UDC 94(477.7):631.1.017.3“175/191”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.23.258965

Hennadi VASYLCHUK
PhD hab. (History), Professor, Vice-Rector for Scientific Affairs of Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia National University, 66 Zhukovskoho Street, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine, postal code 69600 (historyhena@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0003-3023-6682

Oleg PRYIMAK
PhD hab. (History), Docent, Professor of the Department of Social Philosophy and Management Faculty of Sociology and Management, Zaporizhzhia National University, 66 Zhukovskoho Street, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine, postal code 69600 (olegpriimak75@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0003-0896-1431

Геннадій ВАСИЛЬЧУК
доктор історичних наук, професор, проректор з наукової роботи Запорізького національного університету, вул. Жуковського, 66, м. Запоріжжя, Україна, індекс 69600 (historyhena@gmail.com)

Олег ПРИЙМАК
доктор історичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри соціальної філософії та управління факультету соціології та управління Запорізького національного університету, вул. Жуковського, 66, м. Запоріжжя, Україна, індекс 69600 (olegpriimak75@gmail.com)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Vasylchuk, H. & Pryimak, O. (2022). Hamlet farm development in the South of Ukraine (the end of the XVIIIth – the first third of the XXth century). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin], 23,* 17–30. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.23.258965

HAMLET FARM DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOUTH OF UKRAINE (the end of the XVIIIth – the first third of the XXth century)

Abstract. The purpose of the research *is to study the hamlet form of management in the South of Ukraine at the end of the XVIIIth – the first third of the XXth century.* ***The Methodology of the Research.*** *It was possible to achieve the goal with the help of the use of postmodern methodology. The research is based on the principles of objectivity, multifactorialism, historicism, the implementation of which took place due to the use of historical genetics, problem chronological, narrative, retrospective, classification, historical biographical methods and content analysis.* ***The scientific novelty*** *is that for the first time a comprehensive study of the hamlet farm development in the South of Ukraine at the end of the XVIIIth – the first third of the XXth century has been carried out. Numerous new sources have been involved in the scientific circulation, which allows expanding the idea of the existing farm management system in the region. The criteria of the analysis have been formulated and the hamlet classification has been developed, the periodization of hamlet development has been offered. The issues of preconditions, conditions, social mechanisms, algorithms of creation and distribution of hamlets have been elucidated.*

The Conclusions. *The emergence and spread of hamlets had been an integral part of the settlement and economic development of southern Ukraine since the end 1880s. The upper chronological limit of their existence in the region coincided with the beginning of collectivization. For almost a century and a half in the rural areas of the south there were developed eight varieties of farmland: 1) one-yard hamlets of wealthy peasants that existed on privately owned, rented and allotted lands; 2) multi-yard hamlets of wealthy peasants and middle class peasants (on privately owned and rented lands); 3) multi-yard hamlets of wealthy peasants on allotted lands; 4) multi-yard hamlets of poor peasants on allotted lands; 5) one-yard privately owned hamlets of the Azov and Danube troops' officers; 6) one-yard hamlets of wealthy Cossacks on the allotted lands of troops; 7) multi-yard hamlets of wealthy and middle-class Cossacks on the allotted lands of troops; 8) multi-yard hamlets of the wealthy German-speaking colonists on allotted and privately owned lands.*

There wre five stages in their development in the region: the end of the XVIIIth century – 1861; in 1861 – 1906; in 1906 – 1914, in 1914 – 1921, in 1921 – 1929. During the first stage the Cossack, colonial and peasant hamlet became one of the main natural and economic forms of settlement and economic development of the region. During the inter-reform period, i. e., at the second stage, the peasantry was the main subject of the hamlets foundation. At the same time, one-yard as well as in groups and by renting and buying privately owned land, wealthy and middle-class strata spread the hamlet system of management in the region in the competition for land with the community, colonists, burghers, and merchants. There was a noticeable trend in the spread of hamlets-vyselkiv and experimental rental farms. The defining method of spreading hamlet was intra-allotment land management at the third stage. In 1906 – 1917 plot of land strips of rural communities became an arena of internal competition for land. The spread of plot of land management system became widespread at that time. Not only economically stable peasants but also indigenous peasants became owners of hamlets. During the fourth stage – during the period of World War I and the revolution – hamlet development system was regressive. Its defining features were the return of small-scale land hamlet-peasants to the communal system and the forced destruction farms of the German-speaking colonists. During the NEP years, that is at the fifth stage, there was a slight revival of the hamlet system in some southern Ukrainian territories. The destruction of hamlet system took place during collectivization.

Key words: *hamlet, agriculture, land use, agrarian reform, peasantry.*

РОЗВИТОК ХУТІРСЬКОГО ГОСПОДАРСТВА НА ПІВДНІ УКРАЇНИ В КІНЦІ XVIII – ПЕРШІЙ ТРЕТИНІ XX ст.

Анотація. Мета статті *полягає у дослідженні хутірської форми господарювання на Півдні України кін. XVIII – І третини XX ст.* ***Методологія дослідження.*** *Досягнення мети стало можливим завдяки використанню методології постмодерну. В основу дослідницького пошуку покладено принципи об'єктивності, багатофакторності, історизму, реалізація яких відбулася завдяки застосуванню історико-генетичного, проблемно-хронологічного, наративного, ретроспективного, класифікації, історико-біографічного методів та контент-аналізу.* ***Наукова новизна*** *полягає у тому, що вперше здійснене комплексне дослідження розвитку хутірських господарств на Півдні України кін. XVIII – І третини XX ст. До наукового обігу залучено низку нових джерел, що дало змогу розширити уявлення про час існування системи ділянкового господарювання у регіоні. Сформульовано критерії аналізу та розроблено класифікацію хуторів, запропоновано періодизацію розвитку хутірських господарств. Розкрито питання передумов, умов, соціальних механізмів, алгоритмів створення і розповсюдження хуторів.* ***Висновки.*** *Виникнення і поширення хуторів було невід'ємною складовою заселення і господарського освоєння Півдня України з кін. 1880-х рр. Верхня хронологічна межа їх існування у регіоні збіглася з початком колективізації. За майже півтора століття у сільській місцевості півдня отримали розвиток вісім різновидів ділянкових господарств: 1) однодвірні хутори заможних селян, що існували на приватновласницьких, орендованих та надільних землях; 2) багатодвірні хутори заможних селян та середняків (на приватновласницьких та орендованих землях); 3) багатодвірні хутори заможних селян на надільних землях; 4) багатодвірні хутори селянської бідноти на надільних землях; 5) однодвіріні приватновласницькі хутори старшини Азовського та Дунайського військ; 6) однодвірні хутори заможних козаків на надільних землях*

військ; 7) багатодвірні хутори заможної та середняцької верств козацтва на надільних землях військ; 8) багатодвірні хутори заможних німецькомовних колоністів на надільних та приватновласницьких землях.

