

### The economic structure of russian towns in the second half of the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries

Mironov, Boris N.

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

**Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:**

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

#### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Mironov, B. N. (1991). The economic structure of russian towns in the second half of the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries. *Historical Social Research*, 16(2), 128-143. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.16.1991.2.128-143>

#### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

#### Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

## The Economic Structure of Russian Towns in the Second Half of the 18th and the First Half of the 19th Centuries

*Boris N. Mironov\**

Abstract: The economic structure of Russian towns in the second part of the 18th and first part of the 19th centuries is analysed. The author employs a functional approach to classify towns according to their economic types in the 1760s, 1790s and 1850s. The functional approach of the classification of towns allowed to embrace all historically and geographically diverse types of towns, avoiding overestimations of some types of activities and underestimation on the other. The analysis shows that in the Russian towns according to their functions the prevailing type of the urban settlement was the agrarian, administrative-military town. The conversion of the town from the mainly agrarian into mainly industrial commercial centre occurred only by the mid-19th century.

The economic structure of Russian towns of the 18th and 19th centuries has not attracted much attention of scholars so far. The attempts described in the scientific writing to classify towns according to their administrative status and number of residents do not allow to subdivide towns into economic types in the full sense of the word because of a too narrow criterium assumed as the basis for such a classification. However one cannot properly judge about the significance of towns in the life of a country in various periods of its history not knowing about the functions and their level of the socio-economic development, or, in other words, without the knowledge about the structure of towns.

The changes in the economic structure of towns reflect profound processes in the basis of society. The knowledge of the fact how fast and in what direction the transformation of towns' structure had been going on will help to answer the questions of how fast and in what direction Russian society itself had been developing. The typology of the towns of the 1760s

---

\* Address all communications to Boris N. Mironov, Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, USSR.

and 1850s is therefore closely connected with the solution of some debatable questions concerning the role of the second half of the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries in Russian history, and about the direction and rates of Russian socio-economic development in that period.

This outlines the main issue of this study: employing the functional approach to classify towns according to their economic types in the 1760s, 1790s and 1850s.

Then, »towns« are defined as the so-called »official towns« settlements which had been granted the status of a town or posad by the government. It is necessary to mention that not all the historians share this point of view. Within the research community there exist four opinions about what kind of settlement should be considered a »town« in feudal Russia:

- 1) a town per official definition
  - 2) a commercial and industrial centre
  - 3) a commercial and industrial, or a military and administrative centre or a combination thereof
  - 4) a commercial and industrial centre with an urban (posad) community
- (1)

Although it is very important to find an adequate scientific definition of a town theoretically, practical results of the use of this or that definition in determining the composition of towns and especially the size of the urban population differ not so much as it might be expected. The maximum value of practical differentiation can be judged from an estimation made by V.P. Semenov-Tianshansky. According to that in 1897 14.4 mil. people or 13 per cent of the total population lived in the 761 official towns of European Russia, and in the 1287 »economic towns«, following the author's definition, - 16.3 mio people or 15 per cent of the population (2). Of course, in the second half of the 18th and in the first half of the 19th centuries the composition of »economic« and official towns as well as the size of their population differed not so much.

Modern geographers, sociologists and economists have come to the conclusion that the most full valuable and precise classification of towns is based on the distinction between the types of their activities resp. their functions. The term 'function' describes the activity of people living in this town to the adjacent area by means of providing resources necessary for life thus justifying a town's existence, directed for life.

»A function is a sort of a town's profession, the meaning of its existence, the form in which a town appears to the outside world« (3). The internal town activity which meets exclusively internal requirements of the inhabitants does not rise to the level of functions: it does not stipulate the emergence of the town and does not explain the meaning of its existence. In this sense the functions of the town are: industrial, commercial, trans-

port and agricultural - put together they are also called the economic function; religious, scientific, educational, literary and artistic or in short the cultural function; administrative and political; military; recreational (the activity connected with tourism, recreation of people at sanatoria and resorts and services rendered to retired people) (4).

The agrarian function of the town deserves a special proviso. Agricultural activity cannot be completely excluded from the town's functions since there are always towns not only with a developed agrarian sector but also with a pronounced agricultural specialization (5). Some historians either ignore this fact or refuse to accept in this case the status of a town even if it was officially granted by the government. However the problem cannot be solved this way. I believe the solution is to acknowledge the agricultural activity of towns as functional if it goes beyond the limits of meeting their internal requirements, but at the same time not to consider the agrarian function as a specifically urban or town-forming function. According to such an approach agrarian towns are recognized as towns; however, their urban functions are not in agricultural but in some other activities: administrative, military, commercial etc. The agrarian town, in my opinion, is a transitional status from a typically rural to a typically urban form of a settlement with contradictions typical for every transitional phase and with dualism visible in the fact that it contains simultaneously its some obsolete elements and functions for its further development.

