

**“GENERALIZING COGNITION” AND MONOGRAPHIC  
RESEARCH OF THE PAST: OPTIONS OF INTERACTION  
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF BYZANTINISTIC STUDIES IN KYIV  
UNIVERSITY IN THE END OF XIX – EARLY XX CENTURY)**

**Chekanov V. Yu.**

**INTRODUCTION**

The idea behind this article is based upon the obvious difference between two basic kinds of scientific research usual for the humanities:

1. Research in minor articles aimed to discover or to underline some unique but yet unknown features of the subject.

2. Research in big monographic works aimed to generalize the number of abovementioned features and to create the whole picture of the subject.

Some difference may be spotted here even at the first time entry into the issue. It is grounded on the usage of generalization as a feature represented in the research of the Kind 2 only. Researches in minor articles almost never require this; they correspond basically to the need of penetration into the new research field and thus are addressed mostly to the professional audience which doesn't need huge explanations of what it's all about. They can exist as “little explored subjects”<sup>1</sup>. The assumption that smaller articles precede mostly to the generalization phase sounds realistic. However, it should be underlined that presence of explanatory parts within monographic researches never makes them “less scientific”. They just live their own special life. What are its characteristics?

Some of them are commonly known from the history of science. The smaller articles are mainly the cores of crucial discoveries in natural or exact sciences. These discoveries are often represented in the history of science as “breakthroughs”. For instance, theory of relativity started out from an article and only years later it was generalized into the whole picture of the Universe. Some advances in mathematics were made through smaller articles too. That means there is the difference in exact

---

<sup>1</sup> Чеканов Всеволод. Фемний лад у Візантії в історіографії: проблема “малодослідженості”.

sciences between basic concept of the research and the breakthrough: basic concept requires some foreseeing of the results, breakthrough cannot be predicted. That is why the most crucial discoveries in exact sciences are often made thru research Kind 1.

The situation in humanities is quite different due to their special nature. This nature was for the first time traced down by the scientists of Baden philosophical school in the late XIX – early XX centuries: Paul Windelband and Heinrich Rickert.

### 1. The idea of “generalizing” phase in scientific research

P. Windelband and H. Rickert postulated the principal difference between natural and social sciences<sup>2</sup>. The first ones were described as aimed to discover regularities behind the nature and to formulate the laws of it. Their subject is the General. The second ones were described as aimed to discover the unique features just as facts. Their subject is the Event. The Baden school provided special terminology for both kinds: the natural sciences were called *nomothetic* (law-bounded), the humanities were called *ideographic* (individualizing)<sup>3</sup>. For H. Rickert both of them were of the same value. Answering how it could be that law-bounded natural sciences with their evident significance might equal to the cognition of unique and never-again repeated events (as in history), H. Rickert explained their correlation via public values. They reflect social requirement towards humanities to help the self-determination of the society and to create its *Weltanschauung*.

According to H. Rickert the natural and humanitarian sciences differ not by their subjects (which is in fact one – The Entirety) but by their methods. He thought that humanities were “younger” and thus less accomplished in comparison to the natural and exact sciences<sup>4</sup>.

This theory didn't satisfy any historians because it rejected totally their ambitions to undercover the laws of the social development. It considered them as dependents upon such a non-stable and highly changeable factor as social values. However, H. Rickert explained that wasn't bad: the Entirety of the historical research was more versatile and complicated than the one of the research provided by physicist or mathematician. The Entirety of the historian is never speculative but

---

<sup>2</sup> Савельева И.М., Полетаев А.В. История и время в поисках утраченного. Р. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Rickert Heinrich. Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft. S. 54.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., S. 7, 54.

always individual<sup>5</sup>. The regulation in history sounds like a lead motif<sup>6</sup>. History shares the procedure of generalization with natural sciences but it leads historians to the environment with the same individual character as at the start point. The Entirety of the historian never changes its individual nature (state of things absolutely unlike from natural sciences aspiring to achieve the Entirety as the law).

This difference has been spotted long before the works of Baden school. Yet Plato wrote that historical events (“wars, riots and combats”) composed “the flash” of history and contradicted to the philosophical ambition to achieve the pure knowledge. So the subject of history is the main obstacle to the cognition<sup>7</sup>. That is why neither Plato nor his disciple and closest developer Aristotle never tried to build up any sort of philosophical background for history.

Happily, history had obtained this background much earlier than the Baden school expressed its skepticism towards the meaning of history. It was associated with the works of Greek major historians like Thucydides (460–400 BC) and Polybius (200 – 120 BC) who contributed much to the idea of history as a way to reconstruct the truth. So, almost from the very start history was relocated from philosophical Entirety to the field of more practical researches.

