

I.R. Atnagulov

*Institute of History, Philology, and Foreign Languages,
Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University,
Pr. Lenina 114, Magnitogorsk, 455038, Russia
E-mail: i.atnagulov@mail.ru*

THE NAGAYBAKS: FROM SOCIAL STRATUM TO ETHNIC GROUP (THE ORIGINS OF ETHNIC IDENTITY)

The Nagaybak people are a Turkic-speaking ethnic group of the Southern Transurals, related to the Christianized Tatars of the Middle Volga, to the Chuvashs, and possibly to the Udmurts and the eastern Mari. The key factor in their origin was the emergence of the Orenburg Cossack Host and a variety of native military regiments in the 1730s. Unlike the Kalmyks, the Bashkirs, and the Mishar Tatar troops, who constituted independent and ethnically homogeneous regiments, the Nagaybaks served alongside the Russian Cossacks. Owing to some circumstances, specifically to the state policy of “organizing” the natives (Christianization, recruiting for the Cossack Host, and geographic isolation from closest ethnic relatives), their ethnicity shifted from religious (“Christianized Tatars”) and estate-based (Tatar-Cossacks) to a properly ethnic identity (the Nagaybaks). This case exemplifies the impact of state policy on the origins of new ethnic groups. Current Nagaybak self-identity includes geographic, religious, and social constituents. Recent scholarship and the last two census reports mention just one name, Nagaybak, which, in essence, is an exoethnonym. This article discusses the emergence of the Nagaybak ethnic identity and all exoethnonyms and endoethnonyms of that group.

Keywords: *Nagaybaks, ethnic identity, exoethnonyms, endoethnonyms.*

Background of the new ethnic identity (the political and administrative factor)

From the 1730s to the first third of the 19th century, the Southern Transurals was the frontier zone of Russia as well as the ethnic border zone between the Kazakhs and the Bashkirs. The ethnic and political situation in the region at that time was largely defined by strained relations between the Kazakhs and the Bashkirs, which also worried the small Russian population (Rychkov, 1762: Pt. I, p. 157). For establishing state order and developing the territory, the government carried out a program of Russian colonization of the region. For that purpose, the Orenburg Expedition was organized with its main goals: to separate the Bashkirs and the Kazakhs from each other by building a fortification line, and to

make the Kazakhs of the Junior and the Middle Zhuzes subjects of the Russian Empire for gaining subsequent direct access to the Central Asian markets (Ibid.: 146–148). Implementation of these goals was accompanied by the construction of fortresses not only along the outer line, but also in the inner *uyezds* around the Bashkir lands for subduing the rebellious population. Various groups of Cossacks—both Russians and baptized non-Russians—were resettled to the Orenburg Line and other Lines. They constituted the serving population of the newly founded fortresses. Cossacks from different Hosts (the Yaik Host, the Samara Host, the Ufa Host, and the Siberian Host), and also the population enlisted in the Cossacks entered the emerging Orenburg Cossack Host (Starikov, 1891: 75). One of these groups was the so-called “Ufa newly baptized people”. This group also included formerly-

baptized Kazan Tatars who in 1736 were enlisted in the Cossack estate and settled in the Nagaybak fortress, the village of Bakaly, and in a number of surrounding villages (Rychkov, 1762: Pt. II, pp. 206–208). As a result of this action, a part of this population was separated by their estate status from the rest of the baptized Tatars who were not enlisted in the Cossack estate. The subsequent stay of this group in the Orenburg Cossack Host made them find themselves in estate isolation from their closest relatives. Moreover, even according to the new administrative division of the Host, they were not included in the regiments consisting exclusively of Turkic population—the Bashkirs, the Mishar Tatars, and the Teptyars. This situation had an impact on the development of the self-identity of the Nagaybaks.

Origins, structure, and dynamics of the Nagaybak identities

Formation of the Nagaybaks occurred from the second half of the 16th century to the first decades of the 19th century in the course of complex ethnic contacts in the Middle Volga region and the Eastern Trans-Kama region. The ethnic substrate of the Nagaybaks was the Turkic-speaking population, mainly consisting of formerly-baptized Kazan Tatars, the so-called Kryashens, who might also have included the Nogais, who served in Kazan (Iskhakov, 1995: 6–7). One of the main groups which formed the ethnic substrate of the Nagaybaks (the Trans-Kama Kryashens) was formed in the Ufa Province of the Kazan Governorate from the mid-17th century, when the Trans-Kama Line (1652–1656) was made (Ibid.: 12). The resettlement of the ancestors of the Nagaybaks to the Ufa Province followed the general flow of the Kryashen population from the areas beyond Kazan, and from the Laishevsky and Mamadyshsky Uyezds of the Kazan Governorate. The resettled population included the serving Ar Tatars who probably had some ethnic ties with the Nogais (Ibid.: 7). Upon settling in the Eastern Trans-Kama region, they came into contact with the local newly baptized population (the Ufa newly baptized people), including both Tatars and other groups (the Chuvashs, the Eastern Mari, the Trans-Kama Udmurts). Close contacts of the Trans-Kama Udmurts with the Tatars are confirmed by ethnographic materials (FMA*, Bashkortostan, Bakalinsky District, 2010). These groups can be considered a superstrate in the ethnic genesis of the Nagaybaks. Christianization of this population was the first historical factor which influenced the emerging set of ethnic identifying features for the future Nagaybaks. Thus, the first period in the history of this group chronologically corresponds to 1552–1736.

