

UDC 930.1(477):94(477)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226552

Yuriy STEPANCHUK

PhD hab.(History), Docent, Associate Professor of the Department of History and Culture of Ukraine of Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University named after M. Kotsiubynskiy, 32 Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi’ Street, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, postal code 21001 (iiepp@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0001-6693-1463

Tetiana MELNYCHUK

PhD (History), Docent of the Department of History and Culture of Ukraine of Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University named after M. Kotsiubynskiy, 32 Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi’ Street, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, postal code 21001 (tmelnuhyk@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-6814-142X

Юрiй СТЕПАНЧУК

доктор iсторичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри iсторiї та культури України Винницького державного педагогiчного унiверситету iменi Михайла Коцюбинського, вул. Костянтина Острозького, 32, м. Винниця, Україна, iндекс 21001 (iiepp@ukr.net)

Тетяна МЕЛЬНИЧУК

кандидат iсторичних наук, доцент кафедри iсторiї та культури України Винницького державного педагогiчного унiверситету iменi Михайла Коцюбинського, вул. Костянтина Острозького, 32, м. Винниця, Україна, iндекс 21001 (tmelnuhyk@gmail.com)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Stepanchuk, Yu. & Melnychuk, T. (2021). The Concept of “Ukraine” Evolution in Early Modern times in Modern Ukrainian Historiography Coverage. *Skhidnoievropeiskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 229–238. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226552

THE CONCEPT OF “UKRAINE” EVOLUTION IN EARLY MODERN TIMES IN MODERN UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY COVERAGE

Abstract. *The purpose of the research* isto identify the main tendencies of themodern scientific discourse concerning the issue’s evolution interpretation in early modern times of the name “Ukraine”. **The methodology of the research** involves the comparative studies’ methods symbiosis usage, contextual analysis, convergence from the abstract to the concrete and vice versa. **The scientific novelty** is determined by the fact that the basic laws of modern scientific discourse in Ukraine, connected with the understanding of the name “Ukraine” functioning in early modern Ukraine and derived concepts: the “Ukrainian people”, the “Ukrainians”. The thematic and conceptual echo between modern interpretations has been traced, the scientific innovations which have appeared recently were allocated, perspective directions of the further researches were outlined. **The Conclusions.** In the first decades of the XXIst century there has been a renewed research focus on interpretations of the past functioning of the name “Ukraine”, but the emphasis shifted from the problems of the origin and original semantics of this concept to clarify the peculiarities of its use in early modern times. In particular, the concept’s circulation among the Ukrainian nobility and the Cossacks, the place of names “Ukraine”, the

“Ukrainian people”, the “Ukrainians” in the practices of the Hetmanate’s elite until the end of the 70-ies of the XVIIth century, the functioning of the concept of “Ukraine” in the Cossack narratives of the XVIIIth century was considered. Two important tendencies of scientific discourse were singled out: the evolution of the name “Ukraine” did not go beyond the geographical-territorial framework; the name “Ukraine” became a political name, and the terms the “Ukrainian people” and the “Ukrainians” became the Hetmanate’s elite marker of the identity.

Key words: *Ukraine, the Ukrainians, the Ukrainian people, modern historiography, scientific discourse, concept, key tendencies.*

ЕВОЛЮЦІЯ ПОНЯТТЯ “УКРАЇНА” В РАННЬОМОДЕРНІ ЧАСИ У ВИСВІТЛЕННІ СУЧАСНОЇ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ

Анотація. *Мета дослідження* полягає у вияві основних тенденцій сучасного наукового дискурсу щодо інтерпретації проблеми еволюції в ранньомодерні часи самоназви “Україна”. **Методологія дослідження** передбачає використання симбіозу методів компаративістики, контекстуального аналізу, сходження від абстрактного до конкретного і навпаки. **Наукова новизна** визначається тим, що з’ясовано основні закономірності сучасного наукового дискурсу в Україні, пов’язаного з осмисленням функціонування в ранньомодерній Україні самоназви “Україна” та похідних понять – “український народ”, “українці”. Простежено тематичний і концептуальний перегук між сучасними інтерпретаціями, виділено наукові новації, які з’явилися останнім часом, окреслено перспективні напрямки подальших досліджень. **Висновки.** У перші десятиліття XXI ст. спостережено поновлення дослідницької уваги до інтерпретації функціонування в минулому самоназви “Україна”, проте акцент зміщено з проблем походження та первісної семантики цього поняття до з’ясування особливостей його вживання в ранньомодерні часи. Зокрема, простежено обіг поняття в середовищі української шляхти та козацтва, місце самоназв “Україна”, “український народ”, “українці” у практиках еліти Гетьманщини до кінця 70-х рр. XVII ст., розглянуто функціонування поняття “Україна” в козацьких нарративах XVIII ст. Виділено дві важливі тенденції наукового дискурсу: еволюція самоназви “Україна” не вийшла за географічно-територіальні рамки; назва “Україна” перетворилася на політонім, а поняття “український народ” та “українці” стали маркером ідентичності еліти Гетьманщини.

