

Cheremisin A.

Doctor of historical sciences, professor of the chair of philosophy and social-humanitarian disciplines of Kherson State Agrarian University, Kherson, Ukraine

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE SOUTH OF UKRAINE IN THE LIGHT OF THE REGIONAL-INDIVIDUAL THEORY IN THE END OF XVIII – THE BEGINNING OF XX CENTURY

Introduction. At the present stage of Ukrainian state-building it has become a truism to say that today's stage of development of the science of history is characterized by heightened interest in the historical past of certain regions and understanding that the development of historical regionalism should be provisional for studying the processes which took place in the country on the whole. It is absolutely true if we speak about so specific and, at the same time, very important region as the south of Ukraine. This very region, which includes the Crimea and Donbas, has been in the focus of attention of the whole world for the recent years. The problem of manipulating facts, which is to a great extent connected with history of cities of this region, takes not the least place in an instrumental charger of the informational war being a part and parcel of the hybrid war in the east of Ukraine. In the above circumstances it is very important to carry out scientific researches in the sphere of municipal history of the region.

Traditionally the scheme of local self-government was interpreted within the two theories: *self-governmental* by A. Vasilchikov [2] (writer and public figure, lawyer by profession) and *state* by A. Gradovskiy [4] (professor in law, publicist, writer and teacher).

The *self-governmental* theory was to prove the essence of division between local and state government. A. Vasilchikov opposed administrative government to self-government on the strength of the thesis that local government was to serve economical interests of local population. According to his ideas local self-government is absolutely independent and should not be under control of administrative and state authorities.

A. Gradovskiy proposed *state theory*. He regarded civil bodies as part of state authorities (governmental apparatus), as a form of «local self-government» in particular, on the same level as the government office, various departmental committees of the ministries.

In the real life *self-governmental theory* and *state theory* were ideal constructions which only partly described the essentials of civil government in the south of Ukraine. Before 1870, as they were founded on the principles of decentralization, municipalities were more close to the state theory, after 1870 – to the self-governmental theory and after 1892 – again to the state theory. Thus, the Russian state did not answer the

question: what kind of self-government was needed. The political course of the central government changed depending on the popularity of the above theories.

The conditions, under which the settlement of the south of Ukraine took place, the distance of the region from the State, vast spaces, which made it difficult for the government to hold the control of local population's activity, at the first glance, were favorable for development of a self-governmental system in favor of the civil theory, in other words, as an alternative to state authority. In real life, it did not happen, because in the course of moving to the south the State played an active part and the troops and towns were recognized exactly in connection with the State's interests.

The existence of structures with such self-government, which reflected corporative interests of different groups of the population, could not be explained through either civil or state theory of self-government, as in such case it would lack an element of opposition to the State, from the other side, municipalities were not state authorities in the ordinary sense of the word. Moreover, it could be afforded that the existence of self-governmental bodies reflected interests of the State, as it made possible to discharge the state's budget onto town's expenditures for the purpose of their better self-provision. Thus, self-governmental structures, which existed in towns, did not oppose, but strengthened the State's position. Municipalities were to provide the State's interests, not independently, but under the control of the gubernator's administration.

Taking into consideration the abovementioned conditions no theoretical construction can satisfy the researcher who studies municipal self-government in the south of Ukraine. The proposed approach is called «regional-individual» theory of self-government.

Thus, the aim of the present work is to apply the regional-individual theory to studying the southern Ukraine in 1785–1917.

The essence of the regional-individual theory of self-government. The abovementioned theory comes from the concept that the Russian empire is regarded not as an integral construct, but as an «empire of regions» that had their proper historic peculiarities and identities. The diversity of regions brought about peculiarities of communication («modus vivendi») with neighbor regions and the state. The research by L. Gorizontov [3] is dedicated, in particular, to the interaction of regions within the three different empires: Russian, Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman.

In his work the researcher specifies the Russian empire as continental and states that it was an empire of regions which communicated with each other in a special way: the western regions had an influence on the eastern and vice versa. If an empire influenced another one, frontier zones were formed. The abovementioned concept of an empire of regions acquired completeness according to which imperial identity became dominant over regional.

Each region communicated with the imperial centre and the centre distinguished national regions preferentially, because they expressed the national idea best of all. Juxtaposing national regions upon each other the centre remained the arbiter in solving problems with national territories so that national regions did not regard themselves inferior. Each region was multiethnic. So, imperial and regional identity constituted an element of a complex hierarchic system of identities. The element of regional identity evolved depending on traditions and modernization.