У їх розвитку в регіоні можна виокремити п'ять етапів: кін. XVIII ст. – 1861 р.; 1861 – 1906 рр.; 1906 –1914 рр., 1914 – 1921 рр., 1921 – 1929 рр. Протягом першого з цих етапів козацькі, колоністські та селянські хутори стали однією з головних природно-економічних форм заселення і господарського освоєння регіону. У міжреформений період, тобто на другому етапі, головним суб'єктом створення хуторів стало селянство. Однодвірно і групами шляхом оренди і купівлі у приватну власність ділянок представники заможної та середняцької страт останнього поширювали в регіоні хутірську систему господарювання у конкурентній боротьбі за землю з общиною, колоністами, міщанами, купецтвом. Помітною була тенденція розповсюдження хуторів-виселків та експериментальних орендних хуторів. Визначальним способом поширення хуторів на третьому етапі стало внутрішньонадільне землевпорядкування. Смуги сільських общин в 1906 – 1917 рр. перетворилися на арену внутрішньостанових конкурентних змагань за землю. Поширення ділянкової системи господарювання у той час набуло масового характеру. Власниками хуторів стали не лише економічно стійкі селяни, а й незаможні. Протягом четвертого етапу – в роки Першої світової війни та революції – розвиток хутірської системи мав регресивний характер. Визначальними рисами його стали повернення дрібноземельних селян-хуторян до общинного устрою та примусове знищення ділянкових господарств німецькомовних колоністів. В роки непу, тобто на п'ятому етапі, на території деяких південноукраїнських округів мало місце незначне відродження хутірської системи. Знищення останньої відбулося під час колективізації.

Ключові слова: *хутір, сільське господарство, землекористування, аграрна реформа, селянство.*

The Problem Statement. The study of historical forms of social and economic organization of the rural population is a key point for understanding the patterns of the agrarian systemdevelopment in Ukraine. Hence, the topicality of studying the genesis of hamlet management system is outlined by the role of the latter in the domestic agricultural history. Much attention was not paid to the topic by the experts. Published scientific papers need to be rethought because they are fragmentary and contain ideologues. Solving the above-mentioned issue, taking into consideration the regional aspect, would have not only theoretical but also practical consequences. Experience of farming in hamlet would be useful for modern Ukrainian farmers. It would be positive to install it in the context of land market introduction.

The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications. Traditionally, in the historical literature, the spread of hamlet management system is associated with the course of land management during the Stolypin reform. In classical studies of S. M. Dubrovsky, S. M. Sidyelnikova, A. Ya. Avrekha, A. M. Anfimova, O. I. Syzonenko, I. L. Sabadyryeva, P. M. Zyryanova it is emphasized that the main task of government policy direction was to destroy the community and stimulate the development of commodity-market relations in rural areas (Pryimak, 2002, pp. 4–5). At the same time, both in their content and in modern publications (Mykhailenko & Cheremisin, 2020, p. 42) the South of Ukraine was defined as the region with a relatively deeper penetration of capitalism in the agricultural sector, polyethnic and multi-religious composition of the rural population (Savchuk & Vasylchuk, 2020, p. 163). The peculiarities of origin of hamlet and vidrub (land allocated to a peasant on the rights of personal property without the transfer of the estate) on its territory in 1906 – 1917 were analyzed in historiography in great detail. Much attention should be paid to the issue of the essence of the rural community adaptation mechanisms to new conditions of land use, forms of social resistance to land management work in the colonist settlements, desire of the bourgeoisie to create local farms.

At the same time, nowadays there are no complex works in the scientific historical literature, the pages of which would elucidate the issue of hamlet system development in the South of Ukraine at the end of the XVIIIth – the first third of the XXth century. The tradition of recognizing Katerynoslav, Tavriya and Kherson hubernia (provinces) as regions of communal land use is deeply rooted in historiography and prevents scholars from expanding the chronological boundaries of research and covering the entire existence of local farms. The publication by M. A. Yakymenko is considered to be the only attempt to violate it. In the publication content, the assumption was made about the small number of hamlet economies in the steppe zone on the eve of the reform of 1906 – 1917 (Yakymenko, 1996, p. 26). In historical and local works of lore nature (Karagodin, 1998; Boiko, 2005; Malenko, 2008) there is only delineation of the issue field boundaries of research. The issue of hamlet classification, periodization of their development, preconditions, conditions, social mechanisms, algorithms of creation and distribution remains open. This gap can be bridged, because the statistics of that time, reported of the capital auditors, analytical notes of Zemstvo officials (Avgustinovich, 1882; Loginov, 1906), study of the economic system of the southern Ukrainian peasantry economic (Postnikov, 1891) sociological (Stolypin, 1892) sections, other historical sources have a high degree of information and reliability. The outlined moments prompted the authors to write this article.

The purpose of the research is to study the hamlet form of management in the South of Ukraine at the end of the XVIIIth – the first third of the XXth century.

