Rethinking re-carving:
revitalising Roman portraits in the third century

Abstract

Research on the re-use of Roman material culture has often focused on repurposed architectural elements or recarved portraits and new approaches have increasingly focused on culture, context and memory with praxis, agency meaning, materiality, and reception as key issues. Sculpted portraits have been key players in the scholarly discourse beginning with the portraits of Rome’s ‘bad emperors’ such as Caligula, Nero, and Domitian reconfigured as a result of damnatio memoriae in the first century. The third century, however, proves to be a critical moment that witnesses a shift towards affirmative interventions that seek to refurbish and access the positive and legitimising aspects of the original images. Portraits are now redacted from likenesses of ‘good emperors’ such as Augustus, Hadrian, and Trajan to invoke the venerable authority of the imperial past. Private portraiture in the third century also provides evidence for secondary interventions not motivated by denigration but by the prestige of re-use. In a funerary context, the reconfiguration of portraits could confer ancestral honour and status. Ultimately the reuse of portraits, both imperial and private, can be read as highly creative revitalising acts of positive recycling.

Scholarship on the re-use of Roman material culture has exploded over the last two decades. Often focused on repurposed architectural elements or recarved portraits, new approaches have sought to offer more subtly nuanced interpretations of redacted objects in terms of culture and context. Recent interpretations have also relied on memory theory in order to move the discourse away from older monolithic categories of spolia or damnatio memoriae both neologisms of the early modern period. Praxis, agency, meaning, materiality, and reception have become key issues. Re-use, in all of its many manifestations is increasingly revealed to be a particularly Roman cultural and aesthetic paradigm of long duration, with important examples stretching from the mid-Republic well into Late Antiquity.

Architectural spoliation has been well documented, often centred around late Roman buildings like Maxentius’s vestibule for the praefectus urbi, the so called Temple of Romulus, or Constanine’s new Christian basilicas at the Vatican and Lateran. The vestibule of the so-called Temple of Romulus presents an innovative concave façade along the Via Sacra that

1 E.g., Brilliant, Kinney 2011; Ng, and Swetnam Burland 2018b (with references).
showcases an eclectic and colourful ensemble of architectural elements including white marble mouldings, porphyry and cipollino columns, white marble column capitals, and bronze doors that have all been repurposed from earlier structures ranging from the Augustan through the Severan periods; to what degree early fourth-century viewers could recognise a programmatic or political agenda in the re-used materials is highly debatable and probably ultimately un-knowable. While the re-use of earlier materials may have held specific ideological implications intended to lend its patron, Maxentius, imperial legitimacy, the broader decorative aesthetic highlights the heterogeneity of its disparate constituent parts and the richness of the materials. Approximately two decades later, Constantine’s architects would collect and redeploy 100 columns that are conspicuous for their rich array of colours and lack of uniform size in the construction of St. Peter’s basilica. The shafts of africano, portasanta, cipollino, and red and white granite contributed to the dazzling *variétas* of the church’s vast interior leading to aesthetic reinterpretations of late Roman architectural re-use.

As a modern archeological, philological, and art historical concept, *spolia* derives from the military spoils gained in battle and is linked with the first *spolia opima* of Romulus. It is also used to characterise the artworks exported to Rome as a result of Roman expansion in the Mediterranean and ultimately redeployed in new contexts during the Republic. Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus constructed a *porticus* after his triumph in 146 BC, to display the very famous works he had been able to import to Rome as a result of his Macedonian victories. These spoliated masterpieces included the large bronze equestrian group monument created by Lysippus for Alexander the Great to celebrate the 20 members of his horse guard who had perished at the Battle of the Granikos river. This kind of artistic spoliation continued into the early imperial period and culminated in the remarkable collection of old-master sculptures and paintings that Nero expropriated from various locales across the Mediterranean for display in the Domus Aurea and which were ultimately redeployed by Vespasian in his new Forum complex, the Templum Pacis. The early imperial period also witnessed the kind of architectural spoliation that would become common later. The Oppian wing of Nero’s Domus Aurea was systematically spoliated of almost all of its marble floors and wall revetments. Barker has calculated that 693 square metres of flooring and 9,736 square metres of wall revetments could have been stripped from the Oppian wing and its porphyry, giallo antico, pavonazzetto, and africano re-used in the Baths of Trajan.
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2 Kinney 1997, 126; Dumser 2018, 142-148 favours a less insistent reading of these elements as re-used, but the door jamb re-used as an architrave over the door is clearly not in its original context and signals that the whole ensemble is made up of re-used elements.

3 For ideological interpretations, see Brenk 1993, 45-47; Kalas 2015, 62-68.

4 See, for instance, Lindros Wohl 2001; Anguissola 2002; Fabricius Hansen 2003; Bosman 2013, 67-69, 73, 80.

5 Liverani 2021.

6 Viscogliosi 1999.

7 Vel. Pat. 1.11.3-4; Rutledge 2012, 259-261.


9 Barker 2012, 25; 2018, 40-41. The estimates given here for the total square metres of floor and wall revetment have been updated according to on-going research on the marble decoration of the Oppian wing of the Domus Aurea by S. Barker, F. Bologna; pers. com. Barker.
Spoliated identities: “damnatio memoriae” and Rome’s ‘bad’ emperors

The vast number of recarved representations of Rome’s first three ‘bad’ emperors, Caligula, Nero, and Domitian, (at least 125) in the first and early second centuries witnesses the beginnings of sculptural spoliation of identity that is both physical and conceptual. Initially these recut portraits were interpreted as rather straightforward attempts to obliterate the visual images of the ‘bad’ emperors and replace them with new likenesses of victorious successors or revered predecessors that were practically or economically motivated and intended to signal regime change.10 These repurposed portraits, however, raise more broadly complex issues of aesthetics and reception in addition to politics, ideology, and economics.11

Recut portraits of Caligula, for instance, span a range of iconographic intentions and aesthetic choices. They could construct more youthful and classicising images of Claudius, or, at the other end of the spectrum, likenesses that are insistently aged and veristic. A recarved portrait in the Centrale Montemartini stands at the more veristic end of the spectrum (Fig. 1).12 The reconfiguration focuses mainly on the physiognomy endowing the new image of Claudius with tangible signs of ageing including furrows in the forehead, naso-labial lines, sunken cheeks, and pouches beneath the eyes. The coiffure, however, has been largely left unaltered from Caligula’s main portrait type, a potentially legible clue regarding the image’s transformation from Caligula to Claudius.

