

UDC 94(477):327(477)“1920”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.27.281521

Radym HUBAN

PhD hab. (Law), Associated Professor, Deputy Head of the Secretariat of the Legal Policy Committee of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 5 Hrushevskoho Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01008 (rad_80@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0001-9354-0222

Dmytro MALEZHYK

PhD (History), Associated Professor of the Department of History and Historiosophy, Dragomanov Ukrainian State University, 9 Pyrohova Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01601 (d.i.malezhyk@npu.edu.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0002-1242-2134

Радим ГУБАНЬ

доктор юридичних наук, доцент, заступник керівника секретаріату Комітету з питань правової політики Верховної Ради України, вул. М. Грушевського, 5, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 01008 (rad_80@ukr.net)

Дмитро МАЛЕЖИК

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії та історіософії Українського державного університету імені М. Драгоманова, вул. М. Пирогова, 9, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 01601(d.i.malezhyk@npu.edu.ua)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Huban, R. & Malezhyk, D. (2023). Borders of the Late Hetmanate: Current Topics and Prospects of Their Research. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 27, 217–225. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.27.281521

**BORDERS OF THE LATE HETMANATE:
CURRENT TOPICS AND PROSPECTS OF THEIR RESEARCH**

Abstract. *The purpose of the article is to analyze the prospects of interdisciplinary research on the late Hetmanate borders with Russian territories and Zaporizhzhian Sich, borders of Ukrainian autonomy with Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The methodology of research includes the methods of historical and legal sciences and based on the principles of historicism and consistency. Both general scientific (analysis and synthesis, generalization, system analysis), special and historical (critical analysis of sources, retrospective, historical and comparative) methods as well as legal science (formal and legal, comparative legal) methods have been used. The Scientific Novelty. For the first time, in the article there have been singled out separate directions of historical and legal research on the example of the activities of government officials related to the delimitation and demarcation of borders. Prospective ways of the “direction” (in some cases, we can talk about modernization) of borders, such as: delimitation and demarcation of borders, activities of the Ukrainian and Russian government officials, who were engaged in delimitation and demarcation, have been determined. The perspective of a systematic analysis of the Cossack starshyna views, involved in border commissions, on Hetmanship and on the Russian Empire,*

on the neighbouring Zaporizhzhia, on the western neighbour of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, has been also done. **The Conclusion.** The study of the demarcation of the late Hetmanate borders is a promising object for interdisciplinary research by a whole group of researchers in the field of historical and legal research. The evidence suggests that representatives of the administration of the Hetman region tried to carry out border demarcation profitably, while some of them showed an inappropriate attitude to work in joint demarcation commissions. It is shown that the border demarcation was a difficult task; its implementation was carried out by personalities known in the history of Eastern Europe.

Key words: Hetmanate, borders, delimitation, demarcation, Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Russian Empire.

КОРДОНИ ПІЗЬНОГО ГЕТЬМАНАТУ: СУЧАСНІ АКТУАЛЬНІ ТЕМИ ТА ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ ЇХ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

Анотація. Метою роботи є аналіз перспектив міждисциплінарного дослідження кордонів пізнього Гетьманату з російськими територіями та Запорізькою Січчю, кордонів української автономії з Річчю Посполитою. **Методологія дослідження** включає методи історичних та юридичних наук і ґрунтується на принципах історизму, науковості та системності. Застосовано загальнонаукові (аналізу та синтезу, узагальнення, системного аналізу), спеціально-історичні (критичного аналізу джерел, ретроспективний, порівняльно-історичний) та юридичні (формально-юридичний, порівняльно-правовий) методи. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше виокремлено напрями історико-правового дослідження на прикладі діяльності урядовців щодо делімітації та демаркації кордонів. Визначено перспективні шляхи «напряму» (у деяких випадках йдеться про модернізацію) кордонів, таких як делімітація і демаркація, розкрито діяльність українських і російських урядовців, залучених до встановлення кордонів. Проаналізовано перспективи системного аналізу поглядів козацької старшини, залученої до прикордонних комісій, на гетьманство і на Російську імперію, на сусідні Запорізьку Січ та Річ Посполиту. **Висновки.** Вивчення демаркації кордонів пізнього Гетьманату є перспективним предметом міждисциплінарного дослідження для цілої групи науковців у галузі історії та права. Факти засвідчують, що більшість представників гетьманської адміністрації намагались якісно провести демаркацію кордонів, у той час як деякі з них показували неналежне ставлення до роботи в спільних комісіях. Демаркація кордонів була складним завданням, і була здійснена особистостями, добре відомими в історії Східної Європи.