The Results of the Research. Hamlet – a type of a rural settlement, where homestead and field work was performed alone or by a group of related or congenial by common economic human interests (Hurzhii, Shevchenko & Avramenko, 2013, p. 442). The main reason for the relatively late period of settlement and economic development of the South of Ukraine was that the first farms on its territory were founded only, for example, at the end of the XVIIIth century. The reason for their disappearance was the implementation of the course of collectivization proclaimed by the Soviet authorities in 1929. For almost a century and a half, a significant number of varieties of this form of management emerged in the region. In order to classify them, the following four basic criteria are provided: 1) by caste of the khutorianyn; 2) by the level of his socio-economic well-being; 3) by the form of ownership of the land plot; 4) by number of the households.

Due to the application of the first criterion, it was possible to single out the following three groups of hamlet – the Cossack, the peasant and the colonist. The discrepancy between them was not only in the legal status of their owners but also in the traditions of land tenure, land use, agriculture. Each family of the German-speaking colonists, for example, at the time of settlement received a plot of 60 acres. The plot was inherited on the basis of the right of the majorat. The colonists used a multi-field system of crop rotation and had the best stock, cattle (CSHAM, f. 419, d. 1, c. 1877, p. 116). The Cossacks of the Azov and Danube troops founded hamlets based on the customary law of self-occupation of land. Livestock breeding and fishing provided the power of their farms. There was always a homestead on the peasant's hamlet, but agriculture had an extensive feature mostly. The area of arable land could range from a few desiatyn to several hundreds. After the owner's death, the arable land was divided among all male heirs (CSHAM, f. 419, d. 1, c. 1877, p. 121).

According to the second criterion, the farms of hamlet dwellers can be divided into rich, middle-class and poor. The difference issue between them in terms of land, stock, livestock, etc., in our opinion, does not require thorough coverage. It is covered in detail in scientific

literature in the context of socio-economic structure of the rural population of Ukraine and can be extrapolated to the subject of this publication. Consequently, owing to the third criterion there were singled out hamlets that were based either on the principle of a private property, or rent, or allotment use. The fourth criterion came in handy during the conditional division of the southern Ukrainian hamlets on the basis of the number of households (yards) in each of them. The starting point was the understanding that during the covered period there was some identity between the concepts of family, distant family, yard. They were defined as a group of close relatives, who lived together and ran a joint household. Hence, there were one-yard hamlets (those consisting of one household) and multi-yard hamlets (those consisting of two or more households) in the region. Due to the lack of fresh drinking water the multi-yard hamlets were founded. Hence, the hamlet owners built two or four houses near the well. The surveyors took a plot of arable land around the hamlet.

Owing to the application of the above-mentioned criteria it was possible to provide the following classification of the southern Ukrainian hamlet varieties discovered during the research: 1) one-yard hamlets of wealthy peasants (existed on privately owned, as well as rented and allotted lands); 2) multi-yard hamlets of wealthy peasants and middle class peasants (on privately owned and rented lands); 3) multi-yard hamlets of wealthy peasants on allotted lands; 4) multi-yard hamlets of the indigenous peasant on allotted lands; 5) one-yard privately owned hamlets of the Azov and Danube troops' officers; 6) one-yard hamlets of the wealthy Cossacks on the allotted lands of troops; 7) multi-yard hamlets of the wealthy and middle-class Cossacks on the allotted lands of the troops; 8) multi-yard hamlets of the wealthy German-speaking colonists on allotted and privately owned lands. The levers of agricultural policy and public management mechanisms of stimulating development, socio-economic and socio-cultural factors of distribution, the quantitative ratio and economic power of these types of plot farms had been different since the end of 1780s to the end of 1920s. Hence, there were five stages in the evolution of hamlet system in the South of Ukraine.

At the first stage, from the end of the XVIIIth century and before the abolition of serfdom, the Cossacks of the Danube and Azov troops, the peasants migrants from Poltava, Chernihiv, Kyiv, Kharkiv hubernia (provinces), as well as the German-speaking colonists were the founders of hamlets in the region. Under conditions of a low population density, establishment of the above-mentioned hamlets was based on the customary law of self-occupation of land. Generally, they chose a convenient place near the source of fresh drinking water, where the first settler built residential and commercial buildings, a dam with a mill or a windmill. The Cossack received permission to establish one-yard hamlet from the village yurt (community) on condition that there were no obstacles to the others. That is, he became a user of the land on the area lands, which was owned by the Army (Malenko, 2008, p. 112). The Cossack's economy hamlet had a commodity orientation and, before the transformation of the south into a region of capitalized grain growing, specialized mainly in sheep breeding. The ancillary industries such as fishing, honey hunting, gardening, horticulture, etc., were also important. The value of the property could reach 3 thousand karbovantsi in silver. According to contemporaries, those hamlets resembled Zaporizhzhia zymivnyky of the second half of the XVIIIth century in terms of the type of management, form of housing and ancillary facilities (Malenko, 2008, p. 114).

At the same time, after obtaining permission to establish a settlement within the state land fund in the South, the peasants transferred the experience of local management from the place of previous residence – the Left Bank or Slobozhanshchyna. Recepting Tavria as an endless

place with ample opportunities to realize the dreams of free management, the latter often rejected even the idea that the land could be privately owned. The belief that "it is God's" was the basis for the peasant in order to develop the soil until his economic interests collided with those of his neighbours. One-yard hamlets with an agricultural direction turned into settlements over time (Karagodin, 1998, p. 76). The inefficient ones, due to the desire of the local state administration to regulate and provide organized forms of settlement of state lands, were destroyed during the period of the 1830s and 1830s, and their owners were relocated to large settlements by force (CSHAM, f. 419, d. 1, c. 1877, p. 48). However, highly profitable, large in area, focused on commercial breeding of merino sheep, one-yard peasant hamlets continued to exist in the steppes of Azov and Kherson regions until the end of the 1870s, and sometimes even later (Stolypin, 1892, p. 6). The disappearance of the latter was hampered by the lack of the necessary number of sources of fresh water to promote agriculture.

