic legends that surround this scene: PROVIDENTIA AVG, VICTORIA SARMATICA and VIRTVS MILITVM. The second of these clearly refers to the various campaigns against the Sarmatians in the 290’s. The scene is more novel and less traditional than either the genius images of the bronze and the usually conservative gold.\textsuperscript{137}

3. Regular Gold Coinage

The regular gold coinage of the Tetrarchy seems to have employed the more traditional themes that would have appealed to the conservatively-minded higher ranking officers and officials who received it.\textsuperscript{138} For instance, a wreath containing a votive inscription is a fairly common type. Nonetheless, older iconography was still moulded to fit Tetrarchic ideas and to emphasize the new dynasty. Various depictions of Jupiter and Hercules are the most frequently employed images of Tetrarchic gold coinage. Typically, the types of Jupiter are combined with obverses of Diocletian, and those of Maximian with Hercules types, but crossover does occur. One traditional reverse type, used for both Diocletian and Maximian, shows Hercules with his lion skin and club standing next to Jupiter with his staff and \textit{globus}.\textsuperscript{139} There are also double headed coins that bear a Tetrarch on one side and a bust of Hercules or Jupiter on the reverse. Another type has an enthroned Jupiter, a depiction of the god that goes right back to the coinage of

\textsuperscript{137} Sutherland 1967, 110.
\textsuperscript{138} Sutherland 1967, 109.
\textsuperscript{139} E.g. \textit{RIC} VI, Rome, 9.
Alexander the Great.\textsuperscript{140} The corresponding Herculean reverse type shows the god standing nude with his club, bow and lion skin.\textsuperscript{141} The legends of both types read, in a variety of forms: IOVI/HERCVLI CONSERVATORES AVGG ET CAESS NN. Note how the doubled ‘G’’s, ‘N’s and ‘S’’s are used to indicate the number of imperial persons referred to. There are two of each, rather than four, as the inscription reflects only the imperial household of the deity portrayed on the coins.

![Image](image.png)

Fig. 3. Left: Diocletian’s type with Jupiter hurling thunderbolt at giant, 293-4, RIC VI Trier 20, ANS 1001.1.22152. Right: Maximian’s type with Hercules fighting the hydra, 293-4 RIC VI, Trier, 10, ANS 1001.1.22146. (Author)

One series of gold coins seems to use the Jupiter and Hercules connection to make an allegorical point. On one coin type, Jupiter is shown in the act of hurling a thunderbolt at a giant that cowers at his feet. The legend usually reads IOVI FVLGERATORI.\textsuperscript{142} The corresponding Herculean types of Maximian issued around the same time show selected labours of Hercules. The god is shown fighting the Hydra, carrying the Erymanthian boar over his shoulder, grasping the horns of a stag (the Ceryneian hind) on which he is kneeling, and strangling the Nemean Lion.\textsuperscript{143} A variety of reverse legends are employed with these reverses but most common are HERCVLI VICTORI and VIRTVS AVGG.

\textsuperscript{140} E.g. RIC VI, Trier, 55.
\textsuperscript{141} E.g. RIC VI, Trier, 39.
\textsuperscript{142} For instance, RIC VI, Trier, 20.
\textsuperscript{143} Examples: The Hydra: RIC VI, Trier 9; Erymanthian boar: RIC VI, Trier 24 and 25; Ceryneian hind: Bastien and Metzger 1977, no. 147 (Trier); Nemean Lion RIC V.2, Rome, 500.
Aurei of these types are issued from the mid 280’s right until the end of the first Tetrarchy, but are more abundant from the period when the Tetrarchs were still mastering the problems they had inherited from their predecessors. The point of these reverse types is allegorical but clear, and was not lost on contemporary Romans. Just as Hercules is capable of taking on seemingly impossible tasks and conquering ferocious enemies, so too are Maximian and Constantius capable of dealing with the vast problems of the empire. The image of Jupiter smiting a giant with a thunderbolt reflects a similar theme. Kuhoff saw a direct reference to the campaign against the Bagaudae in these issues. The mythology of Jupiter is decidedly less human than that of Hercules. Jupiter’s power is expressed in a more static manner, as on the coin types of Jupiter enthroned, rather than by showing his deeds in the world of men. This ideology and use of allegory was picked up directly in the panegyric of 291:

Indeed that god, Diocletian’s ancestor, besides having expelled the Titans once from their occupation of heaven and having engaged in war soon afterward against the two-formed monsters, governs with uninterrupted care in his realm, peaceful though it is, and revolves this enormous mass with tireless hand, and ever watchful preserves the arrangement and succession of all things. For it is not true that he only bestirs himself on those occasions when he thunders and hurls lightning bolts, but, if he has laid to rest the turbulent manifestations of the elements, all the same he orders the Fates and exhales from his peaceful breast those breezes which glide silently along, and hurries the sun advancing opposite to the movement of heaven.

And it is the same, Maximian, with your Hercules’ power. I omit the fact that while he was among men he pacified all lands and woods, freed cities from merciless masters, even pulled down from the sky the winged shafts of fearful birds, repressed too the fears of those below by abducting their jailer; surely after this adoption by the gods and marriage to Juventa he has been a no less constant advocate of excellence and promotes all the works of brave men; in every contest he supports the more righteous endeavours.

Panegyrici Latin. 11.3.4-7 (Rodgers’ translation)

144 Kuhoff 2001, 39.
The panegyricist contrasts the passive power of Jupiter/Diocletian, who quietly assures the proper order of things, with the earthly deeds of Maximian/Hercules. It has been suggested that the reference to the Titans is a veiled reference to Carinus, but the two formed monsters are the giants and certainly represent external foes, either the *Bagaudae* or the Sarmatians, whom Diocletian was obliged to deal with almost immediately after his succession.\textsuperscript{145} Note also the cosmic and passive depiction of Diocletian’s power.

**MEDALLIONS WITH GENERAL THEMES**

A number of the medallic issues, or gold multiples, use generic reverse types rather than make reference to specific events. This does not mean that the medallion was not produced for a specific event, in fact it almost certainly was, merely that we do not know on what event the iconography of the coin was based.

\textit{4. Two and a half aurei multiple of 287 with sacrificing Tetrarchs}

![Fig. 5. Five aurei multiple with quadriga of elephants. Gnecchi 1912, Diocletian and Maximian Herculius, p. 12, no. 2. (After Lukanc 1991, 175 no. 1).}

This medallion is dated to 287 and was minted at Rome. It is not listed in any of the major catalogues though there is a slightly similar piece described by Gnecchi.\textsuperscript{146} Two examples are known, one in Trier and one in Paris. The one in Paris bears the mintmark of Ticinum.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{145} Nixon and Rodgers 1995, 84 note 15.  
\textsuperscript{146} Gnecchi 1912, 12, no. 3.  
\textsuperscript{147} Lukanc 1991, 119-120, nos. 4 and 5.
obverse shows the two Tetrarchs, cuirassed and laureate facing one another with the legend DIOCLETIANVS ET MAXIMIANVS AVGG. The reverse shows the two emperors, armoured and wearing cloaks, pouring libations over a portable tripod. A pedestal, or the top of a column, behind the two figures supports statues of Jupiter (left) and Hercules (right) This suggests that the left Tetrarch is Diocletian, and the right, Maximian. The reverse legend is IOVIO ET HERCVLIO. The scene is reminiscent of a panel (chap. 6.17) on the Arch of Galerius, and one of the sides of the decennalia base of the Fünfsäulendenkmal (chap. 5.1). It also reminds us of the sacrificing Tetrarchs on the regular silver coinage, no. 2 above. This piece is a continuation of the Jupiter and Hercules theme which is found on both the regular and medallic coinage of the Tetrarchy.

5. Five aurei multiple of 287 with quadriga of elephants

Fig. 6. Ten aurei multiple of Trier, from Arras hoard now in American Numismatic Society Collection RIC VI, Trier 2; Bastien and Metzger 1977, no. 197. (After Lukanc 1991, 120 no. 9)

On the obverse of the medallion are Diocletian and Maximian facing one another. They are laureate and wear decorated trabeae, and hold eagle tipped sceptres. This is the standard dress of consuls and triumphators, that is frequently found on Tetrarchic coins. The obverse legend reads IMPP DIOCLETIANO ET MAXIMIANO AVGG. The reverse shows the two emperors riding in a quadriga pulled by elephants. The reverse legend is IMPP DIOCLETIANO III ET MAXIMIANO CCSS. The car in which they ride is decorated with ovals and a small victory

148 See Bastien 1992, 281-301
flies above it. The figure on the right is probably Diocletian, who holds a long sceptre in his left and statue of victory in his right hand. The figure on the left is, then, Maximian, who holds only a victory.\textsuperscript{149} The heads of soldiers holding spears can be seen below them. Note how the spears of the soldiers bend inwards so as to complete a frame, topped by the victory, to enclose the Tetrarchs and draw the viewer’s eye to them. This sort of trick is frequently found on the Arch of Galerius where one panel (chapter 6.23) shows the presentation of a quadriga of elephants to Galerius. If the reverse of this coin must be connected to a historical triumph, it is probably the conclusion of the treaty by Diocletian with the Persians in 287. Elephants have a long history in Roman triumph, dating back to the Republic.\textsuperscript{150}

6. Ten aurei multiple of 294

![Image of coin](image)

Though struck at Trier in the beginning of 294, the portraiture of the four busts is far more like those of the third century soldier emperors than the Tetrarchic cubic style. Bastien and Metzger

\textsuperscript{149} On a larger 10 aurei multiple of the same type both figures hold sceptres: Lukanc 1991, 119, no. 2.

\textsuperscript{150} For a discussion thereof, see Scullard, 1974.
identified the left hand busts as the Augusti and the right hand ones as the Caesars. The figures are wreathed and, like no. 5, wear decorated *trabeae*. The legends of the two sides read:

\[
\text{DIOCLETIANVS AVG ET MAXIMIANVS C}
\]

and

\[
\text{MAXIMIANVS AVG ET CONSTANTIVS C}
\]

Note that both Maximian, the Augustus, and Galerius, the Caesar, shared the same last name: Maximian. It is clear from the inscription, which identifies the Caesars with a “C” following their names, that each Augustus is depicted with his Caesar.

There are certainly distinctive features to all four busts, but we have little idea what features should be connected to the individual Tetrarchs. The busts are thicker than the two medallions of 287 (nos. 4 and 5), and probably represent a move towards the fully cubic style. Bastien and Metzger’s identifications are probably correct, but this is unimportant. The fact that no identifying attributes were used shows that figures were represented as legitimate equals in the Tetrarchic system. The theme of the medallion is a generic representation of the concordia, harmony, and similarity of the Roman world’s new leaders.

**MEDALLIONS CONNECTED TO SPECIFIC EVENTS**

7. *Five aurei multiple of 303*

\[\text{[Image of five aurei]}\]

---

151 Bastien and Metzger 1977, 88.
Fig. 7. Five aurei multiple of 303. RIC VI, Trier, 27. (After Lukanc 1991, 15)

This five aurei medallion is generally thought to be connected to the vicennalia celebrations of 303. The obverse legend, DIOCLETIANVS PF AVG COS VIII, confirms the date. Diocletian is dressed in the same decorated trabeae, with the same eagle tipped staff as in no. 5. The connection to the vicennalia is made through the reverse type with its legend FELICITAS TEMPORVM. Diocletian and Maximian are shown wreathed and togate pouring libations over a portable tripod. As with no. 4, the medallion calls to mind the libation scenes of the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.17), and the libation scene on the decennalia base of the Fünfsaulendenkmal (chap. 4.1). The bust that springs up between the two Tetrarchs is also reminiscent of the similar lost bust that was once between the two central Tetrarchs in the painted niche at Luxor (chap. 7). The bust on this medallion holds a caduceus and a cornucopia. These two attributes, and the legend, allow her to be identified as Felicitas.

8. The Siscia Medallion

Fig. 8. The Siscia Medallion (bronze), now in Berlin. Gnecchi 1912, II.132, Galerius no. 7. (After Gnecchi 1912, plate 129.4)

The obverse shows Galerius laureate with the trabeae, and eagle tipped sceptre, facing right. The obverse legend is: GAL VAL MAXIMIANVS NOB C. The reverse shows Galerius galloping right on his horse with a spear in his right hand being thrust downwards. A winged victory above

---

152 Sutherland 1967, 166, note 1. The date is given by the obverse legend. Diocletian’s 8th consulship was in 303.
153 LIMC VIII.585-591 (suppl.) s.v. Felicitas (Ganschow).
crows him with the laurel wreath. Two Persians in Phrygian caps lie below the horse, a small child, also in a Persian cap, reaches up to a kneeling female Persian, who probably personifies the region of Persia. A standing Persian behind her raises his arms in supplication.

The bronze medallion was almost certainly produced just after the Persian campaign in 298. RIC VI, which does not record this piece, shows that the mint mark *SIS is used for bronze, silver and gold in 295/6, and again, but only on silver, in 300. The medallion could conceivably have been produced before the campaign in expectation of victory, but this is unlikely. Since bronze medallions do fall outside the usual denominational system, there is no reason to force the mintmark to comply with those in RIC. The exact function of these bronze pieces is not clear, but they are certainly more like the gold medallions than the regular bronze coinage.

The reverse of the medallion is remarkably similar to the representation of Galerius on panel 5 of the Arch of Galerius.

9. The Mainz Medallion:

Fig. 9. The Mainz Medallion, Cabinet des Médailles, Paris. (After Evans 1930, fig. 2)
This enormous (nine cm diameter) uniface lead piece was found in the Sâone near Lyon in 1862 during the construction of a bridge.\textsuperscript{154} The medal was obtained by the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, where it is housed today.\textsuperscript{155} Unfortunately, the medal itself has corroded since its discovery, and a 19\textsuperscript{th} century lead cast, housed in the Mûsée des Beaux Arts de Lyon, is now more legible than the original.\textsuperscript{156} The line drawing commissioned by de La Saussaye in 1862, and reproduced by Evans in 1930, is also useful, even if fanciful and incorrect in certain details.\textsuperscript{157} The object itself is almost certainly a proof or trial strike for the reverse of one of the large gold medallions of the Tetrarchic period.\textsuperscript{158} Bastien considered the dies of the medallion to be incomplete at the time the lead trial was struck.\textsuperscript{159}

The medallion is divided into two registers. Above the upper register is the main legend which reads SAECVLI FELICITAS. In this upper scene, two enthroned and nimbate Tetrarchs gesture to a crowd on their right. The objects in their hands were reproduced as scrolls by De La Saussaye and identified as purses of money by both Turcan and Bastien.\textsuperscript{160} Two soldiers stand behind the thrones to the left. The portion of the crowd immediately in front of the enthroned Tetrarchs includes a man with outstretched hands and a kneeling child with his arms upraised, but is otherwise too badly damaged to distinguish more figures. The helmeted heads of three soldiers in the background are quite distinct. To the right, at the back of the crowd, a man carrying a sack, another man carrying a baby and a small child can be seen walking away from the scene.

\textsuperscript{154} Turcan 1987, 183.
\textsuperscript{155} Turcan 1987, 183. Museum inventory no. K.520.
\textsuperscript{156} Turcan 1987, 183.
\textsuperscript{157} De La Saussaye 1862, 426; Evans 1930, fig. 2. Reproduced here above.
\textsuperscript{158} Toynbee 1986, 67; Bastien 1973, 73.
\textsuperscript{159} Bastien 1973, 91-92.
\textsuperscript{160} Turcan 1987, 185; Bastien 1973, 82.
In the bottom half of the coin, a bridge is shown crossing a river and connecting Mainz on the left side, labelled MOGONTIACVM, with a fort on the right, labelled CASTEL. On top of the bridge three figures bearing sacks on their shoulders are walking across the bridge towards Mainz. They are preceded by a small child. The three adult figures were incorrectly reproduced as winged victories in the 1862 drawing. Bastien considered these four figures to be the same as those seen in the crowd represented in the upper register. He also noted that the sword worn by first of the adult figures in the bottom register does not secure his identification as a Roman soldier, as had once been thought. The river below the bridge is clearly identified as the Rhine by the label FL RENVS.

A variety of interpretations have been advanced as to the historical significance of the medallion. Seston saw the medal as proof of a meeting between Diocletian and Maximian in 288 following the trans-Rhine expedition of 287. Evans pointed out that, on stylistic grounds alone, the medallion could be dated as late as 294. But Evans’ “stylistic grounds” were probably the use of two figures on the medallion rather than four, and the idea that a medallion later than 294 would show all four Tetrarchs. This is not the case, as no. 7 shows. The two most recent theories are those proposed by Bastien and Turcan. Bastien saw the medallion as a celebration of the settlement of barbarians in Roman territory after an imperial largess ceremony after 288. Such a re-settlement of barbarians is given great attention in the panegyric to
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161 Bastien 1973, 82.
162 A full list of the many interpretations is provided by Turcan 1987, 189-190.
163 Bastien 1973, 78.
164 Evans 1930, 237; Alföldi 1927, 45.
Constantius of 296, and he argued that the medallion would have been issued in 297.\textsuperscript{165} Observing that the mint at Lyon was closed between 286 and 355, Bastien also pointed out that the medallion could hardly have been engraved there, and was more likely the work of engravers based in the new mint at Trier.\textsuperscript{166} He argued that chance circumstances must have brought it there. Turcan, on the other hand, sees the medallion as commemorative of the return of Roman prisoners to Roman soil in 286 or 287.\textsuperscript{167} He argued that the medallion was minted at Lyon and may have been abandoned at the close of the mint.\textsuperscript{168}

Bastien rightly noted that a similar use of crowds, sometimes including women and children, are known in the largesse scenes of the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum and the Arch of Constantine.\textsuperscript{169} A close parallel to the bottom register is found in the deportation scene (chap. 6.5) and, to a lesser extent, the procession of prisoners (chap. 6.25) found on the Arch of Galerius. Prisoners begging before the emperor can be seen on the \textit{supplicatio} panels of the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.9 and 6.10), and on the Siscia Medallion, (no. 8 above). In these contemporary representations, the women and children represent subjugated foreign enemies. The presence of soldiers on the Lyon Medallion, as in the other scenes, secures the identity of the crowd as barbarian. The kneeling child and figure with outraised hands seems to suggest supplication as well as the reception of largesse. As Bastien pointed out, the rescue of Roman prisoners is not a theme known elsewhere in numismatics, or indeed Roman art, and is not mentioned in the panegyrics.

\textsuperscript{165} Pan. Lat. 8.21.1; Nixon and Rodgers 1994, footnote 76, p. 142; Todd 1992, 193.
\textsuperscript{166} Bastien 1973, 89.
\textsuperscript{167} Turcan 1987, 195.
\textsuperscript{168} Turcan 1987, 194.
\textsuperscript{169} Bastien 1973, 85; Kleiner 1992, 444-455, fig. 413.
Thus the medallion probably does represent the commemoration of a barbarian migration and submission, but the connection to the campaigns of 288 is unnecessary. Diocletian and Maximian had campaigned against the Germans and Sarmatians as early as 285. There is no reason to suppose that Constantius’ resettlement of barbarians in 288 was a unique event. The medallion could easily refer to any of the Rhine campaigns of the 280’s or 290’s. The enthroned Tetrarchs could be either Diocletian and Maximian, or Constantius and Maximian. The equal size and position of the two figures suggests the former. If the medallion commemorated one of the earlier campaigns, it could have been struck at Lyon before the closure of that mint.

Perhaps more important than the exact historical reference made by the medallion is the manner in which the two emperors are represented. In fact, the ceremony shown on the medallion need not have taken place exactly as depicted. As the following chapters will show, the Tetrarchs were frequently depicted performing ceremonies together, when they were historically very far from each other. Iconographically, the most unusual aspect of the medallion is the use of the nimbus around the emperors’ heads. It is also found in the paintings of the Tetrarchs in the niche of the cult room at Luxor in Egypt (chap. 7). The nimbus is a development of the rayed crown of solar iconography, which has a long history going back into the Hellenistic period. On coins, the nimbus was first used on an emperor on the reverse of aurei and sestertii of Antoninus Pius, and then on the reverse of a sestertius of Geta under Septimius Severus. Depictions of Sol Invictus on coins of the late third century, and in Mithraic art, are frequently nimbate. But the

---

170 See chap. 2.
171 Bastien 1973, 80-83.
172 For a history of the rayed crown from the Hellenistic period to the late Roman empire see Bergmann 1998.
173 Bastien 1992, 170-171. The first appearance of the nimbus on Roman coins was on the reverse of coins of the deified Hadrian, where it surrounds the head of a phoenix: Bastien 1992, 170.
use of the *nimbus* on the Mainz medallion need not refer to a link between the Tetrarchs and the solar cult, with its monotheistic tendencies. It is more likely that the *nimbus* was intended to show the Tetrarch’s close relationship with the gods, and the divine favour bestowed upon them. Similarly, after Constantine, the *nimbus* would be employed to show holiness in religious representations of Christ, saints, angels and emperors. As such, the Mainz medallion foreshadows the frequent use of the *nimbus* around the emperor in the Constantinian and Byzantine periods.\(^{175}\)

10. The Arras Medallion

Fig. 10. The Arras Medallion. Musée des Beau-Arts, Arras, RIC VI, Trier, 34.
(After Bastien and Metzger 1977, no. 218)

A ten *aurei* multiple found along with the Arras/Beaureins hoard, northern France. The celebrated medallion was initially stolen by one of the workers who discovered the hoard in the 1920’s, and only returned thanks to the insistence of the workman’s father confessor.

On the obverse, Constantius is shown laureate to the right in profile. His bust is cuirassed and he wears a *paludamentum*. The obverse legend is: FL VAL CONSTA NTIVS NOBIL CAES. The reverse shows Constantius on horseback with a spear advancing towards a city gate and a

kneeling figure. Both figure and city are identified as London by the letters LON below. A galley, with four soldiers, is depicted on the water below the horse, and a tiny victory flies behind them. It is possible that the number of soldiers is an intentional reference to the Tetrarchic number. If so, all four Tetrarchs are given a part in the victory of Constantius. The reverse conflates time by showing the entry into London and the earlier channel crossing below. The full reverse legend reads: REDDITOR LUCIS AETERNAE. This idea of a Tetrarch returning light to a lost province is also employed in an inscription from North Africa that relates to Maximian’s campaigns there in 297.\(^{176}\) The metaphor contrasts the light of Tetrarchic rule with the darkness of the barbarians and usurpers. The Arras medallion was certainly issued as part of the *donativum* after Constantius' successful campaign in Britain in 296.\(^{177}\)

11. *Pietas Augusti* medallions

![Image of medallions](image)

Fig. 11. Five aurei multiple, Trier RIC VI, Trier, 33; Bastien and Metzger 1977, no. 220.

(After Bastien and Metzger 1977, no. 220)

These four medallions were also probably produced in 297, and relate to the restoration of Britain. The reverse of each shares the same die. The emperor stands in the left and with his right hand raises a kneeling female figure. He is armoured and wears a cloak attached with a round fibula. In his left hand he holds a spear. The female below is robed and wears a mural crown indicating that she is a personification of either a city or a province. She holds a spear and shield

\(^{176}\) Warmington 1954, 8.

\(^{177}\) Bastien and Metzger 1977, 195.
in her left hand, and Sutherland convincingly suggests that she is Britannia.\textsuperscript{178} Behind the emperor a winged victory raises a laurel wreath over his head. The legend reads: PIETAS AVGG.

Fig. 12. The other obverses: Constantius, Diocletian and Galerius. (After Bastien and Metzger 1977, nos. 221, 219 and 222)

Though this medallion refers specifically to a victory of Constantius, it is also found with the obverses of Diocletian and Galerius as well. An obverse of Maximian is not known, but it probably did exist. All of these examples come from the Arras Hoard. The known obverses are:

\textbf{Diocletian.}\textsuperscript{179}

\textsc{IMP DIOCLETIANVS PIVS FELIX AVG}
Diocletian right laureate, nude, perhaps part of the \textit{paludamentum} over his left shoulder.

\textbf{Constantius.}\textsuperscript{180}

\textsc{FL VAL CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES} (image above)
Constantius right, laureate, with \textit{trabeae} and eagle tipped sceptre (see above)

\textsc{FL VAL CONSTANTIVS NOBILISSIMVS C}
Constantius right, wearing lion skin.

\textbf{Galerius.}\textsuperscript{181}

\textsc{GAL VAL MAXI MIANVS NOB CAES}

\textsuperscript{178} Sutherland 1967, 167 in the description of Trier no. 32.
\textsuperscript{179} Bastien and Metzger 1977, no. 219, in a private collection.
\textsuperscript{180} \textit{RIC} VI, Trier and 32; Bastien and Metzger 1977, 221.
\textsuperscript{181} Bastien and Metzger 1977, 222.
Galerius right, laureate and cuirassed.

The use of these emperors in the celebration of a campaign in which they were not involved is not surprising. All four Tetrarchs took the title Britannicus Maximus in 296. The concept of a shared triumph is also expressed in the panegyrics:

Those laurels from the conquered nations inhabiting Syria and from Raetia and Sarmatia made you, Maximian, celebrate a triumph in pious joy; and by the same token the destruction here of the Chaibones and Eruli and the victories across the Rhine and the wars with the pirates who were suppressed when the Franks were subdued made Diocletian share in your vows. The immortal gods cannot divide favours between you: whatever is offered to one or the other belongs to both.

*Panegyrici Latini* 11.7.1-3.

12. *Seven and a half aurei multiple of Trier, early 305*

![Fig. 13. Seven and a half aurei multiple of Constantius Chlorus, Bastien and Metzger 1977, no. 393. (Bastien and Metzger 1977, no. 393)](image)

The obverse legend reads FL VAL CONSTANTIVS NOBIL CAES. A laureate Constantius faces left wearing a decorated *trææ*, and holding an eagle tipped sceptre in his right hand. On the reverse, the main legend reads TEMPORVM FELICITAS. In the exergue below a second

---

182 Barnes 1982, 255.
legend reads CAESS XIII COSS V, which allows the medallion to be dated to early 305. This piece, along with a very similar five aurei medallion, was found in the Arras Hoard.\textsuperscript{183}

The central scene of both medallions is a libation being made on a tripod by two togate Tetrachs in front of a temple. With one hand each Tetrarch holds a patera and a rolled up scroll in the other. The heads of the Tetrarchs on both medallions are surrounded by a small circle that clearly indicates a \textit{nimbus}. Between the Tetrarchs, and above the tripod, a small figure plays an \textit{aulos}. Before the left Tetrarch a bull lies on the ground line, and on the right, a less distinct object, perhaps the pig of a \textit{suovetaurilia}. Flanking the Tetrarchs stand three togate figures. It seems unlikely that any of these are meant to be Tetrarchs. The one large figure on the right seems to be bare chested and could be the Genius of the Roman People. It seems likely that the two sacrificing figures are the Caesars referred to in the inscription of the exergue. The temple behind the Tetrarchs contains two spiral fluted columns and two Doric capitals. The pediment seems to contain a wreath or shield, but this motif in the attic does not allow any identification of the temple. This could mean that no specific temple is intended, and that the scene is ideological rather than commemorative of an historical event. On the other hand, it might also be the result of restricted space. The obverse and reverse inscriptions clearly connect the medallion to the consulship of Constantius.

CONCLUSIONS ON THE NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE

The period of the Tetrarchy marks an interesting point in numismatic history. The Tetrarchs produced a fairly limited number of reverse types compared to the vast array of types employed

\textsuperscript{183} Bastien and Metzger 1977, 394; \textit{RIC} VI, Trier, 35.
in the third century, but the exact opposite is true of their medallic issues. The period marked the end of the large bronze medallions of the second and third centuries, of which the Siscia medallion is a holdover, and saw the increasing production large multiple *aurei* pieces.\(^\text{184}\) The imagery of these medals spoke very directly about Tetrarchic ideology to the soldiers and civil servants to whom they were presented.

There is no denying that numismatic representations of the Tetrarchs are the most reliable in terms of dating. Thanks to mint marks, the various scenes and imperial ceremonies on the reverses of the coins can be accurately dated, often to a single year. This has led to much debate over the exact historical events to which particular images should be associated. The Lyon medallion is a case in point of this. However, it should be noted, that just as the portraits on coins and medallions are ambiguous representations, so too are the imperial scenes of the reverses. While the Siscia medallion (no. 8) clearly refers to the campaigns of Galerius in Persia, and the Arras medallion (no. 10) to those of Constantius in Britain, the simple scenes of sacrifice found on various medallions and coins (nos. 2, 7 and 12), as well as the use of personifications and mythological allegory (nos. 1 and 3), are in no way historically specific. They simply reflect the general ideology of the Tetrarchic government.

