

‘Licentious Girls’ and Frontier Domesticators: Women and Siberian Exile from the Late 16th to the Early 19th Centuries

Andrew A. Gentes

Abstract

This article aims at filling the historiographical gap of the part played by women in the early Siberian exile system. The state exploited both their bodies and labour, forcing them to be sexual pacifiers and producers of babies as well as ‘frontier domesticators’ in general. First sent in the late sixteenth century, their numbers increased after the *Ulozhenie* of 1649, which largely replaced the death sentence with exile. Further important stages in development were marked by Peter the Great as part of his construction of a service state and by Catherine the Great using Siberia for the purposes of expanding the population and removing schismatics. By the end of the eighteenth century, just over 50 per cent of more than half a million Russians living in Siberia’s rural areas were women, both exiles and ‘volunteers’. The article concludes that the treatment of such women impeded later Russian efforts to create a healthy society.

Keywords: Siberia, women, exile, colonization.

Introduction

One of the challenges in studying Siberia’s pre-nineteenth century exilic population is the lack of information distorting. In researching the tsarist exile system, I have been able to gather considerable evidence on women exiles during the late imperial period, but had difficulty accounting for them during the earlier period.¹ Although some of the late revolutionary movement’s leading women wrote and published exilic memoirs,² any studies of women exiles as a group prior to 1917 do not exist. Women exiles occasionally win brief mention in monographs by Soviet era historians, particularly the large group associated with the late L. M. Goriushkin of Novosibirsk University, yet no work is comparable to that, for example, by Deborah Oxley on women exiled to Australia.³

This article is a first step towards filling this historiographical gap. I draw upon various primary and secondary published sources to analyze the state’s treatment of women exiles between 1593, when Siberian exile began, and the early nineteenth century. My findings highlight the need for further and more narrowly focused research, yet suggest three key points of departure. First, I argue that the state used the exile system to exploit women’s bodies and labour, to assign them roles as ‘frontier domesticators’ and sexual pacifiers, and to capitalize upon their biological reproductivity for the purpose of expanding national and regional economies. However, the details and ideologies behind these processes require much more attention. Second, I demonstrate that the percentage of women among the exile population declined after 1800, establishing a trend that continued through 1917, but the reasons for this decline are not entirely clear. Third and finally, I suggest that precedents established during the period in question conditioned the treatment of women exiles during the late imperial period and possibly on into the Soviet period as well. This introduces a *longue durée* argument, which I plan to elaborate in a later article.

Women exiles during the Muscovite era

Women figured among the first group exiled to Siberia in 1593. That year, Boris Godunov banished what by some accounts was the entire population of Uglich to Pelym (a fort [*ostrog*] on the Tavda River east of Verkhotur’e in western Siberia) to punish it for having rioted two years earlier after the apparent murder of the tsarevich Dmitrii. In addition to being Dmitrii’s personal fief, Uglich was one of northern Russia’s principal trade and crafts centres, and so these first exiles likely belonged to the artisan estate (*posadskie liudi*). It seems that at Pelym they were put to work as fur collectors (*promyshlenniki*) and agricultural peasants.⁴ In this first instance of exile to Siberia, women as well as men were punished for political dissent, and similarly made to serve state interests.

As it expanded during the Muscovite era, the imperial state pacified Ukrainians, Circassians, and Cossacks through a combination of warfare and deportation to Siberia. Entire families and communities were exiled in an early form of ethnic cleansing. In Siberia, state servitors (*sluzhiliie liudi*) forced men to serve as Cossacks⁵ or *promyshlenniki* while sequestering their wives and children in the insalubrious *ostrogi* that formed the bases for such cities as Tobol'sk, Irkutsk, and Yakutsk. Officials sometimes assigned families to remote areas like the upper Lena River to grow food for labourers in what by the early seventeenth century was already a massive fur industry.

Whether assigned to *ostrogi* or 'to the field' (*na pashniu*), exiles faced dreadful conditions. In 1668, Tobol'sk *voevoda* P. I. Godunov appealed to Tsar Aleksei on behalf of the Cossack, Iakov Shul'gin, who with his family had been in exile in Yakutsk *ostrog* for several years. 'Iakov, with his wife and children ..., now, without you, great sovereign, without money and without bread and salt and without a daily ration, ... wanders among houses begging in Christ's name, dying of starvation.'⁶ In 1641, the Siberian Department (*Sibirskii prikaz*), responsible for overseeing settlement and exploitation of what the crown often called its 'colony,' cobbled together a large party of 188 Ukrainians, 93 of whom were men, the rest women and children. They were compelled to undertake a four-year peregrination to the headwaters of the Lena River, during which their sufferings matched those of the ill-fated Donner Party in the American Rockies.⁷ As the state uprooted them from their ancestral homes and sent them into the wilderness women, like their husbands and fathers, often needlessly suffered and died because of bureaucratic ineptitude.

Women unfortunate enough to be married to convicted criminals⁸ constituted the largest exilic group. Nineteenth-century officials would come to refer to women and children who accompanied their husbands and fathers into exile as *dobrovol'nye*, implying they had 'voluntarily' chosen to march thousands of miles into Siberia to share the men's trials and tribulations. Although in the nineteenth century women were not legally bound to do so, they had little choice but to go, since neighbours ostracized and economically discriminated against 'exiles' widows' in the same way they did actual widows and soldiers' wives (*soldatki*).⁹ As such, exiles' wives had virtually no more freedom to remain behind than did those of the Muscovite era, who by law typically had to accompany their exiled husbands. In light of this continuity and despite the anachronism, the term *dobrovol'nye* is used here to refer to all 'free' women who accompanied convicts and others to Siberia.

Prior to 1649, the number of criminals exiled to Siberia was in fact quite small, totaling perhaps only several hundred.¹⁰ Tsar Aleksei's *Ulozhenie* of that year almost entirely replaced capital punishment with exile and *ipso facto* greatly increased the exile rate. Much of the *Ulozhenie* left exiles' destinations indeterminate; for example, subjects discovered possessing tobacco were to be knouted in the marketplace, have their nostrils slit and noses cut off, and be 'punished by being exiled to distant cities chosen by the Sovereign.' Only article 13, chapter XIX, specifically designated Siberia (literally, 'the Lena River') as an exile destination. Nevertheless, Siberian exile flourished thanks to the 1649 *Ulozhenie*.¹¹

Under the new laws covering murder and other serious crimes, women, unlike men, remained more likely executed than exiled. Yet because the *Ulozhenie* and many of the 1500 amendments added over the next 50 years stipulated that, if exiled, convicts families were to accompany them, the number of women deported to Siberia grew:

Those thieves and robbers who through their own fault would have been sentenced by previous *ukazy* to death . . . [read one 1653 *ukaz*], will instead of the death penalty be knouted, have a finger cut from their left hand, and be exiled to [either] Siberian, the lower [*ponizovye*], or frontier [*ukrainnye*] cities with their wives and children.¹²

