

a detailed discussion of the pottery data in the light of the choices and opportunities available to different communities' right across the Adriatic. Why, for example, did Gnathia pottery first become popular in the East Adriatic and how was it utilised in local contexts and what does this mean for the societies in question? These are examples of questions M. scarcely addresses. The chapter in general could benefit from a more detailed analysis of the socio-economic and cultural trends in evidence behind the pottery data presented in the book. As it stands M. highlights primarily geo-political factors which according to her might explain certain trends in the data. The chapter nonetheless, as previously stated, provides some important observations and conclusions and provides a suitable conclusion to a valuable piece of work.

Despite its short comings, *Gnathia and Related Hellenistic Ware on the East Adriatic Coast*, is an important new contribution to the field of Hellenistic pottery research and sure to be of value to both students and scholars of Hellenistic pottery. It should also be of interest to those with a wider interest in Hellenistic history and economy who can draw from its pages important data, if somewhat understated, on the function of local communities and their economies in the Hellenistic period. The primary significance of the book lies, however, in its synthesising nature as it summarises and makes available to the reader a wealth of data on a complex topic which has the potential to significantly further our understanding not only of Gnathia pottery as such but also the functioning of and interaction between local and regional economies in the Adriatic area and the way in which ceramics are able to shed light on the restrictions, choices, opportunities and tastes of ancient communities.

MARK VAN DER ENDEN
UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER
markvanderenden@hotmail.com
mv92@leicester.ac.uk

Roman

Two new books on Roman sarcophagi from Greece

Theodosia Stefanidou-Tiveriou. *Die lokalen Sarkophage aus Thessaloniki* (Sarkophag-Studien 8). pp. xviii + 302, 10 p. of b/w figures, 100 p. of b/w plates. 2014. Rühpolding: Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen. ISBN 978-3-447-10240-7 €99.00.

Eleni Papagianni. *Attische Sarkophage mit Erosen und Girlanden* (Sarkophag-Studien 9). pp. xxi + 195, 64 p. of b/w plates. 2016. Rühpolding: Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen. ISBN 978-3-447-10437-1 €88.00.

The *Sarkophag-Studien* series is an offshoot of the *Corpus der Antiken Sarkophagreliefs* project sponsored by the *Deutsches Archäologisches Institut*. Where the volumes of the *Corpus* were concerned primarily with building up an exhaustive catalogue of Roman sarcophagi according to either their type or iconographic theme, the volumes in this series are focused on interpretative studies. Four of the volumes published to date are conference proceedings,¹ two have focused on the monuments of a single production centre or region,² while Katharina Meinecke's study of the display context of sarcophagi was the seventh volume in the series.³ Despite the more wide-ranging aims of this series, these two new volumes, the eighth and ninth in the series, are at their core still catalogues. Theodosia Stefanidou-Tiveriou's dataset is of 216 locally-produced Roman sarcophagi and 26 *ostothekai* from Thessaloniki, while Eleni Papagianni is concerned with the 181 documented Attic sarcophagi decorated with *erotes* and garland motifs. The different focuses of these studies, however, betray some more deep-seated differences of approach. Where Stefanidou-Tiveriou is concerned with the sarcophagi of a single urban centre and what their form, decoration, and inscriptions reveal about local funerary customs and attitudes, Papagianni is interested primarily in the distinctive iconography of a subset of Attic sarcophagi. Papagianni's volume, therefore, feels as if it might have been more at home in the *Corpus der Antiken Sarkophagreliefs*, while Stefanidou-Tiveriou's follows very much in the path trodden by Fahri Işık's study of Aphrodisian garland sarcophagi.

¹ Koch 1998; 1999; 2007; Koch and Baratte 2012.

² Korkut 2006; Işık 2007.

³ Meinecke 2014.

