

OLEG SVYATOSLAVICH SUBMITS TO VLADIMIR MONOMAKH ON THREE COUNTS

According to chronicle information Oleg submitted to Vladimir Monomakh on three counts, each one depriving him and his descendants of important political rights. First, at Lyubech Oleg agreed to being demoted below his brother David in political seniority in the dynasty of the Svyatoslavichi. Second, at Lyubech he also submitted to Monomakh by agreeing to let Monomakh displace him from his genealogical order of succession to Kiev. Third, Oleg submitted to Monomakh when he agreed to let all of Monomakh's numerous sons have the right to succeed their father to Kiev ahead of Oleg. The agreement in effect debarred the Ol'govichi from the right to occupy Kiev according to peaceful succession.

Key words: Oleg Svyatoslavich, Vladimir Monomakh, dynastic rights, princely struggle for control of Chernigov and Kiev.

First Izyaslav Yaroslavich (d. 1078) as prince of Kiev and then his brother Vsevolod (d. 1093), who succeeded him, seized the Chernigov lands from Oleg Svyatoslavich (d. 1115) and his brothers. The sons of Izyaslav and Vsevolod, Svyatopolk (d. 1113) and Vladimir Monomakh (d. 1125) who ruled Chernigov, in turn refused to return Chernigov to Oleg and the Svyatoslavichi. In his battles to reclaim his patrimonial domain from his two cousins Oleg solicited the help of the nomadic Polovtsy. As Oleg's allies they began pillaging his cousins' domains. The latter two persistently demanded that Oleg sever his ties with the tribesmen and join their alliance against the Polovtsy to help them stop the enemy incursions onto their domains. As Oleg refused to comply they declared war on him. In 1096 Monomakh's eldest son Mstislav of Novgorod finally won a decisive victory over Oleg forcing him to agree to attend a congress in Kiev with Svyatopolk and Monomakh at which the princes would be reconciled.

In October 1097, some seven months after Oleg surrendered unconditionally to Mstislav, Svyatopolk of Kiev in collaboration with Vladimir Monomakh convened a congress (*snem*) of all the princes of Rus' [1]. They assembled at the town of Lyubech located west of Chernigov on the left bank of the Dnepr. Even though Oleg was the vanquished prince and had no bargaining power, he evidently refused to meet with his cousins in Kiev and to stand on trial, as it were, before its hostile citizens. This can be inferred from the information that the two princes changed the location of the *snem* to Lyubech and also dispensed with the town's proposed multifarious tribunal. They also changed the number of participants to include, it appears, all the princes of Rus' descended from Yaroslav. The chronicler identifies the participants as follows.

Svyatopolk and Vladimir, David Igorevich, Vasil'ko Rostislavich [his elder brother Volodar' did not attend], David Svyatoslavich and his brother Oleg came and assembled at Lyubech to establish peace. They deliberated in the following manner: 'Why do we continue to feud amongst ourselves and bring ruin to the land of Rus'; the Polovtsy rejoice in our wars and ravage our lands. From

now on, let us be of one heart and preserve the land of Rus'. Each prince shall rule his patrimony: Svyatopolk [will rule] Kiev [and his father] Izyaslav's [patrimony]; Vladimir [Monomakh will rule his father] Vsevolod's [patrimony]; David and Oleg, Yaroslav [will rule their father] Svyatoslav's [patrimony]. To others Vsevolod already allocated towns: David got Vladimir [in Volyn']; of the Rostislavichi Volodar' got Peremyshl' and Vasil'ko got Terebovl'. Then they all kissed the cross pledging that in the future, should any prince attack another, all of them and the entire land of Rus' would join forces against the offender under the Holy Cross. And they kissed each other and returned to their domains [2].