Local population worked out images of towns or localities which, in its turn, formed certain stereotypes. For example, in descriptions of XIX c. Kherson, Mykolaiv and Odessa regions acquired a strong identifying status of an agricultural, commercial and enterprising region [25], Donbas – a stereotype of an industrial region [11], the Crimea's population were proud of the beauties of nature and touristic attractions [22], which facilitated building water-supplies and canalization to a considerable extent. Moreover, the continental part of Tavria region always distinguished itself from the peninsular. The Crimea had the priority in all aspects and criteria, whereas the continental part was much more similar to Kherson and Katherinoslav regions. The continental part of Tavria region belonged to the Crimea only administratively, not in regard to its identity. The regional identity, in its turn, caused the formation of town's identity or *city's patriotism*, which reflected individual priorities in commerce, enterprising, trade and tourism spheres. According to a system of values residents of towns distinguished their city or town from another one and towns got cliché-stereotypes which differed them from others, for example: «the prosperous city of Kherson» or «the cradle of the Black Sea Navy», «the Admiralty centre – Mykolaiv», Odessa – «The southern pearl» or «Eldorado», «Sebastopol – the city of glory». Each town of the Katherinoslav region chose a certain branch of industry for self-identity.

Municipal self-government strengthened such preferences in a necessary way. For example, Kherson self-government always regarded Mykolaiv as its rival city, Odessa's region distinguished its priority not only in the region, but in the whole country, towns of the Crimean peninsular opposed to the continental ones. Each civil government identified itself and the city as an individual and independent institution, not similar to others and defended its interests in different ways.

In each municipal report an attention was drawn onto an individual form of economic measures, at the same time, they were not in a hurry to share their experience with other municipal structures. Town's population identified itself with its own town or city, with certain values and regarded municipal self-government not as a system on the whole, but as a separate representative body of a city, appropriating «our self-government» nominations, which referred only to a body of civil government in a separate town, likewise to their own wishes, criteria for estimating municipal figures

or inclinations towards the elected. Town's deputies tried to be a model only for local residents and criticized self-government only in their elective towns.

The essence of «regional-individual theory» can be explained from the following aspect: «state – region – city – municipal self-government». The state following its own administrative initiative founded cities and broadened civil government, delegating a necessary set of elements used by communities for answering local and state demands on the principles of decentralization. Regions had proper individual particulars, stereotypes, values, historic past, identities which influenced forming, development and activity of local-self-government. In its turn, municipalities were given individual features in managing municipal affairs, forming budgets, fulfilling economic, educational, medico-sanitary policy and had an influence on forming «local patriotism». It was expressed in a system of values or orientations towards individual interests of each town as an indicator of high level concern for their own place of residence in broadening modernization, industrial and trade initiatives as well. The concept of regional-individual self-government in the south of Ukraine was backed up by existence of large municipal property, great influence of trading operations, earlier and faster modernization tempos, rate of financial growth, higher level of development of city territory (town improvement, building water-supplies and canalization, development of education and medico-sanitary work).

The conditions for the regional-individual approach are:

1. special character of the interaction of the imperial centre and the southern Ukrainian region;
2. regional identification which influenced activity of self-government bodies and understanding city's specifics in development of the state;
3. specifying priorities in values according to an individual set of affairs of municipalities in the sphere of building means of communication, modernizing ports, development of cultural-educational institutions, medico-sanitary, engineering-technical measures as well;
4. priorities according to city patriotism in solving problems, not in accordance with the state's interests;
5. individualism in choosing and forming municipalities' staffs;
6. value stereotypes in municipalities;
7. individualism in modernization problem-solving;
8. forming proper regional-individual specifics in realization of economic policy.

In regard to establishing new «centre-region» relationships the institutions of municipal self-government had special regional-individual characteristics:

1. there were lots of land resources at their disposal, they were busy with trade, commerce, at the expense of which they gained more revenues to budgets due to taxes from local population;

2. urbanization and modernization took place at higher rates in comparison with other regions, which was reflected on the condition of municipal self-government;

3. each municipality made an independent decision about a sum of salary, pensions for employees, whereas civil institutions in other regions did not have such possibilities;

4. the principle of election of civil figures was never broken in contradistinction to Russia's regions where mayors/municipal heads, deputies and other employees were designated by the Governors' offices;

5. higher level of their independency;

6. special laws and privileges were adopted to better financial situation of towns' budgets within exclusively the frontiers of the southern Ukrainian region;

7. obvious influence on public opinion and formed elements of «*city patriotism*»;

8. municipalities individually solved town improvement problems, medico-sanitary, educational and cultural problems, carried out canalization conducting, electricity and water-supplies projects.

