

It remains to be seen if the **ancient DNA** of people living in the historical Armenian regions corresponds to the DNA of modern Armenians.

As per **Colin Renfrew**: "There is one obvious path of investigation that does deserve to be explored further — ancient DNA. Of course this is a difficult field — it depends upon the availability of adequately preserved human remains, and the problems of contamination from living humans are well known. But there are puzzling findings from early farming sites in central Europe, indicating that the populations in question did not survive or at least did not get fully integrated into succeeding populations. This requires further examination, as it bears on a general problem of archaeogenetics. Possible population extinctions might call into question the extent to which mtDNA or Y-DNA data from the contemporary populations represent the communities existing in the relevant locations at the times in question. This is where ancient DNA may yet prove to be of crucial importance; not in establishing detailed patterns for early populations — the data are unlikely to be rich enough for that—but in offering spot checks on the conclusions about the past which we are deriving from data taken from populations living today. This may indeed be where the future lies if speculations based on the phylogeography of haplotypes from currently living populations are to be rooted in historical reality."

As per **Dienekes Pontikos**: "Ancient DNA can prove the existence of a particular Y-chromosome haplogroup within a securely dated population. Of course there are issues of possible contamination, but these can be addressed beyond a reasonable doubt when appropriate protocols and tests for contamination are in place. Ancient DNA cannot prove the absence of a particular Y-chromosome haplogroup from a population. However, it can render it very improbable if a large enough sample is studied. So, ancient DNA is very relevant both for the existence and the absence of a haplogroup in a certain area at a certain time. On the whole ancient DNA, properly done, provides much better evidence for past populations than inferences from modern populations. Too many assumptions are needed to peer into the past by studying modern populations, and in the vast majority of cases -with the caveat about sample sizes- when we looked at prehistoric populations we did not get a picture of simple continuity."