

Published in the Republic of Kazakhstan
Asian Journal “Steppe Panorama”
Has been issued as a journal since 2014
ISSN 3135-8055.
Vol. 13. Is. 5, pp. 1353-1372, 2026
Journal homepage: <https://ajspiie.com>

IRSTI / FTAXP / MPHTI 03.20
https://doi.org/10.51943/3135-8055_2026_13_5_1353-1372

LEASE RELATIONS IN THE IRTYSH TEN-VERST STRIP

Toraigyrov Yerzhan Muratovich¹, Beisembayeva Akmaral Rashidkyzy^{2*}, Dzhumashev Askar Mambetovich³

¹Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology
(28 Shevchenko Str., Almaty, 050010, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Candidate of Historical Sciences, Leading Researcher
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3586-5691>. E-mail: toranet2013@gmail.com

²Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology
(28 Shevchenko Str., Almaty, 050010, Republic of Kazakhstan)
PhD, Leading Researcher
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3599-9091>. E-mail: read_and_read@mail.ru
*Corresponding author.

³ Karakalpak Research Institute of Humanities, Karakalpak branch of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan
(179-A Amir Temur Str., Nukus, 230100, Karakalpakstan, Republic of Uzbekistan)
Candidate of Historical Sciences, Head of the Department of History
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3668-6510>. E-mail: djumashev@yahoo.de

© Ch. Ch. Valikhanov IHE, 2026
© Toraigyrov Ye.M., Beisembayeva A.R., Dzhumashev A.M., 2026

Abstract. *Introduction.* The Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip emerged in the course of the colonization of Northeastern Kazakhstan and the construction of a military line on lands traditionally used by Kazakh clans. In 1765, the border authorities prohibited Kazakhs from migrating within the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip, restricting their access to pastures and wintering grounds. The Kazakhs were later permitted to use these lands, but only as temporary users and upon payment of a prescribed fee. The lands themselves were not returned to the Kazakh population. Under these conditions, lease relations began to develop in the Irtysh region. *Goals and objectives.* The article examines the institutional preconditions for the formation and development of lease relations within the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip from 1765 to 1910. The lower chronological boundary marks the establishment of the restricted strip, while the upper boundary corresponds to the 1910 resurvey used for the final statistical comparison. The authors consider changes in the conditions governing Kazakh access to lands along the Irtysh, the arrangements for the use and administration of these lands, the forms and amounts of payments levied, and the impact of leasing on the economic circumstances of the Kazakh population. *Materials and methods.* This study is based on documents from the Historical Archive of the Omsk Region and the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan, materials from statistical expeditions that surveyed the Irtysh region, and published pre-revolutionary sources. The sources were analyzed using problem-chronological and comparative-historical methods, source criticism, and descriptive quantitative analysis of the published survey data. *Results.* Initially, Kazakhs paid a remount levy for

the use of lands within the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip, the proceeds of which went to the Siberian Cossack Host. Subsequently, the levy in kind was replaced by a monetary payment, and in 1880 it was superseded by rent. Kazakh households, which had previously used these lands freely, were compelled to lease pastures on lands of the Siberian Cossack Host, including officers' allotments. The amount of rent depended on the quality and location of the land and gradually increased. As payments rose, some Kazakh households moved to less favorable reserve lands of the Host, while others left Cossack landholdings altogether. Subleasing also became widespread: primary tenants relet leased plots to other households at higher rates. *Conclusion.* Lease relations within the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip developed as a consequence of restrictions imposed on Kazakh access to traditional pastures, wintering grounds, and hayfields. For the Siberian Cossack Host, leasing these lands became a regular source of revenue, whereas for Kazakh households, leasing was necessary to maintain their pastoral economy. Rising rents and the spread of subleasing increased the economic dependence of Kazakh households. Lease relations thus became one of the instruments of the Russian Empire's colonial land policy: Kazakhs were compelled to pay for the use of lands that had formed part of their traditional land-use system before imperial restrictions were imposed.

Keywords: Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip, Irtysh region, Kazakhs, Siberian Cossack Host, land leasing, subleasing, land use, colonial policy

Acknowledgments. This article was prepared with the financial support of the Committee of Science, Ministry of Science and Higher Education, project IRN AP26104261 « The history of the creation of the Irtysh ten-verst strip and the struggle of the Kazakhs for its return (1765-1921)».

For citation: Toraigyrov Ye.M., Beisembayeva A.R., Dzhumashev A.M. Lease relations in the irtysh ten-verst strip // Asian Journal “Steppe Panorama”. 2026. Vol. 13. No. 5. Pp. 1353–1372. (In Eng.). DOI: 10.51943/3135-8055_2026_13_5_1353-1372

ЕРТІС ОН ШАҚЫРЫМДЫҚ БЕЛДЕУІ АУМАҒЫНДАҒЫ ЖАЛҒЕРЛІК ҚАТЫНАСТАР

Торайғыров Ержан Мұратұлы¹, Бейсембаева Ақмарал Рашидқызы^{2*}, Джумашев Аскар Мамбетович³

¹Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты
(Шевченко көшесі, 28, 050010, Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы)
Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, жетекші ғылыми қызметкері
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3586-5691>. E-mail: toranet2013@gmail.com

²Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты
(Шевченко көшесі, 28, 050010, Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы)
PhD докторы, жетекші ғылыми қызметкері
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3599-9091>. E-mail: read_and_read@mail.ru

*Автор-корреспондент.

³Өзбекстан Республикасы Ғылым академиясы Қарақалпақ бөлімшесінің Қарақалпақ гуманитарлық ғылымдар ғылыми-зерттеу институты
(Әмір Темір көшесі 179-а, 230100, Нүкіс қ., Қарақалпақстан, Өзбекстан Республикасы)
Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, тарих бөлімінің меңгерушісі
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3668-6510>. E-mail: djumashev@yahoo.de

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2026

© Торайғыров Е.М., Бейсембаева А.Р., Джумашев А.М., 2026

Аңдатпа. *Kipicne.* Ертис он шақырымдық белдеуі Солтүстік-Шығыс Қазақстанды отарлау және қазақ руларының дәстүрлі жерлерінде әскери шеп салу барысында қалыптасты. 1765 жылы шекаралық билік қазақтардың Ертис он шақырымдық белдеуі аумағында көшіп-қонуына

тыйым салып, олардың жайылымдар мен қыстауларға қол жеткізуін шектеді. Кейін қазақтарға бұл жерлерді пайдалануға рұқсат берілгенімен, олар тек уақытша пайдаланушылар ретінде және белгіленген төлем төлеу шартымен пайдалана алды. Жердің өзі қазақ халқына қайтарылған жоқ. Осындай жағдайда Ертіс өңірінде жалгерлік қатынастар қалыптаса бастады. *Мақсаты мен міндеттері.* Мақала 1765–1910 жылдар аралығындағы Ертіс он шақырымдық белдеуі аумағында жалгерлік қатынастардың қалыптасуының институционалдық алғышарттары мен даму үдерісін зерттеуге арналған. Төменгі хронологиялық шек тыйым салынған белдеудің құрылуымен, ал жоғарғы шек қорытынды статистикалық салыстыру үшін материалдары пайдаланылған 1910 жылғы қайта зерттеумен айкындалады. Авторлар қазақтардың Ертіс бойындағы жерлерге қол жеткізу жағдайларының өзгеруін, бұл жерлерді пайдалану және басқару тәртібін, алынған төлемдердің түрлері мен мөлшерін, сондай-ақ жалгерліктің қазақ халқының шаруашылық жағдайына ықпалын қарастырады. *Материалдар мен әдістер.* Зерттеу Омбы облысының тарихи архиві мен Қазақстан Республикасы Орталық мемлекеттік архивінің құжаттарына, Ертіс өңірін зерттеген статистикалық экспедициялардың материалдарына, сондай-ақ революцияға дейінгі кезеңде жарияланған дереккөздерге негізделген. Дереккөздерді талдау барысында проблемалық-хронологиялық және салыстырмалы-тарихи әдістер, деректанулық сын, сондай-ақ жарияланған зерттеу деректерін сипаттамалық сандық талдау қолданылды. *Нәтижелер.* Алғашқы кезеңде қазақтар Ертіс он шақырымдық белдеуінің жерлерін пайдаланғаны үшін Сібір казак әскерінің кірісіне түсетін жөндеу алымын төледі. Кейін заттай алынатын алым ақшалай төлеммен ауыстырылып, 1880 жылы оның орнына жалдау ақысы енгізілді. Бұған дейін аталған жерлерді еркін пайдаланған қазақ шаруашылықтары Сібір казак әскерінен және офицерлік телімдерден жайылымдарды жалға алуға мәжбүр болды. Жалдау ақысының мөлшері жердің сапасы мен орналасуына байланысты белгіленіп, біртіндеп өсті. Төлем мөлшері артқан сайын қазақ шаруашылықтарының бір бөлігі әскер қорының қолайсыздау жерлеріне көшсе, енді бір бөлігі казак жер иелену аумағынан кетуге мәжбүр болды. Сонымен қатар қосалқы жалдау да кең тарады: бастапқы жалға алушылар жалға алған жер телімдерін басқа шаруашылықтарға жоғары ақыға қайта жалға берді. *Қорытынды.* Ертіс он шақырымдық белдеуі аумағындағы жалгерлік қатынастар қазақтардың дәстүрлі жайылымдарына, қыстаулары мен шабындықтарына қол жеткізуінің шектелуі салдарынан қалыптасты. Сібір казак әскері үшін жерді жалға беру тұрақты табыс көзіне айналса, қазақ шаруашылықтары үшін жерді жалға алу мал шаруашылығын жүргізудің қажетті шарты болды. Жалдау ақысының өсуі мен қосалқы жалдаудың таралуы қазақ шаруашылықтарының экономикалық тәуелділігін күшейтті. Жалгерлік қатынастар Ресей империясының отарлық жер саясаты құралдарының біріне айналды: қазақтар империялық шектеулер енгізілгенге дейін өздерінің дәстүрлі жер пайдалануында болған жайылымдық жерлерді пайдаланғаны үшін ақы төлеуге мәжбүр болды.

