

<https://doi.org/10.53656/his2021-4-4-land>

*Civilization Boundaries*  
*Цивілізаційні границі*

## ACTIVITIES OF LAND SETTLEMENT COMMISSIONS IN THE SOUTH OF UKRAINE IN THE YEARS OF STOLYPIN AGRARIAN REFORM (1906 – 1917)

**Assoc. Prof. Iryna Mironova, DSc.  
Dr. Nataliia Shevchenko**

*Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University (Ukraine)*

**Abstract.** The article is devoted to one of the important aspects of the Stolypin agrarian reform – the practical activities of land settlement commissions in the field of land surveying in Southern Ukraine in 1906 – 1917. The personnel, tasks and functional responsibilities of members of land settlement commissions are clarified. The main types, volumes and results of land surveying works in the region are determined. It is proved that the practice of boundary works differed in the modernization of technical measures for the elimination of cross-strips, small-strips, far-flung land, which led to improved field cultivation, increased agricultural yields and rising land prices. Special attention is paid to land management in the Bulgarian colonies of the region.

**Keywords:** South of Ukraine; Stolypin agrarian reform; land settlement commissions; boundary survey; land management; Bulgarian colonies

The subject of agrarian reform, carried out by the government of the Russian Empire under the leadership of Peter Stolypin in the early XX century, is relevant today. This problem, actualized by life itself, put on the agenda the issue of land reform in many post-Soviet countries a century later. P. Stolypin's agrarian reform was carried out on the largest scale in the Ukrainian governorates. At the beginning of the twentieth century, these governorates were the largest producers of agricultural products of the state. The search for optimal ways of land reform in the modern period raises the issue of studying the historical experience of agrarian transformation in some regions of Ukraine, in particular the Southern Ukraine<sup>1</sup>). The experience of the region, which was recognized as a leader in land management during the Stolypin agrarian reform, will help in increasing the potential of modern transformations of the agricultural sector in post-Soviet countries.

Despite the broad historiographical basis of the problem of Stolypin's agrarian reform<sup>2</sup>), the practical aspects of land settlement commissions activity in the field

of boundary survey in the South of Ukraine have not been studied, which led to the choice of topic and purpose of research. This purpose is realized within the framework of the following research tasks: to find out the personnel, tasks and functional responsibilities of the members of land settlement commissions; determine the main types, scope and results of boundary survey in the region.

As a result of the reform of the abolition of serfdom in 1861, the liberated peasants received their allotments. But most of these peasants could not turn them into quality profitable farms. In the following years, boundary and land management works were gradually discontinued. This fact intensified the peasants' acute need for land management at the beginning of the 20th century and demanded new land management measures from the government. That is why in 1905 the Main Department of Land Management and Agriculture of the Russian Empire made it a priority to reform land relations and land management as a necessary prerequisite for all agronomic work for the sake of agriculture (Tretyak 2002, 25 – 26).

Despite all its complexity, P. Stolypin's agrarian reform was only part of the program of systemic reforms in the Russian Empire. Its main content was to allow peasants to leave the commune, to carry out land management to eliminate the striped area, to "plant" private peasant land property by providing peasants with a preferential state mortgage loan through the Peasant Land Bank and resettlement of peasants with state support to the outskirts of the empire (Proskuryakova 2004).

By the decree of Emperor Nicholas II of November 9, 1906, the implementation of the agrarian program began. It was aimed at creating small peasant property on communal lands. The government attached great importance to the task of changing the forms of land ownership by creating personal households – the individual ("khutor") and holding ("otrub") farms (Reient 2006, 7). It was planned to improve the welfare of the peasants by streamlining land management through the increasing the area of land tenure, as well as improving the forms of land use<sup>3)</sup>.

The main tasks of reforming land relations and land management were determined by the procedure and conditions for the formation of peasant land ownership. The South of Ukraine within the Katerynoslavska, Khersonska and Tavriiska Governorates had a number of features in this process, which defined it as a leading region during the Stolypin agrarian reform.

1) In the south of Ukraine, in comparison with other regions of the Russian Empire, there was a greater number of prosperous peasant farms, in which almost all the improved agricultural tools and mechanisms were concentrated. Strong owners actively bought landlords' land and employed hired labor. The yield in such farms was one and a half to two times higher (Proskuryakova 2004).

