
BOTALOV, Sergey Gennadievich**Late-Hun and Early-Turk Period of V-VIII Centuries
in Ural-Kazakh Steppes**

Keywords: Hunns, Turks, barrows with “moustaches”, Selentash type

A period, related to the very late Hun stage and the Western Turk Khaganate rule in the Volga-Urals steppes, is represented in rather an uncertain manner. Accumulation of traditional burial complex materials (V-VII cc.) with inhumation rites is carried out extremely slowly for all the vast areas of the Southern Urals and Western and Central Kazakhstan. Today we know about a dozen of complexes, belonging to this period, located on the border between steppes and forest-steppes, from the trans-Volga region to Western Siberia, as well as within northern steppes of Kazakhstan (Shipovo, tumuli 2, 3; Novoselki; Verhneye Pogromnoye; Engels (Pokrovsk), tumulus 36, burial 2; Leninsk; Avilov; Berezhnovka I, tumulus 111, burial 1; Borodaevka; Perepolovenka; Kamenny Ambar, tumuli 5, 6; Arkaim burials; Gorodischenskoye IX, tumulus 5; Eraska; Sopka 2, burial 688; Ust-Suerka; Kyzyl-Adyr (fig. 1,2). Notorious exceptions are numerous complexes, demonstrating two largest cultural historical centers, located within Urals forest-steppes and semi-desert steppes of Southern Kazakhstan. We speak of settlement and burial complexes of Turbaslinsk and Dzhety-Asar cultures, which cover a historical period from V to VIII cc. Here one can trace a clear interaction between these cultural epicenters of the Urals and Aral Sea. It is difficult to estimate, whether this interaction had been supported by seasonal migrations of separate groups, or it had been kept as a system of trade-exchange contacts between two different geographical economical areas. We believe that a basis of this communication lied in ethnic cultural oneness of northern and southern provinces, which existed from the first centuries A.D. till VIII c. This oneness reflects not only in separate ceramics types, alike to Dzhety-Asar tableware in Turbaslinsk and Bakhmutino monuments in the Southern cis-Urals, but, what is very important, in similar original cult items. We refer to zoomorphic plates of ritual ceramics and metal anthropomorphic figures. Similarity between metal masculine phallic figures, excavated in Altynasar, Birska and Kushnarenkovo barrow cemeteries, attracts scholars greatly [Levina, 1996. Fig. 169; Gening, 1977. P. 106. Fig. 11, 1].

Attribution of these historical cultural centers is on a stage of development for now. Its main features were designated during studying of a most enormous Turbaslinsk-type monument — a site of a fortified settlement Ufa II. Here, inside Turbaslinsk and Kushnarenkovo horizons, scientists uncovered so-called net polished ceramics. According to shapes and superficies, this material is reasonably being linked to early-Bulgarian cultural influence in the cis-Urals [Mazhitov, Sungatov, Sultanova, Ismailov, Bakhshieva, 2009. P. 125. Fig. 240]. It is worthy to note, that such type of ceramics was also found in early-Saltov burial complexes in the South of Eastern Europe and Western Kazakhstan (Karatobe II, tumulus 1).

Main features of burial rites allow us to state, that abovementioned monuments mostly present a single horizon, characterized by post-Hun traditions: narrow rectangular pits, undercuts, northern orientation and frequent cranium deformation. Substantial innovation is mounting a skull or limbs (fell?) of small and great cattle or camel, horse skeletons less often, at the foot mostly, but sometimes on the side of a body on the credence step-stone. In the first case, this feature draws these complexes with some forest-steppe and forest monuments in the Volga region (Imenkovo culture: Komintern II, Tashkirmen cemeteries) and cis-Urals (Turbaslinsk culture: Kushnarenkovo, burials 2, 27; Manyak, burials 1, 8, 22; Novo-Bikin, Lagerevo, a tumulus of 10 cemeteries) [Botalov, 2009. P. 308–319, 517]. In the second case, a tradition of complete horse skeletons gains development in early-Turkic (Bulgarian-Khazar, Avar) monuments in the Black Sea region and Carpathian basin [Botalov, 2009. P. 464–518]. A tradition of mounting a horse skull and limbs (fell) on the side of a body on the credence step-stone gains development in a forest-steppe area of the Southern Urals, Western Siberia and Eastern Kazakhstan in complexes with broad orientation, emerging in VII-VIII cc. (Manyak, Lagerevo, Borovsk, Blizhniye Elbany XIV, Chernoozerje, Zharly, Chilikry, Egiz Kojtas) and, probably, reflects dynamics of another historical cultural complex (Magyar, Cuman, Kipchak, Kyrgys).

