

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v7i4.1798

Citation: Bessonova, T., & Khanova, A. (2018). Tatar Philistine Family of Kazan in the Middle of the XIX Century. Journal of History Culture and Art Research, 7(4), 1-7.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i4.1798>

Tatar Philistine Family of Kazan in the Middle of the XIX Century

Tatyana Bessonova¹, Aigul Khanova²

Abstract

The article examines the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the Tatar bourgeois family of Kazan in the middle of the XIX century in the era of transition to bourgeois society. Studying the philistine family allows one to get an idea of the way of life of the townspeople, since philistinism was the most massive layer of the urban population of Russia in this period. Kazan, being a multi-confessional and multinational city, along with Russian residents, included the Tatar population in the urban society. The study of the Tatar philistine family makes it possible to reveal the features of the way of life of this category of urban inhabitants, distinguishing it from the Russian philistines of Kazan.

Approaches to the study of this issue are based on methods used in microhistory using historical and demographic analysis tools. The study showed that the Tatar philistine family in its structure, demographic characteristics, occupation, standard of living as a whole led a way of life typical of this class group of Russian society of the period under study. However, petty bourgeois Tatars retained a number of features determined by national traditions.

Keywords: Philistinism, Historical demography, Tatar family, Typology, Population, Marriage, Household.

¹ PhD in History, associate professor, Kazan Federal University - Naberezhnye Chelny Institute. E-mail: bessonovatv@list.ru.

² PhD in Philology, associate professor, Kazan Federal University - Naberezhnye Chelny Institute. E-mail: AjFHanova@kpfu.ru.

Introduction

The class structure of the population of Russia was formed only in the XVIII century. Granted letters to the nobility and the cities of 1785, finally formed the four estates of Russian society: the nobility, the clergy, the urban inhabitants and the peasantry.

City inhabitants divided into merchants of three guilds, craft guilds, townsmen or townspeople and eminent citizens. In 1832 the category of eminent citizens was abolished, instead of it the category of honorary citizens was introduced. This stratification was maintained throughout the pre-reform period. In quantitative terms, the strata of urban citizens differed markedly. The most mass group of townspeople were petty bourgeois. In 1795, the middle class and the guild comprised 80% of the population of the cities of European Russia (without Poland and Finland), in 1811 - 84%, in 1835 - 91.4%, in 1850 - 93%. [1, p.116] Moreover, the category of guilds concerning petty-bourgeois was not large, by 1858 their weight did not exceed 7% of urban inhabitants. [2, p.166] The proportion of merchants in pre-reform Russia also gradually decreased from 20% in 1795 to 7% in 1850 [1, p.116].

Kazan is the largest provincial city of the Russian Empire, a sort of "window to the east". A.I. Herzen, traveling through Kazan in 1835, wrote: "everywhere you see a big city full of life, central to its land, trade and, most importantly, a bicentennial city - European-Asian" [3, p.378]. Kazan, a multinational and poly-confessional provincial town, had two groups in the middle class: Russian and Tatar. Initially, only the Orthodox population was categorized as Kazan's philistines. The Tatar population was designated as servicemen or trading Tatars. Only in 1821 large Tatar businessmen got the right to enter the merchant class, the rest of the population remained in the category of trading Tatars, and from 1825 became part of the middle class. In this case, we are dealing with the process of applying Russian legal categories to non-Russian citizens and social structures within the framework of the integration of the Russian population into a single community [4, p.36]. Formally, integration was due to the entry of the Tatars into one of the legally registered estates, in particular, the middle class. However, in reality, the petty bourgeois Tatars had certain characteristics that distinguish them from the Russian philistines of Kazan, which are revealed, among other things, through the study of the family.

The aim of the study is the reconstruction of the Tatar bourgeois family of Kazan in the middle of the XIX century through the study of demographic and socio-economic characteristics.

The main source is the family list of the Tatar philistine society, compiled in 1855 to monitor the execution of recruit service [5]. The analysis of this document allows us to establish the sex-age composition of Tatar families, the population, the average age of marriage and other demographic parameters, which makes it possible to determine the typology of the Tatar philistine family. The study of economic activities of petty Bourgeois-Tatars, the availability and quality of housing forms an idea of the standard of living of the citizens of this ethnic group, deepening understanding of the diversity of forms and ways of social existence of various groups of urban population.