The functional approach to the classification of towns within a historical research is fully justified. It allows to embrace all historically and geographically diverse types of towns, the whole variety of their activities avoiding overestimation of some types of activities and underestimation of the others. The system of towns of this or that country in every period of its history practically performs the whole set of urban functions, but their relative meaning defined by concrete social, economic and political conditions can vary. The functional approach allows to properly assess the role of towns, to understand the specific features of urban life, the concrete historical meaning of towns' existence in every period. The structure of urban function is the most important indicator of the level and character of development of a given country in a given period.

Determining the functional type of a town it is necessary to compare all forms of intertown activities of its population and to find out a dominant one according to which the town will be classified as this or that type. In view of the fact that it is impossible to find the equivalent value of administrative, cultural, military and other forms of nonproductive activity when comparing various functions, the number of residents involved is taken as a quantitative criterium.

In an agrarian town the greater part of the labor force engaged in farming, stock-breeding, market-gardening, gardening as well as fishing, fo-

restry and other branches of material production which are not included in industry, trade and transport; in a commercial town - resp. in retail and wholesale trade; in an industrial town - in industry; in an administrative-military town - in administrative and military service etc; a mixed type town then does not show a clear-cut specialization, its residents are distributed among various spheres of material production and non-productive fields.

However before establishing the predominant type of the population's functional activity residents engaged in town-servicing should be separated from those engaged in servicing the outside world. Inspecting vast city complexes, for persons engaged in city-servicing in a separate branch, modern geographer-urbanists take, among all cities, minimum percentage of those engaged in a given branch. The difference between this minimum and the share of persons engaged in a certain type of activity in the city will indicate the proportion of functional population in a given branch for a given city.

During the period under consideration the minimum percentage of the urban population engaged in agriculture was about 1 per cent, in industry and handicraft: 2-3 per cent, in trade: 1-2 per cent, in management and culture: 1-2 per cent. According to the methods of geographers more than 92 per cent of the urban population was engaged in a functional activity at that time. Since the total percentage of the city-servicing population, according to these estimates, turned out to be small and the minimum percentages for separate branches differed but slightly, the classification of towns can be based on the branch structure of the employment of the entire urban population. This makes it much easier to determine the functional types of towns. At our disposal we have information on functional kinds of residents' activity in 219 out of 368 official towns in the 1760s, in 489 out of 615 official towns in the 1790s and in 266 out of 644 official townships in European Russia in 1855-1862. I would like to say a few words about the sources of this information.

The answers of the local administration to the almost identical 30-item questionnaires issued by the Academy of Sciences (1760) and by the Shliakhetsky Cadet Corps (1760) (6), as well the answers of town councils and halls to the questionnaire issued by the Board of Commerce (1764) (7) were issued to characterize the towns of the 1760s. In 147 answers to the 5th and 6th questions of the academic and cadet questionnaires («5. What trades are town-dwellers engaged in? 6. What crafts do people practise more and which ones are in a better state?») the predominant kinds of activity of the urban population are indicated in a descriptive form. (The answers of 86 voevodas do not contain detailed information.) Here are some typical answers on the basis of which the conclusion about the functional type of a town was made. An agrarian town whose residents almost

completely till the soil: »In the town of Gremiachev the town-dwellers are not engaged in any trades or crafts, they only have plough-land«. For an agrarian town, where the majority of its population mainly was engaged in market-gardening: »In the town of Dmitrov the town-dwellers are busy mainly with vegetable growing and have only tailoring, shoemaking, mittenmaking and blacksmith's work«. An agrarian town with the majority of its population engaged in grain-growing: »The people in Mozhaisk are busy mainly with grain farming work but some of them prefer to sell food-stuffs«. Example for an industrial town: »The merchants have various industries, but chiefly tanneries at which Russian leather is made for the overseas trade. The people do some work in the interest of home usage in the town of Yaroslavl... but mainly as unskilled labourers«. A mixed type town: »In Romanov (of Yaroslavl - B.M.) there are no craftsmen except two silversmiths, one shoemaker and three furriers. Merchants belonging to the guild are mainly engaged in grain trading, those belonging to the second guild purchase raw leather, sheepskin and this sort of things take them to Yaroslavl and sell them there, and merchants of the third guild make a living by portage, others by farming, growing onions and garlic«. A commercial town: »The local residents earn their living by haggles going to upper Russians towns and to St. Petersburg harbour and by chandlery in that settlement. There are no craftsmen except the merchants in Rybnaia settlement (8).