Ключові слова: Гетьманщина, кордони, делімітація, демаркація, Річ Посполита, Російська імперія.

The Problem Statement. The border is an immanent feature of the state, its necessary attribute. In this regard, the delimitation and demarcation of borders is of great importance, the essence of which is the line of its passage established on the map. Before demarcation of the border, in fact, one cannot speak of establishing a border per se. Since its definition on the ground makes it possible to protect it from illegal crossing. In this aspect, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of the demarcation of the borders of the Hetmanate for the settlement of Russian-Ukrainian relations and the protection of the remaining state sovereignty of Ukrainian lands.

In 18th century there were boundaries between the Hetmanate and Russia (the Russian provinces and Slobozhanshchyna, or Slobidska Ukraine), between the Hetmanate and Zaporizhzhia. In some periods of history, the entire commissions were assembled to work on a clear definition of the border between the Hetmanate (and the Russian Empire) and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Taking this into account, it is important to highlight the role of the Cossack authorities in the demarcation of the Hetmanate boundaries during the rule of K. Rozumovskyi.

The Analysis of Publications and Recent Research. The problem of delimitation of the Hetmanate border is a subject of both Ukrainian and foreign researches. General issues of

state boundaries were analyzed in O. Putro's research on political and administrative issues of the Ukrainian-Russian relationship during the O. Rozumovskyi's Hetmanship (Putro, 2008). The formation of the boundaries of the Hetmanate from its beginning was analyzed in the studies of O. Hurzhii (Hurzhii, 2015), Z. Kohut (Kohut, 2011) and M. Krykun (Krykun, 2016). The problem of personnel policy in the Hetmanate was the subject of V. Patlachuk's research (Patlachuk, 2013). K. Halskyi focused on trade issues and customs duties between the Hetmanate and Russian Empire (Halskyi, 2006). The researches, written by V. Brekhunenko (Brekhunenko, 2014), S. Rusakov (Rusakov, 2022), V. Sklokin (Sklokin, 2019) and T. Chukhlib (Chukhlib, 2014) deal with the study of the political, socio-economical, cultural and legal status of Ukrainian territories in 18th century. Ukrainian researcher Ya. Vermenych turns to the problem of the phenomenon of borders and borderlands as special areas of interaction (Vermenych, 2021). Despite a number of works on the Hetmanate history of 18th century, boundary issues in terms of activity of the Cossack leadership have not become a special subject of study, adding urgency of our paper.

The Purpose of the Research. The main purpose of this research deals with the analysis of the prospects of interdisciplinary research on the late Hetmanate borders with Russian territories and Zaporizhzhian Sich, borders of Ukrainian autonomy with Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The Results of the Research. The Hetmanate inherited the Ukrainian-Russian border from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. It began to be established in accordance with the terms of the Truce of Deulino (1618). However, the exact border was not established at the time. The main obstacle for this issue was the lack of a natural geographical border and the temporary status of the delimitation of the territory of Muscovy and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. According to the Peace of Polyanovka (1634), this border was specified and adjusted, and also determined by special border features. However, even after 1634, there were frequent border conflicts, an example of this might be the "Putyvl border case" (1638) (Hurzhii, 1997, pp. 16–17).

In 1648, the border between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Tsardom of Muscovy was more or less established. However, it continued to be not clearly defined, one of the reasons for which was the lack of sufficient funding in the government of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth for a clear demarcation of borders and the integration of new eastern territories into the state. The Left-Bank Hetmanate received this border as its legal border with the territory of Tsardom of Muscovy. At this border customs duties were charged, some goods were not allowed to pass, quarantines were introduced, fugitives were detained, completely different laws and judicial systems operated on both sides of the border, so different lives were raging. This Ukrainian-Russian border existed until the abolition of the Hetmanate institution in 1764 (with certain exceptions, such as in 1709, the city of Kotelva was taken from the Hadiach regiment and transferred to the Okhtyrka regiment, which was part of the Slobozhanshchyna).

