

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2227-6505-2022-35-09>

УДК 930.1:94(100«653»: 001.817 (477«2012/2022»)

M. E. DOMANOVSKA

PhD (History), Ukrainian Studies Department,

e-mail: marina.domanovska@karazin.ua ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4287-7620>*V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University*

4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine

A. M. DOMANOVSKYI

PhD (History), Docent, Ukrainian Studies Department,

e-mail: gestabaudolini@gmail.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8434-3374>*V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University*

4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine

BYZANTINE STUDIES IN DISSERTATIONS PRODUCED BY UKRAINIAN SCHOLARS, 2012-2022 (HISTORICAL SCIENCES)

The article reviews the dissertations on Byzantine studies, which have been defended in Ukraine over the past decade in historical specialties within the field of “historical sciences”. Byzantine studies in Ukraine, as in previous periods, continue to develop in institutional centers, among which are V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, M. S. Grushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies NASU, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, National Reserve “Sophia of Kyiv”, I. I. Mechnikov Odessa National University etc. The range of dissertations of an interdisciplinary nature is expanding, in particular, historical, theological, historical and philosophical topics are gaining popularity, and art criticism and musicology are becoming popular.

The review identifies the reasons for the reduction in the number of defended dissertations in Byzantine studies during 2012–2022 in the comparison to previous periods. However, the studies presented in the review are original, based on the latest methods and achievements of world science, and they also determine further vectors of the development of Ukrainian Byzantine studies in the near future.

Key words: Byzantine studies, Byzantine studies, dissertation research, 2012–2022.

Як цитувати: Домановська М.Є., Домановський А.М. Візантиністика в дисертаційних студіях науковців України, 2012–2022 (історичні науки). *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія: Історія України. Українознавство: історичні та філософські науки*. 2022. Вип. 35. С. 89-106. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2227-6505-2022-35-09>

In cites: Domanovska M.E., Domanovskyi A.M. (2022). Byzantine Studies in dissertations produced by Ukrainian scholars, 2012–2022 (Historical Sciences). *V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University Bulletin «History of Ukraine. Ukrainian Studies: Historical and Philosophical Sciences»*, Issue 35, (89-106) DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2227-6505-2022-35-09> (in English).

This review³ continues the effort to analyze research in the field of Byzantine studies in Ukrainian historiography. It has been eleven years since the previous reviews of dissertation-level

³ The study was carried out with the support of grant programs: Dumbarton Oaks Mentorship Program and Research Grants for Scholars Affected by the Conflict in Ukraine (2022, Washington DC, the USA) and Shevchenko Emergency Fund to support Ukrainian Scholars and Artists displaced by war (Shevchenko Scientific Society in New York, the USA).

We express our sincere gratitude to our American colleagues for their support in the conditions of Russian-Ukrainian War.

©Домановська М.Є., Домановський А.М., 2022

studies in Byzantinology [9; 10], which covered the period from 2007 to 2011. The ongoing Russian-Ukrainian war has brought about new, almost insurmountable challenges for Ukrainian Byzantinologists. Further reduction of the traditionally modest funding of science and education in Ukraine, the transfer of academics to part-time positions, an increase in the academic workload, temporary or permanent emigration, change of profession and service in the ranks of the Armed Forces – in such conditions, a reduction in scholarly output, including dissertation studies, comes as no surprise.

In the dynamics of dissertation-level research in Ukraine as a whole, a significant decline in activity is noticeable both in terms of dissertation defenses and publications in Byzantine studies. Since 2014, the annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation and cessation of archaeological work by Ukrainian expeditions have had a noticeable impact on scholarship. Researchers lost access to the sites of Byzantine Crimea and to the archive of the museum of the National Preserve of Tauric Chersonesos. In addition, the prolonged quarantine measures during the COVID-19 pandemic and the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine for a long time made it impossible for many Ukrainian Byzantine scholars to work in Ukrainian and foreign archives and libraries.

As in the period from 2007 to 2011, which was considered in the above-mentioned reviews, during the last decade building a shared informational and institutional space, a professional community of Byzantine experts from different regions of Ukraine that could bring together scholars working in philology, history, art history, philosophy, theology, etc., has remained a pressing concern. For a long time, this role was partially fulfilled by the website “Basileus. Ukrainian Byzantine Studies” [3; 8]. It called attention to the publication of monographs and articles and defense of dissertations, posted overviews of conferences and round tables, and covered other events. However, for a number of reasons, currently the website is almost never updated.

In 2016 Serhiy Sorochan, Kostiantyn Bardola, and Andriy Domanovsky founded the public organization Ukrainian Association of Byzantine Studies in Kharkiv. It has an active Facebook page, but almost all of the content is pre-war.

The new publication *Byzantinoucrainica* [2] has promise. It is a thematic collection that the editor plans to transform into a periodical and publish annually. Unfortunately, it owes its existence to the efforts of one enthusiast, Dmytro Gordiyenko, a senior researcher at the M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences. The first volume came out shortly before the start of the war; it remains to be hoped that the publication will become regular and will indeed play the role of a specialized Byzantinological periodical, which will bring together Byzantine researchers from various disciplines. Notably, the efforts of Dmytro Gordiyenko and Vyacheslav Kornienko were also responsible for the publication of the collection *Sofia of Kyiv. Byzantium. Rus'. Ukraine* from 2011 to 2016, special issues of which were dedicated to the anniversaries of the prominent Byzantine scholars Nadiya Nikitenko, Dmytro Ainalov, Yehor Redin, Nikodym Kondakov, and Fyodor Uspensky [12]. It was through no fault of the editors that this quality publication had to be discontinued.

The collection *The Byzantine Mosaic* was published in Kharkiv for eight years and featured the texts of open lectures delivered at the Helleno-Byzantine Lectorium, which functioned at the Church of Saint Panteleimon in Kharkiv. The publication was the print organ of the Inter-institutional Sector of Byzantine Studies at V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University – an informal association of historians and theologians [1]. Nine issues came out from 2013 to 2021, but, unfortunately, it is currently discontinued.

The overview of dissertations in Byzantine studies defended from 2012 to 2022 will be limited to those dissertations that were defended in historical specializations within the field of ‘Historical Sciences.’ We by no means intend to give a comprehensive analysis of the scholarly accomplishment of every dissertation author, which is impossible, both in view of the thematic specificity of every dissertation and due to the lack of a necessary time perspective and ‘reception/integration’ of the results of these studies in Ukrainian and global historiography. However, they deserve detailed

attention from Byzantine scholars, since it is they that determine the future vectors of development of our complex and, in a way, 'orchid-like' field.

A notable phenomenon in recent years has been the appearance of more than a dozen dissertations on Byzantine topics defended in non-historical specializations, such as 'Aesthetics,' 'Musicology,' 'Theory and History of Culture,' 'Pedagogy,' 'Fine Arts,' 'Religious Studies,' or 'Law.' These works once again testify to the interdisciplinary nature of Byzantine studies and will certainly become the subject of our attention in the future.

Dissertations on Byzantine-related subjects defended in the historical specializations can be provisionally grouped into several research brackets: Byzantine Crimea, Byzantium-Rus'-Ukraine, Byzantine history, and historiographical studies. We would like to point out that the list of dissertations considered in this overview is far from exhaustive in any way and can be expanded in further studies. Furthermore, in recent years Ukrainian scholars not only have been actively researching Byzantine themes in the traditional historical and philosophical-theological field, but also put out a whole series of works in the fields of art history and musicology.

The dissertations of Vadym Maiko, Mykhailo Nikiforov, Kateryna Motsia, and Maria Parkhomenko can be grouped under the heading of 'Byzantium-Crimea.'

Vadym Maiko's doctoral dissertation "Southeastern Crimea in the Second Half of the 10th to 12th Centuries" was defended in 2012 at the Institute of Archeology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine [18] in the specialization 07.00.04 – Archeology. Chronologically, the work deals with the Byzantine period and, according to the author, aims to offer a general picture of the development of the southeastern region of the peninsula in the 10th to 12th centuries.

Vadym Maiko proposes to compensate for the limited source base, which is due to the sparse population of the eastern and southern parts of Crimea, by considering comparative material from southern Crimea, Taman, the North Caucasus, and the Balkans. The author was a long-time participant in the archaeological excavations at Sugdeia and Bosphorus and undertook the attribution and publication of the materials that he actively uses in his dissertation.