Methods

For the reconstruction of the Tatar philistine family, the methods and approaches used in microhistory were used. The microhistorical focus of the research makes it possible to identify those phenomena that, in their interconnectedness, allow a deeper understanding of the life of the citizens of pre-reform Russia. The concept of research proceeds from the notion that the Tatar philistine of Kazan is a local social community existing in its concrete historical substratum, a unique poly-ethnic environment. As L.P. Repin, "the reality of human relations and relations can be understood only within the framework of social life, close to the individual, at the level of real social groups and social communities" [6, p.78]. Thus, it is

microanalysis that provides an opportunity to uncover unique signs of the past [7, p.294]. The study of this social group will enrich the ideas about the way of life of the townspeople of the Russian empire, opening up new opportunities for understanding the multiplicity of social practices. Including a person in the historical context, the microhistory is based on the understanding that "these contexts are many" [8, p.59].

The study of the family also relies on methods used in historical and demographic research. This technique is the most reasonable for analyzing the main source. The document contains information about 79 Tatar philistine families, which included 785 people.

Each family includes the head of the family and other relatives, their age, degree of relationship, occupation, availability and cost of housing, attitude to recruitment, availability or absence of previous convictions, literacy. The study of these data makes it possible to implement the typology of Tatar philistine families.

Results and Discussion

In the XVIII - XIX centuries, Russia was characterized by a tendency to reduce the average number of urban families. Thus, by 1897, the average size of the family of urban inhabitants in comparison with the first half of the XVIII century decreased from 6.2 people to 4.2 people [1, p.233]. The Tatar philistine family was much larger in size, the population was 9.9 people, this is much higher than the number of Russian urban families. Thus, the population of the merchant families of Western Siberia in the XIX century was from 5 to 7 people [9, p.117].

Of the 79 family nests mentioned in the source, 35 families (44.3%) had a common house, lived together and paid common taxes. Another seven families (10.1%) also lived together, but taxes were paid separately. As a rule, such families consisted of parents, with whom married sons lived with their children, often they included the families of several siblings. Thus, about 55% of Tatar philistine families lived a large undivided family and led a common household. Such a family by P. Laslett's typology can be attributed to a multifocal household [10, p.136]. Large families consisted of 4-5 generations of relatives, but more often they were multi-nuclear families of several brothers - heads of nuclear families. Such a significant percentage of large families distinguishes strikingly Tatar philistine families from Russian urban families of that period. In Kazan in the middle of the XIX century among Russian middle-class families, only 25% belonged to the category of large families [11]. B.N. Mironov cites data that in the middle of the XIX century in the Yaroslavl and Kiev gubernias, compound, including large families, among the townspeople were 13% and 34% respectively [1, p.234].

In the official or informal section were 32.8% of families. This coincides with the general tendency of the destruction of patriarchal and isolation of individual families, characteristic of the era of bourgeois development.

However, the large scale of the preservation of large families of the Kazan Tatars speaks of the economic weakness of family farms. It can also be assumed that the preservation of large families among the Tatar population is also due to the more vulnerable position of "aliens" within the Russian Empire. In support of this opinion, the fact of greater preservation of large families among the Jewish population of the Kiev province in comparison with the Christian families - 46%, compared with 34% [1, p.234].

The most common occupation of petty bourgeois-Tatars was trade, mention of this type of activity is found in 57 families (72%). Traded, mostly, petty goods, as well as leather, which is historically characteristic of the Tatar part of the citizens of Kazan. In isolated cases, there is mention of the trade in caps, baked bread. In second place in the frequency of mentioning in the source is hiring a service, what

seven families did, three families were engaged in shoemaking and carpentry. Among the handicrafts there is a single mention of the cart and cap masters, the painter, the shoemaker, the watchmaker. Own production had only two families. Iskhak Kadimov had a salon plant, and Ahmet Bastyakov with his brothers owned a Chinese factory. Only one family from the list moved to the merchant class: in 1855 Abdulkarim Zaluliyev and his family became part of the Kazan merchants.

Unlike the Tatar families, where the occupation of trade clearly prevailed, among the Russian burghers there is no noticeable advantage of any one type of activity. An analysis of the list of Russian philistine families in Kazan in 1858 shows that in the first place in the frequency of mentioning is hiring a service - 56 families out of 167 (33.5%), followed by trade - 45 families (30%), crafts were engaged in 33 families (19.7%) [8].

By creating philistinism as "the middle line of people", Catherine II singled out one of its most important features for the existence of own real estate in the city. Nevertheless, by the middle of the XIX century not always this feature retained its defining significance. Of the 79 families mentioned, 22 families (27.8%) did not have a home and lived in Kazan, renting housing, six more lived in the village.

The houses belonging to the petty Tatars were located exclusively in the Tatar Sloboda, defined for the place of residence of the Tatars after the entry of the Kazan Khanate into the Russian state. The source contains information on the cost of 48 houses, the size of which had a significant spread: from 30 to 714 rubles. The average cost of houses was 240 rubles, while the cost of 28 houses (58%) did not exceed 200 rubles. These figures can be compared with the cost of houses of the residents of the Kazan - Sukonnaya Sloboda, which the governor of Kazan I.A. Baratynsky called the place "where the poorest lived". In 1831 in the Sukonnaya Sloboda, 40% of the inhabitants had houses worth up to 258 rubles, whereas the average cost was 761 rubles [12, p.112].

