

UDC 342.25

[https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2021-1\(26\)-123-133](https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2021-1(26)-123-133)

**Marchenko Volodymyr Yurievich**,  
post-graduate student of Scientific Research  
Institute of State Building and Local Go-  
vernment of National Academy of Law Sci-  
ences of Ukraine, leading legal adviser of  
State Enterprise “Malyshev Plant”, 61051,  
Kharkov, Str. Klochkivska, 276-B, fl. 107,  
tel.: +38 (067) 601 32 06, e-mail: [vovamarch1996@gmail.com](mailto:vovamarch1996@gmail.com),  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3663-6399>

**Марченко Володимир Юрійович**,  
аспірант Науково-дослідного інституту  
державного будівництва та місцевого са-  
моврядування Національної академії пра-  
вових наук України, провідний юрискон-  
сульт Державного підприємства “Завод  
імені В. О. Малышева”, 61051, м. Харків, вул. Клочківська, 276-Б, кв. 107, тел.: +38 (067)  
601 32 06, e-mail: [vovamarch1996@gmail.com](mailto:vovamarch1996@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3663-6399>



**Марченко Владимир Юрьевич**,  
аспирант Научно-исследовательского института государственного строительства  
и местного самоуправления Национальной академии правовых наук Украины, веду-  
щий юрисконсульт Государственного предприятия “Завод имени В. О. Малышева”,  
61051, г. Харьков, ул. Клочковская, 276-Б, кв. 107, тел. +38 (067) 601 32 06, e-mail:  
[vovamarch1996@gmail.com](mailto:vovamarch1996@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3663-6399>

---

## ARCHETYPICAL PRINCIPLES OF HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN UKRAINE

**Abstract.** This study deals with the historical development of local self-government on the territory of Ukraine and the possible use of such experience in carrying out the reform of decentralization of power, considering the main archetypes that have developed in society. The following eight main stages of development of local self-government are considered: Trypillian (laying the foundations of local self-government and the emergence of the main archetypes), the stage of existence of the ancient Slavs and Kievan Rus (changing the structure of local power and narrowing the rights of ordinary residents to manage the state, reducing the role of the archetype of ‘personal freedom’), Tatar-Mongol domination and fragmentation (decline of local self-government, dominance of the archetype of ‘poverty’),

Lithuanian-Polish period (departure from the traditional Veche self-government and introduction of Magdeburg law with the narrowing of the rights of residents, and therefore the archetype of 'personal freedom'), self-government in the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires (actual incorporation of local self-government into the system of state power, complete levelling of the archetype of 'personal freedom'), Soviet period (formal presence of local self-government, but in fact it was included in the system of state authorities), the development of local self-government in independent Ukraine, since 1991 (return to traditional archetypes, existing during the Trypillian civilization, but a departure from them in recent years with the renewal of the archetype of 'poverty'). The author identifies the main problems that have arisen in the process of implementing the decentralization of power reform and suggests measures to solve them, considering the historical experience and archetypes that are typical for Ukrainian society. Also, the author identifies a range of scientific problems, the study of which requires additional scientific developments to better understand the processes that took place in the past and are repeated again in our time and to find possible ways to overcome such problems that faced Ukrainian society, in particular, the government.

**Keywords:** archetypes, local self-government, history of local self-government, archetypes of local self-government, stages of development of local self-government, reform of decentralization of power.

## **АРХЕТИПНІ ЗАСАДИ ІСТОРИЧНОГО РОЗВИТКУ МІСЦЕВОГО САМОВРЯДУВАННЯ НА ТЕРЕНАХ УКРАЇНИ**

**Анотація.** Розглянуто питання історичного розвитку місцевого самоврядування на теренах України та можливому використанню такого досвіду при проведенні реформи децентралізації влади з урахуванням основних архетипів, що склалися в суспільстві. Розглянуто вісім основних етапів розвитку місцевого самоврядування: трипільський (закладення основ місцевого самоврядування та виникнення основних архетипів), етап існування давніх слов'ян та Київської Русі (зміна структури місцевої влади та звуження прав звичайних жителів щодо управління державою, зменшення ролі архетипу "особиста свобода"), татаро-монгольське панування та роздробленість (занепад місцевого самоврядування, домінування архетипу "бідності"), литовсько-польський період (відхід від традиційного вічового самоврядування та запровадження магдебурзького права зі звуженням прав мешканців, а отже й архетипу "особиста свобода"), самоврядування в Російській та Австро-Угорській імперіях (фактична інкорпорація місцевого самоврядування до системи державної влади, повне нівелювання архетипу "особиста свобода"), радянський період (формальна наявність місцевого самоврядування, проте фактично воно включалось до системи державних органів влади), розвиток місцевого самоврядування в незалежній Україні з 1991 р. (повернення до традиційних архетипів, що існували в часи трипільської цивілізації, проте відхід від них в останні роки із поновленням архетипу "бідності"). Визначено основні проблеми, що виникли у процесі проведення реформи децентра-

