

UDC 94: [323.3: 66-051] (477) "16/17"

Mulyar Anatoly

*Candidate of Historical Sciences,
Associate Professor of the Department of Social and Humanities
Khmelnyskyi University of Economics and Entrepreneurship
ORCID: 0000-0002-7629-301X*

THE PROSKURIV DISTRICT IN THE POST-REFORM PERIOD (1862 - 1872): DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FEATURES

Summary. *The purpose of the study based on documentary sources is to follow the peculiarities of socio-economic development and demographic state of the Proskuriv district of Podillia province in the post-reform period (1862 - 1872). In the process, we will try to identify the capitalist relations that should have appeared in the study area after the abolition of serfdom.*

The research methodology is based on historical, chronological, logical, comparative, and statistical methods.

The scientific novelty of the study is to raise the question of the need to study the socio-economic development and demographic status of the lands of Right-Bank Ukraine in the post-reform period based on archival sources and documents and reassessment of certain provisions in history related to the development of capitalism.

Conclusions. *Thus, the socio-economic situation of the Proskuriv district after the Peasant Reform of 1861 remained almost unchanged. Agricultural production continued to be dominant and was based on the manual labor of peasants. The lion's share of land continued to be owned by landlords. The feudal*

serfdom system was never eliminated. There was no large-scale commodity production in the region. There was no emergence of capitalist relations.

Key words: *demography, three-tiered system, landowners, demographic growth, dominant form, agriculture, animal husbandry, rent*

In the 60s and 70s of the nineteenth century, the territory of the Proskuriv district was located in the northwestern part of the Podillia province. Its area covered 4,735 miles, 2,291 versts, or 238,646 acres. The area was divided by the Russian authorities into 10 parishes: Kuzminska, Malinichna, Pashkovetska, Sarnivska, Tretelnytska, Felshtynska, Chorno-Ostrovska, Sharivska, Yurynetska, Yarmolynetska.

The county was located between the basins of the Southern Bug and Dniester rivers, which left its mark on the climate, way of life, main types of economy, etc. The Southern Bug moistened the northern and eastern parts of the county, and the Dniester River moistened the western and southern parts of the administrative unit. The Bug River flowed through its lands for a distance of 47 versts. Also in this area, there were such reservoirs as Buzhok, Bubnivka, Vovk, Voitovyna, Hnyla, Hulyanka, Zinchytsia, Kudryanka, Mshanets, Ploska, and Samets. The Buzhok River along its entire length served as a border with the Starokonstantyniv district of Volyn province. All the rivers of the Dniester River system, except for the Zbruch River, originated within the Proskuriv district. Their lower parts belonged to other counties. All rivers were neither navigable nor raftable. There were no lakes in the county, but in the settlements located on the rivers, the inhabitants made dams. Swamps were found mostly in the Bug River valley and the upper reaches of the Smotrych River [6, p. 223].

The climate was moderately continental, with mild winters followed by warm wet summers. The soils were predominantly black earth and were considered the most fertile in the province. They were formed under forest and steppe vegetation. Almost everywhere the land was covered with a thick layer of

"fat" black soil. And only on the hills, in small areas, it was almost rocky [6, p. 223]. A certain part of the county was occupied by forests. In 1858 their area amounted to 4,344 acres. The predominant species were oak and hornbeam. Also widespread were birch, ash, maple, and even beech, which was rare for the area [1, p. 210].

In the Sataniv estate of Countess Potocka, 2,500 acres of forest were divided into 2 parts, and each part into 80 logging areas with "right" forestry. During the period under study, the forests in the county, with few exceptions, were heavily cut down by tenants for no reason or sold to Jews for felling. No one was engaged in artificial reforestation. There were no sawmills. The necessary material for boards was brought from the pine forests of the Volyn province. Wood material was used for local needs. The largest consumers were the railroad, which was being built in the direction of Volochysk, a sugar factory, and distilleries. Construction materials were brought from the Ostroh district of Volyn province, near Radzivilov [1, p. 211].

