Теорія та історія соціальних комунікацій
УДК 003.345:81’22

V. Chekshturina,
Doctor of Social Communications,
Professor, Department of Management of Social Communications, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economic, Kharkiv

HISTORICAL STAGES OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE THEORY OF RUNIC COMMUNICATION

The paper is concerned with the issue of runic communication. The runic sign has been a subject of research over the last 400 years. It is a well-known fact that the runic sign has been used on the territory of Eurasia since the 2nd century AD. During the first century, the runic sign was actively used as a means of written and symbol communication. After the 12th century, it was gradually replaced by other means of written communication, continuing to exist as a means of symbol communication among certain subcultures. The author distinguishes historical, disciplinary and geographical vectors of scientific analysis of the runic sign. The methodology of this study is based on semiotic, socio-communicative, systemic, sociocultural, immanent and contextual approaches. The author suggests that runology can be studied at universities within the framework of socio-communicative cycle disciplines.

Keywords: runic sign, symbol communication, Futhark, semiotics, information, coding, decoding, multimodal text.

Introduction. Establishing the importance of the topic

The runic sign has been a subject of scientific investigations for the last 400 years. It is a well-known fact that the runic sign has been used on the territory of Eurasia since the 2nd century AD. During the first century, the runic sign was actively used as a means of written and symbol communication. After the 12-th century, it was gradually replaced by other means of written communication, continuing to exist as a means of symbol communication among certain

subcultures. However, the bearers of runic signs (Vikings' stones, bracteates, coins, melee weapon ornament and so on) remain the treasury of a thousand-year-old history.

General descriptions of the relevant literature.

The phenomenon of a runic sign has been studied by historians, archeologists, linguists, culture experts, fine art experts. The findings of runic artifacts all over the territory of Eurasia contributed to the rise of scientific centres studying runic inscriptions in Sweden, Germany, Norway, Denmark, Great Britain, Baltic countries, Russia, Kazakhstan.

The findings of runic-like signs made by Ukrainian scientists on the territory of Ukraine (National reservation "Kam'iana mohyla", Zaporizhzhia region, centres of Trypillian culture, Verhniy Saltiv (Kharkiv region)) make the need to conduct a special investigation concerning studying the peculiarities of the usage of runic-like signs as the means to fix information in the process of symbol communication actual.

The availability of a great amount of runic sign systems, specific mediums, peculiarities of runic inscriptions in ancient dialects which are out of use, the change of religious paradigm create certain obstacles concerning the conduction of a complex investigation as to the studying communicative potential of a runic sign.

The analysis of the condition of the development of a scientific problem of determining a runic sign socio-communicative meaning can be conducted along three vectors:

- Historical – the determination of stages of scientific interest to a runic sign and the formation of runology;
- Disciplinary – to cluster all the investigations of historians, linguists and culture experts together and distinguish socio-communicative problems in existing theoretical advances;
- Geographical – to consider the investigations concerning studying European and Turkic runic sign systems.

Deskribin Methods

The methodology of this study is based on semiotic, socio-communicative, sociocultural and contextual approaches. In case study semiotic approach was chosen to identify the semantic and pragmatic components in scientific research on runic text. It was decided that the best method to adopt for this investigation was to socio-communicative analysis of the structure of runic messages. The sociocultural approach has a number of attractive features for the consideration of the semantics of runic Futharks: Scandinavian, Nortrum, Gothic.

Scientific investigations of a runic sign as a communicative means have certain historical, time, territorial, socio-communicative restrictions as it is impossible to interview the founder of a runic system or one of the authors of runic inscriptions on Vikings' stones and to know a reader's (recipient's) comment. The whole socio-communicative system: communicant – code (of a message) – recipient, where code is a runic sign, is almost inaccessible. Only a code of informational message – a runic sign was inherited by the scientists. The revival of a socio-communicative model, the determination of a message context will allow us to know the properties of a rune as a means of communication deeper.

Main body Results

In connection with the change of religious paradigm all the first scientific investigations of a runic sign were carried in very complicated conditions and only in several centuries after the destruction of the original runic socio-communicative system.

