

V. N. Borisenko, L. V. Sidorenko

PROBLEMS OF DEFINITION AND PERIODISATION OF THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

The article deals with the Glorious Revolution in England in the context of usability of definitions “the revolution” and “glorious”, and examines characteristic features of the causes of the revolution, its contradictions, and also the relevance of dating these events. It was shown that initially a “revolution” was synonymous with reaction in the modern sense, and only the events of 1688–1689 listed this word in the political dictionary. The authors conclude that the Glorious Revolution became the first revolutionary event for England, actualized the term “revolution” itself and fixed perception of its positive role by the concept of “gloryness”. Authors also depict the destructive role of James II, whose truly revolutionary reforms were not supported by the society and caused the change of power known as the Glorious revolution, thus having a conservative features, not typical for revolutions in modern sense. An important feature of the Glorious Revolution was the lack of a broad ideological base, it also had not the aim of creating a new type of society, but only ensured the restoration of the old order. The article demonstrates that the events of 1688–1689 did not solved all problems, and have continued a political discourse concerning a balance of Parliament, the monarchy and the Church in the kingdom, that allows one to speak about the chronological openness of the Glorious Revolution, in which the events of 1688–1689 can be see as its decisive point along with a post-revolutionary settlement that continued for decades. The Revolution laid the agenda for its contemporaries, setting the general direction, but not the dogmatic path, of national development. Refs 38.

Keywords: Glorious Revolution, James II, William of Orange, reforms, Catholicism, Whigs, settlement.

For citation: Borisenko V.N., Sidorenko L.V. Problems of definition and periodisation of the Glorious revolution in England. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2017, vol. 62, issue 3, pp. 577–586. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu02.2017.309

В. Н. Борисенко, Л. В. Сидоренко

ПРОБЛЕМЫ ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЯ И ПЕРИОДИЗАЦИИ СЛАВНОЙ РЕВОЛЮЦИИ В АНГЛИИ

В статье рассматривается Славная революция в Англии в контексте применимости к ней определений «революционности» и «славности», исследуются характерные особенности причин революции, ее противоречия, а также актуальность датировки этих событий. В статье показано, что изначально слово «революция» было синонимичным значению реакции в современном понимании, и только события 1688–1689 гг. внесли этот термин в политический словарь. Авторы приходят к выводу, что Славная революция стала для Англии первым по-настоящему революционным событием, актуализировавшим сам термин «революция» и за-

Borisenko Viktor Nikolaevich — PhD in History, Associate Professor, St. Petersburg State University, 7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; v.borisenko@spbu.ru

Sidorenko Leonid Vladimirovich — PhD in History, Senior Lecturer, St. Petersburg State University, 7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; l.sidorenko@spbu.ru

Борисенко Виктор Николаевич — кандидат исторических наук, доцент, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; v.borisenko@spbu.ru

Сидоренко Леонид Владимирович — кандидат исторических наук, старший преподаватель, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; l.sidorenko@spbu.ru

The article was prepared within the grant of the President of Russian Federation to support young Russian scholars, МК-3624.2017.6 (“Theory and practice of revolution in the context of the development of parliamentary monarchy in Great Britain between the 17th and 19th centuries”).

© Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2017

крепившим восприятие ее положительной роли понятием «славности». Авторы также описали деструктивную роль короля Якова II, чьи по-настоящему революционные инициативы в области религии и управления не были поддержаны английским обществом и привели к смене власти монарха, известной как Славная революция, имеющей, таким образом, консервативные черты, нетипичные для революций в современном понимании. Важными чертами Славной революции были недостаток массовой идейной базы, а также то, что она имела целью не создание нового типа общества, а лишь реставрацию старого и привычного порядка. В статье показывается, что события 1688–1689 гг. не решили всех проблем, а скорее продлили политический дискурс о балансе парламента, монархии и церкви в королевстве, что позволяет говорить о хронологической открытости Славной революции, когда события 1688–1689 гг. были ее решающей частью, а постреволюционное устройство затянулось на десятилетия. Таким образом, Славная революция сформировала повестку дня для современников, задав общее направление эволюции, а не догматический путь развития нации. Библиогр. 38 назв.