But even in writings of abovementioned founders of history its aims have been expressed in more sophisticated way than practical investigation required. Thucydides wrote that his purpose in reconstructing history of Peloponnesian War is to warn humans from the repeat of it “by their nature”<sup>8</sup>. Polybius dreamed about the enlightenment of people via increasing their knowledge in history and preparation of them to the social work on a high level. Historians were much more ambitious than just the investigators and searchers for the truth. The best way to get to the point was to understand the meaning of history, its laws and regulations – that is why history re-oriented quickly to the incorporation of elements later discerned as historiosophy. 22 centuries later H. Rickert described this approach as “generalizing cognition”. The priority here belonged to Polybius.

---

<sup>5</sup> Риккерт Генрих. Науки о природе и науки о культуре. Р. 148-149.

<sup>6</sup> Мюллер Макс. Смысловые толкования истории // Философия истории. Антология. Р. 277.

<sup>7</sup> Платон. Федон. Пир. Федр. Парменид. Р. 17-18.

<sup>8</sup> Фукидид. История. Р. 5, 14.

If the initial point of history as a positive science was text<sup>9</sup>, the work of Polybius demonstrated the increase in number of theoretical digressions. Although this trend in his work is evident, none of the main historiosophical questions (What is the motivator of history? What is the movement of history (historical process)? What is the meaning of history?<sup>10</sup>) is formulated in his text. He interpreted history as the spectacle and named the purpose of his work to show how the local histories of Mediterranean during 53 years only became one common history as the region became united under the power of Romans<sup>11</sup>. For Polybius the Entirety was not the category of philosophy but the name of political reality. No combination between history and philosophy is available here.

That is why Polybius sounded archaic in the passages explaining the mechanism backing the processes described above. He used for it ancient category of Fate (mainly represented not in the philosophy of the period but in mythology and dramaturgy). No causal relationship can be traced down in his explanations; that means that questions “How?” and “Why?” sounded differently for him. Only the first of them motivated his work while the second was covered by the usage of magic word *Fate*. Answering the question “How?”, Polybius interpreted history mechanically. His purposes were exclusively concrete, never achieving the level of theoretical generalization.

## **2. “Generalizing cognition” and monographic research: the issue of relationship**

Later developments of history towards strengthening the theoretical constituent belong to the Age of Enlightenment and are associated with names of Voltaire and Johann Gottfried Goerder. The pause over 2000 years long separating them from the achievements of ancient writers witnesses that the need to provide theoretical background for history never was crucial. These years were filled with the number of significant historical works, but no original theoretical conceptions supported them during neither medieval nor Renaissance epochs. Sometimes the voices stating history is not a science sounded loudly. It became commonplace that history is good to exercise the good style in writing or to have

---

<sup>9</sup> Савельева И.М., Полетаев А.В. Знание о прошлом: теория и история. Vol. 1. P. 17-22.

<sup>10</sup> Димитрова Л.М. Філософія історії: від Полібія до Л. Гумільова. P. 6.

<sup>11</sup> Полибий. Всеобщая история Vol.1. P. 148.

pleasure from reading historical works – but nothing more<sup>12</sup>. The doubts concerning value of history entered even XX century<sup>13</sup>.

The reasons of it we have formulated a bit earlier in our article especially devoted to the issue of “generalizing cognition”: the awareness of non-perfection of historical cognition and conviction that historical experience cannot make the mankind better<sup>14</sup>. Only the optimistic Age of Enlightenment hoped to improve the negative influence of previous epochs having been considered “dark”. It restarted the project to strengthen theoretical constituent in history.

These high expectations haven’t been fulfilled and in the mid XIX century Auguste Comte appreciated history very low and gave it place among secondary sciences<sup>15</sup>. This opinion survived during the age of positivism and called forth the theory of H. Rickert (from where we started).

Anyway, the important issue declared above hasn’t been covered yet. It is linked with some structural and compositional peculiarities of historical researches of XIX century comparing to the previous periods. Those periods saw historical works of bigger size like medieval chronicles. The past reality depicted in these texts was considered a sort of whole thing to grab it and to describe – but not the unknown space to penetrate it step by step. The latter way of research became prone to the natural sciences. The exercising it in history required some changes in approach. It came down to reduction of historical works to the small articles. The difference between monographic and smaller formats of research composed the agenda for the first time. Mainly it was linked with the start of exploration of ancient history (especially of the Near East) because it looked mostly like the unknown space, *Terra Incognita*.

To penetrate such a space in the format of monographs was possible only in parts described by ancient Greek and Roman historians earlier. There was no native tradition of writing historical works among the peoples of the East; this tradition should be developed by European historians for the first time and the starting points were the minor articles describing bits of *Terra Incognita* accessible at the beginning. The entire picture had to be the affair of the next phase.

---

<sup>12</sup> Савельева И.М., Полетаев А.В. Знание о прошлом: теория и история. Vol. 1. P. 42-50.

