

moment aux Augustales de la cité, et dont la chercheuse nous explique l'impact visuel ainsi que les fonctions et messages économiques, sociaux et religieux ; d'un autre côté, l'espace cultuel privé que constitue par exemple le *mithraeum*, examiné par L. M. White dans une enquête assez complète sur l'implantation mithriaque dans la ville d'Ostie, doublée d'une réflexion sur les éléments cérémoniels que l'on peut déduire de l'agencement de l'espace et sur les logiques qui président l'organisation et la décoration de ces *spelaea*, reflets de préoccupations mythologiques. Les trois autres contributions de cette partie illustrent à leur manière l'interaction de cette architecture religieuse avec la culture chrétienne : A. Weissenrieder disserte au sujet de la nouvelle dimension du concept de « temple », tendant à s'écarter de la notion matérielle traditionnelle, perceptible dans la pensée chrétienne et véhiculée en particulier dans l'Épître aux Corinthiens ; D. L. Balch discute du chapitre 12 de l'Apocalypse de Jean et suggère intelligemment une mise en relation avec le mythe de Léo donnant naissance à Artémis, matérialisé visuellement dans le groupe statuaire du temple d'Apollon sur le Palatin et rituellement dans des cérémonies éphésiennes annuelles ; enfin, U. Muss retrace l'occupation religieuse du site de l'*Artemision* d'Éphèse sur la longue durée, braquant plus longuement le projecteur sur la destinée du lieu au moment de l'installation du christianisme. En témoignent certains textes chrétiens, mettant par exemple en scène l'apôtre Jean détruisant les composantes païennes du site, ou les aménagements repérés lors des fouilles et liés à la transformation en église et en lieu sacré de souvenir marial. Au final, ce volume, d'une belle variété, développant une approche historiographique actuelle, dans l'ensemble bien documenté, oscillant entre descriptif et interprétatif, remplit son objectif revendiqué (p. v-vi) de multidisciplinarité internationale (chercheurs européens et américains) toujours salutaire, moins celui d'un véritable et constant dialogue entre ces méthodes et points de vue. On regrettera l'absence d'introduction ou de conclusion qui auraient pu, en partie, devenir ce lieu de liaison. On soulignera par ailleurs que certaines contributions ont été traduites en anglais, ce qui en facilite l'accès au plus grand nombre. L'insertion de trois index (sources anciennes, auteurs modernes, structures architecturales et leurs décorations) en rend la manipulation plus commode et la mise à disposition d'un cd-rom d'images (en un fichier .pdf) permet le renvoi à de très nombreuses illustrations et une consultation en haute qualité, même s'il oblige à une lecture accompagnée du matériel informatique adéquat.

Vincent MAHIEU

Martin BECKMANN, *The Column of Marcus Aurelius. The Genesis and Meaning of a Roman Imperial Monument*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2011. 1 vol. 16 x 24 cm, xi-248 p., 69 ill., 1 carte. Prix : 65 \$. ISBN 978-0-8078-3461-9.

On the dust jacket this book is hailed as “the first treatment of the Column of Marcus Aurelius in English”. Strictly speaking this is not the case: see Iain Ferris, *Hate and War. The Column of Marcus Aurelius* (2009), which presumably Beckmann and his publisher had been unable to consult. Ferris was able to use an important preliminary study by Beckmann, in *JRA*, 18, 2005, p. 303-312, while Beckmann cites Ferris's earlier monograph, *Enemies of Rome. Barbarians through Roman Eyes* (2000) (mainly on the Column of Trajan). The Introduction sketches the life and times

