

UDC 930.1:94(477.83/.86) "1914-1923"
doi: 10.15330/jpnu.7.2.7-14

Section: UKRAINE AND THE WORLD

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE WEST UKRAINIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC: THE AFTERTASTE OF THE JUBILEE (MAJOR TRENDS IN THE DISCOURSE ON THE HISTORY OF THE WUPR IN MODERN NATIONAL HISTORIOGRAPHY)

VOLODYMYR VELYKOCHYY

Abstract. The article generalizes the findings about the history of the WUPR obtained by Ukrainian historiographers over the last decade of the 21st century, to outline major trends and methodological frameworks focusing on the ones which have hitherto received little attention for both subjective and objective reasons. It is stated that in Ukrainian historiography romantic positivism is the predominant methodological perspective on the history of the WUPR. Extensive research in this direction conducted mainly by experts in the so-called WUPR studies has yielded solid academic works such as *An Encyclopedia of the WUPR* in three volumes (the fourth volume is being prepared). It is stressed that the number and geographic diversity of researchers interested in exploring the history of the WUPR are expanding. In addition, there is an emphasis on qualitative changes in WUPR studies, which the author illustrates by analyzing the works of Ya. Hrytsak, O. Reient, O. Pavlyshyn, I. Monolatii written in the spirit of intellectual psychohistory, the history of everyday life.

Keywords: WUPR, Ukrainian historiography, Ukrainian Revolution of 1914–1923, historiography of the WUPR, historical national narrative.

1. INTRODUCTION

Jubilees normally serve as occasions to summarize what has been explored, discussed, published, as well as as indicators of what remains to discover, analyze, and rethink. The centennial of the West Ukrainian People's Republic (WUPR) became an event of this magnitude: it did not escape the attention of either academic or public circles. Overall, the event had a high profile in the country (however, we do not intend to assess how powerful the information campaign was).

Neither is this paper intended to discuss the significance of the WUPR, although it would be expected at the time of a jubilee. Though all laws of classical historiography would necessitate such an approach, we will take the liberty to deviate from them since there exist many books, articles, reports, including multi-volume folios, on this topic. In fact, it is taken as axiomatic that the emergence of the WUPR was a logical result of the national liberation movement of the western branch of the Ukrainian people on their lands. The state-building experience of the political elite of the West Ukrainian state is regarded not only as worthy of admiration but also as exemplary for the current legislative, executive, and judiciary branches of the government. The Unification Act (Akt Zluky) signed by the WUPR and

the Ukrainian People's Republic (UPR) is considered to have had a tremendous impact on the further development of the Ukrainian nation. It is considered to be the pinnacle of sobornist not so much in the territorial, but rather in the spiritual, mental, axiological sense. Highly regarded are the efforts of the western Ukrainian elite to establish military forces (the Galician Army), local authorities, self-government, the judicial system, the gendarmerie, and so on.

Such interpretations of the national liberation movement, the state-building processes on western Ukrainian lands came into modern historiography from the works of those who experienced or witnessed the events: D. Doroshenko, K. Levytskyi, I. Sokhotskyi, M. Stakhiv, S. Yaroslavyn, M. Chubatyi. Since the beginning of modern Ukrainian independence in 1991, the works have found further elaboration and substantiation in the papers of modern Ukrainian historiographers [1].

This paper is intended to generalize the findings about the history of the WUPR obtained by Ukrainian historiographers over the last decade of the 21st century, to outline the major trends and methodological approaches and focus on the ones that have hitherto been regarded as terra incognita for both subjective and objective reasons.

2. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Over the last decade, Ukrainian researchers have viewed the history of the WUPR from the perspective of romantic positivism, which was introduced and developed by western Ukrainian and diasporic national historiographers as back as in the 1920s-1960s. The researchers preferred to adhere to or, at best, "complement" the established traditional schemes rather than reconsider them since they were unwilling to run the risk of being rejected or criticized by their peers. Throughout centuries, the romanticist tradition of portraying Ukrainians as major subjects of their national history has transformed into ethno(Ukraino)centrism projecting Ukrainian history as exclusive. On the one hand, it has stimulated heuristic inquiries and the emergence of the history of the WUPR as a separate research trend within the history of the Ukrainian Revolution. On the other hand, it has led to a certain "autarchy" of the history of Ukraine during the period in question, its isolation/alienation from the European and global context.