<sup>13</sup> Блок Марк. Апология истории или ремесло историка. P. 7-8.

<sup>14</sup> Чеканов В. Виникнення “генералізуючого пізнання” в історичній науці. P. 80.

<sup>15</sup> Савельева И.М., Полетаев А.В. Знание о прошлом: теория и история., P. 51.

Spreading this way of research onto other fields of historical knowledge leads us to the subject of the next part of our work.

### **3. An example: Byzantinistics as a branch of humanities**

There were some processes within global historical science parallel to the ones described above. The process we approach closer is spreading of scientific interests of professional historians from nationally oriented topics to the international issues out of any patriotic actualization. In the tsarist Russia this process occurred in the second half of XIX century. It was linked with the widespread liberalization of economical and public life after Crimean war 1853 – 1856 and especially after the Great Reform of 1861. The first of these events has put an end to the role of European gendarme for Russia; the second has opened lots of opportunities for intellectual and even political self-expression within the country. That is why the activation of intellectual life and of revolutionary movements in Russia came out almost at once, and the first of the processes is the subject of our interest<sup>16</sup>.

The field where Russian historians opened the new field was the history of Byzantium – the Eastern offspring of Roman Empire that has survived over 1000 years after its predecessor was over. Up to XIX century Europeans were underestimating the significance of Byzantium cause its size, power and influence became lesser year by year. If it was really influential throughout the period of “barbarian kingdoms” in Europe during V – VI century, the things have changed dramatically by the end of VII century. Byzantium has chosen its own Greek and orthodox identity and concentrated mostly on the Eastern and Slavonic vectors. So Byzantium became significant among peoples of European periphery and newcomers to medieval Europe. Some of them joined civilization and Christianity through Byzantine influence (like Great Moravia, Bulgaria and Kyiv Rus).

Up to XX century Byzantium wasn't considered an important part of European legacy inherited from the Middle Ages. The position towards it was influenced greatly by the book entitled “The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire” in 6 volumes by Edward Gibbon, English historian of XVIII century. In this book Byzantine history was considered

---

<sup>16</sup> Чеканов Всеволод. Візантиністика в Київському університеті в другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст.: “недорозвинена школа” чи “окремий варіант розвитку”? Р. 47.

an integral part of Roman Empire (according to its self-identification; Byzantines called themselves Romans and called their state Roman Empire (although in Greek)); the whole history of Byzantium was depicted in Gibbon's work but just as a very long decline of genuine Rome.

By the end of XIX century German historians noted the imperial entity of Byzantium and drew attention of the global positivist historiography to the economic life of Byzantium. However, the massive interest to Byzantium started out in XX century. Russian historians were ahead here because Byzantine history was very special for them in two reasons:

1. Byzantium provided for Kyiv Rus the passage to European civilization and Christianity.

2. Byzantium was the spiritual source for later tsarist ideology of Russian monarchy which had nothing to do with European political tradition but inherited much from Byzantium.

Russian interest to Byzantium was reduced down to these two positions; for instance, economic issues were accepted later from German historians but the issues listed above were taken as they have been. The later phase of the process was linked with the global processes of science's internationalization, but the starting point related to issues were traditional for imperial researchers accent on church orthodoxy and Kyiv Rus combined with the new opportunities opened since 1861.

During the late XIX century Byzantinistic studies started out in the prominent universities of the Russian Empire, and Kyiv St. Volodymyr University was among them. These studies concentrated there at the faculty for history and philology.

#### **4. An example: humanities in Kyiv before 1917**

Byzantine studies in Kyiv University took place generally between 1873 and 1915 and covered over 70 scientific articles and 3 monographs created by three prominent researchers: professors of faculty for history and philology Philip Ternovsky (1838–1884), Timofey Florinsky (1854–1919) and Julian Kulakowsky (1855–1919)<sup>17</sup>. Each of them had his own research field never covered by others: in case of Ph. Ternovsky it was

---

<sup>17</sup> Чеканов Всеволод. Візантиністика в Київському університеті в другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст.: “недорозвинена школа” чи “окремий варіант розвитку”? Р. 48.

Byzantine church and church historiography; relationship of Byzantium with Slavonian peoples for T. Florinsky; J. Kulakowsky explored a number of versatile topics: from Byzantine remnants in Crimean archaeology to the peculiarities of political and military systems of Byzantine Empire.

It makes us sure that during late XIX – early XX centuries there took place a number of processes we would like to unite under the title of “Kyiv Byzantinistics”. These processes led to the formation of full-fledged scientific school but for some reasons formation of it wasn’t finished up to 1917. The other important side of it is that these processes may be explored in three dimensions:

1. Phenomenon in history of university.
2. Expression of the trend to spread the field of scientific interests of historians from domestic topics to the issues of international meaning.
3. Witness of certain processes in world’s historiography<sup>18</sup>.

