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I. Introduction

Revolution is not a finished concept. It has a specific history and has mobilized great discussions over the centuries; classical antiquity there has been debate about the best Constitution and the form of citizens. However the term is potentially away from its original political conceptions; that relates the word to its social ties; (so crucial in the theoretical structuring in the field of human sciences, in addition to the mobilizations and experiences of individuals and societies).

Linked more to technological innovations or advertising campaigns; revolution; is increasingly distant from the meanings that monopolized investigations into the term in modernity. After 18th century interpretations have been divided into two main branches; one related to the liberal revolutions, American (1776) and French (1789); the other attached to the Marxist tradition and the Russian process (1917). Perhaps, as Tristán and Barros said, Castro’s death in 2016 it was a biological end of events and ideologies that marked the History of the last great political and social revolutions of recent centuries, without which no other could be thought and articulated.2

In a way, the 20th century marks the zenith and decline of the word. Revisionist interpretations and neoliberal governments have been emptied its original meanings.3 Before these, however, every country had possessed a revolution that it could call ‘its own’, influenced by some of the two great epistemological models. Since that; the concept would be a key theme.

Although it is common to search for historical similarities in various moments, the century of Enlightenment has a vital peculiarity: time. Based a progressive temporal perspective, past revolutions could be measured as a stage to be completed in the historical development of a nation and a civilization. Better forms in the States would be achieved soon (to come), legal statutes, populations, science, morals, religion, etc. As Hartog says, ‘The future has passed by.’ Front and past formulations would no longer be seen as the objective of wisdom and knowledge.4

To a large extent, this optimism that we can observe with the Enlightenment is due to the Revolution of 1688. We can place it in the 17th century as an event, but it was the 18th century that most holy and glorified the event as a beacon that would guide all humanity. When the liberal revolutions took place in the second half of the 18th century, in America and France, as Koselleck says, men and women already knew how to identify what was happening as a ‘Revolution’.5

However, we must take a few steps back to better understand the objectives of this text. To observe the rise of the modern meaning of Revolution; in political vocabulary, it is necessary to return to the semantic field of the traditional concept. So the article has three main movements: 1) it reflected on what was understood when the word was used. The modern meaning as we know, it had to fight against the original definitions known existing in the language; 2) the emergence of contemporary sence itself, and how far it differed from the previous meaning and the new temporal perception it adopted; and 3) observe Revolution as an emergency in both senses of the term, something that emerges from the depths, in clashes with other feelings until it becomes visible and dominant, and emergency as something that must be urgently recovered: a medical or social emergency, to that new sensibilities may appear.

II. From Traditional to Modern Sense

Mathematically, the term revolution would describe the movement of circles, a turn around their axis and a transition to their point of origin. Indicated a circular trajectory, whether ascending or descending, complete or half, a semicircle. Constantly appeared in astronomy works, designating the movement of the celestial spheres, which indicated a contemporary interest in the subject; mathematics, geometry, and astrology were practically inseparable subjects. The translation made by mathematician and astronomer John Dee of Euclidean geometry, the editor chose to represent with female figures in the frontispiece of the work the sciences considered superior: Geometry.

---

5 KOSELLECK, Reinhart. op. Cit. p. 67.
Arithmetic, Astronomy, and Music, the first being the root of all the others.  

Interest in mathematics was mainly focused on studying flat shapes and figures until the 19th century, with arithmetic seen only as an auxiliary science. We often find the concept in works on topography, geography, astrology, medicine, navigation, etc., universal knowledge that could be used both on land and at sea. This knowledge was not restricted to scholarly circles but could be observed in poems by Chaucer and Milton and Shakespeare, Ben Jonson and James Shirley play’s. In Hamlet for the Danish prince, a life of pomp would be an eternal return to the dust, or as he describes it, a ‘fine revolution’. Also, in Anthony and Cleopatra, the Roman general says that his wife’s death revealed his opposite ‘By revolution lowering’. It was the meaning found in the period; nothing that came close to the modern understanding of the word.

