

Sheiko, V. M. 2019. Intelihentsiia i vlada v chasy ukrainskoi revoliutsii 1917–1921 rr.: Haluzeva istoriografija [The Intelligentsia and the Authorities during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921: Historiography of Definite Fields of Culture]. *Visnyk derzhavnoi akademii kultur. Vyp. 55.* S. 26–44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31516/2410-5333.054.14> [In Ukrainian]

Sorokin, P. A. 2017. *Leaves from a Russian Diary and Thirty Years After* [Enlarged Edition]. Pickle Partners Publishing.

УДК 94(477)«1918–1919»

DOI: doi.org/10.20535/2307-5244.60.2025.338320

O. Kushnir

ORCID: 0000-0002-5306-9330

Academician Yuriy Bugay International Scientific and Technical University

O. O. Кушнір

*Міжнародний науково-технічний університет
імені академіка Юрія Бугая*

THE OTAMANSHIP (1918–1919): THROUGH THE EYES OF CONTEMPORARIES AND HISTORIANS

Отаманщина (1918–1919 pp.): очима сучасників та істориків

У статті зроблено спробу проаналізувати історіографію отаманщини, виокремити її як унікальне явища Української революції 1917–1921 рр. Розглянуто отаманщину як різновид протестного суспільного руху, спрямованого проти політики Директорії, крізь призму сприйняття серед очевидців подій. Виділено особливості інтерпретації тогодчасної ситуації подальшиими дослідниками отаманщини, її лідерами та учасниками. Проаналізовано праці очевидців подій та істориків про діяльність отаманів. Висвітлено оцінки сучасників, які вони дали формам боротьби Директорії з отаманщиною та її наслідками.

Ключові слова: отаманщина, історіографія, Українська революція 1917–1921 рр., Директорія УНР, Петлюра, ватажок.

This article is devoted to analysing otamanship as a social phenomenon that emerged during the period of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UPR) (1918–1919). The study focuses on the historiographical examination of this phenomenon, considering the works of contemporaries of the events and historians from different periods. Otamanship is characterized as a specific type of protest movement that possessed both social-revolutionary and destructive features. The approach to typologizing the historiography of otamanship by chronology, geography, and the attitude of study authors toward this social phenomenon

is highlighted. A wide source base is utilized, including works of contemporaries, diaspora historiography, Soviet historiography, and modern Ukrainian studies. The author identifies the emphasis of different researchers on the social, political, and military aspects of this phenomenon during the UPR Directory period. The views of contemporaries on otamanship are examined, including those of V. Vynnychenko, D. Doroshenko, P. Khrystiuk, I. Mazepa, and S. Petliura. The works of representatives of the Ukrainian diaspora (M. Kapustiansky, L. Shankovsky, M. Sereda, M. Stakhiv, and B. Koval) are considered, demonstrating their subjectivity while also acknowledging the breadth of their source base and the conceptual and debatable nature of the otamanship problem. The author analyses Soviet historiography (V. Antonov-Ovsienko, M. Kakurin, M. Rakovsky), which primarily interpreted otamanship as «kukul terror». Modern Ukrainian studies focusing on the objectification of the phenomenon are considered (V. Soldatenko, S. Lytvyn, V. Lobodaev, R. Koval, V. Horak). It is emphasized that modern Russian historiography considers the problem of otamanship exclusively within the context of its own history. The article successfully demonstrates the importance of further studying the phenomenon of otamanship for achieving a deeper understanding of the historical processes of the Ukrainian Revolution.

Keywords: otamanship; historiography; Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921; Directory of UPR; Petliura; leader; unit.

Statement of the problem. The otamanship, as an original form of social movement of the Directory of UPR period of 1918–1919, occupies a prominent place among the insufficiently studied problems of the Ukrainian Revolution 1917–1921. This phenomenon significantly influenced the foundations of the domestic and military policy of the Ukrainian People's Republic (hereinafter — UPR) in 1919, negatively affecting the results of the struggle for state independence.

However, there is no consensus among contemporary researchers of otamanship on the definition of this term. Some scholars and publicists have begun to attach to the concept of «otamanship» a different meaning from the original meaning and understanding. They use this concept to refer to the activities of units led by otamans, focusing primarily on the structural unit — the otaman's unit. The concept of «otamanship» emerged in early 1919. It was at this time that it was used in official documents of the UPR authorities and in the press. In their memoirs, participants in the struggle for independence have always tried to distinguish between the concepts of «otamanship» and «insurgency».

The term «otamanship» was used by the participants of the Ukrainian Revolution 1917–1921 not to denote the organisational form of a unit led by an otaman, but to describe the activities of insurgent units that opposed the Directory of UPR.

In the modern Ukrainian historiography, the original meaning of the definition of «otamanship» has been distorted, which has led to the identification of

this destructive phenomenon with the concept of insurgency, which had a positive meaning, due to the arbitrary use of this concept. Therefore, researchers' proposals to draw a clear line between insurgent groups that were useful for state-building processes and similar formations that were harmful to the national movement are quite fair (Лободаєв, Б. 2010, с. 241).

Relevance of the research topic. The problem of the historiography of otamanship requires detailed research. This study contributes to the understanding of the historical significance of otamanship formations, through the prism of the perception of this social phenomenon by contemporaries and later researchers. The importance of the topic is determined by the lack of research that analyzes the works of contemporaries regarding the perception of the emergence, functioning, transformation and elimination of otamanship. The purpose of this study is to identify the types of perception of otamanship by contemporaries and to clarify the features of the subsequent historiography of this historical phenomenon.

The source base of the study consists of works by contemporaries of the otaman movement and historians on the history of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 in general, as well as monographs and articles that specifically address the topic of this insurgency. These works can be classified as follows: works by politicians and military personnel — contemporaries of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921; diaspora historiography; Soviet, contemporary Ukrainian, and foreign (including Russian) studies. An important source for understanding the attitude of eyewitnesses to the events of 1918–1919 to otamanship is the press.

The methodology and methods of the study are based on the use of biographical, geographical and prosopographical approaches. The method of periodisation was used to identify distinctive stages in the historiography of otamanship. The article also uses the method of historical personalisation. It was used to analyze the works of contemporaries about otamanship and subsequent researchers of this topic. When processing the sources, the methodological principles of historical hermeneutics were used: textual analysis, historical criticism of sources, terminological analysis of concepts. The application of the correlation method contributed to the systematic study of the place of otamanship in the history of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921.

Presentation of the main research material. According to chronological periods and geographical criteria, the historiography of otamanship should be divided into several groups: Ukrainian diaspora, Ukrainian Soviet, Ukrainian contemporary and foreign. Former participants in the national liberation struggle: Volodymyr Vynnychenko, Dmytro Doroshenko, Pavlo Khrystiuk, Isak Mazepa, and Symon Petliura were the first to pay attention to this historical phenomenon in the 1920s — 1930s.

In particular, V. Vynnychenko in his work «Revival of the Nation» devoted significant attention to the analysis of otamanship, calling it a separate period

of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, chronologically covering December 1918 and the whole of 1919. He interpreted this phenomenon as a system of disobedience of military power to political power, which led to the defeat of the Directory of UPR. V. Vynnychenko considered S. Petliura to be the founder of otamanship, as he opposed the subordination of the army to politicians (Винниченко, В. 1990).

