

UDC 930:329.73(477.8)
doi: 10.15330/jpnu.6.2.17-27

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WEST UKRAINIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC. THE HISTORY OF THE ZUNR: DIFFERENCES IN APPROACHES AT THE STAGE OF CHANGING PARADIGMS IN UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

VOLODYMYR VELYKOCHYY

Abstract: The article analyzes the conceptual changes in historiographical approaches to the phenomenon of the West Ukrainian People's Republic (the ZUNR), whose centenary is celebrated in 2018. Historiographical sources provide clear evidence of the change in the analytical paradigm: shifting from glorification or a downright defamation to a careful examination of the ZUNR's achievements and failures; investigating the least-studied aspects of its activity; establishing the role and place of the ZUNR in the history of Ukrainian state building.

Keywords: West Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR), Ukrainian national historiography, paradigm of national historiography, national conception.

During this century, Ukrainian historiography has accumulated a considerable amount of historical and memoir literature on the issue of the national state-building processes in the early 20th century; these empirical corpus and documentary sources, theoretical and methodological developments indicate the emergence of a new trend, 'the ZUNR' studies'. In the general context of the history of Ukraine, the ZUNR is viewed from three main perspectives: 1) as an element of the Ukrainian liberation movement, in the 20th century in particular; 2) as a unique national state-building process; 3) as an element of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917–1920. On the other hand, the ZUNR was a system in its own right – the national, political, military, social, economic, religious relations, processes and structures, whose interaction resulted in the creation of a unique phenomenon in Ukrainian and European history. The complexity of the above processes and the differences in methodological and ideological approaches to their studies are reflected in the academic discourse on the subject, which sometimes is marked by controversy. The goal of this article is to highlight the debate on the problem of the efficiency of the ZUNR's representative bodies, the state-building, social and economic processes in the Republic.

One of the key issues in researching the history of the ZUNR is the analysis of its institutional component, the formation and activity of the bodies of state authorities, the bodies of local authorities, and law enforcement bodies. The problem is widely highlighted in historical and historical-legal (generalizing and specializing) literature; the comprehension of this phenomenon has its own

* The ZUNR (Ukrainian: *Zakhidno-Ukrayinska Narodna Respublika*) – the West Ukrainian People's Republic.

dynamics, though. The publications of S. Stebelsky (1919), O. Kohut (1922) and other participants of the events [1; 2] provided the basis for researching the issue. Of greater importance was the first generalizing work by M. Chubaty (1921), who discussed the origins of the ZUNR, the international and geopolitical context in which the state emerged and operated, the state's legislative and executive power structures, the personnel of its governing and legislative bodies, the mechanism of the latter's functioning, etc. [3]. M. Lozynsky (1921) discussed the role and place of the Ukrainian management structures in the general social and political context of Galicia in 1918–1919 [4].

The initial impulse was quite powerful; yet between the 1920s and the 1970s, non-Soviet scholars' contribution to the issue was less than modest. The situation was improved, to some extent, due to the appearance of historical memoirs – numerous articles in various interwar periodicals, in *Litopys Chervonoyi Kalyny* (Annals of the 'Chervona Kalyna' publishing firm) and its calendars, in regional collections of historical memoirs published in the Diaspora; they became the main source of information about the activity of the ZUNR's state bodies. The most important of them, the memoirs of I. Makukh and A. Chaikovsky, will be discussed further in the text.

Historiography has reliable methods of dealing with issues that concern the central power structures of the ZUNR: the UNRada (Ukrainian: *Ukrainska Natsionalna Rada*) – the Ukrainian National Council, the highest legislative body; the RDS (Ukrainian: *Rada derzhavnykh sekretariv*) – the Council of State Secretaries, the highest executive body (the government of the Republic). In most cases, the description of the inner structure, changes in the staff of the UNRada and the government, the governments' functionings (the RDS took over from the State Secretariat) follows the pattern that presupposes the analysis of the laws, statutes, regulations, and the activities of state bodies during the Lviv (October 18 – November 21, 1918) and the Stanislaviv (January 2 – the late May of 1919) periods of the ZUNR's existence. Modern researchers hardly add anything new to what is already known.

A considerable progress in studying the work of the central and local authorities is made by O. Pavlyshyn. Using the accumulated experience of his predecessors, he researches into the institutional and social history of the West Ukrainian state and does a systemic analysis of the organizational forms of the representative power at different levels. The author shows that the change in the organizational form of the powiat UNRadas that involved a broader representation of rural communities was an important stabilizing factor in the social and political life of the new state. Also, he proves that in political management, the government failed to consistently follow the principles of collective decision-making and the division of power into executive and legislative; as a result, the UNRada and the RDS often trespassed on each other's functions [5; 6].

One of the key issues in the historiography of the Ukrainian liberation movement and state building in 1914–1920 is that of the national political elite. On the one hand, it is viewed from different social perspectives: as their precondition; as a factor behind the defeat; as a phenomenon characteristic of the state power, party and political structures, as a component of ethnic and demographic processes, etc. On the other hand, its study involves the employment of specific prosopographical, biographical and other methodologies. The issue of correlation between political class forces and national political forces, which is part of the conception of the Ukrainian revolution, is also of great importance since it helps to establish the elements that enhanced or hindered the revolution's development. But so far, special researches of this kind have covered only the history of Dnieper Ukraine [7, p. 3–16].