The problem of the border between the Hetman state (as part of Russian Empire) and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which existed until 1772, is interesting and multidimensional. It began to be legally formalized according to the Treaty of Andrusovo (1667). Finally, it was formed in accordance with the Eternal Peace of 1686, although de facto it was not the same as de jure. Both the Russian Empire and the Hetmanate wanted him to be pushed to the west in the 18th century. Russia did this during the Great Northern War (1700 – 1721). The Ukrainian administration tried to take control of Right-Bank Ukraine during the reign of Ivan Mazepa in

1704 – 1709. Even subsequent hetmans made attempts to preserve at least a little bit of land on the opposite bank, in order to justify the title “Hetman of both sides of the Dnipro River”. After the Peace of Belgrade (1739) between the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Empire, the starshyna (officers) of the Poltava and Myrhorod regiments extended his administration to a large area of North-Western Zaporizhia (Hurzhii, 2015, p. 32).

Since K. Rozumovskiy gained power over Zaporizhzhia, a large new territory came under his rule. The border between the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Empire can be considered as the southern border of the Hetmanate. This is evidenced not only by the imperial document, but also by the perception of the elite of the Hetmanate. In particular, this can be seen from the “Petition of the Little Russian Nobility”. In the paragraph “On the Establishment of a Port on the Dnipro River”, which can safely be attributed to the modernization concepts of “educated government” and “well-ordered state”, it was proposed that: “having chosen a suitable place lower the rapids on the Dnipro River, to establish a port and make a petition to the Ottoman Porte, so that, although on Turkish and other foreign peoples’ ships, the merchants of the Little Russian people would be free to travel across the Black and Mediterranean Seas” (point 25) (Proshenie, 1993, p. 94).

It should be mentioned that there are quite a lot of archival materials remaining on the demarcation of the borders between the Russian Empire (Hetmanate) and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the time of the Governing Council of the Hetman Office (1734 – 1750) and the reign of K. Rozumovsky (1750 – 1764), as well as the border between the Russian Empire (Hetmanate) and the Ottoman Empire (the Crimean Khanate). There are also a number of interesting materials and subjects about border life from the Ukrainian side during the reign of K. Rozumovskiy. All this makes the issue “Borders of the Late Hetmanate” interesting for in-depth research.

A relevant and versatile research issue is the demarcation of the border along the Dnipro River, which, as it was mentioned, existed until 1772. The wish of the Senate of the Russian Empire to carry out the demarcation of this border by the Ukrainian-Russian commission in the 1740s was never fulfilled. Thus, in 1741, engineer-captain Fedir Molkanov worked on this issue (Hurzhii, 1996, p. 70). In 1742, on the Russian side, adviser Polyakov was appointed to the joint Ukrainian-Russian commission. On November 25 of the same year, General Bunchuk Officer Obolonskyi was appointed to the commission by the General Military Office (Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Kyiv – CSHAUK, f. 260, d. 1, c. 454, p. 6). According to the order of the Russian authorities, when demarcating the borders, it was necessary to involve the starshyna of the regiments where the demarcation was carried out. However, at the same time, the commission still had to be guided by the instructions, according to which the Ukrainian members of the commission were forbidden to argue with the Russians. This clearly indicates an active position in defending the interests of the representatives of the central administration of the Hetmanate in the demarcation of borders that was favorable for the Ukrainian side.

The involvement of a knowledgeable regimental starshyna in the border demarcation process did not help to resolve issues related to setting boundaries in the area. On January 31, 1744, the General Military Office, taking into account the requests of both sides, established a new procedure for determining the passage of the border. According to it, in order to avoid disputes, the owners (or their representatives) of arable land and haymakers from both the Ukrainian and Russian sides were involved in this process (CSHAUK, f. 260, d. 1, c. 454, p. 8). After that, the demarcation process slightly intensified.

