

Orlov, A.V. (2022). Formation of the state model of the estate-representative monarchy. *International collection of the student works on Jurisprudence. Tuculart Student Scientific*, 1 (1), 23-33. Ostrava: Tuculart Edition.

DOI: 10.47451/tss2022-02-03

The paper will be published in Crossref, Internet Archive, ICI Copernicus, Google Scholar, Academic Resource Index ResearchBib, J-Gate, International Scientific Indexing (ISI), eLibrary databases.



Artem V. Orlov, Bachelor Student, Specialty “Judicial and prosecutorial activity”, Department of History of State and Law, O.E. Kutafin Moscow State Law Academy, Moscow, Russia.

ORCID: 0000-0003-3748-3408

Scientific adviser: Svetlana A. Saltykova, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, O.E. Kutafin Moscow State Law Academy, Moscow, Russia.

Formation of the state model of the estate-representative monarchy

Abstract: In world history, one of the undoubtedly important stages is the period of the estate-representative monarchy. It was during this era of mature feudalism that state institutions gradually took shape. To fully understand the impact of this stage in our history, it is necessary to consider the political and social and economic prerequisites for the emergence of this state system, to consider the institutions of power of this period, to consider how this stage affected the entire history of the state as a whole. The study subject is the problem of the formation of state institutions in the conditions of a class-representative monarchy. The study purpose is to show the formation of a class-representative monarchy in world history, as well as its influence on the development of functional elements of states. The study was conducted on the basis of dialectical-materialistic methodology, within the framework of which logical, formal, historical, comparative, and other methods of scientific knowledge were used to solve the research problems. The researcher concludes that the fate of the estate-representative bodies varies in different countries. They have only one thing in common – the presence of representatives of different classes in these institutions. Also, these bodies were united by the fact that representatives of these institutions could formally influence the policy of the state, despite the fact that in some countries this influence was lower, and in some, on the contrary, higher. In other respects, the estate-representative bodies of different countries were little alike, ranging from the political rights of representatives of the estates, ending with the history of the appearance of these bodies.

Keywords: tsar, Boyar Duma, Zemsky Sobor, estate-representative monarchy, the States-General, The Reichstag.



Артём Валерьевич Орлов, студент 1 курса специалитета, Специальность “Судебная и прокурорская деятельность”, кафедра истории государства и права, Московская государственная юридическая академия имени О.Е. Кутафина, Москва, Россия.

ORCID: 0000-0003-3748-3408

Научный руководитель: Светлана Александровна Салтыкова, к.ю.н., доцент, Московской государственной юридической академии имени О.Е. Кутафина, Москва, Россия.

Формирование государственной модели сословно-представительной монархии

Аннотация: В мировой истории одним из наиболее важных этапов является период сословно-представительной монархии. Именно в эту эпоху зрелого феодализма постепенно формировались государственные институты. Чтобы полностью понять влияние этого этапа в нашей истории, необходимо рассмотреть политические и социально-экономические предпосылки возникновения этой государственной системы, рассмотреть институты власти этого периода, рассмотреть, как этот этап повлиял на всю историю государств в целом. Предметом исследования является проблема формирования государственных институтов в условиях сословно-представительной монархии. Целью исследования является рассмотрение формирования сословно-представительной монархии в мировой истории, а также ее влияние на развитие функциональных элементов государств. Исследование проводилось на основе диалектико-материалистической методологии, в рамках которой для решения исследовательских задач использовались логические, формальные, исторические, сравнительные и другие методы научного познания. Исследователь приходит к выводу, что судьба сословно-представительных органов в разных странах неодинакова. У них есть только одна общая черта – присутствие в этих заведениях представителей разных классов. Также эти органы объединяло то, что представители этих институтов могли формально влиять на политику государства, несмотря на то что в некоторых странах это влияние было ниже, а в некоторых, наоборот, выше. В остальном сословно-представительные органы разных стран были мало похожи друг на друга, начиная от политических прав представителей сословий, заканчивая историей появления этих органов.

