CHAPTER 1

THE CELEBRATION OF ‘ANNIVERSARY YEARS’

(i) Roman attention to ‘Anniversary years’

The celebration of past events played an extensive and vital part in the public religion and daily life of Romans of all periods. The present study is intended to indicate certain evidence of this preoccupation, provided by the coins and medallions and relating in particular to anniversaries. But a distinction must be drawn between two quite different senses of the word ‘anniversary’, that is to say between two different categories of anniversary for which these coins and medallions might be, and were, issued:

(a) the annually recurrent noteworthy day of the month or more usually of the year; e.g. the New Year Day, the reigning emperor’s ‘Regnal New Year Day’ and birthday, and probably other days also, hitherto uninvestigated from this point of view.  

(b) the year in which was celebrated the centenary, or multiple or subdivision of a centenary—or other such ‘round’ anniversary—of an important event: here loosely described as the ‘anniversary year’.


2 Lambrechts, L’Antiquité Classique, 1944, p. 48; id. Latomus (Mélanges Heutin), 1946, p. 327.

3 For commemorative issues (some of the instances questionable) see the following writings: coins (BMC. Imp.Lit, pp. 448, 478; ibid. 1v, pp. Lxxvii, 282; M. & S. IV, 1, p. 76; Toynbee, p. 76; id. JRS, 1945, pp. 117 ff.; ibid. 1946, p. 236; Alfoldi, ibid. 1940, p. 9), medallions and semi-medallions (Toynbee, pp. 33 ff., 73 ff., 89; cf. BMC. Imp. IV, pp. xcvii, cxxxi; Alfoldi, Die Konterniaten, Pl. I, 1, 3) and coin series (Toynbee, JRS, 1945, pp. 117 ff.; ibid. 1946, p. 316, accepts a proportion of the attributions of Alfoldi, loc. cit. pp. 37 ff.).

4 Cf. Nock, CAH, x, p. 489; Toynbee, pp. 74 ff.; Snyder, YCS, 1940, p. 266.

5 Cf. Pippidi, Recherches sur le Culte Impérial, pp. 44 f., 116 f. n. 3; Nock, CAH, x, loc. cit.; Kornemann, Gestalten und Reiche, p. 100; Elsslin, SB. München, 1943. Censorinus wrote a work De Die Natali; cf. below, p. 2, nn. 6, 7.

6 Cf. Toynbee, p. 73 n. 1.

7 For this distinction cf. Altheim, loc. cit. p. 191: ‘the year and day…live on in memory.’

8 Here, too, the commemoration centres on the day in so far as it is on this, in all probability, that its climactic point is reached: but this is so, not only or not even principally because this annually recurrent day of the year has again been reached, but because the year (of which for this purpose the day in question is the central point) is of peculiar importance as the 100th (or similarly ‘round’ anniversary; for the importance of to see Roscher, Abr. Leipzig, 1917, Rose, OCD, p. 614) of the event which is commemorated.
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As regards (a), there is abundant evidence of keen attention by Romans of all periods to anniversary days and to coincidences connected with them, and this interest is reflected in coins and medallions. But this book is about (b), for which, indeed, the coinage is rather more appropriate; for it took some time to pass from hand to hand, and was therefore better suited for the celebration of a year than for that of a day. Up to the present, we have known much more about (a) than about (b), since it is naturally the former, rather than the latter, type of occasion with which Fasti and Feriae are concerned. But there are two exceptions to our ignorance about (b).

First, an interest has long been taken (it was stimulated by Laffranchi) in the decennalia, vicennalia, etc., of emperors, and in the celebrations which accompanied, preceded and followed those occasions.

Secondly, great progress has been made, especially by Gagé and Piganol, with regard to the ludi saeculares, which on a number of occasions commemorated intervals of 100 or 110 years, or artificial intervals fixed for political reasons, in the history of Rome.

In the


One of many Republican instances is provided by Cicero (cf. Gaige, RGDA, p. 156 n. 1).