In a way, these generalized numismatic representations of the Tetrarchs are more useful to our understanding of imperial ideology than those with defined historical references. They reveal something about the basic ideological structure of the Tetrarchy, and provide an iconographical dictionary of the Tetrarchic period. The emperors are shown combined in groups of two or four

\(^{184}\) Toynbee 1986, 167.
in order to stress their *concordia*. Their fundamental *similitudo*, on both obverses and reverses, emphasizes this fact. They are frequently shown sacrificing in a group around a tripod. In short, the coins provide us with the same sort of scenes that are known elsewhere in other forms of Tetrarchic art. This point shall be elucidated in the following chapters.
4. THE PORPHYRY STATUES OF THE TETRARCHS

Introduction

One important development of imperial representation under the Tetrarchy was the increased use of porphyry as a medium for imperial portraiture. It was by no means the first time porphyry had been exploited for portraiture in the Graeco-Roman world, but rather the beginning of a period of extensive use of the stone.\(^{185}\) It is generally thought that all Roman porphyry came from the workshops at *Mons Claudianus* in Egypt.\(^{186}\) We have no clear proof from ancient textual sources that the use of this purple stone was restricted to imperial monuments as is often thought, though purple had been used by kings and emperors since the Hellenistic period.\(^{187}\) In fact, a passage in the *SHA* even describes the use of large porphyry columns in a private house.\(^{188}\) The laws regarding the use of porphyry may simply have changed over time.

A few examples of porphyry sculpture can be dated to the Ptolemaic or Republican periods.\(^{189}\) The first period of the extensive use of porphyry sculpture begins under Trajan and, seems to have lasted until the reign of Marcus Aurelius.\(^{190}\) In this period, free standing sculptures were produced that often supported marble portrait busts of the emperors.\(^{191}\) The style of these sculptures, and other porphyry works of this period, seem to be inspired by Classical and

---

\(^{185}\) The principal work on porphyry remains Delbrueck 1932. For the recently discovered porphyry fragments from Serbia see Srejovic 1993 and 1994b. A very recent and useful summary is Laubscher 2000, published after his death. As examples of portraiture, the porphyry statues of Tetrarchs are discussed by L’Orange 1984, Bergmann 1977, and Calza 1972.

\(^{186}\) Delbrueck 1932, 1-2.

\(^{187}\) Delbrueck 1932, 11.

\(^{188}\) *SHA, Antoninus Pius,* XI.4-8.

\(^{189}\) Delbrueck 1932,13-19. Some examples of portraiture include two Ptolemaic portraits, Delbrueck 1932, 37-38 (nos. 5 and 6) and a late Republican bust, Delbrueck 1932, 41-42.

\(^{190}\) Delbrueck (1932, 19) names this the “Hadrianic period” for porphyry.

\(^{191}\) Delbrueck 1932, 21-22.
Hellenistic prototypes. One interesting innovation was the use of imperial portrait busts attached to columns, as demonstrated by armoured busts of Nerva and Trajan that extend from porphyry columns, now housed in the Louvre. The original location and function of these busts is not known, but they foreshadow the emergence of such sculptures under the Tetrarchy.

Porphyry was almost entirely neglected as a sculptural medium during the third century. This may simply correspond to the general lack of monumental sculpture of that period but, may also have been due to the expense of transporting porphyry and the various usurpations in Egypt that would have restricted access to Mons Claudianus. The second renaissance of porphyry sculpture, which began under the Tetrarchy, saw the large scale production of imperial portrait groups. We have no dedicatory inscriptions that relate to these Tetrarchic porphyry sculptural groups. Thus we do not know whether they were all commissioned by the state or by private individuals. The fact that there is such uniformity between the different groups seems to suggest at least an imperial pattern for their production. Srejovic regards the numerous finds of porphyry sculptural fragments in Serbia as evidence for imperial sponsorship by Galerius of local workshops.

1. *The four Tetrarchs in Venice (Fig. 13)*

Today, the four Tetrarchs are incorporated into either side of the south-west corner of San Marco’s Basilica in the Piazza San Marco in Venice. The figures are 1.36 m. high and stand on

---

192 Delbrueck 1932, 22.
193 Delbrueck 1932, 52 Plate 9 and 10.
194 Delbrueck 1932, 24.
79 cm. wide bases. They were clearly once decorative elements that protruded from of columns, like a similar group in the Vatican (no. 2 below). It is thought, on the basis of that group, that the two originally sat on separate columns rather than on two sides of one. Measurements of the surviving bases suggests columns of approximately 7 m. high or 10 to 12 m. with a base and postament included. The figures probably sat towards the top of the columns but it is not known whether the columns were free standing or contained in another building. Decoration of this sort is also known on the columns of the colonnaded streets of Palmyra. Delbrueck suggested that the two porphyry columns in the Louvre with statues of Trajan and Nerva formed part of a long row of divi, perhaps from Hadrian’s mausoleum.

Fig. 14. Group of Tetrarchs in Venice. (After Delbrueck 1932, plates 31 and 32)

196 Delbrueck 1932, 86; Laubscher 2000, 208.
197 Delbrueck 1932, 84.
198 Delbrueck 1932, 86.
199 Kleiner 1992, 403.
200 Delbrueck 1932, 21-22.
It was originally thought that the two pairs were brought to Venice in 1258 from Palestine. But the discovery of the missing foot of one of the Tetrarchs in Constantinople shows beyond any doubt that the statues were taken from that city after the last crusade in 1204, along with numerous other works of art. The foot was found during excavations of a round structure belonging to the Palace of Romanos I (A.D. 920-944), but almost certainly stems from a nearby portion of the Mese, the main thoroughfare of Constantinople, known as the Delphion. The fact that the Byzantine triumphal way would have passed by the Delphion twice is the only connection of the pieces to Roman triumph. It is also possible that the statues were brought by Constantine from Nicomedia en-route to Constantinople. Their use by Constantine and his children in the new capital would have been intended to show dynastic continuity. While the find of the porphyry foot in Constantinople and its connection to the San Marco Tetrarchs is dramatic, it only reveals a portion of the history of the statues, and nothing about their original position and function.

The Venetian Tetrarchs wear cuirasses, the pileus pannonicus (Pannonian caps), tunics, stockings, cloaks, fibulae, campagi, belts and sheathed swords. The left figure of each pair embraces his neighbour with right arm stretching in front of his chest. In turn, the right figures put their right arms around the shoulders of their neighbours. The left hand of each Tetrarch comes out from under his cloak to grasp at the handle of his sword. These are carved as birds’

---

201 Delbrueck 1932, 90. Laubscher 2000, 224.
203 Naumann 1966, 209. The road is so named after the brothers Constans I and Constantius II, rather than having anything to do with the statues.
204 Naumann 1966, 210-211.
205 Naumann 1966, 209.
206 Laubscher 2000, 225.
207 Identified by Delbrueck (1932, 87) as a chlamys, and by Kleiner (1992, 403) as a paludamentum.
heads. The hems and shoulders of the Tetrarch’s tunics are decorated with ovals, showing them to be paragaudae (decorated garments). They wear decorated belts high on their torsos. The details of the chest musculature and the navel can only just be distinguished in the armour breastplates of the four. The fibulae that support the cloaks on the left shoulders of two of the Tetrarchs were originally metal attachments that are now missing. The square shape of the rectangular sockets led Delbrueck to believe that the fibulae were cruciform, rather than round as on the Vatican group. The campagi (sandals) are decorated with round and rectangular shapes representing gems. The sheaths of the swords are also decorated with alternating circles and rectangles. Square holes in the Pannonian caps would have supported either individual gems or wreaths. Based on evidence of the cap of the porphyry bust from Gamzigrad, (no. 3) it is also possible to imagine the bust of each Tetrarch’s protective deity mounted in the holes.

The portraiture of the four Tetrarchs follows an identical pattern. Various attempts have been made to identify the four figures. Delbrueck saw Diocletian paired with Maximian and Constantius paired with Galerius. L’Orange agreed, and cited Lactantius’ description of how Diocletian was forced to witness his own statues pulled down along with those of Maximian. Other scholars have noted that the left Tetrarchs of each pair have beards and deeper brow furrows while the right Tetrarch in each pair is beardless and younger looking. This is

---

208 Laubscher 2000, 211-212, notes that swords with bird head handles came to the Roman art from eastern iconography of the third century, when it is found on coins and sarcophagi.
209 Delbrueck 1932, 88.
210 Delbrueck 1932, 87-88.
211 Delbrueck 1932, 84.
212 L’Orange 1984, 6-10. Lactant. De Mort. Pers. 42.2: Eodemque tempore senis Maximiani statuae Constantini iussu revellebantur et imagines ubicumque pictus esset, detrhebantur. Et quia senes ambo simul plerumque picti erant, et imagines simul deponebantur amborum. “At the same time, statues of the elder Maximian were being torn down on the orders of Constantine, and any pictures in which he had been portrayed were being removed. And because the two old men had usually been painted together, this meant that the pictures of both were being taken down at the same time.” (Creed’s translation)
interpreted as a means of distinguishing the older *Augusti* from the younger Caesars.213 At any rate, the identical dress of the Tetrarchs and the nearly identical facial features seem to stress the idea of *similitudo* of the four.214 For this reason, it is difficult to see any slight difference in facial features as indicative of a particular Tetrarch. The difference between a bearded and unbearded face, however, is more significant, and makes the idea of each pair being a Caesar and an Augustus the more attractive.

Fig. 15. The Vatican Tetrarch groups in the Vatican Library. (After Delbrueck 1932, fig. 34)

2. *The Vatican Tetrarchs*

Very similar to the Venetian Tetrarchic group are two pairs of Tetrarchs mounted on brackets on two porphyry columns in the Vatican Library.215 The figures are about .56 m. high and the columns on which they are mounted are 3.85 m. high.216 The figures are attached to the columns

---

214 L’Orange 1984, 6-7.
216 Laubscher 2000, 208.
very near the top (see fig. 15). The position and dress of the figures are identical to the Venetian group with only a few exceptions. Rather than swords, the left hands of the figures carry globi, and instead of campagi, they wear regular boots. The pileus pannonicus has been omitted in favour of laurel wreaths that terminate in oval gems over their foreheads. Far less of the natural shape of the body can be seen in the Vatican Tetrarchs than in the Venetian groups. The proportions are more dwarf-like and distorted, with shortened legs. Both faces in the right group have more deeply furrowed brows, eyebrows raised higher, sterner frowns, and thicker beards. The facial lines of the other pair are far more shallow; they have lighter beards; and their lips are even slightly upturned in a smile. Delbrueck has identified the left figure of the two sterner Tetrarchs as Diocletian and the left figure of the younger pair as Constantius. Again, as with the Venetian groups, exact identifications may be superfluous, and the principal point is that the younger pair are probably the Caesars and the older two are the Augusti.

Fig. 16. A close up of the Vatican Tetrarchs. (After Kleiner 1992, figs. 368 and 369)

3. Bust and hand from Felix Romuliana

The recently published excavations of Gamzigrad and Magura in eastern Serbia have brought to light exciting new evidence for the Tetrarchic period. The site at Gamzigrad consists of a palace structure inside a small walled city. The palace structure contained a small temple and halls with elaborate mosaics floors and sculpted architectural decoration. The discovery in 1984 of an archivolt inscribed with the words FELIX ROMULIANA identified the site with the ancient city of that name. This same city is mentioned in the late fourth century epitome of Aurelius Victor as being the birth and death place of Galerius, which was renamed after Galerius’ mother Romula. On a high ridge that overlooked the city, known as Magura, two round mausoleums and mounds were found. Large quantities of ash, iron supports, and a hoard of melted gold coins suggest that the mounds were originally the bases for enormous wooden funerary pyres. Four bases found below Magura and outside the palace testify to the existence of a tetrapyylon monument contemporary with the other structures.

Srejovic has convincingly argued from the textual reference, the similarity of the architecture to that of Diocletian’s palace in Split, and the date of the small finds and sculpture that the site was an imperial palace of the emperor Galerius between 294 and 312. Upon the death of Galerius

---

218 The recent publications of the site in English are Srejovic 1993 and 1994. These are by no means complete. The site was known in the 19th century and systematic excavations were first begun in 1953. The most recent excavations were begun in 1984 and completed by 1990.
219 The palace is not yet fully published, brief description is to be found in Srejovic 1993, 33-39, and Srejovic 1994a.
220 Srejovic 1993, 35.
221 Aur. Vict., Epit. XL.16: Orts Dacia Ripensi ibique sepultus est; quem locum Romulianum ex vocabulo Romulae matris appellarat. – “He was born in Dacia Ripensis and there he was buried; in that place which he named named Romuliana from the name of his mother, Romula.” (my translation).
222 These are fully described in Srejovic 1994.
225 Srejovic 1994a, 144-145.
in 310, he was cremated on the Magura outside the city and placed in a mausoleum next to his cremation mound. This monument was next to a similar mound and mausoleum that had been used for Galerius’ mother Romula in 306.226 Though this interpretation must be treated with scepticism until the full publication of the site, Srejovic’s case is far more convincing than that once proposed for the villa at Piazza Armerina as the retirement palace of Maximian Herculius.227

Fig. 17. Over life-size porphyry bust and hand from Felix Romuliana. (After Srejovic 1993, 223)

A large porphyry head was found in 1993 during excavations of the bath buildings at Felix Romuliana.228 The overlife size head (35 cm high) is almost certainly connected with an overlife

---

226 See Srejovic 1994b, 123-139.
228 Srejovic 1994b, 146, note 5.
size hand holding a globus, found in 1972 in one of the halls of the palace complex.\textsuperscript{229} Presumably the two fragments formed part of a seated or standing representation of a Tetrarch. We do not know if it was part of a group of four, or if it stood alone. The face is beardless and youthful, if somewhat chubby. The eyebrows are wide, the forehead furrowed, and the mouth down-turned in a frown. The bust wears a wreath identified by Srejovic as the corona triumphalis.\textsuperscript{230} The wreath is inset with three oval gems which are themselves surrounded by four miniature busts. The busts are badly damaged and their heads obliterated, but traces and outlines of their clothing can still be made out. The bust to the right of the central gem is semi-nude, and its companion wears scale armour. The bust immediately to the left of the central gem wears a cloak, followed by another with a paludamentum.\textsuperscript{231} A small hand clasping the back of the wreath suggests that the monumental sculpture included a small victory crowning the Tetrarch.

Based on the find spot of the piece, its physical features, and the corona triumphalis, Srejovic identified the bust as Galerius.\textsuperscript{232} Though this cannot be proven with certainty, the bust probably does represent Galerius. The bust could well have been one of four similar freestanding statues of Tetrarchs displayed Galerius’ palace. The corona triumphalis, which Srejovic believes to refer to Galerius’ triumph over the Persians, does not secure the identity of the bust, since all the Tetrarchs of the Vatican group (no. 2) are similarly wreathed. Srejovic’s reasons for dating the bust to the first Tetrarchy are more convincing. First, he identifies the busts in the wreath as members of the first Tetrarchy or their patron gods. He sees the semi-nude bust as

\textsuperscript{229} Srejovic 1994b, 146.
\textsuperscript{230} Srejovic 1993, 232; 1994b, 150.
\textsuperscript{231} Srejovic 1993, 232; Srejovic 1994b, 149.
\textsuperscript{232} Srejovic 1993, 232; Srejovic 1994b, 149-150.
Jupiter/Diocletian, and the cloaked bust as Maximian/Hercules. Second, he notes that the bust, if it is Galerius, is too youthful to be a senior Augustus and must represent a Caesar. Thus there is good reason to date the piece to the first Tetrarchy and within the bounds of this thesis.

Other Porphyry Statues

Other works in porphyry, attributable to the Tetrarchic period, are also known, but we know little or nothing about their find spots and function in the ancient world. These include fragments of porphyry statues found in the Forum Romanum in Rome, which probably stem from the Fünfsäulendenkmal. In Cairo there is a life size porphyry bust in Tetrarchic style, with a cloak fastened with a cross shaped fibula on the left shoulder. Most scholars have identified the bust as Galerius based on the deeply furrowed forehead, though Delbrueck thought it might be Licinius. Once again, because of the similitudo of the Tetrarchs, no argument for an exact identity is particularly convincing.

In the museum of Alexandria there is an immense porphyry throne bearing a headless porphyry togatus, which Delbrueck suggests could be Diocletian. The total height of the piece is 3.08 m. with the upper body of the togatus measuring 1.06 m., making it two and half times life size. The togatus wears a long sleeved tunic and campagi. The statue was found while foundations were being dug for modern houses in Alexandria in 1870. It was found amongst granite columns

---

233 Srejovic 1994b, 152.
234 See chap. 5.4 and 5.5.
236 Delbrueck 1932, 96.
237 Delbrueck 1932, 96.
and other architectural remains that suggested the presence of a monumental building.\textsuperscript{238} The statue has been connected to the Egyptian campaign of Diocletian, but the only reason for this identification is its formal similarity to the enthroned seated Tetrarchs on the Arch of Galerius, which was begun around that time.\textsuperscript{239} Colossal statues of later emperors are known in porphyry from later dates, and the attribution of this piece as Diocletian is very tenuous.

Another small piece of a life-sized porphyry bust was also found at Gamzigrad during excavations of the complex’s west gate in 1983.\textsuperscript{240} The fragment preserves only the neck and lower back of the head. The modelling and stylized outline of the hair are comparable to other Tetrarchic porphyry portraits.\textsuperscript{241} While the bust is badly preserved, its findspot at the entrance to the city is interesting. Two other porphyry fragments are known from other parts of Serbia, but both could belong to either the first or second Tetrarchy. The top part of a face, consisting of a deeply furrowed forehead and large almond eyes, wearing a pileus pannonicus, is preserved in one fragment from Tekija.\textsuperscript{242} A somewhat better preserved porphyry bust from Naissus (modern Nis) has a completely plain pileus pannonicus and the usual almond eyes.\textsuperscript{243} The back of this head shows traces of where it was attached to a column, as in the Venetian and Vatican groups (nos. 1 and 2).\textsuperscript{244}

\textit{Conclusions}

\textsuperscript{238} Delbrueck 1932, 98.
\textsuperscript{239} Delbrueck 1932, 97. See 6.21.
\textsuperscript{240} Srejovic 1994b, 145; Srejovic 1993, 231 no. 70.
\textsuperscript{241} Srejovic 1994b, 145.
\textsuperscript{242} Srejovic 1993, 231 no. 72. He provides no indication of the exact archaeological context, and the piece is recorded as being in a private collection. Bergmann 1977, 166-7.
\textsuperscript{243} Srejovic 1993, 234, no. 73.
\textsuperscript{244} Srejovic 1993, 234.
While porphyry statues of emperors had been produced before, the Tetrarchic period saw the true mass production of imperial images in porphyry. The function of the Tetrarchic porphyry statues cannot be determined with certainty in any case although we are not always without clues. The Venetian Tetrarchs (no. 1) the Vatican Tetrarchs (no. 2), and the single fragment of a bust from Naissus all seem to have been used on columns as prominent pieces of architectural decoration. Whether the pillars were indoors, flanking gates, or part of colonnaded streets, is unclear. Such uses find precedent in both Palmyra and Rome. The findspot of the porphyry neck fragment in Gamzigrad, near the gate entrance to the city, seems to suggest that it might have been on display there, perhaps mounted in the gate. The oversized hand holding a globus from the palace at Gamzigrad, and the head that probably goes with it, seem to have served a different sort of function. It probably stood alone, or at least detached from representations of the other Tetrarchs, perhaps in one of the halls of Galerius’ palace. The bust in the Cairo museum and the throne in Alexandria are probably similar in nature. They are too large to have served as mere architectural ornaments or decoration. They probably sat in prominent places within buildings or public spaces. One is inclined to think of the massive marble statue of Constantine found in the Basilica of Maxentius.

More frustrating is the problem of the identities of the Tetrarchs. The chief idea of the porphyry groups seems to be the similitudo of the Tetrarchs, and while most scholars recognize this, many persist in attempts to identify personal facial attributes of the various Tetrarchs. There is simply no trace of individual portraiture to be found in these depictions. Only minor differences,

---

245 Kleiner 1992, 403; Delbrueck 1932, 21-22.
246 L’Orange 1984, 125.
247 Srejovic, for instance, claims to find similarities between the Gamzigrad bust (no. 4) and the porphyry bust in Cairo. Srejovic 1994b, 149-150.
such as the beards of the Venetian group, or the sterner faces of the Vatican group, are notable. These differences were almost certainly intended to differentiate an Augustus from a Caesar, rather than a particular identity.\textsuperscript{248} As such, the porphyry statues are reflections of the Tetrarchic system, rather than the features of the emperors.

Srejovic has argued that the Serbian porphyry statues were produced by artists working in the imperial court of Galerius.\textsuperscript{249} Yet the similarities among the Tetrarchic porphyry statues throughout the empire seem to suggest a common workshop, probably at \textit{Mons Claudianus} in Egypt.\textsuperscript{250} Three pilasters from Gamzigrad with reliefs depicting members of the second Tetrarchy are done in a decidedly provincial style, and reveal just how different the porphyry fragments are from local products.\textsuperscript{251} As discussed in the introduction to this chapter, a single workshop would tend to point towards imperial control of the production of these statues, but without inscriptions we cannot be sure. Whether or not the statues were produced locally or in Egypt, and whether or not they were commissioned by private individuals or the state, does not alter the fact that they obviously follow an official model of production. The influence of the Tetrarchic style of portraiture, as demonstrated in the porphyry groups, can be seen on the reliefs of the arch of Constantine.\textsuperscript{252}

Whatever the exact identification and function of the various Tetrarchic porphyry sculptures, the hard nature of the stone, as well as its purple colour, made it particularly appropriate for the hard

\textsuperscript{248} Laubscher 2000, 229-238.
\textsuperscript{249} Srejovic 1993, 226.
\textsuperscript{251} Srejovic 1994b, 145-146. The pilasters show the members of the second Tetrarchy and the retired \textit{seniores augusti} as statuettes on military standards.
\textsuperscript{252} Delbrueck 1932, 26.
lines and cubic nature of Tetrarchic portraiture.\textsuperscript{253} In fact, it would have been difficult to model a stone as hard as porphyry in the same manner as the earlier classical style portrait heads. The unusual material composition and the use of new types of dress and apparel on these statues makes them uniquely Tetrarchic. Traits such as decorated \textit{campagi}, ornaments and hems on the imperial armour, fittings and robes (\textit{paragaudae}), the \textit{pileus pannonicus}, and the use of jewels all point to the rich eastern style of Tetrarchic representation.\textsuperscript{254}

\textsuperscript{253} Kleiner 1992, 401.
\textsuperscript{254} Laubscher 2000, 209-213.
5. THE FÜNFSÄULEN DENKMAL (FIVE COLUMN MONUMENT)

The Great Fire and Diocletian’s Building Campaign in the Forum Romanum

In 283, a terrible fire ravaged Rome and damaged numerous monuments and buildings. This damage allowed Diocletian to undertake a campaign of restoration and new construction. Though he was in Rome only once, he left his mark on most of the public spaces of Rome. The restored buildings included the Forum of Caesar, the Theatre of Pompey, the Temple of Isis and Serapis, and the Senate House. He is also recorded as having restored two porticoes and three nymphaea. This marked the first major building campaign in the Roman Forum since the Severans, and absolutely nothing of consequence had been built in the Forum Romanum since the Arch of Septimius Severus in 203. Caracalla had managed the Temple of Serapis, on the Quirinal hill, as well as his monumental baths. Aurelian was the most prolific builder, with a temple to Sol Invictus, and new walls around Rome.

---

255 Chron. min. I.148.19.
256 His restoration and reconstruction projects are recorded in Chron. min. I.148.21-4. For the Arcus Novus see chapter 8.
Outside of the Forum, Diocletian built a massive bathing complex on the Quirinal hill and the *Arcus Novus* on the via Lata. Within the Forum, he restored the Basilica Julia, and the reconstructed the *curia* to its present day form. Along the Basilica Julia, and the Via Sacra, a series of seven columns were also put up. These probably supported honorific statues, but we do not know of whom. Diocletian was also responsible for a single column, probably supporting a statue of himself, that would later be turned into the Column of Phocas. In front of the Temple of Julius Caesar he constructed a platform on which there were more columns with statues. This platform served as a counterpart to a major new monument on the other end of the Forum, that stood behind the rostrum and in front of the Temple of Concordia. This monument, which is usually referred to by the name given to it by its German name, the Fünfsäulendenkmal, is the main topic of this chapter.

---

263 Lex. Top.Urb. Rom. II. 342-343 s.v. *Forum Romanum étà tarda* (Giuliani and Verduchi). The reconstruction of this end of the Forum in the Diocletianic period is disputed. Zanker (1972, 53) and Kähler (1964, 34) reconstruct the platform as a compartmented enclosure. They do not specify a function.
Introduction to the Fünfsäulendenkmal

The existence of the Fünfsäulendenkmal, “Five Column Monument”, was first proposed by Hans Peter L’Orange in 1938. L’Orange deduced that the pillars depicted in the background of the *ad locutio* scene on the Arch of Constantine must represent a lost monument of the Tetrarchy. This monument celebrated the *vicennalia* and *decennalia* festivities of 303. On the Arch of Constantine, we see the tops of five columns bearing four statues of *togati* on either side of a statue of Jupiter. The monument would have stood at the far end of the Forum Romanum, next to the Column of Septimius Severus and in front of the Temple of *Concordia Augustae*. It consisted of the five columns fronted by a large platform. L’Orange connected three marble column bases, found in the Renaissance in the same area, with his purported monument. Excavations in this area, conducted in the early 20th century, turned up various architectural fragments that have been connected to the monument.

![Fig. 19. Detail of the Arch of Constantine showing the Fünfsäulendenkmal in the background. (After L’Orange 1938, fig. 15.)](image)

---

264 L’Orange 1938. Other references include *Lex. Top Urb. Rom. II.*343 s.v *Forum Romanum, età tarda* (Giuliani and Verduchi), Richardson 1992, 173-174, figs. 40 and 41 and Kleiner 1992, 413-417. The most comprehensive study, incorporating all of the architectural fragments, is that of Kälher 1964.

265 L’Orange 1938, 149, fig. 15; L’Orange and von Gerkan 1938, plates 14 and 15; L’Orange 1938, 149, fig. 15, 16 and 17.

266 L’Orange 1938, 24ff.
The three marble bases, nos. 1, 2 and 3, bear sculptural reliefs that are both contextually and epigraphically similar.\(^{267}\) On the best preserved base (no. 1), scenes of procession, libation, and *suovetaurilia* are represented. The three bases have been connected to pieces found nearby of monolithic red granite columns, marble fragments of column bases, capitals and pedimental statue bases. Matching iron clamps and slots, as well as the corresponding widths, show that both columns and bases come from the same monument.\(^{268}\) The columns were topped by capitals of which only a few badly damaged pieces survive, and a complete reconstruction of the capitals is therefore possible. The capital fragments include acanthus leaves, and two examples of Gorgon masks surrounded by double wreaths. The remains of small hands, attached to the wreath of one of the fragments, suggest that the masks were supported by flanking victories.\(^{269}\) Another capital fragment consists of a female figure with one breast exposed, rising up from the middle of the capital and sticking her head through a double wreath. This wreath divides the abacus at the very top of the capital. The sculptural style of the capital decoration matches the sculpted bases, and the two probably came from the same workshop.\(^{270}\)

The capitals themselves supported architrave blocks, 1.49-1.53 metres in height, that provided a square platform of 1.50 x 1.50 metres for statues.\(^{271}\) The positions of large iron pegs on the remains of the architrave blocks suggest that they bore heavy stone statues rather than light bronze ones.\(^{272}\) Fragments of three porphyry statues, nos. 4 and 5, were found in the vicinity of the Arch of Septimius Severus, and probably once stood on top of the columns of the

---

\(^{267}\) Kähler 1964, 8-9; L’Orange 1938, 14-15.
\(^{268}\) Kähler 1964, 9.
\(^{269}\) Kähler 1964, 10, plate 11.1 and 11.2
\(^{270}\) Kähler 1964, 10.
\(^{271}\) Kähler 1964, 10.
\(^{272}\) Kähler 1964, 10-11.
Fünfsäulendenkmal. All five columns were fronted by a large platform, the rebuilt *rostrum*, that also incorporated architectural sculpture. This included winged cupids carrying gorgon masks, and possibly busts of empresses with lunar crowns (no. 6).\footnote{Kähler 1964, plate 17.1 and 17.2.}

Fig. 20. Artist’s Reconstruction of the Fünfsäulendenkmal. (After Kähler 1964, fig. 6, p. 29)

Four of the five columns would have supported statues of the Tetrarchs, or their genii. A fifth, larger, column would have supported a statue of Jupiter.\footnote{L’Orange 1938, 19-20.} A full examination of every fragment of the Fünfsäulendenkmal is not possible here. More productive is an examination of some of the more major pieces, and a discussion of how they relate to Tetrarchic imperial representation.
1. *The Decennalia Base*

The most impressive surviving fragment is a marble base with reliefs on all four sides. It was found in 1547 near the Arch of Septimius Severus, but H.P L’Orange was the first to recognize it as part of the Fünfsäulendenkmal.  