Ключевые слова: Славная революция, Яков II, Вильгельм Оранский, реформы, католицизм, виги, устроение.

It is no exaggeration to say that the Glorious Revolution of 1688–1689 in England is one of the most difficult in the study of revolutionary heritage of Europe. It concerns not only the very definition of its events as a revolution, but also covers its causes, course and consequences. The authors of this article examine the evolution of the components of the phrase “the Glorious Revolution”; analyze the causes of the revolution, its distinctive features, as well as the relevance of the dating of these events. These problems are resolved by taking into account traditional and modern approaches of the world historiography.

In the political context, the term “revolution” was first adopted in the mid-seventeenth century to mark a return to some kind of initial order. Thus, initially the “revolution” was synonymous with reaction in the modern sense. In England this word has entered the political dictionary during the events of 1688–1689, which their participants themselves marked as the “Glorious Revolution”. To them it seemed a peaceful end of political turmoil and civil wars, a return of the old order, albeit with some renovation [Bankowicz 2012, pp. 40–41]. Therefore, it can be argued that Englishmen have accomplished this revolution in its original meaning as a restoration of broken order, confirming the “ancient rights and liberties”. Conservative character and “gloryness” of the revolution were confirmed by the fact that almost the whole political nation could accept it [Zuckert 1998, pp. 13–14]. It was the Glorious Revolution which fixed the changing approach to the concept of “revolution” in the 1670-s — 1680-s, making it synonymous with the change of the base of society. Revolution has become customary in political discourse, although previously the definition taken from academic use dominated and was perceived by contemporaries otherwise than it is now [Israel 2006, p. 7]. Up to 1688 the word “revolution” was used to refer to the rotation of governments and movements of stars. The tradition of thinking about politics as entirely depending on turns of the wheel of fortune goes back to the Middle Ages. But by the end of the 17th century, the achievements of astronomy had become so popular, that its terminology was applied to earthly events [Rosenstock-Huessy 2012a, p. 161].

In 1688 the “revolution” for the first time lost its “inaccessible” and “cosmic” nature for politics, becoming familiar and, moreover, a “glorious” event. Even so, the Glorious Revolution in England never lost its positive meaning for contemporaries and descendants, which was not common on the continent where revolutions were considered an unpredictable and uncontrollable breach in social development [Rosenstock-Huessy 2012b,

p.2]. By the end of 1688–1689, the victorious Whig interpretation of the revolution described it as an “extraordinary but not extra-constitutional event”, as such an act of resistance with extreme necessity, which did not result in civil war, nor the complete destruction of the system of power in the country. It was thought that the abdication of James II, making the throne vacant, was not contrary to the Whig theory of resistance to tyranny and secured the old constitutional system of “the king in Parliament” [Rudolph 2002, p. 1].

For contemporaries the Glorious Revolution actually seemed “glorious”, as it wonderfully led to the end of a long period of political and religious instability, civil struggle and conflict between the king and Parliament [Zuckert 1998, p. 5]. The term “glorious” was used extensively from the end of the 1680s, primarily by the clergy to legitimize the new regime. However, in English ecclesiastical literature it can be found earlier to describe the accession to the throne of Emperor Constantine in ancient Rome, and even when describing the restoration of Charles II. Thus the revolutionary propagandists transformed an existing term to suit their needs [Niggemann 2012, pp. 481–482]. So we can agree with the opinion of D. Kuchta that for contemporaries the revolution was glorious because of its conservatism, its political, but not social nature, for the preservation of the monarchy and aristocracy, legitimizing their constitutional foundations, and for the approval of the new political culture [Kuchta 2002, p. 94].

