

**Thesis of PhD dissertation**

**Sarmatian–Roman economic relations  
Historical and archaeological conclusions based on  
the ceramic material of Site Üllő 5–9**

Tamás Szebenyi

Supervisor: Dr. habil. Péter Forisek



UNIVERSITY OF DEBRECEN

Doctoral School of History and Ethnology

Debrecen, 2024

## **State of research, main goals of the PhD dissertation**

In the area associated with the most extensive expansion of the former Sarmatian Barbaricum in the Carpathian Basin (shared by the present-day administrative area of Hungary, Serbia and Romania), the study of Sarmatian–Roman commercial relations are facing serious deficiencies. In the current stage of research, investigation of Roman artefacts from the Great Hungarian Plain usually follows a thematic approach (e.g. terra sigillata, amphorae, lead-glazed pottery, enamelled brooches), but only a few researches are covering a large, coherent geographical area: only the relevant volumes of the CRFB series for Szolnok county (Hungary, 2005, CRFB U1) and Arad county (Romania, 2019, CRFB R1) could be mentioned in this regard. Moreover, the most recent synthesis on this topic written by A. Vaday was published in 1998 (as part of the series *Gyulai katalógusok*, Vol. 6) have not yet been able to integrate the find materials from the rescue excavations following the turn of the millennium.

My PhD dissertation is justified by the extraordinary increase in the number of artefacts of Roman origin in recent years, which could offer an opportunity to specify the statements of the previous research (e.g. on the question of periodization and geographical distribution). Since A. Vaday's summary published in 1998, the literature has largely repeated itself on the subject; while the issues raised by more recent publications of find materials are only less prominently addressed (e.g. the rates of products participate in close and long range trade). The main goal of this paper is to reopen the discussion on Sarmatian–Roman trade relations, which is by its very nature extremely complex and, in many areas, can only be pursued at a theoretical level (e.g. the question of monetary exchange or the delimitation of trade/spoils/gifts).

## **Structure of the dissertation, applied methodology**

My work consists of two basic structural units, which follow different methodologies according to the issues they address. In the first part of the work, I present the Roman pottery material from Site Üllő 5–9 (Chapter 2), which is the largest known assemblage of this kind in the Great Hungarian Plain with its 3481 fragments. I discuss the ceramic types according to their typical material quality categories (I: terra sigillata, II: amphorae, III: *Glanzttonware*, IV: vessels painted in bands, V: uncoated Roman pottery, VI: utilitarian ware of pebbled material, VII–VIII: unique types of imported vessels, IX: lead-glazed pottery),<sup>1</sup> within which the provenance, the production technique and the nature of their coating creates the necessary

---

<sup>1</sup> The terra sigillata vessels (Group I) were identified by Friderika Horváth. Hereby I have to thank her for providing me with the document containing her results!

cohesion. On the level of subgroups, typology is the basic principle of classification, with the type numbers, the textual descriptions and the type tables necessary to understand the system are given in Appendix 3. This is supplemented by a detailed catalogue of the finds (Appendices 5–7), and the illustrated and photographic plates showing the fragments (Tables 1–350), in accordance with the methodology of pottery research techniques of modern archaeology. Although material analyses of the stamp-decorated pottery from Site Üllő 5–9 have been carried out previously, I did not consider it necessary to implement such scientific analyses during the preparation of this manuscript: the researched sites are only 15 km from the Danube, so based on the geographical location of the imported finds, it is likely to be linked to the phenomenon of the ‘trade near the limes’ of the Aquincum foreland.

The second section of the dissertation aims to clarify the theoretical framework of the Sarmatian–Roman interaction. It summarises the relevant literature and addresses the basic issues of the topic: the interpretative framework of Roman artefacts from the Great Hungarian Plain (Chapter 4), furthermore the chronological (Chapter 5.2) and geographical factors (Chapter 5.3) that fundamentally determine the composition of the imported assemblages. The general approach requires a territorial extension of the scope of the investigation to the whole Sarmatian Barbaricum, while in addition to the ceramic material; it is justified to consider other types of imported material (e.g. brooches, metal mirrors, glass vessels, beads) (Appendix 1). In addition to the conclusions drawn from the archaeological material, new results from the research of written sources and economic history can help to reconstruct the background processes as accurately as possible, and the historical analysis (Chapter 3) seems to be of equal importance as the study of material culture.

