

UDC 94(477)(092)“1861/1929”:332.2.021(477)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.30.299912

Mariya ROHOZHA

PhD (History), Associate Professor of the Department e of the History of Ukraine, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, 2 Sadova Street, Uman, Ukraine, postal code 20300 (rohozhamm@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0002-9545-830X

Researcher ID: Z-3069-2019

Zinaida SVYASCHENKO

PhD hab. (History), Full Professor, World History and Methods of Teaching Department, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, 28 Sadova Street, Uman, Ukraine, postal code 20300 (szv09@meta.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0001-5845-3115

Researcher ID: B-5144-2019

Марія РОГОЖА

кандидатка історичних наук, доцентка кафедри історії України історичного факультету, Уманський державний педагогічний університет імені Павла Тичини, вул. Садова, 2, м. Умань, Україна, індекс 20300 (rohozhamm@ukr.net)

Зінаїда СВЯЩЕНКО

докторка історичних наук, професорка кафедри всесвітньої історії та методик навчання, Уманський державний педагогічний університет імені Павла Тичини, вул. Садова, 28, м. Умань, Україна, індекс 20300 (szv09@meta.ua)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Rohozha, M. & Svyaschenko, Z. (2024). Formation of a new model of rational agriculture management by Yevhen Chykalenko. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 30, 50–59. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.30.299912

**FORMATION OF A NEW MODEL OF RATIONAL AGRICULTURE
MANAGEMENT BY YEVHEN CHYKALENKO**

Abstract. *The purpose of the research is to elucidate a personal experience of an efficient agriculture management by Yevhen Chykalenko based on the advanced technologies of the industrial relations organization at the time and conveying it to rural agriculturiers. The research methodology is based on a scientific basis with the application of the following research principles: historical reliability, objectivity, systematicity, scientific comprehensiveness, complexity, multifactoriality. The following research methods have been applied: general scientific – analytical, synthetic and logical; historical – problem chronological, comparative historical, historical genetic, retrospective and periodization; interdisciplinary – structural systemic, source and terminological analysis. The goal achievement was due to a complex use of the research principles and methods in combination with sources. The Scientific Novelty. On the basis of the involved array of sources and newly discovered publications, the application of current methodological approaches, the system of factors that formed*

Yevhen Chykalenko as a multifaceted personality has been highlighted; the periods of life that consistently formed his national consciousness have been researched. There have been determined the reasons for Yevhen Chykalenko's search of a new model of agriculture management, its transformation into a highly profitable one. Emphasis has been put on his activity in the Ukrainian agriculture general development. **The Conclusions.** Due to the study on Yevhen Chykalenko's formation of a new model of a rational agricultural management, it was possible to spot an extraordinary personality in many activities. Our idea is the following: his reformation of an agricultural activity in the economy and introduction into labour and economic relations of the share management set him apart from the mass of landowners, he is not accepted as a typical landowner, since the estate was managed by a specially trained manager. *Prykazhchyky* (a hired employee who supervised some part of a farm, performed various economic tasks or managed the farm) in their turn, provided a daily communication with the peasants tenants of the land. Earned money in agriculture was spent on public affairs, charity, publishing and journalistic activities, cultural promotion (in Ger. – Kulturträger) in agriculture.

Key words: Yevhen Chykalenko, agriculture, rational management, landowners.

ФОРМУВАННЯ ЄВГЕНОМ ЧИКАЛЕНКОМ НОВОЇ МОДЕЛІ РАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО ГОСПОДАРЮВАННЯ НА ЗЕМЛІ

