

## Oryol-gorodok as a Starting Point of Ermak's Campaign

V. V. Shilov

**For citation:** Shilov V. V. Oryol-gorodok as a Starting Point of Ermak's Campaign. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2024, vol. 69, issue 3, pp. 580–595.

<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu02.2024.303>

The article examines the issue of where the decision about the expedition to Siberia under the leadership of Ermak Timofeevich was made and where it began in the estates of the Stroganovs in the region of the Northern Kama. The discussion of this complex and important event in the history of Russia not only continues actively in the academic circles but it is also clearly expressed today in the city of Chusovaya and the village of Oryol-gorodok in the Perm krai (territory, in which monuments to Ermak are erected, with the assertion that it is from these settlements that a campaign to “conquer Siberia” began. The article also considers the attitude of Ivan IV the Terrible to the settlement and development of the eastern borders of his kingdom. The paper explores the personality of the legendary ataman Ermak and the result of his campaign, which raised a number of controversial theoretical and conceptual questions. The reason for this lies in the incompleteness of the factual material and in its inconsistency. Despite the lacunae in the history of this issue, the article argues that Ermak “did not conquer” Siberia, but only restored the status quo in the region beyond the Urals, which ultimately contributed to the trends of progressive development in the new lands of the Russian state expressed in rapprochement and mutual cultural enrichment between the Russian settlers and indigenous peoples of Siberia.

*Keywords:* ataman, the Stroganov family, Ivan IV the Terrible, Verkhnekam'e, Oryol-gorodok, Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok, Siberian Chronicles, the meaning of Ermak's campaign.

### Орёл-городок как начальный пункт похода Ермака в Сибирь

В. В. Шилов

**Для цитирования:** *Shilov V. V. Oryol-gorodok as a Starting Point of Ermak's Campaign // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2024. Т. 69. Вып. 3. С. 580–595.*

<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu02.2024.303>

Рассматривается вопрос о месте принятия решения и начале экспедиции в Сибирь под руководством Ермака Тимофеевича из вотчин Строгановых в Северном Прикамье. Дискуссия по этому сложному и важному в истории России событию не только активно продолжается в научной среде, но и наглядно выражена в наши дни в г. Чусовом и пос. Орёл Пермского края, в которых установлены памятники Ермаку, с утвержде-

---

Vladimir V. Shilov — PhD (History), Associate Professor, Berezniki Branch of the National Research Polytechnic University, 7, ul. Telmana, Berezniki, 618404, Russian Federation; <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4752-4889>, [vvs595959@mail.ru](mailto:vvs595959@mail.ru)

Владимир Викторович Шилов — канд. ист. наук, доц., Бerezниковский филиал Пермского национального исследовательского политехнического университета, Российская Федерация, 618404, Berezniki, ул. Тельмана, 7; <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4752-4889>, [vvs595959@mail.ru](mailto:vvs595959@mail.ru)

© St. Petersburg State University, 2024

нием, что именно из этих населенных пунктов начался поход на «покорение Сибири». Представлено описание этих населенных пунктов, возникших в 1560-х гг. в вотчинах Строгановых, что позволяет утверждать о формировании идеи похода в Сибирь именно в Орле-городке (так в XVI в. назывался современный пос. Орёл) как в неформальной столице клана Строгановых в Перми Великой в тот период. Выясняются противоречивые отношения Русского государства и Сибирского ханства, довольно воинственно настроенного к Московскому царству, особенно к его прикамским территориям. Анализируются спорные мнения историков о сибирской экспедиции, об участии представителей династии Строгановых в снаряжении дружины Ермака и их личной заинтересованности в окончательном присоединении Сибири к Русскому государству. Показано отношение Ивана IV Грозного к заселению и освоению восточных рубежей его царства. Освещается личность легендарного атамана Ермака, итог его похода, что поставило ряд вопросов теоретического и концептуального осмысления, которые не получают однозначного решения. Причина этого кроется в отсутствии полноты фактического материала, в его противоречивости. Несмотря на наличие белых пятен в истории этого вопроса, в статье делается вывод о том, что Ермак Сибирь не покорял, а только восстановил статус-кво в регионе за Уральскими горами, что способствовало в конечном итоге прогрессивным тенденциям развития на новых землях Русского государства, выраженное в сближении, культурном взаимообогащении русских переселенцев и коренных народов Сибири.

*Ключевые слова:* атаман, род Строгановых, Иван IV Грозный, Верхнекамье, Орёл-городок, Нижний Чусовской городок, Сибирские летописи, значение похода Ермака.

More than two centuries ago N. M. Karamzin wrote about the legendary Cossack ataman Ermak<sup>1</sup>. Despite the fact that there is not much knowledge about Ermak, and the discussion about this rather extraordinary (mysterious) person continues<sup>2</sup>, R. G. Skrynnikov<sup>3</sup>, a renowned researcher of the “Siberian epic” and the very personality of the legendary ataman, points out that Ermak is “one of the most remarkable figures in Russian history”<sup>4</sup>. It is no coincidence that his sculpture adorns the famous monument “Millennium of Russia” in Velikii Novgorod, which is traditionally associated with the beginning of the Russian statehood. Nevertheless, there are still enough myths about Ermak and his campaign to Siberia<sup>5</sup>.

The aim of this research is to consider the question of where the decision to “go to Siberia” was made in the patrimony of the Stroganov clan and what the initial point of Ermak’s campaign was: Oryol-gorodok or Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok.

To date, a considerable number of works have been published about Ermak and his expedition to Siberia. At the same time, a number of issues, even such important ones as the date of the beginning of the campaign, are still debatable (September 1, 1581, or September 1, 1582). The early texts of Siberian origin — the Synodic to the Ermak’s Cossacks, the first edition of which was created on the initiative of Archbishop of Tobolsk Cyprian around 1622, and the main edition of the Esipov Chronicle, penned by Savva Esipov, the deacon of Archbishop of Tobolsk, in 1636, attribute the beginning of the campaign even

<sup>1</sup> Karamzin N. M. Istorii gosudarstva Rossiiskogo: in 3 books. Book 3, vol. IX. Kaluga, 1993. P. 154.

<sup>2</sup> Solodkin Ya. G. K sporam o proiskhozhdenii Ermaka // Zapadnaia Sibir': istoriia i sovremennost': Kraevedcheskie zapiski. Issue II. Ekaterinburg, 1999. P. 128–131.

<sup>3</sup> Skrynnikov R. G. Sibirskaiia ekspeditsiia Ermaka. Novosibirsk, 1986.

<sup>4</sup> Skrynnikov R. G. Ermak. M., 2008.

<sup>5</sup> Okladnikov A. P. Pokhod Ermaka: Mif i real'nost' // Nauka v SSSR. 1982. No. 2. P. 28–32.

to the autumn of 7089 (1580), and the capture of the capital of Kuchumov's "kingdom" of Siberia — to October 26 of the same year<sup>6</sup>. This and other facts, such as the number of participants in the campaign or the death of Ermak, show that the Siberian chronicles (Esipovskaia, Stroganovskaia, Pogodinskaia, Kungurskaia, and some others) are largely contradictory, which was well analyzed by R. G. Skrynnikov<sup>7</sup>.

The original point of view about the beginning of the campaign and its "preparation" was expressed by V. I. Sergeev, who claimed that Ermak set out on a campaign in September 1578. In his opinion, Ermak and his men first went down the Kama River by flat-bottomed boats (strug), then — up its tributary, the Sylva river, then the Cossacks returned and wintered near the mouth of the Chusovaya river. This journey along the Sylva River and the wintering on the Chusovaya was supposedly a kind of training that gave Ermak an opportunity to gather his men and test them, to provide them with the experience in the new difficult conditions awaiting them<sup>8</sup>.