Modern nationally oriented historians are positive that the Galician Ukrainians were ready to build up an independent state. Some scholars even claim that in the early 20th century, the Ukrainian movement in Galicia was so strong, politically and socially speaking, that its leaders were ready to take power and historical responsibility for the future of their nation [8, p. 9]. A radically opposite point of view was expressed by I. Kedryn, historian, national democrat, participant in the events of November, 1918. He maintained that on the eve of the revolution, Ukraine did not have any organizational, intellectual (political elite) or psychological potential to govern the state; and that the situation could not change overnight [9]. The representatives of the conservative trend (V. Lypynsky, V. Kuchabsky, O. Nazaruk) took a critical view on the statehood aspirations of Galicia and especially Dnieper Ukraine. It was consistent with their ideological doctrine, according to which the producers of material wealth

(the working people, farmers, the bourgeoisie, the proletariat) formed the basis of society. Farmers and landowners had to play a leading role in its development [10, part 4, p. 202–203]; yet these social strata were only marginally involved in the radical social changes.

Modern researchers also differ, sometimes greatly, in their views on the potential of the national political elite. The Kyiv authors of synthetic, generalizing works on the history of the 20th-century national state-building processes are mostly pessimistic in this regard. They argue – some being more, others less dogmatic – that the low level of structuredness of Ukrainian society, the lack of nationally conscious, experienced state government executives and middle managers were some of the main factors behind the failure of the ZUNR. Some researchers tend to relate the state-building endeavours of the ZUNR to its leaders' attitude towards the UNR (Ukrainian: *Ukrainska Narodna Respublika* – the Ukrainian People's Republic, or the Ukrainian National Republic) and the idea of national unity [11, p. 29–214; 12, p. 263–291; 13, p. 223–265; 14, p. 173]. Within this group of historians, there are scholars whose opinion is somewhat different. They claim that the level of national consciousness and expertise of the state managers in Galicia was much higher than that of their counterparts in Dnieper Ukraine. The proponents of this point of view are O. Rubl'ov and O. Reient. Their approach to the 'problem of the national political elite' involves the analysis of the situation in both the government bodies and such sectors as railroad communications, education system, law enforcement structures; it also covers legislations that regulated their work [18, p. 276–280].

Unlike the Kyiv scholars, historians of the western region are more positive about the ZUNR's state-building achievements. According to them, the institutional structuredness of society and a high level of national consciousness allowed the Republic to avoid the chaos of the war and revolutionary period and to ensure cooperation and civic peace among different political forces and social strata [16, p. 134–141; 17, p. 98–103; 18, p. 166–255]. Irrespective of differences in approach, historians typically place emphasis on the analysis of the Galician authorities. In this regard, I would like to mention the so-called 'era of lawyers' (the 'epoch of lawyers'), a popular notion in professional historical literature, which has ambiguous consequences [19, p. 277; 20, p. 78]. The notion was introduced in 1916; it appeared in the work on the periodization of the national and political development of Galician Ukraine [21, p. 758–763]. In some cases, overestimation of the role of a particular social group in the national and historical processes leads to the disregard of the role of other social strata and particular professional groups in the formation of the new state.

The social, party and political facets of the ZUNR's institutional structure, especially those of its upper level, are studied better. For a long time, references were made to the personified description of the UNRada by M. Chubaty (1921), who listed and characterized 154 of its members [3]. Later, O. Pavlyshyn extended the list to 191 and then to 195 persons. The scholar carried out a prosopographic analysis that enabled him to reconstruct the personal data of the members of the UNRada; the reconstruction involved the following parameters: age, sex, place of birth, social class background, education, occupation, political party affiliation [5; 22; 23, p. 250–252]. The issue is also addressed in my paper *Dmytro Vitovskyi (1887–1919 rr.): dokumentalnyi narys (Dmytro Vitovsky (1887–1919): A Documentary Essay)* (in co-authorship with B. Havryliv) [24, p. 70–77]. The issue of the staff of the ZUNR's mid-level governing structures was examined by O. Pavlyshyn [25]. The research convincingly refutes a popular historiographical thesis that the 'lack' of nationally conscious state managers was a factor behind the ZUNR's failure and its 'unsuccessful' state-building policy.

Of special interest are historical-biographical works dedicated to the leading figures of the national liberation struggle in Galicia in 1914–1919, to the leaders of the ZUNR in particular. There is a tendency to focus on a limited circle of outstanding persons, paying less attention to the rest of Galician politicians of that period. Most of the researches highlight the activity of K. Levytsky and Ye. Petrushevych; somewhat smaller number of works, that of L. Bachynsky, A. Chaikovsky, I. Makukh and some military leaders, whose role will be discussed further in the text.

Such is the collection of vivid essays *Istorychni postati Halychyny XIX–XX st. (The Historical Figures of the 19th–20th-Century Galicia)* by I. Sokhotsky (1961) [26] and some other works by the same author (1965) that address the issue mainly in relation to the state-building activity of Ye. Petrushevych [27]. Less

popular in Ukrainian historiography is the book *Peredvisnyky i tvortsi Lystopadovoho Zryvu* (*The Forerunners and the Creators of the November Action*) by S. Volynets; based on short biographical data records, it gives an account of the activity of about forty outstanding public figures, thus creating a collective portrait of the Ukrainian elite at the crucial stage of the Ukrainian liberation struggle [28].

More than ten articles and books, some of them being quite substantial [29; 30; 31; 21], are dedicated to the activity of K. Levytsky; in general, he is described rather conventionally – sometimes only as ‘a shadow of his own memories’. In comparison, a well-known author, memoir writer A. Chaikovsky is depicted much more vividly. His activity as the Sambir Powiat Commissioner is analyzed against the backdrop of the tragic events in the ZUNR’s history from both a micro-historical and a psychological-historical perspectives [32; 33; 34].

There also exists a distinct group of historiographical reference sources. The leading figures of the ZUNR are extensively and profoundly portrayed in personal entries of two authoritative encyclopedias: *Entsyklopediia ukrainoznavstva* (*The Encyclopedia of Ukraine*), published in the Diaspora, and modern *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy* (*The Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine*). These and other biographical-informational [35] and ethnographical [36] publications of different periods – including specialized ones [37] – are evidence of social and scientific acknowledgement of these persons’ role in the history of Ukraine. At the same time, according to the above publications, the course of the national political life of Galicia during the war and revolution were determined by the activity of two or three dozen prominent persons.