In the traditional sense, ‘revolution’ was not a perspective open to infinity but a knowledge of possibilities that were already known and repeatable: we were underneath a Magistra Vitae paradigms. Indeed the change from traditional to modern vocabulary happened in the 17th century, but first, it is necessary to go back and look at other issues. Simply indicate the difference in the concept is not capable of explain the change in the forms of thought that supported it.

At the beginning of the Modern Era, many certainties and knowledge were crumbling: how was it possible to explain new regions and populations on the globe, that were revealed by navigations? Could it be possible demonstrate the proliferation of new beliefs after centuries of Roman church supremacy? Would it be possible explain the new astronomical knowledge after questioning Ptolemaic model and the invention of the telescope? Can we explain the confrontation with figures of political authority and the revolts in various places, through the current culture? This period of many and severe crises is also a time of search for elements of order and security. Like Theodore K. Rabb observed, there was a ‘Struggle for Stability in Early Modern Europe’. 

Peter Burke suggests that before the mid-seventeenth century, change almost always meant change for the worse. Beliefs that the present or future could be better than the past came from explanations that perceived past times as a Reform or Rebirth, in a perspective that the past would have been recovered in a new context. Newness and what was not yet known would be dangerous and highly frowned upon, to be avoided with commitment. Latest ideas that deviated from already known experiences and knowledge and authority figures terrified and limited inappropriate behavior and reflections.

It was necessary to proceed very carefully and prudently to propose something new. Ginzburg says that for centuries, the wrongly interpreted Pauline words, ‘noli altum sapere’, were considered a warning and prohibition of knowledge of things considered high, whether in the cosmos, religion, or politics. All those who questioned ancient wisdom were generally considered ‘atheists’, as they examined the order known and provided by God, offering formulations that could alter it.

It is interesting to realize that one of the most notable authors of the period and one of the most important in the use and propagation of the term revolution, treats the issue with great humility and care. Nicolaus Copernicus, in his famous book, De Revolutionibus Coelestium Orbium, in the preface addressed to Pope Paul III, says that he considered keeping his opinions in his mind, without publicizing his text, taking it public, due to its novelty and absurdity of its formulations. However, upon being encouraged and
stimulate by friends and people with more knowledge about the scriptures and mathematics, he decided to bring his ideas to light. 16

Furthermore, he sought to examine other authors who, in antiquity, thought similarly to his, that the earth had movement. Was common to search for historical precedents and publicly accessible and available knowledge to legitimize any new idea. Rather philosophies of History, individual formulations, based on private and interior reflection, historicizing an argument, and bringing to light those who thought similarly was the best way to support a proposition. Like a jurist, authors who proposed new things needed to rely on the jurisprudence of an action or thought to innovate. Present required solutions not yet considered of in the customs and experiences of a community, but for that, they needed a historical argument. Future expected was not a utopia: it was just the one we thought we would find after overcoming everyday problems. 17

Two of the greatest minds of the period who innovated in fields politics and science used the same method. Machiavelli, despite the difficulties he faced, proposed in his introduction to the first book of the Commentaries on the first decade of Livy, that: ‘the decision to follow a path not yet taken’. If he was wrong in his attempt, this could possibly be the result of his limited historical expertise. Doing this way, he hoped to find people with more vigor and knowledge who could achieve the goal, knowing that their writing only had the ‘merit of paving the way’ for other discussions. 18

Thus, the author publishes his Commentaries to offer readers situations that can and should be applied to the current moment, not as simple indications of the wisdom of a past era. This way, history; would be helpful to knowledge, not a mere object of contemplation, allowing each person to ‘take from those books all the usefulness that should be sought in the historical study’. 19 It is possible to perceive an attempt to free ourselves from the teaching of the Ancients in several authors: the old quarrel between the Ancients and the Moderns.

