Peculiarities of local in the context of agronomic knowledge
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Abstract. The paper is devoted to the problem of return to a person a commensurate world which is reflected in the phenomenon of local. It identifies peculiarities of local based on agronomic knowledge as traditional knowledge presented as context. Local is determined by ability to cultivate land - ‘vital locus’ of a peasant-farmer. Ability to adapt to natural and social environment to solve the survival problem accompanies formation of a ‘sense of place’. Environment is a factor of agronomic knowledge development. The latter in its pre-scientific form as folk agronomy developed in the agricultural experience of people. Based on the contextual approach, principle of truth specificity, principle of consistency, the paper presents folk agronomic knowledge as a systemic integrity and justifies its elements: prescribed technological knowledge, actual technological knowledge, folk agricultural wisdom. Agronomic knowledge, demanded by context of agrarian activity, sets peculiarities of local: 1) place specificity; spatial forms of material phenomena, objects, bodies, their position in space; 2) variety of forms of adaptation to natural climatic conditions, existence of various methods of farming; 3) farmers’ rooted consciousness. The authors show its potential to be an impetus for development of society. Interaction of old and new can be practical and highly effective.

1. Introduction

The relevance of the topic is determined by the need to justify a change in the modern worldview. Since the second half of the XXth century it becomes obvious that the necessary conditions are formed to return man his place in the current global world. The phenomena of private and small that are consonant with the phenomenon of local become more attractive. In the local element, which is the level of proportionality of the global, ideas about space, infinite, continuous are realized in a concrete form. Local is understood as a way to acquire the human dimensionality of the environment, which is subjectively described by a ‘sense of place’ and is expressed in the anthropocenosis of life [1] of a peasant. The contextual approach may serve to consider the features of local. In our work the concept of context plays an important role since agronomic knowledge as the embodiment of local serves to
implement the contextual approach. An adequate expression of local is consciousness of a responsible peasant-farmer formed in the process of everyday life.

We believe that agronomic knowledge of a peasant is given in a specific form in modern reality. Hence, through agronomic knowledge the local acquires modern value. We are talking about the importance of finding relevance in this knowledge and providing the possibility of its multidimensional assessment based on the problems and needs of modern society. In a philosophical sense, this is related to the need to analyze agronomic knowledge in the dynamic aspect of its existence. Traditions of agronomic knowledge, on the one hand, have the specificity of preserving their locally distinctive character, on the other, they cannot be perceived only as a connection with the past. They can serve as an impetus for the development of society being associated with innovations. The interaction of the old and the new can be highly effective in practical terms in modern life including science. Thus, agronomic knowledge in its pre-scientific form, obtained empirically (such terms as ‘traditional agricultural knowledge’ [2], ‘farmer knowledge’ [3] are also used in the scientific literature), contains the existential aspects of human beings and is the most important source of development of modern scientific agronomic knowledge. Organic farming - a trend in the development of modern agriculture - is associated with the traditional ecological knowledge of a farmer. It is advisable to use achievements of agronomic knowledge of a farmer in the food system, in medical practice, in agritourism - the modern form of tourism that has become widespread, etc.

The ‘organic sector’ [4], which has practical utility for the functioning and development of society, in addition to organic agriculture also includes the system of ‘organic production’ [5], the corresponding system of ‘organic management’ [4]. There is no doubt that the named elements of the organic sector as an organic system were tested in the agricultural practice of peasants. Under the new conditions of civilizational development focused on sustainable development which is associated with the need to rationally organize local management actions (for example, organic management of agricultural land, ‘management of soil resources of farmers and society’ [4], ‘local management of traditional agricultural knowledge as a public domain of a close community with close social links’ [3]) the agronomic knowledge of a peasant-farmer should receive a prominent place.