2) In the period preceding the reform of P. Stolypin private land ownership was dominated in the region (the area of which was 6 908 145 hectares/desiatines<sup>4)</sup> or 51 % of the total area) (Tsybulenko & Tsybulenko 2015, 108). Due to the development of capitalist relations in agriculture in the early twentieth century, South-

ern Ukraine became a region of widespread individual farming (“khutor”) system (Pryimak 2002, 6).

3) The former serfs (landlordly peasants) received their allotments within the same limits in which they used the land during the serfdom. After the process of releasing peasants for ransom, each such peasant had an average of 2,3 hectares/desiatines of land. That is, the peasants were not provided with the allotment of 5 hectares/desiatines per person which was a sufficient and officially recognized at that time (Reient 2011, 207).

The lands of the peasants and the lands of the landlords were in a more or less complex strip holding (“cherespolositsa”). During the period of serfdom, peasant arable lands had a variety of contours that changed easily. After the land reform of 1861, these contours were established as the legal boundary of the new peasant land ownership. But the boundaries of peasant and landlord lands were not actually fixed by boundary markers and did not have an accurate geometric description. Having a complex contour, peasant land plots turned out in an uncertain position for farming (Tretyak 2002, 26 – 27).

4) Due to the fact that the process of settlement and economic development of the southern governorates took place much later than in other parts of the country, and the level of capitalization of the agricultural sector was relatively high, the commune did not acquire the classical features (Pryimak 2002, 9). On the eve of the Stolypin reform, the total area of allotted land tenure in the South of Ukraine was 6 639 322 hectares/desiatines (or 40 % of the region’s land) (Pryimak 2009, 59).

Under communal land tenure, land was often redistributed between households depending on changes in personnel composition of the yard. The social principle of equalizing justice was laid down by the commune in the system of strip holding (“cherespolositsa”) (Pryimak 2009, 60). Each household often received land in several places that were very distant from each other, depending on the quality of the soil and other conditions. Under such conditions, high-quality tillage was impossible, because during sowing grain was wasted, and bread was overgrown with weeds from the borders (Tretyak 2002, 27).

The communal system of land tenure negatively influenced the personal initiative of individual peasants and excluded the possibility of running an independent economy, thereby delaying the increase in the level of agricultural culture. Therefore, the reformers, along with the quantitative ones, saw the qualitative problems of peasant land tenure and land use, which adversely affected agriculture, leading to unjustified costs of national labor and significantly lowering the productivity of tens of millions of desiatines of the allotment fund (Davydov 2016, 433, 447). For these reasons, the redistribution of land ownership according to the needs of the farms was important. Both communal and private farms of the South of Ukraine were interested in practical land management works.

On March 4, 1906, the decree was signed by Emperor Nicholas II on the establishment of the Committee for Land Settlement under the Main Department of Land Management and Land Use (MDLM&LU/GUZiZ). Governorate and county land settlement commissions were also established<sup>5)</sup>. The commissions were created as collegial bodies headed by representatives of the administration, but with the introduction of representatives of peasant societies and zemstvos. This was done to better accommodate local conditions (Proskuryakova 2004). According to the plan developed by the government during 1906 – 1907, land settlement commissions were opened in all counties of Khersonska Governorate, seven counties of Katerynoslavska one, and four counties of Tavriiska Governorate<sup>6)</sup>. These commissions were established to regulate land settlement works on land redistribution, as well as to eliminate shortcomings in land use and land tenure (Teterin 2007, 62).

The course of the transformation was influenced by many factors, one of which had to become the quality of the staff of land settlement commissions. The staff of county and governorate commissions was quite representative. Governorate commissions were headed by governors, and county commissions were headed by local leaders of the nobility. The county commission included: the chairman of the county zemstvo council; an indispensable member<sup>7)</sup> appointed by MDLM&LU/GUZiZ; county member of the district court or chairman of the congress of justices of the peace; a representative from the Department of Appanage; tax inspector; head of zemstvo; three representatives of the district zemstvo; three representatives of district townships (volost)<sup>8)</sup>. The structure of the governorate land management commission was similar. The only difference was that the relevant officials acted within the governorate, not the county (Selikhov 2011, 38).