Анотація. **Мета дослідження** – розкриття особистого досвіду успішного ведення сільського господарства Євгеном Чикаленком на основі тогочасних передових технологій організації виробничих відносин та донесення його до загалу сільських товаровиробників. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтована на науковій основі із застосуванням таких принципів: історичної достовірності, об'єктивності, системності, наукової всебічності, комплексності, багатofакторності. А також методів дослідження: загальнонаукових – аналітичного, синтетичного та логічного; історичних – проблемно-хронологічного, порівняльно-історичного, історико-генетичного, ретроспективного та періодизації; міждисциплінарних – структурно-системного; застосовано також джерелознавчий та термінологічний аналіз. Комплексне використання принципів і методів досліджень у поєднанні із джерелами забезпечило досягнення поставленої мети. **Наукова новизна.** На основі залученого масиву джерел і нововиявлених публікацій, застосування актуальних методологічних підходів розкрито систему чинників, які формували Євгена Чикаленка як багатогранну особистість; досліджено періоди життя, що послідовно формували його національну свідомість. Встановлено причини пошуку Євгеном Чикаленком нової моделі управління господарством, трансформування його у високорентабельне. Наголошено на його культуртрегерській діяльності для загального розвитку українського сільського господарства. **Висновки.** Дослідження формування Євгеном Чикаленком нової моделі раціонального господарювання уможливило побачити непересічну особистість у багатьох іпостасях. Наше уявлення про реформування ним господарської діяльності в економії та введення до трудових й економічних відносини іспольного (дольового) господарювання виокремлює його з-поміж масиву землевласників, зумовило сприйняття як нетипового поміщика, оскільки помістям керував спеціально підготовлений управитель. Прикажчики, зі свого боку, забезпечували повсякденне спілкування із селянами-орендарями землі. Зароблені економією кошти витрачав на громадські справи, благодійництво, плекання української культури та слова, видавничу і публіцистичну діяльність, культуртрегерство у сільському господарстві.

Ключові слова: Євген Чикаленко, сільське господарство, раціональне господарювання, землевласники.

The Problem Statement. Due to the reception of Yevhen Kharlampiyovych Chykalenko (1861 – 1929) as the awakener of the Ukrainian nation, a chief focus is on the activity of a renowned personality. The main analysis regarding his self-realization in various roles focused on the following: Yevhen Chykalenko as a famous author of currently published diaries. The issue of agriculture management, animal breeding, horticulture and other types of agriculture is less covered. Hence, the study on his intellectual achievements regarding

organization and management of agricultural production, formation of a system of a rational land use, understanding and publication of the obtained results, their spread among a wide range of agricultural producers is considered as a problem statement, to the same extent as popularization of a rational agriculture management.

The Review of Recent Researches. In our opinion, the most complete Yevhen Chykalenko's activity was researched by a renowned scholar I. M. Starovoitenko, who noted the following: "The beginning of Yevhen Chykalenko's public activity dates back to the end of the 19th century, which was facilitated by the move to Odesa in 1894 and joining the Ukrainian "Hromada" there. Yevhen Chykalenko supported "Kyivska Staryna" – the only magazine that published the Ukrainian belles-letters at the time, he stood up for the editor's initiative to announce a contest for writing the history of Ukraine and financed this event, and he also began popularization activities: published his illustrated books in Ukrainian – "Rozmovy Pro Silske Hospodarstvo" (Conversations on Rural Agriculture)" (Starovoitenko, 2009, p. 8). In Volume 10 of the Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine, there is information about Yevhen Chykalenko as the author of "Rozmov Pro Silske Hospodarstvo" in fact, the cycle of 5 books of an agrarian nature was called "Rozmovy Pro Silske Khaziaistvo" (Conversations on Rural Agriculture). In addition, a rational agriculture provided the conditions for Yevhen Chykalenko's publishing and philanthropic status (Havryliuk, 2013, p. 550). Yu. O. Boiko did the research on Yevhen Chykalenko's publishing, charitable and public political activities, the following was indicated in the study: "Yevhen Chykalenko's Works" on agronomy (Conversations on Rural Agriculture), Black Fallow and Crop Rotation; Livestock: Horses, Cattle, Pigs and Sheep; Sown Herbs, Corn and Beets; Grape". But the 5th book "Garden" was not included in the list (Boiko, 2008, p. 16). In D. Chorny's publication "Yevhen Chykalenko and Kharkiv: History of Relations", in our opinion, the statement that Kharkiv "...remained neutral..." for him is controversial. First of all, Yevhen Chykalenko, being a member of the Drahomanivtsi Group, was forever imbued with the idea and spirit of service to Ukraine, its acquisition of own statehood... (Chorny, 2021, p. 39). Yevhen Chykalenko's contribution to the development of agriculture in Ukraine was studied by M. Rohozha (Rohozha, 2018). It should be also mentioned that there are other publications related to the article issue indirectly (Sviashchenko, 2020).

The purpose of the research is to elucidate a personal experience of efficient agriculture of Yevhen Chykalenko based on the advanced technologies of the industrial relations organization at the time and to convey it to rural producers.

