

УДК 902

## **Ethnic History of Indigenous Peoples of the Yeniseysky Uyezd in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century and Their Fortunes**

**Mikhail S. Batashev\***

*Krasnoyarsk Regional Studies Museum,  
84 Dubrovinskogo Str., Krasnoyarsk, 66049 Russia*

Received 18.01.2013, received in revised form 21.03.2013, accepted 15.04.2013

---

*This article gives an overview of the ethnic history of the indigenous population of the Yeniseysky uyezd from the 17th century to the historical present.*

*On the basis of a wide range of archival sources and ethnographic data the article suggests the reconstruction of the complex processes of cultural genesis of the Evenks and other indigenous peoples of the Krasnoyarsk Territory in the North Angara Region, in the Yenisei and the Ket river basins.*

*Keywords: ethnography, the Yenisei, the North Angara region, the Krasnoyarsk Territory.*

*The work was fulfilled within the framework of the research financed by the Krasnoyarsk Regional Foundation of Research and Technology Development Support and in accordance with the course schedule of Siberian Federal University as assigned by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation.*

---

In the history of the Eastern Siberia development the Yeniseysky uyezd plays a special role. It was formed from the moment of the chief town foundation and for several decades had spread its boundaries further and further east- and southwards. In the period of the greatest territorial expansion of the Yeniseysky uyezd it included almost the entire basin of the Angara, the Baikal region, Western Trans-Baikal, most of the modern Yakutia (except for its most distant north-eastern part). The Yeniseysky Cossacks, foremen and atamans while on “duty” had to face many tens of tribes and clans whose representatives were at different stages of development of the social system (from relationships based on

tribal principles to communities standing on the threshold of the statehood formation). The Yeniseysky servicemen organized military campaigns to the “non-peaceful lands”, took hostages, charged yasak payments from the ancestors of the modern Khakasses, Evenks, Buryats, Yakuts and Yukagirs. Even in the last quarter of the 17<sup>th</sup> century when the territory of the Yeniseysky uyezd significantly reduced due to the separation of the Krasnoyarsky (1628), the Yakutsky (1641 together with the Ilimsky that was formed later), the Nerchinsky (1658) and the Irkutsky (1682) uyezds, it continued to be one of the most diverse administrative structures in Siberia.

---

© Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

\* Corresponding author E-mail address: bms@kkkm.ru

The central part of Central Siberia that is the border zone to the north, west, east and south of Siberia and because of its location between the taiga and the forest-steppe areas is unique in ethnic terms for the whole Siberian region. This fairly small (judging by the Siberian scale) territory is populated with representatives of several language groups and families. Thus, the western and the south-western parts of the Yeniseysky uyezd at that time were inhabited by representatives of the peoples speaking the Yeniseian languages – the Pumpokols, the Yugs and the Asans. The right bank of the Yenisei River, as well as almost all the Lower and Middle Angara region was a part of the zone of settlement of various tribal groups of the Tungus language. The Upper Angara was inhabited by the ancestors of modern Buryats – the Bulagat, the Ekherit and the Khongodor tribes. The north-western, western and southern parts of the Yeniseysky uyezd bordered with other peoples (the Sayan Samoyeds, among them the ancestors of the modern Tofalars, as well as the ancestors of the Ket, the Selkup and the Chulym Turks), and Yeniseysky serving people had to make contact with their representatives from time to time.

This article applies only to the part of the indigenous population of the Yeniseysky uyezd that lived on the banks of the Yenisei, the Ket and the Lower Angara rivers, which is now the part of the Krasnoyarsk Territory. The Upper Angara region (now the part of the Irkutsk region), with its indigenous settlers – the Tungus and the Buryat clans, although included in the Yeniseysky uyezd at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, is not considered by the author.

The first information about the peoples of the region considered by us dates from the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The origin of the Yeniseysky uyezd associates with the foundation of Surgut (1594). Over the next few years the Surgut Cossacks were able to move far to the east charging yasak payments from the Ostyak

tribes living along the banks of the Ob and its tributaries – the Vakhu, the Tymu and the Ket. Around 1602 in the upper Ket they founded the Kungopsky stockaded town. And by 1605 there was already an independent Ketsky uyezd separated from Surgut. Later, between 1606 and 1610 Kungopsky stockaded town was moved to the lower Ket and was named Ketsky. Over the next 10 years the territory of the Ketsky uyezd had expanded east- and southwards and included the peoples living in the west of the middle Yenisei and in the basin of the Chulym except for its upper reaches. With the arrival of Russian military men to the banks of the Yenisei there was an urgent need for a new base for the further advancement of “meeting the sun”. And such base was the city of Yeniseysk established in 1618 and formed simultaneously with the Yeniseysky uyezd. Originally the Yeniseysky uyezd got from the Ketsky uyezd its most distant eastern areas, yasak paying volosts located in the upper reaches of the Ket and on the left bank of the Yenisei above and below Yeniseysk, from the mouth of the Sym to the mouth of the Kacha. And by the end of the 1620s the Tungus groups of the Lower and Middle Angara became the part of the yasak paying population of the Yeniseysky uyezd.

The Ket River was the main penetration route of the Russian statehood to the Middle Yenisei and further to the east. Of course, there were other ways. For example, along the Vakha and the Tyma and then through a system of trails to the Elogui and the Sym with access to the Yenisei. But it was the Ket road that was the most convenient and less time-consuming, despite all the difficulties that awaited travelers on the way. Moving up the Ket the “sovereign’s people” charged, sometimes with force of arms and sometimes with the promise of protection (from the Tungus “princes” or the Yenisei Kyrgyzs) tributary payments from the local “Ostyak” population. Then, at the

beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, a general system of taxed units (yasak paying districts) developed on the left bank of the Yenisei River, which existed then, with some modifications, for over a century and even longer.

The overview of the indigenous population of the Yeniseysky uyezd shall start with its western and south-western borders, with those ethnic groups that first became a part of the tax-paying population of the Russian state. The exact date of their entry is difficult to state, but by 1607-1609 the farthest eastern parts of the Ketsky uyezd from 1618/19 included in the newly formed Yeniseysky uyezd were introduced as the following yasak paying volosts: the Kungopskaya (Pumpokolskaya), the Kadyzhskaya or the Kadskaya (Natskaya), the Kema Peaks volost, the Makutskaya, the Yamyshskaya, the Kuznetskaya, the Kipanskaya, the Symskaya and the Kasskaya. The documents of that era indicate that all these volosts, with few exceptions, were called "Ostyak". For our convenience we, following Boris O. Dolgikh, combine these volosts into the three ethno-territorial groups: Pumpokolskaya (according to Dolgikh – Natsko-Pumpokolskaya), Kuznetsko-Kipanskaya and the Dyukans group (Symsko-Kasskaya).

The Pumpokolskaya (originally Kungopskaya) yasak paying district was located in the upper reaches of the Ket and bordered with the Ketsky uyezd. It is on its territory that around 1602 the first Ketsky stockaded town, then known as Kungopsky, was formed. Its foundation in this place was probably due to two factors. Firstly, by the time of founding the Kungopsky stockaded town it was probably the most eastern point of penetration of the Russian statehood to the east. Secondly, at the time, the Kungops were the most numerous and organized group of local people. Their head was not only a founder or an elder, but a real military leader, a tribal leader of the squad having residence – a settlement-fortress

fortified with moats, ramparts and palisades. Such Kungops leader in the first quarter of the 17<sup>th</sup> century was Urnuk Piminov (Urnuk, Urnyuk, Urlyuk). The residence of Urnuk was in the Urlyuk yurts, Urlyuk settlement, according to current data, located 679 kilometers upstream from the Ket mouth (Yakovlev, 1997, p. 73). There is a description of the settlement given in 1675 by the Russian ambassador to China N. Spafariy: "... And that settlement is now empty and everything is rotted and overgrown... But the Urlyuk settlement stands on a red land, in the ravine. And the Urlyuk settlement will bring Makovsky Ostyaks" (Milescu Spafariy, 1997, p. 249).

About Urnuk himself it is known that, according to the Russian documentation, he was a knyazets (a prince), the head of the Pumpokolsky (Kungopsky) Ostyaks (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 186). In December 1608 Urnuk informed the Ketsky stockaded town that he had received the news from the knyazets Namak (the head of the Kadyzhsky Ostyak yasak paying volost) about the attack of the Tungus on the Ostyaks of the Kuznetskaya yasak paying volost and their intention to destroy the Ketsky stockaded town. The Tungus, according to Urnuk, wanted to force Ostyaks from the Ket River to pay the yasak to them, but not to Russians (Miller, 2000, pp. 48, 52, 244). In May 1609, the Ketsky stockaded town sent a detachment of Russian military men, the Zyryans and the Ostyaks which included Urnuk and his men to attack the Tungus. The combined forces defeated the enemy; several wounded Tungus men were taken prisoners. However, all of the prisoners died of wounds (Miller, 2000, p. 247). In December 1609, Urnuk, when bringing the yasak to the Ketsky stockaded town, announced the intention of the Tungus people to continue their attacks on the Russians (Miller, 2000, p. 252). In 1619 his volost was transferred to the newly formed Yeniseysky uyezd. In January 1621, Urnuk paid from his 34

yasak payers 31 sables and 282 yasaks. And for the previous debt he paid 93 sables and 1 beaver. In May 1621, he returned the remaining debt in the amount of 83 sables and 7 beavers (Miller, 2000, p. 303). In December 1621, Urnuk paid from his District 34 sables and 374 yasaks and 1 beaver (Miller, 2000, p. 319). In January 1623, for 1622 he made a gift payment of 35 sables and 3 beavers and a yasak payment of 384 sables and 2 beavers (Miller, 2000, p. 340).

Considering the above materials in the initial period of inclusion of the population of the left bank of the Yenisei River to the Russian state, Urnuk from the two evils – to be governed by the Moscow tsar or become a tributary to the belligerent Tungus princes of the Lower Angara region, chose what seemed to him the least. But, over time, with strengthening of the Russian statehood, he became the head of a usual tax-paying unit, one of hundreds of similar ones in Siberia at the time.

The first known information about the number of yasak paying population of the Pumpokolskaya volost belongs to 1617-1618, before the formation of the Yeniseysky uyezd. According to it, the yasak payment was made by 37 people, namely, adult males from 16-18 to 55. Applying the findings of Boris O. Dolgikh that the ratio between the adult male population and the rest of population (women, children, elderly people) in the Siberian taiga (hunters, fishermen, herders) is 1 to 4, the total number of the Pumpokols of that date was 150 people.

Over the following decades of the 17<sup>th</sup> and the first decade of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the total number of the Pumpokolsky Ostyaks had been steadily declining reaching its lowest level for that period – 9 yasak payers (45 people of both sexes) by 1710 (Dolgikh, 1960, P. 187, 190). Like other natives of the Upper Ket the Pumpokols suffered especially great damage in 1630, during the outbreak of the smallpox epidemic that killed

at least half of their population. 18 yasak payers and 88 “wives and children” died. Only 16 or 17 yasak paying people survived (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 187-188).