лізації влади, запропоновано заходи їх вирішення, враховуючи історичний досвід та архетипи, характерні для українського суспільства. Також виділено коло наукових проблем, для вивчення яких необхідні додаткові наукові розробки з метою більш глибокого розуміння процесів, що відбувалися і знову повторюються, та пошуку можливих шляхів подолання таких проблем, що постали перед українським суспільством, зокрема, владою.

**Ключові слова:** архетипи, місцеве самоврядування, історія місцевого самоврядування, архетипи місцевого самоврядування, етапи розвитку місцевого самоврядування, реформа децентралізації влади.

## **АРХЕТИПНЫЕ ОСНОВЫ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОГО РАЗВИТИЯ МЕСТНОГО САМОУПРАВЛЕНИЯ НА ТЕРРИТОРИИ УКРАИНЫ**

**Аннотация.** Рассмотрены вопросы исторического развития местного самоуправления на территории Украины и возможного использования такого опыта при проведении реформы децентрализации власти с учетом основных архетипов, сложившихся в обществе. Рассмотрены восемь основных этапов развития местного самоуправления: трипольский (закладывание основ местного самоуправления и возникновение основных архетипов), этап существования древних славян и Киевской Руси (изменение структуры местной власти и сужение прав обычных жителей по управлению государством, уменьшение роли архетипа “личная свобода”), татаро-монгольское господство и раздробленность (упадок местного самоуправления, доминирование архетипа “бедности”), литовско-польский период (отход от традиционного вечевого самоуправления и внедрение магдебургского права с сужением прав жителей, а значит и архетипа “личная свобода”), самоуправление в Российской и Австро-Венгерской империях (фактическая инкорпорация местного самоуправления в систему государственной власти, полное нивелирование архетипа “личная свобода”), советский период (формальное наличие местного самоуправления, однако фактически оно включалось в систему государственных органов власти), развитие местного самоуправления в независимой Украине с 1991 года (возвращение к традиционным архетипам, которые существовали во времена трипольской цивилизации, однако отход от них в последние годы с возобновлением архетипа “бедности”). Определены основные проблемы, возникшие в процессе проведения реформы децентрализации власти, и предложены шаги для их решения, учитывая исторический опыт и архетипы, характерные для украинского общества. Обозначен круг научных проблем, для изучения которых необходимы дополнительные научные разработки с целью более глубокого понимания процессов, которые происходили и вновь повторяются, и поиска возможных путей преодоления таких проблем, стоящих перед украинским обществом, в частности, властью.

**Ключевые слова:** архетипы, местное самоуправление, история местного самоуправления, архетипы местного самоуправления, этапы развития местного самоуправления, реформа децентрализации власти.

**Problem statement.** A modern democratic, social, legal state and society cannot fully function without a developed system of local self-government. Carrying out the reform of decentralization of power in Ukraine should ensure the construction of new forms and content of municipal relations, ensure the creation of a new balanced model of the organization of power, including local, in the country. One of the aspects of such changes is to consider the customs and traditions that have developed in Ukraine over the years. However, so far, few people pay attention to this. In particular, the archetypal principles of the development of Ukrainian society and local self-government on the territory of our country remain insufficiently researched and considered. Therefore, the processes taking place in Ukraine necessitate research and creation of new scientific foundations for the development of an effective system of local self-government, in particular, in the application of archetypal principles that have historically developed in our country for many centuries of Ukrainian society.

**Analysis of recent publications** on the issues and identification of previously unsettled parts of the general problem. In scientific literature, the following scientists: R. T. Hromiaka, Yu. I. Kovaleva, V. I. Teremka, I. Drobot, M. Smarovailo, V. Zabolotskyi, A. Hubryk, N. V. Kaminska, A. Yu. Amosov, V. Vilizhinskyi, V. B. Antonovych, Ya. Chernysh, I. Butko, H. Shvydko, V. Romanov, Ye. Bruschenko and others turned to cover the development of local self-government.