The Results of the Research. In modern history of Ukraine the figure of Yevhen Kharlampiyovych Chykalenko is multidimensional and multifaceted in the context of his personal qualities realization in the matter of a public service to people, and not the least – in awakening the Ukrainian people consciousness.

The entire family structure of the Chykalenko family contributed to the formation of Yevhen's understanding of a genetic belonging to Ukraine, its history, culture, customs, and faith. His family originated from Poltava steppe region, but for various reasons his ancestors emigrated and moved to the territory of Southern Ukraine. Since childhood Yevhen knew "... that his grandfather, Ivan Hodorozhiy-Chykalenko, was born in Zaporozhzhia zymivnyk (a winter house) on the Saksahan River at the end of the 18th century, later on the above-mentioned territory belonged to Katerynoslav Governorate. His father, Mykhailo, was killed by the Muscovites, perhaps during the liquidation of Sich in 1775. When Tsarina Catherine II presented the land to Count Kankryn on which Chykalenko's great-grandfather's zymivnyk

(a winter house) was located, Chykalenko's great-grandmother moved to Kherson region with her children, where the government allocated land for settlement to the Zaporozhtsi and their families (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 11).

As a young man, Yevhen's grandfather Ivan began his service "... as a Cossack in the Buh Cossack Army, which was formed by the tsarist government from the former Zaporozhtsi in 1784. He rose to the rank of an "official" (pidkhorunzhy), because he did not want to move to Kuban... in the village of Pereshory (Ananyiv povit) he married the daughter of a local landowner... and took her dowry of 150 acres of land (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 11).

The given information gave all the grounds to claim that Yevhen Chykalenko had deep Ukrainian left- and right-bank roots as a unity, introduced into the agricultural background, the foundation of which was laid by his grandfather in Kherson region. One more conclusion should be drawn from Yevhen Chykalenko's genealogy field: "The grandfather enjoyed much respect among the local population, both pany (landowners) and peasants, he was invariably a tytar in Pereshory church for many years, and until the end of his life he came to church in a blue Cossack zhupan (a coat)" (Doroshenko, 1934, pp. 11–12). Pondering over the above-mentioned facts, we should emphasize that this step of a grandfather Ivan laid the first bricks for the foundation of a long process of the Ukrainian nation awakening, and later his son Kharlampiy, and later his grandson Yevhen will bring it to a high level.

Furthermore, we would like to mention the following: "Ivan Chykalenko, having taught his two sons Petro and Kharlampiy to read and write well, helped them start serving in Ananiiv District Court, where they earned the right to nobility" (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 12). In our opinion, it was about personal nobility, in particular, of Yevhen Chykalenko's father. It was received by public servants for impeccable civil service and necessary amount years of service.

Yevhen, a son of Kharlampiy Chykalenko was born on December 9, (December 21 n.s.) 1861 in the family estate in the village of Pereshory.

An in-depth acquaintance with Yevhen Chykalenko's biography (before he was enrolled in studies at Kharkiv University), gives grounds to claim that he went through several periods in his development. In our opinion, it is impossible to understand the phenomenon of his Ukrainization, and hence his Ukrainian-centricity without a thorough analysis of the periods.

The first period is childhood, when due to difficult family circumstances, children, especially "...the boys, lived freely, without special care and affection of the elders, but lived in abundance and in the bosom of the luxurious steppe nature, looking closely at the husbandry, agricultural work, and the life of shepherds among the wide free steppe" (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 12). The second period is studying at Odesa boarding house of Randal, an Englishman. And then a problem occurred, it turned out that a nine-year-old Yevhen "... can only speak the "muzhytska" language well, i.e. the Ukrainian language, that is why, he became ... the object of mockery by the teaching staff and friends" (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 12). The owner of the boarding house changed only three years later, which ensured it the status of a private progymnasium. The teaching staff changed significantly. A philologist and historian Oleksiy Andriivsky, a geographer Petro Nishchynsky and Leonid Smiliansky (an ardent Ukrainian patriot) started to work at a private progymnasium. His father died in 1871, a year later, so Yevhen stopped going to Pereshory for Christmas and Easter holidays. The Sokolovsky family of the Director of the progymnasium took care of him. In this environment, the boy read the poetry written by Taras Shevchenko, the prose by Marko Vovchok (Maria Vilinska), "Taras Bulba" by M. V. Hohol. The third period was the process of inclusion in the national culture. Petro Chykalenko, his uncle, took Yevhen away from Odesa after two years of studying at

