

Slavchev V.¹, Baigunakov D.², Sabdenova G.³

¹Doctor of Historical Sciences, Senior Researcher, Regional Museum of Varna, Bulgaria, Varna, e-mail: vladosl@yahoo.com

²Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

³Candidate of historical sciences, associate professor of al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: dosbol_bs@mail.ru

**THE ENEOLITHIC OF KAZAKHSTAN:
THE HISTORY OF STUDY AND THE MAIN PROBLEMS**

The article deals with the problems of the Eneolithic of Kazakhstan. The history of the study is systematized. The main problems are considered. Eneolithic monuments are well researched in the northern regions of Kazakhstan. The Botay culture is especially prominent, which was named after the village name. It was singled out by archaeologist V.F. Zaibert. About 20 settlements along the steppe rivers are opened. The reference monument is the Botay settlement. Archaeologists have calculated that more than 250 houses were built here by ancient people. The area of semi-dwelling houses was 20–70 square meters. As a result of many years of excavation, numerous tools of labor were discovered. A large number of bone remains were found in the Botay settlement. In addition to the bones of wild animals, everywhere there are a lot of bones belonging to the horse. This proves the signs of domestication.

The study of several local groups (Tersek group, Shidertin group) of monuments by other scientists (V. Logvin, V. Mertz) allowed to expand the geography of the Botay Eneolithic culture, to give its versatile description, to clarify the main problems of the Eneolithic of Kazakhstan.

Many regions of Kazakhstan, especially the Central, Eastern, Southern parts have not yet comprehensively understood. According to some findings, only some areas known to have a few Eneolithic monuments. In the future, researchers should work in this area to find out the historical and cultural processes in the Eneolithic.

Key words: Neolithic, Eneolithic, culture, horse, wheel, dwelling, bone, copper.

Славчев В.¹, Байгунаков Д.², Сабденова Г.³

¹Тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Варна регионалды музейінің аға ғылыми қызметкері, Болгария, Варна қ., e-mail: vladosl@yahoo.com

²Тарих ғылымдарының докторы, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің профессоры, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

³Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің профессоры, Қазақстан, Алматы, e-mail: dosbol_bs@mail.ru

Қазақстан энеолиті: зерттелу тарихы мен негізгі мәселелері

Мақалада Қазақстан энеолитінің мәселелері қарастырылады. Зерттелу тарихы біршама жүйеленген. Негізгі мәселелері сарапталған. Қазақстанның солтүстік аудандарында энеолиттік ескерткіштер жақсы зерттелінген. Әсіресе жергілікті ауылдың атауымен аталған Ботай мәдениеті ерекше көзге түседі. Оны бөліп көрсеткен археолог В.Ф. Зайберт. Далалық өзендер аңғарынан 20 шақты қоныстары анықталған. Археологтардың есептеуінше, мұнда байырғы адамдар 250-ден астам баспаналар тұрғызған. Жартылай жертөле түріндегі баспаналардың аумағы 20-70 шаршы м аралағында. Көпжылдық қазба жұмыстарының нәтижесінде көптеген еңбек құралдары табылған. Ботай қонысынан орасан зор көлемдегі сүйек қалдықтары аршып алынған. Жабай тұз тағыларының сүйектерінен басқа, жылқыға тиісілі сүйек қалдықтары өте көп. Мұның өзі жылқының қолға үйретілгендігінің белгілерін нақты көрсетеді.

Басқа ғалымдар (В. Логвин, В. Мерц) тарапынан бірнеше жергілікті топтардың (терсек тобы, шідерті тобы) зерттелуі ботай энеолиттік мәдениетінің географиясын кеңейтуге, оның

мазмұнына жан-жақты сипаттама беруге, Қазақстан энеолитінің негізгі мәселелерін қарастыруға мол мүмкіндіктер ашты.