V. Kapeliushnyi is right to state that ‘the least researched area’ is the social policy of the ZUNR [38, p. 307]. A considerable number of works on the social policy of Dnieper Ukraine and a well-developed social legislation of the ZUNR make this gap especially conspicuous. Some aspects of the problem are covered in historical memoirs [39; 3; 40] and researches of different periods [41; 42], the most detailed one being the work of S. Makarchuk [43]. The analysis of extensive documentary material enables the scholar to depict the situation in the West Ukrainian state – the devastation caused by the war, economic decline, black market, epidemics. The newly established state had to deal with the problems created by the war, and it had to do it on its own. Not always the actions of the government were effective, which aggravated the inner political situation [43, p. 144–153].

We also have the ‘Soviet version’ of the ZUNR’s ‘social history’ presented in some generalizing historical works. A representative example here is the paper by O. Karpenko (1958), who described, in a traditional manner, the worsening of economic and social conditions of the ‘working masses’, caused by the price rise, food crisis, etc. The author analyzed the situation in the Drohobych-Boryslav basin and extrapolated it to the whole territory of the ZUNR, thus substantiating the idea of the ‘development of the mass working-class movement’, ‘mass repressions’ against its participants, etc. [44]. It is worth mentioning that over the following fifty years, neither Ukrainian historians abroad nor their counterparts in modern Ukraine have made any attempts to investigate the problem, which still remains unresearched.

In my opinion, an in-depth analysis of the ZUNR’s social problems could promote a more balanced assessment of its state-building policy. Yet a still popular approach is to analyze the social situation from the perspective of the social policy of different state and political party structures [18, p. 228–246]; typically, such analyses are fragmentary, limited to the land reform, etc. O. Pavlyshyn’s works are interesting in this respect. Investigating the land policy and some social problems of the ZUNR, he compares its inner stability to the situation in Eastern Europe, destabilized by the revolutionary upheavals. On the territory of the Republic, there was no (‘almost no’, to be more exact) local opposition formations and mass civilian disorders; anti-governmental actions occurred only in the military units in the rear area [5; 45; 22].

The two debatable issues of the ZUNR’s history that require a more detailed investigation are the land reform and the Drohobych uprising.

The land reform, whose core issue was the transference of land estates into the land stock (fund) of the ZUNR, the division of land and its distribution among landless or land-starved peasants, became a matter of primary importance and urgency not only for Galicia with its 95 per cent of rural population,

but for the whole Eastern Europe during the revolutionary period of 1917–1920. Being in the focus of attention, the problem is viewed differently – sometimes from opposite perspectives – by historians who represent different trends. There is much debate around the law passed by the UNRada on April 14, 1919 on the alienation of large landed property and the transference of ownership to landless or land-starved peasants. The key points of the reform were the amount of compensation, the size limits on personal plots, the time and method of land allotment; decisions on these issues had to be taken by the future parliament.

The land reform of the ZUNR was heavily criticized by Soviet historians, who accused the 'bourgeois nationalists' of deceiving the peasantry in order to preserve the power of the bourgeoisie. Conservatively-minded authors, in their turn, said that the liquidation of large land ownership without any compensation would reduce the potential social base of the new power. They meant the ruin of 'positive landlords' (Poles, Ukrainians, 'semi-Poles') that were better prepared for governing the country and political leadership than the West Ukrainian intelligentsia [10, p. 202–203]. According to the historians of the radical trend, carrying out the land reform during the war was inappropriate, for it undermined order and increased chaos [46, p. 58–59]. It should be mentioned that, when already in the Diaspora, the radical historians of the interwar period (M. Stakhiv) tended to idealize the social and economic policy of the ZUNR. Trying to downplay its inner contradictions, they stated that the conscious peasantry ignored the demagoguery of the left forces and welcomed the land reform [47, p. 81].

Modern authors also differ in their assessment of the ZUNR's land policy. Experts on the history of the UNR Directorate compare its policy to that of the ZUNR and point out the latter's inconsistency in the land policy. But the majority of the researchers on the history of Western Ukrainian statehood agree that the land reform did not encroach on the basic principle of western economic life, the sacredness and inviolability of private property, because the ZUNR's leaders counted on the support of the Triple Entente and did not want to be accused of Bolshevism [18, p. 208–209; 15, p. 301–302]. The same idea was expressed by the Western Ukrainian historians of the interwar period. According to O. Slobodych, the ZUNR's leaders adopted the law to please the Triple Entente, but the peasantry did not support the reform [48, p. 27].

O. Pavlyshyn [25, p. 132–193; 49, p. 186] and M. Lytvyn [50] suggest a new theoretical approach to the problem. It may be summarized as follows:

- First. The authors reconstruct the painstaking process of developing the law on land reform, which we do not see in other studies on the ZUNR's acts.
- Second. They view the problem from a different perspective: the Galician Ukrainians did not disregard the land experiments of the Dnieper-Ukraine's governments, but developed their own land policy, taking into account their historical traditions and the social-economic situation in the country.
- Third. The authors aimed at providing a comprehensive analysis of the Republic's land policy, which involved both lawmaking and taking some practical steps: solving food crisis, organizing spring field work, solving social problems of rural areas, etc.
- Fourth. The scholars rejected the idealization of social class relations; they gave an objective analysis of relationship among the governing structures, the peasantry, the working people, the intelligentsia.