the progymnasium, when he was already a student of the 4th grade and in September of 1875 he sent Yevhen to a real school (college) in Yelysavetgrad (nowadays – Kropyvnytsky). It should be mentioned that the real school (college) was maintained by the local zemstvo. According to the statute approved in 1871, the main task of the real school (college) was to give graduates knowledge in the scope of secondary education for admission to higher special educational institutions. But a paramount achievement of the third period was that Yevhen fitted in the environment naturally. Andrii Hrabenko became his classmate, Panas Tobilevych (Saksahansky) shared the same desk with him; a friendly communication with whom contributed to getting to know the brothers: Ivan Tobilevych (Karpenko-Karyi) and Mykola Tobilevych (Sadovsky).

In our opinion, it is important to agree with D. Doroshenko's conclusion regarding the influence of educational and extracurricular environment on Yevhen Chykalenko during the period of studying in the real school (college) in Yelysavetgrad: "Chykalenko found himself in an environment that contributed to the transformation of his spontaneous Ukrainianness into a conscious national feeling in Yelysavetgrad" (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 14). And Doroshenko supported his opinion about the list of factors that contributed to the above-mentioned transformation: "In Yelysavetgrad, the Tobilevych brothers organized an amateur theatre group at the Public Club led by the elder Ivan (Karpenko-Karyi), which gave amateur performances on Saturdays for the benefit of poor students. As a director, the group invited Marko Kropyvnytsky, who lived in Yelysavetgrad at the time (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 15).

It should be highlighted that the milieu of the Ukrainian national intelligentsia had already produced a substantial layer of cultural and historical development based on the Ukrainian realities. Owing to the activities of the amateur group: "Chykalenko watched the plays "Nazar Stodolia", "Svatannia na Honcharivtsi", "Natalka-Poltavka", "Harkusha", "Dai sertsiu voliu zavede v nevoliu" (Give your heart freedom, it will lead you into slavery) (1863, 1873) (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 15). It should be noted that Marko Kropyvnytsky was not only the director of plays, but also the author of one of them – "Dai sertsiu voliu zavede v nevoliu" (1863, 1873) (Kropyvnytskyi, 2014, p. 538). The atmosphere that prevailed in the educational institution had its influence on Yevhen Chykalenko. "At the real school, although the lessons were conducted, as a rule, in the Russian language, there was not even a shadow of any hostile attitude towards Ukrainianism..." (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 15). The final touch was also found to explain the future commitment to the ideas and views of M. Drahomanov: "...a director Zavadsky, entering into conversations with older students on political issues and trying to dissuade them from sympathizing with extreme views, relied on the authority of M. Drahomanov as an opponent of terror" (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 15).

After Decree of 1876, the situation with the atmosphere of Ukrainianism worsened significantly, but the all-Russian radical, revolutionary (organizations "Narodna Volia", "Chorny Peredil") intensified...

However, Decree could not ruin the atmosphere of Ukrainianism as a whole. Yevhen continued his studies. "When visiting Karpenko-Kary, the boy would stay with him on Saturdays with a whole company, which consisted of the Ukrainians themselves, he would listen to good music and sing Ukrainian songs... and when he came to Pereshory, Chykalenko would read Shevchenko, Kulish, and Marko Vovchok to the boys in the yard on Sundays" (Doroshenko, 1943, p. 16). There are grounds to claim that the seeds of service to the enlightenment of the Ukrainian people germinated, which were received from the older generation, and thereby encouraged the young man to continue the idea of service to the people.

In 1878, another circle emerged in Yelysavetgrad, which was organized by Opanas Mykhalevych (1848 – 1925), who was exiled from Kyiv. In the past, he was a member of Kyiv “Hromada” (belonged to the circle of communication with Mykhailo Drahomanov and Dmytro Antonovych). In addition, the intellectual space of the circle included students-realists Andriy Hrabenko, Oleksandr Voloshyn Arkadiy Verzhbysky, Mykola Levtskyy, Mykhailo Vasilyev, Ivan Starynkevych as well as Chykalenko. M. Kropyvnytsky, I. Karpenko-Karyi, M. Sadovsky came to the meetings of the group. Yevhen Chykalenko noted the main thesis of the activities of the circle residents: “Regarding the independence of Ukraine, the sovereignty of its state life... there was no talk in the group, everyone thought only about how to achieve the freedom of the national development...” (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 17). A wise man, a doctor and public figure, O. Mykhalevych did not impose his own vision of the development of events on anyone, as he believed that everyone should choose work for the revival of the Ukrainian nation according to their understanding and abilities.

