

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

**VOL. XLII**

HELSINKI 2008

## INDEX

|                             |   |     |
|-----------------------------|---|-----|
| LUIGI ARATA                 | <i>Impieghi del λιβυστικόν nella medicina greca antica<br/>Una possibile identificazione della pianta</i>           | 9   |
| DAVID J. BUTTERFIELD        | <i>Supplementa Lucretiana</i>   | 17  |
| VIRGINIA L. CAMPBELL        | <i>Stopping to Smell the Roses: Garden Tombs<br/>in Roman Italy</i>   | 31  |
| MAURIZIO COLOMBO            | <i>I soprannomi trionfali di Costantino: una revisione<br/>critica della cronologia corrente</i>                    | 45  |
| RAMÓN GUTIÉRREZ<br>GONZÁLEZ | <i>A Note on Juvenal 11,156: pupillares testiculi</i>   | 65  |
| MIKA KAJAVA                 | <i>Julia Kallitekno and Gaius Caesar at Euromus</i>   | 69  |
| PETER KRUSCHWITZ            | <i>CIL VIII 19 Revisited</i>  | 77  |
| CHRISTIAN LAES              | <i>Learning from Silence: Disabled Children in<br/>Roman Antiquity</i>  | 85  |
| TUOMO LANKILA               | <i>Proclus' Art of Referring with a Scale of Epithet</i>  | 123 |
| AVGI-ANNA MAGGEL            | <i>The Invention of a Deceptive Dialogue: Reconsidering<br/>the False-Merchant scene in Sophocles' Philoctetes</i>  | 135 |
| ANNA REINIKKA               | <i>On the Attribution of a Latin Schoolgrammar<br/>Transmitted in MS Clm 6281</i>                                   | 147 |
| RONALD T. RIDLEY            | <i>Gaetano de Sanctis and the Missing Storia dei Romani</i>   | 159 |
| OLLI SALOMIES               | <i>Some Observations on the Use of the Pronoun<br/>hic haec hoc in Latin Inscriptions</i>                           | 181 |
| KAJ SANDBERG                | <i>The So-Called Division of the Roman Empire in AD 39<br/>Notes on a Persistent Theme in Modern Historiography</i> | 199 |
| HEIKKI SOLIN                | <i>Analecta epigraphica CCXLIV–CCLI</i>   | 215 |

|                |  |     |
|----------------|--|-----|
| JAANA VAAHTERA | <i>On Grammatical Gender in Ancient Linguistics –<br/>The Order of Genders</i> | 247 |
| DAVID WOODS    | <i>Tiberius, Tacfarinas, and the Jews</i>                                      | 267 |
|                | <i>De novis libris iudicia</i>   | 285 |
|                | <i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>                               | 343 |
|                | <i>Libri nobis missi</i>   | 347 |
|                | <i>Index scriptorum</i>  | 355 |

## **JULIA KALLITEKNOS AND GAIUS CAESAR AT EUROMUS**

MIKA KAJAVA

In the early 1970s, a number of inscriptions were discovered during restoration works of the temple of Zeus Lepsynos at Euromus in Caria. Two further inscriptions had been reused in a building east of the temple, but when Malcolm Errington published them together with the other findings in 1993, they were already lost, and so he had to use copies made by R. P. Harper.<sup>1</sup> No photographs seem to exist. During a visit to Euromus in April 2006, I was not able to find any trace of the monuments in question. — For the possibility that both texts had been inscribed on two different sides of one and the same monument, see the end of this article.

The first text, inscribed on a high statue base (225 x 92 x 25 cm; letters 1.8 cm), was published by Errington from Harper's copy as follows (no. 9):

ὁ δῆμος καθιέρωσεν  
τῆς τοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος  
Θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καλλιτεκνί-  
ας ἥς ἱερεὺς Ἀσκληπιάδης Λέον-  
τος ἱερεὺς Διοσκόρων·  
μετὰ Ἀσκληπιάδην ἱερεὺς Πρωτόμαχος  
Διονυσίου πανκράτης.

In this version, something is clearly missing in the beginning, and this is why the reading was soon emended by Christian Habicht, who proposed to read

---

\* I wish to thank Angelos Chaniotis, Malcolm Errington and Giulio Vallarino for useful information.