There were numerous examples in the region of founding hamlets not by one owner but by several owners. There was the algorithm for their creation, which consisted of the following steps. The establishment of settlements was preceded by the creation of a social association of future owners, which acted as a group subject of the interests representation before the State department, landowners and fellow villagers concerning the problem solution as the purchase or lease of land. After that, there was a division into plots according to the size of the share contribution and, not far from each other, the necessary buildings were erected. As a result, such hamlets resembled from afar an incompact, scattered village (RSHA, f. 408, d. 1, c. 117, p. 3). Affluent Cossacks of the Azov and Danube armies, for example, resorted to this type of hamlet settlement, preferring to buy or rent land outside the military lands (Malenko, 2008, p. 114). The German-speaking colonists of Khortytsia Mennonite, Molochansky, Berdyansky, and other districts also settled there, where the state allotted 30 to 60 dozens per family of the formed yard community (Avgustinovich, 1882, pp. 32–36). At the first stage, the examples of the creation of the multi-yard hamlets by landlords and state peasants were infrequent. In the South of Ukraine, the representatives of the situation mentioned above were the compact settlements founders. It should also be emphasized that the Cossack, colonial and peasant hamlets of that time were based on the right of land allotment.

Private one-yard hamlets began to appear in the south of Ukraine around the middle of the XIXth century. Their founders were usually the officers of the Azov and Danube Cossack troops. The main reasons for that were the land purchase and sale operations, which were located outside the army borders. On the one hand, such kind of step was a profitable investment, and on the other hand, it served as a property confirmation of the privileged social status of the hamlet's owner. Probably, the officers had a fervent desire to keep up with those representatives of the Ukrainian Cossack officers, who received noble rights and privileges under the Charter to the Gentry of 1785 and had wealthy hamlets in Poltava, Chernihiv, Kyiv. The purchase of the Novo-Petrykivka hamlet, which cost 6,000 karbovanets, made by Commanding Ataman of the Azov Army, Major General Yosyp Hladkyi could be a vivid example. Sotnyk I. Pavlychenko and military officer (starshyna) M. Tomachynsky of the Danube Army also had private estates in the territory adjacent to the town of Akkerman (Malenko, 2008, p. 114).

In 1861, the second stage of development of the hamlet management system began in the South of Ukraine. Due to the abolition of serfdom, the development of commodity market relations in the agricultural sector, the opening of mortgage institutions, permission to purchase land for subjects of non-noble origin were the reasons that the peasants became the

main participants in this process. Both multi- and one-yard hamlets were founded on allotted, privately owned, and rented lands. It should be mentioned that the owners of the hamlets belonged mainly to the wealthy and middle class.

An important place in the diversity of peasant hamlets that emerged in the south of Ukraine during the second stage, belonged to the monotheistic private owners. In 1905, large peasant estates, with a fixed right of a private ownership of their owners to the land, in the region there were 1778 with a total area of 1608504 desiatyn. A significant place among them belonged to those whose size ranged from 910 to 960 desiatyn (Statistika zemlevladeniya, 1907, pp. 12–13). The state of affairs in Berdiansk povit (county), where the area of one-yard peasant private farms exceeded arithmetically the amount of aristocratic, merchant and bourgeois land ownership should be considered as quite indicative in this context (Statisticheskiy spravochnik, 1917, p. 47).

Societies were the social and organizational basis for the multi-yard hamlets' establishment among southern Ukrainian peasants. By the 1880s, a significant number of societies rented plots of land from the state land fund located on the territory of the mainland counties of Tavriia huberniia (province). If the arable land was in use, the residential and farm buildings of the peasants were privately owned and were subject to sale to the next owner at the end of the rent. Owing to the opening of Kherson Zemsky, Peasant Land, Azov-Don and other banks, such peasant societies were able to take loans in orderto buy state-owned leased multi-yards hamlets in private ownership (State Archives of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea – SAARC, f. 71, d. 1, c. 273, p. 24). In the same way, hamlet settlements were established on lands acquired through mortgages from the landlords (Pryimak, 2012, pp. 241–243). Already in 1905, in the region, in private ownership of 2077 peasant societies there were 798087 desiatyn (Statistika zemlevladeniya, 1907, pp. 12–13).

From the mid-1870s, societies, which consisted mainly of wealthy peasants, began to be the founders of multi-yard hamlets-vyselkiv. In general, the construction of the multi-yard hamlets-vyselkiv was carried out usually in remote corners of the community allotment. Even during land redistributions, such peasants remained in the "corner" of their estates, negotiating with fellow villagers on a mutually beneficial exchange of plots (Loginov, 1906, pp. 64–65). At the beginning of the XXth century such multi-yard hamlets in the region existed in Kherson, Dnipro, Yelysavetgrad, Melitopol and Berdyansk povits (counties). In the territory of the last two administrative units there were a little less than one and a half hundred. For example, there were 198 yards with 1,048 male and 1,021 female in five hamlets-vyselkiv of the village of Andriyivka, Berdyansk district. On average, one family had 37 desiatyn of arable land, 4 desiatyn of grazing land, 4 horses, 5 cows, 9 heads of small cattle (Postnikov, 1891, p. 96).

In addition, local landowners V. I. Vassal, M. O. Hant, D. A. Stolypin took part in the creation of monotheistic hamlets as a social experiment in the Northern Pryazovia. They established local farms on their own lands in order to further lease them to the rural population. At the beginning of the 1870s, the rented plots under the system of "square-hamlets" and "mariazh" were designed by the owners of two southern Ukrainian estates, in particular, the retired engineer-major V. I. Vassal near the town of Nohaisk (modern Prymorsk) and a nobleman M. O. Hant (near Melitopol). Their experience was unsuccessful due to the unwillingness to adapt the foreign experience of hamlet resettlement to local economic conditions. In addition, as tenants V. I. Vassal and M. O. Hant elected the representatives of those sections of the rural population, who did not have a direct rational motivation to achieve the goal of measures. In

the first case, the "square hamlets" were rented to local German colonists and disintegrated due to the reception of their rented land only as ancillary. In the second case, the hamlets were used by the impoverished peasants, whose level of livestock and equipment did not allow even to cultivate the land. Furthermore, Volodymyr Ivanovych Vassal, did not recognize the necessary preliminary construction of hamlet buildings and did not pay attention to the issue of mandatory maintenance of a complex system of crop rotation and agriculture by tenants (Stolypin, 1876, pp. 6–9).