It should be noted that problems with demarcation were not only on the Ukrainian-Russian border. Thus, in 1745, the Board of Foreign Affairs of Russia, referring to the fact that the state borders with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had not yet been definitively defined, prohibited by a special decree from issuing documents for the right to own estates in the border strip to Polish nobles. In the same year, Crimean Khan Selim II Giray complained to Kyiv Governor-General M. Leontyev about the inappropriateness of skirmishes on the border between Zaporozhzhian Cossacks and Nogai Tatars. The authorities of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, in its turn, specified the distances of villages and towns to the Polish-Ukrainian border (Hurzhii, 1996, p. 71). Demarcation of the border was a difficult task, so it was successfully carried out by famous personalities. For example, the well-known Russian historian, military engineer, topographer, Major General O. Rigelman made a significant contribution to the process of establishing the border between the Hetmanate (Russian Empire) and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth along the Dnipro River (Hurzhii, 1996, p. 71).

Determining the border line absolutely wouldn't provide an effective guarantee of its enforcement. We have analyzed a significant number of documents that reported on border violations and the consequences associated with this. Moreover, one of the reasons for the massive violation of the state border was the insufficiently clear definition of it on the ground. For example, individual outposts could be moved in winter or spring for various reasons, such as flood, ice, etc.) (Hurzhii, 2015, p. 40).

An interesting topic on the borders of the late Hetmanate was the constant movement of "illegitimate" persons. For example, on September 20, 1750, in a copy of the letter sent from the State Board of Foreign Affairs to the Hetman of Little Russia, Count K. Rozumovskiy, Kyiv Governor-General Leontiev reported to the Senate that the captain and his team sent by him captured 51 people with 2 cannons, one small mortar and other weapons. These people engaged in robberies in the Polish towns and villages closest to the Pereiaslav Regiment. A significant fact was a reply to Leontiev's question about the punishment of those caught, given by the Senate authorities of the Russian Empire. It proposed to use torture, "so that others will be afraid because of it" and thus discourage the desire to "theft" (Materialyi istorii, 1886, pp. 193–194). These robbers were different people, who violated the legislation of that time, and did it with not always the same motives. It should be said, as it follows from the report of the chief of Haisyn, the cupbearer of Bratslav, Antoni Sudymontovych Chechel, that the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was attacked not only by mounted Cossacks, but also by infantry. Moreover, he reported that these raids were carried out with the permission of the Kish otaman. The captured Cossacks said that Kish otaman and sotnyk (a captain) of Arkhanhelohorod Potapenko were "in cahoots" with them) (Materialyi istorii, 1886, pp. 201–209).

At the same time, the Russian government did not leave the issue of the demarcation of Ukrainian and Russian lands. Thus, on October 6, 1749, a decree was issued on the delimitation of the lands of the Empress and Countess Golovkina. It was assumed that General Bunchuzhny Obolonsky had to take part in this case. However, after the election of Hetman K. Rozumovsky, Obolonsky went to the Hetman's court. Instead, State Councilor Poliakov insisted on the return of Obolonsky or the appointment of another person in his place, since he himself was already in Hlukhiv. In the end, Osavul Yakubovych was appointed by the Ukrainian side. However, even this decision did not solve the problem, as Yakubovych, referring to his illness (arthritis), refused to go to the place of demarcation, although the documents preserved the information

that he left his residence the day before. After that, the Board of Foreign Affairs requested to replace Yakubovych with a colonel, who was to be determined by the General Military Chancellery. At the same time, it was decided that in case of Yakubovych's absence, one of the three colonels – Hadiach (Haletskyi), Poltava (Horlenko), Chernihiv (Bozhich) – should take part in the work of the Commission in his place (CSHAUK, f. 269, d. 1, c. 67, p. 3). Moreover, this time it was planned to involve not only the owners of the respective territories, which were on the border of Little Russia and Great Russia, but also old-timers in the demarcation line of the border (CSHAUK, f. 260, d. 1, c. 454, p. 6).

