

УДК 378.016:930.85(477)

Olejar Slavomir

(St Catharines, Canada)

E-mail: slavomir.olejar@gmail.com

STUDYING THE CORRELATION OF THE TERMS «RUS» AND «UKRAINE» IN CANADIAN UKRAINIAN STUDIES

***The purpose of the study** is to outline the history and current state of the use of the terms «Rus» and «Rusyns» and their correlation with the terms «Ukraine» and «Ukrainians».*

***Methodology.** The main research method was the historical-cultural method, which consists in close studying relevant historical sources. In addition to historical material, data from philology and biology (genetic studies) were used.*

***Scientific novelty.** The article traces in detail the history of the terms «Rus» and «Rusyns» and their gradual replacement by the terms «Ukraine» and «Ukrainians» while preserving the term «Rusyns» in some Eastern European regions. Presented information can be used in teaching History of Ukraine, History of Ukrainian culture, Ukrainian studies and related subjects in schools and higher educational institutions.*

***Conclusions.** The ethnonym «Rusyns» and the name of the state «Rus» were lost in the greater territory of modern Ukraine, and remained in use only in the Carpathian region (and in those areas where emigration from this region took place). At the same time, the rulers of Muscovy appropriated the name Rus in the form of «Russia», which was supposed to emphasize their claims to the heritage of Kyivan Rus. This has led to considerable confusion in Western historical thought. Therefore, the prospects of further research should include not only the clarification and clarification of specific scientific facts, but also further popularization and explanatory work on the origin of nations, states and ethnonyms, which should form a complete picture of historical succession both in Ukraine and abroad.*

***Keywords:** Rus, Ukraine, Rusyn, history of Eastern Europe, Ukrainian studies.*

Statement of the problem in a general form and its connection with important scientific or practical tasks. In the war that Ukraine is currently waging, the information war occupies a certain place. In this context, one of the important tasks is the clarification of historical facts and the activation of their educational potential.

Analysis of the main researches and publications on the raised problem. The origin of Ukrainian people and the story of the name «Ukraine» attracted considerable attention. We should mention such authors as R. Brzezinski, Frank A. Kmietowicz, Paul R. Magocsi, H. Pivtorak, O. Pritsak. The transition from «Rus» to «Ukraine» was studied by Ye. Nakonechny, S. Shelukhin. The genetic aspects were studied by the team of K. Rebała, A. Mikulich, I. Tsybovsky, D. Siváková, Z. Dzipinková, A. Szczerkowska-Dobosz, Z. Szczerkowska.

Formulation of the purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is to outline the history and current state of the use of the terms «Rus» and «Rusyns» and their correlation with the terms «Ukraine» and «Ukrainians».

Research methods and methodology. The main research method was the historical-cultural method, which consists in close studying relevant historical sources. In addition to historical material, data from philology and biology (genetic studies) were used.

Scientific novelty. The article traces in detail the history of the terms «Rus» and «Rusyns» and their gradual replacement by the terms «Ukraine» and «Ukrainians» while preserving the term «Rusyns» in some Eastern European regions. Presented information can be used in teaching History of Ukraine, History of Ukrainian culture, Ukrainian studies and related subjects in schools and higher educational institutions.

Presentation of the main material of the study with justification of the obtained scientific results. There are few written documents about the ancient Slavs from the time of antiquity, and their origin is still a subject of controversy. Most agree that their place of origin is Eastern and Central Europe and that other tribes (Scythians, Sarmatians, Alans, etc.) in these territories were absorbed by the Slavic population [2]. According to Franko A. Kmietowicz, «there is no doubt that Jordanes mentioned Ante as a Slovene when he wrote: 'ab unastirpe exorti, tria nomina ediderunt, id est Veneti, Antes, Sclaveni'. The Veneti were Western Slavs, Anti they were eastern, and the Slavs were southern, i.e. Balkan Slavs» [4]. Based on archaeological research, some authors (Gerard Labuda, Oleg Trubachov) have concluded that the oldest Slavs, the so-called Proto-Slavs, inhabited Europe as early as around 1700 – 1200 BC. Recent genetic research on the male line in the existing Slavic population puts the oldest location of Slavs in the flow of the Dnieper river in today's Ukraine [8].