This three-dimensional look was for the first time proposed by us in the number of our works devoted to personalities of Kyiv byzantinists; the new side added now is the attempt to discover the influence of the turn to monographic research on the basic format and parameters of it and then on the results achieved.

We showed the comparative balance between articles and monographs in their summary output as 70 to 3; now it’s time to place it into the chronological context of their careers and research activity to make visible the effects of turn to monographic phase (if there’s one).

The first personality to establish Byzantine studies in St. Volodymyr University and in secular science simultaneously was professor Philip Ternovsky.

Moscow-born Ph. Ternovsky has been urged to move to Kyiv to strengthen the personnel of Kyiv Theological Academy, and later was reassigned to secular branch of science. After Polish uprising of 1863–1864 massively supported by ethnic Poles of Right Bank Ukraine, there was a strong need to decrease the menace of further uprisings by Depolonization actions among local Polish gentry. One of these actions was the Russification of Kyiv University originally containing strong Polish element within the environment of its professors and students. That is why Ph. Ternovsky became teaching professor of the faculty for history

---

<sup>18</sup> Чеканов Всеволод. Візантиністика в Київському університеті в другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст.: “недорозвинена школа” чи “окремий варіант розвитку”? Р. 48.

and philology. From the beginning the main direction of his scientific interests hardly went out of history of Rus and Russian Orthodoxy although he was opened to perceive some local influences via periodical co-work with the “Historical Society of Nestor the Chronicler” established in Kyiv in 1873.

In 1875–1876 Ph. Ternovsky wrote the sole big monograph in his output, “The study of Byzantine history and its tendentious usage in Kyiv Rus”. This work has been defended as doctor’s thesis but, what is more important, it initiated the systematic exploration of ancient Rus historiography of Byzantine<sup>19</sup>. In fact it was the very first step into the field of Byzantinistics itself, although the author and his colleagues never regarded it as entry into new research field: for them it was considerable effort increasing the round of sources to reconstruct the history of chronicle writing in Rus. Unfortunately, the true significance of this work never was recognized by later scientists, and Ph. Ternovsky died in 1884 having achieved no accolades for his novelty in the field of Byzantine studies.

Later generations of scientists omitted his personality too often although some of them paid attention to his conflict with Ober-Procurator of the Most Holy Synod K. Pobedonostsev with mortal effect on Kyiv professor.

The death of Ph. Ternovsky never hailed as founder of Byzantinistics in Kyiv University marked the pause in its development. For us it’s time to appreciate the place and significance of his monograph in the output on whole. First of all, “The study of Byzantine history and its tendentious usage in Kyiv Rus” was the result of previous studying Rus history. That is why the writer himself thought he made an effort in the branch of Rus studies<sup>20</sup>. That was completely understandable taking into account that Ph. Ternovsky stood at the source of new processes in Russian historiography started since 1861: humanitarian studies in Russian Empire for the first time have been freed from obligation to observe notorious formula (“the Triad”) of “Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality” by Minister of Education Sergey Uvarov.

The most evident result of it became the rise of interest to foreign subjects of no direct connection with history of Rus. They required no

---

<sup>19</sup> Терновский Филипп. Изучение византийской истории и ее тенденциозное приложение в древней Руси. Р. 2-27.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., Р. 2-3.

patriotic motivation and derived from abstract interest to global history. It would be exaggeration to say that no global history was allowed in Russian Empire before. But its presence was reduced to teaching process. The serious work was done only in the field of national history and the need to obtain data about parallel events in Europe was covered by the usage of works by Western historians. Up to the end of XIX century their Russian colleagues never “played on their side”.

The first timid attempts to change situation belong to 1870s. Ph. Ternovsky went on working in Kyiv but he didn't take part in these attempts instead of joining the regional studies of Kyiv province. The new personalities discovered the new space, first of all Timofey Florinsky.

T. Florinsky didn't belong to the theological academia. His way to impartial studies of global history was different although it came through topics not far from nationalistic motivations of previous epoch. He concentrated on the Slavonic studies and used to be a powerful contributor not only to the research of history of Slavs but also to the Slavonic philology. As in case with Ph. Ternovsky, his arrival to the field close to Byzantium wasn't the result of his conscious choice but the result of the fact that Slavs were closest neighbors, partners and enemies of Byzantines during the Middle Ages. Exploring medieval Slavistics T. Florinsky came close to Byzantine subjects in history. The first steps have been done by the end of 1870s yet in St. Petersburg where T. Florinsky was born, made first steps in sciences and obtained his first academic grade. These efforts were done naturally in the format of smaller articles.