Analysis of the scientific literature made it possible to single out main stages of scientific cognition of runic signs:

The first stage (XVII-XVIII centuries) – is the stage of runology origin as a science with rune as a subject of research. Runology was initiated by (Johannes Bureus, 1568-1652) who investigated the cradle of Old Norse. He also considered runes not only as signs of an alphabet but assumed that they fulfilled sacral function as well. He dealt with re-thinking of runic knowledge from the spectacle of Christian mysticism. J. Bureus has left behind seven manuscripts "Adulruna Rediviva". One of them "Cod. Holm. F.a. 16", written in Swedish, disappeared in

1812. Two of the four manuscripts kept in Royal Library – "Cod. Holm. F.a. 21" and "F.a. 23" – are written in Latin, the others "Ral. 98O" – are written in Swedish. One of the two manuscripts kept in "Carolina Rediviva" in Uppsala is written in Latin – "Cod. Av Ups. R 551a", the other – "R 551b" is written in Swedish (Flowers S. E., 1998).

The studying of runic inheritance was continued by the professor of Uppsala University (Sweden) Olof Rudbeck Sr (1630-1702). Olof Rudbeck writes the treatise "Atlantic", in four volumes, in which he highlights the achievements in runic sign investigation and which will be referred to the genre of historic-linguistic patriotism then (E. Gurevich, 2003). A physicist Anders Celsius (1701-1744) continued to study runes on Vikings' stones while travelling about Sweden and greatly contributed to the theoretical inheritance of runology genesis in Uppsala University.

The author of Iceland collection "Runology" ("Runologia", 1732) Scandinavian philologist Jon Olafsson from Grunnavik systemized runic inscriptions and identified certain rules of ancient linguistics development. The text included the materials from runic cryptography, means of rune usage in Galdrastafir etc. The whole chapter is devoted to the ways of rune interlacement. It gives tables showing how to interlace runes "on one stalk". In the end, the researcher determines the rules of runic monogram composition. The peculiarities of punctuation in runic inscriptions as well as their practical application have been considered. Runes, as J. Olafsson asserts, "were carved on stones, wood or embroidered, written on paper. There are a great number of those who still use runes for composing monograms." (L. Korablev, 2005).

The second stage (XIX-XX centuries) – is the formation of runology as an independent scientific discipline. At the end of the XIXth century, numerous attempts of the scientists to find out the origin of runic writing appeared. Several various hypotheses, which are being criticized even now, are made.

A present-day scientific community considers Danish scientist L. Wimmer (1874) to be the forefather of runology, who supposed that runes originate from

Latin writing (Wimmer L., 1894). His opponents S. Bugge and O. von Friesen tried to deduce runic alphabet from Greek, connecting the appearance of runes with Goths' residency in Black Sea region (III century). "Greek theory" of runic writing appearance comes into contradiction with the dating of the oldest runic findings on the territory of Scandinavia (II century). The theory of a Norway runologist K. Mastrander (1928) gained the most part of all the adherents. He thought that runes could be restricted to the group of North-Italian alphabets, which had been used during several centuries B. C. and became known to the Germans due to the mediation of the Celts, but direct prototypes of runic writing hadn't been determined (E. Gurevich, 2003). E. Moltke insists on the genetic relationship between runes and South-European alphabets. He points out that besides magic, runes performed communicative function which puts Old German writing in a line with ancient writing systems (Moltke E., 1985, p. 523).

Since XIX century the analyses of runic inscriptions has become an integral part of Germanic philology and historical linguistics. The fairy-tales by Grimm brothers are well known all over the world but Grimm brothers also studied ancient German runes and are considered to be the founders of runology in Germany. Wilhelm Grimm published a book "On German runes" ("Ueber Deutsche Runen", 1821) in which he analyzed different kinds of futharks, characterized Marcomannic runes, described modifications of runic signs for cryptography (Grimm W., 2013, p. 149-159). In 1828 he published a supplement entitled "Runic literature" («Zur Literatur der Runen») in which he discussed "Abecedarium Nordmannicum" (abecedarium – is an alphabet-poetic system, used in medieval literature of Europe). "Abecedarium Nordmannicum" is composed of 16 runes of Younger Futhark in the form of short verses (sometimes it is considered to be one of the longest "runic poems"), placed in Codex "Sangallensis 878" (page 321, IXth century.). The text of a runic verse in Codex was destroyed in the XIXth century by the chemicals, intended for its preservation but it was preserved well for the future due to Wilhelm Grimm's picture in his "Zur Literatur der Runen".

