

Nataliya SHEVCHENKO
Kyiv

**“COLLECTIVE PORTRAITS”
OF ENGLISH STATE-POWER HOLDERS
OF THE FIRST HALF OF THE 17th CENTURY
IN THE STUDIES OF MODERN BRITISH HISTORIANS**

British historiography has the richest traditions and occupies the leading positions in the world historiography. In the second half of the 20th century one of its main directions – the studying of the English Revolution – was enriched with new techniques and research methods. The elaboration of new methodology was caused by the new tendencies in the development of the British history science after the Second World War and was marked by the challenge of so called sociohistoricism. This wide scientific movement, which sought strong relationships between history and the social sciences (sociology, ethnology, anthropology, economics, demography, psychology etc.) was based on the interdisciplinary approach to the study of human society.

The impact of the “new” (often called “new social”) history on the British political historiography was so strong that it produced some replies of political historians. Actually, new lines of research based on new methods and categories developing by social sciences marked the deep change of political history from its constitutional developments to administrative ones. As to the language of the British political historiography, this period was remarkable by its shift from the political narrative towards the “new political history” (or “professional political history”) based on scientific methods of research.

As a result, in the early 1950s the new direction in the studying of the English Revolution was founded. It was concentrated on the making of so called “collective portraits” (or “social biographies”). What interested modern British historians was not primarily the great political issues of the time or the careers of the leading statesmen, but the composition and recruitment of the political élite as revealed by the minutiae of the personnel case-histories of ordinary MPs and office-holders. The method they used in their researches was collective biography, for which the technical term was “prosopography”. This word popularized since the 1930s for the collective study of individual lives and careers, together with family relationships and patronage connections, then with geographic, economic, religious and mental peculiarities¹. The technique was pioneered in America by Ch.Beard and then enriched and improved for the English history studies by L.B.Namier. Namier’s approach was quickly taken up by historians working on different periods, and the researcher was awarded by the honorary title “Farther of the History of Parliament”².

It was accepted, that new technique allowed to reject the broad social categories and ideological misleading in the studying of the past. The deep analysis also provided historians with possibilities to immerse in the real world of men’s interests, to understand the complicated motivation of men’s political conduct³.

New research methodology was successfully used in the early 1950s for the complex studying of the political mechanisms in the Long Parliament. First at all, it should be mentioned the book of D.Brunton and D.Pennington “Members of the Long Parliament”⁴. The idea of this study was formulated in 1947 under the proposition of L.Namier. At that time both historians had teaching practice at Manchester University, where L.Namier was the head at the chair of Modern history⁵. The book of D.Brunton and D.Pennington contained an analysis of the Commons’ House of the Long Parliament from the opening of that assembly on 3 November 1640, to its expulsion by O.Cromwell on 20 April 1653. The authors’ aim was to show diversities, not only of opinion, but also of social status, occupational interests, education, age and political experience of MPs⁶. Knowledge of these traits, as they saw it, facilitated a more realistic view of the English Parliament at the English Revolution. The authors concluded that choosing of the sides in the conflict by MPs had not been bounded with diversities in their economic and social status⁷. On that point, D.Brunton and D.Pennington stressed, that internal forces and influences had determined political conduct of MPs, so any economic or social explanation of the split within seventeenth-century English community led to distortion of what really had happened. Historical method and controversial results of D.Brunton and D.Pennington’s research provoked the serious critics on their address and caused new wave of debate in the British historiography on the origins and the nature of the English Revolution⁸.

Nevertheless, at the same time, on the other side of Atlantic ocean, in America, another research on this theme

had appeared⁹. Although its author Mrs. M. Keeler outlined the same aim of research, her study was chronologically limited: she analyzed the composition of the Long Parliament only during the 1640 – 1641. The author gave the “Collective Portrait” of the whole group of MPs of the Long Parliament (total 547 members) based on individual biographies each of the Parliamentary man. On this point, M. Keeler’s study is primary the Biographical Dictionary of MPs. As to the merits of her work, we can notice that she also applied modern statistical techniques to the information in order to present the results of her research in numerous tables and schemes. Also it should be mentioned, that M. Keeler avoided the general conclusions, but the results of her research contained a number of controversial issues which helped to renew the discussion among modern British historians about the origins of the English Revolution¹⁰.