The Ukrainian historian D. Doroshenko did not participate in the work of the Directory of UPR and was an opponent of the anti-hetman uprising of 1918, which was the main reason for the emergence of the otaman movement. Describing this social phenomenon, he called it a destructive factor in the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 and a direct consequence of the uprising. However, he blamed the origin of this phenomenon not on S. Petliura alone, but on the Directory of UPR as a whole, since its leaders failed to offer a constructive concept of state-building development (Дорошенко, Д. 2007, с. 396–399).

P. Khrystiuk did not dwell in detail on the essential features of otamanship, considering only its individual aspects in the context of the internal political struggle in the UPR in January 1919. Among the reasons for otamanship, he named the mobilisation law, land legislation, the uncertainty of the Directory's political course, and the existence of various forms of local government that competed with each other. According to P. Khrystiuk, the otamans controlled by S. Petliura actively interfered in state affairs, not submitting to political authority (Христюк, П. 1969, p. 23–24).

Among the first descriptors of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, only I. Mazepa did not emigrate from the UPR in 1919. He devoted significant attention to the analysis of otamanship in his book «Ukraine in the Fire and Storm of the Revolution of 1917–1921». The author thoroughly analysed the causes of its emergence, the process of its spread and consequences, and pointed out its regional specificity. The former prime minister of the UPR viewed otamanship as a manifestation of the military otaman's disobedience to the higher political and military authorities, separating this phenomenon from the insurgency. I. Mazepa noted that S. Petliura lacked the determination to combat this phenomenon (Мазепа, І. 2003). Information about otamanship is also occasionally mentioned in his works by Mykyta Shapoval (Шаповал, М. 1927).

S. Petliura did not leave any works on the history of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, but his epistolary heritage, texts of public speeches, and articles allow us to understand his attitude to the problem of otamanship. Unlike his critics, S. Petliura did not believe that otamanship played an exclusively negative role in the history of the liberation struggle. The Chief Otaman noted that he had deliberately used this phenomenon to implement his own political programme, and it had fulfilled its mission. He considered the insurgency to be a force that supported the UPR army throughout the entire period of the liberation struggle,

while representatives of the otamanate defended their own or narrowly focused interests (Петлюра, С. 1993, c. 518–521).

All of the above works belong to political figures of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921. However, otamanship was a component not only of political processes but also of military construction. Therefore, not only politicians, but also military officers, such as officers of the UPR Army and the leaders of the Red Army, showed interest in its analysis.

Yevhen Konovalets was one of the first to attempt to determine the place of otamanship in the history of the liberation struggle. He called this phenomenon «quite peculiar» for the era of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921. Analyzing otamanship, Y. Konovalets divided it into «rear» and «military». Among the consequences of otamanship, he noted its harmful impact on the structure of the armed forces, emphasizing the need to fight the otamans during hostilities, which negatively affected the struggle for independence (Коновалець, Є. 1991).

In the 1920s, the works of Mykola Kapustianskyi and Oleksandr Dotsenko appeared (Dotsenko, O. 1923). Quartermaster General M. Kapustianskyi was one of the most thorough military analysts. He used an extensive source base: war diaries, orders, and appeals to the army. He did not belong to the UPIS party or to its opponents from the UPSR and the USDWP, which allowed him to avoid political involvement. He considered otamanship to be one of the most vulnerable points of the Directory's army, and associated its emergence with the political leadership's miscalculations in military policy (Капустянський, М. 2004).

Colonel O. Vyshnivskyi defended similar views on the place of otamanship in the history of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921. His work is one of the few entirely devoted to the phenomenon of otamanship (Вишнівський, О. 1973).

In the 1950s — 1970s, works by L. Shankovskyi (Шанковський, Л. 1958) and O. Udovychenko (Удовиченко, О. 1995) were published. However, their authors did not pay much attention to the problem of otamanship, mentioning this phenomenon in fragments. Among other works by former military figures of the UPR army, in which otamanship was briefly mentioned, we note works by V. Savchenko (Савченко, В. 1936), L. Tsehelskyi (Цегельський, Л. 2003), and V. Petriv (Петрів, В. 2002).

In addition to generalising works, the phenomenon of otamanship is analysed in studies devoted to the biographies of otamans. One of the first authors of this area of otaman historiography was the former UPR colonel Mykhailo Sereda. He suggested that otamanship should be viewed through the prism of the actions of its most odious individuals. The author was a career officer, so he mostly negatively assessed the activities of rebel leaders. M. Sereda was one of the first to analyse the mentality of otamans and draw attention to their peculiar vision of their place in the history of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 (Середа, М. 1930).

In the 1950s — 1960s, works appeared that analysed the nature of the otamanship problem or highlighted its specific subjects. In particular, Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, in his book «The Ukrainian Revolution with a Fortieth Anniversary Perspective», called otamanship a destructive socio-political phenomenon that was one of the main problems of the Directory of UPR. In his opinion, the existence of otamanship testified to the inability of the UPR leaders to move from the revolutionary phase of state building to the legitimate one (Лисяк-Рудницький, І. 1973).

For Dmytro Dontsov, otamanship was a socio-political phenomenon of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, a «failed attempt at napoleonism». The main feature of the phenomenon is its spontaneity. However, the UPR lacked a leader who could master it and lead it (Донцов, Д. 2002).

The philosopher and publicist Mykola Shlemkevych called otamanship one of the three components of the Ukrainian national idea, along with democratic and monarchical ideas. However, over time, in his opinion, this union collapsed due to the inability of politicians to lead it and curb the anarchic moods of rebel leaders (Шлемкевич, М. 1949).

Bohdan Koval elaborated on the interpretation of the origins of otamanship. He referred to the traditions of the Cossacks and the mentality of the Ukrainian nation: a tendency to self-organisation, local separatism and the charisma of otamans. Defining the essence of otamanship, the author called it a negative phenomenon, a destructive force that paralysed the central government. In his opinion, P. Bolbochan could have been a person capable of curbing the arbitrariness of otamans. However, due to a conflict with S. Petliura, this attempt was not realised (Коваль, Б. 1968).

The historian Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko saw the causes of otamanship in the negative impact of the land law. It was after its announcement that the disintegration of the Directory's army began. In addition, the absence of a clear political programme made the moods of the otamans change. S. Petliura's low authority among the military, lack of experienced professional staff, and the scarcity of the regular army did not allow the Directory of UPR to successfully fight otamanship (Полонська-Василенко, Н. 1991).

Isidor Nahayevsky did not deny the connection between the land law and the spread of otamanship. The historian believed that the second reason was the confrontation between Ukrainian political parties. The third factor, in his opinion, was the ineffective system of army management, the issuance of contradictory orders from different instances of the disorganised military department (Нагаєвський, І. 1994).

Among the works on otamanship, it is worth highlighting those that were created under the influence of the inter-party struggle between the USDWP, UPSR and UPIS. Their authors, using a party approach to assessing phenomena, set themselves a specific task: to justify their associates and accuse political opponents.

In particular, former Prime Minister Borys Martos blamed the party of independent socialists for the rebellions against the UPR government. In his opinion, the rebellions against the state authorities, which caused significant damage to the UPR, were the result of the political component of the subversive activities of the UPSS, which had no political influence. He did not mention the rebellions of the leaders, supporters of the UPIS or the USDWP, or called them insignificant and secondary (Maproc, B. 1989).