<sup>1</sup> R. M. Errington, "Inschriften von Euromos", *EA* 21 (1993) 30–1 nos. 9–10 (= *SEG* XLIII 711–12 = *AE* 1993, 1521–22).

[ὕπερ Ἰουλίας] at the end of the first line.<sup>2</sup> This may well be correct; the dedication would then mean that Augustus' daughter was considered to be a personification of *kalliteknia* for the sake of the children she bore to Marcus Agrippa.<sup>3</sup> To support his proposal, Habicht referred to two other dedications to Julia in which she bears the title of *kalliteknos*: the people of Priene honoured Augustus' daughter as Ἰουλία Θεὰ Καλλίτεκνος,<sup>4</sup> and she received a dedication as Λατὼ Καλλίτεκνος in the deme of Halasarna on Cos.<sup>5</sup> The adjective *kalliteknos* could be used of especially prolific women, divine or mortal, and Julia herself could well have earned the title as a mother of five (living) children (by Agrippa), but as Habicht observes, there should be no doubt that the reference was primarily to two of them, the young princes Gaius and Lucius Caesar, who had been adopted by Augustus in 17 BC. It is surely significant, furthermore, that one of the two priests of Julia Kalliteknia was also priest of the Dioscuri; a connection with the young Caesars seems obvious.<sup>6</sup> Another detail also deserves to be recorded: the priesthood of Kalliteknia at Euromus seems to have a parallel in the neighbouring city of Mylasa, and though the latter is documented without a date in a very fragmentary context, it may not be excluded that there is a connection between the two cases.<sup>7</sup> In any case, one may assume that the monument, probably supporting the statue of Julia

<sup>2</sup> C. Habicht, "Iulia Kalliteknos", *MH* 53 (1996) 156–59. – Another emendation was made by C. Brixhe, *BE* 1995, 529, pointing out that πανκράτης at the end of the text is to be understood as a second name of the priest Protomachos.

<sup>3</sup> For personifications in ancient Greek sources, see now E. Stafford – J. Herrin (eds.), *Personification in the Greek World: from Antiquity to Byzantium*, London 2005 (*kalliteknia* is not discussed).

<sup>4</sup> *I.Priene* 225.

<sup>5</sup> Discovered as early as 1902, the monument is now, finally, published by L. Hallof – K. Hallof, in Γ. Κοκκορού-Αλευρά, *Αρχαία Αλάσαρνα Ι. Οι Επιγραφές*, Αθήνα 2004, 126–7 no. W45 (*SEG* LIV 753): ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Ἄλασαρνιτᾶν / καθιέρωσεν Ἰουλίαν Σεβαστ[ᾶν] / Λατοῖν καλλίτεκνον, cfr. U. Hahn, *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses und ihre Ehrungen im griechischen Osten anhand epigraphischer und numismatischer Zeugnisse von Livia bis Sabina*, Saarbrücken 1994, 116 n. 72 (for the title itself, see p. 109).

<sup>6</sup> For the evidence, Greek and Latin (literary, epigraphic, numismatic), showing that the brothers were indeed regarded as Dioscuri, see especially M. Spannagel, *Exemplaria principis. Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums*, Heidelberg 1999, 28–34.

<sup>7</sup> *I.Mylasa* 347 (from Le Bas – Wadd. 375: ΛΙΤΕΚΝΙΑΣΙΕΡΑ, explained as .. πο]λ[υ]τεκνίας? ἱερα[τεύοντος in vol. II p. 110), line 3: καλ]λιτεκνίας ἱερα[τεύοντος (the aorist could also be considered in spite of νεωκοροῦντος in line 5).

Kalliteknos, dates before 2 BC, the year of her banishment to the island of Pandateria.