Ключові слова: *Україна, українці, український народ, сучасна історіографія, науковий дискурс, концепція, ключові тенденції.*

The Problem Statement. The scientific discourse’s detailed analysis relevance in the study concerning the concept of “Ukraine” semantic content’s evolution in early modern times was primarily due to the fact that such a discourse was of paramount importance for the adequate scientific ideas’ formation about the identity’s specifics in early modern Ukraine. The belief in the existence of a name of one’s own territorial and political space was a very informative indicator in the worldview’s study of and the elite’s self-awareness. However, owing to the elites’ change in Ukraine after the Hetmanate’s formation left a special imprint, as a result, the competition between the names “Rus” and “Ukraine” intensified. Furthermore, the above-mentioned processes reflected the needs related to the Ukrainian state’s restoration under the Cossack flag of its international recognition, the Cossacks’ emergence on the horizon of a new Ukrainian’s elite formation with a simultaneous decline in thenobility’s representative role.

Hence, the historiographical development analysis of the name of the Ukrainian world process is aimed at highlighting the modern research’s features and a set of problems’ conceptualization, which is related to the elites’ and Ukrainian statehood’s history. There is a drastic need to identify the Ukrainian discourse’s influence on the scientific ideas

concerning early modern Ukraine in the world, especially in the Hetmanate’s essence qualification.

The Analysis of Resent Researches. The functioning specifics’ analysis of the concept of “Ukraine” in early modern times did not serve as an object of in-depth historiographical attention. A few observations are available in the historiographical tradition up till nowadays. Most of them are expressed not in the special investigations on the historiography of the issue, but in the occasional reproduction of their own considerations on the issue. First of all, N. Yakovenko in 2012 limited herself to generalizing that modern historians (both in Ukraine and abroad) reached a certain consensus that “Ukraine” until the Cossack wars of the mid – the XVIIth century was called the south-eastern border of Rzeczpospolita – Kyiv and Bratslav voivodships” (Yakovenko, 2012, p. 32). N. Yakovenko also noted that the researchers managed to notice the gradual expansion concerning the concept’s of “Ukraine” territorial content in the sources. Second of, one more researcher, T. Chukhlib, sought to initiate a new discussion on the use of the terms “Ukraine”, the “Ukrainian people” and the “Ukrainians” in the early modern era, argued with his contemporaries, questioned the main thesis about the geographical and territorial dimension of Ukraine (Chukhlib, 2015, pp. 15–18). Finally, L. Zashkilniak and V. Adadurov accuse modern researchers of illegally using the name “Ukraine” for the early modern era in the ethnopolitical sense, calling for its use only as a geographical-territorial concept, i.e., in the natural, in their opinion, meaning for those times (Zashkilniak, 2008, pp. 77–78; Adadurov, 2013, p. 9).

The Purpose of Publication is to clarify the main tendencies in the interpretation concerning the semantic content of the early modern name “Ukraine” in modern Ukrainian historiography.

The Basic Material Statement. The research interest in the issue of the name “Ukraine” resumed in the mainland Ukrainian historiography at the beginning of 90-ies of the XXth century after a long break. Due to the humanities’ development conditions in Ukraine, which underwent radical changes, the above-mentioned boom occurred. Gaining independence led to the fall of the harsh Soviet ideological dictatorship and the “iron curtain”, to the introduction of institutional innovations in Ukrainian science, to unleash the tightness of the Soviet historiography, the leading Ukrainian historians’ fundamental works publication of the end of the XIXth and beginning of the XXth centuries, as well as the works, written by diaspora researchers. The Ukrainian historiography’s real integration process into the world context also started. Young people deprived of the personal legacy of Soviet totalitarianism joined the scientific discourse. As a result, it led to a sharp expansion of thematic and conceptual horizons of historical research. In particular, there was an interest in the elites’ and the Ukrainian statehood’s history, which paved the way for issues related to both historical names of the Ukrainian world – “Rus” and “Ukraine”. In the end, an additional factor was the general atmosphere filled with new intellectual challenges posed by an independent Ukrainian state’s restoration.