From the 6th century AD, historiographical records of the Slavs appear in the works of Jordanes, Procopius, Emperor Maurice, Theophylact Simocatta, Martin of Braga, Jonas of Bobbio and so on. King Samo created the first recorded union of Slavic peoples only in the seventh century. His state, which he ruled from 623 until his death in 658, stretched from Silesia (part of present-day Poland, the Czech Republic and Germany) to present-day Slovenia. From the seventh to the ninth century, many Slavic principalities in Europe emerged, such as: the principality of Obodrita, Great Moravia, Carantania, Lower Pannonia, Croatia, Serbia, Rus.

The territory between the Baltic and Black seas was inhabited mainly by East Slavic tribes. Like other Slavic tribes, the Eastern Slavs organized themselves into principalities, and due to the constant danger from the Khazars on the east, they united in an alliance with the central government in Kyiv where they decided on common issues such as defending the principalities, war against a common enemy, trade, etc. That is why in history this alliance of principalities is called Kyivian Rus' or simply Rus'. The beginnings of the Rus' state are still the subject of controversy among scientists. According to the Norman theory, the Rus' was founded by the Vikings, who were quickly assimilated among the Slavs, and the ethnonym Rusi (Rusyni), actually means «Norwegians», «Rousi», i.e. «Rowers» [5]. According to the so-called anti-Normanist theory, the Rus' were Slavs and there was no assimilation at all [6; 9].

Traces of the Norman presence among the Slavs are rare in the archaeological, genetic or linguistic sense. Several Norman names among Slavs that appear in the relevant literature do not prove anything, because the name does not determine or reflect national affiliation. Genetic research in the Nordic countries have shown that within the Norwegian population for example, haplogroup R1a which is predominantly Slavic, is present by 10 to 30%, which supports anti-Norman theory.

The most important document referred to by the «Normanists» is the chronicle «Tale of Bygone Years», according to which the Ruthenian (Rus') princes, due to internecine quarrels and battles, called the Vikings. That the Rus' and the Vikings (Normans) may have been different peoples can be seen from the Laurentine Chronicle of 1377, where it is written about the Vikings, the Svei, the Urmans and the Rus.

One of the oldest documents where Ruthenians (Rusyns) are mentioned is «Rus' Justice». From the texts of «Rus' Justice» it can be concluded that the population of the then Kyiv was predominantly mono-ethnic – Ruthenian (Rus'), and together with them there lived foreign traders: Greeks, Vikings, Arabs, Khazars, Syrians, French, Poles, and already in the 10th century, a Jewish community emerged. Over time, «Rus' Justice» began to be applied on the territory of all principalities, and the word «Rusyn» gradually replaced the original names of Slavic tribes that entered into an alliance with the Kyivan Rus (Krivichi, Poljani, Severjani, Derevljani, etc.). Thus, the word «Rusyn» became common for the inhabitants of all Rus'.

While Kyiv, before the Mongol invasion (13th century) was a trade center at the west-east crossroads, Moscow was an insignificant trading post within the Vladimir-Suzdal principality founded by Ruthenians from Kyivan Rus' in a territory predominantly inhabited by Finnish tribes. The geographical term «Rus» did not refer to the territories of the Duchy of Moscow, and initially only to Galicia and Volhynia.

The Rus' (Ruthenian) principalities became vassals of the Mongol Golden Horde after a successful Mongol invasion that lasted from 1237 to 1242. This led to the gradual division of the Rus' state and the formation of three separate nations in the territories of present-day Russia, Ukraine and Belarus, as well as the rise of the Grand Duchy of Moscow, which became Russian Tsardom. Until 1450, the Tatar language was popular among the courtiers of the Grand Duchy of Moscow, it was mostly spoken in «higher» circles. According to one analysis [11], of the total number of Russian nobility in the 17th century, 229 were of Western European origin, 223 Polish and Lithuanian (which includes Ruthenian nobility), 156 of Tatar and Eastern, 168 from the Rurik family, and 42 were of undetermined, «Russian» origin. The Mongols have left lasting traces in the Russian character and laws such as: unconditional hierarchical obedience, death and corporal punishment, ruthlessness, insecurity, and megalomania.

In the Galician-Volyn principality Prince Danilo Romanovich established friendly relations with the Mongols and gradually armed his army with Mongol weapons, which included the use of gunpowder. Such a tactical move enabled him to save the population and strengthen his army composed mainly of Ruthenian peasants, which he finally succeeded in after many fights and compromises. Pope Innocent IV crowned him king of all Rus' (Rex Russiae) in 1245, and he was the only crowned king from the Rurikovich dynasty.