Quite frankly, the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921, projected as linked to the Russian Revolution, quite unreasonably "co-opts" the 1914-1923 state-building processes on western Ukrainian lands. This, in turn, does not nearly help to grasp the continuity of the national liberation movement. Moreover, in the national historiographic paradigm this entrenches the idea of the Ukrainian Revolution being directly and proximately dependent on the Russian Revolution. That being said, it does not make sense to refer to the Ukrainian national state-building process as part of the common European context at the time of the Great Eastern European Revolution.

However, such circumstances did not prevent researchers from exploring the history of the WUPR, so they managed to prepare new publications, diversify their research methodology and discourse, thus making serious steps towards incorporating the history of Ukraine into the common European context. Thus particularly conspicuous is the publication of *Zakhidno-Ukrainska Narodna Respublika 1918-1923 (The West Ukrainian People's Republic of 1918-1923)*, an eight-book collection of documents and materials in five volumes (the last, third, book of the fifth volume was released in 2013) [2]. Another significant publication is *ZUNR. 1918-1923: Iliustrovana istoriia (The WUPR. 1918-1923: An Illustrated History)* [3], an elaborate and informative folio, which summarizes the findings obtained by the Precarpathian historical school during the first decade of the 21st century. In terms of content and especially format, the book meets the highest requirements for publications in historical culturology. Worthy of special mention is *Zvytiazhtsi (Valorous Warriors)*, a series of 20 books of memoirs, whose reprint was timed to coincide with the centennial of the WUPR. In terms of representativeness, the memoirs provide by far the most accurate reflection of the WUPR events and their cause-and-effect relationships and brilliantly capture the spirit of the epoch.

The publication of *Entsyklopediia ZUNR (An Encyclopedia of the WUPR)* edited by Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor M. Kuhutiak [4] must be regarded as one of the most significant

contributions made by WUPR studies. Elaborate and informative, brilliantly compiled and masterfully formatted, it is unique for several reasons. Firstly, *An Encyclopedia of the WUPR* discusses the history of the state, which is left untouched in modern Ukrainian historical research. Secondly, the release of the volumes is the pinnacle of exploration preceded by the publication of the first research monograph *ZUNR. Istoriiia. 1918-1923 (WUPR. History. 1918-1923)* [5] and the above-mentioned eight-book collection of documents and materials in five volumes. Thirdly, the encyclopedia contains extensive information and reference materials, so all-encompassing in terms of personalities and spatiotemporal scope that it resulted in certain adjustments to the existing publications. Finally, the encyclopedia was prepared mostly by non-academic researchers (though some of the articles were written by acknowledged experts in the field of academic historical research, for instance V. Smolii, O. Reient, O. Rubliov, O. Lysenko, M. Lytvyn, I. Soliar), as well as university researchers, and area studies specialists, which is without exaggeration a research feat.

The first two decades of Ukraine's modern independence saw the emergence and development of the so-called WUPR studies in historical discourse. Its characteristic feature was that the history of the WUPR was researched mostly by western Ukrainian scholars, the research institutions of Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ternopil, Chernivtsi, and partially Uzhghorod. The last decade has witnessed qualitative changes in this respect. Researchers from the other regions of Ukraine have shown active interest in the history of the WUPR and western Ukrainian lands at the time of the 1914-1923 Ukrainian Revolution: R. Tymchenko (Kyiv) [6], S. Orlyk (Kropyvnytskyi) [7], O. Lupandin (Kyiv) [8], H. Koroliiov (Kyiv) [9], P. Hai-Nyzhnyk (Kyiv) [10]. More studies have been conducted in this field by academic institutions such as the Institute of History at the National Academy of Science of Ukraine, particularly the History of the Ukrainian Revolution Department headed by Professor V. Verstiuk and the Department of 19th-early 20th Century Ukrainian History chaired by Professor O. Reient. However, the Precarpathian historical school (Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University) is at the forefront of WUPR studies.