Түйін сөздер: Ертіс он шақырымдық белдеуі, Ертіс өңірі, қазақтар, Сібір казак әскері, жерді жалға алу, қосалқы жалдау, жер пайдалану, отарлық саясат.

Алғыс. Бұл мақала ҚР Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитетінің қаржылай қолдауымен, ИРН AP26104261 «Ертіс он шақырымдық белдеуінің құрылу тарихы және оны қайтару үшін қазақтардың күресі (1765-1921 жж.)» жобасы аясында дайындалды.

Дәйексөз үшін: Торайғыров Е.М., Бейсембаева А.Р., Джумашев А.М. Ертіс он шақырымдық белдеуі аумағындағы жалгерлік қатынастар // Asian Journal “Steppe Panorama”. 2026. Т. 13. № 5. 1353–1372 бб. (Ағыл.). DOI: 10.51943/3135-8055_2026_13_5_1353-1372

АРЕНДНЫЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ НА ТЕРРИТОРИИ ИРТЫШСКОЙ ДЕСЯТИВЕРСТНОЙ ПОЛОСЫ

Торайғыров Ержан Муратович¹, Бейсембаева Акмарал Рашидкызы^{2*}, Джумашев Аскар Мамбетович³

¹Институт истории и этнологии имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова

(28, ул. Шевченко, Алматы, 050010, Республика Казахстан)

Кандидат исторических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3586-5691>. E-mail: toranet2013@gmail.com

²Институт истории и этнологии имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова

(28, ул. Шевченко, Алматы, 050010, Республика Казахстан)

Доктор PhD, ведущий научный сотрудник

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3599-9091>. E-mail: read_and_read@mail.ru

*Автор-корреспондент.

³Каракалпакский научно-исследовательский институт гуманитарных наук Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан

(ул. Амира Темура 179-а, Нукус, 230100, Каракалпакстан, Республики Узбекистан)

Кандидат исторических наук, заведующий отделом истории

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3668-6510>. E-mail: djumashev@yahoo.de

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2026

© Торайгыров Е.М., Бейсембаева А.Р., Джумашев А.М., 2026

Аннотация. *Введение.* Иртышская десятиверстная полоса возникла в ходе колонизации Северо-Восточного Казахстана и строительства военной линии на традиционных землях казахских родов. В 1765 г. пограничные власти запретили казахам кочевать в пределах Иртышской десятиверстной полосы, ограничив их доступ к пастбищам и зимовкам. Позднее казахам разрешили пользоваться этими землями, но на правах временных пользователей и за установленную плату. Сами земли казахскому населению возвращены не были. В этих условиях в Прииртышье стали складываться арендные отношения. *Цель и задачи.* Статья посвящена исследованию институциональных предпосылок формирования и развития арендных отношений на территории Иртышской десятиверстной полосы в 1765–1910 гг. Нижняя хронологическая граница обусловлена созданием запретной полосы, а верхняя – проведением повторного обследования 1910 г., материалы которого используются для итогового статистического сопоставления. Авторы рассматривают изменения условий доступа казахов к землям вдоль Иртыша, порядок пользования этими землями и управления ими, формы и размеры взимавшихся платежей, а также влияние аренды на хозяйственное положение казахского населения. *Материалы и методы.* Исследование основано на документах Исторического архива Омской области и Центрального государственного архива Республики Казахстан, материалах статистических обследований Прииртышья и дореволюционных публикациях. Применены проблемно-хронологический и сравнительно-исторический методы, источниковедческая критика и описательный количественный анализ опубликованных данных обследований. *Результаты.* Первоначально за пользование землями Иртышской десятиверстной полосы казахи платили ремонтную пошлину, поступавшую в доход Сибирского казачьего войска. Впоследствии натуральную пошлину заменили денежной, а в 1880 г. вместо нее ввели арендную плату. Казахские хозяйства, прежде свободно использовавшие эти угодья, были вынуждены арендовать пастбища у Сибирского казачьего войска и на офицерских участках. Размер платы зависел от качества и расположения земель и постепенно увеличивался. По мере роста платежей часть казахских хозяйств переходила на менее удобные земли войскового запаса, тогда как другие покидали территорию казачьего землевладения. Распространилась и субаренда: первоначальные арендаторы передавали арендованные участки другим хозяйствам за более высокую плату. *Заключение.* Арендные отношения на территории Иртышской десятиверстной полосы сложились вследствие ограничения доступа казахов к традиционным пастбищам, зимовкам и сенокосным угодьям. Для Сибирского казачьего войска сдача земель в аренду стала постоянным источником дохода, тогда как для казахских хозяйств аренда была необходимым условием ведения скотоводческого хозяйства. Рост арендных платежей и распространение субаренды усиливали

экономическую зависимость казахских хозяйств. Арендные отношения стали одним из инструментов колониальной земельной политики Российской империи: казахи были вынуждены платить за пользование угодьями, которые до введения имперских ограничений находились в их традиционном землепользовании.

Ключевые слова: Иртышская десятиверстная полоса, Прииртышье, казахи, Сибирское казачье войско, земельная аренда, субаренда, землепользование, колониальная политика.

Благодарности: Статья подготовлена при финансовой поддержке Комитета науки, Министерства науки и высшего образования, проект ИРН AP26104261 «История создания Иртышской десятиверстной полосы и борьба казахов за ее возвращение (1765-1921 гг.)».

Для цитирования: Торайгыров Е.М., Бейсембаева А.Р., Джумашев А.М. Арендные отношения на территории Иртышской десятиверстной полосы // Asian Journal “Steppe Panorama”. 2026. Т. 13. № 5. С. 1353–1372. (На Англ.). DOI: 10.51943/3135-8055_2026_13_5_1353-1372

Introduction. The history of the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip is directly connected with the expansion of the Russian Empire into Northeastern Kazakhstan. The lands along the Irtysh had long formed part of the traditional nomadic land-use system of Kazakh clans of the Middle Zhuz. The construction of the Irtysh Military Line in the early 18th century altered this established system of land use. An instruction issued by the commander of the line, I.I. Springer, and approved on 31 December 1765 prohibited Kazakhs from approaching within 5–10 versts of the Irtysh fortifications with their livestock (IAOO. F. 67. Op. 1. D. 3. L. 533–534 ob.). The restricted strip established by this measure was intended to separate Kazakh nomadic encampments from the military fortifications; in practice, however, it restricted Kazakh access to pastures and wintering grounds and aggravated the land problem in the region.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, as the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip gradually lost its former military and frontier significance, Kazakhs were permitted temporary access to lands along the Irtysh. These lands, however, were not returned to them, and Kazakh households were compelled to pay the Siberian Cossack Host for the use of pastures, hayfields, and wintering grounds that had previously formed part of their traditional land-use system. Consequently, lease relations in the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip emerged not through the free development of a land market, but as a result of restrictions imposed by the authorities of the Russian Empire on Kazakh access to their traditional lands.

The chronological framework of the study extends from 1765 to 1910. The lower boundary marks the establishment of the restricted strip, which created the institutional preconditions for the subsequent transition to paid land use. The remount levy itself was introduced only in 1800. The year 1880 represents not the emergence of leasing as such, but the formal replacement of the remount levy by ordinary rent. The upper boundary corresponds to the 1910 resurvey, which provides the latest statistical cross-section examined in the article.

Previous studies by B.S. Suleimenov, M.Zh. Abdirov, and Z.E. Kabuldinov established the dependent nature of Kazakh land use within the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip and interpreted lease relations as an element of the colonial land policy of the Russian Empire (Suleimenov, 1963: 259; Abdirov, 1997: 392, 401; Kabuldinov, 2001: 152). However, the administrative mechanisms through which the rental system was formalised and subsequently regulated, as well as the role of subleasing in the redistribution of rental income, have not been examined within a single analytical framework. In particular, the transition from the remount levy to rent in 1880, the official discussion in 1904 concerning the transfer of the Ten-Verst Strip into the ownership of the Siberian Cossack Host and the fixing of rental payments, and the difference between the sums paid by primary tenants and those charged to subtenants require separate documentary analysis.

The scholarly novelty of this article lies in the introduction into scholarly circulation and integrated analysis of previously unpublished archival documents from the Historical Archive of Omsk Oblast and the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The 1880 decision makes it possible to reconstruct the formal replacement of the remount levy by rent (HAOR. F. 67. Inv. 1. C.

1247. P. 4). The records of the 1904 administrative deliberations demonstrate that the decision officially presented as a means of protecting Kazakh households from impoverishment simultaneously preserved their dependence on Cossack landholders and fixed rental payments at the already established high level (CSA RK. F. 471. Inv. 1. C. 23. 3. 81 rev., 87). Finally, plot-level data from the G.E. Katanaev collection reveal the economic mechanism of subleasing: on certain plots, the sums charged to subtenants exceeded the rent paid by the primary tenants by more than 8 times (HAOR. F. 366. Inv. 1. C. 315. P. 6 rev.–7 rev.). In this connection, the contribution of the study consists not in reproducing the statistical comparisons between the 1897 and 1910 surveys, but in using these published data as a comparative framework for interpreting newly examined archival evidence.

Methods and Methodology. The primary sources for this study are documents held in the Historical Archive of Omsk Oblast and the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The materials examined at the HAOR include the file of the Military Economic Board of the Siberian Cossack Host entitled 'On the Ten-Verst Strip'; memoranda of the Military Economic Board concerning the land settlement and economic condition of the Siberian Cossacks in 1862–1863; and files entitled 'On Cossack Leasehold Lands'. The materials examined at the CSA RK include the file 'On the Transfer of the Lands of the Ten-Verst Strip into the Ownership of the Siberian Cossack Host' and other documents. These sources provide information on the legal status of the Ten-Verst Strip, the terms of land leases, rental payments, and the spread of subleasing. Statistical surveys of the Irtysh region conducted in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were also used to trace changes in lease relations.