O. V. Kohut, O. S. Strazhnyi, M. F. Yurii, I. V. Koziura and others

studied the traditions of the Ukrainian people, archetypes that have historically developed.

However, it should be noted that currently there is a very small number of works devoted to the study of the archetypal principles of local government development in Ukraine. Therefore, it is very important to ensure the creation of a sufficient scientific basis for the archetypal foundations of local self-government in Ukraine to apply these scientific developments in the reform of decentralization of power.

**The purpose of the article.** Analysis of the stages of development of local self-government in Ukraine, considering the archetypal principles and identification of further possible measures to improve the process of decentralization reform in Ukraine.

**Presentation of the main research material.** The emergence of the concepts of symbol and archetype is associated with the teaching of Plato, although the philosopher never directly used these concepts in his work. His ideas are imprints of the process of recollection, which are sometimes correlated with mythological reality. Some scholars believe that his teaching is the starting point of the doctrine of archetypes. In particular, according to the Literary Dictionary-Reference, the name of the ancient Greek philosopher is mentioned when interpreting the concept of 'archetype' [1, p. 64]. However, it should be noted that in those days the doctrine of archetypes was not developed and revealed at the scientific level.

The development of the doctrine of archetypes at the scientific level begins in the early twentieth century, when

C. G. Jung in his research, uses the concept of 'archetype' to denote the primary models contained in the collective unconscious. Archetype (from the Greek – 'prototype') is the original image, which determines the further development of the phenomenon. That is, it is a certain unconscious basis, which determines the possible directions of development. According to Jung, there is a group of obligatory elements in the unconscious, which are the main source of basic motives and memories inherent in all people. O. Kohut notes: 'The uniqueness of the archetype is that it appears not only in the context of the wise past, but also helps to build the landmarks of the present' [2, p. 23]. The main features of a nation and its mentality are reflected in the archetypes. They manifest themselves everywhere in history, cultural transformations, folklore, artistic creativity. At different times of the existence of the people, those archetypes that meet the needs of society and the understanding of people dominate. From the standpoint of archetypal analysis, we can consider the basic principles of local self-government in Ukraine from ancient times to the present.

As a rule, in the process of developing the systems of state and local government, local self-government and state power have always opposed each other, which inevitably led to conflicts. This was mainly because the highest levels of government belonged to foreigners (Rurikoviches, Mongol-Tatars, Poles, Lithuanians, Austro-Hungarians, Russians, etc.), and local power consisted mainly of local residents. Only since 1991, all managerial positions have been occupied by Ukrainians, al-

though in recent years this statement is controversial due to the significant number of people invited from other countries.

V. Vilzhinskyi in his dissertation research [3] substantiates the existence of the following six complex archetypes of local government development: value-ideological, legal, institutional-organizational, functional, personnel and resource. However, in my opinion, it is difficult to agree with such a position due to the lack of integrated directions of local self-government development on the territory of our state in the past, when the territory of Ukraine was divided into many parts between other states. We can only talk about these archetypes, since 1991, when our state officially became independent and the main possible directions for the development of local self-government were singled out. Based on the above, it seems necessary to consider the historical development of local self-government precisely in terms of individual common established archetypes ('land', 'mother', 'personal freedom', etc.).

It should be noted that among scientists there is no unity on the final definition of the stages of development of local self-government in Ukraine [3; 4]. Let's consider what are the main stages of development of local government and identify the main archetypes that are characteristic of a particular period. In my opinion, it is expedient to identify eight main stages of local government development in Ukraine. V. Zabolotskyi also identifies eight stages of development of local self-government (Kievan Rus, fragmentation and Tatar-Mongol invasion, Cossacks, Magdeburg Law, the Russian Empire,

the Central Rada, the USSR, modern Ukraine). However, his classification does not cover all the historical stages of the development of Ukrainian society and does not reveal individual features of a particular time, which will be considered in this study [4].