According to the decree of the empress dated October 30, 1751, in 1752, a second meeting of the joint Commission was foreseen, which was to continue without a stop until “the most inconvenient for the delimitation winter time”. At the meeting the Russian side was to be represented by Poliakov, and from the Ukrainian side, the responsible person was to be appointed by the Hetman (CSHAUK, f. 260, d. 1, c. 454, p. 6). The seriousness of the intentions of the Russian empress is evidenced by the fact that, in accordance with its Decree of May 23, 1753, the Board of Foreign Affairs was ordered to appoint a surveyor with proper tools for drawing up land maps, since the hetman did not have them (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 19). On May 28, 1753, the issue on the need to demarcate Great Russian and Little Russian lands was again raised. Moreover, this demarcation was ordered to be carried out from the beginning of spring until winter (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 19).

Investigating the work of the Commission on the demarcation of the Ukrainian-Russian border provides an opportunity to reconstruct the traditional and modernizing views and ideas of the representatives of the central administration of the Hetmanate. It also helps us to reconstruct relations between Ukrainian and Russian government officials at a lower level. The list of candidates submitted to the hetman for participation in the Commission for the demarcation of the Ukrainian-Russian border was quite extensive. It consisted of such colonels: Lubny (Apostol), Poltava (Horlenko), Gadiach (Galetsky), Chernihiv (Bozhich), Myrhorod (Ostrogradsky). Among the Bunchuk's comrades the Commission included Yakiv Markovych, Ivan Dyiakovskii, Vasyl Hudovych, Ivan Andreiev, Ivan Skorupa, Hryhorii Borozna, Hryhorii Ivanenko, Ivan Yanovskyi. From this list, only the candidacies of the Myrhorod colonel Ostrogradsky and Bunchuk Comrade Yanovsky gained the support of the Hetman. This choice was explained by the fact that they had already participated in the work of the demarcation commission. The will of the hetman was enshrined in his order to the General Military Chancellery dated March 15, 1755. It is obvious that such haste of the General Military Chancellery was explained by the need to implement the Decree of the Empress dated March 9, 1755, in which it was recalled that on February 23, 1755, the Senate made a decision on the demarcation of Russian and Ukrainian lands (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 19). Therefore, the hetman ordered Colonel of Myrhorod regiment, Fedir Ostrohradskyi, and Bunchuk comrade Ivan Yanovskyi to arrive immediately in Hlukhiv. They had to arrive there earlier than State Councilor Poliakov, since they had to receive instructions in Hlukhiv (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 33). As we realize later, as of May 26, 1755, Yanovsky would never arrived in Hlukhiv (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 33). Colonel F. Ostrohradsky also did not arrive in Hlukhiv. He explained that he was absent due to a sore leg (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 38). Meanwhile, Polyakov had already arrived and was waiting at the border (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 42).

It was curious and unpleasant for the Ukrainian side that Polyakov left the meeting point before the arrival of the Ukrainian delegation. On July 7, 1755, Colonel Fedir Ostrohradskyi

and Bunchuk comrade Ivan Yanovskyi complained that they came to the place of work of the Commission, but did nothing, and being there was financially burdensome for them. The letter also stated that the colonel's leg hurt, so he needed to leave. In connection with Ostrohradsky's illness, Major Standard-bearer Mykola Khanenko proposed his candidacy to the commission on August 13, 1755 (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 50). Instead, the Hetman wrote in a letter to the General Military Chancellery on October 20, 1755 that it was not necessary to appoint M. Khanenko, who proposed himself, but it was necessary to appoint Lubny Colonel D. Apostol (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 55). There was no point in remaining Bunchuk comrade without a colonel. They also asked the hetman to appoint a meeting place for the Russian and Ukrainian delegation not far from the border, so that they would not have to go far (CSHAUK, f. 51, d. 3, c. 1390, p. 47). On October 3, 1755, Bunchuk comrade Ivan Yanovsky once again informed the hetman that he lacked money to be a member of the Commission in Hlukhiv (CSHAUK, f. 260, d. 1, c. 454, p. 15). In the same letter, Ostrohradskyi and Yanovsky reported that during the determination of the demarcation line between them and the head of the Russian delegation Poliakov, a dispute arose regarding the settlements in Starodub and Nizhyn regiments. In Starodub regiment, the dispute arose around the settlement of Kamianka, and in Nizhyn regiment – around Chuikivka and Zhuravka. Since the Ukrainian delegation did not agree with Polyakov, it prepared own version of demarcation, which had to be submitted to the Foreign and Patrimonial Collegium (CSHAUK, f. 260, d. 1, c. 454, p. 47).

