DOI: 10.52837/27382702-2023.3.2-83

LOCAL CHOROGRAPHIES AND STRUCTURES OF COMPOSITE MONARCHY IN THE EARLY MODERN ANTIQUARIAN DISCOURSE[*]

Anastasia Palamarchuk

Abstract

The concept of the composite monarchy, developed in contemporary historiography, is an effective analytical research tool for studying large territorial states with complex internal structure. The ground of this concept lies in the famous works by H.G. Koenigsberger [20:301-333;21,19] and J.H. Elliott [11:47-71;12]. Each of them (Koenigsberger mostly relying on the continental material, Elliott - primarily on the British one) reflected the fact that the vast majority of the early Modern States had complex and elaborate internal structure not only in the administrative aspect, but also in the territorial one. In such complex polities the royal power not only evolved from suzerainty to sovereignty, but it also expanded upon a number of autonomous or semi-autonomous territorial entities - composites. The definition of composite comprised autonomies marked by the high level of administrative subjectivity, and the process of their incorporation (implemented or potential) was perceived primarily in formal legal aspect.

Keywords: Monarchy, politics, kingdom, Chronicles.

Koenigsberger saw the degree of maturity of institution within composites, first of all of representative institutions as a crucially important element. For J.H. Elliott, who also gave credit to the institutional aspect of composite state model, instruments and mechanisms constituting composite monarchies represented a wide spectrum of functional loyalties, including the royal court and a special communicative milieu, shaped by the court patronage system. Describing the phenomenon of composite monarchy, Elliott considered it a special impulse for the further consolidation of local communities and identities, able to strengthen themselves under the pressure of confessional factors.

---

[*] The article was submitted on December 1, 2023. The article was reviewed on December 10, 2023.

C. Russel [29:133-146], as is generally known, preferred to use a close, but not completely synonymous to “composite monarchy” term “multiple monarchy”, restraining it constructivity to the Stuart reign in England. Accentuating rather cultural-historical and confessionally-ecclesiological, rather than formal aspect of this institutional phenomenon, Russel interpreted events in corresponding historical perspective. Constituent elements of composite monarchy he described as relatively homogeneous entities.

Considering the structures which Koenigsberger and Elliott labeled as “composite” J. Morrill [27:1-38; 26] preferred the notion “dynastic agglomeration”, stating that the need for dynastic stability represented a determining impulse (and in some measure a natural result) for the rise of large and ethnically heterogenous territorial entities. Emphasizing a dynamical character of the Early Modern polities, Morrill noticed that there was a great configurational variety in such kind of communities until the XVIIIth century. H. Scott standing close to Morrill’s views, defined the Early Modern polities as “subordinated kingdoms” [31:44-87].

Only R.R. Davies [8] expanded the “elliotian” concept of composite monarchy beyond the XVIth and XVIIth centuries and applied the similar approach to the period far more prior to the Tudor and Stuart age. He examined the idea of the High Kingship, common for both Celtic and Germanic regions of Britain (Anglo-Saxon bretwalda) (significantly, Bede in his Historia Ecclesiastica used the Latin word "imperium" as synonymous for bretwalda [40:99-129; 17:9-47]). Taking this in consideration, Davies explained the power strategy that Plantagenets were accomplishing, and stated that regional pan-British leadership could be achieved not only with the means of war, diplomacy, functions of the supreme judge, Arthurian mythology etc., but also with the preservation of multiple ethno-territorial autonomous communities.

R.R. Davies' speculations can be successfully applied for the study of the Norman dynasty - with only difference that the territories that the Normans aspired to dominate, comprised both insular and substantial continental part. Stability and multiplicity of autonomies as an important feature of the Late Medieval age (XIV-XV centuries) of both English and Scottish kingdom became a focus of interest for the pleiad of scholars - H. Cam [5], - K. Stringer [34:5-36], C. Nevill [28] J. Scammell [30:449-473], J.W. Alexander [2] et al.

In all possible interpretations the concept of composite monarchy clearly demonstrates the diversity of ethno-political and ethno-cultural processes within large polities in the Early Modern Europe. Composite monarchies were developing under the permanent impact of the two concurring discourses: the universalistic and particularistic ones. These discourses, in turn, structured the outlines and internal structural boundaries within composite states.

The first, imperial discourse developed the idea of the pan-European Christian Empire. The Second one created the intellectual foundation for the legitimation of the territorial monarchies in Europe. While interacting, both discourses became subordinated to each other, tending to display a potential for the mutual exploitation of sense-making dominants. Figuring out, such discoursive practices not only transformed the traditional medieval universalistic space, connecting it with the mastering of the internal heterogeneity of the state and with the rise of proto-national and later national identities, but also required conceptualization of a special functional units conditionally termed as territorial and ethno-cultural autonomies. Such autonomies were interpreted as locally consolidated ones, built, on the one hand, upon keeping up territorial and regional communities, on the other hand - upon their re-construction in the changing contexts of the Early Modern state.