Қазақстанның көптеген аудандары, әсіресе орталық, шығыс, оңтүстік өңірлер әлі де болса кешенді түрде зерттеліне қойған жоқ. Кейбір аудандарда жекелеген олжалар негізіндегі бірен-саран ескерткіштер ғана кездеседі. Келешекте зерттеушілер осы бағытта жұмыс істеп, энеолит дәуіріндегі тарихи-мәдени үрдістерді анықтаулары тиіс.

Түйін сөздер: неолит, энеолит, мәдениет, жылқы, доңғалақ, баспана, сүйек, мыс.

Славчев В.¹, Байгунаков Д.², Сабденова Г.³

¹Доктор исторических наук, старший научный сотрудник Регионального музея Варны, Болгария, г. Варна, e-mail: vladosl@yahoo.com

²Доктор исторических наук, профессор Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

³Кандидат исторических наук, доцент Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: dosbol_bs@mail.ru

Энеолит Казахстана: история изучения и основные проблемы

В статье рассматривается проблемы энеолита Казахстана, систематизируется история изучения, рассмотрены основные проблемы. Энеолитические памятники хорошо исследованы в северных районах Казахстана. Особенно выделяется культура Ботай, которая была названа по названию села. Выделил ее археолог В.Зайберт. Открыто около 20 поселений вдоль степных рек. Эталонным памятником является поселение Ботай. Археологи посчитали, что здесь древними людьми было построено более 250 жилищ. Площадь полуподземных жилищ составляла 20-70 квадратных метров. В результате многолетних раскопок были обнаружены многочисленные орудия труда. На поселении Ботай обнаружено огромное количество костных остатков. Помимо костей диких животных, повсюду встречается масса костей, принадлежащих лошади. Это доказывает признаки одомашнивания.

Изучение нескольких локальных групп (терсекская группа, шидертинская группа) памятников другими учеными (В.Логвин, В.Мерц) позволило расширить географию ботайской энеолитической культуры, дать ее разностороннюю характеристику, выявить основные проблемы энеолита Казахстана.

Многие районы Казахстана, особенно центральные, восточные, южные регионы, пока комплексно не изучены. В некоторых районах известны лишь единичные памятники энеолита по отдельным находкам. В дальнейшем исследователи должны работать в этом направлении, чтобы выявить историко-культурные процессы в энеолите.

Ключевые слова: неолит, энеолит, культура, лошадь, колесо, жилище, кость, медь.

Introduction

On the territory of Kazakhstan, the Eneolithic Age roughly covers the period of the IV-II millennium BC., although in some territories of the Earth it was longer, and in some territories it wasn't. In Kazakhstan, many scholars unite the Eneolithic and Bronze Age and refer them to the paleometal age. It is considered that during the Eneolithic times copper tools were distributed, but stone tools still prevailed. The appearance of copper tools contributed to the development of human consciousness, opened a wide path for socio-economic development. The introduction of copper tools into life of people led to the emergence of new objects of material culture. This made it possible to improve the instruments of labor, the stone came to oblivion, and the level of agriculture grew strongly, like industry, and military affairs. The copper weapon was rather soft, but it could be repaired if it was deformed.

As the archaeological finds say, it was in the era of the Eneolithic that mankind produced the first wheel. At first it was believed that this discovery was made by the peoples of Mesopotamia, and then they said that the wheel might have appeared on the territory of Eastern Europe. In our opinion, the wheel can also appear on the territory of modern Kazakhstan, where the domestication of the horse took place. Known remains of the wheels in the Bronze Age. Nevertheless, the domestication of the horse contributed to the development of the transport system, agriculture, military affairs, cattle breeding has moved to a completely new level.

From the History of the Kazakhstan's Eneolithic Study

Monuments of the eneolithic age have a special role in the history and territory of the contemporary Kazakhstan, which started to be studied at the end

of the 19th century. Most of them were discovered in the 20th century. However, studying eneolithic monuments in Kazakhstan has not been done systematically. The total number of such kind of monuments is still not clear (Baigunakov, 2013: 94-96).