According to the “Appendix to the order of land settlement commissions”, approved on September 19, 1906, a quite high salary of its members was set: the head of land management – 2500 rubles per year, an indispensable member of the county commission – 2 thousand rubles, senior surveyor – 1500 rubles, surveyor – 900 rubles. In 1912, the tsarist government doubled the salaries of officials of land settlement commissions<sup>9)</sup>. The average monthly salary of an agricultural worker in Ukraine was 10 rubles. Therefore, such salary rates can be described as rather high (Yakymenko 1996, 7 – 8).

One of the key figures in Stolypin’s land management was the figure of an indispensable member of the land settlement commission. In the county commission he performed executive functions, he was entrusted with the management and supervision of all work of land managers carried out in the county, he was responsible for general course of work on land management. In the governorate commission he had the same executive functions, he was responsible for the proper course of land management in the governorate<sup>10)</sup>.

In the course of the reform the role of land managers was significant: they went to the places to find out the legal status of the case, natural and living conditions,

developed the conditions and provisions of future land management, constituted the relevant land management projects<sup>11)</sup>. Such work required considerable technical force. But MDLM&LU/GUZiZ had only a few dozen topographers, and most importantly – there was a lack of officials who were experienced in surveying technique. Therefore, an institution of another department was appointed to assist land management – the Office of Boundary Part Management of the Ministry of Justice. This department was responsible for managing the technical part of land management (Rittikh 1916, 14).

Land management works in the South of Ukraine were carried out mainly in the communities of former state and landowner peasants (Pryimak 2009, 62). Priority in the activities of land settlement commissions was to regulate the allotment of allotted land. During the first five years, land management works could be performed only with the general consent of the owners of all lands, which were subjected to land management<sup>12)</sup>.

More decisive measures for the land management of peasant communal lands were determined by three laws of June 14, 1910; May 29, 1911 and 1912. Under the first law, those communities in which land had not been redistributed for the past 24 years were transferred to household (“podvornyj”) tenure (Teterin 2007, 61). The Law on Land Management of May 29, 1911 gave the right to land settlement commissions to assign allotments to individual householders without first leaving the commune<sup>13)</sup>. From 1912 allotment on holding plots of lands of different ownership, included in one dacha of allotment (i.e. the territory where land management was carried out in a particular area) was introduced (Davydov 2007, 73).

Surveyors and their assistants were engaged in the allotment of land plots, boundary works and drawing up plans, i.e. practical work on land management. Since 1906 their duties were supplemented by engineering work and economic calculations for the rational arrangement of the entire territory covered by land redistribution (Teterin 2007, 61 – 62). The ultimate goal of land management was to give each land tenure such an external form, which would, on the one hand, satisfy the population, and on the other it could help to increase soil productivity and improve agriculture. The most suitable form of holding plots was rectangular or square form (Tretyak 2002, 31).

So, arrangement of practical work of surveyors aimed to achieve technical uniformity of performed work and full compliance with the requirements of surveying art. However, according to the documents, in some governorates and counties surveyors couldn't or didn't want to follow the instructions for the proper conduct of boundary work. For example, in the Katerynoslavska Governorate, land management works were not carried out evenly in all counties, primarily due to the shortage of surveyors themselves. Secondly, drawing up a boundary plan was a challenge due to the diversity of the soils in the area, which was crossed by beams, rocky mountains, sands and swamps. Also, a serious shortcoming of the proper dis-

tribution of land was the lack of water sources in the territory of Southern Ukraine, which made more complicated the arrangement of individual farms (“khutor”) and left holding farms as predominant form<sup>14)</sup>.

One of the reasons for violating the instructions during the boundary survey works was the personal material interests of land managers. In particular, encouraged by high wages, they tried to immediately distribute as much land as possible. Thus, in the report of the head of the zemstvo department Lytvynov on the audit of land management in the Khersonska Governorate in July 1909, it was stated that from the very beginning surveyors had included in the plan a large number of plots for allotment, for which the consent of the communities was not given. It was hoped that when the peasants saw the results of allotment in practice, there would be no protests from them. But the results were quite the opposite. In numerous peasant complaints, there were many indications of incorrect recording of commune verdicts and falsification of peasants’ decisions (Dubrovskiy 1925, 62 – 63, 65). For example, in October 1912, the peasants of the village of Varvarovka in the Alexandria district of the Kherson province filed a complaint with the village court against land surveyors who “unlawfully evicted them for cutting by the violent policy of Stolypin”<sup>15)</sup>.