WUPR studies fit in with the general Ukrainian historiographic context, where they continue to evolve relying on romanticist and positivist principles. Most of the historians still believe that by improving professional instrumentarium, especially by broadening and perfecting the methods of criticizing historical sources, it is possible to achieve the desired "objectiveness" in examining and portraying the processes and phenomena that constitute the subject matter of a research paper. As aptly noted by H. Kasianov, while in earlier times Ukrainian history resembled an unstoppable linear process of class struggle, now it is described as a linear process of forming a nation or state, but according to the same teleology [11].

Overcoming the stereotypes and inert impact of the past, some historians do suggest new methodological approaches and theoretical frameworks for interpreting empirical material; drawing on the traditions of Ukrainian historiography, they try to rethink the complicated and controversial issues associated with the existence of the WUPR.

These qualitative changes apply first and foremost to methodological inquiries. Some researchers have abandoned the practice of glorifying the state-building processes in the WUPR, the unifying processes in the UPR, and so on in interpreting the events of the 1914-1923 Ukrainian Revolution on western Ukrainian lands. This perspective was initiated by Ya. Hrytsak, a researcher from Lviv, as back as in 1999 [12]; and during the last decade, his initiative has been undertaken by professors I. Soliar, L. Zashkilniak, O. Pavlyshyn, among others.

Particularly noteworthy is the research done by Professor I. Monolatii from Ivano-Frankivsk. He examines the complicated ethnopolitical relationships that existed at the time of western Ukrainian statehood, conducts local historical studies (the so-called Kolomyia studies serve as a context for exploring the WUPR) [13]. A number of his recent papers written in the spirit of intellectual history, or even psychohistory, are regarded as most unusual from the perspective of national historiography. To illustrate, in the monograph *Zoosad revoliutsii. Zakhidnoukrainska derzhavnist 1918-1923 rr. i teorii vypadkovostei XX – pochatku XXI storich. Esei (The Zoological Garden of the Revoluton. West Ukrainian Statehood of 1918-1923 and the Probability Theories of the 20th-early 21st Centuries. Essays)* the author adapts

the principles of modern political science to the phenomena and processes that determined the statehood of the WUPR. He always views entrenched paradigms from a critical perspective directed at finding historical truth [14].

The national historiography of the last decade is also marked by novel methodological and historiosophical frameworks for examining the statehood of the WUPR. This refers to papers discussing a number of conceptual issues [15]. One of the issues concerns interpreting the Ukrainian Revolution as a nationwide process irrespectively of the different sociopolitical conditions that existed in Ukraine on the eve of the First World War. This perspective allows for the possibility of incorporating the national revolutionary processes on Ukrainian lands into the common European process, thus abandoning the practice of viewing the Ukrainian Revolution as secondary, the one resulting from the Russian Revolution. The proponents of this research paradigm construct their own conception of the Ukrainian Revolution according to the principle of the multiplicity of national revolutions in Europe as parts of the 1914-1923 Great Eastern European Revolution. Another issue concerns the establishment of a chronological framework for the Ukrainian Revolution proper. Historiographers such as O. Reient, B. Yanyshyn, O. Pavlyshyn, A. Panchuk are of the opinion that the revolutionary events lasted from 1914 to 1923. They argue that the Ukrainian Revolution also spread to the territories of Austria-ruled Ukraine, which, alongside with Russia-ruled Ukraine, joined the movement for national self-determination. Given the differences between the Ukrainian and the Russian Revolution in terms of social basis and objectives, as well as the parallelism in the development of national liberation movements of the other Slavic nations, Ukrainians can also regard the year 1914 as the starting point of their revolution. As per M. von Hagen, the First World War activized "Ukrainian issues" to an unprecedented level, causing the national movement to gather strength. This opinion is based on the specifics of the national and social circumstances faced by the Ukrainian community first and foremost in Galicia.

