

UDC 94(477.54/.62)«17/19»

Trubchaninov M. A.

*Candidate of Historical Sciences,
docent of the World History Chair,
H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University*

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTRY SUBSIDIARY
INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTIONS AND CRAFTS IN THE EUROPEAN RUSSIA
IN THE LAST THIRD OF XVIII - AT THE BEGINNING OF THE XX CENTURY**

© Trubchaninov M.A., 2015

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.34424>

У статті досліджується основні напрями розвитку різноманітних підсобних промислових виробництв та промислів і ремесел в селянських господарствах Європейської Росії. Основна увага приділяється вивченню географії, масштабів та динаміки розвитку селянського промислового підприємництва, аналізу його технічної еволюції та соціально-економічної організації протягом останньої третини XVIII – початку XX ст.

Ключові слова: сільськогосподарське виробництво, селянське господарство, селянські підсобні промислові виробництва і промисли, ремесла, селянське промислове підприємництво, промисловий селянин.

В статье исследуются основные направления развития разнообразных подсобных промышленных производств, промыслов и ремесел в крестьянских хозяйствах Европейской России. Основное внимание уделяется изучению географии, масштабов и динамики развития крестьянского промышленного предпринимательства, анализу его технической эволюции и социально-экономической организации на протяжении последней трети XVIII – начала XX вв.

Ключевые слова: сельскохозяйственное производство, крестьянское хозяйство, крестьянские подсобные промышленные производства и промыслы, ремесла, крестьянское промышленное предпринимательство, промысловый крестьянин.

The article investigates the main directions of various subsidiary industrial productions development and crafts in country farms of the European Russia. The main attention is paid to studying of geography, scales and dynamics of country industrial business development, the analysis of its technical evolution and the social and economic organization throughout the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX centuries.

Keywords: agricultural production, country economy, country subsidiary industrial productions and crafts, country industrial business, trade peasant.

The statement of the research problem is defined by the fact that during the last third of XVIII century – at the beginning of the XX century in social, economic and cultural modernization of the Russian empire rather important role was played by various subsidiary industrial productions and crafts for which peasants often do with agriculture and animal husbandry. Development in country farms of

subsidiary productions and crafts promoted creation of the interacting and mutually promoting systems of increase the efficiency of regional economy when country industrial business financed agrarian production, and the last provided it spatial base for placement, raw materials and labor.

Such system of interaction provided economically effective use of the available re-

sources in country farms, gave the chance of implementation the expanded reconstruction, considerably increased the potential of region development and extent of use of the general set of naturally resource factors of the local character. The organization in many country farms of the European Russia the industrial enterprises and crafts helped the further development of productive forces of the village, increase of its economic potential and also improvement of housing, household and welfare living conditions of the country population. Pre-Soviet country industrial farms can be considered as prototype of modern agrarian microclusters. Today scientists and specialists agrarians consider the formation of the rural industry, creation of industrial workshops and subsidiary trades, farms as one of the directions of social and demographic revival of the village.

The necessity of the chosen problem research is also stipulated by need of modern reconsideration of many essential aspects of the country industrial business history, more objective definition of its place into the modernization of Russian empire during the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century. All these circumstances confirm that research of history in provinces of the European Russia the country subsidiary industrial productions development and crafts remains rather actual and represents considerable scientific and practical interest.

The analysis of actual researches from the history of development the country farms of the European Russia during the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century of various subsidiary industrial productions and crafts testifies that this problem remains the one of the less studied pages in the world history of the peasantry. Among the scientific works devoted to separate aspects of this problem its necessary to emphasize the monograph and scientific articles of O. A. Vasilchikov [1], Ya.E. Vodarskyi, E.G. Istomin [2], V.P. Vorontsov of [3], P. O. Gaselukus [4], M. Gurevich [8], S. M. Dubrovskyi [10], O. A. Kauffman [16], M.P. Maslov [18], O. O. Ribnikov [22], M. A. Trubchaninov [30] and others. Having critically analysed all these scientific works of predecessors, the author managed to find those ques-

tions which are still not solved. Among all these questions the geography and dynamics of country subsidiary industrial productions and crafts, the all-Russian regularities and regional features of their development require special studying.