The Chornoostrovsky sugar factory and distilleries took fuel from local forests. The peasants heated their houses with straw, and less often with brushwood, which they received from clearing forest hayfields.

Hayfields, both for landlords and peasants, accounted for $\frac{1}{4}$ of all land. Special pastures were extremely rare. The largest grazing area was in the village of Bubnivka, where the area reached 1,800 acres. Cattle were grazed on toloks, on the stubble after harvesting, in flocks (after haying), on pastures, and among settlements (releases). Meadows were used mainly in hollows, hollows (rudkas), forests, and very rarely in steppes.

Sowing of grasses was also used but on a small scale. They sowed mainly clover and alfalfa. In the Satanivka estate, clover was mixed with the Timothy grass. At that time, grass sowing was a part of the crop rotation in multifaced farming. In three-tiered farming, part of the spring crop was sown in small areas.

In the Proskurov district in agricultural production, a three-tiered land cultivation system prevailed. It was used in both landlord and peasant farms. In the late 60s and early 70s of the nineteenth century, in many settlements of the county, peasants began to plow their hayfields. As a result, an irregular farm consisting of four fields began to form. The field that was formed was sown every year mainly with spring crops. On the three previous fields, the crop rotation remained unchanged. One-third of the field continued to be fallow and was fertilized with manure from livestock. Mostly peasant fields were manured, as the landlords did not have enough livestock to fertilize them in sufficient quantities. The manure that peasants took to the fields was not of much use. It was taken out in early spring and piled in small piles on the snow. There it was weathered, frozen, and washed away by rain. It got into the soil already dry and less fertile" [1, p. 208].

Multifunctional farming was practiced only in the following landowner's estates: Sahanovske estate of Countess Potocka had 8 plots of land; in the village of Vyhantsi of Kumanivska parish, landowner Ratsyborowski had 7 plots of land; in the village of Zakhariivtsi of Chornoostrovska parish, Mieczysław Przewdziecki had 9 plots of land; in the village of Antonivtsi of the same parish, the landowner had a four-tiered system of farming [1, p. 208]. The order of crop rotation in the estates in the studied period has not yet been fully established. Under this system of farming, mainly wheat and fodder grasses were sown. The parts of the land that were under fallow were fertilized annually. In the nine-tiered farm system, this share was 1/9 of the total area; in the eight-tiered farm system it was 1/8; in the seven-tiered farm system, it was 1/7. There were no slash-and-burn farms in the county [1, p. 209]. Nearly two-thirds of the landowners' estates in the Proskuriv district were rented out, mostly to Jews who were unfamiliar with proper farming. As a result, they tried to plant more crops, which depleted the land; they dismantled outbuildings; and they destroyed gardens and greenhouses. The land was very rarely leased to peasants, especially entire farmsteads. The only

exception may be the lease of a part of Verbka Derevianna village, which belonged to the landowner Dombrowski, with an area of 60 tithes for 200 rubles for 3 years [1, p. 209].

Almost every estate had several yards of Polish gentry and one-farmers who rented arable or tract land from landlords. In those estates where the owners themselves ran the farm; the land was cultivated mainly by their efforts. Hay was given away for 1/3 of the price, i.e., 1/3 was asked for harvesting, and 2/3 was given to the owner. During the harvesting period, reapers were hired to work for the owner. Thus, for 60 sheaves, a worker received from 25 to 40 kopecks and a "hook of vodka" [1, p.209]. Sometimes they harvested bread by the sheaf, where they were paid 8 or 7 sheaves, and sometimes 6 sheaves. It all depended on the quality of the grain. Jewish tenants, and sometimes owners of estates, often gave land to peasants for half. This is when the owner gives the land, and the peasant does all the work on it, including harvesting and transporting it to the tikka.