Turning to the essence of the events of 1688–1689, note that, technically, the Glorious Revolution was primarily a change of monarch. It is significant that the deposed James II is still described positively as a person, a fact that did not preserve him from the shortcomings critical in politics, such as weakness of intellect and lack of flexibility, narrowing his adaptability to changing circumstances. James was egocentric and inclined to a simplified perception of reality that led him to indecision and depression, psychological demotivation and paralysis of the will [Harrison 1990, p. 30]. But the lack of professionalism did not make James a tyrant. Unlike other rulers, who have brought their country to revolution, James didn't fill prisons, but rather liberated them by General amnesties (for example, in 1686 and 1688). He also applied individual pardons for the many dissenters who had suffered under the reign of his brother. As Scott Sowerby noted, revolutions usually occur when the authorities refuse reforms desired by society, in the case of the Glorious Revolution deposed James II acted as a reformer, while English society hold a protective position in religious matters. For this reason, historians have traditionally thought that the Glorious Revolution was conservative [Sowerby 2013, pp. 3, 16].

The main causes of dissatisfaction with James II in English society were his religious policies and apparent desire for absolute power. It should be remembered that opposition sentiments of that period have always been dominated by anti-Catholicism. At this time, many Englishmen believed that the papacy and the freedom of conscience were incompatible. Because of that emancipation in religion was seen as the liberation of the road for Catholics and tyrannical power. For most of the Englishmen the idea of freedom of conscience was quite unusual. In this respect, the assessment of R. Boyer is eloquent: “It is rather paradoxical that the Stuarts, who lost a throne in 1649 partly because of religious intolerance, lost it later on through an attempt to introduce toleration” [Boyer 1964, p. 332]. The steps of James II in the direction of easing the position of religious minorities were seen as extremely suspicious to the majority of the Anglican nation.

Having the presence of such opinions in society, it is no wonder why James II became the materialization of fears of Catholic reaction. This phenomenon allows us to consider

the revolution of 1688 as an Anglican, inspired by the fears of the people and the elite of the country for the safety of the Church of England [Gibson 2001, p. 61]. However, this assessment of the Glorious Revolution is actively revised. If at first James II was definitely thought of as a ruler, who sought to assert Catholicism as the only religion in the state with a further strengthening of absolutism, modern historians see him with more limited purposes, not related to the collapse of the Anglican Church and standing a tyrannical rule [Stroud 1999, p. 182]. Despite his Catholic sympathies, James quickly realized that Catholics were very insufficient in the country to support his course, unpopular among the clergy and the Tories. Therefore, in addition to individual courtiers and Catholics, almost all of his supporters came from those Whig circles that defended the principles of religious freedom, especially dissenters. But even among them, support for James was very limited. The majority of dissenters waited for the reaction of the nation on Royal decisions in the religious sphere [Jones 1960, pp. 65–66], fearing that their advancement in society was just a cover for the implementation of the king's Catholic policy.

James II's desire to hold his religious reforms despite the protest of society is amazing. Such political short-sightedness was not a characteristic feature of his opponent. When in December 1686 a prominent Quaker William Penn was sent to the Prince of Orange by James with the mission to convince William of the positive consequences of religious toleration and the abolition of repressive legislation, the Dutch stadhouder was in a difficult situation: feeling for the non-conformists, he did not want to alienate the Anglicans, therefore, agreeing in soul with the principles proposed by James, he rejected his proposals, and thus secured his position in English society [Boyer 1964, pp. 343–344]. However, this is not the only example of the rashness of James, who trustingly supplied William in his letters with important secret information, including information about weaknesses in the security of the kingdom [Eagles 2013, pp. 135–137].

