

Origin of Ugrians

Subjects: **Genetics & Heredity**

Contributor: Tibor Török

Both genetic and archaeological data indicate the admixture of the Mezhovskaya population with northern forest hunters in the late Bronze Age, which gave rise to a “proto-Ugric” community. This finding is consistent with the linguistic reconstruction of the proto-Ugric language. Genetic data indicate an admixture of proto-Hungarians with early Sarmatians and early Huns, and the first admixture can be reconciled with the formation of the Gorokhovo culture and its integration into the early Sarmatian Prokhorovka culture, while the second admixture corresponds to the transformation of the Sargat and Sarmatian cultures due to Xiongnu invasions.

conquering Hungarians

Sargat

Gorokhovo

1. Introduction

Since the emergence of the ancient DNA field, one of the main ambitions of researchers has been the integration of linguistic, archaeological and genetic data, in order to link language and population histories ^[1]. Recently, this multidisciplinary approach brought about real breakthroughs by unravelling the origin of the Indo-European ^[2] and Transeurasian ^[3] languages. The collaboration of researchers from these three different scientific fields successfully identified the homelands of ancestral languages as well as the archaeological cultures responsible for dispersing the daughter language subfamilies.

Although for the Uralic languages such a comprehensive synthesis is not yet available, last year the linguistic synthesis of Grünthal et al. ^[4] and the ancient DNA genome data of Maróti et al. ^[5] shed new light on the history of ancient Uralic speakers, which opens the door to inspect the correlation between the linguistic, genetic and archaeological inferences. The present overview is confined to the Ugric subgroup of Uralic-speakers.

According to the traditional view, established with the comparative linguistic method, the Uralic languages descended from a common proto-language, which was progressively split into daughter branches ^[6]. The Ugric branch consists of Hungarian and Ob-Ugric, the latter is represented by the Khanty and Mansi languages. Most linguistic analyses support the genealogical relatedness of the Ugric group, with a phylogenetic split into Hungarian and Ob-Ugric ^[7], while some data signify a closer link of Hungarian to Mansi ^[8]. A recent study revealed fairly good concordances between the genetic and linguistic distances measured between modern Uralic speakers, suggesting co-dispersion of genes and languages ^[9]. Uralic-speaking groups were shown to share a distinct, Nganasan-like genomic ancestry component originating from Siberia, with Hungarians being an exception.

2. Population History of the Carpathian Basin

Modern Hungarians stand out as linguistically isolated in Europe, despite their genetic similarity to the surrounding populations ^{[10][11]}. This paradox calls for an explanation, as the co-dispersion of genes and languages is typically observed ^{[12][13][14][15]}, even among groups speaking Uralic languages ^[9]. The Hungarian language is attributed to the immigrant conquering Hungarians, believed to be the descendants of a hypothetical proto-Ugric people ^[16]. Although historical sources report the settlement of various groups of Asian origin in the Carpathian Basin, such as Huns, Avars, Pechenegs, Jazyg people, and Cumans, in addition to the conquering Hungarians, the proportion of Asian genome components in present-day Hungarians does not exceed 4% ^[17]. This can be attributed to two factors. Firstly, the foundational population carrying the common European gene pool remained in a significant majority throughout the migratory periods in the Carpathian Basin ^[5]. Secondly, following the devastations caused by the Mongol and Turkish invasions, settlers from other parts of Europe played a significant role in establishing the modern genetic makeup of the Carpathian Basin ^[18]. This common European gene-pool was formed by the Bronze Age through the admixture of three sources: Western Hunter-Gatherers, the first *Homo sapiens sapiens* appearing in Paleolithic Europe, Neolithic farmers originating from Anatolia, and Yamnaya steppe migrants that arrived in the late Neolithic to early Bronze Age ^{[19][20]}.

This common European gene pool, also characteristic of the Carpathian Basin, has been overlaid by migration waves originating from the east since the Iron Age. During the 9th century BCE, smaller groups of pre-Scythians (Cimmerians) of the Mezőcsát culture appeared, and the single analyzed genome from their scarce findings contained Asian elements ^[21]. The classic Scythian culture spread across the Great Hungarian Plain between the late 7th–early 6th century BCE, but their currently available genetic data represent the genetic profile of the local European population ^[22]. From 50 CE the Sarmatians arrived in multiple waves, leaving a significant archaeological heritage behind. However, the 17 Sarmatian individuals genetically examined also appear to belong to the genetic legacy of the local European population ^[23].