Whereas Svyatopolk and Monomakh's main objective at the congress was to bring Oleg on side against the Polovtsy, Oleg's primary goal was to regain possession of his patrimonial domain of Chernigov. To judge from the chronicler's report, not just Oleg but the other princes attending the *snem*, especially the Rostislavichi in Galicia and David Igorevich in Vladimir in Volyn', also sought guarantees for their domains. Their patrimonies had been appropriated by the triumvirate, the three eldest sons of Yaroslav the Wise – Izyaslav, Svyatoslav, and Vsevolod, and their possession of their domains was now dependent on the goodwill of the prince of Kiev. They therefore demanded assurance from Svyatopolk that he would honour the allocation of domains made by Vsevolod Yaroslavich, his predecessor in Kiev. Svyatopolk and Monomakh's willingness to guarantee all the princes territorial security reveals they realized that the best way to promote peace and unity among the princes was to provide them with hereditary domains. The chronicler's report leads us to believe that the attendees at the congress were satisfied by the guarantees endorsed by all the princes present. Most importantly, of course, Svyatopolk and Monomakh would have promised to honour the rights of the other princes to keep their domains and promised that they would not, like the triumvirate had done, confiscate the domains of politically weaker Yaroslavichi [3]. Although all the princes sealed formally on oath their agreement to respect the permanence of their newly confirmed domains, the chronicler does not tell us that they made any pronouncement concerning the order of succession to Kiev.

It is noteworthy that the chronicler identified the patrimonies of Svyatopolk, Monomakh, and the three Svyatoslavichi, that is, the princes of the inner circle, only by the names of their fathers. Nevertheless, the patrimonies are readily identifiable. In addition to Kiev, Svyatopolk would keep Izyaslav's Turov. Monomakh would rule Vsevolod's patrimony of Pereyaslavl', Rostov, Suzdal', Beloozero, and Smolensk. The Svyatoslavichi, David, Oleg, and their younger brother Yaroslav, were given back their patrimonial domains of Chernigov and Murom. David Igorevich whom Vsevolod had reinstated in his father's patrimony of Vladimir in Volyn' in 1087, was confirmed in that domain. Finally, Volodar' and Vasil'ko's

rule was approved in Peremyshl' and Terebovl', the territories in Galicia that Vsevolod had given them not long before his death. The decisions agreed upon by the princes on oath, which reflected closely the so-called testament of Yaroslav the Wise, would serve as the cornerstone, so to speak, for the future political history of Rus'. Nevertheless, as we shall show from indirect evidence, Monomakh manipulated the decrees of the princes to his advantage and that of his descendants.

Although the princes at the congress were seemingly appeased by the allocation of domains, Svyatopolk and especially Monomakh exacted a heavy price from Oleg for his stubbornness in refusing to assist them against the Polovtsy. To judge from chronicle evidence he was demoted in the political hierarchy below his younger brother David. This can be inferred from the manner in which the chronicler presents the brothers' names in his report. He writes that "David and Oleg, Yaroslav [will rule] Svyatoslav's [patrimony]." In a list of princes it is customary for the chronicler to give the names in the order of the princes' genealogical seniority which determined a prince's political seniority. In this instance, since David is placed ahead of Oleg this suggests that Oleg, who was the genealogically older brother, was demoted in political seniority. This meant that David replaced him as the political head of the Svyatoslavichi [4]. This was the first occasion on which Oleg submitted to Vladimir Monomakh on a matter of genealogical precedence.

Although Svyatopolk and Monomakh punished Oleg for his intransigence, they nevertheless demonstrated their goodwill towards him and his brothers by reinstating them in their patrimonial domains. Indeed, in light of Oleg's campaigns against Monomakh and his sons, Monomakh might have demanded more severe penalties. For example, he and Svyatopolk could have consigned him to an inconsequential provincial town just as they would do three years later to David Igorevich. Although Oleg's punishment appears to be relatively lenient, additional indirect evidence strongly suggests that Svyatopolk and Monomakh, acting from their position of power, also imposed a penalty on the Svyatoslavichi as a dynasty. That penalty would be solely for Monomakh's benefit and the benefit of his descendants. It will be relevant to review our original observations here.

It appears that the princes at the congress, indubitably prompted by Monomakh, approved changing the political seniority of the three families descended from the triumvirs: Izyaslav, Svyatoslav, and Vsevolod. As has been noted above, the chroniclers normally listed the names of princes in the order of their genealogical seniority; a prince's seniority determined his political status. Consequently, it is noteworthy that in listing the names of the princes who arrived at the *snem* before any agreement was reached, the chronicler did not follow this genealogical order. Instead, he listed the names of the princes as follows: Svyatopolk, Vladimir Monomakh, David Igorevich, Vasil'ko Rostislavich, and last of all the Svyatoslavichi, David and Oleg.