Not only Soviet historians, but also some modern researchers see the connection between the 'discontent of the poor and a group of servicemen' about the law on land reform passed on April 14, 1919 and the outburst of the Drohobych uprising on April 14–15. In my opinion, the idea is far-fetched. But this local event in the history of the ZUNR is most extensively discussed and most variously interpreted in a great number of researches and historical memoirs. For obvious reasons, it was a popular topic among Soviet authors in the 1930s and the 1950s–1960s [51; 52; 53]. The political regime of the ZUNR was relatively stable, so this dramatic event gave a convenient reason for the talks about the 'development of the class struggle of the proletariat' in support of the 'socialist revolution', about the 'unmasking of the bourgeois state' and its 'nationalistic leaders'. Some materials were downright fakes, especially those discussing the role of the local 'communist revolutionary committee' and the violent suppression of the workers' uprising by the Legion of Ukrainian Sich Riflemen.

Ukrainian researchers abroad viewed the events from an opposite perspective, criticizing their 'Soviet counterparts'; but there were discussions among them too. L. Lutsiv, well-known literary critic and expert on the issue [55], at first shared the view that it was 'just a riot' without any political motive behind it: a Drohobych police unit (a 'hundred') mutinied over an order to go to the front [54] (a version popular among modern historiographers [42, p. 143]). Later, having analyzed a wider range of sources, Lutsiv accepted the version of other participants of the events [56], who detected the Bolshevik hand behind the uprising. According to them, it was the doings of the Drohobych 'Soldier Council' with well-placed Bolshevik agents [57].

Some modern Ukrainian scholars tend to ignore the Drohobych events; others present them as a local conflict of minor importance; still others actually accept the Soviet version [18, p. 243–244] or state that the uprising resulted from the flaws in the government's social policy, which weakened the position of the ZUNR [43, p. 144–147; 5]. In my opinion, this issue requires a special investigation. On the other hand, I do not think we need to refute the Soviet ideologeme according to which the suppression of the uprising prevented a social revolution in Galicia, and the region did not become 'a bridge between the Sov[iet] Union and Red Hungary' for it to victoriously march west [51; 52]. The position of L. Tsehelsky (for all the bias of his memoirs) is interesting in this regard. He maintained that the Drohobych 'dictatorship of the proletariat' heightened the concern of European business circles, which used their influence with the governments, and it was the 'main factor' behind Galicia's passing under the control of Poland [40].

Generalizing studies on the history of the ZUNR also highlight, to a greater or lesser extent, its getting established in the provinces. Apart from that, there is a corpus of special publications in various genres, dedicated to the November Action of 1918 in Galicia's provinces. Thus, it is possible to reconstruct the full picture of the events – not only in Lviv, but on the whole territory of the Republic. *Litopys Chervonoyi Kalyny* and other Lviv periodicals of the 1920s–1930s, as well as the above regional collections of historical memoirs published in the Diaspora were 'flooded' with historical memoirs on the subject. They published abundant empirical material, interesting analytical articles and even polemics on both typical and specific aspects of the key events of the revolutionary period.

A unique phenomenon in Ukrainian historiography is the research of I. Karpynets, expert on the economic and military history of Ukraine. The author focuses on the revolutionary events in the town of Rudky (1918–1919). The enormous corpus of empirical material and the combination of micro- and macro-level methods of historical analyses enables him to produce a comprehensive and detailed work, a period piece of provincial life in Galicia, in which the situation in one particular powiat is presented from military, political, social, economic, and mass-psychological perspectives [58].

Such a holistic approach, which – among other things – involves the analysis of the position of ethnic minorities, is not often used in modern regional historical studies; in most cases, they are written in the genre of political history and have conspicuous characteristics of positivist methodology [59].

Thus, for a century, from the time of the formation of the West Ukrainian People's Republic, a specific trend – 'the ZUNR studies' – has been developing in Ukrainian national historiography; now it is represented by a massive corpus of works in different genres, including scientific ones. There are various approaches to the analysis of the history of the Republic; but typically it is regarded as part of the 20th-century Ukrainian national liberation struggle and the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1920, a valuable state-building experience.

Thus theoretical scientific approaches, ideological and political stereotypes of different periods of Ukrainian historiography predetermine the continuity and dynamics of the general comprehension and the specificity of assessment of the ZUNR phenomenon.

The range and scope of publications on the ZUNR's history are evidence of the evolution of Ukrainian historiography, the change of its paradigms: the radically nationalistic or social class research paradigms have yielded to the statehood one; they also indicate an increased interest in the general development of the transformational processes, which manifests itself in the accumulation of source material and the renovation of theoretical and methodological principles. An interdisciplinary approach to the problem – studying the ZUNR phenomenon from the perspective of political science,

psycho-history and other sciences related to history and historiography – reveals its new aspects, and the conclusions can be somewhat ambiguous.

Some particular aspects of the ZUNR's historiography are studied better than others; there are areas whose interpretation and assessment are still liable to arouse controversy. For instance, the issues of the November Uprising of 1918 and the Ukrainians coming to power in Galicia are well-investigated, while the state-building principles, the complex of problems related to the ZUNR's legislation, the functioning of the Republic's institutions and some other issues require, in my opinion, further study and discussion. Much attention is given to the social policy of the ZUNR; yet, with the exception of the land reform, we actually do not have special researches on the social and economic situation in the Republic.