Also, land settlement commissions in their work did not always take into account the interests of both ordinary and wealthy peasants. This fact led to the formation of the corresponding dissatisfaction and readiness to protest. Members of the commune saw the surveyors as their enemies, so peasants often hindered their work, did not provide them housing, and their assistants were constantly threatened with beatings (Kornovenko & Herasymenko 2017, 109 – 114). Women and children often went to the surveyors as petitioners. As a typical case, we indicate the collision in the village Antonivka, Ananiivskiy county, Khersonska Governorate. Despite all the protests members of the commune, the surveyors went to the field for delimitation work. Women and children came there, begging the surveyors to stop the work. Some women lay down on the survey tape, shouted, cried, and then, throwing away the pegs and tearing the tape, lifted the surveyor in their arms and carried him outside their land with a shout of “huray”. When the police arrived, the villagers threw stones at them, which ended in mass arrests (Dubrovskiy 1925, 268).

According to the calculations of F. Los’ and O. Mykhailiuk, 1973 peasant uprisings/protests took place in Ukraine during 1907 – 1914. In the first place according to the number of participants was the Right-Bank Ukraine (523 uprisings/protests), then the Left-Bank Ukraine (368 ones) and then the South – 85 uprisings/protests (Los’ & Mykhailiuk 1976, 235 – 237). Given these data, we can state that, in general, in the South of Ukraine Stolypin’s agrarian transformations took place more or less peacefully.

In general, the results of land settlement commissions activity in the South of Ukraine for 1906 – 1915 were successful. The reform took place in three gover-

norates evenly and positively. The percentage of new individual households was 13 % higher than in the rest of Ukraine. During these years, 54,3 % of peasants in the region left the commune, securing 36,9 % of allotted land. Individual and holding farms were created for 2 154 594 hectares/desiatines, which was a quarter of the total area of peasant land ownership (Pryimak 2002, 6 – 8). Of this number, 30,9 % of households in the Katerynoslavska Governorate went to individual and holding farms, in the Tavriiska Governorate – 30,6 %, in Khersonska Governorate – 22,6 % of all households in European Russia (Davydov 2013, 544).

Land management processes, which were related to the formation of individual households, gave good results. In particular, the cultivation of fields became much better in individual and holding farms. Reclamation works were also improved, most peasants switched to multi-field crop rotations with sowing fodder crops. As a result of such attention of the population to agriculture yields increased significantly. The most important evidence of the increasing in the productivity of individual and holding farms in comparison with allotted land, was the rapid and significant rise in prices for peasant lands after their distribution. Thus, in the Khersonska and Katerynoslavska Governorates from 1906 to 1915 land prices doubled from their previous value (in the Khersonska Governorate – from 216 to 415 rubles per hectares/desiatines; in Katerynoslavska – from 189 to 369 rubles) (Tretyak 2002, 35). The lowest cost of land remained in the Tavriiska Governorate – on average it ranged from 107 to 115 rubles per hectare/desiatine<sup>16</sup>).

The process of land management was interrupted by the First World War. Since 1915, delimitation works in the southern governorates of Ukraine almost hasn't been held. Previous problems, such as strip holding ownership, dispersion of individual small plots remained unresolved<sup>17</sup>). Land settlement commissions encountered financial and personnel difficulties, and the number of works decreased significantly. Land management practice increasingly turned to the holding system, when the peasant remained with his estate in the old place, and his field plot was allocated into the holding at a considerable distance (Reient 2006, 12 – 13).

This study should also address the important problem of land management in the Bulgarian colonies of Southern Ukraine during the Stolypin agrarian reform. From the time the Bulgarians settled in the southern region until the beginning of the twentieth century, most of them lived in Bessarabska<sup>14</sup>) (103 225 people), Tavriiska (41 260 people) and Khersonska (25 685 people) Governorates (Derzhavin, 1914: 16). In total, according to the population census of the Russian Empire in 1897, in these Governorates there were more than 170 thousand Bulgarians (3,13 % of the total population of the Governorates) (Lazarovych 2013, 190).

