Early Hungarian history, better known as Hungarian prehistory, is a research area with scarce written sources. Consequently, archaeology, as a scientific discipline boasting a rapidly increasing number of sources, may acquire significant importance in this area. This is a fact even if from a methodological perspective, the historical and ethnic assessment of archaeological findings must satisfy much stricter criteria than before. To arrive at a reliable historical interpretation, we would need to be familiar with the ethnic identity of the original owners of the archaeological findings as well as with their political affiliation, which obviously surpasses the scope of archaeology. Nevertheless, thorough knowledge about the contemporary, significant archaeological differences between the Eastern European grassy and forest steppes, forest regions, and the microregions of the former makes it possible to research migration with traditional archaeological methods. Completing our investigation with natural scientific methods, we may have a lot more to say about these matters than our predecessors. For archaeology, the fundamental question about the early Hungarian history has remained the same to this day: from the archaeological findings of the territory stretching from the Urals to the Carpathian Basin, i.e. west of the Western Siberian proto-homeland hypothesized earlier based on linguistic arguments, what links can be made to the early medieval ancestors of Hungarians? Or in other words, can the location of the individual settlement areas – hypothesized on the basis of the written sources – be confirmed in light of the more recent archaeological findings? Moreover, do the origins and the system of relations of the findings from the Age of the Conquest direct researchers primarily towards the east, and if yes, to what extent? To answer these questions, two research methodologies have essentially been developed in the course of over 100 years. One of them proceeds from the Urals towards the Carpathians, referred to as the linear method, while the retrospective method takes the 10th-century heritage of the Carpathian Basin as a point of reference and guides the researchers in finding the Eastern European antecedents. In my article, I will go over the latest archaeological findings based on the latter.
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Nowadays it is a scientific fact, that there are only a few written sources on the history of the ancient Hungarians. At the same time, archaeology – a discipline with a dynamically growing corpus of finds – plays a key role in this field of research (Fodor, 2012, pp. 125-146). This holds true even if the methodological criteria for the historical assessment of archaeological finds and their cultural contexts have become much stricter, especially regarding the ethnic attribution of archaeological assemblages (Bálint, 1994, pp. 39-46; 1999, pp13-16). For archaeology, the fundamental question about early Hungarian history has been the same to this day: from the archaeological findings of the territory stretching from the Urals to the Carpathian Basin, i.e. west of the Western Siberian proto-homeland hypothesized earlier based on linguistic arguments, what links can be made to the early medieval ancestors of Hungarians? (Türk, 2014, pp.19-30). Or to put it differently, can the location of the individual settlement areas – hypothesized on the basis of the written sources – be confirmed in light of the more recent archaeological finds? Moreover, do the origins and the system of relations of the finds from the Age of the Conquest point primarily towards the east and if yes, to what extent? (Fodor, 1994, pp. 47-65). To answer these questions, two research methodologies have essentially been developed over little more than the past 100 years or so. One of them proceeds from the Urals towards the Carpathians, referred to as the linear method, while the other takes the 10th-century heritage of the Carpathian Basin as a point of reference and guides the researchers in finding the Eastern European antecedents – this is the retrospective method (Langó, 2007; Türk, 2012, pp. 3-28).

One of the greatest difficulties in research on the ancient Hungarians is the overview, filtering and interpretation of the rich corpus of early medieval archaeological finds from the vast region between the Urals and the Carpathian Basin (Pósta, 1905; Bálint, 1989, pp. 44-73; Fodor, 1993, pp. 17-38; Fodor, 1994; 2009; Erdélyi, 2008). The linguistic, palaeoenvironmental and archaeological record, and the ethnography of the population groups living in the area all
suggested that the emergence of the ancient Hungarians could be located to western Siberia, also called the Hungarians' ancestral homeland (Fodor, 2006, pp. 89-114). During the long migration to the Carpathian Basin, the ancient Hungarians lived in various regions, where they encountered and came into contact with many different peoples. Three of the known settlement territories mentioned in the written sources have been studied in more detail: Magna Hungaria, Levedia and Etelköz (Тюрк, 2016, c. 268-272).