In fact, the above-mentioned approaches deconstruct the prevailing paradigm which regards the Ukrainian Revolution as dependent on the Russian one, provide a new chronology for the national revolution, identify its stages. Between 1914 and 1923, at the time of the Ukrainian Revolution on the territory that became an independent state in 1919, there were revolutionary movements, controversial and antagonistic to the national revolution per se. By no means should these movements (of the Bolsheviks, the White Guardists) be considered part of the Ukrainian Revolution. The new approach deviates from the traditional practice of viewing the national liberation movements on the Ukrainian territory as detached processes which led to two national revolutions: the Ukrainian Revolution on the territory of Russia-ruled Ukraine and the 1918 November National Democratic Revolution on western Ukrainian lands, which led to the WUPR. By contrast, the new approach argues for the existence of one common national liberation revolution in 1914-1923, which was part of the Great Eastern European Revolution of the same period.

The conception of the Ukrainian Revolution was another qualitative change in Ukrainian historiography. The previous two decades saw great controversy over the dichotomy of the terms *Ukrainian Revolution* and *national liberation movement*. V. Kapeliushnyi, to his credit, analyzed historiographic sources and demonstrated the origin of these terms, their adaptation to the scientific and public lexicon, their semantic scope. According to the researcher, the terms *Ukrainian liberation movement* and *Ukrainian Revolution* appeared simultaneously in 1917 to denote the social changes stemming from the February Revolution [16, p. 15–18]. Noteworthy is the fact that the term *liberation movement* was coined to refer to a historic event (it did not come into the lexicon from the writings of diasporic authors), thus in its original sense it did not have any "special" political or ideological connotation. This must be taken into account since some researchers use only the term *Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921* [17, p. 45]; other researchers declare the term *national liberation movement* an "anachronism" or an "ideologism" without suggesting an adequate, acceptable alternative to this "hybrid" word combination [18, p. 127]. Professor F. Turchenko provides a comprehensive analysis of the origin and development of the term *Ukrainian Revolution* in national historiography [19]. He emphasizes the long-standing, entrenched tradition of referring to the state-forming processes on

Ukrainian lands as *the national revolution of 1917-1921*. In addition, the researcher does not exclude the possibility of using the term *national liberation movement* alongside *Ukrainian Revolution*.

Despite the achievements of national historiography in exploring the history of the WUPR, many issues still remain untouched. One of them refers to the social and economic conditions and the policy of the WUPR in 1919-1923. From the perspective of methodology, this issue belongs to the so-called social history. Academician V. Smolii aptly notes that modern reconstructions of the historic process in question provide a distorted picture since they ignore socioeconomic factors, which had become immensely hypertrophied by the mid 1980s. The researcher is of the opinion that social history is centered around social groups, their relationships and role in economic and cultural structures and processes [20]. However, from the perspective of Western and post-Soviet (first and foremost Russian) science, social history is viewed as a promising research area, which examines the lives of people at individual and class levels in the following directions: the social and economic development of regions, the history of national minorities, local history (of cities and towns), individual social strata and institutions, gender issues, the history of everyday life (households, mentality) [21]. Such a "universally eclectic" interpretation of social history seems quite problematic. Even postmodernist sociology-centered interpretations "excluded" from its scope not only political but also economic history [22, p. 133–218].

National historiography is lacking in studies examining trends in local history, psychohistory, the history of the frontier zone, the history of everyday life. In any case, it makes sense to move away from the domination of political history in the national narrative. When viewed from a political perspective, a historic event produces a one-sided impression of a society's life and development. The studies in the above-mentioned frameworks enrich the national historiography of the problem, provide a more objective portrayal of a society within a specific spatiotemporal framework. In addition, there is a need for studies written from the perspective of new humanitarianism [23].

3. CONCLUSIONS

Therefore, the analysis of the most representative studies of the history of the WUPR conducted over the last decade (2011-2020) allows for a number of conclusions.

Firstly, over the period in question the national historiography of the WUPR continued to be dominated by the romanticist conception of statehood predicated on Ukrainocentrism.

Secondly, the historical national narrative as a heuristic framework became enriched with a number of serious studies, first and foremost the above-mentioned *Entsyklopediia ZUNR (An Encyclopedia of the WUPR)*.

Thirdly, the centennial of the WUPR served as a starting point for the deconstruction of the national historiographic paradigm viewing the Ukrainian Revolution as part and consequence of the Russian Revolution. Moreover, there emerged a new conception of the national revolution regarded as a logical result of the national liberation movement and part of the Great Eastern European Revolution.