The apparent desire for absolute power of James II was expressed, first, in the rule without a Parliament, and, second, in the raising of the regular army and its Catholicism. However, a year before the landing of William, James, realizing the necessity of parliamentary approval of his religious reforms, began to prepare an obedient Parliament, intending to hold elections on his own terms. He began the transformation of electoral corporations to fit his needs, which was achieved by including Catholics and dissenters. This was carried out by the Declarations of Indulgence and by a Royal pardon, which only served to make the country fearful about the threat of unlimited growth of Catholics in the corporations. Therefore, this method, simple and effective in theory, was dangerous in practice. The second means was to appoint to provincial posts reliable people to carry out the policies of the monarch. It explained the change in 1688 of the lords-lieutenants and other petty officers. In this respect, the policy of James II was quite successful, but was able to provide only local successes in the province, contributing to the growth of discontent in the whole kingdom, which led to the reluctance of many subjects to live under the rule of such a monarch [Plumb 1937, pp. 235–236; George 1940, pp. 54, 56].

However, for most of Englishmen the reign of James II without Parliament seemed the lesser evil in comparison with the growth of the army. For many opponents of the monarch, his military actions were clear evidence of excessive strengthening of the Royal power (though the rule without Parliament of Charles II did not cause a revolutionary upheaval). This was accompanied by the king's distrust of the traditional militia forces,

consisting of local gentry and aristocracy [Harrison 1990, pp. 36–37]. The growth of the army during James' reign turned it in the eyes of society into an extremely dangerous police force set to frighten the civilian population. Giving the army a special legal status and placement of military units across the country contributed to the spread of fears of the establishment of tyrannical power by force. The promotion of Catholic officers by the king was another reason for fears in English society [2007 Goodlad, p. 11].

At the same time, in the complex of reasons of the Glorious Revolution it is possible to observe the paradoxes and contradictions, which are especially noticeable if try to look at the events of 1688–1689 without considering the consequences of regime change. In fact the goals of James II in Church and State Settlement were truly more revolutionary than what was proposed by a new revolutionary regime. In this sense, deconstruction of James II's system can be considered as successful counter-revolution [Harrison 1990, p. 29]. The refusal of James to play by the old rules to the greatest extent alarmed his opponents. By the Glorious Revolution the ruling elites masked their counter-revolutionary purposes [Harrison 1990, p. 43], if we measure from a modern view on improving public administration and religious relations.

Analyzing the Glorious Revolution, we should remember another fact — the fact of the invasion of foreign military forces (the troops of William of Orange) to England, which gave rise to the interpretation of the Glorious Revolution as an act of conquest¹. The theory of conquest was already used by its contemporaries. It was used both by Whigs and Tories, and helped for different groups of society to justify the change of government by the right of conquest in a just war [Goldie 1977, pp. 570–571]. The conquest allowed to clear the conscience of non-jurors, as well as it seemed to solve the legal problem of the abdication of the monarch from the throne. But supporters of the idea of conquest have replaced one problem by another one, as conquest was essentially a denial of the Whig basis for the concept of revolution — the right to resistance [Rudolph 2002, p. 122].

At the same time, the idea of conquest testified that the Glorious Revolution had both equally internal (the struggle for parliamentary rights and interests of the Protestants) and external (the invasion of William of Orange) component. It should be remembered that the intervention was not the idea of the stadthouder alone, whose power was limited in the Republic. For the organization of such an enterprise (when the number of ships exceeded Grand Armada by four times), the stadthouder required the consent of the States General, States of Holland, the authorities of Amsterdam, officials of the Board of Admiralty. William needed to convince the Regents of the country that the danger posed by a rapprochement between James II and Louis XIV was worth all the risks. He successfully employed memories of the Dutch about the Anglo-French attack on the Republic in 1672, which gave rise to a desire to prevent a new Alliance between England and France [Israel 1999, pp. 38–39]. In fact the issue of the expedition was solved by Amsterdam burgo-masters who supported the enterprise. They also outlined religious motifs, which transferred the expedition into the international campaign for the Protestant faith [Onnekink 2009, p. 85]. A part of the Dutch there had fears that William wanted by this campaign to strengthen his position in the Republic, although in reality, his opportunity to do so was limited [Blom, 1990, p. 45]. The risks he incurred in his native country were greater than what he could obtain in England.

