HUMAN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES TRIPOS
PART IIA

POL 7

HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT
TO c. 1700

COURSE GUIDE

2023 - 2024

Course organiser (POLIS): Dr Christopher Brooke cb632@cam.ac.uk

1. Introduction to the History of Political Thought Papers:

For several decades now, Cambridge has been an international centre for teaching and research on the history of political thought, a subject which has formed a substantial component of the undergraduate degrees in both History and Politics. On the Politics side, there is a widespread view among those who teach the subject here that the study of political ideas in their historical contexts offers an invaluable training for thinking critically and flexibly about politics more generally.

Much of the teaching for this paper is organised by the History Faculty. It is responsible for the production of the reading lists, and will have arranged the lectures that will be delivered throughout the academic year. Sometimes Politics students feel intimidated by the lectures—they worry that they don't know enough about the relevant ancient, mediaeval, and early modern history, for example, and they come to believe that the History students are better placed than they are to benefit from what's being said. But if you have thoughts like this, it's worth exploring the other side of the coin. It's true that Historians may initially be more familiar with some aspects of the subject than Politics students. But Politics students (especially if they have taken the Part One paper) usually have considerably more experience at handling political argument at a decent level of sophistication by the time they come to study for this paper, and that gives them a very useful platform on which to build their engagement with the syllabus here—since taking political argument seriously is ultimately what this paper is about.

2. Introduction to the Period:

This paper spans the history of European political reflection from the city states of ancient Greece to seventeenth century arguments about revolution and empire. It offers the chance to investigate ancient conceptions of political organisation, human nature and virtue in their own time and place as well as under the later impact of Christianity in the dramatic dialogue between the Church and the Roman Empire. The paper then explores the afterlife and seemingly inexhaustible powers of these ancient texts to stimulate and structure political thinking in later centuries. Aristotle's works, Roman philosophy and Roman law all re-surfaced and were put to work in the Latin West in medieval debates on the relationship between the Church and secular powers. The paper covers humanist responses to the classical past and classical conceptions of virtue in the political thought of Machiavelli and others, the role of the Reformation in reshaping political discourse and the rise of the state as the object of government and the subject of sovereignty. New this academic year are topics on animals, gender, slavery, monarchy and republicanism, colonialism and Islamic political thought, broadening the range of political actors the paper considers and extending its scope beyond the bounds of Western Europe.

3. Structure of the Paper

Like POL8, POL7 is divided into two parts. Section A topics are single authors and, for the most part, single works. They allow candidates to enter into a series of political philosophies in depth, really getting to grips with the conceptual structure and texture of the arguments and developing their analytical skills.

'B' topics fall into two different kinds. Some of them address intellectual conversations around a particular issue or set of related issues that generated a range of diverse opinions, sometimes highly polemical. They consider a cluster of texts in the intellectual and political context of the conversation, which may be more or less tightly bounded but is nevertheless recognisably continuous as a context. Good answers to these questions offer their own analysis of the dialogue between the texts, thinking about what was really at issue and why that mattered for their authors.

Others are better thought of as 'themes', and are flagged as such. They pick up aspects of political thinking that cross contexts from antiquity to the seventeenth century, and the reading lists are structured into sections to reflect that movement across time. Good answers to these questions will perceptively explore the different ways in which different texts in different contexts address the theme in question, but the relationship between the texts that they construct will inevitably be looser than the kind of dialogue involved in the other B topics. The bibliographies for these topics are prefaced by a short introduction indicating the kinds of lines of enquiry they may inspire, although of course they may be open to others.

As these 'Theme' topics are new this year, two revision lectures in Easter Term will be devoted to how to handle them in the exam. Students may also contact the course convenor and relevant lecturers at any time.

SECTION A

1. Plato
2. Aristotle
3. Augustine
4. Marsilius of Padua
5. More
6. Machiavelli
7. Hobbes
8. Locke

SECTION B

9. Slavery (Theme)
10. Romans and Christians
11. Spiritual and temporal power
12. Medieval Islamic political thought
13. Animals and the natural environment (Theme)
14. Republicanism and monarchy (Theme)
15. Obedience and resistance
16. Reason of state
17. Sovereignty
18. Political thought of the British civil wars, 1640-1650
19. Gender (Theme)
20. Colonial empire (Theme)

4. How to study for this paper

Lectures: There will be twice-weekly lectures (on Tuesdays and Wednesdays at 9) in both Michaelmas and Lent Term. Although you should aim to attend the lectures for the topics you are studying, you may very well want to attend the others, too, as they will help you see how the various topics interlink with one another and both broaden and deepen your understanding of political thinking across this long period.

Lecturers are encouraged to place their outlines, bibliographies and other material on the paper's Moodle site in advance of the lecture—this will be the History Paper T1 Moodle site. Your ID will be added to the list of site users by the course organiser at the start of the academic year, based on information received from the administrative offices of History and POLIS. If you have been omitted, you should contact the course organiser.

Supervisions: For this paper, the norm is to have six paired supervisions for the paper spread over the Michaelmas and Lent terms. In these supervisions, you should cover **six** of the Section A and Section B topics that make up the syllabus, as preparation for answering **three** questions in the examination. In light of the way in which the exam paper is constructed, it is most common to study four authors and two historical topics. Students often comment that they need to do more reading to get on top of the historical topics, so please organise your time so you are able to cover enough material when you are preparing your essays.

Just which topics you study will be a matter to sort out with your supervisor and supervision partner. It's worth thinking carefully about just what you want to cover. Do note, for example, that some topics fit well with one another—Plato and Aristotle if you want to get to grips with ancient Greek political philosophy; Machiavelli, More, and the Republicanism and monarchy topic if you want to explore the world of the Renaissance; and those interested in religion and politics may want to study some or all of Romans and Christians, Augustine, Medieval Islamic political thought, and Obedience and resistance.

5. Lectures

Michaelmas Term

Introductory Session: An introductory session for HSPS students taking POL7 and POL8 will be held at 2pm on Thursday 5th October with Dr Christopher Brooke and Dr Tom Hopkins in Room 6 of the Sidgwick Lecture Block.

Other lectures will take place in the History Faculty.

Tuesdays at 9

- Greek and Roman political thought from Plato to the early Christians (4 lectures, Magnus Ryan)
- Spiritual and temporal power from Augustine to Marsilius (4 lectures, Magnus Ryan)

Wednesdays at 9

- Slavery (2 lectures, Annabel Brett)
- Animals and the natural environment (2 lectures, Annabel Brett)
- Gender (2 lectures, Annabel Brett)
- Medieval Islamic political thought (2 lectures, Magnus Ryan)

Lent Term

Tuesdays at 9

- More, Machiavelli, republicanism and monarchy (4 lectures, Richard Serjeantson)
- Hobbes, sovereignty, and reason of state (4 lectures, Annabel Brett)

Wednesdays at 9

- Obedience and resistance from the Reformation to the British civil wars
  (4 lectures, Magnus Ryan and Annabel Brett)
- Locke (2 lectures, Annabel Brett)
- Colonialism (2 lectures, Richard Serjeantson)

Easter Term

In Easter Term there will be two revision lectures given by Annabel Brett and Magnus Ryan at a time to be confirmed.

6. The Examination

POL7 is marked by examiners appointed by POLIS; students taking the History versions of the paper will sit the same exam, but they will be marked by examiners from the History Faculty.

POLIS Examiners' reports for the last few years will be found in the Appendix to this course guide, which also gives information about how to access past papers.

Candidates can expect that a question will be set on each of the prescribed authors in Section A and topics in Section B. But you should be aware that the guarantee of a question on each author and topic does not mean that examiners will set lowest common denominator, generic questions, open to a pre-prepared answer. They are much more likely to ask specific questions, approaching the author/topic from a particular perspective. Candidates are therefore strongly advised to prepare more than the minimum of required authors and topics.

The examination rubric is: Answer **three** questions, at least **one** from each section.
(Overlap between answers must be avoided.)

7. Reading Lists

Notes

(E) = Available via *iDiscover*

* = either a good introductory treatment or a distinctive interpretative lens that is helpful for thinking.

A1. PLATO

Set text

> Republic. Recommended translation: G.W.F. Ferrari and M. Griffith (Cambridge, 2000). Alternatively trans. F. Cornford (1941), or D. Lee (2nd edn, 1974), or A. Bloom (1968), or Grube and Reeve (1992). Waterfield (World's Classics) is not recommended.

The translations listed above are not available in digital editions through the UL. The library has available the two-volume Loeb edition, ed. by C. Emlyn-Jones and W. Preddy (2013) (E)

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation:
CHGRPT: C. Rowe and M. Schofield, eds, The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought (2000) (E)

M.F. Burnyeat, 'Utopia and fantasy: the practicability of Plato's ideally just city', in Psychoanalysis, Mind and Art, ed. J. Hopkins and A. Savile (1992); repr. in G. Fine, ed., Plato (1999), vol. II
*J.M. Cooper, 'The psychology of justice in Plato', American Philosophical Quarterly, 14 (1977), 151-57, (E); repr. in Cooper, Reason and Emotion (1999)
G.R.F. Ferrari ed., Plato's *Republic* (Cambridge 2007)
*A. Laks, 'Legislation and demiurgy: on the relation between Plato's Republic and Laws', Classical Antiquity, 9 (1990), pp. 209-29 (E)
A. Laks, 'The Laws' in CHGRPT, ch. 12 (E)
* J. Lear, 'Inside and outside the Republic', Phronesis, 37 (1992), 184-215 (E)
*M. Lane, 'Socrates and Plato: an introduction', in CHGRPT, ch. 8 (E)
_____, Greek and Roman Political Ideas (Pelican 2014); available online in its American edition under the title, The Birth of Politics: Eight Greek and Roman political ideas and why they matter, (2015) (E)
*A. Nehamas, 'The Republic', in Virtues of Authenticity: Essays on Plato and Socrates (1999)
*J. Ober, Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule (1998), chs 1, 4 (E)
C.D.C. Reeve, Philosopher Kings (1988)
*M. Schofield, 'Approaching the Republic', in CHGRPT, ch. 10 (E)
G. Vlastos, 'Justice and happiness in Plato's Republic', in Vlastos, Platonic Studies (1973)
*B. Williams, 'The analogy of city and soul in Plato's Republic' in E.N. Lee, ed., Exegesis and Argument (1973) [in Classics Faculty Library]

A2. ARISTOTLE

Set texts

> Politics, trans. B. Jowett, rev. J. Barnes, ed. S. Everson (Cambridge, 1996) or trans E. Barker (Oxford, 1946; rev. R.F. Stalley, 1995) or trans. T. Sinclair, ed. T. Saunders (Penguin, 1981)

These editions are not available digitally from the UL, but see *Aristotle's Politics: Writings from the Complete Works: Politics, Economics, Constitution of Athens* (2016), ed. by J. Barnes and M. Lane (2016) (E)

> Nicomachean Ethics, trans. R. Crisp (Cambridge, 2000) or trans. W.D. Ross, rev. J.L. Ackrill and J.D. Urmson (Oxford, 1980), esp. bks I, II, V, VI, X

These editions are not available from the UL, but see *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. by H. Rackham, rev. ed. (2014) (E)

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviations:
CHGRPT: C. Rowe and M. Schofield eds., <u>The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought</u> (2000) (E)
Rorty: A.O. Rorty ed., <u>Essays on Aristotle's 'Ethics'</u> (1980)

J. Annas, <u>The Morality of Happiness</u> (1993), sections on Aristotle (E)
J. Barnes, ed., <u>The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle</u> (1995) (E)
M.F. Burnyeat, 'Aristotle on learning to be good', in Rorty, ch. 5
J. Frank, <u>A democracy of distinction</u> (Chicago 2005)
*J. Lear, <u>Aristotle: The Desire to Understand</u> (1988) (E)
R.G. Mulgan, 'Aristotle and the value of political participation', <u>Political Theory</u> 18 (1990), 195-215 (E)
W.R. Newell, 'Superlative virtue: the problem of monarchy in Aristotle's <u>Politics</u>', in C. Lord and D.K. O'Connor eds., <u>Essays on the Foundations of Aristotelian Political Science</u> (1991)
M.C. Nussbaum, 'Shame, separateness, and political unity: Aristotle's criticism of Plato', in Rorty
M.C. Nussbaum, <u>The Fragility of Goodness</u> (1986), chs 11-12
*J. Ober, <u>Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule</u> (1998), chs 1, 6 (E)
*J. Roberts, 'Justice and the polis', in CHGRPT, pp. 344-65 (E)
*C. Rowe, 'Aristotelian constitutions', in CHGRPT, pp. 366-89 (E)
M. Schofield, 'Equality and hierarchy in Aristotle's thought', in his <u>Saving the City</u> (1999), ch. 6
* ———, 'Aristotle: an introduction', in CHGRPT, pp. 310-20 (E)
*B. Yack, <u>The Problems of a Political Animal: Community, Justice and Conflict in Aristotelian Political Thought</u> (1993)

A3. AUGUSTINE

Set text

> <u>The City of God against the Pagans</u>, trans. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge, 1998) or <u>Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans</u>, trans. H. Bettenson (Harmondsworth, 1972), esp. bks II-V, VIII, XI-XXII

These editions are not available in digital editions from the UL. The library has available, via Project Gutenberg, the two-volume edition translated by M. Dods (1871) (E).