The second period of Nagaybak ethnic history was associated with the entry of the Ufa newly baptized population into the Cossack estate. This event changed the ethnic picture in the basin of the Ik River. Firstly, on the basis of their common Cossack estate, the groups of the Kryashens, the Chuvashs, and others were consolidated in the Nagaybak fortress, in the village of Bakaly, and other neighboring settlements, having adopted the common self-designation of exogenous origin, “Cossacks” or “formerly-baptized Tatar-Cossacks” (Iskhakov, 1995: 9). Secondly, they began to naturally separate from the related non-Cossack population of the region owing to their belonging to the Cossack estate. Moreover, due to fear of Muslim influence, all non-baptized Tatars were removed from the Nagaybak settlements by administrative actions (Vitevsky, 1897: 441–442). Thirdly, several dozen people from Central Asia, who accepted Christianity in Orenburg, joined this already prepared community (Rychkov, 1762: Pt. I, pp. 191–192). For some time, this component was conspicuous among the Nagaybaks, and thus was noted by observers (Zhurnal..., 1770: 68–69; Georgi, 1776; Zapiski..., 1821: 146–147; Zapiski..., 1824: 260). It had no impact on the culture of the Nagaybaks, but retained its presence in the array of Nagaybak family names (Bekteyeva, 1902: 166). This polyethnic conglomerate might have not become fully homogenous until 1843, yet it did obtain common estate consciousness, as well as common language and culture which were inherited from the local Kryashen substrate. It is very likely that the designation “Nagaybaks” (Dal, 2000: 23 (the article “Armyak”)) was used along with the names “Cossacks” and “formerly-baptized Tatar-Cossacks” (Table 1). In any case, they arrived in the Southern Transurals region in 1843 as “Cossacks-Nagaybaks” or simply “Nagaybaks” (Nebolsin, 1852: 21). The main event of the second period (the transition to the Cossack estate) defined one more ethnic identifying feature of the Nagaybaks for the future. According to their social status, the Nagaybak Cossacks at that time were an estate group of the Kryashens of the Eastern Trans-Kama region.

The organization of Novolineiny District in the 1830s was the final act of Cossack colonization of the Southern Urals and settlement in its Transurals part. This changed the landscape and the ethnic composition of the population living in the area. The Russians, the Nagaybaks, and the Kalmyks were three main ethnic groups which constituted the Cossack population of the region (Pravila..., 1843: 34–39) (Table 2), while the Kazakhs were the most notable component of the non-Cossack population. The Nagaybaks in the area formed three relatively isolated geographic groups—the Troitsk, the Verkhneural'sk, and the Orenburg-Orsk groups. The former two groups preserved their Nagaybak identity until the beginning of

*FMA—field materials of the author.

Table 1. Estate and ethnic groups of Nagaybak settlements in 1795*

Settlement	Ethnic and estate groups	Population	
		Male	Female
Nagaybak fortress	Cossacks	139	122
	Retired military, landowners' peasants, <i>yasak</i> tributary newly baptized Tatars and Teptyars	146	150
Bakaly	Formerly-baptized Tatar-Cossacks	148	160
	Teptyars, <i>yasak</i> tributary peasants assigned to the factory, and clergy	64	58
Staroye Kosteyevo	Formerly-baptized Tatar-Cossacks	66	120
Shershely	Baptized Cossacks	137	179
	<i>Yasak</i> tributary peasants assigned to the factory	72	49
Balykly	Tatar-Cossacks	60	63
	<i>Yasak</i> tributary Teptyars, <i>yasak</i> tributary peasants assigned to the factory	36	24
Starye Maty	Tatar-Cossacks	81	53
	Newly baptized Teptyars	19	11
Staroye Kileyev	Formerly-baptized Tatar-Cossacks	110	136
Staroye Umerovo	Same	88	95
Novoye Umerovo	Formerly-baptized Tatars, peasants formerly assigned to the Petrovsky factory	63	46
	<i>Yasak</i> tributary Tatars	64	58
Staroye Ziyashevo	Formerly-baptized Tatar-Cossacks	179	233
Novoye Yuzeyevo	Same	70	71
	Formerly-baptized <i>yasak</i> tributary Tatars, formerly-baptized Tatars-Teptyars, <i>yasak</i> tributary Teptyars	107	126
Starye Usy	Formerly-baptized Tatar-Cossacks	13	44
Akhmanovo	Same	74	65
	Formerly-baptized landless Tatars, <i>yasak</i> tributary peasants	20	7
Staroye Ilikovo	Formerly-baptized Tatar-Cossacks	141	125
<i>Total**</i>		1897	1995

*Compiled after (Iskhakov, 1995: 9).