The study employs problem-chronological and comparative-historical methods, source criticism, and descriptive quantitative analysis. The problem-chronological method is used to distinguish the successive stages of paid land use: restrictions on access to the strip, the introduction and monetization of the remount levy, its replacement by rent in 1880, and the attempted regulation of rental payments in 1904. The comparative-historical method is used to compare lease terms across different sections of the Irtysh region and categories of Cossack landholding. The quantitative analysis is limited to calculating shares, percentage changes, and average payments from the published tables; no inferential statistical procedures or independent reconstruction of the underlying dataset are undertaken.

The materials of the expedition led by F.A. Shcherbina are not treated as a neutral statistical record. The survey was conducted within an administrative context that included the calculation of land-use norms and the identification of land classified as 'surplus' for resettlement. Moreover, individual uezds were examined by different statistical groups, which did not always apply identical approaches. These conditions could influence the categories of observation and the resulting quantitative estimates. The expedition's publications are therefore used to reconstruct officially recorded forms and scales of land use, while their administrative purpose and possible selectivity are taken into account (Ksenzhik, 2018: 132–133).

The 1897 and 1910 surveys are not treated as a fully homogeneous statistical series. The comparison is restricted to the indicators directly juxtaposed in the 1913 publication, including the number and distribution of tenant households and rent per haystack. The calculations preserve the territorial units and categories used in that publication and serve to establish the direction and approximate scale of change rather than a continuous statistical trend. Since complete identity of coverage, registration procedures, and classifications cannot be assumed, the observed differences are interpreted cautiously (Materials, 1913: 239–261).

The provenance and institutional affiliation of the archival documents are also considered. Fond 67 contains records of the Military Economic Board of the Siberian Cossack Host and therefore reflects the administrative language and fiscal interests of the landholding institution. Fond 366 is the personal collection of G.E. Katanaev, a lieutenant general and official historian of the Siberian Cossack Host. Its personal provenance does not mean that every document was authored by Katanaev; nevertheless, official records preserved in the collection must be distinguished from Katanaev's own writings, copies, and extracts. The collection is particularly valuable for reconstructing the fiscal

practices and administrative arguments of the Host, but Katanaev's assessments cannot be regarded as a neutral representation of Kazakh land use and interests (Ksenzhik, 2018: 131). These materials are compared with the 1904 administrative file held in the TsGA RK, published survey data, and published evidence concerning the petition submitted by Kazakh representatives.

For the purposes of this article, a market lease is understood as a contractual relation in which the tenant has a meaningful choice among plots and counterparties and can refuse the proposed terms. Within the Ten-Verst Strip, the legal form recorded in the sources was lease, but access to essential pastures, hayfields, and wintering grounds was institutionally restricted, while the Siberian Cossack Host and individual Cossack landholders controlled the relevant land resources. The term "lease" is therefore used in its legal and administrative sense; analytically, the payments are interpreted as the extraction of land rent under conditions of monopolistic control over access to the resource and asymmetrical bargaining power. This distinction separates the contractual form of the transaction from the actual distribution of control over land.

Historiographical Review. The most detailed information on rental relations in the Irtysh region is found in pre-revolutionary works. The Cossack researcher F. Usov was the first to attempt to characterise the economic life of the population of the Ten-Verst Strip. He reported a steady increase in rents for land within the strip and noted that Kazakhs were compelled either to buy back their own plots from the Cossack Host or to lease them (Usov, 1879: 111–112).

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, N.Ya. Konshin published a series of works (Konshin, 1899; Konshin, 1900; Konshin, 1901a; Konshin, 1901b; Konshin, 1905; Konshin, 1928) devoted to the everyday life of Kazakhs residing within the Ten-Verst Strip and to the settlement and economic development of the Irtysh valley by Russians and Kazakhs.

These works provide new information on changes in socioeconomic relations within Kazakh communities. In particular, Konshin noted that 'the evolution of Kazakh land tenure consisted in the gradual allocation of land for use by increasingly smaller groups, down to individual households' (Konshin, 1928: 22). The author concluded that the emergence of small-scale households within the Ten-Verst Strip, as well as such negative developments in Kazakh society as antagonism and inter-clan conflicts, resulted from the tsarist reforms of the 2nd half of the 19th century (Konshin, 1928: 21). Konshin also provided some of the earliest evidence on rental relations, noting that 'officers' and military plots used for wintering and haymaking were sometimes leased not by groups of Kazakhs, but by one or several wealthy individuals, who then allowed their fellow clansmen to use the land for a higher fee' (Konshin, 1928: 20).

At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, studies of the economic life and social structure of the Irtysh region began to incorporate a new element: statistical data. Such information is contained in works produced from the findings of the expedition led by F. Shcherbina (Materials, 1903: 387; Materials, 1902; Materials, 1905; Materials, 1909). Shcherbina concluded that if the 'sluggish and economically inert Cossack population' were replaced by «an even more ruthless enemy» – an energetic class of agricultural settlers from Russia—the nomadic population would be unable to withstand the competition, since rents would rise sharply to a level that Kazakhs could not afford (Materials, 1903: 90).

Following his survey of Omsk Uezd, A.N. Bukeikhanov concluded that Kazakh tenants had begun moving away from the Irtysh into the steppe in the 2nd half of the 19th century. In his view, the substantial increase in rents and the spread of mechanical mowers caused the Ten-Verst Strip to lose its former advantages for the nomadic population (Materials, 1902: 30, 67).

The publications and personal archival collection of G.E. Katanaev occupy an intermediate position between contemporary administrative evidence and subsequent historiography. They contain extensive information on the remount levy, rental practices, payment rates, and the economic development of the Ten-Verst Strip. At the same time, Katanaev was a lieutenant general and official historian of the Siberian Cossack Host; consequently, his descriptions reflect the institutional perspective of the Host with which he was directly associated. His works are therefore used to reconstruct Cossack fiscal and administrative practices, rather than as neutral assessments of Kazakh land use (Katanaev, 1904; Katanaev, 1908; Ksenzhik, 2018: 131).

Among the works of the Soviet period, the studies by Kh.A. Argynbaev (Argynbaev, 1959) and B. Suleimenov (Suleimenov, 1963) are particularly notable. Argynbaev traces changes in the economy, culture, and everyday life of both the Kazakh and Cossack populations of the Irtysh region. He argues that from the beginning of the 19th century, following the introduction of leasing on Cossack lands, Kazakhs became the principal tenants of the meadows along the Irtysh. At the same time, they began to adopt tools from the Russian population, including scythes and sickles used in haymaking and agriculture, as well as wooden houses and elements of clothing. From the 2nd half of the 19th century, the Irtysh region became an area of intensive economic and cultural interaction between its different population groups (Argynbaev, 1959: 35, 42, 89).

Argynbaev's dating does not contradict the evidence concerning the reform of 1880 if two different stages are distinguished. His reference to the early 19th century concerns the emergence of actual leasing practices on Cossack lands. The decision of 1880 did not create lease relations *de novo*; it abolished the remount levy and established ordinary rent as the uniform payment for the use of military lands. Thus, the early 19th century marked the emergence of lease practices, whereas 1880 represented their legal and fiscal standardization (Katanaev, 1904: 16–17; HAOR. F. 67. Inv. 1. C. 1247. P. 4).

B. Suleimenov's work provides an assessment of agrarian relations in Kazakhstan in the last 3rd of the 19th and early 20th centuries. He argues that rental relations disrupted the normal development of Kazakh households. Using the distribution of leasehold plots as an example, he identifies numerous abuses that made Kazakhs wintering in the area dependent on plot holders, both Kazakh and Cossack (Suleimenov, 1963: 259).

Rental relations are also addressed in the works of contemporary historians. M.Zh. Abdirov concluded that the military command was interested in allowing Kazakhs to cross to the right bank of the Irtysh and enter the territory of the Line, including the Ten-Verst Strip, because this generated substantial revenue (Abdirov, 1997: 392). Comparing the development of the left and right banks of the Irtysh, he shows that Kazakhs leased officers' plots situated on the more fertile left bank, whereas pastures on the right bank were generally leased by the poorer members of the auls (Abdirov, 1997: 401).

These findings are complemented by the monograph of Z.E. Kabuldinov (Kabuldinov, 2001). The author regards the emergence of rental relations on the lands of the military Cossack population of the Irtysh Line as an artificially created phenomenon. In his view, the tsarist government introduced the rental system as a barrier intended to restrain the further movement of the Kazakh nomadic population into the interior provinces of the Russian Empire (Kabuldinov, 2001: 152).

International scholarship provides a broader framework for interpreting these processes. Yuriy Malikov examines relations between the Siberian Cossacks and Kazakhs as part of the formation of a distinctive borderland culture in northern Kazakhstan (Malikov, 2011). Virginia Martin analyses the interaction between Kazakh customary law and Russian colonial institutions in the Middle Horde, providing a broader legal context for formally contractual relations established under colonial rule (Martin, 2001). Ian W. Campbell connects the statistical surveys of the Kazakh steppe, including the Shcherbina Expedition, with imperial knowledge production and resettlement policy (Campbell, 2017: 125–156). Niccolò Pianciola places the final stage of imperial agricultural colonisation within the longer transformation of Kazakh pastoralism from 1905 onward (Pianciola, 2009). These studies provide the colonial, legal, and epistemological context for the present research, but they do not specifically examine the replacement of the remount levy by rent in 1880 or the documented subleasing chains within the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip.

Discussion. According to conclusions of B.S. Suleimenov, M.Zh. Abdirov, and Z.E. Kabuldinov sathat leasing on Cossack lands developed under conditions of institutionally restricted Kazakh access to pastures, hayfields, and wintering grounds. At the same time, the evidence clarifies the chronology and institutional mechanism of this process. Argynbaev's reference to leasing from the beginning of the nineteenth century concerns the emergence of actual leasing practices, whereas the decision of 1880 standardised the replacement of the remount levy by monetary rent. The Supremely Approved Opinion of the State Council of 31 May 1904 did not abolish leasing or freeze

all rental payments: its provision concerned lands occupied by Kazakh wintering grounds, and the available documents do not establish how consistently it was implemented. The increase in the rent per haystack recorded in 1910 therefore shows that charges for mixed-use plots continued to rise.