Further moving of T. Florinsky to Kyiv can be explained with the same motifs as it was with his predecessor. Later research activity in Kyiv never went out of the venue first drawn in St. Petersburg. However, the “Slavonic” part of his output became ever bigger and soon turned out into the fundamental research of “Greek-Slavonic World”. It was his most hailed monograph “The manuscripts of legislation of Stefan Dušan, the tsar of Serbs and Greeks” first published in Kyiv in 1888. The all-time significance of this work has been confirmed by its full incorporation into the canon of Western Slavistics after its publishing in

London in 1973. It should be considered the most important success of Kyiv historians working on this topic during the period before 1917<sup>21</sup>.

The meaning of the work comes out from definite accent on the fact that medieval Serbia in the time of Stefan Dušan (1331–1355) wasn't just the state of "another" Balkan Slavs but the state formation with ambition to create the powerful empire in the outskirts of Europe meant to combine equally Serb and Greek elements in its ethnicity and civilization. To provide this, Stefan Dušan planned to take advantage of weakening of Byzantium; during the century it passed through civil war for religious reasons and thusly through number of territorial losses for the benefit of its neighbors. By the mid XIV century the territory of Byzantium decreased to the narrow strip between Crusaders' state of Greece in the South and Serbia in the North. From Byzantine view point Stefan Dušan was its strongest and most dangerous opponent powerful enough to put a question of Constantinople siege into agenda in 1354. Byzantine leadership was shocked and invited Turks on the European side of Dardanelles the same year. It was impossible for them to predict the negative effects of this invitation; Stefan Dušan was considered the greatest threat. Serb tsar didn't dare to besiege Constantinople, made a retreat with his troops and soon died in 1355. His death started out the epoch of feudal fragmentation of the state; his plans to create Greek-Serb state never came to reality. In 1371 Stefan Dušan's successors have been defeated by Turks and soon in 1389 the independence of Serbia was lost in the famous battle of Kosovo. Byzantium came to an end in 1453.

The cornerstone thesis of T. Florinsky's work was based upon the idea that further decline of Serbia wasn't an outcome of regular processes but the negative constellation of the events<sup>22</sup>; the reality might change greatly if Serb tsar succeeded. T. Florinsky was famous for his expression that Slavs occupy more places on the map than in history. The ideas of Slavonic nationalism found their great supporter and protector in Kyiv historian.

T. Florinsky used Dušan's Code from 1349 to prove that Serbia accepted more accomplished Byzantine law to modernize its society and to make it more prepared to be a part of bilateral Greek-Serb state (some Greek codes of the period, like Nomocanon and Procheiron, have been

---

<sup>21</sup> Чеканов Всеволод. Візантиністика в київському університеті. Р. 48.

<sup>22</sup> Флоринский Тимофей. Памятники законодательной деятельности Душана, царя сербов и греков. Р. 6, 12.

incorporated into Serb legislation intact a bit earlier). The publication of the Code was the highest phase of the entire process, according to T. Florinsky<sup>23</sup>. He developed the idea of Greek-Slavonic World as counterweight to the Roman-German World united around the Papism and Catholicism. The cornerstone of it should be the reception of Byzantine law and culture.

However, the contemporaries of scientist commonly understood his research as devoted to history of medieval Serbia. When it has resurfaced in the second half of XX century its importance was formulated as the discovery of Serbia for European science.

We can see here the usage of monographic research to summarize the separate ideas from his earlier articles and to develop the whole concept of regional history of Balkans. If the writings of Ph. Ternovsky didn't show out the balance between thematically similar articles and monograph, in case of T. Florinsky this balance is shaped as a sturdy construction optimal to establish the new theory. Although its creator didn't go on accomplishing his theory, his work was generally accepted later as valuable addition to the picture of Balkans of XIV century.

Further studies of T. Florinsky differed greatly from this convincing start: he continued to explore the Slavonic issues but moved to the field of philology<sup>24</sup>. This second direction drove him out of Byzantinistics although it was completely within his political interests: T. Florinsky was famous supporter of Russian nationalism and Russification governmental policy in Kyiv, he opposed fiery the Ukrainian cultural rebirth and the rise of Ukrainian nationalism. In 1910s he became widely known in Kyiv for his Russian patriotic position, but Ukrainian parties weren't his sole opponents; in 1919 he was shot by Bolsheviks during the short period of their control over Kyiv that time.

## **5. The generalization: direct / indirect influences upon it**

The dominance of positivism in the scientific methodology of late XIX century influenced greatly the humanitarian studies of the period. The ones unable to accept positivistic approaches fully had to give up generalization due to their inability to provide completely new ("positive") knowledge. T. Florinsky in 1888 stopped abruptly the

---

<sup>23</sup> Флоринский Тимофей. Памятники законодательной деятельности Душана, царя сербов и греков. Р. 342-343.