However, even if the restoration of [ὕπὲρ Ἰουλίας] were correct, a problem would still remain: to whom was the dedication made? Dedications to gods on behalf of emperors, rulers, or other people (ὕπὲρ, ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας, ὑπὲρ νίκης, ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ αἰωνίας διαμονῆς, etc.) are very well attested, the practice as well as the dedicatory formula being commonly found in many Hellenistic ruler cults, but it appears to have been especially popular in Ptolemaic Egypt. Roman emperors and members of their families were also frequently honoured in this manner. In such dedications, the ruler normally appears as a man since a dedication to one deity on behalf of another would be strange. Therefore, a dedication to Julia Kalliteknia on behalf of Julia Kalliteknia cannot be what is meant here. A dedication to the Dioscuri by a priest of the Dioscuri would sound better, and one may recall that the Dioscuri were often regarded as saviours of men and of human affairs in general. Other deities might be considered as well. Whatever the addressee's identity, there seem to be two alternatives to decide between: either the name of the deity, originally recorded in the dedication, is no longer extant, or the monument was set up in a context that did not require the god's name to be inscribed. A sanctuary (with *temenos*), or any clearly defined sacred environment, would have been such a place. In any case, what was dedicated to a god on behalf of Julia was probably her image, representing a conceptual amalgamation of Julia and Kalliteknia, though the possibility of some other gift or offering to the deity should not be excluded.<sup>8</sup>

Otherwise, the context of the dedication is rather unproblematic, and for the (not very frequent) evidence, epigraphic and literary, on *kalliteknos* and *kalliteknia*, one may consult the article of Habicht (n. 2).

The other text, inscribed on a plaque (no. 10; 32 x 11.5 cm; letters 1.5 cm), requires more attention. The following version, given by Errington, is again based on Harper's copy (Σωτήρι *sic*):

---

<sup>8</sup> For the dedications of statues, altars, etc., to emperors in the Greek world, cfr. now M. Kajava, "Dedications and Honors to Emperors in the Greek East", in P. Iossif – A. Chankowski (eds.), *Royal Cult and Emperor Worship in Classical and Late Antiquity. Proceedings of the Conference organized by the Belgian School at Athens (1–2 November, 2007)*, forthcoming in *Studia Hellenistica* (Leuven).

ὁ δῆμος Θεῶι Σωτήρι  
Γαίου Καίσαρος

Übersetzung: Der Demos macht die Weihung an den Rettergott des C. Caesar.

Not only the missing full stop at the end but also the general structure of the text suggests it to be lacunate. In particular, the idea of a public dedication to "someone's saviour god" is odd. It is true, rulers, emperors, or any people, could show personal associations and contacts with gods, and many surely had their favourite gods to whom they sacrificed and gave other offerings, but dedications were not made "to a (saviour) god of someone", whether he was emperor or not (σωτήρι + gen.); they were very frequently made "to a (saviour) god (or gods) for, and on behalf of, someone" (ὑπέρ / ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας, etc. + gen.).<sup>9</sup> Therefore, one evidently has to restore ὑπέρ before the name of Gaius Caesar at the end of the first line, just as in the previous dedication on behalf of Julia Kalliteknia. But this may not be enough since, to be sound, the text seems to need yet more elements. Two issues in particular have to be adjusted: *soter* is a common epithet of many Greek deities (especially of Asclepius and Zeus), but it is very rarely found alone, without a god's name. It is likely, therefore, that *Theos Soter* was followed by the name of the divine saviour. The other problem concerns the name of Gaius Caesar: considering that at least two words probably have to be restored in line 1, and to make the two lines not only roughly equal in length but also well centred, it seems evident that the text continued after Γαίου Καίσαρος in line 2. One would tend to opt for a reference to Augustus, the adoptive father of the Caesars. The simple style "Gaius Caesar" is very rarely documented.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Cfr. J. Serrati, "A Syracusan Private Altar and the Development of Ruler Cult in Hellenistic Sicily", *Historia* 57 (2008) 83, rightly dismissing the translation "Altar of Zeus Soter of Hieron" for the inscription Διὸς Σωτήρος Ἱέρωνος from Syracuse (*BE* 1953, 282 = 1966, 516). What the text implies is a cult of King Hieron associated with Zeus Soter.