Counterfeiters were to be exiled to Siberia along with their families; and a 1680 *ukaz* ordered that instead of having their hands, feet, or fingers amputated, those guilty of two or more robberies be exiled with their families.¹³ These *ukazy* were used by Moscow to populate the frontier with Russians and other Slavs, but they also produced an entire cadre of innocent victims. There may even have been more *dobrovol'nye* than there were criminals in Siberia during the 1600s. For instance, between 1640 and 1700, 1880 *dobrovol'nye* (including children) arrived in the upper Lena *krai*, as compared to 1150 convicts.¹⁴

An analogy to Romanov Russia's *dobrovol'nye* phenomenon existed in Qing China, where the ancient doctrine of 'collective responsibility' stipulated the exile of major offenders' relatives.¹⁵ Russia continued to produce *dobrovol'nye* into the Soviet period, when especially under Stalin spousal propinquity to an 'enemy of the people' was cause enough to be sent to the GULag. Russian 'collective responsibility,' therefore, would seem conditioned as much by moral imperatives similar to those in China as by the

statist concerns noted above. *Dobrovol'nye*, in other words, were products of both state and society.

In addition to assigning exiles to the servitor and peasant estates, Muscovy exiled artisans to buttress the small numbers surrounding Siberia's fledgling cities. In 1637, the year the Siberian Department was established, 300 families were deported from the northern towns of Vologda, Tot'ma, Zheleznyi Ustiug, and Sol'vychevodsk, each renowned for its crafts industries. As part of this operation, officials also deported 150 'girls' (*devki*) to serve as wives for Cossacks and other servitors.¹⁶ Strictly speaking, neither the families nor the so-called girls were exiles (*ssyl'nye*) but rather 'transferees' (*perevedentsy*), since they were deported not for punishment but as proprietary objects of the crown. None the less, their treatment at the hands of the state rendered them *de facto* exiles.

A brief look at the history of Russian slavery and sexual politics helps to contextualize further Muscovy's use of these 150 'girls'. By the early seventeenth century, slavery had a long pedigree in both Russia and Siberia. Between 1430 and 1714, the state registered 5575 individual slaves of various types, but these represented only a portion of a much larger total.¹⁷ In Siberia, purchase of natives as slaves was common. For example, in 1647 Martin Vasil'ev, an officer assigned to Yakutsk *ostrog*, petitioned Tsar Aleksei for permission 'to have the young woman [a Yakut named Bakaian] whom I bought to do my work for me baptized into Orthodox Christianity and have the priest teach her prayers.' A 1679 document details the successive sales of a 'young Tungus woman named Lavruk,' first purchased by a Cossack, then sold after his death to a Tungus named Kevani, who then sold her to a fellow tribesman named Inkan.¹⁸ Peter I abolished slavery in Russia, but it persisted in Siberia because so many more Russian men than women were there. Empress Anna gave royal imprimatur to what was already the longstanding practice by which Russians purchased native girls as pubescent brides; and in 1767, Catherine II approved the purchase of natives legally defined as 'slaves' (*raby*). The government did not prohibit slavery in Siberia until 1822, but a scant three years later the Senate authorized Siberian administrators to purchase 'female children' (*deti zhenskogo pola*) from among natives so as to provide exiles with wives. Nineteenth-century historian, G. S. Fel'dstein, referred to the 150 roubles paid for each of these girls as a 'bounty' (*premiia*), thereby hinting at excesses committed by male natives seeking to provide goods for this lucrative market.¹⁹

Overlapping and intertwining developments of exile, slavery, and sexual politics suggest that the state conceptualized females, whether Russian or native, as primarily reproductive organs, or procreative engines, within the national economic superstructure. A brief look at prostitution will help explain what is meant. There is no evidence that the 150 'girls' dispatched to Siberia in 1637 were prostitutes, or even considered to be 'loose'. Nevertheless, it will do to point out that once prostitution became prevalent during the late imperial period all women convicted of petty offences tended to receive stiffer sentences than in earlier years. Although the number of women sentenced to exile actually declined during the late imperial period, the sexual exploitation of those exiled reflected the growing anxiety of the patriarchy about the challenges assertive women posed, whether or not these challenges reflected a newfound sexuality.²⁰ Therefore, it may be that this seventeenth century exploitation of 150 vulnerable females was a similar kind of compensatory act by a patriarchal state responding to perceived aggressions from the general female population. What these aggressions could have been are beyond the scope of this article,²¹ but the point to be made here is that although Muscovy intended that these 'girls' would serve statist ends by giving birth to new generations of servitors and peasants. It simultaneously established a precedent for later psychosexual violations against women exiles.²²

In addition to calculatedly viewing women as biological engines driving Siberian colonization, the Muscovite patriarchy also fancifully regarded them as 'domesticators' who could offset and pacify the wild beast that was man. Looking back on three centuries of transuralic exile, the authors of a 1900 official history entitled *Ssylka v Sibir'* wrote that 'Even the most impassioned worshipers [of pre-Petrine exile] recognized that [it] was rife with serious deficiencies.' One of these deficiencies was women, because of whose absence, the authors concluded, 'incest, illegal cohabitation, illegal marriages, and all forms of lechery occurred ordinarily in Siberian life at that time, attracting the special attention of even the upper hierarchy of the church.' To solve this problem, Muscovy 'demanded from the local population ... their own daughters and female kin and threatened disobedient persons with "large fines."' Such acquisitions did little to help.²³ As this and other documents indicate, nineteenth-century Russians shared contemporary Englishmen's quintessentially Victorian view of women as frontier domesticators,²⁴ but a similar view of women is evidenced by Russia's early efforts to colonize Siberia. Nancy Shields Kollmann has observed in her work on Muscovite laws and legal proceedings that when women fulfilled domestic and reproductive functions designated by the ruling patriarchy, they reinforced this same patriarchy.²⁵ Her conclusion helps to explain why the state understood that Cossacks' and servitors' penetrations deep into Siberia had eventually to be accompanied by that complex of socio-sexual norms that reified the patriarchy's *raison d'être*, for otherwise its colonies'

staying power would have been as ephemeral as that of the Vikings in North America.