Justifying the relevance of determining the place of national agronomic knowledge in modern society, we disagree with the position of the researchers and come to the conclusion: this knowledge contains something that serves as a potential resource for sustainable development of mankind. In this regard, in peasant-farmers’ prescientific knowledge one should preserve what is worthy of salvation. But how? We share the point of view of those researchers who propose the idea of cooperation (‘partnership’) between scientists working in areas where traditional agronomic knowledge plays an important role and their carriers. We are talking about the need for cooperation between representatives of the knowledge systems: pre-scientific agronomic and modern scientific-agronomic. They should have one goal: to collect and accumulate farmers’ traditional knowledge, to synthesize it. At the same time, researchers point to the need to take into account an interdisciplinary approach in order to identify similarities and differences between knowledge systems [5], pluralistic scientific assessment and the widespread use of social science methodology to carefully document individual local knowledge [4]. The authors of the idea suggest that the result of cooperation should be collection and accumulation of an effective knowledge base from knowledge systems, their use for making management decisions at both local and global digital levels.

The purpose of the paper is to identify local features in the context of agronomic knowledge based on the analysis of elements (forms, levels) of folk agronomy as a system - prescribed technological knowledge, actual technological knowledge, folk agricultural wisdom.

2. Methods and materials

2.1. Theoretical and methodological prerequisites for the study of local features in the context of agronomic knowledge
Modern philosophy is focused on the dialogue of various cognitive approaches, the possibility of their recognition in the context of the theoretical-cognitive process. We are talking about a variety of types of knowledge through which the increment of knowledge is possible. In the context of the foregoing we pay attention to the practical type of knowledge. According to V. Shtoff practical knowledge grows from the needs of specialized (local) types of practice for its maintenance. These types of practical knowledge include traditional knowledge.

Given the complexity and pluralism of approaches to the definition of traditional knowledge in modern scientific and philosophical literature, without going into the details of the discussion on the concept, we join the definition given by the researchers. Traditional knowledge is ‘knowledge, abilities, experience and wisdom that were created, accumulated, preserved and developed in accordance with the ecological system, the surrounding nature, society and culture’ [6]. We agree with the authors also in their understanding of traditional knowledge as knowledge of the ‘survival strategy’ [6]. But at the same time, we do not agree with them in their understanding of traditional knowledge ‘in the broad sense’ as the totality of elements of ethnic culture [6]. Hence, it is important for us to consider the question of a possible correlation of the concepts of ‘traditional culture’ and ‘ethic culture’. With that said, let us recall a historical fact: Australian Aborigines did not form the ethnic community although their life activity took place in a certain local territory (space). This allowed the researcher to conclude that in this case a person can identify himself ‘only with a local, not ethnic community’ [1]. Therefore, we can safely assert that the concepts of traditional knowledge and ethnic knowledge are not identical. In the context of the foregoing, we pay attention to the concepts of ‘aboriginal and traditional knowledge’, ‘indigenous and traditional knowledge’, ‘local and traditional knowledge’ which researchers point to [7]. They distinguish, firstly, ‘traditional knowledge’ as such. This knowledge is passed down from generation to generation, reflecting the principle of repeatability in culture and in everyday life. They show what worked out and what didn’t in people’s experience. Secondly, holders of traditional knowledge, i.e. sustainable communities of aboriginal, indigenous peoples, local people. Their work through many generations of farmers has survived to the present. Thirdly, the concepts of ‘aboriginal knowledge’, ‘indigenous knowledge’ (‘knowledge of indigenous people’ [8]), ‘local knowledge’, on the one hand, and ‘traditional knowledge’; on the other, are not identical. Aboriginal knowledge, indigenous knowledge is the knowledge of the indigenous people of a particular area living in it since ancient times. Aboriginal, indigenous knowledge is possessed by aboriginal communities, the indigenous population, at the habitat of which from ancient times and now there are plant and animal bodies characteristic of it (locality). The concepts of ‘aboriginal knowledge’ and ‘indigenous knowledge’ appear to be close in meaning. ‘Local knowledge’ is distinguished by the fact that the local population can be called both the indigenous people and the alien population, rooted in the area; but you can’t call them all natives. In our opinion, close to this position is a statement in which the traditional is found in the local with ‘different options’, that is, the local exists in diverse forms. So studying traditional food of the peoples of Russia the researchers point out that the traditions of folk cuisine are maximally adapted to one or another local condition of food, drink or cooking; that food systems characteristic of an ethnic group or a certain region inhabited by culturally similar ethnic groups have a number of local variants [9]. Here we come to the conclusion that the concept of local knowledge is applicable to aboriginal, ethnic, local and indigenous knowledge, which indicates the possibility of its wide application in relation to the listed ones.

