



UDC 323.1

IRSTI 39.29.15

DOI 10.37238/2960-1371.2960-138X.2025.100(4).172

¹Aitenov Zhassulan *, ²Baishov Bakyt, ³Orazayeva Zhazira, ⁴Alikulova Nurlygul,
⁵Eskaliev Samat

¹L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

²T.Ya. Begeldinov Military Institute of the Air Defense Forces,
Aktobe, Kazakhstan

^{3,4}K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional University, Aktobe, Kazakhstan

^{1,5}Eurasian Humanitarian Institute named after A.K. Kusainov,
Astana, Kazakhstan

*Corresponding author: i-10-off@bk.ru

E-mail: dil_123@mail.ru, zh.orazaeva@mail.ru, Nur.AS_74@mail.ru,
samat.eskaliev@mail.ru

COLONIZATION, TOPONYMY AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF HISTORICAL MEMORY: CHALLENGES TO KAZAKHSTAN'S IDENTITY

Annotation. The topic of colonization and its impact on the development of national identity is an important aspect in the study of the history of Kazakhstan. During the colonization of the territory of Kazakhstan by the Russian Empire and the USSR, not only political and social structures were changed, but also elements of cultural memory, including toponymy. Toponymy, as a reflection of historical and cultural identity, underwent changes during the period of colonial power, which affected the perception of the historical past and national identity. The process of changing toponyms, removing historical names and replacing them with new ones associated with the Soviet power became part of a wider phenomenon - the transformation of historical memory. This process was aimed at creating a single Soviet identity, but also had long-term consequences for the preservation and transformation of Kazakh identity. Over the years, there has been a return of historical toponyms, the restoration of lost memory and the search for new ways to strengthen national identity. The article examines how the processes of colonization and changes in toponyms have affected the collective memory of the Kazakh people, and also analyzes the challenges facing modern Kazakhstan in the context of preserving and developing its national identity in the context of globalization and historical transformation. The study uses methods of historical and archival analysis, toponymic research, and a comparative historical method. Archival materials, documents, maps are analyzed, and a comparative analysis of changes in toponyms in various historical eras is conducted. The method of content analysis is also used to study the impact of colonization on cultural memory and identity.

Keywords: Colonization, toponymy, historical memory, identity, Kazakhstan, transformation, cultural heritage.



Introduction

During the period of modernisation, almost all countries are experiencing a process of social transformation, accompanied by the breakdown of traditional consciousness. Historical evidence indicates that this phenomenon often results in the dissolution of entrenched ideals, reference points and values, giving rise to an ideological vacuum. Following the dissolution of the socialist system, Soviet patriotism and socialist pride have gradually lost their predominant influence in Kazakhstani society, highlighting an urgent necessity for the establishment of novel national reference points and values. This necessity demands a novel comprehension, a new ideology, and new methodologies.

The system of conceptualised ideas, perceptions and views on political life reflecting the interests, outlook and ideals of the state and society, playing the most important determining role in the development of the country was and remains the state ideology. It is imperative for the state at every stage of its construction, as the state ideology contains a significant potential for the integration of society, socialisation of the individual and self-identification of the state in the world community. The basis of the state ideology is the state consciousness and the state worldview, the foundation of which is the historical self-consciousness of the people, based on the knowledge of their history. It is evident that during the colonial period and the years of totalitarian regime domination, the historical consciousness of the Kazakh people was systematically erased. The historical memory of the people was erased, including the history of great states, glorious rulers, and national heroes who served and defended their Fatherland and state [1].

It is imperative that we establish a historical self-consciousness, which will serve as the foundation for nurturing a profound sense of Kazakh patriotism. A pivotal aspect in nurturing this historical consciousness among the youth is the education of the history of the Kazakh people, with a particular emphasis on the colonial period, a time marked by the forfeiture of Kazakh national sovereignty.