A letter sent by Tobol'sk *voevoda* Matvei Godunov to Moscow in the 1620s indicates Siberian officials' concerns when such norms were absent or cast aside, as they usually were when Cossacks and *promyshlenniki* piled into town to blow off steam by drinking and brawling. During these sometimes-murderous bacchanals, even monks and nuns demonstrated 'scandalous behaviour' and 'un-Christian manner[s],' wrote Godunov.²⁶ Therefore, virtuous wives and maidens were needed to provide rough frontiersmen and exiles what Godunov's fallen brides of Christ could not: homes and families by which to anchor them geographically and emotionally and upon which civilization would incrementally develop. For this principal reason, the state drew upon utilitarian and idyllic conceptualizations to justify removing women to Siberia, as either *dobrovol'nye* or designated brides. By 1709, estimated the Siberianist P. A. Slovtsov, women already comprised nearly a third of the 44,000 exiles living in Siberia.²⁷

From Peter I to Catherine II (1689–1762)

As historians from Kliuchevskii to Evgenii Anisimov have so well shown, Peter I took the servitor state construct far beyond that of his predecessors. Russian women's prospects were influenced accordingly for good and ill. Peter's investigatory visits to Holland may have briefly influenced Russia's treatment of female criminals. Years before the lamely disguised tsar arrived in Amsterdam, in 1645 the city had opened the Spinhuis, an asylum, devoted to reforming exclusively women prisoners by engaging them in textile production. '[A]s a separate prison for women,' writes penal historian Lucia Zedner, 'it remained virtually unique. Throughout Europe, women were generally housed within male prisons and often herded alongside men with little concern for the likely results.'²⁸ However, in a recent study Anisimov notes the existence in 1723 of a similar 'spinning house' (*priadil'nyi dvor*) in Petersburg, employing 30 women convicts and owned, interestingly enough, by the Dutchman Jan Tammes.²⁹ Tammes, according to another source, entered Russia as early as 1706, whence Peter put him in charge of Moscow's linen factories.³⁰ That, like its Amsterdam predecessor, the Petrine *spinhuis* incarcerated women separately from men makes it an outstandingly rare example of progressiveness in Russia's otherwise retrograde penological development.

This is not to say penal conditions were much superior elsewhere. Prior to the mid-1800s women's prisons were rare in Western Europe and North America as well.³¹ However, after Peter, Russian penology followed a quite different path from its western counterpart, thanks largely to a succession of malfeasant administrations. For example, consciously imitating Peter, Catherine II ordered the establishment of separate workhouses (*rabochie doma*) for male and female offenders in each *guberniia* capital; but her failure to fund the project prevented its realization and, like her predecessors, she continued to rely upon exile instead of establishing the western-style prison system she ostensibly desired. Not until 1827 did the Senate designate a second separate facility for women convicts, the Tel'minsk linen factory outside Irkutsk. However, Tel'minsk excluded those convicted of murder, robbery, or brigandage and so women in these categories continued to be mixed in with the exiled male convict population.³² Moreover, Tel'minsk's distinction as a women's 'carceral' (*pace* Foucault, 'institution' would be misleading) did not last long: in 1839, the Ministry of Internal Affairs reported slightly more male than female convicts there.³³

Peter had also been 'progressive' to the extent that, late in his reign, he absolved the wives of convicts sentenced to penal labour (*katorga*) from having to accompany their husbands into exile. Before the expansion of metallurgical operations at Nerchinsk in the 1760s, *katorga* sites were mostly located along the Baltic littoral (e.g. Petersburg, Port Rogervik, the Reval fortress) or in Orenburg *krai* (then administered as part of Siberia), where convicts built fortifications against the Kazakhs. These places could be especially brutal for women. Because a *katorga* sentence imposed upon the convict a 'civil death' (*kazennaia smert'*), Peter reasoned that it nullified marriage vows and freed a woman to remarry, enter a monastery, or return home to live with her parents.³⁴

However, women's prison and fair treatment of convicts' wives should not suggest that Peter possessed an enlightened, reformatory notion of justice. Far from it; Petrine justice, as one observer noted, was casuistic at best; it meant to serve only the state's interests. The notion of a reformatory penology would have to wait until the Enlightenment, when Beccaria, Montesquieu, and other devotees of humane or at least rational punishment influenced the empresses Elizabeth and Catherine II. If the former's official replacement of the death penalty with banishment and the latter's abolition of the knout's use on women corroborated (and to some extent were ahead of) contemporaneous penal reforms in Western Europe and North America, then both empresses' consistently statist approach

toward subjects in general and convicts in particular reflected more accurately than any fleeting humanitarian impulses, the real motives behind Siberian exile. For this reason, at least in the sphere of penology, the continuities overshadow the caesuras between the Petrine and post-Petrine eras.³⁵

Indeed, Peter's deportation of some 4,000 servitors and *dobrovol'nye* to the lower Don River for the purpose of supporting his ill-fated Azov fleet was to serve as a model for successors' colonial ambitions in Siberia.³⁶ Women and children were almost certainly among those dispatched during the 1730s by Empress Anna to colonize Kamchatka and Orenburg, where in both places many died because of officials' bungling and cruelty.³⁷ Similarly operating on the assumption of woman's civilizing influence, Elizabeth deported women convicts expressly to serve as wives for Siberia's hardscrabble Russian males. In 1759, 77 women between the ages of 19 and 40 – one-third of whom had murdered their husbands, ten their children, and one her father – arrived in Omsk, Orenburg's administrative centre and principal fortress. Garrison commander K. L. Frauendorf divvied them up among officers, Cossacks, soldiers, and clerks. Elizabeth approved a similar plan to redistribute women exiles that were for some reason inhabiting forts along the Irtysh River, but '[d]ue to ... the licentiousness of the "women and girls,"' writes Fel'dstein, 'the settled population carefully avoided them.'³⁸

Fel'dstein's comment introduces centuries old patriarchal mores that branded as whores or fallen women those who had premarital sex.³⁹ Along with the fact that these 'women and girls' had been held in forts overwhelmingly occupied by males, his choice of words suggests their putative 'licentiousness' was the result of having endured some form of sexual bondage. In the first place, these females' status as murderesses legitimated the state's use of them as sexual chattels; yet, ironically, their very criminal and sexual backgrounds hindered subsequent efforts to make them serve the dual role of frontier domesticator. As for the *dobrovol'nye* Anna deported to Kamchatka and Orenburg, they were expected to maintain previously established domestic roles as wives and mothers, albeit in environments so unforgiving as to more likely shape than be shaped by these women. The chasm between civilization and the barbarism that these women were to bridge was nullified once they and their families did whatever necessary to survive.

Administrative exile

One way by which numerous women, like men, found themselves banished to Siberia was the non-judicial procedure of administrative exile (*ssylka po administrativnomu poriadku*).⁴⁰ Until the mid-eighteenth century, only state and church officials exercised exilic authority. This changed on 13 December 1760 when the Senate extended it to individual and monastic serf owners. Working from lists typically prepared by village elders, serf owners could now hand over to the state for removal to Siberia male or female serfs deemed 'indecent,' 'obscene,' or 'rude.' Not crimes but behavioural traits, these characteristics were nevertheless capitalized upon as indelible flaws denoting one for communal excision. The same *ukaz* also extended exilic authority to *obshchestva* (peasant communal associations) and *meshchanstva* (artisanate communal associations). Males 15 years or older registered credit towards either a serf owner's or a commune's military recruitment quota, and both received 20 roubles for each male under 15 and 10 roubles for each one under five. Females fetched half-price. During 1761 and 1762, three separate *ukazy* both reiterated and expanded upon the substance of the original.⁴¹ A person deported under this early form of administrative exile was called a *posel'shchik* – a diminutive of *poselenets* (settler) signifying the paternalism increasingly inflecting the crown's attitude towards its subjects. *Posel'shchiki* were used for the most part as agricultural colonists, though evidence suggests they also laboured in the Nerchinsk mines.⁴²