The purpose of the article is the analysis of various subsidiary industrial productions and crafts development in country farms of the European Russia during the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century, which is priority for modern historical science. The task of this article is to investigate the main factors of formation and history of development the country industrial business, to find out its geography, scales and dynamics, to analyze technical evolution of subsidiary industrial productions and crafts, to define their place in social and economic and cultural development of Russia during the pre-Soviet period.

The statement of the main material. During the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century country farms of the European Russia which differed from other spheres of goods production in a range of specific features, most successfully developed at the rational combination of the main, auxiliary and subsidiary industrial productions. Expediency of combination in many country farms of the European Russia of agricultural production with different types of industrial activity is predetermined by action of many natural, social and economic, organizational, technology and other factors which existed objectively, interacted, mutually influenced at each other and results of housekeeping of peasants in general.

The employment of peasants, uneven throughout the year, in the sphere of agricultural production was the important factor of development in the European Russia country subsidiary industrial productions and crafts. The divergence between the period of production and the working period in agriculture created a natural basis for the combination by Russian peasants of agriculture with subsidiary trades. For example, the period of production of winter grain crops lasted 250-300 days, and the working period which covered cultivation of the soil, sowing, care of crops, harvesting took about two weeks. Similar re-

gularity is shown in other branches of agriculture which predetermined seasonality of agricultural production, uneven distribution and use of a manpower, during a year, creation of their surplus in off-season and a shortcoming during mass field works. Thus, at the beginning of XIX century the difference in extent of employment of the Russian peasant, including women and teenagers, in November in comparison with July was 60%, in December – 70%, January – 82%, to February – 88% [7, p.29-30].

Such indicators considerably differ from averages in naturally economic zones and certain provinces, districts, volosts, villages. Thus, in those regions where at country farms subsidiary productions were a little widespread, still large seasonality in use of the manpower was observed. The necessity of decrease the seasonality of country work use led to development the subsidiary productions as this factor was the most effective. Therefore, for the large extend of country farms of the European Russia the organization of subsidiary productions was the main direction on the way to more uniform use of the manpower. Their intensive development in villages of the European Russia during the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century considerably promoted the reduction in dynamics of the difference in the level of country work use during the months of the year [11, p.315].

Among the natural factors which predetermined the development of country subsidiary industrial productions, also are stocks of raw material resources of local value. The raw factor as well as requirement of the population in production which the big industry almost didn't produce, predetermined the organization of production in country farms of many simplest consumer goods, for example, baskets, potter's ware, painting brushes, brooms etc. Natural conditions of European Russia were rather favorable for providing industrial peasants with various types of raw materials which after processing turned into food, necessary for local population, construction materials, consumer goods, nonfood groups and so forth. Agricultural raw materials which peasants remade on the mills, dairies were the important source for more ra-

tional use of processing equipment of country subsidiary industrial productions, and its production was necessary for satisfaction the requirements of country people and other consumers. The necessity of satisfaction the need for certain types of agricultural production (for example, in fodder grain), products and consumer goods (flour, grains, oil, meat products, dried fruits etc), predetermined the development of processing industries directly in country farms. Their functioning in most cases solved task of the fullest use of the agricultural production developed by peasants, reduction of transportation costs, promoted the growth of the country families profits [20, p.11-14].

The woods and mineral deposits as granite, crushed stone, shell deposit, peat, limestone, clay, sand were natural sources of raw materials for country subsidiary industrial productions and crafts. Practically in all regions of the European Russia most of industrial peasants had opportunity to use these or those raw materials. It is undoubted that rational use in the country subsidiary industrial productions of natural raw materials, in particular for production of construction materials, by its processing on gravel, brick, lime and so forth generally allowed to provide the need of country farms and local population, to receive in country budgets some amounts of money from these kinds of activity, to increase the efficiency of economic activity in general. In this case natural factors interacted with production and social and economic [21, p. 28; 36, p.92].

In country farms of the European Russia the main part of subsidiary industrial productions and crafts appeared as result of necessity to satisfy needs of peasants for ensuring the activity: production of clothes and footwear, the agricultural remanent and other instruments of labor, furniture and ware, construction materials, vehicles etc. Those peasants who were wiser began to work on the market. Work of the industrial peasant on the individual customer, on the buyer or on the factory with mediation of the distributing office, was the same work on the market, only on the regular customer. During the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century the tax policy of the government promoted the

broad development of country industrial business. The certain positive role was played by customs barriers. The importance in strengthening of positions of the country subsidiary industrial productions and crafts was played by societies of the small credit which provided peasants businessmen with small loans [28, p. 228-229].