Suggested secondary reading

P.R.L. Brown, 'Saint Augustine', in B. Smalley, ed., <u>Trends in Medieval Political Thought</u> (1965)
———, <u>Augustine of Hippo</u> (1967)
H. Chadwick, <u>The Early Church</u> (1967), ch. 15
———, <u>Augustine</u> (1986) (E)
P. Garnsey, <u>Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine</u>, chs 13-14
J. Herrin, <u>The Formation of Christendom</u> (1987), chs 2-3
J. von Heyking, 'A headless body politic? Augustine's understanding of <u>populus</u> and its representation', <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 20 (1999) (E)
R.L. Holmes, 'St. Augustine and the justification of war', in Holmes, <u>On War and Morality</u> (1989) (E)
E.J. Hundert, 'Augustine and the sources of the divided self', <u>Political Theory</u>, 20 (1992), 86-104 (E)
*R.A. Markus, <u>Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine</u> (1970) (E)
* ———, 'The Latin Fathers', in J.H. Burns, ed., <u>The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought, c.350-c.1450</u> (1988), ch. 6 (E)
R.A. Markus, 'Saint Augustine's views on the just war', <u>Studies in Church History</u>, 20 (1983), 1-13
* R. Martin, 'The two cities in Augustine's political philosophy', <u>Journal of the History of Ideas</u>, 33 (1972), 195-216 (E)
P. Ramsey, 'The just war according to St Augustine' in J.B. Elshtain, ed., <u>Just War Theory</u> (1992)

J. Rist, Augustine (1994) (E)

*P. Weithman, 'Augustine's political philosophy', in The Cambridge Companion to Augustine, ed. E. Stump and N. Kretzmann (2001), pp. 234-52 (E)

*J. Wetzel ed., Augustine's 'City of God': A critical guide (Cambridge 2012) (E)

R. Williams, 'Politics and the soul: a reading of the City of God', Milltown Studies 19 (1987)

A.4 MARSILIUS OF PADUA

Set text

> Marsilius of Padua, The Defender of the Peace, tr. A.S. Brett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) (E)

These editions are not available online via iDiscover

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviations:

Moreno-Riaño = G. Moreno-Riaño ed., The world of Marsilius of Padua (Turnhout: Brepols 2006) (E)

Moreno-Riaño and Nederman = G. Moreno-Riaño and C. J. Nederman eds., A companion to Marsilius of Padua (Leiden: Brill, 2012) (E)

Mulieri et al. = A. Mulieri, S. Masolini and J. Pelletier eds., Marsilius of Padua. Between history, politics, and philosophy (Turnhout: Brepols, 2023)

Brett, Annabel, 'Issues in translating the *Defensor pacis*', in Moreno-Riaño, pp. 91-108

Brett, Annabel, 'Politics, right(s) and human freedom' in V. Mäkinen and P. Korkmann eds., Transformations in medieval and early modern rights discourse (Dordrecht 2006), pp. 95-117

Briguglia, Gianluca, 'Ghibelline Marsilius', in Mulieri et al., pp.

Courtenay, William J., 'University masters and political power: The Parisian years of Marsilius of Padua', in M. Kaufhold ed., Politische Reflexion in der Welt des späten Mittalters / Political thought in the age of scholasticism (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 209-223 (or his chapter in Moreno-Riaño and Nederman)

Garnett, George, Marsilius of Padua and 'the truth of history' (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Lambertini, Roberto, 'Marsilius and the poverty controversy in Dictio II', in Moreno-Riaño and Nederman, pp. 229-263

Lambertini, Roberto, 'Marsilius as a reader of Aristotle's *Politica*', in Mulieri et al., pp.

Mulieri, Alessandro, 'Marsilius of Padua on representation', History of Political Thought (2017)

Nederman, Cary, Community and consent. The secular political theory of Marsiglio of Padua's Defensor pacis (Lanham MD 1995)

Piaia, Gregorio, 'The shadow of Antenor. On the relationship between the *Defensor Pacis* and the institutions of the city of Padua', in M. Kaufhold ed., Politische Reflexion in der Welt des späten Mittalters / Political thought in the age of scholasticism (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 193-207

Shogimen, Takashi, 'Consent and popular sovereignty in medieval political thought: Marsilius of Padua's *Defensor pacis*', in X. Márquez ed., Democratic moments. Reading democratic texts (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), pp. 49-56 (E)

Shogimen, Takashi, 'Medicine and the body politic in Marsilius of Padua's *Defensor pacis*', in Moreno-Riaño and Nederman, pp. 71-115

A5. MORE

Set text:

> Utopia [1516], trans. G.M. Logan and R.M. Adams, rev. edn (Cambridge, 2002)

This edition is not available in digital form from the UL. There are a number of digital editions available, including the edition in the collection, More, <u>Utopia;</u> Bacon, <u>New Atlantis</u>; Neville, <u>The Isle of Pines</u>, ed. by S. Bruce, (1999) (E)

Suggested secondary reading

*D. Baker-Smith, <u>More's 'Utopia'</u> (1991; repr. 2000) (E)
*B. Bradshaw, 'More on Utopia', <u>Historical Journal</u>, 24 (1981), 1-27 (E)
J.C. Davis, <u>Utopia and the Ideal Society: A study of English utopian writing, 1516-1700</u> (1981), ch. 2
R. Dealy, <u>Before Utopia. The making of Thomas More's mind</u> (2020), esp. Pts VI-VIII
D. Fenlon, 'England and Europe: <u>Utopia</u> and its aftermath', <u>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</u>, fifth
    series, 25 (1975), 115-35 (E)
A. Fox, <u>Thomas More: History and Providence</u> (1982), ch. 2
———, <u>'Utopia': An Elusive Vision</u> (1993)
J. Guy, <u>Thomas More</u> (2000)
J. Hankins, 'Humanism and the origins of modern political thought', in J. Kraye ed., <u>The Cambridge</u>
    <u>companion to renaissance humanism</u> (1996), Ch. 7 (E)
J.H. Hexter and E. Surtz, 'Introduction', in More, <u>Utopia</u>, eds J.H. Hexter and E. Surtz
    (<u>The Complete Works of St Thomas More</u>, vol. IV) (1965)
J.H. Hexter, 'The loom of language and the fabric of imperatives: the case of <u>Il Principe</u> and <u>Utopia</u>', in
    Hexter, <u>The Vision of Politics on the Eve of the Reformation</u> (1973)
G.M. Logan, <u>The Meaning of More's 'Utopia'</u> (1983) (E)
*E. Nelson, 'Greek nonsense in More's <u>Utopia</u>', <u>Historical Journal</u>, 44 (2001), 889-918 (E)
J.M. Parrish, 'A new source for More's <u>Utopia</u>', <u>Historical Journal</u>, 40 (1997), 493-98 (E)
J. Paul, <u>Thomas More</u> (2017), Ch. 2
* Q.R.D. Skinner, 'Sir Thomas More's <u>Utopia</u> and the language of Renaissance humanism', in <u>The Languages</u>
    <u>of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe</u>, ed. A. Pagden (1987), pp. 123-57 (E); rev. in Skinner,
    <u>Visions of Politics</u> (3 vols; 2002), vol. II: <u>Renaissance Virtues</u>, ch. 8 (E)
R. Tuck, 'Humanism and Political Thought', in A. Goodman and A. Mackay eds., <u>The impact</u>
    <u>of humanism Western Europe</u> (1990) (E)
G.B. Wegemer, <u>Young Thomas More and the Arts of Liberty</u> (Cambridge 2011) (E)
T.I. White, 'Pride and the public good: Thomas More's use of Plato in <u>Utopia</u>', <u>Journal of the</u>
    <u>History of Philosophy</u>, 22 (1982), 329-54 (E)
D. Wootton, 'Introduction', to More, <u>Utopia: With Erasmus's 'The Sileni of Alcibiades'</u> (1999)

A6. MACHIAVELLI

Set texts

    <u>The Prince</u>, ed. Q. Skinner, trans. R. Price (Cambridge, 1988) (E)
    <u>Discourses on Livy</u>, ed. J.C. and P. Bondanella (Oxford, 2003) (E) or ed. B. Crick (Penguin, 1970)

Suggested secondary reading

<u>Abbreviation</u>: Bock: G. Bock, Q. Skinner and M.Viroli, eds, <u>Machiavelli and Republicanism</u> (1990) (E)

J. Jackson Barlow, 'The fox and the lion: Machiavelli replies to Cicero', <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 20 (1999),
    627-45 (E)
V. Cox, 'Machiavelli and the <u>Rhetorica ad Herennium</u>: deliberative rhetoric in <u>The Prince</u>',
    <u>Sixteenth Century Journal</u>, 28 (1997), 1109-1141 (E)
*F. Gilbert, <u>Machiavelli and Guicciardini: Politics and History in Sixteenth-Century Italy</u> (1984 edn) (E)
W. Hanasz, 'The common good in Machiavelli', *History of Political Thought* 31 (2010), 57-85 (E)
J.H. Hexter, '<u>Il Principe</u> and <u>lo stato</u>', in <u>The Vision of Politics on the Eve of the Reformation</u> (1973) (E)
M. Hörnqvist, <u>Machiavelli and Empire</u> (2005), chs 2-4 (E)

J.M. Najemy, 'Machiavelli on the Necessity of Interpreting Religion', <u>Journal of the History of Ideas</u>, 60 (1999), 659–8 (E)

*J. M. Najemy ed., <u>The Cambridge companion to Machiavelli</u> (Cambridge 2010) (E)

H. Pitkin, <u>Fortune is a Woman: Gender and Politics in the Thought of Niccolò Machiavelli</u> (1984)

J.G.A. Pocock, <u>The Machiavellian Moment </u>(1975; reissue with new postscript 2003), esp. pt II (E)

R. Price, 'The senses of <u>virtú</u> in Machiavelli', <u>European Studies Review</u>, 3 (1973), 315-45 (E)

———, 'The theme of <u>gloria</u> in Machiavelli', <u>Renaissance Quarterly</u>, 30 (1977), 588-631

N. Rubinstein, 'Machiavelli and Florentine republican experience', in Bock, ch. 1 (E)

Q. Skinner,<u> Machiavelli</u> (1981); new edn, 2000) (E)

———, 'Republican virtues in an age of princes', in id., <u>Visions of Politics</u> (3 vols., 2002), Vol. II, Ch. 5, esp. pp. 142-59 (E)

* ———, 'Machiavelli's <u>Discorsi</u> and the pre-humanist origin of republican ideas', in Bock, ch. 6 (E)

———, 'Machiavelli on the maintenance of liberty', <u>Politics</u>, 18 (1983), 3-15 (E); rev. in Skinner, <u>Visions of Politics</u> (3 vols; 2002), vol. II: <u>Renaissance Virtues</u>, ch. 6 (E)

*P. Stacey, <u>Roman monarchy and the renaissance prince</u> (Cambridge 2007) (E)

_____, 'Definition, division and difference in Machiavelli's political philosophy', <u>Journal of the History of Ideas</u> 75 (2014), 189-212 (E)

*M. Viroli, 'Machiavelli and the republican idea of politics', in Bock, ch. 7 (E)

———, <u>Machiavelli </u>(1998) (E)

M. Viroli, <u>From Politics to Reason of State</u> (1992) (E)

A7. HOBBES

Set text

> <u>Leviathan</u> [1651], ed. R. Tuck, rev. edn (Cambridge, 1996) [not available online]

Students may also wish to consult the 3-volume edition by Noel Malcolm (2012) in the Clarendon Edition (E)

Suggested secondary reading

<u>Abbreviations</u>:
Sorell, <u>Companion</u>: T. Sorell, ed., <u>The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes</u> (1996) (E)
Skinner, <u>Visions</u>: Q. Skinner, <u>Visions of Politics</u> (3 vols; 2002), vol. III: <u>Hobbes and Civil Science (E)</u>

M.M. Goldsmith, 'Hobbes on law', in Sorell, <u>Companion</u>, ch. 11 (E)

K. Hoekstra, 'The de facto turn in Hobbes's political philosophy', in T. Sorell and L. Foisneau (eds.), <u>Leviathan After 350 Years</u> (2004) (E)

_____, 'Hobbesian equality', in S. Lloyd ed., <u>Hobbes today</u> (Cambridge 2013) (E)

D. Johnston, <u>The Rhetoric of Leviathan: Thomas Hobbes and the Politics of Cultural Transformation </u>(1986)

S. Lloyd, <u>Ideals as interests in Hobbes's 'Leviathan'</u> (Cambridge 1992) (E)

*N. Malcolm, <u>Aspects of Hobbes</u> (Oxford 2002), esp. chs 1, 2, 5, and 13 (E)

* N. Malcolm, <u>Thomas Hobbes. Leviathan</u> (Oxford 2012), vol. I: <u>Introduction (E)</u>