Significant merchant farms of the Proskuriv district in the period under study include the farms of the merchant Maranets, a Jew who rented 8 settlements of the Chornoostrovskaya volost; the landowners Przewdziecki; the merchant Berehove, who bought the villages of Arkadiivtsi and Tarnavka, with an area of up to 500 dessiatyns [1, p. 209].

Wheat and rye were sown as winter crops. The most common varieties of wheat sown at this time were: red "ostistaya", girka, sandomyrka (white), etc. Wheat was usually sown on 2/3 of the land that was suitable for sowing winter crops, and 1/3 of it was sown with rye. For comparison, in the Letychiv district, rye was sown 10 times more than wheat during the same period [1, p. 192]. In the Vinnytsia district during the period under study, winter wheat was sown in an area of 30 to 31 thousand quarters. From 30 to 61 thousand quarters were sown with rye [2, p. 35].

To understand the amount of grain sowing in the county, we will trace this process in the dynamics in the period 1870-1872. Thus, in 1870, 76 thousand-

quarters of winter wheat were sown. In 1871, this figure was already 66 thousand quarters. In 1872, 84 thousand quarters were sown. Compared to other districts of Podillia province, Proskuriv district had the largest sowing of winter wheat [5, p. 18-19]. Rye was sown in 1870 - 10 thousand quarters, 1871 - 25 thousand quarters, and 1872 - 19 thousand quarters.

The following crops were also sown in the fields of the county: spring wheat, barley, oats, buckwheat, millet, peas, lentils, etc. Thus, 15, 30, and 23 thousand quarters of oats were sown in the indicated years. Barley was sown in the amount of 16, 21, and 15 thousand quarters, respectively. Buckwheat was also sown in small quantities - 14, 15, and 13 thousand quarters [5, p. 18-19]. On estates with distilleries, rye was sown by the distillery's capacity. Peasants also preferred rye. Only landlords and tenants mostly grew wheat. Peasants sowed all varieties of spring bread almost equally. Only rape and lentils were not sown. The average harvest of winter bread was about 6 sambas, but sometimes this figure reached 10 sambas, spring oats - 8 sambas, barley - 6 sambas, buckwheat - 5-6 sambas, peas - 5 sambas, millet - 15-20 sambas [1, p. 209].

To understand the productivity of crop production in the period under study, we will trace the yield of grain in the same years 1870-1872. Thus, in 1870, 136 thousand quarters of winter wheat were harvested, in 1871 - 118 thousand quarters, and in 1872 - 55 thousand quarters. The difference between sown and harvested winter wheat in 1870 was + 60 thousand quarters. In 1871, this figure was + 52 thousand quarters. And in 1872, the harvest was unprofitable, with 63 thousand quarters less than sown. The rye harvest in 1870-1872 amounted to 134 thousand, 112 thousand, and 46 thousand quarters. Barley was harvested in the amount of 93 thousand, 87 thousand, and 45 thousand quarters, respectively. The amount of buckwheat in these years was 79 thousand, 65 thousand, and 41 thousand quarters. As we can see, almost all grain crops sown in 1872 brought losses to their owners [5, p. 52-53].

Many factors influenced grain yields: from natural conditions to agrotechnical land cultivation. However, most of the Podillia district in the 60s and early 70s was satisfied with its bread. The surplus was sold by landowners to Odesa and Austria through Jewish traders. The peasants sold the extra bread at local markets for the needs of other segments of the population. Sometimes peasants had arrears but in the proportion of no more than 2 months. They were covered mainly by fellow villagers, spare shops, and landowners' estates. The most frequent bread shortages were recorded in the following villages: Trostyanets, Novyi Svit, Vyshyi Vovkivtsi, Kalytyntsi, Zhuravlyntsi, Lankivtsi, Naftulivka, Moskalivka, Vykhnanyntsi, Verkhivtsi, Trehalnyky, Bakiyivka, Shyshkivtsi, Zelena Medvedivka, Pashkivtsi, and Zaruddia. Full crop failures occurred after 10 years, and partial crop failures (i.e., only for certain types of grain) quite often after 3 to 4 years. Quite often, as in 1871, when the harvest looked good, there was poor threshing of grain [1, p. 209].