The Bulgarian population of Southern Ukraine lived mainly in rural areas in compact colonies. The largest Bulgarian colonies were formed in the Bender-skyi and Izmailskyi counties of the Bessarabska Governorate. In the Khersonska and Tavriiska Governorates they lived in Velykyi and Malyi Buialyk, Kubanka,

Katorzhynka, Parkany, Ternivka, village Baltochokrak, Staryi Krym i village Kyshlav (Semenov-Tyan-Shanskiy 1910, 198). In 1914 the total number of Bulgarian colonies in the Bessarabska Governorate was 65, in Tavriiska one – 45, in Khersonska one – 7 (Derzhavin 1914, 26).

The land issue in the Bulgarian colonies constantly remained relevant. Since the beginning of the settlement of the region, there has been established communal land use. The peculiarity of the landownership of the Bulgarian colonists of Southern Ukraine was that the land area at their disposal was not changed since the 1860s and until the beginning of the Stolypin agrarian reform was 605,955 hectares/desiatines, or 4 % of the total area of the three Governorates of the region. The situation was complicated by the fact that during last 50 years the population of the Bulgarian colonies doubled (from 87 thousand to 170 thousand people), but their land area remained the same (Derzhavin 1914, 55 – 56).

In accordance with paragraph 19 of the “Rules on the Arrangement of Peasant Owners (Former Colonists)” of May 31, 1871, Bulgarian communities were given the right to use and dispose of the lands provided to them at their own discretion in compliance with the following rules: 1) with the consent of two-thirds of the members of the commune who had the right to vote at the meeting, the commune could divide their own lands into household (“podvornyj”) tenure plots; 2) the allocation of plots to individual owners from land which was in communal ownership was allowed by the verdict of two-thirds of the members of the commune. These rules were used by most Bulgarian colonies, which adopted a system of household (“podvornyj”) land use. As a result, in the Bessarabska Governorate the land tenure rate was about 50 hectares/desiatines per family, in Khersonska and Tavriiska ones – 53 hectares/desiatines per family.

But for 40 years of existence of the Bulgarian colonies, the distribution of their land ownership took a completely different form. The fact is that population growth has led to the division of household (“podvornyj”) land into smaller plots. As a result, the land tenure rate per family decreased on average to 18 – 20 hectares/desiatines. For example, in the village Ternivka of Khersonskiy county in the distribution of land in 1849, each household received 53 hectares/desiatines, while the total number of yards then was 187 ones. At the beginning of the Stolypin reform, the same amount of land was already owned by 537 owners. Land tenure here was distributed as follows: the largest number of 113 hectares/desiatines had one household, from 53 to 86 hectares/desiatines – 6 households, all the rest had from 18 – 20 hectares/desiatines and less (Derzhavin 1914, 56 – 58).

Thus, the mobilization of land ownership led to the social stratification of the peasantry. Such situation was typical of all Bulgarian colonies that lived on the rights of household (“podvornyj”) land tenure. In turn, in these colonies there were different land trends depending on the property status of the peasants. In particular, in the village Ternivka peasants decided to move to individual farming, in Malyi

Buialyk – the household (“podvornyj”) land tenure was more supported, in the colonies of Berdianskyi county most of the peasants wanted to move to communal land use. That is, the desire of peasants to choose one or another form of land use was directly proportional to the amount of land available to them. The tendency to switch to individual farming became stronger according to the amount of land owned by the household. Those households that had more than 50 hectares/desiatines, wanted to allocate their allotments in the holding plots, to collect together the land plots located in different parts of the field, and to start intensive farming on the whole field area. The situation was complicated by the fact that farms with 1 hectares/desiatines of land and farms with 50 hectares/desiatines could not work next to each other. This fact led to the support of various forms of land use and led to frequent confrontations at meetings (Derzhavin 1914, 59, 64).

It is clear that this situation with land use, which existed in the Bulgarian colonies, required the tsarist government to revise the legislation on the right of land tenure of colonists, to develop a mechanism for their withdrawal from the commune and immediate redistribution of communal land. However, during the years of Stolypin’s agrarian reform, these issues were not resolved, which led to the crisis of agriculture in the colonies. In addition, the communal property of each colony was in fact the personal property of each owner within his household. It is worth noting that the communal land was preserved, it did not fall into the wrong hands, but inside the commune there were both large landowners and landless peasants (Derzhavin 1914, 69).