The work is primarily an archaeological study, which could probably be reflected in the title. Despite the fact that the author cites and engages with an extensive selection of written sources, even a cursory glance at the contents of the chapters shows the predominance of archaeological material. In the historiographical overview, the author notes that from the mid-1950s to the 1980s, researchers traditionally viewed the culture of the population of southeastern Crimea as Byzantine, and in the late 20th and early 21st centuries the majority of scholars held the same opinion (S. Sorochan, Yu. Moharychev, A. Sazanov, and others) [18, p. 7–9]. V. Maiko, however, contests this idea in view of the polyethnicity of the region's population and the lack of information in the written sources about any kind of mass wave of Greek immigration to the area. Limiting himself to a brief review of written, sphragistic, and numismatic sources, the author in his abstract makes no mention of the archaeological sources he uses, and does not even name the areas where he personally carried out archaeological excavations. Perhaps this can be explained by the space limitations of the abstract; these aspects may be addressed at length in the dissertation itself, which, unfortunately, cannot be accessed.

A large part of the main text of the work is devoted to the analysis of archaeological material. The author focuses his attention on residential and farm buildings and workshops, fortifications, temples, necropolises, ceramics, weapons and horse harness, agricultural implements, handicrafts and household objects, jewelry and elements of costume, and objects of Christian worship. The researcher also traces the gradual spread of Byzantine rule in the region bordering on Khazaria, Byzantium, and the principality of Tmutarakan.

As Vadym Maiko notes in the conclusions, beginning in the mid-10th century southeastern Crimea progressively loses its distinct regional features. All elements of material culture, architecture, fortifications, etc. develop similarities with other regions of the peninsula. The unprecedented growth of maritime trade, spread of imperial fashions and lifestyle, Christianization and political dependence all contribute to the formation of a version of the "provincial Byzantine culture of the Middle Byzantine period [characteristic of] the empire's Black Sea provinces, abandoned by the local 'non-

Roman' population" [18, p. 29]. Thus, the results of the study in fact disprove the author's cautious suggestion about the distinctiveness of southeastern Crimea and preservation of regional features.

In 2013, the Institute of Archeology of the National Academy of Sciences hosted the defense of *Mykhailo Nikiforov's Candidate's thesis "The Byzantine Possessions in Mountain Crimea, First Half of the 9th to Early 13th Centuries,"* [Nikiforov] specialization 07.00.02 – World History. According to the author, it was from the mountainous parts of Crimea, where the *theme* of Klimata was founded, that the empire gradually spread its influence over the Northern Black Sea region and established contacts with the Pechenegs and Cumans [23, p. 1]. Like his colleague Vadym Maiko, Mykhailo Nikiforov strives to make a comprehensive study of a Crimean region of the Byzantine era, clearly stressing the reconstruction of its political history. The author focuses on the dynamics of the implementation of the *theme* system, the analysis of the interpretation of the Greek terms *κλιματα* and *pakton*, and the clarification of the chronology of Petronas Kamateros' mission to build the Sarkel fortress on the Don, as well as on the foundation of the first Byzantine *theme* in Crimea [23, p. 3–4].

Mykhailo Nikiforov adheres to the chronological order of presentation in the chapters "Review of the Literature on the Subject and the Source Base of the Study," "Creation of the *Theme* of Klimata in Crimea," "Mountain Crimea in the First Half of the 9th to Second Half of the 10th Centuries," and "Mountain Crimea in the Late 10th to Early 13th Centuries," tracing the evolution of Byzantine power in Mountain Crimea. Overall, the author places the height of Byzantine influence in Mountain Crimea within the first half of the 11th century, when Byzantine administration spread across the entire region. M. Nikiforov sees the second half of the 11th century as a period of the weakening of imperial power in Mountain Crimea, and connects this development with the strengthening of the Cumans; he dates the final loss of this region by Byzantium to the year 1204 [23, p. 12].

Both the Department of Byzantinology of the Crimean Branch of the A. Yu. Krymsky Institute of Oriental Studies of the NASU and the Crimean Branch of the Institute of Archeology of the NASU were founded in the first years of Ukrainian independence. Unfortunately, after the annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation in 2014, they suffered irreparable losses, since a significant number of specialists remained in occupied Crimea, including the aforementioned Vadym Maiko and Mykhailo Nikiforov, and the institutions themselves were merged with other entities.

The theme of Byzantine Crimea is continued in *Kateryna Motsia's Candidate's thesis on "Byzantine art of war in Taurica in IV – the beginning of XII a. d."* [21], defended in 2016 in the specialization 07.00.01 – History of Ukraine. The researcher focuses on the regional specificity and local manifestations of the Byzantine military doctrine in Crimea. She sets out to characterize the functioning of Byzantine fortifications and the legal status, ethnic composition, and numerical strength of the Byzantine military contingent in Crimea, as well as give an overview of the Byzantines' weaponry and military-administrative organization [21, p. 3–4].

The chronological boundaries of the study are notable for their ambition – from 395, when almost simultaneously with the official establishment of the Eastern Empire the Crimean Peninsula found itself in its sphere of interests, to 1204, when, with the formation of the Trebizond Empire, Byzantium finally lost its positions in the Northern Black Sea region.

In a comprehensive and thorough review of the literature and sources, the author notes the lack of a general study of the military arts in Byzantine Crimea and states that the basic strategy of the study is to verify the evidence of the written sources through the analysis of epigraphic, numismatic, and sphragistic data and archaeological material [21, p. 8].

The structure of the work is highly effective: the chapter on "Fortifications" considers cave cities and coastal fortresses and analyzes the functioning of the defensive structures of Tauric Chersonesus and the *kleisourai* of Taurica as the main element of Byzantium's defense strategy in Crimea. The chapter on "The Weaponry of the Byzantine Troops and Their Allies" examines close combat weapons, projectile weapons, and artillery. The chapter "The Military-Administrative Organization, Tactics, and Strategy of Byzantium in Taurica" summarizes information about the Byzantine military-administrative system, the empire's strategic plans, and key features of warfare on land and at sea.

Kateryna Motsia gives an elegant analysis of Byzantine military affairs in Crimea, tracing changes and developments from the 4th to the early 12th centuries. She throws light on the principles of organization and functioning of border defense in southern and southwestern Crimea, the weaponry, and the evolution of the military-administrative system and its correlation with the empire-wide administrative apparatus. Special attention is paid to the strategic plans of Byzantium in Taurica and their evolution during the period under discussion. Given the depth and originality of the work, it is regrettable that it has not been published as a monograph.

The Candidate's thesis of Maria Parkhomenko on "Daily life of Byzantine Chersonesos-Cherson (4th–10th centuries)" [24] was completed in one of the leading centers of Byzantine studies in Ukraine, the Department of Ancient and Medieval History at V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University under the supervision of Serhiy Sorochan, and defended in 2018 in the specialization 07.00.02 – World History. Unfortunately, to date it remains the latest study in Ukrainian historiography devoted to the subject of Byzantine Crimea.

M. Parkhomenko employs the technique of 'drawing out' or distilling the structures of the Chersonites' everyday life, including household, economic, public, medical, and others. This makes it possible to go beyond the description of everyday life and uncover attitudes of a Roman-Chersonite individual towards these structures. The work draws on the principles of historical psychology and historical anthropology. The reconstruction of the living conditions and arrangements in medieval Chersonesos-Kherson and the anthropological appearance and diet of the city's inhabitants using the data of paleoclimatology, paleozoology, and paleobotany is certainly innovative. Such a research approach can become the basis for the study of other cities of ancient and Byzantine Crimea, as it significantly expands traditional approaches, which are often limited to the characterization of material culture [24, p. 2].

The author makes a compelling argument regarding the scholarly originality of the study. Despite the fact that the limited scope of the work allows for only a cursory outline of the basic issues, the non-traditional formulation of questions that are relevant for the analysis of structures of everyday life in any period and region in the history of Ukraine deserves attention.

The work engages a vast historiography and draws on a broad selection of sources – in addition to written, epigraphic, numismatic, and sphragistic materials, the authors uses the results of archaeological excavations in Chersonesus, including materials from the archive of the National Preserve of Tauric Chersonesos [24, p. 10–11]. The latter fact deserves special mention, since the author managed to do important work with these, without a doubt, priceless materials in time before the annexation of the Crimean peninsula by the aggressor state.