REVIEWS

Stefanidou-Tiveriou has been working on the large collection of monuments from Thessaloniki (the largest in Greece outside of Athens) since 1996 and has already published a number of important articles on groups of these pieces. In this volume, she brings together all of this previous research alongside a complete and well-illustrated catalogue in what is an exceptionally detailed and immaculately-presented study. While the locally produced sarcophagi from Thessaloniki are not ground-breaking in terms of their form or decoration, Stefanidou-Tiveriou is able to demonstrate what a careful and sensitive analysis of the small details of these monuments can reveal about localised sarcophagus production in the Roman world, the relationship between carvers and suppliers of raw materials, and the status and demands of the commissioners. The volume is structured fairly predictably. The catalogue is accompanied by chapters dealing in turn with the display context of these monuments (Ch. 2), the typology of their forms (Ch. 3), their relief decoration (Ch. 4), and their date and development (Ch. 6). What make this volume particularly useful, and innovative, however, is the addition of three further chapters, integrated into the otherwise very much art historical analysis. These are chapters on the production of these sarcophagi and the workshops at Thessaloniki (Ch. 7), the inscriptions (Ch. 5) which are studied by Pantelis Nigdelis, and a final appendix on the analysis of the marble used for these objects, which was undertaken by Yannis Maniatis and Dimitris Tambakopoulos.

A crucial point to note about this catalogue is that it presents just the locally produced sarcophagi from Thessaloniki and not all the known sarcophagi from that city. Thessaloniki was a major market for Attic sarcophagi and a number of sarcophagi produced elsewhere in the Roman world have also been found there. While the catalogue does include an appendix listing the ten whole and fragmentary sarcophagi in the andesite of Assos, there is little mention anywhere of the Attic sarcophagi from the city. It could be argued that these pieces are beyond the scope of this study but some discussion of the overall ‘sarcophagus landscape’ of Thessaloniki could have been helpful.

What Stefanidou-Tiveriou is able to do, both thoroughly and succinctly, is pull together all of the evidence relating to these monuments. Context is provided early on by a discussion of their original display locations. Considering the urban history of Thessaloniki this is not easily done. Some of these sarcophagi were found built into the city walls or later structures. Others were repurposed entirely, as water basins (e.g. cat. 53, 125) or fountains (cat. 24), fates common to sarcophagi everywhere (for those which avoided being turned in planters). A number of these pieces were discovered in the nineteenth

century and their findspots only vaguely documented. What is evident, however, and what the author is able to demonstrate in a map of the approximate findspots, is that the bulk of these monuments come from necropoleis located immediately east and west of the city’s walls, with particular concentrations at the points where the via Egnatia met the edge of the ancient urban centre. While the contents of few of these sarcophagi remained intact until the present day, skeletons were found in four examples (cat. 9, 44, 143, 177), including in the spectacular sarcophagus of Annia Tryphaena which graces the cover of this volume; coins and fragments of other small finds were found in a handful of others. In the absence of additional archaeological evidence, it is the monuments themselves, their form and decoration, which are the focus of this study.

In overall form, the sarcophagi produced at Thessaloniki share many of the characteristics of monuments across north-western Asia Minor and the northern Balkans. The largest group among the overall total, numbering 108 (45%), are of the moulded frame (*profilgerahmte*) type. These are similar in form to so-called chest sarcophagi (*Truhensarkophage*) common all around the northern Aegean, the Propontis, and up the Adriatic in Dalmatia and northern Italy.⁴ This type is divided into two further sub-categories: those with an integrated projecting base (22) and those without (43); while a further 43 pieces are too fragmentary to be assigned to either sub-category. Rather surprisingly, aside from this moulded frame, the bulk of these chests and their associated lids were not decorated in any other way. Pride of place was given to the inscription, sometimes placed inside a *tabula ansata* but more often occupying the whole of the front face of the chest (and, on two occasions, the lid). When relief decoration is included, the scenes tend to be restricted to a panel in the centre of the front face, with the bulk of the space still being given over to text. On only two of these sarcophagi is the front face given over to more complex relief decoration: on cat. 1 a series of four busts are represented, while on cat. 66 a garland design is used.

Many of the same observations can be made about the even plainer sarcophagi that constitute the second largest group in Stefanidou-Tiveriou’s dataset. These so-called plain (*schlichte*) sarcophagi, of which 29 are catalogued, were effectively used in the roughly-worked form in which they left the quarries, marks of the point chisel and in some case the quarry pick are visible on their surfaces. In five cases a lower socle is included in the design but the bulk of the chests are basic rectangles (cat. 132–6). Eighteen of

⁴ Asgari and Firatlı 1978; Alexandrescu-Vianu 1970; Gabelmann 1973.

these chests were inscribed at Thessaloniki and in seven of these cases a *tabula ansata* was included. Relief decoration is found on just three of these sarcophagi (cat. 109, 117, 133), though the rough finish of many of these pieces left the option open for further carving. In overall form, these *profilgerahmte* and *schlichte* sarcophagi are comparable to the most popular types roughed-out and exported by the sarcophagus producers at the Prokonnesian quarries. Indeed stylistically the closest parallels for these sarcophagi are to be found in Bithynia, which has long been understood as a hotspot for marble-carving and the export of both carvers and carved products.⁵ However, the sarcophagi are not carved in Prokonnesian marble but rather marble drawn from the much nearer quarries on Thasos. These chests and lids were not imported from faraway, therefore, and nor were they exported; these were local products for a local market.

