

Список використаних джерел:

1. Базаревский А.Х. Наступательная операция 9-й русской армии. Июнь 1916 года. Прорыв укрепленной полосы и форсирование реки / А.Х. Базаревский. – М.: Воениздат, 1937. – 158 с.
2. Волковинський В.М. Бойові дії на українських землях у роки Першої світової війни / В.М. Волковинський // Український історичний журнал. – 2004. – № 4. – С. 38–56.
3. Добржанський О. Хотинщина. Історичний нарис / О. Добржанський, Ю. Макар, О. Масан. – Чернівці: Молодий буковинець, 2002. – 464 с.
4. Заполовський В.М. Буковина в останній війні Австро-Угорщини 1914–1918 / В.М. Заполовський. – Чернівці: Золоті литаври, 2003. – 242 с.
5. Керсновский А.А. История русской армии: в 4 т. / А.А. Керсновский. – М.: Голос, 1992–1994. – Т. 3: 1881–1915 гг. – 1994. – 349 с.
6. Стратегический очерк войны 1914–1918 гг. Часть 7: Кампания 1917 г. / сост. А. Зайончковский. – М.: Высший военный редакционный совет, 1923. – 189 с.
7. Україна між самовизначенням та окупацією: 1917–1922 роки / Вольфрам Дорнік та ін.; упоряд В. Дорнік; пер. з нім. В. Кам'янець. – К.: Ніка-Центр, 2015. – 512 с.
8. Державний архів Чернівецької області (ДАЧО). – Ф. 42. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 149. – 204 арк.
9. ДАЧО. – Ф. 742. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 14. – 120 арк.
10. ДАЧО. – Ф. 742. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 16. – 141 арк.

Italiev V.M.

Master`s Student,

Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy

REFLECTIONS ON THE NATURE OF CONFLICT IN EARLY STUART ENGLAND: AN ATTEMPT TO CONCEPTUAL RECONSIDERATION THROUGH THE PRISM OF REVISIONIST AND POST-REVISIONIST HISTORIOGRAPHY

Nearly all contemporary Ukrainian historians, especially those of «Marxist out of habit» viewpoints, tended to regard the English Revolution as one of the turning points not only in history of England itself, but in European history as well. At the same time, the 17th century English history is studied in terms of historical materialism, while almost no attention to the intellectual history of Early Stuart monarchy and the history of political thought has ever been paid. Such a discourse traces its origins back to soviet historiography, whose representatives interpreted Whig reading of history, which had emerged in 19th century amongst English historians and the works of Robert Tawney and Christopher Hill according to Marxist-Leninist paradigm.

Therefore the tensions between James and Charles and parliamentarians at the beginning of the 17th century and eventual conflict are depicted as that of absolutely unavoidable nature. Leading position in it was taken by abstract social class of gentry, as if they shared common attitudes towards monarchy and its policy, were monolithic political parties and had «class consciousness» similar to that of 20th century international working class. Stuart monarchy was in state of decline, and

productive revolutionary forces of English people have to overthrow it immediately. As a result of long-term inevitable struggle weakened «feudal-absolutist» regime of Charles was collapsed, and the victory of the English people paved the way for the new «bourgeois society» in country and opened the new era which brought England at the top of the capitalist countries in two consecutive centuries.

Such teleological approach to history felt under heavy criticism of British historians over recent decades. The «postmodern challenge» to history contributed heavily to emergence of revisionism. The basic postulate of postmodernism is that society and culture are in transformation in which old essentialist assumptions concerning objectivity, truth, industrial growth, rising economic expectations, and traditional middle-class norms have been shaken [1, p. 181].

Thus the old «whiggish» version of history which means firm belief in distinctiveness of the historical development of England, representation its history from Magna Carta through Glorious Revolution to the parliamentary liberties of the nineteenth century proved to be constructed. The notions contained in Whig grand-narratives were almost entirely rejected. They have been substituted with works in which the appeal to any possibility of revealing the truth in history was no longer existed. As of that time Anglo-centric point of view started to decline gradually: historians now offered to take events occurred in Scotland and Ireland into consideration rather than focus only on English chain of events in their endeavors to explain the causes of English, or, in wider context, British Civil War(s).

As early as sixties revisionist approach to Early Modern British history emerged and from the 1970s onwards prominent historians such as Conrad Russell, Nicholas Tyacke, Kevin Sharpe and John Pocock started to challenge old Whig, Marxist or Weberian views on early Stuart monarchy [2, p. 214]. Stuart politics and miscalculations were abandoned to be seen as a direct causation of the collapse of their monarchy. Moreover, revisionists argued that there was no desire to break the existed consensus between king and subjects, central government and localities, even if Stuart monarchy had inherited and itself accumulated some unsolved problems it would not led directly to civil war. No one anticipated, wanted it or endeavored to subvert legal or political framework of the state even at the beginning of Bishops` Wars. Revisionists emphasized the importance of studying the various aspects of life and activities at the level of county community rather than country gentry. Alan Everett came to conclusion that although national and local awareness were both increasing in sixteenth-and early seventeenth-century England, there was an inevitable tension between local and national concerns in which local interests almost always took priority [3, p. 19]. Revisionist discourse also deemphasized the role of parliament in Early Modern England. It has been stressed that to consider parliament to be a representative institution with respective rights and functions at the beginning of the 17th century is to put it ahead of its time – to modernize history. Parliament had summoned on vary rare occasions and at king`s request for financial reasons concerning crown`s revenue – to vote for subsidies or to approve a new ones.

