Migratory Lapps And The Population Explosion Of Eastern Finns: The Early Modern Colonization Of Eastern Finland Reconsidered

Introduction

According to the traditional account, only a few migratory Lapps were living in the forests of Eastern Finland during the Middle Ages, with peasants from the southern and western agricultural areas visiting the area during summers. They maintained small-scale cultivation, hunting and fishing. Each autumn they transported the harvest to their permanent living places in the south. This so-called “erämark” theory or wilderness economy model has been firmly established in the scholarly literature (Register på Erämarker 61–85; Gissel et al. 1981: 132–135; Taavitsainen 1994: 196, 200–203; Taavitsainen 1999: 310–313; Taavitsainen 2004: 47–48; Taavitsainen et al. 2007: 95–102; Björn 1999: 39–40; Mäki 2004: 138).

Over the last thirty years palaeoecologists have discovered in lake sediments the remains of small-scale medieval cultivation throughout the eastern Finnish and Karelian forest areas, but the quantity of the cultivation increases considerably only in the 16th century. The most recent and sensational finds are from Repovesi and Kuittijärvi (Vuonninen). The first offers proof of a large-scale and permanent human impact after the Viking age in a wilderness traditionally considered to have been unpopulated. The second indicates that the entire East Fennoscandian area was well-populated, because it is so far to the north (Vuorela-Hicks 1996: 245–257; Grönlund 1995: 6–36; Alenius et al. 2006: 164–165; Alenius 2007: 11–12; Alenius et al. 2005: 19–21; Saarnisto-Alenius [in print], cf. Korpela 2008: 118–119).

The results have been explained within the framework of the colonization and wilderness economy model: small-scale cultivation was part of the seasonal hunting and fishing culture, and the strong expansion of agriculture in the 16th century matches the new colonization and the large size of the new population, which was recorded in the contemporary tax rolls. Marek Zvelebil and Paul Dolukhanov call the transition from nomadism to farming “a revolutionary development that provides the basis of civilization throughout the world” (Zvelebil–Dolukhanov 1991: 233–278).
Within this framework scholars have estimated the size of the population in Finland and its growth during the medieval and early modern period. Heikki Simola describes how the population of Finland rose tenfold, from 50,000 to 500,000, between AD 1300 and 1750, and another tenfold to 5,000,000 between 1750 and 2000 (Simola 2006: 165). 16th-century Savo has been called an area of population explosion. There were only some 600 households (6,000 people) in the 14th century, but there were 3,400 households (34,000 people) by the mid-16th century (Orrman 1999: 378–379, 382–383; Gissel et al. 1981: 132–135; Saloheimo 2000: 118–119; Soininen 1961: 11–20, 31–49, 57–58, 122–136, 211–242; Pirinen 1982: 50–104). The Savo people had colonized within a century the entire, previously unpopulated region of Eastern Finland and Karelia north of the modern town of Mikkeli to the coasts of the White Sea and Southern Lapland. Finally, they went on to Central Sweden and in the 17th century to America (Simola et al. 17–30; Gissel et al. 1981: 132–135; Lähteenmäki 2000; Pirinen 1982: 265–308).

The source evidence of the wilderness economy model is problematic. The main support can be found in the living model of Western Finnish societies and the sources dating to the 16th century. Scholars cannot explain in the medieval context of Eastern Finland, which differed considerably from that of Western Finland, why the people returned to the south each autumn. There were no legal, social, religious or other coercive structures that forced them to do so, nor were the families well organized into hierarchical clans, but rather they formed heterogeneous co-resident domestic groups that could not prevent members from going to new places if they so desired. Land was merely used and not owned, and therefore everyone was free to move about and start a new life. Similarly the homes were not large mansions with riches that had to be looked after. Moving over the East Finnish terrain is also difficult due to trees, stones, marshes and lakes. The only connections have gone along waterways. However, they connect the area to the South-East and the North, and moving from the South and the West has been very difficult, because it happens against the waterways. This difficulty explains even the modern cultural differences between Eastern and Western Finland. Finally, the Eastern Finns had no special idols that protected their home and property as was the case with the western Finns according to the 16th-century list of pagan Finnish gods drawn up by Bishop Michael Agricola (Agricola 1987, cf. III.211–213, Korpela [forthcoming(a)]).