The questionnaire of the Board of Commerce was of a more official character. It included five questions about businesses, services and complaints of the posad population and demanded not descriptive but exact, quantitative information from town's councils and halls. Thanks to this questionnaire we have approximate information about the composition of the posad population according to their occupation - commerce, craft, farming and other »unskilled labour« - in 131 towns.

Taken together these three questionnaires allow to assess the functions of 209 towns in European Russia; in functions of 84 towns (40 per cent) according to the information of the Academic and Cadet questionnaires, the functions of 61 towns (29 per cent) according only to the information of the Board of Commerce questionnaire and the functions of 64 towns (31 per cent) according to the information of all the three questionnaires. »The cross interrogation« of different representatives of the local administration gives a good chance both to verify their information and to depict, on the basis of this information, the most probable type of the town's function. The information of the questionnaires was checked and supplemented with data from other sources: Economic notes to the General Land-Surveying, the descriptions of provinces, scientific travels across Russia (9). Altogether we have information about the functions of 219 towns. The historical analysis shows that the information of the Aca-

demie and Cadet questionnaires about this matter is identical and that of the three questionnaires is very close to each other. The information of the Board of Commerce questionnaire somewhat exaggerates the commercial and industrial significance of towns due to the fact that all people engaged in commerce irrespective of its extent were classified as tradesmen (even if a person carried out commercial operations amounting to several roubles a year he would be listed a tradesman). Grain farmers were often numbered among those engaged in other kinds of unskilled work, that is in industry, transport etc.

Information concerning the occupation of residents of 489 Russian towns in the 1790s-1800s was taken from the seven-volume Geographic Dictionary compiled by A.M. Schekatov (10). This Dictionary reports information about 615 towns but only about 489 towns situated in the European part of Russia and Siberia (excluding the Caucasus and Vyborg province). Thus we can form a notion of economic specialization of 72 per cent of the total number of Russian towns. The main source of compiling the Geographic Dictionary were economic descriptions of provinces (11). First of all the so-called Topographical descriptions of all the provinces except the Yekaterinoslav and Estland provinces and the Don Kossacks Province (Zemlia Voiska Donskogo). They were written according to special extensive programmes made up in 1778 and 1790 (12). The greater part of the Topographical Descriptions has not been published so far and is kept in various USSR Archives (13). The Descriptions were produced almost simultaneously in the 1790s-1800s according to a single programme by competent authors, mainly by provincial and district (uyezd) land-surveyors who carried out the General survey of in the country and were very well informed about local economic life and had access to necessary documents (14).

The content of other sources of the Dictionary is similar to that of the Topographical Descriptions. There are numerous economic descriptions of provinces made up on a private initiative under the influence of the Topographical Descriptions or following special instructions of the Free Economic Society and Academy of Sciences as well as the Economic Notes to the General Land-Surveying, the compilation of which began in the 1780s and ended in the 19th century. All these descriptions were used as sources for compiling the »Geographic Dictionary« (15).

After a thorough analysis of the primary sources historians came to the conclusion that the economic descriptions of provinces are the most complete and reliable sources of the socio-economic history of Russia in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Hence, it is quite normal to conclude that A. M. Schekatov's »Geographic Dictionary« synthesizing all these numerous descriptions is also the most complete collection of quite reliable information about the state of Russian towns in the late 18th and early 19th centuries.

