

FROM THE HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF LATE PALEOLITHIC SITES

N. Abduvalieva

Doctoral Student, Department of World History,
Fergana State University

Abstract

The article analyzes the history of the study of the Late Paleolithic period in Central Asia, which began in the 1960s-70s of the 20th century, focusing on the study of sites such as Obirakhmat, Kulbulak, Samarkand, Siyobcha, Shugnov, Khojagor, and Yangaja 2.

Keywords: Late Paleolithic, Neolithic, stone tools, Obirakhmat, Kulbulak, Samarkand, Siyobcha, Shugnov, Khojagor, Yangaja 2.

INTRODUCTION

Nearly a hundred burials belonging to *Homo sapiens sapiens* from the Late Paleolithic period have been studied across Eurasia. Human remains discovered and studied in France, Germany, England, and Eastern Europe are of significant importance. Human bones found at Obirakhmat, Angillak, and Samarkand provide valuable material evidence about the process of anthropogenesis in our country. During this period, people began to inhabit all areas of the Earth, including the Americas and Australia. The Late Paleolithic period saw the Vyurm glaciation forming a unique bridge connecting Eurasia with North America. According to researchers, a layer of soil formed on top of the massive glacier uniting Alaska and Chukotka, creating dry land where plants grew. This area is known as Beringia in Quaternary geology. Through the Beringian land bridge, which emerged during the last glacial period, ancient humans migrated from Asia to the Americas around 30,000-26,000 BC. They spread to the southernmost reaches of South America by the end of the Late Paleolithic period. The sites discovered and studied in Chile date back to the end of the Late Paleolithic [1].

ANALYSIS OF LITERATURE AND METHODOLOGY

The article uses methods such as the principle of historicity, comparative analysis, systematization, classification, and problem-chronological approach. It aims to reveal the extent to which scientific hypotheses presented in research are substantiated by current archaeological studies, which is considered the main goal of the research.

Scholars from our country and around the world, including M.R. Qosimov, O' .I. Islomov, N.K. Anisyutkin, V.A. Ranov, S.A. Nesmeyanov, Z.A. Abramova, D.N. Lev, V.V. Shumov, A.A. Yurev, G.F. Tetyukhin, and S.A. Nesmeyanov, have studied the Late Paleolithic sites of Central Asia in different periods [1-43].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sites such as Obirakhmat, Kulbulak, Samarkand, Siyobcha, Shugnov, Khojagor, Yangaja 2, and others, belonging to the Late Paleolithic period in Central Asia, have been well studied. Kulbulak and Obirakhmat in the Tashkent oasis are important Late Paleolithic sites, with their upper cultural layers dating back to the Late Paleolithic period. Stone tools, animal bones, traces of hearths, and ash remains have been found in the upper three cultural layers of the Kulbulak site, dating back to the Late Paleolithic period [2].

The stone tools were made in a denticulate form, dating back to the end of the Mousterian period. The tool complex consists of nuclei, scrapers, points, and denticulate tools. The bones found and studied belong to animals such as mountain goats, horses, wild sheep, and hyenas. The cultural layers of this site, dating back to this period, are dated to 24,000 BC based on radiocarbon dating.

Until the 1960s-70s of the last century, there were only a few known Late Paleolithic sites in the territories of Uzbekistan. However, recent studies have shown that their number is quite significant [3]. Late Paleolithic sites have been well studied mainly in the Tashkent and Zarafshan oases.

Using the Tashkent oasis as an example, the upper cultural layers of the Kulbulak site belong to the material culture of Late Paleolithic communities. In particular, the Akhangaran valley, where the site is directly located, has long been a convenient place for primitive communities to live due to its natural ecological environment. The history of studying the Late Paleolithic cultural layer of Kulbulak consists of two stages:

The first stage is associated with the name of M.R. Qosimov [4] and covers the period from the discovery of this site until 1990. The results obtained are reflected in a number of scientific articles and in M.R. Qosimov's doctoral dissertation [5]. As a result of the excavations carried out during this period, 600 m² of the surface area was opened and studied in Kulbulak, and 49 cultural layers were identified by excavating the No. 3 trench to a depth of 19 m. It was determined that these layers belonged to the Acheulean (22), Mousterian (24), and Late Paleolithic (3) periods, and a large number of carved and Tayac-type stone tools were found, which formed the basis for a scientific interpretation of a separate culture unique to Central Asia [6].

