

MINERALOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE HAND-MADE POTTERY FROM THE ROMAN CASTLE OF GILĂU

The present study, which has an interdisciplinary character is, in fact a continuation of the analysis of the La Tene tradition pottery in the Roman castle of Gilău. The first part was published three years ago: F. Marcu, O. Țentea, *Die handgearbeitete Keramik aus dem Römerkastell von Gilău*, in *Römer und Barbaren an den Grenzen des römischen Daciens* (Hrsg. N. Gudea) (=Acta Musei Porolissensis 21), Zalău 1997, p. 221-233.

Based on the finding of the clay extraction, clay which was utilised for making the hand-made pottery found in the up quoted castle (it is very likely that the same clay could have been utilised for making the wheel-made pottery as well), we can make certain explanatory notes about the production of this type of artefacts.

It is important to mention that for all the period of time in which the castle of Gilău functioned, the clay used for making almost all of the pottery there, was extracted from the same point. An interesting observation is that the clay naturally contained a certain percentage of sand considered enough by the potters, so that didn't have to supplement it with other degreasing substances. The clay utilised for almost all of the pottery produced in Gilău came from a hill called "Cetate", near Gilău, place where used to be a quite large Hallstatt settlement. For the Trajanic level of the castle, the pottery contains a high percentage of degreasing substances, having a rough aspect. For the 2nd phase hand made pottery is much finer. This situation changes in the 3rd and last level of the castle, where such a flat differentiation is no longer possible to be made. A

particular aspect comes with the cups which for the most part of them, contain a high percentage of degreasing substances.

It is likely that the early alveolar bottomed cups (dated in the second half of 2nd century) may have been better made (technically talking), fact which would underline as we said, the hypothesis of an eventual evolution of this type from the semialveolar bottomed cup type.

For the handmade pottery, we consider that the degreasing substance was not deliberately put into the clay as far as it was already present there in a sufficient quantity. The same provenience of the raw material (degreasing substance and clay) as well as the identification of the calcite coming from the bio lasts only for the samples 116 m/I and 39m/II allow us to consider that we are dealing with products of the same potter who could have produced pottery decorated with ornaments of dacian tradition, in the first half of the 2nd century AD. Analogies which are chronologically very well framed, are to be found at Napoca where the most part of the handmade pottery is dated in the first wooden phases, which correspond to the beginning of the 2nd century AD, including the pre-municipal phase. What we can say for sure is that raw materials for these pottery artefacts are coming from a different place than the most part of those made in Gilău.