

АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ ІСТОРІЇ

УДК 930.2:003.345 (477.7) «07/08»

THE BEREZAN' RUNESTONE AS THE VIKING'S VOICE AND PLACE OF THE MEMORY

Kurzenkova Alla

(Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University)

Runes are not only one of the roots of modern Northern European culture, but also find their way into Eastern European culture, including Ukraine. Study of the Scandinavian runic inscriptions is relevant for a full reconstruction from the perspectives of history and source criticism. The article draws attention on the Scandinavian runic stone from the island of Berezan'. The paper is concentrated on the runic inscription on a stone, which testifies in favor of the desire for presence, involvement, and experience of commissioners of the deceased instead of impressions. Stone is a testimony of the most diverse aspects of human experience, reflecting vertical cultural ties.

The text on the stone is understood as a common place for the development of cultural experience, puts the attention of the person and the cultural environment that was influenced he and which he had formed with the help of his own trade activities.

The study is based mostly on the Scandinavian runic inscriptions, while other sources such as Rus' Primary Chronicle, *De administrando imperio* have been included from an interpretation point of view.

Runic inscriptions from the Age of the Vikings demonstrate various textual as well as broader contextual features that have on many occasions been analyzed as evidence of the influence of the Viking trade on the development of functional space of Berezan' island, which was interpreted as a window into understanding how vikings were behaved in that landscape. Understanding scale viking's activities beyond the island Berezan' adds to the increasingly needed knowledge to help explain terms such as *felagi* that are found on runestones.

Keyword: the Scandinavian rune inscription, the island of Berezan', the Age of the Vikings, the Viking trade, «half (*hvalf*)», «*felagi*».

Березанський рунічний камінь як голос епохи вікінгів і місце пам'яті

Алла Курзенкова

(Донецький національний університет імені Василя Стуса)

Руни є одним із основних духовних витоків не тільки сучасної культури Північної Європи, насамперед Скандинавії, але і суміжної східноєвропейської, передусім України. Тому їхнє вивчення особливо актуальне для повної реконструкції з точки зору історії та джерельної критики.

У статті увага привертається до розгляду скандинавського рунічного каменя з острова Березань (Миколаївська обл., Україна). Дослідження присвячено рунічному написі на камені, що свідчить на користь бажання присутності, причетності, переживання замовників ознаменованого. Камінь є свідченням про найрізноманітніші аспекти людського досвіду, відображає вертикальні культурні зв'язки Епохи вікінгів.

Текст на камені розуміється як місце для витворення культурного досвіду, ставить у центр уваги людину та її культурне оточення, яке на неї впливало та яке вона формувала власною діяльністю.

Дослідження здебільшого ґрунтується на кількох дотичних скандинавських рунічних написах, проте, з точки зору інтерпретації, були включені й інші давньоруські та візантійські джерела.

Рунічні написи Епохи вікінгів демонструють різноманітні текстуальні та широкі контекстуальні особливості, що неодноразово аналізувалися як свідчення впливу торгівлі вікінгів на розвиток функціонального простору острова Березань, який було інтерпретовано як вікно до

розуміння того, як вікінги поводитися у цьому ландшафті. Розуміння масштабів діяльності вікінгів, особливо навколо острова Березань, додає більш необхідні знання, щоб пояснити такі терміни, як «felagi», що зустрічаються у скандинавських рунічних написах із вказівкою на торговельні дії.

Ключові слова: скандинавські рунічні написи, острів Березань, Епоха вікінгів, торгівля вікінгів, «half (hvalf)», «felagi».

Березанский рунический камень как голос эпохи викингов и место памяти

Алла Курзенкова

(Донецкий национальный университет имени Василя Стуса)

Руны являются одним из основных духовных истоков не только современной культуры Северной Европы, прежде всего Скандинавии, но и смежной восточноевропейской, прежде всего Украины. Поэтому их изучение особенно актуально для полной реконструкции с точки зрения истории и критики источников.

В статье привлекается внимание к изучению скандинавского рунического камня с острова Березань (Николаевская обл., Украина). Исследование посвящено рунической надписи на камне, что свидетельствует в пользу желанного присутствия, сопричастности, переживания заказчиков ознаменованного вместо впечатлений. Камень является свидетельством о различных аспектах человеческого опыта, отражает вертикальные культурные связи Эпохи викингов.

Текст на камне понимается как общее место для творения культурного опыта, ставит в центр внимания человека и его культурное окружение, которое на него влияло и которое он формировал собственной деятельностью.