The rationale for granting serf owners and *obshchestva* such awesome punitive authority was the absence of police officials in the countryside. This lack of police persisted until the end of the monarchy, and administrative exile correspondingly played an essential role in *obshchestva*'s ability to police them.⁴³ Another factor behind the extension of exilic authority was the Romanovs' need to ingratiate themselves with the landowning nobility, who maintained this authority until emancipation, but if administrative exile addressed real security and political concerns, it also created an arena for abuse and a Gogolian speculation in living souls. There is little to support Richard Pipes's assertion that '[l]andlords . . . made exceedingly rare use of their right to exile serfs to Siberia ...'⁴⁴ 'Some landlords,' admits Jerome Blum, 'to save good workers from the army draft, banished inefficient and infirm serfs whose only offence was their ineptitude or incapacity.'⁴⁵ Evidence shows that in fact many did so. In the aftermath of a hubristic effort by Emperor Paul to use *posel'shchiki* and other exiles to colonize Zabaikal'e, a Senate investigation found that as many as 10 per cent of the male and female deportees sent there were epileptic, mentally retarded, or insane.⁴⁶ Responding to this and similar abuses, Alexander I rescinded landowners' exilic authority in a series of rulings issued between 1809 and 1811.

However, the ban gradually eroded under political pressure and in 1824, the Senate ordered provincial governors to accept ‘without limitation’ those serfs handed over for exile. Alexander had also initially rescinded *obshchestva*’s exilic authority, but reinstated it almost immediately, possibly in response to the lawlessness that broke out in western Russia following Napoleon’s invasion. Despite later efforts by government ministers and commissions to abolish administrative exile, peasants retained the right to banish their own until 1917.⁴⁷

A premier example of the marriage between administrative exile and the state’s colonial goals was its enforced settlement of the Baraba Steppe. A marshy plateau situated between Omsk and modern-day Novosibirsk, Baraba marked the largest operation before the nineteenth century to settle exiles. Immediately after the promulgation of its 1760 *ukaz*, establishing administrative exile, the government began gathering together *posel’shchiki* to fulfill three projects: 1) to construct that portion of the Great Siberian Road linking Omsk to the upper Ob’ watershed; 2) to serve as coachmen (*iamshchiki*) for delivering goods and mail along the vast expanse between Verkhotur’e and the village of Tulun, 320 kilometers west of Irkutsk; and 3) to populate and ‘civilize’ the Baraba Steppe, through which much of these first two activities were to take place. These projects began during the period 1760–1765, more or less in the order given.

Siberia’s Governor F. I. Soimonov first assigned an indeterminate number of exiles to begin building the road; then, although construction was apparently continuing, he assigned 1,500 *posel’shchiki* to work as coachmen. Virtually all the *posel’shchiki* in these first two projects would have been men, but in 1762, Soimonov began to assign as permanent settlers to Baraba the first *posel’shchik* families. This last project reflected Petersburg’s desire to secure western Siberia’s southern border by establishing a social infrastructure that would produce domestic consumables while protecting trade routes to China. That much of this area was (and remains) marshes, was not considered an obstacle. The government gave each family five roubles and 54 *pudy* of seed, absolved them of *obrok* payments for three years, and ordered them to raise cattle and sow five *desiatiny* (approximately 13.5 acres).⁴⁸

D. I. Chicherin took over the project when he replaced Soimonov as governor in 1763. Sources credit him with overseeing most of Baraba’s colonization, and evaluations of Chicherin are largely negative. The nineteenth century historian, I. Ia. Foinitskii went so far as to include Chicherin on his list of governors who brutalized Siberian society.⁴⁹ However, a contemporary of Foinitskii’s identified only as G. Peizen opined that settlement in Siberia had never been carried out on such a large scale as in Baraba Steppe, and there is still no colony in Siberia derived from exiles which has been established on such a simple basis and brought as much of an actual benefit to the region as that created by Governor Chicherin. The blooming [*tsvetushchiia*] villages and hamlets that now exist in the very best condition along the Baraba road constitute an indisputable monument to the energetic actions of the Siberian administrator.⁵⁰

Peizen’s praise of Chicherin should not be dismissed as mere sycophancy: in the same article he derides the government’s other colonial efforts and indicates more than a polemicist’s familiarity with his topic. Peizen is somewhat backed up by Soviet historian M. M. Gromyko, certainly no defender of Chicherin, who writes that as of 1771 a total of 25 villages comprising *posel’shchiki* and exiled fugitive peasants and totaling 2,459 men, 1,399 women, and 634 children had been founded in western Baraba. One village consisted entirely of serfs from the Orel region, another of penal labourers originally assigned to the Baltic coast. The largest village counted ninety households, the smallest 25. Krepenka, founded in 1764, possessed the largest adult male population (174).⁵¹

Other historians maintain that although a road was created and villages established, thousands of settlers died trying to graze their cattle in Baraba’s marshes; and Gromyko equivocally adds that many of the horses given to settlers died and that harvests were at least initially so poor as to cause famine in some areas. Furthermore, many of Baraba’s *posel’shchiki*, like those later sent to Zabaikal’e by Emperor Paul; appear to have been crippled, elderly, or otherwise incapable of work. The state itself later came to rue Chicherin’s despotic actions: *Ssylka v Sibir*’ reports that ‘gloomy legends’ about the thousands of settlers who died were still being told by residents of Baraba’s ‘blooming’ villages.⁵²

Unfortunately, available sources say almost nothing about the women exiled to Baraba or elsewhere in Siberia during the late eighteenth century, but the state’s heavy reliance upon *posel’shchiki* for colonial purposes strongly suggests that the number of exiled women was nearly equal to the number of exiled men. A consideration of the schismatics also deported by Catherine II helps support this conclusion. Comprehensive statistics are elusive, but in 1772 the German traveller P. S. Pallas reported 2,520 Old Believers living in eight settlements along the Selenga River east of Lake Baikal, where they were colloquially known as *semeiskie*, a word connoting both ‘family’ and ‘seed.’⁵³ Four years later, a Scandinavian doctor travelling with the Russian military described the villages of Bobrovskoe and

Sekisovskoe, located on the Irtysh River in the Altai, as populated exclusively by Polish exiles. In fact, these Russian Old Believers had fled to Poland but were then captured by Catherine's troops and given the choice of settling in Siberia or facing severer reprisals. Bobrovskoe and Sekisovskoe each had between 200 and 300 households and, according to the doctor, were founded in the late 1760s – roughly coincident with Russia's annexation of certain Polish territories in 1767. Their inhabitants were 'honest and hard-labouring farmers,' in contrast to 'the negligent, debauched, so-called *posel'shchiki* exiled from Russia.'⁵⁴ Similar investigations during the early nineteenth century revealed thousands of Old Believers – both Catherinian exiles and their descendents – living in communities in the Altai and Zabaikal'e. Some 8,000 male Old Believers populated a 400-verst-long series of villages in Verkhneudinsk *uezd* in Zabaikal'e, where most engaged in raising cattle. The majority seems to have had families. When the Decembrist brothers Nikolai and Mikhail Bestuzhev settled there after completing their *katorga* terms they found that, excepting the native Buriats, Old Believers made up the bulk of the population.⁵⁵