Following V. I. Sergeev, researcher V. A. Shkerin poses a question whether Ermak's Sylva campaign was a mistake, or was it the Cossacks' way to Siberia<sup>9</sup>.

First, it is hardly possible to suspect the Cossacks of poor knowledge of the area. Even if we assume that Ermak himself did not know this waterway very well (he could have confused the mouth of the Sylva and Chusovaya), but it is unlikely that neither did all those who "came" to the Stroganovs' estates and were in his. Moreover, the chronicles report that the Cossacks had interpreters and guides<sup>10</sup>.

Secondly, the "search for the way to Siberia", if it had been organized by Ermak or the Stroganovs themselves, would most likely have been carried out by a small detachment, and not by the entire team. The search for a road to Siberia by "trial and error" involving the entire group could have been an expensive project. After all, the campaign itself was very costly to its organizers.

According to N. V. Kazarinova, Candidate of Art History, Deputy Director for Science of Perm State Art Gallery (PGHG) "the Stroganovs undoubtedly deserve credit for the provision of Ermak... All the equipment cost almost 20,000 rubles at the time, which was only possible for the Stroganovs: this amount caused even the Moscow government to find it difficult"<sup>11</sup>.

Therefore, it is unlikely that the Stroganovs would have allocated such a fabulous amount to Ermak simply for "reconnaissance by battle" or simply to "gather and check the team", as V. I. Sergeev wrote.

No less controversial is the question regarding the place from which Ermak's team set off on their renowned campaign? In 1964, in honor of the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the foundation of Oryol-gorodok, in the village of Oryol of the Perm region (since 2005 — Perm Krai), the monument-obelisk with the image of Ermak was solemnly opened, which comprises four twenty-meter larch trunks pointed in the upper part (which are associ-

<sup>6</sup> Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei. Vol. 36, pt. 1 (gruppa Esipovskoi letopisi). Moscow, 1987. P. 51–56, 380.

<sup>7</sup> Skrynnikov R. G. Sibirskaia ekspeditsiia Ermaka. P. 12–60.

<sup>8</sup> Sergeev V. I. K voprosu o pokhode v Sibir' druzhiny Ermaka // Voprosy istorii. 1959. No. 1. P. 117–129.

<sup>9</sup> Shkerin V. A. Sylvenskii pokhod Ermaka: oshibka ili poisk puti v Sibir' // Etnokul'turnaia istoriia Urala, XVI–XX vv. Ekaterinburg, 1999. P. 104–107.

<sup>10</sup> Siberian Chronicles: [Publication of the Imperial Archaeographic Commission] / eds L. N. Maikov and V. V. Maikov. St. Petersburg, 1907.

<sup>11</sup> Kazarinova N. S. Oryol-gorodok i ego khudozhestvennoe nasledie XVI–XVIII vv. Perm, 2018. P. 14.

ated either with part of the fortress wall or with the spears of the Cossacks) and a metal bas-relief of the chest portrait of Ermak in the lower part (the author of the monument is L. S. Martynov). On the back side of this obelisk is a cast metal shield with the inscription: “From here in the summer of 1581, having loaded the boats with weapons and supplies, having taken a small team to himself, Ermak went to conquer Siberia”.

The collections of Berezniki Historical and Art Museum (the village of Oryol is part of the city district of Berezniki of Perm Krai) feature cannons, chain mail, bardiches; artefacts from the era of the “conquest of Siberia”; interesting paintings dedicated to the Siberian expedition of Ermak, including “A Meeting of Ermak with the Stroganovs in Oryol-gorodok” (KP 1375-18. Artist Starkov L. A. Oil on canvas. 54×70 pixels. Sketch. 1956).

In June 2013, a monument to Ermak was also ceremoniously unveiled in Chusovaya. The opening of the monument (the bronze figure is installed at the highest point of the city) was timed to coincide with the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the city and the 445<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the economic development of the Chusovskii lands (which formerly belonged to the Stroganovs). In the Urals, this is the first monument to Ermak, and it is quite simple. Apparently, since the campaign began in the fall, the ataman is depicted dressed in a Streltsy caftan, boots, and a fur hat (the author is Perm architect and sculptor A. A. Matveev). At the same time, the name of Ermak in Chusovaya was commemorated even earlier in the local toponyms: the automobile bridge over the Chusovaya River and the lane.

Residents and guides of the modern city of Chusovaya and the village of Chusovaya, Oryol of Perm Krai, inform all visitors that it was from their locality that the famous Cossack ataman, “the historical conqueror of Siberia”, began his legendary campaign.

Historians also do not agree on the place of the beginning of the campaign. The Russian-German historiographer, academician G. F. Miller, in his “History of Siberia”, writes without any comments that Ermak went on a campaign from Oryol-gorodok in 1581<sup>12</sup>. Professor V. V. Kostochkin shares the same version: “in 1581, the Cossack teams of Ermak formed by the Stroganovs left it (Oryol-gorodok — *V. Shilov*) to the east”, and he explains that Oryol-gorodok “was called Kergedan by the Komi-Permians, that is, “the city at the mouth of the river”<sup>13</sup>.

N. M. Karamzin in the “History of the Russian State” writes poetically about the beginning of the expedition: “Ermak *with a vow of valor and chastity*, at the sound of military trumpets, on September 1, 1581, sailed the Chusov River to the Ural Mountains, on a feat of glory, without any assistance, even without the knowledge of the sovereign”<sup>14</sup>.

It is worth describing these localities. Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok began to be built in 1568, when Iakov Stroganov received a grant letter from Ivan IV the Terrible for land along the Chusovaya river and down the Kama river. At the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, after the emergence of another town located upstream — Verkhonii (Upper) Chusovskoi gorodok — it became known as the Nizhnii (Lower) Chusovskoi gorodok. Oryol-gorodok had come into being four years earlier, in 1564, built by Iakov’s brother, Grigorii Stroganov.

Both towns, the Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok and Verkhonii Chusovskoi gorodok, were forts against raids from militant neighbors and marked the southern fortifications of the Stroganovs. At the time, not just fortified settlements were called towns but those localities that were also endowed with administrative functions.

<sup>12</sup> Miller G. F. *Istoriia Sibiri*: in 2 vols. Vol. 1. Moscow; Leningrad, 1937. P. 212.

<sup>13</sup> Kostochkin V. V. *Cherdyn’ Solikamsk, Usole*. Moscow, 1988. P. 160.

<sup>14</sup> Karamzin N. M. *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*. Vol. IX. P. 155.

The tsarist government was also concerned about the security of its eastern borders. In 1574, Iakov and Grigorii Stroganov arrived from Moscow in Alexandrovskaiia Sloboda by the order of Tsar Ivan IV the Terrible, where the tsar talked to them several times, inquiring about the relationship between the Kama lands and Siberia. The tsar was also interested in the Stroganovs' opinion on how to restrain the Tatars, their vassals, and the Siberian Khan Kuchum himself.

Even earlier, on August 16, 1566, the Stroganovs' lands were included into the *oprichnina*, the crown land of Ivan IV (1565–1572) — a special territory with an army and a state apparatus, the income of which went to the state treasury, as evidenced by the document of 1566 “Letter of Tsar Ivan Vasilievich to Anikei Fedorov Stroganov’s son on admission to the oprichnina the towns of Kankor (founded in 1558, the modern village of Pyskor is 25 km from the village Orel. — *V. Sh.*) and Kergedan” (Oryol-gorodok).

Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok was built on the salt brine springs, at a distance of 90 versts from the mouth of the Chusovaya river, and functioned until the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when it was flooded by the waters of the Kama reservoir after the construction of the Kama hydroelectric power station. Nevertheless, nowadays, there is still a small island on the Chusovaya river on the spot of the town, where Ermak allegedly received a blessing on the site of the chapel before going to Siberia. In 1990, a small monument was erected there, and the island was informally named “Ermak Island”.

In addition, five kilometers from the modern city of Chusovaya, there is the “Ethnographic Park of the History of the Chusovaya River”, on the territory of which the exposition “Museum of Ermak’s Campaign to Siberia” is located in a small wooden chapel with a dome and bell tower, where artists depicted scenes of the “conquest of Siberia”.

Undoubtedly, the guides and amateur local historians refer to “authoritative” examples that the campaign of Ermak began precisely from the Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok. The same point of view that the campaign began from Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok (and on September 1, 1582) is shared by some historians of Perm in their textbook<sup>15</sup>.

Oryol-gorodok and Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok were created thanks to the Stroganov clan, which in the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century were granted the right to the lands “from the mouth of the Lysva river... along the Kama river to the Chusovaya river” to empty places in 146 versts. These lands, as modern archaeological data show, were not “empty”, but this was how they were described in “Charter of Tsar Ivan Vasilievich to Grigorii Stroganov on financial, judicial and trade privileges to empty lands on the Kama River 1558 April 4”<sup>16</sup>.

According to this first letter of grant from Ivan the Terrible, Grigorii Stroganov was ordered to build towns with military garrisons “against Nagai people and other hordes”, as well as “to clear up farmland, to found towns and to make salt”. The state, thus, benefitted from these lands’ salt and forbade Stroganov to develop certain minerals (“and he himself did not make those ores without our knowledge”). This is most likely the reason for the unusually twenty-year long tax exemption period.

---

<sup>15</sup> *Agafanova N.N., Belavin A.M., Krylasova N.B.* Stranitsy istorii zemli Permskoi: Prikamè s drevneishikh vremen do nachala XVIII veka. Perm, 1995. P. 111.

<sup>16</sup> *Dmitriev A.A.* “1558 g. 4 apreliia. Zhalovannaia gramota tsaria Ivana Vasilievicha Grigoriu Stroganovu o finansovykh, sudebnykh i torgovykh l’gotakh na pustye mesta po reke Kame” (podlinnik uterian) // Permskaia starina. Perm, 1892. Vol. 4. P. 106–109.

N. M. Karamzin in his “History of the Russian State” wrote: “... the active and rich Stroganovs founded in 1558, near the mouth of the Chusovaya river, the town of Kankor (now the village of Pyskor, 25 km from the modern village of Oryol. — *V. Sh.*), on Cape Pyskorskii, where the monastery of the All-Merciful Savior stood, in 1564 the fortress of Kergedan (Oryol-gorodok, the modern village of Oryol. — *V. Sh.*) on the Oryol Voloč, in 1568 and 1570 several prisons on the banks of Chusovaya and Sylva; attracted many people, vagabonds and the homeless, promising rich fruit of hard work and the spoils of courage; they had their own army, their own government, like the princes of the lords; they protected the north-east of Russia and in 1572 subdued the rebellion of the Cheremis, Ostyaks, Bashkirs”<sup>17</sup>. N. M. Karamzin made a mistake here in “near the mouth of the Chusovaya town of Kankor”, apparently, looking at some map of those years, he could have confused the mouth of the Pyskorki and Lysva rivers.

According to the grant charters to the Stroganovs for the Kama lands, they were obliged not to accept those who paid taxes, and “Boyars’fugitive people... and thieves and robbers”<sup>18</sup>. Moreover, they had to catch fugitives and return them to their owners. However, they most likely never fulfilled these requirements; otherwise, what can explain the significant growth of settlements and population, which is evident from case No. 318 from the Stroganov foundation of the Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts. In particular, the following growth dynamics can be demonstrated: in 1579, the Stroganov estate comprised 352 households in four forts (ostrog) and settlements, and there were 406 people in 39 villages and small settlements (pochinok), according to Iakhontov cadastre.

In 1623/24, the Stroganovs had three towns, three small forts (ostrozhek), two monasteries, one settlement, 132 villages and small settlements (pochinok), which had 1,032 households. According to Kaisarov cadastre, there were 16 churches, 26 hospitals, 31 shops, 12 mills, and 1,485 people.

A couple of decades later, around 1642, the Stroganovs had 196 towns, small forts (ostrozhek), small settlements (sloboda), villages and small settlements (pochinok), in which there were 1204 households and 4529 people of different ranks of the male sex (Chemezov cadastre)<sup>19</sup>.

In 1579, the territory in question was characterized by the following data in the documents: “On the Iaiva River there was a settlement of Iaiva on the river Usolka, 3 small settlements (pochinok)... on the Kama river — settlement Oryol, 3 villages, 4 small settlements (pochinok)”<sup>20</sup>. The documents of 1623/24 read: “Yayvensky ostrozhek — 4 villages, 9 small settlements (pochinok)... Oryol-gorodok on the Kama River — 5 villages, 6 small settlements (pochinok)... Novoe Usol’e settlement belonged to Oryol-gorodok... Pyskorskii monastery — 1 village, 10 small settlements (pochinok)”<sup>21</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Karamzin N. M. Pervoe zavoevanie Sibiri // Karamzin N. M. Istorii gosudarstva Rossiiskogo. Vol. IX. P. 152–153.*

<sup>18</sup> *Dmitriev A. A. “1558 g. 4 aprilia. Zhalovannaia gramota tsaria Ivana Vasil’evicha Grigoriu Stroganovu o finansovykh, sudebnykh i torgovykh l’gotakh na pustye mesta po reke Kame” (podlinnik uterian). P. 107.*

<sup>19</sup> *Istoricheskostatisticheskie tablicy na Permskie imeniia gospod Stroganovykh so vremeni pozhalovaniia ikh do nyne. 1558 po 1850 god // Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (RGADA). F. 1278 (fond Stroganovykh). Op. 1. D. 318. L. 1–2.*

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid. L. 4.*



Soon after the “conquest of Siberia”, according to the cadastre of Mikhail Kaisarov of 1623/1624, the patrimony of the Stroganovs comprised more than 5,600 dessiatine of developed land, on which 9 settlements, 72 villages, 60 small settlements (pochinok) were located, and the number of households amounted to 1032, in which 1,485 men lived<sup>22</sup>.

In three cities of Verkhnekam'e (Cherdyn', Solikamsk, Oryol-gorodok), according to the cadastres of 1579, there were 112 artisans of 33 professions. There were 66 of them in Cherdyn', 17 in Solikamsk, and 29 in Oryol-gorodok<sup>23</sup>. Professor V. A. Oborin also noted: “The largest salt producer in the 16<sup>th</sup> century was N. G. Stroganov, who owned 13 saltworks, and all of them were located in one place — near Oryol-gorodok. In Solikamsk, the saltworks were located “near the posad” (settlement), and the worst situation was in the Cherdyn' saltworks, which were located more than 30 km from the city on the Tolych river”<sup>24</sup>.

Granting for the first time in 1558 the enterprising Stroganovs vast lands along the Kama River from Solikamsk to the mouth of the Chusovaya river (almost 4 million hectares), Tsar Ivan IV the Terrible pursued the goal of securing the eastern borders of the Russian state. They coped with this task brilliantly: already in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Stroganovs owned 170 saltworks in the Northern Kama region and turned into the richest salt producers in the country, the main suppliers of this valuable product on the Russian market<sup>25</sup>.

Oryol-gorodok, at the beginning of Ermak's campaign, represented a more economically powerful settlement than Nizhnii Chusovskoi-gorodok due to the fact that it was still in the “rear” of neighboring warlike unfriendly peoples and was better fortified.