Among the factors which slowed down the development of subsidiary industrial productions and crafts in the country farms of European Russia, its necessary to mention the existence of feudal remnants which deformed development of the capitalist relations in the village and in the country in general; absence of the special legislation which would protect interests of small producers; lack of the capitals, bad condition of communication means; difficulties of transportation the production; narrowness of the domestic market.

The low standard of living and cultures of the Russian peasantry, insufficient education level and professional training, the extreme lack of the educational centers, libraries and schools, also slowed down the formation of business culture though existence of natural resources, big spaces, operability of the population created all necessary prerequisites for successful development of economy, in particular for development of subsidiary industrial productions and crafts in country farms of European Russia [14, p. 150-152].

In the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century subsidiary industrial productions considerably assisted the development of the main agricultural production by rendering the certain types of service, production of appliances processing of agricultural production, decrease of seasonality, in use of labor and ensuring more uniform employment of peasants during a year, more rational use of material, raw material, energy resources. Its especially important that the developed subsidiary industrial productions and crafts economically fixed the country farms, acted as a factor of their stable development, allowed peasants to stand in years, adverse for agriculture, to keep potential for the subsequent market modernization. The country subsidiary industrial productions carried out positive social and economic function not only concerning agriculture and country people. After all,

making food, industrial goods, consumer goods of non-food sphere, art products, construction materials and so forth, they to a certain extent promoted filling of the Russian market with such goods which weren't produced at that time by the factory industry. Thus, even at the beginning of the XX century country small-scale food productions provided release of 95-98% of total amount of dried fruits in Russian empire which were on sale to mainly city inhabitants [5, p. 281-284; 31, p. 52].

During the different periods of the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century in the agrarian sphere of European Russia were over 4 million of subsidiary industrial enterprises and crafts of agricultural production processing, production of construction materials and consumer goods which gave work in the off-season to more than 7-7,5 million people [25, p. 421-430; 35, p. 32]. Upon transition to the market the role of the subsidiary industrial enterprises and crafts had the particular importance as a factor of economic stabilization of agriculture as the last annually received from activity of the subsidiary industrial enterprises and occupation by crafts considerable profits. In the 50-ies of the XIX century all industry of Russian empire gave the production on 500 million rubles where 400 million rubles was given by production of the country small industry and domestic industries [25, p. 429-435 ; 32, p.126-129]. In 1913 total amount of commodity turnover of country mills, dairies, smithies, brick and tile plants, bakeries, shops, skin processing, woodworking, furniture, sewing and other small-scale productions made nearly 2000 million rubles that nearly 25% to commodity turnover of all industry of the Russian empire [15, p. 48-52].

The European Russia annually got about 800 million rubles profits from sales of subsidiary products and industrial branches the peasantry. In particular, in 1895 this indicator was 689 million rubles, or 11, 8% of the general profit got by country farms from all types of economic activity. In certain regions with widely extensive network of subsidiary productions country farms the specific weight of profit exceeded 30% [19, p. 239-240; 32, p. 380-382].

Such rather large-scale development of country subsidiary industrial productions and crafts during the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century was caused by need of increase the economic efficiency of functioning the country farms of the European Russia, increase volumes of small-scale production, more effective use of breaks in agricultural works and need of rational use of a manpower during the whole year. It was predetermined as need of increase the production of food in the village, production of construction materials, instruments of labor, household items, and needs of the peasantry for additional earnings. The economic result became the main criterion of country commodity production development of non-agricultural goods and economic individualism became a basis ideology of the industrial peasantry [6, p.52-56; 27, p. 90-99].