Materials and methods of research

The interdisciplinary nature of toponymy as a field of study facilitates the use of a wide variety of research methods. In the context of our study, the following methods were employed to analyze the toponymic material of the Pavlodar region, focusing on the impact of internal colonization on the transformation of historical memory and Kazakhstan's identity:

This method involves the examination of historical documents containing toponymic and historical-geographical information. It allows for the extraction of data regarding the settlement patterns of Kazakh clans in specific regions, the paths of colonization by non-ethnic settlers, and their original places of residence. By analyzing such documents, we gain a clearer understanding of the historical context in which toponyms were formed and transformed.

The historical-comparative method was utilized to identify both commonalities and distinctions in the development of the toponymic system of the Pavlodar region. This method helped to trace how the toponymic landscape evolved differently in Pavlodar compared to other regions of Kazakhstan, shedding light on the region's unique historical,



cultural, and colonial influences. The comparative method involves examining a particular toponym by drawing analogies with similar names from neighboring and geographically separated regions. This method allows for a broader understanding of the socio-cultural, linguistic, and historical factors that influenced the creation and transformation of place names, providing insights into the processes of naming across different regions.

In conducting this research, we relied heavily on theoretical studies by both Kazakh and foreign scholars. However, particular attention was given to the concept of internal colonization as proposed by A. Etkind. According to Etkind, internal colonization refers to a form of colonial management within a state, where the state's population is treated as subjugated during conquest, and the territory is viewed as conquered and in need of settlement from a central authority. This expanded definition of internal colonization encompasses the social and cultural consequences of these processes, as well as the interactions between 'colonizers' and indigenous peoples. Etkind's concept is central to understanding the complex dynamics of internal colonization in Kazakhstan and its impact on the transformation of toponymy.

As a result of these processes, the research highlights the emergence of territories where the vital interests of the Kazakh population intersected with those of the colonial administration and Cossack forces. This interaction significantly influenced the toponymic landscape, reflecting the various changes and shifts in identity, power dynamics, and historical memory over time.

Discussion

The contemporary conception of the course «History of Kazakhstan» entails its interpretation within the broader context of world history, the history of the Eurasian continent, nomadic civilisations, the history of Turkic peoples and the countries of the Central Asian region. Consequently, the multifunctional role and significance of the course are increased. It is therefore recommended that educational organisations prioritise the instruction of national history, ensuring that the chronological framework and philosophical underpinnings of history are firmly rooted in the concept of statehood. This approach should encompass the history of states that have emerged within the geographical boundaries of the Republic of Kazakhstan and have flourished during various historical epochs and periods.

Consequently, the content of school curricula should encompass the history of the formation of states and the concept of statehood within the territory of modern Kazakhstan. The guiding documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan emphasise that history as a school discipline «forms the core of all humanitarian and social science courses', forms 'national consciousness, moral and ethical norms, serves as a world outlook basis' for all other subject disciplines. A stated objective of history education is the cultivation of tolerance, defined as 'respect and understanding of traditions and cultures of other nations, communication skills in interpersonal relations» [2].

However, it is important to acknowledge that many educators and contemporary professional historians exhibit an excessive idealisation of the historical past of the Kazakh people, and adopt unambiguous approaches when addressing contentious issues.



In our opinion, this concerns first and foremost the complex and contradictory period in the political and military history of the Kazakh steppe – the XVIII-XIX centuries, and the penetration of Slavic toponymy into the geography of Kazakhstan. In 2002, the eighth UN conference on standardisation of geographical names was held in Berlin. The resolution of this conference underscores the imperative for the collection and preservation of geographical names belonging to indigenous communities, emphasising the safeguarding of names that reflect national and regional identity. In the context of Kazakhstan, a full member of the UN, this situation presents a pressing challenge to scientists, practitioners, executive and representative bodies of the republic. It is imperative that they undertake the urgent task of collecting, systematising, studying and unifying the entire complex of toponymy in all regions of the Republic of Kazakhstan [3].