F. Burg's book "Old Norwegian runic inscriptions" (F. Burg, «Die alteren nordischen Runeninschriften») was published in 1885 and was dedicated to the description of approximately 60 runic inscriptions, known at that time. The method of linguistic analyses, given in it, is considered to be an outdated, though it was a considerable achievement in the field of runology in the XIXth century. The edition contributed to the development of runology, to the search of new runic inscriptions, to the improvement of the inscription interpretation methods; as well as to the organization of interrelation between runologists and representatives of other sciences – archeology, paleography, history, ethnography, mythology.

Eric Brate (Erik Brate, 1857–1924) was one of the most fruitful runologists in Sweden. During the period from the end of 1890 till 1900 he was taking photos of many runic stones of Sweden and is one of the founders of the catalogue «Runic inscriptions of Sweden» («Sveriges runinskrifter»), which later on turned into multivolumed catalogue of runic inscriptions, found in different Swedish provinces.

The first edition of the catalogue took place in 1900; over 15 volumes were published during the following ninety years. A standard for Swedish runic inscriptions cataloguing system has been established in the catalogue. Each inscription is identified with a code of a province and a number in a catalogue, e.g.: U 11 - Uppland runic inscription. Nowadays this system of cataloguing is used in electronic databases, such as «Rundata», and is often met in foreign scientific publications of runologists (Institutionen för nordiska språk).

Scientific contributions of Norway scientists Sophus Bugge and Magnus Olsen, Swedish scientists Otto von Friesen, Elias Wessen, Otto von Friesen, Elias Wessen and a number of other researchers (Friesen O., 1941; Wessen E., 1945) favoured to the development of runology in Europe. Sophus Bugge (1833 - 1907) is a well-known Norwegian philologist and linguist in the field of runic inscription investigation. His scientific work was dedicated to runic inscriptions and Scandinavian philology. S. Bugge became famous due to the investigation of runic alphabet and Older Edda. And the fact that, despite the effort of runologists, a

number of inscriptions haven't been decoded yet and the interpretation of many of them is controversial, can be explained by the complexity of the material and its fragmentariness. Data of allied sciences must be involved to decoding inscriptions. According to the statement of a runologist Carl Johan Sverdrup Marstrander, "runology is paleography, linguistics, archeology and mythology" (Michael P.). Actually, very often the lexical meaning of a word of some runic inscription is clear but the function, performed by this text, remains under wraps.

Wolfgang Krause (1895-1970), a German investigator, worked as a linguist at the university in Konigsberg, investigated Celtic study and runic inscriptions. He was the author of a number of editions on the problems of inscriptions in Elder Futhark («Runeninschriften im alteren Futhark», 1937) and the tradition of rune cutting («Was man in Runen ritzte», 1935) etc. In 1943 he headed runic department of «Anenerbe» organization. In 1950 he organized Scandinavian institute, having united with Norwegian research centre of runic inscriptions.

Elmer H. Antonsen (1929-2008) considered runic inscriptions with the purpose to determine the stages of written communication formation, but the scientist emphasised that runic inscriptions contained not only runes-phonemes but runes-symbols, which don't have linguistic sense, but have symbolic context, concerning all the content of the message (Antonsen E., 2002).

The third stage of runology development – is the stage of its development into independent scientific discipline (the end of the XXth – the beginning of the XXIst centuries). The organization and systematic holding (due to the efforts of runologists) of an international symposium "Runes and runic inscriptions" became an important factor that contributed to runology institutionalization. It was first held in 1980 and then was held each five years except for the eighth symposium that took place in 2014 – in four years after forum in 2010. The geography of symposium holding is also interesting: the First International symposium on the investigation of runes and runic inscriptions took place in May 1980 (Ann-Arbor, Michigan), the Second took place on 8-11 September, 1985 (Sigtuna, Sweden), the

Third took place on 8-12 August, 1990 (Grindaheim, Norway), the Fourth took place on 4-9 August 1995 (Gottingen, Germany).