The first stage is the local self-government of the Trypillia civilization. I. Drobot and M. Smarovailo, based on the work of archaeologist Videiko 'The Trypillya Civilization' claim that democracy was well known to Trypillians. They made the most important decisions at the general meeting, and the elders organized their internal life [5, p. 248–249]. For this time, the following archetypes were inherent: 'personal freedom' (the ability to freely make decisions at general meetings and elect elders), 'Earth' (a high level of trust in the 'good mother of the Earth', respect for the Earth), and 'mother' (respect for women, the desire to preserve the motherland) [6; 7]. Each subsequent stage of development of local self-government in Ukraine is characterized by all these archetypes, except for the archetype of 'personal freedom', the weight of which is constantly decreasing, but over time gained importance and new archetypes, which disappeared and reappeared again. It should be noted that after the disappearance of the Trypillia civilization and until the times of Kievan Rus, local self-government did not exist. In the days of the Scythians, Sarmatians and other tribes that roamed the territory of modern Ukraine, the monarchical form of government prevailed, which provided for the existence of only central power in the person of the monarch and his assistants.

The second stage of development of local self-government is the times of Slavic tribes and the existence of Kievan Rus. According to N. Kaminska, in the ancient Kyiv state the subjects of self-government were, urban communities that enjoyed administrative, economic and judicial autonomy, on the one hand, and rural (neighbouring) communities-verva on the other one [8]. At this time, the archetype of 'ritualism' becomes important. All major issues of community life were decided by a chamber that had unlimited powers (in particular, princes were elected for 1 year [9]), as opposed to similar popular assemblies in Europe, which had the right to decide only on the election of government (e.g., prince-manager) [10]. However, over time, among the Slavs, princely power began to be inherited, which partially weakened the meaning of the archetype of 'personal freedom': 'Now we have something else, the princes of polyudye take and transfer power to their sons, from the father to the son, up to the great-grandson' [11, p. 149].

The next stage of development was local self-government at the time of the decline of Kievan Rus during the Tatar-Mongol invasion with the complete loss of the archetype of 'personal freedom' and the special recognition of the archetype of 'poverty' (the defensive response against robberies is to show that a person is poor, although perhaps this is not the case), which will be of leading importance among all the archetypes listed above until the years of independence. Peasant meetings still procedurally resembled a Veche, but they did not have such a breadth of powers as in the past [12, p. 30–31].

The fourth stage is the Lithuanian-Polish period, in which Magdeburg law was actively developing. This period marked the departure from traditional meetings of residents to address key issues and the transition to the existence of elected authorities run by the centre. Magdeburg Law meant the abolition of customary norms, and hence the reduction of the archetype of 'ritualism', the removal of the city from the jurisdiction of local administration and the introduction of municipal self-government as part of state power [13, p. 578].

The emergence of military democracy during the Cossacks marked the transition to the fifth stage of development of local self-government. This was a period of the revival of Ukrainian governing traditions. All archetypes in people's lives were revived. A. Hubryk distinguishes at this time the following three types of self-governing communities: 'regimental' or Cossack communities, which were governed by atamans and colonels, peasant communities led by bailiffs and Cossack-peasant communities of mixed type [14, p. 54]. The main governing body of the time was the council. At the same time, V. Antonovych, interpreting the essence of the Cossack council, emphasized that: 'The council was a response of the old Veche system' [15, p. 167]. At this time there is a revival of the archetype of 'personal freedom' which was so sought to destroy at the previous stage of formation of local self-government.

The sixth stage is the decline of local self-government during the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires. Local governments were formal. Although there were attempts to introduce local self-government, they were

not perceived by local residents. As J. Chernysh notes, local self-government 'cannot be formed from above, due to decentralization. In this case, a purely formal system of institutions will be created, which will not fulfil their real purpose, as it is impossible to artificially create any component of civil society' [16]. This statement, unfortunately, is still relevant today, when the central government, not knowing the situation on the ground, tries to divide the area into separate administrative-territorial units, guided exclusively by formal, often even financial, criteria.

After the decline of local self-government during the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, in the early twentieth century, there was an attempt to restore local self-government. Although the short period of existence of Ukrainian statehood in the 20s of the twentieth century did not make it possible to apply in practice the developments of the Ukrainian People's Republic, hereinafter referred to as the 'UPR' and the Central Rada in the field of local self-government, its development was significantly influenced by the draft law 'On Local Power and Local Self-Government' developed by the Central Rada and the Constitution of the UPR, which fixed the state system on the principles of decentralization (Article 5 of the Constitution of the UPR granted lands, volosts and communities the rights of broad self-government) [17].