2 E.g. Atti e Memorie dell’Istituto Italiano di Numismatica, 1921, pp. 54 ff.

3 There is some reason for thinking that certain developments in the official Alexandrian coinage occurred not every five, but every seven years after accession (cf. Milne, loc. cit. p. xxxiv: for the religious significance of the number, see Nock, CAH, xii, p. 421 n. 1, and references). Asia on the other hand was particularly attentive to Σαββανατ occurring at intervals of four years (cf. FITA, p. 362: on Greek quadrennial and octennial festivals see Thomson, JHS, 1943, pp. 59 ff.; on Roman quadrennial intervals, Ginzel, ii, pp. 250 f.; Bolton, CQ, 1948, pp. 82 ff.). Fourth and seventh centenaries are correspondingly stressed. Cf. Rose, OCD, p. 614.

4 Recherches sur les Jeux Séculares, Sae- culum Novum (Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress of 1935); Milanges d’Archéologie et d’Histoire, 1934, pp. 1 ff., etc.

5 Revue des études anciennes, 1936, pp. 219 ff.; Histoire de Rome, pp. 43, 66, 67, 71, 239, 239, 211, 413, etc. See also now Pighi, Pubblicazioni dell’Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, (ser. V, sc.-fil.), XXXV, 1941.

6 Censorinus, De Die Natali, xvii, 13; cf. Ginzel, ii, pp. 201 and n. 2; CAH, x, p. 150 n. 1.

7 Censorinus, loc. cit. xvii, 95; cf. Ginzel, loc. cit. This interpretation leads (as coins will show) to emphasis on multiples of that figure (and especially on 550) in connection with events other than the foundation of Rome. It is recorded by Horace, Carmen Saeculare, 21.

8 For the persistence of the saeculum motif see Mattingly, CAH, xii, p. 719; id. The Emperor and his Clients (Todd Memorial Lecture, ii, Sydney, 1948), pp. 16 f., 265; Manni, Atene e Roma, 1938; id. Rendiconti R. Ac. Bologna, 1939.
present volume no attempt will be made to discuss the secular celebrations or the well-known coinages in honour of them, though these will be used as evidence in an endeavour to pierce the obscurity surrounding other anniversary issues. The same will apply to our attitude to *decennalia*, etc., and their coinages; except that, in the early empire, some attempt will also have to be made to identify various neglected and unapparent issues of decennial character, since these will be found to throw light on the problems of anniversary coinages as a whole.

Unfortunately mint-masters often preferred to generalise their types, being aware of what was familiar to some contemporaries and careless of the worries of future historians: so that many pieces carry no specific allusion to the occasions of their issue.\(^1\) This applies to anniversary issues as much as any others, and has caused students to ignore the possibility that such issues may celebrate *decennia*, centenaries, etc., of events quite other than the foundation of Rome or the accession of the reigning emperor. For, even viewed as a general hypothesis apart from specific evidence, this possibility must be admitted. A people which was so attentive to the centenaries of its city or to the *decennia* of its ruling *princeps* was not likely to neglect similar anniversaries of other great events in its history. Least of all could such neglectfulness be considered a likely trait in the traditionally minded Roman. Indeed, quite apart from the coins, there is—though ancient authors took such matters too much for granted to comment on them—\(^2\)—specific evidence to the contrary; though it has not, as far as the present writer knows, been collected. For example, under the Republic, the Romans being deeply attentive to the years of temple foundations,\(^3\) it had surely not been fortuitous that the temple of *Concordia in arce* was vowed in the 150th year (218 B.C.)\(^4\) of the traditional foundation-date of the first known temple of Concord in 367;\(^5\) that the temple of *Fortuna Primigenia* was dedicated in the 100th year (194 B.C.)\(^6\) of the temple of *Fors

---

2. Snyder, *YCS*. 1949, p. 225, refers to scattered references by the literary authorities to anniversary days.
5. For references, see Altheim, *History of Roman Religion*, p. 282; Pippidi, *Recherches sur le Culte Impérial*, p. 64 n. 1.
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Fortuna (293 B.C.);¹ that the second temple of Mars (138 B.C.) was dedicated just a quarter of a millennium after the traditional date of his first temple (388 B.C.);² and that C. Sosius is likely to have completed his restoration of the temple of Apollo in the quadripartite year (c. 32 B.C.) of the original date assigned to it (431 B.C.).³ Similarly, the first attested augurium salutis (160 B.C.), a ceremony in honour of Peace, coincides with the centenary of a foundation with preeminently similar associations, the temple of Janus (260 B.C.).⁴