The original reason for going into the wilderness could have been either a lack of food (impoverishment of the land, growth in population), which is not recorded in the sources (Solantie 1997: 48–52, 61–62), or an increasing demand for furs on the market, which was not the case after the 13th century. A third possibility is that no real movement or colonization happened. Our only source material for such movement lies in the medieval archaeological material and early modern tax records concerning colonization. The archaeological evidence is very accidental, because no systematic study has ever been conducted here. Should we assume moreover, that the archaeological (metal) objects reflect only
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a small part of the old population, which was connected with the early, primitive exchange of goods with foreigners? Thus the number of such objects reflects only the long-distance contacts.

Tax rolls and other written materials of the early modern state are not useful sources for the population history of peripheral areas. They reflect the organization of the state and its smooth penetration and realization among the forest populations; they record only those people who paid taxes. The early modern state was not a territorial state which could control fixed land areas and their entire populations (Korpela 2004: 287–298; Korpela 2008: 270–285).

Sirkku Pihlman has discussed the problems of population growth in medieval South-Western Finland, and her ideas could support our conclusions as well. The connection between Christianization and population growth is a fact according to the written sources, but the traditional explanation for the growth is quite unscholarly, because it tries to connect the phenomenon with the prevention of a supposed pagan institution of child murder. Written documents of the early Christian Church and identified burial fields form a source-critical problem, as the areas concerned do not correspond to the size of the settlements. According to Pihlman, the burials identified represent only the upper class and the population that lived permanently in villages throughout the generations. The majority of the population lay outside these groups, subsisted on seasonal natural resources and did not create large farms. They therefore remained outside the sources until they become subject to the Christian administration and were recorded in the registers (Pihlman 2004: 47–98). The conclusion of Pihlman suits perfectly the results concerning the medieval population history of Central Europe (Moore 2000: 39–64).

Second, the first written indications are for the size of the population of Eastern Finland in the tax books of the 1540s, when there were 6,300 households in Swedish Karelia and 3,400 in Savo (Orrman 1999: 378–379, 382–383; Gissel et al. 1981: 132–135). Oiva Turpeinen, who has reconsidered population growth in Eastern Finland during the early modern period, regards the traditional figures of the population size by the end of the Middle Ages as far too low. According to him, the first reliable population statistics date only from the middle of the 18th century. Looking at this material, the growth in population would have had to be unrealistically high if the traditional estimations were correct (Turpeinen 2001: 11–12).

Third, the 16th and 17th centuries were a period of deteriorating climate (Lamb 1995: 211–217, 224–227, 229–233). This “Little Ice Age” could hardly lead to a huge growth in the population and movement toward colonizing the most northern areas. This period was moreover, throughout Europe, a period of strong expansion of taxation and other burdens due to state formation. All economic growth went to the building of administration and armies from the late 15th to the early 18th century. When the living standard collapsed, population growth could not take place without a revolution in medicine, but there was none. The calculations of Reijo Solantie also support this criticism. The
only area of slash-and-burn agriculture that was over-exploited during the late Middle Ages was Central Häme. The crisis of the old methods of agriculture in Southern Savo and elsewhere in Southern Finland occurred in the 18th and 19th centuries. There was no population pressure to warrant massive emigration from the old agricultural areas to form a new wave of colonization in the northern districts (Solantie 1997: 48–51, 58–62).

Fourth, the results of genetic studies indicate very limited male inheritance in the modern population of Eastern Finland. The number of original fathers in the population must have been very small and population growth took place without any major external male input. Rick A. Kittles et al. have proposed that the Finnish male population is of dual origin, i.e. the male inheritance may be derived from two early sources and further research has only confirmed this conclusion (Kittles et al. 1998, 1171–1179; Kittles et al. 1999: 381–399; Raitio et al. 2001: 471–482; Lappalainen et al. 2006: 207–215; Palo et al. 2009: 1336–1346). This result is not only a factor which must be taken into consideration in writing history, but it is also a serious scientific fact, which forms an absolute limit for the population history and therefore must be explained in some “absolute” way. It creates, in my opinion, an obstacle for any theories of external colonization of the area. If somebody wishes to discuss this issue, he or she must explain the genetic fact as well.

The early modern source evidence concerning migrations and colonization was partly administrative chancellery language and partly reflects an internal migration, which was the traditional way of life in the northern Eurasian forests until the modern period. The colonization of new areas within the huge tracts of forest must have been connected with the contemporaneous abandonment of other areas (Korpela 2008: 275–280).

