UDC 008:069.51:64:94(447.46)"653"

DOI: 10.18523/2617-8907.2019.2.41-46

Andrii Moskalenko

THE MATERIAL CULTURE OF THE OLD RUS POPULATION AS A SUBJECT OF A MUSEUM EXPOSITION: INFORMATION AND ATTRACTIVE PROPERTIES

The article considers the problem of determination of information and attractive properties of the Old Rus population's material culture as a subject of a museum exposition. The author analyzes material culture artefacts and archaeological complexes in general. Exhibits are divided into three groups by information and attractive properties: subsidiary, basic, and unique. The first has the least attractive level, the second has the middle attractive level, and the third has the highest attractive level. One of the categories of archaeological findings cannot be a base of an "Old Rus period" museum exposition. The author came to conclusions that artefacts of every group should be represented in a museum exposition.

Keywords: material culture, the Old Rus, the Kaniv Dnipro River region, museum exposition, exhibits, information properties, attractiveness.

The thesis. The culture of Old Rus people (the 10th–13th centuries) took an important place in history of the traditional Ukrainian culture because it is at its civilization origins. The involvement of material remains of Old Rus culture to the present-day cultural process by the way of exhibiting in museum expositions is one of the important tasks of the museums of different historical and cultural profiles.

The determining of exact criterions for choosing artefacts during the process of creation of museum expositions and exhibitions, based on the information and attractive properties of these artefacts is very important because it can help us to display a wide amount of information about the material culture of Old Rus society in a museum exposition.

The state of scientific knowledge. The studying of archaeological remnants as museum specimens is a modern direction in the national science. A number of scientific studies analyze the material culture as a museum subject in scientific literature of Ukraine. Among the latest works may be distinguished PhD research of specialist in museology Olha Hrabovska. She studies brick as museum specimens (based on materials from the 16th to the 20th centuries from Vinnytsia city, Ukraine) (Грабовська 2018, p. 144–67). Archaeologist and museum expert Dmytro Nykonenko has analyzed material culture of the Late Scythian population (the 2nd B.C. – 1st A.D.) of hillforts of Lower Dnipro River territory in his PhD thesis. The author has come to the conclusion that the general base of museum expositions dedicated to the archaeological monuments ought to be represented by the ceramic dishes as the most massive archaeological findings (Никоненко 2018, p. 11). Nevertheless, there is no the study in literature that deals with the determination criterions choice towards the museum-exhibit-value artefacts among the Old Rus archaeological collections discovered in Kaniv region, which determines the relevance of the topic.

The purpose of this article is to determine the information and attractive properties of different categories [1] of material cultural heritage of Old Rus population (the 10th–13th centuries) as museum specimens (at Kaniv Dnipro River region example).

The general presentation. Archaeological excavations at Kaniv region began in the 19th century and still continue. There are more than sixty Old Rus archaeological sites discovered at Kaniv Dnipro River territory during this time. The famous ones are (from north to south) the Monastyrok area archaeological complex (which include the hillfort, burial site, and the remnants of two "Zarub" churches), the Hryhorivka settlements and burial site, the Buchak settlement, the Old Rus town of Kaniv (where preserves rebuilded in the Ukrainian Baroque style the Saint George cathedral (12th century)), the Kniazha Hora hillfort, the Divych-Hora hillfort (at Sakhnivka village area), and others. That is why the source base of the research is the Old Rus (the 10th–13th centuries) archaeological heritage of Kaniv Dnipro River region discovered and published by other researchers (Каргер 1950; Мезенцева 1968; Максимов 1980, 1988; Петрашенко 2001, 2005).

[1] The term "category" should be understood as a group of artefacts that are related by functional value and technical and typological characteristics. For example, these are ceramic dishes, agricultural black-metal tools, silver jewelries, bronze body crosses, etc.

It is well known that the main goal of museum exposition of common historical-profile is to display a wide range of information about Old population's life and culture but not the modern archaeological reality. That is why, in our opinion, one of the categories of archaeological findings should not be a basis for the historical times archaeological exposition because it does not display the range aspects of Old population's culture such as metallurgy and metal products, glassmaking, bone and horn industry, aspects of ancient trade, spiritual life and religion.

We determine the information properties of an ancient artefact as a potential museum exhibit for the historical information about the ancient human (society) or its culture which is encoded in this artefact (by the principle of historical interpretation) and also for the representation level of such artefacts type in culture layers of Old Rus time's archaeological monuments (by the statistical principle). The attractive level is determined, traditionally, by the appearance.