Another important type of religious occasion, the deducio of colonies, sometimes follows a similar pattern. Thus colonia Copia at Thurii (194–3 B.C.) is founded precisely a quarter of a millennium after the Greek colonisation of the same city (444–3 B.C.); and the very next colony to be called Copia, at Lugdunum (43 B.C.), is established just four centuries and a century and a half respectively after the two foundations of Thurii, whose coin-types it deliberately repeats.⁵ Similarly, Caesar apparently planned the colonisation of Carthage just 100 years after its destruction (p. 120).⁶

If we turn to the Principate, Augustus timed his ludi saeculares to occur 10 years after the ‘restoration of the Republic’;⁷ and he assumed the titles of pontifex maximus and pater patriae, with much ceremony, 15 and 25 years respectively after the same great event. His thirteenth consulate coincided with the same quarter-centenary occasion, just as his twelfth consulate had been timed to coincide with the quarter-centenary of Aegyptus capta. The second consulate of Tiberius was likewise arranged to fall on the vicennium of the respublica restituta.⁸ Another vicennium, that of the first victories of Nero Drusus, was signalled by games in A.D. 6.⁹ Attention should also be paid to the simultaneous dedication of altars to Pax, Salus and Janus (with Concordia). This took place in 10 B.C., the sesquicentenary

¹ Wisowa, loc. cit. pp. 216, 595.
³ Cf. Strong, CAH. x, p. 173. For the special importance of four (and its multiples), see p. 2 n. 31; for ‘quadripartite’, p. 13 n. 1.
⁴ PR.; see Liegè, Hermes, 1942, pp. 249 ff.
⁵ Bull; I hope to amplify elsewhere.
⁶ Mommsen, Die römische Chronologie bis auf Cäsur, p. 175, considers a different type of religious ceremony also to have a centenary character, namely the hammering of a nail into the wall of the Capitoline temple, of which he believed the first recorded example (365–2 B.C.; Livy, vii. 3. 5 f.) to have related to a plague of 465–2 B.C. (ibid. iii. 6); but this view is seriously contested; cf. Ginzel, 11, pp. 204 f. (references).
⁷ Cf. Stuart Jones, CAH. x, p. 150. See also below, p. 84 and n. 9.
⁸ Cf. Sutherland, NC, 1943, p. 45. The Carmen Saeulare (29 f.) stresses Tullus, whose temple’s quarter-millenary might have fallen in the previous year, Plutarch and Ashby, loc. cit. p. 111 against Weinstock, PW. vi. 1.804.
⁹ Weber, Princeps, i, p. 231; cf. Dio 55. 27.
year of the first recorded *augurium salus* in honour of peace, and the quarter-millenary of the temple of a deity indissociably linked with peace, Janus: so that the occasion, like *decennia* and *quinquennia* of 27, 17, 12 and 2 B.C., had a multiple anniversary significance. Moreover, the *vicennium* of this same event of 10 B.C. seems to have been signalled by the foundation, or dedication, of a further altar of *Concordia* in A.D. 10.

Similar coincidences occur later. Tiberius’s restoration of Venus’ temple on Mt. Eryx (A.D. 20) was undertaken 200 years after the dedication of the temple of Venus *Erycina* at Rome (181 B.C.). Likewise his *Ara Pietatis Augustae* in A.D. 22 was dedicated just 50 years after the probable establishment of the *Arcus Pietatis* in 29 B.C. Claudius deified Livia in the centenary year of her birth (p. 70). Nero’s closure of the temple of Janus in A.D. 66 (which could, as far as the cessation of warfare was concerned, have taken place several years earlier) coincided with the tercentenary of the first closure that is historically attested (235 B.C.). Vitellius used the apppellative *Germanicus* in a very special sense—initially it even seemed to replace Augustus, whose precedents he partly neglected—and his princepate coincided with the half-centenary of the much commemorated Germanicus’s death. Domitian’s *ludi saeculares*, at a date otherwise inexplicable (A.D. 88), fell in the 100th year of the no less carefully remembered inauguration of the imperial high priesthood. Later, Severus, in A.D. 203, restored the *Circus Maximus*, on which Trajan had spent large sums in c. 103 and of the only three years in which the Arval brothers are known to have carried out special celebrations for all *divi* (the third was for an accession), one (A.D. 183) was the bicentenary year of the *saeculum aureum* of