Fifth, modern ecological theories also do not support the popular ideas of historical colonization movements after population growth. The people cannot survive the period of the colonization movements (the movement and the beginning of cultivation) if population growth is the primary reason. In primitive conditions, production is never so stable and ample that it could make large-scale supply and planning for the support of new settlers possible. In societies such as animal populations, hunger limits population growth to a reasonable level (Hanski et al. 1998: 231–288).

New innovations in food production could have caused a strong but short period of local population growth which diminished when the limits of the new resources were reached. The introduction of a new species of rye, the “root rye”, and the burn-beaten technique of huuhta have been considered such revolutionary innovations, because root rye yields are high and the huuhta technique made it possible to use spruce forest for cultivation (Manninen 1922: 60–67, 113, Soininen 1961: 153–154). According to Reijo Solantie, an even more important factor was that this kind of rye was resistant to snow mould fungi, which had previously been the most important obstacle to successful large-scale cultivation in Eastern Fennoscandia. The conditions for this disease are especially good,
because the thick snow cover keeps the ground unfrozen in many places during the winter (Solantie 1998: 154; Solantie 1997: 28). The timing of the huuhta technique is disputed, because some scholars regard it as the original method (cf. Korpela 2008: 63). The problem of this entire explanation, however, is that the limits of the local resources were not reached before the introduction of the innovations, and therefore they did not fill some resource gap.

According to Marvin Harris, the transition to permanent agriculture did not depend on new knowledge, but on the fact that the existence of the population was challenged and it was forced to expand its production of food. The people of the forest zone of Eastern Fennoscandia obviously did not begin undertaking any large-scale agriculture earlier, because they did not need to. I have attempted to show that fish was the basic diet among the forest dwellers. They changed their way of life to permanent cultivation in the 16th century, because the new state power demanded taxes for the support of the army and the new bureaucracy, and this new taxation plundered the earnings of the locals for state building. In spite of the expansion of field cultivation, the standard of living collapsed in Eastern Finland as well (Harris 1991: 5–7, 18, 40–43, 101–123, 233–235, and passim, Korpela 2008: 200, 273–276).

In this small article I will try to discuss one aspect of the population numbers of medieval Eastern Finland and propose one explanation for the unrealistic population expansion in sources. The criticism of the medieval population size in Finland most probably fits the traditional calculations of the entire European medieval population as well. The idea of a strong decline in population after the fall of the Roman Empire is absurd; the administration collapsed, but this did not mean anything for basic food production and there is no other reason for a decrease in population. Our medieval sources for population size start only in the 12th century in connection with agricultural reform and parish building, which forced people to move into villages (incastellamento) and start field cultivation under the control of a local lord. The stories of unpopulated fertile territories were usually propagandistic writings, which sought to invite people to go to new areas and start field cultivation there to produce tax revenue (Moore 2000: 39–64; Tamm 2009: 20–25).

The People of the Medieval Backwoods

According to scholars, the “Lapps” formed the nomadic hunter-fisher populations of the backwoods, while others say that there is no evidence for the presence of “Sámi speakers” south of the River Oulujoki (Huurre 1995: 151–154; Huurre 1983: 412–414; Carpelan 1984: 104–107; Carpelan 2003: 59–69; Vilkuna 1971: 233–236; Lehtola 2008: 2–7).

Toponyms of Sámi origin are one important group of sources concerning the pre-European past of the forest area, because they have been identified all over Finland and Karelia. There is also a wide distribution of toponyms that
have the prefix \textit{lappi}-, e.g. Lapinjärvi, extending from South-Western Finland to Russian Northern Karelia, and there is other vocabulary in use in the Finno-Ugric languages outside Lapland proper that has Sámi roots. The third set of evidence consists of archaeological finds from an area outside of Lapland that have been connected with Sámi speakers, including Lapp cairns and the Bronze Age culture of Eastern Finland (Korhonen 1979: 175–206; Itkonen 1984: 98–107; Kočkurkina 2005: 55–56; Pöllä 1995: 28–30, cf. Huurre 1995: 152–153).