It should be noted that an important intellectual stimulus for the emergence in mainland Ukraine of new scientific versions of the functioning of the concept of “Ukraine” in early modern times was the development of the conceptual achievements of diasporic historiography, as in many other areas of historical knowledge. The works, written by S. Shelukhin, J. Rudnytskyi, Y. Shevelyov and the representatives of the younger generation (F. Sysyn, Z. Kohut) in this field inspired the directions of issue’s understanding, finally, determined the perspective of many conceptualizations.

Due to S. Makarchuk, who conducted a report at the regular Congress of the International Association of Ukrainian Studies, which was the signal for the revival of interest in the origin and evolution of the meaning of the name “Ukraine” already in 1993 (Makarchuk, 1994, pp. 206–211), and a year later, P. Tolochko’s article made an attempt to trace the semantic changes in the Ukrainian space of the concept of “Ukraine” in the XIIth – at beginning of the XVIIIth centuries. In the end, it was possible to formulate the provisions that initiated one of the main interpretative versions in modern Ukrainian historiography.

The researcher, P. Tolochko used the chronicle material of the XIIth – beginning of the XVIIIth centuries, as well as part of the documentary sources, which were introduced into scientific circulation, and as a result, at the basic level joined the already well-developed in historiography model, which includes the idea of evolving the name “Ukraine” from the “outskirts” sound to denote a specific geographical and territorial integrity in the XIIth – XVIIIth centuries. The starting positions of the researcher coincide with J. Rudnytskyi’s view, who opposed S. Shelukhin’s main thesis that the name Ukraine originally meant “land” as a whole. However, in the interpretation of the early modern semantics of the concept of “Ukraine” P. Tolochko’s and J. Rudnytskyi’s thoughts diverged. According to J. Rudnytskyi, the term in the XVIth – XVIIth centuries acquired the meaning of the “country, land, state” (Rudnytskyi, 1951, pp. 59, 88), for P. Tolochko, the term never went beyond geographical boundaries.

According to P. Tolochko, the “outskirts” pedigree of “Ukraine” had no alternative, as well as restrictions during the Hetmanate semantics of the concept of space. In addition, the author claimed that “The territorial and geographical nature of the name “Ukraine” was not in doubt among any of the serious researchers” (Tolochko, 1994, p. 3). The further main plotline was represented by the thesis that in the future the semantic content of the concept, although undergoing modifications, but it took place within the paradigm of “ukrain”. The multiplicity of the “Ukrainians” was explained by the fact that in scientific sources they “were called the peripheral (border) territories that were under the political protectorate (or entirely in administrative and political subordination) of Poland, Lithuania, Russia, Turkey” (Tolochko, 1994, p. 5). Due to the Hetmanate emergence’s influence in the middle of the XVIIth century, one of them began to acquire a broader meaning, but still, only geographical and territorial denoted only the space of the Cossack state. The researcher denied the possibility of the evolution of the concept towards ethnopolitonym, specifically emphasizing this; the upper limit of such evolution was the establishment in society for “Ukraine” of the status of a separate region: “... during the XVIIth – beginning of the XVIIIth centuries, it gradually acquired the meaning of a specific geographical concept equivalent to the name of Volyn, Podillya, Zaporizhya, Red Rus’, Siveria, Pokuttya” (Tolochko, 1994, p. 8).

Tolochko’s interpretation remains the starting point for conceptual approaches based on the idea of the “outskirts” origin of the concept of “Ukraine” till nowadays. The above-mentioned approaches were in abundance in the Ukrainian historiography. Numerous researchers, for example, V. Adadurov, L. Zashkilniak, G. Kasianov, V. Kravchenko, A. Motsya, and O. Tolochko supported the idea that in the early modern period the mentioned concept should be interpreted from the territorial-geographical point of view. For example, L. Zashkilniak put emphasis on the fact that the authors used constantly the term “Ukraine”, the “Ukrainians”, the “Ukrainian”, although for the Middle Ages and early modern times these terms had primarily geographical and territorial, not national content – we can speak about it only at the end of the XIXth century” (Zashkilniak, 2008, pp. 77–78). The researcher A. Motsia in a scientific article quoted P. Tolochko’s conclusion and commented extensively

on it (Motsia, 2007, p. 343). The notion of “Ukraine” as a separate territory along with Podillya, Volyn or Galicia was appealed to by appeals not to use this concept in the political sense and not to modernize ethnonyms, based on the fact that “each epoch must be described in its own terms” (Adadurov, 2013, p. 9; Kasianov, Tolochko, 2012, p. 20).