The seventh stage was the final decline (we can say the abolition) of the system of local self-government during the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, hereinafter referred to as the

'USSR'. Formally, this system had all the hallmarks of local self-government, but councils and executive committees became part of the management vertical and were the lowest echelon of state power. According to the Constitution of the USSR in 1937, councils acted as representative and administrative bodies of state power at all levels [18], and in the norms of the Constitution of 1978, were enshrined as part of a single system of representative bodies of state power of Ukraine [19].

The last stage of development is the construction of a system of local self-government in independent Ukraine. At the beginning of independence, all the archetypes that were present in the local self-government of the Trypillia and Cossack eras were revived. However, according to the latest tendencies, due to instability and permanent crisis in our country, the archetype of 'poverty' is gaining special importance again. Criticism also deserves the approach to the reform of the decentralization of power, which is purely formal, disconnected from the real state of affairs on the ground. The current situation is reminiscent of the Times of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, which tried to impose a certain structure of local self-government from above, which was not perceived locally. In particular, the modern reform of the administrative-territorial structure provides for the change of administrative-territorial units following financial criteria (whether the community is financially capable), while all social institutions (hospitals, courts, police, prosecutor's office, etc.) will be difficult to access for ordinary citizens living in settlements remote from the centre.

Besides, this division eliminates the archetypes of 'land' (people perceive land not as wealth, but as formal territory), 'personal freedom' (residents do not decide anything), and 'mother' (due to the state of Public Administration, many citizens no longer seek to preserve their homeland and go to work, a permanent place of residence, or try to use as many resources as possible to earn more money).

**Conclusions and prospects for further researches.** Based on the above, it should be noted that our state urgently needs to start forming a professional apparatus of Public Administration, adhere to the established main archetypes ('earth', 'mother', 'personal freedom', etc.) when carrying out reforms, and especially the reform of the decentralization of power. Besides, it is important to bring in line with the archetypal principles of the historical development of local self-government in modern Ukraine the changes that have already taken place, otherwise we risk losing statehood. The historical experience of local self-government development considered in this study allows us to state unequivocally that as soon as the archetype of 'poverty' began to gain weight, and other archetypes lost their positions, Ukrainians lost even the crumbs of local self-government and statehood. This is evidenced, in particular, by the periods of the Tatar-Mongol invasion, the Lithuanian-Polish period, and the periods of Russian and Austro-Hungarian rule. I believe that an in-depth study of the causal relationship of the archetype of 'poverty' and other archetypes with tendencies in the development of local self-government requires additional scientific study.