Finally, the last decade has witnessed a move away from positivism, the dominance of political concepts to new methodological frameworks such as local and regional history, psychohistory, the history of the frontier zone.

However, further studies of the history of the WUPR need to complement the existing findings with new insights and to adopt new frameworks (such as cliometrics, among others), thus facilitating the exploration of topics that have hitherto been left untouched. Such studies will enrich the historical national narrative and open more avenues for further research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Міжнародна наукова конференція до 100-річчя ЗУНР: “Західно-Українська Народна Республіка: революція, державність, соборність. До 100-річчя утворення ЗУНР”. Львів-Івано-Франківськ. 31 жовтня – 1 листопада 2018 р. Режим доступу: <https://old.uinp.gov.ua/announce/naukova-konferentsiya-do-100-richchya-zunr>
[Mizhnarodna naukova konferentsiia do 100-ricchia ZUNR: “Zakhidno-Ukrainska Narodna Respublika: revolutsiia, derzhavnist, sobornist. Do 100-ricchia utvorennia ZUNR”. Lviv – Ivano-Frankivsk. 31 zhovtnia – 1 lystopada 2018 r. Available at: <https://old.uinp.gov.ua/announce/naukova-konferentsiya-do-100-richchya-zunr>]
- [2] *Західно-Українська народна республіка 1918-1923. Документи і матеріали. У 5т., 8-ми книгах. Івано-Франківськ, 2001-2013.* Режим доступу: <http://resource.history.org.ua/item/0013489>
[Zakhidno-Ukrainska Narodna Respublika 1918-1923. Dokumenty i materialy. U 5t., 8-my knyhakh. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2001-2013. Available at: <http://resource.history.org.ua/item/0013489>]
- [3] *ЗУНР, 1918-1923: Ілюстрована історія.* Львів – Івано-Франківськ; Львів, 2008.
[ZUNR, 1918-1923: Iliustrovana istoriia. Lviv – Ivano-Frankivsk; Lviv, 2008.]
- [4] *Західно-Українська Народна Республіка 1918–1923. Енциклопедія: До 100-річчя утворення Західно-Української Народної Республіки.* Т. 1: А–Ж. Івано-Франківськ-Львів, 2018.; Т. 2: З–О. Івано-Франківськ-Львів, 2019.; Т.3: П–С. Івано-Франківськ-Львів, 2020.
[Zakhidno-Ukrainska Narodna Respublika 1918–1923. Entsyklopediia: Do 100-ricchia utvorennia Zakhidno-Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky. T. 1: A–Zh. Ivano-Frankivsk – Lviv, 2018; T. 2: Z–O. Ivano-Frankivsk – Lviv, 2019.; T.3: P–S. Ivano-Frankivsk – Lviv, 2020.]
- [5] *Західно-Українська Народна Республіка. 1918-1923. Історія.* Керівник авторського колективу й головний редактор Олександр Карпенко. Івано-Франківськ, 2001.
[Zakhidno-Ukrainska Narodna Respublika. 1918-1923. Istoriia. Kerivnyk avtorskoho kolektyvu i holovnyi redaktor Oleksandr Karpenko. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2001.]
- [6] Тимченко Р. *Відносини Української Народної Республіки й Західноукраїнської Народної Республіки (листопад 1918 – квітень 1920 рр.).* Київ, 2013.
[Tymchenko R. *Vidnosyny Ukrainkoi Narodnoi Respubliky i Zakhidno-Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky (lystopad 1918 – kviten 1920 rr.).* Kyiv, 2013.]
- [7] Орлик С. *Фінансова політика російського уряду на окупованих територіях Галичини і Буковини в період Першої світової війни (1914-1917 рр.).* Біла Церква, 2018.
[Orlyk S. *Finansova polityka rosiiskoho uriadu na okupovanykh terytoriiakh Halychyny i Bukovyny v period Pershoi svitovoi viiny (1914-1917 rr.).* Bila Tserkva, 2018.]
- [8] Лупандін О. *Чортківський наступ УГА, 1919.* Режим доступу: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Chortkivskyj_nastup_1919
[Lupandin O. *Chortkivskyi nastup UGA, 1919.* Available at: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Chortkivskyj_nastup_1919]
- [9] Корольов Г. *Українські національні проекти та східноєвропейські “держави-нації” 1917–1923 рр. у новітній історіографії: основи компаративного аналізу. Революція, державність, нація: Україна на шляху самоствердження (1917–1921 рр.): Матеріали Міжнародної наукової конференції.* Київ; Чернігів, 2017.
[Koroliiov H. *Ukrainski natsionalni proekty ta skhidnoevropeiski “derzhavy-natsii” 1917–1923 rr. u novitnii istoriohrafii: osnovy komparatyvnoho analizu. Revolutsiia, derzhavnist, natsiia: Ukraina na shliakhu samostverdzhenia (1917–1921 rr.): Materialy mizhnarodnoi naukovoї konferentsii.* Kyiv; Chernihiv, 2017.]
- [10] Гай-Нижник П. *УНР та ЗУНР: становлення органів влади і національне державотворення (1917-1920 рр.).* Київ, 2010.
[Hai-Nyzhnyk P. *UNR ta ZUNR: stanovlennia orhaniv vlady i natsionalne derzhavotvorennia (1917-1920 rr.).* Kyiv, 2010.]
- [11] Касьянов Г. *Ще не вмерла українська історіографія. Критика, 4 (2002), 18–20.*
[Kasianov H. *Shche ne vmerla ukrainska istoriohrafiiia. Krytyka, 4 (2002), 18–20.*]
- [12] Грицак Я. *Українська революція, 1914–1923: нові інтерпретації. Україна модерна, 2-3 (1999), 254–269.*