The history of eneolithic monuments study comprises a special thematic group in the domestic historiography. Because of the fact that most of localities of this age were not identified, they were referred to the neolithic age. However, some of materials were proven as monuments of the eneolithic age by specialists. For the first time eneolithic objects were collected and systematized in "Archeological Map of Kazakhstan" in 1960. Since then, some more monuments were discovered and new facts were collected. For instance, the supervisor of South Kazakhstan archeological expedition A.Kh. Margulan could systematize several neolithic monuments in Saryarka area. On the basis of the research work completed by A.G. Medoev, M.N. Klapchuk and others in the 50-60th of the 20th century, he systematized neolithic localities and burial places found in such historical-cultural areas like Northern-Eastern Kazakhstan, Bayanaul and Karkarali steppes, northern area of the Balkash lake, sand area of Betpakdala, area of Sarysu river, vicinity of Karagandy city, vicinity of Zhezkazgan city. According to the scientists' opinion, some of the neolithic objects of the above mentioned area refer to the eneolithic age. A.Kh. Margulan expresses his confidence that such localities as Akzhal-2, Boribas, Gigant, Aksu-Ayuly, Karagandy-15, Zhezkazgan-13, locality №9 and some localities in the vicinity of Zhezkazgan refer to the Eneolithic Age (Margulan, 1998: 14-48). Most of these monuments consist of several cultural layers. The scientist agrees that monuments of the Eneolithic age were mixed with others in the territory of the Central Kazakhstan. Perhaps, that is why A.G. Medoyev named monuments referring to both the neolithic and eneolithic ages as 'microlith'. He states that the Shyngystau mountain ranges, the northern part of the Balkash lake were areas comprising microlithic culture at the end of the Stone Age (Medoyev, 1962: 86-88). This demonstrates that eneolithic monuments have been ignored by specialists and have not been studied thoroughly.

Although, eneolithic cultures of some areas were mentioned in the works of scientists alongside with the materials of the earlier historical ages. For instance, a scientist from Karagandy A.Y. Chindin studied mesolithic and eneolithic monuments of the Central Kazakhstan. This scientist made a scientific research of such localities as Domalaktas, Akimbek, Dohgal, Narbas, Kreshenovka, Grenada, Karagan-

dy-15, Zelenaya balka several times, demonstrated age measures of a number of monuments, a technical-morphological description of a stone industry, a functional definition of tools, the role of industrial movements, and identified eneolithic complexes among monuments (Chindin, 1992: 8-18). In the result, A.Y. Chindin systematized a historical development of eneolithic age in Saryarka area.

Between 1970-2000, V.N. Logvin from Kostanay, who did archeological research work in the northern part of Kazakhstan, was the first to investigate neolithic and eneolithic monuments found along the Tobyl River and add them into a scientific circulation. Primarily, he did a scientific analysis of Bestamak, Alkau-2, Duzbay-2-3, Svetlyi Dzharkul', Amangeldi, Solenoe Ozero-1, Evgen'evka-2, Livanovka, Kishi Aksuat, Tersek-Karagai, Kara-Myrza-9, Kol and other localities referring to the eneolithic age. Later on, he enlarged the area of his a scientific field, consequently, he could find more new monuments and joined all developing peculiarities and scientific rules of neolithic and eneolithic monuments (Logvin, 2002: 8-38). Materials collected as a result of many-year work allowed demonstrating the differences of Tersek culture from others (Kalieva, Logvin, 1997: 88-128). Several monuments of Torgai area like Kozhai-1 and others were studied by S.S. Kalieva and the results of this work was reflected in her monograph (Kalieva, 1998: 89-138).

From the mid of 1980's an archeological expedition led by V.F. Zaibert has been investigating Botai locality. The materials gained during this studies allowed him making some scientific statements about Botai culture. Nowadays, a number of localities of Botai culture like Krasnyi Yar, Vasil'kovka-4, Roshinskoe, Balandino, Sergeevka, Goluboi Zaliv, Kenotkel-8, Selety-1 and others were investigated and their roles in the world historiography were identified. The research work done in this locality during a quarter century was reflected in V.F. Zaibert's monograph named "Botai culture" (Zaibert, 2009: 238-288). The author could disclose a special role of Botai culture located in Oral-Kazakhstan valley. Recently, much attention has been paid to revival of dwellings of ancient Botai inhabitants and restoration of their cultural-economical and social relations.