Information about various towns given in the Dictionary is not of equal value. Information about some towns and their dwellers' occupation is complete, where as in other cases - brief and incomplete and for 106 towns such information is not available at all. In some cases there is a direct assessment of town's economic specialization. In all the cases the classification of towns was based on the entire available information: the time of the formation, the size and composition of its population according to estates and occupations, the number of commercial, industrial and artisan establishments, the existence of fairs, market days, trade turnover, urban lands and composition of lands, the number of merchants and the amount of capital hold, the location of the town (on the border, river, main road); its status (capital, provincial, uyezd, non-uyezd, fortress, port ect.), the development of seasonal work, cattle-breeding, various kinds of by-trades (hunting, fishing, weaving etc.). The town's specialization in the mid-18th and mid-19th centuries was also taken into account. I proceeded from the hypothesis that during the time under study the general trend of the town development was progressive, towns evolved from administrative-military, agrarian settlements to commercial and industrial centres. That is why I think that when sufficient information is not available a town which was agrarian in the mid-19th century may be considered agrarian at the end of the 18th century, too; and on the contrary a town which was either commercial, industrial or of a mixed type in the mid-18th century had little chance of becoming an agrarian or administrative-military centre by the end of the 18th century. Thus, the conclusion about the economic specialization of a town, as a rule, is a sort of a deduction following experts opinion. If a town has much land and no commercial and industrial institutions and the majority of its population are peasants we conclude that it is an agrarian town. If a town has many merchants who possess a lot of capital and make a big trade turnover, if it has several fairs, daily markets or if it is located on a navigable river, has very little land, not very many artisan and industrial establishments we make the conclusion that it is a commercial town. If a town has a large plant and undeveloped farming, cattle-breeding and trade we conclude that it is an industrial town etc.

Information about the occupation of residents of 266 Russian European towns in 1855-1859 was gathered by provincial statistical committees on the instructions of the Ministry of Internal Affairs according to the programme elaborated in 1855. It aimed at a division of towns into three categories according to their economic potential to impose even more of Zemstvo obligation upon the urban population (16). This information was verified and supplemented with information which in 1862 was reported to the same Ministry from provincial administration and special commissions of the deputies of urban estates formed on the occasion of scheduled reforms of the municipal administration (17). The combination of infor-



mation of the two sources gives us an opportunity to have a complete, although, of course, tentative notion of the occupational structure of the urban population in the mid-19th century.

However, it is not clear whether the obtained information about the economic structure of towns of the second half of the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries is reliable and representative. The answer to this question depends on the reliability and quantity of the initial information. The analysis of primary sources shows that the initial information is sufficiently reliable and more or less correctly reflects the true state of towns. The quality of the initial information, the concurrence of the evidence of different sources, the systematic character of the obtained information for this period give evidence to that. In my opinion, the data we have about the economic structure of towns are representative for the whole of the country: it covers the greater part of Russian towns which are more or less evenly distributed on the territory of Russia - towns in borderlands recently annexed by Russia were not taken into the analysis. As a rule these towns are less populated and less developed economically as compared with the average model Russian town. Hence, one can suppose that the picture obtained as a result of the analysis somewhat embellishes the state of Russian towns, i.e. it slightly reduces the number of the agrarian and administrative-military types and correspondingly exaggerates the number of towns of other economic types.

The statistical analysis of the economic questionnaires of the 1760s, A. M. Schekatov's Geographic Dictionary and questionnaires of the 1855 programme of the Ministry of Internal Affairs give us an insight into economic structure of towns in the 1760s and half a century later, in the late 18th and in the mid-19th centuries (see Table 1 in the Appendix).

In the 1760s the prevailing type of the urban settlement was the agrarian town. Its productive population was exclusively (6 per cent of the cases) or mainly (94 per cent of the cases) engaged in farming, including chiefly grain-growing (88 per cent), market-gardening (11 per cent), gardening (1 per cent). However, it should be taken into consideration that every agrarian town performed at least one typical urban function, administration since almost all of them were district (uyezd) centres, and the majority of them covered two or more functions. As centres of fair, market or permanent trade up to 77 per cent of agrarian towns also included a commercial function (18). Besides the administrative and commercial functions in nearly 29 per cent of towns industrial function can be observed as their residents produced industrial goods to be exported (19). Several agrarian towns were cultural centres. For example, later at the end of the 18th century, every third town had a (primary) school especially for lower class people (20). It is important to see the fact that farming in towns differed from that in the countryside. It was a kind of free commercial enterprise,

often even entrepreneurship, largely orientated towards the market (21). Thus, it is clear that in the 1760s the activity of the population of agrarian towns had a specific urban character although these towns were still on their way of turning from typically rural into typically urban settlements. If we exclude them from the network of towns we would neglect the historical situation, distort the true picture of the Russian town of the 1760s, and substantially decrease the level of urbanization in Russia (22).

In the 1760s nearly 37 per cent of towns were primarily commercial, industrial or mixed type towns. Farming played a functional role in the mixed type towns' economy, and only in commercial and industrial towns it was of minor importance and served to meet the needs of the population. Nearly 5 per cent of towns performed mainly the administrative-military function.