The Montemartini head lacks a precise archaeological context, but two colossal heads of Claudius redacted from Caligula in the Vatican and Carsulae suggest possible modes of reading, reception, and transmission.13 Both portraits come from seated Jupiter portraits derived from the Capitoline cult image. In each case recognisable traces of the original iteration as Caligula remain, especially in the coiffure. Visually astute viewers could have read these remnants of the Caligulan likeness and constructed their own narratives about the transformation substantially informed by context and memory. Both of these sculptures were major protagonists in larger Julio-Claudian group dedications at Otricoli and Carsulae in structures associated with the worship of the imperial gens, so local viewers in particular, who saw the portraits in their original instantions as Caligula and then later as Claudius would have been acutely aware of the reformulations. They could have communicated their assessments and transmitted them through group or communal memory which could be operative for up to two to three generations. At Otricoli, ancient Oriculum, the colossal Caligula/Claudius was the largest imperial image displayed in a ‘basilica’ associated with Fortuna Augusta and the Gens Augusta.14 The cycle of Julio-Claudian portraits, life-sized or slightly over life-sized, was initiated early in the reign of Tiberius and included a heroic statue of Augustus as

11 For some reassessments, see Flower 2006, 1-16 Galinsky 2008; Varner 2008; 2021; Vout 2008; Pollini 2010; Prusac 2016; Longfellow 2018.
12 Centrale Montemartini, 2.74, inv. 2443, h. 0.358 m.; Prusac 2016, 133, no.32; Rossini 2018, 240 (S. Gugliemi).
13 Musei Vaticani, Sala Rotonda 551, inv. 242, h. 0.78 m.; Spinola 1999, 263-5, fig. 44; Prusac 2016, 133, no. 31; Carsulae, Antiquarium, inv. 281290; Prusac 2016, 133, no. 44.
14 Dareggi 1982, 12, 26.
Diomedes, a statue of Livia, a togate statue of Gaius, and a young Julio-Claudian prince with bulla, perhaps Gaius Caesar, Caligula’s brother, and Drusilla as Venus Genetrix. By re-inscribing Claudius into the Julian and Claudian dynastic narratives at Oriculum, the recut colossus effectively edits and updates the familial lineage and ancestral linkages of the Gens Augusta.

Representations of Nero were recycled even more extensively than those of his uncle Caligula; approximately 34 recarved portraits of Caligula have been identified, while at least 63 are known for Nero. Indeed there are more reworked images of Nero than for the ‘bad’ emperors Caligula and Domitian combined (63 vs. 62). The majority of Nero’s portraits, at least 49, have been recarved as Vespasian, Titus, or Domitian. Nero’s prolonged posthumous popularity with various segments of Roman society forced the Flavians to strike a delicate balance negotiating his memory. Like the images of Caligula reformulated as representations of Claudius, recast portraits of Vespasian visually displace and cannibalise pre-existing likenesses of Nero with varied results, and they too range along a spectrum from aged and veristic to youthful and idealised.

Numerous portraits of Vespasian’s sons Titus and Domitian have been reconfigured from pre-existing Neronian images, often exhibiting readily discernible traces of Nero’s distinctive gradus coiffure employed in his final two portrait types. Similarly, representations of Titus’s younger brother Domitian contain legible clues of their original Neronian iteration, confirming the Flavians’ willingness to access the lingering popularity of Nero. A cuirassed statue in the Vatican and formerly in the Giustiniani Collection was transformed into Domitian (FIG. 2). The unusual and innovative imagery on the cuirass – a cupid riding a bull, a female figure with bare upper torso and flowers carried in her mantle, and a female Triton – communicates the emperor’s dominance over land and sea and contributes to the portrait’s prestige. This suggests that the statue may have had a prominent display location in Rome that may have further motivated the Flavian appropriation.

As the third of the canonical ‘bad’ emperors, Domitian’s own portraits were also recut in large numbers. Almost all of his successor Nerva’s surviving portraits have been reconfigured from pre-existing images of Domitian (e.g., FIG. 3), and a number of portraits of Nerva’s successor, Trajan, were also recarved from Domitian, including a portrait in Oslo refashioned as Trajan’s Decennalia type (FIG. 4). The recarved likenesses may on some level have been trying to capitalise on the lingering positive aspects of Domitian’s reputation; the army actually wanted to deify him after his assassination, and Trajan himself was sometimes promoted as the emperor who pursued the positive aspects of Domitian’s agenda as continuator Domitiani.

---

15 Musei Vaticani, Sala a Croce Greca inv. 181; Rose 1997, 97-98, cat. 25, pl. 88; Spinola 1999, 280, no. 19.
16 Musei Vaticani, Sala dei Busti, inv. 637; Rose 1997, 97-98, cat. 25, pl. 89; Spinola 1999, 94-6, no. 52.
17 Musei Vaticani, Sala a Croce Greca, inv. 199; Rose 1997, 97-98, cat. 25, pl. 90; Spinola 1999, 303-4, no. 69.
18 Musei Vaticani, Galleria dei Candelabri 4.93, inv. 2622; Rose 1997, 97-8, cat. 25, pl. 91; Spinola 2004, 280-81, no. 93.
19 Musei Vaticani, Gabinetto delle Maschere, inv. 816; Rose 1997, 97-98, cat. 25, pl. 93; Spinola 1999, 171, no. 42.
20 On the sometimes competing Julian and Claudian narratives in group portrait dedications, see Rose 1997, 22-38.
21 Wood 2016, 132.
22 Braccio Nuovo 126, inv. 2213, h. 2.45; Prusac 2016, 136, no. 93.
23 Nasjonalgalleriet, inv. SK 1154, h. 0.327; Prusac 2016, 137-8, no.129, fig. 4a-d.
The period of the adoptive and Antonine emperors, with its relatively smooth transitions of power and deifications rather than condemnations, witnessed a hiatus in the repurposing of imperial images as a result of damnatio memoriae. At the end of the second century, Commodus was initially subjected to memory sanctions imposed by the Senate, but they were eventually rescinded under Septimius Severus and the Senate was compelled to deify Commodus. Several of his portraits were intentionally mutilated while the sanctions were in force, and he has been entirely effaced from the Aurelian triumph and liberalitas panels. At least two of his surviving images in Rome and Mantua have been recut, but not until c. AD 238 when they were refashioned as Pupienus. These images reflect changing trends in the re-use of portraits, both imperial and private, in the third century.