Subsequently, during the Migration Period, a substantial number of peoples arrived from the East, including the Huns (400–453 AD), Avars (568–822), and the Magyars of the Hungarian Conquest (862–905 AD). The Huns left little trace during their brief presence, but the military leadership of the European Huns seems to have descended from the Asian Huns (Xiongnu), while the majority of them consisted of subjugated Germanic and Sarmatian populations ^[5]. The most significant influx of genes from Asia clearly occurred during the Avar period, arriving in multiple waves. The ruling elite of the Avars originated from the Rouran Empire in Mongolia ^[23], but a significant portion of the masses they brought in consisted of mixed-origin populations that had emerged in the Pontic-Caspian steppe during the Hunnic era ^[5].

The conquering Hungarians exerted the most enduring political and cultural impact on the region, as their descendants from the ruling elite established the Hungarian state. Initial studies of uniparental lineages revealed the presence of approximately 30% Eastern Eurasian components in both sexes of the immigrant elite ^{[5][24][25][26][27]}, while the commoner population appears to have carried the overlaid local European gene pool from previous eastern immigrations ^[28]. The genome data of this population is described in the following section.

3. Genome Data

Because of the careful sampling, large sample size and high-resolution genome analysis, the latest genetic study could reconstruct the population history of the Huns, Avars and conquering Hungarians of the Carpathian Basin with fairly great accuracy [5]. As the subject of the present survey is confined to the Hungarians who immigrated in the Carpathian Basin during the 10th–11th centuries CE, here I will give a short summary of the major findings related to this group.

From the analysis of 113 genomes from the 10th–11th century ancient Hungarians, researchers could identify first generation immigrants (the actual conquerors), native residents and subsequent admixed progenies of these two groups. As expected, most of the locals, with principally European genomes, were buried in large “village” cemeteries of the common people, while most of the immigrants, with eastern genome components, were buried in the small “camp” cemeteries of the contemporary elite. Though the immigrants were assembled from genetically diverse sources, their predominant component originated from a single, genetically well-defined source, referred to as “Conqueror Asia Core” (Conq_Asia_Core), whose ancestors once lived around northern Kazakhstan, between the Ural and Altai regions. Twelve individuals carried this component in a pure form, without recent European admixture, and they belonged to the elite according to the archaeological assessment. Elite status is indicated by jewelry, clothing ornaments, partial horse burial, horse-riding equipment and weaponry. A substantial part of the studied population carried the Conq_Asia_Core component in an admixed form.

Based on F3-statistics, F4-statistics and qpAdm models, the Conq_Asia_Core had a common evolutionary history with the ancestors of Mansis, the closest language relatives of modern Hungarians, and their common ancestors belonged to a single “proto-Ugric” population. It is also shown that this proto-Ugric community originated from the admixture of the Mezhovskaya population with ancestors of modern Nganasans in the late Bronze Age. The Mezhovskaya population had been shown to derive from the Andronovo population with some East Asian admixture [19], and could be qpAdm-modelled from 74% Srubnaya, 18% Nganasan and 8% Ancient North Eurasian (ANE) components [29]. As modelled Mansis from 48% Mezhovskaya, 44% Nganasan and 8% ANE, it follows that the proto-Ugric gene pool emerged from the further influx of the same, or very similar East Asian population in the Mezhovskaya territory that shaped the Mezhovskaya itself from the Andronovo substrate.

The Conq_Asia_Core genome could be qpAdm-modelled from 50% Mansi, 35% early Sarmatian and 15% Xiongnu/Hun ancestries. The Sarmatian admixture was dated between 643–431 BCE, while the Hun admixture was dated between 217–315 CE with the DATES algorithm. The Mansis did not take part in these admixture processes, indicating that they must have separated from the ancestors of Conq_Asia_Core before 643–431 BCE, in the early Iron Age, and in isolation conserved their proto-Ugric gene pool. I will refer to the theoretical ancestral population of Conq_Asia_Core, which separated from the Mansis as proto-Hungarian.