### **Results: conclusions based on the imported Roman pottery from Site Üllő 5-9**

The catalogue of imported Roman pottery from the sites under investigation contains 2971 items (depending on their form, this may even approximately close the actual number of vessels). Although this quantity is extremely high compared to the earlier published assemblages (e.g. the ratio is 5:1 compared to Site Felgyő, Kettőshalmi-dűlő), the imported pottery at Site Üllő 5–9 represent only 1.29% of the total find material, which fits perfectly into the average ratios of this kind of the Sarmatian Barbaricum in the Carpathian Basin (which is typically 1–2.5%). This may be explained by the ‘industrial’ character of the settlement, together with the activity of the local pottery workshops, and thus by the abnormally high number of locally made pottery. Moreover, this ceramic assemblage represents a high degree of variability: it represents all the common variants of imported

pottery types from the Sarmatian Barbaricum from the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century to the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD (see the list of researched pottery types earlier!).

Within the investigated pottery assemblage, the distribution by type of material group shows a highly disproportionate picture, with only 3 out of 9 groups sharing 94% of the total number of items: coated vessel types (*Glanztonware*) (63.5%), terra sigillata vessels (24.9%), and Dressel 24/Zeest 90 amphorae (5.6%). Compared to the production of provincial pottery centres, this clearly points to a pattern in demand of Sarmatian communities, where the primary goal was to buy tableware/luxury products, while their needs for coarse utilitarian pottery could be substantially met by the production of local pottery workshops. Due to the nature of the import, a highly selective composition can also be seen by a typological analysis: the Roman ceramic material is clearly dominated by cups and bowls of a hemispherical base form (66.8% in the *Glanztonware* group, and 42.3% of the total imported ceramic material!). By contrast, the heavy abrasion marks on the inner surface of the lead-glazed *mortaria* are evidence of the use of forms different than those of the Barbarian culinary tradition in their original function.

It may be questionable to what extent the dating of the imported ceramic vessels in the Sarmatian Barbaricum can be reconciled with the time limits provided by the provincial analogues, due to their presumably longer period of use. Despite the well datable types of imported vessels at Site Üllő 5–9 (e.g. 737 items of terra sigillata), even the relative chronological position of the ceramic types is problematic, since the extremely frequent superposition between the 8750 archaeological features of the multi-phase settlement and the phenomenon of planning typical of Sarmatian settlements lead to a high degree of mixing of the finds. Uniquely, within the group of coated, hemispherical bowls and cups (Group III E), a relative chronological system can be established based on the rim constructions (that can be only treated as a working hypothesis), which is showing the use of vessel types over a long period of time, probably in partly overlapping parallel periods.

### **Results: refining the periodization of Sarmatian–Roman commercial relations**

The periodization of Sarmatian–Roman trade relations is a complex issue which we can investigate through the base sources provided by epigraphy/palaeography, economic history and archaeology. Although the chronological classification with its 3 part system (‘provincial period’, ‘imperial period’, ‘Late Antique period’) published by A. Vaday in 1998 is still applicable today, the more recent results of the above-mentioned disciplines provide an opportunity to refine the boundaries of this periodization.

The provenance of the earliest dateable Roman find material in the Sarmatian Barbaricum may raise questions in several cases: while some of the pottery types clearly are Pannonian origin (e.g. figuratively painted pottery or vessels with painted, vertical stripes), in the case of other groups of artefacts (e.g. metal mirrors with perforated edges or strongly profiled brooches with *Stützplatte*), we cannot clearly exclude the possibility that they reached the Sarmatian communities of the Carpathian Basin through Eastern immigrant groups or from the neighbouring Quadi. The material evidence of contact from the last third of the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD (Phase 1a) can be marked differently in character from that of the later periods: the low numbers of Roman imported products are known exclusively from burials, furthermore their occurrence is isolated, which excludes the possibility of a trade with a constant supply of goods.

