

JOURNAL OF ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY

VOLUME 33 2020

* *

REVIEW ARTICLES AND LONG REVIEWS; BOOKS RECEIVED;
AN OBITUARY; AN *ENVOI* AND A WELCOME

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

The sculptor's workshop at Aphrodisias: the remains of a sculptural practice from the Severan age to late antiquity

Elaine K. Gazda

JULIE VAN VOORHIS, *THE SCULPTOR'S WORKSHOP. APHRODISIAS* Band X. *RESULTS OF EXCAVATIONS AT APHRODISIAS IN CARIA CONDUCTED BY NEW YORK UNIVERSITY* (Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden 2018). Pp. x + 117 plus 60 pls. (1 color, 253 black-and-white ill.), 8 figs. ISBN 978-3-95490-268-2. EUR 69.

J. Van Voorhis presents an impressively comprehensive publication of the Late Roman sculptor's workshop at Aphrodisias. More than a catalogue and excavation report, this long-awaited study looks closely at the archaeology of the workshop site and the technical and stylistic characteristics of the sculptures found within or in close proximity to it, as well as those found at other locations at Aphrodisias that are considered to be closely related to the products of this particular workshop. Throughout the study she carefully assesses the evidence of findspots, style, technique and subject matter in reconstructing the workshop's repertoire and production methods and evaluating its relationship to sculptures found elsewhere in the Mediterranean that have been at the center of controversy with respect to their chronology.

In order to situate this book within the broader context of research at Aphrodisias and of the sculptor's workshop in particular, I begin with a brief review of the excavations. K. Erim of New York University began excavating in 1961 with a project designed to focus on the sculpture produced in the city, only a small amount of which had been discovered in the excavations by French and Italian archaeologists of 1904-5 and 1939-40, respectively.¹ During the 30 years before Erim's premature death (1990), an enormously rich corpus of some 3200 sculptures was uncovered: portrait statues, mythological sculptures, versions of earlier Greek statue types, relief sculptures including sarcophagi both figural and non-figural, and architectural sculpture, spanning almost 6 centuries from the second half of the 2nd c. B.C. to the early 6th c. A.D.

Between 1965 and 1969 Erim excavated the sculptor's workshop in the city center north and west of the Bouleuterion, established in two rooms of a partially dismantled stoa. Byzantine walls containing many fragments of sculpture had been built both over and near the workshop spaces. With sculptures and fragments found in the two rooms of the stoa and in an open yard to the south, c.300 pieces were recovered in all. Erim's excavation also established that the workshop was active in the Late Roman period. He published annual reports which included some of the sculptures from the workshop.² Additional studies of the workshop's sculptures were conducted by the sculptor P. Rockwell, a distinguished carver of marble who also examined the stone from local quarries.³ Upon Erim's death, however, much remained unpublished. Responsibility for the project passed to R. R. R. Smith, with C. Ratté as fieldwork director, and the project's goals were reformulated so as to gain a better understanding of the urban topography. The stated aims were to document all previously excavated trenches and buildings and to excavate further only where it was needed to answer targeted questions. In this new phase,

-
- 1 The first campaign, led by the French engineer P. Gaudin, centered on the Temple of Aphrodite, the Hadrianic Baths, a structure misidentified as a gymnasium, city walls, and surrounding necropoleis. In all, 6 portrait statues (3 male, 3 female) and architectural marbles were recovered and subsequently dispersed. The Italian excavations of 1939-40, directed by G. Jacobi, focused on the so-called South Agora. A mask-and-garland frieze belonging to a stoa is in the Izmir Archaeological Museum.
 - 2 K. Erim published annual reports in *Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi* and *Anatolian Studies*, amongst others; see his *Aphrodisias: city of Venus-Aphrodite* (New York 1986) for the main results of his excavations (1961-1980s).
 - 3 E.g., P. Rockwell, "Unfinished statuary associated with a sculptor's studio," in R. R. R. Smith and K. T. Erim (edd.), *Aphrodisias papers* 2 (JRA Suppl. 2, 1991) 127-43.

documentation of all of the c.3200 sculptures and fragments from Erim's tenure, construction of a modern storage facility, conservation of the sculptures, and publication — witnessed by a steady stream of fieldwork reports, studies of finds, and especially the ongoing monograph series on major buildings and sculptural finds (in which Van Voorhis' is the tenth), have played a major part.⁴