The principle of historical interpretation is based on such characteristics as technical and typological features, the functional value and origins of the artefact, the social affiliation and ethnicity of the artefact's owner, or a social value of the object for Old population. One of the basic characteristics is social, because old material culture remains closely connected with certain social groups or with society in general.

The social stratification of Kaniv region in Old Rus times is directly examined in works of Valentyna Petrashenko. The common people at Kaniv Dnipro River territory were slaves, free peasants, craftsmen, and common clergy. The top of the society were prince's warriors (multi-ethnic "druzhyna") who also acted as the administrative authority on the ground, feudal landlords (Петрашенко 2005, p. 145), and also ringleaders of Turkic-tribe nomads military formations who had settled at South borderlands of Kyivan Rus (Моргунов 2009, p. 184).

Of course, the material culture within the top of Old Rus Kaniv region society is characterized by higher level of material welfare, that brightly illustrated by the symbols of authority and other prestigious items including produced with precious materials (Петрашенко 2005, p. 147–8; Моргунов 2009, p. 184).

The Old Rus social value objects are represented by defensive constructions, burial monuments, and religious buildings at Kaniv Dnipro River territory (Максимов 1988; Петрашенко 2005; Моргунов 2009).

It needs to be kept in mind that "Old Rus period" exposition should also illustrate a local specificity of the population's culture. During Old Rus times Kaniv region was a syncretic-culture territory. First, it was a borderland of the Rus State which was adjoined to the Nomad Steppe. Second, it was a land on the medieval trade route from the North European lands to Byzantine Empire. Third, Kaniv region was also a territory which was colonized by the members of different ethnic groups.

Except the supra-ethnic cultural practices such as the Old Rus State culture and Christianity culture, several ethnic and cultural traditions had co-existed during 10th–13th centuries at Kaniv Dnipro River land. The most ethnic component usually belonged to East Slaves folk culture (Петрашенко 2005, p. 149). The second place takes material remains of the Turkic-language community folk culture (Моргунов 2009, p. 178, 184). Other ethnic and cultural groups were represented by West Slaves (Моргунов 2009, p. 224), Volga's Bulgarians (Петрашенко 2005, p. 149), and others.

The second local specificity of the population's culture of Kaniv Dnipro River territory during Old Rus times deals with intercultural contacts, in particular international trade. The Old Rus culture layers include rare foreign goods from the Byzantine Empire, East World, the Central and Western Europe (Мезенцева 1968, p. 118–9; Петрашенко 2005, p. 130).

That is why the statistical principle is based on four aspects. The first point considers artefacts which are typical or rare for the Old Rus State supra-ethnic culture. The second point considers artefacts which are typical or rare for the folk East Slave material culture. The third point considers material remains of traditional culture of other ethnic groups. The fourth point includes rare for Old Rus culture layers imports.

Thus, we propose to divide archaeological findings and complexes into three groups by the information and attractive value for a museum exhibition: subsidiary, basic, and unique. Every group can also be divided into three subgroups by the analogy principle (*Table*) [2].

The exhibits of the subsidiary group are the evidence of subsidiary information about the life and culture of Old Rus population of Kaniv Dnipro River territory. The items are not markers of the archaeological culture but they deal with everyday life of general population (including the social elite). This group of materials complements the basic group of exhibits and enlarges the information diapason of the museum exhibition.

[2] In this work we consider the lower layers of society and the social elites under the common term 'General population'.

Table. **The Old Rus population's material culture of Kaniv Dnipro River region from the 10th–13th centuries as a subject of a museum exposition: information and attractive properties**