The front of the base, as with the next two bases, shows two victories holding a shield. The hair of the victories is tied up in a bun that sits above their foreheads. The victory on the left has just finished inscribing the shield. It reads:

```
CAESARVM
DECENNALIA
FELICITER
```

“The happy tenth anniversary of the Caesars”

This inscription allows us to be fairly sure that the base was originally at the bottom of a column bearing the statue of a Caesar rather than an Augustus.

---

275 L’Orange 1938, 1-7; Kähler, 1964, 7-8.
Two captives kneel below the shield and look up at it. The head of the captive on the right is lost, but the captive on the left has curly hair and a shaggy beard.276 Both wear tunics and cloaks fastened with a circular brooch. Between the two captives, and in front of the trophy, are two crossed greaves.277 In the background, behind each victory, are trophies, engraved with deep lines. The trophy on the right is the better preserved of the two. It sits on the top of a tree stump above two shields and an axe, which lean against the bottom of the stump.

Fig. 22. Decennalia Base: Libation Scene. (After Kähler 1964, plate 3.1)

On the opposite side of the base is a libation scene. A figure wearing an old fashioned priestly toga pours a libation onto a flaming metal tripod.278 Though the head is lost, one would expect the figure to be one of the two Caesars. On the left he is being crowned by a winged Victory holding a laurel branch in front of her. On the right the Genius of the Roman Senate, with a

276 Kleiner sees the captive on the right as wearing a Phrygian cap, and the two would therefore represent northern and eastern barbarians. If this is true, then it seems likely the column supported a statue of Galerius, as he is the only Caesar who could claim victories in both regions.
277 Kähler 1964, 8; L’Orange 1938, 7-10.
278 At least, the toga is the contemporary toga contabulata, as worn by the figures in the procession on another side of the base.
sceptre in his left hand, helps Victory with the crowning. This identification of the figure as the Genius of the Roman Senate is strengthened by the presence of Roma seated on a shield to the right. There is no precedent for a coronation by the Genius of the Roman Senate and a victory elsewhere in Roman relief sculpture. Roma is sitting under a zodiac arch and her drapery leaves one breast exposed. Her right arm is raised around the arch, and a radiate Sol looks out from the inside of it.

In front of the tripod are two *camilli*: one holds an incense box, and the other plays an *aulos*. To the left is a priest of Mars with his characteristic apex hat, followed by a youthful and semi-nude version of Mars himself. Finally, behind Mars, a bearded togate man stands with his right hand on his chest watching the libation. One would expect the Genius of the Roman People to appear on this side, as he is frequently found with the Genius of the Roman Senate, but the dress of the figure does not allow for this attribution. The Genius of the Roman People is usually shown semi-nude, with a cornucopia, and wearing a *modius*.

---

279 Kähler 1964, 8.
280 For the Genius of the Roman Senate see LIMC VII.727-730 s.v. *Senatus* (Canciani); For Roma see LIMC VIII.1049-1068 (suppl.) s.v. *Roma* (Balestrazzi).
282 Kähler 1964, 8.
283 For a description of his iconography see LIMC VII.438-443 s.v. *Populus Romanus* (Canciani).
On the lateral sides of the base, two processional scenes advance towards the libation scene. One is a *suovetaurilia*, featuring a bearded man in front, who wears a toga *contabulata* and holds a knobbed sceptre. He looks towards the *suovetaurilia* and urges it on with his extended arm. The bull, ram and pig were traditionally sacrificed at major Roman rituals, including the taking of new vows in the *vota* ritual. The animals are dressed in the traditional Roman fashion, with sacrificial belts and *dorsuales*, and the bull wears a crescent-shaped headdress with dangling *infulae*. Two *victimarii* stand either side of the bull. Both are nude above the waist and carry hammers with which they will stun the bull immediately prior to the sacrifice. The *victimarius* on the right side wears a *bulla* around his neck. An incised figure behind the bull carries a fruit basket.

---

284 Ryberg 1955, 104-119, esp. 118-119.
The second lateral scene is a procession of men, of whom four wear *togae contabulatae*. These have been interpreted as senators or members of the Tetrarchy.\(^{285}\) The figures advance towards the libation scene on the adjacent side of the base. The first of these is in the act of turning the corner of the base with his back to the viewer. The four remaining *togati* are emphasized by the frontal positions of their bodies. The last *togatus*, who is slightly smaller than the others, rests his hand on the shoulder of a togate boy. Behind the senators are three bearded and two beardless heads that represent a second row of the procession. Amongst these men, protruding above the entire procession, are four military *vexilla*. On the upper flags of these are shields, that might have once borne painted inscriptions or decoration.\(^{286}\) The upper portion of the shafts of the *vexilla* are composed of various symbols, including two eagles, a winged victory carrying a wreath, and a Genius of the Roman People pouring a libation.

Kleiner has proposed that the four frontal *togati* on the lateral side of the *decennalia* base are members of the Tetrarchy. She identifies the small boy as Constantine with his father

---

\(^{285}\) Kähler 1964, 8 (senators) Kleiner 1991, 416-17 (emperors). L’Orange 1938, 14, argues that the standards in the background would have borne symbols representing each of the four Tetrarchs.

\(^{286}\) Kähler 1964, 8; L’Orange 1938, 10-11.
Constantius, and the central figures as Diocletian and Maximian with Galerius ahead of them. But Kleiner incorrectly asserts that Constantine was born in 285, and that he was 18 years old in 303. Constantine was actually born in either 272 or 273 and was 30 or 31 at the time of the celebrations. A more likely candidate for the boy is Candidianus, the son of Galerius. Candidianus was born in 296 to a concubine of Galerius, and was adopted by his barren wife Valeria. He would therefore have been seven at the time of the celebration. If this is the correct identity of the boy, the back figure should be seen as Galerius. Galerius’ status as instigator of the Diocletianic persecutions might also have been the cause of the severe damnatio memoriae that all the heads on the base seem to have suffered. A monument of Constantius, the father of Constantine, and an abstainer from the persecutions, would have been unlikely to receive this sort of treatment.

But there is yet another possibility. Koeppel has observed that the figure turning the corner on the far left of the frieze is turning his head back to the figure behind him. The figure behind raises his hand in a gesture that implies communication between the two. In spite of his backward position, the head of this figure would have been visible, and he may represent a Tetrarch rather than a space filling figure. Thus, the first four togati of the procession, who are all of equal size, represent the Tetrarchs. The back togatus could be Constantine, and the smallest figure Candidianus. Constantine is shown only slightly smaller than the other Tetrarchs in order to represent his status in relation to the emperors. If this interpretation is correct, the

---

289 Barnes 1982, 38. Lactant. De Mort. Pers. 20.4. It has also been proposed, though not accepted by Barnes, that Candidianus was briefly proclaimed Caesar by Galerius in 310 and 311: Barnes 1982, 6, n. 18. He was executed at the orders of Licinius in 313: Lactant. De Mort. Pers. 50.4.
290 Koeppel 1990, 36-37.
decennalia base is the only monument on which Tetrarchic blood relations are explicitly depicted.

As the inscription indicates, this base belonged to a column that supported a statue of a Caesar rather than an Augustus. If the identity of the Tetrarch on this column must be sought, I would suggest that this base belonged to the column of Galerius rather than Constantius. If one of the captives below the trophy is a Persian, and the other a northern barbarian, we can see a reference to Galerius’ Persian victory in 298. The northern barbarian could then represent campaigns against the Marcomanni, Carpi and Sarmatians, undertaken by Galerius between 299/300 and 303. Galerius is the only Tetrarch to have campaigned against both the Persians and the Germanic tribes, and to have been a Caesar at this time. On the other hand, the captives below the trophy could represent an amalgam of the victories in the east and west. Victory titles were certainly shared amongst the four rulers.

2. Vicennalia Augustorum Base

A now lost base, reportedly found in 1509, was thought to relate to the vicennalia of Diocletian as early as 1876, when it was published in CIL. The base is described in the renaissance texts as having been found either near the Arch of Septimius Severus, in the vicinity of the Curia, or in the general area of the Capitol. Other sides are described as having borne sculptural images

291 See Barnes 1982, 63-4 for the chronology.
292 CIL VI 1204 and 31262. L’Orange 1938, 15-16.
293 Kähler 1964, 8 and note 66.
of priests sacrificing a bull.\textsuperscript{294} This description suggests that the base’s sculptural relief followed the theme of no. 1. The inscription reads:

\begin{verbatim}
AVGVSTORVM
VICENNALIA
FELICITER
\end{verbatim}

“The happy twentieth anniversary of the Augusti”

Given the various similarities between this base and no. 1, it is not unreasonable to suppose that it too belonged to the Fünfsäulendenkmal. Just as no. 1 probably supported the statue of a Caesar, this base was probably below a column with the statue of an Augustus.

3. *Vicennalia Imperatorum Base / Ingens Basis*

Larger than the two previous bases, and also no longer extant, this base has been described as the “\textit{ingens basis}.” Again, it is probably safe to assume that the sculptural programme was similar to that of no. 1. It is described as bearing the following inscription in a round shield:\textsuperscript{295}

\begin{verbatim}
VICENNALIA
IMPERATORVM
\end{verbatim}

“The twentieth anniversary of the emperors”

Since this base refers to all of the Tetrarchs, and is larger than the others, it was probably situated at the bottom of the central Jupiter column.

\textsuperscript{294} By Albertini, quoted in *CIL* VI 1204.31262.
\textsuperscript{295} *CIL* VI.1205 and 31262; Kähler 1964, 8; L’Orange 1938, 15-16.
4. Two Fragments of Porphyry statues

Two fragments of over life size porphyry statues were found in 1831 near the arch of Septimius Severus and are now in the Lateran collection of the Vatican Museums. Delbrueck estimated the total height of the statues as 2.40 m., though Kähler has revised this to 2.70-80 m. Both belong to an emperor dressed in an old fashioned tunic, such as is worn by the figure making a libation on the decennalia base (no. 1). The toga does not seem to go over the head, which is missing. Kähler thought that both pieces were from the same workshop as each other and no. 5 below, but it is difficult to be sure. One piece, illustrated here on the left, seems to consist of finer folds, with soft melting curves. The other piece, on the right, has larger folders and sharper angles.
5. *Porphyry Statue*

An over life size porphyry statue was found in 1938 behind the Curia in the Forum Romanum. It would have been 3 m. high if a head of the same proportions were added. It is complete except for the head, arms and feet, which would have been marble inserts. This is shown by holes for a metal pegs to attach the marble arms.\(^{298}\) Again, Kähler has argued that the statue came from the same workshop as the two fragments now in the Lateran (see no. 4 above), and again it is difficult to be sure of this. The position of the statue, with the right arm extended, and its clothing match the statues shown in the *adlocutio* panel on the Arch of Constantine. Its right hand could have been pouring a libation, and the left arm may have once held a cornucopia. Kleiner suggests that the statues on top of the columns of the Fünfsäulendenkmal were the *genii*.

---

\(^{298}\) Kähler 1964, 11. The piece was discovered after the publication of Delbrueck in 1932.
of the emperors, rather than the emperors themselves. This is shown by the fact that they carry *paterae* and *cornucopiae*, typical attributes of the Genius of the emperor.\(^{299}\)

In fact, the only thing to connect this *togatus*, and the two Lateran fragments (no. 4), are their findspots. The body position of the porphyry *togatus* may well match that of a genius, as shown on the Arch of Constantine. We cannot even be sure that the pieces are from the Tetrarchic period. As for the findspot, it should not be forgotten that Diocletian’s changes to the Forum Romanum included a set of seven columns with honorary statues along the Via Sacra. The fragments could easily come from one of these.

6. *Cupids Supporting a Lunar Crown*

Other fragments of architectural sculpture may be connected to the Fünfsäulendenkmal. These come from a *temenos* wall that separated the five columns from the rest of the Forum Romanum and the newly constructed Rostrum. Within the *temenos* wall, or perhaps the back of the new rostrum, were four niches that probably corresponded to the four Tetrarchic columns.\(^{300}\) The number four is, admittedly, Kähler’s guess based on the measurements of the surviving beams, but it is a convincing one. Above the niches, sculpted soffits were incorporated into the marble beams that topped the wall. The soffits and other remains suggest that the niches had a width of .85 m., a height of .95 m., and a depth of at least .45 m.\(^{301}\) Only one soffit survives complete and

\(^{299}\) Kleiner 1991, 414. Similar depictions appear on coins, e.g. *RIC* VI, Siscia nos. 198-200. See also LIMC VIII (suppl.) 605-606 *s.v. Genius* (Ganschow); Wrede 1981, provides a long discussion on the iconography of *genii* and their function on the Fünfsäulendenkmal.

\(^{300}\) Kähler 1964, 28.

\(^{301}\) Kähler 1964, 27.
half of a larger soffit that was above the door. This latter piece bears a winged head that was probably one of two victories holding a shield, wreath or crown.\textsuperscript{302}

The underside of the only complete soffit is sculpted with two cupids holding a *stephane*, or lunar crown. The *stephane* was reserved in Roman art for images of imperial women, sacrificial animals, and priests. Thus it seems likely that the soffit was an architectural crown for a statue of a Tetrarchic woman housed in the niche. One could imagine each niche containing the respective wives of the Tetrarchs, but there is no comparable usage of Tetrarchic women elsewhere.\textsuperscript{303} The two cupids holding the *stephane* seem to look up, perhaps at the emperors surmounting the columns in front of them.

Fig. 27. Fragment of Soffit with Cupids with Lunar Crown. (After Kähler 1964, plate 17.1)

*The Fünfsäulendenkmal in the Context of other Roman Monuments*

The Fünfsäulendenkmal was strategically placed in the forum near the Temple of Concordia, which had been restored by the Senate after the great fire of A.D. 283.\textsuperscript{304} The association is fitting given the Tetrarchic ideal of concord among the four emperors. The very idea of a column

\textsuperscript{302} Kähler 1964, 27.
\textsuperscript{303} Kleiner 1992, 417.
\textsuperscript{304} Kähler 1964, 6.
supporting an honoured individual is a very old Roman idea that stretches far back into the Republic. The first such column was probably that of L. Minucius Augurinus, the *praefectus annonae* in 439 B.C. 305 Another column, decorated with the prows of ships, and supporting a gilded statue of Augustus, was erected in the Roman Forum to celebrate the victory over Sextus Pompey in 36 B.C. 306 Neither column would have been standing by the time of Diocletian, but outside the Forum Romanum, there were other examples of this sort of monument in Rome. These included the columns of Trajan, Marcus Aurelius and Antoninus Pius. 307 The first two had spiral reliefs and bore single statues of emperors. The column of Antoninus Pius, however, was done in plain red granite, and may have supported statues of both Antoninus Pius and Faustina. Thus the Fünfsäulendenkmal does not represent a innovation as much as a Tetrarchic adaptation of an older idea. Instead of supporting representations of one ruler, it bore depictions of four.

**Conclusions regarding Imperial Representation in the Fünfsäulendenkmal**

Not a single imperial face survives from any part of the monument, but one would expect the cubic type found on contemporary coins. By 303 the retirements of Diocletian and Maximian must have been planned. Diocletian had suffered a great illness in 303, and he never fully recovered. His retirement, and the propagation of the Tetrarchic system, was probably already planned by this point. 308 The heads of the porphyry statues of the *genii* at the tops of the columns were probably marble attachments that would have been easy to change, but if their features were simply those of generic Tetrarchs, this would not have been necessary.

---

308 Williams 1985, 191.
In their positions on the tops of the columns, the *genii* of the Tetrarchs commanded a dominating position, but they did not have the airspace of the Roman Forum all to themselves. Directly behind them, the Temple of Concord bore statues of the Capitoline triad on its roof, and they were flanked by Arch of Septimius Severus and the Arch of Tiberius, which may also have supported statues. Directly across the Forum was the Temple of Julius Caesar with Caesar’s star in the pediment, and the Arch of Augustus with its own statuary. The height of the columns of the Fünfsäulendenkmal was estimated by Kähler to be around 20 m. including their statues, but the *adlocutio* panel on the Arch of Constantine shows the statues slightly higher than the Basilica Julia, the Arch of Tiberius, and the Arch of Septimius Severus. Of course, the schematic nature of the scene may not be entirely accurate. The Arch of Septimius Severus is 23 m. high, and its statuary would have topped the columns of the Fünfsäulendenkmal, provided Kähler’s estimate is correct and that the statuary was still present in this period. Had the columns of the Fünfsäulendenkmal been much smaller, they would have been lost amongst the numerous monuments of the Forum. But the design of the monument was not merely intended to avoid the clutter of the Forum. The four Tetrarchs are raised to equal positions in the sky. Only Jupiter stands slightly above them, and the significance was surely that the Tetrarchs were far above the mortal men below, and closer to the gods above.

The Fünfsäulendenkmal was probably as much a monument to the *concordia* and durability of the Tetrarchic system as it was a commemoration of specific victories and anniversaries of the

---

311 Kähler 1964, 8; L’Orange and von Gerkhan 1938, plates 14-15. In fact, the Jupiter column breaks the upper border of the panel.
312 Richardson 1992, 8.
first Tetrarchy. The topics of the surviving relief sculpture, well known on older monuments such as the Ara Pacis, were used again in the Tetrarchic period. If the portraits had survived, they would undoubtedly have been the new cubic type. The use of five columns, including all four Tetrarchs and one of their patron gods, is unusual. It emphasized their *concordia*, and their connection to the gods.
6. ARCH OF GALERIUS AT THESSALONIKE

Introduction

Without doubt, the most important surviving Tetrarchic monument is the Arch of Galerius in Thessalonike.\(^{313}\) Between 297 and 305 Thessalonike was used by Galerius as one of the provincial Tetrarchic capitals.\(^{314}\) As the other Tetrarchs had done at Trier, Nicomedia and Milan, Galerius built an appropriate residence for himself and his court. He added an entirely new section to the old city to incorporate his palace. Extensive remains of this complex of buildings still exist today.\(^{315}\) Like Diocletian’s retirement palace at Split, and Maxentius’ palace outside of Rome, Galerius’ Palace incorporated audience halls, a hippodrome and a mausoleum for the emperor and his family.\(^{316}\) The last of these has been preserved as a church. The mausoleum and hippodrome sections of the palace complex were joined by a short colonnaded street that bisected one of the city’s major colonnaded roads. Over this intersection the remains of a large octopylon monument still stand today. Referred to as the “kamara” – “the vault” – by citizens of Thessalonike since the 19\(^{th}\) century, the arch is intentionally positioned over the crossing of two of the ancient city’s most important streets.\(^{317}\) It is thought that ceremonial processions would have passed under this arch on the way from the palace to the Rotunda.\(^{318}\)

\(^{313}\) The first systematic study of the arch was that of Kinch 1890. Further work was conducted by von Schönenbeck in the 1930’s and he produced a short article in 1937. Schönenbeck died before being able to publish all of his notes, and the next major publication was that of Laubscher 1975. Laubscher incorporated information from some of Schönenbeck’s unpublished notes as well as making numerous observations of his own and taking extensive photographs. His work remains the most important reference on the arch today. Iconographical studies were published by Pond Rothman in 1975 and 1977 and most recently by Meyer 1980. Apart from Pond Rothman, the principal works in English are Vermeule 1968, 336-352, Kleiner 1992, 419-425 and Brilliant 1984, 117-119. A guidebook to the arch, published by Makaronas in 1970, is useful for placing the arch within the context of Galerius’ palace.

\(^{314}\) Barnes 1982, 301-302.

\(^{315}\) Makaronas 1970.

\(^{316}\) Makaronas 1970, 11-31. This mausoleum was not to be used, at least for Galerius himself as it seems likely that he was cremated and buried at Felix Romuliana in Dacia Ripensis, modern Gamzigrad in eastern Serbia. Aur. Vic., Épit. XL.16; Srejovic 1994. See chap. 2.3.

\(^{317}\) Kinch 1890, 1; Makaronas 1970, 10-11. I am informed that the name is still used today.

The arch was an octopylon with four large inner central piers and four smaller outer piers that were incorporated into the colonnaded sidewalks of the via Egnatia.\textsuperscript{319} These sidewalks would have been raised above the level of the street.\textsuperscript{320} The smaller piers, which stood 4.85 m. away from the large central piers, would have supported barrel vaults. The central piers stood on the corners of a square, each approximately 10 m. from the next. The piers supported a cupola, perhaps unique in the realm of triumphal arches, which had a maximum height of 12.5 m. The two main openings onto the via Egnatia were 9.7 m. high.\textsuperscript{321} Today, only the two northwest central piers, and the smaller north-western pier, remain standing.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{319} Makaronas 1970, 19.
\item \textsuperscript{320} Makaronas 1970, 14-15; Kinch 1890, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{321} Makaronas 1970, 21; Kinch 1890, 5.
\end{itemize}
The two main entrances to the arch were surmounted by pediments, with two niches below. The niches were 2.23 m. high, 1.29 m. wide and 0.7 m. deep, and it has been proposed that they contained statues of the Tetrarchs.\textsuperscript{322} The southeast façade would most likely have contained images of Diocletian and Galerius, looking east over their dominions, with statues of Maximian and Constantius on the northwest façade, looking towards the sections of the empire over which they exercised dominion.\textsuperscript{323} It has also been suggested that the niches may have contained statues of Hercules and Mars (Maximian and Constantius) on the northwest, and statues of Jupiter and Virtus at the southeast (Diocletian and Galerius.)\textsuperscript{324} Equally possible are representations of the \textit{genii} of the emperors. Other parts of the monument may have been covered with marble veneer, plaster or even mosaic, of which nothing survives.\textsuperscript{325}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item M\textsuperscript{akaronas 1970, 22-23; K\textsuperscript{inch 1890, 6.}
\item M\textsuperscript{akaronas 1970, 23-25; V\textsuperscript{erreule 1968, 336; K\textsuperscript{l}\textsuperscript{einer 1991, 419.}
\item V\textsuperscript{erreule 1968, 336.
\item M\textsuperscript{akaronas 1970, 26.}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
At the bottom of the central pillars were four bands of marble relief sculpture. On the outside of the two arches, where they connect to the stoa of the street, there was room for only two bands. The panels focus on Galerius’ Persian campaign of A.D. 298, and include scenes that glorify the Tetrarchy and the virtues of Galerius. The interpretation of the panels, and the order in which they are supposed to be read, has been the subject of much controversy.\textsuperscript{326} The events displayed on the pillars do not seem to follow any sort of chronological or conceptual order. Historical scenes from the Persian campaign are interwoven with generic scenes of victory, imperial ceremonies, and Tetrarchic glorification. The best explanation for this order is that of Pond Rothman, who proposed that the location of individual scenes on the pillars was decided by their ideological importance rather than their chronological order.\textsuperscript{327} Processional scenes on both pillars serve to direct the viewer into the monument and towards the palace.\textsuperscript{328} As shall be seen, the distinction between symbolism and historical narrative is blurred on this monument, as in other monuments of late antiquity.\textsuperscript{329}

\textsuperscript{326} The various interpretations are Laubscher 1975, 95-103; Pond Rothman 1977; Meyer 1980, 374-381.
\textsuperscript{327} Pond Rothman 1977, 449-450; Brilliant 1984, 117-119.
\textsuperscript{328} Pond Rothman 1977, 450.
\textsuperscript{329} Pond Rothman 1977, 449. Mentioning specifically the Arch of Septimius Severus at Lepcis Magna and The Arch of Constantine in Rome. Brilliant 1984, 90-123 discusses this phenomenon in Roman state relief from the Trajan’s column to the Arch of Constantine.
The arch cannot be dated later than 305 since both Diocletian and Galerius appear frequently. Laubscher argued that the presence of a votive shield in panel 27 allows the arch’s completion, and perhaps also its dedication, to be in 303. This is based on the similarity of that panel to the votive panel of one of the column bases of the Fünfsäulendenkmal (chap. 5.1), and the similar use of imperial anniversary votives on the arch of Septimius Severus and the Arch of Constantine. Von Schoenebeck saw the panel as related to Galerius’ quinquennalia of 298, which is convincing if the arch was constructed within one year. Of course, the votive scene in panel 27 could equally refer to vows unrelated to the anniversaries of the emperors. The Arch of Constantine was dedicated two years and nine months after the battle of Milvian Bridge; if we assume a similar construction time for the Arch of Galerius, and that it was begun in 299, then it should have been completed around September of 302. But the comparison is problematic, given that the Arch of Constantine is a different shape, was built with far more spolia, and used far less original relief sculpture than the Arch of Galerius.

The following descriptions of the individual panels on the arch follow the numbering system of Laubscher (also used by Pond Rothman), who provides the fullest description of the monument. The descriptions here focus on those scenes containing the figure thought to be Galerius or the other Tetrarchs.

---

Laubscher 1975, 107-108.

1 In an unpublished manuscript used by Laubscher 1975, 107, note 520.

2 Ryberg 1955, 120-140 discusses depictions of the vota ritual in Roman art. Vows were frequently undertaken prior to a campaign (vota suscepta) and thanks offerings made on a successful completion (vota soluta).

Fig. 31. Layout of the Arch of Galerius.
**Pillar A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Cavalry Charge</td>
<td>Battle of Romans and Persians</td>
<td><em>Clementia</em> Scene</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of the Persian Harem</td>
<td>Migration and Submission Scene</td>
<td><em>Clementia</em> Scene</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the Persians across the Tigris</td>
<td><em>Adventus</em> Scene</td>
<td>City Personifications</td>
<td>Dromedary loaded with booty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliterated Panel</td>
<td>Animal Procession</td>
<td>Animal Procession</td>
<td>Animal Procession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pillar B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the Quadriga of Elephants</td>
<td><em>Adventus Augusti</em></td>
<td><em>Adlocutio</em> of Galerius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Scene</td>
<td>Narses and Galerius fighting</td>
<td>Persian Delegation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votive Scene</td>
<td>Persian Prisoners</td>
<td>The Tetrarchs Enthroned <em>(Concordia Scene)</em></td>
<td>Galerius and Diocletian making a sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliterated</td>
<td>Rome and Victory</td>
<td>Victories</td>
<td>Persian Tribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 32. Layout of the Panels on the Arch of Galerius.

Description of Individual Panels

Fig. 33. Panel 1 (above): cavalry charge, and panel 2 (below): capture of Persian harem. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 11, no. 1)

1. Roman Cavalry Charge

The relief has suffered significantly over time, and much detail, including all of the far right end, is now lost.334 A row of horseman are galloping out from an arched and crenellated city gate on the left side of the frieze. They are pursuing a group of fleeing Persian riders who wear Phrygian caps. The badly damaged rider in the middle of the panel, at the head of the Roman riders, is larger than all of the other figures, and takes the dominant place in the scene. These

---

distinctions make it almost certain that he represents Galerius. Unlike the riders who follow him in rows of two, he stands on his own and his horse tramples two fallen Persians who have been outlined with drill channels. The riders following Galerius are wearing the pileus pannonicus. The pill-box shaped hat was not normally worn in battle, and its use in the scene here is probably intended to show that the charge was an impromptu attack.

The shape of the city gate, and its battlements, probably mark an Eastern city, and similar depictions of city gates also appear in Sassanian art. Laubscher describes the scene as Romans breaking out of a besieged city, but he admits that it is not possible to identify the exact event. Contemporary descriptions of the campaign do not describe Galerius breaking out from under siege at any point. Pond Rothman, in her own description, simply labelled the scene as a cavalry charge. On the other hand, we do have a description of Constantius being besieged in Langres, probably in 298. In the course of the surprise raid by the Allemani, Constantius slaughtered 60,000 of the enemy and chased the remainder across the Rhine. Both the description of the panegyric and this sculptural panel are probably examples of generic Tetrarchic military propaganda, rather than depictions of historical events.