<sup>24</sup> Чеканов Всеволод. Візантиністика в Київському університеті. Р. 49.

working out the conception of Greek-Slavonic World. The new generation of scientists represented in Kyiv by Julian Kulakovsky didn't even try to start with working out generalizing ideas. Positivistic methodology required to increase number of newly discovered facts instead of theoretical shaping them into new conceptions. That is why the special historical sciences like archaeology and epigraphy have improved their positions by that time; started as a way to find out interesting antiquates they became by the end of XIX century the influential tool to obtain new information basically regarded authentic because of evident impartiality of sources never aimed to survive upcoming centuries and found by chance mostly. The other trend of the period was the attention to the narrow special issues mostly describing the new discoveries in details but not putting them into framework of generalizing cognition.

The 1890s were the years when J. Kulakovsky started his career at the faculty of history and philology in St. Volodymyr University. From the beginning he was more involved into making small research efforts with typically positivistic purposes than in working out sort of *Opus magnum* to express his ideas in the research field.

This situation became typical for Kyiv; local historians of global history have been left absolutely out of rather common motivations of historians from Moscow and St. Petersburg. Opposing the dominant ideology of previous time they paid attention to new-fashioned methodology of Marxism and researched the agrarian system of Byzantium; in the same reasons they supported the idea of close kinship between Byzantium and the West. For them it was the way to declare their Westernism in the public disputes in the years before revolution of 1905.

The abovementioned trends never impressed majority of Kyiv historians of global history and none of Byzantinists. Most of their output was nevertheless considered belonging to the traditional research fields; the works of Ph. Ternovsky were perceived as studies of ancient Rus instead of Russian historiography of Byzantine history; T. Florinsky was hailed for his input to the Slavistic studies done completely within the political trend to exaggerate everything concerning Slavs. The outcome was the lack of professional contacts between Kyiv historians, although the extant correspondence shows the wide personal contacts.

That was a reason why no scientific school was established in Kyiv in spite of prolific studies in Byzantinistics.

J. Kulakovsky was the author of the first generalizing monograph in Russian Empire devoted to Byzantium. On the one hand, it was started in 1910, decades after his earliest nearing to the issue<sup>25</sup>; on the other hand, the direct impact to start monographic phase of research came not from accumulation of data in his numerous earlier articles but from the inception of the course of Byzantinistics for St. Volodymyr University students. The strangest thing was here that none of previous articles was taken into account by author creating general history; the text of monograph lacks inventiveness of these articles and was not only based upon narrative sources but also inherited their chronological framework accepted non-critically. Although J. Kulakovsky wrote introduction to his work he gave no explanation to this discrepancy.

The start of J. Kulakovsky's involvement into Byzantinistics goes back to 1890s when he started archaeological exploration of Crimea; no special link with Byzantium was planned because scientist's work done before was dedicated to the army of ancient Rome. The Roman army became favorite of J. Kulakovsky for years but the constant and never-changed format of its exploration was the format of smaller articles.

The first and evident conclusion here may be that in spite of writing his own monograph generalizing Byzantine history, J. Kulakovsky never entered truly the phase of monographic research; his work was aimed rather to help students than to summarize the groundwork of previous phase. But another possible explanation here is that the research of Kind 2 isn't the direct continuation of previous phase obligatory. If we take things chronologically, that means that both kinds of research may not be allocated one by one, so we don't have to call them Phase 1 or 2 (it will non-correctly orientate us to perceive them in succession).

Generalization of knowledge in monographs isn't obligatory phase of research following the phase of smaller articles writing. In case of J. Kulakovsky their mutual disposal hardly looks logical. Maybe there is no regulation of inevitable overgrowing of articles' phase into writing big monographs to generalize previous work. For example, the period of positivism opened another chance of self-expression like creating big collection of sources published and put into scientific practice for the first

---

<sup>25</sup> Чеканов Всеволод. Візантиністика в Київському університеті. Р. 50.

time. Commonly known example of it was the founder of epigraphy Theodor Mommsen (rewarded with Nobel Prize for his outstanding collection of ancient Roman inscriptions); if we take it into account we should recognize that in case of J. Kulakovsky there was very similar situation: in 1907 he has published popular monograph “The past of Taurida” with number of finds made in Crimea both by himself and by his colleagues<sup>26</sup>.

## **6. What is seen now and what changed later**

To make final conclusions concerning the topic exemplified by the history of Byzantinistics in Kyiv St. Volodymyr University we have to repeat again the basic assumptions behind the conceptions of our research.

There are two kinds of scientific research common for both exact sciences and humanities.

1. Research in minor articles aimed to discover or to underline some unique but yet unknown features of the subject.

2. Research in big monographic works aimed to generalize the number of abovementioned features and to create the whole picture of the subject.