As part of the new phase of fieldwork, in 1994 the old trenches of 1965-69 north and west of the Bouleuterion were documented by Ratté, who also opened a limited excavation aimed at finding the earliest stages of the stoa building. Van Voorhis, a member of the project team, was tasked both with reconstructing the archaeological history of the workshop complex from Erim's notebooks and with studying all 300 sculptural finds.⁵ Based on characteristics of style, subject matter and/or technique, as well as findspots, she confidently assigned fewer than half of the 300 sculptures and fragments from the area of the workshop to the workshop's actual output. Interim fieldwork reports and articles on various pieces of sculpture found in or near the workshop have appeared, including articles by herself, after first presenting (1999) a synthetic study of the workshop and its sculptures in her Ph.D. dissertation at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University.⁶ In the book under review she updates and expands upon those results. In what follows, I highlight the contents of the chapters and then put forward some thoughts on potential future directions in workshop studies.

In chapt. 1, Van Voorhis provides a snapshot of the contents of each of the substantive chapters that follow. While this structure inevitably leads to some redundancy, it recognizes that the book is not one that will necessarily be read from cover to cover by all who consult it.

The excavations and chronology of the workshop site

Chapter 2 ("Archaeology and urban context of the workshop") contains subsections on the history of the excavation of the workshop, the phases of the N Stoa, and the appearance of the workshop and its chronology. The author synthesizes and reconstructs the archaeological history with detailed discussions of the trenches dug in 1967-69, accompanied by a reconstructed trench plan (fig. 4), in itself a valuable contribution. Briefer discussions follow of work conducted in 1994 (uncovering evidence of the Hellenistic-period stoa) and in 2000 (focused on the central apse of the triconch room of the Bishop's Palace).⁷ Seven phases (Hellenistic to Middle Byzantine) are summarized, accompanied by plans and section drawings. This is followed by a proposed reconstruction of the workshop's appearance and how each space was probably used.

The removal of Byzantine structures by Erim exposed the Late Roman level of the workshop and a plaster floor in Room 3. Significant finds in Room 3 included an overturned column base that may have served as a display stand, a fallen lifesize statue of an unfinished *togatus*, and the lower half of a seated male statue. Some 75 fragments of sculpture were concentrated along the room's N and W walls, perhaps having fallen from shelving units. Especially noteworthy

4 These appear primarily in the *JRA* Supplementary Series, *JRS* and *AJA*, and in a series of monographs published initially by von Zabern and more recently by Reichert Verlag. A bibliography listing all publications of the excavation results through 2006 can be found online: <http://aphrodisias.classics.ox.ac.uk/Aphrodisias-Bibliography-2016.pdf>.

5 As reported by R. R. R. Smith and C. Ratté, "Archaeological research at Aphrodisias in Caria," *AJA* 100 (1996) 7.

6 J. Van Voorhis, *The sculptor's workshop at Aphrodisias* (Ph.D. diss., New York Univ. 1999), curiously not cited in her bibliography and not easily accessible. In the interim, she published related articles: "The training of marble sculptors at Aphrodisias," in R. R. R. Smith, S. Dillon, C. Hallett, J. Lenaghan and J. Van Voorhis, *Aphrodisias II: Roman portrait sculpture from Aphrodisias* (Mainz 2006) 120-35; "Apprentice pieces and the training of sculptors at Aphrodisias," *JRA* 11 (1998) 175-92; and "The working and reworking of marble statuary at the sculptor's workshop at Aphrodisias," in T. M. Kristensen and B. Poulsen (edd.), *Ateliers and artisans in Roman art and archaeology* (*JRA* Suppl. 92, 2012) 38-54, material from all of which is reprised in the book under review.