4. Consistency of Genetic and Linguistic Data

Linguists have reconstructed a “common Ugric” proto-language [30], which could be spoken by a genetically reconstructed “proto-Ugric” community. The divergence of the Ugric linguistic clade into Hungarian and Ob-Ugric

was estimated to have occurred between 3421–745 BCE ^[31] and its upper bond is within the range of an Iron Age separation inferred from genetic data.

Using linguistic, paleoclimatic and archaeological data Grünthal et al., 2022 ^[4] reconstructed the most likely origin and spread of the Uralic-speaking populations. The authors have taken into account and thoroughly discussed all available linguistic data and models to create their newest model that fits the data the best and is the least contradictory. They located the Uralic homeland in Western Siberia, specifically around the Minusinsk Basin. Early Uralic-speaking groups are believed to have spread relatively quickly westward with the Seima-Turbino phenomenon, which occurred in the early Bronze Age and followed the rivers in the forest-steppe zone. The Seima-Turbino archaeological complex is notable for its high-quality tin-bronze artifacts, whose tin source was derived from the Altai. The authors argue that Uralic speakers played a crucial role in the transportation of metal from the Altai and Sayan mines. Furthermore, they assert that Uralic speakers actively engaged in various occupations, such as prospecting, mining, boating, and trade management, within the trading posts that were established at significant river confluences. These trading posts facilitated commerce between Uralic-speaking groups and their Indo-Iranian-speaking neighbors.

An important implication of the model is that the archaeological cultures appearing in the Seima-Turbino zone in later periods were supposedly Uralic-speaking. The original Ugric range is predicted to have been east of the Urals, south of the forest zone and not far from the steppe. This implies that the middle Bronze Age Cherkaskul culture (18th–16th centuries BCE), and its late Bronze Age successor Mezhovskaya (13th–7th centuries BCE), Suzgun and Irmen (14th–10th centuries BCE) cultures were most likely proto-Ugric-speaking.

The model of Grünthal et al., 2022 ^[4] implicitly upholds previous assumptions ^{[32][33]}, that the Iron Age descendants of the aforementioned cultures: the Itkul (7th–3rd centuries BCE), Gorokhovo (6th–3rd centuries BCE), and Sargat (6th century BCE–4th century CE), were most likely also Ugric-speaking. Despite the previous controversies and uncertainties surrounding the exact location of the Uralic homeland, there has been a consensus that the Proto-Ugric languages can be linked to the Bronze Age Mezhovskaya culture and the Iron Age Sargat-Gorokhovo cultures, primarily due to their geographical proximity to the present-day territories of the Mansi and Khanty languages, as well as their nomadic archaeological heritage. The presence of numerous equestrian terms in the Ugric languages indicated that Ugric speakers had a strong association with horsemanship in ancient times ^[33].

5. Consistency of Genetic and Archaeological Data

Archaeological data indicate that during the late Bronze Age, forest hunter Lozva-Atlym immigrants arrived in the Mezhovskaya territory from the northern Ob-Irtis region ^[34]. This finding closely parallels the genetically detected Mezhovskaya-proto-Nganasan admixture. Unfortunately, researchers currently lack DNA data from the Lozva-Atlym population to confirm this assumption. By the Iron Age the Lozva-Atlym descendants were already living among the members of the Mezhovskaya-descendant Itkul culture, and their archaeological remains are known as Gamayun ^[35], researchers have a single published Itkul genome (MJ-42) dated to 793–541 BCE ^[36] which indeed gave valid 3-source qpAdm models for Conq_Asia_Core, if supplemented with Sarmatian and East Asian sources

(Maróti et al. unpublished), suggesting that the Itkul could be a potential Iron Age source population of Conq_Asia_Core.

Archaeological data indicate that in the 8th century BCE the Itkul bronze metalworkers suffered an even more determining impact from the south, as they were gradually integrated into the steppe societies of the Saka and Sarmatian tribes. This integration led to the formation of the Gorokhovo culture (6th–3rd centuries BCE), which was culturally and likely politically linked to the southern nomadic tribal confederations [35]. The early Sarmatians are associated with the Prokhorovka culture (500–300 BCE), which formed in the southern Urals, above the Aral and Caspian Seas, and was adjacent to the Tasmola culture (7th–3rd centuries BCE) of the Saka people. Surprisingly, these culturally related neighboring nomadic groups were genetically different, as the Sarmatian genomes harbored higher European components [37].