**Calculated by the author.

the 20th century. The Verkhneuralsk group was the largest and maintained its population size at about the same level to the beginning of the 21st century.

In the 19th century, the Verkhneuralsk Nagaybaks founded six almost monoethnic villages, which allowed them to sustain their ethnic identity. At that time, they came into contact with Russians from the neighboring villages (Bekteyeva, 1902: 166), which increased

their attraction to Orthodox Christianity. This was fostered by the administrative division of the Cossack lands, according to which all Nagaybak villages were made subordinate to various Russian villages. Other neighbors were the Kazakhs, with whom the Nagaybaks also had some contacts (Ibid.). Finally, the Kalmyks from the former Stavropol Cossack Host were settled in the villages of Parizh and Fershampenuaz

Table 2. Estate and ethnic composition of Nagaybak villages in 1843*

Village	Kalmyks	Russians	Nagaybaks	Total
Kassel	29	–	200	229
Ostrolenka	19	–	200	219
Fershampenuaz	–	–	350	350
Parizh	32	–	300	332
Trebiya	–	–	200	200
Arsi	95	205	–	300
Kulikovskaya	41	167	–	208

*Compiled after (Pravila..., 1843: 34–37).

Table 3. Three most numerous ethnic groups of Nagaybaksy District according to 2002 Census*

Ethnic group**	Settlement	Population
Russians (10,239 pers.)	Fershampenuaz	1951
	Arsinsky	1066
	Severny	612
	Nagaybaksy	589
	Gumbeisky	547
	Other	5474
Nagaybaks (7394 pers.)	Parizh	1676
	Ostrolenka	1621
	Fershampenuaz	1552
	Kassel	918
	Astafievsky	252
	Kuzhebaevsky	181
	Trebiyatsky	138
	Chernorechensky	84
	Podgorny	72
Other	900	
Kazakhs (3445 pers.)	Araslambaevsky	327
	Kuzhebaevsky	181
	Pridorozhny	147
	Kuropatkinsky	142
	Podgorny	137
	Petrovsky	136
	Sovkhozny	128
	Other	2247

*Calculated after (Vserossiyskaya perepis naseleniya 2002 g.: Table 2).

**The population of the District, including the town of Yuzhny, is indicated.

(Pravila..., 1843: 34), and a small part of them was assimilated by the Nagaybaks (FMA, village of Parizh); in the 1920s, the rest of the Kalmyks moved to the Lower Volga region.

By the beginning of the 1930s, a network of settlements emerged in the Nagaybaksy District, which can be divided into three groups—the Nagaybak, the Russian, and the Kazakh settlements (Table 3) in accordance with the ethnicity of their inhabitants. Precisely by that time, the factor of geographic isolation from the Tatars and living among the Russians had a decisive influence on the formation of their new identity. The development of this part of their identity occurred simultaneously with further changes in ethnic culture.

Development of the Nagaybaks from the 20th to the beginning of the 21st century occurred alongside with the industrial and agricultural development of the region. The following factors behind the formation of the Nagaybak identity can be identified. Firstly, having lost their former estate status, the Nagaybaks almost immediately found a new one: they were recognized by the state as an ethnic group, which was officially confirmed by 1926 (Spisok..., 1928: 38–42). Secondly, as a result of administrative reform, the Nagaybak settlements were removed from subordination to the Orenburg Governorate, and became a part of the Chelyabinsk Governorate, and later of the Ural Region. The Nagaybaksy District was created in 1927 as a part of Troitsky Okrug of the Ural Region. Thirdly, the ethnic composition of the population changed due to the development of virgin lands. A great number of Russian villages, founded by migrants from the European part of Russia, came into existence in the midst of the Nagaybak villages. A unique feature of the ethnic situation in the region was that the Nagaybaks became in some way a connecting cultural link between the Turkic population (the Kazakhs) and the Slavic population (the Russians), which implied ethnic symbiosis.

In 2002, 7394 Nagaybaks lived in Nagaybaksy District (Table 3), which is 78 % of their number in the Chelyabinsk Region and 74 % of those over all of

Russia*. Approximately the same pattern with a slight decrease in the number of Nagaybaks in Nagaybasky District and Russia as a whole, persisted in 2010**. The Nagaybaks from the former Troitsky Uyezd mostly live now in Chebarkulsky District. The residents of Nagaybasky District express their ethnic identity in a more pronounced way than the residents of Chebarkulsky District, and the former use slightly different ethnonymic vocabulary. For example, the ethnic name “Nagaybaks” is used more frequently, and the designation “Russians” is not accepted as an endoethnonym, which is not typical of the Chebarkul group, which underwent stronger assimilation processes (FMA, village of Fershampenuaz, village of Popovo, 2014).