It may be questionable in what way we can identify the changes during the reign of Antoninus Pius (Phase 1b), which are strongly emphasized by the literature based on the appearance of Central Gaulish terra sigillata in Barbarian environment. Although the general increase in the quantity of ceramic material is accompanied by the appearance of new types (e.g. marbled pottery, imitations of Pompeian red painted bowls), the main attributes of import continues to retain the characteristics detailed in the previous period. However, an objective indicator of the development of Sarmatian–Roman relations probably can be found among the proportions of strongly profiled brooches variants: the ratio of the variants with *Stützplatte* (type Riha 3.1.1) (which allow dating between Domitian's and Hadrian's reigns) and the variants without it (type Riha 3.1.2) (which can be dated between the last third of the 1<sup>st</sup> and the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries AD) are 2:1. The increase of absolute numbers of imported Roman find material show a long, transitional period, while according to the event history, the earliest turning point for Phases 1a–b could be positioned to the end of the Dacian wars under Trajan (105–106 AD) and the organisation of the province of Dacia. The inscriptions dating to the reign of Antoninus Pius (e.g. the inscription for the construction of the bridge at Intercisa or the fragment of the inscription at Partiscum) clearly suggest the existence of a trade as early as the second third of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD.

The development of trade with a real supply of goods (Phase 2a) could clearly have started before the Marcomannic Wars (166–180 AD). The integration of the Sarmatian markets into the Pannonian economic cycle can be observed in several types of artefact: this process can be seen in the change of terra sigillata vessels from Middle Gaulish to early Rheinzabern (Bernhard Group Ib–IIa) centres, and probably the same phenomenon explains the shift in the fashion of enamelled brooches (through Berecz types IA–IB and Berecz types

IIA–IIB). According to the recently published ceramic assemblages, the separation of phases of periodization on the basis of their ‘provincial’ and ‘imperial’ character is misleading (e.g. in the case of Site Üllő 5–9 the ratio of goods from neighbouring provinces to those from long-distance trade is about 2:1), since the real change in Phase 2a may be marked by the appearance of provincial ‘mass goods’. Contradictorily, the period of the Marcomannic Wars does not indicate any significant decline in the find material of Roman origin, the intensification of the relations may be due to the increase in the geopolitical weight of the Sarmatian communities with the arrival of newer Eastern groups. The heyday of Sarmatian–Roman trade mainly covers the period of the Severan Age conjuncture (193–235 AD), and the steady supply of goods is represented by the homogenised composition of imported wares (see the small scale variability but large number of coated bowls: Group IIIIE) and the extensive integration of Roman goods into the Barbarian communities (see the role of provincial brooches and glass beads in Sarmatian costume).

On the basis of the currently published find material, it is problematic to explain the sudden interruption in Sarmatian–Roman trade relations in the second half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD (Phase 2b). Although the imported Roman goods of the period is largely identifiable as transitional types (e.g. coated bowls with conical body), the near-simultaneous disappearance of certain characteristic find groups may indicate a definite breakpoint: see the decline in the import of terra sigillata vessels in the period after 260 AD, and the disappearance of the knee brooches and the so-called ‘Sarmatian-type’ crossbow brooches in the second quarter/middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD. This complex process probably roots in the stagnation of the Pannonian economy after the Severan Age conjuncture, but the purchasing power of the Sarmatian communities may have been permanently reduced by the events of the second half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD, culminating in the surrender of Dacia (270 AD) and the seven imperial expeditions during the Tetrarchy (285–308 AD). The possibility of double/triple dating of the archaeological source material makes it problematic to assess the intensity of interactions in this period.

The normalisation of commercial relations (Phase 3) is presumed at the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD with a completely new range of imported goods, characterised by lead-glazed pottery and various types of glassware. Although the setback in the absolute number of Roman wares compared with earlier periods is undeniable, the homogeneity of the import (e.g. certain types of *mortaria* among the lead-glazed pottery and the predominance of glassware in the form of cups) suggests that the earlier trade relationships still active. The decline in pottery of Roman origin may be explained by the transformation of the provincial

economy itself, as the action ranges of the Late Roman pottery centres in Pannonia in internal trade is also decreasing. Moreover many of the types of vessels they produced have not found their way to Sarmatian markets (e.g. utilitarian vessels of coarse fabric).