Finally, the fourth period, the final one in the social and personal development of the young man. It began in the spring of 1881, when Yevhen finished Yelysavetgrad real school (college). Taking into account Yevhen’s strong agricultural preferences, he made a decision to get a higher agronomic education first, and then to settle down in his ancestral place and engage in the business, which he knew and understood since childhood. Due to the absence of a specialized higher agronomic school in the Ukrainian lands at the time, Yevhen faced a challenge, in particular – where to study? He didn’t want to go to Moscow, as well as to Pulawy (Poland). Yevhen followed O. Mykhalevych’s advice and went to St. Volodymyr’s University in order to study natural sciences. But according to the statute, the graduates from the real school (college) were not allowed to enter St. Volodymyr’s University as undergraduates. Even V. Antonovych could not help, to whom he had a recommendation made by O. Mykhalevych (at the time of the appeal – Dean of the History and Philology Faculty of St. Volodymyr University, Doctor of Russian history). Owing to the failure with the enrollment, there was also a positive consequence – Yevhen got acquainted with the leading Ukrainian public figures – V. Antonovych and M. Lysenko, later on – with a historian D. Bahaliy, a statistician L. Padalka, O. Rusov, an ethnographer and linguist K. Mykhalchuk, a bibliographer and lexicologist M. Komarov.

In September of 1882, Yevhen overcame himself, he still went to Moscow and was admitted to Petrovsk Agricultural and Forestry Academy and began his studies. But there were student riots, as a result of which, the studies were suspended for an indefinite period of time. Therefore, he headed for Kharkiv, where he began studying as an undergraduate student at the Natural Science Department of a local university. He met his classmates from the real school there: Arkadiy Verzhbysky and Mykola Levytsky. During the educational process, Yevhen was noticed by Prof. A. Zaikevych, Head of the Agronomy Department. Professor realized that the student had a perfect command of the Ukrainian language, he instructed him to write a brochure on the corn (it was the first scientific work, unfortunately, not published, quite obviously, for censorship reasons). As you can imagine, the “first test” of the pen in the field of popularization of agricultural crops and their importance in the economic complex of the peasant husbandry initiated the process of imparting agricultural knowledge to the peasants.

Meanwhile, Yevhen entered a student life, in particular, the Ukrainian student community. There was an acquaintance with V. Maliovany among others, a Ukrainian close to “Narodna Volia”, who kept in touch with the Ukrainian National Movement, and, organizing a radical group of students, maintained relations with M. Drahomanov in exile.

In the same period of Yevhen's life, in particular: "...in 1883, he married ... Maria Viktorivna Sadyk, a panna-kursystka (a college student) from Lubny region" (Doroshenko, 1934, p. 21). But the family happiness had to withstand the test, the police were particularly interested in the activities of the group participants, and some of them were arrested. During the interrogation, one of the members of the group revealed not only Kharkiv Group, but also Yelysavetgrad Group led by O. Mykhalevych. The court decision regarding Ye. Chykalenko was the following: he was sent for five years under strict police supervision to the family estate in the village of Pereshory. Furthermore, the correspondence was prohibited, as well as unsupervised movement outside Pereshory, as well as there were weekly checks by a visiting policeman.

Taking into account the previous period of Ye. Chykalenko's life from the point of view of time, we should note that later on in his life he had a firm conviction in the need to immerse himself in the atmosphere of industrial relations in the village, seeing this as his culture carrier mission. At the same time, he knew, understood and was aware of an actual state of the Ukrainian affairs. Hence, he considered it a personal need to "awaken" the Ukrainian perspective, affirming belonging to Ukraine in the minds of ordinary people. Moreover, he had available forces and means at his disposal, to give them to this noble cause.

His powerful intellect was aimed at the direction of the activity owing to several factors: moved to live in Pereshory under the supervision of the police, took care of the family, economic concerns and industrial relations with the peasants. First of all, he set out to find out the reasons for low grain yields. The reason was dictated by a change in a traditional farming – a powerful transition from multi-disciplinary farming to highly specialized cultivation of grain for sale began. In addition, it was necessary to develop a different scheme of labour relations with the peasants as participants of the production process.