Once the Nagaybaks of the former Verkhneursky Uyezd found themselves in 1927 in a single administrative district named in accordance with the officially approved ethnic name, they had the opportunity to preserve their ethnic identity. In spite of the ban on the use of the ethnonym “Nagaybaks” in the documents from the end of the 1930s, the group unity persevered and probably intensified with time. Having prohibited the use of the ethnonym, the authorities for some reason did not change the name of the district, which also contributed to the preservation of their ethnic identity. By the early 1990s, it turned out that the group of the “baptized Tatars” from the Chelyabinsk Region rejected their Tatar identity, and thus, for the first time since 1926, the issue was addressed again in social, political, and scholarly discussions. In our view, the long residence of the Nagaybaks within an ethnic administrative entity had an additional and significant impact on their ethnic self-identity. We should thus recognize the presence of another feature in ethnic identification of the Nagaybaks—the experience of their ethnic homeland, outlined by specific administrative boundaries.

Transformation of the material culture and the current ethnic self-identity

For studying the Nagaybak identity, we used ethnographic materials reflecting their economy, housing, clothing, and food system. The material culture of the Nagaybaks was mostly studied in the second half of the 19th–early 20th century (Atnagulov, 2007a). This chronological range is most convenient for studying the archaic strata, because it was the time when Russian ethnographic literature was on the rise, which was accompanied by a great number of publications of good scholarly quality; it was also the

period of flourishing for museology. The results obtained at that time make it possible to reconstruct the material culture of the earlier periods. However, the enthusiasm of some present-day scholars towards the ethnography of those years, combined with disregard for the changes which have occurred over the last century, led them to erroneous conclusions. Thus the elements of folk culture were sometimes systematized reflecting the situation of the second half of the 19th century, but conclusions concerning the ethnic characteristics of the group under study were made in regards to the present time.

The sources used for the study of the material culture belonging to the second half of the 19th–early 20th century, include literary materials, archival data, and museum collections. Innovative changes which have occurred over the last hundred years have been personally observed or recorded directly from the informants.

By the early 20th century, the economy of the Nagaybaks was represented by an agricultural and cattle-breeding complex with the predominance of plow farming and well-developed grazing and confinement livestock breeding (Ibid.: 164). A marked differentiation of the population by occupation and employment can be noted in the late 20th–early 21st century (Table 4), which was caused by an increase in the general level of education and opportunities for vocational training (Table 5), increase in the number of people engaged in civil service or working in education, culture, service, trade, etc.

In its development, the material culture of the Nagaybaks became subject to inevitable changes. This process involved all its aspects to varying degrees. The food system is the most conservative in the versions of material culture mentioned above. Over the past century, its basis, defined by the proportion of foods of animal and vegetable origin, the use of grain and garden raw materials in the vegetable segment, the array of mandatory festive and ritual meals, etc., has not undergone fundamental changes. Innovations involved the range of consumed products, which somewhat expanded mostly due to goods purchased in stores, and certain new heat treatment methods for cooking everyday and festive meals. Ritual cuisine mostly continues to maintain the historically evolved set of regulations (FMA, the village of Ostrolenka, 2000) (Ibid.: 150–152).

Construction comes in second concerning the preservation of traditions in the material culture. Even in the late 1990s–early 2000s, the vast majority of buildings in the Nagaybak villages matched the buildings of the late 19th–early 20th century in their design and construction materials (Atnagulov, 2004). The changes mainly involved the roofing as well as some elements of exterior and interior decoration (FMA, villages of Ostrolenka, Fershampenuaz, Parizh, Kassel, Trebiya, 1998–2001) (Atnagulov, 2007a: 117–119). In the last decade, there appeared houses of brick and cinder block

*Calculated according to the 2002 Census: (Vserossiyskaya perepis naseleniya 2002 g.).

**Calculated according to the 2010 Census: (Vserossiyskaya perepis naseleniya 2010 g.)

Table 4. Social and professional structure of Nagaybak population in three villages of the Chelyabinsk Region, %*

Social and professional group	Ostrolenka		Fershampenuaz		Parizh	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Students	12	18	17	16.5	17	23
Blue-collar workers	60	17.5	42.5	15.5	45	11
White-collar workers	12	32	20	40	13	22
Retired persons	8	11.5	11	16	22	35
Employees working in the private sector, housekeepers	8	21	9.5	12	3	9

*Compiled according to the FMA, the village of Ostrolenka, 2005, the village of Fershampenuaz, 2007, and the village of Parizh, 2006.