We must distinguish the following concepts from each other: 1) Sámi speakers; 2) Finno-Ugrian speakers; 3) People who are called “Lapps”; 4) Semi-nomadic hunter-fishers of the forests; 5) Reindeer herders; 6) Subjective identity which plays a role in the formation of local unity; 7) Objective identity which is a classification imposed by outsiders (cf. Korpela 2008: 31–34; Korpela 2008: 42–55).

There are four words to refer to the Sámi. The most common, probably indigenous word is \textit{sápmelaš}, while the second, rarer expression is \textit{vuovjoš}, the third \textit{lapp(i)} and the fourth \textit{finn(a)/skridfinn(a)/terfinnar}. The medieval documents do not employ the first and second appellations, but they are known in toponyms, while the fourth is used in Danish, Norwegian and Anglo-Saxon sources. \textit{Lapp(i)} is the word that the Finns, Swedes and others use traditionally, but in the early Baltic-Finnic languages it acquired the meaning of a remote district and the people living there as well. Some folk poems also use the concept of \textit{lappi} as a synonym for heathen habits and paganism (Valonen 1984: 82–86; Korhonen 1979: 175–179; Carpelan 1998: 76–84; Nuutinen 1988: 128–133; Hansen–Olsen 2004: 47–51; Zachrisson 1997[a]: 158–174; Tarkka 2005: 98–99, 127, 303–304; Ušakov 1972: 21; Saxonis gesta lib. V:13:1; Historia Norwegiae, “De Finnis”, King Alfred’s Orosius I,1 [pp. 16–17]; SKV 6, no. 2 [verse 31–32] [p. 2], no. 4053 [p. 939]).

Heterogeneous Finno-Ugric speakers inhabit forests from Central Norway and Sweden over Finland, Lapland and Estonia to Central Siberia. In the northern areas they are and were Sámi speakers, but in the south they are now Finnic speakers, and east of Lake Onega speakers of Russian and other Finno-Ugric languages. It is difficult to distinguish among the various Finnic languages in the medieval context, since the spoken forms have varied and the written standards have formed under a very strong influence from European state and nation-building procedures over the last five centuries.

The “Sámi language” is in fact a language group that consists today of ten languages. The Sámi languages in Southern Finland, which were spoken in the Middle Ages but which have now died out, may have differed less from other early Finno-Ugric languages than the modern language forms, so their disappearance may have only accentuated the differences between the Finnic and Sámi speakers (Korhonen 1981: 15–18, 48–50; Strade 1997: 175–185).

I do not deny the factual existence of different languages and their speakers in the medieval forests. I only stress that the foreign scribes were neither able nor interested in noting these differences and identifying the populations according to them. I also doubt that language served as an identity-making factor among
the populations. A supra-local consciousness and encounters with others are necessary preconditions for a linguistic identity. Semi-nomadic hunter-fishers hardly formed supra-local entities because their economic, cultural (religious), social and administrative structures were all formed around co-resident groups. Trade contacts did not result in regular encounters with outsiders either, because they were organized along networks and probably took place even in part as a goods exchange ceremony where the people did not always meet each other (Korpela 2008: 16–17, 31–34, 46, 55, 65–75, 208–217 and passim).

According to Lähteenmäki the populations of Lapland were divided into various groups and these established their identities in the 19th century according to their way of life. The Sámi language and its associated ethnic definitions concerned only a small minority, the nomadic reindeer herders, while otherwise the populations consisted of people with mixed backgrounds. According to Zachrisson, problems of identification concerning the medieval (Sámi) hunter-fisher culture of Central Scandinavia are considerable as well (Lähteenmäki 2004: 290–298, 474–475; Zachrisson 1997[a]: 171–172; Zachrisson 1997[b]: 186–188; Zachrisson 1997[c]: 189–220; Hansen–Olsen 2004: 45, 87–90; Odner 1983: 104–106; Aalto 2005: 102–106).

Fishing was the predominant source of livelihood in the medieval Sámi culture, while reindeer played only a limited role. Fishing must also have provided the main sustenance of all the medieval Finno-Ugric forest dwellers (Korpela 2008: 200), which makes it impossible to distinguish in economical terms the Sámi speakers from other Finno-Ugric-speaking forest dwellers. Most probably, the borders of various populations were overlapping and mixed. The economic categorization of the people was decisive in the eyes of outsiders (Pentikäinen 1995: 86–87; Vahtola 2003: 122–127; Nahkiaisoja 2003: 176–177).