By the beginning of the 19th century the economic structure of towns had not undergone any radical transformation although certain changes had taken place. The proportion of agrarian towns went down by 4 per cent and that of the industrial towns - by 3 per cent. The mixed type increase by 5 per cent, and the commercial - by 1.5 per cent. The relative number of administrative-military towns remained the same. This illustrates the fact that despite the undoubtedly progressive development of the Russian towns in the second half of the 18th century a complete and final separation of the town from the countryside, from the economic point of view, by the beginning of the 19th century had not yet occurred.

This conclusion can be confirmed by a more detailed analysis of the functions performed by 150 mixed type towns. Among them only 51 towns (34 per cent) had a developed, relatively predominant, commercial and industrial sector. The agrarian sector of the urban economy, though not predominant, relatively prevailed in 91 towns (31 per cent). The administrative-military function was relatively predominant in 7 towns (5 per cent). Thus, on the whole, the agrarian function prevailed, in 357 out of 489 towns (nearly 73 per cent). The administrative-military functions - in 28 towns (6 per cent), the commercial and industrial functions - only in 76 towns (16 per cent). A relatively predominant function could not be found in 28 towns (6 per cent).

I believe that the stagnation of the economic structure of towns in the second half of the 18th century was affected by the reform of local administration which began in 1775. In 1775-1796 guided mainly by administrative considerations to simply increase the number of urban estates the government transformed by a autocratic decree 271 urban settlements into towns. Naturally, this change of a label did not transform villages into commercial and industrial centres and their population showed no intention to change their social status. The responses given by the local administration in 1797 to the Procurator-General's inquiry into the state of new

towns formed according to the provincial reform of 1775, made this evident. In accordance with the requirements of the Procurator-General the local authorities had to give a clear answer to the question concerning the character of the settlement. »Could it be considered a real town?« So, local authorities declared 171 towns (63 per cent of the total number of newly formed towns) as »fallacious towns« because of the exclusively agrarian character of their economy. That happened 10-20 years after the government act. The remaining 37 per cent of the towns were recognized as real towns or a larger scale (23). In the 1800s the greater part of the »fallacious towns« were given back the status of a district (uyezd) town.

So, in the 1790s there were 55 per cent of agrarian towns among all the towns and 63 per cent among the newly formed. Hence, it is clear that the old towns proved to be much more successful in their commercial and industrial development than can be derived from the comparison of the general data on the economic structure of towns in the 1760s and 1790s, and that the government's voluntaries decision to create new towns had an effect on their functional structure in the 1790s.

By the 1850s the functional structure of towns had evidently changed. Industrial towns had taken a dominant position in the system of towns, along with a growing significance of commercial towns and a stagnation of the mixed type. It is symptomatic that farming lost its former significance for all types observing the percentage of inhabitants engaged.

Number of towns	Percentage of the population engaged in farming
16(6.0%)	75-90
42(15.8%)	50-75
40 ( 15.0%)	25-50
118(44.4%)	1-25
50(18.8%)	0

Total: 266(100%)

Farming ceased to exist as an independent functional kind of activity in 19 per cent of towns in European Russia at all. It played a secondary role in 44 per cent of towns, and an important role in 15 per cent and the leading role in only 22 per cent of towns. It is interesting to note that degradation of the agrarian function of the towns was accompanied by certain progress of urban farming which manifested itself in the substitution of extensive grain-farming by intensive gardening and market-gardening (24).

Towns of various functions differed from each other not only in economic orientation but also in the number of residents, socio-professional composition of the population, structure of production, quantity of land, incomes, production and consumption balance and other characteristic features (see Table 2).

According to the majority of indicators, both in their absolute and relative measuring, industrial towns surpassed commercial, commercial towns surpassed mixed type towns, mixed type towns surpassed agrarian towns, and agrarian towns the administrative-military type. For example, the average number of residents in industrial towns was 14.4 thousand, in commercial towns: 10.5 thousand, in mixed type towns: 5.9 thousand, in agrarian towns: 3.8 thousand, in administrative-military towns: 3 thousand; the gross product of urban economy correspondingly was 954 thousand, 213 thousand, 108 thousand, 51 thousand, 40 thousand; trade turnover 3074 thousand, 861 thousand, 250 thousand, 107 thousand, 156 thousand; urban revenues - 39.5 thousand, 7.1 thousand, 5.5 thousand, 2.4 thousand, 2.4 thousand, 2.9 thousand etc. A sufficiently strict dependence between the functional type of the town and its economic indices testifies to the fact that towns of different specialization had different levels of economic development. On the basis of these indices towns can be ranged as follows: administrative-military agrarian - of mixed type - commercial - industrial towns. (See Table 2 in the Appendix).