In the past decade, the archaeological research of early Hungarian history took a huge leap forward thanks to the new early medieval finds recovered in the region of the River Dniester and the Ural Mountains (Комар, 2008, c. 214–216; Komar, 2011, c. 21-78). From the aspect of archaeological methodology, we can confirm that this group of finds and archaeological phenomena appears to be related to the 10th century material culture of the Carpathian Basin. Such connections have only been established in the South Russian forest and partly grassy steppes, in the region of the Volga elbow of Samara and the Southern Urals.

A handful of eminent Russian, Ukrainian and Moldavian archaeologists, who were familiar with the archaeological material of the Hungarian Conquest period (the 10th-century material in the Carpathian Basin), noted the possible relevance of certain find assemblages to ancient Hungarian history (Иванов, 1999; 2015; Рыбцева, Рабинович, 2007, c. 195-230; Стацишенко, 2009, с. 228–229) and also pointed out the possible cultural contacts in their publications. However, a secure identification requires an archaeological database (Komar, 2013, c. 182-231) covering the entire range of archaeological assemblages and their local cultural contacts with a firm chronological grounding to which the new Hungarian Conquest period assemblages from the Carpathian Basin and the new east european finds can be compared (Fodor, 2009a, pp. 163–171).

The Hungarian Conquest is traditionally dated to 895, but in addition to the data of the written sources, certain archaeological finds also seem to have confirmed recently that the material culture of the Conquest period had appeared earlier in the Carpathian Basin. An indication of that, for instance, is the radiocarbon dating of the graves of a few armed men buried separately (for example near Szeged: Türk et al. 2015). If new discoveries could be added to this group of finds, that will be yet another argument in support of the hypothesis that the Conquest did not take place over one or two years, but that it should be regarded as a historical process lasting for several decades, closed by the battle of Pozsony in 907 (Mesterházy, 1993, pp. 270–311; Révész 1996; Révész, 2003, pp. 338–346).

Archaeological research on the ancient Hungarians is, understandably, inextricably bound up with the 10th-centuries heritage period archaeology of the Carpathian Basin. This is hardly surprising, given that the Hungarian Conquest period is the indispensable reference point for the two basic research designs in studies on the ancient Hungarians, namely the linear (from the Urals to the Carpathians) and the retrospective (the search for earlier eastern parallels starting from the 10th century assemblages of the Carpathian Basin) (Fodor 1975; Révész, 1998, pp. 523-532; Langó, 2007). The archaeological record nowadays clearly indicates that the antecedents to the 10th century find assemblages of the Carpathian Basin can be found in the earlier, 9th-century material of Eastern Europe. While it is now clear that the proportion of eastern find types in the Hungarian Conquest period material is not as high as was assumed a few decades ago, we also know of find assemblages leading all the way to the Urals that were deposited in the 10 century, i.e. after the generally accepted date of the Hungarian Conquest (AD 895), which are thus roughly contemporaneous with the Hungarian Conquest period material from the Carpathian Basin.

Interestingly enough, these finds occur almost exclusively in the regions that can be considered as the possible settlement territories of the ancient Hungarians. The mapping of these finds and their historical and archaeological assessment is at least as important as of the relevant eastern analogous finds that can be dated before 895. In the case of a few assemblages, mostly stray finds, there is no way of telling whether these were deposited before or after 895. This problem, which can hardly be resolved using conventional archaeological methods based on the formal similarities or dissimilarities of various artefact types, again underscores the need for the widespread application of archaeometric analyses such as radiocarbon dating (Türk, 2010; Türk et al. 2015). On the other hand in the case of archaeogenetic studies, mtDNA and Y chromosome analyses can shed light on ancient population lineages (Csakyova et al. 2017). It must be repeatedly emphasized that the comparative material for archaeogenetic studies should be made up of 10th century, rather than modern samples if the aim is to search for the possible eastern relations of the 10th century population (Csőső et al., 2013, p. 237-243;
from the aspect of early Hungarian history. New advances in this field can be expected from the study of the skeletal remains of individuals born in the east, but buried in the Carpathian Basin. It is also clear that the selection of skeletal samples of this type can only be achieved through radiocarbon dating.

Studying the eastern connections and the archaeological heritage of the Conquest period and the early Árpádian Age could reveal some references as to which direction the conquering forefathers may have reached the Carpathian Basin from. The earliest such finds that are relevant to this research are located on the external, eastern side of the Carpathians, in the region of the Moldavian Republic and the Lower Danube (Fodor, 1993, pp. 17-38; Fodor, 1994, pp. 47-65). However, doubts of a chronological nature have been raised recently concerning the historical assessment of the finds. The characteristic S-terminalled ring ornaments exposed in the cemetery near Przemyśl is an indication of burials carried out in the second half and at the end of the 10th century.