The findings also qualify a simple opposition between Cossacks and Kazakhs. The recipients of rental income included the Siberian Cossack Host, stanitsa communities, officers, and primary tenants, while some wealthy Kazakhs participated in subleasing. In this respect, the evidence is consistent with Malikov's interpretation of the frontier as a sphere of interaction among actors whose interests were not always identical (Malikov, 2011). The survey categories themselves must also be treated critically: as Campbell has shown, statistical knowledge about the Kazakh steppe was produced in connection with resettlement policy and the search for supposed land "surpluses" (Campbell, 2017: 125–156).

The literature on post-reform Bashkiria likewise identifies the sale and lease of indigenous lands as a distinct agrarian problem (Usmanov, 1975: 107–123). The specificity of the Irtysh case lay in the combination of the legally restricted Ten-Verst Strip, corporate control by the Siberian Cossack Host, and several levels of rent collection and subleasing. Since the present study does not contain comparable statistical series for Bashkir lands or the Orenburg and Ural Cossack Hosts, this comparison remains institutional rather than quantitative.

Results. In 1765, the Siberian frontier authorities established the so-called 'Ten-Verst Strip' on the left bank of the Irtysh as a restricted zone from which the Kazakh population was excluded (Toraigyrov, 2025: 561).

Paid access to lands within the military line acquired a defined fiscal form under the decree of 7 August 1800. Kazakhs permitted to use these lands were required to contribute one serviceable horse for every hundred adult horses, while the levy on other livestock was likewise calculated at one head per hundred. Subsequent collection rules established cash equivalents: 1 rouble for each adult horse, 75 kopecks for a three-year-old horse, 50 kopecks for a two-year-old horse, and 25 kopecks for a yearling. For cattle, the corresponding rates were 40, 30, 20, and 10 kopecks, while sheep were assessed at 10 kopecks per head (Katanaev, 1904: 5–6).

Following the withdrawal of the dragoon regiments from Siberia, an order of 9 July 1816 assigned the remount levy to supplying horses for ten cavalry regiments of the Siberian Cossack Host. The military line was divided into remount districts, where officials registered livestock, issued time-limited grazing tickets, and supervised collection (Katanaev, 1904: 5–6). Under Governor-General P.M. Kaptsevich, customs posts at the principal fortifications were incorporated into this system (IAOO. F. 366. Inv. 1. C. 331. P. 4). The collected revenues were transferred to the income of the Siberian Cossack Host (IAOO. F. 366. Inv. 1. C. 321. P. 45).

Katanaev's data for 1823–1836 document the gradual monetization of the levy. In 1823, cash receipts amounted to 19,334 roubles 62.5 kopecks, while 400 horses, 54 oxen, and 1,791 sheep were collected in kind. In 1836, cash receipts reached 32,543 roubles 39 kopecks, whereas in-kind collections declined to 292 horses, 34 oxen, and 734 sheep. Although the annual figures fluctuated, the comparison indicates an increasing reliance on monetary collection (Katanaev, 1904: 7).

In the 1870s, the amount collected through the remount levy generally declined. It amounted to 12,721 roubles in 1871, 8,255 roubles in 1876, and 5,761 roubles in 1879. Thus, between 1871 and 1879, receipts decreased by approximately 54.7 per cent (Katanaev, 1904: 16). In 1880, following a petition by Governor-General of Western Siberia N.G. Kaznakov, the remount levy was formally abolished and replaced by ordinary rent for the use of military lands (Katanaev, 1904: 16–17; IAOO. F. 67. Inv. 1. C. 1247. P. 4). Thus, the decision of 1880 standardized an already developing lease regime rather than initiating lease relations for the first time.

This change had significant consequences for Kazakh communities. A large number of Kazakh sharua (rural householders) residing within the Ten-Verst Strip were compelled to lease from the Cossacks, on onerous terms, lands that until recently had been their own. By the late 19th century, the number of Kazakh tenant kubitkas (household units used in imperial fiscal and statistical records) residing on military lands in Pavlodar Uezd had reached 2,577, representing 15,700 people, while 3,463 kubitkas, or 22,604 people, were located on officers' plots (Suleimenov, 1963: 260).

According to Ostafiev’s data for the Kyzyl-Tau and Altybai volosts of Pavlodar district, 588 of the 892 recorded Kazakh households (65.9%) rented land, while 304 households (34.1%) did not (Ostafiev, 1895: 21–22).

Each year, the floodplain lands assigned to the Cossacks were distributed by lot in the form of individual shares to the members of each stanitsa. Every spring, the Cossacks leased these shares to Kazakhs and collected the rent in advance. The price of an allotment varied according to the quality of the grass and the ease with which hay could be transported to the wintering grounds. It also changed annually depending on the condition of the grass cover. Lands belonging to officers and military plots that were not subject to distribution by lot were also leased.

The survey materials distinguish payment in labour from share-based hayfield leasing. On officers’ plots subleased through intermediaries, the household charge was often collected in labour: instead of paying in cash, a Kazakh household could be required to mow and stack 80–120 haystacks (Materials, 1903: 66). In the Alkagul volost, 290 households discharged this charge by harvesting 32,250 haystacks; the survey estimated the value of this work at approximately 5.6 roubles per household (Materials, 1903: 67). The same source noted that the charge was generally levied without regard to wealth, so poor and wealthy households paid the same amount (Materials, 1903: 67). Share-based hayfield leasing was recorded separately: in 1897, 134,240 haystacks were harvested under such arrangements (Materials, 1903: 72–73).

The rental land fund consisted of a broad strip extending along both banks of the Irtysh and belonging to the Siberian Cossack Host. Kazakhs also leased state-owned and peasant lands within the Tomsk and Tobolsk Governorates (Ostafiev, 1895: 25–54).

The distribution of tenant households in Pavlodar Uezd was as follows. According to the figures reproduced in Table 1, 6,768 households were located on Cossack lands in 1897, compared with 7,211 in 1910. Thus, between the first statistical expedition of 1897 and the 1910 survey, the number of households leasing Cossack lands increased by 6.5% (Materials, 1913: 239–240). By comparison, the number of Kazakh households located within the Tomsk and Tobolsk Governorates decreased from 1,052 in 1897 to 938 in 1910. These figures indicate that the overwhelming majority of tenant households resided on leased Cossack lands (Materials, 1913: 239).

The distribution of tenant households on Cossack lands along the Irtysh between the right-bank part of the uezd and the Ten-Verst Strip is presented below (Materials, 1913: 240).

Table 1. Distribution of tenant households within the Cossack Irtysh Strip in the right-bank part of the uezd and in the Ten-Verst Strip

Registration year	Ten-Verst Strip			Right-bank part of the uezd		
	Total number of households	Households leasing Cossack lands	Share of total households, %	Total number of households	Households leasing Cossack land	Share of total households, %
1897	16678	5218	31.3	4132	1550	37,5
1910	17932	5753	32,1	5048	1458	28,9

The table supports the following conclusions:

1. The number of households located within the Ten-Verst Strip was approximately 4 times as high as the number located on the right bank of the Irtysh.
2. The number of households leasing Cossack lands within the Ten-Verst Strip was approximately 3.5 times as high as the corresponding number on the right bank.
3. The number of tenant households in the right-bank area decreased, whereas in the left-bank area it increased, although only slightly.

According to the form of tenure, Cossack lands were divided into yurt allotments (communal land territories assigned to Cossack stanitsas; here yurt denotes a stanitsa land district, not a dwelling) and officers’ plots. The Irtysh Strip also included Host reserve lands and church lands belonging to Cossack stanitsas.

The distribution of tenant households across all categories of Cossack land is presented in the following table (Materials, 1913: 241).

Table 2. Distribution of tenant households by category of Cossack land

Location of households	On yurt allotments		On officers' plots		On Host reserve lands		On church lands		Total	
	Number of households	% of total households	Number of households	% of total households	Number of households	% of total households	Number of households	% of total households	Number of households	% of total households
Ten-Verst Strip	1750	30,4	2937	51,1	1066	18,5	-	-	5753	100
Right-bank area	633	43,4	507	34,8	275	18,9	43	2,9	1458	100
Total	2383	33,0	3444	47,8	1341	18,6	43	0,6	7211	100

Table 2 shows that:

- almost half of all tenant households were located on officers' plots;
- 1/3 of all tenant households were located on yurt allotments;
- approximately 1/5 leased Host reserve lands;
- leases of yurt allotments were more common in the right-bank area of the Cossack lands, whereas officers' plots predominated within the Ten-Verst Strip.

According to the calculations published under the direction of A.V. Perepletchikov, who supervised the 1910 repeat survey of Pavlodar Uezd conducted by the Resettlement Administration, the distribution of tenant households was as follows (Materials, 1913: 241):

Of every 100 tenant households:

- 36.5% were located on yurt allotments;
- 52.3% were located on officers' plots;
- 3.2% were located partly on yurt allotments and partly on officers' plots;
- 8.0% were located on Host lands;
- total – 100%.

These figures reproduce the same ranking of the principal categories but do not numerically confirm the data presented in Table 2. The calculations published in the Perepletchikov survey give 8.0% of tenant households on Host lands, whereas Table 2 gives 18.6% for Host reserve lands. The cited materials do not explain this discrepancy.

The most fertile lands were held by officers and Cossacks, which explains why Kazakhs sought to lease plots in these areas. This distribution, however, did not remain stable for long.

A comparison of the 2 surveys reveals a marked movement of tenants from yurt allotments and officers' plots to Host reserve lands.

During the repeat survey, respondents were asked to indicate the location of their auls' wintering grounds in the year of the 1st statistical expedition. This made it possible to identify 1,106 households that had moved from one category of land to another. In other words, approximately 1,100 Kazakh households in Pavlodar Uezd changed their permanent wintering location during the 10 years between the surveys. This movement was linked, to some extent, to peasant colonisation (Materials, 1913: 241).

The movement of these households between the different categories of land is presented in Table 3 (Materials, 1913: 242).

Table 3. Movement of Kazakh households between categories of land plots

Categories of land	Households residing on land in this category at the time of the 1st	Households that moved to land in this category after 1897, %
--------------------	---	--

	survey in 1897, %	
Officers' plots	53,6	18,5
Yurt allotments	24,0	25,5
Host reserve lands	22,4	51,2
Other lands	-	4,8
Total	100	100

As can be seen, most households that changed plots relocated to Host reserve lands.