7 These excavations were published in detail by their excavators: see 15, nn. 52-53.

among the large number of sculptural fragments employed as building material in the Byzantine settling tank that was built above Room 4 of the workshop are fragments of substantial parts of the Large Satyr with the Infant Dionysos. In addition, statuettes of an Artemis of the Versailles type and of a Europa and the Bull were found below the settling tank, leaning against the door-jamb between Rooms 3 and 4. A thick layer of marble chips indicated that marble was carved in an open area south of the two rooms.⁸

The chapter concludes with the workshop's chronology. It cannot date prior to the construction of the new, enlarged Bouleuterion in the late 2nd c. It has been suggested (plausibly, in my view) that it might well have been established by sculptors who worked on that project before moving into abandoned rooms in the stoa. That the workshop was still active in the late 4th, possibly into the 5th c., is indicated by the unfinished state of the *togatus*, which the author (chapt. 3) dates to the Theodosian period, and a hoard of coins extending between the reigns of Constantius II and Theodosius II (which provide a *terminus post quem*). Erim believed that an earthquake destroyed the workshop, but Ratté associates the end of activity with the impact of the later 5th-c. project just north of the stoa that converted the Temple of Aphrodite into a church. Because the back wall of the stoa that housed the workshop was connected to that temple's temenos, it seems possible that the stoa became church-owned property.⁹ Diminished demand for the workshop's products may also have led to the end of workshop activity. Middle Byzantine graves eventually occupied the site. There was plainly a great deal of disturbance in this area after the workshop ended its operations and the author cautions the reader that what was found in the workshop is simply the detritus of a once-prosperous *atelier*: this limitation must therefore be borne in mind when interpreting its output and history. At the same time (as discussed below), there is much to be learned from the detritus about the workings of the *atelier*: its characteristic products, the techniques of carving, and the training of apprentices.

Reconstructing the workshop's repertoire

At the time of its demise, the workshop appears to have been specializing in portraits and in mythological sculptures. In all, 115 pieces are represented in the catalogue, including c.25 full statues and almost 100 fragments. A number of pieces in various stages of completion allow for a discussion of the carving process; a few appear to be practice pieces for the training of apprentices. Several carving tools were also recovered. In chapt. 3, Van Voorhis first establishes the criteria for attributing sculptures to the workshop. These are the findspot, the sculptural style, technique and, when known, the subject matter. She begins with sculptures that were found in the workshop's two rooms (49 fragments in Room 3, a cache of pieces in Room 4) since these are most likely to be its products, then moves to fragmentary pieces found in the area of the workshop that join to ones found in the rooms. Among these are the over-lifesize statue of a Satyr with the Infant Dionysos, a half-scale version of the same composition, and a statue of the Young Herakles, all reconstructed from scattered fragments. The plan of the excavated area with the findspot of each piece marked in red (fig. 8) gives a clear impression of the density of the finds and their distribution, including those that had been built into the Byzantine structures. This painstaking work pays dividends in producing a firm foundation — alongside the evidence of style, technique and subject matter — for reconstructing what remained of the workshop's repertoire in its latest period. Discussion then focuses on the portraits, with a lengthy analysis of the unfinished *togatus*, which the author re-dates from the Constantinian period favored by Erim to the Theodosian, based primarily on her close analysis of the type of toga and comparisons with togate statues of Valentinian II and Arcadius found during the French excavations (now in Istanbul). Mythological sculptures at large and small scale constitute the other main group of products. Dionysian sculptures rendered in an exaggerated

8 This "sculptor's yard" was probably furnished with an awning to protect the carver from the sun. A delightful imagined drawing of the workshop in action by C. S. Alexander (2006) appears in fig. 7 on p. 21.

9 C. Ratté, "New research on the urban development of Aphrodisias in late antiquity," in D. Parrish (ed.), *Urbanism in Western Asia Minor* (JRA Suppl. 45, 2001) 130-33.

“dynamic” Hellenistic style dominate, but other gods and goddesses, versions of older Greek statue types, are also represented. Lastly, small-scale figures carved out of black-and-white marble from the Göktepe quarry are regarded as another distinctive product.¹⁰ From this core of material, Van Voorhis extends the workshop’s repertoire to works from elsewhere in Aphrodisias that are connected to it by their stylistic and technical characteristics. For comparison, she singles out the Large Satyr statue as representative of what she calls the “Satyr Style”: several statues (or fragments thereof) and statuettes are rendered in this style and thus probably products of the workshop: an Old Fisherman found in the South Agora but probably displayed in the Hadrianic Baths along with a pipe-playing satyr; the boxer Candelianus from the Theater; a priest from the Bouleuterion; and statuettes of Marsyas and an old Fisherman from the Atrium House. By late antiquity, mythological statuettes and portraits, some datable to the late 4th/early 5th c., dominated the workshop’s production.