Thus, the possibility was raised that these archaeological sites – or at least, some of them – are not the westernmost remnants of the settlement areas of Etelköz, but they could be evidence of groups sent to live in the frontier region of the passes at the end of the 10th century, most likely for the purposes of military defence. The graves that were discovered here and there in the multi-grave burial sites of 10th century Rus certainly cannot be linked with the residence of Etelköz (Komar, 2011, c. 21-78). These graves are as distinct from their environment as the group of finds – recently discovered near the battlefield of Augsburg – originating from the 10th century Carpathian Basin. These finds could belong most likely to Hungarian warriors who served in Kiev as mercenaries. In exchange, there were numerous soldiers who came to Hungary from there, commemorated, for instance, by the toponym Oroszvár and the axe-shaped amulets in the Carpathian Basin (Füredi et al., 2017, pp. 413-467). The third heavily contested group of artefacts found around Bucharest and Lake Tei, whose less characteristic archaeological material – mainly based on the features of the Subbotcy horizon to be presented below – is regarded today as belonging to the Pechenegs or other late nomadic groups (Бокий, Плетнëва, 2008). The finds of the more than 20 burial sites, linked with the Hungarians by most researchers and which were dug secondarily into the embankment of the Bronze Age kurgan, clearly reflect Slavic connections, for example the pottery finds of the late Luka-Rakovica culture. However, they also include some Byzantine silk and ceramics supposedly from Crimea, and even wheel-thrown pottery originating from the Volga region. In addition to the types of jewellery and horse harness showing a clear parallel with the 10th century material culture of the Carpathian Basin, the raw material (silver gilt) and the floral ornamentation as well as the manner of burial (skull facing west, flayed horse skin) signal...
an incontestable association. While the finds reflect contact with the neighbouring territories, especially the Slavic lands to the north, principally indicated by pottery imports. These contacts are also mentioned in the written sources.

The territory between the Dnieper and the Volga is the biggest blank spot in the archaeological research of early Hungarian history. The only find that we can mention from here is the grave of Vorobyev (Плетнёва, 2003, c. 103-114) in the Don region. Although it shows strong signs of Saltovo origin (or pseudo-Saltovo, to be more precise), the buckle and some other features indicate an obvious origin from the Volga-Urals region. Levedia, whose existence was hypothesized to begin from the second third of the 8th century, located around Don-Seversky Donets, cannot be archaeologically confirmed, and what is more important: there are no finds originating from the Volga-Urals, either. In fact, archaeologically speaking, there are no signs whatsoever that would indicate the migration of any population to Europe from the eastern bank of the Volga, the possibility of which was, at any rate, successfully reduced by the Khazar Khaganate according to the written sources. On the other hand, it has been clearly shown that such a process did take place in the second third of the 9th century. As a matter of fact, the onetime existence of the settlement area of the Don River region was built on exclusively the etymology of the word Dentimogyer noted down in the 13th century, but the interpretation of the latter as 'Don tői magyar' [i.e. Don-rooted Hungarian] has been discarded. By the way, the 'Don root' was one of the most densely populated areas of Eastern Europe at the time, inhabited by the Alans of the Volga-Mayaki culture in the 8th–10th centuries, so our forefathers would have hardly been able to set up camp there (Fodor, 1977, pp. 79-114). Furthermore, there is another argument that goes against this hypothesis: Levedia's 'placement' in Khazaria was motivated by the attempt to define the place where the ancient Turkish loan words would have been received. However, the Alans living in the above-mentioned area spoke an Iranian language, not Turkish, and the Turkish language swap is neither proven in their case, nor is it likely.

The same two arguments hold true for the northern frontier of the Caucasus in relation to the hypothesis of the Caucasian or Kuban region proto-homeland. In the past couple of years, we have received news of some exciting finds from the region of Krasnodar (quite similar to the ones from the Age of the Conquest). However, these are finds mostly collected by treasure hunters, and they lack the archaeological context. Also, presumably they were not found in pit graves, but in chamber graves that were unique to the Alans. Therefore, their assessment requires further and substantial research. Naturally, the question of Levedia's location does not refute the fact of the Khazar-Hungarian encounters; it is only the geographical site of these ancient relations commemorated by written sources that needs to be reconsidered (Róna-Tas 1999).