The classification of Russian towns in the 1760s, 1790s, and 1850s according to their functions showed that during the second half of the 18th century the prevailing type of the urban settlement was the agrarian, administrative-military town. During the second half of the 18th century no qualitative transformation in the economic structure of towns occurred. There were some slight progressive changes which manifested themselves in the growth of the commercial and industrial significance of towns and in the weakening of their role as agrarian centres.

These unessential transformations of functions presupposes also insignificant changes in the character of labour, in the way of life of the urban population, in the importance towns in the life of the country. The rural appearance of the majority of Russian towns of the second half of the 18th century and the rural character of the urban population's way of life should be considered a natural consequence not of the rural environment which exists at all times, but of the mainly agrarian character of the urban economy, since the dominant kind of labour, as it is well known, has an effect on the people engaged in it, on their living conditions and their every day life. It defines the type of dwellings, the type of buildings in a settlement or in a separate estate, it forms the routine of work and rest, the daily and yearly routine, creates the forms of the social and family life, forms mentality and psychology. If in the second half of the 18th century in 73 or 79 per cent of Russian towns farming was the main or important occupation of residents how could the typical Russian town fail to have the rural appearance, and the average Russian towns-dweller fail to live within the forms of the social and family life which in many respects reminded the forms characteristic of the Russian peasant!? In addition, one

should not forget, that during the whole period under consideration nearly a third of the permanent urban population by their social status were peasants and among the temporary population peasants generally prevailed.

The conversion of the town from the mainly agrarian into mainly industrial commercial centre occurred only by the mid-19th century and was accompanied by the separation of the urban population from farming and by shifting it into industrial and commercial occupation. This facilitated the formation of a peculiar urban every day life characterized by certain reserve, dogmatism, traditional character, in less pronounced connection with nature and its cycles if compared with that of the rural life, and a special urban type of the personality characterized by greater mobility, initiative, enterprise, broad-mindedness and literacy as compared with the villager. Concentration of the industrial and commercial population in towns signified the raising of the regulating role of the town in the economic life of the country. It meant concentration of economic power in the town in addition to political power which was always present, the raising of the town's role in the cultural and political life of Russia. The curtailment of the town's resources necessary for the support, not to mention the improvement, of the agrarian function was the basis of the process of separation of the town from the countryside. The growth of the absolute urban population during the second half of the 18th century within the old town-limits, which practically did not expand, undermined the chances of rational farming because of the land shortages. The transition of town-dwellers from grain-farming to gardening and market-gardening temporarily delayed this process but could not stop it as the intensive forms of farming still required land and to an even greater degree fertilizers and water. But obtaining them in sufficient quantities within the town boundaries was becoming a hopeless business. So the natural course of events was completing the separation of the town from the country-side.

The data at our disposal lead us to the conclusion that the towns of different specialization were of a single socio-economic type and in this sense they were of equal value. At the same time the functional types of the towns differed by the level of their economic development, they were related genetically, since the more developed commercial and industrial towns evolved from the less developed mixed type towns which themselves were transformations of the administrative-military and agrarian towns.