A plethora of studies, both regional and interregional in scope, necessitate rigorous examination. These include comprehensive theoretical generalisations, in-depth analyses of language interaction in the domain of proper names, and the etymology of foreign-language names. Other significant issues within this field demand resolution. The necessity of such work is determined by the possibility to study the whole range of multilateral relations, including the issues of colonisation of Kazakhstan by the Russian Empire, construction of fortification lines, penetration of Slavic toponymy into the Kazakh land, Kazakh-Russian economic contacts and their influence on the processes of gradual transformation of the geography of SaryArka.

The construction of fortified lines in Russia was an activity with a long-standing tradition. Even in the period of Kievan Rus, fortified defensive lines were in existence. The development of these fortifications commenced in the 9th century, with the construction of fortified points and ramparts, primarily along river borders. A significant element of this defence infrastructure were zaseki, which were constructed in forested areas and comprised barriers constructed from fallen trees. These structures were erected expeditiously and possessed a provisional nature. In the 14th century, during the process of strengthening the Moscow Grand Duchy, a border guard line was established along the rivers Khoper, Voronezh and Don. From the XVI century onwards, these defensive lines underwent a transformation, becoming a long-term, periodically renewable defence system, comprising not only outposts but also a number of engineering structures. An archetypal example of such a defence line is the Bolshaya Zaseticheskaya line, constructed in the mid-16th century to the south of the Oka River. Beginning from the second half of the 17th century, the Bolshaya Zasetschnaya Frontier lost its former importance in the Russian Empire's ongoing confrontation with nomads, as the geographical scope of Russian-Tatar confrontations shifted towards the south. Consequently, new fortified fortress cities and fortified serf lines emerged in this region: Belgorod, Simbirsk, Zakamsk and Tambov. The formation of a centralised state precipitated the emergence of systems of fortified lines, as the construction of extensive defensive barriers necessitated the mobilisation of substantial populations and considerable material resources, a feat that would have been impracticable in the absence of a robust centralised authority. As Russia's borders expanded in the 18th century, a system of border fortified lines emerged on the basis of the experience of grid lines, which



consisted of fortresses and fortified towns, between which field fortifications were created, usually in the form of an earthen rampart, sometimes with a wooden rampart on top and a moat. Sieges were set up in front of the moat, and slingshots were placed against cavalry. At regular intervals of 200-600 metres, the rampart featured ledges in the form of redoubts, which enabled the defence of the approaches to the rampart using longitudinal rifle fire [4].

Research results

The construction of military fortifications throughout the existence of royal power in later periods was justified by the mythical defence of the Kazakh people from the Dzungars. Indeed, by the beginning of the 18th century, the Dzungar onslaught on the Kazakh lands had intensified. It is also noteworthy that the interests of five nations converged along the Siberian border: Bashkirs, Kalmyks, Kazakhs, Tatars and Russians. Consequently, this region was a subject of strategic interest for representatives of the Siberian administration, as it was a territory whose effective defence prevented nomads from entering the area of compact Russian settlement in Siberia. In this context, the consolidation of the Irtysh region, devoid of fortifications and outposts, would have been impracticable. In light of these considerations, in 1713, the Siberian governor, M.P. Gagarin, reported to Peter I on the potential for the construction of several fortresses along the Irtysh and the establishment of a fortified line through Dzungaria to Erket. 22 May 1714. On this date, Peter the Great signed a decree addressed to Lieutenant Colonel Ivan Dmitrievich Buchholz, ordering a military campaign against the Kalmyk land on the Darya River with the objective of conquering the regions where gold was being mined [5]. The decree was signed in the following terms: «...to proceed to you, Bukhgoitsu, to Tobolsk and therefrom to take from the aforementioned governor (Gagarin) 1,500 men of military age, and to proceed with them to Yamysh lake, where it is ordered to construct a city, and to proceed to that location, the aforementioned people, in that newly built fortress and in the vicinity thereof, to establish a winter camp, so that in the following spring it would be possible to proceed with those people to Yarket as soon as possible. As one traverses from Yamysh to Yarket, it becomes evident that the route was selected with the intention of providing a favourable path for the populace, with convenient locations such as rivers and forests being utilised as redoubts for the storage of provisions and for communication. The distance between these redoubts was limited to a maximum of six days' travel, ensuring a swift passage. Furthermore, the presence of these redoubts was a strategic measure, with a select few individuals being left in their care [6]. This decree is regarded as a foundational document that guided the subsequent Russian advance along the Irtysh, marking the inception of the Irtysh fortified line. The construction of this line, with minor interruptions, persisted from 1714 to 1720.