In the territories of Poland and the Lithuanian state, the Mongols were not very successful and after several destructive attacks and looting, they were satisfied with the tribute these states will pay to them. As the Mongol cohesion weakened due to internal quarrels over the throne, Lithuanian power grew. They conquered Rus' territories only 100 kilometres from Moscow, and Kyiv as a city had to pay tribute to both Lithuanians and Mongols. But from 1362 it became an exclusively Lithuanian city. Many refugees, especially Ruthenians and the Mongols themselves, fled to Lithuanian territory because they preferred to be with them than under the Golden Horde.

In the 15th century, cossak units were organized, with the aim of defending themselves from oppression by the Polish-Lithuanian Union, the Mongols, and later from Turkish invasions and destruction. The so-called «sich» were formed, mostly on the right bank of the Don, Dnieper, Volga, Urals and Zaporozhye. All Cossack units (sich) were located in the buffer zones between the Polish-Lithuanian Union, Russia and the Mongol Khanate.

After the suppression of the Mongols and the strengthening of the Moscow principality, which eventually became the Russian Empire, there were wars and the division of Ruthenian lands between the Polish-Lithuanian Union (PLU) and the Russian Empire. Russia controlled the left bank of the Dnieper river with Kyiv, and the PLU controlled the right coast as regulated by the Andrusiv Treaty of 1667. The Ruthenians and their Kozak military organizations fell under the influence of either the Catholic PLU or Orthodox Russia, and they were often engaged in wars as a significant military force on one side or the other, often fighting Ruthenians against Ruthenians.

The Ruthenians have long since learned to live in a democratic society (the people chose their princes, the Cossacks chose a hetman, they decided together on important matters, etc.) and therefore foreign rule fell hard on them, especially when it began to interfere with their independence and freedom. That is why Russia and the PLU tried to form Cossack units and sichts (garrisons), the so-called «stations» under their rule. On the other hand, they sought to attract the Ruthenian nobility by giving them various privileges and possessions, while the common Ruthenians were left without leaders and were subjected to constant abuse by landowners who gradually turned them into serfs.

Uprisings against the Russian tsar and against the PLU were not uncommon. During the uprising of 1647-1654, hetman Bogdan Khmelnytsky liberated the Ruthenian (Rus') lands from the PLU and then placed them under the protectorate of the Russian Tsar. Both countries (PLU and Russia) in whose shadow the Ruthenians found themselves, tried to assimilate them.

The efforts of many hetmans to establish a free and independent Ruthenian state failed, so the original Ruthenian country remained divided, and the Ruthenians were almost forbidden to be what they are. In the PLU, Ruthenian peasants were ridiculed, barred from cultural and economic development in many ways, and pushed to the margins of society, although efforts were made to recognize them as the third, constituent people in the PLU because of their many victims and great contributions to wars. It was proposed to form a Ruthenian principality that would be part of the PLU and thus form a Polish-Lithuanian-Ruthenian union, but that idea from 1658 (Gadjac Treaty) never came to life due to strong opposition and Vatican influence on the Sejm.

In tsarist Russia, which appeared as the «collector of all Rus' lands» into one «Great Rus'», our country was called «Little Russia», and the Ruthenians were called «Little Russians». In Western Europe, due to the similarity of words, «Rus'» was equated with «Russia», and such a tendency continues among ignorant scientists even today. For example, Russians say they speak «Russian» while Rusyns say they speak «Rusyn.»

Discussions between Russian and Ruthenian (Ukrainian) scientists have been going on for centuries, and the main disagreements have arisen over two issues: who are the people, whose culture was woven into Kyivan Rus', and who took over and extended that cultural heritage and tradition?

In these debates, the Ruthenians not only lost their territory, which was appropriated by the Grand Duchy of Moscow, but also lost their ancient name. The Grand Duchy of Moscow became a Great Rus' and emerged as the successor to the Kyivan Rus. Among the Russian people, the Great Principality of Moscow is remembered for being a part of and belonging to the Rus', so they often said of themselves that they «belonged to Rus'».