Ключевые слова: царь, Боярская дума, Земский собор, сословно-представительная монархия, Генеральные Штаты, Рейхстаг.



Introduction

The relevance of the study topic is due to the fact that it was this historical stage in the history of Russia and other states that gave impetus to the development of many state institutions. Also, it was during this period, at this stage of state development, that the first prototype of a modern parliamentary system began to appear.

The study subject is the problem of the formation of state institutions in the conditions of a class-representative monarchy.

The study purpose is to show the formation of a class-representative monarchy in world history, as well as its influence on the development of functional elements of states.

Based on the study purpose, the following tasks were set:

- analyse the social and economic prerequisites for the emergence of a class-representative monarchy in Russia.
- analyse the social and economic prerequisites for the emergence of a class-representative monarchy in England, France, Germany and the political institutions that emerged during that period.
- compare features of social and economic prerequisites for the emergence of a class-representative monarchy during that period.

The study was conducted on the basis of dialectical-materialistic methodology, within the framework of which logical, formal, historical, comparative, and other methods of scientific knowledge were used to solve the research problems.

Currently, a large number of scientific works by historians, political scientists and lawyers have been published on the topic of the formation of the state model of a class-representative monarchy.

The origin and development of a class-representative monarchy

Estate-representative monarchy in Russia

The royal power was not so strong that the monarch had absolute power. That is why the estate-representative monarchy is particularly acute in Russian history, as a transitional period to an absolute monarchy. Also, the transition to this period was marked by the emergence of representative bodies, and the previous governing bodies underwent serious changes. It was in the era of a class-representative monarchy that only one form of government became possible in Russia – monarchy, and the status of the monarch changed after the proclamation of Ivan IV as tsar, which symbolized the strengthening of the monarch's power.

Considering this period from a social and economic point of view, it can be noted that the formation of a class-representative monarchy became a necessary measure for the formation of a single state, since it was necessary to overcome the remnants of feudal fragmentation. In addition, the unification of the individual principalities into a single state led to the formation of a single market, which in turn led to the expansion of international trade relations.

If we consider the issue of the formation of a class-representative monarchy in Russia from a political point of view, then the main reason will be the emergence of a new supreme governing body of the state – the Zemsky Sobor, the first meeting of which was held in 1549. It is considered that the convocation of the first Zemsky Sobor finally formalized the estate-representative monarchy in Russia, since representatives of various estates participated in the Zemsky Sobor. Tsar Ivan the Terrible made the very decision to form the Zemsky Sobor after the Moscow Uprising in 1549. Ivan IV hoped to resolve the conflict by involving both boyars and nobles, as well as other representatives of the estates, in the management of the state.

However, despite the tsar's desire to gain absolute power, he cannot yet abandon such a traditional body as the Boyar Duma, which included representatives of the feudal aristocracy. Despite the fact that over time the influence of the Boyar Duma gradually decreases, it still limits the power of the monarch.

The system of the Zemsky Sobor conditionally implied the presence of two chambers: the upper chamber, which included the monarch himself, the Boyar Duma and representatives of the higher clergy, and the lower chamber, which included representatives of the nobility, merchants and merchants. The lower house of the Zemsky Sobor was formed by royal appointment or election. Also, it is worth noting that in the lower house of this estate-representative body, nobles and, above all, merchants played a significant role, since their participation was especially important for the state, due to the possibility of representatives of these estates to help the state solve various problems required financing, for example, the allocation of funds for the organization of the militia.

By the middle of the 16th century, the transition from the palace-patrimonial management system to the command system was finally completed. An extensive system of orders was gradually formed. A special role in the command management system was given to military-administrative orders. During the period of the estate-representative monarchy, the army was reorganized, whose basis began to be the noble cavalry and archers. The personnel of the boyar and noble cavalry was in charge of the Discharge Order. This body recorded all appointments to the service and changes in positions. The very same appointment of posts began to occur on the principle of localism, that is, according to the nobility of the family.