Petro Mirchuk and Roman Mlynovetskyi, supporters of the UPSS, agreed with B. Martos on the negative consequences of the «de-politicisation» of the otamanate (Мірчук, П. 1967). However, they noted that the first riots against the official authorities were launched by rebel leaders who acted under the slogans of the «left-wing» parties, Zelenyi and M. Hryhoriev (Млиновецький, Р. 1953).

In the 1960s, Matviy Stakhiv's eight-volume study «Ukraine in the Era of the Directory of UPR» was published. One of the book's chapters is entirely devoted to otamanship. The author examines the genesis, causes, and transformation of otamanship into a destructive factor in the revolution. The historian presented his own definition of otamanship and made an attempt to classify otaman formations during the Directory of UPR period. The researcher examined this phenomenon in the context of world history, emphasising that despite the uniqueness of Ukrainian otamanship, similar processes took place in Russia and Poland. He denied the thesis that S. Petliura was the sole culprit in the spread of otamanship, but noted the fact that P. Bolbochan was unjustly executed on his orders (Стахів, М. 1968).

Thus, Ukrainian diaspora historiography chronologically covers the period of the 1920s — 1970s. Despite the subjectivity present in it, the works of contemporaries of the otamanate and diaspora historians contain significant factual material. Second, the concepts they developed became the basis for defining otamanship as a historical phenomenon. Third, the contradictory nature of their views made the issue controversial. It was contemporaries and representatives of diaspora historiography who first used the term «otamanship», which was used exclusively to refer to the negative activities of rebel otamans and individual career officers in relation to the Directory's authority (P. Bolbochan, V. Oskilko).

The Soviet period of historiography covers the 1920s — 1980s. Despite its inherent bias and party approaches, it is useful for its completely original interpretation of events in Ukraine in 1919. In the works of Soviet historians, one can find definitions of otamanship, characteristics of individual figures, and analysis of the problem of partisanship.

Volodymyr Antonov-Ovsienko's book «Notes on the Civil War» remains the most thorough study. For the commander of the Ukrainian Front in the war against the Directory of UPR in 1918–1919, otamanship was a form of political regime similar to a military dictatorship. In his opinion, the otamans were the expressors of the Directory's anti-Soviet policy. He called the army of the Directory of

UPR, formed of small otaman units, weak and undisciplined (Antonov-Ovseenko, V. 1932–1933). In addition to V. Antonov-Ovseenko, L. Trotsky (Троцький, Л. 1919), A. Bubnov (Бубнов, А. 1919), B. Kozelsky (Козельський, Б. 1927), and N. Kakurin (Какурин, Н. 1990) also mentioned otamanship.

The work of N. Kakurin seems interesting from the point of view of the author's personality. In 1918–1919 he served in the UPR army, and in 1920 he sided with the Red Army. The reasons for the spread of otamanship were the desire of the middle and large peasantry to have their own armed forces, which led to the spread of the influence of otaman formations across Ukraine. He noted the inability of otaman formations to realise either political or military objectives (Какурин, Н. 2002).

For the next generation of Soviet historians, otamanship did not become an object of scientific research. The number of researchers who touched upon the topic of otamanship in their works was insignificant. In particular, A. Lykholt considered the introduction of otamanship a deliberate step by the Directory of UPR to combat peasants who supported the Soviet regime. In his opinion, the territory of the UPR was deliberately divided into districts ruled by otamans, hostile to Bolshevism (Лихолат, А. 1949).

In general, the works of other Soviet historians, M. Suprunenko (Супруненко, М. 1951) and I. Sherman (Шерман, І. 1969), were not distinguished by original interpretations of the essence and manifestations of the otamanship phenomenon. For the representatives of Soviet historiography, it was a terrorist bourgeois-kulak dictatorship that ignored the power of the Directory of UPR, and with the establishment of Bolshevik rule in Ukraine in 1920, it was modernised into political banditry.

A significant article by M. Rakovsky, which analysed the «Hryhorievshchyna», was important for understanding the Soviet authority's perception of otamanship. However, it used the traditional Soviet methodology of party and class approaches to assessing insurgent movements. These works avoided mentioning the contacts of the Red Army with otaman formations in the winter and spring of 1919. The label «political banditry» was used to characterise the activities of otaman units (Раковський, М. 1966).

In the 1990s, the awakening of interest in our own past and the democratisation of historical science led to a surge in attention to the problem of otamanship. However, the number of works devoted to the era of the Directory of UPR and the otamanate as its component was smaller than those covering other periods of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, as noted by the authors of general historiographical studies V. Kapeliushnyi (Капелюшний, В. 2003) and L. Radchenko (Радченко, Л. 1996).

Historians Valerii Soldatenko and Serhii Lytvyn were among the first to draw attention to the need for a scientific comprehensive analysis of the otaman phe-

nomenon using new sources. V. Soldatenko defined otamanship as one of the least studied pages of the period of the liberation struggle, singling it out as a phenomenon, a distinctive feature of the period of the Directory of UPR. The researcher interprets otamanship as a process of disobedience of military power to political power concentrated in the hands of S. Petliura (Солдатенко, В. 2008). The works of V. Soldatenko contain a deep understanding of the processes of otamanship, the historian offers a meaningful historiographical analysis, considers various aspects of this phenomenon, and presents an original interpretation of sources (Солдатенко, В. 1999).

A well-known researcher, S. Lytvyn, assessed otamanship as a destructive phenomenon that played a negative role in the history of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921. He noted that in the Ukrainian historiography of the so-called Vynnychenko trend, there is a tradition of blaming S. Petliura for the negative manifestations of otamanship. Considering such approaches to be erroneous, the historian looks for the origins of otamanship in a combination of genetic factors, peculiarities of the socio-political situation and the population's distrust of the central government (Литвин, С. 2001). S. Petliura's focus on the army in building the power vertical seems to him to be quite justified in the conditions of war. The historian also cites documents that testify to the Chief Otaman's struggle against cases of violation of subordination and insubordination committed by otamans (Литвин, С. 2006).

The book «Political History of the Twentieth Century. Revolutions in Ukraine: Political and State Models and Realities» pays attention to the influence of otamanship on the political course of the Directory of UPR. Analysing the causes of the phenomenon, V. Verstiuk noted that «the embryo of otamanship was laid in the political and state model created by the Directory» (Political History of Ukraine in the Twentieth Century. 2002–2003, p. 300). The army, deprived of state control, became a source of danger to the functioning of the state mechanism. The essence of otamanship was the subordination of political and civilian power to the military, as the army was the most extensive and effective structure. However, the activities of the otamans were destructive and compromised the Directory of UPR.

In the context of the political struggle, otamanship is discussed in monographs on the national liberation struggle. Lviv historian Yaroslav Hrytsak considers otamanship to be a manifestation of the war of «all against all», which was a characteristic feature of the situation in Ukraine in 1919. Otamans, having numerous armed units, defended their own interests. In the conditions of anarchy, they controlled entire regions, ignoring the struggle for Ukrainian statehood, and became organisers of Jewish pogroms (Грицак, Я. 1996).

The problem of otamanship is mentioned in generalised works on the history of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921. In particular, in monographs by Volodymyr Veriga (Верига, В. 1998) and Volodymyr Lytvyn (Литвин, В. 2003).