## Notes

1. Vodarskii Ya. E. Naselenie Rossii v kontse XVII nachale XVIII veka, Moscow 1977, pp. 115-31.
2. Semenov-Tianshansky V.P. Gorod i derevnia v Evropeiskoi Rossii. St. Petersburg 1910, pp. 76-7.
3. Bogeout-Garniet J., Shabot J. ocherki po geografii gorodov. Moscow 1967, p. 105.
4. Ibid., p. 106; Merlen P. Gorod: Kolichestvennye metody izuchenia. Moscow 1977, p.30.
5. Bogeout-Garniet J., Shabout J. Ocherki..., p.105.
6. Leningradskoe ordelenie Archiva Akademii Nauk SSSR (LO AAN SSSR), f.3 (Kantseliaria Akademii Nauk), 1.10a, c. 1-220; 1.10b, c.1-40. The replies to the questionnaires were partially published in: Bakmeister L. I. Topograficheskie izvestia, sluzhaschie dlia polnogo geograficheskogo opisania Rossiiskoi imperii. St. Petersburg, 1771-1774. P.I-IV.
7. Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi archiv drevnikh aktov, f.397 (Komissia o kommertsii), 1.1, c.441, 445.
8. LO AAN SSSR, f.3, 1.10b, C.130V; 1.10a, c.147; 1.10b, c.131, p.24, 47, 68-70, 76-8.
9. Klokman Yu. R. Sotsiarno-ekonomicheskaiia istoria ruskogo goroda: Vtoraia polovina XVIII veka. Moscow 1967, p.335.
10. Schkatov A. M. Slovar' geograficheskii Rossiiskogo gosudarstva. Moscow, 1801-1809. P. 1-7.
11. Berg L. S. Ocherk istorii russkoi geograficheskoi nauki. Leningrad 1929, pp. 21—7; Kaufman I. M. Geograficheski slovari. Moscow 1964; Milov L. V. Kistorii sozdania »Geograficheskogo slovaria« Afanasia Schekativa // Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1968 g. Moscow 1970, pp. 166-83.
12. Nachertanie obschego topograficheskogo i fizicheskogo opisania Rossiiskoi imperii, predpriniaeoe emp. Sankt-Peterburgskoi Akademiei nauk. St. Petersburg 1778; nachertanie opisania rossiiskikh gubernii. St. Petersburg 1778; Nachertanie ko vseobschei zodache i nagrazhdeniu tekhnicheskikh sochinitelei, koi khoziaistvennye opisania chastnykh rossiiskikh namestnichestv Vbrnomu ekinomicheskomu obshchestvu soobschat' budut. St-Petersburg 1790.
13. Kabuzan V. M. nekortorye materialy dlia izuchenia istoricheskoi geografii Rossii XVIII - nachala XIX v.: (po fondam tsentral'nykh gosudarstvennykh arkhivov i bibliotek Moskvy i Leningrada) // Problemy istochnikovedenia. Moscow 1963, issue XI, pp. 153-95.
14. Rubinstein N. L. Topograficheskie opisania namestnichestv i gubernii XVIII v. pamiatniki geograficheskogo i ekonomicheskogo izuche-

- nia Rossii // Voprosy geografii. Moscow 1953. Vol. 31, pp. 39-89; Ditmar A. B. O topograficheskikh opisaniakh Yaroslavskogo kraia kontsa XVIII veka // Uchen. zap. Yaroslav. ped. in-ta. 1968. Issue 71, pp. 129-42; Emmausskii A. V. Topograficheskie i istoricheskie opisanija Viatskogo namestnichestva v 80-90-h gg. XVIII v. // Problemy istochnikovedenia. Moscow 1959, Vol. 7, pp. 204-5.
15. For the detailed description of the given group of sources see: Kolesnikov P. A. Kameral'nye opisanija - istochniki po istorii godadarnostvennykh krest'ian evropeiskogo Severa Rossii kontsa XVII - nachala XIX veka // Istoriografia i istochnikovedenie istorii severnogo krest'ianstva SSSR. Vologda 1978, pp. 91-7. (Severnyi arheograficheskii sbornik: Issue 2); Milov L. V. Issledovanie ob »Ekonomicheskikh primechaniakh« k Generarnomu mezhevauiu.« Moscow 1965, pp. 9-159; petukhova E. I. Anketnoe obsledovanie Vbrnogo ekonomicheskogo obschestva // Nauchn. zap. Rostovskogo-na-Donu finansovo-ekonomicheskogo in-ta, 1958. Issue 1. Kafedra statistiki, pp. 187-218; Istochnikovedenie istorii SSSR XIX nachala XX v. moscow 1970, pp. 18-9.
  16. Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv SSSR (TsGIA SSSR), f.1287 (Khoziaistvennyi departament Ministerstva vnutrennikh del) 1.39, c.1488-91.
  17. Ekonomicheskoe sostoianie gorodskikh poselenii Evropeiskoi Rossii v 1861/62 g. St. Petersburg 1863. Vol. 1-2. Information came from 593 urban settlements of 45 provinces in European Russia. A sample of 266 towns was quite representative and the following estimation testifies to this: according to the information about 266 urban settlements farming was the main occupation in 22 per cent of settlements and according to the information about 593 settlements - in 20 per cent.
  18. Mironov B. N. Vhutrennii rynek Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XVIII pervoi polovine XIX v. Leningrad, 1981, pp. 56-7.
  19. Indova E. I. O rossiiskikh manufakturakh vtoroi poloviny XVIII v. // Istoricheskaja geografia Rossii: XII - nachalo XX v. Moscow, 1975, pp. 248-345.
  20. KniazTcov S. A., Serbov N. I. Ocherki istorii narodnogo obrazovania v Rossii do epokhi reform Alexandra II. Moscow, 1910, p. 145.
  21. Milov L. V. O tak nazyvaemykh agrarnykh gorodakh Rossii XVIII v. // Voprosy istorii. 1968. No. 6, pp. 54-64; Rabinovich M. G. Ocherki etnografii russkogo feodarnogo goroda Goroshane, ikh obschestvennyi i domashnii byt. Moscow, 1978, pp. 65-8; Rundziunskii P. G. Osnovnye factory gorodoobrazovania v Rossii vtoroi poloviny XVIII v. // Russkii gorod: Istoriko-metodologicheskii sbornik. Moscow, 1976, pp. 118-120.