<sup>10</sup> In *I.Thesp.* 423 (between 17 and 12 BC, and thus perhaps not very long after the adoption by Augustus), the local *demos* honours "Gaius Caesar" and "Lucius Caesar" together with their mother (Julia) and grandmother (Livia), and even more relatives are recorded in *I.Thesp.* 422, belonging to the same monument (Agrippa and the Elder Agrippina). In a sense, the presence of these people served to identify the position of the Caesars within the imperial house. *I.Délos* 1594 seems to me too fragmentary to allow any definitive conclusions (Homolle's restoration: [Ο] δῆμο[ι]ς ὁ Ἀθηναίων Γαίον Καί[σ]αρος τὸ[ν] ἑαυτοῦ εὐ[ρ]γέτη[ν] καὶ --- / [σω]τήρα [Ἀπόλλωνι?], etc.). – In the altars *IG* XII 2, 164 and 167 from Mytilene, the brothers are recorded without patronymic, being styled as ἀγίμονες τῶς

Emperors, and indeed any people, would often need the help of a saviour. We know that Gaius Caesar died, to Augustus' great sorrow, on the 21<sup>st</sup> or 22<sup>nd</sup> of February in AD 4, at the age of 24 (Lucius, the brother, had died two years before). This date constitutes a *terminus ante quem* for this and the other known dedications to Gaius (or those to gods on his behalf; but note that Gaius also enjoyed posthumous worship<sup>11</sup>). A *terminus post quem* is more difficult to define, but it seems to me that the arrival at Euromus of the message concerning Gaius' injury on 9 September AD 3 is a very good candidate.<sup>12</sup> The ultimately fatal episode took place during the military campaign in Artagira in Armenia, and thus it would have been known in Caria in good time before Gaius' death in February of the next year. It appears as if (vain) hopes of his recovery had been circulating here and there,<sup>13</sup> and in fact Gaius was already sailing back to Rome when medical complications or other reasons forced him to disembark at Limyra in Lycia where he died. Gaius' recovery may have been only temporary, but whether it was real or apparent, a dedication for his health would have been perfectly understandable. He was probably a well-known figure in Euromus not only because of his eastern campaigns (Errington even assumes the possibility of a visit on his part), but also because of the local cult of his mother Julia (Kalliteknos). Being weak and wounded, Gaius surely needed the help of doctors, but a divine doctor might have helped even more. Who would be a better *soter*, and indeed a doctor, for Gaius than Asclepius? This god was frequently given dedications for the health of emperors or of any mortal person.<sup>14</sup> If this is correct, the following restoration might work (note that the number of letters in lines 1–2 would be precisely 29 in each, and that in line 2, *Sebastou Kaisaros* could also be in inverse order<sup>15</sup>):

---

νεότατος. But the texts belong to a series of multiple altars (cfr. below n. 15), showing a number of features different from those of inscriptions on the bases of honorific statues.

<sup>11</sup> Cfr. the evidence cited by A. Balland, *F.Xanthos* VII no. 25 (pp. 49–50).

<sup>12</sup> As is also suggested in *AE* 1993, 1522.

<sup>13</sup> For the episode and the literary sources, cfr. F. E. Romer, "Gaius Caesar's Military Diplomacy in the East", *TAPhA* 109 (1979) 211–13.

<sup>14</sup> For the style Θεῶ Σωτήρι Ἀσκληπιῶ in dedications, cfr. e.g. *SEG* XLIV 520 (Macedonia); *I.Stratonikeia* 36; *IG* XIV 1125 (Tibur; Ἀσκληπιῶ Θεῶ / Σωτήρι). Asclepius the Saviour (without "God") is known from numerous inscriptions.

<sup>15</sup> Compare the following two cases from Rhodes: *Tit.Cam.* 99: Γάϊον Κάισαρα Καίσαρος / Σεβαστοῦ υἱὸν εὐεργέταν / Καμειρεῖς ἐτείμασαν, and *I.Lindos* II 388a: [ὑπὲρ] / [Λευκίου Κάισαρος] υἱοῦ / [Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ] / [Λίνδιοι]; b: ὑπὲρ / Γαίου Κάισαρος υἱοῦ / [Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ] / [Λίνδιοι] (note, however, that *Kaisaros Sebastou* is restored in both cases; the name of the deity was not needed, as it was self-evident that the dedication went to



Ὁ δῆμος Θεῶι Σωτήρι [Ἀσκληπιῶι ὑπὲρ]  
 Γαίου Καίσαρος [Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος]  
 [υἱοῦ ---].  
 -----