The phenomenon of otamanship has been analysed by researchers of the military history of the UPR. Yaroslav Tynchenko, the author of several monographs, collections of memoirs and archival documents of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, called otamanship one of the main reasons for the defeat of the liberation struggle. By this term, he meant the irregular structure of the army and the conduct of combat operations by small units (Тинченко, Я. 2007).

Researcher Mykhailo Kovalchuk does not see otamanship as a phenomenon. In his view, the essence of this phenomenon lies in the lack of military discipline and the arbitrariness of individual commanders, which led to the military's opposition to state leaders. Otamanship continued during the events of 1920–1921 in the form of military opposition to S. Petliura (Ковальчук, М. 2006).

In the context of military policy and the use of cossack heritage in the organisation of the army, otamanship is also mentioned in the study by Volodymyr Zadunaysky (Задунайський, В. 2003). Volodymyr Serhiichuk examined some aspects of otamanship in his coverage of the history of Ukrainian-Jewish relations. He considers otamanship to be a spontaneous force that S. Petliura began to fight from the first moment of its emergence. However, the war on several fronts and the lack of sufficient forces did not allow him to overcome otamanship in general (Сергійчук, В. 1998).

Mykola Derzhaliuk presents an original interpretation of the causes of otamanship. He draws attention to the fact that the socialist slogans of the Directory of UPR and the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR were similar, so otamans did not see any difference between them and changed their political orientation depending on the strategic situation (Держалюк, М. 1998). Volodymyr Sidak in his book «National Special Services in the Era of Liberation Struggle» argues that the establishment of the counterintelligence service headed by Mykola Chebotariv was a reaction to the existence of otamanship and its harmful manifestations (Сідак, В. 1998). In other works, on the activities of special services, he gives examples of violations of laws by otamans and mentions the difficulties of fighting leaders who enjoyed the support of politicians (Сідак, В. 2001).

In his monograph on the history of the Free Cossacks, Volodymyr Lobodaev noted that after the liquidation of the Free Cossack units by the Central Rada and the Hetmanate, they were revived in the form of otamanship during the period of the Directory of UPR. The historian identified similarities between the Free Cossacks and otamanship, noted the difficulties in subordinating this movement to the authorities, and the presence of adventurous and anarchic motives in the actions of Free Cossack otamans (Лободаєв, В. 2010).

Otamanship transformed from an insurgent movement into a completely distinctive social phenomenon. Therefore, researchers of peasant movements do not ignore the problem of otamanship. This applies to the studies of P. Zakharch-

enko (Захарченко, П. 2000), A. Lysenko (Лисенко, А. 2001), O. Nesterov¹ (Нестеров, О. 2001), V. Shcherbatiuk (Щербатюк, В. 2012). These works contain information on the insurgents' ideology, military tactics, analyse the insurgents' contacts with the Ukrainian authorities, and attempts to organise and coordinate the insurgency.

Among contemporary researchers of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, the topic of otamanship is addressed by the authors of works on the personalities of the Directory of UPR. Among them is Roman Koval, who considers otamanship as an alternative view of the creation of the army, the organisation of local government, and Ukrainian-Jewish relations. The researcher even proposes to use concepts to distinguish between the types of positive and negative activities of the leaders. The definition of «otamanship» should be used to describe insurgent groups that supported the UPR, and «otamania» should be used to describe groups that were not subordinate to the authorities. He believes that the term «otaman» should be used for a positive characterisation. Instead, «otamanchyky» should be used to describe individuals who harmed the UPR. To these he refers Bidenko, Angel, Paliy, Hryshko, Hutsul, Kotsur (Коваль, Р. 2005, p. 302).

In his works, historian Viktor Savchenko called otamanship a manifestation of the adventurous component of the revolutionary period. Otaman units were an alternative political course to the state, which consisted of a combination of separatism, anarchism and socialism. As a result, «otaman socialism» was formed: a regime of regional semi-military dictatorship that was not subordinated to the central government. The absence of a political and military doctrine, Bolshevik propaganda, and S. Petliura's indecision in the fight against otamanship led to its flourishing (Савченко, В. 2011). V. Savchenko made the first attempt at a comprehensive study of the phenomenon of otamanism during the revolutionary events of 1917 in the territory of the Russian Empire. Among the foci of «Russian otamanism» he singled out the regions of Siberia, Black Earth Russia, and Tambov Oblast (Савченко, В. 2000).

Volodymyr Horak noted the original nature of the relationship between S. Petliura and the otamans, using the example of M. Hryhoriev. The historian understands otamanship as a political course represented by S. Petliura and the wealthy peasantry, who did not agree to the introduction of Soviet rule in the UPR. However, by doing so, the Directory of UPR put the interests of a certain social group (middle and wealthy peasants) above the interests of the poor, which led to a social conflict (Горак, В. 1999).

In their book «Petro Bolbochan: The Tragedy of a Ukrainian Statesman», V. Sidak, T. Ostashko, and T. Vronska present a historical portrait of the colonel

¹ Нестеров О. Селянський повстанський рух на Правобережній Україні (1919 р.): дис. ... канд. ист. наук: 07.00.01. Київ, 2001.

in the context of the situation in the UPR in 1919. The authors consider it unacceptable to include him in the list of military personnel accused of otamanship, unlike the real otamans, former rebel leaders O. Volokh, Y. Bozhko, and J. Bidenko (Сідак, В., Осташко, Т. & Вронська, Т. 2004).

In recent years, the most comprehensive study of otamanship can be considered the work of Yu. Mytrofanenko. Based on a significant number of archival documents, for the first time in Ukrainian historiography, a holistic vision of this revolutionary phenomenon on the territory of Ukraine is presented, which brings us closer to clarifying the nature of the relations between the leaders of the UPR and the military leaders — the otamans. The study contributes to the understanding of why otamanship and the uprising are phenomena similar in form but different in content (Митрофаненко, Ю. 2016).

Thus, the achievements of modern Ukrainian historiography include the focus on the phenomenon of otamanship, the use of new sources, the development of conceptual approaches, and the existence of scientific discussion that contributes to an objective study of the problem.

Foreign historiography should be divided into Russian and Western. Contemporary Russian historiography examines the problem of otamanship in the context of its own history. A peculiar type of «Russian otamanship» was widespread mainly in Siberia, Tambov region, and the black earth zone of Russia. The separatism of the Russian otaman regions was actively sought after by the Japanese interventionists, who wanted to use them to implement their territorial expansion in Siberia. «The otaman movement works for Bolshevism better than all the sermons and propaganda of comrades Lenin and Trotsky...» — wrote A. Budberg, the Minister of War in the Kolchak government. However, it was the otaman movement that largely became the support of Kolchak's forces in Siberia in 1918–1920¹.

Representatives of Russian historical scholarship call «otamanship» a manifestation of a revolutionary phenomenon, when, in the context of weak central political power and declining military discipline, cases of regional separatism and disobedience to orders are spreading (Веллер, М. & Буровский, А. 2007).

Some Russian historians, in particular V. Shuldyakov, consider otamanship a natural manifestation of the reaction to the weakness of the authorities and assess the place of this phenomenon in the history of the civil war more positively (Shuldyakov, V. 2008). Researchers of the history of Siberia, where otamanship was most widespread, pay considerable attention to the problem of otamanship (Ларьков, Н. 1995). The problems of Ukrainian otamanship in the analysis of the Petliura regime are touched upon by the Russian researcher of the period of national liberation struggle Serhiy Shumov (Шумов, С. 2005).