In the chapter on "The Urban Space of Chersonesus-Kherson in the Context of the Criteria of the Quality of Life of a Byzantine Citizen," attention is focused on the local climatic conditions and their role in the shaping of urban space. The author offers a detailed review of the functioning of the public infrastructure and facilities (military and administrative buildings, baths, restrooms, barbershops, hospitals, the theater, etc). The chapter on "The Chersonite's Living Space" explores ideas about a perfect home and the traditional elements of a residential building in Chersonesus-Kherson. The chapter "The Chersonite within the Structures of Everyday Life" considers the ethnic composition and anthropological appearance of the Chersonites, the local cuisine and foodstuffs, and the clothing and appearance of the city's inhabitants.

The work clarifies the reasons for changes in the city's topography and planning in the 4th to 10th centuries and specifics of the functioning of the urban infrastructure. The author surveys the topographical features of the city from the point of view of residential construction, reconsiders the role and place of the barbarian component in the ethnic composition of Chersonesus, proves the prevalence of protein food in the diet of the Chersonites, and attempts to reconstruct the clothing of the townspeople in the early medieval era. Parkhomenko concludes that, in terms of comfort and welfare, the daily life of the early medieval Chersonites was not far removed from the life of the inhabitants of other Byzantine cities. The townspeople sought to preserve traditions of antiquity, but climatic conditions, wars, and diseases forced them to respond to challenges. By the 10th century, the Chersonite had become a Christian of barbarian appearance, consuming mostly protein food, living

in a scaled-down copy of a manor house from classical antiquity, and wearing mostly woolen clothes, common since antiquity. Thus, Chersonesus was a typical Byzantine peripheral center that shared values, problems, and ways of solving them with the empire as a whole [24, p. 19–20].

The dissertations of Dmytro Gordiyenko, Oleksandr Romensky, Vyacheslav Kornienko, Olha Kozachok, Ihor Lylio, and Serhiy Shumylo may be grouped under the heading 'Byzantium-Rus'-Ukraine.'

Dmytro Gordiyenko's Candidate's thesis "The Byzantium-Rus' Relations during Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' Ruling in the Context of the Byzantium Foreign Policy (912–959)." [5] was defended in 2013 in the specialization 07.00.02 – World History. The author sets out to define the characteristics of Byzantine-Rus' relations during the reign of Constantine VII and aims to determine their influence on the formation of the foreign policy conceptions of Kyiv and Constantinople [5, p. 3].

According to D. Gordiyenko, the Rus' vector of Byzantine foreign policy during the reign of Constantine VII is understudied, touched upon only in general works; its analysis requires engaging with the entire complex of Byzantine, Rus', Western European and Arab sources [5, p. 6].

The chapter on "Characteristics of Byzantine Foreign Policy during the Reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus" focuses on the place of Constantine VII in the history of Byzantium, analyzes the political doctrine of Byzantium during the reign of the Macedonian dynasty, and identifies Byzantium's religious mission as an important factor in the imperial foreign policy. In the chapter "Rus' in the Foreign Policy of Byzantium under Constantine VII," the author considers the questions of the role of Rus' as a subject in Byzantium's foreign policy, the Rus' factor in Byzantine security policy, and the Byzantine-Rus' relations as defined by the treaties of 911 and 944. D. Gordiyenko pays special attention to Princess Olha's visit to Constantinople, analyzes in depth the problem of the place and time of Olha's baptism, and dwells in detail on the causes and consequences of Olha's embassy to Constantinople.

D. Gordiyenko disagrees with the view, widely shared in historiography, that Constantine VII was a weak ruler, noting that in his time the empire entered a period of prosperity. It was during this era that the Byzantine political doctrine took shape; important treatises were produced by intellectuals belonging to the scholarly and literary coterie around Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The author examines the principles and components of the foreign policy of the empire of the Romans in the first half of the 10th century, traces the emergence of the Kyivan state as a subject and object of foreign policy, and analyzes trade relations between Byzantium and Rus' from the standpoint of economic security.

For the first time in historiography, the researcher establishes the exact date of the baptism of Princess Olha (on the night of October 17–18, 957 in Constantinople) based on analysis of the evidence from the *De Cerimoniis* in the context of the ritual practice of the Byzantine Church [5, p. 12–14]. The dissertation puts forward many original suggestions and arguments, which are developed further in the author's numerous subsequent publications. Today, Dmytro Gordiyenko is, without a doubt, one of the leading figures in Ukrainian Byzantine studies, known as not only an original scholar and teacher, but also the organizer of numerous academic events and a tireless editor of a number of periodicals, among which of particular importance for the development of Byzantine studies in Ukraine are *Sofia of Kyiv: Byzantium. Rus'. Ukraine, Byzantinoucrainica*, and, in part, *Ucrainica Mediaevalia*.

Oleksandr Romensky's Candidate's thesis "Rus' in the Foreign Policy of Byzantium in the Last Quarter of the 10th Century" [25] was defended in 2015 in the specialization 07.00.02 – World History. The author produced it in the already-mentioned Kharkiv center of Byzantine studies, headed by Serhii Sorochan. It is close in subject matter to Dmytro Gordiyenko's study, and the two historians have debated each other on many occasions. According to Oleksandr Romensky, the empire's view of Rus' and the surrounding 'barbarian' periphery remains poorly understood, including such questions as the circumstances of the establishment of the Byzantine-Rus' alliance, the form, nature, and content of the treaty between Prince Volodymyr and Emperor Basil II, the chronology of Byzantine-Rus' relations in the last quarter of the 10th century, the causes and chronology of the war

in southwestern Taurica (the Korsun campaign), the place and time of the baptism of the Kyivan prince, and church organization in Rus' in the early stages of its development. The author also emphasizes the need to study the relations between Byzantium and Rus' taking into account internal problems of the Byzantine state and the political crisis manifested in the armed insurrections of usurpers (*apostasies*) in 976–979 and 987–989 [25, p. 1–2].

All these questions are explored in the chapters on “The Struggle for Power in Byzantium in 976–989 and the ‘Tauroscythians,’” “The War between Rus' and Byzantium in Southwestern Taurica,” “Rus' in Byzantine Diplomacy in the Last Quarter of the 10th Century,” and “Byzantium and the Baptism of Rus' in the Late 10th Century.”

The study offers a detailed analysis of the internal political situation in Byzantium in 976–989 and its impact on the foreign policy of the empire, the dating of the Battle of Chrysopolis between the armies of Basil II and Bardas Phokas as the *terminus ante quem* for the formation of the alliance between Rus' and Byzantium (March 989), and arguments in favor of the idea that Volodymyr's Korsun campaign stemmed from the desire to control the Baltic-Black Sea route ‘from the Varangians to the Greeks’ and secure the rights and privileges of the Rus' elite in commercial and diplomatic relations with Byzantium. O. Romensky refutes the view about 22 violations of the matrimonial agreement with Rus' by Byzantium, considers the contents and circumstances of conclusion of the Russo-Byzantine treaty, which he dates to the spring-summer of 988, traces the diplomatic and political significance of the marriage of Princess Anna to Volodymyr, confirms the view about the baptism and marriage of the prince in Kherson in the Great Agora on the Easter or Pentecost of 988, and marshals evidence in favor of dating the baptism of the Kyivans to between July 20 and August 1, 988. The researcher connects the delay in the creation of a metropolitan see in Rus' with the church policy of Basil II and the vacancy of the patriarchal see in Constantinople [25, p. 16–17].

O. Romensky has developed individual points of the dissertation in numerous publications; however, most of them have been published in Russian journals and collections, because in 2018, motivated by his love for Chersonesus and desire to work in the preserve and its museum, Oleksandr Romensky made the decision to move to the territory temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation.

Vyacheslav Kornienko's doctoral dissertation “Graffiti of the St. Sophia in Kyiv of the 11th – the Beginning of the 18th Century: an Information Potential of the Source” [16] was defended in 2015 in the specialization 07.00.06 – Historiography, Source Studies, and Special Historical Disciplines.