The final large category of monuments and the most ornately decorated are the garland sarcophagi and *ostothekai*. The precise decorative forms on display here can be clearly traced back to models established by the major production centres of garland sarcophagi in Asia Minor. In most cases the author identifies the influence of the Prokonnesian workshops.⁶ In the case of two sarcophagi and one *ostotheke*, however, the combination of garlands and columns finds parallels among Aphrodisian garland sarcophagi.⁷

A smaller number of sarcophagi do not fit into these three main groups. Six (cat. 137–42) have basic profiles along their tops and bottoms, but not down their sides; these are labelled *Postamentsarkophage* here ('pedestal' sarcophagi). Of these, one example (cat. 137) is carved in Prokonnesian marble, as analysis by Maniatis and Tambakopoulos confirms. The same campaign of analysis, however, demonstrated that a very similar piece (cat. 138) was carved in Thasian marble. Sarcophagus form and material were not always directly connected, therefore. Finally, against the generally monotonous output of the sarcophagus workshops at Thessaloniki, four monuments stand out. Two of these (cat. 175 and 176) are carved in Pentelic marble. The first is a garland sarcophagus while the second has garlands on one side and a frieze depicting *erotes* on the other. The overall form of these two pieces, notably their carefully moulded profiles, as well as their material, would seem to indicate that they are imports, products of the Attic workshops. The author, however, following an earlier assessment by Papagianni based on close stylistic analysis (see below), still argues that they

were locally produced, in the Attic style and in imported Pentelic marble. The final two sarcophagi are so unusual in form that they cannot be inserted into any of the categories identified by the author. The sarcophagi of Annia Tryphaena (cat. 177) and of Corragus (cat. 178). The first of these monuments, on which the author has a separate article forthcoming, has relief decoration on three sides of its chest. On the short ends are garlands, while the front is decorated with a relief depicting four horsemen and a central standing female framed between two busts. This central female, wearing chiton and mantle draped over her head, stands between two altars, a *patera* in one hand. Behind her are a *sistrum* and a *kerykeion/caduceus*. The horsemen, wearing tunic, *chlamys* and boots, are arranged in two pairs either side of this woman and are shown standing, holding the reins of their horses. The busts represent a man and a woman, both middle-aged, the woman with a mantle over her hair and the man with short hair. A third, much smaller bust is depicted in the tympanon at the right end of the lid, while the other ends carries a round shield (*Omphalosschild*). A detailed interpretation of the scene is not given here, though parallels are drawn with Attic sarcophagi. The sarcophagus of Corragus, on the other hand, is primarily interesting for its lid. The chest is of a simple rectangular form and carries a large inscription. The lid, however, is in the form of *klinē* and carries a reclining young man, winged, supporting himself on his bent left arm.

The sarcophagi of Annia Tryphaena and of Corragus aside, the sarcophagi from Thessaloniki offer relatively little in the way of relief decoration; ornate vegetal or figured designs seem not to have appealed or perhaps the local producers felt that they could not compete with the Attic workshops on this front. Portraits appear on just three sarcophagus chests (cat. 1, 18 and 177) and one lid (cat. 221). Figures with possible portraits are found on a further seven sarcophagi (cat. 2, 4, 14, 53, 109, 133 and 178), while other figure types are found on an additional six (cat. 3, 15, 16, 66, 67 and 139), alongside the various garland sarcophagi on which figural supports are common. The portraits show some interesting features. On cat. 18, busts of a couple are represented set into a shallow-relief disc and supported by an acanthus; their facial features are damaged but they wear chiton and *himation* respectively. There are similarities here with the *clipeus* portraits common on Metropolitan sarcophagi, as well as the portrait (left roughed-out) on the Attic sarcophagus from Kephissia, but this composition is unique among the examples from Thessaloniki. The arrangement of four busts in a row on cat. 1 is similarly unparalleled. Interestingly, the author is able to show convincingly that the bulk of these sarcophagi with their figurative decoration, belong to the second century CE; in the

⁵ Ward-Perkins 1980.