The attractive level	The value for museum exhibition		Characteristics	Examples 1	Examples 2
				Groups of archaeological findings by 10th–13th centuries from the Old Rus monuments of Kaniv Dnipro River territory	Archaeological complexes by 10th–13th centuries discovered at Kaniv Dnipro River territory
Low	Subsidiary materials	Subsidiary	Things which are not artefacts, but they deal with the Old Rus human life. These materials are also results of adaptation of the Old Rus human to environment	Anthropological remnants; animal and fish bones; burnt corn of cereals	The concentration of 1922 human bones from 66 individuals that were discovered in 1960, in the pit № 1 at the Kniazha Hora area (did not preserved)
		Basic	Things that deal with the wider public but are not finished products. The subjects of material culture which are the intermediate stage to finished products (raw materials with traces of processing, craft blanks, production defects, etc.)	Burnt puddle (clay); iron slag	Household pits
		Unique	Things which are carriers of subsidiary but statistically rare information	Iron bar, metallurgical nozzles	-
Middle	The base of the exposition	Subsidiary	Finished products which have low information potential and attractive level and are the evidence of subsidiary information for base of exhibition	Iron nails, staples, fishing hooks; grey slate grinder; ceramic and stone grinder disks	The remnants of household buildings
		Basic	The things or complexes that deal with daily (year or season) house or economic usage by a general population. Usually these things or complexes surrounded Old Rus people at home and also during most common economic activity (agriculture works, animal husbandry, fishing, etc.)	Basic types of ceramic dishes (pots, large earthenware pots), black metal tools and household items (knifes, door locks and keys, bucket knobs, fire steel); iron agricultural tools (shovels, primitive proto plows (ards), scythes, sickles, wood axes); bronze and black metal weapon (arrowheads, spearheads); pink pyrophyllite Ovruch slate spindle whorl; Old Rus brick – plinth-form brick	The remnants of living buildings with clay or stone stoves
		Unique	1. Artefacts that deal with everyday usage by a general population but which are statistically rare exemplars 2. Artefacts or complexes that deal with everyday usage by one individual (small group of individuals) but not by a member of social elite 3. Imports that deal with common usage by the wider public For first example, it can be rare type of ceramic dishes, common pots with the rare type of ornamentation, bottoms of vessels with rare type of pottery stumps. For the second example, it can be blacksmith's tools For the third example, it can be Byzantine amphoras, Byzantine glass beads and bracelets	Rare types of ceramic dishes (pitchers of Kyivan type – little East Slavic amphora, bowls, small and miniature ceramic forms); ceramic dishes with rare types of ornamentation; rare types of convex bottom stamps; import ceramic vessels (Byzantine amphora); iron-making tools (blacksmith's instruments); details of the clothes, jewelry and toiletries (iron or bronze belt buckles and jewelries, bronze hand mirrors; bronze or copper earrings, temple rings; amber beads; bronze, copper or glass beads, rings, bracelets; bone combs); prints of textile materials on the metal surfaces; stone, bronze, or glass symbol things (pagan amulets, pagan pendant "Lunnitsas", Christian Body Crosses, medallions, Encolpions, etc.); bronze or glass pendants	The remnants of craft buildings and object (Firing kiln for pottery and remnants of metallurgical production (fragments of metallurgical furnace and iron slags) from the Monastyrok area); the remnants plinth-form-brick stove in the living building at the Monastyrok area

Table (cont'd)

The attractive level	The value for museum exhibition		Characteristics	Examples 1 Groups of archaeological findings by 10th–13th centuries from the Old Rus monuments of Kaniv Dnipro River territory	Examples 2 Archaeological complexes by 10th–13th centuries discovered at Kaniv Dnipro River territory
High	Unique exhibits	Subsidiary	1. Things that deal with usage by the wide range of population (as common people as social elites) but which represented by rare exemplars and are unique archaeological findings (for example, ceramic dishes covered with glass mass; silver ear and temple rings; silver money equivalent – "hryvnia" of Kyivan type) 2. Things which are the evidences of subsidiary information about the top of society (for example, bronze head of sword sheath) 3. Remnants of more high technological crafts, in general, deal with non-ferrous metal production and processing, glass processing, etc. 4. Import things deal with the wider public which are carriers of statistically rare information (for example, foreign coins)	Ceramic dishes covered with glass mass; ceramic dishes with bottom stamps of the symbol of Riuryk prince dynasty – "Riuryk" emblems; cooper, bronze or glass dishes; Old Rus and foreign coins and other money equivalents, such as silver bars – money equivalent – "hryvnias" of Kyivan type; bronze/cooper signet rings; head of swords sheath; combat weights; details of horse and horseman equipment (bridles, stirrups, spurs); prints of textile materials on the metal surfaces; casting forms; smalt (different colour glass geometric figures for mosaics)	The evidences of glass-making (glass slags and drops) (at the Kniazha Hora area, at the Monastyrok area); treasures without precious materials (the Kniazha Hora fortress); two sarcophaguses from Zarub monastery complex (did not preserved)
		Basic	1. Things that deal with the top of society 2. Manor houses of the top of society 3. A works of Old Rus art 4. A remnants (fundaments) of Old Rus monumental architecture 5. An import things that deal with the top of the society (prestige things, weapons, etc.)	Metal weapon (swords, battle axes, maces, barrel-flail, shield umbos, metal helmets, fragments of chain mail); Old Rus stucco with murals; monuments of epigraphic; personal lead stamps; stone, bone, bronze, silver, gold and other materials rare things with symbol value (Old Rus hangings with symbol information – Body Icons, etc.); silver details of clothes and jewelries (beads, rings, bracelets, earrings, pendants, temple rings, silver necklace "hryvna" (pectorals), silver "kolts" – temple ornamented forms)	The remnants of stone-brick fundament ditches of "Zarub" Christian temples (churches); treasures which include silver products (the Kniazha Hora fortress); the remnants of Manor houses of the top of society (the Kniazha Hora fortress, the Monastyrok fortress)
		Unique	1. The most rare archaeological findings (including artefacts that are represented by a singular exemplars) are produced of precious materials and deal with the top of the society 2. The most rare archaeological findings (including artefacts that are represented by a singular exemplars) are produced with common materials but which are the evidence of statistically more rare and unique information (for example, images of principles symbols of "Riuryk" dynasty)	Gold jewelries of symbols of the authority – the princely diadem from Sachnivka area, gold "kolts" with glass mass-images; hangings with symbol information – Old Rus "Zmiovyks"; Old Rus stucco with murals with graphite; things with symbol of Riuryk prince dynasty – "Riuryk" emblems)	Treasures which include gold products (the Kniazha Hora fortress)