J.G.A. Pocock, 'Time, history and eschatology in the thought of Thomas Hobbes', in Pocock, <u>Politics, Language and Time</u> (1972), pp. 148-201

* D. Runciman, <u>Pluralism and the Personality of the State</u> (Cambridge 1997), ch. 2 (E)

A. Ryan, 'Hobbes's political philosophy', in Sorell, <u>Companion</u>, ch. 9 (E)

Q. Skinner, 'Conquest and consent: Thomas Hobbes and the Engagement controversy', in G.E. Aylmer ed., <u>The Interregnum</u> (1972); rev. in Skinner, <u>Visions</u>, ch. 10 (E)

Q. Skinner, <u>Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes</u> (Cambridge 1996) (E)

* _____, 'Hobbes on representation,' <u>European Journal of Philosophy</u> 13 (2005), 155-184 (E)

* _____, <u>Hobbes and republican liberty</u> (Cambridge 2008)

T. Sorell and G.A.J. Rogers eds., <u>Hobbes and History </u>(Routledge 2000)

T. Sorell, <u>Hobbes</u> (1986), esp. chs 1-2, 8-10

* J. Sommerville, <u>Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context</u> (1992)

P. Springborg ed., <u>The Cambridge companion to Hobbes's '</u>Leviathan' (Cambridge 2007) (E)

S. Sreedhar, <u>Hobbes on resistance</u> (Cambridge 2008)

R. Tuck, 'The civil religion of Thomas Hobbes', in N. Phillipson and Q. Skinner, eds,
    <u>Political Discourse in early modern Britain </u>(1993), pp. 120-38 (E)

_____, 'Hobbes and democracy', and reply by K. Hoekstra, 'A lion in the house', both in A.S. Brett and J.
    Tully eds., <u>Rethinking the foundations of modern political thought</u> (Cambridge 2006) (E)

A8. LOCKE

Set texts

> 'Second Treatise', in <u>Two Treatises of Government</u>, ed. P. Laslett (Cambridge, 1988),
> or in Locke, <u>Second Treatise of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration</u>,
> ed. Mark Goldie (Oxford World's Classics, 2016)

Neither of these editions is available in digital form from the UL. Project Gutenberg hosts an edition of the *Second Treatise*, ed. by C.B. Macpherson (1980) (E).

> <u>A Letter Concerning Toleration</u> [1689], ed. J.H. Tully, trans. W. Popple (Indianapolis, 1983) (E), or ed.
> R. Klibansky, trans. J.W. Gough (Oxford, 1968), or ed. M. Goldie (Indianapolis, 2010)

Suggested secondary reading

D. Armitage, 'John Locke, Carolina and the <u>Two treatises of government</u>', <u>Political Theory</u> 32 (2004), 602-27
    (E)

R. Ashcraft, 'Revolutionary politics and Locke's <u>Two Treatises</u>', <u>Political Theory</u>, 8 (1980), 429-86 (E)

R. Ashcraft, <u>John Locke's Two Treatises of Government</u> (1987)

D. Baumgold, <u>Contract theory in historical context: Essays on Grotius, Hobbes and Locke</u> (Leiden 2010)

J. Dunn, <u>The Political Thought of John Locke</u> (1969) (E)

J. Dunn, 'What is living and what is dead in the political theory of John Locke?', in Dunn,
    <u>Interpreting Political Responsibility</u> (1990) (E)

———, 'The claim to freedom of conscience: freedom of speech, freedom of thought,
    freedom of worship?', in O.P. Grell et al., eds, <u>From Persecution to Toleration</u> (1991) (E)

M. Goldie, 'John Locke and Anglican Royalism', <u>Political Studies</u>, 31 (1983), 61-85 (E)

*M. Goldie, 'Introduction', to John Locke, <u>Two Treatises of Government</u> (Everyman, 1993)

*J. Marshall, <u>John Locke: Resistance, Religion and Responsibility</u> (1994), esp. ch. 6 (E)

J. Milton, 'Dating Locke's Second Treatise', <u>History of Political Thought</u> 16 (1995), 356-90 (E)

J. Scott, <u>England's Troubles</u> (2000), ch. 16 (E)

J. Scott, 'The law of war: Grotius, Sidney, Locke and the political theory of rebellion',
    <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 13 (1992), 565-85 (E)

* A.J. Simmons, <u>On the Edge of Anarchy: Locke, Consent and the Limits of Society</u> (1993) (E)

T. Stanton, 'John Locke and the fable of liberalism', Historical Journal 61 (2018), 597-622 (E)

J. Tully, <u>A Discourse on Property</u> (1980) (E)

*———, <u>An Approach to Political Theory: Locke in Contexts</u> (1993), esp. ch. 1 (E)

J. Waldron, <u>God, Locke, and Equality</u> (2002) (E)

B9. SLAVERY (Theme)

Slavery, the ownership of one human being by another, was an accepted feature of Greco-Roman political society and subsequently legitimated in Christian (and other) thought until well beyond the period covered by this paper. This topic covers a range of philosophical and theological discussions of slavery from antiquity to the early modern period. Only the Capuchin friar Epifanio de Moirans, writing in Cuba at the end of the seventeenth century, argues for abolition, although many others recognise at least some immorality or

inhumanity in what they are legitimating and argue for modifications. Nearly all of them agree that enslavement of enemies in a just war is legitimate but is not practised by Christians among themselves, situating the 16th and 17th century discussion squarely within an extra-European and imperial context.

Suggested Primary Reading

4th C. BCE	Aristotle, The Politics, Book I, Chh. 3-7
1st C. CE	Seneca, Epistles, tr. R. M. Gummere, Loeb Classical Library Vol. 75, Epistle 47, pp. 301-313
	St Paul, 1 Corinthians 7.20-24; Colossians 3.22
4th C. CE	Augustine, The City of God, Book XIX, Ch. 15 and 16
1274	Thomas Aquinas, Summa theologiae, Ia Q. 96 a. 3 and a. 4; IIaIIae Q. 104 a. 5 and a.6, in Robert Dyson ed., Aquinas. Political Writings (Cambridge 2002), pp. 1-4; pp. 68-71
1539	Francisco de Vitoria, On the American Indians, Q. 1 a. 4, 5 and 6; On the law of war, Q. 3 a. 3, in A. Pagden and J. Lawrance eds., Vitoria. Political Writings (Cambridge 1992), pp. 247-251; 318-319
1682	Epifanio de Moirans, A just defense of the natural freedom of all slaves: All slaves should be free, tr. Edward R. Sunshine (Edwin Mellen Press, 2006)
1598	Alberico Gentili, The Law of War (Oxford 1933), Book III, Ch. 9 'On slaves'
1625	Hugo Grotius, The rights of war and peace, ed. R. Tuck (Indianapolis 2005), Book II, Ch. 5 'Acquisition of a right over persons', Sections XXVI-XXX; Book II, Ch. 22 'Unjust causes of war', Sections XI-XII; Book III, Ch. 7 'Of the right over prisoners' (full chapter) (E)
1681	John Locke, Second Treatise of Government, Ch. 4 'Of Slavery'; Ch. 11, 'Of conquest', §§ 177-18

Suggested Secondary Reading

<u>Antiquity</u>

Agamben, Giorgio, The Use of Bodies, Ch. 1, in The Omnibus Homo Sacer (Stanford 2017), pp. 1029-1048 (E)
Timothy Brookins, '(Dis)correspondence of Paul and Seneca on slavery', in J. Dodson and D. Briones eds., Paul and Seneca in dialogue (Leiden 2017), pp. 179-207 (E)
Garnsey, Peter, Ideas of slavery from Aristotle to Augustine (Cambridge 1996)
Pellegrin, Pierre, 'Natural slavery', in M. Deslauriers and P. Destrée eds., The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's *Politics* (Cambridge 2013), pp. 92-116 (E)

<u>Thomas Aquinas and the 16th- and 17th-century debate   among Catholic theologians</u>

Cornish, Paul J., 'Marriage, slavery and natural rights in the political thought of Aquinas', The Review of Politics, 60(3) (1998), 545-562 (E)
Hofmeister Pich, Roberto, 'Francisco José de Jaca's (c. 1645–1689) and Epifanio de Moirans's (1644–1689) plea for the liberation of enslaved black people in Latin America', in C. Müller et al. eds., Civilization – Nature – Subjugation: Variations of (De-)Colonization (Frankfurt 2021)

Ireton, Chloe, 'Black Africans' freedom litigation suits to define just war and just slavery in the early Spanish empire', <u>Renaissance Quarterly</u> 73 (2020), 1277-319 (E)

Lingna Nafafé, José, <u>Lourenço da Silva Mendonça and the Black Atlantic abolitionist movement in the seventeenth century </u>(Cambridge 2023) (E)

Pagden, Anthony, <u>The fall of natural man. The American Indian and the origins of comparative ethnology</u> (Cambridge 1982), Chh. 3-5

Luis Perdices de Blas and José Luis Ramos Gorostiza, 'The debate over the enslavement of Indians and Africans in the 16th and 17th century Spanish empire', in J. Tellkamp ed., <u>A companion to early modern Spanish imperial, political and social thought</u> (Leiden 2020), pp. 295-317 (see also Chh. 6 and 9 in the same volume) (E)

Tierney, Brian, 'Aristotle and the American Indians – again. Two critical discussions', <u>Cristianesimo nella storia</u> 12 (1991), 295-322

<u>Slavery and war in the seventeenth century</u>

Allain, Jean, <u>Slavery in international law</u> (Leiden 2013), Ch. 1 'Of slavery and the law of nations' (detailed survey essay covering Aristotle, Rome, the Spanish debate and early modern law of war including Gentili and Grotius) (E)

Cairns, John W., 'Stoicism, slavery and law: Grotian jurisprudence and its reception', <u>Grotiana</u> 22-23 (1) (2001), 197-231 (E)

Stelder, Mikki, 'The colonial difference in Hugo Grotius: rational man, slavery and indigenous dispossession', <u>Postcolonial Studies</u> 25(4) (2022), 564-583 (E)

Uzgalis, William, 'John Locke, racism, slavery and Indian lands', in N. Zack ed., <u>The Oxford handbook of slavery and race</u> (Oxford 2017), pp. 21-3 (E)

B10. EARLY CHRISTIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

Christianity represented a political problem for the Roman Empire, so early apologists sought to reassure the imperial authorities that Christians were politically loyal. The new Christian political theory took shape partly in overt hostility to the tradition of classical politics and ethics, partly by incorporating and subverting large parts of it. In the process, a new political language was born, an amalgam of Christian theology based on the Bible, the Greek and Roman classics, and Roman law. During the same first four centuries of the Christian era, the Roman Empire was changed from within by the process of conversion. Christian political thinking therefore had to adapt as it ceased to be the voice of a persecuted minority and became the official carrier of the imperial message.

Suggested primary reading

<u>The Epistle of St Paul to the Romans</u>, ch. 13, New Testament (E)

Tertullian, <u>Apology</u> (Loeb, 1984) (E)

Lactantius, <u>Divine Institutes</u>, trans. A. Bowen and P. Garnsey (Liverpool, 2003), bks 3-5 [not available online, but see trans. by M.F. McDonald (1955) (E)].

Ambrose, <u>De officiis</u>, ed. and trans. I.J. Davidson, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 2001), I.105-174, III.1-52, pp. 179-219, 345-87. (E)

Ambrose, Letter 17 (<u>Against Symmachus</u>), Letter 21, Letter 51 (<u>To Theodosius, on the massacre at Thessalonica</u>), and <u>Sermon against Auxentius</u> in A. de Romestin (ed.), <u>St. Ambrose, Select Works and Letters</u> (repr. Edinburgh, 1989). Excerpts from these texts are also available in J. Stevenson and W. H. C. Frend (eds), <u>Creeds, Councils and Controversies. Documents illustrating the history of the Church AD 337-461</u> (revised ed., London, 1989). [not available online, but see 1881 edition available from Project Gutenberg (E)]

Augustine, <u>The City of God</u>, trans. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge, 1998), bks 2-5, 8, 19.

St.Gregory the Great. Pastoral Care, tr. H. Davis, Ancient Christian Writers 11 (New Jersey, 1950), parts 1-2. [not available online. The translation by Philip Schaff for the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers series can be found online at https://ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf212/npnf212.iii.iv.i.html [as of 20.3.20]]

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation:
CHMPT: J.H. Burns (ed.), The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350-c.1450 (Cambridge, 1988) (E)

T.D. Barnes, Tertullian. A historical and literary study (Oxford, 1971; reissued 1985)
A. Cameron, Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: the Development of Christian Discourse (Berkeley, 1991) (E)
*H. Chadwick, 'Christian doctrine', in CHMPT, pp. 11-20. (E)
H. Chadwick, The Early Church (London, 1968)
J.F. Childress, 'Moral Discourse about War in the Early Church,' in The Journal of Religious Ethics 37, no. 1 (2009), 131-58. (E)
M. Colish, The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages, 2 vols
	(Studies in the History of Christian Thought 34-5, 1985)
*M. Colish, 'Cicero, Ambrose and Stoic Ethics: Transmission or Transformation?', in A.S. Bernardo and S. Levin (eds), The Classics in the Middle Ages: Papers of the Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies (1990), 95-112.
*R.A. Markus, Saeculum. History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine (rev. ed., Cambridge, 1988) (E)
———, 'The Latin Fathers', CHMPT, pp. 92-122. (E)
*F. Young, 'Christianity', in C. Rowe and M. Schofield (eds), The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 635-660. (E)

B. McGinn, 'The development of Christian theologies of history' and 'The exegesis of the Apocalypse in Latin Christianity', both in McGinn, The Calabrian Abbot: Joachim of Fiore in the History of Western Thought (New York/London, 1985)
N. McLynn, Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital (Berkeley, London, 1994) (E)
L.J. Swift, 'St Ambrose on Violence and War,' in Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association, 101 (1970), 533-43. (E)

And see above, A3, under Augustine.