Statistical impact

Statistical data and foreign visitors' impressions together suggest that exile made a significant impact on Siberia during the late eighteenth century. Soviet historian A. D. Kolesnikov estimates that Russia exiled up to 35,000 males to Siberia between 1761 and 1781.⁵⁶ By adding the *dobrovol'nye*, British historian Alan Wood arrives at a figure of 60,000 adults, but he notes that most of the documents needed to confirm any estimates were destroyed by fire in Tobol'sk in 1788.⁵⁷ However, at least two sources exist to corroborate Wood's estimate. In 1770 Count Maurice Benyowsky, while *en route* to his own exile in Kamchatka, learned of 22,000 exiles living in Tobol'sk *guberniia* alone⁵⁸; and 12 years later the imperial revision, or census, reported 29,108 adult male exiles in all of Siberia.⁵⁹ If just half the men in this latter group were accompanied by a wife and one child who survived into adulthood, then the combined number of adult exiles and *dobrovol'nye* would have been 45,000. Wood's estimate of 60,000 is, therefore, entirely plausible. Additionally, there is the impressionistic evidence of the American John Ledyard, who visited Irkutsk and its environs in the late 1780s:

Not a day passes scarcely but an exile of some sort arrives here[.] There are in this town at present 150. The most of the Inhabitants, and particularly of this remote part of Siberia, are convicts. I find that the worst idea I had formed of the Country, and its Inhabitants does not require correction.⁶⁰

Administrative exile alone resulted in large numbers deported to Siberia. Following the crown's invitation to participate in the already oft-abused application of exile the lowliest of subjects, that is, the peasants, far from exercising this terrible authority with equanimity and prudence, eagerly exceeded their rulers' arbitrariness and improbity. Civilian use of administrative exile grew so widespread that by the early nineteenth century administrative exiles accounted for nearly half of all exiles, who during the period 1827–1831 averaged 9000 per annum. Of the 80,000 persons administratively exiled between 1827 and 1846, 18 per cent (14,135) were women. This percentage later declined; but adding *dobrovol'nye* to those exiled for punishment, the percentage of females among the administrative exile population became much higher.⁶¹

However, as a whole, and despite an increase in absolute numbers, the proportion of women among the exile population declined after 1800. The main reason seems to have been that expansion of Siberia's Russian female population was being achieved through means other than exile. One factor was voluntary emigration; but natural population growth was much more significant. Already by 1797 females accounted for over half (50.5 per cent) of the 565,756 Russians inhabiting Siberia's rural areas.⁶² Other possible factors behind this expansion, such as official policies and perceptions of women, demand more attention than can be given here.

Women in *Katorga*: forecasting the late Imperial period

There is little information to be gleaned from available sources on the small numbers of women sentenced to *katorga* before 1861. The Tel'minsk linen factory near Irkutsk already mentioned as a site for women penal labourers; women also laboured in Nerchinsk and other industrial sites. Fugitive exile lists found in the Irkutsk State Provincial Archive go some way toward limning a picture of Siberian *katorga* during the early nineteenth century; but within a database predominated by male actors, the description of 'the Woman [*Zhenka*] Aksin'ia Agapitova' as having been among a group that fled the

Irkutsk salt works is unique.⁶³ Most women at *katorga* sites were not convicts but *dobrovol'nye*. This despite the 1722 law absolving wives from having to follow convict husbands into exile, for if they remained in their communities such women faced dire poverty and social ostracism. Even if divorced by their husbands they nevertheless suffered because of the 'collective responsibility' discussed earlier.

An anonymous article published in 1878 in *Russkaia starina* provides an example of life in the *katorga* archipelago. The author recalls his 1818 visit to Okhotsk, on the frigid north Pacific coast, where he found exiles labouring in a salt works. Like the contingent of sailors assigned to guard them, the 250 male convicts lived in barracks; but the wives of those who were married maintained separate domiciles nearby. The military command apparently allowed all the convicts to spend until nine o'clock each evening in the wives' homes, where, according to the author, marathon card games were played using bricks and coal as gambling chips. Also available, seem to have been the wives. 'For the dirty, beaten women of disfigured fortune,' writes the author in the overwrought style so appreciated by readers of the time, 'there is passionate love afire; [the men are] rabidly jealous, envious of the predilections of a beauty, leading to frequent fights and often to factions opposing factions [*partiiia na partiiu*].' The author tried to question a convict named Levka, who was beaten for having relations with another convict's wife. Levka refused to identify those who assaulted him, knowing that the criminals' code of honour condemned 'rats' to death.⁶⁴

Despite stylistic flourishes, this account suggests the dangers women in all criminal societies face, and a criminal society is what the Russian government turned Siberia into. Exploitation at Okhotsk and other sites merely crystallized tsarism's large scale economic and sexual exploitation of women via the mechanisms of the exile system. Rather than protect these women, officials facilitated and participated in their exploitation. A state's treatment of its criminal and lower classes is a distillation of its relationship to society, and the Siberian exile system's central role in Russia's penological and territorial development makes clear that the treatment of *dobrovol'nye* and other women exiles impeded later efforts to create a healthy society.

Notes

1 See Andrew A. Gentes, 'Roads to Oblivion: Siberian Exile and the Struggle between State and Society in Russia, 1593–1917' (Ph.D. dissertation; Brown, 2002).

2 See, e.g. 'Nerchinskaia katorga, 1900–1917: Memuary, foto karta, biografii' [http:// www.memo.ru/nerczinsk/](http://www.memo.ru/nerczinsk/); Marie Sukloff, *The Life Story of a Russian Exile*, Gregory Yarros (trans.) (London: William Heinemann), 1915; Barbara Alpern Engel, Clifford N. Rosenthal (eds, trans.), *Five Sisters: Women Against the Tsar* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977).

3 Deborah Oxley, *Convict Maids: The Forced Migration of Women to Australia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

4 See I. V. Shcheglov, *Khronologicheskii perechen' vazhneishikh dannyykh iz istorii Sibiri: 1032–1882 gg.* (1883; rpt. Surgut: Severnyi dom, 1993), p. 47; F. A. Safronov, *Ssylka v vostochnuiu Sibir' v XVII veke* (Irkutsk: Irkutskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1967), pp. 12, 19; N. M. Iadrinsev, *Sibir' kak koloniia v geograficheskom, etnograficheskom i dopolnennoe* (S. Petersburg: Izdanie I. M. Sibiriakova, 1892), p. 245, n. 2; George Vernadsky, *A History of Russia*, 6th edn. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), pp. 113ff; W. Bruce Lincoln, *The Conquest of a Continent: Siberia and the Russians* (New York: Random House, 1994), p. 179. On the *posadskie liudi* see J. Michael Hittle, *The Service City: State and Townsmen in Russia, 1600–1800* (Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press, 1979).