The Beginnings of Royal Administration and Realm Formation

The formation of outer contacts led people to identify themselves as “us versus them”. Because nearly all agricultural vocabulary in the Finnic languages is of Germanic origin, the division among Finno-Ugrian speakers took place when the inhabitants of the south introduced field cultivation and the hunter-fishers remained as they were in the inland forests (Hansen–Olsen 2004: 31–42; Odner 1983: 10, 104–107; Strade 1997: 177; Korhonen 1981: 37; Hansen 1996: 41–42). When the European monarchies were established, they also had to define their relationship with the forest dwellers. The royal steward Knut Jonsson called the people *hominis siluestres et vagi, vulgariter dicti Lappa*, in September of 1328. At a later date, an unknown German chronicler counted the Lapps and Finns among the *wilde lude* (savage peoples) (FMU I 360; Ex prima continuacione a. 1395–1400, a. 1399 [p. 205], cf. also Lamberg 2006: 121–125).
The forest dwellers were not visible in the eyes of the authorities, and these authorities didn’t acknowledge the rights of these peoples. King Albrecht of Mecklenburg gave the area of Sääminginsalo in the Central Saimaa region as a fief to the noblemen Nils and Bengt Thuresson in the 1360s as if it was an uninhabited area, but there is a number of records pointing to an earlier human presence there. The inhabitants had their own system for defining the rights to use and own natural resources and to resolve everyday issues, but these things were not real from the perspective of European rulers (REA 187; Vilkuna 1971: 225–228; Parviainen 1976: 42, cf. Lehtosalo-Hilander 1988: 150–151; Räisänen 2003: 130–131; Korpela [in print(b)])

King Albrecht of Mecklenburg decided in February 1365 that one Mattisse of Orewall had founded a farm according to the law in the wilderness of Valkeala, but the local inhabitants had expelled him from the region. The King ordered the men to return the lands to Mattisse. A folk tale also attests this “Matti” (= Mattisse), but it considers him a criminal. Following the royal declaration, Mattisse had most probably taken possession of lands which belonged to somebody else according to the indigenous norms. He represented the new European order that did not acknowledge the traditional rights of use beyond the King’s jurisdiction (FMU VIII 6585; Mulk 1996: 69–74; Rosén 1936: 95–111; Kepsu 1990: 110–111, 139, cf. also Nahkiaisoja 2003: 168–169).

When King Magnus Ericsson confirmed the rights of Christian colonists in the lands of the north (“Lappmarken”) in 1340, he ordered that the colonists should have free ownership over all that they had taken into use and that they came under Swedish law. When his son, King Eric Magnusson, renewed their privileges in 1358, he explained that the colonists “are there for the increase of the Swedish Kingdom and Christianity” (DS IV 3473; FMU I 675).

When the bailiff of Häme, Magnus Kazi, donated the house of Kantala for the requiem mass of the late Bo Jonsson in 1390, he placed certain restrictions on his donation, one of which concerned “the Lapps that belonged to the house”. Similarly, the bailiff of Norrbotten, Sten Henriksson, decided in 1454 that a group of Lapps who had arrived from Häme were not the king’s Lapps but belonged to the Birkkarlar (private tax collectors) of Piteå and Luleå. Forest people seem to have been considered objects which could be owned (REA 187, 269; FMU IV 2959; Suvanto 1985: 197).

The Supervision Book of 1597 of “Muscovite Lapp pogosts” states expressively, “And in Kuittijärvi there were 33 Lapps living in the forest. And they paid 11 bows in tax to the ruler. In the year 99 [= 1591/1592] they were killed by foreigners. Now five new Lapps have arrived in Kuittijärvi and they pay one and a half bows.” These people just came into existence out of nowhere when they were included on the tax rolls of the prince (Dozornaja kniga lopskih pogostov 1597g., p. 215, [l. 67–67ob.]).

We have similar evidence for Swedish Eastern Finland. In 1564 Judge Jesper Sigfridsson decided in Tavisalmi that the peasant Per Ollikainen could keep a field that the “fisher peasants” had cleared. Who were these fisher peasants
and why did Per Ollikainen receive their fields? According to the “law” of the slash-and-burn culture, the field belonged to the person who had cleared it, and now the king’s judge was making a distinct exception in this respect. Is it possible that they were hunter-fishers who did not pay taxes and were therefore judged to be living outside the realm and beyond the king’s protection (Domböcker 1559 och 1561–1565, p. 177)?