Documents from the 14th century in Lithuania and later in the PLU, such as: chronicles, annals, charters, wills, birth books, etc. unequivocally refer to Ruthenia (Rus') and its inhabitants Ruthenians. For example, the prince of Kyiv, a magnate in the PLU, Marshal of Volyn, founder of the Ostrog Academy, Constantine-Vasily of Ostrog (1526-1608) were mentioned in the documents of the time as Ruthenians [3].

The incessant wars between the PLU and Russia for Ruthenian territories ended in 1667 with the signing of the Andrusovo Armistice, which provided Russia with lands on the left bank of the Dnieper, while the PLU gained lands on the right bank. The Zaporozhian sich remained under the mutual control of Russia and the PLU. The Ruthenians from that sich were not allowed to participate in the negotiations on the Andrusov armistice. The Ruthenian people thus found themselves under pressure from three powers: the PLU, Russia, and the Turks.

Ivan Mazepa's efforts for a free Rusyn land failed in the battle for Poltava in 1709. Since then even the name «Rusyn» meant a potential enemy of the Moscow Empire. Due to that, many Ruthenian nobles became Russified and renounced their origin, and the peasants were gradually turned into serfs tied to the land of one master. In 1721, the Moscow Empire changed its name to the Russian Empire, and the Ruthenians began to be called «Little Russians», «Southern Russians», «Cherkassians», «Cherkassans». All this contributed to the disappearance of the ethnonym «Rusyn» in the Russian Empire. In 1775, Empress Catherine II ordered the destruction of the Zaporozhian Sich, where the last Ruthenian military force were stationed.

Weakening of awareness of national identity was even worse during schooling, which is evident from the terms «Kijivan», «Ruten», «Kozak», «Greek-Catholic faith», etc. which students, as their nationality wrote in the applications enrolment forms when enrolling in the schools. In time, the Ruthenians (Rusyni) in the Russian Empire officially disappeared, and the similarity of the names «Rus'» and «Russia» contributed to even greater confusion among Western scholars, who, under the influence of Russian historians, replaced the two names, so «Rus'» became «Russia» in their texts, and «Rusyn» becomes «Russian». Only the peasants stubbornly kept their old ethnonym.

The division (partition) of the Polish-Lithuanian Union (PLU), where the Ruthenians were a constituent people and present in all areas of state life, took place in 3 phases among the forces in the region. Austria annexed territories inhabited mainly by Ruthenians who settled in the south of the Pannonian Plain within the

Austro-Hungarian monarchy as early as 1746. During the census, they were free to declare themselves as Ruthenians, and they were officially registered as Ruthenians. There were attempts at forced assimilation (hungarization), but without much success.

The fate of the Ruthenians in the territories annexed by tsarist Russia was similar to that on the right bank of the Dnieper, which was given by Bogdan Khmelnytsky under the protection of the Russian tsar in the 17th century, i.e. the name Rusyn was deliberately suppressed by the state, and instead other ethnonyms such as Malorus, Yuzhnorus, etc. were used. The Ruthenians were gradually Russified and disappeared as a people whose name and history were appropriated by the Russians.

The name «Ukraina» is mentioned for the first time in the Galician-Volyn Chronicle which was probably written in the 13th century. Here, Ukraine is mentioned as a border country between Volhynia and Poland, while according to others, this term referred to the Pereyaslav principality which was situated more toward east. The etymology of the term «Ukraine» is still the subject of discussion. It is generally accepted that this word geographically means the periphery and that it is derived from the Proto-Slavic word «kraj» which means «end», «edge», «rim» and the periphery of Kyivan Rus'. There is also an opinion that this word means region, principality, state. Most likely, this word has undergone a dynamic transformation of meaning over the centuries, from the ancient «end» to the more modern «state».

The unknown author of the book «History of Rus'» («Історія Русів») mentions that Ukrainians and Belarus are one people – Ruthenians, unlike Muscovites, and that Ukraine is a territory in the middle reaches of the Dnieper river and does not apply to the whole of Russia. This territory is mentioned in folk songs, especially Kozak ones, already in the 15th century, as well as in later literary works.

The name «Ukraine» is the result of complex geographical, historical, political, religious and economic processes that took place in the territories of the former Russia. At least six theories have been appearing for more than two hundred years with the goal of clarifying the origin and meaning of the word. In addition to these, there are many scientific or pseudo-scientific interpretations, such as that a tribe of mythological Ukra around the Baltic Sea, or that it is actually a country of brothers. The idea that it was a fabrication of Germans or Poles was spread by Russian chauvinists, according to whom Ukraine does not exist and never existed.