A similar integration happened east of the Gorokhovo, at the Tobol-Isim-Irtis region, where the Sargat culture (6th century BCE–4th century CE), the Iron Age successor of the Irmen, was fully integrated into the Scythian-Saka nomadic societies [35]. There are 18 published genomes from the Sargat material, which is genetically quite heterogeneous [37]. I would like to remind the reader once again that the Sargat people have been considered to be the ancestors of Hungarians [32][33][38] because of their nomadic grave goods and linguistically expected location. Indeed, the Sargat genome structure was the most similar to that of the Conq_Asia_Core in admixture analysis [5].

This conclusion also fits with the latest archaeological and anthropological indications. According to archaeological findings, anthropological types and geographical location, it is highly probable that the Gorokhovo culture is more closely related to the pre-Hungarian heritage than the Sargat culture [39]. Anthropological differences between the Sargat and Gorokhovo populations [40] align with genetic data. The Gorokhovo people migrated to the European side of the southern Urals during the 4th–3rd centuries BCE and merged into the early Sarmatian Prokhorovka culture [40][41], which is consistent with the roughly 40% Sarmatian admixture detected genetically in Conq_Asia_Core. While the genetic admixture was dated slightly earlier (643–431 BCE), the early Itkul–Sarmatian integration may explain this discrepancy. Overall, the archaeological, anthropological, and indirect genetic evidence supports the idea that the Gorokhovo culture is the most likely direct ancestor of Conq_Asia_Core. However, the lack of Gorokhovo DNA data currently prevents any conclusive genetic proof.

If the Gorokhovo culture can be traced back to the ancestors of the Conq_Asia_Core, it is likely that they experienced a significant cultural influence from the nomadic Sarmatians, who spoke an Iranian language. This influence is supported by the presence of Iranian loanwords in the Hungarian language [42]. Iranian cultural influences can also be identified in various cultural aspects, including jewelry, clothing adornments, burial customs, metalworking, and the distinct nomadic structure of the conquering Hungarian society. During the Sargat–Gorokhovo period, the archaeological record indicates the existence of a contiguous, massive Ugric-speaking block east of the Urals, living in complex hierarchical nomadic societies. The Gorokhovo and Sargat were interrelated, and the latter seem to have controlled the northern branch of the Silk Road [35], importing goods from Fergana, Bactria, Chorasmia, China and the Xiongnu world. At the height of their power in the 4th–2nd centuries

BCE, the Sargat expanded westwards, incorporating the Gorokhovo territories, which could have triggered the Gorokhovo migration.

The archaeological record indicates that between the 2nd–4th centuries CE both the Sargat and Sarmatian cultures underwent a significant transformation due to the invading Xiongnu. Archaeologist Sergei Botalov proposed the existence of a Hunno-Sarmatian mixed culture near the Urals during this time ^{[43][44]}, which is believed to be the forerunner of the European Huns. In this context it is relevant to note that researchers have detected genetic relations between the Xiongnu and European Huns, as well as Sarmatian genomes among the Huns ^[5]. Genetic studies have also demonstrated the presence of Xiongnu and European Hun populations in the Ural region. For example, the genome of the Kazakhstan_Nomad_Hun_Sarmatian individual, which was excavated in the southern Urals and dated to 330–530 CE, can be traced back to Mongolian Xiongnu ^[22]. Another sample, the Kurayly_Hun_380CE, was excavated southwest of the above, and belonged to a European Hun elite warrior ^[37].