The West Ukrainian People's Republic approached its centenary. What we witness now is the emergence of a new conception of this state in Ukrainian historiography: on the whole, it is regarded as a successful statehood and state-building 'project' initiated by the Ukrainian revolution despite its actual military and political defeat.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ст. Ст. [Стебельський С.] Начерк державного устрою Західної Облaсті Української Народної Республіки. В: *Українець. Календарик на звичайний рік 1919*. Станиславів, 1919, 21–33.
[St. St. [Stebelskyi S.] Nacherk derzhavnoho ustroiu Zakhidnoi Oblasti Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky. In: *Ukrainets. Kaliendaryk na zvychainyi rik 1919*. Stanyslaviv, 1919, 21–33.]
- [2] Когут О. Дещо про адміністрацію в українській державі (З.О.У.Н.Р.) В: *Календар товариства «Просвіта» на звичайний рік 1923*. Львів, 1922, 93–102.
[Kohut O. Deshcho pro administratsiiu v ukrainiskii derzhavi (Z.O.U.N.R.) In: *Kalendar tovarystva «Prosvita» na zvychainyi rik 1923*. Lviv, 1922, 93–102.]
- [3] Чубатий М. *Державний лад на Західній облaсти Української Народної Республіки*. Ставроп. ін-т, Львів, 1921.
[Chubatyi M. *Derzhavnyi lad na Zakhidnii oblasti Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky*. Stavrop. in-t, Lviv, 1921.]
- [4] Левицький К. *Великий Зрив*. Червона Калина, Львів, 1931.
[Levytskyi K. *Velykyi Zryv*. Chervona Kalyna, Lviv, 1931.]
- [5] Павлишин О.І. Формування та діяльність представницьких органів влади ЗУНР-ЗОУНР (жовтень 1918 – червень 1919 рр.). Автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01. Львів, 2001.
[Pavlyshyn O.I. Formuvannia ta diialnist predstavnytskykh orhaniv vlady ZUNR-ZOUNR (zhovten 1918 – cherven 1919 rr.). Avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.01. Lviv, 2001.]
- [6] Бортняк Н. Матеріали до бібліографії наукових праць Степана Томашівського. *Записки НТШ. Т. ССXXXIII: Праці Історично-філософської секції*. НТШ, Львів, 1997, 271–294.
[Bortniak N. Materialy do bibliografii naukovykh prats Stepana Tomashivskoho. *Zapysky NTSh. T. SSXXXIII: Pratsi Istorychno-filosofskoi sektsii*. NTSh, Lviv, 1997, 271–294.]
- [7] Солдатенко В.Ф. Проблема класово і національно-політичних сил у концепції української революції (1). *Український історичний журнал*, 5 (1997), 3–17.
[Soldatenko V.F. Problema klasovo i natsionalno-politychnykh syl u kontseptsii ukrainskoi revoliutsii (1). *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 5 (1997), 3–17.]
- [8] Кондратюк В.О. *ЗУНР: становлення і захист*. Світ, Львів, 1998.
[Kondratiuk V.O. *ZUNR: stanovlennia i zakhyst*. Svit, Lviv, 1998.]
- [9] Кедрин І. У горнілі революції. В: Кедрин І. *У межах зацікавлення*. Бібліотека українознавства, 53. Наук. т-во ім. Шевченка, Нью-Йорк–Париж–Сідней–Торонто, 1986, 135–147.

- [Kedryn I. U hornyli revoliutsii. In: Kedryn I. *U mezhakh zatsikavleniia*. Biblioteka ukrainoznavstva, 53. Nauk. t-vo im. Shevchenka, New-York-Paris-Sidney-Toronto, 1986, 135-147.]
- [10] Кучабський В. Вага і завдання Західно-Української Держави серед сил Східної Європи на переломі 1918/1919-го року. *Дзвони*, 3 (1932), 111-121; 4, 194-203; 5, 353-359; 7-8, 540-553; 11, 723-732; 12, 783-794; 1 (1933), 33-39.
[Kuchabskyi V. Vaha i zavdannia Zakhidno-Ukrainskoi Derzhavy sered syl Skhidnoi Yevropy na perelomi 1918/1919-ho roku. *Dzvony*, 3 (1932), 111-121; 4, 194-203; 5, 353-359; 7-8, 540-553; 11, 723-732; 12, 783-794; 1 (1933), 33-39.]
- [11] Слюсаренко О.Г., Гусев В.І. (та ін.) *Новітня історія України (1900-2000)*. Вища школа, Київ, 2002.
[Sliusarenko O.H., Husiev V.I. (et al.) *Novitnia istoriia Ukrainy (1900-2000)*. Vyshcha shkola, Kyiv, 2002.]
- [12] Шевчук В.П., Тарасенко М.Г. *Історія української державності: курс лекцій*. Либідь, Київ, 1999.
[Shevchuk V.P., Tarasenko M.H. *Istoriia ukrainskoi derzhavnosti: kurs leksii*. Lybid, Kyiv, 1999.]
- [13] Кондратюк В.О., Буравченкова С.Б. *Українська революція: здобутки і втрати в державотворчих змаганнях (1917-1920 рр.)*. Стилос, Київ, 1998.
[Kondratiuk V.O., Buravchenkova S.B. *Ukrainska revoliutsiia: zdobutky i vtraty v derzhavotvorchykh zmahanniakh (1917-1920 rr.)*. Stylos, Kyiv, 1998.]
- [14] Корноненко С.В., Морозов А.Г., Реєнт О.П. *Українська революція*. Фоліант, Вінниця, 2004.
[Kornovenko S.V., Morozov A.H., Reient O.P. *Ukrainska revoliutsiia*. Foliant, Vinnytsia, 2004.]
- [15] Рубльов О.С., Реєнт О.П. *Українські визвольні змагання 1917-1921 рр. Альтернативи*, Київ, 1999.
[Rublov O.S., Reient O.P. *Ukrainski vyzvolni zmahannia 1917-1921 rr. Alternatyvy*, Kyiv, 1999.]
- [16] Грицак Я. *Нарис історії України. Формування модерної української нації XIX-XX століття*. Генеза, Київ, 1996.
[Hrytsak Ya. *Narys istorii Ukrainy. Formuvannia modernoi ukrainskoi natsii XIX-XX stolittia*. Heneza, Kyiv, 1996.]
- [17] Малик Я.Й. (та ін.) *Нариси з історії суспільних рухів і політичних партій в Україні (XIX-XX ст.)*. Світ, Львів, 2001.
[Malyk Ya.I. (et al.) *Narysy z istorii suspilnykh rukhiv i politychnykh partii v Ukraini (XIX-XX st.)*. Svit, Lviv, 2001.]
- [18] Карпенко О. *Західно-Українська Народна Республіка. 1918-1923: Історія*. Сіверсія, Івано-Франківськ, 2001.
[Karpenko O. *Zakhidno-Ukrainska Narodna Respublika. 1918-1923: Istoriia*. Siversiia, Ivano-Frankivsk, 2001.]
- [19] Реєнт О.П., Янишин Б.М. Україна в період Першої світової війни: історіографічний аналіз. *Український історичний журнал*, 4 (2004), 3-37.
[Reient O.P., Yanyshyn B.M. Ukraine during the First World War: historiographical analysis. *Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 4 (2004), 3-37.]
- [20] Гриневич Я. Стрільці під скиптром Мельпомени. В: Лужницький Г. (Ред.) *Наш театр. Книга діячів українського театрального мистецтва 1915-1975; Т. 1*. ОМУС, Нью-Йорк-Париж-Сідней-Торонто, 1975, 589-592.
[Hrynevych Ya. Striltsi pid skypтром Melpomeny. In: Luznysky H. (Red.) *Our Theatre. A Collection of Historical Essays and Memoirs 1915-1975; Vol. 1*. OMUS, New-York-Paris-Sidney-Toronto, 1975, 589-592.]
- [21] Магміт Б. [Федорців Ф.]. Сучасні українські політики. На вершинах політичного проводу. Спроба характеристики посла др. Костя Левицького. *Шляхи*, Падолист-грудень (1916), 758-763.
[Mahmit B. [Fedortsiv F.]. Suchasni ukrainski polityky. Na vershynakh politychnoho provodu. Sproba kharakterystyky posla dr. Kostia Levytskoho. *Shliakhy*, Padolyst-hruden (1916), 758-763.]
- [22] Павлишин О. Польське населення Східної Галичини під владою Західно-Української Народної Республіки. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія Історична*, 39-40 (2005), 203-252.
[Pavlyshyn O. Polske naseleattia Skhidnoi Halychyny pid vladoiu Zakhidno-Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky. *Visnyk of the Lviv University. Historical Series*, 39-40 (2005), 203-252.]
- [23] Павлишин О. Українська Національна Рада ЗУНР-ЗОУНР: реконструкція особового складу (жовтень 1918 р.-червень 1919 р.) В: Грицак Я., та ін. (Ред.) *Матеріали засідань Історичної та Археологічної комісії НТШ в Україні. Вип. 2 (1995-1997 рр.)*. Львів, 1999, 234-252.