The basic group of archaeological findings is the general base for a museum exposition. These artefacts were daily objects (year or season) that have been used by general population (without prestigious things and authority symbols). Usually these artefacts are statistically majority in Old Rus archaeological collections.

One of the goals of unique archaeological findings is to enhance the common attractive level of a museum exhibition. Artefacts of this group usually are statistically minority in the culture layers of the Old Rus archaeological monuments. A general number of these products deal with daily or rare usage by the top of the Old Rus society. Artefacts of this group are the evidence of exclusive historical information and they are the most attractive exhibits.

It should be understood that archaeological complexes, in general, are more informative as historical sources because they usually consist of a number of different artefacts and non-cultural remains (anthropological remnants, bones, agricultures, etc.) which preserve information about short historical-time events or processes. Archaeological complexes show to museum visitors or tourists specific information about the Old population's life and culture like house life, some phase of production, social connections, folk or religious rituals and rites during the short historical period, episode, or moment.

In conclusion, one of categories of archaeological findings from 10th–13th centuries from Kaniv Dnipro River region should not be a basis for "Old Rus period" exposition because it illustrates a narrow range of aspects of Old Rus population's life. The most attractive archaeological findings (precious material jewelries, weapons, etc.) also should not be a basis for exposition because these artefacts illustrate only a life of the top of society.

Thus, artefacts of all the three groups should be represented in a museum exposition with the aim to display a wide range of information about Old Rus population's material culture at Kaniv Dnipro River territory. In our opinion, artefacts of the basic group should take the central place in the museum exposition because they deal with the life of general population.

Список використаної літератури

Грабовська О. В. Цегла ручного формування як пам'ятка історії та культури (на прикладі м. Вінниці XVI – середини XX ст.) : дис. ... канд. іст. наук / Центр пам'яткознавства НАН України і УТОПІК. Київ, 2018. 290 с.

Каргер М. К. Развалины Зарубского монастыря и летописный город Заруб. *Советская археология*. 1950. № 13. С. 33–62.

Максимов Е. В., Петрашенко В. А. Славянские памятники у с. Монастырек на Среднем Днепре. Киев, 1988. 146 с.

Максимов Є. В., Петрашенко В. О. Городище Монастирьок VIII–XIII ст. на Середньому Дніпрі. *Археологія*. 1980. № 33. С. 3–17.

Мезенцева Г. Г. Древньоруське місто Родень (Княжа гора). Київ : Вид-во Київського університету, 1968. 184 с.

Моргунов Ю. Ю. Древо-земляные укрепления Южной Руси X–XIII веков. Москва : Наука, 2009. 303 с.

Никоненко Д. Д. Городища Нижнього Подніпров'я як об'єкти музеєфікації та охорони культурної спадщини : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук / Центр пам'яткознавства НАН України і УТОПІК. Київ, 2018. 21 с.

Петрашенко В. А. Древнерусское село (по материалам поселений у с. Григоровка). Киев, 2005. 264 с.

Петрашенко В. О., Максимов Є. В. Трахтемирів. Подорож у давнину. Київ, 2001. 104 с.

References

Hrabovska, Olha. 2018. "Tsehla ruchnoho formuvannia yak pamiatka istorii ta kultury (na prykladi m. Vinnytsi 16 – seredyny 20 st.)." PhD diss., Tsentr pamiatkoznavstva NAN Ukrainy i UTOPIK. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].