The most important component of traditional pre-scientific (empirical) knowledge is agronomic knowledge. It is used in situations of agricultural activity (‘context of situation’, according to B. Malinowski), requiring a balance between science and art. We understand agronomic knowledge as the aggregate knowledge of the cultivation of agricultural crops: agriculture, crop production, agricultural chemistry, soil science, selection, seed production and seed science, phytopathology, agricultural entomology, land reclamation, etc. Beyond the limits of agronomic knowledge is universal knowledge that is part of human culture (‘context of culture’, according to B. Malinowski). Thus, it becomes clear that agronomic knowledge is not so much agronomic as such, but a basic element of universal human knowledge; they relate to each other as general and special. Universal human
knowledge can be localized in its own way in certain regions of the globe, in certain areas of knowledge, in various social and ethnic communities. Therefore common human knowledge is realized in its locally unique element. It can be argued that the embodiment of universal knowledge in a particular agricultural locus is special agronomic knowledge. The foregoing means that agronomic knowledge is included in both local and universal culture. Such complex interpenetration of local and global is explained by the variety of forms of human practical development of the natural and social environment. Scientific literature points out to various ways of existence of agronomic knowledge in agricultural practice, considered as an organic part of popular consciousness, folk agronomy.

So, the process of dialectical interaction of a person with the natural-geographical environment is carried out through communication with the earth. The latter gives rise to conservatism in the sociocultural sphere, with which the concept of traditional society is associated. The interaction takes place in terms of accessibility, the possibility of cultivating and recultivating the land - the ‘vital locus’ [1]. Thus, we can talk about locality - a specific ‘down-to-earth’ consciousness, the aspirations of the farmer. With long-term residence in a certain place a person develops devotion to it, rootedness, stability of consciousness and spirit - there is a ‘sense of place’ and understanding of his possible lifestyle ‘here and now’ on this land. The latter are realized through man’s unlimited adaptability to existing conditions - the natural and social environment - through a focus on solving the problem of survival and development in the search for the maximum possibilities of life. Modern researchers write about a wide range of ‘adaptive survival strategies’ [8], which are successfully applied by indigenous peoples. Farmer’s adaptation is the need to bring his way of thinking and actions into line with the changing natural and social environment [10]; it acts as a means of survival in the process of life in the most adverse conditions of the natural and social environment. It also encourages him to improve his individual and personal qualities. Nature - the ‘conversation’ of a peasant with it (!) - strengthens farmers’ spirit, makes it possible to overcome themselves and the circumstances of life, and, in the end, gives them joy, does not allow them to be ‘bored’. Communication with nature gives meaningfulness to being on the earth and thereby gives a feeling of a full-fledged life of a person in ‘his place’ where his house, economy, people who communicate with him and with whom he communicates, are located.

The surroundings as an external environment impose restrictions on the methods of active adaptation through knowledge, including agronomic; the latter creates opportunities for a person to become a peasant on the earth which has become ‘his own’. The aforesaid also means that knowledge is acquired, formed, used, accumulated in certain local conditions and boundaries set by extra-natural, extra-weather forces, i.e. by values of a person’s life choice as a farmer. Hence, local, its specificity can be interpreted from an existential perspective of the lifestyle of a peasant farmer. The history of emergence, accumulation of agronomic knowledge indicates that they are phenomena of human existence where the main thing is concern for food, shelter, home, children, health and the future, the desire to form it with today's actions. This is not about a transient state of concern associated with a particular point in time. The farmer has to plan his future, to act ‘ahead of the curve’. The need to take care of his own life encourages the farmer to be active. In this process the mind plays an important regulatory role. The mind through questioning ‘why’, ‘how’, ‘what for’, etc., sets in motion existence – a specific human way of being that represents a person’s life experience in everyday situations.

