

A.V. Chernykh

Perm State National Research University,
Bukireva 15, Perm, 614000, Russia
E-mail: atschernych@yandex.ru

The Festive Culture of Mining Plants in the Urals: The Dobryanka Case

On the basis of documentary ethnographic sources from the late 19th to early 20th centuries, the study reconstructs calendar festivals and rites of that period, recorded at one of the mining plants in the Urals—Dobryanka, in the western part of the Perm Governorate. Common festivals celebrated at Uralian mining plants include the greeting of birds (kashke-plishke), “sending off” water (seeing off the Kama), Day of St. Sergius, Pentecost, etc. The industrial calendar was related to the main household and holiday cycles; special “corporate” festivals emerged at private plants, coinciding with name-days of the plants’ owners; archaic forms of traditional ritualism were preserved; calendar festivals were more and more regarded as forms of leisure with less and less religious meaning; multiple calendar traditions coexisted; and new urban forms of festive culture were adopted. The holiday culture of plant settlements was intermediate between rural and urban forms of calendar ritualism. Each peculiarity of industrial calendar rites is described using ethnographic examples from the corresponding holiday cycle. The findings indicate rather unusual features of folk culture in the industrial settlements of the Urals.

Keywords: Urals, Russian rites, plant culture, calendar festivals, rites, folk calendar, local traditions.

Introduction

Calendar festivals and rites are a traditional topic of ethnographic and folklore research. Russian calendar festivals and rites have been studied for several centuries, and have an extensive historiography. In different periods, various approaches and methods have been used for analyzing the phenomenon of the folk calendar; studies on methodological problems (Chicherov, 1957; Propp, 1963; Sokolova, 1979; Bernshtam, 1988; Baiburin, 1993; Agapkina, 2002; and others), regional complexes (Tultseva, 2001; Tolstaya, 2005; Fursova, 2002, 2003; Korepova, 2009; Zolotova, 2017; Chernykh, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2014; and others), and individual festive cycles and rites (Makashina, 1982; Agapkina, 2000; Lobkova, 2000) have been published. Even today, calendar topics are one of the most important areas of

research in both Russian and international scholarship (The Ritual..., 2015). It seems important to pursue the objectives of identifying and assembling the corpus of sources, and also studying regional complexes, local traditions, and modern forms of rites and festive culture. The analysis of historiography shows that publications on calendar rites include a large amount of works that analyze peasant tradition (which is the most archaic, traditional, and attractive for ethnographers) in great detail. Another group of studies focuses on urban festive culture (Nekrylova, 2004; Kotlyarchuk, 2001; Keller, 2001; Andriets, 2013). The topic of how rites functioned in non-urban plant settlements and social groups has hardly been studied. Calendar traditions and the complex of festival days and rites that evolved in plant settlements of the Urals have so far remained outside the scope of research.

The “plant” culture of the Urals is extremely important in ethnographic research of the region: in the second half of the 19th century, the residents of plant settlements accounted for 23.5 % of the total population of the Perm Governorate. According to the observation of a contemporary, they lived “in conditions which were distinctive and significantly different from the living conditions of peasants and townspeople” (Khlopin, 1891: 278). The festive culture of people living in plant settlements in the Urals contains important information on the development dynamics of festive and ritual culture as a whole, patterns and causes of changes, and the transformation of its forms and main functions. However, only a few studies have addressed some features of calendar customs at the Uralian plants (Krupyanskaya, Polishchuk, 1971; Krupyanskaya et al., 1974; Kruglyashova, 1974; Golikova, 2006: 181–209; Chernykh, 2008: 307–312; 2020). Undoubtedly, even taken together, these do not reveal the entire diversity of the phenomenon. In this context, it seems relevant to present the current research.

This article analyzes specific features in the calendar cycle of festivals and rites using the example of a local tradition that emerged in one of the plant settlements in the Urals—Dobryanka (now the town of Dobryanka in the Perm Territory). The history of the settlement of Dobryanka Plant is typical for the Urals, which underwent rapid mining and smelting development in the 18th century. The Dobryanka Plant was founded in 1752 (according to the decree of the Collegium of Mining as of March 2 in that year) by S.G. Stroganov on the Dobryanka (Domryanka) River, near its confluence with the Kama River, and was put into operation in 1754 (Metallurgicheskiye zavody..., 2001: 183). This plant was arranged on the site of the village of Dobryanka (Domryanka), which was first mentioned in the record book of 1623/24, on the lands that were a part of the Stroganovs’ estate (Kalinin, 1990: 21). Built as a copper-smelter, the Dobryanka Plant quickly turned into iron-smelting plant, since local sources of copper ore turned out to be poor. In the first third of the 19th century, it already functioned as an iron-making plant, producing mainly sheet metal, roofing and boiler iron, anchors and chains, iron dishware, and wire (Materialy..., 1994: 70). In addition, another plant economically connected with the first plant and named “Sofiysky” (‘Sophia’s’) after Countess Sophia Stroganov or Nizhny (‘the Lower’) plant was built half a mile towards the Kama River.