### **Results: problematics of the regional characteristic of Sarmatian–Roman interactions**

In addition to the above mentioned chronological framework, another fundamental issue in the study of Sarmatian–Roman commercial relations is the identification of the locations of interaction. Based on the published find material, the role of the Roman border region (*limes* or *ripa*) in the exchange of products is clearly of paramount importance. The phenomenon commonly referred to as ‘*Grenzhandel*’ can be shown to have influenced not only the quantity of imported wares but also their composition (see the appearance of coated plate types at Site Üllő 5–9). Although, the extent of this zone of influence cannot be clearly defined: based on the results of similar research in Slovakia, a border zone 35–40 km wide can be assumed. At the present stage of research, we can only attempt to define the entry points of Roman products into the Sarmatian Barbaricum. However, based on the results of recent excavations, the left bank infrastructure of the Danube (e.g. the fortress at the mouth of the stream Rákos and at the Eskü Square), previously associated with the intensive contact of Phase 2a, is likely to date to the late 3<sup>rd</sup>, or the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD. Accordingly, we should not necessarily expect a permanent military presence on the left bank of the Danube, but it may be that later construction works reinforced these earlier prominent entry points. The fortlets (fortified ports) of the Nógrádverőce type (e.g. *contra Florentiam*) may have been part of the renewed network of connections of Phase 3.

Identifying interaction zones for trade towards the central Barbaricum can be problematic, too. Although the connecting of Roman imported goods to trade routes crossing the Great Hungarian Plain is a topos in the archaeological research of the Sarmatian Barbaricum, distribution maps based on the recent collection of known terra sigillata vessels over a larger area do not indicate a ‘corridor-like’ concentration of the find material, but rather a ‘radial’ concentration of Roman artefacts (with varying densities). Both the aforementioned terra sigillata vessels and the Dressel 24/Zeast 90 amphorae sites show a uniform geographical distribution, which rather than hypothetical routes emphasises the importance of internal trade within Sarmatian communities. The only routes that can be identified as working hypotheses (among the routes that can be drawn, for the most part, exclusively from sources provided by the archaeological material) are those that connect Pannonia and Dacia as directly as possible as part of the infrastructure of Roman interest: these probably are the

Aquincum–Tiszafüred–Porolissum, the Intercisa–Csongrád–Rescolum and the Lugio–Partiscum–Micia routes. The resulting road network supposes a degree of systematic planning (62.5 and 80 km apart, 322–343 km long, running almost parallel to each other), which could not have been influenced by the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD infrastructure (e.g. the *burgus* at Site Hatvan, Gombospuszta or the Nógrádverőce type fortlets).

As described above, we can perhaps assume a more static model of 'long distance trade' (*Fernhandel*) in the Great Hungarian Plain, where, at a theoretical level, sparse infrastructure primarily supports faster-moving services (e.g. courier/postal services, passenger transport), while the role of roads in the exchange of goods is far over-represented in the current literature. The mass movement of products between the provinces (primarily Pannonia to Dacia in this region) could take place through river transportation. Imported goods may have reached the central areas of the Sarmatian Barbaricum in two basic ways: firstly, through the own activities of Sarmatian communities (e.g. visiting periodic fairs even from a greater geographical distance), and secondly, as supplies for Roman installations in the Barbarian territories (e.g. river crossings and perhaps the military camps that secured them).

### **Results: the role of Sarmatian imitations of Roman pottery types in the research of import**

A detailed study of the Barbarian imitations is of great importance for assessing the level of integration of imported Roman pottery within Sarmatian communities. The discussed find material from Site Üllő 5–9 offers a rare opportunity to study the red painted pottery of Sarmatian origin (Group X), since 296 fragments of this vessel type belonging to 254 items could be identified, which were primarily from settlement objects and only 7 cases were placed into burials.