He characterized this event the following way: "In 1885, I inherited a manor house in the village of Pereshory, Ananyiv povit, in which a large landowner's husbandry was conducted, about 500 acres of land were cultivated with the help of hired peasants..." (Chykalenko, 1899, p. 793). The first year of estate management and the organization of harvest work made it possible to understand the needy situation of the peasants. The majority of them were not land owners, so they worked as hired workers, wages were set by the employer. In order to change their situation for the better, the following year Ye. Chykalenko reduced the grain wedge to save money, leased the freed part of it so that the peasants could cultivate and sow the leased areas independently. But in the fall, the expected result was not achieved due to the low cultivation culture, low-quality seed material and lack of moisture in the soil.

Yevhen Chykalenko obtained agronomic education externally at Kharkiv University, based on the analysis of the results of management, he began to search for an economically efficient model of the husbandry management, optimal in terms of labour organization. Therefore, next year Yevhen decided to introduce the principle of their personal material interest in the final results of work into the system of industrial relations with the peasants. He took several innovative steps in order to do this, it is worth thinking that he was the first to apply them in the South of Ukraine. Yevhen introduced share farming as since being a student, he had an instilled need to learn new trends in agriculture.

Later on, having reached a certain level of balanced relations with the tenant farmers and corresponding economic results, Ye. Chykalenko shared his personal experience on the pages of the periodical agricultural publications, popularizing it. "I gave my land to the peasants on an agricultural (share) basis for 1/3 of the harvest for the benefit of economy, and for

this management I established a crop rotation gradually: 1) par, 2) winter wheat, 3) corn, 4) potatoes, 5) sorghum, 6) barley and rye..." (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 107).

He took the next step in order to organize an efficient production. "The land given to the residents of Pereshory is divided into six plots or crop rotations of 120 acres each" (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 107). He took another step modelling the prospects of further relations with the tenants clearly. "On each of these plots, I have a small piece of land cultivated by husbandry forces..." (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 107). We are talking about a plot, as a model for imitation, hence culture improvement of land cultivating by peasants. Carrying on the reform of relations with the peasants he wrote the following: "Residents of the village Pereshory in the east choose 12 commissioners, each of them is assigned 60 dessiatyn (land measurement), 10 dessiatyn for each crop change; and the owners are grouped next to these representatives (2-5 households in each group), who distribute among themselves the same number of dessiatyn for each family" (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 107). The authors emphasized the fact that Ye. Chykalenko knew the peasants' psychology well: a self-respecting owner-tenant will not allow his plot to be worse than that of his neighbour's.

Then in the publication there was mentioned a personal responsibility of the authorized people. In the long run, by doing the above-mentioned, the sense of master was nurtured. "It is the duty of each commissioner to keep an eye on his companions, who cultivate the taken land as much as possible at the same time and in the same manner as it is done on a variable plot of husbandry; an authorized person monitors the quality of the seed grain and, if it is of a poor quality, husbandry exchanges it, if it is clogged, it is cleaned on husbandry sorter; he monitors gathering harvest in time, so that each polykipok (stook) has the same number of sheaves of the same volume..." (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 107). Then he went on to the technological methods of soil cultivation, the most important of them: "Plowing is carried out with our usual iron plows, peasant cattle, sowing and harvesting is done manually, and only winter wheat is sown with a row drill of husbandry under the guidance of an employee appointed to the husbandry" (Chikalenko, 1900, pp. 107–108). As Yevhen was well aware of the climatic conditions of Kherson area, he strongly recommended the optimal timing of work: "Plowing fallow is carried out at the end of March – at the beginning of April, i.e. immediately after the end of spring sowing" (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 108). It should be emphasized that Ye. Chykalenko had to overcome the inertia of ideas about the terms of spring field toil and rely on the support of those owners, who were able to accept innovations immediately.

It should be highlighted that the relationship between the peasants and the husbandry regarding the return of a share of harvest for rent was based on a mutual trust and control by the husbandry. "When all harvesters bring a share of savings to threshing machine or to skerries, after checking their harvest in the field by a prykazhchyk, they take it home; threshing is carried out by husbandry workers hired" (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 108). The Conclusion: "... owing to modern cultivation and crop rotation, in which grains are not sown by grain, but are sown in fallow, cornfield and threshing floor, the harvest is not less than 100 poods per dessiatyna, even in years like 96 and 99..." (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 108). And as a summary during the period of the field cycle of works: "... even in non-harvest years, by sharing (the land) for 1/3 of the harvest, I received about 30 poods from the dessiatyna; at the same time, the neighbours, renting the land for 2/5 and even for half, in those years had no more than 5 poods from the dessiatyna..." (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 108). "It is impossible to wish for better results and better relations than those that were established between the peasants and me after the introduction of the share farming" (Chikalenko, 1900, p. 108).