¹ To learn more about this concept see [Borisenko, Sidorenko 2013].

However, analyzing the strategy of William in England, we can come to the conclusion that it rather looked like a defensive rather than offensive act: he avoided engaging in battle with the Royal troops, because of the fear of losing the battle for the hearts of the Englishmen (even in case of military victory over the James' forces). At the same time, James has lost the initiative by his retreat to London [Speck 2000, p. 56]. During the invasion, the dynastic claims of William of Orange were not obvious, especially if we note that the flight of James was unpredictable. The stadthouder has chosen a strategy of attracting the sympathies of the population of England by the idea of the election of a free Parliament [Scott 2000, p. 459]. Without domestic support in England, William's chances fell sharply, as there were not enough troops to guarantee the military success of the expedition. So the Glorious Revolution cannot be considered as a result of foreign invasion only. Its support was provided by popular unrest in the country, James' desertion from the army and the accession to the forces of William by the supporters on the ground. If the invasion was in need of mass protests, they also needed the invasion to achieve total success [Sowerby 2013, pp. 219–220].

An important feature of the Glorious Revolution was the lack of a broad ideological base, comparable to the works of the French Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. Locke's oft-mentioned work "Second treatise of civil government" was not a motive for revolution, but rather its *post factum* justification [Thomas 1995, pp. 3–4]. Thus, before the revolution, there existed no relevant ideological works, and we can only talk about different interpretations of events that have already occurred, the most important of which was Whig view on the revolution. Although in general it was similar to the Locke's treatise, there was one significant difference: the writer believed that in case of violation the social contract, all power had to be changed and transferred to the people, while the Whigs were interested only in a partial change of the monarchy, maintaining Parliamentary stability [Rudolph 2002, p. 9]. The Whigs were not unified in the interpretation of the Glorious Revolution: if the Whigs in power believed that the revolution was completed and fulfilled all aims by 1690, the opposition (and very ideological) Whigs considered it as chronologically open, and its agenda actual for the future. For them the consequences of the events of 1688–1689 were more important, symbolizing the continuation of the revolution and its principles [Pincus 2009, p. 21].

We can highlight another feature of the Glorious Revolution: it had not the aim of creating a new type of society, but only ensured the restoration of the old order, using specifically English methods. Therefore, the Glorious Revolution could not be a model for the rest of Europe, and unlike the French and Russian revolutions, it was impossible to export [Malia 2006, p. 160]. Because of that, the events of 1688–1689 can be described as an example of a defensive revolution, which broke out not to change something (though changes did occur), but to prevent the consequences of the policy of James II [Thomas 1995, pp. 124–125].

The revolutionary events of 1688 were unique in English constitutional history because for about seven weeks there was no official monarch in the country, the throne was vacant, a novelty even by the standards of civil wars, when principle "the king is dead, long live the king" continued to be in use. This according to W. Speck was the sign of a real revolutionary feature [Speck 2000, pp. 53–54]. It also was noticeable in January 1689, when a Convention was called for. This body was neither a constitutional Convention nor a regular Parliament, because it has not been approved by the monarch. But the Conven-

tion attempted to get much legitimacy [Rudolph 2002, p.97]. Howard Nenner notes the paradox in the fact that this absolutely unconstitutional action was perhaps an episode of the greatest victory of the English constitutionalism. But the triumph was not in essence, but in the form of how the Convention legitimized illegal actions and stated that there was no revolution [Nenner 1966, p. 282].