A similar stance is adopted by Francis Bacon, who proposes that new scientific knowledge is based on rational knowledge and careful observation of the experiences of human things and nature. To him, ‘Truth is not to be sought in the good fortune of any particular conjuncture of time, which is uncertain, but in the light of nature and experience, which is eternal’. Therefore modern scientists should abandon merely collecting facts from the Ancients and formulating reflections based on preconceived ideas. 20

The present offered new challenges, and the moment demanded a refined reflection on everyday events: there was thus a downgrading of the past and the models of antiquity. Interesting was not only focused on what happened, after all they offered answers that were incompatible with the questions raised by current affairs. How we can read in a sentence by Livy, inserted in the frontispiece of the work An Exact Historie of the Late Revolutions in Naples, by the Italian Alexander Giraffi, and translated into English by James Howell: ‘Leave off admiring what before hath past, this present age will make thee more agast’. 21

However, it is necessary to take a few steps back. Previously the Modern concept of History; laid its foundations in the future, removing experiences from expectations 22 (certainly influencing the understanding of the word Revolution;), men and women had to anchor their ship in the present. The supremacy of the new temporal perception there was first a fight against the interpreting of the human condition as an undeniable decadence: a time independent of historical actors, as it would be controlled by Divinity. The analogy that related human forms to the natural, perishable and, corruptible body, in a certain way, enabled the emergence of a progressive understanding of the future.

Diverse knowledge contributing to weakening the bodily analogy between human corruption and social and political forms. The cleric George Hakewill wrote in 1627 An apology of the people and providence God in the government of the world, in which he extolled the Divine effort to maintain the world as it was, moving away from interpretations that blamed Providence for corruption and social decadence. More than an irremediable force of God, outside of human aspects, the responsibility for the glories, virtues and, falls fell on the shoulders of men and women living in the period. Ruin of Empires, States, and moral examples that could be mirrored in the present would be more the fault of human frailties than an evident decadence of the world. Something due to an inevitable and destructive time of human forms. 23

19 Ibidem. No original [tirar daqueles livros toda a utilidade que se deve buscar no estudo histórico].
20 BACON, Francis. Novum Organum/Book I (Wood) - Wikisource, the free online library https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Novum_Organum/ Book_I (Wood)
21 GIRAFFI, Alexander. An exact historie of the late revolutions in Naples, and of their monstrous successes not to be paralleled by any ancient or modern history / published by the Lord Alexander Giraffi in Italian ; and (for the rareness of the subject) rendred to English, by J.H., Esqr. ; London: Printed by R.A. for R. Lowndes, 1650.
23 HAKEWILL, George. An apologie of the power and providence of God in the governement of the world. Or An examination and censure of
In the same way that he did not observe the disintegrating action of time on human experiences and constructs, he also did not perceive a hierarchy between eras in which the past should be recovered. To Hakewill, the present would have produced more glorious fruits than any other time, criticizing those who sought only to reproduce the wisdom of the Ancients. The author was aware of the innovations he carrying out: ‘I have walked (I confess) in an untried path, neither can I trace the prints of any footsteps that have gone before me, but only as it led them to some other way’. 24

III. The Emergence of the Modern Concept

Beginning it was not the verb but just a desire for the verb, something that could justify and explain the diversity of innovations that emerged. Nothing in England could be called a Revolution; only the experiences of other people’s contestation that changed the meaning of things, both political and religious, as well as in customs, etc. It was not yet in people’s mouths and spellings, although, the revolution; was in their minds: in their cultural senses, impregnated in the Culture of the time. 25

At the end of the 17th century, there was an understanding that the events in England, in the struggle between royal Sovereignty and Parliament, had the nature of a Revolution. Wanting not to explain the conflict through simplifying dichotomies, such as King x Parliament, Catholicism x Protestantism, and Freedom x Tyranny, the fact is that the ‘seismograph’ that measured the shocks of the period indicated the revolutionary substance in their content. There was a proliferation of the term in pamphlets that dealt with the subject between 1688 and 1689, as well as its adjective and temporalization, that is, it would become an example for all of humanity. 26