At each level of the universalistic discourse was exploited the well-known Roman concept of empire as a continually expanding territorial structure, which was gradually absorbing (and in a certain degree unifying) authentic and previously independent "gentes". The particularistic discourse, in turn, referred to the intellectual resources of the medieval corporativist tradition, which had been developing ideas of uniqueness and self-sufficiency of the internally integrated and territorially limited community.

The fact that for the classical Medieval and Early Modern time the term "autonomy" is purely analytical and does not belong to the political or legal vocabulary of that period needs no explanation. Nevertheless, the Western European Middle Ages was the time when autonomies, both territorial and non-territorial, developed and flourished; most of them initially had or later assumed corporate form.

By the late XVIth century observance of external formal boundaries and formalized privileges of feudal autonomies remained an important element of the internal structure of the Early Modern composite monarchy. Nevertheless, local customs, institutes securing the interaction between a corporation and supreme power, local history and traditions as well as the structure of a corporation itself became a more important component.

The History of Britain in the High Middle Ages, under the Tudors and the early Stuarts evidenced the process of emergence of the above mentioned "composite" (or multiple) identities. The perception of England as an empire, entrenched in the insular historical and legal consciousness, recurring during the reigns of the Stuarts and extending to the whole British archipelago, determined the establishment of chorography as a prevalent form characteristic of the English historiography. Chorographic structure of the narrative unfolding the space of the territorial "empire" to the reader corresponded to the method of "intellectual appropriation" of the British Isles by the English antiquarians which could be defined as "cultural-historical". A considerable role was assigned to reactualization of ethnogenetic myths at different levels: while some of them (primarily - the Galfridian myth) were regarded as relevant to the pan-British cultural and historical past, others emphasized autonomous dimensions of the past and present of distinct composites (Scotland, Ireland, Wales).

The rise of the Antiquarian historical writing in the XVIth century was inseparable from the birth of protonational and later national discourse. Aggregation (more precisely re-aggregation) of the land and the community of the realm consistently fulfilled by the Tudors was in a special way reflected in the intellectual field. Chorographical descriptions that constituted a substantial part of the Antiquarian legacy, had both pan-English (Leland's Itinerary [24]) or pan-British (Camden's Britannia [6]) and regional coverage (chorographic surveys by Lambarde [22], Vowell [38:41-53], Stowe [33], Carew [6], Doddridge [9] and later Dugdale). The very genre of chorography was intended to create a comprehensive image of a territory, country or a region similar to what was formed in mind after looking at a geographic map.

Beside chorographies, discourses on the nobility constituted an important complex of the antiquarian narratives: the so-called Catalogues of Honor (Milles [25], Glower [14], Brooke [4], York [41]) and legal-historical surveys of the noble titles, dignities and offices (Titles of Honour by John Selden [32] and its numerous derivatives). Like the chorographies, these texts were also closely related to the intent of the supreme power to put together and configure the Community of the Realm and to unfold before the reader its internal structure. Taking into consideration that by definition a noble title was directly linked to a certain land holding, and the totality of these land holdings formed the territory of the Realm of England, the functional analogy with chorographies is quite obvious.

While the demand for pan-English and pan-British chorographies and narratives came principally from the supreme power and was implemented in the intellectual milieu associated with the traditional central administrative structures (i.e. mostly by lawyers and heralds), intellectual construction of the autonomies and regional identities was initiated and carried out by several actors: central and local elites, by the supreme power, legal-administrative institutions, religious and professional communities etc. In many cases the authors of several locally oriented narratives were closely connected (by origin or by their office) with the communities they were writing about. The common strategy of description of an ethno-cultural autonomy assumed the mechanism of intellectual differentiation, that is finding out and exploring such differences between “our community” and the “outer world” (in the case of the local narrative - England or Britain) that legitimated the existence of an entity and made it worth of description. Locally oriented narratives and pan-England chorographies were not opposed to each other, but were correlating as neo-Platonic macrocosm and microcosm, structurally similar but yet not identical, each having its own spectrum of meanings, sense-making points, events and myths. The microcosm of a local narrative, though having its own semantic stem, was obligatory placed into the wider British context and newer was considered as a completely separated one. Rather we see how the universalistic and particularistic discourses, that initially emerged at the European scale, were accomplishing in the universe of the British archipelago.

The earliest and obviously the most famous of the locally oriented narratives and the first “county history” - “The Perambulation of Kent” by William Lambarde - can be distinguished as an archetype for all later locally oriented chorographies.

The well-known concept of the Heptarchy defined as seven Germanic kingdoms from which the Kingdom of England emerged, took on the new significance in the Early Modern historical thought and especially in the context of the composite monarchy. Originally this concept was invented in the XIIth century by Henry of Hintigdon [36:64-65]: four hundred years later William Lambarde, an outstanding antiquarian, lawyer and creator of Anglo-Saxonism re-actualized it for the English intellectual community [15; 3]. Lambard, who had been serving as a Justice of the Peace for Kent for many years, “a Kentishman by adoption” as M. Zell called him [42], was rightfully styled as a father of the local history by further generations of Kentish intellectuals.