In theory, the Glorious Revolution established the supremacy of Parliament in England, but from a practical point of view, the result was a “mixed and balanced Constitution”, where the power of Parliament and the crown was shared. These two institutions now had to work together, and critical area of their cooperation lay in finances. The mutual struggle for the financial resources culminated later in the adoption of the Civil List, which became a compromise [Reitan 1970, p. 571]. As H. Shinoda rightly observes, despite the view about the Glorious Revolution as a transfer of sovereignty from king to Parliament, the importance of parliamentary sovereignty was not established immediately. It was not mentioned in the Bill of Rights, although Parliament began to play a key role in controlling Royal power; rather the act listed the illegal acts of the monarch [Shinoda 2000, p. 27]. The Declaration of Rights not only failed to approve the legitimacy of the revolution, it did not recognize the Glorious Revolution as a revolution. Perhaps this event should be known in history as “the glorious abdication” [Zuckert 1998, p. 7]. The suspension of legal norms is also apparent, for example, in the suspension in 1689 by the Parliament of the act of *habeas corpus* for the first time, the act which caused the discontent of the deposed James II and was considered as a symbol of the rights and freedoms guaranteed by Parliament [Crawford 1915, p. 613].

The post-revolutionary years were far from those idealized schemes drawn up by Whig ideology. In 1689–1722 parliamentary politics was quite unstable due to the claims of party groups for power and their own views on the Glorious Revolution. The existence of a revolutionary regime led to the division of society into two groups: supporters of the government and the opposition, while within these groups there was also a division [Black 2004, p. 23], most violently in the religious question. It seemed that the effect of the victory of Anglican ideology in the Glorious Revolution was supposed to promote the unity of Church and state for a longer period than it was before. But in reality after 1688 any political question inevitably became religious, causing disputes [Gibson 2001, p. 63]. Despite the stabilization by 1690, it was not possible to achieve true religious unity, primarily because of the continuing violent struggle between the partisans of the Church of England and dissenters. However, such confrontation was observed in all parts of the British Isles — in Scotland, Ireland and Wales [Kearney 1993, pp. 126–127].

The new regime was not able to carry out a momentous shift towards a representative society — it was a long process during the whole reign of the late Stuarts and the result of the interaction of several factors: frequent elections, franchise extension, the abolition of pre-press censorship, the development of factions of Whigs and Tories and their violent ideological struggle [Knights 2006, p. 3]. All acts of the revolutionary settlement from the Declaration of Rights to the Act of Settlement were not reflection of public consensus — on the contrary, they were born from the ongoing political conflict, in turn giving rise to new debates. Thus the Glorious Revolution has transferred the latent conflict into actual crisis, forcing a turn to political reform [Livesey 2009, p. 42]. And thus, the revolution did not set a strict algorithm for the development of the kingdom; it only offered the possibility of improvisation, which it was supposed to finally fix up.

The peculiarities of the Glorious Revolution demanded a new perspective on the problem of its chronology and periodization. Obviously, transformations in English society and state generated by the revolution lasted much longer than was traditionally marked (1688–1689). Moreover, some changes had already begun before the expedition of William of Orange² that permits a longer account of revolutionary events, such as the 1640s — 1720s with the Glorious Revolution of 1688–1689 as a turning point [Knights 2006, pp. 3–4]. In this respect, there is a very interesting idea about the Glorious Revolution of 1688 as not a separate revolution, but as its consequence, for example, as the July Revolution in France (together with other revolutionary explosions of the nineteenth century) was an inevitable sequel to the French Revolution [Rosenstock-Huessy 2012a, p. 165]. Moreover, the revolutionary shock of 1688–1689 can be considered inevitable due to the reluctance of the Stuart kings to accept limitations on their power. Both Charles II and James II acted just like their father, so in 1688 English society had the same problems as in 1640 [Malia 2006, p. 157]. This idea is very similar to the title of the famous book by C. Hill “The Century of Revolution” [Hill 2006], describing the seventeenth century from the standpoint of its revolutionary features. This has also been confirmed by researches of the scholar Neufeld, who came to the conclusion that really long civil peace after the civil wars was established only in the 1690s as the result of the Glorious Revolution. But this peace was formed also earlier in 1649–1688 [Neufeld 2015, p. 1710].