2. Capture of the Persian Harem

In the centre of the plaque a group of Persian men and women are attacked from both sides by Roman cavalry. The female enthroned in the centre has been identified as the Persian queen Arsane, and the scene is consequently regarded as the capture Narses’ Harem early in the

335 Laubscher 1975, 27.
336 As for instance in the later niche carvings in the cave of Taq-i-Bustan. Ghirshman 1962, 193-201; Erdmann 1969, plates 7 and 8; Laubscher 1975, 28, His footnote 142 gives further examples.
337 Laubscher 1975, 28.
338 Pond Rothman 1977, 432.
339 Eutr., 9.23 and Pan. Lat. 6.42 and 6.3; Williams 1985, 94.
campaign. Though the enthroned figure is mostly destroyed, the remaining traces suggest a female wearing a tiara. She is larger than the other figures in the scene and is flanked by two women also wearing tiaras. To the left of the group, again identified by his size, is Galerius himself. He rears up on his horse and points his spear downward at the Persians. Comparisons have been made between this depiction of the emperor and a copper medallion of Siscia that almost certainly depicts the same event (chap. 3.8).

3. Following the Persians across the Tigris river.

This relief is very badly damaged. There is an outline of a figure at the far left of the panel who sits on traces of a rocky grotto. The figure is identified as the river god of the Tigris by the nearby inscription: POTAMOC TIGRIC – “the river Tigris.” A group of Persians, almost totally lost, flee towards the god in the centre of the relief. Behind them the remains of Roman cavalry are in pursuit, and they are wearing the pileus pannonicus. The Romans are similarly dressed in panel 13, the camel tribute scene. The relief seems to have been intended to indicate that Galerius’ campaign focused on pushing the Persians back into their own territory. Once again, an exact historical event is not commemorated.

4. Obliterated panel

341 Laubscher 1975, 28-29.
342 Laubscher 1975, 29.
344 Laubscher 1975, 30.
345 Laubscher 1975, 30, note 153. See section on Tetrarchic dress in Discussion and Conclusions (chap. 9).
Only a short fragment of the left end of the panel survives, and it is badly worn. The remaining traces suggest that the scene belongs to the procession of animal booty that decorates all of the bottom panels around the north tier.\textsuperscript{347}

![Fig. 34. Panel 5 (above): Battle Scene, and Panel 6 (below): Barbarian Migration Scene. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 14.1)](image)

5. \textit{Battle of Romans and Persians}

This is one of the better preserved panels of the monument. The Roman forces on the left meet the Persian forces on the right. Both groups are a mixture of mounted and un-mounted figures. At the far left, behind the Persian army and seemingly unconnected to the main scene, is a seated figure facing left with a bare upper torso. Two animals are paratactically laid out, one above the

\textsuperscript{347} Laubscher 1975, 31; Pond Rothmann 1977, 432.
other. Water flows beneath the seated figure, and a now lost inscription once identified him as a river god. Identifying inscriptions are unusual in triumphal monuments of the west, but are known on other eastern monuments such as the personifications in the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias. This rustic scene is separated from the central action by a plain vertical line.

Five mounted soldiers follow a charging Galerius. As usual, Galerius is larger than the rest of his army, and he wears a cuirass and a helmet with neck protection. His horse rears up and his cloak billows behind him. Below him lie the bodies of horses and slaughtered Persians. The front line of the Persian army is represented by soldiers with rectangular shields, and behind them are Persian cavalry. This depiction of Galerius on a rearing charger is the same as in panel 2, and on the medallion of Siscia with the legend VICTORIA PERSE (chap. 2.8).

A quadriga pulled by elephants is entering the scene from the far right. The elephants, which are ridden by three drivers in Persian dress, are drastically out of scale, and even smaller than the horses around them. Within the chariot is a badly damaged female figure wearing robes and a tiara. The side of the quadriga is decorated with three nude male figures, although only a fragment of one leg survives. They are probably images from Roman rather than Persian iconography, but their precise attribution is difficult. The interpretation of the elephant quadriga has been controversial. Laubscher suggests it is the personification of Persia aiding the

---

348 Laubscher 1975, 32, note 155. The fragmentary inscription was recorded by Schoenebeck but had worn off by 1975.
349 The inscriptions on the reliefs were intended to allow the builders to place each personification in its correct spot within the two porticoes of the building. Inscribed bases, on the other hand, identified the personifications for the viewer: Smith 1990, 94.
350 Laubscher 1975, 34. They may represent the three Fates or Muses.
Persian army.\textsuperscript{351} Pond Rothmann disagrees and argues that the use of a deity aiding the enemy goes against the overall theme of Tetrarchic power found throughout the monument. She proposes instead that it is a triumphal quadriga that is intended to add emphasis to the victory and power of the emperor.\textsuperscript{352} She identifies this panel as the final decisive battle of the campaign.\textsuperscript{353} But this does not explain the entrance of the quadriga on the Persian side of the panel, nor the fact that it is driven by three Persians. Is it possible that the figure in the quadriga represents Arsane, and the bearded male next to her Narses?

6. Barbarian Migration and Submission

A procession of captives emerges from a crenellated city representation in the far right of the relief.\textsuperscript{354} It is possible that this is the same city gate represented in panel 1.\textsuperscript{355} A dromedary laden with women and children is the first to leave the gate. Towards the front of the procession Persian males bow in submission. The very last part of the panel on the far left, where the emperor Galerius presumably stood receiving the captives, is missing.

![Fig. 35. Panel 7: Adventus Scene. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 22)](image)

\textsuperscript{351} Laubscher 1975, 34.
\textsuperscript{352} Pond Rothmann 1977, 436.
\textsuperscript{353} Pond Rothmann 1975, 432 and 436.
\textsuperscript{354} Laubscher 1975, 34-36; Pond Rothmann 1977, 437.
\textsuperscript{355} Pond Rothmann 1977, 437.
7. Adventus Scene

A series of badly worn, robed figures are seen on the far right of the relief. They are raising their right hands as if in acclamation. In front of them, in the middle of the scene, a quadriga approaches. The body of the occupant and most of the quadriga itself have been obliterated, but the size of the remaining outline and his dominant position indicate that it is the emperor Galerius. In the lower left a reclining river personification was probably accompanied by a now lost inscription that allowed the location to be identified.\footnote{Pond Rothmann 1977, 437.} It has been proposed that the figure in the quadriga was Diocletian, and that the scene is his arrival at Nisibis, but there is no reason to believe this is so.\footnote{Laubscher 1975, 38; Pond Rothmann 1977, 437. The idea was that of Schönebeck 1937, 362.} One would expect to see an equally prominent depiction of Galerius if this were the case.

8. Parade of Animals

As with panel 4, the panel shows a line of animals that represent booty from the Persian campaign.
Panels 9 and 10: Two Scenes of Clementia Augusti

The two scenes are virtually mirror images of one another. In no. 9 Galerius sits on the left of the panel on a portable military chair or *sella castrensis*.

His figure is almost entirely destroyed, although traces of his forehead, with its brow lines and hair, remain. He is surrounded by his bodyguards, the presence of whom is a new trait in late antique imperial art. A Persian in front of Galerius is in the act of kneeling, and he is followed by a train of Persians who are led by Roman soldiers. Two of the Persians bring their children with them. Such *clementia* scenes are common on battle sarcophagi of the second and third century A.D., though these usually depict only one barbarian. Group clementia scenes are also known on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius.

---

358 Laubscher 1975, 39.
359 Laubscher 1975, 41.
360 Laubscher 1975, 40. For example the *clementia* sarcophagi in the Vatican, and the Marriage Sarcophagus in Mantua in the Palazzo Ducale; Kleiner 1992, 302-304, nos. 269, 270 and 271. See also the upper scene on the lead medallion from Lyon, 29.
Panel 10 is almost identical except that the emperor is seated on the right hand side of the panel and the procession approaches from the left. The left half of the frieze is destroyed and only the front end of the procession of prisoners survives. The emperor himself is mostly missing.

It is generally thought that the repetition of the same scene indicates that the Persian prisoners were brought in front of both Galerius and Diocletian. But if this is the case, it is odd that there is no small iconographical detail to make a distinction between the representation of an Augustus and a Caesar. Laubscher suggested that the lost portraits might have enabled a distinction to be made. But given the nature of Tetrarchic portraiture, this seems unlikely. It is possible that the duplication of the scene was simply intended to show the large volume of prisoners who were brought low before the emperor.

11. Personifications of Cities

The right half of the scene is lost and the remaining piece is damaged. Female figures stand in two rows and face the left. The attributes, sceptres and cornucopiae held by the remaining forms suggest that they are personifications of Persian cities paying tribute to a now lost figure of the

---

361 Laubscher 1975, 42; Pond Rothmann 1977, 437.
362 Laubscher 1975, 42.
emperor.\textsuperscript{363} The emperor seems to appear in every other panel on the monument, except the bottom friezes; it therefore seems unlikely that he would not have been shown here as well.\textsuperscript{364}

12. Parade of Animals

Only traces of hooves and a few animal forms remain, but the panel would have fit in with the procession panels (nos. 4, 8, 12 and 14) that appear on the bottom of this pillar.

13. Three dromedaries

As with the next frieze, no. 14, this panel covered the inside section of the pier that was under the \textit{stoa} flanking the via Egnatia. A line of four camels and their drivers moves from the right to left hand sides of the scene. The drivers are wearing the \textit{pileus pannonicus}, identifying them as Romans, and the camels are laden with sacks.\textsuperscript{365}

14. Parade of Animals

Only the right hand corner piece of the scene remains and it is badly damaged. An animal form, possibly an ox, shows that the panel was one of the procession of booty scenes that were employed on the bottom panels of this pier. These last two processional and ideologically insignificant scenes, nos. 13 and 14, were intentionally placed on this little viewed side of the pier.

\textsuperscript{363} Laubscher 1975, 43.
\textsuperscript{364} Pond Rothmann 1977, 437.
\textsuperscript{365} Laubscher 1975, 44; Pond Rothmann 1977, 439.
15. The Adlocutio of Galerius

Galerius is easily found here. He stands in the centre on a garlanded platform with his right arm on his chest and his left extended in an *adlocutio* gesture. He is in three quarter profile turning slightly to his left. He wears a *tunica* and *paludamentum* fastened by a round *fibula* on his right shoulder. In his extended right hand is a papyrus.

To the viewer’s right a group of armed soldiers stand listening to him; they are carrying spears, shields, banners and *vexilla*. The shield of a soldier leading a horse on the left was once decorated with a lion, but it is now lost. Similarly, the shield of a soldier at the back of the crowd bears an eagle with thunderbolts in its talons. These attributes have led to a number of different proposals as to the identity of the soldiers or their legions, but they are too generic to provide conclusive evidence. One might imagine the lion representing the western Herculean soldiers, and the eagle, the Jovians, but they could equally be mere decoration. Illustrations of shields belonging to particular units of soldiers from a Carolingian manuscript of the *Notitia*

---

366 On the *adlocutio* gesture, both here and elsewhere in the late antique, see Brilliant 1963, 165-170.
367 Laubscher 1975, 45; Pond Rothmann 1977, 439.
368 Laubscher 1975, 45 note 215. A plaster replica of the lion has also fallen off.
369 Laubscher 1975, 48 and note 222. Kinch (1890, 17) suggested Legio V Macedonia and XIII *gemina* since both were stationed in Macedonia.
Dignitatum do not seem to match the emblems that appear here. At the back of this group of soldiers and at the far right of the scene is a Corinthian column. Behind the column stands a winged Victoria-Felicitas with a cornucopia in a conch-shell niche.

Armoured soldiers emerge from a city gate on the left. One of them holds the reins of a drastically oversized horse. The size of the horse, far larger than those on the right hand side, as well as its ornamentation suggest it is the imperial mount being led to its master. Once again banners (dracones) and vexilla are carried by the soldiers. The two groups of soldiers on either side of Galerius are intentionally smaller than he in order to highlight his importance. The three rows on either side of Galerius are particularly effective at this. The two in the third row both bear spears that frame Galerius’ head.

On the far left, behind the city, a female personification sits in a mountainous setting. She holds a heart-shaped leaf in her right hand. This has been likened to a similar, and also unidentified personification in the late Hellenistic reliefs from the Temple of Hekate at Lagina in Caria. Doubtless the identification of this figure would indicate the setting of the scene and the identity of the city next to her. Many scholars have proposed that the scene represents Galerius’ address to his troops in Serdica before the second Persian campaign. But the scene could equally represent the post battle speech of the emperor in praise of his troops. Such scenes are well known from the Columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius as well as the Arch of Septimius

---

370 Grigg 1983, 134.
372 Laubscher 1975, 46.
373 Laubscher 1975, 48.
374 Laubscher 1975, 47. For the relief sculpture at Lagina see Ridgeway 1990, v. 2, 111-115.
375 Laubscher 1975, 48 and note 224.
Severus, where *adlocutio* scenes follow battles.\textsuperscript{376} If this is correct, then perhaps Galerius’ horse is being brought forth for a victorious parade rather than the setting out of a campaign. The fact that the soldiers are still armed with helmets rather than *pilei pannonici* seems to suggest that action is near at hand.

![Image](image-url)

**Fig. 39. Panel 16: Galerius Receives a Persian Delegation. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 31)**

16. *Galerius Receives a Persian Delegation*

Galerius stands at the far left of the panel. In front of him are two kneeling figures. Galerius is flanked by two of his bodyguards who are armed with spears and shields and look towards him. The shield of one is decorated with a figure of a semi-nude Hercules draped in his lion skin and holding his club. A row of Persian figures with Phrygian caps kneel in front of Galerius with their arms raised in a beseeching gesture that is also known on Sassanian rock carvings.\textsuperscript{377} Behind the kneeling Persians, on the far right side of the panel, stand more Roman soldiers. On the bottom of the shield of the last soldier is the emblem of the wolf suckling Romulus and Remus.

To the right of this last soldier stand five draped female figures. The first, and most prominent of the five, wears a *chiton* that leaves her right breast exposed. Von Schönenbeck has suggested

\textsuperscript{376} Pond Rothmann 1977, 439.

\textsuperscript{377} Laubscher 1975, 51. Thus Gordian III, Philip the Arab and Valerian prostrate themselves in front of Shapur I in relief carvings at Bishapur and Naqš-i-Rustam, see Ghirshman 1962, 152-160 and Ricciardi 2003.
that this is the *genius* of the Roman army, but this is difficult to accept as the figure holds no cornucopia.\(^{378}\) Moreover, *genii* are usually male. Virtus or Roma are possibilities, but, because the four women wear crenellated crowns, it is generally agreed that the four female figures behind this scene are city or country personifications.\(^{379}\) Since the figures are four in number, the Tetrarchic capitals and imperial residences are a good possibility.\(^{380}\) The kneeling personification at the bottom right of this relief, with her mural crown removed and placed on her knee, is probably a representation of *Persia Devicta*. A similar motif is used for Parthia on the arch of Septimius Severus in Rome, and the same kneeling figure appears in the Siscia medallion of Galerius (chap. no. 2.8).\(^{381}\)

![Fig. 40. Detail of Panel 16. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 36)](image)

This panel also contains the best preserved head of Galerius. Though Galerius’ body is mostly lost, the top of his cloak and round *fibula* on his right shoulder are preserved. The head was

---

\(^{378}\) Von Schönebeck 1933, 37; Laubscher 1975, 51.

\(^{379}\) Laubscher 1975, 51-52; Pond Rothmann 1977, 440.

\(^{380}\) Laubscher 1975, 52.

\(^{381}\) Laubscher 1975, 52.
missing in 1937, but von Shoenebeck, amazingly, found it in Berlin, where it had been donated to the museum in 1856 by a certain von Gerhard. According to the museum’s records, von Gerhard claimed to have found the head at the foot of the arch. A plaster copy of the bust was made, and found to fit perfectly on the arch where it is now installed. The original head is now lost.\textsuperscript{382} The head is carved in the typical severe Tetrarchic cubic style. Galerius’ brow is furrowed and his beard and hair clipped short. His eyes are large and oval.

The subject of the panel is universally recognized as Galerius’ reception of the embassy led by Apharban in the winter of 298.\textsuperscript{383} The aim of the embassy was to negotiate a close to the war and to secure the return of the captured harem. It seems likely that the initial negotiations were begun by Galerius and completed with Diocletian at Nisibis in the Spring of 299.

![Fig. 41. Panel 17: Sacrifice by Galerius and Diocletian. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 40.1)](image)

17. **Sacrifice by Galerius and Diocletian**

This well preserved panel shows one of the most well known scenes from Tetrarchic art. It is unsure if the scene is meant to be set in Antioch prior to the campaign or after the end of the

---

\textsuperscript{382} Laubscher 1975, 49 and footnote 226.

\textsuperscript{383} Laubscher 1975, 51; Kinch 1890, 31ff.
Laubscher preferred to interpret the scene as one of thanksgiving at Antioch because of the personifications employed. Pond Rothmann, however, observes that this sort of arcaded background was common in late antiquity, and is even found in a similar scene on a medallion of Constantius Chlorus. Kinch would have preferred to see this as Antioch and the architectural arcade in the background as representative of Diocletian’s palace there. But the columns could simply represent the colonnaded streets of an eastern city. The altar itself bears frontal representations of an enthroned Jupiter and Hercules.

Galerius stands on the right side of the altar. He is dressed in battle gear, a cloak, tunic and a cuirass decorated with a square pattern in the centre. The straps supporting his cloak and armour are decorated with floral motifs. His cloak is folded over his empty left hand, which extends out to the viewer. His right arm is extended over the altar and holds a *patera*, from which he is pouring a libation. The remaining traces of the head indicate that it was frontal. On the left hand side of the altar and directly across from Galerius stands Diocletian. He is dressed in civilian clothing, a tunic, and a heavy mantle with decorated edges. He looks toward the altar and extends his left hand. Though the forearm is missing, it probably contained a *patera* to match that of Galerius. The left hand holds the remains of a papyrus.

Between the two emperors are two female figures wearing *chitons* and mantles. The one on the right, nearest Galerius, wears a diadem and has her arm around the shoulders of the figure on the

---

384 Pond Rothmann 1977, 441.
385 Laubscher 1975, 57.
386 Pond Rothmann 1977, 442. The medallion is Toynbee 1986, pl. VIII, n. 8.
387 Kinch 1890, 30.
388 Laubscher 1975, 53.
389 Laubscher 1975, 53.
left. The head of this latter figure is covered by her mantle, which she pulls with her left arm. Traces of an inscription above the head of this second figure read: [ OYMEN] and allow the figure to be identified as Oikoumene. Thus, the figure next to her is almost certainly Homonoia, who appears on late antique sarcophagi in depictions of a marital dextrarum iunctio. Similarly, Fausta is depicted as Concordia between a sacrificing Crispus and Constantius II on a gold medallion of Trier. Another female figure to the right of Galerius, wearing a chiton, is also identified by the partial inscription [ IRHN] as Eirene. The presence of the personification of peace is a good reason to think the scene represents a sacrifice at the end of the campaign. Moving to the right, a second female figure stands to the right of Eirene. She wears a peplos with one breast exposed. She reaches behind her and pulls the nose ring of an enormous bull whose large head can be seen in three-quarter profile.

Fig. 42. Detail of Panel 17: Diocletian and Galerius at the Altar. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 40.2)

To the left of Diocletian stands a semi-nude figure holding a staff. The arch around him contains small details of a crab, a lion, and twins: signs of the Zodiac. The use of these zodiac signs

---

392 Laubscher 1975, 54.
allows the figure to be identified as Aion, the time god, rather than Jupiter.\textsuperscript{393} The earlier interpretation of the figure as Jupiter had lead to the idea that Galerius was making a vow to Diocletian in place of Jupiter.\textsuperscript{394} But this would go against Tetrarchic principles of equality, even if the figure were Jupiter. Two \textit{camilli} dressed in tunics stand behind Aion watching the sacrifice.

On the far sides of the panel are statues of winged victories mounted on pedestals. At the base of each pedestal is a shield. The decoration of both shields features eagles with thunderbolts that face the central scene.

18. \textit{Procession of Persian Tribute}

A group of Persians with elephants bearing booty, and captive lions, exit from a city full of Persians on the far right side of the panel. One of the Persians standing under the arched city gate may represent Narses sending gifts to the Romans as reparation and payment for the return of the Harem.\textsuperscript{395} The extreme left piece has been broken. Such processions of gifts to the victor by the vanquished are also known on Sassanian rock art and other ancient eastern monuments.\textsuperscript{396} There does not appear to be any imperial representation here, and it seems unlikely that a figure of Galerius was present in the missing piece at the left end.

\textsuperscript{393} Laubscher 1975, 55; Pond Rothmann 1975, 441. For similar depictions of Aion in the Zodiac see LIMC I.399-411 \textit{s.v. Aion} (Le Glay) nos. 11, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 20.

\textsuperscript{394} Kinch (1890, 36) identifies the god as Jupiter. Ryberg (1955, 139f.) identifies the scene as a \textit{nuncupatio vOTORum} of Galerius to Diocletian.

\textsuperscript{395} Laubscher 1975, 59.

\textsuperscript{396} Laubscher 1975, 60. For instance there is a procession of tribute in the rock reliefs at Bishapur celebrating the triumph of Shapur II over the Kushans: Ghirshman 1962, 184-185.
19. Adventus / Profectio Scene

The central scene is framed by two figures of Victoria-Felicitas in conch shell niches behind Corinthian pillars. The emperor can clearly be identified as the figure in the throne-like wagon in the middle of the panel, although the head is completely obliterated. The throne is decorated with intertwining patterns, and the base of the wagon with acanthus leaves. The emperor faces the viewer in three-quarter view and, as usual, is over-life size in relation to the surrounding figures. His left arm is folded over his chest as in the adlocutio scene, (panel 15) and the missing right forearm that extends from his mantle probably rested on his left knee. It may have held a globe or a sceptre. Two riders behind the horses of the wagon look back at the emperor. The features and curly hair of the first of these suggest that he is an African.\(^\text{397}\) Spears of the surrounding crowd touch the top of the panel and frame the emperor’s head. A tiny driver can be seen at the emperor’s feet. In front and behind the wagon are rows of galloping horsemen.

\(^{397}\) Laubscher 1975, 62-3.
At the far left is a city with a soldier looking out of the gate at the departing procession. The destination of the procession seems to be the city depicted on the far right end of the scene. Men are coming out of this city gate raising their hands in greeting to the advancing emperor. Two *vexilla* extend above the welcoming crowd. At the back of the city is a temple with open doors and the cult statue within. It is a goddess wearing a *chiton* and mantle. Her right arm is stretched out in a blessing gesture, while her left holds a now indistinguishable attribute.\(^{398}\)

Kinch proposed that the deity in the temple was Anaitis, and the scene was Galerius’ arrival in the Armenian city of Eriza.\(^{399}\) Laubscher, on the other hand, proposed that the obscure attribute is a *globus* and that a radiate crown is now lost. He thus identifies the cult statue as Sol Invictus. We know that there was a temple of Sol Invictus in Salonica, and it is possible that Galerius may have tried to connect himself with this god.\(^{400}\) The identification of the figure as Sol Invictus seems unlikely, though, as the figure is dressed in a mantle as well as a *chiton*, and Sol is

\(^{398}\) Laubscher 1975, 63.
\(^{399}\) Kinch 1890, 21.
\(^{400}\) Laubscher 1975, 64.
typically shown with only the *chiton*. Pond Rothmann is perhaps correct in her admission that the deity cannot be identified with any certainty.\textsuperscript{401}

As always, it is probably unwise to attempt a historical interpretation of the scene. The voyage of Diocletian from Egypt to Nisibis is tempting, but if that were the case, one would expect to see a figure of Galerius welcoming him. It is more likely that this is simply a generic depiction of the travelling Tetrarch and the *adventus* ceremony of the late antique.

\textbf{Fig. 45. Panel 20: The combat between Galerius and Narses. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 46)}

\textit{20. Battle Between Galerius and Narses}

At the far left of the scene two prisoners, one male and one female, sit back to back on a rock. A soldier directly above them carries a shield with a depiction of Hercules on it. The bottom of the entire scene is crowded with the bodies of dead or dying Persians who are being trampled by the larger Roman soldiers above them.

One soldier stands out prominently on the left side of the scene. He wears the usual cuirass of the Roman troops and carries a round shield. On his head is an Attic helmet with a long plume.\textsuperscript{402}

\textsuperscript{401} Pond Rothmann 1977, 442.
The breast plate is marked with a square pattern in the centre, like that of Galerius in panel 17. He probably held a spear that is now missing, as are his forearms.\(^{403}\)

Galerius is shown bare headed in the centre, mounted on a rearing horse. His cuirass is decorated in the centre with a *Lupercal* (Romulus and Remus under the she-wolf).\(^{404}\) His cloak is attached at the left shoulder by a round *fibula*. Both head and body turn in three-quarter profile, but the head is lost. Galerius is in the action of stabbing Narses with his lance, which was probably a metal attachment and is now gone. Above, contained in the upper edge decoration, is an eagle holding a crown in its talons over Galerius’ head. A similar motif probably appeared above the heads of the Tetrarchs in the central niche at Luxor (chap. 7).

Narses is shown mounted across from Galerius and receiving a blow from Galerius. He is curly haired, bearded and dressed in typical Persian style in a tunic with decorated borders, a Phrygian cap, trousers and shoes. The usual identification of the figure as Narses could be confirmed if the figure’s head gear could be identified as one of the elaborate Sassanian crowns, but unfortunately the damage does not allow this.\(^{405}\) Narse’s right hand grasps at the point of Galerius’ spear which is imbedded in his left arm. Narses’ horse rears up like that of Galerius and the two mounted figures create a triangle that dominates the centre of the scene. There was no historical encounter between Narses and Galerius during the campaign, but such historical fictional combats between Roman emperors and Persian leaders are known elsewhere, such as

---

\(^{402}\) Laubscher 1975, 65.
\(^{403}\) Laubscher 1975, 66.
\(^{404}\) Laubscher 1975, 66.
\(^{405}\) Laubscher 1975, 68. Sassanian crowns were unique to each successive member of the dynasty, and are an easy way of identifying the various rulers. See Göbl 1971, 12-13.
on the Paris Cameo (depicting Valerian and Shapur I), and in Sassanian rock art, where we also find images of Valerian fighting Shapur I.\footnote{Pond Rothmann 1977, 442; Laubscher 1975, 68-69. For the Paris Cameo see Ghirshman 1962: 152, fig. 195. Strikingly similar is the scene of Ardashir I (A.D. 224-241) unseating the Parthian grand vizeer in the rock carvings at Firuzabad: Ghirshman 1962, 127-131. A rock carving at Narqsh-i-Rustam shows Hormizd II knocking an opponent of his horse with a lance: Ghirshman 1962, 177-178.} 

Fig. 46. Detail of panel 20, the combat of Galerius and Narses. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 52.) Below the hooves of both horses a young beardless Persian is crouching, looking up at Galerius and drawing his sword. Next to him an older bearded Persian is in the act of stabbing his sword into his own chest, thereby recalling the old motif of the noble savage.\footnote{Laubscher 1975, 67. The motif has a long history, prominent examples include the Gaul killing himself and his wife, from the Gallic victory monument of Attalos I Pergamon, datable to the 220’s B.C. (Smith 1991, 99-102, fig. 118) and the representation of the Dacian king Decebalus killing himself on Trajan’s column (Coarelli 2000, 210, pl. 171). A more pertinent example on Trajan’s column is a Dacian warrior who kills himself in a battle being lost to the Romans: Coarelli, 2000, 215, pl. 166.} To the right of the central scene a large Roman soldier stands on the back of a grovelling Persian with his left arm raised over his head. In front of him a horse rears up. It is pulling a chariot in which a Victory was probably riding, but the extreme right end is badly damaged, and today it can only be said that the occupant was female.\footnote{Laubscher 1975, 69.} It is decidedly odd that the triumphal chariot and Victory were placed on the Persian side of the relief.
21. The Tetrarchs Enthroned

This is the most static scene of all the surviving depictions and at the same time the most complicated. It is without doubt the most famous panel of the entire monument. It is not concerned with the Persian campaign but rather presents a synopsis of the Tetrarchic form of government. The panel receives extra attention in Laubscher’s descriptions of the arch and has been the subject of an entire article by Pond Rothmann.409

The two central figures of the frieze are the enthroned Augusti Diocletian and Maximian who face the viewer. The legs of both figures are placed one before the other, and their feet rest on two velificans busts below.410 Both Augusti are being crowned by small winged victories which hover on either side of their heads.