According to M.R. Qosimov, the significant aspect of the Kulbulak site is that the cultural layers belonging to the Acheulean, Mousterian, and Late Paleolithic periods are located sequentially, and organically express the transition period from the Acheulean to the Mousterian and from the Mousterian to the Late Paleolithic [7].

The second stage of studying Kulbulak and the surrounding sites begins in 1994. These studies were led by O.I. Islomov, and archaeologist N.K. Anisyutkin from St. Petersburg participates in the research process. The results of the studies are reflected in the book "Preliminary Studies of the Akhangaran River Valley for 1994" [8]. The excavations in 1994-1995 were carried out on the southern surface area of the previously opened J2-R2-40, 41, 49-53 squares (approximately 30 m²). As a result of the research, the following conclusions were obtained:

1) The site is multi-layered, and these "cultural layers" turned out to be different in number and manifestation compared to previous excavations;

2) Among the Late Paleolithic flint tools, the majority are carved, which partially corresponds to M.R. Qosimov's conclusions that there is a separate industry containing many carved stone tools in the territory of Uzbekistan. However, the separation of the independent "Kulbulak culture" in M.R. Qosimov's interpretations is not sufficiently scientifically based;

3) On the contrary, a large part of the materials from the 3rd and 4th layers consists of typical Mousterian stone tools - scrapers and arrowheads, and carved tools are the majority only in the 4th layer. This may not be related to human activity [9].

V.A. Ranov and S.A. Nesmeyanov question the existence of cultural layers in Kulbulak. "This doubt is confirmed by the fact that archaeological materials of various types (in terms of period and patina) are mixed in the monument. Because, mousterian stone tools are mixed with small stone tools from the Late Paleolithic in the layers. In addition, the mousterian materials here are more patinated and sometimes eroded. Apparently, the burial of mousterian and Late Paleolithic materials in the layers occurred at different times. It is doubtful that such different stone tools were made at the same time. Therefore, it can be said that only the artifacts specific to the Late Paleolithic in the upper layers of Kulbulak have a local origin, while the Mousterian materials came from elsewhere. It is unknown how they got here. Perhaps, most of the archaeological materials were washed away from the valleys located higher than Kulbulak. Their accumulation here is related to the geomorphological situation of Kulbulak. The fact is that the upper Jarsoy comes to Kulbulak and forms a sharp low slope, and perhaps that is why alluvial sediments were deposited here. The thick layers of stone boulders in Kulbulak may also be related to such alluvial sediments" [10].

Z.A. Abramova's ideas about the material of the upper layers of Kulbulak, in particular, that it grew out of the local denticulate Mousterian, are important in the book "Paleolithic USSR" [11].

Another Late Paleolithic site in the Tashkent oasis is the Dodikatem find site, found on the terraces of the Chirchik River. In 2005, employees of the Uzbek-Russian joint expedition found stone tools from the last stages of the Late Paleolithic period [12].

The richest area in our country for Late Paleolithic sites is the Zarafshan River valley. One of the main sites in the region is the Samarkand site. It was located on the right bank of Chashmasiyob, directly in the city of Samarkand, in the place of the current water park. The site was discovered in 1939 by N.G. Kharlamov, and a trench was excavated by him in the same year. The second stage of studying the site is associated with the name of D.N. Lev, under whose leadership excavations were carried out from 1958 to 1967. In 1970-1973, the work of studying the Samarkand site was continued by M.J. Jurakulov and Y.N. Amaraseva. Geologists such as V.V. Shumov, A.A. Yurev, G.F. Tetyukhin, and S.A. Nesmeyanov also participated in the excavations of the site in different years. A total of 1000 m² of the site has been opened and studied. Rich faunistic materials were obtained from the excavations. The most numerous bone remains belonged to horses, accounting for half of all identified bone remains. The next positions are occupied by the Pleistocene donkey and the primitive tour. In addition, remnants

of the Knoblocha (Nor) camel, Bukhara deer, and desert sheep, as well as relatively small amounts of gazelle, pig, wolf, and kulan remains, were found in the layers. Also, tubular bones of elephants or rhinos that were difficult to identify, as well as a small number of bone remains of birds and turtles, were found. According to the fauna remains found at the Samarkand site, its surrounding river valleys consisted of a desert and semi-desert landscape with tugay vegetation areas [13]. Thousands of stone artifacts have been found at the Samarkand site, including nuclei, flakes, blades, scrapers, wedge-shaped tools, perforators, cutters, micro-scrapers, retouched blades, and whetstone tools. At the Samarkand site, 7 cultural layers were identified, from which thousands of stone artifacts, rich fauna, hearth remains, human bone fragments, and ochre remains were found.