- [Pavlyshyn O. Ukrainska Natsionalna Rada ZUNR-ZOUNR: rekonstruktsiia osobovoho skladu (zhovten 1918 r.–cherven 1919 r.) In: Hrytsak Ya., et al. (Eds.) *Materialy zasidan Istorychnoi ta Arkheo-hrafichnoi komisii NTSh v Ukraini. Vyp. 2 (1995–1997 rr.)*. Lviv, 1999, 234–252.]
- [24] Великочий В., Гаврилів Б. *Дмитро Вітовський (1887–1919 рр.): документальний нарис*. Вік, Коломия, 1997.
[Velykochyuy V., Havryliv B. *Dmytro Vitovskyy (1887–1919 rr.): dokumentalni narys*. Vik, Kolomyia, 1997.]
- [25] Павлишин О. Організація цивільної влади ЗУНР у повітах Галичини (листопад–грудень 1918 року). *Україна модерна*, 2-3 (1997–1998), 132–193.
[Pavlyshyn O. Orhanizatsiia tsyvilnoi vlady ZUNR u povitakh Halychyny (lystopad–hruden 1918 roku). *Ukraina Moderna*, 2-3 (1997–1998), 132–193.]
- [26] Сохоцький І. Будівничі новітньої української державності в Галичині. В: *Історичні постаті Галичини XIX–XX ст.* Бібліотека українознавства, 8. НТШ, Нью-Йорк–Париж–Сідней–Торонто, 1961, 76–247.
[Sochoky I. Builders of the Modern Ukrainian Statehood in Galicia. In: *Historical Personages of Galicia in XIX–XX cent. Ukrainian Studies*, 8. Shevchenko Scientific Society in USA, New-York–Paris–Sidney–Toronto, 1961, 76–247.]
- [27] Ярославин С. (о. Ісидор Сохоцький). *Визвольна боротьба на західно-українських землях у 1918–1923 роках*. Філадельфія, 1956.
[Iaroslavyn S. (o. Isydor Sokhotskyi). *Vyzvolna borotba na zakhidno-ukrainskykh zemliakh u 1918–1923 rokakh*. Filadelfiia, 1956.]
- [28] Волинець С. Українські Січові Стрільці. *За Державність. Матеріали до Історії Війська Українського*, 11. “Гомін України”, Торонто, 1966, 112–127.
[Volynets S. Ukrainski Sichovi Striltsi. *Za Derzhavnist. Materialy do Istorii Viiska Ukrainskoho*, 11. “Homin Ukrainy”, Toronto, 1966, 112–127.]
- [29] Андрухів І. *Кость Левицький: сторінки життя*. Надвірнянська народна друкарня, Івано-Франківськ, 1995.
[Andrukhiv I. *Kost Levytskyi: storinky zhyttia*. Nadvirnianska narodna drukarnia, Ivano-Frankivsk, 1995.]
- [30] Власова О. Державотворча діяльність Костя Левицького. *Галичина*, 5/6 (2001), 226–230.
[Vlasova O. Derzhavotvorcha diialnist Kostia Levytskoho. *Halychyna*, 5/6 (2001), 226–230.]
- [31] Красівський О.Я., Панчук А.М. Президент Західно-Української Народної Республіки (Євген Петрушевич). В: *Українська ідея. Постаті на тлі революції*. Знання України, Київ, 1994, 156–173.
[Krasivskyy O.Ia., Panchuk A.M. Prezydent Zakhidno-Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky (Ievhen Petrushevych). In: *Ukrainska ideia. Postati na tli revoliutsii*. Znannia Ukrainy, Kyiv, 1994, 156–173.]
- [32] Якимович Б. Наукова, публіцистична та мемуарна діяльність Андрія Чайковського В: *Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність*, 7 (зб. на пошану проф. Юрія Сливки). Ін-т українознавства ім. Крип'якевича, Львів, 2000, 335–341.
[Iakymovych B. Naukova, publitsystychna ta memuarna diialnist Andriia Chaikovskoho In: *Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist*, 7 (zb. na poshanu prof. Yuriiia Slyvky). In-t ukrainoznavstva im. Krypiakevycha, Lviv, 2000, 335–341.]
- [33] Седляр О. Андрій Чайковський – повітовий комісар ЗУНР у Самборі. В: *Науковий вісник Українського Історичного Клубу*, 9. Москва, 2004, 196–199.
[Sedliar O. Andrii Chaikovskyy – povitovy komisar ZUNR u Sambori. In: *Naukovyi visnyk Ukrainskoho Istorychnoho Klubu*, 9. Moskva, 2004, 196–199.]
- [34] Седляр О. Громадська діяльність Андрія Чайковського в роки Першої світової війни. В: *Питання історії України*, 7. Зелена Буковина, Чернівці, 2004, 34–39.
[Sedliar O. Hromadska diialnist Andriia Chaikovskoho v roky Pershoi svitovoi viiny. In: *Pytannia istorii Ukrainy*, 7. Zelena Bukovyna, Chernivtsi, 2004, 34–39.]
- [35] Левицький К. *Українські політики. Сильвети наших давніх послів і політичних діячів*. Діло, Львів, 1936.
[Levytskyi K. *Ukrainski polityky. Sylvety nashykh davnykh posliv i politychnykh diiachiv*. Dilo, Lviv, 1936.]
- [36] Качкан В. Галицькі греко-католицькі священики – носії національної ідеї. В: *Україна соборна*, 2 (2). Київ, 2005, 89–96.