The latter two, who according to their genealogical seniority should have been listed after Svyatopolk as Oleg and David, are placed out of genealogical sequence at the end of the list. The chronicler placed them there, it appears, because, prior to the congress, they had fallen in political status; they were the only two who were not in possession of a domain. David, at best, ruled Smolensk at the goodwill of Monomakh or, at worst, Monomakh removed him as prince of Smolensk when he was summoned to Lyubech. Oleg had lost both Chernigov and Murom to Monomakh.

After the congress ratified each prince's domain and Monomakh returned their patrimony of Chernigov to the Svyatoslavichi, the chronicler listed the princes' names in an altered order. He placed the Svyatoslavichi after Svyatopolk and Monomakh. Thus, in addition to being given back their patrimony, the change in the order of names indicates that Oleg and his brothers were upgraded from the bottom of the hierarchical ladder up to the third rung. Nevertheless, they were not returned to their proper genealogical position, the second rung, between Svyatopolk and Monomakh. This suggests that in 1097 the assembled princes seemingly decreed a new political order: Svyatopolk, Monomakh, and the Svyatoslavichi. It was to replace the traditional genealogical order: Svyatopolk, the Svyatoslavichi, and Monomakh [5]. We may assume that Monomakh used his position of power to advance himself in political seniority.

Promoting Monomakh to the rung immediately after Svyatopolk did not give him additional domains but it had other important political consequences for him and his descendants. Although the chronicler fails to explain the obvious result of Monomakh's advancement, the inference is that he became next in the line for succession to Kiev after Svyatopolk. Had he remained in the political rung below the Svyatoslavichi there was a very good chance that he would not live long enough to take his turn at occupying Kiev via peaceful succession. There were three Svyatoslavichi ahead of him in precedence and the youngest Yaroslav would most likely outlive him [6]. By being promoted in the political order, however, Monomakh would bypass all the Svyatoslavichi. The chronicles indirectly confirm that Monomakh's advancement in the political order made him next in line for Kiev after Svyatopolk. In 1113 he would indeed succeed Svyatopolk and, significantly, Oleg would not challenge his succession. This suggests that Oleg, who was his political senior according to genealogical seniority, saw no violation of the system of succession in Monomakh's occupation of Kiev and conceded that office to him. Although the chronicler fails to tell us that the princes at the congress made changes to the system of succession to Kiev, the order in which he places the names of the princes reveals that they modified it significantly. That change was exclusively for Monomakh's benefit.

The princes at the congress resolved three important issues for Svyatopolk, Monomakh, and the Svyatoslavichi. As we have seen, Svyatopolk and Monomakh's alleged

main concern was to secure a united defence of Rus' against the Polovtsy; they achieved this by pacifying Monomakh with Oleg. The latter's main objective was to regain possession of his patrimonial domain of Chernigov; the princes at the congress guaranteed him possession of his patrimony. In addition, Monomakh's unpublicized personal aim was to secure his succession and that of his descendants to Kiev. Thus he seemingly returned Chernigov to Oleg as a tradeoff; in return for their patrimony Oleg and the Svyatoslavichi relinquished to him their turn in the genealogical order of succession to Kiev. In the long term, Monomakh and his descendants benefited most from the decisions made at the congress. This was the second occasion on which Oleg submitted to Vladimir Monomakh on a matter of genealogical precedence [7].

Surprisingly, it is not until the year 1139, twenty four years after Oleg's death, that we learn about his third acquiescence to Vladimir Monomakh which would greatly debilitate the political fortunes of the princes of Chernigov. On 22 February of that year, four days after the death of Monomakh's son Yaropolk as prince of Kiev, his brother Vyacheslav from Turov, the new senior prince of the Monomashichi, arrived in Kiev. The metropolitan and the townspeople greeted him and "placed him on the throne of his father Vladimir" [8]. Vyacheslav was Monomakh's third son to sit on his father's throne. In light of the Kievans' support his future as prince of Kiev looked promising. Nevertheless, before his rule could be completely assured Vyacheslav had to secure pledges of allegiance not only from the other Monomashichi, but also from the princes of all the remaining dynasties, above all the Ol'govichi. He also had to negotiate new peace treaties with the Polovtsy. Unless he fulfilled these prerequisites successfully his reign in Kiev could be jeopardized.