The political meaning of the word already appears in dictionaries at the beginning of the 18th century. Gradually he moved away from the traditional semantic field, which associated him with the movement of planets and circles. Undoubtedly this change is due to the Revolution of 1688, after, in many compendiums, it is already possible to read an attempt to associate the vocabulary with the English event. An English encyclopedia edited by Ephraim Chambers in 1720, the term was used to describe the assumption of William and Mary after the abdication of James II. 27 The same can be found in the dictionary edited by Samuel Johnson in 1755, which recalled that the term was used among the English “for the change produced by the admission of King William and Queen Mary”. 28

The more we immersed in modernity, the more noticeable the change in the concept was: Revolution was more linked to an expectation, capable of revealing future desires and driving human development itself, 29 than the knowledge of historical ties, constitutions, and customs of the past, previously wielded as justification for resistance. Previously the French Revolution became the elementary model for other social unrest, european eyes were focused on the English example: men and women of the time had their interpretation of the so-called benefits of the Revolution of 1688.

It was considered responsible for justifying a new time, capable of detaching itself from anachronistic and archaic structures. Time become an essential dynamic factor, which hierarchized cultures, since it wasn’t that yet, but has certainty that it wasn’t that anymore’. Imbued in an uniform history and the ideal of Progress, England and its Revolution became an example to be followed, capable of alleviating even internal party disputes for the benefit of social peace and the Constitution; Great Britain was chosen as the great symbol of historical development, a beacon illuminating all countries and free kingdoms from slavery.

For the philosopher Voltaire, who lived in London between 1726 and 1729, the English were ‘the only people upon earth who have been able to prescribe limits to the power of kings by resisting them’. In contradiction to the royal arbitrariness, ‘established that wise Government where the Prince is all-powerful to do good, and, at the same time, is restrained from committing evil’; for this feat, ‘the people share in the Government without confusion’. He says, ‘That which rises to a revolution in England is no more than a sedition in other countries’. 30 It highlights a vital opposition that would incredibly mark the term between the limited and personal interests of a civil war or rebellion and a Revolution. Montesquieu also indicated, in his book On the Spirit of Laws, ‘Thus all our histories are full of civil wars without revolutions’, on the contrary,

24 Idem, p. [16].
‘of despotic governments abound with revolutions without civil wars.’

The same perspective is found in Diderot and D'Alembert’s *Encyclopédie*; as Koselleck indicated. If on the one hand, we have the total absence of references to the civil war (guerre civile) in the entry ‘Guerre’, on the other, we see the adoption of the political meaning in the entry ‘révolution’, being described as ‘un changement considérable arrivé dans le gouvernement d’un état’. Associating the understanding of the new vocabulary with a specific historical event: the Revolution of 1688. As it reads: ‘Quoique la Grande - Bretagne ait éprouvé de tous temps beaucoup de révolutions, les Anglois ont particulièrement consacré ce nom à celle de 1688, où le prince d’Orange Guillaume de Nassau, monta sur le trône à la place de son beau - pere Jacques Steward’. 

However, the 1688 event would be a model restricted to the British domains, would only receive attention from foreign eyes. Considered like a centrifugal force, which should be publicized and recommended by internal authors as something to be followed by other countries. Early as 1711, the English diplomat in Denmark, Robert Molesworth, a few years after the Revolution; stated that ‘No Man can be a sincere Lover of Liberty’ not being supported by the principles of the Revolution; and not acting ‘increasing and communicating that Blessing to all People’. To him, ‘since the Revolution in Eighty-eight, that we stand upon another and a better Bottom’. In the writings of the English radical journalist and politician John Wilkes, the same insight can be found: ‘From this auspicious period, freedom has made a regular uninterrupted abode in our happy island’. The English and their people would be ‘the patrons of universal liberty, the scourge of tyrants, the refuge of the oppressed’ being these ‘true glories of this land of liberty, in the most enlightened age of philosophy’. 