Municipal self-government in the south of Ukraine during the studied period was under special conditions in regard to center-region relationship, which influenced organizational, material-technical, educational, economic-financial, industrial, medico-sanitary and trade activities of municipal self-government bodies.

Becoming aware of a particular city's priorities reflected itself vividly in the middle of XIX century when the whole system of municipal self-government was reformed, in which municipalities took an active part in expressing hopes for the autonomy of government that would be independent of the administration or the state, as they felt themselves self-sufficient, capable of independent making any necessary decision. Most of researchers in history of municipal self-government put an emphasis on an exceptionally positive role of municipalities during the studied period, especially in the second half of XIX – the beginning of XX c., because civil institutions of government made maximum efforts to start-up enterprising, ports modernization, rail-ways building, to increase expenditures on medicine and education, to substantially develop cultural institutions and to make other achievements [1; 11].

If everything was so good (of course, relatively, comparing with other regions), then a question arises: «Why did revolutions in the beginning of XX c. take place? Why did the majority of population including towns' residents support them?» The author does not aim at giving a comprehensive answer to this complicate question, but the results of the analysis given in the present research permit to make a conclusion that one of the reasons was the conflict between modernism and archaism of the imperial regime, the total lifestyle it supported. This conflict was especially appreciable in the south, where modernization went very fast. That is why it is necessary to critically look at problems of towns' life in solving which local self-government in the

south of Ukraine was engaged, especially taking into consideration their regional-individual specifics.

The existence of the monarchy and the decentralized system of self-government as the basic element of democratic society was evidently incompatible.

Each town, depending on more or less extent of administrative, military or commercial subordination and orders, had possibilities to carry out a fully individual activity in medical, educational, engineering-technical and other spheres.

In particular, city councils and departments decided problems of medical activity, organized special commissions and allotted funds from budgets onto improving sanitary-hygienic conditions. Independently and individually each municipality decided modernization of engineering-technical infrastructure, but only in the central areas of towns, leaving suburbs without benefits of modernism. Self-government could not cope with such problems at the expense of own resources, so they took credits (mostly for 30-50 years), which made municipalities owe a lot to the state as well as to financial institutions.

In the same way they individually and independently solved problems of education and development of culture. They formed special commissions; allocated budget funds that increased annually, established new schools, libraries, reading-rooms, but it drew to cultural-educational lifestyle less than half town's population (approximate from 30 to 40 %, in provincial towns – less than 20 %). In ethnical aspect the majority of educated population was the Russians, in social aspect – aristocracy and public servants, merchants and middle-class groups.

In gender aspect there was a perceptible disproportion between man majority and woman minority in educational institutions. The funds allocated by municipalities were insufficient for development of the education sphere, low cultural level of the population manifested itself and the well-to-do of richer social groups of town's population, as pay for education was not affordable for all groups of population, whereas municipalities did not work out any program for supporting poor strata of the population [1; 11; 25].

After 1870 the civil governments were capable of independent and individual solving problems of budgeting policy. Speaking frankly, they had to use 20 % funds to their own expenses and administrative measures, the part (20-30 %) to debts reimbursement and the rest was individually allotted to towns' important items of expenditure. So, they always needed budget funds, and year after year not only incomes and expense grew, but debts as well. Moreover, the most of measures to which municipal funds were allocated, were not profitable, whereas municipal enterprises were granted on lease, which accumulated less revenues to budgets.

That is why, in our opinion, the activity of municipal self-government should be considered in the light of the *regional-individual theory*.

The comparison of activity indicators of municipal self-government in different regions. With the purpose of better illustrating regional-individual specifics of self-government it is necessary to give comparative indicators of self-government institutions' activity in different regions. As a result, the following criteria were chosen: estate representation of self-government, financial possibilities, land property, engineering-technical facilities and education.

Estate representation in all the branches of municipal government depended directly on the vector of towns' social-economical development. Intensive trading activity facilitated broad representation of merchants in the municipal government's bodies. The Granted Chart and administrative development of towns determined the main positions of merchants' representation in civil government.

During the studied period strong positions in the bodies of self-government of towns in the south of Ukraine were taken by representatives of merchant estate. In the majority of provincial towns middle-class representatives prevailed. Artisans were always in the minority amid the deputies from a town's population; representatives from honorary townspople and intelligentsia were nearly absent – they were rare examples [1; 11; 25].