B11. TEMPORAL AND SPIRITUAL IN MEDIEVAL POLITICAL THOUGHT

Almost from the beginning, medieval Christendom had been institutionally divided between the spiritual authority of the ordained clergy, culminating in the papal office, and the power of secular rulers. Some such language of distinctness went back to the very sources of Christian political thought in the Bible. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, vigorous and fresh new concepts and languages became available to thinkers and polemicists when Aristotle's works were translated, and as knowledge of classical Roman law spread. Theology, metaphysics, law and Aristotelian political science sometimes combined, and sometimes opposed one another in varying configurations, with the result that the very idea of politics as an autonomous realm of experience was recovered, re-fashioned, and deployed in political controversies.

Suggested primary reading

Bernard of Clairvaux, Five Books on Consideration, trans. J.D. Anderson and E.T. Keenan
	(Cistercian Fathers Series 37) (Kalamazoo, 1976) [not online, but see trans. by G. Lewis (1908) at
	https://archive.org/details/bernarddeclirvau00bernuoft/page/n4/mode/2up]
Innocent III, selections from Venerabilem and Novit, in B. Tierney, The crisis of church and state (Toronto 1988), pp. 133-8.

Innocent IV, selections from commentary on <u>Novit</u> and <u>Quod super his</u>, in Tierney, <u>Crisis</u>, pp. 153-6.

Hostiensis, selections from commentary on <u>Per venerabilem</u> and <u>Solitae</u>, in Tierney, <u>Crisis</u>, pp. 156-7.
     [Tierney's collection is not available online, and it is not easy to identify a ready substitute. Some relevant selections can be found in the following resource from Fordham University: https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/sbook1l.asp].

John of Paris, <u>On royal and Papal Power</u>, trans. J.A. Watt (Toronto, 1971) [not available, but see trans. by A.P. Monahan (1974) (E)]

Giles of Rome, <u>On Ecclesiastical Power</u>, trans. R.W. Dyson (Woodbridge, 1986),
     bk I, 4-6; bk II, 4, 7-12; bk III, 3, 9, 12. [not available online]

Marsilius of Padua, <u>The Defender of the Peace</u>, Discourse II, trans A. Brett (Cambridge, 2005) (E), chapters 2-11, 15-18, 20-26, 29-30.

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation:
CHMPT: J.H. Burns (ed.), <u>The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350-c.1450</u> (Cambridge, 1988) (E)

J.P. Canning, <u>Ideas of power in the late middle ages 1296-1417</u> (Cambridge 2011) (E)

J.R. Eastman, "Giles of Rome and Celestine V: The Franciscan Revolution and the Theology of Abdication", <u>The Catholic Historical Review</u>, 76, 1990: 195–211 (E)

K. Froehlich, 'St. Peter, Papal Primacy, and the Exegetical Tradition, 1150-1300', in C. Ryan (ed.), <u>The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and Realities 1150-1300</u> (Toronto, 1989), pp. 3-44.

G.S. Garnett, <u>Marsilius of Padua and 'the Truth of History'</u> (Oxford, 2006) (E)

D. Luscombe, 'The *Lex Divinitatis* in the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Pope Boniface VIII', in C. Brooke, D. Luscombe, G. Martin and D. Owen (eds), <u>Church and Government in the Middle Ages</u> (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 205-22.

* D. Luscombe, 'Hierarchy in the late middle ages', in J.P. Canning and O.-G. Oexle (eds), <u>Political Thought and the Realities of Power in the Middle Ages</u> (Göttingen, 1998), pp. 113-26.

K. Pennington, 'Law, legislation and government, 1150-1300', in CHMPT, pp. 444-53

W.H. Principe, 'The School Theologians' Views of the Papacy, 1150-1250', in Ryan (ed.), <u>Religious Roles of the Papacy</u>, pp. 45-116.

* B. Tierney, <u>Foundations of the Conciliar Theory</u> (Cambridge, 1955) (E)

B. Tierney, <u>Crisis</u>, 127-31; 150-53.

———, 'The Continuity of Papal Political Theory in the Thirteenth Century. Some Methodological Considerations', <u>Mediaeval Studies</u>, 27 (1965), pp. 227-45. (E)

* W. Ullmann, 'Boniface VIII and his contemporary scholarship', <u>Journal of Theological Studies,</u> 27 (1976), pp. 58-87 (E); repr. in Ullmann, <u>Scholarship and Politics in the Middle Ages</u> (1978)

W. Ullmann, <u>Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages</u> (4th ed., London 1978), pp. 231-79.

* J.A. Watt, 'Spiritual and temporal powers', in CHMPT, pp. 367-423

* J.A. Watt, <u>The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century</u> (London, 1965)

———, 'Hostiensis on *Per venerabilem*: the role of the College of Cardinals', in B. Tierney and P. Linehan (eds), <u>Authority and Power</u> (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 99-113.

B12. Medieval Islamic political thought

Islam began as a religious polity, ruled by a historical incarnation of the perfect human ruler, with a claim to universal rule over humanity. Its philosophers and lawyers, in particular, would wrestle with this heritage – at once both inspiring and inhibiting – for the rest of the middle ages, as they attempted to make sense of imperfect manifestations of rule over territorially limited polities. They also inherited the political works of Plato, and many of Aristotle's most important writings, which they interpreted within an Islamic framework, some tending towards utopianism, others towards practical reform of existing polities.

Suggested primary reading

Al-Farabi, <u>Al-Madina al-fadila</u>, in Richard Walzer ed. and tr., <u>Al-Farabi on the Perfect State</u> (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), pp. CHECK

   <u>Siyasa al-madiniyya</u> ['The Political Regime'], in Charles E. Butterworth ed. and tr., <u>Al-Farabi. The political writings,</u> Vol. II (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2020), pp. 60-94 (**E**)

Avicenna, <u>On the Divisions of the Rational Sciences</u>

   – <u>Healing: Metaphysics X</u>, chaps 2-5, both in:

Ralph Lerner and Muhsin Mahdi eds, <u>Medieval Political Philosophy: A Sourcebook</u> (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011), pp. 96-7; 98-109.

Averroes, <u>The Decisive Treatise, Determining what the Connection is between Religion and Philosophy</u>, in: Lerner and Mahdi, <u>Medieval Political Philosophy</u>, pp. 165-172.

Averroes, <u>Commentary on Plato's 'Republic'</u> in: <u>Averroes on Plato's Republic</u>. Translated with an introduction and notes by Ralph Lerner (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), pp. 1-151. (**E**)

Al-Mawardi, <u>Tashil al-nazar wa-ta 'jil al-zafar fi akhlaq al-malik wa-siyasat al-mulk</u> ['The Facilitating of Reflection and Hastening of Success: on the King's Moral Dispositions and the Governance of the Realm'], selections in Louise Marlow, <u>Medieval Muslim Mirrors for Princes. An Anthology of Arabic, Persian and Turkish Political Advice</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023), pp. 130-5, 186-90. (**E**)

   Al-Turtushi, <u>Siraj al-muluk</u> ['Counsel for Kings'], chap. 11, in Marlow, <u>Medieval Muslim Mirrors for Princes</u>, pp. 203-15. (**E**)

Suggested secondary reading

1. Political Background

Kennedy, Hugh, <u>The Prophet in the Age of the Caliphate. The Islamic Near East from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century</u> (London: Longman, 1986) (**E** – but only within the UL and faculty libraries)

Crone, Patricia, <u>Slaves on Horses. The Evolution of the Islamic Polity</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980) (**E**)

Lambton, Ann K.S., 'The Internal Structure of the Saljuq Empire', in <u>The Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. V: The Saljuq and Mongol Periods</u>, ed. J.A. Boyle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), pp. 203-82 (**E**)

2. General Accounts

Black, Antony, <u>The history of Islamic political thought</u> (London: Routledge, 2001)

Crone, Patricia, <u>Medieval Islamic Political Thought</u> (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004)

Marlow, Louis, <u>Hierarchy and Egalitarianism in Islamic Thought</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Rosenthal, Erwin I.J., <u>Political Thought in Medieval Islam: An Introductory Outline</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958)

3. The Greek Tradition – Al-Farabi, Avicenna, Averroes

In addition to the introductions by the editors and translators, see:

Adamson, Peter and di Giovanni, Matteo, eds., <u>Interpreting Averroes. Critical essays</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), chaps 3 (Akl, Ziad Bou, 'Averroes on Juridical Reasoning'), 4 (Bouhafa, Feriel, 'Averroes' Corrective Philosophy of Law'), 12 (Woerther, Frédérique, 'Averroes' Goals in the *Paraphrase* (Middle Commentary) of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*'). (**E**)

*Crone, Patricia, Medieval Islamic Political Thought, chap. 14

Morris, James W., 'The Philosopher-Prophet in Avicenna's Political Philosophy', in Charles E. Butterworth, ed., The Political Aspects of Islamic Philosophy : Essays in Honor of Muhsin S. Mahdi (Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard University Press), chap. 4

*O'Meara, Dominic J., Platonopolis. Platonic political philosophy in late antiquity (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), Ch. 14: 'Platonopolis in Islam: Al-Farabi's perfect state'.

Erwin I. J. Rosenthal, 'The Place of Politics in the Philosophy of Ibn Rushd', in Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, vol. 15. no. 2, 1953, pp. 246-78. (**E**)

- 'The Place of Politics in the Philosophy of Al-Farabi', in *Islamic Culture*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1955, pp. 157-78.

4. Mirrors for Princes, Jurists

Al-Azmeh, Aziz, Muslim Kingship: Power and the Sacred in Muslim, Christian and Pagan Polities (London and New York: I. B. Tauris), part 2.

Crone, Patricia, '"Even an Ethiopian Slave"': The Transformation of a Sunnī Tradition', in Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, vol. 57, no. 1, 1994, pp. 59-67. (**E**)

Lambton, Ann, State and Government in Medieval Islam. An Introduction to Medieval Islamic Political Theory: the Jurists (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981) (**E** – but only within the UL and faculty libraries)

Marlow, Louise, 'Introduction' in Medieval Muslim Mirrors for Princes (**E**)

B13. Animals and the natural environment (Theme)

An idea of the human was at the centre of ancient political thought. Centred on the attribute of reason, which made human beings uniquely capable of virtue and the good life in the city, it both distinguished human beings from all other animals and constructed a natural hierarchy of rule over them. Christian theologians found it easy to fit this together with the narrative of creation in the Book of Genesis. The governing conception of the human, however, was not universally accepted even in antiquity, and these challenges were taken up in the later reception to produce a critical discourse on human relations with animals. Beyond the more specific question of animal agency, thinkers throughout were deeply invested in a normative idea of the broader natural world. As technologies for the exploitation of natural resources developed, so did a concern with the proper management of those resources and a critical attitude towards unnecessary destruction.