Production

Chapter 4 focuses on the ways in which the workshop operated, at least in late antiquity but probably all along, given that procedures changed little over time. Although this workshop was relatively small and most of the sculptural finds are fragments, they offer exceptional detail on the day-to-day work of artists and artisans from the High Imperial period down to late antiquity. There is much of interest here concerning the processes of production, training of apprentices, and longevity of small-scale family enterprises. Subsections of the chapter address the quarrying and transport of marble, tools and working practices, portrait production, the division of labor in the workshop, types and versions of mythological sculpture, the re-working of sculpture, the training of sculptors, and the workshop’s sculptors.

The author makes only passing reference to the use of color, although sculptures from elsewhere at Aphrodisias show traces of pigment and gilding.¹¹ Apparently few, if any, traces of pigment remain on the pieces from this workshop. Perhaps this is due to rigorous cleaning? Van Voorhis describes the characteristic surface treatment. While one might not expect a polished surface to have been painted, might some of the rasped surfaces have been intended to enable paint to adhere? It would be interesting to know when and where in the production process color was applied: was it done in the workshop or after the statue had been installed in its display context? Since the coloring of ancient sculptures is a topic of considerable interest, it would have been good to include some comment on it here, if only to state that color does not survive on these pieces.

The chapter concludes with a useful section that compares the workshop to marble workshops at Athens, Delos and Pompeii, concluding that the former is a typical example of such multi-generational, family-operated establishments. In her introduction Van Voorhis had briefly addressed the matter of schools, but some comment in chapt. 4 would have helped readers understand how the sculptor’s workshop might have operated in relation to, or in collaboration with, other workshops, including others at Aphrodisias. The topic of small-scale workshops and how they did, or did not, relate to “schools” of sculpture being one to have received renewed attention in recent years, the workshop studied by van Voorhis holds promise for further clarifying that question.

Questions of chronology and style

Chapter 5 broadens the study. As the author and others have long recognized, a network of stylistic and technical relationships, along with signed sculptures and statue bases, extends to sculptures found at other locations in Aphrodisias and across the empire. After reviewing the dating of small-scale mythological statuettes, a genre now generally thought to be late-antique, Van Voorhis presents a lucid and even-handed discussion of arguments that concern the dating

10 D. Attanasio, M. Bruno and A. B. Yavuz, “Quarries in the region of Aphrodisias: the black and white marbles of Göktepe (Muğla),” *JRA* 22 (2009) 312-48.

11 M. Abbe, “Polychromy and gilding on marble statuary at Aphrodisias,” in R. R. R. Smith and J. Lenaghan (edd.), *Aphrodisias’tan Roma portreleri* (Istanbul 2008) 136-51 (unfortunately not accessible to me at the time of writing this review).

to this period of large-scale mythological sculptures, including the Large Satyr group from the present workshop. She focuses on three sculptural assemblages that have been central to the debate: a group of 5 large-scale mythological sculptures found on the Esquiline, an assemblage from Silaharağa near Istanbul, which N. de Chaisemartin and E. Örgen had previously dated to the 2nd c., and a set of relief sculptures of Herakles's Labors and several portrait tondi from a villa at Chiragan, which M. Bergmann dates to late antiquity and associates with Aphrodisian sculptors in their style, motif and carving technique.¹² At issue is the dating of an inscription found with fragments of the 5 statues on the Esquiline, one of which closely matches the Large Satyr from the Aphrodisias workshop in style and composition. Although the Esquiline statues had long been thought to be works of the late 2nd c., in 1982 K. Erim and C. Roueché discovered that one of the inscriptions associated with the statues could not date prior to the late Constantinian period. This led some scholars, including M. Moltesen and N. Hannestad, to re-date the Esquiline group to the 4th c.¹³ However, as Erim, Roueché and others have recognized, the inscriptions could be later than the statues. Moltesen later modified her view in favor of the earlier date for the Esquiline sculptures while acknowledging that the weight of opinion preferred the later date.¹⁴ Van Voorhis presents the main arguments that affect the dating of the Large Satyr group from her workshop, carefully weighing the stylistic and technical evidence before entertaining a number of scenarios in an effort to explain why the Large Satyr group and other large mythological sculptures remained in the workshop until it ceased being a production site. Ultimately, she finds that stylistic and technical evidence provide the most consistent criteria for dating that group to the late 2nd or early 3rd c. To explain the presence of these statues at the time of the workshop's destruction, she and others have suggested that it was serving in part as a storage depot for older sculptures.