5 By using both capitalized and lower case versions of this word I hope to distinguish between ethno-culturally homogeneous groupings (e.g. Don Cossacks) and 'cossacks' in Siberia, where the term most often signified a category (sometimes defined as a *soslovie*) of military irregulars and their families. N. E. Bekmakhanova writes that the ethnic mix of hosts east of the Urals was quite varied. 'For example, in the Iaik (Ural), Astrakhan', and Orenburg hosts cossacks were drawn from the ranks of the Bashkirs, *Tatar-mishari*, Kalmyks, Tatars, Nogai, etc. In these hosts served Cossacks, who represented the peoples of Siberia, the Altai, and others drawn from Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine, Belorussia, the Caucasus. However, the essential backbone of the Cossack hosts consisted of Russians.' N. E. Bekmakhanova, *Kazach'i voiska Aziatskoi Rossii v XVIII-nachale XX veka (Astrakhanskoe, Orenburgskoe, Sibirskoe, Semirechenskoe, Ural'skoe): Sbornik dokumentov* (Moscow: Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Insitutut Rossiiskoi Istorii, 2000), p. 42.

6 N. N. Pokrovskii, ed., *Pervoe stoletie sibiriskikh gorodov. XVII vek* [issue 7 of *Istoriia Sibiri. Pervoistichniki*] (Novosibirsk: Sibirskii khronograf, 1996), doc. n. 31. III, p. 105.

7 See Safronov, *Ssylka*, pp. 71–75. In the late 19th century, the Donner Party settlers were stranded by a series of blizzards and some resorted to cannibalism.

8 'Criminals' as defined by the state. Sociological analyses reveal 'criminals' and 'crime' to be externally defined concepts reflecting societies' given socio-cultural norms and not any intrinsic or absolute values. See Jack P. Gibbs, 'Conceptions of Deviant Behavior: The Old and the New,' *Deviant Behavior: A Text-Reader in the Sociology of Deviance*, 4th edn, Delos H. Kelly, ed. (New York: St Martin's, 1993), pp. 15–20.

9 Admittedly, this is an inference based on the demonstrated treatment of widows and *soldatki*. cf. Steven L. Hoch, *Serfdom and Social Control in Russia: Petrovskoe, a Village in Tambov* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 1986), pp.

161–162; Rodney D. Bohac, ‘Widows and the Russian Serf Community,’ *Russia’s Women*, op. cit., pp. 95–112.

10 According to figures published by P. N. Butsinkii in 1889, reproduced in Safronov, *Ssylka*, p. 19; V. I. Shunkov, *Ocherki po istorii kolonizatsii Sibiri v XVII-nachale XVIII vekov* (Moscow, Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1946), p. 15.

11 *Sobornoe ulozhenie tsaria Alekseia Mikhailovicha, 1649 goda*, K. A. Sofronenko, ed. [vol. 5 of *Pamiatniki russkovo prava*] (Moscow: Iuridicheskaiia literatura, 1957).

12 Quoted in Safronov, *Ssylka*, p. 15 (ellipsis in source). The ‘lower cities’ typically referred to the Kazan’ region.

13 N. D. Sergeevskii, *Rech’ v godovom SPB Iuridicheskago Obshchestva, 8 Marta 1887 goda, O ssylke v drevnei Rossii* (S.-Petersburg: Tipografiia Ministerstva putei soobshcheniia [A. Benke], 1887), p. 21.

14 Safronov, *Ssylka* table, p. 28.

15 Cf. Joanna Waley-Cohen, *Exile in Mid-Qing China: Banishment to Xinjiang, 1758–1820* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1991), pp. 37–38, 221–222 *et passim*.

16 Shcheglov, *Khronologicheskii perechen’*, pp. 46, 70; James Forsyth, *A History of the Peoples of Siberia: Russia’s North Asian Colony, 1581–1990* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 67. On the above-named cities, see G. M. Lappo, ed., *Goroda Rossii* (Moscow: Nauchnoe izdatel’stvo, 1994), pp. 87, 432, 475, 497.

17 Richard Hellie, *Slavery in Russia, 1450–1725* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 1982), table 2.3, p. 35.

18 Basil Dmytryshyn, et al., eds., *Russia’s Conquest of Siberia, 1558–1700: A Documentary Record*, Volume 1 (Portland: Oregon Historical Society Press, 1985), doc. nn. 71, 112.

19 See Marc Raeff, *Siberia and the Reforms of 1822* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1956), pp. 13–14, 62; Lev Dameshek, ‘“Ustav ob upravlenii inorodtsev” Speranskogo,’ *Zemlia irkutskaia* 8 (1997): pp. 17–19; Forsyth, *History*, pp. 67–69; Evgenii V. Anisimov, *The Reforms of Peter the Great: Progress through Coercion in Russia*, trans. John T. Alexander (Armonk, NY, London: M. E. Sharpe, 1993), pp. 197–202; Shcheglov, *Khronologicheskii perechen’*, p. 279; I.Ia. Foinitskii, *Uchenie o nakazanii v sviazi s tiur’movedeniem* (S.-Petersburg: Tipografiia Ministerstva putei soobshcheniia [A. Benke], 1889), pp. 286–287; G. S. Fel’dstein, *Ssylka: eia genezisa, znacheniiia, istorii i sovremennogo sostoiianiia* (Moskva: T-vo skoropechatni A. A. Levenson, 1893), pp. 169–170.

20 For example, women also began asserting themselves by claiming their legal rights. On society’s and the judiciary’s changing attitudes toward women see Stephen P. Frank, ‘Narratives within Numbers: Women, Crime and Judicial Statistics in Imperial Russia, 1834–1913,’ *Russian Review* 55, n. 4 (1996): pp. 541–566; Laura Engelstein, *The Keys to Happiness: Sex and the Search for Modernity in Fin-de-Siecle Russia* (Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 1992), pp. 84–88 *et passim*; Joan Neuberger, *Hooliganism: Crime, Culture, and Power in St Petersburg, 1900–1914* (Berkeley, London: University of California Press, 1993), pp. 34, 36–38 *et passim*. On late-nineteenth century popular hostility to peasant women, from which group most women exiles originated, see Cathy

A. Frierson, *Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in Late 19th Century Russia* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), ch. 8. The phenomenon of hostility towards women as a symptom of a changing social order seems to explain the similar mistreatment of women prisoners in late-nineteenth century American jails. cf. Estelle

B. Freedman, *Their Sisters’ Keepers: Women’s Prison Reform in America, 1830–1930* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1981), p. 16 *et passim*.

21 Consider, however, Valerie A. Kivelson, ‘Through the Prism of Witchcraft: Gender and Social Change in Seventeenth-Century Muscovy,’ *Russia’s Women: Accommodation, Resistance, Transformation*, Barbara Evans Clements, et al., eds. (Berkeley, Oxford: University of California Press, 1991), pp. 74–94.