Suggested Primary Reading

4th c. BCE	Aristotle, The Politics, Book I, Ch. 8; *The history of animals*, I. 1
1st-2nd c. CE	Plutarch, On the cleverness of animals, Whether beasts are rational and On eating meat, in Stephen T. Newmyer, Plutarch's Three Treatises on Animals (London: Routledge, 2023)
3rd c. CE	Porphyry, On abstinence from killing animals, tr. Gillian Clark (London 2000)
4th c. CE	Augustine, The City of God, Bk I, Ch. 20
1274	Thomas Aquinas, Summa theologiae, IaIIae, Q. 1, a. 1, and Q. 16, a. 1 and 2; IaIIae Q. 94, a. 2, IIaIIae Q. 66, a. 1, in Robert Dyson ed., Aquinas. Political Writings (Cambridge 2002), pp. 116-118, 205-206
1569	Michel de Montaigne, Apology for Raimond Sebond, tr. M.A. Screech (Penguin 1987).
1608	Pierre Charron, Of wisedome, tr. Samson Lennard, Book I, Ch. 34

1672	Samuel Pufendorf, <u>On the Law of Nature and of Nations</u>, = <u>De jure naturae et gentium. Vol. II: Translation</u> (Oxford 1934) Book IV, Ch. 3
1613	Gervase Markham, *The English husbandman*
1625	Hugo Grotius, <u>The rights of war and peace</u>, ed. R. Tuck (Indianapolis 2005), Lib. III, Cap. XII, 'Moderation with regard to spoiling', Sections I-V
1635	George Wither, <u>A Collection of Emblemes</u> (London 1635), Book I, Emblem 35 'Posteritati'

Suggested Secondary Reading

Abbreviation:
Animals = Adamson and Fay Edwards eds., <u>Animals. A history</u> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019) (E)

<u>Antiquity</u>

Grumett, David, 'Aristotle's ethics and farm animal welfare', in <u>Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics</u> 32 (2019), 321-333.
Henry, Devin, 'Aristotle on animals', in *Animals*, Ch. 1
Newmyer, Stephen T., <u>Animals, rights and reason in Plutarch and modern ethics</u> (London: Routledge, 2005)
Osborne, Catherine, <u>Dumb beasts and dead philosophers</u> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
Sorabji, Richard, <u>Animal minds and human morals</u> (Cornell University Press, 1993)

<u>Medieval Christian tradition</u>

McLaughlin, Ryan Patrick, <u>Christian theology and the status of animals</u> (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), Ch. 1 'Thomas Aquinas and the dominant tradition'.
Parel, Anthony, 'Aquinas's theory of property', in T. Flanagan and A. Parel eds., <u>Theories of property: Aristotle to the present</u> (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1979), 55-114
Porter, Jean, <u>A Thomistic theory of natural law</u>.
Toivanen, Juhana, 'Marking the boundaries: Animals in late medieval Western philosophy', in <u>Animals</u>, Ch. 5

Compare: Adamson, Peter, 'Human and animal nature in the philosophy of the Islamic world', in <u>Animals</u>, Ch. 4

<u>Renaissance and early modern</u>

Brett, Annabel, 'Is there any environmental thinking in early modern Western political thought?', in K. Forrester and S. Smith eds., <u>Nature, action and the future. Political thought and the environment</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2018), pp. 23-42
Brett, Annabel, 'Use, war and commercial society: Changing paradigms of human relations with animals in the early modern law of nature and of nations', <u>Journal of the History of International Law</u> 24(1) (2022), 1-35.
Muratori, Cecilia, 'Animals in the Renaissance: You eat what you are', in <u>Animals</u>, Ch. 6
Serjeantson, Richard W., 'The passions and animal language, 1540-1700', <u>Journal of the History of Ideas</u> 62(3) (2001), 425-444
Warde, Paul, <u>The invention of sustainability. Nature and destiny c. 1500-1800</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), esp. Ch. 1

B14. Monarchy and Republicanism (Theme)

The dominant typology of government in ancient Greece was threefold: monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. This trichotomous typology was translated into Roman thinking and thereby persisted into the European middle ages and renaissance. But across the period of this paper a different, dichotomous, typology of governments also emerged, in which the primary difference was held to be between monarchy, in which one person ruled, and republic, in which 'the people' ruled—which was hence sometimes also known as 'popular government'. This topic traces the origin and progress of this latter dichotomy, and considers debates among some of their different exponents. (In the case of Thomas Aquinas and Ptolemy of Lucca, this debate was conducted within the pages of the same book, one which Thomas began and Ptolemy completed.) Among other things, therefore, this topic lays the ground for understanding the emergence of an anti-monarchical and sometimes revolutionary republicanism in the Netherlands in the later sixteenth century, and in England in the middle years of the seventeenth century.

Indicative Primary Reading

44 BCE	Marcus Tullius Cicero, <u>On Duties</u>, esp. iii. [xxi.] 82–85. Trans. M.T. Griffin and E.M. Atkins (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 130–32.
55 CE	Lucius Annius Seneca, <u>On Mercy</u>, esp. i. 10–14. Trans. R.A. Kaster (Chicago, 2010), pp. 156–60.
1266?	Thomas Aquinas, <u>On the Government of Rulers</u>, esp. bk i, chs 1–7. Trans. J.M. Blythe (Philadelphia, 1997), pp. 60–78.
c. 1301	Ptolemy of Lucca, <u>On the Government of Rulers</u>, esp. bk iii, ch. 11 and bk iv, ch. 1. Trans. J.M. Blythe (Philadelphia, 1997), pp. 177–82, 215–19.
c. 1492	Aurelio Lippo Brandolini, <u>Republics and Kingdoms Compared</u>, esp. bk i. 34–46. Trans. J. Hankins (Cambridge, MA, 2009), pp. 49–59.
1566	Jean Bodin, <u>Method for the Easy Comprehension of History</u>, ch. 6 (part only). Trans. B. Reynolds (New York, 1944; repr. 1969), pp. 267–79.
1656	James Harrington, <u>The Commonwealth of Oceana</u>, esp. 'The First Part of the Preliminaries' (part only). Ed. J.G.A. Pocock (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 27–35.
1679/1709	Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, <u>Politics Drawn From the Very Words of Holy Scripture</u>, bk ii, art. i, propositions 5–9. Trans. P. Riley (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 45–49.

Suggested Secondary Reading

<u>General</u>

Nadon, Christopher, 'Republicanism: Ancient, Medieval, and Beyond', in <u>A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought</u>, ed. Ryan K. Balot (Oxford, 2009), 529–41.

<u>Ancient Rome</u>

Lintott, A. W., 'The Theory of the Mixed Constitution at Rome', in <u>Philosophia Togata II</u>, ed. J. Barnes and M. Griffin (Oxford, 1997; repr. 2007), 70–85.

Schofield, Malcolm, <u>Cicero: Political Philosophy</u> (Oxford, 2021), esp. ch. 2.

Stacey, Peter, <u>Roman Monarchy and the Renaissance Prince</u> (Cambridge, 2007), esp. ch. 1.

Middle Ages

Yun, Bee, 'Ptolemy of Lucca – A Pioneer of Civic Republicanism? A reassessment', <u>History of Political Thought</u>, 29/3 (2008), 417–39.
Blythe, J.M. <u>Ideal Government and the Mixed Constitution in the Middle Ages</u> (Princeton, 1992), esp. ch. 1.
Brett, Annabel S., 'Political Philosophy', in <u>The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Philosophy</u>, ed. A. S. McGrade (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 276–99.

Renaissance

Hankins, James, 'Exclusivist Republicanism and the Non-Monarchical Republic', <u>Political Theory</u>, 20 (2010), 1–31.
Nelson, Eric, 'The Problem of the Prince', in <u>The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism</u>, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 319–37.
Skinner, Quentin, 'Republican Virtues in an Age of Princes', in <u>Visions of Politics</u>, 3 vols, vol. II: <u>Renaissance Virtues</u> (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 118–59.

Seventeenth Century

Dzelzainis, Martin, 'Anti-Monarchism in English Republicanism', in <u>Republicanism: A Shared European heritage</u>, ed. M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner, 2 vols (Cambridge, 2002), vol. I, pp. 27–42.
Scott, Jonathan, 'Classical Republicanism in Seventeenth-Century England and the Netherlands', in <u>Republicanism: A shared European heritage</u>, ed. M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner, 2 vols (Cambridge, 2002), 1: 61–83.
Skinner, Quentin, 'Rethinking Liberty in the English Revolution', <u>in From Humanism to Hobbes </u>(Cambridge, 2018), pp. 139–61.
Sommerville, J.P., 'Absolutism and Royalism', in <u>The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700</u>, ed. J.H. Burns and M. Goldie (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 345–73.

B15. OBEDIENCE AND RESISTANCE IN REFORMATION POLITICAL THOUGHT

The Protestant Reformation tore Europe apart politically as well as religiously. The theological commitment of Luther, and later Calvin, to submissive obedience and the maintenance of public order apparently rendered organized political resistance to unjust rulers apparently. Yet by the 1570s, it was precisely theologians and lawyers of the Reformed religion who fashioned a variety of resistance theories so powerful that they were re-cycled by Catholics a generation later, and translated into English during the British civil wars of the seventeenth century. The arguments generated by the Calvinist theorists in particular were a rich admixture of biblical scholarship, medieval scholastic legal theory, humanist classical learning, and universal history, in a wide variety of different configurations.

Suggested primary reading

Luther and Calvin, <u>On Secular Authority</u>, ed. H. Höpfl (Cambridge, 1991)
    [not available online from UL. Alt. trans. of Luther, <u>On Secular Authority</u> available at
    http://ollc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Secular-Authority-To-What-Extent-It-Should-Be-Obeyed.pdf. Alt. trans. of Calvin, <u>On Civil Government</u>, trans, by J. Allen, (i.e. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Bk. IV, ch. XX) available at
    https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.1058/page/n775/mode/2up.]
John Knox, <u>On Rebellion</u>, ed. R. Mason (Cambridge, 1994) (E)
George Buchanan, <u>A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship among the Scots</u> [written c. 1569, printed 1579], trans. R. Mason and M.S. Smith (Aldershot, 2004) [not available online]
François Hotman, <u>Francogallia</u> [1573], trans. R.E. Giesey and J.H.M. Salmon (Cambridge, 1972) [not available online through the UL; see alternatively, https://constitution.org/cmt/hotman/franco-gallia.htm]

Theodore Beza, <u>The Right of Magistrates</u> [1574], in J.H. Franklin, ed., <u>Constitutionalism</u>
      <u>and Resistance in the Sixteenth Century</u> (New York, 1969), pp. 101-35 [not available online through
      the UL; see alternatively, https://www.constitution.org/cmt/beza/magistrates.htm]
Anon., <u>Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos</u> [1579], trans. G. Garnett (Cambridge, 1994) (E)

<u>Abbreviation</u>:
Burns and Goldie: J.H. Burns with M. Goldie, eds, <u>The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700</u>
      (1991) (E)

J. H. Burns, 'The political thought of George Buchanan', <u>Scottish Historical Review</u>, 30 (1951), 60-8 (E)
W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, <u>The Political Thought of Martin Luther</u> (1984)
* M. van Gelderen, 'So meerly humane': theories of resistance in early modern Europe', in A Brett and J.
      Tully eds., <u>Rethinking the foundations of modern political thought</u> (Cambridge 2006) (E)
*R.E. Giesey, 'The Monarchomach triumvirs: Hotman, Beza and Mornay', <u>Bibliothèque d'humanisme et</u>
      <u>renaissance</u>, 32 (1970) (E)
H. Höpfl, <u>The Christian Polity of John Calvin</u> (1982), chs 7, 8 (E)
M. Jensen, *A Humanist in Reformation Politics. Philipp Melanchthon on Political Philosophy and Natural*
      Law (2019), esp. ch. 4.
R.M. Kingdon, 'John Calvin's contribution to representative government', in P. Mack and M.C. Jacob, eds,
      <u>Politics and Culture in Early Modern Europe</u> (1987), pp. 183-98 (E)
*R.M. Kingdon, 'Calvinism and resistance theory', in Burns and Goldie, ch. 7 (E)
S. Kusukawa, <u>The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The Case of Philip Melanchthon</u> (1995), ch. 5 (E)
P. Matheson, 'Humanism and reform movements', in A. Goodman and A. MacKay, eds,
      <u>The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe</u> (1990), ch. 2 (E)
A.E. McGrath, <u>Reformation Thought: An Introduction</u> (1988), chs 5, 8 (E)
S. Mortimer, <u>Reformation, resistance and reason of state, 1517 – 1625</u> (Oxford 2021), chh.
F. Oakley, 'Christian obedience and authority', in Burns and Goldie, ch. 6 (E)
*J.H.M. Salmon, 'An alternative theory of popular resistance: Buchanan, Rossaeus and Locke', and 'Bodin
      and the Monarchomachs', both in Salmon, <u>Renaissance and Revolt</u> (1987) (E)
*Q. Skinner, <u>Foundations of Modern Political Thought</u> (2 vols; 1978), vol II: <u>The Age of Reformation </u>(E)
———, 'The origins of the Calvinist theory of revolution', in B. Malament, ed., <u>After the Reformation</u> (1980);
      rev. in Skinner, <u>Visions of Politics</u> (3 vols; 2002), vol. II, ch. 9 (E)
J. Witte, <u>Law and Protestantism: The Legal Teachings of the Lutheran Reformation</u> (2002), ch. 4

B16. REASON OF STATE

Suggested primary reading:

Justus Lipsius, <u>Politica</u> [1589], trans. J. Waszink (Amsterdam, 2004) or as <u>Six Bookes of Politickes or Civil</u>
      <u>Doctrine</u>, trans. W. Jones [1594; on EEBO (E)] (facs. repr. 1970) Giovanni Botero, <u>The Reason of State</u>
      ed. R. Bireley (Cambridge 2017) (E)
Michel de Montaigne, 'Of the Useful and the Honourable', 'Of the Disadvantages of Greatness', 'Of Evil
      Means Employed to a Good End', 'Of Glory', in <u>Essays</u>, trans. M.A. Screech (1991) [not available online
      in this edition, but see *Essays*, 4 vols, trans. by G. Ives, (1925) (E)].
Francis Bacon, 'Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates', 'Of Empire',
      'Of Simulation and Dissimulation', 'Of Seditions and Troubles' in <u>Essays</u>, ed. M. Kiernen (2000) (E)
Henri, duc de Rohan, <u>Treatise of the Interests of the Princes and States of Christendom</u>,
      trans. H. Hunt (1640) [on EEBO (E)]
Armand du Plessis, duc de Richelieu, <u>The Political Testament of Cardinal Richelieu</u>, trans. H.B. Hill (1964) [not
      available online, but see <u>The Political Will and Testament of the Minister of State Cardinal Duke de</u>
      <u>Richelieu</u> (1695) [on EEBO (E)]].