“The Perambulation of Kent” opens with the image (which included visualization - a map, and verbal description) of primordial complexity of the British ethic and political landscape - seven kingdoms and their neighbors, the Scots, the Picts, and the Franks, with corresponding plurality of laws and customs. Lambarde says: “As each country therefore hath his propre laws, customs and manners of life, so no one man ought to doubt these peoples, being aggregated of so many sundry nations, had their several rules, orders and institutes. Nowbeit, amongst the rest those be most famous, which our ancient writers call the Dane law, west Saxon law, and Mercher law, the first of which was brought by the Danes, the second was used amongst the West Saxons, and the last was exercised in the Kingdom of Mercia” [22:5].

Kent is the outer south-eastern part of Britain: of course, Lambarde does not depict it as a periphery, but in accordance with the tradition created by Bede, rather as the gate to English land, a border region laying between the invaders and the rest of the island [3:138]. “It is called by Caesar and other ancient writers, Cancium, and Cancia in Latine; which was framed either out of Cainc, a word that (in the language of the Britaines, whom Caesar at his arrival found inhabiting there) signifies, Bowghes, or Woods … or else, of Cant, or Canton, which denoteth an Angle or Corner of land” [22:7]. In this aspect very demonstrative is Lambarde’s version of the first population of England. He completely ignores the popular Galfridian story of the giants inhabiting Britain before the coming of Brutus, and instead advocates the “Samothian” version, which suggested the common Celtic origins of the peoples of Gallia and Cantia. “Out of these things thus alleged, I might draw provable conjecture, that Kent which we have in hand, was the first inhabited part of all this our land… Samothes began his dominion over this Realme almost 150 years after such time as he first arrived in that part of France which is called Celtique and had planted his people there, what can be more likely, then, that ha came out of France first into Kent?” [22:14] Kent is depicted as a community where complex inner structure (“four kings” of the pre-Roman period, mentioned by Caesar) transforms into the monolithic kingdom after the coming of the Germans; the line of seventeen Kentish kings, starting with Hengist and ending with Baldred with their respective “memorable things” is finished by the integration with the “English” kingdom of Egbert. All administrative changes imposed by the Wessex monarchy (creation of shires, lathes and hundreds) could not erase the substantial element - the gavelkind; the autonomy of Kent was finally sanctioned by William the Conqueror “at whose hands the cominaltie of Kent, obtey|ned with great honour, the continuation of their aun|cient vsages, notwithstanding that the whole Realme besides suffered alteration and change” [22:22].

The final part of the “Perambulation” transcends the standard chorographic scheme and turns into a legal-historical tract on the most specific Kentish phenomenon - the custom of gavelkind. This principle of landholding required to divide the estate held in socage tenure between male heirs [42:40] (unlike the right of primogeniture in the English Common law) and for Lambarde was meant to represent a peculiar Kentish practice. Lambarde states that gavelkind was the institution entrenched in the ancient German society; it successfully survived the Norman conquest and still defines the Kentish way of life. In Lambarde’s way of thought, evident in his other tracts, custom and law structure a community, that is why he prefers to “descende to the disclosing of the customes themselves: not numbering them by order as they lie in that treatise, but drawing them forth as they shal concerne, either the lande it selfe, or the persons that I will orderly speake of, that is to say, particularly the Lord and the Tenant: The husband and the wife: The child and the gardien, and so after addition of a few other things incident to this purpose, I will drawe to an end” [22:390-391]. Paradoxically, the comparison with the Common law is necessary to demonstrate the unique character of the Kentish tradition, while Royal charters, Acts of Parliament and other legal documents included in the text allow to portray the Royal power as a guarantor of continuity and proper regulation of gavelkind within the realities of the post-Norman English kingdom. Although Lambarde wrote his “Perambulation of Kent” before the Union of Crowns, the existence of the Custom of Kent opens for him a way to show up a variety of legal systems and practices in the kingdom. In his “Eirenarcha” [22] Lambard more explicitly outlines this concept: the function of the supreme Royal power and Equity is to regulate and if necessary to correct the practices of the Common law and local customs. The co-existence of the Common Law, Civil law, Equity along with the continuation of county customs, represented in Lambarde’s book by the Custom of Kent, created a model in many ways parallel to the structure of composite monarchy. R. Brackmann argues that for Lambarde the county of Kent was a model county, England in miniature [3:136], and this is certainly one of the possible interpretations of this text, but it is important to stress that Kent definitely is presented as a specific entity with the defined boundaries; these boundaries are both territorial (spatially determinable from without) and semantic (determinable from within, by the extent of local custom). A complete chorographical description of the English Kingdom, according to Lambarde, can be compared with tessellation of the whole image from individualized particles: "some one in eache Shyre, would make the enterprise for his owne Countrie, to the end that by ioyning our pennes and conferring our labours (as it were) Ex symbolo, wée may at the last by the vnion of many parts and papers, compact a whole and perfect bodie and Booke of our Eng|lish antiquities" [22:387].