Nurbaev K.J., a Doctor of Historical Sciences, asserts that the rapid expansion of Russian territory during the first half of the 18th century was predominantly influenced by three factors. Firstly, the presence of firearms and a well-armed army with extensive combat experience. Secondly, the so-called 'luck factor', defined as a favourable coincidence of circumstances, in this case signifying the Kazakh-Dzungarian military clashes, during which the parties were distracted by each other, thereby enabling Russia to advance almost unhindered deep into the Kazakh lands. Thirdly, the employment of



diplomatic techniques to achieve foreign policy goals by the extermination of nomads by nomads, as well as the temporal aspect of achieving these goals [7].

These factors are considered to be instrumental in elucidating the penetration of Slavic toponymy in the region under scrutiny and the subsequent rise (and eventual predominance) of the Slavic population in the Kazakh steppe.

The construction of the initial geostrategic and military-defence infrastructure in the north and north-east of Kazakhstan, in the form of the Tobol-Ishim, Irtysh and Kolyvan-Kuznetsk (in Altai) fortified lines, created certain prerequisites for mass migrations of agrarian groups of European population to the littoral regions of the region and sedentary-agricultural colonisation of these territories.

During the initial phase of the Irtysh military fortifications, temporary «weather-changing teams» were deployed, and the line remained uninhabited. The logistics of maintaining temporary commands, delivering food and forage over long distances, were immense, and thus, in the 1730s, the command made the decision to transfer a portion of the Tara Cossacks to permanent residence in the Irtysh fortresses and outposts. Furthermore, the Cossacks were permitted to relocate their families to the new location. Consequently, the Cossacks constructed rudimentary dwellings within the fortifications and settlements, thereby establishing Cossack stanitsa.

It is evident that the initial relatively permanent sedentary settlers in the territory of Kazakhstan were servant Cossacks who had been displaced from the border slobodas and stanitsa of the old fortified lines and internal provinces of Russia.

The primary service contingent of the Irtysh and Gorky frontier lines, which encompassed the Kazakh nomads from the north and east, were Siberian Cossacks. The Siberian Cossack Army was established by the first military colonists of the region, known as «serf Cossacks», who comprised various categories of men of war, including town, Don, Ural Cossacks, Bashkirs, Tatars, and Ukrainians, among others.

The renowned Cossack writer Usov provided a characterisation of the Siberian Army that is worthy of note: «It was not, in contrast to the Don and Yaitsky troops, an original product of zemstvo colonisation of the suburbs, but rather it came out of the hands of the administration and owed its existence to the government. This characteristic imprinted its subsequent history; throughout its existence, the government, without the involvement of the populace, implemented reforms, augmented its composition through forced colonisation, facilitated its internal, natural propagation by providing it with spouses from exiled criminals and those released from the stockades, and unified it from diverse elements... from the ultra-plebeian level of the masses advanced by means of service... a privileged class of personal noblemen and officers (Proshloe Kazahstana, 1998, 287).

In 1808, the «Regulations on the Siberian Linear Cossack Army» were ratified, resulting in the unification of the Cossacks from the Novoishimskaya, Irtyshskaya and Kolyvan-Kuznetskaya lines into a single estate, accompanied by the establishment of distinctive social rights and class privileges (Proshloe Kazahstana, 1998, 283).

