

Таким чином, в цілому останні генетичні дослідження не суперечать археологічним і палеонтологічним даним та допомагають більш глибоко зрозуміти такий важливий процес як доместикація.

УДК 930.2:003.345 (48)

## THE INFLUENCE OF THE VIKING TRADE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF KIEV: DATA OF THE SCANDINAVIAN RUNIC INSCRIPTIONS

*A. O. Kurzenkova*

The Eastern trade route from Scandinavia during the Viking Age known as “the way from the Varangians to the Greeks” exerted an important impact on the development of the city of Kiev and on the process of formation of the state of Kievan Rus’. Both medieval written sources and archaeological finds in the Dnieper – runic inscriptions are strong proofs to that.

The influence of the Viking trade on the development of Kievan Rus’ deserves particular attention. Commercial opportunity was a key factor. Due to trade, special trade-and-craft settlements appeared which formed the basis for the early cities of Kievan Rus’. During the Viking Age (from around 800 to around 1050) the Scandinavian merchants based at transit points on the great rivers – the Volga, later the Dnieper – formed the Eurasian trade route through the northern way. It was professional transcontinental trade by sea and river: the shortest, most economic route to Byzantium passed through Kievan Rus’. It started from the Varangian Sea, passed along the Neva, Lake Ladoga, Volkhov, Lake Ilmen, the Lovat, continued onto the Dnieper and further along the Dnieper and across the Black Sea to Constantinople. In the *Rus’ Primary Chronicle* it is described from the South to the North. Western European chroniclers knew the trade way as well. The account of Adam of Bremen reflects the late stage of “the way from the Varangians to the Greeks”, when it’s most active segment was the route from Hamburg to Jumne (Vollin/Jym).

The development of “the way from the Varangians to the Greeks” was caused by the transformation of the trans-European system of military and trade communications, in which the Scandinavian units played a major role. In all three variants of the *Rus’ Primary Chronicle* – according to the Laurentian Chronicle and the *Radzivillovsky* and *Ipatievsky* lists – there is an explanation that Varangians controlled not only northern variants of a way from the Baltic to the Volga – *Austrvegr* [‘East way’], but also a southern route across the Western Dvina to the headwaters of the Dnieper River, and the head of a route directly across the Dnieper – a site on “the way from the Varangians to the Greeks”. The most active use of “the way from the Varangians to the Greeks” occurred from the end of the ninth to the beginning of the eleventh century. During this period it became, on the one hand, an international transit trade route, and on the other hand, a most important tool of communication, ensuring the stability and unity of the Kievan Rus’: the movement of armed workers’ detachments, annual tribute, and regular exchange of goods between the northern and southern kingdoms.

Hopes for gaining access to the markets of Constantinople probably induced the Rus’ to try and establish itself there (by trade agreements) the tribute commonly paid by the local Slavs to the Khazars here and now could be shipped overseas rather than borne overland to the Khazar core lands. There had never before been a regular waterway between the Middle Dnieper region and ports lying to the south of the Black Sea. For the Byzantines the benefits were less commercial than political: by engaging their new neighbours in trade they could reduce raiding.

Kiev, situated on the high right bank of the Dnieper River, was the gateway of Rus’ trade and could control access. The trade transactions of the Rus’ were interrupted and stopped as soon as Kiev was captured by the steppe-nomads. Therefore there was a general economic

interest which tied all trade cities of Rus' to Kiev. That general interest was that Kiev was always open for trade traffic and that there was a free Steppe river waterway to the Caspian and Black Sea trading outposts, therefore there was a force able to defend the crossing point from enemies. The general interest also caused a larger concentration of armed people in Kiev. The importance of this general interest was created through economic activity during the subordination of the Rus' land by Kiev princes in the ninth and tenth centuries. Tribes who lived on the shore of the main river's trade routes going across the Dnieper recognized the power of Kiev over themselves. So Kiev's power was accepted by those who needed it (by tribes who participated in trade activity). The society united by the power of the Kievan prince has been quite mechanically formed of simple ethnographic and economic elements. The commercial capital played an important role until the eleventh century, without encountering a competitor on the side of land ownership. Excavations in the 1970s revealed in the lower part of the Kiev town several well-preserved wooden buildings and even complete merchant properties from the late ninth and tenth centuries. The finds testify that merchants and craftsmen were the main inhabitants there.

An archaeological excavation of an early South Slavic complex (*Shechekovitsa*) shows that settlements contain, along with the Slavic materials, items associated with other ethnographic groups including the Scandinavian.

The material offered to the historian by runic inscriptions includes original data on geographical names which were connected with the Viking trade. They contain data on medieval social and economic history that points to journeys to the east, helps to establish the geographical area where people had travelled, and indicates the function of the trade route to the Dnieper and further to the south. Toponyms represented on runestones represent the destination: only the large water routes to the east were important.

The runestone from *Pilgårds* (Gotland, Sweden, G 280) refers to the southern trade route along the Dnieper River. The inscription commemorates a man who must have died south of *Ru[f]staini* ['Rofstein'] while travelling in *Æifur* ['Aifor']. The latter indicates one of the dangerous Dnieper cataracts, whereas the former has been identified as a cliff located close to the cataract. So, the inscription was erected in honor of a Gotlandic merchant who died while sailing to Byzantium at one of the most dangerous places along the Dnieper route.