In the second half of the 19th to early 20th century, Dobryanka was a typical industrial settlement of the Urals’ mining industry. It was built and rebuilt according to a regular plan, with straight blocks of equal sizes. The plant was located in the center of the village in a depression bordered by steep hills, just below the plant dam. The plant administration and

stone church of the Nativity of the Mother of God was nearby. Private houses were on the hills around the plant and on the bank of a vast pond. The population of Dobryanka in 1869 was 3800 people, who lived in 708 households (Spiski..., 1875: 60) (in 1863, 763 people were employed in main plant works and 700 people in auxiliary works (Metallurgicheskiye zavody..., 2001: 184)). Development and expansion of production in the second half of the 19th century triggered the growth of plant settlement. In 1911, the Dobryanka Plant was considered one of the largest and best iron-making enterprises in the Kama region in terms of its equipment (Illyustrirovanniy putevoditel..., 1911: 44); it employed 4850 workers of whom 1266 were involved in main production and 3584 in auxiliary works (Metallurgicheskiye zavody..., 2001: 185). The total number of households in Dobryanka Plant was 1447; its population was 7548. In addition to plant workshops and production facilities, there were two churches, five schools, library, two volost administrations, 64 trade shops, two state wine and six beer shops, 31 smithies, two carpentry shops, four leather and shoe shops, two saddleries, two dye-houses, one wheeled carriage facility, and six bakeries on the territory belonging to the plant (Illyustrirovanniy putevoditel..., 1911: 45).

The inhabitants of the plant settlement were mainly the population of old residents, which emerged on the basis of serfs from the huge Stroganov estates in the Middle Kama region. For this reason, people were united with the surrounding peasant population by common origin and complexes of traditional culture. The residents of the plant settlement were divided into several social groups. One of these consisted of serving employees—managers, clerks, staff of plant offices, etc. The other group included plant workers and miners—the main category of settlement’s inhabitants. There was also a large category that included the dwellers in the plant settlement and plant peasants employed in auxiliary works (production of charcoal, transportation of raw materials and finished products, etc.).

Sources

One important reason for choosing festive culture among the residents of Dobryanka Plant as a research subject is a sufficiency of sources from the late 19th to early 20th century, collected by several local historians in different years and kept in museum and archival collections. These include a description of individual festivals, with a record of customs and rites performed on Radunitsa, which was compiled in the 1880s by P.I. Syuzev, who was an administrator at the Dobryanka Plant (State Archives of the Perm Territory (GAPK). F. 714, Inv. 1, D. 17). Interesting ethnographic

information about the life of the plant settlement in the early 20th century is available in a voluminous manuscript by a resident of the town of Dobryanka, A.G. Zatoplyayev, entitled “Stories about the Dobryanka Plant” (Dobryanka Museum of Local History (DIKM). No. 1720/2). We should also mention the manuscript of an unidentified author (dated to 1928), “Materials on Creative Folk Arts of the Dobryanka Plant...” from the archives of the Perm folklorist Prof. P.S. Bogoslovsky; it also contains interesting ethnographic descriptions of festive and ritual culture (GAPK. F. 973, Inv. 1, D. 296). Information on the calendar cycle of festivals and rites among the residents of Dobryanka Plant in the early 20th century appears in a section of the manuscript entitled “The Year in Dobryanka” by the local historian and history teacher V.M. Batanov (1897–1966) (GAPK. F. 551, Inv. 1, D. 4, 5). Individual stories about the festivals of the “old Dobryanka” in the early 20th century are present in the manuscript “Materials on the History of the Dobryanka Plant” (State Archive of the Sverdlovsk Region (GASO). F. R-318, Inv. 1, D. 79).

This body of sources on a single plant settlement, different in their origin and belonging to different time periods, is unique. We do not have such extensive and complete ethnographic sources on calendar rites and festive culture for plant settlements in the western Urals.

