

anteriormente por COMFORT, *Roman ceramics in Spain. An exploratory visit*, AEArc., XXXIV, 1961, p. 9, figs. 3-7) o los cuatro fragmentos de forma 27 (p. 144). Estos «contactos» entre producciones pueden llegar a ser muy reveladores cuando se conozcan más ejemplares.

Por último, el libro III, basado en mapas de distribución de formas, trata de los centros de producción, cuya localización, a falta de hallazgos de hornos, está hecha en base a los citados mapas. No entramos en lo que toca a los talleres itálicos, pero nos parece arriesgado lo que se afirma de los talleres hispánicos. En primer lugar hay que hacer una matización a los mapas y es que los hallazgos que reflejan corresponden a los Museos visitados (citados en p. IX), o, mejor dicho, las zonas en blanco son las no visitadas. Cierto es que en esas zonas hay menor abundancia de vasos de paredes finas, pero quizás las conclusiones se pudieran ver en algo afectadas por ello. En segundo lugar, si bien parece lógico que exista algún taller en la cuenca baja del Guadalquivir, de momento, y sin negar que pudiera existir, carece de todo fundamento situar una fábrica en Mérida, a pesar de que fuese la capital de la Lusitania. Hallazgos posteriores han puesto en evidencia que la sigillata hispánica que la autora consideraba procedente de allí (*A propos de deux potiers de Merida: Valerius Paternus et Lapilius*, Mel. Casa de Velázquez, 6, 1970, pp. 5-41) se fabricó en un sitio tan lejano como el valle del Najerilla (GARABITO, T., *Los alfares riojanos. Producción y comercialización*, BPH, XVI, Madrid, 1978, pp. 317-319). Y no es válido el argumento de la abundancia de materiales en este lugar, más bien achacable a la callada labor de años de don José Álvarez Sáez de Buruaga y sus colaboradores. Por esta misma regla Belo o cualquier otro yacimiento importante (como ella misma comenta en p. 155) podría ser considerado productor de las cerámicas que en él se encuentren. Aunque sea poner las cosas un poco más difíciles para los que tienen intereses secundarios en la cerámica, es necesario tener evidencias mayores o el hallazgo de hornos, como el de Braga (citado en p. 145, no incluido en el estudio) o el de Melgar de Tera, Zamora (MARTÍN VALLS, R., DELIBES, G., *Hallazgos arqueológicos en la provincia de Zamora (III)*, BSAA, XLII, 1976, pp. 426-427) para poder sacar partido a todas las conclusiones que se pueden derivar del conocimiento de un centro productor.

La última parte de este libro III está dedicada al viejo tema de los «barros saguntinos», que en esta ocasión se identifican con las paredes finas, sin que, por la naturaleza del tema, se pueda dar por cerrado el debate, cosa que por otra parte tampoco tiene excesiva importancia en comparación a la problemática actual con la que nos enfrentamos en cerámica.

Finalmente hay que señalar la base sobre la que se ha elaborado este volumen: la visita a los Museos. En todos ellos duermen materiales aún sin estudiar y que, a pesar de lo molesto que pueda ser el revisar excavaciones antiguas, cuando las hay, pueden servir de base a la elaboración de estudios como el que nos ocupa, primera piedra en el conocimiento de los vasos de paredes finas.—J. R. LÓPEZ RODRÍGUEZ.

GARABITO GOMEZ, Tomás, *Los Alfares Romanos Riojanos: Producción y Comercialización* [Bibliotheca Praehistorica Hispana XVI]. 645 pp., 129 figs., 67 tables, 102 plates, Madrid, 1978, 4.800 pts.

It is an honor to be invited to comment upon this important work, but what can an American appropriately say of a book which is already a *vade mecum* to readers of

these words? It is more fitting that, rather than summarizing the work, I venture a few thoughts prompted by this massive volume. If I miss some important points, the reader will surely indulge my weakness in the Spanish idiom and in many details of Spanish archaeological topography.

One is impressed by the difficult problem presented to Prof. Garabito, namely the handle whereby to pick up his material. By separate sites (Bezares, Tricio, Arenzana de Arriba)? By potters' names? By decorative motives? By plain forms? Chronologically? With an infinitude of care which must often have «driven him up the wall», as we say, he has managed to pull together all these elements and, in addition, has provided a detailed account of the distribution of each form, throughout the Peninsula and elsewhere, from each of the pottery sites. This has been accomplished by repetition where necessary, by numerous cross-references, and especially by detailed indices and tables and maps covering every aspect of the themes discussed. Compilation of these must have been a boring and penitential exercise, but it makes the facts usable.