Various plagues also affected the size of the harvest. In particular, in 1861 locusts appeared in Novosvitska and Milynychna volosts, which caused significant damage to crop production. In 1862, when the locusts appeared in the Feldshtyn district, they did everything to avoid losses: they dug ditches to cover the "abomination" with earth; they gathered them in piles and burned them with straw, etc. Although gophers did appear, there were so few of them that there was simply no need to fight them [1, p. 210].

Among root crops, potatoes were the most popular and in great demand, as they were consumed here every day and almost all year round. It was also a raw material for sugar and distilleries. This vegetable was planted mainly in vegetable gardens, less often in fields.

For example, in the village of Korytna, up to 50 acres of land were planted with potatoes annually for the local distillery. It was also planted in the Satanivka estate of Potocki in the villages of Oleksyntsi, Skibneve, and others. Sugar beet was sown only near sugar factories. Most of all, it was sown in the

Chornoostrovska parish in the villages of Mykolaiv, Polvi Hrynivtsi, Vezdenky, Stavchyntsi, Khodakivtsi, Oleksyntsi. The area of beet plantations reached 400 hectares. The sugar was sold mainly to the Chornoostrovskiyi and Krasylivskiyi sugar factories. The Krasyliv factory in Volyn province had a 20-hectare plantation [p. 210]. In 1866, only one sugar factory in the county produced 7.470 poods of sugar [4, p.46].

Flax and hemp were sown from fibrous plants for their own needs. A small surplus was sold in the form of plain linen and coarse linen, called "valovina", used mainly for sacks [1, p. 210].

Among oilseeds, a lot of rape was cultivated, which was locally called rape. It was a winter and spring crop. It was sown by both tenants and landlords. It was sold mainly to Jews who traded to Odesa or Austria. They also sowed peas, which were used both for their consumption and pig feed. Lentils were also grown for livestock feed.

No medicinal or industrial plants were grown. Poppies, cucumbers, sunflowers, beans, pumpkins, and beans were grown in gardens for personal consumption. There were no large vegetable gardens or orchards where products were grown for industrial purposes. Peasants had more vegetable gardens, and landlords had more gardens. But they were not well maintained and were destroyed by tenants. The most famous was the peasant gardens in the villages of Yurintsy, Ivankivtsi, Hrynivtsi, Pashkivtsi, and Pecheske, located in almost every estate. In other settlements, they were smaller. The average profit from orchards in the Proskuriv district during the study period was no more than 50 rubles, rents ranged from 10 to 80 rubles, and in rare cases up to 150 rubles. The fruit was mostly dried. The dried fruit was sold at local markets, and only a small surplus was exported to Kyiv, Kamianets, Chisinau, and Odesa. There were no non-fruit or acclimatized plants in the gardens.

Unlike the northeastern part of Podillia province, tobacco was grown in the Proskuriv district. There were no large plantations. The peasants grew it in their

gardens, and therefore it is very difficult to determine the area under this crop. In the villages of Turchyntsi, Oleksinka, Zhishchyntsi, and Balamutivka tobacco was grown planter, thanks to a local landowner. The mostly American "Smooth" and "Bakun" were sown. The locals sold it everywhere, in the surrounding towns. Jews - merchants who sold to local consumers and often sent this product to Riga.

There were no vineyards in the district, so winemaking never developed.

Along with crop farming, livestock farming was also widespread in the county, which in the period under study served mainly to meet their own needs. Peasants used only horses to cultivate their fields, while in the Letychiv district, which bordered on the east, along with horses, they also used oxen, which were used in harnesses of up to 6 pieces [1, p.195]. Proskuriv landowners, unlike peasants, used both horses and oxen for plowing. The Satanivka estate had 160 workhorses and 250 oxen on 3,000 acres of land. In the village of Vyhantsi of the Kumaniv parish, the landowner Ratsyborovsky had 25 workhorses and 16 oxen on 190 acres of land [1, p. 211].