It is important to notice that almost 100 participants from 13 different countries of the world took part in the Fourth symposium. The representatives of complementary sciences, specializing in archeology, history, art, numismatics and religion studies were among the participants except philologists. Among 37 reports, the most interesting were the following: Kurth Braunmuller "Methodological problems in runology", Henric Williams "Runic inscriptions as a source base of proper names", John Sorensen "Runic inscriptions as a source of geographic name studies", Edith Marold "Inscriptions in runes as a source of scald history", Hermann Reichert "Runic inscriptions as a source of heroic legend studies", Catherine Holman "Scandinavian runic inscriptions as a source on the history of British Isles", Bori Westlund "Runic inscriptions as sources on the history of the written language" (Das Vierte Internationale Symposium über Runen und Runeninschriften in Göttingen, Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 4–9 August 1995). So the analysis of the range of problems raised in the reports made it possible to prove interdisciplinary character of runologic investigations: philological, historical, geographical and socio-communicative.

The Fifth international symposium "Runes and runic inscriptions" was held on 16-20 August, 2000 (Elling, Denmark) in the National Museum and the University of Copenhagen. The central problems of the symposium were: runic artifacts with runes of Elder Futhark; the influence of Roman alphabet and Christianization on runic writing; the problems of runic chronology; runology and runic researches: millennium methodology and new challenges.

The Sixth International symposium "Runes and runic inscriptions" took place on 11-16 August, 2005 (Lancaster, Great Britain, The University of Lancaster). Sixty-five delegates from Australia, the USA, Scandinavia and continental Europe took an active part in discussing runology problems. The main topics were dedicated to rune semantics, studying runic alphabets, the technology of cutting runes, and the methods of philological and historical analysis of runic inscriptions.

The main topic of the Seventh International symposium "Runes and runic inscriptions" (9-14 August, 2010, Oslo, Norway) – "Rune in context" is dedicated to the contextual approach to the interpretation of runic inscriptions. Jan Ragnar Hagland in his report "What the "context" in runology means. How to use "context" while interpreting runic inscriptions? Some moments for methodological discussion" (Hagland J. R., 2010) puts a question of a general scientific direction: first, the author is looking for the place of runology among disciplines. He notices that runology is linguistic disciplines, but archeology, history, the history of the Arts also have the right to claim to include runology into scientific field.

Michael P. Barnes in the article "What runology is and its place in contemporaneity" also raises a question of methodological basis of runology as a scientific discipline (Michael P., 2010). He proposes to develop methodological basis of runology for studying runic writing and for expertise, reading and interpreting inscriptions. Complex studying of runic writing in all its aspects, undoubtedly, requires critical inquiry. The definition "Runology" mar include the elements of linguistics, philology, paleography, archeology, culturology, religion, literature and the history of the Arts, mythology, cryptology and occultism. "But how can one define a discipline which includes so many scattered elements?" (Michael P., 2010) – asks the scientist.

To our thought, the controversies can be solved if to refer runology to the field of social communications and to form its methodology within the frames of socio-communicative approach, using it for complex research of runic artifacts and runic inscriptions. Runology goes outside the framework of linguistics because it is in the very name of symposiums that there is a denotation to dichotomy of runologic phenomena: "Runes and runic inscriptions", thereby proving that rune is used not only as a sign of writing communication but is an independent symbol in amulets, adornments, ornaments, having at the same time capacious semantics and vicarious communicative objective.

The Eighth International symposium "Runes and runic inscriptions" took place from the 1st till the 6th of September 2014 (Nyköping, Sweden). The main scientific

problems were: the peculiarities of reading runic inscriptions, discovering new artifacts and the methods of their decoding, documentation of runic artifacts. Almost all the reports raised acute questions of the theory of social communications: Kristian Zimmerman “Runic graphemics: decoding and documenting”, Irene Garcia Losquiño “Evolution of documenting: grouping of elder runic inscriptions”. The researcher proposed to classify runic inscriptions of symbolic origin according to the purpose of the inscription creation.

Explanation for results

Finally, content-analysis of a scientific scope of problems of the materials of international symposiums allows grounding the objective need to develop a separate scientific discipline – runology – as a discipline of a socio-communicative cycle that will contribute to the integration of all the accumulated knowledge about a rune as a unique means of social communication in its cognitive field.

The results of this study indicate that runology as an independent scientific discipline of a socio-communicative field has interdisciplinary nature and connected with such disciplines as: historical linguistics, the history of the Arts, history and archaeology, culturology, document study and so on.

Discussions Suggestions for future work.