There were also special territorial orders that were in charge of the affairs of the annexed or developed new territories, such orders included: the Kazan Order and the Siberian order.

Palace orders were created to serve the royal family. The Palace orders included: the order of the Grand Palace (management of the palace lands), the Bed-keeper's order (in charge of the royal bedroom) and the stable order (in charge of the royal stable), etc.

One of the most important orders was the Embassy Order, due to the fact that before its introduction, a large number of state bodies were engaged in foreign policy issues of the Russian state, which created inconveniences, since in such conditions the disclosure of state secrets quite often occurred. The tsar believed that he personally should deal with the main issues of foreign policy (*Zbiltsov, 2009*). A limited circle of people was called upon to help him in this – the head of the Embassy order and several clerks. This department negotiated with foreign ambassadors, worked out important documents that reflected the position of the Russian state on various foreign policy issues. A special institution is being created that was in charge of the affairs of the serfs. Prior to that, these issues were dealt with by local self-government bodies and the State Order. The main task of the Servile order was to register bonded records in special books. Also, this department could consider claims about fugitive slaves.

In the conditions of a class-representative monarchy, a Petition order was created, within the framework of which nobles and children of boyars could appeal to the court of the tsar himself. Also, a central police body is being born, which is called a Robbery Order. He developed instructions to local government bodies on combating criminal offenses, could independently appoint appropriate officials on the ground.

The transition to a class-representative monarchy led to the abolition of the feeding system, due to which the princely administration was maintained at the expense of the local population throughout the entire period of service. To replace the feeding system, gubernia and zemstvo governing bodies were created, which were headed by gubernia elders and tselovalniks. The governing bodies were elected by the local nobility, whose duty it was to fight the anti-feudal actions of the peasants. The robbery order directed the labial organs. The zemstvo bodies were created to manage the townships, collect taxes, manage the black-collar peasants, to consider civil and criminal cases, for which the zemstvo elders and other officials did not collect duties from the population.

Considering the social system during the period of the estate-representative monarchy, it can be noted that this period is characterized not only by the complete enslavement of peasants, but also by the development of agriculture, crafts and trade.

In the 16th century, the first manufactories appeared, which, for the most part, were based on serf labor, but the labor of hired workers was also partially used. Thus, it is possible to view the ground for the future emergence of bourgeois relations.

The main feudal lord in the state is the monarch. Not a small role in strengthening his power, as well as economic power, was played by Oprichnina. As a result of the oprichnina's action, the tsar received very convenient lands used by him as a land fund to maintain the loyalty of the nobles, as well as to strengthen his power.

The largest feudal lords could be attributed to the boyar aristocracy, which, in turn, consisted of two groups:

- 1) The former appanage princes, who as a result of the unification of the appanages into a single state, lost their former political privileges, but before the introduction of the oprichnina retained their economic importance.
- 2) Large and medium-sized boyars (*Khachatryan, 2008*).

The lower, but the largest in its numerical component, part of the feudal lords are the nobles. Small feudal lords sought to enrich their land plots, as well as to get more enslaved peasants. Due to the fact that Ivan VI was engaged in the expansion of Russian lands and the issuance of annexed lands to the nobles, this group began to actively support the activities of the tsar.

Also, one of the major feudal lords was the church, which at that time had huge land holdings. A large number of serfs worked on monastic lands. Large land holdings continued to accumulate in the hands of the church, which is why in 1551, in the Stoglav Cathedral it was forbidden to buy or give land holdings to the church without the consent of the tsar himself.

For the dependent part of the population, the opportunity was fixed to move from one feudal lord to another on "St. George's Day", but the peasants rarely used this opportunity, since they were legally attached to the land plot. However, during the years of the Oprichnina, there was a mass flight of peasants, because of which their enslavement became a measure to prevent flight. In 1580, the tsar issued a decree "on reserved years", which abolished the "St. George's Day". In 1581 there was a census of peasants, which was completed only in 1592. She created legal grounds for searching for runaway peasants. In 1597, a decree was issued "on fixed-term years", according to which the period of investigation of fugitive peasants was announced, which was five years. Subsequently, the term of the investigation was repeatedly changed, until the Council Code of 1649 made the term of the investigation indefinite.