The materials of the 1st statistical expedition described the settlement of this category of Cossack land as follows: «Few people are willing to settle on Host plots, since lands in this category are in many respects inferior to other plots in terms of quality and convenience. These lands are occupied mainly by the poor, whose ability to pay cannot meet the comparatively high rents charged for yurt allotments and officers' plots» (Materials, 1903: 246). As demonstrated below, the movement to Host reserve lands was caused by a substantial increase in rents for yurt allotments and officers' plots.

Rising rents resulted not only in tenants moving from one category of land to another, but also in the complete termination of leases and the relocation of households to oblast lands (Materials, 1913: 242). Cases of households returning to their former clan territories were not uncommon in Pavlodar Uezd (Statistics, 1895).

A comparison of rental payments in different parts of the uezd shows that, according to the repeat survey, the rent calculated per haystack was higher in the Ten-Verst Strip than in the right-bank area. This is consistent with the data collected by the 1897 expedition and presented in Table 4. Rental payments also increased substantially. In the right-bank part of the Cossack Strip, the land rent equivalent per haystack rose by 175%, while in the left-bank area it increased by 154.8%. Across the uezd as a whole, the average increase was 162% (Materials, 1913: 261).

Table 4. Rental payments for mixed-use plots in Pavlodar Uezd, 1897 and 1910

Location of leased plots	Haystacks harvested in 1910	Total rental payment in 1910, roubles	Rent per haystack in 1897, kopecks	Rent per haystack in 1910, kopecks
Ten-Verst Strip	2145141	170296	3,1	7,9
Right bank of the Irtysh	690490	45776,4	2,4	6,6
Total for the uezd	2835631	216072,4	2,9	7,6

The number of haystacks harvested and the total rental payment refer to the 1910 survey; the 1897 data are presented only as rent per haystack.

Table 5 presents annual rental revenue recorded as income of the Siberian Cossack Host from Host reserve lands and the Ten-Verst Strip, differentiated by uezd. These figures do not represent the aggregate payments made by tenants under all leases involving yurt allotments and officers' plots (Katanaev, 1904: 122).

Table 5. Annual rental revenue of the Siberian Cossack Host from Host reserve lands and the Ten-Verst Strip, by uezd

Uezd	Area of Host reserve lands, desyatins	Total annual rent, roubles and kopecks	Annual revenue per desyatina, kopecks	Area of the Ten-Verst Strip, desyatins	Total annual rent, roubles and kopecks	Annual revenue per desyatina, kopecks
Kokchetav	13340	600,21	4,5	-	-	-
Petropavlovsk	38705	905,00	2,3	171086	12883	7,7
Omsk	109137	3613,61	3,3	178967	6446,80	3,6

Pavlodar	214991	2767,15	1,3	125794	4658,11	3,7
Semipalatinsk	103547	920,24	0,9	228148	2710,58	1,2
Ust-Kamenogorsk	1140	41,65	3,6	80365	751,12	0,9
Zaisan	278	15,5	5,4	-	-	-
Biysk Line	3455	505,83	14,6	-	-	-
Total	484593	9368,74	1,9	784361	27449,61	3,5

A comparison of the figures shows that in Pavlodar Uezd the area of the Ten-Verst Strip was almost half the size of the Host reserve lands, yet it generated considerably more rental revenue. A similar pattern can be observed in Semipalatinsk Uezd, where the rent collected from the Ten-Verst Strip was approximately 3 times higher than that received from Host reserve lands. In Ust-Kamenogorsk Uezd, Host reserve lands were virtually absent, while rental revenue from the Ten-Verst Strip was the lowest among the uyezds listed.

According to data for 1905, Cossack communities received more than 200,000 roubles from leasing yurt lands alone to outside tenants. These revenues were credited to the general stanitsa and settlement funds (HAOR. F. 366. Inv. 1. C. 264. P. 3 rev.).

The figures cited above represent different revenue streams and are therefore not directly comparable. Table 4 records aggregate rental payments for mixed-use plots in Pavlodar Uezd, amounting to 216,072.4 roubles, whereas Table 5 records annual revenue received by the Siberian Cossack Host from the Ten-Verst Strip, amounting to 27,449.61 roubles across all the uyezds listed, as well as 9,368.74 roubles from Host reserve lands. The figure of more than 200,000 roubles for 1905 concerns income received by Cossack stanitsa communities from leasing yurt allotments and credited to stanitsa and settlement funds. Payments derived from officers' plots constituted a separate revenue stream, but the cited materials do not permit their total amount to be calculated independently. Thus, the differences between these figures reflect distinct recipients, land categories, territories, dates, and accounting procedures rather than an internal contradiction.

Aul No. 3 of the 5th starshinstvo in Alakol Volost provides another example. In 1881, the rent for a plot amounted to 40 roubles; by 1895, it had risen to 60 roubles. Thus, over 14 years, the rent increased by 20 roubles, or 50%. The construction of the Trans-Siberian Railway intensified the movement of settlers into Kazakhstan, leading to a rapid increase in land rents. In 1897, landholders in Alakol Volost raised the rent for a plot to 195 roubles. Consequently, within 2 years, the rent increased by 135 roubles, or 225%, while over the entire 16-year period it rose by 387.5% (Materials, 1903: 63–64). The tenant was entirely dependent on the Cossack landholder, who could either lease the plot or refuse to do so. This left the tenant with no alternative and placed his livelihood at risk, since nomadic households had nowhere else to move and no unoccupied land remained in the steppe.

Host reserve lands were leased to several categories of tenants, including Cossacks, peasants, townspeople, Kazakhs, and members of privileged estates. Although these data do not concern the Ten-Verst Strip itself, they provide comparative evidence on the broader structure of land leasing within the Siberian Cossack Host. Table 6 presents the distribution of leased Host reserve lands in Semipalatinsk and Akmolinsk Oblasts according to an undated archival statement from the early 20th century (HAOR. F. 366. Inv. 1. C. 315. P. 6–7 rev.).

Table 6. Distribution of Host reserve lands leased in Akmolinsk and Semipalatinsk Oblasts by category of tenant (undated archival data, early 20th century)

Category of tenants	Number of leased plots	Area of plots, desyatins	Total rent, roubles	Average rent per desyatina, kopecks
Members of privileged estates – Akm.	15	24,896	3,463	13.9
Members of privileged estates – Semip.	1	621	10	1.6
Total	16	25,517	3,473	13.6

Townspeople – Akm.	57	108,396	11,070	10.2
Townspeople – Semip.	51	89,277	7,870	8.8
Total	108	197,673	18,940	9.6
Peasants – Akm.	80	169,104	19,823	11.7
Peasants – Semip.	33	68,136	4,099	6.0
Total	113	237,240	23,922	10.1
Cossacks – Akm.	46	80,732	4,449	5.5
Cossacks – Semip.	99	395,363	10,756	2.7
Total	145	476,095	15,205	3.2
Kazakhs – Akm.	13	34,359	2,816	8.2
Kazakhs – Semip.	44	133,660	3,556	2.7
Total	57	168,019	6,372	3.8
Other categories – Akm.	3	3,137	321	10.2
Other categories – Semip.	3	5,382	71	1.3
Total	6	8,519	392	4.6
Grand total	445	1,113,063	68,304	6.1

As Table 6 shows, the distribution of Host reserve lands varied substantially by region and tenant category. Across the two oblasts, Cossacks occupied the largest total area. In Semipalatinsk Oblast, however, Kazakhs ranked second by leased area after Cossacks. In Semipalatinsk Oblast, the average rent per desyatina amounted to 8.8 kopecks for townspeople, 6.0 kopecks for peasants, and 2.7 kopecks for both Kazakhs and Cossacks. These differences cannot be interpreted as a direct indicator of tenants' ability to pay, because the table contains no information on the quality, location, size, or duration of the leased plots. The data therefore demonstrate differences in the scale and terms of leasing among tenant categories, but do not by themselves establish that Kazakhs were displaced by more solvent tenants.

Subleasing was another widespread form of land use. In such cases, the initial tenant leased the land to third parties, charging them several times the amount originally paid. As Table 7 shows, the rent charged to subtenants on some plots was 8 times higher than the amount paid by the initial tenant (HAOR. F. 366. Inv. 1. C. 315. P. 6 rev.–7 rev.).

Table 7. 'On Cossack Leasehold Lands'

Leased plot No.	Tenants	Amount paid by tenants to the Host, roubles	Amount charged to subtenants, roubles
Omsk Uezd			
1.	Kazakh Urumbai Satubalin	11.25	57
3.	Uryadnik M. Gutov	16.75	51
4.	Uryadnik M. Gutov	18	147
5.	Uryadnik M. Gutov	132.30	174
10.	Cossack Veprev	7.10	15
Pavlodar Uezd			
38.	Retired serviceman S. Rostovtsev	76	200
42.	Retired serviceman S. Rostovtsev	39	70
47.	Retired serviceman S. Rostovtsev	20	60
Semipalatinsk Uezd			
22.	Kazakh Erenbek Tlenchin	110	240
26.	Cossack P. Ivanov	32.60	76
28.	Uryadnik Salnikov	71	142
29.	Cossack Surgutanov	70	450
34.	Kazakh Gali Akbasov and Cossacks Rakhvalov and Afanasyev	17	82.10

35.	Biy Begenov, Kazakh Gali Akbasov, and Uryadnik Kugubin	110	154.10
134.	Blacksmith Nalonov	140	245
135.	Kazakh I. Zhankarin	110	240
141.	Cossack Shcheglov	47.50	95.20

In the archival document, retired serviceman S. Rostovtsev is listed as the tenant of plots Nos. 38, 42, and 47 (HAOR. F. 366. Inv. 1. C. 315. P. 6 rev.–7 rev.).

These examples reveal unequal positions within the subleasing chain, but they do not by themselves demonstrate a general deepening of property differentiation among Kazakh households.

At the beginning of the 20th century, issues relating to land leases were addressed in close connection with the question of transferring the Ten-Verst Strip into the ownership of the Siberian Cossack Host.