The enthroned figure on the left holds a long sceptre in his left hand. It is all lost save for the point, which extends into the top frame of the frieze, and a trace of the lower end at the bottom. He probably held a globe in his right hand, but there are no traces left. The figure wears a long

---

410 Laubscher 1975, 70.
sleeved shirt under a short sleeved tunic. On his waist is a decorated belt, and a mantle draped over his left shoulder is fastened with a round fibula on his right shoulder. Traces of the otherwise obliterated bust suggest that he was bearded.411 The long staff in this figure’s hand gives him a dominant position in the scene and allows him to be identified as Diocletian.412 Similarly, the figure on the right holds a shorter sceptre in his left hand and probably once held a globe in his right. Unlike Diocletian, the traces of the head suggest he is beardless or had a very short beard.413 He wears the same clothes as Diocletian including the mantle draped over his left shoulder and fastened with a round fibula on his right. In spite of the lack of a beard, there can be no doubt that the figure represents Maximian.414

On either side of the two Augusti stand their respective Caesars. Galerius, on the left, next to Diocletian, and Constantius Chlorus on the right, next to Maximian.415 Their clothing is identical to that of the Augusti. Both are in the act of raising a kneeling female figure. Constantius, on the left, stretches out his left hand; Galerius, his right. The kneeling figures are dressed in chitons and mantles which are pulled over their heads. They grasp the extended hands of the Caesars with their right hands. The left figure is somewhat damaged, but the right one is wearing a mural crown. Thus we can recognize the figures as provincial or civic personifications, and they are almost certainly representations of Britain and Syria, the two most recently redeemed provinces.416 Faint traces of a crouching figure, with remains of a Phrygian cap, can be seen at

411 Laubscher 1975, 69.
412 Laubscher 1975, 72; Pond Rothman 1975, 22.
413 Laubscher 1975, 70.
414 Laubscher 1975, 72.
415 Laubscher 1975, 72.
416 Pond Rothmann 1975, 22; Laubscher 1975, 74. Britannia is LIMC III.167-169 s.v. Britannia (Henig), no. 4. For Syria, see LIMC VII.830-831 s.v. Syria (Balty).
the feet of Galerius. This figure is the only reference to the Persian campaign in the entire panel.\footnote{Laubscher 1975, 22.}
On both sides of the Tetrarchs are crowded groups of personifications and divinities. The line drawing on the next page is meant to help the reader in the following descriptions of the figures. To the left of Galerius there is a draped male figure with a medallion on his chest and a modius on his head. The figure has been identified as Serapis by both Pond Rothmann and Laubscher.\textsuperscript{418} The presence of Serapis, who was considered equal to Jupiter, is appropriate to the side of the panel with Diocletian ("Jovius") and Galerius who were the Tetrarchs of the East.\textsuperscript{419} Pond Rothmann has also suggested that this is a syncretic Serapis/Sol Invictus, because Galerius had an interest in the latter as demonstrated by coin types.\textsuperscript{420} Though it is hard to tell from photographs, the figure seems to wear a Phrygian cap, rather than a modius. This would not be appropriate for Sol Invictus who usually wears a radiate crown. Mithras, with his Phrygian cap, is a more likely possibility, but the god is virtually unknown outside of exclusively Mithraic art. Perhaps the deity intended will never be known. Serapis is not a bad bet though, given the proximity of Diocletian.

To the left of Serapis, a male figure protrudes above the kneeling figure of Syria. He wears a pointed cap surmounted with a crescent moon. This figure, and another on the other side of the

\textsuperscript{418} Pond Rothmann 1975, 23-24; Laubscher 1975, 73. For Serapis see LIMC VII.666-692 s.v. Sarapis (Clerc and Leclant).
\textsuperscript{419} Pond Rothmann 1975, 24.
\textsuperscript{420} Pond Rothmann 1975, 23.
panel, has been identified as a Dioscurus. The horses nearby have been connected to these two. Oddly, the horses, attributes of the Dioscuri, are being led in by two other more prominent figures rather than by the twins themselves, as they usually are in Roman art (as for instance on the column of the Fünfsäulendenkmal (chap. 5.1). On the left, a figure dressed as an Amazon, with a robe that leaves the right breast exposed, is carrying a tropaion over her left shoulder. She wears an Attic helmet and has a sword hung at her left side. She is looking back at the horse she is leading. Both Pond Rothmann and Laubscher identify this figure as Virtus. Behind the horse are a few tiny traces of a standing figure that include a hand and perhaps a cornucopia. Pond Rothmann, identifying some of the traces as a sistrum, has identified this figure as Isis, but it seems to me that too little of the figure survives to make any attempt at identification.

One the right side of the seated Tetrarchs we see a semi-nude figure covered by a chiton and holding a staff. The head is badly damaged but wears a modius like the Serapis figure on the left side to whom this figure is a parallel. It is generally thought this is Jupiter, though von Schönbeck thought the figure was Sol Invictus. Von Schönbeck’s interpretation seems more convincing to me if Serapis is being used as an equivalent of Jupiter on the left side. Moreover, Jupiter, unlike Serapis, was never depicted with an upturned modius. Behind Jupiter is the second Dioscorus, less visible than his brother on the left side. Next comes a male figure, a

---

422 Laubscher 1975, 71.
424 Laubscher 1975, 72. I have not been able to find photographs that show these details sufficiently to be able to make any observations of my own.
426 In an unpublished manuscript, Laubscher 1975, 73 note 346.
427 See LIMC 8.310-470 s.v. Zeus (Conciani and Constantini). Depictions of Jupiter as Serapis include a modius, e.g. LIMC 8.444 s.v. Zeus (Conciani and Constantini) nos. 274 and 274; and Jupiter Dolichenus is usually represented with a Phrygian cap, LIMC 8.471-478 s.v Zeus/Jupiter Dolichenus (Volkommer); but both versions of the deity are bearded.
counterpart to Virtus on the left. The figure has been identified as Honos by Pond Rothmann and as Mars (having “overtaken” the place of Honos) by Laubscher. Unlike Virtus, Honos wears a breastplate with a square pattern, but like Virtus he carries a *tropaion* and looks back at a horse he is leading. The fact that the horses, properly attributes of the Dioscuri, are being led by these two personifications has caused some debate. Pond Rothmann suggests that the exact identities of all the figures were simply not understood by the artist. It is also possible that artistic and ideological considerations required the horses to be placed further away from the imperial scene than the two representations of Virtus and Honos. A female figure at the far right is positioned such that she may have had her right hand on a rudder and held a cornucopia in her left. This figure has been identified as Fortuna by both Pond Rothmann and Laubscher.

Geographical personifications fill the bottom two corners of the panel. In the left corner is a depiction of Oceanus leaning backwards with Thalassa holding a cornucopia at his knees. In the right hand corner are Tellus and the Putti. The group calls to mind a similar representation on the east front of the Ara Pacis in Rome. The figures in scalloped shell niches under the feet of the two *Augusti* are more problematic. One is clearly male, the other female. The male figure is identified as Coelus by both Pond Rothmann and Laubscher. But the identity of the female is more elusive. As a counterpart to the heavens, one would expect Gaia, but she already appears in the right hand corner of the relief. For this reason, and because she appears in panel 17 dressed in a similar mantle and labelled, Laubscher identifies the bust as Oikoumene.

---

428 Pond Rothmann 1975, 24; Laubscher 1975, 73.
429 Pond Rothmann 1975, 27.
430 Pond Rothmann 1975, 25; Laubscher 1975, 73.
431 Pond Rothmann 1975, 25.
432 See La Rocca 1983, 45.
433 Pond Rothmann 1975, 25; Laubscher 1975, 75.
434 Laubscher 1975, 76.
22. Procession of victories with statuettes

The panel shows a row of seven winged victories standing in scallop shell niches, or perhaps the colonnaded sidewalk of a street. The capitals of the columns between the individual niches are so damaged as to be unrecognizable, but three of the columns on the far left seem to support small figures. The first and third are damaged beyond recognition, but the second was seen by Laubscher as a dancing figure with a *thyrsos*. Laubscher imagined the three figures as relief decoration on the columns, but the single line below each of them suggests that they represent small statues supported by ledges just like the Venetian and Vatican porphyry Tetrarchs.

The victories face the right and each wears a *peplos* that is draped so as to leave one breast exposed. All of the figures carry a long staff or sceptre in their left arms and small statuettes in their extended right hands. The identification of the statuettes is problematic. They may represent gods of the army or the seven planets. Pond Rothman prefers the latter identification and sees a Mithraic aspect to the use of the seven planets. Given the statuettes’ poor state of preservation, any of these interpretations is possible.

---

435 Laubscher 1975, 79.
436 See chap. 3.1 and 3.2.
437 Laubscher 1975, 79.
438 Pond Rothmann 1977, 444.
Fig. 49. Panel 23: Presentation of the Quadriga of Elephants. (After Pond Rothman 1977, 445 figure 25)

23. Presentation of the Quadriga of Elephants

On the left side of this panel there is a depiction of Victoria-Felicitas with a cornucopia, as she is shown in panels 15 and 19. The figure is separated from the central scene by a column and stands inside a conch shell niche. This detail and the glimpses of a colonnade in the background of the entire scene suggest a city or palace setting.

Directly to the right of the pillar and seated on a throne is Galerius. His head is completely obliterated but his clothing is well-preserved. He wears a short sleeved tunic, trousers, campagi and a chlamys that is fastened by a round fibula on his right shoulder. Galerius holds a long sceptre in his raised left hand. It is possible that the broken right arm once contained a globus.439

To the right of Galerius is a winged victory wearing a necklace and a peplos, with her left leg and right breast exposed. Her left hand, now lost, may once have contained a palm leaf, but her right is clearly in the act of placing a wreath on the head of Galerius.440

On the right side of the relief, a quadriga drawn by elephants is being led into the scene by a female figure who stands between the two frontal elephants. The figure wears a long dress with her right breast exposed and a mantle that hangs down to her hips and her right knee. She is holding a round shield and a lance in her left hand. The figure is probably Virtus, but the use of a long dress and exposed breast is borrowed from the iconography of Roma.441 The chariot itself

439 Laubscher 1975, 81.
440 Laubscher 1975, 81.
441 Laubscher 1975, 82. For Virtus see LIMC VIII.273-281 s.v. Virtus (Ganschow), and for Roma LIMC VIII(suppl.) 1049-1068 s.v. Roma (Balestrazzi).
has been given oval wheels, but these appear round to the viewer below.\textsuperscript{442} Two winged victories advancing left with raised wreaths decorate the side of the chariot.

The use of an elephant drawn quadriga is a well known motif in Roman triumphal imagery with numerous precedents.\textsuperscript{443} A gold medallion of 287 (chap. 2.5) shows Diocletian and Maximian in just such a quadriga. Lactantius paints a picture of his friend Donatus riding a triumphal chariot of elephants over the Tetrarchs, who had martyred him.\textsuperscript{444} Gordian the Third was granted an elephant drawn quadriga by the Senate for his victory over the Persians.\textsuperscript{445} The scene in this panel is probably intended to represent the arrival of the quadriga which Galerius will board for a triumphal procession.

\textit{24. Battle between Romans and Persians}

The panel is so badly damaged that only the outlines of the figures are recognizable. There can be no doubt, though, that the large mounted figure in the centre of the panel is a depiction of Galerius. He is charging to the right with his horses’ front legs raised in the air. The majority of his body is lost, but we can make out his cuirass and flowing cloak and belt. As in panel 20 (the battle of Galerius and Narses), there are traces of an eagle in the decorative border above Galerius’ head.\textsuperscript{446}

The rest of the panel is a confusion of Roman soldiers and Persians. Throughout the entire panel, Persians, recognizable by their Phrygian caps, are shown collapsing on the floor or lying dead.

\textsuperscript{442} Laubscher 1975, 81.
\textsuperscript{443} Scullard 1974, 55ff.
\textsuperscript{444} Lactant. \textit{De Mort. Pers.} 16.6
\textsuperscript{445} SHA Gord. 27.9.
\textsuperscript{446} Laubscher 1975, 82
On the left side of the panel two Roman soldiers in cuirasses stand with their hands raised to strike the Persians beneath them. Again as in panel 20, there are dying Persians below Galerius’ horse. The far right of the panel is lost, but it may have contained similar scenes as on the left, or perhaps fleeing Persians.

This panel, titled “allegorical battle scene” by Laubscher, and “Virtus Augusti” by Rothman,\(^{447}\) is just that. As with the other scenes of battle on the Arch of Galerius there is no reason to connect the battle with any historical event. The panel merely seeks to show a set Tetrarchic scene and emphasize the heroic nature of the emperor and his personal participation in the fighting.

25. Procession of Prisoners

This panel is even more badly damaged than the one above it, yet the subject matter is still discernable. A procession of Roman soldiers is leading a group of Persian prisoners from the left side of the panel to the right. In the centre of the scene is a cart being pulled by donkeys. The occupants of the cart are two Persian women and a child. Two Persian men behind the cart seem to carry something, possibly offerings, in their arms.

The scene is usually, and probably correctly, interpreted as a procession of the Persian harem and prisoners of war.\(^ {448}\) Pond Rothman makes the important point that the scene is typical of Roman triumphal imagery and draws comparisons to depictions on the column of Marcus

\(^{447}\) Laubscher 1975, 26; Pond Rothman 1977, 445.

\(^{448}\) Laubscher 1975, 85 and von Schoenebeck 1937, 363.
Aurelius and the *pompa triumphalis* scenes on the arches of Trajan at Benevento and Septimius Severus in Rome.\textsuperscript{449}

26. *Roma and Victories*

The background of this panel, like that of panel 22, is an arcade of five conch shell niches. The panel is so badly damaged that very little detail can be discerned. The outer four niches probably contained identical depictions of Victory, who is best preserved on the left outside niche. She is winged and faces to the left. She raises her right arm and probably once held a wreath out in front of her.\textsuperscript{450} The damaged bodies were probably covered by long dresses, but it is impossible to tell for sure.

The central panel contains an unusual scene. A seated figure with traces of a helmet holds her left arm under her robe and a long sceptre in her right hand. Kinch identified the round object on which the figure sits as a shield, and thought the figure was a depiction of Virtus. Laubscher, however, thought the traces of relief on the shield were signs of the zodiac. He then identified the figure as Roma and made a comparison to the Roma on the left hand side of the *decessenia* base of 303.\textsuperscript{451} Pond Rothman has agreed with this identification.\textsuperscript{452} Roma is also shown in such a manner in various late antique coins and medallions.\textsuperscript{453}


\textsuperscript{450} Laubscher 1975, 87.

\textsuperscript{451} Laubscher 1975, 87. See chap. 5.1.

\textsuperscript{452} Pond Rothman 1977, 447.

\textsuperscript{453} Laubscher 1975, 87, footnote 446 with references to coins and medals of Alexander Severus, Gordian II and Tacitus.
Fig. 50. Panel 27: Votive scene. (After Laubscher 1975, plate 67)

27. Votive Scene

Though badly damaged, the scene is easily recognized. In the centre of the panel is an altar above which are two winged victories hold a shield. It is unfortunate that the shield is so badly damaged, as it almost certainly once bore an inscription. The scene has been compared to a similar panel on the decennalia base of the Fünfsäulendenkmal of 303 (chap. 5.1), and it has been suggested that the shield here once bore an inscription either for the quinquennalia or decennalia of Galerius.\(^{454}\) Laubscher also suggested that one of the other piers bore a similar depiction in a corresponding position, but was dedicated to Diocletian.\(^{455}\) Both suppositions seem unlikely to me as the captives here are both Persians, whereas the decennalia base has both Germans and Persians displayed, probably relating to victories of all the Tetrarchs. Moreover, since we do not have a corresponding scene on the other surviving column, there is no reason to suppose it existed on a lost pier. One would also expect four such depictions, one on each pier, for all the members of the Tetrarchy and not just Galerius and Diocletian. It must not be forgotten that vows could be undertaken for other events as well as imperial anniversaries. The vow being inscribed on the shield need not have referred to an imperial anniversary. It could

\(^{454}\) Laubscher 1975, 107-108.
\(^{455}\) Laubscher 1975, 107.
have been undertaken merely for the success of the Persian campaign. The inscription could have read PERSIAE VICTOR or even simply the familiar V.S.L.M. - *Votus Solvit Libro Merito.*

Flanking the two victories are palm trees and below each of these are two prisoners with their hands bound behind their backs. The outline of the prisoners’ clothing clearly identifies them as Persians. After these, again on both sides, are two armed figures with Attic helmets.\(^{456}\) Both grab the heads of a crouching Persian next to them with their right hands. The female figure on the right, clad in a *chiton*, carries a lance and an oval shield in her left hand. Long hair protrudes from underneath her helmet. The left figure was probably wearing armour, but his body is very badly damaged. The *tropaion*, supported by this figure’s left arm, is badly damaged. These two are universally identified as Mars (left) and Virtus (right).\(^{457}\) On the outer edges of the panel are two trophies with Persian weapons.

28. *Obliterated*

Nothing remains to be seen of this panel though Laubscher discerned a figure in a long dress facing toward the right end of the panel. He also suggested the scene was once a procession of animal booty, as on the corresponding panel on the other pier (panel 14)\(^{458}\) A procession of Victories, as in panel 22, seems more likely to me than animals, since it would correspond to the rest of the bottom of this pier.

\(^{456}\) Laubscher 1975, 89.
\(^{457}\) Laubscher 1975, 89.
\(^{458}\) Laubscher 1975, 92.
CONCLUSIONS ON THE ARCH OF GALERIUS

*The Arch of Galerius in the Context of Other Roman Monuments*

The relief panels on the Arch of Galerius, and the arch itself, find precedent in numerous Roman monuments. To some extent these have already been alluded to in the descriptions, but a short discussion is still worthwhile. In Rome itself, the obvious predecessors to the relief are the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. Like the arch of Galerius, both columns bear relief sculpture of campaigns conducted by the emperor.\(^4\)\(^5\)\(^9\) Both columns show the emperor amongst the troops involved in the campaign. Like the Arch of Galerius, both have scenes of sacrifice, *adlocutio*, lines of prisoners, and battles. While the two spiral friezes present repeated generic scenes, unlike the Arch of Galerius, they follow a chronological order with distinct beginnings and endings. Moreover, there are none of the purely ideological images that are found on the Arch of Galerius. The two columns also have scenes that are not on the Arch of Galerius. These include the more mundane scenes, such as the building of camps and bridges, as well as the graphic scenes of decapitation.

Trajan and Marcus Aurelius are both given prominence on their columns with some of the same techniques used on the Arch of Galerius. The emperor is usually shown in a higher position than the other figures. His head is typically silhouetted by a blank background, and framed by

flanking figures who turn toward him. But neither emperor is shown significantly larger than the other figures, as on the arch of Galerius. In fact, the sense of perspective and proportion is far more realistic on the two earlier columns. While buildings are represented in a similar splayed out fashion on all three monuments, the Arch of Galerius never attempts the full frontal figures of the Arch of Trajan. The background figures and slaughtered barbarians who fill the bottom of battle scenes are as fully modelled on the two columns as the emperors. On the arch of Galerius, these same background figures have been quickly sketched in outline with the running drill.

Not surprisingly, it is outside of Rome that the Arch of Galerius finds one of its closest parallels. The Arch of Septimius Severus at Lepcis Magna, erected in 203 to celebrate the emperor’s Parthian campaign, is also a tetrapylon, and sits over the intersection of the *cardo* and *decumanus* of the city. The various sculptural panels that decorated the attic of the monument include a sacrifice, a triumphal entry in a chariot and a scene of *concordia augustorum* between Severus and Caracalla. This last scene, like the Arch of Galerius, includes various personifications amongst the various members of the imperial family. Geta stands between Caracalla and Severus, and Felicitas stands behind him. On the left side of the same panel one sees Jupiter, Julia Domna and Virtus. In addition to this similarity of themes, one also sees the same laying out of heads in rows as on the Arch of Galerius.

While the Arch of Galerius was clearly influenced by earlier monuments, the style in which it was made also set the tone for future building. The Arch of Constantine in Rome clearly

---

460 See, for instance, on the Column of Trajan, the scene of the emperor receiving Dacian heads (Kleiner 1992, 220, fig. 183) and on the Column of Marcus Aurelius, the scene of the emperor in a city receiving a messenger (Kleiner 1992, 300, fig. 268).

461 The principal publication remains Bartoccini 1931. For a good summary see Kleiner 1992, 340-343.
represents a new style of monumental sculpture, but at the same time it is a style that clearly developed from the Tetrarchic periods. The long double rows of heads on the monument, the identical figures, the incised background details, and the emphasis placed on the emperor are elements whose roots can be traced to the Tetrarchic period. The re-use of Trajanic and Antonine reliefs on the arch further reflect influence of the Trajanic school on Tetrarchic art. For instance, the panel from the Great Trajanic Frieze, with the emperor on horseback, was not re-used purely as an attempt to connect Constantine and Licinius with a good emperor. It also recalled representations of the Tetrarchs, such as those of Galerius on panels 5, 7 and 20 in Thessalonike.

An Eastern Triumphal Monument

Various facets of Galerius’ Arch set it apart from monuments of the Roman West and confirm its status as a Greek monument. For instance, the inclusion of identifying labels is a decidedly Eastern phenomenon and was avoided on relief sculpture of the Roman west. The thick floral borders that separate the panels and the heavy floral moldings are a strikingly Greek characteristic. The same is true of the use of architectural backgrounds, scalloped niches and end sections ends offset by columns. The relief carvings are far more plastic and better modelled than near the contemporary decennalia bases of the Fünfsaulendenkmal in Rome. Vermeule argues that this too reflects the Hellenism of the work.

---

462 L’Orange and von Gerkhan 1938, 44 and 111.
463 Kleiner 1992, 453 and 222, fig. 185.
464 L’Orange and von Gerkhan 1938, 204; Vermeule 1962, 349-351.
465 Ridgeway 1990 records inscriptions and labels on Hellenistic monuments. In Roman times the Sebasteion Aphrodisias is a case in point.
466 Vermeule 1968, 349.
467 Vermeule 1968, 350.
468 Vermeule 1968, 350.
The numerous comparisons that can be made with Sassanian rock carvings also suggest further influence. Doubtless the craftsmen who built the Arch of Galerius were familiar with Sassanian art. Perhaps they even saw it first hand, while accompanying Galerius on his campaign. In this case, however, it is hard to say just who influenced who. Ghirshman has suggest that the authors of the rock reliefs at Bishapur included Western artists.\textsuperscript{469} Perhaps they were even Romans, captured from Valerian’s army.

\textemdash Ideology and History Combined \textemdash

The most important new aspect of the monument, as it relates to Tetrarchic representation, is the manner in which it combines historical with ideological scenes.\textsuperscript{470} Certain panels depict undeniably real historical events. These include the capture of the Persian Harem, and the reception of Persian ambassadors. While the surviving historical accounts are not detailed enough to use in verifying every scene, it is possible that other panels also depict real events. The \textit{adlocutio} of Galerius (panel 15), or the sacrifice of Diocletian and Galerius, could represent real events. Kinch believed they did, but they may simply be part of a repetitive pattern, as on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius in Rome.\textsuperscript{471} In panegyric it was usual for the speaker to say that the emperor’s deeds were too numerous to relate.\textsuperscript{472} Thus, some depictions of Galerius on the panel can be seen as historical, others as purely generic scenes of imperial activity, and others as purely ideological. The most notable of these is the scene of the Tetrarchs enthroned (panel 21). The four Tetrarchs were never actually together as they are shown in this scene.

\textsuperscript{469} Ghirshman 1962, 159 and 285.
\textsuperscript{470} Brilliant 1984, 117-119 talks about reality and regality on the arch.
\textsuperscript{471} Kinch 1890, 13-20.
\textsuperscript{472} Brilliant 1984, 119.
**Imperial Representation on the Arch**

Since there is only one surviving head of a Tetrarch on the arch, that of Galerius on panel 16, little can be said about its use of Tetrarchic portraiture. The head has the same large almond eyes, short hair, and impersonal cubic features that are found on other coins and porphyry statues of the Tetrarchs. It is far more interesting to consider the various activities in which Galerius and the other Tetrarchs are represented.

From the viewpoint of imperial representation, the scenes can be divided into two types, battle and ceremonial. In the first type, the emperor is shown actively engaged in drawing out the campaign against the Persians. He is a soldier, dressed as a soldier, and actively participating in combat. This emphasis on the personal participation of the emperor in battle draws on Trajanic and Antonine models. The passive scenes are either show imperial ceremonies or are purely ideological. These scenes tend to show the Tetrarchs next to gods and personifications. In panel 21, the four Tetrarchs are shown as central to the cosmic order of the universe. Imperial *pietas* and *concordia* are stressed in the depiction of Galerius and Diocletian sacrificing on panel 17. In these scenes the emperor is presented in various costumes. Sometimes he wears a cuirass, and a *pileus pannonicus*, the insignia of a soldier. At other times, he wears the decorated robes and sandals of the new Tetrarchic imperial uniform. This new uniform, like the arch itself, has been seen as an eastern trait of the Tetrarchic system.\(^{473}\)

In the battle and ceremonial panels of the arch, Galerius is shown as both the competent and capable commander, as well as the invulnerable and omnipotent ruler. We must imagine these

---

473 See in the Discussion and Conclusions (chap. 9) the section on Tetrarchic clothing.
traits being extended to other Tetrarchs as well as Galerius. Even Galerius’ own arch, celebrating a personal triumph, allows a share in his glory to his Tetrarchic colleagues.
7. THE PAINTED CHAMBER IN THE MILITARY CAMP AT LUXOR

Introduction: A Roman Military camp at Luxor, Egypt

Traces of wall paintings at Luxor, near Thebes, in Egypt, seem to depict the members of the first Tetrarchy. They are the only known painted images of the Tetrarchs, and one of the very few examples of painted imperial representations. Here the Temple of Amon, originally a 15th and 13th century BC Pharaonic structure, was surrounded by a fortifying wall and converted into a Roman castrum. This transformation probably occurred towards the end of the third century A.D, and may well have been done in connection with the refortification and pacification of Egypt by Diocletian in 297. Though the fort has only been partially excavated, it would appear that the courtyard of Ramses II, the connecting courtyard, and that of Amenophis III were transformed into the cardo of the camp. The three courtyards culminated in the Pharaonic Temple of Amon, which was also modified.

474 The three main articles on the painted chamber are Deckers 1979, Kalaverzou-Maxeiner 1975, and De Villard 1953.
475 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 228.
Inscribed column bases were found at two intersections of the camp’s colonnaded streets.\textsuperscript{476} On the west side of the temple, the inscribed bases were dedications to the members of the first Tetrarchy from Aurelius Reginus, the prefect of the Diocletianic province of Thebais.\textsuperscript{477} The second group of bases, found at an intersection on the east side of the temple, contained less fragmentary dedications to Galerius, Licinius, Maximinus and Constantine which are datable to 308/9.\textsuperscript{478} The bases were painted white with red letters, with the names of the emperors painted

\textsuperscript{476} These were first published by Lacau 1934, 30 figs. 8-10. They have also been reproduced by Deckers 1979, 604-606 in his note 16.

\textsuperscript{477} Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 228. Aurelius Reginus is otherwise unknown but seems to have succeeded one Julius Athenodoros. The next attested prefect of Thebais, and presumably Aurelius Reginus’ successor, is Satrius Arrianus in 305/6. See Barnes 1982, 147-148.

\textsuperscript{478} Deckers 1979, 604.
in gold.\textsuperscript{479} Only three inscriptions from the earlier group are preserved, and they are not complete. They read:

1:

\begin{verbatim}
[AUR]EL(IUS) REGINUS V(IR) P(ERFECTISSIMUS) [PRAE][SES] PRO[V][INCIAE] ...
[DI]CATISSIMUS.
\end{verbatim}

“Aurelius Reginus, a most perfect man of the province....of his...dedicated....”

2:

\begin{verbatim}
[AUR]EL(IUS) REGINUS V(IR) P(ERFECTISSIMUS) PRAES(ES) PROV(INCIAE)
THEB(AIDOS) N(UMINI) M(AIESTATI)Q(UE) EIUS SEMPER DICATISSIMUS
\end{verbatim}

“...Aurelius Reginus, a most perfect man, the prefect of the province of Thebais eternally dedicated to his spirit and majesty.”