According to J. Scott, we can distinguish four views on the revolutionary features of the seventeenth century: 1) there was no English revolution; 2) the English revolution exists, but it is difficult to date; 3) there have been several revolutions of varying intensity (such as earthquakes); 4) the entire period was a century of revolution [Scott 2000, p. 33–34]. This approach makes more relevant the concept of “revolutionary settlement” — a system of constitutional and political measures that followed the Glorious Revolution and ensured the final triumph of its principles. The instability of ministries in 1690s — 1710s testified that it was not possible to consolidate the results of the revolution definitively for a long time [Black 2004, p. 13]. But during this settlement, the principles of the Glorious Revolution could be carried out in life, which makes it necessary to expand its chronological boundaries for at least three decades into the future.

Summarizing the article, we can come to the following conclusions. The Glorious Revolution in England was the first revolutionary event, which made actual for the political lexicon the term “revolution”, while semantically securing its positive role in the development of the state and society by introducing the concept of “gloryness”, which largely was the result of mental constructions of ideologues respecting the change of monarch. In fact, the events of 1688–1689 did not solve all problems, but rather continued the political discourse on the balance of Parliament, the monarchy and the Church. Revolution laid the agenda for its contemporaries, settling the general direction, but not the dogmatic processes of national development. It allows us to speak about the chronological openness of the English Revolution, where the events of 1688–1689 were its decisive part, and the post-revolutionary settlement extended for many decades after the landing of William of Orange.

² So according to S. Pincus the transition of England to modern state (provided by the Glorious Revolution) began during James II: his wide reforms demanded ever-increasing costs and, accordingly, changes in methods of getting income. Even contemporaries noted that James had ruled in a new way, in the style of the King of France [Pincus 2009, p. 160].