- [Hrytsak Ya. *Ukrainska revolutsiia, 1914–1923: novi interpretatsii. Ukraina moderna*, 2-3 (1999), 254–269.]
- [13] Монолатій І. *Місто без властивостей. Коломийська fuga Великої війни*. Івано-Франківськ, 2014.
[Monolatii I. *Misto bez vlastyvostei. Kolomyiska fuha Velykoi viiny*. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2014.]
- [14] Монолатій І. *Сила Західноукраїнської Народної Республіки: вибрані питання потенціалу, безпеки і дипломатії держави*. Івано-Франківськ, 2020; його ж. *Зоосад революції. Західноукраїнська державність 1918-1923 рр. і теорії випадковостей ХХ- початку ХХІ ст. Есеї*. Івано-Франківськ, 2020.
[Monolatii I. *Syla Zakhidno-Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky: vybrani pytannia potentsialu, bezpeky i dyplomatii derzhavy*. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2020; yoho zh. *Zoosad revolutsii. Zakhidnoukrainska derzhavnist 1918-1923 rr. i teorii vypadkovostei XX- pochatku XXI st. Esei*. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2020.]
- [15] Великочий В. *Велика Східноєвропейська революція, Перша світова війна і Галичина (Українська історіографія суспільно-політичних процесів. Бібліографія)*. Івано-Франківськ, 2014.
[Velykochyi V. *Velyka Shkhidnoievropeiska revolutsiia, Persha svitova viina i Halychyna (Ukrainska istoriohrafia suspilno-politychnykh protsesiv. Bibliohrafiia)*. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2014.]
- [16] Капелюшний В. П. *Українська національна державність доби визвольних змагань (1917–1921): автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора іст. наук: спец. 07.00.06 “Історіографія, джерелознавство та спец. іст. Дисципліни”*. Київ, 2004.
[Kapeliusnyi V.P. *Ukrainska natsionalna derzhavnist doby vyzvolnykh zmahan (1917–1921): avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia doktora ist. nauk: spets. 07.00.06 “Istoriografia, dzhereloznavstvo ta spets. ist. dystsypliny”*. Kyiv, 2004.]
- [17] Солдатенко В.Ф. *Українська революція. Історичний нарис*. Київ, 1999.
[Soldatenko V.F. *Ukrainska revolutsiia. Istorychnyi narys*. Kyiv, 1999.]
- [18] Савченко С. *Сучасна українська історіографія: спроба характеристики*. *Сучасність*, 11 (1999), 127–131.
[Savchenko S. *Suchasna ukrainska istoriohrafia: sproba kharakterystyky*. *Suchasnist*, 11 (1999), 127–131.]
- [19] Турченко Ф. *Українська революція. Погляд із Запоріжжя*. Запоріжжя, 2018.
[Turchenko F. *Ukrainska revolutsiia. Pohliad iz Zaporizhzhia*. Zaporizhzhia, 2018.]
- [20] Смолій В. *Вступаючи у ХХІ століття: деякі теоретично-методологічні аспекти історичних досліджень в Україні. Українська історична наука на сучасному етапі розвитку: міжнар. наук. конгрес українських істориків. Т. 1. Кам'янець-Подільський; Київ; Нью-Йорк; Острог, 2005, 27–34.*
[Smolii V. *Vstupaiuchy u XXI stolittia: deiaki teoretychno-metodolohichni aspekty istorychnykh doslidzhen v Ukraini. Ukrainska istorycha nauka na suchasnomu etapi rozvytku: mizhnar. nauk. konhres ukrainskykh istorykiv. T.1. Kamianets-Podilskyi; Kyiv; Niu-York; Ostroh, 2005, 27–34.*]
- [21] Орлова Т. *Актуальність проблеми соціальної історії*. *Історичний журнал*, 2 (2007), 106–114.
[Orlova T. *Aktualnist problem sotsialnoi istorii. Istorychnyi zhurnal*, 2 (2007), 106–114.]
- [22] Тош Дж. *Стремление к истине: как овладеть мастерством историка*. Москва, 2000.
[Tosh Dzh. *Stremlenie k istine: kak ovladet masterstvom istorika*. Moskva, 2000.]
- [23] Доманська Є. *Історія та сучасна гуманітаристика: дослідження з теорії знання про минуле*. Київ, 2012.
[Domanska Ye. *Istoriia ta suchasna humanitarystyka: doslidzhennia z teorii znannia pro mynule*. Kyiv, 2012.]