With the exception of Cossacks, exiled peasants-settlers constituted an insignificant proportion of the settled population. However, from the 1740s onwards, with the construction of fortifications, redoubts and outposts along the tributaries of the Ishim and



Irtysk rivers, as well as in the vicinity of the saline lakes in the steppe, the first peasant settlements emerged, thereby marking the onset of the popular peasant colonisation of Northern and Eastern Kazakhstan.

Meanwhile, by the 1760s, the service population along the Upper Irtysk lines continued to consume imported bread, the delivery of which from Tobolsk was prohibitively expensive. Consequently, the delivery of bread was often deficient in terms of both frequency and punctuality, resulting in a situation where the Cossacks were subjected to prolonged periods of starvation. In response to this challenge, a decision was made in the early 1600s to address the food problem by settling peasants along the Irtysk line and developing local bread production. The Decree on withdrawal of hunters from peasants for resettlement to Ust-Kamenogorsk fortress was announced in the Tarsk, Tyumen, Yalutorovsk and Ishim uyezds. Exiles arriving from European Russia began to be sent there. The decision was taken to also populate the Irtysk bank with exiles. It is also noteworthy that a significant proportion of exiles in Siberia were accompanied by their spouses and offspring. It was General Springer's order that all these exiles be 'taken out of the prison stockade' and settled. The total number of individuals determined for settlement in 1762 amounted to 144 men, 110 of whom were accompanied by their respective spouses, in addition to 39 sons and 38 daughters. The settlement of this group was undertaken in the newly established village of Sosnino, as well as in the outposts of Achairsky and Cherlakovsky [8].

Consequently, in 1763, the village of Sosnino was established by exiled peasants-settlers, located 20 versts from the Achair fortification. Shortly thereafter, the settlers were subjected to an incursion by the Kazakhs. A detachment of Cossacks from Achair arrived to assist the peasants, forcing the nomads to retreat into the steppes. The conflict resulted in the death of a settler named Sosnin. Subsequent to this incident, a second group of settlers was assigned to the village in the summer and autumn of 1763. The new settlers named the village after Sosnin, who had fallen during the conflict. Towards the close of the 18th century, a church was constructed in the village, dedicated to Pokrovka, and the name of the village was consequently altered to Pokrovskoye. The present-day village of Pokrovka is located within the Omsk region [9].

The settlement of the Priishimya region of northern Kazakhstan by Slavic migrants occurred through voluntary, spontaneous migrations.

It is evident that the construction of the Irtysk and Gorky lines resulted in a substantial increase in the Russian peasantry population in Kurgan, Ishim and Omsk uyezds. In the southern part of Ishim uyezd, adjacent to the line north of the Petropavlovsk fortress, the villages of Dolmatovo, Krasnoyarka, Vagulino, and others, totalling 17 villages with 1430 survey souls, emerged between 1758 and 1763. By 1782, the number of villages had increased to 19, 16 of which had a total population of 2115 (data for 3 villages is missing).

The 1792 revision registered 27 settlements, including the Tatar village of Mavlyutovo (now Mamlyutka), which was founded in 1786. Data pertaining to the population of these 27 villages is extant for 19 of them, with a total population of 2039 souls. By the close of the 18th century, the most populous of these settlements, with a population exceeding 100 males, were Sumnoe (276), Kustovoye (194), Krasnoyarka



(81), Vagulino and Mavlyutovo (176 each), Sokolovo (174), Nalobino (160), Dubrovnoye (133), and Solonovka (159) [10].

The increase in the number of the Cossack class and then peasants, who, when arranging their settlements, gave them Slavic names, could not but affect the toponymy of the region under study and the formation of the multi-ethnic population of Kazakhstan.

It is our conviction that, within a multi-ethnic society, the cultivation of tolerance, respect and benevolence is imperative. However, it is important to acknowledge that contemporary school textbooks on the history of Kazakhstan, as well as general textbooks, do not adequately address the promotion of tolerance among students. The effectiveness of this education is contingent upon the expertise and commitment of educators.