In other regions the correlation in regard to social, national and religious indicators had another picture. In particular, in municipalities of Chernigiv Province the noble estate prevailed. In 1898 in the whole province there were 353 – deputies from the nobles, 34 – from the middle-class and 10 – from the merchants [29]. However, the nobles and the merchants in the municipalities were in the majority. Persons with university and secondary education were in the minority, instead there were a lot of uneducated people, which permits to estimate the qualitative composition of self-government bodies and understand the tasks they set.

In towns of Pskov province the majority of municipalities' representatives were merchants, the minority – middle-class [29]. Everyone was Russian by nationality, and by religion – orthodoxies. The same distribution was in self-government of the following regions: Simbirsk [21], Orenburg [16], Orlov [17], Tambov [23], as the population in the majority was Russian-speaking and orthodox.

Financial possibilities were rather differentiated. For example, in the southern Ukrainian region there were more towns with a million incomes; rates of growth of budgets were higher. Land property, commercial activity and enterprises gave most of the incomes to towns' budgets in the southern Ukraine. Instead, the incomes of towns' budgets in other cities of the empire consisted mainly of valuation duties and taxes from local population. Among the duties in the southern Ukrainian towns there were mostly expenditures on municipal maintenance, town improvement, engineering-technical innovation, education, medico-sanitary services. In other regions of the empire the expenditures on state, administrative, municipal institutions, police and fire-fighting commands dominated. The city of Odessa was the most distinguished in regard

to rates of financial growth and it took the first place among Ukrainian provinces and the 4th among other cities in the empire being inferior only to St. Petersburg, Moscow, Riga and Warsaw [27].

In regard to land property in the end of XVIII c. a new phenomenon for the entire empire was broadened in the southern Ukrainian towns – big city ownership of land. Other cities of the State had land resources. In this regard the south of Ukraine differed substantially; it had regional-individual specifics, because there was big ownership of land (from 2 to 47 thousand dessiatins). The most part of land ownership was in Kherson (47 thousand dessiatins). In other regions of the empire city ownership of land amounted circa 2-4 thousand dessiatins.

In Russian-Belarus towns there was not a great amount of land and in many cases even less than on the average. For example, in Nizhegorod province municipal land resources did not surpass 2 thousand dessiatins [15]. The most amount of land was in the provincial capital – 1785 dessiatins, but only 874 dessiatins were ploughed. In other places only the half of land fund was used. In Voronezhska province the most of land property was in the provincial center – 4.5 thousand dessiatins, other towns had 2-3 thousand dessiatins on the average, but they ploughed only the half of it [10]. In other regions of the European part the situation was nearly similar.

In the Russian empire in XIX c. the cities, which spent large amounts of money from municipal budgets on development of the education sphere, were the following: Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kiev, Saratov, Kharkiv and others. Only a few southern Ukrainian cities were listed in the above category: Odessa (1 182 000 rubles), Kherson (50 000 rubles), Mykolaiv (44 000 rubles), Berdiansk (24 000 rubles), Kerch (48 000 rubles), Elisavetgrad (32 000 rubles). Expenditures of other cities in the southern Ukraine were less in the amount.

Thus, in regard to municipal investments in developing educational institutions the ministry of people's education defined 43 best cities, among which only 6 southern Ukrainian cities were entered in the list. The total amount of expenditures of the above cities was 1/12 of expenditures of municipal budgets. Due to quality of education's criterion the southern Ukrainian provinces took the first places in the empire. According to statistical committees' data the quality of education was distinctive in Moscow province – 25 %, in St. Petersburg province – 20 %, in Tavria, Kherson, Katherinoslav provinces – 16 %, in Saratov province – 13%, in Kursk province – 7,6 %, in Voronezh province – 6,7 % , in Tambov province – 4,6 %, in Poltava province – 5,6 %, in Chernigiv province – 2,6 %, analogous process took place in Kharkiv province [5].

In general, the situation in the medico-sanitary sphere in the southern Ukrainian towns was far from ideal, but better than in other regions of the empire. Among the problems was a constant lack of money; the medico-sanitary situation was far from

ideal, there were just a few culture-educational institutions for local population; education was available for less than a half a towns' population, so, in general, the situation in the sphere of culture was not satisfactory, charity was sponsored on the remaining principle. However, the problems in the southern Ukrainian provinces did not look as acute as in other regions.