Исследование, главным образом, основывается на подобных скандинавских рунических надписях, однако, с точки зрения интерпретации, были включены и другие древнерусские и византийские источники.

Рунические надписи Эпохи викингов демонстрируют различные текстуальные и широкие контекстуальные особенности, которые неоднократно анализировались как свидетельство влияния торговли викингов на развитие функционального пространства острова Березань, который был интерпретирован как окно к пониманию того, как викинги вели себя в этом ландшафте. Понимание масштабов деятельности викингов особенно вокруг острова Березань приводит к все более необходимым знаниям, чтобы объяснить такие термины, как «felagi», встречающихся в других скандинавских рунических надписях на камнях с указанием на торговые действия.

Ключевые слова: скандинавские рунические надписи, остров Березань, Эпоха викингов, торговля викингов, «half (hvalf)», «felagi».

This article sets out to offer a general overview of the understanding of the stone as a carrier of historical memory, faced with the geography of the place and the collective memory of the Age. The stone signals the destination of the path through the island Berezan' making it an integral part of the general concept of movement. It is here that the layering of the past with a human dimension takes place.

The temporal frames – the Age of the Vikings and the Early Middle Ages. The main aim is to study how through the relationship that runestone has had with geography of Berezan's island and space as a window into understanding how individuals behaved in a Viking's landscape. It is documented from the runic and medieval written sources point of view.

First, the article draws attention to deceased on the stone that does not just refer to experience in the special forms of human culture of the Age of the Vikings. A stone that is set up in honor of a person, as if serves as a benchmark for orientation in his own world. That is, this is a testimony to life in a certain way, not life in a certain place.

Second, the strategic purpose of the article is the rune inscription on the stone that signals the movement of thought from the contemplator to the participant of the trade trip, and death in this context is considered as a collective action and a cultural event. That is, the monopoly is lost to its own death, there is a special sensitivity to memory. And thus there is a transformation of the landscape, where the stone was set on a biographical transcultural object. In this way, the rune stone on the Berezan's island appears as a voice and a place of memory.

The attention of scholars has traditionally been directed initially on studying of the phenomenon of «the way from the Varangians to the Greeks»¹, interpretation of the Berezan' stone², but the attention to studying of the rune stone on the Berezan's island as a voice and a place of memory wasn't paid.

The sources were analysed in the frames of this study – among which runic inscriptions make up the core – are due to their specific nature. The runic material that were analysed has been excerpted from the electronic database Samnordisk runtextdatabas (Uppsala University). When quoting runic inscriptions, in article is given their transliterations in non-normalised form according to Samnordisk runtextdatabas. In base the Scandinavian runic inscriptions are supplied with normalisations into Old Norse, and in the case of Swedish and Danish inscriptions also into Runic Swedish and Runic Danish respectively.

Runic inscriptions form the backbone of this study, and they owe this central position to their particular nature as authentic materialised messages from the period in question.

The content analysis method became the principal idea of the research. The research was carried out in two steps: first, the method of group of the conceptual components in logical categories (the varied nature of toponymy is recorded in runic inscriptions). Then examining the text in relation to different levels of contextuality, which are integrated and form part of its historical information, we have understood of its meaning. The list of geographical names were formulated. Application of the method of the content analysis to a research gaining a deeper understanding of the text and its historical information about Viking trade.

The Scandinavian runic inscriptions are an unique, authentic and reliable historical source. The understanding of the runestone comes down to fixing of Historical Memory. Runestones were written by the Vikings in their own words. What do they want to say to us?

Runic monuments are considered as an example of the material embodiment of the Age of Vikings, public art and Historical Memory. The Scandinavian runic stones of the Age of Vikings are eyewitnesses of existence of Viking trade, mini-narratives about landscape of the Age of Vikings.

The Scandinavian runic inscriptions have strengths and weaknesses. Strengths: original and unique documents; universality of human experience; weaknesses: fragmentary; laconic; have homogeneous wording.

¹ Garipzanov I. & Tolochko O. Early Christianity on the way from the varangians to the Greeks. – Kiev: Institute of Ukrainian History, 2011. – 148 p.

² Браун Ф. А. Днепровский порог в шведской рунической надписи / Ф. А. Браун // Сборник археологических статей в честь А. А. Бобринского. – СПб., 1911. – С. 270–276.

Runes surpassed time, geography, language and culture. Through centuries, inscriptions provide historical information that is not available in other sources.