22 A topic I discuss in my dissertation and will develop in my aforementioned followup article. Examples of sexual violence can be found in Anton Chekhov, *The Island: A Journey to Sakhalin*, trans. Luba and Michael Terpak (1967; rpt. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1977).

23 *Ssylka v Sibiri’: ocherk eia istorii i sovremennago polozheniia* (S.-Petersburg: Tipografiia S.-Peterburgskoi Tiur’mi, 1900), pp. 7–8.

24 The English had a number of colonial frontiers, of course, but I am thinking of Australia in this regard. cf. Robert Hughes, *The Fatal Shore* (New York: Knopf, 1986), pp. 244–272; Oxley, *Convict Maids*, *passim*; John Hirst, ‘The Australian Experience: The Convict Colony,’ *The Oxford History of the Prison: The Practice of Punishment in Western Society*, Norval Morris and David J. Rothman, eds. (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 244–245.

25 Nancy Shields Kollmann, ‘Women’s Honor in Early Modern Russia,’ *Russia’s Women*, pp. 60–73.

26 Dmytryshyn, *Russia’s Conquest*, doc. n. 38, p. 107.

27 P. A. Slotvsov, *Istoricheskoe obozrenie Sibiri. Stikhovoreniia. Propovedi*, V. A. Kreshchik, ed. (Novosibirsk: Ven-mer, 1995), table, pp. 219–220.

28 Lucia Zedner, ‘Wayward Sisters: The Prison for Women,’ *Oxford History of the Prison*, op. cit., p. 295.

29 According to one contemporary only attractive young women were employed there. Evgenii Anisimov, *Dyba i knut: politicheskii sysk i russkoe obshchestvo v XVIII veke* (Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 1999), pp. 656–657.

30 Klaus Gestwa, *Proto-Industrialisierung in Russland: Wirtschaft, Herrschaft und Kultur in Ivanovo und Pavlovo, 1741–1932* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), p. 62. (I wish to thank Professor Gijs Kessler for providing me this reference.) Linen manufacture was key to Peter’s development of a Russian navy.

31 In addition to the Zedner and Freedman works already cited, see the documents reproduced in David J. Rothman and Sheila M. Rothman, eds, *Women in Prison, 1834–1928* [series title, *Women & Children First: Social Reform Movements to Protect America's Vulnerable, 1830–1940*] (New York and London: Garland, 1987).

32 S. V. Maksimov, *Sibir' i katorga*, 3rd edn. (S.-Petersburg: Izdanie V. I. Gubinskago, 1900), 484. Under Catherine separate workhouses for men and women were established in Moscow, though apparently nowhere else. See P. V. Vlasov, *Blagotvoritel'nost' i miloserdie v Rossii* (Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, 2001), pp. 56–57.

33 'Izvlечение iz otcheta po Upravleniiu Irkutskoiu Guberniiu, za 1839 god. (Okanchanie),' *Zhurnal Ministerstva vnutrennykh del* 38 (October 1840): pp. 25–27. Foucault's relevant work is cited below.

34 Foinitskii, *Uchenie*, p. 269; *Ssylka v Sibir'*, p. 10.

35 On European and American penal history, see the above-cited *Oxford History of the Prison*; David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown, 1971); Michel Foucault, *Discipline & Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1977). The major text on Russia's penal history is M. N. Gernet, *Istoriia tsarskoi tiur'my*, 5 vol., 3rd edn. (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo iuridicheskoi literatury, 1960–63). On the Enlightenment's impact on Catherinian penology see Tatiana Cizova, 'Beccaria in Russia,' *Slavonic and East European Review* 40, n. 95 (1962); Isabel de Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1981), pp. 155ff.; John P. LeDonne, *Ruling Russia: Politics and Administration in the Age of Absolutism, 1762–1796* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 184–201 *et passim*; Bruce F. Adams, *The Politics of Punishment: Prison Reform in Russia, 1863–1917* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996), ch. 1–2. Elizabeth's reforms have received less scholarly attention than Catherine's, though the various works already cited discuss them partially. See also E. V. Anisimov, *Empress Elizabeth: Her Reign and Her Russia, 1741–1761*, ed. and trans. John T. Alexander (Gulf Breeze, Fla: Academic International Press, 1995), pp. 49ff.; A. B. Kamenskii, *Ot Petra I do Pavla I: Reformy v Rossii XVIII veka* (Moskva: Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Gumanitarnyi Universitet, 1999), ch. 4; W. Bruce Lincoln, *The Romanovs: Autocrats of All the Russias* (New York, London: Doubleday, 1981), 280–283; Alan Wood, 'Siberian exile in the eighteenth century,' *Siberica* 1, no. 1 (1990): pp. 38–63.

36 References to this colony were found in documents reproduced and collected in *Bulavinskoe vosstanie (1707–1708 gg.)* [vol. XII of *Krestianskie i natsional'nye dvizheniia nakanune obrazovaniia Rossiiskoi imperii*] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vsesoiuznago obshchestva politkatorzhan i ssyl'no-poselentsev, 1935), pp. 119, 124, 360. On the navy and the Azov campaign see Edward J. Phillips, *The Founding of Russia's Navy: Peter the Great and the Azov Fleet, 1688–1714* (Westport, Conn., London: Greenwood Press, 1995); Nikolaj N. Petruchintsev, 'The Two Fleets of Peter I: Technological Possibilities,' trans. Hans-Heinrich Nolte (This is an unpublished MS kindly sent to me by Professor Nolte.).

37 On the Kamchatka colony see G. Peizen, 'Istoricheskii ocherk kolonizatsii Sibiri,' *Sovremennik* 77, no. 9 (1859): pp. 22–24; Foinitskii, *Uchenie*, p. 267; *Ssylka v Sibir'*, pp. 14–15; Shcheglov, *Khronologicheskii perechen'*, p. 132; Fel'dstein, *Ssylka*, pp. 152, 156; Lappo, *Goroda Rossii*, p. 547. On the Orenburg colonies see Iu. I. Smirnov, *Orenburgskaia ekspeditsiia (komissii) i prisoedinenie Zavolzh'ia k Rossii v 30–40-e gg. XVIII veka* (Samara: Samarskii universitet, 1997), pp. 41–47, 56–57, 142.

38 Fel'dstein, *Ssylka*, pp. 156–157. See also Shcheglov, *Khronologicheskii perechen'*, pp. 166–167.

39 See Kollmann, 'Women's Honor': p. 72; Christine D. Worobec, 'Temptress or Virgin: The Precarious Sexual Position of Women in Postemancipation Ukrainian Society,' *Russian Peasant Women*, Beatrice Farnsworth and Lynne Viola, eds. (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 41–53; Barbara Alpern Engel, *Between the Fields & the City: Women, Work, & Family in Russia, 1861–1914* (New York, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 8, 55–57, 65.