Suggested secondary reading

*H. E. Braun: 'Knowledge and counsel in Giovanni Botero's '*ragion di stato*', Journal of Jesuit Studies, 4, 2 (2017) (E)

*P. Burke, 'Tacitism, scepticism and reason of state', in J.H. Burns with M. Goldie, eds, The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700 (1991), pp. 479-98 (E)

W.F. Church, Richelieu and Reason of State (1973) (E)

P.S. Donaldson, Machiavelli and Mystery of State (1988), chs 4-5 (E)

H. Höpfl, Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c.1540-1630 (2004), chs 5-8 (E)

* L. Kattenberg, The power of necessity. Reason of state in the Spanish monarchy (Cambridge 2023), Intro. and chh. 1-2 (E)

*N. Keohane, Philosophy and the State in France: Renaissance to Enlightenment (1980), chs 4-5 (E)

*N. Malcolm, Reason of State, propaganda and the Thirty Years War (Oxford, 2007) (E)

A. McCrea, Constant Minds: Political Virtue and the Lipsian Paradigm in England, 1584-1650 (1997), pp. 3-101 (E)

F. Meinecke, The Doctrine of Raison d'État and its Place in Modern History (1957), chs 2-7

*N. Millstone, 'Seeing like a statesman in early Stuart England', 223, 1, Past and Present, 2014 (E)

M. Morford, Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition (1993), ch. 7 on Lipsius (E)

G. Oestreich, Neostoicism and the Early Modern State (1982), pt I (E)

M. Peltonen, Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640 (1995), chs 3-4 (E)

*J.H.M. Salmon, 'Rohan and reason of state', in Renaissance and Revolt (1987) (E)

*J.H.M. Salmon, 'Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England', in L.L. Peck, ed., The Mental World of the Jacobean Court (1991)

D. Thompson: 'Montaigne's Political Education: Raison d'Etat in the Essays', History of Political Thought, 24, 2 (2013) (E)

R. Tuck, Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651 (1993), chs 2-4 (E)

*M. Viroli, From Politics to Reason of State (1992), chs 4-6 (E)

B17. SOVEREIGNTY

Suggested primary reading

Jean Bodin, Bodin on Sovereignty: Four Chapters from the Six Books of the Commonwealth [1579], trans. J.H. Franklin (Cambridge, 1992) (E)

James VI and I, The Trew Law of Free Monarchies, in Political Writings, ed. J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge, 1994) (E)

Francisco Suárez, On Laws and God the Law-giver, Bk III , Chh. 1-4, in Francisco Suárez. Selections from Three Works (Oxford 1944) , vol. II (translation); reprint of vol II, ed. by T. Pink, (Indianapolis, 2015), available online https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/selections-from-three-works ,

Sir Robert Filmer, Patriarcha, in Patriarcha and Other Political Works, ed. J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge, 1991) (E)

Hugo Grotius, The rights of war and peace, trans. F.W. Kelsey (3 vols; Oxford, 1913) or ed. R. Tuck (Indianapolis 2005), Bk I chh. 3-4, available online: https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/grotius-the-rights-of-war-and-peace-2005-ed-3-vols.

Thomas Hobbes, On the citizen, ed. R. Tuck and M. Silverthorne (Cambridge 1998), ch. 6; [not available online; the defective Cotton translation as edited by H. Warrender (1983) is available (E)]. Leviathan, ed. R. Tuck (Cambridge 1996), chh. 16-18 [see A7 Hobbes for details on N. Malcom edition, available online]

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation:
CHPT = J.H. Burns, ed., The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700 (1991) (E)

D. Baumgold, Contract theory in historical context: Essays on Grotius, Hobbes and Locke (2010), ch. 2 and 4
Annabel Brett, 'Political thought', in H. Scott ed., The Oxford handbook of early modern European history,
Vol. II: Cultures and power (Oxford 2015), Ch. 1(E)
Annabel Brett, 'The subject of sovereignty. Law, politics and moral reasoning in Hugo Grotius', Modern
Intellectual History 17/3 (2020) (E)
G. Burgess, Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution (1996), Part I
J.H. Franklin, 'Sovereignty and the mixed constitution: Bodin and his critics', in CHPT, ch. 10 (E)
Mark Goldie, 'Absolutism', in The Oxford Handbook of the History of Political Philosophy, ed. George Klosko
(Oxford, 2011), pp. 282–93 (E).
Kinch Hoekstra, 'Early Modern Absolutism and Constitutionalism', Cardozo Law Review, 34 (2013), 1079–98
(E).
H. Höpfl, Jesuit political thought (2004), chh. 9. 10, 13, 14 (E)
J.H.M. Salmon, 'Catholic resistance theory, Ultramontanism and the royalist response',
in CHPT Ch. 8 (E)
_____, 'The legacy of Jean Bodin: absolutism, populism or constitutionalism', History of Political Thought,
17 (1996), 500-22. (E)
J.H.M. Salmon, 'Bodin and the Monarchomachs', in Salmon, Renaissance and Revolt (1987), ch. 5 (E)
Q. Skinner, 'A genealogy of the modern state', Proceedings of the British Academy 162 (2009), 325-70.
J. P. Sommerville, 'James I and the divine right of kings: English politics and continental theory' in L. L. Peck
(ed.), The mental world of the Jacobean court (1991)
_____, Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context (1992), Ch. 4-5
_____, 'From Suarez to Filmer', Historical Journal, 25 (1982), 525-40 (E)
———, 'Absolutism and royalism', in CHPT (E)
R. Tuck, Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651 (1992), Ch. 5 (E)
_____, The sleeping sovereign (Cambridge 2016) (E)
S. Tutino, Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth (Oxford, 2010) (E)

For further reading on Hobbes see under A7

B18. POLITICAL THOUGHT OF THE BRITISH REVOLUTIONS, 1538-1650

Suggested primary reading

The civil wars (all sources on EEBO (E)*: no modern edition)*

Henry Parker, Observations upon some of His Majesties late Answers and Expresses (1642). An annotated
edition of this text is available on the course Moodle site
[https://www.vle.cam.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=91091&section=13]
Henry Parker, Jus populi (1644)
Samuel Rutherford, Lex, rex: The Law and the Prince (1644); questions I-IX, XXI-XXV, XXVIII-XXIX.

The Levellers

The English Levellers, ed. A. Sharp (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 33-72, 92-157, 168-78 (E)

The Commonwealth

John Milton, Political Writings, ed. M. Dzelzainis (Cambridge, 1991), esp. 'The Tenure of Kings and
    Magistrates' [1649] (pp. 3-48) [unavailable online, but for 1649 edition of . 'The Tenure of Kings and
    Magistrates', see *EEBO* (E)].
Marchamont Nedham, 'A Discourse of the Excellency of a Free-State', in Nedham, The Case of the
    Commonwealth of England Stated (1650), pt II, ch. 5, pp. 80-94. On *EEBO* (E); or ed. B. Worden
    (Indianapolis, 2011) https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/nedham-excellencie-of-a-free-state

Suggested secondary reading

Abbreviation
CHMPT = J. H. Burns with M. Goldie, ed., The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700 (1991) (E)
Milton and republicanism = D. Armitage, A. Himy and Q. Skinner, eds., Milton and Republicanism (1995) (E)

The civil wars

* John Coffey, Politics, Religion, and the British Revolutions: The mind of Samuel Rutherford (1997), ch. 6 (E)
J. D. Ford, '*Lex, rex iusto posita*: Samuel Rutherford on the origins of government', in R. A. Mason, ed., Scots
    and Britons (1994) (E).
* Michael Mendle, Henry Parker and the English Civil War (1995). (E).
* Michael Mendle, 'Parliamentary sovereignty: A very English absolutism', in N. Phillipson and Q. Skinner,
    ed., Political discourse in early modern Britain (1993) (E).
———, 'The Ship Money case, The case of shipmony, and the development of Henry Parker's parliamentary
    absolutism', Historical Journal, 32 (1989), 513-36 (E).
I. M. Smart, 'The political ideas of the Scottish Covenanters, 1638-88', History of Political Thought, 1 (1980),
    pp. 167-93 (E).
R. Tuck, Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651 (1993), ch. 6

Levellers

Rachel Foxley, 'Imagining Citizenship in the Levellers and Milton', in Democracy and Anti-Democracy in Early
    Modern England 1603–1689, ed. C. Cuttica and M. Peltonen (2019), ch. 1 (E).R. Gleissner, 'The
    Levellers and natural law: the Putney Debates of 1647', Journal of British Studies, 20 (1980), 74-89 (E).
* S. D. Glover, 'The Putney Debates: popular vs. elitist republicanism', Past and Present,
    164 (1999), 47-80 (E).
R.B. Seaberg, 'The Norman Conquest and the common law: the Levellers and the argument from continuity',
    Historical Journal, 24 (1981), 791-806 (E).
*K. Thomas, 'The Levellers and the franchise', in G. Aylmer, ed., The Interregnum (1972)
*D. Wootton, 'Leveller democracy and the Puritan revolution', in CHMPT

Republicanism

M. Dzelzainis, 'Milton's classical republicanism', in Milton and republicanism
*Paul Hammond, Milton and the People (2014), ch. 6 (E).
Markku Peltonen, '"All Government is in the people, from the people, and for the people": Democracy in the
    English Revolution', in Democracy and Anti-Democracy in Early Modern England 1603–1689, ed. C.
    Cuttica and M. Peltonen (2019), ch. 3 (E).
Markku Peltonen, The Political Thought of the English Free State (2022) (E).
Lorenzo Sabbadini, 'Popular Sovereignty and Representation in the English Civil War', in Popular Sovereignty
    in Historical Perspective, ed. R. Bourke and Q. Skinner (2016), ch. 7 (E)
Q. Skinner, 'Rethinking Liberty in the English Revolution', in From Humanism to Hobbes (2018), ch. 7 (E).
 Q. Skinner, Liberty before Liberalism (1998) (E).

Q. Skinner, <u>Hobbes and republican liberty</u> (Cambridge 2008)

*B. Worden, 'English republicanism', in CHMPT

* ———, 'Milton and Marchamont Nedham', in <u>Milton and republicanism</u>

B19. The politics of gender (Theme)

The political thought of the classical tradition can appear a purely masculine narrative: written by men and for men, placing men at the centre of the political world just as the male is the central case of the human more generally. Read carefully, however, and sometimes against the grain, it becomes clear that thinkers from Plato onwards envisaged a more complicated political relationship between male and female than simply one of male domination and female subordination. This topic traces reflection on the politics of gender from antiquity to the seventeenth century, showing how gender is folded into the structuring motifs of political thought in the classical tradition, from reason and virtue to society and rule. Reading for gender, however, alerts us to new dimensions of liberty and equality, as well as to the importance of love, friendship and courtesy in a political community.

Suggested Primary Reading

4th C. BCE	Plato, <u>The Republic</u>, Ed. Ferrari (Cambridge, 1991),
4th C. BCE	Aristotle, <u>The Politics</u>, Book I; <u>Nicomachean Ethics</u>, Book VII.
1st/2nd CE	Plutarch, <u>Moralia: Advice to a bride and groom</u> and <u>Dialogue on love</u> (Loeb Classical Library).
1405	Christine de Pisan, <u>The Book of the City of Ladies</u>, ed. Rosalind Brown-Grant (Penguin, 1999).
1525	Niccolò Machiavelli, <u>Clizia</u>, tr. Daniel T. Gallagher (Long Grove, IL 1996); <u>The prince and Discourses on Livy</u> [pp. on fortune; Caterina Sforza]
1540	Thomas Elyot, <u>The Defence of Good Women</u>, in Robert Sullivan and Arthur E. Walzer eds., <u>Thomas Elyot: Critical edition of four works of counsel</u> (Leiden 2018), Ch. 10
1588	John Case, <u>The Sphere of the City</u>, tr. Dana Sutton (online link), Book I, Ch. 1 (The chapter's doubtful question), Ch. 3 (The distinction of the 4th question), Ch. 8
1589	Justus Lipsius, <u>Politica. Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction</u>, ed. J. Waszink (Assen 2004), Book II, Ch. 3
	Arcangela Tarabotti, <u>Paternal Tyranny</u> (Chicago 2004)
1651	Thomas Hobbes, <u>Leviathan</u>, Ch. 20 'Of dominion paternall and despoticall'
1668	Margaret Cavendish, <u>The Blazing World</u>, in Susan James ed., <u>Cavendish. Political Writings</u> (Cambridge 2003).