The students, in conjunction with the teacher, arrived at the conclusion that Abulkhair elected to proffer Russia a more substantial offering than merely a peace treaty or even a military alliance against the Dzungars. The notion of acceding to Russian citizenship by the Kazakh tribes was mooted [11].

It is imperative to acknowledge the pedagogues who, irrespective of governmental directives, elucidate historical phenomena through the lens of problem-solving, and who instruct students to articulate and advocate for their perspectives.

Group work constitutes one of the active forms of teaching in senior classes, and the effectiveness of seminars is noticeably increased through the use of this form of work.

In the initial months, the utilisation of group work facilitates the observation of students' general development and individual characteristics. The formation of groups is predicated on an assessment of their preparedness and interpersonal dynamics. The selection of a leader within each group is also a key aspect of this process. It is only after this preliminary work has been completed that the commencement of seminar classes is deemed appropriate.

The seminar is entitled «Defence of a problem (issue)». The students are informed in advance of the issues that are to be discussed in the seminar. The students are also provided with the necessary literature. At the commencement of the lesson, the questions, contained within an envelope, are meticulously arranged on the table (the number of questions should exceed the number of groups). The groups are expected to complete the task of sorting through the envelopes within a time frame of three minutes. Thereafter, within a span of five minutes, the groups are expected to reflect on the question, select the pertinent materials from those available in the classroom, and designate the individual who will serve as the main speaker. The entire group engages in the defence of the issue (main message, addendum to it, answers to questions). The issue is considered to have been defended when the opponents have exhausted their questions [12].

The 'Small Groups' workshop is distinguished from its predecessor by the method of group formation, which is determined through a randomisation process. In this process, participants are divided into groups of responders, supporters, opponents, and reviewers, based on their responses to a specific issue.

In lieu of a conventional lesson characterised by its repetitive nature and subsequent summarisation, a seminar «Round Table» (by interests) is a viable alternative. A distinctive feature of the latter is the combination of individual and group forms of



activity. A significant proportion of the lesson is allocated for independent work in groups, typically in pairs, with students being united by shared interests. The groups are tasked with working on a set of questions, actively discussing them and thereby forming a small 'round table'. Conversely, other groups (possibly a single student) receive practical tasks in an envelope, such as creating a crossword puzzle, bingo, game, composing a critical note, formulating a plan and theses for the proposed excursion, and so on. At the conclusion of the lesson, pupils discuss the outcomes of their work and the progress of its fulfilment.

It is evident that all the aforementioned seminar types incorporate discussion elements, with the potential for experiential learning and the facilitation of lessons-discussions. This facilitates the articulation of diverse perspectives, cultivates the capacity for proactive and unconventional thinking, and nurtures an environment conducive to dialogue. It is important to note that discussions can be initiated in the event of problematic questions being communicated to students in advance (this does not exclude the discussion of spontaneous questions that arise during the lesson). The teacher's role is to guide the discussion in a manner that anticipates and adapts to its intensity, sharpness, and effectiveness.

With respect to the acceptance of the Russian protectorate by the Khan of the Younger Juz Abulkhair, it is evident that the Russian authorities were primarily interested in the development of the Kazakh steppe, a region of significant geopolitical, trade and economic importance. It is noteworthy that had the Russian Empire not assigned such a role to the region, the government would not have pursued the annexation of such a vast territory solely for the purpose of safeguarding the Kazakh people from incessant external threats. Consequently, Peter I, without altering the fundamental principles of Russian eastern policy, merely imparted to it a more dynamic and appropriate character.