The Conclusions. Thus, in our opinion, transition to subsistence farming had two fundamentally important consequences. The first consequence, a solid economic foundation was created. It was the foundation, which allowed Yevhen Chykalenko to engage in charity work, to be a patron in the realm of the Ukrainian culture, a publisher, a publicist and a popularizer of agrarian knowledge. The second consequence, introducing him to the culture of agricultural production freed him from everyday worries and concerns, turning him into a public and political figure.

An active nature of Ye. Chykalenko, in connection with his Ukrainian centrism, demanded to share the experience of running not only grain farming. Therefore, on the basis of understanding his own experience, he prepared and published, overcoming the tsarist censorship, five books in which he described the culture of black fallow and the introduction of crop rotation as a countermeasure against droughts (Chykalenko, 1897, 32 p.), introduced other types of activities in animal husbandry (Chykalenko, 1899, 82 p.), regarding sown grasses as fodder for livestock (Chykalenko, 1900, 48 p.), viticulture (Chykalenko, 1901, 40), and horticulture (Chykalenko, 1901, 40 p.). The publication “How to Organize Agriculture in Field” deserves a special focus (Chykalenko, 1918, 15 p.).

The most complete and professional assessment of Ye. Chykalenko’s activities in the field of agriculture and formation of a new model of rational management was made by an agronomist V. Bertenson, an official of special assignments at the Ministry for Agriculture and State Property, a member of the Imperial Agricultural Society of Southern Russia. He emphasized the following: “The merit of Ye. Kh. Chykalenko is not that he applied improved methods of soil cultivation, not only that he introduced the importance of black fallow, etc., through the publication, he did more: he introduced these techniques for the agricultural culture of the local peasants” (Bertenson, 1900, p. 1552).

The Prospects for the Further Research. Taking into consideration the perspective of the field of rural studies, which is emphasized by the Ukrainian researchers (Prysiashniuk, 2018), the issue under research article needs further development. “Rozmovy Pro Silske Khaziaistvo” are seen as promising for further research. In our opinion, for the first time, they raised the issue of organic farming, preservation of moisture and humus in the surface layer of the soil, black fallow, crop rotation, plants as organic fertilizer. Extrapolating these issues to the present, it seems possible to trace transformational processes in soil science, agronomy, animal husbandry and other branches of agriculture.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to express their gratitude to the employees of Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, employees of Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences, in particular, I. M. Starovoitenko the senior researcher of the Department of Source Studies of Modern History of Ukraine, candidate of historical sciences.

We would also like to express our sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for the advice they provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

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

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bertenson, V.A. (1899). Po Yugu Rossii. Khozyain [South of Russia. Master]. *Selskokhozyaystvennyy i ekonomicheskyy zhurnal*, (№ 36, pp. 1549–1552). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. A. Porokhovshchikova. [in Russian]

Boiko, Yu. O. (2008). *Vydavnycha, blahodiinytska ta hromadsko-politychna diialnist Yevhena Chykalenka (1880-ti rr. – 1929 r.)* [Publishing, charitable and socio-political activities of Yevhen Chykalenko (1880s – 1929)]. (*Candidate's thesis*). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

Chikalenko, Ye. (1899). Po povodu ispolnogo khozyaystva [Regarding the Economy]. *Khutoryanin. Organ Poltavskogo Obshchestva Selskogo Khozyaystva. Yezhenedelnoe izdanie. Poltava, 51*, 793–794. [in Russian]

Chikalenko, Ye. (1900). Ispolnoe khozyaystvo [Useful Economy]. *Khutoryanin. Yezhenedelnoe izdanie Poltavskogo Obshchestva selskogo khozyaystva. Poltava, 8, 24 fevralya*, 106–108. [in Russian].

Chorny, D. (2021). Yevhen Chykalenko and Kharkiv: The History of Relationship. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin, 20*, 39–48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058X.20.240048> [in English]

Chykalenko, Ye. (1897). *Rozmova pro silske khazaiastvo. Chorny par, plodozmin ta siiana trava* [Talk about agriculture. Black steam, crop rotation and sown grass]. Odesa: Yuzhno-russkoe obshchestvo pechatnoho dela. [in Ukrainian].