In a whole, abovementioned burial complexes allow one to point out some kind of a transient stage, it is possible to call it early-Bulgarian, within Urals-Kazakh steppes in V-VI cc. To all appearance, that is when a cardinal shift of main ethnic cultural vectors occurs (Hun and Turk vectors). We believe that this influenced an anthropological shape of a population as well. Reconstructions (Kamenny Ambar barrow cemetery, tumulus 5, 6) demonstrate following racial shapes: Ural mixed type for women; Central Asian mongoloid type with distinctive features for men (fig. 3).

That is how we see a situation in the Southern Urals during a so-called transient (pre-Turk) stage. Nevertheless, judging to archeological data, the proper Western Turk Khaganate epoch in Urals and Kazakh steppes had remained obscure till recent times.

During the late stage of an early-Turkic period (VIII c., may be the second half of the VII c.) in Kazakh steppes (Chilikty, Egiz Kojtas, Borovsk, Kamyshin, Nurinskoye, Atpa II, Chelkar, Bolgarka, Zhaman Karagajla), Western Siberian and Southern Urals forest-steppes (Chernoozerje, Manyak, Lagerevo) arise rare traditional inhumated burial complexes, which can be corresponded to Sayan-Altai (Teless-Turkic) monuments: broad orientation, fell or separate horse bones, Katanda-type item sets [Arslanova, 1963; 1968; 1980; Bernshtam, 1951a; Botalov, Tkachev, 1990; Savinov, 1984; Mazhitov, 1977; 1981; Zykov, 2002. P. 47–50].

It goes without contradictions, that these monuments mark expansion of Teless-Turkic and probably early-Kyrgyz ethnic cultural areas westwards (according to D.G. Savinov, 1984), nevertheless their extreme paucity and chronological misfits have not allowed one to behold the whole picture of Western Turkic Khaganate culture. Such state lasted for a relatively long time, until there have been pointed out discrepancies of formerly known monuments, gained a nickname barrows with “moustaches”. A while after these complexes were united with Selentash type monuments [Botalov, 1996; 1996a; 1998].

Barrows with “moustaches”, or Selentash type monuments, are concentrated in four main microdistricts: Sary-Arka (Central Kazakhstan, western Irtysh region), Ulytau, Mugodzar and trans-Urals. Today we know more that 400 complexes of this type [Botalov, Tairov, Lyubchanskiy, 2006].

According to our reckoning, these monuments are cult burial complexes with side inhumation on or upon a ritual platform, with subsequent placing of remnants on an open framed (organized) space (fig. 4). There is no need to adduce characteristics and typological peculiarities of referred monuments here, as one can resort to detailed studies on this topic [Botalov, Gutsalov, 2000. P. 185–218; Lyubchanskiy, 2006. P. 386–408; Botalov, Tairov, Lyubchanskiy, 2006; Botalov, 2009. P. 260–408]. In our submission, tumuli with ridges have *two constructive types*. *First type* has a solitary central tumulus or a double tumulus with central earthworks arranged into the N-S line. *Second type* has central earthworks arranged into the W-E line, characterized by the overlaying of two or more mounds. Most times *second type* tumuli demonstrate double planigraphy or stratigraphy of a complex. Monuments, initially designated as Selentash type complexes [Botalov, 1996a], present another *constructive type*. In substance, these objects are equal to central tumuli in tumulus complexes with ridges by architecture and functionality. The only feature they differ in is absence of the ridges. As far as we concerned, this feature is whether a fact of destruction, or a specific chronological mark.

Whereby Selentash type tumuli exist on their own, they in most cases are located near of tumuli with ridges (Kyzyl Zhar, tumulus 3; Suhodol, tumuli 1–4; Gorodischenskoye, tumuli 3, 4; Izhevsky-2, tumuli 5, 6), or in same valleys Alexandrovsky, tumuli 1, 2; Krutoy Ovrage, tumuli 1, 3, 4).