The rune stone from a farm at *Alstad* in eastern Toten (Norway, N 62) refers to three places; the first identifies the place of death and the other two specify the geographical location.

*Uitahol(m)(i)* ['Vitaholmr'] was identified with the strategic settlement of *Vitičev* by the Dnieper River, south of Kiev – where archaeological excavations carried out in 1959-1961 by *Rybakov B.* have revealed remains of Viking Age fortifications (*Vitičev* in 40 km. to the south of Kiev on the Dnieper Current). The second place name, *ustaulms*, established as ['Ustaholmr'] by Kleiber, has been connected with the *Ustje* ['Usti'] fortification at the mouth of the Dnieper.

Those two places may have functioned as the focal points of the ancient Kievan State in an otherwise unclear border region of *Garðar*. *Vitaholmr* and *Ustaholmr* may in N 62 function as blanket designations for certain districts in the Dnieper region, named on the basis of the fortified centres.

The only find of a runestone in the east came to light on the island of *Berezan'* near the mouth of the Dnieper (Ukraine). A slab was raised by *Grani* in memory of his companion *Karl* together with whom he made a trip, probably to Byzantium. The memorial runic monument was established not by relatives of the dead, but by his companion, the partner. Therefore it is unique for Eastern Europe. The island *Berezan'* is mentioned in connection with the functioning of the Dnieper trade way. Perhaps it served as a temporary haven for the ships which had not managed to get back home. Local involvement and the importance of the island *Berezan'* in Viking Age trade contacts was especially remarkable. Geographical names on Scandinavian runestones connected with the Viking trade are shown on the map of "the way from the Varangians to the Greeks"

Therefore, at the time of development of “the way from the Varangians to the Greeks,” Kiev was a city secured by fortifications which was capable both of defending its possessions and the merchant caravans passing through the territories it controlled. Thanks to this control Kiev could gain income not only from trade, but also from various taxes, duties on transit trade. This promoted not only development of its economic potential, but also its establishment as the political and military centre of Rus’.

УДК 929.7(477) «17»

## **ПОЛІТИЧНЕ СТАНОВИЩЕ ГЕТЬМАНЩИНИ XVIII СТ. В УКРАЇНСЬКИХ МЕМУАРНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛАХ**

*Л. І. Салазуб*

XVIII ст. – період в історії України, впродовж якого зміцнювалася російська абсолютна монархія та було ініційовано форсований наступ на автономію Гетьманщини. Українські керманічі, як могли, боролися за політичну самостійність, але зазнали поразки. У радянські часи дану проблему не актуалізували через заідеологізованість історичної науки. Представників українського істеблїшменту висвітлювали виключно зрадниками, не звертали увагу на особливості справжнього політичного розвитку Гетьманщини впродовж XVIII ст. Наразі, ситуація змінилася на краще: у науковців і пересічних людей є можливість вільного доступу до різних типів джерел. Враховуючи зміну акцентів у розвитку вітчизняної науки, сучасні дослідники звертають пильну увагу на мемуарні джерела українського походження, які показують нам реальну картину політичного життя на теренах Гетьманщини впродовж XVIII ст.

Політичне становище Гетьманщини XVIII ст. широко висвітлено в узагальнюючих працях, монографічних дослідженнях і статтях. В історії вивчення проблеми виразно виділяються три етапи: дореволюційний (XIX – поч. 20-х рр. XX ст.); радянський (поч. 20-х рр. XX ст. – 1991 р.) та сучасний (розпочався у 1991 р. й триває донині). Зокрема, Д. М. Бантиш-Каменський та М. А. Маркевич звертали пильну увагу на постаті гетьманів XVIII ст. Вони активно залучали до своїх праць значну кількість українських мемуарних джерел особового походження. Натомість, у працях радянських істориків М. А. Литвиненко, В. А. Смоля, О. М. Апанович політична історія Гетьманщини висвітлена побіжно та з урахуванням тогочасних ідеологічних настанов. Історики діаспори були більш сміливими в своїх твердженнях. Зокрема, О. П. Оглоблин детально висвітлює терор російського царя Петра I після вчинку І. Мазепи та початок форсованого наступу на автономні права України напередодні та під час гетьманства І. Скоропадського.

За часів незалежності України політичну історію Гетьманщини XVIII ст. дослідила низка вітчизняних істориків. Найбільший внесок зробили Б. Крупницький, В. М. Горобець, О. К. Струкевич та ін. Здебільшого, вони акцентують увагу на процесі ліквідації автономних прав. Однак, на жаль, відсутні комплексні дослідження, у яких би було висвітлено ключові перипетії політичної історії через призму мемуарних джерел. Враховуючи те, що джерела особового походження передають нам атмосферу подій, свідками яких були їх автори, ми ставимо за мету дослідити політичне становище Гетьманщини XVIII ст. за мемуарними джерелами українського походження.

Коло проблем політичної історії Гетьманщини XVIII ст., висвітлених в мемуарних джерелах українського походження, достатньо широке. Серед них – постать гетьмана І. Мазепи та становище Гетьманщини після Полтавської битви 1709 р. Зокрема, П. Орлик гостро засуджує дії керманічів Росії щодо українських земель. Він подає відомості про знущання московської влади над козаками, які відмовилися визнати російську владу й