Vyacheslav did not have sufficient time to secure pledges of allegiance from all the princes. Oleg's son Vsevolod prince of Chernigov marshalled a small force made up of Ol'govichi and their cousins the Davidovichi. He led them to Vyshgorod where the local militia joined him. On 4 March they marched against Kiev and attacked the western suburb known as the Kopyrev quarter (*konets*) [9]. Vsevolod's attack with a small force is not surprising in light of Vyacheslav's history of demonstrating a lack of political incentive and military talent. Vsevolod was aware that in the past Vyacheslav had shunned dynastic responsibilities and failed to exercise a leadership role. Whereas his younger brothers Yury and Andrey had defended their claims to succession to Pereyaslavl', Vyacheslav had been content to sit inactive in his domain of Turov. He had also demonstrated a singular lack of loyalty to family tradition when his brother Yaropolk appointed him to the Monomashichi patrimony of Pereyaslavl'. Indeed, while ruling the town his behaviour had been erratic resembling, according to Yaropolk, that of a Polovtsian. Not surprisingly, when Vsevolod attacked the Kopyrev *konets* Vyacheslav demonstrated his usual lack of incentive and made no effort to defend himself. As the new senior prince of the

House of Monomakh he could have appealed for help to his brothers, especially to Andrey in nearby Pereyaslavl', where he was prince. He had ample time to do so since Vsevolod readied himself for his attack on Kiev for some ten days. And yet, Vyacheslav took no action.

We are told that he refused to go into battle because he did not wish to shed Christian blood. In light of Vyacheslav's past conduct, it is difficult to accept this excuse at face value. The desire to save Christians from death was, of course, a noble altruistic motive and other princes from the House of Monomakh had used it in the past to avoid going to battle. In his "Instruction" (*Pouchenie*) Monomakh explained that in 1094, when Oleg had attacked him in Chernigov, he had yielded to Oleg out of pity for his Christian subjects. Monomakh's son Mstislav had used the same excuse in 1127 to avoid waging war against Vsevolod Ol'govich. In 1136 Yaropolk had also given this reason when he refused to go into battle against Vsevolod. Nevertheless, although a prince may have avoided going to war out of a genuine concern for his Christian subjects, on occasion that excuse was also given by chroniclers to cloak the real reason. He may have wished either to justify a prince's capitulation to a superior force when the outcome of the conflict was in question, or to shield the prince's cowardice, or as may have been the reason in Vyacheslav's case, to justify his unwillingness to fight for the prize to be won. That is, Vyacheslav's refusal to defend himself implies that he may have been only too happy to hand over Kiev to Vsevolod so that he could return to his preferred domain of Turov.

Vyacheslav responded to Vsevolod's attack with the following message that he sent via Metropolitan Mikhail. In it he defended his succession to Kiev with a unique argument.

Brother, I have come here [that is, to Kiev] after my brothers Mstislav and Yaropolk according to the testament of our fathers. But if you covet this throne and wish to abandon your patrimony, then, brother, I am younger than you so let it be yours. Withdraw to Vyshgorod for the time being and I shall return to my former domain, and Kiev shall be yours.

Vsevolod did as Vyacheslav requested and the latter returned to his domain of Turov. On 5 March Metropolitan Mikhail installed Vsevolod as prince of Kiev [10]. Significantly, Vsevolod could not occupy the town according to the traditional axiom that he had the right to sit on the throne of his father because his father Oleg had never ruled Kiev. He seized control of the capital through force with the approval of the Kievans. Usurpation was an accepted means of becoming prince of Kiev provided that the townspeople welcomed the aggressor as their prince.