Plant industry and folk calendar

The peasant calendar of Russians emerged as an agrarian calendar closely related to agricultural cycles, with their environmental and economic rhythms. The nature of production at plants was somewhat different. Some plant technological cycles, for example blast furnace and open-hearth furnaces, were continuous; other cycles could stop in the summer season, and some plant operations, such as water logging, transportation, and procurement of firewood, etc., were of a seasonal nature. It would be logical to assume that production at plants had a significant effect on specific features of alternation of weekdays and holidays, and was decisive in the formation of calendar rhythm. However, ethnographic evidence shows a more sophisticated relationship of plant production cycles to the economic cycles of workers and the system of the folk calendar.

The most complete and detailed information on the plant schedule is contained in the materials for 1832. According to the “List of the Staff in the Dobryanka and Sophia Plants”, 250 days were the working days during the year, while 52 Sundays and 32 days of Church festivals were non-working, including four days of Nativity, six days of the Easter Week, two days of St. Nicholas the Wonderworker, three days of the Passion Week, one day for New Year and Theophany, eight days of festivals

associated with the Royal family, three days “for fasting and confession”, and 26 days for “haymaking” (Mukhin, 1994: 12). In total, there were 121 days free from plant work (in fact, there were less of them, since some of the festivals coincided with Sundays). This schedule of working days and holidays was valid until the first third of the 20th century. Before and after Easter, the plant did not work for over a week: “At Easter, the plant was closed for the whole week”. On Christmastide between December 25 and January 6, “the plant... was stopped for 3–4 days”. The Day of the Holy Spirit on Monday after the Pentecost was a non-working day (GAPK. F. 551, Inv. 1. D. 5, fol. 52–70).

The calendar of non-working days at the Dobryanka Plant only partially coincided with the calendar officially established for the plant and mining industry (*O prodolzhitelnosti...*, 1910). The local features were the inclusion of the local festivals, for example, St. Sergius’ Day (September 25 of the Julian calendar), into non-working days. On the occasion of St. Sergius’ Day (the name day of the plant owner) “the plants stopped except for continuously operating workshops: blast-furnaces and open-hearth furnaces. And here in Dobryanka, the administration stopped both plants—the upper and the lower...” (DIKM. Mss. f. 720/2, fol. 176).

The Uralian plants were stopped in the summer—this time was given to the workers for haymaking (Golikova, 2006: 112). At the Dobryanka Plant, works were also stopped for several weeks: “From ‘the Holy Apostles’ Day’, that is, from June 29 of the Julian calendar, the plant was stopped for haymaking. This means—go out to grasslands and mow grass to make hay for the livestock. The plant was closed for two weeks” (DIKM. Mss. f. 1720/2, fol. 165). The timing of the shutdown of the plants apparently differed in some way in different years: sources indicate both different dates of the beginning of haymaking and different durations. If one source indicates a two-week break for household maintenance works, another source mentions a month: “For haymaking, the plant was shut down on the evening of the first Saturday in July for a whole month; such a custom was since long ago” (GAPK. F. 551, Inv. 1, D. 5, fol. 62). The change in the timing of haymaking might have also been caused by the reluctance of plant administration to stop production with increased orders; already in the late 19th century, it was trying to minimize the shutdown time of the plant, and some shops worked without interruption (*Ibid.*).

Thus, the plant calendar included relatively many holidays associated both with important festivals of the Church calendar and folk calendar, and household works in the summer. Such a production “schedule” contributed to the preservation of the set of calendar festivals and rites in plant settlements; calendar festivals and honored days, as well as rites performed during these periods, not only did not conflict with the production working cycle

of the Uralian plants, but also organically fit into existing system of calendar cycles.

Traditionalism and archaism: *Kashke-plishke*

The interaction of tradition and innovation is one of the important aspects of studying traditional culture. The orientation of plant life to urban forms implies not only the emergence of new features, but also the displacement and disappearance of archaic forms of ritual culture. Nevertheless, archaic rituals persisted until the late 19th century in the plant environment, and the active penetration of innovations fell in the second half of the 19th–early 20th century.