Demand on Resources and Control

The commercial turn of the early 14th century concerned the Eastern Fennoscandian area and cut off most contacts between the inland forests and Europe, which made the populations invisible in the sources for the next 200 years. The coastal and southern areas were integrated into Swedish, Norwegian and Novgorodian realm formation, some colonization took place and a permanent parish network was organized there (Mulk 1996: 75–76; Wallerström 2000: 3–39; Korpela 2008: 217–225; Hiekkanen 2002: 488–495).

Despite some early stories concerning the baptism of the interior of Lapland, as late as 1574 King John III of Sweden ordered priests to be sent to the Kemi region of Lapland because the inhabitants were living as pagans. The true work of incorporating the inhabitants of Lapland into the Swedish realm began during the last years of the 16th century, when new churches were built and priests sent off (Handlingar och uppsatser II, no. 1–3, 5–11).

Integration measures started in North-West Russia only in the 16th century as well, although single contacts are recorded earlier and the first monasteries were founded in the 15th century (FMU VII 5935; Korpela 2008: 144–145; Parppei 2010: 30–34; Makarov 1997: 8–47, passim, Ušakov 1972: 23–34, 41; Hansen 1996: 59–62). The Archbishopric of Novgorod was reorganized when Hegumen Makarij was appointed archbishop in 1526. Makarij started a systematic mission to Karelia and Lapland and continued this integration policy of the northern territories after he was promoted to Metropolitan of Moscow and all-Russia in 1542 (N4L 7034; Korpela 2005[a]: 44–53; Korpela 2005[c]: 61–82; Korpela 2010: 205–207, 210–212, 214).

The Supervision Book of 1597 records the number of houses and the names of the taxpayers in the Lapp pogosts (Lintujärvi, Semsjärvi, Selki, Paatene, Rukajärvi, Suikujärvi and Paanajärvi). There are Finno-Ugrian names such as Serguša and Kalinka Sjugiev, Klimko and Griša Nesterov syn Kičin, Timoška Gennjujev, Fed’ko Tjulljujev, Alekseiko Pitkäsilmä and Timoška Tikkela. Moreover, the scribe has attached the term lopin to some Slavic names, e.g. Ostaško lopin, Bojarink lopin and Ivaško Bezimjannov lopin. Ivaško Koivula lopin from Rukajärvi pogost belongs to both groups. The word means “a Lapp”, but it is not clear whether it refers to a Sámi speaker or a Finno-Ugrian forest dweller in general. Moreover, these people bore Christian names, so they must have differed in some way from the pagan populations (Kniga sbora dannyh i obročnyh deneg,
The Supervision Book refers to five “Lapp” newcomers. They had the Christian names Ivanko Igalov, Stepanko Rettij, Ivanko Kuz’min, Naumko Kuz’min and Panko Ortem’jev. They were evidently Christians who were living in permanent settlements, so that they had now given up their nomadic lifestyle and resembled the above-mentioned lopin. The definition of a “newcomer” refers obviously to those “coming” from outside of the realm, from “non-existence” (Dozornaja kniga lopskih pogostov 1597g. pp. 214–215, [l. 64ob. 67–67ob.]; Černjakova 2003: 28). The documents refer to pagans collectively with the expression lopari. In most cases the sources mention that they were living in the forests. These Lapps had no permanent dwellings by Muscovite standards but were leading a nomadic life.

There were three kinds of “Lapps”, which formed predominantly the population of the inland pogosts of Kola (“distant” Lapland), e.g. Munomoše where 42 Christian “Lapps” were living in 15 villages. The “Christian Lapps” formed the first group of “Lapps” and were dealt with as a collective. The second kind consisted of those whose names carried the specification lopin. The peasant Mihałło Savel’ev, for instance, was designated as syn lopin, the son of a “Lapp”, and Stepanko Dement’ev was also syn lopin, but his sister Iriška Ondreeva was a “Lapp” woman and the wife of a “Lapp” man from Munomoše by the name of Selivanov. Thus the local people were divided into “Lapps” and peasants, and an individual could cross the boundary between these groups, because it was one’s way of life and not one’s ethnic origin which mattered. The difference was so clear that the tax books did not use the concept of derevnja (hamlet or village) in connection with the “Lapps” but stated that “the Christian Lapps were living in veža”, i.e. in a Lapp village. The Lapp identity was here subjective as well as objective, but it was an economic and not a language-based identity. (Vypiska, pp. 412 [cap. 12], 417 [cap. 31], 426 [cap. 64], 430 [cap. 80–81]).