References

1. Cavalli-Sforza, L.L.; Piazza, A.; Menozzi, P.; Mountain, J. Reconstruction of human evolution: Bringing together genetic, archaeological, and linguistic data. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 1988, 85, 6002–6006.
2. Lazaridis, I.; Alpaslan-Roodenberg, S.; Acar, A.; Açıkkol, A.; Agelarakis, A.; Aghikyan, L.; Akyüz, U.; Andreeva, D.; Andrijašević, G.; Antonović, D.; et al. The genetic history of the Southern Arc: A bridge between West Asia and Europe. *Science* 2022, 377, eabm4247.
3. Robbeets, M.; Bouckaert, R.; Conte, M.; Savelyev, A.; Li, T.; An, D.I.; Shinoda, K.-i.; Cui, Y.; Kawashima, T.; Kim, G.; et al. Triangulation supports agricultural spread of the Transeurasian languages. *Nature* 2021, 599, 616–621.
4. Grünthal, R.; Heyd, V.; Holopainen, S.; Janhunen, J.A.; Khanina, O.; Miestamo, M.; Nichols, J.; Saarikivi, J.; Sinnemäki, K. Drastic demographic events triggered the Uralic spread. *Diachronica* 2022, 39, 490–524.
5. Maróti, Z.; Neparácski, E.; Schütz, O.; Maár, K.; Varga, G.I.B.; Kovács, B.; Kalmár, T.; Nyerki, E.; Nagy, I.; Latinovics, D.; et al. The genetic origin of Huns, Avars, and conquering Hungarians. *Curr. Biol.* 2022, 32, 2858–2870.
6. Korhonen, M. *Johdatus Lapin Kielen Historiaan (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia)*; Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura: Helsinki, Finland, 1981; ISBN 951-717-248-6.
7. Syrjänen, K.; Honkola, T.; Korhonen, K.; Lehtinen, J.; Vesakoski, O.; Wahlberg, N. Shedding more light on language classification using basic vocabularies and phylogenetic methods. *Diachronica* 2013, 30, 323–352.

8. Janhunen, J. Reconstructing Pre-Proto-Uralic typology: Spanning the millennia of linguistic evolution. In *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Pars I: Orationes Plenariae & Orationes Publicae*; Aaspõllu, A., Palo, T., Seilenthal, T., Eds.; Eesti Fennougristide Komitee: Tartu, Estonia, 2000; Volume 1, pp. 59–76.
9. Tambets, K.; Yunusbayev, B.; Hudjashov, G.; Ilumäe, A.M.; Rootsi, S.; Honkola, T.; Vesakoski, O.; Atkinson, Q.; Skoglund, P.; Kushniarevich, A.; et al. Genes reveal traces of common recent demographic history for most of the Uralic-speaking populations. *Genome Biol.* 2018, 19, 139.
10. Lahermo, P.; Laitinen, V.; Sistonen, P.; Béres, J.; Karcagi, V.; Savontaus, M.L. MtDNA polymorphism in the Hungarians: Comparison to three other Finno-Ugric-speaking populations. *Hereditas* 2000, 132, 35–42.
11. Lazaridis, I.; Patterson, N.; Mitnik, A.; Renaud, G.; Mallick, S.; Sudmant, P.H.; Schraiber, J.G.; Castellano, S.; Kirsanow, K.; Economou, C.; et al. Ancient human genomes suggest three ancestral populations for present-day Europeans. *Nature* 2014, 513, 409–413.
12. Barbujani, G.; Sokal, R.R. Zones of sharp genetic change in Europe are also linguistic boundaries. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 1990, 87, 1816–1819.
13. Baker, J.L.; Rotimi, C.N.; Shriner, D. Human ancestry correlates with language and reveals that race is not an objective genomic classifier. *Sci. Rep.* 2017, 7, 1572.
14. Creanza, N.; Ruhlen, M.; Pemberton, T.J.; Rosenberg, N.A.; Feldman, M.W.; Ramachandran, S. A comparison of worldwide phonemic and genetic variation in human populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2015, 112, 1265–1272.
15. Chen, J.; Sokal, R.R.; Ruhlen, M. Worldwide Analysis of Genetic and Linguistic Relationships of Human Populations. *Hum. Biol.* 1995, 67, 595–612.
16. Róna-Tas, A. Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages: An Introduction to Early Hungarian History; Central European University Press: Budapest, Hungary, 1999; ISBN 963-9116-48-3.
17. Hellenthal, G.; Busby, G.B.J.; Band, G.; Wilson, J.F.; Capelli, C.; Falush, D.; Myers, S. A genetic atlas of human admixture history. *Science* 2014, 343, 747–751.
18. Kocsis, K. Contribution to the Background of the Ethnic Conflicts in the Carpathian Basin. *GeoJournal* 1994, 32, 425–433.
19. Allentoft, M.E.; Sikora, M.; Sjögren, K.-G.; Rasmussen, S.; Rasmussen, M.; Stenderup, J.; Damgaard, P.B.; Schroeder, H.; Ahlström, T.; Vinner, L.; et al. Population genomics of Bronze Age Eurasia. *Nature* 2015, 522, 167–172.
20. Haak, W.; Lazaridis, I.; Patterson, N.; Rohland, N.; Mallick, S.; Llamas, B.; Brandt, G.; Nordenfelt, S.; Harney, E.; Stewardson, K.; et al. Massive migration from the steppe was a source for Indo-