Furthermore, a version appeared that was fundamentally different from the position of the geographical-territorial interpretation of the semantic content of the name “Ukraine” for early modern times, closer to the XXth century. Hence, P. Sas joined the main stream of diasporic historiography (from S. Shelukhin to J. Rudnytskyi and F. Sysyn) and outlined a completely different trajectory of the evolution of the concept. The image of “Ukraine” to the middle of the XVIIth century in the political-territorial categories was interpreted as the “Rus’heirss”, in particular, the following information was mentioned: “At the end of the XVIth – in the first half of the XVIIth century the reductions of the term “Rus’” in its political and geographical aspects to the political-territorial definition of “Ukraine” were traced” (Sas, 1998, p. 98). The above-mentioned approach made possible a new interpretation of the further fate of “Ukraine” in scientific discourse – its transformation into a political name in the restored Ukrainian state in the middle of the XVIIth century (Sas, 1998, p. 105). For the XVIth – the first half of the XVIIth century the researcher, following F. Sysyn (1982), distinguished two versions of the circulation of the concept in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: in a broad sense it covered all Ukrainian voivodships, in a narrow sense – “Ukraine” in the first half of the XVIIth century “acted as a political-territorial definition concerning Kyiv region and Eastern Podillya” (Sas, 1998, p. 104).

Typologically, N. Yakovenko’s conceptual vision is in line with P. Sasa’s work, but the researcher chronologically and thematically expanded the observation to the second half of the XVIIth century. First of all, the unambiguity of the statement about the “outskirts” origin of the term was devalued. N. Yakovenko spoke in support of the possibility of a different interpretation of the content of the first news concerning “Ukraine”, noting that S. Shelukhin’s concept of the origin of the name Ukraine from the Proto-Slavic “*кряжъ*” or “*ukraj*” had a right to exist (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 31, 44). In addition, the researcher expressed solidarity with another S. Shelukhin’s thesis, in particular, the name “Ukraine” arose as an oral name (Yakovenko, 2005, p. 23). Noting the semantic plurality with the use of the concept during the Middle Ages and early modern times, combined with the tendency to cover the term of the entire Ukrainian space, and competition with Rus’ terminology, the researcher summed up the following: “...so, maybe this word really was the specific name of Ukraine-Rus’ and, in fact, that’s why, in the end, it won the name contest” (Yakovenko, 2012, p. 43).

Interpretation of the semantics of the name “Ukraine” in early modern times echoed in N. Yakovenko’s concept with P. Sas’s generalizations. The researcher, who always had a high culture of working with sources, could not miss the frequent mentions that were difficult to fit into the “Ukraine” paradigm – it was just a border with an uninhabited Wild Field. Hence, N. Yakovenko noted that in the scientific circulation the concept of “Ukraine” was in two main meanings – broad and narrow. In addition, the researcher stated the emergence of the terms “the Ukrainians”, “the Ukrainian people”, “the Ukrainian”, which were used in sources in the territorial sense, without connection with the problem of identity (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 35, 61, 83, 86).

In addition, it was first observed that before the Union of Lublin in 1569, the term “Ukraine” and its derivatives were not used in the Polish Crown in relation to the Ukrainian lands. The motivated assumption was also made that the tradition was introduced by the Rus’ Chancellery’ clerks (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 33–34). Another important observation, which

enriched the concept of using the term “Ukraine” in a broad sense, concerned the introduction of the Rus’ and Podolsk voivodships (Yakovenko, 2012, p. 35).

The undoubted priority of the researcher was to develop the question of regional differences in the use of the term “Ukraine” among the Rus’ nobility. While analyzing the elite’s statements from different voivodships, N. Yakovenko came to the reasoned conclusion that Kyiv gentry denied others the right to identify their voivodship with “Ukraine”, reserving this name only for themselves. For the Galician land “Ukraine” began outside the Rus’ voivodeship, while Volyn until the middle of the XVIIth century disowned the “Ukrainian name”, but under the Hetmanate’s influence, which began to apply the latter name to itself in the 1660-ies and 1670-ies” (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 84–89). Finally, without worrying specifically about the analysis of the use of the name “Ukraine” in the Hetmanate, N. Yakovenko noted that there were signs of the “identification – at least in terms of the Cossack elite – the name “Ukraine” with Rus’ space in general”, which opened new interpretative perspectives with the functioning of the concept in the restored Ukrainian state (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 40–41).

