

VESSELS INSIDE AND OUTSIDE

EMAC'07

9TH EUROPEAN MEETING ON ANCIENT CERAMICS

OCTOBER 24-27, 2007

BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

PROGRAM AND ABSTRACTS

Organising Institutions

Hungarian National Museum

with the help of

Archaeocomp Association

Institute of Nuclear Techniques Budapest University of Technology and
Economics

Eötvös Loránd University of Sciences, Department of Archaeometry and
Archaeological Method

Eötvös Loránd University of Sciences, Institute of Geography and Geology
Field Service for Cultural Heritage

Hungarian Archaeological and Art History Society, Archaeometry Workshop
Hungarian Geological Society

Institute for Geochemical Research, HAS

Vienna Institute of Archaeological Science, University of Vienna

Zala County Museum Directorate

P-04

ELECTRON MICROPROBE ANALYSIS FOR ARCHAEOCERAMICS

Volker Hoeck¹ -- Corina Ionescu²

¹Paris Lodron University, 34 Hellbrunner Str., A-5020 Salzburg, Austria (volker.hoeck@sbg.ac.at)

²Babes-Bolyai University, 1 Kogalniceanu Str, RO-400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania
(corinai@bioge.ubbcluj.ro)

The use of the Electron Microprobe for studying archaeological ceramics is not widely applied, even though it enables the identification of mineral compounds of the matrix, temper grains, minerals originated during firing or post-depositional alteration products. In turn, the detailed knowledge of the mineral phase composition allows inferences of the classification of shards, the identification of raw materials and the technological conditions of firing.

Apart from the obvious advantage, several problems are inherent to the method. Among these, the most obvious is the low total sum of the quantitative analyses. This can be due to various factors, such as: the fine porosity of samples, the incomplete dehydroxylation during the firing, or the rehydration and/or rehydroxylation during the burial.

Another problem is related to the identification of mineral components of the clayish matrix, as it represents a more or less homogeneous mixture of extremely-fine grained minerals, usually smaller than the beam diameter (3-5 μ m). The presence of an amorphous or vitreous phase complicates the situation.

The distinction among the primary and the secondary (firing) phases can also be relatively difficult, as the same mineral may occur as both. And the last but not the least, the minerals originated during firing represent basically metastable phases, with non-stoichiometric composition, difficult to be characterized from a mineralogical point of view. Additionally, they are "contaminated" with elements such as Fe, K or P trapped inside the new lattice.

The above discussed situations are illustrated by case studies of archaeological ceramics from Transylvania (Romania).