3:

\begin{verbatim}
NOBLISSIMUM CAE[S]AREM
PONT(IFICEM) MAX(IMUM) TRIB(UNICA) POT(ESTATE) X CO(N)S(ULEM) III
AUREL(IUS) REGINUS V(IR) P(ERFECTISSIMUS) PRAES(ES) PROV(INCIAE)
THEBAID(OS) N(UMINI) M(AIESTATI)Q(UE) EIUS SEMPER DICATISSIMUS
\end{verbatim}

“Aurelius Reginus, a most perfect man, the prefect of the province of Thebais, eternally and fully dedicated (a statue of) the most noble Caesar, the high priest, in the 10\textsuperscript{th} Tribunican power, in his third consulate, to his spirit and majesty”

This last inscription can only be associated with Galerius or Constantius Chlorus in the year 300.\textsuperscript{480} The position of Aurelius Reginus as the praetor of Thebais also reflects Diocletian’s reorganization of the province following the revolt of 297.\textsuperscript{481} As the inscription shows, the columns carried statues of the Tetrarchs themselves.\textsuperscript{482} The inscription makes it unlikely that

\textsuperscript{479} Deckers 1979, 604 n. 16.
\textsuperscript{480} Deckers 1979, 604, n. 16. For a list of consuls and their dates see Barnes 1982, 93.
\textsuperscript{481} Deckers 1979, 605.
\textsuperscript{482} Deckers 1979, 603; Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 228.
they carried statues of the imperial *genii*, which are depicted on the columns of the Fünfsaulendenkmal as shown in the relief panel of the Arch of Constantine (chap. 5). If that were the case, one would expect the inscription to read “GENIUM NOBILISSIMI CAESARIS” or similar. A comparable tetrastyle monument, where all the columns were dedicated to Alexander Severus, is known from Antinoopolis in northern Egypt. Other components of the monument include fragments of acanthus capitals and column segments with drill holes, suggesting the addition of metal ornaments. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner believed the monuments to have reflected a military victory or another important historical event.

The front of the Temple of Amon, originally a pharaonic era hypostyle of 32 massive columns, was transformed into a corridor by constructing walls between the central pillars of the room. The base of a statue of Constantine, probably installed in 324, was found *in situ* between the two columns at the far southeast corner of the corridor. The hypostyle entrance corridor led to the first and southernmost chamber of the Temple of Amon. In the third century alterations, the columns that supported the original roof of the chamber were taken down and their drums used to raise the level of the floor. Steps were added at the end of the hypostyle corridor to allow entrance to the elevated room. A pharaonic doorway in the back of the chamber that had originally led further south into the temple was bricked up, and a raised semicircular niche or apse, with a diameter of approximately 2.8 m., was constructed in its place. The niche was raised above the floor, and there is no evidence that it was ever fronted by steps. Two columns of reddish pink syenite remain *in situ* today on either side of the niche. They are supported by

---

483 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 228, fig. 1.
484 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 228.
485 The inscribed base is *CIL III*.12073; De Villard 1953, 86; Deckers 1979, 607-8. His note 19 also gives the inscription.
rectangular bases and topped with composite capitals. Remains of identical columns were found outside the temple, and sockets in the floor show that the original construction consisted of four columns in a square, with sides of 2.8 m., in front of the niche. These probably supported a ciborium or canopy and perhaps curtains that could shield access to the niche behind.\textsuperscript{487} The inner edges of the niche also bore sockets and a groove, though the function of these was not clear to De Villard.\textsuperscript{488} I would suggest that they supported a wooden door or covering for the niche, or perhaps parts of a mechanism for drawing curtains around the ciborium, but De Villard surely would have recognized this if the sockets and groove served such an obvious function.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig52.png}
\caption{The niche in the painted chamber at Luxor in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. (After Deckers 1979, plate 3 and Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, 1975, plate 4)}
\end{figure}

\textit{Paintings in the Cult Room}

The walls of the original Pharaonic room were covered with low relief sculpture. In the third century these were covered with two layers of plaster. The first was of thick coarse texture and

\textsuperscript{487} Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 231; Deckers 1979, 615.
\textsuperscript{488} De Villard 1953, 88.
was meant to cover the relief sculpture; the second was thin and fine and formed the base of wall paintings. Unfortunately, most of the paintings were removed in the 19th century in order to reveal the pharaonic reliefs below. Very little survives today, though the niche is still complete since the walls were not clad in pharaonic reliefs. Fortunately, the lost paintings were recorded in the sketches and watercolours of J.G. Wilkinson around the middle of the 19th century. These can be found today in the Griffith Institute in Oxford. Deckers’ combined his own examination of the surviving wall paintings and Wilkinson’s watercolours, to create one line drawing. It is reproduced here.

On the northernmost wall, where the main entrance to the room was located, very little painting survives or was recorded by Wilkinson. What little we do know about consists of a lower border of painted imitation opus sectile. Coloured circles and geometric patterns of red, brown, yellow and blue are encased in squares and divided by leafy patterns. This band of painted opus sectile continues around the bottom of all the walls, but is reduced in height by 15 cm. on the south wall around the niche. Above this band only the remains of feet can be seen. On either side they point away from the central door and form the beginning of a procession that continued along both the east and west sides of the room towards the south wall. Our knowledge of the procession is best preserved by a watercolour of Wilkinson that copies the painting on the east wall. Wilkinson shows two registers of figured scenes of which very little survives on the upper

---

489 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 231-2; Deckers 1979, 617ff.
491 The institute’s MS XXXI, with the watercolours being pages 51-62 of the manuscript. Reproduced by Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, as colour plates I to IV.
492 Deckers 1975, fig. 34 (pull-out).
493 Deckers 1975, 622.
The height of the walls in the room is not known, although Deckers reconstructs the second figured register as high as the one below it, with a row of windows above.\textsuperscript{494}

![Wilkinson's painting of the cult chamber looking East](image)

Fig. 53. Wilkinson’s painting of the cult chamber looking East. (After Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, fig. 8)

The subject of the bottom row of the east wall is a procession of soldiers leading horses. The procession moves southward towards the wall with the niche. The figures do not wear armour, but \textit{paragaudae} (tunics with decorated hems) covered with round patterns, \textit{tubiae} (stockings), and \textit{campagi} (military shoes). They carry swords, shields and spears that identify the figures as soldiers.\textsuperscript{495} The clothing of the figures in the procession is mostly represented with light brown or red by Wilkinson, with blue or darker red ornaments and hems, and \textit{fibulae}. Towards the south corner of the east wall, a black horse stands out due to the contrast of the brown saddle, the green saddle cloth, and the skin of the horse. The short haircuts and beards of the figures, both here and on the south wall, are typical of the Tetrarchic period.\textsuperscript{496}

\textsuperscript{494} Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 232; Deckers 1979, fig. 34.
\textsuperscript{495} Deckers 1979, 624.
\textsuperscript{496} Deckers 1979, 635.
Fig. 54. Line Drawing of the Wall Paintings at Luxor. (After Deckers 1979, pull-out)
The second rectangular panel above the procession of men and horses on the west wall is known only from small traces in the south corner. There are fragments of a wall, and a blue shield with golden stars. There are also traces of red cloth and a purple cylindrical object, but the entire panel is too fragmentary and badly preserved to make any guesses as to its subject matter or even the identity of these objects.497

Deckers has argued that the west wall of the chamber, which neither survives nor was painted by Wilkinson, contained a procession similar to that of the east wall.498 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, on the other hand, notes that a blank page in Wilkinson’s sketchbook of Luxor paintings, contains the comment: “Mr. Monier told Mr. Harris that the name ‘Diocletian’ was on one of the chariot wheels in this fresco.”499 Thus there may have been very little left on this wall for Wilkinson to paint. If the note in Wilkinson’s sketchbook does refer to the west wall, it not only provides a firm date for the paintings, but may indicate that the composition of the west wall was different from that of the east wall.500 The use of the words “one of the chariot wheels,” and the fact that the chariot needed to be labelled as that of Diocletian, suggests more than one chariot in the composition. If the west wall was painted with figures of the same proportion as those of the east and south wall, neither a chariot nor a wagon could be represented in a single band of the same height as those of the east wall. The use of carts in which an emperor is seated would have allowed the scene to be squeezed into one band, as is done in the adventus scene on the arch of Galerius (chap. 6.7). Whether it was in one band or two, the painting on the west wall may still have been part of the same procession as those on the north and east that lead toward the central

497 Deckers 1979, 627-628.
498 Deckers 1979, 624.
499 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 238; Wilkinson’s manuscript page 53.
500 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 239.
n niche. It is quite possible that the scene simply continued the procession but merged in one larger register rather than two.

The south wall with the central niche bears the best documented and best preserved painting. To the left of the niche, figures are shown standing in rows around a gem studded platform. The largest surviving group of these is on the left and consists of figures looking to the right. The head of one is turned upward. The figures wear black shoes and decorated *paludamenta* with *fibulae*. Their hair is cut short and some have short stubbly beards. One of the figures in the upper rows carries the remains of what was almost certainly a *vexillum*. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner does not seem to have noticed the left corner of the gem-studded platform in this panel, and argued that the scene was a continuation of the procession on the east wall, an odd interpretation when he argues against the idea of a parallel procession on the west wall. Moreover, he erroneously suggests that two of the figures on the left side of the wall were carrying a draped *ferculum*. His idea of a procession is based largely on the rod (*baculus*) in the hand of a figure on the right side of the panel. Such rods were frequently held by figures at the head of Roman processions, as can be seen on the more or less contemporary *decennalia* base (chap. 5.1)

The platform bears a gemmed purple shoe, and Deckers proposed that the platform originally contained a pair of thrones. Deckers’ reconstruction of the figures on the platform puts one in an *adlocutio* gesture, and has the other grasping a scroll. It is possible he used the *concordia* scene of the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.21) as a model in formulating this reconstruction. A

---

501 Deckers 1979, 628ff.
502 Deckers 1979, 635.
503 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 238-239.
504 Deckers 1979, 636 and 639.
donatio/congiarium scene, like the one on the Arch of Constantine, is also possible, and certainly would have been appropriate considering the military setting of the chamber.\textsuperscript{505} The figures facing away from the frieze might be seen as those who have already received their donation. The figure in front of the one carrying the vexillum might have his arm extended under his cloak in the same way as a figure on the donativum panel of the arch of Constantine.

The central niche of the room would have been visible from as far away as the hypostyle corridor and was clearly the focal point of the room.\textsuperscript{506} It is the best preserved part of the room, and was also painted by Wilkinson. The niche contains four figures of almost equal size, larger than any other figures in the chamber, and paratactically arranged.\textsuperscript{507} The figures stand on a brown floor and are set against a light blue background. All of them wear dark purple mantles with one arm and shoulder exposed. The outer left figure was depicted barefoot by Wilkinson, and shown carrying a cylindrical object in his left hand, and a short stick in his right, lowered, hand.\textsuperscript{508} The figure next to him, the middle-left one, rests his right hand on a long golden staff, and holds an orbus in his left. Nothing remained of the heads of the figures when Wilkinson made his paintings. But traces of golden nimbi, outlined by a thin red line, survive in the area where the heads of the figures would have been.\textsuperscript{509} Deckers thought that the face of the middle right figure was purposely erased in antiquity, and this suggests it was a representation of Maximian, who suffered damnatio memoriae under Constantine.\textsuperscript{510} The evidence for this

\textsuperscript{505} L’Orange and von Gerkhan 1939, plates 16-17.
\hfill \textsuperscript{506} Deckers 1979, 640.
\hfill \textsuperscript{507} The outer two are actually 10 cm. shorter, although the optical illusion of the semi-circle has made them look the same height: Deckers 1975, 640-641.
\hfill \textsuperscript{508} Today both segments with the right hand and feet are missing. It is not entirely clear to me whether Wilkinson simply did not get around to filling in the detail of the shoes, or was merely speculating a detail that was lost in his own time. See Deckers 1979, figs. 27 a and b.
\hfill \textsuperscript{509} Deckers 1979, 642.
\hfill \textsuperscript{510} Deckers 1979, 644.
intentional destruction of the painting is not apparent from photographs. But if so, the middle left figure should be Diocletian, and the two flanking figures, the Caesars: presumably Galerius on the far left and Constantius on the far right. The long staff in Diocletian’s hand supports his identification as the most senior Augustus. He is marked out in the same way on the *concordia* panel of the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.21). If the figures are indeed the Tetrarchs, as is now generally accepted, then this is one of the earliest uses of the *nimbus* on imperial representations. It also ties in to the use of the *nimbus* on the two seated Tetrarchs on the Mainz medallion (chap. 3.9). The nimbus did not become a common attribute in imperial representation until Constantine.

Traces of a *nimbus* can also be seen between the two middle figures along with greyish green flecks that probably belonged to a wreath. This fifth *nimbus* is attached to no body and probably contained a free floating bust. The lost figure might have been Jupiter. Jupiter would be a good possibility considering his use on the highest column of the *Fünfsäulendenkmal*. He may also have been appropriate given the setting, which was the Temple of Zeus Amon. While it is tempting to imagine a horned bust of Zeus Amon, we have no idea how the temple was understood in late antiquity. Furthermore, it seems odd to have such a small bust of the king of the gods. Elsewhere in Tetrarchic art, personified virtues are shown between the emperors, such as Oikoumene and Homonoia between a sacrificing Galerius and Diocletian on the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.17). More similar to the Luxor paintings is the free floating bust of Felicitas that appears between two Tetrarchs pouring a libation on a gold medallion of 303 (chap. 3.7).

---

511 Deckers 1979, 44. The identification was first made by Monneret de Villard 1953, 101.
512 For the use of the radiate crown, and the *nimbus*, in the late third and early fourth century, see Bergmann 1998, 277-290.
513 Deckers 1979, 644.
Since nothing of the bust at Luxor survives save the *nimbus*, itself an unusual attribute for a personification, we can only speculate as to the identity of the figure. At the very least, however, we can say that the presence of a divinity or a personification would not be out of place.

Above the figures, in the top of the niche, was a large eagle that clutched a wreath in its talons. This recalls the eagle above the Tetrarchic platform in the *concordia* scene of the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.21). There are also traces of fresco in the very centre of the south wall in the middle panel above the niche. The traces all show a dark blue background, and Deckers postulates a cosmic scene with stars.\(^{514}\)

The panel to the right of the niche is badly damaged. The only surviving fresco is in the bottom left corner, and it depicts a group of figures facing each other. Like the figures in the panel to the left of the niche, they are wearing decorated *paludamenta*. One of these has a large brown geometric *orbiculus*. It seems likely that the scene echoed the composition of the one on the left side of the niche.

**Conclusions**

Kalavrezou-Maxeiner proposed that the use of a chariot on the west wall showed the theme of the entire room to be either an imperial triumph or *adventus*. She favoured the idea of *adventus*, since triumphs were properly celebrated at Rome.\(^{515}\) But we know this is not the case when one considers the triumphal entries of Maximian and Diocletian at Milan, and that of Maximian at

\(^{514}\) Deckers 1979, 646-7.

\(^{515}\) Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 239.
Rome no longer held the same importance under the Tetrarchy. Moreover, Kalavrezou-Maxeiner did not seem to realise that the scene on the south wall, to the left of the niche, was separate from the procession itself. She viewed the entire programme of the chamber as a single procession leading up to the central niche. In Decker’s reconstruction of the paintings this is not the case, and there is no reason that the various walls and panels of the chamber should not have had related, but chronologically and ideologically separate, scenes. This is the case with the Arch of Galerius at Thessalonike, and seems to be a trend of Tetrarchic art and imperial representation. Individual scenes are used to show ideology, rather than exact events or historical truth. Imperial ceremonies, triumphs, adventus, donativa and sacrifices all seem to be conflated and combined.

Though the painted chamber at Luxor was once thought to be an early Christian church, this idea can no longer stand, and with this notion dispelled, a number of interpretations have been proposed for its use in the Tetrarchic period. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner thought it possible that the room served as an audience hall for the emperor himself, or the local governor, or camp prefect, who would have sat inside the niche or under the ciborium. De Villard proposed that the niche housed an enthroned porphyry statue of Diocletian, like the one in the museum at Alexandria. At any rate, all scholars seem to be agreed that the room served a religious or ceremonial function that related to the imperial cult. Any large object placed under the ciborium seems unlikely, since it would have obscured the view of the concordia scene of the Tetrarchs painted on the back of the niche. I would like to propose that the niche and ciborium contained the

---

516 See above, chap. 2. and Pan. Lat. 11.8.1 and Pan. Lat. 7.8.7.
517 Pond Rothmann 1977, 453.
518 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1975, 249-250.
519 De Villard 1953, 103. The statue is Delbruecke 1932, 96. See also chapter 4.
standards of the legion housed in the fortress.\textsuperscript{520} Perhaps curtains and drapes surrounded the standards and could be pulled back on ceremonial occasions, such as the regular cash handouts that supplemented the meagre pay of the late antique soldiers.\textsuperscript{521}

It is important to note that the dating of the chamber is by no means secure. It rests largely on the severe Tetrarchic style of one head on the east wall, and the possibility that there was a chariot wheel on the west wall with the word Diocletian on it. The painting has also been connected to the tetrastyle monument of the first Tetrarchy outside. None of this is unreasonable, but it must not be forgotten that the central chamber was once thought to be a Christian church because of the nimbate figures in the niche.\textsuperscript{522} Moreover, there is a second tetrastyle of 308 with another group of four figures to which the niche paintings could be attached. Kalavrezou-Maxeiner made many comparisons between the Luxor paintings and the mosaics at Piazza Armerina; but the mosaics, once thought to adorn the floor of the palace of Maximian, are now thought to be merely those of a high ranking official, and they could date anywhere between 300 and 325.\textsuperscript{523} The figures in the niche could also be Constantine and his three sons, with the defaced one being Constantine II, though I admit that I am not aware of any such similar paintings. Another possible interpretation is that the figures in the niche were repainted with \textit{nimbi} at a later date so that the room could fulfil a Christian function. However, it seems unlikely that Deckers’ close inspection of the painting would not have revealed this. So while a Tetrarchic date for the chamber’s paintings seems the most probable, and certainly, the most attractive, one must be cautious.

\textsuperscript{520} De Villard, 1953, 101, also thought the standards were housed in this room, though not under the \textit{ciborium}.

\textsuperscript{521} For a discussion of this ceremony and the coins relating to it, see Bastien 1988.

\textsuperscript{522} De Villard (1953, 85) was the first to dispute this.

If the figures in the niche are members of the first Tetrarchy, then they fit well into the pattern of Tetrarchic representation. The purple clothing, jewelled campagi, and paragaudae, all fit in with other monuments such as the porphyry Tetrarchs and the figures on the Arch of Galerius. The use of the nimbus is somewhat unusual, although also known on the Mainz medallion (chap. 3.9). The themes of the paintings are comparable to the panels on the arch of Galerius. We have two processions, including one with a cart or chariot, that can be compared to the adventus panel in Thessalonike (chap. 6.19). Though the Persian prisoners of the Arch of Galerius are missing, we still have the crowds of robed courtiers. These figures seems to be a means of emphasizing the splendour of the imperial person. The presentation of the emperors enthroned, and on an elevated platform, in the donativum/congiarium scene in Luxor recalls the adlocutio and concordia panels of the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.15 and 6.21). Finally, the painted Tetrarchs in the central niche, with the blue starry background above them, strongly recalls the use of cosmic deities in the concordia scene on the arch of Galerius. The positioning of the Tetrarchs in a niche, perhaps fronted by a ciborium, recalls the placement of cult images in similar niches and apses in the shrines of the third century mystery cults. For example, the cult room of almost every mithraeum contained a niche or aediculum in which an image of the Mithraic bull slaying scene was placed. \(^{524}\) Another contemporary parallel is found in the double apses of the Temple of Venus and Roma in Rome, which are a product of the Maxentian restoration of the temple. \(^{525}\) This same architectural technique of emphasis would later be adopted by the Christians. At Luxor, the Tetrarchs are placed in the culminating point of the room, both thematically and

\(^{524}\) Vermaseren, 1959, 40.

physically. Just as the Tetrarchs are the centre of the cult room, they are also, metaphorically, the centre of the new Roman world.
8. THE ARCUS NOVUS

Introduction

Perhaps the most elusive monument of the Tetrarchic period is the Arcus Novus in Rome.\textsuperscript{526} The arch is described as the Arcus Novus by the chronographer of 354, as one of the new constructions of Diocletian:

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
his imper. multae operae publicae fabricatae sunt: senatum, forum Caesaris, basilicae Iuliae, scaena Pompeii, porticos II, nymphae III, templae II, Iseum et Serapeum, arcum novum, thermas Diocletianas.
\end{center}
\end{quote}

“under these emperors (Diocletian and Maximian) many public works were constructed: the Senate (house) the Forum of Caesar, the Basilica Julia, the theatre of Pompei, two porticos, three nymphae, two temples, the Iseum and Searpeum, the Arcus Novus, the Baths of Diocletian.”

\textit{Chronica Minora}. I.148.22-24 (my translation)

The name of the arch implies the existence of an Arcus Vetus, somewhere in the vicinity of the new arch. A number of objects found on the modern Via Del Corso in Rome, in front of the Church of S. Maria in Via Lata, have been associated with a now lost arch, erected by Diocletian on the occasion of his decennalia in 293/4. The arch is probably the same as the one torn down at the order of Pope Innocent III in 1491. Fragments of it were recovered in 1523 and again in 1923 and 1933.\textsuperscript{527} The pieces associated with the arch suggest a monument composed of both contemporary sculpture, and spolia from older Roman monuments. The fragmentary nature of these objects makes a reconstruction of the arch totally impossible. The principal pieces associated with the arch are:

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{526}{The principal works on the arch are Colini 1935; Kähler 1936; Laubscher 1976; \textit{Lex. Top. Urb. Rom}. s.v. \textit{Arcus Novus} I.101-102 (Torelli); Richardson 1992, 101-102; Kleiner 1992, 409-413; De Maria 1988, 197-203 and 312-314.}
\footnote{527}{Laubscher 1976, 70-71.}
\end{footnotes}
1) Two late 3rd century carved socles, now in Boboli Gardens, Florence, found in the Via Lata in 1523.

2) Fragments of relief sculpture with a figure inscribing a shield, Claudian or Antonine, currently embedded in the walls of the Villa Medici in Rome, also found in the Via Lata in 1523.

3) Architectural remains: marble blocks, coffers and impost moulding, half Corinthian column, spolia, found in 1933 during excavations conducted by Colini. 528

4) Relief fragments with piece of a wing, probably Claudian, found in 1933 in the same location as last. 529

5) More relief fragments. Some were found in 1923 during construction on the Via del Corso, near the church of S. Maria in Via Lata, and now in the Museo del Palazzo dei Conservatori. Others were found in 1523 on the Via Lata and are now in a wall of the Villa Medici. The fragments show a procession of *togati, flamines*, a bull and various temple backgrounds.

It is possible that the *Arcus Novus* had statues of all four Tetrarchs, like the Arch of Galerius, but without more architecture we cannot be sure of this. 530 If such statues were present, it would represent a very early use of all four of the Tetrarchs on one monument. The full Tetrarchic system had only been finalised in 294, the same year as the construction of the arch, with the appointments of the two Caesars. A full discussion of all the architectural pieces associated with the arch is not possible here, nor would it tell us much about Tetrarchic imperial representation. It is worthwhile to consider first the contemporary socles from the arch, and then the spoliate elements employed on it.

528 Colini 1935, 41-43.
529 I have been unable to determine the current location of nos. 3 and 4. It is most likely that they are in the Museo Palazzo dei Conservatori.
530 Kleiner 1992, 413.
Description of Associated Fragments

1. The Socles

The two socles, now in the Boboli gardens in Florence, are the only surviving pieces of sculpture that are contemporary with the Arcus Novus. They would have supported free standing pillars, and flanked either side of the main entrance of the arch in the same way as the socles on the Arch of Septimius Severus in the Forum Romanum.\(^{531}\)

![Fig. 55. Left and right socles. (After Kleiner 1992, figs. 378, 380)](image)

The face of each socle shows a winged Victory, each of whom turned toward the central opening of the arch. Both Victories hold palm branches in their left hands, and the Victory on the right raises a wreath in her right hand. On the bottom left of the right socle is a small palm tree. The left Victory hangs a second shield onto a trophy erected to her right.\(^{532}\) It consists of a full cuirass, two shields, greaves and a helmet. Behind the trophy are the ends of wind instruments and the points of spears.\(^{533}\) The helmet is decorated with two griffins, and the shields with a

\(^{531}\) See Brilliant 1967, 151-165, plates 49-59.
\(^{532}\) Kähler 1936, 5.
\(^{533}\) Kähler 1936, 5.
pattern of vegetation and a gorgoneion. Below the trophy, a kneeling captive with a bare upper torso and drapery over his groin, looks backward over his shoulder.

The prisoner and palm tree are of questionable significance in the Tetrarchic context. The palm tree would seem to suggest an Eastern victory. Diocletian had negotiated a treaty with the Persians in 287 and had campaigned against tribal groups in Syria in 290. It is possible that this was the eastern triumph that the victories commemorate. Erecting a triumphal arch to celebrate a negotiated peace with the Persians was not at all unique. Augustus had erected a triumphal arch in the *Forum Romanum* to commemorate in part the return of standards, by negotiation, from the Persians in 19 B.C.\(^{534}\) Although the dress of the prisoner is not specific enough to allow the identification of his ethnicity, he not specifically dressed as a Persian. He wears neither trousers nor a Phyrgian cap. Perhaps the figure does represent one of the Syrian tribes subdued by Diocletian.

---


---

Fig. 56. Soldiers and prisoners on Left and Right Socles.  
(After Kleiner 1992, fig. 381 (left) and Kähler 1936, pl. 5 (right))
The two outer sides of the socles show prisoners with Roman soldiers. The prisoner on the left socle is being pushed away from the arch, but the prisoner on the right is being pulled towards it. Kähler thought that the prisoner on the left was being driven in front of him, but the prisoner’s body is clearly turned towards the arm that holds him and towards the arch. The prisoner on the right has a curly beard and a bowl cut hairstyle that appears almost as a cap or a wig. This sort of hairstyle is found on other triumphal monuments such as Trajan’s column, or the Great Trajanic Frieze, where it is used to represent Dacians. The prisoner’s arms are bound behind his back and he looks forward with a gloomy expression. He wears long trousers and a decorated belt. His upper torso is bare apart from a long fur cloak that is supported by a fibula on his left shoulder. The corresponding prisoner on the left socle is smaller and more of the Roman soldier behind him can be seen. His hands are also bound and he faces away from the soldier who pushes him forward. He has a short unkempt beard that Kähler described as giving him a “faunish” look. He wears a tunic, plain belt and cloak, which is also fastened by a round fibula on his left shoulder. The exact ethnicity of the barbarian prisoners is difficult to determine. The similarity between these barbarians and the Dacians on Trajan’s column makes it tempting to connect them with the Sarmatians against whom Diocletian had campaigned in roughly the same area. But they could represent members of any Germanic tribe. They are certainly not Persians, who usually wear a Phrygian cap as well as trousers.

535 Kähler 1936, 7.
536 Kähler 1936, 6-7. For an example from the Great Trajanic Frieze see Kleiner 1992, fig. 186.
537 Kähler 1936, 8.
Fig. 57. Dioscuri on left and right Socles. (After Kleiner 1992, figs. 377 and 379.)

On the opposite side of the socles from the prisoners are two Dioscuri. They probably faced each other on opposite sides of the arch’s main passageway. Each Dioscurus is shown in the standard position, with his hand on the reins of the horse standing behind him.\(^{538}\) The figures wear their usual caps surmounted by stars, and a \textit{chiton} draped over their left arms. They also hold swords sheathed in scabbards with foliate decoration. The use of the Dioscuri is known on earlier triumphal monuments, but contrary to Kähler’s opinion, is somewhat unusual.\(^{539}\) They appear on either end of the long south frieze of Augustus’ Arch at Susa.\(^{540}\) A figure in a panel of the east facade of the Antonine Porte Noire in Besançon, France might also represent a Dioscurus.\(^{541}\) Depictions of the Dioscuri on the panels of the base of the Neronian Jupiter column in Mainz are more similar to those on the Boboli Socles, although they are not part of a triumphal

\(^{538}\) For the iconography of the Dioscuri in the Roman period see LIMC II.608-635 s.v. Dioskouroi / Castores (Gury).