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

E-mail: volodymyr.velykochyy@pnu.edu.ua

Received: September 15, 2020; **revised:** October 30, 2020.

Великочий Володимир. Століття Західно-Української Народної Республіки: постювілейний присмак (Основні напрямки дискурсу про історію ЗУНР в сучасній національній історіографії). *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, 7 (2) (2020), 7–14.

У статті робиться спроба узагальнити здобутки національної історіографії в останнє десятиліття ХХІ століття в царині дослідження історії ЗУНР, окреслити основні напрямки і методологічні підходи до аналізу її діяльності, акцентувати увагу на тих з них, які через причини як об'єктивного, так і суб'єктивного характеру залишилися малодослідженими. Констатується факт домінування в національній історіографії історії ЗУНР романтично-позитивістської методології досліджень. Вислідом активної дослідницької роботи в цьому плані насамперед представників так званого “зунрознавчого” напрямку є поява серйозних праць академічного характеру, як от “Енциклопедія ЗУНР” в 3-х томах (четвертий том готується до видання). Наголошується на збільшенні кола вчених, які досліджують історію ЗУНР, поповнюють “зунрознавчий” напрям, розширюють географію його прибічників. Водночас підкреслюються зміни якісного характеру в студіюванні історії ЗУНР. Аналізуються, зокрема, праці таких дослідників, як Я. Грицак, О. Реєнт, О. Павлишин, І. Монолатій, написані в дусі інтелектуальної психоісторії, історії повсякденності. Виокремлюється як одне з найбільш значимих досягнень у вивченні історії ЗУНР останнього десятиліття формування нового/оновленого концепту Української революції 1914–1923 рр., складовою частиною якої були події національно-державного характеру на західноукраїнських землях. Наголошується на парадигмі єдності (при умові констатації різних темпів) розвитку Української революції, що фактично виводить з ужитку термін “Листопадова (1918 р.) національно-демократична революція на західноукраїнських землях”. Аналізуються нові методологічні підходи до унезалежнення Української революції від російської і її “вписування” в загальноєвропейський процес як складника Великої Східноєвропейської революції 1914-1923 рр.

Ключові слова: ЗУНР, українська історіографія, Українська революція 1914–1923 рр., історіографія ЗУНР, історичний національний наратив.