

MICRO-ASIAN VESSELES DISCOVERED IN PRE-ROMAN DACIA (2ND CENTURY BC – 1ST CENTURY AD). WORKSHOPS. PRODUCTION. DISTRIBUTION.*

Mariana-Cristina Popescu**

Keywords: Pre-Roman Dacia, vessels, workshops, Pergamon, Ephesus (?), Mytilene, Micro-Asian, West Slope, appliqué vessels, Hellenistic mouldmade bowls and related ware, lagynoi ware, lead glazed vessels, sigillata.

Abstract: The article presents Micro-Asian vessels from the second century B.C. until the end of the first century A.D. discovered on Geto-Dacian sites. The lot of Micro-Asian vessels under analysis consists of 171 items discovered on the Geto-Dacian sites in Barboși, Bâta - Doamnei, Bedehaza, Bordușani, Brad, Brăilița, București, Grădiștea, Pietroasele Gruiu - Dării, Piscul - Crășanilor, Poiana, Popești, and Răcătău. The material was examined in order to identify the centres of production, the characteristics of each center's specific products, and the dating of the items. The results allowed several preliminary observations on the spread of Micro-Asian vessels in pre-Roman Dacia.

Rezumat: Articolul prezintă veselă microasiatică din sec. II a. Chr. – I p. Chr. descoperită în siturile geto-dacice. Lotul de veselă microasiatică analizat este compus din 171 de piese descoperite în siturile geto-dacice de la Barboși, Bâta - Doamnei, Bedehaza, Bordușani, Brad, Brăilița, București, Grădiștea, Pietroasele Gruiu - Dării, Piscul - Crășanilor, Poiana, Popești și Răcătău. Materialul a fost examinat urmărindu-se identificarea centrelor de producție, caracterizarea produselor specifice fiecărui centru și datarea pieselor. Rezultatele au permis câteva observații preliminare privind pătrunderea vasei microasiatice în Dacia-preromană.

Starting with the second century B.C. one can note an afflux of Hellenistic and Roman pottery in pre-Roman Dacia, with an ascending trend until the end of the first century A.D. and the beginning of the second century A.D. Having the possibility to analyse directly the Hellenistic and Roman pottery discovered on several Geto - Dacian sites, I was able to identify its sources of production.¹ One of the most important source was Minor Asia, in particular the workshops in Pergamum and those that produced pottery under their influence. Following the distribution of discovered shapes according to workshops, their dating, and distribution on each site, one can formulate several preliminary observations on the introduction of Micro-Asian pottery in pre-Roman Dacia, the distribution routes, and the connections to the production centres. The lot of Micro-Asian vessels that I was able to identify consists of 171 items,² mainly preserved in fragmentary state, discovered on the Geto-Dacian sites in Barboși, Bâta - Doamnei, Bedehaza, Bordușani, Brad, Brăilița, București, Grădiștea, Pietroasele Gruiu - Dării, Piscul - Crășanilor, Poiana, Popești, and Răcătău (Fig.1). Besides the items under direct analysis, I also included several items from literature that, according to their published photographs and drawings, I was able to determine.³

* The present contribution elaborates on the paper presented at Symposium "Architecture. Restoration. Archaeology" in April 2013 (ARA/14, 18-20 February 2013), part of the workshop "The Dacians between the Hellenistic East and Roman West, 2nd c. BC – 1st c. AD". The workshop was supported by the National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS-UEFISCDI, project no PN-II-RU-PD-2011-3-0122.

** National Museum for the History of Transylvania, Cluj-Napoca, e-mail: marianacristinapopescu@yahoo.com.

¹ The article presents several observations developed in a forthcoming study focusing on Hellenistic and Roman pottery discovered in pre-Roman Dacia (Popescu forthcoming). This is based on the analysis of a lot of ca. 700 entire and fragmentarily preserved items, most directly examined, with very few items only known from literature included in the database.

² Some of the items under analysis are presented here for the first time, others have been published: Glodariu 1974, pp. 210-219; Popescu 2010, pp. 51-66; Popescu 2011, pp. 315-332; Popescu 2012, pp. 5-10.

³ Sanie 1973, pp. 416-41, pl.3/1, 7/7; Glodariu 1974, no. 6, 19/c, 31/g, 34/7, 35/1-2, 6-8, 39, pp. 210, 212, 214, 216, 219; pl. XVIII, XXII-XXIV, XXXIX; Vulpe, Gheorghită 1976, p. 187, pl. 11/7-8; Turcu 1979, p. 206, pl. XVII/8; Sirbu 1982, pp. 108-111, fig. 4/2, 5/3; Sirbu 1983, p. 15, fig. 7/3; Sanie 1992, pp. 81, 84, pl. VIII/3a-d, 4, IX/ 6a-c, 7; Sirbu 1996, pp. 60,91, 147, fig. 20/4, 104/7,10; Sirbu, Dupoi 2001, p. 43, fig. 114/2-3; Vulpe, Teodor 2003, no. 854, 858, pp. 328-329, fig. 240/4,8; Trohani 2005, pp. 45, 59, pl. 75/8, 91/3.