Around 1705 the Russian administration was forced to organize consolidation of small Ostyak volosts remaining at that time. The Pumpokolskaya volost included its neighboring Natskaya volost located in the Upper Ket region (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 186, 188). This is how Natsko-Pumpokolskaya volost was established, which lasted until the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The Kadyzhskaya volost (Kadskaya). It was also located on the Ket River, but above the Pumpokolskaya volost. It was brought to yasak-paying by the Ketsky service people, apparently, at the same time as the Pumpokolskaya. During its membership in the Russian state the head of the volost was the knyazets Namak (Nomak, Amanak) Koybytsyn. And the history of the Kadtses of that time is closely associated with his name. Between 1602 and 1605 (?) Namak with the knyazets Chaptoday “changed” and killed 20 yasak collectors of the Ketsky stockaded town. A detachment of serving people was sent against them, but the case was settled peacefully. The knyazets repented and took citizenship of the Russian state (Miller, 1999, pp. 449-450). In 1608, through the “best man” of the Pumpokolskaya volost Olku sent to take the yasak from him, Namak informed the Ketsky stockaded town authorities about the attack of the Tungus on the Ostyaks of the Kuznetskaya volost and their intention to destroy the town located then in the Kungopskaya volost. The objective of the Tungus, according to Namak, was to force the Ostyaks to pay the yasak to them, but not to the Russian state (Miller, 2000, p. 48, 244).

In response to this attack in May 1609 the Ketsky stockaded town sent a detachment of Russian military men, the Zyryans and the Ostyaks including Urnuk and his men to attack

the Tungus. The combined forces defeated the enemy; several wounded Tungus men were taken prisoners. However, all of the prisoners died of wounds (Miller, 2000, p. 247). In December 1609, Namak was with the yasak in the Ketsky stockaded town and told that a Kyrgyz knyazets came to the Meletsk to see the knyazets Isek, and incited him not to pay the yasak to Russians, but oppose them with the Kyrgyz (Miller, 2000, pp. 252-253 ). In December 1612, bringing the yasak to Ketsk he announced the desire of the Tungus and the population of the Tyulkin land to accept Russian authorities and pay the yasak (Miller, 2000, p. 264). In 1613, Namak had to lead the Ketsky yasak collectors to the Tungus, but instead he went along with Putnya and Tumet. The Tungus refused to pay the yasak, robbed and nearly killed Namak and his companions (Miller, 2000, p. 266).

In 1617, the Makovsky stockaded town was founded in the territory of the Kadskaya volost (located on the site of the modern village Makovskoe), getting its name from the knyazets's name Namak (Namakovsk – Makovsk). Later, since 1634 the whole volost was called by his name – the Nadskaya or Natskaya. Since 1619 the volost had been transferred to the newly formed Yeniseysky uyezd (Dolgikh, 1969, p. 186; Miller, 2000, p. 48, 49, 52).

We have data on the population of this volost only starting with 1617-1618 years. At that time there were only 8 yasak payers, i.e. the total number of the Kadskaya volost was 32 people. But between 1618 and 1621 the Yeniseysky uyezd administration had made consolidation of several small yasak paying volosts located in the upper reaches of the Ket. Whether this enlargement was only related to the fiscal interests of the treasury, or there were other reasons, we do not know. But we can assume that very close ethnic groups, if not parts of a big one were subject to consolidation. As a result of this reform the Yamyshskaya volost

had completely disappeared (2 yasak payers) and the population of the Kema Peaks volost reduced by half. Apparently, at the expense of the members of these districts the Kadskaya volost numbered, according to the yasak records for 1621-1623, from 21 to 24 yasak payers. Thus, the total population of the volost had grown to nearly 100 people (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 186, 187, 188).

The smallpox epidemic in 1630 negatively influenced the Kadskaya volost as well. Out of 23 yasak payers 11 men and 36 women and children died (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 187-188). Later on, the number of members of the volost continued to decline and reached by the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century 7 yasak payers (about 30 people of both genders) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 190). In 1705, there was a consolidation of the Pumpokolskaya and the Natskaya volosts into one Natsko-Pumpokolskaya volost (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 188).

Other Ostyak volosts – the Yamyshskaya, the Kema Peaks volost and the Makutskaya located in the most upper reaches of the Ket and the Kema, had not existed for a long time as taxable units. By 1632 all of them, for various reasons, disappeared. But their existence for over thirty years was apparently due to some reasons: whether due to yasak paying, remoteness or relatively inaccessible location, or ethnic characteristics of the population of these volosts. Nevertheless, most likely conservatism of the bureaucratic system of the Russian state played its role. While in the initial period of entering the yasak lists, these small-numbered yasak payers and low-powered volosts were able to survive for almost a third of a century. However, the disappearance of the volosts did not mean the disappearance of the people assigned to them. Brief history of these tax-paying units is as follows.

For the first time three above mentioned volosts were mentioned in the formal reply of the Ketsky governor Grigory Elizarov. This reply dated 1609. There “the Makutskaya volost, and

the Kema peaks, and the Yamytskaya land” were called “...distant volosts of the new pieces of land...” (Miller, 2000, p. 252). Thus, in 1609 these volosts were considered as new, “newly founded”, only recently entered into the tax-paying system of the Russian state. The number of population in each of these volosts is unknown, because in the reply it was given summarily: 15 yasak payers, i.e. the entire population of these volosts numbered up to 60 people (Miller, 2000, p. 252).

As of April-August 1618, there were 2 yasak payers (8 persons of both genders) in the Yamyshskaya volost, 15 (60) – in the Kema Peaks volost, and 3 (about 10) – in the Makutskaya volost (Miller, 2000, p. 285). As already mentioned above, between 1618 and 1621, the Yamyshsky Ostyaks and most Ostyaks of the Kema peaks apparently joined the Kadsкая volost. The rest of the Kema Peaks volost headed by Atanzha Chagaev (7 yasak payers) merged with the Ostyaks of the Makutskaya volost headed by Vesla. This new formation in the yasak records received the name of “the Veslovsk Ostyaks of the Kema Peaks volost” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 188).

But soon after the event, in 1630-1631, the whole volost ran to the Krasnoyarsk uyezd, and, despite the efforts of the Yeniseysk administration remained there, having entered it as a special tax-paying unit to the Arinsk land. This fact suggests that ethnically the Veslovsk people were close enough with the Arinsk people, if they were not a peripheral, taiga group. Moreover, the escape was made with the direct participation of the Arinsk people: “...the Veslovsk Ostyaks... with the Krasnoyarsk Arinsk Tatars of the Yeniseysky stockaded town from the Upper Village stole 9 horses and ran to Krasny Yar... Governor Arkhip Okinfov... ordered the Veslovsk Ostyaks to live in Krasny Yar...” (Miller, 1941 p. 44; Dolgikh, 1960, p. 225). In the Krasnoyarsk uyezd the Veslovskaya volost of the Arinsk land was mentioned until

1735. And then it completely merged with the Arins and became a part of modern Khakassia as seok Ara (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 228).

As it is known, modern linguistics recognizes the existence of the Arin and the Pumpokol languages as individual languages in the Yeniseian language family. And, if the Arins occupied mainly the Krasnoyarsk forest-steppe, and the basis of their economy was herding, then the Pumpokols are the typical lowland taiga residents, hunters and anglers. The difference in their economic structure, regardless of the linguistic affinity, is noticeable even in the ethnic nomenclature inherent in the Russian administration at the time. Thus, the Russians called all the people of the taiga zone of the Ob basin and the Lower Yenisei left bank basin leading hunting and fishing economy the Ostyaks. Meanwhile the administration was indifferent to what language families these peoples belonged to. Thus, the Ostyaks included ancestors of the Khants speaking Ugrian, the Samoyeds, the Selkups and the Kets, the Yugs, the Pumpokols speaking the Yeniseian language.

To describe cattle-breeders of the south of Western and Central Siberia the term “Tatars” was used. Thus, the ancestors of the Siberian Tatars were called the Yurt, the Tyumen, the Tobolsk, the Ayalynsk, the Barabinsk and the Tomsk Tatars. The ancestors of the modern Shors were known as the Kuznetsky Tatars, the Chulym Turks as the Melessk Tatars. Of course, by the time of entering of these peoples in the Russian state, they in the vast majority already belonged to the Turkic ethnic group. The process of turkization among them went far enough. However, perhaps some individual groups still remained among them, especially in the reaches of the Chulym and the Shoria (the Kuznetsk Alatau), who continued to speak the Samoyed or the Yeniseian languages. In the Krasnoyarsk uyezd, and in the south-east of the Tomsk uyezd turkization at the beginning

of the 17<sup>th</sup> century was still unfinished. And peoples of different ethnic origins were called the Tartars – the Yeniseian Arins, the Kotts, the Veslovts, the Korchuns, the Turkic Kachints, the Basagary, the Kizylts, the Sagayts and the Tubints, the Samoyed inhabitants of contemporary Tuvan Toji – the Sayants (Tochigases) (Miller, 2000, p. 65).

A peripheral location of the Makutskaya, the Yamyshskaya and the Kema Peaks volosts in relation to the Pumpokols and the Arins allows to see them as the transition groups in the ethnic, linguistic and cultural aspects. Moreover, as already noted above, some of them (the Yamyshsky Ostyaks and more than a half of the Kema Peaks volost) joined the Kadsкая volost and the rest Ostyaks of the Kema peaks united with the Makutsky Ostyaks into the “Kema peaks of the Veslovsk Ostyaks” volost became part of the Arins. However, we should not forget that both of these consolidations were authorized by the administration, in the first case of the Yeniseysky uyezd, in the second – the Krasnoyarsk one. And for any of the fiscal systems the interests of the treasury are in the first place, but not the structure of ethnic communities, although in Siberia it was considered as the basis of the administrative unit being formed. But the case when various ethnic groups are joined in one taxable unit, as in our case, never really happened. Boris O. Dolgikh considered these peripheral groups located on the borders of the “Kyrgyz land” as “the birth of conglomerates of a different origin” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 99), by virtue of their dependence on the Kyrgyz, torn or detached from specific ethnic groups. Perhaps, the Yamyshsky Ostyaks were closer to the Natsk-Pumpokols, the Makutsky were closer to the Arins and the Kema Peaks volost consisted of immigrants both of the first volost and of the second one. And joining these larger units simply meant a return to the once-existing position.

The number of yasak payers of the Veslovskaya volost in the Arin land over the next hundred years mainly corresponded with fluctuations in the population number of that land. Maximum was in 1665, when the yasak was paid by 14 people, that is, the total population of the volost reached 55-60 people. Nevertheless, by 1735 there were only 2 people enrolled into the lists of yasak payers (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 226). Later in 1735 the Veslovts were not mentioned. They fully merged with the Arins who formed the Ara group within the group of the Minusinsk Tatars (Khakassia). By the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the Arins almost completely lost their language and went on with the Kachinsk (Turkic) language (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 228). A part of the Veslovts was Russified. Their descendants now live (the Aminovs, the Veselovskys) in the Yemelyanovsky District of the Krasnoyarsk Territory not even knowing their roots.