Another way to dedicate to Asclepius (or to any god) on behalf of someone's health and safety would have been by using the common ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας (or ὑγείας) construction (cfr. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 3181* from the Asclepieion of Athens, referring to Tiberius: [Ἀσκληπιῶι καὶ Ὑγίαι ὑπὲρ τῆς Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Θεοῦ Σεβα[στοῦ υἱοῦ σωτηρίας *vel* ὑγείας]). In the present case, however, this style would have been somewhat superfluous, though not impossible, because the god is already indicated as *Soter*. Either way, whether a dedication goes to a "saviour god" on behalf of an emperor, or to a god (or gods) on behalf of an emperor's safety, the same message might have been expressed by using a double dative (or a multiple one in case of more recipients). When dedications (of altars in particular) are shared by gods and emperors (with their names in the dative or, occasionally, in the genitive), it might be that both were worshipped with sacrifices, and indeed there is clear evidence that such sacrifices took place (civic decrees, letters, regulations, etc.). On the other hand, the possibility frequently exists that the role of the emperor was not only secondary but of a

---

Athana Lindia), and for the order *Sebastos Kaisar*, cfr. e.g. Segre, *I.Cos* EV 373: [ἀ γερουσί]α Γαίον / [Καίσαρ]α Σεβαστοῦ / [Καίσαρ]ος υἱόν. — For further variation (in the display of names, the use of articles, etc.), cfr. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 3250*: ὁ δῆμος / Γαίον Καίσαρα Σεβαστοῦ υἱόν νέον Ἄρη; *I.Assos* 13: Ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ πραγματε[υόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι] / Γαίον Καίσαρα τὸν τοῦ Σεβα[στοῦ υἱόν, ἡγεμό]να τῆς νεότητος, ὑπατο[ν ---]; *I.Ilion* 87: Ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος / Γαίον Καίσαρα, τὸν υἱόν τοῦ Σεβασ[τοῦ], τὸν συγγενῆ καὶ πάτρωνα καὶ εὐ/εργέτην τῆς πόλεως; *IG XII 6, 395* (Samos): [ὁ δῆμος Γαίον καὶ Λούκιον Αὐτ]οκρά[τορος Καίσαρος Θεοῦ υἱοῦ] / [Σεβαστ]οῦ υἱ[οῦ]ς Καίσαρα[ς, etc.; Robert, *La Carie* II no. 47 (Herakleia Salbake): [ἡ] βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος / Λεύκιον Καίσαρα τὸν / Καίσαρος τοῦ Σεβασ[τοῦ υἱόν]; *F.Xanthos* VII 25: [Γ]αίον Καίσαρα νέον θεόν / υἱόν Σεβαστοῦ Θεοῦ Καίσαρος / Ξανθίων ὁ δῆμος. Still further variation may be observed in the way the names and other items were recorded on altar inscriptions, e.g., *IGR IV 1094* (Halasarna, Cos), showing also the gentile name: Ὁ δῆμος / ὁ Ἀλασαρνιτᾶν / Γαίωι Ἰουλίωι Θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ / υἱῶι Καίσαρι νέωι Θεῶι / τὸν [βω]μόν. In the series of altars *IG XII 2, 164–69* (Mytilene), Gaius and Lucius appear together with a number of relatives or other prominent Romans (Pompey, Caesar, Augustus, Agrippa), being called "sons of Augustus" and/or "first among the youth" (τοῖς παιδέσσι τῷ Σεβάστῳ; ἀγιμόνι / ἀγιμόνεσσι τᾶς νεότατος). Note, finally, *I.Mylasa* 135, showing, among other things, a priesthood of Augustus and of the Victory of Gaius and Lucius, "Caesar's children", lines 4–8: ... ἱερεὺς Αὐτοκράτορος] / Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ καὶ τῆς Γα[ίου Ἰουλίου Καίσαρος,] / τῆς νεότητος ἡγεμόνος, νέου Ἄρεος ---] / καὶ τῆς Λευκίου Ἰουλίου Καίσαρο[ς, τῶν Καίσαρος τέ]λ/κνων, Νείκης καὶ Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Ἡρακλέο[υς ---], etc.