The researcher focuses on the epigraphic artifacts (graffiti) of St. Sophia's Cathedral in Kyiv, which, unlike written sources, have not been influenced by later scribes and therefore represent authentic sources for the history of Ukraine in the Middle Ages. During 2006–2012, V. Kornienko discovered more than seven thousand graffiti dating from the 11th to early 18th centuries, which are included in the author's twelve-volume *Corpus of the Graffiti of the Sophia of Kyiv*. In the dissertation, Kornienko aims not only to catalog the inscriptions on the walls of the cathedral, but also to read, interpret, and determine the informational potential of the epigraphic artifacts from the Sophia of Kyiv as a historical source [16, p. 3].

In the chapter “Characteristics of the Author's Original Methodology of Epigraphic Study in the Sophia of Kyiv,” Kornienko makes a detailed analysis of the currently used methods of study, classification, and dating of the graffiti in St. Sophia's Cathedral. The chapter on “The Graffiti as a Source for the Study of the History, Architecture, and Artwork of St. Sophia's Cathedral” focuses on the new data throwing additional light on the dating of the cathedral's construction. The author notes that the graffiti are a unique and authentic source for the history of the architectural spaces of St. Sophia's Cathedral and its frescoes, as well as for the study of the political, ecclesiastical, and socio-economic history of medieval Ukraine. The researcher also considers graffiti as a source for the history of medieval writing and calendrical and mathematical thought. According to Kornienko, graffiti is also an important source for research in the field of special historical disciplines (biography, genealogy, heraldry, sphragistics, historical geography) and for exploring the worldview and attitudes of medieval people.

In his dissertation, V. Kornienko proposes an original method of comprehensive study of epigraphic artifacts. Analysis of the shape of the cuts, the material in which the graffiti was inscribed, and the shape of the blade that was used makes it possible to reconstruct many texts or their elements that have previously been considered destroyed. A significant number of authentic sources for the history of the Middle Ages and early modernity are made available to scholars. The dissertation and the author's further studies are certainly extremely important both for Ukrainian history and for Byzantine studies, since it was the Byzantine Orthodox tradition that was and remains dominant throughout the history of the Sofia of Kyiv [16, p. 4–6, 25].

Olha Kozachok's Candidate's thesis "Relationships of Galician Principality and Byzantium in the Context of International Relations in the Middle – Second Half of the XII Century." [15] was defended in 2017 in the specialization 07.00.01 – History of Ukraine.

According to the author, there are a number of poorly studied issues in the history of bilateral relations between Byzantium and the Principality of Halych, including the ownership or control over the Lower Danube, the role of dynastic ties, the political dependence of Rus' and, in particular, the Principality of Halych on Byzantium, the presence of Halych in the Byzantine coalition in the mid-12th century, the time of the emergence of the anti-Cuman alliance between Halych and Constantinople, and the involvement of 'Galicians' in the Bulgarian uprising of the mid-1180s. The chronological extent of the work is limited to the period of the existence of a separate Galician principality, but in her analysis of the problem of the anti-Cuman alliance Kozachok also considers the period of the late 11th to early 12th centuries, when the contacts between the Rostyslavids and the Komnenes first emerge, as well as the period of the reign of Prince Roman Mstyslavovych [15, p. 3–4].

The first two chapters are devoted to the historiography and sources and the theoretical and methodological basis of the study. In the main part of the work, the author analyzes the problems of the Byzantine-Galician coexistence and the participation of the Principality of Halych in the Byzantine coalition, the issue of the principality's political dependence on Byzantium, the Cuman factor in Byzantine-Galician relations, and the role of the principality in the Bulgarian uprising in the mid-1180s.

In her conclusions, Olha Kozachok notes that *de jure* the Principality of Halych and Byzantium were neighbors in the area of the lower reaches of the Danube, but *de facto* only their vassal territories adjoined each other; control over these was tenuous on both sides. Only from the mid-1160s to mid-1180s did the Lower Danube remain under the firm rule of Halych. Byzantium and the Principality of Halych were allies, particularly against Hungary and the Cumans. Treaty relations with Byzantium were initiated under Prince Volodymyrko, and the empire sought to continue them under Yaroslav Osmomysl. According to the author, Byzantium was the only initiator of diplomatic meetings. Emperors traditionally turned to Galician princes when the empire was under threat from several directions, as was the case in the 1160s with Hungary and at the end of the 12th century with the Cumans [15, p. 15].

In her dissertation, the author boldly poses questions not all of which can be answered now, primarily due to the lack of source material. This is precisely what makes the study timely and highly relevant not only for Ukrainian and Byzantine, but also for Balkan and nomadic studies.

The subject of Byzantium-Rus'-Ukraine is partially addressed in the *doctoral dissertation of Ihor Lylo "Greeks in the territory of Rus'ke Wojewodstwo in 15th – 18th c."*, completed at the Department of Medieval History and Byzantine Studies of the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv and defended in 2019 in the specialization 07.00 .01 – History of Ukraine.

The author observes that analysis of the contacts between the Galicia-Volyn state and the Byzantine Empire in the 12th to 14th centuries helps trace the processes of evolution and legal succession in relations between the political elites, Church, and artistic world of the Galicia-Volyn lands and the population of the Eastern Mediterranean. Such contacts continued after 1387, when these territories became part of the Kingdom of Poland [17, p. 2]. It is this question that the author investigates in the chapter "The Conditions and Beginnings of the Formation of a Greek Diaspora in the Galicia-Volyn State and Kingdom of Poland in the 12th to First Half of the 15th Centuries."

Ihor Lylo argues that the idea of the Greeks as the legitimate successors of the Byzantine Empire was gradually established in religious painting, literature, the legal sphere, and popular consciousness. The Metropolitanate of Kyiv was a daughter church of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The powerful cultural influence of the Church through hierarchs of Greek origin or those educated in Byzantine centers, in particular Mount Athos, was also felt in the ideological, legal, and political spheres. It also affected handicraft technologies, architecture and construction, and other spheres, including structures of everyday life. As the Galicia-Volyn state declined, its legacy was taken over by the Kingdom of Poland. The new rulers well understood the economic and geopolitical importance of the Northern Black Sea region and its connection with the Mediterranean. And in the conditions of permanent conflict with the Turks that lasted for several centuries, Greeks could be useful for the Polish crown.

Serhiy Shumylo's Candidate's thesis "The Development of Spiritual and Cultural Ties between Ukraine and Athos from the Seventeenth Century to the First Third of the Nineteenth Century," defended in 2021 in the specialization 26.00.01 – Theory and History of Culture (Historical Sciences), may also be included under the heading "Byzantium-Rus'-Ukraine."

Similar to the work of Ihor Lylo, the dissertation deals with the subject that is defined in modern historiography as 'Byzantium after Byzantium,' following the title of a book by the Romanian historian Nicolae Iorga.

Going beyond the declared chronological limits of the study, Serhiy Shumylo considers the events of the 11th to 16th centuries in a retrospective overview of the crystallization of the phenomenon of Ukrainian spiritual presence on Mount Athos [29, p. 3]. Exploring the origins of Athonian hesychasm, the author turns to the works of prominent Byzantine scholars G. Millet, P. Lemerle, D. Likhachev, I. Meyendorff, G. Prokhorov, A. Takhiao, and others.

In his conclusions, the researcher observes that the roots of Ukrainian presence on Mount Athos go back to the history of ancient Rus' monasticism there, which was connected with the processes of the Christianization of Rus' and diplomatic, ecclesiastical, and cultural contacts between Kyivan princes and church leaders and the Byzantine Empire. These ties with Mount Athos continued to develop after the decline of Kyivan Rus' during the 14th to 16th centuries. The influence of the Athonian hesychastic tradition in this period was of great importance for further spiritual awakening and cultural development in the Ukrainian lands. Athos monks participated in the revival and spread of the tradition of hesychasm in the metropolitan see of Kyiv, making a significant contribution to the formation of old-Ukrainian culture, literature, and art.

The dissertations of Iryna Hornova, Pavlo Mykhalitsyn, Kateryna Sorochan, Vitaliy Kalinichenko, Oleksandr Kashchuk, Olesya Zhdanovych, and Vladyslav Vodko are devoted to specifically Byzantine subjects.

The Candidate's thesis of Iryna Hornova "Social and political history of Byzantium of XI century in the system of historical views of Michael Psellus" [6] was defended in 2012 in the specialization 07.00.02 – World History.

The author offers a detailed analysis of the oeuvre of the prominent Byzantine intellectual Michael Psellus, whose work allows us to recreate a broad panorama of Byzantine political life in the 11th century.