In the era of the estate-representative monarchy, one of the most important events in the history of the state took place – the adoption of the Council Code of 1649 by Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich. This code of laws differs enormously from previous legislative codes. The Cathedral Code reflects the legal norms of various branches of law: civil law, criminal law, procedural law. The Cathedral Code of 1649 consolidated the design of the estate structure of society, the process of becoming an absolute monarchy, the regulation of the rights and duties of all estates, the attachment of the inhabitants of the posad to the place of residence.

The period of the estate-representative monarchy was marked by large territorial additions to the Russian state. The Astrakhan and Siberian Khanates were conquered, Bashkiria, part of the lands of the Nogai Horde were annexed, and Little Russia was reunited with Russia.

The entry of the Russian state into the period of mature feudalism is also characterized by a change in the form of the state structure, that is, the transition to a class-representative

monarchy. The power of the monarch is gradually strengthened in this period, which is relevant even in the adoption by the monarch of a new title – tsar. However, the monarch still cannot manage the state without special estate-representative bodies that express the will of the estates. The most important of these bodies was the Zemsky Sobor (*Isaev, 1998:154*). Some of these legislative bodies subsequently evolve into modern parliaments. The authority of the Boyar Duma gradually decreased. With the advent of a new form of government, local governments have also changed. The feeding was replaced by the system of zemstvo and gubernia self-government, which significantly weakened the boyar power and attracted a wider layer of feudal lords - the nobility to the management.

There is also a shift in the field of law. Major legislative codes are being created, and the system of punishments for crimes is being expanded.

Estate-representative monarchy in England

The first of the countries that entered the era of a class-representative monarchy was England. The entry of England into a class-representative monarchy is inextricably linked with the emergence of parliament.

The emergence of parliament in England goes back centuries. The thirteenth century was turbulent for the kings of the Plantagenet dynasty: the country was shaken for almost half a century by the speeches of the barons, who were joined by townspeople and peasants. In many ways, the population was dissatisfied with the policy of John the Landless (1199-1216): the king took land from unwanted barons, executed them or expelled them from the country. The feudal lords were dissatisfied with such arbitrariness. By the end of his reign, in 1215, John the Landless signed the Magna Carta due to the increasing opposition of the barons, to whom the church joined. This document limited the power of the king and protected the rights of the free population. However, after the coronation of John the Landless's son, Henry III (1207-1272), the abuse of royal power did not stop. The king arbitrarily increased taxes, spent huge sums on gifts to his entourage.

The discontent of the subjects was also intensified by the dominance of the French in the country. In the 1250s, a civil war actually began in the country. At the Battle of Lewes in 1264, the barons, led by Simon de Montfort, defeated the royal army and captured the king. Henry III was forced to make significant concessions to the rebels. Such a concession was the convocation of a special meeting in 1265, at which not only large feudal lords and clergy represented their interests, but also knights and citizens from large cities elected from each county. The work of the English Parliament begins from this year.

In the 14th century, the English parliament was divided into two chambers – the upper and lower. The upper house was the House of Lords, which included representatives of the secular and ecclesiastical aristocracy, who were members of the great royal council, and the lower house was the House of Commons, to which ordinary citizens were elected. However, in addition to the townspeople, the lower house of parliament also included knighthood.

These chambers of parliament received a special peak of popularity in the 16th century. To consider the issue of codification of key constitutional conventions, a joint committee was formed, which included two chambers of Parliament at the same time. The Committee, in turn,

categorically rejected the possibility of codification due to the fact that this convention is not a law, which makes it impossible to codify it (*Zaorskaya, 2004:289*).