⁶ Asgari 1977.

⁷ Işık 2007.

REVIEWS

third century the focus was overwhelmingly on the inscription.

Considering the scarcity of complex decorative relief on these sarcophagi, it is appropriate that epigraphic analysis plays a central role in this volume. Indeed the fact that Pantelis Nigdelis' discussion of the inscriptions constitutes a core chapter of this study and is not relegated to an appendix is to the credit of all involved. The texts of the inscriptions themselves are included in the catalogue, where they are also translated. Of the locally produced sarcophagi, 145 have inscriptions, while additional texts belong to 12 *ostothekai* and six sarcophagi in the andesite of Assos, which are included in this section even though they are not discussed elsewhere. Nigdelis focuses especially on the dating information provided by these inscriptions, the terminology used to describe the monuments and their display context, the legal status of the tombs and the fines imposed on violators of them. These texts also reveal a considerable deal about the status of the deceased individuals they commemorate and their families. Of the 123 texts on which the names of the deceased and their family members are preserved, a striking 80% (97 total) belonged to Roman citizens, the majority of them acquiring citizenship prior to the *Constitutio Antoniniana*.

The final core chapter (7), concentrates on what these monuments reveal about workshop practices at Thessaloniki. The author has also published on this topic, most notably in an important contribution in the proceedings of the seventh ASMOSIA conference, but develops some of her earlier lines of enquiry further here.⁸ The dominance of Thasian marble, both calcitic and dolomitic, is proved by Maniatis and Tambakopoulos' analysis, but the close relationship between the quarrymen and carvers on Thasos and the sarcophagus producers at Thessaloniki is also revealed by the form and dimensions of the monuments themselves. The range of very roughly-worked chests and lids (*Rohlinge*), as well as number of pieces with more specific roughed-out forms (*Halbfabrikate*), suggest that this was the condition in which sarcophagi were brought over from Thasos, with further carving and detailing carried out in Thessaloniki. The author is able to convincingly demonstrate that sarcophagi for the Thessaloniki market were produced in multiples of Roman feet, while those used on Thasos tend to be in Thasian feet. Equally, sarcophagi on Thasos tend to be of a different form from those found at Thessaloniki, all of which suggests that the chests and lids shipped to Thessaloniki for carving were not generic, stock products but were specifically quarried and shaped

for this market. There was a close and responsive relationship between the quarries on Thasos and the producers at Thessaloniki.

Where Stefanidou-Tiveriou catalogues all the locally-produced sarcophagi of a single city, Papagianni is interested primarily in the development and interpretation of a series of motifs—*erotes* and garlands—common to early Attic sarcophagi. The details of these motifs, their forms and arrangement are the focus of the first chapter, while further sections deal with the architectural structures of the monuments (3), their date (4), and the importance of the decoration (5). The spread of these motifs and their influence on local sarcophagi production are then treated in chapters 6 and 7. Many of these sarcophagi have already been catalogued in other corpora, notably Matz's work on sarcophagi with Dionysian themes.⁹ This is the first time that all of the Attic sarcophagi decorated with these motifs have been collected together, however. Attic sarcophagi are one of the most widely recognisable and highly decorated sarcophagus types. They were valued as high-end, luxury products and were exported from Athens all around the Mediterranean.¹⁰ Their widespread distribution also means that the motifs on them were widely imitated and replicated. The relatively standardized form of the mouldings and arrangement of the decoration, as well as the evolution of both, suggest that these sarcophagi were produced by either a single workshop, as has been traditionally argued, or by a limited number of workshops operated by skilled craftspeople trained in a common tradition. Beyond this, we know little about how production was organized.

Papagianni distinguishes between ten categories of scenes involving *erotes*. The first of these and the largest are those sarcophagi showing scenes connected by an overarching theme of *komos* or revelry. These include scenes of *erotes* accompanying Dionysos and a satyr (cat. 68 from Athens and cat. 177 from Tyre), central pairs of *erotes* drinking and dancing (e.g. cat. 84 from Beirut), *erotes* with musical instruments (such as the *kithara* and the *aulos* on cat. 57 from Athens), and *erotes* performing offerings. This final group represent an interesting category in which a central pair of *erotes* either hold a goat ready for slaughter or frame an altar. They usually stand amidst a procession of other dancing figures, sometimes including satyrs but more often constituting *erotes* in various states of drunkenness. In three instances these central figures are represented as Eros and Psyche (cat. 6, 50 and 52). These revelry scenes are highly flexible and can be adapted to different chest sizes as

⁸ Stefanidou-Tiveriou 2009.