In the chapter on "Sources and Historiography," Iryna Hornova considers, in addition to the works of Psellus himself, a broad range of 11th-century Byzantine and non-Byzantine sources. The researcher notes that the main direction of today's 'Psellus studies' is the analysis of his texts in dialogue with the legacy of other representatives of Byzantine culture [6, p. 8].

In the main part of the work, the researcher analyzes the formation of Michael Psellus' worldview and examines the scholar's views on the Byzantine state and society of the crisis era of the 11th century, comparing his conception with the views of John Skylitsa and paying special attention to the historians' coverage of the political struggles in the empire during the reign of Emperor Basil II, in particular the uprisings of Bardas Skleros and Bardas Phokas.

Dissertation establishes the socio-political meaning of the chief categories used by Michael Psellus in trying to answer the most important questions that concerned him as a historian and public

figure. *The Chronographia* is almost a political manifesto rather than a dispassionate chronicle; hence Psellus' carelessness about facts and dates. It is a look at the state of the empire, at the life of Byzantine society with the eyes of an intellectual who belonged to the court officialdom. The work gives a wonderful sense of the era and at the same time embodies the leading trends in the development of the secular and rationalist culture of the time. The study of the further development of these trends and identification of the lines of succession that perhaps extend from Psellus to the late representatives of Byzantine civic thought Pliphon and Vissarion, who had a direct influence on the formation of Renaissance Neoplatonism, is considered by the author a promising direction for further studies [6, p. 16–18].

Pavlo Mikhalitsyn's Candidate's thesis "The Literary Heritage of Gregory of Nazianzus as an Early Byzantine Cultural Historical Phenomenon (adapted from the tragedy "Suffering Christ"), defended in 2012 in the specialization 07.00.02 – World History, was completed in the prominent center of Byzantine studies at V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University under the supervision of Serhiy Sorochan.

Pavlo Mykhalitsyn focuses on the tragedy "Christus Patiens" as an artifact of the historical, cultural and theological polemics of the second half of the 4th century and analyzes it from the historical-philological, cultural, and theological viewpoints in the context of the literary legacy of Gregory of Nazianzus and the entire early Byzantine culture.

In a historiographical overview of the attribution (authorship) of the tragedy "The Suffering Christ," the author notes that most modern researchers attribute it to Gregory of Nazianzus [19, p. 7]. In addition to the works of Gregory himself, Mykhalitsyn draws on the testimony of both Gregory's contemporaries and later historians and writers of the 4th and 5th centuries, including Hieronymus, Rufinus, Philostorgius, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomenus, and others. [19, p. 8].

In the main part of the work, the author examines the social and literary activities of Gregory of Nazianzus and develops a detailed historical, literary, and theological analysis of the tragedy "The Suffering Christ." According to the author, Gregory's literary and public activities were aimed at strengthening the church institutions and the Orthodox faith, as well as accelerating the Christianization of the empire. For the first time, the author clarifies the classification of Gregory's poetic oeuvre and the chronology of the writing of the tragedy, as well as develops a clear semantic scheme of the tragedy. [19, p. 13–14].

Kateryna Sorochan's Candidate's thesis "Foodstuffs, Raw Materials, and Craft Products in Byzantium, 4th to 9th Centuries: Professional Specialization in Production and Trade" [26] was defended in 2015 in the specialization 07.00.02 – World History. The work contributes to one of the main spheres of research interests of the Kharkiv school of Byzantine studies – the socio-economic history of Byzantium.

Kateryna Sorochan undertakes a comprehensive study of the nomenclature of basic foodstuffs, raw materials, and handicraft goods traded in Byzantium in the 4th to 9th centuries and of the corresponding specialization of commercial and craft activities. The researcher focuses on the terminology of product categories and nomenclature of goods, defines and systematizes classes of products that dominated agricultural, industrial, and craft production and exchange, and characterizes occupations, their nature and degree of specialization, and division of labor in the field of commerce in foodstuffs, raw materials, and handicrafts [26, p. 2–3].

In the main part of the work, a vast source and historiographical material on foodstuffs and professions related to their production and sale is systematized. The researcher covers virtually the entire range of foodstuffs, both local and imported, and analyzes the basic features of the Byzantine market in raw materials, investigating trade in ferrous, non-ferrous, and precious metals, precious stones, wood, olive oil, raw materials for textile production, wax, skins, furs, etc. Considerable attention is paid to handicraft production and trade and its specialization, in particular to fabrics, clothes, leather goods, ceramics, etc.

Overall, as the researcher notes in her conclusions, cereals and various types of raw materials led the nomenclature of Byzantine trade goods during the 4th to 9th centuries. Still, handicraft goods were responsible for no less than a third of the total volume of trade. The dominant items were basic

necessities and foodstuffs, of which there were more than 150 varieties. They were associated with 67 specializations in craft and commercial activity [26, p. 17–18].

The work is certainly valuable and innovative and fully deserves to be published and made available to the broad circle of specialists in Byzantine studies.

Vitaliy Kalinichenko's Candidate's thesis "Military-political aspects of the development of the First Bulgarian Empire in IX – the first quarter of the X-th century," defended in 2017 in the specialization 07.00.02 – World History, can be included in this Byzantine studies overview, given the fact that the First Bulgarian Empire developed in the orbit of the 'Byzantine commonwealth,' and that the work is primarily based on Byzantine sources [13, p. 8–9]. One of the key theses of the dissertation is the idea that the socio-political organization of the Bulgarian state developed "through a combination and mutual influence of the agricultural economy of the Slavs and the nomadic militarized tribal structure of the Bulgars, as well as the borrowing of the Byzantine political system, which was reflected in military affairs and determined the geopolitical strategy of the Bulgarian rulers." In addition, the strategic priority for the Bulgarian rulers, according to the author, was obtaining political and territorial concessions from Byzantium.

The author's historiographical overview is organized by problem – general works on the military and political history of the Bulgarian state; works dealing with the internal organization of the Bulgarian army; and studies of the weaponry of the army of the Danubian Bulgars, their tactics, and strategy. In terms of theory and methodology, the dissertation is influenced by the work of the Bulgarian researcher Ts. Stepanov, who has written most fully on the phenomenon of the combination of nomadic, Byzantine, and Slavic elements in the military and political history of the First Bulgarian Empire.

In the main part of the work, Kalinichenko primarily analyzes the role of the political factor in the formation of the armed forces of Danubian Bulgaria, in particular focusing on the political basis of the formation of the Bulgarian army under the rule of Krum (800/803-814) and Omurtag (814-831), the military component of Danubian Bulgaria in 832-892, and the evolution of the Bulgarian army during the reign of Simeon I the Great (893-927). The work also contains a detailed analysis of the structure and organization of the Bulgarian army and the principles of its functioning. Among the pressing concerns for today's Byzantine and Bulgarian studies are such issues as the recruitment and ethno-social composition of the army of the First Bulgarian Empire and its logistics. The author also considers the weaponry and military arts of the army of the early Bulgarian state, siege equipment, and the military strategy and tactics of the rulers of the Danubian Bulgars.

Overall, the work can be a solid basis for an in-depth general study of the military history of the First Bulgarian Empire and has value for Byzantine, Balkan, and Ukrainian studies.

The doctoral dissertation of the Lviv researcher Oleksandr Kashchuk "Monothelitism in Byzantium of the Seventh Century: Doctrine, Politics and Ideology of Power" was defended in 2020 in the specialization 07.00.02 – World History and published as a monograph [14]. The author completed it at the Department of Medieval History and Byzantine Studies of the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, which is one of the leading centers of Byzantine studies in Ukraine.

Oleksandr Kashchuk stresses the need to analyze the phenomenon of Monothelitism in its three interconnected aspects – doctrinal, political, and socio-humanitarian [14, p. 3]. The source base of the study is represented by historical chronicles, acts of councils and synods, documents of the imperial court, theological treatises and sermons, and letters of emperors, patriarchs, bishops, and monks. Together, these materials allow the author to reconstruct the course and contents of the Monothelite controversy [14, p. 5]. The author demonstrates a thorough knowledge of historiography, primarily foreign. The overview of the research methodology and use of complex theological terminology is included in the second chapter of the monograph entitled "The Political and Theological Basis of the Monothelite Controversy and the Methodological Justification of Its Study."