The new research approach, the core of which contained the prosopography, quantitative methods and structural analysis of different elements in functioning of state institutions, attracted a number of historians working on British history and was enriched in the officially sponsored fundamental research project: “The History of Parliament”. The *History of Parliament* is the national dictionary of parliamentary biography, which has the main task to record and identify all of the 75000 members, who sat in all the Parliaments and parliamentary assemblies down to 1918¹¹. The project was based at the Institute of Historical Research in the University of London.

There are currently several Sections at work on the House of Commons, and two of them concerning the periods 1604 – 1629 and 1640 – 1660. The biographies required for these two Sections number 3,571, of which 2,582 have been drafted (at April 2002)¹². A considerable attention of researches is placed on attempting to explain each Member’s parliamentary activity, including his committee nominations and this inevitably involves examining in detail their interests outside Parliament. The information presented in the Members’ database cover essential topics such as patronage and office-holding, and also include the studying of MPs’ activity while Parliament was in session and the extra-parliamentary lobbying (of such state-bodies as the Privy Council) by Members on behalf of their constituents. Actually, the five decades covered by these Sections represent one of the most eventful, and from a historiographical perspective, challenging periods in English parliamentary history.

Among the new trends conceived in the studying of the Early Stuart England in modern British historiography in 1960 – 1970s was the elaboration of so called “social biography” of English bureaucracy. This direction came to be closely associated with the name of famous British historian G. Aylmer and with his original works on this theme¹³. G. Aylmer’s books deal with institutions of government, terms and conditions of service, administrative methods and, above all, with the people themselves, who were studied in their political, religious and social context. Within that broad framework the author discussed the complex problems of the relations between bureaucracy and social structure and between politics and administration.

This attempt to build up a composite portrait of a bureaucracy, or to be literal, several hundred portraits of civil servants, inevitably raised question of historical method. The content of the question was: whether the technique of collecting biographical information, which had given fruits in the studying of parliamentary history, would profitably be applied to the study of administration? As historians considered, the deep analysis taken up by G. Aylmer in his books, gave the positive reply on that question¹⁴. The great contribution made by G. Aylmer in the development of Namier’s research approach, as we can judge it, is widely recognized. Actually, historian improved the biographical method (prosopography), enforced it by accurate social analysis, then by severe economic statistics, demographical and psychological attitudes, and by several elements of structural analysis.

Nevertheless, some prejudices about using of new research technique in historical studies were widespread among the large number of British historians. Two main issues of controversy between strong supporters and severe adversaries of this research approach were clearly defined. The first was expressed by famous British historian Ch. Hill. He argued, that the approach to the history of politics (closely associated with L. Namier), which stressed on personal connections and their influence on politics, led to distortion of the historical processes, because it provided historians with “wrong accents” and purely mechanistic explanations of the past¹⁵.

Moreover, the interpretations based on statistics inevitably raised the problem of using the source material. As J. Tosh considered, “no historian, however well endowed with research assistants and computer... could hope to survey all the primary sources needed for a quantitative study”¹⁶. On that point, for the historian of any period, not only of the 17th c. England, the problem of the access to the raw material is the main unsolved problem, and without the studying of all historical evidences the total picture of the past would be distorted.

Finally, it should be noted, that demerits of this research technique produced the moderate view spreaded among British historians towards the using of this approach in historical studies. Though of value for the investigation of élite’s and certain institutions and groups, such as Parliament and political parties and groups (for which there were existing sources), it was pushed too hard to the studying of broad social groups. So, it was accepted, that the areas to which it could usefully be applied were limited.

It must be concluded also, that the accepted picture of seventeenth-century English politics was demolished by the applying of new methods of research. These new developments in the studying of the English Revolution enriched

knowledge about it and caused the elaboration of new interpretations of the 17th century England's history.