The Kind 1 should precede to the Kind 2 because of special nature of humanities; the direction of humanitarian research is always more or less predictable; that means that two phases of scientific research have to be mutually separated. We can spot the correspondence between kinds and phases of research in humanities: Kinds 1 and 2 should meet Phases 1 and 2 directly. They are programmed and performed differently; only the Kind 1 fits perfectly to the “breakthrough” phase. The procedure of generalization belongs to the Phase 2 solely.

It was the starting provision behind our exploration. The true picture obtained after having concluded it enables us to depict the other algorithm of the research making process in humanities.

The examples given in the article before show not the entire picture but illustrate the typical situation embedded into the peripetia of humble career life and aspirations of Kyiv historians. They aren't enough to make certain conclusion but there are several things to summarize.

First of all, the presence of two kinds of research in humanities is irrefutable fact. They differ by their aims, methods, results etc. What is doubted is the mutual disposition of them. Our basic presumption was that

---

<sup>26</sup> Кулаковский Юлиан. Прошлое Тавриды. Р. 80.

Kind 1 is for beginning phase of research (Phase 1) when the accumulation of materials is to be done. The generalization of them is impossible in the format of smaller articles, so it requires wider format for it. But there's still no proof that monographic research coincides with Phase 2 and predictably starts only after Phase 1 is over.

In case of Ph. Ternovsky turn to monograph was explained with the need to get doctor's degree in secular science. It wasn't preceded by gathering materials and publishing them in numerous articles. The topic was exposed by scientist's predecessors and their materials shaped the background. This situation was accepted due to the necessity to strengthen personnel of the faculty of history and philology.

In case of T. Florinsky monographic phase is more justified because of his numerous activities studying both Byzantium and medieval Slavs of Balkans. The monograph was successful combination of topics. Structure of it was very special, however. The research of legislation made in this monograph belonged almost fully to the Phase 2 and was neither preceded nor followed with smaller articles aimed either to gather discoveries in this field for future monograph or to go on with them spreading attention to the legal topics further<sup>27</sup>. The monograph by T. Florinsky cannot exemplify provisional relationship between Phases 1 and 2 as well.

Finally the scientific work by J. Kulakovsky proved full correspondence of his start as historian with Phase 1. Huge number of archaeological finds, separate conceptions (the most important ones touched almost unknown by then issue of "theme system" in Byzantium of VII – VIII centuries) have been gathered by the early XX centuries making their author the reputation of keen researcher. No wonder that in 1902 his candidature has been chosen to represent Kyiv University at the I International Congress of historical sciences in Rome.

But none of these facts got its continuation later. J. Kulakovsky visited two more congresses later but never used these opportunities to promote Byzantinistics in Kyiv University by advertising it internationally; his reports made there didn't concentrate on the issue. Further development of his scientific work widened the circle of his scientific interest onto Byzantine Christianity and Roman army. The combination of them with previously researched issues was never done too. Monograph by J. Kulakovsky analyzed above met the teaching

---

<sup>27</sup> Op. cit., P. 474-477.

troubles but never looked like the realization of Phase 2 of his research activity in the field of Byzantinistics.

We may call these examples “situative”: they are explained fully by different situations the scientists were in; no regularity conditions the turn of events in all three cases. The further development of history as science revealed that by the mid XX century the works combining Phases 1 and 2 have been published in a format of collected works’ publication.

First of all it is about famous work by Lucien Febvre “Combats pour l’histoire” published in 1953. One of the cornerstones of creative method by “École des Annales”, it combines successfully two contradictory kinds of research we named before as 1 and 2, and does it simultaneously. On the surface, the work by French historian is just a collection of separate articles devoted to the small and insignificant issues. So it looks corresponding to the Phase 1. But no Phase 2 is available here because none of these articles was reworked later into part of some monograph dealing with medievistic issues on whole. All of them are re-published untouched, and the succession of them aims to fulfill the certain task: to make reader understand the method of “École des Annales” exemplified with number of small studies covering numerous topics (historical and historiographic equally). The re-working could distort the eloquence of the method and that’s why all of them were left intact<sup>28</sup>.

Similar model of deal is revealed in the work by the next representative of “École des Annales” Philippe Ariès “Les Temps de l’histoire” (1954). This work published even more than his most well-known works belongs definitely to the phase of generalization. But it generalizes not the research results of scientist himself collecting the data obtained in his smaller articles but his personal experience from reading and thinking on the historical issues.

The works by Lucien Febvre and Philippe Ariès reveal the special kind of generalization in historical science: generalizing not the results of concrete finds but of intellectual reflection around professional activity. These works belong to methodology of history. They use the materials gathered while working on the researches of Kind 1 to proceed onto higher level of scientific work.