The name probably originated after 1569, when the south-western parts of the Rus' belonged to the Polish crown and the country from the eastern Podolia to Zaporozhye was unofficially called «Ukraine» due to its geographical position towards the Tatars in the south. On the part of Russian Rus', these areas were called «Little Russia». The inhabitants of that area were unofficially called «Ukrainians», and officially «Little Russians», although they used their real name «Ruthenians» [1].

With the growth of national consciousness among Ruthenians, the term «Ukraine» is spreading not only as a geographical but also as an ethnic name – «Ukrainians». Mikola Kostomarov began to use the ethnonym «Ukrainians» intensively in his writings around 1830. The idea came to life in the east of the former Rus', and then in Galicia, where its main protagonist was Ivan Franko. The change of endonym from Ruthenian to Ukrainian did not happen all at once, but gradually, under the influence of various factors, of which only the most important will be considered here.

1. A turning point in Ruthenian history and identity arose after the Mongol attacks. The Mongol invasion resulted in the later division of Rus' into three parts: Russia, where the Mongol influence was stronger, Ukraine with relatively mild Mongol influence, and the third part – Belarus with the weakest influence. There traces of the Mongol mentality commensurable to the duration and intensity of the occupation of their territories. For example, the death penalty, which was not incorporated into Rus' law, became an integral part of the law of the Russian Empire, which had been under Mongol influence for the longest time (for 250 years).

2. The division of the Ruthenian land into right-bank and left-bank parts took place with the Andrusiv Treaty of 1667 between the Polish-Lithuanian Union and Tsarist Russia, Ruthenians were exposed to assimilatory pressures from both states, i.e. in the PLU – Polonisation, and in the Russian Empire – Russification. Both states belittled the Ruthenians and their participation in the wars, denied them equal status with other state-building nations, and pushed them to the margins of society.

3. Ruthenian leaders, who found themselves on the right-bank (i.e., in the PLU) and left-bank (i.e., in tsarist Russia), had to adopt the state policy of assimilation of the Ruthenians. Some were forced to, and some wanted to conceal their Ruthenian roots and become Poles of Ruthenian descent (Gente Rutheni natione Poloni) or became Russians, in order to obtain or preserve their privileges. The ordinary Ruthenian people remained abandoned on both sides of the Dnieper, without leaders to support their national consciousness, without appropriate schools and institutions where their culture could be nurtured and preserved. When most of the Ruthenian intellectuals and leaders betrayed their own nation, tradition and national memory were maintained mostly by ordinary people in the villages. That is why the Ruthenian tradition in both countries was seen «from above» as rural vulgarity, and the Ruthenians became synonymous for ignorance and stupidity. In the PLU and tsarist Russia, it has become a shame to say that someone is of Rusyn (Ruthenian) origin.

4. Mass Christianization of Rus' and Ruthenians took place at the end of the 10th century (998). Christianization ended under the influence of Constantinople, under the influence of Byzantium. The Ruthenians found themselves between two powers, between the Orthodox East and the Catholic West, divided not only geographically, but also by religion. In the PLU, they were pressured to accept the Catholic Church, and in

imperial Russia, to retain the Orthodox Church and renounce their national identity. A compromise in the PLU was found so that the Orthodox Ruthenians accepted the Uniate (Greek-Catholic) Church. The exceptions were Ruthenian leaders who, due to personal interest, completely converted to Catholicism and became polonized, leaving their own people exposed to even greater disgrace.

5. While the Ruthenian elite adapted to the system of the countries in which they found themselves, the economic position of the common Ruthenian people was unenviable because they were nowhere in their own state. In Kyivan Rus', peasants so-called «smerds», had the right to own limited property within the rights to the territory that belonged to a certain prince. They were protected by law. In tsarist Russia peasants were without own property and were gradually denied the right to move from one estate to another. Serfdom in Russia lasted until the 19th century. Corporal and death sentences were common for peasants (serfs).

The position of the peasants in the PLU was not much better. The lords tried to bind them firmly to the land (*glebae adscripti*), which was confirmed in numerous laws passed by the Sejm. Such laws forbade peasants to leave the owner's land and move freely to other properties. Peasants-Ruthenians, because of their Greek-Catholic faith, were treated anyway as if they were people of lesser value, so their position was worse compared to others, non-Ruthenians. Because of that, many renounced their faith and accepted Catholicism, hoping for equal status with Polish and Lithuanian peasants, and many declared themselves as Poles, relinquishing their national name.