During the last third of XVIII – at the first half of the XIX century in European Russia generally was an industrial geography of country subsidiary industrial productions and crafts. The small country industry gained the broadest development in Moscow, Vladimir, Voronizh, Kursk, Kaluga, Kostroma, Tver, Yaroslavl, Nizhny Novgorod and other provinces. Here or nearly in each village peasants with agriculture actively were engaged in crafts. In European Russia there were many villages and the whole industrial districts in which in country economy not agricultural occupations played the main role, and in big commerce and industry villages which usually were the centers of these districts, agriculture in general was absent [12, p. 218-220; 34, p. 26-28]. Thus, such industrial villages of the European Russia as Ivanovo and Teykovo of the Vladimir province, Pavlovo, Vorsm, Bogorodskoye and Gorodets of the Nizhny Novgorod province, Vichuga and Sreda of the Kostroma province, Bolshoe the Yaroslavl province, Kimri of the Tver province quickly turned into the centers of the textile, skin, metal-working and woodworking industry [13, p. 322-324; 33, p.61-68].

According to the ministry of the industry and trade for 1912 country the strongest positions in industrial business were occupied by production of clothes and haberdashery goods. In this sphere the country farms had

six times more workers, and cost of the made production were three times more, than at the big industrial factories. At the small country industrial productions one and a half times more workers were engaged in processing of livestock products, than at the big industrial productions, but they made only 35-40% of production. In metal working at the small country enterprises a half of employees of branch were occupied, but they gave only 15-20% of production. Small-scale country subsidiary industrial productions also had strong positions in a woodworking, had four times more occupied workers, than at the big enterprises, and the cost of the made production exceeded by one and a half times [24, p.211-212; 32, p. 389-390].

On the first place by the number of engaged industrial peasants there was a group of production of clothes and furniture where were occupied 30% of all engaged in production while in the big industry on this branch had only 2% of all engaged people. In group of livestock products processing industrial peasants were occupied 18%, and in group of metal processing were occupied 14% [15, p. 91-100; 29, p.12-16]. Country industrial business formed broad base for growth of capitalist industrial production: collected the capitals, prepared the staff of taught workers for the big industrial enterprises, formed industrial bourgeoisie. In particular dynasties of famous manufacturers Morozovs, Guchkovs, Garelins, Ryabushinskys and many others, were from the circle of industrial peasants. Development of the country industrial subsidiary productions was turned by an economic view of the village and the life of the peasant. In industrial villages more intensively go process of social stratification of the peasantry, its separation from agriculture, was more clearly shown the conflict between the phenomena of capitalist character and the feudal relations. Usually in those country farms where were developed subsidiary productions, smaller losses of agricultural raw materials were observed, productivity of cultures, especially commercial crops was higher, on average by 1,5 times the best security with a manpower, works youth aged till 30 years, by 1,5-2 times more the highest level of profitability [17, p. 224-225 2-3; 26, p. 251-256].

Conclusions and prospects of the subsequent researches. The studied and generalized actual material convincingly testify that processing at the country subsidiary industrial enterprises of agricultural production and other local raw materials was predetermined by action of several mutually caused and interdependent factors – the need of rational use of raw materials, production of qualitative production, with the minimum expenses, increase of efficiency of country housekeeping. For this reason, during the last third of XVIII – at the beginning of the XX century country subsidiary industrial productions and crafts in the agrarian sphere of European Russia developed rather intensively. All this time country industrial business was an important component of social and economic modernization of the Russian empire. Existence of the huge territory and regions which differed by the geopolit-