Table 5. Educational level of the Nagaybaks in three villages of the Chelyabinsk Region, %*

Level of education	Ostrolenka		Fershampenuaz		Parizh	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Illiterate	0	1	4	4	0	1
Barely literate	2.5	2	6	8	4	2
Primary education	4.5	5.5	6.5	6.5	13	21
Incomplete secondary education	18	19	13	16	16	24
General secondary education	33	22	22	17	16	14
Vocational secondary education	26.5	32	22	27.5	42	25
Incomplete higher education	5.5	4.5	9.5	5.5	4	6
Higher education	10	14	17	15.5	5	7

* See the note to Table 4.

using modern finishing materials. Many logwork houses are being covered with brick or various types of siding; vinyl windows are being installed, etc. Interior decoration of houses also has been changing in accordance with the material wealth of the owners. Household structures of natural stone are disappearing from the village of Parizh. However, the layout of household and living premises, which can be increased by additions, remains unchanged (FMA, villages of Fershampenuaz and Parizh, 2014).

Clothing has undergone the greatest modernization. A little over a hundred years ago, the female clothing assemblage remained a local version of the Kryashen outfit. It emerged in the Eastern Trans-Kama region, where it had region-wide features, and went out of use in the early 20th century (Ibid.: 137). During the 20th century, everyday and festive clothing among the Nagaybaks, just as among the majority of the country's population, was heavily influenced by the mass clothing produced by the national and international textile, clothing, and footwear industry.

Naturally, the material culture of the Nagaybaks was also in a state of continuous transformation in the

previous periods of time. Until 1842, it evolved on the basis of the Kryashen culture. Then, until the beginning of the 20th century, cultural inertia persisted, but the Russian influences intensified. During the last century, the dynamics of changes in the material culture of the Nagaybaks became even more intense.

Social and political realities of the 20th century not only failed to eliminate the ethnic self-identity of the Nagaybaks, but contributed to its preservation and revival in the late 1980s. The situation with various aspects of traditional culture, which was surveyed and monitored in the 2000s, testifies to the level of Nagaybak ethnic self-identity in the post-Soviet period (Atmagulov, 2006, 2007b). Summarizing the results of the survey, we present some key conclusions of research on the subject.

Firstly, the basic elements of Nagaybak traditional culture have been mostly preserved among the elderly age groups (over 60 years of age); the preservation degree decreased with each younger age group. For example, the number of positive responses in the middle and younger age groups concerning “the use of the native language” (Table 6) and “belonging to Orthodox Christianity”

Table 6. Use of native and Russian languages by the Nagaybaks in different situations, %*

Communication	Ostrolenka (N = 598 pers.)			Fershampenuaz (N = 792 pers.)			Parizh (N = 752 pers.)		
	Predominantly Nagaybak language	Nagaybak and Russian languages	Predominantly Russian language	Predominantly Nagaybak language	Nagaybak and Russian languages	Predominantly Russian language	Predominantly Nagaybak language	Nagaybak and Russian languages	Predominantly Russian language
With parents	24	48	28	9.5	42	48	56	19	25
With spouses	19	49	32	9	41	50	50	36	14
With siblings	15	54	31	15	39	46	37	32	31
With children	15	47	38	13.5	48.5	38	22	17	61
With friends	11.5	60	28.5	2.5	44.5	53	30	27	43
At work	9	53	38	0	43	57	32	25.5	42.5

* See the note to Table 4.

Table 7. Religious affinity among the Nagaybaks in three villages of the Chelyabinsk Region, %*

Age group	Ostrolenka			Fershampenuaz			Parizh		
	Non-believers	Orthodox Christians	Hesitating	Non-believers	Orthodox Christians	Hesitating	Non-believers	Orthodox Christians	Hesitating
70 and older	27.5	72.5	0	26	66.5	7.5	52	35.5	12.5
60–69	18	68	14	29	55.5	15.5	47	50.5	2.5
50–59	22	71	7	26	52.5	21.5	57	41	2
40–49	27.5	66	6.5	20.5	56.5	23	57	43	0
30–39	23	70	7	22	64.5	13.5	44.5	55.5	0
20–29	16	75	9	16	73	11	51.5	48.5	0
10–19	13	79.5	7.5	13	70	17	32	68	0
Under 10	12.5	87.5	0	0	100	0	0	100	0

* See the note to Table 4.

(Table 7), was 50 % or less in different settlements (Ibid.). Secondly, the greatest commitment to the traditional culture was found in the village of Parizh, where the percentage of the Nagaybaks was the highest, whereas the lowest commitment was in the village of Fershampenuaz with an ethnically mixed population. Thirdly, in spite of the rapid loss of a number of ethnic identifying features during the 20th century, the Nagaybaks have managed to preserve their ethnic self-identity formed on the basis of at least two determining factors—estate-based and religious affiliation. Currently, the first of the factors ceased to be operative, while the second factor cannot be the marker of ethnic identity, since most of the population surrounding the Nagaybaks practices the same religion. Therefore, the question should be asked: which cultural factors currently foster the ethnic identity of the Nagaybaks? According to field data, we can identify the following important

features of their ethnic identity: awareness of being blood relatives with the representatives of their ethnic group (even if a person lives outside the district, and has no immediate family members in the Nagaybak settlements, he/she is supposed to know (and usually knows) where his/her ancestors lived), be to some degree proficient in the Nagaybak language (at least on the level of concepts and terms), know the basic elements of ethnic culture, and be aware of the socially significant events in the life of the people.