Conclusion

The process of colonization and its impact on toponymy have played a significant role in shaping the historical narrative and collective memory of Kazakhstan. The renaming of places, the distortion of cultural landmarks, and the alteration of historical landmarks during colonial periods have created deep challenges in maintaining and restoring Kazakhstan's identity. As Kazakhstan moves toward a more profound understanding and re-establishment of its national heritage, it must confront these colonial legacies by recovering its indigenous toponyms and historical memory. This process is not merely about restoring names but also about reasserting the values, culture, and historical continuity of the Kazakh people. The transformation of toponyms reflects the broader transformation of identity - shifting from imposed, foreign constructs to locally grounded, authentic representations of Kazakhstan's rich history. Kazakhstan's journey to reclaim its historical memory is crucial not only for healing past wounds but also for cultivating a stronger national identity in the face of global and regional challenges. Re-establishing meaningful toponyms is part of a broader endeavor to ensure that future generations understand and appreciate their history and heritage, free from the distortions imposed by colonial powers. Only through this process of recovery can Kazakhstan fully embrace its sovereign identity and cultural integrity.



REFERENCES

- [1] Kabuldinov Z.E. Obostrenie zemel'nyh problem kazahov v usloviyah massovoj krest'yanskoj kolonizacii v nachale XIX veka // Elektronnyj nauchnyj zhurnal «otan.history.iie.kz» – 2025. T. 28. No 1. S. 5–17. URL: <https://otan.history.iie.kz/main/article/view/879/509>
- [2] Uchebnaya programma «Istoriya Kazahstana» dlya 5-9 klassov obshcheobrazovatel'noj shkoly – Astana, 2010. – 34 p.
- [3] Abdrahmanov S.A. Aktual'nye problemy toponimiki Kazahstana // Geografiya v shkolah i vuzah Kazahstana. - №1. – 2006. p. 8.
- [4] Dzhumagaliev D. Novejshie istoriograficheskie istochniki po istorii Kazahstansko-Rossijskih otnoshenij v novoe Vremya (dissertacionnye raboty otechestvennyh issledovatelej) // Vestnik ZKGU. – 2018. – №. 4. – S. 342-350.
- [5] Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnei V 5 t. T. 3. – Almaty: Atamura, 2000. – 768 p.
- [6] Qabdoldina K.K. Qazakstandagy otarshylyk kezendegi islam tarihy: qazirgi kazakstandyk tarihnamada // Elektronnyj nauchnyj zhurnal «otan.history.iie.kz» – 2023. T. 26. No 3. 567–581. URL: <https://otan.history.iie.kz/main/article/view/574/383>
- [7] Nurbaev K.Zh., Kadysova R.Zh. Istoriya Ertys-Bayantauksogo kraja (XVIII – 30-eg. XIX vv.) – Pavlodar: EKO, 2008. – 341 p.
- [8] Proshloe Kazahstana v istochnikah i materialah. Pod red. Asfendiarova S.D. – 2-e izd. – Almaty: Qazakstan, 1998. Sb. 2. – 350 p.
- [9] Novikov S.V. Ocherki istorii Cherlaka i Cherlaksogo rajona: 1720-1985 gody. – Omsk: OmGAU, 2008. – 314 p.
- [10] Severo-Kazahstanskaya oblast': strany letopisi rodnogo kraja [North Kazakhstan region: pages of the chronicle of the native land]. – Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1993. – 392 s.
- [11] Muhanova M.B. Prisoedinenie Mladshego zhuza k Kazahstanu // Istoriya Kazahstana: prepodavanie v shkolah i Vuzah. – 2009. – №9. – S. 23-29.
- [12] Ybyrai S.B. Mambetali Serdalin o vliyani zemel'nyh reform na tradicionnyj ukhad hozyajstva naseleniya severnogo Kazahstana v konce XIX–nachale XX vekov // Severnyj region: nauka, obrazovanie, kul'tura. – 2024. – T. 25. – №. 4. – S. 37-48.