References

- Borisenko V.N., Sidorenko L.V. Rol' faktora zavoevanija v ocenke Slavnoj revolucii 1688–1689 gg. [The Role of Conquest in the Assessment of the Glorious Revolution (1688–1689)]. *Trudy Kafedry istorii Novogo i novejshego vremeni Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* [Proceedings of the Department of Modern and Contemporary History, St. Petersburg State University], 2013, no. 10, pp. 14–24. (In Russian)
- Bankowicz M. *Coup d'Etat: A Critical Theoretical Synthesis*. Frankfurt am Main; Berlin; Bern; Bruxells; New York; Oxford; Wien, Peter Lang, 2012, 122 p.
- Black J. *Parliament and Foreign Policy in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004. 261 p.
- Blom H.W. "Our prince is king!": The impact of the Glorious Revolution on political debate in the Dutch republic. *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 1990, no. 1, pp. 45–58.
- Boyer R. E. English Declarations of Indulgence of 1687 and 1688. *The Catholic Historical Review*, 1964, no. 3, pp. 332–371.
- Crawford C. C. The Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and the Revolution of 1689. *The English Historical Review*, 1915, no. 120, pp. 613–630.
- Eagles R. "If he Deserves it": William of Orange's Pre-Revolution British Contacts and Gilbert Burnet's Proposals for the Post-Revolution Administration. *Parliamentary History*, 2013, no. 1, pp. 128–147.
- George R. H. The Charters Granted to English Parliamentary Corporations in 1688. *The English Historical Review*, 1940, no. 217, pp. 47–56.
- Gibson W. *Church of England, 1688–1832: Unity and Accord*. London; New York, Routledge, 2001, 269 p.
- Goldie M. Edmund Bohun and Jus Gentium in the Revolution Debate, 1689–1693. *The Historical Journal*, 1977, no. 3, pp. 569–586.
- Goodlad G. Before the Glorious Revolution: The making of absolute monarchy? *History Review*, 2007, September, pp. 10–15.
- Harrison G. Prerogative revolution and Glorious Revolution: Political proscription and parliamentary undertaking, 1687–1688. *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 1990, no. 1, pp. 29–43.
- Hill C. *The Century of Revolution, 1603–1714*. London; New York, Routledge, 2006, 355 p.
- Israel J. I. *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670–1752*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006, 983 p.
- Israel J. I. William III, the Glorious Revolution and the Development of Parliamentary Democracy in Britain. *Foundation of Democracy in the European Union: From the Genesis of Parliamentary Democracy to the European Parliament*. Ed. by Jon Pinder. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 1999, pp. 33–40.
- Jones J. R. James II's Whig Collaborators. *The Historical Journal*, 1960, no. 1, pp. 65–73.
- Kearney H. *The British Isles: A History of Four Nations*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993, 237 p.
- Knights M. *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006, 431 p.
- Kuchta D. *Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550–1850*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London, University of California Press, 2002, 303 p.
- Livesey J. *Civil Society and Empire: Ireland and Scotland in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World*. New Haven; London, Yale University Press, 2009, 294 p.
- Malia M. *History's Locomotives: Revolutions and the Making of the Modern World*. Ed. by Martin Malia, with a foreword of Terence Emmons. New Haven; London, Yale University Press, 2006, 360 p.
- Nenner H. A. The Convention of 1689: A Triumph of Constitutional Form. *The American Journal of Legal History*, 1966, no. 4, pp. 282–296.
- Neufeld M. From Peacemaking to Peacebuilding: The Multiple Endings of England's Long Civil Wars. *American Historical Review*, 2015, no. 5, pp. 1709–1723.
- Niggemann U. Some Remarks on the Origins of the Term "Glorious Revolution". *The Seventeenth Century*, 2012, no. 4, pp. 477–487.
- Onnekink D. The Last War of Religion? The Dutch and the Nine Years War. *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648–1713*. Ed. by David Onnekink. Farnham; Burlington, Ashgate, 2009, pp. 69–88.
- Pincus S. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven; London, Yale University Press, 2009, 647 p.
- Plumb J. H. The Elections to the Convention Parliament of 1689. *The Cambridge Historical Journal*, 1937, no. 3, pp. 235–254.
- Reitan E. A. From Revenue to Civil List, 1689–1702: The Revolution Settlement and the "Mixed and Balanced" Constitution. *The Historical Journal*, 1970, no. 4, pp. 571–588.

- Rosenstock-Huessy E. "England: A Parliamentary Church" and "The European Significance of the Glorious Revolution" — Selections from *Out of Revolution*. *Revolutions: Finished and Unfinished, From Primal to Final*. Ed. by Paul Caringella, Wayne Cristaudo, Glenn Hughes. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012a, pp. 154–166.
- Rosenstock-Huessy E. Revolution as a Political Concept. *Revolutions: Finished and Unfinished, From Primal to Final*. Ed. by Paul Caringella, Wayne Cristaudo, Glenn Hughes. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012b, pp. 1–7.
- Rudolph J. *Revolution by Degrees: James Tyrell and Whig Political Thought in the Late Seventeenth Century*. Houndmills; Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, 231 p.
- Scott J. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, 546 p.
- Shinoda H. *Re-Examining Sovereignty: From Classical Theory to the Global Age*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2000, 228 p.
- Sowerby S. *Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution*. Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press, 2013, 404 p.
- Speck W. A. 1688: A political revolution. *Revolutions: The Revolutionary Tradition in the West, 1560–1991*. Ed. by David Parker. London; New York, Routledge, 2000, pp. 53–67.
- Stroud A. *Stuart England*. London; New York, Routledge, 1999, 220 p.
- Thomas D. L. *Lockean Government*. London; New York, Routledge, 1995, 141 p.
- Zuckert M. P. *Natural Rights & the New Republicanism*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1998, 397 p.

Received: 02.03.2017

Accepted: 10.08.2017