Peasant (here we note that any peasant is a farmer, but not every farmer is a peasant), as a responsible person, is compelled to understand the boundaries of his life opportunities and aspirations. In his existence, he objectively recognizes the spatial boundaries defined by the place called locality. The word ‘local’ is of Latin origin; it means ‘peculiar to this place; not going beyond certain limits’ [11]. We consider local from a certain viewpoint - through the ideas of contextuality. The meaning of local is determined by contexts: it is well known that editing text without understanding the context is impossible. A certain context is necessary for the deployment of local – conditions, circumstances that determine its (local) features. The context can not only set and direct the needs of a human spirit, it can also set itself and be guided by its needs, which are reflected in internal states - experiences, searches, inspiration, striving to comprehend (something). Hence, contexts can be multiple and
variable [12]. The opposite is also possible: contextualization is localization, ‘the transition from a possible variety of meanings to their real limitation, the transition from general to particular’ [13]. It is important to note that context refers to ideal objects being a product of thinking and attitude.

The theoretical and methodological base of the work is a contextual approach, the principle of concrete truth, the principle of systematicity. With their help, the following was established in the work. First, the contextual approach is implemented through the construction of ideal objects. Such objects are the ‘context of situation’ and the ‘context of culture’. Agronomic knowledge is obtained and consolidated in the ‘context of situation’. Through the context of situation the acquisition of agronomic knowledge is carried out. The context of situation is a specific situation of agronomic activity. The context of culture is a system of universal knowledge that is part of universal culture. Secondly, the peculiarities of local knowledge in the context of agronomic knowledge can only be adequately recognized when considered in accordance with specific natural conditions, specific historical features of the region as a relationship that develops between the peasant and agricultural practice. Thirdly, the national agronomic knowledge is presented as a systemic integrity, which includes the following elements – prescribed technological knowledge, actual technological knowledge, folk agricultural wisdom; its application as a certain integrity is determined by the level of individual and personal development of a farmer. Information from history, ethnography, folklore studies and literature is used as empirical material.

2.2. Factors in the formation of agronomic knowledge

Agronomic knowledge as an integrated system is determined by the conditions of the external environment (surroundings). At the same time this knowledge has a reverse effect on the external environment. Here the external environment is understood as a factor - an active force. Objectively, firstly, we are talking about a natural factor. Nature is not spatially localized. It is systematically organized, as evidenced by the close relationship of its components with each other – the atmosphere (earth), lithosphere, hydrosphere, biosphere. The natural factor determines the structure and limits of agronomic knowledge. Objectively, secondly, we are talking about social factors that determine changes in agronomic knowledge. It follows from what has been said that this knowledge has a spatial and temporal structure. Natural and social factors influence the formation and development of agronomic knowledge through person’s subjectivity, his consciousness, creativity.

The specifics of the complex relations between society and nature are associated with two levels of their interaction. One level concerns the interaction of society with the natural-geographical environment or with nature (the concepts of ‘nature’, ‘natural-geographical environment’, ‘geographical environment’ are not identical, but interconnected), which provides a person’s activity with the means included in society as means of production, such as soil, fields, gardens, ponds, birds, as well as draft, beef and dairy cattle (here we can recall the triad ‘land - labor - capital’ [14]). At the same time, the geographical environment includes a complex of different-quality phenomena of the Earth’s surface shell (relief, nature and productivity of the soil, various water resources, climate, diversity of flora and fauna, etc.). The named diverse phenomena become the most important components of social means of production being ‘humanized nature’ and act as a condition for existence and development of human society. Society draws from nature materials and energy for its development: it is a natural ‘text’, the fabric of human being in nature. Another level concerns the interaction of society with nature external to it. Laws of an external nature affect the elements of the means of production of society and the laws associated with them: this is the ‘context of situation’ in which a peasant, as a farmer or herder, organizes his rural life. The laws of external nature determine the specific features of the development of many social phenomena. So, the rhythm inherent in nature in the change of day and night, seasons, the distribution of geo-climatic zones - determine the cyclical nature of work in agriculture. The various properties of nature have also become the natural basis for the division of labor in society: hunting, farming, livestock breeding, fishing, etc.
3. Results and discussion