Due to internal disputes over the inheritance of territories and the supremacy of some princes over others, or due to efforts to «occupy» Kyiv as a centre of religious and administrative influence, Rus' has split even more into many principalities: Novgorod Republic, Kyiv, Chyhyriv, Pereyaslav, Vladimir-Suzdal, Volyn, Galicia, Polotsk, Smolensk and Ryazan principalities.

The Grand Duke of the Vladimir-Suzdal principality, Andrej Bogoljubski, took Kyiv in 1169. Grand Duke Ivan III of Moscow overcame the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, occupied many territories from them and proclaimed himself tsar and «ruler of all Rus'». Grand Duke of Moscow Ivan IV was proclaimed tsar in 1547, and the Moscow principality, along with other principalities under Moscow's domination, was proclaimed the Russian Empire.

The name «Rusyn» was gradually and systematically replaced with the term «Russian», with which the inhabitants of the Grand Duchy of Moscow began to be called since Ivan III proclaimed himself «ruler of all Rus». Therefore, in Rus' (later part of Russia) lived people who «belonged to Rus'» i.e., «Rusky» (later Russians), and Rusyins who were not officially allowed to be what they were. Instead of the ancient name, the name «Malorussians» was imposed on them.

This situation, the suffocation of the Ruthenian national identity and the so-called «theft of the name» by Russians, caused revolt not only among the Ruthenian, but also among the Russian intelligentsia. At the end of 1845 or the beginning of 1846, the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood was formed in Kyiv. Its ideas became the basis for the Ruthenian Renaissance. The old name «Rusyn», which was used unofficially in a negative context, was gradually replaced by the name «Ukrainian», which was first used as a demonym based on the geographical term for Podolia and Zaporozhye i.e., for territories at the «end», on the border with the Tatars. Gradually, the demonym became an ethnonym that, as a name for the Ruthenian people, included the glorious Kozak history, achievements of Ruthenian culture, the influence of Ruthenian leaders on the politics of European states, famous military leaders, victories in wars, democratic life and freedom. All this and more was included in the name «Ukrainian».

After the PLU partition, the Galician Ruthenians found themselves divided between the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires, with the Obruch River as the border. While on the Russian side it was forbidden to even mention the word «Rusyn», in Galicia the cultural and political activities of the Ruthenian intelligentsia that arose there were freely developed. For example, in the passports of Ivan Franko and Stepan Bandera, it was written «Ruthenian». Among the intelligentsia were three prominent Ruthenian geniuses who gave the Galician Ruthenians the name «Ukrainians»: historian Mihajlo Hrushevski, writer Ivan Franko and Metropolitan Andrej Shepticki.

Initially, although the new ethnonym was reluctantly accepted among Galician Ruthenians, it soon came to life as a reaction to the offensive name «Malorussians» that Tsarist Russia coined for them. Patriotic verses and other works of Taras Shevchenko had a powerful influence on the revival of the Ruthenian people, and from Galicia the name «Ukraine» spread to all Ruthenian territories during the following decades, bringing with it honour and historical glory.

Dual terms such as «Ukraine-Rus'» and «Ruthenian – Ukrainian» were increasingly used in written works. According to Ivan Franko, the term «Ukrainian-Ruthenian» was first used by Pavlo Święcicki in the second half of the 19th century. At first, the term was not widely accepted among scholars, but thanks to the work of Mykhailo Hrushevsky (*History of Ukraine – Rus'*) and Ivan Franko (*Essay on the History of Ukrainian – Rus' Literature until 1890*), others began to use it. They were the Galician priest and founder of the «Enlightenment» society, Stepan Kachala, then Panteleimon Kulish, Ivan Puljuh and Ivan Levicki, who translated the Bible into Ruthenian-Ukrainian and printed it in 1871 in Lviv, followed by M. Drahmanov, M. Pavlyuk and S. Podolinsky who in their «Program» marked the territory of Ukraine.