The rites called *kashke-plishke*, performed on Radunitsa on Mount Mendach within the boundaries of the plant settlement, stand out in the spring cycle of rites at Dobryanka Plant. A rather detailed and previously unpublished description of the *kashke-plishke*, which reveals the details of the rite, has survived in two different handwritten versions:

“...As early as Holy Week, elderly women discussed the organization of the festival day; prepared ‘travnik’ [a low-alcoholic beverage based on a decoction of herbs – A.C.], beer, and home-made brew; bought vodka; and baked fish pies, eggs, and whatever anyone desired to cook. The meetings, which were often crowded, began around noon”*. “...At the Dobryanka Plant, there was a custom of organizing a festival on Radolnitsa. At about noon, men, women, and children participating in the festival day gathered on Mount ‘Mendach’, next to the village. Each of the women brought whatever they could: fried fowl, shanga round breads, eggs, milk, beer, wine, travnik, and some certainly brought a fish pie. The festival began under a tree, which was carefully examined beforehand to determine whether it was healthy, and if there were dry branches, they were broken off. The selected tree was hung around with ribbons, towels, lace, colored scarves, handfuls of the best hackled flax, seeds of garden vegetables tied in rags, etc. After decorating the tree and placing food and drinks under it, the guests started the festival with a prayer facing the east. After praying, they said: ‘Fathers, parents, please have some bread and salt with us!’ Then each person took a small piece of pie and ate it after drinking the drink of choice. At the same time, it was required to treat the tree, for which people took a mouthful of drink and sprayed it. The elderly people continued to eat, while young people started circle dancing with songs and different games”**. “After the festival reached its climax, the guests danced around the fir tree with songs. The festival ended before

sunset”*. “Old women believed that it was necessary to celebrate *kashke-plishke* for a good harvest of flax and vegetables. Hanging up flax and seeds, they said: ‘As these haystacks are high, so be my flax high’”**. “Such a celebration of ‘*kashke-plishke*’ was considered by old women to be necessary for a good harvest, and this is why women brought with them ‘handfuls’ of heckled flax, flaxseed, and seeds of all garden vegetables, tied in rags, and hung these on the same fir tree, saying ‘as a fir tree grows, so grow my flax, my carrots’ and so on”* (GAPK. F. 714, Inv. 1, D. 17, fols. 15r–15v, 20–21).

The study of this custom in a wide ethnographic context makes it possible to link it with the rite of greeting birds in the spring, widespread in the Kama region. Its name *kashke-plishke/kashki-plishki* well matches the name of similar rites of *meeting of plishka, plishka, burial of plishka*, derived from the widespread name of wagtail (*plishka*) in Perm dialects (Chernykh, 2007: 52–54). Similar rites were performed in the spring in different areas of the Kama region and were timed to different calendar dates from Easter to Pentecost. In a number of places, just as in Dobryanka Plant, they were performed on Radunitsa. The rite of *meeting the plishka* was associated with good weather and fruitful year (Chernykh, 2006: 164–170). Usually it was performed on a hill; the rite involved collective meal, ritual feeding of the birds, or burying pieces of food in the ground.

The description of this rite in Dobryanka Plant is one of the earliest in the Kama region. The author described the tradition of the 1860s in the late 19th century. Field evidence and other sources testify to the disintegration and disappearance of the rite in the Middle Kama region already in the early 20th century, when it became limited to collective meal on the hills and was usually not accompanied by other rites (Ibid.).

The local features in Dobryanka Plant included the performance of rites aimed at ensuring the productivity of garden crops. Actualization of gardening and performance of the rite exclusively by women may be associated with the specific features of the plant environment. The workers employed in production virtually did not participate in land cultivation; women from the families of workers were engaged exclusively in household work: they worked in the garden and cultivated land.

Thus, the evidence on the *kashke-plishke* rites in Dobryanka Plant testifies to the functioning and relatively long preservation of archaic rites of the folk calendar in the plant environment.

Festivals in plant industrial culture: *Day of St. Sergius*

The annual calendar cycle of the plant included a special festival day established in honor of the name day of the

*Quotation from the first version of the description.

**Quotation from the second version of the description.

current owner of the plant. Such festivals were typical of private Uralian plants (Golikova, 2006: 193–195). At the Dobryanka Plant, in the early 20th century, the autumn Day of St. Sergius (September 25th of the Julian Calendar), or the name day of Serge Stroganov, the owner of the plant, was celebrated: “Every year, Count Serge Stroganov celebrated his name day at his Uralian plants, on the so-called Day of St. Sergius” (DIKM. Mss. f. 1720/2, fol. 176) (this is the owner of the plant Serge Stroganov, 1852–1923). The importance of this holiday was emphasized by the fact that the plant stopped working for this celebration (Ibid.).

The name day of the plant owner was perceived as one of the main local festival days, so people carefully prepared for it. At the Dobryanka Plant, for example, on the eve of the Day of St. Sergius, “garlands were made from the fir branches which were brought there, and all shops were decorated with greenery”, while all workers “walked around the plant in festive clothes” (Ibid.).