In such light rune stones make up a suitable point of departure for discussing the rune stone on the Berezan's island as a voice and a place of memory.

Results

The cultural identity of the Age of the Vikings and relations to the geographical region within which they moved, are of great importance for further understanding the network of trade that stretched from Birka to Constantinople. The Vikings and Rus' cultures were based on trade, travel, where it created an ideological structure that affected all, merchants or not. This ideology became the foundation for the world of ideas and expressions of this societies³.

The network of Rus' trading posts inhabited essentially by people from the North and sharing a common culture, facilitated travel along the eastern trade-routes. The role of the Birka in this system of trade routes was, apparently, significant: it is associated with the birth of urban law, norms of medieval jurisdiction, later known as «*Bjärkearett*». It was suggested that the «right of the Birka» united several centers bearing the same name – Birka to Melar, Birkö to Alands, Berkerøen – to the future of Bergen, island Bjarkoy in Northern Norway, Berezan' to Ukraine. The loose-knit character of the Northern organization have enabled a high level of mobility for the merchants. In a trading network like that of the Rus', finding new assignments along the way or on the return route would not have been a problem. In some support of this, mention should be made of a runic inscription found in the Ukraine.

Testimony to Scandinavian activities of a financial nature, in Rus' comes in the form of a rune stone raised on the island of Berezan'. The island is mentioned in *De administrando imperio* as the island of *St. Aitherios*, where Rus' usually had a rest on the way between Kiev and Byzantium⁴. Berezan' was an important resting point⁵. After sailing the Danube some of the monoxyla required repairs, and the men needed additional rest before the voyage on the sea. It was precisely on Berezan' that the necessary repairs were conducted. The peace treaty of 944/45 signed between the Empire and the Rus prohibited the Rus from spending the winter on the island, which probably means that the Rus were still allowed to use Berezan' as a stopover during their expeditions to Constantinople, but had to leave before winter came⁶.

The island was of too great strategic value to the Byzantine Empire and its lands to allow the Rus to inhabit it during winter, as it could lead to colonization of the area by the Rus. Later on the return trip the island served as a last resting place before facing the rapids portages and backbreaking oar work of fighting the river's currents⁷.

Runestone memorialized merchants with enough information to reconstruct at least some of the routes they took. A little stone (47*48*12 cm), excavated in 1905 on the

³ Hedenstierna-Jonson, Charlotte. *The Birka warrior. The material culture of a martial society.* – Stockholm, 2006. – P. 80.

⁴ Moravchik G. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus. De administrando imperio / Greek text with English trans. by R. J. H. Jenkins.* – Washington, DC: *Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection*, 1967. – P. 61. Retrieved from http://s155239215.onlinehome.us/turkic/10_History/DAIConst.Porphyr/Porphyr/porphyrogenetosDAIpp1-85En

⁵ *Ibid* – P. 60–62.

⁶ *Ibid*.

⁷ Peterson, Gary Dean. *Vikings and Goths: A History of Ancient and Medieval Sweden.* Jefferson, North Carolina: *McFarland & Company*, 2016. – P. 231.

island of Berezan' in the mouth of Dnieper on what was known as the Varangian Way «from the Varangians to the Greeks». The stone was found in a later grave and the original place is unknown. However, it is found on the island, which is mentioned in *De administrando imperio* as the island of St. Aitherios, where Rus' usually had a rest on the way between Kiev and Byzantium. It is evident that Grani chose a place where his monument could be read and understood. Excavations on the island of Berezan' revealed «the gable-stone of a coffin» with an inscription in Scandinavian runes: *krani kerpi half þisi iftir kal filaka sin* [«Grani made this sarcophagus in memory of Karl, his partner»]⁸. Runestone was raised to make the memory of a person echo for an eternity⁹ (Samnordisk runtextdatabas).

The word «*half (hvalf)*» is often interpreted as burial mound or grave vault, but Mel'nikova proposed that Grani had not only erected the stone with the runic inscription, but even had made the mound, too. This assumption is, however, not necessary because the word *hvalf* could simply mean stone grave or sometimes also rune stone. Among 14 inscriptions with *hualf* (12), *hual* (1) and *half* (1) only one makes a differentiation between a rune stone and a mound or a grave (U170)¹⁰. Stefan Brink is noted that the runestone from Berezan' belongs to the type of burial monument made of limestone or sandstone that had strong connections to churches and were raised on many graveyards in Sweden. Because archaeological excavations on Berezan' revealed remains of a settlement and graves from the tenth to twelfth centuries it would be possible to suggest the existence there of a church and Scandinavian visitors¹¹.