The fate of rental hamlets founded by Dmytro Arkadiyevych Stolypin, an amateur sociologist, a student of A. Comte, Zemsky and public figure was different. Based on the Komte triad "observation – description – experiment" D. A. Stolypin visited several ancient state and Mennonite hamlets located near his estates in the spring of 1874. At that time, owing to a poll conducted by the Imperial Agricultural Society, he already had information about the negative experience of artificial introduction of hamlets by local landowners (CSHAM, f. 419, d. 1, c. 1877, p. 43). It is obvious that Dmytro Arkadiyevich came up with the idea of establishing plot rented farms on their lands, because he, in fact, went in search of a natural and social, not an artificial model for his experiment. It should be mentioned that he welcomed the Kalmykovy brothers' hamlet established on rented state lands, but as a role model he rejected it immediately. The reason for the above-mentioned step was large, several hundred acres of land used for commercial sheep, which, as an industry in the region declined gradually. Instead, the analysis of Mennonite farms allowed him to identify and recognize viable principles of focus on the commodity agriculture, multi-field crop rotation system, home gardening and horticulture (Stolypin, 1876, p. 24). Hence, the above-mentioned principles along with the size of the arable land of the Mennonite family formed the basis for the founding of D. A. Stolypin rented hamlets near the estate Mordvynivka Berdyansk district of Tavriya huberniya (province). Right after his arrival, June 4, 1874, he ordered the establishment of eight hamlets, which began a social experiment. In total, during the years of 1874 – 1893, D. A. Stolypin established 22 farms, which involved 214 people (Pryimak, 2012, pp. 114–127). But the further course of the experiment was interrupted by the death of its author (Pryimak & Pryimak, 2021, pp. 96–106).

In 1893, a significant number of the peasants involved in the experiment already bought hamlets into a private ownership or were a few steps away from the purchase. In 1913, during a sample survey, those farms were assessed as wealthy and highly marketable. The experience was used by land managers in founding hamlets in the fund of the southern Ukrainian branches of the Peasant Land Bank during the agrarian reform of 1906 – 1917 (State Archives of Zaporozhe region – SAZR, f. 251, d. 1, c. 16, p. 4).

Hence, at the turn of the XIXth – XXth centuries, the south of Ukraine became a region of widely spread hamlet system. The total number of farms included in the hamlet system, according to contemporaries, coincided roughly with the number of yards, which used a progressive system of crop rotation and was equal to 43 thousand, or 30% of all yards of wealthy peasants (RSHA, f. 408, d. 1, c. 117, p. 23).

During the years of 1906 – 1917, 227877 plot farms appeared on its territory, of which 3,2% were established on the lands of the State Department, 7,3% – on the areas received bythe peasants with the help of Yekaterynoslav-Tavriya and Kherson branches of the Peasant Land Bank. But the fact that 89,5% of farms in the region arose on allotted lands, determined its specificity – Yekaterynoslav, Kherson and mainland counties of Tavriya povit (province) faced the years of reform in the area with high rates of intra-community land management.

The hamlet and vidrub plots of land on their territory were created on 2154594 desiatyn, i.e., 80% of total land area of local peasantry. If other regions of the empire accounted for 3 to 9% of total land management, in the south of Ukraine this figure reached 14% (Otchetnye svedeniya, 1916, pp. 2–3).

During the years of 1906 – 1918, 204055 (89,5% of the total number) hamlets and vidrub emerged on the lands of the southern Ukrainian peasant communities. At the same time, the main direction of intra-allotment land management in the region, as well as on the Left Bank, was not the allocation, but the general deployment, which was used to create 172858 (82,2%) plot farms (Otchetnye svedeniya, 1916, pp. 16–17). But it should be highlighted that the peculiarity of intra-allotment deployment there – was that in 15% of cases of preliminary allocation to a separate piece of a communal allotment.

Furthermore, precinct farms in the southern Ukrainian provinces were established in the communities of former landowners and state peasants mainly. Due to the fact that the area of allotments of the latter was significant in the region and, in numerous cases, exceeded 10 thousand desiatyn, and village itself could stretch one street 6–12 miles, the deployment had a certain specificity. That is why, land management work in the communities of former state peasants took place in several steps. Firstly, the entire communal allotment was divided by surveyors into three sectors – adjacent to the settlement, remote from it and on the outskirts of it. Only then the internal sectoral land management began. Vidruby were created within the first and second sectors. Consequently, while dealing with the last sector – the outskirts, the land managers brought together a separate section of the plot of wealthy peasants. It was there that numerous individual hamlets arose (RSHA, f. 408, d. 1, c. 117, p. 62). That is, in the third sector of land management was aimed not only at the destruction of multi-lanes, but also distant lands, in which representatives of the higher social strata of the peasantry were interested. Although it was not uncommon in the region to transfer the estates of the latter not to privately owned plots, but to adjacent and acquired with the help of the Peasant Bank former landlords or state lands, which led to the establishment of new hamlets (RSHA, f. 408, d. 2, c. 425, p. 36).

The spread of hamlet management system in the South of Ukraine was facilitated by land management works in the communities of former state peasants. This category of rural residents accounted for about 191 thousand (84%) of the improved plots established during the Stolypin reform. At the same time, 32910 (16%) were established on the lands of the communities of former landlord peasants by deploying them (Otchetnye svedeniya, 1916, pp. 11, 13). As the vast majority of settlements of the last category of peasants did not have numerous yards, on their plots vidrybu were created mainly. The hamlet farms arose only where allotted land bordered on rented or purchased from the third parties (Zemleustroennye khozyaystva, 1915, p. 79).

It should also be mentioned that the formation of hamlets and vidruby covered some of the Bulgarian and the Jewish colonies in the south of Ukraine. In the colonies of the Mennonites and the Germans, it was identified with ethnic and socio-cultural assimilation and was blocked. Furthermore, the areas of those willing to go to the hamlet were bought by the decision of the East. Then the German-speaking community bought the disturbers of the area in the resettlement areas of Siberia or the Trans-Urals, paid for their relocation and accommodation in a new place (State Archives of Dnipropetrovsk region – SADR, f. 654, d. 1, c. 152, pp. 2–34).