Most probably, we can regard appearance of a burial with NW orientation and animal parts (great cattle) on a side step-stone (Izhevsky-II cemetery, tumulus 3) near of a tumulus with ridges [Beysenov, Voloshin, 2002. P. 169] as especial diffusion of an inhumation tradition into a medium of a Selentash steppe population. Also we can mention Gorodischenskoye IX cemetery, tumulus 5, which belonged to a complex with a ridged tumulus and Selentash type tumulus (tumulus 3). Here a burial with northern orientation, cranium deformation and a skeleton (fell?) fragment of a camel (skull, spinal part, ribs, one limb) on a step-stone has been found. This tumulus dates within V-VII cc., according to a peculiar iron segmented buckle with a protruding tongue, straight side bails and without a plate [Levina, 1996. Fig. 121, 1–15; 123, 1–18; Zasetkaya, 1994. Tabl. 9, 7, 10; 11, 14; 15, 7; 17, 7; 22, 11; 24, 6; 26, 8; 29, 9; 44, 9, 11, 12]. Finally, a finest example of diffusion is a famous tumulus 19 of Kanattas complex, where a group burial with northern orientation, skulls and limbs of small and great cattle in a SE corner have been found in a central ridged tumulus [Botalov, 2009. P. 376. Fig. 78].

As we mentioned above, Selentash type tumuli appear later, than tumuli with ridges [Botalov, Tairov, Lyubchanskiy, 2006]. The latest, most probably, appear in Urals-Kazakh steppes in the V c., regarding to Solonchanka I tumulus inventory [Botalov, Tairov, Lyubchanskiy, 2006. P. 137–139]. Now it is difficult to state, when Selentash type (without ridges) complexes arise. However, clear typological similarities in ritual traditions and items (ceramics) allow us to speak of these groups within a common context.

A period of Selentash type monuments and tumuli with ridges is from the late V till VIII cc.

These acquisitions are grounded rather strongly by radiocarbon analysis of 3 tumuli with ridges Sarbulat, tumulus 2 (southern) — ceramics test results; Suhodol — bone test results; Kaynsay, tumulus 14 — ceramics test results; Suhodol, solitary tumulus 2, tumulus 5 — coal test results. As one can judge upon these results, Sarbulat, tumulus 2 and Suhodol, tumulus 5 are the earliest and almost synchronical, they date to the beginning of the V-beginning of the VII cc. (peak falls on the middle VI c.) with an accuracy to 68.2% (fig. 5, 6). Later there appear Kaynsay, tumulus 14, which date has been estimated

according to fragments of a vessel-vase, and Gorodischenskoye IX, according to coal, with an accuracy to 68.2%, in the mid VI-mid or late VII cc. (peak falls between VI-VII) (fig. 7, 8). The latest is Suhodol, tumulus 2, according to coal radiocarbon tests: the late VII-late VIII cc. (peak falls on VII-mid VIII cc.), with an accuracy to 68.2% (fig. 9). This tumulus belongs to a group of four Selentash type tumuli, arranged on the perimeter of a ridged tumuli complex (Suhodol, tumulus 5). Of this group, tumulus 4 has a funeral surface with a hollow, where had been put a vessel, peculiar for *typological group 1* vessels and ones of Selentash type [Botalov, Tairov, Lyubchanskiy, 2006. P. 122–123. Fig. 68, 2, 4]. Thus, within this group, which in its turn belongs to an averagely large Kamenny Ambar microdistrict, situated on the river Karagayly-Ayat, we can find evidences of a later position of Selentash type tumuli on one hand, but at the same time, the both represent a single vector of historical cultural development.

Consequently, estimated dates show the time of an early-Turkic steppe horizon, at least in the borders of the Southern Urals microdistrict, as the late V-VIII cc.

In whole, Selentash type traditions were forming in the medium of Central Asian nomads in the boundaries of a rich historical cultural environment. However, Kushnarenkovo type ceramics, found in some of these barrows (Selentash, tumulus 4; Kaynsay, tumulus 14), as well as in northern Kazakh borderlands (Bersuat settlement), allow one to suppose some proto-Magyar occurrence in the Urals-Kazakh nomadic medium during Western Turkic Khaganate.