In addition to all this endless detail necessary for the specialist's use the author provides the more general reader with a 15-page introduction and 8 pages of conclusions. Some of the high points seem to be:

(1) The three potteries under consideration (and others nearby like Nájera to be treated in future studies) comprise the most productive and widely distributed source of T. S. H. This is comparable to the collection of pottery sites around Millau in France; La Graufesenque is the largest and best known, but is by no means the only one within a few kilometers (see Vernhet, *Figlina* 2, 1977, p. 34).

(2) It is now apparent that the Hispanic-type T. S. of Mauretania, published as being locally made imitations because rare or non-existent in Spain itself, actually emanates from the three Rioja factories (Type A) and from Andújar (Type B). A similar but smaller pinpointed export by the potter SN of Tricio appears in significant quantity at Conimbriga but nowhere else except a stray piece at Huerña. Garabito has moved these anomalies, already noted by J. Boube and Mille. F. Mayet, respectively, a step closer to solution; perhaps someday we shall know the «how» and the «why», as well as the «whence», of these peculiar concentrations.

(3) While M. Angeles Mezquíriz's T. S. H. admittedly remains indispensable, Garabito's study establishes a whole new basis by identifying the center from which so much T. S. H. emanated and by analyzing the decoration of moulds and vases, shapes of plain dishes, and names of potters. In a word, he has introduced new order into an area which, despite his predecessors, has remained somewhat murky.

(4) The numerous stenographically abbreviated signatures, almost all of which occur on plain ware, have now been assigned to partnerships (if this is a correct application of a modern term), e. g. the common stamp EX OF VAL PAT is resolved *ex officina Valeri (et) Paterni*. and so on in many less familiar cases. Partnerships are not unknown in both Arretine and Gaulish factories, but they seem to have been almost habitual in Spain, so much so that one wonders whether this can be the correct interpretation of all these abbreviations. Be that as it may, these associations are conjecturally attributed to activity spanning more than a single generation and (why not?) to marriages within the potting community.

(5) On p. 139 and elsewhere Garabito proposes that the letters TR suffixed to Treb(ius) and other names represents Tritius or Tritiensis, indicative of the place of manufacture. As a parallel practice one might note the frequent «Arretine» stamps *Arretinu(m) Veru(m)* which, incidentally, were not made at Arezzo, and *A. Titi figul(i)*

*Arret(ini)*, and especially the South Gaulish *Scotius (e)cit) Aretinu(m)* at Vindonissa (Ettlinger, *Germania* 33 1955, p. 369 and 34 1956, pp. 273-275) and *Acuti Bili(cati) Ar(retinum?)*. Even if one expands the last as *Ar(vernorum?)* with Oswald, *Stamps* p. 4, the parallel is still valid.

(6) Arenzana de Arriba opened for business in the decade A. D. 40-50, and Bezares slightly later; Tricio came into production at the end of the century. All of this will surprise no one, but it does confirm with more solid evidence what had been inferred from stratigraphic and general considerations at other sites.

(7) Oddly, although some 6.000 fragments of moulds, vases and kiln furniture have been found, no dies for making moulds are among them. The author explains this by suggesting that bone or some other perishable material was used for this purpose. But I doubt that the universal Italian and Gaulish use of clay puncheons was abandoned in Spain, and prefer to leave open the explanation of their absence.

(8) For the most part T. S. H. is admittedly crude, dull, unimaginative, repetitive and boresome. It is thus a pleasure to find an occasional figure of which the execution hints at some appreciation of the classical heritage. But at best it is difficult to admire much in the rendering of the decorations drawn on the 60 tables of figure-types. Goya, Velazquez and probably even Picasso would all disclaim these artisans as ancestors.

(9) Further, in the Rioja potteries the tradition of the past does not extend to the combination of figures into a group or scene. For instance, the simple Gaulish erotic groupings, - to say nothing of the more complicated Arretine, - or the familiar Gaulish gladiatorial pair are wholly lacking. What does this say about Hispanic popular taste?