The human-figure fittings of the Subboty chamber grave (i.e. the legacy of the settlement areas of Etelköz) depicting the figures in a characteristic cross-legged position, or the 9th century appearance of the silver and pressed silver mounts – though decorated by Saltovo patterns – in the Saltovo Alan chamber graves can serve as evidence of the ancient connections. The links to the Khazars are also explicitly confirmed by the trapezoid cross section of the bow-hilt plate as well as by certain types of mounts that are typical of the Conquest period and the Sokolovskaya Balka horizon of the Khazar Khaganate (Биро, Йанго, Тюрк, 2009, c. 407-441), despite the fact that the latter had disappeared by the beginning of the 9th century, and we are not yet familiar with the 9th–10th-century archaeological finds of the 'real' Khazars (Афанасьев, 1999, c. 85-89).

The location of Levedia, however, still runs into problems. The archaeological record of the Don–Northern Seversky Donets region, which was earlier identified with Levedia (Аксёнов, 2001, c. 212-214), contains no traces whatsoever of a population arriving from the Ural region between the 6th and the 8th centuries. At the same time, there is barely any resemblance between the Hungarian Conquest period finds and the 8–10th century assemblages of the Saltovo-Mayatskaya culture distributed in the region traditionally identified – mainly in the Hungarian research – with Levedia (Fodor, 1977, pp. 79-114). This culture was earlier interpreted as the archaeological correlate of the entire territory of the Khazar Khaganate, and thus also of Levedia, which was part of the khaganate. The Saltovo culture, which was earlier divided into so-called regional variants in view of the considerable divergences in its material (Плетнёва, 1967; 1981; 1999) is no longer regarded as a big uniform archaeological culture as originally defined by S. A. Pletneva (Афанасьев, 1987; Werbart, 1996).

The archaeological record seems to confirm earlier suggestions that Levedia was maybe not an independent settlement territory of the ancient
Hungarians, but was part of the probably easterly areas of Etelköz. The chronology of the finds from the southern Urals and the Dnieper region suggests a relatively rapid migration of the ancient Hungarians no earlier than the beginning of the 9th century, as was earlier suggested by Russian and Ukrainian research (Иванов, 1999; Белавин, Иванов, Крыласова, 2009).

The distribution of the archaeological material known from the two eponymous sites would only warrant this label for the so-called Alanic or forested steppe variant (Афана-сьев, 2001, c. 43–55); the connections of the other regional variants with the Saltovo culture have been convincingly refuted by Russian and Ukrainian scholars (Иванов, 2002, c. 36-38; Козлова, 2011, c. 21-31; Флёрова, Флёров, 2000, c. 137-141). Owing to the above considerations, the labels 'Saltovo culture' and 'Saltovo cultural-historical complex' are regularly employed in the Russian and Ukrainian archaeological literature even by scholars who do not challenge the cultural primacy or the leading role of the Khazars (Комар, 1999, c. 111-136; 2004, Комар, c. 87-91). Hungarian scholars differ over the interpretation of the Saltovo culture and its cultural impact on the ancient Hungarians ( Bálint 1975, pp. 79-114; Fodor, 1977, pp. 79-114; Révész, 1998, pp. 523-532).

It is now clear that some of the find types, such as the clay cauldrons (Афанасьев, Лопан, 1996, c. 18-20; Лопан, 2007, c. 240-311), that were believed to have their counterparts in the Saltovo culture cannot be derived from that culture or that they are objects which are known also from the territories neighbouring on the Saltovo culture's distribution either as imports or as local copies (for example in the Volintsevskaya culture and in the so-called early Mordvinian burial grounds). Saltovo type finds could thus have reached the ancient Hungarians from areas other than the Saltovo heartland and thus their presence in the archaeological heritage does not necessarily imply that the ancient Hungarians had once lived on the territory of the Saltovo culture (Türk 2010, pp. 261-306). In fact, the Hungarian Conquest period finds and the 9th and 10th century archaeological material of the Etelköz region reflect much closer contacts with the 8th–9th century (and, of course, 10th century) assemblages of the southern Urals and the Middle Volga region. New finds bearing an uncanny resemblance to the Hungarian Conquest period material are known from the Samara area in the Middle Volga region (Сташенков, 2009, c. 228-229).