Out of the Ostyak volosts of the left bank of the Yenisei we have to consider only the Kuznetskaya and the Kipanskaya volosts located along its banks. They were already mentioned for the first time in 1609 in the yasak payment lists (Miller, 2000, p. 247). The Kuznetsky Ostyaks occupied the territory in the immediate vicinity of the Yeniseysk, above and below the stockaded town, and the Kipanskaya volost was near the mouth of the Angara (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 185, 189). Between 1623 and 1628 both volosts had merged into one the Kuznetskaya volost. If there is no doubt that the Kuznetsky Ostyaks belong to the people speaking the Yeniseian languages, then opinions on the language of the Kipants are not so clear. G.F. Miller when mentioning the Kipanskaya volost almost always called its population the Tungus (Miller, 2000, p. 50, 53, 54). However, Boris O. Dolgikh noted that the Kipants were named the “Tungus” only once, when they were first mentioned in the sources. In all other cases, the population of the Kipanskaya

volost and the volost itself were mentioned without any ethnic correlation (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 185). Upon further consideration of the issue, Dolgikh having thoroughly looked through all the references of the Kipants in the sources comes to a definite conclusion about the “Ostyak” (Yeniseian) belonging of the population of the Kipanskaya volost of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 185-186). However, later, V.A. Tugolukov again returned to the issue and, without a sufficient reason, and any expanded argument announces that the Kipants are the “mixed-Tungus Arin group” (Tugolukov, 1985, p. 59). In favor of his point of view, he cites only one fact and that is unproven in my opinion: the escape in 1626 of the whole Kipanskaya volost led by the knyazets Iltik to the Krasnoyarsk uyezd, to the Arins. Following the opinion of Tugolukov, “mixed-Tungus Arin groups” should be also attributed to the Kadsky and the Kuznetsky Ostyaks. In fact, all the above volosts participated in this escape. And, in the voivode’s reply the Kipants are not mentioned separately, as some sort of a special group, but between the Kadsky and the Kuznetsky Ostyaks. However, the Ostyak origin of the Kadskaya and the Kuznetskaya volosts are not the subject to V.A. Tugolukov’s doubt. In all other cases the Kipants always come together with other “Ostyaks” of the Yeniseysky uyezd. They are friendly and even allied with the Kuznetsky and the Kadsky Ostyaks and the Arins. Their bitterness during military clashes with the Tungus of the near Angara region finds parallels in the history of inter-ethnic relations of the Yenisei Siberia at the time. A massacre of prisoners of the Tungus Ostyaks headed by Iltik, the head of the Kipants in 1625-1626, is a vivid example. And joining in the end of the Kipanskaya volost to the Kuznetskaya one, and not to any of the Tunguska volost clearly shows the ethnic closeness of the Kipants to the Ostyaks.

Therefore, the opinion of Boris O. Dolgikh expressed 50 years ago on the ethnicity of the Kipants to this day, in my view, does not need to be revised. Many wrote that the Kipants “...have never been called the Tungus; that they do not differ from the rest of the Ostyaks; that they, like almost all the Ostyaks of the 17<sup>th</sup> century living near the Yenisei, were hostile to the Tungus; that they, along with the Kadsky and the Kuznetsky Ostyaks ‘ran’ to the Tyul’kinsk (strip of) land, where the Yeniseysky Ostyaks usually ran in case of the Tungus attacks and in case of conflicts with the Russians. Iltik with his men does not stand out among the rest Ostyaks” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 186).

The earliest data on population of the Kipanskaya yasak paying volost is found in the materials of 1609-1610. According to them, the volost had 12 yasak payers, i.e. 50 people in total population of the area. But in the early 1620, for unknown reasons for this drop, there were only 6 to 9 yasak payers (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 187). As we know, in previous years, the Ostyak volosts of the Yeniseysky uyezd suffered significant losses from military attacks of the Tungus people. Perhaps this disaster spread to the Kipants, namely because they were the closest Ostyak group to the borders with the Tungus settlements. In the second half of 1620s the Kipants merged with the Kuznetsky Ostyaks and their subsequent life has proceeded within this district.

The Kuznetskaya Ostyak volost, due to its geographical proximity to the Yeniseysky stockaded town, quite early experienced Russian and Orthodox culture, which had a direct impact on life and population of the Ostyaks. Confrontation of the Tungus to the Russian penetration influenced directly the Ostyak volosts of the Yeniseysky uyezd, which recognized the power of the Russian state. The Ostyaks, including the Kuznetsky Ostyaks, suffered losses from the attacks of the Tungus groups, and had joint campaigns with the Cossacks into “non-

peaceful Tungus pieces of land”. Thus, in 1609, the Tungus attacked the Kuznetsky Ostyaks “and they had two people injured, and the other people scattered” (Miller, 2000, p. 247). The Tungus foray next year was more dramatic for the Kuznetsky Ostyaks. The Tungus “... killed the sovereign Ostyaks, namely: Idyuk, two his sons, three people of other Ostyaks, and the other escaped and ran to the Tyulkin land, but their wives and children, who had not manage to escape, were captured” (Miller, 2000, p. 256).

The emergence of the Yeniseysky stockaded town, in building of which the Kuznetsky Ostyaks took part, as an example, Tyumet, the knyazets of the Kuznetskaya volost, at the request of the Tobolsk governor, was to accompany the Cossacks sent to find the most convenient ways for the Yenisei River and the place to build on its banks a new stockaded town (Miller, 2000, p. 280). This decision put Ostyak “distant districts” under the direct and constant control of the Russian administration. The lack of service people on the eastern borders led to the need for recruiting the working class of the local population, capable of military service, or, even, at times, involving combat-ready “strangers” to march to the neighboring “non-peaceful pieces of land”. The Ostyaks of the Kuznetskaya volost were considered the most suitable for this role. Living in the immediate vicinity of the Yenisei, having constant contact with their neighbors and enemies of the Tungus tribes, many of them were recruited for the state service. In 1625-1626 along with the Russian squad 38 Ostyaks led by Iltik, the knyazets of the Kipanskaya volost participated in the march of the Yenisei Ataman Vasily Tyumenets on the Nizhneangarsk Tungus (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 185-186). Some representatives of the indigenous people acted as guides and translators (interpreters) who were paid by the state, receiving a salary from the Treasury and being exempt from incurring

taxes, including tributes. In addition to the above stated fact of Tyumet’s service as a guide we can draw an example of his son Bogdan, who became Orthodox and for nearly two decades served as an interpreter (translator) in Yeniseysk and Krasnoyarsk.

Although throughout the 17<sup>th</sup> century the Tsar government did not welcome the Christianization of the Siberian natives, not willing to lose the yasak payers, the Kuznetsky Ostyaks quickly adopted Orthodoxy, with all the consequences of this fact. Already in 1689 all of them were baptized, were given Russian first name and patronymic. Those of them who had been recruited for the service did not belong any longer to the tax-paying classes. Boris O. Dolgikh took them for this period of time as “... already half-Russified and being on a par with Russian peasants” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 190, 191).

Russification of the Kuznetsky Ostyaks led to a blurring of their ethnic core and, eventually, led to the complete disappearance of this ethnic group. Judging by the materials of 1609-1610 years in the Kuznetskaya volost there were 13 yasak payers (i.e., not more than 50 people in total population). In 1610, in a collision with the Tungus 6 Kuznetsky Ostyaks were killed (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 187). But with the accession of the Kipants township to the Kuznetskaya volost, its population by 1630 increased again to 15-17 yasak payers. However, in the future, with each passing decade, population decline only progressed. By 1710 there were only four yasak payers in the Kuznetskaya volost (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 190, 191). The rest, apparently, by this time had completely merged with the surrounding Russian population. Those Kuznetsky Ostyaks, who retained their ethnicity, by 1735 were included in the Symsko-Kasskaya volost (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 188).

The Symsko-Kasskaya volost as a single taxable unit was formed only between 1624 and

1628. (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 184). But the story of its components began much earlier. In the yasak records of the Ketsky uyezd since 1609 (earlier sources have not survived) there were stated separately the Symkaya and the Kasskaya volosts (Miller, 2000, pp. 247, 252, 253, 254, 256, 259, 260, 282, 285, 303, 319, 340). Judging by the names, the basis of their naming was not tribal, but geographical principle, which simplifies the identification of population resettlement on these territories. Reasoned opinion of Boris O. Dolgikh stated that both districts were located near the Yenisei River: the Symkaya – at the mouth of the river Sym, and the Kasskaya – at the mouth of the river Kas (Dolgikh, 1960, P. 188). However, while designing a map of the Symko-Kassky Ostyaks' resettlement the researcher includes there not only the area at the mouth of the Kas, but its entire basin, that seems logical.

Boris O. Dolgikh, despite the initial for almost twenty years isolated existence of two separate districts in the Russian documentation, thinks about the Symko-Kassky Ostyaks as one tribe. And dividing them into two groups represented, in his opinion, “the intra-tribal division, perhaps, of territorial and phratric-ancestral character” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 184). And then he even reveals their tribal name: “the later name of the Symko-Kassky Ostyaks is dyugun' (yohon'), which existed in the 17<sup>th</sup> century already when it was recorded in the form of 'dyukany'” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 184). In favor of the theory of volosts' unity he cites the fact that in 1609 and 1618, i.e. even before the merger of the volosts, their yasak payers were stated in one list (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 184).

I can also add that these volosts were always mentioned together, next to each other in tsar charters, province runarounds, and records of yasak collection. And representatives of the volosts were often recorded once in one volost,

then in the other. For example, in 1609 Kayget (“Kayaget”) was named a knyazets of the Symkaya volost, and in 1611 he (“Kaigetko”, “Kaygetko”) in one and the same document was named a Symsky Ostyak in one place, and in the other as a head of the Ostyaks living near the Kas (Miller, 2000, pp. 247, 260). A head of the Symsky Ostyaks from 1611 to 1617 years was Kimza and his son Akdon Kymzin in 1620-1622 was a head of the Kasskaya volost (Miller, 2000, pp. 260, 301, 319, 340).

But perhaps the Symko-Kasskaya volost was only a part of a wider association of tribal or linguistic nature, in which, along with them were also included the Ostyaks of the Kuznetskaya volost and the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” of the Mangazeysky uyezd. For example, in earlier documents, even before the formation of the Yeniseysky uyezd, the extreme eastern parts of the Ketsky uyezd were always mentioned in the following contexts: “... the Kas volost, the Sym volost, the Yenisei ...” (Miller, 2000, p. 285), “... for the Sym River, for the Kas and the Yenisei to Ket, to tribute the Ostyaks ...”, “... the Ket yasak paying Ostyaks, the Sym from the Kas and the Yenisei ...” (Miller, 2000, p. 253), “... Ket yasak paying Ostyaks from the Kas River and the Yenisei and the Sym ...” (Miller, 2000, p. 254), “... the Yenisei, the Sym and the Kas yasak paying knyaztsy and Ostyaks ...” (Miller, 2000, p. 282). Boris O. Dolgikh believes that “Yenisei”, “for the Yenisei” mean the Kuznetskaya yasak paying volost (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 186, 187). This assumption is based on the fact that in the records of the tributes the Kuznetskaya volost was referred to as “... the Kuznetskaya volost of the Yenisei River ...” (Miller, 2000, pp. 302, 319). And the list of the Ketsky yasak paying volosts, retreated in 1618 to the newly formed Yeniseysky uyezd, did not mention neither the Kuznetskaya volost, nor the Kipanskaya, which is rather strange, given its location in the

immediate vicinity of the Yeniseysk (“near the city”), but the word “Yenisei” is present (Miller, 2000, p. 285). There is also a specific reference to the Kuznetsky Ostyaks as of the Yeniseysky uyezd: “So ... was telling us the Yeniseysky Ostyak Tymka: ...” (Miller, 2000, p. 292). Tymka Pereorov, mentioned here, was a head of the Kuznetsky Ostyaks in 1620s. Therefore, these three districts were a certain unity. Moreover, in some cases, the number of yasak payers in them was given cumulatively, in one figure: “... So, in the past, in the 119 year I sent for tsar yasak to the same Ketsky, to yasak paying Ostyaks for the Kas River, and for the Sym, and for the Yenisei, and near these three rivers there lived 36 yasak payers ...” (Miller, 2000, p. 260). Or: “... the Kasskaya volost, the Symkaya volost, the Yenisei, 24 yasak payers ...” (Miller, 2000, p. 285).