**Айтенев Ж.К., Байшов Б.Б., Оразаева Ж.Ж., Аликулова Н.С.,
Ескалиев С.А.**

ОТАРЛАУ, ТОПОНИМИКА ЖӘНЕ ТАРИХИ ЖАДЫНЫҢ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯСЫ: ҚАЗАҚСТАНДЫҚ БІРЕГЕЙЛІК МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ

Аңдатпа. Отарлау және оның ұлттық болмыстың дамуына әсері тақырыбы Қазақстан тарихын зерттеудің маңызды аспектісі болып табылады. Ресей империясы мен КСРО-ның Қазақстан аумағын отарлауы кезінде саяси-әлеуметтік құрылымдар ғана емес, мәдени жадының элементтері, оның ішінде топонимика да өзгерді. Топонимика тарихи-мәдени болмыстың көрінісі ретінде отаршылдық кезеңінде өзгерістерге ұшырап, тарихи өткенді және ұлттық болмысты қабылдауға әсер етті. Топонимдерді өзгерту, тарихи атауларды жою және оларды Кеңес өкіметімен байланысты жаңа атаулармен ауыстыру процесі кең ауқымды құбылыс – тарихи жадының өзгеруіне айналды. Бұл үдеріс біртұтас кеңестік бірегейлікті құруға бағытталды, бірақ сонымен



бірге қазақ болмысының сақталуы мен өзгеруіне ұзақ мерзімді салдары болды. Осы жылдар ішінде тарихи топонимдер қайта оралып, жоғалған жады қалпына келтіріліп, ұлттық бірегейлікті нығайтудың жаңа жолдарын іздеу болды. Зерттеу барысында тарихи-архивтік талдау, топонимикалық зерттеу, салыстырмалы тарихи әдіс әдістері қолданылды. Мұрағат материалдары, құжаттар, карталар талданып, топонимдердің әр түрлі тарихи дәуірлердегі өзгерістеріне салыстырмалы талдау жасалады. Мазмұнды талдау отарлаудың мәдени жады мен сәйкестілікке әсерін зерттеу үшін де қолданылады. Мақалада топонимдердің отарлану және өзгеру процестерінің қазақ халқының ұжымдық жадына қалай әсер еткені қарастырылады, сонымен қатар жаһандану мен тарихи трансформация жағдайында оның ұлттық бірегейлігін сақтау және дамыту тұрғысында қазіргі Қазақстанның алдында тұрған міндеттер талданады.

Кілт сөздер: Отарлау, топонимика, тарихи жады, тұлға, Қазақстан, трансформация, мәдени мұра.

Айтенов Ж.К., Байшов Б.Б., Оразаева Ж.Ж., Аликулова Н.С., Ескалиев С.А.
КОЛОНИЗАЦИЯ, ТОПОНИМИКА И ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ
ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ ПАМЯТИ: ВЫЗОВЫ КАЗАХСТАНСКОЙ
ИДЕНТИЧНОСТИ

Аннотация. Тема колонизации и её влияния на развитие национальной идентичности является важным аспектом в изучении истории Казахстана. В ходе колонизации территории Казахстана Российской империей и СССР были изменены не только политические и социальные структуры, но и элементы культурной памяти, включая топонимику. Топонимика, как отражение исторической и культурной идентичности, подверглась изменениям в период колониальной власти, что отразилось на восприятии исторического прошлого и национального самосознания. Процесс изменения топонимов, удаления исторических наименований и замены их на новые, связанные с советской властью, стал частью более широкого явления — трансформации исторической памяти. Этот процесс направлялся на создание единой советской идентичности, но также имел долговременные последствия для сохранения и трансформации казахской идентичности. На протяжении многих лет происходит возвращение исторических топонимов, восстановление утраченной памяти и поиск новых способов укрепления национального самосознания. Для исследования использованы методы историко-архивного анализа, топонимического исследования, а также сравнительно-исторический метод. Анализируются архивные материалы, документы, карты, а также проведён сравнительный анализ изменения топонимов в различные исторические эпохи. Также используется метод контент-анализа для изучения влияния колонизации на культурную память и идентичность. Статья исследует, как процессы колонизации и изменения топонимов повлияли на коллективную память казахского народа, а также анализирует вызовы, стоящие перед современной Казахстаном в контексте сохранения и развития своей национальной идентичности в условиях глобализации и исторической трансформации.

Ключевые слова: Колонизация, топонимика, историческая память, идентичность, Казахстан, трансформация, культурное наследие.