Dissatisfaction with land-use conditions found expression in appeals by Kazakh representatives to the central authorities. In 1904, an eleven-member Kazakh delegation from Pavlodar approached S.Yu. Witte, Chairman of the Committee of Ministers, in St Petersburg. In a supplementary petition, the delegates complained, in particular, of being compelled to rent land within the Ten-Verst Strip and of the appropriation of the best land and freshwater sources for peasant allotments. This appeal indicates that representatives of the population regarded dependence on rented land as a distinct problem requiring intervention by the highest authorities (Anisimova, Lysenko, 2015: 23).

By 1904, the lands of the Ten-Verst Strip had been granted to the Siberian Cossack Host only for temporary use and for deriving revenue from leasing them to Kazakhs for nomadic use. For many years, when these lands were leased to Kazakhs as wintering grounds, the amount of rent was determined by agreement between the Cossacks and the Kazakhs and gradually increased as the value of the land rose. On 31 May 1904, the opinion of the State Council, prepared by its Departments of Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs, State Economy, and Industry, Sciences and Trade, received imperial approval. Under this Supremely Approved Opinion of the State Council, the lands of the Ten-Verst Strip were incorporated into the lands of the Siberian Cossack Host (Sbornik, 1905: 560; CSA RK. F. 471. Inv. 1. C. 23. P. 81 rev.).

Kazakh demands concerning the continued use of land within the Ten-Verst Strip are described in Alikhan Bokeikhan's article '*Eki zhol*'. According to the author, following the announcement issued in 1909, Kazakhs of Pavlodar Uezd adopted communal resolutions and petitioned the Emperor, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and the Minister of War, expressing the interests of four thousand households. The proposed solutions included remaining along the Irtysh subject to rent fixed by law, purchasing the land through instalment payments, and obtaining allotments by joining the Siberian Cossack Host (Bokeikhan, 2014: 220, 222).

This measure was not to entail any limitation or restriction of the rights granted to the Cossacks over lands occupied by Kazakh nomadic settlements. These rights included the right to determine the amount of rent by agreement with the Kazakhs. The Cossacks thus retained complete freedom of action in this regard. At the same time, the Supremely Approved Opinion of the State Council envisaged retaining the existing rent as the maximum rate specifically for lands occupied by Kazakh wintering grounds. According to the members of the Departments, this measure would prevent further increases in payments for those lands even if land values rose, while leaving Kazakh tenants free to seek a reduction in rent (CSA RK. F. 471. Inv. 1. C. 23. P. 81 rev.).

Moreover, the continued recognition of the Cossacks' existing rights was not regarded as an infringement of the lawful interests of the Kazakhs, since it was assumed that the amount of rent was not determined arbitrarily by the Cossacks but was governed by the economic law of supply and demand. It was also argued that 'there was no reason to fear an excessive increase in land rents, since the Cossacks, especially the officers whose plots contained most of the Kazakh wintering grounds, needed tenants, and within the Ten-Verst Strip such tenants were exclusively Kazakhs' (CSA RK. F. 471. Inv. 1. C. 23. P. 81 rev.).

A noteworthy rationale underlay this decision. It was stated that 'the decision to permit the Kazakhs, pending their final settlement, to remain at their wintering grounds within the Ten-Verst

Strip under the existing conditions, that is, subject to the payment of rent to the Cossacks, was motivated by the desire to protect them from ruin' (CSA RK. F. 471. Inv. 1. C. 23. P. 81 rev.). In fact, the impoverishment of the nomadic population and the emergence of thousands of zhataks (impoverished Kazakhs who had lost the livestock necessary for regular nomadic migration and had become partly or fully sedentary) resulted from the very nature of tsarist colonial policy. This interpretation reversed the actual causal relationship, presenting the preservation of rental payments as a concession to the Kazakhs.

Meanwhile, the economic conditions of the Kazakhs living in the Irtysh region had become extremely difficult. Taking advantage of the constrained position of the Kazakhs, who could not maintain their households without access to the lands they leased in the Irtysh valley, the Cossacks imposed excessively high rents. These payments did not remain fixed but increased considerably from year to year. Between 1882 and 1904, the rent charged for the same plots increased 3-fold and, in some cases, even 5-fold. It averaged 13 roubles 25 kopecks per kubitka and reached 14 roubles 90 kopecks per kubitka, thus considerably increasing the financial burden already imposed by the kubitka tax paid by the Kazakhs to the Treasury (CSA RK. F. 471. Inv. 1. C. 23. P. 87).

These relations retained the formal legal features of lease but did not constitute a competitive land market in the operational sense defined above. Kazakh households depended on access to particular pastures, hayfields, and wintering grounds, while the Siberian Cossack Host and individual landholders controlled access to these resources. Consequently, the tenants' ability to select an alternative plot, negotiate with another landholder, or refuse the proposed terms was limited. Rental rates were therefore shaped not only by supply and demand but also by institutional control over access to land and the asymmetry of bargaining power. In this sense, the payments combined the legal form of rent with the economic function of extracting land rent from users whose access to an essential productive resource had been restricted.

A further deterioration in the economic position of the Kazakhs could have caused understandable discontent among them. Against this background, the Supremely Approved Opinion of the State Council included the following provision: 'pending the final resolution of the question concerning the land settlement of the Kazakhs who have wintering grounds within the Ten-Verst Strip of the Siberian Cossack Host, the amount of rent currently paid by them for the lands occupied by these wintering grounds shall remain unchanged' (CSA RK. F. 471. Inv. 1. C. 23. P. 87).

The archival document establishes the content of the 1904 resolution, but the available evidence is insufficient to determine whether, or how consistently, it was implemented. The wording of the resolution applied specifically to lands occupied by Kazakh wintering grounds and did not establish a general ceiling for all categories of leased land. Table 4 concerns mixed-use plots and expresses rent per haystack: between 1897 and 1910, this rate increased from 3.1 to 7.9 kopecks within the Ten-Verst Strip, or by approximately 154.8%, while the average increase across Pavlodar Uezd was 162%. The resolution and Table 4 therefore concern different categories and units of payment. At the same time, the survey data demonstrate that no general stabilization of rental payments had occurred by 1910. Evidence of rising rental payments also appears in Kazakh journalism. Presenting the arguments of the Kazakhs of Pavlodar Uezd, Alikhan Bokeikhan noted that a household had paid 10 roubles annually for land in 1897, whereas subsequent payments reached 20–40 roubles for the use of the same Ten-Verst Strip. The residents explained their inability to leave the Irtysh region by the lack of suitable alternative land and their economic dependence on the territory they had long occupied (Bokeikhan, 2014: 221).

Conclusion. Lease relations within the Irtysh Ten-Verst Strip emerged as a consequence of the colonial land policy of the Russian Empire. Following the construction of the Irtysh Line fortresses, the border authorities began restricting the access of the Kazakh population to their traditional nomadic lands. The restrictions introduced in 1765 created the institutional preconditions for paid access to the lands of the Ten-Verst Strip. From 1800, this access was regulated through the remount levy, while actual leasing practices developed alongside it during the 19th century. The decision of 1880 did not initiate leasing but abolished the levy and standardized ordinary rent as the principal payment for the use of military lands. As a result, Kazakh households were compelled to pay for the

use of wintering grounds, pastures, and hayfields, while land leasing became a source of revenue for the Siberian Cossack Host.

Statistical materials demonstrate that land leasing played an important role in the economic life of the Irtysh region. Most Kazakh tenants lived within the Ten-Verst Strip, primarily on officers' plots and yurt allotments. As rents for the most favourable lands increased, some households moved to lower-quality Host reserve lands, while others left Cossack lands altogether. The choice of a plot depended on its quality, location, and rental cost.

Payments for land were made in money, hay, or labour. Under share-based hayfield leases, Kazakhs harvested hay and transferred an agreed share to the owner of the plot. Subleasing was also practised, whereby the initial tenant relet the land to other households at a higher rate. On some plots, the rent charged to subtenants exceeded the initial payment by more than eight times. Although rents were formally determined by agreement between the parties, Kazakh households remained economically dependent on access to the pastures, hayfields, and wintering grounds of the Irtysh valley and therefore had limited capacity to reject the terms set by landowners. Thus, these relations combined the legal form of lease with the economic extraction of land rent under conditions of institutionally restricted access to an essential productive resource.

In 1904, the Supremely Approved Opinion of the State Council envisaged retaining the existing rent specifically for lands occupied by Kazakh wintering grounds within the Ten-Verst Strip. The available evidence does not establish the extent of its subsequent implementation, while the increase recorded in Table 4 relates to mixed-use plots and rent calculated per haystack. The 1904 measure should therefore be interpreted as an attempt to preserve wintering-ground rents at their already high level, rather than as proof that further increases in rental payments were prevented in practice. Lease relations therefore became a mechanism through which the Siberian Cossack Host derived revenue from lands traditionally used by Kazakh communities before the imposition of imperial restrictions. Their expansion increased the economic dependence of Kazakh households on landowners and facilitated the spread of subleasing. At the same time, the sources indicate unequal positions within the subleasing chain: some primary tenants charged subtenants substantially higher rates. The available evidence, however, does not permit a quantitative assessment of changes in property differentiation among Kazakh households.

Sources

HAOR – Historical Archive of Omsk Region
CSA RK – Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Источники

ИАОО – Исторический архив Омской области.
ЦГА РК – Центральный государственный архив Республики Казахстан.