Thus, it can be stated that the Bulgarian colonists in the southern Ukrainian lands during the years of the Stolypin agrarian reform were in a more favorable economic and legal position than the Ukrainian peasants. The Bulgarian colonies were distinguished by a large amount of land, which made it possible for them to develop a market economy aimed primarily at the foreign market (Derzhavin 1914, 66). But, in comparison with other ethnic nationalities who lived in the region, for example, Germans and Jews, the situation of land management and land use in the Bulgarian colonies was in an unprofitable state. So, according to plans for the reorganization of state quitrent lands in the Jewish colonies of the Aleksandrovsky district of the Yekaterinoslav province, in 1911 – 1915. the peasants of the colonies Veselaya, Gorkaya, Krasnoselki, Mezhirech, Trudolyubovka and Priyutnaya passed from the commune to farms<sup>18)</sup>. The peasants of only two colonies – Novo-Zlatopol and Roskoshnaya<sup>19)</sup> – moved to the cutting plots.

Compared to the German colonists, who also traditionally had a podvornyj land tenure, but with improved methods of management, the Bulgarian colonists needed a legislative regulation of the internal division of land between individual families, which could protect their farms from land shortages and ruin (Derzhavin 1914, 61).

Summing up, we can highlight several important points of this problem.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a favorable atmosphere was created for the reform of peasant land tenure. Land settlement commissions were given the

main role in organizing agrarian transformations in the state. Despite numerous objective and subjective obstacles, these commissions have generally successfully implemented the basic laws of the Stolypin agrarian reform.

In a short period of time, a significant part of the rural population of Southern Ukraine were covered by land management works. The practice of boundary works was characterized by the modernization of technical measures for the elimination of strip farming, small-strip farming, outlands, etc. As a result, it has led to improving field cultivation, the development of reclamation works, increasing agricultural yields and higher land prices. In general, in the governorates of Southern Ukraine, we can see progressive growth of indicators of land management.

At the same time, various forms of land use and land ownership that were established in the Bulgarian colonies of Southern Ukraine, the imperfection of legislation on land ownership rights, did not allow to begin large-scale agrarian transformation in these colonies. Property stratification of the peasantry and the crisis in the agriculture of the Bulgarian population became the result of the influence of these factors.

The First World War, which began in 1914, and the revolution of 1917 in Russia led to a radical change in land relations in the country and opened a new page in the history of land management.

## NOTES

1. Definition of "South of Ukraine", which is used in the article, refers to the southern territory of modern Ukraine. During the period of the Russian Empire, the southern Ukrainian lands (Yekaterinoslav, Kherson, Tauride and southern parts of the Bessarabian provinces) were part of it and were collectively called Novorossiia.
2. For details: Davydov, 2016; Proskuryakova, 2004; Pryimak, 2002; Reient, 2006; Selikhov, 2011; Tretiak, 2002 et al.
3. Pozhigaylo, P. (Ed.). 2011. *P. A. Stolypin: Programma reform. Dokumenty i materialy*. (Vol. 1). Moskva: ROSSPEN, p. 39.
4. A tithe is a Russian unit of land area (until 1917), which was equal to 1,09 hectares.
5. Pozhigaylo, P. (Ed.). 2011. *Ibid*, pp. 371 – 373.
6. Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj istoricheskij arkhiv (RGIA) [Russian State Historical Archives (RSHA)], f. 408, op. 1, d. 3 (*Ob uchrezhdenii zemleustroitel'nykh komissij i nachalo ikh dejstvij*) [*On the Establishment of Land Management Commissions and the Beginning of Their Actions*], l. 7.
7. An indispensable member is a full-time employee of the land management commission, who was responsible for organizing its work.