Karger, M. K. 1950. "Razvaliny Zarubskogo monastyrya i letopisnyy gorod Zarub". *Sovetskaya arkheologiya* 13:33–62 [in Russian].

Maksymov, Yevhen, and Valentyna Petrashenko. 1980. "Horodyshche Monastyrok 8–13 st. na Serednomu Dnipri". *Arkheolohiia* 33:3–17 [in Ukrainian].

_____1988. *Slavyanskie pamyatniki u s. Monastyrek na Srednem Dnepre*. Kyiv [in Russian].

Mezentseva, Halyna. 1968. *Drevnoruske misto Roden (Kniazha Hora)*. Kyiv: Publisher of Kyiv University [in Ukrainian].

Morgunov, Yuriy. 2009. *Drevo-zemlyanye ukrepleniya Yuzhnoy Rusi 10–13 vekov*. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

Nykonenko, Dmytro. 2018. "Horodyshcha Nyzhnoho Podniprovia yak obiekty muzeiefikatsii ta okhorony kulturnoi spadshchyny." PhD diss., Tsentr pamiatkoznavstva NAN Ukrainy i UTOPIK. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].

Petrashenko, Valentyna. 2005. *Drevnerusskoe selo (po materialam poseleniy u s. Grigorovka)*. Kyiv [in Russian].

Petrashenko, Valentyna, and Yevhen Maksymov. 2001. *Trakhtemyriv. Podorozh u davnynu*. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].

Москаленко А. В.

МАТЕРІАЛЬНА КУЛЬТУРА НАСЕЛЕННЯ ДАВНЬОЇ РУСІ ЯК ПРЕДМЕТ МУЗЕЙНОЇ ЕКСПОЗИЦІЇ: ІНФОРМАЦІЙНІ ТА АТРАКТИВНІ ВЛАСТИВОСТІ

Статтю присвячено аналізу матеріальної культури давньоруського населення Канівського Подніпров'я з погляду її інформаційних та атрактивних властивостей як предмета музейної експозиції.

Проаналізовано як предмети матеріальної культури, так і нерухомі археологічні об'єкти та комплекси. Інформаційні властивості давніх артефактів як потенційних музейних експонатів запропоновано визначати за історичною інтерпретацією та статистичним принципом. Рівень атрактивності традиційно визначається зовнішнім виглядом артефакту і має відносний характер.

До історичної інтерпретації входить низка характеристик: техніко-типологічні особливості артефактів, їхнє функціональне значення, походження, соціальна страта та етнічна належність власника або значення об'єкта для давнього суспільства в період його функціонування за прямим призначенням. У музейній експозиції також повинні висвітлюватися регіональні особливості історико-культурного розвитку Канівського Подніпров'я у X–XIII ст.

Статистичний принцип враховує чотири аспекти. У першому випадку статистично опрацьовуються для потреб музейної експозиції масові або рідкісні типи артефактів, притаманні «надетнічній» загальнодержавній культурі Давньої Русі. До другого належать матеріальні залишки, притаманні традиційній культурі східних слов'ян. До третього – об'єкти матеріальної спадщини, характерні для традиційної культури іноетнічних груп, які проживали на теренах Канівського Подніпров'я в давньоруський час. Четвертий аспект стосується імпортних речей.

Отже, за інформаційними властивостями експонати розподілено на три групи: допоміжні, основні та унікальні. Перші відносно інших мають найменшу атрактивність, другі – середню, треті – високу.

Експонати групи «допоміжні» доповнюють музейну експозицію, розширюючи її «інформаційний діапазон». Артефакти групи «основні» є рештками предметів матеріальної культури, здебільшого статистично найпоширеніших у культурних нашаруваннях пам'яток і пов'язаних із широкими масами давньоруського населення Канівського Подніпров'я. Знахідки групи «унікальні» спрямовані на підвищення загального рівня атрактивності експозиції. Переважно це речі, пов'язані з представниками соціальної верхівки давньоруського суспільства; або знахідки, які є носіями статистично рідкісної історичної інформації.

Автор доходить висновку, що задля відображення якомога ширшої інформації про матеріальну культуру давньоруського населення в музейній експозиції мають бути представлені експонати всіх трьох груп. Однак центральне місце має належати експонатам групи «основні», оскільки саме вони відображають характер матеріальної культури найширших мас населення.

Ключові слова: матеріальна культура, Давня Русь, Канівське Подніпров'я, музейна експозиція.

Матеріал надійшов 26.02.2019