Long-term communication between trans-Urals forest-steppe and steppe nomadic areas was suddenly proved by materials of a cemetery complex Uelgi. The complex is being studied for recent four years. It is well-known, that in a whole a monument is attributed to a relatively later period (IX-XI cc.), but we cannot ignore the fact, that alongside with traditional mediaeval materials, peculiar to forest-steppe areas of Bashkortostan and the Kama region, here is being excavating a bright nomadic steppe complex, analogous to not only Altai Eastern and Central Kazakhstan, but much farther western Volga and Danube ones. Firstly this was admitted for item materials (fig. 10).

In this context, stationary studies revealed a series of inhumated burials, which are not peculiar for Urals traditions of a given period.

Most of all, this complex is represented in tumuli 1 and 1a. External features of these tumuli correspond to the same Selentash traditions: rectangular coat, fences, altars and fire products on site covered by tumulus, specific item combination (quiver and horse bridle). Undisturbed burials clearly demonstrate a cremation rite and unusual altars-concealments (fig. 10, 1-6)

An excursus made allows one to state, that processes of a cultural genesis within Urals-Kazakh steppes during a post-Hun and early-Turkic period (V-VIII cc.) have two main tendencies. Against the background of post-Hun traditions, continuing their development from a late-Sarmatian period, such as moderate-sized group tumuli or figurate (subrectangular) mounds, narrow rectangular pits, sometimes with undercuts, northern orientation of body, deformations, adequate item inventory (swords with disc-formed pommel, triangular rhombic arrowheads, horse bits with annular endings, plates-clinches, buckles with moveable plates for men; polychromized diadems and earrings with big hollow beads, pocket-shaped earrings, mirrors, ceramics for women), there appears a completely new historical cultural complex — tumuli with ridges and Selentash type monuments, including barrows-fireplaces

with cremation in the Lower Volga region. Prospective mediaeval Bulgarian, Magyar and Kipchak ethnicities start to shape inside these mainline directions of a cultural genesis.

Briefly, a picture of ethnic cultural transformations during this period is as follows.

Groups of semi-nomadic pastoralists, Kushnarenkovo and Karayakupovotype ceramics bearers, who had been developed at an early stage in trans-Urals forest-steppes within a Bakal historical cultural horizon (IV-VI cc.), start their move westwards into the Belaya and Kama river basins, leaving here numerous monuments of this type (fig. 12, 1). Therewith, Kushnarenkovo materials arise deep in Southern trans-Urals steppes in short-lived stations and ridged tumuli (Selentash, Kaynsay, Bersuat) (fig. 11, 2).

We believe that these facts are not occasional in nature and mark a process of intercommunication between a proto-Magyar population and nomads of evolving Western Turkic Khaganate. A Turkic cultural component of this stage is attributed to builders of ridged tumuli and Selentash type monuments (fig. 13, 3), together with Teless-Turkic nomads of Sayan-Altai, who begin to penetrate the area in the late VII c. (fig. 13, 4).

A collapse of Western Turkic Khaganate, most probably, led to dramatic migrations of its nomadic unions back to the west (fig. 12 1, 2, 3), also in a forest-steppe zone, where an energetic mixture with Petrogrom-Yudino forest cultures takes place (fig. 12 1, 2, 3); the general picture is substituted by a migration of Srostki or Kipchak and, probably, Kyrgyz nomadic populations from Altai areas to the Southern Urals (fig. 12, 5).

Approximately 300 years after their foundation (late IX c.) deep in Southern trans-Urals forest-steppes and mountain-forest Urals, there appear nomadic complexes of a late-Kushnarenkovo-Karayakupovo type, like Sineglazovo, Uelgi, Lagerevo, Karanaevo and others, containing a bright nomadic cultural complex of a syncretical character, in which one can trace elements of Central and Eastern Kazakh and Altai types, and what is more, observe obvious parallels with a western nomadic complex in the Volga, Lower Dnieper and Danube regions.