⁹ Matz 1968a; 1968b; 1969.

¹⁰ Giuliano 1962.

well as to the sides and rears of chests. They usually focus on a central pair of figures with between two and four figures either side of them. As on all Attic sarcophagi, the figures fill the full height of the relief and are carved in deep relief.

The second, third and fourth categories of *erotes* scenes identified by Papagianni involve *erotes* and grape harvesting, in procession (of which only one certain example is known, cat. 137), and riding in chariots. Compared to the *komos*-themed scenes these examples are more varied and complex in design, the subject matter lending itself to more dynamic, all over compositions. This is also true of those scenes showing *erotes* hunting, Papagianni's fifth category, on which mounted *erotes* and wild animals share the space with trees and background vegetation. The final categories of scenes described return to a more ordered formulation and include sport and games scenes and representations of Eros and Psyche. One scene (cat. 91 from Damascus) in which the central figure appears to have his arms bound behind his back is more unusual but does share similarities with a Metropolitan sarcophagus from Warsaw. An additional group of monuments that are not included in Papagianni's main catalogue are also discussed in this chapter: scenes of hunting *erotes* that do not belong to the primary decorative scheme of the sarcophagi on which they are included, which are listed in an appendix to the main catalogue and numbered M1–21. These include those from the side and front panels of Attic *klinē* lids (such as the examples from Thessaloniki and Cyrene), as well as similar scenes integrated into reliefs running around the socles of some of the more elaborate Attic sarcophagi (fragmentary pieces from Thebes and Gortyn are listed here).

The garland sarcophagi receive less attention by comparison. While the garland design became extremely popular in Asia Minor during the course of the second and into the third centuries AD, on Attic sarcophagi the scheme appears to have been favoured only during the first half of the second century. After this the Attic producers distinguished themselves from their rivals by the quality and intricacy of their figurative designs. This question of dating is dealt with in detail in chapter 4. In the case of Attic sarcophagi, which are rarely inscribed, dating is extremely difficult. An elaborate relative chronology has been developed, by Wiegartz among others, but this assumes a consistent evolution of iconography and form across all the producers of these sarcophagi.¹¹ Comparisons are drawn here to both Metropolitan and Asiatic parallels on which garlands and *erotes* are found. While one might take

issue with some of the evidence used to establish this relative chronology, Papagianni's general conclusion that most of the sarcophagi decorated with *erotes* scenes belong to the second century, with some of them (e.g. cat. 1) dating as early as the 140s, seems entirely plausible. The garland sarcophagi belong primarily in the first half of this same century, meaning that a relatively low number of the pieces Papagianni catalogues can be confidently dated to the third century.

While the garland is well understood as a funerary motif, directly referencing the garlands that adorned tombs and were displayed during funerals, *erotes* are less obviously funereal. On Metropolitan sarcophagi *erotes* are frequently found on children's sarcophagi and in this context the motif has received substantial attention, most notably from Janet Huskinson (whose work on the subject is inexplicably absent from Papagianni's bibliography) and Stephanie Dimas.¹² *Erotes* are usually interpreted as reflecting the age of the deceased, the allegorical messages of the scenes filtered through a playful, childish lens. These Attic sarcophagi, however, are full-size and not obviously designed for children. The child connection has still been pushed by some scholars, while others have suggested that the motif might reference the deceased's own children or indeed have a broader relevance and so be applicable to both children and adults.¹³ Others have suggested the motif has a more general meaning that could be employed equally for both adults and children. In the case of Attic sarcophagi, Papagianni rightly queries whether we can use the dimensions of these monuments as a guide to the age of the deceased. Small Attic sarcophagi are comparatively rare and in practice multiple individuals were often entombed together in large sarcophagi. The sudden death of a child, therefore, might prompt the parents to invest in a sarcophagus in which they too would later be laid to rest, and in this instance a scene involving *erotes* might be considered wholly appropriate. A mixed decorative scheme was experimented with in at least one case (cat. 54), on which hunting *erotes* on the front panel of the chest are paired with hunting adults on the short sides. While Papagianni is generally keen to maintain a connection between these *erotes* and the world of children, in some cases she acknowledges that *erotes* are used differently. In the grape harvest scenes, for instance, the *erotes* allude to the overriding Dionysiac theme, while the pairing of Eros and Psyche is more likely a reference to divine love than it is to childhood.