Vyacheslav's reference "to the testament of our fathers" is an allusion to Vyacheslav's father Monomakh and Vsevolod's father Oleg. This is the only instance in the sources in which the two princes are reported concluding this pact. In 1097 at the Congress of Lyubech Svyatopolk and Monomakh had changed the order of succession to Kiev by placing Monomakh ahead of the

more senior dynasty of Svyatoslavichi, that is, ahead of Oleg and his two brothers David and Yaroslav. At a later date, not content with promoting himself in the line of succession, it would seem that Monomakh had forced Oleg to make an additional concession. According to it all of Monomakh's sons would succeed him to Kiev in genealogical order beginning with Mstislav. In this way Monomakh attempted to ensure that his descendants would become the sole ruling family of Kiev.

At the time that he and Oleg concluded their pact Monomakh had some seven living sons who were eligible to succeed him. The Svyatoslavichi, however, had only three princes. These were Oleg and his two younger brothers who all belonged to an older generation than Monomakh's sons. This meant that a number of the younger and more numerous Monomashichi would inevitably outlive the three Svyatoslavichi who would never sit on the throne of Kiev. Accordingly, the latter's sons, including Oleg's son Vsevolod, would also be debarred because their fathers had never sat on the throne of Kiev. When Oleg agreed to this pact, this was the third occasion on which he submitted to Vladimir Monomakh on a matter of genealogical precedence. The agreement in effect debarred the Ol'govichi from occupying Kiev according to peaceful succession. In the future they would have to challenge the Monomashichi with arms for their right to rule the capital of Rus'. In 1139 Oleg's son Vsevolod was the first such challenger.

According to the arrangement Monomakh's sons would also succeed him ahead of his genealogically most senior nephews, Svyatopolk Izyaslavich's sons, from the senior-most family of the triumvirate. Such a pact could not have been concluded while Svyatopolk was alive since he would have objected to his sons being debarred from succession to Kiev. Monomakh and Oleg therefore must have formulated their deal after Svyatopolk's death in 1113 and before Oleg's death in 1115.

Of Oleg's three submissions to Monomakh the third is the only one for which there is firm chronicle evidence. Consequently, since Oleg's first two submissions were determined according to indirect circumstantial data, Vyacheslav's declaration helps to give credence to Oleg's first two submissions. That is, it shows that he was prepared to make genealogical concessions at a great cost to himself and to his dynasty. For the sake of maintaining harmonious relations with Monomakh, he was compliant in his negotiations with his cousin even to the point of undermining his own political rights and those of his descendants.

In conclusion we have seen that Oleg submitted to Vladimir Monomakh on three counts, each one depriving him and his descendants of important political rights. First, at Lyubech Oleg agreed to being demoted below his brother David in political seniority in the dynasty of the Svyatoslavichi. Second, at Lyubech he also submitted to Monomakh by agreeing to let Monomakh displace him from his genealogical order of succession to Kiev. Third, Oleg submitted to Monomakh when he

agreed to let Monomakh's numerous sons to succeed their father to Kiev ahead of Oleg. The agreement in effect debarred the Ol'govichi from the right to occupy Kiev according to peaceful succession. In the future they would have to challenge the Monomashichi with arms for their right to rule the capital of Rus'.

Endnotes

1. On departing from the congress Vasil'ko Rostislavich arrived in Kiev on 4 November. Therefore, the congress presumably took place in October ("Ipat'evskaya letopis'," (Ipat.) *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey* (PSRL) 2, second edition (St. Petersburg, 1908), column (col.) 232; "Lavrent'evskaya letopis'," (Lav.) PSRL 1, second edition (Leningrad, 1926), col. 258).

2. Ipat., columns (cols) 230-231; Lav., cols 256-257.

3. See also, D. Ilovaysky, *Istoriya Rossii*, chast' 1: "Kievskiy period" (Moscow, 1876), page (p.) 128; D. Bagaley, *Istoriya Severnoy zemli do poloviny XIV stoletiya* (Kiev, 1882), p. 270.

4. For a more detailed examination of Oleg's demotion, see M. Dimnik, "Who was the Elder Svyatoslavich, Oleg (died [d.] 1115) or David (d. 1123)?" *Zberezhennia istoriko-kul'turnykh nadban' Siver-shchyny* (Hlukhiv, 2005), pages (pp.) 24-35.