The movement for the unification of all Ruthenian countries that were under Austro-Hungarian and tsarist Russia posed a potential danger to Russia, so in 1881, Russian Tsar Alexander III founded the «Ohrana», the tsarist secret police. «Ohrana» helped founding several organizations in Galicia with muscovite or russophile orijentation, such as: «Stavropigijski institut», «Galichko-Ruska matica», «Narodni dom», «Ruska beseda», etc. within Austro-Hungary. The founding of muscovite organizations was led by logic «the enemy of my enemy is my friend» and succeeded as a reaction to the humiliation and ridicule of the Ruthenians by the Polish nobility, the well-known enemy of Russia. Russophiles had the full support of Moscow in the political struggle against the Polish nobility, and the remnants of muscovophilia are still felt today among some Ruthenians.

A sudden development of events in Galicia followed, which later affected the national consciousness of the Ruthenians:

– The Main Ruthenian Council was founded in Lviv on May 2, 1848, as the first political organization of Ruthenians whose program was the unification of all Ruthenian countries into one province. Lectures in schools and official documents should be in the Ruthenian-Ukrainian language.

– In October 1885, the National Assembly was founded in Lviv, whose president was Julian Romanchuk, and which continued the idea of national identity previously outlined in the documents of the Main Ruthenian Council, with pronounced terminological changes in the Council's Program, stating that Galician Ruthenians are part of the Ruthenian-Ukrainian twenty-million people.

– The terms that define the Ukrainian people have become widely accepted after the great celebration of the anniversary of the poem «Aeneid» by Ivan Kotlyarevsky as the first literary work in the modern Ukrainian language. First, the people of Galicia and Bukovina, with their free will, gradually replaced the expressions «Russian», «Ruthenian», «Rusyn» and «Ruthenia» with the words «Ukrainian-Rus», «Ukrainian», and «Ukraina-Rus'». The ethnonym «Ukrainian» spread and was accepted by most Ruthenians in the eastern and central parts of present-day Ukraine.

– In the West, due to the influence of the Polish policy of active and forced replacement of the new ethnonym «Ukrainian» with the old name «Rusyn», there was a repulsive attitude of Ukrainians towards Rusyns. As a reaction to that, a part of the Ruthenians never accepted the new name, and the antagonism between some Ruthenians and Ukrainians continues to this day. The so-called Ruthenian «awakeners» such as Alexander Dukhnovich and others, usually of Muscovite orientation, sought to completely separate the Ruthenians from the majority of the Ruthenian people who accepted the new name – Ukrainians.

– Regional differences in dialect, tradition, folk costume, songs, etc. between the Ruthenians in the eastern and western parts, became the basis for politically motivated and ill-intentioned scholars to declare the Ruthenians as a separate, fourth Slavic nation (besides Russians, Belarusians and Ukrainians) who had nothing to do with the majority of Ruthenians (now Ukrainians) [10; 11]. Their supporters, consciously or not, contribute to the further division and weakening of the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) people.

So called «Fourth Slavic Nation» i.e. Ruthenians, are subject to even further division geographically and politically separated parts by codification of local dialects. So far, Ruthenians have codified their Voyvodina variant, Slovak/Rusyn variant, Polish/Lemko variant, Hungarian/Rusyn variant, and Ukrainian. Those variants are mutually more or less intelligible with a tendency of creation some artificial lexes which will be taught in the schools resulting in new generations moving further apart.

In my opinion, due to diminishing number of Rusyn native speakers and further breaking the whole Rusyn population into ever smaller fractions, the only stable language pool will remain with Ukrainian/Rusyn people in Ukraine, while other will become a monument and warning of what disunity, personal ambitions, and economic-political-religious influences can lead to.

Conclusions. The ethnonym «Rusyns» and the name of the state «Rus» were lost in the greater territory of modern Ukraine, and remained in use only in the Carpathian region (and in those areas where emigration from this region took place). At the same time, the rulers of Muscovy appropriated the name Rus in the form of «Russia», which was supposed to emphasize their claims to the heritage of Kyivan Rus. This has led to considerable confusion in Western historical thought. Therefore, the prospects of further research should include not only the clarification and clarification of specific scientific facts, but also further popularization and explanatory work on the origin of nations, states and ethnonyms, which should form a complete picture of historical succession both in Ukraine and abroad.