What makes Berezan's runestone more interesting is that the shape of the runestone is very reminiscent of the Gotlandic picture stones, leading some to interpret this stone, and the ones mentioned on it, as Gotlanders. However, their names are not «typical» Gotlandic names, which might indicate that they are from mainland Sweden. The translation of the Icelandic word «*felag*», from the word *filaka* on the stone to the connection with trade, Gun Westholm has interpreted the word as meaning «business partner»¹². The term «*felagi*» occurs in conjunction with «*drengr*» in a number of inscriptions from Denmark and Skåne (D 1, D 68, D 127, D 262, D 330, D 339, Vg 112)¹³ (Samnordisk runtextdatabas), but never with other words, suggesting that it too carries the implication of a close relationship: it is, indeed, often translated as “partner”¹⁴. The term «*felagi*» has often been generalized to friend / comrade but the actual meaning is rather “joint property”. Thus the term has been interpreted as both fellow-in-arms and fellow-in-trade, the exact meaning conditioned by each individual inscription¹⁵. Karl and Grani, mentioned on the stone of Berezan' island, cannot be clearly identified although they may be from Gotland as suggested by the use of the term «*hvalf*» (coffin / vault) found only in this region¹⁶.

⁸ Samnordisk runtextdatabas. Retrieved from <http://skaldic.abdn.ac.uk/db.php?id=1009&if=srdb&table=collections>

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Düwel K., Kuzmenko Y. Runic inscriptions in Eastern Europe – an overview. *Studia Historyczne R. LVI*, 2013. – P. 337.

¹¹ Brink S., Price N. *The Viking World*. – New York, 2008. – P. 520.

¹² Westholm G. *Gotland och omvärlden*. In: Pettersson, Ann-Marie (ed.). *Spillingsskatten: Gotland i vikingatidens världshandel*. – Visby: Länsmuseum på Gotland, 2008. – P. 126.

¹³ Samnordisk runtextdatabas. Retrieved from: <http://skaldic.abdn.ac.uk/db.php?id=1009&if=srdb&table=collections>

¹⁴ Jesh J. *Ships and Men in the Late Viking Age: The Vocabulary of Runic Inscriptions and Skaldic Verse*. UK, 2001. – P. 45.

¹⁵ Hedenstierna-Jonson Ch. *The Birka warrior. The material culture of a martial society*. – Stockholm, 2006. – P. 79.

¹⁶ Ibid. – P. 51.

This word was borrowed into English where it became fellow. Its primary meaning is shown by its etymology. The first element is Old Norse *fe*, «money» the second is related to the verb *leggja* to «lay». Thus «fellow» is someone who laid down money in a common enterprise, a business partner. This sense is certainly recorded in runes. Presumably this is a relic of two partners in trade one of whom died on their travels. A rare piece of evidence a tenth-century runic inscription carved into a stone on the island of Berezan' also testifies that a considerable part of the travelers of the Dnieper route came from a Scandinavian community. So, either the merchants travelled in felag with Scandinavians, or used people in as intermediaries.

Conclusions

An interest in the landscape settings of monuments has been growing over the past few decades and it has been demonstrated that landscape is not just a neutral backdrop but an integral part of Berezan's runestone. As Johnson suggests: «people in the past did not simply live, discard items, and build on sites, but they also interacted with the landscape beyond»¹⁷.

Through the relationship that runestone has had with geography and space of Berezan's island we can understand how individuals behaved in the landscape. The runestone on the Berezan's island appears as a voice and a place of memory. It clearly shows that memory was important at the Age of Vikings.

This research shows how in the past shared memories were important and defining aspects of life, and the practical actions of dealing with commemorating the dead formed a central focus for the definition of social memory.

The role of memory had been crucial to both the initial creation and subsequent use of rune inscription and its information. Runestones may essentially be fragments of memory in the sense that they serve to activate memories of distant places and trade activity.