Suggested Secondary Reading

<u>Antiquity</u>

Beneker, Jeffrey, <u>The passionate statesman. Erōs and politics in Plutarch's Lives</u> (Oxford 2012), ch. 1: 'Erōs and marriage'

Salkever, Steven, <u>Finding the mean. Theory and practice in Aristotle's Politics</u>, Ch. 4: 'Plato and Aristotle on the politics of virility'

Middle Ages

Brown-Grant, Rosalind, Christine de Pisan and the moral defence of women: Reading beyond gender (Cambridge 2004)

Forhan, Kate Langdon, The political theory of Christine de Pisan (Aldershot 2002)

Hult, David F., 'The Roman de la rose, Christine de Pisan and the querelle des femmes' in C. Dinshaw and D. Wallace eds., The Cambridge companion to medieval women's writing (Cambridge 1993), pp. 184-194

Renaissance

Becker, Anna, Gendering the renaissance commonwealth (Cambridge 2021), esp. pp. CHECK

Doran, Susan, 'Elizabeth I and counsel', in J. Rose ed., The politics of counsel in England and Scotland

Ebbersmeyer, Sabrina, 'Humanism and feminism. Some remarks on a difficult relationship' Rinascimento n.s, LX (2020), 373-389

Jordan, Constance, 'Feminism and the humanists: The case of Thomas Elyot's 'The Defence of Good Women'', Renaissance Quarterly 36/2 (1983), 181-201

Pitkin, Hannah Fenichel, Fortune is a woman

Robert Sullivan and Arthur E. Walzer eds., Thomas Elyot: Critical edition of four works of counsel (Leiden 2018), Ch. 9: 'A Defence of Good Woman': Critical introduction

Seventeenth Century

Becker, Anna, 'Gender in the state of nature', in A. Brett, M. Donaldson and M. Koskenniemi eds., History, Politics, Law (Cambridge 2021)

Ebbersmeyer, Sabrina, '"There remains nothing to lose for the one who has lost liberty": Liberty and free will in Arcangela Tarabotti's (1604-1652) radical criticism of the patriarchy', Intellectual History Review 31/1 (2021), 7-26

Hirschmann, Nancy J., and Wright, Joanne, eds., Feminist interpretations of Thomas Hobbes (Philadelphia 2012), esp. chh. 2, 5 and 6, 7

B20. Colonial Empire (Theme)

From their reading of ancient authors – historians and others – early modern Europeans were acutely conscious that the Romans had expanded their rule or 'empire' (*imperium*) to an extraordinary extent by means of the conquest of neighbouring peoples and territories. They further knew that the Romans had done this by the establishment of 'colonies' (*coloniae*), which served to incorporate conquered peoples not only into the cultural but also into the legal ambit of Rome. Visions of this Roman colonial model were found appealing by some early-modern writers considering the extension of *imperium* beyond a state's borders; that is, on what have more recently come to be called simply 'empires'. Other authors, however, wrestled with the implications of the increasingly different circumstances of these growing European empires, which were often transmarine (e.g. in Ireland) and indeed transatlantic (e.g. in the Americas); which were – in contested ways – Christian; which took the form of rural and agricultural 'plantations' as least as much as they did of more urban 'colonies'; and which were increasingly commercial as well as martial in nature. This topic accordingly considers some of the different ways in which European authors imagined, deployed, legitimated, and criticised ideas of colonial empire before *c*. 1700.

Suggested primary reading

1516	Thomas More, Utopia, bk ii, opening of sect. on 'Social relations'. Trans. G.M. Logan and R.M. Adams, 3rd edn (Cambridge, 2016), pp. 56–57.
1519	Niccolò Machiavelli, Discourses on Livy, bk 2, chs. 3–4, 7–8. Trans. J. C. Bondanella and P. Bondanella (Oxford, 1997), pp. 133–38, 142–45.

1539	Francisco de Vitoria, 'On the American Indians', esp. qu. 3 (part). In <u>Political Writings</u>, trans. J. Lawrence, ed. A. Pagden (Cambridge, 1991), esp. pp. 277–92.
1588	Giovanni Botero, <u>On the Causes of the Greatness and Magnificence of Cities</u>, bk 2, chs. 1–3. Trans. G. Symcox (Toronto, 2012), pp. 31–34.
1625	Francis Bacon, 'Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates' and 'Of Plantations'. In <u>The Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall</u>, ed. M. Kiernan (Oxford, 2000), 89–99, 106–08.
1656	James Harrington, 'The Introduction or Order of the Work', in <u>Oceana</u> [1656]. Ed. J. G. A. Pocock (Cambridge, 1992), 3–7.
1682/9	John Locke, <u>Two Treatises of Government</u>, Second Treatise, ch. 5. Ed. M. Goldie (Oxford, 2016), pp. 14–26.

Secondary reading:

*Anghie, Antony, 'Francisco de Vitoria and the Colonial Origins of International Law', *Social & Legal Studies*, 5 (1996), 321–36. Repr. in Anghie, <u>Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law</u> (Cambridge, 2005), ch. 1.

Armitage, David, 'Literature and Empire', in <u>The Oxford History of the British Empire</u>, vol. I: *The Origins of Empire*, ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford, 1998), 99–123.

Armitage, David, <u>The Ideological Origins of the British Empire</u> (Cambridge, 2000).

*Armitage, David, 'John Locke: Theorist of empire', in <u>Empire and Modern Political Thought</u>, ed. Sankar Muthu (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 84–111; repr. in Armitage, <u>The Foundations of Modern International Thought</u> (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 114–32.

Brett, Annabel S., <u>Changes of State: Nature and the limits of the city in early modern natural law</u> (Princeton, 2011), esp. ch. 8.

Canny, Nicholas, 'The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America', <u>William and Mary Quarterly</u>, 3rd ser., 30 (1973), 575–98.

Canny, Nicholas, <u>Making Ireland British 1580–1650</u> (Oxford, 2001), esp. chs. 1, 3, 4.

Clarke, Michelle Tolman, 'Uprooting Nebuchadnezzar's Tree: Francis Bacon's criticism of Machiavellian imperialism', <u>Political Research Quarterly</u>, 61 (2008), 367–78.

Elliott, J. H., 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', <u>Past & Present</u>, 137 (1992), 48–71.

Fitzmaurice, Andrew, <u>Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonization, 1500–1625</u> (Cambridge, 2003).

*Fitzmaurice, Andrew, et al., 'The Intellectual History of Early Modern Empire', <u>Renaissance Studies</u>, 26 (2012), 479–604, esp. the Introduction, 479–90.

Hörnqvist, Mikael, <u>Machiavelli and Empire</u> (Cambridge, 2004).

Ivison, Duncan, 'The Nature of Rights and the History of Empire', in <u>British Political Thought in History, Literature, and Theory, 1500–1800</u>, ed. D. Armitage (Cambridge, 2006), 191–211.

Pagden, Anthony, 'Dispossessing the Barbarian: The language of Spanish Thomism and the debate over the property rights of the American Indians', in <u>The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe</u>, ed. A. Pagden (Cambridge, 1987), 79–98.

Pagden, Anthony, <u>Lords of All the World: Ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France, c.1500–c.1800</u> (London, 1995), esp. chs. 1, 5.

Pagden, Anthony, 'The Struggle for Legitimacy and the Image of Empire in the Atlantic *c*. 1700', in <u>The Oxford History of the British Empire</u>, vol. I: <u>The Origins of Empire,</u> ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford, 1998), 34–54.

Peltonen, Markku, <u>Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570–1640</u> (Cambridge, 1995), ch. 4.

Quinn, D.B., 'Renaissance Influences in English Colonisation', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 26
(1976), 73–93.

Stern, Philip J., The Company-State: Corporate sovereignty and the early modern foundations of the British Empire in India (Oxford, 2011), esp. intro. and ch. 4.

Vance, Norman, 'Imperial Rome and Britain's Language of Empire 1600–1837', History of European Ideas, 26, (2000), 211–24

*Zeitlin, Sam, 'Francis Bacon on Imperial and Colonial Warfare', The Review of Politics, 83 (2021), 196–218.

Appendix: Past Papers and Examiners' Reports

Past papers are most easily accessed via the POL7 Moodle site.
https://www.vle.cam.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=102772

Do note that the reorganization of the paper for 2023-24 means that old exam papers were not set to the same syllabus!

2021-22

Examiner: Sylvana Tomaselli

37 POL7 scripts were submitted in 2022 (compared to 45 in 2021, 24 in 2020, 47 in 2019, 42 in 2018, and 38 in 2017). The quality of most of these scripts reflected the excellence of the lectures offered for this paper as candidates did not simply reproduce the knowledge they had acquired from them, but showed considerable understanding of the concepts, issues, and contexts covered by the lecturers. The average mark across all scripts was like last year just under 67. However, some answers were unquestionably deserving of the very high firsts (high 70s, indeed 80) that they received.

What contributed to making these scripts outstanding is that their authors thought about the wording of the questions very carefully. They made most of the opportunity these terms opened up to display detailed knowledge and responsiveness to nuanced phrasing. Thus, they addressed what the people had been blamed for by the different critics of democracy in ancient Athens in answering question 9: 'Did opposition to democracy amount to no more than blaming the people'. The less impressive scripts merely listed what was said by critics about the ignorance and self-interestedness of the people. Such answers did not tackle the question as it stood. Likewise, candidates who tackled the More question divided between those who reflected on what might (or might not) be deemed fairness and those who did not in answering: 'Does the 'fairness' that is identified by Raphael Hythloday as a key quality of the Utopian commonwealth imply it should be regarded as a democracy'. The best essays reflected on the nature of fairness in Utopia, whether its governance could be deemed democratic, and whether a conception of fairness related to its governance. Amongst the very best answers were some on Aristotle and Roman political thought.

There were 12 first-class marks, 5 lower seconds, and the rest obtained upper seconds. There 16 answers on Plato, 17 on Machiavelli, 11 on More, 7 on Locke, and 6 on Aristotle. All other authors were discussed by at least one candidate, with the question on Aquinas receiving 2 very strong answers. It may be that the question on Hobbes was deemed particularly challenging as it met with little response. Candidates who were not familiar with Machiavelli's *Discourses* inevitably struggled with the question: 'What is the significance of Machiavelli's claim, in his *Discourse on Livy*, that the ancient Romans were more virtuous than they were fortunate?'. In such cases, they wrote of *fortuna* in *The Prince*, with no less inevitable consequences. For the Plato question, 'Is Plato's ideal city best seen as an attempt to satisfy the requirements of human nature?', some reflected on the precise requirements of human nature according to Plato's *Republic*, considered the city of pigs as well the ideal city in relation to meeting such requirements, and specified whose (if not all human beings) requirements might or might not be met in Kallipolis.   In sum, whatever the topic candidates who read questions attentively, thought of the issues underpinning them, and demonstrated close attention to the detailed argumentation in the set texts wrote engaging scripts and were duly rewarded for doing so.

In Section B, there were some impressive answers amongst the 6 that tackled Greek critics of democracy as well as those which discussed 'For early modern political theorists, how important was the question of origins in determining both the nature and the location of sovereign power?'. Weaker responses to the latter question tended to leave out or brush over one or more of the key terms 'origins', 'nature', or 'location'. All Section B questions received at least one answer bar two, namely 'To what extent did medieval thinkers recover the classical understanding of civic liberty?' and 'How important was justice in the resistance theories of the sixteenth century?'. The question on Roman political thought and early Christian thought each attracted 5 replies. The question of Renaissance humanist political thought ('How important in Renaissance humanist political thought is the use of comparison?') received most (8), some of which were very impressive in that they revealed extensive reading of the texts and the scholarly literature. They noted comparisons between individuals as well as regimes and specified the precise nature of their use by various Renaissance humanists.

As Dr Chris Brooke noted in his report for this paper last year 'a small number of essays did read as if they had their origin in supervision essays that were addressing a different question altogether, and candidates do need to be advised on the one hand that it's pretty obvious what they are doing when they hand in an essay that speaks more to the themes of, say, last year's Tripos question on a particular topic than to the question in front of them, and that on the other hand they are never likely to do especially well if they do that.' It is to be hoped that candidates do not resort to such strategies in 2023 and that Dr Brooke's comment will therefore not need repeating.

2020-21

Examiner: Christopher Brooke

Forty-five POL7 scripts were submitted in 2021 (compared to 24 last year, when the assessment was effectively optional, 47 in 2019, 42 in 2018, and 38 in 2017). After last year's exceptional measures we returned to the traditional way of marking POL7, with full blind double-marking restored. The standard was good, with the average mark across all scripts 66.9. There were fifteen first-class marks, twenty-six upper seconds, and four lower seconds.

Popular questions were on Plato, as ever (25), Machiavelli (22), More (13), and Aristotle (10), with the other topics getting single figure answers: Hobbes (8), reason of state (8), Romans (7), Renaissance humanism (7), sovereignty (7), international law (6), Locke (5), Greek critics of democracy (5), resistance theory (3), Augustine (2), temporal and spiritual power (2), religious toleration (2), the mediaeval reception of classical thought (1), mediaeval Roman law (1), and the conflict we used to call the English Civil War (1), with no answers on Aquinas or on the political thought of the early Christians. This is in line with recent patterns; the Renaissance humanism topic in particular is less popular than it used to be.