On average, there were 2 horses per 1 peasant household; 1 cattle per 4 households. There were 2 units of idle cattle and 3 pieces of small cattle [1, p. 211]. As of 1870 Proskuriv district had 28,600 horses, 26,200 cattle, 45,500 common sheep, 43,500 fine sheep, 600 goats, and 13,500 pigs. In total, there was 158,000 livestock in the county at that time. While in 1870 there were 1,950,600 cattle in Podillia province, the size of the Proskuriv district was only 8.10% of the total [5, p.78]. For comparison, in 1856 there were 11,022 horses, 11,749 cattle, 94,189 sheep, 560 pigs, 127 goats, etc. in the Proskuriv district [6, p. 103]. In Kryshpivka village of Tretelnytsia parish, a local tenant fed up to 300 cattle annually, which he sold in bulk through Volochysk to Austria. In the village of Bubnivka Velyka, wholesale cattle belonging to Jews were grazed for hire, who sold them mainly to Poland [1, p.211]. Improved livestock farming did not exist in the district.

There were 2 horse farms on the studied territory in the 60s and early 70s. The first one was located in Voitovyna village of Yurynets parish and belonged to Prince Sangushko. Thoroughbreds were bred here, without an admixture of Arabian bloodlines. There were 80 mares and 8 stallions in the stable, and the entire herd numbered 200. The horses were sold in Moscow and St. Petersburg [1, p. 211]. The second plant was located in the village of Vodychky in the Malinichna parish and belonged to the landowner Zaleski. Thoroughbred Arabian horses were bred here. There were 24 mares and 2 stallions in the stable. The offspring amounted to 32 units. Mixed breed horses were also bred here - Arabian and local. The stable consisted of 1 stallion, 39 mares, and 42 offspring. In total, the plant had 140 horses that were sold annually at local fairs in the Felshtyn and Yarmolynets parishes. The horses were also exported to Austria through the town of Volochysk [1, p. 211-212].

Some estates bred improved breeds of cattle: Tyrolean and Dutch with an admixture of local "pedigree". In general, there were very few animals of improved origin in the county. Breeding was hampered by frequent epidemics that destroyed the livestock.

Cattle and small livestock were fed hay in winter and winter and spring straw, to which bran left over from the bread cleaning process was added. In estates with distilleries, cattle, and horses were fed partially with bard (the residue after the distillation of alcohol from the mash). A large amount of barda was spent on fattening oxen, which were to be sold for slaughter. Horses were fed with hay and straw, oats, and bran left after the bread was cleaned [1, p. 219].

There was no fishing in the district either. Fish in the lakes of the landowners were usually leased to Jews. Pike, perch, crucian carp, tench, and carp were caught in local reservoirs. In addition to the annual fishing with nets, every three years the water in the reservoirs was drained and all but the smallest fish were harvested. The caught fish was transported to local markets and sold exclusively among Jews. They consumed fish mainly before other products [1, p.

212]. There were no fishing factories or artels in the area. There was also no such sphere of economic activity as silk production. There was also no hunting for animals and birds as a trade. Only amateurs hunted. Sometimes in the fall, by order of the police, wolf raids were organized.

Beekeeping has existed in the county since time immemorial, but in the period under study, its size was not significant, indicating the absence of capitalist relations in this sphere of economy.

Along with livestock farming, poultry farming developed in the Proskuriv district. Peasants mainly raised geese, ducks, and chickens, which they sold at local markets. The poultry was almost entirely bought by Jews, who fattened it and ate it. Goose fat, called "smaltz," was sold to Jews abroad [1, p. 212].

Thus, in the 60s and early 70s of the nineteenth century, agricultural production in the Proskuriv district was small-scale, commodity-based, and sometimes subsistence. There was no intensification of commodity-money relations or capitalization of landowners' farms. There were no real changes in this sphere of management after the Peasant Reform of 1861.