For example, in Podolska province in 1911 there were the least of city's doctors – 2 in 35. According to the official calculations 1 (one) doctor referred to 7 842 patients – of those who applied for medical help only. In fact, the diseased were a lot more. Over 1 thousand legal proceedings were fixed for a breach of sanitary-hygienic regulations from which nearly 900 were satisfied. The surpassing number of hospitals belonged to the State and the zemstvos which were less subordinate to self-government [18]. On the territory of Volyn province the situation was much worse, because municipal self-government was almost incapable of rendering medical help. Even in the second half of XIX – the beginning of XX c. from budgets to the sphere of medicine less than 1 (one) thousand rubles were allotted, not to mention the years when only 60–90 rubles were spent on medical needs [24].

Municipalities of Chernigov and Poltava provinces dealt with social and living conditions problems. Sums of money were annually allotted to supporting the diseased, the disabled; hospices, canteens and other charitable measures were organized, but regretfully only in the amount of 600–1200 rubles, which was, in fact, quite inadequate [8; 29].

In Kursk Province there were 15 towns' doctors, in Kovensk province – 38 doctors [13]. In Pskov province towns' doctors were considerably less than the zemstvo's doctors. 123 doctors worked in 161 zemstvo medical workers, whereas 37 in 77 were regarded as zemstvos' doctors [19; 20].

Municipalities carried out modernization of *engineering-technical infrastructure* entirely individually; they did not share their experience. However, without financial participation of the State, banking institutions and local enterprisers they were not capable of implementing innovations. Not all cities of the south of Ukraine carried out engineering modernization. The self-government in Tavria province was the most active where those problems were clearly understood in the majority of the towns, because it was a social must for them. In municipalities of Kherson province a modernization trend was spread in administrative and in some provincial centers, for example in Elisavetgrad. Odessa was a model city. In towns of Katherinoslav province the most of population even did not think about those problems, except for Katherrinoslav and Oleksandrovsk.

Municipal town improvement in Podolska province was carried out through pavements in streets by 80%. However, it was done not due to maximum efforts of municipal self-government; the reason was that the towns existed since a long time.

Canalization and water-supplies were, at the same time, much worse, even in 1911 [18].

In towns of Volyn province engineering-technical modernization began later than in the southern Ukrainian towns, and it went more slowly. In particular, the building of water-supplies and canalization started in 1892–1893, the electrification – in 1912. Municipalities were not busy with town improvement (only 10–11 % funds were allotted to it from budgets and, taking into consideration not big incomes, it was in the amount of some thousand rubles annually), whereas in private towns improvements there were direct townspeople's natural obligations [24].

Self-governmental bodies in Belarus and Russian towns, of course, carried out town improvement but not on a large scale. For example, in towns of Samara, Simbirsk and Penza provinces local-self-government during the end of XIX – the beginning of XX c. commenced its activity, when initiated by gubernators, in case of catastrophes or before the Impetrator's visits. In particular, in Samara after the devastating fire in 1877, when the third of the city was burned, the municipality conducted a meeting and decided to render support to the suffered in the amount of 5 thousand rubles, the gubernator engaged himself in it, when the sums were being distributed. The Empress, when she knew about the aftermath of the fire, rendered support in the amount of 10 thousand rubles, keeping in mind that the townspeople had collected 100 thousand rubles for the Russian-Turkish war [26]. As a result, extra large sums of money were collected to render assistance to the army – from 1 to 25 thousands, but the total amount was enough only to suggest a plate of soup or a slice of bread to the poor of the Volga region.

CONCLUSION

Thus, we may note that the regional-individual theory of self-government has a full right to existence on account of the fact that each region had its own regional-individual proper specifics of self-governmental structures' activity. It influenced the level of identification, self-determination, different degrees of the interaction with central and administrative bodies, a system of values' orientation and the level of city's patriotism.

In general, municipal self-government in the south of Ukraine could not be considered as an ideal-representative institution of civil initiative, although in comparison with other regions and cities of the Russian empire, the дума's model of municipal self-government in the southern Ukrainian region appeared productive and had the following characteristics:

- the majority of a self-government body was represented by merchants, townspeople and artisans;

Odessa was an indisputable leader among Ukrainian provinces, it took the 4th place in the empire in regard to the level of municipal incomes;

- the majority of towns in the south of Ukraine had a million incomes or approached to this figure;
- towns were leaders in regard to profitability rates of municipal budgets; the highest activity in the sphere of town improvement;
- more substantial funds were allotted to education, medicine and engineering-technical spheres.