## REFERENCES

1. Ghromiaka R. T. (Eds.). (2006). *Literaturoznavchyy slovnyk-dovidnyk* [Literary dictionary-reference book]. Kyiv: VC "Akademiia" [in Ukrainian].
2. Kohut O. V. (2010). *Arkhetypni siuzhety i obrazy v suchasni ukrainskii dramaturhii (1997–2007)* [Archetypal plots and images in modern Ukrainian drama (1997–2007)]. Rivne: NUVHP [in Ukrainian].
3. Vilizhynskiy V. M. (2019). Vidtvorennia natsionalnykh tradytsii vriaduvannia v systemi mistsevoho samovriaduvannia Ukrainy [Reproduction of national traditions of governance in the system of local self-government of Ukraine]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Odesa: ORIDU [in Ukrainian].
4. Zablotskyi V. V. (2015). Osoblyvosti rozvytku ta rolj miscevoho samovriaduvannia v systemi publichnoi vlady na terenakh Ukrainy [Features of development and the role of local self-government in the system of public power in Ukraine]. *Derzhavne upravlinnja: udoskonalennja ta rozvytok – Public administration: improvement and development*. 4. Retrieved from: <http://www.dy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=836> [in Ukrainian].
5. Drobot I., Smarovailo M. (2004). Peredumovy vynykennia mistsevoho samovriaduvannia [Prerequisites for the emergence of local self-government]. *Aktualni problemy derzhavnoho upravlinnja: zb. nauk. prats – Current problems of public administration: a collection of scientific papers*. Vol. 2 (18), (p. 324). ORIDU [in Ukrainian].
6. Strazhnyi O. S. (2008). *Ukrainskyi mentalitet: iliuzii, mify, realnist* [Ukrainian mentality: illusions, myths, reality]. Kyiv: Knyha [in Ukrainian].
7. Jurii M. F. (1997). *Etnohenez ta mentalitet ukrainskoho narodu* [Ethnogenesis and mentality of the Ukrainian people]. Kyiv: Takson.
8. Kaminska N. V. (2008). Evoliucija pohliadiv na znachennia mistsevoho samovriaduvannia u rozbudovi ukrainskoi derzhavnosti: istorykopravovi aspekty [Evolution of views on the importance of local self-government in the development of Ukrainian statehood: historical and legal aspects]. *Naukovyj visnyk Lvivskoho derzhavnogo universytetu vnutrishnikh sprav – Scientific Bulletin of Lviv State University of Internal Affairs*, 3. Retrieved from: [https://www.lvduvs.edu.ua/documents\\_pdf/visnyky/nvsy/03\\_2008/08knvdia.pdf](https://www.lvduvs.edu.ua/documents_pdf/visnyky/nvsy/03_2008/08knvdia.pdf) [in Ukrainian].
9. Kovbasiuk Yu. V., Amosov O. Yu., Ihnatenko O. S., Kuznetsov A. O. et al. (Eds.). (2011). *Verv. Entsyklopediia derzhavnoho upravlinnja* [Verv. Encyclopedia of Public Administration]. (Vols. 1–8). Kharkiv: Vyd-vo KharRI NADU "Mahistr" [in Ukrainian].
10. Butko I. (1994). *Mistseve samovriaduvannia v Ukraini* [Local self-government in Ukraine]. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
11. Koziura I. V. (2011). Samovriadni tradytsii skhidnykh slovian [Self-governing traditions of the Eastern Slavs]. Reformuvannia systemy derzhavnoho upravlinnja ta derzhavnoi sluzhby: teoriia i praktyka: proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference – *Reforming the system of public administration and civil service: theory and practice: materials of scientific-practical conferences with international participation*. (Vol. 2), (p. 148–150). Lviv: LRIDU NADU [in Ukrainian].
12. Shvydko H., Romanov V. (1997). *Derzhavne upravlinnja i mistseve samovriaduvannia v Ukraini: istorychni narays* [Public administration and local self-government in Ukraine: a histori-

- cal sketch]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo UADU [in Ukrainian].
13. Brushchenko Ye. (2008) Natsionalnyj pidkhdid pry formuvanni terytorialnykh hromad v konteksti zarubizhnogho dosvidu [National approach to the formation of territorial communities in the context of foreign experience]. *Aktualni problemy yevropeiskoi intehratsii — Current issues of European integration*, 3, 577–580 [in Ukrainian].
  14. Hubryk O. (1997). Silska Hromada v Ukraini XIV–XVIII st. [Rural community in Ukraine of the XIV–XV centuries]. *Ukrainskyj istorychnyj zhurnal — Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 5, 52–66 [in Ukrainian].
  15. Antonovych V. B. (1991). *Pro kozatski chasy na Ukraini* [About the Cossack times in Ukraine]. Kyiv: Dnipro [in Ukrainian].
  16. Chernysh Ya. (n.d.). *Spivvidnoshennia mistsevoho samovriaduvannia ta demokratsii: osnovni pidkhody* [Correlation of local government and democracy: basic approaches]. Retrieved from <http://intkonf.org/chernish-yav-spivvidnoshennya-mistsevogo-samovriaduvannya-ta-demokratiyi-osnovni-pidhodi/> [in Ukrainian].
  17. Konstytuciia Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky (Statut pro derzhavnyj ustroi, prava i vilnosti UNR) [Constitution of the Ukrainian People's Republic (Statute on the State System, Rights and Freedoms of the Ukrainian People's Republic)]. (n.d.). *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/n0002300-18> [in Ukrainian].
  18. Konstytuciia URSR [Constitution of the USSR]. (1937). *zakon.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <http://gska2.rada.gov.ua/site/const/istoriya/1937.html> [in Ukrainian].
  19. Konstytuciia URSR [Constitution of the USSR]. (1978). *zakon4.rada.gov.ua*. Retrieved from <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/888-09> [in Ukrainian].
- ## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ
1. Літературознавчий словник-довідник / за ред. Р. Т. Гром'яка, Ю. І. Ковалева, В. І. Теремка. 2-ге вид, випр. і допов. Київ: ВЦ “Академія”, 2006. 752 с.
  2. *Козут О. В.* Архетипні сюжети й образи в сучасній українській драматургії (1997–2007 рр.) : монографія. Нац. ун-т вод. госп-ва та природокористування. Рівне : НУВГП, 2010. 440 с.
  3. *Віліжінський В. М.* Відтворення національних традицій врядування в системі місцевого самоврядування України: автореф. дис. ... канд. наук з держ. упр.: спец. 25.00.04 “Місьцеве самоврядування”. Одеса: ОРІДУ, 2019. 20 с.
  4. *Заблоцький В. В.* Особливості розвитку та роль місцевого самоврядування в системі публічної влади на теренах України // Державне управління: удосконалення та розвиток. № 4. 2015. URL: <http://www.du.nauka.com.ua/?op=1&z=836> (дата звернення: 20.11.2020).
  5. *Дробот І., Смаровайло М.* Передумови виникнення місцевого самоврядування // Актуальні проблеми державного управління: зб. наук. праць. ОРІДУ, 2004. Вип. 2 (18). 324 с.
  6. *Стражний О. С.* Український менталітет: ілюзії, міфи, реальність. Київ : Книга, 2008. 368 с.
  7. *Юрій М. Ф.* Етногенез та менталітет українського народу. Київ: Таксон, 1997. 237 с.
  8. *Камінська Н. В.* Еволюція поглядів на значення місцевого самоврядування у розбудові української державності: історико-правові аспекти.