The uniqueness of some eneolithic cultures is widely discussed in the domestic historiography. For instance, V. Logvin, who included Tersek culture of Torgai region into a scientific circulation, considers it as a separate culture. It is of great importance to note that between 1946-1951 A.A. For-

mozov was the first to state that it is necessary to differentiate Tersek and Karagai cultures after gaining a large fund of monument materials in this area. Later on, between 1970-1990 a group of scientists like V. Logvin and S. Kalieva completed excavation work in this area and identified the above mentioned culture. Alongside this, several buried treasures like Aksu were discovered.

V.F. Zaibert considers Tersek culture as a part of Botai culture. V. Logvin and S. Kalieva oppose him, while some other scientists suggest to join and call them 'Botai-Tersek' archeological culture, which seems very reasonable for us.

Several eneolithic monuments studied by a joint Kazakhstan-Russian archeological led by A.P. Derevianko between 1992-2002 in the territory of Kazakhstan were given to the world later on by G.T. Iskakov. He studied mesolithic-eneolithic objects found in the northern part of Mugalzhar and Aral sea and included Aral-4 monument into the age considered (Iskakov, 2005: 9-22). In his own turn, G.T. Iskakov discussed the issues like the stone tools evolution, the history of early and middle Holocene monuments investigating.

The history of studying eneolithic monuments was discussed in S.V. Zakharov's scientific work "Studying eneolithic of Northern and Southern Kazakhstan". According to Zakharov's words, in contemporary Kazakhstan's territory 6 localities referring to the copper-stone age were discovered along Esil river, 32 monuments in Torgai cave were found, almost 50 eneolithic monuments were investigated in Southern Oral region (Zakharov, 2009: 10-26). After analysing information gained from the localities discovered, the history of studying was discussed in detail. Which is why, we tried not to repeat these authors and gave a short survey of history of eneolithic monuments. We hope that interested reader would find coherent information in the work named above.

One of the eneolithic monuments is Shidirti near Ekibastuz town, which was studied by V. Mertz. It consists of several cultural layers starting from mesolithic age till Bronze Age.

However, the domestic historiography still has a number of issues in, which demands deep consideration. There is no information on the eneolithic age of cultural-historical areas like Zhetisu and South-Kazakhstan as well. It is of great importance to study such kinds of eneolithic monuments in future. Alongside this, eneolithic monuments in large cultural-historical areas like Saryarka and East-Kazakhstan are to be systematized (Baigunakov, 2013: 95-96).

The problem of identifying localities of the eneolithic age in the domestic historiography is considered one of the most important ones, as only some of them were investigated. An Archeologist A.M. Orazbayev encountered a monument demonstrating burial traditions of eneolithic age in Eastern Kazakhstan. According to this scientist, a mound №2 of Chernovaya locality refers to the eneolithic age, judged by its burial structure and tradition like coating a corpse with a red ochre and others. It resembles monuments found in mounds near Batenei, Tesy villages in Southern Siberia and a tomb near Kurta village in Mountainous Altai region referring to Afanas'ev culture (Orazbayev, Omarov, 1998: 9-70). Since then lots of eneolithic localities were discovered. Although they have not entered a scientific circulation.

Finally, approximately, 200 eneolithic localities were studied in the territory of contemporary Kazakhstan. The number of eneolithic objects were sometimes added to the number of neolithic monuments in some research work. For instance, the authors of the 1st volume of "Kazakhstan history" say that the total number of neolithic and eneolithic monuments are 600. Frankly saying, according to our data the total number of neolithic monuments found in Kazakhstan is more than 800 (Baigunakov, 2003: 12-24). However, because of the fact that tools made from copper are very rare, it is very possible that most of eneolithic monuments are accepted as neolithic ones. Alongside this, the chronological borderline between these two ages is not still clear. The evolution of stone tools found near monuments is not shown clearly by scientists as well (Baigunakov, 2013: 94-96).