It has been established that since nature poses questions to man (and society) subordinate to the natural principle, his rational attitude towards it is expressed, first of all, through knowledge, experience and understanding of its borders - economic and personal - locality in a broad sense. Reasonable attitude to nature, in our opinion, includes the farmer's understanding of the need for 'contextual interaction' [15] with it. Farmers understand the need to take into account the specifics of such interaction. Almost all labor affairs of a villager are intertwined with the nature, and nature is rhythmic: one follows from the other, and everything is inseparable. A person’s practice-oriented consciousness constantly recorded the knowledge which was obtained in the process of agricultural labor and helped to realize what was desired, that is, the needs of human nature. Farmers’ knowledge reflected the wealth of thoughts and feelings of the people about the surrounding nature, social phenomena, i.e. about the most diverse aspects of human life (and humanity).

Based on available studies focusing on complex structuredness of folk agronomy, we clarify and justify the following elements (forms, levels) of knowledge: 1) prescribed technological knowledge; 2) actual technological knowledge; 3) folk agricultural wisdom (in its agricultural aspect) [16]. Forms of folk agronomy, being interconnected, form a unity, in their relation to agronomic knowledge they act as a whole. Moreover, in all forms of folk agronomy its fundamental features (substantial qualities) are reflected. It makes sense to look at the features of these forms.

1) Prescribed technological knowledge is associated with a description of the methods of labor and activity of the subject. Here we are talking about knowledge once found and entrenched in consciousness, which then only repeats itself and becomes a fact of everyday life. This testifies to the routine nature of a farmer’s the work. The method of transferring prescribed technological knowledge is ‘from father to son’, ‘from elder to younger’ directly, by inheritance in a non-genetic way. Here the principle of mentoring transfer of knowledge of the ‘do as I do’ type is of great importance in business and personal communication. During the implementation of this principle all details of the activity are discussed within the environment. Prescribed technological knowledge exists in the form of preaching, instructions, has the features of recipes, operating rules and is focused on comprehension of the immediate practical effect. The layer of farmers’ own experience accumulated in the system of traditional agronomic knowledge as prescribed technological knowledge is embodied in their skills, mental circuits of perception, and their mastery. It should be noted that prescription knowledge of agricultural practice is in demand in our time. In this regard, we recall a story in which a meeting with the Koreans on Sakhalin is described. It tells about how they can grow high-quality tomatoes in difficult natural conditions of the Far East: 'I ask: - What needs to be done to save the fruits? - You need to dunk. - What to dunk? Silence. So I did not get the answer. Secret. This secret is passed down from generation to generation' [17]. In our opinion, it makes sense to clarify: what does ‘secret’ mean? In this regard, we turn to the concept of the ‘principle of the earth’ [18]. According to this principle, with whom, with what and how a farmer is connected, as well as the ‘secret’ - everything is determined by the specifics of agricultural labor on his outlook. The interlocutor is silent, does not answer the question. He is silent as the earth. Thought enters into man. But he ‘begins to speak only by acting’ [1], that is, thought is subordinate to action.

2) In folk agronomy knowledge about the actions of the subject is supplemented by an empirical description of the agricultural objects involved in the activity. The peculiarity of the organization of agronomic knowledge in the process of agricultural production is as follows: it is always built mainly as enumeration and description of sequential operations to achieve the intended result. The description of the objects involved in agricultural activity is scattered, dissolved in the contents of the description of operations.