- European languages in Europe. *Nature* 2015, 522, 207–211.
21. Gamba, C.; Jones, E.R.; Teasdale, M.D.; McLaughlin, R.L.; Gonzalez-Fortes, G.; Mattiangeli, V.; Domboróczki, L.; Kővári, I.; Pap, I.; Anders, A.; et al. Genome flux and stasis in a five millennium transect of European prehistory. *Nat. Commun.* 2014, 5, 5257.
 22. Damgaard, P.D.B.; Marchi, N.; Rasmussen, S.; Peyrot, M.; Renaud, G.; Korneliussen, T.; Moreno-Mayar, J.V.; Pedersen, M.W.; Goldberg, A.; Usmanova, E.; et al. 137 ancient human genomes from across the Eurasian steppes. *Nature* 2018, 557, 369–374.
 23. Gneecchi-Ruscione, G.A.; Szécsényi-Nagy, A.; Koncz, I.; Csiky, G.; Rácz, Z.; Rohrlach, A.B.; Brandt, G.; Rohland, N.; Csáky, V.; Cheronet, O.; et al. Ancient genomes reveal origin and rapid trans-Eurasian migration of 7th century Avar elites. *Cell* 2022, 185, 1402–1413.e21.
 24. Tömöry, G.; Csányi, B.; Bogácsi-Szabó, E.; Kalmár, T.; Czibula, Á.; Csősz, A.; Priskin, K.; Mende, B.; Langó, P.; Downes, C.S.; et al. Comparison of maternal lineage and biogeographic analyses of ancient and modern Hungarian populations. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 2007, 134, 354–368.
 25. Csősz, A.; Szécsényi-Nagy, A.; Csákyová, V.; Langó, P.; Bódis, V.; Köhler, K.; Tömöry, G.; Nagy, M.; Mende, B.G. Maternal Genetic Ancestry and Legacy of 10th Century AD Hungarians. *Sci. Rep.* 2016, 6, 33446.
 26. Neparácski, E.; Maróti, Z.; Kalmár, T.; Maár, K.; Nagy, I.; Latinovics, D.; Kustár, Á.; Pálfi, G.; Molnár, E.; Marcsik, A.; et al. Y-chromosome haplogroups from Hun, Avar and conquering Hungarian period nomadic people of the Carpathian Basin. *Sci. Rep.* 2019, 9, 16569.
 27. Neparácski, E.; Maróti, Z.; Kalmár, T.; Kocsy, K.; Maár, K.; Bihari, P.; Nagy, I.; Fóthi, E.; Pap, I.; Kustár, Á.; et al. Mitogenomic data indicate admixture components of Central-Inner Asian and Srubnaya origin in the conquering Hungarians. *PLoS ONE* 2018, 13, e0205920.
 28. Maár, K.; Varga, G.I.B.; Kovács, B.; Schütz, O.; Maróti, Z.; Kalmár, T.; Nyerki, E.; Nagy, I.; Latinovics, D.; Tihanyi, B.; et al. Maternal Lineages from 10–11th Century Commoner Cemeteries of the Carpathian Basin. *Genes* 2021, 12, 460.
 29. Jeong, C.; Balanovsky, O.; Lukianova, E.; Kahbatkyzy, N.; Flegontov, P.; Zaporozhchenko, V.; Immel, A.; Wang, C.C.; Ixan, O.; Khussainova, E.; et al. The genetic history of admixture across inner Eurasia. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 2019, 3, 966–976.
 30. Honti, L. Ugrilainen kantakieli—Erheellinen vai reaalinen hypoteesi? In *Oekeeta Asijoo: Commentationes Fenno—Ugricae in Honorem Seppo Suhonen Sexagenarii*; Grünthal, R., Laakso, J., Eds.; Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia: Helsinki, Finland, 1998; pp. 176–187. ISBN 952-5150-15-1.
 31. Honkola, T.; Vesakoski, O.; Korhonen, K.; Lehtinen, J.; Syrjänen, K.; Wahlberg, N. Cultural and climatic changes shape the evolutionary history of the Uralic languages. *J. Evol. Biol.* 2013, 26, 1244–1253.