J.M. Adrian [1:307-334] constructively reflects on the idea of the order as the organizing principle of The Perambulation. Certainly, here we see one of the first steps towards the description of a community as a total constituted of all titles and dignities of the *nobilitas nominata and nobilitas innominata* within a certain feudal entity. Later, under the first Stuarts we will see numerous examples of description of the noble community as the hierarchy of orders, which were integrated into heraldic and legal tracts as the structural stem of the narrative, and conceived by its authors - heralds and lawyers - as the key pillar of the Kingdom of England itself. In John Selden's "Titles of Honor" hierarchy of dignities and noble titles perform a universal phenomenon with the range of possible variations peculiar to each monarchy - such approach opened a possibility of comparison between European kingdoms and demonstration of the excellence of the English constitution. When Lambarde structures the Kentish gentry and nobility into Ramistic scheme, he yet does not abstract a title from its living holder; he does not demonstrate a Kentish part of the general English nobility, but reassembles Kentish nobility building on the explicitly confined territory of the county.

One of the most illustrative cases of the Early Modern locally-oriented chorography is the "Survey of Cornwall" written by Richard Carew. Carew was born to the noble Cornish family in about 1555, was educated in Oxford, in London he met William Camden and under his influence became a member of the Antiquarian Society. In his later career Carew served as a High Sheriff of Cornwall and through his wife was also related to the Cornish nobility. In his chorography published in 1602 [6] and dedicated to Walter Raleigh, Lord Warden of the stannaries, Lieutenant General of Cornwall from 1585 and MP from Cornwall, he constructs alternative Cornwall-oriented version of the first population of Britain. This narrative, in some aspects following Camden's Britannia, develops and brings to perfection the narrative scheme proposed by Lambard.

Carew's chorography clearly demonstrates the most characteristic mode of treatment with the local and pan-English ethnogenetic myth. According to Carew, there are three versions of how Cornwall got its name. The first two are derived from its geographical position: some derived it "from Cornu Galliae, a horne or corner of France, where against nature hath placed it; and some, from Cornu Walliae, which (in my conjecture) carrieth greatest likelyhood of truth" [6:1-2]. The third version is ethnogenethic one: "Cornwall got its name after Corineus, Brutus' cousin; this Corineus came from Troy with Brutus, landed in Plymouth, fight a giant Gog-Magog, threw him down to the sea and received the gift of that Countrie, in reward for his prowess" [6:2].

This short note had to re-create two literal associations, well-known to the early XVI century reader. The description of the epic fight between Corineus and Gog-Magog begins with Geoffrey of Monmouth. In "The History of the Kings of Britain" (book 1, 17-21) [13:28] Corineus comes to

Britain with Brutus after a long campaign in Gaul and proves himself to be a valiant giant-fighter. We see Corineus replicating Brutus' actions on the local scale: "Brutus named the island Britain after himself and called his followers Britons. He wanted to be remembered for ever for giving them his name. For this reason, the language of his people, previously known as Trojan or 'crooked Greek', was henceforth called British. Corineus followed his leader's example by similarly calling the area of the kingdom allotted to him Corineia and his people Corineians, after himself. He could have had his pick of the provinces before any other settler, but preferred the region now called Cornwall, either after Britain's horn or through a corruption of the name Corineia" (book 1, 21) [13:28]. The site of this victory was located by Geoffrey in Plymouth [43:527-543].

Holinshed's Chronicles provide a similar version, but with different location. "He got the upper hand of the giant and cast him downe headlong from one of the rocks there, not farre from Dover, and so dispatched him; by reason whereof the place was named long after the Fall or Leape of Gogmagog, but afterwards it was called the Fall of Dover. For this valiant deed ... Brute gave unto Corineus the whole countrie of Cornwall" [18:15]. As we can see, it is Brutus who gives the power over Cornwall to Corineus, leaving him passively accept it.

Choosing of these two equally famous variants, Carew preferred the Galfridian one, with Corineus actively acting as the second Brutus. Considering the credibility of different versions of ethnogenetic myths and the earliest population of Britain, Carew notices: if one accepts the legend of Brutus as true, one should also accept the fact that his first landing took place not in Dover, but in the city of Totness in Devon. All these explications made to the traditional Galfridian narrative were made to represent Cornwall as an opening place for the entire British history. Despite that "nature hath should red out Cornwall into the farthest part of the, and so besieged it with the Ocean" [6:3], in Carew's view is not a real periphery, but lies in the crossroad of the trade routes between Wales, Ireland, Spain and the Netherlands, that allows the Cornish "to vent forth and make return of those commodities, which their own, or either of those Countries doe afford" [6:4]. Cornwall is a self-sufficient, rich, flourishing land, not inferior to all England in every parameter (the only inconvenience mentioned by Carew is the long distance from the central courts in London).