purely honorific nature. Similarly, the emperor's name in the dative could mean that he was somehow under the protection of the god, the "honorific dative" thus being interchangeable with the ὑπέρ construction. In the present case, assuming that the saviour god is Asclepius, the people of Euromus did dedicate to him on behalf of Gaius Caesar, but they might well have dedicated Θεῶι Σωτήρι Ἀσκληπιῶι καὶ Γαίῳ Καίσαρι Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος υἱῶι, etc. Much evidence for this style exists, and though in the present context, the ὑπέρ construction was preferable, being more articulated, as if underlining Gaius' weak condition, on many other occasions it might have been substituted with the dative.<sup>16</sup>

What follows in line 3 is unclear. Some options appear in footnote 15, but since this is a sacred dedication to a god (Asclepius?) on behalf of Gaius Caesar, and not an honorific one (of a statue) to him, it may well be that the text was rather brief. There is a general tendency for dedications of altars to gods or emperors, or of other monuments to gods on behalf of emperors, to be relatively concise. In particular, if the health of a ruler is at stake, one does not need to list all his honorific epithets and titles; the important thing is to communicate his name to the saviour god. The text might have concluded with a verb, καθιέρωσεν or something similar.

What, then, was dedicated to the saviour god? If the inscribed object really is a small plaque (but cfr. below), it does not follow that a statue could not be involved. The tablet could well have been affixed to a statue base, or to some other monument, to a wall or to any structure supporting a statue (or a bust). In any case, if an image was dedicated to the saviour, it was most likely one of Gaius Caesar. One cannot, however, exclude the possibility that the text indicates an altar, which would then imply sacrifices for Gaius' recovery. The rituals would have been accompanied and completed by prayers uttered ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας.<sup>17</sup>

However, the finding conditions of these inscriptions are not quite clear. Malcolm Errington kindly informs me that, depending completely on Harper's descriptions, he understood from Harper's notes that nos. 9 and 10 were on the same block, but that no. 10 is on the north side of the stone, which was still in the ground and not completely excavated. In the meantime, the hole which the

<sup>16</sup> Cfr., in more detail, Kajava (above n. 8).

<sup>17</sup> One should note, however, that the presence of an altar was not a necessary requirement for sacrifices to be performed. Libations and small-scale sacrifices of incense could be offered before statues as well.

excavators dug around the stone had been filled in again so that the stone was not to be found when Errington began the revision work on the documents.<sup>18</sup> If this is so, it probably follows that the right-hand part of no. 10 was not visible to Harper, which, in turn, would explain the respective lacuna in his copy. A further, and more important, consequence would be that the dedication (to Asclepius?) on behalf of Gaius' recovery was incorporated in a monument which already had been dedicated on behalf of his mother's *kalliteknia*. This might have happened because, considering Gaius' severe physical condition, no time was to be wasted in preparing a completely new monument: immediate action was the only option. There would be nothing strange about this. Joint dedications to two or more deities are quite common, gods did live and work together, and they were frequently worshipped along with new arrivals. In the present case, the mother-son relationship would have made the combination even more understandable. If both texts were engraved on the same block, only one statue, that of Julia Kalliteknos, can have stood on it, and so the dedication to the saviour god would not mean that another image (of Gaius Caesar) was offered to him. What it probably does mean is that sacrifices were performed and prayers were uttered for Gaius' health and safety, and that it all took place at his mother's statue.<sup>19</sup>

*University of Helsinki*

---

<sup>18</sup> Errington (cit. n. 1) 31: "Auf der nach Norden liegenden Seite, auf einer eingearbeiteten Tafel". Note that in *AE* both texts are indeed treated as if belonging to one and the same monument (*AE* 1993, 1522: "sur le même bloc, à l'extrémité, sur une table travaillée"). However, from the original publication, one might also gather that no. 10 was found on the northern side of the building, in which the inscriptions had been reused. This seems to be how things were understood in *SEG* XLIII 712 ("small plaque; inscription in a tabula") as well as in *BE* 1995, 530 ("sur une plaque de petites dimensions").

<sup>19</sup> Though very unlikely, in theory, of course, the statue of Julia could have been removed in the aftermath of her banishment in 2 BC. Could this be why Julia's name is not preserved at the end of line 1, as if it had been erased, with the consequence that the dedication now was to *Kalliteknia* alone, with special reference to Gaius and Lucius Caesar? It is true that the role of the brothers was and continued to be prominent in the dedication, but Julia is not known to have suffered general *damnatio*. Her name is well preserved in the epigraphic record, and nothing is reported on erasure in this case either.