Within the group of Barbarian painted pottery, the direct influence of Roman imported ware can be assumed at several different levels. The most obvious connection to provincial antitypes is shown by the variants of hemispherical bowls with thickened rims (Types X/III.2a1–2) decorated with complex stamped ornamentation (Styles B.1.1–2). Despite the necessary simplification of the production technique (e.g. the use of a field of 1–2 motifs), they are still linked to the basic stylistic features of the terra sigillata vessels of Drag. 37 type. A more indirect Roman influence can be assumed for the plate forms (Types X/I.1a–b), the conical-walled bowls with deep incised lines (Types X/II.1a1–2), the spherical vessels (Type X/V.1a1) and the hemispherical bowls with a single row of stamped decoration (Style B.1.3). The Roman influences in the design of these bowls are combined with the characteristics of

Late Sarmatian pottery traditions (e.g. the groove under the rim). Forms that can be as well documented without a similarly complex surface treatment (subsequent smoothing of the painted surface) (e.g. types of hemispherical and conical-shaped cups/bowls) are closer to the local pottery traditions, while we can also be mention painted vessels groups (e.g. tall, conical-bellied bowls or spherical vessels with a high neck) which, apart from their basic shape, can be considered as being independent of their Roman antitypes. As a working hypothesis, the thin-walled hemispherical cups and biconical vessels (Type X/IV1–2) can be related to the glass vessels with applied decoration, which may indicate the complexity of the meaning of painting. The painted pottery, which appeared earliest in the second half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD, show a demand for popular types of imported pottery (e.g. terra sigillata) during the decline of Sarmatian–Roman trade relations in Phase 2b.



Registry number: DEENK/378/2024.PL  
Subject: PhD Publication List

Candidate: Tamás Szebenyi  
Doctoral School: Doctoral School of History and Ethnology  
MTMT ID: 10059403

### List of publications related to the dissertation

#### Hungarian books (1)

1. Szerk. Bíró, G., Pintér-Nagy, K., **Szebenyi, T.**: Új nemzedék: A szegedi Régészeti Tanszék tehetséggondozásának elmúlt évtizedei. SZTE BTK Régészeti Tanszék, Szeged, 440 p., 2020. (Monográfiák a Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszékéről, ISSN 2062-9877 ; 7.) ISBN: 9789633067338

#### Hungarian book chapters (6)

2. **Szebenyi, T.**: A szarmata Barbaricum településeinek üvegedényei I.: Ecser 7. lelőhely.  
In: Párducz 111 : Konferencia Párducz Mihály (1908-1974) emlékére : A Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszéke által 2019. november 4-én szervezett emlékkonferencia anyaga. Szerk.: Istvánovits Eszter; Kulcsár Valéria, Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszék, Szeged, 65-104, 2020, (Monográfiák a Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszékéről, ISSN 2062-9877 ; 8) ISBN: 9789633067741
3. **Szebenyi, T.**: Pecsételt kerámia Ecser 7. lelőhely szarmata településéről.  
In: Új nemzedék : A szegedi Régészeti Tanszék tehetséggondozásának elmúlt évtizedei : Ünnepi kötet B. Tóth Ágnes, Kulcsár Valéria, Vörös Gabriella és Wolf Mária tiszteletére.  
Szerk.: Bíró Gyöngyvér; Pintér-Nagy Katalin; Szebenyi Tamás, SZTE BTK Régészeti Tanszék, Szeged, 89-120, 2020, (Monográfiák a Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszékéről, ISSN 2062-9877 ; 7.) ISBN: 9789633067338
4. Pelőcz, J., Pillér, P., **Szebenyi, T.**: Rómaiak a Tiszánál: Válogatás a szegedi Régészeti Tanszék gyűjteményének római kori anyagából.  
In: "Azért mégiscsak csinálunk intézetet is, gyűjteményt is..." Válogatás a szegedi egyetem Régészeti Tanszékének leleteiből. Szerk.: Kulcsár Valéria; Pintér-Nagy Katalin, SZTE BTK Régészeti Tanszék, Szeged, 28-31, 2020. ISBN: 9789633067499
5. **Szebenyi, T.**: A római kerámia ritka típusai Üllő 5-9. lelőhely szarmata településén (Spruchbecher és "névbélyeges" edény töredéke a szarmata Barbaricumban).  
In: "Vadrózsából tündérsípot csináltam" Tanulmányok Istvánovits Eszter 60. születésnapjára.  
Szerk.: L. Nagy Márta; L. Szöllősi Katalin, Jósa András Múzeum, Nyíregyháza, 215-222, 2018, (A Jósa András Múzeum kiadványai, ISSN 0133-8110 ; 73) ISBN: 9786155619069