In recent decades, the Kryashens and the Nagaybaks have become objects of interest for scholars, politicians, and various public figures. This interest is caused by the attempts to solve the question of their ethnicity. There have been two positions, according to which the Kryashens and the Nagaybaks are either individual ethnic groups or are a part of the Tatars living in the Volga-Ural

region. The arguments from the supporters of the former position include religious and estate differences of the Kryashens and the Nagaybaks, a number of cultural features, their expressed self-identity, and their own ethnonymic vocabulary. The latter position is supported by the common language and ethnic roots, and by a number of general Tatar cultural traits.

The self-identity of the Nagaybaks is manifested in positioning their group as a distinct ethnicity with ethnonyms “Kereshenner” and “Nagaybak”. The demonyms “kiliy” and “sarashly” survived among the residents of the villages of Kassel and Ostrolenka, respectively, from the time of the Eastern Trans-Kama region, while in other villages new demonyms emerged in accordance with modern place names, such as “fershamka”, “parizhlar”, “trebiy”, or “astapyi” (FMA, Nagaybaksy District). The Chebarkul Nagaybaks also have their local self-names corresponding to local place names, such as “popovtsy”, “varlamovtsy”, etc. In addition, they have one commonly used endoethnonym, “bakaly” (FMA, Chebarkulsky District). Initially, it referred to local self-designations of the stratum which included the similar names of “kiliy” and “sarashly” among the Verkhneuralsk group of the Nagaybaks, since these names genetically go back to the demonyms of the Nagaybaks of the Eastern Trans-Kama region. Presently, the name “bakaly” can be considered to be the established self-designation of the Chebarkul group. Thus, the general endoethnonym of the Nagaybaks is “kereshenner”, which is used both within the groups and in communication with the rest of the Tatar-speaking population. The exoethnonym “Nagaybaks” is used in communication with other ethnic groups which do not speak the Tatar language. The ethnonymic vocabulary is more sophisticated in the Chebarkul group in spite of its lower size compared to the Verkhneuralsk group, since in addition to the Kryashen and Nagaybak levels of self-identification, it also includes Bakaly and Russian levels.

Stages in the emergence of Nagaybak self-identity and conclusions

The evolution of the Nagaybak identity can be divided into three periods. The first period lasted from 1552 to 1736, when ethnic and cultural processes took place on the territory of the Kazan Governorate, resulting in the emergence of groups of baptized non-Russian population. In many ways they were still connected to the Kazan Tatars, which was reflected in their language and various aspects of life. With the growing influence of Orthodox Christianity, the dominating cultural trend shifted towards a convergence with the Russians. This process everywhere manifested itself in different ways, but the essence of transformations was the same. As a

result, there emerged a number of territorial groups of non-Russian Christianized population which identified themselves with the confessional name “kereshenner”, that is, “the baptized”. Apparently, they included different ethnic groups, but since the dominant component was Tatar, the Tatar language became the language of everyday life. The elements of material culture were so flexible that several local versions of the Kryashen culture emerged, depending on the ethnic environment. We believe that the most important fact in that period of Nagaybak identity development was Christianization of their ancestors and the adoption of the ethnic-confessional name “kereshenner”.

The second period lasted from 1736 to 1843. In the 1730s, Ufa Province was on the eastern fringe of the area where the Kryashens settled and where the local group of the “Ufa newly baptized” emerged. The group included a significant number of formerly-baptized Kazan Tatars (Rychkov, 1762: Pt. II, pp. 206–208) who were resettled there due to the building of the New Trans-Kama Line. In 1736, they were transferred from the estate of the *yasak* paying tribute to the Cossack estate and moved to the Nagaybak fortress which was built in the same year, in the village of Bakaly, and in a number of surrounding villages. This was the second most important fact in the development of ethnic self-identity of the Nagaybaks. Tatar-Cossacks of the Nagaybak fortress and the surrounding area gradually separated from the Tatars who did not belong to the Cossack estate. For further strengthening of Orthodox Christianity, all Muslims were moved out of the region. At the end of the 18th century, when the administrative reform of the Orenburg Cossack Host was carried out, the Nagaybaks ended up in some cantons with Russian Cossacks, while other non-Russian groups of Cossacks (the Bashkirs, the Mishar Tatars, and the Teptyars) were organized in their own military units (Asfandiyarov, 2005: 20). This certainly had an impact on the further development of the Nagaybak identity.