The third “Lapp” group can be identified in Pääjärv (Pjaozero). The great majority of the “Christian Lapps” of the tax books have Russian Christian names with some exceptions, such as Simanko Mustopartin, but unlike in other places, the names in Pääjärv seem to be predominantly Sámi ones: Hanko Jungin syn, Sarrei Päiviev syn, Ikoiko, Igasa, Ikieva, Lemmit Torviev syn and his children Titto, Janka and Päivi, etc. The area was a remote one and only superficially integrated into the ruler’s dominions (Vypiska iz piscovoj knigi Alaja Mihalkova, pp. 449, [cap. 150], 462 [cap. 196]). The “Lapps” of Pääjärv might be those whom a Solovki scribe described, according to Afanasij Ščapov, as “living in inaccessible wildernesses without churches and without any dwellings or the necessities for human life”, or those about whom the Supervision Book states, “And in Kuittijärv there are baptised and unbaptised Lapps living in the forest who remained alive after the war against the foreigners. The foreigners killed
the other Lapps and burned their tents.” (Ščapov 1906: 83; Dozornaja kniga lopskih pogostov 1597g. pp. 214 [l. 64ob.]).

The Russian material from Lapland shows the pattern of the integration. Pagan Sámi came from outside the records into documentary attestation when they started to pay taxes and settled down more permanently. First, they were referred to with ethnic names and considered “Lapps”. The second level was the introduction of the Slavic Christian names, but they were still called “Lapps” due to their economic system. The third step was total integration into the economical mode of the larger society and the omission of the definition of “Lapp”.

The integration of the southern areas of Eastern Finland and Karelia did not differ much from the process in Lapland. Only the most central areas along the shores of the Gulf of Finland, the Karelian Isthmus, and Olonec were brought into the medieval European realms before the end of the 15th century, when the castle of Nyslott was built and the first Muscovite tax books of Karelia were composed (Korpela 2005[b]: 64–65), which was the beginning of a sovereign, territorialized kingdom and state in these areas.

According to a letter of the State Council of Sweden, the countrymen of Savo and Karelia knew nothing of Christian doctrine nor did they go to church, but rather they were living like “Lapps and other pagans” in 1504. The Council ordered Bishop Laurentius of Åbo to found new parishes, because until that point some people had to travel more than 150 kilometres to attend church. According to canons Michael Agricola and Canutus Johannis Raumensis, the religious situation in northern Savo was still as poor in 1549 (REA 694; Handlingar till upplysning… VIII, no. 15, pp. 58–60). Archbishop Makarij described in a very dark tone the situation in Muscovite Karelia in 1534 as well, and Archbishop Feodosij continued along the same lines in 1548 (N4L 7042; Materialy po istorii Karelii, no. 52, 64). All of this information stresses that there were already many people living in forests outside of state/church control before the founding of the parishes, unlike the traditional literature’s account that parishes were organized after the wishes of the colonists.

The introduction of large-scale cultivation, the change of the economic system and the registration of people as taxpayers took place during the 16th and 17th centuries hand in hand with the building of local administration, parishes and the allocation of the army to the area (Korpela 2008: 227–285). The building of the realm was a slow and enforced process. The peasants of Savo complained to the king in 1545 that Bailiff Clemett Henriksson Krook had ordered them to build a stone mansion in their forests, although it had been their common area for fishing and hunting and was their main source of sustenance. The peasants also wondered why the bailiff had denied them their traditional right to build new houses in the area. The royal bailiff introduced landownership, field cultivation and a permanent way of life among the locals, who simply did not understand these things and wished to continue their traditional forest economy (Handlingar till upplysning af Finlands häfder, VI, no. 147, pp. 309–312).
“Lapps” are recorded as taxpayers in Swedish registers until the tax reform of 1664. Some of them were known by name, such as “Kapain”, “Pänsi”, “Musta”, “Hanno Lauri”, “Suripettari”, “Huumo” and “Suru”. These people represented already a transition culture, because their way of life was permanent enough for tax collection. Per “Lappinpoica” (= son of a Lapp) of Visulahti is recorded in the silver tax register of 1571 as owning a cow, two sheep and one goat (Finlands silverskatteregister, p. 72; Pirinen 1982: 329; Sammallahti 1984: 148–149; Lehtola 2008: 8–14). Nonetheless there still may have been another kind of people as well, just as on the Muscovite side. According to a complaint by a working man, Mikko Kuokkanen, against local officials in 1764, “the inhabitants of Liperi (North Karelia) are moving back and forth in the forests like Lapps”. This indicates that the way of life of the “Lapps” was still a concept in local everyday speech (Tuomiokirjat: Härads Rättens Dombok j Carelen för Åhr 1764, pp. 730ff. 114–117; Korpela 2004: 230–231; Wallerström 1995: 280).