Carew's description of Cornwall consists of two parts (not completely corresponding to the book 1 and book 2 of the narrative), each providing a special approach to the entity. The first one depicts the land of Cornwall, while the second pictures Cornwall as a community; taken together, they make up a tridimensional imaginary structure. The first part of the narrative unfolds the Cornish landscape with all its natural resources, starting from the lower forms of creature (lands and its qualities, minerals, plants, grains, rivers, woods) to the higher (animals, cattle, birds, fishes etc.) and finally, to the description of the customs and the character of a "Cornish gentleman" [6:57-77]. This well-built community (Carew cites a popular proverb "that all Cornish gentlemen are cousins; which endeth in an iniurious consequence, that the king hath there no cousins" [6:64] comprises "learned men", "lawyers" "physicians", "statemen", "martial men", has its peculiar recreations and saints feasts, cannot be understood without a thorough historical description of its formal status, government and feudal jurisdiction [6:78-85]. Thus, the attentive reader can perceive Cornwall as a whole, watching on the land from a bird's eye view and its people as a part of natural hierarchy of creation. The second conceptual part (Cornwall as a community) consists of two elements: the short chronicle of Cornwall, starting with the Roman conquest of Britain and finishing with the last Cornish rebellion of 1549 [6:95-98] and successive chorographical account of the Cornish hundreds. Carew invites his reader to follow him step by step: "I will make easie iournies from place to place, as they lie in my way, taking the Hundreds for my guides, untill I haue accomplished this wearisome voyage” [6:98]. During this travel one can discover the inner structure of the community, not hierarchic but horizontal one, not monolithic but in a sense composite. With several personal and official bonds Cornish community is integrated into the wider British context, so its autonomy and boundaries do not suggest isolation. Significantly, the description of Cornwall ends exactly where it has started: at Land’s End, at the grave of the giant. “Not farre from the lands ende, there is a little village, called Trebegean, in English, The towne of the Giants grave: neere whereunto, and within memory (a's I haue beene informed) certayne workemen searching for Tynne, discouered a long square vault, which contayned the bones of an excessive bigge carkas, and verified this Etimology of the name” [6:159]. The historical, semantical and geographical boundary of the community is thus completed in a full circle.

Very close to Carew’s narrative stands “The Breviary of Suffolk” [35] written by Robert Reyce (or Ryece), a Suffolk gentleman, and dedicated to Sir Robert Crane, a distinguished Suffolk knight and High Sheriff of this county. Reyce had some connection to the Antiquarian circle and was praised by the famous herald John Guillim for his learning, and C.G. Harlow comments that Carew’s book was an immediate inspiration for Reyce [16:43]. But there are some evident differences with the “Description of Cornwall”. The text Reyce created is not a standard chorography, the description of Suffolk land at the opening pages is quite laconic. He does not mention any origin myth or dynastic history of the South Saxons, and generally omits the detailed description of geographical objects (with the exception of the main rivers of the county [35:7-13]). Only once he notices the peripherical situation of the county: “the county is one of the remotest shires of all England eastward” [35:5]. Nevertheless, Reyce sees himself as flesh and blood of Suffolk land: “the fruits and effects of my recreative opportunities, which by all the meanes that I could I have laboured to gather together for the benefit of this Country, unto the which next under God, I doe owe that little that I haue, for my birth, education, and habitation. And indeed what is more commendable (in my weake judgement) than curiously to search out the best ornaments of his native soile?” [35:2] In the antiquarian discourse the idea of the land nourishing the specificity of peoples inhabiting it was quite common, especially for the lawyers antiquarians like Selden and Spelman, with the one important difference: for them the land nourishing and generating the Common law was the whole England. Reyce obviously separates Suffolk as a special space, almost idyllic, “which ministreth unto the inhabitants a full choyce of healthfull and pleasant situations for their seemly houses” [35:25] and to which “the Lord hath voutsafed many singuiar benefltts” [35:21].

Reyce generally adapts Carew’s way of description of the local community as a unity of several orders, but while Carew describes only the selected important categories within Cornish society, Reyce’s description is much more consistent. He starts with the lowest stratum - “the poore” and proceeds to the highest one, namely to the Dukes of Suffolk [35:56-82]. Reyce definitely took his inspiration from heraldic tracts that can be conditionally styled “catalogues of honor” and were aimed at the representing of the noble community at the pan-English scale. Of all the above-mentioned chorographies his text was the most deeply influenced by heraldic literature. He integrates blazons of armorial bearings and genealogies of the Suffolk nobility into his narrative, and so imitates the elements of heraldic visitations. An interesting analogy to Reyce’s we find in “The Union of Honor” by a Caroline antiquary James Yorke [41:19-43], who added to the heraldic tract about the higher nobility a special catalogue of armorial bearings of his native Lankashire gentry.