5. See also, V. L. Yanin, "Mezhduknyazheskie otnosheniya v epokhu Monomakha i 'Khozhdenie' igumena Daniila," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoy literatury*, A.N. SSSR, Institut russkoy literatury, 16 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1960), p. 121.

6. Monomakh would die in 1125 (Lav., cols 293-296; Ipat., cols 289-290); Yaroslav would outlive him by four years and die in 1129 (PSRL 1, col. 301).

7. For a more detailed discussion of the congress, see M. Dimnik, *The Dynasty of Chernigov, 1054-1146* (Toronto, 1994), pp. 207-222.

8. See under the year 1138: Lav., col. 306; see under the year 1139: Ipat., col. 302; concerning the date, see N. G. Berezkhov, *Khronologiya russkogo letopisaniya* (Moscow, 1963), p. 52, 138.

9. Concerning the Kopyrev *konets*, see P. P. Tolochko, "O sotsial'no-topograficheskoy strukture drevnego Kiya i drugikh drevnerusskikh gorodov," *Arkheologicheskie issledovaniya Kiya 1978-1983 gg.* (Kiev, 1985), pp. 6-7. See also Dimnik, *The Dynasty of Chernigov*, p. 24.

10. "Moskovskiy letopisniy svod kontsa XV veka," PSRL 25 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1949), p. 34; under the year 1140, Ipat., cols 302-303.

Дімнік М. Олег Святославич тричі підкоряється Володимирі Мономаху

За літописними даними Олег тричі підкорявся Володимирі Мономаху і кожного разу втрачав для себе та своїх нащадків важливі політичні права. У першому випадку в Любечі 1097 р. Олег погодився віддати його брату Давиду політичну зверхність у династії Святославичів. У другому, в Любечі Олег також підкорився Мономаху і мусив відмовитись від свого права наслідувати Київ за генеалогічним ладом. У третьому випадку Олег підкорився Мономаху, коли визнав право усіх його численних синів успадкувати київське князіння після смерті їх батька поперед Олега. Фактично ця угода позбавляла Ольговичів можливості князувати у Києві за правом престолонаслідування.

Ключові слова: Олег Святославич, Володимир Мономах, династичні права, боротьба князів за столи у Чернігові та Києві.

Димник М. Олег Святославич трижды подчиняется Владимиру Мономаху

По летописным данным Олег трижды подчинялся Владимиру Мономаху, каждый раз утрачивая для себя и своих потомков важные политические права. В первом случае в Любече в 1097 г. Олег согласился уступить его брату Давиду политическое старшинство в династии Святославичей. Во втором, в Любече Олег также подчинился Мономаху, отказавшись от своего права на-

следовать Киев в генеалогическом порядке. В третьем случае Олег подчинился Мономаху, признав право всех его многочисленных сыновей наследовать киевское княжение после смерти их отца прежде Олега. Фактически это соглашение лишило Ольговичей возможности княжить в Киеве по праву престолонаследования.

Ключевые слова: Олег Святославич, Владимир Мономах, династические права, борьба князей за столы Чернигова и Киева.

14.03.2013 р.

УДК 902(477.51) «09/12»

О.М. Веремейчик

ПРОДУКЦІЯ ОВРУЦЬКОЇ ПРОФІЛІТОВОЇ ІНДУСТРІЇ НА ТЕРЕНАХ ЧЕРНІГІВСЬКОГО ПОЛІССЯ У Х–ХІІІ СТ.

У статті розглядаються вироби з пірофілітового сланцю на археологічних пам'ятках Чернігівського Полісся у Х–ХІІІ ст. Аналізуються шляхи попадання пірофіліту та виробів з нього у регіон.

Ключові слова: Чернігівське Полісся, Чернігів, Любеч, пірофілітовий сланець, Х–ХІІІ ст.