Thus, in regard to «state-region-city-municipal self-government» the Russian empire should be regarded as an empire of regions where each region had its own (historically stipulated) properties (regional-individual specifics) including different systems of values and priorities for development, which influenced towns' development, representatives of which were regarded as civil institutions of power.

Municipal self-government defined, in its turn, a character of a town's development on an individual level and solved problems of financial, educational, medico-sanitary and engineering-technical development.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

1. Andrievskiy, F. N. (1915). [in Russian]. *Statistical reference-book of Tavria province*. Simpheropol, #1. P. 52–86.
2. Vasilchikov, A. I. (1871). [in Russian]. *On self-government. Comparative review of Russian and foreign agrarian and civil institutions*. V. III. 839 p.
3. Horizontov, L. (2008). [in Russian]. *The empire in the region, the region in the empire. The empire of regions*. Regional History. #1. P. 127–134.
4. Gradovskiy, A. D. (1904). [in Russian]. *The foundations of Russia's state law: collection of works*. V. 9, P. 3. P. 628 p.
5. DAZO. F.21. Inv.1. Op.32. (1852). [in Russian]. *Documents on the condition and development of people's education in the Russian empire*. P. 20–55.
6. *Historical review of the city of Poltava*. (1856). [in Russian]. Poltava. P. 147–161, 285–300.
7. Konopka, N. O. (2008). [in Ukrainian]. *Malorussia Military gubernator Mykola Grygorovich Repnin*. Dnepropetrovsk. P. 185–186.
8. Nikitin, Y. O. (2004). [in Ukrainian]. *Changes in the conditions of rural and town's population of Kiev and Chernigiv provinces after the rural and municipal reforms in the 60-70s of XIX c.* Kiev. P. 116–118.
9. Pavlovskiy, I. F. (2009). [in Russian]. *Poltava. Historical essay on Poltava as a provincial centre during the epoch of general-gubernators' administration (1802–1856)*. Kharkov. P. 35–67.

10. *Memorial book of Voronezh province*. (1856). [in Russian]. Voronezh. P. 43–54.
11. Golobov, Y. G. (1900). [in Russian]. *Memorial book and address-calendar of Katherinoslav province*. P. 173–213.
12. *Memorial book of Kovensk province*. (1890). [in Russian]. Kovna. P. 132.
13. *Memorial book of Kursk province*. (1892). [in Russian]. Kursk. P. 82–140.
14. *Memorial book of Minsk province*. (1864). [in Russian]. Minsk. P. 80.
15. *Memorial book of Nizhegorod province*. (1855). [in Russian]. Nizhniy Novgorod. P. 207–208.
16. *Memorial book of Orenbur province*. (1870). [in Russian]. Orenburg. P. 11.
17. *Memorial book of Orel province*. (1870). [in Russian]. Orel. P. 147.
18. *Memorial book of Podolska province*. (1911). [in Russian]. Kamencz-Podolskiy. P. 180–192.
19. *Memorial book of Pskov province*. (1864). [in Russian]. Pskov. P. 25–67.
20. *Memorial book of Pskov province*. (1896). [in Russian]. Pskov. P. 67–69.
21. *Memorial book of Simbirsk province*. (1868). [in Russian]. Simbirsk. P. 45–86.
22. Verner, K. (1888). [in Russian]. *Memorial book of Tavria province*. Simpheropol. P. 5–76.
23. *Memorial book of Tambov province*. (1879). [in Russian]. Tambov. P. 36.
24. Prischecha, O. P. (2003). [in Ukrainian]. *Towns of the Volyn region in the second half of XIX – the beginning of XX c.* Chernivtsi. P. 112–115.
25. *The list of populated areas in Kherson province*. (1896). [in Russian]. Statistical data on each populated area. Kherson. 288 p.
26. Turin, V. A. (2007). [in Russian]. *The authorities and municipal self-government in mid-Volga regions: experience of the interaction during the end of XIX – the beginning of XX c.* Samara. P. 109–112.
27. Bychkov, N. (1894). [in Russian]. *Finances of the Russia's largest cities*. Moskow. P. 38–88.
28. Chorny, D. M. (2008). [in Ukrainian]. *Towns of the left-bank Ukraine in the end of XIX – the beginning of XX c.* Kharkiv. 511 p.
29. Shara, L. M. (2002). [in Ukrainian]. *Formation of self-government bodies in towns and suburban areas of Chernigiv province in the third part of XIX c.* Kharkiv. P. 245.