(10) A notable addition to the Hispanic ceramic prosopographia is contributed by the 16 different potters of Bezares, the 7 of Arenzana de Arriba, and the 42 of Tricio. Strangely, the potter Miccio, sufficiently well known to have earned a monograph consecrated to his activity, does not appear among them although he seems to have had some relationships with the Rioja potteries.

(11) Occasional reference to South Gaul and Italy suggests a connection between these sources of the sigillata tradition and the Hispanic potters. There is of course an obvious descent of style from South Gaul to the early stage of Hispanic sigillata in both the decorated and the plain ware, but it is easy to overdo the evidence. Rather it would appear that the Spanish potters early struck out on their own repertoire of patterns, much as the Gaulish potters almost universally eschewed the Greco-Italian decorations in developing their own. The Gaulish motive which seems to have made the deepest and most lasting impression in Spain is the «arrowheads» (tables 46-50), adapted also to separation of metopes (tables 52-60). In this connection Garabito accepts the nautilus fragment of a vase from Tricio (p. 348, no. 35, pl. 68, fig. 82) as Hispanic, against Mezquíriz («Algunos fragmentos de sigillata galica del Museo de Santander», *Sautuola* 1 1975, p. 269); both of these experts know both Hispanic and Gaulish sigillata when they see it, and I am surely incapable of making a judgment from this distance. But both the drawing and the photograph are so different from the usual standard and style of Hispanic work and are so characteristic of Graufesenque design and execution that I prefer to keep that question open, with whatever implications this may have. On the other hand, an occasional motive like the spiral of the Tricio mould 9 (pl. 46, fig. 52) and some of the unimaginative repetitions like Bezares vases 9, 22, 26, 58, 59 evoke a faint reminiscence of Late Italian decoration of the very late first and the early second Christian centuries. But, apart from the contemporaneity, there seems no ground for assuming that Spain received any artistic influences from Gaul after the first beginnings

of the industry or received them from Italy at all. Considering the frequent governmental, commercial, cultural and other contacts between Italy and Spain during the centuries concerned, this lack of influence in pottery deserves mention.

(12) Garabito discusses locally made sigillata pottery only, and perhaps there is nothing else to discuss. But if there are any other artifacts, - Coins, lamps, coarse ware, amphorae, etc., - these might add to the completeness of the picture. More specifically, he notes neither the presence nor absence of any South Gaulish or Italian pottery although these fabrics are widely disseminated in the interior. Nor is any Late Roman Red Ware noted.

(13) I am not sure whether or not Garabito's definition of «interior» and «exterior» corresponds to mine; perhaps he has sufficiently drawn attention to the small ridge under the foot of fig. 19 1 (signed EX OF AR) *et passim* as being «típico de la producción hispánica». But I think it deserves emphasis that, although this kind of ridge is not a necessary criterion of Hispanic manufacture, it is sufficient. So far as I know, no potters elsewhere in the Roman Empire developed quite the same ridge.

(14) Unusual is the Hispanic custom of sometimes signing the plain forms Dragendorff 35 and 36. Compare Oswald and Pryce, *Terra Sigillata* p. 194 (or *Standpoint* as Garabito strangely cites it), who assign this convention to Rheinzabern and Trier in the second century. This is hardly evidence of cross - influence between the Rhineland and Spain, but it raises a question as to why the earlier makers of these forms in Gaul and North Africa did *not* sign them.

One could add many more observations of interest. I shall confine myself to a few more of somewhat different character.

This book, for all its outstandingly high scholarly quality, will not find great reception outside the Peninsula. Its scope is too localized for general sale. This is regrettable, but the plain fact is that most excavations and most museums beyond the Pyrenees are not concerned with T.S.H. and, with prices what they are, they are unlikely to spend money widely beyond their primary interests. Of course within the Peninsula, Mauretania and some neighboring areas Garabito's book stands right up with Mezquíríz.