Along with agricultural production, which was dominant not only in the district or Podillia province but throughout the Russian Empire, small-scale industries based mainly on manual labor developed. They were widespread throughout the study area and were at a very low level of development. They were mainly engaged in servicing their own economic needs, and their products were sold at local bazaars. Small-scale production was carried out by individual owners. There were no officially organized artels or institutions.

Raw materials for production were bought at bazaars or ordered from other localities. The most common small-scale handicrafts were the straw weaving of hats, sieves, and sieves. The cooperage, molding of clay products, sewing of coats, shoes, and scarves, and production of belts and braids for local clothing were also developed.

In Mykolaiv, almost all peasants, with a few exceptions, sewed coats, and boots at home. Jews here formed a society that placed orders with residents and even provided them with their raw materials, such as leather. Even children as young as 10 were involved in this type of craft. The turnover of this craft was sometimes more than 100,000 rubles in silver per year. Cases and boots were sold at separate fairs, where a case cost from 5 to 15 rubles, and boots from 2 to 4 rubles. The material for this production was bought in Bessarabia, but partly at the nearest fairs [1, p. 212].

This trade existed since the eighteenth century and was developed exclusively by peasants. In the 60s and 70s of the nineteenth century, Jews took possession of it, and peasants fulfilled their orders exclusively. They did not have the means to purchase the necessary material on their own. The reason for the prosperity of this trade was the profitable sale of goods to the Kingdom of Poland.

In the villages of Oleshyn and Ivankivtsi, almost every household was engaged in weaving simple cloth. Orders were placed in other villages, which provided their material. Fabric production was carried out on simple looms called "warstats". Weaving was done in the free time of farming.

Carpentry was not widespread in the district. There were also not many stove makers, stonemasons, diggers, etc. There was no chumatsky trade either.

The architectural character of local peasant houses had all-Ukrainian features. The buildings were exclusively one-story with steep roofs covered with sheaves of straw. Rarely was the roof covered with iron, tiles, or shingles. The houses were built without foundations and basements. Houses with stone foundations and basements were built mainly in cities and towns. There were no porches or covered courtyards, as is customary in Russia. The windows were mostly south-facing and were half an arshin in size, without any decorations. Residential buildings were separate from non-residential buildings. Most of the houses had only one living room. The building was separated by a hallway with a barn on the left. In the living room, a stove was built in the left corner, and a bed

was placed in front of it. In the right corner, there were two benches with a chest between them [1, p. 216].

The buildings were located in separate courtyards with streets running alongside them. The streets were straight or broken with numerous alleys. Churches and priests' houses were built in the center of settlements at a certain distance from peasant houses. The landlord's buildings were located at the beginning of the settlement or to the side. They were built of stone or brick, one story. Very rarely were two-story buildings built. The roofs were covered with tiles, tin, or shingles. Outbuildings were wooden and covered with straw.

Cities and towns built more stone and brick houses than rural areas. For example, in the city of Proskuriv, as of 1863, there were 900 residential buildings, of which only 99 were stone [4, p. 119]. In 1870, the number of residential buildings decreased slightly and amounted to 665 units, with only 68 stone buildings [5, p. 98].

As of 1863, the Proskuriv district had 1 city, Proskuriv (8,346 inhabitants), and 8 towns: Kuzmyn (1,671 people), Mykolaiv (1,948 people), Sataniv (3,199 people), Tarnorusy (1,988 people), Felshtyn (1,486 people), Chornyi Ostriv (1,614 people), Shyrokivka (1,822 people), and Yarmolyntsi (2,972 people) [4, p.122]. The total population of the towns was 8,346 (4,835 men and 3,511 women), while the county's population was 139,108 (70,141 men and 68,967 women). If we take into account that 1,868,857 people (942,904 men and 925,953 women) lived in the province that year, the population of the Proskuriv district was only 7.44% of the total population [4, p.23]. For comparison, in 1856 the county was home to 131,442 people (63,913 men and 67,529 women). The increase over 7 years was approximately 7,666 people (6,228 men and 1,438 women) [6, p. 102].