Like last year, the exam was taken remotely in the 'open book' format, i.e. candidates had access to their notes, essays, books, internet, etc. while working on their script, though this year the 'window' was six-hours long for candidates without an allowance of additional time. There was no evidence of malpractice—e.g. plagiarism—but a small number of essays did read as if they had their origin in supervision essays that were addressing a different question altogether, and candidates do need to be advised on the one hand that it's pretty obvious what they are doing when they hand in an essay that speaks more to the themes of, say, last year's Tripos question on a particular topic than to the question in front of them, and that on the other hand they are never likely to do especially well if they do that. The essays they have written for their supervisions are an invaluable resource when preparing for these exams, but the answers they submit do need to have been freshly composed in the examination itself, and tightly addressed to the particular questions that the Examiners are asking.

Turning now to those particular questions, some comments follow on those where we have five or more answers (so as to make generalisation possible). In Section A, stronger answers on Plato tended either to reflect on how the word 'utopian' can be taken in different ways or to discuss the way in which the analogy between the city and the soul complicates a straightforward answer to the question. The more successful

essays on Aristotle got stuck into particular parts of his discussions of particular issues rather than just offering an overview of the basic argument. The essays on Machiavelli were stronger to the extent that they identified points of disagreement between the arguments of the *Prince* and the *Discourses* and talked about those; weaker essays offered bland summary of some of the things that the two texts had in common, which wasn't helpful in getting a grip on the central issue raised by the question. The essays on More were generally fairly good, though a surprising number ended up spending too long discussing topics that weren't really relevant to the matter at hand. Essays on Hobbes often focused too narrowly on his argument about the covenant early on (sometimes also the state of nature and the laws of nature), bypassing his various practical discussions of how the Sovereign might prevent the commonwealth from falling apart through judicious management of religion, education, opinion, and so on. The weaker essays on Locke explained how he was disagreeing with Filmer; the stronger essays paid specific attention to the intriguing mention of 'a Captain of a Galley' in the title quotation.

For the section B topics, essays on the ancient critics of democracy found an ingenious number of different ways of approaching the topic of law, which was refreshing. Answers on the Romans went wrong either because they didn't pause for long enough over the distinction between what was 'social' and 'political' or because they focused more on how various Roman writers were distinctive, rather than addressing the character of Roman political thought more generally. The stronger answers on Renaissance humanism, unsurprisingly, were those that focused their attention on texts presented in dialogue form.

Essays on *raison d'état* that had more to say about what the various authors said about 'structures of government' were better than those that had less, and those essays that were more firmly plugged into the detail of the literature—both primary and secondary—were better than those that were not. Answers on sovereignty rewarded those candidates who were able to make pertinent distinctions amongst the various set authors, and who thought harder about what it might mean to 'escape the orbit' of absolute monarchy. The essays on international law were generally well done, with candidates having both a sense of how the various authors were deploying different sources, or locating their argument in different traditions, and sometimes with a good sense of how this cashed out in different opinions about war, empire, etc.

In short and in sum, on the evidence of these Tripos scripts the POL7 paper remains in rude health. The candidates themselves are to be congratulated for getting through the year in sometimes extremely challenging conditions.

2019-20

Examiner: Sylvana Tomaselli

24 candidates sat this paper. In Section A, the most popular question this year was on Plato (13 answers), followed by those on Machiavelli (12), More (7), Aristotle (7), Hobbes (2), Locke (1) and Aquinas (1), and none on Augustine. In Section B, the most popular question was 'What threatened the stability of democratic government in the differing opinions of its advocates and detractors?' (11), followed by 'How widely were the political ideals of the Florentine republic shared by humanist writers on politics?'(8), 'Did virtue remain the central concept in Roman political thinking despite the mutation of Rome's constitutional form ?'(4), 'Was the early modern law of nations anything more than a charter for European imperial expansion?' (3), 'In what ways did political writers of the British revolutions counter the royalist claim that kingly power came directly from God?', 'Why was Grotius so exceptional among early modern theorists of sovereignty in holding that sovereign power could be divided?', and 'What was the 'reason' in 'reason of state?' each received 1 answer. Several of the candidates chose to answer two questions in Section B.

A few points emerge that reiterate reports of previous years. The first is that while some candidates clearly mastered a wide array of subjects, some were more narrowly focused on the Ancients, and while these included excellent and clearly distinct answers, some came close to repeating the same material. The second is that some scripts seemed oblivious of the fact that they needed to be legible. The third is that, in some cases, there was a lack of critical engagement with the question and/or inattentiveness as to its precise nature. This was evident, for instance, in some of the answers to the question on More ('To what extent

should we regard Thomas More's *Utopia* as exposing the perils of hereditary monarchy?') in which monarchy and aristocracy were amalgamated into one, their hereditary aspect left unexamined, every social ill deemed, by More, to be attributable to hereditary monarchy, and the government of Utopia itself left bereft of scrutiny.

The quality of the scripts was high over-all and truly impressive in some cases. Most were well-written and structured, and the best provided a flowing well-supported argument for the answer they put forward. Some demonstrated not only a close reading of the set texts, but a genuine understanding of the issues these texts were tackling as well as of the context relevant to achieve this level of comprehension. A few were also able to provide a succinct account of the scholarly debate pertinent to the question under discussion. At the other end of the spectrum were answers that began with a potted biographical or historical account followed by a vague summary of the political thought of the author or school in question. These did not focus on the precise question addressed or left out one aspect of it. Some answers to the question on Plato's *Republic*, for example, spoke of the theory of forms, the three classes, and/or the allegory of the cave amongst other parts of that work, but did not explain what it identified as the 'requirements' of human psychology or how that related to Plato's political 'recommendations'. The city of pigs, for instance, was left unmentioned in several of the answers in which it was most needed. Some answer to the question on *Utopia* gave a very good account of Utopia's actual governance, others none. Some outlined what might be taken as 'the expression of a democratic ideal', others took it as self-evident.

Analyses of the arguments about what threatened ancient democratic government were mostly nuanced and some displayed extensive reading and genuine reflection on the views held about rhetoric, demagoguery, and political leadership. One or two of the answers on humanist writers showed unusual level of erudition and originality.

In sum, those who had read the set texts with attention to the shape and detail of the arguments within them, and the language (s) and images used by their authors, as well as demonstrated awareness of the conceptual issues involved and of the debates within the scholarship did best as always. The few, who had read only one of the set texts (e.g. *The Prince*), or who had a very superficial understanding of a set text (e.g. *Utopia*), or who did not explore the full implications of the questions, rehashing their weekly essays or regurgitating their lecture notes, did least well.

What is needed is clear evidence of textual knowledge to be sure, but of the *relevant* and *specific* parts of the text(s). This requires knowledge of the text(s) in the first place, but that should be taken to mean an *understanding* of what they seek to achieve and how they do so, not mere restatement of what it was that the author wrote. This may very well require some biographical knowledge or knowledge of the intellectual and historical contexts in which the author(s) under consideration wrote, but such a knowledge needs to be selective, woven into the answer where appropriate, and only presented if specifically *relevant* to the issue at hand.

This said, this truly was a very good year for POL 7, one that reflected the very high intellectual standard of the lectures and supervisions provided.

2018-19

Examiner: Christopher Brooke

Forty-seven scripts were generated for this paper (up from 42 in 2018 and 38 in 2017), and blind double-marked in the usual way. The standard of the answers was pleasingly high: thirteen students received a first-class mark overall, there were thirty upper seconds, and four lower seconds.

The more popular questions were on Plato (19 answers), Machiavelli (18), More (15), Aristotle (14—more popular than usual), Athenian democracy (10), *raison d'état* (9), and Renaissance humanism (7—less popular than usual). All questions attracted at least one answer—though Aquinas, the mediaeval reception of classical thought, and the English Civil War attracted only one answer. The mediaeval topics were not wholly

neglected: there were four answers on Augustine, four on the early Christians, three on papal power, and two on Roman law. We had fewer answers than we normally receive on Hobbes and Locke.

In general, there were no glaring problems. Last year's Examiner's Report, for example, chastised POL7 candidates for their "insufficiently close engagement with the relevant set texts" and for being "excessively dependent on the views of Bernard Williams concerning Plato, and of Quentin Skinner concerning, especially, Machiavelli and More", but there was little sign of these difficulties this year. Very few essays indeed read like rehashed supervision essays or regurgitated lecture notes. Indeed, the wide range of different arguments that were attempted with respect to the various authors, texts, and topics strongly suggested that students were thinking for themselves, drawing productively on a broad range of reading and reflection—and this made the Examiners very happy to see.

Turning to particular questions in Section A: writing on Plato was very popular, as ever, with the stronger essays avoiding the Scylla of too much exposition of Socrates' argument, getting in the way of answering the question posed, on the one hand, and the Charybdis of having so much to say about particular commentators that a central line of argument was obscured, on the other. Weaker essays on Aristotle got bogged down in his typology of regimes, and had less to say about the concept of *politeia* itself. A strong essay on Augustine needed to discuss (i) love, (ii) as it operates within his political theory, (iii) with specific reference to the text of *City of God*, with too many candidates only managing two out of three. There was a nice variety of answers to the Machiavelli question (concerning war, glory, *fortuna*, religion, the army, dictatorship, tumults, the mixed constitution, liberty, *virtù*, and so on), with stronger essays moving beyond "because that's what humanists did" to focus on a single line of argument ("what best explains…"), discussing particular examples from the set texts, and avoiding getting sidetracked by the attempt to resolve interpretative disagreements in the secondary scholarship. As is usual, the strongest essays on *Utopia* were very strong indeed, with good answers often seeing that the word "virtuous" isn't entirely straightforward, and could be pointing in a number of different directions. Too many candidates who answered on Hobbes just didn't know enough about what he had to say about correct speech in *Leviathan* to write a good essay. Essays on Locke were either weak (candidates with only an introductory knowledge of his political theory, who tried to make things about "liberalism") or strong (candidates who had thought quite a bit about God in Locke's theory, and had things to say), with not much by way of any middle ground.

In Section B, answers to the question on Athenian democracy sometimes spent too long discussing rhetoric or knowledge when there was still quite a bit to say about equality. The stronger essays on Renaissance humanism saw that there were different conceptions of liberty in the various texts, and discussed what some of these were. Some answers on *raison d'état* were strong, with good knowledge especially of Botero on display, but they were strongest when they addressed the precise theme picked out by the question (the relationship between prudence and virtue), rather than just saying a few things about prudence, and a few things about virtue. Essays on international law often expressed criticism of early modern European imperialism, but were stronger to the extent that they were able to explore this theme through the theoretical texts under consideration.

2017-18

Examiner: Christopher Brooke

Forty-two candidates sat the paper, slightly up on last year's thirty-eight. Six received an overall First-class mark, there were thirty-three Upper Seconds, and three Lower Seconds. The median mark was 65, and the mean 65.33.

The Plato question is perennially popular, attracting twenty answers this year, after which they lined up as follows: Machiavelli (14), Locke (12), Renaissance humanism (12), More (9), Hobbes (8), Aristotle (7), Athenian democracy (7), Augustine (6), sovereignty (6), mediaeval reception of classical thought (5), Romans (4), British revolutions (4), resistance theory (3), international law (3), toleration (3), early Christians (2),

Aquinas (1), and *raison d'état* (1), with two of the mediaeval questions, on spiritual and temporal power and on Roman law, attracting no candidates.

The most general difficulty was an insufficiently close engagement with the relevant set texts. Examiners on this paper are used, for example, to essays on Augustine reading as if textbooks were among the main sources, rather than *City of God*, and to Aristotle answers offering too much general summary of his system before getting stuck in to the particular question that has been asked. But this year a version of this problem bedevilled the answers on Hobbes's *Leviathan*, too, with answers that weren't sufficiently able to support their arguments by showing close familiarity with the more puzzling or challenging relevant bits of his text. Other candidates threw away marks with insufficiently productive approaches to the questions (so discussing the mediaeval reception of classical thought in general, rather than specifically with reference to the question of human nature; and the question about what the Athenian critics of democracy shared attracted answers that focused either on what they didn't share, or on some very bland thoughts indeed, e.g. that they didn't like tyrants).

There are some welcome developments. Earlier iterations of this paper have seen candidates excessively dependent on the views of Bernard Williams concerning Plato, and of Quentin Skinner concerning, especially, Machiavelli and More. This tendency was not nearly so prominent this year, with Ferrari, Schofield, Ober, and, especially, Nehamas lining up as alternative interpreters of Plato with whom candidates engaged more or less productively. (There was one mention of Skinner that delighted the Examiners, however, in an essay which discussed his views as if he were actually a participant in the great constitutional debates of 1640!) And—pleasingly—there was next to no sign of essays on particular topics that read as if great chunks of lecture notes were being paraphrased or summarised this time around, with the candidates taking a diversity of approaches, strongly suggesting that they are really thinking for themselves as they construct their answers.