ical situation, economic and social development, defined objective features of formation and development of the country subsidiary industrial enterprises and crafts. The social and economic and technical organization of country industrial business developed gradually and improved together with expansion of their scales and geography. The studied historical experience allows in modern conditions put a new question about combination of agricultural production with the industrial. Integration of farms on the basis of cooperation of agriculture with the industrial productions promotes rational use of seasonal labor redundancy, increase of consumer goods release and the solution of other social problems, increase of material well-being of country people, accent on the work places for the young people at the village.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Васильчиков А.А. *Сельский быт и сельское хозяйство в России* / А.А. Васильчиков. – СПб.: Тип. Стасюлевича, 1881. – XV, 161 с.
2. Водарский Я.Е. *Сельские кустарные промыслы Европейской России на рубеже XIX-XX столетий* / Я.Е. Водарский, Э.Г. Истомина. – М.: Изд-во Инст-т рос. истории РАН, 2004. – 516 с.
3. Воронцов В.П. *Значение кустарных промыслов, общие условия их развития и меры по их поддержке в России* / В.П. Воронцов. – СПб.: Тип. В. Кирибаума, 1902. – 7с.
4. Гасселукус П.А. *Очерки промыслов России* / П.А. Гасселукус. – СПб.: Тип. т-ва «Общественная польза», 1899. – 118 с.
5. *Главное управление землеустройства и земледелия. Обзор деятельности за 1914 год.* – Пг.: Тип. В.Кирибаума, 1915. – 339 с.
6. *Годовой отчет Вятского губернского земства по сельскому хозяйству.* – СПб.: Тип В. Кирибаума, 1910. – 137 с.
7. *Годовой отчет Курского губернского земства по сельскому хозяйству.* – Курск: Тип. губ. земства, 1912. – 198 с.
8. Гуревич Н. *Экономическое положение русской деревни* / Н. Гуревич. – М.: Тип. Н. И. Скороходова, 1896. – 290 с.
9. *Дополнительный свод материалов по кустарной промышленности в России.* – СПб.: Тип. Пантелеевых, 1899. – 249 с.
10. Дубровский С.М. *Сельское хозяйство и крестьянство России в период империализма* / С.М. Дубровский. – М.: Наука, 1975. – 398 с.
11. *Ежегодник народного труда* / Под. ред. В.В. Черняева. – М.: Тип. И.Д. Сытина, 1898. – 461с.
12. *Ежегодник Общества поощрения земледелия и сельской промышленности.* – М.: Тип. ун-та, 1893. – 379 с.
13. *Ежегодник Общества поощрения земледелия и сельской промышленности.* – М.: Тип. ун-та, 1907. – 398 с.
14. *Ежегодник промышленности и торговли.* – СПб.: Тип. ЦСК МВД, 1915. – 205 с.
15. *Журнал Совецания о нуждах крестьянских промыслов.* – СПб.: Тип В.Кирибаума, 1916. – 128с.
16. Кауфман А.А. *Вопросы экономики и статистики крестьянского хозяйства* / А.А. Кауфман. – М.: Леман и Сахаров, 1918. – 333 с.
17. *Кустарные промыслы: Текущая статистика за 1898/9 сельскохозяйственный год.* – СПб.: Тип. В. Кирибаума, 1900. – 270 с.
18. Маслов М. П. *Влияв держави на розвиток селянської промисловості в Україні у другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст.* / М.П. Маслов // *Історія та географія: Зб. наук. пр. Харк. нац. пед. ун-ту ім. Г. С. Сковороди.* – Х.: ОВС, 2002. – № 11. – С. 10 – 16.
19. *Обзор деятельности земств по кустарной промышленности.* – Пг.: Тип. В.Кирибаума, 1916. – 315с.
20. *Обзор состояния сельского хозяйства в Тамбовской губернии* // *Вестник Тамбовского земства 1912 г.* – Тамбов: Тип. губ. земства, 1912. – С.11-14.

21. Отчет Московского губернского земства по развитию сельскому хозяйству. 1914 год. – М.: Тип. градоначальника, 1915. – 141 с.
22. Рыбников А.А. Мелкая промышленность России. Сельские ремесленно-кустарные промыслы до войны / А.А. Рыбников. – М.: Новая деревня, 1923 – 298 с.
23. Сборник статистико-экономических сведений по крестьянским хозяйствам Орловской губернии. – Орел: Тип. Ф. Степанова, 1914. – 118 с.
24. Сборник статистико-экономических сведений по России. – М.: Свободный труд, 1918. – 263 с.
25. Сборник статистико-экономических сведений по сельскому хозяйству России и иностранных государств. – СПб.: Тип. МВД, 1914. – 615 с.
26. Сборник статистических сведений по сельскому хозяйству Смоленской губернии. Отдел земской статистики. – Смоленск: Тип. губ. земства, 1892. – 293 с.
27. Сборник статистических сведений по Тульской губернии за 1885 г. – Тула: Тип. губ. земства, 1886. – 163 с.
28. Свод статистических сведений по сельскому хозяйству России к концу XIX века. – СПб.: Тип. В. Кирибаума, 1903. – 334 с.
29. Статистический обзор Калужского земства. – Калуга: Тип. губ. зем. управы, 1911. – 145 с.
30. Трубочанінов М. А. Розвиток кустарної металообробки в Російській імперії у другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст. / М. А. Трубочанінов // Історія та географія: Зб. наук. пр. Харк. нац. пед. ун-ту ім. Г. С. Сковороди. – Х.: Колегіум, 2012. – № 44. – С. 93 – 97.
31. Труды Владимирского губернского научного общества по изучению местного края. – Владимир: Гос. изд-во, 1921. – Вып. 2. – 148 с.
32. Труды Всероссийского съезда деятелей по кустарной промышленности в С.Петербурге. 1916 г. – СПб.: Тип. Бернштейна, 1916. – 411 с.
33. Труды комиссии по исследованию кустарной промышленности в России. Т. 5. – СПб.: Тип. В. Кирибаума, 1880. – 309 с.
34. Труды комиссии по исследованию кустарной промышленности в России. Вып. 8. – СПб.: Тип. В. Кирибаума, 1882. – 423 с.
35. Труды местных комитетов о нуждах сельскохозяйственной промышленности. – СПб.: Тип. "Народ. польза", 1905. – 560 с.
36. Труды статистического отделения при Саратовской губернской земской управе. – Саратов: Тип. земства, 1877. – 355 с.