V. A. Shmyrov in his PhD thesis “Towns of the Upper Kama region in the 15<sup>th</sup> — early 18<sup>th</sup> centuries” (1982) writes that in 1564, in the flood plain of the Kama river, opposite the mouth of the Iaiva river, the Stroganovs built Oryol-gorodok (Kergedan). According to his calculations, the walls of the town formed a pentagon with five towers, three of which gave access inside. The walls made a fortress, but at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, three of them were replaced by log fortifications. The area of the settlement (posad) at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century was approximately 5 hectares<sup>26</sup>. According to archaeological data, a ditch about 2 meters wide and up to 1,7 meters deep was also dug from the outside of the Oryol-gorodok<sup>27</sup>.

The place for the fortified Oryol-gorodok was chosen quite reasonably, since it was located on a small peninsula formed by the banks of the Iaiva river and Kama river, and in a narrow isthmus the builders dug a ditch, which turned the settlement into a kind of island. In addition, as mentioned above, Oryol-gorodok was fortified.

---

<sup>22</sup> Dmitriev A. A. “1558 g. 4 apreliia. Zhalovannaia gramota caria Ivana Vasilevicha Grigoriuu Stroganovu o finansovykh, sudebnykh i torgovykh l'gotakh na pustye mesta po reke Kame” (podlinnik uterian) // *Permskaia starina*. 1892. Vol. 4. P. 173.

<sup>23</sup> Oborin V. A. *Krest'ianskoe remeslo i promysly v Permi Velikoi v XVI–XVII vv. // Issledovaniia po istorii Urala: Uchenye zapiski Permskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. 1970. No. 227. P. 9.

<sup>24</sup> Oborin V. A. *Zaselenie i osvoenie Urala v kontse XI — nachale XVII veka*. Irkutsk, 1990. P. 140.

<sup>25</sup> Golovchanskii G. P., Mel'nichuk A. F. *Stroganovskie gorodki, ostrozhki, sela*. Perm, 2005.

<sup>26</sup> Shmyrov V. A. *Goroda Verkhnego Prikam'ia v XV — nachale XVIII veka: PhD thesis (History)*. Perm, 1982.

<sup>27</sup> Oborin V. A. *Otchet o rabote Verkhnekamskogo otriada KAE letom 1952 g. (raskopki Orla-gorodka i Kylasova gorodishcha)*. Perm, 1953. — The manuscript is kept in the archeology room of the Perm State National Research University.

From the very beginning, Oryol-gorodok was the administrative, economic, and cultural center of the Stroganovs' estate. The material discovered during archaeological excavations by the scholars of Perm State University named after A. M. Gorky (now Perm State National Research University) O. N. Bader and V. A. Oborin is indicative of the culture of both the Russian and, to some extent, the Komi-Permian population here.

In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Kama riverbed shifted (as a result of neotectonic movements) which since the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century caused constant flooding of Oryol-gorodok. During the flood of 1629, the eastern walls of the town facing the Kama river were washed away. As a result, when the Kama began to change its course, the population of Oryol-gorodok was forced to move to the opposite, right, bank of the river (where the modern village Oryol of Perm Krai is located).

Saltworks were the first to suffer from the erosion, and salt production in Oryol-gorodok was gradually dying down, as was the town as evidenced by the cadastre. Thus, according to I. Yakhontov, in 1579 Oryol-gorodok had 91 households, 15 shops, and 13 saltworks, while the cadastre of M. Kaisarov for 1623 already reports that there were "posadskii people (people from the settlements)) and the most young people, except for bobylskii people (landless peasants) 30 housedolds"<sup>28</sup>.

The construction of the Kama hydroelectric power station (launched in 1954) caused particularly great damage to the territory of Oryol-gorodok, and the Kama reservoir almost completely absorbed the former territory of this ancient settlement. But before the creation of the "Kama Sea", Perm archaeologists O. N. Bader and V. A. Oborin conducted excavations in an "emergency mode", thanks to which a large amount of informative material from the Middle Ages was collected about the economic activities of the population of the former Stroganov patrimonial center of Oryol-gorodok<sup>29</sup>.

On the territory of Oryol-gorodok, the excavations by O. N. Bader and V. A. Oborin revealed the household of a Komi-Permian craftsman of the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, which researchers refer to the Rodanov culture<sup>30</sup> (in addition to the hut, there was a barn and stable, a small bathhouse), household items, tools, jewelry<sup>31</sup>.

Komi-Permian potters lived in Oryol-gorodok (on the bottoms of vessels they put their brand in the form of a bird's claw, resembling tamga, an emblem of the Rodanov culture). Judging by the archaeological material, Moscow craftsmen also lived in Oryol-gorodok in the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries, and most likely they were brought by the Stroganovs to decorate their residence<sup>32</sup>.

The seventeenth-century tiles made of red baked clay are of interest. Various military scenes, animals, and plant ornaments were depicted on their surfaces. Tiles were used to cover stoves in the Stroganovs' mansions, in the homes of the Stroganovs' clerks and well-

---

<sup>28</sup> Dmitriev A. A. Ekonomicheskie ocherki Permi Velikoi (Cherdynskii i Solikamskii kraii na rubezhe XVI i XVII vv.). Issue III. Perm, 1891. P. 172–173.

<sup>29</sup> Oborin V. A. Oryol-gorodok // Sovetskaia arheologiya. 1957. No. 4. P. 143.

<sup>30</sup> The Rodanov culture is an archaeological culture of the 9<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> centuries. in Verkhnekam'e, the population of the culture is the ancestors of the Komi-Permyaks (since the 11<sup>th</sup> century there has been an increase in the ancient Russian population), associated with Perm the Great.

<sup>31</sup> Oborin V. A. Otchet o rabote Verhnekamskogo otriada Kamskoi arheologicheskoi ekspeditsii letom 1952 g. (raskopki Orla-gorodka i Kylasova gorodishcha). — The manuscript is kept in the archeology room of the Perm State National Research University.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.



to-do artisans. In addition, they covered the walls of stone churches and the roofs of the houses of rich people.

The population of Oryol-gorodok in the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries was engaged in agriculture; livestock farming and fishing. The head of the diplomatic mission I. Ides, who was sent by Peter I to China at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, recorded in his notes about the trip: “the beautiful Kama is a wonderful river, rich in all kinds of fish”<sup>33</sup>. The abundant ichthyofauna has contributed to the widespread development of fishing since ancient times<sup>34</sup>. Fish were caught mainly in nets with clay sinkers. Archeologists have found bones of sterlet, bream, ide, roach, catfish and especially often — those of pike bones.

During the excavations of Oryol-gorodok, many pieces of mica were found, and the windows of the poor may have been covered with an ox bladder or with a wooden latch. Copper lamps (on the sites of rich houses), and iron lamps (on the site of poor dwellings) were found that were used for kindling. There were even bone skates for ice skating. As in other Stroganovs’ villages, many small ornaments were found: beads, plaques, earrings, rings, crosses, etc.

In Oryol-gorodok there was a wooden church, church households, households of landless peasants, and behind the village on the bank of the Kama there was one saltwork. In total, there were eleven saltworks with brine pipes and one mill<sup>35</sup>.

Researcher I. S. Ponosova wrote that at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century in Oryol-gorodok there were two tent-shaped wooden churches, one of which had “about five tops” (five domes); a belfry with ten bells; Stroganovs’ mansions, trade shops, houses of artisans and serfs<sup>36</sup>.