References

- Abdirov, 1997 – *Abdirov M. Zh. Voenno-kazach'ya kolonizatsiya Kazakhstana (konets XVI – nachalo XX vv.)*. Opyt istoriko-evolyutsionnogo analiza (Military-Cossack Colonization of Kazakhstan (Late 16th – Early 20th Centuries): An Historical-Evolutionary Analysis). Doctoral dissertation in History. Almaty, 1997. 555 p. (In Russ.).
- Anisimova, Lysenko, 2015 – *Anisimova I. V., Lysenko Yu. A. Vvedenie instituta krest'yanskikh nachal'nikov v Stepnom krae v nachale XX v. i osobennosti ego deyatel'nosti* (The Introduction of the Institution of Peasant Chiefs in the Steppe Region in the Early 20th Century and the Specific Features of Its Activities) // *Izvestiya Altaiskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* (Bulletin of Altai State University). 2015. No. 4/1 (88). P. 20–24. DOI: 10.14258/izvasu(2015)4.1-02. (In Russ.).
- Argynbaev, 1959 – *Argynbaev Kh. A. Istoriko-kul'turnye svyazi russkogo i kazakhskogo narodov i ikh vliyanie na material'nuyu kul'turu kazakhov vo vtoroi polovine XIX – nachale XX v.* (Historical and Cultural Relations between the Russian and Kazakh Peoples and Their Influence on the Material Culture of the Kazakhs in the Second Half of the 19th – Early 20th Century). *Trudy Instituta istorii, arkheologii i etnografii AN KazSSR* (Proceedings of the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR). Alma-Ata, 1959. Vol. 6. P. 19–90. (In Russ.).
- Bokeikhan, 2014 – *Bokeikhan A. Eki zhol* (Two Paths). Alash kosemsozi: zher maselesi (Alash Publicistic Writings: The Land Question) / general editor Q. Saq. Almaty: Qazaq entsiklopediyasy, 2014. Vol. 1. P. 217–223. (In Kaz.).

Campbell, 2017 – *Campbell I. W.* Knowledge and the Ends of Empire: Kazak Intermediaries and Russian Rule on the Steppe, 1731–1917. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2017. XIII. 273 p. DOI: 10.7591/cornell/9781501700798.001.0001.

Kabul'dinov, 2001 – *Kabul'dinov Z. E.* Kazakhs of the Tobolsk and Tomsk Governorates in the Second Half of the 18th – Early 20th Centuries (Historical and Demographic Aspect) (Kazakhs of the Tobolsk and Tomsk Governorates in the Second Half of the 18th – Early 20th Centuries (Historical and Demographic Aspect)). Pavlodar, 2001. 293 p. (In Russ.).

Katanaev, 1904 – *Katanaev G. E.* Kirgizskii vopros v Sibirskom kazach'em voiske (The Kirghiz Question in the Siberian Cossack Host). Omsk: District Headquarters Printing House, 1904. 202 p. (In Russ.).

Katanaev, 1908 – *Katanaev G. E.* Kratkii istoricheskii obzor sluzhby Sibirskogo kazach'ego voiska s 1582 po 1908 (A Brief Historical Overview of the Service of the Siberian Cossack Host from 1582 to 1908). Saint Petersburg: V. Berezovskii, Commissioner of Military Educational Institutions, 1908. 67 p. (In Russ.).

Konshin, 1899 – *Konshin N. Ya.* Pereselencheskie poselki v Ust'-Kamenogorskome uezde; Po Ust'-Kamenogorskome uezdu; Ot Pavlodara do Karkaralinska. Putevye zametki (Resettlement Settlements in the Ust-Kamenogorsk District; Through the Ust-Kamenogorsk District; From Pavlodar to Karkaralinsk. Travel Notes). *Pamyatnaya knizhka Semipalatinskoi oblasti na 1899 god* (Memorial Book of the Semipalatinsk Region for 1899). Semipalatinsk: Publication of the Semipalatinsk Regional Statistical Committee, 1899. P. 1–126. (In Russ.).

Konshin, 1900 – *Konshin N. Ya.* Materialy dlya istorii stepnogo kraia (Materials for the History of the Steppe Region). Semipalatinsk: Regional Administration Printing House, 1900. 54 p. (In Russ.).

Konshin, 1901a – *Konshin N. Ya.* Ocherki ekonomicheskogo byta kirgiz Semipalatinskoi oblasti (Essays on the Economic Life of the Kirghiz of the Semipalatinsk Region) // *Pamyatnaya kniga Semipalatinskoi oblasti PSK na 1901 god* (Memorial Book of the Semipalatinsk Region PSK for 1901). Semipalatinsk: Publication of the Semipalatinsk Regional Statistical Committee, 1901. P. 1–182. (In Russ.).

Konshin, 1901b – *Konshin N. Ya.* Kirgizy na kazach'ikh zemlyakh (Kirghiz on Cossack Lands) // *Pamyatnaya knizhka Semipalatinskoi oblasti na 1901 g.* (Memorial Book of the Semipalatinsk Region for 1901). Semipalatinsk: Tipografiya Semipalatinskogo oblastnogo pravleniya; Tipografiya Torgovogo doma P. Pleshcheev i Ko, 1901. Issue 5. P. 9–182. (In Russ.).

Konshin, 1905 – *Semipalatinskii listok* (Semipalatinsk Leaflet) / ed. by N. Ya. Konshin. Semipalatinsk: Tipolitografiya Torgovogo doma P. Pleshcheev i Ko, 1905. No. 761. (In Russ.).

Konshin, 1928 – *Konshin N. Ya.* Kratkii istoricheskii ocherk Semipalatinskogo kraia (do 1917 goda) (A Brief Historical Essay on the Semipalatinsk Region [Before 1917]) // *Nashe khozyaistvo* (Our Economy). Semipalatinsk: Semgubizdat, 1928. No. 1 (14). P. 3–36. (In Russ.).

Ksenzshik, 2018 – *Ksenzshik G.N.* Istoriografiya i obzor istochnikov po istoricheskoi geografii Stepnykh oblastei Kazakhstana XIX – nachala XX veka (Historiography and Review of Sources on the Historical Geography of the Steppe Regions of Kazakhstan in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries) // *Sbornik prací Pedagogické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity. Řada společenských věd.* 2018. Vol. 32. No. 1. P. 119–140. (In Russ.).

Malikov, 2011 – *Malikov Y.* Tsars, Cossacks, and Nomads: The Formation of a Borderland Culture in Northern Kazakhstan in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2011. 321 p. (In Eng.).

Martin, 2001 – *Martin V.* Law and Custom in the Steppe: The Kazakhs of the Middle Horde and Russian Colonialism in the Nineteenth Century. Richmond: Curzon Press, 2001. 244 p. (In Eng.).

Materialy, 1902 – *Materialy po kirgizskomu zemlepol'zovaniyu, sobrannye i razrabotannye ekspeditsiei po issledovaniyu stepnykh oblastei. Pod rukovodstvom F. A. Shcherbiny. Akmolinskaya oblast', Omskii uezd* (Materials on Kirghiz Land Use Collected and Compiled by the Expedition for the Study of the Steppe Regions. Under the Direction of F. A. Shcherbina. Akmolinsk Region, Omsk District). Omsk: Tipografiya Shtaba Sibirskogo voennogo okruga, 1902. Vol. 11. 359 p. (In Russ.).

Materialy, 1903 – *Materialy po kirgizskomu zemlepol'zovaniyu, sobrannye i razrabotannye ekspeditsiei po issledovaniyu stepnykh oblastei. Pod rukovodstvom F. A. Shcherbiny. Semipalatinskaya oblast', Pavlodarskii uezd* (Materials on Kirghiz Land Use Collected and Compiled by the Expedition for the Study of the Steppe Regions. Under the Direction of F. A. Shcherbina. Semipalatinsk Region, Pavlodar District). Voronezh: Tipografiya V. I. Isaeva, 1903. Vol. 4. 695 p. (In Russ.).

Materialy, 1905 – *Materialy po kirgizskomu zemlepol'zovaniyu, sobrannye i razrabotannye ekspeditsiei po issledovaniyu stepnykh oblastei. Pod rukovodstvom F. A. Shcherbiny. Semipalatinskaya oblast', Ust'-Kamenogorskii uezd* (Materials on Kirghiz Land Use Collected and Compiled by the Expedition for the Study of the Steppe Regions. Under the Direction of F. A. Shcherbina. Semipalatinsk Region, Ust-Kamenogorsk District). St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaya pol'za, 1905. Vol. 9. 369 p. (In Russ.).

Materialy, 1909 – *Materialy po kirgizskomu zemlepol'zovaniyu, sobrannye i razrabotannye ekspeditsiei po issledovaniyu stepnykh oblastei. Pod rukovodstvom F. A. Shcherbiny. Semipalatinskaya oblast', Semipalatinskii uezd* (Materials on Kirghiz Land Use Collected and Compiled by the Expedition for the Study of the Steppe Regions. Under the Direction of F. A. Shcherbina. Semipalatinsk Region, Semipalatinsk District). Voronezh, 1909. Vol. 10. 1117 p. (In Russ.).

Materialy, 1913 – *Materialy po obsledovaniyu khozyaistva i zemlepol'zovaniya kirgiz Semipalatinskoi oblasti. T. 1. Pavlodarskii uezd. Vyp. 2. Povtornoie obsledovanie. 1910 g.* (Materials of the Survey of the Economy and Land Use of the Kirghiz of the Semipalatinsk Region. Vol. 1. Pavlodar District. Issue 2. Repeated Survey. 1910). Under the direction of

A.V. Pereplechikov. St. Petersburg: Pereselencheskoe upravlenie Glavnogo upravleniya zemleustroistva i zemledeliya, 1913. 351 p. (In Russ.)

Ostafiev, 1895 – *Ostafiev V. A.* Kolonizatsiya stepnykh oblastei v svyazi s voprosom o kochevom khozyaistve (Colonization of the Steppe Regions in Connection with the Question of Nomadic Economy) // Zapiski Zapadno-Sibirskogo otdeleniya Imperatorskogo Russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva (Proceedings of the West Siberian Department of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society). Omsk: Tipografiya Okruzhnogo shtaba, 1895. Book XVIII. Issue 1. P. 1–62. (In Russ.)

Pianciola, 2009 – *Pianciola N.* Stalinismo di frontiera: Colonizzazione agricola, sterminio dei nomadi e costruzione statale in Asia centrale (1905–1936) (Frontier Stalinism: Agricultural Colonization, the Extermination of Nomads, and State Building in Central Asia (1905–1936)). Rome: Viella, 2009. 548 p. (In Italian)

Sbornik, 1905 – *Sbornik pravitel'stvennykh rasporyazhenii po kazach'im voiskam. Za 1904 god* (Collection of Government Orders Concerning the Cossack Hosts. For 1904). St. Petersburg: Glavnoe upravlenie irregulyarnykh voisk, 1905. Vol. XL. 829 p. (In Russ.)