The main event of the festival day—the *count's tables*—was preceded by church services and cross processions with blessing of water to the plant workshops: “in the morning, a divine service was performed in the church of the Mother of God, after which a short *moleben* service was held for the health of ‘Boyarin Sergius’, then the icons were ‘raised’, and all those who were in the church went in cross procession to the plant. A short prayer service was performed there in each workshop, and the workshops and those present in them as well as the food and drinks placed on the tables were sprinkled with the previously blessed holy water” (Ibid.).

The main element of the festival day, its distinctive feature, was a meal for all workers organized at the expense of the plant owner—the *tables*: “People set up tables and benches in all shops, brought vodka and fish pies for eating after drinking. And there, in turn, the workers of the shops came to the ‘cupbearer’, drank a glass of ‘state monopoly’ vodka to the health of the name day celebrant, and sat down at the table to have a fish pie. And those for whom it was not enough went to the tavern in the marketplace. Such was the treat for the workers. A so-called count’s dance evening with free refreshments was arranged for office employees...” (Ibid.).

Thus, the *tables* were the culmination of the entire celebration in the plant settlement. Notably, these were prepared for manual workers—the main category of plant employees; festive celebrations and the “count’s ball” for non-manual employees were arranged the next day.

The origins of this tradition can be seen in the customs of organizing collective festive meals associated with the name days of the members of the Imperial House. The celebration of Day of St. Sergius was one of the features of festive culture among the population employed in mining plants and industries of the Urals. The collective meal as a rite served as a basis for paternalistic ideas about the good

owner of the plant, and brought about a sense of unity in the plant environment (Golikova, 2006: 197).

From rite to leisure time: *Seeing off the Kama River*

Customs associated with the beginning of ice drift and spring high water on rivers were widespread in different areas of the Kama region. Ritual activities performed during ice drift involved apotropaic, prognostic, and purifying symbolism. By the movement of water and ice, people determined whether the coming year would have a good harvest. The river was often given gifts: people threw bread and coins “in order not to drown”, and washed themselves with river water “to wash away sins and sores” (Chernykh, 2006: 154–156). As the analysis of the evidence has shown, ritual forms in the customs corresponding to the beginning of ice drift prevailed in the traditions of the rural population of the Kama region, while customs timed to spring high water were typical of plant settlements of the region located near large rivers and settlements economically linked with them. The tradition of gathering on the Kama River on the day of its release from ice turned into an annual large-scale celebration among the Dobryanka residents. The ritual complexes associated with this natural phenomenon were no longer the main elements in the structure of the festival day: “...Only once a year, the plant population gathered together to visit their native river, take a walk along its banks, and celebrate the victory of the Kama over winter. <...> People said: ‘Let’s go to see off the Kama!’ It went like this: as soon as high water receded and the banks dried up, on the very first Sunday, the plant population of all ages, as if by agreement, rushed to the bank of the Kama River above the pier areas at noon. People hurried up: some on foot, some in carriages or on simple carts covered with the canopy where a lot of all kinds of food and drink lay: ‘what holiday can be at the plant without alcohol!’ Of course, mostly people walked, with large and small bundles and fardels, in which there was also something to ‘see off the Kama’—to perform the ‘funeral commemoration festival’ for the Kama’s ice. Many held copper samovars polished with brick in their hands: it was customary at the plant to organize tea-drinking during the outdoor festivities. Small traders set up their tents with groceries: spice cakes, sweets, pretzels, nuts, sunflower seeds, and other goods. Plant female traders of alcohol set their large pots with alcoholic brew made of oat malt, which was the favorite home drink for the rural population of the Kama region. The festivities began with folk dances and circle dances. Here and there, the air was torn apart by Saratov accordions with bells, and squealing squeezeboxes. The people got divided

into groups according to the number of neighborhoods in the plant village: Rynok, Komarovo, Zakholshevka, Zdobryanka, Zalog, Vshivaya Gora. Each group celebrated apart from other groups, especially young people. Each group had its own suitors, its own brides; no one came close to a girl from another group: such a guy would be beaten up right there. ‘Kama is seen off – spring is welcomed!’—this is how the old people explained the meaning of the first spring festival day...” (DIKM. Mss. f. 1720/2, fol. 148).