---

1 *PR.*; cf. p. 3 and n. 4.
2 For the date see Pippidi, *Recherches sur le Culte Impérial*, pp. 63 f. (references on p. 64 n. 1).
6 *PR.*; see Moniglione, *JRS.* 1943, p. 63.
7 *BMC. Imp.* 1, p. cccxviii, cf. p. cccxvii. Here he was accentuating a tendency of the later Julio-Claudians, Snyder, YCS. 1940, p. 137 n. 592. On coinage he often writes *Germanicus* in full even when all titles are abbreviated, *BMC. Imp.* 1, p. 379. 64, etc.
8 *BMC. Imp.* 1, p. cccxviii. His apparent employment of the title *consul perpetuus* (cf. Hammond, *The Augustan Principate*, p. 283 n. 42; Stevenson, *CAH*. x, p. 826) shows an attitude to the constitution very different from that of Augustus from 23 B.C.
10 Cf. Longden, *CAH*. xi, p. 205 n. 3.
12 Of Elagabalus (A.D. 218).
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Augustus, and another (A.D. 224) was the quarter-millenary year of the equally celebrated respublica restituta.¹ Constantine began his Arch, with its Trajanic designs, in A.D. 312–13,² just two centuries after the dedication of the Basilica Vplia and Forum Trajanum (p. 149; cf. also pp. 41–2 n. 5).

There are other instances in which principes seem to have made use, for publicity purposes, of the accidental coincidence of important events with the ‘anniversary years’ of other occasions. Thus it seems that the cult of Actian Apollo under Augustus owed something, not only to the temple on the Epiret promontory, but also to the coincidence of the battle of Actium with the quadringenary of Apollo’s temple at Rome—an occasion apparently signalised in the previous year by a political opponent, Sosius (p. 4). Similarly, Claudius made much of the coincidence of his accession with the fiftieth year of his life and of the Ara Romae et Augusti at his birthplace Lugdunum (pp. 70, 74). Caligula, too, in his extensive and immediate commemoration of Augustus,³ was surely not unaware that his own accession (A.D. 37) fell in the centenary year of the latter’s birth (63 B.C.) (cf. p. 69); and the coincidence of the same event’s bicentenary with the accession of a better Augustan, Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138), is unlikely to have escaped notice. One of his first and most emphasised coin-types is the Augustan Pax; and Gordian I, by stressing the same type, shows awareness that his own accession (A.D. 238) took place a century after that of his model and kinsman⁴ (p. 129).⁵ Likewise Carausius, whose emphasis on Pax was even greater, may have been conscious that he, too, came to the purple

¹ Snyder, loc. cit., has collected a number of inscriptions which, though not explicit, seem to tell a similar story (CIL. xi, 3781: thirtieth anniversary of adoption of Tiberius), 241 (Preissigke and Bilabel, Sommellbach griechischer Urkunden aus Agypten, 4583: fiftieth of dies imperii of Trajan), 245 (CIL. xiv, 4551: beginning of sixtieth year of life of Antoninus Pius), 250 (CIL. xii, 5905: fortieth birthday of Marcus Aurelius), 253 l. (CIL. xiv, 168, ILS. 6172: beginning of fiftieth year of life of Severus), 257 (CIL. vi, 862: tenth year of imperium of Severus). Acclamations of later emperors often took the ‘centenary’ form vivat centum annos, cf. Alfoldi, Rom. Min. 1934, p. 87. It may not be entirely fortuitous that the Theodosian Codex coincided with the half-millenary of the birth of Augustus. For ‘50’ see Rose, OCD, p. 614.
² Toynbee, JRS. 1941, pp. 190, 193.
³ E.g., the dedication of his temple, Balsdon, The Emperor Galerius, p. 35, and coinage.
⁴ Constantius II and his colleagues may likewise have appreciated the quadringenary character of their accession year, A.D. 337.
⁵ The conqueror of Gordian I, Maximinus, may, by his assumption of the title Germanicus in A.D. 235–6 (M. & S. iv, 2, pp. 133 f.), show consciousness that his German victories (ibid. pp. 146 f.) occurred just a quarter of a millennium before the first German victories (15 B.C.) of the first imperial figure to be granted the same title, Nero Drusus—whose same victories, on an earlier anniversary, had
in an anniversary year (the 150th) of the accession of Antoninus, a year which was also the 350th after the birth of Augustus (p. 144). Again, Constantius II, by issuing medallions with the Augustan legends AVGVTVS–CAEÆAR for his visit to Rome in 357, seems to indicate that he appreciated its coincidence with the quadringenary of a year in which contemporaries believed the Principate to have begun (43 B.C.) (p. 152).