REFERENCES

1. Vasil'chikov A.A. Sel'skij byt i sel'skoehozjajstvov Rossii / A.A. Vasil'chikov. – SPb.: Tip. Stasjulevicha, 1881. – XV, 161 p.
2. Vodarskij Ja.E. Sel'skie kustarnye promysly Evropejskoj Rossii narube zhe XIX-XX stoletij / Ja.E. Vodarskij, Je.G. Istomina. – M.: Izd-vo Inst-tros. istorii RAN, 2004. – 516 p.
3. Voroncov V.P. Znachenie kustarnyh promyslov, obshhieslovij i ih razvitijaimerypohipodderzhanij v Rossii / V.P. Voroncov. – SPb.: Tip. V. Kirshbauma, 1902. – 7p.
4. Gasselukus P.A. Oчерки promyslov Rossii / P.A. Gasselukus. – SPb.: Tip. t-va «Obshhestvennaja pol'za», 1899. – 118 p.
5. Glavnoe upravlenie zemleustrojstva i zemledelija. Obzor dejatel'nosti za 1914 god. – Pg.: Tip. V. Kirshbauma, 1915. – 339 p.
6. Godovoj otchet Vjatskogo gubernskogo zemstva po sel'skomu hozjajstvu. – SPb.: Tip V. Kirshbauma, 1910. – 137 p.
7. Godovoj otchet Kurskogo gubernskogo zemstva po sel'skomu hozjajstvu. – Kursk: Tip. Tip. gub. zemstva, 1912. – 198 p.
8. Gurevich N. Jekonomicheskoe polozenie russkoj derevni / N. Gurevich. – M.: Tip. N. I. Skorohodova, 1896. – 290 p.
9. Dopolnitel'nyj svod materialov po kustarnoj promyshlennosti v Rossii. – SPb.: Tip. Panteleevyh, 1899. – 249 p.
10. Dubrovskij S.M. Sel'skoe hozjajstvo i krest'janstvo Rossii v period imperializma / S.M. Dubrovskij. – M.: Nauka, 1975. – 398 p.
11. Ezhegodnik narodnogo truda / Pod. red. V.V. Chernjaeva. – M.: Tip. I.D. Sytina, 1898. – 461p.
12. Ezhegodnik Obshhestva pooshhrenija zemledelija i sel'skoj promyshlennosti. – M.: Tip. un-ta, 1893. – 379 p.
13. Ezhegodnik Obshhestva pooshhrenija zemledelija i sel'skoj promyshlennosti. – M.: Tip. un-ta, 1907. – 398 p.
14. Ezhegodnik promyshlennosti i torgovli. – SPb.: Tip. CSK MVD, 1915. – 205 s.
15. Zhurnal Soveshhanija o nuzhdah krest'janskih promyslov. – SPb.: Tip V. Kirshbauma, 1916. – 128p.
16. Kaufman A.A. Voprosy jekonomiki i statistiki krest'janskogo hozjajstva / A.A. Kaufman. – M.: Leman i Saharov, 1918. – 333 p.
17. Kustarnye promysly: Tekushhaja statistika za 1898/9 sel'skohozjajstvennyj god. – SPb.: Tip. V. Kirshbauma, 1900. – 270 p.
18. Maslov M. P. Vpliv derzhavi na rozvitok seljans'koj promislovosti v Ukraїni u drugij polovini HИH – na pochatku HH st. / M.P. Maslov // Історія та географія: Зб. наук. пр. Харк. нац. пед. ун-ту ім. Г. С. Сковороди. – Х.: OVS, 2002. – № 11. – P. 10 – 16.
19. Obzor dejatel'nosti zemstv po kustarnoj promyshlennosti. – Pg.: Tip. V. Kirshbauma, 1916. – 315p.
20. Obzor sostojanija sel'skogo hozjajstva v Tambovskoj gubernii // Vestnik Tambovskogo zemstva 1912 g. – Tambov: Tip. gub. zemstva, 1912. – P. 11-14.