Based on this conclusion, the committee concluded: “This codification process is not feasible by nature. A codified convention will create complexity with its definition, this process will reduce its flexibility and hinder development, which will lead to the need for judicial resolution of issues.”

The composition of the House of Lords was small. Even if all the invited persons gather for the session, the number of these persons will not exceed one hundred members of the House of Lords. The meeting of this chamber was usually held in the white hall of the Palace of Westminster.

When considering the House of Commons, it can be noted that it will be radically different from the House of Lords. As a separate chamber of Parliament, the House of Commons was formed gradually, during the second half of the 14th century. The House of Commons was characterized by the specifics of a collective meeting. The name of this chamber comes from the English word “commons”, which translates to “communities”. Due to the fact that this chamber included representatives of citizens, communities began to be called that part of the free population that had full rights, which, in turn, was determined by a good name and prosperity. Gradually, the right of every person belonging to this category of subjects to elect and be elected to the lower house of parliament took shape. Thus, the expansion of the political rights of citizens is clearly visible.

The end of the 14th century was marked by the appearance in the House of Commons of the post of speaker, who was elected from among the representatives of this chamber, by voting of all members of the House of Commons. The Speaker of the House of Commons played the role of a representative of this house in negotiations with the lords and the King. Deputies were elected locally according to the principle that had been in effect since the first parliament of Montfort, that is, this chamber consisted of two knights from each county and two representatives from the most important cities. The list of cities and the number of members of the lower house have changed over time. On average, in the 14th century, it amounted to 200 people, and by the beginning of the 18th century, there were more than 500. Representatives of the House of Commons, unlike representatives of the House of Lords, received a monetary allowance. The knights of the counties received four shillings each, and the townspeople two shillings for one day of the session.

The estate-representative monarchy in France

The state-representative monarchy in France replaced the seignorial monarchy at the beginning of the 14th century. Its formation is closely connected with the process of political centralization, which is quite progressive for its time. More than half of the country’s territory was united under a single administration. Also, the period of formation of the estate-representative monarchy in France is inextricably linked with the appearance of the estate-representative body – the States-General (*Pisarkova, 2001*).

By the beginning of the 14th century, the king’s alliance with representatives of various estates, based on a political compromise, had already been finalized. The political expression of this union was made by estate-representative institutions – provincial and General states. The

creation of the States-General was the beginning of a change in the form of government in the state and its transformation into a class-representative monarchy. In 1302, Philip IV the Handsome convened the States-General for the first time. This was due to the unsuccessful war in Flanders, as well as due to the conflict between Philip IV and the Pope of Rome.

The creation of a nationwide estate-representative institution is a manifestation of an objective pattern in the formation of a monarchical state in France. The frequency with which the States-General should be convened was decided by the King, depending on political considerations and circumstances. Each convocation of the states was determined only by the discretion of the king and was individual. The highest clergy (bishops, abbots, archbishops), as well as major feudal lords were invited personally. In their first convocations, the States-General did not have elected representatives from the nobility. Later, the middle and small nobility began to elect their deputies. 2-3 deputies were provided for elections from cities, convents of monasteries and churches. Citizens (in particular, legists) were elected from the estates of the nobility and clergy. About 1/7 of the States-General are represented by lawyers. The patrician-burgher elite of the cities were represented by their deputies. The King determined the issues that were submitted to the States-General for consideration, as well as the duration of meetings.

The States-General could appeal to the King with protests, complaints and requests. They could criticize the activities of the royal administration and make various proposals. There was a certain connection between the requests of the estates and their vote on the subsidies requested by the king. Sometimes the King yielded to the States-General and issued a corresponding ordinance at their request.

The activities of the States-General contributed to the centralization of management. Large magnates often avoided participating in the work of this body, and it was easier for the king to find a common language with representatives of the small and medium nobility and wealthy citizens. The Chambers of the Clergy and nobility were in solidarity on almost all issues. Deputies of the third estate often disagreed with them. Disputes between the estates were used by the king to strengthen his power. He often relied on representatives of the third estate, which emphasized the union of cities with the royal power.