¹¹ Wiegartz 1977.

¹² Huskinson 1996; Dimas 1998.

¹³ Himmelmann-Wildschütz 1959: 30.

REVIEWS

Around 40% of the sarcophagi catalogued were found in Athens. Other examples come from sites at which imported Attic sarcophagi are relatively common: other major Greek cities (Patras, Sparta, Thessaloniki, Nikopolis), Ephesos, Side, Tyre, Salona, Aquileia, and Arles. Papagianni gives a map of these findspots (fig. 8) but it might have been helpful to see how they relate to the overall distribution of Attic sarcophagi. The pattern, in any case, suggests that these motifs were not designed for one specific market but had widespread appeal. The chronology of these exports is also interesting: among the sarcophagi dated to the 130s to 150s are the example from Anafi in the Cyclades (cat. 1), the three from Antioch (cat. 5–7), one from Patras (cat. 60, now in Athens), one from Benghazi in Cyrenaica (cat. 114, now in London), and one from Tyre (cat. 177). The export market for these sarcophagi, in other words, was up and running early on. The peak distribution of these sarcophagi, however, did not occur until the late second and early third century. In this period, sarcophagus workshops elsewhere had also cottoned on to the popularity of these motifs and were producing their own examples in local materials, which in some cases look very much like the Attic imports. Papagianni highlights the local products of other Greek regions, especially of the northern Peloponnese and Lakonia; Nikopolis also seems to have had an active workshop, in some cases importing Pentelic marble. Papagianni also reiterates her argument that two sarcophagi in Pentelic marble from Thessaloniki (discussed also by Stefanidou-Tiveriou, see above) are not Attic but local products. The distinction that Papagianni draws between genuine Attic sarcophagi and these local ‘imitations’ is based on small details of the architectural form of the chest and lid, while occasionally minutiae of the iconography provide a clue. Sarcophagi with unusual designs or unique mouldings, it is argued, cannot possibly be genuine Attic products. Again, however, this assumes that Attic production was to some degree both standardized and predictable, and that there was some sort of control over it. The fact is, though, that many of the examples identified by Papagianni as local products, while they differ from certain Attic sarcophagi, find no parallels among other sarcophagi that certainly are local (and are carved in local materials). The two examples from Thessaloniki are cases in point: their details certainly diverge from the typical Attic design, but they are also unique in a local context, and quite different from each other. Since they are carved in Pentelic marble (not Thasian), it is tempting to see them not as local products but as imports from Athens, perhaps carved by a workshop operating on the edge of the mainstream

Attic producers; however, this would also require the idea of a single Attic production centre to be challenged.¹⁴ This is not a revisionist study, however; its aim is the close analysis of a distinct body of monuments and their iconography in order to understand how the *erotes* and garlands motifs were selected, composed, and what they meant to the commissioners of them.

Both of these volumes are exceptionally well-written and clear. They are produced to the highest standard, like all the volumes in this series. Any faults that can be found are extremely minor. In Stefanidou-Tiveriou’s volume it would have been helpful to hear more about the Attic sarcophagi from Thessaloniki, particularly in the context of the interplay between imports and local products. It is also a little strange that the sarcophagi from Assos are included in the catalogue but not fully discussed anywhere except in the chapter on the inscriptions. Quite why all the names are Latinized is also not immediately clear. In the Papagianni volume, the ordering of the catalogue and plates is not immediately helpful. The catalogue is ordered by current location (Anafi to Zadar) but the plates do not follow the same order, nor do they follow the order in which monuments are discussed in the text. The first sarcophagi that are discussed in the text, therefore, are cat. 68 and 177 but these are not illustrated until plate 5. The reader is forced, as a result, to continually flick between multiple pages of the plates, which becomes rather frustrating.