Even if the ongoing controversy cannot be resolved using evidence of sculptures from this workshop, it does itself provide an unusually detailed view of sculptors and their workspaces and practices. This workshop is the only one known that preserves a large quantity of sculptural pieces, both finished and unfinished, that can reinforce our knowledge of the way in which sculptors worked, trained apprentices, and satisfied the demand for a variety of sculpture types (in this case, portraits and mythological sculptures) over two centuries.

The catalogue of some 115 sculptures and fragments in itself is a valuable resource, offering a data-rich discussion of each find that informs our overall understanding of the workshop and its products between the Severan and Theodosian eras. Organized by sculptural genre (Portraits; Mythological figures; Other sculptural fragments), it is easy to navigate and splendidly illustrated (often with multiple views of the same piece). A few further plates illustrate select comparanda related mostly to the three other assemblages discussed in chapt. 5.

The book lacks an index; some plate numbers cited in the text do not correspond to the plates on which the images appear; there are a few typographic errors in the text, and some publications cited in

12 N. de Chaisemartin and E. Örgen, *Les documents sculptés de Silaharağa* (Paris 1984); M. Bergmann, *Chiragan, Aphrodisias, Konstantinopel: Zur mythologischen Skulptur der Spätantike* (Palilia 7; Wiesbaden 1999).

13 C. Roueché and K. T. Erim, "Sculptors from Aphrodisias: some new inscriptions," *PBSR* 50 (1982) 102-15. M. Moltesen, "The Aphrodisian sculptures in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek," in C. Roueché and K. T. Erim (edd.), *Aphrodisias papers* (JRA Suppl. 1, 1990) 133-46; N. Hannestad, *Tradition in late antique sculpture* (Aarhus 1994) 116 and 118.

14 M. Moltesen, "The Esquiline Group: Aphrodisian sculptures in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek," *AntP* 27 (2000) 111-31. But see also ead. *et al.*, *Imperial Rome II. Statues* (Copenhagen 2002) 352, where, as she acknowledges, "the statues have been dated to the 2nd century AD on the basis of the style of the hair and beards, and also the drilled out eyes. However, the inscriptions have been dated to the 4th century as the title, *diasdemotatos*, a title usually transliterated as "perfectissimus", does not appear in Asia Minor before the time of Constantine. There is, therefore, a lively debate as to whether the statues themselves should be dated to the 4th century or whether they are, in fact, older, and were given their inscriptions in the 4th century AD. It seems, however, that the later dating is receiving the most support".

footnotes are missing from the bibliography. On the whole, however, the quality is of a standard that befits the importance of the material.

Workshop, 'School' or Kunstkreis

Van Voorhis regards the sculptor's workshop as typical of workshops across the empire.¹⁵ Apart from the chronological issues that the sculptures raise, the network of connections that she discusses in relation to sculptors' signatures, stylistic and technical similarities, and mythological subject-matter of many of the sculptures in the four assemblages mentioned above have a bearing on the long-standing notion of an influential "school of Aphrodisias". Although this topic is not discussed at any length in her book, it is an important one for understanding how Aphrodisias functioned as a center of sculpture production and the home of artists (some of whom may have been connected to this particular workshop) who travelled around the Mediterranean to fulfill commissions. It is worth recalling that the notion of a school of Aphrodisian sculptors was first formulated by M. Squarciapino in her 1943 book of the same name.¹⁶ Focusing on Aphrodisian sculptors whose names are inscribed on sculptures and statue bases both at Aphrodisias and abroad, she cast light on the sculptors who were responsible for some of the most spectacular sculptures to have survived. By studying extant works from Aphrodisias as well as from sites around the Mediterranean in combination with the epigraphic evidence, she proposed that the city boasted an important school with talented artists (and not merely copyists) who worked on commissions for influential patrons. One such was Hadrian, whose villa at Tivoli included works signed by Aphrodisian artists Aristeas and Papias (these are the centaurs now in the Capitoline Museums). Her study of inscriptions suggested that Aphrodisian artists came to dominate sculptural production in Asia Minor, eventually rivalling the workshops of Athens. The massive amount of sculpture found by Erim served further to enhance the city's image as a preeminent and influential center of sculptural production. Discovery of the sculptor's workshop prompted him to cite the unfinished and practice pieces found as proof "beyond a reasonable doubt [of] the existence of a highly active 'school' at Aphrodisias".¹⁷ The compelling visual evidence from the city continues to encourage belief in the idea of a school of sculptors, but the rôle of this particular sculptor's workshop in the quest for proof that such a school existed is debatable. Part of the problem is that there is no consistent definition of a "school", the terminological vagueness making it more difficult to come to grips with the issue.¹⁸