The Main Problems of the Eneolithic of Kazakhstan

As can be seen from the above, era of the Eneolithic Kazakhstan is one of the most complex and dynamic historical and cultural periods in Russian history. Long-term archaeological research allows us to trace the quantitative and qualitative transformation of relationship between nature and man in the northern regions, which show significant changes in economic and socio-ideological spheres. Against the background of the incipient Steppe civilization, changes occurred that affected not only the socio-economic spheres of the above-mentioned region, but also cultural and genetic processes throughout Central Asia. Archaeological objects of the northern regions of Kazakhstan reflect the process of historical development both in terms of general patterns

and a concrete historical situation. The development of Botaya culture is not only a general picture, but also the specificity of the Eneolithic era of Kazakhstan, which was closely related to previous periods. Specific features of the nature of Northern Kazakhstan primarily predetermined the process of domestication. Probably, in the Neolithic period that began in Northern Kazakhstan several thousand years ago, there is a differentiation of the forms of economic activity depending on natural and climatic features of places of residence.

In the Eneolithic of Kazakhstan, a separate serious problem is mutual relations and mutual influence of cultures and adjacent territories, since it is almost impossible to make a clear boundary neither in geographical nor in cultural-historical terms in different epochs. After all, many archaeological cultures cover several regions. For example, a certain culture can cover both North Kazakhstan and Central Kazakhstan.

The southern direction is also problematic in the definition of cultural and historical borders, since the materials of Karatau and Moyinkum, especially Zhetysu, have not been studied at all. The Eneolithic of Northern Kazakhstan probably has some similarities with the materials of East Kazakhstan. In the context of growing interest in the issues of regional history, the study of the processes of cultural genesis in the region in antiquity is very relevant. In these regions (Moiynkum, Tarbagatai, Zhetysu, Betpakdala, Priirtyshye, Ustyurt, etc.), complex archaeological work should be carried out. The aim of this work should be: the development of a scheme of culturogenesis in the Eneolithic. The research tasks should be: generalization of the history of archaeological studies of the monuments of the Eneolithic of Kazakhstan; analysis and synthesis of all available sources in the Eneolithic of Kazakhstan; the discovery of new monuments; the definition of the basis of the characteristics of material culture in the Eneolithic era and others.

Conditionally, the Eneolithic stage in the history of Kazakhstan ends at the turn of the III and II millennium BC. (Zakharov, 2010: 38-78). Later on this territory archaeological cultures of the Early Bronze Age spread, some of them begin to exist already at the end of Eneolithic, some later. Nevertheless, the autochthonous line of development of cultures in Kazakhstan, which existed since the Neolithic period (Atbasar culture and others) is not interrupted. All available data to date indicate that the local Eneolithic population participated in the formation of the Bronze Age culture. While it is clear to trace the further destiny of the Eneolithic population, it is rather difficult

in the absence of reliable facts. Between the finale of the Eneolithic and the Early Bronze Age, there are irrelevant lacunae, we think that these gaps fill with time. Numerous tools, ceramics, remnants of wheels, osteological materials of horses in the Bronze Age, undoubtedly take their roots from the era of Eneolithic. We would like to note that the generalization and systematization of the material, the development of versions of cultural and genetic transformations and the chronology of the eneolithic formations of Kazakhstan, the reconstruction of economic and individual aspects of socio-ideological structures, the determination of the historical place of eneolithic cultures in the system of monuments and cultures of the Central Asian region should concern all researchers. They first have to enter in the scientific revolution of new, original monuments; create a database; to study stone and bone tools; to clarify their typology and classification; to analyze complex of findings by methods of mathematical statistics. The tasks of the work should include a description of the specific features of the house-building skills and traditions of the eneolithic population of the districts; classification of inventory and products made of wood, analysis of ceramics by typological and technical-morphological methods. Then we would have received a more complete characterization of the Eneolithic of Kazakhstan, as today's degree of study does not satisfy many specialists.