Oryol-gorodok at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century more than once had to withstand the raids of the Mansi princes, who were vassals of the Siberian khan<sup>37</sup>. The historian of the pre-Soviet period A. A. Dmitriev even noted that at one time Oryol-gorodok was considered a fortified settlement in the Stroganovs’ estates in Perm and had its own special “Oryol uyezd”<sup>38</sup>, and according to Professor G. N. Chagin, Oryol-gorodok “for almost a century became the center of all the northern Stroganov estates”<sup>39</sup>.

Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok also had defensive structures (it was protected with a fort, ostrog) and, according to the cadastre of I. I. Yakhontov, in 1579 it was already the center of the district, which included 5 villages and 16 small settlements (pochinok)<sup>40</sup> (after the division between the heirs in 1584, Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok and Verkhni Chusovskoi gorodok existed independently).

An archaeological survey of the Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok was also conducted. For the first time it was made by Perm archaeologist V. P. Denisov in 1973. In 1975, a second survey was conducted by V. A. Oborin, and under his leadership — in 1977 and 1981.

<sup>33</sup> *Ides I., Brand A. Zapiski o russkom posol'stve v Kitai (1692–1695)*. Moscow, 1967. P. 70.

<sup>34</sup> *Kir'yanov I. K., Korenyuk S. N., Chagin G. N. Rybolovstvo v Permskom krae v starodavnie vremena*. Perm, 2007.

<sup>35</sup> *Dmitriev A. A. Permskaia starina*. Vol. 4. Perm, 1892. P. 163–172.

<sup>36</sup> *Ponosova I. S. Izraztsy Orla-gorodka // Iz istorii nashogo kraia*. Molotov, 1956. P. 52.

<sup>37</sup> Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Permskogo kraia (GAPK). F. 672 (fond Volegovykh). Op. 1. D. 24 (Usol'skaia letopis'). L. 1–3.

<sup>38</sup> *Dmitriev A. A. Sledy russkikh poselenii v Permi Velikoi do poiavleniia Stroganovykh // Trudy Permskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi komissii*. Issue 4. Perm, 1901. P. 74.

<sup>39</sup> *Chagin G. N. Etnokul'turnaia istoriia Srednego Urala v kontse XVI — pervoi polovine XIX veka*. Perm, 1995. P. 37.

<sup>40</sup> *Istoricheskostatisticheskie tablitsy... L. 4.*

Archaeological excavations of the Kama Archaeological Expedition (KAE) of Perm State University (now Perm State National Research University — PGNIU) were conducted there.

Archaeologists carried out excavations in subsequent years, although full-scale work was hampered by the high waters of the Chusovaya river. The material collected there by archaeologists is still inferior to that collected in Oryol-gorodok<sup>41</sup>.

Therefore, it was more realistic to equip (and to financially provide) Ermak's team in Oryol-gorodok. And the very idea of going to Siberia was clearly formed in Oryol-gorodok, the centre of the Stroganovs' estates in the Kama region. Moreover, its owner Semen Anikeevich Stroganov (1540–1586) was at the time the eldest in the Stroganov family<sup>42</sup>, and it was he who could control the economic policy of the entire clan in the region.

After the death of his brother Iakov in 1577, according to his will, Semeon Stroganov inherited the left bank of Chusovaya and Sylva, and Iakov's only son Maxim (1557–1624) received the right bank of Chusovaya (Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok was founded on the left bank). And after the death of Grigorii Stroganov in 1577, his son Nikita (1560–1616), who inherited his father's possessions, was still quite young during the beginning of Ermak's campaign, as was his cousin Maxim. Therefore, it is quite logical that then all the "fateful" decisions were made by their uncle, who often lived in the "patrimonial center" of Oryol-gorodok — Semen Stroganov.

It is noteworthy to outline the biographies of the representatives of the first three generations of the Stroganov dynasty of the Vychevodsk-Perm branch. The Biographical Dictionary (1896–1918) provides the following information about the founder of this last Stroganov line, (Vychevodsk-Perm) Anika (Anikei) Fedorovich Stroganov<sup>43</sup>, the father of S. A. Stroganov, the owner of Oryol-gorodok: "Anika Fedorovich Stroganov (1488, Novgorod — 1569 or 1570, Solvychevodsk) — the creator of the salt industry in Solvychevodsk and Perm Velikaia, colonizer of the Kama lands, the largest Russian entrepreneur of his time, statesman — the youngest (fourth) son of Fedor Lukich Stroganov, a salt-making industrialist from Novgorod (died 1497)"<sup>44</sup>.

In 1559, Anikeii Stroganov and his eldest sons Iakov and Grigorii (and his wife) moved from Solvychevodsk to the granted lands in Perm Velikaia, while the younger Semen remained in the estate in Solvychevodsk, where he successfully continued extensive farming (sometimes his father visited him).

After the death of his father and three brothers (Stefan, Iosif and Vladimir) who had no children, the whole business was concentrated in the hands of Anikei and his sons, mentioned above — Iakov, Grigorii, and Semen.

The foundation of Oryol-gorodok in 1564 is associated with the name of Grigorii Anikeevich Stroganov, who died here in 1577. After his death, his brother Semen became the owner of Oryol-gorodok (c. 1540–1586).

---

<sup>41</sup> *Oborin V. A., Korchagin P. A., Mel'nichuk A. F., Sokolova N. E.* Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok: Katalog arheologicheskikh kollektzii. Il'insk, 1994.

<sup>42</sup> *Vvedenskii A. A.* Dom Stroganovykh v XVI–XVII vv. Moscow, 1962.

<sup>43</sup> Nowadays, every year since 2006, the Perm community has been awarded the Stroganov Prize for high achievements (in six nominations) in various fields of activity of people who have glorified the Perm region and its inhabitants with their deeds. The winners receive a cash prize (500 thousand rubles in 2023), a silver badge and a diploma of the laureate along with a bronze statuette of Anika Stroganov.

<sup>44</sup> Stroganov, Anika Fedorovich // *Russkii biograficheskii slovar'*: in 25 vols. Vol. 19. St. Petersburg; Moscow, 1918. P. 491–494.

Semen Anikeevich Stroganov, after the death of his older brothers Iakov and Grigorii in 1577, took part in the division of the family possessions (with his nephews) and, as it has been said, received his share in Perm Velikaia. After Ermak's campaign, Semen Anikeevich was killed on October 22, 1586, by "Posad people" in Solvychegodsk, where he was buried in the Cathedral of Annunciation.

Before Ermak's campaign, besides Grigorii Stroganov's nephew Maxim Iakovlevich (1557–1624), there was also the son of Grigorii Anikeevich — Nikita Grigor'evich Stroganov (1559–1616), who after the death of his father, the founder of Oryol-gorodok G. A. Stroganov (1533–1577), had clearly serious rights to the inheritance of Anika Fedorovich Stroganov, the founder of the Vychehodsk-Perm line (4.XI.1497 — 2.IX.1569)<sup>45</sup>.

Nevertheless, his uncle Semen Anikeevich had, of course, more life experience than Nikita, and he was still the "main one" in Oryol-gorodok (as in the entire Stroganovs' clan).

Therefore, it is quite logical to assume that Ermak was in Oryol-gorodok and discussed with the Stroganovs the economic support of the campaign to Siberia. At the time, it was impossible to rely on state resources during the Livonian War (1558–1583).

Thus, Ermak most likely went on his campaign from Oryol-gorodok, where the issue with the Stroganovs about the campaign to Siberia had already been resolved, and Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok could only be an intermediate base, where Maxim Iakovlevich Stroganov, naturally, expressing the interests of the entire Stroganov clan, was forced to finally equip the legendary expedition.

It is necessary to refer to the well-known report of the Cherdyn voivode Vasili Pelepelitsyn to Ivan IV the Terrible, when in 1581 in Cherdyn he had to once again repel a raid from behind a Stone (Ural Mountains). In particular, he wrote to the tsar that Cherdyn was attacked on September 1 by "Siberian people and the Pelym prince", and the Stroganovs did not help him in trouble, moreover, on the very day of the assault, they sent Ermak to "fight the Siberian places"<sup>46</sup>.