In 2011, Smith offered a nuanced analysis of epigraphic workshops, visual workshops (sculptors' sarcophagi) and archaeological workshops at the city (including the workshop under discussion) that "describes a more differentiated social and physical background for ancient marble workshops".¹⁹ His work clearly indicates that different circumstances demanded different types of workshop but not a "school" of sculptors as such. For larger projects, Smith envisions numerous individual family enterprises and craftsmen congregating around a major

15 As she states (vii): "While the questions surrounding the chronology and display of the Workshop's output within the broader context of the sculptural landscape of late antiquity are interesting and provocative, the most significant contribution of this publication is the information it provides about the organization and operation of a Roman marble sculpture workshop: the layout of the physical space, the personnel and division of labor, the training of apprentices, and marble carving tools and techniques. Although unique in its state of preservation, the Sculptor's Workshop is typical in the size and scope of its activities, and thus can be used as [an] example for types of workshops, now no longer extant, that would have been operating in cities across the Roman Empire".

16 M. Squarciapino, *La scuola di Afrodisia* (Rome 1943).

17 Erim 1986 (supra n.2) 133-51 elaborated on the evidence for a school of sculptors at Aphrodisias, seeing it as the successor to the Pergamene school. See also M. Squarciapino, "La scuola di Afrodisias (dopo 40 anni)," in Smith and Erim (supra n.3) 123-26.

18 See T. M. Kristensen's "Introduction" in id. and Poulsen (supra n.6) 6-12 for a succinct discussion of the status of the problem.

19 See R. R. Smith, "Marble workshops at Aphrodisias," in F. D'Andria and I. Romeo (edd.), *Roman sculpture in Asia Minor* (JRA Suppl. 80, 2011) 69.

public project such as the Sebasteion.²⁰ As a small-scale, family-operated business, the place of the sculptor's workshop in relation to such larger projects or to sculptures found in other parts of the empire is not as clear as one would wish, but one might well imagine that it normally operated independently while occasionally collaborating with other workshops on larger projects. Smith pointed to questions that have until now been intractable:

We need a way of relating technical workshop aspects to the style and design of figured subjects. This is difficult enough if we assume a theoretically static picture, and how these aggregate factors then correlate with chronological change is ... much more difficult to analyze than has been recognized.²¹

As a more dynamic alternative to the organization of sculptors in workshops or 'schools', the concept of a *Kunstkreis* envisioned by M. Bergmann links artistic production centers (in this case Chiragan, Aphrodisias and Constantinople) more loosely than does the construct of a workshop or 'school'.²² Thinking in terms of a *Kunstkreis* helps one situate Aphrodisias in the context of the Roman sculptural industry in Asia Minor and abroad.

Thoughts on future directions in the study of workshops

Bergmann's notion of a *Kunstkreis*, together with the concerns expressed by Smith, prompt me to think that the place and influence of Aphrodisias might be clarified by applying network analysis to the epigraphic and sculptural evidence. A 2013 study by K. A. Larson holds promise for refining our notions of the mobility of Aphrodisian artists and their part in the spread of stylistic and technical influences.²³ Rather than confirming the model of small family enterprises proposed by recent scholarship on Hellenistic sculpture, her network analysis of hundreds of signatures from the 2nd c. B.C. points in a different direction:

Looking at the evidence more holistically indicates that commonly cited examples of familial workshops and individual itinerancy are exceptional, and prior scholarship overestimates the scale and regularity by which these events took place. Indeed, it is the very exceptionality of a few particularly collaborative or mobile individuals that facilitated the swift and uniform diffusion of sculptural knowledge in a small-world network, particularly regionally within the Aegean during the mid-2nd century BC (the patterns could be different at a larger scale with the inclusion of Rome and Pergamon). The relative degree of independence between the artistic centers of Delos and Rhodes, bridged by Athenian sculptors, lends credence to the existence of distinct sculptural schools of style and skill in the Hellenistic world ... Ultimately, network thinking applied to the epigraphic evidence of sculptors' signatures allows questions regarding the mobility of individual sculptors, the familial organization of workshops, and the existence of sculptural schools to be stringently assessed.²⁴