Again we see that provisional schemes of mutual allocation of smaller articles and monographs contradict to the reality of making

---

<sup>28</sup> Февр Люсьен. Бои за историю. Р. 4-9.

research. Generalization procedure usually performed in a format of monographs is for real but its positioning towards smaller articles cannot be algorithmized.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

So the research made above on the example of pre-revolutionary Byzantinistics in Kyiv St. Volodymyr University comes to its ending finally. It provides us with a number of conclusions enabling to outline on whole the features of gradual development of “generalizing cognition” in historical science and its combination with monographic phase of research in history:

1. There are two basic kinds of scientific research in history:

a) the one featured with the smaller articles devoted to the separate aspects of past reality and mainly oriented onto discovering new facts;

b) the one featured with the big monographs devoted to generalizing knowledge obtained while making smaller researches mentioned above.

2. These kinds are more or less corresponding to the phases of research when the smaller articles’ kind precedes monograph writing because it covers the need to pick up more material but not its generalization yet.

3. The example of humanities in Kyiv St. Volodymyr University reveals the interdependence between this two kinds of research as non-upright: they do not go one by one obligatory although the current of research activity is reflected via using different kinds of research procedures which may be more or less expedient in their career situations.

4. The works by French scientists belonging to famous “Ècole des Annales” illustrate the other way of generalization putting into center generalization not of the data but of the method used while obtaining it. This way shows out the special features of methodology and it is particularly important for projects where not the results themselves but the way to have them is the most appreciated thing.

5. The provisional correspondence between researches of the Kinds 1 and 2 and Phases 1 and 2 cannot be considered immanent feature of scientific research; purposes of generalization are constantly present in history but they do not locate definitely after the researches made in the Phase 1.

## **SUMMARY**

The article deals with the issue on the edge between history and historiography barely touched by contemporary science. It is aiming to discover backgrounds of humanitarian sciences, history in particular, by paying attention to the gradual consequence of research procedures reflecting the progress from exploring separate facts to the phase of “generalization” performed usually in the format of big monographs. The basic assumption was to examine if the correspondence between these two phases is direct (that should mean the presence of strict algorithm in humanitarian research). Explored on the example of Byzantinistics in Kyiv St. Volodymyr University during the period before 1917 the exploration revealed indirect relation between “generalizing” and monographic phases of research work provided by scientists, and proved no algorithm behind research in humanities.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Rickert Heinrich. Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft. Tuebingen : Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, 1926. 144 S.
2. Блок Марк. Апология истории или ремесло историка. М. : Наука, 1986. 232 с.
3. Димитрова Л.М. Філософія історії: від Полібія до Л. Гумільова. К. : ІЗМН, 1997. 200 с.
4. Кулаковский Ю. Прошлое Тавриды. К. : Стилос, 2002. 225 с.
5. Мюллер Макс. Смысловые толкования истории // Философия истории. Антология [под ред. Ю.А. Кимелева]. М. : Аспект-пресс, 1995. С. 274–282.
6. Платон. Федон. Пир. Федр. Парменид / [ред. А.Ф. Лосев, В.Ф. Асмус, А.А. Тахо-Годи]. М. : Мысль, 1999. 528 с.
7. Полибий. Всеобщая история / отв. ред. А. Я. Тыжов. Т. 1. СПб. : Наука, 2005. 496 с.
8. Риккерт Генрих. Науки о природе и науки о культуре. М. : Республика, 1998. 413 с.
9. Савельева И.М., Полетаев А.В. Знание о прошлом: теория и история. Т. 1. СПб. : Наука, 2003. 632 с.
10. Савельева И.М., Полетаев А.В. История и время в поисках утраченного. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1997. 800 с.

11. Терновский Филипп. Изучение византийской истории и ее тенденциозное приложение в древней Руси. К. : Университ. тип., 1875. Вып. 1. 214 с.
12. Февр Люсьен. Бои за историю. М. : Наука, 1991. 632 с.
13. Флоринский Тимофей. Памятники законодательной деятельности Душана, царя сербов и греков. К. : Университ. тип., 1888. 716 с.
14. Фукидид. История / [изд. подг. Г. А. Стратановский, А. А. Нейхард, Я. М. Боровский]. Л. : Наука, 1981. 543 с.
15. Чеканов Всеволод. Візантиністика в Київському університеті в другій половині ХІХ – на початку ХХ ст.: “недорозвинена школа” чи “окремий варіант розвитку”? *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2011. Вип. 3. С. 46–56.
16. Чеканов В. Виникнення “генералізуючого пізнання” в історичній науці. *Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету імені В.І. Вернадського. Серія “Історичні науки”*. 2017. Т. 28 (67). № 1. С. 76–81.
17. Чеканов Всеволод. Фемний лад у Візантії в історіографії: проблема “малодослідженості”. *Київська старовина*. 2010. № 3. С. 83–90.

**Information about the author:**  
**Chekanov V. Yu.**

Candidate of historical sciences,  
Assistant professor of the department of philosophy and history,  
Taurida V.I. Vernadsky National University,  
33 Ivana Kudri str., Kyiv, Ukraine