6. **Szebenyi, T.:** Dressel 24/Zeest 90 típusú amphorák Makó-Igási járandó, M43 33. lelőhely szarmata településéről.  
In: Út(on) a kultúrák földjén: Az M43-as autópálya Szeged-országhatár közötti szakasz régészeti feltárásai és a hozzá kapcsolódó vizsgálatok. Szerk.: T. Gábor Szilvia; Czukor Péter, Móra Ferenc Múzeum, Szeged, 325-343, 2017. ISBN: 9789639804562
7. **Szebenyi, T.:** Gyöngykészletek feldolgozásának lehetőségei és nehézségei az EMIR Szarmata Adatbázisában.  
In: Az Egységes Múzeumi Információs Rendszer Szarmata Adatbázisa. Egy tematikus régészeti adatbázis felépítésének és hasznosításának tanulságaiból (Online tanulmánykötet). Szerk.: Istvánovits Eszter, Kulcsár Valéria, [s.n.], Budapest, 56-60, 2017.

Foreign language international book chapters (1)

8. **Szebenyi, T.:** Imitations of Roman Vessels in the Barbaricum: A Case Study on Red Painted Sarmatian Pottery.  
In: The Sarmatians and the Others : Nomadic and Sedentary Cultures in Central and Eastern Europe in the First Half of the 1st Millenium AD. Eds.: Lavinia Grumeza, Victor Cojocaru, Cristina I. Tica, Editura MEGA, Cluj-Napoca, 269-299, 2024, (Pontica et Mediterranea ; 9) ISBN: 9786060207832

Hungarian scientific articles in Hungarian journals (3)

9. Olgyay, J., **Szebenyi, T.:** Római ólommázás kerámia Üllő 5-9. és Ecser 7. lelőhelyeken.  
*Móra Ferenc Múzeum évkönyve.* 5, 23-43, 2018. ISSN: 2064-8480.
10. **Szebenyi, T.,** Fintor, K., Raucsik, B., Bozsó, G., Tóth, M.: Archeometriai vizsgálatok Üllő 5. lelőhelyről származó pecsételt töredékeken.  
*Archeom. Műh.* 11 (1), 39-46, 2014. ISSN: 1786-271X.
11. **Szebenyi, T.:** Pecsételt kerámia Üllő 5. lelőhely szarmata telepéről.  
*Acta iuvenum, Sect. archaeol.* 1, 9-31, 2013. ISSN: 2064-1222.

Foreign language scientific articles in Hungarian journals (1)

12. **Szebenyi, T.:** The Manifestation of Trade Along the Limes in the District of Aquincum Towards the Sarmatian Barbaricum.  
*Hallg. Műhtanulm.* 3, 17-33, 2015. ISSN: 2063-6024.

Foreign language scientific articles in international journals (1)

13. **Szebenyi, T.:** Imports and imitations: stamped pottery in the Sarmatian Barbaricum.  
*Anodos.* 15, 227-236, 2021. ISSN: 1338-5410.





Hungarian conference proceedings (1)

14. **Szebenyi, T.:** Római export vagy barbár import?: Megjegyzések a szarmata-római kereskedelmi kapcsolatok jellegéhez a szarmata Barbaricum területére került kerámialeletek kapcsán.  
In: Tavasz Szél - Spring Wind 2017. Szerk.: Keresztes Gábor, Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége, Budapest, 504-515, 2017. ISBN: 9786155586187

Hungarian abstracts (3)