The most acute conflict between the States-General and the royal power occurred in 1357 at the time of the uprising of the townspeople in Paris and the capture of the French King John by the British. The States-General, whose work was attended mainly by representatives of the third estate, put forward a reform program called the Great March Ordinance. Instead of granting subsidies to the royal power, they demanded that the collection and expenditure of funds be carried out by the States-General themselves, which were to meet three times a year, and without their convocation by the king. "General reformers" were elected, who were empowered to control the activities of the royal administration, dismiss individual officials and punish them, up to the use of the death penalty (*Ushakov, 2010*).

However, the attempt of the States-General to secure permanent financial, supervisory and even legislative powers was not successful. After the suppression of the Paris Uprising and the Jacquerie in 1358, the royal power rejected the demands contained in the Great March Ordinance.

The estate-representative monarchy in Germany

By about the 14th century, the process of forming estates in Germany had ended.

The upper class:

1. At the very top of the social pyramid were the princes. In their hands were concentrated the main land wealth, income from the development of minerals, feudal rents. Taxes, customs and duties were a powerful financial instrument.
2. The feudal aristocracy, which was able to adapt to the changed economic conditions: an increase in levies from peasants, leasing their land to meyers, breeding sheep on their own pastures, etc. Another way of enriching them was the service of princes.
3. The position of the average feudal lords differed significantly depending on the region, the volume and content of income, personal qualities. The positions of the nobility in the East German lands were the strongest. Here they had a profitable profitable farm, which was in the personal, land and judicial dependence of the peasants. Social stereotypes led to the traditional spending of funds: nobles spent their fortunes on “estate entertainment” (hunting, balls, construction and decoration of estates, etc.).
4. A group of marginal elements emerged from the feudal estate, which included, first of all, ruined knights. At the same time, many nobles went to serve in the officer corps of the princely armies or in the civil apparatus of the princely administrations.
5. New groups have appeared in the composition of the social elite. First of all, these are the heads of large trade and monopolistic companies, rich shop foremen and owners of manufactories. In the 16th century, the formation of a new patriciate was underway from their number, and there was a departure from entrepreneurial activity. Official positions, investments in seignories and castles were considered more profitable, spiritual careers, education, especially obtaining legal professions were also popular in the patrician environment (*Nosov, 1969*).

The formation of the class of townspeople (burghers), a special social group of the free population engaged in handicraft production, entrepreneurship and trade, also began. It carried various duties in favor of its lords and paid chinsh.

The Reichstag became a significant institution of power. The name of the organ has been assigned to him since 1495. The Reichstag, like the states-General, historically grew out of feudal councils. Initially, only princes and counts were called to the feudal congresses. In 1180, the second curia (chamber) was formed – the curia of counts and princes. It is not customary to consider the Reichstag as a classical estate-representative body, such as, for example, the English Parliament. The Reichstag was an assembly (assembly) of the estate elite, had an emphatically aristocratic character. It consisted of three curiae:

- college of coursers;
- college of princes, counts and free lords;
- board of representatives of imperial cities (*Khachatourian, 2008*).

The peasantry and the minor nobility had no representatives in this body.

At the first stage of history Reichstag was convened irregularly. At the end of the work of each Reichstag, resolutions were adopted. After their agreement with the emperor, the resolutions acquired the force of law. In the 17th and 18th centuries, the resolutions were replaced by Imperial resolutions, which were then included in the corpus of imperial legislation.

The competence of the Reichstag included the resolution of issues of peace and war, international relations and financial issues. The emperor had the right to formulate questions submitted to the discussions of the Reichstag. The issues were discussed separately on the curia, after that, negotiations took place between the chambers until a decision was made. If the emperor made a new proposal, it was again submitted for discussion by the Reichstag.