Contemporary British historiography adopted a post-revisionist perspective on the subject of origins and causes of the conflict. It challenged the extremes of revisionist discourse and stressed upon fundamental (structural) problems Stuart

monarchy faced with: financial, ideological and administrative. Its representatives (Ann Hughes, Glenn Burgess, Johann Somerville, Richard Cust, Austin Woolrych, etc.) also modified revisionists' viewpoints, arguing that there was existing deep ideological and mental fault-line between different social groups and individuals represented political nation on the nature of kingship, king's duties to his subjects and the boundary of his prerogatives. What is the king's relationship to the laws of the land? Is he above the law or bound by it in particular cases? Should subjects not obey him if he abuse his prerogative powers? What was, in fact, a legal framework Stuart kingdom was based upon? As Johann Somerville has pointed out, English political thought was a legal thought.

In fact, Stuart polity by 1641-1642 based on balance between king's prerogative and subjects' liberties. However such a balance could have raised the question in time of strife: who has the ultimate authority in the kingdom? Many common lawyers placed sovereignty in the common law, and the law over the King. These men defined the common law as immemorial custom, and believed that custom originated in the old folk moots of the Anglo-Saxon era [4, p. 70].

By inventing the myth of the Ancient Constitution which king on advice of his «evil councilors» had been subverted, parliamentarians left themselves the room for maneuvering, arguing on the defensive character of their actions against the government. They turned the theory of king's two bodies and the essence of the theory of divine right of the kings against Charles himself, separating his natural body from the body politic, legitimate their actions as if they were opposed his confused natural body in the name of king Charles. Theory of divine rights of kings transformed into the theory of divine rights of Parliament.

There was no contradiction for the early modern conscious, as Austin Woolrych put it, to understand the primary secularness nature of conflict and chose the sight to fight for on the base of shared views on church government and religious beliefs. The «British problem» and the outbreak of civil war was much a result of a certain government miscalculations, especially in religious affairs after 1629 along with the monarch personal stubbornness in terms of reconciliation. Nonetheless, we should not underestimate the fundamental problems of managing a multiple kingdom after 1603: there were no match for Stuart monarchy in continental Europe in terms of confessional diversity even within each kingdom which constituted Crown Lands.

None of Laudian innovations of 1630s were of revolutionary character, but the very amount of them along with the Spanish manner of court ceremonials worsened psychological climate in country. Being lived in the age of Religious Wars, his subjects were divided by confessional belonging and seemed to have been aware of the possibility of papists' designs and suspicious activities within the kingdom. The Covenanters' movement inspired reformers and forced king to summon the parliament. When parliament happened to be summoned, even if no one in Westminster wanted to solve internal problems by force in 1640, Charles left himself no room, because his financial condition (hence the war success) was depended on the free will of his subjects, whose willingness to address grievances and change the unacceptable state of affairs in kingdom had become alarming. Had Charles been

successful in managing his multiple kingdom, the result would have been quite different.

To sum up, we stress once again that the outbreak of civil war in 1642 was not inevitable, and viewed now in post-revisionist historiography as the product of short-term political problems, but in a state afflicted by functional breakdown in the fiscal system and disagreements over the form of the Church, both issues with long-term antecedents [5, p. 368].

References:

1. Yilmaz K. Postmodernist Approach to the Discipline of History. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* (14) 2007 / 2 : P. 176-188.
2. Bucholz R., Key N. *Early Modern England 1485-1714: A Narrative History*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. – 440 pp.
3. Hughes A. The causes of the English Civil War. / *British History in Perspective* / Palgrave Macmillan, 1998. – 206 pp.
4. Knafla L. A. *Law and politics in Jacobean England: the tracts of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977. – 335 pp.
5. *Companion to Historiography*: Bentley M., ed. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. – 997 pp.

Козак А.І.

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент,
Чернівецький факультет Національного технічного університету
«Харківський політехнічний інститут»*

ОБЛОГА КРОТОНА (215 Р. ДО Н. Е.) ЯК ВІДОБРАЖЕННЯ ІТАЛІЙСЬКОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ ГАННІБАЛА БАРКИ

Після грандіозної перемоги при Каннах (216 р. до н. е.) Ганнібал Барка розпочав планомірне підкорення територій південної Італії, які повинні були забезпечити йому базу для подальшого продовження війни. Особливо важливим для пунійців було захоплення портових міст, через котрі планувалося налагодити доставку підкріплень і ресурсів безпосередньо із Карфагена. Саме на прикладі капітуляції одного з таких портів – Кротона найбільш яскраво проявилася низка викликаних місцевою політичною ситуацією протиріч, які формували рішення міст залишатися вірними Риму або ж приєднатись до Карфагена і, як наслідок, суттєво впливали на італійську політику Ганнібала.

Політична і дипломатична обстановка в Кротоні загалом відповідала закономірностям, які спостерігалися у регіоні. Правлячі еліти міста були розділені і Рим керував ним з допомогою лояльної частки місцевих аристократів. Тіт Лівій стверджує, що в Кротоні, подібно до інших грецьких колоній на Апеннінському півострові, спостерігався чіткий поділ на вищу верству населення, котра залишалася лояльною римлянам та нижчу, яка прагнула перейти на бік карфагенян (Liv. XXIV. 2. 8). Тим не менш, розповідь