of Marcus Aurelius and previous research on the Column. In chapter 1 Beckmann tackles the Column's date and purpose. He argues against the depiction of Commodus in the frieze, and for the monument having been commissioned in A.D. 176, hence to have covered only the First German-Sarmatian War, which ended abruptly in 175. The case is naturally far from cast iron. Ferris, it may be noted, opts for the Column being commissioned by Commodus after his father's death in 180. Given the extremely limited evidence, scholars have had to make inferences from the Column scenes as to what years are covered, and marked divergences of view remain. V. Huet, for example, in the book she edited with J. Scheid, *Autour de la colonne Aurélienne. Geste et image sur la colonne de Marc Aurèle à Rome* (2000), defined two phases, separated by the Victoria in scene LV, depicting the years 173-175 and 177-180: she referred to J. Morris, *JWCI*, 15, 1952, p. 33ff., who detected Commodus being given the *toga virilis* (in 175) in scene XLII. In chapter 2, Beckmann gives a plausible explanation for the choice of location, on the Campus Martius, at the west side of the Via Flaminia, "the route of departure for and triumphal return from the northern provinces." The third chapter is devoted to a very instructive explanation of the names *columna centenaria* and *columna cochlis* for the Columns of Trajan and Marcus. The former term referred to the height of the shaft, the latter to the internal spiral staircase. Next, in chapter 4, the planning and construction are considered, with much detail on the technical aspects of both Columns and appropriate attention to the differences between the two, showing how the architects and engineers of the Marcus Column had copied but also modified the design of the previous monument. Some estimates are offered of the time taken for the work, the inscription of Adrastus, the freedman procurator of the Column, dated August 193, being reasonably taken to indicate that the monument was by then complete. The estimate by A. Claridge, *JRA*, 18, 2005, p. 313-316, that the frieze would have taken six to eight years to carve, is cautiously accepted. Only in chapter 5, p. 84 ff., does Beckmann turn to the frieze itself, on which most attention and debate has always been focused. He notes a number of convincing examples where scenes from Trajan's Column have been copied. "Carving the Frieze", the subject of chapter 6, is perhaps his most important and innovative contribution, based on his article in *JRA*, 18, 2005, p. 303-312. A close study of the raised border of the frieze reveals a considerable variety of patterns, forty-six in all, which "should give us a rough minimum count of the individual sculptors who worked on the column." Chapter 7, "The Frieze as History" will have particular interest for historians. Long ago, the reviewer wrote, on the chronology of the Marcomannic Wars: "Further complication – rather than clarification – is caused by the existence of the historical reliefs on the Aurelian Column" (*Marcus Aurelius* [1966] 324); but was "inclined to follow Zwicker, Guey and others in believing that the reliefs followed a chronological order...[although] it would not be surprising if the artists of the Column, or those who gave the orders to the artists, had decided to place the 'Rain Miracle' scene (XVI) low down, so that as many people as possible could see it, whatever its place in the historical order of events" (*ibid.*, p. 316). After close examination of the Rain Miracle and other scenes, Beckmann gives a qualified no to the question: Is the frieze historical? He has a plausible suggestion, it may be noted, that the Lightning Miracle in scene XI may have been what led the author of the *Historia Augusta* to attribute this as well as the Rain Miracle to Marcus (v. *Marci*

24,4), in other words, that while the depiction of the latter was “inspired by a well-known historical event”, the former “may have made its way into literature via the column itself.” In chapter 8, “The Frieze as Art”, after detailed examination of numerous scenes, Beckmann returns to his forty-six sculptors, whom he identifies as having been employed previously on sarcophagi. He notes that there are “no clear connections between the column’s frieze and the only major work of historical relief from the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the so-called Panel Reliefs” and suggests that “the designers of the column turned to the Roman sarcophagus industry because the carvers employed there were the most easily accessible large pool of skilled figure-carving labor available in the city.” In chapter 9, “Viewing the Column”, he interprets the Column’s message as “one of harsh and brutal punishment”, of “violent Roman reprisal against rebels.” It might be commented here that more attention might have been given (as it is by Ferris) to what was going on at Rome during the years when the Column’s frieze was being carved, the reign of Commodus. It may be mentioned that a very different (and much more benevolent) interpretation of the reliefs is given by G. Depeyrot, *La colonne de Marc Aurèle*. I. *Introduction*. II. *Iconographie* (2010), of which a condensed version appeared a year later, *Les légions face aux Barbares. La colonne de Marc Aurèle* (2011). There is no need to list Beckmann’s minor misprints or slips. But a few other items must be singled out. At p. 141-142, on the killing with his own hands of the enemy chieftain Valao by M. Valerius Maximianus, *AE* 1956, 124, of which the relevant phrase is quoted in Latin at p. 227 n. 16, this equestrian officer is called ‘Valerius Maximus’ (indexed as “a soldier”) and the text said to have been “recorded on Maximus’s own tombstone”. It was in fact on the great *cursus*-inscription in his honour, clearly a statue-base, set up at Diana Veteranorum in Numidia in the early 180s, by which time the honorand was a senator and legate of III Augusta. At p. 149 Beckmann refers to “a letter [from Lucius Verus] to Fronto, philosopher [*sic*] tutor to both Verus and Marcus Aurelius and later apparently historian of Verus’s campaigns”. At p. 196 we read: “...the barbarians had themselves started the war... by invading Italy itself... they had laid siege to Aquileia... and defeated a Roman force and killed its leader, the praetorian prefect Furius Victorinus”. But as shown in works used by Beckmann, e.g. by W. Zwickler long ago, followed by the reviewer in his *Marcus Aurelius* (2nd ed. 1987 and repr.), p. 156 and n. 37, Victorinus almost certainly died from the plague not in battle; and Beckmann’s own account of the course of the war, p. 3 f., gives a rather different (and more accurate) impression. At p. 217, n. 13, Beckmann has overlooked the Addenda to the paperback edition of the reviewer’s *Marcus Aurelius: A Biography* (1993), p. 297. There the brilliant article by I. Piso, *Tyche*, 6, 1991, p. 131-169, is cited and its conclusion accepted: Piso demolished the restoration and interpretation of the Carnuntum inscriptions, *AE* 1982, 777-778, that were mistakenly followed in the reviewer’s book. But these criticisms should not obscure the great merits of this study.

Anthony R. BIRLEY