Historical reconstruction of these cultural transformations can be executed in a following direction. A well-shaped geohistorical picture of the late IV-early VI cc. allows to put a vast region of trans-Urals and Kazakh steppes into a field, characterized by next cultural political areas. As for its eastern borders, it adjoins to a Gaju-Teless world of Turkic-speaking nomads of Dzhungarian steppes and the Ili river valley. We make a suggestion, that some part of On Ok Budun (Onogurs), consisted of Dulo and Nushibi tribes after their partial exodus to Eastern Europe in 463 (Kutrigurs, Urogs, Onogurs), continued to compile a western wing of a massive Turkistan confederation of Tele-Toghuz-Oghuz (fig.14). Basins of the Chu and Talas rivers were the possible southern boundaries of this confederation. Hereafter, from Sogdiana along the Syr Darya and Tarim river valleys to Karasahr, defended by natural walls of Western and Central Tien Shan, southerly starts a cultural political protectorate of a Kidarite-Hephthalite government. The south-west of the country Sodu-Yancai, from the Syr Darya lower reaches, including Aral Sea region, was controlled by Huns-Huni-Xionites, who by the end of the V c. whether expanded their dominion, or settled close cultural political relations with the Southern cis-Urals and Central Volga region (fig. 13). This affected numerous cross-cultural parallels in Dzhety-Asar, Turbaslinsk and partly Imenkovo monuments of Belaya-Ufa and Kama-Volga confluences (fig. 13, 8-10).

Penetration a large region of Southern Western Siberia by forest populations from the north, and early-Avars (Rourans) and early-Turks (Teless) from the south and south-east; along with the collapse of previous local cultures and types, consequently, initiated the following exodus to the west. This corresponds to Priscus accounts, who describes Saragurs, Ogurs and Onogurs being pushed out from their lands by Sabirs, and Sabirs being in their turn attacked by Avars [Pigulevskaya, 1941. P. 51] (fig. 13). Thereupon, Sabirs positioning before their exodus to Western Siberia, given by M.I. Artamonov [Artamonov, 1962. P. 65–66], is to some extent proved by archeological transformations. Indubitably, this vector of Saragurs migration (East – West) was plotted for Oghuz tribal unions as well, which is confirmed by arising of Central Asian cultural innovations in Eastern Europe, subjectified in numerous items of Sayan-Altai, Western Turkic and Central Asian types, moreover, in cult burial monuments of eastern origin [Semenov, 1988].

The situation described remains unchanging up to a second half of the VII c. A long war between Western Turkic Khaganate ruling houses Dulo and Nushibi (630–634, 640–657), Kipchaks-Xueyantuo migration to the Irtysh and Saryarka region (647), Karluks migration into Turkestan and Southern Kazakhstan (650), Tan army intrusion into Zhetysu (657) [Klyashtorny, Savinov, 2005. P. 97–98, 113–114; Akhinzhanov, 1995. P. 102–103; Botalov, Tairov, Lyubchanskiy, 2006. P. 169–171] together destabilized Kazakh and Central Asian regions and inevitably led to an outflux of some people into other countries, using different directions.

One of these directions, a northern one, is distinctively marked within cis- and trans-Urals steppes. Thus, in VI-VII cc. layers of a site of a fortified settlement Ufa II manifests a specific net ceramic, which is reasonable connected with early-Bulgarian type pottery by many authorities (fig. 14) [Mazhitov, Sungatov, Ivanov, Sattarov, Sultanova, Ivanova, 2007; Mazhitov, Sungatov, Sattarov, Sultanova, 2009; Mazhitov, Sungatov, Sultanova, Ismailov, Bakhshieva, 2009; Mazhitov, Sungatov F.A., Sultanova, Mukhametdinov, Sungatov A. F., 2011].

In 2014 we found a burial cemetery Ingala in the south of the Tyumen Region. The burials date to VII-VIII cc., item inventory is presented by a bright nomadic complex (belt heraldic garniture, weaponry and bridle). It is symptomatically, that amongst ware, aside Bakal type pottery, there were found even-profiled vessels, made of raw clay, directly analogous to pots in ridged tumuli (fig. 15, 16, 21).

Despite a common Turkic cultural unity, newcomers (Karluk, Uyghurs, Oghuzs, Kimeks, Kipchaks and others) essentially differed from Western Turkic Khaganate aboriginals of an early-Turk stage. They were fragments or components of western Turkic ethnic cultural areas, whose original lands was left far in the East, moreover, they spoke absolutely different, though also Turkic, languages (Western Turkic group Saz) (according to M.I. Artamonov, 1962. P. 68).