22. Vodarskii Ya. E. Promyshlennye selenia Tsentralnoi Rossii v period genezisa i rasvitiia kapitalizma. Moscow, 1972. P. 256; Klokman Yu. R. Ocherki sociarno-economicheskoi istorii gorodov Severo-Zapada Rossii v seredine XVIII v. Moscow, 1960. PP. 120-85; Razgon A. M. Promyshlennye i torgovye slobody i sela Vladimirskoi gubernii vo vtoroi polovine XVIII v. // 1st. zap. Moscow, 1950. Vol. 32. PP. 133-72.
23. TsGIA SSSR, f.1374 (Kantseliaria general-prokurora), 1.1, c.188a, b.
24. Rabinovich M. G. Ocherki etnografii russkogo feodal'nogo goroda. PP. 23, 53-45, 59-62, 283-5.

## Appendix

**Table 1.**  
**The Economic Structure of Russian Towns in the 1760s, 1790s and 1850s.**

Economic types of towns	the 1760s		the 1790s		the 1850s	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Administrative-military	10	4.6	19	3.9	12	5
Agrarian	129	58.9	266	54.4	58	22
Mixed	67	30.6	179	36.6	53	20
Commercial	5	2.3	19	3.9	27	10
Industrial	8	3.6	6	1.2	116	43
<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>100</b>



**Table 2.**  
**Socio-Economic Characteristics of Towns of Various Functional Types in the 1850s (Average Indices for Each Type).**

	Types of Towns by Functions				
	Admini- strative military	Agrarian	Mixed	Com- mercial	Indu- strial
1.	3,0	3,8	5,9	10,5	14,4
2.	136	2877	1605	739	579
3.	350	583	1535	5538	2433
4.	53	82	408	458	2540
5.	442	423	1530	2033	5431
6.	981	3415	5076	8768	11033
7.	172	320	496	782	926
8.	454	459	581	832	1118
9.	3.7	9.3	4.8	12.5	4.3
10.	7.1	12.5	17.8	22.2	42.2
11.	15.6	10.3	24.6	86.1	313.4
12.	5.8	13.4	49.5	74.2	377.2
13.	7.9	5.1	11.4	17.8	216.8
14.	40.1	50.6	108.1	212.8	953.9
15.	155.9	107.0	249.9	861.4	3074.3
16.	0.26	0.47	0.43	0.25	0.37
17.	1271	4517	2309	2485	2945
18.	90.7	62.7	146.1	325.3	623.1
19.	2.9	2.4	5.5	7.1	39.5
20.	9.6	5.1	8.0	9.8	35.6
21.	0.5	2.0	6.5	10.5	11.9
22.	59.7	73.7	135.8	225.2	289.5

**Description of towns:**

1. Population, thousand; 2. Number of farmers; 3. Number of tradesmen; 4. Number of workers; 5. Number of artisans; 6. Total number of people engaged in productive labour; 7. Number of people engaged in seasonal work; 8. Number of owners of immovable property; 9. Farm products, thousand roubles; 10. Cost of livestock, thousand roubles; 11. Products of trade, thousand roubles; 12. Industrial products, thousand roubles; 13. Artisan products, thousand roubles; 14. Gross product, thousand roubles; 15. Trade turnover, thousand roubles; 16. Production and consumption balance; 17. Urban land, dessiatinas; 18. Real estate tax, thousand roubles; 19. Urban revenues, thousand roubles; 20. Tax sum, thousand roubles; 21. Arrears, thousand roubles; 22. Sum of declared capital, thousand roubles