\(^{539}\) Kähler 1936, 5.

\(^{540}\) Studniczka, 1903, 6-7, plate 1. Southfriese nos. 1 and 34. Though the Dioscuri were already known as helpers in battle and symbols of victory, Augustus was the first to employ them on his Temple of Castor and Pollux in the Forum. See Poulsen, 1991.

\(^{541}\) Walter 1986, 80-83, plate XXVI. The attribution here is somewhat questionable as the figure is shown without his horse, one of the most important attributes of the Dioscuri. A corresponding panel on the other side of the arch’s opening presumably once bore a similar figure.
monument.\textsuperscript{542} The Dioscuri are also found in a panel of the almost contemporary Arch of Galerius in Thessalonike (chap. 6.21). At least on the \textit{Arcus Novus}, and perhaps also on the Arch of Galerius, the Dioscuri were used as a metaphor for the brotherhood of the two Augusti, Maximian and Diocletian.\textsuperscript{543}

It should be noted that the Dioscuri and prisoner sides of the socles seem to be cut from larger pieces.\textsuperscript{544} On the inner sides, the horses of the Dioscuri would have been continued on separate marble slabs. On the outer sides, the soldiers would have been completed on pieces of marble that have been cut away. There is no way of telling how much further the relief scenes originally continued, nor is it possible to say what their original function was. There cannot be any doubt, however, that the style of the sculpture belongs to the late third century.\textsuperscript{545} But the connection to the \textit{Arcus Novus} is not just stylistic; it also stems from the find spot of the socles. They were found together in the Via Lata in 1523, and originally purchased by the Medici family for the garden of the Villa Medici in Rome. They were sent to the Boboli Gardens in Florence in 1785.\textsuperscript{546}

\textit{Spolia Elements}

Fragments of relief sculpture, as well as architectural elements, have been found on the Via Lata, near the church of S. Maria in Via Lata, and thus connected to the \textit{Arcus Novus}. Some of the fragments, like the socles (no. 1), were recovered by antiquities hunters in 1523 and placed in the

\textsuperscript{542} Kleiner 1992, 157-158.
\textsuperscript{543} Kleiner 1992, 412.
\textsuperscript{544} Kähler 1936, 4.
\textsuperscript{545} Kähler 1936, 24-28; Kleiner 1992, 412. De Maria 1988, 197-198 and 313. Though De Maria agrees that the socles are late third century, he is highly doubtful of their attribution to the \textit{Arcus Novus}.
\textsuperscript{546} The complex history of the socles in the renaissance is described by Kähler 1936, 3-4 and De Maria 1988, 198, note 8.
Villa Medici. Others were found accidentally by road workers in 1922 and 1933, and in subsequent excavations by Colini.547 But the sculptural style of these fragments belongs to a period much earlier than that of the Tetrarchy. Laubscher has argued that the source of some of the *spolia* was almost certainly the Arch of Claudius, which commemorated Claudius’ conquest of Britain in 44, and was dedicated in 51/2.548 The arch is known to have stood over the Via Lata in the neighbourhood of Palazzo Sciarra. A fragment of the wing of a victory, probably Claudian in date, was found near S. Maria in Via Lata in 1933.549 The very name, *Arcus Novus*, suggests that by the time the chronography of 354 was written, the nearby Arch of Claudius was known as the *Arcus Vetus*.550 Obviously, the plundering of the Arcus Vetus for sculptural relief cannot have completely destroyed it. The recovered spolia allows a somewhat tenuous reconstruction of the iconography of the *Arcus Novus*.

2. *The Villa Medici Reliefs*

![Fig. 58. Villa Medici fragments, found in 1523. (After Laubscher 1976, plate 11)](image)

547 The details of the excavations can be found in Colini 1934.
549 Laubscher 1976, 72; Colini 1935, 47 fig. 8.
550 Laubscher 1976, 106.
Sixteenth century descriptions of the discovery of the socles (no. 1) also mention the discovery of an inscribed relief fragment that read VOTIS X ET XX.\textsuperscript{551} This has allowed a connection to four relief fragments built into a garden wall in the Villa Medici in Rome. The pieces, like the Boboli socles, were purchased by Cardinal Medici in 1584.\textsuperscript{552} A further connection to the *Arcus Novus* is seen in the re-carving of a head into a Tetrarchic portrait on the far left fragment. The fragments are labelled from left to right, a to d, although c and d are separated only by a small splinter. We do not know where or how the 1.82 m. high relief was displayed on the *Arcus Novus*. Though these four fragments are thought by most scholars to be Antonine or Hadrianic, Laubscher has argued that they are actually Claudian and come from the *Arcus Claudius*.\textsuperscript{553} This view has not been widely accepted, and Laubscher’s suggestion ought to be rejected.\textsuperscript{554}

Fragment a: Virtus is shown standing on the far left attired as an Amazon. She wears an Attic helmet and, in her right arm, carries a standard with an eagle, and grips a sword with her left hand. Laubscher argues that the military standard carried by the figure secures the identification as Virtus and not Roma.\textsuperscript{555} This would be an attribute more appropriate to Virtus. Roma is more frequently, although not always, shown seated. It is often difficult to decide whether female figures dressed in this way are intended to represent Roma or Virtus. The figure welcoming Marcus Aurelius back to Rome, on a relief panel re-used on the Arch of Constantine, and the figure behind Domitian in the *profectio* scene of the Cancellaria reliefs have been identified as

\textsuperscript{551} Laubscher 1976, 71.
\textsuperscript{552} Laubscher 1976, 70-71.
\textsuperscript{553} Laubscher 1976, 83 ff.
\textsuperscript{554} Kleiner 1992, 412.
\textsuperscript{555} Laubscher 1976, 79 and 87. For the iconography of Virtus see LIMC VIII.273-281 s.v. Virtus (Ganschow). For the iconography of Roma see LIMC VIII.1048-1068 (suppl.) s.v. Roma (di Filipo Balestrazzi)
both personifications. The figure here wears a *balteus*, decorated with animals of the zodiac, and her helmet features a sea monster. Laubscher saw this detail as testimony to the Roman seamanship that played a part in the conquest of Britain that the arch of Claudius commemorated.

The man next to Virtus seems to have held either a long sceptre or a lance, although the figure is very fragmentary. The head has been reworked, and the strong lines of the forehead, traces of a beard, and hairstyle suggest a Tetrarchic portrait. This is further evidence that the pieces were re-used on the *Arcus Novus*. The figure was an emperor and not just a soldier, as the connection to the deity behind him suggests. Moreover, the fact that his head was re-worked, the other figures in the relief fragments have been left alone, assures us of his imperial status. The head would not have been changed except to separate this figure from the others. In Roman iconography the emperor is often shown standing above a kneeling defeated female personification of a region, and we might expect to have found Britannia below him, calling to mind both the victories of Claudius and of Constantius Chlorus. But Constantius Chlorus did not capture Britain until 297, three years after the supposed date of the *Arcus Novus*. Since the first attempt to take Britain by Maximian in 289 had failed, the use of Britannia here would at best be optimistic propaganda. Moreover, this would require the fragments to be Claudian in

---

556 The panel on the Arch of Constantine is identified as Roma by LIMC VIII.1062 (suppl.) s.v. *Roma* (di Filipo Balestrazzi) no. 199, and as Virtus by LIMC VIII.278 s.v. *Virtus* (Ganschow) no. 56. The figure in the *profectio* scene on the Cancellaria reliefs is identified as Virtus by LIMC VIII. s.v. *Virtus* (Ganschow) 277 no. 38, and as Roma by Kleiner 1992, 191.
557 Laubscher 1976, 87.
558 Laubscher 1976, 86.
559 Laubscher 1976, 88.
560 Laubscher 1976, 104-5.
561 Laubscher 1976, 105.
date and stem from the Arcus Claudius, and most scholars prefer to see the reliefs as Antonine.\textsuperscript{562} The fragment preserves nothing beyond in front of the emperor, and it is probably better not to speculate as to what may have come next.

![Fig. 59. Reworked head on fragment a. (After Kähler 1936, plate 13.)](image)

Fragment b: A standing female figure wears a dress, tunic, trousers and a mantle. Laubscher saw her right hand as touching a duck’s head, one of her attributes, but this appears to be just a fold in her drapery.\textsuperscript{563} She is looking at a female figure behind her, who rests her hand on her left shoulder. Only the forearm of this second figure survives, but traces of clothing on it suggest that she was similarly dressed.\textsuperscript{564} The tunic, mantle and trousers were not used for Roman matrons or personifications of virtues. The dress is probably intended to denote the ethnicity of the figures, and they are most likely geographical personifications. But their standing positions are not those of vanquished areas. Laubscher thought they represented areas that had achieved provincial status under Claudius.\textsuperscript{565} He proposes that they represent Mauretania Tingitana and Mauretania Caesariensis, whose governance by client kings was removed, and provincial status granted in

---
\textsuperscript{562} Kleiner 1992, 412.
\textsuperscript{563} Laubscher 1976, 80.
\textsuperscript{564} Laubscher 1976, 80.
\textsuperscript{565} Laubscher 1976, 92.
On coins of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, Mauretania is depicted wearing a similar tunic and mantle, with the mantle slipping off her right breast, and with comparable short hair. But on these coins she also carries two javelins, and is usually shown with a horse. Alternatively, Laubscher suggested that the two figures were Moesia, which was separated from Macedonia around 44, and Thrace, which was turned into a client state in 45/6. Moesia is found on several Roman provincial coins with a variety of attributes, often including a *labarum*. Her only similarity to the figures in fragment b is the tunic she wears. The iconography of Thrace is quite distinct. She appears on a base from the Temple of Hadrian, and on sestertii of Hadrian and Antonius Pius. She is always shown wearing a tunic, with one breast exposed, and a long cloak. The dress of the figures on fragment b is simply not enough to allow us to identify them as anything more than geographical personifications. It is interesting to note, however, that all of our possible comparanda are Hadrianic or Antonine, and not Claudian in date. This is further evidence for the Antonine date of the relief.

While the exact identify of the figures is impossible to determine, and they are probably not even Claudian, they are personifications of regions. Since they are standing, instead of kneeling or crouching, they might well represent provinces that had been restored or helped, rather than conquered. In the Tetrarchic period, they might have been used to recall the *Bagaudae*

---

566 Laubscher 1976, 92. For the iconography of Mauretania see LIMC VIII.816-818 (suppl.) s.v. *Mauretania* (Ganschow) and Ostrowski 1990, 186-188.
567 LIMC VIII.817 s.v. *Mauretania* (Ganschow) nos. 3-7; Ostrowski 1990, 186 nos. 1 and 2. Examples include RIC II nos. 854 and 860 (Hadrian) and RIC III nos. 583-585 (Antoninus Pius). She also appears on a relief sculpture, in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, thought to come from the Temple of Hadrian in Rome. Her iconography there is somewhat different: LIMC VIII.816 (suppl.) s.v. *Mauretania* (Ganschow) no. 1; Ostrowski 1990, 187 no. 5.
568 Laubscher 1976, 93. For Moesia see LIMC VI.635-636 s.v. *Moesia* (Popovic) and Ostrowski 1990, 189-191. For Thrace see LIMC VIII.16-17 s.v. *Thracia* (Houghtalin) and Ostrowski 1990, 204-205.
569 Thus LIMC VI.636 s.v. *Moesia* (Popovic) nos. 4, 6 and 9.
570 Ostrowski 1990, 204 no. 4., LIMC VIII.17 s.v. *Thracia* (Houghtalin) no. 2.; RIC II no. 907 (Hadrian) and RIC III no.591 (Antoninus Pius).
campaigns of Maximian, in which Gaul and Germania were freed from lawlessness, but not fully subdued. This interpretation is, of course, very tenuous.

Fragments c and d: Only a small piece is missing between these two fragments. Most of a figure inscribing a shield is lost. Her right arm, with the *stilus*, is preserved on fragment c, and her left shoulder and bent arm are on fragment d. The shield, on fragment c, is resting on a pillar and is being inscribed *VOTIS X ET XX*. It seems that an original inscription was filed off and this new one, contemporary to the *Arcus Novus*, was put there instead. The inscription allows the arch to be dated to 293/4, the *decennalia* of Diocletian and Maximian. The XX represent the *vota suscepta*, vows undertaken for twenty more years of successful rule. A winged cupid flies above the female scribe figure carrying a long thin vessel. Laubscher argued that the cupid allows the scribe to be identified as Venus. But we have no other depictions of Venus in the act of inscribing an object. The usual figure that inscribes or supports a votive shield is Victory, who performs this function from the Republic until the late antique, such as on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. Thus the figure here is far more likely to be Victory than Venus. While there are no wings visible on these fragments, it is possible that they were on the missing sliver between fragments c and d.

Two kneeling figures, one below the shield, the other behind Venus, wear crenellated crowns. The better preserved figure on the right wears a *chiton*, a dress and a mantle, and her counterpart
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571 Laubscher 1976, 85.
572 Laubscher 1976, 77. See chronological table in the appendix and chap. 2.
573 Laubscher 1976, 80. The figure is also identified as Venus in LIMC VIII.212 no. 210.
574 For the iconography of Venus see LIMC VIII.192-230 s.v. *Venus* (Schmidt)
on the left was probably similarly dressed. Laubscher argued that these were *Hispania citerior* and *Gallia comata*, who funded massive golden wreaths for Claudius’ triumph.\(^ {577}\) Certainly Hispania and Gallia sometimes wear crenellated crowns, but so do numerous personifications of cities and provinces.\(^ {578}\) Laubscher further proposed that in their re-use on the *Arcus Novus*, the two figures represented the two halves of the empire under the Tetrarchic system.\(^ {579}\) No such iconographic representation of the two halves of the empire is found elsewhere on Tetrarchic monuments. This interpretation, like most of Laubscher’s speculations about the Arch of Claudius and the *Arcus Novus*, is not terribly convincing.

3. *The so-called Ara Pietatis Augustae:*

It is possible that more fragments of relief sculpture from the Villa Medici were re-used as spolia in the *Arcus Novus*. Like the Boboli socles (no. 1) and the other reliefs fragments from the Villa Medici, the pieces stem from the finds in the Via Lata of 1523.\(^ {580}\) The most important fragment shows two *victimarii* leading a bull, a *togatus*, and a temple in the background. The head of the *togatus* has been re-worked into a Tetrarchic portrait. Other fragments show groups of *togati* and *flamines* in a procession.\(^ {581}\) It is generally agreed that the reliefs are Claudian in date. They have been connected, both on the basis of their findspots, and on stylistic grounds, to other sculptural fragments found in the via Lata in 1922 and 1933.\(^ {582}\) These fragments show similar temple backgrounds and one head.

---

\(^ {577}\) Laubscher 1976, 91; Plin. *NH* 33.16.54.

\(^ {578}\) For Gallia see LIMC VIII.594-596 (suppl.) *s.v. Gallia* (Henig). For Hispania see LIMC VIII.638-640 (suppl.) *s.v. Hispania* (Salcedo).

\(^ {579}\) Laubscher 1976, 103.

\(^ {580}\) De Maria 1988, Koeppel 1983, 98-103.

\(^ {581}\) Koeppel 1983, 104-108, figs. 18, 19, 20 and 21.

The reliefs are the most problematic of all the fragments connected to the lost monument. It was once thought that the fragments were originally part of a monument vowed by Tiberius, but not dedicated until 43 by Claudius. Our knowledge of the existence of the monument comes only from a lost inscription and a passage in Tacitus. This monument was usually referred to as the *Ara Pietatis Augustae*, until it was pointed out that neither inscription nor Tacitus necessarily refer to an altar. Nor is there any reason to connect the inscription and the textual reference. It is possible that the fragments come from the *Arcus Claudius*, but it is probably best to say that the fragments simply come from an otherwise unknown Claudian monument.

The connection of these fragments to the *Arcus Novus* can be made only on the basis of their find spot, and the head of a *togatus* that has been re-worked into a Tetrarchic portrait. The re-cut head only appears on the fragment in the Villa Medici wall, with bull being led towards a temple by two *victimarii*.

---

584 *CIL* VI.562; Tac. *Ann.* 3.64.
586 De Maria 1988, 199.
The bull wears a diadem with *infulae*. The temple pediment shows a throne containing a turreted crown that is flanked by two *galli* with tambourines. This secures the identity of the building as the temple of Magna Mater on the Capitoline hill. The head of the togate figure standing in front of the temple has been re-cut into a Tetrarchic portrait. It has the deeply furrowed forehead and the short beard that are typical of Tetrarchic portraits. The fact that the head was re-cut implies that the figure was meant to be recognized as an imperial person, and not a mere citizen participating in the procession. The heads of the other *togati* on other fragments have been left alone.

Laubscher proposed that one theme of the *Arcus Novus* spolia was images of the Tetrarchs making a sacrifice in front of certain temples. Certainly the other fragments fit in with that interpretation. But how many of the fragments were used on the *Arcus Novus* is unclear. Sacrificial scenes would be fitting in connection with the *vota soluta* and *suscepta* indicated in

---

587 Kleiner 1992, 144.
588 Laubscher 1976, 76.
the re-cut inscription of the shield in the fragments described above (no. 2.c). But the Temple of Magna Mater has no particular significance for Diocletian.

Fig. 61. Reworked head of a *togatus* from the *Ara Pietas Augustae* relief. (After Laubscher 1976, plate 2)

**Conclusions on the Arcus Novus**

We know very little about the *Arcus Novus*. The arch probably stood over the Via Lata near S. Maria in Via Lata, and was adorned with sculpture plundered from older monuments. Some of these may have come from the nearby Arch of Claudius, the *Arcus Vetus*, that celebrated Claudius’ conquest of Britain. But a few of the fragments that have been attributed to the older arch may actually be Antonine. In any event, the use of spolia on the arch is interesting. So far as I am aware, it marks the first instance of spolia on a Roman triumphal arch, thereby foreshadowing the use of spolia on the Arch of Constantine, and the later Arco di Portogallo. By the late third and early fourth centuries, many older monuments must have been in a bad state of repair, or had been damaged in the fire of 283, and would have provided an excellent source

---

589 Laubscher 1976, 76.
of ready made sculpture. But the re-use of these earlier monuments was more than just practical; it was also intended to recall the golden ages of the Antonines and Julio-Claudians.\(^{591}\) In the biography of Antoninus Pius in the SHA, which was written in the Tetrarchic period and dedicated to Diocletian, we are told how Diocletian worships Marcus Aurelius with extra devotion.\(^{592}\) As well as being the founders of a new golden age, the Tetrarchs also attempted to connect their regime to earlier stable dynasties. Just as Diocletian and Maximian adopted the name Aurelius Valerius to connect them to Marcus Aurelius, as well as their immediate predecessors, the Arcus Novus used spolia to connect them to the Antonine and Julio-Claudian rulers.

The Arcus Novus tells us very little about imperial representation under the Tetrarchy; not a single object can be said definitely to come from the arch. Even if all of the fragments found in the Via Lata and the fragments in the Villa Medici are from the Arcus Novus, they only provide two instances where the emperor might be represented: the re-cut heads on the Villa Medici fragments (nos. 2b and 3). The image of the Tetrarchs pouring a libation in front of a temple is known on at least one medallion, but there is no way of telling what this figure is doing or what was in front of him.\(^{593}\) Of more interest is the use of the Dioscuri on the socles, who function as a metaphor for the Tetrarchs. Both the two gods and the two Augusti are brothers. But all of this interpretation rests on the very tenuous attribution of the pieces to the Arcus Novus.

---

\(^{592}\) SHA, Marcus Aurelius, 19.  
\(^{593}\) See for instance chap. 3.12.
9. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As the chapters of this thesis have hopefully demonstrated, the representation of the Tetrarchs was radically different from anything that had occurred before. The period of the Tetrarchy saw the establishment of a new set of rules and guidelines for imperial representation. The more important of these developments, and their ideological interpretations, are discussed here.

The Monuments

It is important to note right away that the Tetrarchic building programme was significant simply because it happened. It was the first major campaign of building and restoration since the Severan dynasty, over fifty years before. Between the Severans and the Tetrarchs very little had been built in Rome, since no emperor had reigned long enough to undertake any kind of serious building programme. Buildings such as the Baths of Caracalla and Trajan Decius, Aurelian’s Temple to Sol Invictus and his new city walls, all served practical purposes. With the exception of the Arch of Gallienus, there had been no purely honorific or triumphal monuments built in Rome since the Arch of Septimius Severus in 203. Diocletian’s building campaign in Rome was, in part, necessitated and made possible by the fire of 283. The fire not only created the need for restoration, it probably also cleared up space for new projects in the cluttered Roman Forum.

The same pattern holds true outside Rome. Vermeule’s examination of inscribed statue bases from Greece and Asia Minor showed that there were very few dedications after the Severans.

In addition to the Arch of Septimius Severus at Lepcis Magna, we have evidence for Severan arches at Herakleion in Thasos, and perhaps also at Smyrna.\textsuperscript{597} The only notable exception is the restoration of a nymphaeum at Miletus by Gordian the Third.\textsuperscript{598} Under the Tetrarchy, provincial cities were turned into imperial residences, so it is not surprising that they should have received new monuments. The projects initiated by Diocletian must have been a great novelty to his subjects, and Lactantius even complained of Diocletian’s excessive building as if he were a second Nero.\textsuperscript{599}

The sorts of monument on which the Tetrarchs were depicted were not unusual as Roman monuments, but they were not exactly standard. In Rome either the Tetrarchs, or the Senate, constructed the \textit{Arcus Novus}, and the \textit{Fünfsäulendenkmal} (chap. 5 and 8). Triumphal arches and statue bearing columns were well recognized forms of honour since the Republic, and both continued through the empire.\textsuperscript{600} As for monuments in the provinces, we have the well-preserved Arch of Galerius in Thessalonike, possibly another tetrapylon at Gamzigrad, and the four columns flanking an intersection at Luxor. Srejovic has suggested that tetrapylon monuments were preferred by the Tetrarchs because of their four main supporting elements.\textsuperscript{601} The obvious allegorical interpretation is attractive, but then again, the practice of placing tetrapylon monuments at important intersections was not new, as the Arch of Septimius Severus at Lepcis Magna demonstrates.

\textsuperscript{597} Vermeule 1968, 315 and 319.  
\textsuperscript{598} Vermeule 1968, 322.  
\textsuperscript{599} Lactant. \textit{De Mort. Pers.} 7.8  
\textsuperscript{600} For the development of the triumphal arch, see De Maria 1988, 31-78.  
\textsuperscript{601} Srejovic 1994, 124-125.
The real innovation of Tetrarchic monuments was the inclusion of all of the Tetrarchs at once. Though we cannot be sure about the *Arcus Novus*, every other monuments that has been examined contained representations all four rulers. The Fünfsäulendenkmal was not unusual because of its form, but because it had statues of four emperors rather than just one. Both the regular coins of the Tetrarchs (e.g. chap. 3.2), and the more impressive medallion issues, such as a ten *aurei* multiple of 294 (chap. 3.6), make the same novel effort at inclusivity. The porphyry groups of the Tetrarchs (chap. 4.2 and 4.3) employ the same technique, though they are unusual because of their material and their iconography. The tetrapylon Arch of Galerius (chap. 6) probably also included statues of all four Tetrarchs in its upper niches, and all four were featured on one of its surviving relief panels as well (chap. 6.21). A similar depiction of the four Tetrarchs together is found in the painted niche at Luxor (chap. 7). Prior to 294, Diocletian and Maximian’s coinage also makes an effort to depict both the Augusti chapter 3.4 and 3.5. Thus the concept of depicting all of the empire’s rulers at once had been developed before the full foundation of the Tetrarchy. While the empire was ruled by four individuals, their monuments made every effort to represent them as one cohesive unit.

In a triumphal context, unity was shown by the inclusion of all four Tetrarchs on monuments that celebrated the victories of an individual Tetrarch. This was the case with the coinage that commemorates Constantius’ capture of Britain (chap. 3.10 and 3.11), and the Arch in Thessalonike (chap. 6), that celebrates Galerius Persian campaign. Moreover, all of the Tetrarchs shared in the victory titles of each other’s campaigns. Thus all four Tetrarchs became *Persicus maximus* and *Britannicus maximus* in 296 and 298 respectively.\(^6^0^2\) This idea of sharing triumphs

---

\(^6^0^2\) Barnes 1982, 255.
is expressed even before the full establishment of the Tetrarchy in the panegyric to Maximian of 291:

Those laurels from the conquered nations inhabiting Syria and from Raetia and Sarmatia made you, Maximian, celebrate a triumph in pious joy; and by the same token the destruction here of the Chabones and Eruli and the victories across the Rhine and the wars with the pirates who were suppressed when the Franks were subdued made Diocletian share in your vows. The immortal ones cannot divide favours between you: whatever is offered to one or the other belongs to both.

Panegyrici Latini11.7.1-3 (Rodger’s translation)

The continuous inclusion of all four Tetrarchs, as well as their shared triumphs, was one way of showing the Tetrarchic ideal of concordia among the emperors. The second important element was the iconography and portraiture of the rulers. Before considering just what Tetrarchic concordia meant, let us first consider how portraiture and iconography contributed to it.

Portraiture

A noteworthy innovation of the Tetrarchy was the introduction of a new portrait type. In some ways the new portraiture was a direct development from the portraiture of the third century. All of the portraits of the emperors between Gallienus and Diocletian included the short military beard, down-turned mouth and furrowed brow. These features were symbolic of the emperor’s concern for his dominion, as well as evidence of his harsh military nature and competence. The earliest coins of Diocletian and Maximian, and perhaps some unprovenienced marble busts, follow this pattern of the portraiture of the soldier emperors.

---

603 For the portrait types of these emperors see, Wegner 1979.
604 L’Orange 1984, 15.
Under the Tetrarchy, whatever traces of individuality remained in Roman portraiture were completely lost. The Tetrarchs have short military hair and beards, large oval eyes, furrowed brows, frowns and angular facial features. Their heads are large and are closer to being boxes than spheres. This new cubic type of portrait is seen on the coins, on porphyry statues, and in relief on the Arch of Galerius, where only one imperial head, in the *clementia* panel (chap. 6.16), survives. It is not too much to assume that this same portrait type was used on the *Arcus Novus*, the Fünfsäulendenkmal, and in the niche at Luxor. As before, the harsh faces represented the toughness and capacity of the Tetrarchs as soldiers. The almost cubic shape and jutting angularity of the new portraits made porphyry an ideal stone in which to carve them.605 The lack of individual features in Tetrarchic portraiture underscored the *similitudo* of the new emperors. The Tetrarchs were not only related fraternally and paternally, but they also looked and acted alike. Only small points in dress and position distinguish the Augusti from the Caesars. Thus the *similitudo* of the Tetrarchs was another means of presenting their *concordia*.606

This point has been overlooked by those scholars who have attempted to show the identity of individual Tetrarchs within each portrait. Some have even gone so far as to take Lactantius’ description of Galerius as the literal truth. He describes Galerius as having a barbarian mother, a beastly and enormous body, as well as a fierce face when angry (*trux vultus*).607 On the basis of Lactantius, it has been argued that those Tetrarchic portraits with more deeply furrowed brows and frowns are representations of Galerius!608 Not only does this interpretation ignore the Tetrarchic concept of *similitudo*, it also ignores the very obvious bias of Lactantius. The
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606 L’Orange 1984, 3-13.  
608 L’Orange 1984, 26.
Christian author had only bad things to say about the persecutors. This description of Galerius is simply one of many stock tyrant motifs found in his writing.

_The New Imperial Costume and Attributes_

The clothing of the Tetrarchs is quite strikingly different, their clothes are more elaborate and ornate than past emperors. Not surprisingly, the Tetrarchs were usually dressed in an identical fashion. They are presented in either civilian or military garb, but there is a preference for the latter. The military dress of the Tetrarchs typically consists of a breastplate, a short tunic, and a military cloak fastened by a round _fibula_. They are found armed with both swords and spears. Where the Tetrarchs are portrayed in civilian outfits they wear purple clothing, including garments with decorated hems and patterns (_paragaudae_), and jewelled _campagi_. They also carry sceptres, rods and _globi_. The square Tetrarchic cap, the _pileus Pannonicus_, is worn by the Tetrarchs with both civilian and military costumes, and is another Tetrarchic innovation. Porphyry statues of the Tetrarchs, the paintings at Luxor, and the Arch of Galerius supply our best examples of civilian dress.