The rite of “seeing off the Kama River” described above reflects the transformational processes in the calendar rites of plant settlements: it became filled with leisure pastime forms and turned into public outdoor festivities. Manifestations of such processes can be observed in the evidence on other festivals and rites. For example, the Day of the Holy Spirit in Dobryanka Plant in the early 20th century, was celebrated with “picnics”; on this day, “many families also celebrated the ‘Earth Festival’ on shore meadows in the upper part of the Dobryanka pond... <...> People came there in boats, shitiks [flat-bottomed river boats – A.C.], 10–15 people at once, with samovars, drinks, foods, and fish pies made of fresh bream” (Ibid.). This feature of the plant calendar rite (replacement of ritual and magical functions by purely entertaining aspects) has been already pointed out by scholars (Krupyanskaya, Polishchuk, 1971: 162; Golikova, 2006: 152–163). Similar processes took place in the peasant environment, yet they happened in a more active manner in plant settlements.

Traditional and urban forms in festive culture: *The Pentecost outdoor festivities*

The complex social composition of the population living in industrial settlements, which entailed different versions of festive culture (traditional peasant and urban), as well as dynamics in the development of cultural forms, led to the coexistence of ritual and festive traditions different in origin, and stadially dissimilar, in the structure of the holiday. This feature was most clearly manifested in the celebration of Pentecost.

Until the early 20th century, the main elements of the traditional Pentecost rite typical of the northern regions of the Kama region were actively used in Dobryanka Plant, and included decorating a birch tree and circle dance outdoor festivities. Young birch trees were also used in decorating the space in front of the house: “The day before, on Saturday, several young snow-white birches were stuck into the ground in front of almost every house. On some of these, people hung stripes of multi-colored calico instead of ribbons” (DIKM. Mss. f. 1720/2, fol. 157). Decorating houses and grounds in front of the homestead was the main action with the birch

tree in the Pentecost set of rites in the north of the Perm Territory (Chernykh, 2006: 136–137). Birches were also set in the glades and grounds of the plant village, where circle dance festivities took place: “On Pentecost, birches decorated with colorful ribbons were placed on the best glades, and after noon, the girls who were not old enough to go to the garden did their circle dances around the birches. Later, they were joined by the grown-ups, who had returned from the garden” (GAPK. F. 551, Inv. 1, D. 5, fol. 12). Circle dance outdoor festivities took place in several locations of the plant village: “A large birch tree was set on the grounds where round dances were usually done, and girls and boys did the Pentecost circle dances around it. <...> Young people did a large circle dance on the ground. Only plaintive songs were sung during circle dancing. The evening was approaching. They stopped dancing by the evening. When circle dance ended, those who came to festivities went back go to their streets” (Ibid.: Fols. 11–12).

The main round dance outdoor festivities for grown-ups took place in the “count’s garden”—the plant park. After the round dances, an orchestra of employees and plant workers, peasants, and students of the Dobryanka two-grade school performed marches, quadrilles, waltzes, opera overtures, and folk music in the garden. The choir of some tailor Shilov also performed there (Kalinin, 1995: 94).

The above evidence indicates the existence of both traditional forms of Pentecost rites associated with decorating birch trees and round dance outdoor festivities, and urban forms of festive leisure time, such as festivities in the “Count’s Garden” with choir and orchestra performance, coexisting in the plant environment. According to data from other festive cycles, such coexistence of different forms of festive culture was common in the Uralian mining plants (Chernykh, 2008: 310–311).

Conclusions

Analysis of individual festivals and rites of the local tradition using the evidence from one of the plant settlements of the Urals—the settlement of the Dobryanka Plant—makes it possible to get an idea about specific aspects of the existence and development of calendar festivals and rites in plant settlements of the Urals in the late 19th to early 20th centuries. The study has revealed the preservation of the main festive and ritual cycles of the Russian folk calendar, as well as the similarity of customs and rituals in Dobryanka Plant to regional forms of calendar rites; for example, the customs of decorating the space in front of the house and homestead with the birch tree and the spring “seeing off the Kama River”, which was also typical of the Russian population

living in the adjacent ethnographic area. Specific plant features included the emergence of a special industrial calendar associated with main economic and festival cycles, the establishment of special “corporate” plant festival days at private plants, the preservation of archaic forms of traditional rites, the evolution of calendar rites with a tendency to reinforce leisure forms, loss of sacred meaning by many rites, the multi-layered nature of calendar traditions, and active assimilation and adaptation of new urban forms of festive culture. These features make it possible to conclude that some aspects of traditional culture with unique specific features existed in the plant settlements of the Urals.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Russian Science Foundation (Project No. 20-18-00269).