In addition to the Reichstag, another symbol of the estate-representative monarchy in Germany was the “Golden Bull”. The Golden Bull consolidated the historically established practice in which the administration of Germany was actually concentrated in the hands of seven electors, three archbishops – Main, Cologne and Trier, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the King of Bohemia, the Duke of Saxony, the Palatine of the Rhine.

The Golden Bull regulated in detail the procedure for electing the emperor by electors. If the votes were equal, the decisive vote belonged to the Archbishop of Main. He voted last, was chairman of the college of Electors and had to convene a meeting of the entire college in Frankfurt am Main. The Archbishop of Main could ask in advance for the consent of other electors for this or that candidacy. The “bull” provided for the transformation of the College of electors into a permanent state administration body. A collegium congress was to be held annually for one month to discuss state affairs. The Collegium had the right to try the emperor and remove him.

The Golden Bull recognized the complete political independence of the electors, their equality to the emperor. It secured the rights of their territorial supremacy, established the indivisibility of electorates, their inheritance. The electors retained the regalia they had seized, especially such as ownership of the subsoil and its exploitation, collection of duties, coinage. They had the right of supreme jurisdiction in their possessions. Vassals were forbidden to wage wars against the lords, cities were forbidden to form alliances against the electors. Thus, the oligarchy of several major feudal lords, which had developed even before the Golden Bull, was legally formalized in Germany. The electorates were united only by common allegiance to the emperor and did not have only the right to declare war on their own and make peace with foreign states (this prerogative was reserved for the emperor).

Conclusion

The fate of the estate-representative bodies varies in different countries. They have only one thing in common – the presence of representatives of different classes in these institutions. Also, these bodies were united by the fact that representatives of these institutions could formally influence the policy of the state, despite the fact that in some countries this influence was lower, and in some, on the contrary, higher. In other respects, the estate-representative bodies of different countries were little alike, ranging from the political rights of representatives of the estates, ending with the history of the appearance of these bodies.

This period of world history was marked by the development of many state institutions, the creation of legislative acts, the development and strengthening of the state power of monarchs.

Subsequently, it can be noted that these actions will lead the countries to the next stage of historical development – absolute monarchy. Some of the institutions of power will move to modernize and move into a new generation. Modern parliamentary systems that exist in different countries of the 21st century have their own historical prototype, which takes roots just from

the period of the estate-representative monarchy. That is why this period is so important for world history.



References:

- Cherepnin, L.V. (1978). *Zemsky sobors of the Russian state in the 16th and 17th centuries*. Moscow.
- Isaev, I.A. (1998). *History of the state and law of Russia. Textbook for law schools*. 3rd edition. Moscow: Jurist.
- Isaev, I.A., & Filippova, T.P. (2015). *History of state and law of foreign countries*. Moscow: Prospect.
- Khachaturian, N.A. (Ed.) (2008). *Power, society, individual in Medieval Europe*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Klyuchevsky, V.O. (2003). *On statehood in Russia*. Moscow: Mysl.
- Matyukhin, A.V., Ushakov, A.I., & Azizbayeva R.E. (2010). *Domestic history. Textbook for universities*. Market DS.
- Nosov, N.E. (1969). *The formation of estate-representative institutions in Russia*. Leningrad.
- Pashkova, T.I. (1993): *Feudal Russia. New research*. St Petersburg.
- Pisarkova, L.F. (2001). Development of local self-government in Russia before the Great Reforms: custom, conscription, law. *Domestic History*, 3, 25-39.
- Titkova, S.S. (1987). *The estate-representative monarchy in Russia*. Moscow: VYUZI.
- Zaorskaya, I.Yu., & Zotova, M.V. (2004). *Formation and rise of the Russian state of the 15-18th centuries. (Positions, comments, documents). Study Guide*. Moscow: MGAP World Books.
- Zhiltsov, S.V. (2009). A class-representative monarchy in the Russian Unified State. *Bulletin of V.N. Tatishchev Volga State University*, 70, 207-218. Tolyatti.