The Severan period is a watershed moment for secondary interventions on imperial images. The turbulent political situation that emerged at the end of the second century and continued into the third witnessed the re-emergence of violence enacted against portraits as a result of memory sanctions, and a destructive aesthetic emerges with a vengeance. The deliberate mutilation of portraits overtook recarving as the primary form of secondary intervention in imperial portraiture.

In the early third century, the first major crisis surrounding representations occurred in AD 205 with the alleged conspiracy of Plautianus. His portraits, which Cassius Dio claims outnumbered those of Caracalla and Geta, were destroyed, and on the Arch of the Argentarii his name has been erased from the dedicatory inscription and his relief portrait removed from the western interior bay. Erasure and obliteration also continued to be a major option when contending with the portraits of Geta after his murder and condemnation in AD 212. His epigraphic and portrait identity has also been eradicated from the Arch of the Argentarii. In addition, his numismatic identity has been canceled on a number of eastern issues. In the realm of repurposing, a rock crystal intaglio stands as a rare example of a miniature intervention: a figure of Victory has been incised directly over that of Geta, effectively eradicating him from the scenes of Septimius Severus and Caracalla sacrificing to Serapis. The brief interregnum of Macrinus after the death of Caracalla ended in AD 217 with the widespread mutilation of Macrinus’s portraits. All of his surviving sculpted representations have been intentionally defaced. Representations and inscriptions of Macrinus’s son and heir, Diadumenianus, were also attacked as confirmed by a bust in the Museo Gregoriano Profano in the Vatican.

The late Severan period saw a resurgence in recarving. Several images of Elagabalus were transformed into portraits of his younger cousin and successor, Severus Alexander. A portrait in the Nelson Atkins Museum in Kansas City has been extensively recut c. AD 225. Traces of Elagabalus’s more curly hairstyle from his second portrait type are still visible at the occi-
put. The current ears have been carved out of the mass of Elagabalus’s coiffure, but traces of the original ear canal are visible in front of the earlobes.

A colossal statue from the Farnese Collection in Rome has been transformed in a much more unusual fashion. Here, the face of Elagabalus has been cut from the head and replaced with a new visage of Severus Alexander. Based on the length of Severus Alexander’s sideburns, some time must have elapsed between the assassination of Elagabalus in AD 222 and the transformation of the statue which does not seem to be earlier than AD 225. The statue may have actually received two subsidiary interventions. In AD 222, the facial features could have been disfigured and then later recuperated with the addition of the new face of Severus Alexander. In that case, the first phase of re-use was mutilation with the statue repurposed as a denigrative monument of Elagabalus and ultimately recuperated as a new likeness for Severus Alexander. In the immediate aftermath of the fall of the dynasty in AD 235, portraits of Severus Alexander and his mother, Julia Mammaea were also subjected to destructive interventions, although their memories were never officially sanctioned and Severus Alexander was actually deified.

The third century: new trends in transformation

Not surprisingly, destructive violence remains a primary response to imperial depictions throughout the 50 year period of political, social, economic, and military upheaval that followed the deaths of Severus Alexander and Julia Mammaea in AD 235. For instance, all of the surviving portraits of Maximinus Thrax, the first of the soldier emperors, have been attacked. Towards the middle of the century, however, important new trends in the transformation and change of official imagery were emerging. The Gallienic period has often been interpreted as a renaissance of classical forms in sculpture, taking inspiration from the Hadrianic period, as well as Greek Classical sculpture. Prusac has underscored the period as pivotal in terms of the re-use of imperial portraits with new modes of positive recycling no longer inspired by damnatio memoriae and coinciding with a change in laws regarding the refurbishing of imperial images. According to Aelius Marcianus, it was no longer a treasonable offence to redo imperial statues that had been spoiled by age (non contrahit crimen maiestatis, qui statuas Caesaris vetustate corruptas reficit).

Many of Gallienus’s portraits confirm these new trends and attitudes; at least seven seem to have been reconfigured from pre-existing likenesses of Hadrian, including a bust formerly in the Palazzo Corsini and now in the Palazzo Altemps redone as Gallienus’s second (Louvre) type (Fig. 5). Again, much of the bulk of the original Hadrianic hair remains swept
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32 Museo Nazionale Archeologico, inv. 5993, h. 3.78 m.; Gasparri 2010, 19-200, no. 83, pl. 72.1-6 (C. Capaldi).
34 Wood 1986, 101-121; Prusac 2016, 52.
35 Digesta 48.4.5: Pekány 1985, 39; Prusac 2016, 51-54.
36 Palazzo Altemps, inv. 8633, h. 0.34 m. (head); De Luca 1976, 86-87, no. 50, pl. 76-7; Fittschen 1993, 214, pl. 30b; De Angelis D’Ossat, Capodiferro 2011, xxx (xxx); La Rocca et al. 2015, 365-366, no. 1.55 (C. Parisi). Other portraits reconfigured from Hadrian include: Rome, Museo Torlonia, inv. 603; Bergmann 1977, 51-52, no. 12; Fittschen, Zanker 1985, Beilage 92a-b; Prusac 2016, 142, no. 213, fig. 20a-b; Alberese, Tenuta Granducale; Ciampoltrini 1985; Palermo, Museo Nazionale, inv. 18592, h. 0.30 m; Prusac 2016, 143, no. 220; Paris, Louvre, MA 1223; de Kersauson 1996, 484-485, no. 228; Prusac 2016, 142, no. 211; Private Collection, Hannover (likely recarved from Hadrian’s late Sala dei Busti 283
forward from the back of the head. The ears are carved deeply into the coiffure and set well
back on the head. Pupils and irises are more emphatically cut than they would have been in
the original. This intervention was not meant to cannibalise or negate the original representa-
tion of Hadrian who was a highly admired and respected predecessor, but rather to create a
renewed image of Gallienus that is quite literally founded on the monumental legacy of the
imperial past. The eclectic and retrospective references in Gallienus’s portraiture have long
been recognised: the Augustan/Julio-Claudian hairstyle of his first type while he was co-
emperor with his father Valerian from AD 253-59/60; the beards in all portrait types looking
back to Hadrian, as well as the Hadrianic recollections in the bulkier, curlier coiffures of the
later portrait types when he was sole ruler c. AD 259/60 to 258; further Augustan intimations
in the hairstyles of the Lagos type; and the Alexander allusions in the arrangement of the hair
over the forehead in his third (Terme) portrait type.\footnote{Mласовский 2001, 263-268; Mласовский 2006, 88-89; Prusac 2016, 52-53.}