These tendencies in the development of the British History science in the second half of the 20th c. and methodological attitudes of the modern British historians towards the elaboration of the different social aspects of the English administrative history of the first half of the 17th c., merits and demerits of the works discussed here, there were the issues of the several works in the British and Soviet historiography before (see, for instance works by R. Richardson, T.Pavlova, I.Sharifzanov)¹⁷. But the more detailed analysis of their works has shown, that the authors often studied these issues separately. Actually, this article is the first attempt in the contemporary Ukrainian historiography to study these problems not only in the conditions of the elaboration of English 17th c. history, but also in the context of the developments in the British history science of the second half of the 20th century. The author consider, that at present the acquaintance with these developments in modern British historiography has a practical value for Ukrainian historians looking for new methodology of historical research.

¹ Prosopography // The Blackwell Dictionary of Historians /ed. by J. Cannon. – Oxford, 1988. – P. 344.

² Ерофеев Н. А. Нэмир и его место в буржуазной историографии // Вопросы истории. – 1973. – № 4. – С. 86 – 87.

³ Ibid. – С. 86.

⁴ Brunton D. Pennington D. Members of the Long Parliament. – London, 1968 (first edition in 1954).

⁵ Шарифжанов И. И. Современная английская историография буржуазной революции XVII в. Основные идейно-методологические тенденции и направления. – Москва, 1982. – С. 40.

⁶ Brunton D. Pennington D. Opt. cit. – P. 176.

⁷ Ibid. – Pp. 176 – 185.

⁸ Hinton R. W. K. review of: Brunton D. Pennington D. Members of the Long Parliament/ Introd. by R.H.Tawney. – 2nd edn. – London. – 1954. // Economic History Review. – 2nd ser. – vol. VII. – № 1. – August. – 1954. – Pp. 102 – 103; Manning B. The Long Parliament and the English Revolution.// Past and Present. – № 5. – May. – 1954. – Pp. 71 – 76.

⁹ Keeler M. F. The Long Parliament. 1640 – 1641. A Biographical Study of Its Members. – Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society. 1954.

¹⁰ Antler S. Quantitative Analysis of the Long Parliament // Past and Present. – 1972. – № 56. – Pp. 154 – 157; Shofield R. Quantitative Analysis of the Long Parliament // Past and Present. – 1975. – № 68. – P. 130.

¹¹ The History Of The History Of Parliament // http://ihr.sas.ac.uk/hop/abt_hhop.html; The History Of Parliament // <http://ihr.sas.ac.uk/hop>.

¹² History Of Parliament. The House Of Commons 1604 – 1629 // <http://ihr.sas.ac.uk/hop/period5.html>; History Of Parliament. The House Of Commons 1640 – 1660 // <http://ihr.sas.ac.uk/hop/period6.html>.

¹³ Aylmer G. The King's Servants. The Civil Service Of Charles I 1625 – 1642. – N-Y, 1961; Aylmer G. The State's Servants. The Civil Service Of the English Republic 1649 – 1660. – London, 1973.

¹⁴ Федоров С.Е. Джеральд Эйлмер: штрихи к портрету историка // Англия XVII века: социальные группы и общество. – Санкт-Петербург, 1994. – С. 89.

¹⁵ Hill Ch. Recent Interpretations of the Civil War // History. – 1956. – Vol. XLI. – № 141 – 143. – Pp. 78 – 79.

¹⁶ Tosh J. The Pursuit of History. Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History. – London, 1999. – P. 168.

¹⁷ Richardson R.C. The Debate On The English Revolution: Revisited. – London, 1988; Павлова Т.А. Английская буржуазная революция в освещении современной англо-американской историографии. // Новая и новейшая история. – 1975. – № 5. – С. 57 – 76; Шарифжанов И.И. Исторические предпосылки английской революции XVII в. в освещении современной английской и американской буржуазной историографии. // Средние века. – Вып. 41. – Москва, 1977. – С. 278 – 299; Шарифжанов И.И. Основные направления развития английской историографии буржуазной революции XVII в. в Англии. // История и историки. Историографический ежегодник. 1980. – Москва, 1984. – С. 119 – 139; Шарифжанов И.И. Современная английская историография буржуазной революции XVII в. Основные идейно-методологические тенденции и направления. – Москва, 1982.