In other words, a tribe of the Symsko-Kassky Ostyaks named by Boris O. Dolgikh as “the Dyukans” included the Kuznetsky Ostyaks as an integral part of the tribe. However, the question remains, should the word “Yenisei” always mean the Kuznetsky Ostyaks? First, the Symsky and Kassky Ostyaks lived not only along the tributaries of the Yenisei, but at the Yenisei River itself. Their encounters with the Tungus occurred exactly on the banks of the Yenisei (Miller, 2000, pp. 253, 259). Secondly, in all of these volosts – the Symkaya, the Kasskaya, the “Yenisei”- the yasak was collected by one group of the yasak collectors, who from the upper river of the Ket descended to the Kas River by portage (apparently, it was the route of the later Ob-Yenisei Canal), then they descended by the Kas River to the Yenisei and got to the mouth of the Sym by the Yenisei. Direct indication of this is recorded in a formal reply of the Ketsky governor G. Elizarov to the main Siberian administrator, Tobolsk governor Prince I.M. Katyrev-Rostovsky, dating from 1609/10 years. (Miller, 2000, p. 254). The Kuznetsky volost, as can be seen on the map, was

located far above the mouth of the Kas and was serviced by the same service people who collected the tribute from the population of the upper Ket, and the Ostyaks from the Pumpokolskaya and the Kadskaya volosts. Even more than that, in the early years of the Ketsky uyezd the yasak collected in the Kuznetskaya volost was brought to the town frequently by knyaztsy themselves or ordinary yasak payers of these Upper Ket districts (Miller, 2000, pp. 247, 252, 256). Thus, the direct road to the Kuznetsky Ostyaks, to the Yenisei, ran through the lands of the Pumpokolskaya and the Kadskaya (Natskaya) volosts, by portage from the Ket to the Kema River. Notices of this path in general were contained in two of province formal replies dated by 1617 (Miller, 2000, pp. 280, 281). In addition, in cases where knyaztsy or “best people” of all three volosts were collectively described: “Oneska ... and ... Kemsya and Kaygetko ...”, “... Yelifatko and Kilgot and Kinza ...” (Miller, 2000, pp. 256, 260, 282), among them there is no name that could refer to the known names of the Kuznetsky Ostyaks. Although, I must admit not having at present a full list of the yasak payers from all three volosts.

Thus, in most cases, by the terms “Yenisei” and “Yenisei Ostyaks” the authors of the documents did not actually mean the Kuznetsky Ostyaks themselves, but the Ostyak population living near the Yenisei, regardless of its precise reference to any yasak paying volost. That is, they did not mean a specific administrative unit, but the geographical location of the group. Although in some cases the terms “Kuznetsky Ostyaks” and “Yenisei Ostyaks” coincided and were even identical. But every such case requires special consideration.

Turning to the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” we should emphasize that in the 17<sup>th</sup> century they belonged to the yasak paying volost of the Mangazeysky uyezd, although under the current administrative division their territory is almost

completely included into the modern Yeniseysk District. The centre of this Ostyak group paying tribute was Zakamennoe – wintering harbor, which was located at the mouth of the Dubches River (Dolgikh, 1960, P. 122). However, Boris O. Dolgikh reasonably notes that the Dubches basin is too small to accommodate on its territory an ethnic group numbering up to 700 people, so he extends the borders of the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” settlement. According to him, they settled on the entire basin of the Sym River, except the upper river and its estuary area. The mouth of the Sym, as it was mentioned above, was inhabited by the Ostyaks of the Sym area of the Symsko-Kasskaya volost of the Yeniseysky uyezd (the Dyukans). And the upper Sym was also inhabited by the Ostyaks united in the district of the same name (Sym), but subordinate to the administration of the Surgut area.

Boris O. Dolgikh claims that this Surgut Sym volost was a part of the tribal group of the “Zakamennye Ostyaks”, and it seems to be quite realistic in the light of the evidence presented by him (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 145, 149, 150).

Data on the number of the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” appear since 1607. Perhaps it was this year that was the beginning of the inclusion of these ethnic groups in the Russian state. But only by 1620 all of the adult male population had been fully identified and recorded into tribute lists whom Boris O. Dolgikh consider to belong to the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” tribe. The total number of the yasak payers for this year was not less than 175 people, which proves that there were about 700 people in total population (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 146, 148). Judging by the Siberian scale the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” were a quite significant in size ethnic community. And all the more surprising that after 60 years, in the 1680s, from such a large tribe only a pitiful bunch of 10-12 yasak payers was left, i.e. only 40-50 people of both genders. For the peoples of Central and

Western Siberia in the 17<sup>th</sup> century such a dramatic reduction in number, by more than 10 times, was a unique case, taking into consideration that the sources have no information about the reasons for such decrease of the population.

What are the explanations for such a recurrent catastrophe for this tribal group? Boris O. Dolgikh suggested several solutions for this problem. Firstly, the smallpox epidemic. For some indigenous groups of the Mangazeytsky uyezd in the 17<sup>th</sup> century the mortality from infectious diseases was in the first place, the mortality rate from the smallpox was catastrophic. For example, the epidemic of 1630-1631 reduced the number of the yasak payers of the Khantaysky wintering harbor (the ancestors of the tundra Enets) from 217 to 72 people (thrice). A new epidemic of 1690-1692 though did not bring a similar devastation, but its blow was quite drastic. The number of the ancestors of the modern tundra Enets fell from 109 to 75 people, that is, killed up to 30 percent of the population (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 128, 129). More significant losses were incurred in the 17<sup>th</sup> century by tundra tribes of the Yakut area. For example, smallpox of 1651-1652 destroyed nearly 90 percent of the Tungus tribe of the Azyans: in 1661, of 110 payers of the yasak (total population was 440 people) there were alive only 11 people (44 people of the total population) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 447). The population of the Dolgans reduced from 90 people (in 1640) to 20 (at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century) (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 458, 459). Of the nearly 5,000 Yukagirs employs living in the first third of the 17<sup>th</sup> century by the end of this century there were only a little over two and a half thousand people alive (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 440). But then, during the 18<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the Azyans and the Dolgans could overcome the effects of epidemics and over time they became the main ancestors of a new nation of the Dolgans (according to the census of 1926-1927 the population of the Edyans was

151 people, and the population of the Dolgans – 791) (Dolgikh, 1963, p. 93), but the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” simply disappeared. Although, as the researcher emphasized himself, “we have no specific indications of epidemics among the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 147).

Secondly, Boris O. Dolgikh assumed that the reduction in number of the yasak payers of Zakamenny wintering harbor could be affected by the population withdrawal by the service people of neighboring volosts (the Narymskaya and the Surgutskaya), who sought to fill the number of tax-paying people of their administrative units. Thus, in 1653, “the Narym service people and the Narym Ostyaks ... of the Dubches River at the top” attacked the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” and “killed two people and captured 10 people” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 147). That is, about 50 people immediately (if we count their family members) left the Mangazeysky uyezd.

Well, another reason he considers the eviction of the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” outside the territory of the Mangazeysky uyezd. By assumption of the researcher “the Tym-Karakonsk Selkups in the Taz basin included a number of people from the Dubches and the Sym basins ... some “Zakamennye Ostyaks” also became members of the Inbatsk Ket tribes”. They also “replenished the Sym-Kass Kets of the Yeniseysky uyezd, so-called Dyukans” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 147).

Below Boris O. Dolgikh particularly focuses on the amount of the tax burden of the yasak paying population of the Mangazeysky and neighboring uyezds. And it turns out that the annual yasak rate and gifts of the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” of the Mangazeysky uyezd were two or more times lower than in neighboring uyezds: not 10-12 sables per person, but only five. Therefore, according to Dolgikh, “many Ostyaks (the Selkups and the Kets) of the Surgutsky, the Narymsky and the Yeniseysky uyezds initially sought to pay the yasak in the Zakamenny wintering harbor of the

Mangazeysky uyezd, regardless of their actual place of residence and their tribal and clan ties”. That was the cause of seizures and withdrawals of the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” by the service people of Surgut and Narym, as mentioned above (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 147, 148). But Boris O. Dolgikh did not go beyond this finding, he stayed on the assumption, though sufficiently reasoned, that the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” were a special Ket tribe that bore the name “haybangdyang” (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 145, 148).

However, following the opinion of Boris O. Dolgikh concerning the efforts of tax-paying population of neighboring uyezds to reduce the burden of the yasak taxation by escaping to the territory of the Mangazeysky uyezd, we may presume that a considerable amount of the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” could be such refugees. All the more so, because the territory of the “Zakamennye Ostyaks” was located at the junction of five uyezds, creating an extremely convenient situation for the natives “to make fools” of the yasak collectors. A similar pattern was observed for another border area of the Mangazeysky uyezd – the Taz and the Turukhan rivers. It was the area, that the Ostyak (Selkup and Ket) population of the Surgutsky, the Narymsky, the Ketsky and Mangazeysky uyezds had been longing for since the second quarter of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Having established a foothold in the new places, these tribes formed the northern ethnic group of the Selkups, which consisted of two ethno-territorial units – the Tazovsky and the Baishensky.

Another group of the yasak paying population, which lived in the Yeniseysky uyezd and spoke one of the Yeniseian languages, was in some isolation from the main part of their relatives living on the left bank – in the lower reaches of the Chuna and the Biryusa (Ona) rivers, and in the upper reaches, where the two currents flow one into the other, forming the Taseeva river. Since

1621 it was on the list of the yasak payers of the Yeniseysky uyezd, but until 1669 its name varied greatly in the written sources: “Vasanskaya”, “Vasaganskaya”, “Osanskaya”, “Savanskaya” and even “Sayanskaya”. And only in 1669 was established the name by which the group was recorded in the history – “Asanskaya”. It is known that the Asans were representatives of the northern periphery of the Kotts – a tribe speaking one of the Yeniseian languages, which lived on the territory of the Kan Forest-Steppe and in its neighboring areas. In addition to the Asanskaya volost there was the Taseevskaya yasak paying volost. By 1696 the two volosts were united and became one volost, which obtained its name as “The yasak paying volost along the Taseeva, the Usolka and the Ona rivers” (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 204, 205). According to the shert-oath record books<sup>1</sup> in 1683 there were 45 yasak payers in the both volosts, i.e. about 180 people (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 197, 206). Most of them are referred to in the sources as the Tungus people, but Boris O. Dolgikh conducted the analysis of personal names of these “Tungus people” and came to the conclusion that they all are of the Asansky (the Yeniseian languages) origin. Boris O. Dolgikh considered the residents of the Taseevskaya and the Asanskaya volosts to be the Asans in origin, which by the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century were heavily influenced by the Tungus, and in the end, were fully “tungussified” (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 205, 206). G. M. Vasilevich found that a part of the Evenk population west of the Yenisei River, was originally from the Lower Angara river (Vasilevich, 1931, pp. 133, 134). Dolgikh pointed out that the everyday life of the left bank Tungus had some features, which were not typical of the Evenk culture. In particular, their men did not know how to ride a reindeer, there was a special type of sharpened blade placed on the shaft and a sled without runners, in contrast to the other Tungus, who used birch bark canoes, they used

dugouts. In addition, the Kima, a family of the left bank Tungus, had another name – Koshka. Dolgikh notes that at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> – the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the Asanskaya volost was headed by Koshka, or Koshko Sigasev. On the basis of these data Boris O. Dolgikh makes an assumption that the family of Kima can be regarded as “tungussified” descendants of the Asans, who left the Angara river territory for the left bank of the Yenisei in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. In support of his hypothesis, he cites an Evenk legend that, “Kima” was the name of an ancient population that preceded the Tungus, and from which descended some of the Evenk families along the Angara and the Podkamennaya Tunguska rivers (see below) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 206). In 1926-1927 there were 84 people of the Kima family on the left bank of the Yenisei and 10 people of the Kimal family among the Yataelsky (Yatoulsky) Tungus on the Komo river (a tributary of the Podkamennaya Tunguska River) and in Pitsko-Velminsky territories (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 206; Tugolukov, 1985, p. 253).