- [Kachkan V. Halytski hreko-katolytski sviashchenyky – nosii natsionalnoi idei. In: *Ukraina Soborna*, 2 (2). Kyiv, 2005, 89–96.]
- [37] Гловацький І.Ю., Гловацький В.І. *Українські адвокати Східної Галичини (кінець XVIII – 30-ті роки ХХ ст.)*. Львівський юридичний інститут МВС України, Львів, 2004.
[Hlovatskyi I.Yu., Hlovatskyi V.I. *Ukrainski advokaty Skhidnoi Halychyny (kinets XVIII – 30-ti roky XX st.)*. Lvivskiy yurydychnyi instytut MVS Ukrainy, Lviv, 2004.]
- [38] Капелюшний В.П. *Здобута і втрачена незалежність: історіографічний нарис української державності доби національно-визвольних змагань (1917–1921 рр.)*. Орлан, Київ, 2003.
[Kapeliuschnyi V.P. *Zdobuta i vtrachena nezalezhnist: istoriohrafichnyi narys ukrainskoi derzhavnosti doby natsionalno-vyzvolnykh zmahani (1917–1921 rr.)*. Orlan, Kyiv, 2003.]
- [39] Лозинський М. *Галичина в рр. 1918–1920*. Червона Калина, Нью-Йорк, 1970.
[Lozynskiy M. *Halychyna v rr. 1918–1920*. Chervona Kalyna, New-York, 1970.]
- [40] Цегельський Л. *Від легенд до правди*. Булава, Нью-Йорк; Філадельфія, 1960.
[Tsehelskyi L. *From Legends to Facts*. Bulava, New-York; Philadelphia, 1960.]
- [41] Литвин М.Р., Науменко К.Є. *Історія ЗУНР*. ОЛІР, Львів, 1995.
[Lytvyn M.R., Naumenko K.Ie. *Istoriia ZUNR*. OLIR, Lviv, 1995.]
- [42] Панчук А.М. *Історіографія Західно-Української Народної Республіки (1918 – 2000 рр.)*: автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук: 07.00.06. Київ, 2000.
[Panchuk A.M. *Istoriografiiia Zakhidno-Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky (1918 – 2000 rr.)*: avtoref. dys. kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.06. Kyiv, 2000.]
- [43] Макарчук С. *Українська республіка галичан: нариси про ЗУНР*. Світ, Львів, 1997.
[Makarchuk S. *Ukrainska respublika halychan: narysy pro ZUNR*. Svit, Lviv, 1997.]
- [44] Карпенко О.Ю. *Боротьба робітничого класу Східної Галичини проти влади української буржуазії під час існування*. В: *З історії західноукраїнських земель*; кн. 3. Вид-во АН УРСР, Київ, 1958, 69–96.
[Karpenko O.Iu. *Borotba robotnychoho klasu Skhidnoi Halychyny proty vlady ukrainskoi burzhuziії pid chas isnuvannia*. In: *Z istoriії zakhidnoukrainskykh zeme*; кн. 3. Vyd-vo AN URSR, Kyiv, 1958, 69–96.]
- [45] Павлишин О. *Єврейське населення Східної Галичини у 1918–1919 рр.: соціальний аспект*. *Галичина*, 12/13 (2006/2007), 103–117.
[Pavlyshyn O. *Yevreiske naselennia Skhidnoi Halychyny u 1918–1919 rr.: sotsialnyi aspekt*. *Halychyna*, 12/13 (2006/2007), 103–117.]
- [46] Будзиновський В. *Ішли діда на муки. Введення в історію України*. В: *Студійно-наукові матеріали*, ч.1, вип: 109. Говерля, Нью-Йорк, 1958.
[Budzynovskiy V. *Ishly dida na myky. Vvedennia v istoriіu Ukrainy*. In: *Studiino-naukovi materialy*, ch.1, vyp: 109. Howerla, New-York, 1958.]
- [47] Стахів М. *Західна Україна. Нарис історії державного будівництва та збройної і дипломатичної оборони в 1918–1923 : в 6 т; Т. 4*. Скрентон, 1962.
[Stakhiv M. *Zakhidnia Ukraina. Narys istoriії derzhavnoho budivnytstva ta zbroinoї i dyplomatychnoi oborony v 1918–1923 : v 6 t; T. 4*. Skrenton, 1962.]
- [48] Слободич О. *Історія Галичини в рр. 1918–19: нарис історії української революції 1917–1920*. Яворів, 1930.
[Slobodych O. *Istoriia Halychyny v rr. 1918–19: narys istoriії ukrainskoi revoliutsiї 1917–1920*. Yavoriv, 1930.]
- [49] Павлишин О. *Підготовка аграрної реформи в ЗОУНР. Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність*, 6 (2000), 170–183.
[Pavlyshyn O. *Pidhotovka ahrarnoi reformy v ZOUNR. Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist*, 6 (2000), 170–183.]
- [50] Литвин М.Р. *Західноукраїнське село в період визвольних змагань*. В: *Історія українського селянства: нариси в 2 т.; Т. 1*. Наук. думка, Київ, 2006, 597–621.
[Lytvyn M.R. *Zakhidnoukrainske selo v period vyzvolnykh zmahani*. In: *Istoriia ukrainskoho selianstva: narysy v 2 t.; T. 1*. Nauk. dumka, Kyiv, 2006, 597–621.]
- [51] Бруно-Миронів. *До історії революційного руху на Західній Україні (з приводу десятиріччя повстання в Дрогобичі)*. *Літопис революції*, 3 (36) (1929), 209–225.