"The Stroganovs were sent to Siberian places from Cherdyn", and Oryol-gorodok is much closer to Cherdyn than the Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok. Today, a straight line distance from Cherdyn to the village Orel of Bereznikovskii district of Perm Krai to the south is 118 km (by road — 140.6 km), and from the city of Cherdyn a straight line distance also to the south to the city of Chusovaya is 248 km (by road — 297 km).

Pelepelitsyn's horror after the havoc in the Kama lands of 1581 is quite understandable, and his complaint about the Stroganovs made a great impression on the tsar — he ordered the Stroganovs to return the Cossacks, "keep up to 100 Cossacks", and "send all the rest to Cherdyn". In case of non-fulfillment of the tsar's decree, Ivan the Terrible warned: "we will disgrace you for this, but we will order the atamans and Cossacks who listened to you and served you, and gave our land away, to be hanged"<sup>47</sup>.

However, when the tsar learned of the success of the campaign, he decided to "consolidate" it, as evidenced by the letter of January 7, 1584, to Semen, Maxim, and Nikita

---

<sup>45</sup> *Mudrova N. A.* Roditel'skie letopisy Stroganovskikh sinodikov kak istochnik po genealogii Stroganovykh // *Obshchestvennoe soznanie, knizhnost', literatura perioda feodalizma: Arkheografiia i istochnikovedenie Sibiri.* Novosibirsk, 1990. P. 290–296.

<sup>46</sup> *Dmitriev A. A.* Sledy russkikh poselenii v Permi Velikoi do poiavleniia Stroganovykh. P. 74.

<sup>47</sup> *Solov'iov S. M.* Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen. Vol. VI. Glava VII. Stroganovy i Ermak. St. Petersburg, 2015.

Stroganovs about the preparation of 15 flat-bottomed boats (strug) for people and supplies sent to Siberia<sup>48</sup>.

At the same time, one can hardly agree with some researchers who present the raid of Cossacks from Stroganov estates as revenge for the Tatar raid: “On September 1, 1582, a group of Ermak and “povolniki” from among the Stroganovs; people”, according to Perm authors of the textbook, “set off from Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok up the river to Siberia and Takhchei — to strike back”<sup>49</sup> (the Stroganovs themselves, in their opinion, were allegedly simply afraid of the Cossacks).

The authors also allow such a speculative conclusion: “We must assume that the salt producers, frightened by such terrible events in 1581–1582, did not want to let the Cossacks go at all. Therefore, it should be assumed that Ermak went on the campaign against the will of the Stroganovs”<sup>50</sup>.

The researcher A. T. Shashkov holds a more categorical opinion: “From the very beginning, it was a typical act of pillage (“they decided to run to Siberia to break up with the enemy”), which unexpectedly for the Cossacks themselves led to the collapse of the terrible Siberian “kingdom” and, due to various circumstances, was subsequently delayed for three whole years”<sup>51</sup>.

The conclusion that it was a “typical act of pillage” is unwarranted “Robbers” do not receive from those in power such comprehensive and financially costly assistance (strugi, weapons, provisions, banners, priests, interpreters, etc.), which Ermak’s team received from the Stroganovs.

Most likely, the historians N. M. Karamzin, S. M. Solov’ev, A. A. Dmitriev, S. F. Platonov, A. A. Vedenskii, V. I. Sergeev, and S. V. Bakhrushin, who assigned the Stroganovs a decisive role in organizing Ermak’s campaign to the Urals, are right

Sending Ermak and his team to Siberia, the Stroganovs simply did not know about the impending raid on the Kama lands in 1581 by the Siberian Tatars and their vassals. Then Pelym Prince Kihek in 1581 captured and burnt Sol’-Kama (he could not take Cherdyn). Another warlike prince of Pelym Mansi Ablegirim with 700 soldiers burnt many Stroganovs’ buildings, while at the same time detachments of Alei (son of Kuchum) killed and robbed the local population and Russian peasants, taking many prisoners.

If the Stroganovs had known about these impending raids, then, of course, they would have detained the Cossacks in their estates for some time. The Tatars and their vassals, most likely, knew through their spies that a large campaign was being prepared against them (the construction of 80 boats for Ermak could hardly be hidden) and probably tried to prevent it with their raids.

The constant concerns about the security of their estates and the acquisition of new lands in the Trans-Urals apparently played a decisive role in organizing Ermak’s campaign since the 20-year period of tax exemption under the first grant charter of Ivan the Terrible dated April 4, 1558, was ending.

---

<sup>48</sup> Gramota tsaria Ivana Vasilevicha Semionu, Maksimu i Nikite Stroganovym o prigotovlenii k vesne 15 strugov dlia liudei i zapasov, napravlyaemykh v Sibir’ // Tobol’skii khronograf. Issue 4. Ekaterinburg, 2004. P. 8–9.

<sup>49</sup> *Agafanova N. N., Belavin A. M., Krylasova N. B.* Stranitsy istorii zemli Permskoi: Prikamè s drevneishikh vremion do nachala XVIII veka. Perm, 1995. P. 111.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> *Shashkov A. T.* Sibirskii pokhod Ermaka: khronologiya sobytii 1581–1582 gg. // *Izvestiia Ural’skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.* 1997. No. 7. P. 50.

Representatives of the dynasty also had a royal charter dated August 6, 1572, given to Iakov and Grigorii Stroganov for the entire Stroganov clan, according to which they had the “legitimate” right to recruit “willing people”, that is, to form their own army<sup>52</sup> (they could well show Ermak this certificate).

It is also worth noting the charter of Ivan IV from 1574: “1574 May 30. — The grant charter of Tsar Ivan Vasil'evich to Iakov and Grigorii Stroganov on the release for 20 years from various taxes and duties of their lands on Takhchei and Tobol”<sup>53</sup>. It is also interesting that the tsar “grants” the lands of the “Siberian Khanate”, not at all embarrassed at the same time, apparently being fully confident of his legal right to this territory.

In addition, the “robbers” of Ermak could also earn the tsar’s forgiveness, with which many “willing people” could even be very satisfied. N.M. Karamzin writes about the 840 participants of the campaign (their motivation): “the Don people hoped to earn the mercy of the sovereign, and the German and Lithuanian prisoners — freedom”<sup>54</sup>.

Perhaps the Cossacks could have been “forgiven” even then, because they mostly helped the Stroganovs protect their settlements from predatory raids by the Siberian Khan Kuchum and his vassals “from behind the Stone”. And even after the “conquest of Siberia” it was not very calm in the patrimony of the Stroganovs and on their borders, as chronicles report: “7124/1616 (years from S. M. and A. D. — V. Sh.) B[arons] Stroganovs pacified the Kazan Tatars, Cheremis, Votiaiks and Bashkirs under Sarapul, as evidenced by the royal charter 7181/1673 June 1”<sup>55</sup>.

Despite all the difficulties of the campaign of Ermak, during the first stage, the “conquest of Siberia” was quite successful<sup>56</sup> and caused delight not only among the Stroganov clan, but also at the highest state level: “For a long time, as they write, there was no such joy in despondent Moscow: the sovereign and the people took heart”<sup>57</sup>.

Western Siberia was connected with the Russian lands for a relatively long time, when the Ugra tribes that inhabited the interfluvium of the Ob’ and Irtysh rivers began to sell furs to Novgorodians who went along the Pechora river and its tributaries to the lower Ob’ and the Taz, to the famous Mangazeia<sup>58</sup>.