To date, several hundred monuments of the Eneolithic Age have been investigated in Kazakhstan. Monuments are represented as single-layered sites, or eneolithic layers on multilayer sites – (Shiderty, etc.), and lifting charges (Mertz, 2005: 265-271).

Conclusion

The Eneolithic of Kazakhstan is represented by several cultures. The system of some cultures, genetically related to each other (Botai and Tersek) and coexisting at a time, reflects the processes of cultural genesis of the region. All Eneolithic cultures arose on the basis of the late Neolithic (Atbasar culture, etc.) of Kazakhstan. Microindustrial complexes, plate technology and tooling are greatly expanded, modernized and enriched by the introduction of new types of retouching, the emergence of bilateral machining and grinding tools. Neolithic traditions are preserved in the early and middle stages. At the end of the Eneolithic, the role of stone implements and plate-like technique is slightly weakened, although it persists until the late Bronze Age. Probably, a certain role in this was played by the emergence of the processing of native

copper and the actual metallurgy of copper. Ceramic complexes of the Eneolithic show development in the manufacture of dishes and its ornamentation within the framework of a single technological and historical and cultural tradition.

In our opinion, the state of study in Eneolithic Kazakhstan remains unsatisfactory, as many regions remain intact. For example: Moiyunkum, Zhetyysu, Tarbagatai, South Kazakhstan, East Kazakhstan, Irtysh regions.

References

- Baigunakov D. (2003). Kazakstan tas gasury dauiri: zerttely tarixi men negizgi ma'seleleri [Stone century of Kazakhstan: history of studying and main problems]: avtoreferat. ... kand.ist.nauk: 07.00.06. Almaty.
- Baigunakov D. (2013). From the History of the Kazakhstan's Eneolithic study// 2nd International scientific conference "European Applied Sciences: modern approaches in scientific researches". 18-19th February 2013. –Vol.1. Stuttgart, Germany
- Chindin A.Y. (1992). Kamennye industrii plemen Tzentral'nogo Kazakhstana epokhi mezolita-eneolita (na osnove tipologii, trasologii, eksperimenta) [The stone industries of the Central Kazakhstan tribes of the Mesolithic-Eneolithic epoch (based on typology, tracology, experiment)]: avtoreferat. ... kand.ist.nauk: 07.00.06. Saint-Petersburg.
- Iskakov G.T. (2005). Kamennaya industriya Mugodzhar i Severnogo Priarali'ya v mezolite-eneolite [The stone industry of Mugodzhar and the Northern Aral Sea in the Mesolithic-Eneolithic]: avtoref. ... kand.ist.nauk: 07.00.06 Almaty.
- Kaliova S.S., Logvin V.N.(1997). Skotovody Turgaya v tret'em tysacheletii do nashei ery[Cattlemen Turgai in the third millennium BC]. Kustanai: Kustanaiskii pechatnui dvor.
- Kaliova S.S. (1998). Poselenie Kozhai 1[Settlement Kozhai 1]. Almaty.
- Logvin V.N.(2002). Turgaiskii progib v epokhu mezolita-eneolita [Turgai trough in the Mesolithic-Eneolithic]: avtoref. ... d-ra ist.nauk: 07.00.06. Novosibirsk.
- Margulan A.Kh. (1998). Begazy-dandybaevskaia kul'tura Tzentral'nogo Kazakhstana. Sochinenia: v 14 t.-T.1. [Begazy-dandybai culture of Central Kazakhstan // Works. In 14 volumes. -T.1]. Almaty: Atamura.
- Medoyev A.G. (1962). Novye materialy po kamennomu veku Severnogo Pribalkhash'ia i khrebta Chingiz. [New materials on the Stone Age of the Northern Pribalkhash and Chingiz Ridge]. Vestnik AN Kazakhskoii SSR. –№3.
- Мерц В.К. (2005). Issledovaniia mnogoslinoi stoyanki Shiderty 3 [Investigations of Shiderta III multilayer parking]. Otchet obarcheologicheskikh issledovaniyach po Gosydarstvennoi programme «Kul'turnoe nasledie» v 2005 godyy. Almaty.
- Orazbayev A.M., Omarov G.K. (1998). Nekotoruyie itogi arkheologicheskogo issledovaniya Vostochnogo Kazakhstana. [Some results of the archaeological research of East Kazakhstan]. Problemy izucheniya i sokhraneniya istoricheskogo naslediya (materialy mezhdumanarodnoi archeologicheskoi konferencii). Almaty.
- Zaibert V.F. (2009). Botaiskaya kul'tura. [Botay Culture]. Almaty: «KazAqparat».
- Zakharov S.V. (2009). Iszuchenie eneolita Severnogo Kazakhstana i Yuzhnogo Zaural'ya. [The study of the Paleolithic of Northern Kazakhstan and the Southern Trans-Urals]: avtoreferat ... kand.ist.nauk: 07.00.06. Almaty.
- Zakharov S.V. (2010). Istoriya izycheniya eneolita Ural-Ityschskogo mejdyreschya [The history of the study of the Eneolithic of the Ural-Irtysh interfluve]. Petropavlovsk: SKGU im. M. Kozybaev.