Значення речових джерел для реконструкції галузей давньоруської економіки важко переоцінити. Суттєве накопичення інформації, особливо за останні роки, дозволяє по-новому поглянути на багато проблем, пов'язаних з давньою економікою, визначити галузеву спеціалізацію, оцінити значення її галузей для окремих регіонів Давньої Русі. Все вище сказане в повній мірі стосується давньоруської торгівлі, напрямки якої протягом Х–ХІІІ ст. суттєво змінювались. Враховуючи високий рівень археологічного вивчення деяких територій, шляхом картографування окремих категорій знахідок, можна оцінити рівень торговельних зв'язків поміж регіонами та країнами.

Однією з яскравих особливостей давньоруського культурного шару є вироби з пірофілітового сланцю (шиферу) різних відтінків червоного кольору – від світло-рожевого до фіолетового. Вироби з пірофіліту дуже різноманітні: плити для гробниць та крупні декоративні різьблені деталі прикрас давньоруських храмів, іконки, жорна, оселки, грузила, ливарні форми, пряслиця, хрестики, намистини та інші вироби. Попри вивчення різних категорій виробів з пірофілітового сланцю, майстерень по їх виготовленню, шляхів розповсюдження готової продукції та періоду побутування речей з пірофіліту [12, 188-195; 11, 220-224], нез'ясованих питань залишилося багато. Останнім часом, завдяки проекту по вивченню та збереженню спадку середньовічної Овруцької волості під

керівництвом А.П. Томашевського [16, 151-155; 18, 186-194], відбулися суттєві зрушення у вивченні не тільки родовищ пірофілітового сланцю, поселень та майстерень по виробництву виробів поблизу Овруча, але і знахідок зі сланцю інших територій Південної Русі.

Одним з регіонів, де зроблені спроби більш глибокого вивчення виробів з пірофіліту, була територія Чернігівського Полісся. Так, за запропонованою авторами Овруцького проекту схемою, оброблені пряслиця з сільських поселень регіону та пряслиця з археологічного комплексу в ур. Коровель поблизу с. Шестовиця [1, 339-375; 15, 286-297]. Однак накопичений до сьогоднішнього дня потенціал речових джерел з даної проблематики не використаний в достатньому ступені.

Чернігів, як центр князівства, насичений виробами з пірофіліту значно більше, ніж інші населені пункти. Хоча спеціальних підрахунків кількості різних категорій речей, у тому числі з пірофіліту, у Чернігові не проводилось, з публікацій можна відзначити достатньо високу концентрацію цього мінералу. Крім того, у Чернігові зафіксовано використання пірофіліту і в інтер'єрі деяких соборів, і для спорудження гробниць. Особливо зауважимо, що при дослідженні ділянки давньоруського дитинця в 50 м від церкви-усипальниці (70-і рр. ХІ ст.) виявлені залишки розбитих пірофілітових плит, котрі за характерними слідами обробки могли бути деталями гробниць. На думку дослідників, виявлений на цій ділянці шар з великою кількістю крошки та уламків (виробничого браку та відходів) свідчить про витесування плит [4, 122]. У шарі пірофіліту простежені стовпові ями, вірогідно від навісу або споруди, яка захищала територію майстерні від опадів [19, 8]. Таким чином, до Чернігова потрапляли як готові вироби, так і сировина, обробка якої відбувалася на місці.

Окрім Чернігова, пірофілітова плита від гробниці зафіксована на поселенні Сибереж, розташованому приблизно посередині одного з відгалужень водного шляху між Черніговом та Любечем. В інших населених пунктах пірофілітові вироби, які використовують у монументальній архітектурі, відсутні.

Більш розповсюдженими виявилися пірофілітові жорна, хоча їх виявлено менше, ніж жорен з інших порід каменю у регіоні. Їх багато зафіксовано у Чернігові, Любечі (як фрагментованих, так і цілих), комплексі пам'яток в ур. Коровель, городищах регіону та на 14 сільських поселеннях.

Варто зазначити, що майже на кожному поселенні виявлені також великі уламки пірофіліту. Не дивлячись на неможливість їх ідентифікувати, залишити без уваги факти подібних знахідок, на наш погляд, неприпустимо.

Самою розповсюдженою категорією речей з пірофіліту є пряслиця. На 46 сільських поселеннях