Garabito's maps on p. 582 clearly show a genuine commerce between the Rioja potteries and Mauretania Tingitana, and one might also envisage a small but tangible commerce with St.-Bertrand-de-Comminges. But Marseilles, Stockstadt and London are something different, and the 16 decorated sherds from Ostia (increased by another reported by Pucci, *Ostia IV*, p. 322, fig. 594) are also more probably strays than imports in the usual commercial sense. Garabito seems to vacillate between the two views. To these occurrences may now be added some 20 Hispanic decorated fragments and 8 signatures from the neighborhood of Algiers published by R. Guéry, *Antiquités Africaines* 13 1979, especially pp. 31-37; at least three of these - CVLAO (= CA · LV · ), C · LOF (= C · LPF) and EX : O : IVMA - are of Tricio and at least one, TREBTR, is of Bezares. Of all these Guéry comments that they are «des apports accidentels au lieu de témoigner d'une quelconque filière commerciale».

A book of this magnitude cannot escape an occasional «typo». I have noted only very few in the main text and notes, but a rereading of the bibliography and other foreign names would have suggested some emendations; one such entry compresses five errors into three lines. Somewhat more serious is the omission of Jacqueline Rigoir's studies of late stamped ware. But as a whole, the bibliography and notes are witness to the massive progress of Peninsular studies in Roman pottery through the last few decades.

Garabito refers to unpublished T. H. S. at Alcudia/Pollentia on Mallorca. It does indeed exist, but so far as I know there are no plans for its publication; it deserves the attention of an expert in the subject. However, closer at hand there are several significant groups at Valencia, a site which does not appear in Garabito's text or distribution maps. My notes of what I saw some years ago in the Museo Arqueológico Municipal of that delightful and hospitable city include a number of Hispanic signatures, many of which are not in Garabito's list, and many small moulded and plain fragments of no great importance individually but quantitatively deserving of expert inspection and evaluation. Nor have I noted more than passing reference to the collection from many sources now in the Seminario de Historia Primitiva del Hombre in Madrid.

Garabito's work will greatly expedite the task of tying up loose ends like those mentioned, and it places the study of Hispanic terra sigillata upon a solid new foundation.—HOWARD COMFORT.

Haverford College, U. S. A.

NESTORI, Aldo, *Monumentum Fl. Eusebi fatto ecclesia S. Eusebi presso Ronciglione*, Città del Vaticano, Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1979, 4.º, 160 pp., 121 figs., V láms.

Los estudios efectuados en la comarca de Ronciglione, provincia de Viterbo, que constituye un interesante conjunto de época medieval han dado lugar a que el autor cuidara de estudiar y restaurar la iglesia rural de S. Eusebio. Una construcción altomedieval, que no carece de aditamentos más recientes, rodeada en tiempos de algunas dependencias. Vinculada en tiempos a la diócesis de Sutri, uno de cuyos primeros obispos fue San Eusebio, podría considerarse que su título recordara al obispo local. Sin embargo aquí empieza la labor, y novedad, del doctor Nestori. La iglesia ha sido construida en torno a un monumento funerario tardorromano, que Nestori reconstruye como de planta rectangular y techo a dos vertientes, erigido para Fl. Eusebius, funcionario imperial, probablemente oriundo de la localidad o *possesor* en la misma, cuya carrera es bien conocida (MARTINDALE, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, I, 1971, 307, n.º 38). En torno a este monumento surgiría un culto y la identificación del funcionario imperial con el obispo.

El proceso de identificación no ha sido fácil pero lleva a pensar en cuántas otras localidades puede haber tenido lugar un hecho análogo. Piénsese en el caso de la Península Ibérica en Irún o, posiblemente, en Santiago de Compostela, y, con un carácter algo distinto en la iglesia de Santa María de la Mar en la ciudad de Barcelona, localidades que se citan a vuelapluma puesto que los ejemplos deben multiplicarse.

Hay que añadir que, de una parte, el libro de Nestori incluye un detenido estudio de la decoración pictórica, medieval, y, de otra parte, los tipos de aparejos y capiteles. El estudio de estos últimos representa un avance en un campo tan difícil como es el de la escultura de la Alta Edad Media pero el estudio de los aparejos arquitectónicos, desde el siglo IV hasta el siglo XVI, constituye un punto de partida muy sólido para la datación de las técnicas constructivas en la Tuscia y el Lacio durante la Edad Media. Hay que añadir que un elemento de la cubrición ha sido fechado, mediante la técnica del C-14, en el siglo IX d. C.

Este estudio de la iglesia de San Eusebio junto a Ronciglione constituye un buen ejemplo de lo que puede esperarse del estudio de las pequeñas iglesias rurales quizás,