From an economic point of view, there were nomadic hunter-fisher populations living in the forests of Eastern Fennoscandia in the 16th century. The border between these and the culture of permanent large-scale cultivation is unclear but not identical to the language or “ethnic” borders between the Finns, Karelians and Sámi. (Huurre 1995: 144–145, 153–154; Taavitsainen 1990: 54–55; Taavitsainen 2003: 21–47; Lehtinen–Sepänmaa 1995: 81, cf. also the map of Huurre 1995: p. 30).

Homogenization of Subjects, Change of Lifestyle and the Savo Population Explosion

The real number of medieval “Lapps” must have greatly exceeded their number in sources. If only a few poor fishermen lived there, why did Swedish peasant troops make raids through roadless forests to Dvina in places located more than 600 kilometres away from their homes? The story of the Lapps of Kuittijärvi as well as that about “fisher peasants” in Tavisalmi reveals the nomadic population that remained off the books. This population and their impact on the surrounding area are visible in the recent analysis of lake sediments all over Eastern Fennoscandia as well.

The supposed colonization and population growth of earlier studies can be easily explained by the notion that the building of the new administration registered the entire heterogeneous population of the forests as taxpayers and thus a medieval “invisible” population of the forests became “visible”. The records about newcomers, new houses and considerable desertion can be easily explained as reflections of the traditional semi-nomadic way of life (Korpela 2008: 279–282).

The church was an organization that had control over everyday life, and therefore the religious reform of the 16th century meant the real start of the
cultural homogenization of the forest areas. An especially important tool was the use of local languages which started at this time. Medieval Latin or Church Slavonic were not suitable tools for the administrative control, cultural subjection and homogenization of forest dwellers.

The change in the economic system meant also a change in the objective identity of the southern forest dwellers, because the sources began to describe them in a different way: they were no longer “Lapps” and outsiders to the scribes, but rather they were now members of the same society, peasants. Most probably it meant also a smooth change in their subjective identity, because the people changed their way of life and religion and came in permanent contact with outsiders. They started to form a supra-local identity for themselves and to consider the last hunter-fishers of the forests as foreigners, the Lapps proper.

The new Swedish power integrated in the late medieval period the Finnic speakers of the south. When the development penetrated further north, these Finnic speakers formed an instrument of development and the new Finnish-language church supported this. On the Muscovite side, however, the times of troubles stopped the development in the north. Despite some possible early attempts at the creation of a written Finnic language for Muscovite northern areas, the language of church and civil administration remained Russian (Korpela 2010: 217–218).

Perhaps the southern Sámi and other “Lapps” were assimilated to Finns in the Swedish realm, where they formed the population of Savo, and the other Sámi were marginalized in the north, while in the Muscovite realm the integration took place in Russian, leading to a marginalization of Karelian and Sámi. The language shift of a population within a few generations is not at all a unique phenomenon in history but usually connected with economic turns, re-organization of societies and cultural ruptures. It enables the integration of locals into new structures and it supports their social rise (Fishman 1997: 40–67).

Thus the traditional population explosion theory of Savo people must be re-evaluated. The recorded colonization partly reflects the traditional semi-nomadic way of life and the description of the colonization process in the former studies has been limited within these cases. A more essential part of the registered colonists consisted of former forest dwellers, Lapps, who had now changed their economic system and were integrated into the realm and its records. A portion of this population were local Sámi speakers who had also now changed their language to Finnish.
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