15. **Szebenyi, T.:** Tipológiai kísérlet egy ritka szarmata kori edénytípuson: a vörösre festett kerámia esete.  
In: "100 éves a szegedi régészképzés". A Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszékének ünnepi rendezvénysorozata és konfeenciája : Rezüméfűzet. Szerk.: Kulcsár Valéria, Pintér-Nagy Katalin, Szebenyi Tamás, Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszék : Dél-alföldi Régészeti Egylet, Szeged, 39, 2024. ISBN: 9789633069844
16. **Szebenyi, T.:** Megjegyzések a szarmata Barbaricum pecsételt kerámiájához az újabb Pest megyei leletek kapcsán.  
In: "Hadak Útján" A népvándorláskor fiatal kutatóinak XXIX. konferenciája. Budapest, 2019. november 15-16.. Szerk.: Sudár Balázs; Türk Attila, PPKE BTK Régészettud. Int. : Martin Opitz K. : BTK MÖT, Budapest, 49-50, 2019. ISBN: 9789639987579
17. **Szebenyi, T.:** Barbaricum pecsételt kerámia Üllő 5-9. lelőhelyen.  
In: XXXI. Országos Tudományos Diákköri Konferencia : Humán Tudományi Szekció. Összefoglalók. Szerk.: Pete László, Debreceni Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Debrecen, 320, 2013. ISBN: 9789633183168

## List of other publications

Hungarian book chapters (1)

18. Tóth, Á. B., Mihácz-Pálfi, A., **Szebenyi, T.:** "Rejtélyes fibulák": régészeti vizsgálatok egy szokatlan tárgycsoport témájában.  
In: Párducz 111 : Konferencia Párducz Mihály (1908-1974) emlékére : A Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszéke által 2019. november 4-én szervezett emlékkonferencia anyaga. Szerk.: Istvánovits Eszter, Kulcsár Valéria, Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszék, Szeged-Nyíregyháza, 177-204, 2020, (Monográfiák a Szegedi Tudományegyetem Régészeti Tanszékéről, ISSN 2062-9877 ; 8) ISBN: 9789633067741





Hungarian scientific articles in Hungarian journals (1)

19. Gyurka, O., **Szebenyi, T.**: Ókori leletek a Debreceni Egyetem Klasszika-filológiai és Ókortörténeti Tanszékének régészeti gyűjteményéből.  
*Tört. tanulm.* 24, 114-135, 2017. ISSN: 1217-4602.

Foreign language scientific articles in international journals (3)

20. Molnár, Z., Németi, J. L., Liviu, M., Szócs, P., Hágó, A. N., Gindele, R., Gyurka, O., **Szebenyi, T.**: Carei, jud. Satu Mare. Punct Bobald: Campania 2019.  
*Cronica cercetărilor arheologice din România*. 2019, 69-70, 2020. ISSN: 2343-919X.
21. Molnár, Z., Németi, J. L., Liviu, M., Szócs, P., Hágó, A. N., Gindele, R., Gyurka, O., **Szebenyi, T.**, Katócz, Z.: Carei, jud. Satu Mare. Punct Bobald: Campania 2018.  
*Cronica cercetărilor arheologice din România*. 2018, 35-37, 2019. ISSN: 2343-919X.
22. Roman, C. A., Nagy, S., Pirooska, E., Tecar, T., Pop, A., Ferenczi, M., Gheorghită, F., Gyurka, O., **Szebenyi, T.**: Luna. Punct: Nod Rutier.  
*Cronica cercetărilor arheologice din România*. 2013, 83-84, 2014. ISSN: 2343-919X.

Hungarian conference proceedings (1)

23. Gyurka, O., **Szebenyi, T.**: Óskori fémtárgyak a Debreceni Egyetem Klasszika-filológiai és Ókortörténeti Tanszékének régészeti gyűjteményéből: Rézkori csákányok.  
In: Tavaszai Szél = Spring Wind 2019 : Tanulmánykötet. III. kötet. Szerk.: Bihari Erika; Molnár Dániel; Szikszai-Németh Ketrin, Doktoranduszok Országos Szövetsége, Budapest, 699-705, 2020. ISBN: 9786155586620

Informational/educational articles (2)

24. **Szebenyi, T.**: Variációk egy témára - Gondolatok a szarmata-római kapcsolatfelvétel természetéről.  
*Határtalan régészet*. 9 (2), 16-19, 2024. ISSN: 2416-3074.
25. **Szebenyi, T.**, Gyurka, O.: Az antikvitás emlékei egy elfeledett egyetemi gyűjteményben.  
*Határtalan régészet*. 3 (3), 84-86, 2018. ISSN: 2416-3074.

The Candidate's publication data submitted to the iDEa Tudóstér have been validated by DEENK on the basis of the Journal Citation Report (Impact Factor) database.



21 June, 2024