21. *Otchet Moskovskogo gubernskogo zemstva po razvitiju sel'skomu hozjajstvu. 1914 god.* – M.: Tip. gradonachal'nika, 1915. – 141 p.
 22. Rybnikov A.A. *Melkaja promyshlennost' Rossii. Sel'skie remeslenno-kustarnye promysly do vojny / A.A. Rybnikov.* – M.: Novaja derevnja, 1923 – 298 p.
 23. *Sbornik statistiko-jekonomicheskikh svedenij po krest'janskim hozjajstvam Orlovskoj gubernii.* – Orel: Tip. F.Stepanova, 1914. – 118 p.
 24. *Sbornik statistiko-jekonomicheskikh svedenij po Rossii.* – M.: Svobodnyj trud, 1918. – 263 p.
 25. *Sbornik statistiko-jekonomicheskikh svedenij po sel'skomu hozjajstvu Rossii i inostrannyh gosudarstv.* – SPb.: Tip. MVD, 1914. – 615p.
 26. *Sbornik statisticheskikh svedenij po sel'skomu hozjajstvu Smolenskoj gubernii. Otdel zemskoj statistiki.* – Smolensk: Tip. gub. zemstva, 1892. – 293 p.
 27. *Sbornik statisticheskikh svedenij po Tul'skoj gubernii za 1885 g.* – Tula: Tip. gub. zemstva, 1886. – 163 p.
 28. *Svod statisticheskikh svedenij po sel'skomu hozjajstvu Rossii k koncu HHH veka.* – SPb.: Tip. V. Kirshbauma, 1903. – 334 p.
 29. *Statisticheskij obzor Kaluzhskogo zemstva.* – Kaluga: Tip. gub. zem. upravy, 1911. – 145 p.
 30. Trubchaninov M. A. *Rozvitok kustarnoi metalobrobki v Rossijs'kij imperii u drugij polovini HHH – na pochatku HH st. / M. A. Trubchaninov // Istorija ta geografija: Zb. nauk. pr. Hark. nac. ped. un-tu im. G. S. Skovorodi.* – H.: Kolegium, 2012. – № 44. – P. 93 – 97.
 31. *Trudy Vladimirskogo gubernskogo nauchnogo obshhestva po izucheniju mestnogo kraja.* – Vladimir: Gos. izd-vo, 1921. – Vyp. 2. – 148 p.
 32. *Trudy Vserossijskogo s#ezda dejatelej po kustarnoj promyshlennosti v S.Peterburge. 1916 g.* – SPb.: Tip. Bernshtejna, 1916. – 411 p.
 33. *Trudy komissii po issledovaniju kustarnoj promyshlennosti v Rossii. T. 5.* – SPb.: Tip. V. Kirshbauma, 1880. – 309 p.
 34. *Trudy komissii po issledovaniju kustarnoj promyshlennosti v Rossii. Vyp. 8.* – SPb.: Tip. V. Kirshbauma, 1882. – 423 p.
 35. *Trudy mestnyh komitetov o nuzhdah sel'skohozjajstvennoj promyshlennosti.* – SPb.: Tip. "Narod. pol'za", 1905. – 560 p.
 36. *Trudy statisticheskogo otdelenija pri Saratovskoj gubernskoj zemskoj uprave.* – Saratov: Tip. zemstva, 1877. – 355 p.
-