By the early 1840s, the estate group of Cossacks was finally formed from among the local Kryashens in the villages of Nagaybaks kaya, Bakalinskaya, and in other villages in the territory of Belebeysky Uyezd of the Ufa Governorate. The confessional name “kereshenner”, common to all baptized Tatars, continued to be used as an endoethnonym. The same situation probably continued into the first half of 19th century, since the names “Nagaybatsky Cossacks” and “Cossack-Nagaybaks” were of exogenous origin, and were perceived as a Russian designation. The second period resulted in the formation of a two-level self-identity among the Nagaybaks: the ethnic-confessional identity (“kereshenner”) and the ethnic-estate identity (“Cossacks-Nagaybaks”).

The third period began in 1843 and has continued until the present day. We should first describe the movements of the Nagaybaks and their consequences. According to the

plan of the army command, all Cossacks-Nagaybaks were resettled in three districts of new deployment: 1) Troitsky Uyezd, 2) Verkhneuralsky Uyezd, and 3) Orenburgsky and Orsky Uyezds (Bekteyeva, 1902: 180). In the Orenburgsky and Orsky Uyezds, they were assimilated by the Muslim Tatars (Ibid.: 180–181). In the Troitsky and Verkhneuralsky Uyezds, the Russians and the Kazakhs became the new neighbors of the Nagaybaks. This situation influenced the further formation of the Nagaybak identity. The Nagaybaks of the Verkhneuralsky Uyezd settled in five villages with almost monoethnic population (except for a small number of Kalmyks). This allowed them to survive as a coherent ethnic and cultural entity. At the same time, according to the administrative division, the Nagaybak villages were subordinate to villages with Russian population, which contributed to intensification of Nagaybak-Russian contacts.

In the second half of the 19th–early 20th century, the ethnic group under study was consistently referred to as “Nagaybaks” (Nebolsin, 1852: 21; Vitevsky, 1897: 439; Bekteyeva, 1902: 165; and others), and not as “formerly-baptized Tatar-Cossacks”. However, the two names were often used together: “Nagaybaks – baptized Tatars” or “Nagaybaks – baptized Tatar-Cossacks” (Nebolsin, 1852: 21; Vitevsky, 1891: 257; Tolstoy, 1876: 350–351; Chernavsky, 1900: 128–129; Bekteyeva, 1902: 165; and others), reflecting the transformation of Nagaybak self-identity. The designation of their origins most likely served in these studies as information for uninitiated readers. Thus, in the second half of the 19th century, the name “Nagaybaks” was both the designation of the former estate-based affiliation and of the emerging ethnic affiliation.

The processes of ethnicity transformation among the Nagaybaks in the second half of the 19th–early 20th century were concluded by the events of the 1920s, undoubtedly caused by the changes in the political regime. The state again played a crucial role in the history of the people, just as it happened almost two hundred years ago. The impacts of various social and political events of the 1920s and all subsequent decades on the Nagaybak ethnic identity were very contradictory. It would seem that the abolition of estates and the antireligious policy should have destroyed the foundations of the Nagaybak ethnic identity. However, in the materials of the 1926 All-Union Census of the Soviet Union, they were recorded as a separate ethnicity of the USSR, and the name “Nagaybaks” was selected as an ethnonym. This confirms once again that by the beginning of the 20th century this designation, which until 1843 was used along with the word “Cossacks” and thus was exclusively a social designation, became an ethnonym.

Another important state act was the creation of Nagaybasky District in 1927. It is known that a number of national districts and rural councils were created in the

country at that time for the ethnic groups whose numbers did not allow for organizing a republic or a national okrug. However, ten years later almost all of them were abolished. This coincided with the reduction of the list of Soviet ethnicities for the 1936 All-Union Census. For some reason, the Nagaybaks, having been deprived of their own ethnic name just like the most of the other ethnic minorities of the country, did not lose the right to have an ethnic territorial entity. Creation and preservation of an ethnic administrative entity among the Nagaybaks may be regarded as another, most recent, event in the history of the people, which made a significant contribution to the foundations of Nagaybak identity. The Nagaybaks passed a historical path from an estate group of baptized Tatar-Cossacks of the Ufa Province to an ethnic group which now mostly resides in the Nagaybasky and Chebarkulsky Districts of Chelyabinsk Region.