References

- Braun, F. A. (1911). Dneprovskiy porog v runicheskoy nadpisi. *Sbornik arkheologicheskikh statey, podnesenny A. A. Bobrinskomu*, 270–276. [in Russian].
- Braun, F. A. (1907). Shvedskaya runicheskaya nadpis, naydannaya na o. Berezan. *Izvestiya Arkheologicheskoy komissii* 23, 66–75. [in Russian].
- Brink, S., & Price, N. (2008). *The Viking World*. New York, 717. [in English].
- Düwel, K. & Kuzmenko, Y. (2013). Runic inscriptions in Eastern Europe – an overview. *Studia Historyczne* R. LVI, 326–361. [in English].
- Garipzanov, I. & Tolochko, O. (2011). *Early Christianity on the way from the varangians to the Greeks*. Kiev: Institute of Ukrainian History. [in English].
- Hedenstierna-Jonson, Ch. (2006). *The Birka warrior. The material culture of a martial society*. Stockholm. [in English].
- Jesh, J. (2001). *Ships and Men in the Late Viking Age: The Vocabulary of Runic Inscriptions and Skaldic Verse*. UK. [in English].
- Johnson, M. (2005). Thinking about landscape in C Renfrew and P Bahn (eds) *Archaeology. The key concepts*. London: Routledge, 156–159. [in English].
- Lebedev, G. S. (1985). *Epokha vikingov v Severnoy Yevrope*. Leningrad, 286. [in Russian].

¹⁷ Johnson, M. (2005). Thinking about landscape in C Renfrew and P Bahn (eds) *Archaeology. The key concepts*. London: Routledge, 156.

Moravchik, G. (1967). Constantine Porphyrogenitus. De administrando imperio / Greek text with English trans. by R. J. H. Jenkins. – Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection. Retrieved from http://s155239215.onlinehome.us/turkic/10_History/DAIConst.Porphyr/Porphyr-rogennetosDAIpp1-85En. [in English].

Mel'nikova, Ye. A. (2001). Skandinavskie runicheskie nadpisi. Novye nakhodki i interpretatsii. Teksty, perevod, kommentariy. Moskva. [in Russian].

Page, R. I. (1987). Reading the past runes. London: Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Publications. [in English].

Peterson, G. D. (2016). Vikings and Goths: A History of Ancient and Medieval Sweden. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company. [in English].

Samnordisk runtextdatabas. Retrieved from: <http://skaldic.abdn.ac.uk/db.php?id=1009&if=srdb&table=collections> (1.11.18). [in English].

Svanidze, A. A. (2014). Vikingi – lyudi sagi: zhizn i nrawy. Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. [in Russian].

УДК 930.2:94(477.52/6)

СЛОБІДСЬКА МЕЖОВА КОНТОРА (1769–1781 / 1782 рр.): СТРУКТУРА, ОСОБОВИЙ СКЛАД, ФУНКЦІЇ

Петрова Інна

(Донецький національний університет імені Василя Стуса)

Петров Олексій

(Державний університет телекомунікацій)

У статті досліджується проблема формування особового складу та структури Слобідської межової контори, окреслено коло посадових обов'язків її співробітників, відтворено їхнє повсякденне життя. Також аналізуються нормативно-правові акти, що сприяли створенню та функціонуванню Слобідської межової контори, проведенню Генерального межування в регіоні: «Инструкция землемерам, к генеральному всей империи размежеванию (№ 12570 от 13 февраля 1766 г.)», «О учреждении Слободской Межевой Конторы в Харькове. Сенатский указ (№ 13293 от 7 мая 1769 г.)», «О размежевании вновь присоединенных к Харьковскому наместничеству селений и земель от Курского наместничества. Сенатский указ (№ 15149 от 16 апреля 1781 г.)». Також на основі архівних документів реконструйовано етапи проведення Генерального межування на теренах слобідсько-українських земель. Виокремлено проблеми, що впливали на перебіг, терміни та якість межових робіт у Слобідсько-Українській губернії. Серед них – рівень освіти та професійної підготовки працівників межової контори, процес заселення та господарського освоєння регіону, що вплинуло на становлення тамтешньої системи землеволодіння та землекористування, численні випадки порушення норм земельного та кримінального законодавства учасниками межового процесу, фіксація великої кількості конфліктів тощо. Однак, незважаючи на всі труднощі, службовці Слобідської межової контори досягли основної мети – впорядкували поземельні відносини в губернії з урахуванням традицій і форм землекористування та землеволодіння, що раніше побутували в регіоні; закріпили остаточно право власності дворян на землю, завершили період тривалих поземельних конфліктів, окреслили площу ділянок, що перебували у власності держави.

Ключові слова: Генеральне межування, Слобідська межова контора, межувальники, земельна дача, план дачі.