Hence, such functioning was in the center of attention for a number of researchers and brought to the horizon the generalizations that were in the plane of recognizing the evolution of the term “Ukraine” in the direction of becoming a political name. The researchers, F. Sysyn and Z. Kohut focused on the analysis of the Hetmanate elite’s ideas emergence concerning “Ukraine” as a “homeland”, which automatically introduced this name into the circle of political concepts. F. Sysyn proved that in the time of Ivan Mazepa the Cossack Officer unequivocally considered the name “Ukraine” as a homeland, using other terms as well: “homeland Little Russia” and “our homeland Ukraine Little Russia” (Sysyn, 2006, pp. 13–17).

Another fundamental thesis of the researcher was the following: “It seems that the use of the term “Little Russia” could be an assertion of the unity of the Right Bank Ukraine and the Left Bank Ukraine when international treaties and competing governments and Hetmans divided this unity” (Sysyn, 2006, p. 13). This approach differed significantly from P. Tolochko’s position, according to which “Ukraine” in the Hetmanate times was only a geographical and orientation concept. Instead, Z. Kohut traced the origins of the speculations about the Cossack ideas’ erosion concerning the “Fatherland of the Commonwealth”, the emergence of the “Fatherland of Little Russia”, and then – “Ukraine, the dear homeland” (Kohut, 2008, pp. 228–239). Accordingly, “Ukraine” as an object of political loyalty and manifestation of the identity of the Hetmanate still appears in the state-political sense. In addition, F. Sysyn made inspiring judgments about the then semantics of the concept of the “Ukrainian people”, bringing it from the territorial concept to the level of a new name: “after 1648, the terms “the Cossack”, “the Rus’”, “the Ukrainian” became almost synonymous (Sysyn, 1995, p. 55). However, the researcher did not try to consider the above-mentioned connotations specifically.

At the same time, the research was launched in the Ukrainian historiography in order to clarify the place of the concept of “Ukraine” in the conscious choice and political concepts of the Hetmanate’s elite. V. Stepankov and V. Smolii emphasized that under the influence of the appearance in the middle of the XVIIth century, the name “Ukraine” acquired the function of a political name in the Ukrainian state (Smolii, Stepankov, 2014, p. 14). One more researcher, S. Bahro found that in both the broader and shorter editions of H. Hrabianka’s Chronicle the term “Ukraine” was used much more often than “Little Russia”, and in many cases – as “Fatherland” (Bahro, 2013, pp. 188–191). In addition, O. Dziuba traced the circulation and context of the concept of “Ukraine” in the Cossack Officers’ diaries of the XVIIIth century, the bottom line was that the concept of “Ukraine” prevailed in them over the term “Little

Russia”, identifying both the Hetmanate as such and the homeland, ie, used as a political name (Dziuba, 2015, pp. 46, 52). Consequently, V. Balushok, following F. Sysyn, put emphasis on the fact that after the Hetmanate’s emergence, “the term “the Ukrainians” gradually spread as a name among the inhabitants of the Cossack Ukraine” (Balushok, 2014, p. 53). Due to the researcher, the basis for the terminological orientation of modern Ukrainian nation-building was created.

V. Brekhunenko and T. Chukhlib tried to generalize such observations in their entirety. In a conceptual work devoted to the Hetmanate’s era, V. Brekhunenko traced the evolution of the name “Ukraine” in the Hetmanate specifically. Ideologically in the canvas, paved by F. Sysyn and Z. Kohut, the researcher not only stated the fact of turning the name “Ukraine” into a political name, but also closely linked it with the state’s and the Cossack state’s legitimation issue, noting the parallel use of concepts in the Hetmanate the terms “Ukraine” and “Mala Rus”: “If the appeal of the new Ukrainian elite to the concept of “Mala Rus” was to demonstrate the continuity between ‘knyaz’ times and the Hetmanate, the spread of “Ukraine” to “Mala Rus”/ Hetmanate symbolized the transformation of the Cossacks into a representative of the Ukrainian world”. At the same time, from the fact that the foreman operated with the concept of “Ukraine” consistently, when it came to the optimal borders of the state – ethnic, it follows that in the territorial-political sense, the concept of “Ukraine” covered the entire territorial settlement of the Ukrainians (Brekhunenko, 2014, pp. 107–108). The reasons why the name “Ukraine” did not become the only name of the state should be sought in the the Officers’ unwillingness to “break stereotypes and oust the nobility from the highest, as at that time, level – symbolic” (Brekhunenko, 2014, p. 109).