References

- Asfandiyarov A.Z. 2005**
Kantonnoye upravleniye v Bashkirii (1798–1865 gg.). Ufa: Kitap.
- Atnagulov I.R. 2004**
Settlements and houses of the Upper Ural Nagaibaks from the late 19th–early 20th centuries. *Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Eurasia*, vol. 20 (4): 149–159.
- Atnagulov I.R. 2006**
Yazykovaya situatsiya u nagaybakov kak sostavlyayushchaya etnicheskoi identichnosti. *Problemy istorii, filologii, kultury*, iss. XVI (2): 390–396.
- Atnagulov I.R. 2007a**
Nagaybaki: Opyt kompleksnogo istoriko-etnograficheskogo issledovaniya khozyaistva i materialnoi kultury vtoroi poloviny XIX – nachala XX veka. Novosibirsk: Izd. IAE SO RAN.
- Atnagulov I.R. 2007b**
Religioznaya identichnost nagaybakov: Istoriya formirovaniya i sovremennoye sostoyaniye. *Problemy istorii, filologii, kultury*, iss. XVIII: 305–312.
- Bekteyeva E.A. 1902**
Nagaybaki: (Kreshchenye tatory Orenburgskoi gubernii). *Zhivaya starina*, iss. II: 165–181.
- Chernavsky N.M. 1900**
Orenburgskaya eparkhiya v proshlom eye i nastoyashchem. Iss. I. Orenburg: [Tip. Orenburg. dukhovnoi missii]. (Trudy Orenburgskoi uchen. arkhivnoi komissii; iss. 7).
- Dal V.I. 2000**
Tolkoviye slovar zhivogo velikorusskogo yazyka. Vol. I: A–Z. Moscow: Rus. yaz.
- Georgi I.G. 1776**
Opisaniye vsekh v Rossiyskom gosudarstve obitayushchikh narodov, tak zhe ikh zhiteiskikh obryadov, ver, obyknoveniy, zhilishch, odezhd i prochikh dostopamyatnostei. Pt. II: O narodakh tatarskogo plemeni. St. Petersburg: Izd. K.V. Millera, pp. 75–84.
- Iskhakov D.M. 1995**
Etnodemograficheskoye razvitie nagaybakov do pervoi chetverti XX v. In *Nagaybaki (kompleksnoye issledovaniye*

gruppy kreshchenykh tatar-kazakov). Kazan: IYALI ANT, pp. 4–18.

Nebolsin P.I. 1852

Otchet o puteshestvii v Orenburgskiy i Astrakhanskiy krai. *Vestnik IRGO*, pt. IV, bk. 1: 1–34.

Pravila o pereselenii na zemli Orenburgskogo kazachyego voiska kazakov uprazdnennogo Stavropolskogo kalmytskogo voiska,

belopakhotnykh soldat i soldatskikh maloletkov. 1843

St. Petersburg: [Tip. Departamenta voyennykh poseleniy].

Rychkov P.I. 1762

Topografiya Orenburgskaya, to est: Obstoypatelnoye opisaniye Orenburgskoi gubernii, sochinennoye kollezhskim sovetnikom i Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk korrespondentom Petrom Rychkovym. Pt. I, II. St. Petersburg: Imp. Akad. nauk.

Spisok naseleennykh punktov Uralskoi oblasti. 1928

A.M. Pleshkov, M.P. Antonov (gen. sup.); I.N. Gridin, A.A. Kolupayev, F.N. Lebedev (eds.). Vol. XIII: Troitskiy okrug. Sverdlovsk: Orgotdel Uraloblispolkoma, Uralstatupravleniya i okruzhnykh ispolkomov.

Starikov F.M. 1891

Istoriko-statisticheskiy ocherk Orenburgskogo kazachyego voiska s prilozheniyem statyi o domashnem byte orenburgskikh kazakov, risunkov so znamen i karty. Orenburg: [Tip. B. Breslina].

Tolstoy D. 1876

Otechestvennaya tserkov v 1874 godu: Rasprostraneniye i utverzheniye very i religioznaya zhizn. *Orenburgskiyeparkhialnye vedomosti*, No. 10: 349–356.

Vitevsky V.N. 1891

Skazki, zagadki i pesni nagaybakov Verkhneuralskogo uyezda Orenburgskoi gubernii. In *Trudy IV Arkheol. syezda v Rossii, g. Kazan, 31 iyulya – 18 avg. 1877 g.*, vol. II. Kazan: pp. 257–286.

Vitevsky V.N. 1897

I.I. Neplyuev i Orenburgskiy krai v prezhnem ego sostave do 1758 g., vol. I. Kazan: [Litotip. V.M. Klyuchnikova].

Vserossiyskaya perepis naseleniya 2002 g.

URL: <http://www.perepis2002.ru/index.html?id=17> (Accessed November 2, 2008).

Vserossiyskaya perepis naseleniya 2010 g.

URL: http://www.perepis-2010.ru/results_of_the_census/results-inform.php (Accessed December 2013).

Zapiski puteshestviya akademika Falka. 1824

Pt. 1. St. Petersburg: Imp. Akad. nauk. (Poln. sobr. uchenykh puteshestviy po Rossii; vol. VI).

Zapiski puteshestviya akademika Lepekhina. 1821

Pt. 1, 2. St. Petersburg: Imp. Akad. nauk. (Poln. sobr. uchenykh puteshestviy po Rossii; vol. III).

Zhurnal ili dnevnnye zapiski puteshestviya kapitana

Rychkova po raznym provintsiyam Rossiyskogo gosudarstva, 1769 i 1770 gody. 1770

St. Petersburg: Imp. Akad. nauk.

Received September 26, 2014.