The embodiment of actual technological knowledge was methods of cultivating the land, understanding of when and how to sow, harvest, how to apply fertilizers, which animals and how to grow, information about wild plants, system of feeding, etc. So, in the national agricultural industry, the importance of connection between agriculture and livestock farming is important, as the following sayings testify: ‘Cattle is the owner of the farm: there is none – there is nothing’, ‘No cattle - no care’,
etc. A responsible farmer was well versed in the fertilizer system: he considered sheep, cow, goat manure to be the best; manure of annual exposure good, etc. The issues of high-quality seed preparation for the upcoming sowing were connected with the special attention of the farmer to their germination, variety, and adaptability to local conditions (in pre-revolutionary Russia varieties of local origin were mainly distributed in the farms), to the interconnection of natural conditions and crops. The significance of seed work as knowledge established experimentally is expressed in aphorisms: ‘Better to starve, but sow with good seed’, ‘What you sow, you will reap’, etc.

Significant are formation and accumulation of agronomic knowledge under the influence of natural and geographical conditions, especially the law of climatic zonality. The experience of a farmer necessarily includes the search for and the ability to find the best options for the implementation of universal laws and methods of farming, animal husbandry, horticulture, etc. in specific natural conditions of farming. Thus, according to the zonal ecological criterion, knowledge was accumulated about the peculiarities of distribution of plants [here we can recall the negative, simplistic experience of Russia in the Soviet period when according to a decree from above there was an attempt to introduce in the fields an unconventional crop for most of its regions (corn), regardless of climatic conditions], animals, insects, methods of adaptation to the conditions of the forest zone, warm climate, northern zone, cold climate, etc. For each type of work in different zonal conditions a certain technique was used. So, peasant farmers used to say: ‘Every grain has its own furrow and every tool has its own service.’ As you can see, agronomic knowledge is ‘tied’ to a specific natural environment, to the specifics of the area - to a specific space. This means that it is not cosmopolitan and cannot be used in a significant part of the world. In its local significance, agronomic knowledge is of an applied nature. Hence, the knowledge of a farmer is the fragmentary acquired knowledge that is available in the common human culture as a cultural context.

Thus, farmers’ practical knowledge must have grown based on the needs of specialized (local) types of practice for its maintenance. This knowledge contains knowledge about agriculture, about its connections with nature, its assessment, the knowledge that testifies to the deep connection of man with the earth and reflects the pre-scientific knowledge of a farmer, as well as the peculiar and complex play of his essential forces and nature which acts as art. Here are the impulses of the creative activity of the consciousness of the liberated personality of a farmer. Such activity is aimed at practical creation by a peasant of a new local event. The totality of actual technological knowledge being a part of everyday consciousness was the basis of farmers’ mental and life efforts, which were the source of the dynamics of their subjectivity. The combination of this knowledge was part of everyday consciousness of a farmer. The proof is the following words about the value of diverse knowledge for farming: the knowledge ‘stands closest to wisdom and is in a kindred relationship with it’ [19].

3) All agricultural wisdom (by wisdom we mean the flexibility of mind), both in its farming aspect and in agriculture as a whole, is owned by all wealthy peasants (wealth here is understood as the expression, the result of the virtue of a person who actualizes himself on ‘his’ land). Hence, wisdom, being a component of farmers’ everyday consciousness, does not include only knowledge about agriculture and its relationship with nature. In this knowledge there is also awareness of wisdom as a life value. Popular utilitarian wisdom is a synthesis of everyday experience and a healthy outlook on things, but it also has an existential character as a humanitarian attractor, a regulator of lifestyle of a peasant. We share the characteristic of traditional knowledge given by the researchers: ‘local knowledge is neither singular nor universal, but rather a voluminous, diverse and extremely localized source of wisdom’ [8]. The forms of expression of agricultural wisdom are diverse: from aphoristic conclusions (for example, proverbs and sayings) to peculiar algorithms of activity. In traditional societies folk agricultural wisdom has always been a component of folklore. Researchers acknowledge that folklore can rightly be considered the most important source for studying agronomic knowledge of the past and present. This can be judged by a number of monuments of folk art. In this regard, as an example, let us turn to the legend of a hedgehog. It tells that animals and birds gathered in order to come up with a way of cultivating the land. As a skilled farmer, a hedgehog was called for advice. But offended by inattention, the hedgehog was forced to leave the council. Leaving, he said: ‘You are
laughing at me but it is you who don’t understand anything. First of all, the land must be plowed, then cultivated and sown. And when the crop ripens - removed with a sickle and thresh. Then grind the grain and bake bread from the flour. It is how century is being fed [20]. As can be seen from the legend, peasants have knowledge of the basics of agriculture, a certain sequence of agricultural actions, as well as their ultimate goal - to make a food product called bread. In the legend, it is of interest that agricultural work is divided by the mouth of a hedgehog. He gives the names of the divided agricultural work until the completion of the entire cycle of work. It can be seen from the story that this whole long process of obtaining bread coupled with great labor efforts (‘whoever has work, has bread’, was the expression of farmers’ consciousness of labor as a moral act) requires knowledge and experience from a person. In the story, the hedgehog acts as the ‘subject’ of action.