In the territory enclosed by the Dnieper and the Volga rivers, the 9th–11th century cemeteries of the ancient peoples speaking most likely Finno-Ugric languages, who lived on the frontier of the forests and the forest steppe, represent much closer parallels in archaeological terms. At the same time, the so-called proto-Mordovian and proto-Cheremis burial sites (Иванов, 1952) are not related to the ancestors of the Hungarians in an ethnic sense.

The similarities observed should be interpreted primarily as cultural links, even though the archaeological material that is of interest to us often emerge from women's tombs, and may be a sign of intermarriages in the given period. Although both criteria – the co-presence of the Uralian and the Conquest period traits – are satisfied here, further detailed chronological examinations will be necessary. For instance, it has already been revealed about some supposedly Hungarian finds (e.g. the belt mounts of Grave 505 of Kryukovo Kuznoye) that based on their technical specificities and material composition, they are most probably objects of Bulgarian origin. Nevertheless, the historical–archaeological analysis of the typological similarities and their characteristic distribution areas will continue to be a cardinal task (Zelencova, Saprykina, Türk, 2018, pp. 689-720).

At the Samara elbow of the Volga, on the left bank of the river, we know of six or seven archaeological sites from the 8th and 9th centuries (Немчанка, Пролетарское Городище 116 km, etc.) that are noteworthy from a Hungarian perspective. In addition to the metal finds, the appearance of Uralian-type ceramics is a significant phenomenon here (Bakalskaya culture and Kushnarenkovo/Karayakupovo culture). Among the latter, we can mention the hand-made pots with a sphere-shaped bottom and a braid ornament around their neck, slimmer by river mussels or tale. These kinds of pots occur at several other sites, also from much earlier times (Сташенков, 2009, c. 228-229). The early medieval finds of this microregion show that waves of migration from the direction of the Urals hit the territory in two or three periods from the Hun period until the 9th century. On the right bank of the river, research has discovered the appearance of supposedly Turkic-speaking peoples in a similar chronological order; thus, in other words, it was not only and primarily the appearance of the Volga Bulgarians that led to the 'Turkization' of the Volga region. From the territory of the Saltovo culture, there are unquestionable traces of relocation from the end of the 9th century, as was earlier suggested by Russian and Ukrainian research (Иванов, 1999; Белавин, Иванов, Крыласова, 2009).
of the 7th century. Thus, if finds should appear around the Samara Elbow of the Volga that are the archaeological legacy affiliated of the Khazar Khaganate, then we can rightly hypothesize the presence of a population speaking a western Turkic language near the middle course of the Volga (Матвеева, 1997; Казаков, 1999, c. 23-38).

This seems to be confirmed by the disappearance of the archaeological assemblages closely related to the Slatovo complex (such as the Novinki- and Uren’ type find horizons) by the turn of the 7th–8th centuries at the latest (Сташенко, 1995, c. 268-291). It is difficult to determine when the ancient Hungarians first appeared in this region. The hand-thrown, cord-impressed pottery tempered with crushed mussels of the Ural region typical for the Kushnarenkovo (6th–8th centuries) and the Karaiakupovo cultures (8th–9th centuries) has been reported from several sites (including settlements) in the Samara area (Сташенко, 2009, c. 228-229).

Why, and more importantly, how the Hungarians crossed the Volga and moved to the west, we do not yet know. In my opinion, we have reason to suppose that – as written sources report about it later, in the case of the Pechenegs – these events could not have taken place without the cooperation, agreement, and alliance of the Khazars. A probable underlying reason of the move could have been the arrival of the Pechenegs in the frontiers of the Southern Urals at the turn of the 8th and 9th centuries from the south, and then the Kimeks, maybe Bashkirians (Сроstrinsk culture) from the east. The threat embodied by the nomadic Petchenegs may also explain the scarcity of ancient Hungarian finds between the Volga and the Dnieper, and especially of nomadic cultures (8th–9th centuries) has been reported from several sites (including settlements) in the Samara area (Сташенков, 2009, c. 228-229).