40 See Alan Wood, 'The Use and Abuse of Administrative Exile to Siberia,' *Irish Slavonic Studies* 6 (1985): pp. 65–81.

41 *Ssylka v Sibir'*, pp. 46–47; V. M. Kabuzan and S. M. Troitskii, 'Dvizhenie naseleniia Sibiri v XVIII v.,' *Sibir' perioda feodalizma, vypusk I*, V. I. Shunkov, et al., eds. (Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo Sibirskogo otdeleniia AN SSSR, 1962), p. 149; Wood, *Siberica*: pp. 55–56.

42 See Alan Wood, 'Crime and Punishment in the House of the Dead,' *Civil Rights in Imperial Russia*, Olga Crisp and Linda Edmondson, eds. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 221; idem, 'Administrative Exile and the Criminals' Commune in Siberia,' *Land Commune and Peasant Community in Russia: Communal Forms in Imperial and Early Soviet Society*, Roger Bartlett, ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), pp. 396–397; idem, *Siberica*: p. 55; V. N. Dvorianov, *V sibirskoi dal'nei storone . . . (ocherki istorii politicheskoi katorgi i ssylki. 60-e gody XVIII v.–1917 g.)* (Minsk: Nauka i tekhnika, 1985), pp. 26–28; A. P. Okladnikov, et al., eds., *Istoriia Sibiri s drevneishikh vremen do nashikh dnei*, 5 vol. (Leningrad: Nauka, 1968), v. 2, p. 190.

43 Stephen P. Frank, *Crime, Cultural Conflict, and Justice in Rural Russia, 1856–1914* (Berkeley, London: University of California Press, 1999), pp. 30–36, 236–242. On the limited police presence in the countryside during Catherine's reign see LeDonne, *Ruling Russia*, pp. 91ff. LeDonne writes: 'Outside the two capitals there existed no separate police organization.'

44 Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974), p. 154.

45 Jerome Blum, *Lord and Peasant in Russia: from the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 430 [my italics].

46 The investigation's findings are summarized in Peizen, *Sovremennik*: pp. 28–32; *Ssylka v Sibir'*, p. 15.

47 *Ssylka v Sibir'*, pp. 49–54; N. M. Iadrintsev, *Russkaia obshchina v tiur'me i ssylke* (S. Peterburg: Tipografiia A. Morigerovskago, 1872), pp. 524–525.

48 M. M. Gromyko, *Zapadnaia Sibir' v XVIII v.: Russkoe naselenie i zemledel'cheskoe osvoenie* (Novosibirsk: 'Nauka' Sibirskoe

Otdelenie, 1965), p. 101; Okladnikov, *Istoriia*, v. 2, p. 191. On the need to fortify and settle the border, see LeDonne, *Ruling Russia*, pp. 278ff.

49 Foinitskii, *Uchenie*, pp. 274–275.

50 Peizen, *Sovremennik*, op. cit.: p. 25.

51 Gromyko, *Zapadnaia Sibir*’, pp. 101–102 and table 29, p. 103. Unfortunately, Gromyko provides no figure on the number of Krepenka’s households. Such information would serve to establish the ratio of households to adult males and help distinguish the men with families from the hired hands and the unemployed, who tended to be bachelors.

52 Gernet, *Istoriia*, v. 1, p. 65; *Ssylka v Sibir*’, p. 15; Shcheglov, *Khronologicheskii perechen*’, p. 132; Fel’dstein, *Ssylka*, p. 156.

53 A. M. Selishchev, *Zabaikal’skie staroobriadtsy. Semeiskie* (Irkutsk: Izdanie Gosudarstvennago Irkutskago Universiteta, 1920), pp. 71–72, 74.

54 ‘O sostoianii novykh poselenii v iuzhnoi Sibiri, i o tamoshchnem pchelovodstve. (Iz *Nordisches Archiv. juni* 1803. Sochinenie G. Berensa.) (Soobshcheno.),’ *Sibirskii vestnik* 2 (1820): pp. 293–305. The cross-border raids into Poland are mentioned in Donald W. Treadgold, ‘The Peasant and Religion,’ *The Peasant in Nineteenth-Century Russia*, Wayne S. Vucinich, ed. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968), p. 84.

55 ‘Zapiski o Sibiri. (Prilozhenie.) Kratkoe opisanie Zabaikal’skago kraia,’ *Zhurnal Ministerstva vnutrennykh del* 3 (1830): p. 173; N. A. Minenko, ‘Ssyl’nye krest’iane – “poliaki” na Altae v XVIII-pervoi polovine XIX v.,’ *Politicheskie ssyl’nye v Sibiri (XVIII-nachalo XX v.)*, L. M. Goriushkin, ed. (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1983), pp. 199–202; Jeanne Haskett, ‘Decembrist N. A. Bestuzhev in Siberian Exile, 1826–55,’ *Studies in Romanticism* 4, no. 4 (1965): p. 193.

56 A. D. Kolesnikov, ‘Ssylka i zaselenie Sibiri,’ *Ssylka i katorga v Sibiri (XVIII-nachalo XX v.)*, L. M. Goriushkin, et al., eds. (Novosibirsk: ‘Nauka’ Sibirskoe otdelenie, 1975), p. 51.

57 Wood, *Siberica* pp. 56, 59.

58 Oliver Pasfield, ed., *The Memoirs of Mauritius Augustus Count de Benyowsky in Siberia, Kamchatka, Japan, the Liukiu Islands and Formosa*, trans. William Nicholson (London: T. Fisher Unwin; New York: Macmillan, 1893), p. 95.

59 Cited in Dvorianov, *V sibirskoi storone*, p. 29.

60 *John Ledyard’s Journey through Russia and Siberia, 1787–1788: the Journal and Selected Letters*, Stephen D. Watrous, ed. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), pp. 152–153.

61 E. N. Anuchin, *Izsledovaniia o protsente soslannykh v Sibir’ v period 1827–1846 godov: materialy dlia ugolovnoi statistiki Rossii* (S.-Peterburg: Tipografiia Maikova, 1873), table, p. 23; *Ssylka v Sibir*’, appendices, tables, pp. 3–5, 6–13.

62 This figure comes from the imperial revision of that year, as reproduced in Shcheglov, *Khronologicheskii perechen*’, pp. 208–209. There is a computational error in the source’s total for males. Also, the total number of Russian settlers for this period differs slightly from those found in other sources. Cf. Donald W. Treadgold, *The Great Siberian Migration: Government and Peasant Resettlement from Emancipation to the First World War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), table 1, p. 32; Okladnikov, *Istoriia*, v. 2, table, p.184.

63 Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Irkutskoi Oblasti (GAIO), f. 435 [*Kirenskaia gorodskaia uprava*], op. 1, d. 87, l. 48. Circular from the Irkutsk guberniia administration to Kirensk and other local officials, 15 July 1807.

64 E.....v [anon.], ‘Ocherki, razskazy i vospominaniia: Ssyl’no-katorzhnye v Okhotskom solevarennom zavode,’ *Russkaia starina* 22 (June 1878): pp. 301–316, quotation on p. 304.