For the radical preacher Richard Price, England would have influenced other uprisings worldwide. His text received severe criticism from the conservative polemicist Edmund Burke, who tried to show in his work that England was far from the assumptions defended by the French revolutionaries. To the preacher the contestation: ‘Behold, the light that you cast, after freeing America, reflected on France, and lit a fire that cast despotism into ashes, warming and illuminating Europe!’ In similar form these words can be found in John Millar: ‘The revolution in England kept alive that spark which kindled the flame of liberty in other countries, and is now likely to glide insensibly over the entire habitable globe’. 

Due to the significant changes they perceived in customs and the State, the Scots were the greatest interpreters of the Revolution and the Establishment of the new dynasty. Two the most significant works on the History of England come from there: *The History of England* v.6 - from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution; in 1688 by David Hume and *An Historical View of the English Government* v .4 – From the Settlement of the Saxons in Britain to the Revolution in 1688 by John Millar. Both works place the Revolution; as a landmark for their narrative. To Millar the History of England could be divided into two axes: what happened before the Revolution and what happened after, in which royal sovereignty ceased to be an individual and family right and began to be controlled by bureaucratic laws and magistrates.

The Revolution of 1688 to him was the most rational and produced the best fruits, ‘of all the great revolutions recorded in the history of ancient or modern times’. Also, for the philosopher David Hume, the event would be a milestone in the History of freedom and humanity, being ‘a new epoch in the constitution’. He perceived the benefits that the population had since they were organized ‘if not the best system of government, at least the most entire system of liberty, that ever was known amongst mankind’. 

Both works are based on a philosophical perspective of history; that is not limited to merely indicating facts, but showing the progressive character of humanity in its continuous movement away from barbarism. Written from philosophical thinking and

---

41 Ibidem.
reflecting on rational laws, they intended to offer safe statements, distanced from everyday interests and contrary to factional, political, or religious disputes. Principles were observed and defended then, with the 1688 Revolution being the most decisive proof.

In the 18th century, many Scots analyzed the causes of English success, looking for elements that could explain such rapid economic development, the organization of the State, and the freedom that this allowed for new ventures. Adam Ferguson, James Anderson, his brother Adam Anderson and Adam Smith, have looked into the subject. A concern that was not limited to studies relating to trade, industry and agriculture, but it was widespread in all society and cultural manifestations, something that was called by Steve L. Kaplan and Sophus A. Reinert for 'economic turn'. This interest fostered many economic analyzes and influenced the Scottish historical novel.

IV. Revolution as Emergency

The Revolution of 1688 had its peak in the 18th century it also had its twilight. Before the American and French events, English were of some interest in the Enlightenment century; after its middle, many criticisms of the Establishment began to emerge: corruption, the long-term permanence of members of Parliament, the interpretation that social changes should arise from parliamentary action, and the perception that the Revolution had been just a stage in a process that was still incomplete, contributed to a more critical perspective on the benefits brought to the British dominions and its possibility of being an example for future political and social uprisings.

If on the one hand, there was a discourse that sought to compare the English past with the unrest in France, there was another that sought conformity and distance from the events that were happening on the other side of the English Channel. Like said the radical preacher Richard Price we must know that ‘although the Revolution was a great work, it was by no means a perfect work’. This perception contributed to a reflection that abandoned the traditional radical discourse that proposed the possibility of rebelling only due to the breaking of signed pacts. After the middle of the century onwards analyses began to emerge that advocated that actions be thought of beyond the experiences already known, in the name of human Progress and in the precepts of rationality.

With this in mind, there was also a conservative interpretation of the Revolution; that aimed to defend the achievements and stability obtained in the State and society, the best known and most fruitful being that of Edmund Burke. In combating the French rationalist tendency, he defended attachment to past experiences and stories. This interpretation came to fruition, having very long roots in English historiography on the disturbances of 1688.