Литература

- Байгунаков Д. (2003). Қазақстан тас ғасыры дәуірі: зерттелу тарихы мен негізгі мәселелері: тар. ғыл. канд... автореф.: 07.00.06. Алматы.
- Baigunakov D. (2013). From the History of the Kazakhstan's Eneolithic study// 2nd International scientific conference "European Applied Sciences: modern approaches in scientific researches". 18-19th February 2013. Vol.1. Stuttgart, Germany
- Чиндин А.Ю. (1992). Каменные индустрии племен Центрального Казахстана эпохи мезолита-энеолита (на основе типологии, трасологии, эксперимента): автореф. канд. ист. наук: 07.00.06. Санкт-Петербург.
- Искаков Г.Т. (2005). Каменная индустрия Мугоджар и Северного Приаралья в мезолите-энеолите: автореф. канд. ист. наук: 07.00.06. – Алматы.
- Калиева С.С., Логвин В.Н. (1997). Скотоводы Тургая в третьем тысячелетии до нашей эры. Кустанай: Кустанайский печатный двор.
- Калиева С.С. (1998). Поселение Кожай 1. Алматы.
- Логвин В.Н. (2002). Тургайский прогиб в эпохи мезолита-энеолита: автореф. д-ра. ист. наук: 07.00.06. Новосибирск.
- Маргулан А.Х. (1998). Бегазы-дандыбаевская культура Центрального Казахстана // Соч.: в 14 т. – Т.1. Алматы: Атамұра.
- Медоев А.Г. (1962). Новые материалы по каменному веку Северного Прибалхашья и хребта Чингиз // Вестник АН казахской ССР. №3
- Мерц В.К.(2005). Исследования многослойной стоянки Шидерты 3. Отчет об археологических исследованиях по Государственной программе «Культурное наследие» в 2005 г. Алматы.
- Оразбаев А.М., Омаров Г.К. (1998). Некоторые итоги археологического исследования Восточного Казахстана. Проблемы изучения и сохранения исторического наследия (материалы международной конференции). Алматы.
- Зайберт В.Ф. (2009). Ботайская культура. Алматы: «ҚазАқпарат».
- Захаров С.В. (2009). Изучение энеолита Северного Казахстана и Южного Зауралья: автореф. канд. ист. наук: 07.00.06. Алматы.
- Захаров С.В. (2010). История изучения энеолита Урал-Иртышского междуречья. Петропавловск: СКГУ им. М. Козыбаева.