¹ Революция и Гражданская война в описаниях белогвардейцев: в 6 т. Т. 4. Гражданская война в Сибири и Северной области. Мемуары: Авксентьев, Раков, Зензинов, Гоппер, Сахаров, Будберг, Добровольский, Соколов, Буллит. [Сост. С. А. Алексеев. Под ред. Н. Л. Мещерякова]. Москва — Ленинград: ГИЗ, 1927.

In Western historiography, much less attention is paid to the problems of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 and the otamanship. In 1951, C. Manning's work was published. Analysing the period of the Directory of UPR, he noted that a significant number of «local gangs», uncontrolled by the government, were operating in Ukraine at that time. They did not follow the orders of the command and rebelled against the central government. The author uses the term «otamanship» to describe these processes, and calls the leaders otamans (Manning, C. 1951). M. Baker analyzed the modern Ukrainian historiography of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 and drew attention to the need for a more detailed analysis of the peasant post-war movements (Бейкер, М. 2005). The problems of the Ukrainian peasant insurgency, its ideology and driving forces are the subject of studies by A. Adams (Адамс, А. 1977) and A. Graziosi (Граціозі, А. 2005).

In Western historiography, much less attention is paid to the problems of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 and otamanship. In 1951, C. Manning's work was published. Analysing the period of the Directory of UPR, he noted that a significant number of «local gangs», uncontrolled by the government, were operating in Ukraine at that time. They did not follow the orders of the command and rebelled against the central government. The author uses the term «otamanship» to describe these processes, and calls the leaders otamans (Manning, C. 1951). M. Baker analyzed the modern Ukrainian historiography of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 and drew attention to the need for a more detailed analysis of the peasant post-war movements (Бейкер, М. 2005). The problems of the Ukrainian peasant insurgency, its ideology and driving forces are the subject of studies by A. Adams (Адамс, А. 1977) and A. Graziosi (Граціозі, А. 2005).

Conclusions. The analyzed works from the first researchers to modern historians, despite their shortcomings, have been and remain extremely important for the analysis of the social phenomenon of otamanship. Even despite the sometimes inherent bias, subjectivity, and concepts developed by their authors regarding the causes, essence, and consequences of this phenomenon, well-grounded approaches to the study of this phenomenon remain relevant for subsequent researchers of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921. The analysis of historiographical material shows that despite the study of otamanship since the 1920s, it has not been the subject of a separate consideration. Therefore, there are no generalised works on the problem of otamanship in Ukrainian and foreign historical science.

An analysis of the historiography of otamanship has shown that researchers' attention has been mainly focused on considering this phenomenon as a component of military policy or a form of insurgency. Historians have not paid attention to the dynamic changes that led to the conflict between the nationalist otaman formations and the Directory of UPR and turned otamanship into a destructive force against the central government in Ukraine. Such a single-minded approach to the problem, i.e., consideration at a certain historical juncture, without taking into

account the changes in this phenomenon, led to the identification of otamanship with the insurgency and distortion of the essence of this historical phenomenon.

Адамс, А. 1977. Велика Українська Жакерія. *Україна, 1917–1921. Дослідження з питань революції*. Кембрідж, Масачусетс. С. 268–277.

Антонов-Овсєенко, В. 1932–1933. *Записки о гражданской войне*: в 3 т. Т. 3. Москва–Ленінград.

Бейкер, М. 2005. Погляд одного історика на розвиток сучасної історіографії Української революції 1917–1920 рр. *Україна модерна*. № 9. С. 69–77.

Бубнов, А. 1919. О каких уроках идёт речь. *Коммунист*. 28 мая.

Веллер, М. & Буровский А. 2007. *Гражданская история безумной войны*. Москва: АСТ.

Верига, В. 1998. *Визвольні змагання в Україні, 1914–1923 pp.*: в 2 т. Т. 2. Львів.

Винниченко, В. 1990. *Відродження нації*: в 3 ч. Ч. 3. Київ: Видавництво політичної літератури.

Вишнівський, О. 1973. *Повстанський рух та отаманія*. Детройт: Капітула відзнаки Хреста залишного стрільця.

Горак, В. 1999. *Повстанці отамана Григор'єва*. Фастів: Поліфант.

Граціозі, А. 2005. *Війна і революція в Європі, 1905–1956 pp.* Київ: Основи.

Грицац, Я. 1996. *Нарис модерної історії України*. Київ: Генеза.

Держалюк, М. 1998. *Міжнародне становище України та її визвольна боротьба у 1917–1922 pp.* Київ: Орієнта.

Донцов, Д. 2002. *Рік 1918, Київ*. Київ: Темпора.

Дорошенко, Д. 2007. *Мої спомини про недавнє минуле (1914–1920 pp.)*. Київ: Темпора.

Доценко, О. 1923. *Літопис Української революції: матеріали й документи до історії Української революції 1917–1923 pp.*: у 3 т. Т. 2. Кн. 4. Київ; Львів.

Задунайський, В. 2003. Загальнівійськовий та козацький аспекти становлення структури армії УНР (листопад 1918 р. — лютій 1919 р.). *Донецький вісник Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка*. Т. 4. Донецьк: Східний видавничий дім.

Захарченко, П. 2000. *У поході за волею (Селянсько-повстанський рух на Правобережній Україні у 1919 р.)*. Київ: Нічлава.

Капустянський, М. 2004. «*Похід Українських армій на Київ — Одесу в 1919 році*» / Є. Маланюк. «Уривки зі спогадів». Документи та матеріали; [передм. Я. Тинченко]. Київ: Темпора.

Кақурин, Н. 1990. *Как сражалась революция (1919–1920 гг.)*: в 2 т. Т. 2. Москва: Політизdat.

Кақурин, Н. 2002. *Гражданская война 1918–1921 гг.* Санкт-Петербург: Полігон.

Капелюшний, В. 2003. *Здобута і втрачена незалежність: історіографічний нарис української державності доби визвольних змагань (1917–1921 pp.)*. Київ: Олан.

Коваль, Б. 1968. Симон Петлюра в перспективі історії. *Ідеї і люди визвольних змагань 1917–1923 pp.* Нью-Йорк: Булава.

Коваль, Р. 2005. *За волю і честь*. Київ: Діокор.

Ковалчук, М. 2006. *Невідома війна 1919 року: українсько-білогвардійське збройне протистояння*: Наукова монографія. Київ: Темпора.

Козельський, Б. 1927. *Шлях зрадництва і авантюр (Петлюровське повстанство)*. Харків.

Коновалець, Є. 1991. Причинки до історії Української революції. *Київ*. № 11. С. 105–124.

Ларьков, Н. 1995. *Начало гражданской войны в Сибири: армия и борьба за власть*. Томск.

Лисяк-Рудницький, І. 1973. *Між історією і політикою*. Мюнхен: Сучасність.

Литвин, В. 2003. *Україна: доба війн і революцій (1914–1920)*. Київ: Альтернативи.

Литвин, С. 2001. *Суд історії: Симон Петлюра і петлюріана*. Київ: Вид-во ім. Олеся Теліги.