Selecting in the source of married couples where both spouses are alive, you can consider the average number of children in families and the average age of marriage. The document contains data on 153 such families. Of these, 37 families (24%) were childless, and in their composition, there are very young spouses, apparently, recently married, so not yet had time to acquire offspring. It is possible that some families had children, but they died. In most families, there were one child, two or three children (21.5%, 22% and 13.7%, respectively), 7.2% of families had four children. The largest family was 73-year-old Fatkulla Zagitov, who had 8 children, the oldest of whom was 34 years old, the youngest - 6 years. The average number of children in families was 2 people, but this is an approximate figure, because the source does not have instructions, married men first or second marriage. Apparently, the second marriage was often the case, since in a number of cases with a sufficient young wife in the family there were adult children. Russian families in Kazan are less numerous, the average number of children in families was 1.7 people. Based on the assumption that the first child in the family was born approximately one year after the marriage, it is possible to establish the average age of marriage. For men, it was 26.9 years, for women - 20.7 years. These figures differ from the data given by A.B. Kamenskiy for families of Russian urban inhabitants. According to his calculations, the average age of marriage for men was 25.7 years, and for women 23.2 years [13, p.80].

As we see, in the Tatar bourgeois families, men married more mature than in Russians, but women married more young. In the source are frequent references to wives who in 14-15 years already had a child. Even more prominent feature of the Tatar families, based on religious traditions, was polygamy, eight men from 153 families had two wives.

Summary

Thus, the Tatar bourgeois family of Kazan in the middle of the XIX century was a social unit, existing as a whole in accordance with the general tendencies of development of the family of urban inhabitants. Just as for the philistine estate as a whole, small-scale Tatars are characterized by economic activity of a small scale, primarily aimed at satisfying their own needs, among which small trade, crafts and hiring for service predominated. Cases of transfer to the merchant class or the opening of their own production were quite rare. Low quality of housing, determined by low cost, indicates a low standard of living. A large number of children are no longer typical for this time, families with 1-3 children predominate. There is also a tendency to destroy a large patriarchal family and isolate nuclear families.

However, the Tatar philistine families had significant distinctive features, determined by national and confessional traditions, the level of economic well-being. First of all, a significant degree of preservation of large undivided families in which several generations of nuclear families lived, as well as close relatives, is noticeable. In the Tatar families, men later created a family, but women usually married at a fairly young age. In full accordance with Muslim traditions, polygamy was practiced. Among the traditional characteristics of the Tatar population is the clear predominance of trade among other types of economic activity.

Conclusion

Historical demography, in addition to its own scientific significance, is an important element in the study of social history, since demographic processes explain social attitudes and social behavior [14, p.18]. Russian Society of the middle of the XIX century retained a class structure, the state sought to include in the class all social groups of a huge multinational country.

To some extent it was a flexible system, social status was determined not only by origin, but also by economic circumstances, education, ethnic and religious affiliations, and so on. The same conclusion was reached by the German historian Manfred Hildermeier, who studies urban estates in Russia in the social and structural context [15]. Separate groups were formed within the classes, which indicates the maneuverability of the system. In detail, this phenomenon of the Russian estate society, using the example of commoners, was examined by Ellis Firtshafeter, showing that all social categories and their types were intermingled and overlapping, representing an interlacing of formal positions, classifications and definitions reflecting the variability of the way of life [4, p.43]. Such a society, Alfred J. Rieber called "sedimentary", allowing the existence of intrasystem constantly overlapping layers of social organization [16, pp.346-366].

In the case of Kazan, we see that philistinism, being one of the estates of Russian society, was not homogeneous, representing a lot of identities that were largely preserved at later time. A. Kaplunovsky emphasizes that "in the late empire the class system and other forms of sociocultural identity and self-organization based, for example, on professional or ethno-confessional affiliation, not only co-existed, but also complemented each other" [17]. Thus, historical demography in addition to its own scientific issues successfully solves the problems of interdisciplinary research, as evidenced by the findings of modern scientists [18, p.2-32].