It should be emphasized that Russian government officials ignored the interests of the Ukrainian side sporadically. Also, some representatives of the Ukrainian administration did not see great prospects for themselves in defending the borders of the Hetmanate. Thus, in 1760 Bunchuk comrade Danylo Treblianskyi wrote to Hetman K. Rozumovskyi that he had come to the Commission meeting, but he turned out to be one of the Ukrainian side. In this regard, he asked for permission to leave the commission, as he does not want to leave it arbitrarily so that he is not fined (CSHAUK, f. 269, d. 1, c. 3124, p. 1). As follows from the letter, Yakym Lytvynov was also supposed to take part in the work of the Commission. In September, 1760, he wrote a letter in which he apologized to Trebliansky and informed that he was forced to leave for St. Petersburg because he was summoned by the empress. At the same time, he claimed that he left all the documents necessary for negotiations with the "copyist" (CSHAUK, f. 269, d. 1, c. 3124, p. 2).

Problems in the work of representatives of the Hetmanate in the Commissions on border demarcation can be seen from the clarifications of the border between the Russian Empire and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1753 – 1754. When establishing the border, the main criterion was the exact demarcation of the territory of both countries. Old-timers respected in a particular area were used in the work on border demarcation (Hurzhii, 1996, p. 74). However, the demarcation process was difficult. This is evidenced, in particular, by a letter to Hetman K. Rozumovskyi, which the empress sent to him, summarizing the materials received from Colonel Myronov. In the letter, the hetman wrote that Bunchuk comrades from the Commission are often irresponsible in performance of their duties. Often they do not appear at the commission meeting at all. Even more often, they come next to close of its work. Even when they arrived at the Commission meeting, they were often not ready for constructive work. As a result, the representatives of the Polish side simply mocked them, and the commission meeting could never begin. In the end, the empress concluded that Bunchuk comrades should appear immediately after receiving the summons. Also, the

empress ordered to prepare carefully for participation in the work of the Commission, and not to come unprepared (CSHAUK f. 269, d. 1, c. 1232, p. 2).

The Conclusion. Therefore, the process of demarcation of the borders of the late Hetman state is a promising object for interdisciplinary research of a whole group of researchers in the field of both history and law. The study of the borders of the late Hetmanate sheds light on the views of the Cossack starshyna on their state and empire. Contrary to the official statements of the imperial authorities about a parity approach to the formation of joint commissions and their conventional activities, the final word in defining the border line still remained with the Russian representatives. On the one hand, representatives of the Hetmanate administration tried to demarcate the borders profitably. On the other hand, a large part of them showed an inappropriate attitude to work in joint commissions on border delimitation.

Acknowledgement. We express our sincere gratitude to the staff of the Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Kyiv for their help in getting the necessary archival materials.

Funding. The authors did not receive any financial support for the publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brekhunenko, V. (2014). *Skhidna brama Yevropy. Kozatska Ukraina v seredyni XVII – XVIII st.* [The Eastern Gate of Europe. Cossack Ukraine in the middle of the 17th – 18th centuries]. Kyiv: Tempora. [in Ukrainian]

Vermenych, Ya. V. (2021). Kordony ta pohranychchia v dyskursyvnomu prostori sotsiohumanitarystyky: teoretychni proiektivni [Borders and Borderlands in the Discourse Space of Socio-Humanitarian Studies: Theoretical Projections]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoi akademii nauk Ukrainy Bulletin of National Academy of Science of Ukraine*, 7, 55–70. Doi: 10.15407/visn2021.07.055. [in Ukrainian]

Halskyi, K. Ye. (2006). *Torhivlia i mytna sprava Hetmanskoï Ukrainy: seredyna XVII – XVIII st.* [Trade and Customs Affairs of the Hetman's Ukraine: the middle of the 17th – 18th centuries]. Kyiv: Panorama. [in Ukrainian]