Further research should be done to investigate runic signs along three vectors:

- Historical – the determination of stages of scientific interest to a runic sign and the formation of runology;
- Disciplinary – to cluster all the investigations of historians, linguists and culture experts together and distinguish socio-communicative problems in existing theoretical advances;
- Geographical – to consider the investigations concerning studying European runic sign systems.

Conclusions

This study has shown that of runic communication theory will be able to become a scientific platform to determine the evolution of the formation of graphic

communicative means, specific character of symbol communication, peculiarities of the communicative interaction of peoples who migrated through the territory of Eurasia.

Finally, content-analysis of a scientific scope of problems of the materials of international symposiums allows grounding the objective need to develop a separate scientific discipline – runology – as a discipline of a socio-communicative cycle that will contribute to the integration of all the accumulated knowledge about a rune as a unique means of social communication in its cognitive field.

So, runology as an independent scientific discipline of a socio-communicative field has interdisciplinary nature and connected with such disciplines as: historical linguistics, the history of the Arts, history and archeology, culturology, document study and so on.

Runology founded on the basis of the theory of social communications will be able to become a scientific platform to determine the evolution of the formation of graphic communicative means, specific character of symbol communication, peculiarities of communicative interaction of peoples who migrated through the territory of Eurasia.

References

1. Antonsen E. H., (2002), Runes and Germanic Linguistics. Walter de Gruyter, 380 p.
2. Das Vierte Internationale Symposium über Runen und Runeninschriften in Göttingen, Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 4–9 August 1995 [http://www.khm.uio.no]
3. Elliott R. W. Runes (1989): [Texte imprime] : an introduction. 2-nd ed. Manchester : Manchester University Press.
4. Fifth International Symposium on Runes and Runic Inscriptions, 16th-20th August 2000, Jelling, Denmark [http://www.khm.uio.no]
5. Flowers S. E. (1998), Johannes Bureus and the Adalruna. Runa-Raven, 40 p.

6. Friesen O. (1941), Runbrynet fran Timans i Roma // Gotlandskt Arkiv. Visby, P. 7–14.
7. Grimm W. (2013), Über Deutsche Runen. Repr. 1821. London : Forgotten Books, 339 p.
8. Hagland J. R. What does ‘context’meanin runology — and how are we to use ‘context’ when interpretin runic inscriptions? Some points for a methodological discussion Seventh International Symposium on Runes. [http://www.khm.uio.no]
9. Institutionen för nordiska språk http://www.nordiska.uu.se/forskn/samnord.htm.
10. Karlevi: [http://www.fotevikensmuseum.se/sweden/oland/karlevi/karlevi.htm]
11. Knirk J. E. (1999), Runer i Hagia Sofia i Istanbul. Nytt om runer. № 14. P. 26–27.
12. Moltke E. (1985), Runes and their origin, Denmark and elsewhere Copenhagen, 554 p.
13. Michael P. Barnes What is runology and where does it stand today? http://www.khm.uio.no
14. Moltke E. (1985), The runes and their origion : Danemark and elsewhere. Kopenhagen, 231 p.
15. Page R. I. (1995), Runes and Runic Inscriptions. Collected Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Viking Runes. Woodbridge : The Boydell Press. 346 p.
16. Stephens G. (1868), The Runic Hall in the Danish Old-Northern Museum Inglese, 617 p.
17. The 8th International Symposium on Runes and Runic Inscriptions, Nyköping–Sweden, September 1–6, 2014 [http://www.runforum.nordiska.uu.se/readingrunes/-abstracts/?all=true]
18. The Sixth International Symposium on Runes and Runic Inscriptions, Lancaster, 11th-16th August 2005 [http://www.khm.uio.no]