Литвин, С. 2006. Феномен отаманщини в українській історіографії. *Воєнна історія*. № 4–6. [Online]. Available at: http://warhistory.ukrlife.org/4_6_06_1.htm.

Лихолат, А. 1949. *Разгром буржуазно-националистической Директории на Украине*. Москва: Госполитиздат.

Савченко, В. 2000. Авантуристы гражданской войны. Харьков: Фолио, 2000.

Лободаєв, В. 2010. *Революційна стихія (Вільнокозацький рух в Україні 1917–1918 pp.)*. Київ: Темпора.

Мазепа, І. 2003. *Україна в огні й бурі революції 1917–1921*. Київ: Темпора.

Мартос, Б. 1989. *Визвольний здвиг України*. Нью-Йорк.

Мірчук, П. 1967. *Українська державність*. Торонто.

Митрофаненко, Ю. 2016. *Українська отаманщина 1918–1919 років*. Кропивницький: Імекс-ЛТД.

Млиновецький, Р. 1953. *Історія українського народу: нариси з політичної історії*. Мюнхен: Українське наукове в-во.

Нагаєвський, І. 1994. *Історія Української держави ХХ ст.* Київ: Український письменник.

Петлюра, С. 1993. *Статті*. Київ: Дніпро.

Петрів, В. 2002. *Військово-історичні праці*. Київ: Поліграфкнига.

Полонська-Василенко, Н. 1991. *Історія України. 1900–1923 pp.: в 2 т.* Т. 2. Київ: Пам'ятки України.

Радченко, Л. 1996. *Сучасна історіографія національно-демократичної революції в Україні 1917–1920 pp.* Харків: Око.

Раковский, М. 1966. Крах григорьевщины. *История СССР*. № 5. С. 35–52.

Савченко, В. 2000. Авантуристы гражданской войны. Харьков: Фолио, 2000.

Савченко, В. 2011. *Атаманщина*. Харків: Фолио, 2011.

Савченко, В. 1936. Нарис боротьби війська УНР на Лівобережжі кін. 1918 — поч. 1919 pp. За державність. № 6. С. 119–155.

Сергійчук, В. 1998. *Погроми в Україні 1914–1920. Від штучних стереотипів до гіркої правди, прихованої в радянських архівах*. Київ: Видавництво ім. О. Теліги.

Середа, М. 1930. Отаманщина. Отаман Болбачан. *Літопис Червоної Калини*. Ч. 3. С. 15–16.

Середа, М. 1930. Отаманщина. Отаман Юрко Тютюнник. *Літопис Червоної Калини*. Ч. 10. С. 15–17.

Сідак, В. 1998. *Національні спецслужби в період української революції 1917–1921 pp. (невідомі сторінки історії)*. Київ: Альтернативи.

Сідак, В. 2001. *На шляху до воєнної доктрини*. Київ: Вид-во Національної академії СБУ; Вид-во МАУП.

Сідак, В., Осташко Т. & Вронська Т. 2004. *Полковник Петро Болбочан: трагедія українського державника*. Київ: Темпора, 2004.

Солдатенко, В. 1999. *Українська революція: концепція та історіографія: в 2 кн.* Кн. 2. Київ: Книга пам'яті України; Просвіта.

Солдатенко, В. 2008. Петлюра — отаманщина — погроми (історичні факти й оцінки на тлі новітніх публікацій. *Україна в революційних процесах перших десятиліть ХХ ст.* Київ: ППЕнд ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України. С. 329–439.

Стахів, М. 1968. Україна в добі Директорії УНР: у 8 т. Т. 2, Т. 6. Торонто.

Супруненко, М. 1951. Україна в період іноземної воєнної інтервенції та громадянської війни (1918–1920 рр.). Київ: Політвидав.

Тинченко, Я. 2007. Офіцерський корпус Армії Української Народної Республіки (1917–1921). Київ: Темпора.

Троцький, Л. 1919. Махновщина. Коммунист: орган ЦК КП(б)У. 8 липня.

Удовиченко, О. 1995. Україна у війні за державність: Історія організації і бойових дій Українських збройних сил. Київ: Україна.

Христюк, П. 1969. Замітки і матеріали до історії Української революції 1917–1920 рр.: в 4 т. Т. 4. Нью-Йорк: Видавництво Чарторийських.

Цегельський, Л. 2003. Від легенди до правди: Спомини про події в Україні. Львів: Свічадо.

Шанковський, Л. 1958. Українська армія в боротьбі за державність (1917–1920 рр.). Мюнхен: Дніпровська хвиля.

Шаповал, М. 1927. Велика революція і Українська визвольна програма. Прага: Вільна спілка.

Шерман, І. 1969. Проблема громадянської війни на Україні в українській радянській історіографії (1956–1967 рр.). Український історичний журнал. № 3. С. 117–126.

Шлемкевич, М. 1949. Українська синтеза чи українська громадянська війна. Нью-Йорк.

Шулдяков, В. 2008. Мифы и реалии атаманщины. *Родина*. № 3. С. 84–87.

Шумов, С. 2005. Петлюровщина. Москва: Эксмо Алгоритм.

Щербатюк, В. 2012. Селянський повстанський рух в Україні 1917–1921 років: українська історіографія. Київ: Наукова думка.

Manning, C. 1951. *Twentieth-Century Ukraine*. New York: Bookman associates.

Adams, A. 1977. Velyka Ukrainska Zhakeriia [The Great Ukrainian Jacquerie]. *Ukraina, 1917–1921. Doslidzhennia z pytan revoliutsii*. Kembridzh, Masachusetts. S. 268–277. [In Ukrainian].

Antonov-Ovseenko, V. 1932–1933. *Zapiski o grazhdanskoy voynе* [Notes on the Civil War]: в 3 т. Т. 3. Москва — Ленінград. [In Russian].

Beyker, M. 2005. Pohliad odnoho istorika na rozvytok suchasnoi istoriohrafii Ukrainskoi revoliutsii 1917–1920 rr. [One Historian's View on the Development of Modern Historiography of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1920]. *Ukraina moderna*. № 9. S. 69–77. [In Ukrainian].

Bubnov, A. 1919. O kakikh urokakh idyot rech [What Lessons Are We Talking About?]. *Kommunist*. 28 maia. [In Russian].

Veller, M. & Burovskiy, A. 2007. *Grazhdanskaia istoriia bezumnoi voyny* [Civil History of the Mad War]. Москва: AST. [In Russian].

Veryha, V. 1998. *Vyzvolni zmahannia v Ukraini, 1914–1923 rr.* [Liberation Struggle in Ukraine, 1914–1923]: в 2 т. Т. 2. Lviv. [In Ukrainian].

Vynnychenko, V. 1990. *Vidrodzhennia natsii* [Revival of the Nation]: в 3 ч. Ч. 3. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo politychnoi literatury. [In Ukrainian].

Vyshnivskyy, O. 1973. *Povstanskyi rukh ta otamaniia* [Insurgency and Otamanship]. Detroyt: Kapitula vidznyky Khresta zaliznoho striltsia. [In Ukrainian].

Horak, V. 1999. *Povstantsi otamana Hryhor'ieva* [Otaman Grigoriev's rebels]. Fastiv: Polifant. [In Ukrainian].

Hratsiozi, A. 2005. *Vyna i revoliutsiia v Yevropi, 1905–1956 rr.* [War and Revolution in Europe, 1905–1956]. Kyiv: Osnovy. [In Ukrainian].