The new dress of the Tetrarchs did not escape the notice of ancient historians. In general, the non-military clothing of the emperor was seen as something extravagant. For instance, in opening his chapter on the period of the first Tetrarchy, Aurelius Victor wrote of Diocletian:

> He was a very great man, yet he had the following characteristics: he was, in fact, the first who really desired a supply of silk, purple and gems for his sandals, together with a gold-brocaded robe. Although these things went beyond good taste and betrayed a vain and haughty disposition

Aurelius Victor 39 (Bird’s translation)

Similarly, Eutropius wrote:
He had his clothing and shoes decorated with gems, whereas previously the emperor’s insignia comprised only the purple robe; the rest of his dress was ordinary.

Eutropius 26 (Bird’s translation)

These textual descriptions match artistic representations of the Tetrarchs. Jewel encrusted campagi are to be found on the feet of the Tetrarchs in the niche at Luxor, as well as on the feet of the Venetian porphyry Tetrarchs (chap. 4.1). In both instances we see oval and rectangular shapes on the straps of the sandals that clearly indicate gems. The Vatican Tetrarchs (chap. 4.2 and 4.3) and the porphyry bust from Gamzigrad both wear unusual jewel encrusted wreaths. The clothing of the Tetrarchs is similarly decorated. The hems of their garments are often have similar oval and rectangular patterns (paragaudae) as well as patterned circular motifs (oribiculi). Representations of Tetrarchs with this sort of decoration on their clothing, armour and other accoutrements can be found on the Arch of Galerius (see chaps. 6.17, 6.19, 6.20, 6.21), the Venetian and Vatican Porphyry Tetrarch groups (chap. 4.2 and 4.4), and their coins and medals (e.g. chaps. 3.5, 3.6 ,3.7, 3.8, 3.12). The garments of the Luxor Tetrarchs seem to be borderless, and solid purple, but they are not complete. The crowds of figures that surround the Tetrarchs, on the other hand, do wear paragaudae, decorated with very elaborate oribiculi. These can be compared to the nearly contemporary figures in the mosaics at Piazza Armerina.609 It is possible that the new use of lavish clothing, like some of the scenes on the Arch of Galerius, was something borrowed from the Sassanians.

Perhaps the most conspicuous aspect of the new Tetrarchic clothing was the Pannonian cap, the pileus Pannonicus. It is on worn by both the Tetrarchs, and their followers, in numerous

609 Most notably, it is worn by the officials seen in the villa’s Great Hunt Mosaic: Wilson 1986, 85-87.
representations. In a section of his book about past military practices, Vegetius describes the period of the Tetrarchy and mentions the function of this headgear:

Almost down to the present day the custom survived whereby all soldiers wore leathern caps which they called “Pannonians”. This was observed so that a helmet should not seem heavy to a man in battle, who was always used to wearing something on his head.

Vegetius I.20.510-514. (Milner’s translation)

Vegetius gives a entirely pragmatic function for the new headgear, but its frequent use on the Tetrarchs and their followers seems to show their high rank. The cap seems very much like a uniform. It is found worn by the Tetrarchs in the porphyry statue group in Venice (chap. 4.1), and a fragment of a porphyry head in Nis, Serbia. It is also worn by figures in various panels on the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.1, 6.3, 6.13).

The use of the pileus Pannonicus was almost certainly intended to reflect the military background of the Tetrarchs. Even in depictions where the Tetrarchs are not engaged in combat, they are shown and were conceived of as soldiers. A panel on the Arch of Galerius shows Galerius (chap. 6.1) and his soldiers rushing into combat wearing the pileus Pannonicus. They have not had time to exchange their caps for helmets, but are nonetheless ready for combat. Similarly, the Venetian porphyry Tetrarchs (chap. 4.2), are all dressed in armour, with their hands gripping their swords in readiness to deal with anything that might threaten the security of the empire under their care. Not only did this sort of combination of peace-time and wartime clothing cater to the soldiers who saw this monument, it also appealed to the commoner as an assurance that the safety of the empire was in good hands.
The panegyric of 289, addressed to Maximian, illustrates this dual military and civilian nature of the Tetrarchs through a description of their changing clothing:

We saw you, Caesar, on the same day both in the most splendid garb of peace and in the magnificent accoutrements of war.

I should say, with apologies to the gods, that not even Jupiter himself changes the face of his own heavens, O Emperor, as swiftly and easily as you doffed the *toga praetexta* and put on the cuirass, laying down staff and seizing a spear, transporting yourself from the tribunal to the field of battle, from the curule seat to horseback, and returning again from the fray in triumph, and filling the whole of this city, anxious at your sudden sortie against the enemy, with joy and exultation, with blazing altars and sacrificial perfumes kindled in honour of your divinity. Thus twice, both at the beginning and end of that day, were religious ceremonies celebrated with equal solemnity, in that vows were pledged to Jupiter for what was to come, and discharged by you for victory granted.

*Panegyrici Latini* 10.3-5. (Nixon’s translation)

In the odd instances when dress is used to make distinctions among the Tetrarchs, it is used to distinguish Augusti from Caesars or the *Jovi* from *Herculii*. For instance, Constantius and Maximian sometimes appear wearing a lion skin headdress on coin obverses, as is the case on the multiple aurei discussed in chapter 3.11. In other places, Diocletian is seen holding a long sceptre to indicate his status as the most senior Tetrarch and the representative of Jupiter. This is done on panel 21 of the Arch of Galerius, and in the painted niche at Luxor.

The new imperial clothing, almost a uniform, was employed equally by all four different Tetrarchs. Had Constantius erected a tetrapylon triumphal arch in Trier to celebrate his conquest of Britain, we can be reasonably sure that he would have been represented wearing outfits similar to those on the Arch of Galerius. The proof for this uniformity of dress is found in both the porphyry statues and the coinage. Just like their identical portraits, the indistinguishable dress
of the Tetrarchs was used to underscore their *concordia*. The use of *similitudo* to show *concordia* is perhaps the most important element of Tetrarchic representation.

It is not necessary to look far for an explanation of the continual emphasis on *concordia* in imperial representation. The past fifty years of strife had been as much the result of internal usurpations and civil war as it had been the fault of external pressure. A system of government of four rulers must have caused some unease amongst the general population, and the emphasis on the emperor’s *concordia* was intended to address these concerns, and bolster confidence in the government.

*The nimbus*

In addition to this new dress, the Tetrarchs are among the first emperors to be depicted nimbate. The *nimbus* was a direct development off the radiate crown, which was used in representations of Hellenistic kings, and deified emperors of the Julio-Claudian period.\(^{610}\) Traces of gold around the heads of the figures in the niche at Luxor are certainly the remains of *nimbi*. The two enthroned figures on the Mainz Medallion (chap. 3.9) and the sacrificing Tetrarchs of two gold multiples (chap 3.12) of 305 are also nimbate.\(^{611}\) Though the *nimbus* had only rarely been used prior to the Tetrarchy, it took a new Christian significance after Constantine, and became a standard motif for the emperors by the mid fourth century.\(^{612}\) Evans interpreted the following passage in the Panegyric of 289 as a reference to the *nimbus*:

> Your triumphal robes and your consular fasces, your curule thrones, this glittering crowd of courtiers, that light which surrounds your divine head with a

\(^{610}\) The radiate crown was also employed on the Colossus of Nero, and coinage. It did not become common for imperial representation until the reign of Caracalla. See Bergmann 1998.

\(^{611}\) Bastien and Metzger 1977, nos. 393 and 394.

shining orb, (*et illa lux divinum verticem claro orbe complectens*) these are the trappings of your merits, very fine indeed, and most majestic.

*Panegyrici Latini* 10.3.2 (Nixon’s translation)

Nixon commented, however, that he thought the passage referred to the radiate crown, rather than a *nimbus*, because this would fit better with the physical trappings described in the rest of the passage. It is interesting to note that there is a reference to the crowd of courtiers, since in most instances of imperial representation, the Tetrarchs are shown with large groups of attendants. This is the case in numerous instances on the Arch of Galerius, and probably also in the side scenes of the cult room at Luxor.

*The Scenes and Themes of Imperial Representation*

The Tetrarchs are found represented in three types of scenes, purely ideological, ceremonial, and battle.

*Ideological Scenes*

The purely ideological scenes range from depictions of the four Tetrarchs posing, to depictions of the Tetrarchs engaged in libations, sacrifices, and other ceremonies. These scenes range from portrait groups, to depictions of religious events such as sacrifices and libations. A key trait of the ideological scene is a separation from any historical reality. In favour of a focus on imperial virtues. The failure to realise this fact has caused a lot of unwarranted speculation about the nature of the surviving panels on the Arch of Galerius.  

---

614 Kinch’s historical interpretations of every panel are the prime example of this. Kinch, 1890.
The regular issues of silver argentarii, showing all four emperors pouring libations over a tripod in front of a city gate (chap. 3.2), are a fine example of the ideological scene. The legend usually found on these coins, PROVIDENTIA AVG, stresses one of the virtues of the rulers: their wisdom. The city gate behind the figures is not meant to be any specific city. Moreover, the Tetrarchs were never physically present in one place, and such a libation never took place. The statues on the Fünfsäulendenkmal the porphyry groups of the four Tetrarchs, the Luxor niche paintings, the multiple busts on Tetrarchic coins and medals (e.g. chap. 3.5 and 3.6) and, most importantly, the concordia scene of the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.21), are all examples of ideological portraiture. In such representations, the Tetrarchic concordia and similitudo is most apparent. The fact that the Tetrarchs were never physically together is besides the point. The friendly embrace of the porphyry groups, and the closeness of the other representations, recalls the familial relationship among fathers, sons and brothers. Their indistinguishability is a clear sign of their equality and interchangeability. The representation of the Tetrarchs together in this manner was a stark contrast to the individualised representations of their predecessors.

Religious scenes are slightly less static than the portrait groups, but are equally ideological. These scenes focus on the Tetrarchs’ virtues, especially their pietas. On regular coinage and medallions (chaps. 3.2, 3.4 and 3.5), the Tetrarchs are found pouring libations, and offering sacrifices,. It also seems likely that the ArcusNovus employed spolia that specifically contained scenes of emperors sacrificing in front of temples. The decennalia base of the Fünfsäulendenkmal shows two processions leading up to a libation scene which, unusually, represents only one Tetrarch in the act of pouring a libation. On the Arch of Galerius, there is a panel (chap. 6.17) showing a double sacrifice by Diocletian and Galerius. While the two
probably did meet and sacrifice during the Persian campaign, there is no reason to suppose that the panel represents a particular sacrifice at any particular moment.

The ideological nature of some of these scenes is underscored by the inclusion of divine and cosmic elements. A column with a statue of Jupiter stood higher than the other four columns of the Fünfsäulendenkmal. The idea of the monument seems to have been to set the Tetrarchs up in heaven, alongside the king of the gods. The use of the genius, instead of the Tetrarch himself, shows a clear overlap between the Tetrarch’s person and his divine spirit. We are told that a column to Jupiter was erected on the spot outside Nicomedia where Diocletian raised Galerius to the rank of Caesar, and later resigned the purple.615 There are sixteen deities and personifications surrounding the Tetrarchs in the concordia panel of the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.21), and seating the Tetrarchs amongst these gods was surely a striking reminder of their own divine prerogative. The Dioscuri appear both in the concordia panel, on the socles of the Arcus Novus (chap. 7.1), and a gold coin from Aquileia.616 The use of these two gods was surely because of their role as twins, and an allegorical comparison to the Augusti and Caesars, who were also identical brothers.

The ideological representations of the Tetrarchs also have a distinctly cosmic flavour. The appearance of Tellus and Oceanus on either side of panel 21 of the Arch of Galerius show the ubiquitous ever presence of the Tetrarchs. It is also likely that the blue traces above the niche in Luxor are the remains of the heavens. The presence of Aion in a sacrifice scene on the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.17), and the placement of Roma under a zodiac arch on the decennalia base are

616 RIC VI Aquileia, 1.
further examples of this. This cosmological element of Tetrarchic imperial representation may have been part of the move towards a more eastern style of monarchy, where the leader is a god, or at least a god’s representative on earth. The panegyricist of 291 stated of Diocletian and Maximian: “For this reason it is manifest that the souls of the rest of men are earthbound and perishable, but yours are heavenly and eternal.”

While Tetrarchic monuments were erected on specific occasions, and for specific reasons, the manner in which they represented the Tetrarchs was not restricted to these events. The divine and cosmic elements, the inclusion of deities and personifications, allowed the monuments to be understood as indicators of the divine backing of the Tetrarchy and the divine nature of the Tetrarchs themselves. The cosmic element, on the other hand, emphasized that the new system was not confined by spatial or temporal boundaries. In this respect, these non-historical depictions of the Tetrarchs are highly effective in communicating the ideology of the Tetrarchy. These ideas could not be effectively communicated by scenes that were restricted to geographical places or specific points in time.

*Ceremonial Scenes*

The ceremonial category of Tetrarchic representation includes such scenes as the *adventus* of emperors, the *adlocutio*, the distribution of *donativa*, the subjugation of prisoners of war, processions, receptions of legations, and so on. Libations and sacrifices are, of course, also ceremonies, but their abundant use in the Tetrarchic period, and the inclusion of divinities in these scenes, seems to set them outside the more earthly ceremonial category, and in the realm of

---

617 *Pan. Lat.* 11.6.4.
ideological representations. The ceremonies of late antiquity were also conflated, such that adventus, triumphs, and anniversaries could all be celebrated simultaneously. One reason for this evolution of ceremony was the fact that the Tetrarchs were always on the move, and never stayed in one place for long. Combining ceremonies allowed them to maximize propaganda in a shorter period of time. The panegyric of 291 discusses the combination of adventus and triumph and the wanderings of the Tetrarchs:

> These are the rewards which you win for the greatest deeds, this is the way that you celebrate triumphs in the consciousness of merits while you always put off the triumphal processions themselves by conquering, because whatever illustrious things you are doing you immediately accomplish and hurry to something greater, so that while we are marvelling at your traces and think that you are still in our sight, we suddenly hear of your distant miracles. All of your provinces, which you travel through with divine speed do not know from one moment to the next where you are: yet they do know that you have conquered everywhere.

*Panegyrici Latini* 11.4.3-4 (Rodger’s translation)

Unlike the ideological scenes, there is some historical truth in ceremonial scenes. For instance, the subjugation of Persian prisoners before Galerius, (chap. 6.9 and 6.10), probably did happen. But the addition of second scene of the subjugation of prisoners before Diocletian was done for the sake of Tetrarchic ideology. The reception of a Persian legation by Galerius (chap. 6.18) is also a historical fact, as is the payment made by Narses at the conclusion of the Persian campaign. Some ceremonial scenes, such as the *adlocutio* of Galerius (chap. 6.15), or the possible *donatio* scene at Luxor, could be entirely ideological or may be connected to actual events. Galerius probably did give a speech to his troops, either before or after the Persian campaign, but the scene at Luxor cannot be connected to any specific campaign with certainty. The same is true of the adventus scenes of the Arch of Galerius (panels 7 and 19), where the
image could recall the entrance of any Tetrarch into any city. This use of generic ceremonial scenes is also found on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius.

The ceremonial scenes had a universal appeal that went beyond any historical connections they may have had. The scenes reminded the viewer of the everyday events connected with the emperor. The *adventus* scenes of the Arch of Galerius recalled the fact that the Tetrarchs were constantly on the move, and their arrival at different cities was a time of celebration and ceremony. The same is true of the *adlocutio* of Galerius, and the *donatio* scene at Luxor. The crowds of courtiers who surround these scenes are equally important reminders of court ceremony. It is interesting that we have no surviving depictions of the *proskynisos* ceremony that was supposedly introduced by Diocletian.\(^{618}\) The usually unbiased Eutropius describes the introduction of the ceremony with disdain:

> Nonetheless he was a very industrious and capable emperor and the one who was first to introduce in the Roman empire a practice more in keeping with royal usage than with Roman liberty, since he gave orders that he should be revered with prostration, although before him all (emperors) were simply greeted.

Eutropius 26 (Bird’s translation)

Perhaps the ceremony was still too foreign and monarchical to be used in Tetrarchic imperial representation. Or perhaps the historians are wrong to attribute the introduction of the ceremony to Diocletian.

*Battle Scenes*

As the successors of the soldier emperors, and themselves military men, it is not surprising that the Tetrarchs were often depicted in battle. Such representations were almost certainly aimed at

\(^{618}\) It has been used as evidence for an Eastern style monarchy, see Kolb 2000, 38-46.
the army, whose continued loyalty was essential. We are told in the panegyric of 289 how Maximian himself fought in a battle against the Germans, and both a later panegyric and Eutropius tell us how Constantius was wounded during the siege of Langres. Yet the descriptions of Constantius’ charge from the besieged Langres, and the representation of cavalry charging out of a city on the Arch of Galerius (chap. 6.1), are too similar for mere coincidence. Eutropius writes:

Near Langres he experienced both bad fortune and good in a single day, for although he had been forced into the city by a sudden attack of the barbarians and with such headlong compulsion that the gates were closed and he had to be lifted onto the wall by ropes, when his army had advanced he cut down almost sixty thousand of the Allemanni in barely five hours.

Eutropius 9.23 (Bird’s translation)

The frequent appearance of the emperor fighting with the cavalry probably recalls the increasing use of more mobile cavalry in the late antique. Gallienus had developed a new cavalry army, stationed in Milan, that was able to be deployed quickly. Under the Tetrarchic system of defence, infantry forces were permanently stationed along the frontier, while the emperor travelled with his mobile cavalry army. There is no reason that the Tetrarchs should not have participated in actual battles. After all, they probably would not have reached their high ranks in the army without seeing some actual fighting. This point is illustrated by the panegyricist who describes Maximian fighting German invaders with only part of his entire army:

For what need of a multitude when you yourself took part in the fray, when you yourself did battle in each spot and over the whole of the battlefield, and you yourself ran to counter the foe everywhere, both where he resisted, and where he gave way and fled, and deceived equally your adversaries and your

---

619 Pan Lat. 10.5.3. It is reproduced in this chapter above.
620 Pan. Lat. 6.6.2.
621 For a description of this, see Williams 1985, 91-102.
own troops, since neither did the barbarians suppose you to be one man nor were your soldiers able to follow you, I don’t mean in a band as your escort, but even with their eyes. Indeed you were born over the whole field of battle in the fashion of a great river, swollen with winter rain and snow, which is wont to flow wherever the plain extends.

*Panegyrici Latini* 10.5.3. (Nixon’s translation)

The battle between Galerius and Narses on the arch of Galerius (chap. 6.20) is totally fictional. We have no record that Narses was present at any of the fighting during the Persian campaign, let alone that he engaged in combat with Galerius. The explanation for both panels is that the individual combat scenes are ideological rather than historical. The same is probably true of the combat descriptions of the panegyrics. They simply show, and perhaps accurately, that the emperor participated in the fighting along with the soldiers whom he himself resembled.

*Interpreting the Present through the Past*

But the choice of scenes employed on Tetrarchic monuments is due to natural causes as well as ideological developments. It is sometimes argued that the sculptors and artisans of the Tetrarchy found their training and inspiration in the battle sarcophagi that were the chief artistic legacy of the past hundred years.\(^{622}\) The frequent use of relief panels on Tetrarchic monuments suggests that artists were most familiar with working in this kind of format. The combination of battle scenes, libation scenes and *clementia* scenes on the Arch of Galerius call to mind the battle sarcophagi that became popular in the Antonine period and the third century.\(^{623}\) The scenes of the emperor on a rearing mount, with a raised spear and defeated enemies below, as seen on the Ach of Galerius (chaps. 6.1, 6.5 and 6.20), and the Siscia Medallion (chap. 3.8), recall the Hunt

---

\(^{622}\) Kleiner 1992, 419-420; Strong 1988, 265.

\(^{623}\) Kleiner 1992, 301-308 and 390.
sarcophagi of the mid third century, in which a mounted hunter, the deceased, rises up above a cowering animal whom he threatens with a spear.  

The various representations of the Tetrarchs are based on models of Hadrianic and Antonine date. The purpose of this was to recall images and ideas of a more prosperous period. A relief panel in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, showing Marcus Aurelius pouring a libation (a ceremonial scene), and a panel of Trajan fighting on horseback (a battle scene), are both examples of artistic formulae that were adopted by the Tetrarchs. The fact that the Trajanic panel was re-used on the Arch of Constantine shows how this method of re-interpreting the past was applied after the Tetrarchic period as well. The very idea of using spolia was a Tetrarchic innovation, first seen on the Arcus Novus, was continued on the arch of Constantine. The scenes that were chosen for the Arcus Novus and the Arch of Constantine were carefully selected to fit with the ideological programmes of the day. Elsner has argued that the ability of Roman art to re-interpret the past is one of its defining qualities.

There is another important point that must be made here. While Tetrarchic art contained many innovations, it nonetheless had its roots in Roman tradition. The fact that so many precedents for Tetrarchic monuments can be found serves to dispel the notion of sudden change or decline. The changes in art are better explained by changes in ideology, wherein older scenes and motifs were increasingly reduced to ideological symbols.

---

625 Kleiner 1992, 294 and 222.
626 Elsner 1998, 1ff.
627 Berenson 1954.
628 A full description of this process, which cannot be properly treated here, is given by Elsner 1998.
The idea of mixing the emperor with divinities in artistic representations was by no means new. Our earliest instance of this is a triumphal scene on the Arch of Titus, which after this, the practice became standard. The spiral friezes on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius contain personifications and deities, but their use is far more muted than in the friezes on the Arch of Galerius. The Tetrarchic period was the last important period in which pagan gods would be represented alongside the emperors. The monuments of Christian emperors, such as the now lost column of Arcadius in Constantinople, would no longer employ these pagan divinities. Only winged victories continued to be employed, and these were re-interpreted as angels. Geographical personifications also appear on the column’s base, but clearly serve a purely symbolic function. The use of personifications in Tetrarchic imperial representation, to add a cosmological and universal element to ideological scenes, has been discussed above. But the Tetrarchs also employed the gods more directly to legitimize their power.

It will be recalled that Diocletian had established a special connection to Jupiter, and Maximian to Hercules. Thus Jupiter and Hercules receive special attention in Tetrarchic representations. The Tetrarchs also seem to have placed a renewed emphasis on the Genii Augusti, and this is especially apparent on the coinage. The most common reverse type on the bronze nummi of the Tetrarchs (chap. 3.1), presumably the most circulated denomination, showed a nude genius pouring a libation with the legend GENIO AUGUSTI. The columns of the Fünfsäulendenkmal probably bore statues of genii rather than the emperors themselves. Reverse types on other coins often incorporated the patron deity of the Tetrarch depicted on the other side. Thus the aurei of

---

620 Kleiner 1992, 187-188.
630 Giglioli 1952, fig. 17. The monument consisted of a column, with a sculpted spiral frieze, and a base with three bands of decoration. Today, the monument is known only from drawings and a few fragments.
Diocletian often showed Jupiter, while those of Maximian showed Hercules (chap. 3.3). The use of deities could also be metaphorical. On the same gold coins, for example, Jupiter was shown smiting a giant, and Hercules performed his labours. By metaphor, these deeds were compared directly to the efforts of the Tetrarchs.

However much past artistic endeavours influenced Tetrarchic art, it cannot be denied that the period saw a distinct shift in the mode of imperial representation. The system of Tetrarchic government collapsed only a few years after the retirement of Diocletian, but the manner in which the emperor was depicted was permanently changed. Though the cubic Tetrarchic portraits and porphyry groups would soon be abandoned, and a new brand of Christian imagery would replace many of the favourite Tetrarchic scenes. The fact that the Roman world did not revert to an older modes of imperial representation is a strong testament to the power and influence of the Tetrarchic legacy, and the advent of a new religious tradition in imperial commemoration.
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*Modern Works*


11. APPENDICES

Timeline

The following timeline is based of the narratives of Williams 1985 and Kuhoff 2001 as well as the chronological tables of Barnes 1982. Wherever there has been any disagreement between these authors I have followed Barnes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT EVENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>284 20 Nov.</td>
<td>• Diocletian proclaimed Augustus at Nicomedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285 spring</td>
<td>• Diocletian defeats Carinus at Viminacium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 July</td>
<td>• Maximian proclaimed Caesar at Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late summer</td>
<td>• Maximian campaigns against Bagaudae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autumn</td>
<td>• Diocletian campaigns against Sarmatians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autumn</td>
<td>• Maximian campaigns against Germans in Gaul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286 1 April</td>
<td>• Maximian proclaimed Augustus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Titles Jovius and Herculius assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Carausius proclaims himself Augustus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>• Diocletian negotiates with Persians, installs Tiridates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximian makes an expedition across the Rhine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>• Diocletian campaigns against Germans on frontier of Raetia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>• Conference of Diocletian and Maximian at Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximian settles Gennoboudes and Franks in northwest Gaul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 summer</td>
<td>• Diocletian campaigns against Sarmatians in Dacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximian’s failed British expedition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Constantius surprised at Langres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 May/June</td>
<td>• Diocletian campaigns against Saracens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 290</td>
<td>• Conference of Diocletian and Maximian at Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 1 March</td>
<td>• Diocletian raises Galerius to Caesar / Maximian raises Constantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early summer</td>
<td>• Constantius expels Carausius’ troops from Gaul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Constantius defeats Franks in Batavia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
294

295

- Constantius visits Italy
- Galerius campaigns on Persian frontier

296 summer/autumn

summer/autumn late-spring 297

- Diocletian campaigns against the Carpi
- Maximian defeats Franks in Spain
- Galerius campaigns against Persians, defeated near Carrhae
- Constantius invades Britain and defeats Allectus

297 autumn

- Diocletian suppresses revolt in Egypt, begins siege of Alexandria
- Maximian campaigns in Mauretania, expedition to Tripolitania
- Galerius collects new army from Danube

298 spring

10 March

- Diocletian’s siege of Alexandria ends
- Maximian has triumph in Carthage
- Diocletian settles Nobades and renews Egyptian defences
- Galerius’ 2nd Persian campaign
- Galerius negotiates with Persian envoys
- Constantius besieged at Langres

299 spring

(or 300)

- Diocletian and Galerius meet at Nisibis
- Maximian enters Rome in triumph (Pan. Lat. 7.8.7)
- Galerius campaigns against Marcomanni

300

(or 301)

- Diocletian on Danube, possibly defeats the Carpi
- Constantius has a victory of the Franks

301 late

- Galerius campaigns against Carpi

302

- Constantius defeats Germans in territory of the Lingones
- Galerius campaigns against Sarmatians and Carpi

303 Nov./Dec.

autumn

- Maximian and Diocletian in Rome
- Constantius defeats Germans
- Galerius campaigns against Carpi

304 late Winter

- Maximian meets Galerius
- Constantius defeats German invaders who have crossed frozen Rhine

305 1 May

- Resignation of Diocletian and Maximian
- Constantius in Britain campaigns against the Picts
Fig. 62. The Roman Empire in the period of the Tetrarchy. (After Barnes, 1981)
IMPERIAL TITLES

(As presented by Kienast 1996)

Diocletian:

20. Nov. 284: IMP. CAES. C. AURELIUS VALERIUS DIOCLETIANUS P. F. INV. AUG., PONTIFEX MAXIMUS, PATER PATRIAE, PROCONSUL.

1. Apr. 286: JOVIUS

1. May 305: SENIOR AUGUSTUS. PATER AUGUSTORUM. PATER IMPERATORUM ET CAESARUM.

Maximian:

Dec. (?) 285: AURELIUS VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS NOB. CAES.

Early 286: CAES. M. AURELIUS VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS P.F. INV. AUG., PONTIFEX MAXIMUS, HERCULIUS, FRATER AUGUSTI DIOCLETIANI, PATER PATRIAE, PROCONSUL.

May 305: SENIOR AUGUSTUS. PATER AUGUSTORUM. PATER IMPERATORUM ET CAESARUM.

Constantius:

1. Mar. 293: FLAVIUS VALERIUS CONSTANTIUS NOB. CAES., HERCULIUS, PRINCEPS IUVENTUTIS

1. May 305: IMP. CAES. C. (or M.) FLAVIUS VALERIUS CONSTANTIUS AUG., PONTIFEX MAXIMUS, PATER PATRIAE, PROCONSUL.

Galerius:

21. May 293: C. GALERIUS VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS NOB. CAES., PRINCEPS IUVENTUTIS, IOVIUS,

1. May 305: IMP. CAES. GALERIUS VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS P.F. INV. AUG., PONT. MAX., PATER PATRIAE, PROCONSUL.