Reyce's description of Suffolk community is still multi-dimensional. The image of the community builds of a functional description of each group (the poor, husbandmen, yeomanry, gentlemen, knights and the nobility, additionally - the clergy, lawyers, martial men, statesmen), personal and family lineup with the short history of each noble family and the first creation in Suffolk and finally, the arms. Beside this, Suffolk is defined through its administrative division and government structure, where for every office its holder is identified. Finally, we find descriptions of the local places of memory, namely the churches, where the arms of the higher nobility and the monarchs of Britain were demonstrated. Reyce takes his reader for the tour into the church of Preston, where along the arms of the local gentry the bearings of the British monarchs are exposed. The first and the most honorable place belongs to queen Elizabeth Tudor and her imperial shield [35:188]; then we return to the origins of the history of Britain, reading the blazon descriptions of the arms of Edward the Confessor, Edward the Martyr, the King of Norway (Reyce means Sweyn the Forkbeard "king of Denmarke, England, Norway, Scotland and Sweden"), Julius Caesar, Brutus, Belinus, Saint George, Roderick the Great king of Gwynedd, also the arms of Scotland and Ireland [35:192-201]. So, from the local church in Suffolk the reader can perceive the "composite" retrospective of the Tudor state.

William Smith (1550?-1618), the author of the chorographic narrative "The Vale-Royall of England" [37], structures his description of the Country Palatine of Chester almost completely relying on Raphael Holinshed's Chronicles [18]. While Holinshed saw the history of Britain as the aggregation of territories and dynasties into the integrated whole continuous over time, as a demonstration of continuity of the royal power dominating over the Kingdom of England - the entity that had been born from the heterogenous components, Smith applies the same principle to the history of a local community, to the particular feudal and ethno-cultural autonomy. Smith demonstrates that name, status and character is a subject of historical change. The Mercian community starts as the borderland one: “The Kingdom of March, reached from London to the river of Marcey, which parteth Cheshire form Lancashire; of which river, some write, it should take name. But that cannot I believe, but think rather it is so called, because it marched or bordered upon all the other” [37:1] Without any rational critics Smith reproduces Holinshed, stating that “Crida was the [first King] of March … He was descended from Woden and the tenth from Him, by lineal extraction” [37:2]. He demonstrates the Mercia-centric historical continuity in the form of a short chronicle. The Kingdom of Mercia [37:2-6] transforms into the Duchy of Mercia under the last Anglo-Saxon kings [37:7-8], then into the County of Chester and finally into the County Palatine [37:49-54]); the succession line of the twenty-two kings of Mercia continues with the succession of William the Conqueror’s vassals; the real immutable constants of the community are embodied in the administrative and legal institutions, power structures and local privileges constituting its territorial integrity. In accordance with the antiquarian tradition, Smith integrates into the text three documents, establishing the Palatinate of Chester and conforming the corresponding privileges of autonomy (“Supplication, exhibited to the King Henry VI by the Inhabitants of the County Palatine Chester” (1450), the response Royal proclamation, and “The Confirmation of the Liberties of the County Palatine” by Elizabeth I (1568) [37:9-15].

John Doddridge, the author of the short text “History of the Ancient and Modern Estate of the Principality of Wales, Duchy of Cornwall and Earldom of Chester” [9] was born in Devon, made a successful career in the Court of the King’s bench and hold several estates in his native county, including Bremridge, a manor mentioned in Domesday Book. In his survey Doddridge emphasizes that three abovementioned autonomies making up the title of the Royal Heir to the Throne, constituted the essential part of the

Royal domain lands: they were the fountain of the Crown income and dynastical wealth. The royal will, expressed in granting of privileges and in formalizing the status of the autonomies with regard to the other lands in the Kingdom, is understood as a guarantee and basis of their existence.

All three feudal autonomies held by the Prince of Wales as feudal tenure are located in periphery, as Doddridge emphasizes. Moreover, the history of these peripherical territories goes back to the Briton period predating to the rise of the kingdom of England. For Doddridge this is a chance to recall the idea of all-Briton unity. "This part of this island, which is called Wales … was anciently called by the Saxons conquering this land, called the said Territorie (into the mountaines whereof the remnant of the Britaines that remayned were fled , and not to be overcome by them) Wallia, and the people Welshmen, that is to say, vnto them strangers" [9:1-2]. "The uttermost part of this island toward the West, stretching it selfe by a long extent into the Ocean is called the County of Cornewall; lying ouer against the Duchie of Britaine in France. The people inhabiting the same, are called Cornishmen, and are also reputed a remnant of the Britaines, the ancient Inhabitants of this land: they have a particular language, called Cornish, (although now much worne out of use) differing but little from the Welsh" [9:77-78]; "this Earledome [Chester] bordering upon North Wales for the better defence of that Country" [9:123]. For every community Doddridge follows the same pattern: localization on the imaginary map of Britain, development of customs and privileges (transition from earldom to dukedom for Cornwall and to county Palatine for Chester), territorial structure (counties and manors), income rates, courts of justice and jurisdictions. Doddridge demonstrates how over the century's legal acts of the English monarch formed community - its territories, its autonomy, its institutes. It is the king of England who creates the proper order from "peripherical" and "extraneous". By reconstructing the long process of "territorial appropriation" he shows how the ancient Briton periphery becomes one of the key elements of the contemporary English monarchy.