Most probably, a flow of this new population played a key role in ethnical genesis of the Urals and Volga region peoples. Probably, a peculiar linguistical character of Kazakh and Bashkir tribes starts to develop from the VIII c.: Kipchak and Kipchak-Bulgarian subgroups of a Turkic group of an Altai family [Valeev, 2003. P. 312; Rybalko, 2004. P. 20]. Thus, all abovementioned allows us to state, that a considered period V-VIII cc. is a key stage of autochthonous peoples of Urals-Kazakh steppes development, their anthropological type and ethnical linguistical shape formation.

References

- ✚ Arslanova F.Kh. **Арсланова Ф.Х.**, 1963. Бобровский могильник // ИИА АН КазССР. Серия общественные науки. Вып 4.
- ✚ Arslanova F.Kh. **Арсланова Ф.Х.**, 1968. Памятники Павлодарского Прииртышья с VII–XII вв. // Новое в археологии Казахстана. – Алма-Ата.
- ✚ Arslanova F.Kh. **Арсланова Ф.Х.**, 1980. Керамика раннесредневековых курганов Казахстана, Прииртышья // Средневековые древности евразийских степей. – М.
- ✚ Artamonov M.I. **Артамонов М.И.**, 1962. История хазар. – Л.
- ✚ Akhinzhanov S.M. **Ахинжанов С.М.**, 1995. Кыпчаки в истории средневекового Казахстана. – Алматы.
- ✚ Beysenov A.Z., Voloshin V.S. **Бейсенов А.З., Волошин В.С.**, 2002. Могильник Ижевский-2 // Изучение памятников археологии Павлодарского Прииртышья. – Павлодар.
- ✚ Bernshtam A.N. **Бернштам А.Н.**, 1951a. Находки у оз. Боровое в Казахстане // СМАЭ. Т. XIII.
- ✚ Botalov S.G. **Боталов С.Г.**, 1996. Волго-уральские и казахстанские степи в VI - VIII вв. (Некоторые вопросы тюркизации Евразийских степей) // Новое в археологии Южного Урала. - Челябинск. - С. 194–209.
- ✚ Botalov S.G. **Боталов С.Г.**, 1996a. Памятники селенташского типа в Южном Зауралье // Материалы по археологии и этнографии Южного Урала. – Челябинск.
- ✚ Botalov S.G. **Боталов С.Г.**, 1998. Раннетюркские памятники урало-казахстанских степей // Культуры евразийских степей второй половины I тысячелетия н. э. (вопросы хронологии). – Самара. – С. 321–330.
- ✚ Botalov S.G. **Боталов С.Г.**, 2009. Гунны и тюрки (историко-археологическая реконструкция). – Челябинск: ООО «ЦИКР «Рифей». – 672 с.
- ✚ Botalov S.G., Gutsalov S.Yu. **Боталов С.Г., Гуцалов С.Ю.**, 2000. Гунно-сарматы урало-казахстанских степей. – Челябинск.
- ✚ Botalov S.G., Tairov A.D., Lyubchanskiy I.E. **Боталов С.Г., Таиров А.Д., Любчанский И.Э.**, 2006. Курганы с «усами» урало-казахстанских степей. Челябинск. – 232 с.
- ✚ Botalov S.G., Tkachev A.A. **Боталов С.Г., Ткачев А.А.**, 1990. Нуринское погребение VIII–IX вв. // Проблемы археологии Волго-Уралья. – Свердловск; Челябинск.
- ✚ Valeev G.K. **Валеев Г.К.**, 2003. Башкирский язык // Челябинская область: Энциклопедия. / Гл. ред. К. Н. Бочкарев. Челябинск: Каменный пояс, 2003. Т. 1. А–Г. – С. 312–313.
- ✚ Gening V.F. **Генинг В.Ф.**, 1977. Памятники у с. Кушнаренково на р. Белой (VI–VII вв. н. э.) // Исследование по археологии Южного Урала. – Уфа.