A colossal type-2 head, allegedly found near the Baths of Caracalla and now in the Ny
Carlsberg Glyptotek, has likely been refashioned from a portrait of Augustus.\footnote{Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, inv. 832, h. 0.53m; Johansen 1995, 128, no. 53; Prusac 2016, 142, no. 219, fig. 21a-b; Prusac 2018, 150, fig. 13. A portrait in Berlin also appears to have been recut from a Julio-Claudian portrait, perhaps also Augustus, Berlin, Antikensammlung Staatliches Museum, inv. R114; Prusac 2016, 53, 142, no. 212, fig. 19.} The hair over
the forehead has been reshaped into Gallienus’s centrally parted arrangement in his second
(Louvre) type. The longer curving locks over the ears and hair brushed forward on the nape
of the neck are remnants of the original likeness that recall Augustus’s main Prima Porta
type. The colossal scale of the portrait may also have motivated the re-use in order to create a
new image of Galleinus commensurate in scale with the Baths.

Another portrait of Gallienus, from Egypt and now in the Museum of the University of
Missouri at Columbia, has been recarved from a representation of Nero that had been ware-
housed as a result of the memory sanctions enforced after his suicide in AD 68.\footnote{Columbia, Missouri, University of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology, acc. no. 62.46, h. 0.42 m; Prusac 2016, 142, no. 210; Attanasio, Bruno, Prochaska 2019, 184, 266, cat. no. 13.} The portrait
is of Parian II marble and remains of Nero’s third type coiffure are still plainly visible at the
temples. A light, stippled beard has been added to the head, but the intervention did not in-
clude the carving of the eyebrows or pupils and irises which would have endowed the re-
carved likeness with a somewhat antiquated appearance. The hair over the forehead is too
damaged to permit precise identification of which of Gallienus’s portrait types was intended.
The fuller hair on the top of the head could indicate any of his last three portrait types in use
while he was sole emperor, while the light stippled beard is more in accordance with the first-
type when he was co-emperor with his father Valerian. The hair at the temples is fairly con-
sonant with all four types. The full, elaborately curled coiffures of Nero’s third type, which
anticipate Hadrian’s elaborately curled coiffures, may have made this portrait an appealing
target of re-use. The head is worked for insertion into a togate statue, likely \textit{capite velato} as
the back of the head is flat and unworked. The Columbia head confirms that the reconfigura-
tion of Gallienus’s portraits from pre-existing imperial portraits was not just confined to
Rome but could occur even in politically and militarily volatile areas like Egypt which was
especially problematic in this period. Prusac identifies four other additional portraits of Gal-lienus, including another likeness reconfigured from a Julio-Claudian portrait in Brussels and another from Egypt recarved from an unidentified individual.\textsuperscript{40}

In thinking about Gallienus’s relationship with the tangible imperial past, Brilliant formulated an intrinsic reading of the Boboli Gardens’ bases based on the concepts of \textit{spolia in se} and \textit{spolia in re}. Brilliant argues that the bases were both physical \textit{spolia} taken from a Gal-lienic colonnade, perhaps never completed, and ultimately re-used on the Arcus Novus at the end of the third century (\textit{spolia in se}), but that they were also from their inception under Gal-lienus monuments that conceptually spoliated forms and ideas from Antonine works like the female personification reliefs from the Hadrianeum (\textit{spolia in re}).\textsuperscript{41} Gallienus’s recarved rep-re-sentations are themselves simultaneously \textit{spolia in se} that refurbish and refresh earlier images and \textit{spolia in re} that liberally access the imperial past through visual allusions to previous epochs and emperors. Their redeployment as \textit{exempla} of good emperors like Hadrian and Augustus signal the beginning of new panegyrical rhetorics that seek to establish imperial legitimacy. Borg has detailed the change in rhetorical strategies in the third century that include new emphasis on vividness, emotion, veracity, value, and memorability as reflected visually on sarcophagi. Similar concepts are certainly embedded in the re-used portraits as well.\textsuperscript{42}

The dual concepts of literal and figurative spoliation are also perfectly at play in a Julio-Claudian sardonyx cameo in St. Petersburg that had been updated in the third century (Fig. 6).\textsuperscript{43} The cameo depicts facing busts of Divus Augustus with radiate crown, \textit{corona civica}, and veil and Livia with \textit{corona spicea} and veil. Above Livia and Augustus is a bust of a young Julio-Claudian prince, also with \textit{corona civica}. Livia’s centrally parted hairstyle has been reconfigured with a Scheitelzopf, and pupils and irises have lightly been incised on her eyes, as well as those of the prince. Livia’s characteristic profile with hooked nose and receding lower lip, and her wide almond shaped eyes are still plainly visible. The original identity of the prince, seemingly marked out as an heir by his \textit{corona civica}, has proved elusive, and its precise Julio-Claudia dynastic message remains enigmatic. Gallienus, Salonina, and one of their sons would seem to be the most likely candidates in a third century context as they sought dynastic legitimacy and stability through the promotion of their two oldest sons as Caesars and heirs; first Valerian II c. AD 255-6, and then Saloninus in AD 258. Coins of both celebrated them as \textit{Princeps Iuventutis} a title also used for Julio-Claudian heirs.\textsuperscript{44} On the Hermitage cameo, the two male portraits are essentially unaltered from their original Julio-Claudian format in order to avoid diluting direct allusions to the past, while the updating focuses principally on the empress’s new hairstyle. The wholesale re-use of an earlier Julio-Claudian monument with minimal revisions recalls the co-option of the Augustan Porta Es-quilina whose original inscription was erased and replaced with a dedication to Gallienus as

\textsuperscript{40} Brussels, Musées Royaux d’Art et Histoire, inv. A3558; Prusac 2016, 142, no. 216; Alexandria, Greco Roman Museum, inv. 3701; Prusac 2016, 142, no. 214. The two additional portraits recarved from unidentified subjects are: Prusac 2016, 142, nos. 215 (Naples, Museo Nazionale Archeologico, inv. 6183) and 217 (Rome, Palazzo Quirinale inv. 5171).

\textsuperscript{41} Brilliant 1982, 12.

\textsuperscript{42} Borg 2014, 238, 252-253.

\textsuperscript{43} Hermitage, Ž 149, diameter 8.3 cm; Megow 1987, 123, 167, no. A 222, pl. 10.13; Bartman 1999, 103, 192, no. 105, fig. 81; Mlasowski 2006, 87; Prusac 2016, 52; Smith 2021, 88, 111-12, no. 16, fig. 16.

\textsuperscript{44} For example, Valerian II: RIC 5, 121, no. 44; Saloninus RIC 5, 125, no. 19.


clementissimus princeps and Salonina as sanctissima Augusta, effectively transforming the gateway into an arcus Gallieni.\textsuperscript{45} The rededication of the Augustan monument employs a distinctly panegyric tone in its description of Gallienus as a ruler whose unconquered virtus is only surpassed by his pietas.

Within the realm of large scale imperial cameos the shift to affirmative interventions in imperial portraiture seems to have occurred even earlier as evidenced by a large sardonyx cameo of Faustina the Younger as Victory that has been reconfigured as Julia Domna and which stands as one of the earliest affirmative interventions in imperial portraiture (Fig. 7).\textsuperscript{46} Here the recarving sought to capitalise the Severans’ self presentation as a continuation of the Antonine dynasty, as well as to accentuate the close linkages between Julia and Faustina as Matres Castrorum.\textsuperscript{47} The cameo depicts Faustina/Julia in the guise of Victory seated on a pile of arms and armour, extending a laurel wreath with her right hand and cradling a palm branch in her left arm. Faustina’s type-8 hairstyle has been retouched as Julia Domna’s type-1 Helmsfrisur and retrofitted with a large bun covering the back of the head. The cameo’s military and triumphal imagery would have strongly evoked both empresses’ position as Mater Castrorum, a bold new title created for Faustina and subsequently awarded to Julia Domna in AD 195 and used extensively in her inscriptions.

As is clear from the Missouri head of Nero/Gallienus, the re-use of earlier images was not limited to Rome. An important likeness of Julius Caesar from Corinth was evidently refurbished in the later third century (Fig. 8).\textsuperscript{48} The portrait has been renovated with an incised beard, but the eyebrows, pupils, and irises have not been carved and updated. The overall style of Julius’s portraits suggest that it was carved in the Augustan period. After its relatively light resculpting it seems to have been publicly displayed near the Peirene fountain together with other sculptures. Without corroborating inscriptive evidence it is unclear whether this was intended and recognised as an updated likeness of the founder of the Roman colony at Corinth or as a contemporary late third-century ruler or official capitalising on a prestigious and venerable image from the past. At Athens, several recarved cosmeτe portraits provide additional evidence for the reconfiguration of male likenesses during the third century in Greece.\textsuperscript{49}

A portrait of a late third-century emperor or tetrarch, now in New York, has similarly been reconstituted from a Julio-Claudian image of Caligula (Fig. 9).\textsuperscript{50} The hair over the forehead has been cut back to approximate third-century military coiffures, but the long, curving locks from Caligula’s coiffure on the left side of the neck are essentially untouched and plainly visible. Light, schematic furrows consisting of two long, slightly curved horizontal lines and two short staccato vertical lines over the bridge of the nose have been cut into the forehead, and the pattern of these furrows recalls similar configurations in tetrarchic images like the porphyry tetrarchs in Venice and the Vatican. Naso-labial lines have also been added. Carved

\textsuperscript{45} CIL 6.1106; Rodrigues Almeida 1993.
\textsuperscript{46} Kassel, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Ge 236, 16.3 x 10.7 cm.; Megow 1987, 270-71, no. B 52, pls. 46.8, 47.2, 48.12; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 202, fig. 753.
\textsuperscript{47} Hekster 2015, 144-146.
\textsuperscript{48} Archaeological Museum of Ancient Corinth, inv. S 2771, h. 0.325 m.; de Grazia Vanderpol 2018, 370-4, fig. 2a-c.
\textsuperscript{49} Prusac-Lindbagen 2018. For other sculptures from the Peirene fountain, see Robinson 2011, 281-284, figs. 159-64.
\textsuperscript{50} New York, Private Collection (Shelby White, Leon Levy), Metropolitan Museum of Art, L. 2007. 8.11; h. 0.407 m.; Prusac 2016.
eyebrows have been added, and pupils and irises have been cut into the eyes as part of the refurbishment. The tear ducts have been deeply drilled creating dramatic points of shadow that add to the expressionistic impact of the recarved image. The reduced sculptural volumes of the face make the unaltered corona civica disproportionately large and prominent as a venerable imperial insignia. Again, the combination of new third-century elements with unaltered Julio-Claudian aspects makes its recycled status clear.51

A colossal portrait in the Galleria of the Museo Capitolino has also been subjected to a major sculptural intervention (Fig. 10).52 Restored by Bartolomeo Cavaceppi in the eighteenth century, the head eventually entered the Capitoline collections in 1839 as a ‘Galba,’ but it is actually a Republican portrait from the first half of the first century BC that has been updated in the late third or early fourth century. The hair has been reworked and currently has a fringe of comma shaped locks that frame the face, many of which are bisected, resembling the a penna technique seen in many third-century coiffures. Modelled eyebrows with bold, calligraphic curves have been added to the image, but the pupils and irises have been left uncarved and the tear ducts have not been deeply re-drilled, maintaining antique aspects of the image. Part of this portrait’s appeal lay in its colossal size, but the lack of beard and insistently veristic handling of the facial features suggest that it may have retained its Republican identity, updated and refreshed for a new audience and context.

The two re-used reliefs from the Arco di Portogallo represent another very public affirmative intervention in imperial image making that has been associated with Gallienus.53 The panels were originally created for a monument celebrating Hadrian and Sabina; one scene depicts Sabina’s apotheosis, while the other shows an emperor making an address in the presence of the Genii of the Senate and Roman people and a togate youth with a temple façade in the background. The scene is most often interpreted as Hadrian making an announcement of imperial alimenta or introducing eventual heirs, or both. The reliefs were heavily restored after their removal to the Palazzo dei Conservatori in the seventeenth century, but the essentially unaltered portrait of Sabina, a version of her main type, in the apotheosis scene confirms the initial Hadrianic date for the reliefs. In this scene, the emperor’s hair and beard have clearly been shortened, and the coiffure over the forehead is rendered as parallel curving locks combed to the left. Pupils and irises are fairly deeply carved. In the adlocutio scene, the original section of the emperor’s head closest to the relief preserves similar traces of a shortened coiffure and beard, although the pupils and irises are less deeply carved. The hair of the beardless youth standing in front of the emperor has been similarly reduced in volume (Fig. 11). The recarved elements of these three heads would seem to indicate that the reworking was undertaken in the third century. La Rocca has suggested that that the re-elaboration may have been intended to evoke the apotheosis of Gallienus’s mother Mariniana whose Egnatian lineage was part of the emperor’s nomenclature and that the adlocutio scene was reconfigured to celebrate the new dynasty and.

51 An apparent companion piece (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art L. 2013.61) has been recut from a Julio-Claudian image in a nearly identical manner. More of the longer locks have been removed on the nape of the neck, but traces are still visible at the left of the neck behind the ear. Similar schematic furrows have been added to the forehead, and the portrait has the same deeply re-drilled tear ducts. The reduction of the volumes of the face has resulted in an even more oversized corona. The recarved image is so close in appearance to the companion piece that they may be intended as tetrarchs (or dyarchs), stressing the similitudo of the two rulers.
52 Museo Capitolino, inv. 492, h. 0.76 m.; Fittschen, Zanker 2010, 8-9, no. 6, pls. 8-10.
like the Hermitage cameo, to promote one of Gallienius’s older sons, Valerianus Minor or Saloninus, as Caesar and heir.\textsuperscript{54} What remains of the original recarved portrait of the boy is not incompatible with the coin likenesses of either son.

Liverani has proposed an alternative interpretation of the Arco di Portogallo, which he identifies with the Arch of Honorius mentioned in Claudian’s panegyric celebrating that emperor’s sixth consulship in AD 404.\textsuperscript{55} Liverani’s reading of the Arco di Portogallo as a whole as a monument to Honorius in the context of early fifth-century Rome is appealing, and architectural details and re-used elements of the arch that were carefully recorded by Carlo Fontana when the Arco was dismantled in 1655 support a late date for its assemblage. The specific details of the recutting of the reliefs, however, including the hair of the boy in the \textit{adlocutio} scene and the hair and beard of the emperor in both scenes, as well as the possible subjects of the reliefs themselves, present some difficulties which do suggest that the scenes were at least initially recarved in the third century. La Rocca’s hypothesis remains the most likely scenario for that intervention. If both La Rocca and Liverani are right, then the reliefs had a long history of re-use, having been first created for Hadrian, then adapted in the third century, likely for a Gallienic monument, and finally re-used in the arch for Honorius. The basic themes of the reliefs, \textit{adlocutio} and \textit{consecration}, held an enduring imperial appeal.

The Arcus Novus, probably dedicated in AD 293 by Maximian and Diocletian to mark the 10 year anniversary of the dyarchy and the establishment of the tetrarchy, presents less ambiguous evidence for the reworking and redeployment of earlier imperial reliefs.\textsuperscript{56} The arch was destroyed in 1491 under Innocent VIII Cybo together with the old church of S. Maria in Via Lata to make way for the construction of the new church. Further works in the area in 1523 revealed additional sculptural and architectural fragments. Several of the relief fragments entered the Della Valle-Capranica Collection and were eventually acquired in 1584 by Cardinal Ferdinando dei Medici and installed on the garden façade of the Villa Medici on the Pincio. Many of the surviving reliefs are Claudian in date, but one of the figures has clearly been updated with late third-century portrait features and incised beard in a scene of sacrifice at the Temple of the Magna Mater on the Palatine (Fig. 12).\textsuperscript{57} The original Julio-Claudian coiffure of the figure standing at the temple’s left corner has been cut back creating a curving contour line over the forehead typical of tetrarchic portraits (Fig. 13). A light beard and moustache have also been incised continuing the contour line around the face. A second complementary relief depicts a sacrifice at the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus.\textsuperscript{58} In this relief, the Julio-Claudian features of the heads have been left untouched.

An Antonine relief has also been updated for the Arcus Novus.\textsuperscript{59} This relief depicts Venus inscribing a shield which has been re-inscribed with VOTIS X ET XX, likely referring to the \textit{vota soluta} for the completed \textit{decennalia} and the \textit{vota suscepta} for the anticipated \textit{vice annalia}.\textsuperscript{60} Venus is flanked by two kneeling turreted female figures evoking the eastern and

\textsuperscript{54} La Rocca 1987.
\textsuperscript{55} 370-371; P. Liverani 2004.
\textsuperscript{57} Cozza 1958, 107-108, fig. 1; Koeppel 1983, 101-103, cat. 13, figs. 16-17; Kinney 1997, 131, fig. 8.
\textsuperscript{58} Cozza 1958, 108-109, fig. 2; Koeppel 1983, 98-101, figs. 13-15; cat. 12; Kinney 1997, 131, fig. 7.
\textsuperscript{59} Cozza 1958, 109-111, fig. 3; De Maria 1988, 199-200, pl. 89.1; Kinney 1997, 131, fig. 7.
\textsuperscript{60} De Maria 1988, 314.
western parts of the empire and two standing female personifications of provinces or peoples of the empire. To their right stand an emperor and Roma or Virtus. Although the imperial portrait is not well preserved, the back of the head confirms that it, too, like the emperor(s) in the Claudian relief(s) has been recut and the hair substantially cut back into a tetrarchic coiffure.

The recarved reliefs effectively celebrate the dyarchs Maximian and Diocletian and the extent of the newly re-organised empire. The location of the Arcus Novus in the Via Lata aligns it directly with Claudius’s Britannic arch, approximately 150 metres north on the Via Flaminia, and places it in the orbit of related sculptural monuments and portrait statuary that flanked the Claudian arch. It is unclear if the reliefs on the Arcus Novus were actually spoliated from the Claudian monuments, but viewers would certainly have been able to compare the re-used reliefs to their Claudian contemporaries to the north. De Maria has also posited that architectural elements from the new arch, including mouldings and column capitals, were taken directly from the Claudian arch. Whether the recarving of the Claudian reliefs and possible re-use of architectural elements from the Britannic arch was intentionally programmatic and intended to directly link Claudius’s victories in Britain with Diocletian’s recent defeat of Carausius, as Laubscher and others have claimed, is uncertain, but viewers could easily have made general comparisons between the new arch and the Claudian monuments to the north and drawn their own conclusions.  