Statistika, 1895 – *Statistika Rossiiskoi imperii. T. XXVII. Volosti i naselennye mesta. 1893 g. Vyp. 5.* Semipalatinskaya oblast' (Statistics of the Russian Empire. Vol. XXVII. Volosts and Settlements. 1893. Issue 5. Semipalatinsk Region). St. Petersburg, 1895. 48 p. (In Russ.)

Suleimenov, 1963 – *Suleimenov B. S.* Agrarnyi vopros v Kazakhstane poslednei treti XIX – nachale XX vv. (1867–1907 gg.) (The Agrarian Question in Kazakhstan in the Last Third of the 19th – Early 20th Centuries (1867–1907)). Almaty: Izdatel'stvo AN KazSSR, 1963. 411 p. (In Russ.)

Tileke, 1995 – *Tileke Zh.* Shezhire: Ertis – Bayanaula oneri (Shezhire: The Art of the Irtysh–Bayanaul Region). Book 1. Pavlodar: Daa; Qazaqstan, 1995. 368 p. (in Kaz.)

Toraigyrov, 2025 – *Toraigyrov E. M., Abenova B. S., Abenov D. K.* Strategiya rasshireniya Rossiiskoi imperii na primere Irtyshskoi voennoi linii (The Expansion Strategy of the Russian Empire: The Case of the Irtysh Military Line) // *Byl'e Gody.* 2025. Vol. 20. No. 2. P. 548–566. (In Russ.)

Usmanov, 1975 – *Usmanov Kh. F.* Prodazha i arenda bashkirskikh zemel v poreformennyi period (The Sale and Lease of Bashkir Lands in the Post-Reform Period) // *Voprosy agrarnoi istorii Urala* (Questions of the Agrarian History of the Urals). Sverdlovsk, 1975. P. 107–123. (In Russ.)

Usov, 1879 – *Usov F. N.* Statisticheskoe opisanie Sibirskogo kazach'ego voiska (Statistical Description of the Siberian Cossack Host) / comp. by F. Usov. St. Petersburg: Glav. upr. irregulyarnykh voisk, 1879. 284 p. (In Russ.)

Литература

Campbell, 2017 – *Campbell I.W.* Knowledge and the Ends of Empire: Kazak Intermediaries and Russian Rule on the Steppe, 1731–1917. – Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2017. – XIII, 273 p. DOI: 10.7591/cornell/9781501700798.001.0001.

Malikov, 2011 – *Malikov Y.* Tsars, Cossacks, and Nomads: The Formation of a Borderland Culture in Northern Kazakhstan in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. – Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2011. – 321 p.

Martin, 2001 – *Martin V.* Law and Custom in the Steppe: The Kazakhs of the Middle Horde and Russian Colonialism in the Nineteenth Century. – Richmond: Curzon Press, 2001. – 244 p.

Pianciola, 2009 – *Pianciola N.* Stalinismo di frontiera: Colonizzazione agricola, sterminio dei nomadi e costruzione statale in Asia centrale (1905–1936). – Rome: Viella, 2009. – 548 p.

Абдиров, 1997 – *Абдиров М.Ж.* Военно-казахья колонизация Казахстана (конец XVI - начало XX вв.). Опыт историко-эволюционного анализа // Диссертация на соискание ученой степени доктора исторических наук. - Алматы, 1997. - 555 с.

Анисимова, Лысенко, 2015 – *Анисимова И.В., Лысенко Ю.А.* Введение института крестьянских начальников в Степном крае в начале XX в. и особенности его деятельности // Известия Алтайского государственного университета. - 2015. - № 4/1 (88). С. 20–24. DOI: 10.14258/izvasu(2015)4.1-02.

Аргынбаев, 1959 – *Аргынбаев Х.А.* Историко-культурные связи русского и казахского народов и их влияние на материальную культуру казахов во второй половине XIX - начале XX в. // Тр. Института истории, археологии и этнографии АН КазССР. Алма-Ата. 1959. - Т. 6. - С. 19-90.

Бөкейхан, 2014 – *Бөкейхан Ә.* Екі жол // Алаш көсемсөзі: жер мәселесі / жалпы редакциясын басқарған Қ. Сак. – Алматы: Қазақ энциклопедиясы, 2014. – Т. 1. – С. 217–223.

Кабульдинов, 2001 – *Кабульдинов З.Е.* Казахи Тобольской и Томской губерний во второй половине XVIII – начале XX вв. (историко-демографический аспект). – Павлодар, 2001. - 293 с.

Катанаев, 1904 – *Катанаев Г.Е.* Киргизский вопрос в Сибирском казачьем войске. Омск: Типография Окружного штаба, 1904. 202 с.

Катанаев, 1908 – *Катанаев Г.Е.* Краткий исторический обзор службы сибирского казачьего войска с 1582 по 1908. - СПб.: Издал В.Березовский комиссионер военно-учебных заведений, 1908. - 67 с.

Коншин, 1899 – *Коншин Н.Я.* Переселенческие поселки в Устькаменогорском уезде; По Устькаменогорскому уезду; От Павлодара до Каркаралинска. Путевые заметки / Памятная книжка Семипалатинской области на 1899. Семипалатинск: Издание Семипалатинского Областного Статистического Комитета, 1899. С. 1-126.

Коншин, 1900 – *Коншин Н.Я.* Материалы для истории степного края. Семипалатинск: Типография Областного Правления, 1900. 54 с.

- Коншин, 1901а – *Коншин Н.Я.* Очерки экономического быта киргиз Семипалатинской области // Памятная книга Семипалатинской области ПСК на 1901 год. Семипалатинск: Издание Семипалатинского Областного Статистического Комитета, 1901. С. 1-182.
- Коншин, 1901б – *Коншин Н.Я.* Киргизы на казачьих землях // Памятная книжка Семипалатинской области на 1901 г. – Семипалатинск: типография Семипалатинского областного правления; типография Торгового дома П. Плещеев и Ко, 1901. – Вып. 5. – С. 9–182.
- Коншин, 1905 – *Семипалатинский листок* / под редакцией Н. Я. Коншина. – Семипалатинск: Типо-литография Торгового дома П. Плещеев и Ко, 1905. – № 761.
- Коншин, 1928 – *Коншин Н.Я.* Краткий исторический очерк Семипалатинского края (до 1917 года) // *Наше хозяйство*. – Семипалатинск: Семгубиздат, 1928. – № 1 (14). – С. 3–36.
- Ксенжик, 2018 – *Ксенжик Г.Н.* Историография и обзор источников по исторической географии Степных областей Казахстана XIX – начала XX века // *Sborník prací Pedagogické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity. Řada společenských věd*. – 2018. – Т. 32. – № 1. – С. 119–140.
- Материалы, 1902 – *Материалы по киргизскому землепользованию, собранные и разработанные экспедицией по исследованию Степных областей*. Под руководством Ф.А. Щербины. Акмолинская область, Омский уезд. – Омск: Типография Штаба Сибирского военного округа, 1902. – Т. 11. – 359 с.
- Материалы, 1903 – *Материалы по киргизскому землепользованию, собранные и разработанные экспедицией по исследованию Степных областей*. Под руководством Ф.А. Щербины. Семипалатинская область, Павлодарский уезд. – Воронеж: Типография В.И. Исаева, 1903. – Т. 4. – 695 с.
- Материалы, 1905 – *Материалы по киргизскому землепользованию, собранные и разработанные экспедицией по исследованию степных областей*. Под руководством Ф.А.Щербины. Семипалатинская область, Усть-Каменогорский уезд. - Санкт-Петербург: Общественная польза, 1905. - Т.9. - 369 с.
- Материалы, 1909 – *Материалы по киргизскому землепользованию, собранные и разработанные экспедицией по исследованию степных областей*. Под руководством Ф.А.Щербины. Семипалатинская область, Семипалатинский уезд. - Воронеж, 1909. - Т. 10. - 1117 с.
- Материалы, 1913 – *Материалы по обследованию хозяйства и землепользования киргиз Семипалатинской области*. Том 1. Павлодарский уезд. Выпуск 2-й. Повторное обследование. 1910 г. - С.-Петербург. Переселенческое управление главного управления землеустройства и земледелия, 1913. - 351 с.
- Остафьев, 1895 – *Остафьев В.А.* Колонизация степных областей в связи с вопросом о кочевом хозяйстве // Записки Западно-Сибирского отдела Императорского Русского географического общества. – Омск: Типография Окружного штаба, 1895. – Кн. XVIII. – Вып. 1. – С. 1–62.
- Сборник, 1905 – *Сборник правительственных распоряжений по казачьим войскам. За 1904 год*. – СПб.: Главное управление иррегулярных войск, 1905. – Т. XL. – 829 с.
- Статистика, 1895 – *Статистика Российской империи*. Т. XXVII. Волости и населенные места. 1893 г. Вып.5. Семипалатинская область. - СПб., 1895. - 48 с.
- Сулейменов, 1963 – *Сулейменов Б.С.* Аграрный вопрос в Казахстане последней трети XIX - начале XX вв. (1867-1907 гг.). – Алматы: Издательство АН КазССР, 1963. - 411 с.
- Тілеке, 1995 – *Тілеке Ж.* Шежіре: Ертгіс - Баянаула өнері / Ж. Тілеке 1 кітап. - Павлодар: Дауа; Қазақстан, 1995. - 368 б.
- Торайгыров, 2025 – *Торайгыров Е.М., Абенова Б.С., Абенов Д.К.* Стратегия расширения Российской империи на примере Иртышской военной линии // *Bylye Gody*. - № 20(2). - 2025. - С. 548-566.
- Усманов, 1975 – *Усманов Х.Ф.* Продажа и аренда башкирских земель в пореформенный период // Вопросы аграрной истории Урала. – Свердловск, 1975. – С. 107–123.
- Усов, 1879 – *Усов Ф.Н.* Статистическое описание Сибирского казачьего войска / Сост. войсковой старшина Ф. Усов. - Санкт-Петербург: Глав. упр. иррегулярных войск, 1879. - 284 с.