The perception of the royal power as an organizing and ordinating principle of the English state was a general characteristic for all antiquarian and legal narratives, where the history of potestary institutions was reconstructed and examines in pan-Anglian scale. By the end of the XVI century we can clearly see the shift of emphasis in the key issues characteristic for the medieval perception of the autonomies. Formalized boundaries and fixed privileges continued to be a substantial element of the internal structure of the composite monarchy. For the Early Modern period the key elements of "autonomy" were local custom, institutes of interaction between the supreme power, its history, traditions and community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adrian J.M., Tudor Centralization and Gentry Visions of Local Order in Lambarde's "Perambulation of Kent", English Literary Renaissance, Vol. 36, No. 3, 2006, pp. 307-334.
2. Alexander J.W., The English Palatinates and Edward I, Journal of British Studies, 1983, № 22, p. 2-22.
3. Brackmann R., The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England, by Nowell L., Lambarde W., and Study of Old English, D.S.Brewer, 2012, 244p.
4. Brooke R. A., Catalogue and Succession of the Kings, Princes, Duke, London, printed by W. Stanseby, 1622.
5. Cam H., Liberties and Communities in Medieval England: Collected Studies in Local Administration and Topography, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1944.

6. Camden W., Britannia: sive Florentissimorum Regnorum, Angliae, Scotiae, Hiberniae, et Insularum Adiacentium ex intima antiquitate chorographica descriptio. London, Radulphum Newbury, 1586
7. Carew R., The Survey of Cornwall and An Epistle Concerning the Excellencies of the English Tongue, With the Life of the Author, London, 1769, p. 1-2.
8. Davies R. R., The British Isles 1200-1500: Comparisons, Contrasts and Connections. Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers, 1998.
9. Doddridge J., The history of the ancient and moderne estate of the principality of Wales, dutchy of Cornewall, and earldome of Chester Collected out of the records of the Tower of London, and diuers ancient authours, By Sir Iohn Dodridge Knight, one of his Maiesties iudges in the Kings Bench. And by himselfe dedicated to King Iames of euer blessed memory. London, 1630.
10. Dutton R., Shakespeare and British History, The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles, ed. by R.Kewes, J.W. Archer, F. Heal. Oxford, 2013, pp. 527-543.
11. Elliott J. H., A Europe of Composite Monarchies, Past and Present, N 137 1992, pp. 48-71.
12. Elliott J.H., Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain, 1492-1830, Yale University Press New Haven, 2006., 608.
13. Geoffrey of Monmouth, The History of the Kings of Britain, Ed. by M.D. Reeve transl. by N. Wright, Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 2007. pp. 20-21.
14. Glower R., Nobilitas Politica vel Civilis, London, typis G. Jaggard, 1608.
15. Goffart W., The First Venue into "Medieval Geography": Lambarde's Map of the Saxon Heptarchy, Alfred the Wise, Studies in Honor of Janet Bateley, ed. by J. Roberts et al. Cambridge, 1997.pp. 53-60.

16. Harlow C.G., Robert Ryece of Preston (1555-1638). Suffolk Archaeology and History. Vol. 32. Part 1. 1970.
17. Higham N., An English Empire: Bede and the early Anglo-Saxon Kings, Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York, 1995, 288p..
18. Holinshed R., The firste volume of the chronicles of England, … Fragments concerning the history of Mercia see p. 143, 165, 176, 189 et al.
19. Koenigsberger H.G., Monarchies, states generals and parliaments: the Netherlands in the 15th and 16th centuries, Cambridge, 2007.
20. Koenigsberger H.G., The Empire of Charles V in Europe, The New Cambridge Modern History. Vol.2., Ed. by G.R. Elton. Cambridge, 1958, pp. 301-333.
21. Koenigsberger H.G., The Practice of Empire, Cornell University Press Ithaca, 1969, 229p.
22. Lambarde W., Eirenarcha or of the Office of the Justices of Peace. London: Printed for the Company of Stationers, 1619.
23. Lambarde W., The Perambulation of Kent: Conteining the Description, Hystorie, and Customes of That Shyre, London, 1576.
24. Leland J., The Itinerary of John Leland in or About the Years 1535–154, 5 vols., ed. by L. Toulmin Smith. London, George Bell and sons, 1909–1910.
25. Milles' The Catalogue of Honor, or, Treasury of True Nobility, Peculiar and Proper to the Isle of Great Britaine, William Jaggard, London, 1610.
26. Morrill J., Dynasties, Realms, Peoples and State Formation, 1500-1720, Monarchy Transformed. Princes and Their Elites in Early Modern Western Europe, ed. by R. von Friedeburg, Cambridge University Press, 2017. p. 17-43.