The third chapter of O. Kashchuk's monograph, "The Official Introduction of Monoenergism: Between Doctrine, Identity, and Politics," traces the crystallization of the main aspects of this movement. With the start of the Arab invasion, the demand for religious unity among the Byzantine provinces, heterogeneous in their Christian faith, became urgent. This prompted Emperor Heraclius

and Patriarch Sergius to more actively introduce the doctrine of monoenergism as a basis for church unity [14, p. 13–15]. The fourth chapter, “Doctrinal Evolution of the Polemic,” presents in detail the doctrinal development of the controversy, because it was the need to adopt a doctrine that determined the actions of both sides and revealed the true motives behind the continuing debates [14, p. 15–17]. The fifth chapter considers “The Tactics and Politics of the Monothelite Controversy,” examining the connection between the tactics and politics characteristic of each side in the controversy. This approach also helps reveal the true motives and nature of the confrontation. The sixth chapter, “From the Clash of Ideologies of Power to Confrontation of Identities,” aims to sketch out the ideology of power in 7th-century Christianity. After all, the study of the tactical aspects of the polemical exchanges showed that it was not actually Christological views that clashed in the Monothelite controversy, but rather divergent ideologies of supreme power in the Church. The principle of *ikonomia*, followed by the Monothelites, became an expression of loyalty to the emperor. The principle of purity of faith, professed by the Diothelites, expressed loyalty to the Roman throne. That is why doctrinal contradictions led to a resurgence of the discussion about doctrinal authority in the Church – namely, regarding the authority of the emperor in the Church [14, p. 17, 20].

As O. Kashchuk argues in his conclusions, it was the Monothelite polemic that became the turning point in the history of Christianity and the Byzantine Empire. In the crucible of this polemic on ecclesiastical identity, backed by the testimony of Pope Martin I and Maximus the Confessor and his disciples, emerged the pentarchic consciousness of Eastern Christianity, which to a great extent determined the subsequent course of world history. The Monothelite polemic showed that it is religious identity that protects the inviolability of the boundaries of the Church, which neither politicians nor church hierarchs should violate, including in the modern world [14, p. 26].

The PhD dissertation of Vladyslav Vodko on “Ideological and political struggle in the Church of Roman Syria 30-40-th of the 5-th century” [4] in the specialization 032 – History and Archeology was defended in 2020.

As we know, in the year 395 Syria became part of Byzantium, with Antioch as the second most important city in the empire after the capital Constantinople. Most of the themes touched on in this study have value for Byzantine studies – in particular, the analysis of such issues as the Antioch school of theology and the legacy of its key figures, the institutional development of the Christian church in Roman Syria, the policy of the imperial government regarding conflicts on the periphery of the empire, and others.

In the main part of the work, the author considers the religious situation in Roman Syria in the 430s to 440s, the political and religious landscape of Roman Syria in the first half of the 5th century, the intellectual, theological, and ascetic traditions of Syrian Christianity and the historical memory of Syrian Christians. In the chapter “Confrontations in the Church of Roman Syria in the 430s to 440s,” Vodko analyzes the controversy surrounding the figure of Nestorius, the struggle around the legacy of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the key features of ideological and political struggle in Roman Syria in these decades.

The author argues that the main motive of the imperial policy regarding Christological and ecclesiastical-political disputes in Roman Syria was the desire for ecclesiastical peace, to be achieved through compromise formulas and forced concessions. Vladyslav Vodko also proves that the ideological and political struggle in Syria after the Third Council of Ephesus was fueled primarily by ecclesiastical-political factors and the factor of identity, and was not exclusively a theological dispute, as it has often been assumed in historiography [4, p. 4].

The doctoral dissertation of Olesya Zhdanovych “The Byzantine Empire and the barbarians in the work of Menander Protector” was defended in 2021 in the specialization 07.00.02 – World History.

The author’s focus is on clarifying the Byzantine Empire’s relations with Turkic-speaking nomadic peoples in the second half of the 6th century and the Byzantine perception of the nomadic periphery. The main sources for the study are the work of Menander the Protector and other Byzantine and Turkic materials containing information about Byzantium and the barbarian world in the second half of the 6th century. In this period, during the reigns of Justinian I, Justin II, Tiberius I, and

Mauritius, the Great Turkic Khaganate and the Avar Khaganate became Byzantium's neighbors. The geographical scope of the study is limited to the territory of the Byzantine Empire and its periphery, including South Altai, the Black Sea and the Eurasian steppes, and the region of the Danube [11, p. 2].

In the main part of the dissertation, Zhdanovych examines the figure of Menander and the principal features of his work. Researchers will find useful the chapters on "The Turks in Menander" and "The Avars in Menander," which consider the mental foundations of early Byzantine society in the context of its perception of nomadic peoples.

As the author notes in the conclusions, it was Menander who first mentioned the Turks – nomads from South Altai. The Byzantine historian and politician provides valuable information about the embassies between the Great Turkic Khaganate and Byzantium and about Zemarch's travels to Altai, to the headquarters of the Turkic Khagan, which allows us to trace the route from the political center of the ancient Turks to Constantinople. Menander's information about the Great Turkic Khaganate is unique, since other Byzantine authors do not report anything on South Altai and the state of the Turks. His testimony is reliable and objective; it was confirmed by archaeological excavations in the south of Altai in the second half of the 19th century. Menander provides a significant amount of data about the Avars as well. Zhdanovych explores the diplomatic contacts between Byzantium and the Avars, about which Menander speaks at length and in detail [11].

Overall, the dissertation offers a comprehensive analysis of Byzantium's relations with Turkic and Avar proto-state and state entities in the second half of the 6th century, primarily on the basis of the author's own translation of the work of the Byzantine author Menander the Protector.

Maryna Domanovska and Oleksandr Muzychko authored historiographical dissertations that summarize the development of Byzantine studies in Kharkiv and Novorossiysk universities from the middle of the 19th to early 20th centuries. These works logically complete the survey of Byzantine studies in the higher educational institutions of imperial-era Trans-Dnieper Ukraine begun in the Candidate's theses of Oleh Fayda [27] and Vsevolod Chekanov [28], devoted to the Kyiv Theological Academy and Kyiv University of St. Volodymyr, respectively. These earlier dissertations are considered in the previous reviews.

Maryna Domanovska's Candidate's thesis "Byzantine Studies at Kharkiv University (Mid-19th to Early 20th Centuries)" was defended in 2015 in the specialization 07.00.06 – Historiography, Source Studies, and Special Historical Disciplines.

Maryna Domanovska focuses on the Byzantine component in scholarly works and courses in medieval studies, the history of the Southern Slavs, Russian history, church history, and the history of law prepared and taught at Kharkiv University. She also stresses that it was at Kharkiv University that Oleksandr Zernin, for the first time in the Russian Empire, began teaching courses in Byzantine subjects and do research on individual problems of Byzantine history.

The study is built on the problem-chronological principle. The first phase of the development of Byzantine studies at Kharkiv University spanned the period from the early 19th century to the late 1860s. The corresponding chapter explores the general conditions for the development of Byzantine studies in the Russian Empire and first works in Byzantine studies by Kharkiv University professors – Oleksandr Zernin and the brothers Mykola and Petro Lavrovsky. During the second phase (early 1870s to late 1880s), studies and courses in political history of Byzantium, Byzantine law, and Byzantine-Slavic relations appeared at Kharkiv University. In her analysis of the third phase (early 1890s to early 20th century), the author focuses on scholarly studies and academic courses in the history of Byzantine art and literature and problems of Russo-Byzantine relations in works and courses on Russian history, and examines in detail Yevhen Chernousov's works in the history of the Byzantine state, law, and economy. Domanovska also considers the problem of the emergence of a research school in Byzantine studies at Kharkiv University [7].

The dissertation for the first time comprehensively explores the process of formation and evolution of Byzantine studies as an academic discipline at Kharkiv University from the mid-19th to the early 20th centuries, proposes its periodization, and characterizes the political and socio-cultural conditions for the early development of Byzantine studies at Kharkiv University. Domanovska

defines the circle of Byzantine scholars who worked at the university, describes their scholarly legacy, and considers the role and place of Byzantine history in the educational process. She analyses the academic communications of the scholars under study and touches on the issue of the existence of a research school in Byzantine studies at Kharkiv University [7, p. 10–14].