(ii) The numismatic record of ‘Anniversary years’

The coincidences, deliberate or accidental, to which the last section has called attention, are only the concern of this book in so far as they are recorded by coins and medallions; and its aim is to suggest the extent to which these, like other instruments of official policy, coincided with, and celebrated, years possessing an anniversary character. As monetary and medallic issues play a great part in commemorating ludi saeculares and decennalia, there is no reason why they should not equally have joined in the celebration of other anniversaries. Moreover, the strongly marked anniversary character of the coinage at Roman colonies and municipia and even at civitates peregrinæ\(^1\) would be strange if similar customs did not prevail at Rome. This would harmonise with the intensely traditional appearance of the Roman coinage, illustrated, for example, by the numerous ‘restorations’ and revivals of earlier emperors’ portraits and types.\(^2\) Indeed, Fasti, Acta and Ferialia show clearly that even at late periods the celebration of recurrent rites dating from Republic or early empire was by no means limited to ludi saeculares or decennalia; and it is on general grounds likely that the coinage was included among the media of propaganda utilised for such commemorations.

Finally, there is a special reason for believing this probable: namely, the peculiar attention devoted to their coins by the Roman

---

\(^1\) *FITA.* pp. 295 ff., 338, etc.
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authorities and so by the people of the empire. This is a topic on which the present writer has enlarged elsewhere as follows: ‘Roman coinage is a branch of archaeology which has two arresting features. First, it is enormously varied, offering a kaleidoscopic variety of types, usually numbering hundreds in every reign. And secondly—the reason for such variety—it served a propagandist purpose far greater than has any other national coinage before or since. This was the means which the Roman government, lacking modern media of publicity, used to insinuate into every home in the empire each changing nuance of imperial achievement and policy. Their unremitting use of this means is evidence enough, if evidence is needed, that in the course of their vast circulation these coins were studied with an attentiveness that is quite alien to our own practice. Their subtle and highly differentiated symbolism is often hard for us to understand, but millions of contemporaries must have been immune from this difficulty. For if this were not so, the hard-headed Roman government would not have been so foolish as to continue, for centuries, this lavish outlay of energy and ingenuity. I do not mean that everyone who saw a coin would necessarily understand each of the often complex significances of its type; but I do mean that most people, or most educated people, noted and understood at least some of the several imperial themes imprinted thereon; and to us, as to them, the fluctuations of these themes are of peculiar interest as reflecting the principles which successive imperial governments wished to have identified with the bases of their rule.’

A particular aspect of this attentiveness to coinage which is relevant here is the religious character not only of the mint (which was in the temple of Juno Moneta and was, from the second century A.D., described as sacra), but even of coin-types, and especially portraits. MONETA itself begins, before the death of Caesar, to appear on the coinage (on an anniversary occasion) as a religious concept (p. 15); and before the end of the next century it has become MONETA AVGSTI. Indeed, not only were old and unusual pieces

1. Cf. Charlesworth, The Virtues of a Roman Emperor, p. 8; and PR.
2. PR.; cf. CSNM., and below, p. 171.
3. ILS. 1638 (Hadrian); cf. Hirschfeld, Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten, p. 186 n. 3; Ensslin, C.A.H. xii, p. 362.
5. BMC. Imp. iii, pp. xxxv ff. (cf. ii, pp. xii, lxxii, lxxiv n. 1, xo); Strack, 1, pp. 154 ff. (references on p. 161 n. 675); cf. Dieudonné, Rn. 1940; Mattingly, NC. 1943, p. 36. See also Grimal, Lettres d’Humanité, iv, 1945, pp. 29, 120.
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selected by Augustus for his Saturnalia presents (p. 24), but coins,¹ as well as medallions and medallic objects,² were themselves objects of consecration. They were thus very easily utilisable for the commemoration of the great anniversaries of public religion. But the coins’ own religious character leads to a further point also: we ought not to be surprised if we find coins commemorating the anniversaries, not only of earlier events, but of earlier coins—just as a number of emperors, of whom the most thoroughgoing is Trajan,³ stresses the significance of much earlier coinage by reviving or ‘restoring’ a large number of its types.⁴