Hrytsak, Ya. 1996. *Narys modernoi istorii Ukrayny* [Essay on the Modern History of Ukraine]. Kyiv: Heneza. [In Ukrainian].

Derzhalyuk, M. 1998. *Mizhnarodne stanovishche Ukrayny ta yii vyzvolna borotba u 1917–1922 rr.* [International Position of Ukraine and its Liberation Struggle in 1917–1922]. Kyiv: Oryany. [In Ukrainian].

Dontsov, D. 2002. *Rik 1918*, Kyiv [Year 1918, Kyiv]. Kyiv: Tempora. [In Ukrainian].

Doroshenko, D. 2007. *Moi spomyny pro nedavnie mynule (1914–1920 rr.)* [My Memories of the Recent Past (1914–1920)]. Kyiv: Tempora. [In Ukrainian].

Dotsenko, O. 1923. *Litopys Ukrainskoi revoliutsii: materialy y dokumenty do istorii Ukrainskoi revoliutsii 1917–1923 rr.* [Chronicle of the Ukrainian Revolution: Materials and Documents on the History of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1923]: u 3 t. T. 2. Kn. 4. Kyiv; Lviv. [In Ukrainian].

Zadunayskyy, V. 2003. *Zahalnoviyskovyy ta kozatskyy aspeky stanovlennia struktury armii UNR (lystopad 1918 r. — liuty 1919 r.)* [General Military and Cossack Aspects of the formation of the UPR Army Structure (November 1918 — February 1919)]. *Donetskyi visnyk Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka*. T. 4. Donetsk: Skhidnyi vydavnychyy dim. [In Ukrainian].

Zakharchenko, P. 2000. *U pokhodi za voleiu (Seliansko-povstanskyi rukh na Pravoberezhniy Ukrayni u 1919 r.)* [In a March for Freedom (Peasant Insurgency in Right-Bank Ukraine in 1919)]. Kyiv: Nichlava. [In Ukrainian].

Kapustynskyy, M. 2004. «Pokhid Ukrainskykh armiy na Kyiv — Odesu v 1919 rotsi» [The campaign of the Ukrainian armies to Kyiv — Odesa in 1919]. *Ye. Malaniuk. «Uryvky zi spohadiv»*. Dokumenty ta materialy; [peredm. Ya. Tynchenko]. Kyiv: Tempora. [In Ukrainian].

Kakurin, N. 1990. *Kak srazhalas revoliutsia (1919–1920 gg.)* [How the Revolution Fought (1919–1920)]: v 2 t. T. 2. Moskva: Politizdat. [In Russian].

Kakurin, N. 2002. *Grazhdanskaia voyna 1918–1921 gg.* [The Civil War of 1918–1921]. Saint Petersburg: Polygon. [In Russian].

Kapeliushnyy, V. 2003. *Zdobuta i vtrachena nezalezhnist: istoriohrafichnyy narys ukrainskoi derzhavnosti doby vyzvolnykh zmahan (1917–1921 rr.)* [Independence Gained and Lost: A Historiographical Essay on Ukrainian Statehood in the Era of Liberation Struggle (1917–1921)]. Kyiv: Olan. [In Ukrainian].

Koval, B. 1968. Symon Petliura v perspektyvi istorii [Simon Petliura in the Perspective of History]. *Idei i liudy vyzvolnykh zmahan 1917–1923 rr.* Niu-York: Bulava. [In Ukrainian].

Koval, R. 2005. *Za voliu i chest* [For Freedom and Honour]. Kyiv: Diokor. [In Ukrainian].

Kovalchuk, M. 2006. *Nevidoma viyna 1919 roku: ukrainsko-bilohvardiiske zbroynye protystoiannia* [The Unknown War of 1919: the Ukrainian-White Guard armed confrontation]: Naukova monohrafia. Kyiv: Tempora. [In Ukrainian].

Kozelskyy, B. 1927. *Shliakh zradnytva i avantur (Petliura's Uprising)*. Kharkiv. [In Ukrainian].

Konovalets, Ye. 1991. *Prychynky do istorii Ukrainskoi revoliutsii* [Reasons for the History of the Ukrainian Revolution]. Kyiv. № 11. S. 105–124. [In Ukrainian].

Lar'kov, N. 1995. *Nachalo grazhdanskoy voyny v Sibiri: armiya i borba za vlast* [The Beginning of the Civil War in Siberia: the Army and the Struggle for Power]. Tomsk. [In Russian].

Lysiak-Rudnytskyy, I. 1973. *Mizh istoriieiu i politykoiu* [Between History and Politics]. Miunchen: Suchasnist. [In Ukrainian].

Lytvyn, V. 2003. *Ukraina: doba viyni i revoliutsiy (1914–1920)* [Ukraine: the Age of Wars and Revolutions (1914–1920)]. Kyiv: Alternatyvy. [In Ukrainian].

Lytvyn, S. 2001. *Sud istorii: Symon Petliura i petliuriana* [The Court of History: Simon Petliura and the Petliurians]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo im. Oleny Telihy. [In Ukrainian].

Lytvyn, S. 2006. Fenomen otamanshchyny v ukrainskiy istoriohrafii [The Phenomenon of Otamanship In Ukrainian Historiography]. *Voienna istoriia*. № 4–6. [Online]. Available at: http://warhistory.ukrlife.org/4_6_06_1.htm. [In Ukrainian].

Lykhlat, A. 1949. *Razgrom burzhua-zno-natsionalisticheskoy Direktorii na Ukraine* [The Defeat of the Bourgeois-Nationalist Directory on the Ukraine]. Moskva: Gospolitizdat. [In Russian].

Lobodaiev, V. 2010. *Revoliutsiyna stikhia (Vilnokozatskyy rukh v Ukrainsi 1917–1918 rr.)* [Revolutionary Element (The Free Cossack Movement in Ukraine in 1917–1918)]. Kyiv: Tempora. [In Ukrainian].

Mazepa, I. 2003. *Ukraina v ohni y buri revoliutsii 1917–1921* [Ukraine in the Fire and Storm of the Revolution of 1917–1921]. Kyiv: Tempora. [In Ukrainian].

Martos, B. 1989. *Vyzvolnyy zdvyh Ukrayny* [The Liberation Shift of Ukraine]. Niu-York. [In Ukrainian].

Mirchuk, P. 1967. *Ukrainska derzhavnist* [Ukrainian Statehood]. Toronto. [In Ukrainian].

Mytrofanenko, Yu. 2016. *Ukrainska otamanshchyna 1918–1919 rokiv* [Ukrainian Otamanship of 1918–1919]. Kropyvnytskyy: Imeks-LTD. [In Ukrainian].

Mlynovetskiy, R. 1953. *Istoriia ukrainskoho narodu: narisy z politychnoi istorii* [History of the Ukrainian People: Essays on Political History]. Miunchen: Ukrainske naukove v-vo. [In Ukrainian].

Nahayevskyy, I. 1994. *Istoriia Ukrainskoi derzhavy XX st.* [History of the Ukrainian State of the Twentieth Century]. Kyiv: Ukrainskyy pismennyk. [In Ukrainian].

Petliura, S. 1993. *Statti* [Articles]. Kyiv: Dnipro. [In Ukrainian].