27. Morrill J., The British Problem, 1534-1707, State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago, Basingstoke, MacMillan, 1996, p. 1-38.
28. Neville C.J., Land, Law and People in Medieval Scotland, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2012, 264 p.
29. Grant A., Stringer K. , Russel C., Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History, London, 1995, 322p.
30. Scammell J., The Origins and Limitations of the Liberty of Durham, English Historical Review, №81, 1966. pp. 449-473.
31. Scott H., Dynastic Monarchy and the Consolidation of Aristocracy during Europe's Long Seventeenth Century, Monarchy Transformed, Princes and Their Elites in Early Modern Western Europe, ed. by R. von Friedeburg and J. Morrill. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017. pp. 44-87.
32. Selden J., Titles of Honor, London, W. Stanseby for John Helme, 1614.
33. Stow J., A Survey of London. ed. by C. L. Kingsford., (reprinted from the text of 1603), Clarendon, Oxford, 1908.
34. Stringer K., States, Liberties and Communities in the Medieval British Isles, ed. by M. Prestwich, Boydell Press, Woodbridge, 2008, 225p.
35. Reyce R., Hervey F., Suffolk in the Seventeenth century. The Breviary Of Suffolk (1902), Kessinger Publishing, 2010, 306p.
36. The Chronicle of Henry of Hintingdon. Comprising the History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Accession of Henry II, ed. and transl. by Th. Forrester. AMS Press, London, 1853. 442p.
37. The Vale-Royall of England, or, The County Palatine of Chester Illustrated… Performed by William Smith, and William Webb, Gentleman, Mr. Daniel King. London, J. Streamer, 1656.
38. Vowell J., The order and vsage of the keeping of a parlement in England, and The description of tholde and ancient cittie of Excester, Col-

lected by Iohn Vovvel alias Hooker gentleman. London, 1575. pp. 41-53.

39. Williams I., Developing a prerogative Theory for the Authority of the Chancery, Law and Authority in British Legal History, 1200-1900, ed. by M. Godfrey Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016, p. 33−60.
40. Wormald P. B., Ideal and reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society,Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1983, 345 p.
41. Yorke J., The Union of Honor, containing the Armes, Matches and Issues of the Kings, Dukes, Marquesses and Earles of England from the Conquest until 1640. With the Armes of the English Viscounts and Barons now being: and of the Gentry of Lincol, London, Printed by Edward Griffin for William Leake, 1640.
42. Zell M., Landholding and the Land Market in the Early Modern Kent, Early Modern Kent, 1540-1640, Ed. by M. Zell. Woodbridge, 2000, p. 40.
43. Kewes R., Archer I.,The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed’s Chronicles, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013, 772p.

Anastasia Palamarchuk
Institute of Oriental Studies NAS RA
sir.henry.finch@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0851-6875

ԿՈՄՊՈԶԻՏԱՅԻՆ ՄԻԱՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՏԵՂԱԿԱՆ ՏԱՐԵԳՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆ ՈՒ ԿԱՌՈՒՅՑՆԵՐԸ ՎԱՂ ՆՈՐ ՇՐՋԱՆԻ ԽՈՍՈՒՅԹՈՒՄ

Անաստասիա Պալամարչուկ

Բանալի բառեր՝ միապետություն, քաղաքականություն, թագավորություն, տարեգրություն:

Կոմպոզիտար միապետության հայեցակարգը, որը մշակվել է ժամանակակից պատմագրության մեջ, արդյունավետ վերլուծական հետազոտական գործիք է բարդ ներքին կառուցվածքով խոշոր տարածքային պետությունների ուսումնասիրության համար: Այս հայեցակարգի հիմքն են հանդիսանում հայտնի հետազոտողների՝ Քյոնիգսբերգերի և Էլիոթի աշխատությունները: Նրանցից յուրաքանչյուրը (Քյոնիգսբերգերը հիմնականում հենվում է մայրցամաքային նյութի վրա, Էլիոթը՝ բրիտանականի) արտացոլում էր այն փաստը, որ վաղ արդի պետությունների ճնշող մեծամասնությունն ուներ բարդ և մշակված ներքին կառուցվածք ոչ միայն վարչական առումով, այլ նաև տարածքային: Նման բարդ քաղաքականության ժամանակ թագավորական իշխանությունը ոչ միայն զարգացավ գերիշխանությունից դեպի ինքնիշխանություն, այլև ընդլայնվեց մի շարք ինքնավար կամ կիսաինքնավար տարածքային միավորների՝ կոմպոզիտների: