

A NUMISMATIC DATE FOR THE DEPARTURE OF C. CAESAR?*

F. E. ROMER

Stanford University

The series of coins celebrating the mounted and armed C. Caesar f. Aug. is well known but has usually been dated on assumptions that may still be questioned. The commemoration of the youth, which occurs on aurei and denarii but not on coins of base metal, has been described as follows:¹

OBV.: Head of Augustus, laureate, r. AVGVSTVS DIVI F. l. down, r. up, outwardly.

REV.: Gaius Caesar galloping r., holding sword in r. hand and shield in l.; behind him, on l., aquila between two standards, set up in ground. C. CAES. above. AVGVS. F. in ex.

The standard reference works have assigned this series to either 8–6 B.C. or 5–3 B.C. (with strong preference for the earlier period).² The different datings are based on arguments of style and fabric or else on what one may suggest is a loose, or at best a narrow, association with the written record. Considerations of style and fabric can mislead the historian because these terms frequently conceal the subjective impressions of numismatists. The use of written accounts, it hardly needs mention, requires caution.

*Lionel Pearson has offered lively criticism of an earlier draft of this paper and I am greatly indebted to him. Others have helped also: A. E. Raubitschek who first turned my attention to C. and L. Caesar, M. Grant, John Nicols and, of course, those much-thanked individuals, the anonymous referees of the Association.

Cassius Dio (hereafter Dio) is cited from U. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Quae Supersunt* (Berlin 1895–1901; reprint, Berlin 1955) 3 vols., and, for ease of access, the *Res Gestae* of Augustus (hereafter Aug. RG) from V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Oxford 1974²; hereafter E-J Docs.).

¹H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (London 1923; hereafter *BMCRE*) I, Aug. nos. 498–502 = H. A. Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum* (London 1910; hereafter *BMCR*) II 443–44, nos. 221–225; H. Mattingly and E. A. Sydenham, *Roman Imperial Coinage* (London 1923) I, Aug. nos. 348–349. *BMCRE* I, Aug. no. 503, is a type of this denarius in copper and is there described as “probably an ancient forgery: perhaps the base core of a plated coin.”

²See below, notes 3, 5.

The present argument urges dating this series firmly to 2 B.C. by re-examining the reverse type and attempting to identify the occasion it celebrates. The iconographic investigation of this type will attempt a more complete connection with the full historical record than previously assumed. Redating the coins in this way has important implications for the nature of imperial propaganda as well as for the chronology of C. Caesar's career. If the new dating proves acceptable, the coins help to specify the circumstances of Gaius' departure for his tour of duty in the East.

The reasons for choosing either 8–6 B.C. or 5–3 B.C. are clear. The later period, now out of vogue, may be dealt with first. Explaining the chronological arrangements of the Count de Salis in the British Museum's collection, H. A. Grueber catalogued the coins as belonging to 5–3 B.C.³ De Salis' conjecture rested on the assumption that the reverse type of the armed and mounted youth suited his rôle as *princeps iuventutis*, an honor bestowed by equestrian acclamation in 5 B.C. (cf. Dio 55.9.9 [Zonaras]; Aug. *RG* 14). Since the coins do not allude to brother Lucius, three years his junior, and since no parallel issue is known for the younger, this type may be presumed to have been struck when the elder alone was *princeps iuventutis*, i.e., 5–3 B.C. When he came of age in 2 B.C., Lucius was likewise honored by equestrian acclamation (cf. Dio 55.9.10 [Zonaras]; Aug. *RG* 14). De Salis' date also minimizes the significance of the legionary eagle and the two *signa cohortis* shown to the rear of Gaius; he assumed that the standards merely conjure up military associations of a general nature (a sense which similar arrangements had later) since Gaius' rôle as *princeps iuventutis* was tied not to a legionary command but to the command of the first *turma* of the cavalry. We shall return in time to the problem of the standards.

Grueber gave his own reservations about this dating (above, note 3): "The portrait on these aurei and denarii is precisely similar to that on those assigned to B.C. 8–5, and they could so far as fabric and style are concerned be attributed to the same period." No dating should rest chiefly on the imperial portrait and Grueber's approach to style and fabric is open to

³*BMCR* II 443, note 1, where Grueber also indicates reservations. E. A. Sydenham, *Historical References on Coins of the Roman Empire* (London 1917) 27–28, assigns the series a date of 5 B.C. on the occasion of Gaius' investment with the *toga virilis* but conjectures that the type is meant to recall also Gaius' appearance among the Rhine legions in 8 B.C. E. Groag, "Studien zur Kaisergeschichte III: der Sturz der Iulia," *WS* 40 (1918) 163, identifies the coins of this series as those distributed in 5 B.C. on the occasion of Gaius' acclamation as *princeps iuventutis*. H. Cohen, *Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'empire romain* (Paris 1880) I, Aug. no. 39, specifies "vers 752; av. J. C. 2" without further comment. Cohen's catalogue date is merely a general temporal reference, presumably a *terminus ante quem*. M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coin Hoards* (London 1969) 38, Table XVIII, simply lists the series at the end of his group struck 10–2 B.C.

question.⁴ Official portraits were likely to remain static over long periods of time and dies once in use might be retired only to be recalled for later service. Except in unusual cases of radical innovation, a conservative medium like the engraver's cannot be expected to yield a detailed chronology on the basis of portrait style alone. Furthermore, we may note that Augustus' own nomenclature on these coins is particularly uninformative; any key to the date of issue will have to be found on the reverse.

The alternate dating of 8–6 B.C., which prevails today largely under the influence of H. Mattingly's catalogue,⁵ is derived from the recorded date of Gaius' first presence among the legions. The occasion was a minor campaign across the Rhine (Dio 55.6.1–6). Although the imperial salutation was received by Augustus and allowed for Tiberius, the Rhine legions obtained a donative, we are told, not for their accomplishments under Tiberius but for Gaius' presence among their ranks.

Dio's description should not be taken to mean that Gaius was in any way, even symbolically, active in the campaign as is sometimes overstated;⁶

⁴For his approach to style and fabric, cf. *BMCRR* I xcvi–cii. But see now the salutary remarks of M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge 1974) II 569–89 and 745–50 for guidelines on approaching these questions.

⁵*BMCRE* I 85 where the series is dated as 8 B.C. (?); elsewhere Mattingly is without doubt (pp. cxiii, 48 with 89) that the type refers to 8 B.C. Similarly M. Grant, *Roman Imperial Money* (London 1954) 28, gives the date c. 8 B.C. while on p. 315 in the note to pl. VI, no. 3, he sets the limits c. 8–6 B.C. So too J. P. Kent, B. Overbeck, A. U. Stylow, *Die Römische Münzen* (Munich 1973) pl. 38, no. 147 and the note on p. 96, give 8–6 B.C. C. H. V. Sutherland, *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy, 31 B. C.–A. D. 68* (London 1951) 68–69 and pl. V, no. 18, dates the series 8 B.C.; but it was perhaps felicitous that M. Grant, *Roman Anniversary Issues* (Cambridge 1950) 20–24, did not find the vicennial significance which Sutherland, p. 68, note 5, supposed. L. Laffranchi, "La Monetazione di Augusto," *RIN* 26 (1913) 313, gives 7 B.C. because he associated the victory with the smaller disturbance of that year in Germany (below, note 6). Historians regularly follow Mattingly's catalogue date; for convenience we may cite *PIR*² I no. 216 (C. Caesar f. Aug.) and also, because her influential work incurs our heavy obligation even when one may disagree on details, B. A. Levick, "Tiberius' Retirement to Rhodes in 6 B.C.," *Latomus* 31 (1972) 785.

⁶Grueber, *BMCRR* II 443, note 1: "Augustus especially celebrated Caius' first campaign;" 441, note 2: "on the pretext that Gaius Caesar . . . had served his first campaign among them." Laffranchi (above, note 5) gave the coins to 7 B.C. after a minor action against the Sicambri "alla quale Caio Cesare partecipò." It is not certain from Dio's account that Roman troops were involved in the incident of 7 B.C. This view of Gaius' presence with the army is apparently derived by adding the information of Dio 55.10.17 (from the *Excerpta Valesiana* and relating to 1 B.C. according to Boissevain [below, note 36]) to the passage we are now discussing. It is a false problem to associate Gaius' early presence among the soldiers with formal military training (*tirocinium militiae*). If Gaius "wurde . . . stillschweigend dispensirt" from *tirocinium*, there need have been no simulation or dissimulation in 8 B.C., but cf. V. Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit* (Leipzig 1891–1904) I 1118, 1123, 1135 and II 730, note 8. Sutherland (above, note 5) 68 realizes the honorary significance of the youth's presence with

rather that he took part in the victory exercises (or perhaps in preliminary drills since Dio's phrase *ἐν ταῖς γυμνασίαις τότε πρῶτον συνεξεταζόμενον* is not precise). The presence of the youth, not yet thirteen years old, was a newsworthy display intended for his advancement, not for detracting from Tiberius' prestige. Even Dio's elliptical account makes clear that Tiberius' service, far from being demeaned, was treated as a significant victory.

We must be careful not to let hindsight after Tiberius' political withdrawal in 6 B.C. color our interpretation of Dio's factual material. There is no substantive rivalry here between Gaius and Tiberius. Dio distinguished precisely between the real honors given to Tiberius and the less substantial favor shown to Gaius. This donative seems to have been the last of the Augustan period and its separation in principle from the military victory was deliberate. Roman arms served the *princeps*, not he his soldiers. In 8 B.C. Augustus was attempting to bind the allegiance of the army to the imperial house rather than to a lucrative policy of aggression.

Awarding the donative in Gaius' name did not slight Tiberius who then received an imperial salutation (his second), a new command and designation for the consulship (Dio 55.6.4–5). These were not consolation for a donative given in honor of another but proper rewards for valorous action. Outlandish treatment of Tiberius is unthinkable here since it would have undermined his prestige among the troops despite Augustus' increasing reliance on their loyalty to Tiberius especially for his German policy. On the contrary, Tiberius' honors in 8 B.C. mark a rapid ascent in imperial favor.⁷

Dio accurately preserved the most startling event of the day: the twelve-year-old adopted son of the *princeps* had performed in exercises of the Rhine legions. This was news in its own right. One might have expected to hear, after all, of a German victory celebrated in the names of Augustus and Tiberius, but the presence of the boy among the ranks was a curiosity

the army but, in keeping with his assumptions, does not doubt that this issue is composed of the very coins distributed in the donative at that time—an easy conjecture like Groag's (above, note 3; cf. also below, note 9).

⁷Augustus' complaints to the senate on Tiberius' withdrawal in 6 B.C. (Suet. *Tib.* 10.2) emphasize his increasing dependence on Tiberius. On the timing of Tiberius' and the elder Drusus' careers, see B. A. Levick, "Drusus Caesar and the Adoptions of A.D. 4," *Latomus* 25 (1966) 231, 235–36 and *op. cit.* (above, note 5) 780–86; for her interpretation of Tiberius' rapid ascent, *ibid.* 786 ff. with further elaboration in "Julians and Claudians," *G & R* 22(1975)32ff. Her book *Tiberius the Politician* (London 1976) 19–47 now incorporates and expands the striking insights of her previous publications.

especially since Augustus had been so close-lipped about his dynastic plan.⁸ An important step had been taken toward predisposing the military to the idea of blood succession and toward securing its favor for the person of the young C. Caesar.

In relating this coin type directly to the events of 8 B.C., the standards have again been used for their general military associations and are understood to be referring to the Rhine legions. This assumption begins, however, with an historian who has his Dio in one hand, the coin in the other. Nothing on the coin specifies these legions and such an interpretation does not consider the exactness of the reverse type. Gaius alone is shown on the coins and the standards are planted on the ground. Supporters of this dating construe both the ensigns and Gaius' armament simply in a general military sense.⁹ The die-sinker's art is economical of expression; much space and consideration is unlikely to be given to details of so unspecific a nature on a coin struck to identify a special honor for the elder of Augustus' adopted sons. A contemporary ought to have been allowed no room for a mistake in recognizing the occasion of these coins. If the dating of these coins to c. 8 B.C. gives *prima facie* consideration to the obverse portrait (as Grueber indicated), it does no more for the reverse. This dating imposes Dio's account of 8 B.C. as the explanation of this coin type. But it is also possible to work outwardly, as it were, from the iconography of the reverse which may here be expected to be the more informative and precise type.

The three standards must be accounted for in any interpretation and they may actually be met on other Augustan coins. In 19 B.C. Augustus had returned to Rome from the East and in his possession were the ensigns of three armies which he had recovered through peaceful negotiation with King Phraates IV of Parthia in the previous year (Dio 54.8.1-3). This diplomatic coup was advertised by the princeps as a military victory:

⁸Despite Dio's remarks (54.18.1) that Gaius and Lucius were to succeed him, Augustus' succession policy seems never to have been elaborated publically in any detail and it must have been preserved as the subject of both rumor and well-informed speculation if it is not here simply Dio's inference. The general lines of all phases of the succession policy emerge but details remain obscure; for recent discussions of various aspects, see J. H. Corbett, "The Succession Policy of Augustus," *Latomus* 33 (1974) 87 ff.; B. A. Levick, "Abdication and Agrippa Postumus," *Historia* 21 (1972) 674 ff. and "The Fall of Julia the Younger," *Latomus* 35 (1976) 301 ff. with her other work (above, notes 5, 7); and S. Jameson, "Augustus and Agrippa Postumus," *Historia* 24 (1975) 287 ff.

⁹Analogies on coins prior to the Augustan principate, such as Antony's fleet coinage, tend to be specific in reference. The general military associations of similar iconography are clear in the adlocution issues of later principates; this aspect of the adlocution typology may have been derived from the series under consideration. We should also not forget that the representation of the mounted youth became the regular type of the *princeps iuventutis*.

Parthos trium exercitum Romanorum spolia et signa re[ddere] mihi supplicesque amicitiam populi Romani petere coegi (Aug. *RG* 29). The standards which had been lost by Crassus in 53 and by Antony's armies in 40 and 36 B.C. were represented on a variety of coins from the period immediately following their recovery. Although they are variously portrayed as a single standard or two or three, the coins which show them erected in a shrine regularly, but not universally, show the symmetrical arrangement of a legionary eagle flanked on either side by a *signum cohortis*¹⁰—precisely the same arrangement as on the series of the mounted and armed Gaius. The point for our consideration: whenever three standards are depicted, the symmetrical organization is used. Unless it be on the issue honoring Gaius, this arrangement of military standards does not appear on coins of other significance during the Augustan principate and yet it might be expected if the standards had only a general military significance.

It is worthwhile to pursue this lead further. If the standards recovered in 20 B.C. are meant on this series honoring C. Caesar, their appearance here apart from any temple or cult statue or (apparently) any direct cultic context must be explained: why have they been removed from their resting place? Fortunately we have a clue to the explanation in the words of Dio (54.8.3):

ἀμέλει καὶ θυσίας ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ νεῶν Ἄρεως Τιμωροῦ ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ, κατὰ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Φερετρίου ζήλωμα, πρὸς τὴν τῶν σημείων ἀνάθεσιν καὶ ψηφισθῆναι ἐκέλευσε καὶ ἐποίησε.

Difficulties with what Dio meant have long been recognized. To be sure, archaeologists have given us no round temple on the Capitoline which will match the representation on the coins of c. 19 B.C. or which can be attributed to Mars Ultor.¹¹ The evidence of Horace (*Carm.* 4.15.6)¹² suggests that the standards were temporarily housed in a temple of Jupiter—Tonans or, as we should prefer because of its own historical traditions, Feretrius.¹³ Either Dio, writing two centuries and more after the

¹⁰For example, *BMC REI*, Aug. nos. 384–389 (*aquila*); nos. 366–370, cf. also nos. 410–415 (*aquila* and *signum cohortis*); nos. 371–375 (*aquila* and two *signa cohortis*).

¹¹In general see H. R. W. Smith, "Problems Historical and Numismatic in the Reign of Augustus," *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology* 2 (1952) 194–204.

¹²Prop. 3.4.6 may also be relevant if it is informed anticipation.

¹³The temple of Jupiter Feretrius is preferable because of its similar purpose and because its other military memorabilia were commemorated on the doors and art of the new temple in 2 B.C. (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 5.561–66). The point of Dio's comparison between the temples of Mars Ultor and Jupiter Feretrius seems to have been their similar functions. See S. B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Oxford 1929²) 293–94, for the references to Jupiter Feretrius.

event, has become confused in his facts and the ultimate repository of the standards was mistaken for the temporary one; or else his text has been badly handled by a scribe.¹⁴ Nor are the coins of c. 19 B.C. more helpful since the round temple or shrine which they depict has not been located on the Capitoline. The coins may portray an artist's conception of the projected temple of Mars Ultor which was scrapped in the years before the surviving rectangular edifice in the Forum Augustum was undertaken. The coins of 19 B.C. need not show a supposed *templum* or *aedicula* of Mars Ultor which was specially constructed to house the standards until the greater temple was completed in 2 B.C. In the *Res Gestae* Augustus specifies no such building among his construction projects and his own words are generally taken as referring to the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum: *ea autem s[ign]a in penetrali, quod e[st] in templo Martis Ultoris, reposui* (RG 29).¹⁵ Without entering further into the question of the shrine of Mars Ultor on the Capitoline, it will be sufficient to observe that the standards had to be housed somewhere for the seventeen years between 19 and 2 B.C. and that all indication points to a repository on the Capitoline.

The recovered standards were removed from this temporary shelter in 2 B.C. and brought to their new and permanent resting place in the temple of Mars Ultor in the Augustan Forum. The standards also deserved commemoration therefore on coins of 2 B.C. when the new temple was

¹⁴Dio may have been thinking of another shrine to Mars on the Capitoline when he was writing: cf. Dio 41.14.3, also August. *De civ. D.* 4.23 and Platner and Ashby (above, note 13) 327. On the other hand, it has been suggested that ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ has been transposed from its original position modifying the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, cf. Smith (above, note 11) 195, note 11. In any event Dio 54.8.4 says of the preceding sentence: ταῦτα μὲν ἐπ' ἐκείνους ὕστερον ἐπράχθη, which supports the principle of emending our passage. These remarks from Dio are the unique evidence for a Capitoline shrine of Mars Ultor and are accepted by Platner and Ashby 329–30, and by G. Lugli, *Roma Antica* (Rome 1946) 32. The fact that Ov. *Fasti* 5.545–98 gives a feast of Mars Ultor on May 12th and Dio 60.5.3 on August 1st is sometimes construed as pointing to two temples, cf. J. G. Frazer, *The Fasti of Ovid* (London 1929) IV 61–62, and Platner and Ashby, *ibid.* Mommsen had associated Ovid's evidence with the dedication of a supposed Capitoline shrine c. 19 B.C. (*CIL* I, p. 318) but this contradicts Aug. RG 22 which places the first performance of *ludi Martiales* at Rome squarely in 2 B.C. Even granted the lack of his *Fasti* for August, Ovid's description of the May festival knows only the temple in Augustus' forum and Dio is never taken in this passage as referring to any but that. The forum and the temple may have been dedicated separately (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 29.1). E. S. Shuckburgh, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Augustus* (Cambridge 1896) 62, had thought that "as early as 20 B.C. the temple in the forum seems to have been sufficiently advanced to receive the standards recovered from the Parthians;" still a third reconciliation is possible (below, note 16).

¹⁵That Augustus is referring to the temple in his forum is usually taken from RG 21: *in privato solo Martis Ultoris templum [forumque Augustum [ex ma]n[i]bis feci*. Cf. Frazer (above, note 14) IV 71.

dedicated; nothing in fact prevents their being the very ones on the coins honoring Gaius. The ensigns would be depicted independent of any structure while in transit and on display outdoors during the inaugural ceremonies of the temple in the forum on the twelfth of May in that year.¹⁶

Gaius' prominence in the same ceremonies will explain his association with the standards on these coins for which we now suggest a commemorative date of 12 May 2 B.C. When the temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated as the central feature of the Forum Augustum, the adopted sons of Augustus were also on parade, but, in keeping with his usual procedure, Augustus gave something of an edge to the elder's appearance. Augustus himself conducted a ritual purification while Gaius and Lucius as *duoviri aedis dedicandae* performed the formal consecration of the temple.¹⁷ An annual festival in the charge of the *seviri equitum* was also established and, as *seviri* of the first *turma* of the knights, Gaius and Lucius will have had an obvious hand in the management of the first games.¹⁸

The new temple was, of course, properly martial. Suetonius knew it as the symbol of Rome's military glory (*Aug.* 29.2):¹⁹

Aedem Martis bello Philippensi pro ultione paterna suscepto voverat; sanxit ergo, ut de bellis triumphisque hic consuleretur senatus, provincias cum imperio petitori hinc deducerentur, quique victores redissent, huc insignia triumphorum conferrent.

The reconstituted text of Dio 55.10.2–5 [Xiphilinus] refines Suetonius' information:

¹⁶Dio 55.10.1–8 [Xiphilinus] for the celebration and the year, *Ov. Fasti* 5.545–98 for the day and the month. Dio 60.5.3 gives August 1st for the dedication of the temple. In defense of Ovid and against the conventional acceptance of Dio's day and month, C. J. Simpson, "The Date of Dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor," *JRS* 67 (1977) 91–94, argues that, Dio's assertion to the contrary, the *ludi Martiales* of 1 August 41 A.D. were purposely celebrated to mark Claudius' birthday, that "similar games had also occurred on the birthdays of other members of the imperial family" (p. 93), and finally that supporting a dedication date of August 1st means that "Augustus, Ovid and Horace are guilty of gross historical inaccuracy" (p. 92). Eyewitnesses are to be preferred to Dio's unsupported claim. An anonymous referee is to be thanked for providing a copy of Simpson's preliminary abstract of this discussion.

¹⁷Dio 55.10.6 [Xiphilinus]: *ἐθελῶσε* of Augustus' participation, *ἱεροῦν* of his sons'. See T. Mommsen's suggestion in *Römisches Staatsrecht* (Leipzig 1887³) II 621, note 1, and 624.

¹⁸Cf. Dio 55.10.6 [Xiphilinus]: *καὶ τήν γε ἱπποδρομίαν αὐτοὶ τότε διέθεσαν, τήν τε Τροίαν καλουμένην οἱ παῖδες οἱ πρῶτοι μετὰ τοῦ Ἀγρίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῶν ἱππεύσαν*. See T. Mommsen, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (Berlin 1883²) 56–57, and L. R. Taylor, "Seviri Equitum Romanorum and Municipal Seviri," *JRS* 14 (1924) 160–62.

¹⁹S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971) 130–32, argues that the original idea of a temple of Mars Ultor is owed to Julius Caesar who planned it as the monument of his expected victory over the Parthians in vengeance for Crassus. Weinstock clarifies Suetonius' striking phrase *pro ultione paterna*.

. . . "Α]ρει, ἐαυτὸν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐγγόνους, ὅσῳκις ἂν ἐθελήσωσι, τοὺς τε ἐκ τῶν παίδων ἐξιδόντας καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἐφήβους ἐγγραφομένους ἐκέισε πάντως ἀφικνεῖσθαι, καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τὰς ἐκδήμους στελλομένους ἐκείθεν ἀφορμᾶσθαι, τὰς τε γνώμας τὰς περὶ τῶν νικητηρίων ἐκεῖ τὴν βουλὴν ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ τοὺς πέμψαντας αὐτὰ τῷ Ἄρει τούτῳ καὶ τὸ σκῆπτρον καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἀνατιθέναι, καὶ ἐκείνους τε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς τὰς ἐπινικίους τιμὰς λαμβάνοντας ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ χαλκοὺς ἵστασθαι, ἂν τέ ποτε σημεία στρατιωτικὰ ἐς πολέμους ἀλόντα ἀνακομισθῇ, ἐς τὸν ναὸν αὐτὰ τίθεσθαι, καὶ πανήγυριν τινα πρὸς τοῖς ἀναβασμοῖς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν αἰὶ ἱλαρχούντων ποιεῖσθαι, ἡλὸν τε αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῶν τιμητευσάντων προσπήγνυσθαι, καὶ τὴν τε παράσχεσιν τῶν ἵππων τῶν ἐς τὴν ἵπποδρομίαν ἀγωνιουμένων καὶ τὴν τοῦ ναοῦ φυλακὴν καὶ βουλευταῖς ἐργολαβεῖν ἐξείναι, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τε τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Καπιτωλίου ἐνενομοθέτητο.

Unfortunately the relevant portion of the reconstruction begins with a lacuna but in the extant portion Dio generally confirms Suetonius' account, omitting only notice of the meetings of the senate on those occasions on which the debate was *de bellis*, and gives supplementary information among which I call attention to the following items: (a) that recipients of the *toga virilis* proceed ceremonially to the temple of Mars Ultor on the day of investiture, (b) that military standards recovered from enemy possession be installed in the temple, and (c) that the *seviri equitum* be charged with the management of an annual festival beside the steps of the temple. These arrangements all have proper military associations and are suitably joined to a cult of Mars; they are also keyed to highlight activities conducted by or in conjunction with Augustus' adopted sons at the dedicatory ceremony and were presumably intended to furnish prototypes for similar celebrations at the temple in the future.

The dedication came too late in 2 B.C. to celebrate the investiture of that year's recipients of the *toga virilis* since this ritual regularly, but not invariably, occurred on March 17th. Lucius who received his toga in this year may have been invested at a special ceremony on New Year's Day.²⁰ At any rate the year's registrants will have been called upon for an inaugural procession with Lucius at the head. The youths proceeded from the Capitoline into the Forum Augustum and, we may further conjecture, brought with them the standards recovered in 20 B.C.

All this suits the military aspect of the new forum. The ceremonial bestowal of the *toga virilis* had in 5 B.C., and subsequently in 2, been the

²⁰J. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer* (Leipzig 1886) 124, note 2, discusses the variable date of the *deductio in forum*; Mommsen (above, note 18) 52 conjectures that January 1st was the day on which both Gaius and Lucius in their respective years put aside the *toga praetexta*.

occasion on which Gaius first, and then Lucius, was honored as *princeps iuventutis* by the equestrian order. This ceremony is in any case of military import; it provides the moment at which a Roman youth became eligible for service in the army. In 5 and 2 B.C., by equestrian acclamation, it had also made assignment of a cavalry command and leadership of the *iuventus*. At the dedicatory festival of Mars Ultor, then, not only were members of the imperial family—Julius Caesar, C. and L. Caesar and Augustus—being honored but also the equestrian order, that foremost provider of Roman military leadership. So, too, the *seviri equitum* acquired superintendence of the annual festival beside the temple steps to celebrate the close association between the newly prestigious order and the military virtues of Rome. Among the *seviri* who celebrated the first festival were, as we have said, C. and L. Caesar. Augustus whose explicit policy had been to promote the males of his line by associating them with public games did not hold back at this opportunity.

We are left, however, with an unexpected imbalance. Augustus had always been careful to maintain only the slightest degree of difference in the external indications of *dignitas* between individuals of nearly equal position—two men of whom the less prestigious might in unforeseen circumstances be called upon to substitute for his more prestigious counterpart.²¹ In situations of this kind the necessary preferment of the inferior member of the pair would appear less like a retraction or a compromised decision.

Augustus did maintain distinctions between Gaius and Lucius. His intention seems to have been that Gaius might succeed him with greater *auctoritas* than his brother while the younger son might have a subordinate capacity roughly on the model of the elder Agrippa to Augustus. (The model does not provide an exact correspondence since the *princeps*, having learned from his own military shortcomings, will have wanted stronger

²¹That Tiberius and Marcellus were kept in close, but unequal, relationship is shown by Dio 53.30.2 and Suet. *Aug.* 28.1; similarly M. Agrippa's relation to Augustus (see now the discussions of an important new papyrus fragment [= E-J *Docs. Add.* 3] by L. Koenen, "Die 'laudatio funebris' des Augustus für Agrippa auf einem neuen Papyrus," *ZPE* 5 [1970] 217 ff., and by E. W. Gray, "The Imperium of M. Agrippa," *ZPE* 6 [1971] 227 ff.); and, ultimately, Lucius' position *vis-à-vis* Gaius. After Marcellus' death Tiberius was paired with his own brother Drusus. Augustus' failure to elaborate on his nascent policy had helped to create popular confusion during the crisis of 23 B.C. B. A. Levick (above, note 7) *Latomus* 25, pp. 227 ff., discusses the use of various pairs in Augustus' dynastic scheme and notes, p. 235, the effects of differences in prestige and precedence due to age; she does not consider additional differences due to deliberate policy. After his marriage to Julia, Tiberius had increased *dignitas* as son-in-law of Augustus and also had active responsibility for the *princeps'* adopted sons. My views on the arrangement and uses of the pairs differ in details from Levick's (above, note 7).

control for Gaius in this respect. The disparity of their subsequent commands bears this out.) Not all of the difference in *auctoritas* is attributable to a function of time. Many of the honors and experiences of the two youths were kept parallel with differences of timing due only to age, e.g., the manner of their education, their rôles as *principes iuventutis*, the designated consulships. But there are differences of another sort which are meant to distinguish between the youths in popular prestige.

Even allowing for the accidents of preservation in the historical record, one can find important distinctions in Augustus' treatment of the boys. Only Gaius' birthday is reported as commemorated annually (Dio 54.8.5)—a distinctive enough honor to have earned a report by Dio if Lucius had had his remembered too. Gaius held a priesthood (cf. *CIL* II 3828, VI 897, IX 3343, XI 1421 *et al.*) and Lucius an augurate (cf. *CIL* II 2109, VI 898, IX 3914, XI 1420 *et al.*) which Gaius never held. (*CIL* II 2422 where Gaius is miscalled an augur must be a stonemason's or bureaucrat's error if the reading is correct.²²) The *pontificium* was required to succeed Augustus as *pontifex maximus*. Nor is Lucius reported as participating in a *consilium amicorum* as is Gaius on the problem of the Judaeian succession after the death of Herod the Great.²³ The lack of a parallel for this last honor is not entirely convincing since no suitable occasion may have arisen for Lucius' presence on a state council of similar importance. In this regard, however, we should not forget the incomparability of their subsequent military assignments (see below and note 29). The coins of the series under investigation provide a final example: whatever the occasion of their issue, they are unparalleled for Lucius.²⁴

²²The most numerous issue of coins in honor of C. and L. Caesar (*BMCRE* I, Aug. nos. 513–543) have the augural *lituus* and pontifical *simpulum* between the representations of the otherwise indistinguishable youths on the reverse type; this is meant apparently, in the iconographic shorthand of the coins, to identify each of the youths. The *lituus* specifies the nearer figure as Lucius, the *simpulum* identifies Gaius. If this suggestion needs reinforcement, an engraved carnelian in Florence has the initials CL placed under the *simpulum* and *lituus* respectively. For a reproduction of this gem see M. L. Vollenwieder, "Principes Iuventutis," *Schweizer Münzblätter* 14 (1964) 79, ill. 6.

²³This *consilium amicorum* met twice. Gaius' presence is specifically attested at the first (Joseph. *BJ* 2.25, *AJ* 17.229) and is possible at the second (cf. Joseph. *BJ* 2.81, *AJ* 17.30); J. Crook, *Consilium Principis* (Cambridge 1955) 32–33 and 110, discusses the meetings but suggests, p. 32, that "on the second occasion its composition was the same, except that Gaius is no longer mentioned, which may be because these proceedings were more public and official." Still Gaius' presence at the first session was remarkable enough.

²⁴Groag (above, note 3) 153, note 5, thought that Gaius' Pisan cenotaph, *CIL* XI 1421 (= E-J *Docs.* 69, *ILS* 140), admitted of the interpretation that he alone was considered as Augustus' successor. It does, but the significance is uncertain. Minimally the expression *iam designatu[m] iustissimum ac simillimum parentis sui virtutis principem* (lines 12–13 of the inscription) gives only what was obvious after Lucius' death and before the adoption of

The unexpected imbalance in our discussion of the ceremonies of 2 B.C. arises from the fact that Lucius, the junior and subordinate member in this pair, will have received the greater publicity unless we can take our discussion further. Lucius was prominent in the procession of the year's newly enrolled young men, in the formal dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor and in the management of the equestrian games; Gaius only in the last two which he obviously shared with his brother. The coins of the present series cannot be honoring Gaius in connection with his share in the management of the equestrian games (although the iconography does suit his equestrian pose) since Lucius is not similarly honored. It is unlike Augustus to make a false distinction in honor between the youths by giving one credit where both were deserving. Likewise, it is unlikely that Augustus gave more display to Lucius without arranging a parallel or a superior honor for Gaius since in every case where there is a difference of degree the elder's honors surpass his younger brother's. An appropriate display, parallel or superior, for Gaius was needed at these ceremonies and possibly the coins of this series mark it.

An additional inference can be made on the basis of the coin type if it is agreed that the standards are those recovered from the Parthians in 20 B.C. and that they are represented here in transit at the dedication of the temple of Mars. The military significance of the temple, as we have seen, pervaded every aspect of its intended function and of the inaugural ceremonies. The very Forum Augustum in which it stood had been financed, its founder boasts (*RG* 21), from the spoils of war; the temple became in every sense "the military center of the city."²⁵ The temple, as Dio and Suetonius agree, was to be the starting point for all newly assigned provincial governors and the point of return for victorious generals. We know that an honorific eastern governorship as *Orienti praepositus* (Suet. *Tib.* 12.2) and a military command were already scheduled for C. Caesar. He was apparently expected to be the first to complete the circuit and to win the attendant glory.

Ovid's vulgar apostrophe (*Ars Am.* 1.177–228) makes the connection between the dedication of the temple and Gaius' impending eastern duties clear enough. The coins of the series under discussion reflect the great honor which the *princeps* provided for his adopted son's eastern governorship by having him depart directly from the inaugural ceremony

Tiberius and Agrippa Postumus. Likewise Aul. Gell. *NA* 15.7.3, quoting a letter of September 23, A.D. 1 from Augustus to Gaius, gives ἀνδραγαθούτων υἱῶν καὶ διαδεχομένων *stationem meam*. The plural is for the rôles of both sons but *stationem meam* was quite accurate after the expiration of Tiberius' commission in 1 B.C.

²⁵L. R. Taylor (above, note 18) 161.

for the East (symbolized by his mounted charge) and by intending him to be the first to return victoriously to this holy spot.²⁶ The enormous prestige of his assignment cannot but have been enhanced by the presence of the standards; he was about to drive to its logical conclusion the same policy which had returned the standards to Roman hands in 20 B.C. In the sense that these ceremonies and honors for Gaius are unparalleled for his brother, we can agree with Groag's suggestion that the coins of this series, which portray Gaius alone, mark him out for Augustus' position.²⁷ The military standards are shown on display in the forum at this festival to indicate that Gaius' departure was the climactic part of the inaugural program.

Before concluding this discussion, one further piece of evidence which recapitulates the events of this year needs examination:²⁸

Ein verbrannter Sard im Museo Archeologico in Florenz . . . wiederholt das im Jahre 8 v. Chr. entstandene Münzbild, auf dem Gaius Caesar zu Pferd an den Standarten und dem Legionsadler vorbei nach rechts galoppiert . . . ; ja er gibt noch eine ausführlichere Szene als dieses: Zwischen dem Legionsadler und dem vorderen Signum ist gleich hinter dem Kopf des Gaius die auf dem Boden stehende Lanze mit dem Schild des Princeps iuventutis abgebildet, welcher mit der zum Gruss erhobenen Rechten im Galopp dem auf einem hohen Podium sitzenden Augustus entgegeneilt. Als Augustus ist die sitzende Figur lediglich durch ihre Attribute zu bestimmen, durch sein astrologisches Symbol des Capricornus, den Lituus, den der Kaiser wie auf den grossen Kameen in der Hand hält, und die Victoria, die eben von hinten her auf ihn zugeflogen kam, ihren Fuss auf den am Ende der Leiter befestigten Globus absetzte, um den Kaiser mit der ausgestreckten Rechten zu krönen.

M. L. Vollenwieder interpreted this representation of the mounted and armed Gaius as "eine 'Investitur' eines Kronprinzen" in the context of 8 B.C. Augustus, she says, is shown as distributing the donative on that occasion. We have already discussed the date of the representation of the mounted youth and that discussion is not contradicted by this piece; we have also given an understanding by which this scene may be said to appoint Gaius as Augustus' successor. The distribution of a largesse does not conflict with

²⁶Despite the evidence of Ovid, there has been some confusion about the date of Gaius' departure; we may quote Gardthausen (above, note 6) I 1135 for the *communis opinio*: "Es war noch in der ersten Hälfte des Jahres 753/1, als Gaius mit seinem Gefolge Rom verliess, um seinen Zug in den Orient anzutreten" (cf. *RE* X 426 also by Gardthausen and see *PIR*² I, no. 216).

²⁷Groag (above, note 3) 153, note 5, and also "Studien zur Kaisergeschichte III: der Sturz der Iulia," *WS* 41 (1919) 87–88.

²⁸Vollenwieder (above, note 22) 76–78. The reader is referred to her ill. 1–3 for reproductions of the gem described in this passage.

the present argument. Augustus records (*RG* 15) that in 2 B.C. he distributed sixty denarii to each of about 200,000 citizens who were receiving the *frumentum publicum*; it has been said (but this is not likely) that the *congiarium* may have been distributed at the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor.²⁹

Vollenwieder implicitly contradicts herself by suggesting that the gem does not refer to the events of 8 B.C. when she subsequently observed that “Schild und Lanze haben Bezug auf die Ernennung zum Princeps iuventutis, und wohl als Anführer der vornehmen jungen Ritter bei den trojanischen Spielen des Jahres 2 v. Ch. ist Gaius zu Pferd dargestellt.”³⁰ On her argument the shield and lance point, of course, only to a date after 5 B.C. But Gaius who had received his *toga virilis* and was *sevir equitum* cannot have led the *lusus Troiae* or *Troia* after 5 B.C. but Agrippa Postumus—ten years old and not yet fallen *mira pravitate animi atque ingeni* (Vell. Pat. 2.112.7)—was prominent in this exercise for boys (above, note 18).

There are distinct advantages in elaborating on these ceremonies in this way and in assigning Gaius’ departure for the East to them. First his departure is brought into alignment with his brother’s later departure for the Spanish armies in the summer of A.D. 2 when he was not scheduled to be consul until A.D. 4; this provides an attested gap of about a year and a half between the departure of each from Rome and his designated consulship.³¹ Lucius’ departure was, significantly, not accompanied by the same fanfare as his brother’s and the suggestion of Lucius’ military command has been all but lost.³² Second, because he did not begin to negotiate with the

²⁹Nothing compels this suggestion by M. Rostovtzeff, *Römische Bleitesserae* (Leipzig 1905) 25; the gem itself may represent a synopsis of the year’s events in a single dimension if the figure of Augustus is to be taken as presiding over a distribution. If the distribution was moved to the dedicatory ceremonies, this again breaks the parallel pattern in favor of Gaius. Although this is the same number of denarii per eligible citizen as Augustus had distributed in the year of Gaius’ *deductio in forum*, D. Van Berchem, *Les distributions de blé et d’argent à la plèbe romaine sous l’empire* (Geneva 1939) 143, conjectures, with the help of Suet. *Aug.* 42.2, that a larger amount, perhaps 75 denarii per eligible citizen, had been proposed in 5 B.C. If so, the distribution *per capita* was determined in 2 B.C. on the analogy of the *per capita* distribution three years before; cf. Mommsen (above, note 18) 62.

³⁰Vollenwieder (above, note 22) 78.

³¹Lucius, who was to be consul in A.D. 4 (cf. *PIR*² I, no. 222), died of a sudden ailment in Marseilles on 20 August A.D. 2; *CIL* XI 1420 (= E-J *Docs.* 68, *ILS* 139) with Gardthausen (above, note 6) II 737, note 40, gives the date of his demise; the city of his death is undisputed (Vell. Pat. 2.102.3, Suet. *Aug.* 65.1, Dio 55.10a.9 [Zonaras]); cause of death is mentioned by Dio 55.10a.10 [Zonaras]. Tacitus refers (*Ann.* 1.3) to *mors fato prospera vel novercae Liviae dolus* which preserves rumor as well.

³²Only Tac. *Ann.* 1–3 mentions that Lucius’ journey was to the army in Spain but cf. Suet. *Aug.* 64.1. However Vell. Pat. 2.102.3 indicates Spain as his destination. See Gardthausen

Parthians until his consulship in A.D. 1, Gaius' early departure suggests that when his itinerary was laid out in 2 B.C., Parthia did not present the same problem in foreign policy that it became during 1 B.C. Indeed Phraataces, the Parthian usurper, approached Augustus with new demands in 1 B.C. (Dio 55.10.20 [Xiphilinus]). The grand reappearance of the standards, recovered so neatly through negotiation nearly two decades earlier, gave the illusion of a great mission in 2 B.C. But in fact although the Armenian question, the point at issue with the Parthians, had been left open by Tiberius in 6 B.C., it was still expected to be resolved as easily as Tiberius had managed it in 20 B.C. (cf. Dio 54.9.4–5). Dealing with the Parthians even in this manner was a fit subject for domestic propaganda and would bring great prestige to the untried young man.³³ Finally, this interpretation also allows for Gaius' leisurely circuit of the eastern Mediterranean with various ports of call (Vell. Pat. 2.101.1; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 64.1)—Corinth (?),³⁴ Athens (*IG* II² 3250 = E-J *Docs.* 64),³⁵ the lower Danube (Dio 55.10.17

(above, note 6) I 1125–26 for the reasons Spain required attention. A command against fractious hill peoples in Spain cannot have been equated in the public mind with the negotiation of an important frontier treaty with Parthia (but see also below, note 33).

³³The Parthian negotiation, though first in the propaganda of 2 B.C., was apparently to be conducted after an elusively attested Arabian campaign which Gaius waged during his consulate, cf. G. W. Bowersock, "A Report on Arabia Provincia," *JRS* 61 (1971) 227–28; Augustus may have taken his fifteenth imperatorial salutation after this Arabian campaign, cf. T. D. Barnes, "The Victories of Augustus," *JRS* 64 (1974) 22–23. Perhaps this Arabian command is to be compared with Lucius' Spanish one (above, note 32) but we may still say that the less grand circumstances of Lucius' departure mean that no counterpart of the Parthian negotiations lay in the program of his immediate future.

³⁴This is a tentative suggestion which I have adapted from E. H. Swift, "A Group of Roman Imperial Portraits at Corinth III: Gaius and Lucius Caesar," *AJA* 25 (1921) 360, although the statues which sparked his interest are of more problematic date, cf. S. S. Weinberg, *The Southeast Building, the Twin Basilicas, the Mosaic House* ("Corinth," I.5; Princeton 1960) 53–54. A visit by Gaius to once recalcitrant Colonia Laus Julia Corinthiensis is quite in order and there may be numismatic evidence: in their duumvirate C. Servilius C. f. Primus and M. Antonius Hipparchus (*PIR*² A, no. 838) honored C. and L. Caesar on their coins (B. V. Head, *British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins: Corinth* [London 1889; reprint, Bologna 1963] no. 505). J. Kent, *The Inscriptions 1926–1950* ("Corinth," VIII.3; Princeton 1966) 24, dates these coins to the period 29/28–19/18 B.C.—clearly impossible since Lucius was not born until 17 (Dio 54.18.1). This last is the year to which they are given by K. M. Edwards, *Coins 1896–1929* ("Corinth," VI; Cambridge, Mass., 1933) 6. The iconography of the youths does not suggest babes. (The duumvirate occurred during Lucius' lifetime, i.e., between 17 B.C. and A.D. 2.) Regrettably Kent died before he could give us his promised study of the Corinthian duumvirate.

³⁵The text of the inscription has been corrected: see the addendum of *IG* II² p. 349 and M. and E. Levensohn, "Inscriptions on the South Slope of the Acropolis," *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 68–69. For this inscription P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste* (Cairo 1927) 51, suggested without

[*Excerpta Valesiana*]],³⁶ Assos (*IGRR* IV 248),³⁷ Samos (and/or Chios),³⁸ Cyprus (?).³⁹ This itinerary reflects the considerations of 2 B.C., not those that developed in the following year. The coins honoring C. Caesar, with which we began this discussion, marked the beginning of his lengthy ceremonial tour of the East.

argument a date between A.D. 2 and February 21, A.D. 4 on the assumption that Gaius' salutation as "Ares Reincarnate" refers to his military career in this period but this is not necessary as Graindor knew, cf. p. 51, note 1. His proposed date has been accepted (again without argument) by W. Dinsmoor, "The Temple of Ares at Athens," *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 49–50, but the greeting better fits a visit by Gaius shortly after 12 May 2 B.C. when he may have arrived for a prolonged stay. Dinsmoor has been unquestioningly followed in subsequent excavation publications, cf. R. E. Wycherley, *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia* ("The Athenian Agora," III; Princeton 1957) 55, and H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens* ("The Athenian Agora," XIV; Princeton 1972) 163. There is perhaps other evidence for Gaius' visit at this time, namely the dedications associated with his companions L. Domitius Ahenobarbus and M. Lollius (*IG* II² 4139, 4140, 4144 and cf. Graindor 51, 66, 68–69). Nothing precludes an academic visit to Athens, if I may call it that, cf. Gardthausen (above, note 6) I 1135–36. The "Ares Reincarnate" inscription is the only epigraphical evidence for the relocation of the temple of Ares in the Athenian agora; it should be (but has not been) irresistible for the excavators to date this reconstruction in closer proximity to the building of the temple of Mars Ultor in the forum at Rome.

³⁶From the *Excerpta Valesiana*: ὅτι Γάϊος τὰ στρατόπεδα τὰ πρὸς τῷ Ἰστροῦ εἰρηνικῶς ἐπῆν· πόλεμον γὰρ οὐδένα ἐπολέμησεν, οὐχ ὅτι οὐκ ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἐν τε ἡσυχίᾳ καὶ ἀσφαλείᾳ ἄρχειν ἐμάνθανε, οἱ δὲ δὴ κίνδυνοι ἄλλοις προσετάσσοντο. This is a difficult passage but surely, because of its language (especially in the last clause), to be associated with Vell. Pat. 2.101.1 and 1 B.C. as Boissvain did. Such a date implies the lower Danube because the visit did not significantly affect Gaius' eastward progress (also below, note 37). Gardthausen (above, note 6) II 730, note 8, gives two other possibilities for this passage: 8 B.C. (Gaius among the Rhine legions) and, his own preference, an identification with the young Caligula.

³⁷Cf. the emendation by R. Merkelbach, "Gaius Caesar, Princeps Iuventutis, in Assos," *ZPE* 13 (1974) 186. Formerly Gaius was commonly thought to have gone from Athens directly to Samos or Chios, cf. Gardthausen (above, note 6) I 1136 and *RE* X 426.

³⁸The infamous meeting between Gaius and Tiberius occurred either at Samos (Suet. *Tib.* 12.2) or Chios (Dio 55.10.19) but visits by Gaius to both are not excluded.

³⁹"It is futile to speculate whether Gaius on his voyage from Samos to Egypt took the opportunity of visiting Cyprus." So T. B. Mitford, "Some Published Inscriptions of Roman Date from Cyprus," *ABSA* 42 (1947) 224. *IGRR* III 997 belongs before Gaius' mission (*ibid.* 225) and probably to 7/6 B.C., cf. T. B. Mitford, "A Note from Salamis," 114–15 in D. W. Bradeen and M. F. McGregor, eds., *Phoros* (Locust Valley, N. Y. 1974). H. A. Tubbs, "Excavations in Cyprus, 1889," *JHS* 11 (1890) 75, no. 22, edited an inscription from Soli in Cyprus which he restored as a dedication to Gaius but only the final letter of the name is legible and the restoration is unsure.