Concerning the eastern precedents, we should mention the recently outlined Bakalskaya culture (4th–6th centuries). At certain archaeological sites of this culture, the proportion of the so-called 'Proto-Kushnarenkovo ceramics' is as high as 25 percent (Боталов, 2017, c. 267-334). The significance of the distinction of the Bakalskaya culture in the forest steppes of the Trans-Uralian forest steppes – Sineglazovo, Karanayevo, Uelgi), even overlapping into the 10th century at places (Боталов, Лукиных, Тидеман, 2011, c. 104-114). There were obviously significant changes taking place in the territories lying east of the Urals at the turn of the 8th century (e.g. the disappearance of the kurgan burials). Leaving the eastern side of the Urals has been linked with various historical events by different researchers, and most often, they have been interpreted as the northern effect of mass migrations related to the emergence of the First Turk Khaganate (Боталов, 2017, c. 267-334).
researchers do not see any Hungarian–Ugrian precedents in the Sargatskaya culture; rather, they emphasize the mostly southern, Scythian-type features and origin of the latter. While this question necessitates a lot more future investigation, we can ascertain that this is the most distant archaeological culture in time and space to which we can go back on the basis of the heritage of the Hungarian Conquest period with more or less certainty.

It is, of course, possible to study the historic events of the Iron Age of the region (Marbėva, 2016), as well as the Uralian archaeological cultures of the period prior to the evolution of the Hungarian language. At the same time, there are more and more Hungarian researchers who think that the events that took place before the birth of the independent Hungarian language (approx. 1000–500 BC) (Fodor 1975) should no longer be considered as part of the early Hungarian history.
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ВОСТОЧНОЕВРОПЕЙСКИЕ КОРНИ И АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКОЕ НАСЛЕДСТВО ДРЕВНИХ МАДЬЯР КАРПАТСКОЙ КОТЛОВИНЫ (X В.) В ЗЕРКАЛЕ НОВЫХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ

Аттила Тюрк

Исследование восточных связей по археологии Карпатского бассейна в X в. является одной из важнейших задач в изучении древнемадьярской истории. В последние 5-10 лет эта работа получила новые импульсы благодаря новым восточным находкам, и открытию материалов Субботцевского горизонта – переходного звена между венгерскими памятниками Урала и Карпатского бассейна. Ныне известно происхождение восточных аналогий находкам эпохи обретения родины (X в). К их первой группе принадлежат синхронные материалы восточного происхождения. Например, амулеты-топорики, число которых в последнее время резко возросло. Ко второй группе можно отнести находки позднее эпохи обретения родины. Например, изобразительное искусство с пальметтами. Восточные параллели венгерских находок можно найти, в частности, в степи, на территории Хазарского Каганата. Сегодня возрастает количество артефактов, указывающих на непосредственную связь Карпатской котловины с Волжско-Уральском регионом и Южным Уралом (например, трубочки для трута, и. т.д.). Иногда мы можем определить точную функцию этих находок с помощью именно восточных аналогий. Результаты антропологии и биоархеологии подтверждают сложность древнемадьярской истории аналогичной описаниям из письменных источников. Таким образом, для исследования археологического материала Карпатского бассейна X в. необходимо знать раннесредневековый археологический комплекс Восточной Европы. Географическое распространение восточных аналогий позволяет сделать важные исторические выводы. В целом, находки, связанные с мадьярами, обнаружены на тех территориях, на которых и по данным лингвистики и истории происходил этногенез венгров, или на тех краях, где жили народы, контактировавшие с мадьярами. В последнее время возросло число могильников на территории древней Руси, в которых погребения совершались с предметами «венгерского типа». Полагаем, что эти находки принадлежали тем наемникам, которые, возможно, переселились в Русь из Венгрии. Находки,
связанные с венграми, распространены не по всей Евразии, что может помочь в реконструкции пути передвижения мадьяр – вопрос, который до сих пор остается дискуссионным. Хронология движения венгров также спорная, ведь материалы Субботцевского типа и возможные древневенгерские памятники между Днепром и Уралом появились приблизительно одновременно. Археологический материал не позволяет говорить о том, что венгры пересекли Волгу в середине VIII в., как это утверждают венгерские исследователи. В последнее время возникли сомнения относительно западносибирского происхождения кушнаренковской культуры. С другой стороны, реальным продвижением в тематике стали последние биоархеологические исследования. Благодаря им, удалось установить, что генетический материал части венгров эпохи обретения родины связан с раннесредневековым населением Волжско-Уральского региона и Южного Урала.
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