Her study suggests ways in which we might advance our knowledge of how Aphrodisian family workshops and individual artists participated in networks of production and the spread of artistic influence. In such a network analysis, the rôle of the marble quarries of Asia Minor should have a prominent place.²⁵

20 Smith *ibid.* 71, describes a "big-project workshop" as "one that brought together a number of different workshops and craftsmen working simultaneously on commissions for different parts of a large complex"; as an example, he cites the Sebasteion.

21 *Ibid.* 70.

22 Bergmann (*supra* n.11).

23 K. A. Larson, "A network approach to Hellenistic sculptural production," *JMA* 26.2 (2013) 235-60.

24 Larson notes (*ibid.* 256) that the theory of schools of Hellenistic sculpture has fallen from favor in scholarship subsequent to Palagia and Coulson (1998) Pollitt (2000) and Ridgway (1990).

25 L. E. Long, *Urbanism, art, and the economy: the marble quarrying industries of Aphrodisias and Roman Asia Minor* (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Michigan 2012): "The greatest asset of the resources located in territories of marble-rich cities was the opportunity for civic beautification on a local level. Yet the cultivation of an exceptional architectural and sculptural carving-tradition fostered conditions for social mobility for select sculptors whose skills allowed them to begin on projects in local quarry or city workshops, and embark on international careers" (xv).

Future work on the sculptures from the Aphrodisias workshop itself might address the question of why the Large Satyr and other large mythological marbles remained there until it closed its doors in the late 4th/early 5th c. Perhaps an analysis of the workshop's sculptural 'detritus' as a material assemblage that was formed over time would illuminate the "use lives" of its constituent pieces, as well as that of the physical facility. A recent book on *The afterlife of Greek and Roman sculpture* offers thought-provoking essays on a variety of ways in which the sculptural works of late antiquity can enlarge our perspective on the value of information held by deposits or detritus.²⁶ Given that the depositional contexts of the sculptures and fragments associated with the workshop are known, this sort of analysis, ultimately based on the theory formulated by the biological archaeologist M. Schiffer, ought to make it possible to document more than just the end of the sculptures' use-life and the workshop's last phase. Thinking in terms of their use-life and the stages by which the pieces reached their final context (some still in workshop spaces, others built into Byzantine structures) might yield new insights into how their function changed and how they were perceived differently over time.²⁷

For any such investigations into larger questions concerning workshops, 'schools' or artistic circles of sculpture associated with Aphrodisias, the detailed analyses that the author performs are a fundamental prerequisite. Through her systematic analytical process — from reconstructing the phases of the site from Erim's excavation notes, to a stylistic and technical analysis of key sculptures in order to reconstruct the workshop's repertoire, to an analysis of production processes from quarry to training apprentices, and finally to the place of this workshop in the controversy over the dating of large-scale mythological sculptures associated with this city, Van Voorhis has demonstrated the value of hewing closely to the archaeological and visual evidence and interrogating it from a number of perspectives. As such, the book marks an important step forward in our study of the exceptional sculptors of Aphrodisias.

gazda@umich.edu

Kelsey Museum / Dept. of the History of Art, University of Michigan

26 L. Stirling and T. M. Kristensen (edd.), *The afterlife of Greek and Roman sculpture: late antique responses and practices* (Ann Arbor, MI 2016), with fig. 2 on p. 7 for a visualization of the various and variable stages in the life of a statue.

27 Stirling and Kristensen (ibid. 8) express the hope that their book "will convince readers that the study of Greek and Roman sculpture would benefit greatly from further work that zooms in on its place in the archaeological record and its gradual decay over time, not least when considering that the attribution of the destruction of monuments to specific periods or historical agents has frequently become an issue of political contestation both in the past and the present. The study of Classical sculpture would then not only realign itself with broader trends in archaeological theory and method, but also other fields, such as cultural studies and architecture, where scholarship also has been devoted to the life of buildings over time and the impact of natural processes, such as weathering and ruination. As scholarship currently stands, many discussions of the use-life of Greek and Roman sculpture rely on arguments drawn from 'common-sense' observations of singular cases, or entirely by reference to textual sources".