Наталія ШЕВЧЕНКО

Київ

**“КОЛЕКТИВНІ ПОРТРЕТИ” НОСІЇВ ДЕРЖАВНОЇ ВЛАДИ АНГЛІЇ
ПЕРШОЇ ПОЛОВИНИ XVII СТОЛІТТЯ
В ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯХ СУЧАСНИХ БРИТАНСЬКИХ ІСТОРИКІВ**

В статті розглядаються нові тенденції у вивченні англійської адміністративної історії перш. пол. XVII ст. в сучасній британській історіографії. Висвітлюється поява так званих “колективних портретів”

англійських парламентаріїв та управлінської бюрократії. Проаналізовано нову техніку дослідження, запропоновану британськими істориками для вивчення соціальних аспектів процесу державного управління Англії першої половини XVII століття та визначено наукову цінність окремих методів, зокрема біографічного методу (просопографії), для історичних досліджень. Простежено перебіг наукових дискусій, що розгорнулися в британській історіографії з приводу комплексного використання нової методики дослідження та виявлення її можливостей для об'єктивного пізнання минулого. Автор показує, що дослідницькі прийоми британських істориків дозволили подати нові інтерпретації характеру політичних процесів в Англії в першій половині XVII століття.

Olesia MANDEBURA

Київ

MYKOLA SUMTSOV'S RESEARCH OF BREAD AND GRAIN SYMBOLISM IN THE FAMILY RITUALS OF UKRAINIANS

The young Ukrainian science of ethnology is going out on its thorny path of self-knowledge and self-research with great difficulties. The crisis of transition period, the crisis of social, ideological, value creeds leave their imprint on processes of scientific work and creative search. However, as the historical experience shows, a truth that was ascertained in hard times stands the test of time and does not even lose its scientific authority, but, on the contrary, strikes by its greatness and courage. That's the very description of Mykola Sumtsov's scientific heritage who was a researcher of encyclopedic knowledge, with a large-scale view on issues, whose contribution to the development of the Ukrainian ethnology can scarcely be overestimated.

Symbolism of bread and grain in the Ukrainian festivals and rituals of family cycle has been already investigated¹. The objective of the article is to show Mykola Sumtsov's considerations of that issue as he was the first to raise this scientific problem; to elucidate his thoughts, ideas and to compare them with other researchers' hypotheses including the contemporary ones.

Questions on symbolic functions of cereal foods, forms of usage of ritual bread in the family rituals and calendar festivals, ritual poetry occupy a prominent place among Sumtsov's interests. He devoted the separate work to the issue and he obtained a Doctor of Philosophy degree for it². Partially the researcher touched this problem in some of his other searches³. Writing the book "Bread in Rituals and Songs" (Khleb v obriadakh i pesniakh) he worked up a lot of scientific literature. But it was dealt up mostly with general historical questions: the beginning of agriculture on the Slavic lands, problems of the Slavic primitive and ancient history, folk outlook, festivals and customs etc. Meanwhile there was no research that could sum up a lot of information about ritual use of bread at that time. Even later the researchers raised either separate questions⁴ or simply described ritual bread and various cases of its usage without deep scientific analysis⁵. Recently several works have been published, the majority of them are articles and their authors investigate different aspects of ritual usage of grain and cereal food in the Ukrainian festivals and rituals both of annual calendar cycle and family one⁶.

M.Sumtsov put forward very weighty arguments that among the Slavic peoples the Ukrainians were marked out in the first place because in their wedding celebrations the features of pouring with grain had been preserved completely at the end of 19th century. There was a very interesting custom described by P.Chubynsky, it was held before a bridegroom was going to his bride and was performed as follows: a bench was put in the yard, on it there was a dough-trough covered with a clean towel. On the dough-trough bread and salt were put. Beside the bench there was a bucket of water and a jug. A bridegroom with his boyars (bridesmen) were standing facing the bread. A bridegroom's mother went out of the house, she was wearing a turned out sheepskin coat and a hat. In the hem of her skirt she was carrying oats, nuts, sunflower and pumpkin seeds, coins, she had been saving all these things since the birth of her son. The bridesman gave a rake or a pitchfork to the mother and she mounted it like a horse. The bridesman took the pitchfork and led it round the dough-trough, a boyar hurried "the horse" from behind. At that moment mother was scattering oats. Making three circles, the bridesman led "the horse" to the bucket. The bridegroom imitated watering a horse by ladling out and pouring some water on the end of pitchfork.