-
- ✚ Zasetzkaya I.P. **Засецкая И.П.**, 1994. Культура кочевников южнорусских степей в гуннскую эпоху IV–VI вв. – СПб.
- ✚ Zykov A.P. **Зыков А.П.**, 2002. Гуннское погребение у села Черноозерье и проблемы этнокультурной ситуации в лесостепном Прииртышье в эпоху великого переселения народов // Тюркские народы. Материалы V Сибирского симпозиума «Культурное наследие народов Сибири». Томск - Омск.
- ✚ Kazakov E.P. **Казаков Е.П.**, 1996. К вопросу о турбаслинско-именьковских памятниках Закамья // Культуры Евразийских степей второй половины I тысячелетия н.э. – Самара.
- ✚ Klyashpornyi S.G., Savinov D.G. **Кляшторный С.Г., Савинов Д.Г.**, 2005. Степные империи Древней Евразии. – СПб.
- ✚ Levina L.M. **Левина Л.М.**, 1996. Этнокультурная история Восточного Приаралья. – М.: Вост. лит.– 396 с.
- ✚ Lyubchanskiy I.E. **Любчанский И.Э.**, 2006. Курганы с усами: типология и хронология // Археология Южного Урала. Степь (проблемы культуригенеза). Серия «Этногенез уральских народов». – Челябинск: ООО «ЦИКР «Рифей». – С. 386–408.
- ✚ Mazhitov N.A. **Мажитов Н.А.**, 1977. Южный Урал VII–XIV вв. – М.
- ✚ Mazhitov N.A. **Мажитов Н.А.**, 1981. Курганы Южного Урала VII–XII вв. – М.
- ✚ Mazhitov N.A., Sungatov F.A., Ivanov V.A., Sattarov T.R., Sultanova A.N., Ivanova E.V. **Мажитов Н.А., Сунгатов Ф.А., Иванов В.А., Саттаров Т.Р., Султанова А.Н., Иванова Е.В.**, 2007. Городище Уфа - II. Материалы раскопок 2006 года. – Уфа, 2007. – Т. I. – 160 с.
- ✚ Mazhitov N.A., Sungatov F.A., Sultanova A.N., Ismailov R.B., Bakhshieva I.R. **Мажитов Н.А., Сунгатов Ф.А., Султанова А.Н., Исмаилов Р.Б., Бахшиева И.Р.**, 2009. Городище Уфа - II. Материалы раскопок 2008 года. Т. III.- Уфа: ГУП РБ УПК.-368 с.
- ✚ Mazhitov N.A., Sungatov F.A., Sattarov T.R., Sultanova A.N., **Мажитов Н.А., Сунгатов Ф.А., Саттаров Т.Р., Султанова А.Н.**, 2009. Городище Уфа - II. Материалы раскопок 2007 года. – Уфа, 2009. – Т. II. – 224 с.
- ✚ Mazhitov N.A., Sungatov F.A., Ф.А., Sultanova V.I., Mukhametdinov V.I., Sungatov A. F. **Мажитов Н.А., Сунгатов Ф.А., Султанова В.И., Мухаметдинов, В.И., Сунгатов, А. Ф.** Городище Уфа - II. Материалы раскопок 2009 года. – Уфа, 2011. – Т. IV. – 244 с.
- ✚ Pigulevskaya N.V. **Пигулевская Н.В.**, 1941. Сирийские источники по истории народов СССР // Труды Института востоковедения. Т. XLI. М.–Л.
- ✚ Rybalko A.A. **Рыбалко А.А.**, 2004. Казахи // Челябинская область: Энциклопедия. / Гл. ред. К. Н. Бочкарев. Челябинск: Каменный пояс, 2004. Т. 3. К–Л. С. 20.
- ✚ Savinov D.G. **Савинов Д.Г.**, 1984. Этнокультурные ареалы Южной Сибири в эпоху раннего средневековья // Проблемы археологии степей Евразии. – Кемерово.
-

-
- ✚ Semenov A.I. **Семенов А.И.**, 1988. К выявлению центрально-азиатских элементов в культуре раннесредневековых кочевников Восточной Европы // АС ГЭ, вып. 29.
 - ✚ **Erdélyi I.**, 1982. Az avarság és Kelet a régészeti források Tükrében. – Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