It should be noted that the researcher T. Chukhlib managed to trace the functioning of the ambiguous interpretation of the concept of “Ukraine” in the second half of the XVIIth century in a number of articles. The researcher calculated scrupulously all cases of using the term “Ukraine”, “outskirts”, “the Ukrainian” in the sources introduced into the scientific circulation, as well as in the documentary materials he found. Therefore, T. Chukhlib’s conclusions were made on a wide source base. Dominant for the conceptualizations of the scientist was the separation of the actual Ukrainian practices of using the concepts of “Ukraine” from the neighbors, which structured the existing cases, overcoming the semantic chaos that allegedly existed. There were also two main meanings of the name in the Ukrainian texts: the historical territory of the Rus’ / Ukrainian people, the state headed by the Hetman. It is important to note that B. Khmelnytskyi already tried to introduce the diplomatic name “Ukraine” into the diplomatic circulation, that it was included in the text of the March Articles of 1654, and in the Buchach Treaty of 1672 between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Ottoman Empire the term “the Ukrainian state” was used. According to T. Chukhlib, “From specific geographical-territorial” and “geographical-orientational concepts” (as they were at the end of the XVIth – in the first half of the XVIIth century), these terms became “political territorial” and “political national” definitions (Chukhlib, 2015, pp. 39–41).

In addition, the researcher traced the emergence in the discourse of the Hetmanate’s elite of the concepts of “the Ukrainian people”, “the Ukrainians” and their semantics. The researcher considered the 1660-ies to be the time of the final approval of these former territorial terms in the new semantic content as names and equivalents of “Rusyn” and “the Rus’ people” (Chukhlib, 2017, pp. 7–39).

Recently, V. Brekhunenko added new arguments regarding T. Chukhlib’s generalizations concerning “the Ukrainians” and “the Ukrainian people”, for the first time involving the

Hetmanate's court documentation. The everyday use of the term "all the Ukrainian people" in the 1670-ies and its semantic echo with the "Little Russian people" allowed to strengthen the basis for the conceptual thesis that the term "the Ukrainian people" already meant the identity of the Hetmanate's elite (Brekhunenko, 2019, pp. 14–17; Brekhunenko, 2020, pp. 137–141).

At the same time, V. Brekhunenko also managed to expand the range of observations on the concept of "Ukraine" as a political name. While analyzing the Russian origin's documentary sources, the researcher came to the conclusion that the name "Ukraine" was established firmly in Moscovia Russia to denote the Hetmanate as a political entity and a subject of international relations. The apogee of the concept's usage by the Russian sources in the political-territorial sense dates back to 1708 – 1709.

The Conclusions. Finally, it should be noted that in the scientific discourse in general, and in modern Ukrainian historiography in particular, the issue of the evolution of the semantic content of the concept of "Ukraine" occupies a prominent place. The two conceptual lines are competing nowadays. According to the first, the change of content took place exclusively within the framework of geographical and territorial significance. Instead, the second line states the transformation (after the Hetmanate's emergence) of the name "Ukraine" into a political name, and the names "the Ukrainian people" and "the Ukrainians" (in the 1660-ies at the latest) – on the horizon of the new Ukrainian elite's identity. If the supporters of the first interpretation are limited to the XXIth century only by static remarks, within the second interpretation the researchers carry out numerous scientific researches, expand the nomenclature of aspects, specify positions and approaches, which makes it flexible and open for further improvements, and therefore much more promising.

Acknowledgement. The authors of the article are sincerely grateful to all members of the editorial board for the advice provided during doing the research and writing the article.

Financing. The authors did not receive any financial support for doing the research and writing the article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adadurov, V. (2013). Teoretychni zasady ta metodolohiia vpysuvannia ukrainskoi istorii v yevropeyskyi kontekst (pohliad istoryka-vsesvitnyka) [Theoretical Principles and Methodology of Incribing the Ukrainian History in the European Context (The View of a World Historian)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 2, 4–23. [in Ukrainian]

Bahro, S. (2013). Vitchyzna Hryhoriia Hrabianky: mirkuvannia pro poshyrennia poniattia kozatskoi vitchyzny v Hetmanshchyni u kintsi XVII — pershii polovyni XVIII st. [Hryhoriy Grabianka's Fatherland: Reflections on the Spread of the Concept of the Cossack Fatherland in the Hetmanate in the Late 17th – First Half of the 18th Century]. *Siversshchyna v istorii Ukrainy*, 6, 188–191. [in Ukrainian]

Balushok, V. (2014). Yak rusyny staly ukrainsiamy (transformatsiia ukrainskoi etnonimii v XIX – XX stolittiakh) [How Ruthenians Became Ukrainians (Transformation of the Ukrainian Ethnonymy in the 19th and 20th Centuries)]. *Materialy do ukrainskoi etnolohii*, Kyiv, 52–57. [in Ukrainian]