32. Fodor, I. The Hungarian conquest. In *The Ancient Hungarians*; Fodor, I., Ed.; Hungarian National Museum: Budapest, Hungary, 1996; pp. 13–18. ISBN 963-9046-05-1.
33. Parpola, A. Formation of the Indo-European and Uralic language families in the light of archaeology: Revised and integrated “total” correlations. In *Linguistic Map of Prehistoric North Europe*; Grünthal, R., Kallio, P., Eds.; Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne; Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura: Helsinki, Finland, 2013; pp. 119–184. ISBN 978-952-5667-42-4.
34. Zimina, O.; Anoshko, O. Historic and Cultural Situation at the Turn of the Bronze and Iron Ages in the Trans-Urals. *Teor. Prakt. Arkheologicheskikh Issled.* 2021, 33, 24–42.
35. Koryakova, L.; Epimakhov, A.V. *The Urals and Western Siberia in the Bronze and Iron Ages*; Yoffee, N., Ed.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, NY, USA, 2007; ISBN 978-0-521-82928-1.
36. Järve, M.; Saag, L.; Scheib, C.L.; Pathak, A.K.; Montinaro, F.; Pagani, L.; Flores, R.; Guellil, M.; Saag, L.; Tambets, K.; et al. Shifts in the Genetic Landscape of the Western Eurasian Steppe Associated with the Beginning and End of the Scythian Dominance. *Curr. Biol.* 2019, 29, 2430–2441.e10.
37. Gneccchi-Ruscione, G.A.; Khussainova, E.; Kahbatkyzy, N.; Musralina, L.; Spyrou, M.A.; Bianco, R.A.; Radzeviciute, R.; Martins, N.F.G.; Freund, C.; Iksan, O.; et al. Ancient genomic time transect from the Central Asian Steppe unravels the history of the Scythians. *Sci. Adv.* 2021, 7, 4414–4440.
38. Erdélyi, I.; Benkő, M. The Sargatka Culture and the Huns. *J. Eurasian Stud.* 2015, 7, 17–31.
39. Matveeva, N.P. The Sargat and Gorokhov cultures: Historical fates. Early Iron Age of the West Siberian forest-steppe according to archaeological data. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Magyar Symposium on Archaeology, Budapest, Hungary, 6–10 June 2016*; *Studia ad Archaeologiam Pazmaniensia*: Budapest, Hungary, 2018; pp. 15–34, ISBN 978-963-9987-35-7.
40. Sleptsova, A.V. The origins of the population of Western Siberia in the Early Iron Age according to odontological data. *Bull. Archeol. Anthropol. Ethnogr.* 2021, 3, 163–175.
41. Matveeva, N.P. Migrations from western Siberia to Europe in the early Iron Age and the Migration Period. In *Archaeology of the Eurasian Steppes*; Sitdikov, A.G., Ed.; Tatarstan Academy of Sciences: Kazan, Russia, 2018; pp. 150–156.
42. Abondolo, D.M. *The Uralic Languages*; Abondolo, D.M., Ed.; Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA, 1998; ISBN 978-0-415-41264-3.
43. Botalov, S.G.; Gutsalov, S. *Hunno-Sarmatians of the Ural-Kazakh Steppes; Riphean: Čeljabinsk, Russia, 2000*; ISBN 5-88521-149-3.

44. Symonenko, O. On the problem of the “Huns-Sarmatians”. In *Anabasis 3/2012, Studia Classica et Orientalia, Studies in Memory of V. M. Masson*; Olbrycht, M.J., Ed.; University of Rzeszów: Rzeszów, Poland, 2012; pp. 289–303.
-

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/108005>