In 1870 the demographic situation in the county changed somewhat. The urban population amounted to 11,751 people (5,856 men and 5,895 women). Compared to 1863, the number of townspeople increased by 3,405 people in 7

years. In total, 149,668 people (72,891 men and 76,777 women) lived in this administrative-territorial unit at that time. For comparison, the highest number of people lived in the Balta district – 221,692 (112,002 men and 109,690 women), and the lowest number in the Letychiv district – 114,092 (59,190 men and 54,902 women). In total, 1,933,188 people lived in Podillia province in that year. In percentage terms, the population of the Proskuriv district continued to account for 7.74% of the total provincial population [5, p. 14].

Religiously, the population of the Proskuriv district was not homogeneous. Thus, in 1870, 93,041 Orthodox Christians (46,175 men and 46,866 women) lived here, 3 men belonged to schismatics, and 38,083 people (18,140 men and 19,943 women) belonged to the Roman Catholic community, which was one of the largest in the Podillia province at that time. The Protestant community consisted of 31 people (18 men and 13 women). The Jewish community was numerous, numbering 18,507 people (8,552 men and 9,955 women). Only 3 men belonged to the Muslim faith [5, p. 60-61].

Thus, the socioeconomic situation of the Proskuriv district after the Peasant Reform of 1861 remained almost unchanged. Agricultural production continued to be dominant and was based on the manual labor of peasants. There was no large-scale commercial production in the region. There was no emergence of capitalist relations. The lion's share of land continued to be owned by landlords. The feudal serfdom system was never eliminated. Some landowners leased their property (land, outbuildings, gardens, ponds, etc.), which did more harm than good. Farming, animal husbandry, poultry farming, gardening, etc. were aimed at satisfying their own needs, and only the surplus was sold mainly at local markets. As for the industry, there was little of it in the district. These were mainly small sugar factories and distilleries based on old technologies with a large share of manual labor. The vast majority of industrial products were produced by small craft associations, mostly family-type, which worked to meet local needs. Although hired labor was used, it was used in very small quantities. Large

factories and plants were not built in this region because, in our opinion, these were Ukrainian lands, not Russian. Trade was of a small-scale commodity nature, serving mainly the local market. Only in rare cases were certain samples of products exported for sale to Russian provinces or Austria. The local Podillia population continued to live according to old customs. The Peasant Reform changed almost nothing in their lives. The majority of the population did not have the money to buy back their land, so they were forced to accept the realities of the time.

Literature

1. Материалы для исследования Подольской губернии в статистическом и хозяйственном отношении / Центр. стат. ком. Министерства внутр. дел. Каменец-Подольск : Тип. Губ. упр. 1873. 243 с.
2. Муляр А. М. Вінницький повіт у пореформений період (1862 – 1872 рр.): особливості демографії та соціально-економічного розвитку // Міжнародний науковий журнал "Інтернаука". 2022. №13. С. 34-37. doi: <https://doi.org/10.25313/2520-2057-2022-13-8389>
3. Семенов-Тян-Шанский П.П. Географическо-статистический словарь Российской империи : сост. по поручению Рус. геогр. о-ва д. чл. О-ва П. Семенов, при содействии д. чл. В. Зверинского, Н. Филиппова и Р. Маака : Т. IV. Санкт Петербург, 1873. 873 с.
4. Статистический временник Российской империи. серия I. Центральный статистический комитет Министерства внутренних дел. Санкт-Петербург, 1866. 453 с.
5. Статистический временник Российской империи серия II, выпуск X, Центральный статистический комитет Министерства внутренних дел. Санкт-Петербург, 1875. 287 с.

6. Статистические таблицы Российской империи / сост. и изд. по распоряжению Министра внутрен. дел Стат. отд. Центр. стат. ком. СПб. : Центр. стат. комитет Мин-ва внутр. дел, за 1856. СПб., 1858.