Chykalenko, Ye. (1899). Rozmova pro silske khazaiastvo [Talk about Agriculture]. Kn. 2. *Khudoba: koni, skotyina, vivtisi ta svyni*. Odesa: Yuzhno-russkoe obshchestvo pechatnoho dela. [in Ukrainian].

Chykalenko, Ye. (1900). Rozmova pro silske khazaiastvo [Talk about Agriculture]. Kn. 3. *Siiani travy, kukuruza ta buriaky*. Odesa: Yuzhno-russkoe obshchestvo pechatnoho dela. [in Ukrainian]

Chykalenko, Ye. (1901). Rozmova pro silske khazaiastvo [Talk about Agriculture]. 4-ta kn. *Vynohrad*. Sankt-Peterburh: Blahotvorytelnoe obshchestvo yzdanyia obshchepoleznukh y dostupnykh knyh. [in Ukrainian]

Chykalenko, Ye. (1903). Rozmova pro silske khazaiastvo [Talk about Agriculture]. 5-ta knyzhka. *Sad*. Sankt-Peterburh: Blahotvorytelnoe obshchestvo yzdanyia obshchepoleznukh y dostupnykh knyh. [in Ukrainian]

Doroshenko, D. (1934). *Yevhen Chykalenko 1861 – 1929: yoho zhyttia i hromadska diialnist* [Eugene Chykalenko 1861 – 1929: his life and public activities]. Praha: Vydannia fondu imeni Ye. Chykalenka pry Ukrainському Akademichnomu Komiteti. [in Ukrainian]

Havryliuk, L. O. (2013). Chykalenko Yevhen Kharlamovych [Chykalenko Eugene Kharlamovich]. *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy. U 10 t. Redkol. V. A. Smolii (holova) ta in. Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy*, (vol. 10, pp. 550). Kyiv: Naukova dumka. [in Ukrainian]

Kropyvnytskyi. (2014). Kropyvnytskyi Marko Lukych (1840 – 1910) [Marko from Kropyvnytskyi (1840 – 1910)]. *Entsyklopediia suchasnoi Ukrainy*, (vol. 15, pp. 538–539). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].

Prysiazhniuk, Yu. (2018). Perspektyvy selianoznavstva yak sfery doslidzhen suchasnoi ukrainskoi istoriografii [Prospects of peasant studies as areas of research of modern Ukrainian historiography]. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi Istorychnyi visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin, 6*, 187–193. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.8.143300> [in Ukrainian]

Rohozha, M. M. (2018). “Rozmovy pro silske khazaiastvo” Ye. Chykalenka yak dzherelo v konteksti “materialnoi tkany ny nashoi istorii” [Ye. Chykalenko’s “Talks on Agriculture” as a Source in the Context of the “Material Fabric of Our History”]. *Naukovi pratsi Istorychnoho fakultetu Zaporizkoho natsionalnoho universytetu – Scientific works of the historical faculty of Zaporizhzhya National University, (51)*, 167–172. DOI: 10.26661/swfh-2018-51-015 [in Ukrainian]

Rohozha, M. M. (2018). Vnesok Ye.N. Chykalenka u rozvytok silskoho gospodarstva Ukrainy [The contribution of Ye. N. Chykalenko in the development of agriculture in Ukraine]. *Istoriia nauky i tekhniki – History of science and technology, 8 (1(12))*, 218–227. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.32703/2415-7422-2018-8-1\(12\)-218-227](https://doi.org/10.32703/2415-7422-2018-8-1(12)-218-227) [in Ukrainian]

Starovoitenko, I. M. (2009). *Yevhen Chykalenko: liudyna na tli epokhy* [Eugene Chykalenko: a man against the background of the era]. Kyiv, Tempora. [in Ukrainian]

Sviashchenko, Z. V. (2020). Poreformene ukrainske selo v ahrarnykh studiiakh naukovtsiv Kyivskoi shkoly [Post-reform Ukrainian village in agricultural studies of Kyiv School Scholars]. *Eminak, 2 (30)*, 220–228. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/emina2020.2\(30\).422](https://doi.org/10.33782/emina2020.2(30).422) [in Ukrainian]

The article was received January 17, 2023.

Article recommended for publishing 28/02/2024.