Riddles, proverbs and sayings, observations, signs, calendars testify to the peculiarities of formation and development of the system of farmers’ agronomic knowledge. Puzzles straining the mind are aimed at guiding the development of active mental ability, awakening the mind of a person (child). They teach to think with imagination (a visual image arises in the human mind on the basis of his own projection), they are called upon to influence the formation and development of the ability to observe, to be attentive to the slightest shades of observed phenomena; they contribute to the development of ingenuity, the acquisition of knowledge about the surrounding nature, as well as about other aspects of the daily life of a farmer consisting of a variety of specific situations. Let us cite examples of riddles where different aspects of agricultural practice are reflected: ‘a small, hunchbacked little one galloped across the field’ (sickle), ‘small but bent, went around the whole meadow’ (scythe), ‘I scatter with time, gather time, feed myself and feed people’ (bread), ‘without windows, without doors is the temple full of people’ (cucumber), etc. [21]. The system of folk agronomic knowledge is fixed in the folk calendar (it was almost agricultural). Although it is an expression of old time it is massively used in our time. The calendar shows dates, days that are interconnected with the characteristic seasonal phenomena and events of the economic life of a farmer. It marks seasonal changes. However, the farmer knows in practice that there are more stages (sub-stages) in the seasonality of agricultural labor: planting, weeding, watering, harvesting, fertilizing the soil, etc. Certain days and seasons of the annual cycle are associated with the system of signs, beliefs. We also note that the system of peasants’ agronomic knowledge includes knowledge about the possibility of applying them to the features of a particular locality in the region (North, West, South, East, Middle strip of Russia). They distinguished the specifics of agricultural work taking into account the sowing dates, soil quality, etc. For example, among the Chuvash peasants the names of the months were associated with the alternation of agricultural work: steam time, cultivation, haymaking, hay harvesting, sickle (harvest), collecting flax, threshing, etc. The knowledge by farmers of natural phenomena in all their connection, mutual conditioning was reflected in other forms of folk wisdom: proverbs and sayings, songs, epics, observations, signs. All elements of folk wisdom are presented as a kind of practical guide for a farmer, both in the past and present.

All the above folklore examples, even if they do not prove, but testify that for a peasant - person in ‘his place’ - every object of his labor in the field is penetrated by the moral principle of life. In other words, ‘his place’ is considered by the peasant-farmer as a vital existential with all the philosophical and anthropological consequences that come and are brought with it.

Conclusion

Thus, agronomic knowledge being demanded by the ‘context of situation’ sets the peculiarities of local. The opposite is also true: local features seem to be superimposed on this context. These features are reflected in the following characteristics of local: 1) specificity of the place - space that is not blurred; specific spatial forms of material phenomena, objects, bodies (natural or man-made), their position in space; 2) variety of forms of adaptation to various natural and climatic zonal conditions, existence of many forms of management on earth; 3) ‘earthiness’, rooted consciousness of a farmer which forms in him a ‘sense of place’, a sense of ‘his place’.
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