- [Bruno-Myroniv. Do istorii revoliutsiinoho rukhu na Zakhidnii Ukraini (Z pryvodu desiatyrichchia povstannia v Drohobychi). *Litopys revoliutsii*, 3 (36) (1929), 209–225.]
- [52] Бруно-Миронів. До 11-річчя Дрогобицького повстання. *Західна Україна*, 3-4 (1930), 35–37.
[Bruno-Myroniv. Do 11-richchia Drohobytskoho povstannia. *Zakhidna Ukraina*, 3-4 (1930), 35–37.]
- [53] Черненко А., Хонігсман Я., Розумний В. *Дрогобицьке повстання*. Каменяр, Львів, 1965.
[Chernenko A., Khonihsman Ya., Rozumnyi V. *Drohobytske povstannia*. Kameniar, Lviv, 1965.]
- [54] Бірчак В. Дрогобицька Епопея. *Літературно-науковий вісник*, 9 (1931), 751–765.
[Birchak V. Drohobytska Epopeia. *Literaturno-naukovy visnyk*, 9 (1931), 751–765.]
- [55] Луців Л. Дрогобич під час української влади в 1918–1919 роках. В: *Українська Галицька Армія*; Т. 3. Д. Микитюк, Вінніпег, 1966, 164–172.
[Lutsiv L. Drohobych pid chas ukrainskoi vlady v 1918–1919 rokakh. In: *Army of the Western Ukraine (Galicia)*; Т. 3. D. Mykytiuk, Winnipeg, 1966, 164–172.]
- [56] Рабій Ю. Дрогобицька революція в 1919 р. *Свобода*, 94-95 (1962).
[Rabii Yu. Drohobytska revolta v 1919 r. *Svoboda*, 94-95 (1962).]
- [57] Луців Л. Чи був більшовицький бунт у Дрогобичі? *Літопис Червоної Калини*, 4-6 (1994), 38–41.
[Lutsiv L. Chy був bilshovytskyi bunt u Drohobychi? *Litopys Chervonoї Kalyny*, 4-6 (1994), 38–41.]
- [58] Карпинець І. Історія 8-ї галицької бригади (давнішої “Групи Рудки” або “Групи Гофмана”) В: Карпинець І. *Галичина: Військова історія 1914–1921 років*. Панорама, Львів, 2005, 82–252.
[Karpynets I. Istoriiia 8-yi halytskoi bryhady (davnishoi “Hrupy Rudky” або “Hrupy Gofmana”) In: Karpynets I. *Halychyna: Viiskova istoriia 1914–1921 rokiv*. Panorama, Lviv, 2005, 82–252.]
- [59] Арсенич П. *Станіслав – столиця ЗУНР*. Івано-Франківськ, 1993.
[Arsenyich P. *Stanislav – stolytsia ZUNR*. Ivano-Frankivsk, 1993.]

Address: Volodymyr Velykochoyy, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57, Shevchenko Str., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025, Ukraine.

E-mail: wws@pu.if.ua

Received: 14.05.2018; **revised:** 03.12.2018.

Великочий Володимир. До 100-ліття Західно-Української Народної Республіки. Історія ЗУНР: контрверсійність підходів на етапі зміни парадигм в національній історіографії. *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, 6 (2) (2019), 17–27.

У статті зроблено спробу аналізу зміни концепту вивчення стрижневих проблем історії Західно-Української Народної Республіки (ЗУНР) за її столітню історію в українській історіографії. Аналіз історіографічних джерел відкриває перспективи констатувати зміни парадигми розгляду історії ЗУНР: від глорифікації і відвертого шельмування – до об’єктивного показу здобутків і прорахунків у її діяльності, з’ясування найменш вивчених аспектів діяльності, місця і ролі в історії національного державотворення.

Ключові слова: Західно-Українська Народна Республіка, українська національна історіографія, парадигма національної історіографії, національний концепт.