References

- Agapkina T.A. 2000**
Etnograficheskiye svyazi kalendarnykh pesen: Vstrecha vesny v obryadakh i folklоре vostochnykh slavyan. Moscow: Indrik.
- Agapkina T.A. 2002**
Mifopoeticheskiye osnovy slavyanskogo narodnogo kalendarya: Vesenne-letniy tsikl. Moscow: Indrik.
- Andriets G.A. 2013**
Povsednevnyaya i prazdnichnaya kultura dalnevostochnykh gorodov: Sfera dosuga (vtoraya polovina XIX – nachalo XX v.). *Vestnik Dalnevostochnogo otdeleniya RAN*, No. 4 (170): 114–124.
- Baiburin A.K. 1993**
Ritual v traditsionnoy kulture. Strukturno-semanticheskiy analiz vostochnoslavyskikh obryadov. St. Petersburg: Nauka.
- Bernshtam T.A. 1988**
Molodezh v obryadovoy zhizni russkoy obshchiny XIX–nachala XX v.: Polovozrastnoy aspekt traditsionnoy kultury. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Chernykh A.V. 2006**
Russkiy narodniy kalendar v Prikamye: Prazdniki i obryady kontsa XIX – serediny XX v. Pt. 1: Vesna, leto, osen. Perm: Pushka.
- Chernykh A.V. 2007**
Narodniy kalendar v russkikh traditsiyakh Permskogo Prikamya (konets XIX – pervaya polovina XX v.). Pt. 1: Obryady vstrechi ptits. *Traditsionnaya kultura*, No. 1 (25): 52–59.
- Chernykh A.V. 2008**
Russkiy narodniy kalendar v Prikamye: Prazdniki i obryady kontsa XIX – pervoy poloviny XX v. Pt. 2: Zima. St. Petersburg: Mamatov.
- Chernykh A.V. 2010**
Russkiy narodniy kalendar v Prikamye. Pt. 3: Slovar khrononimov. Perm: Pushka.
- Chernykh A.V. 2014**
Russkiy narodniy kalendar v Prikamye. Prazdniki i obryady kontsa XIX – pervoy poloviny XX v. Pt. 4: Mestniye prazdniki. St. Petersburg: Mamatov.
- Chernykh A.V. 2020**
Spetsifika kalendarnoy obryadnosti na uralskikh gornykh zavodakh v kontse XIX – pervoy poloviny XX v. In *Aktualniye problemy izucheniya istoricheskikh gorodov-zavodov: Materialy Vseros. nauch.-praktich. konferentsii (22–23 sentyabrya 2020 g., Izhevsk)*. Izhevsk: pp. 200–206.
- Chicherov V.I. 1957**
Zimniy period russkogo narodnogo zemledelcheskogo kalendarya XVI–XIX vv. Ocherki po istorii narodnykh verovaniy. Moscow: Izd. AN SSSR. (TIE. Nov. ser.; vol. XL).
- Fursova E.F. 2002, 2003**
Kalendarniye obychai i obryady vostochnoslavyskikh narodov Novosibirskoy oblasti kak rezultat mezhetnicheskogo vzaimodeistviya (konets XIX – pervaya tret' XX v.). In 2 pts. Pt. 1: Obychai i obryady zimne-vesennego perioda. Pt. 2: Obychai i obryady letne-osenego perioda. Novosibirsk: Izd. IAET SO RAN.
- Golikova S.V. 2006**
“Lyudi pri zavodakh”: Obydennaya kultura gornozavodskogo naseleniya Urala XVIII – nachala XX v. Yekaterinburg: Bank kulturnoy informatsii.
- Illyustrirovanniy putevoditel po reke Kame i po r. Vishere s Kolvoy. 1911**
[Perm]: [Tipolit. Perm. gub. pravleniya].
- Kalinin M.A. 1990**
Ocherki po istorii Dobryanki i kraya s drevneishikh vremen do kontsa XIX v. Dobryanka: [Dobryan. tip.].
- Kalinin M.A. 1995**
Obshchestvennaya zhizn Dobryanki (vtoraya polovina XIX – nachalo XX v.). In *Istoriko-kulturnoye naslediyе gorodov i zavodskikh poseleniy Urala*. Perm: Perm. Gos. Univ., pp. 89–97.
- Keller E.E. 2001**
Prazdnichnaya kultura Peterburga: Ocherki istorii. St. Petersburg: Mikhailov.
- Khlopov G. 1891**
Dvizheniye naseleniya Kusye-Aleksandrovskogo zavoda Permskoy gubernii i uyezda. In *Sbornik rabot Permskoy zemskoy sanitarnoy stantsii*, iss. 2. Perm: pp. 278–326.
- Korepova K.E. 2009**
Russkiye kalendarniye obryady i prazdniki Nizhegorodskogo Povolzhya. St. Petersburg: Tropа Troyanova.
- Kotlyarchuk A.S. 2001**
Prazdnichnaya kultura v gorodakh Rossii i Belorussii XVII v.: Ofitsialniye tseremonii i krestyanskaya obryadnost. St. Petersburg: Peterburg. vostokovedeniye.
- Kruglyashova V.P. 1974**
Trudoviye obryady rabochikh gornozavodskogo Urala po materialam narodnykh rasskazov. In *Folklor i etnografiya: Obryady i obryadoviy folklor*. Leningrad: Nauka, pp. 42–51.
- Krupyanskaya V.Y., Budina O.R., Polishchuk N.S., Yukhneva N.V. 1974**
Kultura i byt gornyakov i metallurgov Nizhnego Tagila (1917–1970). Moscow: Nauka.
- Krupyanskaya V.Y., Polishchuk N.S. 1971**
Kultura i byt rabochikh gornozavodskogo Urala (konets XIX – nachalo XX v.). Moscow: Nauka.