Brehunenko, V. (2019). *Arkhiv rannomodernoï Ukrainy: Dokumenty kolektsii Oleksandra Lazarevskoho (Seria: Dokumenty Heneralnoho viiskovoho sudu ta Heneralnoi viiskovoi kantseliarii)* [Archive of the Early Modern Ukrainian State. Documents of the Collection of Alexander Lazarevsky (Series: Documents of the General Military Court and the General Military Chancellery)]. Kyiv, 432 p. [in Ukrainian]

Brekhunenko, V. (2014). *Skhidna brama Yevropy. Kozatska Ukraina seredyny XVII – XVIII st.* [Eastern Gate of Europe. Cossack Ukraine in the Middle of the XVII – XVIII Centuries]. Kyiv, Tempora, 504 p. [in Ukrainian]

Brekhunenko, V. (2020). *Ukraina y ukrainsi. Imia yak pole bytvy* [Ukraine and Ukrainians. Name as a Battlefield]. Kyiv, 272 p. [in Ukrainian]

Chukhlib, T. (2015). Poniattia “Ukraina” ta “Ukrainnyi” v ofitsiinomu dyskursi Viiska Zaporozkoho (1649 – 1659 rr.) [The Concept of “Ukraine” and “Ukrainian” in the Official Discourse of the Zaporozhian Army (1649 – 1659)]. *Ukraina v Tsentralno-Skhidnii Yevropi*, 15, 13–41. [in Ukrainian]

Chukhlib, T. (2016). Poniattia “Ukraina”, “Ukrainskyi”, “Ukrainska derzhava” v ofitsiinomu dyskursi Viiska Zaporozkoho (1659 – 1665 rr.) [The Concept of “Ukraine”, “Ukrainian”, “Ukrainian State” in the Official Discourse of the Zaporozhian Army (1659 – 1665)]. *Ukraina v Tsentralno-Skhidnii Yevropi*, 16, 13–46. [in Ukrainian]

Chukhlib, T. (2017). “Usi zhyteli ukrainskoi porody...”: movna ta svidomisna evoliutsiia poniattia “narod” u Viisku Zaporozkomu (druha polovyna XVII st.) [“All the Inhabitants of the Ukrainian Breed...”: Linguistic and Conscious Evolution of the Concept of “People” in the Zaporozhian Army (Second Half of the XVII Century)]. *Chornomorska mynushyna, Odesa*, 12, 17–39. [in Ukrainian]

Chukhlib, T. (2017). Poniattia “Ukraina”, “ukraintsi”, “Otchyzna”, “narod” v ofitsiinomu dyskursi Viiska Zaporozkoho (1666 – 1672 rr.) [The concept of “Ukraine”, “Ukrainians”, “Moherland”, “People” in the Official Discourse of the Zaporozhian Army (1666 – 1672)]. *Ukraina v Tsentralno-Skhidnii Yevropi*, 17, 41–79. [in Ukrainian]

Chukhlib, T. (2019). Poshyrennia nazvy “Ukraina” v ofitsiinomu dyskursi Rechi Pospolytoi yak odyn iz naslidkiv Liublinskoi unii 1569 r. [Dissemination of the Name “Ukraine” in the Official Discourse of Rich Pospolyta as One of the Consequences of the Union of Lublin in 1569]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1, 4–24. [in Ukrainian]

Dziuba, O. (2015). “Ukraina” i “Malorosii”: slova i poniattia v ukrainskii memuarinii literaturi XVIII st. [“Ukraine” and “Malorosii”: Words and Concepts in the Ukrainian Memoir Literature of the XVIII Century]. *Ukraina v Tsentralno-Skhidnii Yevropi*, 15, 42–54. [in Ukrainian]

Kasianov, H. & Tolochko, O. (2012). Natsionalni istorii ta suchasna istoriografii. Vyklyky y nebezpeky pry napsyanni novoi istorii Ukrainy [National Histories and Modern Historiography. Challenges and Dangers in Writing a New History of Ukraine]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 6, 4–24. [in Ukrainian]

Kohut, Z. (2008). Vid Hadiacha do Andrusova: osmyslennia “otchyzny” v ukrainskii politychnii kulturi [From Gadyach to Andrusov: Understanding the “Fatherland” in Ukrainian Political Culture]. *Hadiatska unia 1658 roku*. Kyiv, 352 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kravchenko, V. (2011). *Ukraina, imperiia, Rosiia. Vybrani staty z modernoi istorii ta istoriografii. [Ukraine, Empire, Russia. Selected Articles on Modern History and Historiography]*. Kyiv, Krytyka, 544 p. [in Ukrainian]