The hamlet management system development during the Stolypin agrarian reform was constrained in the south of Ukraine by a number of factors. The most crucial among them

were the following: small number of land management commissions, the insufficient level of professional training of their staff, the lack of adequate land reclamation, the agronomic and financial assistance to farmers from zemstvos, the insufficient number of sources of drinking water in the steppe landscape. Due to this state of affairs, the land management commissions managed to satisfy the needs of only half of the applications received from the peasants. The same factors led to the unevenness in the ratio of types of local farms – there were a little more than 69 thousand hamlets created in the region. It was 2,3 times less than the number of vidruby (Otchetnye svedeniya, 1916, pp. 11, 13).

The cost of building hamlets was also a deterrent factor. On average, a farmer had to spend from 500 to 1,500 karbovantsi in order to move from a village or build a new estate, and a well near it, which cost 200 karbovantsi (RSHA, f. 408, d. 2, c. 425, p. 98). In general, there was not enough money, which forced the farmers to apply for a loan to the branches of the Peasant Land Bank or County Zemstvos. But the financial funds of the first were directed mainly to the development of land mortgages. The volume of construction and reclamation loans of this financial institution was insignificant in the region – the owner of a one-man hamlet received about 300–350 karbovantsi. It was only 1/5 to 1/2 of the required amount. Zemstva acted as guarantors for the peasant, for its reception and, at the same time, the controllers for its spending. But the main focus of the staff of those local governments was not on issues of lending to farmers, but on the creation of demonstration sites, educational lectures, agricultural exhibitions, etc. (Pryimak, 2002, p. 71).

At the local level, the rate of establishment of local farms had different levels of intensity. In the rural areas of the mainland counties of Tavriya huberniya (province), the influence of the above-mentioned negative factors on them was insignificant. Out of the total number of applications submitted to the land management commissions, 54,3% were satisfied by peasants, which was facilitated by the professionalism, enthusiasm, attentive and systematic attitude of the staff. Furthermore, intra-community allocation or general deployment was not conducted in the office, but exclusively in the field. In addition to the staff of land management commissions, zemstvo employees, employees of the bank, the State Department and other government agencies took part in the establishment of new types of farms. Extensive financial and agronomic assistance was provided to those willing to become hamlet owners.

Tavriya land managers also drew attention to the algorithm, which was developed by them. The previous stage in it began only after the establishment of soil quality indicators and multiple coordination of the plan with the peasants. Preparing the plan with the necessary explication was carried out after the end of autumn agricultural work: in September – October. The owners of the future plots, hence, were given some time not only to resolve interpersonal disputes finally, but also to get used to new business conditions. The above-mentioned approach contributed to the fact that there were plot farms out of the total number 9/10 established hamlets in Berdiansk, Melitopol and Dnieper povit (counties) (RSHA, f. 408, d. 2, c. 425, pp. 27–36).

The least efficient land management commissions worked in Yekaterynoslav huberniya (province). Their employees, whose professionalism was assessed negatively by both the peasants and the capital auditors, managed to perform only 50,9% of the planned work. The share of farms there was 6,6% of the total number of plot farms (RSHA, f. 408, d. 1, c. 117, pp. 19–23). Consequently, the communities resistance and the presence of a large number of landless peasants-desyatynnyky determined the specifics of hamlet establishment in Kherson region – 62,3% (Statisticheskie materialy, 1916, p. 218). The majority of them were located

on the former state and banking lands (State Archives of Herson region – SAHR, f. 6. d. 1, c. 11, p. 7).

The answer to the question concerning the economic capacity of hamlets established in the south of Ukraine during the Stolypin reform can be found in the results of a sample survey of land management farms in Berdiansk povit. The survey was conducted in 1913 and allowed us to determine that, in terms of socio-stratification, their owners were divided intothe wealthy (26.1%), the middle class (22.1%) and the poor (51.8%) (Zemleustroennye khozyaystva, 1915, pp. 82–86).

In 1917, on average, one farm of a wealthy peasant in the region had 44 desiatyn of sowing, 3 horses, 8 head of cattle, 11 units of stock. The arable land of a hamlet was usually used for commercial cultivation of grain. In turn, the middle-class farmer had a plot of land of about 19 acres, 2–3 horses, 3–5 head of cattle, several hundred karbovantsi of net income per year. A large part of the owners of the wealthy and the middle-class hamlets ran multi-productive farms and had ancillary industries. (Statisticheskiy spravochnik, 1917, pp. 127–129). At the same time, hamlets of the poor (with an area of, on average, 6 des.) gave the impression of the weak plants in a drastic need of care. According to the auditors, their owners looked confused, and sometimes could not explain the reasons for leaving the community (RSHA, f. 408, d. 1, c. 117, p. 89).

The chronological boundaries of the fourth stage of the studied process cover the years of World War I and the Revolution. Mobilization and death of men during hostilities, requisitioning of draft cattle, significant reduction of arable and homestead areas, and other integral components of wartime caused deteriorating living standards not only for farmers but also for the majority of the rural population of southern Ukraine. The ruin of small and, in some places, middle-class farms, the organization of auctions for the sale of their mortgaged property, the curtailment of loan programs led to growing discontent in the countryside (SAARC, f. 71, d. 1, c. 2351, pp. 126–129). In June of 1917, the Provisional Government suspended the activities of land management commissions due to the above-mentioned reasons. At that time there was a revival of the rural community along with a significant reduction in the number of hamlets.