Ivan the Terrible himself considered Siberia the territory of the Moscow Kingdom. Back in 1563, in a letter to the Polish King Sigismund, he called himself the tsar of “Udorskii, Kondinskii and All Siberia”<sup>59</sup>. And this was generally true, since Khan Kuchum’s “Siberian kingdom” was a patchwork, ephemeral “state” (the fragility of uniting different peoples, who often professed different religions and led different lifestyles).

Therefore, Ermak’s campaign to “conquer Siberia” can be considered (and should be) an attempt to restore Russia’s status quo in this region. It seems that in Oryol-gorodok, representatives of the Stroganov clan could have discussed the “purpose and objectives” of his campaign with Ermak in exactly this manner.

---

<sup>52</sup> Miller G. F. *Istoriia Sibiri*: in 2 vols. Vol. 1. Moscow; Leningrad, 1937. P. 331–335.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>54</sup> Karamzin N. M. *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*. Vol. IX. P. 154.

<sup>55</sup> *Usol'skaia letopis' // GAPK. F. 672 (fond Volegovykh)*. Op. 1. D. 24. L. 3.

<sup>56</sup> *Sibirskie letopisi. Kratkaia sibirskaia letopis' (Kungurskaia) / comp. by A. I. Tsepkov. Ryazan, 2008. (Istochniki istorii)*.

<sup>57</sup> Karamzin N. M. *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*. Vol. IX. P. 160–161.

<sup>58</sup> Belov M. I. *Raskopki “zlatokipyashchei” Mangazei: Publichnye lektsii, pročitannye v lektorii imeni Yu. M. Shokal'skogo*. Leningrad, 1970.

<sup>59</sup> Andreev A. R. *Stroganovy. XIV–XX veka*. Moscow, 2000.



At the same time, Ermak's expedition should be characterized as a very serious, well-thought-out event. The Stroganov estates in the Northern Kama region served as the "springboard" of preparation, the material support of Ermak's campaign, and the "conquest of Siberia", has, in our opinion, primarily an economic background. Conducting economic activity in a region rich in natural resources, but with rather harsh climatic conditions during the Middle Ages, was quite difficult and tax exemption played an important role in the development of productive forces on the eastern outskirts of the Russian empire.

As the historian V.O. Kliuchevskii, who introduced the concept of "colonization", said, it is "the process of economic development and settlement of new lands". He pointed out that economic and political components play the main role in the process of colonization (other aspects of the process are only derived from them)<sup>60</sup>.

Of course, the Stroganov clan was also concerned with the security of their lands, but the main objective was the desire to acquire new lands in the Trans-Urals, since the 20-year period of tax exemption under the first charter of Ivan the Terrible (dated April 4, 1558) was ending, which contributed to the decision made in the center of Stroganov lands in Oryol-gorodok "on the conquest of Siberia", since the mentioned charter of 1574 gave them an additional exemption for 20 years from various taxes and duties on their lands in Takhchei (the Southern Trans-Urals transport corridor between the Kama Region and Siberia) and Tobol.

The Stroganovs staked on acquiring new lands with the richest natural resources, like Verkhnekam'e, and on the official "tax evasion" for 20 years. Almost a century after Ermak's campaign, the Stroganov estate in 1678 already had 4 towns — Kankor, Oryol-gorodok, Nizhni Chusovskoi gorodok, 3 small forts (ostrozhek) — Iavenskii, Ocherskii, Sylvenskii, 1 settlement ("sloboda") (New Usole), 10 villages, 176 villages, 153 small settlements (pochinok), a total of 347 settlements, in which there were 2,875 households, and 9462 males lived<sup>61</sup>.

The Stroganovs' role in the development of the eastern borders of the Russian state is very significant<sup>62</sup>. After the successful campaign of Ermak organized by them<sup>63</sup>, "Ermakov's campaign in Siberia"<sup>64</sup> Russia soon became not just a "European", but a "Eurasian" power.

It is also appropriate to note that among the local population of Western Siberia, Ermak became a rather revered figure<sup>65</sup>. According to S.U. Remezov, whose father, the Cossack Ul'ian Moiseevich Remezov, personally knew the surviving participants of Ermak's campaign, the famous ataman was "very courageous, and humane, and bright-eyed, and endowed with wisdom, flat-faced, with a black beard, of average height, and flat, and broad-shouldered"<sup>66</sup>.

---

<sup>60</sup> *Klyuchevskii V.O.* Russkaia istoriia: Polnyi kurs lektsii: in 3 vols. Vol. 1. Moscow, 2002.

<sup>61</sup> *Istoricheskoe-statisticheskie tablitsy...* L. 7.

<sup>62</sup> *Chagin G.N.* Etnosy i kul'tury na styke Evropy i Azii. Perm, 2002. P. 16.

<sup>63</sup> *Nikitin D.N., Nikitin N.I.* Pokorenie Sibiri. Voiny i pokhody kontsa XVI — nachala XVIII veka. Moscow, 2016.

<sup>64</sup> *Solodkin Ya. G.* "Ermakovo vziatie" Sibiri: Diskussionnye problemy istorii i istochnikovedeniia: monografiia. Nizhnevartovsk, 2015.

<sup>65</sup> *Zavarihin S.P. V drevnem tsentre Sibiri.* Moscow, 1987. P. 25–29; *Katanov N.F.* Predanie tobol'skikh tatar o Kuchume i Ermake // *Tobol'skii khronograf.* Issue 4. Ekaterinburg, 2004. P. 145–167.

<sup>66</sup> *Remezovskaia letopis' // Sibirskie letopisi / eds L.N. Maikova, V.V. Maikova.* St. Petersburg, 1907. P. 344.



Perhaps the “keyword” here will be “humane”. It is no coincidence that after the death of Ermak, the Siberian Tatars and other peoples of the region developed a peculiar cult of him, which was based not only on military success and valor, but also on other personal qualities, primarily, justice and mercy to the vanquished<sup>67</sup>.

The territory of the Northern Kama region, its active economic and socio-cultural development in the late Middle Ages is closely connected with the history of the house of successful entrepreneurs, landowners, merchants, salt magnates, and later well-known statesmen, military figures and patrons —the Stroganovs, since 1610 “eminent people”, and then “barons and counts”<sup>68</sup>.

The natural resources of the Upper Kama region, personal ingenuity and hard work helped the Stroganovs become the richest people in Russia, and whatever personal goals they pursued in the new lands in Siberia, from a historical point of view, the Northern Kama region, which was powerful in economic terms at the time, for many years became a “cultural reserve” for the development of Western Siberia. The very next decades allowed Russian pioneers to successfully develop vast territories of Siberia<sup>69</sup>, and contributed to the introduction of new forms of economic management, housing construction, and a higher material and spiritual culture to the peoples of Siberia.