References

1. Русина О. В. Україна під татарами і Литвою. Київ: Видавничий дім «Альтернативи», 1998.
Rusyna, O.V. (1998). *Ukraine pid tataramy i Lytvoyu [Ukraine under Tatars and Lithuania]*. Kyiv, Ukraine.
2. Brzezinski R., Mielczarek M. *The Sarmatians, 600 BC – AD 450*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002.
Brzezinski, R., Mielczarek, M. (2002). *The Sarmatians, 600 BC – AD 450*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing.
3. Iakovenko N. M. Українська шляхта з кінця XIV до середини XVII ст. (Волинь і Центральна Україна). *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. Toronto, 1996. Vol. 21, Iss. 1, P. 274.

- Iakovenko, N. M. (1996). *Ukrainska shliakhta z kintsia XIV do seredyny XVII st. (Volyn i Tsentralna Ukraina) [Ukrainian nobility from the end of the 14th to the middle of the 17th century. (Volyn and Central Ukraine)]*. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. Toronto, 21, 1, 274.
4. Kmietowicz Frank A. *Ancient Slavs*. Stevens Point: Worzalla Publishing Company, 1976.
Kmietowicz, Frank A. (1976). *Ancient Slavs*. Stevens Point: Worzalla Publishing Company.
 5. Logan F. D. *The Vikings in History*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2005. pp.183.
Logan, F. D. (2005). *The Vikings in History*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. pp.183.
 6. Magocsi P. R. *A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020.
Magocsi, P. R. (2010). *A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
 7. Magocsi Paul R. «The Fourth Rus': A New Reality in a New Europe». *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. 2011. №35-36 (2010-2011), P. 167–177.
Magocsi, Paul R. (2011). «The Fourth Rus': A New Reality in a New Europe». *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 35-36 (2010-2011), 167–177.
 8. Rebała K, Mikulich A, Tsybovsky I, Siváková D, Dzapinková Z, Szczerkowska-Dobosz A, Szczerkowska Z. Y-STR variation among Slavs: evidence for the Slavic homeland in the Middle Dnieper Basin. *Journal of Human Genetics*. 52(5). February, 2007. 406-414.
Rebała, K, Mikulich, A, Tsybovsky, I, Siváková, D, Dzapinková, Z, Szczerkowska-Dobosz, A, Szczerkowska, Z. (2007). Y-STR variation among Slavs: evidence for the Slavic homeland in the Middle Dnieper Basin. *Journal of Human Genetics*, 52(5), February, 406-414.
 9. Struk D. H. *The Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
Struk, D. H. (1993). *The Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
 10. Vernadsky G. *The Mongols and Russia. A History of Russia, Vol. III*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
 11. Vernadsky, G. (1970). *The Mongols and Russia. A History of Russia, Vol. III*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Олеяр Славомир

(м. Сент-Кетерінс, Канада)

E-mail: slavomir.olejar@gmail.com

ВИВЧЕННЯ КОРЕЛЯЦІЇ ТЕРМІНІВ «РУСЬ» ТА «УКРАЇНА» В КАНАДСЬКОМУ УКРАЇНОЗНАВСТВІ

Мета дослідження – окреслити історію та сучасний стан використання термінів «Русь» і «русини» та їх співвідношення з термінами «Україна» і «українці».

Методологія. Основним методом дослідження став історико-культурологічний, який полягає у детальному вивченні та співставленні даних з релевантних історичних джерел. Крім історичного матеріалу білі використано дані філології та біології (генетики).

Наукова новизна. У статті детально простежується історія термінів «Русь», «русини» та їх поступова заміна термінами «Україна», «українці» зі збереженням терміну «русини» в окремих регіонах Східної Європи. Представлена інформація може бути використана при викладанні історії України, історії української культури, українознавства та суміжних предметів у школах і вищих навчальних закладах.

Висновки. Етнізм «русини» та назва держави «Русь» були втрачені на більшій території сучасної України і збереглися в ужитку лише в Карпатському регіоні (і в тих районах, де відбувалася еміграція з цього регіону). Водночас правителі Московії привласнили собі назву Русь у формі «Росія», що мало підкреслити їхні претензії на спадщину Київської Русі. Це призвело до значної плутанини в західній історичній думці. Тому перспективи подальших досліджень мають передбачати не лише з'ясування та уточнення конкретних наукових фактів, а й подальшу популяризаційно-роз'яснювальну роботу щодо походження націй, держав та етнізмів, що має сформувати цілісну картину історичної настанності як в Україні, так і за кордоном.

Ключові слова: Русь, Україна, русин, історія Східної Європи, українознавство.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 11.04.2024

Рецензент – доктор педагогічних наук, професор С. В. Грищенко