The status of the reliefs as re-used, however, with their combination of recarved third-century portraits, and unredacted beardless heads and early imperial toga styles, is fairly unequivocal. Once again, contemporary political legitimacy is visually constructed on the authority of the imperial past as embodied and recycled in concrete sculptural monuments.

_Private practice: re-use prestige_

Private portraiture in the third century also provides additional evidence for secondary interventions not motivated by violence or denigrative politics. Many of the recycled private portraits lack a detailed archeological context, so recovery of their intention and reception can be difficult. Nevertheless, their re-use may have been occasioned partly by the emotional appeal of the past and the authority of antiquity and ancestors. A bust of a young woman in the Museo Capitolino was reconceived in the early second century, approximately a century after its original creation (Fig. 14). The facial features have been extensively recarved; new, more deeply cut pupils and irises have been added to the eyes, and the tear ducts have been re-drilled. The current ears have been cut from the mass of the original Hadrianic coiffure, but the original ear canals are still visible as a deep rectangular void in front of the new ears. The most dramatic reworking involves the hair. The original coiffure has been entirely carved away, and the head has been retrofitted with a marble wig which is a mid- to late Severan *Nestfrisur* that fits closely to the cranium. The new marble wig is similar to contemporary marble wigs in other Severan marble portraits carved *ex novo* including another bust in the

---

61 Laubscher 1976, 105-108; De Maria 1988, 200; Kinney (1997, 132), and Dumser 2018, 153 express healthy skepticism about the programmatic intentions of the re-use and the visual and historical linkage of Claudian and tetrarchic events in Britain.

62 Museo Capitolino, Stanza degli Imperatori, inv. 488, h. 0575 m.: Fittschen, Zanker 1983, 104-106, no. 155, pl. 182.3; La Rocca 2015, 348, no. 1.31 (E. Laurenzi); Prusac 2016, 141, no. 193., fig. 11a-b.
RETHINKING RE-CARVING: REVITALISING ROMAN PORTRAITS IN THE THIRD CENTURY

Museo Capitolino. The bust form itself, with its lightly modelled drapery, stands in contrast to the larger busts with more voluminous drapery in vogue for female portraits in the Antonine and Severan periods and would have lent the recarved image an antiquated aura in the early third century. The acanthus support for the bust suggests a possible funerary context, and if so, this may be an image of an ancestor that has been transformed and adapted for a newly deceased family member.

The bust of the so-called ‘Tragic Actor’ in the Stanza dei Filosofi of the Museo Capitolino was also reconfigured from a Hadrianic portrait, probably early in the Gallienic period (Fig. 15). The hair and beard have been drastically shortened to conform to mid-third-century trends, but fuller, more plastically rendered locks are still visible at the back of the head, as are the larger Hadrianic ears. Horizontal furrows have been carved into the forehead, as well as deep frown lines over the bridge of the nose, typical of third-century male portraits. The eyes have also been re-drilled with lentoid shaped pupils seen in third-century portraits but not in those of Hadrianic date. A tragic theatrical mask has been incised in low relief on the right shoulder as part of the reworking. The nude bust form is late Trajanic to early Hadrianic in terms of its shape and style and, like the Hadrianic/Severan woman, would have lent the recut image a somewhat antiquated format very different from the larger togate or cuirassed bust forms favoured in the third century.

The portrait’s findspot, a tomb on the Via Latina in 1825, provides intriguing clues as to the motivations for its re-use, as well as its context and reception in the mid-third century. Two funerary inscriptions in Latin and Greek were discovered with the bust. The Latin inscription is a dedication to M. Ulpius Chariton made on behalf of his sister Ulpia Charitine and brother-in-law P. Aelius Africanus. Both men are explicitly named as imperial freedmen. The inscription further indicates that the tomb was made by Charitine and Africanus also for themselves, their freedmen and freedwomen, and their descendants, which envisions the tomb’s use over time and through future generations. The Greek inscription is also for Chariton (Καριτων). The Trajanic-Hadrianic date for the original creation of the bust aligns perfectly with the date of the inscription based on the Ulpian and Aelian imperial affiliations of Chariton, Charitine, and Africanus which raises the intriguing possibility that the portrait could have initially represented Chariton himself who lived 25 years and 18 days. The recarving of the portrait suggests that the tomb was in fact used over time by multiple generations as was not atypical in the third century. Heirs and descendants of freedmen took exceptional pride in the sepulcrum familiarie which were most often embellished and upgraded over time.

64 Fittschen, Zanker 2010, 170-171, no. 169, pls. 210-211; Prusac 2016, 143, no. 230, fig. 22.
65 On the late Trajanic and early Hadrianic bust form, see Fittschen, Zanker 2010, 171.
66 CIL 6. 29152:
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M. VLPIO. AVGG. LIB CHARITONI
VLPIA. CHARITINE. FRATRI. DVLCLIS
SIMO. QVI. VIXIT ANNIS XXV. DIEB.
XVIII ET P. AELIVS. AVGG. LIB. AFRICANVS
COGNATO BENEMERENTI FECRVRNT
ET. SIBI. ET. SVIS. LIB. LIB. POSTERISQ
EORVM. H. M. D. M. A.
67 CIGr 6299 Kaibel epigr. Gr. no. 622.
rather than abandoned or replaced; the continued use of tombs by multiple generations bestowed honour and status through ancestry and family. The Via Latina tomb conferred prestige and could boast impeccable Ulpian and Aelian gentilicia. The recarving of the portrait, perhaps of one of the tomb’s first honourands, directly linked the present users with the ancestral past and effectively renovated an august lineage. Liverani has underscored the semiotic connections between portraits (imagines) and names (nomina) in Roman tombs, and the reconfiguration of the bust may have coincided with the updating of the epigraphical record at the site. The addition of a tragic mask, a common motif on sarcophagi, may be more eschatological and conceptual, marking the bust as funerary rather than a literal allusion to the individual’s profession as a tragic actor as reflected in the bust’s popular appellation.

A Julio-Claudian portrait in the Uffizi, close to the images of Germanicus and Drusus Minor, was also updated in the Gallienic period with an incised beard (Fig. 16). The combination of beard and Julio-Claudian coiffure made the new portrait perfectly consonant in its Gallienic context. Like the recarved Julius Caesar in Corinth, the eyebrows, pupils, and irises, however, have not been carved during the third-century intervention ensuring that it maintained its prestige as a relic or artefact from the past, originally created over two hundred years earlier. The portrait’s updated Gallienic character, however, was clearly recognised by its eighteenth-century restorer, possibly Innocenzo Spinazzi, who completed the ancient fragmentary head with a bust form whose titulus is inscribed GALLIENVS. Like most of the ancient portraits in the Uffizi, this is likely from Rome or its environs but lacks a more precise provenance.