19. Wessen E., Jansson Sven B. F. (1945), Upplands runinskrifter. Uppsala, Del. 2, H. 1. [http://www.therunesite.com/swedish-national-heritage-board/stone13/] (U 455) .
20. Wimmer L. (1894), De tyske Runemindesmrker. Kobenhavn : Thieles Bogtrykkeri, 82 p.
21. Wimmer L. (1887), Die Runenschrift / Von Ludv. F. A. Wimmer ; aus dem Dänischen übers. von F. Holthausen. Berlin : Weidmann, 392 p.
22. Zilmer K. (2005), Records and representations of Baltic Traffic in the Viking Age and the Early Middle Ages in Early Nordic sources. Dissertationes philologiae Scandinavicae Tartuensis. Tartu : Tartu university Press, 401 p.
23. Baltin-Kolsky A. (1959) On the Runic inscription from Staraya Ladoga. Scandinavian. Sat. IV. - Tallinn: Eston. State. Publishing House, Issue. 4. P. 19-22.(in Russian)
24. Gurevich E. (2006) The genre of "strands about Icelanders" in ancient Scandinavian literature: to the problem of historical poetics of a small prose form: dis. ... Dr. Philol. Sciences: 10.01.03. Institute of World Literature. them. A. Gorky of the Russian Academy of Sciences. M., 612 p.(in Russian)
25. Gurevich E. (2003) Runes, runic writing. Dictionary of medieval culture. M., 2003. P. 415-423. (in Russian)
26. Karlsson T. Adulruna. Gothic Kabbalah [Electronic resource] Access mode: http://www.ereading.by/bookreader.php/148161/Karlsson_Adulruna._Gotiche skaya_kabbala.html. (in Russian)
27. Korablev L. (2005) The Yun Oulafs-Sona rogue from Grünn-Wick: Icelandic treatises of the 17th century. M.: Veligor, 246 p.(in Russian)
28. Kurzenkova A. (2011) Application of technology of content analysis to the study of the Scandinavian runes of the Senior Futark: [ist. Source] Gilea: Sciences. Visn : Sb Sciences. No. 11. P. 33-39 (in Russian)
29. Makaev E. (1965) The language of the most ancient runic inscriptions M.: Science, 180 p.(in Russian)

30. Proskurina A. (2014) Sacred vocabulary of the oldest runic and non-German short inscriptions as a semiotic aspect of information transfer / Criticism and Semiotics. No. 2. P. 254-264. (in Ukraine)
31. Smirnitskaya O. (1989) The oldest runic inscriptions as a monument to the protostich Epic of Northern Europe. Ways of evolution. Moscow: Mosc. University, P. 35-68.(in Russian)
32. Smirnitskaya O. (1990) What is a runic proposal? Scandinavian Languages. Structural and functional aspects. M.: Institute of Linguistics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, P. 198-209.(in Russian)
33. Tikhanova M. (1970) To the question of the links of Southern Scandinavia with Eastern Europe in the 1st half of the 1st millennium. Studia archaeological: In memoriam Harri Moora. Tallin, P.202-206.(in Russian)
34. Tikhanova M. (1976) Traces of runic writing in Chernyakhov culture. Medieval Russia: [Sat. Item]. M., P. 11-17. (in Russian)
35. Toporova T. (1994) Semantic structure of the ancient German world model: monograph. M.: Radiks, 192 with.(in Russian)
36. Thorsson E. (2002) Runic Teachings: Introduction to the Esoteric Runogue. M.: Sofia: Helios, 320 p.(in Russian)
37. Khlevov A. (2002) Historical and cultural phenomenon of Northern Europe I-VIII centuries. : Dis. Dr. Philos. Sciences: 24.00.01. St. Petersburg, 2002. 468 p. (in Russian)

ІСТОРИЧНІ ЕТАПИ ЕВОЛЮЦІЇ ТЕОРІЇ РУНІЧНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

Досліджено питання рунічної комунікації. Рунічний знак був предметом досліджень протягом останніх 400 років. Відомо, що рунічний знак існував на території Євразії з 2-го століття нашої ери. Протягом першого століття рунічний знак активно використовувався як засіб письмового і символьного спілкування. Після 12-го століття руну поступово замінили іншими засобами письмового спілкування, однак рунічний знак продовжив існувати як засіб

символьної комунікації. Виділені історичні, дисциплінарні та географічні вектори наукового аналізу рунічного знаку. Методологія цього дослідження базується на семіотичному, соціально-комунікативному, системному, соціокультурному та контекстуальному підходах. Запропоновано, що рунологія може вивчатися в університетах в рамках соціально-комунікативних циклічних дисциплін.
Ключові слова: рунічний знак, символ, футарк, семіотика, інформація, кодування, декодування, мультимодальний текст.

ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЕ ЭТАПЫ ЭВОЛЮЦИИ ТЕОРИИ РУНИЧЕСКОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ

Исследован вопрос рунической коммуникации. Рунический знак был предметом исследований в течение последних 400 лет. Известно, что рунический знак существовал на территории Евразии со 2-го века нашей эры. В течение первого века рунический знак активно использовался как средство письменного и символьного общения. После 12-го века руну постепенно заменили другими средствами письменного общения, однако рунический знак продолжил существовать как средство символьной коммуникации. Выделены исторические, дисциплинарные и географические векторы научного анализа рунического знака. Методология данного исследования основана на семиотическом, социально-коммуникативном, системном, социокультурном и контекстуальном подходах. Предложено, что рунология может изучаться в университетах в рамках социально-коммуникативных циклических дисциплин.
Ключевые слова: рунический знак, символ, футарк, семиотика, информация, кодирование, декодирование, мультимодальный текст.

V. Chekshturina,
Doctor of Social Communications,
Professor, Department of Management of Social Communications, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economic, Kharkiv

HISTORICAL STAGES OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE THEORY OF RUNIC COMMUNICATION

The thesis is dedicated to the runic symbol communication. The state-of-the-art of this problem in the theory and practice of social communications has been analyzed. A runic sign has been the object of scientific investigations during the last 400 years. It is a well-known fact that a runic sign has been used on the territory of Eurasia since II century AD. During the first century a runic sign was actively used as a means of written and symbol communication. After the XIIth century it has been gradually substituted with other means of written communication, continuing to exist as a means of symbol communication among certain subcultures. However the bearers of a runic signs (Vikings' stones, bracteates, coins, melee weapon ornament and so on) remain the treasury of a thousand year old history. The phenomenon of a runic sign has been studied by historians, archeologists, linguists, culture experts, fine art experts. The findings of runic artifacts all over the territory of Eurasia contributed to the emergency of scientific centres studying runic inscriptions in Sweden, Germany, Norway, Denmark, Great Britain, Baltic countries, Russia, Kazakhstan. The findings of runic-like signs made by Ukrainian scientists on the territory of Ukraine (National reservation "Kam'iana mohyla" (Zaporizhzhia region), centres of Trypillian culture, Verhniy Saltiv (Kharkiv region)) make the need to conduct a special investigation concerning studying the peculiarities of the usage of runic-like signs as the means to fix information in the process of symbol communication actual.

The analysis of the condition of the development of a scientific problem of determining a runic sign socio-communicative meaning can be conducted along three vectors: historical – the determination of stages of scientific interest to a runic sign and the formation of runology; disciplinary – to cluster all the investigations

of historians, linguists and culture experts together and distinguish socio-communicative problems in existing theoretical advances; geographical – to consider the investigations concerning studying European and Turkic runic sign systems.

Let's note main stages of scientific cognition of runic signs:

The first stage (XVII-XVIII centuries) – is the stage of runollogy origin as a science with rune as a subject of research. Runology was initiated by (Johannes Bureus, 1568-1652) who investigated the cradle of Old Norse.

The second stage (XIX-XX centuries) – is the formation of runology as an independent scientific discipline. At the end of the XIXth century, numerous attempts of the scientists to find out the origin of runic writing appeared.

The third stage of runology development – is the stage of its development into independent scientific discipline (the end of the XXth – the beginning of the XXIst centuries). The organization and systematic holding (due to the efforts of runologists) of an international symposium "Runes and runic inscriptions" became an important factor that contributed to runology institutionalization.

Scientific investigations of a runic sign as a communicative means have certain historical, time, territorial, socio-communicative restrictions as it is impossible to interview the founder of a runic system or one of the authors of runic inscriptions on Vikings' stones and to know a reader's (recipient's) comment. The whole socio-communicative system: communicant – code (of a message) – recipient, where code is a runic sign, is almost inaccessible. Only a code of informational message – a runic sign was inherited by the scientists. The revival of a socio-communicative model, the determination of a message context will allow us to know the properties of a rune as a means of communication deeper.

Theoretical foundations have been determined and the conceptual idea of runology as a subject of sociocommunicative cycle has been developed. The laws of runic symbol communication functioning have been formulated. The stages of evolution and diversification vectors of a runic sign-symbol have been

distinguished. The transformations of a semantic component of runic signs-symbols which they underwent in the course of sociogenesis have been selected.

Keywords: runic sign, symbol communication, Futhark, semiotics, information, coding, decoding, multimodal text.