- ти // Наук. вісник Львівського держ. ун-ту внутрішніх справ. 2008. № 3. URL: [https://www.lvduvs.edu.ua/documents\\_pdf/visnyky/pvsvy/03\\_2008/08knvdiia.pdf](https://www.lvduvs.edu.ua/documents_pdf/visnyky/pvsvy/03_2008/08knvdiia.pdf) (дата звернення: 23.11.2020).
9. Енциклопедія державного управління: у 8 т. / Нац. акад. держ. упр. При Президентіві України; наук.-ред. колегія: Ю. В. Ковбасюк (голова) та ін. Т. 5: Територіальне управління / наук.-ред. колегія: О. Ю. Амосов (співголова), О. С. Ігнатенко (співголова) та ін. ; за ред. О. Ю. Амосова, О. С. Ігнатенка, А. О. Кузнецова. Харків: Вид-во ХарПІ НАДУ "Магістр", 2011. 408 с.
  10. *Бутко І.* Місцеве самоврядування в Україні. Київ. 1994. 160 с.
  11. *Козюра І. В.* Самоврядні традиції східних слов'ян. Реформування системи державного управління та державної служби: теорія і практика: матеріали наук.-практ. конф. за міжнар. уч. (Львів, 8 квітня 2011 р.). Львів: ЛРІДУ НАДУ, 2011. Ч. 2. С. 148–150.
  12. *Швидько Г., Романов В.* Державне управління і місцеве самоврядування в Україні: історичний нарис. Київ: Вид-во УАДУ, 1997. Ч. 1. 140 с.
  13. *Брущенко Є.* Національний підхід при формуванні територіальних громад у контексті зарубіжного досвіду // Актуальні проблеми європейської інтеграції. Одеса: Фенікс, 2008. Вип. 3. С. 577–580.
  14. *Губрик О.* Сільська громада в Україні XIV–XVIII ст. // Український істор. журн. 1997. № 5. С. 52–66.
  15. *Антонович В. Б.* Про козацькі часи на Україні. Київ: Дніпро, 1991. 238 с.
  16. *Черниш Я.* Співвідношення місцевого самоврядування та демократії: основні підходи. URL: <http://intkonf.org/chernish-yav-spivvidnoshennya-mistseвого-samovryaduvannya-ta-demokratiyi-osnovni-pidhodi/> (дата звернення: 23.11.2020).
  17. Конституція Української Народної Республіки (Статут про державний устрій, права і вільності УНР) URL: <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/n0002300-18> (дата звернення: 23.11.2020).
  18. Конституція УРСР від 30 січня 1937 р. URL: <http://gska2.rada.gov.ua/site/const/istoriya/1937.html> (дата звернення: 23.11.2020).
  19. Конституція УРСР від 20 квітня 1978 р. URL: <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/888-09> (дата звернення: 23.11.2020).