8. RGIA [Russian State Historical Archives (RSHA)], f. 391, op. 4, d. 288 (*O perepiske s zemleustroitel'nymi komissiyami*) [*About Correspondence with Land Survey Commissions*], l. 12.
9. RGIA [Russian State Historical Archives (RSHA)], f. 408, op. 1, d. 1786 (*Ob attestacii nepremennykh chlenov uездnykh zemleustroitel'nykh komissij*) [*On Certification of Indispensable Members of County Land Management Commissions*], l. 2.
10. Pozhigaylo, P. (Ed.). 2011. *Ibid*, pp. 417 – 418.
11. *Ibid*.
12. *Ibid*, pp. 380 – 385.
13. *Zakon o zemleustroystve 29 maya 1911 goda i izdannyy na osnovanii sego zakona Nakaz Zemleustroitel'nykh komissiyam ot 9 iyunya 1911 goda*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiya “Sel'skogo vestnika”.
14. Rogdakov, G. (Ed.). (1910). *Adres–kalendar' Yekaterinoslavskoy gubernii na 1910 god*. Yekaterinoslav: Tipo–Litografiya Gubernskogo Pravleniya, p. 10.
15. Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Khersonskoy oblasti (GAKHO) [State Archives of the Kherson region (SAKR)], f. 248, op. 1, d. 1 (*Delo po razboru zhaloby krest'yan s. Varvarovki Aleksandriyskogo uyezda, vyseleennykh na otruba nasil'stvennoy politikoy Stolypina*) [*The deed for the analysis of complaints from peasants the village of Varvarovka, Alexandria district, evicted to the cut by the violent policy of Stolypin*], l. 16.
16. GAKHO [State Archives of the Kherson region (SAKR)], f. 44, op. 1, d. 431 (*Aktovaya kniga notariusa porta Khorly Dneprovskogo uyezda Semena Grigor'evicha Sulimy na 1910 god*) [*Act Book of the Notary of the Port of Horla of the Dneprovskij County of Semen Grigor'evich Sulima for 1910*], l. 98.
17. Rogdakov, G. (Ed.). *Yekaterinoslavskiy adres–kalendar'. 1917 god*. Yekaterinoslav: Gubernskaya tipografiya, pp. 36 – 40.
18. Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Zaporozhskoy oblasti (GAZO) [The State Archives of Zaporizhia oblast] f. 192, op. 1, d. 45 (*Delo po vydeleniyu khutorskikh khozyaystv iz obshchiny yevreyskoj kolonii Veseloj*) [*The deed of the separation of isolated hamlets from the commune of the Jewish colony Veselaya*], l. 8; d. 67 (*Delo po vydeleniyu khutorskikh khozyaystv iz obshchiny yevreyskoj kolonii Gor'koj*) [*The deed of the separation of isolated hamlets from the commune of the Jewish colony of Gorky*], l. 21; d. 85 (*Delo po vydeleniyu khutorskikh khozyaystv iz obshchin yevreyskikh kolonij Krasnoselki, Mezhirech', Trudolyubovki*) [*The deed of the separation of isolated hamlets from the communities of the Jewish colonies Krasnoselki, Mezhirech, Trudolyubovka*], l. 40.
19. GAZO [The State Archives of Zaporizhia oblast], f. 192, op. 1, d. 44 (*Delo po razmezhevaniyu gosudarstvennykh obrochnykh zemel' yevreyskikh kolonij Veseloj, Novo-Zlatopol', Roskoshnoj na otrubnyye uchastki*) [*The deed of delimiting the state quitrent lands of the Jewish colonies Veseloi, Novo-Zlatopol, Roskomnaya into cut plot*], l. 15.