Petriv, V. 2002. *Viyskovo-istorychni pratsi* [Military and Historical Works]. Kyiv: Polihrafknyha. [In Ukrainian].

Polonska-Vasylenko, N. 1991. *Istoriia Ukrayny. 1900–1923 rr.* [History of Ukraine. 1900–1923]: v 2 t. T. 2. Kyiv: Pamyatky Ukrayny. [In Ukrainian].

Radchenko, L. 1996. *Suchasna istoriohrafia natsionalno-demokratichnoi revoliutsii v Ukrainsi 1917–1920 rr.* [Modern historiography of the national democratic revolution in Ukraine in 1917–192]. Kharkiv: Oko. [In Ukrainian].

Rakovskyy, M. 1966. *Krakh hryhor' yevshchyny* [The Collapse of the Grigoriev Movement]. Istoriia SSSR. № 5. S. 35–52. [In Russian].

Savchenko, V. 2000. *Avanturysty grazhdanskoy voyny* [Adventurers of the Civil War]. Kharkov: Folio. [In Russian].

Savchenko, V. 2011. *Atamanshchyna* [Otamanship]. Kharkiv: Folio. [In Russian].

Savchenko, V. 1936. Narys borotby viyska UNR na Livoberezhi kin. 1918 — poch. 1919 rr. [Essay on the Struggle of the UPR Troops on the Left Bank in Late 1918 — Early 1919]. *Za derzhavnist.* № 6. S. 119–155. [In Ukrainian].

Serhiychuk, V. 1998. *Pohromy v Ukrainsi 1914–1920. Vid shtuchnykh stereotypiv do hirkoi pravdy, prykhovanoi v radianskykh arkhivakh* [Pogroms in Ukraine 1914–1920. From Artificial Stereotypes to the Bitter Truth Hidden in Soviet Archives]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo im. O. Telihy. [In Ukrainian].

Sereda, M. 1930. Otamanshchyna. Otaman Bolbachan [Otamanship. Otaman Bolbachan]. *Litopys Chervonoi Kalyny*. Ch. 3. S. 15–16. [In Ukrainian].

Sereda, M. 1930. Otamanshchyna. Otaman Yurko Tiutiunnyk [Otamanship. Otaman Yurko Tiutiunnyk]. *Litopys Chervonoi Kalyny*. Ch. 10. S. 15–17. [In Ukrainian].

Sidak, V. 1998. *Natsionalni spetssluzhby v period ukrainskoi revoliutsii 1917–1921 rr. (nev-idomi storinky istorii)* [National Special Services during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 (Unknown Pages of History)]. Kyiv: Alternatyvy. [In Ukrainian].

Sidak, V. 2001. *Na shliakhu do voiennoi doktryny [Towards a Military Doctrine]*. Kyiv: Vyd-vo Natsionalnoi akademii SBU; Vyd-vo MAUP. [In Ukrainian].

Sidak, V., Ostashko, T. & Vronska, T. 2004. *Polkovnyk Petro Bolbochan: trahediia ukrainskoho derzhavnyka [Colonel Petro Bolbochan: the Tragedy of a Ukrainian Statesman]*. Kyiv: Tempora. [In Ukrainian].

Soldatenko, V. 1999. *Ukrainska revoliutsia: kontsepsiia ta istoriohrafia [Ukraine in the Revolutionary Processes of the first Decades of the Twentieth Century]*: v 2 kn. Kn. 2. Kyiv: Knyha pamiaty Ukrainsky; Prosvita. [In Ukrainian].

Soldatenko, V. 2008. Petliura — otamanshchyna — pohromy (istorychni fakty y otsinky na tli novitnikh publikatsiy [Petliura — Otamanship — Pogroms (Historical Facts and Assessments against the Background of Recent Publications)])]. *Ukraina v revoliutsiynykh protsesakh pershykh desyatylitt XX st.* Kyiv: IPIEnD im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainsky. S. 329–439. [In Ukrainian].

Stakhiv, M. 1968. *Ukraina v dobi Dyrektorii UNR [Ukraine in the Era of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic]*: u 8 t. T. 2, T. 6. Toronto. [In Ukrainian].

Suprunenko, M. 1951. *Ukraina v period inozemnoi voiennoi interventsii ta hromadyanskoi viyny (1918–1920 rr) [Ukraine in the Period of Foreign Military Intervention and Civil War (1918–1920)]*. Kyiv: Polityvdav. [In Ukrainian].

Tynchenko, Ya. 2007. *Ofitserskyy korpus Armii Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky (1917–1921) [Officer Corps of the Army of the Ukrainian People's Republic (1917–1921)]*. Kyiv: Tempora. [In Ukrainian].

Trotskiy, L. 1919. Makhnovshchyna [Makhnovshchyna]. *Kommunist*: orhan TsK KP(b) U. 8 yiunia. [In Russian].

Udovychenko, O. 1995. *Ukraina u viyni za derzhavnist: Istoryia orhanizatsii i boyovoykh diiy Ukrainskykh zbroynykh syl [Ukraine in the War for Statehood: History of the Organisation and Combat Operations of the Ukrainian Armed Forces]*. Kyiv: Ukraina. [In Ukrainian].

Khrystyuk, P. 1969. *Zamitky i materialy do istorii Ukrainskoi revoliutsii 1917–1920 rr. [Notes and Materials to the History of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1920]*: v 4 t. T. 4. Niu-York: Vydavnytstvo Chartoryysskyh. [In Ukrainian].

Tschelskyy, L. 2003. *Vid lehendy do pravdy: Spomyny pro podii v Ukraini [From Legend to Truth: Memories of Events in Ukraine]*. Lviv: Svichado. [In Ukrainian].

Shankovsky, L. 1958. *Ukrainska armiya v borotbi za derzhavnist (1917–1920 rr.) [The Ukrainian Army in the Struggle for Statehood (1917–1920)]*. Miunchen: Dniprova khvylia. [In Ukrainian].

Shapoval, M. 1927. *Velyka revoliutsia i Ukrainska vyzvolna prohrama [The Great Revolution and the Ukrainian Liberation Programme]*. Praha: Vilna spilka. [In Ukrainian].

Sherman, I. 1969. Problema hromadyanskoi viyny na Ukraini u ukrainskiy radyanskiy istoriografi (1956–1967 rr.) [The Problem of the Civil War in Ukraine In Ukrainian Soviet History (1956–1967)]. *Ukrainskyy istorychnyy zhurnal*. № 3. S. 117–126. [In Ukrainian].

Shlemkevych, M. 1949. *Ukrainska synteza chy ukainska hromadyanska viyna [The Ukrainian Synthesis or the Ukrainian Civil War]*. Niu-York. [In Ukrainian].

Shuldyakov, V. 2008. *Mify i reali atamanshchyny [Myths and Realities of Otamanship]. Rodyna*. № 3. S. 84–87. [In Russian].

Shumov, S. 2005. *Petliurovshchyna [Petliurivshchina]*. Moskva: Eksmo Algoritm. [In Russian].

Shcherbatiuk, V. 2012. *Seliansky povstanskyy rukh v Ukrainsi 1917–1921 rokiv: ukainska istoriografiia [Peasant Insurgency in Ukraine in 1917–1921: Ukrainian Historiography]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. [In Ukrainian].

Manning, C. 1951. *Twentieth-Century Ukraine*. New York: Bookman associates.