Regarding the latter problem, the author argues that the key point is presence of symbolic continuity of Byzantine studies at Kharkiv University from the turn of the 20th century to the present day. The Kharkiv Byzantinologists of today consistently defend in their writings the idea that their professional community has inherited the best traditions and achievements of their predecessors. From this angle, the work of the scholars of the era when Byzantine studies at Kharkiv University were just emerging acquires particular importance, creating a symbolic basis for the subsequent revival and progress of Byzantine studies at Kharkiv University, Kharkiv more broadly, and Ukraine as a whole [7, p. 3–4].

A chapter from the *doctoral dissertation of Oleksandr Muzychko “The process of institutionalization of historical research in the territory of Southern Ukraine (the second half of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries),”* defended in 2020 in the specialization 07.00.06 – Historiography, Source Studies, and Special Historical Disciplines, is dedicated to Byzantine studies at Imperial Novorossiia University in Odesa. The work is extremely thorough and informative, and the author’s analysis of the process of institutionalization of history as a discipline and teaching subject in imperial-era southern Ukraine is generally important for the study of the development of Byzantinology in this period [22].

However, the fifth chapter on the “Institutionalization of Individual Areas of Historical Research” and section 5.5 on the “Development of Byzantine Studies” deserve special mention. According to Oleksandr Muzychko, southern Ukrainian Byzantine studies made a tangible contribution to the overall process of making sense of the Byzantine phenomenon in history, primarily its cultural aspects. Moreover, Odesa scholars made a truly innovative infrastructural breakthrough in founding the Historical and Philological Society and the Department of Byzantine Philology at Novorossiia University. Of course, all this could not have happened without the prolonged residence in the city of several giants of Byzantine studies, who deliberately chose Odesa as a location closer to Constantinople, a kind of bearer of the historical spirit of Byzantium. Among them were Fyodor Uspensky, Mykhailo Popruzhenko, Synodiy Papadimitriou, Nykodym Kondakov, and others. Thanks to their active and varied teaching and research work, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries Byzantine studies became a kind of business card of southern Ukrainian historiography, slightly behind only classical studies in strength [22, p. 17–18].

Summing up this review of dissertation studies in Byzantinology, we must note a considerable decline in the research activity of Ukrainian scholars due to the war and the challenges it has brought about. Currently, there is no information about dissertation defenses on Byzantium-related subjects in 2022 and the first half of 2023.

Compared to the previous period, considered in the earlier reviews, the number of defended dissertations in Byzantine studies has decreased during the last decade. So, for example, during the five-year period from 2007 to 2011, sixteen dissertations were defended in Ukraine in specializations belonging to the field of ‘historical sciences,’ and five in other disciplines (one in philology, one in cultural studies, one in art history, and two in philosophy) [9; 10]. Over eleven years from 2012 to 2022, nineteen dissertations were defended in historical sciences, and we are aware of thirteen studies dealing with Byzantine subjects in the fields of musicology, cultural studies, aesthetics, philosophy, art history, religious studies, and pedagogy. The total number of theses over the past eleven years is thirty-two, and this number may be amended. Even without exact calculations, we may notice that it is specifically the historical sciences that have experienced a significant decline in the number of works (about 40 per cent, while the dynamic in other fields is positive).

It is dissertations defended in non-historical specializations that will be the subject of our attention in the next review. There is a noticeably growing interest today in the study of Byzantine music, icon painting, monumental and decorative art, aesthetics, and religious philosophy, as well as the legacy of Ukrainian art historians.

Конфлікт інтересів

Автор заявляє, що конфлікту інтересів щодо публікації цього рукопису немає. Крім того, автор повністю дотримується етичних норм, включаючи плагіат, фальсифікацію даних та подвійну публікацію.

References

1. «Византийская мозаика»: Сборник публичных лекций Эллино-византийского лектория при Свято-Пантелеимоновском храме (Міжінституційний сектор візантиністики Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна) [Електронний ресурс]. URL: <https://byzantina.wordpress.com/mozaika/>
2. Byzantinoucrainica, vol. I. Київ: Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. С. Грушевського НАН України, 2022. 508 с.
3. Василевс. Українська візантиністика [Електронний ресурс]. URL: <https://byzantina.wordpress.com/>
4. Водько В. І. Ідейно-політична боротьба в Церкві Римської Сирії 30-40-х рр. V ст.: дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора філософії (в галузі історії). Одеса, 2020. 200 с.
5. Гордієнко Д. С. Візантійсько-руські відносини за Константина VII Порфирогенета (912–959 рр.) в зовнішній політиці Візантії. Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. К., 2013. 22 с.
6. Горнова І. С. Суспільно-політична історія Візантії XI ст. в системі історичних поглядів Михаїла Пселла. Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Одеса, 2012. 23 с.
7. Домановська М. Є. Візантиністика у Харківському університеті (середина XIX – початок XX ст.). Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Київ, 2015. 20 с.
8. Домановський А. М. Відтворення віртуальної Візантії, або Василевс. *Deadministrando «Візантійською цивілізацією» засобами Інтернету»* / А. М. Домановський // Методичний вісник історичного факультету Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Харків, 2011. № 10. С. 7–19.
9. Домановський А. М. Проблеми візантиністики у дисертаційних дослідженнях, захищених в Україні у 2007–2009 рр. / А. М. Домановський // Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. 2011. № 939. Серія: Історія України. Українознавство: історичні та філософські науки. Вип. 14. С. 71–91.
10. Домановський А. М., Домановська М. Є. Проблеми візантиністики в дисертаційних дослідженнях, захищених в Україні у 2009–2011 рр. / А. М. Домановський, М. Є. Домановська // Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. 2012. № 1006. Серія: Історія України. Українознавство: історичні та філософські науки. Вип. 15. С. 110–141.
11. Жданович О. П. Візантійська імперія і варварський світ у Менандра Протектора. Дис. докт. іст. наук. Київ, 2021. 344 с.
12. Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. С. Грушевського НАН України [Електронний ресурс]. URL: http://archeos.org.ua/?page_id=4839
13. Калініченко В. А. Військово-політичні аспекти розвитку Першої болгарської держави у IX – першій чверті X ст. Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Чернівці, 2017. 20 с.
14. Кашук О. Я. Монотелітство у Візантії VII століття: доктрина, політика та ідеологія влади. Автореф. дис. докт. іст. наук. Львів, 2020. 32 с.
15. Козачок О. Б. Відносини Галицького князівства з Візантією у контексті міжнародних зв'язків середини середини – другої половини XII століття. Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Львів, 2017. 19 с.
16. Корнієнко В. В. Графіті Софії Київської XI – початку XVIII ст.: інформаційний потенціал джерела. Автореф. дис. докт. іст. наук. Київ, 2015. 41 с.
17. Лильо І. М. Греки на території Руського воєводства у XV–XVIII ст. Автореф. дис. докт. іст. наук. Львів, 2019. 34 с.
18. Майко В. В. Південно-східний Крим у другій половині X–XII ст. Автореф. дис. докт. іст. наук. К., 2012. 35 с.

19. Михалицын П. Е. Межинституциональный сектор византистики «Византийская мозаика» как объединяющий фактор богословской и светской гуманитарной науки [Електронний ресурс]. URL: <https://byzantina.files.wordpress.com/2017/04/mihalitsyn.pdf>
20. Михалицын П. Е. Літературна спадщина Григорія Назіанзіна як ранньовізантійський культурно-історичний феномен (за матеріалами трагедії «Стражденний Христос»). Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Харків, 2012. 22 с.
21. Моця К. О. Воєнне мистецтво візантійської Таврики наприкінці IV – на початку XII ст. Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. К., 2016. 23 с.
22. Музичко О. Є. Процес інституціоналізації історичних досліджень на території південної України (друга половина XIX – початок XX ст.). Автореф. дис. докт. іст. наук. Київ, 2020. 35 с.
23. Нікіфоров М. А. Візантійські володіння у гірському Криму у першій половині IX – на початку XIII ст. Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. К., 2013. 16 с.
24. Пархоменко М. В. Повсякденне життя візантійського Херсонеса-Херсона (IV–X ст.). Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Харків, 2018. 27 с.
25. Роменський О. О. Русь у зовнішній політиці Візантії в останній чверті X ст. Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Харків, 2015. 24 с.
26. Сорочан К. С. Продовольство, сировина і ремісничя продукція у Візантії IV–IX ст.: професійна спеціалізація у виробництві та торгівлі. Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Харків, 2015. 25 с.
27. Файда О. В. Візантиністика в Київській Духовній Академії (1819–1919). Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Львів, 2006. 18 с.
28. Чеканов В. Ю. Візантиністика в Київському університеті Св. Володимира (друга половина XIX – початок XX ст.). Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. Київ, 2010. 19 с.
29. Шумило С. В. Розвиток українсько-афонських духовно-культурних зв'язків у XVII – першій третині XIX ст. Автореф. дис. канд. іст. наук. К., 2021. 19 с.