Hurzhiï, O. (1996). *Ukrainska kozatska derzhava v druhii polovyni XVII – XVIII st.: kordony, naseleñnia, pravo* [The Ukrainian Cossack State in the second half of the 17th – 18th centuries: borders, population, law]. Kyiv: Osnovy. [in Ukrainian]

Hurzhiï, O. I. (2015). *Polityko-administratyvne i terytorialne reformuvannia Hetmanshchyny u XVIII st.: prychny, perebih, naslidky* [Political-administrative and Territorial Reform of the Hetmanate in the 18th century: causes, course, consequences]. Kyiv: In-t istorii Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Kohut, Z. (2011) Kordony Ukrainy: terytorialni vizii kozakiv vid hetmana B. Khmelnytskoho do hetmana I. Samoilovycha [Borders of Ukraine: territorial visions of the Cossacks from Hetman B. Khmelnytskyi to Hetman I. Samoilovich]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 3, 50–73. [in Ukrainian]

Krykun, M. (2016). *Kordony voievodstv Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy u XVI – XVIII stolittakh* [Borders of the Voivodships of Right-Bank Ukraine in the 16th – 18th centuries]. Lviv: Vyd-vo Lviv. politekhniky. [in Ukrainian]

Materialy istorii. (1886). *Materialy istorii yuzhnorusskogo kraya v XVIII stoletii (1715 – 1774) izvlechenykh iz starykh del Kievskogo gubernskogo arhiva A. A. Andrievskim.* Izdaniye imperatorskim Odesskim obschestvom istorii i drevnostey [Materials of the history of the South Russian region in the 18th century (1715 – 1774) extracted from the old files of the Kyiv provincial archive by A. A. Andrievsky. Published by the Imperial Odessa Society of History and Antiquities]. Odesa: Tipografiya A. Shultse. [in Russian]

Patlachuk, V. N. (2013). Rol starshynskykh rad u kadrovii politytsi Hetmanshchyny [The Role of Senior Councils in the Personnel Policy of the Hetmanate]. *Visnyk Maripolskoho derzhavnoho*

universytetu. Serii: Pravo – Bulletin of Mariupol State University. Series: Law, 5, 29–34. [in Ukrainian]

Proshenie. (1993). Proshenie malorossiyskogo shlyahetstva i starshin vmeste z getmanom, o vozstanovlenii raznykh starinnykh prav Malorossii, podannoe Ekaterine II v 1764 godu [Petition of the Little Russian nobility and foremen, together with the hetman, for the restoration of various ancient rights of Little Russia, submitted to Catherine II in 1764]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 9. URL: https://archive.org/details/uizhur/1993_9/page/94/mode/2up?view=theater. [in Russian]

Putro, O. I. (2008). *Hetman Kyrylo Rozumovskyy ta yoho doba (z istorii ukrainskoho derzhavotvorennya XVIII st.)* [Hetman Kyrylo Rozumovskyy and his era (from the history of Ukrainian state formation in the 18th century)]. Kyiv: Derzhavna akademiia kerivnykh kadrov kultury i mystetstv. [in Ukrainian]

Rusakov, S. (2022). Establishment of the Art Market in the Context of Ukrainian Historical and Cultural Tradition. *Studia Warmińskie*, 59, 111–124. Doi: 10.31648/sw.8330. [in English]

Sklokin, V. (2019). *Rosiiska imperiia i Slobidska Ukraina u druhiy polovyni KhVIII st.: prosvichenyi absoliutyzm, imperska intehratsiia, lokalne suspilstvo* [Russian Empire and Sloboda Ukraine in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century: Enlightened Absolutism, Imperial Integration, Local Society]. Lviv: Vyd-vo UKU. [in Ukrainian]

Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Kyiv [CSHAUK – Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Kyiv]

Chukhlib, T. (2014). *Donechchyna ta Luhanshchyna – kozatski zemli Ukrainy (XVI – XVIII st.)* [Donetsk region and Luhansk region – Cossack lands of Ukraine (XVI – XVIII centuries)]. Kyiv: In-t istorii Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received September 05, 2022.
Article recommended for publishing 14/06/2023.*