A portrait from the Farnese collection and now in Naples provides additional evidence for secondary interventions in portraiture at the end of the third century (Fig. 17). The head has been extensively recarved and numerous traces of the point chisel are still visible all over the back of the head. They attest to the large volume of the original coiffure that has been removed, which is further confirmed by the substantial sections of marble that have not been removed behind both ears. Emphatic furrows have been added to the forehead and above the bridge of the nose. The tearducts have been deeply drilled adding to the expressionistic aspect of the redacted likeness. The beard has also been drastically cut back allowing the contours of the jawline to be amply revealed. The remnants of drilled curls from a substantial beard foreground the recycled nature of the image and suggest an Antonine or early Severan date for the original.

Past as prologue: the creative art of re-use

By the early fourth century, the concepts of positive recycling of exemplum portraits of earlier good emperors were firmly entrenched. Several representations of Maxentius recycled exempla 68 Borg 2013, 159-160. 69 Liverani 2019. 70 Uffizi, Corridoio 3, inv. 1914.266, h. 0.23 m (ancient segment); Mansuelli 1961, 57-58, no. 44, fig. 44; Romauldi 2007, 181-189. 71 Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6101, h. 0.23 m (head); Gasparri 2009, 119-120, no. 95, XCV 1-4 (F. Coraggio).
plary emperors including Augustus (FIG. 18), Trajan, and Hadrian, while almost all of Constantine’s type-2 (quinquennalia) likenesses have been recarved from earlier representations, also encompassing Augustus, Trajan, and Hadrian. The colossal from the Basilica Nova encapsulates the recuperative processes at play in the images of both Maxentius and Constantine (FIG. 19). The largest imperial image to have survived from Rome, the portrait was initially conceived as an acrolithic representation of Hadrian as confirmed by its creased earlobes, a physiological feature found only in his images, as well as its material, Parian marble. The portrait was reconceived as Maxentius, its monumental scale commensurate with the vast interior of the new basilica. After Constantine’s defeat of Maxentius at the battle of the Milvian bridge on 28 October AD 312, the colossal was reconfigured yet again as Constantine who expropriated Maxentius’s new basilica and the monumental centrepiece of its interior decoration, putting his name on the building and his face on the statue. The overwhelming size of the portrait suggests that it must have been a very well-known image within the urban landscape and that its transformations would not have gone unnoticed.

Dumser has underscored the innovative aspects and non-traditional design elements of the Basilica Nova as a work of ‘statement architecture’ that embodies one of the core principals of Roman architectural practice, *distributio*. Vitruvius defines *distributio* (allotment or distribution) as the advantageous management of resources and building site (*copiarium locique commoda dispensatio*), as well as the economical and reasonable moderation of expenses in the works (*parcaque in operibus sumptus ratione temperatio*). The Basilica Nova embodies the principals of *distributio* in its redeployment of the eight 50-foot Proconnesian marble columns, perhaps surplus material from the rebuilding of the temple of Venus and Roma next door, to spectacular effect in its soaring interior. The initial renovation (and repair) of the Hadrianic colossal as a new image of Maxentius can be read as a parallel phenomenon to the re-use of the columns, and it too may have been salvaged from the temple of Venus and Roma. Like the enormous columns, its display in the new basilica would have underscored Maxentius’s novel and daring architectural achievement in creating a vaulted interior space capable of containing it.

---

72 Ostia, Museo, inv. 70; Romeo 1999, 211, figs. 31-2 (with earlier literature); Parisi-Presicce 2012, 110; Prusac 2016, 143, no. 233; (formerly) Rome, private collection; Giuliano 1991, 7, figs. 5-8; On the portraits of Maxentius and Constantine recarved from Augustus, see also Longfellow 2018, 26-27.

73 Stockholm, National Museum, SK 106; Prusac 2016, 147, no. 298, fig. 54; Panza 2017, 324.

74 Bolsena, now Viterbo, Museo, formerly Rome, Villa Giulia, inv. 104973, h. 0.375 m.; Giuliano 1991, 3-6, figs. 1-4; Giuliano 1997, pl. 7.3-4; London (private collection); Giuliano 1991, 7-8, figs. 9-11; Rome 1999, 214, figs. 34-6.

75 New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 26.229; Fittschen, Zanker 1985, 149-150, no. 3; Schröder 2006, 125 E, h. 0.26 m; Fittschen, Zanker 1985, 149-150, no. 3; Schröder 1993, 296-298, no. 89; Prusac 2016, 147, no. 147.

76 Rome, Museo Torlonia 619; Fittschen, Zanker 1985, 150-151, no 11; Evers 1991, 799-800, fig. 9; Prusac 2016, 152, no. 396, fig. 107.

77 Museo Capitolino, inv. 1622, h. 2.97 m.; Fittschen, Zanker 1985, 147-152, no. 122, pls. 151-152; Parisi Persicce 2006a; 2007; Ruck 2007, 235-247; Varner 2014, 53-61.

78 Dumser 2022, 86-87.

79 Vitruvius, *De Arch.*, 1.2.8.

80 Dumser 2022, 80-81. Alternatively, the columns may be re-used from the monumental temple on the Quirinal, Taylor 2004, 244-251.
The portraits of Augustus, Hadrian, and Trajan were produced in great quantities, and they would have provided plenty of available exempla suitable for redacting into new likenesses, like those of Gallienus, Maxentius, or Constantine, within the confines of the late Roman statuary habit. Colossal scale would also have lent an additional advantage. The enduring relevance of the exemplary imperial predecessors as optimi principes is further confirmed by the continued celebration of their birthdays (Natales Caesarum) as recorded in the Chronograph of AD 354.81 The re-use of representations of imperial ancestors conferred prestige and legitimacy. Dumser has underscored how the practice of architectural re-use, far from suggesting decadence and depletion in late-imperial Rome, is actually inspirational and a source of creativity in new architectural forms and formats.82 The same can be said for the revitalised portraits that forged new panegyrical rhetorics from the visual monuments of the imperial past.
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82 Dumser 2022, 80-81 ‘practice of reuse offering vital inspiration.’
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