The external similarity of the materials from the Samarkand site to the materials of the Late Paleolithic period in Siberia (Malta, Buret, Achinskaya, etc.) gave rise to ideas about ethnic connections between the cultures of these regions. The disproportion of the combined occurrence of galet and lamellar techniques and the lack of clear technical-typological ideas about the characteristics of the Samarkand site industry led to the emergence of various ideas about the paths of its cultural-genetic and chronological development. According to A.P. Okladnikov, the inventory of the Samarkand site structurally repeats the industries of the Malta, Buret, and Achinskaya sites. The similarity of the materials from the Samarkand site to the Late Paleolithic industries of the Yenisei region was also noted by Z.A. Abramova [14].

Z.A. Abramova initially included the materials from the Samarkand site in one of the variants of European or Near Eastern cultures. G.F. Korobkova, paying attention to the peculiarities of the Samarkand site industry, expressed the opinion that it has no analogs in Central Asia and neighboring regions [15]. V.A. Ranov also did not stay away from such discussions and proposed to include the industry of the Samarkand site typologically in the direction of the development of Asian cultures [16]. D.N. Lev, in his time, genetically linked the industry of the Samarkand site with the Mousterian materials of Amankutan [17]. The similarity of the site to the materials of the Siberian Late Paleolithic period was also noted by M.J. Jo'raqulov [18]. In addition, it was noted that the materials of the Samarkand site are similar to the Sangao cave industry in Pakistan [19]. The discovery of the Late Paleolithic Shugnou site in Tajikistan led to a new wave of comparisons. V.A. Ranov [20] and Y.P. Kholyushkin [21] emphasized the periodic proximity of Shugnou to the Samarkand site. In subsequent studies by M.J. Juraqulov, the Samarkand site was included in the sphere of Siberian-Chinese Paleolithic cultures [22]. Initially, the Samarkand site was dated archaeologically and stratigraphically to the beginning of the Late Paleolithic period or to the 40th millennium BC [23]. This opinion was also confirmed by P.P. Yefimenko [24] and P.I. Boriskovsky [25].

M.J. Juraqulov proposed a dating for the site to the 33rd millennium BC [26]. Z.A. Abramova, however, viewed this antiquity of the Samarkand site with suspicion [27]. According to V.A. Ranov [28], it was found that the Samarkand site should be dated to the second half of the Late Paleolithic, that is, to the 15th-20th millennia BC. This dating of the site was confirmed by the geological assessment of the beginning of the Yalangdasht (Golodnostep) and Syrdarya stages and the study of the Upper Pleistocene fauna [29]. Based on the materials obtained from the

lower terrace, G.F. Korobkova found the materials of the Samarkand site to belong to the final stage of the Late Paleolithic [30].

Y.P. Kholyushkin, taking into account the similarity of the materials of the Samarkand site to the industry of the upper layers of Shugnou, placed its materials periodically between horizons 1 and 2 of Shugnou. However, there are no clear ideas about the cultural characteristics of the Samarkand site. D.N. Lev, based on the peculiarities of the industry of the Samarkand site, proposed to separate it into an independent Samarkand Late Paleolithic culture [31], and this opinion was supported by V.A. Ranov [32] and Y.P. Kholyushkin [33]. Y.P. Kholyushkin regards the Samarkand site as a separate cultural and economic complex [33]. M.J. Juraqulov, however, believes that it is too early to draw such conclusions [34].

There is also no consensus on the functional essence of the Samarkand site. According to D.N. Lev, it is a stone-working workshop [35], for Y.P. Kholyushkin – a site-workshop [36], while G.F. Korobkova interprets the site as an area intended for knapping stones in some places [37]. There are also different opinions regarding the synchronicity of all three lower terraces where the site is located. Therefore, the materials from all three layers were interpreted in a generalized manner [38]. S.A. Nesmeyanov introduced some clarity to this issue. Based on geological and palynological data, he emphasizes that the layers of the Samarkand site may belong to different periods [39]. L.B. Vishnyatskiy also does not deny this idea [40]. Currently, there is insufficient evidence to prove both hypotheses regarding the stratigraphic situation of the site. Firstly, very few archaeological materials have been collected from the lower layer of the upper terrace of the site. Secondly, the materials of the cultural layers of the site have not been sufficiently studied in terms of accurate typological, technological, and comparative aspects.

Thus, the scientific debates surrounding the Samarkand site have not subsided to this day. Unfortunately, the planigraphy of the site and the functional analyzes of stone artifacts have not been fully published. Based on traceological analyzes, G.F. Korobkova connects the genetic origin of the Samarkand site with the Mousterian sites adjacent to it. The genetic connection of the dominant technique in the Samarkand site is observed in adjacent, but much older sites. We are talking about Kutirbulak and Zirabulak, dating back to the Late Mousterian period [41]. According to researchers, the Kutirbulak and Zirabulak industries are the main and initial layers that led to the Samarkand Late Paleolithic culture [42]. Later studies by M.J. Jurakulov and Ye.N. Amaraseva once again confirmed this idea. The proximity of the Samarkand site with the industry of the upper layers of Kutirbulak is also approached by the increase in the ratio of parallel-shouldered tangs and the rare leveling of the impact areas [43].

Conclusion

Scholars from our country and around the world, including M.R. Qosimov, O.I. Islomov, N.K. Anisyutkin, V.A. Ranov, S.A. Nesmeyanov, Z.A. Abramova, D.N. Lev, V.V. Shumov, A.A. Yurev, G.F. Tetyukhin, and S.A. Nesmeyanov, have well studied sites such as Obirakhmat, Kulbulak, Samarkand, Siyobcha, Shugnov, Khojagor, Yangaja 2, and others, belonging to the Late Paleolithic period in Central Asia. Kulbulak and Obirakhmat in the Tashkent oasis are

important Late Paleolithic sites, with their upper cultural layers dating back to the Late Paleolithic period.

References

1. Ibragimov R. Arxeologiya. – Toshkent. O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Fanlar akademiyasi “Fan” nashriyoti davlat korxonasi, 2022. – B. 37-39.
2. Ibragimov R. Arxeologiya. – Toshkent. O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Fanlar akademiyasi “Fan” nashriyoti davlat korxonasi, 2022. – B. 41.
3. Ташкенбаев Н.Х., Сулейманов Р.Х. Древнекаменный век долины реки Зарафшана. Ташкент. 1980. – С. 76-97. Ранов В.А., Несмеянов С.А. Палеолит и стратиграфия антропогена Средней Азии // Душанбе. 1973. – С. 68. Джуракулов М.Д. Самаркандская стоянка и проблемы верхнего палеолита в Средней Азии. Ташкент. 1987. – С. 1-128.
4. Джуракулов М.Д. Самаркандская стоянка и проблемы верхнего палеолита в Средней Азии. Ташкент. 1987. – С. 1-128. Лев Д.Н. Палеолит Самаркандской области и его специфические особенности – Труды СамГУ, новая серия, вып. 166. Самарканд. 1967. – С. 76. Сайфуллаев Б.К., Курбонбоев И.М. Қизилкумдаги палеолит даври устахоналарини ўрганишга доир (Есен 2, Қорақудук, Шахпахти, Кўкаёз 1, 2 ва 3 материаллари асосида). ИМКУ. №36. 2008. – С.13; Сайфуллаев Б.К. Палеолит долины реки Зарафшана и Северо-Восточных Кызылкумов // автореферат канд. Дис-С. Самарканд. 2003. – С. 1-24; Сайфуллаев Б.К., Хушвақтов Н.О., Курбонбаев И.М. Поздний палеолит Узбекистана (по материалам новых технико-типологических исследований индустрии верхних (I-III) слоев Кульбулака. ИМКУ. №36. Самарканд. 2007. – С. 12-16; Касымов М.Р. Кремнеобрабатывающие мастерские и шахты каменного века Средней Азии. Ташкент. 1972. – С. 16; Касымов М.Р. Результаты археологических работ в долине р. Сох в 1966-1967 гг. // ИМКУ. Вып. 9. 1972а. – С. 18-23, 31; Касымов М.Р. Проблемы палеолита Средней Азии и Южного Казахстана. Автореферат докт. Дис-С. Новосибирск. 1990. – С. 13; Касымов М.Р. О проблемах изучения палеолита на территории Средней Азии и Южного Казахстана. // ОНУ. № 9. 1990а. – С. 22.
5. Касымов М.Р., Коробков И.И., Годин М.Х. Стратиграфия, литология и характеристика каменной индустрии многослойной стоянки Кульбулак // Проблемы взаимосвязи природы и общества в каменном веке Средней Азии. Ташкент. 1988. – С. 42-43; Касымов М.Р. Проблемы палеолита Средней Азии и Южного Казахстана. Автореферат докт. Дис-С. Новосибирск. 1990. – С. 13; Касымов М.Р. О проблемах изучения палеолита на территории Средней Азии и Южного Казахстана. // ОНУ. № 9. 1990а. – С. 22.
6. Касымов М.Р., Годин М.Х. Важнейшие результаты исследований многослойной стоянки Кульбулак // ИМКУ. Вып. 19. 1984. – С. 46-48; Касымов М.Р., Годин М.Х., Худайбердыев Т.Н. Домустьерские культуры на территории Узбекистана //

-
- Хроностратиграфия палеолита Северной, Центральной и Восточной Азии и Америки. Новосибирск. 1992. – С. 18-20.
7. Касымов М.Р., Дуке Х., Гречкина Т.Ю. О новых данных по каменному веку Туябугуза // ИМКУ. Вып. 15. 1979. – С. 11- 15.
 8. Анисюткин Н.К., Исламов У.И., Крахмаль К.А., Хушвактов Н.О. Предварительные исследования долины реки Ахангаран за 1995 г. ИИМК. Санкт-Петербург.1995. – С. 72.
 9. Анисюткин Н.К., Исламов У.И., Крахмаль К.А., Сайфуллаев Б.К., Хушвактов Н.О. Предварительные исследования долины реки Ахангаран за 1994 г. // ИИМК. Санкт-Петербург. 1995. – С. 16-18.
 10. Ранов В.А., Несмеянов -С.А. Палеолит и стратиграфия антропогена Средней Азии // Душанбе. 1973. – С. 94.
 11. Абрамова З.А. Ранний палеолит Азиатской части СССР // Палеолит СССР. М. 1984. – С. 308.
 12. Деревянко А.П., Исламов У.И., Кривошапкин А.И. и др., Новосибирск. 2007. – С. 156.
 13. Джуракулов М.Д. Самаркандская стоянка. Ташкент, 1987. – С. 23; Джуракулов М.Д., Джуракулов М.Д., Холюшкин Ю.П., Холюшкина В.А., Батыров Б.Х. Самаркандская стоянка и ее место в позднем палеолите Средней Азии // Палеолит Средней и Восточной Азии. Новосибирск, 1980. – С. 123
 14. Абрамова З.А. Ранний палеолит Азиатской части СССР // Палеолит СССР. М., 1984. – С. 302-334.
 15. Коробкова Г.Ф. Трасологическое исследование каменного инвентаря Самаркандской стоянки. (По материалам 1958-1960 гг.) // МИА. № 185. Палеолит и неолит СССР. Т.7. Л., 1972. – С. 157-168.
 16. Ранов В.А. Самаркандская стоянка и ее место в каменном веке Средней Азии // ИАН Тадж.ССР. Отд. общ. наук. №4/58. Душанбе, 1969. – С. 14.
 17. Лев Д. Н. Поселение древнекаменного века в Самарканде // Труды СамГУ. Вып.135. Новая серия. Самарканд, 1964. – С. 5-109.
 18. Джуракулов М.Д. Самаркандская стоянка и про-блемы верхнего палеолита в Средней Азии. Ташкент, 1987. – С. 116-122.
 19. Ранов В.А. Самаркандская стоянка и ее место в каменном веке Средней Азии // ИАН Тадж.ССР. Отд. общ. наук. №4/58. Душанбе, 1969. – С. 36.
 20. Ранов В.А. Шугноу - многослойная палеолитическая стоянка в верховьях р. Яхсу. Раскопки 1969-1970 гг. // Археологические работы в Таджикистане. Вып.10. Душанбе, 1973. – С. 91.
 21. Холюшкин Ю.П. Проблемы корреляции позднепалеолитических индустрий Сибири и Средней Азии. Новосибирск: Наука, 1981. – С. 53.
 22. Джуракулов М.Д. Самаркандская стоянка и про-блемы верхнего палеолита в Средней Азии. Ташкент, 1987. – С. 119.

23. Лев Д. Н. Поселение древнекаменного века в Самарканде // Труды СамГУ. Вып.135. Новая серия. Самарканд, 1964. – С. 97-107.
24. Ефименко П.П. К вопросу о возрасте позднепалеолитической стоянки в Самарканде. Вероятность раннего возраста стоянки // Тр. СамГУ. Новая серия. Вып. 135. Самарканд, 1964. – С. 110-112.
25. Борисковский П.И. Предисловие // Лев Д.Н. Поселение древнекаменного века в Самарканде // Тр. СамГУ. Новая серия. Вып. 135. Самарканд, 1964. – С. 135.
26. Джуракулов М.Д. Самаркандская стоянка и про-блемы верхнего палеолита в Средней Азии. Ташкент, 1987. – С. 116.
27. Абрамова З.А. Микронуклеусы в палеолите Енисея // КСИА. Вып.120. М., 1971. – С. 280.
28. Ранов В.А. Самаркандская стоянка и ее место в каменном веке Средней Азии // ИАН Тадж.ССР. Отд. общ. наук. №4/58. Душанбе, 1969. – С. 36.
29. Несмеянов С.А. Геологическое строение Самаркандской верхнепалеолитической стоянки // Палеолит Средней и Восточной Азии. История и культура Востока Азии. Новосибирск, 1980. – С. 46.
30. Коробкова Г.Ф. Трасологическое исследование каменного инвентаря Самаркандской стоянки. (По материалам 1958-1960 гг.) // МИА. № 185. Палеолит и неолит СССР. Т.7. Л., 1972. – С. 168.
31. Лев Д. Н. Поселение древнекаменного века в Самарканде // Труды СамГУ. Вып.135. Новая серия. Самарканд, 1964. – С. 109.
32. Ранов В.А. Самаркандская стоянка и ее место в каменном веке Средней Азии // ИАН Тадж.ССР. Отд. общ. наук. №4/58. Душанбе, 1969. – С. 36.
33. Холюшкин Ю.П. Проблемы корреляции позднепалеолитических индустрий Сибири и Средней Азии. Новосибирск: Наука, 1981. – С. 53.
34. Джуракулов М.Д. Самаркандская стоянка и про-блемы верхнего палеолита в Средней Азии. Ташкент, 1987. – С. 125.
35. Лев Д.Н. Палеолит Самаркандской области и его специфические особенности // Труды СамГУ. Вып. 166. Новая серия. Самарканд, 1967. – С. 84-87.
36. Холюшкин Ю.П. Проблемы корреляции позднепалеолитических индустрий Сибири и Средней Азии. Новосибирск: Наука, 1981. – С. 51.
37. Коробкова Г.Ф. Трасологическое исследование каменного инвентаря Самаркандской стоянки. (По материалам 1958-1960 гг.) // МИА. № 185. Палеолит и неолит СССР. Т.7. Л., 1972. – С. 168.
38. Лев Д. Н. Поселение древнекаменного века в Самарканде // Труды СамГУ. Вып.135. Новая серия. Самарканд, 1964. – С. 97-107; Джуракулов М.Д. Самаркандская стоянка и проблемы верхнего палеолита в Средней Азии. Ташкент, 1987. – С. 126.
39. Несмеянов С.А. Геологическое строение Самаркандской верхнепалеолитической стоянки // Палеолит Средней и Восточной Азии. История и культура Востока Азии. Новосибирск, 1980. – С. 46.
40. Вишняцкий Л.Б. Палеолит Средней Азии и Казахстана. С-Пб., 1996. – С. 75.

41. Ташкенбаев Н.Х., Сулейманов Р.Х. Культура древнекаменного века долины Зарафшана. Ташкент, 1980. – С. 38; Гречкина Т.Ю. Некоторые итоги исследования Зирабулакской палеолитической стоянки // Археологические работы на новостройках Узбекистана. Ташкент, 1990. – С. 10.
42. Лев Д. Н. Поселение древнекаменного века в Самарканде // Труды СамГУ. Вып.135. Новая серия. Самарканд, 1964. – С. 64.
43. Ташкенбаев Н.Х. Новая мустьерская стоянка Кутурбулак // ИМКУ. Вып.10. Ташкент, 1973. – С. 220.