The Upper Tunguska, which at present is known as the Lower Angara region, by this very name appears in the sources of the 18<sup>th</sup> century as a territory inhabited by the Tungus. A separate group of the Asans, who spoke one of the Yeniseian languages, lived along the bank of its left-bank tributary – the Taseeva and its confluent – the Ona. Materials on the number and dispersal of the Lower Angara Tungus people of the 17<sup>th</sup> century are only in the “census books” for 1631, 1669 and from 1696 onwards, and in one of the shert-oath record books of 1683. In 1696 a list of yasak paying volosts was formed, which survived until 1824, till the reform of Yeniseysk governor A. P. Stepanov. Some of them existed till 1917 (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 195, 196).

The dispersal of the Tungus clans in the Lower Angara of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> centuries was studied in detail by Boris O. Dolgikh and V.

A. Tugolukov (Dolgikh, 1960; Tugolukov, 1985). In most cases they coincide in the outcomes of the research, but in a number of cases the scholars came to different opinions concerning the origin, places of residence and ethnic history of some of the tribal groups of the local population of the Tungus people.

The both authors agree that by the time the Russian troops appeared on the Angara River, the lower part of it was inhabited, from west to east (to the mouth of the Kata), by the following tribal groups of the Tungus: the Lapagirs (Lopalsky Tungus), the Toporks and the Chipagirs (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 196; Tugolukov, 1985, p. 48). The materials of the early 1630s in the documents mention the Icherents (hereinafter Icherivsky and Icheriliny clans), and the Mendizinkurskaya and the Kaivaganskaya volosts. One of the shert-oath record books of 1683 contains records of several generic names of the local Tungus – Koyungolsky, Nanadunsky, Nemedinsky and Zyatoyaginsky (yatoyagir) clans (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 196; Tugolukov, 1985, p. 49-50). In addition, in the population census of 1669 the Tungus people of the Lower Angara were represented not under their ethnic names, but were divided by the territorial principle: the names of volosts were given in accordance with the names of the rivers on which they lived. Since 1696 the ethnic names were finally replaced by geographic ones – Rybenskaya, “along the Taseeva, the Usolka and the Ona rivers” (the Asans), Chunskaya, the Chadobskaya, the Katskaya, the Murskaya and the Kovinskaya (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 196).

Boris O. Dolgikh divides the Tungus people of the Lower Angara region into two tribal groups: the Toporks and the Icheril (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 197-203). The first included such clans as the Lapagir, the Yatoyal (Yatoyagir), the Toporks themselves and the Mendizinkursky Tungus living along the Chuna River. The Kaivaganskaya volost (the Koyungolsky clan),

and the Nanadunsky and the Nemedinsky clans, in his view, were also territorial or tribal divisions of the Toporks. The second group contained the Icheril (Icheren, Icherivsky, Icherilin, Icherilsky clan) and the Chipogir (Chipogur, Chipugir clan). Dolgikh treated the Chipogir as one of the clans of the Icheril, probably the most important one.

The settlement area of the Toporks covered the Angara river basin and its tributaries from the mouth of the Taseeva to the Mura (the Lapagirs and actually the Toporks themselves), the Chuna River (the Mendizinkurs) and the middle course of the Podkamennaya Tunguska (the Toporks), which flew through the territory of the Mangazeysky uyezd. And above them, to the mouth of the Kata (the main settlement area of the Chipogirs) lived the Icherils (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 197-204). And he believed, that the Icherils and their immediate neighbors – the Shamagirs (“Tungus shaman people”) of the Ilimsky uyezd were one tribe, who became known to Russians albeit under different names, but having one meaning (“icheri” – “shaman”) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 199).

Here the attention should be focused on the problem of the existence of the Tungus tribe, which, to date, remains a big question. Researchers such as A. F. Anisimov and B. O. Dolgikh, followed the classic writings of F. Engels and L.G. Morgan, and confidently wrote about the tribes of the Tungus, but often designing them in their own way. However, they gave no or could not give any public data on tribal organization of the identified “tribes” (Anisimov, 1936; Dolgikh, 1974, pp. 55-56). G. M. Vasilevich assumed that “one of the forms of the tribe” for the Tungus was their existing merger of two or three clans linked by marital relations and mutual assistance (Vasilevich, 1968, p. 30). The tribe, as this notion is understood in modern ethnographic field of study, is of course different from these associations of people. V. A. Tugolukov also

believes that the existence of tribes in the Tungus people is a matter of question, even though he believes that in pre-Russian times the Tungus had “associations of blood relatives larger than a clan”. Moreover, some of them were formed, in his opinion, “on the basis of inter-ethnic relations of the Tungus with the previous inhabitants” (Tugolukov, 1985, pp. 274, 275). Thus, V.A. Tugolukov followed the well known by that time theory of phratric social organization of many Western Siberian tribes (the Nenets, the Enets, the Hunts and others), that is one phratry is the descendants of South Siberian newcomers, and the other is the descendants of the taiga and tundra indigenous peoples (Dolgikh, 1962; 1964, Vasilyev, 1970; 1974; 1979, Sokolova, 1970; 1974 et al.), so he transferred the findings of his predecessors on the Tungus material. But until now almost no trace of tribal organization have been identified for the Tungus, if we understand it as a knitted, organized community (consisting of many clans), combined on the basis of kinship and economic ties, with a common territory, a special dialect, one tribal council, a tribal chief and / or military leader and religious traditions and rituals.

Now we return back to the Icheril people. V.A. Tugolukov treated the Icherils as the Shamagirs, but attributed their name to the Ichera River, a tributary of the Lena River in its upper reaches. He justified this by the fact that it is at the mouth of the river in 1639 one of the Shamagir groups was forced to pay the yasak on the regular basis. According to him, some of these “Ichersky Shamagirs” several years before moved to the Angara River, near the mouth of the Mura, and there they called themselves Ichera or Icherils, i.e. belonging to the Ichera. After 1683 a part of the Icheril people were assimilated with Russians, and some went to other regions, which explains the disappearance of this ethnonym (Tugolukov, 1985, p. 58). We can hardly agree

with this thesis for several reasons. Firstly, the Ichera is located at the distance of not less than 600 kilometers away from the Mura. And for the first third of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and even later, when the breach of another’s tribal boundaries was one of the most serious “misconduct”, which led to bloody civil strife, such movements of large masses of the Tungus people was not typical. That is, the concepts of “tribal areas”, “ancestral lands” were perfectly familiar to the Evenks. On this occasion, we can recall the wars between the Essei Vanyad people with the Oleneksky and the Anabarsky Adians and the Sinigir people, between the Shilyagir and thetrans-Baikal Kindigir and the Chilchagir people, or with the Lena-Vilyuisky Nyurmagan, the Nanagir and the Kantakul people. Although there were some examples of mass departures of entire clans, and even tribal groups from their places of permanent residence. For example, in 1683 the Vanyad people fled from the Mangazeysky uyezd. They beat the military people of this uyezd “in a battle” and were taken over by the district administration of the Yakutsky uyezd. But again, I shall repeat, by the time the third generation of the Vanyad people lived in the Russian state on its territory and to a greater or lesser extent, was forced to their external contacts to obey the laws of this state, and not to the traditions of their customary law. That is why, going into the territory of the Yakutsky uyezd, they immediately made contact with its authorities and confessed “the crime” they had committed.

Secondly, as inhabitants of the Mura area the Icheren people were mentioned a few years before 1639, back in 1631 and the amount of not less than 50 people of both genders (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 195). In 1683 in the Lower Angara region with the Taseeva and the Chuna river there were already 400 people (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 197). “Searching” for new yasak payers was the main objective of migration of the Russian

military people to the East, and it would have been awkward if such substantial in number groups of people would have been left unattended by the Cossacks, even at the initial stage of their arrival to the Lower Angara river region. Active agricultural development of the Lower Angara region by the Russian population began only in the 80s of the 17<sup>th</sup> century (Aleksandrov, 1964, pp. 114-115), and, in spite of constant assimilation of the Evenks by Russians, even at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century many groups of the Tungus people continued to maintain their ethnic look. Therefore, the explanation of V.A. Tugolukov concerning the reasons of disappearance of the ethnonym by the assimilation with Russians is quite far-fetched.

Thirdly, B. O. Dolgikh by comparing the nominal lists of 1669, 1683, 1696, and “following” found out that the Icheril did not disappear, and formed the Kovinsky yasak paying volost. A part of them together with the Chipogirs joined the Katskaya volost (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 197). In accordance with one of the shert-oath record books of 1683 four groups of the Icherils (“along the Kova river...Icheril clan”, “along the Kezhma river...Icheril clan”, “along the Taseeva and the Chuna rivers”) were 94 yasak payers, which totals 376 people. And “along the Kate river...of the Chipugir clan” was 39 men of labor capable age (156 people of both genders). Thus, in general in 1683 there were about 530 representatives of the Icheril people (Dolgikh, 1960, pp.197, 199). At the same time, V.A. Tugolukov does not consider the Chipogirs as a part of the Icherils, and relates them to the Chipagirs of the Podkamennaya and the Lower Tunguska rivers, a territorial group of which, in his opinion, they were (Tugolukov, 1985, pp. 48, 49, 113, 115-116).

The administrative reform of A.P. Stepanov (1824) transformed the Kovinskaya volost into the first Lapogirskaya, and the Katskaya volost – into the second Lapogirskaya councils. These new

names were not successful, because the Lapagirs in the 17<sup>th</sup> century lived far to the west from the Kova and the Kata, but B. O. Dolgikh considered that it was symptomatic that both of the councils received the same name. That is, the Yeniseysky administration recognized the similarity of their origin.

The fate of the members of the administrative units varies in different authors. Thus, S. Patkanov believed that by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century they died of smallpox (Patkanov, 1906, p. I, issue. 2, p. 152). B. O. Dolgikh saw the descendants of the first Lapagirskaya council in the so-called Kolangirsk Evenks of the population census in 1926-1927. They consisted of the Kuchal, the Oedal and the Tonkul clans (87 people) and lived on the Taimba, the Como and the Velmo rivers (the Podkamennaya Tunguska River basin) and the Pit (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 199). V.A. Tugolukov believed that the Kuchal and the Oedal belonged to the first administrative Kurkugirsky clan, and he considered the Tonkul clan to be, albeit with some doubts, a spin-off patrimony of the Lower Tunguska clan of the Muchugirs (Tugolukov, 1985, pp. 87, 89, 90).

B. O. Dolgikh believed that the clan Lopokol (136 people) were the descendants of the Katsky Tungus (2nd Lapogirskaya council). This clan evicted, according to a legend, at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century from the Parta river (between the Kova and the Kezhma rivers on the Angara) at the Podkamennaya Tunguska river and became a part of the Kurkogirs (Chapagirs) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 199). V.A. Tugolukov opposes such an identification, and considers the Lopokol, the Lopukor and the Lopal clans (see below) to be the descendants of the Lower Angara Lapagirs of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, which subsequently disintegrated into several local groups (Tugolukov, 1985, p. 84). G. M. Vasilevich at first supported the opinion of B. O. Dolgikh (Vasilevich, ERS, 1958, p. 581), but later she confirmed the identity of these clans

(Vasilevich, 1969, p. 273). In this issue the author is inclined to believe G. M. Vasilevich and V.A. Tugolukov. In fact, it is hard to believe that the names are so similar and quite common in the local area (there were no similar ethnonyms found on the entire rest of the vast area populated by the ethnic Evenks) could belong to different groups of different origin. Although, with respect to the Lopokol clan we can assume that the determination of its members for a hundred years in the second administrative Lapagirskaya council served as an important factor in their perception of the name, derived from the ethnonym Lapa, Lopal, Lapagir. So far, the available data do not allow us to neither fully adhere to the views expressed by the above experts, nor to put forward any theory about the fate of the descendants of the Kovinskaya (the first Lapogirskaya) and the Katskaya (the second Lapogirskaya) volosts in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Now we turn to the Lapagirs. The first time when they were mentioned was found in a collective petition for their “services” to the Yeniseysky military men dating back to 1630 (Miller, 2000, p. 240). But these “services” refer to an earlier time, to the middle or second half of the 1620s. The petition lists the Tungus clans who lived in the Lower Angara and were forced by the Cossacks to pay the yasak on a regular basis. The Lapagirs in the document presented as the west, next to the Yenisei, the Tunguska family, developed areas of the Rybnaya river mouth. The Lapagirs were led by, in Russian terminology, knyaztsy (princes) Irkiney Chekoteev and Bolkey Kelov. Tasei, a famous military leader of the Tungus also belonged to the same clan. His name is reflected in the name of the river Taseeva, a most large inflow of the Angara. Danul, apparently, also belonged to the Lapagirs. He led several attacks on subservient to Russian administration Ostyaks and threatened to take the Ketsky stockaded town. Apparently, it was

the Lapagirs who initiated the attacks on Russian property and the Ostyak population subservient to the Russian administration of the Ketsky and then the Yeniseysky uyezds. Such aggression was based, apparently, on the factor that the Lapagirs were the most distant south-western outpost of the Tunguska world, come into direct contact with the more advanced socially and economically ethnic groups of southern Siberia. Their eastern and southern neighbors, such as the Kuznetsky Ostyaks, the Arins and the Asans, before their transfer under the authority of the Russian Tsar, were dependent on the state of organized entities (principalities) of the Yeniseysky Kyrgyz, regularly paying the yasak to them and to the extent necessary, supplying troops for raids to the neighboring peoples. They knew the power structure, responsibilities in relation to the ruling stratum, social stratification. Despite the independence of the Lower Angara Tungus people in relation to the Kyrgyz, the impact of the first in part of social life and community aspects on the second cannot be excluded. In life of the Lower Angara Tungus, and in particular in the life of the Lapagirs, a significant role was played by the military component of the organization of the society. The desire to protect the lives and the property wealth of the society led to the appearance of the Lower Angara Tungus strong enough military organization and the military leaders who wanted not only military glory, but also the subordination of weaker neighbors in order to obtain the tribute.

In the eastern written sources it is mentioned that in the 17<sup>th</sup> century at the mouth of the Angara there was a Kyrgyz city Kikas. “The city” – that sounds pretty loud, but the fact that it was a fortification, located on the border of the Kyrgyz impact is unlikely to be questioned. Thus, by the time when Russian troops appeared in the Lower Angara region the Tungus local population of nearly half a millennium was even in the

mediated, but contact with the Kyrgyz. They were familiar with their culture and traditions of the military. They could use them as a base to develop their military code and warlike lifestyle. In this connection it is appropriate to quote the words of a local knyazets, Tasin, who said they “are brave, our young people, and in no way they to listen to us and they are going to battle the Ketsky fortress, and to fight with the Kets and the Kasovsky Ostyaks” (Miller, 2000, pp. 53, 292). According to ethnographic materials it is known that in the societies in which the war was to occupy a significant place, military valor and fortune valued very highly. And the most active fighting force advocated the youth for whom the war represented the fastest and most radical way to improve their property and social status, gain prestige, get things valued by the society. The fact that the war took quite a significant place in the life of the Lower Angara Tungus documents show Russian administration of the Ketsky and Yeniseysky uyezds of the first quarter of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. They often documented evidence of attacks on the Angara Tungus Ostyaks, who were subservient to Russian population. And this despite the fact that the documentation of that time came to us not in full.

Therefore, in 1608, Danul led the Tungus “in the latest way” to attack the Ostyaks of the Kuznetskaya volost of the Ketsky uyezd “and they injured two-persons, and other yasak paying people scattered.” Not only the combat capabilities of the Tungus and the purpose of their leaders in the face of Danula were perfectly illustrated by the following lines: “the same Tungus want sovereign yasak payers, military people who come to them for the yasak, to beat, and to leave one Cossack and an interpreter, and want to make the yasak payers downstream the Ket to the Ketsky stockaded town, so that they could not give the yasak to the sovereign, but to pay the yasak to them” (Miller, 2000, pp. 244, 247). It clearly

shows the desire of the military leadership of the Tungus not only defeat the enemy, and put it in a dependent tributary position. Such a situation was not at all typical of other groups of the Evenks of Siberia. V.A. Tugolukov even believes that until Russians appeared in the Yeniseysky region the local Ostyak population had been paying the yasak to the Tungus people of the Lower Angara (Tugolukov, 1985, p. 47).

The subsequent course of events was as follows: in May 1609 from the Ketsky stockaded town a detachment of Russian military men, and the Zyryan Ostyaks was sent, who defeated the enemy and captured several wounded Tungus people. However, all of the prisoners died of his wounds. (Miller, 2000, p. 247). The defeat did not break the force of the Tungus, and they immediately afterwards attacked the Ostyaks from the River Sym (Miller, 2000, p. 247). By the end of 1609 there were several reports that Danul and his men were still not willing to give the yasak and prepared to continue the fight against Russians (Miller, 2000, p. 252). In 1610 and 1611 Danul continued attacks on the Ketsky Ostyaks and prevented further advancement of Russians to the east. The Kuznetskaya volost especially suffered from his actions, as it was the closest to the Angara. So, in 1610, “in the fall” the Tungus (“about 100 man”) “fought” this town and killed six people. The Ostyaks fled to the Tyulkin land, and women and children who left, were taken into captivity by the Tungus (Miller, 2000, p. 256). In June 1611 15 Tungus again attacked the Dyukans that came to the Yenisei and killed their 6 people, next of kin of Chiemsee and Kayget, who were knyaztsy of the Symsko-Kassky Ostyaks (Dyukans) (Miller, 2000, p. 259). At the end of 1612 it became known about the desire to join the Tungus, however the Ostyak knyaztsy Namak and Tumet, who were sent to them for the yasak, in the next year were robbed and sent home only “soul and body” (Miller, 2000, p. 266). In 1618, out of

the Makovsky stockaded town a detachment of serving people was sent to beat the Tungus. The Tungus people led by Danul were “beaten” and were put “under the sovereign’s ... a high hand.” This campaign involved the Cod Ostyaks (Mansi) of the knyazets Michael Alachev (Miller, 2000, p. 668).

The Lower Angara Tungus experienced some impact of the Buryat knyaztsy, whose nearest lands were located in the area of modern Bratsk and Nizhneudinsk, but their influence extended to a much larger area. It is known that in their military campaigns “Bratsk people” reached the shores of the Yenisei River near Krasnoyarsk forest steppe. Moreover, they represented a potential threat to western tribal groups such as the Arins, the Kachins and even residents of the Middle Chulym – the Basagars, the Kereksus, the Achints, the Meles and others. Many of them were forced to pay the yasak to the Buryat feudal elite. On this score, there are direct indications in the sources. In letters of the Yeniseysky writ man M. Trubchaninov, dated 1620, is written: “... in the Chulym upper part there are Tomsk yasak paying people: the Kyzyl, the Bogasars, and adjusting to them Kachi, Milis, Macaws, Brata, Mats, and Mats and Brata are great people, did not pay the yasak to the sovereign, and they themselves collect the yasak from sovereign’s yasak paying people who wander close to them: from the Kyzyl, from the Bagazars ...”(Miller, 2000, p. 293). A letter in 1622 states: “... the Arin knyazets Tataush sent his messenger to Basagary and Kerekusy and Upper Melestsy and his Bratsk banner, truly go to fight Bratsk people with the Arins and the Kachins and the Basagars and the Kereksuses, the Melesky people and 3,000 people of Bratsk except the Kyshtyms” (Miller, 2000, p. 337).

The Lower Angara Tungus also had direct contacts with the Buryats. It is known that an authoritative warchief of the local Tungus Tasei

was killed by the Buryats at the beginning of 1626 at the Chuna river. The most western groups of the Buryat population lived in the upper reaches of this river known as the Uda (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 185, 202). The lands of the Lapagirs and the Uda Buryats were separated by more than 500 kilometers on the straight. Nevertheless, this fact did not prevent them from mutual invasions.

A whole series of “military” burials found recently in the Lower Angara region and the Yenisei regions adjacent to it, which are dated the 5<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> (11<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup>) centuries, speak for a quiet developed military culture of the local peoples, may be even the pre-Tungus. The burials are represented by cremated bodies, which also demonstrates the influence of more south cultures, the Kyrgyz in particular. The cremation ceremony is almost untypical for the peoples of the taiga zone of Central and Eastern Siberia, and among the Yeniseysky Kyrgyz it had survived through two thousand years. Among the burial instruments those typical for military societies are prevailing: iron arrow heads, pikes, knives, broadswords (Mandyka et al., 2011, p. 432).

Returning to the Lapagirs, according to the data of 1631 the Lapagirs were exploring the most lower reaches of the Angara river, including the tributaries the Taseeva, the Kamenka, the Irkineeva, the Karabula and the Pinchuga. They included three territorial groups: the Lapagirskaya volost itself, the Kaivaganskaya volost and “the Lapagirskiye districts along the Karabula river”. The total amount of the yasak payers in these volosts amounted to 78 people, which corresponds to 310-320 people of both genders (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 195). The fact that the Kaivagans were a part of the Lapagirs is also confirmed by Bolkey Kelov being their chief, who was called a Lapagir knyazets in the petition of 1630 (Dolgikh 1960, p. 196). Nevertheless, we shall consider that according to Boris O. Dolgikh

opinion, “the Lapagirs from the Karabula” (an therefore, the Pinchuga Tungus they joined in one Murskaya volost) were not even the Lapagirs but the Toporks, another class of the same tribe or the tribal name of all the Lower Angara Tungus (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 197, 201). Without them the amount of the Lapagirs will be only 190 people.

After comparing the names in the “census books” and the oath book Boris O. Dolgikh determined that according to the census of 1669 the Lapagirs formed the Rybinskaya and the Kamenskaya volosts and the total population of the yasak payers was 59-62 people (i.e. 240 people of both genders of the total population) (Dolgikh, 1960, pp. 196, 201). In 1683 the following yasak payers could be considered as the Lapagirs: the Lapagir clan (8 men), the Koyungol clan (12), the Kamenka Tungus (11), the Irkineeva clan (13) and the Nanadun clan (17). The name “Koyungol” is a wrong pronunciation of “Kaivagan” recorded in the census of 1631. This is also confirmed by the fact that the chief of the Koyungols was Naunts Bolkeev, the son of the chief of the Kaivagans and a Lapagir knyazets, Bolkey Kelov (see above). It is a little bit more complicated with the Nanadun clan. In the oath book its members are named as “belonging to the Nanadun clan, being the Toporaks also”. As it was previously mentioned, Boris O. Dolgikh thought that the name “Toporks” (Toporaks) was the name of the Tungus clan in the lowest Angara. At that time it united the clans of the Lapagirs, Yatoyals, Toporks and Mandezinkur Tungus from the Chuna river (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 200). Therefore, there are two possible ways of understanding the census of 1683. The Nanadun clan in the census represented the Lapagirs, but specification refers not to the name of the clan, but the name of the tribe (“being the Toporaks also”), or they were still the Toporks (clan), but at the beginning of the following century they had almost assimilated with the Lapagirs and lost their clan differentiation from the latter. Boris O.

Dolgikh preferred the latter version stating that the Nanaduns by the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century were included into the Rybenskaya yasak paying volost formed by the descendents of the Lapagirs and the Kaivagans according to the names recording of the census of 1631 (Dolgikh, p. 197).

The Rybenskaya yasak paying volost, which first appeared in the sources in 1669, had survived until the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Nevertheless, the population of this volost started to decrease a hundred years before this time. By 1669 the Rybenskaya and other volosts joined to it later had 59 yasak payers, and by 1696 there were only 31, and by 1735 only 10 (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 201). Such a disastrous decrease requires an explanation and Boris O. Dolgikh provides it. For example, in the materials of the yasak records for 1767 it is said: “the Chunkskaya (volost-Boris Dolgikh’s comment) and the Rybenskaya volost joined to it”, “the Chadobskaya volost and the Irkineevskaya and the Kamenskaya volosts joined to it” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 201). According to these records a part of the Lapagir population in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century joined the adjacent volosts, which were more numerous in population. The main part of population in such volosts were not the Lapagirs. Moreover, he turns to the materials of the field research of G.M. Vasilevich. According to the data of this research “the earliest migration of the Tungus, especially the Kim clan, from the Angara regions to the left banks of the Yenisei happened 200 years ago according to the genealogic records, i.e. in 1720-1730” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 201; Vasilevich, 1931, p.134). At the same time he adds that “possibly a part of the Rybensky Tungus migrated to the left banks of the Yenisei in 1690-1720 already” (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 201). Therefore, the members of the Kim clan (84 people in 1926) are recognized by Boris O. Dolgikh as the descendents of the Tungus of the Rybenskaya volost, i.e. direct descendents of the Lapagirs of the Lower Angara

region of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Even though he makes an assumption that the Kim clan may have come from the Asans, the group speaking one of the Yeniseian languages, recorded in the 17th century on the Taseeva river and in the lower reaches of the Chuna (Dolgikh, 1960, p.206). He considers the following clans recorded in the Turukhansk census of 1926-1927 to be the descendents of the Lapagirs: the Lopukor (26 people) in the Nanadal group (between the upper waters of the Mura and the Chuna rivers), the Lopal clan (27 people) and its derivation the Kochonil (82 people) in the Chapagirs tribe at the Podkamennya Tunguska (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 202). Among the Yataelsky (Chadobsky) Tungus the Kimal clan (10 people), the main part of which lived on the left bank of the Yenisei (the Kim clan), could be referred to the Lapagirs' descendents. May be the Lapagirs' descendents can be found among some other clans of the Yataelsky volost of the 19<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but to clarify this issue a separate research is required.

V.A. Tugolukov unlike Boris O. Dolgikh does not consider the Kaivagans (Koyungols) a part of the Lapagirs judging only by the assonance of their name with toponymic and ethnonymic terms determined at the Kets' territory. He offers to consider them as an ethnically mixed group (Tugolukov, 1985, p. 58).

The Toporks are first mentioned in the Yeniseysky servicemen's petition in 1630. Then they were localized in the area of the mouths of the Mura and the Chadobets rivers. The chiefs of the Toporks were knyaztsy Mamyga and Multa (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 196). Therefore, each of these knyaztsy was a chief of one territorial group of the Toporks: the Mura group or the Chadobets group. Nevertheless, already in 1631 the Toporks are not mentioned as a separate territorial group neither in this region, nor somewhere nearby. Instead the Icherents appear on the Mura ("on the Mura rift"), and the Chadobets Tungus are

named simply by their territorial name "on the Chadopcha river" (Dolgikh, 1960, p.195). Neither Mamyga, nor Multa are the chiefs of these territorial units. Nevertheless, the name of Mamyga is recognized in the name Mommoka Toyanets recorded among the Chadobets Tungus. As for Multa, he does not appear in the records himself, but his five sons and three grandsons are named. Herewith, three of his sons appear in the list of the Chadobets Tungus, while the two others are listed among the Mura Icherents. Moreover, the chief of one of the groups was Multa's son, Gotal Multin. At the same time thereof his sons and also grandsons were assigned to the neighboring Chadobskaya volost (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 200). Individual Toporks are mentioned though. Thus, in the list of the Chadobets Tungus during this year three names received the addition "Toporoks" or a "Toporok". One Toporok is also present in the list of the Tungus "on the Apla rift", i.e. among the Icherils (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 200).

The next mentioning of the Toporks on the Angara dates only 1683. They are a part of the clans and territorial groups of the Rybenskaya yasak paying volost ("of the Nanadun clan, being the Toporoks also" – 17 men) and on the Chuna river (the Toporkil clan – 22 men) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 197). As it was mentioned above Dolgikh consider the name Toporks to be general for the Tungus tribes which inhabited the Angara river basin from the Chadobets river to the mouth. Boris O. Dolgikh's statement was based, apparently, on several reasons. Firstly, when the ethnonyms of the Lower Angara Tungus, who lived along the Yenisei to the Kata river, are first mentioned (1630), the place of inhabitation of the three groups of the natives are determined: "the Lapagir Tungus", "the Tungus Toporks" (on the Mura and the Chadobets) and "also the Tungus Chipog...s" (i.e. Chipogirs) (Dolgikh, 1960, p.196). Therefore, the name "Toporks"

determined quite a significant group of the Lower Angara region population living in its middle part. Secondly, “the census book” of 1631 shows that not the Toporks, but the Icherents lived on the Mura, but their chief was Gotal Multin, the son of one of the Toporks chiefs in 1630 and it is possible that the chief of the Mura Toporks. Among these Icherents another son of Multa is found as well. Thirdly, in the oath book of 1683 the Toporkil clan is recorded to inhabit the Chuna banks. And about 100 Toporks of the Mangazeysky uyezd lived in the basin of the middle reaches of the Podkamennaya Tunguska during the whole 17<sup>th</sup> century. Thus, this clan (tribe) inhabited quite a large territory. Moreover, the members of the Nanadun clan of the Lapagirs were also named the Toporks in 1683. And Mommoka Toyanets (mentioned in the census book of 1631 among the Tungus of the Chadobskaya volost), i.e. Mamuga-Yatoyanets (from the Yatoyal clan), was the chief of the Toporks on the Mura and the Chadobets in 1620s. Therefore, the Lapagirs and the Yatoyals were also recognized as the Toporks, but the Toporks themselves always remained only the Toporks. Boris O. Dolgikh outlines that there are quite enough examples when the name of one of the tribal clans, the chief one as a rule, becomes a general name for the whole tribe with time (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 198).

Boris O. Dolgikh basing on the personal names of the Tungus from the lists of the yasak payers for the 17<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century comes to the conclusion of the succession of the Lapagirs from the Karabula (“on the Karabula river, the Lapagirs”) of 1631 (31 yasak payers – i.e. about 120 people of the total population) with the peoples of the Murskaya and the Pinchugskaya volosts of 1669 (40 yasak payers and 160 people of the total population) and of 1683 (45 and 180 correspondingly). The latter together with the population of the Murskaya volost of 1669 (43 and 170) and the following years (in 1735) there were

only 38 yasak payers (about 150 people of both genders) in the Murskaya volost (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 201). This is quite strange, while the Mura Tungus are not named the Toporks in none of the sources. Moreover, in 1631 when this territorial group was first mentioned in the sources, it was called the Lapagirs contradicting the above stated idea that the Toporks have always remained only the Toporks. Boris O. Dolgikh also notes that in the 17<sup>th</sup> century some Toporks along with the Yatoyants formed the Chadobskaya volost, and other Toporks formed the Chunkskaya volost together with the Mendizinkurskaya (see the data of 1683) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 197). Therefore, it happens that the Toporks for the whole century are mentioned only several times: in 1630 (this document contains the data for the second half of 1620s) on the Angara, the Mura and the Chadobets; in 1631 three of them were recorded in the Chadobskaya volost and one in the list of the yasak payers of the volost “on the Apla rift, i.e. among the Icherints”; in 1683 the members of the Nanadun clan of the Rybenskaya volost were named the Toporks and the Toporkil clan on the Chuna is mentioned as well. Moreover, during the whole 17<sup>th</sup> century, starting from 1630 the Toporks had been constantly mentioned on the Podkamennaya Tunguska, where they were permanent yasak payers of the Teter wintering place.

In 1824 the Murskaya yasak paying volost (the Toporks descendents according to the opinion of Boris O. Dolgikh) was transformed into the Nanadalskaya volost by the Yeniseysk governor A.P. Stepanov (let us remember the Nanadun clan of 1631). Stepanov wanted to return the “original” (as he understood them) names to the existing yasak paying units. But often he messed them up even worse.

In the Subpolar census of 1926-1927 there were 50 Nanadal Tungus including three clans: the above mentioned Lopukor (26 people), the

Tumnyyar (10 people) and the Bagdalil (14 people) (Dolgikh, 1960, p.202). At that time they inhabited the upper reaches of the Mura and the Chuna, but some of them had already left for the Podkamennaya Tunguska (Vasilevich, 1969, pp. 263, 273, 276, 280).

The Yatoyants are also mentioned in the sources of the 17<sup>th</sup> century only several times, being more exact two times: in 1631 (Yatoyanets or Toyanets) and in 1683 (Zatoyaginsk clan). And both cases took place on the Chadobets river, which was more likely their place of residence. In other cases the Tungus on the Chadobets are mentioned as the Chadobskaya volost. The yasak paying population of this volost in 1631 was 62 people, i.e. total pollution of this volost was 250 people. In 1696 the population decreased to 48 (about 190 people of total population) of the yasak payers, and in 1735 the amount of the yasak payers was 35 (140 people of total population) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 201). The Chadobskaya volost existed until 1824. Moreover, smaller territorial groups of the Rybensky Tungus (paying the yasak in the Rybensky stockaded town) (Irkineevsky and Kamensky in 1767), i.e. the Lapagirs, were joined to this volost as it was mentioned above.

A.P. Stepanov renamed the Chadobskaya (at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century it was called the Chadobets bank volost) volost into the Yataelskaya (compare the Yatoyants and the Zyatoyaginsk clan). The census of 1926-1927 considered the Yataelts of seven clans existing only in one territorial group: the Tepurekol (52 people), the Yatoyal (47 people), the Kiroktol (19 people), the Tukul (19 people), the Kurichel (17 people), the Sulikal (11 people) and the Buldagir (7 people). There were also 10 people of the Kimal clan, the main part of which nomadised on the left bank of the Yenisei. As we can see, the descendents of the Yatoyals and the Toporks of the 17<sup>th</sup> century were the biggest part of the population in this

group. But at that time the Yataelts did not inhabit the Angara basin anymore. They moved to the north to the Podkamennaya Tunguska, to get far from the Russian settlements.

Another Tungus speaking group of the Lower Angara region lived in the Middle Chuna basin and was headed by the knyazets Mendizinkur. By the name of this knyazets it was called at the end of 1620s-beginning of 1640s the Mendizinkurskaya volost. The census of 1669 calls the whole group the Chunskaya volost. In the oath book of 1683 the names of separate parts of the Chunskaya volost are given: the Nemedin clan of the Rybny stockaded town (9 yasak payers), Nemedin clan on the Chuna (17 yasak payers), the Toporkil clan on the Chuna (22 yasak payers), the Chuna Tungus having paid the yasak on the Mura (30 yasak payers), the Chuna Tungus having paid the yasak on the Pinchuga (10 yasak payer) and the Chuna Tungus having paid the yasak on the Chadobets (15 yasak payers). Total 103 yasak payers, i.e. 410 people of the total population. The “Chunskaya” volost had existed with this name until 1824, when the Yeniseysk governor A.P. Stepanov “corrected” its name into the Mendezhel clan (compare Mendizinkur) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 203). By the 19<sup>th</sup> century the Chuna Tungus were Russified and turned into Christianity and in 1832 most of them became peasants and remained in the villages on the Chuna river (Bedoba, Takhmay, Vydrina, Bideya – 97 people) and Karabula (Gavrilskaya – 9 people) (Dolgikh, 1960, p. 204). Their descendents, who still remembered their Tungus origin, were found in this area even at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Pokrovsky, KKKM, o/f 7886/190, p. 60-62; Chekaninsky, 1914, pp.70,74).

Thus, by 1920 there were almost no Evenks left in the Angara river basin. Some of them having settled in the Russian villages got totally Russified, others left this region, mainly for the

Podkamennaya Tunguska river basin, to the north. The Lower Angara known previously as the Upper Tunguska lost its Tungus status and became a Russian river. The same can be stated for the rest of the Yeniseysky uyezd of the end of the 17th century, where the clans speaking one of the Yeniseian languages lived. Most of

them got Russified by the beginning of the 20th century, the last Yartsev and Vorogov Yugs have disappeared before our eyes, in 1980s. Some of them were included into the Ket people. This is a brief history of the indigenous northern peoples of the Lower Angara and the Middle Yenisei territories for the past 400 years.

<sup>1</sup> Shert-oath record books (Russian: шертоприводные книги) were books, which contained written oaths (“sherts” – after Arabic šart – “condition”) of loyalty and allegiance to the Russian Tsar. These oaths were taken by the indigenous peoples of the region – translator’s note.

### References

1. Aleksandrov V.A. *Russkoe nasledie Sibiri XVII- nachala XVIII v. (Yeniseiskii krai)* [Russian Heritage of Siberia of the 17<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries (The Yeniseysky uyezd)], Moscow, 1964.
2. Anisimov A.F. *Rodovoe obshchestvo evenkov* [The Tribal Community of the Evenks], Leningrad, 1936.
3. Vasilevich G.M. *Symskie tungusy* [The Sym Tungus] // *Sovetskiy sever*. 1931, No. 2.
4. Vasilevich G.M. *K voprosy o plemenakh u evenkov k severu ot Nizhnei Tunguski* [About the Evenks Tribes to the North from the Lower Tunguska] // Abstracts of the Annual Scientific Session Reports, May 1968. Leningrad, 1968.
5. Vasilevich G.M. *Evenki. Istoriko-etnograficheskie ocherki (XVIII-nachala XX v.)* [The Evenks. Historical and Ethnographic Reviews (the 18<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century)]. Leningrad, 1969, 304 p.
6. Vasilyev V.I. *Sotsial'naya organizatsiya aziatskikh nentsev, entsevi nganasan* [Social Organization of the Asian Nenets, Enets and Nganasan] // *Social Structure of the Northern Siberia Peoples*. Moscow: Nauka, 1970.
7. Vasilyev V.I. *K probleme etnogeneza severosamodiiskikh narodov* [To the Issue of the Northern Samoyed Peoples' Ethnogenesis] // *Social Organization and Culture of the Peoples of the North*. Moscow, 1974, pp. 133-175.
8. Vasilyev V.I. *Problemy formirovaniya severosamodiiskikh narodnostei* [The Problems of Formation of the Northern Samoyed Peoples] Moscow, 1979, 243 p.
9. Dolgikh B.O. *Rodovoi i plemennoi sostav narodov Sibiri v XVII veke* [The clans and Tribes of the Peoples of Siberia in the 17<sup>th</sup> century] Moscow, 1960, 622 p.
10. Dolgikh B.O. *Rodovaya ekzogamiya ynganasan i entsev* [The Clan Exogamy among the Nganasans and the Enets] // *Siberian Ethnographic Collection*. Moscow: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1962 (The Ethnography Institute Works, IV, V. 78).
11. Dolgikh B.O. *Proiskhozhdenie dolgan* [The Origin of the Dolgans] // *Siberian Ethnographic Collection*. V. Moscow, 1963, pp. 93-141.
12. Dolgikh B.O. *Rod, fratriya, plemya u narodov Severnoi Sibiri* [Clan, Phratry, Tribe in the People of Northern Siberia]. Report on the VII Moscow Congress of Anthropologists and Ethnographers, Moscow: Nauka, 1964.

13. Dolgikh B.O. *K voprosu o sootnoshenii Bol'shoi i maloi sem'i u narodov severa v proshlom* [To the Issue of Relation of the Big and the Small Families among the Peoples of the North in the Past] // *Social Organization and Culture of the Peoples of the North*. Moscow, 1974, pp. 21-57.
14. Milescu Spafariy N.G. "*Puteshestvie chrez Sibir ot Tobolska do Nerchinska i granits Kitaya russkogo poslannika Nikolaya Spafariya v 1675 godu*" ["The Journey through Siberia from Tobolsk to Nerchinsk and the Chinese Border of the Russian Ambassador Nikolay Spafariy in 1675"] // *Zemlya Verkhneketskaya*. Tomsk, 1997
15. Miller G.F. *Istoriya Sibiri* [The History of Siberia], V. I, Moscow, 1999.
16. Miller G.F. *Istoriya Sibiri* [The History of Siberia], V. II, Moscow, 2000. 798 p.
17. Mandyka P.V., Senousova P.O., Biryulyova K.V. *Resul'taty rabot na ansamble arkheologicheskikh pamyatnikov Shivera Prospikhinskaya na Angare* [The Results of works on the Archeological Sites Shivera Prospikhinskaya on the Angara] // *Problemy arkheologii, etnographii, antropologii Sibiri i sopredel'nykh territorii* [The Problems of Archeology, Ethnography and Anthropology of Siberia and Adjacent Territories]. Materials of the Final Session of the Institute of Archeology and Ethnography of SB RAS 2011, V. XVII. Novosibirsk, IAET, 2011, pp. 432-436.
18. Patkanov S. *Opyt geografii i statistiki tungusskikh plemen Sibiri na osnovanii dannykh perepisi 1897 i drugikh istochnikov* [Experience of Geography and Statistic of the Tungus Tribes of Siberia Basing on the Data of the Census of 1897 and Other Sources]. Saint-Petersburg, P. I: The Tungus. Issues 1 and 2, 1906.
19. Pelikh G.I. *Selkupy XVII veka (ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii)* [The Selkups of the 17<sup>th</sup> century (social and economic history notes)], Novosibirsk, 1981, 177 p.
20. Pokrovskiy I.I. *Doklad podatnogo inspektora 1-go uchastka Yeniseiskogo uyezda po voprosu ob obsledovanii inorodtsev Angarskogo kraja Yeniseiskogo uyezda* [The Report of a Tribute Collecting Inspector of the 1<sup>st</sup> District of the Yeniseysky Uyezd about the Study of the Foreigners of the Angara Region of the Yeniseysky Uyezd] // KKM, o/f 7886/190, 93 sheets.
21. Sokolova Z.P. *Sotsial'naya organizatsiya obskikh ugrov i selkupov* [Social Organization of the Ob Ugrs and Selkups] // *The Social Structure of the Northern Siberia Peoples*. Moscow: Nauka, 1970.
22. Sokolova Z.P. *Sotsial'naya organizatsiya obskikh ugrov (k istorii voprosa)* [Social Organization of the Ob Ugrs (to the History of the Issue)] // *The Social Structure of the Northern Siberia Peoples*. Moscow, 1985, 285 p.
23. Tugolukov V.A. *Tungusy (evenki i eveny) Srednei i Zapadnoi Sibiri* [The Tungus (the Evenks and the Evens) of Central and Western Siberia]. Moscow, 1985, 285 p.
24. Chekaninskiy I.A. *Sledy shamanskogo kul'ta v russko-tungusskikh poseleniyakh po reke Chune v Yeniseiskoi gubernii* [The Traces of the Shaman Cult in the Russian-Tungus Settlements on the Chuna River of the Yeniseysky Governorate] // *Ethnographic Review*, No. 3-4, 1914.
25. Yakovlev Ya. A. *Geographicheskie nazvaniya Verkhneketskogo raiona. Chto oni oznachayut?* [Geographic Names of the Upper Ket Region. What Do They Mean?] // *Zemlya Verkhneketskaya*. Tomsk, 1997.

## **Этническая история коренных народов Енисейского уезда XVII века и их судьбы**

**М.С. Баташев**

*Красноярский краевой краеведческий музей,  
Россия 660049, Красноярск, ул. Дубровинского, 84*

---

*В данной статье представлен обзор этнической истории коренного населения Енисейского уезда с XVII века до исторической современности.*

*На основе широкого круга архивных источников и этнографических данных дана реконструкция сложных процессов культурогенеза эвенков и других коренных народов Красноярского края на территории Северного Приангарья, в бассейне р. Енисей и р. Кеть.*

*Ключевые слова: этнография, Енисей, Северное Приангарье, Красноярский край.*

*Работа выполнена в рамках исследований, финансируемых Красноярским краевым фондом поддержки научной и научно-технической деятельности, а также в рамках тематического плана СФУ по заданию Министерства образования и науки Российской Федерации.*

---