Makarchuk, S. (1994). Ukraina i ukraintsi: poiava, poshyrennia ta utverzhennia nazv [Ukraine and Ukrainians: the Emergence, Spread and Adoption of Names]. *Druhyi mizhnarodnyi konhres ukrainistiv Lviv 22–28 serpnia 1993 r. Dopovidi i povidomlennia. Istoriografii ukrainoznavstva, etnologii, kultura*. Lviv, 206–211. [in Ukrainian]

Motsia, O. (2007). Yak Rus stavala Ukrainoiu [How Russia Became Ukraine]. In V. A. Smolii (ed.). *Terra Cossacorum: Studii z davnoi i novoi istorii Ukrainy. Naukovyi zbirnyk na poshanu profesora Valerii Stepankova*, Kyiv, Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 339–345. [in Ukrainian]

Nakonechnyi, Ye. (2001). *Ukradene imia: chomu rusyny staly ukraintsiamy [Stolen Name: Why the Ruthenians Became Ukrainians]*. Lviv, 242 p. [in Ukrainian]

Rudnytskyi, Ya. (1951). *Slovo y nazva “Ukraina” [Word and Name “Ukraine”]*. Vinnipeh, 132 p. [in English]

Sas, P. (1998). *Politychna kultura ukrainskoho suspilstva (kinets XVI – persha polovyna XVII st.) [Political Culture of the Ukrainian Society (End of XVI – First Half of XVII century)]*. Kyiv, 296 p. [in Ukrainian]

Sas, P. (2001). Vid “Rusi” do “Ukrain” [From “Rus” to “Ukraine”]. *Istoriia ukrainskoi kultury u piaty tomakh, t. 2: Ukrainska kultura XIII – pershoi polovyny XVII stolit*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 795–800. [in Ukrainian]

Shelukhin, S. (1936). *Ukraina – nazva nashoi zemli z naidavnishykh chasiv [Ukraine is the Name of Our Land From Ancient Times]*. Praha, 248 p. [in Ukrainian]

Smolii, V. & Stepankov, V. (1997). *Ukrainska derzhavna ideia XVII – XVIII st.: problemy formuvannia, evoliutsiia, realizatsii [Ukrainian State Idea of the XVII – XVIII Centuries: Problems of Formation, Evolution, Realization]*. Kyiv: “Alternatyvy”, 367 p. [in Ukrainian]

Smolii, V. & Stepankov, V. (2014). *Ukrainskyi politychnyi proekt XVII st.: stanovlennia natsionalnoho instytutu vlady*. [Ukrainian Political Project of the XVII Century: the Formation of a National Institution of Power]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 194 p. [in Ukrainian]

Sysyn, F. (1982). Regionalism and Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ukraine: The Nobility's Grievances at the Diet of 1641. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 6 (2), 167–190. [in English]

Sysyn, F. (1995). Khmelnychyna ta yii rol v utvorenni modernoi ukrainskoi natsii [Khmelnitsky Region and Its Role in the Formation of the Modern Ukrainian Nation]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 4, 67–77. [in Ukrainian]

Sysyn, F. (2006). “Otchyzna” v politychnii kulturi Ukrainy pochatku XVIII st. [«Fatherland» in the Political Culture of Ukraine in the Early XVIII Century]. *Ukraina moderna*, 10, 7–18. [in Ukrainian]

Tolochko, P. (1994). Nazva Ukraina v pivdenno-ruskykh litopysakh i aktovykh dokumentakh [Name Ukraine in the South Russian Chronicles and Act Document]. *Kyivska starovyna*, 3, 2–9. [in Ukrainian]

Yakovenko, N. (1997). *Narys istorii serednovichnoi ta rannomodernoi istorii Ukrainy* [Essay on the History of Medieval and Early Modern History of Ukraine]. Vydannia druhe, pereroblene ta rozshyrene. Kyiv: Krytyka, 382 p. [in Ukrainian]

Yakovenko, N. (2012). *Dzherkala identychnosti. Doslidzhennia z istorii uiaвлен ta idei v Ukraini XVI – pochatku XVIII stolittia* [Mirrors of Identity. Research on the History of Ideas in Ukraine in the XVI – Early XVIII Centuries]. Kyiv, Krytyka, 472 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zashkilniak, L. (2008). Shkilna istoriia ochyma istorykiv-naukovtsiv [School History Through the Eyes of Historians-Scientists]. *Materialy Robochoi narady z monitorynhu shkilnykh pidruchnykiv istorii Ukrainy*, Kyiv, 77–78. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on March 29, 2020.
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*