## REFERENCES

- Davydov, M., 2016. *Dvadsat let do Velikoy voyny: rossiyskaya modernizatsiya Vitte-Stolypina*. Sankt-Peterburg: Aletejya.
- Davydov, M., 2007. Statistika zemleustroystva v khode Stolypinskoy agrarnoy reformy (1907 – 1915 gg.). *Imushchestvennye otnosheniya v Rossiyskoy Federatsii*. 7(70), 69 – 75.
- Davydov, M., 2013. Agrarnaya reforma P. A. Stolypina: tsifry i lyudi. *Istoricheskiy zhurnal: nauchnye issledovaniya*. 5(17), 541 – 560.
- Derzhavin, N., 1914. *Bolgarskiye kolonii v Rossii (Tavrisheskaya, Khersonskaya i Bessarabskaya gubernii)*. Sofia: Martilen.
- Dubrovskiy, S., 1925. *Stolypinskaya reforma: kapitalizatsiya sel'skogo khozyaystva v XX veke*. Leningrad: Priboy.
- Kornovenko, S., & Herasymenko, O., 2017. *Selianyn-buntar. Selianska revoliutsiia v Ukraini 1902 – 1917 rr.* Cherkasy: Chabanenko Yu. A.
- Lazarovych, M., 2013. Bolhars'ka natsional'na menshyna Ukrayiny naperedodni Natsional'noyi revolyutsiyi 1917 – 1921 rr. *Drynovskiy zbirnyk*. 6, 187 – 195.
- Los', F., & Mykhaylyuk, O., 1976. *Klasova borot'ba v ukrayins'komu seli, 1907 – 1914 rr.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Pryimak, O., 2002. *Stolypinska ahrarna reforma na Pivdni Ukrainy (1906 – 1917 rr.) (Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis)*. Zaporizhzhia.
- Pryimak, O., 2009. Sotsialna transformatsiya pivdenoukrayins'koyi selyans'koyi obshchyny naprykintsi XIX – pochatku XX stolittya. *Naukovi pratsi istorichnoho fakultetu Zaporizkoho natsionalnoho universytetu* 27, 59 – 64.
- Proskuryakova, N., 2004. Stolypinskaya reforma: vykhod iz krizisa. *Otechestvennye zapiski* [online]. 1(16) [viewed 3 July 2021]. Available from: <https://strana-oz.ru/2004/1/stolypinskaya-reforma-vykhod-iz-krizisa>
- Reient, O., 2006. Stolypinska ahrarna reforma: osnovni podii, periodyzatsiia, osoblyvosti, naslidky. *Ukrainskyi selianyn* 10, 6 – 16.
- Reient, O., 2011. Ukrayins'ke poreformene selyanstvo (1861 – 1914 rr.): stan zemlevolodinnya. *Hurzhivivski istorichni chytannya* (4), 203 – 211.
- Rittikh, A. (Ed.), 1916. *Rossiya. Komitet po zemleustroitel'nyim delam. Kratkiy ocherk za pervoye desyatiletie: 1906 – 1916*. Petrograd: T-vo R. Godike i A. Vilborg.
- Selikhov, D., 2011. Zmist, formy i znachennya diyal'nosti zemlevporyadkuvalnykh komisiy u Naddnipryanskiy Ukrayini epokhy stolypinskykh reform. *Problemy zakonnosti: akademichnyy zbirnyk naukovykh prats* 114, 36 – 43.

- Semenov-Tyan-Shanskiy, V. (Ed.), 1910. *Rossiya. Polnoye geograficheskoye opisaniye nashego otechestva* 14. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdaniye A. F. Devriyena.
- Teterin, G., 2007. *Istoriya mezhevaniya, zemleustroystva i zemelnogo kadastra*. Novosibirsk: SGGA.
- Tretyak, A., 2002. *Istoriya zemelnykh vidnosyn i zemleustroyu v Ukrayini*. Kyiv: Ahrarna nauka.
- Tsybulenko, H., & Tsybulenko, L., 2015. Ahrarna kryza na tli ekolohichnoi katastrofy v Khersonskii hubernii na pochatku XX stolittia. *Scriptorium nostrum* (3), 107 – 124.
- Yakymenko, M., 1996. Stanovlennia selianskoho (fermerskoho) hospodarstva v Ukraini pislia skasuvannia kriposnogo prava (1861 – 1918 rr.). *Ukrainskyj istorychnyj zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal* (1), 3 – 14.

✉ **Assoc. Prof. Iryna Mironova, DSc.**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3039-742X>

Web of Science ResearcherID: X-2454-2019

Black Sea National University of Petro Mohyla  
68, Desantnykiv St.

54003 Mykolaiv, Ukraine

E-mail: [iryna.mironova@chmnu.edu.ua](mailto:iryna.mironova@chmnu.edu.ua)

✉ **Dr. Nataliia Shevchenko**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6570-4944>

Black Sea National University of Petro Mohyla  
68, Desantnykiv St.

54003 Mykolaiv, Ukraine

E-mail: [nataliia.shevchenko@chmnu.edu.ua](mailto:nataliia.shevchenko@chmnu.edu.ua)