## References

- Agafanova N.N., Belavin A.M., Krylasova N.B. *Stranitsy istorii zemli Permskoi: Prikam'e s drevneishikh vremen do nachala XVIII veka*. Perm, Knizhnyi mir Publ., 1995, 176 p. (In Russian)
- Belov M.I. *Raskopki “zlatokipyashchei” Mangazei: Publichnye leksii, pročitannye v lektorii imeni Yu. M. Shokal'skogo*. Leningrad, Geograficheskoe obshchestvo SSSR Publ., 1970, 40 p. (In Russian)
- Chagin G.N. *Etnokul'turnaia istoriia Srednego Urala v kontse XVI — pervoi polovine XIX veka*. Perm, Permskii gosudarstvennyi universitet Press, 1995, 364 p. (In Russian)
- Chagin G.N. *Etnosy i kul'tury na styke Evropy i Azii*. Perm, Permskii gosudarstvennyi universitet Press, 2002, 384 p. (In Russian)
- Dmitriev A.A. *Ekonomicheskie ocherki Permi Velikoi (Cherdynskii i Solikamskii krai na rubezhe XVI i XVII vv.)*. *Permskaia starina*, issue III. Perm, Tipografiia P.F. Kamenskogo Publ., 1891, 176 p. (In Russian)
- Dmitriev A.A. *Sledy russkikh poselenii v Permi Velikoi do poiavleniia Stroganovykh*. *Trudy Permskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi komissii*, issue 4. Perm, Tipografiia gubernskoi zemskoi upravly Publ., 1901, pp.71–77. (In Russian)
- Golovchanskii G.P., Mel'nichuk A.F. *Stroganovskie gorodki, ostrozhki, siola*. Perm, Knizhnyi mir Publ., 2005, 229 p. (In Russian)
- Ides I., Brand A. *Zapiski o russkom posol'stve v Kitai (1692–1695)*. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1967, 404 p. (In Russian)
- Karamzin N.M. *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, book 3, vol. IX. Kaluga, Zolotaia alleia Publ., 1993, 592 p. (In Russian)
- Katanov N.F. *Predanie toboľskikh tatar o Kuchume i Ermake*. *Toboľskii khronograf*, issue 4. Ekaterinburg, Ural'skii rabochii Publ., 2004, pp.145–167. (In Russian)
- Kazarinova N.S. *Oryol-gorodok i ego hudozhestvennoe nasledie XVI–XVIII vv.* Perm, Permskaia gosudarstvennaia khudozhestvennaia galereia Publ., 2018, 24 p. (In Russian)
- Kir'yanov I.K., Korenyuk S.N., Chagin G.N. *Rybolovstvo v Permskom krae v starodavnie vremena*. Perm, Knizhnyi mir Publ., 2007, 168 p. (In Russian)

<sup>67</sup> *Muhin V.V. Ermak Timofeevich*. Perm, 1957.

<sup>68</sup> *Mezenina T.G., Mosin A.G., Mudrova N.A., Neklyudov E.G. Rod Stroganovykh: Kul'turno-istoricheskie ocherki*. Ekaterinburg, 2007.

<sup>69</sup> *Preobrazhenskii A.A. Ural i Zapadnaia Sibir' v kontse XVI — nachale XVIII veka*. Moscow, 1972.

- Klyuchevskii V. O. *Russkaia istoriia: Polnyi kurs lektsii*, vol. 1. Moscow, AST Publ.; Minsk, Kharvest Publ., 2002. (In Russian)
- Kostochkin V. V. *Cherdyn', Solikamsk, Usol'e*. Moscow, Stroiizdat Publ., 1988, 184 p. (In Russian)
- Mezenina T. G., Mosin A. G., Mudrova N. A., Neklyudov E. G. *Rod Stroganovykh: Kul'turno-istoricheskie ocherki*. Ekaterinburg, Sokrat Publ., 2007, 256 p. (In Russian)
- Miller G. F. *Istoriia Sibiri*, vol. 1. Moscow; Leningrad, Vostochnaia literatura Publ., 1937, 631 p. (In Russian)
- Mudrova N. A. Roditel'skie letopistsy Stroganovskikh sinodikov kak istochnik po genealogii Stroganovykh. *Obshchestvennoe soznanie, knizhnost', literatura perioda feodalizma: Arkheografiia i istochnikovedenie Sibiri*. Novosibirsk, Tsentral'naia nauchnaia biblioteka Ural'skogo otdeleniia RAN Press, 1990, pp. 290–296. (In Russian)
- Muhin V. V. *Ermak Timofeevich*. Perm, Permskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo Publ., 1957, 46 p. (In Russian)
- Nikitin D. N., Nikitin N. I. *Pokorenie Sibiri. Voiny i pokhody kontsa XVI — nachala XVIII veka*. Moscow, Fond "Russkie Vitiazii" Publ., 2016, 124 p. (In Russian)
- Oborin V. A. Krest'ianskoe remeslo i promysly v Permi Velikoi v XVI–XVII vv. *Issledovaniia po istorii Urala*, 1970, no. 227, pp. 5–22. (In Russian)
- Oborin V. A. Oryol-gorodok. *Sovetskaia arkheologiia*, 1957, no. 4, pp. 145–164. (In Russian)
- Oborin V. A. *Zaselenie i osvoenie Urala v konce XI — nachale XVII veka*. Irkutsk, Izdatel'stvo Irkutskogo universiteta Press, 1990, 169 p. (In Russian)
- Oborin V. A., Korchagin P. A., Mel'nichuk A. F., Sokolova N. E. *Nizhnii Chusovskoi gorodok: Katalog arkheologicheskikh kollektzii*. I'insk, Tipografiia Upravleniia pechati i informatsii Permskoi oblasti Publ., 1994, 34 p. (In Russian)
- Okladnikov A. P. Pokhod Ermaka: Mif i real'nost'. *Nauka v SSSR*, 1982, no. 2, pp. 28–32. (In Russian)
- Ponosova I. S. Izraztsy Oryola-gorodoka. *Iz istorii nashego kraia*. Molotov, Molotovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet Press, 1956, pp. 48–57. (In Russian)
- Preobrazhenskii A. A. *Ural i Zapadnaia Sibir' v kontse XVI — nachale XVIII veka*. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1972, 392 p. (In Russian)
- Sergeev V. I. K voprosu o pokhode v Sibir' druzhiny Ermaka. *Voprosy istorii*, 1959, no. 1, pp. 117–129. (In Russian)
- Shashkov A. T. Sibirskii pokhod Ermaka: khronologiia sobytii 1581–1582 gg. *Izvestiia Ural'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 1997, no. 7, pp. 35–50. (In Russian)
- Shkerin V. A. Sylvenskii pohod Ermaka: oshibka ili poisk puti v Sibir'? *Etnokul'turnaia istoriia Urala, XVI–XX vv*. Ekaterinburg, Ural'skii gosudarstvennyi universitet Press, 1999, pp. 104–107. (In Russian)
- Shmyrov V. A. *Goroda Verkhnego Prikam'ia v XV — nachale XVIII veka*. PhD thesis (History). Perm, Permski gosudarstvennyi universitet Press, 1982, 16 p. (In Russian)
- Skrynnikov R. G. *Ermak*. Moscow, Molodaia gvardiia Publ., 2008, 256 p. (In Russian)
- Skrynnikov R. G. *Sibirskaiia ekspeditsiia Ermaka*. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1986, 320 p. (In Russian)
- Solodkin Ya. G. "Ermakovo vziatie" Sibiri: *Diskussionnye problemy istorii i istochnikovedeniia: monografiia*. Nizhneartovsk, Nizhneartovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet Press, 2015, 234 p. (In Russian)
- Solodkin Ya. G. K sporam o proiskhozhdenii Ermaka. *Zapadnaia Sibir': istoriia i sovremennost': Kraevedcheskie zapiski*, issue II. Ekaterinburg, Ural'skii rabochii Publ., 1999, pp. 128–131. (In Russian)
- Solov'iov S. M. *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremion*, vol. VI. Glava VII. Stroganovy i Ermak. St. Petersburg, Amfora Publ., 2015, 416 p. (In Russian)
- Vvedenskii A. A. *Dom Stroganovykh v XVI–XVII vv*. Moscow, Sotsekgiz Publ., 1962, 308 p. (In Russian)
- Zavarihin S. P. *V drevnem tsentre Sibiri*. Moscow, Iskusstvo Publ., 1987, 192 p. (In Russian)

Статья поступила в редакцию 18 сентября 2023 г.

Рекомендована к печати 10 апреля 2024 г.

Received: September 18, 2023

Accepted: April 10, 2024