The scale of the regress in the region was facilitated by the German colonists farms destruction, which began on February 2, 1915, in accordance with the Law "On the Elimination of Land Ownership of Citizens and Immigrants from States at War with Russia" (SAZR, f. 59, d. 1, c. 16, p. 62). In accordance with the main provisions of the Law, during the years of 1915 – 1916 the southern Ukrainian branches of the Peasant Land Bank purchased 126,246 des. It was 35,5% of the banking fund in the region during the war. At the same time, there was the non-cash payment with the colonists. The former owners of hamlets received 6% of securities (SAARC, f. 71, d. 2, c. 111, p. 128). There was no time for the sale of real estate due to the immediate forced eviction of former colonists outside the country (RSHA, f. 1284, d. 190, c. 317, p. 64). Under such circumstances, the acquisition of new lands by the Peasants Bank was more like a confiscation than an act of purchase and sale. The largest volumes of liquidation of German land tenure were in Berdiansk, Melitopol and Kherson povit (counties). They accounted for 75% of all lands acquired by the southern Ukrainian branches of the Peasant Bank during the years of 1915 – 1916. The average size of the land purchased at that time was 65 des. (SAARC, f. 71, d. 2, c. 187, p. 12). It coincided with the area of the colonist allotment at the end of the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth century.

The last – the fifth stage of the hamlet management system development was during the period of the NEP. On the one hand, the process was tolerated by the Soviet authorities, and on

the other hand, the southern Ukrainian peasantry was aware of the shortcomings of the outdated communal system. Small and cross-plots, redistributions and distant lands again became the reasons for the resumption of land management work. But the share of allocation to hamlet in a total volume of the latter was insignificant. In 1923 it was only 0,7%, and in 1927 – 1,8% (Central State Archive of the highest authorities and administration of Ukraine – CSAHAA of Ukraine, f. 2, d. 7, c. 33, p. 29). Probably, based on the experience of previous years, the rural population of the region took such step more prudently and cautious. In order to run a self-sufficient or small-scale farm, a peasant had to have not only 12–16 des. land, but also livestock, equipment, funds for the construction of buildings, wells, etc. The issue of transporting children to school, purchasing everyday goods, and maintaining family and social ties was also topical. Hence, during the years of a new economic policy implementation for the transition to peasant life in the south dared mostly wealthy peasants. The share of the latter, for example, among the peasants of Mariupol district in 1925 was 85% in 1925. Instead, the lack of land for peasants made it irrelevant to go to hamlets in Kryvyi Rih district (CSAHAA of Ukraine, f. 27, d. 10, c. 598, p. 174). Therefore, if in the first half of the 1920s there was a tendency of the working peasantry to be evicted to hamlets and vidruby, then in the second half there became noticeable its decline. In 1929, hamlets occupied only 1,4% of the total area of peasant land use (CSAHAA of Ukraine, f. 27, d. 10, c. 598, p. 18). Finally, in November of the same year, the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) approved the line of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) U to eliminate hamlet and vidruby forms of management.

The Conclusions. The development of hamlets in the south of Ukraine occurred since the end of the 1780s to the end of the 1920s. Hamlets became widespread in both privately owned and leased and allotted lands. On the eve of World War I, hamlets along with landed estates and communities, became the main form of management in rural areas of the region. The local specificity was that they were owned not only by wealthy peasants, but also by representatives of other segments and classes of the rural population.

There were five stages in hamlet management development in the South of Ukraine. The first stage lasted from the end of the XVIIIth century until the year of 1861. Hamlets became one of the main natural and economic forms and methods of economic development of the region. Their founders were the Cossacks of the Danube and Azov armies, the German-speaking colonists and peasant settlers. In economic terms, hamlets established at that time had a high level of power and often became outposts for future large settlements. During the second stage – 1861 – 1906 – the peasantry became the main founder of both single and multi-yard hamlets. The wealthy and middle-class members of this social group usually united in societies in order to establish a hamlet settlement on state-owned leased or mortgaged lands. At that time, the tendency to establish hamlets on the lands of communities of former state peasants was also conspicuous. In addition, in the last third of the XIXth century mainland povita of Tavriya huberniya (province) became a field for social experiments of local landowners. The latter created rental farms in order to increase the profitability of their own property and prove the need to change the course of agricultural policy from community support to betting on a single peasant. It should be mentioned that at the turn of the XIXth – XXth centuries the hamlet system covered about 43 thousand farms in the territory of the South of Ukraine.

The mass spread of precinct management during the Stolypin agrarian reform led to the separation of the third stage of the studied process. In the south, at that time there were about 69 thousand farms, among the owners of which were the representatives of all social strata of

the local peasantry. Only a small part of hamlet farms in the region arose on lands acquired by the peasants from the treasuries or landowners. The main way of their foundation in the years of reform was intra-allotment land management, the dominant variety of which was the general development of communal land.

The chronological boundaries of the fourth stage covered the years of World War I and the Revolution. Its main feature was the ruin and return to a communal life of a large number of peasants. In addition, for political reasons, hamlets farms of the German-speaking colonists suffered devastating destruction in the region. Despite some progress during the fifth stage – during the years of the NEP – the development of land management in the South of Ukraine did not reach the pre-war levels. The verdict was announced in 1929 by proclaiming a course of collectivization.

The publication is a part of a comprehensive study of the economic system in the southern Ukrainian village of the end of the XVIIIth – the Ist third of the XXth century. The prospects for further research are in the field of analysis of the evolution of land tenure and land use, agricultural culture, the relationship of hamlet and other historical forms of social self-organization of the rural population. No less interesting could be the study of the peculiarities of the worldview of hamlet peasants and vidrubiv, as well as differences in the social consciousness of them and the peasants-communists.

Acknowledgements. We express our sincere gratitude to the editors for the opportunity to publish the article.