These minor criticisms aside, these two volumes make important contributions to our understanding of sarcophagus production and use in Greece in the Roman period. By focusing on locally-produced sarcophagi from a single site, Stefanidou-Tiveriou is able to reveal particular idiosyncrasies in the way these monuments were made and used in their specific socio-cultural context. The relationship between different craftspeople in the production cycle is especially well analysed, while the foregrounding of the epigraphic study is to be celebrated. Papagianni has wholly different aims. The organization of production of Attic sarcophagi is much more opaque, despite what is often stated, and there are no inscriptions to provide further contextual information. Where these sarcophagi differ from the Thessalonikan examples is in the richness of their relief decoration and, not unreasonably, it is this which draws Papagianni’s attention. Although fundamentally different in focus, if not in method, these two new studies illustrate, each in their own way, the variety and wealth of sarcophagus evidence and what it reveals about attitudes to death, monumental commemoration, and even craft practices in Roman Greece.

¹⁴ On which, see Russell 2011.

- Alexandrescu-Vianu, M. 1970. Les sarcophages romains de Dobroudja. *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 8.2: 269–328.
- Asgari, N. 1977. Die Halbfabrikate kleinasiatischer Girlandensarkophage und ihre Herkunft. *Archäologischer Anzeiger*: 329–380.
- Asgari, N. and N. Fıratlı 1978. Die Nekropole von Kalchedon, in S. Şahin, E. Schwertheim, and J. Wagner (eds) *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasien. Festschrift F.K. Dörner* (Études Preliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain 66), vol. 1: 1–92. Leiden: Brill.
- Dimas, S. 1998. *Untersuchungen zur Themenwahl und Bildgestaltung auf römischen Kindersarkophagen*. Münster: Scriptorium.
- Gabelmann, H. 1973. *Die Werkstattgruppen der oberitalischen Sarkophage* (Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher 34). Bonn: Rheinland-Verlag.
- Giuliano, A. 1962. *Il commercio dei sarcophagi attici*. Rome: Bretschneider.
- Himmelmann-Wildschütz, N. 1959. Fragmente eines attischen Sarkophags. *Marburger Winckelmann-Programm*: 25–40.
- Huskinson, J. 1996. *Roman Children's Sarcophagi: their Decoration and Social Significance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Işık, F. 2007. *Girlanden-Sarkophage aus Aphrodisias* (Sarkophag-Studien 5). Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Koch, G. (ed.) 1998. *Akten des Symposiums 125 Jahre Sarkophag-Corpus* (Sarkophag-Studien 1). Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- (ed.) 1999. *Akten des Symposiums 'Frühchristliche Sarkophage'* (Sarkophag-Studien 2). Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- (ed.) 2007. *Akten des Symposiums der Sarkophag-Corpus* (Sarkophag-Studien 3). Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Koch, G. and F. Barratte (eds) 2012. *Akten des Symposiums 'Sarkophage der Römischen Kaiserzeit: Produktion in den Zentren—Kopien in den Provinzen'* (Sarkophag-Studien 6). Ruhpolding: Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen.
- Korkut, T. 2006. *Girlanden-Ostheken aus Kalkstein in Pamphylien und Kilikien* (Sarkophag-Studien 4) Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Matz, F. 1968a. *Die dionysischen Sarkophage. Die Typen der Figuren. Die Denkmäler 1–71b* (Die Antiken Sarkophagreliefs IV.1) Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- *Die dionysischen Sarkophage. Die Denkmäler 72–161* (Die Antiken Sarkophagreliefs IV.2) Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- 1969. *Die dionysischen Sarkophage. Die Denkmäler 162–245* (Die Antiken Sarkophagreliefs IV.3) Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- Meinecke, K. 2014. *Sarcophagum Posuit. Römische Steinsarkophage im Kontext* (Sarkophag-Studien 7). Ruhpolding: Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen.
- Russell, B. 2011. The Roman sarcophagus 'industry': a reconsideration, in J. Elsner and J. Huskinson (eds) *Life, Death and Representation. Some New Work on Roman Sarcophagi* (Millennium Studies 29): 119–47. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Stefanidou-Tiveriou, T. 2009. Thasian marble: a connection between Thasos and Thessaloniki, in Y. Maniatis (ed.) *ASMOSIA VII* (Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique Suppl. 51): 19–29. Athens: Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique.
- Ward-Perkins, J.B. 1980. Nicomedia and the marble trade. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 48: 23–69.
- Wiegartz, H. 1977. Zu Problemen einer Chronologie der attischen Sarkophage. *Archäologischer Anzeiger*: 383–8.

BEN RUSSELL

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

ben.russell@ed.ac.uk