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

The work was prepared under support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project No. 18-09-00353 / 18

Footnotes

1. Mironov, B. N. (2003). Social history of Russia during the period of the empire (XVIII - early XX centuries). St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin.
2. Pajitnov, K. A. (1952). The problem of craft shops in the legislation of Russian absolutism. Moscow.
3. Herzen, A. I. (1957). Letter of A. I. Herzen, April 22, 1835, Letter from the province. In N. A. Zakharina (eds.), A. I. Herzen Selected works. Moscow: Nauka.
4. Virtshafter, E. (2002). Social structures: commoners in the Russian Empire. Moscow: Logos.
5. National Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 570. Op. 1. D.29.
6. Repina, L. P. (2009). "New historical science" and social history. Moscow: Publishing house LCI.
7. Ginzburg, K. (2004). Microhistory: two or three things that I know about it. Myths - emblems - signs: morphology and history. Digest of articles. Moscow: New publishing house.
8. Uvarov, P. Yu. (2004). France of the XVI century: Experience in reconstruction through notarial acts. Moscow: Nauka.
9. Goncharov, Yu. M. (1999). Merchant family of the second half of the XIX - early XX centuries. Moscow.
10. Laslett, P. (1979). Family and household: historical approach. Marriage, birth rate, family for three centuries. Moscow: Statistics. NART F. 570. Op. 1. D.1.
11. Bessonova, T. V. (1999). Kazanskaya Sukonnaya Sloboda in the XVIII - the first half of the XIX centuries. Naberezhnye Chelny: Publishing house of the Institute of Management.
12. Kamensky, A. B. (2007). Daily routine of Russian urban inhabitants: Historical anecdotes from the provincial life of the XVIII century. Moscow.
13. Imhof, F. Hrsg. (1975). Historische Demographie als Sozialgeschichte. Darmstadt und Marburg.
14. Hildermeier, M. (1986). Bürgertum und Stadt in Russland, 1760-1870: Rechtliche Lage und soziale Structur. Köln, Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
15. Rieber, A. J. (1991). The Sedimentary Society. In E. W. Clowes, S. D. Kassow, and J. L. West (eds.). Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in the Late Imperial Russia, (pp.343-366). New Jersey: Princeton.
16. Kaplunovski, A. A. (2015). Social Phantom: Meshchanstvo in the Socio-Cultural Context of Late Imperial Russia. Ab imperio [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://abimperio.net/portal/outreach/AKberlin.pdf> (Access date 26.08.2015).
17. Campbell, C. (2012). Historical Demography. California Center for Population Research. On-Line Working Paper Series.

References

Bessonova, T. V. (1999). Kazanskaya Sukonnaya Sloboda in the XVIII - the first half of the XIX centuries. Naberezhnye Chelny: Publishing house of the Institute of Management.

- Campbell, C. (2012). Historical Demography. California Center for Population Research. On-Line Working Paper Series.
- Ginzburg, K. (2004). Microhistory: two or three things that I know about it. Myths - emblems - signs: morphology and history. Digest of articles. Moscow: New publishing house.
- Goncharov, Yu. M. (1999). Merchant family of the second half of the XIX - early XX centuries. Moscow.
- Herzen, A. I. (1957). Letter of A. I. Herzen, April 22, 1835, Letter from the province. In N. A. Zakharina (eds.), A. I. Herzen Selected works. Moscow: Nauka.
- Hildermeier, M. (1986). Bürgertum und Stadt in Russland, 1760-1870: Rechtliche Lage und soziale Struktur. Köln, Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
- Imhof, F. Hrsg. (1975). Historische Demographie als Sozialgeschichte. Darmstadt und Marburg.
- Kamensky, A. B. (2007). Daily routine of Russian urban inhabitants: Historical anecdotes from the provincial life of the XVIII century. Moscow.
- Kaplunovski, A. A. (2015). Social Phantom: Meshchanstvo in the Socio-Cultural Context of Late Imperial Russia. Ab imperio [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://abimperio.net/portal/outreach/AKberlin.pdf> (Access date 26.08.2015).
- Laslett, P. (1979). Family and household: historical approach. Marriage, birth rate, family for three centuries. Moscow: Statistics. NART F. 570. Op. 1. D.1.
- Mironov, B. N. (2003). Social history of Russia during the period of the empire (XVIII - early XX centuries). St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin.
- National Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan. F. 570. Op. 1. D.29.
- Pajitnov, K. A. (1952). The problem of craft shops in the legislation of Russian absolutism. Moscow.
- Repina, L. P. (2009). "New historical science" and social history. Moscow: Publishing house LCI.
- Rieber, A. J. (1991). The Sedimentary Society. In E. W. Clowes, S. D. Kassow, and J. L. West (eds.). Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in the Late Imperial Russia, (pp.343-366). New Jersey: Princeton.
- Uvarov, P. Yu. (2004). France of the XVI century: Experience in reconstruction through notarial acts. Moscow: Nauka.
- Virtshafter, E. (2002). Social structures: commoners in the Russian Empire. Moscow: Logos.