Funding. The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avgustinovich, E. (1882). *Po seleniyam i koloniyam v Novorossii* [In Villages and Colonies in Novorossiya]. Sankt-Petersburg, 72 p. [in Russian]

Boiko, A. V. (2005). Istoriia stepovoi Ukrainy seredyny XVIII – XIX stolittia i yii selianska viziia [History of Steppe Ukraine in the Middle of the XVIIIth – the XIXth Centuries and its Peasant Vision]. *Dzherela z istorii Pivdennoi Ukrainy. Ch. 1: Memuary ta shchodennyky* (Vol. 5, Book 1, pp. 33–46). Zaporizhzhia. [in Ukrainian]

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Avtonomnoi Respubliky Krym [State Archives of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea – **SAARC**]*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Dnipropetrovskoi oblasti [State Archives of Dnipropetrovsk region – **SADR**]*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Khersonskoi oblasti [State Archives of Herson region – **SAHR**]*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Zaporizkoi oblasti [State Archives of Zaporozhe region – **SAZR**]*

Hurzhii, O. I., Shevchenko, V. M. & Avramenko, A. M. (2013). Hutir [Hamlet]. *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy* [Encyclopedia of History of Ukraine] (p. 442). Kyiv, 784 p. [in Ukrainian]

Karagodin, A. I. (1998). *Istoriya Zaporozhskogo kraya (1770 – 1917)* [History of Zaporozhzhie Region]. Zaporozhe: "Stat", 285 p. [in Russian]

Loginov, A. (1906). *Kratkiy ocherk zemlevladeniya i zemlepolzovaniya v Aleksandrovskom uezde* [A Brief Outline of Land Ownership and Land Use in Aleksandrovsky district]. Aleksandrovsk, 84 p. [in Russian]

Malenko, L. M. (2008). *Kozatski stanytsi ta khutory Pivdennoi Ukrainy v XIX stolitti* [Cossack Villages and Hamlets of Southern Ukraine in the XIXth century]. *Kozatska spadshchyna, 4,* 112–123. [in Ukrainian]

Mykhailenko, H. & Cheremisin, O. (2020). New Ukraine vs Novorossia: Myths and Realities of Geopolitical Changes during the Second Half of the XVIIIth – at the End of the XIXth Century. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin], 14,* 36–45. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197177. [in English]

Otchetnye svedeniya. (1916). *Otchetnye svedeniya o deyatelnosti zemleustroitelnykh komissiy na 1 yanvarya 1916 g.* [Reporting Information on the Activities of Land Management Commissions on January 1, 1916]. Petrograd, 109 p. [in Russian]

Postnikov, V. Ye. (1891). *Yuzhnorusskoe krestyanskoe khazyaystvo* [South Russian Peasant Farm]. Moskva, XXXII +392 p. [in Russian]

Pryimak, O. & Pryimak, Yu. (2021). Dmytro Stolypin's Social Experiment Repercussions in the Agricultural Reform of 1906–1917. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin], 19,* 96–106. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.19.233837. [in English]

Pryimak, O. M. (2002). *Stolypinska ahrarna reforma na Pivdni Ukrainy (1906 – 1917)* [Stolypin's Agrarian Reform in the South of Ukraine (1906 – 1917)]. Zaporizhzhia: RA "Tandem-U", 187 p. [in Ukrainian]

Pryimak, O. M. (2012). *Selianstvo Pivdennoi Ukrainy: sotsialna istoriia kintsia XIX – pochatku XX stolit* [The Peasantry of Southern Ukraine: Social History of the end of the XIXth – beginning of the XXth centuries]. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizkyi natsionalnyi universytet, 458 p. [in Ukrainian]

*Rosiiskyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv [Russian State Historical Archives – **RSHA**]*

Savchuk, T. & Vasylchuk, H. (2020). The 1920s Soviet Ukraine's Political and Social Transformations as Reflected by Serhii Mizetsky, a Country Parson Intellectual. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin], 14,* 156–165. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.17.218204. [in English]

Statisticheskie materialy. (1916). *Statisticheskie materialy k Otchetu Krestyanskogo pozemelnogo banka za 1914 god (sedmoy god vedeniya)* [Statistical Materials for the Report of the Peasant Land Bank for 1914 (seventh year)]. St. Peterburg, 392 p. [in Russian]

Statisticheskiy spravochnik. (1917). *Statisticheskiy spravochnik po zemlevladeniyu i zemlepolzovaniyu Yekaterinoslavskoy gubernii* [Statistical Reference Book on Land Ownership and Land Use of Yekaterinoslav Province]. Yekaterinoslav, 184 p. [in Russian]

Statistika zemlevladeniya. (1907). *Statistika zemlevladeniya. 1905 god. Svod dannykh po 50 guberniyam Yevropeyskoy Rossi* [Land Ownership Statistics. 1905 Collection of Data on 50 Provinces of European Russia]. St. Peterburg, 267 p. [in Russian]

Stolypin, D. A. (1876). *Dva doklada v Komissiyu Moskovskogo Imperatorskogo Obshchestva selskogo khozyaystva po voprosu ob ustroystve krestyanskikh khutorov na vladelcheskikh zemlyakh* [Two reports to the Commission of the Moscow Imperial Society of Agriculture on the Issue of Organizing Peasant Farms on Owner's Lands]. Moskva: Tipografiya V. Gote, 126 p. [in Russian]

Stolypin, D. A. (1892). *Ob ustroystve arendnykh khutorov na vladelcheskikh zemlyakh i krestyanskom khozyaystve voobshche* [On the Arrangement of Rental Farms on the Owner's Land and Peasant Farming in general]. Moskva: Tip-ya M. Golovina, 20 p. [in Russian]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchykh orhaniv vlady ta upravlinnia Ukrainy [Central State Archive of the highest authorities and administration of Ukraine – **CSAHAA of Ukraine**]*

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv m. Moskvy [Central State Historical Archive of Moscow – **CSHAM**]*

Yakymenko, M. A. (1996). Stanovlennia selianskoho (fermerskoho) hospodarstva v Ukraini pislia skasuvannia kriposnoho prava (1861 – 1918) [Formation of Peasant (Farmer) Economy in Ukraine after the Abolition of Serfdom (1861 – 1918)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal, 2,* 14–32. [in Ukrainian]

Zemleustroennye khozyaystva. (1915). *Zemleustroennye khozyaystva. Svodnye dannye sploshnogo po 12 uezdam podvornogo obsledovaniya khozyaystvennykh izmeneniy v pervye gody posle zemleustroystva* [Land farms. Summary data of a continuous house-to-house survey of economic changes in 12 counties in the first years after land management]. Petrograd, 138 p. [in Russian]

The article was received August 05, 2021.
Article recommended for publishing 25/05/2022.