ДОМАНОВСЬКА М.Є.,

канд. істор. наук, старший викладач кафедри українознавства
marina.domanovska@karazin.ua ORCID: : <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4287-7620>

*Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна,
площа Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна*

ДОМАНОВСЬКИЙ А.М.,

канд. істор. наук, доцент,
канд. істор. наук, доцент кафедри українознавства
gestabaudolini@gmail.com ORCID: : <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8434-3374>

*Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна,
площа Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна*

**ВІЗАНТИНІСТИКА В ДИСЕРТАЦІЙНИХ СТУДІЯХ НАУКОВЦІВ УКРАЇНИ,
2012–2022 (ІСТОРИЧНІ НАУКИ)**

У статті здійснено огляд дисертацій з візантиністики, які були захищені впродовж останнього десятиліття за історичними спеціальностями в межах галузі «історичні науки». Не претендуючи на детальний аналіз наукового доробку кожного з дисертантів, прагнемо акцентувати увагу на тому, що візантійські студії в Україні, як і в попередні періоди, продовжують розвиватися в інституційних осередках, серед яких Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна, Інститут української археографії і джерелознавства імені М. С. Грушевського НАНУ, Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка, Національний заповідник «Софія Київська», Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова тощо. Розширюється коло дисертацій міждисциплінарного характеру, зокрема

набуває популярності історико-богословська, історико-філософська тематика, популярними стають мистецтвознавчі і музикознавчі дослідження.

В огляді визначені причини скорочення кількості захищених дисертацій з візантиністики впродовж 2012–2022 рр. порівняно з попередніми періодами. Утім презентовані в огляді дослідження і оригінальними, базованими на новітніх методиках і досягненнях світової науки, і саме вони визначають подальші вектори розвитку української візантиністики у найближчому майбутньому.

Ключові слова: візантиністика, візантійські студії, дисертаційні дослідження, 2012–2022.

References

1. «Byzantine mosaic»: Collection of public lectures of the Hellenic-Byzantine Lecture Hall of the Holy Panteleimonovsky Church (Inter-institutional sector of Byzantine Studies, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University). URL: <https://byzantina.wordpress.com/mozaika/> (in Ukrainian)
2. Byzantinoucrainica, vol. I. Kyiv: M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies NAS of Ukraine, 2022. 508 p. (in Ukrainian)
3. Basileus. Ukrainian Byzantine Studies. URL: <https://byzantina.wordpress.com/>
4. Vodko V. I. Ideological and political struggle in the Church of Roman Syria 30-40-ies. V century: dis. for the degree of PhD (in the field of History). Odesa, 2020. 200 p. (in Ukrainian)
5. Gordiyenko D. S. The Byzantium-Rus' Relations during Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' Ruling in the Context of the Byzantium Foreign Policy (912–959). Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Kyiv, 2013. 22 p. (in Ukrainian)
6. Gornova I. S. Socio-political history of Byzantium of the XI century in the system of historical views of Michael Psell. Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Odesa, 2012. 23 p. (in Ukrainian)
7. Domanovska M. E. Byzantine Studies at Kharkov University (mid-19 – early 20 centuries). Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Kyiv, 2015. 22 p. (in Ukrainian)
8. Domanovsky A. M. Reproduction of virtual Byzantium, or “Vasilevs. Deadministrando of Byzantine civilization” by means of the Internet // Methodical Bulletin of the Faculty of History of Kharkov National University named after V.N. Karazin. Kharkiv, 2011. № 10. P. 7–19. (in Ukrainian)
9. Domanovsky A. M. Problems of Byzantine Studies in Dissertation Studies defended in Ukraine in 2007–2009 // *Bulletin of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. 2011. № 939. Series: History of Ukraine. Ukrainian Studies: Historical and Philosophical Sciences. Vip. 14. P. 71–91.* (in Ukrainian)
10. Domanovsky A. M., Domanovska M. E. Problems of Byzantine Studies in Dissertation Studies Defended in Ukraine in 2009–2011 // *Bulletin of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. 2012. № 1006. Series: History of Ukraine. Ukrainian Studies: Historical and Philosophical Sciences. Vip. 15. C. 110–141.* (in Ukrainian)
11. Zhdanovich O. P. Byzantine Empire and the barbaric world of Menander Protector. Autoref. dis. doct. hist. science. Kyiv, 2021. 42 p. (in Ukrainian)
12. M. S. Grushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies NASU. URL: http://archeos.org.ua/?page_id=4839(in Ukrainian)
13. Kalinichenko V. A. Military and political aspects of the development of the First Bulgarian state in the IX – the first quarter of the X century. Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Chernivtsi, 2017. 20 p. (in Ukrainian)
14. Kaschuk O. Ya. Monothelitism in Byzantium in the 7th century: doctrine, politics and ideology of power. Autoref. dis. doc. hist. science. Lviv, 2020. 32 p. (in Ukrainian)
15. Cossachok O. B. Relations of the Principality of Galicia with Byzantium in the context of international relations of the middle – second half of the XII century. Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Lviv, 2017. 19 p. (in Ukrainian)
16. Kornienko V. . Graffiti of Sophia of Kyiv XI – early XVIII century: information potential of the source. Autoref. dis. doc. hist. science. Kyiv, 2015. 41 p. (in Ukrainian)

17. Lillo I. M. Greeks on the territory of the Russian Voivodeship in the XV–XVIII centuries. Autoref. dis. doc. hist. science. Lviv, 2019. 34 p. (in Ukrainian)
18. Maiko V. V. Southeastern Crimea in the second half of the X–XII centuries. Autoref. dis. doc. hist. science. Kyiv., 2012. 35 p. (in Ukrainian)
19. Michalitsyn P. E. The Byzantine interinstitutional sector “Byzantine mosaic” as a unifying factor of theological and secular humanities. URL: <https://byzantina.files.wordpress.com/2017/04/mihalitsyn.pdf> (in Ukrainian)
20. Mikhalitsyn P. E. The literary heritage of Grigory Nazianzin as an early Byzantine cultural and historical phenomenon (based on the materials of the tragedy “The Suffering Christ”. Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Kharkiv, 2012. 22 p. (in Ukrainian)
21. Motsya K. O. Military art of Byzantine Taurica in the late IV – early XII century. Autoref. dis. candidate hist. science. Kyiv, 2016. 23 p. (in Ukrainian)
22. Muzychko O. E. The process of institutionalization of historical researches on the territory of southern Ukraine (the second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries). Autoref. dis. doc. hist. science. Kyiv, 2020. 35 p. (in Ukrainian)
23. Nikiforov M. A. Byzantine possessions in the mountain Crimea in the first half of the IX – at the beginning of the XIII century. Autoref. dis. candidate hist. science. Kyiv, 2013. 16 p. (in Ukrainian)
24. Parkhomenko M. V. Everyday life of Byzantine Chersonesos-Kherson (IV–X centuries). Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Kharkiv, 2018. 27 p. (in Ukrainian)
25. Romensky O. O. Russia in the foreign policy of Byzantium in the last quarter of the X century. Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Kharkiv, 2015. 24 p. (in Ukrainian)
26. Sorochan K. S. Food, raw materials and craft products in Byzantium IV–IX centuries: professional specialization in production and trade. Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Kharkiv, 2015. 25 p. (in Ukrainian)
27. Fayda O. V. Byzantine Studies at the Kyiv Theological Academy (1819–1919). Autoref. dis. candidate hist. science. Lviv, 2006. 18 p. (in Ukrainian)
28. Chekanov V. Yu. Byzantine studies at St. Vladimir Kyiv University (the second half of the XIX – the beginning of the XX century). Autoref. dis. cand. hist. science. Kyiv, 2010. 19 p. (in Ukrainian)
29. Shumilo S. V. Development of Ukrainian-Athos spiritual and cultural relations in the 18th – the first third of the 19th century. Autoref. dis. candidate hist. science. Kyiv, 2021. 19 p. (in Ukrainian)