On the one hand a conservative tradition was built, which despite realizing the importance of the conflict, strengthened mythologies that proposed the non-revolutionary nature of the clashes between the King and Parliament. By this analysis, the conflict would be perceived as a ‘Glorious Revolution’, something consensual, ‘without bloodshed’, which would be better described without the terrible name of Revolution, as stated by an influential 19th-century interpretation, Thomas Babington Macaulay, in which not a ‘single flower of the crown was touched’. An effective and long-lasting, being present in many parliamentary speeches on the celebrations of the third centenary of the Revolution, its emphasizing the achievements that could still be experienced today, that being a solid heritage that everyone should strive to maintain.

This perspective has led many researchers to seek to move away from the Revolution of 1688 and this heavy tradition that, as political scientist Charles Tilly said, made British History a genuine ‘manual for the avoidance of revolution’. Revolutionary conflict was obscured and was seen only as a coup d’état, which consolidated capitalist transformations, bourgeois society, and the Industrial Revolution. ‘Radical’ potential and the germ of change should be sought at other times and other social actors, causing many researchers to focus on the years of civil war. The complexities of society could not be restricted to parliamentary discussions only.

However, we should not silently wait for the repercussions of a more social historiography of the

---

52 Idem, p. 377.
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20th century. In the second half of the 18th century, it was possible to hear the first criticisms of the Revolution of 1688; influenced by conflicts in America and France and inspired by Enlightenment precepts, some thinkers sought to break with the strong English constitutionalist tradition, which kept political and social changes limited to the pact of 1688. This break can be seen in Thomas Paine, an Englishman who was present in the revolutions of the 18th century, actively participating in the American protests and the French movement. Many authors interpreted the change of the English dynasty as a beacon guiding a new world, the pamphleteer saw in this movement an immaculate Light that left America and France against the Kings and the entire Ancien Régime, becoming a reference for all future revolutions. Your response to Edmund Burke, he saw the decline of the Revolution of 1688 and, in this movement, the beginning of a new stage in the History of humanity. He pointed out in the work *The Right of Man*:

As the estimation of all things is by comparison, the Revolution of 1688, however from circumstances it may have been exalted beyond its value, will find its level. It is already on the wane, eclipsed by the enlarging orb of reason, and the luminous revolutions of America and France.

This way, we move on to another meaning used in the word emergence(y). We sought initially to understand the emergence of the modern concept of Revolution, going from traditional definitions, more linked to the movement of circles, to the known semantic field, breaking with the past, inaugurating a rupture and a new era: in other words, how it ‘emerged’ in dispute with other traditional semantic fields and vocabularies in a cultural environment averse to changes and novelties, becoming a landmark for a new Era. It used initially historical knowledge and available examples for this task, they looked at the English model of the 17th century: the first great Revolution that they were aware of.

At the end of the 18th century, with new examples coming from the American and French uprisings and from the Enlightenment precepts, there was the twilight of the Revolution of 1688. Similarly Tristán and Barros indicated, the death of Fidel Castro, perhaps, is a symbol of the end of a generation that supported this ideal in its speeches, practices, and experiences. The departure of known meanings and social and political struggles, which sought to hierarchize uprisings and discover formulas that could be applied in any clash, perhaps it is necessary for the ‘emergence’ of a new meaning, more cultural and that seeks what is revolutionary in each conflict.

The ‘Emergency’ is supported in the medical sense of the term; as an urgency that needs to be carried out for the good of the social body. As the philosopher Walter Benjamin said, Revolution is perhaps an act that enables humanity to ‘pull the emergency brakes’ of this ‘locomotive’, which thoughtlessly moves forward, towards inexorable Progress. Maybe its time we pull those brakes to reflect on other structuring possibilities. Less than a closed conclusion, the proposed meaning becomes a provocation yet to be resolved.

54 THOMPSON, Edward Palmer (1963). *The Making of the English Working Class.* London, UK.; both radicals and conservatives were tied to constitutionalist discourses.