Lobkova G.V. 2000

Drevnosti pskovskoy zemli: Zhatvennaya obryadnost: Obrazy. Ritualy, khudozhestvennaya sistema. St. Petersburg: Dmitriy Bulanin.

Makashina T.S. 1982

Ilyin den i Ilya-prorok v narodnykh predstavleniyakh i folklоре. In *Obryady i obryadoviy folklор*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 83–101.

Materialy po Permskoy oblasti k Uralskoy istoricheskoy entsiklopedii. 1994

Iss. 1. Perm: [s.n.].

Metallurgicheskiye zavody Urala XVII–XX vv.: Entsiklopediya. 2001

Yekaterinburg: Akademkniga.

Mukhin V.V. 1994

Dobryanskiy zavod. God 1832. In *Istoriya i kultura Dobryanskogo kraya v XIX–XX vekakh*. Dobryanka: [s.n.], pp. 5–15.

Nekrylova A.F. 2004

Russkiye narodniye gorodskiyе prazdniki, uveseleniya i zrelishcha. Konets XVIII – nachalo XX v. St. Petersburg: Azbuka-klassika.

O prodolzhitel'nosti i raspredelenii rabochego vremeni v zavedeniyakh fabrichno-zavodskoy i gornoy promyshlennosti: Vysochaishe utverzhdennoye mneniye Gosudarstvennogo Soveta ot 02.06.1897. 1910

Polnoye sobraniye zakonov Rossiyskoy imperii. Sobraniye 3, No. 14231, vol. 17. St. Petersburg: [Gos. tip.], p. 355.

Propp V.Y. 1963

Russkiye agrarniye prazdniki: Opyt istoriko-etnograficheskogo issledovaniya. Leningrad: Izd. Leningr. Gos. Univ.

Sokolova V.K. 1979

Vesenne-letniye kalendarniye obryady russkikh, ukraintsev i belorusov. XIX – nachalo XX v. Moscow: Nauka.

Spiski naselennykh mest Rossiyskoy imperii, sostavlennyye i izdavayemye Tsentralnym statisticheskim komitetom Ministerstva vnutrennikh del. 1875

Vol. XXXI: Permskaya guberniya: Po svedeniyam 1869 goda. St. Petersburg: [Tip. K. Vulfa].

The Ritual Year 10: Magic in Rituals and Rituals in Magic. 2015

Innsbruck, Tartu: ELM Scholarly Press. (The Yearbook of the Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folklore, T. Minniyakhmetova, K. Velkoborská (eds.)).

Tolstaya S.M. 2005

Polesskiy narodniy kalendar. Moscow: Indrik.

Tultseva L.A. 2001

Ryazanskiy mesyatseslov: Krugliy god prazdnikov, obryadov i obychayev ryazanskikh krestyan. Ryazan: Ryaz. obl. nauch.-metod. tsentr narod. tvorchestva. (Ryazanskiy etnograficheskiy vestnik; iss. No. 30).

Zolotova T.N. 2017

Traditsionniy prazdnichniy kalendar vostochnoslavlyanskogo naseleniya Zauralya i Zapadnoy Sibiri. Moscow: Institut naslediya.

Received November 20, 2020.

Received in revised form February 3, 2021.