These points will be illustrated during the identification and discussion of anniversary issues which will follow. These will be seen to be of considerable number. Modern writers have identified a minute proportion of them.⁵ For example, Lafranchi and Mattingly appreciated that certain issues of Vespasian commemorated the centenary of Actium and of the respublica restituta of Augustus in 27 B.C. (p. 88); and Strack has rightly ascribed Hadrianic innovations to the 150th anniversary of the latter occasion (p. 101). Mattingly has also attributed a Lugdunese quadrans of Claudius to his fiftieth birthday (p. 74). Wruck assigned the Eastern s.c. aes of Tiberius to the half-centenary of the inauguration of that series by Augustus (p. 65).⁶ Gagé, too, noted the lapse of 100 years between the consecration (?) of the Temple of Venus and Rome and a reminiscent medallion of Severus Alexander. He did not pursue this topic, but rightly added cette coincidence nous paraît mériter réflexion (p. 127). The same thought was probably also in the mind of Dobiaš, who observed (without comment) that the issues of Claudius in honour of Nero Drusus were made just half a century after the latter’s death (p. 73). There may be similar references that have escaped the present writer’s notice. But in any case such allusions are very few indeed, and only refer to an insignificant percentage of the issues

3 BMC. Imp. 111, pp. lxxxvi ff., 132 ff.—he was ‘one of the first to recognise Numismatics as an aid to History’ (M. & S. 11, loc. cit.) (on an anniversary, p. 100).
4 Republican issues remained a very long while in circulation: cf. BMC. Imp. 111, p. lxxviii and n. 2.
5 Von Schrötter’s Wirerbuch der Münz- kunde, p. 297, s.v. Jahrhundertmünzen, mentions no ancient examples.
6 I would express it differently.
to which, in the present writer’s view, an anniversary character is to be ascribed.

Before an attempt is made to review these issues, certain observations are necessary regarding the methods which we may expect the coinage to adopt in celebrating anniversaries. Nowadays we should often confine our attention to the actual day, or at any rate to the week or other brief period, in which the centenary (or its multiple or subdivision) falls. The Romans took a rather more elastic view, according to which celebrations might instead (or in addition) be held within the year immediately preceding, as well as the year immediately following, the anniversary day. To take the former of these two marginal years, Vespasian, Septimius Severus and Gallienus are among the numerous emperors who celebrated their decennalia not on the tenth, but on the ninth, anniversary of their accession—that is to say at the beginning, not the end, of the tenth year of their reigns. Likewise, Augustus chose Livia’s 49th birthday for the dedication of the Ara Pacis Augustae; and Tiberius dedicated a statue of Divus Augustus on the 49th anniversary of his own assumption of the toga virilis. The second Republican temple of Concord was vowed not much more than 149 years after the first, and 99 years separate two Republican temples of Fortuna (pp. 3 f.); while inscriptions possibly commemorate the 59th and 49th birthdays of Antoninus and Severus respectively, and the ninth anniversary of the latter’s dies imperii.

Our understanding of this emphasis on the year preceding an anniversary (which the coins and medallions may be expected to share) is assisted by entries in the Acta Arvalia such as the following: vota quae superioris anni magister vocebat persolvi et in proximum annum...nuncupavit. Thus anniversary celebrations came to have two parts, one of which was naturally felt to be concerned with the

1 Cf. BMC. Imp. 11, p. liii.
2 Cf. Miller, CAH. xii, p. 19.
4 Cf. Snyder, YCS. 1940, p. 214. For recent contributions to the voluminous literature on the Ara, see Strong, Quaderni di Studi Romani, 11, 1939, pp. 23 ff. (bibliography); Picard, Revue des études Latines, 1941, pp. 279 ff. (bibliography); Momigliano, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 1942, p. 228; id. JRS. 1944, p. 110; Poulsen, Acta Archaeologica, 1946, pp. 1 ff.
5 Weber, Princeps, i, pp. 94*, 99*.
6 CIL. xiv, 4553, 168, vi, 862: cf. above, p. 6 n. 1.